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ABBREVIATIONS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation offers – from a biblical theological perspective – an examination of Jesus’ conception of time on the basis of Mark 1:15. The thesis defended in this study is that Jesus views time in its totality as the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring. After providing the scholarly context (chapters 1-3), this study contends that the background which makes Mark 1:15 most intelligible is God’s covenant with day and night which is established in the act of creation, specified in prophetic eschatology, and developed in some of the Second Temple literature; it is God’s commitment to give day and night in their appointed time, promising the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring. On the basis of recent developments in the scholarly literature concerning the Greek verbal aspect (Chapter 5), this study argues that the perfect verbs in Mark 1:15 denote an ongoing dynamic of time fulfilment, closely tied to the ultimate restoration of Israel. This begins with the appearance of Jesus during the days of John the Baptist (Chapter 6) and is mapped onto two phases of the horizon of Jesus’ view of time (Chapter 7). In Paul, this dynamic of the restoration of Israel as the fulfilment of time is explicated as the adoption of Jew and Gentile to God’s family on the basis of Jesus’ death during the fullness of time (Chapter 8). The present study concludes that the biblical notion of time is to be tied intimately to the hope of the restoration of Israel, ultimately manifested as the establishment of the Kingdom of God. In that light, Jesus’ programmatic announcement in Mark 1:15 may be paraphrased in the following way: Time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is fulfilled and this is manifested in the Kingdom of God progressively drawing near.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This thesis is an examination of Jesus’ view of time. On the basis of Jesus’ programmatic announcement in Mark 1:15, Πέπλω τω οκαίροι και ἥγγικεν ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ, this study will argue that Jesus views time as the promise of the coming of the Kingdom of God.¹ The problem of time intersects a number of disciplines, including philosophy, science and theology.² In Christianity, the problem of time is particularly acute because of the fundamental time-relatedness of its truth claims. By making historical truth claims, the Bible is set fundamentally within a framework of time. Not all religious traditions take historical facts so seriously. Christianity, on the other hand, rests entirely upon the affirmation that an actual series of cosmic and historical events occurred in which God revealed himself in action for the salvation of the world.³ This study is built upon the observation that central to the biblical framework is an underlying conception of time and history.⁴ Although this study is written with an awareness of philosophical treatments of time,

---
¹ On the authenticity of Jesus’ statement in Mark 1:15, see our discussion in Chapter 3.2. On the relationship of the historical Jesus to Mark’s presentation of Jesus, see our discussion in section 1.6 below. See further under sections 4.3.1, ‘Excursus 5’ and 7.3.
² See Actner, Kunz and Walter, Dimensions, viii; Fagg, Becoming; Davies, Physics; idem, New Physics; idem, Time Machine; Moltmann, ‘Time’, 27. A study which has attempted to cater for the various treatments of the subject of time in these diverse disciplines is that of Jackelén, Time. Mention should also be made here of the contribution of the ‘International Society for the Study of Time’ founded and directed by J. T. Fraser who co-edited with H. P. Soulsby over 240 papers of the ten volumes in The Study of Time Series. 1972-2000. Fraser has also made a number of significant contributions to the philosophical discussion of time by proposing the ‘hierarchical theory of time’. See Fraser, Of Time; idem, Time; idem, Evolution; idem, ‘Eternity’, 40-45.
³ See Dodd, History, 11-12; Berdayev, Meaning, 40.
⁴ This observation has been maintained predominantly by a past generation of Old Testament scholars. See for instance, Rad, Theology II, 99-125; Bright, Authority, 130-31; Wright, ‘Theology’, 11-38; Cf. Cullmann, Christ and Time, 26. It has, however, been challenged specifically by Tesfai amongst others who argue for the notion of ‘space’ as being more central to the biblical presentation than time and history. See Tesfai, ‘Resting Place’. See also Brinkman, Space, 240-56. Cf. Childs, Myth, 84-94; Kunin, God’s Place, 11-45; idem, ‘Sacred Place’, 22-55.
it will approach the topic of time from a biblical-theological perspective.\footnote{While the terminology of biblical theology is happily used by scholars of all persuasions, it is possibly one of the most difficult concepts to tie down. For a working definition of what is involved in biblical theology and envisaged in the present study, see section 1.6 below and Rosner, ‘Biblical Theology’, 3. For a bibliographical survey of current trends, see Reventlow, \textit{Problems}, 145-78.}

1.2. The Problem

As a biblical theological study of time, this work aims at bringing a different perspective to an old problem. The classical statement of the problem of time for philosophical, theological and scientific inquiries was long ago formulated by Saint Augustine:

\begin{quote}
For what is time? Who is able easily and briefly to explain that? Who is able so much as in thought to comprehend it, so as to express himself concerning it? And yet what in our usual discourse do we more familiarly and knowingly make mention of than time? And surely, we understand it well enough, when we speak of it: we understand it also, when in speaking with another we hear it named. What is time then? If nobody asks me, I know: but if I were desirous to explain it to one that should ask me, plainly I know not.\footnote{See Augustine, \textit{Confessions} xi. 14.}
\end{quote}

time? What is the relationship between time and eternity? Does God exist in or outside of time? The present study shall speak to some of these issues by reframing these questions in terms of Jesus’ view of time: What is the distinctive conception of time that can be discerned in Jesus’ teaching in the Scriptures? How does Jesus’ conception of time relate to a broader biblical conception of time? To what extent does Jesus’ understanding of time provide a conceptual framework for understanding God’s relationship to/with time and time in relation to eternity? As indicated, this study will attempt to make its contribution to these questions on the basis of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15,  πεπληρώθη ὁ θεός τοῦ βασιλεία του θεοῦ.

The intention to question a subject matter already presupposes the subject matter’s existence in the objective sense. Our inquiry into Jesus’ conception of time already presupposes that Jesus has a distinctive view of time. Among New Testament scholars, there are those who find no concern for time in Jesus’ teaching. Of those who do, the discussion is often confined to the ‘farness’ or ‘nearness’ of his prediction about the Kingdom of God. Writing in 1940, Delling contended that the question of time in relation to Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God was a matter of little significance:

[D]a ist das geschehene Werk Jesu entscheidende, vollgültige Erfüllung des Alten Testaments und steht in sachlichem Zusammenhang mit der zu erwartenden Parousie, so dass deren zeitliche Nähe oder Ferne gleichgültig erscheint.

---

8 See Meyer, *Critical Realism*, 7-8 drawing upon the philosophical insights of Bernard Lonergan. See also Meyer, *Aims*, 16-21. Cf. Gadamer, *Truth*, 337. ‘We must attempt to reconstruct the question to which the transmitted text is the answer’.

Delling’s observation is taken a step further by Bowman who, in 1948, argues that from the teaching of Jesus, ‘the category of “time” was of no interest to him’. \(^\text{10}\)

Writing in 1957, Conzelmann affirms that ‘Jesus ignores time’: \(^\text{11}\)

Jesus gibt nicht eine neue Antwort auf die Frage: „Wann?“ – damit wäre er immer noch Apokalyptiker - , sondern überholt diese Frage als solche. Solange ich überhaupt noch nach dem Zeitpunkt frage, habe ich den Anruf noch gar nicht begriffen. Ob ich dann den Termin etwas näher oder ferner ansetzte, macht wenig aus.\(^\text{12}\)

In a study of Jesus’ teaching about judgment in 1963, Baird maintains that, ‘Jesus was not so much concerned about time or even cosmology as he was about God and his judgment’. \(^\text{13}\) Baird’s view finds independent confirmation in Jüngel: ‘The coming of the kingdom of God cannot possibly be grouped in the paradigm of an experience of time’. \(^\text{14}\)

The consensus emerging amongst those who find little or no temporal concern in Jesus’ teaching, as we shall see below, has asserted itself in recent New Testament scholarship’s attempt to rethink Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God by placing it in a framework other than the temporal paradigm of past-present-future. \(^\text{15}\)

\(^{10}\) See Bowman, *Religion*, 143 n. 4.

\(^{11}\) See Kümmel, ‘Die Naherwartung’, 458 n. 6.


\(^{13}\) See Baird, *Justice*, 125.

\(^{14}\) See Jüngel, ‘Dogmatic Significance’, II, 106.

\(^{15}\) See Borg, ‘Temperate Case’, 525.
Even amongst those who recognize a temporal element in Jesus’ teaching, its significance is often downplayed. So, for example, Linnemann contends that the temporal language in Jesus’ proclamation ‘war für ihn alles andere als blosses Vehikel, um etwas „Überzeitliches” auszusagen’. Moreover, Herrmann observes that, ‘Jesus himself did not bring about a great alteration of the understanding of time and history’.

However, despite this long history of denial, others have not given up on ‘time’ in Jesus’ message. In fact, for Grässer, the failure to observe the temporal dimension of Jesus’ message is tantamount to a failure to understand the meaning of Jesus’ teaching:

Die Eliminierung der temporalen Spannung aus der Verkündigung Jesus bedeutet jedoch nicht nur eine exegetische Vergewaltigung der Texte, sie vermag auch kein einleuchtendes Bild von der Entwicklung der urchristlichen Eschatologie zu zeichnen.

Given how significantly time appears to be tied to Jesus’ central message, it is no surprise that many have resisted such ‘elimination’. Kümmel maintains that to deny Jesus’ teaching a temporal component is to replace the central message of the New Testament about God’s definitive redemptive act through Jesus in history with a timeless message concerning the spiritual nearness of God. It moreover undermines Jesus’ preaching of an eschatological future and the determination of the present by

---

16 See Linnemann, ‘Zeitansage’, 257. It ought to be acknowledged here that Linnemann has recanted the stance represented in this particular article. See Linnemann, Historical Criticism, 20.
17 See Herrmann, Time, 138.
18 See Grässer, Die Naherwartung, 70.
that future. Hence, for Kümmel, ‘it is impossible to eliminate the concept of time’ from the eschatological message of Jesus.\textsuperscript{19}

From this representative sketch of scholarly views about Jesus’ conception of time, a tension has emerged. There are those who insist on the absence or the insignificance of time for Jesus as reflected in his proclamation of the Kingdom of God. On the other hand, there are scholars such as Grässer and Kümmel who maintain that Jesus’ teaching will be misunderstood seriously if its temporal component is denied.\textsuperscript{20}

1.3. \textit{The Position Taken in This Study}

This study identifies itself with those such as Grässer and Kümmel who insist on the foundational significance of Jesus’ view of time for a proper understanding of his teaching, especially his teaching about the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{21} We shall argue that Jesus’ temporal conception is underscored in his programmatic proclamation, Πεπληρώθη ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 1:15). The authenticity of this passage, even though frequently challenged, has been widely acknowledged in recent New Testament scholarship.\textsuperscript{22} We shall draw on this programmatic announcement as an interpretive ‘window’\textsuperscript{23} through which to explore the broader ‘horizon’ of Jesus’ view of time regarding its constitutive ‘inside phases’.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{19} See Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, 148.
\textsuperscript{20} See Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, 152-53.
\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Grässer, ‘Verheissung’, 33-49.
\textsuperscript{22} See our discussion in Chapter 3.2.
\textsuperscript{24} These aspects will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 7. To foreshadow the position argued there, it is assumed that the ‘horizon’ of Jesus’ view of time is the broader framework comprising all temporal elements from Jesus’ ‘angle of vision’ derived from his teachings in Mark. ‘Inside phases’ are specific events consecutively arranged into a coherent structure that constitutes the horizon of Jesus’ view of time.
As a subset of the long-standing problem of understanding the self-consciousness of Jesus, an objection that can immediately be raised against the attempt to study Jesus’ conception of time is that it is primarily a matter for psychological and not historical analysis. This kind of questioning is often driven by a profoundly sceptical attitude towards the nature of historical evidence.\(^{25}\) In recent Jesus scholarship, however, Meyer and Wright have championed a critical realism approach that insists on the possibility of historically determining and verifying the ‘intention’ and ‘consciousness’ underlying an historical event without recourse to psychological considerations.\(^{26}\) According to Wright, for instance, to determine the ‘motivation’ for Caesar’s murder does not imply a necessary analysis of the psychological make-up of Brutus and Cassius. Rather, the study of the conspirator’s motivation ‘remains a matter of history, not of covert psychology’.\(^{27}\) This study will assume the viability of critical realism and contend that, by operating within its appropriate set of controls,\(^{28}\) it is possible to determine Jesus’ conception of time on the historical level without requiring us to delve into Jesus’ psychological constitution.

1.4. The Need for this Study

Despite claims for the underlying significance of Jesus’ view of time to the proper understanding of his teaching there have not been many studies that directly address the topic. As long ago as 1955, Robinson lamented the apparent lack of any

\(^{25}\) See for example, Johnson, \textit{Real Jesus}, 126-133.
\(^{27}\) See Wright, \textit{Jesus}, 143.
\(^{28}\) These controls are those that set apart critical realism as ‘sane, rigorous and productive’ which, according to Meyer, include the authority of fact, the correlativeity of ‘true’ and ‘real’, the primacy of insight into the text as individual, the ‘intended sense’ of the text as constitutive of discourse, the indispensability of judgment, the circular interrelation of things and words and the requirement that the interpreter’s interpretation measure up to the text. See Meyer, \textit{Critical Realism}, xiii.
monograph-length treatment of Jesus’ understanding of time and history.\textsuperscript{29} However, even though Robinson rightly diagnoses the problem he does not provide a satisfying response to it.\textsuperscript{30} The situation Robinson lamented more than five decades ago seems to persist. Even the most widely known treatment of time in the New Testament, namely, Cullmann’s \textit{Christ and Time}, is not primarily a monograph on Jesus’ conception of time but on early Christianity’s view of time.\textsuperscript{31} The most that New Testament specialists seem to devote to the consideration of Jesus’ understanding of time is a chapter inserted in a treatment of other aspects of Jesus’ teaching that are accorded much more importance.\textsuperscript{32}

Many have however acknowledged the necessity of investigating Jesus’ view of time. Baird, though not thoroughly convinced about the centrality of the topic of time in Jesus’ teaching, has, nevertheless, highlighted the importance of examining Jesus’ conception of time for fully grasping Jesus’ ministry: ‘The world picture of Jesus takes on larger dimensions when we sketch in the details of time, when we discuss the “scene” of God’s judgment in terms of its “history”.’\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, Jeremias underscores the need for a systematic deepening of our appreciation of Jesus’ view of time: ‘The conception of the eschatological measure of time, which is prominent in the NT calls for further study’.\textsuperscript{34} The importance of Jeremias’ observation is highlighted by Wright’s recognition that, without the proper consideration of the

\textsuperscript{29} See Robinson, ‘Jesus’ Understanding’, 17.
\textsuperscript{30} See our discussion of Robinson’s view under Chapter 2.3.2 and 2.4.7.
\textsuperscript{31} See our discussion of Cullmann in Chapter 2.2.1.
\textsuperscript{32} See our discussion under Chapter 2.4.
\textsuperscript{33} See Baird, \textit{Justice}, 94.
\textsuperscript{34} See Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 152 n. 92.
question of time in Jesus’ teaching, the overall structure of his message ‘collapses into the timelessness which characterizes some non-Judaeo-Christian worldviews’.  

Even in more recent theological scholarship, many have underlined the importance of understanding the problem of time for achieving a better grasp of Christology. Gunton, for instance, has suggested that a study of Jesus’ conception of time would offer a more accurate Christological descriptive category relative to Barth’s and Bultmann’s Christology ‘from above’ on the one hand, and, on the other, Pannenberg’s Christology ‘from below’. He observes that, ‘[t]he real problem of Christology is rather the problem of time. How far, and in what sense may we affirm that God is present in our time? And how far may we locate that presence in Jesus?’ MacKinnon has independently confirmed Gunton’s observation by pointing, for instance, to the significance of Jesus’ expectation of ‘his hour’ in the Gospels for Christological considerations.

The general neglect of any thorough treatment of Jesus’ understanding of time may be symptomatic of a larger problem with the positioning of time relative to the theological enterprise as a whole:

Any systematically worked out doctrine of the nature of time has never been arrived at in the established theology of the Church. The statements about time which this contains have remained scattered throughout the particular theological treatises, ranging from the treatise on creation to that on eschatology. What is true with regard to any formal theology of history is

35 See Wright, *Jesus*, 443 n. 1.
37 Rahner is also associated with Pannenberg as exponents of this Christological position. See Gunton, *Yesterday and Today*, 10-31. See Pannenberg, *Jesus-God*, 33.
also true with regard to a theology of time. It does not yet really exist, and even though here and there time is inevitably spoken of in the treatises which exist on particular topics, still even here the question is not for the most part entered into very deeply in this established theology.  

This study will, to some degree, be an attempt to redress the situation.

However, the challenges here are considerable. Blocher warns about the difficulty of dealing with the question of time in general:

The topic [of time] is fraught with exceptional difficulties. We find it hard to bring to the fore notions that are so basic that we constantly think through them, and which we always presuppose without reflection. As soon as we start asking what time is, we no longer know, exactly as St. Augustine confessed.  

More particularly, Jackelén observes that discussions of Jesus’ conception of time in scholarship illustrate that the topic of time in the New Testament is ‘a phenomenon shimmering with many nuances’.  

This study aims to demonstrate that despite these problems, it is still possible to investigate the topic of time in the Bible and more specifically in relation to Jesus’ teaching in the New Testament.

1.5. The Thesis Statement

The thesis to be argued and defended in this study is that Jesus’ proclamation of the gospel,  

\[ \text{Peplhvtaio kai roj kai hggiken h` basilea tou` qeou` (Mark 1:15b),} \]

---

41 See Blocher, ‘Time, Times’,183. His emphasis.
42 See Jackelén, Time, 76-77.
signifies that he views time in its entirety (ὸκαιρός) as the *promise* of the Kingdom of God, the fulfilment of which is now taking place.

Amongst the important findings of scholarship regarding Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God is that the Kingdom of God consists of two inseparable components – a dynamic reign and a coming realm. That is, the Kingdom of God in Jesus’ proclamation describes both a *relationship* to the king in which the human subjects willingly submit to him and a *place*, whether a celestial city with a throne or a national boundary with subjects and a king, into which his people are incorporated as his ‘house’.\(^{43}\) This study is built upon the observation that through Jesus’ earthly ministry culminating in his death, resurrection and coming in the clouds to God’s right hand, the reign component of God’s Kingdom is proleptically realized.\(^{44}\) Nevertheless, its spatial component, the Kingdom’s realm is still progressively coming near.

In this study, the notion of ‘space’ will be understood following Pannenberg as both the ‘receptacle of things’\(^ {45}\) and the ‘epitome of relations’ of the ‘bodies’.\(^ {46}\) From the biblical viewpoint, the spatial component of God’s kingdom appears to include both these conceptions of space. The kingdom’s spatial domain begins as a people-space comprising of an intimate relationship between Jesus and his people as they are incorporated to him by means of discipleship. This incorporation is essentially tied to

\(^{43}\) See McKnight, *New Vision*, 77.
Jesus’ role as the representative Son of Man-Son of God.\textsuperscript{47} In the Old Testament, the notions of the Son of Man and the Son of God are often employed as corporate representatives of God’s chosen people Israel.\textsuperscript{48} These notions seem to be applied to Jesus in Mark.

However, this people-space should be perceived in the light of Tesfai’s observation that in the Bible, ‘space’ refers to sacred place such as the Temple, the Promised Land, and the Jerusalem of the world to come.\textsuperscript{49} Jesus’ programmatic announcement, \textit{Pephrwtai o’ kairoj kai. hggiken h’ basilea tou qeou} implies a direction of progress of the coming near of the kingdom’s realm. From an inter-relational spatial reality inaugurated in Jesus and his followers, the realm of the kingdom progresses through time towards its ultimate manifestation as a \textit{receptacle} reality in the form of the resurrection and the world to come. In that sense, the sacred space of the Kingdom of God is inaugurated as a people-space in the intimate relationship of Jesus and his followers. But this people-space expands, as we shall see, through Jesus’ ongoing ministry – both earthly and post-resurrection – to its final realization as people-in-the-territorial-space of the Kingdom of God in the world to come. The manifestation of this territorial reality in the world to come will be the ultimate realization of the fulfilment of time as the promise of the Kingdom of God.

\textsuperscript{47} The term ‘perichoretic’ is frequently employed in theological scholarship in relation to the trinitarian relation within God. Recently, scholars begin to speak of a notion of ‘trinitarian space’ to which believers are incorporated to God. See Fiddes, \textit{Promise End}, 262-88; Pannenberg, \textit{Theology} II, 82-83. Cf. Moltmann, \textit{Coming}, 299; \textit{idem}, \textit{Trinity}, 191-202, 212-19; Gunton, \textit{The One}, 214-29; Zizioulas, \textit{Being}, 44-49, 139-42; Boff, \textit{Trinity}, 20-24; LaCugna, \textit{God for Us}, 399-400.

\textsuperscript{48} On the ‘Son of Man’ as representative of God’s people, see Daniel 7: 13, 22. For the ‘Son of God’ being a representative of God’s people, see Exodus 4:22 and Hosea 11:1. This notion will be developed in relation to Jesus’ teaching in Chapter 7 below.

\textsuperscript{49} See Tesfai, ‘Resting Place’, 3-4. Admittedly, this is a more narrow definition of ‘space’ with special reference to ‘God’s space’.
This progression of the space of the God’s kingdom is foreshadowed by the distinction between Israel in the wilderness and Israel in the Promised Land. In the wilderness, God’s place was mobile as he dwelt within his people wherever they went, thus constituting a people-space. In Canaan, however, the people-space of the wilderness gives way to the people-living-in-God’s-territorial-space.

This study shall attempt to show that it is the coming near of the kingdom’s realm component that constitutes the ongoing fulfilment of time as the promise of the Kingdom of God. In biblical scholarship, the spatial coordinate of the kingdom has all too often been distinguished from the community of people constituting the kingdom. The definition of ‘space’ adopted from Pannenberg allows for the merging of these categories (viz. space and community) and enables us to argue that the spatial component of the Kingdom of God is inaugurated in Jesus as a people-space and expanded through discipleship in anticipation that, ultimately, it will become in its fully realized form a people-within-the-territorial-space of God in the world to come.50

This is where the insights from a biblical-theological viewpoint will be helpful. We shall argue that Jesus’ proclamation of the fulfilment of time as the promise of the Kingdom of God is grounded in God’s covenant with ‘day’ and ‘night’, the fulfilment of which is the restoration of Israel after the exile (Jer 33:20-26; Jer 31:35-36). This covenantal commitment seems to have been established in creation and confirmed to Noah (Gen 8:21-22). In creation, time is created in the creation of ‘light’ since, from ‘light’, ‘day’ and ‘night’ are separated (Gen 1:3-5). Biblically speaking therefore, time is fundamentally understood as ‘day’ and ‘night’. Hence, God’s covenant with ‘day’ and ‘night’ can be rendered more specifically with the designation, God’s covenant with time.

In creation, time is given a definitive shape. The refrain, ‘and there was evening and there was morning ... day’ (Gen 1:3, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31) establishes the cyclic component of time that configures the daily human experience of time. Interestingly, however, ‘day one’ (דֵי, אֶלֶף) of creation flows irreversibly to ‘the seventh day’ (יְבֵית, אֶתֶנְב). This establishes, alongside the cyclic rhythm, an unswervingly linear component to time. Hence, on the basis of the creation account, time bears an irreducibly paradoxical cyclic-linear shape. It is cyclic since God gives ‘day’ and ‘night’ in their time, separated by ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ on a daily basis. However, it is linear since the cyclic rhythm of ‘day’ and ‘night’ flows irreversibly towards God’s rest on the ‘seventh day’ as its ultimate goal. God’s commitment to maintain the cyclic rhythm of ‘day’ and ‘night’ as time flows irreversibly towards its ultimate goal becomes foundational for the promise of the post-exilic restoration of Israel under David’s offspring (Jer 31:35; 33:20-26; cf. Pss. Sol. 17:21). Since the throne of David is often identified with the throne of God (cf. 1 Chr 28:5; 29:23; cf. 2
Chr 6:10, 16), the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring is therefore the promise of the establishment of God’s kingdom.

In previous attempts to grasp the meaning of Jesus’ programmatic announcement in Mark 1:15, biblical scholars have frequently overlooked the intimate connection between the phrases Παρθένος, ρωτάτε ο’καιρός and ἡγγικέν ἡ βασίλεια του θεοῦ. On the basis of God’s covenant with time, however, it seems plausible to posit that o’ kairoj (‘the time’), as a unique conceptual category, is the promise of h` basilea tou theou/ the fulfilment of which Jesus is announcing in Mark 1:15.

1.6. Methodological Considerations

Having set forth the thesis to be defended in this study, it is helpful here to indicate the methodological approach that the study will adopt as the premise upon which its reconstruction of Jesus’ conception of time shall be attempted and upon which its conclusions should be evaluated for their integrity or lack thereof. As aforementioned, we wish to approach the topic of time from a biblical theological viewpoint, taking the announcement, Παρθένος, ρωτάτε ο’καιρός και ἡγγικέν ἡ βασίλεια του θεοῦ in Mark 1:15 as the ‘window’ through which we shall explore the biblical data. In this connection, the present study subscribes to the view that Mark’s Gospel operates on three levels, each of which must be taken seriously. Firstly, Mark is a well-told narrative that has employed all the devices of good story-telling to convey the person of Jesus and his message in a holistic way. Secondly, the story of Jesus that Mark is narrating is not just a good story written out of mere antiquarian interest on the author’s part. Rather, Mark’s narrative is traditionally understood to be based

51 See Chapter 5.3.5.
52 I am indebted to Dr Peter G. Bolt of Moore College for these presuppositions. See Bolt, Cross, 15.
upon Peter’s eyewitness testimony to the historical reality of Jesus.\textsuperscript{53} On the basis of its character as eyewitness testimony, Mark invites his readers to trust his narrative as a trustworthy account of the historical reality of Jesus. Hence, the historical reality of Jesus, his person, acts and words, is presupposed throughout this study to be accessible through Mark’s narrative. Thirdly, Mark’s narrative not only contains the historical evidence about Jesus insofar as the historical reality of Jesus is accessible to us through the testimony of the Gospels, but, not unlike any other attempt at history writing, it is ‘an inextricable combination of fact and interpretation, the empirically observable and the intuited or constructed meaning’ of the historical reality of Jesus.\textsuperscript{54} In other words, Mark displays the historical reality of Jesus as a theological narrative of Jesus’ person, acts and words. In effect, the Jesus that Mark conveys to his readers is both the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith.

In order to gain access to the historical Jesus to which Mark testifies and to obtain an adequate picture of Jesus’ conception of time from his utterance in Mark 1:15, we shall adopt the critical realism of Meyer and Wright. This approach establishes that a text-mediated external reality is adequately knowable through the dynamic involving the interaction of initial observations and critical reflections resulting either in the confirmation or reconfiguration of initial impressions. Admittedly, this is a complex process but the depictions of the historical reality of Jesus in the works of Meyer and Wright indicate the pragmatic achievements of this approach. In the case of this study, the figure of Jesus, insofar as his reality is accessible to us through Mark’s


story as an eyewitness testimony, is the external reality. More specifically, it is Jesus’ view of time reflected in Mark 1:15 that is the specific object of the present inquiry. Through the critical interaction of initial observations, reflection, confirmation and reconfiguration of our initial impressions of Jesus’ proclamation in Mark 1:15 we may arrive at an adequate reconstruction of Jesus’ view of time on the basis of Mark 1:15.  

