

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE BACKGROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT EXPECTATION

As a preface to our examination of the New Testament expectation, a brief review is here undertaken of the expectation in the Old Testament and in the inter-Testamental period (as it is found in Apocalyptic in Wisdom literature, in Hellenistic Judaism, in Rabbinic Judaism, and in particular group movements).

#### EXPECTATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The central concern of the Old Testament is the sovereignty of God.<sup>1</sup> The actual phrase 'the Kingdom of God' (מַלְכוּת יְהוָה) is seldom used in a religious sense prior to Daniel,<sup>2</sup> but the *concept* is certainly early and central.<sup>3</sup> General agreement exists to-day that the phrase means primarily 'sovereignty' as a characteristic of JHWH and only secondarily a territory and a people wherein this sovereignty is displayed and acknowledged.<sup>4</sup> It is, therefore, better to speak of 'the sovereignty' than of 'the kingdom' of God.

This concept of God's sovereignty is related in the Old Testament to Israel's past, present and future.

#### *The relation to the past*

In the creation stories of Genesis, as also in such isolated references as Ps. 104,5; 119,90; Is. 47,16; I Chr. 29,11, etc., we find Israel's conviction that the act of creation attests God's sovereignty in and over nature.<sup>5</sup> But it was in the Covenant in particular that Israel saw the sovereignty of God displayed; in the establishment

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jacob, *Theology*, p. 37; Davidson, *Theology*, pp. 1-4; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 512ff.; Anderson, 'Hebrew Religion', pp. 308f.; Hebert, *Authority*, pp. 47ff.; Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 30ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. von Rad, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 569.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the use of מַלְךְ in the names of national gods among Israel's neighbours; cf. von Rad, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 567.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 94; von Rad, in *T.W.N.T.* I, pp. 564ff.; Flew, *Church*, p. 28; Richardson, in *T.W.B.*, pp. 119ff.; etc.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Orr, in *H.D.B.* II, pp. 844ff.

of Israel as His people God's Lordship was expressed and given form and location.<sup>1</sup> It is to this election of Israel in sovereign love that the prophets look back, seeing in it the basis of God's concern with Israel's history and of the obligations of service imposed on Israel.<sup>2</sup>

#### *The relation to the present*

The Old Testament recognises that in every present moment Israel exists under God's kingship.<sup>3</sup> This is declared both by prophet and priest.<sup>4</sup> The nature of this kingship and its moral and religious implications comprise the burden of the prophetic message; JHWH is *now* King over Israel, therefore Israel must obey his commands.<sup>5</sup>

Recently the role of the cultus in Israel's life and the development of its religious ideas has been increasingly recognised. It appears that some Psalms reflect a cultic pattern, the centre of which concerned the (?annual) enthronement of the king (? at the New Year Festival), through which ritual the present kingship of JHWH was both personified and assured.<sup>6</sup>

Since *malkuth*, as it is applied to God, means primarily 'sovereignty' as distinct from 'a kingdom', it follows that human disobedience cannot affect JHWH's kingship, either to annul it or to establish it.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, every movement in the history of Israel

<sup>1</sup> See e.g., Ex. 19, 5; Deut. 14, 2; 26, 18; Ps. 135, 4. cf. Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 60-74; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 36 ff.; Jacob, *Theology*, p. 209ff. It is significant that the Deuteronomist uses the phrase 'at that time' (בְּעֵת הַהוּא) 16 times, indicating that the establishment of the Covenant was 'the classic time' of God's activity (cf. Marsh, in *T.W.B.* pp. 258f.).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g., Hos. 11, 1ff., Mal. 1, 2; Is. 51, 2; Amos 3, 2; Hebert, *Authority*, p. 55; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 58f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Köhler, *Theology*, p. 66; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 70ff., p. 92.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g., Is. 6, 5; I Chr. 29, 11;

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 316ff.; Snaith, *Ideas*, pp. 51ff.; Robinson, *Religious Ideas*, pp. 154f.

<sup>6</sup> Engnell, *Studies*, pp. 43ff., is prepared to speak of the king in this respect as the personal incarnation of God; cf. similarly Bentzen, *King*, p. 37; Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien* II, passim; Pedersen, *Israel*, III-IV, passim; H. J. Kraus, *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im A.T.* passim; Jacob, *Theology*, pp. 262-270. Criticism of this reconstruction is offered by e.g., Eissfeldt, 'Jahve als König', in *Z.A.W.* XLVI, 1928 pp. 81-105; Snaith, *Studies in the Psalter*, and *Jewish New Year Festival*; Anderson, 'Hebrew Religion', pp. 297ff.

A bibliography of selected works to 1955 is given in Jacob, *Theology*, p. 279.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Flew, *Church*, p. 28; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 457ff.; Jacob, *Theology*, p. 105; Snaith, *Ideas*, pp. 94ff.

was motivated by the need to make clear in the pattern of Israel's life, the truth that JHWH was the sovereign Lord.<sup>1</sup> The reciprocity of the Covenant relationship meant that JHWH was not simply king *per se*, but that this kingship should be manifestly acknowledged in Israel's history:<sup>2</sup> Israel's drastic failure in this respect was regarded as the cause of all national disasters. Such failure *concealed* JHWH's kingship and compromised his sovereignty and resulted in this sovereignty being displayed now primarily through judgement.<sup>3</sup> It also hid JHWH's sovereignty from the eyes of the surrounding nations and was regarded as a slight upon JHWH himself.<sup>4</sup>

This failure and subsequent ambiguity became particularly apparent at the time of the Babylonian captivity. During the exile and in the post-exilic period great emphasis was laid upon the need to acknowledge JHWH's kingship *in the present*.<sup>5</sup> Isaiah's concept of a 'remnant' was extended, and legalistic separatism and pietistic particularism received much emphasis, the intention being that, if not in all Israel, then at least in a group within Israel, JHWH's kingship might be openly acknowledged.<sup>6</sup>

#### *The relation to the future*

The growth in Israel's religious consciousness of an expectation of a future manifestation of the Kingdom of God has been ascribed variously to a number of factors. Some suggest the ethical fulfilment of the purpose of creation, coupled with the non-realisation of this fulfilment in Israel's empirical life.<sup>7</sup> Others suggest Israel's understanding of its Covenant relationship; i.e. 'because Israel belongs to JHWH and can depend on Him, it has a future'.<sup>8</sup> Israel's eventual understanding of JHWH's transcendence has also been suggested.<sup>9</sup> Another suggestion is Israel's human aspiration

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 45-69.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 64ff.; Robinson, *Religious Ideas*, p. 41; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 36ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 462ff., *Interpretation*, pp. 66ff., Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 209ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. esp. Is. 52, 5-6; Ezek. 36, 20; (cf. Rom. 2, 24!). cf. Vriezen, *Theology*, pp. 228ff., Rowley, *Israel's Mission*, passim.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Cook, *Old Testament*, pp. 195ff., Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 467ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Cook, *Old Testament*, p. 194; Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 71-87.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Orr, in *H.D.B.* II, pp. 844ff.

<sup>8</sup> Robinson, *Religious Ideas*, p. 185.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Otto, *Kingdom of God*, pp. 40f., similarly Heim, *Jesus the Lord*, p. 27.

after world renewal.<sup>1</sup> Popular hope in the overthrow of Israel's enemies in a world catastrophe has also been put forward as the cause.<sup>2</sup> Some argue that eschatology arose through the cult; it was a projection into the future of what had been dramatically represented in the cult.<sup>3</sup> Yet again, Israel's theocentric understanding of history has been suggested.<sup>4</sup> Others argue that eschatology arose through the recognition that God must meet Israel's failure to acknowledge his sovereignty by an unambiguous manifestation of it throughout the world.<sup>5</sup>

It is possible that many of these features played a part in the development of Israel's eschatology. But in view of the fact that eschatological expectation deepened and prospered during and following the exile,<sup>6</sup> it seems likely that the two last suggestions were most influential and themselves encouraged the particular reading of history embodied in the first two suggestions.

Although there is a growing admission that the roots of Israel's eschatological hope go back far in its history,<sup>7</sup> it remains a fact that the experience of the exile intensified the problems of evil and of human failure<sup>8</sup> and intensified this forward look towards a future goal of history.<sup>9</sup> There is an increasing longing for the time when God would make his Kingship unambiguously clear.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Althaus, *letzten Dinge*, p. 7; Althaus sees all eschatology as having this same origin, though he adds (p. 11) that in Israel, the Covenant relationship gave specific content to the O.T. hope.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. e.g., Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*; and concerning this, Anderson, 'Hebrew Religion', pp. 303f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien* II. Mowinckel maintains that Israel's eschatology arose through the meeting of the Canaanite cyclic view of history with the historical view characteristic of Israel. Contrast Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*, passim; Anderson, 'Hebrew Religion', p. 304.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Rowley, *Faith*, p. 177; North, *Interpretation*, pp. 126ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Richardson, in *T.W.B.* pp. 119ff.; von Rad, in *T.W.N.T. I*, pp. 567ff., Vriezen, *Theology*, pp. 351f., Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 218f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 88-94; and see below pp. 18 ff., concerning the rise of apocalyptic.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Rowley, *Faith*, p. 177; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 385f., Anderson, 'Hebrew Religion', pp. 303ff. (Dr. Anderson has some qualifications to make concerning this contemporary tendency).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Whitley, *Exilic Age*, p. 100; Rops, *Israel*, pp. 214f., Bright, *History*, p. 350f.

