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Abstract

The quest for the historical Jesus can be advanced by a consideration of disagreement scenarios recorded in the gospels. Such “conflicts” afford the opportunity not only to analyse the positions of the protagonists, but by comparing them, to better appreciate their relative stances.

One area of disagreement that has remained largely unexplored is that between Jesus and the Pharisees over the “kingdom of God”. Indeed, “kingdom of God” formed the very foundation of Jesus’ preaching and thus ought to be the place where fundamental disagreements are to be found. As Luke 17:20-21 represents the only passage in the Gospels where the Pharisees show any interest in the kingdom of God, it forms the central hub of the thesis around which an account of the disparate beliefs of Jesus and the Pharisees on the kingdom of God is constructed.

The main thesis is this. Luke 17:20-21 can best be explained, at the level of the Pharisees and Jesus, as betraying a fundamental disagreement, not in the identity of the kingdom of God, which they both regarded as primarily the Divine Royal Presence, i.e. God himself as king, but in the location of that kingdom. The Pharisees located the kingdom in the here-and-now, Jesus located it in heaven. Conversely, at later stages in the formation of the pericope, the pre-Lukan community identified the kingdom as the Holy Spirit located in individuals with faith in Jesus and the redactor identified the kingdom as Jesus, located both in the Historical Jesus and the Jesus now in heaven.

Chapter 1, after the usual preliminary remarks, presents an analysis of Luke 17:20-21 as a chreia, a literary form ideally suited as the basis on which to compare the beliefs of the Pharisees and Jesus. The work of three scholars vital to the development of the main thesis is then reviewed and evaluated. By way of background, a portrait of the Pharisees is then presented, highlighting in particular, issues that will be of importance in later chapters. Finally, a section on the Aramaic Targums suggests that some targum traditions may be traced back prior to AD 70 and that these reflect the influence and beliefs of first century Palestinian Pharisees.

Chapters 2 and 3 are a consideration of every instance of the explicit mention of God as king (or his kingship) and the Divine Kingdom respectively, in contemporary and earlier Jewish Palestinian literature and in Luke-Acts. A model of the kingdom of God is developed in these chapters that will be applied to Luke 17:20-21 in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 presents a detailed exegesis of Luke 17:20-21, taking into account scholarship on the pericope since the last monograph (an unpublished dissertation of 1962) on the chreia. It offers a composition history of the pericope and measures previous exegesis against the view of the kingdom of God as developed in chapters 2 and 3.

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the work that relates directly to Luke 17:20-21, some implications arising from the findings and, several possible avenues for future research.
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Every effort has been made to conform all abbreviations and other issues of style to the following:


Where discrepancies exist, it is hoped that ambiguity will not.

Two exceptions to the above should be noted.

Where the use of a captial letter for a proper noun is either not given or is ambiguous, the lower case has been preferred, e.g. tent (of meeting), rather than Tent (of Meeting).

The second exception to the above is the inclusion, in footnote citations, of the date of publication and, where relevant, edition details (in superscript). Such information in the footnotes proves useful in noting over time the persistence of an idea or the progress of a debate. It is also of some benefit in looking up the details of the particular citation in the Bibliography, especially when a scholar is represented by several or more works.
1 INTRODUCTION

Once Jesus was asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God was coming, and he answered, “The kingdom of God is not coming with things that can be observed; nor will they say, ‘Look, here it is!’ or ‘There it is!’ For, in fact, the kingdom of God is among you.”

(Luke 17:20-21, NRSV)

1.1 PREFACE

The third quest for the historical Jesus is distinguished by two major scholarly endeavours: to understand the Jewish milieu in which Jesus of Nazareth lived and of which he was a part; and to peel away the layers of redaction and tradition that have contributed to the extant canonical Gospels, in an attempt to get as close as possible to the actual words and deeds of Jesus.¹

Both enterprises feature scholars who are either sceptics or fundamentalists, but many today seek to take a mediating position.² This third group, while fully taking account of the fact that the extant gospels do not necessarily contain the ipsissima verba of Jesus, but rather betray also stages of formation subsequent to the events described, nevertheless acknowledge their essential reliability. Its members accept too that Jesus was a Jew who lived and preached in the predominantly Jewish sections (Galilee, and Judaea) of the Roman province of Syria in the first century A.D., with all that that implies as regards beliefs, culture, language, etc.

This work seeks to understand Jesus of Nazareth by comparison and contrast with the pre-70 Pharisees, while fully taking into account the possibility of manipulation of the


² “The view today seems to be that we can know pretty well what Jesus was out to accomplish, that we can know a lot about what he said, and that these two things make sense within the world of first century Judaism”, E. P. Sanders, (1985), Jesus and Judaism, 2. Cf. N. T. Wright, (1992²), “History and Theology”, 379.
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Gospel text up to its final redaction, since it is often in disagreements that the protagonists and a third party can better understand, if not appreciate, the positions taken. Jesus and the Pharisees disputed over many points and so it is not unreasonable to suppose that a careful analysis of these disputes will lead to a better comprehension of the beliefs and assumptions of both Jesus and the Pharisees.

Jacob Neusner identified three main areas of halakot of primary concern to pre-70 Pharisees: ritual purity (mostly to do with food and hand-washing), Sabbath observance and tithing.\(^3\) It is precisely these areas that form the topics of the majority of disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees as depicted in the Gospels. To a non-Jewish reader of the twenty-first century, these disagreements may seem trivial to the point of absurdity. The fact that they argued at all about these issues demonstrates that they had some common basis from which to argue. Surprisingly enough for us, it was not the existence of these areas that was the cause of friction, but how they were to be observed, in short, their respective halakot.\(^4\) In that, Jesus and the Pharisees were no different from any other group in the multi-faceted world that was first-century Judaism.

This work then is directed not to one of the three issues identified above, but to the common basis, the foundational belief, that probably lies behind the disagreements between Jesus and at least some of the Pharisees. To that end we need look no further than the overriding theme of Jesus’ teaching, namely the kingdom of God.

---


\(^4\) Fredriksen, (2000), Jesus of Nazareth, 52, made the significant observation that concern with sacrifice and purity was inherent in the religious ritual of the ancient world, both eastern and western. Dunn, (1988), “Pharisees, Sinners, and Jesus”, 273, noted that no one in ancient Judaism argued the necessity of observing the Sabbath.
1.2 AIM, METHOD AND SOURCES

It is an extraordinary fact that while the kingdom of God was the predominant theme of Jesus’ teaching, there is only one place in all the Gospels in which the Pharisees are said to have expressed any curiosity themselves in the kingdom of God. Certainly, Jesus had a great deal to say about what he thought of the Pharisees’ attitude to the kingdom of God, if the Gospel records are to believed on this point, especially as recorded in Matt 23. Yet, it is only in Luke 17:20-21 that we find the Pharisees themselves - or rather a group of them - mentioning anything at all about the kingdom of God.

A thorough understanding of Luke 17:20-21, therefore, will encourage comparison between the Pharisees and Jesus on the kingdom of God and contribute to our understanding both of the historical Jesus and of first century Pharisees.

1.2.1 Aim

The aim of this thesis is three-fold.

The ultimate aim is to present an exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 based on a particular understanding of the “kingdom of God” developed in the preceding chapters. Given its enigmatic nature, the pericope will form both an ideal test case and sufficient reason for developing such an understanding.

While attempts at the exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 abound, this one will, one hopes, be different on at least three counts.

Firstly, whereas most commentaries have concentrated almost exclusively on the meaning of the words παρατηρήσεως and ἐντός, the emphasis here will be on the subject of the conversation, namely the kingdom of God. The exegesis of the pericope will be the subject of special study in chapter 4.

Secondly, it will be an exegesis that pays particular attention to the generally accepted three stages of gospel formation and will note the influences that resulted in modification of the pericope during its transmission and final redaction.5

Thirdly, much effort will be devoted to ascertaining the attitude of the Pharisees to the kingdom of God. The reason for this is that the literary form of Luke 17:20-21 provides a unique opportunity to compare and contrast the views of the Pharisees and those of Jesus

5 More will be said on this in the next Section, 1.2.2 and in Section 4.1.
(and subsequent stages in formation) on this matter.\textsuperscript{6} By doing so, a better understanding of their relative positions should be possible. Though the primary interest will be on establishing the likely understanding held by the historical Jesus and the Pharisees themselves, this will of necessity entail discerning the particular contributions of the pre-Lukan community and of the redactor himself so that these can be distinguished from those held originally by Jesus and the Pharisees.\textsuperscript{7}

The intermediate aim then, will be to arrive at an understanding of the kingdom of God that can be considered contemporary to each of the three stages of the formation of the pericope. This will properly be the subject of chapter 3.

The proximate aim, the subject of chapter 2, will be an investigation of certain consequences stemming from the metaphor of God as king. Since it will be determined in chapter 3 that “kingdom of God” meant both for Jesus and the Pharisees primarily God Himself as king, a thorough appreciation of the metaphor of God as king with particular emphasis on the Divine Royal Presence will first need to be established.

Various preliminary issues, the resolution of which will aid the attainment of the aims, will be considered in this Introduction chapter, after discussion of method and sources.

\subsection*{1.2.2 Method}

The method will be largely determined by the aim as outlined above. Indeed, a variety of methods will be employed and to avoid reinventing the wheel on every page, many will, of necessity, go unacknowledged.

However, two assumptions underlying the approach are of such importance that they ought to be mentioned here. They result in two methodological considerations which will then be outlined.

The first assumption will be that both the Pharisees and Jesus (and for that matter their followers) were each inheritors of and contributed to the theological stream of which they were a part. In other words, for any given text there is both continuity and discontinuity with intellectual antecedents.\textsuperscript{8}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{6} See Section 1.3.
  \item \textsuperscript{7} This is something like the so-called criterion of dissimilarity or discontinuity. However, its use here will be to discern the contribution of each stage - not the complete understanding at each stage. For more on this criterion, see Section 4.4.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} With different terminology, this might also explained by acknowledging that the sources, especially the Torah and Prophets, were normative for first century Jews. Even though the major emphasis is on the diachronic approach (i.e. looking for streams of tradition), it should not be
\end{itemize}
There is continuity because both Jesus and the Pharisees and, for that matter, the pre-Lukan community and the redactor are inheritors of theological streams of tradition or “prior notions” (Vorstellungen). Indeed, it is impossible for it to be otherwise, since it is impossible for a text (or conversation based on mutually agreed terms) to originate utterly divorced from its intellectual world.9

On the other hand, there is discontinuity whenever a new nuance of that tradition is attempted or whenever that tradition is interpreted and preserved for current and future generations. Luke 17:20-21 can be no exception.

To trace therefore the development of the foundational understanding of “kingdom of God” forms no mere background to Luke 17:20-21, but constitutes an integral part of its exegesis. Recognising the theological baggage that each person or group brought to the incident or pericope enables an appreciation of its intended meaning more in tune with the period of its formation.

The second assumption will be that despite the fact that Luke 17:20-21 is from the so-called L source, it nevertheless underwent three stages of formation typical of much gospel material. These stages can be delineated in the following way.10

a) The (final) redaction, which resulted, practically speaking, in the text as we have it and in the location in which he/they placed it. For convenience sake we shall call this redactor(s) ‘Luke’ and use masculine singular pronouns.11

b) The oral or written form which underwent incorporation and alteration by the (final) redactor. For our purposes, it is generally considered to have been the form that circulated and developed in the early pre-Lukan (Christian) community.
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c) The oral stage prior to any serious or discernible influence by the second stage. This may or may not represent the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, but is more likely to do so than the final redaction.

Each chapter, and particularly chapter 4, will be arranged in such a way that issues affecting each stage of formation will be dealt with separately.

Reiteration of these now well-known stages is important because exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 has in the past largely proceeded as if one or more of these stages did not exist. In other words, scholars have generally simply assumed either that what Luke meant by the words, particularly the actual words of Jesus, is what Jesus also meant by them, or that the words of Jesus as recorded by the redactor are the actual words spoken by him (allowing of course for translation from Aramaic into Greek). The result has been that no serious effort has been made to date to offer an explanation of the meaning of the passage within the context of each of the three stages of formation. 12

With these assumptions in mind, two methods employed in this present thesis deserve mention and justification.

The first is that the so-called “case study” approach will be used. Individual passages (or, in the case of Luke 17:20-21, individual clauses) will be examined one-by-one, largely in isolation from one another, so that the particular concept of Divine Royal Presence they carry may be considered objectively and independently. Only with the synthesis will a reconstruction of trajectories of tradition and an articulation of fundamental connecting ideas be made. 13 The case study approach offers one of the best ways of limiting the inevitable imposition of preconceived ideas in any examination of history.

The second method to be employed, already hinted at, will be to ask of each passage how the writer understood the Divine Royal Presence, particularly its location and identity.

It may be objected that the use of the notion of Divine Royal Presence or indeed of taking for granted three stages in gospel formation is nothing more than eisegesis, that is, looking for something that one has already decided is there. 14

---

12 To be fair, several scholars have remarked that what Jesus meant by the words may not be what Luke meant by them, but they have made nothing of it. E.g. Creed, (1930), *Luke*, 219b; P. M. S. Allen, (1938), “Luke xvii. 21”, 476b. To his credit, Sneed, (1962), *Dissertation*, chapter 5, made such an attempt. It was however, far from balanced, see Section 1.4.3.3.


In response, one may say the following. There is a fine line between what is preconceived and therefore perhaps prejudiced and what is carefully considered. Circular arguments can be minimised: by not wanting to say more than the evidence allows, that is, by being deliberately cautious in drawing conclusions and accepting data; by allowing some expected evidence to say nothing at all; and, when positive evidence is found, by placing it up against similar observations made by other scholars for different purposes and in different contexts. Each of these will be firmly in mind as the ancient texts are considered.

Two other short comments are necessary.

Philosophical reflection has been carefully avoided. Often it would have been easy to place certain conclusions into metaphysical or existential categories, but this would have been anachronistic if not simply inaccurate. None of the sources consulted made any pretence to philosophical forms. This meant that they were interested, not in the existence or otherwise of God nor of his nature per se, nor indeed how that god was to be experienced in himself, but in how they perceived the God of the covenant to be working in history and as we shall see, where he was present in relation to their world. It will become clear too that Wolfhart Pannenberg’s work on the philosophy of the kingdom of God, adopted by numerous other scholars, in which he claimed that God’s “[active] rule and his being are inseparable”, is patently not subscribed to by the writers of the texts. Apart from being unrepresented, it ignores the desire to explain evil or misfortune (theodicy) as being allowed by God’s inactivity (hiddenness) while at the same time desiring to maintain a belief in God’s abiding presence and kingship. Again, only an analysis of the relevant data from the perspective of Divine Royal Presence can demonstrate this.

It would be equally tempting is to succumb to mysticism. Yet, there is no hint of a desire for a spiritual unity of the individual with the Divine King in any of the texts studied, even in the “visions”. Certainly later theologians, both Jewish and Christian, exploited the potential of the Divine King or kingdom of God motif for mysticism, but their reflections frequently bore little exegetical relationship to the originally-intended meaning.

---

17 Pannenberg, (1969ET), The Kingdom of God, 56.
19 E.g. Sir 49:8. One also thinks immediately for example of the allegorical method of Origen (see Section 4.3.4.1 under Recent Exegetical Comment) and especially of the Merkavah (“chariot”) mysticism of some parts of medieval Judaism (see Section 2.2.1.2 under Ezek 20:33). See also E. P. Sanders, (1977), Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 220 n. 50.
1.2.3 Sources

Various restrictions will be observed in the accumulation of data, specifically in the material that will be addressed. These limitations are imposed to a great extent by the aim of the present work and by considerations of space.

Chapter 4 will attempt, among other things, to present a comprehensive if not complete picture of modern scholarship on Luke 17:20-21, especially since the work of Richard J. Sneed in 1962. This will be weighed against the proposed exegesis based on the understanding of “kingdom of God” developed in chapters 2 and 3.

Notions of Divine Royal Presence discussed in chapters 2 and 3 will be confined to their association with the explicit mention of God as king or his kingship (chapter 2) and the kingdom of God (chapter 3). In the Hebrew and Aramaic texts for example, this means only considering those texts and their contexts that use the word קַיִם or its cognates in relation to God (and βασιλεία for the Greek texts).

The objection might be that such a limitation of the sources will necessarily ignore many other relevant, albeit indirect, references. But if the thesis that will be presented here can be sustained in the case of the most explicit cases, it augurs well for demonstrating it using less direct anchor points. Indeed, conclusions based on less explicit cases must themselves be weighed and measured against the more explicit.

This limitation also has positive advantages. It avoids the danger of imposing Divine King or kingship or kingdom of God ideas where the implication is secondary and therefore possibly less clear, or in reality non-existent. It provides the opportunity for clarity in following the development and use of the metaphors and their relationship to the notion of Divine Royal Presence, while at the same time offering the possibility for thoroughness.

In any case, it is not the primary intention of chapters 2 and 3, for example, to discuss every nuance of meaning behind the metaphor of God as “king” and the “kingdom of God”, but simply to gain some insight into the legacy the various documents bequeathed to, and the light they shed on the concept of Divine Royal Presence.

---

20 See Section 1.4.3.
23 If this were the intention, then the comments of Brettler, (1989), God is King, 23, would be pertinent here.
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The assumption that the final redaction of the Gospel of Luke and Acts took place late in the first century, namely after A.D. 70, provides a convenient terminus ante quem in considering relevant documents. Their provenance is less certain, though it was probably written outside Palestine (possibly in Antioch) for a largely, though not exclusively, Gentile audience.

Consequently, the Palestinian Judaism of Luke’s (the redactor’s) time is to be found in the legacy of the Yavnean rabbis (A.D. 68 - 132) and the synagogues of the period.

With regard to rabbinic literature, therefore, account will only be taken of the Mishnah. Although redacted ca. A.D. 200 in Palestine, it nevertheless is the document that has the best chance of reflecting the thoughts of the Yavnean rabbis. The Tosefta and the baraitoth of later literature will be ignored as being too far removed from the first century to be trustworthy, even after critical evaluation.

As for the teaching emanating from first century synagogues, the Targumim will be of major importance in this study. It will be argued in Section 1.6 of this Introduction that the traditions or substance lying behind some targumim may have the potential to be traced back to the pre-70 and early post-70 synagogue.


25 Prior to, during, and after the first Jewish revolt of A.D. 66-70, many of the leading Jews of Jerusalem re-grouped in Yavneh (Jamnia) under Yohanan ben Zakkai. Yavneh was a coastal town near Azotus (Ashdod) to which Vespasian had sent loyal Jews (J.W. 4:130,444). On the Yavnean rabbis, see Gafni, (1987), “Historical Background”, 14-20.


Since the aim of this present work is to discern the relative positions of the Pharisees and Jesus regarding the kingdom of God, the Dead Sea Scrolls will not be considered. The exception will be where they shed light on the original Hebrew of an otherwise relevant translated document. The Qumran sect neither claimed to be nor were, as far as we know, either Pharisaic or Christian. 29

Diaspora documents such as the Septuagint and Philo will also be ignored because the interest here is exclusively Palestinian. The two exceptions are those deuterocanonical books for which an earlier Palestinian origin can be established (e.g. Sirach) and the writings of Josephus, since he was based in Palestine for most of his life and was an eyewitness to the Pharisees. A similar limitation will be placed on a consideration of books normally assigned to the Pseudepigrapha.

It may be objected that the LXX can on occasion represent a lost early Hebrew/Aramaic manuscript and that in any case Diaspora Judaism prior to A.D. 70 may have influenced the Judaism of Palestine, 30 so that the LXX ought to form an important potential witness to Palestinian thought. However, a comparison of the LXX with the \textit{BHS} with respect to material considered in this thesis reveals that it is not often that they are very different in substance. The position adopted here will be that, unless contrary evidence exists, the differences between the LXX and the \textit{BHS} will be considered generally to be the result of the concerns of the translators, the needs of their (Diaspora) audience, and to factors peculiar to Egypt and its Hellenistic milieu. 31 In other words, the LXX translators were largely operating from a Hebrew and Aramaic text not appreciably different in most places from the \textit{BHS}. 32 However, since other explanations are possible, where such differences do exist, they will be noted and discussed individually in the footnotes.

---

29 Some would want to identify the Pharisees with “the seekers of smooth things” or “Ephraim” in Qumran texts, but the identification is far from certain, see footnote in Section 1.5.1. A good example, too, of the limitation imposed here, is the exclusion from consideration of the “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice” (11Q17, 4Q400-407). Despite the numerous references to God as king and to his kingdom, they are generally considered to be from the Qumran sect, though Newsom, (1992), “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice”, \textit{ABD VI}, 155b, considered it possible that they were not originally composed by the Qumran community.

30 E.g. Hengel, (1974\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Judaism and Hellenism I}, 312.


1.3 LUKE 17:20-21 AND ITS LITERARY FORM

The literary or rhetorical form of Luke 17:20-21 has been variously classified. Martin Dibelius classified it as a “paradigm” (πράξεις).33 Rudolf K. Bultmann labelled it a “scholastic dialogue” type of “apophthegm” (ἀπόφθεγμα).34 Vincent Taylor called it a “pronouncement story”.35

While Dibelius and Taylor did not attempt to further classify their paradigms and pronouncement stories into types, Bultmann divided his apophthegms into three classes which unfortunately overlook significant similarities and differences between the texts.36

In recent years further division of types and refinement of definition of Taylor’s “pronouncement story” have been undertaken by Robert C. Tannehill. Under his system, Luke 17:20-21 is a correction-pronouncement story.37 Further nuances of types have been proposed by Vernon K. Robbins based on classical works.38

There are two major problems with the above labels. One is that they are inventions of modern times and do not take into account the system of classification operating in the first century A.D. when the pericope was written and the question and response first uttered.39 When an artificial framework is constructed, the intention of the original author in formulating the pericope, or the intention of those who subsequently use it, may be lost. The other problem is that the labels are not exact equivalents of one another, so that a pericope labelled a paradigm under the system proposed by Dibelius may not be called a

---

33 This was done in the earlier edition of his work. In the later edition, Dibelius, (1965ET), From Tradition to Gospel, 156, 158, 163; he considerably modified his views. For a critique of Dibelius’ “paradigm”, see Robbins, (1989), “Chreia & Pronouncement Story in Synoptic Studies”, 3-6.


pronouncement story in another.\textsuperscript{40} Not only then is there little uniformity in classification, there is the potential for confusing and contradictory conclusions based on different classification systems.

Yet classification remains important because it leads to a better understanding of the intended purpose and therefore the meaning of the account.

\subsection*{1.3.1 The Chreia}

In recent years a few authors have renewed the preference for the rhetorical form known as the chreia (χρεῖα, sometimes spelt “chria”),\textsuperscript{41} It was one of the ten fundamental rhetorical forms taught student writers and orators as well as budding philosophers.\textsuperscript{42} Thus it has the advantage of having being well known and having been closely defined by the rhetoricians at the time when the canonical Gospels (including Luke) were written. Indeed, the definition of the rhetorician Aelius Theon, who lived in Alexandria in the mid to late first century A.D.,\textsuperscript{43} is to be favoured over other classical attempts because of its precision and because it is contemporary to the formation of the third gospel.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{40} E.g. discussion in Robbins, (1981), “Classifying Pronouncement Stories”, 31. Dibelius, (1965\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{From Tradition to Gospel}, 152-53, placed the “Chria” as a subset of “Apophthegmata”.
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Theon, *Progymnasmata* lines 2-4

Theon, *Progymnasmata* lines 2-4

Χρεία ἐστί σύντομος ἀπόφασις ἢ πράξεις μετ’ εὐστοχίας ἀναφερομένη εἰς τι ὄρισμένου πρόσωπου ἢ ἀναλογούν προσώπῳ.

Translation of Theon, *Progymnasmata* lines 2-4

A chreia is a concise statement or action which is attributed with aptness to some specified character or to something analogous to a character.

While it is clear that Luke 17:20-21 is an example of a chreia, the extant version has three statements attributed to the character of Jesus rather than the usual one. The statements are preceded by a question from the Pharisees.

Chreiai were used as repositories of received wisdom. In other words, as James R. Butts put it, they were “carriers of culture”. Theon himself said “it is useful in many ways for life”. Their form was such that it made them easier to remember and recall in debate or speech.

Chreiai have been detected not only in the gospels but in rabbinic literature, including the Mishnah and in other ancient Jewish and Christian literature. This suggests that this Hellenistic literary form was well known not only in Diaspora Jewish and Christian circles but in those of Palestine. In particular, according to Tannehill, “correction stories” are one of the more common types of “pronouncement stories” in many classical authors.

This coincides with what we know of the formation and preservation of classical Greek chreiai. Chreiai were composed to preserve teachings for learning. By the time of Theon (i.e. the NT), nothing of substance was invented in the preservation and manipulation of

---

chreia, although manipulation can be detected if individual chreiai are traced over time. This is not to say that chreiai were retained word-for-word, but their sense and meaning were, including the attribution to a particular character.

Luke 17:20-21 was likely formed as a chreia to meet the apologetic, catechetical and homiletical needs of the community. The disproportionally large number of so-called “correction stories” found only in Luke (L) indicates that this literary form was favoured by the pre-Lukian community with the possibility that Luke 17:20-21 received its chreia form not from the redactor but from this community or perhaps even earlier.

It is likely then that as a chreia Luke 17:20-21 was not composed by the redactor but incorporated into the gospel from some earlier source. A pre-Lukian community probably formed it into a chreia from an oral tradition or traditions about Jesus and preserved it in written form. To have invented such a chreia at any stage would have defeated its purpose since it was essential that hearers acknowledge its authenticity. Yet the very act of incorporating it into his gospel entailed some level of manipulation on the part of the redactor. As part of the exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 in chapter 4, a likely scenario for the manipulation of the passage and the possible reasons for doing so will be traced.


55 Whether this occurred in Palestine or in the Diaspora is not actually relevant. We may assume however, that very early on apologetic, catechetical and homiletical preaching extended from Hebrew and/or Aramaic into Greek in Palestine. The chreia was a well established rhetorical form that reached into all levels of society and to all parts of the empire,Tacitus, Dial. 19. See also footnote 51 above on chreiai in the Gospels, rabbinic literature and other Jewish and Christian literature.

1.3 Introduction: Luke 17:20-21 and its Literary Form

1.3.2 A Responsive Sayings Chreia

While Theon gave the usual division of chreiai into sayings (λογικαί), action (πρακτικαί) and mixed (μικταί), another great advantage in using Theon as the master is that he - virtually alone - further subdivided sayings and action chreiai.57

Theon wrote that each sayings chreia (“those which make their point in words without action”) presents either a statement (ἀπόφασις) or a response (ἀπόκρισις). The statement could either be unprompted or could arise out of a specific circumstance. The response can be to: a simple question; an inquiry; a question calling for an explanation; and a fourth type about which Theon is ambiguous.59

Robert C. Tannehill, in opting for the designation “pronouncement story”, effectively made that equal to the responsive sayings chreia of Theon.

The presence of Ἐπερωτήθης in 20a and γὰρ in 21b enables Luke 17:20-21 to be classed as a responsive sayings chreia to a question which prompted an explanation.60

1.3.3 Expressed as a Change of Subject

Theon then went on to elaborate 12 ways in which chreiai may be expressed.61 Number 11 is relevant to Luke 17:20-21 for it is the chreia expressed with a change of subject. The question of when the kingdom of God prompts in response a series of statements that simply do not answer the question. We do not find out when the kingdom of God is to come.

Robert Tannehill’s study of pronouncement stories both in the gospels and in classical literature led him to devise six categories which delineate the various relationships between

---

57 Theon, Progynasmata lines 30-31; Hock and O’Neil, (1986), The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric, 84.
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The prompting statement (Tannehill: stimulus, stimulating occasion) and the response.\(^62\) While noting that the stimulus may take numerous forms, he observed that:

“...In the case of requests or questions, the primary character does not respond by granting the request or answering the question but by correcting an assumption on which the request or question was based.”\(^63\)

This is very similar to Theon’s sub-category of “change of subject”.

Assuming that Tannehill is correct and that this can be applied to Luke 17:20-21 (which he himself does\(^64\)), the three responses lead to the conclusion that they not only negate the views held by the Pharisees or whoever the “Pharisees” stand for in the various stages of the tradition, but that, by not directly answering the question, Jesus effectively undermines the assumption on which the question is based (cf. Luke 11:27-28\(^65\)).

Noting that Luke 17:20-21 is a chreia expressed as a change of subject also enables the question to be classed as rhetorical. It is possible, even likely, that no answer was expected, but that by asking it something is thereby being obliquely asserted or denied.\(^66\) Therefore, it is that which is indirectly asserted or denied which becomes the target of the responses. If the question can be traced back to the Pharisees themselves, it says something about the motive behind the question - an issue that has at times been hotly debated.\(^67\)

Luke 17:20-21 is therefore uniquely suited to the purpose intended in this thesis. Not only is it the only pericope in which Pharisees are reported to show interest in the kingdom of God, its very form shows that it is fruitful ground from which to extract not simply the meaning of the story but the assumptions underlying it. Ultimately, the chreia is not about the \textit{when} of the kingdom of God, nor directly about the \textit{coming} of the kingdom. It is about the different and contrasting notions that the Pharisees and Jesus had about the kingdom and specifically about where each located this kingdom.

\(^{62}\) The six are: correction, commendation, objection, quest, inquiry and description. There is an inherent inconsistency in the categorisation, as pointed out by Bailey and Vander Broek, (1992), \textit{Literary Forms}, 116. This is addressed by Tannehill, (1981), “The Pronouncement Story and its Types”, 6.


\(^{65}\) Dibelius, (1965\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{From Tradition to Gospel}, 162, described this as a “Chria”.

\(^{66}\) Corbett, (1990\textsuperscript{1}), \textit{Classical Rhetoric}, 460.

\(^{67}\) See Section 4.2.1.1.
1.3.4 Manipulated by Expansion

In Theon’s third and last section on chreiai, he discussed their manipulation. The chreia can be changed in eight ways. The one relevant to our chreia is “expansion”, where in a sayings chreia the response can be enlarged or the number of responses increased.

Recent scholarship, particularly under the direction of Vernon K. Robbins, has sought to differentiate between an expansion and an elaboration in chreiai by their order of argumentation. An expanded chreia completes the presentation with a dramatic finish, whereas an elaborated chreia has the most important point at the beginning with the argumentation flowing from it.

Based on such a refinement of Theon’s classification, Luke 17:20-21 is an expanded responsive sayings chreia expressed with a change of subject and prompted by a question calling for an explanation.

Theon’s work is useful in an appreciation of Luke 17:20-21 because it enables us not only to describe the rhetorical form and style in a way that may have been familiar to the redactor, but it also enables us to pin-point with a high degree of certainty the purpose or climax of the pericope, which is v. 21b, “For, in fact, the kingdom of God is among you”. Equally importantly, it suggests that the extant text, because of its expanded form, may have been the result of manipulation probably both by the redactor and by those who preserved and passed on the chreia. Yet it also affirms that the attribution and the setting of the chreia were important and essential aspects of its preservation. In other words, it was not the question (since it wasn’t answered) but who asked it and its underlying assumption that was important in this particular instance. It calls for an understanding of what the Pharisees themselves understood by the “kingdom of God”, an analysis that, strangely, has been almost totally lacking in discussions of Luke 17:20-21. It is hoped that this present work will go someway to remedying the situation.

1.4 THREE IMPORTANT SCHOLARS

Of all the scholars that will be consulted during the course of this thesis, three call for special mention here because without their unique contributions this thesis would have been all the poorer if not downright impossible.

1.4.1 Samuel L. Terrien on Divine Presence

One of the unique approaches in this present work is that the notion of Divine Royal Presence is to be used as a tool to understand the notion of the “kingdom of God”. This understanding in turn will help us to appreciate more fully the intended meaning of Luke 17:20-21. With that end in view, the following comments on Terrien’s work are offered.

Consideration of the notion of Divine Presence per se and its place in the history of ideas as preserved in the Bible and other associated literature is synonymous with the 1978 work of Samuel L. Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: toward a new Biblical Theology.*

This is not to say of course that Divine Presence was not studied prior to Terrien’s work, but it is this book which established the notion, alongside others such as covenant and Salvation-History, as a major OT theme and even one that has the potential to link the Hebrew Bible with the NT.

These, however, have proved of limited use in the present exercise since they either are of limited scope or, focus on the Divine Presence associated with the temple rather than on the presence of God as king, though of course the two do overlap. See also the list in Terrien, (1978), *Elusive Presence*. For philosophical reflection on later Jewish thought on the Divine Presence, see Fackenheim, (1970), *God’s Presence in History*, passim.

The work of Clements, (1965), *God and Temple*, stands out as being second only to that of Terrien in importance. However, Menahem Haran severely criticised Clements’ work especially because it assumed that there is an all-encompassing schema which can explain all the data and because it assumed there was a “dialectical conflict” between YHWH’s covenant and the temple as his abode. See Haran, (1969), “Divine Presence”, 253, 257. The same criticism can be levelled at Terrien’s work and indeed at any attempt to see order out of potential chaos. Yet the work must go on.

---


73 The work of Clements, (1965), *God and Temple*, stands out as being second only to that of Terrien in importance. However, Menahem Haran severely criticised Clements’ work especially because it assumed that there is an all-encompassing schema which can explain all the data and because it assumed there was a “dialectical conflict” between YHWH’s covenant and the temple as his abode. See Haran, (1969), “Divine Presence”, 253, 257. The same criticism can be levelled at Terrien’s work and indeed at any attempt to see order out of potential chaos. Yet the work must go on.
With the aim of establishing the “peculiarly Hebraic theology of presence” (3)\(^{74}\) as the
organising principle of the Bible, Terrien considered numerous passages in the OT and
NT\(^{75}\) - a series of epiphanies and theophanies - in which the characters and writers were
confronted with a sense of Divine Presence.\(^{76}\) He extracted from them a notion of Divine
Presence that not only was “Hebraic” but extended into the NT, transformed as it was by
belief in the incarnation.\(^{77}\) He claimed that this was better than previous attempts to find a
unifying theme because it incorporated the contribution of Wisdom literature (473). Divine Presence is to be seen as the primary motif (3).

The book is no more and no less than what Terrien claimed it to be, “a prolegomenon to a
genuinely “biblical” theology which will respect historical complexity within, as well as
between, the Old Testament and the New” (xxix). No more, because unfortunately
Terrien’s challenge has not been taken up in any comprehensive way. No less, because
there is no doubt that his work has established a prima facie case for the proposed role of
the motif.

Terrien’s book has been extensively reviewed.\(^{78}\) All have acknowledged its eloquence and
contribution to biblical theology. As seems to be the custom, most have pointed out
problems with the work, usually centring around: the possibility of there being a single
unifying “biblical theology”; the limited number of passages considered, especially those
of the prophets; and the fact that Terrien insisted on a dichotomy between presence and
covenant rather than “the covenant relationship as a form of divine presence”\(^{79}\). Two
further criticisms of his work may (and some related comments) be made that have a direct
bearing on the present work.

\(^{74}\) Numbers in brackets in this Section, 1.4, refer to the relevant page numbers of the work being
discussed.

\(^{75}\) Very few of these coincide with the passages considered in this present work.

\(^{76}\) It is no wonder that Terrien’s Divine Presence is “elusive”, since epiphanies and theophanies are by
definition transitory.

\(^{77}\) E.g. Terrien, (1978), *Elusive Presence*, 5, “It was a new theology of presence, drawn from the
Hebraic complex of cultus and faith, which presided over the emergence of Christianity from
Judaism.”

\(^{78}\) E.g. Childs, (1979), “Review of *The Elusive Presence* by Samuel Terrien”, 441-42; Moriarty,

totally ignored the Deuterocanonicals (he gave brief mention only to Sirach), which is odd
considering his desire to offer a theology that was “ecumenical”. See Terrien’s own response to
1.4.1.1 Terrien: No Definition of Divine Presence

Terrien peppered his work with the expression *Deus absconditus* (Vulg. Isa 45:15) “the hidden God”, at the end declaring: *Deus absconditus atque praesens* “God hidden and yet present” (470). It is surprising then that Terrien nowhere gives a definition of his “Hebraic theology of presence” which is not, as the phrase might suggest, an encompassing theology of presence, but a consideration of the presence of God. There are at least two inherent dangers in this.

First, the lack of definition means that not only can we never be sure of what we are looking for in any given passage, but also that we can never be sure that we have found what we are looking for. Terrien’s method can mean that we will find evidence of Divine Presence wherever we look. Worse, we will not be able to weigh such evidence.

Second, there is the danger that a discussion of the presence of God may degenerate or metamorphose into theology proper. That is, consideration of the perception of the presence of God may lead, without a clear definitional anchor, into a discussion about God. Scholarship on Divine Presence is essentially pre-theology. This present work thus deliberately makes no claim to be a “theology” or even a “theology of presence”. If a label must be given, it falls into the arena of the history of ideas. The need for a definition of Divine Presence is thus urgent.

خد, the name of the God of the Bible, is now thought to be derived from the verb היה “to be, become”. Its origin from the hiphil (causative) form, favoured by some, has the difficulty of being otherwise unattested in our sources. The more probable qal form of ייה in Exod 3:14 suggests an approximate meaning for the name as simply “the one who is”. For present purposes, the solution is unimportant. As we shall see in chapters 2 and 3, in the biblical world presence was never of mere philosophical concern, but an active, dynamic reality. On the occasions when the opposite belief was expressed of the Divine Royal Presence, it precipitated great anguish in the believer (e.g. Pss 10, 22).

---

80 Terrien, (1978), *Elusive Presence*, 1, 227, 250, 251, 301, 321, 390, 461, 470, 474. On p. 251 for example, he wrote “The presence which conceals itself is not an absence”.


For the ancient Israelites, existence was not metaphysical but phenomenal, not Sein but Dasein. In other words, God’s existence was assumed, but his whereabouts and his relationship to them was of paramount importance. For them “to be” could never be simply an abstraction. Rather it was “to be somewhere”. If something or someone was, then that thing could be situated or located. This is confirmed somewhat by the presence of the phrase יִהְיֶה “I will be with you” in Exod 3:12, suggesting a profound link between the divine Name and the perceived reality of his presence. יִהְיֶה “the one who is” is also “the one who is (there, somewhere)”. At the risk of lapsing into philosophical anachronism, the God of the ancient Jews and early Christians was at once incorporeal and yet an individual person. As such, he shared the categories of being as enumerated by Aristotle, including the fifth one, τὸ ὑπὸ “where”, for which notions of presence actualise. Divine Presence was never a Platonic abstract idea. God could be encountered in the here-and-now.

Thus a working definition of Divine Presence might be something like: the acknowledgment of God being present before, in front of or in the same place as the human subject. In other words, the essence of Divine Presence is to be able to provide a location for the perceived Divine Presence. It is, quite simply, to know his “whereabouts”. It is to be noted that this stands in explicit contradiction to whatever notion Terrien might have had: “Presence dilutes itself into its own illusion whenever it is confused with a spatial or temporal location” (476).

The approach to Divine Presence being offered here finds immediate support in both the OT and NT.

---


87 Aristotle, Metaphysics 5.7.4.

88 Cf. “Presence” in the Compact OED, (19912), 1420/393c, 1 a, “The fact or condition of being present, the state of being before, in front of, or in the same place with a person or thing; being there; . . . Usually with of or possessive indicating the person or thing that is present”; 1420/394b 4a, “with possessive, denoting the actual person (or thing) that is present (his presence = his present self, himself being present); hence sometimes nearly = embodied self, objective personality”.

89 Terrien, (1978), Elusive Presence, 404, is right that “omnipresence” totally fails to capture the Hebraic “awareness of communion”.

Neither the OT nor the NT has a word for “presence”. The nearest equivalent is מֵיתִיבָה, mostly translated by πρόσωπον in the LXX. Its primary meaning is “face” and is a common metaphor for “presence” in both Testaments. However, as the Greek indicates, and contrary to Terrien (65), it speaks more to the being of the person than to his or her actual presence or location. The lament of God hiding his face did not mean that the worshipper thought that God had withdrawn himself - his person - from him so that his “presence” was no longer there, but that, confronted with evil or misfortune, the only explanation was a god who for whatever reason had withheld his divine aid, i.e. refused to help. The words for “to hide” מֵיתִיבָה or עַלְמַנָּה are the common antonyms of מֵיתִיבָה “to reveal, uncover” and have nothing to do with movement away from a place. In fact, when applied to human beings, the hiding or covering of the face is an expression of sorrow, not a removal of presence.

To indicate location, the preposition ל was added, so that מֵיתִיבָה literally means “to (the) face of” and is often simply translated as “before” or “in the presence of”, that is, in the immediate vicinity of some person or object. Thus the phrase מֵיתִיבָה מִפְרָצִים before the LORD most often indicates the localised Divine Presence, especially his cultic presence, that is, that God is in front of or very near the person.

---


The *location* of the Divine Presence is thus integral to the concept. In this thesis, it is the *location* of the Divine *Royal* Presence that is of interest.

### 1.4.1.2 Terrien: A Single Post-Exilic View of Divine Presence

Terrien claimed that the pre-exilic understanding of Divine Presence was characterised by the belief that God was present in a special sense in the here-and-now chiefly in and through the Jerusalem temple, but that Second Temple Judaism did not have such a belief. “Hebraism had been founded on divine presence. Judaism arose from divine absence” (390); “A second temple was built in 516 B.C., but Yahweh did not come down to inhabit his ‘house’” (402).

Apart from the fact that this view is shared by other scholars and that it is incorrect (e.g. Joel 2:27, 4:17), a more basic assumption lies behind it: it assumes that two seemingly contradictory viewpoints cannot subsist in the one belief system. Therefore, argued Terrien, one must have given way completely to the other.

Many would solve the problem by describing the situation as a “creative tension”. They would postulate that the two do in fact co-exist in the belief system of individuals for whom the texts are normative. However, to do so would be to do less than justice to the integrity and common sense of those individuals, to say nothing of their sanity.

To be preferred is the simple scenario that some individuals held one view and others another, while at the same time recognising each other as legitimate heirs of the same faith. Such a picture would result in dialogue and debate - that would be the “creative tension”. That there were many such “Judaisms” in the first century is now accepted. The dialogue between the Pharisees and Jesus over the kingdom of God as preserved in Luke 17:20-21 is simply another example.

---


96 Terrien, (1978), *Elusive Presence*, 307, “divine presence lingered in the temple, even without the conjunction of sacerdotal and congregational activity”.

97 See Section 2.6.1.

98 The very point of whether God was present in the second temple was a topic of debate amongst the rabbis, see footnote in Section 2.6.1.

1.4.2 Bruce D. Chilton on the Kingdom of God

Bruce D. Chilton was chosen for discussion because he is a modern scholar who has written on the kingdom of God from the unique perspective of the Targumim. Since analysis of some Targum verses in this thesis forms a crucial element in constructing a picture of the Pharisaic understanding of the kingdom, there is need to come to terms with Chilton’s work.

To date there have been only four major studies on the targumic notion of the kingdom of God, if Chilton’s works (which are largely repetitious) are subsumed under one heading: Klaus Koch’s article;\(^\text{100}\) Chilton’s studies,\(^\text{101}\) which, though the most detailed, concentrated almost exclusively on *Tg. Neb.* Isa; Odo Camponovo’s\(^\text{102}\) compendious dissertation on all instances of God as king and his kingdom in the *OT* (*BHS* and *LXX*), the Deuterocanonicals, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, and Targumim; and John P. Meier’s\(^\text{103}\) work within his *Marginal Jew* trilogy, which largely echoed the conclusions of Chilton. Thus, for all intents and purposes, Chilton is the only scholar who has written extensively on the subject of the kingdom of God in the Targumim. He has made three far-reaching contributions.

Chilton developed a schema, not for dating those Targumim verses as written, which mention the “kingdom of God” or the like, but for proposing a time period in which the tradition that lies behind these verses probably originated. Since this is by far the most important contribution that is relevant to the present study, it will be discussed more fully in Section 1.6.3 below.

Secondly, Chilton discussed at length the parallels between the use of “kingdom of God” in *Tg. Neb.* Isa and by Jesus in the Gospels.\(^\text{104}\) Using the criterion of Targumic diction rather than the more frequently used criteria employed in the quest for the historical

---
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Jesus, he concluded from this that they share a common first century (pre-70) tradition, namely the use of the phrase “kingdom of God”.

Thirdly, by comparing the BHS and Targum texts, Chilton drew the conclusion that the phrase “kingdom of God” meant for the Targumist the self-disclosure of God. He also concluded that such was the basic aspect of the meaning for Jesus.

Leaving aside issues relating to his dating methods, which will be dealt with in Section 1.6.3, Chilton made a number of assumptions and methodological tactics that call into doubt the last two of these conclusions.

1.4.2.1 Chilton: Kingdom Targumim Reflect Position of Jesus

Chilton went further than simply claiming that the historical Jesus and the Targumim share the common pre-70 tradition of the use of the phrase “kingdom of God”. He argued that since both Jesus and some of the traditions behind the Targumim are first century, the Targumim reflect the understanding of the kingdom held by Jesus far better than any other group or individual in the first century. For example, he wrote: “[T]he Targumic kingdom passages are substantively as well as linguistically coherent with Jesus’ preaching of the kingdom”. He based this on two incorrect premises.

First, he categorised the language of the extant Targumim to the Prophets (on which he based most of his work) as Middle Aramaic (200 B.C. - A.D. 200) rather than Late Aramaic (A.D. 200-700), to which Fitzmyer places the final redaction of all extant Targumim, to which Fitzmyer places the final redaction of all extant Targumim.

Second, he thought that parallels between the NT and the Targumim, or at least the traditions behind them, were to be explained by the dependence of the former on the

---

105 Such as multiple attestation, discontinuity, coherence, etc. See Section 4.4.
106 Chilton, (1979), God in Strength, 95, 171, 226-27, 277; Chilton, (1980), “Targumic Transmission”, 39. Given the fact that both the Gospels and the targumim were initially transmitted orally before being redacted, Chilton claimed that “the disciples might have used Targumic methods to transmit the words and deeds of Jesus”.
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latter. But dependence might be the other way round, especially since the redaction of the Targumim is centuries after that of the NT. Indeed, it is not unknown for borrowings of terminology and concepts to flow from Christian to Jew in the Byzantine period (fourth - 15th centuries) - and these especially associated with the synagogue in the time of Targum literary formation.

Chilton posited such parallels mainly because, limiting himself to passages where Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God, he noted that the Tg. Neb. Isa also features kingdom language in a proclamation or festive setting. He failed to take into account the simple fact that the original BHS passages are also set within eschatological genres similar to those of the NT.

Apart from questionable premises, there are two important linguistic reasons for suspecting that the targumim in fact represent a different but parallel tradition of the kingdom of God.

In the effort to draw strong parallels between Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God and Tg. Neb. Isa’s use of the phrase, Chilton consistently claimed that, like the Targumim, Jesus insisted on “a personal God revealed”. The fact is, however, that the Gospels never record Jesus as having used Κυρίας or rather its Greek equivalents (τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ θεοῦ, πανελπόμων) in speaking of the kingdom of God. Jesus instead used the verb ἐρχόμενοι (or rather, the Aramaic equivalent, סְדִיקָה), or occasionally ἐγγίζω, ἐκρύμοιαι or ἰκμ. Conversely, the only occasion in which a Targum uses the equivalent of “to come” is in Tg. Neb. Mic 4:8 - a passage that Chilton himself (correctly) assigned to the Amoraic


stage of Targum formation. In other words, a passage whose tradition let alone redaction is much too late to reflect first century thought.

Indeed, what Chilton also appears to have missed is the fact that the Aramaic phrase מָלָכָהָּּ אֱלֹהִים “kingdom of God”,\textsuperscript{117} nowhere appears in the extant Targumim. What does appear that is closest is מָלָכָהָחַ אֱלֹהִים “the kingdom of your God”,\textsuperscript{118} and perhaps the slightly better: מָלָכָהָוּ אֱלֹהִים “the kingdom of the Lord”.\textsuperscript{119} The first phrase appears nowhere in its Hebrew equivalent in the \textit{BHS} nor the Greek of LXX. The second though appears twice in the \textit{BHS} and LXX, at 1 Chr 28:5 and 2 Chr 13:8 (in addition to Wis 10:10) and once in the NT at 2 Pet 1:11 (and \textit{Pss. Sol.} 17:3).

\subsection*{1.4.2.2 Chilton: “Reveal” and “Come” are Synonyms}

Chilton equated the Hebrew בָּאתֶה “to come” and the Aramaic (targumic) גלָל “to reveal”, seeing no difference between the two.\textsuperscript{120} Yet, elsewhere, he defined revelation as revealing something that is present but hidden.\textsuperscript{121} Yet, something that is already present cannot be said “to come”. Given the presence of “come” in Luke 17:20-21 with the “kingdom of God” as its subject, this issue will receive separate treatment in Section 3.7.

\subsection*{1.4.2.3 Chilton: A Confused Picture of the Kingdom}

As just discussed, Chilton effectively mixed Targum traditions regarding the kingdom of God with those of Jesus as presented in the Gospels and he (therefore) saw no difference between the targumic “revealing” of the kingdom and Jesus’ “coming” of the kingdom. It is not surprising then to find that Chilton presented a very confused picture of his understanding of the first century notion of the kingdom, even within individual works.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textsuperscript{117} & The determinative or emphatic state. The use of the construct form מָלָכָהָּּ אֱלֹהִים is also a possibility. & \\
\textsuperscript{118} & \textit{Tg. Neb.} Isa 40:9d and \textit{Tg. Neb.} Isa 52:7b. & \\
\textsuperscript{119} & \textit{Tg. Neb.} Isa 24:23b, \textit{Tg. Neb.} Isa 31:4c, \textit{Tg. Neb.} Obad 21, \textit{Tg. Neb.} Mic 4:7, \textit{Tg. Neb.} Zech 14:9. In \textit{Tg. Ket.} 1 Chr 28:5, מָלָכָהָּּ אֱלֹהִים “the kingdom of the LORD” appears. However, \textit{Tg. Ket.} was redacted too late to be of relevance in the present analysis. & \\
\textsuperscript{120} & Chilton, (1979), \textit{God in Strength}, 89, 287; Chilton, (1996), \textit{Pure Kingdom}, 60. & \\
\textsuperscript{121} & Chilton, (1982), \textit{The Glory of Israel}, 151 n. 1; Chilton, (1984), \textit{Galilean Rabbi}, 60; Dalman, (1902), \textit{Words of Jesus}, 100-101 (not 97 as in Chilton); G. F. Moore, (1927), \textit{Judaism II}, 374. & \\
\end{tabular}
\caption{Footnotes for Section 1.4.2.2 and 1.4.2.3}
\end{table}
On occasion, for example, Chilton was able to touch on the notion of the kingdom of God as God himself. “The kingdom of God refers to God himself, as it were, personally”.\textsuperscript{122} “[T]he kingdom is . . . a theologoumenon, a manner of speaking of God”.\textsuperscript{123}

Sometimes, the kingdom seemed to be the act itself of divine disclosure.\textsuperscript{124} “The kingdom is the self-revelation of God”.\textsuperscript{125} “[T]he kingdom is taken as the self-revelation of God”.\textsuperscript{126} “[T]he kingdom is a personal God revealed”.\textsuperscript{127}

At other times, the kingdom was divine revelation for the specific purpose of salvation. “The saving revelation of God Himself”.\textsuperscript{128} Once, the intervention was without revelation. “Conceptually, the phrase “kingdom of God merely refers to the fact, or the claim, that God will intervene on behalf of his people””.\textsuperscript{129}

Sometimes, the kingdom was merely divine activity. “. . . [T]he kingdom in Jesus’ preaching [is] a symbol of God’s own activity . . .”.\textsuperscript{130}

Finally, on occasion, Chilton combined several of these elements. “The emphasis is on the dynamic, personal presence of God - not on the nature of God in itself, but on his saving, normally future activity”.\textsuperscript{131} “[T]he kingdom is nothing other than God’s ultimate disclosure and activity on behalf of his people”.\textsuperscript{132}

It is hoped that by focusing on one aspect of the kingdom of God, namely the presence of the Divine King, confusion will be minimised and clarity and consistency be more likely.

\textsuperscript{124} He made too much (“it is not likely a coincidence”) of the similarity between Tg. Neb. Isa 40:10 “the Lord God is revealed with strength (ה""ש)קם""ו) and Mark 9:1 “until they see that the kingdom of God has come with power (ἐν δυνάμει)”.\textsuperscript{131}
\textsuperscript{126} Chilton, (1979), \textit{God in Strength}, 284.
\textsuperscript{127} Chilton, (1979), \textit{God in Strength}, 285.
\textsuperscript{128} Chilton, (1979), \textit{God in Strength}, 283.
1.4.3 Richard J. Sneed on Luke 17:20-21

Literature on the pericope Luke 17:20-21 is large. Beginning with Tertullian, Christian scholars have responded to the enigmatic nature of the dialogue with unflagging zeal in order to explain its meaning or at least to account for its existence. In modern times, the first major study was included in Bent Noack’s *Das Gottesreich bei Lukas*, followed by Richard J. Sneed’s unpublished dissertation *The Kingdom’s Coming* and his summary article “The Kingdom of God is within you” in the same year.

Prior to and after these studies there have been numerous smaller studies largely confined to a study of the meaning of two words which together form the key to understanding vv. 20-21, namely παρατηρήσεως and ἐντός. While these smaller studies will be accounted for in chapter 4, several deserve mention here either because of their comprehensiveness or because they have provoked further discussion.

There are, firstly, the studies in English: Colin H. Robert’s article “The Kingdom of Heaven”; a section of Andrew J. Mattill’s book *Luke and the Last Things*; the commentaries of I. Howard Marshall, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Darrell L. Bock; a section in George R. Beasley-Murray’s book *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*; and the article by Tom Holmén, “The Alternatives of the Kingdom”.

German scholars have been no less prolific. Translated works are numerous, but three deserve mention here because of their influence: an appendix to Gustaf Dalman’s *The Words of Jesus*; a section of the book *Promise and Fulfillment* by Werner G. Kümmel; and a section in Hanz Conzelmann’s *The Theology of St. Luke*. Of note among the untranslated works are: a section of the book *Die Botschaft Jesu* by Ernst Percy; the various articles of August Strobel, especially his “Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17 20f”; Alexander Rüstow’s article “ΕΝΤΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ”; Franz Mussner’s “Wann kommt das Reich Gottes?”; a section of Rudolph Schnackenburg’s essay “Der Eschatologische Abschnitt”; a section of Joseph Zmijewski’s book *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas - Evangeliums*; a secton of Ruthild Geiger’s book *Die Lukanischen Endzeitreden*; and the article by Günther Schwarz entitled “Οὐκ . . . μετὰ παρατηρήσεως?”.

What is striking about these lists is that there is no *published* monograph devoted exclusively to a consideration of Luke 17:20-21. That alone is enough to justify this present attempt at unravelling the pericope which has been described as the “crux interpretum”133 and the “Gordian knot”134 of Gospel studies.

---

Sneed’s unpublished dissertation is divided into five chapters. After the Introduction, chapter 2 is a collection, in chronological order, of various interpretations of Luke 17:20-21 from the early patristic period to around 1960. He acknowledged his debt here to Noack, but advanced his work by including material in the period from 1948 and included some commentators that Noack neglected.

Chapter 3 represents the heart of the thesis. It is an exposition of the meaning of the two key phrases μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντὸς ὑπόν, mainly relying on ancient texts and versions (e.g. the LXX and Syriac translations).

Chapter 4 is a justification and explanation of form-critical methods and a division of gospel forms into three stages of formation with their associated liturgical, catechetical and missionary “milieux”. Sneed included a discussion of possible motives, based on these conclusions for the eventual selection of individual gospel sayings.

Chapter 5, the final chapter, is a form-critical analysis of Luke 17:20-21 based largely on the fundamentals discussed in chapter 4. Sneed identified the pericope as a pronouncement story and because it is without exact parallel in the synoptics, proceeded to argue for a parallel with Rom 14:17.135 As a result of this parallel, Sneed interpreted ἐντὸς ὑπόν as a reference, by Jesus, to the coming Holy Spirit. The narrative introduction with its attribution of the question to Pharisees “would have conjured up a vision of unbending religious observance of the Mosaic Law” (119, 120) and hence μετὰ παρατηρήσεως can mean little else other than a reference to the observance of the Torah (i.e the practice of torah or halakot).

Sneed’s dissertation is useful because it provided, in chapter 2, a sort of catena of works of interpretation of the past two millennia, some of which are difficult to obtain even today. However, it is disappointing on at least three counts.

1.4.3.1 Sneed: Uncritical Use of Secondary Sources

Little critical reflection was applied to early interpretations or versions. Thus for example, a work of the second century was considered by Sneed to be of equal value to one of a later century in providing the original meaning to the passage.

In this present thesis however, all Christian references after ca. A.D. 300 (i.e. from the Nicene period onwards) and all Jewish references after ca. A.D. 200 (the redaction of the

---

135 On Rom 14:17 see Sections 3.4 under Luke 12:31,32, 3.6.3, 4.3.4.1 under Recent Exegetical Comment and 4.4.2 under Recent Exegetical Comment.
Mishnah) will be deliberately ignored. A critical evaluation of those before will ensure that only considerations that stand the best chance of being pertinent to the first century will be taken into account.

1.4.3.2 Sneed: Minimised Importance of “Kingdom of God”

In his dissertation, Sneed relegated discussion of the meaning of “kingdom of God” to a single footnote. He largely dismissed consideration of its meaning as irrelevant to his task: “the pericope is not directly occupied with the nature of the kingdom as such” (62 n. 30).

The corrective to this in this thesis will be that the exegesis will proceed on the basis of a thorough appreciation of what the fundamental meaning of the crucial phrase “kingdom of God” must have meant both to the audience of the pericope and to the parties who preserved it and especially to Jesus and the Pharisees. It is here that the pericope exposes a fundamental difference in understanding between: the Pharisees and Jesus; the later pre-Lukan community and the Pharisees; and Luke and the Palestinian Judaism of his time as represented by the synagogue community and the Yavnean rabbis.

1.4.3.3 Sneed: Unbalanced Consideration of other Elements

Because he largely confined his work to unravelling the meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως and ἐντὸς ψυχῶν, other sections of the pericope received scant treatment (for example, the narrative introduction and the second negative reply, to say nothing of the kingdom of God itself).

What is particularly perplexing is that despite the presence of the (today) superfluous chapter 4, there is no thorough composition-critical analysis of Luke 17:20-21. Sneed believed that the evangelist “incorporated the whole form as he found it” and that it was transmitted as such from the oral stage (110). This, despite a clear articulation of the three stages which he labelled in chapter 4.

This resulted in a surprising error. Sneed concluded that the meaning of the pericope was the same at each stage of its transmission, namely: that Jesus originally foretold of the coming of the Spirit; that these words were preserved by the early pre-Lukan community because of their associations with the Spirit; and that Luke not only preserved the form as he received it, but that he did not add to its meaning (135-37).

As a corrective to Sneed, the whole of the pericope will be analysed and a composition-critical picture of its formation constructed. This picture will then form the basis of an
exegesis of the passage for each of the three stages of formation. In the case of the role of the Holy Spirit, it will be found that no such foretelling can be attributed to Jesus in this pericope, but that such an interpretation was made by the pre-Lukan community of the pericope as a result of the Pentecost experience. Luke then placed his own christological interpretation on it.
1.5 THE PHARISEES

This Section, 1.5, will not be a rehearsal of what is known today of the Pharisees. There are already some excellent summaries which are readily accessible and a major work, which is a “critical and nuanced rehabilitation of the more traditional view of the Pharisees”, is currently in progress.

Instead, this Section will first present a very brief outline of who the Pharisees were and what can be known of them by a critical evaluation of each of the three major sources, namely Josephus, the Mishnah and the Gospels. In succeeding subsections, certain...
issues surrounding the Pharisees that will be of primary significance to the presentation of chapters 2, 3 and 4 will then be discussed in more detail.

1.5 The Pharisees before A.D. 70

Modern scholarship on the Pharisees is marked by three admissions. First, unlike, for example, the Qumran sect, we do not have in fact any literature that can be said for certain to have been written by the Pharisees or by a Pharisee. Second, that the amount of secondary material that we do have that is contemporary or near contemporary on the Pharisees is very small. Third, that this secondary material is either contradictory or, at best unable to be corroborated. Michael J. Cook’s comment that, “the truth of the matter may be that we cannot know the truth of the matter”,139 is echoed by that of Joseph Sievers, “we know considerably less about the Pharisees than an earlier generation ‘knew’”140

No better example of this confusion and paucity of evidence can be found than when the simple question is asked, what does the word “Pharisee” mean? The verb מַשִּׁרֵם, from which the proper noun is derived, has, unfortunately, three distinct meanings: “to specify”;141 “to interpret”;142 or “to separate”.143 Each meaning has its supporters when

4QMMT that are correspondingly mentioned in early rabbinic literature as positions held by the Sadducees in their disputes with the Pharisees.


Qimron and Strugnell, (1994), Discoveries in the Judaean Desert X, 175, identified the “they” group in 4QMMT as Pharisees.


140 Sievers, (1997), “Who were the Pharisees?”, 138.

141 The least favoured possibility is that championed by: G. F. Moore, (1927), Judaism I, 62; A. I. Baumgarten, (1983), “The Name of the Pharisees”, 411-28; N. T. Wright, (1992), People of God, 185. מַשִּׁרֵם originally meant “specifiers”, since another meaning of the verb is “to specify” both in biblical and rabbinic Hebrew (Lev 24:12, Num 15:34, Ezra 4:18). Here precision or accuracy (אֲיֵרֹן) in determination of the laws is implied - a picture of the Pharisees more than once...
it comes to the origin of the word “Pharisee”. As it happens, these three possibilities more-or-less coincide respectively with the three main groups various historians have proposed as the forerunners of the Pharisees: the priest/scribe such as Ezra or the scribes (scribes) in general, with their desire for the specifics of the Torah; the Hasidim (the Hasidim, Asozialen), with their zeal for a strict interpretation of torah; or a group which separated from the Sadducees (scribes, Scribes) because of those tenets which are contrary to those of the Sadducees. 

---

142 The second possibility is that מדרש means “interpreters” since the verb מדרש can mean “to interpret”: Neh 8:8; Graetz, (1893), History of the Jews II, 18; Mendenham, (1998), “The Yeast of the Pharisees”, 39. For a denial of this meaning see Herford, (1924), The Pharisees, 33; G. F. Moore, (1927), Judaism II, 62. The name would then refer to those who interpret the Torah and therefore derive binding laws not explicitly in it. Against this, however, is the fact that there is not one halakah given in the name of the Pharisees in rabbinic literature, something we would normally expect, see S. Zeitlin, (1961), “The Pharisees”, 228.

143 The third possibility and the one most favored by scholars, is that מדרש means “separatists”, since the verb most often means “to separate” and the nouns מדרש and מדרש occur in rabbinic Hebrew with the meaning of “separation” from that which makes unclean, e.g. m. Sot. 9:15L, m. Toh. 4:12, m. Zab. 5:1I. Cf. Ant. 13:296; Origen, Comm. On Matt 14.17 (ANF X, 507a). See: Herford, (1912), Pharisaism, 41; Schürer, (1890ET), Time II.II, 19; Herford, (1924), The Pharisees, 32; Simon, (1967ET), Jewish Sects, 27-28; A. Guttmann, (1970), Rabbinic Judaism, 131; Schürer, (1973), Age II, 396.

For a list of authors who argue for either a perjorative or approbative sense for “separatists” see: Schürer, (1973), Age II, 396 n. 54; A. I. Baumgarten, (1983), “The Name of the Pharisees”, 411 n. 1; R. Meyer and K. Weiss, (1974ET), “פריסאיסיס”, TDNT IX, 12; Baron, (1952), Social and Religious History of the Jews II, 35. Separation from whom or what, though, is another matter. Some suggest that it was separation from the high priest John Hyrcanus I, e.g. A. Guttmann, (1970), Rabbinic Judaism, 131. Some place it earlier, when the Hasidim withdrew from fighting with the Maccabees and sought peace, e.g. 1 Macc 7:13; Hussey, (1920), “Origin of the Name Pharisee”, 66-69. Others give it a religious connotation, signifying the group’s voluntary separation from other groups considered by them to be unclean, mostly either the Sadducees (e.g. Finkel, (1964), The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth, 39, 47; S. Zeitlin, (1969), “The Origin of the Pharisees Reaffirmed”, 255), or the “people of the land” (m. Hag. 2:7A, Sot. 9:15L, Zab. 5:1J; Schürer, (1890ET), Time II.II, 20-21; G. F. Moore, (1927), Judaism I, 61; Bowker, (1973), Jesus and the Pharisees, 4; Herford, (1912), Pharisaism, 42; Herford, (1924), The Pharisees, 32-35; Schürer, (1973), Age II, 396-98; Finkelstein, (1962), The Pharisees I, 76; Oesterley and Robinson, (1948), A History of Israel II, 317 n. 2). Note also Ezra’s desire to separate Jews from Gentiles, Ezra 6:21, 9:1, 10:11, Neh 9:2, 10:28, 13:3.


When it comes to the three sources that explicitly mention the Pharisees, a critical evaluation reveals that not a great deal can be taken as reasonably certain.

Steve Mason wrote what may be termed the definitive work on the Pharisees as presented in Josephus. His most important conclusion was that Josephus’ portrait of the Pharisees as the “dominant religious group among the Jews” and as the one “who had the support of the masses” is to be taken as reliable since Josephus often lamented this fact and thus would have had no reason to invent or inflate their popularity or influence. They, in fact, represented the “popular middle ground” on such questions as fate and life after death. They had a reputation for “accuracy” in the laws, tempered and enhanced by their “regulations” (i.e. torah or halakot) which were not part of the written Torah. Josephus himself shared the Pharisaic belief in fate, immortality and the goal of accuracy in the handling of the Torah. A number of
Pharisees were politically active right up to and including the war with Rome (as was Josephus).\textsuperscript{155} The Mishnah, on the other hand, presents a very different picture.\textsuperscript{156} Synonymous with the name of Jacob Neusner,\textsuperscript{157} work in this area is even more dominated by issues regarding

---


\textsuperscript{156} This of course may be due in large part either to the fact that the Mishnah was redacted ca. A.D. 200, some 130 years after the demise of the Pharisees as an identifiable group and so issues of anachronism naturally arise, or to the fact that it is by no means certain that the rabbinic \textit{סִדְרֵי מְלֶאךְ} is equivalent to the Josephan (or NT) \textit{φαρισαῖοι}. See: Neusner, (1970), \textit{Traditions III}, 304; Mason, (1991), \textit{Josephus on the Pharisees}, 10.


the critical evaluation of the “evidence” than is that of Josephus. Nevertheless, the portrait emerges of a non-political group overwhelmingly concerned with ritual purity, particularly with regard to the eating and preparation of ordinary everyday food. There is, it is to be noted, nothing in common with the picture given by Josephus.\footnote{Although N. T. Wright, (1992), \textit{People of God}, 188, suggested that \textit{Ant.} 18:12a, which said that the Pharisees pursued a simple style of living, was in fact a coded references to their observance of the purity laws.}

As for the NT, the portrait is inconsistent even within individual Gospels. While the special case of Luke-Acts will be treated in Section 1.5.5, there are examples of congruency of themes between the Gospels and Josephus and between the Gospels and rabbinic literature. For example, resurrection was a noted belief of the Pharisees in Josephus and Acts\footnote{\textit{J.W}. 2:163b, \textit{Ant.} 18:14, Acts 23:8. Cf. \textit{J.W}. 3:374, \textit{Ag.Ap}. 2:218, where Josephus expressed a similar belief; 2 Macc 7, \textit{m. Sanh}. 10:1.} and a concern for ritual purity may be found both in the Gospels and rabbinic literature.\footnote{E.g. \textit{m. Hag}. 2:7A,B, \textit{Sot}. 3:4I,J,K, Mark 2:15, 7:3-4.} The most important parallel for our purposes between Josephus and the Gospels is the portrayal of the Pharisees as an \textit{influential} group in first century Jewish Palestinian society. Of particular concern here is whether and to what extent the Pharisees exercised any influence in pre-70 Palestinian synagogues. This will be discussed fully in Section 1.5.6.

### 1.5.2 Pharisees in the Pre-Lukan Community

The Pharisees continued as an identifiable group within first century Palestinian society right up to A.D. 70,\footnote{See Section 1.5.3.} so the above comments apply not only to the Pharisees of Jesus’ time (Stage I) but also to the Pharisees at the time of the pre-Lukan community (Stage II) of which Luke was heir.

There is some evidence to suggest that some Pharisees were also members of this pre-Lukan Christian Palestinian community.\footnote{The figure of Nicodemus in John (John 3:1, 7:50, 19:39), designated a Pharisee, was clearly sympathetic to Jesus, though since the Gospel was redacted well after A.D. 70, this cannot be used as evidence for the issue at hand. One scholar, de Jonge, (1971), “Nicodemus and Jesus”, 337-59,} While the evidence is not conclusive, it clearly points in that direction.\footnote{Not found many followers) can be found in: de Lacey, (1992), “In Search of a Pharisee”, 361-71; S. J. D. Cohen, (1983), “Jacob Neusner, Mishnah, and Counter-Rabbinics”, 48-63. A more accessible summary of this last work can be found in: Shanks, (1985), “The Neusner Phenomenon”, 60-69; and of course, Neusner and Chilton, (1993), “Sanders’s Misunderstanding of Purity”, passim. For a modern reconstruction of the history of the Pharisees that is dependent on a conservative view of rabbinic literature, see: Finkelstein, (1989), “Pharisaic Leadership”, 245-77.}
Firstly, Acts 15:5 most likely refers to “believers” who also remained Pharisees.  

Secondly, in the parallel passage, Gal 2:4, Paul complained of “false brethren” who insisted on circumcision (cf. Acts 15:1). Not a few commentators link them to some extent with the Christian Pharisees of Acts 15:5, since the discussion is on a similar topic.

Thirdly, the believing Jews who were “zealous for the law” in Acts 21:20, fit in well with these being the Christian Pharisees of Acts 15:1 and/or 5, or at the very least sympathetic to these Christian Pharisees.

Fourthly, Luke depicts Paul as a Christian Pharisee. The present tense of Acts 23:6 and the perfect tense of Acts 26:5 strongly suggest that Luke at least wanted to give this impression. However, it should be said that Phil 3:5, where Paul claims a Pharisaic pedigree, is in a context in which that claim is clearly of the past.

Robert A. Wild approached the question by focusing his search on legal (halakic) arguments which appear in Q or Mark, since these can be assumed to have been redbotted before A.D. 70. Wild’s judgement of the issue, based on an analysis of Matt 23:23 / Luke 11:42 and Matt 23:25-26 / Luke 11:39-41 from Q and Mark 2:15-17 and 7:1-23, was inconclusive. That is, these sayings could have come from conflict between Pharisees and Christian Pharisees, or between Christian Pharisees and non-Pharisaic Christians, or indeed between Jesus and the Pharisees. Wild’s work signals a much needed word of caution about being either over sceptical or too accepting at face value of the Gospel record.

Nevertheless, there is enough evidence to say that if the assumption that some Pharisees were members of the early pre-Lukan Palestinian community is correct, then it opens the possibility that some or all of the controversies between the Pharisees and Jesus in Luke-
Acts may reflect not simply the historical situation of Jesus but the concerns of the early pre-Lukán Christian community depicted in Acts. Given the attribution of the question in Luke 17:20-21 to Pharisees, such Pharisees may have been either these Christian Pharisees or the question may reflect the on-going polemic between the pre-Lukán community and “normal” Pharisees.

1.5.3 The Pharisees and the Yavnean Rabbis

Since Luke wrote his Gospel and Acts sometime between A.D. 70 and 100, let us now turn by way of setting the scene for discussion in subsequent chapters, to consider the place of Pharisees in Luke’s time (Stage III) and then to ask what he made of the Pharisees that he wrote about.169

The rabbis of Yavneh who grouped during and after the A.D. 66-70 war were not made up exclusively of former Pharisees. Certainly some were included,170 but they also consisted of priests, scribes and others.171 Although the Mishnah contains pericopes attributed to pre-70 Pharisees, it contains much that is not. The rabbis were heirs to Pharisaism but they were also heirs to the wisdom of other pre-70 sects (except, as far as we know, that of Qumran).172

---

169 See Section 1.5.4.

170 Not only those aligned with the houses of Hillel and Shammai, but those associated with Simeon ben Gamaliel I found their way to Yavneh, see Neusner, (1973), From Politics to Piety, 98. On the debate whether the house of Hillel or Shammai dominated at Yavneh, see: Neusner, (1973), From Politics to Piety, 103; Neusner, (1973), Rabbinic Perspectives, 14, 22, 282-84; Saldarini, (1974), “Rabbinic Chain of Tradition”, 103.

171 See the list of disciples of rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai in m. Abot 2:8C. Also note: Buchanan, (1970), Consequences of the Covenant, 261; Sigal, (1980), Foundations of Judaism III, 2; Saldarini, (1988), Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 131; Saldarini, (1992), “Delegitimation of Leaders”, 663. Although not directly relevant, it may be mentioned that Josephus claimed to follow Pharisaic ways (Life 12) and to be a priest (Life 1-2, J.W. 1:3, 3:352). See S. Schwartz, (1990), Josephus and Judæan Politics, 100-101, for a list of Tannaitic rabbis who were priests, 205.

172 Sigal, (1980), Foundations of Judaism III, 2. For a recent and more confident connection between the Pharisees and the early rabbis, see: McNamara, (1983), Palestinian Judaism, 162-63; McNamara, (1983), Intertestamental Literature, 275-80; Maccoby, (1988), Early Rabbinic Writings, 11-13. Modern scholarship has at least formed a consensus on this point that the Pharisees and the rabbis cannot be simply equated. See: E. P. Sanders, (1977), Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 60-62; Neusner, (1981), Judaism: the Evidence of the Mishnah, 70-71. Earlier work by Neusner linked the rabbis with both the Pharisees and the scribes. The following deny any link between the Pharisees and the rabbis: Bowker, (1973), Jesus and the Pharisees, 4-6; Sigal, (1980), Foundations of Judaism III, 1. Earlier Scholarship virtually assumed a one-to-one correspondence, exemplified by: Klausner, (1925), Jesus of Nazareth, 212; Alon, (1961), “Attitude of the Pharisees”, 53-78. It should be noted that Jacob Neusner has altered his position on this. He earlier regarded the rabbis as a product of Pharisaic and scribal legacies. Later he presented a more complicated and comprehensive picture, i.e. that the rabbis were formed from members of many different pre-70 groups. Noting Neusner’s change of stance: S. J. D. Cohen, (1984), “The
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What is more important for the present purpose is that no-one,\textsuperscript{173} including these Yavnean rabbis,\textsuperscript{174} called themselves “Pharisees” after A.D. 70.\textsuperscript{175} The rabbis of Yavneh preferred the label דנה “sage”.\textsuperscript{176} Even more telling for the perspective of the redactor of the third gospel, there is no Christian evidence until the fifth century (apart from one inconclusive passage in Justin) that equates contemporary Jewish rabbis with the Gospel Pharisees.\textsuperscript{177} Thus a similar equation between Pharisees and rabbis cannot be casually made for Luke or his audience.

1.5.4 The Pharisees in Luke-Acts

If there was no identifiable group of Pharisees in Luke’s time, how did Luke regard the Pharisees as depicted in his Gospel and Acts?\textsuperscript{178}

Like Josephus who described the Pharisees as an αἵρεσις within Judaism,\textsuperscript{179} Luke too labelled them a “school” or “sect”.\textsuperscript{180} Again, while Josephus depicted Pharisaism as a


\textsuperscript{175} M. Goodman, (1994), “Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE”, 347-56, argued for the continued existence after 70 of Sadducees and the Essenes. If he is right, then it might be possible that Pharisees as an identifiable group survived after 70, but positive evidence is lacking.

\textsuperscript{176} E.g. \textit{t. Nid.} 5:3; S. J. D. Cohen, (1984), “The Significance of Yavneh”, 41. It is possible that a group calling themselves Pharisees persisted after A.D. 70, however there is no evidence that any did. “Sectarian consciousness was minimal” (p. 42).
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Luke came close to this when Jesus accused the Pharisees of “justifying” (δικαιοσύνη) themselves to others. Luke and his audience saw the Pharisees as contemporary “sparring partners” of Jesus and the apostles, but this reflects the actual historical situation at the time of Jesus when competing “Judaisms” engaged in debate with each other and probably even within each group. The Pharisees were of course no match for Jesus, having “rejected God’s purposes for themselves” (Luke 7:30). The debates with Jesus (in the Gospels) largely centre around the same three subjects: ritual purity; Sabbath; and tithing (with other issues such as fasting and divorce). Doctrinal questions, such as the value of baptism, the payment of taxes (and for that matter the kingdom of God), these have no parallels in rabbinic literature concerning the Pharisees.

As for the literary purpose to which the redactor might have employed the Pharisees in Luke-Acts, several theories have been proposed.

John A. Ziesler’s article initiated scholarly attention on the issue and may be said to summarise previous scattered opinion. Here, Matthew, Mark and John were “uniformly hostile”, suggesting that their respective communities only knew the Pharisees as opponents. Luke, however, portrayed the Pharisees as friendly “at least in part”, suggesting a community where not all Pharisees were foes. On the other hand, Anthony

---

180 Acts 15:5, 26:5. Elsewhere in Acts the Sadducees (5:17) and the Christians (24:5, 14, 28:22) were described as αἵρεσις.


185 See Section 1.1.

186 Neusner, (1982), “The Pharisees in the Light of the Historical Sources of Judaism”, 75-76. Rarely noted, however, is the parallel between the Gospels and Josephus with regard to the involvement of Pharisees with politics. Neusner, (1982), “The Pharisees in the Light of the Historical Sources of Judaism”, 72, wrote “[T]here is a striking discontinuity among the three principal sources which speak of the Pharisees before 70, the Gospels, and the rabbinic writings of a later period, on the one side, and Josephus, on the other”.

J. Saldarini and others see the Pharisees in Luke-Acts as serving the literary purpose of “stereotyped opposition to Jesus”.

Robert L. Brawley was of the opinion that the Pharisees, as authentic representatives of Israel, legitimated Jesus in the Gospels and the apostles in Acts as the true heirs to pre-70 Judaism. Jack D. Kingsbury, arguing against Brawley, demonstrated that the role of legitimator for Luke cannot be given to the Pharisees but must rather be given to God. David B. Gowler and others, on the other hand, followed Brawley’s picture: they saw the Pharisees presented in Luke in largely negative terms, in Acts generally in positive terms. In the Gospel, as the opponents of Jesus, they are used to legitimate him. In Acts they “serve as positive legitimation for Christianity”.

For John T. Carroll, Luke used “Jesus’ encounters with the Pharisees to portray opposing conceptions of the kingdom”. In Acts the Christian Pharisees continue this opposition. Like Brawley’s portrait, both the Christian Pharisees and the non-believing Pharisees serve as a literary device to legitimate the Christian movement.

Carroll based his belief that the Pharisees and Jesus opposed each other on their respective conceptions of the kingdom on just two sections of the Gospel, Luke 14:15-24 and 17:20-21. Unfortunately, neither the Parable of the Great Dinner in Luke 14:16-24 nor subsequent parables with the Pharisees as audience (e.g. The Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke 16:19-31) can be described strictly as kingdom parables since they are not described as such in the Gospel. Carroll also failed to offer an illustration of how the Pharisees themselves might have conceived the kingdom of God. The only sure ground for coming


191 Gowler, (1991), Host, Guest, Enemy and Friend, 301, 304-305.


194 See also: Neale, (1991), None but the Sinners, 108.
to terms with these opposing views is Luke 17:20-21, and this is not given the attention it deserves by Carroll.195

Jack T. Sanders, representing the first serious alternative to the above, claimed that the hostile Pharisees of the Gospel corresponded to the hostile Christian Pharisees of Luke’s community and that their hostility - condemned by Luke - centred around the conflicting interpretation of halakot issues between the Christian Pharisees and the rest. The friendly Pharisees serve to legitimate the link between Christianity and ancient Judaism.196

John A. Darr saw the role of the Pharisees in Luke-Acts as a purely negative example of “how not to apprehend the account of ‘things fulfilled among us’” (Luke 1:1).197 In other words, the audience is encouraged to repudiate their views and the basis behind them, much as the responses to the rhetorical question of Luke 17:20-21 directly contradict the underlying beliefs of the Pharisees regarding the kingdom of God.198

Because no group or individual identified themselves in Luke’s time as Pharisaic199 and because the portrait of the Pharisees in Luke-Acts lacks a common thread, it is difficult to agree without reservation with any of the above stances.

Recent scholars, Eric Franklin and Steve Mason, among others,200 in arriving at the same conclusion, have suggested that the Pharisees are for Luke “figures primarily of the past”201 and that:

“To make sense of all the narrative indicators, one must respect Luke’s avowed historical interest - in describing how things got to be the way they are now - and shed the old form-critical bugbear that requires each item in the story to correspond to some aspect of the reading community’s life.”202

Thus, even if redactional motives can be detected in Luke-Acts, the ambivalence and inconsistencies in the portrait of the Pharisees in Luke-Acts are probably due to Luke’s


198 See Section 1.3.

199 See the previous Section 1.5.3.


desire to preserve faithfully his sources (on the whole) and due to the simple fact that Luke would never have had direct contact with a Pharisee. Nor should there be any surprise that Jesus and the Pharisees (and the early church and the Pharisees) are portrayed frequently as being in dispute over matters of halakot. This was normal fare in Palestine between (and within?) the various “sects” of first century Jewish Palestine.

In other words, it looks as though the attribution of the question in Luke 17:20-21 to the Pharisees may be from Luke’s source rather than an invention from the hand of the redactor. Whether this is in fact so and how Luke used the Pharisees in this particular pericope, incorporating them into his gospel, will have to wait until Section 4.2.

### 1.5.5 Fate, Torah and the Kingdom of God

As noted above, it looks as though Josephus gave the most reliable and consistent data on pre-70 Pharisees.

Josephus distinguished the three main Jewish sects (Pharisees, Sadducees and the Essenes) by their differing attitudes to εἰμι ἄριστην “fate”. Of the 20 times the word occurs in the works of Josephus, it occurs seven times in connection with these sects, four of those in describing the Pharisees. Given the extent of the Josephan corpus, these statistics indicate that Josephus regarded the word as an important tool in describing to his readers the differences between the various first century Jewish sects.

In fact, it will be established in this Section, 1.5.5, that for the Pharisees, as depicted by Josephus, there was an intimate connection between fate, torah and the kingdom of God - a connection that sheds light on their attitude to the kingdom of God. It is an attitude of the Pharisees that will be confirmed later in Sections 2.3.1 and 3.3.1, where explicit instances of God as king and the kingdom of God will be discussed.

---

203 See Section 1.5.3.
204 See Section 1.5.1.
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1.5.5.1 What Josephus meant by “Fate”

The case for a connection between fate, torah and the kingdom of God for Pharisees may now be made by first understanding what Josephus himself meant by “fate”. Since he distinguished the three major sects of Judaism by their differing attitudes to fate, it is necessary to understand his view of it.

The passage that best serves this purpose is Ant. 16:397-98.207

Ant. 16:397-98

LCL of Ant. 16:397-98

We are persuaded that human actions are dedicated by her beforehand to the necessity of taking place inevitably, and we call her Fate on the ground that there is nothing that is not brought about by her. Now it will, I think, suffice to compare this doctrine with that according to which we attribute some part of the cause to ourselves and hold ourselves not unaccountable for the differences in our behaviour, as has been philosophically discussed before our time in the Law.

Josephus, in searching for reasons why Herod Antipater had two of his sons brutally and callously murdered, enunciated three possible views on fate. The first is that all human actions are the result of fate. The second is that some part of the cause of human actions may be attributable not to fate but to each particular person. These two views were not in fact considered mutually exclusive, at least in Josephus’ time.

---

207 That Josephus wrote his Jewish War originally in Hebrew or Aramaic and that 12 of the 20 occurrences of ējimi are in J.W. begs the question as to what word he might have used in that earlier edition. Two Hebrew words are occasionally translated as “fate” (George F. Moore insisted that there was no Hebrew term for fate: G. F. Moore, (1927), Judaism III, 140 n. 184; G. F. Moore, (1929), “Fate and Free Will in Josephus”, 379). לְוֻת “lot” is by far the most common and therefore probably the word Josephus used. It refers to the assignment of duties, property, one’s share, etc. and therefore also to the thing assigned (often לְוֻת “portion”). D. J. A. Clines’ (1993) The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, gave three examples of its use in the OT in the sense of the destiny of persons, Isa 17:14, Jer 13:25, Ps 16:5. Clines, (1993), DCH II, 337b. The other word is קְרֵיָה which has a variety of meanings but is translated as “fate” by the NRSV in Eccl 2:14, 3:19, 9:23. קְרֵיָה in the sense of fate seems to be the inevitable consequences of breaking the covenant with God, whereas קְרֵיָה, when applied as “fate”, is the inevitability of death.
In the case of the first view, Cicero observed that the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (ca. 279 - 206 B.C.) wanted to distinguish fate (what will be) and necessity (what must be).\(^{208}\) He did so by attributing fate to proximate causes which are under divine control and are thus of necessity and distinguishing them from principal causes which are in nostra potestate “in our power”. For human actions to occur, proximate and principal causes must both be present.\(^{209}\) With the passage of time, some Stoics began to fuse the two, so that by the time of Marcus Aurelius (121 - 180) we find the phrase άκάδη β xương “necessity of fate”.\(^{210}\) Philo (ca. 20 B.C. - A.D. 50), saw fate as linking the causes of everything.\(^{211}\) Seneca (ca. 1 - 65), who may be considered a contemporary of Josephus, in fact defined fate as the “necessitatatem rerum omnium actionumque”.\(^{212}\)

The second view, which retained some role for human will, is also “typically” Stoic.\(^{213}\) For the Stoic, there were certain actions that are επ’ ήμιν “in our power” and thus not of necessity.\(^{214}\) For example, death was regarded as fate, it was an inevitable necessity. Yet the manner and timing of one’s death is to some degree “in our power” and hence not fated.\(^{215}\) This is exactly what Josephus maintained. Death itself was fated for all,\(^{216}\) so much so that it was inevitable (χρεων).\(^{217}\)


\(^{211}\) Philo, *Aet*. 75.

\(^{212}\) “[N]ecessity of all events and actions”, Seneca, *Nat*. 2.36.1. See also his *Ep*. 101.7, “inexorabilis fatorum necessitas fixit”, “the remorseless necessity of fate has fixed it”.

\(^{213}\) The Stoics in turn may well have borrowed the term from Aristotle, who first popularised it as a way of explaining the cause of virtue and vice: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 3.5.2; Mason, (1991), *Josephus on the Pharisees*, 154.


It would seem, then, that Josephus was doing nothing less than following the generally accepted Stoic understanding of fate in his time. We ought not to be surprised at this when we consider that in Life 12 he likened the Pharisees to the Stoics and that he admitted that he followed many of the ways of the Pharisees.

1.5.5.2 Fate and Torah

An important element in Ant. 16:397-98, which can easily go unnoticed, introduced a Jewish “twist” into this otherwise typical Stoic discussion on fate. That was the introduction of the νόμος “Law”, “Torah”, into the discussion. For Josephus, torah was nothing less than God’s will - the law of the Divine King (Ag.Ap. 2:184).