Since this study takes Mark 1:15 as an essential literary component of Mark’s narrative of Jesus and that it is true to Jesus’ original historical utterances, the significance of literary context for semantic investigation shall be adopted as our overarching conceptual guide. Being aware that our examination of Jesus’ conception of time does not occur in a vacuum but in the context of scholarly reflections over a long period of time, we shall begin with an assessment of Jesus’ proclamation of the gospel of God in Mark 1:15 as represented in various scholarly contexts. We shall start with a representative survey of the various ways in which Jesus’ understanding of time is indirectly dealt with in scholarly discussions (Chapter 2).

Since our examination of Jesus’ view of time is based on Mark 1:15, we shall provide a broad survey of the history of interpretation of Mark 1:15 in biblical scholarship – from its reception in the patristic church fathers right down to some of the prominent sixteenth century reformers and then followed by modern interpreters (Chapter 3). The opening of Mark’s Gospel with the reference to Isaiah (1:2-3)

55 A diagrammatic representation of this kind of critical interaction can be seen for example in Wright, New Testament, 44.
invites readers to understand the story of Jesus in the light of the Old Testament, and thus in Chapter 4 we shall relate Mark 1:15 to its most plausible background in the Old Testament. To grasp the way in which the Old Testament is received in the New Testament and therefore in Mark 1:15, we shall explore how the Old Testament background to Mark 1:15 is interpreted in the Second Temple Jewish literature.

We shall then focus more intensely on Mark 1:15 in its immediate literary context within Mark’s Gospel by means of a synchronic approach to the grammatical and syntactical relations embedded in it (Chapters 5, 6, 7) in order to specify the beginning, the subsequent development and finally the realization of the Kingdom of God’s political space as the fulfilment of time as the promise of the Kingdom of God. By way of confirmation of the integrity of Jesus’ view of time derived from Mark 1:15, we shall explore its possible reception in Paul in Chapter 8. A conclusion will finally summarize the findings of this study indicating possible areas that may require further research and the implications of the findings of the present study for other related issues and problems in Jesus scholarship.

---

2. JESUS’ CONCEPTION OF TIME IN BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP

In this chapter, we shall survey the various ways in which the discussion of Jesus’ conception of time appears to have been conducted in biblical scholarship. Whereas there seems to be no monograph-length treatment of Jesus’ view of time, the subject has been addressed implicitly in scholarly discussions regarding the nature of Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God and even in the analyses of the Gospel writers’ division of history. A number of scholars have however devoted some attention to Jesus’ conception of time in their inquiries into various other aspects of his teaching – and we shall evaluate their work below. We will begin with discussions in which Jesus’ view of time is implied but not directly addressed since the issues addressed by these scholars become fundamental to the reconstruction of Jesus’ view of time by those who have written on the topic.

2.1. The Eschatological Dimension of Jesus’ Kingdom Proclamation

Discussions of the eschatological nature of Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom are predicated on certain suppositions about Jesus’ view of time, as we shall see below. Our aim here is to give a representative sketch of the various positions advocated in this discussion and then to show how a conception of time implicitly attributed to Jesus underlies the premise upon which arguments for Jesus’ eschatological perspective are proposed.58

58 For a concise summary of the positions advocated in this discussion, see Kümmel, Promise, 15-16; idem, Heilsgegeschend, 457-58. For a more extensive discussion of the positions involved, see Perrin, Kingdom of God; Lundström, Kingdom of God; Willis (ed), Kingdom of God. A discussion from a premillennial viewpoint can be found in Ladd, Crucial Questions.
2.1.1. Futuristic Eschatology

One position insists that Jesus, in intimate connection with Jewish apocalyptic understanding, made the announcement of the imminent end of the world and his expected appearance as the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven during his lifetime.59 This view is associated with Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer. Weiss, for his part, draws on Mathew 12:28 (= Luke 11:20) and focuses on the term ef qasen which occurs in both these verses whereby Jesus seems to be speaking of the kingdom of God as having come already. He argues that this passage must be read in terms of passages such as Mark 1:15, Matthew 4:17; 10:7 and Luke 10:9, 11; 21:31 in which the Kingdom of God is described with the verb hqgiken, meaning ‘has drawn near’.60 Thus, for the early church, the Kingdom remained a ‘near expectation’.61

59 This is more widely identified with Schweitzer’s konsequente Eschatologie which is translated by some as ‘consistent eschatology’ (e.g. Cullmann, Wilder) and others as ‘thoroughgoing eschatology’ (e.g. Perrin). What is important to understand from this expression is that it ‘consistently’ maintains a ‘futuristic’ ‘near expectation’ view of the Kingdom in Jesus’ proclamation. See Kümmel, Promise, 15 n. 2 and the literature cited therein. For a more extensive treatment of this position, see Lundström, Kingdom of God, 69-95; Willis, ‘Discovery’, 1-14. These studies helpfully document the important literature associated with this view.

60 See Weiss, Proclamation, 67-74.


62 Weiss, Proclamation, 84.
Weiss’ view was popularized by Schweitzer.\(^{63}\) Schweitzer’s eschatological insight emerged in response to the many and varied attempts of nineteenth-century German theologians to write a *Leben Jesu*.\(^{64}\) These attempts, extensively documented by Schweitzer, conclude with the thoroughgoing scepticism of Wilhelm Wrede, who asserts that we can virtually know nothing of the historical Jesus. Schweitzer structured his argument so that at the end of it, the reader is left with a clear choice: Wrede’s thoroughgoing scepticism about Jesus or his (Schweitzer’s) own reconstruction of Jesus’ Kingdom proclamation which came to be known as ‘thoroughgoing eschatology’.\(^{65}\)

Following Weiss, Schweitzer argued that the Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus is an apocalyptic event and its coming was expected by Jesus during his generation.\(^{66}\) According to Schweitzer, when Jesus realized that this expectation was doomed to fail he went up to Jerusalem and offered himself to die there in an attempt to forcibly initiate the coming of the Kingdom of God and, with it, his expected...

---

\(^{63}\) The influence of Schweitzer’s critical examination of the nineteenth century German scholars’ attempt to write an account of the life of Jesus was felt in such a way that projects of this kind were put on hold in Germany for over fifty years. See Bornkamm, *Jesus*, 13; Cadoux, ‘Historical Jesus’, 406; Wright, *Jesus*, 21 who continues to affirm this consensus. This categorical depiction of Schweitzer’s influence has, however, been subjected to correction by Porter who demonstrates that the ‘quest’ for the historical Jesus did not in fact *completely* cease after Schweitzer. In actual fact, there were other developments on Jesus scholarship during the period usually referred to as the ‘no quest’ period but which are often left unaccounted for in the interest of maintaining the supposed influence of Schweitzer’s analysis. See Porter, ‘Reading the Gospels’, 27-55; *idem*, Criter, 28-59. In support of Porter’s challenge, I wish to refer, for instance, to Thomas James Thorburn’s slim volume published in 1915 under the contentious title *The Historical Jesus* as a response to the sceptical views on Jesus propagated at the time. He examines the evidence from non-Christian literature such as Josephus and Tacitus through to the Jewish Talmud and even Krishnaism and Buddhism about the historical Jesus. See Thorburn, *Historical Jesus*.

\(^{64}\) See Schweitzer, *Quest*.

\(^{65}\) See Perrin, *Kingdom of God*, 32. Perrin uses the term *konsequente Eschatologie* as an encompassing term for the Weiss-Schweitzer eschatological view (see *Kingdom of God*, 32 n. 1). However, this has been correctly identified to be an erroneous use of the term. See Hiers and Holland, ‘Introduction’ in Weiss, *Proclamation*, 31-32, 100.

manifestation as the Son of Man. Since the kingdom did not come as a result of Jesus’ death, the earliest believers were forced to accept the delay of the *parousia* and with it a wholesale revision of their initial theological convictions, which are supposed to have been naively based on the hope of the imminent appearance of God’s kingdom. In Schweitzer’s view, Jesus died as a deluded fanatic.

2.1.2. Realized Eschatology

An alternative viewpoint in the debate regarding the eschatological nature of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation is advocated by those who insist to varying degrees on eliminating the futuristic dimension from Jesus’ Kingdom proclamation. In this view, Jesus taught that the Kingdom of God had already arrived. This position came to be widely known as ‘realized eschatology’ and is associated with Dodd. Interestingly, Dodd arrived at this position through the consideration of the very same texts from which Weiss derived his futuristic eschatological position. The crucial issue lies in the distinctive ways these two scholars translate the verb *higgien*. Weiss argues that the verb *higgien* in Matthew 12:28 and the term *elqasen* in the parallel passage in Luke 11:20 both stem from a common Aramaic term, *ajm*, which signifies something approaching.

---

67 Both Weiss and Schweitzer maintain the conviction that Jesus was not the ‘Son of Man’ during his earthly ministry but expected himself to obtain the title in the imminent future manifestation of the Kingdom. The difference is that while Weiss believes that no human activity would bring the Kingdom, not even Jesus’ death, but only God’s intervention, Schweitzer seems convinced that Jesus saw his death as an invocation of that divine intervention. See Weiss, *Proclamation*, 82; Schweitzer, *Quest*, 386-387.


Dodd, for his part, argues that since άλμ means ‘has come’, all sayings which express that the Kingdom of God ‘has come near’ should be interpreted as ‘has come’.\textsuperscript{71} Hence, for Jesus and his disciples and more importantly, for the primitive church, the kingdom was indeed a realized-in-the-present phenomenon. On the other hand, all terminologies in the Gospels which reflect a future expectation of the kingdom, according to Dodd, imply an ‘ eternal order lying beyond all history’.\textsuperscript{72}

2.1.3. Non-eschatological View of the Kingdom

A third trend of thought in relation to Jesus’ eschatological perspective is advocated by those who either deny the eschatological dimension of Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God\textsuperscript{73} or insist that the expectation of an imminent ‘end’ is a rather less important feature of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation.\textsuperscript{74} Two sub-categories emerge within the ambit of this position. On the one hand, Perrin subsumes any notion of the temporal dimension of the Kingdom of God in his discussion in Jesus’ teaching as a ‘tensive’ symbol signifying a reality beyond the graspable capacity of language.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{71} See Dodd, \textit{Parables}, 44; Perrin, \textit{Kingdom of God}, 58-78.
\textsuperscript{72} See Dodd, \textit{Parables}, 207.
\textsuperscript{73} See Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, 16 n. 4 and the literature cited therein. See also Borg, Mack and Malina amongst those who associated themselves with the Jesus Seminar. See especially Borg, ‘Noneschatological Jesus’, 521-535; Mack, ‘Kingdom Sayings’, 3-47. Cf. Malina, ‘Received View’, 171-194; Funk and Hoover, \textit{Five Gospels}, 40. For a brief summary of this view, see Evans, \textit{Fabricating Jesus}, 40-43. For recent rebuttals of the Jesus Seminar viewpoint, see Johnson, \textit{Real Jesus}, 20-27; Evans, \textit{Fabricating Jesus}, 15-138. Manson suspects that a ‘non-eschatological’ understanding of Jesus is already anticipated in Schweitzer’s ‘thoroughgoing eschatology’ which was subsequently demonstrated in Schweitzer’s commitment to be a medical missionary to Africa. For Schweitzer, even though Jesus’ expectation of the Kingdom was a gigantic mistake, it was the indispensable driving force in Jesus’ ministry to others. Hence, even if there is no parousia in the conventional Jewish understanding of it, its expectation should still impose upon us a desire to minister to the needs of others as Schweitzer did in Africa. See Manson, ‘Quest’, 8-9. Cf. Burkitt, \textit{Earliest Sources}, 56-76.
\textsuperscript{74} See Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, 16 n. 5 and the literature cited therein.
\textsuperscript{75} See Perrin, \textit{Jesus}, 29-30. Perrin arrives at this view through Alan Watt’s definition of ‘myth’ as cited in Philip Wheelwright: ‘Myth is to be defined as a complex of stories – some no doubt fact, and some fancy – which for various reasons, human beings regard as demonstrations of the inner meaning of the universe and of human life’ (see p. 22). Moreover, Perrin also comes under the influence of Wheelwright’s distinction between a ‘steno’ symbol that has one-to-one relationship with the reality it represents and a ‘tensive’ symbol whose meaning cannot be exhausted by any one
Malina suggests an alternative view. He surveys the social background of first century Palestine and observes that ‘past’ and ‘future’ temporal modes occupy a secondary and tertiary status of importance relative to the centrality of the ‘present’ as the temporal category in which first-century peasants couched their understanding of time.\[76\]

A related position is advocated by France who argues that since the Kingdom of God is eternal, it cannot justifiably be spoken of in temporal, spatial or situational terms – as if there was a point in time during which God did not reign universally. He claims that ‘to declare that God’s kingship has come near is to say that God is now fulfilling his age long purpose, rather than to point to a specific time or event which can be defined as either already present or still future, but not both’.\[77\] In other words, temporal categories such as past and future are irrelevant for evaluating Jesus’ kingdom proclamation. France acknowledges that his position is proximate to that of Perrin which we have delineated above.\[78\] Nevertheless, he admits that he would identify himself with the ‘realized eschatology’ camp if a temporal component were to be attributed to Jesus’ kingdom proclamation.\[79\]

As a symbol, the Kingdom of God is more open to the subjective interpretation which seems to have originated – as we shall see below – with Origen (ca. 185-251 AD).\[80\] For Origen, the Kingdom of God is the timeless rule of God in one’s heart.

\[78\] See France, \textit{Mark}, 93 n. 6.
\[79\] See France, \textit{Mark}, 92.
\[80\] See Origen, \textit{Matthieu} 10. 14. 69. But perhaps the subjectivization of the kingdom is a view that can traced to the rabbinic writings. See Strack and Billerbeck I, 172-80, 182. See also Lundström, \textit{Kingdom of God}, 11-12.
Just as the temporal understanding of the nearness of the Kingdom of God assumes an objective view of time, so also in these non-temporal stances regarding Jesus’ message of the Kingdom of God a subjective view of time by either Jesus or the Gospel writers (or both) is presupposed.\textsuperscript{81}

2.1.4. \textit{Sich realisierende Eschatologie}

Perhaps the position that has been most widely favored in New Testament scholarship regarding the eschatological nature of Jesus’ teaching about the Kingdom of God is the mediating position between ‘thoroughgoing eschatology’ and ‘realized eschatology’ suggested by Joachim Jeremias.\textsuperscript{82} Jeremias observes that these extreme positions fail to adequately account for the fact that in Jesus’ teaching, the futuristic and presentist emphases regarding the Kingdom of God are found alongside each other. As a modification to Dodd’s ‘realized eschatology’, Jeremias therefore proposes a stance which embraces both the futuristic and presentist elements of Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom, namely, eschatology in the process of realization or \textit{sich realisierende Eschatologie}.\textsuperscript{83} Writing some twenty years after initially proposing this conception, Jeremias observes that the phrase ‘sich realisierende Eschatologie’ has particularly engaged New Testament scholarship. This view indicates that ‘the age of salvation is now being realized, the

\textsuperscript{81} As we shall see below, in this category belong most treatments of Jesus’ view of time by Fuchs, Linnemann, Jüngel and even Baird. See under section 2.4 below.

\textsuperscript{82} In many respects, this modification is already anticipated in Jeremias, \textit{Weltvollender}, 44. Dodd notes that emendations to his ‘realized eschatology’ came from Georges Florovsky’s suggestion of ‘inaugurated eschatology’ and Joachim Jeremias’ ‘sich realisierende Eschatologie’ which he much preferred but cannot translate into English. See Dodd, \textit{Interpretation}, 447 n. 1. Unfortunately, Dodd does not document where he got these insights from.

\textsuperscript{83} See Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 159. For a concise account of Jeremias’ position, see Perrin, \textit{Jesus}, 39; \textit{idem}, \textit{Kingdom of God}, 73-74, 81-82. Dodd’s acceptance of Jeremias’ modification is evident in a later work where he interprets Mark 9:1 as the beginning of a ‘new era’ in the resurrection and Pentecost with the Son of Man coming in power. See Dodd, \textit{Coming}, 12-15. See also Perrin, \textit{Kingdom of God}, 74. Nevertheless, Dodd indicates that he still wishes to maintain his ‘realized eschatology’ as a presentist emphasis and thus relegates temporal categories such as the ‘new era’ to the ultra historical domain. He asserts that the event of the final coming of the Son of Man unlike his first coming ‘is not an event in history’. See Dodd, \textit{Coming}, 27. His emphasis.
consummation bestowed in advance, the “in-breaking” of God’s presence into our lives’. 84

2.1.5. *Jesus’ Conception of Time Implied in the Discussion of his Kingdom Proclamation*

The views regarding the nature of Jesus’ eschatological perspective just delineated seem to be implicitly shaped by underlying presuppositions about time. Those who advocate futuristic eschatology clearly attribute to Jesus a basic compliance with the contemporary Jewish apocalyptic view of time somewhat similar to that reflected in John the Baptist’s proclamation.85 From an apocalyptic perspective, time is viewed as the duration of waiting for the expected catastrophic end of the spatio-temporal continuum.86

The inquiry into whether Jesus’ kingdom expectation was rooted in Jewish apocalypticism associated with Second Temple Judaism has elicited lively discussions in current biblical scholarship, with no clear consensus emerging.87 It seems that the debate on the degree to which Jesus was influenced by Jewish apocalypticism is largely determined by the possible meaning of the term ‘apocalyptic’ and its derivative, ‘apocalypticism’. In fact, ‘apocalyptic’ has proven to be a slippery term in this regard.88 A number of scholars have understandably refused to give a definition of ‘apocalypticism’, opting rather to offer simply a ‘description’

85 See Käsemann, ‘Christian Apocalyptic’, 99-133.
88 See a brief sketch of the biblical scholarship in Koch, *Rediscovery*, 36-56.
of it. But even this attempt does not seem to resolve the impasse that the discussion has thus far generated. Hence, to attribute Jesus’ conception of time to Jewish apocalypticism seems to place us in a ‘no man’s land’ relative to understanding what this category signifies. We shall see below that what would have been more helpful is a redefinition of what is specifically involved in the end of the world, according to Jesus’ teaching.

For representatives of ‘realized eschatology’, on the other hand, Jesus’ conception of time virtually resembles the Platonistic distinction between time and eternity. Time, according to Plato, is the ‘moving image’ of timeless eternity. This supposition is discernible in Dodd’s insistence that the blessings of life in the Kingdom of God, the coming of the Son of Man, judgment and the expectation of the cosmic transformation of the world can be experienced only in the eternal order, of which ‘there is no before and after’ since these ultimate realities are timeless. By implication, therefore, these are events that can no longer occur in a future considered in chronological continuity with the present. All this suggests that Hiers’ verdict on Dodd is sound: ‘Dodd’s Jesus resembles more nearly a Cambridge Platonist than a first-century Jew’.

---

90 See the discussion under Chapter 7.3 and 7.5.3 below.
91 See Plato, *Timaeus* 37D – 42E.
92 See Dodd, *Parables*, 83; *idem*, *Founder*, 115: ‘The kingdom of God, while it is present experience, remains also a hope, but a hope directed to a consummation beyond history’. This future aspect of Dodd’s teaching seems to have been overlooked by Sullivan’s critique of ‘realized eschatology’. See Sullivan, *Rethinking*, 118.
Located between these two extreme views, as we have seen, is Jeremias’ *sich realisierende Eschatologie* (‘eschatology in the process of realization’). This view makes reasonable sense of the occurrence of the metaphor of ‘growth’ in the parables of Jesus (e.g. Mark 4:26-29) and the juxtaposition of present and future elements of the Kingdom of God in Jesus’ teaching. The basic hindrance regarding this conjecture of Jesus’ eschatological view seems to be its striking resemblance to a view of time associated with Darwinian evolutionary theory. The evolutionary notion of time supposedly supplants the cyclic view of time largely prominent in an agricultural milieu such as that of first century Palestine. Cast in that light, the Jesus of Jeremias’ progressive eschatology would appear to be more consistent with nineteenth century scientific theory than with the first century Jewish pattern of thinking. Nevertheless, Jeremias’ dynamic view of the progress of the Kingdom of God can be distinguished in a number of important ways from modern evolutionary theory. We shall see below that a linear view of time must be supplemented with a cyclic view of time, and not replaced by it.

For those advocating a ‘non-eschatological’, the Jesus envisaged seems firmly rooted in a modern existential philosophical framework more congenial to the work of Martin Heidegger. In keeping with this philosophical stance, the ‘past’ and the ‘future’ are collapsed into the ‘present’ moment which is transformed into a

---

95 See Chapter 7.9 below.
98 In fact, it has been noted that the progressive eschatological picture is not one of evolutionary progress since evil does not simply wither away without the need for God’s Judgment (see Matt 13:1-31; Mark 4:1-32; Luke 8:4-15; 13:18-19). See Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus*, 290 n. 2.
99 See Chapter 4.4.
‘situation’ in one’s personal life. Such an existential supposition does not adequately deal with Jesus’ continuity with the Old Testament, attested at least in the genealogies in the Gospels but more emphatically by the promise-fulfilment correlations reflected throughout the New Testament.

2.2. The Gospel Writers’ Division of History

Another way in which Jesus’ conception of time is implied but not directly discussed is through analyses of the Gospel writers’ division of history. In the ‘heyday’ of form and redaction critical approaches, the study of Jesus’ teachings was overshadowed by the study of the Gospel writers whose literary products were often regarded as more the creative inventions of their respective communities than as eye-witness testimonies to the historical figure of Jesus. Consequently, any conception of time Jesus might have had was thought to have been eclipsed by the theologies of the earliest believers.

2.2.1. Oscar Cullmann

Perhaps the most widely known treatment of time thus far from a biblical theological perspective is Cullmann’s Christ and Time. At the outset, Cullmann clearly

---

101 This is best exemplified by the works of Crossan. See section 2.4.5 below.
102 See Schmidt, Rahmen, 317; idem, Place, 43-44; Dibelius, Tradition, 9-36; Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 4. A brief but critical discussion of this development is given in Dodd, ‘Framework’, 1-11.
103 For a concise account of this development, see Telford, ‘Introduction’, 4-9.
104 In many respects, W. C. van Unnik’s verdict on Cullmann’s Christ and Time still rings true even today: ‘In my opinion [Christus und die Zeit] is the best contribution to the theme [of the primitive Christian concept of time] to date’. See van Unnik, ‘Contemporary Problems’, 232. For the further development of Cullmann’s view in Christ and Time, see Cullmann, ‘Relevance’, 9-22. A concise summary of Cullmann’s Christ and Time thesis is given by Fuchs, ‘Christus’, 83-86. See also Bultmann’s Review of Christ and Time which Cullmann refers to as a ‘correct review of its content’. See Bultmann, ‘History of Salvation’, 268-284. See also Cullmann, Christ and Time, 4. For the prevailing impact of this important book, see Bauckham, ‘Time and Eternity’, 177 n. 41. Dunn observes that Cullmann’s Christ and Time ‘has been largely ignored in the last thirty years’. Dunn, Theology, 466 n. 20. See Goldsworthy, Preaching, 24. See also Carson, Divine Sovereignty, 209-10; Stamm, ‘Jesus Christ’, 208-210. Sometimes Cullmann’s influence is discussed even without the
indicates that he wishes to investigate ‘the basic presuppositions of all New Testament theology, that is, the New Testament conception of time and history’.\textsuperscript{105} The New Testament, however, is implicitly presupposed to be the theological product of primitive Christians and thus it is their view of time rather than that of Jesus that Cullmann sets out to explore. The point of departure for his investigation is his observation that the basic structure of the Western conception of time as represented in the Roman calendar precisely corresponds to the perception of time of primitive Christians. This, accordingly, is evident in the fact that the number of our years decreases until Christ and, from then on, it begins to increase. In that scheme of time, the Christ event is the ‘temporal mid-point of the entire historical process’.\textsuperscript{106}

Over against the Greek cyclic view of time, Cullmann asserts that the biblical understanding of time bears a rectilinear shape sloping upwards towards Christ as its mid-point. Two Greek words – \textit{kairos} and \textit{aiōnion} – are singled out as the lexical foundation for the reconstruction of the primitive Christians’ view of time. \textit{Kairos} is defined as a ‘definite point of time’ and \textit{aiōn} as a ‘duration of time’.\textsuperscript{107} According to Cullmann, God’s redemptive activities happened in \textit{kairoi} (specific points in time), the joining together of which result in a linear time scheme.\textsuperscript{108}

Cullmann claims that primitive Christianity’s conception of time is a fundamental modification of the Jewish view of time.\textsuperscript{109} He detects a number of striking

\begin{footnotes}
\item[105] Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 26. His emphasis.
\item[106] Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 18.
\item[107] Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 39. His emphasis.
\item[108] Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 43.
\item[109] The doctrine of the ‘two ages’ is widely held to be a development that can only be traced to Jesus’ teachings in the Gospels in terms of its origin and not of the Jews. See Hill, \textit{Greek Words}, 187; Ladd, \textit{Jesus and the Kingdom}, 86 n. 35.
\end{footnotes}
similarities between the Jewish and Christian conceptions of time. Firstly, in both cases, time is primarily linear in shape. Secondly, common to both is a three-fold division of time: (1) Time before the Creation; (2) Time from the Creation to the *parousia*; (3) Time after the *parousia*. In Judaism, however, there is only one mid-point of history, namely, the coming of the messiah. This constitutes the dividing line between the ‘present age’ and the ‘age to come’. While this division is not abandoned in the thought of primitive Christianity, it is intersected by a new one: the mid-point of time is no longer the future coming of the messiah, but rather the historical life and work of Jesus Christ, already concluded.

This conception of the Christ-event occurring in the mid-point of time effectively split in two the section of time between Creation and the parousia. As a result, the historical dispensation that follows the mid-point of history already belongs to the new age. However, in accordance with the existing threefold division of time, the final dispensation beginning with the parousia has not yet arrived. In that sense, the entire attitude towards time of primitive Christianity can be radically distinguished from that of Judaism:

The entire New Testament, including the Synoptic Gospels, holds the view that the mid-point of time no longer lies in the future but in the past, or in the present for Jesus and the apostles. This is true not only in the sense that all New Testament writings were written after Easter – this also to be sure, should be noticed, for even the Synoptic Gospels were written in the light of the Easter event, which had already occurred; it also holds true, as we have already seen, for Jesus himself. For him too, his coming signifies that the mid-point of the process has already

---

110 Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, 82.
111 Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, 81-82.
112 We shall see in Chapter 8 that Cullmann misrepresented the Jewish view of time. See also Licht, “Time and Eschatology”, 179-81.
113 Cullmann, *Christ and Time* 82; his emphasis.
been reached in his lifetime. Therefore he sees Satan already fallen from heaven, he already
expels demons “by the finger of God”, he heals the sick, he checks the power of death, he
forgives sins and explains that the Kingdom of God has already come, although he holds fast
on the other hand to the future character of this Kingdom.\(^{114}\)

Since the mid-point of time occurs prior to the final in-break of the age to come in
the parousia, Cullmann must explain the nature of the intermediate period that spans
till then. He offers a helpful scheme of time based on the chronological distinction
between D-Day and V-Day in World War II. Accordingly, in a war the decisive
battle may already have occurred at a relatively early stage (viz. ‘D-Day’) without
ending it. Further, the decisive effect of such a battle may not be recognized by all
parties involved. Nonetheless victory is already decided. Until ‘victory day’ (V-Day)
is reached, however, the war must continue for an intermediate but undefined period
of time.

Applied to the New Testament, this implies that the decisive battle has been won at
the mid-point of time in Jesus’ ministry, a battle during which the blind receive their
sight, the lame can walk, the lepers are healed and so forth. Ultimately, however, the
decisive battle converges at the mid-point of time in the death and resurrection of
Jesus.\(^{115}\) Cullmann claims that the quality of time issued from the mid-point onwards
is not ‘a new time’ which is created after Christ. What is new is not the quality of
time but the division of time. Since the new two-fold division of time does not do

similarity of his idea to that proposed by Kümmel that even for Jesus, the preaching that the Kingdom
of God is present stands with all emphasis alongside the preaching that the Kingdom of God is still to
come.