<sup>9</sup> This intensification is expressed to some extent in legalism (e.g. Ezra's promulgation in 444 BC), to some extent in mysticism or personal pietism (e.g. Job, Ps. 73); perhaps too, an element of stoic resignation entered in (cf. Ecclesiastes) (cf. Manson, *Teaching*, p. 151). But see further below, p. 19.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Mic. 4, 2; Is. 2, 3; Jer. 3, 17; etc. von Rad, in *T.W.N.T. I*, p. 567; Rowley, *Faith*, pp. 181ff.

Three further matters concerning Israel's hope in the manifestation of God's kingship must be mentioned. They are 1) the central figure in the expected End-drama: 2) the content of Israel's expectation: 3) the scope of this future expectation.

#### 1) *The central figure in the expected End-drama:*

One strand in the traditions looks for JHWH himself to visit his people.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that disillusionment with Israel's kings and the reinterpretation of the cultic Psalms encouraged this conception; from the proclamation 'JHWH has become king' comes the hope 'JHWH will become king'<sup>2</sup>. This expectation lays weight on the End as a time of the peculiar activity of God.<sup>3</sup>

There is also a 'messianic' expectation, and here the problem arises as to the significance of the king's role in the cult and its relation to 'messianic' expectation. It is beyond the scope of the present survey to dwell on this<sup>4</sup> and a few tentative remarks must suffice. On the one hand there appears to be a development through cultic practice, whereby the idea of the king as representative of JHWH's Lordship could come to be thought of as 'Messiah'.<sup>5</sup> As disillusionment grew through experience of the monarchy, and in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Is. 44, 6-23; 46, 9-13; 52, 7-9; Zech. 1, 3; 1, 16-17; etc., and the expression 'the day of JHWH', Amos 5, 18; etc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Is. 24, 23; 33, 21-22, Zeph. 3, 15f., Zech. 14, 16; etc. cf. Otto, *Kingdom of God*, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Is. 18, 7; Jer. 3, 17, Joel 3, 15-17, etc., cf. Marsh, in *T.W.B.* pp. 258f.

<sup>4</sup> Detailed discussion may be found in Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien* II, and *He that cometh*; Gressmann, *Der Messias*; Bentzen, *King*; Ringgren, 'König und Messias' in *Z.A.W.* 64, 1952, pp. 120-147; and *Messiah*; Johnson, *Sacral Kingship*; Jacob, *Theology*, pp. 327ff (plus bibliography pp. 342f.).

<sup>5</sup> Mowinckel (*He that cometh*, passim) argues that since the term 'Messiah' involves eschatology it cannot be used of the contemporary Israelite king. Bentzen (*King*, p. 37), however, commenting on the role of the king in the cult, maintains that 'the Psalms experience in living actuality what eschatology expects. Therefore the king of the Psalms is in the main the same . . .' (similarly Engnell, *Studies*, pp. 176f.). Ringgren rightly points out that the simple application of the term 'messianic' to the king's cultic role does not necessarily mean that the role is considered 'prophetic' or eschatological; he notes that Engnell states, 'By messianism I mean elaborate king ideology' (Ringgren, *Messiah*, p. 24, referring to Engnell, *Studies*, p. 43, n. 3.). Anderson ('Hebrew Religion', p. 305) therefore contends that 'it can only make for confusion' if the words 'Messiah' and 'messianic' are used 'in any other than a future sense'. At the same time, as Rowley (*Faith*, p. 192) maintains, the royal Psalms may well be regarded as 'messianic' in setting before the king in the cult both a pattern for himself and an ideal hope for the future, the latter aspect predominating in post exilic times.

due course as the monarchy ceased, a 'messianic' future hope arose.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, there is the expectation of a future Davidic king,<sup>2</sup> which suggests that the specific promises given to David<sup>3</sup> have been applied to the general 'messianic' hope.<sup>4</sup> If the references to a 'Messiah' are not abundant, this may be due to the complexity of Israel's expectation.<sup>5</sup> Certainly the Old Testament expectation is fuller than the usage and occurrence of the technical term 'Messiah' might suggest.<sup>6</sup>

Then there is the concept of the 'Servant of JHWH' (עבד יהוה). The major problem is to determine the subject of the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>7</sup> Various former or contemporary historical figures have been suggested; also, Israel itself, an ideal remnant, an abstract ideal, or a hoped for group or individual.<sup>8</sup> Actually for our purposes the problem is peripheral; for although the Christian church has, from the beginning, 'seen an impressive foreshadowing of Christ' in these songs,<sup>9</sup> there is in fact 'little to connect the Servant superficially with the Davidic leader, and it is not surprising that there is no solid evidence that the two were identified in pre-Christian times . . .'.<sup>10</sup>

The expression 'Son of Man' (בר-אנוש בן-אדם) must concern us rather more fully, and particularly three problems arising from its occurrence in Daniel.<sup>11</sup> First, the problem whether the term in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ringgren, *Messiah*, pp. 23ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Is. 9, 6ff.; Mic. 5, 1-5, etc. Whereas the king is termed JHWH's anointed, the expected Davidic king is nowhere in the O.T. referred to technically by this term; cf. Rowley, *Faith*, p. 188; Campbell, in *T.W.B.*, pp. 44f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. II Sam. 7, 12; Jer. 17, 25; 33, 17; Amos 9, 11; Hos. 3, 5; Ezek. 45, 8.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ringgren, *Messiah*, pp. 25-38; Robinson, *Religious Ideas*, p. 199f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Campbell, in *T.W.B.*, p. 44.

<sup>6</sup> This is illustrated not only by other terms but also by all the material collected in Klausner, *Messianic Idea*.

<sup>7</sup> i.e. Is. 42, 1-4; 49, 1-6; 50, 4-6; 52, 13-53, 12.

<sup>8</sup> For an exhaustive survey of interpretations cf. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah*, pp. 6-116; see also Zimmerli and Jeremias, in *T.W.N.T.*, V, pp. 655ff., and *Servant*, pp. 23-24; Lundhagen, *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament*, Campbell, in *T.W.B.* p. 223f.

<sup>9</sup> Campbell, in *T.W.B.* p. 224.

<sup>10</sup> Rowley, *Faith*, p. 197. For a full discussion of the significance of the 'Servant of JHWH' in the O.T. cf. the works cited above n. 8, and Snaith, 'The Servant of the Lord', pp. 187ff. Lindblom, *Servant Songs*; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 483ff. (Lindblom, *Servant Songs*, pp. 105f. and Zimmerli and Jeremias, *Servant*, pp. 105f., include bibliographies.)

<sup>11</sup> Elsewhere in the O.T. the title is used infrequently (except in Ezekiel) as a synonym for man (e.g. Ps. 8, 4). Bentzen (*King*, p. 43) maintains that

Daniel is corporate or individual. T. W. Manson's 'corporate' thesis<sup>1</sup> has received many advocates.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, evidence to suggest that the Son of Man in Daniel is an individual,<sup>3</sup> though a representative figure,<sup>4</sup> for the four beasts (7, 3-8) are described (in v 17) as 'four kings' (ארבעה מלכין) suggesting 'the possibility of interpreting "one like unto a Son of Man" in v. 13 as the ruler of the "Saints of the Most High", who appears as their representative, rather than as identical with them'.<sup>5</sup>

Secondly, there is the problem whether the Son of Man in Daniel is a Messianic figure, or not. Mowinckel sharply distinguishes between 'Messiah', a figure which he sees developing from sacral kingship themes adopted by Israel into its cultus, and 'Son of Man' which he regards as arising from the eastern 'primal man' concept. Riesenfeld and others take the opposite view.<sup>6</sup> Bentzen, on the other hand, cites Pss. 8, 4-5 and 80, 17-18 as occasions when the king is termed Son of Man, suggesting that the two concepts at least run parallel.<sup>7</sup> Some association between an idealised king expectation and this Son of Man in Daniel who enters upon a future 'kingship' seems likely<sup>8</sup> though there are obvious differences.<sup>9</sup> Of the two terms, Son of Man is the more inclusive and is capable of taking up into itself the older hope of a 'Messiah' in the narrower sense.

The final problem is whether or not the Son of Man and the idea

the term is used of the king (and thus with messianic overtones at least) in Pss. 8, 4-5, 80, 17-18. Cf. further Vriezen *Theology*, p. 367.

<sup>1</sup> *Teaching*; and 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels', in *B.J.R.L.* XXXII, 1950, pp. 174ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. those cited by Higgins, 'Forschung', p. 126.

<sup>3</sup> Mowinckel, (*He that cometh*, p. 352) says the expression in Daniel is corporate but that this is a reinterpretation of an individual concept which existed c 200 B.C. cf. also Jacob, *Theology*, p. 341.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g. Cullmann, *Early Church*, p. 130; Taylor, *Names*, p. 26 Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 274; Barrett, 'Background', p. 17 n. 39.

<sup>5</sup> Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 274.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Higgins 'Forschung', p. 122.

<sup>7</sup> For a survey of these views see Higgins, 'Forschung' p. 122; cf. Emerton, 'The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery', in *J.T.S.* IX 1958. Bentzen, *King*, p. 75; *Commentary*, p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Vriezen, *Theology*, p. 367; Jacob, *Theology*, pp. 341f.

