

KINGDOM OF GOD, SON OF MAN AND JESUS' SELF-UNDERSTANDING

CHRY S. C. CARAGOUNIS

Part II

IV. The Context

It is often overlooked that the Beelzebul controversy with our two logia, on the Kingdom of God and on the Son of Man [SM] occurs at a critical juncture of Jesus' public ministry. The time gap between Jesus' first proclamation μετανοεῖτε· ἡγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (Mat. 4:17) and the present Kingdom logion (Mat. 12:28) is considerable. So also is the difference of context in Jesus' external circumstances. Yet most works on the Kingdom of God appear to treat the various Kingdom texts indiscriminately, failing to note the progression of thought and the change of perspective and emphasis. Although it is admittedly not easy to put the Gospel material in strict chronological order, an approximate sequence of the central events is nevertheless ascertainable. In the case at hand it may be noted that a number of events have transpired since Jesus' first proclamation of the Kingdom of God which have brought about a change in Jesus' circumstances and especially in his relations to his environment. This is evidenced by *inter alia* the following circumstances:

a) In all three synoptics the Beelzebul controversy is preceded by a number of events which show that a considerable time has elapsed since the commencement of Jesus' public ministry, and that in the meantime mounting opposition against Jesus has developed. The following examples will confirm this. First, the healings of Jesus,¹²⁵ which earn him

¹²⁵The man with the unclean spirit (Mark 1:21–8 = Lk 4:31–37); Peter's mother-in-law and others (Matthew 8:14–7 = Mark 1:29–34 = Luke 4:38–41); a leper (Matthew 8:1–4 = Mark 1:40–5 = Luke 5:12–6); a paralytic (Matthew 9:1–8 = Mark 2:1–12 = Luke 5:17–20).

great esteem and popularity among the people,¹²⁶ arouse the suspicion and ill-feeling of the Jewish authorities.¹²⁷ Secondly, Jesus' claim as SM to have the right to forgive sins exasperates the scribes and the Pharisees,¹²⁸ who consider it as blasphemous. Third, the plucking of grain on the Sabbath¹²⁹ which in Jewish eyes rendered Jesus a law-breaker, and Jesus' claim that the SM was lord of the Sabbath, earns him their permanent hostility. Matthew and Luke take us further than Mark, in that prior to the Beelzebul controversy they include some other incidents¹³⁰ which also account for the Jews' animosity, such as Jesus' castigation of the scribes and the Pharisees.¹³¹ Finally, all three evangelists relate the Jews' decision, following the dispute in connection with the healing of the man with the withered hand, to do away with Jesus.¹³² Thus, through these sample incidents, it becomes obvious that the Beelzebul controversy belongs to a more advanced context of Jesus' ministry, a context, moreover, in which Jesus' life was seriously threatened. This is corroborated by the following point.

b) In the period between the Beelzebul controversy and the three crucial events of Peter's confession, Jesus' first prediction of his suffering and the transfiguration (according to the outline of Mark and Matthew), the movements of Jesus in Galilee, Decapolis, Phoenicia and Caesarea Philippi betray a restlessness on his part which is without precedent. These movements do not seem to have any pattern or plan. They rather give the impression that the subject is acting under uncertainty and strain. There does not seem to be any other adequate explanation for such behaviour than that Jesus is acutely aware of a storm that is gathering around him and

¹²⁶Matthew 8:27; 9:7, 26, 31; Mark 1:27f. = Luke 4:36; Mark 1:45 = Luke 5:15, 26, 7:16.

¹²⁷E.g. Matthew 9:34; 10:25; Luke 6:7.

¹²⁸Matthew 9:3 = Mark 2:7 = Luke 5:21.

¹²⁹Matthew 12:1-8 = Mark 2:23-8 = Luke 6:1-5.

¹³⁰Among them also the healing of the Gadarene / Gerasene (Matthew 8:28-34 = Mark 5:1-20 = Luke 8:26-39), and the Mission of the Twelve (Matthew 10:5-15 = Mark 6:7-13 = Luke 9:1-6).

¹³¹Matthew 11:16-19 = Luke 7:31-35.