\(^{115}\) Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, 85.
away with the old division, believers found themselves in an already-but-not-yet eschatological tension at the present time:

Thus, we stand in a section of time in which we are already redeemed through Christ, in which we already have the Holy Spirit, who is characteristic of the new section of time, but in which also the sin characteristic of the entire period before the Parousia is not done away. Just as, before Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, in isolated instances, is already present in the prophets upon the basis of the divine anticipation, but really only as anticipation of the final state, just so sin is still present.\textsuperscript{116}

According to Cullmann, this eschatological tension was inherited by primitive Christianity from Jesus himself.\textsuperscript{117} The understanding that the mid-point is already in the past and that the present period is the ‘time between the decisive battle … and the “Victory Day”’ in the parousia, means that Christ has already ruled over all things. Yet, the Kingdom of God will begin ‘only at the end of the revelatory process’.\textsuperscript{118} The church in between these times is to be characterized by mission in which the gospel is proclaimed to the nations.\textsuperscript{119} The church is already empowered for its missionary responsibility by the gift of the Spirit and maintained in it by the hope of the resurrection.\textsuperscript{120}

In summary, Jesus’ earthly ministry as conceived by Cullmann is reduced to a geometrical point constituting the mid-point of time. In that sense, Cullmann’s assessment of the early believers’ view of time seems to have derived primarily from

\textsuperscript{116} Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 92.
\textsuperscript{117} Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 88.
\textsuperscript{118} Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 151.
\textsuperscript{119} See also Cullmann, ‘Eschatology and Missions’, 409-421.
\textsuperscript{120} Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 222-30., 231-42.
the Epistles rather than the Gospels.²¹¹ There may have been an implicit connection between the primitive Christian community and Jesus in this formulation of the concept of time but this is not absolutely clear from Cullmann.

2.2.2. Hans Conzelmann

If Cullmann’s *Christ and Time* is best known for its treatment of time in the New Testament, probably the best known advocate of the Gospel writers’ division of history is Conzelmann’s *Die Mitte der Zeit*²²² which has been translated into English under the unlikely title, *Theology of St. Luke*.²³³ Conzelmann sets out to assess two observations from the text of Luke’s Gospel: (1) whether the time of Jesus and the time of the church constitute two distinctive historical epochs; (2) whether there is a clear distinction between the time of the author of Luke and the ‘beginning’ of the time of the apostles.²⁴⁴

Conzelmann’s *Die Mitte der Zeit* was written to argue that the view of time advocated by Cullmann does not belong to the New Testament as a whole but is rather confined only to Luke’s two-volume work (i.e. *Luke* and *Acts of the Apostles*). According to Conzelmann, Luke abandoned the essence of Jesus’ imminent anticipation of the ‘end’ by dividing history into three consecutive epochs: the age of prophecy in the Old Testament; the mid-point of time in the coming of Jesus as fulfilment of prophetic expectation; and the time of the church, which embraces the

---

²¹¹ Indeed, Cullmann acknowledges that his notion of Christ as being the ‘mid-point’ of time was derived primarily from Galatians 3.6-4.7. See Cullmann, ‘Kingship of Christ’, 139. Robinson has noted that Paul takes the point of reference for his understanding of time from the death and resurrection of Jesus and not from the earthly ministry of Jesus. See Robinson, ‘Jesus’ Understanding’, 17-24.


present.\textsuperscript{125} In so structuring his work, Luke, according to Conzelmann, would have been able to set aside once and for all the scandal in the early church supposedly emerging from the delay of the parousia.\textsuperscript{126} Conzelmann is representative of many who believed that the delay of the parousia was a prominent crisis for believers in the first century in wake of the recognition that Jesus’ prediction of the imminent ‘end’ did not come to pass.\textsuperscript{127} As evident in Cullmann, so also in Conzelmann, Luke’s division of history cannot finally be traced to Jesus since the structure of the Gospel is supposed to reflect Luke’s theological creativity in trying to address a specific crisis emerging in their historical setting.

2.2.3. T. A. Burkill

A similar attempt to derive a philosophy of history, but this time from Mark, can be found in the work of Burkill who identifies four principal epochs in Mark’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{128} There is firstly the period of preparation which comes to an end with the imprisonment of John the Baptist. This is followed by the period of Jesus’ earthly ministry including his death and resurrection. The post-resurrection period follows, in which the gospel of the messianic status of Jesus is publicly proclaimed; this is followed by the period of eschatological fulfilment supposed to be gloriously inaugurated by the appearance of the Son of Man in his parousia.\textsuperscript{129} We shall offer a corrective to this view in our analysis of the horizon of Jesus’ time conception in Chapter 7.

\textsuperscript{125} See Conzelmann, \textit{Die Mitte}, 10-11, 192.
\textsuperscript{127} See Conzelmann, \textit{Theology of St. Luke}, 97. On the problem of the delay of the parousia see Grässer, \textit{Die Naherwartung}, 125-28; \textit{idem}, \textit{Das Problem}, 17-59. While Cullmann accepts that the delay of the parousia was possibly a problem in the first century, he nonetheless holds that it was a point of further development in the biblical salvation history since its beginning is already present in Jesus. In other words, even Jesus’ preaching already contains the supposition of a very short intermediate period lying between his death and the end. See Cullmann, \textit{Salvation}, 126, 236-48.
\textsuperscript{129} See Burkill, ‘Philosophy’, 143.
2.3. The Gospel Writers’ View of Time

A third way in which Jesus’ conception of time seems to be presupposed in New Testament scholarship is in the inquiry into the Gospel writers’ view of time.

2.3.1. Jindřich Mánek

On the basis of Marsh’s distinction between ‘realistic’ and ‘chronological’ time,130 Mánek argues that – with the possible exception of Luke (who appears to have employed a chronological conception of time in the structure of his presentation) – evangelists consistently utilized a ‘realistic’ view of time.131 According to a ‘realistic view’ of time, the value of the chronological dimension of time is relativised. The fundamental concern is not primarily with when an event took place but rather with what content the event has. The ‘content of time’ is supposed to be repetitive and is the same for people living in different chronological dispensations. Consequently, the ‘content’ of events in Jesus’ time is conceivably equivalent to the ‘content’ of events in the time of early Christianity and thus makes them ‘contemporaries’ even though, chronologically speaking, the historical Jesus antedates the early church. Ultimately therefore, the Gospels no longer depict the historical Jesus of Nazareth as their primary subject matter. Rather, they were written as historical accounts of the early church. In other words, the Gospels’ narrative of Jesus is in reality an allegorical account of the experience of the early church because according to a ‘realistic’ conception of time, the church and Jesus are coeval historically.

130 See Marsh, Fullness of Time, 21.
Mánek, as aforementioned, concedes that Luke did not conform to this realistic conception of time. Rather, Luke indicates how the chronological concept of time gradually began to overshadow the ‘realistic’ concept of time employed by earlier Gospel writers.\textsuperscript{132} Whereas the other evangelists produced only a Gospel, Luke – under the impact of a far more chronological perception of time – wrote two volumes, one following the other. Nevertheless, Mánek suspects that even Luke’s two-volume work is not absolutely free of elements identifiable with the life of the primitive church, due to Luke’s incorporation of materials from the life of the historic Jesus alongside those from the life of the early church.

Ultimately, for Mánek, Jesus’ view of time is utterly inaccessible from the Gospel material. Rather, the depiction of Jesus in the Gospels is, as we have seen, an allegorical portrait of the early church. Mánek’s position not only resembles a Platonistic view of time,\textsuperscript{133} it moreover asserts that the temporal framework of the Gospels is merely a medium for presenting the history of the early church.\textsuperscript{134}

\textbf{2.3.2. James M. Robinson}

A similar line of thinking is reflected in Robinson. Robinson claims that the Markan conception of ‘history after A.D. 30’ is of a continuation of the cosmic struggle with the Evil One in which Jesus was engaged, but now played out in the experience of earliest Christianity.\textsuperscript{135} In that sense, Robinson’s scenario of time from Mark is fundamentally similar to Mánek’s ‘realistic’ time scheme. Both attempt to specify a

\textsuperscript{132} See Mánek, ‘Biblical’, 49.
\textsuperscript{134} Cf. Linnemann, ‘Zeitansage’, 257. What Linnemann attributes to Jesus, namely, the conception of time as a means of communication, Mánek attaches to the Gospel writers.
\textsuperscript{135} See Robinson, \textit{Problem}, 43-85.
quality of time which is applicable for Jesus and also for the earliest believers. Nevertheless, Robinson seems to retain the chronological distinction between the ‘time of Jesus’ and that of the early church. In fact, Robinson affirms that the church’s historical experiences are predicted by Jesus in the so-called ‘Markan Apocalypse’.\textsuperscript{136}

Robinson’s analysis of Mark’s view of time implied that, for Jesus, time is the realm within which the cosmic struggle with the Evil One is ongoing.\textsuperscript{137} Nevertheless, Robinson seems to arrive at Jesus’ conception of time through what he supposed to be Mark’s understanding of time. Again, Jesus’ view of time is not dealt with in a more direct way from the Gospel data.

2.3.3. J. Edgar Bruns

A more symbolic construal of time in the Gospel with specific reference to John’s Gospel is advocated by Bruns. Following Lightfoot\textsuperscript{138} who holds that the topic of ‘time’ in John’s Gospel sometimes carries significance beyond its surface meaning, Bruns affirms that ‘[John] uses time throughout his gospel for its symbolic value’.\textsuperscript{139} Thus, when Jesus speaks of his ‘hour’ as now coming, he was in fact referring to the ‘hour to which the whole gospel has been pointing, the hour toward which human history had been converging, the hour when Jesus would be “raised up”, the hour of glorification’.\textsuperscript{140} According to this symbolic reading, the ‘day’ of Jesus is considered

\textsuperscript{136} See Robinson, Problem, 63.
\textsuperscript{137} There is a real sense, as indicated in Luke and in Josephus, that the basic struggle undergone by the Jews during Jesus’ time was evidently political and nationalistic in nature. Cf. Luke 13:3; Josephus, Ant. xviii. 3-5; J. W. ii. 1-10.
\textsuperscript{138} See Lightfoot, St. John’s, 103.
\textsuperscript{139} See Bruns, ‘Use of Time’, 290.
\textsuperscript{140} See Bruns, ‘Use of Time’, 289.
as the first day in the history of the church. Such a symbolic reading of the Gospel writer’s view of time, while helpful in determining a distinctive mode for understanding the Gospel material regarding Jesus’ view of time, would, on the other hand, lead to unnecessarily dispensing with references to calendrical time in John’s Gospel (1:39; 4:6; cf. 19:31).

2.3.4. Summary

In summary, we have seen that the discussion of Jesus’ conception of time has been largely implied but not directly addressed in three key areas: (1) the debate over the temporal reference of his proclamation of the Kingdom of God; (2) the scholarly considerations of the distinctive division of history of the Gospel writers; and (3) considerations of the specific conception of time of the Gospel writers.

In (1), the existence of a temporal component in Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom is presupposed. Scholars either embrace this temporal coordinate in Jesus’ proclamation and thus attribute it to a future, present or progressing time view, or they reject it and are forced to look for alternative descriptive models for understanding the eschatological dimension of Jesus’ proclamation. Whichever way scholars choose to construct their descriptions of the temporal component of Jesus’ message, it seems that more often than not, Jesus has been attributed a view of time more in line with philosophical frameworks than with thought patterns compatible with Jesus’ own first century Jewish religious and cultural matrix. Undoubtedly, the merit of Weiss’ and Schweitzer’s conjecture of Jesus’ Kingdom proclamation lies in

their recognition of the Jewishness of Jesus.\textsuperscript{142} The problem however lies in the understanding of the end of the world that Schweitzer seemed to espouse, namely, the end of the spatio-temporal continuum.\textsuperscript{143} Even the Jesus Seminar’s non-eschatological Jesus invokes a fundamental element of Jesus’ proclamation which seems to have been misunderstood by Schweitzer, namely, the possibility that Jesus did not expect the imminent end of the world.\textsuperscript{144} At least, not in the way Schweitzer had expected it.

On the other hand, those who infer Jesus’ view of time by evaluating the Gospel writers’ own conception of time as represented in (2) and (3) seem to be victims of the pervasive influence in biblical scholarship of a ‘scepticism masking itself as scholarship’.\textsuperscript{145} Such an attitude has tended to regard the view that the Gospels are the most reliable sources of eyewitness information about the historical Jesus with unwarranted scepticism.\textsuperscript{146} In the specific cases delineated above, it is taken as obvious that Jesus’ conception of time cannot be discovered through a rigorous examination of the Gospels. In any case, an impermeable wall of suspicion has been erected between the Gospels and the historical reality of Jesus. What is therefore pressingly needed for a more adequate depiction of Jesus’ conception of time is a ‘hermeneutics of reconciliation’; a hermeneutics that begins not with a sceptical distanciation from the Gospel texts but rather by seeking ‘to try to befriend the text’

\textsuperscript{142} This has eventually become the basis of the so-called ‘Third Quest’ of the Historical Jesus. See Evans, ‘Third Quest’, 532-60; Ladd, ‘Place of Apocalyptic’. 75-85; \textit{idem}, ‘Origin of Apocalyptic’, 140-46.
\textsuperscript{143} See our analysis of Jesus’ teaching about the end in Chapter 7.6.3.
\textsuperscript{144} See Wilson, \textit{When Will These Things}, 251-52.
\textsuperscript{145} See Evans, \textit{Fabricating Jesus}, 46.
and ask the question which the text itself poses.\textsuperscript{147} We shall attempt just such a hermeneutics, especially in Chapter 7 below.

2.4. Jesus’ Conception of Time in New Testament Scholarship

We wish now to survey Jesus’ view of time as it features in New Testament scholarship. Wright observes that this question has spilled more ink than anything else to do with discussions about the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{148} However, while the volume of literature dealing with the topic of time in scholarship is massive, there have been few, in comparison, that directly address Jesus’ conception of time. Here, we wish to focus on the more prominent representatives of this group.

2.4.1. Ernst Fuchs

Although Fuchs’ treatment of Jesus’ conception of time in his \textit{Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesu} comes under the title of ‘Das Zeitverständnis Jesu,’\textsuperscript{149} his main concern is more specifically ‘was Jesus von Gott zu sagen hatte’.\textsuperscript{150} Admittedly, Fuchs’ account of Jesus’ view of time is ‘at times opaque and appears to take place on several levels at once’\textsuperscript{151} but, in general, it is possible, despite the difficulty one might encounter in trying to understand the flow of Fuchs’ thinking, to discern a pattern of Jesus’ view of time from Fuchs.

\textsuperscript{147} Cf. Endres, ‘Spiritual Vision’, 5. Endres suggests a ‘hermeneutics of generosity’ which bears the same attitude that we propose here towards the text. I think what is envisaged in our ‘hermeneutics of reconciliation’ is best exemplified by Wright’s ‘critical realism’ approach to the Gospels. See Wright, \textit{New Testament}, 32-44. See also Meyer, \textit{Aims}, 95-110. It is based squarely on the scientific view of reality. See Mckenzie and Myers, ‘Dialectical’, 49-66.

\textsuperscript{148} See Wright, \textit{Jesus}, 467. What Wright has in view is the discussion of the temporal component of Jesus’ eschatological teaching which we have discussed in Chapter 2.1 above.

\textsuperscript{149} See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 305-76, ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 104-66. Even though Fuchs’ work has been translated into English, we shall draw on the German version here since his argument is stated more precisely therein but we will also include references from the English translation for those interested.

\textsuperscript{150} Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 304; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 104.

\textsuperscript{151} See Jackelén, \textit{Time}, 78.
Fuchs follows Bultmann in regarding the so-called ‘logia source’ consisting of the core passion narrative, a collection of individual sayings, parables and miracle narratives, to make up the oldest layer of the synoptic traditions. On the basis of this classification, Fuchs undertakes ‘an existential examination of the texts’ and their inter-relation with time. This existential approach is ostensibly based on a method he has developed elsewhere. His examination begins with the ‘saying of the raven’ (Luke 12:24; Matt 6:26). He concludes that such sayings bear the explicit marks of popular piety and of Jewish wisdom rather than those of eschatology. Hence, the relation of these sayings to the temporal dimension of the proclamation of Jesus highlights that ‘Denn Gottes Wirken bezieht sich gerade in diesen Worten auf die Gegenwart. Und für sie wird ja Glaube gefordert!* If faith in the Synoptic tradition is more related to the Jewish wisdom tradition than with Jewish eschatology, the question, according to Fuchs, has to be asked as to the connection of faith and eschatology in the teaching of Jesus: “Inwiefern galt Jesu eschatologische Verkündigung überhaupt dem Glauben? Anders formuliert: Vertragen sich Glaube und Eschatologie?”

Fuchs examines this question from the passage about ‘the warning about timely settlement’ (Luke 12.57-59; Matt 5:25-26). He observes that since there is an

---

152 See Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 81-109. In this sense, Fuchs’ treatment of Jesus’ understanding of time can be compared to Conzelmann’s treatment of time in Luke. They both acknowledge their indebtedness to Bultmann’s *Synoptic Tradition*. See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 304 n. 1; Conzelmann, *Die Mitte*, 1 n. 2.
admonition for timely settlement before it is too late in this passage, it implies the believers ‘having time’ in the ‘present’. The emphasis apparently falls on the present as ‘die letzte Zeit vor dem Gericht’. The ‘konkrete Gegenwart’ is inevitably to be used for ‘timely settlement before it is too late’, that is, before Judgment comes. Fuchs stresses however that ‘Die Zukunft ist in diesem Falle also nicht an die Gegenwart angestückt, sondern die Gegenwart ist der Vorläufer der Zukunft’. The present is more important than the future ‘weil und sofern sich in ihr unsere Beziehung zur Zukunft entscheidet’.

Having established that the earliest strand of Jesus’ teaching concerns itself primarily with the present rather than the future, Fuchs develops his argument by inquiring into the sense in which the present can be understood eschatologically. He turns to Matthew 25:31-46. Fuchs follows Bultmann in reading this passage as a reflection of Jewish moral teaching, namely, that humanity must act like God (cf. Isa 58:7). In that light, the present can be viewed as ‘die Zeit zur Entscheidung, d. h. die Zeit zu radikalem Gehorsam einräumt’. Obedience, according to Fuchs, assumes that we can freely come to a decision. ‘Wofür? Eben für die Gegenwart! Nicht nur in der Gegenwart! Für welche Gegenwart? Für die eschatologisch gesehen!’

Since the freedom for decision making, according to Fuchs, can only be experienced in the present, he insists that we can no longer ignore the present as is necessarily the
case resulting from an over-emphasis on the *Naherwartung* (‘near expectation’). For Fuchs, to so emphasize *Naherwartung* as the conceptual grid for understanding Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God, as Bultmann, for example, does, results in a *reductio ad absurdum* of the present to a mathematical point of transition to the future: ‘Andersfalls wäre die Gegenwart ja nur ein Raum, den man möglichst rasch zu verlassen hätte. Sie wäre nur eine Zeit des Übergangs, nur Vorbereitung’. As long as the conviction of *Naherwartung* prevails as the primary reference of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation, Fuchs believes that we shall continue to flee from ourselves, that is to say, from the present. *Naherwartung* instills a legitimate anxiety in us due to its appeal to time and its limitation.

On the contrary, if the present is understood as the ‘eschatological present’, we are consequently summoned to accept the present and its limitation acquiring therewith the full freedom to live within it. According to Fuchs therefore, the incentive for living in the present should no longer result from our anxiety about the limitation of time as imposed upon us by *Naherwartung*. Rather, the ethical impulse for our lives should emerge from our present experience of reading biblical texts:

\[\text{Das ist dann eschatologisch gesehene Gegenwart! Sie ist eschatologisch gesehen, nicht weil ich in naher Zukunft etwas erwartet, sondern weil ich durch ein Wort wie dieses Gleichnis von} \]

---

166 The crucial issues relating to this aspect of Jesus’ teaching are addressed in Grässer, *Die Naherwartung*, 84-85; *idem*, *Das Problem*, 3-8, 76.


Since the ‘present is our business’ and not the future, Fuchs sets out to show the inadequacy of seeing *Naherwartung* as the proper motivation for living in the present.¹⁷⁰

Fuchs begins by addressing himself to the question regarding the futurist element of Jesus’ teaching. He turns to Bultmann’s insistence that *Naherwartung* confronts us in the present with ‘the call for decision’; that is, the decision to repent.¹⁷¹ In response, Fuchs observes that in the New Testament as well as the early church, the call for repentance is always accompanied by the demand for baptism. This implies that repentance has no apparent connection with the ‘near expectation’ of the coming reign of God which, according to Bultmann, will ‘destroy the present course of the world’.¹⁷²

Fuchs points out that while on the basis of form criticism we cannot be certain whether Jesus or John began their ministry with the call to repentance, it can nevertheless be affirmed ‘dass die christliche Gemeinde den Bussruf mit der Taufverkündigung zusammenbrachte’.¹⁷³ Fuchs finds support for his insight from Qumran. Even though ‘near expectation’ was foundational to the conviction of Qumran, Fuchs claims that its intricate link to a call for repentance similar to what is

¹⁶⁹ Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 317-18; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 115. His emphasis.
found in the synoptic tradition is altogether lacking. Rather than connecting it with the ‘near expectation’ of the reign of God, Fuchs suggests that since the call for repentance belongs together with baptism (and not with ‘near expectation’) in the early church, the synoptic teaching on repentance must have been rooted in the early Christian mission’s demand for conversion and not in Jesus’ preaching.

At once, Fuchs is confronted with passages such as Matthew 4.17, Luke 11:20 and their parallel renditions in Matthew 12:28; Luke 6:20-21 and Matthew 5:3-12 in which the call for repentance is clearly tied to Jesus’ proclamation of the ‘near expectation’ of the kingdom. While affirming the centrality of the announcement of the kingdom’s ‘near expectation’ in Jesus’ proclamation, Fuchs nonetheless asserts that it is highly questionable to attribute these passages to Jesus because the proclamation of the nearness of the kingdom largely belongs to John the Baptist and the early Christian community and decidedly not to Jesus. This latter point, namely, the absence of the problem of the delay of the parousia in Jesus, is developed more fully when Fuchs turns to specifically address Jesus’ understanding of time. It is here that Fuchs’ indebtedness to Martin Heidegger is more obvious. On the basis of Heidegger, ‘existence’ is defined as ‘being-alongside-another’. Jesus’ proclamation, according to Fuchs, concerned itself with existence

---

174 Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 324.
175 Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 325; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 122. Due to his determination to emphasize the eschatological ‘present’, Fuchs is somewhat careless with his exegesis at this point. A better solution has been provided by Delling. While he acknowledges that the delay of the parousia was a problem in the early church, he affirms that it did not cause such a fundamental crisis amongst them. See Delling, Zeitverständnis, 118-120. See also Grässer, Die Naherwartung, 51.
177 See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 336-37; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 131-33. This seems to be based on Heidegger’s notion of ‘being-towards-death’. On the influence of death on Heidegger’s notion of time, see Alweiss, ‘Heidegger’, 121-22.
understood as an event. This event consists of a ‘decision’, as Bultmann stresses, but rather than a ‘decision to repent’, Fuchs inveighs that it is ‘die Entscheidung für “Jesu Zeitverständnis”’.\footnote{Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 337; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 132.}

Jesus’ understanding of time, according to Fuchs, is ultimately derived from the parables.\footnote{Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 337-38.} In the parable of the ‘seed which grows automatically until the harvest’ (Mark 4:26-29), for example, the earth upon which the seed is sown is God himself and the farmer corresponds to the believer.\footnote{See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 338.} While the farmer is free to sleep day and night, the earth (= God) allows time to work for the farmer in the sense that the farmer gains time.\footnote{Cf. Jülicher, Die Gleichnisered, II: 581.} Fuchs draws on Ecclesiastes 3:1. Since ‘everything has its time’, there is the time for the sowing, time for the growth and time for the harvest and time for the farmer to be freed up for other business. Moreover, since the earth (= God) gives the farmer time, it therefore releases him from being anxious for the future. Just as the farmer is given time by the earth, which is entrusted with the process of growth leading towards the harvest, so also the believer is given time for the dissemination of the gospel: ‘Inzwischen gewinnt aber der Bauer seinerseits Zeit, weil die Erde die Zeit für ihn arbeiten lässt, nämlich im Wachsen bis zum Zeitpunkt der Ernte, die dann wieder ihre eigene Zeit mitbringen wird.’\footnote{Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 338; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 133.} Such a viewpoint, according to Fuchs, would naturally unburden the early believers of any concern about the delay of the parousia: ‘Wenn alles seine Zeit hat, so werden Christen auch warten können’.\footnote{Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 339; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 134.}
Since everything has its own time, Fuchs is able to distinguish between the present and the future. The present is not only the last time before judgment; it is also the time for God’s call to salvation. Thus, there can be no more explicit expression of obedience in the present than to accept that call since this ‘eschatological present’ is confined by God’s future, that is, by the Kingdom.\(^{184}\) This is not to say that the present and the future stand in chronological relation. Fuchs refuses to allow for such temporal continuity because of its tendency to reduce the present simply to a point of mere transition to the future.\(^{185}\) The present corresponds to the future, according to Fuchs, in the sense that each has its own time – the present as a time for God’s call; the future as the time for God’s coming.\(^{186}\) However, the present, according to Fuchs, is ‘eine chronologisch unmögliche Zeit’ since it is vulnerable to being reduced merely to a mathematical point.\(^{187}\) But to do this, according to Fuchs, is no longer to do justice to the expression ‘time between times’ because ‘time between times’ is not a mathematical point but rather a dialectical relation. Jesus’ ‘time between times’ is therefore a unique situation. In fact, ‘Jesus nimmt seine Zeit als Gegenwart vor Gottes Kommen so in Anspruch, dass er sie jeder andern Zeit entgegengestellt’.\(^{188}\)

Fuchs concludes his discussion of Jesus’ view of time with an inquiry into the nature of love. He stresses that Jesus’ ‘word’ which calls people was no less than ‘the time-word’.\(^{189}\) The word which love speaks is the word of promise. It is the lover’s wish that the beloved take him according to his word. Hence, love gives time as a gift and

\(^{184}\) Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 359; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 151.
\(^{185}\) Fuchs, ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 122-23, 144, 158. This is the basis of his dissatisfaction with Bultmann’s presentation of Jesus’ proclamation. See ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 123; ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 326. Fuchs distinguishes between the ‘time in which one moves’ and the ‘time which is defined…by a definite content’.
\(^{186}\) Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 351; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 144.
\(^{188}\) Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 367; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 158.
\(^{189}\) Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 367; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 159.
can therefore wait. Fuchs claims that Jesus’ understanding of time is of this kind: ‘Von dieser Art ist Jesu Zeitverständnis. Es ist nur in seinem Wort zugänglich, weil sein Wort ein Wort der Liebe war.’\textsuperscript{190} This, for Fuchs, constitutes the uniqueness of Jesus’ time. Just as love distinguishes between the present and the future by giving time in the form of a promise, so also Jesus distinguishes between the present and the future. In this distinction, however, the past is abolished because Jesus’ word is primarily a call which is appropriated in the present. The present is therefore the time of those who have been called. The future is the time of God which does not impose a sense of urgency in the present.\textsuperscript{191} Our calling is in fact to be free for the present and to live alongside time always with the temporal limit of the present in view, which is dialectically understood as the future.