The relationship between fate and divine will in the writings of Josephus is extremely instructive. It is clear that far from equating the two, Josephus thought that fate was the inevitable result of choosing to live life outside of God’s will. For example, in J.W. 4:622, the rise of Vespasian, who did not obey the Torah, was fated and yet fell within the sphere of πρόνοια “providence”. In J.W. 6:108, Josephus, at the request of Titus, pleaded with those besieged in the Antonia fortress to surrender. The rebels had previously ceased to offer the daily sacrifices (6: 94), thus moving outside providence to the sphere of fate. Their fate was now to die, but Josephus sought to circumvent that with their surrender. In J.W. 6:250, Josephus explained that God had long ago decided against the temple, thus sealing its fate.

This divine αποστρέφω “turning away” or abandonment, leaving the transgressor to the inevitable forces of fate, may be considered as the prime reason - in Josephus’ eyes - for the outbreak of hostilities. It was precisely the failure of the people (ἀπεβίω) to live by the Torah that led to their abandonment by God to fate, a fate which led inexorably to defeat. In fact, the war with the Romans was an inevitable necessity (Life 27). Scholars


Carson, (1981), Divine Sovereignty, 119, “According to his own classification, Josephus himself seems to fit more into the Pharisaic group than into any other - which is, of course, where one would expect to find him”.

have previously ignored this crucial aspect, choosing simply to lay the cause of the war for Josephus simply on the sin of certain individuals and groups.\textsuperscript{221}

Josephus also betrayed his thinking in a number of speeches.\textsuperscript{222} In Moses’ farewell speech, sin will lead to the forfeiting of God’s favour and thus to defeat in war (\textit{Ant.} 4:190). In David’s farewell speech to Solomon, David promised that following the Torah would bring mercy and assistance from God, while rejection of it would mean ἀποπτερέως πρόνοιαν “the abandonment of providence” (\textit{Ant.} 7:385). \textit{J.W.} 2:390-94 forms part of a similar speech Agrippa II made to the people of Jerusalem in the summer of A.D. 66. He claimed that the rebels, in transgressing God’s laws, had forced God to abandon them to destruction.

In other places, too, Josephus wrote of this divine abandonment to the inevitable forces of fate. For example, in \textit{J.W.} 2:539 God abandoned Jerusalem not merely to capture but to destruction. In \textit{J.W.} 6:250,267 we learn that the temple was long ago given over by God to fate, which Josephus saw as leading to its inevitable destruction.\textsuperscript{223}

But this turning away by God, this divine abandonment, was more than simply a cessation of divine aid. For Josephus, it meant literally the physical removal of the Divine Presence.\textsuperscript{224}

\textsuperscript{221} Josephus frequently pointed to three events which in a socio-political sense he regarded as the immediate causes of the war. They were: Florus’ appropriation of money from the temple treasury (\textit{J.W.} 2:282-83,293,296,305-308,318,331,333,420,531-32,558, \textit{Ant.} 18:25, 20:257); the disturbances in Caesarea (\textit{J.W.} 2:284,288, \textit{Ant.} 20:184); and the interruption of the daily sacrifices for the Roman Emperor (\textit{J.W.} 2:409-10,417). Cf. Bilde, (1979), “The Causes of the Jewish War According to Josephus”, 181-85. Hengel, (1989\textsuperscript{27}), \textit{The Zealots}, 128, noted \textit{Ant.} 18:4, which depicts Judas the Galilean urging the people to revolt because of a census by Quirinius the new governor of Syria on the people of Judaea, cf. \textit{J.W.} 7:253, Ant. 18:9.

To the above may be added: the murder of surrendered Roman soldiers in Jerusalem on a Sabbath (\textit{J.W.} 2:450-56); the murder of the high priests Ananus and Jesus in Jerusalem (\textit{J.W.} 4:314-18); the murder of priests and worshippers in the temple (\textit{J.W.} 5:11-19); the murder of the high priest Jonathan under Felix and other worshippers in the temple and Jerusalem (\textit{Ant.} 20:162-67); the Levites being granted permission to wear priestly linen robes (\textit{Ant.} 20:216-18); the Hellenising activities and laws of Herod the Great (\textit{Ant.} 15:267-76); and the philosophy and activity of the Zealots (\textit{Ant.} 18:9, \textit{J.W.} 7:253-57,324). See: Bilde, (1979), “The Causes of the Jewish War According to Josephus”, 191-94; McLaren, (1998), \textit{Turbulent Times?}, 152-53.

Josephus generally saw sin as punished by the loss of providence or divine favour, e.g. \textit{Ant.} 5:98, 6:148, 7:385.

\textsuperscript{222} Josephus’ speeches are accepted as betraying as much of Josephus’ own thoughts as that of the speaker, see: Mason, (1992), \textit{Josephus and the NT}, 193; Rajak, (1991), “Friends, Romans, Subjects”, 80-81.

\textsuperscript{223} Also see \textit{J.W.} 5:559, 2:391,539.

\textsuperscript{224} The verb ἀποπτερέω which Josephus frequently used to portray this physical abandonment, has in fact a very strong physical connotation. It usually means something more than a simple rejection, but involves “bodily gestures”, BDAG, 123a.
Prior to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the Divine Presence, according to Josephus, dwelt in the temple.\textsuperscript{225} Because of the sins of the people, that is, their failure to live by the Torah, God physically left the temple.\textsuperscript{226} It is this abandonment of the Divine Presence that enabled the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. Indeed, it appeared as if God was literally with the Romans against the Jews.\textsuperscript{227} In reality, their destruction was the result of fate. God, who had previously dwelt with his people, had physically fled because of their failure to live by the Torah,\textsuperscript{228} leaving them to their fate.\textsuperscript{229}

Briefly then, we may summarise the findings on Josephus and fate so far as follows: fate came within the providence or oversight of God but was not the same as the divine will. Rather it was part of God’s permissive will.\textsuperscript{230} The war and the destruction of the temple was as a result of the abandonment by God of the Jewish people, an abandonment which left the Jews at the mercy of the inevitable forces of fate. Even the gods of other nations, according to Josephus, are themselves subject to fate to the extent that they cannot do other than behave in a debased manner.\textsuperscript{231} Fate, then, exists through God’s permissive will. He abandoned the Judaeans to the necessary consequences of fate because they had forsaken his Law, which was, after all, nothing less than his will.

Josephus had made a real connection between the Divine Royal Presence and the observance of torah. God, as the Divine King,\textsuperscript{232} was present in his kingdom in his temple and one acknowledged this Divine Royal Presence or kingdom by observance of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{225} J.W. 5:459, Ant. 8:102,106,114. Cf. Ant. 3:100.
\item \textsuperscript{229} Note Apost. Const. 6.2.6 (ANF VII, 452a), which claimed that the Pharisees ascribed sinners to “fortune and fate”. Ezekiel had earlier explained the literal abandonment of the temple by the Divine Presence “glory” and the resulting exile in a similar way. However, Ezekiel did not couch it in terms of “fate”, nor did the removal of the Divine Royal Presence mean the cessation of divine favour from his people. See Section 2.2.1.2 under Ezek 20:33. Cf. also 4 Ezra 3:20-27 (which is more or less contemporary with Josephus), on which see M. E. Stone, (1981), “Reactions to Destructions”, 201.
\item \textsuperscript{230} Nothing is done without the divine will (Ant. 4:60), since God himself is omniscient (Ag.Ap. 2:190,294). Providence included acts that were part of the divine permissive will (Ant. 4:128). These acts may appear to be God’s direct intervention (Ant. 10:214, J.W. 3:28), but they are not (Ant. 7:245). In Ant. 2:116 for example, a distinction is made between what God might send to those who obey, and what will happen if one chooses to do something else.
\item \textsuperscript{231} Ag.Ap. 2:245. Cf. Philo, Mig. 179.
\item \textsuperscript{232} See Section 2.5.1.5.
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divine will, the Torah. Failure to observe torah meant the withdrawal not simply of divine aid, but of the Divine Royal Presence which led inexorably to the clutches of fate and its inevitability.

The next Section describes also the connection that the Pharisees maintained between fate, observance of torah and the kingdom.

1.5.5.3 Pharisees, Fate and Torah

Far from being “unjewish”, Josephus’ choice of distinguishing the sects through their differing attitudes to fate, was in keeping with his Jewish heritage. It remains then in this and the subsequent subsection to outline how the Pharisees related fate, Torah and the kingdom of God, at least in the writings of Josephus.

In J.W. 2:162-63, the Pharisees, we are told, εἶμαρμένη τε καὶ θεῶ προσάπτουσι πάντα “ascribe all to fate and to God”. They apparently allow for some human freedom in moral actions which ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κεῖσθαι “lie within men”, although even here fate is not totally absent.

In Ant. 13:172-73, the Pharisees were said to ascribe certain human actions to fate but οὐ πάντα “not all”. These others were said ἐφ’ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς κεῖσθαι “to lie within our own [power]”.

In Ant. 18:13, the Pharisees believe that τὰ πάντα “all things” are done by fate, but that this does not negate the ability (ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς) of the human will (τὸ βουλόμενον), since it pleased God to have both fate and human will (τὸ ἐθελήσαν). Again, some freedom in moral actions was allowed by the Pharisees.

Several points arise from the above.

The first is that the mediating position of the Pharisees as presented by Josephus corresponded not only with his own position but also with the position we may assign to the contemporary Stoics. Again, there should be no surprise at this given Josephus’ preference for Pharisaic ways and his likening of them to the Stoics.

---

233 There is a slight parallel to Ant. 18:13 in Herodotus (ca. 484 - ca. 425 B.C.) viii.60: “when in their counsels (δολευομένοι) [men] reject reason, God does not choose to follow the wanderings of human fancies”. With Herodotus as with Josephus, human will, divine will and fate are distinct. Noted by Thackeray, (1932), “Pharisees’ Doctrine of Fate”, 93 n. 3. Translation: Herodotus, (1990ET), History, 270a.

Second, they differed with the Stoics in that fate was not considered to be God’s direct will.\textsuperscript{235}

Third, according to Josephus, the Pharisees believed that life under fate lead to punishment, life lived under the Torah lead to reward (\textit{J.W.} 2:163). Failure to obey the will of God leads to abandonment by God to the inevitable forces of fate. Conversely, one may in fact obtain a certain freedom from fate by observance of the Torah or divine will.\textsuperscript{236}

Finally, a few scholars have noted the parallel between the portrait given by Josephus that the Pharisees believed in fate tempered by human will and a mishnah attributed to rabbi Aqiba b. Joseph (A.D. 40-135).\textsuperscript{237}

\textit{m. Abot} 3:15A

Translation of \textit{m. Abot} 3:15A\textsuperscript{238}

Everything is foreseen, and free choice is given.

While there is no suggestion that this is to be linked directly to the pre-70 Pharisees, the parallels are obvious. Within the context of the responsibility of man for his own actions,\textsuperscript{240} God’s foresight or providence (하실מ, פセンター) is counter-balanced with an individual’s רשות “free choice”. Yet they do not stand in opposition to one another. Whatever the individual does, whether it is within the torah or exposed to fate, he or she is governed by free choice and all is overseen by God.\textsuperscript{241}

Assuming the general reliability of Josephus’ account of the Pharisees, we may say that the Pharisees believed in fate as inevitable necessity, while allowing for certain actions to remain within the power of the individual. They saw torah as the means of freedom from fate since life lived by observance of the Torah meant life lived in the presence of the


\textsuperscript{238} Blackman, (1963-64), \textit{Mishnayoth IV}, 513.

\textsuperscript{239} Neusner, (1988\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Mishnah}, 680.

\textsuperscript{240} \textit{m. Abot} 3:15B-C, “In goodness the world is judged. And all is in accord with the abundance of deed[s]”; Urbach, (1979\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Sages I}, 257-58.

\textsuperscript{241} \textit{m. Abot} 2:1G.
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divine. Failure to live by torah meant the abandonment by God not only of his presence but also the abandonment by him of the “sinner” to the inevitable forces of fate. Nevertheless, all this comes under divine providence or foresight.

1.5.5.4 Torah and the Kingdom of God

Finally, how might we relate this picture of the Pharisees to the “kingdom of God”, a major theme of this thesis?

Josephus claimed that the Zealots (“fourth philosophy”) held very similar beliefs to the Pharisees except for one. They differed precisely in the degree to which the divine sovereignty of God overruled the secular rule of the Romans. For the Zealots the reality of God’s rule was such that μόνον ἡγεμόνα καὶ διεστότητα τῶν θεῶν “God alone is their leader and master” (Ant. 18:23, cf. J.W. 2:118,433). Those who continued subject to foreign rulers were equated with Gentiles and were to be punished with death. For them, freedom consisted not merely in rejection of the secular rule of the Romans, but also in observance of the Torah. They were thus like the Pharisees for whom observance of torah meant freedom from fate.

We may therefore rightly suspect that some Pharisees shared at least the theory behind the stand of the Zealots and certainly many more probably would have acknowledged the kingship of God while accepting the reality of, if not the need for, secular governance.

While Josephus never used the phrase “kingdom of God” or the like and only mentioned God as universal king and his reign three times, it would appear that Josephus shared the notion of the primary sovereignty of God. He described the Jewish nation as fundamentally θεοκρατία “theocracy”. No ruler was needed other than God.

---

242 Cf. Ant. 18:4, where one of the founders of the Zealots was a Pharisee. See: Riches, (1980), Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism, 93-94, 97; Riches, (1990), The World of Jesus, 118; Rogers, (1992), The Topical Josephus, 87.


246 See Section 2.5.1.5.
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It is more than possible then that this belief reflected the beliefs of the majority of pre-70 Pharisees. The Pharisees of the first century probably regarded observance of the Torah as not only freedom from fate but also as thereby responding to the reality of the sovereignty of, or the kingdom of, God. God’s sovereignty was a here-and-now universal reality (confirmed by the Divine Royal Presence in the temple) participated in by observance of the Torah.248

This picture of the Pharisaic attitude to the kingdom of God will be confirmed in Sections 2.3.1 and 3.3.1. It will come to a sharp focus particularly in Jesus’ first negative reply to the Pharisees in Luke 17:20-21, “The kingdom of God will not come by observance” and also in his positive reply, “The kingdom of God is among you”.249

1.5.6 The Influence of the Pharisees in Pre-70 Synagogues

Perhaps the most lively debate surrounding the picture of the Pharisees painted by Josephus and echoed in the Gospels, is over whether and to what extent the Pharisees exercised any influence over the Jewish people of Palestine and whether they exercised control over the synagogues. The second area is of particular relevance here because in the next Section, 1.6, it will be established that some of the “kingdom of God” verses in the Aramaic Targumim may have the potential to reflect pre-70 traditions taught in the synagogues. If pre-70 synagogues were either controlled or at least strongly influenced by the teaching of the Pharisees, then a reasonable case exists for concluding that any pre-70 talmudic “kingdom of God” sayings reflect the position of the Pharisees.

The debate over the influence of the Pharisees in first century Jewish Palestinian society per se was set in motion by Morton Smith’s seminal article entitled “Palestinian Judaism in the First Century”250 and championed by his student Jacob Neusner and others.251

---

248 Though based on later rabbinic literature, the following comment indicates that this attitude to the Torah (written and halakah) extended into the rabbis: “Rabbinic Judaism extended that perceived range of God’s authority by making His kingdom a kingdom of halakah: God reigns in the world now even when we do not see Him defeating Israel’s enemies, since He reigns through His Torah, which moulds all facets of Jewish life”, D. Hartman, (1985), A Living Covenant, 224. Cf. E. P. Sanders, (1977), Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 221-23; N. T. Wright, (1992), People of God, 228. Sanders and Wright both note that the Shekhinah rests on those who study and practice torah (m. Abot 3:2), so that the temple itself - the palace of the Divine King - is replaced by observance of torah. See Section 2.5.1.1.

249 See the relevant Sections in chapter 4.
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These insisted that, prior to A.D. 70, the Pharisees did not dominate or influence Palestinian Jewish society and that Josephus deliberately portrayed them as doing so especially in the later Antiquities in order to point out to his readers that their successors, the rabbis, now enjoyed such a position in Jewish society.

This view is now seriously undermined because the general reliability of the Josephan evidence regarding the three “sects” has recently been convincingly reaffirmed. The amount of Josephan material on the Pharisees in particular is so small in comparison with his entire corpus of work that no reader could assign any specific motive to his description that might have coloured or affected his comments.

More specifically however, several of the passages in Josephus that tell of Pharisaic influence also bemoan it - somewhat lessening the impact of the Smith-Neusner theory that Josephus wrote them as propaganda in favour of the Pharisees. Even if they can be conclusively shown to be originally Nicholaus of Damascus’ hostile opinion of the sect which opposed his patron Herod, they were nevertheless incorporated by Josephus and he made them his own as it were. Either way, they cannot be readily dismissed.

Josephus too, named a number of respected political figures both before and during the A.D. 66-70 war, all of whom were Pharisees, leading to the conclusion that Pharisees were not without representation in official circles.


See Section 1.5.1.


See also Mason, (1991), Josephus on the Pharisees, 372-73, who concluded: “[T]his ongoing lament over Pharisaic predominance would be unnecessary - indeed it would make no sense - if the Pharisees did not hold a dominant position in pre-70 Palestine. Josephus had no discernible reason to invent their popularity, since he regarded it as an unpleasant fact of life”.

This Josephan picture of Pharisaic influence if not dominance in the hearts and minds of the first century Palestinian Jew is supported by the Gospels. Their evidence also cannot be easily dismissed on the grounds of a religious agenda to bolster the image of Jesus and the early church. To be sure, they were possibly used for that purpose by the redactor of Luke-Acts for example, but Luke and the other Gospel writers based their “use” of the Pharisees on good source material. Indeed, all Gospel sources affirm that the Pharisees were indeed influential in society and held in high esteem.

But were they influential in the synagogues?

It is unfortunate that this question is not discussed today, for it is overshadowed by a narrower and therefore potentially misleading question, namely, did the Pharisees control the synagogues? This narrow question must be dealt with first. Three possibilities are open.

The first position is that the Pharisees had no connection whatsoever with pre-70 synagogues. Principal modern scholars who hold this are Lester L. Grabbe and Richard A. Horsley. Their argument is three-fold and amounts to a denial of the evidence. They claim their position on the grounds that: Josephus made no mention of synagogues in any of his descriptions of the Pharisees; only one NT passage, John 12:42, suggests a connection and since this was written after A.D. 70, the connection is anachronistic and therefore unreliable; and finally, that the early rabbinic traditions about the Pharisees also make no mention of a connection.

While it is true that Josephus made no explicit connection between synagogues and Pharisees, in Ant. 18:15, he wrote, ὅποσα θεία εὐχέων... καὶ ἔφων ποιήσεως “... all prayers and sacred rites of divine worship are performed according to their [Pharisees] exposition”.

Now, the evidence for prayer in first century Palestinian synagogues is not as strong as the evidence for prayer for Diaspora synagogues, but may be confidently presumed.

259 See Section 1.5.4.
Josephus most likely refers to the custom of praying in (Jerusalem and Galilean) synagogues, as does Jesus in Matthew's Gospel (6:5, notably a saying set in Galilee).

Given then the likelihood that Palestinian and particularly Galilean synagogues included prayers addressed to the “divine” as part of their liturgy, there is no reason for thinking that this phrase merely refers to the temple, nor is it probable, since neither the Pharisees nor ordinary people had control over the proceedings of temple worship. Thus, it is difficult to account for the meaning of this passage in any other way than to suggest that it is referring - albeit tangentially - to Pharisaic influence in synagogue worship, even if allowance is made for exaggeration on the part of Josephus. We may note that Josephus says nothing explicitly here about Pharisaic control, simply that they were able to strongly influence what was said and done.

John 12:42 is certainly the most important and explicit reference to the influence of Pharisees in synagogues in the NT. However, it is neither anachronistic nor the only such reference. For a discussion on this and the other NT verses, see below.

Finally, while it is true that the Mishnah makes no explicit connection between Pharisees and synagogues, there is no reason to expect any. Not only did the rabbis not consider themselves to be the heirs exclusively of the Pharisees, the rabbis were made up of other prominent Jewish men, some of whom no doubt were leaders of synagogues. In other words, there was nothing to be gained by emphasising such a connection. This point is


266 E. P. Sanders, (1992), Judaism, 395-98.

strengthened by the fact that there is possibly only one example where rabbinic literature as a whole discusses pre-70 synagogues.268

The second position is that the Pharisees did indeed control the synagogues. This is the older “traditional” view,269 but is held by a few modern scholars, including: Seán Freyne270 and Hyam Maccoby.271 Their view is based on the belief that the Pharisees founded the institution of the synagogue and that because the rabbis, the heirs to the Pharisees, controlled the post-70 synagogues, so did the Pharisees.

Unfortunately, not only is there no evidence that Pharisees founded the institution of the synagogue, the earliest archaeological evidence for synagogue buildings dates from the third century B.C. in Egypt.272 This suggests that in all likelihood the synagogue had its origin in the Diaspora of the Greek period and from there made its way into Palestine, precluding any initial involvement on the part of the Palestinian Pharisees.273 The earlier

---


1.5 Introduction: The Pharisees

Theories that the synagogue had its antecedents in the Babylonian exile and was encouraged by Ezra, or that Moses instituted regular synagogue worship, are now discounted on the basis of a lack of archaeological evidence.

When it comes to first century Palestinian synagogues, there is a fierce debate over whether the literary evidence suggests synagogue buildings or merely congregations and whether the archaeological finds of synagogue buildings in Palestine are in fact synagogues or constructions for other purposes. Though the debates are interesting,

---


For the suggestion that the synagogue emerged from the city-square, see: Hoenig, (1979), "The Ancient City Square", ANRW II.19.1, 448-76 (first and second century A.D.); Finkel, (1994), "Jesus’ Preaching in the Synagogue", 325-26 (exilic or early post-exilic); Horsley, (1995), Galilee, 226 (until early rabinnic times).

That the synagogue emerged as a result of the centralisation of the cult under the Deuteronomic reforms, see von Waldow, (1979), "The Origin of the Synagogue Reconsidered", 278.


they say nothing about whether Pharisees may have influenced their liturgy and teaching, which is the ultimate concern here.

As for the view that the Pharisees controlled the synagogues, because the rabbis, their heirs, did so, it may be quickly dismissed on two grounds. First, the rabbis were not heirs to the Pharisees as if there was a one-to-one or continuous relationship between the two. In any case, the Pharisees themselves did not control the synagogues. Secondly, as will be discussed in Section 1.6.6, there is no unequivocal evidence that the Yavnean or Tannaitic rabbis controlled the synagogues of Palestine.

The third, mediating, position, and the one that will be adopted here, is that the Pharisees neither controlled nor had nothing to do with synagogues, but rather that their influence extended to both synagogue liturgy and particularly to teaching. The leading modern scholars who may be said to opt for this position did so by arguing the case against Pharisaic control. They are: Ed P. Sanders, Martin Hengel and Roland Deines, and Shaye J. D. Cohen. They argued that: the Gospel evidence of a connection between Pharisees and synagogues does not demonstrate a picture of Pharisaic control; some

See Section 1.5.3.

279 See Section 1.5.3.

280 Others include: M. Smith, Jesus the Magician, 157; Hengel and Riches, The Charismatic Leader, 45 n. 26, 55; Saldrini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees, 52, 195. An interesting comment in favour of the stand can be found in: Cathcart and Gordon, The Targum of the Minor Prophets, 236 n. 13.

281 E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 193, 198, “one must certainly grant them some influence [in synagogues]”; E. P. Sanders, Jewish Law, 80; E. P. Sanders, Judaism, 398, “I think that we cannot safely generalize about who dominated how many synagogues, but we must doubt the general view that the Pharisees ran all of them.” Yet, on page 450 he wrote: “The Pharisees were generally responsible for the development of synagogues in Palestine”. See Neale, None but the Sinners, 26-27, who misunderstood Sanders on this point.

282 Hengel and Deines, “Common Judaism”, 32-34.

283 S. J. D. Cohen, Josephus in Galilee and Rome, 226; S. J. D. Cohen, “Pharisees and Rabbis”, 89-105, “No doubt some, perhaps many, synagogues in antiquity will have been under the religious influence of the Pharisees/rabbis”. See also: Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, 252 n. 26.
synagogues were in fact *controlled* by priests; no Pharisee is ever called an ἄρχισυνάγωγος “synagogue leader”; and, the number of Pharisees was too small to enable firm *control* over the synagogues.


**Matt 23:6a // Mark 12:39 // Luke 11:43, 20:46.** The Pharisees and scribes love “the best seats in the synagogues”. Although Cohen is probably right is saying that this verse merely indicates that the Pharisees occupy the best seats because of their social prominence,284 their social prominence would have translated into some *influence* in the synagogue itself.

**Matt 23:2.** “The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses’ seat”. This verse has been variously interpreted, most commentators preferring to draw out from it a references to an actual physical seat in synagogues because of its association with Matt 23:6.285 But it is likely to be rather a metaphor for the *influential* position the Pharisees held in the study and exposition of the Torah. That they held just such a position in society is confirmed on several occasions by Josephus (see below).

**Matt 23:34.** “... some you will flog in your synagogues”. The synagogues are those of the scribes and Pharisees.

**John 12:42.** “Nevertheless many, even of the authorities (τῶν ἄρχων), believed in him. But because of the Pharisees they did not confess it, for fear that they would be put out of the synagogue.” This is a telling verse. The “authorities” were members of the Sanhedrin. If they of all people were afraid of being put out of the synagogue because of the Pharisees, the Pharisees at the very least must have exercised strong *influence* in synagogues, particularly in the area of what was taught and preached.


The second claim made against Pharisaic control of synagogues, that some synagogues were controlled by priests, is certain. The Theodotus inscription from Jerusalem and Philo of Alexandria both indicate that at least their synagogues were led by priests. However, to use this as an argument that therefore Pharisees did not control any synagogues is flawed. Not only is this evidence merely from a single synagogue in Palestine and possibly third century A.D. at that, a priest was in fact not necessary for conducting synagogue liturgy. It also ignores the fact that some priests were Pharisees.

That no Pharisee is ever called an “synagogue leader” may be conceded, but again that does not necessarily preclude Pharisees from influence within the synagogue community. In any case, in ancient Diaspora synagogues at least, hierarchical authority structures were largely non-existent. The title “synagogue leader” was symbolic and based on benefaction. Other strong figures in Jewish communities exercised influence if not control.

The third claim, that the number of Pharisees was too small to ensure general control over Palestinian synagogues looks like a convincing argument also against their effective influence, but closer inspection reveals otherwise.

Josephus, in Ant. 17:42, claimed that more than 6,000 Pharisees refused to make an oath of allegiance to Herod the Great. This is taken by some to be the total number of Pharisees in Palestine (under the rule of Herod). Such a small number, it is said, could not hope to be in a position to control much at all. However, even if this number was in fact the total number of Pharisees and not merely the number of those who refused to swear allegiance, it still amounts to at least three per cent of the total Jewish population, given a total adult

---


291 In the *Dialogue with Trypho* 137.2, Justin Martyr wrote: “Assent, therefore, and pour no ridicule on the Son of God; obey not the Pharisaic teachers, and scoff not at the king of Israel, as the rulers of the synagogues (ἀρχισυνάγωγοι) teach you to do after your prayers” (*ANF I*, 268a). Justin clearly distinguished between Pharisees and the rulers of the synagogues, and it is likely that he referred to the pre-70 Pharisees, see S. J. D. Cohen, (1999), “Pharisees and Rabbis”, 100-101.

male population of around 200,000.\textsuperscript{293} This would be more than enough to be able to influence key institutions and for prominent Pharisees to rise to positions of leadership - as in fact they did.\textsuperscript{294}

Finally, while the possibility that Pharisees in fact grew out of the institution of scribes is in dispute,\textsuperscript{295} it seems clear that in the first century some Pharisees were scribes.\textsuperscript{296} In three places in the NT (Mark 2:16, Luke 5:30, Acts 23:9) we are told that some scribes were Pharisees. Since “scribes” were also teachers,\textsuperscript{297} we have here some indication that at least some Pharisees might have been in positions not merely of influence in society but of some measure of influence in the teaching of torah in general. In fact, that Pharisees were listened to by the population generally and specifically in matters to do with the exposition and interpretation of the Torah, is a point repeated numerous times by Josephus.\textsuperscript{298}

All this of course presupposes that pre-70 Palestinian synagogues conducted liturgy, Torah study and exposition.\textsuperscript{299}

The liturgical use of the Torah and Prophets in synagogues is indicated by: contemporary literary evidence and evidence that repositories were kept in synagogues for that purpose; and if a building at Masada is a synagogue, by the fragments of biblical texts found

\textsuperscript{293} Jeremias, (1969\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus}, 205, estimated the total Jewish population to have been between 500,000 and 600,000. Assuming half were female and at least 100,000 boys, 200,000 adult males does not seem unreasonable. Hengel and Deines, (1995), “Common Judaism”, 33 n. 85, estimate 200,000 adult males.

\textsuperscript{294} See footnotes above which give references in Josephus and the Gospels of prominent named and unnamed Pharisees.

\textsuperscript{295} See Section 1.5.1.


\textsuperscript{297} Neh 8:9,13, Philo, \textit{Flacc.} 3; Binder, (1999), \textit{Into the Temple Courts}, 363-35, 433.

\textsuperscript{298} See: Ant. 13:297-98, the Pharisees had the support of the masses when it came to the interpretation of the Torah; Ant. 13:401,408, Alexandra Salome restored τὸ σῶμα σωματίδιον “the regulations” of the Pharisees because they were popular; J.W. 2:162, the Pharisees had the reputation for accurate interpretation of “the regulations”; Ant. 20:264, Josephus stated that deference is paid by Jews generally to anyone who acquires an accurate knowledge of the Torah and an ability to interpret it; Ant. 18:15, cf. J.W. 2:166, the Pharisees were popular among the people because of their views; and, Ant. 18:17, where presumably even the Sadducees were forced by the Pharisees’ popularity to acquiesce in matters to do with the synagogue.


Of particular note is \textit{Ag.Ap.} 2:175, in which Josephus stated that every week men assembled “to listen to the Law and obtain a thorough and accurate (\textit{e\textbeta\textomicron\nu\textomicron\nu\textomicron\sigma\textomicron\nu\textomicron\nu}) knowledge of it”. The use of the adjective “accurate” in association with the Torah strongly hints at the direct \textit{influence} of the Pharisees in the teaching of it in synagogues, though other groups and individuals may have had a similar reputation.\footnote{m. \textit{Meg.}, 4:6A,D. See Section 1.6.4.}

As for non-liturgical education, this too may be assumed, though no explicit evidence presently exists. First, the need to teach children to read was an understood requirement of Mosaic law.\footnote{Frey, (1936), \textit{CIJ II}, n. 1404; Matt 4:23, Luke 13:10.} Minors and other non-officials were apparently permitted not only to read the Hebrew but also to give an Aramaic targum of that reading in liturgical worship.\footnote{Guttmann, (1992), “Gamla”, \textit{NEAEH II}, 461-62; Binder, (1999), \textit{Into the Temple Courts}, 434. For the link between school and synagogue, see Bloedhorn and Hütt enmeister, (1999), “The Synagogue”, 293.} Teaching was associated with synagogues.\footnote{Frey, (1936), \textit{CIJ II}, n. 1404; Matt 4:23, Luke 13:10.}

Second, a small room inside the first century synagogue at Gamla was quite possibly used as a school-room.\footnote{Frey, (1936), \textit{CIJ II}, n. 1404; Matt 4:23, Luke 13:10.}

Third, although all these functions were carried out also by the Jerusalem temple,\footnote{Frey, (1936), \textit{CIJ II}, n. 1404; Matt 4:23, Luke 13:10.} daily or regular travel to Jerusalem by students even from areas in Judaea would have been
impractical and certainly not conducive to good study. Even if the reference in Luke 4:16 to Jesus reading from the Hebrew scroll in the synagogue at Nazareth is anachronistic, the assumption of the redactor (and his source?) nevertheless was that Jesus did learn to read Hebrew, despite growing up far from Jerusalem.

Lastly, Philo on five occasions called a synagogue a διδασκαλεῖον “school (building)” - an indication of one of its functions. At least two of these references imply that such synagogues were present in Palestine as well as in the Diaspora.

To sum up, many individual Pharisees were influential members of society and indeed most ordinary Jews looked to the Pharisees in general for correct interpretations of Torah, though few Pharisees were probably in control of any institution. This influence, by its very nature, extended into the synagogue, especially into the area of the study and exposition of the Torah and Prophets.

---


306 For this opinion, see H. A. McKay, (1994), Sabbath and Sacrifice, 164.

307 Philo, Mos. 2:216, Decal. 40 (including Palestine), Spec. Leg. 2:62, Praem. 66 (including Palestine), Leg. 312. See also Binder, (1999), Into the Temple Courts, 133-35.
1.6 THE TARGUMIM

Along with such phrases as “my kingdom” and “his kingdom”, the Aramaic Targumim also contain a number of examples of “kingdom of the Lord” as well as numerous references to God as king. If it can be demonstrated that even some of these may be traced in origin back to the pre-70 synagogue, a strong case will have been made for supposing that these pre-70 traditions reflect the position of the Pharisees since the Pharisees influenced the teaching of first century Palestinian synagogues.

1.6.1 What are the Targumim?

Traditionally, the literary genre of the non-Qumran Aramaic Targumim has been described as translation from the Hebrew. More recently, the Targumim have been described as paraphrases, or interpretations. Alexander Samely described the Targumim as “dedicated exegetical rewording of Scripture”, though of a different kind to midrash. Given the fact that the Aramaic word means both “translation” and “interpretation”, this confusion in definition is understandable. However, perhaps as an indication of the complexity and infancy of Targum studies, neither is uniformly the case.

As a literary corpus, the non-Qumran Targumim may be classified along the following lines.

---

308 The Hebrew word occurs in the Hebrew Bible only at Ezra 4:7. In this and subsequent Sections and chapters, the Jewish Targumim as opposed to the Samaritan Targum are meant in every case, cf. Tov, (1992), Textual Criticism, 149.


315 As recently as 1995, Paul V. McC. Flesher was able to write: “the targums remain an under-utilised source; scholars of Second-Temple Judaism, rabbinic Judaism, and early Christianity have only begun to delve into them”, Flesher, (1995), “The Targumim”, 41.
**The Targumim to the Pentateuch.** Targum Onqelos (Tg. Onq.) is the best known. Its Aramaic dialect shows strong western elements indicating its genesis in Palestine, yet since it is mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud and shows the influence of eastern Aramaic, its redaction probably took place in Babylon under the influence of the rabbis, so that its dialect is now designated “Babylonian Aramaic” of the “Late Aramaic” phase.\(^{316}\) The dialect of Targum Neofiti (Tg. Neof.), the most recently discovered of the Targumim, is “Palestinian Aramaic”, since there is no evidence of redaction outside of Palestine. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (Tg. Ps.-J.) may be similarly described. Two groups of Targum fragments, those of the Cairo Geniza (Tg. C.G.) and those grouped under the title “Fragments” with two main recensions, one from the Paris library (Tg. Frg. P) the other from the Vatican (Tg. Frg. V), also show similar characteristics to Neofiti and Pseudo-Jonathan.\(^{317}\)

**The Targumim to the Prophets.** Targum Jonathan (Tg. Neb.) incorporates the whole of the Former and Latter Prophets. It had a similar composition history to Onqelos, i.e. it originated in Palestine but received redaction in Babylon. Its Aramaic is from the “Late Aramaic” period and is again of the eastern variety. This would place its literary formation in the period A.D. 200-700 in Babylon, i.e. somewhat contemporary with the formation of the Mishnah-Talmud corpus.\(^{318}\)

**The Targumim to the Writings or Hagiographa (Tg. Ket.).** Redaction of these books is considered to be medieval though again betraying “Late Aramaic”. As such they will not

---


be considered here. They are of diverse literary form, ranging from translation to midrash, though even here some scholars would posit a Palestinian origin. They fall into two groups: the five scrolls (Megilloth); and the rest (except for Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel which do not have a Targum).319

1.6.2 Translation Techniques

Linguistically, Aramaic is very similar to Hebrew. Both languages have the same grammatical, syntactical and semantic structures. Thus in theory a translation of Hebrew into Aramaic can be done in a word-for-word manner retaining the original structure in a way impossible say for the translators of the LXX.320 It ought to be the case then that any deviation along grammatical, syntactical or semantic lines from the original Hebrew will reflect the particular concerns not simply of the final translator but of the tradition behind the formation of the text for which he is the last in a long line.

In broad terms, several techniques in Targum translation have been uncovered: the word-for-word translation, sometimes called “literal” or “base” translation; the base translation with a word or two altered;321 the base translation with explanatory additions;322 and a free paraphrase such that it is frequently impossible to detect any base translation.323 That such a literary analysis is possible warns against categorising the literary genre of the Targumim as a whole.324

Specific issues within these basic techniques have also received scholarly attention,325 especially: the extent and meaning of supposed anti-anthropomorphisms;326 the instances

---


322 E.g. Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 4:3-16, 18:1-5.

323 E.g. Tg. Lam 1:1, Song 5:10-16.


325 See Alexander, (1988), “Jewish Aramaic Translations”, 226-29, for brief descriptions of these and others.
where the Targum does not “translate” at all but simply ignores the text;\textsuperscript{327} and instances where the Targum translates in such a way as to completely oppose the meaning of the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{328}

It is this last phenomenon that is of special interest here, not only because several relevant passages that will be discussed in Section 3.7 will be shown to exhibit this technique known as “Converse Translation”, but that such translation exposes a fundamental conceptual shift from the time of the Hebrew to the time of the Targum tradition. Here it is enough to simply establish the principle and make a few comments on its significance.

Michael L. Klein is credited with reviving awareness of the technique in modern times.\textsuperscript{329} He noted that the Targumim execute their converse translation in one of four ways: by the addition or deletion of the negative particle;\textsuperscript{330} by the replacement of the verb; by resolution of rhetorical questions; and by addition of the negative particle שֶׁלשׁ “lest”.

In the examples Klein cited, he concluded that converse translations were made for a variety of reasons.

The addition or deletion of the negative particle was made for example in: Gen 4:14, to ensure that it could not be said that man could hide from God; Gen 4:23, to harmonise the text and thus avoid a contradiction; Gen 5:24, 42:36, to give the current exegesis especially where the Hebrew text is ambivalent; Gen 37:33, 43:14, 46:30, to ensure that the belief in the resurrection of the dead is not denied;\textsuperscript{331} Gen 48:22, to avoid ascribing battle with bow and sword to Jacob; and in Exod 33:20 to reinforce the belief that no one can see God and live.

The replacement of the verb with one of opposite meaning was done, for example in: Exod 33:3,5, to ensure that the presence of God was always with his people; and in Deut 15:4 and 15:11 to harmonise a possible contradiction.


\textsuperscript{329} Through his article, Klein, (1976), “Converse Translation”, 515-37. He noted on p. 516 n. 5 that Elias Levita had previously observed this feature in the sixteenth century.

\textsuperscript{330} Gordon, (1999), “Converse Translation”, 3-21, is concerned with this first category.

\textsuperscript{331} See also Gordon, (1978), “Targumists as Eschatologists”, 114.
Finally, the addition of אָלַד “lest” is made to avert a curse or evil prediction, for example, in Exod 22:23 and Deut 7:4.

Any translation of a document, more especially that of the Scriptures, does not take place in a vacuum. The relative frequency of the phenomenon of converse translation testifies to the fact that we cannot often blame textual variants for the deviations but must look for other motives for the interpretations that the Targumists placed on their text.332 Not only will the translator bring to the text his own ideas and even prejudices, traditions of interpretation, especially those surrounding difficult texts, will also have a bearing on the final product. Further, the translator will be writing for a contemporary audience.333

In Section 3.7 it will be demonstrated that the Hebrew verb אָבַב “to come” is conversely translated by the Aramaic verb חָלֵג “to reveal” in those contexts where the kingdom of God is referred to or where the metaphor of God as king is explicit or implied. It is therefore an example of Klein’s second category (the replacement of the verb with one of opposite meaning). This translation reflects the fundamentally different understanding of the nature of the presence of the Divine King between the writers of the Hebrew text and those represented by the targumic tradition.

1.6.3 Dating the Targumic Kingdom Traditions

Before addressing the specific issue of dating the kingdom traditions in the Targumim, certain general problems relating to the dating of the Targumim need to be tackled.

The dating of the various Targumim is extremely problematic (the various arguments being described by one scholar as inconclusive and “circular”334) for much the same reasons as it is difficult to obtain a precise date for the Christian Gospels. Scholars are no longer as confident as Martin McNamara was in 1972, “[T]he bulk of the material which we have in the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch comes from pre-Christian times”.335

Among the reasons for the difficulty may be deduced the following:

332 “Targumist” is used in a collective sense, of all who contributed to the final text.
334 Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 11.
335 McNamara, (1972), Targum and Testament, 88, see also 85.
First, there is no consensus on the method to be employed in approaching the field of Targum study. Three examples will suffice to illustrate the reality of this problem.

For some time two assumptions by Paul Kahle and others have produced results of dubious or no value: the so-called Palestinian Targumim are older than Onqelos and Onqelos and Jonathan are wholly Babylonian; and, if a halakah is contrary to known halakot in the rabbinic literature, then it must be older than that ruling in the rabbinic literature. Both have been sufficiently called into question, notably by Anthony York as to exclude any conclusion based on these assumptions.

There is also the debate over the dating of Tg. Ps.-J. Two scholars Avigdor Shinan and Charles T. R. Hayward use similar methods applied in different ways to come to completely different results. Shinan argued for a post-Islamic (early medieval) dating, while Hayward proposed at the latest a date in the late fourth or early fifth century, suggesting that verses which betray a very late date were contemporary interpolations.

There is the question of how to interpret: the absence or inclusion of verses of Targumim that are forbidden to be translated in rabbinic literature; and the contradictions between the Targumim and rabbinic halakot. The fact that some of the Targumim include most if not all of these forbidden translations or contradictions is thought by some to indicate that

---

Targumim were used for study purposes in addition to public worship, while for others it means merely that they were composed prior to the relevant rabbinic record.

The second problem in dealing with the dating of the Targumim is the fact that there is no scholarly consensus regarding the interrelationships between the Targumim. Attempts to find proto versions, by Bruce Chilton, Paul V. McC. Flesher and others, by employing similar techniques as those used for the Synoptic Gospels, based on the premise that all the Targumim exhibit indications of a Palestinian origin, have yet to be fully tested. As Walter Aufrecht pointed out, the Targumim were “composed at different times to meet different translational, hermeneutical, and liturgical needs”. Gabriele Boccaccini, in the same book as one of Flesher’s essays on synoptic parallels, pointed out forcefully that such a desire to get back to a proto-targum presupposes that there was a single Targum tradition and indeed a single first-century Judaism. “But discontinuity - not less than continuity - characterizes targumic tradition; each Targum has its own personality and defines a distinct ideological system. . . . Parallels among documents do not mean dependence or agreement.”

Finally, all the Targumim show evidence of language and material that can be individually dated to various periods. This includes Tg. Neof. which was thought by Alejandro Díez Macho and others to be entirely pre-Christian. This early dating of Tg. Neof. in its

---

347 Kaufman, (1994), “Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums”, 129. This desire is very much like Martin McNamara’s habit of labelling numerous Targumim (Tg. Ps.-J., Frg. Tg., Tg. C.G., Tg. Neof., i.e. all but Tg. Onq.) under the one epithet “Palestinian Targum”. See any of his works, e.g. McNamara, (1972), *Targum and Testament*, 81, 173; McNamara, (1983), *Palestinian Judaism*, 207; McNamara, (1983), *Intertestamental Literature*, 269. This habit is explained in his recent book McNamara, (1992 ET), *Neofiti I, Genesis*, 8. Here he claimed that Neofiti 1 is a “complete copy of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch”.
present form has been well refuted by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Anthony D. York, Stephen A. Kaufman and others by convincing critiques of their textual analysis and methodology.

The situation, however, is not hopeless. With two caveats these potential pitfalls may be avoided or at least limited in their effectiveness. Each Targum document will be treated initially as if it has the same chance of preserving old traditions and each relevant verse in the Targumim will be treated (without further evidence to the contrary) as if it is embedded in younger traditions and redactional material. That is, each verse will be treated on its own merits and exegesis may be necessarily limited to that particular verse or part thereof.

One further methodological approach needs to be flagged before discussion of the dating of the kingdom of God sayings in the Targumim. That is, that like the formation of the Gospels, the assumption will be that the Targumim underwent a similar three-fold stage of formation, namely: oral; oral and written; and redaction.

This of course begs the question as to when Targum traditions first began to be written. The answer, whatever it may be, is in fact not relevant here. The interest is in the

---


357 See Section 1.2.2.

358 Golomb, (1985), Grammar of Targum Neofiti, 5, insisted that there was no connection between the extant Targumim and the activities of the Ṣebenna “Meturgman” in the synagogue liturgy. Even if he is right (few today would argue for absolutely no connection), what is being argued here is a connection of tradition or substance between them.

359 The question is, nevertheless, quite fascinating. The evidence of at least a tradition of written targumim in the first century seems incontrovertible, though nothing conclusive exists that the present Aramaic Targumim had written forms or sources in the first century. See, e.g. Shinan, (1992), “The Aramaic Targum as a Mirror of Galilean Jewry”, 244, “The phenomenon of the Aramaic Targum is, of course, very early and can be traced back to the Second Temple period, while the extant manuscripts of Targum are relatively late”.

Aramaic translations of fragments of Job and Leviticus have been found at Qumran. For a discussion of the Targumim from Qumran, especially 11QtgJob, see Fitzmyer, (1997), “The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI”, 161-82. The problem with using this as evidence of a first century written Targum tradition is that depending on one’s definition of targum these may or may not be targumim. 4QtgLev, 4QtgJob and 11QtgJob are straight translations without the normal exegetical embellishments associated with the Targumim, see: Fraade, (1992), “Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum”, 254; McNamara, (1972), Targum and Testament, 63-66; McNamara, (1983), Intertestamental Literature, 268; Fitzmyer, (1997), “The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI”, 164. For example, Samely, (1994), “Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew?”, 98 n. 18, did not want to label 11QtgJob as a Targum because of this, although designating the Qumran
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Introduction or the substance behind the relevant extant Targumim not in their precise semantic syntactical or grammatical construction.

Paul V. McC. Flesher and Bruce D. Chilton delineate four and two stages respectively in the formation of the Targumim. These can be easily accommodated into the three-fold scheme by incorporating two or more of their stages into Stage II.


1QapGen is sometimes included in the list, though its literary genre is better categorised as “Rewritten Bible”, similar to Jubilees and Josephus’ Antiquities. See: Flesher, (1995), “The Targumim”, 43; Fitzmyer, (1971), The Genesis Apocryphon, 11; McNamara, (1983), Intertestamental Literature, 147. The Aramaic portions of 4QTob may be remains of Tobit in its original language. In any case they do not display the targumic style of free translation and so should not be included.

Secondly, we know that the Jews of the Greek Diaspora had not hesitated to translate the Scriptures. The LXX not only offers a simple translation - a precedent for a translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic text (Norton, (1994), “Jews, Greeks and the Hexapla of Origen”, 403) - but in places embellishes or alters the BHS (e.g. apart from Job 42:17b, LXX Isa 9:11 replaces “Aram and the Philistines” with “Syria and the Greeks”). See also Section 1.2.3 on the LXX.

Thirdly, in the LXX version of Job 42:17b, just such an embellishment contains an allusion to an Aramaic version of the book: ὁ δὲ ἀκούσει ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βιβλίου “This (man) is explained in the Syriac book”. The noun Συριακή is commonly understood as referring to Aramaic (e.g. NRSV 2 Macc 15:36), and is similar to the adverb Συριστή in LXX 2 Kgs 18:26, Ezra 4:7, Isa 36:11, Dan 2:4 (BHS Συριστή in each case). If this does refer to an Aramaic version of Job and not to some Aramaic apocryphal work, then this is a very early indication of a possible Targum to Job. See: McNamara, (1972), Targum and Testament, 66; Winter, (1954), “Lc 249 and Targum Yerushalmi”, 157; Fitzmyer, (1997), “The Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI”, 167.

For a brief discussion of the problems associated with equating Συριακή with Aramaic, especially its relationship to the adverb Ἐβραϊστή (which can sometimes mean “Aramaic”. e.g. John 19:13) and related words, see Fitzmyer, (1997), “The Languages of Palestine”, 43.

Fourthly, works generally classified as “rewritten Bible” around the first century such as those of Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, Philo and Jubilees are thought to have had access to targum traditions if not the written Targumim.


Turning our attention to Chilton’s stages, he claimed that *Tg. Neb.* Isa was amongst the earliest of the Targumim to be committed to writing. He saw in it two stages of formation, not unlike the four stages of Targum formation of Flesher: the Tannaitic and the Amoraic, with the Tannaitic divided into two strata: pre-70 and post-70. The stages are to be distinguished chiefly by their respective attitudes to the (Jerusalem) temple. The first still hopes for the actual rebuilding or restoration of the temple, the second sees God’s dwelling place as already existing in heaven. The Tannaitic is nationalistic and eschatological, the other “more settled” and “theoretical”. Given the complexity of formation and language of any Targum, Chilton wisely cautioned against assuming either that these different stages can be discerned in a single given passage or that every section or chapter can be necessarily assigned to one or the other. In the end, it is “impossible with any certainty to decide when the work of one leaves off and that of another takes up”. His general failure to take into account the natural influence of the foundational Hebrew text should warn against taking this development of kingdom doctrine as assured.

With regard to the “kingdom of God” verses in the Targumim, Chilton dated them according to the above schema. In the Tannaitic stage the universalistic rendering of the Divine Kingdom in *Tg. Neb.* Obad 21b and *Tg. Neb.* Zech 14:9a, characteristic of pre-70, gave way to the nationalistic connection between the divine kingdom and “Zion” as in *Tg. Neb.* Isa 24:23b, 31:4c. In the later Amoraic period, the Messiah was associated with the kingdom of God and the late term מועדנה “congregation” - indicating a loss of

---


362 According to Chilton, the pre-70 phase articulates this in terms of a proper regulation of the cult, the post-70 phase of an actual physical rebuilding, Chilton, (1982), *The Glory of Israel*, 99.


364 Chilton, (1982), *The Glory of Israel*, 101, “What we have postulated to explain the growth of the Isaiah Targum is not a series of mechanical redactions, but the unfolding of an interpretive continuum”.


367 See Section 3.3.1.3. Chilton ignored *Tg. Neb.* Jer 10:7,10, 49:38, and the Pentateuchal Targumim.

368 See Section 3.5.1.3. Chilton made very little use of *Tg. Neb.* Isa 40:9,10 and *Tg. Neb.* Ezek 7:7,10.
national identity - was used to describe God’s people. This is encapsulated in Tg. Neb. Isa 52:7 and Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7b,8.\(^{369}\)

While this method of dating the kingdom of God sayings in the Targumim will be followed in this thesis and in fact used to date other closely related targumim, it suffers to an extent from being based on circular arguments.

For Dennis C. Duling,\(^{370}\) A. P. Hayman,\(^{371}\) and Ed P. Sanders,\(^{372}\) Chilton used perceived similarities between Jesus and the Targumim on the kingdom of God as proof that his dating of them was correct and then proceeded to conclude that pre-70 traditions show that the similar sayings of Jesus were authentic.\(^{373}\)

Richard White\(^{374}\) saw circular reasoning in Chilton’s otherwise “very plausible” picture. Chilton’s dating of material on the basis of whether the temple had or had not been destroyed neglected the fact that the Targumim frequently do little more than modify a similar statement in the original Hebrew. So that, for example, a verse that gives no hint of the destruction need not therefore have its origin before A.D. 70.

A third possible circularity lies in the use of allusions to datable historical events, a technique Chilton\(^{375}\) adopted from what was for him a very influential work, Pinkhos Churgin’s *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. However, such a method is fraught with pitfalls, unless it is confined to explicit references. The danger is two-fold: that of anachronism;\(^{376}\) and that which has become known as “Parallelomania”.\(^{377}\) That is, reading back with the benefit of hindsight what we know to have occurred and finding parallels with the smallest of coherences. These dangers have been known for some time

\(^{369}\) Chilton, (1978), “Regnum Dei Deus Est”, 269; Chilton, (1982), *The Glory of Israel*, 77-81, 100, 103. Meier, (1994), *Marginal Jew II*, 287 n. 113, criticised Chilton’s use of Isaiah because of problems about dating. He cited unfairly Chilton’s (1978) early work as if this was all Chilton had to say on the matter. See also the much earlier Schechter, (1895), “Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology”, 208, which noted the nationalistic rabbinic connection “of the kingdom of Israel with the kingdom of God”, played out particularly with the contrast between the kingdom of God/Israel and that of Rome.


\(^{373}\) Cf. Section 1.4.2.1.


\(^{376}\) In regard to the use of rabbinic literature in the study of the NT, see Section 1.2.3.

now with respect to the use of rabbinic literature in NT studies. To be fair, Chilton acknowledged these dangers (without the use of the technical terms), though they were not enough to deter him from drawing conclusions based on these allusions, given the layers of formation he discerned.

Despite these reservations, Chilton’s method for dating the kingdom targumim will be used in this present work. They represent the only coherent attempt to so date these targumim and they provide a way of screening out late traditions. Chilton’s dating of the tradition of universal kingdom sayings to the pre-70 period will in fact be borne out by the evidence presented.

1.6.4 The Targumim and the First Century Pre-70 Synagogue

Neh 8:8 (and to a lesser extent Neh 13:24), following talmudic and midrashic references, has often been cited as the first indication of an Aramaic translation alongside the Hebrew original in a worship setting. However, the passage is neither explicit that translation was involved nor that the setting was synagogue worship. In fact, the passage refers to a homily and was a special, singular, though nonetheless liturgical occasion.

There is no direct evidence that either written Targumim or oral targumim were used in the liturgical worship of the first century pre-70 Palestinian synagogue. However, we may assume that the Hebrew portions of the Torah and Prophets were followed by an Aramaic targum for the following reasons.

In the liturgies of Ptolemaic Egypt (cf. m. Meg. 1:8B), the Septuagint actually replaced the Hebrew text. While there is no indication that the Septuagint was used in the synagogues of Palestine (even amongst the Hellenistic ones), or that the Septuagint was read in addition to the original Hebrew, the Egyptian practice was no doubt discussed there, and perhaps followed in synagogues that catered for foreign Jews.

378 Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 5-7; Chilton, (1984), Galilean Rabbi, 45.
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In a mishnah that dates from the Usha period (based on the mention of the Ushan sage R. Judah b. Ilai) which followed the Bar Kochba revolt, the following directions are given for the recitation of an Aramaic translation of the Hebrew (m. Meg. 4:4-10): readings from the Hebrew Torah are read one verse at a time first, followed by the translator (נְמַגְּרוֹמֵן, "meturgman") and readings from the Prophets, three verses at a time; a child (נַעַר) may read the Hebrew or translate (i.e. provide a targum), but the same person may not do both; the translator must translate without simultaneous recourse to a written text (i.e. the blind man of 4:6D, a prohibition which indicates that there must have been even at this early stage such a written translation); there are some passages (see also m. Sot. 7:2) that are read in the Hebrew but are not to be translated; and, if the meturgman gave an incorrect targum, he could be silenced or rebuked there and then.

That this Ushan rule exists without justification suggests that the practice may go back prior to A.D. 135, and there is no reason why it could not have originated before A.D. 70. After all, the נְמַגְּרוֹמֵן did not operate in a vacuum, translating and interpreting as he chose, but gave the sense of the Hebrew based on accepted exegesis, the substance of which would have had a long, albeit continuously developing, tradition.

A third indirect indication is that since the common language of the day was Aramaic, to learn Hebrew required education and not all Jews, particularly women, would have had access to this. Thus the provision of an interpretation/translation of the biblical text in the vernacular would seem to have been a natural imperative.

On the other hand, it must be repeated that no direct evidence exists for the use of Aramaic translations in the liturgical worship of second temple synagogues, including the time of Jesus. Precisely where we might expect to find such references (the NT, Josephus, Philo, the Mishnah) there is utter silence.

Yet, some scholars are surely wrong to draw the conclusion from this silence that targumim were not given either in Palestine or in the Diaspora in Second Temple times.

---

383 Cf. Golomb, (1985), Grammar of Targum Neofiti, 7, made this conclusion based on later Talmudic references, strangely ignoring this one.
384 See Section 1.6.3 above.
The reason for the silence might simply be due to the real possibility that such a targum was either taken for granted or delivered as an early form of homily or commentary.\(^{387}\)

In addition to these tantalising possibilities, there is stronger evidence to suggest that Targumim, or at least the targumic tradition of Aramaic “translation” of Hebrew Scriptures, was a feature of the first century synagogue school.

The Qumran targumim (if that is their genre),\(^{388}\) especially 4QtgJob and 11QtgJob, indicate that written targumim were used in the late Second Temple period in situations other than liturgical celebrations, because Job was never read in the synagogue worship. Indeed the Targumim to the Writings, apart from the Megilloth, were not read in the synagogue at all.

Secondly, the unattributed mishnahs \textit{m. Shab.} 16:1, \textit{m. Meg.} 2:1 and \textit{m. Yad.} 4:5, attest to the existence of written Aramaic targumim, certainly in the Tannaitic period but probably in the pre-70 period as well. But again, there is no indication in any verse that they were to be used in liturgical worship.

Thirdly, some scholars have suggested that targumim, otherwise forbidden in rabbinic literature, were translations or traditions of interpretation meant for study purposes and not for the general public.\(^{389}\) If the rules regarding forbidden targumim were adhered to and if such a tradition can be traced back to the first century, it is hard to account for their presence in any other way than in the first century synagogue school.

Fourthly, since a minor or any suitably qualified person was able to read the Hebrew and offer a translation, this points to the situation that reading Hebrew and translating it into Aramaic while observing the accepted interpretation were skills possessed by more than the synagogue hierarchy.\(^{390}\)

Lastly, that \textit{m. Meg.} 4:4-10 only applied to synagogue worship does not logically exclude the use of written Targumim either in preparing the meturgman for his task or in studying the Scriptures outside worship.\(^{391}\) That the Targumim are not vernacular but technical Aramaic, also suggests that they were used in education, both in the study of the Hebrew


\(^{388}\) See footnote in Section 1.6.3 above.

\(^{389}\) See Section 1.6.3 above.


\(^{391}\) McNamara, (1966\(^2\)), \textit{The NT and the Palestinian Targum}, 41.
Scriptures for its own sake and in the training of meturgmans. They probably represent
the authorised standard interpretation of their day, which again would have been based
on traditions of interpretation. Such traditions would have become fixed at different times
for different verses, sections, etc.

There would thus have been a great deal of training and preparation to read the Hebrew
and to offer an Aramaic targum that was both faithful to the Hebrew and to the current
exegesis. The only place that had the necessary equipment and teachers would have been
the schools attached to synagogues (cf. m. Abot 5:21).

Given that exposition of Scripture was part of both the school and the synagogue, a sharp
distinction between the two cannot be drawn. Although the earliest sure evidence we
have that Aramaic targumim were given in synagogues dates from the Ushan period, there
are strong indications that the custom was derived from earlier and probably pre-70
practice. These traditions were ultimately directed to the worshipping public, though
they were also used and formulated by scholars in the study of the Hebrew Scriptures.
In both cases, their home was the synagogue.

1.6.5 Pharisees and the Targumim

What then was the relationship of the Pharisees to the pre-70 targumic tradition? The
conclusions of previous Sections which are relevant to an answer to this question may be
summarised thus: the Pharisees exercised some influence in the teaching conducted in first
century Palestinian synagogues, particularly in the interpretation and exposition of

---

Aramaic Targum as a Mirror of Galilean Jewry”, 241-42; McNamara, (1983), Palestinian
395 There is a great deal of other material from the Tosefta and Talmuds which elaborates on this basic
information. However, to have included them would have meant incorporating not only late
material, but traditions which were developed from those of the Tannim.
Synagogue and in the School”, 83; Shinan, (1992), “The Aramaic Targum as a Mirror of Galilean
397 The probability that Aramaic Targumim of both the oral and written varieties were used and
formulated by scholars challenges the prevailing view that this was done because the original
Hebrew text read in synagogues was becoming increasingly less understood. Their use may have
been primarily because it enabled the Hebrew text to stand apart from any attempt to alter it by
paraphrase or comment. For modern scholars who assume the common opinion see: Fitzmyer,
1.6 Introduction: The Targumim

Scripture;\textsuperscript{398} Aramaic targumim, both oral and written, which present not only translation, but interpretation and exposition of Scripture, were probably in use in these synagogues;\textsuperscript{399} and, within the extant Aramaic Targumim, may be traced some traditions which go back to the pre-70 period.\textsuperscript{400}

Thus, given the influence the Pharisees had in the synagogue and their predilection for “tradition”,\textsuperscript{401} it is not unreasonable to suppose that their involvement in targumic traditions was influential. If a Targum tradition can be traced back to the first century, we may presume that it indicates a tradition that reflects the beliefs of the Pharisees.

1.6.6 The Influence of the Yavnean Rabbis in Post-70 Synagogues

If the Pharisees were influential in the teaching of the pre-70 Palestinian synagogues,\textsuperscript{402} did the rabbis similarly exercise an influence on the teaching undertaken in post-70 Palestinian synagogues? In short, would any possible post-70 Tannaitic targumic traditions reflect the position of these rabbis?

The fact is that there is little, if any, evidence that Yavnean rabbis exercised any control in Palestinian synagogues,\textsuperscript{403} let alone that they were able to influence the teaching of such synagogues.\textsuperscript{404} The most that can be said is that by the time of Judah the Patriarch (fl.
A.D. 190) who redacted the Mishnah, a certain - though far from total - uniformity had taken root and that this long process may be traced back, in germ, to the program initiated by the Yavnean rabbis. However, the rabbis both in the Tannaitic and Amoraic periods had no official status within the synagogue. In other words, the influence of the rabbis took many years and generations to infiltrate into the synagogue system.

Thus, with regard to any possible post-70 Tannaitic targumic traditions, they generally would not have reflected the beliefs of the Yavnean rabbis, but may possibly reflect the beliefs of the later Tannaim. On the other hand, any early post-70 Tannaitic targumic traditions may be considered to reflect the beliefs current in Palestinian synagogues at the time of the Yavnean rabbis.

Gamliel II of Yavneh possibly went on a circuit of towns (e.g. m. Erub. 10:10, Git. 1:5, Abod. Zarah. 3:4), but his דוכים "regulations" had nothing to do with the synagogue. See: Alon, (1980ET), Jews in their Land I, 232-33; Freyne, (1980), Galilee, from Alexander the Great to Hadrian, 324-25.

There is “no evidence of Rabbis who studied with their groups in this building [synagogue]” (Z. Safrai, (1995), “Communal Functions of the Synagogue”, 202), and not much evidence that rabbis took part in synagogue worship and such as there is gives no indication that they were able to dictate procedures, see Cohen, (1999), “The Rabbi in Second-Century Jewish Society”, 973-74.


---


1.7 SYNTHESIS

Within the context of the quest for the historical Jesus, the ultimate aim of this thesis is to construct a working model of the kingdom of God and to draw certain conclusions regarding the differences between the Pharisees and Jesus in their understanding of it. By way of testing that model it is intended to apply it to Luke 17:20-21, a procedure that will in itself shed light on that most enigmatic of Gospel passages. To that end source material will be considered that can reasonably be expected to have influenced or to have been influenced by either the Pharisees or the authors behind Luke 17:20-21.

Luke 17:20-21 was chosen not simply because it is the only example in the Gospels where the Pharisees themselves demonstrate explicit interest in the kingdom of God, but because as a chreia it has the potential to contain within itself not only the plain meaning of the question and answers but the assumptions underlying them.

Naturally, the positions of numerous scholars will be considered and weighed in subsequent chapters, but the criticism of three scholars enables a number of issues to be clarified. Among those issues include: the realisation that notions of presence include the reality of location; the need for clarity when discussing first century notions of the divine kingdom; and the need for a fresh consideration of Luke 17:20-21.

The Pharisees were an identifiable group within first century Palestinian Judaism, characterised by their own set of halakot. Though there were some Pharisees in the early pre-Lukan (Christian) community, they ceased to be an identifiable sect after A.D. 70. Luke’s picture of them is inconsistent, probably because he had no direct contact with them. Josephus, on the other hand characterised them as accurate interpreters of the Torah with an attitude to “fate” that distinguished them from the Sadducees and Essenes. A careful analysis of this leads to the conclusion that, according to Josephus, the Pharisees regarded observance of the Torah (their particular halakot) as living the law of the divine King, or as we would want to say, living in the kingdom of God. The kingdom was intimately associated with the divine presence in the Temple. To not observe the Torah is to fall under the umbrella of fate.

Finally, it was argued that the Pharisees were able to gain some measure of influence over the teaching undertaken in synagogues of the time, particularly in the interpretation and exposition of Scripture. Given the likely fact that the Aramaic targum tradition originated in pre-70 Palestinian synagogues (a tradition which by definition is the interpretation and exposition of Scripture), any targum tradition that may be traced back to the pre-70 period may be presumed to reflect the influence and therefore the beliefs of the Pharisees.
2 THE PRESENCE OF
THE DIVINE KING

Truly, you are a God who hides himself, O God of Israel, the Savior.
(Isa 45:15, NRSV)

2.1 PREFACE

Luke 17:20-21 represents a brief conversation between the Pharisees and Jesus. The Pharisees asked Jesus when the kingdom of God was coming. As extant in Luke, Jesus responded with three brief sayings that seem at first not to answer the question. Though the first and third responses at least are about the kingdom of God, they do not address the timing of the kingdom. Jesus’ replies are framed and modified at each stage of the formation of the chreia in such a way that they reflect fundamental concerns and differences regarding the notion of the kingdom of God.

The notion of the kingdom of God that we wish to bring to an exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 is that at Stage I, the Pharisees and Jesus agreed that it first and foremost meant God himself as king - that is, the Divine Royal Presence. It does not primarily mean God’s rule or reign as most scholars claim, or even his sphere of rule. It does not even mean God in his saving activity, but simply the Divine Royal Presence itself. Further, it will be demonstrated that the Pharisees and Jesus disagreed precisely in their location of the Divine King and hence of the kingdom of God. In subsequent stages differences in the identity of the kingdom of God rather than location will be found to have existed between the Pharisees and the early pre-Lukan community and between Luke himself and the Yavnean rabbis and the Palestinian synagogues of his time.

To reach such an understanding first requires a thorough analysis of the presence of God in his capacity as the Divine King, with the aim of formulating a picture of how this was conceived at each stage of the formation of Luke 17:20-21.

To that end, in this chapter every instance of the description of God as king that may have a bearing on both the formation of the pericope and the understanding of the Pharisees will be analysed. Two matters in particular will be considered for each verse: its date and historical context; and any attached notion of Divine Royal Presence. Language regarding the “coming” or “appearing” of the Divine King will be noted for special consideration in Section 3.7.
This endeavour raises the issue of the semantic domain from which one might gather material.

For example, the Hebrew word that is translated “king” is the noun קַרְם. It occurs 42 times in the OT in describing God (excluding the Aramaic instance in Dan 4:37). The related word הָלַךְ קָרַמ “kingship” occurs twice as an attribute of God. There is also the verb קָרֵם “to reign” of which God is the subject 13 times.

However, there are numerous other words that are used and that could be said to relate to God as king in the OT, such as the nouns: מָלַק “throne”; שְׁבָיִם “sceptre”; and even רְשָׁא “shepherd”. This list could easily be extended. In short, the metaphor of YHWH as “king” is known as a “root metaphor” because it is a key concept that generates other related metaphors.

Similar problems exist in the consideration of “kingdom of God” in the next chapter.

The following discussion in this chapter will be confined to a consideration of notions of Divine Presence attached to the root metaphor (i.e. קַרְם and in Greek the βασιλεύς group), since, except perhaps for “shepherd”, each of the others refers to God as king or his kingship only indirectly. Further reasons for this limitation have been outlined in Section 1.2.3.

---


2 Lists of occurrences of the verb קָרֵם when it refers to God may be found in: Eissfeldt, (1928), “Jahwe als König”, 180-81; Mettinger, (1988ET), In Search of God, 116; Ringgren, Seybold and Fabry, (1997ET), קָרֵם melek”, TDOT VIII, 365.


4 E.g. Ps 45:6.

5 E.g. Ps 23:1, 77:20, 80:1, Isa 40:11, 63:11, Jer 31:10, Ezek 34; Mic 5:4; F. F. Bruce, (1970), This is That, 100-101; Brettler, (1989), God is King, 36-37.

6 See Brettler, (1989), God is King, 26, and the introduction to each chapter.

2.2 ANCIENT PALESTINIAN LITERATURE

The origin of the concept of God as king has been the source of considerable debate.

Some have suggested that the events of the exodus from Egypt were the occasion on which the Hebrews first acknowledged their God as king (cf. Exod 15:18, Num 23:21).\(^8\)

Some have suggested that the notion is to be found implicitly in the Mosaic covenant where God as the law-giver is the suzerain and Israel is his vassal (cf. Deut 33:5).\(^9\)

Some have suggested that it was gradually appropriated from Canaanite religion after settlement.\(^10\)

Some proposed that it wasn’t until Israel herself instituted a monarchy that the notion was applied to God.\(^11\)

Others consider it to be derived from a new year cultic enthronement festival,\(^12\) though with less success, since it remains debatable whether the Israelites ever had such a festival for YHWH.\(^13\)

Marco Treves even went so far as to claim that the beginning of the concept of God as king wasn’t until the days of the Maccabees.\(^14\)

Though not germane to the present task, it is likely that the concept was appropriated by the Israelites only after settlement. Although its development was no doubt accelerated by the introduction of the Davidic dynasty, allusions from Canaanite myths have been shown to lie behind much of the imagery of the psalms.

The purpose of this Section is to amass the imagery and notions of Divine Royal Presence to which the first century Pharisees and Jesus owed their respective positions. This will enable a more nuanced interpretation not only of their respective positions but also of the differences between them.

---

\(^8\) E.g. T. W. Manson, (1935\(^2\)), *The Teaching of Jesus*, 131.


\(^13\) Kraus, (1988\(^ET\)), *Psalms 1-59*, 87-88, mounted a convincing case against such a festival, as did: Brettler, (1989), *God is King*, 149, 157-58.

To that end, questions of dating are of secondary importance. Nevertheless, they have not been avoided because when approached with due care they enable the individual passages or at least groups of them to be placed in relative chronological order. This in turn will enable streams of tradition to be more easily identified, again with the view of discovering which survived into the first century.

This combined historical-critical and synchronic approach has the added benefit of both neatly side-stepping and taking into account the effect of the results of the minimalist or revisionist school represented by such people as Niels P. Lemche, Philip R. Davies and Thomas L. Thompson and others. This school suggests that the Hebrew Scriptures contain “invented history” which reflect metaphorically only the period of its construction which they typically date to the Persian and even Hellenistic period. Any effort to reconstruct the earlier history of Israel must be based purely on archaeology and other non-biblical evidence.

If this school should prove to be correct, and that the few sources are either historically unreliable or cannot be traced much further back than the sixth century B.C., it will undermine only that part of the following presentation that relies on the more commonly accepted chronology. While any description of diachronic trajectories of tradition may thus be suspect, the more crucial result (and indeed the purpose of Section 2.2), namely that by the first century certain differing traditions regarding the Divine Royal Presence coexisted in Palestine, will in fact be strengthened. This will be because it will be shown that the OT does indeed encompass within itself differing views on this very subject.

---

15 E.g. Lemche, (1988), Ancient Israel, passim, esp. 29-73; Lemche, (1997), “Clio is also among the Muses!”, 124; Lemche, (1998), Prelude to Israel’s Past, passim, esp. 12-26; Lemche, (1998), The Israelites, passim, esp. 1-21, 22-23. Lemche, (2000), “Reconstructing History”, 4.2, wrote, “The conclusion that historical-critical scholarship is based on a false methodology and leads to false conclusions simply means that we can disregard 200 years of biblical scholarship and commit it to the dustbin. It is hardly worth the paper on which it is printed.”


2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

2.2.1 The Old Testament

The explicit references to God as king and his kingship in the OT occur in the following places. With the caveat as regards dating outlined in Section 2.2, the verses have been arranged into three groups according to their probable dating. Instead of a more exact chronological order within each group, verses have been arranged according to their appearance in the (English) Bible, in order to emphasise that some verses are extremely difficult if not impossible to date and that, after all, the purpose here of dating is to obtain relative and not absolute chronological relationships so that streams of tradition into the first century may be discerned.\(^{19}\)

The superscripts c and r (in this and subsequent Sections) refer to a related reference to the “coming” or “revealing” of God respectively, discussed briefly under each citation. The implication will be more fully explored in the Excursus at the end of chapter 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probably Pre-Exilic</th>
<th>Probably Exilic</th>
<th>Probably Post-Exilic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exod 15:18</td>
<td>Ps 10:16</td>
<td>1 Chr 16:31(^{c})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 23:21</td>
<td>Ps 44:4</td>
<td>Ps 97:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 33:5(^{c})</td>
<td>Ps 74:12</td>
<td>Ps 98:6(^{c})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 8:7</td>
<td>Isa 24:23</td>
<td>Ps 145:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam 12:12</td>
<td>Isa 33:17,22(^{c})</td>
<td>Ps 146:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 5:2</td>
<td>Isa 41:21</td>
<td>Ps 149:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 22:28</td>
<td>Isa 43:15</td>
<td>Zech 14:9,16,17(^{c})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 24:7-10(^{c})</td>
<td>Isa 44:6</td>
<td>Mal 1:14(^{bc})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 29:10</td>
<td>Isa 52:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 47:2,6,7,8</td>
<td>Jer 10:7,10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 48:2</td>
<td>Jer 48:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 68:24</td>
<td>Jer 51:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 84:3</td>
<td>Ezek 20:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 93:1</td>
<td>Obad 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 95:3</td>
<td>Mic 2:13b, 4:7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 96:10(^{c})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 99:1,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 6:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 8:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 46:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph 3:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{19}\) In addition, unless otherwise stated, references have been standardised to conform to their appearance in English Bibles.
2.2.1.1 Probably Pre-Exilic

Exod 15:18

*BHS* of Exod 15:18 (cf. LXX Exod 15:18\(^20\))

\[\text{יִהְיֶה יִמְלָךְ לְעֵד רַעְדָּה} :\]

*NRSV* of Exod 15:18

The LORD will reign forever and ever.

Wide debate exists as to the date of the original composition of Exod 15:1b-18, the Song of the Sea. Suggestions range from the time of Moses to after the exile. The original may be very old and pre-date the J material in which it is now embedded. Alternatively, it could be a late composition using earlier forms, since such early forms and much-post exilic redaction can be detected.\(^21\) Whatever its origin, the original setting was most likely cultic and the possibility that it was very early on associated with Passover cannot be ruled out,\(^22\) though no consensus has been reached.\(^23\)

In the present context, the declaration of YHWH’s sovereignty at the end of the poem comes after his action as אִשְׁתָּלְחָה “Warrior” (v. 3, through his capacity as god of storm and sea\(^24\)) in defeating the army of Pharaoh and as a shepherd-figure leading his people to a pasture where he himself camps.\(^25\) Such imagery is not unlike that of the judges and indeed Saul and David, each of whom achieved their leadership roles in part as

---

\(^20\) The contrast between the imperfect בִּלְךָ and the present בַּשָּׁמַע of LXX and ב’ seems neither to betray an older MSS different from the *BHS* nor a different theological approach. Both α’ and σ’ have the future, βσαλασσαί. Cf. Camponovo, (1984), *Königtum*, 384; Wevers, (1990), *Greek Text of Exodus*, 235.


\(^25\) Exod 15:13 הַלַּיְלָה “to lead” and לָיָלָה “to guide” apart from general guidance, both have associations with “herding”; הַבַּיִד “abode” is literally “pasture” or “camp”. See: Hyatt, (1971), *Exodus*, 166; Propp, (1998), *Exodus 1-18*, 531-32.
a result of their charismatic qualities and expertise in battle.\textsuperscript{26} Other key words that point to God as king are: יְהֹוָה רָעָם “my salvation” (v. 2), כָּלָּיָה “you redeemed”, נְחַיֶּה “you led” (cf. Ps 5:8) and נְהָלֶה “you guided” (cf. Isa 40:11), all in v. 13.

YHWH’s presence or whereabouts in all this is not mentioned until v. 13 and v. 17. The question here is two-fold: whether vv. 13, 17 are referring to the same place; and where that place(s) might be. Given their close proximity and their presence in the same unit of tradition it is most likely that they refer to the same place.

The phrase הָעֲבֹדֵי “holy abode” (v. 13) occurs here and nowhere else.\textsuperscript{27} הָעֲבֹדֵי is literally a pasture for sheep.\textsuperscript{28} The divine הָעֲבֹדֵי is mentioned elsewhere only at Jer 25:30 where it clearly refers to a location.\textsuperscript{29} In Jer 50:7 YHWH is himself called the מֹרֶם רִיָּם “true pasture” (cf. Jer 31:23) of the people of Israel and Judah.

The phrase מָכְר וָלֶסֶר “a place to dwell” (v. 17)\textsuperscript{30} or its equivalent, occurs in 1 Kgs 8:13,39,43,49 (and in the parallel verses in 2 Chr) in the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. There it refers first to the temple itself and subsequently to מֶשֶׁך “heaven”. Similarly, v. 17 credits YHWH with having built this place without help. Pss 78:69 and 147:2 claim that YHWH built the temple and Jerusalem respectively.

The phrase מֵגֶשׁ נָחָל “mountain of your (own) possession” (v. 17) is again unique, though Sinai, or Zion would naturally spring to mind as possibilities.\textsuperscript{31} At Jer 31:23, Isa 11:9, 57:13 and Ezek 20:40 יְהֹוָה לֵדֶשׁ “holy mountain” refers to the whole of Judah and we may note that these are all probably at least exilic in date. The parallel at Ps 78:54 suggests that we have here a reference to the whole “promised land” in its present context, though in a later cultic setting it could have meant little else than Mount Zion.\textsuperscript{32}


\textsuperscript{27} Brenner, (1991), The Song of the Sea, 131, was wrong to claim that הָעֲבֹדֵי also occurs at BHS Jer 31:23.

\textsuperscript{28} Cross, (1973), Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 141; Freedman, (1975), “Early Israelite History”, 6-7; 9; Mann, (1977), Divine Presence, 127, who thought that this referred to Sinai.

\textsuperscript{29} “from on high”, see: Bright, (1965), Jeremiah, 161; J. A. Thompson, (1980), Jeremiah, 519; D. R. Jones, (1992), Jeremiah, 334; R. P. Carroll, (1986), Jeremiah, 505, Zion.

\textsuperscript{30} The phrase מֶכְר לְבָעָה “throne place” occurs only at Pss 89:14, 97:2. Consequently, it is difficult to agree with William H. Propp that there is a parallel reference to enthronement, Propp, (1998), Exodus 1-18, 542-43. More likely is a connection between מֶכְר לְבָעָה and מֶכְר וָלֶסֶר “to dwell on a throne”, 1 Kgs 22:19 (\parallel 2 Chr 18:18), Ps 9:4, 47:8, Isa 6:1, though because of the limited number of examples, the possibility remains slim. See Brenner, (1991), The Song of the Sea, 138, 141.

\textsuperscript{31} E.g. Freedman, (1975), “Early Israelite History”, 6, Sinai.

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. Clements, (1965), God and Temple, 51; Coats, (1969), “The Song of the Sea”, 12-13; Clifford, (1972), Cosmic Mountain, 139; Cross, (1973), Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 142;
The presence of "sanctuary" (v. 17) is a probable anachronism since this word is elsewhere used only of permanent shrines. When used of the Jerusalem temple, it always occurs in exilic and post-exilic references.33

Together with "Philistia" in v. 14,34 the above anachronisms alert us to the probability that this poem was interpreted in different ways during the course of its transmission and probably altered accordingly.35

The inverted syntax of v. 18, i.e. "Klmy hwhy" instead of "hwhy Klmy", emphasises the fact that it is "hwhy" (and no other god) who reigns.36 Having brought them into his presence, God then reigns for ever at least over Israel and probably over the whole of creation (from Israel) given his activity in vv. 1-12. The parallelism between YHWH leading his people into Canaan and leading his people into the temple is a theme that finds a home only in post-exilic literature,37 though the connection between divine kingship and presence was probably established much earlier in the song’s transmission.

The post-exilic synthesis underlying this song seems to be then that the whole land was the Divine King’s abode because of his primary presence in the מֶלֶךְ צֶרֶנֶון of Mount Zion.38

The use of the verb יָשָׁב “to dwell, abide” is illustrative of Divine Presence and its association here with the Divine King warrants a brief consideration.39 It is to be

---

33 The exact phrase קָרַבָּנְתָּא שב אל "sanctuary of the Lord" is found only at Lam 2:20 and means the temple, see Brenner, (1991), The Song of the Sea, 138, 141-42. Freedman, (1975), “Early Israelite History”, 6, considered that in Exod 15:17 it referred to Sinai.


35 Some scholars regard the whole of Exod 15:1-18 as composed of at least two sections, namely vv. 1-12 and vv. 13-18, e.g. Hyatt, (1971), Exodus, 163 and, G. H. Davies, (1967), Exodus, 126, though most refrain from too close an analysis. The presence of anachronisms indicates that some later tampering probably took place.


39 Cf. Brenner, (1991), The Song of the Sea, 145-46, though its use is not as clear or as consistent as Brenner made out.
distinguished from its synonym שָׁכַן which originally had the connotation of a temporary sojourn as opposed to the more permanent ישב.40

The Deuteronomistic school could not conceive of YHWH “dwelling” anywhere but heaven.41 Perhaps the absence of the ark prompted a re-evaluation. Whatever the reason, this concept was followed in post-exilic literature, notably in the rewriting of the Chronicler.42 Elsewhere the notion of YHWH “dwelling” occurs with one exception only in the Psalms43 and (Proto and Deutero) Isaiah. The Isaiah references are indicative of the older belief in the presence of the Divine King in the temple without reference to heaven.44

Again, that the motif of YHWH “dwelling” occurs elsewhere other than Exod 15:17 only in exilic or post-exilic literature, suggests that its use in Exod 15:17 is anachronistic.


2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

Num 23:21

_BHS_ of Num 23:21b (cf. LXX Num 23:21b\(^{45}\))

: הוהי אלהים עמם וכריסטעם מלך ביר.

_NRSV_ of Num 23:21b

The LORD their God is with them, acclaimed as a king among them.

Part of the second oracle of Balaam to Balak, king of Moab (vv. 18b-24), like the Song of Moses, it links YHWH’s kingship with the events of the exodus (cf. v. 22a).\(^{46}\) The second oracle is attributed by some to a northern (i.e. the E) tradition.\(^{47}\) A date in the late monarchical period is most likely, given the presence of a character named Balaam in the eighth century B.C. texts recovered at the Jordanian site of Tell Deir ‘Allâ (the biblical Succoth).\(^{48}\)

Unlike the Song of Moses, however, God is said here to have been “with” Jacob and Israel as he brought them out of Egypt, his Divine Royal Presence guaranteeing protection from harm (v. 48). The preposition אִם “with” is an expression of this presence and is not merely an indication of divine protection.\(^{49}\)

Interestingly, Balaam is said to have received his oracle from YHWH near an בִּני־הָאָרֶךְ “altar” which Balak had built (vv. 14-15, cf. vv. 1-3). It is near this altar that Balaam הֵמָּה “met” with YHWH.\(^{50}\) Although the verb has the connotation of a temporary presence of the deity,\(^{51}\) Balaam’s acknowledgment of YHWH as king is nevertheless in association

\(^{45}\) LXX Num 23:21 translates it in such a way that a messianic interpretation is possible. The reference to God has been deleted. Cf. Camponovo, (1984), Königstum, 386; LXX Deut 33:5, Tg. Ps.-J. Num 23:21b. Wevers, (1998), Numbers, 396, commented that the only king for Israel was YHWH so LXX Num 23:21 was written to avoid any possible notion of a king in Israel.

\(^{46}\) Noth, (1968\(^{\text{ET}}\)), Numbers, 187.

\(^{47}\) See Gnuse, (2000), “Redefining the Elohist”, 201-20, for a reaffirmation of the existence of a northern Israelite E tradition which he dated to post 721 B.C.


\(^{50}\) Cf. Exod 3:18(J), Num 11:23(J), 23:3(E),16(E).

2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

with Divine Presence. This Divine Royal Presence is again associated with the exodus (v. 22) as the event in which God established his kingship over his people.

The joyful shout or acclamation (תַּעַרְטְרָה) is both acknowledging that YHWH is king and that he is present “among them” as king. תַּעַרְטְרָה is frequently the response given to the presence of God. Both “to shout” and דָּרֵי “to shout out” or “sing for joy” are verbs often associated with the presence of monarchs and in particular it is the emotional response of being in the cultic presence of the Divine King.

Deut 33:5

BHS of Deut 33:5 (cf. LXX Deut 33:5)

(srēlḥyā bēhūtāṣēm ḥālēṣ ṣēm)

NRSV of Deut 33:5

There arose a king in Jeshurun, when the leaders of the people assembled - the united tribes of Israel.

Jeshurun is a poetic (affectionate?) name for Israel. Its recurrence at v. 26 of the Blessing of Moses after each of the twelve tribes has received its blessing suggests that originally vv. 2-5, 26-29 formed a unit which was subsequently enlarged with the insertion of the individual tribal blessings. Even if this were not true, the sudden change of context in v. 6 means that v. 5 can be analysed from its immediate context of vv. 2-5. A cultic setting for the original poem cannot be ruled out, though it is usually based on a

52 The so-called northern (E) tradition associated altars with the presence of the deity (Exod 20:24, cf. Gen 28:17, 35:7), though there is no suggestion of permanent presence. YHWH was said awb “to come” from מִמְוָן “heaven” whenever sacrifice was performed on them. Cf. B. A. Levine, (1990), “Lpny YHWH”, 202-203.

53 Ashley, (1992), Numbers, 479.

54 1 Sam 4:5-6, 2 Sam 6:15 (cf. 1 Chr 15:28), 2 Chr 15:14, Ezra 3:11-13, Ps 27:6, 33:3, 47:5, 89:16, 150:5, Job 33:26. Most often, however, it occurs as a prelude to war, though the connection between this and YHWH as the Divine Warrior King leading his people to war should not be forgotten, e.g. 2 Chr 13:12.


56 The LXX of Deut 33:5 is probably (Davidic) messianic, cf. Camponovo, (1984), Königstum, 387. Wevers, (1997), “The LXX Translator of Deuteronomy”, 87, suggested that the LXX translation betrays a deliberate avoidance of referring to any other king of Israel other than YHWH. Thus ἅπαξ λεόνς is avoided in favour of θεοῦ.

57 Deut 32:15, 33:5, 32:22. The late use in Isa 44:2 need not imply lateness of the poem in Deut, see Buber, (1967), Kingship of God, 209 n. 75.

conjectured annual enthronement or covenant-renewal festival. In any case, a setting in some sort of cultic worship seems most likely. It is difficult to envisage any other.

There is some debate as to whether v. 5 constitutes a reference to YHWH as king. Most commentators assume that it is a reference to YHWH as king in and of Israel. Gerhard von Rad and others prefer the other possibility, namely that it is an anachronistic reference to the rise of kingship in Israel. Though their reasons are unconvincing, it is nevertheless possible. The next instance of divine kingship to be discussed (1 Sam 8:7), comes from the same school as Deut 33:5. There the “elders of Israel” also “gathered together” and asked Samuel for a king (vv. 4-5).