¹³²Matthew 12:14 = Mark 3:6 = Luke 6:7.

which may break out at any time. It appears as if he seeks to avoid it, and this is perhaps the reason for his journeys to Phoenicia and Caesarea Philippi.¹³³

c) The three crucial events of Peter's confession, Jesus' first prediction of his death and the transfiguration, constitute a turning-point in Jesus' history.¹³⁴ Peter's confession¹³⁵ signifies the acceptance of Jesus by his followers at a time when rejection seems to be widespread.¹³⁶ Jesus' first prediction of his death,¹³⁷ repeated a little later,¹³⁸ shows that Jesus is aware of the prospect of an imminent death hovering in the background. As for the transfiguration,¹³⁹ it supplies God's approval of Jesus' mission and, so to speak, his 'green light' for Jesus to go forward and complete his task. These three events highlight Jesus' self-consciousness with regard to his filial relationship to God,¹⁴⁰ and his acceptance of the role and destiny of the Son of Man for the coming of the Kingdom of God.

It might be objected that in Mark's and Mathew's scheme the Beelzebul controversy is placed altogether too early and is separated from the three crucial events that signal the turning-point in Jesus' public ministry by too many other events.¹⁴¹ It would have been more appropriate if the Beelzebul controversy had been placed somewhere *during* or *after* those

¹³³See also Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* 479.

¹³⁴Cf. Mark 8:31: καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν Matthew 16:21: ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν Luke 9:51: Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς το; πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

¹³⁵Mark 8:27–29 = Matthew 16:13–19 = Luke 9:18–20.

¹³⁶The pericope is often regarded as a church creation. I hope to deal with this issue in a forthcoming study.

¹³⁷Mark 8:30–9:1 = Matthew 16:20–8 = Luke 9:21–7.

¹³⁸Mark 9:30–2 = Matthew 17:22–3 = Luke 9:43–5, and Mark 10:32–4 = Matthew 20:17–9 = Luke 18:31–4.

¹³⁹Mark 9:2–8 = Matthew 17:1–8 = Lk 9:28–36.

¹⁴⁰The voice heard at Baptism is sounded again, though this time it is more emphatic, cf. e.g. αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε, Luke 9:35, par.

¹⁴¹It should be noted that Mark, who places the controversy earlier than the others, omits both of the logia in which our present interest lies. With the reference to the Kingdom and to the Son of Man thus missing, the significance of the controversy is inevitably altered!

events, as in Luke. This objection loses most of its force when it is remembered that the Gospel tradition, being more interested in events of salvific importance, preserved and expatiated on events that were more contingent on and significant for the passion.¹⁴² This interest is seen even more clearly in Luke's redaction. Moreover, the events between the Beelzebul controversy and Peter's confession, as narrated by Mark require some thirty days, while the events of the corresponding period narrated by Matthew demand about three weeks. The actual time for these events may have been much longer; the interesting point, however, is that the Gospel tradition is presenting these momentous events as having taken place within a comparatively brief period of time, and as being connected with the turning-point in Jesus' history. This turning-point surely did not occur overnight. The new insight into what was expected of him must have been ripening in the mind of Jesus for quite some time. The increasing rejection which he experienced from all quarters, and the Jews' designs against his life could have easily led him to see his eventual death as the pre-condition for the coming of the Kingdom of God. At any rate, it is this cluster of decisive events which supplies the general context for the Beelzebul controversy.

Luke is even clearer. According to the Lucan redaction, soon after the transfiguration and while urging upon his disciples his coming suffering, Jesus 'sets his face to go to Jerusalem'.¹⁴³ The activities are now intensified, and the Seventy (-Two) are sent out with the solemn charge to proclaim the nearness of the Kingdom, and in the event of their being rejected, to wipe the dust off their feet as a prophetic protestation, while testifying solemnly *πλήν τοῦτο γινώσκετε*

¹⁴²This means that the tradition shows a predilection for expatiating on later material with theological significance, thus passing over material that would have come earlier. This may explain why e.g. the Beelzebul controversy and the ruptured relations with the Jews appear so early in the tradition, rather than at the very close of Jesus' public life, as would have been expected. The answer would seem to be that they are not placed 'early': the material of the last few weeks or months has bulged out so as to dwarf or completely eject earlier material.

¹⁴³Luke 9:51.