In summary, Fuchs argues against Bultmann’s insistence on the fundamental importance of ‘near expectation’ (\textit{Naherwartung}) for understanding the eschatological element of Jesus’ proclamation that it is not the near expectation of the Kingdom which is meant to be the primary concern of believers. Rather, believers’ proper concern is the eschatological present during which they respond to Jesus’ call with a decision of faith. Nevertheless, the present, according to Fuchs, as the time of Jesus’ call and of believers’ faithful response to him, is a chronologically ‘impossible time’ because it does not chronologically precede the future. That is to say, the present and the future do not relate in a sequential fashion but rather in a dialectical correspondence. The believers’ business, according to Fuchs, is to live and to enjoy the present, just as the future is God’s. While Fuchs is able to free himself from Bultmann’s emphasis on near expectation he stops short of completely

\textsuperscript{190} Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 368; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 160.

\textsuperscript{191} See Fuchs, ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 163.
liberating himself from the existential framework which definitively shapes Bultmann’s interpretation of the New Testament.192

This latter tendency is where the main weakness of Fuchs’ treatment of Jesus’ conception of time lies. That a first century Jew such as Jesus would be influenced by a twentieth century philosophical framework is undoubtably anachronistic. Ultimately, it is an imposition on the biblical data of a conceptual framework incompatible with the Jewish eschatological framework discernible in the Gospels.193 Moreover, Fuchs’ restriction of his sources for determining the essential features of Jesus’ understanding of time in keeping with Bultmann’s form-critical emphasis effectively impoverished his estimation of this important aspect of Jesus’ teaching. By focusing on what he considered to be the ‘earliest strand’ of the synoptic tradition, namely, parables, he has left a substantial segment of the Synoptic data unaccounted for, namely, the narrative of Jesus’ ministry. It is this abandoned segment of the Gospel data that we wish to bring to bear upon the discussion of Jesus’ understanding of time.

2.4.2. Eta Linnemann

Fuchs’ description of Jesus’ conception of time is further developed by Eta Linnemann.194 She affirms that the tension between the present and the future in the teaching of Jesus regarding the nearness of the Kingdom of God cannot be resolved by the chronological framework of time that has been traditionally associated with

---

193 See Chapter 7.6.4.
194 It is probably fair to indicate that the view attributed to Eta Linnemann here is considered by her as constitutive of the ‘past’ from which she has now deliberately and publicly distanced herself. See Yarbrough, ‘Eta Linnemann’, 158-84. See also Linnemann, Synoptic Problem; idem, ‘Gospel of Q?’, 19-23, 42 for Linnemann’s newer standpoint.
the discussion of the eschatological nature of Jesus’ proclamation. Against Jeremias, Kümmel and Grässer, Linnemann insists that there is no evidence for a near expectation of the *parousia* in Jesus’ kingdom proclamation. Rather, she argues that the passages exhibiting a presentist element and those that proclaim a futurist component of Jesus’ teaching in the Gospels contradict each other. This contradiction, Linnemann insists, cannot simply be resolved by downplaying the near expectation of the reign of God as Fuchs does. To resolve this contradiction, she conceives of time as a social phenomenon and attributes to *kairos* what she believes to be the more original meaning of time ‘als Zeit-zu, als Sein bei, als Gegen-war’. This quality of time is couched in terminologies that reflect Fuchs’ influence as ‘being in relation with’ or ‘being present’ in relation to something.

In this view of time, the distinction between present and the future becomes obsolete since time is understood socially as time in relation to something. The social relationship Linnemann envisaged is that between Jesus and his hearer in the present but not in connection with the near expectation of the kingdom. This relationship can only begin when the hearer makes a decision for the proclamation of Jesus, a decision for faith. Hence, the temporal aspect of Jesus’ proclamation is not a conception in its own right but rather a *Sprachmöglichkeit* (‘language possibility’).

Both Jesus and his hearers found themselves in a common situation: ‘Die Situation,'
welche Jesus vorfand, war konstituiert durch eine allgemeine und intensive apokalyptische Erwartung’.\(^{205}\) This ‘intensive apokalyptische Erwartung’, according to Linnemann, produces ‘eine starke eschatologische Spannung’ that demands the appropriation of Jesus’ proclamation.

From the vantage point of the ‘outcome’, namely, faith in the proclamation of Jesus, the supposition of a near expectation functions not in a historical framework but primarily an existential framework where it induces a ‘situation’ common to Jesus and his hearers. In other words, the near expectation of the kingdom is no longer an impending future catastrophe that imposes the urgency of repentance in the present since the time-binding element of Jesus’ message has no temporal force. Rather, it is only by the common situation of Jesus and the hearer that the hearer is challenged with Jesus’ kingdom announcement. It is in precisely this way that Jesus’ proclamation functions as a ‘speech-event’ (Sprachgeschehen) that confronts the hearer not by its time-connection but rather by its connection with the possibility of faith every time the proclamation is heard: ‘Als Sprachgeschehen ist die Verkündigung Jesu nicht tradierbar; es erwies sich aber, dass dieses Sprachgeschehen wiederholbar war. Es kam zu einer “Sprachgeschichte” des Glaubens’.\(^{206}\)

It is here that Fuchs’ emphasis on the present becomes evident.\(^{207}\) For the ‘speech-event’ which gives the hearer the possibility of believing is indeed the proclamation of the message of Jesus in the present situation of the hearer whether it is the present

---

\(^{205}\) Linnemann, ‘Zeitansage’, 262.

\(^{206}\) Linnemann, ‘Zeitansage’, 263. This is a point which Linnemann has developed more fully in Linnemann, Parables, 30-31.

\(^{207}\) See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 347.
in the time of Jesus or the contemporary situation of today. Linnemann’s special contribution in this regard is the recognition that the effectiveness of Jesus’ proclamation on his hearers did not depend on the near expectation component of his message but rather on the possibility of faith that it offers every time his message is heard whether in its oral or written form. In this way, the force of the near expectation of the kingdom is dampened because people come to the decision of faith not because of the legitimate anxiety about the imminence of the kingdom but through the effectiveness of the ‘speech-event’ itself in the hearer’s present. Here, we can almost hear Fuchs’ insistence that the motivation for the Christian life in the present time does not necessarily come from the near expectation of the Kingdom of God but rather from the ‘speech-event’ that brings it about by reading the text of Jesus’ proclamation.208

2.4.3. Eberhard Jüngel

Alongside Fuchs and Linnemann is Jüngel’s reconstruction of Jesus’ conception of time.209 Jüngel agrees with Fuchs and Linnemann that the distinctive nature of Jesus’ view of time is the more primary experience of time as ‘time for.’ This understanding of time is to be distinguished from the purely chronological view. According to Jüngel, the notion of time as ‘time for’ is particularly relevant for theology insofar as we think of God’s relation with humanity as a temporal relation in which God who is

208 See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 347; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 141. While Linnemann uses the terms Sprachmöglichkeit and Sprachgeschehen, Fuchs maintains the term Sprachereignis to express basically the same idea, namely, that the word of Jesus has a binding effect on the hearers and the hearers’ response of faith is a kind of ‘holding on’ to this binding effect of the ‘word that gives because it gives itself’. According to Fuchs, the power of ‘das Wort, dass gibt’ is found in, (1) the truthfulness of God (i.e. he can be taken on his word), and; (2) the ‘gift’ character of his word (i.e. it is a word that gives specifically and unsurpassably to address the hearers unconditionally).

209 See Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus; idem, ‘Dogmatic Significance’, 82-119.
ever present in the ‘now’ and the measurement of the distance between specifically designated ‘nows’ can always relate ‘only to inner-worldly entities’. 210

Jüngel claims that when Jesus announces the nearness of Kingdom of God, there are two levels of ‘nows’ involved. On the one hand, there is God’s ‘now’ and, on the other, the human ‘now’. The two ‘nows’ are incommensurable. God’s ‘now’ in contradistinction to humans’ ‘now’ cannot be measured in terms of movement of space or distance of time. God in fact is already too near to us, so that the measurable distance of before and after (i.e. of God’s coming near to us) becomes meaningless. According to Jüngel, it is in this way that Jesus understood his proclamation of the Kingdom:

> What we know historically about Jesus is this: that he understood the coming of the Kingdom of God, from which he himself ek-sisted (sic) totally and completely, as the event of an adventus [coming] in which the measurable difference between before and after becomes meaningless. The Kingdom of God is already too near for that. The coming of the Kingdom of God is for him the event of the coming-to-the-world of the God who reigns, and as such an event of direct nearness, of an unsurpassable nearness in the horizon of the world’s time. 211

While we may remain at a distance from an event declared by God, it is already happening before God. Thus, we can never speak about the future in relation to Jesus’ understanding of time as if there is a stretch of time between him and some temporal point in the future. Rather, the future is really the present in Jesus. On the basis of the Rabbinic anticipation of the abh · l yw (‘coming age’) corresponding to the time of the Messiah, Jüngel argues that this ‘ferne Zukunft’ has become in Jesus’

---

proclamation of the Kingdom of God a ‘nahe Zukunft’, so much so that the distance between the present and the future no longer applies:

Die in der Olam-Terminologie unter dem Begriff des abh vorgestellte ferne Zukunft wird an die in dem Begriff der Gottesherrschaft beschlossene nahe Zukunft gebunden, so dass jede apokalyptische oder theologische Distanz zwischen der Gegenwart und jener Zukunft ent-fern ist: Die Zukunft ist als die nahe Zukunft direkt zur Gegenwart; sie kennt keine Zeit-Zwischen-Räume.  

Fuchs, as we have seen, argues against Bultmann’s emphasis on near expectation (Naherwartung) for the significance of the present as a self-contained duration which is no longer conceived of in chronological relation to the past or the future. Jüngel presses Fuchs’ presentist emphasis a little further by viewing the present as the eschatological future time. The present is indeed the expected endless future, the age to come. Since the present, according to Jüngel, is also the eschatological future, no longer is there any near expectation of the future. We are already living in the future.

In that sense, Jüngel’s reconstruction of Jesus’ view of time effectively reduces to absurdity the language of ‘nearness’ or ‘farness’ in Jesus’ proclamation. If the present is indeed the future then, according to Jüngel, there is an apparent paradigm shift entailed in Jesus’ kingdom proclamation, namely, a return from the chronological to the original understanding of time as time for. In other words, the present and the future are no longer arranged consecutively. Rather, the present and

---

212 See Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus, 180. His emphasis. Jüngel acknowledges his indebtedness to Bultmann, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, 4 on this point.

213 This in fact is a reaction against Cullmann’s ‘time between the times’. See Grässer, Die Naherwartung, 76.

214 Jüngel, ‘Dogmatic Significance’, 105. His emphasis.
the future are ‘nows’ in the sense that the present as humanity’s ‘now’ is the time for repentance and the future as God’s ‘now’ is the time for announcing glad tidings. These ‘nows’ coalesce to constitute the present time. If indeed the future is already the present then it underscores the urgency of Jesus’ message:

Only from the fact that the coming of the Kingdom proclaimed by Jesus renders meaningless the measurable distinctions between before and after does the urgency of this proclamation become understandable. It is the urgency of joyful tidings.²¹⁵

Again, as we have observed in Fuchs and similarly in Linnemann, Jüngel’s proposal appears to be another response to Bultmann’s emphasis on the near expectation of the kingdom, aiming to strip it of its status as the underlying motivation that lends the message of Jesus its relevance and urgency in the present. For Jüngel, the fact that God has come too near in Jesus’ kingdom proclamation stripped his message of its near expectation component. Since now is the future, we no longer live with a near expectation of the future, being already there.

2.4.4. Joseph Arthur Baird

Baird’s analysis of Jesus’ conception of time is also to some extent grounded in the existential philosophical framework that has influenced Fuchs, Linnemann and Jüngel. Baird observes that Jesus views time from what seem to be two vantage points – the human and the divine: ‘It is as if at times he talked of these matters from a human point of view, and then suddenly baffles us by speaking from a plane of reference that cuts across the human scene in a strange, oblique direction, from a

²¹⁵ Jüngel, ‘Dogmatic Significance’, 107. His emphasis.
point of vantage beyond the human’. Following Barth, Baird takes horizontal time to refer to human time and vertical time to be spiritual time. While spiritual time cuts across the horizontal plane of time ‘from above’ these temporal axes, according to Baird, ‘represent the cosmological dimensions of physical and spiritual applied to chronology and are thoroughly complementary’. On the horizontal temporal plane, Jesus’ language about time is limited on the ‘left’ side of the time-line by the ‘beginning of creation’ and on the ‘right’ side by the *eschaton*. Baird claims that for Jesus, the past is perceived only ‘in its relation to the present as a horizontal tension between promise and fulfilment’.

When Baird comes to analyze Jesus’ understanding of the present, his indebtedness to the existential philosophical framework is more obvious. He thinks that for Jesus, ‘every current moment is a time of crisis, every age an “age of decision”’. Jesus saw the ‘now’ of history as being filled with God’s crisis presence because of the impending judgment of God. It is therefore necessary that the ‘now’ of history becomes a time for decision, as Bultmann insists, because in the historic future lies the eschatological consummation of all things which, for Baird, is God’s judgment.

Whereas Fuchs wishes to abandon any chronological relationship between the present and the future, Baird firmly maintains the sequential arrangement of present and future time: ‘It would seem that Jesus was indeed interested in the continuation

---

218 Baird, *Justice*, 95. It is Barth’s insistence on this ‘vertical’ dimension of time as missing from Cullmann’s *Christ and Time* that forces Cullmann to revise his view of time as linear horizontal to one with a ‘crooked line’ shape. See Cullmann, *Salvation*, 15, 125. As far as I am concerned, this revision has not been widely acknowledged in New Testament scholarship.
219 Baird, *Justice*, 97. Baird is not absolutely clear as to how the ‘past’ in terms of the ‘beginning in creation’ stands in relation to the promise and fulfilment framework. This is an issue we shall address as our argument unfolds.
of history, and to deny him such a concern is to excise or twist a large body of evidence’.  

In fact, in the Gospels Baird observes that Jesus has a very real concern for time in the horizontal sense bounded by creation on the one hand and the eschaton on the other. Moreover, this linear pattern of time will continue ‘till heaven and earth pass away’ (Matt 5:18; 24:3). At the end stands the ‘hour’ which Jesus describes only as fulfilment and judgment. Thus, humanity’s ‘now’ is, in Baird’s view, ‘a valley of decision, fraught with the tension of crisis’.  

Baird acknowledges that the vertical dimension of Jesus’ conception of time is a far more difficult element to grasp. Nevertheless, he claims that Jesus’ distinctive contribution to the Jewish understanding of time rests more specifically on his notion of the vertical dimension of time. Jesus’ conception of time, according to Baird, cannot be intricately linked to a pre-Copernican, pre-Einsteinian or even a post-Einsteinian cosmology. He contends rather that Jesus fits in more strikingly with the conceptual symbols of twentieth-century cosmological thought forms. Baird claims that Jesus views the relation between space and time in terms of a ‘spiritual continuum’ where the coordinates of time and space operate according to the axioms of the Spirit in a ‘curved theological space’ from which all is viewed from the perspective of the God who is Lord of time and history.

221 See Baird, Justice, 99.
222 Baird, Justice, 112.
223 Baird, Justice, 113: ‘This vertical, spiritual view of time is one of the most difficult aspects of Jesus’ theology to understand’.
224 See Baird, Justice, 113.
225 Baird, Justice, 114: ‘Much that Jesus had to say, especially in the realm of “vertical cosmology”, the very heart of his creative addition to Judaism finds strikingly accurate conceptual symbols in twentieth-century physical cosmology’.
226 Baird, Justice, 115. Baird’s insight on this point finds close affinity with the conceptual framework of T. F. Torrance. See Torrance, Incarnation, passim; idem, Resurrection.
Baird’s analysis of Jesus’ view of time concludes with a discussion of eternity. He admits that of all Synoptic expressions indicating the vertical component of Jesus’ understanding of time, the term ‘eternity’ or ‘age’ is the clearest. There are four ways, according to Baird, in which Jesus employs this term: (1) To refer to time as an indefinitely repeated horizontal series of time; (2) To refer to the world as a time-space reality between creation and the *eschaton*; (3) To refer to a non-spiritual, immortal realm of time and space set in opposition to the realm of God; (4) To refer to the eternal presence of God to whom all time is immediately related. In other words, the vertical dimension of Jesus’ view of time as expressed by the word ‘eternity’ is a supra-historical phenomenon which includes temporal, spatial and supernatural in its conceptual stretch.

2.4.5. J. Dominic Crossan

A determinative influence in Crossan’s analysis of Jesus’ understanding of time is the conviction that time in the Bible is defined as ‘time for something’ and Heidegger’s notion of ‘*Ereignis*’ in which the coming of the kingdom constitutes ‘the power of a *present* which is now really and truly an *action*’. In application to Jesus’ parables, Crossan argues that Jesus experienced the Kingdom of God in terms of three simultaneously related modes of existence: revelation, revolution and resolution:

The experience of God’s rule comes to Jesus as revelation, as gracious and joyous gift from God. But it also comes as involving the radical reappraisal of past views and values, as a

---

revolution at the very centre of his existence. Because of this it also comes as demanding a resolution, as challenging to immediate response and acceptance.\textsuperscript{230}

These existential modalities, according to Crossan, constitute the essential temporality of the Kingdom experience. As revelation, the experience of God’s rule creates and discloses a future. This future illuminates the past of one’s personal experience and thus revolutionizes it. Once the past is overturned, there emerges a demand for a resolution, which determines the present mode of one’s personal existence.\textsuperscript{231}

These modes of one’s experience do not occur exactly in the sequence in which they are depicted. Rather, Crossan insists that they are simultaneous modes of the one personal experience. Jesus’ conception of time is presented in his parables according to these three modes of existential experience. They constitute, according to Crossan, the ‘ontological temporality and radical historicity of Jesus’ situation’ which can be reiterated in one’s personal experience at any given point in time. That is to say, the temporal modes reflected in Jesus’ parables abolish the chronological distinction between past, present and future by replacing them with modes of experience constituting a ‘situation’ which can occur simultaneously in one’s personal experience. Crossan therefore concludes:

With this structure the parables verbalize poetically Jesus’ own experience of God’s rule. The hearer or reader is drawn into participation in this experience and challenged, and empowered

\textsuperscript{230} See Crossan, ‘Parable’, 353.
\textsuperscript{231} In his \textit{In Parables}, these modes of existential experience assumed the form of ‘advent’; the advent of the kingdom opens up new world and unforeseen possibilities for the hearer. As a result of this advent, the hearer ‘reverses’ his past in order to obtain the future that has been revealed by the advent. This advent and reversal in turn give him a new world of life and ‘action’ which he did not have before. In that sense, the kingdom’s advent dictates the present by making it a ‘time for action’. See Crossan, \textit{In Parables}, 34.
to establish thereby his own historicity in the gift of the revelation, the awe of the revolution, and the strength of the resolution. The rest is commentary and can be best epitomized in one all-embracing formula: He who has ears to hear, let him hear.  

Thus, whenever Jesus’ parables are heard, the audience is confronted with the possibility of participation in Jesus’ experience of God’s rule. In that way, Jesus’ historicity is established, not objectively, but subjectively through the re-enactment of Jesus’ experience in the hearer’s own experience. Jesus, according to Crossan’s scenario of time, appears simply to be a figment of the believers’ own existential experience of his parabolic teachings. Moreover, in keeping with the trend discernible in Fuchs, Linnemann and Jüngel, the near expectation component of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation is implicitly replaced by a transformed attitude towards the present effected by the advent of the Kingdom in hearing the parables.

2.4.6. A. E. Harvey

For Harvey, Jesus’ view of time was simply that of a deluded fanatic looking desperately to provide meaning for his own teaching and its impact on its hearer by prophesying the imminence of the end of the world that did not come to pass. Harvey claims that Jesus sees the necessity of talking about the end of the world as a traditional cultural trait identifiable with the Old Testament prophets, who must warn their contemporaries of an imminent end occurring at a still unknown moment roughly within their own generation in order to invest the present with meaning and urgency. Jesus insists on the imminent end since he sees that it necessarily provides the story of his ministry with its overarching meaning. According to

---

233 See Harvey, Jesus.
234 See also Kermode, Sense, 3-31.
Harvey, however, the end which Jesus predicted did not come to pass. Despite the best efforts of biblical scholars to provide alternative explanations to the meaning of Jesus’ prediction, Harvey insists that we must allow for the embarrassing fact that Jesus was indeed wrong about the end he so firmly anticipated.235

Why then was Jesus’ credibility maintained? Harvey observes a remarkable similarity in the preservation of Jesus’ teachings and the reception of prophetic predictions in the Old Testament. The prophets, so the argument goes, consistently predict the end not to be far away in time but as imminent in order to ensure that their message has relevance upon their contemporaries. Similar to Jesus’ prediction of the end, most of these prophetic predictions of course failed to be fulfilled precisely in accordance with their terms. However, this did not result in the falsification of the prophets or in their teachings being repudiated. Rather, the credibility of their message was maintained due to the validity of its interpretation of the present in the light of an imminent end.236

Similarly, Jesus’ prediction of the kingdom coming in power during his generation, even though it did not take place, nevertheless retains its credibility. Such teachings gain an abiding significance as means for stimulating moral and religious conduct in the light of a possible future crisis in every subsequent ‘now’. Harvey likens the crisis effect of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation to a number of contemporary phenomena: (1) Contemporary doomsday ‘prophets’ alerting us to the possible threat

235 ‘Our embarrassment when we read this saying [Mk. 9:1] is caused by the fact that it was not fulfilled’. Harvey, Jesus, 88. ‘These people [followers of Jewish sectarian religions in the time of Jesus] may have been sensible and sophisticated in their way, but their attitude to time and history is not merely difficult for us to enter into: it was wrong. Their predictions were never fulfilled’. Harvey, Jesus, 71.
236 See Harvey, Jesus, 90.
of nuclear war and of environmental catastrophe if necessary measures are not immediately and urgently taken now to secure a more desirable future; (2) The basic element of the Marxist message that a future socialist state is not a distant utopian ideal which may one day be brought to fulfilment but which is an achievable goal even within a generation if it can be preceded by a violent overthrow of the existing structures of society. Common to these contemporary prophetic patterns of thought is the option of a time-scale which is open to them exactly in the same manner as in the case of the biblical prophets and Jesus:

Their message is necessarily of a catastrophic event which will take place in this very generation unless strenuous measures are taken to avert it – indeed unless (as they may well put it) there is a fundamental change of heart. They may be wrong. This generation may (we pray it will) pass without bringing destruction on itself. But such a delay would by no means discredit the prophets. For we can all see the truth of a message which interprets the present time in terms of a highly probable future, instead of regarding it merely as a series of opportunist steps in a direction which cannot be certainly charted.\(^{237}\)

Similarly, Jesus’ message of the kingdom and the radical transformation he predicted did not come to pass. Yet its abiding implication remains: ‘Live joyfully, responsibly, to the full; but never lose sight of that crisis, that dénouement, that ending which alone makes sense of the present, and which affects your living precisely because it is a possibility every day of your life’.\(^{238}\)

This, for Harvey, is the ‘constraint of history’ to which Jesus exposed himself during his earthly ministry. He did not speak merely as a teacher about the kingdom but also

\(^{237}\) See Harvey, *Jesus*, 95.
\(^{238}\) See Harvey, *Jesus*, 95.
as a prophet. Even though, according to Harvey, Jesus was wrong about the end, the imminence of the end of the world that his teachings emphasized undoubtedly assists his contemporaries towards responsible living in the present. In that sense, Jesus’ view of time must be appreciated not because it can ever be validated from the historical continuum. Rather, its significance lies in its pragmatic value for the present; both of Jesus and of the contemporary situation: ‘Jesus spoke as a prophet: that is to say, he gave significance to the present time by relating it, through both word and deed, to a future world-order in which the power of evil and the social priorities are reversed’. In that sense, the message about the end of the world is only important inasmuch as it gives meaning to the present time.

In the final analysis, Jesus’ view of time as expounded by Harvey is sustainable only if Schweitzer’s ‘thoroughgoing eschatology’ is confirmed. However, many New Testament specialists have demonstrated the inadequacy of Schweitzer’s depiction of Jesus’ scenario of the future and thus maintained that Jesus did expect life to continue after his death and resurrection (e.g. Mark 2:19-20; 14:25).

2.4.7. James M. Robinson

The existentialist approach to Jesus’ view of time which we have seen in Fuchs, Jüngel, Linnemann, Baird and Crossan is also evident in Robinson’s contribution to

---

239 ‘Surely there can be no virtue in twentieth-century people like ourselves committing ourselves to the same naive attitudes and exposing ourselves to the certain consequences of being proved, as they were, utterly mistaken. Even if the Jews were by no means exceptional in their expectation of an imminent end to the present world order, and even if the whole of the ancient world shared something of this view, must we not be prepared to say that the ancient world itself was (in this respect) primitive, and that being more advanced ourselves we cannot now be expected to move back into a world of ideas so different from our own?’ See Harvey, Jesus, 71.

240 See Harvey, Jesus, 94. Emphasis added.


242 See Marsh, Fullness of Time, 126. See Perrin, Kingdom of God, 147. See also scholars analyzed by Perrin, Kingdom of God, 130-46.
Robinson distinguishes what he believes to be two controlling termini in the prophetic view of history. He refers to these termini as the ‘already-historical’ (i.e. past) and the ‘not-yet-historical’ (i.e. future). These termini form conceptual ‘poles’ which generate for Jesus’ hearers a ‘situation’ formally (but not materially) parallel to the ‘situation’ reflected in Jesus’ parables. Robinson suggests that when Jesus tells his parables, the hearer is placed in the midst of this tension-laden situation in which s/he is confronted with a decision to make. The ‘not-yet-historical’ terminus has to do with God’s coming reign. The ‘already-historical’ terminus, according to Robinson, is prophetic in the sense that it prophesies the not-yet-historical, that is, the future.

In hearing a parable, therefore, the audience is supposed to re-locate themselves to the situation between the already-historical and the not-yet-historical termini. In so doing, they are caught up in a movement from initiation (= already-historical) to consummation (= not-yet-historical). In that situation, a decision is demanded from them. Whether this tension situation is a historical phenomenon is not clear from Robinson. Nevertheless, he refuses to think that it is an abstract ideal. Perhaps all that can be said is that Jesus understands time as an existential situation created by the movement from prophecies to their fulfilment to which Jesus’ audience are exposed in hearing his parables and are thus confronted in the present with a decision to make. In that sense, the not-yet-historical is only significant in its function to impose upon the hearer the urgency of the decision that must be made in the present.

2.4.8. Summary

In the foregoing survey of scholarly treatments of Jesus’ understanding of time the pervasive influence of Heidegger’s philosophical existential framework can hardly be missed. This is reflected in an underlying uneasiness with Jesus’ near expectation of the Kingdom of God which therefore seeks to trivialize the connection between the present and the future in order to place the emphasis squarely on the present. Fuchs dissolves the sequential arrangement between the present and the future by posing them as dialectical ‘times for something’. The future is God’s time for judgement and the present is the believer’s time for faith. Here the emphasis is placed on the present as the proper concern of believers and not the future. Jüngel and Baird offer an alternative way of dismissing the future component in Jesus’ proclamation by coalescing the present and the future as two different ‘nows’ constituting the present. Since the future is already subsumed in the present there should no longer be any concern for the near expectation of the kingdom.