To be preferred, however, is that, for the final redactor, it was a reference to Moses himself. The first part of Deut 33:5 reads literally “And he was in Jeshurun a king” (cf. KJV). Given that there is a change of subject from YHWH in vv. 2-3 to Moses in v. 4, that it was originally a reference to Moses does justice to the text as it now stands, although it has to be admitted that nowhere else is Moses described as a king.

Originally, however, it must have referred to YHWH, as v. 26, which followed immediately, brings the subject back to YHWH. If this is the case, “Moses” in v. 4 is a later alteration (or copyists’ error), prompted no doubt by the imagery of the giving and execution of the law in v. 21.

The imagery of YHWH (v. 26 ֶֶ) contained in vv. 2-3, 26-27 has similarities in other ancient Near Eastern religions, and recalls a similar image to that of the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1-18), namely the march of the Divine Warrior from the south. Verse 26


60 E.g. Miller, (1973), Divine Warrior, 82; Craige, (1976), Deuteronomy, 393-94; Payne, (1985), Deuteronomy, 190.


62 von Rad, (1966ET), Deuteronomy, 205, for example claimed that this was the case because “Elsewhere the conception of Yahweh as king is understood to be confined [my emphasis] to a kingdom over the gods and the nations”, a claim that is patently false.

63 Mann, (1977), Divine Presence, 181, considered this the most obvious reading. Wevers, (1998), Numbers, 541, considered LXX Deut 33:5 as implying some kind of “Moses redivivus”.

64 Cairns, (1992), Word and Presence, 295.


makes no claim that מים is his home, but reiterates the belief that God is king of creation.67

YHWH is said בָּרָא “to come”, יָרָה “to rise” and תַּשְּׁא “to shine” from Sinai and after victory to become king in Israel, though he was king of creation from the beginning. Despite the presence of תַּשְּׁא there is no hint of theophany because nothing is seen,68 merely presence and activity, as is the case with Exod 15:1-18. יָרָה “shine forth” is little more than a battle term particularly associated with deities and does not here indicate light or revelation.69 Indeed, Patrick D. Miller may be right in supposing that the march of YHWH from Sinai was not a mythological motif but a historical march of conquest from Sinai to Canaan with his people, at the end of which YHWH became king.70

Of particular interest also is the use of the verb בָּרָא “to come” in the context of divine kingship. YHWH is said “to come” from somewhere else (Sinai) as king to be the (hidden) king in Israel, in the process giving victory to her enemies (vv. 26-29). The parallels, Judg 5:4-5, Ps 68:8-9, Hab 3:3-7, similarly preserve a tradition of movement of God from the south.71

67 The poetic parallel between שָׂפְטָא and שָׂפְטָמ presents the possibility that שָׂפְטָא here refers to the “air”. See Section 2.2.3 under Dan 4:37.


“Theophany” may be distinguished from “epiphany” and “vision”. Theophany is the perceived appearance of God to physical sight, “epiphany” an indirect manifestation of Divine Presence through the evidence of unusual phenomena which are physically visible. In the OT, God is more often heard than seen and unusual physical events are often explained in terms of epiphany. “Visions” are usually individual encounters where God is perceived, as it were, in the mind’s eye. These distinctions will be followed in this present work. Cf. Lindblom, (1961), “Theophanies”, 91.


70 Miller, (1973), Divine Warrior, 83; E. C. Kingsbury, (1967), “Theophany Topos”, 210. “Sinai” in v. 2 is its only occurrence in Deut which otherwise uses Horeb. Thus it could be an addition to the poem.

71 For a discussion of בָּרָא “to come” in the context of this present work, see Section 3.7.
1 Sam 8:7

*BHS* of 1 Sam 8:7

רַמְלֵיהָ יְהוָה אֲלֵהֶם אֲלֵהֶם בָּכֹל הָעָם לִבְּלָן אֲלֵהֶם אֲלֵהֶם כִּּלָּם אֲלֵהֶם מַלְפֵּת בָּכֹל לִבְּלָן

*NRSV* of 1 Sam 8:7

and the Lord said to Samuel, “Listen to the voice of the people in all that they say to you; for they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them.

1 Sam 8 is a crucial chapter in the Deuteronomistic History. The elders of Israel asked Samuel, a judge, to appoint a king for them “like other nations” (cf. Deut 17:14), ostensibly because they disapproved of the idea of Samuel’s corrupt sons being judges (v. 5).72 We are told that Samuel did not appreciate their request (v. 6), perhaps because he saw it as a reflection on himself and his sons (v. 7). The response to his prayer was a confirmation of his attitude.

Very little redactional activity can be detected in 1 Samuel. In particular 1 Sam 8:7, like most of the book, is from material inherited by the Deuteronomistic historian.73 We may note that v. 8 also contains explicit mention of the exodus from Egypt in connection with the declaration of the kingship of YHWH.

Were it not for the mention that these events took place at Ramah, Samuel’s home town, there would be no hint of Divine Presence in 1 Sam 8.

The editorial summary of 1 Sam 7:15-17 may at least provide a clue to the understanding of the redactor. Here we are told that Samuel’s court circuit consisted of the towns of Bethel, Gilgal, Mizpah and Ramah. We are told that he built an altar to YHWH at Ramah.

In each town there was, at least according to the Deuteronomistic editor, an Israelite cultic site. The presence of an altar is either explicit or implied in each case.74 Ramah is subsequently implied indirectly as a cultic site in 1 Sam 9:12-14, and in 1 Sam 19:23 as the place near where the “spirit of God” came upon David. Consequently, it is significant that Ramah was thought by the editor to need an altar.

---

72 The customary reason given for the desire for a king is that the Philistine menace was too strong for one or a group of Israelite tribes and that they needed the unifying effect of a single king (cf. 1 Sam 4:2,10, 7:7, 8:20). However, this is not explicit, see: McCarter, (1980), *I Samuel*, 16; Brueggemann, (1990), *I & II Samuel*, 61. Indeed, note 1 Sam 7:13. Taken at face value, according to the editor, the immediate occasion of the request was the behaviour of Samuel’s sons.


The implication then is that we are meant to conclude that Samuel prayed and received an answer to his prayers in chapter 8 at this altar at Ramah.\textsuperscript{75} Samuel prayed to YHWH, “in his ears” (vv. 6, 21), and his prayers were answered.\textsuperscript{76} Echoing the E tradition,\textsuperscript{77} for the Deuteronomistic editor, altars were associated with the presence of the deity (Judg 13:20), and their proscription against being made of cut stone (Deut 27:5-7, cf. Josh 8:31),\textsuperscript{78} appears to have been because unworked stone retained something of the presence of the god.\textsuperscript{79}

Thus again, articulation of YHWH as king comes in the context of his cultic presence, though in this case the presence is transitory, i.e. it is present only when invoked, though it is perhaps pertinent to point out that in the case of 1 Sam 8, YHWH’s response was as a result of Samuel’s intercession, not sacrifice. YHWH’s implied kingdom is Israel.

1 Sam 12:12

\textit{BHS} of 1 Sam 12:12

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\texttt{תִּרְאֶהָ כִּי־נָחַשׁ מֶלֶךׁ בָּנָי תּוֹמָךְ בָּא עָלֵיכֶם תָּהָפֵּק׃}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textit{NRSV} of 1 Sam 12:12

But when you saw that King Nahash of the Ammonites came against you, you said to me, ‘No, but a king shall reign over us,’ though the L ORD your God was your king.

1 Sam 12 stands at the end of the period of the last judge, Samuel, and at the beginning of the new era of monarchy under Saul. Previously, Saul had been anointed king by Samuel at Ramah (1 Sam 10:1), proclaimed king by the people at Mizpah (1 Sam 10:24) and renewed in his kingship at Gilgal (1 Sam 11:14-15), following the victory against the Ammonites. Samuel now old, symbolically hands over the reins of authority to Saul in this speech, rehearsing the events by which God brought them to their present situation, exhorting the people to renew the covenant stipulations with the usual blessings and curses.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{75} Hertzberg, (1964\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{I & II Samuel}, 69, was probably correct in assuming that Samuel also “judged” at each of the four sanctuaries “before the presence of the Lord”.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Cf. \textit{Ant.} 6:60 in Section 2.5.1.5, where God is said by Josephus to have actually appeared to Samuel.
\item \textsuperscript{77} See the discussion for Num 23:21(E) above.
\item \textsuperscript{78} Taken over from Exod 20:25(E).
\end{itemize}
As is the case with the other speeches in the Deuteronomistic History, 1 Sam 12 comes from the hand of the (Josian) Deuteronomistic Historian, except for vv. 24-25 which come from the exile.\(^{80}\)

The sequence of events as they now stand in 1 Samuel place Samuel in the Gilgal shrine immediately after the renewal of Saul’s kingship there. Sacrificial worship and the renewal occur in the same place and occur in the presence of YHWH, “before the LORD” (1 Sam 11:15).\(^{81}\) Indeed such a site for covenant renewal is indicative of the Deuteronomist.\(^{82}\)

Addressed to “the people” (v. 6, cf. v. 1 “all Israel”), the Deuteronomistic editor affirmed his conviction that the making of a human king over Israel was only reluctantly allowed by YHWH, but that, even so, the existence of the monarchy should not mean therefore that God ceased to demand obedience as their Divine King. YHWH’s kingdom is the people of Israel. He is present with them chiefly, though not exclusively, at the shrines. Again there is the connection with the exodus (vv. 6, 8).

Psalm 5 was classified by Hans-Joachim Kraus as a Song of Prayer for the individual.\(^{83}\) As its setting is obviously the temple (v. 7) perhaps as part of the morning sacrifice (v. 3), it was probably sung within the context of congregational worship.\(^{84}\) Nothing precludes a date for this psalm in the days of the pre-exilic temple.\(^{85}\)


\(^{81}\) The phrase \(\text{לְכָּל יֵצֵּרָה יָּכָּֽלָּהָ} \) “before the LORD” is a recurrent one in the OT and most often indicates the localised Divine Presence without any indication of theophany or manifestation. See Section 1.3.1.

\(^{82}\) Moses in Moab, Deut 29:14. Joshua at Shechem, Josh 24:1 (\(\text{לְפָנָי יִשְׂרָאֵּל} \)). Josiah in the temple, 2 Kgs 23:3. Cf. a covenant made between David and Jonathan, 1 Sam 23:18; a covenant made between David and the elders of Israel at Hebron, 2 Sam 5:3; Jer 34:15.


\(^{84}\) Psalms classified as those of “individuals” need not have been sung by solitary persons, e.g. Ps 35:18. Cf. Amirtham, (1968), “To be Near to and Far away from Yahweh”, 32-33. Terrien, (1978), *Elusive Presence*, 307, surmised, plausibly, that such psalms for individuals may have been commissioned by temple officials for pastoral occasions, such as ritual cleansing.

The prayer presupposes that God is present, enthroned above the ark. It is a presence that only the righteous may fairly approach (v. 12). The element of “joy” simply expressed in v. 11 (using the verbs שָׁלָה (šalah) and עֹלָה (ule)) is indicative of the natural response to being in the Divine Royal Presence (see under Num 23:21 above). The boastful and the evildoers have no such right (v. 5) to the Divine Presence. Yet YHWH is king to all (vv. 6, 11), not simply the obedient, since there is a strong element of the Divine King as both judge of all and protector of the righteous.

Ps 22:28

BHS of Ps 22:29

כִּי לְדַיְוָה הַמָּלָאךְ רַפְגָּל בַּיָּמִים

NRSV of Ps 22:28

For dominion belongs to the LORD, and he rules over the nations.

This is one of two places in the OT that contain the abstract noun מלךְ in reference to God. The other instance is Obad 21. It is properly translated “kingship” rather than “dominion” or “kingdom” since it refers to the office of king or the status of being a king.

Psalm 22 is clearly divided into two parts: vv. 1-21 and vv. 22-31, the second of which is a Song of Thanksgiving of an individual. Despite the two distinct parts, most commentators maintain the unity of the psalm. Verses 22 and 25 give the setting: the temple during the course of a communal gathering, perhaps in association with a meal (v. 26).

Because of YHWH’s “kingship”, he rules over the nations (v. 28) and so they owe him homage (v. 27), including, oddly enough, the dead (v. 29). That the dead are mentioned at all could mean either a late composition or a late redaction of the psalm, since the next instance of this is in Dan 12:2. It certainly means that to rule over the nations is effectively the same as saying that YHWH rules over the whole created order.

---

86 See also Ps 44:4, 84:3.
87 G. R. Driver, “מלך”, in Ch. 8 of TDOT VIII, 359.
88 A. A. Anderson, Psalms I, 184-85; Kraus, Psalms I-59, 293-94.
89 In contrast, Ps 6:5 and Ps 88:10-12.
Verse 28 contains the verb מָלַל “to rule, govern” with YHWH as the subject and thus connects both YHWH’s attribute of מִלְתָּרַּם “kingship” and the expression of that in his consequent ruling of the nations. Because God is king he therefore has a realm to rule, one which is “over the nations”. In Ps 145:13 it is מִלְתָּרַּם “dominion” that stands in parallel with מִלְתָּרַּם “kingdom”, further suggesting that the “kingdom of God” is not devoid of spatial inferences.

But where is the Divine Royal Presence and what is its relationship to the sphere of his rule? There are in fact few indications of Divine Royal Presence in this psalm.

The phrase יְשֵׁשׁ הַחִלְצָה יְשֵׁשׁ יָשָׁרֶל literally “sitting on the praises of Israel” in v. 3, is unfortunately of not much help. It is an obscure one, occurring only here. It probably does not refer to YHWH’s understood location but merely to the reception of adulation.

Verse 27 is reminiscent of the post-exilic eschatology of Zech 14. The universal sovereignty of YHWH will be acknowledged by all peoples. They will come לפני YHWH in the temple to worship him. One day, YHWH, who is already king of the earth, will be acknowledged as such. Meanwhile, YHWH does not הַיְּשַׁרְיָה “hide his face”, i.e. refuse to help, but hears the cry of the petitioner in the temple (v. 24, contrary to the first part of the psalm, v. 1). Because, unlike Zechariah, there is no hint that prior to this picture of universal worship YHWH was not present in the temple, the assumption must be that the writer and users of this psalm considered the Divine Royal Presence to be in the temple. The Divine King lives in his kingdom.

---

90 The verb is applied to YHWH in 11 verses: Judg 8:23, 1 Chr 29:12, 2 Chr 20:6, Job 25:2, Isa 40:10 (his הַרְשַׁע “arm”), 63:19, Pss 22:28, 59:13 (עַל יְשֵׁשׁ יָשְׁרֶל), 66:7 (עַל יְשֵׁשׁ יָשָׁרֶל), 89:9, 103:19 (his מַלָּל, see Section 3.4.1.1). See: Brettler, (1989), God is King, 47; Soggin, (1997 ET), “lvm msal to rule”, TLOT II, 689; Gross, (1998 ET), “lvm masal II”, TDOT IX, 69-70. The only derivative word to apply to God is מִלְתָּרַּם “dominion, rule, realm”: Pss 103:22, 114:2; 145:13. The others are מִלְתָּרַּם “dominion” and, מַלָּל “dominion, ruler”. The Aramaic equivalent verb מַלָּל is never applied to God, though the cognates of the Aramaic sometimes are, מַלָּל “dominion” (noun) in Dan 4:3,34, 6:26 and מַלָּל “ruling” (adjective) in Dan 4:17,25-26,32, 5:21.

91 See Section 3.2.1 under Ps 145:11-13.


93 Treves, (1969), “The Reign of God”, 233, thought that this hope was “typical of the Maccabean age”.

94 See Section 1.4.1.1. Contrary to Kraus, (1988 ET), Psalms I-59, 299, there is no theophany here. There is rather auricular communication between God and the petitioner.
Ps 24:7-10

**BHS of Ps 24:7-10**

> שַׁלַּא שָׁעָרִים לְאֶפְרָצֵם יָהֳעָרָיִם פָּתַח וּלְעָלָם רוּבֵא מִקְלַל הָכְבֹּד׃
> מִי הוֹז מִקְלַל הָכְבֹּד יָחָד מִקְנֵּר יָוִּים בָּבָּר פָּתַח׃

> שַׁלַּא שָׁעָרִים לְאֶפְרָצֵם יָהֳעָרָיִם פָּתַח וּלְעָלָם רוּבֵא מִקְלַל הָכְבֹּד׃
> מִי הוֹז מִקְלַל הָכְבֹּד יָחָד מִקְנֵּר יָוִּים בָּבָּר פָּתַח׃

**NRSV of Ps 24:7-10**

7 Lift up your heads, O gates! and be lifted up, O ancient doors! that the King of glory may come in.
8 Who is the King of glory? The LORD, strong and mighty, the LORD, mighty in battle.
9 Lift up your heads, O gates! and be lifted up, O ancient doors! that the King of glory may come in.
10 Who is this King of glory? The LORD of hosts, he is the King of glory.

Psalm 24 is cultic versicle and response probably originating in pre-exilic times. It most likely formed part of a liturgical re-enactment of the bringing of the ark into the temple (hence its origins are probably early monarchic), but exactly what was the festival that might have been celebrated cannot be determined. Like Ps 22, Ps 24 is in distinct parts but should be considered as a whole. It combines three motifs with that of kingship. YHWH has gained victory over the forces of chaos (v. 8), created the world (v. 2), and entered his royal palace, the temple on Mount Zion. “hosts” denotes an all-mighty or all-powerful god-king, hence one whose reach - as it were - is universal, “the ruler of all things”.

Verse 3 with its פְּלֹס מִרְשָׁא יְהֹוָה מְרֵאָה הָרָא יִדְרִיהָ “hill of YHWH” and מִרְשָׁא חָכָם קרֵשָׁה “his holy place”, points unequivocally to the Temple Mount as the primary place of YHWH’s presence as king.

---


To be in this presence (v. 6) requires “clean hands and a pure heart” (v. 4), i.e. ritual and moral purity. Notably the earth belongs to YHWH but he is not explicitly called its king or its ruler.

A small group of scholars have detected the notion in these verses that despite the temple being the primary place of YHWH as king, he nevertheless “bursts the confines of the temple”. This is possible, even likely, despite the psalm being set in a re-enactment of the original divine entry. The temple is unable to contain the entering “LORD of hosts” - a concept also depicted in Isa 6:1, where only the “hem of his robe filled the temple”.

Ps 29:10

_BHS_ of Ps 29:10 (cf. LXX Ps 28:10)

ψυ τῷ βρόμῳ ἠτατά

_NRSV_ of Ps 29:10

The LORD sits enthroned over the flood;
the LORD sits enthroned as king forever.

There seems to be a consensus that Psalm 29 is derived from Canaanite ritual where Baal was worshipped as a storm-god. Carefully avoiding theophanic images, the psalm has been adapted for YHWHistic use. It is generally dated to the pre-exilic monarchic period and may be much older.

Given the different syntax of the first and second part of this verse, it is likely that the phrase לֶבֶן לֵבֶן “from/over the flood” stands not in synonymous parallel but in antithesis to מלך מלך “as king forever”. In other words, the first part should be interpreted spatially, the second temporally. YHWH sits/dwells above the primeval waters of creation, he has always been its king.

---

101 Based on the reconstruction of Ps 24:6 by the LXX which is followed by the NRSV. Cf. Dahood, (1965-70), _Psalms I_, 152.
102 Mettinger, (1982ET), _Dethronement of Sabaoth_, 31-32 and, the scholars mentioned there.
103 Both verbs (κατακώι and καθεταὶ) are in the future tense, as well as those of v. 11, suggesting an eschatological interpretation, cf. Camponovo, (1984), _Königtum_, 391.
106 Or perhaps the waters above the firmament, cf. Gen 1:7, Ps 104:3, 148-4.
However, YHWHistic adaptation has meant that the temple must feature in the psalm to counter the obvious Canaanite imagery. In v. 9 all in ולקי "his temple" - literally "his palace" - say to YHWH בבר המ "glory". This is probably a reference to the worshipper in the earthly temple, despite the similar ascription of "glory" on the part of the בבר המ "sons of gods" in vv. 1-2. Although ולקי can refer to the "heavenly" temple, it does so only in exilic and post-exilic literature. Here it no doubt means the earthly temple in general and sometimes, specifically the largest of its three sections, also simply called the שדר "(the) holy".

The noun בבר המ (and the Aramaic הלם, which is also used in Hebrew texts as a loan word) occurs here in association with the Divine King for the first time and so a brief digression is warranted.

בבר המ has the basic meaning of "heavy", and by extension "wealth, dignity, honour". In other words, that for which respect is due. When applied to the OT Deity, it is usually an attribute of God that can be seen either directly or indirectly and frequently has the connotation of brilliant light, even blinding light (e.g. Ezek 10:4). Thus it is: an attribute of God; something that is owed to kings and to God as king; and a quality of something that demonstrates the sovereignty or majesty of God (e.g. Ps 19:1). Hence its relevance here. In this context it is almost invariably translated in English by "glory" (and

---


110 E.g. Ps 19:1, “The heavens are telling the glory of God”.


in the LXX by δόξα. The word is particularly associated with Ezekiel (see under Ezek 20:33 below), but also with Isaiah, the Psalms and P.

Both Isaiah and the psalms associate the חֵרְבּוּם of YHWH with the temple and cultic worship respectively. God’s “glory” is experienced there and yet the temple cannot contain it (cf. Num 14:21(ו)). The psalms, in addition, look to a future revelation of God’s “glory”, something that is continued in the later Isaiah tradition.

The P tradition on the other hand, does not associate the חֵרְבּוּם exclusively with the shrine. Taking on an almost anthropomorphic quality, it led the Hebrews out of Egypt and through the Red Sea. It descended from heaven to Mount Sinai and accompanied them in the wilderness often in the בַּעֲנָה “cloud” and in association with the בֵּית לֹוי “tent of meeting”. It could, on occasion, be seen.

Contrary to Gerhard Kittel and others, חֵרְבּוּם is not always rendered by the Aramaic מָרְבּוּת in the Targumim. At least once the Hebrew word is retained. Kittel’s explanation of its use, namely that it is used in the Targumim to avoid anthropomorphisms, is also questionable. More likely it is not a circumlocution but was used to avoid any implication that “the Lord” was or could be seen. Rather it is his “glory” that is seen,
and is used “to emphasise his incomprehensible splendour”. A comparison between BHS Isa 6:5 and Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5 is as good an example as any.

Ps 47:2,6,7,8

BHS of Ps 47:3,7,8,9

NRSV of Ps 47:2,6,7,8

2 For the LORD, the Most High, is awesome, a great king over all the earth.
6 Sing praises to God, sing praises; sing praises to our King, sing praises.
7 For God is the king of all the earth; sing praises with a psalm.
8 God is king over the nations; God sits on his holy throne.

The first of the so-called “Enthronement Psalms”, Psalm 47 most likely was part of a yearly celebration of YHWH’s kingship (rather than an annual re-enthronement) at the Autumn festival (Tabernacles) and composed in the late pre-exilic period.

Quite likely it was part of the same celebration that used Ps 24. Indeed, Ps 24:3 and Ps 47:5 both employ an important cultic verb, יָלַל “to go up, ascend” (cf. John 2:13). In Ps 47:5, it refers not to the perceived movement of God, but the celebration of his Royal

122 Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 75.
123 For BHS Isa 6:5 see below. For Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5 see Section 2.3.1.2 below. At least in the rabbinic literature that is dealt with in this present work (Tannaic), there is a clear difference, too, between חכמה and חכמה “Shekinah”, nor does חכמה replace חכמה. In later Jewish literature, however, חכמה and חכמה are equated, e.g. Tg. 2 Chr 7:13 and, apparently חכמה is replaced by חכמה. See: Abelson, (1912), The Immanence of God, 380-82; Baltzer, (1965), “The Temple in Luke”, 270; Weinfeld, (1997 ET), “דבוק kabod”, TDOT VIII, 32.
Presence which had previously ascended Mount Zion when the ark was installed in the temple.\textsuperscript{125}

In v. 8 God sits/dwells on ובֵדֶק כְּרֵשׁ “his holy throne”. Given the context, it is possible that this is a reference to the ark-throne.\textsuperscript{126} However, the ark is never called a throne of YHWH\textsuperscript{127} and on the rare occasions that the verb יָכֹס is used with כְּרֵשׁ, it is either the heavenly throne or Zion (Jerusalem) itself that is indicated.\textsuperscript{128} The adjective נוֹעַיִל “Most High” is of little help here. It is used not only as a description of God as the highest of gods but may refer to something that is “spatially higher” than something else.\textsuperscript{129} Thus not only could it be an oblique reference to the heights of heaven but also to Mount Zion, since, ideally, Mount Zion could be regarded as the highest of mountains.\textsuperscript{130}

We cannot then be sure where the worshipper who used this psalm considered the Divine Royal Presence to be. Nevertheless, YHWH was king of all the earth / all nations, though there was clearly a special relationship between YHWH and Israel (vv. 3, 6b).

\textit{Ps 48:2}

\textit{BHS of Ps 48:3b}

נה יָכֹס יִרְבַּע יִפְסָר כְּרֵשׁ מַלֶּר רֹב

\textit{NRSV of Ps 48:2b}

Mount Zion in the far north, the city of the great King.

Probably dated to pre-exilic times, Psalm 48 is a hymn praising Zion (Jerusalem) and therefore her Divine King.\textsuperscript{131} It was intended to be sung in and around Zion. We may note


\textsuperscript{126} So: A. A. Anderson, (1972), \textit{Psalms I}, 365; Kraus, (1988\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Psalms I-59}, 469. Dahood, (1965-70), \textit{Psalms I}, 286, declined to give an explanation, pointing out simply that ובֵדֶק כְּרֵשׁ is unique in the OT.

\textsuperscript{127} von Rad, (1962\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Theology I}, 237 n. 110; Fabry, (1995\textsuperscript{ET}), “כְּרֵשׁ kisse’”, \textit{TDOT VII}, 254.


\textsuperscript{130} “Highest of the mountains”, Isa 2:2 // Mic 4:1, cf. Ps 95:4. But see Clifford, (1972), \textit{Cosmic Mountain}, 157 n. 77, who wrote, that it “does not mean the highest point of a peak but the position at the head of a range of mountains”. “Heights of heaven”: Job 11:8, 22:12; Ps 103:11; Isa 55:9.

again the motif of battle in vv. 4-8 in which YHWH defends his city. His presence guarantees the safety of the city, unlike the theology of the prophets, especially that of Isaiah and Jeremiah (see below).

Quiet apart from the Canaanite echo in the parallel of Mount Zion, the home of YHWH, with נוֹפֵלָה “Zaphon”, the home of Baal,132 Ps 48:2b is unusual in that it describes Mount Zion as a יִירָע “city”. In vv. 1 and 8 the psalm uses a synonym of נוֹפֵלָה.133 The synonym usually simply means the city of Jerusalem, but occasionally can mean something like “temple quarter”,134 so that it incorporates within it the belief that YHWH inhabits the whole city of Jerusalem, effectively making the whole city his temple, as is explicitly the case in Ps 46:4.135

Ps 48:2b probably should be interpreted in this light. Mount Zion, indeed the whole city of Jerusalem, not only belongs to YHWH the Divine King but is his dwelling place.136

Ps 68:24

BHS of Ps 68:25

רחא הרחבsgiving הלוחמים אל יהוה הַמַּלֶךְ יְהוָה נַחַל.

NRSV of Ps 68:24

Your solemn processions are seen O God, the processions of my God, my King, into the sanctuary -

Like Exod 15, Psalm 68 has been adapted from very old storm-god Canaanite motifs and has undergone emendation (e.g. vv. 5, 29, 32-35).137 Even if the theory of William F. Albright is correct,138 namely that Psalm 68 is a list of the beginnings of songs, it is best to


133 BDB, 900a, described יִירָע and נוֹפֵלָה as synonyms.


consider the psalm as a whole. Nevertheless, the psalm clearly finds its cultic setting in a festival involving a re-enactment of the procession of YHWH into the temple (vv. 17, 18, 24) and a consequent celebration of his kingship.\textsuperscript{139}

YHWH as Divine King resides on the Temple Mount (vv. 16, 18, 35), having come as the Warrior from Sinai (cf. Deut 33:2). In v. 5 God is in מֶלֶךְ יְהוָה קֹל כְּלָלָה, “his holy habitation”, a phrase which here and elsewhere refers to heaven.\textsuperscript{140} From there he exercises his kingship as father and protector.\textsuperscript{141} The lateness of the tradition probably means that this verse is a later, perhaps post-exilic, insertion.\textsuperscript{142}

Ps 84:3

\begin{align*}
\text{BHS of Ps 84:4} & \quad \text{נֶפֶשׁ מַפְאֶרֶתָּא בִּרְתַּרְסָרָא כְּלָלָה}
\text{אַשָּׁר שְׁמַעְתָּא אַשְׁפָּרִיהָ אַתְּ מֵעְבַּדְתָּהּ}
\text{יִהְוֶהָ בֶּאֱדַרְתָּא פְּלַקַּלְּךָאָלֶיהֶא}
\end{align*}

\text{NRSV of Ps 84:3}

Even the sparrow finds a home, and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, at your altars, O LORD of hosts, my King and my God.

Ps 84 is generally considered to be pre-exilic because of the mention of “your anointed” (the Davidic king) in v. 9. It is a psalm for an individual who need not be in the temple.\textsuperscript{143} Indeed, there is the unmistakable element of nostalgia for the temple, which suggests that, for the one reciting this psalm, God could still be addressed outside of it.

Unambiguous too is the perceived location of the Divine Royal Presence. It is the temple, or, more precisely, to the entire complex on the Temple Mount, poetically called the שְׁמַעְתָּא אַשְׁפָּרִיהָ אַתְּ מֵעְבַּדְתָּהּ, “dwelling places” (v. 1) and הַפְּרַשְׁתָּא הָיְיָהָ אַתְּ מֵעְבַּדְתָּהּ, “courts of the LORD” (v. 2, cf. v. 10).

\begin{footnotes}
\item[139] Fohrer, (1971\textsuperscript{ET}), “Ωτος”, \textit{TDNT VII}, 310; J. Marcus, (1988), “Entering into the Kingly Power of God”, 667. If it was an annual enthronement festival then Marcus’ comments to the effect that it was a divine procession in which the participants of the celebration liturgically accompany YHWH’s entry would be valid.
\item[142] On “heaven” as a late reference to the location of the Divine King, see: Section 2.2.3 under Dan 4:37.
\end{footnotes}
Verse 3 presents a beautiful picture of Divine Royal Presence at once literal and metaphorical. Birds were a constant problem for the temple authorities, even in Second Temple times, because of the accompanying excrement. Nevertheless, the birds are a metaphor for Israel. Their feelings of being protected (cf. v. 12) by the very presence of the Divine King means that they can make nests and have young in safety.

Regardless of the location of the reciter, YHWH is a personal king, dispersing grace and glory (v. 11) and dwelling on the Temple Mount (vv. 5, 6). To be in the temple and thus in his presence brings joy (v. 2) and happiness (v. 4), responses that are extended in vv. 5, 12 to all who trust in God.

Ps 93:1

BHS of Ps 93:1a (cf. LXX 92:1b)

NRSV of Ps 93:1a

The LORD is king, he is robed in majesty;

This psalm belongs to the category of psalms often called the “Enthronement psalms” (Pss 47, 93, 95-99), though their original setting was probably as part of an annual festival celebrating YHWH’s kingship. It is almost certainly pre-exilic. It is quoted in the Mishnah (m. Tam. 7:4G) as the psalm that was sung by the Levites every Friday for the morning and evening sacrifices.

Since YHWH “established the world” (v. 1b) as king, it is the world that is effectively his kingdom. He rules by “decree” (v. 5), thereby establishing order. In v. 5 שִׁירֵי

---


145 Weiser, (1965ET), The Psalms, 567. This picture is used by Jesus in his description of the kingdom of God (Section 3.3.2 under Luke 13:18,20).

146 LXX Pss 92:1, 95:10, 96:1, and 98:1, translate מלך אלהים by κύριος ἡμών.

147 Dahood, (1965-70), Psalms II, 339; A. A. Anderson, (1972), Psalms II, 665-66; J. Gray, (1979), The Reign of God, 46; Kraus, (1993ET), Psalms 60-150, 233; Treves, (1969), “The Reign of God”, 234, Pss 93, 95-100, are Maccabean; Ringgren, Seybold and Fabry, (1997ET), מֶלֶךְ, TDOT VIII, 372, post-exilic. This also is the psalm that usually initiates discussion on the phrase מֶלֶךָ, discussion which centres on whether המלך is a noun, a stative or action verb and, on the significance of the word order. Such discussions are beyond the scope of this present work, but see for example: Brettler, (1989), God is King, 141-44; Mays, (1994), “The Centre of the Psalms”, 231-46; Lipinski, (1963), “Yahweh malak”, 405-60.

148 See under Section 2.5.1.1.

149 Cf. 1 Chr 16:30, Jer 10:12, 51:15, Ps 96:10.
“holiness” befits the "house" of YHWH, because as the temple, it is where God dwells and from which he exercises his kingship.\textsuperscript{150}

Ps 95:3

\textit{BHS} of Ps 95:3

כּ אֵל מִרְרָל יְהוָה רְמֹל מֵרָל עַל-כָּל-אָלְמָר

\textit{NRSV} of Ps 95:3

For the LORD is a great God, and a great King above all gods.

This “Enthronement Psalm” is difficult to date, but could well be originally pre-exilic (cf. the polytheistic “above all gods”).\textsuperscript{151} Its setting is clearly liturgical worship in the temple (v. 2). It is a song of praise of God as king.

YHWH’s ownership and creation of the earth signifies that he is king of the earth (vv. 4-5).\textsuperscript{152} In v. 2, worshippers are called literally "to meet his face", a cultic term indicating that the Divine Royal Presence was considered to be in the temple.\textsuperscript{153} The Divine King lived not above but in his realm.

Ps 96:10 (cf. 1 Chr 16:31)

\textit{BHS} of Ps 96:10a

אמר בעם יוהי מלך

\textit{NRSV} of Ps 96:10a

Say among the nations, “The LORD is king!

Another so-called Enthronement Psalm. It may be considered pre-exilic because it does not exhibit any signs of late biblical Hebrew.\textsuperscript{154} It too has the phrase “above all gods” (v. 4) suggesting a time before absolute monotheism became a distinctive feature of YHWH worship.

\textsuperscript{150} A. A. Anderson, (1972), \textit{Psalms II}, 669; Kraus, (1993\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Psalms 60-150}, 236. Cf. Dahood, (1965-70), \textit{Psalms II}, 343, who thought it referred to heaven. His argument is too far fetched to be probable.

\textsuperscript{151} I.e. יָלַד-כָּל-אָלְמָר: Ps 95:3, 96:4, 97:9, 1 Chr 16:25.

\textsuperscript{152} J. Gray, (1979), \textit{The Reign of God}, 48-49.

\textsuperscript{153} A. A. Anderson, (1972), \textit{Psalms II}, 677. See also Section 1.4.1.1.

2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

The mention of YHWH’s “sanctuary” in v. 6, and “his courts” in v. 8 (cf. Ps 84:3), culminates in v. 9 with “before him” (cf. 1 Chr 16:29). The worshipper considered YHWH to be in the temple.\(^{155}\)

This means that the remaining verses must be interpreted non-eschatologically.\(^{156}\) The verb form אָב (v. 13) should be seen as a perfect “he has come”,\(^{157}\) so that the rejoicing of vv. 11-12 and the judgement of v. 13 is a present reality. YHWH would have been thought of as already having come to the temple (the setting of the psalm) and from there reigning as king and judging the peoples.\(^{158}\)

Ps 99:1,4

*BHS of Ps 99:1,4*

הָרָהוֹת מַלֶּךָ הָרָעָם עִמּוֹ יְשָׁב כֹּרְבֵיהֶם חָנְן הָאֲדָמִים:

1 רֹעְיָהּ מַלֶּךָ נְשָׁמָה אַתָּה

NRSV of Ps 99:1,4

1 The Lord is king; let the peoples tremble! He sits enthroned upon the cherubim; let the earth quake!

4 Mighty King, lover of justice, . . .

The last of the “Enthronement Psalms”, this one praises God’s kingship and his holiness. Its setting is cultic and most probably originally pre-exilic.\(^{159}\)

There are numerous indications of the presence of the Divine King in this psalm. YHWH as king יְשָׁב כֹּרְבֵיהֶם “sits enthroned upon the cherubim” (v. 1) and is “great in Zion” (v. 2). The singers of the psalm call all to extol God and worship at הָרָעָם רַכִּילָא “his footstool” and הָרָעָם הָרָעָם “his holy mountain”, both of which refer to Mount Zion generally, though the footstool would ultimately be the ark (cf. 1 Chr 28:2, Ps 132:7).\(^{160}\)

All point to the Divine Royal Presence in the temple from which YHWH is king over “all peoples” (v. 1, 2) dispensingMalchut “justice”.

---
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Isa 6:5

BHS of Isa 6:5

כִּי הָאֱלֹהִים הָיוֹתָה תְפַסְמוֹת רַאֶה עֹנְרֵי

NRSV of Isa 6:5

yet my eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts!"

According to v. 1, this vision of Isaiah took place in the year of Uzziah’s (Azariah’s) death, i.e. 739 B.C. It ought to be classed as a vision (ראה, “to see” vv. 1, 5) rather than a theophany since we are to assume that Isaiah was the only person who saw אלôn “the Lord” (v. 1), nor are there any words describing the self-revelation of God. It is the only vision of the Divine King recorded in the OT.

The location of Isaiah’s vision was the Jerusalem temple. In v. 6 “altar” is mentioned as being part of this temple complex. ירבד in v. 1, meaning “palace” or “temple” or specifically the larger room of a temple attached to the ירבד, refers to the earthly temple or shrine, as elsewhere in pre-exilic literature.

First Isaiah located YHWH on the “high and lofty” (v. 1) Mount Zion (cf. Isa 8:18), so his vision must be interpreted with that in view. The additional metaphors such as “the hem of his robe” that filled the ירבד and that the whole earth is full of כבירה “his glory” (v. 3) indicate that Isaiah saw God as at once dwelling in the temple but not confined in or by it. For example, Isa 13:5 and 35:4 use earlier Canaanite imagery to depict YHWH as the Divine Warrior King coming with his army amassed from all over the world to save the redeemed. The Divine Royal Presence was beginning to expand.


162 See also under Ps 29:10 above.

163 The motif of the glory of God filling or being over an area can also be found in: נקר wilderness “tabernacle”, Exod 40:34,35; ירבד ירבד, 1 Kgs 8:11, 2 Chr 7:1, Ezek 43:5, 44:4, cf. Hag 2:7; ירבד ירבד “court”, Ezek 10:4; ירבד, Num 14:21, Ps 57:5,11, Isa 3:6, cf. Hab 2:14. Whether כבירה is an attribute of or a circumlocution for God himself must be decided on a case by case basis as the word has numerous possible meanings, even with respect to God, depending on the context. For discussions on כבירה see (in addition to the standard dictionaries): Eichrodt, (1961ET), Theology of the OT I, 29-35; von Rad, (1962ET), Theology I, 239-41; Preuss, (1995-96ET), OT Theology I, 167-70. In the present case, Isa 6:3, כבירה emphasises the “fact and apprehension of God’s presence”, Brockington, (1957), “ΔΩΞΑ”, 3; Brockington, (1945), “The Presence of God”, 21b. See also Tournay, (1991ET), Seeing and Hearing God, 113, who claimed that the “whole earth” of v. 3 meant only the land of Israel. כבירה occurs in Proto-Isaiah 21 times, only four of which refer to God, Isa 4:5, 10:16, 24:23, 35:2. Each of these could be construed in a different way.
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Jer 8:19

**BHS of Jer 8:19b**

היהוה אֱלֹהֵי צְיֹולָה זֶכֶר לָכֶם

**NRSV of Jer 8:19b**

“Is the LORD not in Zion? Is her King not in her?”

Writing at a time (before 587 B.C.) when the temple still stood, Jeremiah did not doubt that despite the stream of disasters affecting Judah, and despite the fact that he believed that these disasters were punishment due to sin (e.g. 8:14), doubts about the Divine Royal Presence with his people were unfounded. This verse proclaims that God was both king and present in the temple in Zion, in his city of Jerusalem (cf. 14:9). 164

This explanation is in keeping with the vowel pointing of רָאָשָׁבָן אָלְכָּם “and I will let you dwell” in Jer 7:3 adopted by the BHS. 165 Here, YHWH makes the presence of the people of Judah in the land conditional on the amendment of their ways. 166 In v. 4 he explicitly insists that the existence of the temple (and therefore his presence, v. 10) does not mean that the people of Judah are guaranteed to stay. Indeed, such was their sin that Jeremiah predicted that it would be the people who would first leave YHWH’s “sight” (7:15). After that, not even the temple itself would be safe once YHWH himself had left it (7:12, 12:7, cf. 14:9; 2 Macc 5:17-20). 167

Jer 46:18

**BHS of Jer 46:18 (cf. LXX Jer 26:18)***

ה-אֱלֹהִים-הַמְּנָחָה וְרָחַבָּת שְׁמָר

**NRSV of Jer 46:18**

As I live, says the King, whose name is the LORD of hosts, one is coming like Tabor among the mountains and like Carmel by the sea.

---


168 LXX Jer 26:18, lacks the word ἱερατεύς.
There is no good reason to doubt that Jer 46:14-24 can be attributed to Jeremiah. The Babylonians were threatening the Egyptians with invasion to the extent that Jeremiah thought it imminent, although it did not actually occur until 568 B.C. YHWH, the powerful king who is behind the Babylonians’ push towards Egypt, is contrasted with the ineffective pharaoh.\textsuperscript{169} Within the poem, however, there is no indication of Divine Royal Presence.

2.2.1.2 Probably Exilic

Ps 10:16

\textit{BHS} of Ps 10:16

יהוה מלך עולם על̀ אברם נייר שלמה

\textit{NRSV} of Ps 10:16

The LORD is king forever and ever; the nations shall perish from his land.


Psalm 10 completes the acrostic begun in Psalm 9. Whereas Psalm 9 is a song of praise and thanksgiving from the pre-exilic period, Psalm 10 is a lament, most likely from the exilic or early post-exilic period. The lament of course is due to the singer’s belief that YHWH does nothing to stop the wicked preying on the poor and helpless. His explanation is that YHWH has “hidden his face”, a euphemism for divine inactivity rather than divine absence - although the effect is as if YHWH “stood far off” (v. 1).

Ps 9:7-11 (cf. 10:17-18) uses royal motifs to describe the presence of YHWH as king of the world enthroned in Zion, dispensing justice (שפט “to do justice”) because of his attribute of קדוש “righteousness”. Indeed his righteousness and kingship demand the exercise of justice. This theme of justice is carried over into Psalm 10. The differences between Psalms 9 and 10 can be seen in the fact that God is firmly enthroned in Zion in Psalm 9 but literally nowhere to be found in Psalm 10. No doubt the writer of Psalm 10 thought that God’s true home continued to be Zion.

“from his land” cannot mean Israel, but the whole earth (cf. v. 18), affirming that the “kingdom” of YHWH in the mind of the singer is indeed the whole earth. The Divine Royal Presence could be found in his kingdom.

Ps 44:4

BHS of Ps 44:5

אַהֲדָה-הָרָם מָלֵךְ אֲלָהָמָּנוּ הָאָדָם יִשְׁרָעֵה כֹּעָב

NRSV of Ps 44:4

You are my King and my God; you command victories for Jacob.

Though difficult to date, the communal lament which is Psalm 44 probably belongs to the early exilic period (cf. v. 12). As with Ps 10 above, the lament is again due to the inactivity of God, this time for failure to help in time of war. The question לָמָּה מְרַר הָעָדָם מִרְמָר “why do you hide your face”, asked of God in v. 24, speaks not of the


172 See Section 1.4.1.1 and also Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 22:28.


174 E.g. Briggs and Briggs, (1907), Psalms I, 81.

withdrawal of his presence ("face") from the community but of the failure of divine aid and redemption (cf. v. 26). 

Verse 4 is linked thematically with v. 26. There YHWH is called on to arouse from his apparent inactivity and help and ransom his people. הцеז and כהא "help" and כהא "ransom" his people are virtually synonyms and are key aspects of divine kingship. Like כהא "to redeem", they refer to a rescuing from some enemy/sin/disaster, whereas כהא "to save" is generally a saving for something better.

There is however, no explicit reference to the location of the Divine Royal Presence.

Ps 74:12

_BHS_ of Ps 74:12

האלרהט מלך מוכרים על ישרעיה לבורא הארזה:  

_NRSV_ of Ps 74:12

Yet God my King is from of old, working salvation in the earth.

The text of this psalm is corrupt in many places, striking a note of caution not only in dating the psalm but in any interpretation that may be offered. With suitable care, the psalm may be tentatively dated to the very early post-exilic period, prior to the construction of the second temple. It is a communal lament, again prompted by the inactivity of God (v. 11), recited at the site of the ruined temple (v. 3) and calling on him to restore his honour. 

Like Ps 44, the motif of the Divine Warrior is evident here. Deliverance from chaos is followed by the "salvation" of creation.

Despite the destruction of the temple, according to v. 2, Mount Zion is still the place where the Divine King dwells (כע"ב and from which he works (literally) "salvation in the midst of the land".

In v. 7 the מיכר "sanctuary" is the proper מיכר "dwelling place" of God’s כע"ב "name". At the time of the lament God himself was thought to still "dwell" on Mount Zion, since כע"ב and its verb כע"ב both denote a permanent physical construction and a

---

176 See Section 1.4.1.1.

permanent presence respectively. However, YHWH’s name no longer did, since that was dependant on the existence of the “sanctuary”.

Isa 24:23

*BHS* of Isa 24:23

והספת ה зависитה ובשמת התסה כ- possibilità היא יהודתcoder.

*NRSV* of Isa 24:23

Then the moon will be abashed, and the sun ashamed; for the LORD of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders he will manifest his glory.

Isa 24-27 are chapters within First Isaiah commonly known as the “(Little) Apocalypse of Isaiah”. Modern scholarship has tended to deny authorship of these chapters to the prophet Isaiah, but nevertheless still places them firmly in the Isaianic school. They were probably composed in response to the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. Isa 24:23 looks forward to the restoration of the divine kingship after the desolation outlined in chapter 24 (particularly the cosmic and earthly battles in 24:21-22) and the restoration of Judah in 25:6-27:13.179

The NRSV translation of Isa 24:23 is unfortunate because neither the Hebrew nor the LXX state that YHWH will *manifest* his glory at the restoration.180 In fact, nowhere in Isaiah 24-27 is there a picture of divine manifestation. Granted that the picture of an abashed moon and ashamed sun imply that YHWH’s glory will itself outshine these celestial bodies (gods?) and therefore will be seen, nevertheless the text is not explicit that this will be the case. This point is important because it is only in the Targum version that we find explicit use of appearance or revelation language in Isa 24:23, which, it will be argued, is an articulation of a particular view of the kingdom of God.181

---


180 The KJV is perhaps the most accurate here, “and before his ancients gloriously”.

181 See further, Sections 3.2.3 and 3.7.
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Isaiah 27:13 (cf. Zech 14:16,17) is perhaps the only other related passage in Isaiah 24-27. There the writer looks forward to the day when all the people of God (and not simply the elders) “will come and worship the LORD on the holy mountain in Jerusalem” (cf. a feast in 25:6). Taken together with 24:23, it is clear that the writer saw the Divine Presence as intimately connected with the temple - no temple, no Divine King. At the time of writing the Divine King was no longer present on the mountain as far as the writer was concerned. He looked forward to the time when YHWH would “come out from his place” (not the temple, but probably heaven) and execute judgement (26:21, cf. Zech 14:3). At the restoration of the earth, YHWH will resume his kingship and presence from and on Mount Zion, the holy mountain. At the very least, the elders will be directly conscious of this presence.

The words of sorrow felt by the people are an added indication of the contemporary lack of Divine Royal Presence. This sorrow will be removed by YHWH (25:7-8). The opposite, joy, is an emotional response to the presence of the Divine King, though in 25:9 the positive outburst is in response to what YHWH will do (cf. 1 Chr 16:31, Ps 96:10, 149:2) and in anticipation of his Royal Presence.182

The crucial verse for the present task is 31:4. Here YHWH “will come down (ירד) to fight upon Mount Zion and upon its hill” in his capacity as the Divine King of his people.

Chapters 28-33 of Isaiah form a unit because of the repetition of the interjection ירד “Ah, Ha, Oh”. The unit comes from a time later than First Isaiah. They recount the arrogance and misplaced trust of God’s people and the consequent coming judgement of YHWH.183

The crucial verse for the present task is 31:4. Here YHWH “will come down (ירד) to fight upon Mount Zion and upon its hill” in his capacity as the Divine King of his people.

---

182 See Section 1.4.1.1 and also Section 2.2.1.1 under Num 23:21.
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(c.f. 29:6, 37:35). Now, YHWH cannot descend from Mount Zion to fight upon Mount Zion, so the natural implication is that he will come from higher up or far away. This notion is confirmed by 30:27, and 33:5. Isa 30:27 states: “the name of the LORD comes from afar”. It points to a place far away from Mount Zion. Isa 33:5: “the LORD . . . dwells on high”, points to a permanent Divine Royal Presence at an unspecified location. The writer, presumably, has already decided that YHWH the Divine King no longer rules from Mount Zion because of the arrogance and misplaced trust of the people. He looks forward to the day when God will reclaim his rightful place on Mount Zion as king.

Finally, the designation of YHWH as judge and saviour are two activities associated with kingship, especially that of YHWH. He is the Divine King sitting in judgement who will help his faithful people.

Isa 41:21, 43:15, 44:6, 52:7

BHS of Isa 41:21, 43:15, 44:6, 52:7c

41:21 קֹרֵבְּךָ רַבָּכָם אָמְרֵי יְהֹוָה הַנִּשְׁרָה אֶת-עָמְדוֹתךָ אָמְרֵי מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
43:15 אַתָּה יְהֹוָה קֹרֵבְּךָ מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל׃
44:6 מָלָא הָאָרֶץ מַעֲלוֹת יְהוָה אֲדַלְתָּה
52:7b כִּלּוּ אָדָם הַיָּמִים

NRSV of Isa 41:21, 43:15, 44:6, 52:7c

41:21 Set forth your case, says the LORD; bring forth your proofs, says the King of Jacob.
43:15 I am the LORD, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King.
44:6 Thus says the LORD, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the LORD of hosts:
52:7c . . . “Your God reigns.”

These verses may be taken together because they all come from so-called Second Isaiah. For the sake of clarity and the ever-present danger of wandering too far out of context from the kingship motif, the comments below will thus be confined to chapters 40-55, without entering into the debate regarding the existence of a third Isaian prophet behind chapters 56-66. In any case, the divine kingship motif does not occur explicitly in chapters 56-66.

---


185 Although this limitation needs to be made, several passages would have made the case presented here stronger: Isa 60:2, 63:15, 66:1,15,18.
For present purposes the major thing to notice in the above verses is that YHWH is regarded as king explicitly only of Israel (even though he is also acknowledged as creator\textsuperscript{186}). Because of this, the prophet looks forward to a future time when “the Lord GOD comes (שׁלד) with might” to Judah (40:10, cf. 42:13),\textsuperscript{187} “the return of the LORD to Zion” (52:8), to redeem and save (52:9-10) his people because he is their king.\textsuperscript{188} The image of YHWH as the Divine Warrior King (especially in 51:9-11), this time leading his people out of Babylon (cf. “like a shepherd” 40:11), has been cleverly recast by Second Isaiah.\textsuperscript{189}

In other words, because of the sins of the people, YHWH had withdrawn his Royal Presence, but one day he will return to Zion after a period of punishment (i.e. the exile, 42:24-25). The formula אִתִּי אֱלֹהֵינוּ “I am with you” (43:2,5), does not contradict this.\textsuperscript{190} By this formula Second Isaiah expressed the belief that YHWH had not forgotten the covenant relationship forged with his people (43:1), but was working even in his punishment of them for their good.\textsuperscript{191} It was a formula guaranteeing divine protection, not Divine Presence.\textsuperscript{192}

\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{Jer 10:7,10} \\
\textit{BHS of Jer 10:7a,10a} \\
מי לא רדף \\
מלך הירדן . . . \\
\textit{NRSV of Jer 10:7a,10a} \\
7a Who would not fear you, O King of the nations? . . . \\
10a But the LORD is the true God; he is the living God and the everlasting King.
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{186} J. Gray, (1979), \textit{The Reign of God}, 167-68.

\textsuperscript{187} According to 41:5, YHWH’s glory will be revealed before he comes.

\textsuperscript{188} Cf. W. H. Schmidt, (1983\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Faith of the OT}, 148, the kingship of YHWH is a future reality.

\textsuperscript{189} For a fuller analysis of this theme in Isa 40-55, see Mettinger, (1997), “Hidden Structure”, 143-51.


\textsuperscript{192} See also Section 2.2.1 under Num 23:21 for a similar formula which speaks of presence rather than protection.
The poems of Jer 10:1-16, as they are extant, are most likely not from Jeremiah himself. They have undergone considerable reworking (e.g. the LXX does not have vv. 6-10). There is the presence of an Aramaic gloss (v. 11) and the repetition of vv. 12-16 in material that is clearly exilic (51:15-19). Yet, even if they were from Jeremiah himself, there is no indication in the poems regarding the presence of the Divine King. They do proclaim, however, that YHWH made the universe and is king of the nations.

Jer 48:15

_BHS_ of Jer 48:15 (cf. LXX Jer 31:15)

בְּנֵאָם חַנָּן חַנָּן: מִユーザー לְהוּרֶה יֵדַע לִיָּרָה נֶרֶבֶשׁ

_NRSV_ of Jer 48:15

The destroyer of Moab and his towns has come up, and the choicest of his young men have gone down to slaughter, says the King, whose name is the LORD of hosts.

Chapter 48 of Jeremiah consists of a collection of poems against Moab. The assumption of the poems is that Moab has already been destroyed (e.g. 48:2,4) - an event that occurred shortly after the Babylonians invaded it in 582 B.C. (cf. _Ant._ 10:181). These poems may therefore be dated to early in the exilic period. In any case, they do not prove helpful in the search for indications of Divine Royal Presence. Yet, the poems leave the reader in no doubt that the “LORD of hosts” has ultimate control over Moab and therefore over all nations. His reach is universal.

Jer 51:57

_BHS_ of Jer 51:57b

וָּמַלְּכֶךָ יְרוּם עֲבֹרָה שַׁמָּה

_NRSV_ of Jer 51:57b

... says the King, whose name is the LORD of hosts.

---


194 Jer 10:10 מִלְּכָּה עִירֵי הַמַּלֶּכָּה may also be translated “king of the world” which only confirms the title “king of the nations” of v. 7 and his act of creation in Jer 10:12 // 51:15. See also Weisenberg, (1964), ”melekh ha-olam”, 11.

195 LXX Jer 31:15 lacks “says the king whose name is the LORD of hosts”. See LXX Jer 28:57 (BHS Jer 51:57).
Linked to Jer 46:18 and 48:15 because of the refrain, 51:57 (cf. v. 39) is part of a collection of poems against Babylon stretching across chapters 50 and 51. They can be dated to the exilic period. Together with 51:51 they betray a high concern for the integrity of the temple and look forward to the time when the profanities committed against the temple (the LORD’s house, 51:51) will be avenged.

Although there is nothing in these poems to indicate that the composer thought that the Divine Royal Presence was removed because of the destruction of the temple, the writer probably followed the Jeremiah school. That is, the Divine Royal Presence removed itself, thus allowing the destruction of the temple. The writer looks forward to the time when the people of Israel and Judah may be able once again to “seek the LORD” (50:4). Where will they go to seek him? Zion.

Ezek 20:33

_BHS_ of Ezek 20:33

וְיָדַעְתָּנָּה יְרֵה הַמִּשְׁרָחָה אֶצְּלָּךְ לַא בִּרְכָּה רְוֹחֵךְ נְחָרֵךְ יְדָעָה

쉐פרה שלמה עלים:

_NRSV_ of Ezek 20:33

As I live, says the Lord GOD, surely with a mighty hand and an out-stretched arm, and with wrath poured out, I will be king over you.

The initial part of Ezekiel’s first divine vision (chs. 1-7) speaks indirectly of YHWH’s kingship over creation. He has attendants and is free to move about the earth (cf. Ps 29). The vision proclaims not “the presence of Yahweh among the exiles” but precisely this ability to grant such a vision of divine realities to anyone anywhere.

Although Ezek 1:1 would appear at first to suggest that Ezekiel thought of God as dwelling in “heaven”, all other instances of שֵׁם in Ezekiel indicate either “air” or

---

196 Jer 50:5,28, 51:10,24,35.
197 Jer 50:28, 51:11.
199 See comments in Section 2.2.1.1 under Jer 8:19.
200 So: Block, (1997), _Ezekiel 1-24_, 108. Ezek 11:16 may either imply a “reduced” presence among the exiles, so: Greenberg, (1983), _Ezekiel 1-20_, 190 and, Block, (1997), _Ezekiel 1-24_, 350. Or, as most likely, since God’s “glory” did not follow them into exile, that even in Babylon God can be encountered as in the temple, so Eichrodt, (1970ET), _Ezekiel_, 145.
2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

“sky”.201 It is only with later reflection that Ezekiel’s divine “chariot” was to be located in heaven.202

Nevertheless, for Ezekiel himself, the Divine King was to be found, prior to the exile, in the temple. After his exile, he discovered through vision that YHWH had literally and physically abandoned the temple and could be accessed even in Babylon. This picture of Ezekiel’s notion of Divine Royal Presence is to be found in his use of בּוּרֵר “glory”.

Ezekiel’s well-known reticence to describe YHWH directly is countered by his liberal use of “glory”. For him, God’s glory is only observed in vision never in theophany and is effectively a circumlocution for the Divine Presence. It appears to him in vision in human form, though like P it is also associated with a cloud (Ezek 10:4). There is little doubt that Ezekiel came closest to claiming a hypostatic status for the בּוּרֵר.

Before the exile, God’s בּוּרֵר rested on the cherubim of the ark (9:3). At the exile, it left the מִדַּבֵּר and moved to the Mount of Olives (11:23).204 More than a symbol of divine disfavour or abandonment to the inevitable forces of fate as punishment for sins,205 this withdrawal from the temple by God’s glory was meant by Ezekiel to be taken as a physical self-removal of the Divine Royal Presence. Behind the anxiety expressed by the elders of Israel that God had forsaken them (8:12, 9:9) was more than an admission that God had withdrawn his divine aid.206 It prompted Ezekiel to insist that God’s favour and presence was still with them as it was in the temple (cf. 8:6) because his glory could now be found with the exiles in Babylon.207

---

201 Ezek 8:3, 29:5, 31:6,13, 32:4,7,8 38:20, are all either the “air” or the “sky”. See Section 2.2.3 under Dan 4:37.


Indeed, although God’s glory would not return to Zion until his אֶּרֶם “house” was restored (43:4, 44:4)\(^{208}\) and regardless of what happened to Jerusalem and Judah, YHWH remained in charge.\(^{209}\) His divine kingship was to be recognised in the historical events that had occurred and would occur.\(^{210}\)

The context of 20:33 (cf. Jer 21:5) confirms the above. It is part of an auricular encounter with God stretching over 20:1-44. After a recitation of earlier opportunities for the execution of divine wrath, God finally punished Israel with the exile. Despite this punishment and the removal of his presence, God will be king again over his people and bring them back to “the land” (20:40). It will be a new exodus (vv. 34-37) in which YHWH himself will return “from the east” (43:2), leading his flock back to Zion (v. 40, cf. the Shepherd motif of 34:11-31). There, all Israel will serve YHWH and he will reign as their king (cf. 48:35, Exod 15:1-18) from the new temple (37:27-28, 43:7).\(^{211}\)

Obad 21

*BHS* of Obad 21 (cf. LXX Obad 21\(^{212}\))

והשל מושלים מבחר צורע לפשת את-ה רעה

わりוה הלחיה הפלכות:

*NRSV* of Obad 21

Those who have been saved shall go up to Mount Zion to rule Mount Esau; and the kingdom shall be the LORD’s.

Obadiah is probably early exilic, though wide opinion still exists.\(^{213}\) The prophet looks forward to an eschatological יהוה יומם “day of the L ORD”\(^{214}\) (v. 15) when YHWH’s

---


\(^{209}\) Block, (1997), *Ezekiel 1-24*, 107. Ezek 16 echoes the relationship of the divine מקבר to Jerusalem. YHWH abandoned Jerusalem to her enemies (vv. 37-40) because of sin (v. 27), but will one day renew the covenant with her (vv. 59-63).


\(^{212}\) LXX Obad 21b has בַּאֲאוֹלָה, though the future sense is maintained with ἔσται.


kingship shall be reclaimed after the nations are punished (v. 21b). His activity of judging, in virtue of his kingship, will be delegated to and shared by human beings (cf. Dan 7:14,27), who will be saved by the Divine King from punishment (cf. Isa 33:22). It will be exercised from Mount Zion, the “holy mountain” (vv. 17, 16). That this place is twice called הַר הַיּוֹם “holy” is an indication that Obadiah probably thought of it as the place of the Divine Royal Presence, though again, that is in the future (vv. 17, 21b).

Mic 2:13, 4:7

BHS of Mic 2:13b, 4:7b

רְמְלַה יְהוָה עָלָיוֹת בָּהֵר צִיּוֹן וּרְמַתָּהוּ

NRSV of Mic 2:13b, 4:7b

Their king will pass on before them, the LORD at their head.

and the Lord will reign over them in Mount Zion now and forevermore.

Because Mic 2:12-13 interrupts the flow of denunciation in 2:1-11 and 3:1-12, questions of its dating and authorship have provoked much discussion. It has no explicit internal pointers to dating, yet nothing in it positively precludes it having been composed by the pre-exilic prophet Micah himself. However, its promise of restoration strongly suggests a time during the exile, particularly as its terms and imagery are similar to those of Second Isaiah and Ezekiel. Its similarities with 4:6-7 both in vocabulary and sentiment suggest that these two passages originally belonged together and were inserted into the Micah tradition at a later stage.

As shepherd-king, YHWH will both protect and lead Israel. The image cannot be anything less than literal, that is, the Divine Royal Presence will be at the head of his flock when they break out of the exile and return. 4:6-7 continues the imagery. This shepherd-king will continue his protection and leadership from Mount Zion once they have returned. The

not necessarily indicated, though it would be hard for the “day of the Lord” not to at least begin on a specific day. See too Schaefer, (1993), “The Ending of the Book of Zechariah”, 169-70.

On מֶלֶךְ מָלָא הָיְשָׁם מִשְׁכֵּבָם see Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 22:28.


implication is that at the time of writing, the author of 2:12-13 and 4:6-8 believed that the Divine Royal Presence was not (yet) in Mount Zion.

This in fact is probably a tradition of the Micah school. Mic 1:2-3 contains the phrases מִתקוֹם יְהֹוָה “from his holy temple” and מִחֲבָל יְהֹוָה “from his place” indicating the location from which the Divine King will come. They refer not to the Jerusalem temple but this time to the “heavenly” palace.\(^{220}\)

### 2.2.1.3 Probably Post-exilic

1 Chr 16:31 (cf. Ps 96:10)

\[\textit{BHS} \text{ of 1 Chr 16:31 (cf. LXX 1 Chr 16:31)}^{221}\]

ymphov θεομένων ουκ ἡερὶ οἰερω ρεψαμοί οὐχι ηερίον κλιθιν Μιλτ: \[
\textit{NRSV} \text{ of 1 Chr 16:31}
\]

Let the heavens be glad, and let the earth rejoice, and let them say among the nations, “The LORD is king!”

1 Chr 16:8-36a is a cultic hymn of praise and is a post-exilic reworking of the parts of three psalms (Pss 105, 96, 106) and with three distinct parts (vv. 8-22, 23-34, 35-36a).\(^{222}\) In particular, the present verse is virtually identical to Ps 96:10a,11a.\(^{223}\) Here, YHWH is king of: all gods (v. 25); creation and the earth (vv. 14, 30, 33); and all nations (v. 31). He is not designated as king of Israel, though that is implied in v. 31 and a loose reading of v. 36a might also suggest it.

The final editor, probably fourth century B.C.,\(^{224}\) wished us to envisage this hymn being sung at least for the first time in the tent in Jerusalem לְפָנָי אֶלֹהִים “before God” (v. 1), i.e. לְפָנָי אַפְרֵה בֵּית אֵלֶּה “before the ark of the covenant of God” (v. 6, cf. vv. 4, 37). Ps 96, however, was probably sung at an annual autumn festival celebrating the kingship

---


221 The LXX of 1 Chr 16:31 translates ραδας Μιλτίας, a present active participle; Camponovo, (1984), Königstum, 387-88.


223 See Section 2.2.1.1 above.

of YHWH. Because both Ps 96 and 1 Chr 16:8-36a were to be sung in the same place cultically, the Chronicler probably wanted to draw a connection between the two. That is, the tent with the ark (Ps 96) and the second temple without it (1 Chr 16:8-36a), so that even without the ark the second temple was still the place where the Divine King dwelt.\textsuperscript{225} Worshippers are still bidden in the hymn to bring an offering "and come before him" (v. 29b), "in his place" (v. 27b).\textsuperscript{226}

This conviction of the abiding reality of the Divine Royal Presence is matched in v. 33 by the perfect הב “he has come”. God has come and is already present in the temple, from where he judges the earth in the worshipper’s present. The appropriate response is that “the trees of the forest” shall "sing for joy" before the LORD the king.\textsuperscript{227} Note that there continues to be no hint of theophany, only Divine Royal Presence and judgement.

Ps 97:1

\begin{align*}
\text{BHS of Ps 97:1a} & \\
\text{NRSV of Ps 97:1a} & \\
\text{The LORD is king! Let the earth rejoice; let the many coastlands be glad!}
\end{align*}

Another so-called Enthronement Psalm, this one betrays not an enthronement festival but at least a cultic celebration on Mount Zion (v. 8). Most scholars regard the psalm as post-exilic, though it incorporates older material.\textsuperscript{228}

There are no indications of Divine Presence in the temple, so the psalm is a general hymn extolling the kingship of God over all peoples, nature itself and even other gods. The various motifs of kingship are very old, probably Canaanite. They include: his control over nature (vv. 2-5) and his exercise of Vũ "justice, judgement" (vv. 2, 8). The verbs לילע "to rejoice" and שב "to be glad" occur together three times in this psalm and occur elsewhere in connection with God as king to denote the response to God’s presence as


\textsuperscript{226} The “place” was no doubt coterminous with the ark, cf. 1 Chr 15:1.3. רבחאlinikפי replaces the phrase יכדרה לארשי "into his courts" of Ps 96:6, בקמרא replaces the phrase לארשי "in his sanctuary" of Ps 96:6.

\textsuperscript{227} See on Ps 96:10 above.

king. “gladness, joy” is also associated with the response to the deeds of a human monarch and is thus indicative of the deeds of any king, human or divine.

Contrary to numerous scholars, the images presented in this psalm are not theophanic but are events that accompany the Divine Royal Presence. They are to be classified rather as epiphanic events. The events so described are universal, suggesting a universal kingship and presence for YHWH.

Ps 98:6

BHS of Ps 98:6

בְּהֵמֵרֵדֵת וְכָלָל שֶׁמֶר הָעָרְיָ הלֵעֶל הָלֵהוּ:  

NRSV of Ps 98:6

With trumpets and the sound of the horn make a joyful noise before the King, the LORD.

Similar to Psalm 96, this psalm is considered post-exilic, though it has motifs of the Divine Warrior (vv. 1b-3). There are no indications that the psalm was to be sung in the temple.

The psalm bids the earth to make a joyful noise “to the LORD” (v. 4), “before the King, the LORD” (v. 6b). This can only be done if God is already present. Like Ps 96:13 and 1 Chr 16:33, אֱלֹהִים at v. 9 should be considered a perfect form “he has come”. YHWH has already come to judge the earth. The Divine Royal Presence is over all the earth so that joyful noise can indeed be made before him over “all the earth” (v. 4).

---

229 Cf. 1 Chr 16:31, Pss 48:12, 68:3, 96:11, 97:1,8,12, 149:2.
230 Earthly, for example: 1 Sam 18:6, Ps 45:15, Esth 8:16,17.
232 See footnote in Section 2.2.1.1 under Deut 33:5.
233 S. L. Cook, (1992), “Apocalypticism and the Psalter”, 95, claimed that Ps 97 “describes the apocalyptic coming of God”, though no “coming” vocabulary is used in the psalm. The beholding of YHWH’s מְלֶךְ in v. 6 need only be of these epiphanic “signs”.
Ps 145:1

BHS of Ps 145:1
אָמַרְתָּם אַל-לֹּאֵרָי הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶזְכֶּרֶת שֵׁם לְעֵילֵם וּרְאוֹ

NRSV of Ps 145:1
I will extol you, my God and King, and bless your name for ever and ever.

Psalm 145 is an acrostic hymn of praise for an individual, with 13b (beginning with כ) missing from the MT but surviving in the LXX and Syriac versions and in 11QPs col. 17. It is generally dated to the post-exilic period, not because of its acrostic pattern, but in view of the late Hebrew and the use of יִכְלָסָרָה מֶלֶךְ “kingdom” in relation to YHWH which, as will be shown in Section 3.2.1, occurs elsewhere only in post-exilic literature. It does not betray a temple setting but rather is for an individual, perhaps to be said “every day” (v. 2).

Just as the reciter of this psalm need not be in the temple, the perceived location of the Divine Royal Presence is one that is not confined to the temple. In his kingdom which is the whole of creation (vv. 9, 10), YHWH stands ready to hear the prayer and bring justice to those who “fear” him and “call on him in truth” (vv. 19, 18), in fact “all who are bowed down” (v. 14), wherever they may be. The Divine King is to be found everywhere in his kingdom.

The use of the adjective מֶרְכָּבָה “near” to describe YHWH’s relationship to such people (v. 18), is more than an acknowledgment that divine aid is readily available. Sometimes, as is the case here, it is an adjective of place even when applied to God, e.g. Ps 119:151. The Divine King is able to hear and answer prayer because, for the reciter of this psalm, he is not confined to the temple, but is present wherever the psalm is sung.

---

236 See Section 3.2.1 under Ps 145:11-13a especially for a consideration of the mention of YHWH’s מֶלֶךְ “kingdom” in this psalm.


238 Cf. Pss 9-10, Section 2.2.1.2.

239 E.g. כּוֹכֵב of v. 14 occurs only elsewhere at Ps 146:8 and Ezra 6:11; BDB, 279a, late.


241 So also Ps 34. Other suggestions include: A. A. Anderson, (1972), Psalms II, 936, a representative of the whole community; Croft, (1987), Individual in the Psalms, 181, a temple singer.


Given the three-fold repetition of ב placer “name” in the psalm (vv. 1, 2, 21), in connection with its blessing and praise, v. 18 could also be saying that those who call on YHWH call on his name. The name in other words, is nothing less here than the pledge of the presence of the Divine King promised in v. 18a. If this is the case, the contrast to “in truth” would be the commandment not to misuse the Divine Name (Exod 20:7). 245

Ps 146:10

*BHS* of Ps 146:10

יהוהLTE הולמה אליירה ציון לחר ורה

*NRSV* of Ps 146:10

The LORD will reign forever, your God, O Zion, for all generations.
Praise the LORD!

Probably post-exilic because of the Aramaisms in vv. 4-5, 246 Psalm 146 is the first of the Hallel Psalms (Pss 146-50) which close the Psalter. It is an individual psalm of praise and gives no indication of an original cultic setting. 247 “Zion” in v. 10 is here a synonym for the people of God (cf. Ps 149:2, Isa 52:7). 248 There is also no indication of Divine Presence within this psalm. YHWH as king is primarily maker (v. 6), helper (v. 5) and judge (v. 7).

Ps 149:2

*BHS* of Ps 149:2

ונמה ירשא בנותיכם מיכי וניירל במלכון

*NRSV* of Ps 149:2

Let Israel be glad in its Maker; let the children of Zion rejoice in their King.


Ps 149 is a post-exilic psalm of praise (cf. Isa 25:9). As with Ps 146, there is neither a firm indication of a cultic setting nor of Divine Royal Presence. “assembly” in v. 1 may either refer to the worshipping community or the cultic congregation. YHWH is primarily a Warrior King (v. 4).

Zech 14:9,16,17

BHS of Zech 14:9,16,17

9 והיה יהוה לכלות על כל הארץ
בימי ההווה יהוה יהוהuego יאחר באה והיה
16 והיה מכל התרות מכל התרות בא שהם על הארץ
על אלות באה בשעה לשלחתו לכלות יהוה אלות
להלך אחר יושב בכותבaten
17 יהוה אשר לא יงלה יושב משפחתיות הארץ אל-רחלים
להלך לכלות יהוה לעבתר ומלך עהלות יהוה משמה

NRSV of Zech 14:9,16,17

9 And the LORD will become king over all the earth; on that day the LORD will be one and his name one.
16 Then all who survive of the nations that have come against Jerusalem shall go up year after year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the festival of booths.
17 If any of the families of the earth do not go up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, there will be no rain upon them.

Scholarly consensus admits that Zech 9-14 was written by a later hand than Zech 1-8, but as to its date and literary genre debate continues. Some even suggest that chapter 14 is itself a separate composition. We may however, place 9-14 generally in the late post-exilic period. Zech 14:9,16,17 occurs within an oracle “concerning Israel” (12:1) that stretches across the last two chapters of Zechariah.

The oracle depicts a future “day” when YHWH, the Divine Warrior King, will bring victory to Jerusalem over her enemies, cleanse the inhabitants from “sin and

---


250 Kraus, (1993ET), Psalms 60-150, 556.

251 A. A. Anderson, (1972), Psalms II, 634, 952.


254 Zech 12:3,4,6,8,9,11, 13:1,2,4, 14:1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,13,20,21.
impurity” (13:1) and make the city the focal point for worship for all people who survive (14:16).

In each of the three instances of יָלַע, the Divine King is associated with Jerusalem. On the future “day” YHWH “will become king over all the earth” and reign from Jerusalem (14:9). It is to there that pilgrims from many nations will travel in order to serve him at the autumn Feast of Tabernacles (14:16,17, cf. 8:20-23). This response of “worship” or “bowing down” is one made only to kings and gods in their presence. Before that, however, YHWH will be the Divine Warrior who will himself "go forth" and fight (14:3).

In short, the verb “go forth” in Zech 14:3 betrays not so much an exact location of the Divine Royal Presence but at least a location that was somewhere other than Jerusalem and the temple. Indeed, the plunder that is described in vv. 1-2 can take place precisely because YHWH is not present there.

After the battle, YHWH יִבְרֹא “will come” with all the ברק יְהֹוָה “holy ones” (his loyal retinue) from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem to take up residence in his house.

---


258 BDB, 1005.


(14:20,21) as king “over all the earth” (14:5,9, cf. vv. 16, 17). He is not king - does not reign (directly) - until then.

Such a picture is consistent with the rest of Zechariah and so fits in with the traditions that are grouped under Zechariah. In Zech 1-8, especially 2:10-11 for example, the writer looked forward to the return of YHWH to the soon to be rebuilt temple. In Zech 12-14 this return of YHWH is pushed into the future. Perhaps this later member of the Zechariah school was convinced that YHWH had in fact not yet returned to the second temple (probably because of the continued sins of the people) but would do so on some future “day”. Thus it is clear that the Zechariah school saw the Divine Royal Presence as absent from the second temple. This absence, however, would not last forever.

Mal 1:14

Malachi is a single early post-exilic oracle. Despite the impure sacrifices offered to him, YHWH is and remains king and is acknowledged as such by people of all nations. But he seems for the time being to be an absent king. The temple is his (2:11, 3:10), yet he is not actually present as king there (witness for example the question at the end of 2:17).

Chapter 3 is of special relevance to the present discussion. Because of the various profanities conducted in the temple and various social improprieties, Malachi foresees that the time will come when YHWH will deal with it. YHWH will send a messenger who will “come” and “appear” (3:1a,c-2a) and purify the Levitical priests so that they can offer
sacrifices pleasing to YHWH (3:2b-4). Then the Divine King קָדָם הַיָּמִים “will come unexpectedly” to his temple (3:1b). He קָדָם הַיָּמִים “will draw near” to judge (as king) those who commit social evils (3:5). Again, it is worth noting that there is no theophany associated with the “coming” of YHWH.

2.2.2 The Deuterocanonicals

The Deuterocanonicals receive separate treatment here. They are ignored in some studies of the OT and bundled with the Pseudepigrapha in others, though chronologically, they fall within the same period as those normally designated as part of the Pseudepigrapha.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late third century B.C.</td>
<td>Tob 1:18, 10:13, 13:6,7,10,11,15,16⁷⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late second century B.C. to early first century A.D.</td>
<td>Jdt 9:12</td>
<td>Wis 3:8, 18:15²⁷³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶⁸ Based on the extant text, this messenger may be a priest (2:7) or Elijah (4:5), though other suggestions have been made (e.g. Messiah, John the Baptist, etc.). See discussions in: Verhoef, (1987), Malachi, 287-88; A. E. Hill, (1998), Malachi, 287-89.

²⁶⁹ There is some scholarly debate as to the identity of נַוָּדָה “the Lord”. Most concede that it refers to YHWH, for example: Verhoef, (1987), Malachi, 288; Redditt, (1995), Malachi, 176; A. E. Hill, (1998), Malachi, 289. Some believe it refers to the messenger, e.g. Petersen, (1995), Zechariah 9-14, 211-12. The simple observation that it is to “his temple” that “the Lord” will come, favours the majority view.


In this body of literature, God is depicted or addressed as a king 21 times. However, only four of those times occur in books whose origin can be confidently said to be Palestinian. The remaining instances come from the Diaspora, more importantly, from books whose influence on the Palestine of the first century, especially on the Pharisees and Jesus is questionable. For example, no Jewish writer of the first two centuries A.D. mentions or quotes Wisdom,\textsuperscript{274} yet fragments of five scrolls of Tobit have been found in Cave 4 at Qumran, indicating that it at least was known among the sectarian circles of Qumran in Palestine before A.D. 70.\textsuperscript{275} If they did influence Palestinian thought, their contribution to Palestinian belief will in any case be secondary and not reflective. No harm then will be done by excluding them.\textsuperscript{276}

Sir 50:15

\textbf{LXX of Sir 50:15d}

δοξήν εὐαγγέλιας ψιήστω ρωματσιλεῖ.

\textbf{NRSV of Sir 50:15d}

a pleasing odor to the Most High, the king of all.

Sir 50:1-24 is an eulogy for Simon II ben Onias II, high priest 219-196 B.C. (cf. Ant. 12:224).\textsuperscript{277} Unfortunately, though now extant completely only in Greek and Syriac, Sirach was originally composed in Hebrew in Palestine but translated into Greek in Egypt by the author’s grandson (prologue).\textsuperscript{278} Although Sir 50 is largely well preserved in the Hebrew, it does not include this verse, though verses either side are preserved.\textsuperscript{279} This suggests that this particular verse may be from the Diaspora.

In any case, it is not much use for the present purpose, since the whole chapter is ambiguous as to the location of the Divine King. Seven times ψιήστος “Most High” is used of God, possibly indicating that God was considered to dwell somewhere high and from there was king of all (cf. Ps 47:2, Sir 24:3-4).\textsuperscript{280} The odor rising from the outside

\textsuperscript{276} See also the remarks in Section 1.2.2 with regard to the LXX.
\textsuperscript{278} Schürer, (1973\textsuperscript{2}), Age III.1, 202; Skehan and Di Lella, (1987), Ben Sira, 8-10; Di Lella, (1990), “Sirach”, NJBC, 496b-97a; Camponovo, (1984), Königtum, 133.
\textsuperscript{279} Beentjes, (1997), Ben Sira, 89, 176. Verse 15 is missing from all Hebrew MSS.
\textsuperscript{280} See Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 47:2,6,7,8.
altar (50:15c) rose up (cf. Judg 13:20), not horizontally into the holy of holies. Yet, 50:19
depicts worshippers in the temple offering their prayers κατέναντι “before” God.

Sir 51:1

Hebrew of Sir 51:1a (MS B)²⁸¹

יְבֹאֵל יְהוָה יְשָׁעֵל אֵל אֱלֹהִי אָבִי.

LXX of Sir 51:1a

Ἐξομολογήσομαι σοι, κύριε βασιλεύ,
καὶ αὐξήσω σε θεόν τὸν σωτήρα μου.

NRSV of Sir 51:1a²⁸²

I give you thanks, O Lord and King, and praise you, O God my Savior.

Curiously, the LXX departs significantly from the extant Hebrew at 51:1. The Hebrew may
be translated: “I will praise you my God and my salvation, I will sing to you my God my
Father”. There is, in other words, no mention of God as king in the Hebrew.

It is possible that the Greek is a reflection of another older Hebrew text that is now lost.²⁸³
It is possible too that the Greek text is indicative of the theological predilection of the
translator who had before him a Hebrew text similar to the one we now possess but for
some reason chose to include a mention of God as king.²⁸⁴ If it is attributable to the
second possibility, it would remove the verse from further consideration here because the
verse is of relevance only insofar as it yields an indication of Palestinian thinking, not that
of the Jewish Diaspora.

As it happens, the problem need not be resolved here. If the text betrays an underlying
Hebrew MSS, it tells us little of the notion of Divine Royal Presence. In v. 9 Ben Sirach
“sent” his prayer “from the earth”, suggesting that for him that the Divine King was not
on earth. But that is about all that can be ascertained.

²⁸¹ Vattioni, (1968), Ecclesiastico, 277; Beentjes, (1997), Ben Sira, 91.
²⁸² The Greek verbs are in the future, so, “I will give you praise, O Lord king and, will tell of you my
Saviour God”.
²⁸³ Ziegler, (1982), Sirach, 362, does not indicate a Hebrew text underlying any MSS variant of Sir
51:1.
²⁸⁴ Cf. Section 1.2.3.
Sir 51:12.n

Hebrew of Sir 51:12.n (MS B)\textsuperscript{285}


dwxd Mlwel yk Myklm yklm Klml wdwh

NRSV of Sir 51:12.n

Give thanks to the King of the kings of kings, for his mercy endures forever;

Sir 51:12.a-p is a hymn modelled on Psalm 136 because of the similar refrain “for his mercy endures forever”. It survives only in the Hebrew. Although probably not composed by Ben Sira, it nevertheless was written in the second century B.C. when the Zadokites were still high priests (v. 12.i), i.e. before 152 B.C.\textsuperscript{286} The three-fold expression “Myklm yklm Klml” in 51:12.n occurs elsewhere in later literature, with its two-fold counterpart first occurring in \textit{1 Enoch} 9:4.\textsuperscript{287} It acknowledges and proclaims the universal sovereignty of God over all kings and therefore over all nations.

Verse 12.g is a thanksgiving to YHWH for rebuilding “his city and his sanctuary”.\textsuperscript{288} Either it is possible that the author considered the Divine King to dwell in the temple in his present, or it is a future hope that the temple will be rebuilt by God since at the time of composition it already existed. The former possibility seems more likely as the author seemed happy with the present temple (v. 12.i).

Jdt 9:12

LXX of Jdt 9:12

\begin{align*}
\text{NRSV of Jdt 9:12} & \\
\text{Please, please, God of my father, God of the heritage of Israel, Lord of heaven and earth, Creator of the waters, King of all your creation, hear my prayer!}
\end{align*}


\textsuperscript{286} Di Lella, (1966), \textit{Hebrew Text of Sirach}, 102, 105; MacKenzie, (1983), \textit{Sirach}, 194; Skehan and Di Lella, (1987), \textit{Ben Sira}, 569-70. About two-thirds of Sirach has been recovered in the Hebrew. Schürer, (1973), \textit{Age III.1}, 203, 205, pointed out that the Syriac was translated from the Hebrew, not the Greek, but with frequent recourse to the Greek.

\textsuperscript{287} Earlier: \textit{1 Enoch} 9:4 (2-fold). Later: \textit{1 Enoch} 84:2 (2-fold), Aleinu, \textit{m. Sanh.} 4:5N, \textit{Abot} 3:1E, 4:22O.

\textsuperscript{288} Cf. Exod 15:17, \textit{Jub.} 1:7. The references that are given in Skehan and Di Lella, (1987), \textit{Ben Sira}, 570, either refer only to Jerusalem or are not explicit as regards God himself building the temple.
The original language of the book of Judith was probably Hebrew, since the LXX gives every indication of being a translation from a Hebrew text. It was most probably composed towards the end of the second century B.C. and in Palestine. As recently as 1985, the author was considered by at least one scholar to have been a Pharisee, though most remain indifferent to this claim.

Jdt 9:2-14 forms the prayer of Judith, prayed by her at “Bethulia” (8:11b) at the time of the evening sacrifice in the temple (9:1). Whether Bethulia was an actual city (4:6, 6:10-11), or as seems more likely, a substitute for Jerusalem, there is no indication that we are meant to think that Judith offered her prayer in the temple. The text is more concerned with the timing of the prayer (v. 1).

For the writer of Judith, God is ὁ θεός τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “the God of heaven” and the ἄριστος “Most High”. Yet, in 9:8 it is his θόομα that rests in the σκήνωμα, a less frequently used synonym for σκηνή, literally a “tent”. It refers to God’s house or temple. Elsewhere, too, God himself is thought of as residing in the temple (e.g. 9:1, 11:13). Judith’s prayer, though not uttered in the temple, was nevertheless heard by God. The Divine Royal Presence, though centred on the temple, was not confined to it.

---


293 It is not the first time that the divine “name” has been encountered within the context of the Divine Royal Presence. See discussions under Isa 33:17,22, Ps 74:12, 145:1, Zech 14:9, Mal 1:14.
### 2.2.3 The Pseudepigrapha (and Daniel)

Explicit mention of God as king, his reign (noun or verb) or his kingship, occur in the following places in the (Jewish) Pseudepigrapha and Daniel.\(^{294}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Century B.C.</th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Enoch 9:4c, 12:3, 25:3,5,7, 27:3 1 Enoch 81:3</td>
<td>Dan 4:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Century B.C.</th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Enoch 84:2,3,5 1 Ench 3:1</td>
<td>1 Esdr 4:40(7),46,58,(^{295}) T. Naph. 8:3, Dan 5:13, Benj. 10:7(^{296}) Sib. Or. 3:499,560,617,717-18,808(^{297}) Frag. Sib. Or. 1:7,35, 3:42(^{298})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jub. 1:28r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Century B.C.</th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pss. Sol. 2:30,32, 5:19, 17:1,34,46</td>
<td>Sib. Or. 3:48,56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Century A.D.</th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As. Mos. 4:2, 10:3c L.A.E. (Apoc.) 29:4</td>
<td>Ps.-Phoc. 111(^{300})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Century A.D.</th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Ab. A 2:6,11 8:3(^{301}) Sib. Or. 5:348,352,499(^{302}) 3 Bar. 16:4(^{303})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

294 It also occurs in: 3 Enoch 1:10, 10:3, 15B:3, 22B:5,7, 22:15,16, 25:4, 29:1, 35:6, 45:6. 3 Enoch, however, is thought to have been composed in the fifth or sixth century A.D. in the Diaspora, see Alexander, (1983), “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch”, OTP I, 229. On p. 241 Alexander wrote, “According to 3 Enoch 5:1-14, after Adam was expelled from Eden, the Sekinah remained on earth, but since the generation of Enosh (the third in line from Adam) it has been residing in the highest heaven”. For a lists of references in the Deuterocanonicals and the Pseudepigrapha, see for example: Swanson, (1980), “Kingship of God”, 1-25; Camponovo, (1984), Königtum, passim.