ὅτι ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.¹⁴⁴ The whole atmosphere about Jesus is very tense. The Jewish leaders' inimical attitude towards Jesus has by now hardened to permanent hostility and they accuse him of collusion with Satan.¹⁴⁵ For Jesus, who is persuaded that his message and acts are inspired by God and are performed by the power of the Spirit, this is a blasphemy which leaves no room for forgiveness. Hence, to say an irreverent word against the SM is forgivable, but to harden oneself in the face of so many tokens of God's saving activity and to permanently reject it, places one outside the sphere of forgiveness. It is in just this context that Luke places this crucial saying: εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Jesus as the plenipotentiary of God, gives a new drive to his message, and it is fitting that the announcement should come directly from him. It should be noted that in both Matthew and Luke¹⁴⁶ ἔφθασεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is placed after all the sayings which use ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. "Ἐφθασεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is *an advance on ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *an advance both linguistically and contextually-theologically!* And therefore it should not be interpreted in the light of the ἡγγικεν type of sayings.

The question now is, how far can Matthew's and Luke's reconstructions of the movements and sayings of Jesus be credited with anything approaching historical reliability? As is well-known it is notoriously difficult—if not simply impossible—to reconstruct Jesus' movements and chronology from the circumstantial notices of the synoptic Gospels. The data supplied is, however, not entirely valueless, in that it gives an authentic picture as to the general outline, the general flow of events, and this is quite adequate for the present argument. Though the synoptics are painfully at variance in details, they all concur in the general thrust of the events.

Thus, if it is true that not only Matthew but all the synoptists have put to use their redactional genius, it is also a

¹⁴⁴Luke 10:1–12.

¹⁴⁵A similar accusation is mentioned earlier (Matthew 9:34; cf. 10:25), but is not as pointed.

¹⁴⁶Mark has only the initial saying with ἡγγικεν.

fact that all three evangelists agree in placing the Beelzebul controversy at some remove from Jesus' initial *kerygma* and prefacing it with a number of events, which in various degrees, but none the less sufficiently clearly in every case, supply the motive for these developments. This, according to the *criterion of multiple attestation*, would seem to imply that there was good traditional basis for placing the Beelzebul controversy at a more advanced stage of Jesus' public ministry, when there was a clear and permanent rupture in Jesus' relations with the Jews, and when the Jews had already been looking for ways to get rid of Jesus. Luke is unequivocal in placing the Beelzebul controversy at the final stage of Jesus' public ministry, when Jesus has started on his long, tortuous, and at the same time, fateful journey to Jerusalem. Granting that this is carefully redacted, and that the chronological progression is theologically conditioned, he gets at least some corroboration for his general plot from Matthew (and even Mark).¹⁴⁷ Though details cannot be pressed, it would seem that the general testimony of tradition is that Jesus uttered the gist of the words Ἐφθασεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ at a time when outward circumstances were making it increasingly clear to him that his message had been definitely rejected by the religious leaders and that he even ought to reckon with the prospect of a violent death. It is obvious that looked at in this light the saying and its Aorist ἔφθασεν receive new significance.

V. Jesus' Expulsion of Demons and the Kingdom of God

The healings of Jesus, and especially his expulsions of demons, have been generally related to the Kingdom of God, though variously, both by the advocates of Realized Eschatology and by those of Futuristic Eschatology. The former school has seen them as proof that the Kingdom of God has actually arrived,

¹⁴⁷For example, between his account of the controversy and the three events, Peter's confession, the predictions, and the transfiguration, Matthew has the long discourse on the parables of the Kingdom (ch. 13), Jesus' flight on hearing of the Baptist's death (ch. 14), and, following another dispute with the Jews, Jesus' retreat journey to Tyre and Sidon (ch. 15). All these events underline the gravity of the situation, the irretrievability of the broken relations with the Jews, and give us a situation that is similar to the Lucan one.

the latter as indicating that the Kingdom of God is near. Matthew 12:27 = Luke 11:19: εἰ (δὲ) ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; has been something of an embarrassment. Jesus appears to echo the conviction that the Jewish exorcists, too, performed their exorcisms by the power of God, as he did himself. But then, in view of verse 28, the critical question arises, Why could not the Kingdom of God be said equally well to have come through the Jews' exorcisms?¹⁴⁸ The problem has been usually 'solved' by assuming that originally verse 27 was not connected with verse 28.¹⁴⁹ This cutting of the Gordian knot seems, however, to be unnecessary.¹⁵⁰ As far as the Jews' attribution of Jesus' expulsions of demons to Satanic power is concerned, it is answered decisively in verses 25-26 with the rebuttal that Satan cannot drive out Satan because that would signal the end of his kingdom. Verse 27 seeks to show that there is another alternative, namely, the power of God, which the Pharisees, too, would be prepared to concede in the case of their own sons (or disciples). It is important to note that Jesus is not seeking here a recognition that would place him on a par with Jewish exorcists. The argument is an *argumentum ad hominem*,¹⁵¹ simply to force them to admit that God is at work. Having brought the argument thus far Jesus states his position unequivocally in verse 28,¹⁵² where he does not class himself with any Jewish exorcists, but stands alone as the Agent of the Kingdom of God. What then of the problem of verse 27? Why are not the Jews' exorcisms connected with the coming of the Kingdom like Jesus' own?