<sup>9</sup> Jacob, *Theology*, p. 342 writes, 'The Son of Man is, then, a real king, his function overlaps the Messiah's, but by giving him the title of man the author of the book of Daniel seeks to disentangle Messianism from national ties and to link it with the universal outlook of Genesis.'

of suffering are brought together in Daniel. Rowley<sup>1</sup> denies any connection, because 'the saints suffered before the appearance of the Son of Man . . .' On the other hand, if the Son of Man is understood as the peoples' representative, then the connection is close, for he comes as representative of the *suffering* saints.<sup>2</sup>

One further title must be considered under this section; the term 'Son of God' (בן אלהים).<sup>3</sup> Its application to the king (Pss. 2 and 89) suggests a certain messianic overtone.<sup>4</sup> It is interesting that the idea of kingship runs through, and therefore to some extent unites, the terms Son of Man, Son of God and the future Davidic Messiah.

### 2) *The content of Old Testament expectation:*

Israel's hope in the final manifestation of God's sovereignty involved the expectation both of judgement and of vindication. To recognise God as righteous<sup>5</sup> meant drawing the conclusion that all iniquity must fall under his judgement. Amos (5, 18) fulminates against the failure to take this fact seriously. Social injustice (cf 5, 11f. and Is. 3, 15, 5, 8 etc.) and idolatry (cf Amos 5, 23, Is. 2, 17f. etc.) cannot be set aside by mere religious conformity (Amos 5, 22) but must lead to the revelation of God's judgement upon them.<sup>6</sup> Therefore the expected intervention of God in Israel's history would not simply involve the exaltation of Israel and the destruction of her enemies, but would include judgement upon Israel.<sup>7</sup>

The threat of judgement, however, does not eclipse the hope of restoration and the fulfilment of JHWH's promise to bless and to

<sup>1</sup> *Servant*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 117; Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 280; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 275; Barrett, 'Background' pp. 2f.

<sup>3</sup> For its various applications—to the true Israel, the remnant, Israel as a whole, angels, etc.—cf. Taylor, *Names*, p. 52.

<sup>4</sup> Manson, *Jesus*, p. 103, connects the title with the 'halo of religious significance surrounding the person of the Davidic prince in Israel', and thinks that it was therefore 'through Scripture a Messianic potential'.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Snaith, *Ideas*, pp. 51ff.; Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 209f., etc.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. esp. Is. 2, 12 where the unambiguous reversal of human unrighteousness is promised.

<sup>7</sup> The same opening formula of judgement is applied by Amos to the nations (1, 3-2, 3) as to Israel and Judah (2, 4-16). Cf. North, *Interpretation*, p. 64; Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 464-7.

establish his people.<sup>1</sup> Alongside the expectation of doom stands that of glory.<sup>2</sup> This hope certainly intensified during and through the experience of the Exile, but the distinction is only one of degree. Behind the expectation of a final, unambiguous manifestation of God's kingship in these two forms lies the perception that this same kingship is *already* being displayed in judgement and mercy though, in the present, only in a provisional and equivocal way.<sup>3</sup>

### 3) *The scope of Old Testament expectation:*

Israel's peculiar consciousness of God and of themselves as his people, involved for them a sense of priority.<sup>4</sup> The priority in judgement was not by any means regularly perceived,<sup>5</sup> and the priority in blessing was not infrequently expressed negatively,<sup>6</sup> at times, however, it was understood in a more positive manner.<sup>7</sup>

The awareness that JHWH is not solely concerned with Israel, or at least does not concern himself with Israel in isolation from her neighbours, goes back 'long before the time of the Deuteronomist'.<sup>8</sup> The promise 'and in thee (thy seed) shall all the families of the earth be blessed'<sup>9</sup> emphasises that the Covenant between JHWH and Abraham had some significance for the whole of mankind.<sup>10</sup> If this is only implicit universalism, the 8th century prophets are explicit that the future holds in store JHWH's acknowledgement by all men.<sup>11</sup> The scope of JHWH's kingship already embraced all

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Robinson, *Religious Ideas*, pp. 197f., Davidson, *Theology*, p. 377; North, *Interpretation*, pp. 130f.

<sup>2</sup> Even in Amos this subsequent glory is not lacking if the last five verses are authentic. (Edghill, *Commentary*, *ad loc.*, thinks they were inserted by a different writer who regarded punishment as 'a means of purification, even preservation'. Similarly, Cripps, *Commentary*, *ad loc.*; Harper, *Commentary*, p. cxxxiv; Smith, *Twelve Prophets* I, pp. 199-205; Vriezen, however, thinks it more probably 'a message from the prophet which he passed on in the circle of his disciples'; *Theology*, p. 359).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Eichrodt, *Theology*, pp. 67, 461; Vriezen, *Theology*, p. 229.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 79ff., Martin-Achard, *Israel*, pp. 32ff., Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 19ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, n. 1; Eichrodt, *Theology*, p. 471; North, *Interpretation*, p. 64.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. in the overthrow of Israel's enemies, Zech. 14, etc.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. in descriptions of universal peace and harmony centring on the glorified city of Jerusalem, Is. 9, 6-7. 17, 25-26.

<sup>8</sup> Rowley, *Faith*, p. 183.

<sup>9</sup> Gen. 12. 3. 18, 18. 22, 18. 26, 4. 28, 14.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Martin-Achard, *Israel*, p. 35.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Jer. 16, 19; Ps. 22, 7; Zech. 8, 22; Zeph. 3, 10; North, *Interpretation*, pp. 72-74; Robinson, 'The Modern World', pp. 346ff., Rowley, *Faith*, p. 180.

natural phenomena;<sup>1</sup> therefore the prophets could not stop short of speaking of the future manifestation of God's kingship as embracing all nations and the entire cosmic order.<sup>2</sup>

It was with a view to this ultimate end that Israel's role in the world was occasionally understood as one of mission.<sup>3</sup> This is especially the case with Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>4</sup> At the same time, whatever stress was laid upon Israel's mission and on acceptance by the Gentiles of JHWH's rule, the coming age of glory was never regarded in the Old Testament as anything but the sole gift of God; always the day of JHWH is a day of special *divine* activity.<sup>5</sup>

It remains now only to draw out of this survey three points which elucidate the significance of the Old Testament hope.

Firstly, the contrast between the kingship of JHWH acknowledged by Israel's 'prophets' in the present, and that to which they look forward in the future, is essentially a contrast between concealed and revealed kingship. Kingship as a characteristic or attribute of JHWH could not be thought of as at one time partial, and later complete;<sup>6</sup> the contrast could only be between present hiddenness and future manifestation.<sup>7</sup> Already through the Covenant relationship JHWH's sovereign rule was manifested; but the manifestation was clouded by the partiality of Israel's response, and the sphere of the relationship was in any case limited to Israel. The expected revelation would involve an open recognition by all.<sup>8</sup>

Old Testament eschatology is eschatology and not simply mysticism,<sup>9</sup> so that the tension arising from the contrast between hidden and revealed lordship is a tension between what *is now*, and what *will be then*. The unambiguous revelation and acknowledgment of JHWH's lordship was awaited *not* in mystical perception

<sup>1</sup> E.g. I Kings 17, 14, 16; II Kings 1, 10f; 2, 8; etc. Ezra 1, 1; Jer. 1, 15; Is. 44, 24f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Is. 11, 10; Dan. 7, 27, etc. Rowley, *Faith*, p. 180; Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 85-98; North, *Interpretation*, pp. 76-78.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 17ff., Cook, *Old Testament*, p. 156; Jeremias, *Promise*, pp. 58f., Vriezen, *Theology*, p. 230; Browne, *Early Judaism*, pp. 1ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Is. 45, 22; 42, 6; 43, 10; 49, 6; and the Servant Songs in toto.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 28; Davidson, *Theology*, pp. 374f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Köhler, *Theology*, p. 31.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. von Rad, in *T.W.N.T.* I p. 567.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. e.g. Jer. 31, 34; Is. 2, 2. Köhler, *Theology*, p. 230; Smith, *Commentary*, Isaiah 2, 2; ad loc.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Eichrodt, *Theology*, p. 176.

of the truth by individuals but in the future inbreaking of God into history in an unmistakable manner.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, the contrast between concealed and revealed, and the tension between 'now' and 'then', arise from the fact of divine promise and the assurance of divine fulfilment. Israel's hope was never founded on human optimism, nor upon any reading off from nature of a certain evolutionary tendency, or the like; nor was the expected future conceived as a human goal nor even the reward of human obedience and activity. The hope persisted rather *in spite of* these factors, being based entirely on the promise of God through his covenant relationship with Israel. The conviction that God's past promises *will be* fulfilled gives to prophecies of coming judgement their sense of imminence.<sup>2</sup> This 'nearness' is made, to some