298 See references for Sib. Or. 3.


303 The date and provenance of 3 Baruch (the Greek and Slavonic versions) are much in dispute. A Diaspora origin in the first or second century is not improbable. See: Schürer, (1973\(^2\)), Age III.2, 791; Nickelsburg, (1981), Jewish Literature, 303; Charlesworth, (1981), The Pseudepigrapha
References from the Diaspora may be immediately discarded from further consideration. Christian influence cannot be entirely ruled out for many of them (e.g. the Testaments, 3 Baruch) and as the purpose here is to gain some insight into the situation pertaining to the Pharisees and Jesus of first century A.D. Palestine, it would seem unnecessary to take these documents into account. It is to be noted that according to the fourth edition of the UBS Greek NT, there are no allusions or verbal parallels between any of these works and Luke-Acts, indicating that they had no influence at any stage of the formation of the third Gospel. This is still so in the case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, even if their earlier pre-Christian forms were used by first century A.D. Palestinian groups.

The one exception is Dan 4:37. Thus there are some 21 verses and their contexts that need to be surveyed for their notions of the Divine Royal Presence.

Dan 4:37

*BHS* of Dan 4:34 (Aramaic)

כָּעַ֣ן עַלֶּה נְבּוֹכָדְנֵזֶ֑ר שָׁמַ֖שֶּׁהוּ מִרְּאוֹמָ֑ם מֵרָ֥הָר לְפָ֖לֵךְ שְׁפִּֽירָאָֽו

רַחֲלִיְּנַ֔בּוֹכָדְנֵֽזֶר שָׁמַ֖שֶּׁהוּ רְעוֹר מִרְּאוֹמָ֑ם בְּנֵי לְפָלֵךְ שָׁפַֽירָאָֽו

*NRSV* of Dan 4:37

Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor the King of heaven, for all his works are truth and his ways are justice; and he is able to bring low those who walk in pride.

---


307 Cf. Section 1.2.2.

308 UBS, 900-901.

Dan 1-6 was composed in the Diaspora and was joined with Dan 7-12 in the second century B.C. in Palestine. Hence consideration is given to it here and in Section 3.2.3.

The motif “king of heaven” is not an indication that God was thought of here as the king in and of heaven only, simply that he is king of the earth but ruled as king from heaven. This explanation conforms with such phrases in Daniel as “God in heaven” (2:28) and with the fact that Nebuchadnezzar’s kingship and kingdom is subtly compared and contrasted with the Divine Kingdom and Kingship (e.g. 4:22,25,26). We may note, too, the association of Divine Kingship with judgement, justice’.

This verse has the distinction of being the first to locate the Divine Royal Presence explicitly in “heaven”.

The term “heaven” (literally “heavens”, Aramaic שמיים) can mean both the dwelling place of God, “air” or “sky” and God himself, much like the word הים “pasture” on occasion.

Particularly when not in conjunction with “kingdom”, “heaven” is the uppermost world of the three-tiered Hebrew cosmos. It is literally a location in space to be distinguished from “earth” and Sheol or the underworld. This “heaven” was nothing less in some circles than the dwelling place of God, though as Ps 139:7-10 testifies, that did not necessarily nullify God’s perceived ability to be anywhere.

---


312 Cf. Deut 5:8, 2 Sam 18:9, Ezek 8:3, Ant. 1:30; Bähr, (1963), Justice of God, 77; Stadelmann, (1970), Hebrew Conception of the World, 9-10, 40; Nickelsburg, (1991), “Reality in 1 Enoch”, 59-59. A similar three-tiered view may be found in the contemporaneous 1 Enoch. Heaven in this sense is separated from the Earth and Sheol by the firmament.


314 Also 1 Kgs 8:27, Isa 66:1, 2 Chr 2:6, 6:18. This need not mean that God was thought to be omnipresent as most scholars conclude, merely that God was not able to be confined, that is, he had the ability to be anywhere he desired. The multiplicity of heavens in later rabbinc Judaism need not be of concern here, cf. 2 Cor 12:2.
On a few occasions the word can mean “air” or “sky”, i.e. the space “between heaven and earth”, particularly the place from which rain comes.\(^{315}\)

From the Greek period onwards, “heaven” became also a circumlocution for God.\(^{316}\)

\section*{1 Enoch 9:4, 12:3, 25:3, 5:7, 27:3}

\begin{quote}
1 Enoch 9:4 (Greek)\(^{317}\)

Καὶ εἶπα[ν] τῷ κυρίῳ Σὺ εἶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ ο θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων: ο θρόνος τῆς δόξης σου εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεάς τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα σου τὸ ἄξιον καὶ μέγα καὶ εὐλογητὸν εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας.

1 Enoch 9:4 (Aramaic) = 4QEn b 1 iii 14-15 (4Q201)\(^{318}\)

\[\text{Translation of 1 Enoch 9:4 (based on the Ethiopic)}\]

And they said to the Lord of the potentates, “For he is the Lord of lords, and the God of gods, and the King of kings, and the seat of his glory (stands) throughout all the generations of the world.

1 Enoch 12:3 (Greek)\(^{320}\)

Καὶ ἐστῶς ἡμῖν ἕνως εὐλογῶν τῷ κυρίῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, τῷ βασιλείῳ τῶν αἰῶνων.
\end{quote}


\(^{320}\) Black, (1970), Apocalypsis, 27; Camponovo, (1984), Königtum, 244.
2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

\[I\ Enoch\ 12:3\] (Aramaic) = \[4QEn\ v\ 19\ (4Q204)\]

Translation of \[I\ Enoch\ 12:3\] (based on the Ethiopic)

And I, Enoch, began to bless the Lord of the mighty ones and the King of the universe.

\[I\ Enoch\ 25:3,5,7\] (Greek)

Translation of \[I\ Enoch\ 25:3,5,7\] (based on the Ethiopic)

These verses of \[I\ Enoch\] are from the “The Book of the Watchers” (chs. 1-36). Because of Aramaic fragments discovered at Qumran which have been palaeographically dated to the early second century B.C., \[I\ Enoch\ 1-36\] is generally believed to have been composed


in Palestine in the third century B.C. Its original language (whether Hebrew or Aramaic or a combination), however, is uncertain. It is extant completely only in Ethiopian.\(^{328}\)

At the beginning of 1 Enoch, Enoch’s vision begins with the stirring of God. God “will come forth” from heaven, march on Mount Sinai, and there “appear” (1:3-4, cf. 25:3). Then judgement will take place and the righteous in particular will be preserved (1:5-9, 5:7-10).\(^{329}\) The picture is much like the OT “day of the LORD”. We may note the order of the verbs here. God first “comes” from heaven to earth, and then “appears”, suggesting not only that “to come” is non-theophanic but that the verbs are essentially different in meaning. God must be present before he can reveal himself. The implications of this for the present task are explored in Section 3.7.

1 Enoch 9:4 depicts the intercession of four archangels to the “Most High” on behalf of humankind. The location is literally the “sanctuary in heaven” (v. 1), which probably refers to the heavenly temple of God rather than to heaven itself (cf. 14:10-16).\(^{330}\) It is from there that God is king of “everything” (v. 5), a sentiment embedded in the two-fold title “king of kings”, with its implication that God is king of all (earthly) kings and nations.\(^{331}\) There is an emphasis on the divine kingship lasting for all time (cf. 22:14).

1 Enoch 12:3, God is king of the universe, though other translations place the emphasis on time, e.g. “King of Eternity” and “King of the ages”.\(^{332}\)

1 Enoch 25:3,5,7. Michael responds to Enoch. The “tall mountain” (v. 3) which is at present the vacant throne of God is most likely Mount Zion rather than Sinai.\(^{333}\) It is to there that God will descend (from heaven) as king to judge (v. 4, cf. 1:3, 91:7).\(^{334}\)

---


\(^{330}\) Black, (1985), The Book of Enoch, 129. See also Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 29:10. 1 Enoch 14:8-25 is an elaborate vision of the heavenly house of God where his throne is set.

\(^{331}\) See also: 1 Enoch 84:2 (2-fold), Sir 51:12,n, Aleinu, m. Sanh. 4:5N, Abot 3:1E, 4:22O (all 3-fold. On the two-fold title, see: Beale, (1985), “King of Kings and Lord of Lords”, 18-20.


\(^{333}\) 1 Enoch 26:1, has “the center of the earth”, an occasional circumlocution for Mount Zion or Jerusalem, see Charles, (1913), Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha II, 205.

\(^{334}\) Cf. Mic 1:3, Isa 26:21, As. Mos. 10:3.
2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

1 Enoch 27:3. Uriel replies to a question from Enoch. The “accursed valley” (v. 2) is probably Gehenna (a valley south of Jerusalem) the place where those condemned by the Divine King will be gathered for judgement (54:1-2, 90:25-27). The righteous/merciful will be nearby on Mount Zion continually blessing the Divine King.

1 Enoch 81:3

Translation of 1 Enoch 81:3a (based on the Ethiopic)\(^\text{336}\)
At that very moment, I blessed the Great Lord, the King of Glory for ever, for he has created all the phenomena in the world.

1 Enoch 81:3 is from “The Book of Astronomical Writings” (chs. 72-82). For similar reasons to 1 Enoch 1-36, the original was written in Palestine and can be dated to the third century B.C.\(^\text{337}\) Within the immediate context, there are no indications of Divine Royal Presence. As creator of “all the phenomena in the world” we may merely assume that the writer thought of God as king of the world.

1 Enoch 84:2,3,5

Translation of 1 Enoch 84:2,3,5 (based on the Ethiopic)\(^\text{338}\)
2 Blessed are you, O Great King, you are mighty in your greatness, O Lord of all the creation of heaven, King of kings and God of the whole world. Your authority and kingdom abide forever and ever; and your dominion throughout all the generations of generations; all the heavens are your throne for ever, and the whole earth is your footstool forever and ever.
3 For you have created (all), and all things you rule; not a single thing is hard for you - (absolutely) not a single thing or wisdom; Your throne has not retreated from her station nor from before your presence. Everything you know, you see, and you hear; nothing exists that can be hidden from you, for everything you expose.
5 “Now, O God, and Lord and Great King, . . .

1 Enoch 84 is part of the “The Book of Dream Visions” (chs. 83-90). It purports to be the response of Enoch to the first dream vision of the Flood, recounted in chapter 83, and

was most probably written shortly after Dan 7:27, during the campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus (164-60 B.C.). Far from describing a future event, the prayer describes the position of God in the here-and-now.

God is “King of kings”, i.e. king of all the kings of the nations and therefore is God of the whole world. God rules over “all things” and is all powerful (“not a single thing is hard for you”). He knows, sees and hears everything. His kingdom is everlasting. Again, God does not exercise his sovereignty by intervening in the here-and-now. The Flood was in the future for the character of Enoch and divine punishment for sinners in the future for the writer (84:5-6).

The Divine Royal Presence is in heaven (e.g. 89:70,76, 90:14), so the writer was still able to describe God as “descending” at the exodus to act on Israel’s behalf (89:16). But such is his “greatness” (v. 2), that his presence extends to the whole earth.

There is corresponding hostility towards the Zerrubbabel temple. It is polluted and as good as fallen down (89:72-73). It is to be replaced by the “Lord of the Sheep” with a larger and more glorious house (probably not a “heavenly Jerusalem”), in which he will live (90:28-36).

Jub. 1:28

Translation of Jub. 1:28, 16:18 (based on the Ethiopic)

And the Lord will appear in the sight of all. And everyone will know that I am the God of Israel and the father of all the children of Jacob and king upon Mount Zion forever and ever. And Zion and Jerusalem will be holy.”

Purporting to be a revelation given to Moses and probably originally written in Hebrew, the only text of Jubilees that has survived in a virtually complete form is the Ethiopic text. One fourth is extant in Latin and fragments in Hebrew (from Qumran), Greek and Syriac. It was written sometime after the wars of Judas Maccabaeus by a Jew who lived in

339 Also: 1 Enoch 9:4 (2-fold), Sir 51:12.n, Aleinu, m. Sanh. 4:5N, Abot 3:1E, 4:22O (all 3-fold).
341 Wicks, (1915), The Doctrine of God, 42.
Palestine. He may have belonged to a priestly family, given its concern for cultic details. *Jub.* 50:12 forbids war on the Sabbath, which may suggest that the writer belonged to a similar Hasidic group as that described in 1 Macc 2:29-42 and 2 Macc 6:11. The purpose of *Jubilees* is to instruct and exhort readers to observe the Torah (i.e. practice *torah* or *halakah*) faithfully through the upheavals of the period.

Gene L. Davenport claimed that *Jub.* 1:27-28 was the work of a later (still second century B.C.) redactor who saw the temple as having a central place. The last phrase of v. 26, “until I descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity”, was also apparently added by this redactor.

Chapter 1 is an account of the conversation between Moses and God on Mount Sinai. In it God tells Moses what will happen to his people. After the exile (v. 15), God will return them. Rather than the people rebuilding the sanctuary, it is God who will build his “sanctuary in their midst” and so “dwell with them” (v. 17, cf. v. 10, 32:10). The present one (Zerubbabel’s) is so defiled (23:21) that only God can build a suitable sanctuary. Thus for the present, the Divine King does not dwell there.

*Pss. Sol.* 2:30,32

LXX of *Pss. Sol.* 2:30,32  
30 αὐτός βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν  
καὶ κρίνων βασιλεῖς καὶ ἀρχάς.  
32 Καὶ νῦν ἰδετε, οἱ μεγιστάνες τῆς γῆς, τὸ κρίμα τοῦ κυρίου,  
ὅτι μεγάς βασιλεὺς καὶ δίκαιος κρίνων τὴν ἔκκρισιν οὐρανῶν.

Translation of *Pss. Sol.* 2:30,32  
30 He is king over the heavens, judging even kings and rulers,  
32 And now, officials of the earth, see the judgement of the Lord,  
that he is a great and righteous king, judging what is under heaven.

---


346 Schürer, (1973), *Age III.1*, 314; Ladd, (1952), “The Kingdom of God in Jubilees”, 165, the writer was Pharisaic.

347 See footnote in Section 1.1 and, Lodahl, (1992), *Shekhinah / Spirit*, 54, for whom halakah is the “study and application of Torah”.


Extant in Greek and a late Syriac version, the general consensus of scholarship is that the *Psalms of Solomon* were composed in Jerusalem by various authors, originally in Hebrew, again in response to the invasion by Pompey and the fall of the Hasmonean dynasty in the middle of the first century B.C. Allusions to the fate of Pompey’s body enable a date after 48 B.C. to be given to *Pss. Sol.*

The *Psalms of Solomon* have frequently been ascribed to Pharisees and to a lesser extent to the Essenes, though this theory is now discredited. The theory that they come from a synagogue setting has been recently revived, and if proven, would suggest, not their Pharisaic authorship, but that they may contain notions which reflect the influence of Pharisees in pre-70 synagogues. They are representative of views, such as belief in resurrection, prayer apart from the temple and fasting, likely to have been held by the “ordinary” synagogue-going Jew of the period.

God is king “over the heavens” and “what is under heaven”. Despite the defilement of the sanctuary (vv. 2, 3) and God’s glory (v. 5), the worshipper is still able to be in “the Lord’s presence” (v. 22). It is from the temple that God is the universal Divine King.

---


355 See Section 1.5.6.


2.2 The Presence of the Divine King: Ancient Palestinian Literature

Pss. Sol. 5:19

LXX of Pss. Sol. 5:19
19 εὐλογημένη ἡ δόξα κυρίου, ἐάν αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν.

Translation of Pss. Sol. 5:19
19 May the glory of the Lord be praised, for he is our king.

God as king exercises his kingship in the here-and-now by protecting the poor (v. 2), exercising judgement (v. 4) and helping those who ask him (v. 5). The Divine King sustains the created order by feeding the birds and fish, sending rain, providing pasture and feeding people both powerful and humble (vv. 9-11).

It is only at the last two verses (vv. 18-19) that the subject of God’s kingdom and his kingship is introduced. Though God is king of the created world, he has a special place for Israel. His kingdom extends beyond Israel. There is, however, no indication of the location of the presence of the Divine King.

Pss. Sol. 17:1,34,46

LXX of Pss. Sol. 17:1,34,46
1 Κύριε, σὺ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτη . . .
34 Κύριος αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ . . .
46 κύριος αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτη.

Translation of Pss. Sol. 17:1,34,46
1 Lord, you are our king forevermore, . . .
34 The Lord himself is his king, . . .
46 The Lord Himself is our king forevermore.

Though generally assigned with the other Psalms of Solomon to a date around the time of Pompey’s invasion, recent work has proposed a date between 37 and 30 B.C. for Pss. Sol. 17. In any case, a date in the first century B.C. is still generally accepted.

358 Though the manuscript evidence is inconclusive, one is tempted to suggest that perhaps vv. 18 and 19 were latter additions designed to incorporate more familiar notions of divine sovereignty. For the Manuscript evidence, see Hann, (1982), Psalms of Solomon, 43.
359 See Section 3.2.3 under Pss. Sol. 5:18 for more on the Divine “Kingdom” in this psalm.
Pss. Sol. 17 is strongly influenced by earlier traditions, especially Isaiah and the royal canonical psalms.\textsuperscript{361} It acknowledges the supreme kingship of God, but also calls the eventual Messiah King of Israel (vv. 32, 42). As king, God’s location is undefined.\textsuperscript{362}

\textbf{As. Mos. 4:2, 10:3}

\begin{quote}
\textit{As. Mos. 4:2, 10:3}\textsuperscript{363}

4:2 ‘Domine, omnis rex in alta sede, qui dominaris saeculo, qui voluisti plebem hanc esse tibi plebem [hanc] exceptam. . . .

10:3 <Exur>get enim Caelestis a sede regni sui et exiet de habitatione sancta sua cum indignationem et iram propter filios suos.

Translation of \textit{As. Mos. 4:2, 10:3}\textsuperscript{364}

4:2 “Lord of all, king on the lofty throne, you who rules the world, who has willed that his people be for you a chosen people, . . .

10:3 For the Heavenly One will arise from his kingly throne. Yea, he will go forth from his holy habitation with indignation and wrath on behalf of his sons.
\end{quote}

The \textit{Assumption (Testament) of Moses} survives in an incomplete Latin text, with the original language most probably Hebrew.\textsuperscript{365} It is usually dated to the first half of the first century A.D.\textsuperscript{366} Johannes Tromp saw a two-fold purpose for the book. Its intent was to encourage faithfulness to the law and offer comfort in the face of the disastrous state of Israel by looking forward to the salvation coming in the near future.\textsuperscript{367}

In 4:2, God is king of the world, but has a special relationship with the people of the covenant. The immediate context does not give an indication of Divine Presence. 2:4,9 and

\begin{thebibliography}{9}

\bibitem{362} Though see further in Section 3.2.3 under \textit{Pss. Sol.} 17:3.
\bibitem{363} Tromp, (1993), \textit{The Assumption of Moses}, 10-11, 18.
\end{thebibliography}
5:4 might suggest the temple (cf. 1:18), though the title “God of heaven” in 2:4 and repeated with variations in 4:4 and 10:3, point to God dwelling in heaven.

10:1-10 is a poem or hymn describing future eschatological judgement. In 10:3 the “Heavenly One” will “go forth” from his “holy habitation”. These designations have been met with elsewhere and point once again to the notion of the Divine Royal Presence residing in heaven (cf. 10:9), but that the time will come for God to “come” to earth (cf. 10:12) as the Divine Warrior. In v. 7 God will be seen (palam veniet, literally “come into public view”) in order to execute judgement on the nations, a motif repeated earlier at v. 1 with respect to God’s kingdom. One result of his appearance will be the trembling of the earth (cf. Ps 29:6-8, 97:4-5).

L.A.E. (Apoc.) 29:4

And they [the angels] came to God and said, ‘Jael, eternal king, command that fragrant incenses from Paradise be given to Adam.’

The Life of Adam and Eve (Apocalypse) was most probably originally composed in Hebrew in Palestine towards the end of the first century A.D. and translated directly into the extant Greek some time later. Its similarities with rabbinic midrash led one

---

369 Cf. 2 Chr 36:23, Ezra 1:2. 5:11, 6:9, Dan 2:18; Sib. Or. 3:19,174.
commentator to suggest that the author’s theology was that of “Pharisaic Judaism”, though that conclusion will not be considered here.

Chapters 15-30 purport to be a description by Eve of the fall and expulsion from paradise. In 22:3 God is depicted as “coming” into paradise to judge Adam and Eve. When he is in paradise his throne is near the tree of life (19:2, 22:3). At 29:4 the angels intercede to God on behalf of Adam for incense so that Adam might be able to offer a fitting sacrifice to God when necessary. Later, however, heaven is mentioned several times in a vision of Eve, indicating that God can be found there (33:2, 35:2, 38:3, 42:8, cf. 34:1, 37:3). In fact wherever God’s throne is, there is God (e.g. 32:2, 37:4).

At the “end of times” (v. 13:2), there will be a general resurrection of the “holy people” who will be given “every joy of Paradise”, including the Divine Presence, “God shall be in their midst (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν)” (v. 13:4). We may note that it is God who will be in their midst rather than the holy people being in the presence of God - an indication that it is the earth that is the place this will happen.

---


2.3 THE PHARISEES AND JESUS

Leaving aside for the moment the particular legacy inherited and advanced by the Pharisees and Jesus, this section will deal with those passages in contemporary or near-contemporary literature that purport to present a picture of what the Pharisees and Jesus thought of God as king.

2.3.1 The Pharisees

As regards the Pharisees, just two sources contain information that may be relevant to the present task, namely, one synagogue prayer and eight passages from the Targumim.

Questions of dating and their link to the first century Palestinian Pharisees naturally arise. The dating of the synagogue prayer to the pre-70 period and some targumim will be discussed under each reference below. Their link to the Pharisees has been established in Sections 1.5.6 and 1.6.4.

2.3.1.1 A Synagogue Prayer

One synagogue prayer, the ḥדyme “‘Amidah”, 379 despite having undergone considerable redaction and emendation over the centuries, is commonly considered to contain traditions going back prior to A.D. 70. It is a set of blessing prayers which today form the climax of synagogue worship. The Babylonian recension, that used today, is more recent than the Palestinian recension. 380 The possibility, therefore, is that any traditions contained in the earlier recension that can be traced back to the first century A.D. will reflect Pharisic convictions (though not necessarily beliefs exclusive to the Pharisees), on the grounds of the established influence of the Pharisees on synagogue worship.

---

379 This is the modern name. It is also called “Shemoneh Esreh” (Eighteen) and simply “The Prayer”; Schürer, (19732), Age II, 456.

380 Schürer, (19732), Age II, 455-63; Meier, (1994), Marginal Jew II, 299-300, 363 n. 44.
The `Amidah`  

Benediction 11 from the Cairo Genizah

Translation

Restore our judges as in former times and our counsellors as in the beginning; and reign over us, thou alone. (Blessed art thou, Lord, who loveth judgement.)

While the Palestinian recension of the ‘Amidah can not be reconstructed in detail, it is assumed today that the text found in the Cairo Genizah comes closest to this earlier version. Whereas the Babylonian rendering contains eight instances of God as king and one referring to his reign, the Palestinian version contains only this one reference.

In each of the Babylonian examples and in the above text, God is thought of as either king of the worshipping community only or of one day ruling it only. Thus if Chilton’s dating method for the Targumic “kingdom of God” is applied here, a date in the Amoraic period or later for these “king” additions is indicated, despite other attempts to date the eleventh benediction in particular to the pre-70 period. The often cited parallel Matt 6:10 // Luke 11:2 in the Lord’s Prayer would be much more ancient if Chilton’s dating method were applied to it. The “kingdom” prayed for there is universal.

Thus neither recension can be used with any degree of certainty as giving an indication of the notion of the presence of the Divine King in pre-70 synagogues or among the post-70 Tannaitic rabbis. In fact, given the lack of any such witness in the older Palestinian recension, it is quite likely that if the prayer existed in some form prior to A.D. 70, it did not contain any reference to God as king. Perhaps, with the destruction of Palestine and the temple and the failure of the Bar Kochba revolt, there was the need to reassert the kingship of God over believing Jews.

---

384 See Section 1.6.3.
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2.3.1.2 The Targumim

In the search for clues to the thinking of the Pharisees regarding God as king, the Aramaic Targumim are an indispensable source. This is because of the conclusions arrived at in Section 1.6.5 which may be repeated here.

The Pharisees exercised some influence in the teaching conducted in first century Palestinian synagogues, particularly in the interpretation and exposition of Scripture. Aramaic targumim, both oral and written, which present not only translation, but interpretation and exposition of Scripture, were probably in use in these synagogues and, within the extant Aramaic Targumim, may be traced some traditions which go back to the pre-70 period. Thus, given the influence the Pharisees had in the synagogue and their predilection for “tradition”, it is not unreasonable to suppose that their involvement in the targum traditions was influential. If a Targum tradition can be traced back to the first century, we may presume that it indicates a tradition that reflects the beliefs of the Pharisees.

Ideally, every instance of the use of the Aramaic קִלּות as the noun “king” or verb “to reign” or “to be king” as it is applied to God in the Targumim should be canvassed. This is neither practical nor necessary in the present work. What is needed here is to see what the Targumists have done with the Hebrew verses that mention God as king or his reign and to take particular note (for Section 3.7) of those associated instances in which the verbs “to come” and “to appear” have either been preserved or inserted into the Targum. This will provide enough information from which to draw some conclusions regarding the understanding of “God as king” and the meaning and use of these verbs with regard to God as king.

Bruce D. Chilton developed his method of dating Targum traditions using the instances of “kingdom of God” in the Targumim to the Prophets. Though not without problems, this method will be followed in this Section and in Section 3.5.1.3.

We shall, therefore, consider here those Targum translations from the Torah and Prophets that may be dated to the pre-70 period, using Chilton’s dating criteria. Those of the post-70 period will be considered in Section 2.5.1.3.

---

387 See Section 1.5.6.
388 See Section 1.6.4.
389 See Section 1.6.3.
390 See Section 1.6.3.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-70 Tannaitic (universal)</th>
<th>Tg. Neb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jer 46:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 48:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 51:57b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech 14:9, 16, 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal 1:14b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tg. Neb. Jer 46:18**

NRSV of Jer 46:18

As I live, says the King, whose name is the LORD of hosts, one is coming like Tabor among the mountains and like Carmel by the sea.

Tg. Neb. Jer 46:18[^391]

כְּרוֹד אַנְאָא אֶלֶהָא מַלְכָּא רוּ בּסַעַת שֵׁמָּא
אֶלֶה קְנֹת רַעַע פַּעַקָת רַעַע אֶלֶה בּסַעַת שֵׁמָּא בּכָּלָא כּוּ

Translation of Tg. Neb. Jer 46:18[^392]

I am the Living One, says the king, the Lord of Hosts is his Name; for just as the matter is true, that Tabor is among the mountains, and like Carmel by the sea, so shall his destruction come.

The retention of the מַלְכָּא רוּ הָאֹרֶם “Lord of Hosts” suggests a universal divine kingship and so a pre-70 origin for the tradition of interpretation of Jer 48:15.[^393]

Despite the change in the subject of the verb “to come”, this targum of Jer 46:18 is a typical base translation with a word or two altered or added (section 1.6.2).[^394] Of itself it adds little to the meaning of the Hebrew and like the Hebrew, the surrounding context gives no indication of Divine Royal Presence.^[395]


[^393]: See Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 24:7-10.

[^394]: The targum adds a midrash at the end of this verse, which adds nothing to the present discussion. See R. Hayward, (1987ET), *The Targum of Jeremiah*, 168 n. cc, 169 n. 17.

[^395]: There is no mention of “Shekhinah”, or “Glory” and “Memra” is mentioned once in passing at v. 28. מַלְכָּא רוּ הָאֹרֶם “Shekhinah” is discussed in Section 2.5.1.3 under Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5. מַלְכָּא רוּ “Glory” is discussed in Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 29:10. The targumic מַלְכָּא רוּ “Memra” is discussed in Section 3.3.1.3 under Tg. Neb. Isa 40:10, since it is the only place where it occurs together with either God as king or the kingdom of God.
2.3 The Presence of the Divine King: The Pharisees and Jesus

**Tg. Neb. Jer 48:15**

NRSV of Jer 48:15
The destroyer of Moab and his towns has come up, and the choicest of his young men have gone down to slaughter, says the King, whose name is the LORD of hosts.

**Tg. Neb. Jer 48:15**

The Moabites have been plundered and their cities are a destruction; and the pick of their young men have been handed over to the slaughter, says the King, the Lord of Hosts is his Name.

Though no Divine Royal Presence indicators exist in the context of this targum, like the Hebrew original, it is God who is in clear control of Moab and its punishment and therefore over all nations. God as king in v. 15, is clearly contrasted with the evil king of Moab on whom the “Lord of Hosts” passes judgement.

**Tg. Neb. Jer 51:57**

NRSV of Jer 51:57b
... says the King, whose name is the LORD of hosts.

**Tg. Neb. Jer 51:57b**

... says the King; the Lord of Hosts is his Name.

As with the previously discussed targumim, the retention of the name ירַעְיָה “Lord of Hosts” strongly points to a universalistic understanding of the nature of divine kingship and hence to the possibility of a pre-70 origin for the tradition of this interpretation of Jer 51:57b. The presence of the explanatory addition כְּנֵשָׁה “congregation” in v. 35 which itself can be dated to the Amoraic period, should not be taken into account for dating v. 57. It is too far removed from v. 57 for a commentator to be anywhere near certain that it belonged to the same stream of Targum tradition.

---

There are no indicators for the location of the Divine Royal Presence. As universal king, God will merely punish Babylon (Rome?) for the destruction of the temple (v. 51).

_Tg. Neb. Zech 14:9,16,17_

_NRSV of Zech 14:9,16,17_

9 And the LORD will become king over all the earth; on that day the LORD will be one and his name one.

16 Then all who survive of the nations that have come against Jerusalem shall go up year after year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the festival of booths.

17 If any of the families of the earth do not go up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, there will be no rain upon them.

_Translation of Tg. Neb. Zech 14:9,16,17_

9 And the kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed upon all the inhabitants of the earth; at that time they shall serve before the Lord with one accord, for his name is established in the world; there is none apart from him.

16 And it shall come to pass, everyone who is left of all the nations which assemble and come against Jerusalem shall go up year by year to worship before the King of the ages, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the festival of Tabernacles.

17 And it shall come to pass, if any of the families of the nations of the earth will not go up to Jerusalem to worship before the King of the ages, the Lord of hosts, there shall not be rain upon them.

 Probably the whole of chapter 14 can be attributed in origin to the pre-70 period. Not only is there not much emendation of the Hebrew, but the universal aspect of vv. 9, 16, 17 and the retention of the “Lord of hosts” both point to such a dating. The universal kingship of God is in the here-and-now, though it will be acknowledged and God worshipped as king only in the eschatological future.

---

402 This targum is also discussed in Section 3.3.1.3.
403 See also discussion of _Tg. Neb. Zech 14:9_ in Section 3.3.1.3. Chilton dated this targum to the pre-70 period.
The Targum chapter looks forward to the "day" (14:1) when God shall reveal himself (14:3,4,5) to lead the nations against Jerusalem in battle and to battle against the nations themselves. After the battle, God will reveal himself again as king, and as having been king in and of the earth (v. 9). Only then will those who acknowledge his kingship go to Jerusalem to worship "before the king", a phrase which emphasises YHWH’s presence as much as his kingship.404

[to reveal, uncover] is used four times with God as the subject of the reflexive in chapter 14. In v. 3 the verb translates “will go forth”, in v. 4 “his feet shall stand”, in v. 5 “will come” and in v. 9 “will become king”. It is thus abundantly clear that is not simply a slavish translation of the Hebrew “to come” without a differentiation in meaning.405

The intentional use of this verb has the effect of eliminating the movement of God so evident in the Hebrew version406 and thus of emphasising that God as king has always been with all the inhabitants of the earth. The Targumist has deliberately rewritten this section of Zechariah to make it conform to a prevailing synagogue/Pharisaic doctrine of Divine Royal Presence - a doctrine which should become increasingly clear as the data is scrutinised. More on the implications of the use of this verb as a substitute in the Targumim for the Hebrew “to come” will be found in Section 3.7.

_Tg. Neb. Mal 1:14_

NRSV of Mal 1:14b
for I am a great King, says the LORD of hosts, and my name is reverenced among the nations.

_Tg. Neb. Mal 1:14b_407
אֲרוֹר מֶלֶךְ רֵא צֵאֵם אִמְרוּ יְדוּ אֶל יָסְרָא אִם הָעֵלֶם בֵּיתֵם אֵלֶם:

Translation of _Tg. Neb. Mal 1:14b_408
for I am a great King, says the Lord of hosts, and my name is mighty among the nations.

---

404 Cf. Dalman, (1902ET), Words of Jesus, 214; Klein, (1979), “The Preposition דֵּין”, 502-507. Here seems to be a simple Aramaic equivalent to יָסָר, emphasising the kingship of YHWH, where one speaks in the presence of the king never “to” him. Where it is a substitute for the Hebrew יִשָּׂר (direct object marker) it apparently is an expression “of deference to a respectable person or institution” - a sentiment valid here.

405 Cf. McNamara, (1966²), The NT and the Palestinian Targum, 250 n. 34.

406 See Section 2.2.1.3.


408 Cathcart and Gordon, (1989ET), The Targum of the Minor Prophets, 231.
The Targum to Malachi, like all Targumim, is likely to have had a mixture of traditions from various periods. Some, based on methods developed here, may be dated to the pre-70 period, including Tg. Neb. Mal 1:14b (because of: the universality of the divine kingship (cf. 1:11) and the retention of the name “Lord of hosts”). Others can be clearly placed in the post-70 period. For example in 1:9,11 “prayer” is substituted for temple “sacrifice”. Therefore, it looks as though 1:14 has been closely surrounded by later tradition, so can tell us little about how its tradition regarded the presence of the Divine King. Unlike the Hebrew version, chapter 3 of the Targum is too removed in context to tell us anything with confidence regarding the presence of the Divine King.

2.3.2 Jesus

There can be little doubt that Jesus subscribed to the tradition that located God very firmly in heaven. For example, he is recorded as having used “heaven” as a circumlocution for God, it was the throne of God (Matt 5:34) and particularly it was the place of the Father. The Synoptic writers, too, shared this view. When Jesus prayed over the loaves and fishes, he looked up to heaven to address the Father.

However, there is little evidence - as will be shown - that Jesus ever used Κλῆ or its cognates to describe God (βασιλεὺς in the Gospels). It is a curious fact that in the Gospels, only Matthew claimed that Jesus explicitly called God a king (the “great king”), and that only once in Matt 5:35. The royal metaphor for God is indirectly used for a character in three Synoptic parables - one in Matthew and two in Luke. One of those occurrences in the parables (Matt 18:23), occurs only in Matthew and will be dealt with shortly. The

---

409 Also, for example, the sign of the (continuing) debate over resurrection which in fact ceased after A.D. 70 in Tg. Neb. Mal 3:6. Cf. Tgs. Neof. Gen 4:8; Ps.-J. Gen 4:8; m. Sanh. 10:1. See: Gordon, (1978), “Targumists as Eschatologists”, 129-30; Cathcart and Gordon, (1989ET), The Targum of the Minor Prophets, 236 n. 13. Both these scholars noted that the targum upholds the Pharisaic (positive) position. Tg. Neb. Mal 2:7, has been emended to emphasise that a priest is one who “serves before the Lord of hosts” - a cultic term denoting service before the presence of God in the temple.

410 Indeed, the few examples there are which depict Jesus expressing a belief in the Divine Presence in the temple all suffer from extensive reworking: Matt 21:13 // Mark 11:17 // Luke 19:45 // John 2:16, 23:21; Luke 2:49 (if ὅλωθ is assumed). For a consideration of “heaven” as a location and the dwelling place of God, see Section 2.2.3 under Dan 4:34.


remaining occurrences (Luke 14:16,21 // Matt 22:2,7,11,13 and Luke 19:14,27) will be considered in Section 2.5.2. As will be shown, none can be traced back with confidence to Stage I.

There appear to be two obvious reasons for this lack of reliable evidence for Jesus’ use of “king” for God.

The first is that there was a concerted and conscious effort by the writers of the Gospels to claim for Jesus all the rights and prerogatives of God as king. When the virtual silence of God as king is contrasted with the frequent description of Jesus as king there can be no other explanation. When this took place in the tradition and for what reason is of no concern here.

The second is that Jesus much preferred the phrase “kingdom of God”, whatever his justification might have been. It could be that “kingdom of God” was a better expression for Jesus of what he wanted to say about God as king. This will be more fully explored in the next chapter.

Matt 5:35

This is the only place where Jesus is purported to describe God explicitly as king, in fact the μεγάλος βασιλέως “great King”. It is part of the Sermon on the Mount and part of the so-called fourth antitheses, Matt 5:33-37. There are three problems with this description that are relevant here.

First, it is likely that Matt 5:35b is not from Stage I of the tradition, and, therefore, tells us little either of Jesus or of later Lukan influence. The parallel with James 5:12 gives no clue to the origin of Matt 5:35b, since it is impossible to determine which is closer to the original. Nor does the often-cited LXX Ps 48:2b, since Matthew’s arrangement is

---

414 Most scholars assume this, for example: W. D. Davies and Allison, (1988), Matthew I, 533; Theissen and Merz, (1998ET), The Historical Jesus, 274, Duling, (1991), “[Do not swear . . .] by Jerusalem”, 292, stated that there is a large consensus among scholars that Matt 5:34b-36 comes from the “pre-Matthean church” and not from either Jesus or the redactor.

different from that of the LXX. That is, it is not dependent on the LXX but possibly on oral tradition. Far more promising is Matt 23:16-22. Unlike Matt 5:33-37, it does not reject swearing per se but rejects swearing by the various items because, despite the supposed arguments of the Pharisees, it is effectively swearing by God. Its context thus reflects the “polemic of the early church” against scribal casuistry. So Matt 5:35b is likely to come from the same source. This is confirmed somewhat by the use of ἡκοσσατε in the introduction to five of the six antitheses in Matt 5:21-48 and the fact the first two amplifications have ἐν but this one has δὲ, destroying the symmetry and pointing to an independent origin.

The second problem is that it is by no means certain that “Great King” here refers to God. The title certainly was applied to God, but it was also given to human kings, including kings around the time of Jesus and the time of the formation and redaction of Matthew’s Gospel. Further, to make an oath by the name of a human king was not unknown. Certainly, the clause it belongs to is the third in a series of four, the first two of which refer directly to God. However, if this clause refers to a human king, it just as easily goes with the fourth clause since the first two clauses would then refer to God and the second two to a human agent.
The third problem with claiming a Stage I origin for Matt 5:35 is that even if it could be attributed to Stage I (and therefore presumably to Jesus) it tells us little regarding the notion of Divine Royal Presence. The genitive is of possession not presence. Matt 23:21, which points in the direction of presence, suffers from the same formation issues as does Matt 5:35b.

Matt 18:23

\[
\text{NA}^{27} \text{Matt 18:23} \\
\text{\textup{Διὰ τοῦτο ὁμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀμβρώπω βασιλεία, ἐξ ἡμέλησεν συνάραι λόγου μετὰ τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ.}} \\
\text{NRSV of Matt 18:23} \\
\text{For this reason the kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who wished to settle accounts with his slaves.}
\]

Similarly, Matt 18:23 is not likely to come from Stage I of the tradition and so is not useful in determining Jesus’ attitude to God as king. Apart from the opening Διὰ τοῦτο, the verse matches almost word-for-word Matt 22:2 which, as will be shown, is a Matthaean construction.\(^{423}\) Also, aside from this introduction, the rest of the parable never calls this central character a βασιλεύς. It consistently calls him κύριος (vv. 25, 27, 31, 32, 34) - another sign of later insertion.\(^{424}\)

\(^{423}\) See: Section 2.5.2; Jeremias, (1972), Parables of Jesus, 28; Gundry, (1994), Matthew, 371; Keener, (1999), Matthew, 457. In an effort to validate the “authenticity” of the parable and its introduction, Keener drew attention to rabbinic parables that feature kings. However, only two, T. Abr. A 2 (second century A.D.) and Apoc. Ezek 1 (first century A.D.), can lay claim to an origin prior to the redaction of the Mishnah. The fact that the large number of parables featuring kings is a later phenomenon supports the redactional nature of Matt 18:23.

\(^{424}\) See: W. D. Davies and Allison, (1988), Matthew II, 797; Jeremias, (1972), Parables of Jesus, 28 n. 17, 210. Jeremias thought that the magnitude of the debt could only imply that the one to whom the debt was owed was a king. But the size is hyperbole, emphasising the extent of the Father’s generosity in forgiveness.
2.4 THE PRE-LUKAN COMMUNITY

Continuing the analysis of instances of God as king and discerning notions of Divine Royal Presence attached to them, it is very noticeable that the pre-Lukan community has not preserved any sayings or narratives that contain references to God as king in any form.\footnote{Though it is dangerous to suggest a reason for this, since it would be arguing from silence, it is nevertheless tempting to think that the Holy Spirit in some sense usurped the role of God as king.}

Noting the presence of Pharisees in the pre-Lukan community, it is not impossible to picture that they influenced the emerging concept of the Holy Spirit in this direction. After all, it certainly would have fitted their concept of the “here-and-now” but hidden Divine King which has already been detected (See Section 2.3.1). In Acts 2:37-40 the Holy Spirit is closely associated with judgement (which repentance and forgiveness can avoid) and salvation - two prime functions of the Divine King. In Acts 5:32 the Holy Spirit is given “to those who obey” God. In Acts 20:28 the Holy Spirit can impart authority to rule. This model complements Paul’s own soteriological understanding of the Holy Spirit (E.g. 1 Cor 6:11, Gal 4:4-6, 5:22-24) which itself suggests a connection with the Divine King. In other words, at times the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts is a way of “ascribing divine presence and activity among the people of Israel or among early Christians”, at other times πνεῦμα is personified (Fitzmyer, (1999), “Spirit in Luke-Acts”, 171, 177-78).

These cursory observations present a \textit{prima facie} case for the possibility that a pre-Lukan belief somehow connected the Holy Spirit with God as king. To explore this possibility, each instance of “Holy Spirit” would have to be analysed in a similar way that examples of God as king are being done here - a task beyond the scope of this present dissertation. It may profitably be the subject of further study (See Section 5.3.2).

In the next chapter in Section 3.4, an argument will be presented that sees the pre-Lukan community as having reinterpreted Jesus’ teaching on a future kingdom of God as having been fulfilled in and by the Holy Spirit.
2.5 THE YAVNEAN RABBIS, THE SYNAGOGUE AND LUKE

The destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 precipitated a re-examination of the Divine Royal Presence both in Christian communities and in the newly emerging Palestinian rabbinic schools. If, as is generally assumed, Luke wrote his two-volume work after A.D. 70 and towards the end of the first century, then Luke, the Yavnean rabbis and the Palestinian synagogues, were operating at the same time. What were their respective ideas regarding God as king and the location of the Divine Royal Presence?

2.5.1 The Yavnean Rabbis and the Early Post-70 Synagogue

Two possible sources for the opinions of the Yavnean rabbis were canvassed: the Mishnah and the Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. The early post-70 Palestinian synagogue is represented by targumim that can be dated to the period. The Tosefta and the baraitoth are excluded from consideration, on grounds established in Section 1.2.3. Several passages in Josephus will be canvassed, even though their author was neither a post-70 Palestinian rabbi nor attached to a Palestinian synagogue.

2.5.1.1 The Mishnah

The foundational rabbinic text, the Mishnah, was redacted ca. A.D. 200 in Palestine from earlier material, and thus represents the best document from which to extract traditions that can be traced to the Yavnean rabbis. God as king is mentioned four times in the Mishnah, but none can be traced definitely to the Yavnean rabbis. Nevertheless, they provide a glimpse at what later rabbis thought the situation was before they made their contributions. Before looking at the specific instances of God as king, some general comments on the outlook of the Mishnah are appropriate.

Jacob Neusner made much of the observation that for the Mishnah, the presence of God was largely assumed and implicit but thereafter played a limited, passive role, intervening only through the Torah. He argued that although God was located in one place rather than another, namely in the holy of holies, the overwhelming emphasis was on obedience (i.e. practice of torah) and God’s response to human intention.

---

429 See Section 1.2.3.
430 See Section 1.2.3.
There is no question that the belief that God was to be located in the holy of holies describes the general belief of the post-70 rabbis regarding the situation prior to A.D. 70.

Firstly, *m. Suk.* 5:4M-O, though it comes from after the destruction of the temple, describes a procession eastwards towards the east gate of the temple which could only have taken place before the destruction. Having reached the gate, the worshippers turned to direct their eyes "toward the Lord", i.e. westwards, in the direction of the holy of holies.432

Secondly, the use of הָרְדוּ for God in the Mishnah is probably a veiled reminiscence of the Temple Mount as “the place” of God’s presence, as הָרְדוּ was chiefly used prior to 70, though none of the Mishnah examples is explicit in this association with the temple.433 After A.D. 70, since the temple was no longer standing, the term was used by the rabbis as a circumlocution for God Himself,434 though there is some evidence that מָקוֹם and תּוֹטִּיס were used in this sense prior to A.D. 70.435

Before A.D. 70, too, the Divine Presence was considered to extend beyond the confines of the holy of holies to embrace the whole land of Israel (*m. Kel.* 1:6-9). Such a limit of Divine Presence, as will be noted, is not unlike the “Zion” traditions in the Targumim which have been traced to the post-70 Tannaitic period.436

After A.D. 70, however, the perceived location of the Divine Presence is far from obvious. Towards the end of the Mishnaic period, the fourth generation R. Halafta (A.D. 140-165)

---

433 In two places, *m. Eduy.* 5:6C and *Abot* 2:13C, it occurs in the phrase מָקוֹם הָרְדוּ, but the context need not be of the temple.
436 Section 2.5.1.3.
thought that “mere” study of the Torah would be enough to secure the Divine Presence (m. Abot 3:2E,6A)\(^{437}\) - which surely implies that at other times the Divine Presence was not present.

Far more certain is the epithet “Father in heaven” which occurs six times in the Mishnah, twice in attributions to Yavnean rabbis,\(^{438}\) but mostly from fifth generation rabbis.\(^{439}\) It is possible, even likely, that the Yavnean rabbis considered the Divine Royal Presence to be located, therefore, in heaven, after the destruction of the temple. However, such a radical relocation of the Divine Royal Presence from the temple to heaven is neither confirmed nor undermined by a consideration of the three places in the Mishnah that describe God as king.

\textit{m. Sanh. 4:5N}

\begin{quote}
And to portray the grandeur of the Holy One, blessed be He. For a person mints many coins with a single seal, and they are all alike one another. But the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be He, minted all human beings with that seal of his with which he made the first person, yet not one of them is like anyone else. Therefore everyone is obligated to maintain, “On my account the world was created.”
\end{quote}

\textit{m. Sanh. 4:5} is a mishnah on the method and reason for cautioning witnesses in cases where the punishment is death. The reason such witnesses must be extra vigilant in telling the truth is that the accused was created (a Divine Royal activity) by God and is unique, possessing his or her own God-given worth.\(^{442}\)

The usefulness of this mishnah for the present purpose is, however, questionable. The repeated phrase וַיהָ רָבָּרָו “the Holy One, blessed be He” is Amoraic. Though it

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Aqiba, \textit{m. Yoma} 8:9G. Eliezar the Great (b. Hircanus), \textit{Sot}, 9:15V.}
\footnote{Blackman, (1963-64), \textit{Mishnayoth IV}, 255.}
\footnote{Neusner, (1988\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Mishnah}, 591.}
\footnote{Urbach, (1979\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Sages I}, 217.}
\end{footnotes}
may be a later insertion, since it frequently replaced the Tannaitic מֶלֶךְ רָאוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ, it may also not be, thus dating the whole mishnah to the Amoraic period.

On the other hand, the three-fold title מֶלֶךְ לֶוֶת לֶוֶת מֶלֶךְ “King of kings of kings”, is identical to that found in the Aleinu and Sir 51:12.n and close to the other mishnahs considered below. The origin of the Aleinu prayer may be traced back to at least the first century (though individual traditions within it are more problematic) and Sir 51:12.n can be dated with much greater certainty to the second century B.C. The phrase certainly expresses a universal sovereignty for God, which elsewhere is distinctive of the pre-70 period in Judaism.

Whatever the solution, apart from the obvious connection between God as the supreme king and God as the Creator, there are no indications of Divine Royal Presence.

*m. Abot* 3:1E

445

Translation of *m. Abot* 3:1E 446

“And before whom are you going to give a full account of yourself? Before the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be he.”

*m. Abot* 3:1 is a mishnah attributed to Aqabiah b. Mehallalel, a first century B.C. sage. The three-fold title, with its universalistic implications for divine sovereignty, points to a pre-70 date for the tradition. The presence of the cultic בְּהֵמָּה “before”, suggests that after death a person will “stand” before God and justify his actions during his lifetime. The images of God as king and judge are clear, as well as the personal responsibility of man, but no definite location of the Divine Royal Presence can be made here either.

443 Urbach, (19792ET), *The Sages I*, 67-68.
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\text{Translation of } m. \text{Abot} \ 4:22\]

“For despite your wishes were you formed, despite your wishes were you born, despite your wishes do you live, despite your wishes do you die, and despite your wishes are you going to give a full accounting before the King of kings of kings, the Holy One, blessed be he.”

Attributed to Eliezer Haqqappar, a fifth generation (A.D. ca. 165-200) Tannim. 449 The sentiment espoused, namely that we are born to die, can be found in Josephus (J.W. 7:381) and the context, i.e. that of giving a final account of one’s life, is similar to that of \(m. \text{Abot} \ 3:1\) above, attributed to a first century B.C. sage. This, then, may be a good example of a late attributed mishnah, the substance of which can be traced back to much earlier times. However, for the present task, little more can be said.

\[m. \text{Tam} \ 7:4\]
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\text{Translation of } m. \text{Tam} \ 7:4\]

“On the sixth day they did sing, The Lord is king and has put on glorious apparel.”

\(m. \text{Tam} \ 7:4\) is an unattributed mishnah listing particular psalms to be sung by the Levites in the temple, one each day of the week, as part of the morning and evening sacrifices. Thus on Fridays the Levites were to sing (according to the rabbis) Ps 93, of which the above is the first five words. The mishnah thus harkens back to an earlier time and purports to give the situation prior to A.D. 70 - as the rabbis envisaged it.

\[\text{447 Blackman, (1963-64), Mishnayoth IV, 524-25.}\]
\[\text{448 Neusner, (1988ET), Mishnah, 685.}\]
\[\text{449 Danby, (1933ET), Mishnah, 800.}\]
\[\text{450 Blackman, (1963-64), Mishnayoth V, 497.}\]
\[\text{451 Neusner, (1988ET), Mishnah, 873.}\]
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This does not mean of course that the comments made under Ps 93 can be applied to the post-70 rabbinic milieu. For the rabbis, there was no temple, no holy of holies. God as Creator King and Judge was "majestic on high" (Ps 93:4).

2.5.1.2 Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum

Scholarship is divided on whether Pseudo-Philo’s Latin Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum is to be dated prior to or after A.D. 70. The earlier date is proposed because of 22:8 and 32:3 which assume that the temple is still standing. The later date is sometimes preferred because of 19:7 which may tell of its destruction. However, the references that assume the temple is standing may be later insertions and 19:7 may refer rather to the earlier destruction by Nebuchadnezzar.

Its likely provenance is Palestine, and though no suggestion is being made here that it is necessarily connected with the Pharisees, Daniel J. Harrington acknowledged its shared milieu with “the Palestinian synagogues at the turn of the common era” and the new Schürer “places Pseudo-Philo within mainstream Jewish thought, with non-sectarian Pharisaic thought”. Given also its many similarities with both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, which themselves have much in common with the Yavnean rabbis, it deserves some attention here, even if its status as representative of early rabbinic or synagogue thought is uncertain.

---

452 On Ps 93, see Section 2.2.1 above.
452a The interest of the rabbis in the temple, its significance and particularly its rituals, was nevertheless more than simply antiquarian. They were concerned to preserve and provide a basis for its meaning and a faithful and practical halakah surrounding its worship, in case it was ever rebuilt. Nevertheless, for the moment, God’s earthly abode did not exist. Hence the uncertainty over the perceived location of the Divine Royal Presence as noted above.
456 Schürer, (1973²), Age III.1, 328.
457 James, (1917), Biblical Antiquities, 47-58. James thus thought that the three works emanated from the same “circle”. On 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, see Section 3.5.1.2.
458 McNamara, (1983), Intertestamental Literature, 280-83. McNamara noted on p. 281 that some scholars (unnamed) explain Pseudo-Philo’s lack of interest in the temple as indicative of the book’s origin in a synagogue context. On p. 282 he agreed with this. For the connection of the Pharisees with the synagogue, see Section 1.5.6.
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*L.A.B. 22:5*

*L.A.B. 22:5*\(^{459}\)
Et dixit Ihesus: Nonne fortior est rex Dominus super milia sacrificia?

Translation of *L.A.B. 22:5*\(^{460}\)
And Joshua said, “Is not the LORD the King more powerful than a thousand sacrifices?”

The author of the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* did not give a systematic presentation of God Himself, preferring rather to concentrate on divine activity in history\(^{461}\) and the necessity of following his will as expressed definitively in the Torah. Nonetheless, in Joshua’s speech (22:5-6), God as king is also “a witness and judge”\(^{462}\).

At the end of time God will “visit” to the world (visito 19:12, 26:13).\(^{463}\) He is frequently described as *Fortissimus* “the Most Powerful” (or “the Most High”).\(^{464}\) In two such instances (32:4,13) it is possible to infer that God is in heaven, though it is far from explicit. Nonetheless, the author probably saw the Divine Royal Presence as dwelling in heaven, from which he will one day “visit” the world.

### 2.5.1.3 The Targumim

Refer to Section 2.3.1.3 for preliminary remarks about the Targumim.

The following chart represents those Targum passages that translate Hebrew passages containing +klm (except for *תָּבֶל* km) in reference to God and for which a date post-70 has been tentatively ascertained. These may reasonably be quarried for additional information as to how the Palestinian synagogues might have regarded “God as king”, especially the Divine Royal Presence. Those dated to the Amoraic period and those for which a date could not be decided are discussed in the footnotes.

---


\(^{463}\) The Latin *visito* means “to see”, “to visit”, and in a few places in the Vulgate “to punish”, e.g. Lev 18:25, Ps 88:33, Jer 14:10.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-70 Tannaitic (&quot;Zion&quot;)</th>
<th>Tgs. Torah</th>
<th>Tg. Neb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 6:5,</td>
<td>Isa 43:15, Is(a) 466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 33:17(b), 22,</td>
<td>44:6, 52:7b(a), 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 41:21</td>
<td>Jer 8:19b(a), Mic 2:13b, 4:7b(a), Zeph 3:15(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amoraic or later (&quot;congregation&quot;)</th>
<th>Deut 33:5(465)</th>
<th>Isa 43:15, 44:6, 52:7b(467)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Num 23:21(466)</td>
<td>Jer 8:19b(468), Mic 2:13b, 4:7b(469), Zeph 3:15(470)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Each of the targumim contain the word ש一定能 “congregation”. All, except Tg. Ps.-J. Deut 33:5, interpret Deut 33:5 as a reference to the Davidic king (which may or may not also be the Messiah), and so are of little use in ascertaining notions of Divine Royal Presence, cf. Drazin, (1982), *Deuteronomy*, 295 n. 20. In Tg. Ps.-J. Deut 33:5, it is the law that is king. McNamara, (1997\(ET\)), *Targum Neofiti 1, Deuteronomy*, 164 n. 17, thought it referred to the expected Messiah, at least in Tg. Neof. Deut 33:5. If so, it is another example of the Amoraic pre-existent “hidden” Messiah.


The Targumic verses surrounding v. 21b, vv. 20-21a and 23, are so similar that a common tradition may be supposed. However, although each of the targumim of v. 21b has deliberately removed anthropomorphisms (B. B. Levy, (1987), *A Textual Study II*, 135, on Tg. Neof. Num 23:21), they vary considerably, suggesting at least three traditions: the tradition represented by Tg. Onq. and its “Shekhinah”; that of Tg. Ps-J. with its explicit replacement of the Divine King with the “King Messiah”; and those of Tg. Neof, Tg. Frg. P and Tg. Frg. V, for whom the acclaim is “of the splendour of the glory of their king” and which may or may not be messianic.

Tg. Ps.-J. Num 23:21b may be dismissed as Amoraic because of its explicit mention of the Messiah in place of the Divine King. Although סaviest “congregation” is not used here, it is difficult not to think that what is in mind here is a clearly defined worshipping community. Hence all these targumim to Num 23:21 may be dated to the Amoraic period.


Tg. Neb. Isa 43:15 may be dated to the Amoraic period, along with the whole of chapter 43, despite the lack of “congregation”. “Zion” does not appear in the chapter even though opportunity for it abounded in the later verses. It is to be noted that YHWH is the creator of Israel, not of everything. In 43:10 the Messiah already exists and is not a purely eschatological figure - a development of the Amoraic period (but see, e.g. 1 Enoch 48:6. Perhaps the tradition influenced the Targumim only from the Amoraic period). See: Chilton, (1987\(ET\)), *The Isaiah Targum*, 85 n. 43:1-43:28; Chilton, (1982), *The Glory of Israel*, 90-91, G. F. Moore, (1927), *Judaism II*, 349.
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Again, Tg. Neb. Isa 44:6 is embedded in material that clearly directed the kingship of God towards Israel exclusively, though in v. 24 God is the creator of the heavens and the earth. There is no mention of “Zion” and the introduced “the woman” of v. 13 was applied to Eve by the Amoraim. See Chilton, (1987ET), The Isaiah Targum, xxiv, 89 n. 44:9-44:20.

Tg. Neb. Isa 52:7b has already been assigned to the Amoraic period, because of the presence of נטושה “congregation”, see Section 3.2.1.3.


This particular Targumic tradition maintained the sense of the Hebrew, namely that the Shekhinah was present in “Zion” at least up until the exile. It is impossible to say how the tradition was interpreted in the post-70 period. The insertion of נטושה “congregation” in vv. 19a, 20 indicates that the immediate context is Amoraic. The graphic picture of the midrash in v. 21 brings to mind the utter devastation of A.D. 70.


Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7b-8 is likely to be Amoraic because: of the presence of נטושה “congregation” twice in v. 8; the inclusion of Messiah in v. 8 to whom the Divine Kingdom is about to come (not seen elsewhere); and because v. 8 is the only place in the targumim where the kingdom is said נטושה “to come”. For further comment on Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7b, see: Smolar, Aberach and Churgin, (1983), Studies in Targum Jonathan, 132; Chilton, (1978), “Regnum Dei Deus Est”, 269; Chilton, (1979), God in Strength, 290; Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 80, 114. The only challenge to the lateness of the tradition in Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7-8 known to the present writer is that of: White, (1984), “Review of The Glory of Israel by Bruce D. Chilton”, 107. He saw a similarity between 1QFlor and Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7-8 that ruled out for him Chilton’s fourth century date for Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7-8. However, there is no Florilegium from Cave 1 and 4QFlor Frag. I col. I, 21.2 line 19, although it refers to a future Davidic king, does not describe him explicitly as a messiah, nor does it link this Davidic king with a Divine Kingdom. See Martínez and Tigchelaar, (2000), Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition I, 352-55, where “Messiah” has been supposed in the translation.


The presence of נטושה “congregation” twice in v. 14 points to an Amoraic dating. To be noted is the absence of the Shekhinah in the time of the formation of the targum (also vv. 5, 17). When the Shekhinah does dwell once again in the temple (v. 7), then the Lord will “appear” (חַגִּירָתָךְ, v. 8). See Cathcart and Gordon, (1989ET), The Targum of the Minor Prophets, 171 n. 12, 173 n. 36. Cf. Tg. Neb. Zech 2:14, where all these elements are also present.
Tgs. Torah | Tg. Neb.
---|---
Targumim for which a date could not be ascertained | 1 Sam 8:7
| 1 Sam 12:12
| Ezek 20:33

Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5

NRSV of Isa 6:5b
yet my eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts!"

Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5b

آنא זיהבי אשיר יקר ספרנות מפלך עלם🎤 ישיבת הatronה עלון

Translation of Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5b

for my eyes have seen the glory of the Shekhinah of the eternal king, the LORD of hosts!

Tg. Neb. Isa 6:5b may be tentatively dated to the Tannaitic period, though it is embedded in Amoraic text, with Tannaitic traditions preserved. The construct כִּי לֹא מְלַאכָּךְ "LORD of Hosts", retained by the targum tradition, strongly points to a universal understanding of the nature of God’s kingship. Normally, the retention of “LORD of hosts” in kingship targumim is one indication of pre-70 tradition material. In this case, it is likely to indicate, at the very least, preservation of Tannaitic tradition.

---


477 The exception would be Tg. Neb. Isa 44:6, dated to the Amoraic period.
The use of the important term שְׁכֶחֶנָּה “Shekhinah” twice in Tg. Neb. Isa 6:1-6 is another indication of a post-70 dating, since there is no unequivocal evidence that this term was used prior to A.D. 70.\(^{478}\) It is derived from the root שָׁכַן “to dwell” and in essence, is used to express the nearness of God to humankind. It refers to God himself in an immediate sense as present in this world, “des Daseins Gottes in der Welt”.\(^{479}\) In short, it is a circumlocution for God, much the same as “heaven” can be, though Shekhinah emphasises the Divine Presence whereas heaven highlights his location.\(^{480}\)

---

\(^{478}\) It is commonly held that the word was not used until well into the second century as a device to reinforce the notion of Divine Presence with Israel after the destruction of the temple. See: Goldberg, (1969), Schekhinah, 443; Urbach, (1979\(^{2}\)ET), The Sages I, 44; C. R. Koester, (1989), The Dwelling of God, 72; Wolters, (1997), "The Shekinah in the Copper Scroll", 389.

\(^{479}\) In short, it is a circumlocution for God, much the same as “heaven” can be, though Shekhinah emphasises the Divine Presence whereas heaven highlights his location.\(^{480}\)

\(^{480}\) Only in later rabbinic literature did Shekhinah occasionally become a separate entity, though all the time dualism was avoided. See: Abelson, (1912), The Immanence of God, 80; Unterman, (1972), “Shekhinah”, EncJud XIV, 1352; Sigal, (1980), Foundations of Judaism I.II, 117. Cf. Congar,
The “heavens of the height” is the place where: the glory of God is (v. 1); where his sanctuary is (v. 3); and where his Shekhinah is to be found (v. 6). In Tg. Neb. Isa 5:5, 33:5, the Shekhinah has been taken back to heaven and is thus no longer on the Temple Mount. It is to be recalled that Isaiah himself located the Divine King in the temple. Isaiah is now prevented not only from seeing God, but from seeing even the Shekhinah, because it is no longer in the temple. He merely sees the Shekhinah “glory” (of the Shekhinah). In v. 2, two “holy attendants” cover the body of God so that “he might not be seen”.

Tg. Neb. Isa 33:17,22

NRSV of Isa 33:17,22
17 Your eyes will see the king in his beauty; they will behold a land that stretches far away.
22 For the LORD is our judge, the LORD is our ruler, the LORD is our king; he will save us.

Tg. Neb. Isa 33:17,22

Translation of Tg. Neb. Isa 33:17,22
17 יְהִי יִרְאְךָ שֶׁקֶחְנוֹת מֶלֶךְ עֶפֶרֶם בַּשְׁבַעַת
יְהוָה עִנָּרְךָ וּסְתַחֵל רַחֵיָּתָו בִּרְחָבָה לְאָרוּן לְנוֹרָהָה.
22 אֶרֶץ יְהוָה וַיִּרְאֶךָ רוּחָנָתָו בְּכֶרֶם וַיֹּקְדַשֶּׁךָ מִסְפָּר הַכֶּרֶם
וְיֵרָבְגֵּה לְוַיִּרְאֶךָ מִלְמָנָה לְאָרוּן לְנוֹרָהָה מִסְפָּר נַעֲרֵי נוֹשָׁר.

17 Your eyes will see the glory of the Shekhinah of the eternal king in his celebrity; you will consider and behold those who go down to the land of Gehenna.
22 For the LORD is our judge, who brought us by his might out of Egypt, the LORD is our teacher, who gave us the teaching of his law from Sinai, the LORD is our king; he will save us and take just retribution for us from the armies of Gog.

The tradition behind this targum may be dated to the early post-70 period. Apart from the “our king” of 33:22, God is thought to punish (not merely judge as their king) all the

(1962 ET), The Mystery of the Temple, 94; Kadushin, (1972), The Rabbinic Mind, 223; Urbach, (1979 ET), The Sages I, 63; Lodahl, (1992), Shekhinah / Spirit, 52, all of whom denied that the Shekhinah ever had separate existence in rabbinic literature.


See Section 2.2.1.1.

Sperber, (1959), The Bible in Aramaic III, 67.

Gentiles with destruction, vv. 11-12, 23. The word הַצִּילֵי “Zion” is in vv. 5, 14, 20, suggesting the possibility of a post-70 Tannaitic origin.  

As for the presence of the Divine King, his Shekhinah will be one day again in Zion (cf. vv. 5, 14, 24). It is from there that God יִהְיֶה will be revealed (v. 10, cf. v. 21) and “seen”, vv. 17, 20. Indeed, it is this revelation that will herald the punishment of Gentiles and security for the “house of Israel” (v. 24).

*Tg. Neb. Isa 41:21*

NRSV of Isa 41:21  
Set forth your case, says the LORD; bring forth your proofs, says the King of Jacob.

*Tg. Neb. Isa 41:21*  
קרבהشرحך אמה ויהיו אעילך והיהךך אמה מלאך רחפכ.

Translation of *Tg. Neb. Isa 41:21*  
Set forth your cause, says the LORD; bring your *fitting arguments*, says the king of Jacob.

God’s “Memra” is used extensively in 41:1-16 and then not again until 42:1, replaced by frequent use of the first person personal pronoun, suggesting a different tradition formed 41:17-29. Interestingly, neither “Shekhinah, nor “Glory” occur in 41:17-29. Here, it is God who as king of Jacob will bring from among the Gentiles (v. 18) his people. The retention of “Zion” in v. 27 might indicate the post-70 Tannaitic period for this targum. Certainly the basic translation suggests an early date. However, no comment can be made regarding the presence of the Divine King. All is directed towards his redeeming action.

2.5.1.4 A Synagogue Prayer

The הַגֶּזֶר “Aleinu” is a synagogue prayer that, like the הִדָּמָה “Amidah”, may contain traditions that can be traced back to the pre-70 period. However, in the case of the Aleinu, the redaction is so extensive, that it is better to treat the prayer here and take care not to dwell on the details but merely to note the general thrust of any tradition within the prayer.

---

487 On the presence of Shekhinah in a pre A.D. 70 targum, see *Tg. Neb. Isa* 6:5 above, in this Section.
488 On the Aramaic יִהְיֶה in the targumim associated with the Divine King or the kingdom of God, see Section 3.7.
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The “Aleinu”

The “Aleinu”

Translation

We bend the knee and bow and acknowledge before the supreme King of kings, . . .

This prayer is “a confident and triumphant proclamation of God’s universal kingship”, implied at the very least in the three-fold title of God as “King of king of kings”. Because of this affirmation of universal kingship, this phrase is likely to be the legacy of a pre-70 tradition. Considered isolated from the rest of the prayer, the presence of “before”, would appear to indicate that the original composer of this phrase considered himself or herself to be in the Divine Royal Presence anywhere the prayer is recited, including synagogues.

However, the prayer in general has undergone such extensive redaction that the remainder may be assumed to be post-70 and so bears no historical relationship to this phrase. Elsewhere the divine “seat of glory” and “abode of majesty” are in “heaven”. There is no doubt that this post-70 Divine Royal Presence is to be found in heaven.

2.5.1.5 Josephus

Josephus wrote his works roughly at the same time Luke redacted his Gospel. Although he was neither a rabbi, nor, as far as we know, a synagogue official, his references to God as king may shed light on the prevailing Jewish opinion of the time and even on belief prior to the destruction of the temple. In any case, Josephus claimed some sympathy with the “philosophy” of the Pharisees. So it is worthwhile surveying the

---

494 See also Section 3.5.1.4.
496 Cf. King of kings, 1 Enoch 9:4, 84:2; King of king of kings, Aleinu, Sir 51:12.n, m. Sanh. 4:5N, Abot 3:1E, 4:22O.
references to God as king in Josephus in order to gain an understanding of his concept of the relationship between God as king and the Divine Royal Presence.

Ant. 6:38-60-61

LCL Translation of Ant. 6:38,60-61, 14:24
38 Such was [Samuel’s] state when the Deity appeared and consoled him, telling him not to take these demands of the multitude amiss, since it was not him whom they had spurned, but God Himself, not wishing Him to reign alone; . . .
60 [Samuel] said that, albeit God had granted them liberty and enslaved their enemies, they had been unmindful of His benefits and rejected His sovereignty, unaware that it was to their highest interest to have the best of all rulers at their head and that the best of all was God; . . .

Ant. 6:60 (// 1 Sam 8:7) recalls 6:38 (// 1 Sam 10:19) and so may be considered together.498

It is interesting that Josephus should choose ἐμφανίζεται in describing Samuel’s conversation with God.499 In the middle voice and in religious contexts, as it is here, its meaning is “to appear” or “to manifest oneself”.500 In 1 Sam 8:7 (both the BHS and LXX) there is no such theophany, nor does God speak unsolicited but only after prayer.

The theophany takes place, according to Josephus, at Ramah and in this he agrees with 1 Sam. However, unlike 1 Sam, Josephus is silent on the existence or otherwise of an altar or cultic site there, though he is not so silent about other similar sites such as Gilgal (Ant. 6:57). Thus, at least in the context of Samuel and the choosing of a king, Josephus gives no indication of a permanent or semi-permanent presence of the Divine King.

498 For a discussion of 1 Sam 8:7, see Section 2.4.1.1.
499 ἐμφανίζεται also occurs in LXX Wis 1:2, though it is not inapplicable to Samuel.
These are the opening words of a prayer uttered by a man named Onias immediately prior to his execution by a mob of disaffected Jews. Unfortunately, neither the context nor the actual words of the prayer give any suggestion as to the concept of the Divine Presence attached to this prayer.

If a slightly wider semantic net is cast, and the contexts in which God is described as a ruler using other nouns or adjectives is considered, the picture is still the same. There is no hint of Divine Presence attached to such descriptions.

That Josephus shied away from notions of God as king seems certain. On each of the three occasions he does use it, it is, even for him, in the distant past - far removed from the time of Roman rule. On the other hand, he definitely shared the notion of the primary sovereignty of God. He described the Jewish nation as fundamentally a "theocracy" and believed no ruler was needed other than God. Rather than being unimportant to him, he probably deliberately avoided the notion of God as king for the sake of his audience.

This is not to conclude, of course, that Josephus had no articulated notion of Divine Presence per se. For Josephus, God’s true home was now in “heaven”. Like the great prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Josephus considered the Divine Presence to have inhabited the temple, only to leave prior to its destruction because of the failure of the people to live by the Torah. It would seem, too, that Josephus probably followed the standard rabbinic line regarding the present location of the Divine Royal Presence.

---

501 He was not one of the Hellenistic priests of that name.
503 A good example would be Ant. 4:223 where Josephus described God as the only ἡγεμόν, but an earthly ruler as a βασιλεύς. This reticence on the part of Josephus was hinted at by Beek, (1959), “Hasidic Conceptions of Kingship”, 350.
504 Ag.Ap. 2:165. See also Section 1.5.5.4.
505 E.g. Ant. 11:64,143,162, J.W. 1:630.
506 See Section 1.5.5.2.
2.5.2 Luke

As noted in Section 2.3.2, the Gospel of Luke contains no explicit mention of God as king. Indeed, of the 31 instances of βασιλεύς in Luke-Acts, all but five refer to ordinary earthly kings. The five refer to Jesus as king (Luke 19:38, 23:2,3,37,38, Acts 17:7).

Since Luke contains no explicit mention of God as king, evidence for the peculiar contribution of the redactor may be sought in his alterations to Q (Mark has no references to God as king). In the first group below, it is Matthew who adds the royal metaphor, in the second, it is Luke, so that Q may well have contained no royal descriptions of God as king. This confirms the picture intimated in Section 2.3.2 that Jesus did not use royal metaphors of God, apart from “kingdom of God”.


NA27 of Luke 14:16,21
16 Ὅ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίει δεῖπνον μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοὺς
21 . . . τότε ὄργισθεὶς ὁ οὐδεσπότης . . .

NRSV of Luke 14:16,21
16 Then Jesus said to him, “Someone gave a great dinner and invited many.
21 . . . Then the owner of the house became angry . . .

NA27 of Matt 22:2,7
2 ὁμοιόθητι ἢ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἄνθρωπῳ βασιλεῖ, ἣτις ἐποίησεν γάμος τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ.
7 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὄργισθε . . .

NRSV of Matt 22:2,7
2 The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who gave a wedding banquet for his son.
7 The king was enraged . . .

The Critical Edition of Q placed the parable of the “Great Dinner” (Matt 22:1-14, Luke 14:15-24) in Q. Verses 15, 22 and 24 were considered not to be from Q and the remaining verses (vv. 16-21, 23) were given a lower than average probability.507 From the
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reconstruction, Luke better preserves the original identity of the main character (ἀνθρώπῳ in v. 16 and κυρίῳ in v. 21).\footnote{508}

Thus it is Matthew (or the tradition from which he worked) who has altered the character to a βασιλεύς and added the extra features of “wedding” banquet for the king’s “son”.\footnote{509} Although “the man” in Luke’s version is “God” himself,\footnote{510} since there are no indications of royal designations in Luke or his tradition, the parable will not yield any results regarding the notion of the presence of the Divine King in the mind of the redactor.\footnote{511}

Luke 19:14,27

\begin{quote}
NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 19:14,27
\begin{align*}
14 & \ldots οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεύσαι ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς. \\
27 & πλὴν τοὺς ἔχθρους μου τούτους τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεύσαι ἐπ’ αὐτούς . . .
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
NRSV of Luke 19:14,27
\begin{align*}
14 & \ldots ‘We do not want this man to rule over us.’ \\
27 & But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be king over them - . . .
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

Luke 19:11-27 (cf. Matt 25:14-30), the parable of the “Ten Pounds”, was thought by The Critical Edition of Q to be from Q, though with considerable redactional activity evident in the version extant in Luke.\footnote{512} In fact, each instance of βασιλ+ in the parable (vv. 11, 12, 14, 15, 27), including the depiction of the main character as a nobleman (v. 12), is there as a result of later redaction. In other words, they are either definitely not from Q or, as in the case of v. 27, of such low probability that it is safer to discount it.\footnote{513}

\footnote{508} An identity which is also preserved in the parallel Gospel of Thomas, saying 64, M. Meyer, (1992), The Gospel of Thomas, 50-51, 94. For a discussion of the parable in relation to Gos. Thom. 64, see: Jeremias, (1972\textsuperscript{3}), Parables of Jesus, 176-80; Fitzmyer, (1983), Luke X-XXIV, 1050-52.

\footnote{509} On the changes in Matthew, see: Bultmann, (1963\textsuperscript{ETRev}), Synoptic Tradition, 175; Jeremias, (1972\textsuperscript{3}), Parables of Jesus, 28, 67; Marshall, (1978), Luke, 587; Gundry, (1994\textsuperscript{2}), Matthew, 433.


\footnote{511} For other discussions of the parable, see Jeremias, (1972\textsuperscript{3}), Parables of Jesus, 63-66.


\footnote{513} See Sections 3.5.2 and 3.7.5. Unfortunately, in N. T. Wright, (1996), Jesus, 632-39, the otherwise insightful discussion of the parable assumed that the character of the “king” originated with Jesus and that therefore Jesus himself was speaking of the return of the Divine King in similar terms to those of Mal 3:1-3.
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Whether or not v. 27 is from Q, it is clear that the chief character, the nobleman, is for Luke Jesus himself. Even though v. 27 is the first time that Jesus is called a king in the Gospel, soon after, in v. 38, he is declared such. After that, he is accused of claiming to be the Messiah-King and made fun of as a result (23:37-38).

It is noteworthy, too, that the parable of the ten pounds follows the story of Zacchaeus. The saying at the end (Luke 19:9-10) firmly identified Jesus with salvation itself - something that is intimately linked in the OT with God as the Shepherd-King who will also “seek the lost” and “save his flock” (Ezek 34:16,22). Jesus is both salvation and the one who saves.\(^{514}\) The very next verse introduces the parable as Jesus’ response to a perceived misunderstanding regarding the timing of the “appearance” of the kingdom of God.\(^{515}\) There is thus a certain irony in their misunderstanding. For Luke the Shepherd King - salvation itself - was standing right in front of them. In short, Luke wanted the parable to link closely together the nobleman (king) and Jesus.\(^{516}\)

For Jesus though, the central character of the king is a metaphor for God,\(^ {517}\) his going away and returning is either reminiscent of the departure of God from the temple at the exile and his return in the future, or suggestive of the departure of God from the temple prior to its destruction in A.D. 70. It is noteworthy that Matthew placed the parable towards the end of a series of sayings and parables prompted by just such a prediction of the destruction of the temple (Matt 24:2). Verse 15, in speaking of the nobleman “receiving the kingdom”, need not contradict this possibility. Many OT passages picture a future time when God will consummate or activate his kingship.\(^ {518}\) Nor indeed should v. 14 which spelled out the rejection of the nobleman by his citizens. One thinks immediately of 1 Sam 8:7 where the Israelites rejected the kingship of YHWH, preferring instead a human king.\(^ {519}\)


\(^{515}\) See Sections 3.4.2.6 and Excursus of Section 3.7.


\(^{517}\) Jeremias, (1972\(^{3}\)), *Parables of Jesus*, 58-62, also thereby denied an original Christological meaning to the story, but failed to articulate who the nobleman would be at the level of Jesus and his original hearers.


2.6 SYNTHESE

It is now possible to draw together the main findings of this chapter that will be of relevance in supporting the hypothesis, to be demonstrated in the next chapter, that in the time of the Pharisees and Jesus, “kingdom of God” meant first and foremost God himself as king and that the Pharisees and Jesus differed not so much in the identity of the kingdom but in their notion of Divine Royal Presence, that is, where the kingdom was located. The scene will also be set for a modification of this understanding in subsequent stages in the formation of Luke 17:20-21.

Given the variety and development in the understanding of the presence of the Divine King, three features were always present to a greater or lesser degree.

The first is the fact of God’s kingship. Amidst the diversity and debates, it was always a common belief that God was king and that except for Second Isaiah and most post-70 Jewish sources, God’s reign or kingship extended over the whole earth or the whole of creation. What was argued, of course, was the effectiveness of and the evidence for that rule or reign, i.e. whether God was actively ruling in the world as Divine King. A clear distinction between the Divine King’s effective rule and the acknowledgment of his reign or kingship can always be made in the literature.

The second feature is the issue of the Divine Royal Presence. Except for a few cases which remain unclear, the motif of God as king was closely associated with a concern to locate the Divine Royal Presence. From what location did God rule as king?

Lastly, between passages that are to be dated to roughly the same period, contrasting views on the location of the Divine Royal Presence were noted, though significantly after A.D. 70 a great uniformity of belief in this matter can be detected. If the OT proves to reflect more intimately the emerging and conflicting Judaisms nearer the first century, the results of the analysis of ancient Palestinian literature will prove to be of even greater worth in discerning streams of tradition that survived into the first century.

Assuming that “nations”, “earth”, “world”, “creation”, effectively are the same thing. This observation goes far in supporting Bruce D. Chilton’s chronology (see Section 1.6.3) of Targum traditions whereby universalistic verses may be tentatively dated prior to A.D. 70. J. J. M. Roberts, (1973), “Zion Tradition”, 340-41, claimed to detect a development in the conception of YHWH’s universal rule between the time of Samuel and David, but the verses used to demonstrate this fall outside the range considered here.
2.6.1 Ancient Palestinian Literature

Most scholars believe that the Israelites derived the motif of God as king from the Canaanites after settlement and reworked it in the light of YHWHism. It was “derived from the common theology of the Near East rather than the development of the monarchy”. The Canaanite motif of the Divine Warrior fighting the forces of chaos and nature, in particular, underwent historification into the events of the Exodus and Sinai. In some of the post-exilic prophets, the Divine King’s arrival would be eschatologised into a future hope.

In pre-exilic times, the notion of Divine Royal Presence was confined to the cultic sphere, being intimately associated with the temple. The temple was his palace and from there the Divine Royal Presence judged the earth and protected his chosen people. The Divine King lived in his “kingdom”. He was, nevertheless, a “hidden” Divine King whose presence was at once admitted and yet lamented because such a presence did not by itself mean action on the part of God. Divine Royal inactivity in the face of evil or misfortune was a source of great and continuing anguish.

Within this “here-and-now” tradition, an extension, or more crudely an enlargement, of the Divine Royal Presence can be detected. There were, of course, exceptions, but the picture can be summarised thus. In the early monarchic period, the Divine King was thought to be located “above the ark”. Later he was associated with the temple itself. In the late monarchic period and the exilic period he could be found in the city of Jerusalem or Zion. In the late post-exilic period the Divine Royal Presence was thought to be present over the whole earth, in other words, to be coterminous with the extent of his reign.

The cataclysmic event of the exile, particularly the destruction of YHWH’s house, precipitated the birth of a stream of tradition regarding the Divine Royal Presence in which it became independent and even divorced from the temple. Nevertheless, a special feature

524 Particularly evident, for example, in the so-called enthronement psalms, Curtis, (1988), “God as Judge”, 10. For a good summary of the motif of YHWH as king in the psalms, see: Mays, (1994), “The Centre of the Psalms”, 231-46. Cultic references are largely, though not exclusively (e.g Exod 15:18, 1 Chron 16:31), confined to the Psalms.
of the so-called “Zion” theology”, 526 the older “here-and-now” tradition, continued to coexist as long as the second temple stood. 527

Indeed, this older “here-and-now” tradition found an able, though only partial, ally in Jeremiah. He believed in the presence of the Divine King on the Temple Mount, despite the sins of the people. His only explanation for the destruction of the temple was, however, that the Divine Royal Presence had removed itself from it.

Second Isaiah, on the other hand, saw the crisis of the exile and the events leading up to it as indications that any dependence the Divine Royal Presence might have had with the temple was severed by the sins of the people. Ezekiel echoed Second Isaiah theologically, depicting the movement of the Divine Royal Presence out of the temple in graphic, almost physical, terms.

However, slowly, over a period of several hundred years after the exile, a new stream of tradition emerged. This may be conveniently called the “heaven” tradition.

It began firstly with a reluctance to locate the Divine Royal Presence anywhere, notably the temple.

The post-exilic prophets, at least those who explicitly mentioned God as king, began this process. While acknowledging the kingship of YHWH, they pushed the effectiveness or consummation of that kingship into the future when the Divine King would “come (down)” as judge and king. 528 He was an absent king who would one day come to take up residence in the midst of his people. 529

From the Greek period onwards, the Palestinian Deuterocanonicals, Daniel and the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha, right down to and including the first century A.D., demonstrate that the overwhelming preference is for God as king to reside in “heaven”, from which he is king of the universe and from which he will eventually “come” as

---


528 Kupp, (1996), Matthew’s Emmanuel, 135.

529 Contrary to W. H. Schmidt, (1983ET), The Faith of the OT, 148, who saw YHWH’s kingship in “the late period” as only a future reality.
warrior to punish his enemies and judge everyone.\footnote{Clements, (1965), \textit{God and Temple}, 131; Levenson, (1981), “From Temple to Synagogue”, 159. Charlesworth, (1983), “Introduction”; \textit{OTP II}, xxxi, noted the emphasis in the Pseudepigrapha on the transcendence of God.} Notably, until he comes, his inactivity as king results in a free reign of sin and evil, the perpetrators of which will be punished when the Divine King does come. As we might expect, the “hiddenness” of the Divine King is never mentioned within the context of the Divine \textit{Royal Presence} located in heaven.

It may be noted, finally, that whether considered from the perspective of the “here-and-now” or heaven tradition, the Divine \textit{Royal Presence} always meant for the faithful and obedient, not personal disaster and terror, but an experience of joy and happiness as well as salvation and redemption. In the case of the “here-and-now” tradition, that experience was, like the heaven tradition, increasingly pushed into the future, when the Divine King would reveal himself and thus initiate judgement and salvation. Divine judgement and salvation may be considered hallmarks of the Divine \textit{Royal Presence}.\footnote{Cf. Amirtham, (1968), “To be Near to and Far away from Yahweh”, 38.}

\subsection*{2.6.2 The Pharisees and Jesus}

With regard to the Pharisees, only a few passages from the Targumim were found to contain relevant information.\footnote{If the deuterocanonicals Sirach and Judith (see Section 2.2.2), were composed by Palestinian Pharisees (this, it must be noted is very unlikely), they are ambiguous enough not to contradict the conclusion drawn in the following sentence.} In each such example, the Divine \textit{Royal Presence} was thought to be located in the “here-and-now” with its epicentre in the temple.\footnote{If the Pharisees originated as a group initially connected with the temple, this position would hardly be surprising. See Section 1.5.1.} He was a “hidden” Divine King who would reveal himself in the future and re-establish his position as universal Divine King.

In the case of Jesus, explicit mention of God as king or his kingship or reign cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. The possible instances have been shown to come either from the early church or from the final redactors of Matthew and Luke.\footnote{Cf. Theissen and Merz, (1998\textsuperscript{ET}, \textit{The Historical Jesus}, 274.}

Importantly, there is no reliable record of Jesus’ belief in the Divine Presence \textit{per se} in the temple, much less that of the Divine \textit{Royal Presence}. The passages that may be quoted in support of such a belief on his part all suffer from extensive reworking. On the contrary, all the evidence suggests that Jesus regarded God as located in “heaven”.
It looks as though, Jesus, in other words, shared the tradition that was contained in such writings as Daniel and the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha. For Jesus, the Divine Royal Presence dwelt in heaven, but would one day come to execute judgement and bring joy and salvation to the repentant.

Because of the above, it is therefore submitted that the Pharisees belonged to the “here-and-now” tradition and that Jesus aligned himself with the “heaven” tradition with regard to the location of the Divine Royal Presence. We know that these two traditions survived into the first century. The Pharisees and Jesus reflect the immense variety of “Judaisms” in first century Palestine.

2.6.3 The Pre-Lukan Community

Given the semantic domain designated at the beginning of this chapter, it would appear that the pre-Lukan community left nothing to indicate that they had any concept of God as the Divine King nor any concept of his Divine Royal Presence. Though an argument largely from silence, it is suggested that the Pentecost event may have led to an appropriation of the position of the Divine King on the part of the Holy Spirit for this community. This possibility will be developed further with regard to the kingdom of God in Section 3.4.

2.6.4 The Yavnean Rabbis, the Early Post-70 Synagogue and Luke

Both the Yavnean rabbis and Luke were faced with the fact of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70 and both struggled to confront its significance.

For the Yavnean rabbis, the symbol of the “here-and-now” presence of the Divine King was destroyed and they were faced with the same dilemma that challenged Second Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. What did it mean as far as the location of the Divine Royal Presence was concerned? Had the Divine King once again removed himself from the temple and the world?

Unfortunately, the Mishnah, despite containing numerous references to God as king which may be dated prior to A.D. 70, fails to provide any indication of the notion of Divine Royal Presence attached to such references. There seems little doubt, however, that the rabbis believed that God (considered, for the moment, independently of the +Klm motif) was now located in heaven. Prior to A.D. 70 his Shekhinah was to be found in or associated with the
temple, but after 70 it was in heaven, or at least no longer bound to the site of the temple. It could be, for example, with individuals who studied the Torah.\textsuperscript{534}

Josephus may be said to confirm this general picture. Writing after A.D. 70, Josephus also articulated no interest in the Divine \textit{Royal} Presence as attached to instances of God as king. However, he clearly located God in his own time in heaven. Further, God had previously inhabited the temple but had physically left prior to its destruction, because the people had failed to live by the Torah.