¹⁴⁸The question was posed by e.g. Bultmann, *History* 14; B. Noack, *Satanas und Soteria*, (Copenhagen 1948) 28, 71.

¹⁴⁹See e.g. Kümmel, *Verheissung* 98f.; Marshall, *Luke* 474; Fitzmyer, *Luke* 918.

¹⁵⁰Matthew 7:22 does not seem to have suggested itself as a possible solution.

¹⁵¹Note how he concedes for the sake of argument his cooperation with Satan, and cf. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville 1934) 1008.

¹⁵²In the form of a conditional sentence, which assumes the condition as true, and where the apodosis follows as the logical result. See Robertson, *Grammar* 1007f.

The problem arises out of the failure to differentiate between Jewish exorcisms, as indeed, Hellenistic exorcisms generally, and Jesus' expulsions of demons. To start with, strictly speaking, it is improper to use the terms 'exorcist' and 'exorcism' of Jesus and his works. The reasons for this are linguistic as well as religio-historical. The verb ἐξορκίζω occurs just once in the NT, in Matthew 26:63, when the high priest during the trial 'adjures', or 'charges under oath' Jesus to tell whether he is the Christ, the Son of God. The noun ἐξορκιστής occurs once in the NT, in Acts 19:13, of the seven sons of the Jew Sceva. Thus, there are no NT instances of ἐξορκίζω = 'exorcise' or of ἐξορκιστής being applied to Jesus. This suggests that although the terms were not unknown to them, the NT authors studiously refrained from applying them to Jesus and his activities.¹⁵³

With respect to the religio-historical aspect of the issue, we have a great deal of papyrological¹⁵⁴ and other evidence on how antiquity practised its exorcisms.¹⁵⁵ Even the Jewish exorcisms, described by Josephus,¹⁵⁶ are a long way from what we have in the Gospels. All the *characteristica* of such exorcisms are lacking from the Gospel stories. The various acts or rituals, the magical formulae, the incantations, the threats of banishment and punishment, if the demons did not obey, etc.,

¹⁵³The terms were quite rife at this time so that it is not possible to argue that the evangelists were ignorant of them. Their knowledge of these terms is confirmed by the use of ἐξορκιστής by Luke. The relevance of this is that although Jesus' castings out of evil spirits are described many times, these terms are never used. That the terms are not used of Jewish exorcisms is to be explained by the fact that no Jewish exorcisms are ever described in the Gospels. Matthew 12:27 par. constitutes no such description: ἐκβάλλω is a generic term not disclosing by which means the action takes place.

¹⁵⁴See e.g. A. Dietrich (ed.), *Papyrus Magica musei Lugdunensis Batavi* (*Jahrbuch für die klassische Philologie*, Suppl. 16, 793–818; Leipzig 1888); C. Wessely (ed.), *The Paris Magical Papyrus* (*Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien*, 36, Wien 1888) 27–280; as well as the collection in K. Preisendanz (ed.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechische Zauberpapyri* (Leipzig 1928–31).

¹⁵⁵Cf. e.g. Lucian, *Philopseudes* 16.

¹⁵⁶See e.g. *Antiquitates* VIII, 45ff.; *Bellum Jud.* VII, 178ff.; Str.-B., IV:1 527–35 and the discussion by P.S. Alexander in G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Goodman (edd.), E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* III:1 (Edinburgh 1986) 342–79.

are all absent from Jesus' expulsions of demons, whose simple word is sufficient.¹⁵⁷ Therefore, to lump Jesus' expulsions of demons together with Jewish or Hellenistic exorcisms is to introduce religio-historical confusion. If the *characteristica* of the exorcist and his exorcisms are absent from Jesus and his works, there is no longer any ground for classifying Jesus along with the exorcists of antiquity. Religio-historical differences should be respected.