In Linnemann, Robinson, Crossan and Harvey the near expectation dimension of Jesus’ teaching is reasserted but not in a historical framework. Rather, it is viewed within an existential framework in which it functions as a rhetorical strategy for generating the most appropriate ‘situation’ in which the urgency of Jesus’ message is driven home to its hearers, regardless of whether they are first century Jews or twenty-first century contemporaries. Harvey’s special contribution to this connection is the recognition that Jesus’ emphasis on the imminence of the end of the world is appropriate only insofar as it asserts this overarching relevance principle to his message.

---

244 On the importance and limitation of existential interpretation, see Anz, ‘Bedeutung und Grenze’, 348-58.
However, in their collective attempt to dismiss the future near expectation component of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation, these scholars succeed only in highlighting the relevance of Jesus’ message to the present. To them, there seems to be an either-or relationship between the possible present and the potential future components of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation. They set forth the choice as either one or the other; either the present or the future, but not both. The fundamental problem, however, remains unaddressed, namely, that in Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God, both future and present elements are perplexingly found alongside each other. In recent scholarship, Wilson has demonstrated from Jesus’ teaching on judgment in Matthew’s Gospel that it is certainly possible to hold together social engagement in the present with the near expectation of the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{245} In what follows, we shall see that undue emphasis on the presentist component of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation does not do justice to the whole of Jesus’ teaching. There is indeed a presentist component to Jesus’ teaching; however, this cannot be rightly severed from its futurist component without diminishing the integrity and the coherence of Jesus’ kingdom proclamation.

\textsuperscript{245} See Wilson, \textit{When Will These Things}, 250.
3. UNDERSTANDING PEPLHRWTAI O KAIROS IN MARK 1:15: A HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION

3.1. Introduction
Since the time-word in Mark 1:15 - Peplhrwtai o’kairoj - is the foundation of our exploration of Jesus’ view of time, we shall turn now to survey the way in which this passage has been interpreted in biblical scholarship. We shall begin with some remarks on its authenticity.

3.2. Authenticity of Peplhrwtai o’kairoj
A number of scholars have dismissed Jesus’ time-word, Peplhrwtai o’kairoj as ‘a quite secondary formulation’. Kelber, for instance, compares the phrase peplhrwtai o’kairoj with a number of other passages in which o’kairoj functions to indicate a future expectation and not a past event as is implied in Mark 1:15. These passages include John 7:81; 1 Corinthians 7:29; 1 Thessalonians 5:1 and Revelation 1:3 and 22:10. Kelber therefore concludes that the phrase has been Mark’s invention because it is ‘unprecedented in New Testament literature’. Chilton has, however, contested this observation on the basis of the occurrence of a combination of plhrwqai and kairoj in the so-called ‘apocalyptic discourse’ in Luke 21:24 (ácri ou-plhrwqai n kairoj. énwh). Chilton takes it that this passage resembles the grammatical structure of the time-word in Mark 1:15. Chilton therefore argues that it is indeed an exaggeration to refer to the time-word as unprecedented in the New

246 The term ‘time-word’ is our way of referring throughout this study to Jesus’ announcement, Peplhrwtai o’kairoj.
247 See Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 118, 127; Dibelius, Message, 133-34; Marxsen, Mark, 132; Ambrozic, Hidden Kingdom, 4; Kelber, Kingdom in Mark, 65 n.13.
248 See Kelber, Kingdom in Mark, 9-10. Cf. Merklein, Jesu Botschaft, 37; idem, Gottesherrschaft, 17, 19 following Schmidt, Rahmen, 33.
Testament. His argument finds further support in the occurrence of parallel constructions in the Jewish and Hellenistic literature contemporaneous to the New Testament:

What is more telling against this position [i.e. that the time-word is unprecedented in the New Testament] is that precedents for the diction of [Mark 1:15] have been cited in apocalyptic Judaism, diaspora Judaism and Hellenistic writings, i.e., precisely in those circles which most influenced the development of NT diction.249

In current New Testament scholarship, the authenticity of Mark 1:15 is widely acknowledged. It is either assigned to the tradition of Jesus’ earthly ministry250 or to the undisputed ‘kingdom’ sayings that can be confidently traced back to Jesus himself.251

Regarding the issue of authenticating Jesus’ words, it is probably helpful to bear in mind that, as investigators of history, we must presume that our sources report reliably, within the limits of their possibilities, until their unreliability either in detail or as a whole has been proven. In other words, it is not the authenticity of a document that must be proven, but its falsity.252


251 See Käsemann, ‘Christian Apocalyptic’, 103. See also Funk and Hoover and the Jesus Seminar, *Five Gospels*, 40.

3.3. Meaning of Περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ θείου εἰρήματος in the History of Biblical Scholarship

We turn now to sketch the way in which Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15 has been received in the history of interpretation. Again, our aim is not to be exhaustive but to offer a representative sample. We shall begin with the post-apostolic church fathers, followed by the medieval church fathers and through to the Reformers before we settle into an analysis of the distinctive ways in which this passage has been construed in modern (and postmodern) biblical scholarship.

3.4. Interpretations of Mark 1:15 in Pre-modern Biblical Scholarship

The evidence for any serious scholarship involving Mark’s Gospel in the period of the patristic fathers is scarce. Mark appears to have been neglected by prominent biblical commentators of the time and the bulk of attention devoted to Matthew, probably due to Matthew’s traditional status as the earliest Gospel. Sufficient data have, however, been generated in biblical scholarship during the period in question to allow for restrained speculations into how Mark 1:15 could have been conceived by the prominent exegetes of the church at the time.

3.4.1. Justin Martyr (d. ca. 165 AD)

According to Justin, Jesus’ appearance coincided with the cessation of John the Baptist’s activity of prophesying and baptizing by preaching the gospel, ‘saying, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand’ (Matt 4:17; cf. Mark 1:15). Justin read this passage in the light of Matthew 11:12-15:

---

253 The use of term ‘pre-modern’ here is not to be understood as an historical category with conventionally definable limits but simply for the convenience of categorizing biblical scholarship beginning with the post-apostolic fathers through to the sixteenth century Reformers.
The law and the prophets were until John the Baptist; from which time the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for (sic) to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

While John is understood to be the final prophet of the Old Testament prophetic tradition, Justin’s rendering of the passage parallel to Mark 1:15 (i.e. Matt 4:17) enabled him to speak of the arrival of Jesus at the Jordan as the beginning of the Kingdom of God:

[And Christ, while he [John the Baptist] was yet by the river Jordan, came unexpectedly upon him, and made him cease from prophesying and baptizing; and preached the gospel himself, saying, that the kingdom of heaven was at hand; and that he must suffer many things of the scribes and Pharisees, and be crucified, and rise again the third day from the dead; and that he should come again to Jerusalem, and eat and drink with his disciples; and that during the time of his absence, heresies and false prophets should arise in his name, as I said before – all which things, as it is evident, are accordingly come to pass…254

By implication, the fulfilment of time which Jesus announced in Mark is here rendered as the time of the Kingdom of heaven, beginning with the arrival of Jesus in the Jordan (Mark 1:9).255 Jesus is implicitly identified with the Kingdom of God and therefore the ‘kingdom of heaven suffereth violence’ is embodied not only in the suffering of Jesus, leading ultimately to his crucifixion, but also in the subsequent suffering of his people through the oppression of false teachers. In that sense, the time of fulfilment spans from the coming of Jesus to include even the time of Justin and his contemporaries, and until the parousia.

254 Justin, Dialogue, 115.
255 Cf. Hahn, Theologie, 52: ‘Johannes steht als Grösser am Ende einer Epoche, die durch die anbrechende Gottesherrschaft abgelöst wird; insofern gab es für ihn und zu seiner Zeit keine Teilhabe an dem eschatologischen Heil’.
3.4.2. *Clement of Alexandria* (ca. 160-215 AD)

In his *Exhortation to the Heathens*, Clement draws on the parallel passage of Mark 1:15, namely, Matthew 4:17, as Jesus’ public exhortation of his audience towards salvation: ‘The kingdom of heaven is at hand’.\(^ {256}\) According to Clement, this message underlies Paul’s announcement to the Macedonians: ‘The Lord is at hand’. It was meant to instil a righteous fear in his hearers leading to faith in the Lord. Those who have been led in by faith and trained by Scripture will ‘see good days’. According to Clement, these ‘good days’ are ‘the never-ending day of God [which] extends over eternity’. The present time is characterized by the proclamation of Jesus’ kingdom, the promise of eternal rest. ‘Today’ is therefore an opportunity for all people to ‘obey the voice of the divine word’ until the arrival of the ‘true today’, the ‘never-ending day of God’.

Consequently, the present dispensation consists of two distinct epochs. There is ‘today’ during which the proclamation of the gospel of God is heralded, the beginning of which can be traced to the advent of Jesus with the gospel of the kingdom.\(^ {257}\) This present dispensation will ultimately lead on through the wrathful ‘day of the Lord’\(^ {258}\) and to the ‘never-ending today’ of God that believers anticipate. In this light, the ‘extended today’ during which gospel proclamation continues would correspond to the fulfilment of time that Jesus announces in Mark 1:15.

---

\(^ {256}\) See Clement, *Exhortation*, ix.
\(^ {257}\) See Clement, *Exhortation*, xi.
\(^ {258}\) According to Clement, the ‘day of the Lord’ comes only as the wrathful day for those who would remain adamant in their refusal to partake of the ‘light’ that shines forth from heaven during the ‘extended today’ of gospel proclamation. Those, on the other hand, who have accepted the celestial ‘light’ are already partaking in the ‘never-ending day of God’ in eternity. See Clement, *Exhortation*, xi.
3.4.3. Tertullian (ca.160 AD.)

Tertullian does not deal directly with the time-word in Mark 1:15. However, he made an important distinction between John the Baptist’s and Jesus’ ministry in terms of historical dispensations, which is applicable to Mark 1:15. Commenting on Luke 16:1-17, Tertullian speaks of John the Baptist as, ‘constitutum inter vetera et nova, ad quem desineret Iudaismus et a quo inciperet Christianismus, non tamen ut ab alia virtute facta sit sedatio legis et prophetarum, et initiatio evangeli in quo est dei regnum, Christus ipse’. 259

He maintains the status of John the Baptist as the forerunner who prepares the way of the Lord who brings the gospel of the reign of God. 260 Tertullian affirms that the ‘old’ dispensation constituted of the ‘law and the prophets’ came to its end at the point at which John appeared. Thus, John served as the ‘dividing-line between the old things and the new’. For Tertullian, John the Baptist also functions as the point of discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity.

He speaks therefore of the ‘sunset of the law and the prophets upon John and the daybreak that came after’ with Christ. 261 Tertullian explains that the ‘law and the prophets’ which constituted the foundational documents of Judaism are not rendered obsolete in the sense of being destroyed by the advent of Christ. Rather, they are being fulfilled in the proclamation of the Kingdom of God by Christ. Thus, there is clearly an historical scenario depicted here. The old dispensation comprising the law

---

259 See Tertullian, Adversus, 4.33.8: ‘…has been set as a sort of dividing-line between old things and new, a line at which Judaism should cease and Christianity should begin – not however that by the action of any alien power there came about this cessation of the law and the prophets, and the inception of that gospel in which is the kingdom of God, Christ himself’.

260 Tertullian, Adversus 4.33.8: ‘…and proclaim the kingdom of God’.

261 Tertullian, Adversus, 4. 33. 9. Cf. Ernst, Johannes, 68.
and the prophets predicted and anticipated the advent of Christ to proclaim the Kingdom of God; but Christ is also the Kingdom of God himself. This past dispensation ceased at the point of John the Baptist’s advent. In that sense, John the Baptist is the end of the Law and the prophets. He represents the point of transition to the new dispensation – comprising the advent of Christ to proclaim the Kingdom of God which, in turn, corresponds to the time of fulfilment of the law and the prophets. Thus, even though the time-word in Mark 1:15 does not feature in Tertullian’s work, the insight derived from the passage just mentioned is applicable to it.

3.4.4. Origen (ca. 185-251 AD.)

On three different occasions, implicit references to Mark 1:15 are discernible in the works of Origen. In his *Commentary on Romans*, Origen discusses the phrase ‘gospel of God’ in relation to its proclamation in Mark 1:15. Mark 1:1 (‘the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ’) is read in the light of John 1:1 (‘In the beginning was the Word’). Since the Word was God, and since Jesus asserted ‘I and the Father are one’ (John 10:30), Origen draws the connection that the ‘gospel of God’ is also the ‘gospel of Jesus Christ’, perceived in its objective sense, namely, ‘the gospel about Jesus Christ’. Consequently, for Origen the content of the ‘gospel of God’ that Jesus preached in Galilee, according to Mark 1:15, is Jesus Christ, the ‘word made flesh’.

The second implicit reference to Mark 1:15 appears in his *Commentariorum in Evangelium Joannis*. Origen summarizes the activities of Jesus in Capernaum from Matthew. He explains that, according to Matthew, Jesus came from Nazareth to

---

262 See Origen, *Romans*, 66.
Capernaum to proclaim (Matthew 4:17) and Jesus, after having been tempted by the Devil and having heard of the imprisonment of John, came into Galilee (Mark 1:14-15). Subsequently, Jesus began to call the apostles to accompany him to Capernaum. According to Origen, Mark, being the earliest interpretation of Matthew, has it that Jesus, after having been tempted by the Devil and having heard of the imprisonment of John, came into Galilee khrussonta to. euaggelion tou/ qeou/ elv/ ugennai ton kuriou. Subsequently, Jesus began to call the apostles to accompany him to Capernaum. It would be helpful to juxtapose these two passages, reading them in terms of Matthean priority:

Matthew 4:17

Mark 1:14-15

le, go nt a Metanoite h`basileia twn ouranwn. = khrussonta to.

euaggelion tou/qeou/

hjgi ken gar h`basileia twn ouranwn = elv/ugennai ton kuriou

While a reference to the time-word in Mark 1:15 is clearly absent, it can be deduced from this juxtaposition that, according to Origen, the fulfilment of time corresponds to the time of the coming of the Lord. However, this is most likely to be a reference to the coming of the Lord in the parousia.

In the third (implicit) reference to Mark 1:15, Origen draws on Paul’s idea of the ‘fullness of time’. In his Commentary on Matthew, he distinguishes between the dispensation before Christ and that during Christ’s coming. Commenting on Matthew 13:45-46, he asserts that Christ is ton e`na polutimon margarithn which demands forfeiting of everything in order to possess it. According to Origen, ‘a lamp’ was

---

264 See Origen, Joannis, I: 193.
shining in the darkness until that ‘one pearl of great price’ appeared. That ‘lamp’ was the glory upon the face of Moses through which we are empowered to see the glory of Christ. It is the glory of Christ that the Father affirms in Jesus’ baptism by saying, ‘This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased’ (Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17). The knowledge acquired from Moses’ glory, according to Origen, was only partial, foreshadowing the appearance of the ‘greater glory’ in Christ. This greater glory is telos which renders all previous partial knowledge obsolete. The ‘perfection’ arrives at to ple wma tou cr onou (Gal 4:4).266

From this viewpoint, believers were all ‘infants’ and ‘slaves’ until the perfected glory appears in the ‘fullness of time’. Since then, all infancy and slavery ceased as we are liberated and entitled to a ‘greater understanding by the knowledge of Christ’.

According to this scenario, John the Baptist’s ministry is subsumed under the analogy of the ‘lamp’ shining in the darkness until the perfect greater glory’ appears in Christ in the ‘fullness of time’. By implication, the fulfilment of time can be identified with the fullness of time whose principal content is characterized by the acquaintance of the fullness of glory in the knowledge of Christ.268 In that time, the ‘lamp’ that has been shining in the previous Mosaic and prophetic dispensation is rendered obsolete by the glory of the rising ‘sun’, the Christ.269

265 See Origen, Matthieu, 10. 9. 8.
266 Origen, Matthieu, 10. 9. 18-21.
267 Origen, Matthieu, 10. 9. 29. Cf. Scott, Adoption, 149-71.
268 The closest Origen came to making a reference to Mark 1:14-15 in his Commentaire sur l’Évangile selon Matthieu is a reference to Jesus’ coming to Galilee having heard about John’s imprisonment, in his commentary on Matthew 15:21, 22. See Origen, Matthieu, 11. 16. 60.
269 Cf. Tertullian, Adversus, 4. 33. 9.
3.4.5. Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 260-339 AD.)

Like many before him, Eusebius does not explicitly comment on Mark 1:15 even though he mentions Mark 1:14 in connection with John the apostle’s assessment of the Synoptic Gospels. This passing comment, however, offers an important ‘window’ into an early reception of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15. According to Eusebius, the apostle John observed that the historical framework of the Synoptic Gospels deals only with the period of Jesus’ ministry after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, which altogether amounts to one year of Jesus’ earthly ministry. This observation therefore necessitated the production of John’s Gospel which, according to Eusebius, consisted of the ‘first acts of Christ, while the others [i.e. the Synoptic Gospels] give an account of the latter part of his life’. If this is the case, then the time of fulfilment Jesus announced in Galilee should encompass the narrative frameworks represented collectively by the Synoptics and John’s Gospel.

3.4.6. Hilary of Poitiers (ca. 315-367 AD.)

Hilary, like Origen, appears to have subsumed the consideration of the notion of time fulfilment under the notion of the ‘fullness of time’ (cf. Gal 4:4). In his explanation of Psalm 1:3, the ‘fullness of time’ corresponds to ‘the time’ during which the ‘tree’ that symbolizes ‘the righteous’ bears its ‘fruit’. For Hilary, the fullness of time refers to both a geometrical point in time and a duration. On the one hand, it is a point in time when the ‘right moment’ comes, according to Psalm 1, for the ‘giver’ of the ‘fruit’ to give, and for the ‘receiver’ to receive it. Yet, fullness of time is also the ‘dispensation of yielding fruit’. It is a dispensation that awaits the ‘giver’, who alone
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270 See Eusebius, History, 3. 24. 10.
‘has [the] choice of the season’ – that is, to bring it about. The ‘fruit’ to which Hilary refers is the glorious transformation of the believer’s body when Jesus returns in the parousia. Hilary’s understanding of the ‘fullness of time’ seems to represent an early attempt to interpret the notions of time fulfilment and the fullness of time in terms of the ‘right moment’ or the ‘right season.’ For Hilary, however, the right moment or the right season signifies the time of the future hope of glory for believers. It will therefore become a reality when Jesus returns.

3.4.7. Augustine (354-430 AD.)

Amongst the early patristic fathers, Augustine is probably the first to specifically interpret Mark 1:15. In correspondence with Hesychius, bishop of Salona, (in Dalmatia possibly about 415 AD), Augustine set forth an historical interpretation of Mark 1:15. He paraphrases the passage as, ‘Do penance; the times are completed; believe the gospel’. Augustine’s interpretation is as follows: ‘[Jesus] was correct to tell the Jews that the times were completed, because their times came to an end thirty-five or forty years after he preached’.275

The fulfilment of the ‘times of the Jews’ here refers to the destruction of the temple in 70 AD which, from Jesus’ perspective, still lies in the future.276 This view is maintained in Augustine’s next letter in his response to Hesychius’ reply to the first letter.277 Hesychius appears to be struggling with the issue of the exact timing of the second coming of Jesus. In response, Augustine affirms that since the Jews did not

275 See Augustine, Letters 156-210, 198. 3.
276 In that sense, Augustine anticipated the position advocated by N. T. Wright on the ultimate realization of Jesus’ ministry in the destruction of the temple in 70 AD, even though Wright does not seem to be aware of Augustine’s interpretation of Mark 1:15. See Wright, Jesus, 360-68. Cf. Bailey, ‘Fall of Jerusalem’, 102-5.
277 The exchange between Augustine and Hesychius is dated to the end of 419 or the beginning of 420. See Augustine, Letters, 197.
recognize the first coming of the Lord but crucified him, they were destined to the destruction of 70 AD:

\[
\text{For if the Jews recognized his first coming, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory (1 Cor 2:8). And for this reason they could have not been overthrown but could have remained.}
\]

But his words to them, \textit{Do penance; the times are completed; believe the gospel} (Mk 1:15), you yourself have maintained were said of the times of the Jews that were going to come to an end after a few years, and we now know that those times have passed, that is, when the city was destroyed in which their kingdom was established.\textsuperscript{278}

Here, the time-word in Mark 1:15 serves as a warning for the Jews about the coming destruction of Jerusalem at the hands of the Romans in 70 AD. Thus, from Jesus’ viewpoint, time fulfilment predicted a specific event in the horizon that had befallen the Jews as their punishment for rejecting him. From Augustine’s standpoint in time, the time fulfilment is therefore an event of the past.

Augustine’s emphasis on the proclamation of the fulfilment of time as an opportunity for the Jews to repent was already foreshadowed in a sermon preached on Mark 1:15 in 397 AD. In that sermon, the scope of those in need of repentance included the ‘idolatrous Gentiles’.\textsuperscript{279} The time of fulfilment is moreover interpreted in terms of Galatians 4:4 as ‘the fullness of time’. It is an opportunity not only for Jews but for all people to repent in view of the threatening certainty of death and of Christ’s return in judgment. According to Augustine, Jesus’ coming in the ‘fullness of time’ was ‘to make an advance payment of grace’, offering the world an opportunity to repent and believe the gospel. However, he will come again to judge.

\textsuperscript{278} See Augustine, \textit{Letters}, 199. 4. 12.
\textsuperscript{279} See Augustine, \textit{Sermons} 94A. 2.
Hence, Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 is charged with uncompromising urgency for both his contemporaries and those living in Augustine’s time. Augustine envisages the godless as saying, ‘I’ll put [repentance] off till tomorrow and tomorrow till the day after tomorrow’. At the same time, God is saying to them, ‘I promised you forgiveness; I didn’t promise you tomorrow’. The announcement of the fulfilment of time generates an opportune time beforehand for repentance and believing in the gospel. Since the fulfilment of time refers to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, it issues a solemn warning for the rest of humanity. Just as the announcement of the fulfilment of time gave the Jews the opportunity to repent and believe in the gospel before the end came for them in 70 AD, so also it is now. The announcement of the time of fulfilment, the judgment at the return of Jesus, offered to the rest of humanity an opportunity to repent. Hence, time fulfilment, for Augustine, is a time of judgment; the judgment of the world in the return of Jesus, foreshadowed in the judgment of the Jews in 70 AD.

3.4.8. Victor of Antioch (c. 400 AD.)

Victor’s work is widely perceived to be the earliest commentary on Mark. In his reflections on Mark 1:15, Victor maintained the trend of reading Jesus’ announcement, Προφητείαν αἱροτικήν ἡγιστέλεται τοῦ Θεοῦ in the light of Galatians 4:4, ἐδείξει δεῖ προφητείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καιροῦ. “οἱ θρωματίδες θόρυβος θεοῦ et. θρωματίδες θορυβίων θεοῦ θρονούσας οἱ Ἰουδαίοι θεοῦ. ” Here, the fullness of time
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280 See Augustine, *Sermons* 94A. 7.
constitutes the point at which Jesus is sent. Victor distinguishes John’s and Jesus’ ministry in the following way:

(1) John came before the coming near of the kingdom of heaven and preached the message of repentance in preparation for the Lord’s coming. The Lord came in Jesus’ coming preaching the repentance that John preached is clearly preparatory in relation to the coming of the Lord identified with the advent of Jesus;

(2) John exhorts his hearers to repent from their evil ways, but Jesus proclaims repentance after John’s imprisonment, Jesus’ ministry began to fulfill what was foreordained for him, namely, his humiliation and death on the cross. As a result, the specific content of the fulfilment of time is Jesus’ earthly ministry characterized by his self-emptying obedience until death on the cross. In other words, the end of the fulfilment of time is signalled by the cross.

3.4.9. First Commentary on Mark (c. 600-650 AD.)

A work which has been dated to about the first half of the seventh century has been translated as the First Commentary on Mark’s Gospel. Its interpretation of Mark 1:15 occurs in a comment in relation to the imprisonment of John the Baptist in Mark 1:14. The imprisonment of John the Baptist is interpreted as, ‘things of the flesh are...
beheaded while spiritual realities are brought to life. Pretence gives way; truth arrives. John is in prison – the Law is in Judea. Jesus is in Galilee – there is salvation among the [G]entiles’. 287

While the time-word in Mark 1:15 is not explicitly commented upon in this instance, the fulfilment of time Jesus announces in Galilee is identified with the arrival of ‘truth’ which is subsequently interpreted as the coming of ‘salvation’ to the Gentiles whilst the Jews are still seeking salvation by doing the ‘works of the Law’. Thus, in this interpretation of Mark, already the Law-Gospel antithesis is used to distinguish between: (1) the time of fulfilment Jesus proclaims in Galilee, which is understood as the coming of the gospel to the Gentiles, and, on the other hand, (2) the previous historical dispensation of the Law, which is supposed to have prevailed in Judea.

3.4.10. Erasmus

Erasmus’ *Paraphrase on Mark* was completed in November 1523. 288 At that stage, he had already completed *Paraphrases* on each of the other three Gospels. Consequently, his reading of Mark often reflects how the other three Gospels have reinterpreted Mark even though Erasmus appears to give no thought to the possibility of Markan priority. In that sense, Erasmus’ reading of Mark implied a hermeneutical departure from the patristic fathers who, as we have seen, read Mark as an interpretation of Matthew. Erasmus’ paraphrase of Mark 1 implies the Law and Gospel antithesis. The imprisonment of John as the point at which Jesus appeared in Galilee to begin his earthly career is interpreted as a necessary step since ‘the Mosaic
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287 See *First Commentary*, 30-31.
288 See Erasmus, *Mark*, xi.
law must be made to disappear when the bright evangelical light rises’. This ‘bright evangelical light’ does not however abolish the authority of the Mosaic law. Rather, Jesus came to perfect the law as its fulfilment:

The law with its figures has made allusions to him, and the prophets in their oracles have predicted the coming of one who would offer perfect salvation to all nations. Because the fulfilment of this promise was delayed for a long time, the world had, so to speak, grown deaf to it, but the Lord has not forgotten his promise. The time he had set in advance for this matter has now run its course; there is no reason why you should hereafter await other figures or dark sayings of the law, no reason why you should expect new prophets. Behold, the kingdom of God is here.

Here, Jesus’ announcement that \( \text{pep} \ \text{hr} \ \text{twai} \ \text{o} \ \text{kai} \ \text{roj} \) is the declaration that the kingdom of God is here. The ‘time of delay’ has now ended and the fulfilment of God’s promise of perfect salvation for the Gentiles is realized. In that sense, Erasmus understands the manifestation of the Kingdom of God as the coming of the one who would offer ‘perfect salvation’ to the Gentiles. He is convinced that such an offer of salvation is foreshadowed by Jesus’ appearance in Galilee at the beginning of his earthly ministry. The position adopted by Erasmus in relation to the coming of Kingdom of God anticipates Dodd’s ‘realized eschatology’ . The time of fulfilment is both the completion of the delay and the arrival of the fulfilment of God’s promised salvation for all nations in Jesus.

---

291 See the discussion of ‘realized eschatology’ in the previous Chapter.
3.4.11. John Calvin

In Calvin, one sees an interpretation of Mark 1:15 which is heavily indebted to his own historical setting in the sixteenth century Reformation. The fulfilment of time was indeed the arrival of the time when ‘it was the will of God to restore his ruined church’. Calvin, however, does not deal directly with the time-word in Mark 1:15. He prefers to read the notion of time-fulfilment as expressed through its re-statement in Luke as the ‘acceptable year of the Lord’. This phrase is interpreted as a time determined by God to bring about the fulfilment of his plans. Calvin implies that the time beforehand, or the time leading up to this special time, has been characterized with the long delay of the promised salvation. The ‘acceptable year’ then coincides with what Paul declares as ‘the fullness of time’ (Gal 4:4). It is indeed the right time for God to restore his church. Hence, fulfilment of time is characterized by the ongoing process of church restoration which describes Calvin’s own historical setting in the sixteenth century. Notably, the restoration of the church is accomplished through the revelation of the promised salvation which in fact is similar to what we have seen in Erasmus’ Paraphrase.