<sup>1</sup> The problem of the O.T.'s understanding of time obviously calls for consideration at this juncture, but it would be beyond the bounds of this survey to do more than draw attention to recent lines of enquiry. Cullmann (*Time*, pp. 51ff.) contrasts the Biblical time conception with that of Greek thought, maintaining that in the Bible 'because time is thought of as an upward sloping line, it is possible here for something to be "fulfilled"; a divine plan can move forward to complete execution . . .' Modifications, or criticisms, of this thesis are offered by Marsh (*Fulness*), Boman (*Hebrew Thought*), Ratschow ('Anmerkungen' in *Z.T.K.* LI, 1954, pp. 36ff.), Eichrodt ('Heilserfahrung' in *T.Z.* XII, 1956, pp. 104ff.), Minear ('The time of hope' in *S.J.T.* VI, 1953, pp. 337ff.), and most recently by Barr (*Biblical Words*). Barr is critical of the semantic methodology underlying Cullmann's thesis (cf. Barr's *Semantics*). Marsh, arguing that the O.T. is dominated by the idea of 'real' time (paralleling the N.T. 'kairos' concept), holds that the O.T. is not concerned with chronological time (*Fulness*, p. 20). Similarly, Boman (*Hebrew Thought*) p. 137 elucidating O.T. time from the subjective side, argues that 'time is something qualitative' for the Israelites, 'because for them it is determined by its content'. Ratschow thinks in terms of 'time for' and 'time not for', though recognising that the O.T. knows of chronological time too, whereby 'time for' and 'time not for' is objectivised. Both Boman (*Hebrew Thought*, p. 141) and Eichrodt ('Heilserfahrung', pp. 118f.) are critical of Marsh's dismissal of chronological time in the O.T., and they are concerned with the relationship between the 'kairos' and chronological time; with the relationship of a psychological time-view to the idea of an objective time-sequence. Eichrodt maintains that it is in the encounter of faith that man perceives that God's acts in history do not occur sporadically or disconnectedly, but that he has provided a framework in which these acts can connectedly proceed in the form of a salvation-history; that there is a real past and a real 'not yet'—although the O.T. recognises that men are able to participate in a 'supra-temporal' salvation ('Heilserfahrung', p. 125); cf. Boman, *Hebrew Thought*, p. 143 (It is surprising that Boman nowhere mentions P. S. Minear's article which has much in common with his own view.)

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ezek. 30, 3; Is. 13, 6; Joel 1, 15; 2, 1; 3, 14; Obad. 15; Zeph. 1, 14; etc.

extent, to appear simply an astute reading of the political situation at particular moments. Actually, the situation itself was taken as a sign of God's readiness to fulfil his promises; the situation did not give rise to the imminent hope, but rather the imminent hope gave rise to the particular understanding of the situation as a 'sign'.<sup>1</sup>

#### EXPECTATION IN THE INTER-TESTAMENTAL PERIOD

##### I. *Expectation in Apocalyptic*

Apocalyptic<sup>2</sup> has three roots. There is, in the first place, Old Testament prophecy. In common with prophecy, apocalyptic sought to declare and relate God's word to the men of its generation.<sup>3</sup> To some extent there is a concern to re-interpret unfulfilled promises,<sup>4</sup> a process already begun by Ezekiel. The scope of prophecy embraced past, present and future, and this total sphere is also apocalyptic's concern. Thus the older tendency to eliminate any predictive element from prophecy<sup>5</sup> is as erroneous as the suggestion that apocalyptic is concerned only with the future.<sup>6</sup> There are, of course, differences, but these are mainly of emphasis: apocalyptic is *especially* concerned with the future and lays more stress on the expected age of bliss as a divine irruption into history than do the prophets.<sup>7</sup> But its basic presuppositions it shares with the prophets of the Old Testament.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Köhler, *Theology*, pp. 87f.; Davidson, *Theology*, pp. 379ff. 381; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Apocalyptic properly begins with Daniel. Most scholars regard the apocalyptic passages in Joel, Zech. 9-14 and Is. 24-27 as transition passages, for whilst these passages are certainly 'apocalyptic' in character, there is more to the apocalyptic of Daniel, etc., than these passages contain. cf. Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 23; Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 45f., Welch, *Visions*, pp. 32ff., North, *Interpretation*, pp. 119f. Köhler, *Theology*, p. 225; Jacob, *Theology*, p. 319.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Welch, *Visions*, pp. 32f.; Charles, *Development*, p. 14; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Dan. 9, 2; which 'corrects' Jer. 29, 10. Cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 185; Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 100ff.; (Lake, *Introduction*, p. 200 goes too far in saying, 'Apocalyptic . . . arose during the Greek period, chiefly in order to explain the non-fulfilment of prophecy . . .')

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Charles, *Commentary on Daniel*, p. xxvi; cited by Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 35, n. 1; Kent, *Growth*, p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Kent, *Growth*, p. 134; Cook, *Old Testament*, p. 207.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 193; *Development*, p. 22; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 97.

<sup>8</sup> Welch, *Visions*, pp. 32ff., draws the two very close. For a discussion of the relation of prophecy to apocalyptic cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 173ff.,

In the second place, some foreign influence is likely to have affected the rise of apocalyptic,<sup>1</sup> but it is difficult to determine to what exact extent.

In the third place, apocalyptic was motivated by circumstance. The problems of sin and of righteous suffering (and hence of the equivocation of God's kingship in Israel) increased to an unprecedented degree under the circumstances leading to the Maccabean revolt,<sup>2</sup> and to this root apocalyptic owes more than to prophecy or foreign influence. In the situation of near despair, apocalyptic brought a message of imminent hope, its purpose being to sustain fainting faith in the moment of doubt.<sup>3</sup> Concentration upon the future is basically due to the contemporary situation in which faith in the sovereign rule of God was radically being called in question. The portrayal of future events is given for this purpose and *not* for its own sake.<sup>4</sup> Whatever 'fantastic' details apocalyptic might contain, its expectation cannot be summarily dismissed, nor should it be scorned as a decline from the high spiritual insights of Old Testament prophecy.<sup>5</sup>

The chief themes of apocalyptic<sup>6</sup> which concern us here are, the Kingdom of God, the element of imminence, and the central figure in the End-drama.

The expression 'the Kingdom of God' 'hardly ever occurs in apocalyptic, though the thing itself is presupposed'.<sup>7</sup> The primary

*Development*, pp. 12ff. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 96f., Rowley, *Relevance*, pp. 13ff., Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 11f., 46ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 40; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 91; Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 94ff., Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 71ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Brockington, *Apocrypha*, p. 6; Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 8ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 36; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 97; North, *Interpretation*, p. 136.

<sup>4</sup> H. T. Andrews, 'Apocalyptic Literature' in Peake's *Commentary* (unrevised ed.) p. 423 (quoted, North, *Interpretation*, p. 139) quite misunderstands the apocalypticist's intention. His motivation is *not* morbid resignation or boredom, *nor* incurable curiosity or speculation, but, in the difficulties of the contemporary situation, to re-affirm God's sovereignty.

<sup>5</sup> As, e.g., in Cook, *Old Testament*, pp. 207f., contrast Welch, *Visions*, pp. 34f. For details of the imagery one may cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 97; Otto, *Kingdom of God*, p. 37; etc.

<sup>6</sup> For full details cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, 101-112; Frost, *Apocalyptic*, passim. but esp. pp. 242-258; North, *Interpretation*, pp. 132-140; Charles, *Development*, pp. 47-159; *Eschatology*, pp. 157ff., Lake, *Introduction*, pp. 203-208; Bouset, *Religion*, pp. 242-289.

<sup>7</sup> Charles, *Development*, p. 48.

meaning is still that of God's kingship<sup>1</sup> though the idea in its eschatological aspect as much as in its present involves much more explicitly than before a 'kingdom', a sphere and people in which this rule is manifested.<sup>2</sup> A characteristic feature is its supernatural quality;<sup>3</sup> the earth as the sphere of God's future rule seems to become less and less suitable<sup>4</sup> and the scene of the future consummation is laid more often than before in a radically transformed earth.<sup>5</sup> The coming of this Kingdom is conceived variously. Sometimes it is expected in a sudden catastrophic moment,<sup>6</sup> sometimes it is preceded by the so-called Messianic kingdom, during which it is often anticipated progressive work would take place.<sup>7</sup>

Characteristic of apocalyptic expectation is the sense of imminence.<sup>8</sup> To suppose that this intense hope was based simply on a longing for better times would be to miss the point entirely.<sup>9</sup> The hope was built upon the conviction that God is already God, and his

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, pp. 91ff.; Edersheim, *Life*, p. 270.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 137; Charles, *Development*, pp. 48ff. (the development is here perhaps over-emphasised); Otto, *Kingdom of God*, pp. 36f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Otto, *Kingdom of God*, p. 40; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 97; Bousset, *Religion*, p. 242.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 97; North, *Interpretation*, p. 136. Yet God's Lordship over the present is still recognised (the demand for repentance, for instance, is in no way minimised; cf. Test. Dan. 6, 4, Jud. 23, 5; Ass. Moses 1, 18 etc.) cf. Charles, *Development*, p. 30; Stauffer 'Das theologische Weltbild der Apokalyptik', in *Z.s.T.* VIII, 1931, pp. 201ff.

<sup>5</sup> Though Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 97f. overstresses this transcendent note. Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 165, n. 1 refers to the argument put forward by N. Messel, that 'the Kingdom is uniformly thought of as an earthly one'. The idea of a transformed heaven and earth is quite distinct from the idea of an abandonment of the universe, cf. further, Frost, *Apocalyptic*, p. 21ff.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. I Enoch 83-90; cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. II Bar. 40, 3; I Enoch 90, 33; 38; Jub. 23; 26-28. A similar pattern is sometimes found although there is no actual Messiah, as e.g. in I Enoch 91, 12; Ass. Moses 10, 7-10, etc. cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic* p. 22; Walker, *Hebrew Religion*, pp. 47ff., Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, pp. 222ff., Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 208ff; Bousset, *Religion*, Anhang, pp. 286-289 and see further below, p. 29.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 25; Welch, *Visions*, p. 36; Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 20-33; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 97, 99; Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 100ff; Bousset, *Religion*, p. 249.