If the proposed differentiation is correct, then it is precisely here that the answer to the problem of Matthew 12:27 = Luke 11:19 lies. Jesus' works of power are conceived as being of a different category and have a relation to the Kingdom of God that is absent from the exorcisms of Jesus' contemporaries. His expulsions of demons have the significance of Son of Man attacks on the kingdom of evil, and are performed by Jesus by virtue of his assumption of the role of the Son of Man in connection with the Kingdom of God. Jewish exorcisms, even if performed in God's name or by God's power, are irrelevant here. The difference does not lie in the mode of performance (i.e. the exorcists perform their exorcisms through the use of magical acts, formulae and incantations, whereas Jesus simply utters his authoritative word), but in the essence and ground of the respective healings. And this difference was determined by the special relation which Jesus bore to the Kingdom of God, which was one of unique personal involvement. For he was not merely the Herald of the Kingdom (as, for example, John the Baptist), but in his capacity of Son of Man he was the actual Bearer of it. Thus, the Kingdom of God was bound up with his person, work and destiny as Son of Man, and it is here suggested that it was precisely this relation that constituted the basis of his works of healing.

What is being suggested here will be appreciated better following the next section.

¹⁵⁷This is precisely the point in Abgar's letter to Jesus: ἤκουσά μοι τὰ περὶ σοῦ καὶ τῶν σὺν λαμάρων, ὡς ἀνευ φαρμάκων καὶ βοτανῶν ὑπὸ σοῦ γινομένων (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* I 13,6-9) i.e. in contradistinction to those who applied such methods. See J. Schneider, Art. ὄρκος etc. in *TDNT* V 464f. The rare incidents recorded in Mark 7:33, 8:23 have nothing magical about them, and as for John 9:6f., it is rather akin to OT prophetism and has symbolical meaning.

VI. The Son of Man and the Kingdom of God

As hinted at, above, the Son of Man question is one of the broadest and most intricate questions in Gospel research. It is impossible within present limits to give even the barest outline of the issues involved. This has been done at considerable length in my work on the Son of Man,¹⁵⁸ to which the interested reader is referred.¹⁵⁹ Therefore, none of the many and interesting questions about the Danielic 'SM's' identity, exalted status, solidarity in suffering with his saints, his being the Agent of God's Kingdom, his inspiration of a new messianology in Judaism, and his influence on the teaching of Jesus, where the term SM becomes titular, and is used by Jesus to describe his calling through diversified functions to be the Agent of God's Kingdom, etc., will be treated here, except for the last point which will be considered from the angle of the suffering of SM's relation to the Kingdom of God.

Thus, in the present discussion I will content myself with presenting only a small fraction of the SM evidence, which not only supports, but actually seems to demand the kind of interpretation of Matthew 12:28 suggested here.¹⁶⁰ At this

¹⁵⁸Which also has a critique of the circumlocutional theory represented by G. Vermes, M. Casey and B. Lindars, esp. in ch. 1. For more recent works like G. Gerleman, *Der Menschensohn* (Leiden 1983), who postulates Davidic traditions as the background to the Gospel SM, see my review in *SEA* 53 (1988); on G. Schwarz, *Jesus 'der Menschensohn'* (Stuttgart 1986) who has tried to introduce Vermes' theory to Germany, cf. my review in *TLZ* 113 (1988); on R. Kearns, *Das Traditionsgefüge um den Menschensohn*, in which he argues for a Near Eastern, chiefly Pharaonic and Ptolemaic Egyptian, background, see my review in *TLZ* 112 (1987); and on M. Müller, *Der Ausdruck 'Menschensohn' in den Evangelien* (Leiden 1984) see my forthcoming review in *SEA*.

¹⁵⁹Nothing of what has come to my attention in the meantime has caused me to alter the views expressed therein. The reviews seen so far have been overwhelmingly positive apart from one or two, written by such as hold diametrically opposed views, and who did not consider it necessary to present my position correctly (B. Lindars in *TLZ* 1987). In one case, M. Casey (*ExpT* 1987), without caring to verify it, actually tried to discredit my work not by counter argument, but by representing me as a Greek Orthodox — as if works by Greek Orthodox scholars must necessarily be nonsensical!

