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ABSTRACT

The Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark

Margaret Anne Laycock Moore

Since Johannes Weiss' work in 1892, it has been assumed that the Kingdom of God is a Judaic apocalyptic concept. According to this assumption, the Kingdom of God refers to the full manifestation of God's sovereignty that was expected at the end-of-history. The Gospel of Mark took this concept leaving the basic content unaltered. The only modification Mark made involved the temporal position of the Kingdom. Depending on the specific interpretation, the Kingdom of God was changed from a future hope to an imminent expectation or a present reality.

This thesis contends that the Kingdom of God was a polyvalent symbol. The Kingdom of God was a unification of concepts and ideas connected with Yahweh's kingship and his salvatory actions as king. The Kingdom symbol has four basic aspects or dimensions. First, the Kingdom of God is eternal. It is not confined to a specific period of time. Second, the Kingdom is a soteriological category. It represents God's salvatory actions as king. The Kingdom of God implies the protection of the divine monarch. It also may refer to the realm/community that enjoys the protection of the heavenly sovereign. Third, there is an obligatory aspect to the Kingdom. The subjects of the divine king must demonstrate their loyalty through adherence to God's law. Finally, the Kingdom of God has a communal dimension. The Kingdom connotes the people who have enjoyed the saving actions of the divine sovereign and the community that adheres to the laws.
It is the Kingdom of God as a polyvalent symbol that Mark incorporated into his Gospel. The Markan understanding of the Kingdom contains all four aspects of the symbol. However, the symbol has been modified by Mark's christology. The Judaic views of Kingdom of God are intertwined with the Markan mission and the evangelist's proclamation of Jesus.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Thesis Statement

Scholarly research suggests that the Kingdom of God was a Judaic symbol for the full manifestation of God's sovereignty expected at the end-of-history.¹ It is hypothesized that this understanding of the Kingdom was incorporated into the Gospel of Mark without significant alterations to its meaning. This restriction of the Kingdom of God to an apocalyptic definition may be inappropriate.

The exclusive apocalyptic designation of the Kingdom of God has been challenged by three observations. First, the Kingdom of God is seldom found in Old Testament Pseudepigrapha texts which are most concerned with the end-of-history.² Second, the Tanakh, Pseudepigrapha, Apocrypha and the Qumran Scrolls contain references to the Kingdom of God which are not eschatological (Dan. 3:33; 4:32; 6:26; Tobit 13:1; Wis. Sol. 6:3–5; 10:10; Ps. Sol. 2:30–31; 5:18).³ In these references the Kingdom is a present reality. Third, according to the Judaic texts contemporaneous with the Gospel, the future manifestation of the Kingdom of God does not occur at the end-of-history. The emergence of the divine Kingdom often coincides with the destruction of an old order. However, this destruction does not represent the end-of-history. Nevertheless, the Kingdom of God is classified by scholars as an apocalyptic term. It is considered a univalent symbol/synonym for the "age to come".

This thesis will propose that the Kingdom of God is a polyvalent symbol.⁴ The Kingdom symbol is the unification of several concepts and
ideas associated with God's saving activities as king. These concepts and ideas determine the meaning(s) of the symbol.

There seem to be four basic concepts associated with the Kingdom of God. First, since God is understood as the eternal sovereign, his kingship and his Kingdom are continuous (Tobit 13:1, 6, 15-16; T. Abrah. 8:3; Ps. Sol. 17:1-3). The Kingdom of God is a testimony of the past, a present reality, and a future expectation. The symbol, in a given context, may have a specific temporal designation. However, the Kingdom of God is not limited to a particular age or time. Second, the Kingdom of God exists de jure over the earth since creation. However, it exists de facto for those who acknowledge Yahweh’s kingship (Wis. Sol. 6:1f.; 2 Macc. 7:9; T. Ben. 9:1; T. Mos. 4:1-4; 3 Macc. 2:2; 6:2f.; Ps. Sol. 5:1-19; 17:1-3). The human acknowledgement of God's sovereignty is predicated on God's saving actions. The human response is solicited through deeds or actions performed by God for the benefit of his people. Consequently, both a divine action and a human response is necessary for the Kingdom of God to exist de facto. Third, the Kingdom of God has soteriological significance. As previously mentioned, the human acknowledgement of God's sovereignty is predicated on God's saving actions (T. Mos. 4:1-9; 3 Macc. 2:1f.; 5:35; 6:2f; Ps. Sol. 5:1-19). The ancient understood God as the king who saved his nation in the past, protects his subjects in the present, and he will continue to defend his people in the future. Finally, the Kingdom of God involves a community. That is, it refers to those individuals who acknowledge God's sovereignty. They are the recipients of God's saving actions and they are the subjects of the divine will, law, and kingdom.

It is the Kingdom of God as a polyvalent symbol that appears in the Gospel of Mark. The Markan Kingdom is not confined to a single temporal
category. The Kingdom of God exists in the present as a dynamic salvatory force. This dynamic force is present in the proclamation of the gospel and the miracles of Jesus. Through Jesus' words and deeds, people are redeemed and restored (Mk. 1:1-15; 4:26-32). Further, the Kingdom is a future expectation. The future Kingdom will be manifested with the arrival of the Son of Man (Mk.13; 9:1; 14:25). The Markan Kingdom is a soteriological category. The Kingdom represents both the actions undertaken to transfer individuals into the people of God (Mk.1:40-44; 5:25-34) and the community which has benefited from those salvatory actions (Mk.4:1-20; 10:30). Finally, the Kingdom of God has a communal dimension. The followers of Jesus comprise the members of the Kingdom (Mk. 10:30). The followers receive the benefits of entering the Kingdom (Mk. 9:47-48). The followers maintain their status by believing in the gospel and adhering to the ethical pronouncements of Jesus (10:17-27; 12:28-34).

Limitations and Methodology

The focus of this study is the Marcan Kingdom of God. There will be no attempt made through form or redaction analysis to establish Jesus' view of the Kingdom or to determine the development of the Kingdom symbol within early Christianity. Textual, form or redaction criticism will enter into the discussion only if they assist in the interpretation of a relevant passage. Historical information and background about the first-century Palestine will be mentioned insofar as they are significant for an appreciation of the text or a particular concept. In an effort to focus upon the Markan view of the Kingdom of God, the Gospel will be studied in isolation from other Christian texts.

In the opening paragraphs, the Kingdom of God was described as a polyvalent symbol. The term, polyvalent, was originally borrowed from
chemistry. A polyvalent element is an element which has the capacity to unite chemically with several other elements. Labeling the Kingdom of God a polyvalent symbol indicates that it has the capacity to unite several concepts or ideas. The polyvalent label also has other implications. Similar to a polyvalent element, the Kingdom's combination of concepts is both limited and specific. Every element has a stated valence number which indicates the exact number of hydrogen atoms with which any element can chemically combine. Correspondingly, the Kingdom of God symbol contains a finite number of concepts and/or ideas. A polyvalent element can unite only with particular elements or atoms. Likewise, the Kingdom of God symbol contains particular concepts and ideas. These concepts and ideas are associated with God's sovereignty. This thesis will attempt to identify the specific concepts and ideas united in the Kingdom symbol.

Labeling the Kingdom of God as a symbol has methodological implications. This study will focus on the communicative dimension of a symbol. A symbol will be viewed as a class of sign. A sign is something perceivable by our senses, like a word, which refers to something other than itself. For example, the word "cat" refers to a particular four-legged mammal.

It seems that signs are culture-specific. In other words, the meaning for signs/symbols are developed within a socio-historical environment. This social dimension of signs is known as convention. Convention is the agreement amongst users about the range of meanings for, the appropriate uses of, and the responses to a sign. The Kingdom symbol, like all symbols, has a limited conventional range of meanings. This range of meaning is developed and sanctioned within Mark's and Jesus' society - early Judaism. In other words, within postbiblical Judaism, the Kingdom of God symbol had
a specific scope of interpretations. Anyone utilizing the symbol would normally operate within the conventional range of meaning. If the symbol was employed in a manner contrary to convention, this usage would require explanation. Since Mark employs the Kingdom symbol without any accompanying interpretation, it is assumed that his usage of the symbol is within the normal conventions of postbiblical Judaism. Consequently, any understanding of the Markan Kingdom of God must originate with an understanding of the symbol within Second Temple Judaism.

An estimation of the Kingdom of God within postbiblical Judaism will be gained through a brief analysis of specific Judaic texts. The texts will provide the socio-historical environment for understanding the symbol. This will be a thematic study and there will be no attempt made to establish a chronological development of the symbol within Judaism.

There is both collective and individual aspects in the interpretation of symbols. As previously mentioned, the collective aspect is social convention. The individual aspect is the user's own experience or interpretation of the symbol. For example, a cat for some people is a cute, furry pet. Another connotation presents cats as sneaky, cruel, hunters of birds. Both groups are referring to the same four-legged mammal. Mark's interpretation of the Kingdom of God is effected by his experiences as a follower of Jesus. Therefore, the Kingdom of God as understood by Mark reflects contemporary Judaic views of the Kingdom adjusted or focused in light of Jesus' ministry, death and resurrection. That is, the Marcan Kingdom of God is influenced by the author's christology. This study will indicate the focus Mark has given to the Judaic view of the Kingdom of God. It will also attempt to establish the reasons for the particularities of the Marcan position.
Terms

Three terms should be clarified for this study. They are apocalyptic, eschatology and soteriology. These terms will be defined for the context of this thesis only. The proposed definitions are not intended as definitive interpretations of the terms.

The term apocalyptic will be employed in a qualified sense. There are four reasons for the limited use of this term. First, apocalyptic may be inappropriate for first-century Judaism. Apocalyptic was first coined by Friedrich Lucke in 1832. It is a modern term that has been applied to first-century beliefs and literature. There is a question whether this term truly reflects the thoughts of late antiquity or whether it is a modern construct which has been forced upon the material. Morton Smith has conducted a survey of first-century Jewish and Christian material. The Greek form, apokalyptikos, either as a noun, verb or adjective is rare. Consequently, the term may not be appropriate for early Judaism or the earliest forms of Christianity.

Second, our modern perception of apocalyptic beliefs may reflect a Christian bias. The Christian text Revelation was originally the basis for estimating the literary genre of the apocalypse. It provided a provisional list of apocalyptic concepts. Further, many of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha have undergone Christian redactions and additions. Because of the history of texts' transmission and our lack of knowledge on first-century Judaism, it becomes difficult to extract Jewish apocalyptic beliefs or concerns from Christian ideas. For example, was the concept of a transcendent messiah a major concern for first-century Judaism? Or, is the supernatural messiah a Christian idea which has been added or read into the texts? In fact, the Christian concern over the origins
of apocalyptic beliefs may have overemphasized the role of the apocalyptic within postbiblical Judaism.

The third reason for qualified use of the term apocalyptic is subjectivity. Apocalyptic has been characterized by derogative terms such as "lifeless" or "speculative." Often, a scholar's own personal bias distorts his perception of apocalyptic beliefs.

Finally, there is a tendency to define apocalyptic according to a list of characteristics upon which there is no consensus. What has been called "apocalypticism" is apparently not an autonomous institution, not a species in the realm of religion, like a flower in the field, but a mixtum compositum, which scholars have arbitrarily blended. (T. Olsson, "The Apocalyptic Activity" 22).

Apocalyptic has been discussed as if it was a definitive and defined set of beliefs. However, the list of concepts and the identification of groups using apocalyptic ideas vary between different scholars.

It may appear, given the numerous difficulties, that the terms apocalyptic and apocalypticism should be avoided. However, since Johannes Weiss' work in 1892, Kingdom of God research has been intimately connected with Jewish apocalypticism. Therefore, the terms cannot be easily avoided. This study concurs with Tord Olsson, "this state of affairs is far from satisfactory, but since we cannot do without such 'umbrella terms' as 'apocalypticism' once they have been adopted in the scholarly language, we should at least try to produce tentative definitions . . ." (T.Olsson, "The Apocalyptic Activity," 22).

For this study, apocalypticism will be employed as a sociological term. It will designate a particular society or sect which maintained apocalyptic
beliefs. Jewish apocalypticism will refer to group(s) of Jews which held apocalyptic beliefs. Apocalyptic will refer to a specific combination of beliefs. These beliefs include:

1. Destruction of the current historical order (2 Bar. 70:8; 4 Erza 5:4f.; Apoc. Abrah. 30).

2. Creation of a new transcendent order (2 Bar. 29:1f.; T. Levi 18:1f.).

3. A difference in nature between the two ages (1 Enoch 45:3f.; 2 Bar. 29:1f.; 73:1f.; T. Levi 18:1f.).

4. The dominant role of God in establishing the new age (2 Bar. 29:1f.; T. Levi 4:1f.; 18:1f.).


6. Destruction of Satan and his demons (1 Enoch 51:1f.; T. Mos. 10:1).

7. Appearance of a supernatural messianic figure (Dan. 7:13f.).

This list of characteristics represents a rough consensus of scholarly views. Specifically, it is the description of apocalyptic concepts frequently found in discussions of the Kingdom of God. Any interpretation of the Kingdom which reflects the above characteristics will be called an apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God.

Caution will be used in labeling a specific text as apocalyptic. There has been a tendency to classify a document as apocalyptic even if it possesses only one or two apocalyptic characteristics. Such a classification often suppresses ethical or sapiential aspects of the document. The subsequent interpretation of the text may not reflect the actual concerns of
the manuscript. In an attempt to obtain an objective reading of the texts, this study will not classify any document as apocalyptic unless it contains a substantial number of apocalyptic beliefs.

There are similar difficulties with the term eschatology. It is also a modern term coined by K.G. Bietschneider in 1804. Consequently, there is a question whether the term is appropriate for the thought of late antiquity. Subjectivity also has influenced definitions of eschatology. Eschatology may reflect an individual scholar's personal understanding of the last things (I.H. Marshall, "Slippery Words," 264-65). For example, eschatology has referred to "the situation of decision" instead of events associated with the end of a historical age (O. Cullman, Salvation in History 79). There is also confusion whether the end of the present order occurs simultaneously with the end-of-history or whether it occurs within history. For this study, eschatology will refer to the expectation of an imminent end to the current order that will occur within the historical continuum. Apocalyptic will be employed when the end of the current order coincides with the end-of-history.

The final term to be considered is "soteriology" and its corresponding term "salvation". Soteriology will refer to the inclusion and continuance within the people of God. The inclusion within the people of God entitles the individual to various benefits. The benefits are determined by the various sects or writer. This definition is sufficiently neutral to allow the term to be employed in both Jewish and Christian contexts. Salvation will refer to the inclusion within the people of God and the benefits of being a member of the community.
Review of Secondary Sources

The Kingdom of God is one of the major themes of the Markan Gospel. Scholars have consequently hypothesized that almost all the issues contained in the Gospel illuminate or illustrate some aspect of the Kingdom of God. However, the sheer number, complexity, and diversity of the issues can distract and confuse an analysis of the symbol. The various "messianic" titles given Jesus will elucidate Mark's view of the Kingdom only if there is a consensus on the titles' significance. In an effort to both limit and focus this discussion, only those issues which directly arise from the Markan references to the Kingdom will be considered. Consequently, the review of secondary sources will be restricted to eight issues.

1. What is meant by the phrase "Kingdom of God"?
2. What is the temporal aspect of the Kingdom? Does the Kingdom represent a future expectation or a present reality (Mk. 1:14-15)?
3. What do the "seed" or "growth" parables indicate about the Kingdom of God (Mk. 4:26-29, 30-32)?
4. What is meant by the "kingdom coming in power" (Mk. 9:1)?
5. How is entrance to the Kingdom understood (Mk. 9:47; 10:14, 23-27)?
6. What is meant when Jesus informs the scribe he is not far from the Kingdom of God (Mk. 12:32-34)?
7. What is the significance of "drinking wine anew in the Kingdom of God" (Mk. 14:25)?
8. How are Jesus' exorcisms related to the Kingdom of God?21
Previous trends in the Kingdom debate also necessitate concentration on specific issues. The Kingdom of God has been generally discussed in one of two contexts. First, the Kingdom has been examined in the context of the quest for the historical Jesus. Second, the Kingdom has been discussed as a concept within early Christianity. The Gospel of Mark has been analyzed as a source for Jesus' view of the Kingdom or it has been merged with Luke and Matthew for a view on early Christian theology. Few studies have concentrated on Mark's view of the Kingdom. Therefore, in an effort to focus attention on the Markan perception of the Kingdom of God, only the eight previously listed issues will be examined.

A great diversity of opinion has been generated during the debate on the Kingdom of God symbol. However, there is consensus on two points. First, it is an opinio communis that the Judaic view of the divine Kingdom is the foundation for the Gospels' and Jesus' understanding of the symbol. This premise was first proposed by Johannes Weiss in his 1892 work Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God (Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes). Weiss was reacting against proposals made by Albrecht Ritschl, Weiss' father-in-law and teacher. A nineteenth-century liberal theologian, Albrecht Ritschl believed the Kingdom of God was "the moral organization of humanity through action inspired by love." Ritschl surmised that this ethical view of the Kingdom originated in Jesus' own proclamation. Weiss found that this supposedly first-century view of the Kingdom possessed resounding similarities to Kant's philosophy and Schleiermacher's theology (Jesus' Proclamation 64).

Weiss credited Ritschl with bringing the Kingdom of God to "the centre of current theological interest" (Jesus' Proclamation 57-60). However, he
condemned Ritschl for interpreting Jesus' view of the Kingdom according to twentieth-century philosophy.

From what has been said, it is sufficiently evident that we ought to be grateful for the new emphasis upon this central idea of Jesus. It therefore seems all the more necessary, however, to submit the historical foundations of this concept to a thorough investigation. . . . In this regard, it might not be superfluous if we attempt once more to identify the original historical meaning which Jesus connected with the words "Kingdom of God", and if we do it with special care lest we import modern, or at any rate, alien ideas into Jesus' thought world. (Jesus' Proclamation 60).

Biblical scholarship has completely accepted Weiss' demand for a historical understanding of the Kingdom of God. A comprehension of post-biblical Judaism is now a necessity for any critical inquiry into the Kingdom of God.

The Christian view of the Kingdom of God arises out of the Jewish. For this reason a knowledge of the expectation of the Kingdom of God found in the prophets and late Judaism is essential if we are to understand the background of the thought of John the Baptist, Paul and earliest Christianity (A. Schweitzer, Kingdom of God 3).

Most scholars agree that the Judaic view of the Kingdom forms the basis for Mark's understanding of the divine Kingdom. Mark was reporting and recording the words and deeds of Jesus. It is the Kingdom of God as viewed by Jesus, and consequently his Jewish contemporaries, which is the basis of
the presentation in the Gospel. As a result, any analysis of the Markan
Kingdom of God commences with a survey or a determination of the symbol
within postbiblical Judaism.

The second point of consensus among scholars is the intimate
connection between Judaic views of the Kingdom of God and Jewish
apocalyptic concepts. This premise also originated with the work of
Johannes Weiss. Weiss firmly believed that the specific source for the
Gospels' portrayal of the Kingdom was Judaic apocalypticism and its belief
system. Albert Schweitzer accepted, popularized, and expanded Weiss'
proposal. Schweitzer concurred with Weiss' historical approach and he also
assumed that Jewish apocalyptic beliefs provided the basis for the Christian
view of the Kingdom of God (Quest for the Historical Jesus 239f.).

Subsequent scholars have generally accepted Weiss' and Schweitzer's
estimation of the Jewish apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom and its
continuity with the Gospels' view of the symbol. It is surmised that, within
postbiblical Judaism, the Kingdom of God was solely a future expectation. The
divine Kingdom would be revealed only at the eschaton/end-of-history. It is
conjectured that the Jewish apocalyptists were incredibly pessimistic about
their present age. God had distanced himself from humanity. He was no
longer active in history. The present mundane age was ruled by Satan and
his demons. The world was marked by sorrow, suffering and sickness.
However, God was expected to re-assert his sovereignty at the eschaton.
The assertion of God's sovereignty would be seen in the destruction of the
wicked nations and the defeat of Satan and his demons. The Jewish
apocalyptists described these supernatural acts in vivid portraits of natural
disasters, abnormal events and cosmic catastrophes. The present world and
age would be annihilated. The historical continuum would be ruptured.
However, after the annihilation of this present age, God would establish a transcendent and morally perfect era. In other words, the new age would be radically different from the present. This contrast between the present age and the "age to come" is considered one of the major tenets of apocalyptic thought. The mundane present and the divine future are two successive stages on the temporal nexus; however, they were completely antithetical in nature. In this view, the Kingdom of God is not nor could it ever be effectively part of the present. The Kingdom is an apocalyptic term for the "age to come" or God's re-assertion of his sovereignty. It is this apocalyptic view of the Kingdom of God scholars believe Mark incorporates into his Gospel.

The Kingdom of God debate at this point diverges. These divergences are due to a subtle difference in the definitions given the Kingdom of God. Scholars are agreed on the Judaic and apocalyptic foundation of the Kingdom. They also concur on the futurity of the Kingdom. However, they differ on whether the Kingdom of God was understood as a future realm or whether the symbol represented the future activity of the divine sovereign.

As a result, there are basically two interpretations of the Judaic view of the Kingdom. The first interpretation defines the Kingdom of God as the state or era of eternal blessedness that would appear following the destruction of the present order. The Kingdom of God is a synonym for the "age to come". For the convenience of discussion, this estimation of the Kingdom will be known as the static interpretation.

The Kingdom of God will then be established throughout the whole creation and for all ages. Necessarily, Satan or Beliar would have no more place there. Some of the sources contemplate a final battle of cosmic proportions in which
God and his host of armies overcome and finally defeat Belial and his horde, either before, or in connection with the day of judgment. In the process, perhaps, the world will pass away or be destroyed, or will be so radically transformed that a new world, both heaven and earth, will come in its place; . . . . Thus the new or transformed earth is referred to not only as the Kingdom of God, but also as the world (age) to come. (R. Hiers, *Jesus and the Future* 45-46).

The static interpretation will refer to views in which the Kingdom is a future state.

The second interpretation assumes a dynamic view of the Kingdom of God. It is hypothesized that early Judaism understood the Kingdom of God as that activity in which God demonstrates his sovereignty. The Kingdom of God is an alternative term for the Kingship of God. For the convenience of discussion, this view of the Kingdom will be known as the dynamic interpretation of the Kingdom.