3.4.12. Summary

With the exception of Augustine, who identifies the fulfilment of time Jesus announced in Mark 1:15 with an historical event (viz. the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD), most patristic commentators and even the Reformers, exhibit an attempt to interpret the time-word theologically in relation to John the Baptist (so Justin, Tertullian, Victor and First Commentary on Mark). On the other hand, some interpret Mark 1:15 in terms of Galatians 4:4 (so Origen, Hilary and Tertullian). In general,

292 See Calvin, Harmony, 230.
the time of fulfilment either constitutes the present dispensation (so Justin and Calvin) or anticipates the future return of Jesus Christ in the judgment and transformation of the elect (so Clement, Augustine and Hilary). In Erasmus and even in Calvin, the Law-Gospel antithesis is employed to distinguish between the dispensation of the prophets that concludes with John the Baptist and that of Jesus. Thus, fulfilment of time corresponds to the time under grace in opposition to the passing time under the Law.

3.5. Construal of *Peplhȳwtaio e kairō* in Modern (and Postmodern) New Testament Scholarship

Having surveyed the way in which Mark 1:15 was construed in ‘pre–modern’ scholarship, we turn now to explore the way in which the time-word has been interpreted in current New Testament scholarship. As far as we are concerned, *peplhȳwtaio e kairō* seems to have been interpreted in five different ways. These include: (1) The arrival of the decisive moment; (2) The completion of the time of waiting; (3) A combination of these two ideas, namely, the arrival of the decisive moment and the completion of the time of waiting; (4) Time is fulfilled in the experience of reading Mark, and; (5) The time of recovery has come.

3.5.1. The ‘Decisive Moment’ has arrived

Firstly, *peplhȳwtaio e kairō* has been interpreted on the basis of the definition of *kairō* as the ‘decisive moment’. In this view, *kairō* is often paraphrased as the

---

‘appointed time’. Many commentators tend to speak of the fulfilment of a specific moment with insufficient consideration of how ‘a moment’ can be fulfilled. Pēlē hρwτᾱ is often understood as the ‘coming to pass’ of events predicted rather than the ‘completion of a specified duration’. Jesus is therefore announcing ‘the coming to pass of a decisive moment in time’. It is argued that if Jesus implies ‘a span of time reaching its completion’ the term χρόνος would have been more appropriate.

Those who advocate this position agree that the ‘decisive moment’ is a time appointed by God, even though they differ in specifying its content. Some commentators keep their construal of the time-word open-ended by speaking of the ‘moment of significance’ for God’s promises. Others, however, seek to attach a specific theological content to the ‘decisive moment’ announced by Jesus. Hooker, for instance, affirms that Jesus is announcing the arrival of the time of salvation and judgment. Thus, the ‘decisive moment’ that has arrived is understandably a time charged with soteriological significance.

Still others have attached to it the potentially tautological idea that it is indeed ‘God’s time’, that announced by the prophets of the Old Testament, that has arrived. In this connection, Bolt reads the ‘decisive moment’ as the fulfilment of John the Baptist’s prediction about the ‘one greater’ than him who would come after him. The
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295 Chilton, God in Strength, 85-86; Hiebert, Mark, 42.
296 See Hiebert, Mark, 42; Guelich, Mark, 43; Taylor, St. Mark, 166.
297 See Hare, Mark, 20-21; France, Mark, 91.
299 See Lane, Mark, 65; Link, Mustard Seed, 18; Delling, και ρο, 295.
300 See Hooker, Mark, 54.
301 See also Barnett, Servant King, 28; Johnson, St. Mark, 42.
302 See Hare, Mark, 20-21. We shall see in the next chapter that all time is God’s time in the sense that he is committed to giving it day and night.
decisive moment is therefore the moment of the arrival of the ‘stronger one’.  

Bryant specifies that the ‘decisive moment’ concerns God’s divine visitation to Jerusalem, ultimately manifested in the destruction of the temple in 70 AD.  

Johnson sees in Jesus’ announcement here the arrival of the time in which God will finally be victorious over his enemies.

This punctiliar ‘moment’ of decisive importance, however, appears to undergo a gradual elongation in the work of several commentators. For Harnack, on the one hand, the decisive moment is the ‘last hour, the eleventh hour’. E. Lohmeyer, on the other, maintains that it is the ‘hour of fulfilment’ that has come. The ‘hour’ becomes, for Taylor, the ‘day’ in which all things are to be put right. This notion of the ‘day’ is lengthened further to become a ‘fixed season’ in God’s foreknowledge but which has now come to pass. It is further extended to become an ‘age’, the ‘age of fulfilment’. In fact, a ‘new age’ is understood to have entered history in the ministry of Jesus. This ‘new age’ according to H. Ridderbos is ‘the threshold of the great future’. It corresponds to the period predicted by the prophets in which the Christ would appear. Eventually, this gradual lengthening of finds an alternative interpretation in France who removes the temporal
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304 See Bryant, *Judgement*, 20.
305 See Johnson, *St. Mark*, 42.
313 See Johnson and DeWelt, *Mark*, 38.
dimension and instead conjectures it as a ‘state of fulfilment’ that has arrived with Jesus.\textsuperscript{314}

In summary, the interpretation of \textit{ka\textsuperscript{i}r\textsuperscript{o}j} as a ‘decisive moment’ expresses a punctiliar understanding of time. There is, however, no apparent attempt to deal with the import of the connection of \textit{pepl\textsuperscript{h}r\textsuperscript{w}t\textsuperscript{ai}} with \textit{o\textsuperscript{\textit{k}}ai\textsuperscript{r\textsuperscript{o}j}} in Mark 1:15. The meaning of \textit{o\textsuperscript{\textit{k}}ai\textsuperscript{r\textsuperscript{o}j}} is taken on its own and defined as ‘a decisive moment’ and then imposed upon the whole phrase. This way of reading Mark 1:15 takes \textit{pepl\textsuperscript{h}r\textsuperscript{w}t\textsuperscript{ai}} as referring to the ‘coming to pass’ of the ‘decisive moment’. Most commentators who subscribe to this reading appear to read into \textit{pepl\textsuperscript{h}r\textsuperscript{w}t\textsuperscript{ai}} the meaning of the Greek term \textit{h\textsuperscript{i}\nu\textsuperscript{q}e\textsuperscript{n}} which is employed in connection with time in other contexts in Mark (e.g. 14:41; cf. 13:33).\textsuperscript{315}

3.5.2. \textit{The ‘Time of Waiting’ is Completed}

Secondly, some commentators have argued that \textit{ka\textsuperscript{i}r\textsuperscript{o}j} here refers to ‘a span of time’ rather than a moment of time. Mussner argues that \textit{ka\textsuperscript{i}r\textsuperscript{o}j} in Mark 1.15 does not follow the classical Greek definition of being a ‘decisive moment’.\textsuperscript{316} Rather it refers to a ‘span of time’. Nevertheless, Mussner is prepared to admit that, in a number of other instances in Mark’s Gospel, interpreting \textit{ka\textsuperscript{i}r\textsuperscript{o}j} as ‘decisive moment’ would be more appropriate (12.2; 13.33). But \textit{ka\textsuperscript{i}r\textsuperscript{o}j} can also mean a longer (10.30) or shorter (11.13) span of time.\textsuperscript{317} Mussner, however, opposes the consistent application of the translation ‘decisive moment’ to other occurrences in the Bible. Moreover, he

\textsuperscript{314} See France, \textit{Mark}, 91.
\textsuperscript{315} See Chapter 4.3.1 below.
\textsuperscript{316} See Mussner, ‘Gottesherschaft’, 88.
\textsuperscript{317} See Marcus, ‘Time’, 49.
observes that the distinction between καιρός and χρόνος ‘ist dabei fließend’. 318 Mussner acknowledges that the punctiliar understanding of καιρός contrasts distressingly with the linearity implied in its connection with the verb πληρέω in Mark 1:15.

The import of the combination of καιρός with πληρέω has been examined by Moule. He lists three basic usages of the word ‘to fulfill’ (αλμ/πληρέω) in both the Old Testament and the New Testament: (1) verification of a prediction; (2) termination, completion, or confirmation of a beginning, project, or promise; and, (3) the fulfilment of the covenant-promise. 319 Moule observes that none of these meanings seems to fit quite neatly with the concept of καιρός construed as ‘appointed time’. The root image behind πληρέω is that of a container receiving more and more contents until it is full. 320

From a linguistic viewpoint, therefore, it seems that the term πεπληρώτας would have initially evoked the imagery of the spatio-temporal continuum as a container being filled. In combination with καιρός, the meaning of a ‘span of time’ becomes the most plausible. On the basis of these observations, it seems more natural to construe πεπληρώτας ο’ καιρός either as a ‘span of time that is now filled’ or ‘a stretch of time which is now completed’. Mussner reinforces this observation by drawing on evidence from secular Greek, 321 the LXX 322 and the New Testament 323 which shows

321 Papi. Oxyr. II. 275, 24, μερι του τον χρόνον πληρωθήται) See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 86. 322 Tobit 14.5. Mussner is impressed with the rendering in the Codex Sinaiticus: έξω του χρόνου (ου= an pl. hrwhtai o’ kairos twn kairwn. See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 87 n. 20.
that πληροφ, in conjunction with καιρός, consistently denotes a ‘span of time’. In Mark 1:15, this implies that the previous epoch, the ‘old age’, is now ‘filled up’ and therefore the eschaton is imminent.

In summary, this view is grounded on the understanding of the meaning of καιρός from the immediate literary context of Mark 1:15 as a span of time rather than a punctiliar point in time. Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 indicates an old epoch concluding and a new one beginning. Time fulfilment, according to this view, signifies that the ‘old age’ has been ‘filled up’. Now the stage is ready for the ‘new age’ to begin. Notably, πεπληρώτας ο Καιρός denotes a past epoch and therefore ἡ γείσην ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ must function as the description of the new. However, the emphasis is on the age that is concluding rather than on what is beginning.

3.5.3. The ‘Time of Waiting is Completed’ and the ‘Decisive Moment’ has Arrived

A third way in which πεπληρώτας ο Καιρός is interpreted by commentators combines the two meanings we have just dealt with, and thus speaks not only of the ‘completion of the span of time past’ but also of the ‘arrival of the decisive moment’ as constitutive of the meaning of πεπληρώτας ο Καιρός. Moule refers to this juxtaposition of the completion of time with the beginning of the new age as a
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323 Cf. Luke 21.24, πληρωσίν καιρόν εἰς γείσην ['times of the Gentiles are fulfilled']; Eph 1.10, τοῦ πλήρωσίν τοῦ καιροῦ ['the fullness of the times']; Gal 4.4, πληρώσας τοῦ χρόνου ['fullness of time']; Freer Logion which appears in a fifth-century Greek uncial (W) in the longer ending of Mark in which Jesus replies to his disciples’ request that he reveal his righteousness, δι' ἓν πεπληρώτας ο Καιρός τῶν εἰῶν θεοῦ αὐτοῦ Σατανᾶς ἀλλὰ ἐγκαίνια ἀλλὰ δείνα, 'The term of the years of the dominion of Satan has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near’. According to Lane, this last passage seems to be an isolated saying embodying a local tradition. See Lane, Mark, 607. See also Marcus, ‘Time’, 54-56.

324 See Moloney, Mark, 49.
‘paradoxical correlation’. He affirms that, to a unique degree, ‘Jesus is seen as the
goal, the convergence-point of God’s plan for Israel, his covenant-promise’.

Writing about Mark 1.15, Moule concedes that the occurrence of πληροφορία in the form of προβάλλων in connection with καιρός implies ‘a significantly complete and final coming of the eschatological epoch’. The overall sense of Moule’s insight is that προβάλλων καιρός encompasses a two-fold reference: (1) The completion of the epoch of time as expectation; and, (2) The final coming of the long awaited eschatological epoch. This ‘eschatological epoch’ is the ‘new era’ that begins paradoxically at the completion of all God’s promises, converging in Jesus Christ.

3.5.4. The Time is Fulfilled in the Experience of Reading Mark

A fourth way in which προβάλλων καιρός has been construed is represented by Fowler. He views Mark 1:14-15 as ‘an admission by the narrator of what he wants to happen to the reader in the course of the reading experience… For the reader, the time is filled full and the Kingdom of God draws nigh in the experience of reading Mark’s Gospel’. Rather than examining some aspects in the background or even in terms of the grammatical structure of the passage, Fowler represents a mode of reading any given text in which meaning is found in the effect of the text upon its readers. The kind of reading Fowler advocates is no longer interested in the supposed meaning of προβάλλων καιρός to Jesus’ original hearers or even to Mark’s
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325 For an extensive survey of the occurrence of μιλ/pleroun words throughout the Bible and the Inter-testamental literature, see Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 308-320.
326 See Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 301.
327 See Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 317. Cf. Bruce below in Chapter 4.2.4.
328 Cullmann refers to this period as the ‘era of grace’ granted by God to humanity as an embodiment of his will that all may have the opportunity to respond to the gospel. See Cullmann, ‘Eschatology and Mission’, 416-17.
329 See Fowler, Let the Reader, 90-91. A similar idea is found in Linnemann, ‘Zeitansage’, 263.
audience. Rather, it is the readers’ experience of reading the Gospel that occupies pride of place. In that sense, the subjective dimension of the reading experience becomes the main aim of interpretation. This is pursued at the expense of the grammatical historical aspect of the text. Reading of this kind will be considered of no great value to those who wish to retain the prime importance of deriving meaning not from the effect of the text on the reader but primarily from the linguistic and grammatical elements of the text.

3.5.5. The Time for the Ineffable Joy of Recovery has Come

The fifth category within which has been construed is a contextual interpretation of Mark 1:15 for alcoholics or addicts of other abusive substances. This way of reading once again deals primarily with the way in which the reader might respond to the text. While Fowler appears to be writing for the general audience, Mellor aims at a more specific audience. As a recovered alcoholic, Mellor’s commentary on Mark is written from the pastoral perspective of dealing with addicts. Mellor paraphrases as ‘the time has come for the ineffable joy of recovery’ from your addictive habits.

3.6. A Critical Evaluation of the Conception of Time that Underlies Modern Construals of

In summary, we wish to make two observations. (1) Those who maintain the arrival of the ‘decisive moment’ as the meaning of can be associated with a view of time as consisting of punctiliar events which may be loosely or systematically connected to one another either in a linear fashion or some alternative

330 In that sense, it is proximate to Fuchs’ Sprachereignis approach. See Chapter 2.4.1 above.
331 See Fuchs, ‘What Is Interpreted’.
332 See Mellor, Mark, 150.
principle of systematizing historical events. When punctiliar events are taken to be
self-contained with no conceivable link to events in their immediate chronological or
historical surroundings it readily becomes an irrelevance to speak of the ‘conclusion’
of some past epoch coming about in the present.\(^\text{333}\) The underlying supposition here
is that historical events are unique in themselves but do not necessarily relate in a
sequential chronological fashion to other events in their immediate historical context.
The apocalyptic view of history seems to promote this kind of temporal conception.
In an apocalyptic conception of history, divine interventions are often expected to
initiate something utterly and totally new.\(^\text{334}\) It somewhat resembles a naturalistic
conception of history in which events happen by chance without a goal or even a
beginning.\(^\text{335}\) However, in the biblical apocalyptic view of time, ‘decisive moments’
occur according to a previous decision made by God in eternity.

On the other hand, the interpretation of \(
\text{pe\i plhrwt\a\i\ o\'kai\rj}\)
as the ‘completion of a
past temporal epoch’ which paradoxically becomes the beginning of another\(^\text{336}\)
appears to presuppose a view of time as a chronological sequence of events in which
events cohere in some observable way with one another in a linear arrangement.\(^\text{337}\)
The coherence of events, according to this view, is driven by an overarching purpose
imposed upon the whole from outside by God. In a thoroughly punctiliar

\(^{333}\) See Guelich, \textit{Mark}, 43.
\(^{334}\) See the discussion of the possible meaning of the term ‘apocalyptic’ in the history of interpretation
in Strum, ‘Defining’, 25-37. This kind of apocalyptic understanding probably underlies Schweitzer’s
and Bultmann’s estimation of the temporal dimension of Jesus’ proclamation. See Bultmann, \textit{History
and Eschatology}, 7: ‘In the apocalyptic view the end of history comes with necessity at the time
determined by God’. For a brief discussion of this development, see Schmithals, ‘Jesus’, 59-64; Ernst,
\textit{Geschichte}, 11-12, n. 2.
\(^{335}\) Nicholas Berdayev identified this kind of historiography with the Greek philosophers. See
Berdayev, \textit{Meaning}, 36.
\(^{336}\) Perhaps only God can enjoy the privilege of espousing such a conception of time both in theory
and more so in practice: ‘I am the alpha and the omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the
end’ (Rev 22:12).
\(^{337}\) This is best exemplified by Cullmann, \textit{Christ and Time}, 51.
understanding of time, the perception that historical events arbitrarily happen by chance is inevitable. By contrast, in understanding kārōj as a ‘span of time’ sequentially related to what comes before and after, a more coherent relationship of one event to another in a linear pattern is presupposed. Consequently, the completion of one event possibly becomes the beginning of another as time flows on irreversibly towards its goal. The relationship envisaged in the linear configuration of historical events is not viciously cyclic in fashion, where the end is also the beginning. Rather, in the linear view of time there is a recognizable distinction between the beginning and the end.

(2) There seems however to be an underlying conception of time common to all of the modern construals of peplhrwtai o kārōj. With the exceptions of categories explicated in sections 3.5.4 and 3.5.5 above, the rest implicitly employed a notion of time that Linnemann has referred to as the ‘time for something’. According to this view, time is defined more specifically in terms of its content. Fuchs expresses it more lucidly: ‘die Zeit an, als Zeit zum Aufstehen, Essen, Arbeiten, Spielen, Schlafen usw’. This understanding of time is often supposed to have been prominent in Israel.

However, the understanding of time as ‘time for something’ can hardly form an all-embracing definition for the biblical view of time since it properly belongs to one aspect of Israel’s experience, namely, the cultic context. It is only in the cultic

341 See Aune, Cultic Setting, 9: ‘“Cult” may be defined as “the visible, socially arranged and ordered, efficacious forms through which the religious experience of communion between deity and the “community” is actualized and its effects expressed”'.
context of Israel’s religion that one finds more or less a concentration on the ‘quality’
of time which often undergirds the distinction between the sacred and the more
ordinary activities of life.\footnote{See Bauckham, ‘Time and Eternity’, 169-70.} To be sure, the conception of time as ‘time for
something’ tends to helpfully identify and distinguish one occasion from another:

\begin{quote}
Die Zeit ist ihrem Wesen nach, jedenfalls in der Familie, keine Messungskonstante, keine
Einheit ohne Grenzen, sondern sie ist pluralisch, immer nur jeweils Zeit für etwas oder für
etwas anderes, so dass gleichzeitig verschiedene Zeiten da sind.\footnote{See Fuchs, ‘Das Neue Testament’, 210.}
\end{quote}

As we have seen in Fuchs’ analysis of Jesus’ conception of time, this conception of
time is grounded upon Ecclesiastes 3:1-8\footnote{See Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 339; ‘Jesus’ Understanding of Time’, 134.; Cf. Linnemann, ‘Zeitansage’, 258. See also Jackelén, Time, 77-78. Ben Zvi Ehud even observed evidence of cyclic
time in the Book of Chronicles. See Ehud, ‘About Time’, 17-31.} which Barr has observed as the evidence
for a cyclic view of time in the Bible.\footnote{See Barr, Biblical Words, 140.} The cyclic view of time was often
considered to be antithetical to the linear biblical view of time.\footnote{See Cullmann, Christ and Time, 51-55; Boman, Hebrew Thoughts, 123-124. Contra Barr, Time, 142.} We shall see in the
next chapter how time in creation essentially features a paradoxical cyclic-linear
shape. The point here is that a thoroughly cyclic view of time is as much a distortion
of the biblical notion of time as a strictly linear framework of time. On their own,
neither can adequately represent the paradoxical property of time discernible in the
Bible.\footnote{See Chapter 4.}

3.7. Summary

Admittedly, the representative survey of the meaning of \textit{pe\textit{h}\textit{wr}\textit{t}\textit{ai} o\textit{kai} \textit{ro}j} we
have provided here is far from exhaustive. Yet, it is probably sufficient to indicate
the interpretive trajectories that scholars have taken in biblical scholarship regarding Mark 1:15. Two things tend to stand out from the way in which \textit{pepl \textit{hrwtai} o\'kai\textit{roj}} has been construed hitherto in modern biblical scholarship: (1) The tendency to lean too heavily either on the definition of \textit{kai\textit{roj}} or on the verb \textit{pepl \textit{hrwtai}}, which is then indiscriminately read back into Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 as its meaning; (2) The conception of time as \textit{time for} underlies attempts at understanding \textit{pepl \textit{hrwtai} o\'kai\textit{roj}} and tends to sway the interpretation one way or the other. This is the result of a predominantly philological construal of Jesus’ time-word. By contrast, the pre-modern scholarship on Mark 1:15 in the main seems more interested in offering a theological interpretation of Jesus’ time-word, emphasizing in various ways the newness of the time inaugurated in the coming of Jesus, most often with the parousia in view.
4. JESUS’ UNDERSTANDING OF TIME IN MARK 1:15 AGAINST ITS JEWISH BACKGROUND

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter we shall attempt to project Jesus’ announcement Πεπλήρωσεν ο Καί ροή και ηγηκήν ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ against its Jewish background consisting of the Old Testament and the Second Temple Jewish literature. Our aim is to determine on the basis of these sources what factors (apart from the creative thought of Jesus) contributed to the formation of this saying. We want to ask – against what background does the saying in Mark 1.15 become most readily intelligible?348

4.2. Proposals for the Background of Jesus’ Conception of Time in Mark 1.15

Chilton has observed that ‘a kingdom saying of the cast of Mk 1, 15 is not to be found in the Greek or Hebrew OT’.349 Chilton’s observation seems to be reflected in the way scholarly attempts to determine the provenance of Mark 1.15 tend to abandon the Old Testament and look elsewhere. This attempt, as we shall see below, is driven by the desire to obtain a principle or a conceptual framework which may assist us to better grasp the meaning of Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15. We shall turn now to consider scholars, along with Chilton, who have taken this passage as the specific focus of their inquiry and attempt to suggest a possible background from which it was derived for a better grasp of its semantic import. In this respect, scholars have turned to a wide range of biblical and Jewish texts including Tobit 14:5, 4 Ezra 4:36-37, Testament of Naphtali 8:3-4, Targum Isaiah 60:22, 11QMelch, 4QS 215a, Isaiah 52:7, Zechariah 14:21, Daniel 7:22, and 9:24-25.

349 See Chilton, God in Strength, 86; Jeremias, Theology, 32-33.
4.2.1. Franz Mussner

Mussner deals specifically with Mark 1.15 in a number of publications.\(^ {350}\) He maintains that pepl hrwtai o’kairoj indicates the conclusion of a period of time:


Die Zeit der Verheissungen ist zu Ende; es kommt die Zeit der Erfüllung.\(^ {351}\)

Clearly, for Mussner, the ‘time of waiting’ for the promise of the Kingdom has now come to its ‘end’ and therefore the ‘time of fulfilment’ has arrived. Mussner derives this interpretation, in part, by comparing the expression pepl hrwtai o’kairoj with Tobit 14:5:\(^ {352}\)

But God will again have mercy on them and bring them back into their land; and they will rebuild the house of God, though it will not be like the former one until the times of the age are completed (σπύτου ο’νόματος υπερανελθείς ο’νόματος των χρονίων των αἰώνων).

\(^ {350}\) See Mussner, ‘Die Bedeutung’, 257-75; idem, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 81-98; idem, “Evangelium”’, 159-77; idem, ‘Jesu Ansage’, 223-244.

\(^ {351}\) See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 88.

\(^ {352}\) See also Delling, Zeitverständnis, 87.
Here, the notion of ‘fulfilment’ is indeed one of conclusion or ending. Mussner finds additional support for this interpretation in Josephus Antiquities 6 § 49, Esther 4:12 (sic)\(^{353}\) and in New Testament passages such as Luke 21:24, John 7:8, Ephesians 1:10 and Galatians 4:4 and even from the Papyri (Pap. Oxyr. II 275, 24). All these passages ostensibly affirm the notion derived from Tobit 14:5 that ‘fulfilment’ implies the conclusion of a span of time. However, doubts arise concerning the specific literary link with Tobit that Mussner posits. Apart from the fact that there is no evidence that Jesus or the Synoptists knew Tobit the conceptual framework represented in Tobit 14:5 is given more attention in the Old Testament post-exilic prophets such as Haggai and Zechariah. The probability of Jesus being influenced by such writings rather than Tobit seems higher.

4.2.2. Joel Marcus

Mussner’s view of καιρός as the ‘time of the promises’ which corresponds to the previous epoch of the ‘old age’ arriving at its conclusion becomes foundational for Marcus’ analysis of πεπλήρωται ο’καιρός.\(^{354}\) He concurs with Mussner’s observation that ‘fulfilment’ means ‘the end of the time of waiting’.\(^{355}\) For Marcus, Mussner’s view can be schematized in the following way:\(^{356}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD AGE</th>
<th>NEW AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repent</td>
<td>believe in the gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURN AWAY</td>
<td>TURN TO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{353}\) Mussner often refers to Esther 4:12 as a possible parallel for Mark 1:15 but the correct reference is Esther 2:12. See Mussner, ‘Die Bedeutung’, 263.

\(^{354}\) See Marcus, ‘Time’, 49-68.

\(^{355}\) See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 88, 91.

\(^{356}\) See Marcus, ‘Time’, 52.
Marcus identifies the ‘old age’ with the period stretching from the Fall (Gen 3) to the advent of Jesus. This age is viewed as a ‘unity of disobedience’ so much so that any attempt to divide it into distinctive historical dispensations would be irrelevant.  

In support of his view, Marcus draws on a variant reading from the Freer Logion which appears in the longer ending of Mark, dated to about the fifth century, δι πεπι λή ρωταί οφ ον των ενω σι ατ η ον Σατανά αλά α μπίζει αλά δι ανα. In comparison with Mark 1:15, Marcus observes that what is fulfilled, in accordance with the Freer Logion reading, is ‘the term of the years of the dominion (εξουσία) of Satan’. On this basis, he suggests that this is precisely the sense attested in Mark 1.15: ‘The καιρός that is fulfilled with Jesus’ advent is the time of the dominion of Satan, his reign is now over’.  

The observation of the relation of the advent of Jesus with the completion of the dominion of Satan is strengthened by considering the immediate literary context of Mark 1.15. Before Jesus comes proclaiming the fulfilment of the time in Galilee, he is drawn into a confrontation with Satan (1.13). Satan appears to have been defeated as a result and thus in the course of Jesus’ ministry ‘his minions, the demons, shriek in terror as Jesus exorcizes them (1.24, 29)’. Marcus finds the same kind of reasoning in the Testament of Naphtali 8.3-4:

358 ‘The term of the years of the dominion of Satan has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near’.
Through his *kingly power* (*skēptros*) God will appear

To save the race of Israel….

if you achieve the good, my children,

men and *angels* will bless you…

the *devil* will flee from you…

*wild animals* will be afraid of you

and the *angels* will stand by you

Marcus observes that all three characters that feature in Mark’s narrative of Jesus’ temptation appear in this passage – a passage which clearly deals with the revelation of God’s kingly power. Given that Mark’s readers were familiar with this tradition they ‘would therefore have been primed to think of the end of Satan’s rule when they read in 1.15 of the fulfilment of the time and the advent of the Kingdom’.  