¹⁶⁰It is not without interest to note that the Earthly SM sayings occur in the earlier part of each of the synoptic Gospels, with very little overlap between them and the Suffering and Exaltation sayings, which occur in the later part, thus (the figures within brackets giving the number of sayings, while the

point it would seem appropriate to mention three emergent positions in present scholarship, which actually simplify my task considerably.

The first position is that Jesus' death cannot have overtaken him as a blind fate.¹⁶¹ The hostile treatment which he had received at the hands of the Jewish leaders together with his background knowledge of the execution of many prophets, and recently of John the Baptist, could hardly have failed to lead Jesus to the conclusion the he, too, one day might have to seal his ministry and teaching with his own life. Thus, J. Jeremias, for example, says: 'That Jesus reckoned with the possibility of a violent death has the strongest historical probability behind it',¹⁶² while M. Hengel puts it even more unequivocally: 'It should no longer be doubted that he reckoned with the possibility of his own execution, at the latest after that of John the Baptist'.¹⁶³ Hengel is therefore of the opinion that the evidence makes it imperative that the inquiry concerning the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death—which is often put to the credit of the early church—be pushed further back, to Jesus himself.¹⁶⁴

The second position is a corollary from the first one, namely that the passion predictions, which present the SM as suffering, can no longer in their entirety be regarded as *vaticinia ex eventu*, but must, in their essential core, go back to Jesus himself.¹⁶⁵ For example, with respect to the first prediction of suffering (Matthew 16:21), E. Schweizer says:

references giving the first and the last occurrence): Matthew: Earthly Life: (7) 8:20–16:13; Sufferings: (10) 12:40–26:45; Exaltation: (13) 10:23–26:64; Mark: Earthly Life: (2) 2:9–27; Sufferings: (9) 8:31–14:41; Exaltation: (3) 8:38–14:63; Luke: Earthly Life: (7) 5:24–17:22; Sufferings: (8) 9:21–24:7; Exaltation: (10) 9:26–22:69. More importantly the Sufferings and the Exaltation sayings run concurrently, in the case of Mark and Luke both beginning at the same pericope. This is an indication of their mutual connection.

¹⁶¹Cf. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* 478f.

¹⁶²*The Servant of God* 100.

¹⁶³*The Atonement* 71. See further Kümmel, *Promise* 99; Schürmann, *Jesus ureigene Tod*, 33, and note 68 for literature; Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer*, 478; Caragounis, *The Son of Man* 190–201.

¹⁶⁴*The Atonement* 71.

¹⁶⁵See Caragounis, *The Son of Man* 190–201, and for a list of scholars who accept the suffering SM sayings, 149.

'For this statement only or a very similar one could have caused the protest of Peter and the harsh rebuke of Jesus calling him "Satan" which cannot have been invented by the church'.¹⁶⁶

The third position is that one of the most important Suffering SM sayings, the ransom logion in Mark 10:45 = Matthew 20:28, is increasingly being regarded as a genuine saying of Jesus. Thus, in an important study P. Stuhlmacher¹⁶⁷ rejects the thesis of e.g. Pesch¹⁶⁸ that this logion has its origin in the 'urchristliche Abendmahlstheologie', and drawing upon W. Grimm's work,¹⁶⁹ sees the main ideas as deriving primarily from Isaiah 43 and Daniel 7 and some aspects also from Isaiah 53, and considers it as a creation of Jesus. In another investigation of this logion, S. Kim¹⁷⁰ has come to a similar overall conclusion, though he pushes the inquiry further by seeking to explain how Jesus' preaching of the coming of the Kingdom was connected with his death, a problem beyond the scope of this article.¹⁷¹ The saying is accepted also by e.g. Schürmann,¹⁷² Colpe (partly),¹⁷³ Grimm,¹⁷⁴ Hengel,¹⁷⁵ O. Betz and O. Hofius¹⁷⁶ and, apparently, Beasley-Murray.¹⁷⁷

¹⁶⁶JBL 79 (1960) 121.

¹⁶⁷'Existenzstellvertretung für die Vielen: Mark 10:45 (Matthew 20:28)' in R. Albertz, H.P. Müller, H.W. Wolff, W. Zimmerli, (edd.), *Werden und Wirken des Alten Testaments* (C. Westermann Fs.) (Göttingen, 1980) 412-27. See also *id.*, 'Reconciliation in the Preaching and Work of Jesus', *Theology News and Notes* (March, 1985) 6.

¹⁶⁸*Das Markusevangelium* II 362.