<sup>9</sup> Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 96ff., and Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 356f., give the impression that this expectation arises from the selfish desire for national aggrandisement. Actually, it is based on the covenant promises and that which they involve. cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 241ff., Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 97; and note the idea of a mission to the Gentiles, not wholly lacking—cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, p. 41; Bosch *Heidenmission*, pp. 35-39.

control in history an established fact. This, in conflict with the blatant denial of such rule and control by evil forces, was essentially the motive force behind apocalyptic.

The urgency sometimes takes the form of chronological calculations. This, in turn, leads to re-interpretations of 'faulty' predictions.<sup>1</sup> But this intense concentration was not allowed to diminish present obedience,<sup>2</sup> nor were the chronological calculations the primary matter.<sup>3</sup>

Concerning the central figure in the awaited End-drama there is considerable variation. In some visions the figure of Messiah is entirely absent.<sup>4</sup> In such cases 'the kingdom was always represented as under the immediate sovereignty of God'.<sup>5</sup> Where Messiah is spoken of he is sometimes represented as a supernatural figure<sup>6</sup> who 'arises'<sup>7</sup> and who perhaps had some form of pre-existence.<sup>8</sup> Where he is pictured as a human figure<sup>9</sup> his lineage acquires some significance: the old expectation of an ideal Davidic king appears,<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jer. 25, 11 and 29, 10 with Dan. 9, 24-27; II Bar. 36-40 and II Esdras 10, 60-12, 35. Cf. Box, *The Ezra Apocalypse*, pp. 35ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 99 cf. the stress upon the Law, I Enoch 5, 4; 99, 2; 99, 14; Sib. Or 3, 27f. II Esdras 9, 7-12, etc.; and the asceticism advocated in, e.g., I Enoch 108, 7; Ass. Moses 9, 6; etc.

<sup>3</sup> Box, *The Ezra Apocalypse*, pp. 35ff., overemphasises such calculations. Contrast Charles' virtual omission of this element. The ease with which predictions could be re-calculated (cf. Snaith, *Cyrus*, pp. 100ff.) witnesses to the fact that the Apocalyptic writers maintained a certain detachment from the strict consequences of their chronological calculations.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Daniel, Jubilees, Enoch 1-36, 91-108, Ass. Moses, Slav. Enoch, Baruch (though here a Messianic Kingdom is mentioned; cf. 4, 25; 31ff. 4, 36-5, 4) Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 235f. thinks that the hope of a Messiah is not abandoned in Jubilees: contrast Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Charles, *Development*, p. 76. cf. Vriezen, *Theology*, p. 369.

<sup>6</sup> Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 107 says this is 'characteristic of the Apocalyptic literature taken as a whole'. But apart from the figure of the Son of Man in I Enoch and the 'Blessed Man' of the Sibylline Oracles (5 : 414ff.), the figure of the Messiah is more often regarded as human, though endowed with outstanding characteristics (cf. Test. Levi 18, 10ff. etc.) cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, p. 240; Walker, *Hebrew Religion*, p. 50.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Test. Dan 5, 10. Ps. Sol. 17, 47, etc.

<sup>8</sup> II Bar. 29, 3 speaks of 'The Messiah (who) shall begin to be revealed' at the appointed time, though this does not necessarily involve the idea of pre-existence: cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 106; Walker, *Hebrew Religion*, p. 48; Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, pp. 42f. 56. Parallel to the hints at pre-existence there are hints of a return to heaven—cf. II Bar. 30, 1. contrast II Esdras 7, 29-30.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. II Bar. 29-30, the Salathiel Apoc., II Esdras 3-10, etc.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. I Enoch 90, Test. Jud. 24, Test. Simeon 7, 2, Test. Levi, 8, 14 etc. (where Charles, *Development*, p. 80, suggests the references are due mainly

whilst sometimes the lineage is traced to Levi.<sup>1</sup> The Messiah's character is essentially two-fold. On the one hand he is to war against the enemies of the righteous saints<sup>2</sup> (the prophetic conjunction of political and religious aims is not altogether lost sight of<sup>3</sup>), and on the other hand he is to be endowed with the Spirit<sup>4</sup> so as to be able to obey God's will,<sup>5</sup> 'working righteousness and mercy',<sup>6</sup> being 'pure from sin so that he may rule a great people'.<sup>7</sup>

As for the term 'Son of Man', its use in Daniel has already been discussed,<sup>8</sup> and in apocalyptic it 'did not become a Messianic title'.<sup>9</sup> The term occurs in I Enoch and II Esdras, and a similar expression 'Blessed Man' is found in the Sibylline Oracles. In Enoch<sup>10</sup> the term takes up the attributes and functions of the

---

to literary reminiscence). This concept reappears in literature of the 1st Century A.D. (cf. additions to the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs—Test. Jud. 24, 5-6. etc.).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Test. Reuben 6, 7ff. Test. Dan 5, 10, etc. Many think that this is due to a 're-adaptation of the messianic idea, due to the occupation of the throne and high priesthood by the Hasmonaeon house, giving rise to the substitution of a scion of the house of Levi for a scion of the house of David' (Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 27), (cf. similarly Charles, *Development*, pp. 80-90, esp. pp. 83-4). Following disillusionment in the Maccabean leaders, the Davidic descent was re-asserted, though a total abandonment of the Levitic lineage did not occur—hence sometimes the two are juxtaposed (cf. Test. Reuben 6, 10-11, Test. Simeon 7, 2). K. G. Kuhn, however, interprets this as a union of two ideas, of a priestly Messiah on the one hand and of a political Messiah on the other (cf. 'The Two Messiahs', in *N.T.S.* 1954-6, pp. 168ff., and see also below under 'Expectation in the Qumran Community').

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Jubilees 18, Test. Jos. 19, 8, I Enoch 90, 19, etc.—the purpose being ultimate peace, cf. I Enoch 94, 4, 1, 8. Sib. Or. 3: 373-376. Ps. Sol. 17, 37f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rowley, *Relevance*, pp. 15ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ps. Sol. 17, 42, 18.8.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Sib. Or. 3: 655f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Test. Naph. 4, 5.

<sup>7</sup> Ps. Sol. 17, 41. Cf. Test. Jud. 24, 1. Test. Levi 18, 7. Ps. Sol. 17, 31. Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 105f. Sometimes—generally in early apocalypses—the Messianic kingdom occurs where the Messiah is absent (cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 241ff.), and was generally temporally unlimited. In later apocalypses the duration is variously limited (cf. Snaith, *Cyrus to Herod*, pp. 104f. Lake, *Introduction*, p. 206, who suggest that this development was due to a coalescing of views). Later the idea even of a temporary Messianic kingdom is abandoned (cf. Charles, *Development*, p. 62).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above pp. 12ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 249.

<sup>10</sup> The term occurs in 46, 4, 48, 2, 62, 5; 9; 14, 63, 11, 69, 26-27, 70, 1 and 71, 1 (cf. also 62, 7 where the demonstrative is omitted). Cf. Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 214.

Messiah and brings other features besides,<sup>1</sup> thus at least giving the term a 'Messianic significance'. It has been argued that the Son of Man here should be identified with Enoch himself,<sup>2</sup> but this is very unlikely.<sup>3</sup> He is a supernatural figure and pre-existence in some form is attributed to him.<sup>4</sup> His work and character are closely allied to God's own:<sup>5</sup> he is the Christ (48, 10), the Righteous One (38, 2), the Elect One (40, 5). He is to judge the world and is revealer of all things and champion of the righteous.<sup>6</sup> (It is disputed whether or not the idea of suffering enters into the presentation of the Son of Man in Enoch, but the question cannot be entered into here).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 243, 'It is clear, at all events, that "son of man" is not taken for granted by the author as an already established title for the Messiah. But it is not to be denied that the author, though in this part of the Similitudes he avoids every other Messianic title, really imputes to the "son of man" a Messianic significance'. Cf. also Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 214; Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 105f. *Judaism*, pp. 155-159. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 273. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 44. *Menschensohn*, pp. 169ff. Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 28ff. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 224, 228 (who maintains that 'the Son of Man who was great enough to sit in JHWH's seat, would have little difficulty in attaching the Davidic Messiah to his person', p. 228).

<sup>2</sup> The identification is made by Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, ad. loc. Otto, *Kingdom of God*, pp. 201ff. Sjöberg, *Menschensohn*, pp. 186ff (and concerning Sjöberg, cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 220f). T. W. Manson, 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels', in *B.J.R.L.* XXXII, 1950, pp. 171ff. M. Black, 'The son of Man in the Old Biblical Literature', in *E.T.* 1948, LX.

<sup>3</sup> The only basis is in 71, 14 where Charles emends to 'this is' instead of the 'thou art' of the text. Against Charles cf. Higgins, in *N.T. Essays*, p. 58 note 134-5; Manson, *Jesus*, p. 120; Dalman, *Words*, p. 244; Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 56.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 48, 2; 3, 46, 1-2, 49, 2, 62, 7, 70, 1. Cf. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 44, n. 5 and p. 45. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 218f. Otto, *Kingdom of God*, p. 188 (who speaks of an 'ideal pre-existence which passes over into a mysterious sort of present existence'). Preiss, *Life in Christ*, p. 50. Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, pp. 290ff. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 263.