The dynamic interpretation of the Kingdom of God originated with the work of Gustaf Dalman in 1902 (*The Words of Jesus* 91f.). It was later popularized by C.H. Dodd during 1930's. Dalman reviewed the Tanakh, Talmud and Targums for the Jewish understanding of the *malkûth* (kingdom) of God. He concluded that the essence of the Kingdom of God was the kingly activities of God. The Kingdom symbolized not a particular realm of future blessedness but the entire sovereignty of God (G. Dalman, *The Words Of Jesus* 91f.). C.H. Dodd expressed Dalman's conclusion in the following terms:

"The expression "the *malkûth* of God" connotes the fact that
God reigns as King. In sense, though not in grammatical form, the substantive conception in the phrase "the Kingdom of God" is the idea of God, and the term "kingdom" indicates that specific aspect, attribute or activity of God, in which He is revealed as King or sovereign Lord of His people, or of the universe which He created (C.H. Dodd, *Parables* 21).

Dalman's explanation of the Kingdom of God has become an accepted premise of biblical scholarship. Most scholars now believe that the Judaic view of the Kingdom emphasized the sovereign activities of God.31

Dalman and Dodd elaborated further on the usage of the Kingdom of God in first-century Judaism. They discovered two manners in which the term was employed.32 First, the Kingdom of God could refer to Israel's acceptance of Yahweh's sovereignty. Yohanan ben Zakkai summoned Jews "to take upon oneself the yoke of the Kingdom of God" (J. Kidd. 59d). This meant that Jews were to acknowledge the divine monarch and obey His divine laws - the Torah. The Kingdom of God is present for anyone who is a subject of the divine sovereign. However, during the first-century, the acknowledgement of God's monarchy was an abstract idea. As previously mentioned, the Jewish apocalyptists believed God had withdrawn effectively from history. Satan was now the ruler of the present age. Dodd, based on his understanding of Jewish apocalyptic thought, concluded:

In all these forms of belief the common underlying idea is that of God's sovereign power becoming manifestly effective in the world of human experience. When it pleases God to "reveal" or to "set up" His kingly rule, then there will be judgment on all the wrong that is in the world, victory over all the powers of evil and, for those who have accepted His
sovereignty, deliverance and a blessed life in communion with Him (C.H. Dodd, Parables 24).

Jews could acknowledge the present abstract notion of God as King. Nevertheless, it is the Kingdom of God as an apocalyptic hope which dominated early Judaism. The Kingdom of God was commonly understood as the future manifestation of God's sovereignty.

In summary, both the static and dynamic interpretations share some of the same precepts. The Judaic view of the Kingdom of God is fundamental for an estimation of the Gospel understanding of the symbol. Further, the scholars believe the Judaic view of the Kingdom is interconnected with apocalyptic beliefs. The Kingdom of God, within postbiblical Judaism, was a future expectation. The scholars differ on whether the symbol refers to the actual "age to come" or whether the Kingdom is the future divine activity that will establish the "age to come".

Both schools of interpretation concur that Mark adopted the Judaic apocalyptic view of the divine Kingdom. It is the Kingdom of God as the future age or activity that is present in the various "Kingdom" passages. However, due to Jesus' mission, death and resurrection, the Markan Kingdom of God demonstrates some discontinuity with the Judaic version of the symbol. According to the static interpretation, the discontinuity is the imminence of the Kingdom of God. "Thus Jesus does take over the apocalyptic picture of the future . . . . What is new and really his own about it all is the certainty . . . ."33 Expressed metaphorically, the Kingdom is so near it can be seen on the horizon. The blessed realm is already casting its shadow on the world. The discontinuity, according to the dynamic interpretation, is Jesus' announcement of the presence of the Kingdom. The Kingdom which was
expected at the end-of-history has actually broken into the historical continuum. According to the static interpretation, the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark is a future expectation. In his proclamation, Jesus announces, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel." (Mk 1:15). The Kingdom of God has drawn near; it has not arrived. It is an imminent expectation. The futurity of the Kingdom is affirmed in two other passages. Mark in his report of the last supper relates the following words of Jesus: "Truly I say to you, I shall never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" (Mk. 14:25). This statement, according to Weiss and R.H. Hiers, alludes to the future expectation of the Kingdom of God. Weiss further suggests that the phrase "drink it new" refers to new transcendent world of the Kingdom. The evangelist, in conformity with Jewish apocalyptic expectations, believed the Kingdom would feature a newly created earth and heaven. Jesus, too, seems to have expected a new heaven and a new earth. In any case, he declared that he would drink of the fruit of the vine anew in the Kingdom of God his Father (Mark 14:25). And the land which will produce this never-withering vine is the promised land, arising in new splendor (J. Weiss, Jesus' Proclamation 93).

Hiers suggests that Mark 9:1 conveys the same two ideas. The Kingdom of God is a future expectation and it will feature a new heaven and earth. It is sometimes argued that 9:1, which speaks of the coming of the Kingdom of God with power (en dunamei), implies that the Kingdom is already present without power. But Jesus and his followers expected the Kingdom of God and
the Son of Man to come powerfully: heaven and earth would be transformed (13:26,31; cf. Luke 17:24). The expectation that when the Kingdom comes, it will do so "in power" or powerfully, does not imply that it was already present without power or powerlessly. Moreover, there is no evidence in Mark that Jesus thought the Kingdom of God present at all. According to Mark, Jesus' initial proclamation was that the Kingdom of God would soon come (1:15) (R. Hiers, *Kingdom of God* 82; author's own italics).

The Markan Kingdom of God echoes Jewish apocalyptic expectations. The Kingdom is a future state featuring a new heaven and new earth. It is no longer a distant hope. The Kingdom is an impending occurrence.

In the *static* interpretation of the Kingdom of God, the exorcisms are signs of the Kingdom's *imminent* arrival. The exorcisms prepare the way for the Kingdom by driving out the demonic ruler of this age. The world is being wrested from Satan's control (J. Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation* 77-80). Jesus' exorcisms are "penultimate" phenomena to distinguish them from actual eschatological phenomena.

An "eschatological" phenomenon may be one that belongs in the coming age or Kingdom of God (e.g., the messianic banquet), or it may be one that marks the transition or border between the ages - the coming or parousia of the Son of man, the resurrection or the judgment. Or it may be one which was to take place in the last days of the present age, near, but not at its end (e.g., the coming of Elijah, the task of exorcisms, and the preaching of repentance) .... It might be useful to introduce some further analytical
categories, e.g., a distinction between "ultimate" eschatological phenomena or events, "border" events, and "penultimate" phenomena. (R. Hiers, The Kingdom of God 95).

The exorcisms are precursors to the Kingdom of God. Complete victory over Satan's horde is still a future expectation.36

The Markan Kingdom of God is the future expectation of a transcendent state (Mk. 1:14-15; 9:1; 14:25). The exorcisms are precursors for the Kingdom's assured manifestation. According to the static interpretation, the Markan Kingdom of God is consistent with the perceived Judaic version of the Kingdom. The only point of discontinuity is in the temporal position of the Kingdom. The static scholars believe that, within postbiblical Judaism, the Kingdom was a future hope. In the Gospel of Mark, it is an imminent expectation.

The dynamic interpretation has a different perspective of the Markan Kingdom of God. Jesus, and subsequently his followers, announced the arrival of the Kingdom. The Kingdom of God had come (Mk. 1:15).37 This is the key difference between the two interpretations. The dynamic interpretation, because it views the Kingdom as the actions of God, can visualize the Kingdom operating in the present. The activity of God that was expected at the end-of-history is occurring, at least partially, in the present. The static interpretation of the Kingdom, because it equates the Kingdom with the "age to come", limits the Kingdom of God to a future expectation.

There are two streams of thought in the dynamic interpretation of the Kingdom of God. Both groups believe the Kingdom of God has broken in on history. However, they differ as to the extent the Kingdom is present. C.H. Dodd, D.A. Lane, Werner Kelber, and G.R. Beasley-Murray assert that the Kingdom has arrived.38
This declaration that the Kingdom of God has already come necessarily dislocates the whole eschatological scheme in which its expected coming closes the long vista of the future. The eschaton has moved from the future to the present, from the sphere of expectation into that of realized experience... It represents the ministry of Jesus as "realized eschatology," that is to say, as the impact upon this world of the "powers of the world to come" in a series of events unprecedented and unrepeatable, now in actual process (C.H. Dodd, The Parables 34-35).

The Kingdom has been revealed in history; however, it has not appeared in glory and power. This is the concept behind the phrase: "... until they see the kingdom of God after it has come with power." (Mk. 9:1). The passage implies that the Kingdom of God exists currently without power. The Kingdom appearing with power refers to the Kingdom's evolution to a purely transcendent state. Dodd believes these ideas lie behind the saying at The Last Supper (Mk 14:25). Jesus' statement of "drinking wine anew in the kingdom" refers to drinking wine in the evolved transcendent Kingdom. The Kingdom is undergoing a maturation process during which the new world of eternal blessedness will evolve into being (C.H. Dodd, Parables 37-40). This is the basis of "realized or inaugurated eschatology". The "age to come" has begun but it is not complete.

The second stream in the dynamic interpretation views the Kingdom of God as both present and future. The Kingdom is present in history in a limited capacity. The full manifestation of God's sovereignty is still in the future. The present Kingdom does not mature into the future Kingdom of God. "The Kingdom of God involves two great moments; fulfillment within
history and consummation at the end of history". The Kingdom of God is two separate, yet supplementary, stages. Oscar Cullman's analogy of D-Day and V-Day best illustrates the two stages of the Kingdom (O. Cullman, Christ and Time 84f.). D-Day corresponds to the birth of Jesus and it represents the decisive battle in the war against Satan. The victory against the demonic forces is assured and the believers begin to reap the benefits of liberation. However, the war still continues. V-Day is still in the future and only on that day will there be complete victory and liberation. D-Day and V-Day like the two stages of the Kingdom of God are separate, yet complementary, events. There is the decisive intervention in history and human experience which is the present Kingdom of God. There will be a final action of God which will manifest his sovereignty over the world. This final act is the future Kingdom of God (N. Perrin, The Kingdom of God 168, 178).

In either stream of interpretation, Jesus' exorcisms are testimony to the presence of the Kingdom of God. Concurring with the static interpretation, the dynamic scholars associate the exorcism with the apocalyptic defeat of Satan. Nevertheless, the static interpretation view the exorcisms as preparation for the Kingdom's arrival. The actual defeat of Satan is still a future expectation. The dynamic interpretation views the exorcisms as the actual binding of Satan (Mk. 3:23-30). If Satan is being bound, then the powers of the Kingdom must be operative in history. Otherwise, Satan could not be placed under Jesus' control. Further, "according to Jewish expectations, only the salvation-bearer of the end-time can bind the prince of demons" (W.G. Kummel, Theology of the New Testament 37). Since Jesus has bound Satan, he must be the salvation-bearer of the end-time. Consequently, the end has arrived and the Kingdom of God must be present.
God's kingdom is present in Jesus in a new and unique way. In the mission of Jesus, God has taken the initiative. God has acted. God has manifested his kingly rule. The exorcism of demons is indeed a sign of the kingdom, but it is not a sign of an imminent approaching kingdom; rather it is a sign of present kingdom. In the coming of Jesus God has entered into history in his kingly activity to accomplish his redemptive purpose. (G.E. Ladd, "The Kingdom of God," 237).

The exorcisms confirm the historical presence of the Kingdom of God. The "age to come" has actually broken in on history.40

God's Kingdom is present in an inceptive or inaugural sense. It is present in the deeds and teaching of Jesus. The redemptive powers of the sovereign are concentrated in Jesus' ministry. It is with Jesus' exorcisms that God rescues His people (Mk. 1:23-27; 5:1-19; 7:24-30; 9:14-19). It is through Jesus' proclamations that God seeks out and redeems the sinners (Mk. 2:1-12.17). "The Kingdom 'exercises its power' and 'the Kingdom is preached' express the same idea; the dynamic presence of the Kingdom in the deeds and words of Jesus" (G.E. Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom, 162). Consequently, the Kingdom of God can be said to be present in Jesus and his ministry.

The Kingdom of God is present for those who accept Jesus' teaching and who are, consequently, recipients of the redemptive acts of the sovereign.

To experience the kingly activity of God one must have faith, i.e. one must interpret the event aright and commit oneself without reservation to the God revealed in the event properly interpreted. Then, and only then, does the Kingdom
become a matter of personal experience. But it *does* become present as personal experience, and so the Kingdom as present in the teaching of Jesus means, in effect, the Kingdom as potentially—actually present in the personal experience of the believer (N. Perrin, *Kingdom of God* 187; author's own italics).

The believer can experience now the eschatological gifts of salvation. He can participate in the Kingdom of God.

Both groups of scholars agree that the presence of the Kingdom is the major element which separates the gospel's view of the symbol from the Judaic. As previously mentioned, the apocalyptists believed God has distanced himself from humanity.

... the God of late Judaism had withdrawn from the evil world and was no longer redemptively working in history. One final redemptive act was expected at the end of the age; but meanwhile, God stood aloof from history (G.E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom* 169).

God's sovereign or redemptive acts were viewed as future events. According to Mark, God's Kingdom is present.

The Kingdom in this age is not merely the abstract concept of God's universal rule to which men must submit, it is rather a dynamic power at work among men. This is not only the element which sets our Lord's teaching most distinctively apart from Judaism; it *is the heart of his proclamation and the key to his entire mission* (G.E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom* 135; author's own italics).
The point of discontinuity between the Markan and Judaic views of the Kingdom is temporal.

At this stage of the hypotheses, both the dynamic and static interpretations have established their definitions for the Kingdom of God. They also have estimated the points of continuity and discontinuity between the Judaic and Markan understanding of the symbol. Logically, their analyses of the remaining "Kingdom" passages are consistent with their definitions of the Kingdom and their estimation of the points of continuity and discontinuity.

According to the static interpretation, the "seed" parables refer to the proclamation of the Kingdom. Weiss observed that the parable of "The Sower" (4:14-20) precedes the "seed" parables (Jesus' Proclamation 72). "The Sower" refers to the spreading of the gospel or the word. This is indicated by the interpretation found in the Gospel (Mk. 4:14-20). The parable was, during Mark's time, a reference to the proclamation of the Kingdom and the reception the proclamation received from different groups of people. Weiss believed this theme was continued in the subsequent parables. In the "Seed Growing Secretly" (4:26-29) and the "Mustard Seed" (4:30-32), the seeds referred to the proclamation of the Kingdom. However, the emphasis was now placed on the growth of the message. The parables alluded to the development of the gospel about the Kingdom of God. They did not refer to Kingdom itself.

There may have been an alternative interpretation of the "Seed Growing Secretly" that emphasized the behaviour of the sower and the fate of the seed. The Seed grows to maturity without any assistance from the sower. The sower neither waters, fertilizes nor aids the growth of the seed in any manner. Likewise, the Kingdom of God will appear without human
assistance. It is a miraculous act of God. The parable confirmed the Jewish belief that the Kingdom of God was solely an act of the divine sovereign. Mankind could not aid or hasten its coming.\(^{41}\)

In summary, the parables referred to the development and reception of Jesus' proclamation concerning the Kingdom. The parables confirmed the divine establishment of the Kingdom. According to the static interpretation, the parables did not represent the growth of the Kingdom nor did they suggest the present existence of the Kingdom. The parables were consistent with the interpretation of the other 'Kingdom' passages. The Kingdom, in the Gospel of Mark, was understood as the imminent transcendent "age to come".

In the dynamic interpretation, the parables of the "Seed Growing Secretly" (4:26-29) and the "Mustard Seed" (Mk. 4:30-32) are often cited as support for the presence of the Kingdom of God. According to "realized eschatology", the seeds' growth is an allusion to the Kingdom's development. This deduction is based on the continuity between the seed and the plant. The continuum indicates that the implied subject is a single object or event.

(W)e have to recognize the continuity between them, and therefore their unity. "We have to do with a single event," Polag has remarked in this connection, "with the destiny of a single object." The single event, the single object, is coming of the kingdom in its totality, beginning and end and whatever may lie between (G.R. Beasley-Murray, \textit{Jesus and the Kingdom} 124).

The parables refer to the Kingdom of God's progression toward its future consummation.

According to other scholars, the parable is a message of comfort and instruction about the nature of the Kingdom. Like the seed, Jesus' ministry is
modest. However, similar to the seed which contains the potential to become an expansive tree, Jesus' ministry contains the germ of the future glorious Kingdom.

What the image of growth toward maturity does express is the intimate link between Jesus' ministry and the full manifestation of the kingdom. There is a continuity between what is happening before the eyes of the disciples and crowds and definitive establishment of the kingdom . . . .
The kingdom is thus already active, already present; this presence is, of course, different from its glorious future coming . . . (A. Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom 119)

The disciples are assured that despite the small beginnings, the Kingdom will surely come in glory.

As can be inferred, both the static and dynamic scholars have numerous explanations for the "seed" parables. The interpretation of the parables depends substantially on the definition of the Kingdom and the perceived point of comparison. Until a conclusive understanding of the Kingdom is reached, it is impossible to select even the most feasible explanation for the parables.

There are three statements in the Gospel of Mark which refer to particular behaviour necessary for entrance to or receipt of the Kingdom of God (9:47; 10:15, 24-25). Both static and dynamic scholars agree that these statements are components of Jesus' ethical teaching. "Receiving the Kingdom like a child" and the other pronouncements represent the outlook required for participation in the Kingdom. It is further hypothesized that the ethics of entrance represent Jesus' own understanding of God's will and law. Jesus "claims to have a more correct knowledge of God's commandments
than have the Pharsaic teachers and, going beyond this, he sets himself unequivocally against certain demands of the written law itself" (W.G. Kummel, *Theology of the New Testament* 52). It is an opinio communis that the requirements for entrance to the Kingdom consistent with Jesus' ethical pronouncements.

The *dynamic* and *static* interpretations, due to their divergent definitions for the Kingdom, have different understandings of the actual entrance into the Kingdom. The *static* view believes Jesus' ethics prepares one for admittance into the future Kingdom of God. They cite Jesus' conversation with the scribe as a reflection of this view (Mk. 12:28-34). The scribe possesses the moral quality required for entrance into the Kingdom of God. Now the scribe must await the Kingdom's arrival. "You are not far from the kingdom of God" (12:34).

The "not far" must in fact be understood in a purely chronological sense, not as denoting some small measure of perfection which the man still lacks. He is not far from the Kingdom of God because he possesses the moral quality which will identify him as a member of the same when after a short space it appears. Whosoever at the dawning of the Kingdom is in possession of a character morally renovated; he will be found a member of the same. This is the adequate expression for a relation of morality to the coming Kingdom of God (A. Schweitzer, *Mystery* 56).

The *dynamic* interpretation believes adherance to Jesus' teaching admits one immediately into the Kingdom of God.

The passage (Mk. 9:43-48) makes it quite clear that it was Jesus' understanding that entrance into the kingdom of God
in the present entails participation in the kingdom that will arrive in its fullness after the judgment, since the alternative to entering the kingdom is going into Gehenna (G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom 175).

Admittance into the Kingdom of God guarantees continuing participation in the Kingdom of God as it evolves into its transcendent state. In fact, one could be said to be entering the "age to come" since the present Kingdom will develop into the "age to come" (C.H. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching 11).

The conversation between the scribe and Jesus, according to dynamic scholars, centres on the moral quality required for entrance into the Kingdom of God (Mk. 12:28-34). The phrase "not far" implies that the scribe is still lacking some quality. Hence, the scribe cannot yet enter the Kingdom.

In conclusion, the dynamic and static interpretations commence their studies with an understanding of the Judiac view of the Kingdom of God. Both groups believe that the Judiac view of the Kingdom is intimately associated with apocalypticism. Specifically, the Kingdom of God is connected with the "age to come". Consequently, it is a future expectation.

It is at this point that the opinions diverge. The static scholars maintain that the Kingdom of God is a synonym for the "age to come." It is the transcendent state expected at the end-of-history. According to the static interpretation, the apocalyptic view of the Kingdom persists in the Gospel of Mark. The Markan Kingdom is a future expectation (Mk. 1:14-15; 9:1; 12:28-34; 14:25). Further, it refers to a transcendent state (Mk. 9:1; 14:25). Jesus' exorcisms are understood as signs of the imminence of the Kingdom. The dynamic interpretation understands the Kingdom of God as the apocalyptic activities of God. Because the Kingdom is a dynamic concept, it has the potential to break in on history. This is exactly the Markan view of the
Kingdom. The apocalyptic actions of the divine sovereign that were expected at the end-of-history have broken in on history. The Kingdom is a present reality (1:14-15; 9:1). This present Kingdom is the inaugural state or the first stage of a process that will lead to the transcendent "age to come" (14:25). The exorcisms are proof of the Kingdom's existence and the parables allude to the Kingdom's presence and development. The discontinuity between the Judaic version of the Kingdom and the Markan view of the symbol is fundamentally temporal. Both the dynamic and static interpretations maintain that the Kingdom of God, within postbiblical Judaism, was a future expectation. Both groups of scholars concur that Mark distorted the apocalyptic time schedule. This distortion, depending on the interpretation accepted, is either the imminence or the presence of the Kingdom.

The Kingdom debate revolves around the Judaic understanding of the Kingdom of God. As has been demonstrated, the interpretation of the Markan "Kingdom" passages is dependent upon presumed Judaic views of the symbol. The interpretation of the Markan passages varies with the different definitions of the Judaic Kingdom. Therefore, any resolution of this debate must begin with the Judaic texts and their estimation of the Kingdom symbol. Is the apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God a true representation of the Judaic views of the Kingdom? This study will attempt to show that the apocalyptic interpretation is inappropriate. The Kingdom of God, within postbiblical Judaism, was a soteriological category. It referred to the divine king's saving actions on behalf of his people. Further, the future manifestation of the Kingdom was eschatological. The manifestation of the Kingdom occurred within history. It did not coincide with the end-of-history.
Chapter 2
Kingdom of God within Postbiblical Judaism

Approach to the Material

The analysis of the Kingdom of God within early Judaism is limited by three concerns. First, the focus of this thesis is the Markan understanding of the Kingdom. The Judaic material examined will provide a foundation for understanding Mark's employment of the symbol. Therefore, the analysis of the Judaic understandings will be restricted. The intention is to form representative views of the Kingdom of God. The purpose is not to provide an exhaustive study. Second, the Gospel of Mark was written between 65-70 C.E. and prior to the destruction of the Temple. Consequently, the Gospel, consequently, reflects a Judaism that has yet to be influenced and affected by the loss of the Temple. With this assumption, only those Judaic texts which most probably represent pre-70-C.E. forms of Judaism will be examined. While it is acknowledged that Rabbinic literature probably does contain examples of pre-70-C.E. Judaism, the Rabbinic material will not be considered in this study. The complexity involved in dating the Rabbinic documents may serve only to cloud any assessment of the material and it may disadvantage the survey. Third, it is presumed that the Judaic understandings of the Kingdom of God are founded upon ideas of Yahweh's actions as king.