¹⁶⁹*Weil ich dich liebe. Die Verkündigung Jesu und Deuterocesaja* (ANTJ 1) (Tübingen 1976) 231ff.

¹⁷⁰'The "Son of Man" as the Son of God' (Tübingen 1983) 38-73.

¹⁷¹Kim sees the connection as effected through the three concepts: atonement, covenant and people of God.

¹⁷²*Jesu Abschiedsrede Lk 22:21-38* (NTA 20; Münster (1957) 85f., but cf. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* 279.

¹⁷³Art. 'Ο Ἰδὸς τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου, TDNT VIII, 455 with regard to Mark 10:35b.

¹⁷⁴*Weil ich dich liebe.*

¹⁷⁵*The Atonement* 36, 42, 71.

¹⁷⁶Cf. Stuhlmacher, 'Reconciliation in the Preaching and Work of Jesus', *Theology News and Notes* (March 1985) 6.

¹⁷⁷*Jesus and the Kingdom of God* 278ff.

A. Schweitzer's provocative thesis¹⁷⁸ that Jesus having been proved wrong in his prediction of the immediate arrival of the Kingdom of God, decided to cast himself headlong to death in a final, heroic effort to force God to set up his Kingdom, has been rightly rejected. However, Schweitzer thereby was echoing a valid insight—which his critics have generally missed—that the Kingdom of God was insolubly connected with the death of the Son of Man.¹⁷⁹

This insight of Schweitzer's is now being vindicated from many quarters and by scholars of different theological stance, who freely recognize the connection of the Kingdom of God with the death of the Son of Man or of Jesus.¹⁸⁰ As examples may be mentioned J. Behm,¹⁸¹ Schürmann,¹⁸² Hengel,¹⁸³ S. Kim,¹⁸⁴ while Pesch¹⁸⁵ is of the opinion that Jesus understood his death as having atoning significance.

Therefore there cannot be any doubt that at least from the time of the crucial events of Peter's confession, the first prediction of suffering and the transfiguration, i.e. the time that brought about a turning-point in Jesus' life and ministry, Jesus considered the coming of the Kingdom as dependent upon his SM duty 'to serve and to give his life a ransom for many'. That Jesus in some way drew this conclusion of his call, perhaps under the impact of his circumstances, and that he attributed to his eventual death atoning significance is a conclusion that is forcing itself upon sober scholarship with increasing force today. The necessity of his death which Jesus saw is brought

¹⁷⁸*Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, (Tübingen ²1913) 405–34.

¹⁷⁹Cf. *Geschichte* 434: 'Er muss für die anderen leiden ... damit das Reich komme'.

¹⁸⁰The connection of the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man in Jesus' teaching has been upheld (against Conzelmann, Vielhauer, *et al.*) also by Tödt, *Der Menschensohn* 298–316; Marxsen, *Anfangsprobleme der Christologie* (Gütersloh 1960) 29; E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus* (Tübingen 1962) 229ff.

¹⁸¹Art. *diativqhmi*, etc., *TDNT* II 134.

¹⁸²E.g. *Jesu ureigene Tod* 33; 'Jesu ureigene Todesverständnis' *Begegnung mit dem Wort* 279.

¹⁸³*Atonement* 72.

¹⁸⁴'The "Son of Man" as the Son of God' 66.

¹⁸⁵*Markusevangelium* II 362.

out fittingly by the use of the particle δεῖ.¹⁸⁶ In the entire OT this word has analogous meaning only in four Danielic passages regarding the Kingdom of God.¹⁸⁷ In the first passion saying Jesus applies this Danielic δεῖ more narrowly to his own personal history and in particular to his destiny in his capacity as SM. The Danielic δεῖ originally denoting the necessity of God's will with regard to the occurrence of historical events demanded for the accomplishment of his purpose, becomes for Jesus the inexorable *must* of divine necessity in reference to his own role and place as SM in that divine purpose... By means of this innovation, the traditional nature and function of the SM is widened to include that which according to Jesus' conviction is God's call to humiliation and suffering as the necessary preliminary to his exaltation and glory. In this Danielic δεῖ, we have the key to Jesus' view of his mission expressed by the phrase δεῖ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου'.¹⁸⁸ And in this we get perhaps a glimpse of Jesus' self-understanding.