Marcus contends that this is supported in Mark 3.27 where Jesus’ exorcism is viewed as a defeat of Satan, which again can be compared to *Testament of Moses* 10.1 where the manifestation of the kingdom of God happens as the result of the defeat of Satan.

However, Marcus admits that passages such as Mark 4.15 do imply the continuation of Satan’s activity. This aspect of Satan’s activity is notably compatible with the dethronement of Satan, as is shown in Revelation 12.7-12. While the defeat of Satan is announced in Mark 1.15 and is demonstrated in Jesus’ exorcisms, the ultimate victory, according to Marcus, is not truly achieved until the crucifixion-and-resurrection. In the light of these considerations, Marcus paraphrases 1.15 in a way

---

364 See Marcus, ‘Time’, 68 n. 74. He draws on Wrede’s theory of ‘messianic secret’ in order to explain this seemingly contradiction. While Jesus is already the Messiah during his ministry and while his divine power constantly breaks through in miraculous activities, it is indeed his crucifixion-and-resurrection that truly establishes his identity. See Wrede, *Messianic*, 124-129.
that highlights the implicit alternation between the basiléa of Satan and the basiléa of God:

The time of the dominion of Satan has been fulfilled,
And the kingly power of God has drawn near
Turn away, therefore, from the dominion of Satan
And turn to the coming manifestation of the power of God.\(^{365}\)

Hence, the statement Πεπλήρωθαι ὁ καιρὸς announces the conclusion of ‘time of the dominion of Satan’. A new regime is about to replace it. The imperatives ‘repent’ and ‘believe’ therefore call for the recognition of the new situation God has brought about in Jesus Christ: ‘One world has died, another is being born; Jesus calls his hearers to recognize the new world in which they live’.\(^{366}\)

The fundamental problem with Marcus’ view, however, is how to square the observation that the ‘time of the dominion of Satan is now over’ with the ongoing activity of Satan in the present time – the time between the first and second coming of Jesus. In the rest of the New Testament, there is a sense in which the reign of Satan is still a reality in the time between Jesus’ first coming and his return. Paul, for example, still speaks of the Evil One and his minions as ο̂ ὁ βασιλεῖος τοῦ οἰκονομίας τοῦ κόσμου ‘the god of the this world’ (2 Cor 4:4). Moreover, Revelation 12, from which Marcus draws in support of his view of the dethronement of Satan in the ‘new age’,\(^{367}\) indicates that even though Satan has been cast from heaven, his ‘time’ is not yet

---

366 Marcus, ‘Time’, 56. This idea has a striking resemblance with Barn. 15.5, ‘When God’s son comes, he will destroy the kairos of the lawless one. See Marcus, ‘Time’, 65 n. 49.
completed since εἰ δεῦρον τῇ διάνυσιν θανάτου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐχθρίᾳ (‘he knows that his time is short’. Rev 12:12).

4.2.3. Bruce David Chilton

Chilton basically affirms Mussner’s and Marcus’ findings regarding the meaning of πεπληρωθέντα οἱ καιροὶ as referring to the completion of a designated period of time or process.368 However, Chilton questions how the combination of πεπληρωθέντα οἱ καιροὶ in connection with ἡγιάσας ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ could have been understood in Jesus’ historical setting. His inquiry into the meaning of πεπληρωθέντα οἱ καιροὶ led to the conclusion that the time Jesus announced is congruous with that found in Isaiah 60:22, ‘the time in which God acts’. Hence, ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ refers to an expected ‘divine manifestation’ that would accompany that ‘time’. He finds this expectation in the Targumic understanding of the ‘kingdom’ which is a reference to God’s ‘dynamic presence’.369 Thus, Chilton contends that the Targum Isaiah provides the specific background for Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15:

Targum Isaiah is the single most important extant witness to the conceptions which are at the base of this announcement. It preserves instances of diction which appear to correspond to three out of the four key terms in the saying (πεπληρωθέντα οἱ καιροὶ τῆ βασίλειας τοῦ θεοῦ), and language which is suggestive of what must lie behind the fourth (ἡγιάσας).370

For Chilton, the combination of these terms (πεπληρωθέντα οἱ καιροὶ τῆ βασίλειας τοῦ θεοῦ) denotes the time in which God acts (Tg. Isa. 60: 22). In fact, Targum Isaiah 60:20 speaks of ‘days of mourning’ which are completed (Tg. Isa. 60:20; cf. 57:18) as the reign of

368 See Chilton, God in Strength, 82.
369 See Chilton, God in Strength, 87.
370 See Chilton, God in Strength, 88-89. See also Stuhlmacher, Evangelium, 237; Jeremias, Theology, 102 n. 5.
God breaks in (Tg. Isa. 31:4; 52:7). In that light, what Jesus announced in Mark 1:15 is the coming near in strength of the presence of God (Tg. Isa. 40:10; 56:1): ‘His own might is near to disclosure (hagigken, in the sense of Is 56, 1); “the kingdom of God” refers to God’s dynamic presence’. The most pressing problem with Chilton’s position is the scarcity of evidence pertaining to Jesus’ familiarity with the Targumic sources. Even if the thought forms represented in the Targum at a later time could be traced to the time of Jesus, an Old Testament link would seem more convincing.

4.2.4. F. F. Bruce

Bruce observes that Jesus’ announcement peplhrotai o’ kai roj could have been equally proclaimed a generation earlier by Judas the Galilean or a generation later by the Zealots who fanned the revolt against Rome in AD. 66. Common to both these messianic movements was the conviction, grounded on the Jewish Scriptures, that at that very time, world dominion would fall to a man or group of men from Judaea. While Josephus and Roman writers attributed the prophecy’s fulfilment to the rise of Vespasian, the Roman emperor, Bruce, on the other hand, thinks that it is more plausible for Jesus’ audience to have understood Mark 1:15 in terms of Daniel 7:22 which speaks of the time for the saints to receive the Kingdom. Thus, the general implication of the announcement is that ‘the time had come when the God of heaven was to inaugurate the indestructible kingdom which would supersede all other forms of world dominion’.

371 See Chilton, God in Strength, 89.
372 See Bruce, Time is Fulfilled, 15.
373 Included in Scriptural passages central to this conviction were Daniel 2:44; 7:14, 27, Genesis 49:10 and Numbers 24:17. See Bruce, Time is Fulfilled, 16-17.
374 See also Evans, ‘Defeating Satan’, 167-68.
375 See Bruce, Time is Fulfilled, 20.
Bruce suggests that the principal distinction between Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 and the same message emerging from persons such as Judas the Galilean and his spiritual heirs lies in the different ways in which they would have understood the Kingdom of God. Whereas for Jesus the Kingdom belongs to both the present and the future, his Jewish contemporaries were looking for a nationalistic kingdom to be established in their contemporary situation. Moreover, Jesus looks to God for the kingdom’s arrival whereas Judas the Galilean and his legacy trusted in their military competence to bring it about. An important contribution of Bruce’s position to understanding Mark 1:15 is viewing the ‘time of fulfilment’ as no longer a past historical epoch (as we have seen in Mussner and Marcus) but, in keeping with its supposedly Danielic background, as corresponding to the present time. However, Bruce fails to observe the important syntactical and semantic connection between the time-word, Παρθένοι και ῥοζ, and ἡ βασιλεία του θεοῦ.376 For him, the time-word merely indicates a condition (‘the right time’) for the more important event to occur, namely, ‘the coming near of the Kingdom of God’.

4.2.5. Margaret Barker

Barker interprets Mark 1:15 in terms of a combination of Daniel 9:24, 25 and Qumran documents such as 11QMelch. In the light of these sources, Παρθένοι και ῥοζ announces that the tenth Jubilee is inaugurated. This tenth Jubilee is meant to coincide with the advent of ‘Melchizedek’ who would announce, ‘[T]he kingdom of God is at hand, repent’ because the final Day of Atonement was near, so ‘believe the

376 On our discussion of this issue, see Chapter 5 below.
good news’ of the Jubilee release. Barker finds this view confirmed by Luke’s account of Jesus in the synagogue in Nazareth where ‘he claimed to have inaugurated the final Jubilee’. In keeping with 11QMelch’s interpretation of Isaiah 61:1, the Jubilee is a time of judgment which was supposedly realized in Palestine in the famines of the 40s and early 60s in the first century. In fact, based on Daniel’s ‘seventy weeks of years’, Barker calculated the first week of the ‘tenth Jubilee’ to be the beginning of Jesus’ ministry and its culmination to be the destruction of Jerusalem. However, a proposal of this kind, with its required mathematical precision, needs to be nuanced more carefully. It stands vulnerable to the charge of imposing on Mark 1:15 a conceptual framework of which Jesus himself was quite unaware. It is far more probable for Jesus to have drawn on the Old Testament for the background of Mark 1:15 than from the sectarian documents of Qumran.

4.2.6. Marc Philonenko

While Barker finds literary and theological affinity with Mark 1:15 in 11QMelch, Marc Philonenko observes it in 4Q215a. According to Philonenko, this document asserts that the ‘time of impiety and perversity’ has passed and that the ‘today’ of justice, peace and truth of God’s ‘domination’ has arrived. He observes similar notions in Qumran’s Commentary on Habakkuk 5:7-8 and Damascus Document 6:10, 14; 12:23 and 15:7 as well as in the Testament of Daniel 6:6. The same idea also appears in the ‘Logion Freer’ version of Mark 16:4 where the reference is to the completion of the term of Satan’s activity. Echoes of the same concept resonate in Epistle of Barnabas 18:2 where an appeal is made to Satan as the prince of the

381 See Philonenko, ‘Marc 1,15a’, 213-20.
present ‘time of iniquity’ – an expression which can be traced to Ezekiel 21:25, 29 in accordance with its Vulgate rendering as ‘in tempore iniquitatis’. It is this ‘time of iniquity’ that is being contrasted with the ‘today of justice’ and the ‘time of peace’ in 4Q215a: ‘Le “temps de l’iniquité” est consommé, l’“heure de justice” est arrivée, le «temps de la paix» est arrivé, même si l’on attend encore que prenne fin la Perversité’. 382

For Philonenko, this implies that παῦλος ἡρώτησεν τὸ καιρὸν is the announcement of the completion of a past historical dispensation: ‘“Le temps de l’impiété est accompli” annonce la formule de Marc 1, 15: «Le temps est accompli»’. 383 The idea of the ‘completion’ of the time of impiety, according to Philonenko, is already anticipated in 4 Ezra 11:44 and 2 Baruch 70:2 where it is identified with the arrival of the ‘harvest of the seed of the evil ones’. The statement ἕξετε βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is accordingly an indication that a qualitatively new time, namely, the ‘domination of God’s favor’ has arrived over humanity and the world. The term ἕξετε is interpreted in the light of Matthew 12:28 and Luke 11:20 as ‘has arrived’ which is taken to be the figurative understanding of the verb εἰσέρχεσθαι (Mark 9:1; Matt 6:10; Luke 11:2; 17:20; 22:18), derived from the Aramaic term, “atá”, which is traditionally associated with the Hebrew term “bô” meaning, ‘to come’. 384

Hence, ‘La formule «la domination de bonté est arrivée» nous paraît donc toute voisine de la formule «le règne de Dieu s’est approché»’. 385 Thus, Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 declares not only the completion of a passing historical

382 See Philonenko, ‘Marc 1, 15a’, 216.
383 See Philonenko, ‘Marc 1, 15a’, 217.
384 Philonenko, ‘Marc 1, 15a’, 217.
385 Philonenko, ‘Marc 1, 15a’, 218.
dispensation, namely, ‘the reign of impiety’ but also that the domination of God’s
truth, peace, justice and favor has arrived in Jesus. The fundamental difficulty in
Philonenko’s insistence that the kingdom has already arrived lies in the existence of
Gospel passages that affirm a futuristic component of the kingdom (e.g. Mark 9:1;
14:25).  

4.2.7. N. T. Wright

Wright argues that the narrative told by Jesus’ contemporaries upon which Jesus’
ministry can be properly understood was about ‘the present evil age’ and ‘the age to
come’ as presented in Scripture. The ‘present evil age’ is designated as the time of
Israel’s ‘exile’ and the ‘age to come’ is Israel’s promised restoration. This was the
story of Israel and their God and their ongoing and ‘often checkered relationship’.
Since Israel’s God was also the Creator of the universe Israel’s story becomes also
the story of the world. The content of this story speaks of when and how the present
evil age would come to an end and the new age is born. Wright insists that ‘most of
Jesus’ Jewish contemporaries believed that the exile was still continuing and that
what they needed and longed for was the real return from exile’. What guaranteed
that this would come to pass were the promises given in the Pentateuch and
confirmed by the Prophets. To believe in the God of Israel was to hold firmly that

386 The ‘completely certain evidence’ of the imminent ‘near expectation’ of the kingdom, according to
37. Crawford’s attempt to discredit these texts on the basis of their inauthenticity is unconvincing if
these texts were to be measured against the criterion of embarrassment alone. See Crawford, ‘Near
Expectation’, 225-44. If it was clear to the Gospel writers that Jesus was wrong about the ‘near
expectation’ of the kingdom, would it not be enormously embarrassing to include these passages in
their rendition of the Jesus event? Moreover, in Qumran, the kingdom still lies in the future. See 1QH
xxi 15; 4Q418 161 9; 1 QS iii 14-15; 4Q416 1 13; 1QM i 5. See also Brin, Time in the Bible, 267.
388 Wright refines his usage of the notion of ‘exile’ to mean not primarily a ‘geographical’ idea but
rather ‘the period of history characterized by the suffering and oppression which, according to
prophets, had resulted from the national sin’. Hence, it is a theological notion applied to an actual
389 See Wright, ‘Dialogue’, 258.
these promises would one day come true and thus to live ‘within a story’ that had a future that would be confirmed for them.

For Wright, ‘Jesus’ kingdom-announcement makes sense with this same narrative...’ The background for Wright’s scenario is derived from Daniel 9 in which the period of Israel’s exile is prophetically extended to become ‘seventy weeks of years subdivided into seven, sixty-two, and one’ (Dan 9:24-27). Consequently, this prolonged period of exile is supposed to have embraced in its scope the restoration of the Second Temple as well as Jesus’ birth. Daniel 9 according to Wright contains ‘the prayer of Daniel in Babylon, inquiring after the time when Jerusalem will be rebuilt’. The real return from exile is bound up with the restoration of Jerusalem. In fact, the Kingdom of God Jesus proclaimed is, according to Wright, ‘a shorthand for not only the hope for return from exile but several other aspects of “restoration eschatology”’. In Daniel 9 it is associated with the end of sin and the provision of atonement for Israel’s iniquity which drove them into exile in the first place (Dan 9:15-19). According to Wright, this will come about in perilous times (Dan 9:24-27) climaxing in the cessation of sacrifices and the setting up of ‘an abomination that desolates’. Jesus’ usage of this phrase attested in Mark 13 and Matthew 24 indicates his intention ‘to hook in to Daniel’s scheme of thought’.

---

390 See Wright, ‘Dialogue’, 257.
393 See Wright, ‘Dialogue’, 258.
394 See Wright, ‘Dialogue’, 260. Wright acknowledges his indebtedness to Sanders for the designation ‘restoration eschatology’ as a descriptive category for various movements within Second Temple Judaism driven by the ‘new exodus’ motif combined with a counter-temple theme including those of John the Baptist, Jesus and the early church. See ‘Dialogue’, 254. See also Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 78-90.
By implication, the fulfilment of time Jesus proclaims reflects the coming fulfilment of the heptads scheme of Daniel 9, namely, the real return from exile and the decisive restoration of Israel’s fortune as in the days of old. However, Wright is not altogether clear whether Israel’s real return from exile and restoration is realized in the death and resurrection of Jesus or in the events that took place in Jerusalem in 70 AD.  

4.2.8. Christian Grappe

Grappe thinks that the background to Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 comes from Zechariah 14:20-21. He argues that the fulfilment of time arrives in the cleansing of the temple. Grappe draws on the Old Testament, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the Vulgate as well as contemporary commentators on Zechariah to support his view that the term ‘Canaanites’ in Zechariah 14:21 really stands for ‘merchants’. The cleansing of the ‘merchants’ from the temple sanctifies the temple space for the real presence of God to dwell there:

L’évocation du temps de l’accomplissement eschatologique s’achève avec l’annonce de la fin de tout commerce dans la Maison du Seigneur. L’explication de cette absence ou de cette disparition des marchands paraît obvie: la sanctification de l’espace rendra superflue leur présence.

396 In one sense, Wright maintains that the resurrection is the real restoration of Israel, the real return from exile. But in another sense, the effect of Jesus’ ministry in re-enacting Israel’s real return from exile, according to Wright, is not implemented until the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in AD 70. See Wright, *Jesus*, 473-74. Precisely on this point Blomberg finds fault with Wright’s presentation of Jesus: ‘How does Jesus’ going to die in Jerusalem to bring about the turn of the ages fit in with Wright’s insistence that the really crucial terminus of the exile is the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C. E.? ’ See Wright, *Jesus*, 631-45; Blomberg, ‘Wright Stuff’, 37
398 Grappe’s eschatology seems to be a realized eschatology in which the kingdom of God has already arrived as demonstrated by Jesus’ exorcism: See Grappe, ‘Le Temps’, 169. He also refers to his book *Le Royaume de Dieu*, 171-72 where his position is argued in detail.
399 See Grappe, ‘Le Temps’, 171 n. 5.
The main purpose of Jesus’ triumphal entry to Jerusalem, according to Grappe, is in order to fulfill Zechariah 14 with the expulsion of the merchants from the temple.\textsuperscript{401} The coming of the Kingdom of God generates ‘une dynamique nouvelle’ in the midst of Israel. Therefore, Israel’s cultic experience in which the mediatorial role of the sacrifice was central to approaching God in the temple is now rendered obsolete. It is replaced with the exclusive presence of God in his house. This scenario, according to Grappe, is precisely what is envisaged in Zechariah 14:20-21.\textsuperscript{402} Grappe’s observation of the possible role of Zechariah 9 and Zechariah 14 in the framework of Mark’s presentation of Jesus’ eschatological teaching elicits admiration.

The fundamental flaw in Grappe’s argument, however, lies in his construal of $\text{πρωταύται ο'καίρο}$ as predicting a future event, namely, Jesus’ temple cleansing. This is a meaning which can hardly be supported by the grammar of Mark 1:15.\textsuperscript{403} Grammatically speaking, there is a better possibility for construing the time-word to refer to a past event (as Mussner and Marcus have done) than to a future event.\textsuperscript{404}

4.3. God’s Covenant with Time as the most Plausible Background of Mark 1:15

Having surveyed the way in which Mark 1:15 has been understood according to its possible biblical and/or Jewish background, we shall now turn to offer our own proposal of what seems to be the most plausible background of Jesus’ time-word from the Jewish sources. To foreshadow the position to be argued below, I shall contend that $\text{πρωταύται ο'καίρο}$ is the announcement that God’s

\textsuperscript{401} See Grappe, ‘Le Temps’, 172.
\textsuperscript{402} See Grappe, ‘Le Temps’, 180.
\textsuperscript{403} Even the traditional definition of the perfect tense, namely, a past action with continuous effect in the present [see our discussion below under section 5.2.2.] cannot support Grappe’s view.
\textsuperscript{404} See under section 5.2.3 below.
covenant with time is now fulfilled. The fulfilment of that covenant is manifested more specifically as the restoration of Israel under the reign of David’s offspring.

4.3.1. The Linguistic Uniqueness of \textit{Peplh\textit{rwta\textit{i o\textit{\'kai\textit{roj}}}}

Jesus’ time-word, \textit{Peplh\textit{rwta\textit{i o\textit{\'kai\textit{roj}}}}, is unique with respect both to its grammatical structure and its linguistic constituents. Even though it has often been rendered with the English phrase ‘the time has come’, this is not entirely accurate and, worse still, the translation risks distorting the idea Jesus conveys in this statement. Bible versions in the main render Jesus’ utterance in Mark 1:15 as ‘the time is fulfilled’ (e.g. NRSV, RSV, KJV, ESV, JB, ASV), thus presupposing the arrival of a ‘decisive moment’ in God’s salvation plan. While these translations highlight the centrality of the Kingdom of God in Jesus’ proclamation, there is a fundamental difficulty with them which is discernible on at least two levels.

(1) To interpret \textit{peplh\textit{rwta\textit{i o\textit{\'kai\textit{roj}}} merely as the arrival of the ‘decisive moment’ reduces Jesus’ time-word to a mere time indicator and thus hastily transfers the status of importance to the second phrase, \textit{hgi\textit{ken h\textit{basileia tou\textit{qeou}}} as if Jesus uses the time-word merely to highlight this phrase (Cf. Luke 10:9, 11; 21:31; cf. Matt 4:17; 12:28; Luke 11:20).

\textsuperscript{405} That is, the regular succession of day and night which was established at creation (Gen 1:5; 8:22) is described in Jeremiah 33:20 as God’s ‘covenant’ with day and night. See Bright, \textit{Jeremiah}, 297. Commenting on this passage, Guest challenges his readers to look to the sun and the moon as ‘promises of God’s faithfulness to fulfill his word with the restoration of his people. See Guest, \textit{Jeremiah}, 239-40.

\textsuperscript{406} See, for example, NIV, CJB. See also Hooker, \textit{Mark}, 54-5. Cf. Marcus, \textit{Mark 1-8}, 171. Cf. ‘The time is accomplished’ (Douay-Rheims American Edition, 1899); ‘The time promised by God has come at last’ (NLT); ‘The tyme is come’ (Tyndale’s New Testament, 1534; Bishop’s New Testament, 1595).

\textsuperscript{407} See Edwards, \textit{Mark}, 47; Guelich, \textit{Mark}, 43; Johnson, \textit{St. Mark}, 42. Cf. ‘This is the time of fulfilment’ (NAB); ‘Fulfilled hath been the time’ (Young’s Literal Translation, 1862/1898).
(2) Jesus employs statements about time in the Gospels which fit more precisely with translations such as ‘the time is at hand’, ‘the time is near’ or ‘the time has come’. He, for instance, summarizes the message of the messianic pretenders who will arise to falsely proclaim the imminence of the ‘end’ as Ο καιρός ἡγιστήρεν (Luke 21:8). He, moreover, implies the notion that a ‘special time has come’ in statements such as ποτέ ο καιρός εστίν (13:33), ἡ γενεαν η ὁδά (Mark 14:41) or εἴρεισονται δέ χρήσιμοι (Mark 2:20; cf. Luke 21:6). Even Mark’s usage of cognates of the term εὐκαιρία, which more forthrightly convey the idea of the ‘the right time’ (Mark 6:21, 31), implies its availability as a grammatical choice in Jesus’ historical setting. That Jesus, however, employs these time expressions in other contexts of his teachings suggests that even though linguistic choices of this kind were available, he deliberately chose to grammaticalize his gospel proclamation in the unique way we find it in Mark 1:15 with Πεπλήρωται ο καιρός.

We must concede that there are two assumptions here: (1) The statement Mark reported in 1:15 is authentically Jesus’ statement. We have affirmed the authenticity of Mark 1:15 in the previous chapter; (2) Even though the extent to which Jesus used the Greek language (besides Aramaic as his mother-tongue) in his teaching cannot be specified with absolute certainty, we will assume for the purposes of the argument of

---

409 Cf. Matt 21:34, ο ἡγιστήρεν ο καιρός; Matt 26:18, ο καιρός ην ε广告服务 εστίν; Rev 22:10, ο καιρός γὰρ ε广告服务 εστίν.
412 E.g. ESV; KJV; NAS. Cf. NIV: ‘the time will come’.
413 For other expressions of this kind that seem available to Jesus in his time, see also our discussion of Josephus’ view of time below in Chapter 4.7.
this section that Jesus may have addressed his Galilean public audience in Greek.\textsuperscript{414} Even if Aramaic was the language in which this statement was originally made, we must assume that Mark’s renderings of programmatic statements of this kind were faithful to the original. However, whether Jesus used Greek in the initial proclamation of Mark 1:15 is not essential to this study; after all we are dealing with Mark’s report of an utterance made by Jesus, the authenticity of which, as we have seen, is widely acknowledged. For readers more sceptical of Jesus speaking Greek and/or Mark recording or translating his words faithfully, the present study may still be read as a contribution to Mark’s theology. Where our discussion speaks of Jesus’ view,\textsuperscript{415} it may be understood as Mark’s presentation of Jesus’ view. Our argument does not depend on a particular view of the historical Jesus or even the language that he spoke.

That the linguistic peculiarity of the statement ρεπληρωται ο’ θαι Ῥωσί is unique grammatically does not imply that it is unparalleled within the New Testament.\textsuperscript{416} We have considered the soundness of Chilton’s observation that structural as well as linguistic affinities are discernible between Jesus’ time-word and Luke 21:24, \textit{πλήρωσιν θαι Ῥωσί αγωνιή.} \textsuperscript{417} However, a closer inspection of the grammatical structure of Luke 21:24 reveals significant divergences from Mark 1:15, on at least two key points.

Firstly, Luke 21:24 not only uses the plural form θαι Ῥωσί, but also qualified ‘the times’ envisaged as the ‘times of the nations’ (cf. \textit{T Mos} 7:1-4). This slight variation may

\textsuperscript{414} See Excursus 3 below.  
\textsuperscript{415} See especially Chapter 7.3 below.  
\textsuperscript{416} Contra Kelber, \textit{Kingdom}, 9-10.  
\textsuperscript{417} See Chapter 3.2 above; Chilton, \textit{God in Strength}, 55. See also Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 309; Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 83-84.
not appear important at first but in actual fact it holds the key for distinguishing between grammatical constructions of this kind and Jesus’ time-word. In Mark 1:15, it is obviously not the time of something that is being fulfilled. Rather, it is ‘the time’ (ο’ καιρό) itself spoken of in a unique sense that is being fulfilled. This observation is vulnerable of course to the charge that too much weight is placed upon the use of the definite article. However, the absence of the definite article in Luke 21:24 may have something to do with the specifying of καιρό,

Secondly, the force of the preposition αερί in Luke 21:24 clearly denotes that the fulfilment of the ‘times of the nations’ is the completion of an elapsed period of time characterized by a specified activity, namely, the humiliation of Jerusalem by the nations. In Mark 1:15, on the other hand – as we shall argue below – the fulfilment of time seems to be an imperfective dynamic. In other words, whereas the fulfilment of time in Luke 21:24 implicates a punctiliar activity that comes at the completion of a specified elapse of time, in Mark 1:15 what is envisaged is an unfolding activity in the present time.

Another possible parallel with Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15 can be found in Jesus’ utterance in John 7:8, ο’ ενώ καιρό οπω πεπληρωται. Even though Jesus’ statement about time is herein expressed in the negative, time fulfilment is unambiguously presupposed. Yet, ‘the time’ Jesus has in view to be fulfilled is notably qualified as ο’ ενώ καιρό (‘my time’; cf. Matt 26:18). The parallel in Mark’s Gospel is probably found in Jesus’ prediction of the ‘day’ when the bridegroom will be removed from

418 But see our discussion of the function of the definite article in ο’ καιρό in section 5.2.1 below.
420 See the next chapter for the discussion of this point.
the bridal party (Mark 2:20). This prediction seems to have arrived when, in the
presence of his betrayer, Jesus realizes that ‘the hour has come’ (Mark 14:41). In
other words, Jesus’ ‘hour’, according to Mark, is an aspect – and an important one –
of the time fulfilment dynamic that Jesus announces in Mark 1:15.