This last concern reflects a major assumption of this analysis. I believe that the Judaic views of the Kingdom are rooted in ideas of Yahweh's sovereignty and sovereign actions. The perception that the Judaic notions of the Kingdom of God are rooted in the concepts of divine kingship rests on two observations. First, there is the linguistic observation that the abstract noun, malkûth (kingdom), was probably formed from the
verbal root màlak. The idea of "kingdom" is based upon an understanding of the actions associated with "ruling" or "being king". This implies that the Kingdom of God cannot be conceived without speaking of God's sovereign activities and deeds. This is dramatically demonstrated in Psalm 145.

All thy works shall praise Thee, O Lord;
And Thy saints shall bless Thee.
They shall speak of the glory of Thy kingdom,
And talk of Thy might;
To make known to the sons of men His mighty acts,
And the glory of the majesty of His kingdom.
Thy kingdom is a kingdom for all ages,
And Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations.
(Ps. 145:10-13).

This linguistic impression is verified by a second observation. The term "kingdom" is often found in close association with its relatives "king" (mèlek) and "rule" (màlak). In some instances, the noun and various verbal forms are used almost interchangeably. Scholars have cited examples of this association and interchange in the rabbinic Targums, Midrashim and Qumran scrolls. In 1 QM XII.16 Israel's future role is expressed with the verb limèlòk, "Sovereignty shall be to the Lord and everlasting dominion to Israel (1 QM XII.16)." The last phrase "and everlasting dominion to Israel," appears in XII.16 as ysr'l lmìlwk 'wlìmym, using the infinitive of màlak. In its doublet XIX.8, the noun, malkùth is used: "Israel for an eternal kingdom". This association of the kingdom with the actions of "being king" is also evident in other passages in the Tanakh, Deuterocanonical corpus and Pseudepigrapha (Ps. 47:2-8; 145; Tobit 13; T. Abrah. 8:3; T. Mos. 10; Ps. Sol. 17).

Consequently, the Judaic texts associate the Kingdom of God with God's
sovereign activities and research into the Judaic understandings of the Kingdom of God should include those ideas connected with God's kingship.

It is an opinio communis that concepts associated with Yahweh's sovereignty form the foundation for the Kingdom of God symbol. Both the static and dynamic interpreters profess adherence to this axiom. However, neither group applies the axiom with academic rigor.49 A case in point is Norman Perrin's analysis of the Kingdom of God within the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.50 He restricts his analysis to verses containing the explicit word "kingdom" (Sib. Or. 3:46, 767; T. Mos.10:1; Ps. Sol. 5:18; 17). He omits from his examination references to God as King (Sib. Or. 3:499, 560, 616, 784, 808; T. Mos. 4:1-3; Ps. Sol. 2:30,32 ). If the Judaic Kingdom symbol is contained in ideas of Yahweh's sovereignty, these references should not be excluded from analysis.51

In this study, the inquiry will include references to divine kingship, ruling, and kingdom. Specifically, various permutations of the Hebrew màlak, the Greek basileuein and Latin regere that are associated with God, will be reviewed.52 This obviously expands the material that has normally been examined in the Kingdom debate. For example, discussion of the divine Kingdom within Daniel has usually been limited to chapter two and seven. In this study, chapter four will be included.

Temporal Aspect of the Kingdom of God

The majority of biblical scholars, as was noted in the previous chapter, interpret the Kingdom of God as an apocalyptic concept. This apocalyptic interpretation emphasizes two points. First, within early Judaism, the Kingdom of God was solely a future expectation. The Kingdom would be revealed only at the eschaton. It was a synonym for the "age to come".53
that early Judaism and its documents contained the concept of temporal dualism. Temporal dualism is the radical opposition between "this age" (ha-'ōlam hazzeh) and the "age to come" (ha-'ōlam habba'). Although the two ages are successive stages on the temporal nexus, due to their radical contrariety, the "age to come" is never depicted as a development or continuation of "this age". The present age is limited and mundane. The "age to come" is transcendent and eternal. Therefore, the Kingdom of God, if equivalent to the "age to come", must be supermundane and everlasting. Further, the divine Kingdom can never be part of the present age. Satan is the ruler of the present age. God will re-assert his sovereignty in the future. This temporal dualism between "this age" and the "age to come" leads to the second point. Since "this age" is opposed to the "age to come", "this age" must be completely destroyed before the Kingdom of God can be manifested. There will be a definite break in the historical continuum. This is the eschaton/ end-of-history. The manifestation of the Kingdom coincides with the end-of-history.

The apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God has dominated the Kingdom debate. However, its validity and prominence should be challenged. According to the Judaic material, the Kingdom of God was part of the present age. The Kingdom was not confined to the future. Contrary to the assumptions of the dynamic interpretation, this present Kingdom was not an abstract entity. It represented the effective rule of God. The texts do refer to the future manifestation of the Kingdom. Nevertheless, this appearance of the Kingdom was not expected at the end-of-history. The emergence of the future Kingdom did not coincide with the destruction of the present age.

The presence of the Kingdom of God is attested in the everlasting nature of God's sovereignty and the divine monarch's control over history.
The eternal quality of Yahweh's sovereignty/Kingdom is confirmed in numerous texts.

Thy kingdom is a kingdom for all ages,
And Thy dominion endureth throughout all the
generations (Ps. 145:13; cf. Exod. 15:18; Ps. 10:16; 29:10; 95:2; Daniel 4:34; 6:26; I Chron. 29:11; Tobit 13; Wis. Sol. 3:8; I Enoch 9:4; 12:3; 25:3-5,7; 27:3; Sib. Or. 3:616; T. Abrah. 8:3).

Since God is understood as the eternal sovereign, His kingship and His Kingdom are continuous. The Kingdom of God is a testimony of the past, a present reality, and a future expectation. In the past, Yahweh redeemed the Israelites from the Egyptians and he established His "kingdom of priests" (Exod. 19:6). In previous times, the Davidic monarchs were the trustees of God's Kingdom (I Chron. 17:14; 28:5; II Chron. 13:8). Throughout history, the divine sovereign has been called upon to respond and Yahweh has responded (Tobit 13; Ad. Es. 13:9f.; 14:3f.; 3 Macc. 2:2f.; 6:2f.). Finally, in the future the Kingdom of God will appear throughout the entire world (Zech. 14:9; Daniel 2, 7; Sib. Or. 3:47; 767; T. Mos. 10:1). Yahweh will be recognized by all men as the sole universal monarch (Zech. 14:9; Sib. Or. 3:767).

Consequently, Yahweh's sovereignty/Kingdom is not restricted to a specific time or period. The Kingdom of God is everlasting. Yahweh as creator of the cosmos is by right the king of his creation (Ps. 24:1; 95; 96; Tobit 13; 3 Macc. 2:2-4).57 His sovereignty extends over space and time. It is both universal and eternal. The Kingdom symbol, in a given context, may have a particular temporal designation. A text may refer to the future manifestation or the present existence of the Kingdom. However, the Kingdom of God symbol cannot be confined to any specific period. The Kingdom exists de jure over the earth since creation.
Most scholars concede that God's kingship exists in the present. Nevertheless, they suggest that Yahweh is a king in name only. God is the absent landlord of the earth (J.H. Charlesworth, "The Historical Jesus." 472). Satan is in control of the present age (R.H. Hiers, Jesus and Future 67). Consequently, the "present" Kingdom of God is merely an abstract concept. This assumption is not supported by the texts.

Yahweh's sovereignty is not an abstract concept (Ps. 103:19; I Chron. 29:11). Yahweh influences and guides the nations.

And at the end of the days I Nebuchadnezzar lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honoured Him that liveth for ever; . . . And He doeth according to His will in the host of heaven, And among the inhabitants of the earth; And none can stay His hand, Or say unto Him: What doest thou? (Daniel 4:31-32; cf. Jer. 10:7,10; 48:15; 51:51; Obad. 21; Ps. 22:29; 47:8-9; Wis. Sol. 6:1-3; Sir. 10:4,8; 1 Enoch 9:4; Ps. Sol. 2:30-32).

In similar fashion to his past manipulation of the Pharaoh (Exod. 9:35; 10:17 etc.), Yahweh influences later regents.

However, the King of kings aroused the rage of Antiochus against Menelaus; Lysias produced evidence that this criminal was responsible for all Antiochus' troubles, and so the king ordered him to be taken to Beroea and there to be executed in the manner customary at that place (2 Macc. 13:4; cf. Daniel 4; Ad. Es. 15:8; 3 Macc. 5, 6).
The divine sovereign is actively and effectively involved in the world (Wis. Sol. 6:1-21; T. Mos. 1:12-18; 3:11-12; 12:4-5; Ps. Sol. 17:7-8).

This concept of God's participation in human affairs is echoed in the various prayers and psalms. (Tobit 13; Ad. Es. 13; 14; 3 Macc. 2: 6). In the Greek Additions to Esther, both Mardochoeus and Esther pray to the divine monarch (13:9f.; 14:3f.). The "characters" are convinced that Yahweh has the ability to answer their petition thus defeating Haman's plot against the Jews. Tobit praises the "King of ages" for the mercy he has shown and will show to Israel (13:1f.). Eleazer petitions God to protect the Jews from Ptolemy IV (3 Macc. 6). These prayers suggest that the various authors and their audiences believed in God's active sovereignty. Since these passages were written/edited between 150 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., it may be assumed that postbiblical Judaism maintained the concept of an effective heavenly monarch.58

The canonical psalms confirm God's effective sovereignty. G.H. Wilson notes that the psalms were undergoing an editorial process prior to the turn of the common era (Editing the Psalter 91-2). This process distanced the compositions from their original cultic setting while providing them with a new context. The psalms were reformed as "individual responses to life situations" (Editing the Psalter 172-3). Accordingly, within Second Temple Judaism, the psalms were not merely dusty memories of a forgotten "entronement festival".59 They could be and possibility were read as expressions of individual piety. The phrase "The Lord reigneth" was not an echo of a past ritual. It confirmed that heavenly monarch protected and governed the world (Ps. 22:29; 29:10; 44:5; 47:8; 68:5; 74:12; 84:4; 95; 97; 99; 145).60 The recitation of the psalms in the temple and proto-synagogue
services indicates their relevance and commonality. It also suggests that the ideas contained in the psalms were familiar to the postbiblical Judaism.

In summary, the Kingdom of God exists de jure over the world since creation. This does not mean that the Kingdom exists conjecturally. God has the potential and the ability to exercise his sovereignty at any time in any place. He is an active and effective monarch. God's Kingdom is part of the present age. The divine Kingdom was not solely a future expectation.

**Eschatological Manifestation of the Kingdom of God**

There is no doubt that the Judaic texts do refer to the manifestation of a future Kingdom of God.

And then, indeed, he (God) will raise up a kingdom for all ages among men, he who once gave the holy Law to the pious, to all of whom he promised to open the earth and the world and the gates of the blessed and all joys and immortal intellect and eternal cheer. (Sib. Or. 3:767-771; cf. 3:47; Isa. 24:23; Obad. 21; Zech. 14:9; Daniel 2, 7; T. Mos. 10:1; Ps. Sol. 17.).

However, this future Kingdom of God is not consistent with the categorization and definition provided by the apocalyptic interpretation. The future Kingdom of God is manifested within the normal historical process at a time appointed by Yahweh. This time may coincide with the final stage in a series of ages; however, it is not the end-of-history. The natural calamities which accompany the Kingdom's emergence represent God's appearance in history and/or His acts of judgment. They are not, as inferred by the apocalyptic interpretation, signs for the end-of-history. Further, there has been the tendency to view the future Kingdom as a transcendent realm. It is surmised that the transcendent nature of the Kingdom is incompatible with the
mundane line of history. Accordingly, the Kingdom must be an apocalyptic category. However, the concept of a transcendent Kingdom is not contained in the documents.

The major tenet for the apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God is the concept of temporal dualism. If the apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom is valid, the concept of temporal dualism should permeate those Judaic texts which refer to the Kingdom. Two factors immediately challenge the assumed pervasiveness of temporal dualism. First, the actual terms "this age" and the "age to come" are absent from the texts under consideration. Second, there is a tendency within the texts to divide world "history" into several periods rather than two. For example, a four-age schema is used by Daniel (2:7) and the Sibylline Oracles (Book 3). The Testament of Moses presents a series of several ages (1-10).

These observations alone do not refute the existence of temporal dualism. Several scholars assert that while the terminological distinction between "this age" and the "age to come" may not appear in the texts, the concept of the two ages is indeed present. Phrases such as "on that day" (bayyôm hahû', e.g. Isa. 7:18f.) and "at the end of the days" (bê'ahâcît hayyamîm, e.g. Isa. 2:2) are cited as rudimentary concepts for temporal dualism. Further, the prophetic books and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha do contrast the present age with an expected age of blessing.

Still others among them will be punished by torture, both by fire and sword, and they will be compelled to bear publicly (as burdens) idols which are polluted just as those who revere them are polluted...

Then His (God's) kingdom will appear throughout his whole creation
Then the devil will have an end.
Yea, sorrow will be led away with him.

(T. Mos. 8:4-5: 10:1; cf. Isa. 49.51; Zech.14:1f.; Daniel 7:23-27;
Sib. Or. 3:624-668; 741-795; Ps. Sol. 17:19-20; 26-32).

There is a contrast being made between a troubled present time and a blissful future period. Nevertheless, this contrasting of two ages is not sufficient to validate the apocalyptic interpretation. First, the transition between the two ages must involve the destruction of "this age". There must be the idea of the eschaton as the end-of-history. Second, the expected age must be transcendent and eternal.

Natural catastrophes and abnormal events often precede the manifestation of the future Kingdom of God. These calamities have been interpreted as signs for the end-of-history.

Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty and maketh it waste,
And turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. . . .
The earth will be utterly emptied and clean despoiled.
For the Lord hath spoken this word.

(Isa. 24:1-3).

Fire falls from the heavens (Sib. Or. 3:53-54, 85, 673f.). The earth trembles (Isa. 25:12; Zech.14:4-5; Sib. Or. 3:680; T. Mos.10:4). There is a saturnalia of blood (Obad. 1f.; Zech.14:3; Ps. Sol. 17:22f.).

High ravines in lofty mountains
will be full of corpses. Rocks will flow
with blood and every torrent will fill the plain.

(Sib. Or. 3:682-684).

However, these calamities alone do not signal the end-of-history.
The historical gap between the modern biblical scholar and the ancient Jew produces a tendency to categorize natural disasters as apocalyptic events. The modern scholar fails to view history through the eyes of the ancient Jew. For the ancient, the normal historical process was the setting for supernatural events. God and his agents acted in human history.

In the debate on Old Testament eschatology, much has been made of the catastrophes in the descriptions of doom. Earthquake, pestilence, fire, etc., of course, are often regarded as elements in the future judgement; but they are frequently presented as purely natural events, readily understandable in the milieu of the Old Testament (J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* 362; see also A. Lacoque, *The Book of Daniel* 130-1).

As demonstrated in this chapter, the idea of God as historical agent continues in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Yahweh governs history and controls both Israel and gentile kingdoms (Wis. Sol. 6:1-3; Sir. 10:4; 2 Macc. 13:4; 3 Macc. 2,5,6). Divine actions are not limited to the end-of-history. There is nothing in the content of the events which essentially categorizes them as apocalyptic. The calamities and disasters are apocalyptic only if they represent the destruction of "this age" or they occur simultaneously with the end-of-history.

The mass mayhem and desolation described in the prophetic books and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha do not represent the destruction of the present age. The destruction is limited. It is generally confined to the gentile kingdoms, the wicked and/or Israel's enemies.

For God Most High will surge forth,

the Eternal One alone.
In full view will he come to work vengeance on the nations.
Yea; all their idols will be destroy.
Sib. Or. 3:657; Ps. Sol. 17:30f.).

There are no specific references of the actual eradication of "this age".

Verses which seem to imply the annihilation of this age are either ambiguous or they are highly figurative expressions. Sib. Or. 3:53-54 reads, "All men will perish in their own dwellings when the fiery cataract flows from heaven". The statement may imply the destruction of all mankind. However, this sentence directly follows a reference to Rome and the wrath that "will fall upon Latin men" (3:51). Consequently, 3:53-54 may refer to the elimination of all Roman men rather than all men. This is supported by the conclusion to this particular section. Sib. Or. 3:46-62 ends with "but, I will tell all in turn, in how many cities will endure evil". It can be inferred from this statement that not all cities will be desolated. Only specific cities will be ruined. The destruction is limited. This interpretation is consistent with the remainder of Book Three. The oracles of Book Three do not prophesy the destruction of "this age" and the abolition of human history (J.J. Collins, Sibylline Oracles 98).

The prophetic books contain highly figurative expressions which seem to predict the earth's demise.

The earth reeleth to and fro like a drunken man
And swayeth to and fro as a lodge;
And the transgression thereof is heavy upon it.
And it shall fall, and not rise again.
(Isa. 24:20; cf. Isa. 24:1-6)
However, Jerusalem and its elders remain after the earth's stumble (Isa. 24:23; cf. Isa. 24:6). Similarly with Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles, the prophetic books do not predict the annihilation of "this age".

If the modern definition of eschatology excludes any continuity between the new age and previous world history, then the word cannot be employed in the exegesis of the prophetic books; for prophets have no conception of eschatology as the end of history... (K. Koch, The Prophets 2:117; author's own italics).

The prophetic books do not contain a belief in the passing away of this world. 64

If the natural calamities are not signs for the end-of-history, what do they signify? The destruction seems to be directed at Israel's enemies and/or the wicked. The mass mayhem is part of the judgment Yahweh has placed upon the gentile nations and/or the impious.

God will judge all men by war and sword and fire and torrential rain. There will also be brimstone from heaven and stone and much grievous hail (Sib. Or. 3:689-692; cf. Isa. 24; Zech. 14:12f.; T.Mos.10:3f.; Ps. Sol. 17:29f.).

Yahweh is the divine warrior and judge who vanquishes the enemies of Israel and the usurpers of God's sovereignty. "And it shall be, that whosoever of the families of the earth goeth not up unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, upon them there shall be no rain" (Zech. 14:17). God is also the divine warrior who restores and preserves His people (Isa. 24:22f.; Obad. 18; Zech. 14:9f.; Daniel 7:25f.).

For he alone will shield them, standing by them magnificently
as if he had a wall of blazing fire round about.
They will be free from war in towns and country.
No hand of evil war, but rather the Immortal himself
and the hand of the Holy One will be fighting for them.
(Sib. Or. 3:705-709).

The descriptions of natural calamities and abnormal events are theophanic portraits. They express in vivid images the coming of the divine sovereign and His actions as warrior and judge.

Some scholars have suggested that the end-of-history is implied through various *termini technici*. The phrases "on that day", "at that time" and "day of Yahweh" are often cited by apocalyptic interpreters as end-of-history designations.

It is commonly acknowledged that the Day of the Lord in the Old Testament is not a date but an event . . .
It forms the boundary between history and kingdom of God (G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* 11).

Since the manifestation of the divine Kingdom is said to occur "on that day", the appearance of the Kingdom must coincide with the end-of-history. "The Lord will be king over the whole earth. On that day there will be one Lord, and his name the only name" (Zech.14:8-9; cf. Isa. 24:21-23; Obad. 8,21). However, the various phrases are not necessarily *termini technici* for the eschaton. The phrases "on that day" and "day of Yahweh" indicate an appointed time for the fulfillment of a divine purpose.65 The appointed time is the end-of-history only if God's purpose is the destruction of "this age" and the creation of the "age to come". This is not the case. The appointed time has several purposes. It is the day of judgment for Israel's enemies ( Isa. 24). It
is the day Yahweh is universally recognized as king (Zech. 14:9f.). It is the
day that Edom is incorporated into God’s Kingdom (Obad. 21). It is the
day that Yahweh has appointed for the reign of his agent (Ps. Sol. 17:21; 18:5).
There is no indication in the texts under consideration that the specific
phrases signal the end-of-history.

The phrases "the time of the end" (Daniel 11:35; 12:4,9) and "the
consummation of the end of days" (T. Mos.1:18) are regarded as termini
technici for the end-of-history. In Daniel the Hebrew word qêts is used for
"end". It first appears in chapter eight.

He then came near where I was standing and as he came, I fell
prostrate in terror. But he said to me, "Understand, 0 man,
that the vision refers to the time of the end." When he spoke
with me, I dropped prostrate to the ground. But he touched
me and raised me to my feet. "I will tell you," he said,
"What is to be at the last days of the time of wrath; for
there will be an end to the period." (trans. L.F. Hartman & A.A.
Dilella, Daniel 222; Daniel 8:17-19).

In this section, "the end" refers to the completion of God’s wrath. God’s wrath
is the persecution the Jews are suffering under Antiochus Epiphanes (Daniel
9:26; cf.1 Macc 1:64). Consequently, "the time of the end" is the period of
Antiochus’ persecution.66 "The time of the end" is not the end-of-time.

In the Testament of Moses, two phrases are cited as end-of-history
designations. They are "the consummation of the end of days" (1:18) and "the
end of the age" (12:4). In 12:4, "the end of the age" is used in reference to
God’s omniscience and omnipotence.

And he (God) has foreseen both them and us from the
beginning of the creation of the world even to the end
of the age. Indeed, nothing, to the least thing, has been overlooked by him. But, (rather), he has seen all things and he is the cause of all: ... (T. Mos. 12:4-5).

The phrase may be an end-of-history term. Nevertheless, it functions as part of a description for God's control of the world. It is not linked to the manifestation of the divine Kingdom. Consequently, even if “the end of the age” is an apocalyptic designation, the phrase has no association with the kingdom of God.

There is ambiguity over the phrase, “consummation of the end of days”, in chapter one.

But (you) take this writing so that later you will remember how to preserve the books which I shall entrust to you. You shall arrange them, anoint them with cedar, and deposit them in earthenware jars in the place which (God) has chosen from the beginning of the creation of the world, (a place) so that his name may be called upon until the day of recompense (or repentance) with regard to which the Lord will regard them in the consummation of the end of days. (1:16-18).

The function of the phrase “consummation of the end of days” is obscure. It may be a reference to the temple and its long-term significance for Israel (J.J. Collins, "Testament of Moses," 151). The phrase may also operate as an assurance that those who call upon the Lord will be remembered. The actual nature of the “consummation” is ambiguous. There is no accompanying description. Finally, there is only inference that the manifestation of the Kingdom in chapter ten coincides with the “end of the days”. Since chapter ten is the last "period" in the book, it is assumed that it is the "end of days".
Nevertheless, there is no unequivocal connection made between chapter one and ten.