Finally, before concluding, to return to the above question of Jesus' works of power. J. Jeremias,¹⁸⁹ E. Lohse¹⁹⁰ and M. Hengel¹⁹¹ have pointed out the Jewish belief in the atoning power of vicarious death in the first century A.D. and the probability that Jesus understood his death in that way. Jeremias has actually shown the belief in the vicarious effects of fasting and prayer generally also in connection with healing.¹⁹² Now if vicarious suffering and death were understood as having atoning effects (and prayer and fasting as availing for healing), could they not have been understood as being effective also for healing, in as much as illness was part and parcel of the curse on man, following his alienation from

¹⁸⁶Matthew 16:21; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22; 17:25; 24:7. See also John 8:14; 12:34.

¹⁸⁷LXX, Q: 2:28, 29 (bis); Q: 2:45.

¹⁸⁸Caragounis, *The Son of Man* 198f. in disagreement with J. Jeremias, *Theology* 277.

¹⁸⁹See e.g. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* 207–18.

¹⁹⁰*Martyrer und Gottesknecht* (Göttingen 1963).

¹⁹¹*Atonement* esp. 47–75.

¹⁹²*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 213ff. See e.g. the parallel Christian view in Mark 9:29. See also Luke 5:16.

God? The citation in Matthew 8:17 of Isaiah 53:4—*Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν*—summing up Jesus' healings is Matthew's own reflection.¹⁹³ But the question is, is it possible that this task of the Servant-Substitute had preoccupied also the mind of Jesus? Is it perhaps possible that Jesus had elected to 'throw himself into the breach' as Jeremias expresses it,¹⁹⁴ and that he understood his works of healing as stemming from his role as Son of Man for the coming of the Kingdom of God (his self-giving), rather than being the result of exorcistic activity of the kind his contemporaries practised?¹⁹⁵ And could this be the explanation why the coming of the Kingdom was related to Jesus' driving out of demons but not to Jewish exorcisms?

These are important but difficult questions, and hence it behoves us to tread circumspectly. They will require much more research and more space than is available at present.

¹⁹³Since Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (Edinburgh 1903) 102f., it has been usual to regard the activity predicated of Jesus here, through the terms *e[laben]* and *ejbavstasen*, in terms of the activity of the Greek physician in antiquity, who 'carried away' the disease from the sick person (so e.g. W. C. Allen, *Matthew* [ICC] 80). But such a sense can be maintained here only in complete disregard of the context of Isaiah 53 with its strongly substitutionary thought. Matthew departs radically from the LXX, which spiritualizes the 'illnesses' into 'sins', apparently making his own translation and keeping closer to the MT. A look at the use of *bastavzw* in the NT and other contemporary literature (see also L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament* [Acta Univ. Upps., 1967] 161ff.) shows that *bastázō* means both 'carry (away)' and 'bear' in the sense of bearing in one's own person, cf. e.g. Matthew 20:12; John 16:12; Galatians 6:2ff. and Romans 15:1: *τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν*, in which, though *ἀσθενήματα* signifies weaknesses regarding maturity, the thought is very similar.

¹⁹⁴*Eucharistic Words* 218.

¹⁹⁵There seem to exist Gospel traces which might imply the connection of healing with Jesus' suffering, e.g. the parallelism between Moses' lifting up of the serpent and Jesus' being lifted up on the cross in John 3:14; the *double entente* of *σώζω* as 'saving' and 'healing' (Matthew 9:21f., Mark 5:23, 28; 10:52), the various occasions of healing when peculiar personal emotions are attributed to Jesus (Mark 7:34; John 11:33f. with the peculiar use of *ἐμβριμῶμαι*, also Mark 1:43; Matthew 9:30) or when he was aware of power going forth from him (Mark 5:30 = Luke 8:45f.; Luke 6:19; also 5:17), as well as his forgiving of sins before an act of healing (Mark 2:5ff. = Matthew 9:2ff. = Luke 5:20ff.). If it is objected that healing could not be understood as being based on an event (his death) that had not yet transpired, it may be countered that neither could forgiveness of sins (Mark 2:5 = Matthew 9:2 = Luke 5:20) be granted prior to the Atonement.

Nevertheless, the gist of the present discussion would seem to point to the view that with the new turn of events and his orientation towards Jerusalem, Jesus spoke of the coming of the Kingdom of God as unprecedentedly imminent *because* he connected it with the supreme act of the Son of Man's self-giving in the fulfillment of his final task: δεῖ τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου...