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INTRODUCTION

A. The Problem

Until recent years the virtually unchallenged position of modern scholarship has been that Jesus founded his kingdom ideals on the teachings of the prophets. Now there is a school of thought, notably led by Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer, which denies this. It is maintained that all of Jesus' teaching must be understood from the viewpoint of Jewish apocalypticism. Jesus is claimed as a prophet on the basis that his sayings will not admit apocalypticism. On the other hand, he is claimed as an apocalyptist on the basis that this position alone provides the key to his teachings.

Was Jesus an apocalyptist or a prophet? Is his supposed apocalypticism to be interpreted in strict conformity with his prophetic teaching? Is it possible that his supposed prophetic teaching is not really prophetic but must be re-interpreted in conformity with his apocalypticism? Are we to believe that this apocalypticism does not actually belong to what Jesus taught but represents only the apologetic interpolations of the early Christian community? Can it be that the definitely prophetic teaching of Jesus does not actually belong to what Jesus taught but represents only the apologetic interpolations of the early Christian community?

1. Bousset, Jesus; Case, Jesus, A New Biography.
2. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus.
belong to the original teaching, having crept in through the constant pressure upon the early disciples to prove Jesus the Messiah according to the Scriptures?

Is it possible to say that Jesus was both an apocalypticist and a prophet? If so, was his teaching mainly apocalyptic or mainly prophetic? What considerations will determine the issue? Furthermore, how much of the record is devoted to each teaching? What conclusions are to be drawn from the number of instances devoted to each teaching? Which teaching represents the fuller and which the more fragmentary use of the corpus of ideas from which it has been derived? In the use of derived ideas, which teaching seems to show a studied spirit of discernment for that which is ageless and permanent? Which seems to show the absence of this discernment by the admission of that which is local, temporary, and passing? Are these two teachings to be distinguished in general as essential and non-essential or must they be otherwise evaluated? Are these teachings inseparable or are they separate and distinct? Do they relate to the same functions in the teaching of the kingdom or do they represent different functions? Do the two teachings belong to Jesus' ministry as a whole or may they be separated into different periods? Are these teachings paradoxical or are they reconcilable? Are they partly paradoxical and partly reconcilable?
The problem of this thesis is to determine whether or not both teachings are found in the records; if they are, to determine the extent and significance of each; and to determine on the basis of the records, critically evaluated, the relationships between the two teachings.

B. Importance of the Problem

This problem of relationship between apocalypticism and prophetism in the teaching of Jesus bears directly upon his significance for modern religious life. The answer to it should determine whether Jesus' teachings were the embodiment and fulfilment of the best teachings of the Old Testament or were products of a school of thought that was largely developed between the Testaments. It should determine whether Jesus' teachings belong to the inner and ethical spirit of life or are only a sort of midrash on Jewish legalism looking to a supernatural and physical vindication which is no longer tenable for modern thought.

C. Some Previous Developments

Many scholars have already written on subjects allied to the problem of this thesis. Some have presented Jesus as the fulfilment of prophecy\(^1\); some have presented him as a

\(^1\) Baron, *The Servant of Jehovah*, esp. Part Two; Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*.
successor to the prophets\(^1\); some have emphasized similarities between Jesus' teaching and that of the apocalyptists\(^2\); others have indicated certain contrasts between them\(^3\); still others have dealt with Jesus' idea of the kingdom of God without particular reference to either prophetism or apocalypticism\(^4\); quite a number have suggested possible solutions to the problem of this thesis. There are those, as has been said, who deny that Jesus was an apocalyptist, and there are those who deny that he was a prophet. Between the two positions there is a mediating school which seeks to maintain that Jesus taught both prophetism and apocalypticism in such a way as to mean no conflict.\(^5\) Finally, there are those who see both positions in Jesus, who accept the conflict as irreconcilable and leave the matter as paradoxical.\(^6\) These various views will be examined in Chapter Five.

D. Our Contribution

The contribution of this thesis to the problem in

---

4. Tolstoi, *The Kingdom of God is Within You*.
question is in its method of attack and in its solution, both of which differ from the treatment by previous writers. In general, the method of attack will be: first, to present a comparison of leading characteristics in Jesus' kingdom ideals with the ideals of the prophets on the one hand, and with those of the apocalyptists on the other; secondly, to show the relationship of the two contacts in Jesus by means of these comparisons and by a critical evaluation of possible solutions.

E. Our Method of Attack

More specifically, in the first four chapters on comparisons, we shall seek to determine the answers to the following questions: What are the leading characteristics in the kingdom ideals of the prophets? What are the similarities and the contrasts between Jesus' kingdom ideals and the kingdom ideals of the prophets? What are the leading characteristics of the kingdom ideals of the apocalyptists? What are the contrasts and the similarities between Jesus' kingdom ideals and those of the apocalyptists?

Under leading characteristics of the ideals of the prophets we shall seek to answer the following questions: Do the prophetic ideals present a present kingdom relationship or a future one, or both? What are the characteristics that may be said to belong to the nature of the prophetic ideals? What are those which belong to the prophetic plan for the institution of the consummated kingdom?
Under our study of the similarities and contrasts between Jesus' kingdom ideals and the ideals of the prophets we shall deal with the following questions: What verbal proof have we that Jesus' message is related to that of the prophets? What proof have we from general life situations that would tend to show him as belonging to or dependent upon the prophets? What are the similarities between his kingdom teaching and the ideals of the prophets? Do these similarities in the kingdom teaching belong to one particular phase or period of his teaching? What are the contrasts that separate Jesus from the prophets? Do these contrasts belong to one general phase of his teaching? Are these contrasts separated from the similarities by any instance or situation belonging to the life of Jesus?

In the examination of the leading characteristics in the kingdom ideals of the apocalyptists, this thesis will seek to solve the following questions: What is the relationship of these ideals to the present world order? What is their relation to the future order? Does this relationship involve a definite dualism in kingdom operation? What is the general nature of the apocalyptic ideals? and by what definite and leading characteristics in these ideals are we to prove its nature? What is the apocalyptic plan for the inauguration of the future kingdom? and by what definite apocalyptic teachings may this plan be proved?
In the examination of contrasts and similarities between Jesus' kingdom ideals and the ideals of the apocalypticists this thesis will seek to solve the following problems: What are the points of major contrast between the two ideals? Do these contrasts belong to a separate phase or period in Jesus' kingdom teaching? What are the points of similarity between the two ideals and do these similarities belong to a separate phase or period of his teaching? Are these similarities separated from the contrasts by any instance or situation that arose in the historical ministry of Jesus? A brief summary of conclusions will be found at the close of each of the four chapters developing the field of these questions.

In Chapter Five, a brief survey of these four summaries will be followed by a brief survey of the possible proposed solutions to our general problem, and this will be followed with a proposed adjustment.
CHAPTER ONE

KINGDOM IDEALISM AS FORESHADOWED IN THE PROPHETS

A. Introduction

1. Beginning with Amos

In our study of the ideals of the prophets we shall begin with Amos, the first of the literary prophets, because the literary prophets as a class bring to culmination the leading ideals of the prophetic movement in Israel. We shall refer incidentally to the way in which the previous movements in Israel prepared the way for Amos and his successors, not considering in detail these background materials.

2. Irrelevancy of Textual Criticism

This thesis will not concern itself with arguments belonging to textual criticism. Whether certain passages were actually and completely original or have crept into the text from later sources is irrelevant. The fact that such passages stood in the text at the time of Jesus and were then considered as part of the teachings of the prophets is all that is of concern.

3. Absence of Phrase "Kingdom of God"; Teachings as Ideals

The phrase "kingdom of God" is not found anywhere in Old Testament prophecy. One is rather impressed with this
absence when one considers the prevalence of this term and that of the "kingdom of heaven" in the teachings of Jesus. But there is a group of ideals in the prophets which foreshadow the kingdom idealism of Jesus. That these ideals of the prophets operated powerfully on the mind of Jesus in his teaching on the character and nature of the kingdom of God, this thesis will seek to demonstrate. These ideals will be studied in respect to their time elements, their fundamental nature, and their indications of plan for the future and fuller realization of the ideals.

B. The Time of the Kingdom

1. Present

a. Present Covenant Relationship

That the ideals of the prophets were intended to affect the contemporary life of Israel is attested by several considerations. The first of these is the covenant relationship. However wide the power of Yahweh over the nations of the world, he had no nation of his own but Israel, and whatever power may be attributed to the gods of the other nations, the nation of Israel had no god but Yahweh. This was the cornerstone of the religion of Israel both in the popular apprehension and in the explicit affirmation of the religious leaders in all periods. (Amos 2.9-10; 3.1-2; Hos. 2.16; 11.1; etc.)

(1) Nature, a Contract

This covenant was distinctly a contract. The common man doubtless considered the relation between Yahweh and Israel rather similar to the relation of any surrounding god to the particular people over which the god ruled. The religious leaders of Israel on the contrary, at least from the eighth century, taught that the relation between Yahweh and Israel was peculiar in that it was constituted by his own choice¹, and rested on a compact the terms of which he had prescribed and Israel had accepted. (Judges 11.23f; 2 Kings 3.4ff.)

(2) Basis, Ethical

Prophetically, this contract rested on ethical grounds. The election by which Israel alone of all the nations of the earth was made the people of Yahweh is Israel's glorious prerogative, but it also implies peculiar and heavy obligations.

Semitic deities generally were believed to be bound to their worshippers by ties of kinship. ...Yahweh was related to his worshippers not by kinship but by contract. If they did not fulfill their part of the contract, they could not expect him to fulfill his. ... In this fact lay the possibilities of Israel's ethical and spiritual progress.²

¹ Cf. The marriage relationship taught by Hosea; Kirkpatrick, The Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 117f.
² Barton, The Religion of Israel, p. 63-64.
Actually, the Mosaic covenant may originally have been considerably ritualistic, but in the thought of the prophets it was presented as of ethical and spiritual content. The literary prophets themselves had much to do with the development of this interpretation.\(^1\)

(3) Requirement, Higher Ethical Living

The covenant relationship thus implied a demand for a higher righteousness.\(^2\) Conversely, Yahweh would visit sin in judgment. Therefore, Amos declared, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore, I will visit upon you all your iniquities." (3.2) This demand for a higher righteousness was centered in present ethical living. The prophets traced the course of God's dealings with Israel in history. They knew the inevitable results of natural righteousness and natural corruption. Their concern, however, was not principally with the past or the future. Chiefly, at least, they valued the past and the future because of the light which they cast on present duty.\(^3\) After recounting God's former dealings, Amos lays down his present challenge, "Seek good and not evil, that ye may live; and so Yahweh, the

3. Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 31.
God of hosts, will be with you, as you say. Hate evil, and love the good, establish justice in the gate: it may be that Yahweh, the God of hosts, will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph." (5.14,15)

Since the requirement of the covenant relationship was higher ethical living, as a present obligation, sin was regarded as apostasy from that which God now had a right to expect and from that which he had previously received.1 Among the many passages that show this is Jeremiah 3.21,22: "A voice is heard upon the bare heights, the weeping and the supplications of the children of Israel; because they have perverted their way, they have forgotten Yahweh their God. Return, ye backsliding children, I will heal your backsliding." God had performed his part of the covenant obligation. It was then Israel who was failing to perform. Isaiah compared Israel to a stupid child (1.2,3). Again he compared her to an unprofitable vineyard (5.1-7). In each case, Yahweh, the father and owner, was keenly disappointed in the return he gained from his possessions.

b. Present Ethical Incentive in Dream of Future

A present ethical incentive was prominent in the fond

1. Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 95, 145, 244.
dreams of a better future. Jeremiah, for instance, placed the abject repentance and Yahweh's gracious pardon of Ephraim in the center of such a future picture (31.18-20)\(^1\) It is possible to regard this present ethical incentive as the chief purpose of this idealization.

c. Present Fulfilment of Ideals

Not only was this covenant relationship a present obligation to higher ethical living, not only was the future largely used as incentive to the performance of this obligation, but the ideals involved were, to some extent at least, being fulfilled.

(1) The Prophets Themselves

The lives and teachings of the prophets themselves abundantly show that they, as a class, experienced the Godward relationship so vitally that they were impelled to become its standard bearers before the people.\(^2\) They were men of the relationship before they were messengers about it. Sometimes this meant that the prophet himself had to undergo a process of inner moral purification before he could enter with reverent sympathy the mind of God which he would

---

interpret to others. This is why Isaiah's lips were cleansed with a burning coal from the heavenly altar. Jeremiah in his weakening condition heard Yahweh say, "If thou wilt return, then will I bring thee again that thou mayest stand before me: and if thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as my mouth" (15.19).

(2) The Inner Israel

The prophets themselves were not the only ones who were actually entering into the ideal relationship. As the prophets saw the whole nation suffering exile for its sins, they also saw the preservation of a remnant, a true and inner Israel, those who had remained and would remain faithful to Yahweh. These would survive the calamity and would be saved as the nucleus of a new beginning. (Jer. 4.27; 5.10; 29.11; 30.11; 46.28; etc.)

2. Future

a. Future Ideals of Other Ancient Peoples

This idealization concerned not only the present but the future as well. In this respect, Israel was like other nations who had prophets picturing future greatness.

In the presence of deplorable social conditions resulting from defective government, an early Egyptian prophet declares his faith in the advent of a new ruler who will save the people from their distresses.
At present, normal industrial and commercial activities have ceased. Justice has disappeared, blood is everywhere, and the people wander about like shepherdless sheep; but the prophet looks for the coming of a brighter day when a deliverer will arise who will rule justly and bring cooling to the flame.

Hammurabi, king of Babylon, viewed his rule as the dawn of an ideal regime when the evils of former days had come to an end with the appearing of a new kingdom of social justice.

Persian speculation divided the course of the world's history into four main periods, each embracing three thousand years. The fourth period, which is the present age, opened with the coming of Zoroaster, the alleged founder of the true religion. This fourth period is to close with the catastrophic end of the world, after which will follow the final triumph of God.

Among the Greeks there was the hope of the "isles of the blest." Ancient worthies who had not been rewarded with a position among the gods were thought to be leading a delightful existence in the isles of the blest at the confines of the world.

b. Future Ideals of the Prophets

(1) Varied Forms

The prophets among the Hebrews entertained hope of

future greatness for their people. They sang of material prosperity and agricultural fertility. (Amos 9:13; Hos 2:21, 22; etc.) They foreshadowed a perfect fellowship of life and love with Yahweh. (Hos. 2:14,19,20; 14:1-3; etc.) They depicted Israel as the spiritual teacher of the nations (Isa. 2-4; etc.) or they prophesied the arrival of the ideal king (Isa. 11:1-5). They told of a time when the dispersed Jews would be gathered from the ends of the earth, and the united north and south would subdue the neighboring nations (Isa. 11:11-16; etc.) The hope had many detailed phases.  

(2) Near Hopes

The consummation of the prophetic ideals was usually thought of as occurring in the near future.  

1. These hopes are frequently Messianic. A number of scholars deny their existence before the exile (Soeren sen, Cuthe, Giesebrecht, Duham, Cheyne, Hackman, Brückner, Volz, Marti). Others, on the basis of certain myths which are believed to have had an early circulation in Israel, make this kind of prophecy possible before the exile (Gressmann, and Oesterley. Cf. Edersheim, Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah, p. 17). Oesterley and Gressmann seem weightier as they argue that the ancient "Tehom" (Gen. 1:2a) myth became Satan, that the ancient "Heilbringer" myth became the Messiah, that the ancient "Paradise" myth became the Messianic era (Gressmann, Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie, Tubingen, 1903-1904; Oesterley, Evolution of the Messianic Idea, New York, 1908.)  

2. Driver, The Ideals of the Prophets, p. 15.
was immediately to follow the great events in the history of
the people and the nations, taking place in their own day.
(Isa. 29.9ff; 30.19ff; 31.5ff; Hag. 2.6; Zec. 1.16ff; 2.10ff;
etc.) For instance: "Jeremiah named seventy years....
Ezekiel named forty years. ...Haggai expected the unrest of
the Persian empire of his time would usher in the day of
judgment and salvation."¹ The consummation was near because
it stood in organic relationship to present history. It was
usually in the midst of great historical crises that the
prophets came to the front. They saw these crucial move-
ments as part of the operation of Yahweh, which would have
only one result, the realization of his character through
Israel.

The movements had all moral significance; they
were the judgment of God on his people, which
would so change them as to lead them into the
final salvation (Isa. 29.9ff; etc.) or they
were the judgment of the world removing the
obstacle to the coming of his kingdom.²

The prophets were dealing in general conceptions. Israel
was not only one of many nations, she was the people of God.
Her swift opponent was not only one of the wicked nations, she
was the idolatrous world. The conflict between them was the
conflict between Yahwehism and idolatry, between truth and

¹. Jer. 25.11,12; Ezek. 29.11,12; Hag. 2.20-23. Cf.
Davidson, Prophecy and the Prophets, HBD, Vol. IV, p. 121.
². Orelli, Old Testament Prophecy, etc., p. 295.
falsehood, between good and evil. She seemed to see in any single triumph the ultimate triumph of God's character.

C. The Character Of It - The Nature of God

1. Unitary
   a. Source and Control

Yahweh alone was the source of these ideals. He alone was in control. This unitary source and control was seen to occupy the whole of the spiritual world. "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil." (Isa. 45:7) Yahweh and his plans exhaust the spiritual element in the world. Against him and them nothing can stand. All that lives has life through him. All things serve him, the powers of the world, the stormy sea, the stars of heaven. "Before me was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am Yahweh, and beside me there is no saviour." (Isa. 43:10)

b. Operation

The operation was unitary. In the pre-exilic and exilic prophets there was no rivalry in the spiritual world to thwart or deflect the uniformity of operation.

1. Addis, Hebrew Religion, etc., p. 150.
2. See also Micah 1:3,4,10-16; 3:1; Hos. 2:8; etc.
There is no mention of demons in the ordinary sense of the term in the pre-exilic prophets. The agencies referred to are either manifestations of Yahweh (as in 'angels', Hos. 12.4) or attendants of Yahweh (as 'seraphim' in Isa. 6.1-7 and 'cherubim' in Ezek. 1 and 10). Satan and his attendant demons who have played such a prominent part in later thought, had no place in the pre-exilic prophets. Amos, for example, believed that Yahweh did all that was done whether good or bad. He asks, 'Shall evil befall a city and Yahweh hath not done it?' (3.6). The prophets of the exile, Ezekiel and Second Isaiah, maintain in general the pre-exilic attitude with reference to angels and demons. The same is true of Third Isaiah whose expression 'the angel of his presence' (Isa. 63.9) is probably a reference to Exodus 33.12ff where it is promised that Yahweh's presence will accompany Israel.\(^1\)

This unrivalled and uniform operation was equally active and determining both for the present and the future.

\[c\]. Applicability

The prophetic idealism presented a unified applicability. At its best, it was not restricted to nation nor to a group within the nation. Even Gentiles could heed and receive its consequent benefits.\(^2\) The very character of the idealism as based upon the moral nature of God was inherently destined to a universal and unitary applicability.

---


2. Ethical
   
a. Non-legal Requirements

(1) Ethical Inadequacy of Legalism

These ideals had for their standard the nature of Yahweh. 1 His ethical and moral nature could not adequately be expressed by any form of legalism. Anything that in any way failed to measure up to his holy nature and will was to be challenged.

They make no appeal to the written law, though there is reason to believe that before Hosea's time (Hos. 8.12) codes of civil and moral law had already been drawn up. They did not make any such appeal because no code could be comprehensive enough and subtle enough to embrace all the sins which the prophets had in view. ...Plainly, no written law could tabulate such offenses, nor, if it could have done so, would that have been enough, for whereas law, so far at least as it imposes penalties, confines itself to regulating action, the prophets stood to inspire right desire from which great deeds flow. 2

These ideals involved an ethical fellowship with Yahweh which no legalism could adequately convey. Sin was a violation of this inner ethical fellowship (Amos 3.2-3; 7.7-9; etc.) 3

It became sin not because it was an infraction of rule or precedent but because it violated this fellowship. Isaiah's

2. Addis, Hebrew Religion, etc., p. 146-147.
3. Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 103.
unclean condition demanded cleansing from the heavenly altars (Isa. 6.1-8). Jeremiah's wavering attitude demanded inner, moral purification (Jer. 15.19). Isaiah saw the exile as a judgment on Israel for her sins, and believed that it was God's way of working the necessary inward and moral purification (Isa. 4.4; 6.11; 7.21).

To the ordinary Israelite sin was a neglect of regulations; to the prophet it was a violation of the moral law. The two were in spheres between which there was no point of contact, and there could be no valid connection between them. ¹

The criterion of judgment in all moral matters was no kind of statute, but rather the ethical holiness of Yahweh. The thing that caused Isaiah to feel his undone condition was that he saw "the king, the Lord of Hosts" and heard the seraphim crying "holy, holy, holy." (Isa. 6.1-5) Hosea declared boldly that, in spite of Yahweh's great love for Israel, he could not overlook her infidelity for the very reason that he was "the holy one in the midst of them" (11.9).

It is the work of the prophets that has made of the concept of God's holiness a high quality of ethical rectitude.

It had been familiar to the Hebrews from time immemorial. Applied to things, it meant consecrated, set apart from common use, 'taboo'. As an attribute of Jehovah it signified the

difficulty and danger of approaching him save
with due precautions. ...To the prophets,
Jehovah is holy because he hates and punishes
sin.

(2) Social Inadequacy of Legalism

Legalism was not an adequate instrument in effecting
Yahweh's religious purpose for the group. The prophetic
teaching concerning this purpose could not have been covered
by law. Hosea, for instance, pictured Israel as the bride
of Yahweh. Yahweh betrothed her while she was yet in the
wilderness (2.1-3). But Israel had played the harlot with
many lovers forgetting her earlier exclusive devotion to
Yahweh, her true husband. (3.1ff; 9.14) Amos presented
the divine ideal for Israel as a social unit in terms of a
collective fellowship with Yahweh which became impossible as
the group fell away from conformity to his nature. (3.2; 5.4,
24; 6.14) Because Yahweh sought and loved this collective
fellowship he had in various ways made known his nature and
will. The preaching of the prophets and the Nazarites (2.11;
3.7), the law of Judah (2.4), Amos himself (3.8; 7.15), and
acts of divine providence (4.6-11) were among these. Isaiah
believed that this collective fellowship with Yahweh could
never be fully realized without the aid of an ideal king.

He had a childlike faith in the importance of the personality of the king. He expected an ideal age from the rule of the ideal monarch and the administration of righteous office holders.\(^1\)

As a result of this kind of ruler the nation was pictured in full ethical harmony and fellowship with Yahweh. All the lower proclivities of life would cease and all man's wanton impulses would be conquered by God's higher will (Isa. 11.9ff). Here the highest peak of social idealism was realized in a fullness of knowledge concerning the nature and purpose of Yahweh.\(^2\)

Individual social responsibility as well as the collective purpose demanded a more adequate means than legalism. The prophets addressed themselves to the nation.\(^3\) But in appealing to the whole they appealed to each individual, though no doubt especially to those whose conduct was influential in shaping the whole. Yahweh chose a nation because of his idea of mankind as a social organism. But, though the relation might seem to be with the ideal unity, it operated in disposing rightly to one another all the parts making up the unity. And in this way each individual felt Yahweh to be his God. The nationalism of the Old Testament

\(^3\) Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 6f.
did not exclude individual religion. Jeremiah 31.29-30
is a classic illustration of the individualism of the later
prophets. Jeremiah's doctrine of individual responsibility
was elaborated by Ezekiel (chap. 18). But here the require-
ment was one of ethical consonance, not outward observance.
Jeremiah saw this inward consonance and fellowship between
Israel as a group and Israel as individuals consummated as
Yahweh's law was written in man's inward parts and upon his
individual heart. (31.31-34)

It is the picture of an entire community ruled
by God's law and acting conformably to his will;
every member from the least of them unto the
greatest of them having clear and full knowledge
of what God demands, and regulating their thoughts
and deeds accordingly.  

b. Non-ritualistic Maintenance

1. Individual Prophetic Emphases

With Amos the religion of Yahweh was conceived not only
as socially ethical but as that alone. There is no evidence
that sacrifice and burnt offering had any place in it. These,
Amos declared, were no part of Yahweh's original covenant
(5.25). In a very striking way he declared Yahweh's

1. Duhm, The Ever-Coming Kingdom of God, p. 31f.
2. Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets, p. 162.
displeasure and even abhorrence of the sacrificial feasts (4.4,5; 5.21-24). The burden of Hosea was that Israel as a fallen wife should return to Yahweh, her faithful husband. In this marital wooing Hosea declared that Yahweh wanted goodness rather than sacrifice and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offering (6.6). Hence, while he did not, with Amos, denounce the ritualistic, it was made to occupy a secondary position. In a moment of crisis Isaiah declared Yahweh would come down and protect Jerusalem (31.5,8). He could denounce unspiritual ritual as eloquently as any prophet (1.10-17), but he could not see that Yahweh's religion could live without a Temple. Some sort of external dwelling was necessary for Yahweh. Yet, aside from this, the whole impact of his message was inner, ethical, and spiritual.

Jeremiah believed that the religion of Yahweh could survive in the absence of all outward things. Dearly as he loved the Temple, he could see it perish without losing faith in Yahweh's presence and power (26.6). Perhaps the climax of prophetic teaching on the secondary place of outward observance was marked by Jeremiah. Speaking of Jeremiah's teaching as to circumcision of heart, Professor Leslie says:

When this is achieved, when the heart, the seat of the affectional and volitional nature, has been made basic in religion and the right attitude toward Jehovah has become its highest expression, then all the institutional trappings of religion might be destroyed - ark (3.16),
torah (31.31-34), Temple (7.14), and even the State itself (29.4-14) but religion in all its power would remain a reality in the hearts of the individual Judeans.\(^1\)

(2) Ezekiel and the Rise of Ritualism

Ezekiel felt a higher regard for the outward. He undertook to shape the ritual of the priesthood so that it should become an instrument for the preservation and expression of the prophetic ideals. In this he was but carrying out the work of the Deuteronomists, for their code was a fusion of ritual with prophetic ideals. Ezekiel's emphasis of the outward was continued in the later prophets until we find Malachi making all blessing depend largely upon the faithful fulfilment of ritual. "When prophets took this attitude it is clear that the age of the free spirit of prophecy had passed."\(^2\) Thus, though late prophecy emphasized ritualism, the general prophetic emphasis on ethical righteousness was dominant over an inadequate legalism with its ritual.

3. Experiential

a. The Medium of the "Spirit"

(1) Early Prophetic Rejection of Pre-Yahweh Conception

The idealism of the prophets was experiential. It was born out of intensely personal experience with Yahweh.


Later prophets sometimes employed the idea of the "Spirit" as a medium of this experience.¹ Ideas on the "Spirit" early in the Old Testament were often transferred from the days before the true emergence of Yahweh worship, and were, probably for this reason, rejected by the pre-exilic prophets. In action, the "Spirit" then belonged to the exceptional and strange (Judges 9.23; 1 Sam. 16.14; 18.10), and came spasmodically and suddenly (Judges 6.34; 1 Sam. 10.6). In nature it was sometimes an angelic messenger (1 Kings 18.18), sometimes a demon (2 Kings 2.16) which transferred from place to place, and sometimes perhaps a substance or essence of finely penetrating matter which was "poured into" its subject. As such, it would be capable of division.² When the seventy elders were chosen the Lord took part of the Spirit that was in Moses and bestowed it on them (Num. 11.25). Elisha prayed that a double portion of the Spirit of Elijah be granted him (2 Kings 2.9). In the earlier stages, the "Spirit" accomplished God's purpose, but was itself non-ethical.³ It was a detached instrumentality through which God worked. It was of itself simply a mysterious force which made a man different from ordinary men. Hence, the same Hebrew word

¹ Kent, Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, p. 3ff; Montgomery, Religions Past and Present, p. 86.
³ Carpenter, The Bible in the Nineteenth Century, p. 183.
sometimes denoted on the one hand the raving of a madman and, on the other, the afflatus of God's spokesman (חזר). Because of the action, nature, and purpose of the "Spirit" according to these transfers from pre-Yahweh worship, there was a virtual rejection of the idea of "Spirit" by the pre-exilic prophets. They usually insisted that the divine commission was from God himself. "The breaking away from traditional prophecy must have been deliberate and was most probably due to the very fact that the Spirit and prophetic madness were so closely connected in the popular mind."¹

(2) Later Prophetic Transformation of Conception

After the exile the need for reticence was apparently over. Second Isaiah in some of his most impressive allusions described himself as under the influence of the Spirit (48.16; 51.1). Ezekiel constantly spoke of the Spirit as the source of his revelations and fell back at times on the primitive idea of the Spirit as a demonic agency which transferred him from place to place. But these later prophets have worked a transformation of the idea. They have not freed themselves from the belief that the Spirit acted suddenly and intermittently (Isa. 29.19), but for the most part they think of it as a permanent influence (Isa. 32.15;

Zech. 4:6). "The service of such a God called for a steadfast mood of loyalty and obedience, not merely in conspicuous deeds achieved now and then in the strength of a sudden impulse."¹ It became the Spirit's one function to accomplish the will of God, and its attributes were all understood in the light of the divine character (Zech. 7:12; Mal. 2:15; etc.). So true was this that we find the very word "God" used interchangeably for "the Spirit of God" (Ezek. 11:24-25).² In the prophets the Spirit lost its identity as a detached agency and became the vital nature of God in action.

b. Direct Contact with God

Usually, the experiential contact was with God directly. Jeremiah knew that he stood in the council of Yahweh, and he was certain that the false prophets had not this experience (Jer. 23:28,29). He did not hesitate further to assert that these prophets whom he opposed were conscious that they had no true fountain of inspiration within them. Their prophetic manner, "saith Yahweh", was affectation (Jer. 23:31), and there was nothing personal in their oracles which they stole every one from his neighbor (23:30). It was of this direct experience that Micah declared, "I am full of power to declare to Jacob his transgressions" (3:8).

². Also Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 280-284.
c. Experience as a Source of Ideals

Not only did this experience give the prophets an inner sense of surety, but it also contributed to their ideals. Professor Bade presents personal religious experience and revelation along with reason and reflection upon the lessons of history as the fountain springs of prophetic ideals.

All the prophets, in analyzing their intuitions of the future and laying them before the people usually present them in the form of a moral syllogism. ...Everywhere the menacing future is connected with the evil past by therefore... But their syllogisms were first inspired by their experience.1

Not only did this interaction of reason and experience afford new ideals, it also stimulated the prophetic concept of the nature of God. The old anthropomorphic statements about God were still used. To them, however, such phrases were symbols and nothing more. God was spirit. As such he pervaded all things and was himself contained by no created object. A clear illustration of the work of reason and reflection in union with experience producing this supermundane God of Spirit is found in Isaiah 40. 18-31.

4. Universal
a. Implication in Monotheism

This ethical, unitary idealism operative through the hearts and consciences of men was bound to become universal.

For centuries it had been the fundamental dogma of Judaism that there was but one God, creator and ruler of the world. The most elementary reflections on the implications of monotheism make it clear that an only God's interest cannot be confined to a particular nation. The elevation of Yahweh to the place of sole God thus seemed to threaten the foundations of the national religion, the peculiar and exclusive relation between Yahweh and Israel.

b. Two Effects

One effect of this antinomy was expressed in emphatic assertions of the arbitrariness of the divine election (Deut. 7:6-11; 10:14ff; 4:32-39). Another effect was to build a line of reasoning to meet it. Then, indeed, Israel knew and worshipped this God, but in his larger purpose he would be known and worshipped by all. God was de jure king over all the earth from creation on, but de facto, he was king only of those whose words and deeds acknowledged his sovereignty. Israel alone of all the nations did this at Sinai, and therefore he was, in a peculiar sense, the king of Israel as he was the God of Israel. The heathen, as nations and as individuals, rejected the true God and his religion. They would not have the rightful king to rule over them. Even in Israel true adherence was limited to a small

"spiritual" Israel.  

**c. Envisioned Result**

Thus it had been in all the past. But it would not always be so. The time would come when all mankind would bow to his rule, and do homage to him alone and obey his will (Zeph. 3:9; Isa. 2:2-4; Mic. 4:1-5; Isa. 42:4-13; 49:6f; 45:3-6; etc.). Then the reign of God would be universal. The end of all God's ways, the goal of human history would be attained. Indeed, "The Second Isaiah felt his own peculiar message, his new truth to be this; the inclusion of the whole Gentile world, side by side with Israel, in the family of the one God."  

The envisioned result would take the form of the national religion in varying aspects becoming internationalized. Jerusalem would be the seat of the Cultus, to which the converted nations would resort to worship the true God, bringing their offerings. (Isa. 56:6-8; 60; 66:18-21; Zech. 14:16-21; etc.)

**d. Ethical Idea of God in Aiding Result**

Monotheism was greatly aided in reaching its true conclusion in universalism by the conception of God as ethical, a concept which knows no race nor nation. Even

---

during a considerable time from Amos onward when universalism had reached no dogmatic form there was a profound and passionate conviction that Yahweh, the righteous and holy God whom all things serve, differed from all other gods not only in degree but in kind. The Canaanite Baals, Bel and Nebo of the Assyrians, fell away into mere nothingness before him (Amos 5:4-6; Hos. 8:9) Amos did not recognize the reality of other gods nor deny their existence. He simply ignored them and told how Yahweh ruled the nations. Yahweh brought the Philistines from Caphtor and the Aramaeans from Kir (9:7). The Philistines, Damascus, Moab, Edom, and all the nations mentioned were responsible to Yahweh for their acts and were judged by him. "Amos' thought grew out of the old conception of Yahweh as holy and jealous and of the ethical and spiritual discoveries of his own soul."1 Here it is significant to notice that the woes of judgment upon neighboring nations with which Amos began his prophecy were based upon violations of ethical principles and in one case a judgment was pronounced for unnecessary and unfeeling violence upon an enemy of Israel (2.1-3).2 Bruce maintains that the preaching of judgment upon other nations came as moral lessons in the grand doctrine of an absolutely universal,

1. Barton, Religion of Israel, p. 96.
impartial moral order enforced by the just will of Yahweh.¹

5. Redemptive, Motivated by Love

a. Amos' Implication

Such idealism claiming universal scope had for its purpose nothing less than the spiritual redemption of mankind. This purpose was motivated by Yahweh's love. Amos dwelt upon the sternly ethical demands of God's redemption and said nothing of his love. Yet we cannot read such a passage as 8.4-7 without feeling the compassion of God for the poor, the needy, and the oppressed. In a sense, it was the very love of God for the people that moved Amos to hot indignation at their economic and social condition. It was the keen consciousness of God's purpose of redemption for them that drove him forth in heroic effort to remove all physical injustices and handicaps of the social order.

b. Marital Wooing of Hosea and Jeremiah

This redemptive love of Yahweh was tenderly described by Hosea as the wooing of a husband. Yahweh loved Israel as a true husband loves his wife. Israel's sin not only injured herself but broke his heart. In the midst of her waywardness, this powerful love of Yahweh exerted itself in

¹ Bruce, Apologetics, p. 233ff.
redemptive effort (Hos. 2.14-16). Jeremiah revived the main features of the teaching of Hosea, dwelling on the love of Yahweh and interpreting the covenant of Yahweh with Israel as a marriage contract. In tenderness and depth of feeling he surpassed all his predecessors except Hosea in setting forth the wooing, suffering love of God as it expressed itself in redemptive effort (2.1-3; 3.1-5; 4.1,2; etc.). In 31.9 the figure was changed and Yahweh was yearning Father to Israel.

c. Isaiah's Return and Deutero-Isaiah's Transcendence

Isaiah's vision of returning prosperity was based upon Yahweh's gracious mercy to Israel. It was the work of his redemptive love (Isa. 30.18-28). Yahweh was the keeper of the vineyard of Israel. He declared, "I will water it every moment, lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day. Wrath is not in me...In days to come shall Jacob take root; Israel shall blossom and bud; and they shall fill the face of the world with fruit." (Isa. 27.3-4a,6) Here God's spirit of redemptive love sustained his patience in dealing with Israel. In Deutero-Isaiah 57.15 the moral transcendence of God, instead of meaning separateness, meant spiritual union with the humble and the contrite, and enabled him to carry out his spirit of redemptive love in reviving them. As with Hosea, this prophet also saw God as the Father of Israel, and declared that though Abraham forgot his people,
God the Father would not (Isa. 63.16).

d. Requirement, Man's Answering Love

This redemptive love operated through the kindling of man's answering love. It required this.