<sup>5</sup> He is to receive the homage of all men, will judge all men, condemning and slaying the wicked and rewarding the just. cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 218ff. Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, pp. 291f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 214 (note on 46, 2-3). For his judgement cf. 38, 2, 39, 6, 53, 6. Wisdom, cf. 49, 1ff. 51, 3. Power, cf. 49, 3, 52, 6. For his work as revealer cf. 64, 3, 49, 2. etc. and for his work as champion cf. 39, 7, 48, 4, 51, 5, 53, 6. etc.

<sup>7</sup> Bevan, *Jerusalem*, p. 162 says there is 'no hint of incarnation of abasement . . . no shadow of death . . .' Jeremias and Zimmerli, *Servant*, pp. 59ff. contend that numerous parallel expressions in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah and I Enoch 'Son of Man' passages point to the conclusion that Son of Man and Servant of God are here combined for the first time. But contrast

In the vision of II Esdras 13 the 'likeness of a man' (אִי דְמוּת דְּבָר) <sup>1</sup> rises from the sea causing consternation (v. 4), annihilating the wicked who dare to war against him (vv. 5-11) and gathers together the 'multitude which was peaceable' (v. 12). In the interpretation which is given it is said that the Son of Man is the 'messianic' deliverer <sup>2</sup> 'Whom the Most High is keeping many ages' (v. 26) and who is to come to judge and establish his Kingdom. <sup>3</sup>

There is mention of a 'Blessed Man' in the Sibylline Oracles (5, 414), but in view of the fact that he is said already to 'have come from the plains of heaven . . .' and also that the section is to be dated about 125 A.D. (and possibly is of Christian origin), the passage can help little in determining pre-Christian hopes. <sup>4</sup>

The term 'Son of God', although 'through Scripture (cf. Ps. 2, 89, 26-27) a Messianic potential', <sup>5</sup> seems to have been made little use of in Apocalyptic expectation. <sup>6</sup>

Similarly the concept 'Servant' appears to have been another Messianic potential which was not generally taken up by Apocalyp-

Sjöberg, *Menschensohn*, pp. 116ff. and *verborgene Menschensohn*, pp. 70f. Otto, *Kingdom of God*, p. 255. Some think that suffering at least looms in the background here—cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 275; Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 279 and p. 280, n. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Dated by Charles in the 1st Century AD but before 70. Cf. *Eschatology*, pp. 337f. Similarly Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 514f. who dates it just prior to A.D. 70; contrast Brockington, *Apocrypha*, pp. 25f. who dates it about 100 A.D.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 516. Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup> Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 616 suggests that in its earliest form this material contained ideas of an 'Urmensch' which ultimately developed into the heavenly Messiah figure. Cf. also *Development*, p. 242: Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, p. 353 (who concludes that oriental influences of some kind lie behind this passage). Jeremiah, in *Erlöser und Erlösung im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, D.T. II, 1929, pp. 106ff., wants to connect the Son of Man here with suffering. Sjöberg, on the other hand, denies the connection—'Der verborgene Messias wird nach ihm nicht im Hades, sondern im Himmel von Gott aufbewahrt' (*verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 47, n. 4). But the argument that elsewhere in II Esdras the Son of Man is reserved in heaven until his appearing amongst men does not exclude the possibility, surely, that this appearing might occur through a process and in a context of suffering.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Charles, *Development*, p. 226. Pfeiffer, *History*, pp. 226ff.

<sup>5</sup> Manson, *Jesus*, p. 103.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Test. Jud. 24, 2. Ps. Sol. 17, 28f., 30. 18, 4. Test. Jud. 24, 3. Test. Levi 18, 8. Oesterley's translation of II Esdras 7, 28 (cf. *Apocrypha*, p. 517) is rejected by Taylor, *Names*, p. 53, n. 2 and cf. further Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 47, n. 1. Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, p. 358. Jeremiah and Zimmerli, *Servant*, pp. 49f.

tic. <sup>1</sup> II Bar. 70, 9 mentions 'My servant Messiah', but the authenticity of the verse is questionable. <sup>2</sup> II Esdras 7, 28f. <sup>3</sup> reads in the Ethiopic 'My servant' and in 7, 30 this servant dies. But this is hardly a description of Messiah in terms of the suffering servant of Deutero-Isaiah even if a link is facilitated. <sup>4</sup>

We see, then, that the pattern of expectation and the pattern of ideas concerning the Kingdom of God found in the O.T. re-appear here. There is a concern with the past: older prophecy is re-interpreted to be sure—but it is older prophecy. The Apocalyp-tists based their work on that which had gone before them. <sup>5</sup> Further, they wrote from an historical standpoint. This was more than a literary device for it betrays an awareness that in the past outstanding events in Israel's life could be found those acts of God whereby he made known to the nation his Lordship over it: and that those acts were the basis on which any confident expectation that God would one day intervene to make clear his Lordship, could be founded.

There is also concern for the present: the faithfulness to the Covenant relationship of at least the remnant of Israel must be upheld—there is not the least tendency to antinomianism in the face of the expected catastrophic intervention—rather the reverse, in as much as the coming climax was expected to reveal the moral demands of God, already valid and binding. <sup>6</sup>

The future contains the key to the present and the past: all the equivocation would one day be put to an end through the divine intervention in history for the sake of manifesting the Kingship of God. In judgement and blessing he would manifest his Lordship, and this would involve a total transformation of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jacob, *Theology*, p. 342.

<sup>2</sup> Charles, *Pseudepigrapha*, *ad loc.*, counts the verse a later interpolation: 'verse 10 is the natural sequence to verse 8.'

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also 13, 32; 37; 52. 14, 9. Jeremiah and Zimmerli, *Servant* p. 45, n. 163, p. 49.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. there is no explicit redemptive suffering here. Cf. Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, p. 361. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 257. Nevertheless the title is perhaps helpful in facilitating a subsequent union of the two concepts—cf. Jeremiah and Zimmerli, *Servant*, pp. 59f. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 277.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the interest in the chronology of the past as well as of the future. Cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup> Hence the dual themes of pessimism (perhaps better designated realism) regarding this world and 'now': and optimism (perhaps better described as faith) regarding the future—cf. North, *Interpretation*, p. 136.

present situation, hence the picture of world renewal enhanced sometimes by the idea of an entirely supernatural realm.<sup>1</sup>

Whether God would act directly or mediately through an appointed representative, it is essentially *divine* activity which is awaited. The expectation is held with particular intensity and the end is thought to be imminent. But the basis of this is not a desire for a time chart, but rather the conviction that it is unfitting and intolerable that God's Lordship should be made so ambiguous by the ascendancy of the wicked and the suffering of the righteous and that therefore he must and will quickly intervene to change the situation and make himself manifest.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Expectation in Wisdom literature

In the later wisdom writings particularly, although the Hebrew characteristics remain,<sup>3</sup> 'we certainly find . . . positions taken up which show to some extent a departure from traditional Judaism'.<sup>4</sup> There is still a concern with the past, for wisdom itself is culled from past experiences and traditions,<sup>5</sup> and there is also the idea of wisdom operative in creation.<sup>6</sup> There is a strong emphasis upon the present. Human conduct and right behaviour is its chief concern.<sup>7</sup> This is certainly practical<sup>8</sup> and has a universal appeal and relevance,<sup>9</sup> but it is not entirely correct to see this as thoroughly anthropological, for it is sufficiently Hebrew to retain God as its basis,<sup>10</sup> exalting law and obedience to law as the height of wisdom.<sup>11</sup> The future expectation is, however, slight.<sup>12</sup> The reason appears

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Frost, *Apocalyptic*, pp. 20ff.

<sup>2</sup> The contrast therefore, between now and then, which has been traced in the O.T. understanding of God's kingship is found here too.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Snaith, *Cyrus to Herod*, p. 163; Oesterley, *Jews*, p. 234; Box, *Judaism*, p. 118.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 245. Cf. also Pfeiffer, *History*, pp. 64ff. Rankin, *Wisdom*, p. 5. Baumgartner in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, pp. 210ff. Box, *Judaism*, p. 118.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. the title 'Pirce Aboth'—sayings of the fathers.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Snaith, *Cyrus to Herod*, p. 177. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 248.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Snaith, *Cyrus to Herod*, p. 166. Cook, *Old Testament*, p. 204. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 236. Box, *Judaism*, p. 119. Rankin, *Wisdom*, p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Box, *Judaism*, p. 119.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Baumgartner, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, p. 211. Cook, *Old Testament*, p. 204. Box, *Judaism*, p. 119.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 214.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Snaith, *Cyrus to Herod*, p. 166. Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 64.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Rankin, *Wisdom*, p. 3. Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, p. 252.

to be the emphasis upon the present and present behaviour and, of course, apocalyptic writings could be said to balance the deficiency here.<sup>1</sup>

## 3. Expectation in Hellenistic Judaism

Already the influences at work during the Hellenistic period have been seen in apocalyptic and wisdom writings. It is only necessary to add a note concerning other minor or peripheral evidence.<sup>2</sup> First Philo<sup>3</sup> who, though to some extent a unique phenomenon,<sup>4</sup> must be accepted as the chief monument of Hellenistic Judaism.<sup>5</sup> In combining the religious understandings of Hebrew and Greek,<sup>6</sup> Philo retained a respect for the law and an obedience to it, and the fundamental conviction in a transcendent God.<sup>7</sup> He held, too, a national hope for the future<sup>8</sup>—but his chief element of hope was personal, involving ecstasy,<sup>9</sup> mysticism<sup>10</sup> and illumination<sup>11</sup>. Secondly, the mystery religions which held a fascination for the Graeco-Roman world.<sup>12</sup> Essentially, however, the mystery cults were individualistic and aimed at a mystic incorporation into the divine.<sup>13</sup> The Corpus Hermeticum<sup>14</sup> which reflects such 'syncretistic Mystery cult' views<sup>15</sup> has as its chief end and aim knowledge (γνώσις) of God.<sup>16</sup> Then, the fourth Eclogue

<sup>1</sup> There is no reason to suppose that the wisdom writers of the Hellenistic period were ignorant of or antagonistic to apocalyptic expectations.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of the expectation in Hellenistic Judaism in more detail, cf. Box, *Judaism*, pp. 72ff. Oesterley, *Jews*, pp. 19ff. Pfeiffer, *History*, pp. 181ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 61ff. *Jews*, pp. 20ff. Snaith, *Cyrus to Herod*, p. 173. Bousset, *Religion*, pp. 438f., 452ff. Pfeiffer, *History*, pp. 197ff.

<sup>4</sup> So Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, pp. 61f. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 438; contrast, Kennedy, *Mystery Religions*, p. 64.

<sup>5</sup> So E. Bevan, *Later Greek Religions*, p. 98.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 440. Goodenough, *Philo*, pp. 97ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 64. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 439.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Goodenough, *Philo*, pp. 113f.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 449. Bevan, *Religions*, p. 98.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Kennedy, *Mystery-Religions*, pp. 65ff. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 452.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Oesterley, *Apocrypha*, p. 65.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Kennedy, *Mystery-Religions*, p. 20. Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 147.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 290. Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 148.

<sup>14</sup> Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*, 1910, p. 33 dates the material as 1-3rd centuries A.D. Kennedy, *Mystery-Religions*, pp. 104ff. argues for about 300 B.C.—300 A.D.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Kennedy, *Mystery-Religions*, p. 104.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Kennedy, *Mystery-Religions*, p. 109.

of Vergil presents the hope of a 'golden age' but in fundamental contrast to apocalyptic expectation; although it is on a cosmic scale it is the hope of revolution from within rather than of intervention from without.

Still, therefore, an interest is found in past, present and future. The past is the time of God's working in Israel (cf the 'historical' writings of Hellenistic Judaism).<sup>1</sup> The present is the occasion when men are required to live a virtuous life by practice of wisdom. The future is viewed primarily as the ultimate end of human aspiration (rather than as the movement of God towards the world). The contrast of hidden and revealed is not at all prominent, and the tension between a 'now' and a 'then' gives way to one between 'here' and 'there'.<sup>2</sup> Instead of confidence in God's fulfilment of given promises, we find rather striving after the attainment of human longings.<sup>3</sup>

#### 4. *Expectation in Rabbinic Judaism*

A hard and fast division is not here intended between apocalyptic and Rabbinic expectations,<sup>4</sup> and only the main outlines of expectation will be noted<sup>5</sup> (the material does not offer us systematics but does allow us to distil certain ideas).<sup>6</sup>

The meaning of *Malkuth* is still 'rule', 'sovereignty'.<sup>7</sup> It is not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> Boman, *Hebrew Thought*, pp. 161ff. accepts the Greek idea of a 'flight from this wretched world into the blessed timeless Beyond' (p. 163) as a parallel to the Hebrew 'now'—'then' contrast, both of which, he says, are subsumed under the Christian idea of Revelation in Christ, and he argues on these lines against Cullmann (*Christ and Time*). In fact he appears to be at cross-purposes, for Cullmann is not suggesting that the Hebrew 'now'—'then' contrast excludes a 'here'—'there' contrast, and his point is only that the Hebrew does not long for absorption into the divine nor for an abandonment by God of this world, but looks for a future inbreak into history in fulfilment of Covenant promises.

<sup>3</sup> The contrasts may be overdrawn, but the differences are none the less real; cf. Schmidt, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 574.

<sup>4</sup> Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 9 writes, 'The Pharisees . . . would not only be cognisant of apocalyptic speculation but in varying degrees doubtless attracted by it.' Cf. also Lake, *Introduction* pp. 202f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*: Bonsirven, *Judaïsme*: Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*. The difficulty in using the Mishnah as evidence for 1st century Rabbinic views is noted. Cf. Danby, *Mishnah*, pp. xiii ff. Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Montefiore, *Judaism and Hellenism*, p. 139 calls the material 'as a whole, rambling, discursive, inartistic, amorphous!'

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Kuhn, in *T.W.N.T.* I, pp. 570f. Dalman, *Words*, pp. 96f.

so prominent in Rabbinic Judaism as in the N.T. proclamation. It has past, present and future reference. As for the past, God is regarded as Creator-King. On account of the fall of man he limited his kingship, but a significant step forward came with Abraham.<sup>1</sup> In its present application, the *Malkuth* JHWH takes on two senses. First, it is now an eternal reality.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, it can be accepted or rejected in the present by acknowledgement and obedience or their opposites.<sup>3</sup> The characteristic feature of the present Lordship is, however, its hiddenness,<sup>4</sup> and in this respect the old problem of suffering was acutely felt.<sup>5</sup> With reference to the future, there is an attempt to some extent to unite various ideas.<sup>6</sup> The coming aeon is spoken of as the heavenly realm into which the Righteous enter on dying:<sup>7</sup> it is also the final aeon which lies beyond the days of the Messiah.<sup>8</sup> The scope of the future expectation varies, but generally a certain prominence attaches to Israel.<sup>9</sup> The hope does not mean that the present is a matter for indifference.<sup>10</sup> The coming aeon could and should be prayed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Targum Onkelos of Ex. 15, 18. Cf. Bousset, *Religion*, pp. 374f.

<sup>3</sup> Acceptance in point of fact comes to mean recognition of monotheism and the Shema. Cf. Kuhn, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 572. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 177. Bonsirven, *Judaïsme*, pp. 77ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 178.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 178.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 799ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 968ff.

<sup>8</sup> Sometimes this is thought of as *not* immediately following the advent of the Messiah, though the usual view is that the coming age 'unmittelbar an die Tage des Messias anschliessen werde und dass sein Beginn zugleich die Erneuerung der Welt bedeute' (S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 969f.). There is a splitting up of future expectation into the 'days of the Messiah' followed by the 'final aeon'. Behind this lies the attempt to harmonise the expectation of a direct intervention of JHWH himself, with that of his action through a mediator (cf. Dalman, *Words*, pp. 269f. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 968ff. Kuhn, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 573. Bousset, *Religion*, p. 238). It is perhaps strange that 'nirgends erscheint etwa der Gedanke, dass das Königsreich des Messias die herbeiföhre, o.ä.' (Kuhn, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 573).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Sanh. 10, 1. 'All Israel has a share in the coming Aeon.'

<sup>10</sup> Some references suggest that it is only human sin which holds back the coming aeon (cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, p. 30 and Excursus pp. 977ff.), whilst others without going this far give human obedience a significant place. Yet other references show that the divine initiative in the whole matter was not lost sight of.

for.<sup>1</sup> The characteristic of its coming would be the manifestation of God's (already real) Kingship.<sup>2</sup>

The central figure of the end is variously portrayed. The 'Son of David' concept of the Messiah occurs (cf Ps. Sol. 17, 21) in pre-Christian times—more frequently in post Christian Jewish writings.<sup>3</sup> Not infrequently the figure of Messiah is clothed with the character of the old idealised King expectation.<sup>4</sup> His work includes political aspects, though this is only a part of his total concern.<sup>5</sup> His work in judgement varies according to the position given to the Messianic Kingdom in relation to the final aeon. Variation is found also concerning his pre-existence.<sup>6</sup> The term 'Son of Man' was not a regular Jewish designation, though for example in Rabbinic 'messianic' interpretation of Dan. 7, 13 the term seems 'certainly sometimes' to have been understood to 'denote the Messiah'.<sup>7</sup> The term 'Son of God' is used with reference to Israel as a whole, as the people of God,<sup>8</sup> but it is evident that 'Son of God was not a common Messianic title.<sup>9</sup> As for the 'Servant' concept, there is no general or frequent or obvious connection in Rabbinic literature of about the 1st century of the Messiah with the figure of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the 11th prayer of the Shemoneh Esre; cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 178. Kuhn, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 572.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 100. Bonsirven, *Judaïsme*, p. 157. Kuhn, in *T.W.N.T.* I, p. 572. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, p. 525 and IV, pp. 968ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 872f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 297f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, pp. 300f. Sometimes the idea of pre-existence is lacking, cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 302.

<sup>7</sup> So Dalman, *Words*, pp. 244ff. who sets out the evidence for Rabbinic interpretations of Dan. 7, 13. Cf. also Manson, *Jesus*, Appendix C, pp. 173ff. Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 279ff. Albright *From Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 292 (who think the terms 'Son of Man' and 'Messiah' merged in the pre-Christian era: contrast Rowley, *Relevance*, p. 29).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, III, pp. 17ff. Dalman, *Words*, pp. 268ff.

<sup>9</sup> Manson, *Jesus*, pp. 105f. similarly Dalman, *Words*, p. 272; S.-B. *Kommentar*, III, p. 20.

<sup>10</sup> Manson, *Jesus*, pp. 168ff., sets out the evidence showing how in the Targum on Is. 52, 3-53, 12 all the elements of suffering are attributed to Israel or the heathen nations. He nevertheless asserts that 'in Biblical and Jewish belief the ideas Son of God, Servant of the Lord and Son of Man, however separate they may have been in origin, had come to signify only variant phases of the one Messianic idea . . .' (op. cit. p. 110). Certainly it is true that the figures of Messiah and Servant are at least brought into close contact in the Targum and therefore an identification of the two seems to be partially facilitated.

There is evidence that some circles engaged in speculations and reckoning the date of the end.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand there is also evidence that some rejected entirely such attempts.<sup>2</sup> This reckoning hints at an earnest desire for the coming of the End, similar to the urgency manifest in apocalyptic. Further evidence can be found in the frequent prayers where the longing for God quickly to bring in his kingdom finds voice.

### 5. Expectation amongst particular groups

#### a. The Qumran Community.<sup>3</sup>

Only the briefest sketch can here be given of the various elements in this community's expectation.<sup>4</sup> God's rule is again comprehended under a three-fold pattern. In the past God made known his Lord-

A fairly detailed discussion of attempts to find an actual identification in early Rabbinic literature is given by Davies, *Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 275ff. He quotes Volz (*Jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 237) as giving an often drawn conclusion, 'Von einem Leiden des Messias ist in unserer Periode noch nicht die Rede. Is. 53 hat man erst später mit dem Messias in Verbindung gemacht'. He hesitatingly rejects King's argument (E. H. King, *Yalkut on Zechariah*, 1882, pp. 85ff.) that a 'Messiah ben Joseph' (usually given a 2nd century dating) can be found in our period: and he accepts Rowley's refutation of the thesis that Taxo in the Ass. Moses is to be seen as a suffering servant in 2nd Isaiah's sense. He concludes that 'the assumption is at least possible that the conception of a suffering Messiah was not unfamiliar to pre-Christian Judaism' (op. cit. p. 283). Cf. further, Jeremias in *Mélanges offerts à M. Goguel*, pp. 118f., for similar views. Contrast Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn* pp. 256ff. 264ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 799ff. Bonsirven, *Judaïsme*, pp. 161ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, p. 1013.

<sup>3</sup> The question as to the identity of this community with the Essenes is here peripheral. A comparison of the sources of information on the Essenes (Josephus Ant. XII: v. 9. XV: x. 4f. XVIII: i. 5. Wars II: viii.2-13. Philo in Eusebius, Pliny, Natural History V: 17) with the scrolls is enough to show that the correspondence between the ideas of the Brotherhood and those that obtained generally in Palestine during the Graeco-Roman age and that survive sporadically among the more exotic sects is especially striking in the field of eschatology' (Gaster, *Scriptures*, p. 32). And this general correspondence includes the more particular similarity with the Essenes. Qumran expectation we shall take to be representative of all such communities.

<sup>4</sup> For fuller discussion cf. esp. Dupont-Sommer, *Dead Sea Scrolls*; Rowley *The Zadokite Fragment and the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Allegro, 'Further Messianic References in Qumran literature', in *J.B.L.* LXXV, 1956, pp. 182ff. References to the scrolls will be made according to the system listed by R. de Vaux, 'Fouille au Khirbet Qumran', in *R.B.* 1953, p. 88.

ship especially to Israel's leaders, and in particular in the establishment of the Covenant by which Israel became a people 'unto God' and received the expression of his will.<sup>1</sup> In the present we find a double understanding: on the one hand God's sovereignty was thought to be acknowledged in the community itself, in the faithful remnant whose 'main purpose was to exemplify and promulgate the true interpretation' of the Law,<sup>2</sup> and whose life reflected this submission in obedience to God's rule. On the other hand, there is a recognition that God's present Lordship is but an aspect of his eternal sovereignty.<sup>3</sup> This Lordship is not generally recognised because at present Belial holds sway in the world.<sup>4</sup> Therefore there is also a future aspect to the Kingdom, the expectation that God would one day put an end to the present ambiguous situation and reveal himself as Lord in the punishment of the wicked and the blessing of the faithful. The future age was expected to come into being through the mediation of a Messiah, variously conceived. We meet again the expectation of two Messiahs, one of Levi and one of Judah,<sup>5</sup> the significance of which is not entirely clear. The relation

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Oration of Moses, and see Gaster, *Scriptures*, pp. 225ff. cf. also the fact that the Community was founded upon Scripture and its interpretation. Cf. Burrows, *Scrolls*, pp. 247ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gaster, *Scriptures*, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. I. Q.S. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. I. Q.S. xii, 2. C.D. iv, 12.

<sup>5</sup> The expectation is already found in the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs of a Levitical Messiah alongside a Kingly descendant of Judah. In an older recension of the Testaments (fragments found in Qumran) this Levitical Messiah is himself both priest and king (cf. Test. Reub. 6, 7-12). Elsewhere the priest Messiah of Levi is superior to the kingly (cf. Test. Jud. 21, 1-15. Test. Naph. 5, 1-3). The Zadokite Document in its mentions of 'Messiah from Aaron and Israel' 'might be thought to point more naturally to one Messiah: but in the light of cognate references in other Qumran texts a strong case can be made out for understanding them to point to two Messiahs—a Messiah of Aaron and a Messiah of Israel' (Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 44). This twofold expectation is linked in I.Q.S. with the hope of a prophet (cf. I.Q.S. ix, 11) and this threefold expectation is supported by I.Q. Testimonia referring to the coming prophet (Dt. 5, 25-26, 18, 18f.) the coming Messiah of Jacob (Num. 24, 15-17) and the coming priest of Levi (Dt. 33, 8-11), the last having the preeminence.

The teacher of Righteousness is connected with the coming Messiah in some way. Dupont-Sommer 'believes that the writer of the Damascus Document expected the teacher of righteousness to return at the end of the world as the Messiah. To support this view he quotes the expression "from the gathering in of the unique teacher to the arising of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel"', but this implies a distinction between the unique teacher and the Messiah rather than their identification. Believing that the teacher

of the Messiah to a (? the) Teacher of Righteousness is also disputed. No use of the term 'Son of Man' in a Messianic connection is made, but it may be that it remained a potential. Some references seem to regard the whole community as 'suffering servant',<sup>1</sup> and it is possible that in I.Q.Sa. 53, 14 we have a reference to a priestly Messiah identified with the suffering servant—which could be a category for the community and for an expected individual.<sup>2</sup>

The intensity of the community's hope is reflected in the careful and detailed preparations for the work of its members in the messianic woes.<sup>3</sup> There is, in the community, a tension between the present and future. And whilst there is no indication that the present was regarded with indifference, there is certainly a straining after that which is to come.

#### b. The Zealots.<sup>4</sup>

Here we can confidently trace a doctrine of the sovereignty of God over the past life of Israel, and an awareness that this sovereignty is inadequately acknowledged in the present. But what the Zealot expectation for the future was, is a problem. It is usually said that they sought to establish the Messianic Kingdom.<sup>5</sup> Their first aim, however, seems to have been simply the recovery of a theocratic government on the former pattern. If this was confused with the hope of the messianic kingdom,<sup>6</sup> there still seems reason to distinguish the two ideas and to accept the theocratic as the Zealot's primary aim.<sup>7</sup>

of righteousness was put to death in 65-63 B.C. Dupont-Sommer infers that the end of the world was then expected very soon . . . (Burrows, *Scrolls*, pp. 265f. Dupont-Sommer's reconstruction of the community's hope has received little support; cf. Burrows, *Scrolls*, p. 266).

<sup>1</sup> I.Q.S. 3, 6-12, 4, 20-21, 5, 6-7, 9, 3-5.

<sup>2</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis*, p. 62.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. I.Q.M. *passim*. Gaster, *Scriptures*, p. 258 writes, 'To men who believed that the Final Age was indeed at hand, preparations for this war were a matter of imminent and urgent concern.'

<sup>4</sup> I.e. ζηλωτής ΝΔΠ. Josephus says the term was applied to the anti-Roman party from the time of Judas' revolt.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Angus, in *E.R.E.* XII, pp. 849f. Cullmann, *State*, pp. 8ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Cullmann, *State*, p. 9.

<sup>7</sup> J. N. Schofield, *The Historical Background to the Bible*, p. 292 writes, the Zealots were 'ready to support any self-styled Messiah or prophet who proclaimed the imminent coming of God and the establishment of His Kingdom.' But there is no evidence that they regarded any of their own

They reveal an intense religious zeal and maintain a definite conjunction of political and religious hopes. They also reveal deep dissatisfaction with their present situation, in as much as it departed from the theocratic situation of former times where God's Lordship over Israel was more faithfully set forth than it could be under Roman rule. But as an extreme nationalist wing of Pharisaism it seems unlikely that they would have entertained hopes of forcing in the messianic age, and therefore their significance for our survey here is slight.

---

leaders as Messiah, until the Bar Kochba rising in 132 A.D. (cf. Duncan, *Son of Man*, p. 67). There is, similarly, no evidence that Zealots immediately hailed John the Baptist as leader or Messiah.