Finally, the Targumim containing traditions that could be dated to the early post-70 period and therefore which reflect the position of the Palestinian Synagogues of the time, picture the Shekhinah intimately associated with the Divine King. The Shekhinah has moved to heaven. One day it will return to Zion and will be “revealed” and “seen”. Despite this divine absence, God continues to reign,\textsuperscript{535} though his effectiveness will not be realised until this revelation. This picture of the divine \textit{royal} Shekhinah is consistent with that presented in the Mishnah, though it thus need not be indicative of a later period when the rabbis were gradually gaining an effective influence over the Palestinian Synagogues.

Luke, the redactor of the Gospel, chose another route. For him the Divine \textit{Royal} Presence resided in the person of Jesus even before the destruction of the temple. No longer present in the “here-and-now”, Jesus - the Divine King - was in heaven, awaiting, as it were, the time for his second advent. This return would bring about judgement and salvation.

Curiously, then, the tables were turned. Whereas Jesus and the Pharisees agreed on the identity of the Divine King but not on the location of his presence, the Yavnean rabbis and Luke agreed on the location of the Divine King, but not on his identity. Is it any wonder then that Luke repeatedly emphasised the kingship of Jesus?

\textsuperscript{534} Cf. Sievers, (1981), “Shekinah”, 178; Chilton, (1982), \textit{The Glory of Israel}, 75; Wolters, (1997), “The Shekinah in the Copper Scroll”, 390. In later rabbinic literature there is record of a dispute whether the Shekinah was present in the second temple, e.g. \textit{b. Yoma} 9b-10a, and a tradition that the Shekinah continued to be everywhere, e.g. \textit{b. B. Bat.} 25a, \textit{Sanh.} 39a, \textit{Exod R.} 2:5. Ritual was nevertheless to be performed as if the ark (and therefore the Shekinah) were present, \textit{b. Yoma} 52b. For an interesting discussion of later rabbinic responses to the removal of the Shekinah, see N. J. Cohen, (1982), “Shekhinta Ba-Galuta”, 147-59.

3 THE PRESENCE OF
THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come.
(Matt 6:9, NRSV)

3.1 PREFACE

Having determined the parameters of the notion of the Divine Royal Presence as attached to explicit instances of God as king as it sheds light on each stage of the formation of Luke, the next step is to compare these with the notion as attached to explicit occurrences of the kingdom of God. Such a comparison has three aims.

The first is to establish the legitimacy of the hypothesis that the phrase “kingdom of God” means first and foremost God as Divine King for both the Pharisees and Jesus. A necessary corollary of this aim will be to uncover any additional layers of meaning placed on this by the early pre-Lukan community and subsequently by the redactor so that these may be distinguished from those of Jesus.

Secondly, in order to draw out the parallels between God as king and the kingdom of God, the question of the location of the kingdom of God will be asked of each passage as well as the location of the Divine King in relation to his kingdom. By doing so, it is hoped that the fundamental similarities and differences between the Pharisees and Jesus regarding the kingdom of God (and the parties associated with Stages II and III) will be highlighted.

Thirdly, the perennial question of the timing of the kingdom, which cannot be ignored, will be considered in the light of the results of the above investigations.

The conclusions reached will enable a full appreciation of the notion of the kingdom of God to be brought to bear on that most enigmatic of passages, Luke 17:20-21.

The “model” proposed here for understanding the kingdom of God, namely that “kingdom of God” was at least for the Pharisees and Jesus first and foremost God himself simply as Divine King, varies in two crucial respects to another which occasionally figures in scholarship. That model is that “kingdom of God” means God acting as king.
That view of the kingdom is no recent invention, though compared with other models it is rarely mentioned.\footnote{For example, Theissen and Merz, (1998\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Historical Jesus}, 275-79, gave a comprehensive list, but did not include God acting as king. See also Section 3.3.2.} Adolf von Harnack sowed the seeds of this conception in modern scholarship, calling the kingdom of God “God himself in his power”.\footnote{von Harnack, (1901\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{What is Christianity?}, 56.} What is interesting is that von Harnack has been followed by only a relatively few scholars and almost all of them have done little more than restate the principle, without demonstration, that the “kingdom of God” is God as king \textit{in action}.\footnote{This list makes no claims to be exhaustive: Gerhard Gloege, (1929), \textit{Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament}, 36 (unavailable, but quoted by Ladd, (1974\textsuperscript{2}), \textit{Presence of the Future}, 145); Bornkamm, (1960\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Jesus of Nazareth}, 77, 200 n. 2; Aalen, (1961), “Reign and House”, 221-22; Gloege, (1963\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Day of His Coming}, 141; Baird, (1963), \textit{Justice of God}, 122, 141; Perrin, (1963), \textit{Teaching of Jesus}, 187; Perrin, (1967), \textit{Rediscovering}, 55; D. Hill, (1981), “Kingdom of God”, 68, 72; Goppelt, (1981\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Theology of the NT I}, 56; Borg, (1984), \textit{Conflict, Holiness and Politics}, 262-64; Fitzmyer, (1983), \textit{Luke I-IX}, 155; Beasley-Murray, (1992), “The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus”, 29; Meier, (1994), \textit{Marginal Jew II}, 298, 299. Cf. N. T. Wright, (1996), \textit{Jesus}, 202-203, 223. On Perrin’s position see particularly Section 3.6.2.} Two notable exceptions are Joachim Jeremias in his \textit{New Testament Theology} and Norman Perrin in his \textit{Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom}. While neither book was directly concerned with establishing the principle of the kingdom of God as the Divine King \textit{in action}, where they do discuss it, both works suffer from a lack of precision and a failure to consider all examples. For example, Jeremias concluded that “kingdom of God” can be used as a “periphrasis for God as ruler . . . in the sayings of Jesus which speak of the coming of the reign of God”,\footnote{Jeremias, (1971\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{NT Theology I}, 102.} whereas Perrin’s existential approach may now be considered anachronistic when applied as an explanation of first century thought regarding the kingdom of God.\footnote{See Section 3.6.2.}

On the other hand, both works contain valuable insights. Jeremias was basically correct in calling the “kingdom of God” a “periphrasis for God as ruler”, if by ruler is meant the particular case of God as king. Perrin will be seen to be correct too in his suggestion that “kingdom of God” evoked the myth of God as king, if we understand “evoked the myth” not as an internal experience or a personal decision, but as a verbal reference to a perceived \textit{concrete} reality.

The model of the kingdom of God as God the Divine King \textit{in action}, will need to be modified in the light of a consideration of all relevant instances. Already we can suspect some modification of this view, since such a model fails to explain those sayings of Jesus
where the action is done to the kingdom.\textsuperscript{6} If the parallel between God as king \textit{in action} and the kingdom of God is valid, how else then, too, do we explain those cases where the believer complained that God the Divine King is \textit{not} acting?

The second crucial difference between the model proposed and the older one is that no previous consideration has been given as to how and to what extent Stages II and III of the formation of the canonical Gospels both modified and expanded the view of the kingdom bequeathed by Jesus. It has simply been assumed that their view coincided exactly in all respects with that of Jesus. By asking the deceptively simple question of the whereabouts of the kingdom as perceived in each stage, the nuances in meaning contributed by each stage may come to light. Indeed such a question is necessary to avoid confusing such possible contributions with those of Jesus and the Pharisees.

\textsuperscript{6} Witherington, (1990), \textit{Christology}, 196, rejected this model of the kingdom as the Divine King \textit{in action} because he thought that “kingdom” meant the saving activity of God itself.
3.2 ANCIENT PALESTINIAN LITERATURE

For the rationale behind the approach adopted here and in subsequent Sections of this chapter, please refer to Sections 3.1, 1.2.2, and 1.2.3.

3.2.1 The Old Testament

Explicit references to YHWH’s שמה (“kingdom”) or מלכה (“dominion”)⁷ occur in the following places in the OT (excluding Daniel and its additions).⁸

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronicles</th>
<th>Psalms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 17:14</td>
<td>Ps 103:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 28:5</td>
<td>Ps 145:11,12,13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 29:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 13:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two observations may be made immediately. Explicit reference to God’s kingdom or dominion was originally apparently confined to cultic circles, if, as is generally agreed, the author of Chronicles was a Levite.⁹ Yet this need not deter investigation. If the principle of lex orandi, lex credendi applies here (and there is no reason why it does not), it may well mean that they express the theology of the day and that of the general population admirably. Secondly, as will be shown, the two psalms are probably post-exilic and given the certain post-exilic date for the Chronicles,¹⁰ this means that explicit mention of God’s kingdom or dominion began only after the exile.

---
⁷ שמה and מלכה are synonyms, though “dominion” is a common translation and will be used as a convenient distinctive flag. See: Japhet, (1989ET), Ideology of Chronicles, 397; Ringgren, Seybold and Fabry, (1997ET), מלך melek, TDOT VIII, 360. For the opinion that the two are not synonyms see von Rad, (1964ET), מלך and מלכה in the OT, TDNT I, 570 n. 28. von Rad was wrong in locating מלכה at Ps 22:28 and Obad 21. The word in each case is מלכה.

⁸ Ps 45:6 (cf. Heb 1:8) is often cited as an example. However, the psalm is a royal wedding psalm and 45:6 refers to the king. See: Weiser, (1965ET), The Psalms, 363; Dahood, (1965-70), Psalms I, 269; Gerstenberger, (1988), Psalms Part I, 189. See Selman, (1989), “The Kingdom of God in the OT”, 175-76, for the view that Ps 45:6 refers to both the Davidic and Divine Kingdom.
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1 Chr 17:14

*BHS* of 1 Chr 17:14 (cf. LXX 1 Chr 17:14\(^{11}\))

BHS of 1 Chr 17:14

NRSV of 1 Chr 17:14

but I will confirm him in my house and in my kingdom forever, and his throne shall be established forever.

In the parallel verse of 2 Sam 7:16, it is David who is the subject of the promise of God through Nathan. Here it is Solomon.\(^{12}\) The promise in 1 Chr 17:10b-12 is that YHWH will build a house or dynasty for David by choosing a son from David and establishing his מָלֶךְ “kingdom” and throne.\(^{13}\) It will be he, rather than David (cf. v. 1) who will build YHWH’s house. The relationship between God and this king (Solomon) will be that of father to son (v. 13a).\(^{14}\) God will never withdraw his לֹּשֶׁנֶר “steadfast love” from him (v. 13b), but will confirm, i.e. appoint him,\(^{15}\) to God’s house and kingdom forever (v. 14). YHWH’s house is probably the temple that Solomon will build.\(^{16}\) The rewriting of Nathan’s dream by the Chronicler saw YHWH build David a dynastic house and Solomon build YHWH’s house (cf. 2 Chr 13:5).

The identity of God’s kingdom is also not difficult to discern. It is coterminous with the kingdom of Solomon, or more precisely that of the Davidic dynasty (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 5:18). If “my house” is indeed the temple, then it is closely associated with “my kingdom” because of the parallel use of the prepositional prefix ב “in”.\(^{17}\) The verb לֹּשֶׁנֶר translated by the NRSV as “to confirm” actually means “to stand”. That is, Solomon ruled by divine decree both in the temple and in God’s kingdom. The permanency of both of “my kingdom” and “his throne” also suggests an element of equality.\(^{18}\)

It is only in Chronicles that the kingdom of God is equated directly with that of the Davidic dynasty.\(^{19}\) The Chronicler’s “throne of the Lord” is not referring to the ark, but to the fact that Solomon and his successors are YHWH’s representatives, ruling over the

---

\(^{11}\) The LXX ἐν βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ “in my kingdom” is probably due to confusion between +++ (“my”) and *’*+ (“his”), Camponovo, (1984), *Königtum*, 388.


\(^{13}\) On the promise to David generally, see Duling, (1974), “The Promises to David”, 55-77.

\(^{14}\) Ps 2:7. See Buchanan, (1970), *Consequences of the Covenant*, 57.

\(^{15}\) לֹּשֶׁנֶר, Japhet, (1989\(^{\text{ET}}\)*), *Ideology of Chronicles*, 398 n. 10.


\(^{17}\) Aalen, (1961), “Reign and House”, 220, 234


Divine Kingdom. Again, this interpretation stands in deliberate contrast to 2 Sam 7:16. There the monarchy is strictly David’s, here it is YHWH’s.

This is even more significant when it is recalled that in the Chronicler’s time, the dynasty of David/Solomon had long since disappeared. It was the temple that alone remained as the symbol of the reality that YHWH continued to dwell in his kingdom. Because there was no longer a Davidic viceroy ruling God’s kingdom, it did not mean, for the Chronicler, that God’s kingdom had ceased to be, or that he had withdrawn his Divine Royal Presence.

As for indicators of Divine Royal Presence, Nathan’s prophecy was the result of an auditory “vision” (v. 3). Unlike v. 16, where David is depicted as entering “before the LORD”, i.e. the tent of vv. 1 and 5, here there is no indication that Nathan was within the cultic tent. Verse 8, with the formula “I have been with you” is not a reference to the Divine Presence being with David but merely an affirmation of God’s protection of David, confirmed in the rest of the verse (cf. for Solomon in 1 Chr 28:20, also 2 Chr 13:12).

Nevertheless, the Divine Royal Presence was thought by the Chronicler to be in the temple, as Solomon’s throne and royal presence was in his palace. Prior to the temple’s construction, the Divine Royal Presence was in the “tent”. Thus like Solomon and his successors, YHWH dwelt in his kingdom.

1 Chr 28:5

BHS of 1 Chr 28:5

NRSV of 1 Chr 28:5

And of all my sons, for the LORD has given me many, he has chosen my son Solomon to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel.

1 Chr 28:5 forms part of the address made by David, according to the Chronicler, to the elders of Israel. It highlights again the preference the writer had for Solomon. Solomon is David’s rightful successor, not through the natural circumstances of history, but through divine choice. Solomon too, not David, has been chosen to sit on YHWH’s throne.


22 See further Section 2.2.1.4 under Isa 41:21, 43:15, 44:6 and 52:7.

23 See: 1 Chr 28:5,6,10, 29:1; Myers, (1965), 1 Chronicles, 192.
Here, the “kingdom of YHWH” is explicitly Israel, the area which Solomon ruled, as is clear from v. 7, “I will establish his kingdom forever”. Together with 2 Chr 13:8, it forms the closest verbal counterpart with the NT phrase.

Following from 1 Chr 17:14 above, the existence of the kingdom of God is not dependent on a legitimate successor of Solomon occupying the throne. God’s kingdom of Israel, like God himself, is forever. Joseph A. Fitzmyer is thus quite wrong to suggest that the phrase here “expresses an eschatological hope”.

For the Chronicler, the location of the Divine Royal Presence in his kingdom was dependent on the existence of the temple and not on the presence of a successor to Solomon. It was, after-all, YHWH’s house (vv. 6, 12, 13).

1 Chr 29:11

BHS of 1 Chr 29:11 (cf. LXX 1 Chr 29:11)

NRSV of 1 Chr 29:11

Yours, O LORD, are the greatness, the power, the glory, the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heavens and on the earth is yours; yours is the kingdom, O LORD, and you are exalted as head above all.

1 Chr 29:11 is part of the prayer of David at the end of his life and is reminiscent both of Ps 145:11 and the doxology to the Lord’s Prayer in some manuscripts of Matt 6:13. Like Ps 145, it is set in a cultic context: the praise of God as funds for the proposed temple are donated. It acknowledges the greatness of God, the universal reach of his rule

---

24 See: 1 Chr 29:23, 2 Chr 9:8; Selman, (1994), 1 Chronicles, 250.
26 Fitzmyer, (1983), Luke I-IX, 155. Surprisingly, some scholars still ignore 1 Chr 28:5 and 2 Chr 13:8, in their discussions of OT antecedents to the NT phrase, e.g. Goppelt, (1981), Theology of the NT I, 45, wrote, “Nowhere in the OT are the two elements combined into the expression ‘reign of God’ as a standard phrase”.
28 The LXX varies in the second half and considerably in that last section: ἐξί νὰ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς δεσπόζεις, ἀνέκστη σοι τὰ πάσα βασιλεία καὶ ἐπὶ ἐννοιούς “for you are Lord of all in heaven and on earth, before your face every king and nation is troubled”. “Kingdom of God” is not mentioned at all, cf. Camponovo, (1984), Königtum, 389.
29 See also: Did. 8:2, 9:4, 10:5; b. Ber. 58a.
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(v. 12 "rule over all")\(^{30}\) and the fact that the Davidic ממלכת "dominion", or better, the one David had just bequeathed to Solomon, in reality belongs to YHWH. Solomon will rule God’s dominion (v. 19), but it will always be God who will be the true king of Israel.\(^{31}\)

Again, the Divine Royal Presence was firmly in the בְּרָה יְהוָה "house of God" (v. 7, cf. vv. 3, 8, 16).\(^{32}\) The speeches of David in 1 Chr 28 and 29 were, as depicted by the Chronicler, delivered in front of an assembled crowd of dignitaries (1 Chr 28:1). The writer placed the dignitaries immediately near the “tent”, since at the conclusion “all the assembly . . . prostrated themselves before the LORD and the king” (1 Chr 29:20) - the phrase “before the LORD” being a clear indication of their relative proximity to the present “house of God”.

2 Chr 13:8

**BHS of 2 Chr 13:8**

> וַיִּשְׁמָר אֶת הַמֶּitational לַהַחֲקִית לְפָנֵי מֶitational יְהוָה בִּרְכָּת בֵּית הָיוֹרָה
> יהַמֶitational נָשִׁים בֵּית מֶitational יְהוָה יְשֹׁעָה לְכָּם יְרָבָּם אָלְמָרָם.

**NRSV of 2 Chr 13:8**

> "And now you think that you can withstand the kingdom of the LORD in the hand of the sons of David, because you are a great multitude and have with you the golden calves that Jeroboam made as gods for you.

2 Chr 13:8 is a taunt that comes within the sermon of Abijah, king of Judah (913-911 B.C.) to the army of Israel and Jeroboam I (922-901 B.C.) as they prepared to attack Abijah and his forces.\(^{33}\) Despite their material advantage, the people of Israel could not possibly prevail against the ממלכת "dominion" of YHWH\(^{34}\) in the hands of his anointed.\(^{35}\) After all, despite Abijah’s sins, the Divine Royal Presence had not withdrawn from the Jerusalem temple, its cult or its priests and Levites (vv. 10-11).

---

\(^{30}\) I.e. God’s *kingship*, Gross, (1998\(^{\text{ET}}\), מַמלֶכֶת "masal II", *TDOT IX*, 70, rather than that the divine *kingdom* is universal in extent, which would be contrary to the view of Chronicles. Nevertheless, Japhet, (1989\(^{\text{ET}}\), *Ideology of Chronicles*, 397-98 n. 9, saw in this verse the “complementary” idea of the divine universal kingdom.


\(^{32}\) Apart from Judg 18:31 and Eccl 5:1, the phrase is confined to Ezra, Neh and 1 & 2 Chronicles.


\(^{34}\) Selman, (1989), “The Kingdom of God in the OT”, 163, claimed that 2 Chr 13:8 “contains the only example in the Old Testament of the simple phrase ‘kingdom of Yahweh’”. ממלכת יְהוָה as the exact phrase, occurs in the OT only in 1 Chr 28:3, ממלכת יְהוָה only here in 2 Chr 13:8.

\(^{35}\) Myers, (1965), *II Chronicles*, 80. Myers thought that the passage was also directed in the writer’s time to the people of Samaria. For the contrary, see: Williamson, (1977), *Israel in the Book of*
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Here again, God’s dominion or kingdom is that of David and his anointed successors. Abijah is not included specifically by name here, which may indicate that the Chronicler wished to maintain a distance between the holy God and the unholy individuals who occupied and would occupy the throne. Yet, the Davidic kingdom is still YHWH’s, presided over by his viceroy (cf. v. 5). So much is this the case, that to fight against Judah is to fight against YHWH (vv. 12, 15).

Ps 103:19

*BHS* of Ps 103:19

The LORD has established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom rules over all.

Typical of many if not most psalms, Ps 103 is difficult to date but is probably post-exilic, though whether it is early or late post-exilic cannot be determined. Its post-exilic origins are generally considered to be indicated by the echoes to Second Isaiah in vv. 15-16 (cf. Isa 40:7) and Third Isaiah in v. 9, (cf. Isa 57:16) and the possible Aramaic suffixes (e.g. כול ומכ) in vv. 3-4. Ps 103 is a psalm of individual thanksgiving and is divided into four sections, of which v. 19 forms the opening lines to the last. Verse 19 acknowledges the universal sovereignty of God both in the past and in the here-and-now. Verses 20-22 call on the whole of creation to bless YHWH. There is no hint here of eschatological expectation.

The psalm clearly places the Divine Royal Presence in heaven, v. 19a. From there he rules his kingdom which extends spatially over all (heaven and earth), v. 19b. Because of this, everything that God does is as a blessing to him everywhere within his “realm” (NRSV “dominion”), v. 22.

---

39 Cf. 1 Chr 29:12, 2 Chr 20:6.
41 Apart from two isolated cases (Gen 1:16, 2 Chr 32:9), ממלשהל always referred to the spatial extent of domination, i.e. the realm or domain: 1 Kgs 9:19, 2 Kgs 20:13 // Isa 39:2, 2 Chr 8:6, Isa
What is especially striking about v. 19b is that it is the only case in the OT where the verb "to rule", "to be king", has a non-living being as its subject (cf. Pss. Sol. 17:3).\(^{42}\) Although other explanations are possible,\(^{43}\) it is better to stay with the more difficult rendering followed by the NRSV and more importantly the LXX (Ps 102:19). It is of course not YHWH’s kingdom that rules over all but the Divine King himself, so that what we probably have here is one of the earliest examples where ‘kingdom’ is used as a circumlocution not simply for God but for God as king.

Ps 145:11-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BHS of Ps 145:11-13a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>כבורי מלכותך יאמרו נבוכים יברור יברור.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>טהרותינו לטינ אלפים נבוכים יברור יברור יברור:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מלבכים מלכותך כל-עולמים ו_Output Limited_ כבורי יברור.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRSV of Ps 145:11-13a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They shall speak of the glory of your kingdom, and tell of your power,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to make known to all people your mighty deeds, and the glorious splendor of your kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and your dominion endures throughout all generations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas Ps 103 emphasised the spatially universal aspect to YHWH’s kingdom, in Ps 145 it is its infinite longevity that is explicit in v. 13a, although vv. 9-10 imply a universal dimension to it. Both YHWH’s works and his faithful proclaim “the glory” and “the glorious splendor” of his kingdom (vv. 11, 12). יברור “glory” in this context is the quality of YHWH’s kingdom that demonstrates his sovereignty or majesty (cf. v. 5).\(^{45}\) YHWH’s kingdom thus shares two attributes with YHWH himself, namely longevity and glory.

The Divine Royal Presence is קריר “near” those (within his kingdom) who “are bowed down”, “fear” him or “call on him in truth”, vv. 14, 18, 19, though it must be stressed that YHWH is “good to all” v. 9, for all are within his kingdom. Though not identified with his kingdom, YHWH nevertheless dwells within it and not “above” it.

---


\(^{43}\) E.g. that of Dahood above which is not followed by others and is somewhat contrived. The JB translation avoids the problem altogether with “his empire is over all”, as does the NEB with “his kingly power over the whole world”.

\(^{44}\) See also Section 2.2.1.3 under Ps 145:1 for initial comments and dating.

\(^{45}\) See Section 2.2.1.1 under Ps 29:10.
3.2 The Presence of the Kingdom of God: Ancient Palestinian Literature

3.2.2 The Deuterocanonicals

There are just four times βασιλεία occurs in connection with God in the Deuterocanonicals (excluding the additions to Daniel which in accordance with common practice are discussed under Pseudepigrapha).46,47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late third century B.C.</th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tob 13:148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second century B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Macc 1:749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late second century B.C. to early first century A.D.</td>
<td>Wis 6:4, 10:1050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be unwise to offer an explanation why there is no Palestinian example of God’s kingdom in the Deuterocanonicals. As shown below, there are such examples in the Pseudepigrapha, and from writings which date from a similar time.

Although Wisdom, 2 Maccabees and probably Tobit originated in the Diaspora, there are numerous allusions and verbal parallels between them and various NT passages, particularly Paul but also from the Gospels.51 Fragments of five Tobit manuscripts were found in Cave 4 at Qumran, indicating that it at least was known among the sectarian circles of Qumran in Palestine before A.D. 70. On the other hand, no Jewish writer of the first two centuries A.D. either mentions or quotes Wisdom.52

As the influence of these Diaspora writings on either the Pharisees or Jesus is either unproven or remote, particularly with regard to God’s kingdom, it is probably safer to disregard them.

In the same category may be placed the works of Philo of Alexandria (c20 B.C. - A.D. 50). Along with Wis 6:20 and 4 Macc 2:23 (cf. 7:10), Philo wrote that the kingdom is given by

47 2 Macc 1:7 (cf. Jub. 50:9) is sometimes offered as an example, not because of the definite article attached to βασιλεία which gives it a sense of almost sacred grandeur, but because of the adjective άλγη describing the land of the Jews. It is possible on syntax grounds that it applies also to βασιλεία, in which case it would refer either to the ownership of the land by God or at least refer to some close connection of God with the land, see: J. J. Collins, (1987), “The Kingdom of God in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha”, 87. In response, Goldstein, (1984), Il Maccabees, 145, pointed out that “the kingdom” in fact refers to the Seleucid empire, as this was its sole official name.
48 See Section 2.2.2.
49 See Section 2.2.2. for dating and provenance. See Section 3.2.3 under Jub. 50:9 for discussion of similar phrase.
50 See Section 2.2.2.
51 E.g. on parallels between the NT and Tobit see: UBS4, 901; C. A. Moore, (1996), Tobit, 46 n. 110; Wisdom: Gilbert, (1984), “Wisdom Literature”, 313 n. 100.
God to the wise man,\textsuperscript{53} i.e. the one who practises virtue\textsuperscript{54} and observes the Torah (i.e. practices torah or halakah).\textsuperscript{55} It is God who has an invincible and impregnable kingdom, which is the universe itself.\textsuperscript{56} Other less direct allusions to God’s kingdom are present in the writings of Philo.\textsuperscript{57}

### 3.2.3 The Pseudepigrapha (and Daniel)

Numerous scholars have attempted to collate the instances where explicit references to God’s kingdom are made in the Pseudepigrapha (and Daniel and its additions).\textsuperscript{58} None of them listed every instance. James H. Charlesworth even claimed to have listed all of them, though he only recorded seven.\textsuperscript{59} There are in fact five instances in Daniel and one in the Additions to Daniel and 17 occurrences in those books or sections of books of the Pseudepigrapha which can be dated prior to the third century A.D.\textsuperscript{60} For further preliminary comments, see Section 2.2.3.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{55} Philo, Mig. 197, Sac. 49, Spec. Leg. 4:164, Post. 102. Cf. Quis. Her. 21.
  \item \textsuperscript{56} E.g. Philo, Spec. Leg. 1:207, Post. 5. Cf. Som. 2:100.
  \item \textsuperscript{60} Sometimes Dan 4:31 (Sidebar) is included with the Pseudepigrapha and Daniel, but this refers to Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom. Though of later dates than those considered here, the following may be mentioned as they are not mentioned elsewhere in other lists: Apoc. Sedr. 15:5, Vis. Ezra 66, 3 Enoch 6:3, 35:6, 39:2, 44:7, 48A:5.
\end{itemize}
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Palestinian Origin</th>
<th>Diaspora Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Century B.C.</strong></td>
<td>Sg Three 33</td>
<td>Dan 2:44, 4:3,34b, 6:26b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Century B.C.</strong></td>
<td>Dan 7:27</td>
<td>T. Jos. 19:12, Benj. 9:161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Enoch 84:2, 1 Enoch 91:13, 103:1</td>
<td>Sib. Or. 3:767,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jub. 12:19, 50:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Century B.C.</strong></td>
<td>Pss. Sol. 5:18, 17:3</td>
<td>Sib. Or. 3:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Century A.D.</strong></td>
<td>As. Mos. 10:1</td>
<td>T'Ab. 8:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Bar. 11:265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Enoch 33:7, 34:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Century A.D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Odes Sol. 8:55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sg Three 33

θ' of Dan 3:54
εὐλογημένος εἰ ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς βασιλείας σου
καὶ υπερμιμητὸς καὶ υπερψυχομένος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

NRSV of Sg Three 33
Blessed are you on the throne of your kingdom,
and to be exalted and highly exalted forever.

The Song of the Three Young Men was probably written and inserted into the Daniel material by a later Palestinian author, though it is still considered to be an early composition, or at least constructed from early material.68

What exactly is the Divine Kingdom is unclear, though it is probably the whole created order, heaven and earth. As for the location of the Divine King, according to v. 34, God

---

61 For dating and provenance see Section 2.2.3 and corresponding footnote.
62 For dating and provenance see Section 2.2.3 and corresponding footnote.
63 For dating and provenance see Section 2.2.3 and corresponding footnote.
64 For dating and provenance see Section 2.2.3 and corresponding footnote.
65 For dating and provenance see Section 2.2.3 and corresponding footnote.
66 2 Enoch is very difficult to date and more so to give a location of its origin (though it is likely to be from the Diaspora). See: Schürer, (19732), Age III.2, 748-49; Andersen, (1983), “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch”, OTP I, 91-97.


dwell in the “firmament of heaven”, while v. 33 implies that he is “on the throne of [his] kingdom”. The logical conclusion is that for the composer, the Divine King dwells on his throne which is in heaven.

Dan 2:44

BHS of Dan 2:44 (Aramaic)

הַמַלְכֵּה הַלְוָלֵד הַיְיִיתָם אֲלֵהֶם אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּ אֶל הַמַּלְכֵּה הַלְוָלֵד הַיְיִיתָם אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּ לַהַמַּלְכֵּה הַלְוָלֵד הַיְיִיתָם אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּ לַהַמַּלְכֵּה הַלְוָלֵד הַיְיִיתָם אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּ לַהַמַּלְכֵּה הַלְוָלֵד

NRSV of Dan 2:44

And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, nor shall this kingdom be left to another people. It shall crush all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, and it shall stand forever;

The kingdom of God is a major theme in Daniel. It is contrasted with earthly kingdoms in origin, in longevity and in power.

Part of the Aramaic section of Daniel (2:4b-7:28), Dan 2:44 comes towards the end of Daniel’s interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream. The future "kingdom" (Aramaic) that God will set up after the four earthly kingdoms, is symbolised by the stone of v. 35. This stone will fill the whole earth, so presumably the kingdom, which is emphatically God’s kingdom, will be earthly and coextensive with it and will replace and destroy the previous Gentile kingdoms. Unlike the other earthly kingdoms, it will last forever. Presumably too, this kingdom does not yet exist but is for some time in the future. Who shall rule this kingdom? The “not another people” is an allusion to such verses as Dan 7:27 (see below).

---

69 See Section 2.2.3 under Dan 4:37 for a note on the date and provenance of Dan 1-6.
70 Cf. Tob 14, Sib. Or. 4:49-101.
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Dan 4:3,34

*BHS of Dan 3:33, 4:31b (Aramaic)*

3:33 אַהֲרֹn כְּפָה יְבֵרְכֵנָה וְחִפְרֵה כִּפָּה שְׁכִּפֵּר
말ֹכְהָה מַלֹּכְהָה עִלָּהוֹת וְשִׁלְשַׁמָּה וּמֵ-דִי יְהוָה
רִי אַל-יְבֵרְקֵנָה אֵלָה חֲזִי שְׁכִּפֵּר רִי

4:31b הָעִלְוֹת אֲבָרוֹן בַּחֲזִי עֲפָרָה שְׁכִּפֵּר רִי
רִי שְׁלֹטֵה עִלָּהוֹת וְשִׁלְשַׁמָּה וּמֵ-דִי יְהוָה

*NRSV of Dan 4:3,34b*

3 How great are his signs, how mighty his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his sovereignty is from generation to generation.

34b I blessed the Most High, and praised and honored the one who lives forever. For his sovereignty is an everlasting sovereignty, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation.

In stark contrast to Dan 2:44, the מַלֹּכָה "kingdom" and שְׁלֹטֵן "sovereignty" (royal authority) is everlasting. The similarity is that both contrast the transience of human kingdoms and the (future, in the case of Dan 2:44) permanence of God’s.

The other difference is that the kingdom of Dan 2:44 is clearly earthly, whereas here in Dan 4:3,34b its location is uncertain. John J. Collins used Dan 4:25 to claim that it is not an earthly kingdom being referred to in 4:3. However, Dan 4:25 states that God has sovereignty over the kingdom of men. If anything, it reads in favour of an earthly kingdom for God. God’s real kingdom is the kingdom of men.

Dan 6:26

*BHS of Dan 6:27b (Aramaic)*

רִי לְ-הָגַּדְדָה אֲלָה עִלָּהוֹת לְ-לוּלְמָה

*NRSV of Dan 6:25b*

For he is the living God, enduring forever.

His kingdom shall never be destroyed, and his dominion has no end.

After the rescue of Daniel and his companions from the lion’s den, king Darius wrote a decree extolling the virtues of respect for the God of Daniel. Dan 6:26b forms part of this. Again, God’s kingdom shall never be destroyed, i.e. will last forever and his dominion or sovereignty is also everlasting, cf. Dan 4:3,34. Divine Royal Presence is not as important as the longevity of the Divine Kingdom.

---

72 Cf. Section 2.2.3 under Dan 4:37.
Dan 7:27

*BHS* of Dan 7:27 (Aramaic)

מלכדתא ישלכמדא רבחתא כל מלכודה החוה לכל-שומר

NRSV of Dan 7:27

The kingship and dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the holy ones of the Most High; their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them.”

John J. Collins described the genre of Daniel 7 as a “symbolic dream vision”. It was written early in the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, probably late 167 B.C., to give hope to the Jews in the face of this persecution. Dan 7:27 comes at the end of a section (Dan 7:19-27) which is a clarification regarding the fourth beast (Dan 7:7).

The kingdom that will be given to the people is God’s, since it is everlasting. Because it is manifested by the dominance of Israel over all nations, it indicates that the writer believed that God’s kingdom would encompass the whole earth and that one day the people of Israel (“the people of the holy ones”) would rule it. It cannot then in any sense be a purely heavenly kingdom.

The future kingdom here and in Dan 2:44, contrasts markedly with a present kingdom in earlier parts of Daniel. It may be explained by suggesting that though the Divine King’s kingdom was indeed the whole earth, he is not yet (in the writer’s mind) acting as a king should over his kingdom. Such a theme is, as we have already seen in the previous chapter, a typical one, especially in the psalms.

---


76 1 Chr 10:14, 14:2, 22:10, 28:7, 29:25, 2 Chr 7:18, 13:5, Dan 7:18.27; cf. 4 Macc 12:11, where Antiochus’ kingdom was said to be given to him by God; 1 Cor 6:2; cf. *Jub.* 32:19, Wis 3:8, Buchanan, (1970), *Consequences of the Covenant*, 64, for God’s kingdom being ruled by the people of Israel.
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1 Enoch 84:2

Translation of 1 Enoch 84:2 (based on the Ethiopic)\(^{80}\)

Blessed are you, O Great King, you are mighty in your greatness, O Lord of all the creation of heaven, King of kings and God of the whole world. Your authority and kingdom abide forever and ever; and your dominion throughout all the generations of generations; all the heavens are your throne for ever, and the whole earth is your footstool forever and ever.

1 Enoch 84:2 is very similar to Daniel conceptually and in phrasing. The whole of creation is God’s kingdom which he rules from heaven, though he does not exercise that kingship in the here-and-now - that is for the future.\(^{81}\)

1 Enoch 91:13, 103:1

1 Enoch 91:13b (Aramaic) = 4QEn\(^{82}\) 1 iv 18 (4Q212)

ירחבנה ירכת (מ)לעב זי רבא ברבתה ויה לוכמל רידעלפ

Translation of 1 Enoch 91:13b, 103:1 (based on the Ethiopic)\(^{83}\)

91:13b A house shall be built for the Great King in glory for evermore.

103:1 “I now swear to you, righteous ones, by the glory of the Great One and by the glory of his kingdom; and I swear to you (even) by the Great One.

1 Enoch 91:13 and 103:1 are from “The Book of the Epistle of Enoch” (chs. 91-107), which typically dated to second century B.C. Palestine.\(^{84}\) 1 Enoch 91:13b is included here, because though the English rendering of the Ethiopic is “king”, the older Qumran fragment has רַח[מ]ל[ת] “kingdom”.\(^{85}\)

In 1 Enoch 91, Enoch recounts to his sons his prediction for a future when, as the result of sin, God will come from heaven bringing “wrath and plague” as judgement (v. 7).\(^{86}\) Afterwards the sinners will be destroyed by fire, and a house built for God.

---


\(^{81}\) See the discussion in Section 2.2.3 under 1 Enoch 84:2,3,5.


\(^{85}\) Meier, (1994), Marginal Jew II, 254, 284 n. 90, translated the Qumran text as “The temple of the kingdom of the great One will be built in greatness for all generations.”

The house is no doubt the Jerusalem temple. That it needs to be built, may indicate that the writer (second century B.C.) considered the temple of Zerubbabel unsatisfactory. In any case, the Divine King resided, for the writer, in heaven, not in the existing temple.

The oracle encompassed by *1 Enoch* 102-104 and delineated by “In those days” at 102:1 and 105:1 concerns the final judgement. Sinners will dwell in Sheol, the righteous will live in heaven, including those who died and first went to Sheol. This tiered cosmos and the promise that the righteous will be remembered by the angels in heaven “before the glory of the Great One” (104:1), confirms that the writer considered the Divine King to be in heaven. His kingdom is no doubt heaven and earth.

**Jub. 12:19, 50:9b**

Translation of *Jub.* 12:19, 50:9b (based on the Ethiopic)  
12:19 My God, the Most High God, you alone are God to me. And you created everything, and everything which is the work of your hands, and you and your kingdom I have chosen.  
50:9b And a day of the holy kingdom for all Israel is this day among their days always.

*Jub.* 12:19 is the first part of a prayer of Abraham while he was in Haran prior to his journey into Canaan. In rejecting astrology as little more than idolatry, Abram acknowledged that the Most High God is the creator of everything and the god he has chosen. Abram chose God’s “kingdom”, which in this case probably means little more than his power and authority, especially over the evil spirits of v. 20, i.e. his sovereignty.

*Jub.* 50:9b occurs in the midst of laws concerning observance of the Sabbath. The “day” is the Sabbath. Since “holy kingdom” (cf. 2 Macc 1:7, 2 Bar. 71:1) and “Israel” are separate notions here, they cannot easily be equated. The sentence probably implies that proper observance of the Sabbath means that the “holy kingdom” exists for that day. If so, there is a clear connection between observance of the Torah and the kingdom of God. Unlike the later rabbinic notion, however, this is much more communal than individual, given the presence of “Israel” here and elsewhere in *Jub.* 50.

---

89 For discussion of the date and provenance of *Jubilees*, see Section 2.2.3 under *Jub.* 1:28.
90 Cf. Theissen and Merz, (1998 ET), *The Historical Jesus*, 251, who interpreted it as implying that proper observance of the Sabbath is a confession of the kingdom.
91 Though the kingdom of God is not mentioned specifically in *L.A.B.*, Torah observance is (cf. Section 1.5.5.4). Frequently the Torah is described as “light” (e.g. 9:8, 15:6, 19:4, 33:3. Cf. 9:8, 19:9. James, (1917), *Biblical Antiquities*, 49b), i.e. the light of guidance provided by God for right behaviour, to be learned and observed by Israel because it is everlasting (11:2,5). By it they
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Pss. Sol. 5:18

LXX of Pss. Sol. 5:18
εὐφρανθείσαν οἱ φοβοῦμενοι κύριον ἐν ἄγαθοῖς,
καὶ ἡ χρηστότητης σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.

Translation of Pss. Sol. 5:18
Those who fear the Lord are happy with good things.
In your kingdom your goodness (is) upon Israel.

Given the context, v. 18 cannot imply that God’s kingdom is Israel, merely that within his kingdom his goodness (or favour) is on Israel. As with 1 Chr 17:14, the use of the preposition “in” implies that God’s kingdom is something which one can be “in”, that is, it is considered in a locative or spatial sense. It is Israel that is “in” God’s kingdom. Unlike the Chronicler, there is no indication that what God does in providing food and rain etc. is confined to the borders of Israel. The location of the Divine Royal Presence is unstated.

Pss. Sol. 17:3

LXX of Pss. Sol. 17:3
ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐλπίσομεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν σωτῆρα ἡμῶν,
ἐπὶ τὸ κράτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μετ’ ἐλεοῦς,
καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐπὶ τὰ ἑθνη ἐν κρίσει.

Translation of Pss. Sol. 17:3
But we [will] hope in God our savior,
for the strength of our God is forever with mercy.
And the kingdom of our God is forever over the nations in judgement.

Pss. Sol. 17:3 contains the only explicit reference in the pseudepigraphal literature to the precise phrase “the kingdom of God”. As in Daniel, God’s kingdom has existed forever, is eternal and is over all nations. It is a “here-and-now” kingdom, not a future hope. There is no sense in which God’s kingdom comes into existence with the Messiah nor is

will be judged (11:2, 15:6). Idolatry and mixed marriages are the most serious violations of the Torah (e.g. 9:5, 25:9-13, 44:6-7), probably because they deny the exclusive sovereignty of God over Israel. For example, in 18:13 the sin of fornication leads to defeat at the hands of their enemies. In 19:4, transgression results in the withdrawal of divine aid, “he will cut us off”.

93 See Section 2.2.3 under Pss. Sol. 5:19 for introductory remarks.
94 See Section 3.2.1.
95 Aalen, (1961), “Reign and House”, 220. On Jesus’ use of “in” the kingdom, see below, Section 3.3.2.
there any hint of its revelation. Sometime in the future, a Davidic Messiah will be raised up by God (verses 21ff) to mediate his kingdom, not to bring it about.

John P. Meier\textsuperscript{97} noticed a parallelism between parts b and c of v. 3, i.e. that “strength” parallels “kingdom”, so that in this case “kingdom” must be taken to mean the “powerful exercise of the king’s rule” through judgement. Given the influence of the royal psalms, this must be taken as a distinct possibility. It is more likely, however, that we have here a similar notion to that of Ps 103:19b where God’s kingdom rules, since it is the “kingdom of God” that sits in judgement cf. v. 10. The “kingdom (of God)” is being used here as a circumlocution for God himself. As such, Divine Royal Presence is to be located among the nations, though probably centred on the temple, cf. v. 31.

\textit{As. Mos. 10:1}

\textit{As. Mos. 10:1}\textsuperscript{98}
Et tunc parebit regnum illius in omni creatura illius. Et tunc zabulus finem habebit, et tristitia[m] cum eo adducetur.

Translation of \textit{As. Mos. 10:1}\textsuperscript{99}
Then his kingdom will appear throughout his whole creation.
Then the devil will have an end.
Yea, sorrow will be led away with him.

Following the death of Taxo and his sons (9:6),\textsuperscript{100} God’s kingdom \textit{parebit} “will appear”\textsuperscript{101} in his \textit{omnia creatura} “whole creation”. This will result in the end of the devil and of sadness. God’s kingdom already exists prior to its revelation and is as real as the Roman occupation was to the writer. What will be made clear is the fact that the entire creation is God’s kingdom, notwithstanding the fact that in v. 8 it is only Israel that will be exalted.\textsuperscript{102}

The “appearance” of God’s kingdom (v. 1) and the “manifestation” of God himself (v. 7) are one and the same, since they effect the same result, namely justice (in the form of punishment of the nations and the destruction of their idols) and salvation (vv. 8-10). Especially noteworthy is the connection between this event and exorcism (v. 1). The

\textsuperscript{97} Meier, (1994), \textit{Marginal Jew II}, 258.

\textsuperscript{98} Tromp, (1993), \textit{The Assumption of Moses}, 18.


\textsuperscript{100} For preliminary remarks and context, see Section 2.2.3 under \textit{As. Mos. 4:2, 10:3}.

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. \textit{Sib. Or. 3:47}, \textit{2 Bar. 39:7}, and some of the prophetic Targums. See Sections 3.3.1.3 and 3.5.1.3.

\textsuperscript{102} Wicks, (1915), \textit{The Doctrine of God}, 209; Tromp, (1993), \textit{The Assumption of Moses}, 236.
kingdom of God and exorcism were probably closely linked in the teaching of the historical Jesus.\textsuperscript{103}

The \textit{Assumption of Moses} also counsels faithfulness to the commandments (3:12, 12:10-11). Observance brings good things, disregard for them will result in punishment. However, contrary to the statements of Robert H. Charles,\textsuperscript{104} there is no connection here between keeping or observing the Torah and God’s kingdom. The writer’s kingdom is thoroughly eschatological. It is brought by God in the future, not by any human activity or agent - not even by a messiah (cf. \textit{Pss. Sol. 17}).\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{103} See Section 3.3.2 under Luke 11:20.
\textsuperscript{104} Charles, (1913), \textit{Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha II}, 412.
3.3 THE PHARISEES AND JESUS

While two probable examples of the kingdom of God as a periphrasis for God as king were detected in literature more or less contemporary with the Pharisees and Jesus, in this Section other contemporary or near-contemporary literature will be analysed to see what it may tell us.

3.3.1 The Pharisees

Three contemporary sources are of possible relevance here: the works of Josephus; two synagogue prayers; and the extant Aramaic Targumim.

3.3.1.1 Josephus

Josephus does not explicitly mention any “kingdom” associated with God in any of his writings, much less in connection with the Pharisees. It would be idle speculation to offer reasons for this. In a chapter devoted to consideration of explicit instances of the Divine Kingdom, further consideration of Josephus’ stance is out of place. Nevertheless, as discussed in Section 1.5.5.4, there is every reason to suspect that, according to Josephus, the Pharisees saw the observance of torah as the only appropriate response to the universally and “here-and-now” present kingdom of God. This is in keeping with Jub. 50:9 (cf. L.A.B.).

3.3.1.2 Synagogue Prayers

One Aramaic synagogue prayer, whose extant version was redacted in the third century or later, but which is commonly considered to contain traditions going back to the first century, contains explicit references to the kingdom of God. That it reflects Pharisaic convictions (though not necessarily beliefs exclusive to the Pharisees) will be assumed on the grounds of the influence of the Pharisees in the pre-70 synagogue.

---

106 Pss. Sol. 17:3, As. Mos. 10:1. See also the earlier Ps 103:19.
108 See Section 1.4.2.2.
The קדיש “Kaddish”

The קדיש “Kaddish”

Glorified and sanctified be God’s great name throughout the world which he has created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom in your lifetime and during your days, and within the life of the entire house of Israel, speedily and soon; and say, Amen.

The K(Q)addish prayer is properly a doxology, a short prayer added to the end of principal sections of the Jewish liturgy. The traditions it embodies, if not the exact wording, go back to at least before A.D. 70. It expresses hope that God may reign over his kingdom soon, within the lifetime of the worshipper, i.e. that his kingdom may be effective. Contrary to numerous writers, the verb here is neither “to come” nor “to establish” and so is not a good parallel to the similar petition in the Our Father (Matt 6:10, Luke 11:2).

The kingdom here is likely to be the divine sovereignty lived out by those who observe the Torah (practice torah). This is not to say that God’s kingdom exists only for such people, but that by observing the Torah they live out the reality of the here-and-now kingdom. The previous sentence, like that of the next petition in Jesus’ prayer, refers to God’s will, which to the hearer would mean little else than the Torah. The following petition of the Kaddish asks that God may soon rule in the lives of all Israel,114 no doubt through diligent

113 The two principal Hebrew words meaning “to come” (Aramaic: אֲלֵיהוֹ, אֵלֶּה) and אֶלֹהָי never occur in Jewish literature of the period under study in connection with מָלַיְמָה - a fact which will be explored and exploited in Section 3.7. The establishment (משה “to establish”) of a kingdom occurs in 2 Chr 7:18 and with מְלַיְם in: 1 Sam 20:31, 1 Kgs 2:12, 1 Chr 17:11, 28:7, 2 Chr 12:1. אֶל “to establish” does not occur in connection with מְלַיְם. Meyer, (1999), “Appointed Deed, Appointed Doer”, 171, saw a parallel between this and the parallels to Luke 10:9,11 (see Section 3.3.2) and Isa 52:7 (see Section 2.2.1.2).
114 Buchanan, (1970), Consequences of the Covenant, 65, apparently interpreted this to mean that “to pray for God’s kingdom was the same as praying for the restoration of the Davidic kingdom”. However there is nothing in the prayer that points clearly to this.
observance of his will (Torah). If this is the case, the Kaddish prayer was not originally interpreted eschatologically.\textsuperscript{115}

### 3.3.1.3 The Targumim

Targumim will be considered here which explicitly mention the Divine Kingdom and which may be dated to the pre-70 period, using Chilton’s dating criteria.\textsuperscript{116} Those of the post-70 period will be considered in Section 3.5.1.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pre-70 Tannaitic (universal)</th>
<th>Tgs. Pentateuch</th>
<th>Tg. Neb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neof. Exod 15:18</td>
<td>Jer 10:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G. Exod 15:18</td>
<td>Jer 49:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frg. P Exod 15:18</td>
<td>Obad 21b\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zech 14:9a\textsuperscript{r}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{116} For preliminary comments on the choice of targumim, see Sections 1.6.5 and 2.3.1.2.
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NRSV of Exod 15:18
The LORD will reign for ever and ever.

Tg. Neof.,\textsuperscript{117} Tg. C.G.,\textsuperscript{118} Frg. Tg. P\textsuperscript{119} Exod 15:18

\textit{Neof.} פָּרְסֵדַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאָה תְּלֵה הָאָדָם כּוֹלֵךְ מֵאָלֶמֶת אֱלֹהִים פֶּלֶג הַמַּרְאָה. יִהְיֶה הָאָדָם מֵאָלֶמֶת עַל עֹלֵם עָלָם.

\textit{C.G.} יִוְרָדֶה אֲדָמָה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאָה תְּלֵה הָאָדָם כּוֹלֵךְ מֵאָלֶמֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. יִהְיֶה הָאָדָם מֵאָלֶמֶת עַל עָלָם עָלָם.

\textit{Frg. P} בַּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאָה תְּלֵה הָאָדָם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאָה תְּלֵה הָאָדָם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Translation of Tgs. Neof.,\textsuperscript{120} C.G.,\textsuperscript{121} Frg. P\textsuperscript{122} Exod 15:18

\textit{Neof.} The children of Israel said: How the crown of kingship becomes you, O Lord! . . . Of the Lord is the kingship before the world and for all ages.

\textit{C.G.} The Lord shall reign: The Israelites said: Kingship is the Lord’s, in this world; and it is His in the world-to-come. The Lord will reign forever and ever.

\textit{Frg. P} and the Israelites will say: “(His) kingship is the Lord’s, in this world and in the world to come - it is His.”

These three may be considered together because each represents a targum on Exod 15:18 with the use of the equivalent of מֵאָלֶמֶת and because each betrays universalistic associations of “kingdom”, which point to a pre-70 genesis for their tradition(s).

Tg. C.G. is structured like a midrash with the Hebrew literally translated, in between which is the targumic explanation. The explanation of Tg. C.G. is effectively the same as Frg. Tg. P. The first half of Tg. Neof. agrees in substance with the first part of what the Israelites say in Tg. C.G. and Frg. Tg. P.

In each case, “the Lord” possesses the מֵאָלֶמֶת “kingdom” (in the translation “kingship”). But whereas Tg. Neof. has “before the world and for all ages”, Tg. C.G. and Frg. Tg. P have “in this world and the world to come”. Tg. Neof. anchors “kingdom” firmly and only in this present earthly world, whereas Tg. C.G. and Frg. Tg. P see the Divine Kingdom as extending into the new world brought about by God.

\textsuperscript{117} Díez Macho, (1968), Neophyti I II, 101.


\textsuperscript{119} M. L. Klein, (1980), The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch I, 80. See also McNamara, (1966\textsuperscript{2}), The NT and the Palestinian Targum, 207.

\textsuperscript{120} McNamara, (1994\textsuperscript{ET}), Targum Neofiti I, Exodus, 67.

\textsuperscript{121} M. L. Klein, (1986), Genizah Manuscripts, 246.

\textsuperscript{122} M. L. Klein, (1980), The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch II, 48.

\textsuperscript{123} Dalman, (1902\textsuperscript{ET}), Words of Jesus, 182-83.
John P. Meier\textsuperscript{124} claimed that in each case of targumim to Exod 15:18, the Hebrew verb is replaced by the abstract noun “kingdom”. However, in the BHS, the word קָלָם may be either a noun or a verb, so that an equally viable translation of the Hebrew would be: “The LORD is king for ever and ever.” Thus, in these Targum examples, “kingdom” could just as easily replace the noun “king”. The Targumist is more likely to have done this, given the various methods of translation available to him (see Section 1.6.2). But what is the “kingdom”?

\textit{Tg. Neof.} Exod 15:18 has two relevant occurrences of the emphatic מָלַךְ. The first is a celebratory response to a redeeming action that the Lord will do, the second to a redeeming action (Red Sea) that he has done. The emphasis is clearly on God’s saving activity both past and eschatological, though there is no suggestion of other-worldliness. The presence of the crown\textsuperscript{125} in the first and the addition of “before the world” in the second, would indicate that it is God’s kingship or rather God’s victory as king that is being celebrated.

\textit{Tg. C.G.} Exod 15:18 is a small midrash. The Lord’s “kingdom” is presently in this world and is also his in the “world-to-come”. This may refer to two spatial spheres, though it is more likely to refer to the fact of God’s kingship throughout the (two) ages.

\textit{Frg. Tg.} P Exod 15:18 is another midrash, though much longer than the other targumim. Explaining “the Lord will reign”, it chronicles three nights when הָלַךְ הָאָדָם “the Lord was revealed”: on the world to create it; to Abraham to tell him of the conception of Isaac; and on the Egyptians. On the fourth night it looks forward to a future “when the world will reach its fixed time to be redeemed”.\textsuperscript{126} The “kingdom” could refer either to the kingdom of God which encompasses this world and the world to come, or it could mean that God is king (his kingship) in this world and in the world to come. Neither can be determined with certainty.

\textsuperscript{124} Meier, (1994), \textit{Marginal Jew II}, 263.
\textsuperscript{125} See also \textit{Tg. Ps.-J.} Exod 15:18 and \textit{Frg. Tg.} V Exod 15:18.
\textsuperscript{126} Cf. \textit{Tg. Neof.} Exod 12:42 and \textit{Tg. Ps.-J.} Exod 12:42. Onqelos provided a typical literal translation. See also Chester, (1986), \textit{Divine Revelation and Divine Titles}, 192-99.
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Tg. Neb. Jer 10:7,10

NRSV of Jer 10:7a,10a

7 Who would not fear you, O King of the nations? For that is your due; among all the wise ones of the nations and in all their kingdoms there is no one like you.

10a But the LORD is the true God; he is the living God and the everlasting King.

Tg. Neb. Jer 10:7,10a127

אֵל שָׁבַע יְהֹוָה בַּעֲמָם בְּכָל עָלְפָיו

לֹא בִּלְעַד אֶחָד אֶחָד קָרֵם בַּעֲמָם בְּכָל מָלָכָיו

יהי יִשְׁמַע לָעֲשָׂר הַבַּעֲמָם בְּכָל שִׂמְעָה בְּכָל מִלָכָיו

. . . יְהֹוָה בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ אֵל שָׁבַע יְהֹוָה בַּעֲמָם בְּכָל עָלְפָיו

10a

Translation of Tg. Neb. Jer 10:7,10a128

7 Who shall not fear before you, O King of all the Ages? For the kingship is yours; since among all the wise men of the nations and among all their kingship there is none beside you.

10a But the Lord God is truth. He is the Living God and King of Ages.

Chilton doesn’t treat Tg. Neb. Jer 10:7,129 though its universal connotations would suggest a pre-70 origin for the tradition.130 The context is a prayer of praise.

The first “kingship” in v. 7 may also be translated as “kingdom” so that the Divine Kingdom is all the nations / kingdoms of this and all the ages.131 The phrase “there is none beside you” is a repeat from v. 6 and probably turns the Hebrew “there is no one like you” into an “assertion of monotheism”.132 It is thus not necessarily an affirmation that the Divine King is present in his kingdom among the nations, though that connotation should not be ruled out. Apart from this possibility, no firm conclusion as to the notion of the Divine Royal Presence may be drawn from this targum.

130 R. Hayward, (1987ET), The Targum of Jeremiah, 38, claimed that the foundations of Tg. Neb. Jer were laid in the first century A.D.
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**Tg. Neb. Jer 49:38**

NRSV of Jer 49:38

and I will set my throne in Elam, and destroy their king and officials, says the LORD.

Translation of Tg. Neb. Jer 49:38

And I will set the throne of my kingdom in Elam, and I will destroy from there king and rulers, says the Lord.

The Hebrew Jer 49:38 is part of an oracle vv. 34-39, made by Jeremiah, presumably at the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah (ca. 597 B.C.) against Elam, which lay north east of the Persian Gulf. At the time, Elam appeared to threaten Babylon but was turned back by Nebuchadnezzar, thus perhaps dashing the hopes of the exiled Jews for an early return. 

Ignored completely by Chilton, Tg. Neb. Jer 49:38 may be dated to the pre-70 period because the destruction to be wrought by the Lord is to be much wider in scope and area than the Hebrew oracle which limits it to the key figures of Elam.

In the present verse, God is thought one day to place the seat of his power in Elam. In BHS his motive is vengeance, but in the Targum it seems to be more a flexing of divine muscle, exercised over a broader area than Elam. The phrase “the throne of my kingdom” is reminiscent of the OT Ps 103:19, 1 Chr 17:14, 28:5, Sg Three 33 and the Pseudepigraphal 1 Enoch 84:2, all of which associate in one way or another the divine throne and kingdom.

In both the BHS and Tg. Neb. versions of Jer 49:38, “the throne” is a symbol for the Divine Royal Presence, so that in exacting vengeance against Elam, God will personally go there to do it. While an area larger than Elam may be inferred as God’s kingdom and that he himself will move there to carry out the destruction envisaged, little else may be said, as most of the oracle is metaphorical. There could be, after all, no suggestion that the Divine Royal Presence will one day be centred permanently in Elam.

---

136 See Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3.
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Tg. Neb. Obad 21

NRSV of Obad 21
Those who have been saved shall go up to Mount Zion to rule Mount Esau; and the kingdom shall be the LORD’s.

Tg. Neb. Obad 21

Those who have been saved shall go up to Mount Zion to rule Mount Esau; and the kingdom shall be the LORD’s.

Translation of Tg. Neb. Obad 21
Liberators shall go up to Mount Zion to judge the citadel of Esau, and the kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed over all the inhabitants of the earth.

Obad 21 represents the last words of a vision of Obadiah. Despite the retention of “Zion”, the deliberate universalistic perspective dates this targum to the pre-70 period.\(^{139}\)

“The kingdom of the Lord” in a spatial sense can mean nothing else than all the nations and their peoples, v. 15. Yet, for the Targumist, the “kingdom of the Lord” clearly has an additional meaning.

The day of the Lord will bring the destruction of all nations, v. 16. Some מְשַׂרְבִּי יָדָם will find safety on Mount Zion, v. 17. Afterwards, the Davidic kingdom will be repossessed by the remnant people of God, vv. 18-20.\(^{141}\) According to the targum, only then “the kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed over all the inhabitants of the earth”. Apart from the last, this sequence of events is shared by both the Hebrew and the Targum versions.\(^{142}\)

If the Targum sequence is consistent, the kingdom of the Lord will be revealed only over Mount Zion (cf. Tg. Neb. Isa 24:23b)\(^{143}\) since all the inhabitants of the earth will be there. It is a clear reference to the Divine King whose presence was always centred on Mount Zion. Interestingly, the kingdom of the Lord will be revealed after the punishment and only

---

\(^{137}\) Sperber, (1959), The Bible in Aramaic III, 435.


\(^{139}\) Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 78; Chilton, (1984), Galilean Rabbi, 66.

\(^{140}\) Or “those who has escaped”, “refugees”, either of which is better than “liberators”. See: Jastrow, (1903), Dictionary, 852a.

\(^{141}\) Edom, Gilead to the east of the Jordan and the Negeb to the South, were part of the Davidic kingdom, see: Aharoni and Avi-Yonah, (1993), The Macmillan Bible Atlas, 80.

\(^{142}\) Raabe, (1996), Obadiah, 252.

when the survivors gather on Mount Zion, unlike \textit{Tg. Neb. Ezek 7:7,10,}^{144} where it is the revelation of the kingdom that ushers in the punishment.

\textit{Tg. Neb. Zech 14:9}

NRSV of Zech 14:9

\begin{quote}
And the \textit{LORD} will become king over all the earth; on that day the \textit{LORD} will be one and his name one.
\end{quote}

\textit{Tg. Neb. Zech 14:9}^{145}

\begin{quote}
חתנוול מלכותה היא על כל החב נאם ביעברת ההרא היעלון
קרם יד יהוה הוא שמה יישמע לעם בשלום ליה יד מנה.
\end{quote}

Translation of \textit{Tg. Neb. Zech 14:9}^{146}

\begin{quote}
\textit{And the kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed upon all the inhabitants of the earth; at that time they shall serve before the Lord with one accord, for his name is established in the world; there is none apart from him.}
\end{quote}

Chilton\textsuperscript{147} dated this targum to the first century because of: its universalistic application; a statement about the kingdom ascribed to the first century rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanos in association with Zech 14:9;\textsuperscript{148} and the reproduction of the same phrase “and the kingdom of the Lord shall be revealed upon all the inhabitants of the earth” at \textit{Tg. Neb. Obad} 21.\textsuperscript{149}

Despite the exact verbal similarity with \textit{Tg. Neb. Obad} 21, which depicts “all the inhabitants of the earth” as one day gathering in one place, Mount Zion, \textit{Tg. Neb. Zech} 14:9 must refer to the whole earth. For although the nations will be gathered to Jerusalem to do battle, v. 2, this is temporary, cf. vv. 16-20. The kingdom of the Lord will be revealed as having encompassed the earth.

As to the identity of the targumic “kingdom of the Lord” here, we may note that this phrase is a substitute for the Hebrew “the Lord” (as king), just as the verb “shall be revealed” is substituted for “will become” or “shall be”. Although there are other factors to consider in the case of the verbs,\textsuperscript{150} one effect of the verb change is to remove any suggestion that the Lord was ever not king of all the earth. Like \textit{Tg. Neb. Obad} 21, the

\textsuperscript{144} See Section 3.5.1.2.

\textsuperscript{145} Sperber, (1959), \textit{The Bible in Aramaic III}, 498.

\textsuperscript{146} Cathcart and Gordon, (1989\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Targum of the Minor Prophets}, 224.


\textsuperscript{148} Mekilta \textit{Exodus} 17:14, 148-49. Alexander, (1985), “Review of \textit{A Galillean Rabbi and His Bible} by Bruce D. Chilton”, 240, accused Chilton here of anachronism because of his “unquestioning acceptance of the historicity of a dictum attributed to Eliezer b. Hycanus in the Mekhila”.

\textsuperscript{149} See also discussion of \textit{Tg. Neb. Zech} 14:9,16,17 in Section 2.3.1.2.

\textsuperscript{150} See Section 3.7.
“kingdom of the Lord” is a circumlocution for God as king. He will be revealed as having been all along present as king among “all the inhabitants of the earth”.

3.3.2 Jesus

The “kingdom of God” formed the locus classicus of Jesus’ preaching and is a necessary but not sufficient point of reference for a consideration of his eschatological views. Because of this, every book, essay and article which attempts to give an account of the message and intent of Jesus, focuses on this foundational concept.

The vast majority of the modern works on Jesus and the kingdom of God concentrate their attention on the timing of this kingdom. To that question, three possibilities have been put forward.

The oldest modern view is what has become known as “consistent” or “thorough-going” eschatology. This conceives of the kingdom as being for Jesus utterly in the future. One explanation for sayings which otherwise might naturally be interpreted in a present sense is that they are of the “prophetic present”. Scholars who share this view nevertheless argue whether Jesus thought of a kingdom in the very near future - even during his lifetime - or whether he thought of an indeterminate or far off period.

---


152 See the Bibliography for a representative sample.


154 For example: Weiss, (1971ET), Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom, passim; Schweitzer, (1954ET), The Quest of the Historical Jesus, passim; Loisy, (1903ET), The Gospel and the Church, esp. 53, 61, 65, even a verse such as Matt 11:12 Loisy described as implying that the kingdom of heaven was merely “inaugurated in its preparation”; Burkitt, (1910), “Preface to the First Edition”, xvii-xix; Bultmann, (1958NewET), Jesus and the Word, 44; Bultmann, (1955ET), Theology I, 22, though see p. 4 which may be classed as inaugurated eschatology, and Theissen and Merz, (1998ET), The Historical Jesus, 244, who classified Bultmann’s approach as an existentialist form of consistent eschatology. Bultmann’s pupils such as Bornkamm, Fuchs and Conzelmann opted for an existentialist form of inaugurated eschatology, see below. Other scholars who saw an exclusively future kingdom for Jesus include: Goppelt, (1981ET), Theology of the NT I, 53; Käsemann, (1969ET), Questions, 111; Hiers, (1970), Kingdom of God, e.g. 4, on p. 15 Hiers described Dodd’s exegesis as “devious”; Hiers, (1973), The Historical Jesus and the Kingdom of God, iii, 111; Fredriksen, (1988), From Jesus to Christ, 101. For a summary of Hiers’ eschatology, see J. T. Carroll, (1988), Response to the End of History, 12 and, E. P. Sanders, (1985), Jesus and Judaism, 152.
As a reaction to this view, the “realised” eschatology school maintained that Jesus saw himself as fulfilling all eschatological expectations either in his person or ministry or both. In other words, the kingdom of God was very much in the present of Jesus. Any unambiguously future sayings are either to be reinterpreted or given little weight.

The third option, which is still the consensus view today, is that Jesus uttered sayings that indicated both a future and a present understanding. Sayings are categorised as either one or the other. It is usually called “inaugurated” eschatology because the kingdom is thought of as having begun with Jesus, but its full realisation or consummation is still in the future. Scholars continue to argue about the length of time Jesus had in mind between himself and this future consummation.


A fourth option in current favour in many circles is the existentialist or non-eschatological explanation. It is not dissimilar to the earlier short-lived “spiritual” kingdom of so-called liberal theologians and may be considered as a development of “realised eschatology”. Far from preaching a future reality, Jesus was concerned with the present. Jesus himself demythologised any future kingdom and reinterpreted it as the experience of God in the present. This view has peculiar problems of its own, not least of which is its anachronism and its failure to take seriously the perceived objective reality of eschatological images in the first century A.D.

In much of the scholarship that may be classified in one of the above categories, surprisingly little consideration has been given to what Jesus thought the kingdom of God actually was. A notable exception is those few scholars who see the kingdom of God as God the king in action. Many simply prefer to ignore the issue on the grounds that Jesus also ignored it, that is, the Gospels have left no record of Jesus supplying anywhere near a definition of the kingdom of God. Many others, however, either assume that it meant God’s dynamic royal rule or will, or quickly pass from a demonstration of that to the supposedly more important issue of timing. A few see the OT use of ‘kingdom of God’ as normative for Jesus and go on to claim that Jesus actually meant a dynamic reign or sovereignty within a territorial or spatial kingdom.


158 E.g. von Harnack, (1901ET), What is Christianity?, 56, 61. See Section 3.1 and especially Section 4.3.4.1 under Recent Exegetical Comment.

159 See Section 3.1.

160 Many have made such an observation, for example: Goppelt, (1981ET), Theology of the NT I, 67; Scott, (1981), Symbol-Maker, 126; Ricoeur, (1981), “Kingdom in the Parables of Jesus”, 166.


The approach adopted here is unique in several respects. Questions regarding the timing of the kingdom will not be asked of individual instances in Luke-Acts directly but will be considered in the light of the question of the location of the kingdom. The issue of the identity of the kingdom that may be behind an individual example will be considered from the perspective of whether and to what extent the proposed definition of the kingdom of God as the Divine Royal Presence may be admitted.

Given the mass of material regarding the kingdom of God in the Gospels, scholars have adopted several methods of dealing with the material. Many deal with future sayings and parables and present sayings and parables separately. Others divide the material form-critically, still others according to the verbs or phrases associated with it.

Again, the method chosen here will be unique. While every occurrence (or absence when compared to the source) of the Divine “Kingdom” in Luke-Acts was originally considered in the order of appearance, for the sake of clarity, they are presented here and in Sections 3.4 and 3.5.2 divided according to whether they shed more light on one of the three stages of formation of the Gospel. This will enable a clearer picture of the contributions of each stage to be made. In the past, the possible contribution of the various stages in the composition history of the kingdom passages have been largely ignored. It is possible that variations in the timing of the kingdom, for example, may be due more to the influences of these stages than to the indecisiveness or the deliberate obscurity of Jesus.


164 E.g. Chilton, (1979), God in Strength, 14, according to the form-critical categories of Charles F. D. Moule, i.e. proclamation, catechesis and controversy.


Here, then, those instances in Luke-Acts and their parallels that shed more light on the understanding of Jesus himself will be considered.

**Luke 6:20b // Matt 5:3**

NA\(^{27}\) of Luke 6:20b

Μακάριοι οί πτωχοί, ἐκ μέτρα ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

NRSV of Luke 6:20b

“Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God.

In the first of the beatitudes, Matthew adds “in spirit” and alters “of God” to his usual “of heaven”. Luke is the more ancient form and varies little from the Q passage as reconstructed in *The Critical Edition of Q*.\(^{167}\) Both Q and Luke make the audience the disciples (cf. v. 17), whereas in Matthew it is the crowd.\(^{168}\) For Luke too, it is the only mention of the kingdom of God in the Sermon on the Plain (v. 17, Matthew: Mount), whereas Matthew mentions it in total five times.

For present purposes, it is to be noted that the “poor” are “blessed” (natural happiness) because they first possess the kingdom of God and not visa versa. The present tense preserved here and in Matthew and Q over against the other beatitudes which are in the future tense,\(^{169}\) makes it likely that the disciples, here called the “poor”, were already in possession of the kingdom of God because they were followers of Jesus (Luke 5:27). For Luke, the kingdom of God and Jesus are intimately connected.

However, it is asked what Jesus himself might have said, it is likely that the present tense ἐστιν, which Luke wanted to preserve, in fact underlies a future Aramaic sense.\(^{170}\) In other words, we are to take it, at least for the meaning intended by Jesus, as a prophetic present.\(^{171}\) The opposing woe, v. 24, is addressed to those who are rich precisely because they have already received their consolation. The poor have yet to receive their consolation, which will be the kingdom of God.\(^{172}\) In addition, the only other place in Luke-Acts where

---

170 Bultmann, (1963ETRev), *Synoptic Tradition*, 109, thought it future as well, though it has nothing to do with “Messianic salvation”.  
171 In Luke 21:31, ἐστιν is associated with the kingdom of God and is clearly a prophetic present.  
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μικρότερος and ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occur together is Luke 14:15. As a Lukan composition, 14:15 serves merely as an introduction to the parable which follows (in which the “poor” are among the ones invited to the eschatological banquet) and alludes to 13:29 which like Luke 6:20b is from Q. Luke 13:29 and 14:15 look forward to the (future) eschatological banquet where eating in the kingdom of God is the same as being in the presence of the Divine King.\(^\text{173}\)


NA\(^\text{27}\) of Luke 7:28

\[\text{λέγω ἦν γεννητὸς γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου οὐδεὶς ἐστιν.} \]
\[\text{ό δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μεῖζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.} \]

NRSV of Luke 7:28

I tell you, among those born of women no one is greater than John; yet the least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.”

This verse has been and continues to be surrounded by controversy. A recent article by Benedict T. Viviano\(^\text{174}\) conveniently summarised its exegetical history and posited a new interpretation based on a perceived parallel between the verse and Dan 4:17. In particular, Viviano suggested that the whole verse was a unity from the beginning - a beginning most likely in Q and not with Jesus.\(^\text{175}\) Since Dan 4:17 speaks of the present rule of God over the “kingdom of mortals”, Viviano took Luke 7:28 to indicate primarily a realised eschatology and that “the least in the kingdom of God” was Jesus. In other words, the verse is a Christological commentary.

The saying, when compared to the version of Q reconstructed in The Critical Edition of Q, is taken over by Luke with some modification such that Matthew is closer to Q than Luke.\(^\text{176}\) However, the meaning is the same and all three preserve the antithetical parallelism - a feature which points to the verse having been a unity since its beginning.\(^\text{177}\)

Viviano is on less certain ground when he argued that its origin can be more easily traced back no further than Q. There is no good reason for rejecting its dominical origin, but that it indicates a present kingdom may be rejected.


\(^{175}\) Also Kirk, (1998), The Composition of the Sayings Source, 375.


Firstly, the parallel saying in *Gos. Thom.* 46, which betrays targumic-like expansion of the saying, rewrites the last section to read: “whoever among you becomes a child will know the kingdom . . .”!178 The writer was compelled to rewrite the saying so that the kingdom was able to be known and therefore present. Thus he took the more original saying to be indicating a future kingdom.

Secondly, the phrase ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ occurs elsewhere in the Synoptics from different sources, in every case in the context of a future kingdom.179

Thirdly, given the antithetical parallelism, “those born of women” stand in contrast to “the least in the kingdom of God”. Earthly180 status as it is at present, bears no relationship or is reversed (cf. Luke 6:20) to that which will pertain in the kingdom of God.181

Fourthly, the presence of ἐστιν, which is normally unstated in Hebrew/Aramaic and the fact of its position at the end of the phrase rather than at the preferred Hebrew/Aramaic position of the beginning, is cause enough to question the implied tense.182 Either the saying as recorded in Q is the result of manipulation, in which case we are being required by the author(s) of Q to take it in the present tense, or it is once again an example of the prophetic present. The latter is the most likely, given the second observation above.

If Jesus then spoke of a future kingdom of God here, we may take it to mean that status reversal is a feature of the life to be lived in the kingdom of God. Yet, it is also a feature of life lived in the Divine Royal Presence. Such a picture has been previously encountered in chapter 3. Dan 4:17, which is part of a vision of future possibilities and envisages the “lowliest of human beings” being set over “the kingdom of mortals”. Just as importantly, it comes in the middle of two references to divine kingship, Dan 4:3 and 4:34. Also, Zech 12:8 envisages a reversal that will take effect after YHWH has reclaimed his kingdom and moved into the temple: “On that day the L ORD will shield the inhabitants of Jerusalem so that the feeblest among them on that day shall be like David, . . .”. Could it be that for Jesus, the kingdom of God and the Divine Royal Presence are one and the same?

---

182 On the position of the verb in Aramaic, see Section 4.4.1 under Aramaic Retranslation.
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NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 8:10a

\[\begin{align*}
\text{NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 8:10a} & \\
\text{Ψηπὶν ἔδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασίλειας τοῦ θεοῦ.} & \\
\text{NRSV of Luke 8:10a} & \\
\text{"To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God;}" \\
\end{align*}\]

Both Matthew and Luke insert “to know” and change the singular “secret” to “secrets”, which suggests that Matthew and Luke rely on another tradition (Q?) in addition to (or other than) Mark.\textsuperscript{183} The plural points to the various aspects of the teaching of Jesus on the kingdom of God (as opposed to Mark’s singular use which refers to the kingdom of God itself).\textsuperscript{184} It is the message of Jesus that is being stressed by Luke.

Μυστήριον is used in the LXX to translate the Aramaic 咙 in Dan 2:18-19, 27-30, 47, 4:6, where it is God who reveals mysteries. In Wis 2:22 God has secrets unknown to humankind. Joseph A. Fitzmyer proposed that the plural “secrets of the kingdom” may reflect a contemporary use of גנ说明书 “mysteries of God” which can be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.\textsuperscript{185} Although Fitzmyer made nothing of this, if he is right, then it amounts to an equivalence between God and the kingdom of God by the source of Luke 8:10a and therefore possibly by Jesus.


NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 10:9,11b

\[\begin{align*}
\text{NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 10:9,11b} & \\
9 \text{ καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄθενεῖς καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς: ἡγγικέν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ.} & \\
11b \text{ πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσκετε ἐξὶ ἡγγικέν ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ.} & \\
\text{NRSV of Luke 10:9,11b} & \\
9 \text{ cure the sick who are there, and say to them, ‘The kingdom of God has come near to you.’} & \\
11b \text{ Yet know this: the kingdom of God has come near.’} & \\
\end{align*}\]

These verses are part of the speech given by Jesus to “the seventy” prior to their mission of going to the towns and places Jesus later intended to visit, v. 1.


While there is no doubt that the phrase ἡγγικέν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ or its Aramaic equivalent goes back to Jesus (given its frequency in different settings in the Synoptics), its use here also betrays the hand of Luke. In Matthew 4:17 and Mark 1:15 its placement is such that there is no doubt that they considered it to be programmatic for Jesus’ ministry. For Luke the programmatic message of Jesus was Luke 4:43, hence the “nearness” of the kingdom is included only now. It may be legitimate to ask first then, what did it mean for Luke?

The Critical Edition of Q assigned Luke 10:2-12 to Q, except for 11b which is a Lukan repetition of part of v. 9 but omitting ἐφ’ ὑμῖν.187 Even when no healing of the sick takes place, the kingdom of God can still be said to ἡγγικέν. We may note too the link with judgement. The wiping off of the dust is a “portend” of the coming judgement (reinforced by vv. 13-15) associated with the kingdom.188

Much scholarly ink has been spent on the meaning of ἡγγικέν, the third person singular of the perfect indicative active of ἐγγίζω.189 Its literal meaning is “he/she/it has come/drawn near”. Given that the NT perfect depicts a present “state of affairs” of the subject,190 it cannot mean, as many suggest, that the kingdom of God has arrived in the sense that its coming near is at an end.191 It simply means that the coming near of the kingdom has completed its beginning but that it is continuing to come, i.e. that it is still in a state of coming. In other words, whether taken in a temporal or spatial sense, the kingdom of God was not yet there.

---

That this is so may be seen by briefly surveying the other examples of ἐγγίζειν in the NT that are not in association with the kingdom of God.\(^\text{192}\) Matt 26:45,46 // Mark 12:42, depicts Jesus declaring the imminent arrival of his betrayer, Judas. Judas had not yet come near, though he was doing so as Jesus spoke.\(^\text{193}\) Luke 21:8 has similar issues to the kingdom examples, and cannot be considered here. Luke 21:20: “When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation is near.” The desolation of Jerusalem was not its surrounding by armies. The desolation was nevertheless soon to follow. Rom 13:12: Paul contrasts the aorist active προέκυψεν “is advanced” with ἐγγίζειν. That is, this present time or age is almost at an end and the new is about to start.\(^\text{194}\) Jas 5:8: “the coming of the Lord is near”. 1 Pet 4:7 “The end of all things is near”. Clearly the end of all things had not arrived at the time of writing!

Since the Lukan setting is the missionary activity of the seventy prior to the arrival of Jesus, Luke the historian must have taken Luke 10:9,11b to mean simply that welcome or not, the kingdom in the person of Jesus will come and is even now coming.\(^\text{195}\) Eschatologically, of course, it meant also that no matter what the response might be to the missionary efforts of his community, Jesus, as the kingdom, will come.

When it comes to what Jesus might have meant, there seems little doubt that he saw the arrival of the kingdom as being in the near future and that he meant the coming of the Divine King. The element of judgement emphasised with the coming of the kingdom in v. 12,\(^\text{196}\) which is from Q, suggests that the coming kingdom is also the coming of the judge, the Divine King - a theme frequently played out in connection with the Divine King as noted in chapter 3. In particular, if as seems likely,\(^\text{197}\) Jesus used the Aramaic verb בָּרַךְ “to draw/come near”, it finds an immediate parallel in the Hebrew equivalent בָּרַך used in Mal 3:5 in the context of the Divine King coming near to judge those who commit social evils, among which, like Luke 10:10, is inhospitality.\(^\text{198}\)

---


\(^{194}\) Barrett, (1957), Romans, 253, 402.


\(^{197}\) See references cited above.

\(^{198}\) See under Mal 1:14 in Section 2.2.1.3.
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Luke 11:2 // Matt 6:10

NA²⁷ of Luke 11:2b
Πάτερ, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω η βασιλεία σου·

NRSV of Luke 11:2b
Father, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come.

These are the opening words to the Lukan Lord’s Prayer, which Luke apparently preserved unchanged from Q.¹⁹⁹ “Kingdom” stands alone without “of God” in Luke or “of heaven” in Matthew.²⁰⁰ Luke’s is the more primitive version, the Matthean “your will be done” either a later gloss or an addition by the redactor of Matthew.²⁰¹

That this is a virtually explicit reference to the Divine King as the kingdom is indicated by the synonymous parallelism in the two petitions,²⁰² better seen in the Greek, and the notion of a coming of the kingdom in the second petition.

The passive ἀγιασθήτω is a reference to the desire on the part of the one who prays that all people may reverence the Father’s name, i.e. God Himself. The aorist imperative active ἐλθέτω is a petition to the Father, also by the one who prays, that his eschatological kingdom come.²⁰³ Thus “your name” and “your kingdom” stand in a synonymous relationship to each other.

As for the “coming” kingdom, it is one of four places where this verb has as its subject the kingdom of God.²⁰⁴ Nowhere in Jewish literature contemporary to or prior to Luke is

---


²⁰¹ Chilton, (1996), Pure Kingdom, 58-59. As a commentary on “your kingdom come”, the phrase “your will be done” is similar to the rabbinical and Pharisaic understanding that observance of the Torah is both a sign of and brings the kingdom. See Sections 3.2.1 and 3.3.1.

²⁰² Jeremias, (1971²), NT Theology I, 197-98.


the Divine Kingdom said to come. On the other hand, there are numerous places where
the hope is expressed that the Divine King will one day come. What is often not
appreciated is that it is nowhere recorded in the Gospels that Jesus spoke of the coming of
God. He only ever spoke of the “coming”, “drawing near”, “arriving” of the
kingdom. The possibility, therefore, cannot be easily dismissed that Jesus’ “coming”
kingdom is nothing less than the “coming” of the Divine King.

Indeed, such a possibility is strengthened by a parallel with Zechariah. The theme of
eschatological worship, connected as it is here with the Divine Kingdom, recalls Zech
14:1-21 where after the Divine Warrior cleanses Jerusalem, he will become king over all
the earth (v. 9) and all those who survive worship the Divine King (vv. 9, 16-17). Seen
in this light, Luke 11:2 becomes not simply a petition for the effective rule of God in the
world, or for the establishment of God’s territory on earth, but that the Divine King
himself may come.

If so, then the petitions that follow, namely the provision of daily (not eschatological!)
bread, the forgiveness of sins and support through temptation, are not, as Norman Perrin
would have it “experience of God as king”. Rather, because God is king, he is able to
send aid to those in need while still remaining essentially remote (cf. Ps 145, Luke
11:20). They are indicative of an experience of divine help, not of Divine Royal
Presence. Must those we want to forgive be with us before we are able to forgive them?

---

205 Tg. Neb. Mic 4:8 is an apparent exception, but it is to be dated to the Amoraic period, see Section
3.5.1.3.

206 See Section 3.7.1, for a list and discussion of these.

207 \( \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \iota \zeta \omicron \omega \): Matt 4:17 // Mark 1:15, Matt 10:7 // Luke 10:9,11.

208 \( \phi \theta \alpha \nu \omega \): Matt 12:28 // Luke 11:20.

209 Jeremias, (1971), *NT Theology I*, 198, arrived at a similar conclusion, though without recourse
to Zech 14:1-21. He preferred the supposed parallels with the Kaddish, which, however, was not
likely to have been interpreted originally as eschatological. See also the following, though none


212 Beasley-Murray, (1986), *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*, 151, “‘Your kingdom come’ is a prayer
for God himself to come and achieve his end in creating a world”.


the future and for a daily living out of its power *meanwhile* in the present” (my emphasis).

NA\(^{27}\) of Luke 11:20

εὰν δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἐφθασεν ἐφ’ ψάμας ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

NRSV of Luke 11:20

But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you.

This is one of the three key passages that Charles H. Dodd used to argue for his theory of “Realised Eschatology”.\(^{215}\) It is generally conceded, as does *The Critical Edition of Q*, that Luke preserves the Q form, including the important “finger of God”\(^{216}\) as opposed to Matthew’s “Spirit of God”.\(^{217}\) The saying is regarded almost universally as authentic, that is, it is believed that it goes back to Jesus himself.\(^{218}\)

If the addition of ἐγώ, not found in Q, is Lukan, and not the result of a copyist trying to align the text with Matthew, then Luke has attempted to place a Christological emphasis on to the saying, since it places the emphasis of the action on Jesus himself (and not on the “finger of God”).\(^{219}\)

Without the additional ἐγώ, the action is attributed to the “finger of God” with Jesus as the instrument. That the “finger of God” is paralleled with the “kingdom of God” strongly suggests that the two are somehow equated,\(^{220}\) but at the same time it “distances

---

220 Cf. Dunn, (1980), “Demon Possession and Exorcism”, 182 n. 30, though there is no connection here between the Spirit and exorcism, as Dunn frequently suggested.
the kingdom from the earthly arena”. God’s finger (e.g. Exod 8:19 NRSV) is an anthropomorphic way of expressing the belief that the Divine King, while present in heaven is still able to intervene miraculously as the Divine Redeemer in this world, just as other similar expressions, such as God’s “arm”, e.g. Isa 51:9, do the same.222

The significance of the aorist ἐφθασεν of the verb φθάνειν comes naturally to the fore at this point.223 The natural rendering is: “the kingdom of God came upon you”224 in the act of casting out demons. It can mean little else than that God the king, as the kingdom of God, broke into the “here-and-now” momentarily every time Jesus “cast out demons”.225

While maintaining his location in heaven, it is as if, in the exorcism, God reached down and with his finger performed the exorcism. God is capable of acting as Divine King even from heaven. That the kingdom of God has not come to stay, may be seen by the addition of ἑστήκε. This emphasises the localised and temporary entry of the Divine King.226 There is a real sense in which the kingdom had come only to the individual on the receiving end of the exorcism momentarily.227

---

222 Gloege, (1963ET), The Day of His Coming, 142-43.
224 E.g. N. T. Wright, (1996), Jesus, 469 n. 86.
225 Beasley-Murray, (1986), Jesus and the Kingdom of God, 80, saw Luke 11:20 as indicating that the kingdom of God “had occurred in the advent of Jesus”. This would be Luke’s perspective, not that of Jesus himself. See also: E. P. Sanders and M. Davies, (1989), Studying the Synoptic Gospels, 296; Reese, (1992), “Demons : NT”, ABD II, 141a. Clark, (1940), “Realized Eschatology”, 381-82, explained it as “the kingdom of God has reached you”, in the sense of “reaching after to make contact” but not actually present. Meyer, (1999), “Appointed Deed, Appointed Doer”, 164, argued that it meant that the kingdom of God had “virtually” come as opposed to “formally” come. This scholastic distinction, though helpful, is a little anachronistic.
Another possibility is that the verb should be understood to imply that “the kingdom of God will come upon you immediately”, i.e. in the very near future. A number of LXX examples and one NT example of the use of the aorist are to be taken in this way.228

Whatever the truth may be, neither of these possibilities supports the thesis of full-blown realised eschatology, namely that for Jesus the kingdom is a reality permanently at work in his here-and-now.229

Nevertheless, Jesus explained his exorcisms in terms of the kingdom of God struggling against the kingdom of Satan (Luke 11:18230, cf. 4:6).231 He shared this with the author of As. Mos. 10:1, who also equated a future “kingdom of God” with the Divine Royal Presence.232 In an exorcism Jesus saw himself as the instrument through which the Divine King prepared the way for the kingdom.233 Jesus saw the Divine Warrior King as doing battle directly with the forces of evil on behalf of his people. Because the final victory was yet to come (Satan is not yet defeated),234 there can be no sense in which Jesus considered that the kingdom of God had come (to stay).235


229 Cf. Mattill, (1979), Luke and the Last Things, 176. Another possibility that Mattill mentioned is that the aorist is a “prophetic aorist”. This is favoured by O’Neill, (1993), “The Kingdom of God”, 139. However, no other example of this use of the aorist can be found in the Bible.


232 See Section 3.2.3.


NA\(^{27}\) of Luke 13:18-20

\(^{18}\) Εἶλεγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς: τίνι ὁμοία ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίνι ὁμοιόμορος αὐτήν; 
\(^{19}\) ὁμοία ἐστιν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃς λαβὼν ἀθροισμὸς ἐβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἐαυτοῦ, καὶ ἠζητήσαν καὶ ἠζύμησαν εἰς δενδρον, καὶ τὰ πετεινά τοῦ ὀφυανοῦ κατεσκήνωσαν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ. 
\(^{20}\) Καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν: τίνι ὁμοιόμορος τήν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; 
\(^{21}\) ὁμοία ἐστιν ζύμη, ὃς λαμβάνον γυνὴ ἑνακρυφυςεν εἰς άλευρον σάτα τρία ἐμφανής ζύμημόδθη ἄλοι.


\(^{18}\) He said therefore, “What is the kingdom of God like? And to what should I compare it? 
\(^{19}\) It is like a mustard seed that someone took and sowed in the garden; it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the air made nests in its branches.” 
\(^{20}\) And again he said, “To what should I compare the kingdom of God? 
\(^{21}\) It is like yeast that a woman took and mixed in with three measures of flour until all of it was leavened.”

Both parables and the introductory rhetorical questions are from Q, which Luke preserves.\(^{236}\) The different contexts in Matthew and Luke indicate that the parables originally were detached, though the fact that they occur together in both Gospels suggests that their main points are the same.\(^{237}\) The similarity of the parable in Luke to that in Mark is minimal.

The main emphasis of the parables is not on the growth of the seed and the flour, but on the contrast (or reversal, see under Luke 7:28) between the initial and final stages.\(^{238}\) The last stage, namely the tree-sized mustard bush and the three measures (39.4 litres) of flour are deliberate exaggerations, suggesting that they deal with “divine realities”.\(^{239}\)

Once this is clearly seen, the parables do not contradict the picture building up of Jesus’ understanding of the kingdom. Here too the emphasis is on the divine reality of the future

---


\(^{239}\) Cf. Mattill, (1979), Luke and the Last Things, 177-82, for other suggestions. Mattill himself saw in the parables the stress on the certainty and speediness of the coming kingdom. This too implies a future kingdom.
kingdom. The sheltering of the birds in the branches of the mustard tree is generally recognised as an allusion to Ezek 17:22-24 and Dan 4:12,21.\textsuperscript{240} Significantly both passages depict God as Divine King acting in his (earthly) kingdom.\textsuperscript{241} A better parallel might be Ps 84:3, where the sparrow and swallow make nests in the presence of the Divine King.\textsuperscript{242} The birds in the parable are thus to be taken as people who will enjoy life in the presence of the Divine King, i.e. the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{243}

This picture of life in the kingdom is again similar to that depicted in Zech 14:9 and even more so in \textit{Tg. Neb.} Zech 14:9, where such life will be enjoyed by all who survive the punishment of the Divine Warrior. Dan 4:12,21, where the birds stand for Gentiles,\textsuperscript{244} fits well into the parallel with Zech 14:1-21. In Zech 14:9,16 people from nations other than Israel are specifically mentioned as enjoying the Divine Royal Presence.

By appending the parables after the exorcism of the crippled woman, Luke was probably making the point that in Jesus the kingdom was already present. His ministry, particularly that of exorcism was a manifestation of that reality. In comparison with this ‘one-man-kingdom’, the future kingdom of God would encompass all the nations. Thus, if there is any “realised eschatology” to be had in these parables, they have received this at a stage later than that of Jesus.

\textit{Luke 13:28,29 // Matt 8:12,11}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{NA}\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 13:28,29
\item 28 ἔκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμός καὶ ὁ βρυγμός τῶν διόντων. ἔταν διήθησαι 'Αβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἐξω.  
\item 29 καὶ ἠξουσιῶν ἀπὸ ᾧστολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου καὶ ἰμαχίασονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{NRSV} of Luke 13:28,29
\item 28 there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrown out.  
\item 29 Then people will come from east and west, from north and south, and will eat in the kingdom of God.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{240} Ps 104:12 is sometimes quoted here, but is merely an expression of God’s care for nature.

\textsuperscript{241} Beasley-Murray, (1986), \textit{Jesus and the Kingdom of God}, 123.

\textsuperscript{242} See Ps 84:3 under Section 2.2.1.1.


The order of the sayings is reversed in Matthew and they are in quite a different context. In Matthew they form the climax to the healing of the centurion’s servant, whereas in Luke they are in response to a question about the number to be saved. There are numerous other minor differences between the two Gospels, but *The Critical Edition of Q* considered Q to be preserved in order in Matthew but in content largely in Luke.245

The future eschatological banquet is envisaged. Numerous passages in the OT and Pseudepigrapha depict the new order as one where Gentiles and Jews share together a banquet in the presence of the Divine King, usually on Mount Zion.246 It is not simply a banquet arranged by the Divine King for his chosen ones. The phrase “in the kingdom of God” means nothing less than “in the Divine Royal Presence”.


---

**Luke 14:15,16 // Matt 22:1,2**

NA27 of Luke 14:15,16

15 Ἄκουσας δέ τις τῶν συνακειμένων ταύτα ἐπεν αὕτω: μακάριος ἄρτις φάγεται ἐπὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 16 Ο δὲ ἐπεν αὕτω: ἥλιον τις ἐποίει δείπνου μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοὺς

NRSV of Luke 14:15,16

15 One of the dinner guests, on hearing this, said to him, “Blessed is the one who will eat bread in the kingdom of God!”
16 Then Jesus said to him, “Someone gave a great dinner and invited many.

---


3.3 The Presence of the Kingdom of God: The Pharisees and Jesus

Luke 14:15 is a Lukan addition to the Q parable, though it is entirely plausible as an historical reminiscence. It provides both a link to the previous dinner conversation (L) and the subsequent parable (Q). The reference to the kingdom of God originally in v. 16 and attributed to Jesus has been deleted by Luke. This was probably because of its presence in v. 15 which made repetition superfluous.

The reference to the eschatological banquet is in keeping with the images Jesus used to portray the kingdom of God (cf. Luke 13:29). The “happiness” is possibly an allusion to Luke 6:20, which describes the state of one who is in the kingdom, in the presence of the Divine King.

The fact that Luke placed this saying within the context of a meal suggests that for him those who were there at table with Jesus already enjoyed the banquet in the presence of the kingdom, i.e. the Divine King Jesus. The expansion of the Q parable in Luke by the second invitation to the uninvited outside the city (v. 23) may indicate Luke’s own contemporary concern to include Gentiles in the eschatological kingdom of God - the same point made in 13:29.


NA of Luke 18:16,17

16 ὁ δὲ Ἰσαὰκ προσεκαλέσας αὐτὰ λέγων ἀφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχουσιν πρὸς με καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

17 ἀπὸν λέγω σοὶ, ἵνα μὴ δέχηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἶχεν εἰς αὐτήν.

NRSV of Luke 18:16-17

16 But Jesus called for them and said, “Let the little children come to me, and do not stop them; for it is to such as these that the kingdom of God belongs.

17 Truly I tell you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will never enter it.”

---


The antiquity, if not the genuineness, of these sayings from Mark need not be doubted, though Luke has slightly altered the wording.\textsuperscript{251} Their meaning is probably similar to the negative implication of Luke 16:16 (and Luke 6:20), the last time the motif of entering the kingdom was used in Luke. Entry into the Divine Royal Presence is dependent not on one’s own merits, for example by scrupulous observance of the Torah (cf. Luke 10:21),\textsuperscript{252} but on total surrender or dependence on the one in whose gift it is.\textsuperscript{253}

For the redactor, the parallel between the little children coming to Jesus and a little child entering the kingdom of God would have been a none too subtle reminder that in Jesus the kingdom of God was already present to those children.\textsuperscript{254}

Again, we may note that the kingdom of God is entirely passive. There is no hint of action on its part. The kingdom of God is not solely the Divine King in action. It is first and fundamentally simply the Divine Royal Presence.


NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 18:24,25,29

\begin{itemize}
  \item [24] Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [περίλυπον γενόμενον] ἔπειν· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται;\textsuperscript{25}
  \item [25] εὐκοπῶτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρῆμας βελώνης εἰσελθείν ή πλοῦτον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθείν.
  \item [29] ὁ δὲ ἔπειν αὐτοῖς: ἠλθεν λέγω ἵπποι ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐστιν ἐξ αἱρήκειν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀξιόλογος ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.
\end{itemize}

NRSV of Luke 18:24,25,29

\begin{itemize}
  \item [24] Jesus looked at him and said, “How hard it is for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God!
  \item [24] Indeed, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God.”
  \item [29] And he said to them, “Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house or wife or brothers or parents or children, for the sake of the kingdom of God,
\end{itemize}

Luke 18:24,25 is identical to Mark except for a change in verb and tense, from εἰσελθεῖσθαί to εἰσπορεύονται, from a future to a present. It is possible that Luke is


\textsuperscript{252} Pereira, (1983), \textit{Ephesus}, 120.


\textsuperscript{254} Cf. Pereira, (1983), \textit{Ephesus}, 123.
using the present in a future sense, though if that is the case why the need to change the already future tense to a present? The answer is probably that there is a real sense in which those who wish to enter continually strive to enter.

The older Markan future tense is in keeping with Jesus’ understanding of the kingdom that is emerging, just as the use of the motif of entering the kingdom is a future reality and one in which dependence on anything other than God (e.g. wife etc.) prevents. The kingdom is not yet, and one must continually make preparations, so that when it - the Divine King, the saviour (v. 26) - comes, one will be fit to enter into the Divine Royal Presence. The phrase “to enter the kingdom of God” is the equivalent of “being saved”, because by entering into the Divine Royal Presence we are “saved” by Him.

Luke 18:29 contains a significant insertion by Luke of “for the sake of the kingdom of God”. Mark has “for my sake and for the sake of the good news”, Matthew simply “for my name’s sake”. Luke saw the kingdom of God as intimately associated with Jesus himself, just as he saw the good news as being that of the kingdom of God.

---


3.4 THE PRE-LUKAN COMMUNITY

For comments on the method of approach, see Section 3.3.2.

Luke 4:15 // Mark 1:15, Matt 4:17

NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 4:15
\begin{equation*}
kαί αὐτὸς ἐδιδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων.\end{equation*}

NRSV of Luke 4:15
He began to teach in their synagogues and was praised by everyone.

Despite the noted parallels, Luke 4:14-15 is probably neither from Mark nor Q but is rather a “summary” statement written by Luke himself and typical of others in his work.\textsuperscript{259}

His source however is disputed.\textsuperscript{260} Although it is likely to have been inspired by the Markan parallel, either it early received independent form in the pre-Lukan community and was later moulded by Luke (effectively L), or Luke composed it directly, based on his reading of Mark.

The omission of “kingdom of God” and “repentance” in v. 15 and the inclusion of “the Spirit” in v. 14 suggest that Luke moulded this summary from existing material. On the one hand, it is not likely that he would have deliberately removed references to the kingdom of God, nor on the other, would he have inserted himself references to the Holy Spirit.

The presence of the “Spirit” in 4:14 comes between two other instances. In 4:1 Jesus is “led” by the Spirit and in v. 18 the “Spirit” compels Jesus to preach. Both of these passages show signs of composition prior to Luke.\textsuperscript{261} That Jesus was “filled with the power of the Spirit” in v. 14 (and cf. 4:1) suggests that Jesus was subject to the “Spirit”,


\textsuperscript{261} Luke 4:1 is from Mark, 4:18 from L.
not simply empowered by it\textsuperscript{262} - an unlikely picture from the redactor, who took pains to portray Jesus as always the one in control (e.g. Luke 23:46).

The omission of “kingdom of God” fits the emerging picture that the redactor saw Jesus himself as embodying the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God could not be taught (as opposed to proclaimed) by Jesus because he was the kingdom of God.

As for the omission of “repentance”, this is in keeping with the fact that while both Matthew and Mark associate the approach of the kingdom of God with the need for repentance, a connection that is probably from Jesus, Luke nowhere associates the two. Why? Could it be because for Luke, Jesus as the kingdom of God, was already present and thus repentance was superfluous? An affirmative answer to that question is indicated by Luke 3:3, a summary of the preaching made by John the Baptist. It included a call for repentance in preparation for the coming of “the Lord” (3:4). Jesus had not yet arrived on the scene.

\textbf{Luke 9:60,62 // Matt 8:22}

\textit{NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 9:60-62}

60 ἐίπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς, οὐ δὲ ἐπέλθωσιν διάγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
61 Ἐίπεν δὲ καὶ ἄτερος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψον μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἴκον μου.
62 Ἐίπεν δὲ [πρὸς αὐτῷν] ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χείρα ἐπ τὸ ἄροτρον καὶ βέλτων εἰς τὰ ἄποστολοι ἐμβεβέλτωσεν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

\textit{NRSV of Luke 9:60-62}

60 But Jesus said to him, “Let the dead bury their own dead; but as for you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God.”
61 Another said, “I will follow you, Lord; but let me first say farewell to those at my home.”
62 Jesus said to him, “No one who puts a hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God.”

\textit{The Critical Edition of Q} excluded the second part of v. 60 and vv. 61-62 from Q after initially including verse 62.\textsuperscript{263} Thus Luke 9:60b comes from the hand of the redactor and is typical of his insistence that Jesus and his disciples proclaim the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{264}


\textsuperscript{264} Kümmel, (1961\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Promise and Fulfilment}, 125 n. 75; Perrin, (1967), \textit{Rediscovering}, 144.
Verses 61-62 do not appear in either Matthew or Mark and so could either be editorial addition or from Luke’s special source. Considering the length, the latter is more likely to be the case, and so vv. 61-62 betray the influence of the pre-Lukan community.

Thought by some to be reminiscent of the conversation between Elisha and Elijah in 1 Kgs 19:20, the saying emphasises the ethical prerequisites of the kingdom. Whereas Elijah granted the request, following Jesus in discipleship is an all or nothing effort demanding single-mindedness and detachment from one’s previous way of life.

A better parallel can be found which supports this conclusion and provides a hint to its milieu within the community. The NRSV of 2 Thess 1:4-5 reads:

4 Therefore we ourselves boast of you among the churches of God for your steadfastness and faith during all your persecutions and the afflictions that you are enduring.
5 This is evidence of the righteous judgement of God, and is intended to make you worthy (καταξιωθηναι) of the kingdom of God, for which you are also suffering.

The verb καταξιωθη is also found in Luke 20:35 where it refers to “the age to come”. It is similar in meaning to the verb εὐθετο, from which εὐθετός in Luke 9:62 is derived. As already suspected, Luke 9:62 may well be a construction of the pre-Lukan community encouraging faithfulness (steadfastness and faith) to the demands of belief in Jesus in the face of suffering under persecution and affliction. No doubt persecution encouraged dangerous nostalgia for one’s pre-Christian life. Only those who thus remain faithful will be worthy or fit for the kingdom. In any case, it certainly fits a pre-Lukan context better than that of the historical Jesus, where no such persecution of the disciples was yet under way.

Further, if, as seems likely, this saying does come from the early pre-Lukan community, it is not impossible that the kingdom of God referred to is no less than the Holy Spirit. It is, after all, faith in Jesus that is the essential prerequisite for its bestowal: “If then God gave

---


268 Cf. Dalman, (1902ET), Words of Jesus, 119.
them the same gift that he gave us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I
to hinder God?” (Acts 11:17).  


NA²⁷ of Luke 12:31,32

31 πλὴν ζητείτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑµῖν.
32 Μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ µικρὸν ποίµιον, ἐὰν εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑµῶν
dούναι ὑµῖν τὴν βασιλείαν.

NRSV of Luke 12:31,32

31 Instead, strive for his kingdom, and these things will be given to you as well.
32 “Do not be afraid, little flock, for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.

According to The Critical edition of Q,²⁷⁰ Luke preserved Q in v. 31 so that “first” and “and his righteousness” in Matthew were additions by that redactor to Q.

As with Luke 9:60,62, 12:31 is better thought of as coming from the early pre-Lukan (Christian) community. The context gives this away. The worry over food and drink (v. 29, cf. 1 Cor 8:8) echoes Rom 14:17 (cf. Sir 30:24-25). Although Rom 14:17 is in the context of what sort of food and drink is suitable, Paul nevertheless contrasted the worry over food and drink with the kingdom of God.²⁷¹ Concern for food and drink and of the right sort, should not deter the Christian from living as if the kingdom of God were already present. In fact, as will be shown, the kingdom was present in the Spirit.

Excluded from Q by The Critical edition of Q, 12:32 is an addition made by Luke.²⁷² Whether it is from the redactor himself or an isolated saying which was inserted here by the redactor is difficult to determine. The latter is possible on the grounds of its stand-alone quality and from the observation that Luke 12:22-31 loses nothing by its removal. In


²⁷¹ Morris, (1988), Romans, 488. On Rom 14:17, see Sections 1.4.3, 3.6.3 and, 4.3.4.1 and 4.4.2 under Recent Exegetical Comment.

addition, the motif of the giving of the kingdom by the Father is one peculiar to the Gospel of Luke. At the very least, Luke 12:32 was inserted by Luke because of the kingdom motif in the previous Q verse.\textsuperscript{273}

The motif of the giving of the kingdom is not confined to L, though it occurs only elsewhere in the special Matthew saying of Matt 21:43. There is a trace of Dan 7:27 here too.\textsuperscript{274} But what is the kingdom that is given here? That what is meant here is the Holy Spirit was first proposed in modern times by Richard J. Sneed\textsuperscript{275} and later by James D. G. Dunn and others.\textsuperscript{276}

Dunn made the observation that Luke 11:13(Q) is the only other place in the third Gospel where Jesus spoke of the Father giving anything (to those other than Jesus himself), and there it is the Holy Spirit that is given. To this may be added: Luke 24:49, where it is Jesus who will mediate this gift from the Father;\textsuperscript{277} Acts 1:4-5, 2:33, where the Father’s promise is nothing less than the Holy Spirit; and Acts 5:32, 15:8, where the Holy Spirit is something that God gives to those who have faith.\textsuperscript{278} In addition, there is the more difficult manuscript variant to Luke 11:2(Q),\textsuperscript{279} which, because it is likely to be a liturgical variation to the original Lord’s Prayer, may represent a pre-Lukan tradition independent of Q.

It is not unreasonable then to suppose that what the pre-Lukan community had in mind for the kingdom was the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{280} Indeed, by the use of Joel 2:23-27 in the Pentecost account, the Holy Spirit is presented in Acts as the fulfilment of eschatological hopes.\textsuperscript{281}


\textsuperscript{274} See Section 3.2.3.


\textsuperscript{276} See Section 3.3.2 under Luke 11:2.


\textsuperscript{278} Cf. John 3:34, Rom 5:5, 1 Cor 12:7, 2 Cor 1:22, 5:5, 1 Thess 4:8, 2 Tim 1:7, 1 John 3:24, 4:13.


\textsuperscript{280} Contrary to: Franklin, (1970), “Eschatology of Luke-Acts”, 198; Menzies, (1991), \textit{Early Christian Pneumatology}, 184 n. 3. Their reasons are unconvincing because they failed to take into account the possibility that the various stages of composition each contributed their own nuance, though this criticism can be levelled at James D. G. Dunn, and Stephen S. Smalley as well.


Finally, the formula Μη φοβοῦ is often recited in the context of a theophany, in the Synoptics exclusively in Luke (except for Mark 5:36). In the OT the command is most often used in the context of a divine (or angelic) theophany. This would indicate too that a present Divine Presence or gift is indicated by “the kingdom”. The Holy Spirit was in the present of the pre-Lukan community.

Acts 1:3,6

NA of Acts 1:3,6,8
3 οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν ἐαυτὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν πολλοίς τεκμηρίοις, δι’ ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ἦπεριόμονος αὐτοῖς καὶ λέγων τά περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.
6 Οἱ μὲν αὐξομελόντες ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες: κύριε, εἶθεν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἐπικαθιστανεῖς τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἱσραήλ;
8 ἄλλα λήμψεθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ αὐξομελός θεοῦ ἐπί σας καὶ ἐσεθεῖ μου μάρτυρες εἰς τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ [ἐν] πάσῃ τῇ οὐδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἐως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

NRSV of Acts 1:3,6,8
3 After his suffering he presented himself alive to them by many convincing proofs, appearing to them during forty days and speaking about the kingdom of God.
6 So when they had come together, they asked him, “Lord, is this the time when you will restore the kingdom to Israel?”
8 But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.”

Acts 1:3,6 form part of the introduction to Acts. A recapitulation of the events in the third Gospel and so with the exception of 9-11 was composed by Luke himself,

---

though some of it from material supplied by his sources.\textsuperscript{286} In short, we may say that the substance is from the pre-Lukan community but the composition is Luke’s.

Acts 1:3 reiterates Luke’s own concept of Jesus as the first proclaimer of the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{287} The apostles will continue that proclamation.\textsuperscript{288} It also anticipates the question in v. 6.\textsuperscript{289}

The question asked by the apostles in Acts 1:6 is similar to the question of the Pharisees in Luke 17:20 and concerns the timing of the kingdom. As in Luke 17:20-21, Jesus did not answer the question immediately. He answered it in v. 8.\textsuperscript{290} The restoration of the kingdom to Israel will not be as perhaps the apostles envisaged, a political revival,\textsuperscript{291} but will be the Holy Spirit coming on the new Israel, the apostles and disciples of Jesus.\textsuperscript{292} The “promise of the Father” in v. 4, in view of Luke 11:13 and Jesus’ words regarding a baptism with the Holy Spirit in v. 5, is likely to have been the Holy Spirit, especially given the additional parallel between the “power from on high” promised by the Father in Luke 24:49 and the “power” associated with the Holy Spirit in Acts 1:8. The parallelism between Acts 1:8 and v. 3 also strongly points to the Holy Spirit being closely associated with, if not synonymous with, the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{293}

The use of επήρχομαι to describe the coming of the Holy Spirit is not insignificant. In Luke 1:35 the Holy Spirit “came upon” Mary, the result of which was the conception of Jesus - for Luke the embodiment of the kingdom. Here, the coming of the Holy Spirit, as the answer to the question of v. 6, is itself the kingdom, at least for the pre-Lukan community.


\textsuperscript{287} On the phrase περί τῆς βασιλείας, see comment in Section 3.5.2 under Luke 9:11.


\textsuperscript{290} Conzelmann, (1961\textsuperscript{ET}), Theology of St. Luke, 163, noted that Acts 1:6 is answered by v. 8, but interpreted the connection differently.


Acts 14:22

NA²⁷ of Acts 14:22
επιστηρίζοντες τάς ψυχάς τών μαθητῶν, παρακαλοῦντες εμμένειν τή πίστει καὶ ἀτί διά πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσέλθειν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

NRSV of Acts 14:22
There they strengthened the souls of the disciples and encouraged them to continue in the faith, saying, “It is through many persecutions that we must enter the kingdom of God.”

This has been interpreted either as simply referring to future individual reward for persecution (cf. Luke 24:26(L))²⁹⁴ or to a present reality of which persecution is an inevitable outcome.²⁹⁵ The themes of θλίψις “affliction” and διωγμός “persecution”, pepper Acts.²⁹⁶ They are themes identified more with the writings of Paul and his community (see under Luke 9:62),²⁹⁷ which make persecution the means by which one can be made fit for (entry into) the kingdom. This suggests that this entire section (vv. 1-23) has, as at least one of its sources, the Pauline communities mentioned.²⁹⁸ Nevertheless, Luke himself has composed v. 22 along with the entire section from disparate sources and so we may reasonably search also for a Lukan stamp.

The theme of entering the kingdom is typical of Luke (see under Luke 16:16) and always occurs in the sense of a future kingdom.²⁹⁹ It cannot here for Luke refer to the Holy Spirit for two important reasons. First, it is always the Holy Spirit that enters (comes) to the believer, not the believer who enters the Holy Spirit. But more importantly, for Luke the present afflictions stand in such stark contrast (reversal) to the future kingdom that it is not possible for the kingdom to be in his present.³⁰⁰ Rather, faithfulness to Jesus is the prerequisite for later entry into his presence, into the kingdom.

²⁹⁸ Cities mentioned: Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, Antioch. All but one are mentioned in the Pauline writings as being founded by or at least connected with Paul: Iconium, 2 Tim 3:11; Lystra, 2 Tim 3:11; Antioch, Gal 2:11, 2 Tim 3:11. Derbe is the one not mentioned in the Pauline writings.
3.5 THE YAVNEAN RABBIS, THE SYNAGOGUE AND LUKE

Luke, the redactor of the third Gospel and author of Acts, wrote his two-volume work after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 and probably before the end of the first century. Most scholars proceed also on the basis that he wrote outside Palestine for a largely Gentile audience. 301

These points will be assumed here, yet they beg an important series of questions. What was the conception of the “kingdom of God” held by Luke and those who represented late first century Judaism? Were they different? If so, were those differences reflected in Luke 17:20-21? The first two questions will be answered in this Section, the third in chapter 4.

3.5.1 The Yavnean Rabbis and the Early Post-70 Synagogue

Just four documents will be considered as of potential relevance in this section: the Mishnah; 4 Ezra; 2 Baruch; and the Aramaic Targumim.

No attempt will be made here to equate what is said in these documents with the understanding of pre-70 Pharisees. 302 What is aimed for here is to gain a picture of what the Yavnean rabbis and the Palestinian synagogues of Luke’s time thought of the kingdom of God, i.e. its identity and especially its location. Parallels, if any, will be drawn between this picture and that gained in Section 2.6.4 regarding the notion and location of the Divine King.

3.5.1.1 The Mishnah

The word “kingdom” occurs in just a few places in the Mishnah in reference to God, 303 and they can easily be divided into three groups. 304 The indications of the date of the

---

301 See Section 1.2.3.

302 The relationship between the pre-70 Pharisees and the post-70 rabbis, for example, is not a simple one-to-one correspondence, see Section 1.5.3.


traditions represented, give confidence that the phrases “his kingdom” and “kingdom of heaven” were employed by the rabbis around the time Luke was redacted.\textsuperscript{305}

\textit{m. Ber. 2:2I, 5E}\textsuperscript{306}

\begin{verbatim}
m. Ber. 2:2I, 5E

2:2I "So that one may first accept upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven and afterwards may accept the yoke of the commandments.

2:5E He said to them, “I cannot heed you to suspend from myself the kingdom of heaven [even] for one hour.”
\end{verbatim}

This first group yields the most for our purposes. Both sayings refer to the recitation of the Shema (Deut 6:4-9, 11:13-21, Num 15:37-41).\textsuperscript{308} \textit{m. Ber. 2:2I} distinguished this from the מלאכתו של פיה “yoke of the commandments”.\textsuperscript{309}

\textit{m. Ber. 2:2I} is attributed to rabbi Joshua b. Qorha who flourished in the middle of the second century.\textsuperscript{310} That the term “yoke” occurs in Matthew and Acts\textsuperscript{311} in a similar context would suggest that the terminology was current in the first century,\textsuperscript{312} an observation confirmed by the fact that “yoke” is used in a similar way in Jeremiah (2:20,
According to the early rabbis, recitation of the Shema meant that the reciter acknowledged the uniqueness and oneness of God and thus placed himself under the sovereignty of God, since “heaven” is often merely a circumlocution for God. Once under that sovereignty, life consisted of observance of the commandments or the Torah, or to put it another way, experience of the kingdom of God could be had through the practice of Torah through submission to the will of God as king. Although use of the word “yoke” tends to conjure up notions of burden and monotonous drudgery, carrying out the demands of Torah was, on the contrary, a joyful privilege. In fact, to accept the Torah “yoke of Torah” meant freedom from other yokes, namely that of the state and the normal cares and vicissitudes of life.

There is no eschatological thread with respect to God’s kingdom in the Mishnah, nor does there seem to be any obvious spatial element. God is able to exercise his sovereignty and guidance in the here-and-now through the Torah. In short, one is “in” the kingdom of God if and wherever one accepts the Shema and observes the Torah (cf. Matt 7:21).
There is a subtle but important distinction here between the positions of Josephus and the Mishnah on this point. Josephus seemed to imply - at least for the days before the war - that the kingdom of God was everywhere and that the practice of torah was merely an acknowledgment of that fact.\(^{323}\) The Mishnah, on the other hand, clearly implies that even though it is God that brings the kingdom, it is nevertheless brought to individuals who take upon themselves the “yoke of the kingdom of heaven” so that it can, as it were, exist for them.\(^{324}\)

This change between Josephus and the Mishnah is consistent with the view that the kingdom is nothing less that God Himself as king. Both Josephus and the Mishnah expressed the belief that before the war the Divine Royal Presence - the kingdom of God - was present on the earth, but after the war this presence was to be found primarily in heaven.\(^{325}\) The Divine Royal Presence could be brought to earth, so to speak, wherever and whenever the Torah was observed.

\textit{m. Yoma} 3:8H, 4:1H, 4:2G, 6:2D

\textit{m. Yoma} 3:8H, 4:1H, 4:2G, 6:2D\(^{326}\)

\begin{quote}
ברוך שם חכור מלכורי עליהمم עוה.
\end{quote}

Translation of \textit{m. Yoma} 3:8H, 4:1H, 4:2G, 6:2D\(^{327}\)

\ldots “Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever.”

This group occurs in the tractate \textit{Yoma}, a tractate which deals with the requirements for the Day of Atonement.\(^{328}\) Each is in a cultic setting and originally constituted a response to the different words and actions of the High Priest as he prepared the bull and goats. All are unattributed. The insertion of a comment by rabbi Ishmael b. Elisha who flourished in the early second century at 4:1G, together with its four-fold repetition, suggests that the tradition is older than the insertion.

The emphasis of the response is on the eternal blessedness of “the name of the glory of his kingdom”, a blessedness that is forever. The identity of “his kingdom” is unclear,


\(^{323}\) See Section 1.5.5.4.

\(^{324}\) Cf. also \textit{m. Abot} 3:2E, 3:6A.

\(^{325}\) See Sections 2.5.1.1 and 2.5.1.5.

\(^{326}\) Blackman, (1963-64), \textit{Mishnayoth II}, 286, 289, 290, 300.


\(^{328}\) Cf. 3 \textit{Enoch} 39:2.
though its association with “name” and “glory”, two attributes of God, may point to its being also closely associated with God himself.

*m. Rosh HaSh. 4:5B, E, F, 6A, C*

4:5B “One says the Fathers, Powers, the Sanctification of the Name, including the Sovereignty verses with them, and does not sound the *shofar*;

4:5E “Said to him R. Aqiba, “If he does not sound the *shofar* in connection with the Sovereignty verses, why does he make mention [of them at all]?

4:5F “But: one says the Fathers, the Powers, the Sanctification of the Name, and includes the Sovereignty verses with the sanctification of the day, and then sounds the *shofar*;

4:6A They do not say less than ten Sovereignty verses, ten Remembrance verses, ten *Shofar* verses.

4:6C They do not make mention of verses of Remembrance, Sovereignty, or *Shofar*, which speak of punishment.

This group merely refers to the order of blessings in the additional prayer for the New Year.

4:5B is attributed to rabbi Yohanan b. Nuri from Beth Shearim (in Galilee), who flourished in the first half of the second century. He is frequently depicted in the Mishnah in disputes with rabbi Aqiba who was the most famous Palestinian rabbi of the end of the first century and early second century. This and the fact that the group do not refer to cultic worship but to that of the synagogue, suggests a date for the discussion around the end of the first century.

The Sovereignty verses referred to are any verses from the Bible that allude to divine sovereignty. This means that God was known and referred to as king in the Palestine of the end of the first century. Little else can be deduced.

---

331 DJBP, 683b.
3.5.1.2 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch (Syriac Apocalypse)

These two Jewish apocalyptic works stand apart from others in several respects. First, the general consensus is that they can be dated to around A.D. 100, with 4 Ezra (chapters 3-14) being written before 2 Baruch. Second, the majority of scholars maintain that they were both originally written in Hebrew and that they come from Palestine. Thirdly, and more importantly for the present purpose, a strong case can be made for their having been written by those who were, if not part of, then closely connected with the early Yavnean rabbis and who, like the apocalyptic writers, was struggling to redefine Judaism in the wake of their total defeat by Rome.

In other words, both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch may be taken into account with some confidence in any estimation of early rabbinic notions of the kingdom of God that were circulating at the time of the redaction of Luke.

Having said that, while kingdom references have been detected in other contemporary Jewish/rabbinic literature, none occurs in 4 Ezra and 2 Bar. The absence is especially


noteworthy in 4 Ezra, for like the Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,\(^{339}\) it has a strong and consistent emphasis on the Torah,\(^{340}\) a primary element in the rabbinic understanding of the “kingdom of heaven”.

This absence can best be explained by observing that notions of the Torah in 4 Ezra are closely associated with future events. Indeed, the whole direction of 4 Ezra is to the future rather than to the present, whereas the opposite is the case in the earliest of rabbinic literature, the Mishnah (apart from such exceptions as m. Sot. 9:15 and other so-called apocalyptic passages\(^{341}\)). Nevertheless, obedience to the Torah is called for in the here-and-now.

The writer of 4 Ezra acknowledged the divine origin of the Torah (\textit{lex})\(^{342}\) and its eternal nature, 9:37.\(^{343}\) In 4:23 and 14:21 he lamented the destruction of the written Torah in the catastrophe of 587 B.C., and the failure to observe it.\(^{344}\) By divine inspiration Ezra was able to dictate it once again, 14:37-48. Careful obedience to the Torah or commandments is the sure way of avoiding any further punishment\(^{345}\) and of receiving reward after death.\(^{346}\) The Torah is the embodiment of God’s will, given not to individuals,\(^{347}\) but to Israel.\(^{348}\) Indeed, we might say that the kingdom of God is the Israel that keeps his Torah - a sentiment perfectly in keeping with post-70 Tannaitic Targumim which limit the kingdom of God to “Zion”.

With regard to 2 Bar., the central message is the same, namely that “one has to live according to the Law”.\(^{349}\) It is a message similar to that of Deuteronomy.\(^{350}\) It views the Torah as having effectively replaced the temple: “Zion has been taken away from us, and we have nothing now apart from the Mighty One and his Law” (85:3b). Like

---

\(^{339}\) See Section 2.5.1.2.


\(^{343}\) Cf. Wis 18:4, 2 Bar. 59:2; Stone and F. M. Cross, (1990), \textit{Fourth Ezra}, 308 n. 7.


\(^{345}\) 4 Ezra 7:20-21,24,72,79-81, 8:55-56, 9:11-12,36.


Deuteronomy, in 2 Bar. trespass against the Torah results in punishment (15:5), but those who believe will be rewarded (59:2).

3.5.1.3 The Targumim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tgs. Pentateuch</th>
<th>Tg. Neb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-70 Tannaitic (“Zion”)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isa 24:23</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 24:23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isa 31:4, 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 31:4, 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isa 40:9d, 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 40:9d, 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ezek 7:7, 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ezek 7:7, 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amoraic or later (“congregation”)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neof. Gen 49:2end</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 52:7b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.G. Exod 15:3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mic 4:7b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frg. P Exod 15:3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 52:7b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frg. V Exod 15:18</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 52:7b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ps.-J. Exod 15:18</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 52:7b</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onq. Exod 15:18</strong></td>
<td><strong>Isa 52:7b</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


The whole of Tg. Neof. 49:2 represents non-translation material inserted into the literal rendering of Jacob’s farewell discourse (B. B. Levy, (1987), A Textual Study 274-75). The end represents the response made by Jacob to the opening words of the Shema uttered by his twelve sons. John P. Meier (Meier, (1994), Marginal Jew II, 263, tried to argue that since “kingdom” is parallel both to “name” and “glory” here, it must refer to the mode of God’s being, i.e. his sovereignty or kingship rather than to a spatial kingdom. In fact, far from being in parallel, “glory” is possessed by God’s “kingdom”. It is the “glory” that will last forever, not necessarily the “kingdom”, though it is difficult to envisage the glory of the kingdom without the kingdom. It would be tempting to conclude that because of the use of “glory”, which is often associated with the being of God, that “kingdom” must then refer to the Divine Presence. However, “glory” is not an exclusive attribute of God. The parallel between this and the mishnaic (see Section 3.5.1.1) “Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever”, is noteworthy, as is also the fact that the Hebrew word for “glory” is used (דבק), rather than the Aramaic דֶּבֶק (Note also the Hebrew מֹסֶר rather than the Aramaic מֹסֶר). However, since מֹסֶר is unpointed, it could also be the alternative Aramaic spelling, Bietenhard, (1967ET), “כַּפֶּרְא”, TDNT V, 267 n. 158). Ps 145:11,12 also associates דבֶּק as a present possession of the divine kingdom, though without the refrain “for ever and ever”. We may conclude then that the writer of this targum believed that God had a “kingdom” which possessed “glory”. It is possible that it is echoing a similar early rabbinic belief which itself may be pre-70. The part parallel with Ps 145:11,12 should not be dismissed in this regard. However, for the present purpose, if Chilton’s criteria for dating the targumim in Tg. Neb. Isa is applied to this targum, the lack of any universalistic associations would place it at least in the Amoraic period, if not later. It is, therefore, of little immediate use in determining the pre-70 kingdom Targum tradition.


Again, these represent non-translation material. Despite the English translations, the first part of Tg. C.G. Exod 15:3 and Frg. Tg. P Exod 15:3 are identical. This time “kingdom” does stand in parallel to “name”, “strength” and “might”. Thus, it more likely refers to an attribute of God rather than to a spatial kingdom (Meier, (1994), Marginal Jew II, 263). This is confirmed by the context: Moses is describing the warrior-like qualities of יִּהְיָי יִּמְעָר, i.e. “the Lord” (Cross, (1973), Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 155-77). Again, the lack of universalistic associations would,
according to Chilton’s dating criteria, place these targumim at least in the Amoraic period if not later.


Frg. Tg. V Exod 15:18 is a midrash on “the Lord”. God is proclaimed king of Israel after their redemption from the Red Sea. The context and the “crown” clearly show that it is God as king that is meant.

Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 15:18 is the longest expansion of Exod 15:18 in the Targumim, though there is little relevant difference with Frg. Tg. V. Here, too, God is crowned king and is to be king in this world, in the world to come and forever.

Tg. Onq. Exod 15:18 is the shortest of the Targumim on Exod 15:18 and represents little more than a literal translation of BHS (Cranfield, (1963), Mark, 65 translated it thus: “God’s kingdom stands firm”). It is easier, therefore, to see that יְהֹוָה is replaced by יְהֹוָהוֹ, similar to the previous group of targumim to Exod 15:18. It is a proclamation of God’s kingship because of his redeeming acts, rather than a reference to the intervention itself.

In Frg. Tg. V Exod 15:18 and Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 15:18, God’s kingdom is not in this world but “for the world to come”, whereas in Tg. Onq. Exod 15:18 it is “for ever and ever”.

The Targumim of the Pentateuch, even in their extended paraphrases and midrash do not add to what could be said of the original Hebrew. There is emphasis on God’s activity as king and redeemer. There is little or no indication that God commands a kingdom in the spatial sense. Because of the lack of universal associations, these Targumim may be assigned, using Chilton’s dating criteria, to a late period. Interestingly though, God acted as king in the past and will do so in the future, but despite being king in the here-and-now there is no evidence that he so acts in the here-and-now.

Aramaic text: Sperber, (1959), The Bible in Aramaic III, 106.


Refer to Section 2.2.1.2 for a separate discussion of the Hebrew text. Chilton dated this Targum verse to the Amoraic phase of formation because of the use of the word “congregation”. So it is beyond the limit of use here. Like Tg. Neb. Isa 40:9, it is an announcement. The phrase “the kingdom of your God” substitutes “your God” and, “is revealed” substitutes for “reigns” (or “is) king”). The kingdom is associated with: “the land of Israel” mentioned earlier in the verse; “the congregation of Zion”; and indeed with the “Shekhinah” of v. 8, which we are told will return to Zion. See Chilton, (1987ET), The Isaiah Targum, 103 n. to 52:1-52:15.

See footnote in Section 2.5.1.2. The “former dominion” in Tg. Neb. Mic 4:8 is better translated as “former domination”, as the Aramaic word הלפרנשון היאנש has nothing to do with territory but with power or the exercise of an office. The Aramaic word הלפרנשון הנש appears to be similar in meaning to the Hebrew הלפרנשון הנש. Thus the targum looks forward to the restoration to pre-eminence of the kingdom (Israel) among the nations under the Messiah. Contrary to Duling, (1992), “Kingdom of God”, ABD IV, 54a who wrote that “the kingdom that comes to the Messiah is equivalent to the “former dominion” which comes to the kingdom of the congregation of Israel”.

The fourth century rabbi Aibu offered an exegesis of Obad 21 in which God will restore the kingdom to Israel because of her repentance (Esth. Rab. 1.2, 19-20; cf. Psalms Midrash 99.1 in the name of another fourth century teacher R. Jehudah, see: Midrash on Psalms 145). The similarity between this and Tg. Neb. Mic 4:8 prompted Chilton to see confirmation of his notion of the development of the kingdom motif, Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 80. Certainly, it doesn’t rule out that possibility.
3.5 The Presence of the Kingdom of God: Yavnean Rabbis, the Synagogue & Luke

**Tg. Neb. Isa 24:23**

NRSV of Isa 24:23b
for the LORD of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders he will manifest his glory.

**Tg. Neb. Isa 24:23b**

הנהל מלכים מהיבא בתרות רפיים והרחלשים והרropolis עפרה

Translation of **Tg. Neb. Isa 24:23b**

... for the kingdom of the LORD of hosts will be revealed on the Mount of Zion and in Jerusalem and before the elders of his people in glory.

Similar to the scenario in **Tg. Neb. Obad 21**, this time the audience of the divine revelation will be restricted to those in Jerusalem and the elders, hence its dating to the early post-70 period.

The noun replacement, i.e. “kingdom of the Lord” for “YHWH” in this Targum passage and others has of course been observed by numerous scholars from Gustaf Dalman to Bruce D. Chilton.

Chilton incorrectly claimed that the noun “kingdom” together with the verb “will be revealed” renders “will reign” so that “kingdom” is God’s saving and vindicating activity. Though he didn’t state it, perhaps Chilton was thinking of the Amoraic Pentateuchal Targumim where “kingdom” does render “reign” or “is king”. There the emphasis is on God’s kingship. Here the emphasis is on the saving action of disclosure.

Seen rather as a simple noun-to-noun and verb-to-verb substitution typical of a technique of Targumic translation, it is clear that the writer used the phrase “kingdom of God” as a circumlocution for YHWH as the Saviour King. One day God himself will be revealed on Mount Zion (the site of the destroyed temple) in all his majestic glory.

---

358 See Section 3.3.1.3.
362 See Section 1.6.2.
3.5 The Presence of the Kingdom of God: Yavnean Rabbis, the Synagogue & Luke

Tg. Neb. Isa 31:4,5

NRSV of Isa 31:4c,5

4c so the LORD of hosts will come down to fight upon Mount Zion and upon its hill.

5 Like birds hovering overhead, so the LORD of hosts will protect Jerusalem; he will protect and deliver it, he will spare and rescue it.

Tg. Neb. Isa 31:4c,5

4c so the kingdom of the LORD of hosts will be revealed to settle upon the Mount of Zion and upon its hill.

5 Like the bird soars, so the might of the LORD of hosts will be revealed over Jerusalem; he will protect and deliver, rescue and remove.

Again dated to the post-70 Tannaitic period because of the continued association with Zion (though note its presence in the Hebrew text), a similar pattern to Tg. Neb. Isa 24:23b can be observed in the substitution of the Hebrew “LORD” for the Aramaic “kingdom of the LORD”.

The substitution of the Aramaic verb “to settle” for the Hebrew “to fight” emphasises the sequence of events depicted. The kingdom of God, i.e. the Divine King, will settle (like a bird) on Mount Zion. The verb substitution from the Hebrew יַרְדָּה “will come down” to the Aramaic יָדָה “will be revealed” means that after this movement of the Divine King, he will be revealed.

Verse 5 continues the sequence. After this revelation, the might of God will swing into action to “protect and deliver, rescue and remove”. Thus although “kingdom of the LORD” is in the context of God’s personal and dynamic intervention in the world, it does not itself represent “the very activity of God”, 365 since God’s mighty activity occurs after the revelation of the kingdom.

Whatever way the verses are explained, the phrase “kingdom of the LORD” is a substitution for YHWH in the context of saving action. These Targum verses emphasise the belief that the Divine King was considered absent from Mount Zion until this sequence of eschatological events occurred. This represents a marked change from the pre-70 Targum understanding, where the kingdom of God, God as king, is firmly present on the

---

363 Sperber, (1959), The Bible in Aramaic III, 62.
earth on Mount Zion. His absence is consistent with the findings on this period, deduced in Section 2.6.4.

_Tg. Neb._ Isa 40:9,10

NRSV of Isa 40:9c,10

9c . . . say to the cities of Judah, “Here is your God!”

10 See, the Lord GOD comes with might, and his arm rules for him; his reward is with him, and his recompense before him.

_Tg. Neb._ Isa 40:9c,10

(parts of Aramaic translation are not included in the NRSV, but are mentioned in the Tg. Neb.)

Translation of _Tg. Neb._ Isa 40:9c,10

9c . . . say to the cities of the house of Judah, “The kingdom of your God is revealed!”

10 Behold, the LORD God is revealed with strength, and the strength of his mighty arm rules before him; behold, the reward of those who perform his Memra is with him, all those whose deeds are disclosed before him.

Oddly enough, although Chilton made use of _Tg. Neb._ Isa 40:9, he did not date it - an oversight that somewhat undermines his conclusions. Dating this targum can be little more than extremely tentative. The word **כֹּהֵן** “congregation” appears in v. 3 suggesting the Amoraic period, yet that is a little far removed from v. 9. Verse 5 with its “all the sons of flesh shall see it [the glory of the LORD] together” points to a universal (pre-70) revelation. On balance, a Tannaitic post-70 dating is preferred, since the restriction to the house of Judah has been kept, despite the fact that there is no “Zion” catch word.

Nowhere is it more explicit that “kingdom of God” means God himself as king in the Targumim. Apart from the simple parallel between “kingdom of God” in v. 9d and “the LORD God” in v. 10a, made clear by the two-fold use of the same verb, the use of the adjectives in v. 10 indicates that it is God as king, that is, God as warrior, God as ruler, that is meant.

What is revealed is God himself, and this simultaneously means the unfettered visible operation of his might and strength (cf. _Tg. Neb._ Isa 31:4c,5). Unfortunately, where he will
be revealed is not given, so nothing can be said regarding the Divine Royal Presence either before or after this revelation.

Memra, usually simply transliterated as “Memra”, features only here in connection with either the kingdom of God or God as king. It is used inconsistently in the Targumim, which suggested to Robert Hayward that there was a development in its meaning.371 However, its basic meaning is that of the active presence of God in the world, the Targumim originally identifying it with the biblical אֶרֶץ אֶֽהְיֶה “I am”. It never became a hypostasis.372

_Tg. Neb. Ezek 7:7,10_

NRSV of Ezek 7:7,10
7 Your doom has come to you, O inhabitant of the land. The time has come, the day is near - of tumult, not of revelling on the mountains.
10 See the day! See, it comes! Your doom has gone out. The rod has blossomed, pride has budded.

_Tg. Neb. Ezek 7:7,10_<sup>373</sup>

אֵלָ֔לְכֶּ֖ים מֵלֶכְתָּ֥הָ יִנְשַׁ֖ל רַחַ֣ב אֵלָ֑הֲנֲא מִנְאֲאֵ֖נַ֑ה יָנָֽה תִֽבְרַֽיע ֑וֹאֵר
7 בֵּית אֲדֹנָיָ֖ם תְּלֻשַׁ֥רָא בָּאֵֽלָ֑ה יְהוָ֖ה תִֽבְרַֽיע ֑וֹאֵר
10 תַּהֲקַ֥ת אֲדֹנָיָ֖ם לָאֵלָ֑שַׁלְכֶּ֖ים יִנְשַׁ֥ל עֵֽלֶם יִנְשַׁ֖ל עֵֽלֶם ֑וֹאֵר

_Translation of _Tg. Neb. Ezek 7:7,10_<sup>374</sup>

7 _The Kingdom has been revealed_ to you O inhabitant of the land! The time of misfortune has arrived, the day of tumultuous confusion is near, and there is no escaping to the mountain strongholds.
10 Behold, the day of retribution! Behold, it is coming! _The Kingdom has been revealed!_ The ruler’s rod has blossomed! Wickedness has sprung up.

Ezek 7:7,10 are part of another oracle. “The day” is not eschatological, but denotes impending punishment for evil committed in this present world. The revelation of the kingdom is not universal but confined as it were to the inhabitants of Judah, though this too is governed somewhat by the similar context of the Hebrew text. Neither does it

---


<sup>372</sup> G. F. Moore, (1927), _Judaism I_, 419; Kuhn, (1964<sup>ET</sup>), “בָּאֵֽלָ֑ה יְהוָ֖ה”, _TDNT I_, 571 n. 34; Urbach, (1979<sup>ET</sup>), _The Sages I_, 213. Cf. E. P. Sanders, (1977), _Paul and Palestinian Judaism_, 215. It is perhaps also worth recording the observation that the Hebrew מָמָר does not occur in connection with either God as king or the kingdom of God.

<sup>373</sup> Sperber, (1959), _The Bible in Aramaic III_, 276.

<sup>374</sup> Levey, (1987<sup>ET</sup>), _The Targum of Ezekiel_, 32.
contain the terms “Zion” or “congregation”, so the genesis of its tradition cannot be
determined absolutely, though if Chilton’s dating method is strictly followed it would
possibly date from the post-70 Tannaitic period. The similarity of the Aramaic word for
שידר “stronghold” in v. 7 and the fortress name “Masada” has prompted speculation
that the Targumist was an eyewitness to the events surrounding Masada towards the end
of the war with Rome. Even if the play on words is deliberate, it gives us no more than a
terminus a quo for the verse.

The refrain “the Kingdom has been revealed” appears twice, presumably prompted by the
Hebrew כתר “crown”. In each case the kingdom brings with its revelation misfortune, confusion and retribution, unlike Tg. Neb. Obad 21 where the kingdom is
revealed only after the punishment. It is an event to be feared. In vv. 4, 8 and 9 of the
Targum, it is God himself who will visit and execute the punishment for sins committed,
so that “the Kingdom” cannot mean anything other than God himself. The kingdom of
God will be revealed as having been in Israel, unlike the day of punishment which will
arrive, since it is not yet “there” in the temporal sense.

3.5.1.4 A Synagogue Prayer

The Aleinu

The Aleinu378

לתיִּקְנָה עַלְּכֶם מְכַלְכִּיָּה שִׁרֵּא
רָקִּּיֶּל כְּלֵם שלִּכֶּם שִׁרֵּא
כֵּי מְכַלְכִּיָּה שִׁרֵּא רְאָה

Translation379
when the world shall be perfected under the reign of the Almighty, . . .
may they all accept the yoke of thy kingdom, . . .
For the kingdom is thine, . . .

The ‘Aleinu prayer380 contains the hope that God will remove all idolatry and destroy all
false gods, “when the world shall be perfected under the reign of the Almighty” and when

375 Levey, (1987ET), The Targum of Ezekiel, 33 n. 5.
377 See section 3.3.1.3.
380 For earlier comments, including dating issues, see Section 2.5.1.4.
everyone in the world will accept the yoke of your kingdom”.\(^{381}\) The strong universal and eschatological focus of the prayer has a corollary.\(^{382}\) In the here-and-now, the call is to submit to the yoke of the kingdom (the Shema), with the observance of the Torah a natural and necessary consequence.\(^{383}\) This emphasis on the observance of the Torah as acknowledgment of living here-and-now in the Divine Kingdom is similar to that of Josephus.\(^{384}\)

### 3.5.2 Luke

For comments on the method of approach, see Section 3.3.2.

**Luke 4:43 // Mark 1:38**

\[\text{NA}^{27}\text{ of Luke 4:43}\
\begin{align*}
\text{kai tais eterasi poloein evaggeleiasathai me dei tin baiileian tou theou, d} & \text{i} \text{ epi tou to to apoestalh.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{NRSV of Luke 4:43}\
\begin{align*}
\text{“I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose.”}
\end{align*}
\]

Though similar to Mark 1:38, Luke changed his source in two major respects. First, the audience is not the disciples but “the people”. Second, the subject of Jesus’ preaching is made explicit: it is the “good news of the kingdom of God”. Luke 4:43 is the first mention of the kingdom in the Gospel. In Matthew it is John the Baptist who first speaks of the kingdom of God (Matt 3:2, cf. Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3). Thus for Luke, Jesus was the first proclaimer of the kingdom of God.\(^{385}\) This verse is clearly intended by the redactor to be programmatic not only for the ministry of Jesus but for his entire Gospel and Acts.\(^{386}\)

---


382 Cf. Section 3.3.2 under Luke 11:2.


384 See Sections 1.5.5.4 and 3.3.1.1.


The saying seems to imply a present kingdom, since there is no mention of proclaiming the coming or nearness of the kingdom as we have in (say) Mark 1:15. As such, it is consistent with the view, which became evident in earlier Sections, that Luke regarded Jesus as himself the kingdom of God (cf. 10:23-24).


Soon afterwards he went on through cities and villages, proclaiming and bringing the good news of the kingdom of God. The Twelve were with him,

Luke 8:1-3 is a summary, typical of Luke’s work. Unlike the earlier 4:14-15, its parallels are not strong, and it contains many words and phrases either unique to Luke or typical of his work. Ascription to the redactor, rather than a composition of the redactor from earlier sources, seems safest.

That Jesus is here depicted as “proclaiming” the “good news of the kingdom of God” recalls 4:43 and anticipates 16:16 and Acts 8:12. As with 4:43, the summary statement seems to imply a present kingdom, since there is no mention of proclaiming the coming or nearness of the kingdom. Indeed, there is no hint in this passage of when the kingdom might arrive - an issue vital to Matthew and Mark. We are left with the impression that Luke regarded it as being in Jesus’ present. As such, it is consistent with the view that Luke regarded Jesus as himself the kingdom of God.

---

388 See discussions under some of the Lukan instances of “kingdom of God” in Sections 3.3.2 and 3.4.
3.5 The Presence of the Kingdom of God: Yavnean Rabbis, the Synagogue & Luke


NA\(^{27}\) of Luke 9:2
καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰάσθαι [τοὺς ἰαθενείς].

NRSV of Luke 9:2
and he sent them [i.e. the twelve] out to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal [the sick].

Here Luke associates Jesus’ task of proclaiming the kingdom of God with the Twelve. Again, the element of time is excluded, perhaps deliberately, if Matthew is the older version.\(^{391}\) Luke turns the whole into indirect speech. The disciples are not to proclaim the coming or the nearness of the kingdom but simply the kingdom. Together with proclamation of the kingdom, the disciples are to heal and exorcise δαιμόνια “demons” (v. 1).\(^{392}\) The hand of the redactor is dominant.

The parallels between this and Ps 103 are striking.\(^{393}\) In Ps 103:3b, the Divine King heals in his kingdom. The LXX word for heal in the psalm is also ἰάμασι, a word preferred by Luke over the other Gospel writers.\(^{394}\) The disciples proclaim the kingdom and are able to heal because Jesus the kingdom is present.\(^{395}\)


NA\(^{27}\) of Luke 9:11
οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι γνώντες ἥκολοθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἔλαλε αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἔχουσας θεραπείας ἔπες.

NRSV of Luke 9:11
When the crowds found out about it, they followed him; and he welcomed them, and spoke to them about the kingdom of God, and healed those who needed to be cured.


\(^{392}\) A discussion of the significance of “demons” in relation to the kingdom of God can be found under Luke 11:20, Section 3.3.2.

\(^{393}\) On Ps 103, see Section 3.2.1.


\(^{395}\) This is prior to (independent of?) the disciples receiving the Spirit, a point noted by Menzies, (1993), “Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts”, 15, 19. Menzies’ article is a reply to M. M. B. Turner, (1991), “The Spirit in the Lucan Conception”, 124-52, who argued that the Holy Spirit in the pre-Lukan community was associated with healing and exorcism. However, a consideration of Luke 11:20 in Section 3.3.2 found no immediate or obvious connection between the Holy Spirit and exorcism.
The phrase περὶ τῆς βασιλείας occurs here and in Acts 1:3, 8:12 and 19:8, in each case programmatically by way of a summary description of the message. Comparison with the parallels confirms that the mention of the kingdom of God here is a redactional addition.396

Again, there is no mention of the timing of the kingdom and as with Luke 9:2, healing by Jesus is closely associated by Luke with the kingdom.397 For Luke, Jesus can heal because he is the kingdom.


NA27 of Luke 9:27

NRSV of Luke 9:27

But truly I tell you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God.”

Luke dropped the Markan “has come with power”.398 The significance of this deletion is not easy to determine, since Luke is not shy of using the verb “to come” in association with “kingdom” and Matthew retains it in a modified form.399 For Luke, though, “power” is never associated verbally with the kingdom. It is rather much more frequently allied either with Jesus himself, the Spirit or with God.400

By so expunging this phrase, Luke 9:27 does not eliminate the futurist eschatological aspects as some have rightly noted,401 but it does move the emphasis to the verb ἴδωσιν,
where what is to be seen is the kingdom of God itself and not, as in Mark, the fact “that the kingdom of God has come with power”. Only in John 3:3 is the motif of seeing the kingdom of God repeated. The result of which will be that the kingdom of God will be seen by those listening to Jesus “who will not taste death” (cf. Gos. Thom. 1).

Luke 2:26 gives away the meaning intended by the redactor. Simeon had been promised that he would not “see death” before he had seen Jesus. Some, listening to Jesus, would not “taste death” until they saw/realised that Jesus was the kingdom. Whether it is the transfiguration, the resurrection or Pentecost that would trigger such a response is not clear and should not be pressed.

If the pre-Lukan community did indeed see in the Holy Spirit the awaited kingdom, then clearly this verse was interpreted by them as a promise that the Holy Spirit would come before those who first listened to the words of 9:27 would die.

But what of Jesus’ meaning? Assuming that the Markan version is closer to the actual words of Jesus, the meaning intended by Jesus must be guessed at because the verse originally stood as an isolated saying (cf. Mark 9:1 ἐλέγειν αὐτοῖς as introduction). That is, verses such as Mark 13:26,30 can only be used to ascertain the Markan contribution.

---

405 See Mattill, (1979), Luke and the Last Things, 59-70, for these and other suggestions.
406 See Marshall, (1978), Luke, 378. Mattill, (1979), Luke and the Last Things, 60, objected to this view on the grounds that, like the transfiguration and resurrection, not enough time had elapsed. However, it is not suggested here that this is what Jesus himself meant, merely what the early community made of the saying in the light of the Pentecost event.
407 This is by no means certain, see for example Beasley-Murray, (1986), Jesus and the Kingdom of God, 191-92.
The verse is actually easy to explain if the emerging model is applied. Jesus is speaking of the future coming of God to earth when his Divine Royal Presence and thus kingdom will be made openly visible to all who are alive then (cf. As. Mos. 10).\textsuperscript{409}

\textbf{Luke 16:16} // \textbf{Matt 11:12}

\begin{quote}
NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 16:16  
Ό νόμος καὶ οἱ προφήται μέχρι Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
NRSV of Luke 16:16  
“The law and the prophets were in effect until John came; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and everyone tries to enter it by force.\textsuperscript{409}

The \textit{Critical Edition of Q} has reconstructed this verse.\textsuperscript{410} In effect, Luke better preserves the first part, Matthew better preserves the longer second and third parts.\textsuperscript{411} Luke has substituted the negative “the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence”, for the more positive and typically Lukan “the good news of the kingdom of God is proclaimed” and replaced “and the violent take it by force” for “and everyone tries to enter it by force”. Thus, as it stands in Luke, the saying better reflects the concerns of Luke.

With the first substitution, Luke is clearly wishing to contrast the kingdom of God with the law and the prophets, especially given v. 17. John (the Baptist) did not preach the kingdom of God so far as Luke is concerned,\textsuperscript{412} though he did preach “the good news” (Luke 3:18), so it is likely that John was considered by Luke as in the era of the law and the prophets.\textsuperscript{413} The new era of the proclamation of the kingdom of God began with Jesus, though this is not to say that John was ineligible to enter the kingdom (cf. Luke 13:28).
As for the second alteration, the kingdom of heaven is the subject of the passive form of the verb ἐλθεῖν in Matthew, whereas in Luke the kingdom of God is the object of the middle form.\textsuperscript{414} John was a kingdom preacher in Matthew (3:2), so since the kingdom of God could not have suffered violence before it was preached by and present in Jesus, Luke needed to change this.\textsuperscript{415}

What exactly is meant by “everyone tries to enter it by force” remains obscure.\textsuperscript{416} Whatever it may mean it cannot refer, as does the Matt 11:12 parallel, to the war of the Divine King against the powers of evil.\textsuperscript{417} The element of proclamation in Luke has replaced the violence suffered by the kingdom.

By way of a suggestion as to the meaning of the phrase, its similarity to Matt 22:11 may be noted, a Matthew addition to the Parable of the Great Supper. There one guest enters without a wedding garment and is subsequently thrown out. If the Matthean verse may be used as a means of commentary on Luke 16:16, the Lukan verse may indicate that those who enter the kingdom by force are those who enter, or who think they can enter, by their own merit or terms, rather than those of the Divine King.\textsuperscript{418} The universal πᾶς may thus refer to the Pharisees of vv. 14-15 whom Jesus (in Luke’s eyes) condemns for seeking to justify themselves by human standards rather than those of God.\textsuperscript{419} They no doubt encouraged others to do the same.


\textsuperscript{415} Contrary to Conzelmann, (1961\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Theology of St. Luke}, 112, who thought that the preaching referred to in Luke 16:16 was that of John with whom the time for the preaching of the kingdom had come. Also N. T. Wright, (1996), \textit{Jesus}, 468.


\textsuperscript{417} Perrin, (1976), \textit{Language}, 46.

\textsuperscript{418} On Matthew’s version, see E. Moore, (1975), “Cognates in Josephus”, 519-43, who made the point that the two verbs together in Josephus always indicate physical violence and that the saying in Matthew thus indicated that “something is being strongly condemned”. The sentiment is also in Luke.

Elsewhere in the Synoptics (and once in John and Acts), “entering the kingdom of God” is a common enough motif on the lips of Jesus to assume that it goes back to Jesus himself.\(^{420}\) It is always in the context of a future kingdom\(^ {421}\) and may be uniformly interpreted, in Jesus’ case, as entering into the Divine Royal Presence. In other words, it betrays a similar sentiment to the Hebrew יברל הלל אל “to come/go before the LORD”,\(^ {422}\) though with eschatological intent on the part of Jesus. The phrase is also important because it places the action not on God as king but on those who wish to enter his presence. The “kingdom of God” does not always imply “the action of God the king” as many suppose.


\(\text{NA}^{27}\) of Luke 19:11

'Ακουόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταύτα προσθείς εἴπεν παραβολὴν διὰ τὸ ἔγγυς εἶναι Ἑρεμουσαλήμ αὐτῶν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτούς ἢ παραχρήμα μελλει ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι.

\(\text{NRSV} \) of Luke 19:11

As they were listening to this, he went on to tell a parable, because he was near Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately.

Excluded absolutely from Q by The Critical Edition of Q,\(^ {423}\) Luke 19:11 is a Lukan addition and serves a similar purpose to 14:15, i.e. it provides a link to the previous public conversation with Zacchaeus (L) and the subsequent parable (Q).\(^ {424}\)

The identity of the “they” in this Lukan introduction is vague,\(^ {425}\) but probably refers to those who, as depicted by the redactor, accompanied Jesus on his journey to Jerusalem, i.e.

---


421 Schnackenburg, (1963\text{ET}), God’s Rule and Kingdom, 161, 227; Ambrozic, (1972), Hidden Kingdom, 139-40.


the ἕχλος “crowd”,426 the μαθηταί “disciples”,427 and others, especially the Pharisees.428

This is the only place in the NT where the kingdom of God is said to ἀναφαίνεσθαι “appear”. In its use, the redactor displays his characteristic knowledge of contemporary Jewish thinking. It represented a stream of tradition which anticipated not the coming of the kingdom, but its appearance or manifestation.429 The following parable is thus given to counteract this prevailing Jewish opinion.430 The very next verb (πορεύματα), the first of the parable, tells of the nobleman who went away, only to return (ἐπαύρχομαι).

Allegorically, the nobleman is, for Luke, Jesus himself, who departed after his ascension (Acts 1:9).431 Thus the “appear” of Luke 19:11 is in opposition to the “come” or “return” of the parable.432 Luke’s contribution to the meaning of the parable was thus in the direction of a correspondence between Jesus and the kingdom of God. Such a meaning cannot be attributed in any way to Jesus himself for whom the kingdom was always and only “of God”.433


NA27 of Luke 21:31
οὐ γὼς καὶ ζητεῖς, ἂταν ἴδητα ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ἃ ἔγγυς ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

NRSV of Luke 21:31
So also, when you see these things taking place, you know that the kingdom of God is near.

429 Beasley-Murray, (1986), Jesus and the Kingdom of God, 218, and many other scholars, placed emphasis on the “immediate” element. Whether it was immediate or not, it was still future and the use of the word “appear” is unique and in no way “characteristic of Jesus”.
433 For more on Luke 19:11, especially in the contrasting verbs “to appear” and “to come”, see Section 3.7.4
Luke 21:31 is identical to its Markan source except that ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ has been substituted for Mark’s ἐπὶ θύρας “at the gates”. The effect is to shift the subject from the “Son of Man” (v. 27, Mark 13:26) to the kingdom of God.

This Lukan ending of the parable of the fig tree, implies that the kingdom of God is not ἐγγύς “near” in the time or place that Jesus speaks, but will be near (whether in time or place is unclear) after the Son of Man comes and the other signs mentioned in vv. 11, 25 take place. Therefore, despite the substitution of 21:31, it is not the Son of Man who brings the kingdom of God, nor is he to be identified with the kingdom. Rather his coming is one necessary precondition for the coming of the kingdom. It is only after he comes that the kingdom of God can be said to be near.

The parallel with v. 28 is also instructive. There, the time of ἀμλικός “redemption” will be ἐγγύς “drawing near”, once the Son of Man comes. Elsewhere Luke links “redemption” with “salvation” (cf. Luke 1:68-71) and salvation is brought by the kingdom (cf. Luke 18:24-25, from Mark, where to enter the kingdom is paralleled to being “saved” and Luke 18:29-30 where it is paralleled to “eternal life”). In the OT the only redeemer is God the Divine King, so that when Luke parallels redemption and the kingdom of God, the obvious inference is that the kingdom of God is redemption, is the Divine King.

---


NA\textsuperscript{27} of Luke 22:16,18
16 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔδωκα ἑαυτῷ ὑμῖν μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἐως ἐκεῖνον πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.
18 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔδωκα [ἓν] ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἕως ἐκεῖνον γενήματος τῆς αἰωνίου ἐοικῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλήθη.

NRSV of Luke 22:16,18
16 for I tell you, I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.”
18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.”

Luke 22:16 has no parallel in either Mark or Matthew, and so the entire verse is an addition to the Markan source by Luke. Jesus told the apostles that he will not ἔσθιον “eat” Passover (again) “until (ἐως) it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God”. The meaning is obscure,\textsuperscript{440} but probably is similar to the vow in v. 18 which concerns drinking. The motif of eating “in the kingdom” is one employed elsewhere by Luke (13:29, 14:15 and cf. 22:30 where it is in Jesus’ kingdom\textsuperscript{441}) and only by Luke. It looks forward to a time (and place?) when disciples will, as it were, enjoy fully the very presence of the Divine King (see e.g. Exod 14:11, Zech 14:20-21). The kingdom of God that Luke refers to here, through the words of Jesus, is not in Luke’s time, a present reality.\textsuperscript{442}

Luke 22:18 expresses similar sentiments to verse 16, but the redactor has moved 22:18 out of the Markan sequence (which Matthew follows) so that two cups of wine are mentioned.\textsuperscript{443} What is of import here is the change Luke has made after the conjunction ἐως: Luke, “until (ἐως οὐ) the kingdom of God comes (ἔλθη)”; Mark, “until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God”. Here the use of “come” emphasises the action of God in bringing the kingdom.\textsuperscript{444} Indeed, we may now say with confidence that for Jesus it was God the king that would come.

\textsuperscript{443} Jeremias, (1966\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Eucharistic Words}, 164, 210, regarded this doubling as original and the wording in Mark as more original than Luke.
\textsuperscript{444} Jeremias, (1966\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Eucharistic Words}, 210 n. 6. On ἔρχομαι and the kingdom of God, see Section 3.3.2 under Luke 11:2 and Section 3.7.
If Luke is being influenced by a similar tradition as in 1 Cor 11:26,⁴⁴⁵ (“For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes (ἀνεστήσεται θεός ἐν οὐρανοῖς)”) then his formulation of “until (ἐκεῖνος οὖν) the kingdom of God comes (ἐλθῇ)” may be more primitive than Mark’s and betray an early substitution of “kingdom of God” for Jesus.⁴⁴⁶ Given: that Luke is breaking from the Markan sequence at this point; that both Luke and Paul use identical forms of the verb ἐρχόμενος; that the verb is used in both cases with the adverb αὐτῶν and, especially considering that the only other places Luke has used the verb in connection with the kingdom is in verses he has incorporated from other sources (Luke 11:2(Q), 17:20-21(L), 18:16(Mark)),⁴⁴⁷ then the use of “kingdom of God” here in Luke may indeed be a Lukan circumlocution for Jesus himself.


NA²⁷ of Luke 23:51
- αὐτός οὖν ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ θουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν
- Ἄρειμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἡς προσεθέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ,

NRSV of Luke 23:51
[this one] had not agreed to their plan and action. He came from Arimathea, and he was waiting expectantly for the kingdom of God.

This verse, as with the whole of Luke 23:50-56a, is taken from Mark 15:42-47. The differences are inconsequential for present purposes.⁴⁴⁸

With the use of προσέχομαι, there seems little doubt that we are meant to recall Simeon (Luke 2:25) and Anna (Luke 2:38)⁴⁴⁹ and probably too those who await the return of their master from the wedding banquet (Luke 12:36).

Although Simeon awaited the “consolation of Israel”, Luke does not explain this further and it bears no relationship to the promise that he would not die until he saw the Messiah, Luke 2:26. The “consolation of Israel” probably refers to the hope, expressed in Isaiah

---


3.5 The Presence of the Kingdom of God: Yavnean Rabbis, the Synagogue & Luke

40:1,10, that God will come and be the Shepherd King. The consolation of Israel which Simeon waited for was nothing less than the presence of the Divine King.

Anna addressed those in the crowd who awaited the “redemption of Jerusalem”. The Redeemer is God the king (see under Luke 21:31). There is little difference therefore between “the consolation of Israel” and the “redemption of Jerusalem”, where Jerusalem as the capital of Israel stands for Israel.

A consideration of Luke 12:36, with its metaphor of the watchful slaves, confirms the above.

The emphasis of Luke 12:35-38, from L, is also on waiting. Luke no doubt regarded the master as Jesus himself, the Son of Man, v. 40. Jesus on the other hand, probably saw a connection in the metaphor with the coming of the kingdom, especially since the saying is within the context of a banquet as a possible reward for readiness.

---


453 Luke 12:36: “be like those who are waiting for their master to return from the wedding banquet, so that they may open the door for him as soon as he comes and knocks.”


Acts 8:12, 19:8, 20:25, 28:23,31

NA\textsuperscript{27} of Acts 8:12, 19:8, 20:25, 28:23,31

8:12 ἀπές ἐπίστευσαν τῷ φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐβαπτίζοντο ἢδές τε καὶ γυναῖκες.

19:8 Ἐξέλθων δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν ἐπαρρησίαζετο ἐπὶ μήνας τρεῖς διαλέγομένος καὶ πείθον [τὰ] περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

20:25 Καὶ ὃν Βασίλειαν τῷ Θεῷ ἐπίστευε καὶ ἐνεργεὶ ἐκείνῳ τῷ πρόσωπών μου ὕπατες πάντες ἐν οἷς διήλθον κηρύσσοντι τὴν βασιλείαν.

28:23 ἐν οἷς ἐξελθότων διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθον τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου Μωσῆσας καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπὸ πρῶτο έώς ἔστερας.

28:31 κηρύσσοντι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκον τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρασκευῆς ἄκωλυτως.

NRSV of Acts 8:12, 19:8, 20:25, 28:23,31

8:12 But when they believed Philip, who was proclaiming the good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.

19:8 He [Paul] entered the synagogue and for three months spoke out boldly, and argued persuasively about the kingdom of God.

20:25 “And now I know that none of you, among whom I have gone about proclaiming the kingdom, will ever see my face again.

28:23 . . . From morning until evening he explained the matter to them, testifying to the kingdom of God and trying to convince them about Jesus from the law of Moses and from the prophets.

28:31 proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness and without hindrance.

Each of these verses represents the continuation of the Lukan theme of the proclamation of the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{456} Paul and Philip are depicted as both imitating and obeying the command of Jesus (Luke 4:43, 9:2).\textsuperscript{457}

In 28:23, the juxtaposition of “the kingdom of God” and “trying to convince them about Jesus” with the correlative τε, means that the second is a fuller explanation of the first.\textsuperscript{458}

\textsuperscript{456} Conzelmann, (1987\textsuperscript{ET}), Acts, 163.


and betrays Luke’s now obvious intimate connection between the kingdom of God and Jesus. Acts 8:12 and 28:31, as Lukan summaries, should also be read in this light.⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁹ Though Luke may still have used sources. For example, the verb at 28:23 is διαμαρτύρομαι and occurs 15 times in the NT, nine times in Acts. It is unique here in association with the kingdom, and since it occurs four times in the Pauline letters, it is possible that it is from the Pauline community in this instance, but taken over by Luke because of his familiarity with it. Its meaning varies little from the idea of proclamation. On the connection here between the kingdom of God and Jesus, see: Pereira, (1983), Ephesus, 125; Barrett, (1994, 1998), Acts II, 1252; del Agua, (1999), “Evangelization”, 655, 656, “[T]o be a witness of Jesus . . . is to bear witness of the Basileia”.
3.6 SYNTHESIS

Three questions directed the inquiry of this chapter: the identity of the “kingdom of God” at each stage of formation of Luke, particularly that held by the first century Pharisees and Jesus; the perceived location of that kingdom; and the timing of its “coming” or “manifestation”.

The following synthesis of conclusions will pave the way for a new exegesis of that most enigmatic of all kingdom passages, Luke 17:20-21.

3.6.1 Ancient Palestinian Literature

Although explicit mention of the kingdom of God is confined to just eight instances in the OT, several conclusions may reasonably be drawn, since all come from post-exilic cultic circles.

In the OT passages analysed, God was thought to dwell in his kingdom, whether that was the whole created order as in the psalms, in which case God dwelt in heaven, or the land originally ruled by Solomon and his successors as in Chronicles, in which case God dwelt in the temple, even after the disappearance of the Solomonic dynasty. Importantly, in both Chronicles and Psalms God’s kingdom was a present historical reality and not a future promise. The writers believed that they were already living in the kingdom of God as indeed was the Divine King himself. It was in the here-and-now. The identification of the kingdom of God with God as king could not be made, though Ps 103:19 is a possible exception.

The picture presented in Daniel (though Dan 4:3,34 is another exception) seems to be that God’s kingdom does not yet exist, but one day will be brought into existence by God and from then on will last forever. It is contrasted with human kingdoms in origin, longevity and power. It will encompass the whole earth. In the meantime, God is in heaven as king in name only. He is not yet acting as king. When the Divine Kingdom does come, so will justice and salvation.

A subtle, but profound, shift may be observed between Daniel and the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha. While both acknowledge the universal and everlasting nature of the Divine Kingdom and the fact that the Divine King is to be located in heaven, the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha see this kingdom as a present earthly reality like the earlier Chronicler and Psalms. Consequently, the kingdom of God is in some cases in direct
opposition to earthly kingdoms which it will ultimately replace. It will be exposed not by a person or persons but by God himself.\footnote{Which fact alone counsels extreme caution when attempts are made to link the kingdom of God with a Messiah or Son of Man figure, cf. Conzelmann, (1961ET), Theology of St. Luke, 116-17, 118 n. 2.}

The parallels between the notions of God as king and the kingdom of God now become evident. There is the “here-and-now” tradition, represented in the notion of the kingdom of God by the Chronicler, Psalms and the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha and the “not-yet” (later “heaven”) tradition represented by Daniel.\footnote{See Section 3.6.1.} The two traditions, too, each in their own way, tried to explain the present ineffectiveness of the divine kingship, though occasionally the Divine King is seen as an active protector. The first explained it in terms of the “hiddenness” of the Divine Royal Presence, the other in terms of its complete absence (albeit temporary) from the world. These two traditions continued into the first century A.D. and were still current in the time of the Pharisees and Jesus.

Significantly, two references in the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha, which are both effectively contemporary with the first century Pharisees and Jesus, contain near explicit examples of the use of the phrase “kingdom of God” as a circumlocution for God as king. In \textit{Pss. Sol. 17:3} and \textit{As. Mos. 10:1}, the Divine Kingdom brings judgement and salvation - two hall-marks of the kingdom for Jesus - and two functions previously reserved for the Divine King.

Finally, it is be noted that \textit{Jub. 50:9b} (cf. \textit{L.A.B.}) may provide an early example of the link between observance of torah and the kingdom of God.\footnote{Cf. Section 1.5.5.4.}

### 3.6.2 The Pharisees and Jesus

The analysis of first century Jewish cases of explicit references to the Divine Kingdom and a consideration of the likely forms of the phrase at Stage I of the formation of Luke, indicate that “kingdom of God” was a well-accepted circumlocution for God as king in the time of the Pharisees and Jesus.

Rather than being a “plurisignificant” or “tensive” symbol evoking many different aspects of the myth of God as king in action, it is better to see “kingdom of God” at the time of Jesus as a foundational metaphor, whose base or irreducible meaning is that of the perceived concrete reality of the Divine Royal Presence, that is, God as king. This sentence...
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needs to be carefully explained before we can move to highlighting the core difference in understanding between the Pharisees and Jesus.

There is no doubt that Norman Perrin, in describing “kingdom of God” as a “plurisignificant” or “tensive” symbol that evoked many different aspects of the myth of God as king, did biblical scholarship a valuable and timely service. He thereby emphasised its multifaceted and complex nature, something that was in danger of being lost in the deluge of attempts to find a unifying theory.

The problem with Perrin’s approach however, was that what those who used the phrase in the first century meant was the concrete reality of God himself as king, not some anachronistic existential experience of the fact of divine kingship, however real Perrin thought that might be.

---


466 Perrin, (1976), Language, 54, “One cannot ‘be fit for’ or ‘receive’ or ‘enter’ a symbol; one can only respond in various ways to that which the symbol evokes, in this instance the experience of God as king”. Perrin, (1984), “Theology of the NT”, 422, “The language of Jesus, and the fact that it was the language of Jesus, mediated to his hearers the existential and experiential reality of God as King”. Perrin’s existential exegesis was evident even in his (1963) Teaching of Jesus, 171, 186-87, and can be easily traced in his subsequent works. His position was very similar to Bultmann’s understanding of the proclamation of the kingdom as “the hour of decision”, see: Bultmann, (1955), Theology I, 22; Breech, (1983), The Silence of Jesus, 38-39, 112, 213; cf. Theissen and Merz, (1998), The Historical Jesus, 244, 277. See also the criticism of Perrin in Breech, (1978), “Kingdom and Parables”, 21-22.
On the other hand, there is no doubt that “kingdom of God” did indeed evoke in the minds of first century A.D. hearers many aspects of the myth of God as king in action. We have seen in passages reflective of Pharisaic understanding and especially those that reflect Jesus’ use, that notions of judgement and salvation, for example, key notions in the concept of God as king, figure intimately with “kingdom of God”. For first century Jews, Jesus included, the fact of God’s kingship was no mere fantasy, no mere set of ideas to which one responded. “kingdom of God” had content, separate existence, apart from its believers, and that content was simply the objective reality of God himself as king. The phrase was first and foremost a circumlocution for God himself as king, by the first century A.D., in much the same way as “heaven” had become a circumlocution for God.

The terms “kingdom of God” and “heaven” have this in common, that both initially were and continued to be locations of the Divine Presence. By the first century A.D. they became more than existential signs, more than a mediation of the action or fact of divine activity. They had indeed become separate circumlocutions for God, as for example, “the Place” would become in later rabbinic literature. A particular nuance may have been emphasised above another in a particular context, but every instance had as its core the concrete Divine Royal Presence. “Kingdom of God” is best viewed not as a multi-faceted gem, but as a many-branched tree with God as king as the base and trunk.

But did the Pharisees and Jesus so use it?

It is not likely that the Pharisees and Jesus, immersed as they were in the Judaism of their time, used the phrase “kingdom of God” in a way other than the contemporary manner. In fact, a consideration of kingdom passages likely to reflect pre-70 Pharisaic thought and a consideration of passages in Luke that may be traced with confidence to the historical Jesus, may best be explained by recourse to this model of the kingdom of God. In other words, “kingdom of God” is best seen as the foundational metaphor for the Divine Royal Presence for the Pharisees and Jesus.

With this as the common understanding of the Pharisees and Jesus regarding the kingdom of God, the fundamental difference between them may now be considered. The deceptively ordinary question of the location of this kingdom - the Divine Royal Presence - yielded an important distinction in their concepts of the kingdom of God.

---

467 On מֶקֶק לָכָה “the Place” in rabbinic literature, see Section 2.5.1.1. On “sign” and “metaphor” see Wilder, (1964), The Language of the Gospel, 92, “Now we know that a true metaphor or symbol is more than a sign, it is a bearer of the reality to which it refers”. Yet Perrin was happy to quote this, Perrin, (1976), Language, 56, 130. See also: E. P. Sanders, (1982), “Jesus, Paul and Judaism”, 419 n. 109; O’Toole, (1987), “The Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts”, 147 n. 2, “A symbol cannot say everything, nor can it be deprived of some definite content”.

---
Evidence of Pharisaic thinking on the kingdom of God was found in those targumim whose traditions could be dated to before A.D. 70. In them, the kingdom of God (the Divine Royal Presence) is a present reality in the here-and-now. At the same time, it will one “day” be revealed for all to see. The centre of that revelation will be Mount Zion, though it will extend throughout the world. It will be a true exposure of something already present but hidden from view. After this, the world will be radically different. God’s rule as king will be effective. If the Psalms of Solomon, like the Targumim, also have a synagogue origin, Pss. Sol. 17, in particular, also supports this Pharisaic picture.

In a non-eschatological setting, such as was found in those portions of Josephus dedicated to the Pharisees and the synagogue Kaddish, the kingdom of God was seen to be intimately associated with the observance of torah. Faithful obedience to the precepts of the torah was the response to the presence of the kingdom of God. This approach can now be seen to be based on the notion outlined in the previous paragraph.

When the question of location was applied to the analysis of Jesus’ utterances on the kingdom as recorded in Luke, a very different picture emerged.

While, like the Pharisees, Jesus regarded “kingdom of God” to be the Divine Royal Presence, he located the kingdom of God in heaven. At some time in the future this kingdom will come to earth and be throughout the world. Repentance is the key means of preparing for this event. The present life is not a life lived in the presence of the kingdom but a life to be lived in anticipation of and in preparation for the arrival of the Divine King.

There was, therefore, no dialectic in the teaching of the historical Jesus between a present and future kingdom, between the “already” and the “not-yet”. Such nuances are indeed present in the Gospel accounts of the words of Jesus, but these are to be attributed to later stages of formation. Those who claim otherwise, must contend with the observation, demonstrated in this and the previous chapter, that not a single writer was found who located the Divine Royal Presence in both a heavenly and an earthly site. Never once was it a case of both. Certainly, writers differed amongst themselves as to the location of this presence, even writers of similar periods. But never once was it found that a single writer

---

468 See further, Section 3.7.6.
469 On the possible synagogue origin for the Pss. Sol., see Section 2.2.3 under Pss. Sol. 2:30,32. On Pss. Sol. 17, see Section 2.2.3 under Pss. Sol. 17:1,34,46 and especially Section 3.2.3 under Pss. Sol. 17:3.
acknowledged a duality of location with regard to the Divine Royal Presence. Jesus was no different.

This view of Jesus is also unfashionable at present on another front, where attempts to de-eschatologise Jesus abound.\textsuperscript{472} If the above picture is correct, Jesus cannot and should not be rescued from an objective eschatology.\textsuperscript{473} The myth evoked by “kingdom of God” in first century A.D. Palestine was no mere fairy tale designed purely to elicit an existential response. It was as objective and other as the temple itself.

Though Jesus and the Pharisees agreed in their identity of the kingdom of God, namely that it was God himself as king, Jesus believed in a future “coming” and non-present kingdom. The Pharisees believed in a future “revelation” and present hidden kingdom. This association of the verbs “coming” and “manifesting” with the beliefs of Jesus and the Pharisees respectively, is of such importance that an Excursus in Section 3.7 will be devoted to it.

3.6.3 The Pre-Lukan Community

Whatever the reality of the Pentecost event might have been, something special must have happened in the days after the resurrection. The effects surrounding the event and its aftermath were explained as being the result of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{474} It would appear that the Holy Spirit was not the redactor’s solution to the problem of the supposed delay in the return of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{475} It is rather the special contribution of the pre-Lukan community to the notion of the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{476}

For this community, of which the Lukan redactor was the inheritor, the Spirit was the “creative and prophetic presence of God” (Acts 5:9, 8:39)\textsuperscript{477} and “the continuing

\textsuperscript{472} This trend may be said to have been initiated if not encouraged by Borg, (1988), “A Temperate Case for a Noneschatological Jesus”, 521-35, cf. Borg, (1987), “Jesus and the Kingdom of God”, 378-80. This is not to say Borg’s work or those that follow this thinking are without merit or usefulness. See also for example: D. Hill, (1981), “Kingdom of God”, 64-65, who unfortunately based this conclusion on the assumption that the phrase “kingdom of God” is absent from inter-testamental apocalypses.

\textsuperscript{473} Cf. Jeremias, (1971\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{NT Theology I}, 102.

\textsuperscript{474} See Dunn, (1975), \textit{Jesus and the Spirit}, 135-56, for a careful consideration of the key issues.


\textsuperscript{476} See Section 2.6.3.

\textsuperscript{477} Fitzmyer, (1983), \textit{Luke I-IX}, 230, though no author referred to, including Fitzmyer, attributed the Lukan Holy Spirit to the pre-Lukan community.
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presence of the kingdom of God”. The pre-Lukan community saw it, therefore, as indeed the “promise of the Father”, that is, the Father himself, nothing less than the promised kingdom of God. They reinterpreted the words of Jesus regarding the kingdom in the light of their experience of the Holy Spirit.

In this we find a convenient echo in the Pauline literature. Paul does not often mention the kingdom of God, but where he does, it is almost invariably a future kingdom. The exception is Rom 14:17: “For the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit” (cf. 1 Cor 4:20). Righteousness (Justice), peace and joy in particular, are dispositions or gifts enjoyed because one is in the presence of the Divine King (cf. Gal 5:22). For Paul, the Holy Spirit is this future kingdom in the present.

It is possible, now, to make a bold claim. To the pre-Lukan community may be attributed the first fully worked out “realised eschatology”, at least insofar as that phrase may be confined to the kingdom of God. This community saw itself as living in the period of the Eschaton (cf. Acts 2:17), a period marked by salvation (Acts 2:21). For them the


480 Rom 14:17, 1 Cor 4:20, 6:9-10, 15;24,50, Gal 5:21, Eph 5:5, Col 4:11, 1 Thess 2:12, 2 Thess 1:5.

481 As we saw in Section 2.6.1.


kingdom of God was patently here-and-now. “The presence of the Spirit is the ‘already’ of the kingdom. . . . Where the Spirit is there is the kingdom”.484

If this is correct, it would explain why, after Pentecost, the kingdom was not central in the preaching of the early pre-Lukan community.485 Jesus’ preaching of the kingdom and that of his disciples during his ministry was, as has been shown, exclusively future. The Pentecost event must have been so intimate and overwhelming that the future aspect of the kingdom either faded very much into the background, or as seems likely, was answered by the here-and-now presence of the Spirit.486

Yet, as if to echo the contemporary Pharisees who also believed in a here-and-now kingdom, the pre-Lukan community believed that faithfulness to the teaching of Jesus (rather than the Torah directly) made them fit for the kingdom, i.e. for the Holy Spirit. For them however, faithfulness was a necessary precondition for reception of the kingdom and not a response to its presence. Perseverance in the face of persecution brought with it the reward of entry into the kingdom of God.

3.6.4 The Yavnean Rabbis, the Early Post-70 Synagogue and Luke

What did the Yavnean rabbis, the early post-70 Palestinian synagogue and Luke, contribute to their respective traditions regarding the “kingdom of God”? That was the central question of this Section.

The early Yavnean rabbis, insofar as their legacy may be isolated in the Mishnah, saw the observance of the Torah (i.e. the practice of torah or halakah) as the means by which the kingdom of God could be lived in the here-and-now. It could exist in the here-and-now, but only for individuals who observed the halakot. The Divine Royal Presence for these rabbis was in heaven, but would visit those who faithfully observe the Torah.487

The targumim that could be dated to this period and which thus represent the position of the early post-70 Palestinian synagogue, demonstrate a divergence of opinion from the rabbis. This difference is perhaps indicative of a situation in which the rabbis did not have effective control over the Palestinian synagogues.488

484 Dunn, (1970), “Spirit and Kingdom”, 38b; Smalley, (1973), “Spirit, Kingdom and Prayer”, 68. If the above conclusion is correct, it would mean that the intimate connection between Jesus and the Spirit, so obvious in Luke, did not come from the redactor but from the early pre-Lukan community as theological reflection on the meaning and significance of Pentecost.

485 Acts 14:22, probably has its source in a Pauline community.


487 This is also consistent with the results summarised in Section 2.6.4.

488 See Section 1.6.6.
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The post-70 Tannaitic kingdom targumim saw the kingdom not merely as the Divine Royal Presence, but as still present and hidden in the world. The important exception is Tg. Neb. Isa 31:4-5, which thus probably represents an early attempt to standardise teaching on the kingdom in line with other post-70 Tannaitic targumim which located the Divine King somewhere other than the world.\textsuperscript{489} In Tg. Neb. Isa 31:4-5, the kingdom will one day return to Mount Zion. In all cases however, a future revelation of the kingdom is maintained.

Within the constraints imposed by a consideration of explicit instances of the divine kingdom in the sources,\textsuperscript{489a} we may conclude that Luke, the redactor of the third Gospel, believed that the kingdom of God and Jesus were one and the same.\textsuperscript{490} In what we would now call the historical Jesus, Luke located the kingdom of God, just as previously, Jesus located the kingdom in God, the Chronicler in the Davidic kingdom and so on. To locate the kingdom was to locate the Divine Royal Presence. It is why Luke’s Jesus never proclaimed the nearness of the kingdom. It was already present.

Yet, Luke was naturally aware, when he wrote, that Jesus was no longer present in the here-and-now, and therefore the kingdom, for Luke, was no longer in the here-and-now. The Ascension relocated the kingdom to heaven, one day to come “in the same way you saw him go” (Acts 1:11).\textsuperscript{491} In the meantime, there was plenty to do. Because of the gift of the Holy Spirit the kingdom was to be proclaimed,\textsuperscript{492} there were persecutions to suffer and there was the mission to the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{493}

\textsuperscript{489} See Section 2.6.4.

\textsuperscript{489a} See Sections 1.2.3 and 2.1.


\textsuperscript{493} Cf. Cranfield, (1963), “The Parable of the Unjust Judge”, 301. Gager, (1975), Kingdom and Community, 43-49, suggested in fact that the very non arrival of the kingdom was the driving force behind missionary activity.
If there is to be a present-future tension in Luke-Acts, it is to be found through the pen of Luke the redactor. The kingdom was the same Jesus who lived long ago in Israel and who, Luke hoped, would one day return. He is the kingdom in both its present (in the time of Jesus) and future dimensions.494

In inheriting the notion of the Holy Spirit as Jesus' future kingdom, Luke for a reason that is not evident in the passages studied, threw up “a dam against the flood of enthusiasm”.495 While not totally divorcing himself from the legacy of his community, Luke was clearly compelled to anchor the kingdom firmly in Jesus. Luke effectively equated the Parousia with the future coming of the kingdom. Was it because undue emphasis was being placed on the experience of the Holy Spirit rather than faith in Jesus?

This naturally begs the question as to what Luke made of the Holy Spirit within the context of the kingdom. On the one hand, Luke could hardly ignore, nor did he, the events and after-effects of Pentecost. On the other hand, he embraced the legacy of his earlier community and incorporated the intimate association of the Spirit with Jesus in his relocation of the kingdom.496 Though the Spirit did not constitute “a continuing presence of the kingdom of God” nor “the anticipation of the end in the present”497 for Luke, as it did for the pre-Lukan community, its presence nevertheless quelled both eager anticipation for and anxiety over any notion of an imminent coming of the kingdom. “The Spirit Himself is no longer the eschatological gift, but the substitute in the meantime for the possession of ultimate salvation.”498 Luke in the end, while identifying the kingdom with Jesus, was doing little more than returning to the teaching of Jesus himself. The Divine King would indeed return to Zion.

This synthesis of Luke’s position has implications for Hans Conzelmann’s justly seminal conception of Luke’s chronology. Conzelmann saw the Lukan view of salvation as divided

494 Cf. J. T. Carroll, (1988), Response to the End of History, 15, 17, cf. 82. According to Carroll, this would seem to approximate the view of Noack, (1948), Das Gottesreich bei Lukas, 45-49, except that Noack apparently saw the kingdom as present with the activity of Jesus. Noack’s work was unavailable to the present writer.

495 Käsemann, (1969ET), Questions, 22. This is not to deny also Conzelmann, (1961ET), Theology of St. Luke, 123, who saw Luke’s struggle as an “essentially an anti-apocalyptic one”, by which he probably meant “calculations” of the end, p. 121. However, in the passages surveyed the reorientation away from emphasis on the Holy Spirit is evident.


497 Cullmann, (1962ETRe), Christ and Time, 72.

into three epochs: from creation to the imprisonment of John the Baptist; from the baptism of Jesus to his ascension; and from the ascension to the parousia. 499

This chapter has shown that while no evidence of any delay or concern with a delay in a future coming of the kingdom of God could be detected, there is rather a four-fold division of time in Luke’s mind. It is: the epoch prior to the historical Jesus (kingdom absent); the epoch of Jesus of Nazareth (kingdom present); the epoch between the ascension and a future coming of God’s kingdom (kingdom absent); and the new epoch from the arrival of this future kingdom (kingdom present). 500 Because Jesus was the kingdom as far as the redactor was concerned, Conzelmann can be seen more clearly to have been right in his claim that Jesus stood, for Luke, in the middle of time. More accurately, we might say that the person of Jesus as the kingdom stood for Luke both in the middle and at the climax of time.

---


3.7 EXCURSUS: “REVEAL” AS CONVERSE OF “COME”

The survey of literature on God as king and the kingdom of God in the preceding two chapters, highlights an important phenomenon, namely that in the Targumim, the Aramaic הילל “to reveal” is frequently used as the translation for either the Hebrew אל “to come” or the verb נלל “to be, become king”. Given that Luke 17:20-21 contains the verb ἐφροισσαί twice with the “kingdom of God” as subject, the substitution is of potential major relevance to an understanding of the pericope.

It will be argued here that within the specific context of the present work, there is a real difference in intended meaning between “to come” and “to reveal”. This difference highlights the conclusion drawn in chapter 3, namely that the Pharisees believed in a realised, present kingdom of God, in contrast to Jesus who maintained that the kingdom was not in the here-and-now but was to come some time in the future.

Firstly however, a brief consideration of the verbs is in order.

3.7.1 נלל (qal) “to come”

In the OT, נלל in the qal form exhibits a wide range of meaning. Nevertheless, it always expresses movement either in space or time towards a certain goal. The significance of this observation for the present enterprise cannot be overstated. The implication is that an object or event cannot be said “to come” or “be coming” unless it is either coming from somewhere else or will occur at some future time. The immediate consequence is that until it has come, neither the object nor the event can be said to be present either in space or time.

This is confirmed with respect to God by a brief survey of the OT instances in which God is the subject of נלל. For the sake of convenience, these may be divided into three

---

501 Contrary to such scholars as: Buchanan, (1970), Consequences of the Covenant, 67 n. 4; Chilton, (1979), God in Strength, 89, 287; Preuss, (1995-96 ET), OT Theology I, 203; Chilton, (1996), Pure Kingdom, 60. See Section 1.4.2. Though to be fair, they considered the verbs from a wider perspective.

502 According to Clines, (1993), DCH I, 454a, the synonym יכש, has God as its subject only once in the OT at Deut 33:5, which is curious given 1 Cor 16:22 and Rev 22:20.

categories: the so-called “old narratives”; those associated with the cult or temple; and its use in the prophets.504

The coming of God in the “old narratives” occurs largely in night dreams and once in the cloud (Exod 19:9).505 Even if the “coming” of God in these narratives is formulaic, in each instance it is clear that until the coming, YHWH is not present with the person concerned. Exod 19:9 is an interesting case in itself. In this J tradition YHWH “comes” only to Moses and not to the people (cf. v. 21).506 He comes from Sinai to the tent of meeting in the camp, and until he does so he is not present with Moses in the camp.

The cultic use betrays a similar movement of YHWH in space. Exod 20:24 assumes that God will come to every צְרוּם “place” where his name is remembered, not “be” at every such place, as if he was waiting there to be remembered.507 In 1 Sam 4:7 the Philistines believed that God had come into the camp of the Hebrews with the ark, implying that until then God was not in the camp. Ps 24:7,9 is again a cultic use associated with the ark. Here God moves, as it were, through space into the temple. In Ezek 43:2,4 44:2, Ezekiel looks forward to the return of God to the new temple.

The prophetic use is the most explicit of all. In many cases, God is depicted as either coming from somewhere on the earth, be it from Sinai, Zion, Teman, or the North,508 or from heaven. In so-called Third-Isaiah, Isa 59:19-20, 63:1, 66:15,18 also speak of a future coming of YHWH to Zion as Redeemer. God’s glory will not be seen, until he comes (60:2, 66:18). In fact, for this post-exilic prophet (community?), God lives in heaven (63:15). Zech 2:10 was probably written at a time when the second temple was yet to become a reality.509 This verse contains the priestly יִתֵּן “to dwell”. It looks forward to the day when once again God will come from his “holy dwelling” (v. 13), i.e. heaven,510


507 Preuss, (1975 ET), “יָבֹא bo’”, TDOT II, 44, suggested that this is a late priestly redaction. Since it varies from the Dtr formula “cause my name to be remembered” this is probably the case.

508 Sinai, Deut 33:2 (for battle); Zion, Ps 50:3 (for judgement); Teman, Hab 3:3 (for battle); North: Ezek 1:4, cf. Job 37:22.


510 See under Ps 68:24 in Section 2.2.1.1.
to dwell in the temple in the midst of his people. In Isa 19:1, YHWH will come into Egypt for judgement on that nation. Presumably God is not there normally.

The remainder of the examples are connected by their immediate context of God as king.511

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God as קְדוֹשׁ “king”</th>
<th>יָבֹא “to come”</th>
<th>from</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 33:5</td>
<td>Deut 33:2</td>
<td>Sinai</td>
<td>Jeshurun</td>
<td>salvation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 24:7-10</td>
<td>Ps 24:7,9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 98:6</td>
<td>Ps 98:9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 6:5</td>
<td>Isa 13:5, 35:4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>salvation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 41:21, 43:15, 44:6, 52:7b</td>
<td>Isa 40:10 (cf. 52:8), 50:2</td>
<td>Zion</td>
<td>redemption &amp; salvation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech 14:9,16,17</td>
<td>Zech 14:5</td>
<td>Mt Olives</td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal 1:14</td>
<td>Mal 3:1, 4:6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>temple</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each instance was discussed in chapter 2 under the heading of the reference in the first column. As can be seen from the above chart, even though explicit mention of the origin of YHWH is only in two cases,512 in each instance a movement in space is indicated.

Though later literature has not been canvassed as extensively for every instance of the “coming” of God, those that are associated with God as king are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God as “king”</th>
<th>“to come”</th>
<th>from</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Enoch 9:4, 12:3, 25:3,5,7, 27:3</td>
<td>1 Enoch 1:3</td>
<td>his dwelling / heaven</td>
<td>Mt Sinai</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enoch 91:13b</td>
<td>1 Enoch 91:7</td>
<td>heaven</td>
<td>earth</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As. Mos. 4:2, 10:3</td>
<td>As. Mos. 10:3,7</td>
<td>holy habitation</td>
<td>earth</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam and Eve (Apoc.) 29:4</td>
<td>Adam and Eve (Apoc.) 22:3</td>
<td>heaven</td>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>judgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from an actual spatial movement from heaven to earth, each example of the “coming” of the Divine King is a future event. The example from Adam and Eve (Apoc.), though set in the past, is probably parabolic and thus teaches a future judgement for all.

Moving onto the NT, not once is it recorded that Jesus spoke of the coming (ἐρχόμενος) of God (θεός). Nor, for that matter, did any of the Gospel redactors. On the other side of the

511 Isa 30:27, 31:4, could have been included here in relation to Isa 33:17,22, but were not since 30:27 refers to the coming of the name of YHWH and 31:4 used the verb יָבֹא. Ps 68:17 is mentioned by Preuss, (1975ET), “יָבֹא bo”, TDOT II, 46 and, Jenni, (1997ET), “יָבֹא bo’ to come”, TLOT I, 203, in this context but in Ps 68:18 (BHS) יָבֹא is not present. Isa 35:4 is not mentioned by Jenni.

coin, nowhere outside the Synoptic Gospels is there any mention of the “coming” of the kingdom of God. This begs the question whether the coming of the kingdom of God in fact means the coming of God as king.

In chapter 3 that question was answered in the affirmative. The “kingdom of God” meant for the Pharisees and Jesus first and foremost God Himself as king. In addition, it is clear that, for whatever reason, Jesus preferred “kingdom of God” to any other divine royal appellation. Therefore, the coming of the kingdom of God meant for Jesus fundamentally the coming of God as king, whose Royal Presence was yet to be in the “here-and-now”.

3.7.2 הילי, הלי (niphal and ithpeel) “to reveal, uncover”

הלי (Aramaic הלי) has two basic meanings: the transitive “to uncover”, “to make/become clear”, “to appear”; and the intransitive “to proceed toward”, “to leave”, “to go forth”, “to go into exile” and “to emigrate”.

We are interested here in the Hebrew niphal form and the Aramaic ithpeel form of the transitive verb, in which it is reflexive, with God as the subject. In such a context, the Hebrew verb, so limited, appears in the following verses in the OT: Gen 35:7, 1 Sam 2:27, 3:21 and Isa 22:14.

Gen 35:7(E) refers back to Gen 28:10-22, where God appears to Jacob in a dream at Bethel. It is thus not strictly a theophany. 1 Sam 2:27 occurs in an oracle against Eli’s family. Together with 1 Sam 3:7,21 which effectively constitute a fulfilment of the oracle, these indicate “a verbal revelation in prophetic fashion”, similar to Isa 22:14, where God literally “reveals himself” in the ears of the prophet (cf. Dan 10:1), by again issuing a threat.

What is crucial for the present task is that whereas האב in the qal future form implies something or an event that is not yet present, הלי in the niphal future form implies that the subject is in fact present but in some sense hidden from view or knowledge, only to be exposed to sight. In fact the common antonym of הלי is הול, which means “to hide, cover” something that is already “there”.

---

513 An important observation, made often, for example: Lohmeyer, (1965ET), Lord’s Prayer, 90; Perrin, (1967), Rediscovering, 59; The exception is Tg. Neb. Mic 4:8, but this is to be dated to the Amoraic period. See Section 2.5.1.2, the footnote to Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7b, and Section 3.5.1.3, the footnote to Tg. Neb. Mic 4:7-8.


“To reveal” then is to uncover something that is present but hidden from view,\(^{516}\) whether it is an object, event or secret. A brief survey of the other instances of the niphal of הָלַג in the OT will confirm this view.

1 Sam 14:8,11. Jonathan, accompanied by his armour bearer, sneaked into a Philistine camp and hid. Once there, they “revealed themselves” to the Philistines.

2 Sam 6:20. Michal, Saul’s daughter and David’s wife, complained that David exposed his body in public. This form is often used in a similar context.\(^{517}\)

2 Sam 22:16 (// Ps 18:15). Part of a psalm of thanksgiving. The bottom of the ocean was exposed to the light from heaven (cf. Ezek 13:14).

Isa 23:1. Knowledge of an event that had occurred or would occur in a prophetic future.

Isa 40:5. God’s glory will be revealed. Again, not a theophany, but an acknowledgment that God’s act of deliverance, which had previously been effected, would be seen and stand as a testimony to his majesty (cf. 53:1). It is a particularly interesting verse, since הָלַג niphal and הָזֲזַה “to see” are together implying that revelation means that such an object or event can, in fact, be seen or acknowledged.\(^{518}\)

Ezek 16:57, Hos 7:1, Prov 26:26. The exposure or discovery of wickedness previously hidden, unnoticed or ignored.

1 Sam 3:7, Dan 10:1. A word of God or a divine secret told (revealed) to someone.

The Pseudepigrapha contains two instances where God as king “is revealed” or “appears”, 1 Enoch 1:3-4 and Jub. 1:28. In each case this appearance comes only after God first “comes forth” or “descends” from his heavenly abode. Similarly, the Pseudepigrapha contains only one instance where the “kingdom of God” is said to appear: As. Mos. 10:1.

In other words, within the context under discussion, “reveal” implies the exposure to physical sight of something present but previously hidden from view. In the few instances were God is the subject of the verb, it also implies a previously present but hidden God.

---

\(^{516}\) See Dalman, (1902ET), Words of Jesus, 100-101 (not 97 as in Chilton); G. F. Moore, (1927), Judaism II, 374; Chilton, (1982), The Glory of Israel, 151 n. 1; Chilton, (1984), Galilean Rabbi, 60; Moltmann, (1996ET), The Coming of God, 137; See Section 1.4.2.


\(^{518}\) Cf. 1 Sam 3:21, 2 Sam 22:16 (// Ps 18:15). There are no such occurrences of הָזֲזַה and הָלַג. Cf. Vetter, (1997ET), "וַיֶּהַב hzh to see", TLOT I, 401; Jub. 1:28.
3.7.3 In the Targumim

As noted at the beginning of Section 3.7, in the Targumim, a phenomenon which until now has either escaped notice or defied full explanation, may be found. That is, that on a few crucial occasions the Targumim substitute the Aramaic ילב “to reveal” for the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים “to come”. They are crucial because they occur precisely in the context of divine kingship, or in association with “kingdom of God”.

The verses in the right-hand column of each chart below have been isolated as instances where the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים has been translated by the Aramaic ילב within the context of either the kingship of God (first table) or directly referring to the kingdom of God (second table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date for targumim</th>
<th>God as “king” see Section 2.2.1 for OT</th>
<th>God as “king” to reveal himself</th>
<th>Date for targumim</th>
<th>“kingdom of God” to be revealed See Section 3.2.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-70 see Section 2.3.1.2</td>
<td>Zech 14:9,16,17</td>
<td>Zech 14:3,4,5</td>
<td>Pre-70 see Section 3.3.1.3</td>
<td>Isa 40:9,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-70 see Section 2.5.1.3</td>
<td>Mal 1:14</td>
<td>Mal 3:5,24</td>
<td>Obad 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 33:17,22</td>
<td>Isa 33:10</td>
<td>Zech 14:9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-70 see Section 3.5.1.3</td>
<td>Isa 24:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 31:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek 7:7,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Section 1.6.2 the phenomenon of “converse translations” in the Targumim was discussed. It is submitted that, in the Targumim, within the context under discussion, the Aramaic ילב is not a synonym for the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים, but is an example of this technique of translation known as “converse translation” - but such a translation being made because of theological rather than semantic reasons. This may be claimed for three reasons.

First, within the context of divine kingship, ילב translates more than simply אֱלֹהִים, as is shown by the following table, so that a simple translation with the same meaning cannot be assumed.
Second, the Targumim whose formation occurred before or soon after A.D. 70 had a particular understanding of the presence of God as king / the kingdom of God. To have said that it was coming would have been an absurdity since, as far as the originators of their tradition were concerned, it was already in the here-and-now, waiting for the time of revelation. This is confirmed not only by the conclusions drawn in section 3.6.2 and 3.6.4 but also by the simple fact that none of these targumim used the world “come”.

Third, the idea of “to come” has nothing to do with theophony or epiphany, whereas “to reveal” does, *per se*. In every instance discussed above with the verb “to come”, it is associated with theophany only when that is explicitly mentioned, as if the verb “to come” did not on its own imply that. The event of the “coming” of God or the kingdom is therefore something different from its “revelation”, which may or may not follow.

In short “to come” testifies to a future reality, “to reveal” to a present one. The two verbs mean exactly the opposite to one another in this context.

### 3.7.4 Arguments against Converse Translation

The primary argument against regarding the two verbs as converse translations, at least within the limited context of divine kingship and the kingdom of God, is that they do sometimes occur in parallel and where they do so, they seem to indicate the same action. Thus the verbs may in fact be synonyms.

As mentioned in Section 3.7.2, the following references have been found to contain “come” and “appear” in close proximity when referring to the Divine King: Isa 56:1, and other OT passages; *I Enoch* 1:3-4; *Jub.* 1:28; and *As. Mos.* 10:3,7,12.

---


521 *Tg. Neb.* Mal 3:1,5,24, may be relevant here, but its dating is problematic. God will send a messenger to prepare his way (3:1a, cf. v. 24). The messenger will “come” and then be “revealed” (3:1c,2a,3a) in order to prepare for God by purifying the sons of Levi (3:b, cf. 1:7) so that they may be able to offer acceptable sacrifices “before the Lord” (3:4, cf. 1:14a). Then God himself “shall enter his temple” (3:1b, cf. v. 12) and “reveal himself” (3:5,24) in order to judge (a kingly activity) those who sinned. We may note the strong emphasis on Divine Presence highlighted by the fact that God must “come” to be in his temple before he can “reveal” himself there. Thus, this
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Isa 56:1

BHS of Isa 56:1

כִּי אָמַר יהוה שֶׁמֶתֶר וּנְשֵׁר פְּרָקָה

NRSV of Isa 56:1

Thus says the LORD: Maintain justice, and do what is right, for soon my salvation will come, and my deliverance be revealed.

At first sight this verse from (third?) Isaiah may appear to undermine, or at least weaken, the above argument that there is a fundamental difference between אֲבֹהַ and הָלָל. The verbs appear to be in synonymous parallelism and the verse mentions two key indicators of divine sovereignty, namely חֶוֹבֵי “salvation” and רַדְרוֹת “deliverance”. However, this is not the case.

First, we may note the order of the verbs. If it is God himself as king that is being described, then the order of the verbs is significant. He must first come (from heaven) before being revealed. Indeed, in every other case where the Divine King is said to be revealed and there are indications of his location in heaven, the verbs “come” and “reveal” always come in that order.

Second, for the synonymous parallelism to be relevant here, the two nouns “salvation” and “deliverance” need to be themselves synonyms. For the Isaian tradition, God himself is חֶוֹבֵי “salvation”. His very Presence means salvation. On the other hand, רַדְרוֹת better translated “righteousness”, although an attribute belonging to God, is not exclusive to him. God is able to impart the quality of “righteousness” to humans. It is also his instrument for his act of impending redemption and salvation.

Targumic tradition saw ‘the house of the Shekhinah’ (v. 12), i.e. the temple, as currently vacant and it awaited the time when “the Lord” will enter it. In the meantime, God was a rex vagus, a king not living in his kingdom.


The (third) Isaian tradition maintained that YHWH lived in heaven, see Isa 63:15, 66:1.

Related to the verses analysed are the following: Deut 33:2 (if כי לְךָ “to shine” were a revelatory verb rather than a verb for battle); Mal 3:2, the messenger of YHWH, רַדְרוֹת followed by נַצְלָת. In fact, in every case where the two verbs appear together in the same verse in BHS (1 Sam 2:27, 9:15, 2 Kgs 15:29, 17:28, Isa 16:3, 23:1, 56:1, Jer 24:1, Hos 7:1, Amos 5:5), רַדְרוֹת always precedes נַצְלָת. The two exceptions, Jer 24:1 and Hos 7:1, do not count because the verbs have different subjects.

In the Isaian tradition: attribute of God, 5:16, 45:8,23,24, 51:6,8, 56:1, 59:16,17; it comes from God and some humans can have it, 5:23, 9:7, 28:17, 33:5,15, 48:18, 54:14, 57:12, 58:2, 59:9,14,
Third, the nouns occur together in four other verses: Isa 46:13, 51:6,8 and 59:17, if the synonym to שָׁשֶׁת כָּלַל מִלָּתְךָ namely שָׁשֶׁת כָּלַל מִלָּתְךָ is taken into account. The first three confirm that God’s righteousness is an instrument for salvation, the last depicts God as the Divine Warrior preparing for battle (cf. 42:13, 52:10). Both righteousness and salvation come from YHWH. He is righteousness and salvation.

1 Enoch 1:3-4

The sequence of events is clear. God will “come” from heaven, proceed to Mount Sinai as the Warrior King and there “appear”. Though the whole may be one continuous event, the sequence and order of the verbs is important. It indicates not only that they mean different things, but that “come” implies a previous absence, whereas “appear” implies a previous presence, no matter how short the period.

61:10,11, 64:5; for redemption, 1:27, 10:22; for salvation, 32:16,17, 45:8, 46:13, 51:6,8, 56:1, 63:1.


531 This has been previously discussed in Section 2.2.3 under 1 Enoch 9:4.

532 Black, (1985), The Book of Enoch, 106. Black explained the odd Greek rendering as being due to a later copyist.
Jub. 1:26,28

Translation of Jub. 1:26d,28 (based on the Ethiopic)^533

1:26 until I shall descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity.

1:28 And the Lord will appear in the sight of all. And everyone will know that I am the God of Israel and the father of all the children of Jacob and king upon Mount Zion forever and ever. And Zion and Jerusalem will be holy.

This passage has been previously discussed in Section 2.2.3 under Jub. 1:28. The sequence of events is similar to that of 1 Enoch 1:3-4. In v. 26, God will “descend and dwell” in the sanctuary once the sanctuary is built. Only then will he “appear in the sight of all” (v. 28, cf. Isa 40:5). Everyone will then know that God is “king upon Mount Zion forever and ever” (cf. Isa 24:23). God “will appear” only after he “descends and dwells”.^534

As. Mos. 10:3,7,12

Translation of As. Mos. 10:3,7,12^536

3 <Exur>get enim Caelestis a sede regni sui et exiet de habitacione sancta sua cum indignationem et iram propter filios suos.

7 Quia exurgit summus Deus aeternus solus, et palam veniet ut vindicet gentes et perdet omnia idola eorum.

12 Erunt enim a morte, receptione m<ea> usque ad adventum illius tempora CCL quae fiunt.

Aspects related to the above have been previously discussed in Sections 2.2.3 and 3.2.3.

The sequence of events is slightly mixed in chapter 10. Verses 1 and 2 describe the appearance of the kingdom of God. How that will happen is described in subsequent verses. God will first rise from his throne in heaven and “come” to earth, which will


suffer earthquakes and lack of light as a result (vv. 3-6). Only then God will *palam veniet* “manifest himself” in order to punish the nations and destroy idols. God’s “coming” is alluded to again in v. 12.

Thus the Divine King’s “coming” and “manifestation” are always separable events and mean different things.

### 3.7.5 Parallel Examples Supporting Converse Translation

**Messiah**

Judaism does not speak of the “coming” of the Son of Man,
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540 Justin *Dialogue*, VIII (ANF I, 199a).
Luke 19:11

NA$^{27}$ of Luke 19:11

'Ακούοντος δὲ αὐτῶν ταύτα προσθεὶς εἶπεν παραβολὴν διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ἱερουσαλήμ αὐτῶν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοῖς ἃτι παραχρήμα μέλει τὴ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναφαίνεσθαι.

NRSV of Luke 19:11

As they were listening to this, he went on to tell a parable, because he was near Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately.

This verse forms the introduction to the parable of the ten pounds (Luke 19:11-27) and has previously been discussed in Section 3.5.2. As the parable contains five instances of words with a ψεφιν stem, they have been discussed in Section 2.5.2.1.

Unfortunately, exactly what Luke meant by ἀναφαίνεσθαι, the present infinitive passive of ἀναφαίνω, is not at all clear.

ἀναφαίνω occurs only twice in the NT - both in Luke-Acts (Luke 19:11, Acts 21:3). The one in Acts refers to the sighting of land (Cyprus) from an approaching ship - land, as it were, hidden from view until sighted.$^{541}$ It occurs five times in the LXX: Song 6:5, translating the verb שׁלָל “to sit, recline”, which occurs only here and at BHS Song 4:1, where it is translated by αἰσκολυπτόω “to reveal”; Job 11:18, translating בִּלְשָׁנ “to lie down”; Job 13:18 and 40:8, combined with δίκαιος, translating מַר “to be righteous” and meaning “to be declared righteous”, in the sense that the righteousness already present is clearly seen and declared; and Job 24:19, which bears little relationship to the Hebrew.

In Josephus, the verb in the passive voice usually means “to appear, discover” either something that seems to be the case or is found to be so.$^{542}$ Again, prior presence or existence is assumed.

Whatever the exact meaning, the picture for our purposes is clear. Luke thought that those who followed Jesus believed that the kingdom of God was going to appear παραχρήμα “immediately”. The verb is ἀναφαίνω and not ἔρχομαι. That is, the hidden kingdom was soon “to be revealed”.$^{543}$ Those in the caravan with Jesus, did not believe that the kingdom of God would “come”, because for them it was already in the here-and-now, only hidden.

---

The subsequent parable can be understood as a corrective to this misconception. There is not a single word depicting the “appearance” or “revealing” of the nobleman. There are, however, words of motion. The nobleman “went to” a distant country (v. 12) only subsequently “to return” (vv. 12, 15). The idea was that the nobleman left the presence of his slaves for a time. Whether one interprets the nobleman as being Jesus or God (with the kingdom of God identified with each), the effect is the same. The kingdom is not present in the here-and-now of the redactor, but will be when Jesus/God returns. Quite simply, the nobleman does not hide within his territory from his slaves only to “appear” and demand an account of their actions.

3.7.6 Synthesis

Within the context under discussion, namely that of God as king or the kingdom of God, the following observations have been made:

That “to come” refers to the approach of an event or object that is not yet in the here-and-now, whereas “to reveal” refers to the exposure to sight of something that is present but hidden. In other words, these two verbs do not mean the same thing but refer to different events, even when they occur together;

That in the Targumim containing traditions that can be dated to prior to and shortly after A.D. 70 (and therefore are reflective of both Pharisaic and post-70 synagogue ideas respectively), the Aramaic “to reveal” is a converse translation of the Hebrew “to come”.

The Pharisees therefore always referred to the “revealing” of the kingdom of God and never to its “coming” since for them the Divine King or kingdom of God was already present in the here-and-now but hidden.

Conversely, it should come, therefore, as no surprise that Jesus is never recorded as having spoken of a revealing of the kingdom of God. For him to have done so would have been a denial of his understanding of the kingdom not simply as God the king but a denial of the kingdom which in his time he believed was fundamentally removed from the world, i.e. it was in “heaven”.
4 AN EXEGESIS OF
LUKE 17:20-21

“[I]f we could know (which we never can) whether Jesus really said 21, and if so, what he meant by it, it would be intensely interesting.”
(Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, 546)

4.1 PREFACE

The aim of this chapter is simple. Having proposed a new way of regarding the phrase “kingdom of God”, the present task is to apply that understanding to Luke 17:20-21 in order to appreciate better and to shed light on that most enigmatic of Gospel passages. The success or otherwise of the endeavour will be an indication of the validity of the proposed model of the “kingdom of God”.

The method employed will be a carefully layered consideration of each element of the pericope.

First, to avoid circular arguments, the composition history of each element will be ascertained, independent of exegetical considerations. To use the probable meaning of a text in order to discern its composition history only later to conduct an exegesis on the result, is to employ hermeneutically unsound reasoning.¹

There have been earlier attempts, of course, to unravel the composition history of this passage. The most notable was that of Josef Zmijewski in his 1972 book Die Eschatologiereden des Lukas - Evangeliums. However, his effort suffered from three fatal errors: he accounted for only two stages of formation, the first and the third, which meant in effect that the second stage was absorbed into the first;² he attempted his reconstruction only after and in the light of his exegesis, leaving open the real possibility of false or

¹ Bultmann, (1963ETRev), Synoptic Tradition, 5, was himself aware, for example, of the tempting circularity of the form-critical method: “The forms of the literary tradition must be used to establish the influences operating in the life of the community, and the life of the community must be used to render the forms themselves intelligible”.

² Zmijewski’s approach is typical of scholars who have tackled Luke 17:20-21. Hence in this chapter there is little to note under the headings marked “Recent Exegetical Comment” as related to Stage II. Indeed, almost all Recent Exegetical Comments ought to be discussed under Stage III, though for the sake of clarity some are reserved for Stages II and I.
biased results; and finally, his treatment was far from comprehensive and balanced, for example he dealt with the composition of v. 21b in half a page.

The second methodological consideration, made in order to gauge the success of the new model of “kingdom of God” as applied to the passage, will be an attempt to give as comprehensive an account as possible of all significant work that has been carried out on Luke 17:20-21 since Richard J. Sneed’s 1962 dissertation and summary article. Since it has been some 40 years since a single work has been devoted to the passage, that in itself is sufficient justification for such a presentation.

Third, while using the positive points of the last 40 years of scholarship, the deficiencies will be answered by using the proposed model of the “kingdom of God” to demonstrate that it is the best way, perhaps the only way, of extracting the original meaning of the passage at each of the three stages of its formation.

This chapter then is unique in several respects. It is the climax of the first separate treatment of Luke 17:20-21 in almost 40 years; it is the first exegesis of the passage to be based on a predetermined and independent composition history; and it is the only one to offer an explanation founded on a perceived contrast in the understanding of the kingdom of God not simply between the Pharisees and Jesus but at each of the three stages of its formation.

---

3 Zmijewski, (1972), Die Eschatologiereden, 361-78. The methodological flaw is one typical of much German scholarship, i.e. of providing an exegesis based on a (limited) composition history which itself is based on the exegesis, e.g. Schnackenburg, (1970), “Abschnitt”, 213-34, and the list of German works in Section 1.4.3.

4 Zmijewski, (1972), Die Eschatologiereden, 361-97, the composition history of v. 21b is on p. 386.

5 See Section 1.4.3.
4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage

The text of Luke 17:20-21 as received (finally redacted) is as follows. It has been divided into convenient subsections for closer analysis.

Luke 17:20-21 at the end of Stage III

Luke 17:20a 20ας Ἐπερωτηθεῖς δὲ
20βς ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων
20γς πότε ἔρχεται
20δς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
20ες ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν
But having been asked
by the Pharisees
when is coming
the kingdom of God
he answered and said to them,

Luke 17:20b 20βα σῦκ ἔρχεται
20ββ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
20βγ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως,
20βδ ἢ ἑβού τῶν ἑρωτῶν
20βη ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
20βγ ἢ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.
“It is not coming
the kingdom of God
with observation,
for behold
the kingdom of God
is within you.

4.2.1 The Narrative Introduction

In typical chreia style, the so-called “Narrative Introduction” (Luke 17:20a) places the more important sayings of Jesus in historical context by providing a question in indirect speech for which the sayings are Jesus’ response.

4.2.1.1 Ἐπερωτηθεῖς δὲ (20ας)

Redactional Considerations

Of the 19 times Ἐπερωτήθεις is used in Luke-Acts, its presence in Luke 17:20 has two unique properties: it is the only passive use; and it is the only anaphoric example of the

---

6 The best manuscripts read as given: 75, Ν, B, L, 1241. The following insert Ἰδοὺ here: A, D, (W), Ψ, f1,3, lat, syC-PH. See Aland, (19752), Synopsis, 202 and NA27, 217, for this and the following two footnotes.

7 The following replace ἐκεῖ with ἔκει: Θ.


9 See Section 1.3.

10 Indeed, the only passive use of this verb in the entire NT. Its only occurrence in the LXX is at Sir 32:7. For passive verbs in the Gospels, see Deer, (1975), “Constructions with a Passive Meaning”, 338-46. For other near contemporaneous examples of Ἐπερωτήθεις, see for example: Let. Aris. 10, 2 Clem. 12:2.
verb. The Lukan redactor clearly favoured the indicative active form in direct speech referring back to the object with a pronoun. These observations would normally lead one to suspect that the redactor had received this form from his sources and incorporated it untouched into his work.

On the other hand, three factors make this simple conclusion questionable: Luke clearly preferred this word in cases of dispute, one other time in relation to Pharisees (Luke 6:9); he used it at the beginning of two other sentences where it is followed immediately by δὲ; and on four other occasions he used it in indirect speech.

---

11 Porter, (1994), *Idioms*, 134, a verb is “anaphoric” when it refers to something mentioned previously as understood.

12 The main method used to ascertain the text received by the redactor prior to his modifications is that known as “redaction criticism”. That Luke (i.e. the redactor) did in fact redact his material is certain from the mere fact that he did not hesitate to redact Mark. Since he did so with Mark there is no reason to suppose that he did not also do so with his other sources (whether written or oral), including those usually designated as part of his “special source” (“L”), Gagnon, (1993), “Statistical Analysis”, 711. The corresponding goal of the method is to determine the theological and other factors that influenced the redactor, thus arriving at the redactor’s intended meaning. See, for example, the classic studies which consciously employed this method: Marxen, (1969), *Mark the Evangelist*, esp. 15-29; Bornkamm, Barth and Held, (1963), *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* passim; Conzelmann, (1961), *Theology of St. Luke*, passim; Stein, (1970), “A Markan Seam”, 70-94.

Criteria for differentiating between tradition and redaction will include the redactor’s composition style and vocabulary, Stenger, (1993), *NT Exegesis*, 50. For a general picture of Lukan style, see Cadbury, (1920), *Style and Method of Luke*, 213-38, in addition to the other works given below. It will also involve approaching the problem as if nothing was known about the redactor’s sources. See Tyson, (1978), “Source Criticism of the Gospel of Luke”, 39, who pointed out that “Since we do not know anything [about Luke’s sources], this would appear to be not only a necessary but also a legitimate approach”.

On a practical level it will proceed by asking two fundamental and interrelated questions: is the vocabulary what one might reasonably describe as typical of Luke; and, is the interrelationship of the words what one might reasonably describe as typical of Luke? If the answer is no to one or both of the questions then the probability of it being non-Lukan and therefore from a Stage prior to redaction is increased. There are problems with this method. For example, if a word or a stylistic feature is found to be unique or nearly unique to Luke, especially in pericopes exclusive to Luke, it merely makes it more likely that it is a contribution from Luke’s source. The possibility must not be forgotten that it could just as easily be a feature of Luke which he considered to be uniquely suited to the purpose and context. See, for example Gagnon, (1993), “Statistical Analysis”, 712, for examples of words unique in Luke-Acts in pericope redacted from Mark.

Another caveat concerning the method to be followed in ascertaining a likely composition history is that the use of statistics to decide probable transmission alterations may seem to be unconvicing or indecisive in individual cases. What should be borne in mind is the totality of the presentation, especially given the fact that, a relatively small section of the largest single corpus of work (Luke-Acts) in the NT is being dealt with. So, Chilton, (1979), *God in Strength*, 33, wrote: “[I]ndividual guesses about word use are only part of the redaction critical process. When guesses collectively form a pattern of diction which is suggestive of the deliberate work of the redactor, then the credibility of this pattern is greater than the individual guesses which make it up. Patterns more than particulars provide reliable insights into the governing intentions of an author”.


Yet, Henry J. Cadbury\textsuperscript{15} noted that Luke preferred rather the simple verb ἐρωτάω, changing Mark’s ἐπερωτάω to ἐρωτάω on at least three occasions.\textsuperscript{16} In addition, whereas Mark used ἐρωτάω three times (Matthew four times), Luke-Acts used it 22 times. Further, Luke-Acts with its 52 chapters, used ἐπερωτάω just 19 times compared with Mark’s 16 chapters and 25 times (Matthew, eight times in 28 chapters). All this, despite Luke’s otherwise penchant for compound verbs.

Did Luke then compose the question to introduce sayings material? Some commentators suggest that the sentence is “typically Greek” and that therefore the entire question came from the pen of the redactor.\textsuperscript{17}

There is, of course, nothing to prevent “good Greek” coming from the tradition, nor should it be forgotten that the opening verb in its passive form is unique to Luke and the entire NT and that, had Luke composed the first verb of the sentence, he more than likely would have chosen ἐρωτάω over ἐπερωτάω.

There is, therefore, nothing conclusive to confirm that Luke composed the opening verb. Even if there were, however, it does not follow that Luke constructed the entire sentence ex nihilo. It could be, in fact, little more than a Hellenisation of an earlier Semitic (Hebrew and/or Aramaic) source, whether oral or written. In short, the weight of argument is in favour of the origin of Ἐπερωτήθησις being at the non-redaction stage.\textsuperscript{18}

As for δὲ́, this conjunctive particle is a favourite of Luke over κάι.\textsuperscript{19} There seems little reason not to suppose that the redactor used it to insert the passage into his Gospel after vv. 11-19. Whether it has a copulative or adversative role will be determined below.

Recent Exegetical Comment

The context of Luke 17:20-21, sandwiched as it is between the healing of ten lepers and a vivid description of the revealing of the Son of Man, is no accident. Although it may safely


\textsuperscript{18} Gos. Thom. 113, couches a similar story in direct speech. Even if independence is admitted, this does not alter the argument given, since the direct speech of Gos. Thom. 3 merely conforms to the style of Thomas.

\textsuperscript{19} Cadbury, (1920), Style and Method of Luke, 142-45.
be assumed that its placement is the work of the redactor, because of its self-contained standard literary form, that still leaves the question why it is in this particular place in his Gospel.

As noted above, the redactor added the initial δὲ to the pericope. This has the effect of linking it in some way with what precedes it, namely vv. 11-19, the healing of the ten lepers. But what is the function of the link? Is the particle acting in this instance as an adversative or merely as a copulative conjunction joining two otherwise unrelated sections? If as an adversative, then what follows is meant by the redactor as a contrast, however faint, to the story of the healing of the ten lepers.


Their reasons may be listed thus:

a) The faith of the leper is contrasted with the lack of faith of the Pharisees indicated by their need to ask the question.31 A similar contrast regarding discernment of the divine in Jesus’ acts can be found in Luke 5:17-26.

b) The experience of the leper is an illustration of Luke 17:21.32

c) The attitude of the nine lepers is compared to the misunderstanding of the Pharisees.33

---

d) Confronted with a miracle, the Pharisees are prompted to ask such a question.\(^{34}\)

While these reasons are plausible, more convincing justifications can be offered.

a) Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, mention of the kingdom of God is coupled with or follows immediately after acts of healing on the part of Jesus.\(^{35}\) Significantly, three of these (11:20, 13:18,20 and 17:20-21) occur in the travel narrative (Luke 9:51 - 19:27). Rudolf K. Bultmann noticed that there were several other instances in the travel narrative where dialogues were occasioned by Jesus’ healing.\(^{36}\)

b) In addition, vv. 11-19 contain material largely either from L or the redactor, as do vv. 20-21,\(^{37}\) whereas vv. 22-37 are recognised as composite. For example, v. 22a is redactional and vv. 23-24 are from Q.\(^{38}\) Because vv. 11-19 and vv. 20-21 may share the same source, a connection is more likely than between vv. 20-21 and vv. 22-37. Even if vv. 11-19 and vv. 20-21 were in fact presented to the redactor as a single unit, the redactor’s penchant for connecting the kingdom with healing enabled him to reinforce that connection through repetition.

c) Finally, there is neither a change of scene nor necessarily a change of audience between the two.

Nevertheless, the vast majority of commentators look rather to a link between vv. 20-21 and vv. 22-37, seeing vv. 20-21 as an introduction to the longer discourse.

Their reasons include the following:

---


\(^{37}\) It is being assumed here that Luke 17:20-21 is not from Q. On this, see Section 4.3.1.

4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage

a) There are strong dictional parallels between v. 21a and v. 23a. 39

b) Both vv. 20-21 and vv. 22-37 are from Q and were, prior to the redactor, probably linked by their common theme. However, against this is the fact that most scholars place Luke 17:20-21 in L since it does not appear in Matthew. 40

c) The common theme is eschatological, discouraging speculation. One emphasises the present aspects, the other the future. 41 The second is an explanation to the disciples of the first. 42

d) A few years ago, Bruce D. Chilton proposed that vv. 22-37 follow vv. 20-21 because in Luke’s mind the kingdom was Jesus and the ease of transition from the kingdom to the Son of Man is evidenced by this. 43 While the link between the Son of Man and the kingdom in Luke is nowhere near as strong as Chilton would suggest, the link between Jesus the healer and the kingdom is much stronger and more explicit between vv. 11-19 and vv. 20-21.

Yet, not a few commentators have pointed out that there are sufficient differences between vv. 20-21 and vv. 22-37 to suggest that there is little parallel between the two even in the mind of the redactor.


---


40 See Section 4.3.1.


43 Chilton, (1987), “Kingdom Come, Kingdom Sung”, 67. “But the primary achievement of the Lukan presentation is the practical equation of the kingdom and Christology, as effected (and evidenced) by the ease of transition from the statement about the kingdom in verses 20 and 21 to the statement about the Son of Man in verse 22. . . . That verses 20 and 21 refer, within the Lukan design, to Jesus’ presence among the Pharisees appears a straightforward conclusion.”


4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage

Where they give reasons they include:

a) Vv. 20-21 are about the kingdom of God, whereas vv. 22-37 are about the Son of Man. Indeed, Luke took care not to mention the kingdom of God with the Messiah or the parousia.\(^{48}\)

b) The Son of Man is never the subject of ἔρχεται in Luke-Acts. Rather, he is the subject of ἀποκαλύπτω (see especially Luke 17:30), a verb previously mentioned as standing in contrast to ἔρχεται.\(^{49}\)

c) The audience in the first consists of Pharisees and, in the second, disciples.\(^{50}\) Indeed, Pharisees (and/or lawyers, scribes) and disciples are alternating audiences for Jesus in the travel narrative.\(^{51}\)

d) The question is “where” in the second (v. 37), but “when” in the first (v. 20αγ).\(^{52}\)

e) There is no hint of vigilance in vv. 20-21 as contrasted with vv. 22-37.\(^{53}\)

f) Assuming that μετὰ παρατηρήσεως in v. 20bγ refers to the prediction of the “when” of the kingdom,\(^{54}\) it stands in contrast to the preliminary signs of the arrival of the Son of Man in vv. 22-37.\(^{55}\)

The evidence as presented here, therefore, strongly supports the primary connection, made by the redactor, being between Luke 17:11-19 and 17:20-21 rather than between 17:20-21 and 17:22-37.

Apart from the issue of the context of Luke 17:20-21, the other issue here amongst commentators has been whether the question was posed with a negative or hostile intent.\(^{56}\)

---


\(^{49}\) See Section 3.7.


\(^{53}\) Though see Section 4.2.2.3.


4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 : The Third (Redaction) Stage

Epêrhothâmos is used in the LXX to translate ἐρωτάω “to ask, demand” as is also the simple ἐρωτάω and the synonym ἔρωμα. It is largely indistinguishable in meaning from ἐρωτάω, though a special use is in asking a question the answer of which explains or expounds a point in dispute. 56

Leaving aside for the present the problem of whether the Pharisees themselves may have intended the question to be hostile or not (or rhetorical or not), it is clear that Luke would have regarded the question as rhetorical and therefore its motive would have been secondary to the response (nor to what occasioned it, i.e. the healing in vv. 11-19). The use of the passive participle form of the verb shifts the focus of the pericope very firmly from the question to the answer. Nor should it be forgotten that Jesus’ response does not in fact answer the question. If it is rhetorical, this increases the likelihood that the question was not written by Luke in its extant form since it has been previously recognised that the redactor tended to avoid the use of rhetorical questions. 57

Nevertheless, a hint of hostility was probably conceded by Luke. Luke 11:53-54, probably from the redactor, 58 suggests that all subsequent questions by scribes or Pharisees were designed to trap Jesus, 59 despite the earlier use ἐπερωτάω on the lips of Jesus himself in Luke 6:9. 60

Proposed Exegesis

It would appear that Luke inserted δὲ with the intention of placing vv. 20-21 as a sequel and commentary on the healing of vv. 11-19 rather than as an introduction to vv. 22-37. The redactor followed vv. 20-21 by vv. 22-37 probably because of the similarity between

---

4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage

v. 21a and v. 23a and introduced vv. 22-37 not by vv. 20-21 but by himself constructing 22a.

Though the primary intent for Luke of the question would have been as that which prompted the response given by Jesus, questions in chreiai often were attempts to “prove something or score points rather than neutral requests for information”.\(^{61}\) Given the retention of \(\text{Ἐπερωτηθηκε}\), rather than the use of a simpler synonym, some such hostile motive cannot be wholly denied also to the redactor.

4.2.1.2 Υπό τῶν Φαρισαίων (20αβ)

Redactional Considerations

\(\text{Υπό}\) with the genitive following a passive verb occurs frequently enough in Luke-Acts to warrant caution in ascribing this phrase to a source of the redactor. However, three factors point to a genesis prior to the redactor: in the use of prepositions, Luke generally agreed with his sources;\(^ {62}\) rather than \(\text{Υπό}\) he preferred to use \(\text{Πρὸς}\) with the accusative with verbs of speaking;\(^ {63}\) and thirdly, on the two other occasions that the Pharisees are involved in indirect speech in Luke-Acts (Luke 7:36, 11:37), the word used is the Lukan preferred \(\text{ἔρωτάω}\).

The question can be posed differently. Was the attribution of the question to the Pharisees a literary device of the redactor or did he preserve it from his source?\(^ {64}\)

The arguments that have been put forward in favour of Lukan origin include the following:

a) Because Jesus could not have spoken of the kingdom of God as “within” the Pharisees, the original question must have been asked by the disciples.\(^ {65}\)


b) There is a literary tendency in the Synoptics to present the opponents of Jesus as Pharisees or some other well-known group.\(^{66}\)

c) Luke 17:20a is an example of Luke’s fondness for introducing a Saying of Jesus with a question.\(^{67}\)

By way of reply and in favour of the question having originated at a stage prior to the redactor may be said the following:

a) The first argument presupposes a particular understanding of Luke 17:21b, one that is questionable. In any case, nowhere else was Jesus asked when the kingdom of God was coming.

b) Luke 17:20-21 is embedded in Luke’s so-called travel narrative (Luke 9:51 - 19:27) which is interspersed with dialogues involving Pharisees and “disciples”. As such there would have been no pressing need to change the attribution of the question to the Pharisees. In fact every mention of the kingdom of God by someone other than Jesus except Luke 14:15 was uttered by “disciples” or “followers” of Jesus.\(^{68}\) Thus it would be easier to account for a change in attribution from \(\Phi\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota\iota\) to \(\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota\) than the reverse. That Luke did not do so is a strong indication that he received the question as coming from the Pharisees.

c) Jesus’ words convey the distinct impression that they were indeed a response to a question rather than independent statements to which a question was constructed.\(^{69}\) In any case, its chreia form of question and response is indicative of the preservation of the question with manipulation by expansion of the response rather than invention of the question.\(^{70}\)

\(^{66}\) Bultmann, (1963\(^{\text{ETRev}}\), Synoptic Tradition, 52-54.


\(^{70}\) See Section 1.3. Witherington, (1992), End of the World, 267, claimed that it was not a Lukan trait to add the Pharisees into a narrative, citing Matt 3:7 and Luke 3:7. However, Q 3:7 as reconstructed by the International Q Project, also does not include Pharisees, see J. M. Robinson, Hoffmann and Kloppenborg, (2000), Critical Edition of Q, 8.
Recent Exegetical Comment

As discussed elsewhere, there was no identifiable group called “Pharisees” within the Judaism of Luke’s time or within the Lukan Christian community. However, this does not necessarily mean that the question posed by the Pharisees was not also asked either by some Jews or by Christians within the redactor’s audience. Many facets of the kingdom of God were of interest to both groups.

Nevertheless, Luke retained the attribution. He knew that Pharisees not only existed in the time of Jesus but that they put many questions to him which were opportunities for Jesus to teach. Indeed, the conclusion of Section 1.5.4 was that, given the inconsistent use by Luke of the Pharisees, the only statement that can be made with any degree of certainty is that Luke was at least interested in the Pharisees as a historian. That is, Luke kept the attribution of the question to the Pharisees because he had received it as such and it fitted what he knew of the Pharisees.

Is there any significance for Luke in the Pharisees asking the question?

Several scholars, as noted above, point to the fact that Pharisees (and/or lawyers, scribes) and disciples are alternate audiences for Jesus in the travel narrative. Presumably, the implication is that it was the turn of the Pharisees at this point in the narrative. However, there is not strict alternation. The Pharisees of 13:31 are followed immediately by lawyers and Pharisees again in 14:3.

Some, such as Joel B. Green, have suggested that it was the Pharisees who asked the question since for Luke they were the ones who had an inability to understand Jesus’ preaching (cf. Lk 8:10). Yet, it must be said, the disciples are depicted as also misunderstanding the message of Jesus. Luke even explicitly stated as much (18:34) in the travel narrative itself.

Proposed Exegesis

The attribution of the question to the Pharisees was almost certainly received as such by Luke. The chreia form mitigates against alteration of the attribution. Had the attribution as Luke received it been “disciples” his alteration would be difficult to explain.

---

71 See Sections 1.5.3 and 1.5.4.
73 See Section 1.3.4.
Commentators have been confused as to the purpose Luke intended to serve by preserving the attribution to the Pharisees. But, it is possible now to say more with some degree of certainty.

Luke believed that the kingdom was in some sense Jesus himself and this was manifested in his ministry, especially that of healing and exorcisms. The Pharisees are made by Luke to respond in ignorance to a clear example of the kingdom with the healing of the ten lepers. Luke’s primary purpose here was to retain the narrative introduction as just that, viz. an introduction to the all-important responses of Jesus.

4.2.1.3 πότε ἐρχεταί (20αγ)

Redactional Considerations

The sequence πότε ἐρχεταί cannot be Lukan. It is the only place in Luke-Acts where the combination occurs. The use of the present tense to indicate a future (possible) action “figures strongly” in the Gospels. Moreover, ἐρχομαι is found 39 times in material peculiar to Luke, of which Luke 17:20-21 is an instance. The weight of evidence points to Luke preserving this phrase from his source.

Recent Exegetical Comment

Πότε is universally translated as an interrogative adverb of time so that the question refers to an event of unknown time in the future.

The question asked by the Pharisees regarding the “when” of the kingdom stands in contrast to the “where” (ποῦ) asked by the disciples in v. 37 of the revelation of the Son of Man and indeed to the ὁδεί “here” and ἐκεῖ of “there” v. 21αβ.
Proposed Exegesis

There was widespread and long-standing agreement by first century Jews and Christians that the place or centre of the eschatological kingdom of God would be Jerusalem. What was in dispute was the timing and present location of that kingdom.

The presence of ἐρχέται here at first sight appears to be anachronistic. In none of the sources that may reasonably be said to reflect the views of first century Pharisees on the kingdom of God is the kingdom said “to come”. This was because they believed that the kingdom in a fundamental sense was already present but hidden. In fact it would seem that Luke himself knew of this tradition of the Pharisees. Luke 19:11 (a composition of the redactor\(^{80}\)) indicated that the redactor thought that the members of Jesus’ caravan (the crowd of v. 3, disciples and others, including Pharisees) expected the kingdom of God “to appear” (ἀπαραίτερα), and in this he was correct.

If, as seems likely, there is for Luke more than a hint of hostility in the question, this is nowhere better seen than in the attribution of the verb ἐρχέται to the Pharisees. The healing of the ten lepers (at least according to Luke) would have been for them evidence of the presence of the kingdom. As if to mock the preaching of Jesus they ask in effect, “Well then, when is the kingdom of God coming?” since Jesus often said that it was coming (i.e. not yet here).

Nevertheless, the question would have been relevant for Luke’s audience, situated as they were between kingdoms, that is, between the time of Jesus and the time of the second coming of Jesus as the kingdom of God.

4.2.1.3 ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (20aδ)

Redactional Considerations

The exact phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs 21 times in the NT, 13 of those in Luke. It is often labelled therefore as “Lukan”,\(^{81}\) though its presence in Mark and Paul as well as Pss. Sol. 17:3 (independent witnesses), suggest that it was in wider use. There is no detectable difference in meaning between this form and others where one or more articles are missing or where indeed τοῦ θεοῦ is absent.

---

\(^{80}\) See Sections 3.5.2 and 3.7.5.

Recent Exegetical Comment

The only other question in Luke-Acts regarding the timing of the kingdom is Acts 1:6.82 Acts 1:1-14, with the exception of vv. 9-11, was composed by the redactor, but from material supplied by his sources.83 Given that it is posed by the apostles, it is clear that the question may well also have been asked by certain members of Luke’s community concerned with such peripheral matters as the timing of the kingdom.84

Although both Luke 17:20a and Acts 1:6 derive from a stage earlier than the redactor, each point in different directions for Luke. Luke 17:20a is about the timing of the “coming” of the kingdom of God, Acts 1:6 is ultimately about the timing of the “coming upon” (επέρχομαι) of the Holy Spirit. Only for the pre-Lukan community in Stage II were these identical concerns.85

Proposed Exegesis

The question of the timing of the kingdom must have been a question asked by certain members of Luke’s community. It was not an immediate concern for members of the Jewish synagogue, especially that of Palestine, since the kingdom could be had, as it were, by observance of the Torah. That it should also not be an immediate concern for the Lukan community is indicated by the fact that Jesus’ responses treat the question as merely rhetorical.

4.2.1.4 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπευ (20αε)

Redactional Considerations

Forms of ἀποκρίνομαι occur 66 times in Luke-Acts, all but 23 instances with a form of λέγω. All but 13 are in response to a direct question, every one of which is introduced by

---

83 See Section 3.4 under Acts 1:3,6.
84 Zmijewski, (1972), Die Eschatologiereden, 383-84, though Zmijewski was both anachronistic and wrong to describe this as Pharisaic tendencies within Luke’s community, “pharisäische Tendenzen innerhalb seiner Gemeinde”.
85 See Section 3.6.3.
86 See Section 3.6.4.
a form of λέγω or another verb in association with a form of λέγω. Further, three occur in reply to ἐρωτάω, while four are in reply to ἐπερωτάω. What is particularly interesting about the latter is that, except for 17:20, each of the others introduce a direct question or statement and each is also coupled with a form of λέγω. The use of καὶ to coordinate the two verbs occurs in the Synoptics only in L and then only twice. It is John who prefers this construction.

Nevertheless, the syntax is not unrepresentative of Luke-Acts. However, it is unique in being an introduction to an indirect question itself ushered by ἐπερωτάω. It is likely therefore that Luke has altered what was presented to him. Luke has replaced the identification of the respondent (Jesus, needed because vv. 20-21 was probably independent in the tradition) with the grand-sounding and laboured ἀφημίζω καὶ εἶπεν, preparing the reader for the important replies.

It should be pointed out here that the so-called “Septuagintism” in the coupled use of ἀποκρίνομαι and the second aorist of λέγω (without καὶ), recognised by Gustaf Dalman and others, is not an argument for a construction prior to redaction. It may simply be an element of Lukan style, given the frequency of its use.

---

4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21 : The Third (Redaction) Stage

Recent Exegetical Comment

No significant comment has been made since 1962 on v. 20αε, other than that given immediately above.

Proposed Exegesis

The anaphoric state of v. 20αε may mean that vv. 20-21 may have been intended by Luke to be part of vv. 11-19. Other than that, Luke’s minor adjustments merely point the reader more firmly away from the question to the replies. Overall then, Luke 17:20α was incorporated virtually unchanged into the Gospel.94

4.2.2 The First Negative Reply

Prompted by the question of the Pharisees, Jesus made three statements by way of reply. That they were introduced by an indirect question and by the solemn construction of 20αε indicates that the replies far outweigh the question in importance in Luke’s mind.

4.2.2.1 οὐκ ἔρχεται (20bα)

Redactional Considerations

The only other places in Luke-Acts where “the kingdom” is attached to ἔρχομαι is 11:2 (from Q) and 22:18 (from Mark). Like v. 20bα, both are sayings of Jesus and well preserved from their respective sources. Thus it may reasonably be suspected that Luke has preserved his source in this instance also.

Recent Exegetical Comment

Two questions have arisen here: what does the particle οὐκ negate; and what is the implied tense of the verb ἔρχεται.

---

94 Contrary to such scholars as: Zmijewski, (1972), Die Eschatologiereden, 386-87; McNicol, Dungan and Peabody, (1996), Beyond the Q Impasse, 233. Cf. Dillon, (1978), From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers, 43 n. 123.
The natural demands of the Greek indicate that the particle negates the verb. Thus the literal meaning is, “The kingdom of God is not coming μετὰ παρατηρήσεως [or with/by anything else]”. However, there is no other instance where Jesus is depicted by the gospel writers as claiming that the kingdom is not coming.

Despite its location, the particle must in fact negate μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, as is universally translated, so that it should be read, “The kingdom of God is coming (but) not μετὰ παρατηρήσεως”.

As for the tense of the verb, its present form echoes that of the question and is governed by ἔρωσιν in v. 21α. In other words, it is an example of the use of the present to indicate a future action. Even if the present should be strictly interpreted as such, so that the kingdom was in the act of coming in Luke’s (and/or Jesus’ present), its arrival was yet to occur.

**Proposed Exegesis**

Luke believed that the kingdom, as Jesus, was not in his own here-and-now, though it could be thought of as in the process of coming or as coming in the future. Either way, it was not (yet) present.

4.2.2.2 ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (20bβ)

**Redactional Considerations**

See comments in Section 4.2.1.3 under this heading.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

The question of the Lukan understanding of the kingdom of God has been closely examined in the previous chapter. See the relevant Sections there and the summary of the position adopted here, below.

---


96 See Section 3.6.4.
Proposed Exegesis

Luke understood this reference to the kingdom of God as referring to the future coming of Jesus himself. Concern over the timing of this event that was shared by at least some of his community was not as important as other details.

4.2.2.3 μετὰ παρατήρησεως (20by)

Redactional Comments

Μετὰ with the genitive is common enough in Luke and the other Gospels to be unremarkable. On the other hand, παρατήρησεως is one of two Lukan hapax legomena in Luke 17:20-21, the other being ἐντός. The noun παρατήρησεως does not appear anywhere else in the NT, not at all in the LXX and with μετὰ rarely in ancient Greek literature. The frequently cited exception (without μετὰ) is Aquila’s translation of Exod 12:42 in which it renders the noun ὄρασις “vigils”.

The single occurrence of the noun in the LXX and NT and the comparative rarity of the combination of the preposition and the noun in ancient Greek literature generally point to its relative obscurity and to the reasonable conclusion that the redactor did not compose the phrase but for some reason felt compelled to retain it from his source.

---

97 See Section 3.6.4.
100 For example, Riesenfeld, (1972ET), “παρατήρησις”, TDNT VIII, 149, listed only one other instance other than Luke 17:20.
101 Field, (1975), Origenis Hexapolorum I, 102a; BDB, 1037b. A synonym to τήρησις, namely φυλακή (a guard, watch) occurs 24 times in Luke-Acts, though the corresponding compound noun παραφυλακή occurs nowhere in the NT.
Recent Exegetical Comment

The meaning of this phrase or more specifically the noun in its context has given birth to a literature only slightly less in volume than that for ἐντὸς ἡμῶν ἔστιν (21bγ). 102

To simplify the survey of opinion,103 three of the five proposed meanings will be considered here. The other two will be tackled in later Sections because they more closely resemble the meaning that will be suggested for the earlier stages.104

The first possible meaning is the translation “with the Passover”.

Some have pointed to an ancient Jewish belief that the kingdom of God will come on the night of Passover, so that Jesus in Luke 17:20b rejected the idea that the parousia will occur on the night of 14 Nisan.105

This view was championed by August Strobel106 and favoured by just a few scholars, including: Roger L. Déaut (1963);107 E. Earle Ellis (1974);108 and Walter Grundmann (1974).109

Appeal is made to the following:

102 For a monograph dedicated to the word παρατήρησις, see: Mette, (1952), Parateresis, passim.
104 I.e. Sections 4.3.2.2 and 4.4.2.
107 Le Déaut, (1963), La Nuit Pascale, 272 n. 21, 284-85.
a) The translation of Exod 12:42 made by Aquila used the noun παρατήρησης twice in the expression νυξ παρατήρησεως for the Hebrew לילה שבעות.110 This denoted a night of "vigil" in honour of God.

b) This memorial of the redemption from Egypt became united with a first century rabbinic tradition which claimed that the messianic era would begin on the first night of Passover.111

c) Josephus and an early Christian writer used the noun to designate the keeping of religious communal rites. Passover would certainly qualify.112

d) Forms of the verb παρατήρεω were similarly used to designate the observance of religious rites and festivals.113

However, there are numerous problems with this opinion.

a) Although the context of Exod 12:42 is the Passover, there is no sense in which שבעות denotes anything other than the keeping of the feast itself.114

b) The rabbinic documents used to support the meaning come from much later than the redaction of the Gospels, so the tradition cannot be dated with any certainty to the first century. In short, there is no evidence that either the redactor or the Pharisees themselves knew of the tradition.115

c) It is sometimes claimed that the idea lacks any connection with Christian tradition and therefore could not be the meaning of Luke 17:20b at any stage.116 Yet, although this

---

110 Field, (1975), Origenis Hexaplorum I, 102a; Sneed, (1962), Dissertation, 52; Reider and N. Turner, (1966), An Index to Aquila, 184. The versions by Symmachus and Theodotion also used it once in the second position, though these are rarely noted by modern scholars.


criticism is given by prominent scholars, it is difficult to reconcile with the existence of Gal 4:10 and Diognetus 4.5.

On balance, although attractive because of its simplicity, this suggestion cannot be sustained.

The second suggestion is that the phrase means in effect “secretly” or “invisibly”. That is, that Jesus (or rather Luke’s Jesus) rejected any notion that the kingdom of God would come openly or visibly.

A surprising number of recent scholars have opted for this view, along with some modern translations. They include: Gerald F. Hawthorne (1962); Alois Stöger (1969); Josef Zmijewski (1972); Ray Summers (1972); George H. P. Thompson (1972); Leon Morris (1974); Richard J. Dillon (1978); William Hendriksen

---


126 Dillon, (1978), From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers, 43.
As is often the case, not all commentators offered reasons for their view. Their reasons, when given, were the following:

a) It has been proposed that παράτηρήσεως is a translation of the Aramaic证实 “observance”, since this Aramaic noun translates the Hebrew תובלו in Tg. Onq. Exod 12:42 and since the verb παράτηρήσεως could be a translation of the verb תובלו “to observe, guard, keep, wait”. Thus μετὰ παράτηρήσεως would be ב DateTimeOffset - a word which itself means “secretly” or “in secret”.

b) It is claimed that the Pharisees were expecting a kingdom that would itself be obvious. Jesus is thus saying that the kingdom would be quite different from what they expect, i.e. it would not be obvious.

c) These scholars see the exegesis of v. 20b as being dependent on their interpretation of either v. 21a or v. 21b or both. Since these passages for them deny the visibility of the kingdom per se, then v. 20b must mean that the kingdom will not come in any way visible to the sense of physical sight.

d) Since the kingdom of God is, for them, the “spiritual” rule of God, it cannot be identified with anything that can be seen or observed.

Scholars rightly dismiss this meaning as too hypothetical. Three arguments may be put against it.

a) Not only is it not necessary to base the exegesis of one phrase on that of either of the others, the negative stance of v. 21a and the contrary positive stance of v. 21b would equally suggest that each reply has little to do with the other except in-so-far as they deal with the kingdom of God.

---

b) There is nothing in the Gospels that depicts Jesus ever having “spiritualised”, “internalised”, or denied visibility to the kingdom.

c) Another example of this proposed use of the noun in Greek Jewish, Christian or Classical literature has yet to be isolated.

Finally, there is the suggestion that the phrase should be understood as literally as possible so that it should be simply translated “with observation”, i.e. watching, vigil, scrutiny, (hostile or otherwise).


Effectively, they maintain that v. 20b should be translated something like: “The kingdom of God does not (or “will not”, or “is not”) come with observation (or “by watching for it”)”. Those who adhere strictly to the Greek decline also to provide an object of the action implied by the noun. This is supported by the Syriac translations, Gos. Thom. 113.2 and the Old Latin version, which are also without explicit reference to an object.

---

134 See Section 4.2.4.3 below.
139 Gowler, (1991), Host, Guest, Enemy and Friend, 265.
143 The Syriac Peshitta translation of ἔρχεται τοῦ βασιλείου is simply מְלֹא (or transliterated into Hebrew/Aramaic script: מְלֹא), see Section 4.4.2 under Recent Exegetical Comment. For convenience, all Syriac words have been transliterated into Hebrew/Aramaic script, based on Kiraz, (1988), Syriac Primer, 2, 9, 14, 18, 25, 30. On Syriac translations in general, see: Brock, (1998), “Translating the NT”, 371-85; Mathews, (2000), “Syriac Versions”, 374-77.
144 See Section 4.3.1.1, “ἔρχεται μη δι εὐθυς ἐπισκοπήν “it will not come by waiting for it”.
145 Cum observatione: Sabatier, Fischer and La Rue, (1743), Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ Versiones Antiquae III, 342a; Jülicher, (1976), Itala III, 196.
Proposed Exegesis

That the phrase should be taken at face value when discerning the meaning intended by Luke seems to be the best approach here. The object of the observation must be therefore the kingdom of God. That it is Jesus that is the kingdom of God is confirmed by the proposed understanding of Luke’s meaning of the kingdom and by the fact that each of the three occurrences of the verb παρατηρεῖν in Luke has Jesus as its object and either the Pharisees (Luke 6:7, 14:1) or scribes and chief priests (Luke 20:20) as its subject. In each case the watching is hostile in intent.

Talk of the timing of the kingdom must have consumed at least some in Luke’s community so much that they needed to hear that it would not come by watching or waiting for it (i.e. Jesus). In other words, it was pointless to watch for it. The kingdom/Jesus would come, but there were more important things to do in the meantime.

4.2.3 The Second Negative Reply

Of all the sections in Luke 17:20-21, v. 21a has suffered the most by way of textual emendation. None, however, significantly affects the following discussion and so reference has not been made to manuscript differences.

4.2.3.1 οὔδὲ ἐροῦσιν (21αα)

Redactional Considerations

Οὐδὲ occurs 33 times in Luke-Acts, in all but three cases (all in Acts) it is part of direct speech and in all but 13 cases stands in opposition to οὐ, as is the situation here.
4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage

Δροσις occurs once in Matt 7:22, three times in Luke (17:21, 23, 23:29) and once in 1 Cor 14:23. The corresponding verse to Matt 7:22 is Luke 13:26. It uses Δροσις Χενις, a similar construction being used at 23:30 following Δροσις at 23:29.

What would seem to indicate that the whole of v. 21a is out of context is the fact that Δροσις is surrounded by verbs in the present tense, yet it is surrounded by verbs in the future tense in v. 23. Indeed, the absence of v. 21a would not be noticed.  

This raises the question whether Luke inserted v. 21a into the chreia. Rhetorically, this procedure of expansion is in keeping with the nature and transmission of chreiai, yet one must ask whether Luke would have separated two sayings linked by the topic of the kingdom of God with another saying taken out of context and having no such link?

One theory to justify such a move by Luke is that he drew v. 21a almost verbatim from v. 23 to link vv. 20-21 and the following Son of Man passage together. But why would he do this if the link is stronger between vv. 11-19 and vv. 20-21? In any case, v. 21a denies that “they” will say “Behold, . . .” presumably about the kingdom, whereas v. 23 in fact says that when the days of the Son of Man come, “they” will in fact say that very thing. Luke always managed to keep the kingdom of God and the Son of Man separated.

Another theory is that Luke developed v. 21a from Matt 24:23 and Mark 13:21. The redactor, having Θου γαρ in v. 21b already before him, searched for other material containing Θού and found Matt 24:23 (or Mark 13:21), altering the subject from “Christ” to “kingdom of God”. However, this cannot be accepted since the topic there is the coming of “the Christ” and not the kingdom. In any case, as will be noted in Section 4.2.4.1, the phrase Θοῦ γαρ is itself a Lukan composition.

Since there is no good reason why Luke would have destroyed the balance of vv. 20-21 by inserting v. 21a, it is likely that the redactor found v. 21a already within vv. 20-21. That he


152 See Section 1.3.4.


154 See Section 4.2.1.1.


156 Montefiore, (1927²), Synoptic Gospels I, 23. Marshall, (1978), Luke, 653, merely stated that “v. 21a may be based on the saying of Jesus in v. 23”. Also see: Witherington, (1992), End of the World, 70. Nolland, (1993), Luke 35B, 852, stated as “the closeness of the wording” one argument in favour of a Lukan repetition from verse 23. However, without further analysis the opposite may also be the case.
chose not to remove it, indicated that he saw this as a convenient dictional link to vv. 22ff, but little more than that.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

Two questions have arisen regarding οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν: the identity of the subject of the verb; and its implied tense.

The verb does not identify its subject, and is not obviously anaphoric. Since the pericope depicts Jesus speaking either directly to or in the presence of the Pharisees it is unlikely that Luke had them in mind otherwise he would have modified it to read something like “Nor will you say”. 157

More likely is the possibility that the redactor had in mind a commonly known group who might say something like the phrase that is being denied. Some have suggested that they were “false prophets”, given the anti-parallel of v. 23. 158 This is not impossible.

As for the tense, three possibilities have been proposed. Some see it as a “modal” future, i.e. equivalent to “nor can they”. 159 Others see it as an implied present standing in parallel to the true present of ἔστιν in v. 21b. Most, however (or at least the very few who comment), see it as a future, resting their case not only on its actual form but on their understanding of the preceding two instances of ἔρχεται being understood as implying a future coming of the kingdom. 160

The problem with the last two choices is that both ἔρχεται and ἔστιν have themselves been taken in a present as well as in an implied future sense. Despite this, it is better to assume that the redactor took the tense in the sense of future.

**Proposed Exegesis**

Contrary to some scholarship, there is no reason to suppose that Luke 17:21a was composed by the redactor. He retained it unaltered in his otherwise modified chreia.

---

157 Contrary to O’Neill, (1980), Messiah, 22, who claimed that Luke 17:21a was a later gloss.
For the redactor, οὐδὲ clearly stood in opposition to the Οὐκ of v. 20bα. But it cannot imply, as some scholars suggest, that therefore v. 21αβ is another way of phrasing the intent of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, as if it were a type of synonymous parallelism common in the psalms. Rather, it is a juxtaposing of two different but not necessarily opposing ideas. That this must be so is indicated by the use of different verbs, namely ἔρχεται and ἔρουσιν.

From this perspective, Luke maintained the future sense of the verb. The “they” cannot be readily identified as the Pharisees but must refer to a group whom Luke thought would expect to say what follows when the kingdom arrived, but will, in fact, not say it.

4.2.3.2 ἲλου ὡδὲ ἦ ἐκεῖ (21αβ)

Redactional Considerations

In Section 4.2.3.1 it was concluded that in all probability v. 21a is not from the hand of the redactor.

Recent Exegetical Comment

A number of possibilities have been proposed for the meaning of this exclamation. Though scholars have previously sought an explanation from Jesus’ perspective, here the task is to identify the likely meaning of the redactor.

One Jesus was denying that the kingdom of God could be localised, i.e. that it could be associated with a particular place or nation (cf. Acts 1:6-8).¹⁶¹ In other words, when it comes it will be everywhere.

Recent scholars who opt for this meaning include: Richard J. Sneed (1962);¹⁶² Hans Conzelmann (1969⁴);¹⁶³ Richard H. Hiers (1970);¹⁶⁴ Joachim Jeremias (1971⁴);¹⁶⁵ I.

¹⁶³ Conzelmann, (1969⁴), Outline, 110.
¹⁶⁵ Jeremias, (1971⁴), NT Theology I, 101.
4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage


For these scholars, the kingdom of God is not a political or geographical “entity”,174 but rather the “rule” of God.175 Just as the calculation of a future time for the kingdom is rejected (v. 20b), so too is a future location.176

TWO It refers to Jesus and/or his ministry which the “they” have failed to perceive as the presence of the kingdom of God.177


For them this interpretation is dependent on a particular understanding of v. 21b, namely that in it Jesus stated that the kingdom of God is present either in his person or his ministry.180

THREE Since the kingdom will not be accompanied by visible signs (v. 20b), either people will not be able to point it out, or its arrival will be so obvious that such exclamations will be unnecessary.181

166 Marshall, (1978), Luke, 655, with the variation that it refers to “the ruler himself”.
177 For works approximately prior to Sneed: Darby, (1922), Notes of Addresses, 197; W. Manson, (1930), Luke, 197; Geldenhuys, (1946), Luke, 440; Moorman, (1960), Path to Glory, 206.
Those who prefer this interpretation include: Richard H. Hiers (1967, 1970); Ray Summers (1972); Harald Riesenfeld (1972ET); C. Leslie Mition (1978); William Hendriksen (1978); George R. Beasley-Murray (1986); R. Alan Culpepper (1994); and C. Marvin Pate (1995).

FOUR This is a slight variation on the previous suggestion. The kingdom itself will not come in any “externally visible way”.

This explanation has been championed in recent times by David W. Gooding (1987).

FIVE This yet another variation. Jesus was affirming that the kingdom is already present but “invisible”. This explanation is similar to the meaning attached to it in Gos. Thom. 113.4.

This description was espoused by Francis W. Beare (1964).

SIX It refers to the belief that the Messiah will be hidden, or that his identity will remain unknown, until it is revealed.

Those who favour this view include: Norman Perrin (1963); Christopher F. Evans (1990); and George R. Beasley-Murray (1992).

---

185 Mition, (1978), Your Kingdom Come, 42.
187 Beasley-Murray, (1986), Jesus and the Kingdom of God, 100.
190 See the earlier: Meyer, (1884ET), Mark and Luke, 490.
192 See Section 4.3.1.1 and the earlier: A. B. Bruce, (1897), Expositor’s Testament I, 594b; von Harnack, (1901ET), What is Christianity?, 61.
194 Cf. Mark 13:21 and Section 3.7.5.
195 Perrin, (1963), Teaching of Jesus, 175.
Suggestions THREE, FOUR and SIX may be dismissed from further consideration. The pericope is not about signs or the Messiah. The invisibility of Jesus’ kingdom has also been firmly rejected.

From previous research, it may be assumed that the rabbis and the synagogue tradition of Luke’s time believed in the here-and-now presence and future revelation of a universal kingdom of God.\(^{198}\) In fact, Tg. Neb. Isa 40:10 and Tg. Neb. Ezek 7:10 both use נוף (behold) and נב (reveal),\(^{199}\) indicating the possibility that these two words were associated in Jewish circles in the context of the kingdom at the time Luke redacted his Gospel. This is confirmed somewhat when it is observed that the normal role of בָּא (behold) here is supplanted by its more fundamental meaning of “Look!” with the eyes (at “here” or “there”).\(^{200}\) So the suggestions of ONE and FIVE may also be ruled out.

**Proposed Exegesis**

Luke quite likely saw in this saying not a denial of the universal nature of the kingdom but a denial of its existence in the here-and-now and therefore its subsequent revelation. The kingdom/Jesus will not one “day” reveal itself, as if it was until then present but hidden from view.\(^{201}\)

If this explanation is correct, the “they” of v. 21α that Luke had in mind were Jews who followed the standard line of the rabbis and the synagogue which taught a future manifestation of the kingdom.\(^{202}\)

There is of course a certain irony in the saying. For Luke the historian, the kingdom was visible and present to the hearers of this saying in the person of Jesus. Meaning TWO, if applied not to Jesus but to Luke’s Jesus, fits best what has been discovered. The Pharisees in other words, could not see the kingdom standing right in front of them.

---

198 See Section 3.6.4.
199 See Section 3.3.1.4.
200 בָּא is literally the second aorist imperative middle of בָּא and serves here as a demonstrative particle. The basic meaning of בָּא is to “see” with the eyes, though the subjective sense is not thereby ruled out.
201 See Section 3.7.
202 See Section 3.6.4.
4.2.4 The Positive Reply

The two negative replies explain what is not the case. The last response to the question is the all-important positive emphasis that must be lived and believed.

4.2.4.1 ὢδοῦ γὰρ (21bα)

Redactional Considerations

ἐδοῦ γὰρ occurs outside of Luke-Acts only at 2 Cor 7:11. Nigel Turner and others have identified it as a “Septuagintism” since it occurs a number of times in the LXX. On the other hand, John C. Hawkins and others have described this construction as particularly characteristic of Luke.

Given Luke’s predilection for Septuagintisms and for this clause in particular, it may be wondered whether it is not a redactional insertion or alteration designed to link v. 21b with vv. 20b-21a.

Just what sort of redactional activity it might represent is exposed by the extraordinary observation of Henry J. Cadbury. He noted four instances where ὢδοῦ without a verb, as is the case here, takes the place of ἔρχομαι in Luke’s use of Mark.

| Mark 1:40 | Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπτὸς | Luke 5:12 | καὶ ὢδοῦ ἀνήρ πλήρης λέπτας |
| Mark 2:3 | καὶ ἔρχονται πέρὶ αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν | Luke 5:18 | καὶ ὢδοῦ ἄνδρες πέρὶ αὐτῶν |
| Mark 14:3 | ἦλθεν γυνὴ | Luke 7:37 | ἦλθεν γυνὴ |
| Mark 15:43 | ἐλθὼν Ἰώσηφ | Luke 23:50 | ἐλθὼν Ἰώσηφ |

If Luke was able to make this exchange with Markan narrative, is it also possible that he did so here with L speech material?

Not only is it possible that the redactor made this substitution at Luke 17:21bα, it is likely that he did. An ἔρχεται at the beginning of v. 21bα would form an elegant parallel with its occurrences in v. 20αγ and v. 20βα since in each case the subject would be βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. It would also fit well with the syntactical tendency in the NT for the verb to stand at the beginning of a sentence or clause,208 as does the other instances of the verb in vv. 20-21.

Given its close association with ὅπως in Luke-Acts, the conjunction γὰρ is also likely to have been an insertion by Luke, though admittedly it could possibly be from Luke’s source, inserted early in the second stage to contrast the οὐκ of v. 20βα.209

Recent Exegetical Comment

The change from two negative replies to a final positive one naturally forms the climax of the pericope.210

Proposed Exegesis

The substitution by the redactor of ἔρχεται for ὅπως γὰρ admirably reinforces this movement towards the climax of the chreia and eliminates what could have been “bad Greek”, i.e. the otherwise triple repetition of ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in vv. 20αγ-δ, 20βα-β and 21βα-β.

4.2.4.2 ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (21ββ)

Redactional Considerations

See comments in Section 4.2.1.3 under this heading.

---

208 BDF, 248 § 472(1), “The verb can certainly occupy the initial position in the sentence in the continuation of a narrative in non-biblical Greek as well, but it is very common only with verbs of saying. In Semitic languages, on the other hand, this order is the rule with all verbs and consequently very popular in the NT, especially in Mark (on account of Aramaic)”. Also: N. Turner, (1976), “The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts”, 391; Voelz, (1984), “The Language of the NT”, ANRW II.25.2, 958.


4.2 Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21: The Third (Redaction) Stage

Recent Exegetical Comments

See comments in Section 4.2.1.3 under this heading.

Proposed Exegesis

See comments in Section 4.2.1.3 under this heading.

4.2.4.3 ἐντὸς ὑπὲρ ἐστὶν (21bγ)

Of all the clauses in Luke 17:20-21 this one has attracted by far the most attention and rightly so since it represents the climax of the chreia, the point to which the previous statements are directed.\(^{211}\)

Redactional Considerations

Work has centred around the meaning of and hence the most suitable rendering of ἐντὸς, one of the two Lukan hapax legomena in the chreia. It occurs only at Matt 23:26 in the NT and in the LXX just nine times.\(^{212}\) It usually operates as either an adverb of place or as an (improper) preposition,\(^{213}\) though in Matt 23:26 it functions as a noun.

On a redaction-critical level there are just two choices. Either Luke preserved this word as he received it, or for some reason chose to change or add to what was in front of him. Its uniqueness in the Lukan corpus places the onus of proof on its being a Lukan insertion.

Arguments that have been put forward in favour of its being a Lukan composition have not stood the test of time.

\(^{211}\) Even more attention than the μετὰ παρατηρήσεως of v. 20bγ.


One suggestion has been that ἐντὸς is another example of Luke’s fond choice of “Septuagintisms”. That is, another similar word was sidestepped in favour of ἐντὸς. Unfortunately, however, none of the LXX instances is in the context of the kingdom of God.

It has been suggested, too, that the very rarity of the word and its use with a plural pronoun leads one to suspect that an individual was responsible for it. Yet, Luke is not known for such singular innovation, preferring rather to agree with his sources in the use of prepositions. 214

Finally, it has been proposed that because the use of ἐντὸς is a mark of sophisticated Greek, it came from someone not only immersed in Greek culture but who wrote mainly for Greeks. Luke the redactor fits the bill on both counts. Further, most examples of the use of the preposition in Greek literature involve an antithetic function, that is, they point to something “outside the object of their headword” and contrast with it. 215 If, as seems likely, the redactor did indeed replace ἔρχεται with Ἰδοὺ (γὰρ), then the contrasting clause in this case can easily be spotted. It is “μετὰ παρατηρήσεως”.

Yet, while this argument makes much sense there is a simple problem with it. It necessarily denies the capability of composing good Greek to the pre-Lukan community and ignores the fact that chreiai were well known both in Greek and Jewish-Palestinian circles. 216

There is, then, no good reason for supposing that ἐντὸς is the work of the redactor.

The presence and location of the verb ἔστιν may be accounted for by using the redactional history already developed. By substituting Ἰδοὺ (γὰρ) for ἔρχεται, Luke needed to insert a verb into v. 21b. He did so in good Greek style (contrary to Semitic custom) by placing ἔστιν at the end of the clause rather than at the beginning. Why he chose this particular verb and the present tense will be considered below.

Recent Exegetical Comment

For the sake of clarity, given the amount of material written on ἐντὸς Ἰδοὺ ἔστιν (21bγ), each word will be considered separately and those meanings better suited to earlier stages will be dealt with later. This was done in the case of v. 20bγ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως for similar reasons.

214 See Section 4.2.1.2.
216 See Section 1.3.1.
Two traps have marred much scholarship on this difficult word.

First, examples of the meaning of ἐντός have been taken not simply from a wide range of literature but from works that extend over a millennium. Wariness of the use and meaning of the word should increase the further it is taken from the first century.

Second, frequently examples are quoted in support of a particular meaning that involve a singular instead of a plural, or where the meaning is clearly impossible for Luke 17:21b.

In order to avoid such inherent problems, three limitations will be observed.

First, as with the other issues raised in the exegesis of Luke 17:20-21, reference to examples will be limited to those prior to the fourth century (i.e. the ante-Nicene period). A very few exceptions will be made because of their frequent appearance in scholarly works or because of their potential importance.

Second, because to list and compare every example of the use of ἐντός in Greek literature is beyond the scope of this present work, only those examples quoted or referenced in scholarship on Luke 17:21 will be noted. Again a few exceptions will be made, notably three examples from the Greek OT Pseudepigrapha.

Third, although examples where the preposition qualifies a singular noun or pronoun will be taken into consideration, these will be accompanied by examples in the plural.

The Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon lists the meaning of ἐντός only as “within”. But to simply translate ἐντός as “within” without further ado loses sight of the complexity of

---


218 The largest list of such references in published works is to be found in Mattill, (1979), Luke and the Last Things, 204. However, it is far from complete and has some glaring omissions and misprints. Obvious omissions are: three from the Greek Pseudepigrapha namely, Ep. Arist. 68 (OTP II, 17) and Jos. Asen. 2:3,11 (OTP II, 204, 205); four from the Apostolic writers, Pol. Phil. 3:3; Ign. Trall. 7:2, Eph. 5:2; Iren. Haer. 3.21.4; and, references in Hippolytus and Origen. His references to Job 18:19 (Codex Alexandrinus) and P. Fayum 7052.21-22 are unfortunately misprints and his references to P.Oxy. are incomplete.

219 Note that a reference may appear more than once, since examples are not necessarily limited to one meaning in a particular context.

the problem because both in Greek and English “within” has a variety of meanings - a fact that has frequently gone unnoticed in scholarship.221

Yet, quite apart from the nuance to be placed on the word, “within” remains the best translation even over “among”. The reasons for this may be quickly listed.

a) An “interior” dwelling of the kingdom is perfectly possible given the equation of the Holy Spirit with the kingdom made by the pre-Lukan community.222

b) The kingdom can be “possessed” by an individual.223

c) The other alternative meaning “among” is elsewhere represented in Luke-Acts by ἐν ἔσω.224 In other words, had Luke wanted this meaning he would have altered his source accordingly.225

d) The revision to the Old Syriac version, the Peshitta, translated ἐν τῷ by αἷμα (יָע), which itself is best translated as “within”.226 The older Diatessaron has “within your heart”.227

e) Similarly, the older (probably second century) Old Latin version translated it by intra, i.e. “within”.228

f) The Sahidic Coptic version (third century) translated it by ηὐθο, which means “inside”.229


227 Tatian, Diatessaron 40:23 (ANF X, 105); Ephraem, (1993ET), Commentary, 274.

228 Sabatier, Fischer and La Rue, (1743), Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae III, 342a; Jülicher, (1976), Itala III, 196.

229 Schrage, (1964), Thomas-Evangeliums, 30; Sneed, (1962), Dissertation, 46. The Bohairic version (which similarly translated it) is later than the Sahidic, the earliest MSS dating from the fourth
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4) ἐντὸς is merely a strengthened form of ἐν. Given the equation between “kingdom of God” and God, the parallel between Luke 17:21b and 1 Cor 14:25 is thus especially notable.

h) The Coptic Gos. Thom. 3 has the word στήθεις, meaning “inside of you”, contrasting it with “outside of you”. Although the extant edition of P.Oxy. IV.654.16 has not preserved the complete sentence, reconstructions have consistently contrasted the preposition in a similar way to the Coptic version.

While not all the above points ought to be considered relevant (because of the lateness of the texts), it is enough to confirm that “within” must be considered the basic meaning of ἐντὸς here. Its probable nuance, however, is quite another matter.

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) lists nine main meanings for the English “within” as a preposition. The meaning is partially dependent on the identity of the ἐντός, but this will be dealt with separately in the following Section. Given the presence of this dependent genitive plural pronoun, the nine basic meanings allow just three possible interpretations of ἐντὸς in v. 21b. All three are represented in the scholarly literature on the verse.

---

230 Dodd, (1961 Rev), Parables, 64 n. 4; Baird, (1963), Justice of God, 173.
231 Cf. Stauffer, (1965ET), “μέτα αυτοῦ”, TDNT III, 118, who along with the NRSV, translated the ἐν of 1 Cor 14:25 as “among”.
234 Compact OED, (19912), 2329a-b.y.
Option 1: “Within” in the sense of “inside” (OED meanings 1, 2, 5) either a particular group of individuals or all individuals.

Option 2: “Within” in the sense of “among” or “in the midst of” or “between” (OED meanings 3, 4) either a particular group of individuals or all individuals.

Option 3: “Within” in the sense of “in the reach/grasp of” or “in the power of” (OED meanings 6, 7, 8, 9) either a particular group of individuals or all individuals.

Of these three options, the first one is better discussed under Stage II. Option three will be discussed here first, immediately followed by option two.

According to the third option, the intended meaning is that the kingdom of God is capable of being possessed or seen (cf. Luke 6:20, 18:16, 12:32) and therefore is “within the power of”, “within the grasp, reach of” individuals. Tertullian, who first proposed this explanation, harmonised the passage with Deut 30:11-14. He has been followed by numerous modern scholars who, while not necessarily using Deuteronomy, frequently place an ethical dimension on it. It is also supported by similar meanings in Greek literature.

Recent authors who consider this understanding as the most likely include: Andrew J. Mattill (1979); John A. Fitzmyer (1985); Robert E. Obach and Albert


237 “Within” a certain distance or area: Homer *Iliad* 12.374; σ’ Mic 5:6 (NRSV); Xenophon *Institutio Cyri* 1.4.23; Euripides *The Madness of Heracles* 991; Josephus J.W. 2.531,632, 4:8.564. “Within” the capability/control of a person: LXX Ps 39:3 (NRSV); 109:22 (NRSV); σ’ Ps 140:5 (NRSV); Ant. 2:304, 4:80; P.Ross.-Georg. 3.1.9. “Within” a certain time: σ’ Hab 3:2; P.Oxy. IV.724.11, 728.15, 729.20,30, 1278.28; P.Oxy. X.1274.13 (within a certain age); P.Oxy. XII.2342.8. See also: Mattill, (1979), *Luke and the Last Things*, 205.

238 The superscripts All and Phr and Aud indicate those authors who identify the υμῖν as either all people or the Pharisees or the wider immediate audience of Jesus respectively. The issue of identity will be discussed below. Scholars without a superscript either did not venture a suggestion or their decision was unclear.


Against this view is the fact that it lays great emphasis on human effort, which would seem to contradict v. 20b and indeed Luke 6:20 and 12:32, which imply if nothing else that the kingdom is a gift from God.\textsuperscript{249}

The second option, namely that ἐντὸς means that the kingdom of God is “among” or “in the midst of” or “between” a particular group of individuals or all individuals, is much more likely to reflect the intended meaning of the redactor.

Works (from around the time of Sneed) in which the authors opted for “among” include:\textsuperscript{250} Werner G. Kümmel (1961\textsuperscript{ET});\textsuperscript{251} Herman Ridderbos (1962\textsuperscript{ET});\textsuperscript{252} Franz

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{244} Darr, (1992), \textit{On Character Building}, 113, the kingdom is within your “range of perception”.
  \item \textsuperscript{246} D. Hill, (1981), “Kingdom of God”, 72.
  \item \textsuperscript{247} N. T. Wright, (1996), \textit{Jesus}, 469.
  \item \textsuperscript{248} Green, (1997), \textit{Luke}, 630 n. 54.
  \item Scholars prior to about Sneed who considered that the meaning was “among” Jesus’ audience include Beasley-Murray, (1954), \textit{Jesus and the Future}, 174-75.
  \item Scholars prior to about Sneed who opted for the meaning “among” all people include: Meyer, (1884\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Mark and Luke}, 491; Willcock, (1896), \textit{Luke}, 463 (present in the community of believers); Ryle, (1896), \textit{Luke}, 242; A. B. Bruce, (1897), \textit{Expositor’s Testament I}, 594b; Burton, (1912), “Luke 17:20-21”, 278-83 (future); Easton, (1926), \textit{Luke}, 262 (future); Montefiore, (1927\textsuperscript{2}), \textit{Synoptic Gospels II}, 549 (future); Otto, (1943\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{The Kingdom of God and the Son of
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Mussner (1962); George B. Caird (1963); Francis W. Beare (1964); Karl L. Schmidt (1964); Ethelbert Stauffer (1965); Martin Dibelius (1965); Helmut Flender (1967); Alva J. McClain (1968); Wilfrid J. Harrington (1968); Alois Stöger (1969); Richard H. Hiers (1970); Frederick W. Danker (1972, 1988); Josef Zmijewski (1972); Harald Riesenfeld (1972); E. Earle Ellis (1974); Leon Morris (1974); Eric Franklin (1975); J. Vernon McGee (1975); Helmut L. Egelkraut (1976); Luke T. Johnson (1977); Warren W. Glover (1978); I. Howard Marshall (1978); Eugene LaVerdiere

---


Kümmel, (1961), Promise and Fulfilment, 34.

Ridderbos, (1962), The Coming of the Kingdom, 475 (future).


Caird, (1963), Luke, 197, saw it as a future event.


Dibelius, (1965), From Tradition to Gospel, 162 n. 1.


McClain, (1968), The Greatness of the Kingdom, 272.

W. J. Harrington, (1968), Luke, 210, saw the sense as essentially that of v. 24, namely that the verb should be taken in a future sense and that therefore when the kingdom comes it will be “suddenly” in the midst of all.


Hiers, (1967), “Why Will They Not Say”, 383; Hiers, (1970), Kingdom of God, 28. Because he interpreted the verb in a future sense, and saw the kingdom as wholly future, Hiers did not link the future kingdom of God with the person or work of Jesus.


Zmijewski, (1972), Die Eschatologiereden, 378, “die Gottesherrschaft schon in seiner Person, in seinem Wort und seinem Wirken”, “the kingdom of God is already in his person, in his word and his works”.


Franklin, (1975), Christ the Lord, 17-18.


Egelkraut, (1976), Jesus’ Mission to Jerusalem, 186.
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275 LaVerdiere, (1980), Luke, 216
290 Lebourlier, (1992), “Entos hymon”, 259-62. Lebourlier made the interesting comment that even when ἐντὸς is best translated as “inside”, when it is followed by a plural noun it need not mean “inside” every individual of that group but “inside” the group itself, see p. 259.
For these scholars, the phrase meant that the kingdom was already present in the person and/or work of Jesus (cf. Luke 11:20, John 1:26, Gos. Thom. 51, 82, 113) - but a presence it must be stressed, acknowledged by Jesus himself, not simply, as it was argued in the previous chapter, a presence put forward by the redactor.\(^{303}\) LXX Isa 45:14 is often quoted by way of explanation since it has ἐν σοὶ ὁ θεός ἐστιν for the BHS ἐν ὑμῖν (both literally “God [is] in you”).

Arguments that have been put forward for the translation of “among” include:

a) Two witnesses to the Old Syriac version, Sinaiticus and Curetonianus, have ἐν ὑμῖν, which means “among you”.\(^{304}\) However, these belong properly to the fifth century\(^{305}\) - too late to be of benefit in determining a likely original meaning.

b) At Exod 17:7 and 34:9, Aquila translated the Hebrew יִתְרוֹס הַמְּכֹב while Theodotion rendered it by ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν.\(^{306}\) This suggests that ἐντρός and ἐν μέσῳ could have been taken as synonyms on occasion, at least in the Jewish Diaspora of the

---


\(^{299}\) Loader, (1997), *Jesus’ Attitude Towards the Law*, 341.


\(^{303}\) There are of course exceptions, though very few, to this generalisation. One such is del Agua, (1999), “Evangelization”, 653, who argued on quite different grounds what was deduced in the previous chapter (see Section 3.6.4), namely that Jesus as the kingdom is a Lukan insight.


second century and therefore possibly earlier, namely in the time of the third Gospel’s redaction.

c) The θαῦμα at the beginning of v. 21b would seem to imply a kingdom that was observable, i.e. not “within” individuals but “among” them.307

d) The saying should be interpreted in the light of other sayings in Luke, such as Luke 10:9,11, 11:20 where the kingdom may be said to be so near as to be “among”.308 These also occur in the context of healing, as may v. 21.309

e) The word occurs with this meaning in numerous examples in Greek literature including translations of the OT.310

f) The alternative “within you” cannot be right since nowhere else is there a saying of Jesus which points to an inner spiritual kingdom within each individual.311 Or, the saying


309 See Section 4.2.1.1.


is addressed to the Pharisees who could not have possibly been described either by Luke or Jesus as having the kingdom “within” them.312

The recent work of Tom Holmén stands out in the above group. In an important article he analysed most major examples of the use of ἐντὸς that have been used in support of the various translations. He concluded that in most cases an antithetical function can be discerned.313

“The purpose of the choice of the preposition ἐντὸς in Luke 17:20-21 is thus obviously to articulate and emphasize the antithetical structure of the saying: the kingdom is not this, nor is it that (v. 20-21a), for it is this (v. 21b).”

That is, the preposition is better translated “within” in the sense of “inside” as opposed to “outside”. He thus renders Luke 17:21b as “within (the limits of) your group”, using the word “within” in the sense others use “among” in order to highlight this antithetical function. Thus for him, the kingdom “dwells in the group of questioners”, that is, it is Jesus himself.

Holmén’s proposal has three distinct advantages. It explains the presence of ἐντὸς, as opposed to another word or phrase such as ἐν μέσῳ. It is also consistent with Luke’s understanding of the kingdom and with the natural “dictionary” translation of the preposition.

Against Holmén, however, is the fact that the antithetical function of ἐντὸς is unequivocal only when it stands in explicit contrast to such words as ἐκτὸς, ἐξω or ἐξωθεν314 and not infrequently when it functions as an adverb. Further, in the form of pericope of which Luke 17:20-21 is a prime example, namely the chreia, the replies of Jesus need not be connected in the intimate way Holmén saw. Thus Luke 17:21b needs to be interpreted as a reply to the question independently of the other negative replies. In any case, these small criticisms of Holmén’s work do not detract from his conclusion, though it cannot be conceded that this understanding reflects that of the historical Jesus.


The key issue here is the identity of the ἐστιν. Three possibilities have been suggested: all individuals (scholars previously labelled with the superscript All) either now or when Jesus spoke; the Pharisees (Phr), either the group who asked the question or all Pharisees; or the wider immediate audience of Jesus (Aud).

Who Luke thought of is dependent on the implied tense of ἐστιν, because as has been discerned, Luke inserted this verb himself.

Two possibilities have been canvassed for the implied tense of ἐστιν: the actual present tense as presented; or as an implied future.

Those who opt for a present tense include: 315 Rudolf Schnackenburg (1963ET); 316 Gerhard Gloege (1963ET), 317 Ethelbert Stauffer (1965ET); 318 Norman Perrin (1967); 319 Helmuth L. Egelkraut (1976); 320 Eric Franklin (1975); 321 C. Leslie Mitton (1978); 322 I. Howard Marshall (1978); 323 Eugene LaVerdiere (1980); 324 Leonhard Goppelt (1981ET); 325 David L. Tiede (1988); 326 Brian E. Beck (1989); 327 John P. Meier (1994); 328

---

315 Scholars prior to Sneed include: Montefiore, (1927), Synoptic Gospels II, 549; A. T. Cadoux, (1940), The Theology of Jesus, 50-51; Otto, (1943ET), The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, 135; Kümmel, (1961ET), Promise and Fulfilment, 35.
317 Gloege, (1963ET), The Day of His Coming, 144.
319 Perrin, (1967), Rediscovering, 73.
320 Egelkraut, (1976), Jesus’ Mission to Jerusalem, 186.
321 Franklin, (1975), Christ the Lord, 17.
322 Mitton, (1978), Your Kingdom Come, 42.
324 LaVerdiere, (1980), Luke, 216
325 Goppelt, (1981ET), Theology of the NT I, 63-64.
Tom Holmén (1996); Darrell L. Bock (1996); N. Thomas Wright (1996); Joel B. Green (1997); and Gerd Lüdemann (2000). The kingdom of God was already present in the person and/or ministry of Jesus. Thus they do not need to search for it since it is literally before them.


331 N. T. Wright, (1996), Jesus, 469.
335 Bultmann, (1958), Jesus and the Word, 37; Bultmann, (1963), Synoptic Tradition, 121-22.
337 Beare, (1964), The Earliest Records of Jesus, 185.
339 W. J. Harrington, (1968), Luke, 210, called it a “prophetic present”.
344 Weiss, (1971), Jesus’ Proclamation of the Kingdom, 91.
the two instances of ἐρχεῖται (vv. 20αγ and 20βα) as well as the natural future tense of ἐροῦσιν (v. 21α, 23).\[348] It also requires the sense “suddenly” to be extracted from ἢδοὺ γὰρ.

Proposed Exegesis

Luke 17:21βγ, ἐντός ὕπον ἐστίν, has been altered by the redactor. He added ἐστίν to this clause to supply a verb lost by his substitution of ἐρχεῖται with ἢδοὺ (γὰρ).

The preposition ἐντός should be translated literally as “within” but with the nuance for Luke of “among” or “in the midst of”.

As for the identity of ὕπον, even though the clause was prompted by a question from the Pharisees, Luke placed the chreia both in the travel narrative and as a natural response to the witnessing of the healing of the ten lepers. In other words, Luke saw the audience as being all those who accompanied Jesus to Jerusalem. Simply put, all those who were with Jesus had the kingdom of God among them.

The present tense of ἐστίν is deliberate on the part of the redactor. He could have easily chosen the future form of εἴλι (i.e. ἐσται) but did not\[349] and so it cannot be interpreted as an implied future. Further, the position of ἐστίν at the end of the sentence shifts the focus of the extant form of v. 21β to this verb which thus becomes all the more important. The effective deletion of ἐρχεῖται again puts the emphasis back to the present. And the main point, the “suddenness” of the arrival, otherwise has to be added with no real justification.

---


\[349\] Hiers, (1970), Kingdom of God, 28, in particular made much of this supposed connection between v. 21α and v. 23.

Did Luke see the present tense of ἐστιν as referring to his present or that of the “historical” Jesus? Given the conclusion of Section 3.6.4, namely that for Luke the kingdom was first and foremost Jesus himself (whether or not he acted as such in his “ministry”), and that therefore the kingdom was not in Luke’s own present, the clause must refer in Luke’s mind to the present of the historical Jesus.

In other words, “the kingdom of God is within you” is an accurate translation of the meaning intended by Luke as long as the particular nuance of “within” is what is meant by the English word “among”, since for Luke Jesus as the kingdom was “within” in the sense of “among”, “in the midst of” his hearers.
4.3 THE SECOND (TRANSMISSION) STAGE

If the above redactional considerations are correct, Luke received the following chreia from the pre-Lukan community.

Luke 17:20-21 at the end of Stage II

| Luke 17:20a | 20αα Ἐπερωτήθης | Having been asked |
| 20αβ τῷ τῶν Φαρισαίων | by the Pharisees |
| 20αγ πότε ἔρχεται | when is coming |
| 20αδ ή βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ | the kingdom of God |
| 20αε ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς | Jesus answered, |

Luke 17:20b

| 20βα οὐκ ἔρχεται | “It is not coming |
| 20ββ ή βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ | the kingdom of God |
| 20βγ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως. | with/ by observation, |

Luke 17:21a

| 21αα οὐδὲ ἔρουσιν | nor will they say, |
| 21αβ Ιδοὺ οὐδὲ ἡ ἐκεῖ, | “Behold here”, or |

Luke 17:21b

| 21βα ἔρχεται (γὰρ) | (for) is coming |
| 21ββ ή βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ | the kingdom of God |
| 21βγ ἐντὸς ψηλῶν. | within you. |

4.3.1 The Narrative Introduction

It is highly likely that the above was received by Luke as an independent chreia. Its absence in Matthew means that there is no evidence that it circulated as an isolated saying in Q. 350 Its exegesis therefore in Stages II and I must be without recourse to its gospel context.

---


4.3.1.1 Ἐπερωτηθεὶς τῶν Φαρισαίων (20αα - 20αβ)

**Source-Critical Considerations**

The use of the passive form of ἐπερωτάω strongly hints at the chreia having been received by Luke in written form. It is absurd to think that a question would be preserved in oral form in the passive voice. It may be assumed though that in the oral stage (Stage I) the verb was in the aorist indicative active form: ἐπερωτήσαν. If that were the case, Ἰησοῦν would have been its non-anaphoric object.

The attribution of the question to the Pharisees is again at issue because logion 113 of the *Gospel of Thomas*, which represents a parallel saying, attributed a similar question to the “disciples” of Jesus.

**Gos. Thom. 113**

1. Ἡ μνήμη ἡμῶν ἱερὰ ἔγινε τὰ μνημειώματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἡμῶν
2. Μὴ θέλετε ἐστίν ἡμῖν ἃ οὐ έκκλησία ἐστὶν ἡμῖν έγερθεν ἐκ φύσεως
3. Μὴ θέλετε ἐστίν ἡμῖν ἀλήθεια ἡ ἐμὴ τῆς ἡμείς \(\Delta\chi\) ἦσθε ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἂν ἐκ φύσεως
4. Ἐγέρθη ἡμῖν ἀλήθεια ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν \(\Delta\chi\) έστίν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἂν ἐκ φύσεως

Translation of **Gos. Thom. 113**

1. His disciples said to him, “When will the kingdom come?”
2. <Jesus said,> “It will not come by waiting for it.
3. It will not be a matter of saying ‘Here it is’ or ‘There it is’.
4. Rather, the kingdom of the father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it.”

If this logion is dependent on Luke, then of course the change in attribution is due to the editors or the subsequent separate transmission history of the Thomas logion. If, however, it represents an independent tradition, that leaves the question which (the *Gos. Thom.* or Luke) represents the earlier form.353

---


353 The question of the dependence or otherwise of the *Gospel of Thomas* on the canonical Gospels has produced a large and continually growing bibliography (see the annual bibliography in *Novum Testamentum*). The issue is not settled by mere reference to the fact that the *Gospel of Thomas* is
In the *Gospel of Thomas*, whenever the Pharisees are mentioned, it is always on the lips of Jesus. Conversely, where a question is asked of Jesus it is invariably ascribed to his “followers” or “disciples”, occasionally named. Thirdly, in the *Gospel of Thomas* other attributions are altered in order to conform them to this intended style. For example *Gos. Thom.* 99, “The followers said to him, “Your brothers and your mother are standing outside”, is paralleled in Matt 12:47, Mark 3:32 and Luke 8:20, where in each case it was someone from the crowd who spoke the words.

usually dated to the early second century - well after the Synoptics (though some date it earlier) - since source critical issues apply to it also. The issue is frequently confused by imprecision. Many scholars simply adopt “independence” or “dependence” without defining what they mean, e.g. McLean, (1995), “On *Gos. Thom.* and Q”, 322 n. 4.

The following are the most important positions that have been taken by scholars regarding the relationship between the *Gospel of Thomas* and the Synoptics.


c) It is dependent on a common shared tradition where parallel sayings exist, but independent of the final redaction of the Gospels, e.g.: Koester, (1980), “Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels”, 112; Patterson, (1990), “*Gos. Thom.* and the Historical Jesus”, 681 n. 19, 622, 636. Also Robbins, (1997), “Rhetorical Composition and Sources”, 102, where that tradition is Q.


Because the scholarly debate is far from settled on the matter, the safest procedure is to err on the side of caution and proceed initially as if d) was operative. This will allow a case by case analysis.
Thus it is clear that the editors of the *Gospel of Thomas* felt the need to alter attributions and other characters in order to conform them to this pattern. Since Luke is much freer in his attribution of questions, the witness of the *Gospel of Thomas* may be discounted. Again, the “Pharisees” as the intended questioners is the best option.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

The significance of the attribution of the question to the Pharisees, has not been previously explored in relation to Stage II.

**Proposed Exegesis**

While “Pharisees”, as an identifiable group, had effectively ceased to exist in Luke’s time, the same was not true for the pre-Lukan Christian community. This community had to deal with members who still identified themselves as Pharisees as well as with Pharisees outside it. It is hard to see how either group would not be in the minds of those in the pre-Lukan community who heard/read this chreia in this period.

As for the change from a direct to indirect question, it can be attributed to the transfer from oral to written form, but also to a strict translation from the Aramaic oral form to a style that conformed to the Greek literary form of chreia. It suggests that the change took place when the story moved out of Palestine into the Christian communities of the Mediterranean. The answers given to the question were no less relevant to the Greek-speaking Christians than they were and continued to be to Palestinian Jewish Christians.

### 4.3.1.2 πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (20αγ - 20αδ)

**Source-Critical Considerations**

Apart from altering the question from a direct to the present indirect, there is no reason to think that it underwent alteration or indeed composition during Stage II. If *Gos. Thom.*

---

356 See Sections 1.5.1 and 1.5.2.


358 See Section 1.3.2.
113, with its similar question, represents a separate tradition, the question as written is even on surer ground as being left untouched by Stage II.

Recent Exegetical Comment

The significance of the question has not been previously explored in relation to Stage II.

Proposed Exegesis

For the early pre-Lukan Christian community this question would have been full of irony.

The Pharisees proper, as discerned earlier, believed that the kingdom of God was already present and so in a fundamental sense could not “come”. What was future was a revelation or exposure of the present kingdom. The use of the verb in their case contributes to the irony and to the hostile intent of the question.

On the other hand, the Christian Pharisees, having expressed faith in Jesus, evidently had fulfilled the basic requirement for reception of the Holy Spirit. There is therefore no reason to deny that they too had received the gift of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 15:8). Why then would they have asked such a question, considering that they believed that the kingdom in the form of the Holy Spirit was present within them? It is possible that these Pharisees misunderstood the intimate connection between the kingdom and the Spirit, because of their continued emphasis on observance of the Torah (cf. Acts 15:5) and that they continued to look forward to a future revelation of the kingdom.

4.3.1.3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς (20αε)

Source-Critical Considerations

Some such word as ἀπεκρίθη would normally be expected here, however the whole phrase is uncharacteristically absent from Gos. Thom. 113.2. It is thus not impossible

359 See Section 4.3.1.1.
360 See Section 3.6.2.
361 See Section 3.7.
362 See Section 4.2.1.1.
363 See Section 3.6.3.
364 See Section 4.3.1.1.
but unlikely that no such introduction to Jesus’ replies existed in the oral stage. At least it can be said that since Ἰησοῦς would have been the explicit object of ἐπερωτήσαν at the beginning of the chreia,⁶⁶ there would during the oral stage (Stage I) have been no Ἰησοῦς here.

Recent Exegetical Comment

Since these changes are being proposed for the first time here, there has been no previous comment on them.

Proposed Exegesis

The changes noted above are of no exegetical significance, other than that they indicate adaptation from an oral to written form, indicative of the movement from Stage I to Stage II of the formation of the chreia.⁶⁶

4.3.2 The First Negative Reply

It is worth repeating that the aim of the exegesis in Stage II is not to discern any prophetic connotations in the utterances of Jesus regarding, for example, the place and meaning of the Holy Spirit. Rather, it is to uncover the interpretation that the early pre-Lukan community placed on the received words of Jesus. As Stage I is approached, this interpretation may then be distinguished, along with that of Stage II, from that of Stage I, so that the meaning probably intended by the historical Jesus may be more clearly seen.

4.3.2.1 οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (20α - 20β)

Source-Critical Considerations

Because Jesus never said that the kingdom of God was not coming (at all), the negative particle οὐκ should qualify μετὰ παρατηρήσεως rather than the verb. The resulting construction οὐ μετὰ occurs often enough in the NT and the LXX to be unremarkable.⁶⁷

---

⁶⁵ See Section 4.3.1.1.
⁶⁶ See Section 4.3.1.1.
It would appear that early on in the transmission of the chreia (Stage II) the particle was moved to its present location where it naturally modifies the verb.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

This question has not previously been discussed from the perspective of the pre-Lukan community.

**Proposed Exegesis**

There is deep significance in the relocation of the negative particle from μετὰ παρατηρήσεως to έρχεται. The effect is the statement that the kingdom of God is in fact not coming.

This actually fits precisely what can be known of the pre-Lukan community. For them, the kingdom of God was not coming because it was already present through and in the Holy Spirit to those who had faith in Jesus.368

On the other hand, the Pharisees, to whom the reply is ostensibly addressed,369 believed that the kingdom was not confined merely to those who belonged to the covenant of Moses or indeed to those who correctly observed the Torah.370 The Divine Royal Presence was at once everywhere and yet hidden. Interestingly, Gos. Thom. 113.4 has a similar connotation, “[T]he kingdom of the father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it”.371

**4.3.2.2 μετὰ παρατηρήσεως (20by)**

**Source-Critical Considerations**

As noted above, at the beginning of Stage II, the negative particle stood in the Greek at the head of this phrase and qualified it.
Recent Exegetical Comment

Though not discussed from the perspective of Stage II, previous scholarship has highlighted one possible meaning of the phrase that would appear to fit best what has been deduced regarding the pre-Lukan community.

This possible meaning can be conveniently divided into two distinct types: either “with signs” in the sense of observable events or objects heralding the kingdom of God which enable the observer to predict either the timing or the fact of the imminent coming; or “with signs” in the sense of observable events or objects which accompany the kingdom of God.

Scholars who see Jesus’ first negative reply as referring to events or objects which herald the coming kingdom include: 372 Werner G. Kümmel (1961ET); 373 Norman Perrin (1963, 1967); 374 Rudolf K. Bultmann (1963ET); 375 Francis W. Beare (1964); 376 Arthur L. Moore (1966); 377 Wilfrid J. Harrington (1968); 378 J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel (1971); 379 Joachim Jeremias (1971ET); 380 Eric Franklin (1975); 381 C. Leslie Mitton (1978); 382 Charles H. Talbert (1982); 383 Eduard Schweizer (1984ET); 384 Joseph A. Fitzmyer (1985); 385 Wah B. Khoo (1986); 386 Robert E. Obach and Albert Kirk (1986); 387 Samuel Kümmel, (1961ET), Promise and Fulfilment, 32.


373 Kümmel, (1961ET), Promise and Fulfilment, 32.

374 Perrin, (1963), Teaching of Jesus, 175, 177; Perrin, (1967), Rediscovering, 72-73.

375 Bultmann, (1963ETre), Synoptic Tradition, 125.


381 Franklin, (1975), Christ the Lord, 17.

382 Mitton, (1978), Your Kingdom Come, 41-42.


Their reasons include the following:

a) Jesus is depicted on numerous occasions as having rejected the speculation of the time of the coming of the kingdom. Some go on to suggest that this was because Jesus either signified or was himself the kingdom already in the world. 404

b) Speculation regarding the time of the end and the techniques employed in calculating that are evidenced in earlier literature. Such techniques were based on the premise that...
there was a divine plan for the world culminating in some sort of apocalyptic climax and that this could be known by discerning and observing the signs.405

c) Similar warnings against calculating the end appear in rabbinic sources.406

d) In classical literature the noun is sometimes employed as astrological terminology to indicate the observation of certain precursors to immanent events.407

Arguments that have been mounted against this proposal include the following:

a) Jesus was apparently not averse to giving “signs” of the end.408

b) Other “signs” were not signs of the approach of the end, but of God at work in the world.409

c) In any case, calculating signs was designed to ascertain the appearance of the Messiah not the appearance or coming of the kingdom of God.410

d) Finally, μετά with a dependent genitive refers to acts which occur along with παρατήρησις.411 This leads to the other associated meaning.

Scholars who see the phrase as meaning that Jesus is condemning search for accompanying evidence for the kingdom of God include:412 Alexander Rüstow (1960);413


408 E.g. Mark 13:7-28-29.


410 Dalman, (1902ET), *Words of Jesus*, 144.


Their reasons for opting for this possibility may be summarised thus:

a) Sign watching has already been condemned in Luke (11:16,29-32).

b) In classical Greek literature there are examples of the use of the noun παρατήρησις to indicate symptoms of a present disease which a doctor would watch out for.
c) The kingdom of God will be obvious in itself when it comes.\textsuperscript{435}

d) The advent of the kingdom is completely independent of human action, dependent only on divine will (Acts 1:7).\textsuperscript{436}

e) The Pharisees were expecting an unmistakable sign which would demonstrate that the kingdom was present.\textsuperscript{437}

f) As noted above, μετὰ with the genitive denotes association or accompaniment. So Jesus was saying that there would be no accompanying sign to mark the arrival of the kingdom.

**Proposed Exegesis**

If, as is being suggested, the kingdom of God is the Holy Spirit for the pre-Lukan community, then the kingdom comes “into” individuals without prior or accompanying signs (though note Acts 2:3). The exercise of the charismatic gifts was the sign that the Holy Spirit had already come, e.g. Acts 2:4.\textsuperscript{438} That is, charismatic gifts were neither heralding nor accompanying signs. If one must look for a heralding sign, then it is some act of faith on the part of the individual.\textsuperscript{439}

As for their opponents, the Pharisees, they believed not so much that the (hidden) kingdom would be revealed by practice of torah, but that by observance of the Torah one would thereby properly and fittingly acknowledge the presence of the (hidden) kingdom.\textsuperscript{440} Thus it is possible that in Stage II, the pre-Lukan community took the saying as a charge against this attitude of the Pharisees as opposed to faith in Jesus. In other words, the “signs” were the practice or observance of the Torah.


\textsuperscript{436} Weiss, (1971\textsuperscript{ET}), *Jesus’ Proclamation of the Kingdom*, 91; J. T. Carroll, (1988), *Response to the End of History*, 87.


\textsuperscript{438} Horn, (1992\textsuperscript{ET}), “Holy Spirit”, *ABD III*, 277-78.

\textsuperscript{439} See Section 3.6.3.

\textsuperscript{440} See Section 3.6.2.
4.3.3 The Second Negative Reply

### 4.3.3.1 οὐδὲ εἰροθείνει μὴ σοῦ οἶκον ἐκεῖ (21a)

**Source-Critical Considerations**

There is every good reason to suspect that v. 21a did not originally belong to the other sayings of Jesus in vv. 20b and 21b. It contains no mention of the kingdom and the verb is the only explicit future in the chreia. Further, the parallels Matt 24:23,26 and Mark 13:21 and for that matter Luke 17:23 have nothing to do with the kingdom of God. This is not to say of course that v. 21a is not authentic, especially given its multiple attestation, simply that there is reason to deny its original location here as part of the conversation on the kingdom Jesus had with the Pharisees.  

This first part of v. 21 is likely, then, to have been inserted into vv. 20-21 in Stage II, since it was received by Luke in its present location.

*Gos. Thom.* 113.3 may at first sight appear to undermine this conclusion, if it is assumed that it represents a tradition independent of that of Luke 17:20-21. This very similar saying is also flanked by sayings which parallel Luke 17:20a and 21b. However, what can be said of Luke 17:21a can also be said of *Gos. Thom.* 113.3, in particular that it too contains no explicit mention of the kingdom though it is surrounded by short sayings that do.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

This saying has not previously been discussed from the perspective of the pre-Lukan community.

**Proposed Exegesis**

If this saying was inserted during Stage II, then the reason for the inclusion ought to be explained by our model of the understanding of the kingdom of God.

---


442 ἐγινάυοκς ἢπα τε εἰς εἰς ❦ητε πληκαν εἰς εἰς ❦ητε θ, “It will not be a matter of saying ‘Here it is’ or ‘There it is’”. See Section 4.3.1.1.
The future tense of ἔροῦσιν was a concession made by the pre-Lukan community to the time of Jesus when the Holy Spirit had not yet come.

4.3.4 The Positive Reply

4.3.4.1 ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ἁλών (21b)

Source-Critical Considerations

What changes were made to v. 21b in Stage II to produce the form given here? Since source-critical issues are of major importance in Stage II, special consideration ought to be given here to Gos. Thom. 3.3 and P.Oxy. IV.654.15-16.

**Gos. Thom. 3**

**Gos. Thom. 3a**

1. Πες τε Χε ευγνωσος ημιν η το εις χε εις θυσιν ετοιμερο σε η τε η εις ιμπαλην υφ ωρπ ερωτησε τη
2. Ευγνωσος ημιν Χε εις ζην ολακας εις ις ημβ η ωρπ ερωτη
3. Δια τειμερο σιμπετησουν Δωρ σιμπετησα

Translation of **Gos. Thom. 3a**

1. Jesus said, “If those who lead you say to you, ‘See, the kingdom is in the sky, then the birds of the sky will precede you.
2. If they say to you, ‘It is in the sea,’ then the fish will precede you.
3. Rather, the kingdom is inside of you, and it is outside of you.

**P.Oxy. IV.654.9-16**

**P.Oxy. IV.654.9-16**

1. Λεγει ης(ςου· .Relative
2. οι μελέντες ημις [ειπωσιν ψιν ἑνου]
3. η βασιλεια έν ουρανω, ως φησοται
4. τα πετεινα του ουρ[ανου] ένων 5. ειπωσιν δυ
6. Τη την γην έστων, εγελευονται
7. οι ιδιες της θαλασσας[σθης προφθασαν-]
8. της ψιν και η βασιλεια του θεου
9. εντος ψιν τη [ες]τι [και τος...]

Translation of **P.Oxy. IV.654.9-16**

1. Jesus said, “[If] those who lead you [say to you, ‘See,] the kingdom is in the sky, then the birds of the sky [will precede you.
2. If they say that] it is under the earth, then the fish of the sea [will enter it, preceding] you.
3. And, the [kingdom of God] is inside of you, [and it is outside of you.

Unfortunately, for immediate purposes, **Gos. Thom. 3.3** and **P.Oxy. IV.654.16** give no clues to the manipulation that Luke 17:21b might have undergone in Stage II. Where,

---

according to the theory of independence, it might have led to an expected a closer parallel between the above and v. 21b in Stage II, in fact this extra-canonical source at the crucial point exhibits closer parallels to the final form of v. 21b. It is more likely, in other words, to be dependent on the final redaction of Luke, though it may be of some help in determining the meaning of ἐντός (see below).\textsuperscript{447}

Thus, there seems to be no reason to suspect that v. 21b underwent modification in Stage II.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

Although this saying has not previously been discussed from the perspective of the pre-Lukan community, it is appropriate now to discuss the literature that gives another optional meaning for ἐντός.\textsuperscript{448}

This meaning is the simple “inside” and a favourite of so-called “liberal Protestants”.\textsuperscript{449} It boasts among its supporters some of the ante-Nicene church fathers,\textsuperscript{450} as well as others who would also shy away from such a label as “liberal Protestant”.

Recent scholars who support this meaning include the following:\textsuperscript{451} Richard J. Sneed\textsuperscript{All (1962)};\textsuperscript{452} Alfred F. Loisy\textsuperscript{Aud (1962ET)};\textsuperscript{453} Joseph A. Baird\textsuperscript{All (1963)};\textsuperscript{454} Charles F. D.

---


\textsuperscript{448} Option 1, see Section 4.2.4.3.


\textsuperscript{451} Other scholars prior to Sneed who maintained this meaning may be conveniently divided.


For them, the kingdom is essentially an “inner”, “spiritual” reality given by God and present within an individual. It is most often no more defined than that. Where arguments are presented, they are confined to three.

a) The kingdom was not an outward reality so that people could say v. 21a, (or that it would be heralded or accompanied by outward observable signs, v. 20b), but an inward reality.463

b) Jesus placed this kingdom “in men’s hearts”.464

c) For some, this “inner”, “spiritual” reality is nothing less than the Holy Spirit. That this was one concept held by the early Christian community is evidenced by Rom 14:17, where life in the kingdom was life “in the Holy Spirit”.465

453 Loisy, (1903ET), The Gospel and the Church, 163.
459 Perrin, (1967), Rediscovering, 74, “within the experience of an individual”; Perrin, (1976), Language, 45, “It [ἐν τῆς ἑδρᾶς ἡμῶν ἐστὶ] means that the symbol of the kingly activity of God on behalf of his people confronts the hearers of Jesus as a true tensive symbol with its evocation of a whole set of meanings, and that the myth is, in the message of Jesus true myth, with its power to mediate the experience of existential reality”. Cf. Section 3.4.2.1 d); Seal, (1984), “Retracing a Pilgrimage”, 101; Elmore, (1987), “Linguistic Approaches to the Kingdom”, 62. See Perrin’s earlier work, where he opted for the NEB translation “among you”, Perrin, (1963), Teaching of Jesus, 176.
That ἐντὸς can sustain such an interpretation is supported by the fact that examples of this use or a similar one can be found in other Greek literature including OT translations and by Gos. Thom. 3.3 and P.Oxy. IV.654.16 (see above). In the last two, for example, εἰσέρχομαι and ἐντὸς ἐστιον “inside you” are clearly contrasted with εἰσέρχομαι and κατὰ τὸν [ἐστιον] “outside you” respectively.

**Proposed Exegesis**

The notion that the kingdom of God is the Holy Spirit for the pre-Lukan community sheds a great deal of light at this point.

A survey of the verbs associated with the presence or the bestowal of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts not only confirms that the Holy Spirit is given only to individuals but is an independent entity that “fills” each of them. The sense of ἐντὸς, meaning “within” in the connotation of “inside” each individual, fits Stage II perfectly.

Since it is not the concern here to discern the meaning Jesus might have intended but simply the meaning attached to it by the early pre-Lukan community, it does not represent a prophecy of Jesus regarding the coming of the Holy Spirit, but is rather how the pre-

---


Lukan community would have interpreted it. Ἐρχεται would have been taken as a prophetic present, that is, an implied future, where Jesus was interpreted as predicting the coming of the Holy Spirit within individuals.
4.4 THE FIRST (ORAL) STAGE

At the end of Stage I, the following was received by the pre-Lukan community.

Luke 17:20-21 at the end of Stage I

Luke 17:20a  
20α ἐπερωτήσαν  
20αβ οἱ Φαρισαιοί ἤσοῦν  
20αγ πότε ἔρχεται  
20αδ ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ;  
20αε ἀπεκρίθη  
Luke 17:20b
20αβ ἔρχεται  
20ββ ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ  
20εγ οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως,  
Luke 17:21a
21α  
21αβ
Luke 17:21b
21αβ ἔρχεται (γὰρ)  
21ββ ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ  
21βγ ἐντὸς ὕποποιν.

As near as can be judged, this represents a literal translation of the Aramaic. As such it probably never received the written form as presented here, though it might have circulated orally in a form not dissimilar to this for a short while. Consequently, it is legitimate to ask what might have been the oral Aramaic form.469

Any attempt to write an Aramaic retroversion is fraught with complications. From a purely scientific perspective, there cannot be absolute certainty that the Greek from which an Aramaic translation is derived represents a precise translation of the authentic words of Jesus. There is not a fixed one-to-one correspondence of words between Aramaic and Greek.470 The comparative ease with which a retranslation is made may be simply indicative of the kind of Greek someone steeped either in Aramaic or the Septuagint would write.471 Verbatim accounts do not exist, nor is there any certainty that composition did not occur very early in Stage I yet after the time of Jesus. In addition, while it can be assumed with some confidence that Jesus would have spoken Aramaic at least on most

469 It is assumed here that any Aramaic form of the passage was not committed to writing but was transmitted orally. The comment of Black, (1967)3, Aramaic Approach, 271, that “it is not possible from the evidence to decide” whether this Aramaic source was written or oral, is still pertinent.


471 See footnote in Section 4.2.1.4.
occasions, precisely which dialect he spoke is unknown. Further, the Jerusalem church spoke both Aramaic and Greek from its beginning (cf. the Hellenists of Acts 6), so the Aramaic form may not have circulated for very long or very widely before being translated into Greek.

While these inherent problems are real in any endeavour to posit an Aramaic retranslation, they can be mitigated to a considerable extent if two points are kept in mind.

First, by applying the so-called criteria of authenticity to the earliest possible account, these criteria may be used most effectively, since there is less likelihood of the results being confused by subsequent manipulation of the text. By taking as the point of departure not the extant Gospel form but that arrived at after careful consideration of its transmission history, better grounds for the resultant Aramaic may be had. Yet, like the methods employed in Stage I, any success ought to be measured not individually but cumulatively. In any case, the best that can be hoped for is a high probable degree of antiquity if not authenticity.

Though a complete application of the “criteria of authenticity” to Luke 17:20-21 at each stage of its formation including Stage I is beyond the scope of this present work, the passage more than satisfies these criteria. Briefly, it satisfies: multiple attestation, since the Pharisees appear in various form-critical categories and ask questions of Jesus, and since “kingdom of God” is a constant motif attributed to Jesus, as is its “coming”; discontinuity, since the particular question posed by the Pharisees is unique, as are Jesus’ replies; coherence, since the Pharisees were a real historical group at the time of Jesus and from what little is known of them it is possible, even likely, that they engaged in debate with Jesus over the kingdom of God; and style, since elements of the literary style of the pericope cohere with those that are characteristic of Jesus.

Second, by keeping in mind that any resultant Aramaic text will not necessarily be the ipsissima verba of Jesus, a form close to that which circulated orally in Stage I may be reached. But any certainty that it therefore represents the actual words of Jesus will remain

---

472 Fitzmyer, (1997), “The Languages of Palestine”, 46; Casey, (1998), *Aramaic Sources*, 79, 81, 86, 88, 255. Jesus perhaps knew how to read (and speak?) Hebrew (e.g. Luke 4:18-19) and some Greek (e.g. his conversations with Pilate).


elusive.\textsuperscript{476} It must be said, however, that such an Aramaic text will be more likely to be closer to the actual words of Jesus than any retroversion direct from the extant Gospel form.

With the above in view the following is offered. Whether or not the Aramaic retranslation is accepted, it is hoped that the comments under “Recent Exegetical Comment” and “Proposed Exegesis” may stand independent of the retranslation. They may in that case be considered as exegetical comment on the form of the chreia as presented at the beginning of this Section.

4.4.1 πότε ἐρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (20αγ -20αδ)

Aramaic Retranslation

A simple retranslation of the question back into Aramaic would be:

אֲרַמְאָ הָאִירֶבָא מִלְכַּתא דָּרוֹלָדָא “When is the kingdom of God to come?”

The verb קָאַרְנָ to come is here given in the infinitive mood מַעְרַה to emphasise better the future direction of the question. The interrogative adverb אֲרַנְבָא אֲדַנְבָא when? stands first in the sentence.\textsuperscript{477} The normal place for the verb is at the head of the sentence, followed by its subject and object, except for example where adverbs or negations occur.\textsuperscript{478}

More important, however, is that the phrase “kingdom of God” has been used instead of “kingdom of heaven”.\textsuperscript{479} The former is to be preferred because: it was the common phrase of Jesus; no contemporary Palestinian literature used the phrase “kingdom of heaven”, preferring rather “kingdom of God” or “kingdom of the Lord” or simply “kingdom”; and because the Gospel of Matthew, being the only exception, means that it is unlikely that the other Gospel redactors changed to “kingdom of God” deliberately and with absolute consistency.\textsuperscript{480}

\textsuperscript{476} Hollander and de Jonge, (1985), \textit{The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs}, 355. There is no need to be as sceptical as Hollander, though prudent caution regarding the limitations of the exercise is still warranted.

\textsuperscript{477} אֲדַנְבָא, Jastrow, (1903), \textit{Dictionary}, 51b; קָאַרְנָ, Jastrow, (1903), \textit{Dictionary}, 780a.

\textsuperscript{478} Black, (1967\textsuperscript{3}), \textit{Aramaic Approach}, 50; Stuckenbruck, (1991), “Aramaic Sources: the Recent Debate”, 18.

\textsuperscript{479} “Kingdom of heaven” was preferred by: Dalman, (1902\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{Words of Jesus}, 93; Schnackenburg, (1963\textsuperscript{ET}), \textit{God’s Rule and Kingdom}, 80; Cranfield, (1963), \textit{Mark}, 64; Walther, (1979), “Late Reflections on the Kingdom of God”, 178.

Recent Exegetical Comment

Recent exegetical comment has been considered in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.3.1.

Proposed Exegesis

Although the Pharisees would not naturally have used the verb “to come” in relation to the kingdom of God, its use here cannot be denied. Indeed, its use by the Pharisees brings with it a sense of mocking. They were using Jesus’ own words probably in an effort to discredit him or win a point of argument. Jesus used the opportunity not to answer the question but to undermine one of the fundamental principles of their understanding of the kingdom of God.

4.4.2 ἐρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως (20b)

Aramaic Retranslation

The proposed Aramaic retroversion is the following:

"The kingdom of God is not coming by observance."

This reconstruction is slightly different from that of Gustaf Dalman. Like the Greek, the negation at this location governs the verb, though the meaning is that the kingdom of God is coming, but not with observance, so it has been moved back to the beginning of the sentence along with the verb which in Aramaic usually stands at the beginning of a clause. As noted above, “kingdom of God” has been used instead of “kingdom of heaven”.

However, there seems to be no good reason for rejecting Dalman’s reconstruction of the all-important phrase “by observance” with בֵּין הָאָדָמִים. This word was previously discussed under Section 4.2.2.3. The use of the +2 prefix has the advantage that it has a similar nuance of meaning to μετά + genitive. They both can be used instrumentally to mean “with” or “by”.

---

481 Dalman, (1902ET), Words of Jesus, 145.
482 See Section 4.2.2.1 under Recent Exegetical Comment.
483 BDB, 1083b; LSJ, 1108-109.
Recourse to the *Gospel of Thomas*, logion 113 and the phrase ἐξωτερικά εἶναι produces inconclusive results at best.

Gilles Quispel\(^{484}\) followed by Norman Perrin,\(^{485}\) claimed that ἐξωτερικά εἶναι from *Gos. Thom.* 113.2\(^{486}\) and μετὰ παρατηρήσεως could be translated by the single Aramaic verb ὄπελ. However, this assumed of course that *Gos. Thom.* 113 had a transmission history independent of Luke 17:20 - a possibility that is very unlikely. In any case, ἐξωτερικά εἶναι also translates ἀποκαραδόκια in Rom 8:19 and Phil 1:20 and the participle of προσέχομαι in Mark 15:43 of the Sahidic NT.\(^{487}\) Given that ἐξωτερικά εἶναι appears also at *Gos. Thom.* 51 in the context of a question regarding a possible future, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the redactor of *Gospel of Thomas* has himself penned the phrase to drive home his opposition to any expectation of a future kingdom of God.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

As noted in Section 4.2.2.3, there have been five proposed meanings of the phrase (οὐ) μετὰ παρατηρήσεως that have been offered by scholars in the last 40 years. The last to be considered is that the phrase means effectively that Jesus denied the Pharisaic belief that the kingdom of God would come by observance of the Torah (i.e. by practice of torah or halakah).

The following scholars adopt this view:\(^{488}\) Richard J. Sneed (1962),\(^{489}\) Josef Zmijewski (1972),\(^{490}\) and J. C. O’Neill (1980, 1993).\(^{491}\)

Their reasons for doing so are the following:

a) A parallel is claimed between Luke 17:20b,21b and Rom 14:17a,17b respectively.\(^{492}\)

Both are within the context of the kingdom of God and a negative statement is followed by

---


\(^{486}\) See Section 4.3.1.1.


a positive. Specifically, μετὰ παρατηρῆσεως is parallel to ἄρωσις καὶ πόσις “food and drink”. Since Paul is discussing the occasions when Christians may follow or not follow the halakah with regard to “food and drink” (cf. 1 Cor 4:20, 8:8),493 the parallel in Luke 17:20b presumably is about a similar denial of a link between halakah and the kingdom of God.494

b) In describing Solomon’s temple, Josephus recorded that entry to the people’s part of the temple was restricted to those who were ritually pure and who were in παρατηρῆσει τὸν νομὸν “observance of the laws” (Ant. 8:96).495

c) Rabbinic literature claims that certain human acts, particularly observance of the Torah, can hasten the day of redemption.496

d) The Syriac Peshitta of μετὰ παρατηρῆσεως, namely סֵפֶל (סֵפֶל), may be translated “with observation of the law”. 1 Cor 7:19 in the Peshitta used the same word where the context is precisely that of “obeying the commandments of God” (NRSV).497

e) P.Oxy. IV.654.35 used the word παρατηρήσεως in the phrase “What diet shall we observe?498

f) There are examples of such a use of the noun in Christian documents in the ante-Nicene period.499 There are examples, too, in classical literature of its use in the observance or following of rules, especially to do with principles of rhetoric.500

492 On Rom 14:17, see Sections 1.4.3 and 3.4 under Luke 12:31,32, 3.6.3 and, 4.3.4.1 under Recent Exegetical Comment.


494 “Presumably” because Sneed, who used Rom 14:17 in support of the meaning under discussion, did not draw out the parallel to the extent done here.


497 Walton, (1657), Biblia Sacra Polyglotta V, 350; 33; Aramaic-English NT I, (1988) 521; Jennings and Gantillon, (1926), Syriac Lexicon, 139; Dalman, (1902ET), Words of Jesus, 143; Sneed, (1962), Dissertation, 46; Mattill, (1979), Luke and the Last Things, 192. See especially ANF X, 105, which is a translation of the reconstructed Diatessaron, at this point in Arabic (which is why it does not appear in Louis Leloir’s Ephraem, (1963), Texte Syriaque, “with expectation”; Ephraem, (1993ET), Commentary, 272, “cannot be observed according to days”.

g) Though not employed by scholars, Tertullian’s exegesis of Luke 17:20 would seem to imply that he took *cum observatione* to mean the commandments of God.\(^{501}\)

The arguments that have been mounted against this view, include the following:

a) The parallel with Rom 4:17 is not close. In any case, care should be exercised in reading Paul’s understanding into Luke.\(^{502}\)

b) The rabbinic texts used in support of the meaning are too late to be of significance.\(^{503}\)

c) The Peshitta revision belongs to the fifth century\(^{504}\) and thus like the late rabbinic references, is too far removed from first century Palestine to be of immediate relevance. In any case, the Syriac versions may all simply be translated “with observation”.\(^{505}\)

d) The context of Luke 17 does not substantiate this possibility. If v. 20b is about the law, it is the only reference in the chapter.\(^{506}\) However, this objection is of relevance only if what the reply meant for Luke is considered. It is important to recall that the passage has had a past and a past that need not bear any relationship to the context that Luke gave to it.

e) The theological problem of the relationship between the Torah and the kingdom does not appear to be one of concern for Christians in the time of Luke.\(^{507}\) Indeed, the inconsistent attitude of Jesus towards the law as presented by Luke in his Gospel, strongly suggests that Luke and his immediate audience saw themselves as no longer coming within the reach of the law.\(^{508}\) The vocabulary that Luke used when writing about the law

\(^{499}\) E.g. *Const. App.* 6.30.7 (*ANF VII*, 464a).

\(^{500}\) E.g. Dionysius Thrax (Lallot 1989) 2.8; *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* 2.294 (Dindorf, (1877), 3.136.22); Plutarchus *Capitulorum descriptio* 9 (2.266b).


\(^{505}\) Jennings and Gantillon, (1926), *Syriac Lexicon*, 139; Dalman, (1902ET), *Words of Jesus*, 143; Sneed, (1962), *Dissertation*, 46. See especially, ANF X, 105, which is a translation of the reconstructed Diatessaron, at this point in Arabic, “with expectation”, and Ephraem, (1993ET), *Commentary*, 272, “cannot be observed according to days”.


\(^{508}\) S. G. Wilson, (1983), *Luke and the Law*, 57, 61, claimed that even in Acts Luke is nowhere critical of anyone, Jewish or Christian, who choose to keep the law (with the possible exception of Peter in Acts 10-11). Wilson’s approach is consistent with the view of the Pharisees as presented in Luke-Acts (cf. the view of Steve Mason and Barnabas Lindars, Section 1.4.1.2). Other
nowhere else included παρατηρήσις or related words. He preferred φυλάσσω “to guard, keep (watch)”.

Proposed Exegesis

The arguments against the meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσις as being “with/by observance (of the law)” are more arguments against such a meaning for Luke.

On the other hand, the pre-Lukan community probably placed observance of the Torah in opposition to faith in Jesus, because of their conviction that the kingdom was the Holy Spirit. It is likely, too, that while there would have been no connection with the Holy Spirit, Jesus was also objecting to an observance of the Law connected to a particular understanding of the kingdom of God.

It has been concluded that the Pharisees believed that the kingdom could be lived in the here-and-now through the practice of the Law. Their desire to practise meticulously the halakah reflected their belief that they lived with the presence of God in the here-and-now.

Jesus rejected this notion. He never taught that the kingdom could or would come by human effort. It was God’s kingdom and would come only by and through the divine will (cf. Luke 12:32). Nor was it present in his here-and-now. The kingdom ventured briefly into the here-and-now, principally through his ministry (cf. Luke 11:20), but it was in a fundamental sense otherwise absent from the world.


511 See Sections 3.6.3 and 4.3.2.2.
512 See Section 3.6.2.
513 Craddock, (1990), Luke, 204. Cf. Section 4.2.4.3.
514 See Section 3.6.2.
4.4.3 ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τούτῳ μᾶς (21b)

**Aramaic Retranslation**

This may be retranslated back into Aramaic in the following way:

Nwtna ta ahlad atwklm atym

"The kingdom of God is to come among you."

This is substantially different from Gustaf Dalman’s reconstruction because he provided a largely literal translation of the extant Greek.515

When viewed in combination with Jesus’ first reply three features distinctive of Aramaic stand out in support of this retranslation. There is repetition of the main verb and subject of the first reply;516 there is antithetic parallelism between the two sentences with the stress falling on the second517 and there is the use of asyndeton, i.e. the lack of any connecting particle between the two sentences.518

Most of these features are also prominent in the Greek translation with which the exercise was started. Therefore, even without the attempt to retranslate back into Aramaic, there are enough stylistic features of Jesus’ sayings to point in the direction of antiquity.

Like its Hebrew counterpart, the Aramaic preposition ṭa ("with", "among", in the reconstruction literally "(to be) with") was chosen because it denotes proximity or close association to a stronger degree than ἐν.519 ἐντός captures this sense of intimacy better than ἐν μέσῳ, and it is perhaps for this reason that it was chosen and persisted in the tradition.

**Recent Exegetical Comment**

Because few scholars sought a distinction in their exegesis between the various stages of formation, comment may be found under Stages III and II.

---

515 Dalman, (1902), *Words of Jesus*, 146. Ῥάθα ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τούτῳ μᾶς “Behold the kingdom of heaven is within you”. See the similar criticism of Dalman’s retranslations in: Casey, (1998), *Aramaic Sources*, 18.

516 BDF, 261 § 493.


519 BDB, 85b, 87a, 767a, 1107a; Jastrow, (1903), *Dictionary*, 132a, 1086a.
Proposed Exegesis

The masculine plural pronoun נֶחְנוּ “you” cannot refer to anyone other than the Pharisees who asked the question. But like Jesus’ first reply, it has universal consequences, for just as no-one can bring on the kingdom by observance of the Torah, so too the kingdom - the Divine Royal Presence - will eventually come to be with everyone.

The Pharisees believed ultimately in a kingdom, in the Divine Royal Presence, that was present but hidden. This presence will one day be revealed, but in the meantime acknowledgment of its existence in the here-and-now meant observance of the Torah.\(^\text{520}\)

On the other hand, Jesus, while agreeing that the kingdom was first and foremost the Divine Royal Presence, nevertheless believed that this presence was fundamentally absent from the world. One day it would come to be with all people on earth permanently.\(^\text{521}\)

---

\(^{520}\) See Section 3.6.2.

\(^{521}\) See Section 3.6.2.
4.5 SYNTHESIS

In Chapter three, “kingdom of God” was seen to have been effectively a circumlocution for the Divine Royal Presence in first century Judaism - a belief shared by the Pharisees and Jesus alike. In the light of this, the pre-Lukan community was seen to have interpreted their experience of the Holy Spirit in a similar way. Likewise, the redactor of Luke-Acts identified the kingdom with Jesus. Further, the question of the respective locations of the kingdom of God, far from being trivial, proved to be the one which allowed such an identity to be made and which allowed key distinctions in the understanding of the notion to be found.

Has Divine Royal Presence proven, then, to be the exegetical key which both unlocks Luke 17:20-21 and has it passed the test for plausibility which this chreia represents? If the measure of success is the ability of such an hypothesis to explain with ease previously intractable issues and to place in context redactional, source-critical and other compositional aspects, then the conclusions reached point to at least a credible attempt, if not probable success.

4.5.1 The Third (Redaction) Stage

The redactor made modifications to the chreia, which may be summarised in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At the end of Stage II</th>
<th>As received by the Redactor</th>
<th>At the end of Stage III</th>
<th>As modified by the Redactor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:20a</td>
<td>20aa Ἠπερωτηθεῖς</td>
<td>Ἠπερωτηθεῖς δὲ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20ab ἔρχεται</td>
<td>ἔρχεται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20ad ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20ae ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς</td>
<td>ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:20b</td>
<td>20ba οὐκ ἔρχεται</td>
<td>οὐκ ἔρχεται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20bb ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20by μετὰ παρατηρήσεως</td>
<td>μετὰ παρατηρήσεως</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:21a</td>
<td>21aa οὐδὲ ἔροισιν</td>
<td>οὐδὲ ἔροισιν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21ab Ἰδοὺ ὁδε ἢ ἐκεί</td>
<td>Ἰδοὺ ὁδε ἢ ἐκεί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:21b</td>
<td>21ba ἔρχεται (γάρ)</td>
<td>ἔρχεται (γάρ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21bb ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21by ἐντὸς ψυχῶν</td>
<td>ἐντὸς ψυχῶν ἐστίν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke (the redactor) placed this important chreia immediately after the healing of the ten lepers in the travel narrative because he wanted it to form a natural response of the Pharisees to the healing. The one who healed was no less than the kingdom of God - the Divine Royal Presence - which itself heals and saves. Yet, for Luke himself and also for
his readers, the kingdom as Jesus was no longer present. The conversation recounted in
the chreia took place in the redactor’s past. The question of the timing of the coming of
the kingdom was therefore of concern to at least some members of his community since
this kingdom was now located in heaven.522

The attribution of the question to Pharisees was left untouched by Luke because of his
concern for historical accuracy. By his time there was no group that would readily identify
itself as Pharisaic.

Jesus’ replies provided Luke with a necessary and convenient corrective to speculation
regarding the timing of the kingdom.

In the first negative reply Luke wanted to tell his Christian community that the kingdom
would not come simply by their waiting for it, as if nothing else was required.

The second negative reply provided Luke with a convenient attack on current Jewish
synagogue thinking on the kingdom (the “they” of v. 21αε), as well as a dictional link
with vv. 22-37. Their belief that the kingdom was present but hidden in the here-and-now
but one “day” to be revealed stood contrary to Luke’s identifying of the kingdom with
Jesus and its location in heaven.

The irony of both sayings would not have been lost on Luke the historian. The kingdom
was visible and present to the hearers of this saying in the person of Jesus. The Pharisees
could not see the kingdom already standing right in front of them. They did not have to
wait for it.

The final reply, which forms the climax to the chreia in this and every stage, was also the
one to undergo the most manipulation by the redactor. The modifications proposed are
consistent with and are explained by Luke’s view of the kingdom, namely that it is to be
identified with Jesus. The kingdom could not come among the listeners of Jesus because it
was already present.

The difficult phrase ἐν τῷ ἱλαρόν, though best translated strictly as “is within
you”, has the sense for Luke better conveyed by “is among you”. The verb in the present
tense, deliberately inserted by Luke, was for him the present of the historical Jesus. As
there is no hint either of a “spiritual” or “eschatological” kingdom for Luke in this
phrase, the ἱλαρόν, therefore, is firstly the Pharisees and secondly others who were in the
caravan to Jerusalem with Jesus, simply because Jesus as the kingdom was indeed among
them.

522 See Sections 2.6.4 and 3.6.4.
4.5.2 The Second (Transmission) Stage

The pre-Lukan community made modifications to the chreia, which may be summarised in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20μβ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι Ἰησοῦν</td>
<td></td>
<td>20ββ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20αγ πότε ἔρχεται</td>
<td></td>
<td>20βγ οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20μδ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ;</td>
<td></td>
<td>21αα οὐδὲ ἐρούσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20με ἀπεκρίθη</td>
<td></td>
<td>21αβ οὐδοῦ ὡδὲ ἢ ἐκεῖ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20ββ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>21ββ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20βγ οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως,</td>
<td></td>
<td>21βγ ἐντὸς ψήλων.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this period the Pentecost experience coloured and informed all reflection on Luke 17:20-21. Continuing to be assailed by questions from Pharisees both within and outside, the early pre-Lukan community sought both to answer and take advantage of misunderstandings surrounding their beliefs. The fact that the Pharisees were depicted as asking the question may be an indication that the Pharisees within this Christian community in particular misunderstood Christian teaching on the kingdom and so this pericope served in part as catechesis.

The misunderstanding may well have arisen out of the fact that for the pre-Lukan Christian community the kingdom of God was not entirely unlike the notion held by the Jewish Pharisees. For both the kingdom was present but hidden in the sense that it could not be directly seen. Unlike the Pharisees, however, the pre-Lukan community considered the kingdom to be confined to the Christian community (the new Israel) and not a universal fact. It was to be identified not directly as the Divine Royal Presence but with the Holy Spirit which first “came” in the Pentecost experience. For the Pharisees, observance of the Torah (i.e. practice of torah or halakah) was required because of the universal Divine Royal Presence. For the pre-Lukan community, it was faith in Jesus that was the essential pre-requisite to the coming of the Holy Spirit.\(^{523}\)

In this Stage, Jesus’ replies should be interpreted in the light of the above.

---

\(^{523}\) See Sections 2.6.3 and 3.6.3.

The first reply was confirmation of the experience of the Holy Spirit as the kingdom of God and a veiled attack on a treasured belief of the Pharisees. The kingdom did not “come” to individuals by their own observance of the Torah, it came as a gift from God through faith in Jesus.

The second negative reply, inserted as it was during Stage II, reinforces this understanding. ἵδον ἰδεῖ ἢ ἐκεῖ is precisely what would not have been said by a community who believed that the kingdom in the form of the hidden or invisible Holy Spirit was on all those who professed faith in Jesus. The future tense of ἐρούσιν, otherwise out of place in the chreia, was a concession made by the pre-Lukan community to the time of Jesus when the Holy Spirit had not yet come.

The final reply, Luke 17:21b, unmodified by the community, was understood by them as a prophecy of the coming of the kingdom in the form of the Holy Spirit. The crucial word ἐντός meant for them literally “inside”, that is, the Holy Spirit would come to each individual (who had faith in Jesus).

4.5.3 The First (Oral) Stage

During this Stage the conversation between the Pharisees and Jesus was transmitted in Aramaic but very soon translated and also transmitted orally in Greek. A retranslation of the possible words exchanged was proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early (Jesus?) Stage I</th>
<th>At the end of Stage I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:20a 20α α</td>
<td>ἐπερωτήσαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20β β</td>
<td>οἱ παρασκευαὶ Ἰησοῦν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20γ γ</td>
<td>πότε ἐρχέται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20δ δ</td>
<td>ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20ε ε</td>
<td>ἀπεκρίθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:20b 20α α</td>
<td>ἐρχέται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20β β</td>
<td>ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20γ γ</td>
<td>οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:21a 21α α</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21β β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:21b 21α α</td>
<td>ἐρχέται (γὰρ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21β β</td>
<td>ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21γ γ</td>
<td>ἐντὸς ψῆμων.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is only here that an attempt can be made to discern the likely meaning of the replies of the historical Jesus to the question put to him by the Pharisees.524

524 Assuming that what has been categorised as the material as it was at the end of Stage I is in effect the actual words of the Pharisees and the historical Jesus. There is no absolute certainty in this, however. See Section 4.4.
As the work of chapters 2 and 3 demonstrated, Jesus and the Pharisees shared the common first century Jewish Palestinian custom of using the phrase “kingdom of God” to refer to the Divine Royal Presence. However, they differed precisely in their location of that presence.

The Pharisees located the kingdom in the here-and-now. Granted it was hidden, but its presence necessitated the only logical response, careful observance of the divine will, the Torah. Because it was already present it could not “come”. Rather, one day it would “be revealed” for all to see. When that happened, judgement, salvation and so on would be meted out. Jesus on the other hand, believed that the kingdom was fundamentally absent from the world. One day this kingdom would “come” to be among humankind. Its arrival will bring judgement and salvation. The natural and logical response to this scenario was repentance.

Viewed in the light of the above, the question posed by the Pharisees is a natural expression of curiosity mixed with some level of hostility regarding the teaching of Jesus. It has been noted that the Pharisees were vitally interested in the kingdom of God, though only secondarily in the “when” of its revelation. Jesus’ teaching regarding its “coming” would have naturally provoked such a question from members of this group, especially if it was preceded by a healing miracle.

Refusing to answer the question directly, Jesus undermined the whole edifice of Pharisaic thought on the kingdom of God.

In the first reply, Jesus rejected any notion that the kingdom would come by observance of the Torah. Implicit, too, is a rejection of the Pharisaic notion of a future “revealing” of the hidden kingdom. For Jesus there was no hidden kingdom of God in the here-and-now. For him its coming lay in the future. For the present it was located in heaven with and in God.

In the second reply, while rejecting the Pharisaic notion of the here-and-now hidden kingdom, Jesus did not thereby reject either the circumlocution or the shared fundamental understanding of the identity of the kingdom of God. Jesus shared with the Pharisees the belief that the kingdom of God was in a basic sense God Himself. But God was not present in the here-and-now. One day in the future God would come to be with them and all people for ever in an intimate and immediate way.

\[525\] In particular, see Sections 2.6.2 and 3.6.2.
5 CONCLUSION

Examine the witnesses with great care. And watch what you say, lest they learn from what you say how to lie.
(Simeon b. Shatah, 1 cent. B.C., m. Abot 1:9)

5.1 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

While a detailed synthesis of the conclusions may be found at the end of chapters 2, 3 and 4 and at the end of the excursus to chapter 3, it is appropriate to summarise here those conclusions which more directly bear on the ultimate aim of this work, namely a new exegesis of Luke 17:20-21.

5.1.1 The Presence of the Divine King

Attached to the explicit notion of God as king (in most cases), were clear indications that the writer thought of a particular location for the Divine Royal Presence. By the first century A.D., Palestinian Judaism exhibited at least two different and mutually exclusive views of this presence of God as king. The first was that some, including Pharisees, believed that the Divine King dwelt in the world in the “here-and-now”, though his presence centred on the temple. One day the Divine Royal Presence would be revealed. Judgement and salvation would result. The second view, to which Jesus probably subscribed, was that the Divine Royal Presence resided in “heaven”. From there he would one day come to execute judgement and bring salvation.

The early Yavnean rabbis and the Palestinian synagogues of the period after A.D. 70 had a view not dissimilar to the “heaven” tradition. Because of the sins of the people, the Divine King had literally deserted his people and retreated to heaven. His Royal Shekhinah would only come in the present to those who observed the Torah (i.e. practiced torah or halakah). One “day”, however, the Divine King would come and reveal himself, bringing judgement and salvation.

Luke, the redactor of Luke-Acts, while also an heir to the “heaven” tradition, identified Jesus as the Divine King. As Jesus, the Divine King will one day return to bring judgement and salvation.
5.1.2 The Presence of the Kingdom of God

A formal and material identity of the Divine Royal Presence with the “kingdom of God” was made in first century Palestinian Judaism. Both the Pharisees and Jesus agreed with this identification. Where they differed was precisely in their location of this presence. The Pharisees were inheritors of a tradition which saw the kingdom of God as a present reality hidden in the world. For them practice of torah was the natural expression of such a belief. One day, however, this kingdom of God, this Divine Royal Presence, would reveal himself to have been all along in and encompassing the world.

Jesus rejected this location of the kingdom of God. For him, the kingdom of God, Divine Royal Presence, was to be found only in heaven. Its coming into the world was a future event that again would mean judgement and salvation. The way to prepare for this event was not by observance of the Torah but by repentance.

The pre-Lukan community identified this promised (future) kingdom of God as the Holy Spirit. It had, in fact, come at Pentecost and could be “possessed” by individuals who had faith in Jesus and persevered in that faith. Faith in Jesus rather than obedience to the Torah could realise a present kingdom of God.

The Yavnean rabbis and, a little later the Palestinian synagogues, did not alter the fundamental association of the kingdom of God with God himself as king. Yet the kingdom of God was no longer present in the world per se. Obedience to the Torah would bring the reward of the kingdom of God, which would one day permanently return to Mount Zion and be revealed.

Luke, however, differed with this early rabbinic view, like Jesus, precisely in the location of the kingdom of God. For him it was located in Jesus the king. It was present in the historical Jesus and in the Jesus who was now in heaven. It was not present in Luke’s own here-and-now, but will one day come “in the same way you saw him go” (Acts 1:11).

5.1.3 An Exegesis of Luke 17:20-21

Such conclusions must not only be tested, they must have a purpose. Luke 17:20-21 provides both a test and a purpose. It is fertile ground for a test of the conclusions of chapters 2 and 3 because it is the only place in the Gospels where the Pharisees and Jesus engage in conversation regarding the kingdom of God. It fittingly gives a purpose to the research of chapters 2 and 3 because it is generally considered to be one of the most
difficult passages in the Gospels. If the conclusions shed light on this passage at each stage of its formation, then they will have at least passed the test of plausibility.

Luke positioned the chreia as the natural response of Pharisees to the healing of the ten lepers rather than as an introduction to the discourse on the coming Son of Man. Jesus as the kingdom of God brought healing and salvation. He retained the attribution of the Pharisees to the question because of his desire for historical accuracy, though the question itself echoes the concerns of some in his community to knowing the timing of the kingdom.

Jesus’ three replies, rather than answering the question, undermine the fundamental presuppositions regarding the kingdom that lie at the basis of the question. The first reply meant for Luke that people should not think that the kingdom would come to them merely by waiting for it (Jesus), as if nothing else was required. The second reply attacked the current synagogue belief (albeit slowly coming under the influence of the rabbis) that the kingdom was present but hidden, yet one day to be revealed. There would be no revelation so that people would say “Look!” . The final reply, which forms the climax of the chreia, also underwent the most alteration by the redactor. The present tense, a deliberate alteration by Luke, points the reader to Jesus as the kingdom, as indeed the embodiment of the Divine Royal Presence. Jesus as the kingdom was among those who were travelling to Jerusalem, seeing the healing of the ten lepers and listening to the conversation with the Pharisees.

At Stage II, the chreia was manipulated to conform to the conviction that the kingdom promised by Jesus had arrived in the form of the Holy Spirit. Because Pharisees were an identifiable group both within and outside the fledgling Christian community, it is likely that they still misunderstood Jesus’ teaching on the kingdom of God. The first reply reminded such people within the pre-Lukan community that the kingdom could not be acknowledged - would not “come” - by observance of the Torah. The Holy Spirit would come rather because of faith, an unmerited gift from God. The second negative reply, inserted in this stage, reinforces this understanding. The Holy Spirit, as the hidden invisible kingdom, cannot be seen, only its effects. The final reply, as reconstructed, was then interpreted as a prophecy by Jesus of the coming of the Holy Spirit “within” individuals of faith.

At Stage I, which is that of the Pharisees and Jesus themselves (or at least the nearest we can get to them), the question regarding the timing of the kingdom probably would have been prompted by Jesus’ frequent teaching on the coming of the kingdom. That the Pharisees did not believe that the kingdom needed “to come” suggests that there was a certain hostility in the question. In the first reply, Jesus rejected any notion that observance of the Torah was necessary. This was because the kingdom - the Divine Royal Presence -
was in fact not in the here-and-now as the Pharisees believed. In the second reply, Jesus affirmed his own view. The Divine Royal Presence, God himself as king, will one day “come” to be with them. The way to prepare for this was not by observing the Torah but by repentance.

That Jesus did not answer the question regarding the timing of the kingdom is to be seen as the clue to the success of the proposed exegesis. The fundamental difference, and this was at each stage of formation, was not over issues of timing, but over differences in the location of the kingdom and thus in Stages II and III over its identity as the Divine Royal Presence. It is submitted that only an understanding of “kingdom of God”, as proposed, highlights this and so is indeed the exegetical key to Luke 17:20-21.
5.2 SOME IMPLICATIONS

There are a number of implications that arise as a result of the conclusions drawn in this work. Many will only become apparent with the passage of time. However, two can be readily seen now.

5.2.1 Jesus Maintained a Consistently Future Eschatology

The quest for the historical Jesus is dominated by the question whether Jesus’ own eschatology may be described as either present, future or, present and future.\(^1\)

The results of this work mount a serious attack both on the question itself and on its answer, if such a question is asked.

Rather than seeing eschatology (or at least the subset of the kingdom of God) in terms of timing, Jesus, along with other first century Palestinian Jews, saw it in terms of Divine Royal Presence. Since all agreed that one “day” this Divine Royal Presence would be here to exercise sovereignty, the issue was whether this Presence was in the here-and-now or not.

If the question, however, must be asked in chronological categories, then Jesus’ kingdom of God was utterly future since the Divine Royal Presence was not in the here-and-now.

This implication follows from the results on two counts. First, Luke 17:20-21 is one of the three classical passages (the other two being Luke 11:20 // Matt 12:28 and Mark 1:15) which Charles H. Dodd used to support his “realised eschatology” thesis and which subsequent scholars have used in support of the consensus view (the “both/and” eschatology, i.e. both present and future) in the light of the probability that most other passages point to a future kingdom.\(^2\) If a thorough analysis of Luke 17:20-21, especially v. 21b, results in a future kingdom in the mind of Jesus, then it is likely that a similarly comprehensive treatment of the other two will also result in a future, non-present, kingdom for Jesus.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) See Section 3.3.2.

\(^2\) A small minority of scholars have relabelled the “realised eschatology” view as the “noneschatological” Jesus, see Section 3.3.2.

\(^3\) That is certainly likely, given the analysis of Luke 11:20 and Mark 1:15 (under Luke 4:15) presented here. See Sections 3.3.2 and 3.4 respectively.
The second reason is perhaps not immediately noticeable. For every work that was considered in chapters 2 and 3, not a single one - except for Luke-Acts - gave any sign that it held within it a “both/and” eschatology. That is, in every case it was shown that the writer had a clear unambiguous view as to the location of the Divine Royal Presence. The exception, Luke-Acts, on closer inspection was found to exhibit a “both/and” eschatology - at least in the area of the kingdom - precisely because of the contributions made at each stage of formation to the modification of the identity of the kingdom. At Stage III, the kingdom was past and future because it was Jesus. At Stage II, the kingdom was present because it was the Holy spirit. At Stage I, Jesus’ kingdom was future because it was the heavenly Divine Royal Presence. At no Stage could a “both/and” eschatology be said to be indicative of that Stage. In other words, a “both/and” eschatology was never a feature of anyone’s eschatology in the first century, much less that of Jesus.

5.2.2 The Pharisees Observed Ritual Purity for the Kingdom of God

A second important implication is that the results may advance towards resolution the debate surrounding the Pharisees and their observance of ritual purity, especially regarding food, outside the temple.4

Jacob Neusner and Ed. P. Sanders, in disagreeing about the relative importance for the Pharisees of maintaining ritual purity outside the temple, also disagreed about the reasons for this behaviour.5 Neusner claimed that it was because the Pharisees believed that the Divine Presence extended beyond the confines of the temple. Just as the priests, when they

---

4 See Section 1.1.


Sanders, however, is not without his supporters on this point, e.g: N. T. Wright, (1992), People of God, 187 n. 109; and, Poirier, (1996), “Why Did the Pharisees Wash their Hands?”, 217-33, who opted for a “middle” view, between Neusner and Sanders. Also Regev, (2000), “Pure Individualism”, 186, who also supported Sanders, though the reason was a struggle for the minds of ordinary Jews between the sages (Pharisees) and priests, p. 195.
were on duty in the temple, observed the highest level of ritual purity due to their proximity to the Divine Presence, so, too, the Pharisees felt the need to observe a similar level of ritual purity outside the temple for similar reasons. Sanders rejected this explanation entirely. The Pharisees, for example, washed their hands not to protect their own food from impurity but rather the priest’s food. While pursuing purity, they did not aspire to that of serving priests.

The problem with this is that both Neusner and Sanders based their respective views on rabbinic material that is either too far removed from the first century or that has no proven connection with first century Pharisees. They both applied their views without due critical process to those few Gospel accounts of Pharisees observing ritual purity laws outside the temple.

The present work, apart from arguing from sources that have been carefully dated and linked with first century Pharisees, has, without recourse to purity issues, arrived, first, at a fundamental belief of the Pharisees, namely their perceived identity of the kingdom of God and its location. Starting from this foundation, it can readily be seen that their desire to observe ritual purity laws outside the temple is consistent with their view of the kingdom of God. Ritual purity was an expression of the perceived awareness of the kingdom of God, the Divine Royal Presence (cf. Exod 19:10-15, Deut 23:10-15).

---

6 E.g. m. Kel. 1:6-9, Sifre to Num 1:X.1.B.
7 This begs the question whether Jesus’ observance or otherwise of ritual purity halakot can be explained in a similar way. It would seem that Jesus himself was not concerned with purity laws not directly associated with the temple precisely because he did not believe that the Divine Royal Presence was in his here-and-now. He probably observed such laws when it came to entering the Temple Mount because this was simply the thing that any faithful Jew would do, if for no other reason, out of respect for Him whose house it once was. b. Yoma 52b noted that ritual in the temple was to be performed as if the ark and therefore the Shekhinah were present. Although from a later period, it gives some indication that such justification was possible. Fredriksen, (2000), Jesus of Nazareth, 203, argued that Jesus observed purity laws, taking them for granted as a true Jew of his time. She failed to note that there was great argument and variety as to how purity was to be kept and that therefore non-observance in a particular area probably was not unusual. She failed to note, too, that the only evidence we have on Jesus, the canonical Gospels, depict him as observing purity laws only when approach to the temple was involved (e.g. Mark 1:40-44). On other occasions he is depicted claiming that ritual purity concerns were at best secondary to moral purity (e.g. Mark 7:1-22).
5.3 SOME DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Considerations of space have prevented the walking of numerous byways exposed in this study. Five that ought to prove worthwhile, if only for the scenery that may be discovered, are the following.

5.3.1 Luke 17:20-21 and Subsequent Christian Writers

Although Richard J. Sneed has to some extent done this, it would be highly desirable to trace more thoroughly the use of Luke 17:20-21 through the church fathers and up to modern times. Such a task ought to be increasingly possible given the daily digitisation of works. It need not be a mere catena of passages, though that would be a valuable work of reference in itself.

To be able to trace the central role that the verses have played in the formulation of the notion of the kingdom of God in every age is in itself sufficient justification for such an undertaking. Did, for example, the passage play a role at the Reformation, where Protestant ideas on the “invisible” church were crucial?

Given the three-fold understanding of the kingdom of God inherent in the formation of Luke 17:20-21, it begs a further question that may be answered in part by such an analysis. If Jesus saw the kingdom of God as fundamentally God himself as king, if the pre-Lukan community saw it first and foremost realised in the Holy Spirit and if Luke saw it embodied in Jesus, what role did an understanding of the kingdom of God play in the formation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity?

5.3.2 The Holy Spirit as the Divine King

In Section 2.4 a *prima facie* case was made for the suggestion that the pre-Lukan community identified the Holy Spirit as the Divine King. Section 3.4 demonstrated that this community identified the kingdom of God with the Holy Spirit.

5.3.3 Paul, Divine Royal Presence and the Kingdom of God

Paul himself claimed once to have been a Pharisee (Phil 3:5, echoed in Acts 23:6, 26:5). Is it possible that Paul’s understanding of the kingdom of God is coloured by what has been seen was that of the Pharisees? For example, Paul’s connection between the kingdom of God and the Holy Spirit in Rom 14:17, may betray such signs since both the Pharisaic notion and that of the early pre-Lukan community saw the kingdom as a present but hidden reality.

5.3.4 The Gospels and the Zechariah Tradition

Bruce D. Chilton and others have done a valuable service in re-reading much Gospel material in the light of the Book of Isaiah and its Targum. Perhaps the time has come to view similarly the Gospels through the book of Zechariah and its Targum, looking at a broader picture than simply concentrating on messianism as presented in Zechariah and the Messiah Jesus of the Gospels. 8

In the case of the Gospel of Luke, for example, at least three allusions to Zechariah are already well known. 9 This study has detected others which invite a closer inspection than that warranted here. 10

5.3.5 The Uniqueness of Luke 17:20-21

If Luke 17:20-21 does reveal a central point of difference between Jesus and the Pharisees regarding the location of God’s kingdom, it would be intriguing to pursue the question

---

8 E.g. C. A. Evans, (1999), “Jesus and Zechariah’s Messianic Hope”, 373-88. He similarly lamented the meagre list of literature on Zechariah’s influence on Jesus, p. 380 n. 11.


10 The following allusions to motifs in Zechariah 14 have been detected in Luke and depicted as coming from Jesus: Zech 12:8 in Luke 7:28, fortune reversal in the kingdom of God; Zech 14:9,16-17 in Luke 11:2, 13:18-20,28-29, eschatological worship and banquet in the Divine Royal Presence which is the kingdom of God. All these may be found discussed in Section 3.3.2.
why is it that only one explicit reference to the dispute from both sides of the fence has survived.

Two comments may be made that arise as a result of this present work.

The first is that the passage is not the only reference to a dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees regarding the kingdom of God, nor has that claim been made here. There are other places in the Synoptic gospels where Jesus attacks the Pharisees within the explicit context of the kingdom of God, Matthew 23:13 being a notable example. Luke 17:20-21, however, is the only place where the Pharisees themselves show any interest in Jesus’ attitude to the kingdom (cf. Section 1.2).

The second is that the Pharisees themselves were far more concerned with issues of halakah. It was suggested that their position regarding these issues arose out of their perceived location of the kingdom of God (cf. Section 1.1), a location that compelled them to adopt priestly-styled halakah outside the temple (cf. Section 5.2.2). Their attitude to the kingdom was central, though admittedly rarely, made explicit.

Although a question about the ‘silence’ of our extant sources, a more thorough pursuit of this curiosity may lead to further insights.
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