It is not enough to demand of men that they should behave themselves; they must have that deep within them which will compel them to upright and loving conduct. It is this which Yahweh himself has exhibited in his dealings with Israel, and she can fulfil his demands only by giving him her answering love.1

Israel was dear to God because he remembered the love of her espousal (Jer. 2.2). In those early days, God's love proved as bands to draw the love of Israel after him (Hos. 11.4).

The burden of the prophetic appeal was simply that men would allow this redemptive love of God to wake within them a true affection for him and his ways, and that they should return unto him from all their unfaithfulness. (Isa. 44.22; Jer. 3.1, 12, 22; etc.)

6. Causative

a. God as Present and Morally Earnest

This prophetic idealism was considered as vitally causative. God sustained a near and present relationship to them in all his moral earnestness. The prophets could

1. Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion, etc., p. 207.
not imagine that God was less concerned in loving the right and hating the wrong than they themselves were. Indeed, their passion for righteousness was nothing more than a rallying to this central activity on the part of God.¹ This rallying sometimes took the nature of present and inward compulsion. "Yahweh himself laid irresistible hold on them and revealed himself to them in all his might."² Sometimes this sense of inward compulsion seemed to take the dominance over their own wills. "They do not resist; they cannot resist in the prospect of a ruin which would leave Yahweh without any worshippers on the earth."³ Amos, for instance, felt that Yahweh himself had taken him from his flocks, had led him to Bethel and made him a prophet against Ephraim (3.7-8).

b. The Message as Power

These prophetic ideals were more than intellectual speculation. They were dynamic and powerful. Through them God was not only active in the life of Israel but also in the nations of the world. (Amos 3.1,2; 7.7-9; 8.1-3; 9.8; etc.)

---
¹ Bruce, Apologetics, p. 233.
³ Loisy, The Religion of Israel, p. 156.
Isaiah's conception of faith was bound up with his idea of God's activity. This was brought out plainly in three statements found in 7.9; 28.16; 30.15. From these passages it is evident that he understood faith to be a practical thing, namely, a calm and courageous reliance upon God, who was able to prevent the evil and bring to pass the good; such reliance to result in the non-use of all means that might seem a denial of God's present power and activity.

When everything was trembling and falling, even the pillars and the thrones, where was deliverance to be found? Such a deliverance there was; the very name of Isaiah means "Salvation from Yahweh". It did not lie with men.1

Micah presented right doing as the cause of God's active favor (2.7), while apostasy was the cause of his certain judgment (2.1-3). The violations of the ideals were met with the indignation of God. His wrath was stirred against those who stole, murdered, committed adultery, swore falsely, and burned incense to Baal, thinking that these things could all be covered by pious exercises in the Temple. (Jer. 7.9-11) He pictured the wrath of God bursting forth like fire against hypocrisy (Jer. 4.3,4; 6.8; 7.3; etc.). Jeremiah saw the present patience of Yahweh becoming exhausted (7.16; 14.12). Deutero-Isaiah saw God as choosing Cyrus to carry out his purpose (41.4b-7). In all such passages and in many more

1. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, p. 141.
Yahweh was in the very midst of things, the chief struggler of them all in championing righteousness, loving mercy, pleading the cause of the oppressed, and threatening all evil with sure and certain punishment.

The prophetic idealism not only revealed a vitally active and causative God, but required a becoming activity on man's part.⁴ Everywhere God was calling upon man to repent, to revise his ways, to "cease doing evil that he may learn to do well." It was presupposed that it was possible for man actively to respond. The exile itself was allowed by God as a moral discipline because of the violations of these ideals. It was intended to restore Israel to them and, through them, to her salvation. (Isa. 50.1; 40.1-2)

c. God as Man's Personal Helper

But the ideals were not causative in a general or abstract way. They were causative because God was in them and of them. They were facets of his morally active nature. Hence, his relationship to those who honored them was more than a legal connection. He was man's personal helper.

God is nowhere conceived as sustaining a merely legal relation to men, making certain demands on them which it lies with them to comply with, and administering rewards and punishments according as His behests are obeyed and disobeyed. He

---

1. Ottley, The Religion of Israel, p. 78.
is not only an objective power siding with righteousness, but a gracious help for man in becoming righteous.¹

Even the Decalogue was prefaced with the remembrance of God's deliverance from bondage. All along God appeared as doing for Israel what she could not do for herself, in "love and pity", redeeming a helpless, enslaved race from a state of bondage; not rewarding for work done, but benignantly conferring benefit unmerited. (Isa. 51.2; 43.16ff; 51.9-10; 43.15; 45.11; 49.15ff; etc.)²

7. Volitional

a. Implication of Sin as Guilt

But God's help was not without condition. Instead of a legal compliance, a volitional one was required. It was the will of man which God sought to change and to direct. Sin was regarded as guilt because it was rooted in a will contrary to that of God. Its guiltiness presupposed that man's will was free to choose. Hence, sin was a moral matter.

The mass of the people, in accordance with nature religion, would have seen in their imminent doom, if they had considered it at all, simply the blind sway of the divine indignation, like a fate; the prophet saw in it the national guilt.³

Almost every page of prophecy presupposed the freedom of man's

1. Bruce, Apologetics, p. 249.
will and made God's idealism an appeal to man's power of volition.

b. Implication of Prophetic Appeal

The whole implication in the prophetic appeal was that man could conform himself to the ways of God if he would. There would have been no spirit of prophecy if man had been regarded as caught within the iron grip of irresistible circumstances. Cold fatalism would have produced no impassioned entreaties. A very few of the relevant passages will suffice.

Amos challenged the people with conformity to the moral character of God as the basis of intimate fellowship with him. (3.2; 5.4,24; 6.14) Hosea saw Yahweh busy in winning back his faithless wife (6.14-23). Isaiah (22.1-14) condemned the people's conduct during an attack upon the national capitol and declared that Yahweh would hold them to account for their disregard of him. His doctrine of the redeemed remnant showed that certain ones would amend their ways in the face of all the evil around them. A present corruption of the people made judgment necessary, but from the judgment he saw emerge a redeemed and purified remnant, a nucleus of a new nation. (10.20,21; 4.3,4; 1.24-27; etc.) Micah, in chapters four and five, took up the theme of the remnant, and proved his faith in the power of man to adjust himself to the terms implied in moral fellowship with God, despite environmental influences.
c. Free Will in Jeremiah and Ezekiel

It remained for Jeremiah and Ezekiel to declare man's free will in its extreme form. Jeremiah in 31.29-30 renounced the idea of the binding power of heredity, and declared that the individual alone was separately and entirely responsible for his own moral conduct. "The rest of the world seems shut out and the man stands alone with his God." Ezekiel emphasized and expanded Jeremiah's doctrine. In the eighteenth chapter we have a detailed explanation of the thought that God does not visit the iniquities of the fathers on the children, and that parents are not responsible for the moral acts of their children. "The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (vs. 20) "Each generation, each individual, can begin life afresh and lay the foundation of a new order."*

8. Hopeful

a. A Consequence of Foregoing Characteristics

Because God was one and his ideals were a unity, because God was ethical in his righteousness and his ideals were based on ethical requirements, because these ethical requirements became dynamic by personal fellowship with God, because an only God and an only order of idealism implied a

1. Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion, etc., P. 301.
world dominion and the principle on which it operated knew no race nor nation, because the ideal purpose was redemption motivated by love, because the idealism was implicit with the work of a vitally present, all-powerful, and earnest God in cooperation with the prophets who heard him and the hearers who heeded -- the idealism of the prophets was filled with indomitable and indestructible hope. That this hopefulness was implicit in the general character of prophetic ideals is seen in the fact that it is declared rather than argued. Isaiah cherished high expectation from the beginning. When he met Ahaz about 734, he was accompanied by a son called Shear Yashub, meaning "a remnant shall return." The one great basis for the hope of the return and restoration of Israel during her exile was this moral nature of God reflected in his ideals. His judgment was redemptive and merciful. It would result in a true transformation of the individual heart. (Jer. 31.33,34; etc.) God in his love would remove the evil influences which had sprung from the people's contact with heathen neighbors in the past (Ezek. 28.24-26; 29.16; etc.) In short, there was no limit to what might be expected from such an active and almighty love: "With him is plenteous redemption" (Ps. 130.7) in all senses and in all spheres external and internal, and in all parts of the world.
b. A Consideration of the Power of God

This power of God not only extended throughout the realm of nature, but also throughout the moral world. God could pardon the most aggravated guilt, subdue the power of evil habit, and extricate from the chains of punitive consequences. The prophets spoke as men who believed this with all their hearts and cherished boundless expectations from God's beneficent will.¹

Who is a God like unto thee that pardoneth iniquity and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not his anger forever because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again; he will have compassion on us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depth of the sea. (Mic. 7.18,19)

Again, said Hosea, "I will heal their backsliding. I will love them freely. I will be as the dew unto Israel and he shall grow as the lily and cast forth his roots as Lebanon." (14.4,5)

Yahweh himself was their hope. They could confidently leave in his hands the shaping of the future and the realization of their salvation.²

D. The Plan for the Consummation of it

1. The Day of Yahweh

a. A Crisis in Human Affairs

Having considered the time and the character of the prophetic idealism, the plan for its consummation among men must be investigated. This was prepared for by the Day of Yahweh as a crisis in human affairs. This day often ushered in the return of the dispersed tribes, which led to the restored Israel as the final triumph of the prophetic idealism foreshadowing the kingdom.

(1) Catastrophic Natural Disturbances as Forerunners

The Day of Yahweh as a crisis in human affairs was sometimes connected with all manner of catastrophic disturbances in nature, which were meant to signalize the might and majesty of Yahweh. Amos called it a day of darkness (5.18). Isaiah continued:

Behold, the day of Yahweh cometh, cruel, with wrath and fierce anger; to make the land a desolation and to destroy the sinners out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in its going forth, and the moon shall not cause its light to shine. ... It will make the heavens to tremble and the earth shall be shaken out of its place. (13.9,10,13)

In Zephaniah 1.2-9, Yahweh was represented as consuming the

1. דִּיָ' , meaning of דִּי': a definite period of time, not necessarily one sudden eventuation.

birds of the heavens, the beasts of the earth, and man himself on that Day. The apocalyptic portions of the Old Testament greatly emphasized these catastrophic disturbances in nature. (Joel 2.2,10,19; Isa. 24.1-20; etc.)

(2) Early Conception - Day for Destruction of Israel's Foes
According to the early conception, the phrase, "Day of Yahweh", meant little else than a day when Yahweh would destroy Israel's enemies. The victories to which Israel went were the victories of Yahweh. It was expected that he would show his power in behalf of Israel. He might be quiet for a time. Israel might undergo reverses, but Yahweh would surely intervene again. There was a continual expectation of the Day of Yahweh as intervention for the discomfiture of the present adversaries of Israel.¹

(3) Prophetic Conception - Day of Moral Judgment
But with the prophets, Yahweh was an ethical being, not merely a national protector. Therefore, the Day of Yahweh could not be regarded as merely national intervention. It was a Day of moral judgment, a judgment unto salvation for the morally righteous and a judgment unto condemnation for all the wicked. As it meant the manifestation of Yahweh,

God of Israel, in his fulness, and therefore in a way to realize his purposes which, with Israel and even with the world, were those of grace, it was fundamentally a day of joyful moral triumph to Israel and also to the world. (Ps. 149.2; 97.1; 96.10-13) That Yahweh should reign and that he should come to earth as king must, in spite of all the terrors that might attend his coming, bring to the world a pervading gladness. The falsehood and injustice that had cursed the earth so long would disappear, and the longing of men would be satisfied. But it would be a day of satisfaction, above all, to Israel.\(^1\) But the condition of Israel was mixed. There were many in Israel who only belonged to her by race. They were "filled with customs from the east, and were soothsayers like the Philistines." (Isa. 2.6) They shared the idolatries and practised the sins of the nations; and, as Jeremiah charged it to them, their sin was double. (Jer.2.11-13) Therefore, the Day of the Lord would come upon many in Israel with terror and destruction. This thought formed a staple in prophetic warning. (Amos 5.18; cf. 3.2,11,12; 4.2,3,13; 5.1-3,27; 6.1,2,7; etc.) Sometimes the salvation was prominent, and sometimes the condemnation. The Day was represented as a process of sifting, or refining. (Zeph. 1.7-12; Isa. 1.25; Mal. 3.1,2-3) 

\(^1\) Eiselen, *Prophecy and the Prophets*, p. 70-71.
2. The Return

a. Consequence of the Day of Yahweh

The result of this Day of Yahweh was to be the establishment of the true Israel and the universal recognition of her work and of her God. In order to accomplish this, the Day was usually seen as ushering in the return of the dispersed tribes (Isa. 31.1-14.2; Hag.; Zech. 1-8; etc.) The return was very prominent from Jeremiah onward. (Jer.30.3; 23.1-8; 29.10-14; 32.36-44; Ezek. 39.25-29; 34.11-16; etc.)

b. Its Extent as a Hope

The liberation of Israel from the domination of the nations and the gathering of the dispersion to their own land had a place in the oldest prayers of the synagogue:

Sound the great horn (as a signal) for our freedom; lift up the standard for the assembling of our exiles. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest the dispersed of his people Israel. Restore our judges as at the first and our counsellors as at the beginning; and reign over us, Thou alone. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who lovest judgment.1

The exodus from Egypt had been the great miracle of history, a monument of God's almighty power and of his goodness to his people. But as Jeremiah had foretold, it would be eclipsed by the greater miracle of Israel's return from all the countries whither she had been dispersed.

The days are coming, saith the Lord, when they shall no more say, As the Lord liveth, who led up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, but as the Lord liveth, who led up and brought the posterity of the children of Israel from the northern land, and from all the land whither I had driven them away; and they shall dwell on their own soil. (Jer. 27.7f)

3. The Restoration

The final goal of all the discipline involved in the sorrows of exile was the Restoration of Israel, which was visioned as the perfecting of all the blessings contemplated in the foundation of Israel as a community. "This joyous, cheering outlook...can alone constitute the final prophetic anticipation in the series of true expectations."2

a. A Davidic Kingdom

The Restoration was often idealized as the return of the Davidic kingdom. The victories and power of David became a symbol for the future ideal.3 It connected itself literally with the name, the place, and the family of David, and yet what was looked for was not David, but the kingdom and glory of David fulfilling his covenant with Yahweh.

David was the symbol of the ideal king ruling in accordance with divine law. The return of the Davidic kingdom was probably always the popular form of the hope.

b. A Direct Theocracy

(1) A Non-Political Organism

At other times there was no mention of the return of the Davidic kingdom. It was pictured as the emergence of a direct theocracy in which both king and nation seemed to disappear.

In the earlier days of the Davidic monarchy the Messianic conqueror is more prominent, but in the darkest days the Messiah retires into the background and the divine king becomes more prominent.

Psalm 24 represented Yahweh Sabaoth entering the holy city in triumph. Psalms 46 and 48 described Jerusalem as the city of the great king whence he triumphed over all his enemies. Isaiah 40ff was a conspicuous example of this direct theocracy. In such citations there is no mention of political king or nation.

(2) Israel as the "Suffering Servant of Yahweh"

Instead of Israel as a political organism, we here

3. Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, p. 484. For a study of the relationship of the two hopes, see Peters, The Religion of the Hebrews, p. 430. For a fusion of the two, see Addis, Hebrew Religion, etc., p. 234f.
find her as the "suffering Servant of Yahweh." The business of this "Servant" was to become God's world-winning missionary through vicarious suffering. This conception powerfully transfigured the idea of Israel's work and destiny.

Second Isaiah gave a new interpretation to Yahweh's choice, Israel's mission, and Israel's suffering. Yahweh had chosen Israel to be his interpreter to the world. Israel's election was, accordingly, an election of service. His mission was to be Yahweh's missionary to the world and His sufferings were a part of the appointed means by which He should make Yahweh known to the nations.₁

As God's missionary through vicarious suffering, Israel sometimes proved unfaithful, dull of understanding, and wayward of heart in the discharge of this high responsibility. (Isa. 43:22-24) But at other times she was the chosen servant (Isa. 41:8-9), upheld by Yahweh to bring justice to the Gentiles (Isa. 42:2-4). For this reason, she heroically endured the insults showered upon her (50:4-9). Finally, kings stood astonished at the "Servant's" fate and wondered why it should be (Isa. 52:15). Then, they became conscious that her sufferings were for their salvation (53:4-6)

The "Servant" rôle was visioned as God's agelong purpose for Israel according to Second Isaiah. He called her for this high mission and endowed her with his spirit and message for this end.² Nothing could thwart God's world-

₁ Barton, Religion of Israel, p. 130-131.
² Moore, Judaism, p. 228.
redemptive purpose in Israel, not even her bitterest suffering and degradation. Speaking of Isaiah 52.13-53.12, Box says:

The Servant is depicted as a man of sorrows, enduring patiently the suffering brought about by a terrible disease (apparently leprosy), persecuted and despised by his contemporaries who, seemingly, at the last hound him to a shameful death. But martyrdom is only the prelude to supreme glory. The Servant's unparalleled suffering and the tragedy of his death in due time produce a revulsion of feeling...Penitence, confession, and recognition of the martyr's mission are the result.¹

Though the emergence of this direct theocracy made no definite place for king or nation, Israel enjoyed priority in the new order. The center of spiritual transformation would be the Jews. Jews would be called "priests of the Lord, ministers of our God." (Isa. 61.5f)² It was the Jewish spiritual restoration that was to make of her God's instrument in the enlightenment of the Gentiles, and the enlargement of God's salvation to the ends of the earth. (Isa. 42.1-7; 49.6; 60.3; etc.) It was Israel who was rebuked most severely for her failure to witness because it was through her that a continuous preparatory work must be carried on.³

c. The Final Triumph of Prophetic Ideals

The nature of this consummated kingdom, whether in the

1. The Book of Isaiah, p. 265,266.
political form of the returned Davidic kingdom or in the form of the direct theocracy, is found to be nothing more nor less than the present kingdom ideals of the prophets in full realization. ¹ In its political form the king himself epitomizes the nature of the kingdom. He comes to rule by active, ethical righteousness. He is the center of a tender and redemptive love. He maintains inner experience with God. His sway is enlarged to the ends of the earth. Through him, "kings and princes will be the devoted guardians of justice. None will look to them in vain for wrongs to be redressed and innocence vindicated."² The clearer it became that the restoration and perfection of the moral condition of the people were not to be looked for from pious kings like Hezekiah and Josiah, the more imperative was it felt to be that the Deliverer and Ruler of the seed of David should stand in a relation of nearness and unity to Yahweh transcending the limits of everyday humanity. This union between him and Yahweh should be realized on a basis of exceptional dignity of nature, raising him to a supreme level of character and authority. (Ps. 110; Isa. 9.6-7; Jer. 31.22; Mic. 5.2; Zec. 3.8; Mal. 3.1; etc.) The very conception of Israel as

¹. Cf. Riehm, Messianic Prophecy, pp. 125ff; also Cornhill, The Prophets of Israel, p. 122.
². Driver, The Ideals of the Prophets, p. 11.
prophet, missionary, and martyr under the form leading into the direct theocracy is wrought through and through with the deepest expression of the same qualities which the prophets had constantly revealed as the ideals for God's kingdom.\(^1\) It is here vastly empowered by a vision of world sacrifice and service.

**Summary**

It has been seen that the prophetic idealism was of present operation and future consummation. Its character represented the nature of God. It was unitary in its operation and applicability because its unrivalled source and control was God. It was ethical in principle rather than legal or ritualistic. Its standard was the moral nature of God. It looked toward inner fellowship with God through conformity with his nature. In judgment it was ethical and in social aim ethical principles governed. It did not lean upon outward observance for its maintenance, but rather upon experiential contact with God. Because of the inward ethical nature of this idealism based upon the unitary rule of the one God, it became universal. Its purpose matched its universal scope. It sought the spiritual redemption of man. In this it was motivated by love. In the realization of this purpose the idealism was causative. It was indwelt with the

---

present and morally earnest God as man's personal helper. Its causative operation rested upon one condition, the volition of man. In this condition, it presupposed man's free will. Throughout the idealism there was an attitude of underlying hopefulness which sprang from the consideration of the power of God and of the immediate connection and purpose of God in the idealism. The prophets visioned the consummation of these ideals through the Day of Yahweh as a crisis in human affairs. On this day, through Yahweh's moral judgment, his ideals will reach a joyful triumph. This triumph was usually considered as ushering in the return of the dispersed tribes and preparing the way for the Restoration of Israel. This Restoration was usually visioned as a new Davidic kingdom. Sometimes it was seen as a direct theocracy with Israel as the "suffering Servant of Yahweh." This latter conception, as will be seen later, was most significant for Jesus.
CHAPTER TWO

JESUS' KINGDOM IDEALS AND THE IDEALS OF THE PROPHETS

A. Similarities in Language

There are many indications that Jesus founded his kingdom ideals upon the idealism of the prophets. Among these indications Jesus' verbal indebtedness to them is noteworthy. The New Testament abounds in quotations from the Old, and the synoptic gospels are especially rich in such quotations.

1. Quotations

The following table will illustrate the extent of exact quotation from the Old Testament to be found in the first three gospels.

| Quotations peculiar to Matthew | 17 |
| Quotations peculiar to Mark | 1 |
| Quotations peculiar to Luke | 6 |
| Quotations peculiar to Matthew and Mark | 11 |
| Quotations peculiar to Matthew and Luke | 4 |
| Quotations found in all three synoptists | 14 |

A large portion of these quotations are from the Prophets and the Psalms.

The quotations by the Evangelists themselves relating to the life of Christ, are all from the Prophets and Psalms, except Luke 2.23,24, from Exodus 13.2; Leviticus 12.8. ...The citations from the Law, with the above exceptions,

are in the course of legal and ethical discussions by Jesus; and the mass of his quotations also are from the Prophets and the Psalms.¹

The above table does not include the many references to the Old Testament passages not directly quoted.

Inasmuch as the direct concern of this thesis is with the literary prophets, we shall mention in detail, prophet by prophet, the direct citations in the synoptics.²

**Isaiah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Mt.</th>
<th>Mk.</th>
<th>Lk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1,2</td>
<td>21.33; 12.2; 20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9,10</td>
<td>13.14,15; 4.12; 8.18; 8.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>21.44; 20.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.23; 9.1</td>
<td>4.15; 16; 1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 (2)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.13-15</td>
<td>11.23; 10.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>15.8,9; 7.6,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-66</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>3.3; 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.3-5</td>
<td>3.4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.8-14</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>3.17; 17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.1-4</td>
<td>12.18-21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.12</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.6; 6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>21.13; 11.17; 19.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.1,2</td>
<td>4.18,19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>5.4; 6.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.24</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jeremiah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Mt.</th>
<th>Mk.</th>
<th>Lk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>21.13; 11.17; 19.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


From the preceding table it is obvious that all our synoptic records of Jesus are freely impregnated with prophetic quotations, to say nothing of the many indirect allusions to prophetic ideas. Also, we especially notice Jesus' fondness for Isaiah, and, more especially, for Isaiah 40-66. Macfarland groups the outstanding citations (including prophetic Psalms) according to synoptists as follows:\footnote{Macfarland, \textit{Jesus and the Prophets}, Table of Contents, p. 13.}
At the Temple Cleansing - Mark 11.17; Matthew 21.13,14; Luke 19.46; - from Isaiah 56.7 and Jeremiah 7.11.

The Unworthy Husbandman - Mark 12.2; Matthew 21.33; Luke 20.9; - from Isaiah 5.1,2.


The Divided Households - Mark 13.12; Matthew 10.35,36; Luke 12.52,53; Matthew 10.21; - from Micah 7.6.

In Mark and Matthew

Jesus' Rebuke of Unreality in Worship - Mark 7.6,7; Matthew 15.8,9; - from Isaiah 29.13.

The Sheep Shall be Scattered - Mark 14.27; Matthew 16.31; - from Zechariah 13.7.

In Mark Only

A Doubtful Passage - Mark 9.48; - from Isaiah 66.24.

In Matthew and Luke

John the Baptist an "Elijah" - Matthew 11.10; Luke 7.27; - from Malachi 3.1.


In Matthew Only


In Luke Only

The Sermon at Nazareth - Luke 4.18,19; - from Isaiah 61.1,2.


2. Allusions

Macfarland cites the allusions to the prophets as follows:¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 7.21,22</th>
<th>Hosea 8.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Isaiah 53.6; Jeremiah 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>Isaiah 8.12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.33ff (and parallels)</td>
<td>Micah 7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Isaiah 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3ff</td>
<td>Isaiah 55.10; Amos 9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>Isaiah 53.2 and Ezekiel 33.31,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>Isaiah 51.10 and Malachi 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>Isaiah 60.21 and 61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Malachi 2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.26</td>
<td>Jeremiah 32.17 and 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>Isaiah 61.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>Isaiah 53.10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>Ezekiel 21.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>Isaiah 64.11; Jeremiah 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah 22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>Joel 3.12; Ezekiel 34.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>Zechariah 9.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mark 8.38       | Isaiah 52.3 |
|                | Zechariah 13.7 |

| Luke 6.38       | Isaiah 65.6,7; Jeremiah 32.18 |
|                 | Ezekiel 13.10-16 |
| 7.23            | Isaiah 8.14,15 |
| 10.18           | Isaiah 14.12 |
| 10.20           | Ezekiel 13.9 |
| 11.2            | Isaiah 29.23 |
| 11.9            | Isaiah 55.6; Jeremiah 29.13 |
| 12.32           | Isaiah 40.11; 41.14; 44.2 |
| 13.6            | Isaiah 5.2ff |
| 14.16           | Isaiah 25.6 |
| 15.4f           | Ezekiel 34.1-16; Isaiah 40.11 |
| 16.24           | Zechariah 14.12; Isaiah 66.24 |
| 18.7            | Isaiah 63.4 |
| 19.40           | Habakkuk 2.11 |
| 19.43           | Isaiah 29.3; Jeremiah 6.6; Ezekiel 4.2; and 26.8 |
| 19.44           | Hosea 13.6 |

¹. Macfarland, *Jesus and the Prophets*, pp. 129-134.
These tables abundantly prove that Jesus was deeply indebted to the prophets for many quotations and also for innumerable phrases, terms, and figures. Many of these, as will be seen, were directly involved in his major kingdom ideals.

B. Similarities in Life Situation

Not only was Jesus deeply indebted to the prophets in his use of language, but his consciousness, his experiences, and his relationships present many similarities with them.

1. Home Training

As a boy, Jesus was acquainted with the prophets. He had often heard them read in the local synagogue service, and had probably read them himself to the listening congregation. "Jesus' parents were not of the rabbinical or priestly occupation; they rather held to the great utterances of the old prophets." As illustrated in the previous table of quotations, this early training bore abundant fruit in the teachings of Jesus, especially in his fondness for Second Isaiah.


2. Vocational Call

Jesus' call to his life work was the true prophetic call. As through the symbolic act of receiving Elijah's falling mantle, Elisha was consecrated, just so through the symbolic act of baptism at the hands of John the Baptist, Jesus was led to feel that he was set apart for a distinctive religious purpose. Samuel's call came in a dream as he lay in the temple. Isaiah's call came in a marvelous vision. So Jesus, as he came forth from baptism, saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him, and a voice out of heaven saying, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." (Matt. 3.17; cf. Mk. 1.11; Lk. 3.32)

3. Personal Prophetic Consciousness

Jesus referred to himself as a prophet. In Matthew 13.37 he applied to himself the proverb, "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and in his own house." The only sign he would give was the sign of the prophet Jonah, namely, the preaching of repentance. (Lk. 11.29-32)

It was necessary that he should go up to the Holy City, "for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." (Lk. 13.33) He mourned over the Holy City, "Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets." (Matt. 23.37) He predicted

---

1. Headlam, The Life and Teachings of Jesus the Christ, p. 147. For baptism as the prophet's anointing, see Friedlander, The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount, p. 2.

2. Edgehill, An Enquiry, etc., p. 438.
that there should come after him those who would subvert his teachings and mislead his followers, and he designated them, in contrast with himself, as "false prophets". (Matt. 24.11; Mk. 13.22) His messengers, like himself, were prophets, and were to rejoice and be exceeding glad in that persecution which was his and theirs, "for so persecuted they the prophets." (Matt. 5.12; Lk. 6.23)

4. Estimation of the People

The people considered Jesus to be a prophet and did so, apparently, with his own consent.1 In Luke 7.16 the people said, "A great prophet is arisen among us." In connection with Herod's superstitious opinion that Jesus was the reincarnate Baptist, Mark reports other rumors generally current: "But others said, It is Elijah. And others said, It is a prophet, even as one of the prophets." (Mk. 6.15) And when Jesus questioned the twelve in regard to public opinion concerning himself, they replied, "Some say John the Baptist; some Elijah, and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets." (Matt. 16.14)2 That this claim was made for Jesus by his friends was indicated by the retort of his accusers to Nicodemus, "Search and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." (John 7.52) The woman of Samaria

2. Bundy, The Religion of Jesus, p. 31f.
(John 4:19) and the blind man, speaking to the Pharisees (John 9:17), declared, "he is a prophet." The multitudes said, "This is the prophet, Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee." (Matt. 21:11) In a recent trip through Palestine, the author found that the native Moslem Arabs spoke reverently of the "prophet Jesus." He was told that one of the considerations operative in the giving back of the Mosque of St. Sophia in Istanbul was the rising Moslem respect for Jesus and John the Baptist as prophets.

5. Religio-Historical Situation

a. Foreign Oppression and Gloomy National Outlook

The exigences that called forth both John and Jesus offered parallels to the older prophetic activity. For two hundred years great emergencies had arisen and momentous events had followed in rapid succession. There had been the religious persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, the Maccabean uprising, the establishment of the Hasmonean kingdom, its weakening through embittered party contests, and its downfall at the hands of Rome, the return of foreign lordship, the vain but unceasing attempts to cast off the yoke, and, finally, the oppressive tyranny of the great Herod. The question in all thoughtful minds was, "What is to be the result? A similar question raised itself before Amos and Jeremiah at the threatened conflict with the Assyrians and Chaldeans.
b. Religious Interpretation

Just as in the case of the older prophets, Jesus saw the outward threat to the future of the people as a punishment from God for their sin.¹ Because they would not repent and receive his teaching, there was no outward hope. (Lk. 13.34, 35; Matt. 23.37-39) Jesus saw in advance the inevitableness of destruction. The prophecy of the immediate coming of the Kingdom of God was inseparable from the prophecy of the destruction of the temple and the Holy City. But the Kingdom of God, in the mind of Jesus, as the foreshadowing ideals in the minds of the prophets, was not dependent upon the temple or the Holy City.²

6. Persecution and Rejection

Furthermore, Jesus shared the persecution and rejection of the prophets. In Mark 6.1-4, he bore witness that he was rejected as a prophet. His statement concerning the use of parables in Mark 4.12 was identical with the language and idea of Isaiah 6.9,10, and both seem to indicate rejection. Isaiah and Jeremiah had found the Israels of their day unable to comprehend spiritual worship. Jesus faced a similar inability on the part of the people. (Isa. 29.13; Jer. 5.21; Mk. 7.6,7) The "Servant" idea of Isaiah 53.7ff

¹ Montefiore, Religious Teachings of Jesus, p. 17f.
² Candlish, The Kingdom of God, p. 159.
was mentioned in Luke 22.37 in relation to Jesus' consideration that rejection proved his rejectors sons of them that "slew the prophets." The people of his race and generation were in the succession of those who killed, scourged, and crucified the prophets. (Matt. 23.34ff) "The blood of all the prophets which was shed from the foundation of the world" would be chargeable to his generation. (Lk. 11.50)

C. Similarities in Time

The foregoing considerations present a set of circumstances in which it would be reasonable to suppose that Jesus' general teachings on the kingdom would be rather closely connected with the ideals of the prophets.

1. Present

a. Direct Statements

When we begin to study Jesus' idea of the kingdom, it is seen that his outward connection with the prophets in language and life situation was matched by the inward thought of his teaching. This is notably true of the present time to which it applied. Direct statements indicate this. His first announcement of the "gospel of God" was "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe in the gospel." (Mk. 1.15) In Matthew 12.28, "the

kingdom of God is come upon you (εἰς ἡγεμονίαν). Luke declared that "the kingdom of God is among you" (ἐν τοῖς ἡμεροῖς, Lk.17.21).

b. Indirect Statements

Indirect statements imply the presence of the kingdom. Jesus said that from the days of John the Baptist the kingdom of Heaven was being taken by violence (Matt. 11.12). It was being seized by the perishing in a rush to save their lives. Jesus spoke of persons who were entering it at the time (Matt. 21.31; 23.13), and called upon men to seek it (Matt. 6.33), and to enter the narrow door into life (Matt. 7.13), which was but another way of presenting it. Further, the humblest member of the kingdom of God (Matt. 11.11), that is, the least disciple of his, was said to be greater than John the Baptist. This saying assumed that the kingdom was a present reality.

c. Parabolic Teaching

In the parable of spontaneous growth (Mk. 4.26-29) the kingdom was a germinating force in the earth which, like seed, would grow to the harvest. In the parable of the tares (Matt. 13.24-30; 13.36-43) the good seed, as the sons of the kingdom, were then growing along with the tares. In the parable of the mustard seed (Mk. 4.30-32; cf. Matt. 13.31,32; Lk. 13.18,19) the very process of continuous growth from
present small beginnings was emphasized.\textsuperscript{1} The same teaching is given concerning the leaven (Matt. 13.33; Lk. 13.20,21). Neither the smallness nor the obscurity of present kingdom beginnings could thwart its irresistible and continuous spread.

2. Future

a. Direct Statements

On the other hand, as in the hopes of the prophets, the kingdom was often spoken of as taking place in the future. Direct statements affirm this.\textsuperscript{2} Some of those who heard Jesus would not die till they saw the kingdom of God come with power (Mk. 9.11). Men would come from the east and from the west and sit down in the kingdom of God (Lk. 13.29). At the last supper with his disciples, his mind turned to the repast to be enjoyed in the kingdom of God (Mk. 14.25). It was that which was yet to be entered by his own disciples on the basis of a righteousness that was superior to that of scribes and Pharisees (Matt. 5.20). The disciples were taught to pray for its coming (Matt. 6.10; Lk. 11.2).

b. Indirect Statements

Aside from such direct statements, we find indirect

\begin{enumerate}
\item Trench, \textit{Notes on the Parables of Our Lord}, pp. 78f, 108f.
\item Bosworth, \textit{Studies in the Teachings of Jesus and His Apostles}, p. 18.
\end{enumerate}
statements. His hearers were told that a great change was impending at which time all opportunity for preparation would cease, and many would find themselves outside the door of the master's house (Lk. 13.25-27; Matt. 25.11b,12). In Matthew 24.27, the coming (ματαιούντας, presence) of the Son of Man would be "as the lightning coming forth from the east and is seen even unto the west." In the Lukan parallel (17.24) this lightning-like revelation was spoken of as the day of the Son of Man.

c. Parabolic Teaching

Various parables continue the idea of a particular future significance of the kingdom of God. The bridegroom of the kingdom would come at an unexpected time and find foolish virgins unprepared to meet him (Matt. 25.1-13). In the parable of the talents (Matt. 25.14-30) and in the parallel parable of the pounds (Lk. 19.17-27) the lord of the servants "after a long time" suddenly returned home and called his household to account. Again, in Luke 14, 15-24 (cf. Matt. 22.1-10) Jesus spoke of a great supper yet to be held. In both Luke and Matthew this supper was spoken of in connection with the idea of the kingdom.

2. Trench, Notes on the Parables of Our Lord, p. 246f.
3. Ibid, pp. 268f, 505f.
d. A Near Future

As with the prophets, this future aspect of Jesus' idealism was conceived to be near at hand. In Mark 9:1 (cf. Lk. 9:27; Matt. 16:28) he said to a little group about him, "There are some here of them that stand by who shall in no wise taste of death until they see the kingdom of God come in power." Again, in Mark 14:25 (Lk. 22:16; Matt. 26:29) Jesus said to his disciples at the last supper, "Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God." In Mark 13:30, Jesus said "this generation shall not pass away until all these things be accomplished." (Cf. Lk. 21:29-33; Matt. 24:32-34)¹

e. Organic Relation to the Present

Again, as with the prophets the future was organically related to the present. He lamented over the future of Jerusalem because of the results which he foresaw in their present rejection of his message (Matt. 23:37; Lk. 13:34). Because the future was in moral connection with the present, his opening message was, "Repent ye, and believe in the gospel." (Mk. 1:15) In such parables as that of the mustard seed and the leaven, the future was only the full manifestation and realization of that which was now operative. Because of this

¹ Winstanley, Jesus and the Future, p. 26f.
organic relation of the future with the present kingdom operation, Jesus sought to interpret the future and to make its laws effective about him.\textsuperscript{1} The results which were being produced were "an earnest of the kingdom's future power and greatness."\textsuperscript{2}

D. Similarities in Character - Both the Nature of God

1. Unitary

a. Present and Future Governed by Same Principles

What kind of kingdom did Jesus teach? Here this thesis proposes to present the character of the kingdom as the nature of God, which Jesus held in common with the prophets. As with them, Jesus' idealism was God's nature in operation. His kingdom ideals were unitary. Though Jesus spoke of this world in contrast with the world to come, there were not two independent orders under separate rules. God ruled now and would rule more fully hereafter. The principles of his nature that mark the nature of his rule were identical with those which would one day usher in the culmination of his kingdom. These unitary kingdom ideals admitted no division in principle.

It (Jesus' message) is superior to all antithesis and tension between this world and a world to come, between reason and ecstasy, between work and isolation from

\begin{itemize}
\item 2. Winstanley, \textit{Jesus and the Future}, p. 61.
\end{itemize}
the world...it can dominate them all.¹

These unitary ideals made no provision for two different sets of responses.

It is absolutely false that it (the gospel) was the last effort of a decadent age, driven by distress into a renunciation of this earth, and then trying to storm heaven and demanding civic rights there.²

b. A Unified Kingdom Activity

Because Jesus conceived of present and future as governed by the same principles, his teaching presented a unified kingdom activity.³ He expected that the culminating judgment of God would be nothing different in principle from his agelong and continuous moral judgment against sin. He had already judged Sodom and Gomorrah. He would judge the little Galillean towns that were rejecting him and by his unitary principle of judgment, they would receive severer sentence. (Matt. 11.21-23; Lk. 10.13-15) God had not given over the present world to the powers of evil with the idea of a world to come for the faithful who then endured. Through his kingdom plan he was seeking to set in motion those principles which were redeeming in character regardless of their time application. The judgment scene in Matthew 25.31-46 had for

¹. Harnack, What is Christianity?, p. 63.
². Ibid., p. 16.
its criterion of judgment exactly that mercy taught in the Beatitudes and undergirded with the love that could reach even unto enemies. (Matt. 5.44; Lk. 6.27,35) "Every kingdom or house divided against itself cannot stand." (Matt. 12.25; Mk. 3.24-25; Lk. 11.17) These words were spoken concerning the impossibility of his kingdom as a duality in activity.

2. Ethical

Jesus' kingdom unity in principles and activity is ethically developed. As with the prophets, Jesus' idealism reflected the ethical nature of God and was both individual and social.

a. In Its Individualism

On the individual side there was an immediacy of relationship which God would have with the soul alone. One's alms-giving should be done before the secret eye of God (Matt. 6.2-4). There should be a place in one's life for inner closet praying when only God is present. (Matt. 6.5-8) One's fasting should be an individual matter between himself and God (Matt. 6.16-18). One's service should be, first of all, a service unto God (Matt. 6.24). One should

depend for individual necessities, first of all, upon God (Matt. 6.25-34; Lk. 12.22-30). One should learn to ask of God for daily needs (Matt. 7.7-11; 6.11; Lk. 11.3). One should seek the child-like attitude toward God (Matt. 18.1-5; Mk. 9.33-37; Lk. 9.46-48). All this rested upon the fact that God considered the individual as exceedingly precious.¹

The loss of one soul was of vital concern to him. The parable of the lost sheep (Lk. 15.1-7; Matt. 18.12-24), the lost coin (Lk. 15.8-10), the lost son (Lk. 15.11-32) all set forth the high worth of the individual to God. So great was God's concern for him that the very hairs of his head were numbered (Matt. 10.30; Lk. 12.7).

b. In Its Social Relationships

On the other hand, these ethical principles had to do with man's behavior in the group. Forgiveness was conditioned upon man's forgiving attitude towards others. (Matt. 6.12; Lk. 11.4; 6.37; Mk. 11.25) On knowing of a rift in fellowship between one's self and his brother, definite steps should be taken, first with the offender alone, next with two witnesses, and finally before the church in an effort to restore fraternity (Matt. 18.15-17). So important was this sense of moral concord between men that one should be willing to leave his gift before the altar and seek reconciliation and an understanding

¹ Bosworth, The Teaching of Jesus, etc., pp. 17, 33, 34.
with his brother before completing his offering (Matt. 5.23-24). In the Beatitudes, the merciful obtained mercy (Matt. 5.7), and the peacemakers were called the children of God (Matt. 5.9). When hated or persecuted or reviled one must refuse to let fraternity be ruined, but must seek to woo back the aggressor with love and blessing (Matt. 5.45-48). When smitten on the face, one must turn the other cheek instead of doubling the barrier by returning the blow (Matt. 5.38-42). His parables reflected the social meaning of his ethical teaching. The kingdom was like leaven that would eventually leaven all the meal in which it was hidden (Matt. 13.33; Lk. 13.20,21). In the parable of the unmerciful servant (Matt 18.21-35) the lord withdrew his forgiveness of the servant because that spirit of forgiveness was not communicated by him to his fellowmen. The parable of the rich man and the beggar had as its central point a rebuke to that selfishness that withheld the practical expressions of sympathy from the poor and afflicted. The parable of the good Samaritan accentuated the moral beauty of true neighborliness, and showed that this quality knew no racial boundary (Lk. 10.25-37).

1. Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 65f.
Through the changed inner will of the individual, Jesus sought to change human society. He never viewed the individual in absolute isolation, but he never forgot that the only way to change society genuinely was to change the individuals who compose it.¹ The fact that Jesus used the term "kingdom" showed that he was not oblivious of human relationships. Yet it was a personal kingdom. It was the kingdom of God, the kingdom of the Father. Men were sons of the kingdom (Lk. 11.11-14; etc.) Jesus never allowed the government of the kingdom to obscure the individual, personal relationships of family intimacy.²

c. In Its Conception of Sin

Nowhere can the strictly ethical import of Jesus' kingdom teaching be felt more than in its conception of sin.³ As with the prophets, sin was not the breaking of a law, but the disruption of the soul's inner ethical fellowship with God. Therefore, the only remedy for sin was an inward turning of mind and will away from the path of offense and toward the

¹ Cf. Scott, The Ethical Teaching of Jesus, p. 59.
² Cf. Bousset, Jesus, p. 112f. Note: For the extreme social position as a thesis, see Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, or, Matthews, The Teaching of Jesus. For a denial of the historicity of Jesus on the basis of the social milieu as sufficient explanation for the rise of Jesus-lore, see Kalthoff, Das Christus-Problem, Grundlinien zu einer Sozialtheologie. For an example of the extreme individual, religious position, see Case, Studies in Early Christianity, Chap. 10, pp. 239ff.
³ Cf. Burton and Matthews, Constructive Studies, etc., p. 39.
ethical nature of God. Accordingly, he preached repentance as a fundamental necessity. He coupled it with his earliest announcement of the kingdom. (Mk. 1.15) His aim was to call sinners to repentance (Mk. 2.17). He sent out the twelve to preach that men should repent (Mk. 1.15; 6.12). His sore dissatisfaction with the present generation was that they did not repent at his teaching (Matt. 12.41-42; 11.20-24). There was joy in heaven over one sinner who repented (Lk. 15.7-10). The story of the prodigal son illustrated the value of repentance (Lk. 15.20). In contrast with the self-righteous Pharisees, Jesus set the publican, whose prayer was, "God be merciful to me the sinner." (Lk. 18.13) Without repentance his hearers would perish (Lk. 18.3-5).

d. In Its Subordination of Outward Observance

Because this kingdom relationship was so inwardly ethical, no one of the prophets was more specific than Jesus in relegating the outward observances of ritual to a secondary place. The Temple was a house for prayer. He was not interested in its ceremonials. (Matt. 21.13; Mk. 11.17) The matter of the Sabbath, of fasting, of foods clean and unclean,

these all were held only insofar as they served human needs. He ridiculed the pious who tithed garden vegetables but neglected justice, mercy, and good faith (Matt. 23:23). He was against the Pharisees in their over-emphasized ritualism. They were filled with extortion and excess. Their food was acquired in injustice and consumed in luxury. (Matt. 23:25,26) Thus, religion which ought to be the source of morality, drugged and blinded the moral judgment so that the teachers of religion locked the doors of the kingdom of God in men's faces. (Matt. 23:13) He condemned the way in which the Pharisees set at nought the basic obligation of a child toward a parent by teaching that if a man gave money to the Temple and thus supported the ritual worship, he was to be excused from support of parents. (Matt. 7:1-13) Throughout his whole teaching this same note on inner ethical rectitude as Israel's true security rather than dependence upon outward observances and physical things is sounded. The energy that ruled in his idealism was new life.¹ Yet it would not be correct to say that Jesus allowed no quarter whatever to ritual observance. The teaching of Matthew 5:23,24 was that the moral must precede the ethical performance if the latter is to have any value. The natural, moral duty of man out-

weighed the formally religious. (Mk. 7:11)

e. In Its Reasoning

The reasoning of Jesus about his kingdom ideals was ethical. Love was to be a moral quality of life based upon the perfect love of God, not a mere return of like for like and measure for measure. Hence, men were even to love and pray for enemies (Matt. 5:45). All life possessed moral value to God, even the life of the sparrow. And so his disciples should not fear because of their value to God as persons (Matt. 10:29-31). Because men possessed great moral value to God then, so much so that God communed with them, they would be raised from the dead. Thus would God preserve the ethical fellowship that was already dear to him. (Matt. 12:24-27) Things in themselves were not unclean. It was the unclean act that proceeded from the unclean heart that defiled. (Matt. 7:17-23) Because the prophets primarily appealed to the nation, their ethical reasoning, as has been seen, was in terms of the nation's history. Because Jesus primarily appealed to the individual, his ethical reasoning usually took the form of teaching on individual attitudes and conduct. Both rooted their reasoning in the

1. For analysis of Jesus' teaching on the place of ritualism, see MacIntosh, Christ and the Jewish Law, p. 115ff.

moral nature of God and required of man inward moral qualities of life.

3. Universal

a. Jesus' Connection with the Prophets

Like the prophets, Jesus' ideals were universal. In several instances he bore witness of his consciousness of similarity with them. In Mark 12.1-12, he anticipated the rejection of himself by Israel and the acceptance of the Gentiles by borrowing a parable from Isaiah 5.1-7.2 When he declared that the last should be first and the first last, we are reminded of Malachi 1.11f; Isaiah 45.6; 49.12; 59.19; etc. In his famous sermon at Nazareth, he illustrated the universality of God's grace by the mission of Elijah and Elisha to the heathen outside of Israel (Lk. 4.16-30). His parable of the wicked husbandmen (Matt. 21.33-41; Mk. 12.1-9; Lk. 20.9-16) drew its imagery very probably from Isaiah 5.1,2. It was on the background of this prophetic imagery that the annunciation was made that the vineyard which Israel had abused would be given to others. In Mark 11.17 Jesus spoke of the Temple as a house of prayer for all nations, which statement seems to connect directly with a beautiful passage in Isaiah 56.7 where

1. Scott, The Ethical Teaching of Jesus, p. 129.
foreigners, joining themselves to Yahweh, were to be made joyful in his house of prayer.

b. Jesus' Advance beyond the Prophets

(1) Less Racial Preferment

But Jesus did not simply reiterate the universalism found in prophecy. In some respects, he went beyond them.\(^1\) Their idea of the future was largely that of the Jewish religion internationalized, with Jerusalem as its geographical center and the Jewish people as its special ministers of truth. With Jesus, there was no essential preeminence of race or nation.

There is no proof that the divine rule meant to him, at one time, Jewish independence and the propagation of the gospel by a redeemed Jewish kingdom, and that later, after he had failed to impress the people as a whole, the divine rule became in his thought wholly spiritual.\(^2\)

He had several opportunities to hint or suggest that his first purpose was Jewish independence and a redeemed Jewish kingdom. There was the time when the multitudes from Tyre and Sidon flocked to him (Mk. 3.8; Lk. 6.17b), when he called Levi, the tax collector (Matt. 9.9-13; Mk. 2.13-17; Lk. 5.27-32), when he healed the centurion's servant (Matt 8.10; 11.1-11).

---


Lk 7.9), or when news was brought to him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices (Lk 13.3-5). In none of these instances did he indicate that his mission was politically confined to Israel or bore to her any essential preeminence. He sent his emissaries first to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." They went under the double prohibition that they should "go not into the way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans." (Matt. 10.5) Yet the very prohibition might be seen to imply a consciousness that one day the Gospel would go the way of the Gentiles. "The reason of the double prohibition is not given, but doubtless it lay in the grounds of (teaching) policy ... and also in the crude religious state of the disciples." The disciples were to receive their first missionary training in carrying out the message to those who were acquainted with the foundations on which the message rested, namely, the religious history and development with Israel. "Much would have been unintelligible if addressed to Gentiles, for it is not possible to communicate one's ideas to anyone unless there is a common background."  

1. It would appear from the synoptists that Jesus did entertain an early hope of gaining the people at large for his message. (Cf. Wendt, Die Lehre Jesu, Vol. II, pp. 319-320) This is a different matter and need have no connection with Jewish independence and a redeemed Jewish kingdom.  


(2) More Non-racial, Ethical Preferment

On the other hand, there are numerous instances of non-racial, ethical preferment. On principle, Jesus said that Gentiles from afar would come and sit down at table with the great worthies of Israel while Israelites of blood would be cast out (Matt. 8.11,12; Lk. 13.29). Ethical attitudes and deeds alone declared who were the children of Abraham (John 8.39). At the conclusion of the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, he said to the Jews, "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (Matt. 21.43) He could say of a Gentile, "Verily, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." (Matt. 8.10; Lk. 7.9) He could remind the indignant audience at Nazareth that Elijah had found his refuge with a heathen Phoenician, and that Elisha had healed a Syrian leper. (Lk. 4.16-30)

4. Redemptive, Motivated by Love

As with the prophets, Jesus' ideals were characterized by God's redemptive purpose, motivated by his love. Fairweather has well said that what Jesus sought was "a spontaneous fruit of an inward life grounded on the pardoning love

a. Parabolic Teaching

The parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the lost son, which we have already cited in connection with the extreme worth of the individual, may equally illustrate the redemptive attitude of God regarding him. In the first two cases, God searched for man that he might be redeemed. In the third case, God watched and waited anxiously for his return. The last two cases couple the idea of God's redemptive purpose with his love. The lost sheep was carried back to the fold on the shoulders of the shepherd. The waiting, hoping father spied the returning son while he was yet "afar off", and, moved with compassion, ran toward him, fell upon his neck and greeted him with kisses.

b. The Motive to Repentance

The basis of repentance was this redemptive love of God. If God had not been lovingly redemptive, repentance would have been without significance. This attitude, on God's part, may be viewed as active in man's desire to repent. Jesus offered this divine attitude as a motive to repentance.

3. Ibid., p. 130f.
He wooed men to repentance by telling them that the repentance of one sinner made joy in heaven (Lk. 15.7,10). On the other hand, the woes pronounced against certain cities were uttered because they remained unrepentant in the face of the lovingly redemptive efforts of God through him (Matt. 11.24; Lk. 10.13-15).

c. Jesus' Life Example

Jesus' own life example bodied forth this redemptive love of God toward sinners. He was the friend of publicans and sinners because he was the representative of such a God. (Lk. 7.34) He had no fan of judgment in his hand, as his forerunner expected he would have (Matt. 3.12), and he did not begin at once to cleanse thoroughly his threshing floor. He did not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax. (Matt. 12.20) The cry of his heart was, "Come unto me and I will give you rest." (Matt. 11.28) His love sought to be to Jerusalem like the brooding of the mother-bird's wings. (Lk. 13.34) The redemptive love of God through him sought to gather the great crowded city into its fold.

d. God's Fatherhood

Though the prophets were not slow in presenting this lovingly redemptive purpose of God, they did not usually

think of it as the operation of fatherhood. Rather, it was the operation of a kind and gracious king in moral covenant with his people. Hosea and Jeremiah, as has been previously seen, changed this figure to that of a husband. Jeremiah, in one instance, went so far as to declare God's fatherhood (31:9). But this conception, which was barely suggested in the prophets, was central and basic in Jesus. That God's fatherhood was the source of his redeeming love was a constant implication. In fact, the word "father" seems often to be a substitute for the word "love".  

e. Requirement, Man's Answering Love  
(1) Parabolic Teaching  
This redeeming love of God required the spirit of love among men. In the parable of the unmerciful steward, God reacted severely toward one who would not act toward his fellowmen upon the same high principle of pardoning love which God had first shown to him. (Matt. 18:21-33) The good Samaritan of another parable (Lk. 10:25-37) not only proved that a Samaritan could be good but also that a part of goodness consisted in man's social reaction to the redeeming love of God. The forgiveness of God was conditioned upon the

responsive attitude of forgiveness in man (Matt. 6.14,15; Mk. 11.25; Matt. 18.35) For that reason, one was to exercise all patience with repeated offenses so long as penitence was in evidence, and where it was not in evidence, one's love was to seek its production (Matt. 18.21,22; Lk. 17.4; Matt. 18.15-17). It was on the basis of illustrating this patience in forgiving penitent offenders that Jesus gave his parable on the unmerciful steward.

(2) Spirit of Response as Full Zest

This answering love was to be pursued with full zest, first, as an individual response and, secondly, as a social attitude.

Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. (Mk. 12.29-31)

Here Jesus demanded the most intense application of the whole man to the individual, religious response. One's inner condition would then be in a state of readiness to entertain the proper social reaction to one's fellows. Here the way in which Jesus focused faith on principal points, his simplification of statement, and his intensity of feeling remind us of the prophets. "Both of these Old Testament commandments

are the crystallization of the religion of the prophets."

f. Definite Connection between His Teaching and Prophecy

Furthermore, the example of the prophets in preaching the pardoning, redeeming love of God was not remote from the consciousness of Jesus. The essential divine mercy upon which it rested was twice referred to in the language of Hosea (Matt. 9:13; 12:7; cf. Hos. 6:6). The heart experience through which it operated was insisted upon in the language of Isaiah (Mk. 7:6-7; cf. Isa. 29.13) The purpose of his life to achieve the ends of God's redemptive love was crystallized in the language of Isaiah (Lk. 4:17-19; cf. Isa. 61.1-2) To act as the embodiment of this redeeming love entailed sacrifice and suffering. John 12:24 reported him as saying, "Except a grain of corn fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Pursuant to such a teaching, he later faced the prospect of his own death as in accord with a law applicable to all who were loyal to divine interest in the world (Matt. 16:21-23). He was reported as of the belief that his own death would work vitally in man's redemption (Matt. 20:28). He therefore died willingly in the spirit of self-sacrifice (Matt. 26:18).

In all this self-sacrifice and suffering it is probable that Jesus acted on the basis of Isaiah's superb picture of the "suffering Servant of Yahweh." Luke reported him at the close of the Last Supper as considering himself the fulfilment of "him who was reckoned with transgressors." (Lk. 22.37; cf. Isa. 53.12) Matthew saw in his healing ministry a fulfilment of the same section of Isaiah. (Matt. 8.17; cf. Isa. 53.4)

5. Experiential

a. Jesus' Experience Evaluated

Jesus' kingdom ideals were more than intellectual concepts. They were born out of his constant experience with God. His basic faith in God's fatherhood, his ethical nature, and his redemptive purpose were largely the result of his own personal, religious experience. "He was the spokesman of God, the preacher of what God can and may mean in human life, and this meaning of God was what he himself had found God to be in his own personal experience." In nothing was Jesus more distinctive than in the degree to which his spirit was conscious of the presence and will of God. "Never in the life

of any man was God such a living reality as in the life of Jesus.  1 The kingdom with Jesus was a matter of experience because God was primarily a matter of experience, and the kingdom with Jesus was centered in God. "Jesus' faith in God was the basis of the whole of his message and the foundation of the whole of his life and work." 2

b. The Major Content of His Experience

   (1) God's Fatherhood

Jesus' experience taught him to call God "father". We have seen that Jeremiah did this in one instance. But what in the religious experience of the prophets was barely suggested became in the experience of Jesus essential and distinctive. Seventeen times in Matthew alone is found his expression "my father". In every detail of human existence the Father was revealing his love and care for his children (Matt. 6.26-34; 5.45b; 10.29-31). The benignity of his rule in nature was matched by his disposition toward individuals (Lk. 11.11-13; Matt. 6.8). He it was who forgave sins, protected in temptation, and provided daily bread (Matt. 6.9-15; etc.) How this naïve sense of the all-pervasive providence of the Father could be maintained in the face of the bitter facts of life leads us to consider the nature of Jesus' inner experience

1. Bousset, Jesus, p. 47.
2. Wernle, Jesus, p. 41.
of God and his care.

Jesus did not resort to faith in God as a man at bay in the world; he did not trudge along under the strain of existence as a man who makes the best of things. In spite of all the facts to the contrary, Jesus felt the thrill of life in the uninterrupted presence of the Heavenly Father.1

God was more willing to give than his children were to ask of him. (Matt. 7.7-11; Lk. 11.9-13) His response was neither slow nor grudging. (Lk. 11.5ff; Lk. 18.2-7)

(2) God's Inward, Ethical Nature

With Jesus as with the prophets the experience of God was closely connected with his ethical nature.2 Jeremiah flung the weight of his keen experience of God against lying prophets who thought to console the self-righteous ceremonialists that walked in stubbornness of heart, declaring future peace and security. Their tragedy was that they had no personal experience with the present God. (Jer. 23.17,18) With Micah, as with Jeremiah, this experience was an ethical corrective. "I am full of power to declare to Jacob his transgressions." (3.8) As we have already seen, it was the work of the later prophets to connect the idea of the spirit with the moral purpose of God. In this connection, there are statements of Jesus found in Matthew which we may not neglect,
for they reveal very clearly that religious experience for Jesus was based upon the inward, ethical nature of God in contrast to a prevalent type of outward, Pharisaic piety. (Matt. 6.2-4; 6.5-6; 6.16-18) In all these it was the experiential note that changed religion from an outward observance to an inward ethical fellowship. At another time the inward penitence resulting in personal confession and forgiveness of an obscure publican was contrasted with the outward ostentation of a proud Pharisee (Lk. 18.9-14). ¹

c. Jesus' Advance beyond the Prophets

Yet the idea of the spirit as a medium of experience with God was hardly used at all by Jesus.² He was announced by John as one who would baptise with the spirit (Lk. 3.15-17). At his baptism the spirit came upon him (Matt. 3.16). The spirit was with him on his return from temptation (Lk. 4.14). He announced the purpose of his mission while preaching at Nazareth in the words of Isaiah 61.1f which began, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me." (Lk. 4.17f) There is the difficult teaching about the "sin against the Holy Ghost" in Luke 12. 10-12, and there is the Last Commission (Matt. 28.19), whose form many scholars believe to be unhistorical. These few references practically cover all the relation of Jesus to the

¹ Montefiore, Religious Teachings of Jesus, p. 37.
² Lewis, A Manual of Christian Beliefs,
spirit. It seems rather surprising that one who maintained such an intense and continuous experience with God should have said so little about the Spirit. The probable reason is that in his own thought there could be no real distinction between the Spirit and that presence of God which was his very life. He himself seems to stand in that immediacy of connection with God which the Spirit as the expression of God's power and will had exercised in the Old Testament. It was, therefore, not unnatural that Paul eventually reached the interpretation that the presence of the Spirit was the presence of Jesus; that all that the Spirit was said to do, Jesus himself had done; that to be filled with the Spirit was to be filled with Jesus; and that to live the life of the Spirit was to live a life hidden with Jesus in God. (2 Cor. 3.17, τὸ κύριον τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν, 1 Cor. 15.45, εἰσενέχω... τὸ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν ἐστὶν)

6. Causative

a. Parabole Teaching

Jesus' parables taught a causative kingdom operation. God was busy in loving righteousness and hating iniquity. Men did not have to wait and beg for his future redress of evil. God was not an unrighteous judge who had to be evoked by the appeals of an importunate widow. (Lk. 18.1-8)

2. Bruce, The Kingdom of God, p. 113.
would, as it were, even leave his bed at midnight to be of help to a distressed friend (Lk. 11.5-13). He would not leave the spiritually lost and undone with the cold fatalism that they were not predestined to salvation. The shepherd sought his sheep (Lk. 15.1-7; Matt. 18.12-14). The woman sought the coin (Lk. 15.8-10). The father ran to meet the son (Lk. 15.11-24).\textsuperscript{1} Because God himself was active in loving moral righteousness and hating iniquity, he required this attitude of men.\textsuperscript{2} Forgiveness was only for those who were willing to forgive (Matt. 18.21-35; etc.). The privilege of his active benefits involved the duty of fruit-bearing (Lk. 13.1-9). The privilege of such active benefits from God should save one from all false pride in the service he might render (Lk. 17.7-10). In the parable of the rich fool, we have the picture of one who was always receiving from the physical bounties of God and giving nothing in recognition of the moral nature of God (Lk. 12.13-21). In the parable of the rich man and the beggar, the same principle was illustrated. A conventional sympathy that shared the crumbs of one's bounty was not enough. Moral sympathy was to be practical and commensurate with one's ability (Lk. 16.19-31).\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Swete, \textit{The Parables of the Kingdom}, p. 168-169.
\item Bruce, \textit{The Kingdom of God}, p. 55-56.
\end{enumerate}
b. Jesus' Ministry as Exemplification

This causative activity was exemplified in the ministry of Jesus. It was the active Spirit of God that thrust him into the wilderness for his period of inner testing (Matt. 4.1; Mk. 1.12; Lk. 4.1) Again, it was the active Spirit of God that empowered him as he faced his task (Lk. 4.14). When the disciples of John would take back evidences of his work (Matt. 11.5f), Jesus replied in the language of Isaiah (35.5, 6; 29.18,19; 42.7), "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them." The nature of his activity as bearing out the nature of the present and active God was his claim to attention. He was carrying on the active redemptive work of God's love. This he commissioned and empowered his disciples to do likewise. (Matt. 10.5-15; Lk. 6.6b,7; Lk. 9.1) Later, for the same purpose, he sent out the seventy (Lk. 10.1-6).

7. Volitional

a. Sin as Moral Guilt

Jesus' kingdom idealism was volitional. It presupposed man's ability to choose. Just as in the teachings of the prophets, the causative activity of God's ethical and redeeming love implied an element of free will in man. Sin was a

moral matter, and involved the judgment of God because it represented man's choice.  

Jerusalem was mourned over because she "would not". (Matt. 23:37-39) On the assumption that man's will was fundamentally his own, he was bid to form his conduct on the basis of that conduct which he should like to receive from others (Matt. 7:12; Lk. 6:31). The unmerciful servant was condemned because he "would not" (Matt. 18:30a) act towards his debtors as God had acted towards him. In the parable of the marriage feast, the bid "would not" come (Matt. 21:3ff). Hence, they that were bid "were not worthy" (21:8). The parable of the pounds ended with the terrible words, "But these mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me." (Lk. 19:27)

b. Presupposition of Inner Weighing

The inner weighing of this essentially free will was portrayed in the parable of the uncompleted tower (Lk. 14:25-30). Here one was taught to count the cost before deciding upon discipleship. The same lesson was taught in the continuing parable of the rash king's warfare (Lk. 14:31ff). In Matthew 21:28-30 there is this inner weighing again. One son said, "I will not" to the call for vineyard service, and later repented and went. Another son agreed, but later

changed his mind. Naturally, the presupposition in all such instances was that man could determine his choice. Yet Jesus' appeal for moral action through the will did not mean a cleavage between the religious life and the moral life. "Jesus conceived of God as supreme will, which is forever working toward love and righteousness. To commune with him is to participate in his will."¹

8. Hopefulness

a. Kingdom Ideals as Germinating Power

Like the idealism of the prophets, Jesus' kingdom teaching was one of hopefulness both for the present and for the future.² It depended not only upon God's direct activity and man's response, but also upon the character of the ideals as possessing germinating power. These kingdom truths were like seed then being sown in the earth. They carried within themselves the germs of irresistible growth.³ The harvest was certain. In certain ways, it was always plenteous, far beyond the capacity of present kingdom workers to reap (Matt. 9:37; Lk. 10:2). Matthew made Jesus give this statement as he was thronged by the multitudes. Luke connected it with

1. Scott, The Kingdom of God, etc., p. 98.
2. Buttrick, The Parables of Jesus, p. 6; Bruce, Apologetics, p. 246-261.
the sending out of the seventy. John, in 4.35, reported him as saying, "Say not ye, There are yet four months and then cometh the harvest. Behold I say unto you, Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, that they are white already unto harvest." John also reported a high promise to Nathaniel which was presumably to occur not many months hence (1.51). Mark reported Jesus as of the belief that some of those who heard him speak should not die till they saw the Kingdom of God come with power (9.1). This germinating power of kingdom ideals seems to be connected with Jesus' belief in the power of faith. In Matthew 17.20 a mustard seed of faith would remove a mountain. Evidently, Jesus' conception of faith yielded large hope. The withering of the fruitless figtree was nothing in comparison with what his disciples might be able to accomplish through their faith (Matt. 21.21; Mk. 11.22). By it sycamine trees might be uprooted and planted in the sea (Lk. 17.5-6). The disciples' fear of perishing on a storm-swept sea was just a lack of faith (Mk. 4.41). Doubtless, the ideals owed part of their power to Jesus' belief in the present providential care of God. It was this which undergirded them and added hope. (Matt. 6.25-34; Lk. 12.22-34; etc.)

As men sought the things of the Father's kingdom, all lesser needs would be provided.  

b. Present Hope in Eschatological Teaching

It may be argued that there was a shift in the goal of Jesus' hope as he began to lay stress upon the future coming of the kingdom. It then became a hope that looked ahead to last things. Yet his hope did not become isolated from the present moral conditions among men. In the parable of the faithful servant (Matt. 24:45-51; Lk. 12:42-46) it was the just and ethical present dealing with one's fellow servants that was to be richly rewarded "when his lord cometh." In the parable of the ten virgins it was the present bearing of the light-giving oil that was the best guarantee of future preparedness (Matt. 25:1-13). In the parable of the talents it was the present and proper use of the lord's money that was to reveal his servant faithful at his lord's coming (Matt. 25:14-30; Lk. 19:12,13,17). At the judgment scene of Matthew 25:31-46 the hope was held out that those on the right hand would be welcomed into the kingdom as a result of those present deeds of mercy which represented inward, ethical, and religious brotherhood.¹

E. Similarities in Plan for Their Consummation

a. Jesus' Omissions

As one passes from similarities in character between Jesus' kingdom ideals and the ideals of the prophets and

¹. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 27ff.
devotes himself to the similarities in plan concerning the consummation of the ideals, it must be recalled that the prophets' plan was that of a Day of Yahweh as a crisis in human affairs which was frequently considered as ushering in the return of the dispersed tribes. This return was to take the form either of a restored Davidic kingdom or of a direct theocracy in which Israel would act as God's prophet-missionary to all the world. In Jesus there was no return of the tribes and no restoration of the kingdom as Davidic or theocratic.

2. Elements of Similarity

Yet there were elements of similarity. At times, Jesus spoke of the kingdom as in process of development in a way that would seem to argue the prophetic idea of its culmination through missionary work. It was germinating seed; it was leaven; kingdom workers were sowers. (Matt. 13:1-9, 24-30, 31-33; Mk. 4:26f; Lk. 8:5f) It was a discovery which a man could make for himself (Matt. 13:44, 45). Jesus identified himself with the "suffering Servant" of Isaiah who, as has been seen, was to bring in the new day through prophetic missionary witnessing. All the evidence that Jesus expected a near future kingdom manifestation goes to show that he anticipated a great change which was to usher in a more complete rule of God. This change was to mean a moral judgment

1. Bruce, Apologetics, p. 380f.
upon the people not unlike that taught by the prophets in connection with the Day of Yahweh. The idea was coupled with a call for moral repentance. There was practically nothing in the earlier placements of the teaching concerning the change which would prove foreign to the prophetic idea of the Day of Yahweh and the culmination of idealism through prophetic missionary work. (Cf. Matt. 6.10; Lk. 11.2; Matt. 8.11-12; 10.23; 16.28) It is argued that the crisis at Caesarea Philippi established Jesus as Son of Man Messiah. Yet there was at that time, according to the records, no settled teaching at variance with the prophetic. He spoke of a "coming" with the accompaniment of angels. Both Mark and Luke connected this with personal witness bearing (Mk. 8.38; Lk. 9.26) while Matthew connected it with cross-bearing (Matt. 16.27-28). Both involved the prophetic missionary task with at least the presumption that the "coming" was in vital and organic relation to it. In the Perean ministry, represented by the evangelists as Jesus' sayings while journeying to Jerusalem for the final crisis, there are several instances which would point to kingdom culmination through present faithfulness and missionary


F. Contrast in Plan for Their Consummation

1. A Celestial Intervention

On the other hand, that the late placements of Jesus' sayings contain an element of contrast with the prophetic plan is unquestionable. (Matt. 24.20-31; Mk. 13.24-27; Lk. 21.25-28; Matt. 25.31-46; Matt. 26.64; Mk. 14.62) In these sayings the kingdom was pictured as coming by means of a supernatural, celestial intervention. In a sudden, catastrophic and miraculous way it would break in upon the world from above. The center of this dramatic scene was to be the coming of the Son of Man Messiah from heaven, riding on the clouds and accompanied with angels. The scene was physical, objective, and local. It was in no sense to be a crisis in human history, brought to realization by prophetic missionary work. It was a celestial intervention in the affairs of earth. It was preceded by conditions which mark the very opposite of kingdom success among men. Persecution and tribulation have driven the faithful to desperation. (Matt. 24.3-14; Mk. 13.3-13; Lk. 21.7-19) When things were about as hopeless as they could be, God through his Messiah would break through upon the earthly scene and set up his judgment. This judgment, unlike the continuous moral judgment of God in human

1. Pounds or talents - Luke 19.13f; Matt. 25.15f. Success of Seventy as "Satan being cast out of heaven." (Lk. 10.18)
affairs culminating in the Day of Yahweh according to the prophets, was to be formal and forensic. It represented the verdict of the Judge who had tried the case. The future kingdom into which the faithful should enter was not the completion and fulfilment of the present kingdom life which had come through inner development. It was rather a ready-made gift from heaven. (Matt. 25.34)¹

2. A Modification in the Contrast

This element of contrast is somewhat modified when one considers Jesus' descriptive noun phrase commonly used in relation to it. It is "The coming of the Son of Man" (Xπαρουσία τοῦ ζιων τοῦ ἄνθρωπον, Matt. 24.3, 27, 37, 39). The use of the word παρουσία seems to argue that the significance for Jesus in the event was not primarily in the matter of method. It lay in the fact that his present ethical fellowship with his followers would not be destroyed. He was so sure of this that the violation of the natural order was of smaller moment and would be implemented if necessary. John the Baptist also gave to the Messianic coming a descriptive phrase, "the coming one", ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Matt 11.3. It is significant that John used a different term, one which laid the emphasis upon the action involved in the coming. To be sure, Jesus used this same word in relation to his coming (Matt. 24.32) as a verb

¹ Schmiedel, Jesus in Modern Criticism, pp. 43, 28.
of action, but the fact that he did not use it in his de-
scriptive noun phrases but rather used the term of personal
presence and relationship seems to indicate the thing which
was uppermost in his mind.

G. Summary

In review, it has been seen that Jesus maintained a
great similarity in language with that of the prophets. His
general life situation bore an extended correspondence with
theirs in home training, vocational call, personal conscious-
ness, the estimation of the people, the religio-historic
situation and his interpretation of it, and in the persecution
and rejection which were his lot. His kingdom idealism,
like the ideals of the prophets, was of present and future
application. The character of his kingdom idealism, in
common with the idealism of the prophets, represented the nature
of God. It was unitary in principle and operation, allowing
no difference in God's relationship or in man's response as
between the present order and the order which would be. His
kingdom was ethical in its individual religious relationship
between men and God and in its social requirements. Sin was
a moral rather than a legal offense. No outward observance
was allowed to take the fore over God's inward ethical require-
ments. These unitary ethical principles were of universal
application. They were redemptive in purpose and loving in
spirit. As such they required this purpose and spirit of
They were more than intellectual ideas. They represented living contact between the soul and God. They were powerful and causative, representing in themselves a germinating growth. Man's participation in this beneficent provision was conditioned upon his own choice and volition. Because God was present and causatively active in his kingdom ideals, because they themselves were powerful, a note of hopefulness pervaded them. This note was not lost as Jesus fixed his attention upon the future. His hope was proven to be ethical and present within his message on the future. The general similarity between Jesus and the prophets extends to the matter of plan for the consummation of the ideals. There are a number of evidences that Jesus thought of a developmental outcome and of a prophetic crisis in human affairs. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that some of his sayings, placed late, bear a contrast to this plan. In these sayings, the kingdom will come through a celestial intervention centered in the coming of a heavenly Son of Man Messiah. It will be preceded and accompanied by supernatural arrangement. Judgment will be formal and forensic. The kingdom itself will be a ready-made gift out of heaven. There is, however, one modification in this contrast. The word Jesus used as the center of his descriptive noun phrases in relation to it emphasized his continued presence and fellowship rather than the method of his approach.
CHAPTER THREE

THE KINGDOM OF THE APOCALYPTISTS

Introduction

1. Books Considered as Apocalyptic

The literature from which we shall draw our evidence is found in the Old Testament and in inter-testamental writings. Considered as apocalyptic are: the book of Joel, the last six chapters of Zechariah, Isaiah chapters 24-27, Ezekiel chapters 38-39.16, Habakkuk chapter 3, and the book of Daniel. Among the inter-testamental writings, considered as apocalyptic are Ethiopic Enoch, Slavonic Enoch, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Psalms of Solomon, The Book of Jubilees, and portions of Books 3-5 of the Sibyllines Oracles. The rest of the oracles, The Assumption of Moses, The Apocalypse of Baruch, and Fourth Ezra, as literature of the first century A.D., came too late to have influenced the thought of Jesus. Yet we shall quote these later books freely. As continuing tendencies of thought they possess comparative value which is helpful in understanding the earlier works. But because their value is secondary to the purpose of this thesis, they will always be accompanied by citations from the earlier sources.
2. Definiteness of Kingdom Teaching

It was pointed out at the beginning of the treatment on the prophets that there was no mention by them of the term "kingdom of God". What they presented were certain ideals which foreshadowed later kingdom teaching. With the inter-testamental apocalyptists we reach firm ground on this point. Here, the teaching on the kingdom certainly implied a separate order of existence.¹

3. Our Delimitation of Task

As in the study of the prophets, so here, there will be no attempt made to enter into the critical questions, such as date and authorship. Neither will it be considered our task to exhaust the contents of our sources. This thesis seeks to confine itself to that which bears directly upon kingdom ideals. As in the case of the prophets, inquiry will be made into the time relationships of the ideals, the nature of the ideals, and the plan by which they are to be finally instituted.

I. Time - Future Only

A. Remoteness of God from Present World

As to the time relationship of the apocalyptic ideals,

¹. Psalms of Solomon 17.4 (non-technical use of the term), Sibylline Oracles 3.47,48 (semi-technical use), Assumption of Moses 10.26f (technical use, but here no Messiah is involved). Cf. Drummond, The Jewish Messiah, p. 319ff.
The total absence of anything that could be called a present kingdom is impressive. Everything pointed to a future kingdom only. God was far removed from the scene of the present human struggle. In Ethiopic Enoch 24. 1-4 we read of a great mountain range flaming with fire day and night. There were seven summits: three facing east were piled one upon another; three facing south were also so arranged; the highest summit of all was the seventh which was situated between both of these serried ranks of three, having its base on their tops. There were great ravines on all sides, but no one of them joined any other one, so that ascent from the bottom was impossible. On top of this highest summit was the throne of God. This citation is a classic illustration of the absolute remoteness of God from the present world, which is taught throughout apocalyptic literature.¹ Slavonic Enoch vied with Ethiopic Enoch in declaring God’s remoteness. In 30.2,3 we are told that God made seven heavens to cover the expanse between man and himself. Again, in 20.1-3 we have the array of the heavenly hosts that came between man and God, given in the order of their ranks.² This book viewed the person of God as forbidding any present connection with him.

His face is as iron heated in the fire, sending forth sparks and burns. His eyes shine like

a ray of the sun and strike terror to human eyes. His words are like thunder, with continual agitation of winds. It is terrible and awful to stand before the face of an earthly prince; how much more terrible and awful to stand before the Lord of Lords! Who can endure this never ending terror? (39.2-8)

The Proem to the Sibylline Oracles continued the doctrine of God's remoteness with a strong account of the unbearable and intense light that formed a barrier between God and all outer creation (lines 8-23). The book of Fourth Ezra yielded its contribution to the idea by the thought that God's knowledge was inscrutable by men (4.7-11; 5.35f). Human intelligence could not cope with it or hope to understand it (4.22-32).

B. Resultant Dualism

It is easy to understand how, with God so completely apart, there was a dualism between present hopelessness and future help. In the dream visions of Ethiopian Enoch (chaps. 83-90) Hebrew history was traced to the Hasmonaean Revolt by means of symbolic animals. The years of misery were represented by a flock under seventy shepherds, who, in the new age about to dawn, were to be cast with evil men and angels into an abyss of fire. The Messiah would then appear. In the Apocalypse of Baruch (21.19; 44.9-15; 85) this world was a

scene of corruption; its evils were irremediable; it was a never-ceasing toil and strife. But its end was at hand; its youth was past; its strength was exhausted; the pitcher was near to the cistern, the ship near to the port, the course of the journey near to the city, and life near to its consummation (chap. 85). The advent of the times was nigh; the corruptible would pass away, the mortal depart, that the abiding should forever come and the new world incorruptible.¹

In Fourth Ezra 7.114 it frankly told that the present age was hopeless, and that the future spiritual world would solve all difficulties. The masses of the present world were worthless in God's sight (7.49-61).² Such dualism may even jeopardize the reality of God and his future.

The whole idea of God is endangered; for it has lost its meaning if God is not thought of as the power which determines man in his present existence ... The future becomes less a real future - by which is meant a future which determines the present, because as its own future it is indissolubly connected with it. Rather, the future is unrelated to the present, something which possibly might not be, and its not being would make no change to the present; it is something which is coming sometime but which, as far as its essential nature is concerned, could already have been sometime.³

---

II. Nature - Mechanical, Legal System of Physical Power

A. Picture of God Himself

1. His Names as Indications of Impersonal Power

When an investigation is made of the nature of this future kingdom, it is found in general to be a mechanical, legal system of physical power. With a few exceptions, it can hardly be said that God possessed a personal nature. The very phrases that were used to describe him were largely those of impersonal authority and power. His titles in Ethiopic Enoch are as follows: Creator; God; The Great Glory; Head of Days; King of Kings; Lord of Glory; Lord of the Mighty; Lord of the sheep; Eternal King; God of the world; Great King; Great One; Lord of Heaven; Lord of spirits; Lord; Lord of Judgment; Lord of Rulers; Lord of Wisdom; Most High; God of the whole world; Eternal Lord of Glory; Lord of the whole creation of the Heaven; Honored and Glorious One; He that is Blessed Forever; He that liveth Forever; Holy and Great One; Holy One. Of these twenty-seven titles, only two referred to his character; the other twenty-five referred to his power and authority.

2. His Power as Physical

The usual meaning of this power and authority was

---

physical force rather than the inner suasion of ethical nature. The signs and portents of the last days are a typical example of the physical force upon which God's power and authority usually rested. The moon will alter its course; the stars will wander from their orbits; trees will flow with blood, while the very stones cry out (Eth. Enoch 60.3-7; cf. Baruch, chap. 27). Fountains will dry up; the earth will refuse to yield; the heavens will be turned into brass; the rains will fail; wars and rumors of wars will prevail (Eth. Enoch 99.4; cf. Fourth Ezra 9.3). It will be a time of private feuds and recklessness (Eth. Enoch 100.2; cf. Baruch 48.32). Women will cease to be fruitful and miscarriages will occur (Fourth Ezra 5.8; 6.21). Across the face of the heavens dread signs will appear, such as extended swords (Sib. Orac. 3.796-806).\(^1\) Furthermore, the physical force of God was emphasized by the vision of his court. In Slavonic Enoch (chaps. 20ff) he is found seated upon his throne while spread out before him in magnificent array were ten chief orders of angelic hosts, each order duly marshalled in sub-divisions.\(^2\)

3. Mechanical Unvarying Reaction to Opposition

There was very little that represented the exercise of

a personal nature in the apocalyptic God. His attitude in the face of opposition was practically always that of a revenger. In Ethiopic Enoch (chaps. 83-90) the heathen enemies will be destroyed; the fallen watchers will be condemned, together with the faithless angel shepherds and the apostate Jews. It would be gratuitous to labor the point. Judgment in vengeance was climatic in most of the major apocalypticists. Sibylline Oracles (3.97-828) dealt at length with the punishment of the Gentiles. The chief theme of Ethiopic Enoch in chapters 1-36 was the punishment awarded the enemies of the Jews and sinners generally on the day of judgment. A chief function of the "Son of Man" Messiah in the Similitudes of Ethiopic Enoch, chapters 37-70, was to destroy the wicked as God's active agent of judgment. Moreover, the mechanical unvarying reaction of God to all opposition is seen in its action upon all classes. Judgment in vengeance was often upon Gentiles, sometimes upon apostate Jews, and sometimes it was directed toward a definite group, as in the Eagle Vision of Fourth Ezra (11-12). Here it was directed against the political wickedness as centered in Rome. Not only was God's vengeance directed to the

2. Ibid., p. 31.
destruction of all his enemies among men, he had an archenemy to fight called Beliar, Mastema, Azazel (Satan), etc., who at every point undertook to thwart the purpose of God. It was he who tempted and misled Adam and Eve. As he took a body and appeared on earth in order to defeat the Messiah, he was Antichrist. In this capacity, he was sometimes represented as taking the form of a king (Antiochus Epiphanes) and sometimes that of a false prophet (Sib. Orac. 3.55-88).  

In all God's reaction to opposition one looks well-nigh in vain for such reactions of personal nature as entreaty, sympathy, sorrow, long-suffering, or forgiveness. To all opposers the reaction of God was usually mechanically sure, unchangeable, and inescapable. To be sure, the apocalyptists were not devoid of prophetic language about God's unity, his omnipotence, and his omnipresence (Eth. Enoch 1.3; 25.3; 9.5; 14.22; Test. of Twelve Patriarchs (Test. of Judah) 20.3). They involved all these characteristics in their idea of his power and authority. What they do lack is the personal yearning of God, as in Hosea or Jeremiah; the spirit of entreaty, challenge, and warning, as in Amos; or the spirit of suffering and redemptive love as in Deutero-Isaiah.

1. Terry, The Sibylline Oracles, Book III, p. 73f.
B. The Prime Place of Agents

1. Old Testament Beginnings

This God of mechanical and physical power was matched by a kingdom of mechanical and physical operation. The prime place of agents in its operation demonstrates this. This kingdom functioning through agents was rooted in the later Old Testament. The point of departure for the post-exilic development is found in the prologue of Job. Whether it was written before or after the exile is not known. Here Yahweh was surrounded by the "Sons of God", beings of a divine class, his courtiers. These correspond to the "angels" of a later time. Here Satan was an angel, though a disgruntled one. He had become skeptical of human virtue and stood apart. Later, he was spoken of as a "fallen angel". In Zechariah (written about 520 B.C.) the function of the angel as intermediary between God and men was clearly developed. All the prophetic messages of Zechariah were said to have been revealed to him by an angel (1.9,11-14,19; 5.5,10; 6.4,5). The contemporaneous development of the idea of God as so exalted that he could not act like a man may have been responsible for this. In Zechariah, Satan appeared again. Here his character was determined, though not yet was he the archfiend. From this time on, angels played a prominent part in Jewish thought. They were called "Sons of the Mighty" (Ps. 29.1; 89.6), "Mighty Ones" (Joel 3.11), "Watchmen" (Isa. 62.6), "the host
of the high Ones" (Isa. 24.2), "morning star" (Job 38.7), "Watchers" (Dan. 10.13,20,21). Their functions were various. They acted as God's council (Ps. 89.7), as intercessors for men (Job 5.1), as guardians for the righteous (Ps. 34.7), whom they bore up in their hands (Ps. 91.11f). They were channels of divine revelation (Dan. 8.16ff). They inflicted punishment on the wicked (Ps. 78.49). Some of them guarded nations (Dan. 10.20,21). Some were given definite names, as Michael (Dan. 10.13,21) and Gabriel (Dan. 8.16; 10.4).^1

2. Forces of Nature as Agents

The apocryphal Jewish literature that developed between 200 B.C. and 100 A.D. is a prolific source of information on angels of various kinds. This is especially true of apocalyptic writers. Even the forces of nature were usually angelic agents, or were under their direct superintendence. In Ethopic Enoch (chaps. 72-82) there is what Charles has called the "book of celestial physics". The sun, moon, and stars were quartered with God in the highest heaven. They came in through their appointed apertures and left their heavenly terminal "on schedule", being punished as responsible agents if they got out of their courses. In their work was facilitated

---

2. Ibid., p. 187-189.
through the work of angelic agents. Myriads of angels attended the sun (Slav. Enoch 14). They regulated the courses of the stars (chap. 19). Not only the work of the celestial bodies but that of the forces of nature in general were under angelic control. Here, as in the case of the celestial bodies, the object itself was considered as agent, and was, likewise, facilitated in its work by agents. In the Enoch Parables (chaps. 37-70), the writer spoke of the spirit of the sea, of hoar frost, of hail, of snow, of fog, of dew, and of rain (60.17-21). The author of the Book of Jubilees spoke of the spirit of fire, of wind, of darkness, of hail, of snow, of frost, of thunder, of cold, and of heat. Winter and Summer were spirits (Jub. 2.2-4). He also called these spirits angels. Angels guarded the habitations of the snow (Apoc. Baruch 5). They kept the treasuries of the oil (chap. 6). They controlled the lightning and caused a pause before the thunder. (Eth. Enoch 60.13-15) They presided over the treasuries of frost, hail, dew, and rain (60.16-20).

3. Agents as Intermediaries

Not only is the use of agents found in the forces of nature, but they are also found as intermediaries between God

and man. They functioned as guides to instruct the apocalyptic seers. Enoch was guided about the universe by an angel who revealed secrets to him (Eth. Enoch 40.8; etc.). An angel talked to Ezra (Fourth Ezra 2.44f). Angels, according to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, communed with most of the sons of Jacob.¹ Certain angels were appointed to administer punishment. They were to administer this punishment in the other world as well as in this world. (Slav. Enoch 10.2ff) When Jerusalem was destroyed, four angels were said to have stood at its four corners with lamps and accomplished the ruin (Baruch 7.1; 8.1). An angel would be the avenger on the day of judgment (Assum. of Moses 10.2). But a chief function of angels was that of warrior attendants. In Slavonic Enoch (chaps. 20-36), one of Enoch's visions of heaven opened with that which he saw in the seventh heaven. God was seated on his throne while spread out before him in magnificent array were ten chief orders of angelic hosts, each order duly subdivided. Four were "angels of the throne" (cf. 9.1; 40.2), Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael.² In the Third Similitude of Enoch (61.14ff) God seated the Messiah on his own throne and by his judicial sentence he slew all sinners. The mighty of earth too late would acknowledge him,

¹ Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. 39ff.
who was hidden, and was revealed only to the elect. They would be thrust from his presence in shame, and he would give them to the punishing angels because of their persecution of the righteous and they would be destroyed by the angels in the sight of those whom they had oppressed. In other connections the mighty of earth will be destroyed by the Messiah as chief warrior-agent. In the fifth vision of Fourth Ezra is given the fall of Rome. The Messiah appeared as the one who charged Rome with its sins and announced God's just judgment. (11.36-46) Then he was the one who destroyed Rome after he had reproved her (12.31-33). In the Psalms of Solomon he "girt him with strength that he may shatter unrighteous rulers." (17.23-25) This is followed by the statement that ungodly nations will be destroyed by the word of his mouth and, when these have been destroyed, the rest will become subject to him (17.27).

C. A Departmentalized Creation

1. The Functioning of Seven Heavens

This mechanical departmentalizing of function among the angels was matched by an equally departmentalized creation. In Slavonic Enoch 30.2ff, it states that God made seven heavens to cover the expanse between man and himself. Each

heaven had its own order of departed spirits from this world and its own distinctive order of created hosts. The substance of which these heavens was made was light in the literal sense. This light was more intense as one approached the seventh heaven, and still more intense in approaching the throne of the seventh heaven on which God sat. With God in this seventh heaven were to be found the forces and persons that waged his warfare and carried out his plans.\(^1\) Mention in another connection has been made of the sun, moon, and stars as coming and going by means of apertures in the seventh heaven, and of how they, as responsible agents, were punished for offenses against the mechanical operation outlined for them. It might also be pointed out that the winds were twelve, each with its separate portal in the seventh heaven, and each with its separate power and effect (Eth. Enoch 76).\(^2\)

2. Earthly Storage and Punishment Compartments

In the first journey of Enoch (chaps. 17-19) we have a typical illustration of the mechanical arrangement of the hidden forces of earth. Here Enoch viewed the secret places of thunder and lightning, the great ocean stream, reservoir of all waters, the chambers of the winds, the cornerstone of the earth and the four winds on which earth and heaven rested

---

as pillars, and the winds that turn the sky about and those that bear the clouds. He visited the terrible places where heaven and earth ended, and where the seven stars that had transcended their orbits and, by so doing, had transgressed, were being punished.\(^1\)

D. A Mechanical Idea of History

1. Four Empires and Their Computations

This mechanical array of agents, each functioning strictly within his own sphere, plus this mechanical array of creation, full of chambers and compartments and paths and levels, was in keeping with a thoroughly mechanistic idea of human history.

The four great empires, for example, successive representatives of the kingdom of this world in its hostility to God and His people, and the destruction of this power to make way for the kingdom of the saints of the Most High, become a standard scheme. Similarly, the computation of the time when the rule of the heathen will be overthrown and the golden age begin, operating with a cycle of 490 years - 70 x 7, or, as in Enoch, 10 x 49 - is, from the second century B.C. on, a recurring exercise in apocalyptic arithmetic.\(^2\)

This pre-established order of human affairs governed entirely by divine arrangement stood in bold contrast to the organic sequence of human events as viewed by the prophets.

\(^1\) Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, p. 87f.
\(^2\) Moore, *History of Religions, Judaism*, p. 64.
2. Divisions of Creation's Time-Span

The whole range of creation's time-span was divided to fit systems of computations. One of these systems declared that God had completed his creation of the sixth day as a sign that creation's history would last for six thousand years, each day equalling one thousand years. God's rest on the seventh day signified that at the end of the six thousand years of history there would follow a millennium of one thousand years (Slav. Enoch 32.2-33.2). At the close of the millennium would begin the eighth eternal day of blessedness when time should be no more.¹

Not only did these systems of computation propose to cover creation's time-span for humanity at large, but they also proposed to cover the whole history of Israel to the appearance of the Messianic kingdom. For instance, there is a typical apocalyptic procedure and an outstanding feature of Baruch in the "cloud visions", where a great cloud poured forth black waters and bright waters alternately. This occurred for twelve successions, ending with bright waters. The explanation was that Israel's history could thus be divided: periods of great righteousness and prosperity were immediately followed with great national wickedness and sorrow, only to be followed in turn by periods of righteousness. The

arrangement in brief was as follows:

- Black waters - Adams' transgression
- Bright waters - Coming of Abraham
- Black waters - Egyptian bondage
- Bright waters - Advent of Moses and Aaron
- Black waters - Days of the Judges
- Bright waters - David and Solomon
- Black waters - Division of the nation through the sin of Jeroboam
- Bright waters - Days of Hezekiah
- Black waters - Wicked days of Manasseh
- Bright waters - Days of good king Josiah
- Black waters - Fall of Jerusalem, 70 A.D.
- Bright waters - Beginning of Messianic kingdom
  (Apoc. Baruch, chaps. 53-74)

E. Predestination

1. Its Agreement with the General Apocalyptic Scheme

By such arrangements the historical course of Israel and the duration of the present world were viewed as strictly pre-determined by God and everything was running according to form (Fourth Ezra 4:28-31, 33-43). The natural conclusion drawn from such an arrangement was that the courses and destinies of men were likewise pre-determined. This conclusion is stated in various places. The souls of men were created before the foundation of the world (Slav. Enoch 33.5), and also a future place of abode in heaven or hell was already prepared for each individual soul (Slav. Enoch 49.2; 57.5; 61.2). Both the pre-determined course of creation and the pre-determined course and destiny of individual human life

were in agreement with the apocalyptic system of thought as a whole. We have seen that its picture of God was largely that of a centralized, mechanical source of rather impersonal power and authority. This kind of God was matched by a mechanized functioning of innumerable agents. It has also been shown that the very creation itself, celestial and terrestrial, was thought of as a complex system of comparatively static and unrelated compartments. What other conclusion could have been reached as to man's history and individual destiny?

2. Hopelessness of Mankind in General

This idea of human predestination meant a general hopelessness for mankind at large. It had already been determined that the many were simply worthless in the sight of God (Fourth Ezra 7.49ff). The coming age would mean redemption for the few but torment for the many (Fourth Ezra 7.62-69). The Law was the special, divine gift of God to Israel. God offered it to the nations of the world and they rejected it. Accordingly, they were usually considered as nothing, as inescapably outside the pale of God's consideration. (Fourth Ezra 3.19f; 9.31f; 7.23,24; 6.56) God did not wish that the masses of mankind should even receive the compassion of the elect and he prohibited intercession in their behalf (Fourth Ezra 7.104,105). Man's will was pre-determined to evil. The free will of man ended in the Garden of Eden when he chose
The evil. Hence, there was nothing left for mankind in general except punishment from God (Slav. Enoch 30.15-16; 41.1,2). Nothing could avert the disaster. Petition on the part of the accursed would not avail. The petition of the fallen angels was denied (Eth. Enoch 12.1-13). The cry for mercy from the mighty of earth to the Son of Man Messiah of Enoch's Similitudes fell on deaf ears (Eth. Enoch 62.9-11).

3. The Scope of the Predestined

Hope was usually confined to Israel. The usual meaning of the term "God's children" was that of physical descent from Jacob according to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and also the Book of Jubilees. God hated the sinner and loved the righteous Israelite (Jub. 30.21f; 1.24f). Even the writer of the beautiful Psalms of Solomon did not escape the limitation of God's pre-determined goodness to Israel. In Psalm 17 the good and faithful shepherd "tends the flock of the Lord with faith and righteousness and suffers none of them to faint in their pasture." Yet the sublime scenes of the glorified Israel and their shepherd-leader contained no faint ray of hope for the world at large. This was God's

gift to his own. Both the beginning and the close of the Psalm showed that these joys belonged to Israel.¹ In the Apocalypse of Baruch (82.4-6) the persecution of Israel was the basis for the destruction of certain Gentiles. In the Sibylline Oracles God was the "all Father" (3.550), but elsewhere we are given to understand that this fatherhood was confined to Israel (3.710f). Not only were the masses of mankind pre-determined to hopelessness, not only was God's hope distinctively for the Jew, but there was some teaching of individual determinism within Israel. Each future abode, whether in heaven or hell, had been prepared from the foundation of the world (Slav. Enoch 49.2; 57.5; 61.2). In Fourth Ezra 4.33-37 it states that every single thing had been pre-determined and that the number and measure of all things was strictly according to divine decree.

F. Righteousness as Law-keeping

1. No Differentiation between Ethical and Ceremonial

In a world whose order of creation, whose operation and destiny were mechanized; in a world where human life was strictly regulated and pre-determined, it is not surprising to find a standard of righteousness which, taken literally, rested on mechanical conformity. Righteousness was usually law-keeping in apocalypticism, with no differentiation between

¹Ryle and James, The Psalms of Solomon, p. 126f.
the ethical and the purely ritual requirements.1 (Assum. of Moses 12.10-12; Apoc. Bar. 15.5-9; 19.1-2; 13.3; etc.) Whatever may be said as to individual admonitions by the men in whose names the works were written, whenever there was an action on the part of God, the Law was usually the standard of his judgment. The writer of Jubilees never tired of this theme.2 Though there were mentions of moral qualities, the test of conduct was that of conformity to a written body of rules. The bare acceptance of the law, apart from the observance of it, was an advantage. (Fourth Ezra 8.35) Ezra himself was encouraged by this consideration (7.48, 64, 118, 126). This undifferentiated law-keeping meant future salvation and present confidence. In the Apocalypse of Baruch, the righteous were saved by their works, the keeping of the Law. This was the ground of their confidence in prayer. This law-keeping was visited as a blessing upon their people after them. (51.7; 67.6; 63.3,5; 85.2; 14.12; 2.2; 14.7; 84.10)

2. Legalistic vs. Prophetic Righteousness

This strictly legalistic righteousness stood in bold contrast to the righteousness of the prophets. The prophetic righteousness rested upon inner will and motives. These were influenced by the order of the prophets themselves, appearing

1. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, pp. 9, 554.
personally before the people as representatives of God, independent of traditional law or ordinance. When this literary type of prophecy, this apocalypticism, had firmly established itself upon the law, anyone representing the old order of the prophets would have been regarded as an impostor. Thus, Zechariah 13 declared that if any man attempted to prophesy in the pre-exilic fashion his father and mother should put him to death as a deceiver. Joel, in the fourth century, still promised an outpouring of the spirit on all flesh, but later Jewish writers held that this promise had already been fulfilled in the law. The Book of Jubilees declared that the Law alone was valid for all eternity.1

3. Sin and Grace as Non-moral

Because righteousness literally consisted in conformity to outward rules, sin and grace were literally non-moral. Here again, the issue is not whether sin and grace are sometimes indicated as moral matters, but whether the system of law-keeping itself provided for such conceptions. According to this system, sin was a breach of law. It was an outward infraction (Jub. 23.22; Fourth Ezra 9.36) which was to be covered, presumably, by the keeping of proper outward prescriptions. Because man's duty consisted simply and only in law-keeping with no differentiation between the ethical and

ceremonial, sin as a breach of law was not necessarily an inward, moral matter. Even those occasional teachings which may seem to indicate sin as an inward moral matter sometimes lose their point by the modifications inherent in their contexts. Ezra spoke of sin in almost New Testament terms (8. 31-36), but the shallowness in his use of the term "sin" was later manifest as he declared that the bare acknowledgement of it led to pardon. "The very idea of sin was not radically conceived so long as the idea of the possibility of good works persisted along with it ... It was not radically conceived if the thought prevailed that good and evil works were to be weighed against each other."¹ Under this system of law-keeping the remedy for sin was actually constituted likewise in outward observance except in cases of definite revolt against the basic authority of Yahweh.² Hence, God's grace was a disregarding rather than a forgiving of sin. Yet it is this very forgiveness of sin in response to man's inner repentance that makes God's grace inwardly moral and ethical.³

G. Present Passivity

1. Absence of Occasion for Initiative

Because righteousness did not depend upon changed

---

wills or motives, and because the circle of those who kept the Law was regarded as pre-determined, there was practically no occasion for present initiative in behalf of promoting the interests of the kingdom. The apocalyptic kingdom ideals in general, as has been shown, followed the pattern of a mechanical, legal system depending ultimately upon supernatural and physical power. Such ideals created no necessity for personal and present initiative. All that the faithful needed to do was to observe the law, to be consoled by its promises of the future, and to await the supernatural, physical help from God. One looks in vain for the idea of the "Spirit" as God's moral nature in action, inspiring and empowering men. On the contrary, the term "Spirit" was used almost entirely concerning the survival of the individual after death. Sometimes earnest wooing and entreating were found, but these were usually designed to promote faithfulness to the Law within a group rather than to win the hearts and consciences of the people in general. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs contained many truly beautiful and noble entreaties. Still, the purpose in writing the book was to inspire law-keeping within the group who, at that time, entertained high Messianic hopes for Hyrcanus.

3. Ibid., pp. 40, 41, 228.
2. Probable Reasons for Present Passivity

Undoubtedly the general apocalyptic idea of God's entire remoteness from the present order had much to do with this attitude of present passivity. But it was not the only reason. The idea of racial and individual determinism, together with the idea of a legalistic righteousness requiring no fundamental changes in motives must have contributed largely. Added to these was the general historical situation of Israel between the Testaments. In her grim struggle for racial and religious self-preservation, it was quite natural that her thought should turn inward and concern itself almost entirely with the problem of bare survival and continuance.

H. Non-experiential Relationship

2. Vision as Mechanical Device

Just as the apocalyptic idea of God and of righteousness made no draft upon present initiative in behalf of kingdom interests in the world, so they required practically nothing of individual religious experience. God's remoteness was antithetical to any idea of present contact with him. His determinism offered no encouragement. His legalistic righteousness created no necessity for such a contact. The obvious thing followed. Apocalypticism was usually intellectually speculative rather than experiential.

Vision was little more than their mechanical device. It is not until Ezekiel that vision assumes primary importance
among the prophets. Even then, vision was chiefly an emotional experience. In apocalypse, the significance of vision was largely intellectual. It became the only means by which man could obtain a knowledge of the secrets of heaven and of the future. The symbolic language in which alone visions can be described ceased to have the value of poetry and were taken in a more literal sense.¹ For instance, Enoch's journeys through the nether regions were meant to supply solid information on the unseen world and to answer in a factual way certain problems (Eth. Enoch 17-19; 20-36; etc.). Another approach to the speculative nature of these visions is the consideration that the materials that composed them are marked by allegory and tradition. For instance, the ram and the goat in Daniel 8 were rather transparent figures picturing the conquest of Persia by Greece, and the interpretation which followed was hardly needed. Enoch 85-90 is a poor allegory of the history of Israel. Such a clumsy literary fancy would hardly be connected with an emotional experience.² The beasts of Daniel 7 were a recast from the Babylonian chaos dragon used also in Revelation 12.13,17.

2. Mechanical Handling of Prophecy

The speculative nature of apocalypticism is further

---

² Cf. Ibid., p. 36.
argued by mechanical handling of prophecy. Much of their work had to do with unfulfilled prophecy. Prophecies which had failed were reinterpreted to argue that they had not failed but rather pointed to that which was yet future. This thesis has already shown that this justification of the prophets involved fanciful computations.¹ Even the imagery in such cases made little draft upon emotional experiences. Isaiah 40-66 proved a rich source for images of the world-age to come. Isaiah 34-35 gave abundant material on the execution of God's wrath against the nations. Haggai contributed the expectation of the coming of the wealth of the nations to glorify the Temple (1-8), etc.²

3. Evidences of Stereotyped Concepts

Furthermore, in writings vitally related to personal experience, one would not expect to find so much of the stereotyped form and approach as one does find in apocalypticism. Such things as pseudonymity, the vision trance, the four kingdoms, numerical computations of the time of the end, reiteration of the past as predictive revelation, animal symbolism, names and allocations of angels, the various heavens, and so forth, may be named among them. As one moves from writer to writer, he becomes conscious that he is dealing with

¹ Pages 114-116.
the mechanics of apocalypse.¹

I. Acknowledgement

1. These Characteristics Prominent but not Exhaustive

By way of general acknowledgement, this brief survey of characteristics belonging to the nature of the apocalyptic hope is confessedly not exhaustive. It has been the intention only to present some of the more outstanding elements which would contribute most vitally to our estimation of the apocalyptic kingdom as a whole. Again, this thesis does not claim that everywhere and at all times the apocalyptic teaching corresponds to what is here given. This literature is full of variety, and exceptions could be found to almost any statement that might be made.

2. Mention of Exceptions

Even the generally accepted idea of the apocalyptic remoteness of God was not taught with absolute consistency.² It was constantly taught, as we have sought to illustrate, that righteousness was by legal arrangement. Yet there are notable passages in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

¹ Porter, The Message of the Apocalyptical Writers, p. 27ff.
² Cf. Test. of Twelve Patriarchs (Test. of Reuben) 1.7; (Test. of Nath.) 6.8; (Test. of Jos.) 3.3; 4.8; 7.4; (Test. of Gad) 5.9; 7.1; Eth. Enoch 47.1.
which presented the constraining, fatherly love of God.\(^1\)

Nationalism usually prevailed to the virtual exclusion of
universalism. Yet there are some passages pointing the
other way.\(^2\) The apocalyptic teaching as a whole was not man-
ifestly ethical. Nevertheless, the Testaments of the Twelve
Patriarchs present the duty of reciprocating God's forgive-
ness to others.\(^3\) It also couples love to God with love to
neighbor.\(^4\) In both these instances, we are reminded of
Jesus.\(^5\) It is even claimed that these teachings of the
Testaments represent distinctive ethical advance.\(^6\) But they
contributed nothing to the idea of service and suffering for
the Gentiles.\(^7\) This "Servant" idea, as will be shown later,
was prominent in the teaching of Jesus.

\(^\text{1}\) Pace, *Ideas of God in Israel*, p. 142.
\(^\text{2}\) Ibid., p. 147.
\(^\text{3}\) Test. of Twelve Patriarchs (Test. of Gad) 6.3; 6.6.
\(^\text{4}\) Ibid., (Test. of Dan) 5.3.
\(^\text{6}\) Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Intro.,
p. 78f for these and minor ethical similarities with the
synoptics. For other ethical portions in apocalyptic
literature, see Slav. Enoch 42.7; 49.1; 50.4; 51.1-2; 63.4;
Psa. Sol., chap. 17.
\(^\text{7}\) Pace, *Ideas of God in Israel*, p. 143.
III. Basis - Moral Nature of God

A. Exceptions as Temporary Basis-domination

Yet these exceptions are not to be set aside lightly. They are very significant as one of the arguments indicating the true basis of apocalyptic kingdom hopes. Strange as it may seem, this mechanical, legal hope in God's miraculous and physical power had the same basis as the future hopes of the prophets. Both built their hopes on the firm conviction of God's moral and ethical nature. Such occasional apocalyptic passages dealing with the love of God and his ethical requirements of man are a kind of temporary dominance of the basic consideration which called these hopes into being.

B. Basic Consideration in Rise of Apocalypticism

This basis is strongly argued by the situation which gave historic rise to apocalyptic literature. Under the Seleucidae there came to be formed a wealthy official class in Palestine whose sympathies were increasingly with Hellenic culture discovered during their intercourse with the Egyptian court.\(^1\) As time went on, the presence and influence of this class precipitated struggle between Hellenistic religious domination of the Hellenizing party. The upholders of the traditional Mosaic law were largely the poor fellaheen of the land. Their sense of misery was deepened by being sundered from what fellow-feeling may have previously resulted in a

common devotion to the law.\(^1\) Adding to their misery was the imposition of heavy taxes the collection of which sometimes led to individuals and even cities being sold into slavery.\(^2\)

The sack of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes led to conditions vastly worse. With his political domination there came an adroit attempt to destroy the anti-Hellenistic party. For the first time in the history of the Graeco-Roman world there began a war of extermination of a religion. Its victims were those who clung to Judaism, and above all the Pious (the Chasidim). The observance of all Jewish rites, especially the Sabbath and circumcision, was punished by death. Heathen altars were erected everywhere. Such persecution only intensified the spirit of martyrdom and the devotion of the Pious (the Chasidim) to their law. It also led to the beginning of a literature of persecution designed to show forth the triumph of God by extreme measures in spite of the chaotic conditions among men.\(^3\) Daniel and part of Ethiopic Enoch probably belong to this period. The brief spells of political hope which came in the victories of Judas Maccabaeus and his brothers Jonathan and Simon were, for awhile, powerfully confirmed by

---

John Hyrcanus. But they were soon to be demoralized by John's change of front and to settle back into a period of hard struggle with the Asmoneans and the Sadducees. With the Roman conquest of Judea all possible hope of a political nature was practically at an end. The fact that the loyal Jew answered his increasing hopelessness and defeat with fantastic dreams of miraculous triumph must be accounted for by the thought that his strong belief in the ethical justice and faithfulness of God would not die. Yet in view of world conditions, it seemed that God was shut up to such a method if he was yet to be vindicated in his essential nature at all.

C. Ethical Purpose in Its Epic Form

Not only did the historic rise of this literature represent a special defense-mechanism for the preservation of the idea of the moral nature of God but the form into which the hope was cast shows an underlying purpose which is ethical. When one says that an apocalypse owed its birth, as a rule, to a particular crisis in national affairs, one does not mean to infer that the book was concerned only with that crisis, or that its predictions applied merely to the issue of one special conflict. The battle of which the author was himself a spectator was, to his mind, an example of many similar conflicts, an episode in the age-long war between the evil and the good. The problem which he faced was not merely the difficulty of explaining why the unrighteous should triumph in
his own generation; it was the problem of the prosperity of the wicked in all generations. Accordingly, his thought travelled far beyond the circumstances which immediately suggested his writing, and embraced the whole moral problem of history as he understood it.¹

D. Ethical Cast of Its Effects and Requirements

Again, the fact that this literature is based upon the moral nature of God is argued by its effects. It was designed to sustain faithfulness to what were believed to be the requirements of God: to comfort amidst persecution, sorrow, and death; and to inspire a continued hope in the justice and goodness of God.² All such general purposes are likewise common to the prophets. Even the mechanical ideas of kingdom requirement, predestination and law-keeping, maintain an underlying connection with this ethical basis. While the law did not differentiate between the more purely ceremonial and the ethical, it is beyond argument that the law dealt largely with ethical issues, and, in the main, produced an ethical effect upon the people who observed it. It may be said that it owed its life to its ethical insistence.³ Predestination was not a coldly

¹ Leckie, The World to Come and Final Destiny, p. 11-12.
arbitrary matter in its practical application. The only real
evidence that one had of being predestined lay in the fact
that he loved and kept the law which maintained its strongly
ethical cast.

E. Answer to Objection: Changed View of Man

Against this ethical basis for apocalypticism, there is
the reminder that the picture of God is that of a remote being
bearing no connection with the present earth struggle, and
that his great intervention is usually that of warrior-chieftain.
It is considered that his unswerving spirit of vengeance is
non-ethical; and that the present passivity which the hope
engenders is non-ethical. There is considerable ground for
such a contention. The apocalyptic emphasis is undoubtedly
on the mechanical, physical, catastrophic scheme of kingdom
operation. So large and prominent is this emphasis that it
may justly be said to portray the immediate nature of the
kingdom as such a system. Further, the basically ethical
significance is not usually manifest. It is inherent or
implied. It must also be remembered that there are two main
factors involved in all religious hope, God, and man. The
idea of God's essential nature may not vary while necessitating
a wide variance in plan due to the changed conception of man.
The prophets believed in man's spiritual possibilities. Their

hopes were based upon a certain co-operative relationship with him. The apocalyptists viewed mankind as utterly hopeless. God's ethical dignity and uniqueness necessitated his utter remoteness. God's ethical faithfulness will necessitate his miraculous intervention. Present passivity is only a reliance upon God's faithfulness. Our modern arguments that such a plan was not consistent with such a God does not affect the fact that hounded and outraged Jews of the first or second centuries B.C. either gave up their God or resorted to such devices in order to retain him.

IV. Plan for Institution of Future Kingdom

The question that now presents itself is this: What was the plan whereby the future kingdom was to be instituted? We shall seek to answer this question by a brief survey of the nature, the method, the result, and the accompanying factors involved in the plan.

A. Nature - God's Final Protest against Failure of World Order

1. As Seen in the General Features

The nature of the plan is that of God's final protest against the failure of the present world order. This may be seen in the general features of the plan. There is every indication of the moral failure of man in the tribulations thrust upon the righteous by a godless and hostile environment. The very fact that conditions are pictured as reaching such a pass
that only miraculous methods will avail for God argues that the natural methods operative in human affairs had apparently failed. The further fact that the coming kingdom came to be thought of as something separate and distinctly apart from any existing kingdom or from any earthly condition portrays the apocalyptic sense of hopelessness and despair of the present world order.

2. As Seen in Specific Teachings

The impression which is gained from the general features pertaining to the nature of the plan is verified by a number of specific teachings. According to Ethiopic Enoch 83-90 the seventy angel shepherds over Israel have betrayed her. (89.59) Their judgment is at hand. When Israel's oppression is sorest a righteous league will be formed (i.e. Chasidim, 90.6) and in it there will be a family from which will come forth Judas, the Maccabee (90.9-16) who will war victoriously against all the enemies of Israel. While the struggle is still raging, God will appear in person, and the earth will swallow the adversaries of the righteous (90.18). In Ethiopic Enoch 91-104 the wicked now seem to sin with impunity, but their evil deeds are recorded every day (104.7). For these they will suffer endless retribution in Sheol (99.11). In Book 3 of

the Oracles is seen the fate of the four successive kingdoms which are to bear rule over the Jews, and of the judgment of God on both Jews and Gentiles. In Ethiopic Enoch 37-70 sin flourishes in the latter days. Sinners will deny the name of the Lord of Spirits (38.2; 41.2) and of his anointed (48.10). The kings and the mighty will oppress the elect of the children of God (62.11) But suddenly the Head of Days will appear and with him the Son of Man (46.2,3,4; 48.2) to execute universal judgment. In the Psalms of Solomon, God destroys the ungodly nations with the breath of his mouth (17.27). He will overcome sinners with the might of his word (17.41). In Jubilees, Israel will suffer every kind of calamity (23.13,19,22). Then she will repent of her neglect of the commandments of the law (vs. 22,24,26). She will then be empowered to drive out her adversary and establish great peace (vs. 30ff).

B. Method - Often Catastrophic Inbreak of Celestial World

1. Basic Place of Inbreak

The nature of the plan as God's final protest against the failure of the present order is seen most vividly in the method of the plan. This method is often that of the catastrophic inbreak of the celestial world upon the scene of earthly action. This is to be sudden, unexpected, and outward.

(Fourth Ezra 9.3; 6.14-24; Assum. Moses 10.3-7; Eth. Enoch 1.9; Baruch 59.9). Pace maintains that this intervention of God in the world by a catastrophic action is the primary assumption of apocalypse, and that it is this beyond all else that differentiates apocalypse from the older prophecy. While the principle of miraculous intervention is not the only method employed in apocalyptic literature for kingdom coming, even those sections which tend to run more in parallel with the methodology of the prophets tend to show more of the miraculous and also an interposition of the celestial world beyond that of the prophets.

2. Central Figures and Functions

The center of action at times is the presence of God himself. In Ethiopic Enoch 1-36 it is God who makes his abode with men (25.3). There is no Messiah. In Ethiopic Enoch 83-90 it is God himself who will appear in person and set up the New Jerusalem (90.28,29). When all is accomplished, the Messiah will appear (90.30). In the Assumption of Moses, God intervenes in behalf of Israel (10.12) and the ten tribes are brought from captivity. Again, the center of action may be the Messiah, who is variously conceived. In one case he

1. Ideas of God in Israel, p. 140.
is merely a passive figure, without much to do except to represent the dignity of his office (Eth. Enoch 83-90). In another, the Messiah is a warrior. In the third chapter of the Oracles and in Baruch 36-40; 53-74 (cf. Fourth Ezra 10.60-12.35) he plays this role in his temporary kingdom. His enemies are done away with by the warring skill of his own hands. In a third grouping the Messiah destroys his enemies by the word of his mouth (Ps. Sol. 17, 27, 31, 37, 39, 41; Fourth Ezra, chap. 13). In a fourth grouping the Messiah is the supernatural, eternal ruler and judge of mankind (Eth. Enoch 37-70).

C. Result - Institution of the Kingdom

1. Eternal Messianic Kingdom on Earth

The result of such actions whether from the Messiah or from God himself is to institute the kingdom. The kingdom which is thus instituted is presented according to four main views. First, it is conceived as an eternal kingdom on earth. This is the view of Ethiopic Enoch 1-36, of Daniel, and of the Oracles. Here the idea comes nearest to the prophets of the Old Testament. This is the most primitive view.

---


in the literature of the second century B.C. The eternal Messianic kingdom is established with Jerusalem and Palestine for its center (Eth. Enoch 25.5). Gentiles become righteous and worship God (Eth. Enoch 10.21). The righteous eat of the tree of life and enjoy patriarchal lives (Eth. Enoch 5.9; 25.6) and every material blessing (Eth. Enoch 5.7; 10.18,19). As in the case of the prophets, this kingdom is conceived both as Messianic and theocratic. In Book 3 of the Oracles the coming of the Messianic king is prophesied and the victory over his adversaries is described. This is followed by an account of the material prosperity of the kingdom. In Ethiopic Enoch 1-36 the kingdom is directly theocratic. God makes his abode with man (Eth. Enoch 25.3).

2. Temporary Messianic Kingdom on Earth

Secondly, the kingdom is conceived as a temporary Messianic interim on earth. Here too, except for its temporariness, the conception is close to the prophets of the Old Testament. This view is the one usually found in apocalyptic literature. (Eth. Enoch 91-104; Ps. Sol. 17,18; Jubilees; Slav. Enoch; Assum. Moses; Baruch; and all parts of Fourth Ezra except the Salathiel Apocalypse) Commenting on the likeness between this kingdom and that of the prophets, Professor Candlish, in speaking of the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, says:

Here we have obviously an echo of some of the prophetic descriptions of the Messianic times, and a reproduction of some of the leading ideas of the Old Testament. That Israel is the people of God, that prosperity depends on faithfulness to Him and to His law, that He chastens them for their sins by means of the heathen nations, but will ultimately judge these nations and sift His people. ... that God is to raise up a Son of David to reign over Israel in righteousness and peace ... are genuine utterances like Amos, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and parts of Isaiah.¹

But this temporal kingdom on earth also presents a bold contrast to that of the prophets.

There is no echo of that other line of prophetic teaching that is given especially by Hosea, Joel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, and foretells the conversion of Israel by God's gracious chastisement, and the pouring out of His spirit.

... There is no word of a New Covenant or of God's gift of the new heart.²

3. Eternal Kingdom in Heaven Alone

Thirdly, the hope is held out for an eternal kingdom in heaven alone. Here there is no Messianic kingdom on earth. Men enter after death into an intermediate state (Hades, Sheol). The only future blessedness that awaits the righteous is that which awaits all the righteous, namely, the final award after the last judgment.³ One writer in the Apocalypse of Baruch presents the hopelessness of the present corruptible world and


fixes his regard wholly on the incorruptible world to be. This world will be renewed (32.6), and in this renewal, from being transitory and verging toward its close (48.50; 85.10), it will become undying (51.3) and everlasting (48.50). From being a world of corruption (40.3; 74.2), it will become incorruptible and invisible (74.2; 51.8). Thus, while the other world is made out of this present world, the transformation is of such a basic nature that it may not be regarded as this present order somewhat transformed. In the Apocalypse of Salathiel, found in Fourth Ezra, this world closes with the final judgment and the next world begins (7.113). It will be a new creation (7.75). The world is nearly at an end.

Retribution will set in immediately upon death (7.69,75,80). After final judgment, glory and transfiguration await the righteous (7.95,97).

4. Eternal Kingdom on Transformed Earth and in Heaven

Fourthly, in the one instance of Ethiopic Enoch 37-70 there is an eternal kingdom on a transformed earth and in heaven, which is instituted by the Son of Man Messiah. While human conditions are at their worst, suddenly the Head of Days will appear and with him the Son of Man (46.2,3,4; 48.2) to execute universal judgment. The sinners and the godless will be driven off the face of the earth (38.3; 41.2); the Son of Man will slay them by the word of his mouth (62.2). Heaven and earth will be transformed (45.4,5); they will become
the heritage of the righteous (45.4). The righteous will be clad in garments of life (62.15,16) and become angels in heaven (51.4) and grow in knowledge and righteousness (58.5). In both the third and fourth types, the kingdom scene is entirely separate from the present world. It is these types that have given to apocalyptic literature a large share of its emphasis on other-worldliness.

D. Accompanying Factors

1. The Return of the Jews

Whatever the method employed in kingdom establishment and whatever the kind of kingdom conceived as being established, one accompanying factor is often the return of the Jew. This was one of the most common hopes of the prophets. It received no new development from the apocalyptists. It is found in Ethiopic Enoch, Baruch, the Sibylline Oracles, the Psalms of Solomon, and Fourth Ezra. The Israelites scattered abroad over the earth were to be brought back to Palestine in order that they might enjoy the time of bliss in the transformed land or receive their award into the bliss of the other world. Oesterley goes further and suggests that some are returned to receive their condemnation and destruction. In

---

Ethiopic Enoch 90.33 the gathering in of the dispersion is the last step in the sequence of events which prepares the way for the victorious appearance of the Messiah (90.30). In the Psalms of Solomon a genuinely prophetic Messiah from the lineage of David (17.23), a righteous king (17.35), pure from sin (17.41), will gather the dispersed tribes (17.28,50), and purify Israel (17.28,29).

2. The Resurrection

The idea of the resurrection as an accompanying factor in the institution of the apocalyptic kingdom is a very prominent and characteristic doctrine. It received a variety of developments. The earliest attested view in the second century B.C. is that of the resurrection of all Israel (Dan. 12.1-3). About the same time the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous only came to be taught in Ethiopic Enoch 83-90. Toward the close of the same century there was the teaching pertaining to a blessed immortality for the soul or spirit after the final judgment (Eth. Enoch 91-104). This non-bodily, spiritual resurrection after the final judgment is believed to have held the field through the first century B.C.1 In the first century of the Christian era this idea received two modifications. On the one hand, it meant a blessed

immortality for the souls of the righteous beginning immediately after death. On the other hand, it was broadened to include all mankind and made to precede the final judgment (Jub. 23; Bar. 3.2-5, 50-51; Fourth Ezra 7.32,37).

3. Judgment

Of course the central factor in all the apocalyptic plan for kingdom institution is that of judgment. It is the climax of the whole sequence of events which are meant to usher in the kingdom. With a few exceptions (Jub.; Ps. Sol.2.1-33), practically no attention is paid to the matter of day to day judgment in return for our deeds.\(^1\) Apocalyptic attention as a whole is riveted on that judgment which is to come in the last days. This divided itself into two phases, the Messianic judgment and the final judgment.

a. Messianic

The Messianic judgment is often a judgment of battle in which the chief actors are the saints of Israel or those led by the Messiah. It is conceived of in a two-fold way. Some thought of it as the actual victory of the righteous over their enemies in open battle. Others thought of it as the forensic victory of their words in slaying their opponents. In both these lines of thought there is also a two-fold division.

\(^1\) Cf. Candlish, *The Kingdom of God*, p. 78f.
Some held that the battling would be done by the Messiah. Others held that the saints would do it. In the Similitudes of Enoch 30-70 the element of battling is absent. All is accomplished by judgment from the Son of Man (41.9; 69.27; 62.6). Hesits on the throne of God (47.3; 51.3). At his command the fallen angels will be cast into a fiery furnace (54.6), and the kings and the mighty will be tortured in Gehenna by the angels of punishment (53.3-5; 54.1,2).

b. Final

As to the final judgment, this is always administered by God himself save in the one case of Ethiopic Enoch 37-70, which is both Messianic and final. Here, as we have seen, judgment is given over to the Son of Man Messiah. Where the Messianic kingdom is considered permanent, the final judgment occurs at its beginning; where this kingdom is of temporary duration, it comes at the close; where there is no such kingdom, it comes at the end of the world. This judgment means

1. For Messiah's realistic part, see Ps. Sol. 17.18; Apoc. Bar. 30; 40; 72; 73, also Fourth Ezra 12.32-34. For his forensic part see Ps. Sol. 17; 18; Fourth Ezra 13; 28; 32-50. For saints of warfare, see Dan. 2.44; Eth. Enoch 90.19; 91.12; 96.1; 98.12; Sib. Orac. 3.781; Assum. Moses 10.9. Saints of forensic triumph are not pictured in apocalyptic literature extant, but see Book of Wisdom 3.9 (cf. I Cor. 6.2). Cf. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of the Future Life, pp. 196-197, 233-234, 248, 261, 286-289.

Divine wrath on the wicked and proportionate blessings on the righteous. Every manner of illustrative description is used. All nature is called into play. Every manner of human condition is made to do service. The supernatural world exhausts every resource for harrowing or for hallowing.

Summary

In review, the strictly future apocalyptic kingdom presented itself in its immediate nature as a mechanical, legal system of physical power. Its pictures of God, of the use of agents, of arrangements in nature, of dispensational history, of human predestination, of righteousness as law-keeping, of present human passivity, and of non-experiential relationship fit into this apocalyptic conception of power. Yet at bottom the apocalyptists were grounded in the moral nature of God as were the prophets, their difference being that of a changed point of view due to physical and historical circumstances. Because they had lost all spiritual faith in mankind as a whole, they viewed all kingdom operation as God's movement only. Thus the kingdom would be instituted by direct and miraculous intervention. This kingdom was variously conceived. It was earthly, heavenly, and a mixture of both. It was temporal and Messianic; it was eternal and heavenly. Sometimes both kingdoms were taught. Its institution was usually accompanied by the

return of the Jews, the resurrection, and a crisis of judgment.
CHAPTER FOUR

JESUS AND THE KINGDOM IDEALS OF THE APOCALYPTISTS

Introduction

The following treatment will concern itself with contrasts and similarities. The contrasts will be found to deal with the nature of Jesus' kingdom ideals, twelve characteristics of which we shall consider as of major importance. The similarities will involve: first, concepts common to the prophets, the apocalyptists, and Jesus; secondly, concepts common to contemporary Pharisaism, the apocalyptists, and Jesus; thirdly, miscellaneous words common to the apocalyptists and to Jesus; fourthly, terms common to the apocalyptists and to Jesus; and fifthly, the general line of similarity between the two as to the plan of future kingdom institution.

I. Contrast - Nature of Kingdom Ideals

A. Secondary Place of Agents

1. No Vital Place

Among the twelve major characteristics that distinguish the nature of Jesus' kingdom ideals from those of the apocalyptists is the important consideration that Jesus gave a secondary place to celestial agents. Instead of a kingdom manipulated by innumerable celestial agents, Jesus spoke of one in which such action plays practically no present role. With
the exception of the statement that angels ministered to Jesus after his temptations (Mt. 4.11; Mk. 1.13) celestial agents played no part in his life. His dealings were directly with God, his Father. According to Mark, angels are mentioned four times in connection with Jesus' eschatological teaching: in 12.25 one is told that the life of the righteous after the resurrection is like that of angels of God; in 13.32 not even the angels of heaven know the time of the end; in 8.38 the Son of Man comes in the glory of his Father with his holy angels; in 13.27 the work of his angels is to gather in his elect at his coming. The situation is the same in the other gospels. Matthew 18.10 may seem to teach a present activity of angels: "See that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Yet here, as Stevens emphasizes, the point was not to establish any teaching on angels, but rather to emphasize the guardian care of God. Bayschlag would rule out the evidence as to angels in connection with the eschatological teaching of Jesus. He would regard them as poetic imagery. However, the sum of the allusions here would certainly tend to present Jesus as

1. Page 83-84.
accepting the current doctrine of angels without giving to them any vital or indispensable place.

We may not be justified in denying that Jesus accepted the popular Jewish idea of angels, but we cannot maintain that it is in any way essential to his thought. ...his language is ...quite reserved...always as means to some end lying beyond. ...He represented God as being in living contact with the world, and as directly operative in human affairs. He accordingly spoke less frequently of angel-mediation.

There was no attempt to demarcate angelic functions, or to divide them off according to rank and station, or to name them.

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

Jesus' few bare allusions to angels stand in bold contrast to the preeminence of celestial agents found in apocalyptic literature, where every sphere of heaven and earth is replete with angelic warriors, guides, punishers, guards, and attendants. Even in Jesus' eschatological teaching the function of celestial agents was confined to the one mission of gathering in the elect (Mk. 13.27; Matt. 24.21; cf. Lk. 16.22f).

2. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 151.
B. Unitary Kingdom

1. Two Ages in Apocalypse and in Jesus

Jesus' kingdom of direct human relationship with God was unitary. With the apocalyptists there are two ages. The future age is the age of the kingdom; the present age is hopeless. With Jesus there were two ages. "In this time" should the disciple who had given all for the teacher's sake, receive houses and brethren and sisters and mothers and children and lands a hundred-fold, with persecutions, and "in the age to come" eternal life (Mk. 10.28-30). When the Sadducees sought to discredit the life hereafter on a case of complicated relations, they were met by a reply which assumed a two-age distinction:

The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage, but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that age, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage (Lk. 20.34,35).

On the gravest of sins, the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, was pronounced the awful doom: "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor in that which is to come." (Matt. 12.32)

But we must observe that there was a striking difference between the teaching of the "two ages" in apocalypticism and the same teaching in Jesus. This difference related to

1. Chapter Three, p. 102-103.
the ideas of the present, of the future, and of the connection between present and future.

a. The Present

With the apocalyptists the present was hopelessly evil. The present age was one of endless corruption. The youth of the world was past; only decay lay before; God himself was in remote isolation. There was nothing that could be done to remedy the undone moral conditions of earth. With Jesus, the present age was one of moral possibility. The abundant life of Mark 10:28-30 led into the more abundant life hereafter. Even the statement concerning the unpardonable sin (Matt. 12:32) showed that both present and future were under the same moral laws and that what was done then had its bearing on the future. The distinction between mortal state and immortal (Lk. 20:34, 35) was no exception. It made no pronouncement on the moral principles that were to govern both states. At this point one needs only to recall the many evidences previously cited to show that Jesus considered the present age as one of moral challenge and opportunity.1

b. The Future

With the apocalyptists the future was an entirely different moral order from the present. It was the age of the

1. Chapter Two, p. 65f; cf. Burton and Matthews, Life of Jesus, p. 120; Harnack, What is Christianity?, p. 17.
kingdom, of the very presence, interest, and control of God. Then all wrongs would be righted, the oppressors would be punished, and the faithful would receive their just reward.\(^1\)

According to Ethiopian Enoch 25.3 God would then make his personal abode with man. He would personally set up his new Jerusalem (Eth. Enoch 90.28,29). The Messiah would then appear (Eth. Enoch 90.30), and all would be transformed into his likeness.\(^2\) Many such instances may be cited to indicate that the future order with the apocalyptists represented a miraculous transformation in relationships and conditions. With Jesus the future was the same moral order as the present. The only difference was that then God's will would have complete sway. His will which is now often thwarted and incompletely understood and obeyed would then reach its fulness of realization.\(^3\)

2. Connection between Present and Future Order

The apocalyptists saw no possible connection between the present age-order and the age to come. The two periods were a dualism. There was a complete break between them.\(^4\)
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For instance, in the Similitudes of Enoch, the present order was represented as ending in abject moral failure. In the latter days sin would flourish in the world; sinners would deny the name of the Lord of Spirits (38.2; 41.2) and of his anointed (48.10); and the kings and the mighty would oppress the elect of the children of God (62.11). But suddenly the Head of Days would appear and with him the Son of Man to execute universal judgment (46.2, 3, 4; 48.2).

On the other hand, the two ages in Jesus bore an organic and indissoluble relationship to each other. The ardor of his evangelizing campaigns and of the extension of this campaigning among his followers was rooted in the fact that he believed the two ages vitally and morally related, so that what was then being done to change men's wills toward God would have eternal significance. This conclusion is emphasized by Scott:

He transports himself out of the present, in which the higher will strives vainly to assert itself in the face of earthly resistance, into the future. He conceived of a time when man's life is placed amid perfect conditions, when God is known as an ever-present reality. ...It was in very truth the reign of God, who would at last subject all things entirely to His will. In the light of those future conditions when God's will would be fully manifest, he sought to interpret it and make it effective now.

1. Chapter Two, p. 64-65.
C. Organic Conception of History

1. Apocalyptic Dispensations versus Historical Growth

Jesus' idea of the organic relationship between the present and future order was only a part of his larger idea of the organic development of history. Nowhere did Jesus divide history into stages of dispensation. The present was the outgrowth of the past. In the parable of the vineyard (Matt. 21.33ff; etc.), God had planted Israel, had hedged her about, had digged her winepress, and built her tower. Her present situation represented her indebtedness to God for the sequential and providential developments in her past. Accordingly, the future would be the outgrowth of the present. He taught the principle of inner historical development, both for the kingdom and for kingdom faith (Matt. 13.31; Mk. 4.31; Lk. 13.19; Matt. 17.20; Lk. 17.16). He entertained no belief in the mechanical emergence of world changes. He sought to effect changes in human wills by personal effort, and, through these changed ones, to extend the circle of desired change to others. Those whom he had won, he promised to make fishers of men (Matt. 4. 18-22; Mk. 1.16-20; Lk. 5.1-11).1 They were to go out and "take men alive" for the message which had first taken possession of them. He maintained no belief in mechanical time relationships. Herein lay the contrast

---

between Jesus and apocalyptists. Unlike them, he never suggested that certain things would take place among men simply because the time had come around for those things according to the predetermined system.  

2. Examples

Of this sequential relationship he presented historical examples. For instance, Jerusalem would not fall and be destroyed because this was her predetermined lot, but because she herself knew not the day of her visitation (Matt. 23.37-39; Lk. 13.34,35). Again, the kingdom would be taken away from the Jews, not as a part of a predetermined pattern, but because the Jews lacked the spiritual faith in him and in his work to enter it (Matt. 8.11,12; Lk. 13.29). Such examples have nothing in common with the mechanistic idea of historical dispensations found in apocalyptic literature (Cf. Dan. 9.24-27; 4.13-34; etc.).

D. Principles of Kingdom Participation

1. Contrast in Ultimate Basis

Jesus' organic conception of the two ages and of history in general presents no greater contrast to apocalypticism in kingdom operation than the principles taught by Jesus concerning kingdom participation. That the apocalyptists taught a

---
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non-moral, predetermined choice by God has been demonstrated. There was no hope for mankind in general: he had no essentially free will; his will was predetermined to evil; nothing could avert his disaster.¹ Often God's choice was national.² The usual use of the term "God's children" pointed to the Israelites. The sublime promises even in the Psalms of Solomon were for Israelites who were God's own.³ There was sometimes a choice of individuals. One writer showed that each future destiny had been prepared from the foundations of the world, another that everything had been predetermined by number and measure through God's divine decree.⁴ In the Similitudes of Enoch (37-70) the individual was referred to as "the elect" or "mine elect" with no distinctively moral basis either taught or implied.

With Jesus, God's choice was moral. Jesus' specifications of choice contained none on the basis of nation. He went beyond all question of racial priority. There was no ideal of Jewish independence. Definite statements repeatedly point away from any kind of national exclusiveness.⁵ There are a number of instances in which God's choice of the individ-
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ual was mentioned (Matt. 22:14; 24:24,31; Mk. 13:27; Lk. 18:7). These passages speak of the "chosen" or of the "elect". They are all connected with the apocalyptic coming of the Son of Man, but they are unaccompanied by any kind of teaching as to what Jesus meant by these terms. In Deutero-Isaiah the same terms are found (42:1; 45:4; 65:9,22). Here they undoubtedly indicate moral choice. Jesus' general teaching would certainly indicate the prophetic moral use of this term. He never acted as though he in any way precluded man's moral responsibility or possibility, neither did he ever teach that God was pre-conditioned for or against an individual. The "whosoever" spirit of Jesus' teachings allowed no such distinctions. Whosoever should find no occasion of stumbling in him was pronounced blessed (Matt. 11:6). Whosoever should do the will of his father in heaven was his brother, sister, and mother (Matt. 12:50). A general principle of getting and losing was alike applicable to all (Lk. 8:18). In such a parable as that of the sower, the seed was scattered broadcast over all the earth equally. The thing that made the difference was the condition of the soil itself. (Mk. 4:3-9; etc.)

2. Contrast in Immediate Basis

a. Legal versus Ethical Righteousness

The apocalyptic findings on legal righteousness have shown that the very term "the righteous" - which is of constant recurrence in apocalyptic literature - was usually a synonym
for the "law-keepers". As a rule, no distinction was made between the ethical and the ritualistic in the law. Sin assumed the formal nature of an omission or infraction of outward observances. Law-keeping alone meant personal confidence and hope of future salvation. God's grace thereby tended to become the formal disregarding or overlooking of wrong rather than the inward and ethical operation of forgiveness.

In Jesus, on the contrary, righteousness was ethical will, based upon the will of the Father. The term "righteous" had nothing whatever to do with outward legal fulfilment; it was used to describe ethical will. In Matthew 21.32 Jesus said that John came in the way of righteousness. Yet John's insistence was the direct antithesis to outward legalism. Jesus definitely contrasted the higher righteousness which he demanded with the righteousness of scribes and Pharisees. His contention with them was that their righteousness was outward while inwardly they were full of hypocrisy and iniquity (Matt. 23.23).
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b. Distinction between Ethical and Ritualistic

Instead of ignoring the distinction between the ethical and the ritualistic, Jesus constantly gave primacy to the ethical over the ritualistic. In Matthew 5.23,24 the ethical was to precede ritual performance if the latter was to have any value. In Mark 7.11 the natural, ethical duty of man outweighed the formally religious. The Temple was a place for prayer. He was not apparently interested in its ceremonials. (Matt. 21.13; Mk. 11.17; Lk. 19.46) The Sabbath was to serve human needs, and these needs were never to be sacrificed in the interest of a system of outward observances (Mk. 2.27; cf. 2.28; Lk. 6.5). The legal commitments on food, clean and unclean, were insignificant in comparison with the expressions of inner spirit of life (Matt. 15.17-18; Mk. 7.15,23). He ridiculed the pious who tithed garden vegetables but neglected justice, mercy, and good faith (Matt. 23.23). The indifferent formalism of the Pharisees invited his indignation. Their food was procured in injustice and used in luxury (Matt. 23.25,26).

c. Legal versus Ethical Security

Instead of the formal nature of sin as an omission or infraction of outward observance, Jesus taught the inward ethical nature of sin. Sin, with Jesus, was never the mere infraction or omission of outward rule.¹ It was a breach

¹ Robertson, The Pharisees and Jesus, p. 77f.
of inward spirit that led the prodigal into his ruinous condition; hence, his cry to his father, "I have sinned", was closely connected with the inward, ethical nature of sin. (Lk. 15:18-21) Because of the moral nature of sin, law-keeping was never offered by Jesus as a means of personal security. This could be effected only through personal repentance. Accordingly, Jesus' earliest message was on repentance (Mk. 1:15; 6:12; etc.). As men repented and confessed their sins, they received John's baptism (Matt. 3:6; Mk. 1:5).¹ There was no indication that this procedure was altered by Jesus.

d. Contrast as to God's Grace

Never in Jesus did God's grace assume the formal nature of an overlooking or of a letting pass of that which was wrong. Because Jesus' idea of sin was uniformly inward and ethical, it could only be remedied by the inward, ethical grace of God in forgiveness.² Because the apocalyptic idea of sin was formal, there was practically no mention of this inward grace of God in forgiveness. It was God's justice that condemned, and it was only by putting one's self on the side of that justice through law that one was believed to be justified. There was practically no New Testament doctrine

of God's grace in apocalyptic literature. Yet this idea of the forgiving grace of God abounded in the teaching of Jesus. We are taught to pray for God's forgiveness and to communicate that spirit of forgiveness to others (Matt. 6.12; Mk. 11.25, 26; Lk. 11.4; Matt. 6.14,15). One is to be tireless in his forgiving spirit on the repentance of others (Matt. 18.21ff; Lk. 17.3,4). Jesus declared that every manner of sin and blasphemy may be forgiven by God save one (Matt. 12.31; Mk. 3.28; Lk. 12.10).

E. Jesus' Characteristic Conception of God as Father

1. Its Prominence

This teaching on the forgiving grace of God led to Jesus' characteristic conception of God as Father. Whenever the personal relation between God and himself was involved, he employed no name but "Father", except in a single passage where he quoted from the twenty-second Psalm (Mk. 15.34). In each of the five prayers where the words of Jesus are given he addressed God as Father (Matt. 11.25-27; 26.39,42; Lk. 23.34,46); and in the longest of these which included but three verses, the name was repeated five times. When speaking of God in the third person, Jesus referred to him once as "the great King" (Matt. 5.35), and once as "the Lord of the harvest" (Matt. 9.38), but in almost every case he used the name "God" or the name "Father".

God the Father bestowed upon men a present and benign
providence. He sent the rain upon the just and the unjust. He took thought of his children's daily needs and numbered the very hairs of their heads (Matt. 6.11; 10.30). It was his nature to give good gifts to his children (Matt. 7.11; Lk. 11.13). He was ready to give the kingdom of heaven and the vision of himself to the poor in spirit and the pure in heart (Matt. 5.3, 8).

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

How different was all of this from the apocalyptic conception of God, who usually sat in judgment upon the actions of men, who would surely execute his sentences with irrevocable vengeance! There were hardly any of the impersonal and formal designations of God in Jesus which, as has been seen, were rife in such a book as Ethiopic Enoch.1 Jesus' conception of the intimacy of the Father's love and care would not permit such descriptions. Again, according to Jesus, there was no remoteness of distance between God and man. God could be reached in daily prayer. Jesus was preeminently a man of constant contact with God.2 He taught his disciples to maintain intimacy of personal contact.3
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F. Filial, Ethical Fellowship as Kingdom Purpose

1. Examples

This Fatherhood of God revealed the purpose of the kingdom ideals in Jesus. God's ultimate purpose was to draw to himself men who should be fully conscious of their moral sonship, their inner likeness to their Father, and who, by virtue of this, should share unbroken fellowship with him. At the close of Matthew's enumeration of the character and duties which befit a disciple there are these words; "Even so let your light shine before men; that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven." (Matt. 5:16) Again, at the close of both the Matthean and the Lucan accounts of Jesus' teaching on a higher righteousness than that of conventional legalistic requirement, the purpose was set forth that in this kind of action men would prove themselves in accord with that sonship to the Father which was their ultimate goal (Matt. 7:43ff; 7:48; Lk. 6:35-36). All through Jesus' teaching on true kingdom righteousness in contra-distinction to the ostentation of the Jews the purpose was that this conduct would set forth the essential and inward relation which ought to obtain between the character of the Father and that of his son.

3. Ibid., p. 48-49.
(Matt. 6.1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18; Lk. 12.30; 11.2-4) It was this inner harmony with the Father's will that finally determined kingdom entrance (Matt. 12.21). It was this which united others to Jesus in closest kinship.

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

The purpose of the ideals in the two cases presents a conflict. The purpose of apocalyptic ideals was to set forth God as fully vindicated against those who oppressed the people of the law and against those Jews who were unfaithful to the law. This he would accomplish by the ultimate exaltation of the legally loyal and the due punishment of the disloyal. In other words, there was to be a full vindication of mechanistic legalism, the result being that the faithful would enjoy a full blessedness in contrast to the utter defeat and destruction of their foes.¹ This was not at all the ultimate purpose of Jesus' ideals. He did not present a God anxious to vindicate himself. God's honor was not involved in any outward institution or observance. He made no discrimination between men on the basis of such outward institutions or observances. His purpose was the establishment of a true, ethical fellowship with men as his sons by an inward change of their wills.²

¹ Chapter Three, p. 135-136.
G. Redemptive Love as Kingdom Motive

1. Examples

God's purpose to establish inner, ethical fellowship with men as his sons worked through redemptive love. This is proved by numerous parabolic teachings, by Jesus' teaching of repentance, by his own life example, and by his definite requirements of others. Jesus taught that this redemptive love of God, mediated through us to others, would entail sacrifice and suffering, and he gave indication that such experiences were in line with the teachings of the prophets.

Jesus' estimation of the importance of man's proper social response to the redemptive love of God was indicated in the fact that he made this response a corollary of his first great commandment (Matt. 22.37-39; Mk. 12.30-31). It was further indicated in his teachings that one's spiritual fraternity with his brother was so vital that even the offering of a gift at the altar should be suspended, if need be, in its behalf (Matt. 5.23-24).

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

How different is this from the set, unvarying, inescapable, and machine-like activity of the apocalyptic God in the face of all opposition? Here God's stern justice allowed
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practically no room for his mercy (Slav. Enoch 40.12-41.2; 42.1-2; Fourth Ezra 13.9,28; 13.38,49; etc.); his sense of insult precluded his love of the offender (Zech. 8-14; etc.); his purpose of vengeance would not keep company with the idea of redemption (Dan. 7.9-12; etc.). One looks in vain for any purpose of discipline or reformation through punishment. Instead, it was absolute and vindictive.

H. Active Kingdom

1. God's Redeeming Activity and Its Requirements

This redemptive love of God, according to Jesus, was then actively seeking to win men. As has been seen, God's forgiving grace, his fatherly concern, his benign providences, and his redeeming love made him an active, moral power of present earnestness. This thesis has presented this ceaseless activity of God in Jesus' parabolic teachings, in Jesus' idea of God's requirement of active response, and in God's activity as exemplified in Jesus' own ministry.¹ Men were not only to hear, but they were to perform. The disciples and the seventy shared his missionary crusading. He who had come "to seek and to save that which was lost" bade men leave the dead to bury their own dead and come follow him in his evangelizing task (Matt. 8.22; Lk. 9.60).

¹ Chapter Two, p. 86f.
2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

Here one needs only to remind himself of what has already been said concerning the present passivity of apocalypticism. It presented no occasion for personal effort in behalf of kingdom promotion. The faithful must be consoled and wait. The idea of the "Spirit", instead of representing a medium of God's activity with men as in the case of the prophets, was confined to indicate that part of man which would survive death. Their system did not necessitate God's forgiving grace since righteousness was confined to law-keeping; it did not require his fatherly concern since all things were working according to predetermined patterns and would inflexibly fulfill their appointed destinies. God's love for mankind could not be featured in a system whose major objective was to execute vengeance upon a Godless world. There was no logical place for the redemption of the lost where the lost condition was according to the structural plan of God.

I. Universal Kingdom

1. Jesus' Advance beyond Racial Priority

God's activity in behalf of his kingdom and man's present response operated in an unlimited scope, according to Jesus. It has been shown that the moral nature of God's
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choice caused his teaching to go beyond racial priority. There was no ideal of a Jewish triumph. While it was true that he sent his disciples first to the Jews, this was probably done for reasons involving no racial preference. His exact statements presented God's preference as non-racial, as entirely moral. In this conception he caught up the best that was in the prophets and went beyond them. In their loftiest teachings, as has been seen, there did remain something of racial priority even in the midst of God's universal dominion. The Jews were to be the special ministers of Yahweh and the teachers of the nations. The nations were in return to render service and support to the Jews.

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

The apocalyptists, on the whole, were more racially exclusive than the prophets. Their literature was largely

1. Cadeaux's recent argument for a Jewish triumph (The Parables of Jesus), like other arguments for the nationalistic position, is strained and considerably artificial. For instance, savourless salt meant Israel (p. 80-81); the city set on a hill meant Jerusalem (p. 83); the individuals invited to supper collectively personified Israel (p. 86); etc.
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born out of the persecutions directed against Israel as a race and as a religion. It was natural that their future hopes should be centered around their own racial and religious vindication. Again, their system of thought required a more exclusive emphasis. Righteousness meant the keeping of the Jewish law; the nations of the world did not know the Jewish law. If this kind of law-keeping was the only means available for kingdom participation, mankind at large was per force largely excluded. When this situation was backed by the thought that God, for the most part, meant to exclude them because they were not a part of his original choice, Jesus' teaching of a strictly moral, non-racial preferment is made to stand out against apocalypticism in prominent relief.

J. Hopeful Kingdom

1. Implication in Jesus' Basic Conceptions

Since Jesus viewed God as presently and morally active in behalf of his kingdom and as requiring man's present and active response, since this activity was unlimited in scope, and since kingdom requirements were moral and non-racial, his view of the kingdom's future contained much hope. The kingdom ideals themselves were considered to be possessed with germinating power. They were as seed; they would grow to
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harvest. They were as leaven which would permeate the meal.¹ These ideals were backed by Jesus' idea of the power of faith. Through the operation of faith, kingdom workers might pluck up sycamine trees and remove mountains.² This kingdom optimism was undergirded in the teachings of Jesus by his idea of God's tender, present, and abundant providence for his children.³ Even Jesus' late eschatological emphasis did not destroy his spirit of present hopefulness.⁴

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

One will appreciate the contrast between Jesus and apocalypticism here as he recalls such citations from the previous chapter as the Apocalypse of Baruch 21.19; 44.9-15; 85 where this world was the scene of irremediable corruption, with its youth past, its strength exhausted, and its only hope in the future. Couple with this group of citations the teaching of Fourth Ezra that all effort to solve difficulties was doomed to futility (7.1-14), and that all mankind in general was not worth the effort (7.49-61), and the picture of present hopelessness is complete. There was nothing left for the masses but the sure punishment of God (Slav. Enoch 21. 2; 30.15,16; 40.12,13).

¹ Chapter Two, p. 60-61.
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K. Experiential Kingdom

1. Centrality of Jesus' Personal Religious Experience

The same present moral activity of God which undergirded Jesus' spirit of hopefulness also provided the basis for his own personal religious experience. God was his near, sympa-thetic, and all-powerful partner in the kingdom task. His message came straight from an ever fresh experience with God in his own soul. All that he borrowed from the prophets he must first have passed through the crucible of his own prayer life with God. For this reason his handling of prophecy was never mechanical. He sought no belief in himself on the basis of mechanical, Messianic fulfilment.¹

It was in the desolation of the Galilean deserts, in the heavy solitude and seclusion of its nights that Jesus struck deep into the richest source-springs of personal religious experience that our human history knows. Solitude, seclusion and silence filled with his supplications were the things that made Jesus the One he was and always will be.²

The first three Gospels report twelve instances of definite prayer. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At the baptism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apart from Simon's house</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. After cleansing the leper</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Before choosing the twelve</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. After feeding the five thousand</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. At Caesarea Philippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. At the Transfiguration</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.28-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. At giving the Lord's prayer
9. At Gethsemane
10. Feeding five thousand
11. Feeding four thousand
12. At Lord's Supper

But one is certainly not to suppose that these were all the times Jesus prayed. The records are very fragmentary.

Furthermore, there was a certain quality of prayerfulness in his teaching.

The whole teaching of Jesus is grounded in what may be termed an ethical mysticism. He is possessed with the thought of love and goodness as so inherent in the divine nature that by attaining to them we apprehend God. In every act of justice and compassion we become for that moment one with God, and by constant obedience to His will we live the divine life. ¹

The reason for this is not hard to find. "That he himself had sensed, sought, and secured, he in turn sought to show and to share with others."²

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

Here the contrast to apocalypticism is striking. Because Jesus was preeminently a man of religious experience, he never resorted to stereotyped forms of ideas such as the mechanical use of vision as a literary device, the progression of the four animal kingdoms, the variations of computation based on the numbers seven and seventy, etc. He even went

¹ Scott, The Ethical Teaching of Jesus, p. 41.
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beyond the prophets in ridding himself of stereotyped formulas. Moreover, the apocalyptists turned continually to the intellectually speculative. The universe was seen as punctiliously divided into myriad compartments. Almost every function of God was relegated to an appropriate host of angels. Imagined schemes of mechanical and sometimes rhythmical succession allowed one to prognosticate the future events of the world. Jesus was far too intent upon a practical purpose to give place to such fanciful speculation; on the contrary, he distinctly declined to enter upon such speculations. (Matt. 24:36; Mk. 13:32)

L. Spiritually Empowered Kingdom

1. Examples

Lastly, Jesus taught in his kingdom ideals of power from that held by the apocalyptists. The record speaks of power to forgive sins (Matt. 9:6, 8; Mk. 2:10; Lk. 5:24), power to heal (Matt. 9:10; Lk. 9:1; Mk. 3:15; Lk. 4:36; 5:17), power of the preached word (Lk. 4:32; Matt. 28:18), power of a true teaching about God (Matt. 22:29; Mk. 12:24), power as a heavenly endowment within (Lk. 24:49). Excepting the late eschatological placements, which represent the true zones of apocalyptic influence, the common conception of power was inward and ethical. Indeed, it may be maintained
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that Jesus repudiated the use of physical power at the beginning (Lk. 4:6; Mk. 4:8-10). When physical power was first invoked by his enemies as an answer to the moral issues which he had raised, he branded it as the "power of darkness" (Lk. 22.53). It seems that he refused to shift his side of the conflict to that level. He would not allow Peter to use his sword in Gethsemane (Matt. 26.52).

2. Contrast to Apocalypticism

We have seen how the whole idea of the apocalyptists concerning power was virtually an outward display of physical force. God's own presence, his names, his signs of the end, his attitudes to opposition, his myriads of warrior hosts, as well as his eschatological and catastrophic inbreak upon the world, were surcharged with the idea of power as outward and physical force. On the contrary, with Jesus God's power was ethical and spiritual. It was the goodness of his character in active triumph.

The emphasis of the current apocalyptic program was the (physical) power of God, that of Jesus upon his character. For apocalypticism the glory of God is to be found in His majesty and His exaltation above men... There is no want of reverence with Jesus' thought of God nor lack of the sense of God's power, but it is the goodness of God that he wishes men to see, and that goodness, so far from separating from God, brings him near to man.

II. Similarity

A. General

1. Common Basis, Moral Nature of God

This thesis has presented the negative side of the comparison between Jesus' kingdom ideals and those of the apocalyptists, namely, the continuous chain of contrasts between the character and nature of the two ideals. On the other hand there are many similarities.

A very significant general similarity lies in the fact that both Jesus and the apocalyptists founded their hopes essentially upon the moral nature of God. The contrast between them as to the kingdom's nature was wholly a matter of deduction or application and emphasis. In the nature of the kingdom Jesus followed the prophets who believed in man's spiritual possibilities. Accordingly, his kingdom teaching presented an ethically co-operative relationship between God and man. The apocalyptists did not believe in man's spiritual possibilities. Mankind was essentially and fundamentally perverse, corrupt, and hopeless. Therefore, the same moral nature which in Jesus and the prophets demanded a co-operative relationship, with them demanded a present remoteness, a determinate dealing through intermediaries, and an eventual intervention. The contrast between Jesus' kingdom ideals and those of the apocalyptists is very pronounced because the emphasis with Jesus was continually upon the essential nature of the
kingdom, while the apocalyptic emphasis was continually upon the plan of kingdom operation. Because the apocalyptic insistence was upon plan or method which was adapted to a different conception of man, the immediate nature of the kingdom was seen as a mechanical, legal system of physical power.

2. Evidence in the Records

That the apocalyptic kingdom was, nevertheless, based on the moral nature of God, may be illustrated by the occasional passages which manage to get away from the question of plan and method and speak directly about God's nature and his inner will for man. Here Jesus' teaching on the nature of the kingdom strikes comradeship with apocalypticism, as we have seen in two distinctive instances, the coupling of love to God with love to neighbor and the duty of forgiving one another. It was possible for Jesus to make this specific use of the ethical to be found in apocalypticism because of the common basis in the moral nature of God.

Furthermore, because of this common basis, it was natural for Jesus to make an ethical use of his distinctive apocalyptic ideas, as when he gave the parables of apocalyptic warning in order to arouse men to a proper moral preparation, or when he presented loving service as the standard in the
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Matthean judgment scene. The apocalyptists had not usually made such a use because their emphasis was not on the essential nature of the kingdom as belonging to the nature of God, but on the idea of the immediate nature of the kingdom as a mechanical, physical plan of operation.

B. Specific

It is now time to state the specific similarities between apocalypticism and Jesus. These will be divided into three classes: those held in common with prophetism and apocalypticism, those held in common with Pharisaism and apocalypticism, and those which seem to connect him with apocalypticism alone. In the first two cases, Jesus' apocalyptic indebtedness is obviously indeterminate. In the last case it seems fairly definite.

1. Indeterminate Indebtedness

a. Elements in Common with Prophetism and Apocalypticism

(1) Expectation of Near World-change

Some teachings Jesus held in common with the prophets and the apocalyptists. All expected a near change the proportions of which would involve the whole world. The prophets saw this change as just beyond the historical crisis before them. The apocalyptists often saw it as the next step beyond

1 Chapter One, p. 9f.
the present plane of successions.¹ Jesus lived in the thought of the world-change soon to ensue (Matt. 11:21; Lk. 10:13; Matt. 23:37; Lk. 13:34). Jesus sometimes spoke as one standing among those things that are old and ready to vanish away. He saw the Galilean towns and the city of Jerusalem lying under the shadow of approaching doom.²

(2) Expectation of a "Coming"

With all three the change was often connected with a "coming". The prophets awaited the coming of the Day of Yahweh.³ Often the expectation of the apocalyptists was little more than this, but there was also the definite teaching from them of the coming of God or the Messiah from heaven in judgment.⁴ In the earlier placements of Jesus' sayings about the "coming", it usually seems to be an open question whether he meant the prophetic Day of Yahweh or the apocalyptic intervention. There is practically nothing in the pre-Caesarean placements that would bar either view. There are a number of indications that Jesus might have followed the "servant" idea of Deutero-Isaiah and considered the "coming" as a prophetic emergence or fruition of missionary work.⁵ From the incident

¹ Chapter Three, p. 115-116.
³ Chapter One, p. 38f.
⁴ Chapter Three, p. 136f.
⁵ Chapter Two, p. 93.
at Caesarea Philippi onward, there are the placements which present the coming of the apocalyptic Son of Man Messiah, though it was not until the midst of the Passion Week that there was a settled and definite apocalyptic discourse on the coming.

b. Elements in Common with Pharisaism and Apocalypticism

(1) The Role of Satan

Secondly, there are ideas which Jesus held in common with contemporary Pharisaism and apocalypticism. Here belongs Jesus' idea of Satan and the evil work of demons. In the Old Testament Satan had been described as the accuser, adversary, or destroyer of mankind; he was employed as a minister of God for the testing and chastisement of men.¹ In the Pharisaism of Jesus' day the idea of Satan was developed as a characteristic of religious thought.² In the narrative of the temptation as given by Matthew (4.1-11) and Luke (4.1-13) it was Satan who presented to Jesus alluring prospects of success if he would abandon the divinely appointed path. If the words τοῦ πανηγεῦ in Matthew's version of the Lord's prayer are to be taken as personal, we have here a clear reference to Satan as the source of temptation to evil.³ In the parable of the sower (Mk. 4.15; Matt. 8.18; Lk. 8.12) the questionable interpretation makes

---

Satan "the enemy". 1 Jesus said to Peter, "Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat." (Lk. 22.31) Again, Satan was "the prince of the demons", who, as head of the kingdom of evil spirits, was likened to the "strong man" guarding his house. Men who had been seized by his vassals were his "spoil" and could not be rescued except by one who was more powerful than the chief himself. (Mk. 3.22-27; Matt. 12.25-29; Lk. 11.17-22)

(2) Demon Possession

Closely associated with the idea of Satan was that of demon possession. The man "with an unclean spirit" in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk. 1.21f; Lk. 4.31f), the Gerasene demoniac (Mk. 5.1f; Matt. 8.28f; Lk. 8.26f), a dumb man who spake as soon as the demon which had caused his dumbness was cast out (Matt. 9.32,33; cf. Lk. 11.14; Matt. 12.22); the little daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman who was "grievously vexed with a demon", and who, when healed, went home and lay down upon the bed, restored to health (Mk. 7.25f; Matt. 15.22f) are a few of the examples. Again, this belief in demon possession was rooted in contemporary Pharisaism. When the Pharisees charged him with casting out demons by the aid of their prince, Jesus replied, "If I by Beelzebub cast out demons,

by whom do your sons cast them out?" (Lk. 11.19; 12.27) Satan and his demons played a large part in apocalyptic literature under many names. But one is not at all warranted in making Jesus directly indebted to the apocalyptists because he sought the downfall of the demons. By the same judgment, practically every Pharisee of Jesus' day would be judged apocalyptic.

(3) Moral Ideas

There are also certain moral ideas which Jesus held in common with contemporary Pharisaism and apocalypticism. One was that of man's duty to extend God's forgiveness of him to others. The prophets constantly taught a social ethic based upon the nature of God. But they did not develop this ethic definitely to include forgiveness between men. This idea was well-known to the Pharisaism of Jesus' day. It occurred again, as has been seen, in a portion of one apocalyptic book (The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs). That the idea was common to Jesus needs no argument. Again, the coupling of love to God with love to men may be found in all three. This

1. Robertson, The Pharisees and Jesus, p. 84.
4. Chapter One, p. 15-16.
6. Chapter Three, p. 128.
7. Chapter Two, p. 67.
was a common thought in contemporary Judaism according to Montefiore. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs contained it, and Jesus used this coupling as the essence of the Law. Here again it should be noted that while the prophets did not make this combination, the combination itself was nothing more than the development of their social ethic based upon the nature of God.

It is not possible to determine Jesus' specific indebtedness to apocalypticism on any of the foregoing matters because apocalyptic literature is only one of the previous sources from which Jesus could have derived these ideas. The oral Talmud and the Midrash, the two great sources of Pharisaism, probably taught similar ideas.

2. Definite Indebtedness
   a. Apocalyptic Words

There are other instances where Jesus' apocalyptic indebtedness seems fairly clear and absolute. First, it should not be denied that his teaching contained a number of individual words which are of frequent occurrence in apocalyptic literature. No word taken separately would prove indebtedness, but such a group as the following present cumulative evidence

2. Chapter Three, p. 128.
3. Chapter Two, p. 80.
of familiarity with the language: συντέλεια, παλιγγενεσία, αἰών, κόσμος, ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς, ἄγιος, οὐτοὶ, αὐτότατος, κρίνων, δαίμον, πτωχοί, ἄγιος, οὐτοί, αὐτότατος, γενίς, φῶς, βασιλεία, χριστός.

b. Apocalyptic Phrases

(1) "Kingdom of God"

Secondly, the use of three recurrent phrases seen to indicate indebtedness. Jesus was probably indebted to apocalypse for the use of the exact term "kingdom of God". As remarked elsewhere, the term is not found in prophecy though foreshadowing ideals were frequently taught. It is not until intertestamental apocalyptic literature that there is what may be called a definite doctrine of the "kingdom of God". Here is found the exact term used to describe the zone of God's influence and to demarcate the separate order over which he will have control.

The verses of the synoptic gospels in which the term "kingdom", "kingdom of heaven", or "kingdom of God" was directly used by Jesus to signify this general community under the reign of God are as follows:

Kingdom

"And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom." Matt. 4:23.

"Thy kingdom come; thy will be done..." Matt. 6:10; Lk. 11:2.

"And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness..." Matt. 8:11-12.

"And Jesus went about in all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom..." Matt. 9:35.

"When anyone heareth the words of the kingdom and understandeth it not, then cometh the evil one, and snatcheth away that which hath been sown in the heart." Matt. 13:19.

"And he answered and said, 'He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; and the field is the world; and the good seed, these are the sons of the kingdom; and the tares are the sons of the evil one.'" Matt. 13:37-38.

"The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father." Matt. 13:41-43.

"Verily I say unto you, There are some of them that stand here who shall in no wise taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." Matt. 16:28.

"...Command that these, my sons, may sit, one on thy right hand and one on thy left hand in the kingdom." Matt. 20:21.

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24:14.

"Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom...for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25:34.

"But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Matt. 26:29.
"Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our Father David; Hosanna in the highest." Mk. 11.10.

"And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Lk. 1.33.

"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Lk. 12.32.

"I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Lk. 22.29.

"...Jesus, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Lk. 23.42.

**Kingdom of God**

But seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." Lk. 12.31.

"But if I by the spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you." Matt. 12.28; Lk. 10.9,11; 11.20.

"And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." Matt. 19.14; Mk. 10.23; Lk. 18.24.

"...Verily I say unto you that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." Matt. 21.31.

"...the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and shall be given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt. 21.43.

"...Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel." Mk. 1.14.

"...Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables." Mk. 4.11.

"...So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up." Mk. 4.26-27.
"How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth, yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof." Mk. 4.30-32; Lk. 13.18,20.

"...Verily I say unto you, There are some of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power." Mk. 9.1.

"And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, cast it out: it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell." Mk. 9.47.

"Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for to such belongeth the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter in." Mk. 10.14,15.

"...Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God." Mk. 10.24.

"Thou art not far from the kingdom of God..." Mk. 12.34.

"...And I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Mk. 14.25.

"There came Joseph of Arimatheae, a councillor of honourable estate, who also himself was looking for the kingdom of God." Mk. 15.43.

"...I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also, for therefore was I sent." Lk. 4.43.

"...Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God." Lk. 6.20.

"...Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of God is greater than he." Lk. 7.28.

"...he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God." Lk. 8.1.

"And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick." Lk. 9.2.
"...Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but go thou and publish abroad the kingdom of God." Lk. 9.60.

"But the multitudes perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he cured." Lk. 9.11.

"But I tell you of a truth, There are some of them that stand here, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God." Lk. 9.27.

"...No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." Lk. 9.62.

"There shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and yourselves cast forth without." Lk. 13.28.

"And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God." Lk. 13.29.

"And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God." Lk. 14.15

"The law and the prophets were until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it." Lk. 16.16.

"And being asked of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said," The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you." Lk. 17.20-21.

"...There is no man that hath left house, or wife, or brethren, or parents, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive manifold more in this time, and in the world to come eternal life." Lk. 18.29,30.

"...he added and spake a parable because he was nigh unto Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear." Lk. 19.11.

"Even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all things shall be accomplished." Lk. 21.31,32.
...with desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I shall not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Lk. 22.15,16.

"I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." Lk. 22.18.

Kingdom of Heaven

"Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt. 3.2; 4.17; 10.7.

"Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5.3,10.

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5.19.

"For I say unto you, except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5.20; 18.3.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." Matt. 7.21.

"And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 8.11.

"...Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he "hat is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Matt. 11.11.

"And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force." Matt. 11.12.

"...Unto you is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." Matt. 13.11.

"...The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that soweth good seed into a field." Matt. 13.24. (a grain of mustard seed, 31); (leaven, 33); (a treasure hidden, 44); (a man seeking goodly pearls, 45); a net cast into the sea, 47); (a householder who hired vineyard laborers, 20.1); (a king who made a marriage feast for his son, 22.2); (ten virgins, 25.1); (a man journeying, who entrusted talents to his servants, 25.14).
"I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 16.19.

"In that hour cometh the disciples unto Jesus saying, Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And he called unto him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 18.1-4.

"But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering in to enter." Matt. 23.13.

One observes that the use of this apocalyptic term "kingdom of God", with its cognates, in its pre-Caesarean placements bore no clear conflict with Jesus' general teaching on the prophetic character and nature of the kingdom. The kingdom was repeatedly referred to as that which challenged the active effort of preaching and teaching, as the inward and ethical doing of the Father's will, and as in no way limited by race. Kingdom truth and kingdom men then were to exhibit the germinating power of good seed sown in the world. The kingdom was definitely connected with the ethical righteousness of God, overcoming the operation of evil within man. It demanded a higher righteousness than legal scribism or Pharisaism. It could be prepared for only by moral repentance. It was the special heritage of the poor in spirit. It could be blocked by the substitution of the outward observance for the inward will.
After the crisis at Caesarea Philippi\(^1\), the nature of the term "kingdom of God" and its cognates is presented as mixed with prophetic elements and an element of apocalyptic intervention.\(^2\) Jesus could still remind men that repentant publicans and harlots would have a better chance entering the kingdom than the unrepentant self-righteous (Matt. 21.31). His nation was missing the kingdom by failure to bring forth its ethical fruits (Matt. 21.43). It was the inward quality of childlikeness toward God that made one great in the kingdom (Matt. 18.1-4; Mk. 9.33-37, 46-48). Yet in those post-Caesarean placements a meaning is also detected which is foreign to the prophetic element.\(^3\) The kingdom will come apparently as a ready-made gift from God out of heaven (Matt. 25.34). It will be consummated by the heavenly Messiah and his celestial agents (Matt. 24.30-31; Mk. 13.26-27; etc.). Mankind will have no part in the transaction. There is no escaping the fact that these late and isolated placements, because of this intervention, contain implications which, if developed, would present Jesus' kingdom as "one divided against itself." But

---

1. Here the order employed is that given in Burton-Goodspeed's A Harmony of the Synoptic Gospels.


3. Winstanley, Jesus and the Future, p. 120; cf. Schweitzer, The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, p. 80.
these implications were not developed. His developed teaching consisted largely in the nature and character of the kingdom rather than in the manner of its coming. He made no effort to change this kingdom nature.¹

(2) "Son of Man" as Messianic Title

The use of the term "Son of Man as a Messianic title (Matt. 24.30; Mk. 13.26; Lk. 21.27; Matt. 25.31) seems to be identified with the apocalyptic portion of Daniel (7.13) or with the language of Ethiopian Enoch (46.3; 48.2; 69.27), or with both. In either case, it seems to represent a debt to apocalyptic literature. Whether this term was uniformly a Messianic title with Jesus², or whether its earlier use belonged to the Old Testament meaning of "Son of Man", indicating man as a member of the human race in distinction from God by reason of finite lowliness³, is of little importance to this thesis. The fact that the latter placements of the term seem to bear the Messianic title establishes Jesus' debt to apocalypticism at this point. Porter claims that Daniel was

probably the source of this Messianic use. On the other hand, Charles argues at length that only Ethiopian Enoch could have supplied the term as a personal Messianic designation.2

(3) Phrases to Denote the Two Ages

In Jesus' use of differentiating phrases to denote the two ages, "this age — that (or the coming) age" (Lk. 20.34, 35; Matt. 12.32; etc.), he was probably following apocalyptic literature. As has been demonstrated, this literature made a clear cleavage between the present age or world and the age or world that was to come.3 While Jesus did not follow apocalypticism in an essential dualism between the two ages in the kingdom operation4, yet in the bare use of the terms for the two ages, he seems to have followed apocalypticism.

c. Signs of the End

The end of the present age and the approach of the new age were to be signalized by various signs, according to apocalyptic literature.5 Jesus may be indebted to this

3. Chapter Three, p. 100f.
5. Chapter Three, p. 105.
literature for a portion of his teaching on these foreshadowing signs of the end. Such signs were common to both prophecy and apocalypse. But in prophecy they were of a general nature; in apocalypse they were both general\(^1\) and especially operative upon the faithful.\(^2\) This apocalyptic two-foldness is portrayed in the late teachings of Jesus. Speaking of Mark 13, Charles says:

> It appears that there are two originally independent series of sayings worked together by the Evangelist in this chapter ... of these two one deals with the persecutions which will befall the disciples of Christ in reference to their faith at the hands of the Jews. ... The woes predicted in the other have no relation to the disciples or their faith.\(^3\)

The apocalyptic emphasis upon the troubles of the faithful is found also in isolated passages (Lk. 12:43-36; 21:34-36; Matt. 24:24; cf. Mk. 13:22). In all these the pressure was represented as so great that the many would not endure but would fall away.

**d. Plan of Future Kingdom Inauguration**

These signs foreshadowing the end led into the operation of the plan for future kingdom inauguration. In Jesus this

\(\text{1. Eth. Enoch 1.5-7; 99.4,5; 102.1,2; Sib. Orac. 3.71f.}

\(\text{2. Eth. Enoch 100.1,2; Sib. Orac. 3.184f; Test. Twelve Patriarchs, Levi, 4.1; Asher 7.2.}

plan seems to represent a chain of indebtedness to apocalypse. The main features of this plan requiring emphasis are: the parousia, the resurrection, the Hessianic judgment, and final destinies.

(1) Parousia

Jesus may be indebted in his teaching on the parousia, or second coming. The manner was to be sudden, unexpected, and outward (Mk. 13.35; Lk. 21.27; Matt. 24.27; 25.1-13; cf. Dan. 7.13; Fourth Ezra 9.3; 6.14-24; Assum. Moses 10.3-7; Eth. Enoch 1.9; Apoc. Bar. 59.9). The extent of the possible debt is here hard to determine. The prophets often pictured the coming of the Day of Yahweh with a similar dramatic vividness, only that it was a crisis in human affairs rather than an intervention from heaven (Isa. 13.6-13; etc.). Perhaps the most noticeable detailed likenesses between Jesus and apocalypse would be the sound of the trumpet in Fourth Ezra, the coming on clouds with the accompaniment of the heavenly host in Ethiopic Enoch 37-70, and the connection with lightning in the Apocalypse of Baruch. 1

(2) Resurrection

Jesus' teaching on the resurrection seems to mark a

further indebtedness. There is no direct mention of the resurrection in the eschatological discourses, but it is affirmed in his reply to the entangling question of the Sadducees; and the report of the words spoken on that occasion belongs to the stream of narrative common to the three Gospels (Matt. 22. 23-33; Mk. 12.18-27; Lk. 20.27-40). Other of his sayings seem to imply it (Matt. 8.11; Lk. 12.38,39). While it is true that such a passage as Isaiah 53.10-12 offered a strong suggestion of immortal life for Israel as God's Suffering Servant, while it is also true that such apocalyptic portions as Isaiah 24, the Book of Daniel, and Job may be interpreted as having taught the return of deceased individuals to life, there was no definite doctrine of the resurrection such as is found in Ethiopian Enoch 91.10; 92.3; Psalms of Solomon 3.16; 13.9; Sibylline Oracles 1.440; 2.274,275; 4.228,229; Apocalypse of Baruch 30.1-5; and Fourth Ezra 7.32. Furthermore, it was this apocalyptic development that gave to the idea a world enlargement although it is hard to say just when and where the enlargement first took place. Qualifications in Jesus' resurrection teaching do not escape the question of his

---


indebtedness. If we should agree with Oesterley¹ and Weiss² that the express teaching of Jesus on the resurrection was limited to the righteous, it is to apocalyptic literature that we must go for the first known presentation of this idea as a set doctrine. If we should further qualify the teaching of Jesus and say with Professor Bailie that Jesus did not teach a corporeal resurrection but rather a resurrection of angelic bodies "made from the light and glory of God", we should have to acknowledge that the first account of such a resurrection is to be found in Ethiopic Enoch 51.4 and 62.15f.³ But it was to the bare idea of the resurrection as a method of immortality that Jesus was indebted. His idea of immortality was not based upon the resurrection and was in no way dependent upon it. Such a thought was made possible for him because his idea of the Father in communion with his children demanded immortality. It could not be imagined by Jesus that lives which mattered to God and with whom he was connected in covenant communion would be allowed to perish. The incongruity of such a thought was thrown into bold relief with the mention of God's connection with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. 22.31,33; Mk. 12.26,27; Lk. 20.37,38).


(3) Messianic Judgment

While the parousia and the resurrection were highly significant in the apocalyptic plan for future kingdom inauguration, the climax of the plan was in the element of judgment which would ensue. In the prophets, this judgment was wrought out by God through human operation.\(^1\) In the apocalypticists, in addition to this prophetic teaching there is the teaching of God's miraculous intervention. In one section of one apocalyptic book (Eth. Enoch 37-70) the Messianic Son of Man would take the place of God as the judge. It seems that Jesus claimed for himself this Enochic position as the Messianic judge (Matt. 25:31; etc.). Like the Messianic figure depicted in Ethiopic Enoch, "he has his place on the throne of God. He is judge and saviour. He condemns the wicked."\(^2\) But it was for the bare idea of the Messianic judgment by the Son of Man that Jesus was indebted. He did not present the same teaching in connection with it. The Enochic teaching involved the Messiah's pre-existence (45:3; 51:2-3; 48:3). This teaching is not present in the synoptic gospels.\(^3\) In Enoch the judgeship was by virtue of pre-existent

\(^1\) Chapter One, p. 38ff.

\(^2\) Eth. Enoch 41.9; 47.3; 51.3; 55.4; 61.8; 62.2-11; 69.27; cf. Charles, Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments, p. 85.

appointment in heaven (46:3; 48:2). With Jesus the judgeship seems to come as the climax of the character and nature of the kingdom for which he made himself the unique spokesman (Matt. 25:36-43).

(4) Final Destinies

The Messianic judgment by the Son of Man ended in the assignment of final destinies. According to the one place in the synoptic gospels where the Messianic judgment scene was developed (Matt. 25:31-46), the king will say to those on his right hand, "Come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (vs. 34) He will also say unto them on his left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." (vs. 41) In Jesus' presentation of the kingdom itself as the final reward, God's gift from heaven, again his idea differed from Ethiopic Enoch 37-70. In Enoch there was no ready made kingdom prepared from the foundations of the world. Rather, heaven and earth would be transformed (45:4,5), and the righteous would dwell therein clad in garments of life (62:15,16), living as angels (51:4), and growing in knowledge and righteousness (58:5).¹ But Jesus' idea of the ready made heavenly kingdom prepared from the foundations of the world

had its correspondence elsewhere in apocalyptic literature. (Cf. Sib. Orac. 3.47,48; Assum. Moses 10.26f)\(^1\) In Luke 23. 43 it was Paradise and not the kingdom that was promised to the thief on the cross. Paradise, as the reward of the just, was a well-known term with the apocalyptists (Fourth Ezra 6.1-3; 52-54; Slav. Enoch 8; etc.).

The place of fire to which Jesus referred in Matthew 25.41 probably meant Gehenna. In the synoptic gospels the word "Gehenna" occurs in different phrases eleven times: "in danger of the Gehenna of fire"; "into Gehenna"; "to cast into Gehenna"; "to go to Gehenna"; or "be cast into Gehenna"; "the damnation of Gehenna"; "the child of Gehenna". The word was common to all three evangelists (Matt. 5.22,29,30; 10.28; 18.9; 23.15,33; Mk. 9.43,45,47; Lk. 12.5). The word "Gehenna" as the destiny of the wicked is repeatedly found in apocalyptic writings (Eth. Enoch 53.3-5; 54.1,2; Assum. Moses 10.10; etc.).\(^2\) The intermediate state (Sheol or Hades) was not taught by Jesus. The term "Hades" was employed three times; two were metaphorical. The third was merely parabolic setting.\(^3\) Yet his allusions to Hades bear similarity to the Hades doctrine in apocalypticism (Cf. Eth. Enoch 99.11; Psa. Sol. 14.6; 15.11; etc.).

---

3. Ibid., pp. 273f; 277f.
Summary

In review, it has been found that the nature of Jesus' kingdom ideals stood in decided contrast to the immediate nature of the apocalyptic kingdom ideals. This is revealed in his slight use of agents, his unitary kingdom operation, his organic conception of history, his inner and ethical kingdom participation, his Fatherhood of God, his ideas of filial ethical fellowship as kingdom purpose and redemptive love as kingdom motive, his picture of God's redeeming activity and its requirements, his universal kingdom scope, his pervading hopefulness, his direct contact with God, and his idea of spiritual power. Yet there was a line of similarity. Both kingdoms were at bottom based upon the moral nature of God. Because of this fact there were a few striking ethical similarities. The specific elements involving the indebtedness of Jesus to the apocalyptists were both indeterminate and definite. There were specific elements held in common with apocalypticism and prophetism, also those held in common with contemporary Pharisaism and apocalypticism. Other specific elements seem to have been in common with apocalypticism alone. In the first class was the general expectation of world-change and of a "coming". In the second class were the role of Satan, demon possession, and certain moral ideas. In the third class were apocalyptic words, the phrases "kingdom of God", "Son of Man", "this age", and "the age to come". Here also
were the apocalyptic treatment of the signs of the end and the apocalyptic plan for future kingdom inauguration. This plan was composed of four leading factors: the parousia, the resurrection, the Messianic judgment, and the final destinies.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT

Introduction: The Use of Both Elements in Jesus

1. List of Prophetic Evidence

There undoubtedly is a prophetic element in Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God. The conclusion is based upon the following considerations:

1. God is now present in the world.
2. The future is the fulfilment of the present.
3. The same moral principles obtain in present and future.
4. These principles present an inward, ethical righteousness.
5. This righteousness is based upon the moral nature of God.
6. These principles are universal in essence.
7. They are purposed in redemptive love.
8. They are wrought out in religious experience.
9. They pre-suppose free will and personal responsibility.
10. God's work involves present teaching activity.
11. It is a work of ultimate hopefulness.
12. Jesus himself exhibits prophetic consciousness.
13. The people regard him as a prophet.

2. List of Apocalyptic Evidence

It is just as true that there is an apocalyptic element in Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God according to records. The following facts indicate this:

1. The use of words common to apocalypticism.
2. The use of apocalyptic phrases.
3. A general expectation of near change instituting a different world order.

1. Chapter Two.
4. The present power of Satan and his demons.
5. The prominent place given to miracles.
6. The apocalyptic signs of the end.
7. The physical, catastrophic parousia.
8. The Messianic judgment scene.
9. The acceptance of the doctrine of individual resurrection.
10. The naming of final destinies.

3. The Conflict Involved

In the prophetic element God is now present in the world; in the apocalyptic element there is the present power of Satan and his demons. In the prophetic element the future is the fulfilment of the present; in the apocalyptic element a near change will institute a different order. In the prophetic element God works through an inward, ethical righteousness conformable with his moral nature; in the apocalyptic element a major method is miracles and miraculous signs of the end. In the prophetic element the kingdom activity is largely that of teaching and the future is conceived as its triumph; in the apocalyptic element instead of the triumph of the teaching process there seems to be its failure remedied by God through a physical, catastrophic intervention. How may one regard, treat, or dispose of these apparent conflicts in the facts in regard to the teaching of Jesus?

1. Chapter Four.
I. Some Principal Ways of Facing the Problem

A. Division of Elements into Different Periods

A study of some principal ways of facing this problem reveals a number of different approaches. There are those who divide the two elements into two different periods. Those who hold this approach follow the Marcan narrative order for the teachings of Jesus. Usually, the crisis at Caesarea Philippi is considered the dividing line. Up until this time Jesus is seen as a prophetic teacher. From this time on he is an apocalyptist. Thus, the bulk of his teaching is prophetic, but the last few weeks are to be regarded as separate from this bulk. They are definitely apocalyptic. (Baldensperger, Carpenter)\(^1\)

B. The Two Elements as Insoluble

A direct counter to this approach is seen in the position held by some that the two elements are insoluble. One can, to be sure, glean elements here and there that have direct prophetic meaning. Others speak directly of an apocalyptic event, but the two elements in general are so intermingled and diffused that it is not now possible to determine precisely what the relationship was.\(^2\) Obviously, this

---


approach rules out all question of division into periods. The intermingling and diffusion of the two elements is heightened by the variety of meanings possible in given instances. It is evident that Jesus himself used apocalyptic speech in a number of ways, sometimes as images, sometimes as framework for prophetic principles, and possibly sometimes as a dramatization of general ethical principles. Add to this the many chances for interpolation, mis-arrangement, and poor translation and one has a situation which really precludes the possibility of ever knowing the actual status of Jesus' mind on these matters. (Stevens, Easton)

C. The Prophetic Emphasis

1. Dominance over Apocalypticism

Others approach the problem from the point of prophetic emphasis. Some of these see this emphasis as a dominance over apocalypticism. There is an element of apocalypticism in Jesus, but it is well-nigh crowded out by Jesus' highly prophetic convictions and purpose. Much of the apocalyptic which now stands in the records was put there by a later age. Jesus' general teachings were too dominantly prophetic to admit them as they stand. Jesus may have entertained some few conceptions derived from the apocalyptists where these

conceptions were obviously in accord with his prophetic convictions, but since much of the apocalyptic teaching recorded of him is at variance with these convictions, they must be discarded or altered. (Wellhausen, Weiffenbach, Julicher, Bacon, Schmiedel, Moffatt)\(^1\)

2. Absorption of Apocalypticism

With many, this prophetic emphasis is carried much further than that of general prophetic dominance. Jesus' prophetic purpose is made to absorb the apocalyptic element. Jesus was never actually apocalyptic. Basic considerations of his thought and general teaching absolutely forbid that he should have had any real part in the apocalyptic movement. All the apocalyptic element has come from later sources, or else must be understood as language adaptation. (Calani, Case, Rall, Bousset, Haupt, Macfarland, Bulcock)\(^2\)

---

1. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, pp. 509-513; Weiffenbach: Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 224, for a summary of Weiffenbach; Julicher, Die Gleichnissreden Jesu; Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, pp. 86, 133; Schmiedel, Jesus in Modern Criticism; Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 208-209.

D. The Apocalyptic Element

1. Dominance over Prophetism

On the other hand there are those who approach the problem from the apocalyptic emphasis. With them the important thing in the teaching of Jesus is his apocalyptic pronouncement. Some of these would not altogether rule out prophetism. They would admit that the prophetic element is present, but they conceive of it as having undergone apocalyptic transformation. This dominant apocalyptic belief of Jesus lays hold upon prophetic ideas and fuses them into itself. They reach a new strength and significance due to their being a part of Jesus' apocalyptic belief. (Charles, Burkitt)¹

2. Absorption of Prophetism

But this dominance over prophetism is not considered a strong enough statement of the facts by a school of thinkers who would interpret Jesus solely on the basis of his apocalyptic eschatology. For them, he had only one mission before the people. That mission was not to teach, but simply and only to announce or herald the approach of the coming kingdom. The teaching was confined to "mysteries" cast in parabolic form and designed only for the predestined. His whole life

and thought were centered in the apocalyptic coming of the kingdom. (Schweitzer, Johannes Weiss, Bundy)

E. The Two Elements as Paradoxical

Thus far it has been seen that the main approaches are argued in opposing ways by scholars. Again, there are those who see the opposition as inherent in the elements themselves. With these, the elements represent two contrasting attitudes which have nothing in common with each other. They are mutually exclusive and irreconcilable. Eduard von Hartmann feels the acuteness of the paradoxical situation to the point of making it evidence of Jesus' psychic abnormality. Wrede sees in the essential groundwork of historical events nothing that would allow or suggest apocalyptic importance. This emphasis is considered by him to be so radically different that nothing in the ministry could have possibly produced it. He considers that it grew up among the disciples as a result of the resurrection "appearances", and that it now stands in

1. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus; Weiss, Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes; Bundy, The Religion of Jesus, p. 122-123; cf. Schmoller, Die Lehre vom Reiche Gottes, etc.; Schnedermann, Reich Gottes, etc.; Issel, Reich Gottes, etc.; Wernle, Die Anfänge unserer Religion; Cone, Rich and Poor in the New Testament.

bold contrast with the rather ordinary teacher-healer.¹

F. The Two Elements as Reconcilable

The opposite point of view to the one just given is that the two elements are thoroughly reconcilable. It is true that the literal return of Jesus is not to be fulfilled, but the idea is not paradoxical, since it is nothing more than Jesus' age-bound way of giving expression to his sure faith in his own certain triumph and the triumph of his cause through the direct operation of the power of God. The principle is the same in relation to all his other apocalyptic ideas. They are the garb of his thought as a first century man. Our age may call for a different expression of the same faith. The form in which the faith is stated in a given age is rather insignificant. (Scott, Harnack, Wendt, Matthews)²

II. A Study of Possible Solutions

A. The Two Elements as Belonging to Different Periods

We have seen that the conflicts in solutions proposed are as marked as the seeming conflicts in the elements themselves. For our own adjustment, we must return to the


original question. How may we regard, treat, or dispose of the apparent conflicts between prophetic and apocalyptic elements in the teaching of Jesus? Do they belong or may they be accounted for as belonging to different periods in his life? It has been seen that the crisis at Caesarea Philippi has been given as the dividing instance, with the previous ministry as prophetic and the latter as apocalyptic.

1. Positive Argument
   a. Nature of Caesarean Crisis
      (1) For Jesus Personally

      The positive argument for this position turns largely upon the nature of the Caesarean crisis. It had vitally to do with Jesus' person and the question of his own immediate future. The incident itself called forth the confession of him as Messiah (Matt. 16.16; Mk. 8.29; Lk. 9.20). Immediately afterward, according to all three synoptists, Jesus began to tell his disciples of the suffering, rejection, and death which lay before him (Matt. 16.21; Mk. 8.31; Lk. 9.22). In the same chapter in each of the evangelists he spoke of the Son of Man's coming "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mk. 8.38; cf. Matt. 16.27; Lk. 9.26) The psychological situation may be viewed as lending some color to the idea that on this occasion Jesus' apocalyptic Messiahship reached an openness and definiteness which it had not hitherto assumed. The storm clouds were gathering. He was probably
already a fugitive from Galilee in retreat from the precipitate 
wrath of the scribes and Pharisees and from the hostility of 
Herod. Probable death was in the offing. Yet in the face 
of this, he was absolutely sure of his own moral and experien-
tial uniqueness with God. How could God allow such an one 
as he to be thus overcome and killed by his enemies? If God 
did so, what was to become of Jesus' very unfinished work? 
The progress of the kingdom had been slow and difficult under 
his heroic leadership. What was he to expect for it if he 
should be taken? Might it be that God, in a miraculous way, 
would intervene and save him from the hands of his enemies? 
Might it be that God, through the death of Jesus and even be-
cause of it, would bring about a speedy and miraculous inter-
vention which would establish the kingdom?

(2) For the Kingdom Teaching

That this crisis stood vitally related to Jesus' king-
dom teaching seems to be argued by the fact that all the 
evangelists place the bulk of the definite apocalyptic teach-
ings after the incident at Caesarea Philippi. In this late 
placement occurs the extended teaching on the coming of the 
kingdom in Luke 17.20-18.8 which has scattered parallels in 
Matthew and Mark. Here, as late as the Passion Week the 
strongly eschatological discourse, much of which is common to 
all three evangelists, was placed. This discourse occupies
two continuous chapters in Matthew (24-25; cf. Mark 13, Luke 21). The range of this discourse covers a group of prominent eschatological ideas. The prediction of the Temple's destruction, the great tribulation, the abomination of desolation, the coming of the Son of Man, the hour that no one knoweth, the parables of the wise servant, the parable of the ten virgins, the parables of the talents, and the Messianic judgment scene are all component parts of the discourse according to Matthew.

b. Tenor of Subsequent Teaching

The post-Caesarean teaching, in general, maintains a considerable tenor of probable apocalypticism according to the Marcan narrative order. Three connected chapters in Luke (12,13,14) deal with the general subject of trustfulness and watchfulness. Again, Luke devotes over three chapters (16-19.28; cf. Matt. 19.3-20.34; Mk. 10.2-52) to parables of warning which involve sudden and catastrophic crisis. The Passion Week, as already said, is largely taken up with discourses on last things. To this may be added the three parables of warning which occur in Matthew 21.28-22.14.

2. Negative Argument

a. General Extent of Apocalypticism

But there are weightier arguments against this division of the two elements into two separate periods. The apocalyptic teaching is not strictly confined to the post-Caesarean place-
ment in the records. Jesus' woes pronounced against certain Galilean cities may be interpreted as his envisioning of a near change instituting a different world condition (Matt. 11. 21f; cf. Lk. 10.13f). His contact with the power of demons is freely taught in the pre-Caesarean records (Mk. 1.34,39; Lk. 4.41; etc.). As he sent out the apostles, according to Matthew 10.23, he gave them the promise that they should not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man had come. According to Matthew 13.36-43, the explanation of the parable of the sower gives an apocalyptic picture of the kingdom consummation by the Son of Man. The predicted persecutions of Matthew 10.16-23 are in harmony with the period of tribulation held by the apocalyptists to precede the kingdom consummation.

b. Weakness of Marcan Narrative Order

An even greater objection to the theory lies in the fact that it is based upon the Marcan narrative order. It may be freely demonstrated that this order employs connections which are ambiguous, rather artificial, and arbitrary.¹ Furthermore, Dibelius shows that some of the traditional phrases used by Mark were formulas of literary connection rather than statements of chronological fact.²

---

2. Dibelius, Gospel Criticism and Christology, p. 32ff.
c. Insoluble Aspects of the Relationship

This theory of the division of the elements into two different periods acts upon the basis that each element is clear, distinct, and entirely separate from the other. As already seen, there are instances and connections wherein no such distinctness or separateness may be found. As will be seen later on, apocalypticism and prophetism maintain a number of historical affinities. Because of this fact, no hard and fast line can be consistently and continuously drawn between them. Prophecy may, at times, become considerably apocalyptic by gradual transition of ideas. Apocalypticism, on the other hand, may, almost imperceptibly, shade out into prophetism. The two often tend to diffuse themselves into each other. For instance, the picturization of the prophetic Day of Yahweh in many particulars is not unlike the apocalyptic picturization of the miraculous intervention.1

d. Other Crises

The division of the two elements into two periods is further weakened by the fact that it usually rests upon the idea that only one crisis could have held vital significance in working a general change in Jesus' thought. On the contrary, there are those who declare that vital changes in Jesus'

thought relevant to the two elements may be found in other crises. His contact with John the Baptist, his experience at baptism, his experience in the temptations, his transfiguration experience, and the crisis at Caesarea Philippi have all been argued as determining points in Jesus' thought both on the prophetic kingdom teaching and on the manner of its fulfilment.  

e. No Determination of the Relationship Either Way

While the arguments against the division of the elements into periods seem far weightier than those in favor of it, the theory itself is not vital to the present problem because it contains no solution of relationship between the elements. Even if it were possible so to divide the elements, we have not disposed of either of them. The questions raised by their apparent conflict are not solved; no relationship or adjustment has been determined between them.

B. The Prophetic Emphasis

Returning to the study of alternatives, can we say that the prophetic element may be made to absorb the apocalyptic or so to dominate as to rule it out or discredit it?

1. Suggestion of Etymological Criticism

a. Lietzmann and Dalman

Critical study on Jesus' use of the title "Son of Man" has furnished us with the suggestion that this designation as an apocalyptic title might be ruled out. Lietzmann has argued that the title "Son of Man" was non-existent in the Aramaic of Jesus' day.¹ If he is correct, naturally, we can dispose of the idea of the Son of Man Messiah as an individual and probably as Jesus himself. Dalman has decided that such a title did exist, but that it was too highly enigmatical to constitute a definite teaching, being used rather as a challenge to further thought upon the question of Jesus' person.²

b. The Untouched Larger Problem

While both Lietzmann and Dalman would tend to rule out the use of the term "Son of Man" as an individual, Messianic title belonging to the apocalyptic plan of kingdom coming, their conclusions are not far-reaching in the solution of our problem. Their positions have not gained general acceptance among scholars. Yet if, on the basis of their arguments, "Son of Man" as a Messianic title should be ruled out, all the other apocalyptic terms, figures, and teachings would remain without

¹ Lietzmann, Der Menschensohn, etc.
adjustment. The problem is much larger than the use of a single phrase.¹

2. Argument of Textual Criticism
   a. Positive Argument
      (1) Little Apocalypse

      There are those who go far beyond the deletion of a phrase, who tend to leave the prophetic emphasis in command of the field by disqualifying sections of the apocalyptic teaching. The "Little Apocalypse" (Mk. 13:7-8, 14-20, 24-27) is often disposed of as the interpolation of a previous Jewish apocalypse.² Others reduce it to a few general eschatological beliefs which have suffered conflation by the evangelists, especially Matthew, perhaps in the interest of ideas current in the early church.³

      (2) Judaistic Tendency of M

      The Judaic tendency of the special source (M) from which Matthew, according to the Four Document hypothesis, derived materials peculiar to his gospel may be viewed as responsible for a portion of his distinct apocalyptic meaning.⁴

Matthew 10.23 may be viewed as the end of a Judaistic version of the Charge to the Twelve. According to Streeter's demonstration, Matthew 10.5-23 is a late conflation of at least two sources, Mark and Q, reflecting a situation which did not come into existence till the missionary journeys of Paul. He considers Schweitzer's argument that Jesus expected the parousia before the return of the twelve from their preaching tour to be fallacious because it depends upon Matthew 10.23 as an exact report of what Jesus said at this time.

(3) Luke's Lighter Emphasis

Along with the idea of disqualifying the "Little Apocalypse" and of somewhat discrediting the special tendencies of Matthew toward apocalypticism, one may place the argument of Luke's lighter emphasis upon apocalyptic teaching. Matthew represents the strongest synoptic emphasis on this teaching while Luke represents the weakest. Matthew's chief idea is to show Jesus to be the Jewish Messiah according to characteristic Jewish expectations. Luke represents more of the Gentile, Hellenic interest in Jesus. Consequently there is less of the distinctly Jewish cast and more of those general attitudes and deeds which would make Jesus the world's friend and saviour.¹ The fact of these differing degrees of

apocalyptic influence within the first age of Christianity shows that the apocalyptic element was not a settled doctrine of uniform significance.

(4) Change of Teaching in John

It is further argued that the apocalyptic teaching in Jesus was not only capable of marked differences in emphasis and significance but that, within the apostolic age itself, it was capable of two entirely different interpretations. The synoptists represent it as a literal hope. The earlier teachings of Paul present the literal hope. (1 Thes. 1.10; etc.) Yet the later teachings of Paul (Phil. 3.20; etc.) are not so literalistic and in them his emphasis upon the coming of Jesus is by no means so pronounced. In John, the transition begun in Paul is completed. Here there is no literal hope of the second coming of Jesus. Instead, there is the coming of the Spirit which has already been fulfilled (John 14.26f).

It may be argued that one of the purposes of the evangelist in the production of this late book was the correction of what to him was a false hope.


b. Negative Argument

(1) Extent of Apocalypticism

None of the arguments on textual criticism which look toward the deletion of apocalyptic sections or the discrediting of the apocalyptic tendency contain a real solution to the problem. The element cannot be ruled out on the basis on spurious text. Our study has demonstrated that the nullifying of the late eschatological discourse or its partial impairment would still leave us with a range of apocalyptic ideas not altered by this process. Jesus' general use of language bears evidence of apocalyptic indebtedness. The idea of the kingdom itself as a separate moral order is apocalyptic. The ideas of the two ages, the power of demons, the signs of the end, and the individual resurrection owe much to apocalypticism. Deletion of text relating to apocalypticism seems largely to be leveled at the apocalyptic parousia, yet this idea is not done away with by the invalidation of the Little Apocalypse. In Jesus' reply to the high priest (Matt. 26.64f; Mk. 14.62f), in the same chapter with Peter's confession (Mk. 8.38; cf. Matt. 16.27; Lk. 9.26), and in the interpretation of the parable of the tares (Matt. 13.36-43), the same idea is apocalyptic. If Matthew's judgment scene is not to be included in the Little Apocalypse (Matt. 25.31-46), we may add this passage to the list. Thus we see that the extent of apocalypticism in language, forms of ideas, and
in the parousia teaching itself is too wide to be dealt with by the method of sectional invalidation or impairment.

(2) Factors in Lighter Emphasis and Changed Interpretation

The fact that in Luke and in the later teachings of Paul there is a lighter emphasis upon the coming of Christ does not necessarily mean any discredit to the genuineness of the literal hope in the teaching of Jesus. Both Luke and Paul were confronted with the practical missionary task of winning the Hellenic world to the gospel. To accentuate distinctively Jewish expectations was not essential to their purpose. The further fact that in the late teaching of Paul and in John there is a marked radical transition in interpretation which in John entirely does away with the second coming does not necessarily invalidate the synoptic teaching about it. It is believed that the early Christian world by this time was becoming somewhat restless over the delay in the coming.¹ To continue emphasis upon the older interpretation would be to stir discontent and misgiving while to accentuate present relationship with the Lord would tend to solve the difficulty.² Even if the complete change of interpretation in John represents his correction of what to him was a false

hope, the weight of his testimony will still have to be considered as against the testimonies of the synoptists. The gospel of John came late. There are a number of important reasons for believing that it was not written by John the Apostle, but rather by John the Elder or by some other John of Asiatic residence in the last decade of the first century. Of course, if this is correct, the testimony loses something of its historical weight. Even if it was written by the apostle, as some contend, the lateness of its production, the philosophical, doctrinaire handling of the person of Jesus, the radically different historical framework of piety intermingled with statements of fact would all tend to place the historical trustworthiness of John's gospel on a different plane than that of the synoptists.

(3) The Danger of Thorough-going Skepticism

When the prophetic emphasis is allowed to rule the field by the excision or depreciation of apocalyptic passages in the synoptics, the operation involved is so major as to suggest a thorough-going skepticism regarding the teachings of Jesus in general. Wrede is a conspicuous example of such

2. Bruce, Apologetics, p. 474f.
a skepticism. He considers that the positive facts concerning Jesus compose nothing more than a brief historical framework and that his sayings are the result of a later developing dogma. He attributes the apocalyptic Messianism of Jesus to the effect wrought upon the minds of the disciples through the resurrection appearances.

3. Argument of General Theological Teaching

Not only is the prophetic element emphasized by the exclusion or the discredit of apocalyptic teaching, but it is also emphasized on the basis of the over-mastering power and significance of the prophetic element itself.

a. Positions of Various Scholars

Bousset considers that Jesus' estimation of the present precludes apocalypticism with its emphasis upon the future. His present experience of life and joy in it preclude the spirit of renunciation inherent in apocalypticism. Weiffenbach feels that the element of apocalypticism is too sensuous to be congruent with the inner, spiritual nature of Jesus. Wellhausen declares that it was Jesus' central purpose to establish an ideal fellowship with and among men. He sees no

2. Bousset, Jesus, p. 130f.
3. Weiffenbach, Der wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu.
place for apocalypticism in such a purpose.\(^1\) Julicher argues that Jesus' conception of present kingdom developments forbids apocalypticism.\(^2\) C.H. Dodds denies any occasion for apocalypticism on the ground that Jesus' parables present a "realized" eschatology. The seemingly apocalyptic is reduced to symbols of realities beyond human comprehension.\(^3\) Case sees the nature of Jesus as too quiet and reticent to have given himself any place in the apocalyptic program. He only held a few general eschatological beliefs.\(^4\) Rall sees Jesus' idea of God as too ethical and loving to admit the apocalyptic interpretation.\(^5\)

b. Their Fundamental Fallacy

There is weight in all such arguments. All of them illustrate the power and centrality of Jesus' prophetic purpose. But they may not be accepted as the conclusion of the problem. To nullify or to disqualify entirely the apocalyptic element on the basis of the prominence of another element is not good exegesis nor is it a fair interpretative


process or method. Further, it is not good psychology. We may not assume that we can know ahead of time exactly what belief or position a person may take in a given instance or situation by virtue of his belief or position in other instances or situations. Who is to say with absolute assurance what it is possible or impossible for one to believe under any or all circumstances?

c. Evidence from Developments

Good exegesis or interpretative process applied to the apocalyptic element was hardly possible until the pioneer works of Hilgenfeld and Dilmann. From then on our developing knowledge of the apocalyptic literature of the inter-testamental period has placed us in possession of materials which enable us to make some detailed comparisons between what Jesus taught and what they taught. Now, numerous and sometimes exact similarities in thought and word structure may be traced. To absorb this, to deny it, or so to dominate it as to invalidate it, one would have to lift Jesus out of the age to which he belonged or else to employ a kind of exegesis or interpretative method which, in any other connection, would be readily considered as neither sound nor fair.

1. Hilgenfeld, Die judische apokalyptik, etc., 1857; Dilmann, Das buche Henock, etc., 1853.

2. Charles, Religious Development between the Old and New Testaments, pp. 147-158.
d. Position of Early Church

Moreover, such arguments leave the early church with apocalyptic conceptions without inner tradition or authority at the very time that Judaism is beginning to drop it. With the fall of Jerusalem and the still greater disaster of the rebellion of Bar-cochba, Judaism became an entirely self-centered religion, dominated by the idea that the Law must be observed. During this period, it was the Christian community that preserved the former apocalyptic hope and literature.\(^1\) How shall we maintain that she was led to do this in the face of her environment if not on the strength of her own inner tradition and authority from the teachings of Jesus? This argument gathers force as one considers that the literal hope of Jesus' coming was not a subordinate belief. The expectation of the speedy coming of the Lord was a central hope of the early Jerusalem congregation.\(^2\) Like the early disciples generally, Paul in his earlier epistles emphasized the near coming of Christ and the end of the existing world order. Though his views underwent some modification, he evidently believed in a literal coming within his own lifetime according to his earlier epistles.\(^3\)

3. Ibid., p. 32.
C. The Apocalyptic Emphasis

1. General Teaching as Kingdom Announcement

Since there are a number of important reasons why the prophetic emphasis may not be made so to dominate the apocalyptic element as to nullify it, discredit it, or absorb it, we may ask, Can the apocalyptic element be made to absorb or so to dominate the prophetic element as to rule it out or to impair it? It has been seen that such attempts have been made. It has been said that, beyond the parables and ethical instructions, Jesus' general teaching before the people is mere kingdom announcement.¹ Can this general teaching be confined to the heralding of an approaching kingdom?

a. An Admission of an Announcement Element

To be sure, Jesus did begin his ministry with the great announcement, "The kingdom of God is at hand." (Matt. 4.17; Mk. 1.15) A portion of his work did consist in proclamation. He published abroad the tidings of the kingdom of God (Matt. 4.23; etc.). Much of his later teaching, according to the records, did involve the presentation of the fact of the approaching kingdom. But when this element of announcement is considered to be the one general purpose of Jesus before the people at large, one meets very serious objections.

¹ Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 351-352.
b. Arguments against the General Theory

(1) Statements beyond Announcement

If his only purpose in the general teaching before the people was that of kingdom announcement, why should he have directly coupled this announcement with repentance? (Matt. 4. 17; Mk. 1. 15) If, with this work of heralding, there was no intention of winning men for his message but only of making them aware of what was soon to follow, why should his call to repentance be as general as his declaration of the kingdom's approach? If it is contended that this was only a part of the announcement plan, not expected actually to change the inner conditions of people from the masses, there is the answer, then, that it failed in its intention. According to the records, there was a measure of response. (Lk. 19. 1-10; Mk. 2. 1-12; and parallels; Lk. 23. 41-43)

Further, the so-called general announcements of the kingdom's approach included, as has been seen, a rather full description of the kind of kingdom that was coming and the requirements for admission therein. It was to be a kingdom founded upon the ethical nature of God. As such, it required an inner, ethical righteousness. In essence, it was universal, looking beyond distinctions of race or nation. It was posited upon God's purpose of redemptive love. Its principles were wrought out in experiential contact between God and his people. It presupposed free will and personal responsibility.
It was a kingdom implying present moral challenge and personal activity. It was actuated by the spirit of hope. Such teachings were not confined to his injunctions on present conduct nor to his parables. One would certainly not expect to gain so much kingdom information from one who only meant to be its herald. Least of all, would one expect to receive so much insistence upon the necessary conditions of personal entrance to the kingdom. (Matt. 5-7:27; Lk. 6:20-26, 27-36, 37-42, 43-39; etc.)

(2) Evidence of a Present Kingdom

The idea of Jesus as only a herald for the approaching kingdom in his general sayings before the people carries with it a denial of the present kingdom. Yet there is strong evidence that Jesus taught a present kingdom, a kingdom that he himself was inaugurating in his ministry. It may be argued that Jesus, as a healer and miracle-worker, presented further evidence that he was the mediator of a new regime. Satan's subjects immediately recognized Jesus and, full of fear, hurled imprecations at him (Mk. 5:6f; Lk. 8:28f). He had bound Satan and plundered his house. (Matt. 12:29; Mk. 3:27; Lk. 11:21-22) When John the Baptist was identified with

1. Chapter Two.
2. Chapter Two, pp. 59-61.
Elijah, whose return was to precede the new order, the beginning of Jesus' public career was assumed to be the immediate appearance of the new age. How can Jesus be the mere herald or announcer of that which is already present in the earth and which it is his own particular function to inaugurate?

(3) Spirit of Invitation

The spirit of personal invitation, entreaty, and appeal found in Jesus' teaching before the people is a denial of the theory that his purpose toward them was fulfilled in announcement. His would-be disciples were invited to become "fishers of men". (Mk. 16.15) In a parable, the servant was entreated to go out into the highways and bid men to the wedding feast (Matt. 22.9). Jesus was enthusiastic over the harvest-like response to his message on one occasion, and entreated his disciples to pray for ready reapers willing to labor (Matt. 9.37,38). In Matthew 11.28 he invited the multitude with the impressive words, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." On another occasion he made this inviting, entreating, appealing spirit central to his mission. He was come to seek and save that which was lost (Lk. 19.10). This spirit agreed with his personal compassion for the multitudes (Matt. 9.36), which led him to heal

their sick and provide food for their hunger (Matt. 14.14-21). Such facts as these can hardly be made to fit the picture of one whose only relation to the people at large was that of official announcer or herald.

(4) Implications in Jesus' Laments

Even the laments of Jesus in the face of popular rejection implied that he had hoped to be a determining factor in the lives and destinies of the people (Matt. 11.21f; Lk. 10.13f; Matt. 23.37-39). Bethsaida and Chorazin had been visited with a greater present opportunity than had ever come to Tyre or Sidon. Jerusalem had missed her chance to be gathered, sheltered, and secured "as a hen gathereth her chicks under her wings."

2. Ethical Instructions as Interim-ethic

a. An Admission of a Possible Element

Along with the idea that Jesus' general sayings before the people must be taken as mere kingdom announcements is placed the further idea that his injunctions on present conduct are merely an interim-ethic, designed to offer a few practical regulations for the control of the conduct of kingdom heirs until the kingdom should appear. It may be admitted that there are a few statements which may possibly be

considered as such an interim-ethnic. Emmet believes that we may have a touch of this kind of ethic in the statement that we should take no thought for the morrow (Matt. 6:34), and in the idea that one taking a coat should be allowed to have a cloak also (Matt. 5:40; Lk. 6:29).^1

b. Arguments against the General Theory

(1) Confusion of Terms: Interim-ethnic, Ethic for Interim

Yet when one tries to compress all the ethical teaching of Jesus into the strict implications of an interim-ethnic, he confronts heavy obstacles. First, there is a real difference between an interim-ethnic and an ethic for an interim. Here there seems to be a confusion of terms. If it were admitted that Jesus taught an ethic for an interim, it would not necessarily follow that he taught an interim-ethnic. Even if a principle of conduct should be given with particular regard to a time period, it may not be bound to the period for which it was originally intended. A common saying with us is that we should live each day as though it were the last. We certainly do not mean by this that we propose to change our principles so as to make them the principles of a single day. The idea that our opportunity in applying them may be limited to a day serves only to heighten and intensify the

^1 The Eschatological Question in the Gospels, p. 56f.
ethical issue but not to change it.  

(2) Jesus' Ethical Purpose

Secondly, the interim-ethic theory tends to picture Jesus as a giver of rules. He sought to codify, to legislate, to prescribe the stipulations that should determine the detailed conduct of his group for the interval until the coming of the kingdom. Yet the general study of his teaching has shown that he had small sympathy with legalistic righteousness, and that his constant appeal was to the inward spirit of the new life. It was in this sense that Paul regarded him as the end of the Law to everyone that believeth. (Rom. 10.4) No longer the stricture of the letter but the constraint of the inner spirit is the primary law according to Christ.

(3) The Timeless and Universal in Jesus

Because Jesus' ethical teaching appealed to the inward spirit of man and sought to create and shape his motives in terms of his filial relationship to God and his fraternal relation to man, it is filled with timeless and universal elements. Love, truth, goodness, brotherhood, personal purity, patience, forgiveness, etc. bear no time period label. In

1. Rashdall, Conscience and Christ, p. 61f.
2. Chapter Four, p. 160f.
their very nature, they belong to no particular system of eschatology. Rather, they belong to the elemental needs for the well-being and promotion of human life itself. It is this element that so distinguished the ethical teaching of Jesus.¹

(4) Jesus' Ethical Basis

This timeless and universal element so conspicuous in the ethical teaching of Jesus is based upon the ethical nature of God. Here, the interim-ethic theory meets its most formidable obstacle. When it seeks to absorb this teaching into a mere temporary plan of conduct looking to the apocalyptic inbreak, it has not sufficiently weighed the real basis of Jesus' ethical teaching. This basis is not in any way dependent upon the manner whereby the kingdom is to be established, nor on the nearness of the time, nor on any other apocalyptic consideration. Our studies have demonstrated that Jesus' ethical teaching was based on the ethical nature of God because of his prophetic viewpoint.² Men were to forgive because God is forgiving. Men were to be pure in heart because only thus could they spiritually see God. Men were to be peacemakers because such an ethical attitude belongs to the spiritual kinship relation as his children. His disciples were commanded to love enemies and to pray for those despitefully

². Chapters One and Two.
using them in order that they might show themselves to be sons of their Father (Matt. 5:44f; Lk. 6:27,35). An ethic cannot be interim-bound when it is the direct translation of the character and nature of God into terms of human conduct.

(5) The Effect on the Early Church

The validity of our whole line of argument against the interim-ethic theory is illustrated in the fact that the early church did not act according to the implications of the theory. They did not receive these injunctions as a mere provision for a passive continuance of a rather static form of life which was merely to maintain its existence for a little while. Rather, through this teaching they continued the evangelizing, teaching crusade which Jesus had begun. It in no way interfered with the gospel's penetration into new territory, with the establishment of new churches, nor even with the teaching development of the ethic itself.1

3. Parabolic Teaching as Kingdom Mystery

a. A Slight Justification for the Theory

Since the apocalyptic attempts to rule out the prophetic element in Jesus' general purpose for the people at large and in his specific injunctions on conduct have been found to be largely untenable, we ask if there is any further idea for the absorption or disqualification of the prophetic element by

1. Emmet, The Eschatological Question, etc., p. 57f; Deissmann, Paul, pp. 223-258.
means of the apocalyptic emphasis. One more such approach would rule out the parables from Jesus' prophetic teaching. As has been seen, a considerable portion of Jesus' ethical, prophetic element comes in the form of parables. It is contended that this element in the parables was nothing more than the disclosure of the kingdom mysteries designed especially and only for the understanding of those predestined for the apocalyptic kingdom.¹ There is a slight justification for this position. Several times the parables are presented with interpretation (Matt. 13.47-50; 13.24-30, 37-43; 11.16-19; Lk. 7.31-35; etc.)² In the one incident of the parable of the sower, we encounter the non-understanding of the parables and the subsequent disclosure of meaning to the disciples (Matt. 13.10-17; Mk. 4.11-20; Lk. 8.10-15) in relation to an utterance which, taken alone, is capable of bearing a doctrine of predestination (Matt. 13.11; Mk. 4.11; Lk. 8.10). But when we try to compress the teaching significance of every parable into this single mould, we meet insuperable difficulties.

b. Arguments against the Theory

(1) Other Meanings in Basic Instance

First, the one basic instance, in its Matthean form,

¹ Schweitzer, The Mystery of the Kingdom of God.

² Cf. Cadeau, The Parables of Jesus, pp. 15-42, for the inconsistencies of such interpretations and the argument that they are the work of the evangelists.
is itself capable of other meanings. Bruce views it as teaching that Jesus resorted to parables in order to remedy the non-understanding of the masses, and at the same time complimented the disciples because they were able to understand without this device.¹ Buttrick holds that the intention of Jesus was to quicken the hearers into self-examination. Hence, the first words of the story challenged the attention - "Harken!" The last word repeated the challenge - "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."² Others see in it the accentuation of a well-known truth, that improper hearing may harden against future responsiveness while attentive hearing increases the capacity of responsiveness.³ Secondly, this theory in its one basic instance, according to Mark and Luke, hangs largely upon the difference between two Greek conjunctions which could easily represent an error in text or a misunderstanding of the evangelists.⁴ In Matthew, Jesus speaks in parables because (οὐχί) seeing they do not see; which may naturally mean that they are dull of apprehension, therefore I do my best to enlighten them. But in Mark and

2. Buttrick, The Parables of Jesus, p. 41.
Luke, Jesus speaks in parables in order that (*-:* seeing they may not see. Here the purpose of the parable seems to be that the people should not understand.

(2) An Acknowledgement of Parabolic Inadequacy

Not only does this theory hang largely upon one instance which is capable of other interpretations and which turns upon the difference between two Greek conjunctions, but the theory is acknowledged to be inadequate for the explanation of all parables.¹ It is admitted that it does not explain the parables of the pearl of great price (Matt. 13.45,46), nor does it explain the group of parables dealing with coming judgment (Matt. 25.1-13, 14-30; Lk. 16.1-13, 19-31; etc.). Why should Jesus make an exception of these parables? If he knew that the truth which he offered was exclusively for those who had been definitely predestined, that the general and public understanding of his message could only thwart the plans of God, why should he abandon his method of mystery on any occasion? The chosen were already receiving their salvation from God.² Why should he present to the multitudes a man who discovered for himself the value of the kingdom as that of a lordly pearl and who forthwith provided for his possession of it? Why should Jesus come down to plain speech

¹. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 351f.
². Ibid., p. 333.
in his parables of warning? What has a moral warning to do with the mere announcement of the kingdom to those predestined to exclusion?

(3) Limitation of Kingdom Message to Parables

The theory proceeds upon the unwarrantable position that the real message of Jesus on the kingdom is uniquely contained in the parables alone. Do the temptations of Jesus teach us nothing about the inner message of the kingdom? Do the controversies of Jesus with the scribes and Pharisees concerning ceremonial and ethical righteousness teach nothing about the kingdom? Has the Matthean sermon on the mount no bearing on the real message of the kingdom? Jesus once spoke of his miracles as "The kingdom of God come upon you". (Matt. 12:28; Lk. 11:20) Are these miracles unrelated to the message of the kingdom because they are not parabolic? It is significant to recall that Jesus' reply to the query of John the Baptist has nothing to say about parabolic mysteries. Here apparently his works are his evidence that he is the coming one (Matt. 11:4-6; Lk. 7:22-23). Would it be natural to say that a thing which proves Jesus' distinctive place in the kingdom is, nevertheless, unrelated to the kingdom message?

1. Schweitzer, The Mystery of the Kingdom of God; Dodd, C.H., Parables of the Kingdom.
(4) Parabolic Frequency and Jesus' Popularity

The very frequency of Jesus' parables considered in connection with the general popularity of his message tells against any general purpose of hiddenness. At least forty-three times he employed this device. According to bulk alone, they make up a large element in Jesus' teaching. According to the arrangement of the records, they apparently were not confined to any particular time in Jesus' ministry nor to any particular type of occasion.¹ Is it probable that so large a dealer in "hiddenness" should have drawn the multitudes and should have received popular acclaim as a prophet? Flavius Josephus informs us that the common people heard Jesus gladly.² This would certainly seem to indicate that any teaching method used by him to considerable extent must have contributed to their mental and spiritual enrichment.

D. The Two Elements as Paradoxical

From this brief survey, it may be concluded that no attempt to rule out or discredit the prophetic element by means of a dominant apocalyptic element is tenable. Since it has already been seen that the prophetic element may not take this course with the apocalyptic, one concludes that neither element may discredit, absorb, or rule out the other. How

then shall these two elements be considered in relation to each other? Are the two elements unalterably paradoxical? Are they mutually and necessarily exclusive?

1. Positive Arguments
   a. Miraculous Intervention

To a certain extent, they are paradoxical. They each present a different method or manner for the kingdom's coming. The prophetic suggests that the kingdom will come through an educative, evangelizing process.¹ It is now inwardly growing in the world. With time and continued human compliance with divine conditions, it will reach its own inward consummation in full growth, maturity, and fruition. This consummation will involve the spirit of crisis in human affairs, but will be accomplished entirely by God through human means. The apocalyptic element had a very different method or manner of kingdom coming. Instead of an educative, evangelizing process of development, there was to be an outward, physical, catastrophic and miraculous intervention of the celestial world. This took the form of a material coming of the Son of Man.

1) Vividness of Language

That this is so may be argued in various ways. First, the language is most vivid. The characteristic word employed

¹. Chapter One, pp. 43-45.
by Jesus for the advent of the apocalyptic kingdom is

The kingdom will shine out, will reveal itself instantaneously. Some of the most solemn warnings of Jesus derive their whole weight and impressiveness from the thought of the suddenness of the consummation. It will leap as from ambush (cf. Lk. 12.37-48). While men are in the midst of their ordinary work and pleasure, apprehensive of nothing, the great day will overwhelm and separate them. (ὁ εἰς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ ὁ εἰς αφέται Matt. 24.40) The kingdom will burst like the flood in the days of Noah on a careless generation (Matt. 40.38-39; Lk. 17. 26-27). All in a moment, it will flash like lightning from one side of heaven to the other.

(2) Historical Relationship and Early Christian Belief

That a literal and physical coming is taught by Jesus may be further argued by the fact that in the text it stands related to two historical situations. The apocalyptic eschatology pictured the heavenly intervention as preceded by a historical period in which there would be many signs and portents of the approaching end.¹ The intervention taught by Jesus will be so preceded.² The implication is that the intervention will be as real a fact in the physical world as

the signs preceding it. Again, Jesus closely connects the coming with the fall of Jerusalem (Matt. 24.1-14; etc.). It is not easy to distinguish fully between the two predictions. It is probable that Jesus believed that the coming would take place immediately after the fall.\(^1\) Apparently it was the further development in the chain of historical sequences. Because of such indications that the coming would be an outward and physical manifestation, the early Jerusalem church ardently awaited the return of Jesus (Acts 1.11; etc.). While it is argued that this expectation of the early church crept into it after the ministry of Jesus, when we consider that this faith was cherished by it at the very time when all apocalyptic teaching was being deserted by Judaism\(^2\), it is more natural to suppose that their attitude rested upon an inner tradition and authority, the teaching of Jesus himself.

(3) Textual and Psychological Support

As in the case of the general apocalyptic element, the argument for Jesus' belief in a literal coming may not be eradicated by means of textual criticism. The supporting passages belong to all three evangelists, though Matthew and Mark contain considerably more than Luke, and Matthew more

---

than Mark. The elimination of the Little Apocalypse will not do away with the teaching. There are still left, on practically indisputable grounds, such sayings as those of Matthew 16.27f; 26.29,64; 10.23; 19.28f and parallels.¹ The textual recurrence of the idea suggests that there were factors in Jesus' environment which encouraged the hope. Such factors may well be argued. First, there was the historic opportunity for Jesus to have been imbued with apocalyptic ideas. The apocalyptic movement was well under way both as a literature and as a popular hope before Jesus' day.² Secondly, Jesus' personal situation may be viewed as suggesting an apocalyptic solution. When we consider his own sense of moral and spiritual uniqueness with God, when we recall the gathering storm clouds with their meaning of possible death, when we enter into the dilemma as to why God should allow his seeming defeat and possible death at the hands of his enemies with his work far from done, we can understand how he may have come to believe that such a precipitate action of God might vindicate him and establish his work.³

b. Evidences of Intervention as Paradoxical

This literal, miraculous intervention stands in a paradoxical relationship to Jesus' teaching as a whole. This method of establishing the kingdom partakes of the contrast between Jesus' prophetic message and apocalypticism in general.\footnote{1} First, the place of angels is prominent. They form the heavenly host which accompanies him. At his command, they gather in his elect from the four winds. Secondly, there is a prominent use made of material things. He comes on the clouds. His coming is announced with a great trumpet sound. He sits on a throne. A physical scene is prepared before him as the nations are hurled together. He himself conducts a physical separation between them, making up those on the right hand and those on the left. Thirdly, the idea of power is physical. He is the judge because he is the central figure of the inbreak. The nations are gathered because the angels bring them. They are divided because the Son of Man separates them. Fourthly, the plan is rather mechanical. It is preceded by natural convulsions, persecutions, and apostasy as required by the apocalyptists. The parousia is synchronous with the moment of greatest tribulation. Angels, clouds, a trumpet, a judge, and a crowd witness the apocalyptic conformity. This display

\footnote{1} Chapter Four, p. 174-175.
of mechanical, physical, material power fortified by a host of angels is certainly a different picture from that of the prophetic teaching which revolted against the merely formal and mechanical in current Pharisaism (Matt. 23.1-12; etc.), which repudiated the idea of establishing a kingdom on physical force (Matt. 4.7-10; etc.), and continually taught the danger of material domination (Lk. 16.19-31; etc), with its chief representative distinguished for his sheer intimacy and directness of connection with God and man.  

Fifthly, the very idea of celestial intervention as the method of kingdom establishment is paradoxical. It runs counter to the passages which deal with growth development. It forms no logical connection with the evangelizing, missionary task as the work of God for man and by man. It does not comport with the idea of a present kingdom on the earth. It does not fit the essential hopefulness and the power of human faith so taught and practised by Jesus.

---


2. Mais il est impossible d'admettre que Jésus a eu en vue un règne spirituel, une régénération s'opérant pour les hommes et par les hommes, qu'il a été le plus éclairé et le plus puissant des réformateurs religieux, prévoyant et dominant l'avenir, et qu'il a prêché en même temps une intervention de Dieu destructrice de la nature elle-même, et qui ferait disparaître ainsi le terrain d'expériences où devait croître la morale nouvelle. LaGrange, La Vie de Jesus d'après Renan, p. 105. (Troisième Edition)
2. Modifying Arguments

a. Reconcilable Features within the Intervention

But this single instance of paradoxical teaching is somewhat relieved by modifying features within the teaching itself which continue the prophetic emphasis. The late parables of apocalyptic warning do not allow their emphasis upon the coming to foreshadow their ethical messages. Instead, this message is given added significance by the thought of the near coming. The parable of the two sons (Matt. 21.28-32) is directed against the pretext of honoring God in our lives and than failing utterly in the test of deeds. The parables of the cruel vine dresser (Matt. 21.33-41; Mk. 12.1-9; Lk. 20.9-16) accentuates the fact that men are trustees of God's estate, that they are morally free in their response to the divine owner, but that their accountability is sure. Their doom is the effect of ethical unfaithfulness. The parable of the great feast portrays the moral demands of God as an invitation to man's own high felicity (Lk. 14.15-24). Man's excuses in declining such an invitation are invalid. God will bestow his blessing only on condition of unqualified and unhesitating conformity to his will. This condition is elemental and without favor. In the parable of the wedding robe (Matt. 22.11-14) the man without the wedding robe was punished because of his wilful lack of conformity to the will and probably to the provision of the host. He had
taken his connection with the affair in a spirit of rude lightness. In the parable of the ten virgins (Matt. 25.1-13) it is the present bearing of the light-giving oil that insures a joyful entry. It is present spiritual power that will stand one in hand at the crisis. The parable of the talents (Matt. 25.14-30) with its parallel parable of the pounds (Lk. 19.11-27) teach that future reward is only the inevitable outcome of present ethical faithfulness. Even Matthew's scene of the last judgment (Matt. 25.31-46) presents a norm of judgment which keeps closest company with Jesus' general teaching on God's redemptive love and our duty to imitate it. In so doing, we are serving him (vs. 40).

b. Reconcilable Features in the Late Records

Not only are these reconcilable features within the teaching concerning the intervention, but the late records in general bear evidence of the same kind of ethical reconcilability. Among these late records are to be found the parables of the ninety and nine (Matt. 18.12-14), the unforgiving servant (Matt. 18.21-35), the lost sheep (Lk. 15.1-7), the lost coin (Lk. 15.8-10), and the lost son (Lk. 15.11-32). Not only is this reconcilability in the parables of the late record in general, but also in the direct teachings. According to the Marcan narrative framework, even the Passion Week bears ample testimony to Jesus' prophetic emphasis. In the cursing of the fig tree (Matt. 21.20-22; Mk. 11.20-25) Jesus
is concerned that his disciples understand the extent to which God may become a present helper through their obedient faith. In the cleansing of the Temple (Matt. 21.12-17; Mk. 11.15-19; Lk. 19.45-48) Jesus is deeply concerned for the purity and spirituality of worship. In the late controversy with the Pharisees concerning the resurrection (Matt. 22.23-33; Mk. 12.18-27; Lk. 20.27-38) Jesus, for the only time, gives his argument for a blessed and personal immortality. This argument is based upon religious experience which was a characteristic of prophetic idealism. Again, during the Passion Week, according to the Marcan order, Jesus entered into a general denunciation of the scribes and Pharisees because of their substitution of outward ostentation for inward ethical righteousness (Matt. 23.1-12; Mk. 12.38-40; Lk. 20.45-47).

E. The Two Elements as Reconcilable

1. An Admission of One Exception

Since this ethical prophetic emphasis is constant in both the earlier and later placements in the record and even within the parousia teaching itself, must it be concluded then that the two elements are thoroughly reconcilable? To be sure, they are far more reconcilable than is ordinarily considered. This has been shown already. But they are not entirely so. We have already found it necessary to admit one exception, the parousia teaching as a celestial intervention.
a. A Matter of Method

Yet it is well to consider that this one exception is purely a matter of method. It is not essential to the teaching of the kingdom itself. This teaching looked toward the certain triumph of the kingdom. One of its characteristics was hopefulness. But it is in no way dependent upon any particular means or method for the realization of its goal. On the contrary, it inculcates an implicit trustfulness in God and an unquestioning reliance upon him to take care of all matters beyond our human control but effecting our personal welfare (Matt. 6.19-34; 7.7-11; 10.24-32). Jesus may have considered that in the light of the moral emergencies involved in his personal situation and that of the future of the kingdom it might be compatible with the will of God to act through such physical means. But here again the appeal would be to God himself, and Jesus' attitude would be that which he taught, the ultimate consignment of all such arrangements into the Father's hands with the confidence of his faithfulness.

b. Its Subordinate Place

(1) One Phase of One Teaching from Apocalyptic Methodology

That this intervention occupies a relatively subordinate place in the teaching of Jesus may be illustrated in several ways. First, it is only one phase of one teaching from apocalyptic methodology. Intervention is not the only method of kingdom coming presented in apocalyptic literature (Bar.
Within the idea of intervention the coming of the Messiah is only one phase. This phase is to be found only in the Similitudes of Enoch (37-70). Usually, God himself is the one who intervenes (Eth. Enoch 25.3; 90.18; etc.). Sometimes there is no central figure in the intervention (Jub. 23.26-31; etc.). It is hardly to be expected that Jesus meant to pivot his message on an element which has so small and so slight a part in the body of thought from which it is derived.

(2) Its Place in the Records

It seems quite evident that the evangelists did not consider the teaching of the intervention as strategic to the general understanding of Jesus. Else, why should they have placed his definite pronouncements on intervention within the last few weeks of his life? While it may be argued that there are possible hints and suggestions of the intervention in the earlier records, the very fact that their general teaching and significance does not demand the thought of intervention is rather conclusive proof that this idea is not vital to the general comprehension of Jesus. Furthermore, there is a relative scarcity of definite intervention teaching. Much of Jesus' teaching concerning the coming of the kingdom does not in any way prescribe its intervention. As already seen

this teaching could be made to coincide with the prophetic idea of the Day of Yahweh as a crisis in human affairs.¹ Our investigations have shown that the Little Apocalypse and a few scattered sayings of the last weeks practically exhaust all that may be found concerning the apocalyptic intervention of the Son of Man.

(3) Its Non-essential Relationship to the Kingdom Message

That this teaching of intervention is non-essential to the kingdom teaching as a whole becomes evident as we recall some of Jesus' foremost teaching topics. The duty of forgiveness, the inwardness of true righteousness, God's provident care, the power of faith, the principles of kingdom blessedness, the divine value of the individual, the duty of neighborliness, the need of repentance, and the redemptive love of God are all among those major teaching topics of which Jesus was most fond.² None of them depend upon miraculous intervention. Even the parables of direct apocalyptic warning make no point of the intervention. Their messages would not need any kind of change if the element of intervention were turned into God's sudden judgment in the course of human affairs.

1. Chapter Two, p. 94.
2. Arguments for General Reconcilability

a. Historic Affinities between the Two Types of Thought

(1) Common Concern for Historical Connection

Having admitted the one minor instance of paradox, we are now ready to present the arguments for general reconcilability. In order that the arguments may be viewed in their historical perspective, we shall begin by reviewing the historical affinities between the two types of thought. Both types of thought are concerned with historical connections. Again and again the prophets present their message in relation to Israel's past (Isa. 5.1-7; Jer. 11.1-10; Hos. 11.1-4; Amos 2; etc.). They see the organic relationship between what has been and what shall be. The apocalyptists are greatly concerned with historical connection, though with them these connections present a mechanistic rather than an organic relationship. In this concern they are more ambitious than the prophets in that their historical comparisons and predictions are on a much wider scale. A scheme of the succession of nations to world rulership is outlined which, in a sense, has the character of a philosophy of history.¹ By this philosophy of history, mysteries and problems are explained. Men understand God's plan of creation (Eth. Enoch 72.82; etc.). They learn the causes of present evil in the world (Eth. Enoch 6-16). They foresee the end of evil (First Vision of Ezra).

---
They are able to place their present as immediately on the
threshold of final victory and deliverance. 1

(2) Common Concern for Unfulfilled Prophecy

Not only have both prophetism and apocalypticism a
common concern for historical connections, but in this treat-
ment both seek to provide the fulfilment of unfulfilled pro-
phecy. Obviously, there would not be so much of this element
in prophecy itself. Prophecy contained two chief predictions,
that of judgment upon Israel and that of its restoration.
The prediction of judgment had been fully realized in the
exile, but the hope of restoration had not been realized in
the return. Thus, a dealing with unfulfilled prophecy by the
prophets themselves would necessarily be limited on the whole
to the late post-exilic writers. Faced with the apparent
failure of the glorious prophecies of restoration, Ezekiel
seeks to show the prophetic fulfilment through a miraculously
transformed land and a miraculously changed human heart (36.
24-31, 33-38). A final, vain assault by the wild horsemen
of Gog from the land of Magog will fulfill the predictions of
Jeremiah and Zephaniah, and prove the security of the city in
which God himself dwells (39.1-7). Many apocalyptic passages
deal with unfulfilled prophecy. For instance, there are a
number of fanciful calculations based upon Jeremiah's pre-

diction of restoration after seventy years which aim to explain and justify his prediction; Dan. 9 may serve as illustration. Here the seventy years are reckoned as seventy weeks of years, that is, four hundred and ninety years. This is the appointed time of Israel's desolation. This time is divided into periods which are meant to enable the reader to understand that the time of which Jeremiah spoke is still future and that his prediction has not failed. 1 Another favorite apocalyptic way of pointing to the fulfilment of unfulfilled prophecy was by making the prophecies against foreign nations refer to the nations that in their own day seemed to oppose the plan of God. Again and again in the Apocalypse of John which closes the New Testament canon, there is the idea of the prophecies against Babylon as being fulfilled in the downfall of Rome (cf. Chap 18). Even the exact language of the prophets is repeatedly borrowed to describe the fall. 2

(3) Eschatology in Common

But unfulfilled prophecy is not the only concern of the two types of thought in their treatment of history. Both look forward to the end of present human history because they see in it a climactic inauguration of the will of God. Both are definitely and decidedly eschatological. With the prophets,

2. Ibid., p. 266f.
this future inauguration will come as the fulfilment of principles now operative, the fuller manifestation of relationships now partially realized. With the apocalyptists, this inauguration represents the mechanistic arrival of the time of the kingdom. With the prophets, the future hope becomes a present moral incentive, while with the apocalyptists, it becomes a present consolation. Yet both wanted this inauguration of the full will of God; both dreamed about it and sang about it continually. Both believed devoutly that the plan of God would require it, and that God himself would become vitally active and determining in its realization. With the prophets, God's will and activity works through men; with the apocalyptists, he works independent of man. But in both cases, the initiative is with God. The crisis will come and the inauguration will follow because God wills it and is active in it. By both, the future inauguration is both national and individual. As has been shown, while the prophets thought continually of the nation, they were not unmindful of the individual religious and ethical relationships upon which the welfare of the nation depended. The apocalyptists also were nationalistic. Many of their visions confined their hopes entirely to Israel. Yet here again the individual is not lost in the group. There are some apocalyptic passages of rare beauty

1. Chapter One, p. 16-17.
which accentuate personal religious and ethical relationships (Test. Gad 7.1; Test. Jos. 18.2; Test. Benj. 5.4). The common scene of these hopes is frequently that of a renewed earth, an earth so transformed that all the hindrances and inconveniences to life will be removed while fertility, plenty, and peace will ensue. (Isa. 26.1-19; Dan.; Eth. Enoch 21-36, 83-90; etc.) On the other hand, both sometimes represent the scene as a new earth (Isa. 65.17; 66.22; Eth. Enoch 91-94, 37-70; Psa. Sol.; etc.). There is more of the new earth idea in the apocalyptic element, it being limited in the prophets to the one instance cited. The nature of the hope is in both elements Messianic (Isa. 2-4; 11-12; etc.; Jub.; Eth. Enoch 90; etc.). Again, in both it is directly theocratic (Isa. 60-62; 65-66; Bar.; Secrets of Enoch; Assum. Moses; etc.). As to the time span of the new condition, the prophets seem to infer that it will be permanent. With the apocalyptists there is also the arrival of one permanent condition (Eth. Enoch 21-36; 83-90; etc.). At other times, they picture the first kingdom as temporary leading into the final kingdom (Jub.; Test. of Twelve Patriarchs; etc.).

(4) Common Belief in Ethical Nature of God

We have said that the determining factor in these common eschatological hopes is the will of God. The reason why both types of thought entertain such hopes is to be found in their common idea of the ethical nature of God. Both believe
devoutly that God is pure and just and that he will keep faith with his people. Their difference in teaching as to how or by what method he will prove his ultimate faithfulness is at bottom a difference in point of view. The prophets see the possibility of man's moral and ethical response. They believe that man's spiritual nature is such that the response may be effected by the teaching appeal. The need for this response is so great that God himself is believed to operate presently and directly in inspiring this teaching appeal and its results. This being so, they cannot imagine that this direct working of God could fail so as to necessitate a miraculous intervention. It will, however, necessitate crisis in human affairs.

On the other hand, the apocalyptists view the bitter discouragements due to man's moral indifference and perfidy. They see the wide chasm between man's condition and God's absolute and ethical perfection. They believe that such a difference argues the ethical and spiritual hopelessness of man. Yet the fact remains that some men are definitely and truly responsive to God. These are so unlike the rest of mankind that they must represent a separate order, the pre-destined. They cannot imagine that God is present or has anything to do with a general order that is so different from and so opposed to his ethical will. Yet they cannot imagine God as giving up in defeat or as deserting the faithful few. Hence, they see him as sustaining a relationship to the
present world through a connective host of functional intermediaries. Soon the sufferings of the faithful few and the belligerent obstinacy of the godless many will reach such a pass that, in justice to his moral nature and to those who have trusted in him, God’s heavenly order will break through the skies, wreak vengeance upon man and gather his people to himself.

That both types of thought cherish the idea of the ethical nature of God is not only argued by their points of view but also by the very existence of their future hopes. Why should God act to promote righteousness through natural means or to institute it through supernatural means if he is not himself righteous? In both cases, the future action of God is a kind of ethical faith-keeping. In the face of all evidences to the contrary, God can be trusted. He will ultimately honor the loyalty and confidence of his people. Because God is ethical, the right must ultimately triumph, though it may mean a sifting of the nations or even a cleaving of the skies. It was this belief in the ethical faithfulness of God that fed and sustained the future hopes of both elements even in the midst of apparent defeat.

Chapter Four presented the contrasts between the apocalyptic kingdom and the kingdom taught by Jesus. Yet these contrasts are not a difference of ultimate basis but of deductions and applications. The same moral and ethical
nature of God cherished by prophetism takes a radically different form with the apocalyptists because, in the face of present extremities, this form seems to him to be the only way whereby God could keep faith with his people. They feel themselves confronted with two alternatives, either to give up their belief in the ethical faithfulness of God or else to see his faithfulness vindicated through miraculous methods. It was, indeed, because of their high desire to maintain their idea of the moral and ethical nature of God that they resorted to the method of supernatural, catastrophic inbreak.

(5) A Common Ethical Cast

Furthermore, due to this common basis, both bear an ethical cast. This is especially manifest in the prophetic element. It is just as certainly inherent in the apocalyptic element, though not dominant as in prophetism. For instance, though we know that the immediate kingdom requirement was law-keeping, without special regard to whether the law in question was ceremonial or ethical, we must not forget that the ethical element was large and significant within the law. To this element it owed its life. 1 Also, though the precise requirement was literally satisfied through the performance of an outward observance, we must not underestimate the general

effect of the law upon ethical living. One may debate the degree of its efficacy as a method in the accomplishment of ethical ends, but that it did, to a considerable degree, so function is beyond reasonable doubt. Again, though this immediate requirement of law-keeping rested upon the idea of predestination with some apocalyptists, even here the ethical element of the requirement is not necessarily excluded. The only human proof that one had been predestined lay in the fact that he loved and kept the law. This law-keeping, as shown previously, largely involved ethics and was historically useful in the promotion of ethical living. But the ethical cast in apocalypticism is not always inherent. At times, it is as openly declared as in prophetism. Sections from The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The Psalms of Solomon, and from Slavonic Enoch well attest this (Test. Levi 18.9; Test. Jud. 25.5; Test. Dan 6.7; Test. Asher 7.3; Psa. Sol. 17; Slav. Enoch 22.8; etc.). Indeed, it has been argued that Jesus derived his idea of coupling love to God with love to man in the two great commandments from apocalyptic literature. Such a claim is also made for his teaching that God's forgiveness is conditioned upon our forgiving each other.

b. Teachings Common to the Two Elements in Jesus

(1) God's Ethical Nature and Requirements

Some of the most important of these historical affinities between the two types of thought are very evident in Jesus' handling of the two elements. In both, God's ethical nature and requirements are his constant insistence. It has already been seen that such an insistence was primarily derived from prophetism and that it continued through the more apocalyptic zones of teaching.\(^1\)

(2) Future Hope as God's Faithfulness

Again, Jesus' teaching is fully in line with the idea historically held by both that the future hope would be realized because of God's faithfulness. The things of which Jesus was absolutely sure in relation to the future were that God's will would triumph and that this triumph would mean a moral and ethical judgment that would consummate God's faithfulness to the principles of his nature and of his kingdom.

(3) Ethical Reconcilability of Distinctive Apocalyptic Conceptions

As a result of that which the two elements historically held in common, the distinctive apocalyptic conceptions of Jesus, other than intervention, are capable of ethical reconcileation with the prophetic element. It is often considered

---

Chapter Two, p. 42ff.
that these form-ideas are at hopeless variance with Jesus' message and that we must be comforted by the thought that they are only forms and may be denied without denying the message they transmit.\(^1\) Because of such considerations, we shall examine these ideas. Is there anything essentially paradoxical in the apocalyptic idea of the kingdom itself? As previously seen, the very idea was probably derived from apocalyptic literature. Yet the kingdom of Israel in the Old Testament bears striking similarity when considered under the light of prophetic idealism.\(^2\) It would be hard to understand how such an idea as the kingdom of God could be in any way opposed to the prophetic element in view of the fact that prophetic idealism was wrought out for and in behalf of a kingdom.

(a) The Kingdom

It is argued that Jesus' idea of the kingdom was taken over bodily and entirely from John the Baptist whose idea was strictly that of contemporary apocalypticism. This is the position of Schweitzer and Johannes Weiss.\(^3\) There are two

---

main objections to this. First, it is by no means proven that John the Baptist preached merely a contemporary apocalypticism. He has been freely held as a social reformer.¹ There is very little of this in apocalypticism. Again, it is by no means certain that Jesus merely continued John's message. Jesus was less a prophet of judgment and doom and more a prophet of God's redemptive plan through his kingdom.

Statt einer Botschaft vom drohenden 'Tag Jahweh's', wie Johannes, bringt Jesus die Botschaft vom 'Reiche Gottes', und dies ist etwas neus und anderes als jenes."²

Further, the apocalyptic form itself as used by Jesus seems to lay more emphasis upon the inner nature of man. Our study has demonstrated that this inner ethical insistence was fully evident within apocalyptic forms of expression as within prophetic.

Beide, Johannes und Jesus, tragt die eschatologische Richtung ihrer Zeit. Aber gegen die Gestalt des Bugpredigers hebt sich die Jesu deutlich ab als eine innerlich wesentlich andere Gestalt, wir sagen zunächst.³

(b) The Two Ages

Not only is the idea of the kingdom reconcilable, but there is also a group of subsidiary apocalyptic form-ideas likewise reconcilable. There is nothing essentially paradoxical in the "two ages" as Jesus used his phrases. On the

¹ Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis, Chap. 1.  
² Otto, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn, p. 52.  
³ Ibid., p. 51.
common basis of the moral nature of God, his faithfulness, and his ultimate triumph, Jesus, with the prophets, made the difference between the present and the future that of development and perfection, growth and fruition. Now God's will and fellowship are partially realized; then this realization will be complete. While the prophets did not speak of the "two ages", they clearly differentiated between the present and the future conditions. Our study has shown that Jesus did not consider the "two ages" as two independent and mutually exclusive orders of existence, but rather as the prophetic differentiation mentioned above.

(c) The Power of Demons

In the present age belonged the "power of the demons" which was a distinctive apocalyptic conception. Yet Jesus' belief in this power under the headship of Satan was not necessarily antithetical to his message. Again, on the common basis of the moral nature of God, his faithfulness, and his ultimate triumph, Jesus views this rule as an added challenge to further kingdom activity, sure that in him and in his disciples was invested the power to overcome. Instead of such an idea leading him into a moral dualism, - this world versus the next, - it only intensified his sense of God's unitary control and his desire to exercise it. Jesus was sure that he was in league with God's spiritual world, that
this world of the spirit was a full part of God's one plan for life¹, and that it could be drawn upon for power against all the forces of earthly evil with the assurance of victory.

(d) The Impending Change

The dividing line between the present age now fraught with the power of demons and the future age of blessedness is signalized as a great point of change. There is no divergence from the prophetic element in this sense of impending change. The prophets themselves had the same kind of experience as they anticipated the Day of Yahweh. The impending change with Jesus, as with the prophets, only served to stimulate his activity and his moral warning. Here again his sense of God's fundamental and unitary control was heightened. There was no fundamental need for special rules governing the brief present. This order could come to an end, but the larger order of which it is a part, the moral order governed by the moral nature of God, could not. Hence, the only true preparation for whatever change lay ahead was that of personal conformity to God's will and purpose. Because the time is short, decisive and heroic human action is demanded.

(e) Signs of the End

The signs foreshadowing the change in which Jesus is so like the apocalyptists are not divergent from the prophetic teaching. These signs create no break in human affairs; they are hindrances. Such hindrances and calamities, were commonly predicted by the prophets as signs of the approaching Day of Yahweh. The crisis of change seems to be connected in the mind of Jesus with individual resurrection. This idea, as has been demonstrated, became a definite doctrine in apocalypticism. Here also we find nothing divergent from Jesus' prophetic teaching.

f. Individual Resurrection

The idea of individual resurrection, while not featured by the prophets, is nevertheless inherent in their teaching. The reincarnation of Israel after her experience of exile and dissolution may be viewed as containing the germ of the later doctrine. The mention of rewards for the "suffering Servant" after what appears to be his martyrdom would also point toward the later doctrine. Further, Jesus does not build his idea of individual immortality upon the apocalyptic idea of individual resurrection, but rather upon the prophetic idea of individual fellowship with God. The resurrection with Jesus is

2. Chapter Four, pp. 195-197.
4. Bailie, And the Life Everlasting, p. 157f.
only a method whereby God may work in the continuance of the fellowship tie. Inasmuch as it in no way impinges upon the sequential relationships in human affairs, it carries with it no opposition to the prophetic emphasis.

c. The All-important Significance of Their Common Ground

(1) The Character of the Kingdom in Both

From our study of the arguments for the general reconcilability of the two elements in the teaching of Jesus, the all-important significance of their common ground is seen. Both elements present the character of the kingdom as the active organized expression of the ethical nature of God. This is made possible because of that which the two elements historically hold in common. Both involve inward ethical righteousness. Both teach God's faithfulness. There is no divergence from these common emphases in Jesus' distinctive apocalyptic conceptions. These are the emphases that comprise the character of the kingdom. This kingdom character is Jesus' one great and abiding message. It is his one sure conviction. In it the prophetic element is dominant.

(2) Difference: Manner of Kingdom Coming

The one exception to this general and all-important reconcilability is in the manner of kingdom coming. This exception plays no essential rôle in the fundamental message of Jesus. Its presence in the records contributes nothing
to his essential ideas because it is not required for his emphasis on crisis. The crisis emphasis did not necessitate intervention. Yet it is possible to understand that Jesus, with full prophetic reliance upon the inwardly ethical God, could have envisioned his possible use of such means to save the very principles of his nature from seeming defeat in dire emergency.
CONCLUSIONS

A. Both Prophetic and Apocalyptic Elements in the Records

It must be concluded, then, that both the prophetic and the apocalyptic elements are to be found in the records. No fair exegesis or good interpretative method may be made to discredit or to rule out either one. The evidences on both sides are too many and too weighty for such treatment.

1. Prophetic Emphasis on the Character of the Kingdom

A discriminating review of our records develops the interesting fact that where Jesus is dealing with or teaching the character of the kingdom he is in marked sympathy with the prophets and draws largely from them. On the other hand, when he speaks of the manner of kingdom coming, he is more apt to appeal to or make use of apocalypticism, though he is not exclusively apocalyptic even here. As to his conception of the kingdom, namely, its character, its inherently essential make-up, his thinking here is evidently, as everywhere else, controlled by his conception of the character of God. It is God's kingdom; therefore, it must fulfill the will reflected in the character and realized in the purpose of God as he knew him. Here Jesus is certain. The kingdom to be established must fulfill God's character and will. All his teachings were invested in that one pervading principle. That determined the kind of kingdom that was to come.
2. Apocalyptic Emphasis on Manner of Kingdom Coming

But as to the future, as to the plan for the kingdom coming, the modus operandi involved in its inauguration, Jesus' emphasis in the late records is apocalyptic. That such a teaching may have been uttered by Jesus is not inherently impossible. Jesus may readily have hoped that the kingdom coming ought to be so soon as to be precipitate and even catastrophic.

3. Presence of an Element of Paradox

This apocalyptic idea of the kingdom's coming through divine intervention is the one exception to the general reconcilability in thought between the two elements. Because of this, the two elements may not be entirely reconciled. This teaching stands in contrast to the idea of the kingdom as a growth development or as the fruition of prophetic missionary evangelizing. It conflicts with the idea of the present kingdom and of the organic relationship between the present and the future.

4. Their Almost Entire Reconcilability

a. The Unity of Jesus' Great Emphasis and Contribution

But these elements, as has been demonstrated, can be reconciled or harmonized to a much greater degree than has often been allowed. This reconciliation or harmony is to be found in the fact that prophecy and apocalypse had much in common, and what they had in common is mainly to be found in
connection with the character of the kingdom, its essential nature. Where they diverge or differ is in the possible method of kingdom coming or in the mechanism thus involved. Jesus' great emphasis and contribution was on the character of the kingdom. Here his teaching is ageless; here he felt sure. This great emphasis and contribution is a unitary teaching throughout the records of Jesus. No apocalyptic word, phrase, or pattern of thought is ever allowed to change it or to submerge it.

b. Intervention as a Possible Hope

While Jesus held unalterably to his conception of the kingdom as suggested by his conception of the character of God, he may well have entertained a hope that it was consistent with the character of God to employ such methods of setting up the kingdom as apocalypse offered. Even here the point of appeal would be to his conception of the character of God. At most, the question of method was only a question of hope. It was never a certain matter as the character of the kingdom was. The element of paradox must be allowed wherever anything is offered in kingdom teaching that would not be strictly in harmony with his conception of the kingdom. We have already conceded that there are some passages. In respect to these he would get encouragement and inspiration from the apocalyptists. But the idea they contained was wholly a hope which
he left in the hands of God. Over against this possible hope there is his teaching on kingdom character as his solid ground. The whole body of his thought rests upon the conviction that he knows God's character and hence the kind of kingdom God seeks to establish. Everything must conform to this.

c. The Two Elements as Points of Emphasis

Now where prophetism and apocalypticism approach each other, as we claim they do, we find the approach or sympathy in the conception of the character of the kingdom and the corresponding concept of God; they diverge most noticeably in the places where they raise the question as to how the kingdom will come or be set up, that is, in the method or modus operandi of kingdom building. Both prophets and apocalyptists wanted the kingdom realized, but their emphases diverged. In prophetism the great headlands were in the conception of character; in apocalypticism, in their introduction of schemes for the kingdom's early coming, involving their different idea of God's present relationship to the world from that held by the prophets.

B. Jesus' Transcendence of Both

Jesus transcended both the apocalyptists and the prophets in their points of view. He superseded both as his conception of God's character was in advance of theirs. While it is not germane to this thesis to prove this transcendence,
our mention of its presence may well conclude the study of the relationship between these two elements. Though we have pointedly shown his transcendence in relation to apocalypticism, that he also at times transcended the prophets may be illustrated in the fact that he coupled with their general insistence upon ethical reclamation through repentance the further insistence upon progressive righteousness. This prophetic repentance was only the point of a new beginning. The new life that was to issue therefrom was to have as its aim the full spiritual and ethical advancement and enrichment of the Sons of the Kingdom.

Love your enemies, bless them that persecute you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.

*Be ye therefore perfect (τελειοι) even as (ους λεγεται) your Father which is in heaven is perfect.* Matt. 5:44-45,48.

Sometimes this transcendence was in disregard of the prophets. For instance, Jesus never appealed to the terms of the Mosaic covenant in ethical admonition. His appeal was only and always to the nature of the kingdom, the nature of God.
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