In summary, the apparent *termini technici* for the end-of-history are either ambiguous or they are multireferential. The phrases may refer to the end of a specific period of persecution (Daniel 8:17-19) or God's judgment over the nations (Isa. 24). The terms do suggest there is a divinely appointed time for the manifestation of the Kingdom. However, this appointed time is not the end-of-history (Isa. 24:21-23; Obad. 21; Zech.14:8-9). The terms "this age" and the "age to come" which usually signal the belief in the end-of-history are absent in the texts under consideration. There is a contrast between a troubled present period and a blessed future age. This contrasting though is not sufficient to validate an apocalyptic interpretation. The texts do refer to the termination of a strife-filled period of time. There is an expectation that religious persecution (Daniel 7:25; T. Mos. 8:1-9:7), armed conflict (Sib. Or. 3:635f.) and/or exile (Isa. 51:17-52:1; Ps. Sol. 17:5-20) will be ended. Further, the cessation of tribulation is usually accompanied by natural calamities and cosmic upheavals. These events do involve the destruction of Israel's enemies and the wicked. However, the destruction is limited. The present age is not annihilated. The descriptions of natural disasters and abnormal events are theophanic portraits of God's appearance as judge and divine warrior. There is nothing in the texts to suggest that the manifestation of the Kingdom of God coincides with the end-of-history.

The second argument of the apocalyptic interpretation focuses on the presumed transcendence and eternalness of the Kingdom. A supramundane Kingdom is assumed to be incompatible with the mundane line of history. Subsequently, the Kingdom of God must be beyond history and the historical nexus must be terminated. Validation for this hypothesis rests on proving
the transcendent nature of the Kingdom of God. It is obvious that the texts refer to the everlasting nature of the future Kingdom of God (Sib. Or. 3:767-773; Daniel 2:44; 7:26-27; Zech. 14:9-19; T. Mos. 10:1-10). Nevertheless, this everlasting future Kingdom of God is not supramundane.

In a number of texts, the "future" Kingdom of God is definitely mundane. For example, in Psalm of Solomon 17, the Kingdom of God is an earthly political entity. At a time appointed by God, a Davidic messiah/ideal king arises to purify Jerusalem and to secure Israel against the gentile nations (17:2f.). The actions of the messiah are devoid of "supernatural events". The messiah himself is not a supernatural agent; he is human.67 There are no descriptions of cosmic battles between God and Satan. The focus of the Psalm is the restoration of a pious Israel under a righteous king and the subjection of the gentile nations. This view concurs with Burton L. Mack's evaluation of the ideal king in Psalm of Solomon 17. Mack believes that the figure of the king served as a constructive picture for an imagined re-organization of society. The king was a focal point for a social formation that would reunite and reinvigorate a currently divided and oppressed society.68 The future Kingdom in Psalm of Solomon 17 is idealized. However, the Kingdom is not transcendent. Further, this re-organization is eschatological. It occurs within the historical continuum. It is not apocalyptic.

The desire for an "ideal" pious state is found in other texts.

In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses: HOLY UNTO THE LORD; and the pots in the lord's house shall be like the basins before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be holy unto the LORD of hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein; and in that day there shall be no more trafficker
in the house of the LORD of hosts (Zech. 14:20-21).

Again, these changes may be idealized; nevertheless they are not supramundane. There is no suggestion that the world must be transformed into a transcendent entity before the desired results can be achieved. The pious ideal state is possible within the normal historical process.

In other texts, the nature of the future Kingdom of God is vague. In Obadiah, the focus is upon the events which precede the Kingdom. The document concentrates on the crimes of Edom, God's punishment of Edom and the restoration of Israel. The incorporation of Esau into God's Kingdom and the restoration of Israel as a political entity are the only descriptions associated with the future emergence of the divine Kingdom (Obad. 21).

The first oracle in Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles also focuses on the events preceding the emergence of the Kingdom (J.J. Collins, Sibylline Oracles 66, 99). The oracle concentrates on the judgment levied against the Romans, Beliar and Beliar's followers (3:50-54; 63-74). Similarly, the book of Daniel concentrates on the present period of tribulation and the destruction of the wicked (Daniel 2, 7). There is little information on the events that follow the "setting up of the Kingdom" (P.R. Davies, Daniel 68-9). In other words, various documents emphasize God's judgment of the wicked. They do not provide elaborate descriptions of the divine Kingdom. As a result, there is no evidence in these texts to support or refute the transcendent nature of the divine Kingdom.

Other texts have a correspondence with the Kingdom's appearance and an ideal state of fertility, peace and blessedness.

For the all-bearing earth will give the most excellent unlimited fruit to mortals, of grain, wine and oil
and a delightful drink of sweet honey from heaven, 
trees, fruit of the top branches, and rich flocks 
and herds and lambs of sheep and kids of goats . . . .
The cities will be full of good things and the fields will 
be rich. There will be no sword on earth or din of battle, 
and the earth will no longer be shaken, groaning deeply. 
(Sib. Or. 3:744-752).

The earth undergoes a transformation which produces tremendous change in 
the quality of life on earth. These changes are so far-reaching that a new 
division or period in history may be said to emerge.70 Nevertheless, the 
apocalyptic idea that there is break in the historical continuum and the 
creation of a new supramundane world is absent.

It is said that on that day new heavens and a new earth will 
come into existence. Isa. lxv.17: 'Behold, I will create new 
heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered or come into mind.' The new heaven and the 
ew earth which Yahweh will make will remain before Him forever, lxvi.22. Such utterances do not mean that this 
universe will entirely pass away and a totally new universe 
be created; they simply give forceful expression to the 
thought that all the conditions of the present age will be 
altered and that 'etwas ganz anderes', a quite new order, will 
come into existence. There will be continuity; but at the 
same time everything will be changed in a way which is 
often described as a restoration of old conditions, a 
turning of fortune, a restitutio in integrum. (J. Lindblom, 
Prophecy in Ancient Israel 420).
The appearance of the divine Kingdom coincides with the emergence of a radically-changed world. The change in the quality of life on earth justifies the labelling of this period as a "new" age. However, it is not a transcendent age nor is it a state beyond history.

Specific expressions within particular texts have been cited as references for the supramundaneness of the divine Kingdom. In the Testament of Moses, the phrase "in Gehenna" has been used to justify a transcendent Kingdom. However, this attempt to establish the transcendence of the Kingdom rests on an emendation. The passage in question is 10:10.

And you will behold from on high
Yea, you will see your enemies on earth.

R.H. Charles translated the Latin "in terram" (on earth) as "in Gehenna". Charles reasoned that a Greek scholar translating the Hebrew be ge hinnom (in the valley of Gehenna) dropped hinnom and transliterated the Hebrew ge thus producing the Greek word for "earth". The document was later translated into Latin at which time the error produced by the Greek scholar became "in terram". Charles suggested that "Gehenna" dramatizes the torment Israel's enemies will receive after the final judgment. J. Priest notes that:

Charles' emendation to "in Gehenna" has been widely accepted and the conclusion drawn that TMos. thus speaks of a totally extramundane salvation and damnation. The translation here (referring to Priest's own) assumes simply an imagistic contrast between the exaltation of Israel and the fall of its enemies... Theology based on emendation and/or imagery is precarious (J. Priest, "The Testament of Moses," 933; J. Priest, "Some Reflections," 33).
Certainly, Charles and Priest agree that the main theme of the passage is the contrast between Israel's fate and the destiny of Israel's enemies. It is questionable whether the passage has a secondary theme of a transcendent Kingdom. The absence of any other description of the Kingdom and the tendency in other texts to maintain a mundane Kingdom suggests that the secondary theme is not present.

There are two references in the book of Daniel that have been cited as support for a transcendent Kingdom. The first is chapter two. Chapter two is the description and interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the statue. The statue is comprised of various materials symbolizing the succession of four world kingdoms (2:31-33; 37-43). Later, this statue is destroyed by a stone. This action represents the destruction of the world kingdoms and the establishment of the eternal Kingdom of God (2:34-36; 44-45). It is assumed that the eternal Kingdom is transcendent. However, other scholars observed the following factor.

(T)his kingdom set up by God is not further described. From the context we should suppose that it is a Jewish kingdom which will rise to replace and destroy the previous gentile kingdoms. It differs from other kingdoms in so far as it will not pass away, but it is presumably a political, earthly kingdom like them (J.J. Collins, "Kingdom of God," 82; A. Lacoque, Daniel 52).

Chapter two does not refer to a transcendent Kingdom of God.

Chapter seven uses the same four-kingdom schema found in chapter two. This time it is Daniel’s vision and the four world kingdoms are symbolized by various beasts rising out of the sea (7:1-9). The beastly kingdoms are again destroyed as God establishes the fifth kingdom (7:9-14).
This Kingdom is given to the "son of man" and the "saints of the Most High" (7:13-14,18,22,27). It is the presentation of the Kingdom to the "son of man" and the "saints" that becomes the foundation for advocating a transcendent Kingdom. It is surmised that the "son of man" and the "saints of the Most High" are supernatural entities. Since the Kingdom is handed over to these supernatural entities, the Kingdom also must be supernatural.

The interpretation of the "son of man" and the "saints" is one of the most controversial debates in biblical scholarship. There are scholars who maintain that these beings are transcendent. Other scholars believe the expressions refer to a righteous individual ("son of man") and righteous Jews. While this debate is beyond the scope of this study, it should be noted that the latter interpretation is favoured. Interpreting the "son of man" as a righteous man and the "saints of the Most High" as the Jewish people is preferred for several reasons. First, both expressions occur in previous texts and approximately half of the citations refer to human entities. Second, verse 27 contains the phrase "the people of the saints of the Most High". The use of the term "people" suggests that the referent is the Jewish people (L.F. Hartman & A.A. Dilella, The Book of Daniel 95-96). Third, verses 24-25, a king, generally acknowledged as Antiochus Epiphanes, "wears out" the "saints". It is inconceivable that a human king would and could persecute Yahweh's supernatural agents. Therefore, the "saints" who are under persecution must be the Jewish people (L.F. Hartman & A.A. Dilella, The Book of Daniel 95).

Based on the above interpretation, the Kingdom of God in the Book of Daniel is mundane. The power, sovereignty and prestige awarded the "saints" are the previous qualities held by the terrestrial pagan kingdoms (7:27).
Whereas the Kingdom presented to the "saints" will endure forever, it is not a supramundane reign.

In summary, the Judaic texts support the eternal nature of the future Kingdom of God. However, there is no evidence for a transcendent Kingdom of God. The future appearance of the divine Kingdom does occur simultaneously with a transformation of conditions. These alterations usually represent a transformation into ideal state of peace and righteousness. The conditions may represent such a radical change in the quality of life that a new division of time may said to be created. However, there is no evidence that the new division is beyond history or supramundane. Consequently, there is no evidence that the Kingdom of God is transcendent.

The texts under consideration do not support the apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God. The manifestation of the Kingdom does not coincide with the destruction of "this age" or the creation of a new transcendent order. This seems to be consistent with the overall distribution of the Kingdom references within the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Tanakh and the Deuterocanonical writings. The Kingdom of God tends to be found in non-apocalyptic texts. For example, the canonical psalms and the deuterocanonical books lack apocalyptic motifs. The paucity of apocalyptic concepts has been noted in the Psalms of Solomon. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs is better described as an ethical treatise than an apocalyptic document (H.C.Kee, "The Ethical Dimension,"268-70). The concerns expressed in the Testament of Abraham are focused on the present and they are not concentrated on an apocalyptic future (N. Turner, "The Testament of Abraham", 219). The prophetic books, Book Three of Sibylline Oracles and Daniel all possess an eschatology that presents the establishment of the Kingdom of God within the line of history. All these texts do contain
numerous references to Yahweh's kingship and Kingdom (Isa. 6:5; 24:23; 52:7; Obad. 21; Zech. 14:9; Ps. 5:3; 10:16; 22:29; 24:7,8,9,10; 29:10; 44:5; 47:8; 48:2; 95:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1; 145:1; Daniel 2:44; 4:14, 22, 31, 32; 7:14, 18, 22, 27; Tobit 13:1,2; Wis. Sol. 6:4, 20; 10:10; Sir. 50:15; 2 Macc. 7:9; 13:4; Sib. Or. 3:47,767; T. Ben. 9:1; T. Abrah. 8:3; Ps. Sol. 17:1,3,34, 36).

In contrast, the Kingdom of God is not found in the more apocalyptic documents. I Enoch refers to the Lord as the eternal King (9:4; 12:3; 25:3-5,7; 27:3). However, the final transcendent state is not represented as the Kingdom of God (I Enoch 22f.). Both 4 Erza (11-12) and 2 Baruch (39) use the four-kingdom schema found in the Book of Daniel and Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles. Nevertheless, in both texts, the future age is not called the Kingdom of God. If the Kingdom of God was an apocalyptic concept, it would seem logical to find the symbol in these apocalyptic texts. The absence of the Kingdom of God in both I Enoch and 4 Erza is significant given that both books do possess the concept of the temporal dualism (J. Gammie, "Spatial and Ethical Dualism," 357). As previously noted, the apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom is dependent upon the concept of temporal dualism. It is the concept of temporal dualism which supports the futurity of the Kingdom and the presumed transcendence of the realm. The Kingdom of God is believed to be a synonym for the "age to come". It is surprising that those documents that contain the idea of the "age to come" do not refer to the Kingdom of God. This contradiction within the apocalyptic interpretation has been noted by some scholars.

 brief note will be taken of the writings in which the royal rule of God plays no part: Martyrdom of Isaiah, Baruch (Greek), Enoch (Slavonic), 4 Erza, Baruch (Syriac). The last two are related to one
another and were written in Palestine towards the end of the first-century A.D.; the absence of the kingdom reference in them is especially important because they ascribe overwhelming significance to among other things, the scheme of two ages; the coming of the messianic king or judge, otherwise called "(son of) man". 78

The Kingdom of God is not a common motif in the more apocalyptic-oriented documents. Consequently, the distribution of the Kingdom of God in the Judaic material verifies this analysis’ conclusion. The Kingdom of God is not an apocalyptic category.

In conclusion, the emergence of the future Kingdom occurs simultaneously with the termination of a troubled period and the appearance of a new set of conditions (Isa. 51-52; Daniel 7; Sib. Or. 3:635f.; T. Mos. 8:1f.; Ps. Sol. 17). The transition between the troubled period and the new conditions is usually marked by natural disasters and abnormal events. These occurrences are the theophanic portraits of God’s appearance as judge and divine warrior. The new set of conditions usually represents an ideal state of fertility, peace and blessedness (Isa. 25; 52; Zech.14; Sib. Or. 3:744-795; T. Mos.10; Ps. Sol. 17). These alterations may be so far-reaching that a new division of time may be said to emerge. However, the new division of time remains within the normal historical continuum. The appearance of the divine Kingdom may coincide with the final stage of history; but it never extends beyond history. Consequently, the future Kingdom of God is eschatological. It is the expectation for a new order within history. The eschatological view of the Kingdom is not the only understanding of the Kingdom within postbiblical Judaism. The Kingdom of God also exists in the present as the everlasting universal sovereignty of the divine creator. The
present Kingdom of God is not an abstract concept because Yahweh is the effective sovereign of history. Yahweh controls the historical process and he can be expected to participate in human affairs. The present Kingdom of God is the universal eternal exertion of Yahweh's sovereignty.

In the introduction, it was noted that the Kingdom of God was a polyvalent symbol. As a symbol, it has a conventional range of meanings within postbiblical Judaism. This range of meanings has been described above. However, as also noted in the introduction, the socio-historical meaning(s) can be altered. This is evident in the way specific authors chose to emphasize a particular feature or aspect. For example, the Sibylline Oracles concentrate on the future ideal aspect of the Kingdom (Sib. Or. 3:744-795). Sections of Daniel focus on the universal present Kingdom of God (2:44; 6:26). However, a symbol can only be communicative if the author remains within the scope of agreed-upon meanings. If the author extends beyond this range of meanings, he must explain his own particular use of the symbol. The Judaic texts do not provide an explanation of the Kingdom. The documents operate within the scope of meanings early Judaism developed for the Kingdom of God. This cluster of concepts includes the everlasting nature of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom is not restricted to a specific temporal category. It is part of the historical continuum. Even in its future appearance, the Kingdom remains part of the historical line. As well, the activity of God is emphasized either in the idea of creating the present Kingdom or in the concept of establishing the future Kingdom. Finally, the future Kingdom stands in contrast to previous periods of strife and tribulation. Ideally, the Kingdom of God represents an eternal state of piety, blessedness and fertility.
Kingdom of God as a Soteriological Category

In the discussion of the temporal aspect of the Kingdom of God, the apocalyptic interpretation of the symbol was invalidated. It was shown that the Kingdom of God, within postbiblical Judaism, was not solely a future expectation. The Kingdom exists as a present reality. It refers to God's effective and active sovereignty over the world. A sovereignty Yahweh established de jure at the time of creation. It was further demonstrated that the future expectation of the Kingdom was eschatological. The appearance of the Kingdom will occur within the line of history. The Kingdom is not an entity beyond history nor is it a transcendent state. The Kingdom of God remains part of the historical continuum. Since the apocalyptic interpretation does not appear valid for early Judaism, there must have existed an alternative understanding of the Kingdom of God.

It is contended that early Judaism comprehended the Kingdom of God as a soteriological symbol. The Kingdom exists de jure over the entire earth. The Kingdom also exists de facto for those who have benefited and continue to benefit from Yahweh's saving actions. God is the divine monarch who redeemed the Israelites, protects Israel and will save the righteous. In response to God's saving actions, one acknowledges Yahweh's sovereignty and one adheres to his law. In other words, the de facto Kingdom involves a reciprocity between the benevolent monarch and his obedient subject. This reciprocity is expressed in obedience to the law and divine protection for the faithful. There is also a communal aspect to the Kingdom. The lawabiding individual is a member of the people of God who as a unit express obedience to the divine monarch.

Several scholars, most notably Norman Perrin, have noticed the dual foundation of Yahweh's sovereignty. The act of creation is one basis for the
divine monarchy. It is the creation of the earth and the heavens that established Yahweh as the de jure King (Ps. 24:1; 95; 96; Tobit 13; 3 Macc. 2:2-4). In this context, the Kingdom of God is the universal eternal exercise of Yahweh's sovereignty. It is evident in God's control of national politics and his participation in human history (Daniel 4; Wis. Sol. 6:3, 20; 3 Macc. 2; 5; 6). The second foundation for Yahweh's sovereignty is the Exodus. In the drama of the Exodus, Yahweh became specifically the king of Israel (Exod. 15; Ps. 74). The Exodus established God as the de facto King over a particular community.

Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel:
For your sake I have sent to Babylon,
And I will bring down all of them as fugitives,
Even the Chaldeans, in the ships of their shouting.
I am the Lord, your Holy One,
The Creator of Israel, your King.
( Isa. 43: 14-15; cf. Exod. 19:6; Isa. 33:22; 41:21; 44:6; Jer. 8:19; Ps. 44:5; 84:4; Tobit 13; Wis. Sol. 3:1f.; Ad. Es. 13:9f.; 14:3f.; 3 Macc. 2:2f.; 6:2f.).

Yahweh is repeatedly referred to as "our King" or the "King of Israel" (I Sam. 12:12; Isa. 33:22; 41:21; 44:6; Jer. 8:19; Ps. 74:12; 84:4; 145; Tobit 13; Ad. Es. 14:3-19). Logically, Israel is God's Kingdom (Exod. 19:6).

There are two prominent aspects to this relationship between the divine monarch and his people. First, Yahweh claims sovereignty over Israel because of his saving actions. The Exodus redeemed Israel from the wrath of Pharaoh. There is an expectation established that Yahweh is a King who protects and rescues his people. Second, there is an obligation for the
maintainance of this relationship. Israel must be obedient to the king's laws (Exod. 19:6). This is succinctly expressed in Isaiah.

For the LORD is our Judge.
The LORD is our Lawgiver,
The LORD is our King;
He will save us (33:22).

There is both a soteriological aspect and an obligatory component to the de facto Kingdom.

This soteriological aspect commences with the Exodus. The first time Yahweh's kingship is acknowledged is in the victory song recited by Moses and the children of Israel (Exod. 15:18). The song clearly refers to Yahweh as the redeemer and protector of Israel.

The LORD is my strength and song
And He has become my salvation;
This is my God, and I will glorify Him;
My father's God and I will exalt Him (Exod. 15:2).

The same themes are found in the "enthronement psalms". Yahweh is Israel's King and protector. Yahweh's Kingship is intertwined with ideas of Israel's salvation.

O come, let us sing unto the LORD;
Let us shout for joy to the Rock of our salvation . . .
For the LORD is a great God
And a great king above all gods; . . . . (Ps. 95:1-3;
cf. 96:1-3; 97:10-12; 98:1-3).

Isaiah echoes similar refrains (Isa. 33:22; 43:14-21; 44:6; 52:1-7). The salvation of Daniel and his three friends from the fiery furnace is due to the protection of the divine sovereign (Daniel 3). The heavenly monarch
delivers Daniel from the lion's den (Daniel 6:17-29; cf. 3 Macc. 6:7). The combination of Yahweh's kingship and salvatory actions is evident in the various prayers and petitions (Tobit 13; Ad. 13; 14; 3 Macc 2; 6).

And now Lord, God and King, God of Abraham, spare thy people; for our enemies are watching us to bring us to ruin, and they have set their hearts upon the destruction of thy chosen people, thine from the beginning. Do not disdain thy own possession which thou didst ransom for thyself out of Egypt (Ad. Es. 13:15-16).

Repeatedly, the people are saved from the wrath of various gentile kings through the actions of their own divine king (Ad. Es. 13, 14, 2 Macc. 13; 3 Macc. 2, 5,6). In the future manifestation of the Kingdom of God, the soteriological aspect of the Kingdom is apparent. The appearance of the Kingdom coincides with the termination of religious persecution (Daniel 7; T. Mos. 8:1-10:10); armed strife (Zech.14; Sib. Or. 3:657-795) and exile (Isa. 52; Obad.; Ps.Sol. 17). The natural disasters and abnormal events are the consequences of God's appearance as judge and warrior. He redeems Israel from the gentile nations (Isa. 52; Obad; Daniel 7; T. Mos. 8:1-10:10). And he restores his people (Zech.14; Sib. Or. 3:702-795; Ps. Sol. 17).

Another prominent concept associated with the Kingdom of God is the acknowledgement of the divine sovereign. The acknowledgement of the divine monarch takes the form of obedience to the law. The association between the allegiance to the heavenly King and compliance with the law begins with Sinai (Exod.19:5-6). Yahweh is declared Israel's sovereign and lawgiver (Isa. 33:22; 43:15f.). Israel is Yahweh's lawabiding subject.

One of the covenant texts depicts the origin and nature of YHWH's sovereignty. This is Ex 19:3b-8. Israel is designated
"a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" [v. 6]. That is to say, the people constituted a national political entity with YHWH as their king. The people are offered this constitutional arrangement on the condition that they agree to obey YHWH [v 5a], which they do in their response to the offer [v 8, also 24:3-8]. The offer and its acceptance put in force a structure of authority in which YHWH has the sole authority to command, and the people of Israel are bound by pledge to obey him. (D. Patrick, "The Kingdom of God," 75).

If Israel is obedient to the divine precepts, the divine sovereign will act on her behalf (Ps. 93:5; 96:13; 97:8-12; 98:9; 99:5-9; Tobit 13:6). The relationship between the acknowledgement of Yahweh's sovereignty, obedience to the law and soteriology is vividly illustrated in the Testament of Moses.

It has been noted that the Testament of Moses is a retelling of Deuteronomy 31-34. Therefore, particular attention should be placed on the parallels and allusions drawn between Deuteronomy and the Testament. The Testament author incorporated Deuteronomy's pattern of Sin-Punishment-Turning Point-Salvation into his texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testament of Moses</th>
<th>Deuteronomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:1-6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Punishment</td>
<td>3:1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Turning Point</td>
<td>3:5 - 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Salvation</td>
<td>4:4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28:15 32:15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28:16-68 32:19-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30:2 32:28-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30:3-10 32:35-43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Literature Between 81)

The implication is that the prayer of the anonymous intercessor in chapter four and Taxo's martyrdom in chapter nine share the function of a "turning
point" in the storyline of the text. These turning points involve the re-affirmation of God's sovereignty. The re-affirmation is expressed in terms of obedience to the law. Further, the re-affirmation of God's kingship results in particular benefits for the people.

The first turning point involves the people's return to God's rule. The people previously denied God's kingship by establishing their own laws (2:6), defiling the Lord's oath (2:8) and worshipping foreign Gods (2:8). The prayer in chapter four "re-pledges" the people to God's sovereignty (4:1-4). The re-affirmation of God's sovereignty has particular consequences. The punishment of exile is removed and the people are restored (4:5-9).

A similar pattern emerges in chapters nine and ten. The people have again denied God's Kingship (5:7). The only people who have remained loyal are Taxo and his family. "If you investigate, you will surely know that never did (our) fathers nor their ancestors tempt God by transgressing his commandments" (9:4-5). And Taxo and his sons choose death, "rather than transgress the commandments of the Lord of lords, the God of our fathers" (9:7). Taxo chooses matryrdom and, in doing so, he reaffirms his allegiance to the divine sovereign. The anonymous intercessor in chapter four returned the people to the sovereignty of the Lord. Taxo never denied God's sovereignty. Both units function as an affirmation of God's Kingship. The affirmation of God's sovereignty is intimately related to obedience to the law.

This factor of obedience is echoed in 2 Maccabees. A mother and her seven sons are under torture to renounce the laws of their fathers (7:1f.). As Taxo and his sons refused to transgress the commandments, the seven sons also choose to die instead of disobeying the law.

'Never!', and so he in turn underwent the torture. With his last breath, he said: 'Fiend though you are, you are
setting us free from this present life, and, since we die for his laws, the King of the universe will raise us up to a life everlasting made new.' (2 Macc. 7:9).

The sons remain loyal to the heavenly monarch, they adhere to his commandments. Warren J. Heard cites this section as the turning point of the story. The martyrdom of the seven sons leads to salvation of the people. 82 Affirmation of God's sovereignty results in particular benefits for the community.

Obedience to the law is a prominent concept associated with God's Kingdom/Kingship (Isa. 33:22; Jer. 8:19; Mal. 1:14; Ps. 5:10; 45:7-8; 95:7-11; 96:6-13; 97:1-2; 10-12; 99:6-9; Daniel 3; Tobit 13:1-6; T. Ben. 9:1; Ps. Sol. 17). Further, obedience to the law results in particular benefits. In the Psalm of Solomon 17, Israel is restored to her lands (17:26) and her enemies are destroyed (17:22-25). In the Testament of Moses, the return to God's Kingship in chapter four removes the punishment of exile (4:5-9). Taxo's affirmation of the law results in the annihilation of Israel's enemies (10:1). Acknowledgement of the divine king through his laws includes one in the people or Kingdom of God. Further, this membership entitles one to particular benefits.

The interconnection of soteriology, adherence to the law, and the Kingdom of God is evident in the references to the future manifestation of the Kingdom. The membership of the future Kingdom of God is confined to the righteous (Isa. 24:21-23; 52; Zech.14:9-21; Daniel 7:13-28; Tobit 13; Sib. Or. 3:702-795; T. Mos. 10; Ps. Sol. 17). If gentiles are admitted, it is because they now worship the divine sovereign and adhere to the law (Zech.14:16; Sib. Or. 757-761, 773-775; Ps. Sol. 17:31). Otherwise, the gentile nations are
destroyed (Jer. 10:10; 48:15; 51:57; Obad.; T. Mos. 10:1). The wicked are certain excluded from the Kingdom.

They (the righteous) shall judge nations and have dominion over peoples,
And their Lord shall reign over them for ever . . .
But the impious shall receive punishment in accord with their reasonings,
They that heeded not the righteous and revolted from the Lord.

(Wis. Sol. 3:8, 10; trans. by J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom 75; cf. Isa. 44:6f.; Jer. 10:10f.; Ps. 5, 97).

The benefits of the future Kingdom of God will be available only to those who accept Yahweh as King.

It should be noted that particular texts have variant ideas of the law. In other words, the "law" is not always understood as the Torah. The Sibylline Oracles believe a new law will be established.

The Immortal in the starry heaven will put in effect a common law for men throughout the whole earth for all that is done among wretched mortals

(Sib. Or. 3:757-759).

Regardless, it is only the lawabiding righteous who belong to the future Kingdom of God.

What is the relationship between the de jure, de facto and future Kingdom of God? The de jure Kingdom is the universal eternal exercise of Yahweh’s sovereignty. It is the sphere of God’s authority. Because Yahweh is the universal sovereign, he has the ability to control and influence history. The de jure Kingdom of God represents God’s potential and ability to act. The
The *de facto* Kingdom represents Yahweh's willingness to act. Because of his unique relationship with Israel, the divine monarch chooses to participate in history. "If he (Yahweh) did not control the history of nations and processes of nature, he could not be counted on; if he did not exercise royal sovereignty over Israel, YHWH's control of the world would have no purpose of denouement" (D. Patrick, "The Kingdom of God," 77).

The *de facto* Kingdom is also man's acknowledgement of the eternal sovereign. It represents man's response to God's saving actions. It is the *de facto* Kingdom that will be established on a universal and eternal scale in the future. It has been noted that the *de jure* Kingdom of God exists throughout heaven and earth. Consequently, the future Kingdom of God could not be a manifestation of the *de jure* Kingdom. The *de facto* Kingdom is confined to those who affirm Yahweh's Kingship. In the present age, those who pledge allegiance to Yahweh are a limited community. The rest of the world consists of gentiles and the impious who deny Yahweh's sovereignty. However, after the manifestation of the divine Kingdom, the world will consist of only those who are loyal to the heavenly monarch. The *de facto* Kingdom of God will be manifested and will expand throughout the whole creation. This is evident in the vocabulary choices of the Testament of Moses and Sibylline Oracles. The "future" is manifested (T. Mos. 10:1) or is raised up (Sib. Or. 3:767). In the Testament of Moses the Latin verb *parere* is employed. The verb has the sense of something expanding or becoming more evident (G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* 100). The adverbial phrase "throughout his whole creation" supports this nuance of expansion. In Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles, the Greek verb *exegeiro* is used. The verb has the sense of arousing or stirring to action (Gen. 28:16; 41:21; Num. 10:35; 24:19; Judg. 15:12, etc.). The implication is that something exists but must be put into action or force. In
the context of the Sibylline Oracles, the Kingdom of God is being put into force (manifested) for all men (Sib. Or. 3:767f.). All men will be united under one law constituted by the divine monarch (Sib. Or. 3:767-771). All men will be joined in the common worship of the one universal King (Sib. Or. 3:772-774; cf. Zech.14:9-21).

The Kingdom of God has a communal aspect. This communal aspect is evident in the language associated with the Kingdom and in some of the motifs connected with the symbol. As previously noted, Yahweh is said to reign over Israel/Jerusalem (Exod. 19:6; Isa. 24:23; 52:7; Jer. 8:19; Ps. 95:7; 99; Tobit 13; Ad. Es. 13:9-18; 14:3-19; 3 Macc. 2; 6). The choice of corporate terms like Israel, Zion and Jerusalem indicates that Yahweh is King over a community. The membership of the future Kingdom is expressed in communal language. The Kingdom is given to "the people of the saints of the Most High" (Daniel 7:27). Or "the sons of the Great God" will participate in the Kingdom (Sib. Or. 3:702). The motif of the law implies membership in a community. Adherence to the law includes one in the Kingdom (Exod. 19:6; Ps. 95:7-11; 97:10-12; 98:6-9; Daniel 7; Tobit 13:1-6; Ps. Sol. 17).

Disobedience excludes one from the community (Wis. Sol. 3:8,10). Finally, a frequent motif in the future Kingdom of God is the temple (Zech.14:9-21; Tobit 13; Sib. Or. 3:702-795). The righteous gentile and Jew are expected to join in the worship of Yahweh at the Jerusalem Temple. Worship is a communal activity. Consequently, the motif of the temple implies the existence of a community.

In conclusion, within postbiblical Judaism, the Kingdom of God is a polyvalent symbol. The Kingdom symbol is the unification of several concepts and ideas associated with God's kingship and his salvatory actions as king. Since God is understood as the eternal sovereign, his Kingship and
his Kingdom are everlasting. The Kingdom has existed **de jure** over the world since creation. The Kingdom of God is a testimony of the past, a present reality and a future expectation. The symbol, in a given context, may have a specific temporal designation. However, the Kingdom of God is not limited to a particular age or time. The Kingdom is a soteriological designation. It refers to Yahweh's continuing involvement with his people as their warrior and redeemer. This relationship was established at the Exodus when Yahweh was first acknowledged as Israel's monarch. The relationship continues in the present as the people call upon the divine protection of their king. It is a future expectation when Yahweh will establish a blessed, fertile state for the righteous. There is an obligatory component to the Kingdom. Only those who acknowledge Yahweh's Kingship receive the benefits of the Kingdom. This acknowledgement takes the form of adherence to the law. The reciprocity between the divine king and his subjects forms the basis for the **de facto** Kingdom. It is an expanded form of the **de facto** Kingdom which is the future manifestation of the Kingdom of God. The future Kingdom will be comprised only of individuals who acknowledge the divine sovereign. These concepts form the core of the Kingdom symbol. The individual emphasis of a specific writer may accent a given feature. Further, variant ideas of the law and community may modify the symbol. However, the above cluster of concepts seems to form the basis for the various Judaic views of the Kingdom of God.
Chapter Three
Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark

Approach to the Text

Several points should be reiterated before commencing with the analysis of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark. First, this study is not a reconstruction of Jesus' view of the Kingdom nor a reproduction of the Kingdom's development within early Christianity. Second, Mark's view of the Kingdom symbol will not be discussed in association with the other synoptic Gospels or other Christian literature. This study is concerned with the Kingdom of God as it is understood in the context of the Gospel of Mark.

There is scholastic consensus that the earlier version of Mark encompassed 1:1-16:8. Verses 16:9-20 are likely a subsequent addition. There are several reasons for this conclusion. The section's vocabulary and style differ substantially from the rest of Mark. Further, the verses are absent from several of the early manuscripts of the Gospel and there are only two traces of the entire section in Ante-Nicene literature. Consequently, 16:9-20 is regarded as a late addition to the Gospel of Mark and it is believed to represent the views of a subsequent Christian writer(s). This study will be concerned with the early version of the Gospel. Therefore, verses 16:9-20 will be excluded from this analysis.

Most scholars agree that the Gospel of Mark was written between 65-70 C.E. and prior to the fall of Jerusalem. Scholars further concur that the place of composition was probably Rome. Although the Gospel of Mark was composed in a Gentile city, it is characterized by its Jewishness. The Judaic background and foundation of both the Gospel and/or the writer is evident in the text's vocabulary and style. Familiarity with Jewish ritual and
customs, and the numerous Old Testament references and allusions are testimony to the Judaic aspects of the gospel. While the Jewishness of the Gospel is prominent and pervasive, there are indications that the author did make adjustments for a gentile reading of the material. The various latinisms (cf. 5:9) and the occasional explanations of Jewish customs (cf. 7:3-4) suggest the gospel also was intended for a gentile audience (H. Anderson, The Gospel of Mark 29). The Gospel of Mark could be summarized as a Jewish-Christian document composed by a Jew for Jewish and gentile readers.

The Markan understanding of the Kingdom of God has two aspects. As discussed in chapter one, symbols have collective and individual aspects. The collective aspect is the set of agreed-upon meanings a specific society has developed for a particular symbol. It is assumed that the agreed-upon meanings for the Kingdom symbol were formulated within postbiblical Judaism. Further, it is conjectured that this set of meanings formed a basis for Mark's view of the Kingdom of God. This presumption is supported by two points. First, there is the Jewishness of the Gospel's writer, protagonist and narrative. The natural source for the writer's motifs, concepts and symbols would be his own society of early Judaism. The second point involves the functioning of a symbol within a given society. Within postbiblical Judaism, the Kingdom of God symbol had a specific scope of interpretations. Anyone utilizing a symbol would normally operate within the conventional range of meaning(s). If the symbol was employed in a manner contrary to convention, this usage would require explanation. Since Mark employs the Kingdom symbol without any accompanying interpretation, it is assumed that his usage of the symbol is within the normal range of convention. Therefore, it is presumed that the Markan Kingdom of God reflects Judaic views of the symbol.
The second aspect of a symbol is individual. A person's experience and perception may modify the conventional meanings for a symbol. In the case of Mark, his perception of the Kingdom was modified by Jesus' mission, death and resurrection. The symbol is filtered through the Christ event of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection. Consequently, the Markan Kingdom of God incorporates Judaic views of the Kingdom with Mark's christology.

Temporal Aspect of the Kingdom of God

The prevailing position in the Kingdom of God debate stresses the temporal tension of the Kingdom symbol. The Kingdom of God is both present and future. It is "now" and "not yet". This temporal tension is evident in the Gospel of Mark's understanding of the symbol. Jesus announces the arrival of the Kingdom of God (1:15); however, the Kingdom, in some form, is still expected in the future (9:1; 14:25).

The presence of the Kingdom of God is attested in two of the most disputed verses in the Kingdom of God debate.

After John had been arrested, Jesus came into Galilee proclaiming the Gospel of God: "The time has come: the kingdom of God is upon you: repent, and believe the Gospel (Mk. 1:14-15)

Discussion has focused on the Markan meaning of "engiken" (come). Should the verb be translated as "at hand" or "is near" or should the word be read "has arrived"? The later translation is preferred for several reasons. First, the verb is in the perfect tense. The perfect tense has the sense of a completed action the results of which are continuing (F. Blass & A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar 175). The phrases "is near" and "at hand" do not imply a completed action. They connote a future action. Second, the synthetic parallelism between peplerotai ho kairos and engiken he basileia
reinforces the idea of a completed action. The announcement is: "the time is fulfilled" in parallel with "the kingdom of God has arrived" (A. Ambrozic, The Hidden Kingdom 21). Third, the phrase neplerotai ho kairos indicates that the time "before the Kingdom" has been completed. It is now the time of the Kingdom (W.H. Kelber, The Kingdom in Mark 9). Fourth, the translation of engiken as "has arrived" is consistent with the verb's usage in the remainder of the gospel. In Mark 14:42, Jesus announces "egeiresthe, agomen! idou ho paradidous me engiken." In this verse, engiken is usually translated as "at hand". However, verse 43 notes eti autou lalountos, Judas arrives. In other words, Judas is present as Jesus speaks. The engiken in verse 42 should be translated as "has arrived" to indicate that Judas is indeed present during Jesus' statement. If Mark's use of engiken is consistent, 1:15 should also be translated as "has arrived."

The translation of engiken as "has arrived/come" is not made solely on grammatical grounds. In the verses preceding 1:15, Mark gives a brief portrait of John the Baptist and his message. John the Baptist is depicted as Elijah redivivus (1:2,3,6). He is the forerunner /precursor to the arrival of Jesus. The period of the precursor ends with John's arrest (1:14). The period of Jesus' mission commences. Jesus' mission begins with the proclamation of the Kingdom (1:15). John the Baptist's period is the time before the Kingdom. This phase has now been completed (peplerotai ho kairos). The second phase, Jesus' mission, is the time of the Kingdom (engiken he basileia). According to Mark, the Kingdom of God has arrived. The Kingdom is present in/with Jesus' mission.

The parables confirm the presence of the Kingdom of God. In the parables, the Kingdom of God is compared to a seed(s) which grows into a crop or a bush (4:8, 20, 28, 32). The various seeds have been cast or sown
(4:3-7). In other words, the placement of the seeds, as evidenced in the use of the aorist tense, has taken place in the past (4:3-7, 26, 31). The growing of the seed is a present phenomenon as indicated by the use of present tenses (4:8, 26, 28, 32). Consequently, the incipient stage of the Kingdom is considered as past event like the sowing of the seed. The Kingdom is now present and developing similarly to the growth of the plants. According to Mark, the Kingdom of God is a present reality.

The parables compare the casting of the seed to the sowing of the word (4:14). The sower is Jesus. This is indicated by the context of the parables and vocabulary choice. The sower went out (ἐξελθεν) to sow. Jesus goes out (ἐξελθεν) to preach (1:28; 2:13). Jesus is teaching the crowd which is standing ἐπί τῆς γῆς (4:1). The sower casts his seeds εἰς τὴν γῆν (4:5, 8, 20). The sower casts his seeds on all soils. Jesus teaches anyone who will listen (J. Marcus, The Kingdom in Mark 56-7). The incipient stage of the Kingdom is associated with the initial proclamation of Jesus. The Kingdom is, in some form, present in Jesus' preaching. The Kingdom's arrival is connected with Jesus' mission.

The Eschatological Manifestation of the Kingdom

Mark refers to the future manifestation of the Kingdom of God.

He also said, "I tell you this: there are some of those standing here who will not taste death before they have seen the kingdom of God already come in power."

The futurity of τέν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλευθεριάν ἐν δύναμι is indicated by the context of the phrase and the author's particular word choice. First, the context of the statement is a conversion between Jesus and his disciples. The future manifestation of the Kingdom is said to occur after the death of some of Jesus' circle (ὅτι εἰσίν τινες ἡδος τῶν ἡστεκότων ἡσίν τινες οὐ με
geusontai thanatou). Since, according to the plot of the narrative, all the disciples are currently alive, the statement is an announcement of future events. Second, only a particular number of Jesus' sentences begin with the word amen. This word is reserved for either predictions (8:12; 14:9, 18, 25, 30), pronouncements on behaviour for the community (6:11; 10:15, 29; 11:23; 12:43) or statements on Jesus' authority (3:28; 9:41). The category of prediction seems to be the most appropriate for Mark 9:1. Therefore, Mark 9:1 refers to a future manifestation of the Kingdom of God.

The expectancy of a future appearance of the Kingdom is consistent with Judaic concepts of the Kingdom of God. However, most scholars insist the Markan expectation is apocalyptic. As noted in chapter two, the Judaic texts held an eschatological view of the future Kingdom of God. The expected Kingdom was neither a transcendent state nor did the Kingdom interrupt the historical continuum. Both of these ideas need to be present for an apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom. Is Mark's understanding of the Kingdom consistent with Judaic views? Is Mark's expectation of the Kingdom apocalyptic or eschatological? It is contended that Mark, in conformity with postbiblical Judaism, holds an eschatological view of the Kingdom. The future Kingdom is not a transcendent state. The appearance of the Kingdom does not break the line of history.

Mark 14:24-25 has been used by scholars to support an apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God. However, their conclusions are tenuous. Mark 14:24-25 reads:

And he said: "This is my blood, the blood of the covenant shed for many. I tell you this: never again shall I drink from the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."
This specific statement is one of three predictions made in chapter fourteen. The first prophecy is Judas’s betrayal of Jesus (14:8) and the final forecast is Peter’s denial of Jesus (14:30). Each of these predictions begins with amen. Since 14:25 also commences with amen, it seems logical to classify 14:25 as a prophecy of future activities. The ἁρτὰν ἀυτὸν πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ is a future event.

The futurity of the Kingdom is insufficient to support an apocalyptic interpretation of 14:25. However, the use of the Greek word kainon for “new” and presumed allusions to the messianic banquet are believed to provide justification for an apocalyptic expectation. The Greek word kainon has been regarded as a reference to a transcendent Kingdom (E. Gould, Commentary on the Gospel 266). However, there is nothing in Mark’s employment of the word which supports this interpretation. Mark uses kainon to refer to Jesus’ new teaching (1:27). It is used in the parables of the new wine and new cloth (2:21,22). The new wine and new cloth are assumed to represent Jesus’ proclamation (E. Gould, Commentary on the Gospel 46-7). Consequently, kainon is a term Mark uses to describe Jesus’ mission or proclamation. The term does not have a supramundane connotation.

Several critics refer to the Judaic ideal of a messianic banquet in the Kingdom of God. This banquet is a feature of the expected transcendent age. Mark 14:25 is believed to imply this ideal of a messianic banquet. Jesus, as the Son of Man, drinking and eating with the disciples is an allusion to the Judaic concept of the messianic banquet. Therefore, it can be concluded, based on the messianic banquet connotation, that the future form of the Kingdom will be transcendent. V. Taylor cites Isaiah 25:6; 1 Enoch 62:14; 2 Baruch 29:5f. and 4 Erza 6:51f. as references for this concept (The Gospel According to St. Mark 547). 1 Enoch 62:14 is the only reference in which the
Son of Man dines with the elect ones at a banquet. The other references contain no mention of a messianic figure. Isaiah 25:6 refers to a feast that God prepares for his people. 2 Baruch 29:5f. stresses the new fertility of the earth which will abundantly nourish the people. 4 Erza 6:51f. refers to the eating of the monster Leviathan. These citations do not provide a consistent portrait of a messianic banquet. Further, the last three texts do not contain any references to the Kingdom of God. As noted in the previous chapter, apocalyptic-oriented books do not favour the term Kingdom of God. Consequently, Taylor's conclusion is tenuous. His citations for a Judaic ideal of a messianic banquet are inconsistent. Furthermore, there is no connection between the Kingdom of God and a messianic banquet. A Markan view of an expected transcendent Kingdom of God cannot be supported by this presumed allusion to a messianic banquet.

Proof for the transcendency of the Markan Kingdom has been sought in 12:25. In 12:25, Jesus' answer to the Sadducees' question on resurrection and marriage refers to the "angel-like" state of the resurrected. W. G. Kummel hypothesizes that the future Kingdom of God is associated with the resurrection of the dead. Further, εἰσίν ὁσαν ἀγγελοὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς alludes to the transcendent nature of those resurrected and the Kingdom of God (Promise 90). However, this interpretation is not appropriate in the context of Jesus' answer. Jesus suggests that those resurrected are no longer in a state of matrimony - ἥτον γὰρ εκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὐτε γαμουσίν οὐτε γαμίζονται. The phrase "like angels in heaven" echoes this sentiment. Within postbiblical Judaism, it was believed angels did not marry or procreate. Accordingly, 12:25 does not refer to a transcendent Kingdom. It confirms the idea that the resurrected, like angels, will not be married.
Temporal dualism is a major tenet of the apocalyptic thought. The presence of the terms "this age" and "age to come" could confirm an apocalyptic view of the Kingdom. In one verse, the Gospel appears to refer to the doctrine of temporal dualism.

But that he shall receive a hundred times as much now in the present age, houses and brothers and sisters and others and children and farms, along with persecutions; and in the age to come, eternal life (10:30).

However, 10:30 uses the Greek expression en to aion to erchomeno. A literal translation would be something like, "in the age in the one coming". The "age to come" is a terminus technicus in apocalyptic thought. This terminus technicus uses a definitive Greek phrase - ho aion mellon (Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon 27). The "age to come" in 10:30, according to the Greek, is not the apocalyptic terminus technicus. Consequently, 10:30 does not necessarily refer to the doctrine of temporal dualism. It is merely presenting the benefits bestowed upon people in two different ages.

The "Little Apocalypse" or the "Apocalyptic Discourse" (13:1-37) has been cited in support of an apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom. Chapter thirteen focuses on the "coming of the Son of Man" and the events preceding his arrival. The expected appearance of the Kingdom is associated with the "coming of the Son of Man." There are several reasons for this assumption. First, the "coming of the Son of Man with power" and the "coming of the Kingdom with power" use the same vocabulary. The Greek verb erchomai is used for both the "coming" of the Kingdom (9:1) and the "coming" of the Son of Man (8:38, 13:26, 14:52). The Greek word dunamis is used for the adverbial phrases "with/in power" (13:26; 16:52; 9:1). Second, the coming of the Son of Man is associated with the judgment of the people
(13: 20- 26). The parable of the "Seed Growing Secretly" associates the Kingdom of God with the judgment of the people (4:29). Finally, the Son of Man is expected to send his angels to gather his followers from the four corners of the world (13:27). The parable of the "Mustard Seed" connects the Kingdom of God with the gathering of the people (4:32). Therefore, the "coming of the Son of Man" and the future appearance of the Kingdom are regarded as simultaneous events. Based on this connection with the "coming of the Son of Man", the future appearance of the Kingdom of God is given an apocalyptic interpretation. It is assumed that the events associated with the arrival of the Son of Man are apocalyptic.

The "coming of the Son of Man" is preceded by wars, natural disasters, the destruction of the temple and abnormal cosmic events (13:1-8, 24-25). However, as mentioned in chapter two, calamities and strange occurrences singly do not indicate an apocalyptic event. These occurrences are only apocalyptic if they coincide with the end-of-history and the total destruction of the world. Mark 13:31 has been cited as a reference to the apocalyptic destruction of the cosmos.

Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall never pass away.

The phrase ho ouranos kai he ge paraleusontai functions as a figurative expression attesting to the enduring nature of Jesus' words. This is very similar to an expression used in Isaiah.

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth;
But the word of our God shall stand forever (Isa. 40:8).

The vaqum le'olam in Isaiah stress the abiding nature of God's words. Mark 13:31 can be read as a rhetorical statement on the eternal nature of Jesus' words. The verse is not necessarily a pronouncement on the destruction of
Further, verse 20 in chapter 13 of Mark refers to the survival of some people. This survival of a group suggests a continuum between the present age and the future age. This is echoed in 14:52 when Jesus informs the high priest he will be alive to see the Son of Man coming. Both verses show that the historical continuum is not broken. The Gospel does not envision a break in the historical nexus.

The "Little Apocalypse" has been inappropriately titled. The chapter does contain descriptions of calamities and the appearance of a "messianic figure". However, these motifs are insufficient to support an apocalyptic interpretation of Mark. The Gospel does not contain any concept on the termination of the world. Further, there is emphasis on the historical continuum (13:20; 14:52).

The exorcisms have often been cited in support of an apocalyptic interpretation. The exorcisms are interpreted as signs for the apocalyptic defeat of Satan which was to occur simultaneously with the destruction of the present age. This association of the exorcisms with the apocalyptic demise of Satan is invalid for two reasons. First, there is nothing inherent in the exorcisms themselves that connects the expulsion of demons with the defeat of Satan. In the Tanakh, Deuterocanonical writings or the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the demise of Satan never takes the form of an exorcism. Further, exorcists were a fairly common phenomenon in first-century Palestine. The activity of these exorcists was not viewed in an apocalyptic context. There is no Judaic concept which associates the expulsion of demons with the end-of-the world. If the exorcisms were to be viewed as the apocalyptic demise of Satan, Mark would have had to provide that interpretation.
Mark does not associate the casting out of demons with the conquest of Satan. This is the second argument against the apocalyptic interpretation of the exorcisms. In fact, Mark does not even suggest that Satan is defeated in any manner. In Satan's forty-day temptation of Jesus, Jesus is aided by angels and he emerges from the desert to begin his Galilean mission. There is no mention of Jesus defeating Satan (1:12-14). Rather, Satan continues to operate throughout the whole Gospel (1:23-26,39; 5:1-20; 7:26-30; 9:17-30). The disciples, along with their commission to preach, are given the power to cast out unclean spirits (3:14-15; 6:12-13). This authority to expel demons would be unnecessary if Satan had been vanquished. The sayings attached to the Beelzebub Controversy are cited as evidence for the demise of Satan (3:22-30). However, a careful reading reveals that Jesus does not believe that Satan has been defeated. The first three sayings (3:24-26) answer the scribes' accusation by proving the existence of Satan. If Jesus was using Beelzebub to expel demons, the demonic army would be divided. A divided force cannot stand and Satan should be finished. However, Jesus' point is Satan is not finished. Further, verse 27 does not speak about the destruction of Satan, but only his binding and the plundering of his house. The strong man and his house are ravaged. Jesus is only stealing the strong man's goods. In summary, the exorcisms are not understood as the apocalyptic defeat of Satan.

In conclusion, the Gospel of Mark does not hold an apocalyptic view of the future Kingdom of God. There is no evidence for a transcendent future state. The Gospel does not refer to the destruction of "this age" or a break in the historical continuum. Mark's view of the future Kingdom of God is consistent with Jewish eschatological understandings of the Kingdom. The future Kingdom of God is a new age or order (9:1; 10:30; 13: 26-27; cf.
Daniel 2:7; Zech. 14:9-21; Sib. Or. 3:767ff.). It is part of the historical nexus (13:20; 14:52; cf. Isa. 24:23; 52:7; Zech. 14:4; Daniel 2:7). The future appearance of the Kingdom is preceded by strife and persecution (10:30; 13:7-25; cf. Isa. 49; Zech. 14:1-9; Daniel 7:23-27). The trouble-filled period stands in contrast to the future age (10:30; T. Mos. 10; Ps. Sol. 17). Mark provides very little additional information on the nature of the future Kingdom (E. Best, The Gospel as Story 42). Mark does not calculate or provide an exact determination for the arrival of the Kingdom (13:32-37). He does seem to expect the Kingdom during the lifetime of his generation (9:1; 14:52). The manifestation of the Kingdom is associated with the "coming of the Son of Man" (13:26), the gathering of the elect (4:32; 13:28), and judgment of the people (4:29; 13:28). It can also be inferred that the Kingdom will contain the elect (10:30; 13:27).

Soteriological Aspect of the Markan Kingdom of God

Does the Markan view of the Kingdom of God also adhere to the soteriological aspect contained in Judaic understandings of the symbol? It is proposed that Mark does have a soteriological understanding of the Kingdom. A soteriological theme is apparent in the opening verses of the gospel (1:1-15). The vocabulary and typological references to the Exodus encase the announcement of the Kingdom's arrival in a salvation motif. Mark's depiction of the exorcisms classifies the expulsion of the demons as a soteriological activity. The exorcisms' association with the Kingdom of God links this soteriological activity to the symbol. Finally, the ideas of "entering the Kingdom of God" emphasize the inclusion in or exclusion from the people of God.

Most commentaries separate 1:1-13 from 1:14-15. However, there are several reasons for regarding 1:1-15 as a total unit. First, an inclusio is
formed with the word "gospel". Verses 1, 14, and 15 all use euaggelion, thus suggesting these verses be treated as one unit. Second, the word kerusso (1:4.7.14) links all fifteen verses into a single passage. Third, verse 14 clearly indicates that Jesus' mission does not begin until after the arrest of John the Baptist. John is a thematic foil for Jesus' appearance. The significance of John is only understood if verses 1-13 are read with 14 and 15. Fourth, the portrait of John the Baptist and Jesus have a similar threefold division.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John the Baptist</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Word from God</td>
<td>1:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to Person's Work</td>
<td>1:4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to Preaching</td>
<td>1:7-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jesus' appearance mirrors the activities of the Baptist (R.A. Guelich, "The Beginning of the Gospel," 7). This indicates that Jesus' mission must be read in association with the Baptist. Finally, the theme of discipleship may act as a dividing line between sections. The summoning of Simon and Andrew in verse 16 divides 1:1-15 from the next unit 1:16-3:12 (R.A. Guelich, "The Beginnings of the Gospel," 7). Therefore, verses 1-15 will be treated as a unit.

The salvatory character of the Kingdom emerges first with the word "gospel". Euangelion has several connotations. In Hellenistic circles, it may refer to the announcement of victory in battle or, it may be used as a technical term to describe decrees and events that surround the activity of the monarch (C. Kazmierski, Jesus, the Son of God 19). In the Septuagint, euangelion is used for good news or the reward for good news (II Sam. 4:10; 18:20,22,25,27; II Kings 7:9). However, it is the use of the verb...
euangelizesthai which is most often cited in the context of Mark. The verb is used in Isaiah 52:7.

How beautiful upon the mountains
Are the feet of the messenger of good tidings
(euangelizomenou)
That announceth peace, the harbinger of good tidings,
That announceth salvation;
That saith unto Zion:
'Thy God reigneth!'

It is concluded that the Markan usage of euangelizesthai refers to coming of the reign of God. However, this is a very restrictive reading of the verb. The verb is used in Isaiah 40:9; 60:6 and 61:1. These verses refer to God's appearance and the subsequent acts of divine salvation. Given the salvatory aspect of Judaic view of the Kingdom of God, it seems more appropriate to the material, if the euangelion is interpreted as a proclamation for the dawn of God's acts of salvation. This is supported by the Old Testament references in Mark 1:2-3.

As it is written in Isaiah the prophet,
Behold I send my messenger before your face,
who will prepare your way;
the voice of one crying in the wilderness,
make ready the way of the Lord,
make his paths straight (Mk. 1:2-3).

These verses are based on Isaiah 40:3; Exodus 23:20 and Malachi 3:1 (W.L. Lane, The Gospel of Mark 42). The common motif behind these verses is Yahweh's salvation. In Exodus, the angel is to lead Israel to the promised land. In Isaiah, it is anticipated that Yahweh will restore his people. In
Malachi, the Lord is expected to purify his people and return them to a state of righteousness. The common theme is soteriological. The people have been or will be saved by an action of God. They are included in a group who will receive God's protection. Consequently, Mark's allusions to these Old Testament passages likely summon to mind the soteriological aspect of past actions and future expectations.

The theme of salvation is supported by the typological references to Moses and the Exodus and Elijah. Mark's use of the Exodus and Elijah is evident in several verses. John the Baptist is clothed as Elijah (Mk. 1:6; cf. 2 Kings 1:8). Jesus is tempted in the wilderness for forty days (Mk. 1:13). This is an allusion to Israel's forty-day sojourn in the wilderness (Exod. 16:1f.). There is a parallel between Mark 1:15 and Exodus 14:31 when Yahweh is first declared King over Israel. The Exodus and Elijah typology recalls contexts in which Israel is saved by the actions of Yahweh and the divine Kingship is initiated or restored over the people. Mark's employment of the Exodus and Elijah typology serves to stamp his own narrative with this idea of salvation. The reader anticipates that Israel is in a context where God's Kingship will be renewed and the people will be saved.

In conclusion, the opening unit of Mark confirms the soteriological aspect of the Markan Kingdom. The vocabulary, Old Testament allusions and typology create the expectation of salvation. It is assumed that Yahweh is coming to redeem and restore his people. In this context, the people are requested to renew their allegiance to Yahweh - metanoeite. The Greek word metanoeo connotes the idea of "changing of one's mind" (Walter Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon 511-2). The people are called upon to reaffirm their relationship with God. The divine King has arrived to restore his community (1:15).
Exorcisms and the Soteriological Aspect of the Kingdom

Previously, in this chapter, it has been shown that the expulsions of demons are not viewed as the apocalyptic defeat of Satan. How then does the Gospel of Mark view the exorcisms? Mark, consistent with his contemporaries, understood exorcisms as a soteriological activity.

In reconstructing first-century Judaic beliefs on demonic possession, three points should be made. First, a reconstruction of demonic possession must assume an *emic* model of reality (J.J. Pilch, “Healing in Mark,” 142). An *emic* view is concerned with the definitions, beliefs and ideas of the actual participants. For example, according to the participants in Mark 9:14-29, the boy is “possessed with a spirit that makes him mute” (9:17). It is a spirit which causes the boy’s convulsions and seizures. In contrast, an *etic* view would diagnose the boy as an epileptic. The convulsions and seizures would be regarded as symptoms of an epileptic condition. The *etic* view is usually concerned with the definitions, beliefs and ideas of twentieth-century science. With such a view, the passage in Mark is interpreted according to the understandings of modern man. This study is concerned with the understanding of the ancient (i.e. the participants of the exorcism). Consequently, this study will assume an *emic* view of demonic possession. Second, the *emic* view logically places primacy on the culturally construed causes of demonic possession. The participants are individuals within a society from which they derived their sense of reality. Therefore, demonic possession is defined within the matrix of ideas, beliefs and concepts of first-century Palestine. It must be consistent with that matrix. Third, demonic possession was not merely a primitive rationalization for illness. “(It) was not another way, or a primitive way, of talking about certain illnesses, nor was every case of illness caused by demons. To be sick did not mean you
were demon afflicted, nor did demon possession necessarily mean that you were ill. As evidenced in the Gospel of Mark, demonic possession was distinguished from other illnesses: although it was considered within the same category (Mk. 1:34; 3:10,11; 6:13). Demonic possession was part of the matrix of ideas which governed concepts of illnesses and disease. However, it had its own special and separate significance within that matrix.

As noted by John J. Pilch, early Judaic understandings of illnesses and demonic possession centred on two questions (J.J. Pilch, "Healing in Mark," 148). First, who is responsible? Second, why did it affect me? The first question would appear to have an easy answer. In the case of demonic possession, Satan and his demons are the responsible parties. There are arbitrary or unjustified demonic possessions in which the demon seems to be the responsible party. The possession of Sarah by the demon Asmodaeus is an example of an unjustified possession (Tobit 3:7-9). There is no reason but the whim of the demon given as a basis for the possession (Tobit 6:14,15).

The second, more frequent, type of possession is the result of the victim committing a sin. The Pharaoh, in the Genesis Apocryphon, is possessed by an evil spirit because he attempted to lie with Abram's wife Sarah (1QAP xx: 9,11, 14-25). Nabonidus was afflicted because he committed idolatry.

I was afflicted with an [evil] ulcer in Teimann [by decree of the Most High God]. For seven year [I] prayed to the gods of silver and gold, [bronze and iron], wood and stone and clay, because [I believed] that they were gods...

(The Prayer of Nabonidus).99

This idea also emerges in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. Although this book is not often associated with demonic possession, it evidently deals
with the concept. Several of the patriarchs are said to have been possessed by spirits of fornication, envy or jealousy (T. Sim 3:1; T. Judah 19:4; T. Dan 1:7; 2:1f.). These spirits are associated with the prince of deceit - Beliar (T. Reuben 4:11; T. Sim. 2:7; 5:3; T. Judah 19:4; 23:1f.; T. Zeb. 9:7, 8; T. Dan 3:6; 5:5; 6:1-10; T. Gad 2:1-4:7; T. Asher 1:3-9; T. Ben. 6:1-7:1). Consequently, the affected patriarchs could be said to be possessed by Beliar or his demons. The possession of the patriarchs is consistently initiated by an act of sin (T. Reuben 1:7-10; T. Sim. 2:10-3:6; T. Judah 19:1-4; T. Dan 1:7-9). Further, the patriarch is liberated by prayer and/or repentance (T. Reuben 1:8; T. Sim. 2:15; T. Judah 19:3).

The Judaic views of demonic possession are consistent with Judaic understandings of the role and power of Satan. Satan is the tempter, accuser and punisher of men (Jub. 10:1-4; 17:15-18:13; Sib. Or. 3:363; 1 Enoch 19:1-3). He has been given only limited power over mortals and men have been given the power and ability to resist (Jub.10:11-13; 17:15-18:13; 1 Enoch 92:1f.; T. Reub. 4:11; T. Judah 10:1-5; T. Iss. 4:1-6; 7:7; T. Dan 5:1; 6:1-10; T. Naph. 3:1; T. Asher 1:3-9; T. Ben. 6:1-7; Frag. Zad. 20:2). This ability to resist is linked to obeying God and maintaining a righteous life.

Be ye, therefore, not eager to corrupt your doings through covetousness or with vain words to beguile your souls; because if ye keep silence in the purity of heart, ye shall understand how to hold fast to the will of God, and to cast away the will of Beliar (T. Naph. 3:1).

However, if any individual disobeys God and his commandments and leads a wicked life, he will succumb to Satan (T. Asher 1:8; cf. I QS ii. 1 - iv. 1).

Demonic possession is generally the result of sin.
This implies that the battle in demonic possession is not between God and Satan, but between Satan and man. It is man who, by his actions, falls under the rule of Beliar. And it is man, through repentance, prayer or invocation of the sovereign power of God, who can restore the rule of God over the human soul. Therefore, Satan is not the sole responsible party in the event of a demonic possession. The individual being possessed must have committed a sin or succumbed to a life ruled by Satan.

This connection of demonic possession with sin is consistent with contemporaneous views of illness and healing. Sijobolt Noorda in his study on Ben Sira notes the interrelationship between sin and physical health (S. Noorda, "Illness and Sin."). Ben Sira states that illness is the result of injustice, partiality and sin (38:10). Even a skilled physician can only cure the patient if the patient has asked for forgiveness from God (38:15). Early Judaism accepted a connection between physical health and sin.

The transfer which occurs during an exorcism has particular consequences for the individual. First, it frees him from the specific physical consequences of illness and, in some cases, death (Mk. 9:15-27; T. Sim. 3:1-2; 4:1-9; T. Judah, 14:1-15:6; T. Zeb. 5:1-5; T. Dan 6:5; T. Gad 5:1-11). Second, the exorcism liberates the person from the bondage of Satan (T. Reub. 4:11; T. Naph, 3:1,2). Third, it reverses the separation from God (T. Sim. 5:3; T. Zeb. 9:7-9; T. Dan 5:1-6; T. Naph. 3:1-5; T. Asher 1:1-7:7). The exorcism frees the victim from illness, possible death and reinstates him as a member of God's community. The exorcism is a soteriological activity.

Does the Gospel of Mark share this soteriological view of exorcisms? The sayings of 3:22-30 do associate the forgiveness of sins with Jesus' exorcisms. Jesus, in answering the accusations of the scribes, states:

Truly I say to you, all sins shall be forgiven the sons of men.
and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin (3:28,29).

The statement implies that Jesus' exorcisms do involve the forgiveness of sins. A forgiveness which will not be extended to the scribe because he has slandered the source of Jesus' power - *enchos estin aioniu hamartematos*.

Consistent with the general Judaic view of illness, Mark also associates Jesus' healings with sin and forgiveness. "*ti estin eukopoteron*, *eipein to paralutiko aphientai sou hai hamartai*, *e eipein egeire kai aron ton krabatton sou kai peripatei?* (2:9)" The numerous associations between demonic possession, sin and sickness indicate that the exorcisms of Jesus may be understood, as are the healings, as a form of the forgiveness of sin (*aphientai sou hai hamartai*).

The exorcisms' connection with sin may also be behind Mark's choice of the term *akatharton pneuma* (1:23, 26; 3:11, 30; 5:2; 7:25). J. Neusner suggests that, during the first-century, sin was regarded as a source of impurity or uncleanness (*The Idea of Purity* 35-54). Further, Satan is viewed as the head of all apostasy (1 Enoch 6:2-5; 7:1-2; 8:2-3; 10:8; T. Naph. 3:5; cf. Mk. 3:30). And Mark equates Satan, the father of sin, with an "unclean spirit" (Mk. 3:22,30). Therefore, if demonic possession is due to sin, it would be natural to refer to the possessing spirit as sinful or unclean. It is interesting to note that Mark begins almost all the exorcism stories by identifying the entity as an "unclean spirit" (1:23; 5:3; 7:25; 9:25). Mark is, in his use of the term, emphasizing the antithesis between Jesus - the Holy one of God - and the demons - the unclean spirits. This antithesis, as suggested by Weiss and others, is not the final meeting of two armies on the battlefield. It is the age-old and continuing war between what is Holy and
committed to God and what is sinful and not committed to God. The antithesis is focused on the status of the individual. It is whether the person is included in the community or whether he is excluded from the community. This is vividly illustrated in the story of the Gerasene demonic. Prior to the exorcism, the demonic was isolated from his community. He dwelt in the tombs (5:3-5). After the exorcism, the man could reenter society. In fact, he is ordered - $hupage\ eis\ ton\ oikon\ sou\ pros\ tous\ sous$ (5:19).

This soteriological view of the exorcisms also explains why this activity was important for the missions of the disciples (3:13-15; 6:7-13). The disciples were commanded to preach (3:13-15; 6:7-13). The purpose of their preaching was that men should repent (6:12). In other words, their purpose was to get men to change their status from one of sinfulness to one of being again with God. The exorcisms would be a natural companion to their preaching. Exorcisms involved the changing of men's status. The demonic was seen as a man ruled by Satan. He was excluded from God's rule. His status was equivalent to that of an "outsider". The exorcism changed a man's status by including him in God's community. The person again had a position with the people of God.

In summary, Mark understood the exorcisms as a soteriological activity which transferred an individual from the rule of Satan to the rule of God. The activity resulted in a change of status for the individual and, thus, it included the individual in the community of God.
Entrance to the Kingdom of God

The soteriological aspect of the Kingdom symbol is reflected in the ideas of “entering the Kingdom of God” (9:47; 10:17-27). In 9:47 eiselthein eis ten basileian tou theou is contrasted with blethenai eis ten geennan (gehenna). Admittance into the Kingdom of God places one in a salvatory position. Those outside the Kingdom are condemned (9:48; cf. 9:43-44, 45-46). This is emphasized in the commitment one should have toward the Kingdom. The sacrifice of a limb or an eye is preferred to losing one’s position in the Kingdom of God (9:48).

In 10:17-27, an equation is made between eiselthein eis ten basileian tou theou and with zoen aionion. “Entering the Kingdom of God” is equivalent to “inheriting eternal life”. In this same section, Jesus states the requirements for “inheriting eternal life”/“entering the Kingdom of God”. The requirements include adherence to the commandments (10:19) and following Jesus (10:21). Following Jesus and accepting his gospel are the main criteria for admittance into the Kingdom. This concept is repeated throughout Mark’s Gospel. In 10:30, the followers of Jesus are rewarded with eternal life. In other words, they are assured, because they have accepted the gospel, that they have been admitted to the Kingdom. In 13:13, those who have suffered in Jesus’ name (13:9-12; cf. 10:30) are promised salvation. The opening section of the gospel gives the same message. Repentance is not totally sufficient. The announcement demands repentance and belief in the gospel (1:15). Verse 1:1 indicates that the gospel under consideration is the gospel of Jesus Christ. Consequently, admittance to the Kingdom of God requires acceptance of the gospel.

In the previous chapter, it was observed that a human response or obligation was implicit in the Kingdom symbol. Humans were required to
acknowledge the divine sovereign and adhere to his laws. The following of Jesus and the acceptance of his gospel is the human response required by the Markan Kingdom. The benefits of the Kingdom are bestowed only on those who believe the gospel (1:15; 10:19, 30; 13:13).

This is obviously a point of discontinuity between the Markan and Judaic views of the Kingdom of God. In the Judaic understandings of the Kingdom, adherence to the law was the criterion for admittance and maintenance within the Kingdom. In the Gospel, the criterion for admittance and maintenance is belief in the gospel. This does not mean that the law has been completely circumvented. As evidenced in the story of the rich youth, adherence to various aspects of the law is expected (10:19; cf. 12:19-31). The law has not been abandoned. It is now the law as interpreted by Jesus (2:23-28; 3:1-6; 7:5-25; 9:39-50; 10:1-12; 12:13-17, 29-34).

The association of the Kingdom with the followers of Jesus suggests the entrance into the Kingdom is understood as present event. Since the individual has now accepted the gospel, he has now entered the Kingdom (10:30). However, the benefits of Kingdom membership are given in both the present and the future (10:30). The benefit of eternal life is a future expectation.

In conclusion, the Markan Kingdom of God is a soteriological term. The opening section of the gospel encases the announcement of the Kingdom's arrival in motifs of salvation. There is an expectation that Yahweh, as divine king, has come to redeem and restore his people. The exorcisms are a soteriological activity. The expulsion of demons transfers the individual from the control of Satan to the rule of God. The person is readmitted to the Kingdom governed by Yahweh. This transfer frees the person from demonic possession, sickness and possible death. Finally, the ideas of "entering the
Kingdom" are connected with the promise of salvation. Those admitted to the Kingdom of God receive eternal life. Those outside the Kingdom of God are condemned to Gehenna.

**Communal Dimension of the Kingdom of God**

As noted above, the Kingdom of God is comprised of the followers of Jesus. The Kingdom represents a group or a community. This communal dimension of the Kingdom is evident in chapter four. Mark refers to two separate groups of people. The first group is comprised of the twelve disciples and the followers of Jesus (4:10). The second group is called ekeinoi de hoi exo (4:11). This phrase is used in various Judaic texts to connote individuals who are not members of Israel (G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom 103). It is a term indicating exclusion. The phrase refer to individuals who are not members of a community. In contrast, the disciples and the followers represent members of a community. The followers receive mysterion tes basileias tou theou. The community represent those who are connected with the Kingdom of God.

The communal dimension of the Kingdom of God is echoed in the motif of the redefined family (H.C. Kee, New Rule 109). The redefined family forms the basis of the new community (10:30; cf. 3:31-35). The followers of Jesus now comprise a new family unit with each believer a sister or a brother.

The concern over the temple is another theme which suggests the existence of a community. The importance of the temple is evident in the story of "Jesus' Cleansing of the Temple" (11:15-17) and ideas of the temple's destruction and subsequent restoration (14:52). The temple is foremost a place of worship for a community. In other words, the existence of a temple implies a community (R.N. Flew, "Some Outstanding Problems," 218).
The communal dimension of the Kingdom may resolve one of the anomalies of Mark. In 15:43, Mark introduces a person by the name of Joseph of Arimathaea. Joseph is the one who petitions Pilate for the release and burial of Jesus' body. The only justification Mark gives for Joseph's behaviour is that he "was expecting" (en prosdechomenos) the Kingdom of God.

It evidently means that he was in sympathy with the disciples in this element of their faith. He was not a follower of Jesus but in common with him he was awaiting the Kingdom of God and wished to do honour to one who had suffered in its behalf (E. Gould, The Gospel of Mark 297-98).

The motive of sympathy is tenuous. Joseph's sympathy would have had to have been overwhelming for a prominent counsellor to associate himself with a politically executed prisoner and a man accused of blasphemy (14:64). Other scholars suggest that Joseph was a very pious man and he was concerned about the removal of the corpse in accordance with Deut. 21:23 (V. Taylor, The Gospel of Mark, 600). If Deut 21:23 was the justification for Joseph's action, Mark likely would have, following his previous tendency, explained this Jewish custom (7:3-4). Or a clearer allusion or Old Testament reference would probably have been used.

There is an alternative reading for this verse. The verb prosdechomai is generally translated as "accept" or "receive" (Gen 32:20, Exod. 22:11; 36:3; Lev. 22:23; etc.). In only rare cases is the verb translated as "expect" or "await" (Job. 2:9; 29:23; Ps. 54:8). If the verb is translated in Markan text as "receive" or "accept" then Joseph's motive is clarified. Joseph has received the Kingdom of God. In other words, he has accepted Jesus' proclamation. Having accepted the teacher's proclamation, Joseph would have been
compelled to request Jesus' body. This interpretation would also explain why Mark chose to name Joseph. Mark tends to name only those who have followed Jesus. Pilate is the only other character otherwise named in the gospel. The other people in the narrative are known only by titles such as scribe, Pharisee and so on. Mark names the important members of Jesus' community. In naming Joseph, Mark indicates that Joseph is a member of Jesus' community.

The communal dimension of the Kingdom of God is also present in the parables. In the parable of "The Sower" and its subsequent interpretation, various groups of people are mentioned. The seeds being sown are cast upon various types of soil. The various soils are compared to the different group responses to Jesus' proclamation. The groups pictured in 4:15-20 conform in general outline to groups encountered in the Gospel narrative. The stealing of the seed by Satan can be compared to the Pharisees' and scribes' actions of opposition to Jesus. The rocky soil is the crowd who after hearing Jesus' word (12:37) later turn away from him (15:11-14). The thorny soil is the rich youth who is prohibited from following Jesus because of worldly concerns (10:17-27). The good soil is the followers of Jesus. They are the people receptive to the proclamation (J. Marcus, The Mystery of the Kingdom 96-101). According to Mark, their numbers will continue to grow and expand. Although the community is now small, Mark expects a bountiful crop.
This image of expansion is repeated in the parable of the "Mustard Seed". The smallness of the seed is stressed through a chiastic structure (4:31).

A which when sown
B upon the earth
C being smaller than all the seeds
B' upon the earth
A' when it is sown

(J. Marcus. The Mystery of the Kingdom 309).

In the comparison between the mustard seed and the community, Mark acknowledges the initial community is extremely small in number. However, the community will develop and grow similarly to the mustard bush. The community will eventually outnumber most other communities.

The parable of the "Mustard Seed" also alludes to another aspect of the community. The community is to include gentiles. The use of the verb kataskenoo refers to the inclusion of gentiles in the community. The verb is extremely rare and it is found only in Zechariah 2:11 and a version of Joseph and Aseneth. In both cases the verb refers to the incorporation of gentiles into the community (J. Marcus, The Mystery of the Kingdom 328). The image of the tree also alludes to the ingathering of gentiles (Eze. 17:23; 31:6; Daniel 4:10-12). The inclusion of the gentiles may explain Mark's adaptation of the tree image. John D. Crossan notes that the Judaic texts refer to a mighty cedar. Mark changed the image of a lofty cedar to a mustard plant. His intention may have been to stress the different composition of the community (In Parables 47). Contrary to various Jewish expectations, the community would include gentiles.
The idea of the Kingdom community embracing all nations is reinforced in the motif of the temple, the "coming of the Son of Man" and Jesus' encounters with gentiles. According to Mark, Jesus envisioned the temple as a place of worship for all nations (11:17). The temple was not the exclusive property of Israel. Further, chapter 13 makes reference to the gospel being preached to all nations and the gathering of the elect from the four corners of the world (13:10,27). Finally, Jesus encounters gentiles, such as the Gerasene demonic and Syro-Phoenician woman, and he provides them with the same benefits as the Jews he meets. The Gerasene Demon and the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman are healed.

The community of the Markan Kingdom is to include gentiles. The inclusion of the gentiles seems to be scheduled for the later development of the Kingdom. The Syro-Phoenician woman, while a recipient of Jesus' power, is told that the first stage of Jesus' work involves the Jews. The Gerasene Demonic requests to follow Jesus (5:18). However, Jesus sends him to preach among his own people (5:19). Finally, the Mustard Seed includes the gentiles when the seed has become a plant. Consequently, the gentiles are intended members of the community. However, their inclusion is part of the later stages of the Kingdom's development.

The communal dimension of the Kingdom resolves the tension between the present and future aspects of the Kingdom of God. The sowing of the seed represents the initial stages of the Kingdom. This, as has been noted in this chapter, is viewed as a past action. The seed has been sown and the Kingdom has arrived. However, like the seed, the Kingdom is small. It is composed of those few followers of Jesus who have responded positively to his proclamation. However, the seed is growing and developing. The followers begin with Simon and Andrew (1:16). Then, the other disciples join
the original group (3:14). Finally, Jesus is teaching crowds of people (4:1). The community of the Kingdom is continuously expanding. The future Kingdom will be the expanded community of Jesus' followers. It will be composed of believers drawn from all the nations (13:27). Finally, it will be this expanded community which will enjoy the benefits of the future Kingdom (13).

**Authority for the Kingdom of God**

The difference between the Markan Kingdom of God and the Judaic views of the Kingdom of God centres on the authority for admittance into the Kingdom. This is evident in the composition of the community. The community is comprised of believers in the gospel. Jesus made a unique claim of determining the membership in the Kingdom of God.

This unique claim of determining membership in the Kingdom of God is evident in the exorcisms. Mark's accounts of Jesus' exorcisms contain no lengthy incantation or prayers which are usually associated with the work of magicians (D.Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," 1531). In the exorcism of the Gentile woman's daughter, for example, there are no statements addressed to the demon. In the other three exorcism stories, Jesus drives out the demon with only brief succinct commands (Mk. 1:25, 5:8; 9:25). There is a common phrase in these stories in the command "exelthe ex autou". John Hull suggests this phrase represents Jesus' commonality with other Hellenistic magicians because the phrase appears in the Magical Papyri (J.M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic* 68). However, David Aune found the imperative *exelthe* only four times in the papyri (D. Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," 1531). "Rather, the usual form of addressing a demon is an expression of adjuration followed by the naming of those supernatural powers being invoked, frequently accompanied by *voces magicae.*" 106 According to Mark,
Jesus did not behave like an ordinary magician. He did not indicate the power or deity from which he drew his authority for the expulsion of demons. Because his source of power is not identified, Jesus can be logically charged with being possessed by Beelzebul (Mk. 3:22). The scribes and Pharisees do not know if Jesus' power is derived from a malevolent or benevolent source.

The absence of ritual goes beyond the ambiguity surrounding the source of Jesus' power. Hans Betz notes that even in the varied corpus of the Magical Papyri, there is some claim to an authoritative tradition. The Magical Papyri trace this authoritative tradition back to the gods themselves or particular traditional figures. The existence of the Sepher Ha-Razim and the Testament of Solomon also indicates the development of an elaborate system of demonology and angelology. There was a tendency to associate particular powers or the granting of specific wishes with specified angels. In the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the exorcising of demons is repeatedly preceded by prayer and the repentance of sins (T. Reuben 1:8; T. Sim. 2:15; T. Judah 19:3). Jubilees contains an explicit claim to an authoritative tradition. The protective spells which are used to ward off Satan and his demons are traced back to instruction received by Noah from the angels (Jub. 10:1-14). Josephus' exorcism account makes an appeal to the authority of Solomon for the foundation and validity of its ritual. Goodenough notes that given even the highly syncretistic nature of the Magical papyri, amulets, and Aramaic Bowls, there are specific characteristics which identify an incantation or amulet as Jewish (E.R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols 2:161). Jewish "magic", while it made use of pagan names or ideas, was firmly centred in its "cult loyalty in the Jewish holy name" (E.R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols 2:202). When an incantation was addressed to "Sabaoth, to Adonai,
to Michael, or any of the angels, to Jacob, Moses, Solomon, or any other Old Testament figure, it seems clear that God or power was thought of in Jewish terms (E.R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols* 2:192). In other words, there was some understanding of "approved" traditions connected with magical/exorcism rituals. These rituals not only identified the exorcist's source of power; they placed him within a particular authoritative tradition.

According to the Gospel of Mark, Jesus created his own authoritative tradition. An exorcist's/magician's own name is never used in the ritual as a source of power (S. Eitrem, *Some Notes on Demonology* 31). The only Jewish names which had earned the status for inclusion in magical rituals were God, the angels, Solomon, David, Moses, the prophets and the patriarchs. Jesus empowers his disciples and others to expel demons in his name (3:13-15; 6:7-13; 9:38). He is claiming for himself an authority which has been bestowed only on such figures as Moses, Jacob and Solomon (H. Betz, "Formation," 166). This claim to a new tradition is reflected in the early church.

In 2 Apol. 6, Justin contrasts successful Christian exorcists who use the name of Jesus Christ, with others who use incantations and drugs. In referring to Jewish exorcists, Justin claims that exorcisms attempted in the names of Israelite kings (Solomon?) righteous men, prophets or patriarchs will not be successful, while those done in name of the God of Abraham, Issac, and Jacob have a better chance of success (Dial. 85): ... Jesus is challenging tradition and, without apparent justification, awarding himself honour, prestige and authority formerly reserved for the patriarchs and prophets. Peter Brown notes that the charge of sorcery (Mk. 3:22; Sanh. 43a) usually represents a clash between two systems. One system represents
the articulated power. This power has been defined, agreed upon and vested in precise people who operate in recognized channels. Although the ritual of exorcism is still fluid in first-century Palestine, the articulated power would be represented by professional exorcisms, the Pharisees and the priests. The other system is unarticulated power. This power has not been defined and sanctioned by society. In this case, Jesus represents the inarticulated power (Peter Brown, "Sorcery, Demons," 21).

Given that the exorcism is a soteriological activity, Jesus has claimed particular authority with regard a person's inclusion in or exclusion from the rule of God. It is in Jesus' name that a person may be transferred from the reign of Satan to the Kingdom of God. Meanwhile, there were other "approved" authoritative traditions which sanctioned this transfer in the name of God, the patriarchs or angels. The use of Jesus' name in exorcisms challenges the Jewish traditions. This is a point of direct confrontation between the Jewish authorities and the early Christian sect.

Jesus' authority over admittance into the community is evident in the healing of the leper (1:40-45) and the hemorrhaging woman (5:24-34). The woman, for twelve years, attempted to be healed through the socially sanctioned institution of the physician. The physicians were ineffective. The woman, because of her affliction, remained outside the community (J.N. Blackwell, Myth, Meaning 72-73). Jesus healed the woman through mere contact between his cloak and her hand. This is a reversal of what should have occurred. The woman's touch should have made Jesus "unclean". Instead, the touch cleansed/healed the woman. The touch should have resulted in Jesus' exclusion from the community due to impurity. The touch reinstated the woman into the community (J.H. Neyrey, "The Idea of Purity" 111). Similarly, the healing of the leper contravenes the socially sanctioned
purity rites. There is a ritual for the cleansing of leprosy (Mk. 1:44). However, Jesus cleansed the leper on his own authority (1:41-43). Again, the act of cleansing reinstates the person into the community. According to Mark, Jesus is circumventing the socially sanctioned rites of admittance. Jesus' own authority is sufficient to determine membership in the community.

In the story of Jesus and the scribe, Mark depicts Jesus as claiming the ability to decide who is admitted to the Kingdom of God (12:28-34). During the discussion, it is agreed that the first and second commandments are:

Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: 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: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. (Mk. 12:30,31).

The scribe concurs with Jesus' statements. The first statement is a paraphrasing of the Shema' (V. Taylor, The Gospel of Mark 486). In early rabbinic literature the recitation of the Shema' was interpreted as taking upon oneself the yoke of kingdom of heaven (D. Hill, "Kingdom of God," 65). In other words saying the Shema' was an acknowledgement of the divine monarch and it admitted one into the Kingdom of God. The Shema creates identity for the people (Patrick D. Miller, "The Most Important Word," 19). In this passage, the recitation of Shema' is not sufficient for admittance in the Kingdom. "And Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." (12:34). The acknowledgement
which would generally admit one into the Kingdom has been declared invalid by Jesus. Jesus is claiming authority to determine membership in the Kingdom of God. This implicit claim may explain why the scribes did not dare to ask Jesus further questions.

Jesus' authority to determine the membership of the Kingdom of God is reflected in the sayings about the children receiving the Kingdom and the impossibility of rich men to entering the Kingdom. In Mark 10:13-16, the disciples attempt to restrict the children's access to Jesus (10:13). However, Mark very dramatically shows that children are to be welcomed. Jesus embraces (enagkalizomai) the children and he titheis tas cheiras ep' auta. The embrace shows a strong sense of bond between the children and Jesus. The laying on of hands has been a action reserved for healing. (J. Derrett, "Why Jesus Blessed the Children," 10-15). Both actions serve to emphasize Jesus' acceptance of the children. The children referred to in Mark are under the age of twelve (C.E.B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark 522-4). They were not considered full members of the religious community. They were still too young to maintain and follow the precepts of Torah. This does not necessarily mean they had a lower status in the community; but they had a different status. Jesus seems to abolish this distinction. He is not permitting any other person or institution to determine membership in the Kingdom of God.

The story of the rich man who wished to follow Jesus is also an indication of Jesus' claim to this status-determining authority. According to Jewish way of life, the young man should have been a member of the Kingdom of God. He had faithfully and obediently followed the law of the divine monarch from his youth (10:19-20). However, Jesus wanted him to give up his possessions and follow him. The youth could not comply. The
youth could not perform the requirement necessary for admittance into the Kingdom. The youth could not follow Jesus. Again, Jesus has altered the membership requirements. Adherence to the commandments should have been adequate for admittance into the Kingdom of God. The youth had performed the requirements usually necessary for membership. However, Jesus places an additional requirement.

In summary, the Gospel of Mark asserts Jesus' claims as an authority for determining membership within the community. This is obviously a point of discontinuity between the Judaic and Markan views of the Kingdom. The Judaic texts emphasize the role of law for admittance and maintenance within the community. Jesus challenges this perception. Admittance and maintenance now involve following Jesus and believing in the gospel.

Conclusion

The Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark is a soteriological term. The Markan Kingdom has a present form. It exists as a dynamic salvatory force in the words and deeds of Jesus. This view of the Kingdom of God is similar to the Judaic understandings of the Kingdom as the salvatory actions of God. The Kingdom refers to activity undertaken for the protection and benefit of God’s people. The difference between the Markan and Judaic views is the medium through which the dynamic force of the Kingdom operates. In Mark, Jesus is the medium for the salvatory actions of the Kingdom. Jesus, as the agent of God, is the means of conveyance for the Kingdom (1:9-15; 2:5-9; 9:2-7).

The dynamic aspect of the Kingdom is evident in both Jesus' proclamation and miracles. Jesus' healings and exorcisms transfer men and women into the realm of God. According to early Judaic views of demonic possession, the possessed individual is under the rule of Satan. The demonic
is a victim of trials of sickness and he is exposed to the possibility of death (5:3-5; 9:17-27). The exorcism results in two sets of benefits. The demonic is delivered from sickness and death. Further, the expulsion of the unclean spirit transfers the individual from the realm of Satan to the reign of God. In this analysis of the exorcism, Mark conforms with first-century Judaic views on exorcism. The point of discontinuity between the Markan and Judaic views is the authority of Jesus. It is solely on the basis of Jesus' authority that the demons are expelled and the individual is transferred from the reign of Satan to the realm of God.

The dynamic aspect of the Kingdom of God is present in Jesus' healings. Prior to the healing, the person is often regarded as an outsider to the community (1:40-44; 5:25-34). The individual is re-admitted through the action of Jesus. The person, as a member of the community, is now eligible for the benefits awarded the group.

Finally, Jesus' preaching is a salvatory action. It is through his teaching that a person acknowledges the Kingdom and the gospel. Those receptive to Jesus' words become his followers. It is the followers of Jesus who comprise the community of the Kingdom (4:1-20; 10:30). The believers in the gospel represent those who have benefited from the salvatory action of Jesus. Furthermore, they are the community who will receive the benefits of the future Kingdom (10:30). The believers in the gospel will comprise the community of the elect in the future (13:1-27).

This is the communal dimension of the Kingdom of God. It is similar to the creation of the community following Exodus. Yahweh redeemed and protected Israel, and on the basis of these salvatory actions, Yahweh claims kingship over Israel. The Kingdom of God exists de facto over a specific community (Exod. 19:6). In the gospel, the proclamation and miracles of
Jesus result in the creation of a community. The community is created through the dynamic salvatory force of the Kingdom of God. As a result, the community can be viewed as the realm of the Kingdom's activity. In a form of symbolic shorthand, the community may be said to be the Kingdom of God. However, it must be remembered that the Kingdom symbol signifies more than the community. The emphasis of the Kingdom is on the actions of God. The community is the special realm of those actions.

Consistent with the Judaic views of the Kingdom, Mark emphasizes the obligatory aspect of the Kingdom. In the Judaic views, admittance and maintenance within the community is founded on adherence to the law. In the Gospel, admittance and maintenance is based on following Jesus (9:47-48; 10:17-27; 12:28-24). It is the law interpreted by Jesus and Jesus' own ethical pronouncements which guide the community.

The Kingdom of God symbol in Mark is holding in tandem collective and individual aspects. The collective aspect is the Judaic understandings of the symbol. There are several points of conformity between the Judaic and Markan understandings of the symbol. The symbol is viewed as a dynamic salvatory force. The symbol involves the establishment and maintenance of a community. However, as has been previously noted, these views are modified by Mark's christology. Jesus is the medium through which the dynamic salvatory force of the Kingdom operates. Jesus determines membership in the Kingdom and he alters the law of the Kingdom. Jesus in a sense becomes the gateway to the Kingdom. The Judaic understandings of the Kingdom have been modified in light of Mark's christology.

In the Gospel, it is the modification of the symbol which brings conflict between Jesus and the various Jewish sects and officials. In the expulsion of demons, Jesus is implicitly determining membership in the Kingdom of God.
He is transferring people from the reign of Satan to the realm of God. In the performance of this transfer, Jesus does not follow any authoritative tradition. In fact, he creates his own tradition. He promotes the use of his own name in the performance of exorcisms. As indicated in Mark, this is a point of contention between Jesus and the various Jewish sects (3:22-29). In the story of the leper and hemorrhaging women, Jesus cleanses and heals on his own authority. The official rites and rituals for these situations have been circumvented. Finally, Jesus implies that the law is insufficient for membership within the Kingdom of God (10:17-27; 12:25-34). According to the narrative of Mark, Jesus is reconstituting the people of God and the criteria for admittance and maintenance of membership (H.C. Kee, "New Rule" 30).

Mark has a future expectation of the Kingdom of God. This expectation is very similar to Judaic views of the future Kingdom. The manifestation of the future Kingdom is eschatological. The historical nexus will not be interrupted. The future Kingdom is not transcendent. Consistent with various Judaic views, the Markan Kingdom will involve the gathering of the elect and the inclusion of gentiles. The Kingdom's appearance will be preceded by a time of persecution and strife. Finally, the coming of the Kingdom is associated with the "coming of the Son of Man". Various Judaic texts do associate the future Kingdom with a messianic figure (Ps.Sol. 17). The exact influence the Son of Man figure may have on the Markan expectation of the Kingdom is beyond this study.

As was noted in chapter three, Mark provides very little information on the future Kingdom of God. In fact, Mark gives very little importance to this aspect of the Kingdom. Most of the Gospel narrative is devoted to the historical figure of Jesus and the present Kingdom of God (1:9-12:44; 14:1-
This stress on the historical figure of Jesus may explain Mark's use of the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God plays almost no part in the Pauline material (H.C. Kee, *Jesus in History* 135). Paul stresses Jesus' role as an eschatological salvation-bringer (H.C. Kee, *Jesus in History* 132). Paul's focus is eschatological. In contrast, Mark places very little emphasis on eschatology. Mark's concern is soteriological. Specifically, Mark focuses on the soteriological aspect of Jesus' ministry. Mark emphasizes the historical Jesus. He is concerned with the man who preached, taught and healed in first-century Palestine. It is through these actions that the salvatory force is revealed. The Kingdom symbol, because of its temporal flexibility and its soteriological aspect, was a natural symbol to emphasize in the presentation of the historical Jesus. Although it is conjecture, the gospel may have been written in response or reaction to the eschatological image created by Paul. Mark may have created a new genre to counteract the growing predominance of an eschatological Christ. It is through a historical narrative that Mark hoped to convey the present-age Jesus and his acts of salvation.

Why has the apocalyptic view of the Kingdom of God dominated scholarship for such an extended length of time? The Markan Kingdom of God has been affected and influenced by the questions asked of the material. As stated in the introductory chapter, Mark has been grouped with the other synoptic gospels and Pauline literature for an estimation of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' thought or early Christianity. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke and Pauline literature do contain apocalyptic motifs. There is the idea of "this age" passing away (1. Cor. 2:6) and the doctrine of two ages (1 Cor. 2). There is the demise of Satan (Lk. 10:18). These concepts are transferred or read into the Gospel of Mark.

The present state of biblical scholarship has also contributed to the
dominance of the apocalyptic interpretation. Jack N. Lightstone’s discussion of the sociology of knowledge and biblical scholarship provides the most comprehensive perspective.

Premises which informed scholarly taxa may fail today to satisfy. Still the classifications themselves, by which scholars ‘made sense’ of their ‘world’ of data, have not undergone general reformulation. Cultural perceptions and symbolic patterns persist, even after the abandonment of those more abstract ideologies and views. This is because the self-evident appropriateness of the former depends less upon ‘logical’ premises than upon a total social context of knowledge and of shared perceptions. Academics are socialized into patterns of scholarship and categories which retain their plausibility even apart from their (supposedly) general underpinnings (J.N. Lightstone, Commerce of the Sacred 2-3).

In other words, the apocalyptic interpretation of the Kingdom of God has remained prominent because scholars have been socialized into its acceptance. A few scholars have questioned the foundation for this interpretation. F.T. Glasson noted that the distribution of the Kingdom symbol in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha suggests that the Kingdom was not favoured by the apocalyptists (“What is the Apocalyptic,” 103). Martin Hengel and J. Gammie commented on the absence of temporal dualism in a number of the Judaic texts. Dale Patrick, in his recent analysis of the Kingdom of God in the Old Testament, queries the existence of an apocalyptic Kingdom (“The Kingdom of God,” 67-79). However, these observations have not yet resulted in a revision of the Kingdom of God interpretations.
It would appear that as our perceptions of early Judaism and Christianity change due to new information or revision of existing data, a revision of fundamental terms should also be undertaken. For example, there is now an attempt being made to revise our definitions of "apocalypse" and "apocalyptic". (D. Hellholm, *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World*). This attempt came as scholars recognized the variety of documents which comprised the Apocrypha or held the name of apocalyptic text. I hope that this thesis has indicated that a similar re-examination should be conducted on the Kingdom of God.
Notes


3 There are very few references to the Kingdom of God in the Qumran Scrolls. However, the text of the Angelic Liturgy does contain numerous citations on God's Kingship and these references do provide some insight into Judaic notions of God's Kingship and Kingdom. Jean Carmignac noted that the Angelic Liturgy ideas on divine Kingship/Kingdom have nothing in common with the modern interpretations of the Kingdom of God. Jean Carmignac, "Roi, Royauté et Royaume dans la Liturgie Angélique," Revue de Qumran 12 (1986): 184.

4 "Polyvalent symbol" was coined by J.D. Crossan. If refers to a symbol that cannot be adequately expressed by one reference. It is the opposite of a univalent or steno-symbol which has only one referent. For example, the mathematical symbol $\pi$ represents a specific number. This is a univalent symbol. J.D. Crossan, "Literary Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics," Journal of Religion 57 (1977): 76-80.

5 The composition of community of the Kingdom varies among different texts. In some cases, the community may have a political overtone or aspect (T. Mos.10:1; Ps.So. 17). In other words, the community may refer to a political entity. The political aspects of the Kingdom of God have been traditionally viewed as a side issue in the Kingdom debate. D. Hill, "Towards
an Understanding," 63-4. Full consideration of political factors would take a separate study.

6 Norman Perrin first introduced the idea of "symbol" into the Kingdom debate. Perrin's perception of a symbol was based on the writings of Philip Wheelwright and Paul Ricoeur. N. Perrin, Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom 29-30. Both Wheelwright and Ricoeur emphasized the cross-cultural classification of symbols. Their examinations of symbols draw on Jungian psychology and they focus on the responses to symbols. This study will focus on the communicative dimension of a symbol. Consequently, various assumptions have been drawn from communication studies including the theories of C.S. Pierce and Ferdinand de Saussure. A survey of their theories, within the context of communication studies, is provided in: John Fiske, Introduction to Communication Studies. Studies in Communication, ed. John Fiske (London: Methuen, 1982).


8 T. Francis Glasson, " What is the Apocalyptic?" 98


14 Johannes Weiss first connected the Kingdom of God with Jewish apocalypticism in his work: Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God 82, 113-15, 131-35.

15 The list of characteristics is consistent with other records of apocalyptic features. T. Francis Glasson, "What is Apocalyptic?," 101; N. Perrin, Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom 164; E.P. Sanders, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses," 448; J. Weiss, Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God, 80.

An example of this distortion is the classification of the Psalms of Solomon and Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles. Both documents have been designated apocalyptic texts. Recently, scholars have determined that this classification is inappropriate. G.E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom* 79. Tord Olsson has analyzed how manuscripts with few apocalyptic motifs are classified as apocalyptic. Tord Olsson, "The Apocalyptic Activity: The Case of Jamasp Namag," *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala August 12–17, 1979*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983) 21-22.


Not all the "Kingdom" passages in Mark have been adequately discussed in the debate (e.g., 15:43). This is due to an emphasis on Jesus'...
understanding of the Kingdom. Some of the passages, such as 15:43, are not considered reflective of Jesus' teaching. Consequently, they have received little attention from scholars. This study will redress this omission by including an analysis of 15:43.


Schweitzer believed that Weiss' discussion of Jesus' apocalyptic beliefs was incorrectly limited to Jesus' proclamation. Schweitzer expanded upon Weiss' thesis. Schweitzer proposed that Jesus' entire life, his work, and his teaching was motivated and determined by his apocalyptic/eschatological expectations. The essence of Jesus' ministry was found in "consistent or thoroughgoing eschatology" which related all of Jesus' words and deeds to his apocalyptic/eschatological beliefs. A. Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, trans. W. Montgomery (1908: New York: The MacMillan Company, 1961) 239f.

R.H. Hiers (*Jesus and the Future* 45-6; *Historical Jesus* 13-15; *Historical Jesus* 13-15; *Jesus and the Future* 45-6; *Historical Jesus* 13-15; *Jesus and the Kingdom* 45-6; *Historical Jesus* 13-15; *Jesus and the Kingdom* 45-6; *Historical Jesus* 13-15; *Jesus and the Kingdom* 84-95; N. Perrin, *Kingdom of God* 158-178; A. Schweitzer, *Kingdom of God* 60, 93-96; J. Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation* 77f.; 93f.


32 G. Dalman, The Words Of Jesus 96f.; C.H. Dodd, Parables 22f.

33 R. Bultmann, Theology of New Testament 1:6; see also R. Bultmann, Jesus Christ and Mythology 12; R.H. Hiers, Historical Jesus 13-26; R.H. Hiers, Jesus and the Future 67-9; 87-9; A. Schweitzer, Quest for the Historical Jesus 239; J. Weiss, Jesus' Proclamation 130-1.


35 R. H. Hiers, The Kingdom of God 82; R.H. Hiers, Jesus and the Future 71-74; J. Weiss, Jesus' Proclamation 93.
The arrival of the Kingdom of God is so near that Weiss and Hiers occasionally refer to the Kingdom being present in the exorcism conflicts. R.H. Hiers, *The Kingdom of God* 96; J. Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation* 79. Rudolf Bultmann notes, "Jesus expected that (the arrival of the Kingdom of God) would take place soon, in the immediate future, and he said that the dawning of that age could already be perceived in the signs and wonders which he performed, especially in his casting out of demons." *Jesus Christ and Mythology* 13. Jesus and the synoptic evangelists were so certain of the Kingdom's manifestation that occasionally they viewed the Kingdom as being present in Jesus' exorcism activity. However, Weiss notes "these are moments of sublime prophetic enthusiasm, when an awareness of victory comes over him" *Jesus' Proclamation* 78.

C.H. Dodd translated *engiken* as "has come" instead of "at hand" or "drawn near". The linguistic arguments behind the various choices are inconclusive. A. Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom* 21-25. The particular translation greatly depends on the particular definition of the Kingdom of God under consideration and the context of the verse.


As previously noted, there are two versions of the *factus* interpretation of the Kingdom. There are those scholars who view the development of the Kingdom as a "maturation" process and there is another group of scholars who believe the Kingdom appears in a two-stage process. These two versions produce some variations in the interpretation of the
exorcisms. The proponents of "realized eschatology" believe the exorcisms are the actual overthrow of Satan. see: C.H. Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching* 49.

The proponents of the both present and future Kingdom have an alternative interpretation. The exorcisms represent a decisive defeat for demonic forces. However, the actual overthrow of Beliar is still a future expectation. see: G.E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom* 147-8.


42 The proponents of the Kingdom as both present and future also believe one enters immediately into the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom one enters is the present Kingdom. It is the Kingdom which exists in a limited capacity. Admittance into the present Kingdom does grant one entrance into the future Kingdom. There is a sense of a double entry with admittance into the present Kingdom providing the opportunity to enter the Kingdom of the new age. A. Ambrozic, *The Hidden Kingdom* 158.


44 The specific reactions to the fall of Jerusalem and how those reactions are expressed in the literature are beyond this study. However, it is generally assumed that the destruction of the Temple did have an impact on Judaic thought and belief. Daniel Jeremy Silver & Bernard Martin, *A History of Judaism*, 2 vols. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974) 1:255-78; George C. Brauer Jr., *Judea Weeping: The Jewish Struggle Against Rome From*
The texts include: the books of the Tanakh: Tobit; Wisdom of Solomon; Ben Sirach; 2 Maccabees; Greek Additions to Esther; 1 Enoch; Book Three of the Sibylline Oracles; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; Testament of Abraham; Testament of Moses; 3 Maccabees; Psalms of Solomon.

All quotations for the Tanakh will be from: The Holy Scriptures According to the Masoretic Texts (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1955). There was probably no standard authoritative version of the Tanakh during the second temple period. S.J. D. Cohen, From the Maccabees to the Mishnah 192f. However, it seems that the various books that now comprise the Tanakh did exist in a form similar to the Masoretic texts.

All quotations for the Deuterocanonical writings will be from: The New English Bible with the Apocrypha (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1970).


47 G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus 91-141.

48 M. Lattke, "On the Jewish Background," 73.

49 Weiss and Dodd give cursory treatment to the Pseudepigrapha. C.H. Dodd, The Parables 22f.; J.Wiess, Jesus' Proclamation 56f. J.J. Collins in his article "The Kingdom of God in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" concentrates on "kingdom" citations. He only alludes to "kingship" citations

50 N. Perrin, Kingdom of God 168f.; N. Perrin, Jesus and the Language 16-32.

51 An argument may be made that the "kingdom" references may be more temporally appropriate for study. The "kingdom" references may be contemporaneous with the Gospel of Mark. However, this is not the case. The history of transmission for the Ps. Sol. is difficult to reconstruct. The Psalms are similar in topic and style suggesting that they originated within a close-knit group of writers in a common time period. Robert Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon, The Pharisees, and the Essenes," 1972 Proceedings IOSCS Pseudepigrapha, vol. 2 of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, ed. Robert A. Kraft (Society of Biblical Literature, 1972) 136; Leonhard Rost, Judaism Outside the Hebrew Canon: An Introduction to the Documents, trans. David E. Green (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976) 119. Therefore, there is nothing to suggest that Psalm 17 is earlier or later in composition than Psalm 2. The "king" references in the Sibylline Oracles (3:499, 560, 616, 784, 808) are probably from the same layer of tradition as 3:767. J.J. Collins, The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism, vol. 13 of Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series (Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974) 28. Finally, the literary structure of the Testament of Moses parallels chapter 4 with chapter 10. This indicates that references in both chapters supplement one another. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 80-81.
The texts under consideration are found in all three languages. Based on the Septuagint, the Hebrew MALAK is consistently translated as the Greek BASILEUO (Exod. 15:18; 19:6 etc.). The Greek BASILEIA is also the word used in the New Testament for the "kingdom" (Mk. 1:14; 4:11, etc.). The Testament of Moses, the only text to be studied in Latin, uses rex and regnum for "king" and "kingdom" (4:2; 10:1). R.H. Charles, ed., The Assumption of Moses (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1897) 69,85.

This statement is not entirely accurate. In the preceding chapter, it was noted that the locus scholars view the Kingdom of God as a synonym for the state represented by the "age to come." The factus scholars equated the Kingdom with the apocalyptic re-assertion of God's sovereignty that would establish the "age to come". This difference is still recognized. However, for the ease of discussion, and because both groups of scholars share similar views on the apocalyptic nature of the Judaic Kingdom, the difference between the two views need not be rehearsed in this discussion.


Not every scholar who equates the Kingdom of God with the "age to come" emphasizes the same characteristics. Those characteristics named are the most frequently cited. J. Bright, Kingdom of God 186-214; J. Gray, The


It is believed that Psalms 47, 93, 96-99 were originally part of the "enthronement of Yahweh" ceremony. According to S. Mowinckel's proposal, Yahweh was annually enthroned as king of the world. There seems to be very little evidence for this annual enthronement ceremony. W. Stewart McCullough, "The 'Enthronement of Yahweh' Psalms," *A Stubborn Faith: Papers on Old Testament and Related Subjects Presented to Honor William Andrew Irwin*, ed. Edward C. Hobbs (Dallas: Southern Methodist UP, 1956) 60. Further, if the psalms did originate with an enthronement ceremony, this ceremony was pre-exilic. Within postbiblical Judaism, the psalms were part of the services for the Second Temple and proto-synagogue. Pius Drivers, *The Psalms: Their Structure and Meaning* (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1965)

60 There is some dispute whether the phrase is "Yahweh reigns" or "Yahweh will reign". The latter translation rests on the underlying supposition of the enthronement festival. The word order, previous citations in the Tanakh and the context of the psalms all suggest that the phrase is "Yahweh reigns". A. Gelston, "A Note on YHWH mlk" Vetus Testamentum 16 (1966): 507-12.


62 M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism 1:190.


64 J. Gray, The Biblical Doctrine 183f.; D. Patrick, "The Kingdom of God," 76; G.E. Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom 51; J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel 360; N. Perrin, Kingdom of God 161. James Dunn cites the belief in the destruction of this present age as a distinctive characteristic of the apocalyptic. The destruction of this world distinguishes the apocalyptic from the prophetic forms of thought. Unity and Diversity 316.


70 J.J. Collins, Sibylline Oracles 98; J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel 361.


72 This creates an ambiguity as to whether this fifth kingdom is the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of the 'son of man' and the 'saints'. This ambiguity cannot be resolved without a detailed exegesis of Daniel which is
beyond this study. For the purposes of convenience and scholarly tradition, the Kingdom in chapter seven will be regarded as the Kingdom of God.


81 George Nickelsburg stresses the similar pattern between chapters four and nine. However, he suggests that both units represent a kind of repentance. Nickelsburg, "An Antiochan Date," 33. David Harrington, cited by Nickelsburg, finds the characterization of Taxo's action as "repentance" inappropriate. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Introduction", in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*, vol. 4 of *SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. G.W.E. Nickelsburg (Cambridge: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973) 8. Harrington is correct given the fact that Taxo and his sons have no sins of which repentance is required (9:4). Further, there is no idea in the text that they are suffering for the sins of the people. Rather, Taxo's action, as with the intercessor's prayer in chapter four, confirms God's Kingship.


86 It is almost universally held that the Gospel of Mark was composed by John Mark. John Mark, according to Acts, was a Jewish companion of both Paul and Peter. The Gospel, according to various traditions, is believed to be the record of Peter's sermons or teachings. V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to Mark* 26-31.

87 The interpretation of the parables will employ the interaction theory for identifying and interpreting metaphors. Briefly, parables are understood as a form of metaphor. In the interaction theory, a metaphorical statement is assumed to have two subjects. One is a "primary" subject. The other is a "secondary" subject. The secondary subject has linked with it a set of concepts, assumptions and ideas known as the secondary predicate. This set of concepts is drawn from the socio-historical matrix of the metaphor's composer and the context of the metaphor. For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Subject</th>
<th>Secondary Subject</th>
<th>Secondary Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>is a hunter, loner, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, the characteristics of the wolf are those our society have come to associate with the animal. It is difficult to determine which characteristic is implied by the metaphor until a context is provided.

Man is a wolf. He hungers for the solitude of his own den. The context suggests that the one "wolfish" characteristic implied by the metaphor is the "loner" trait. Similarly, in the parables in chapter four, one trait is repeated. The parables emphasize the growth of the seeds. A full discussion of the identification and interpretation of metaphors is provided by Mogen S. Kjargaard, *Metaphor and Parable: A Systematic Analysis of the Specific Structure and Cognitive Function of Synoptic Similes and Parables qua Metaphors*, vol. 20 of *Acta Theologica Danica*, ed. Leif Grane et. al. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986).


89 The parable refers to the harvest of a crop. Verse 29 is based on Joel 3:13 which uses the harvest as a metaphor for eschatological judgment. The parable is believed to recall this same concept. V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to Mark* 268.


93 Morton Smith, *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978); Geza Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1983). It should be noted that Jesus' status as "messiah" would not have necessarily equated the exorcisms with the apocalyptic defeat of Satan. It is
assumed that one of the activities of the messiah was to be the defeat of Satan. However, the deuterocanonical writings do not see the binding of Satan as a common activity of a "messianic" figure. The binding or vanquishing of Satan tends to be an act associated directly with God (Jub. 23:29; T. Zeb. 9:8; T. Naph. 8:3-10; Sib Or. 3:373; T. Mos. 10:1), the angels (1 Enoch 54:6; T. Levi 3:3), or, infrequently, a descendent of Levi (T. Levi 18:1-4; T. Dan. 5:10,11). The only reference in which God's Elected One/Son of Man has any direct contact with Satan/Azazel is 1 Enoch 55:4. In this passage, God's Elected One has been given the task of judging Azazel; however, it is still the angels who bind him and his hosts (1 Enoch 54:6; 88). Therefore, Jesus' messianic status would not have instinctively connected the exorcisms with the demise of Satan.


95 T. Francis Glasson notes that the Gospel has no more than one quotation from an apocalyptic text (other than Daniel which some consider apocalyptic). T. Francis Glasson, "What is Apocalyptic?," 104.


103 It should be noted that the concepts of demonic possession are still fluid at this time. The idea of an unjustified or capricious kind of possession may be more applicable when trying to explain the possession behind the
daughter of the Syro-phoenician woman (7:24-30) and the epileptic boy (9:14-29). Or, as is evidenced in some Judaic writings (Ex. 20:5; Deut. 5:9; T. Zeub. 5:1-5) the sins of the father can be visited upon the children. This transfer of sin may explain why Jesus was concerned that the father had faith (9:23-24). The boy may have been possessed because of the father's sin and he could not be cured without the father's belief. However, the narrative is so laconic and ideas of demonic possession so fluid, it is difficult to state explicitly why the children were possessed.


108 Some scholars refer to the first-century B.C.E. rabbi, Joshua ben Perahiah as an example of a contemporaneous figure who is named in magical incantations. D. Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," 1547. However, Joshua is not cited because his name drives out demons. He is cited because
he is the source of a rabbinic ruling which enables men to drive demons out of their homes. In other words, Joshua's name is shorthand for a particular law of the Talmud. It is not a testimony to the magical expertise or power of Joshua ben Perahiah.


110 M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, 1:190; J. Gammie, "Ethical and Spatial Dualism," 357
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