Similarly, the construal of Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15 as a reference to the
completion of a past historical epoch seems potentially unhelpful not only on
grammatical grounds but more so on theological considerations. In accordance with
the traditional view of the perfect verb, it seems rather incongruous to interpret
pepl hρwται as referring to the completion of a past action and then to interpret
hγγίκεν as denoting the newness introduced by Jesus’ earthly ministry when both
verbs occur in the perfect tense form. This kind of interpretation seems to be a
typical case in which overriding theological concerns prevail over careful exegetical
considerations. If Jesus frequently identifies himself with the fulfilment of Scriptures
in the Gospels (e.g. Matt 5:17-20; cf. 11:5-6; Luke 4:21; 24:44-47; cf. John 5:39-40,
46) then it seems more reasonable to understand his present rather than his past as the
time during which fulfilment becomes the governing principle, at least, of his own
ministry.

Moreover, this construal of pepl hρwται o’ kai ρό is the completion of a past
historical epoch is vulnerable to the charge of parallelomana. Sandmel has rightly
cautioned biblical scholars against a tendency to naively jump from similarity of

421 Besides Mussner and Marcus above, see also Fallon, Saint Mark, 58; Garland, Mark, 59; Kilgallen,
Mark, 32-33.
422 Contra the diagrammatic representation in Dechow, Gottessohn, 67-68 where the fulfilment of
time constitutes the past of Jesus.
thought forms to conclude one writer’s dependence on another.\textsuperscript{423} Similarly, Barr has alerted us to the error often associated with the old biblical theological school of deriving theological concepts from individual lexical items of the Bible and then seeking to impose them indiscriminately on other occurrences of the same term in the text.\textsuperscript{424} This seems to have marred the construals of Mussner, Marcus and Philonenko.

4.3.2. \textit{God’s Covenant with Time in the Old Testament}

What then is a more plausible alternative as background for Mark 1:15? We wish to propose that when Jesus announces \textit{πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ}, he had in view the fulfilment of ‘time’ itself, \textit{ὁ καιρός}. In the Old Testament, as we shall see below, God maintains ‘time’ in terms of day and night as the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.\textsuperscript{425}

This proposal is grounded on two presuppositions. Firstly, the phrase \textit{πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός} in Mark 1:15 seems to specify ‘time’ (\textit{ὁ καιρός}) itself as the promise that is coming to its fulfilment.\textsuperscript{426} That is, underlying Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 is the promise-fulfilment correlation employed in the New Testament to establish Jesus’ continuity with the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{427} Secondly, to state the same point negatively, what is being fulfilled here is apparently ‘time’ (\textit{ὁ καιρός}) itself and not

\textsuperscript{424} See Barr, \textit{Biblical Words}, 147-48.  
\textsuperscript{427} See Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 312.}
the Scripture; otherwise Jesus would have employed ἡ γραφή as he does in Luke 4:21.428.

We shall begin the evaluation of our hypothesis regarding the possible background of Jesus’ time-word with the Old Testament. Then we shall draw on the Jewish Second Temple literature in order to explore how our findings from the Old Testament might have been appropriated by the supposedly Jewish commentators who stand behind the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and who presumably bequeathed to later generations of Jewish bible students the meaning of their Scriptures.429

4.3.2.1. The Time and not the Scripture is Fulfilled

The grammatical structure of the announcement ἡ πρεσβυταιρία o’καιρός καὶ ἡγισάθη πρὸ τοῦ καθισμοῦ is essential for the consideration of our hypothesis. There seems to be an intimate connection being made here between the fulfilment of time and the coming near of the Kingdom of God. This connection has often been described as that between a mere time indicator and a much awaited more central event – namely, the coming near of the Kingdom of God.430

Delling, however, has correctly observed that it is ο’καιρός (‘time’) that Jesus singles out to be fulfilled here and not the Scriptures:

428 The ‘fulfilment formula’ is most prominent in Matthew’s Gospel. See Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 312; Prabhu, Formula Quotations, 18-23. The term πρεσβυταιρία appears five times in the New Testament (Mark 1:15; Luke 4:21; John 3:29; 7:8; Gal 5:14) and in all these occurrences, the encoded verbal activity is actualized upon its grammatical subject. On this use of the perfect tense-form, see Campbell, Verbal Aspect, 172-75.

429 See Charlesworth, ‘In the Crucible’, 21. For a different viewpoint on the Pseudepigrapha, see de Jonge, ‘Developing’, 29-38 who argues that to some extent these writings find their origin in Christian circles. It is understandable that de Jonge’s view has not been favourably received in biblical scholarship thus far (since much of the extensive scholarly literature on this material risked being rendered obsolete), but it sufficiently cautions against confidently asserting conceptual premises constructed upon these sources.

430 See Chapter 5.3.2 below.
Über das Wort führt noch weiter: Markus (oder auch schon Jesus) kennt jene Verheissungen; es ist indessen wohl bezeichnend für ihn (und für Jesus gült es auch), dass er nicht sagt: 

pepl hρwta i η γραφή, sondern: pepl hρwta i οκαιρος. 431

Nevertheless, Delling did not attempt to isolate an Old Testament provenance for his observation. 432 We wish to propose however that time itself (οκαιρος) is the promise of the Kingdom the fulfillment of which is manifested concretely in Jesus’ ministry.

In previous attempts at tracing Jesus’ time-word to its possible Jewish background, the intimate connection between the time-word and the coming near of the kingdom in Mark 1:15 is usually explained in such a way that makes the time-word irrelevant to the rest of Mark 1:15. 433 Commentators often adopt conceptual frameworks most promising in providing descriptive categories to account for the meaning of the Kingdom of God at the expense of the time-word. For Chilton therefore as we have seen, it is ‘God in strength’, for Marcus and Mussner, on the other hand, it is the ‘new age’, for Barker, it is the ‘time of the tenth jubilee’, and so forth. Apart from an inconsistent application of the traditional definition of the perfect tense form to Mark 1:15, the express effect of such attempts is that the grammatical significance of Jesus’ time-word is often regarded as conditional for the programmatic summary of Jesus’ proclamation in the remainder of Mark 1:15. Here, we shall propose that the promise of the restoration of Israel seems to be the most plausible background.

431 See Delling, Zeitverständnis, 88.
432 This is probably the result of his thinking that the phrase pepl hρwta i οκαιρος is more proximate to Greek thought forms than to Jewish. He discusses the possible influence of Persian ideas on Jewish eschatology and concludes on the basis of Daniel 2 that it must have been Babylonian influence that was predominant. See Delling, Zeitverständnis, 94-95. He goes on to trace the concept of ‘fulfilment’ from Persian influence through a Greek conceptual framework to its final realization in Christ. See Delling, Zeitverständnis, 88, 103-4.
433 See Chapter 5.3.5 below.
against which Jesus’ announcement Πεπλήρωσεν ο Καιρός και ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ γεου is to be understood.\(^{434}\)

4.3.2.2. God’s Covenant with Time in the Context of the Promise of Israel’s Restoration

The focus of our inquiry into the background of Mark 1:15 is a statement about God’s covenant with day and night that appears in the context of Yahweh’s promise of Israel’s restoration in Jeremiah 33:20-21:\(^{435}\)

Thus says the LORD: If you could break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night would not come at their appointed time, then surely could my covenant with my servant David be broken, so that he would not have a son to reign on his throne, and my covenant with my ministers the Levites. (Jer 33:20-21)

And again in Jeremiah 33:25-26:

\[\text{Thus says the LORD: If you could break my covenant with the day and my covenant with the night, so that day and night would not come at their appointed time, then surely could my covenant with my servant David be broken, so that he would not have a son to reign on his throne, and my covenant with my ministers the Levites. (Jer 33:20-21)}\]


\(^{435}\) Here we shall draw from the critical version of *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia* text since it is more convenient for the purpose of exegesis and even for readers of this study even though it should be noted that Masoretic accents were added later.
Thus says the LORD: If I had not established my covenant with day and night and the statutes of heaven and earth, then surely would I reject the offspring of Jacob and of my servant David and not appoint any of his descendants as rulers over the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But I will restore their fortunes, and will have mercy upon them (Jer 33:25-26).

While Jeremiah 33:14-26 is attested in the Masoretic Text, it is missing from the LXX. On that basis, some have thought that this is ‘a very late secondary addition to the book’. However, Talmon has argued that the pattern of restoration depicted here is conceivably a reflection of historical experience under David and Solomon. Moreover, Fishbane has demonstrated the relationship of this oracle to Jeremiah 23:5-6 – a passage that clearly entertains the hope of the restoration of Israel under David. Furthermore, some of the linguistic elements and semantic import of Jeremiah 33:20-26 are already represented in Jeremiah 31:35-36. It seems most likely, then, that this oracle’s attestation in the Masoretic Text is more original. But even if this passage was a later addition to Jeremiah, it should not affect the result of our inquiry here, since it would still belong to the Scriptural corpus presumably available to Jesus. Several important observations can be deduced from


441 Pomykala concludes that ‘Jer 33:14-26 could date anywhere from between the end of the pre-exilic period to the beginning of post-exilic era’. See, *Davidic Dynasty*, 44.
Jeremiah 33:20-21 and 25-26 about the intimate relationship of time with the fulfilment of Israel’s hope of restoration.

(1) Two distinctive covenants are set forth in these passages in a manner that conveys that God’s faithfulness to one necessarily conditions his faithfulness to the other. The protasis covenant is God’s covenant with day and night (vv. 20, 25). The apodosis covenant is God’s covenant with David (vv. 21, 26). Commentators often interpret the relationship between God’s faithfulness to his covenant with time to his covenant with David, in this passage, as analogous.442 Just as God has been faithful to one, namely, his covenant with day and night, he will indeed be faithful to his covenant with the other, that is, with David. However, the positive form of the utterances in verses 25-26 affirms that the fundamental reason for God’s establishment of his covenant with day and night is ultimately tied to his faithfulness to Israel and David. In other words, the relationship envisaged in this passage seems more likely to be one of a fulfilment becoming a promise awaiting further fulfilment.443 In that sense, God’s faithfulness to his covenant with the day and the night constitutes the promise guaranteeing the fulfilment of his covenant with David and with Israel (vv. 21, 26).444 Since ‘day’ and ‘night’, as we shall see, constitute the basic unit of time in Israel,445 I shall refer to God’s covenant with the day and the

442 See Brueggemann, To Build, 100; Thompson, Jeremiah, 603; Jones, Jeremiah, 424; Freehof, Jeremiah, 201.
443 This pattern of fulfilment becoming another promise awaiting a fulfilment is an essential aspect of the promise-fulfilment correlation in the Bible. Cf. Fuchs, ‘Verheissung und Erfüllung’, 78. For instance, the fulfilment of God’s promise to Israel in giving them the land becomes, for David, the promise of God’s rest into which only the faithful will enter (Ps 95:7-11). Moreover, the fulfilment of the restoration of the temple after the return from the exile becomes the promise of a house more glorious that God will establish in some future time (Hag 2:7-9; cf. 2 Bar 32:1-7). Cf. Hammerton-Kelly, ‘Temple’, 13-14
444 See Thompson, Jeremiah, 603. 46-61, Coppens, ‘L’espérance’, 51-54 who imply the possibility of this interpretation. Contra Keown et al who think that it is the ‘enduring nature of Davidic rule and levitical priesthood’ which is assimilated to the fixed order of day and night. See Keown et al, Jeremiah 26-52, 174.
445 See Brin, Time in the Bible, 52-57; DeVries, Yesterday, 39-53.
night as God’s *covenant with time*.\(^{446}\) Here, day and night are personified as covenantal partners.

(2) The use of the particle "g in verse 21 and 26, while maintaining its additive force, is emphatic in its affirmation that God’s faithfulness to his covenant with time is the promise of his faithfulness to the Davidic covenant.\(^{447}\) In that capacity, it can be translated as ‘then surely’ or ‘then indeed’.\(^{448}\) When "g occurs after a conditional clause such as here in verse 20-21 and 25-26 it stresses the main clause, which is God’s covenant with David.\(^{449}\) Consequently, God’s fulfilment of his covenant with time daily *surely* promises the fulfilment of his covenant with David for the restoration of Israel.

(3) The binding element of God’s covenant with time is specified as God’s commitment that day and night will occur *in their appointed time* (¬T‬). The occurrence of "a both in verse 20 and in its negative form al ¬ai in verse 25 indicates that the condition set forth is realizable.\(^{450}\) That is, God is actually giving ‘day’ and ‘night’ in their time. As Brueggemann observes, ‘the rhythms of night and day are not “natural” phenomena, but happen in regular ways because God has promised that each of them will have an assured and regular time of presence’.\(^{451}\) In that sense, God’s covenantal commitment to time may be stated in the following

---

\(^{446}\) Brueggemann refers to this as the ‘covenants of night and day’. This is true in verse 20 but in verse 25, God refers to it as ‘my covenant with day and night’ which could probably be read (according to the Masoretic Text textual apparatus) as ‘my creation of day and night’. In either case, it envisages one and not two covenantal arrangements. See Brueggemann, *To Build*, 100. Jones calls it the ‘covenant with Noah’. See Jones, *Jeremiah*, 424. Calvin employs ‘the general law of nature’ as the descriptive label for this covenant. See Calvin, *Jeremiah*, 266.


\(^{449}\) See Labuschagne, ‘Emphasizing Particle’, 201.

\(^{450}\) See Seow, *Grammar*, 324.

\(^{451}\) See Brueggemann, *To Build*, 100-1.
way: ‘I shall give day and night in their appointed time’. Two important points are implied here. God determines the time for the occurrence of the day and the time for the occurrence of the night. Moreover, God gives ‘day’ and ‘night’ precisely in that time. Thus, his covenant with time sets in motion ‘day’ following ‘night’ in the cyclic pattern in which they occur on a daily basis.

(4) God’s covenant with time is fulfilled daily as is manifested in the occurrence of day and night. That day and night occur in their time demonstrate God’s commitment to maintaining the orderly nature of their sequential occurrence. This implies not only that God separates ‘day’ and ‘night’ in a fixed orderly fashion so that they will never, so to speak, run into each other. He moreover gives them their time-content ‘in their time’. This cyclic pattern of day following night, according to Jeremiah 33:25, constitutes the ‘fixed order of heaven and earth’ – an expression which once again underscores its covenantal character.

(5) God’s daily fulfilment of his covenant with time (i.e. in giving day and night in their time) is tantamount to a promise. As just indicated, this is a typical case in

---

452 God’s covenant with time belongs to the unique form of contractual relationship found only in the Bible which Freedman refers to as ‘a covenant of divine commitment’. See Freedman, ‘Divine Commitment’, 420. It is analogous to God’s covenant with Abraham where God promised himself that he will give the promised land to Abraham’s posterity as their inheritance (Gen 15:17-21). It is possible of course to argue that God made this covenant to/with Abraham. However, there are good reasons from the text to believe that God made his commitment to give Abraham’s descendants primarily to himself. Firstly, Abraham’s participation, if it can be granted, was profoundly passive since he was in a deep sleep (Gen 15:12). Secondly, in the actual ritual of the covenant, it was the person obligated to observe the covenantal terms who was supposed to walk between the animal pieces which have been cut in half. It is most likely that this was to signify a commitment to be treated as the animals (i.e. to be cut in half) in the case of breaching covenantal terms (cf. Jer 34:17-19). In Genesis 15, it was certainly not Abraham who walked between the animal pieces (Gen 15:17). See Freeman, ‘Divine Commitment’, 420-21; Freedman and Miano, ‘People of the Covenant’, 8. The Davidic covenant is likewise ‘a covenant of divine commitment’ since its continuation is not dependent upon the fidelity of David’s posterity. See McCarthy, ‘Covenant’, 238.

453 Cf. Philo, Opif 32-33.
which fulfilment itself paradoxically becomes a promise.\textsuperscript{454} In this particular case, however, the giving of time on a daily basis in terms of ‘day’ and ‘night’ is the promise of the coming restoration of the kingdom of David. That is, each new day and night comes forth with the silent declaration, ‘God will restore the kingdom of David’ (cf. Ps 19:2-3).

(6) The terms of God’s covenant with David are specified in verses 21 and 26 as the restoration of David’s throne under David’s son. Notably, the restored Kingdom will be inhabited not only by royal offspring but also by Levitical priests (v. 21; cf. \textit{CD} i 1-8). This implies that the restored kingdom of David will be a kingdom of priests, the ultimate embodiment of God’s purpose in the election of Israel (Exod 19:6). Since Levitical priests were entrusted with the Law and were expected to minister before God by offering sacrifices on behalf of God’s people (Exod 30:20; 2 Kgs 17:27; 2 Chr 17:8-9) we may reasonably deduce that the restored Davidic kingdom will administer those priestly functions.\textsuperscript{455}

(7) From the viewpoint of the passages cited from Jeremiah 33 above, the covenant with David is clearly not yet fulfilled. God’s fulfilment of his covenant with time consistently and universally demonstrated daily as day and night follow one another in their time promises the fulfilment of the Davidic covenant. In other words, God’s faithfulness to his covenant with time is a declaration of God’s promise: ‘I shall restore the fortunes of the offspring of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and will have

\textsuperscript{454} Cullmann finds examples of this in John 14:12. However, it is precisely this observation that prevents Cullmann from making the promise-fulfilment scheme a controlling scheme in his salvation historical view of time. See Cullmann, \textit{Salvation}, 124.

\textsuperscript{455} Cf. In Qumran, the messianic hope is tied to a priestly figure descended from Aaron who will atone for the sin of the people (\textit{CD} 14.19; \textit{4Q541}; 4\textit{Q175}) and who will be an interpreter of the Law (4\textit{Q174}). See Collins, ‘What Was Distinctive’, 87; \textit{idem}, \textit{Sceptre and the Star}, 74-77.
mercy on them by choosing one of David’s offspring to rule over them’ (cf. Jer 33:26).

4.3.2.3. Summary: God’s Covenant with Time and Israel’s Hope of Restoration

In summary, the cumulative force of these observations establishes that time, considered as God’s covenantal commitment to giving day and night in their appointed time, is the promise of the restoration of Israel as a priestly nation under David’s offspring. In the Old Testament, the throne of David was often identified with the throne of God (1 Chr 28:5; 29:23; cf. 2 Chr 6:10, 16). Thus, the restoration of the throne of David will also be the establishment of the Kingdom of God. In Jeremiah 33, the identity of this restored Davidic dynasty is tied to the identity of Jerusalem (Jer 33:16). Its king will accomplish justice and righteousness before God on behalf of his people (Jer 33:15). In that light, David’s offspring will in some sense be identified with the end-time dwelling place of God’s people.

4.3.3. God’s Covenant with Time in Creation

In the passage just considered, God’s covenant with time is assumed to have been established at a previous point in time in the history of Israel. It is therefore instructive to trace the point of inception of this covenantal arrangement in the canonical framework of the Jewish Scriptures with the expectation that it may further elucidate the significance of God’s commitment to time in connection with Israel’s hope of restoration.456

456 For this definition of ‘covenant’, see Dumbrell, *Covenant*, 31; Kutsch, *Verheissung*, 203. Williamson has recently challenged this understanding of ‘covenant’. His definition, however, is not contradictory but complementary to that advanced by Dumbrell. See Williamson, *Sealed*, 43.
4.3.3.1. *God’s Covenant With Time Confirmed to Noah*

It has been pointed out that God’s covenant with Noah subsequent to the Flood is an affirmation of God’s obligation to time – more specifically, a commitment to uphold the cyclic pattern of time: \(^{457}\) ‘While the earth remains, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, shall not cease’ (Gen 8:22).

In Genesis 8:21, God declares that his intention is no longer to ‘curse the ground because of humankind’. The cursing of the ground is the situation that has prevailed since Genesis 3 resulting from the wilful disobedience of the man and his wife to God’s instruction as to how they were to live in Eden (Gen 2:15-17). The Flood is entailed in this curse. By cursing the ground in Genesis 3:17 the notion of the ‘end of all flesh’ develops (Gen 6:13), which finds its concrete manifestation primarily in the death of Adam and his descendants (Gen 5:1-31) and more extensively in the catastrophic ‘end of all flesh’ coming into the presence of God manifested in the Flood (Gen 6:13; cf. Amos 8:2). \(^{458}\)

Subsequent to the Flood, God promises to Noah that the catastrophic ‘end of all flesh’ will no longer be experienced throughout the irreversible flow of time. \(^{459}\) In verse 22, God reiterates what he has set forth in verse 21 but with special reference to

---


\(^{458}\) This seems to be the proper biblical foundation of understanding that there is an end of history. The notion of the ‘end’ of history is not a later development associated with the *Apokalyptiker* such as Daniel. Neither was it a concept adopted from Persian Zoroastrianism for there is hardly any evidence for that. It was rather established right at the very beginning of creation in Genesis 3 through the assertion of what Paul refers to as the reign of death when sin enters the world through Adam (Rom 5:12-14). The ‘end of all flesh’ is their being given over to death as God’s judgment because of sin. Cf. The list of other contenders for the origin of thinking about the ‘end’ can be found in Bull, ‘On Making’, 6.

\(^{459}\) See Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 455.
the temporal pattern of nature. As the earth remains, the cyclic pattern of nature guarantees God’s promise never to curse the ground again. This oath to Noah includes a divine commitment to maintain the rhythm of day and night:

‘and day and night will not cease’). The reference to ‘day and night’ here seems to be the climactic point of a set of couplets mentioned in the same passage: ‘seedtime and harvest’, ‘cold and heat’, ‘summer and winter’ and then finally and climactically, ‘day and night’.461

There may be no underlying significance in the way these couplets are arranged here. Nonetheless, ‘day and night’ are the fundamental expressions of the natural cycle in creation.462 The regularity of their occurrence is herein given a promise of God.463 In that sense, God’s commitment to maintain day and night ceaselessly in their cyclic order is foundational to him sustaining the rhythmic movements of the weather patterns of the world between cold and heat and of the seasons, summer and winter. Talmon affirms: ‘The Covenant with Noah for eternity … means that the rhythm of nature is assured forever’.464

The specific terms of this covenant are set forth in Genesis 9:8-11:

Then God said to Noah and to his sons with him, “Behold, I establish my covenant with you (your offspring) and every living creature that is with you, the birds, the livestock, and every beast of the earth with you, as many as came out of the ark; it is for every beast of the earth. I establish my

---

461 See Westermann, Genesis 1-11, 458.
463 See Hamilton, Genesis, 311.
covenant with you (וְיִשְׂרָאֵל), that never again shall all flesh be cut
off by the waters of the flood, and never again shall there be a flood to destroy the
earth.”

Here, God solemnly guarantees never again to destroy all flesh with a Flood. His promise is sealed by placing his ‘bow’ upon the clouds as the ‘sign of the covenant’ (Gen 9:12-13). Here, God commits himself to the sustenance of his creation as an everlasting commitment (v. 16). God’s commitment to the sustenance of ‘every living creature’ presupposes his commitment to his covenant with time stated in Genesis 8:21-22.

4.3.3.2. God’s Covenant with Noah Presupposes a Prior Covenant

That God promises to establish his covenant with Noah and his offspring and with every living creature upon the earth (Gen 9:8-17) seems to presuppose a prior covenantal relationship. It is this prior covenantal commitment that is now being solemnly ratified to every living creature, with Noah. Dumbrell has convincingly argued that Genesis 9:8-17 is a restatement of Genesis 6:18, which is a reference to a prior covenantal arrangement. In an extensive survey of the occurrence of the term תִּיָּב צָה (‘to establish a covenant’) in the Old Testament, Dumbrell observes that it almost always refers not to the institution but to the perpetuation of a prior covenantal arrangement. Based on this observation, Dumbrell contends that the previous covenantal arrangement that God had established which is now being confirmed to Noah in Genesis 9:8-17 is ‘a divine relationship established by the fact

466 Apart from Genesis 6:18; 9:9, 11, 17, other clear examples include the reference in Genesis 17:7, 19, 21 to the Abrahamic covenant established in Genesis 15. See also Exodus 6:4; Leviticus 26:9; Deuteronomy 8:18 and 2 Kings 23:3. See further Dumbrell, *Covenant*, 15-26; *idem*, ‘Covenant With Noah’, 1-9; Matthew, *Genesis*, 367.
of creation’. If therefore the covenant with Noah is the ratification of God’s covenant in creation then God’s covenantal commitment to day and night may be seen as established by the fact of creation.

In Genesis 1:1-2:3, we find several events in creation that implicitly entail a covenantal relationship between God and the ‘day’ and the ‘night’. Firstly, time seems to be created in the creation of ‘light’ (רָאָה) on ‘day one’ of creation (Gen 1:3). From ‘light’, God separated ‘the light’ (רָאָה) and ‘the darkness’ (ךְָּהֹל) and called ‘the light’ ‘day’ (יָיֵד) and ‘darkness’, he called ‘night’ (הָלִיל). ‘Day’ and ‘night’ therefore constitute the most foundational conception of time in the Bible.

In relation to ‘the light’ of creation, time in terms of day and night may be defined as the condition in which God’s purposes are unfolded since light punctuates the

---

467 See Dumbrell, Covenant, 28, 31-32. Williamson’s argument that a covenant in creation is mistaken seems to be firmly based on an argument from silence – that is, the fact that the word ‘covenant’ does not appear in the creation account. See Williamson, ‘Covenant’, 1-14. Terminological absence, however, does not necessarily imply conceptual absence. This is also true of covenantal relationships. See McCarthy, ‘Covenant’, 234-35.


470 Whether this was a 24 hour ‘day’ is not relevant for our purposes here. It is notably interesting nevertheless to realize that the sun and moon were created later whereas ‘day’ and ‘night’ already existed since ‘day one’ of creation. Some commentators refer to this ‘day’ as ‘aeons’. See Delitzsch, Genesis, I, 84. It would perhaps be better to think of the ‘days’ of creation as ‘light days’ rather than ‘solar days’. In that sense, they tend to foreshadow ‘glory days’ in the New Jerusalem (Rev 21:23; 22:5).

471 ‘Day’ and ‘night’ are therefore not merely ‘units of time’ as maintained by many. See, for example, DeVries, Yesterday, 42-45; Brin, Time in the Bible, 153. Cf. Marsh, Fullness of Time, 26. It appears that Augustine, and even Philo before him, were driven by philosophical concerns in order to overlook this crucial point about the beginning of time. Hence, they assert that time begins with the statement ‘in the beginning’. Their concerns seem incompatible with those of the writer of Genesis to whom even day and night are created before the sun and the moon. See Augustine, Confessions xi. 13; Philo, Opif, 26-31. It seems more appropriate, on the basis of Genesis 1:3-5, to understand the separation of ‘day’ and ‘night’ from ‘light’ as the beginning of time itself. Notably, in Jeremiah 33:20, 26, as we have seen, God’s covenantal commitment to time is not with ‘day’ and ‘night’ as units of time. Rather, it is with ‘day’ and ‘night’ as time itself, that is, God is committed to giving the time to ‘day’ and ‘night’ daily.
ensuing events of creation from ‘day one’ to the ‘seventh day’. In context, day (~Ay) and night (~hLy) are contained in ‘the light’ (ArAh). Interestingly, at this point in creation, before the creation of the sun and the moon, ‘day’ and ‘night’ cannot be supposed to constitute a 24 hour unit. This probably underlies the diverse ways in which the term ‘day’ is used in the rest of the Scriptures. Frequently, it denotes a period of time as in the ‘day of the Lord’ or an era in the expression, ‘the days of x’. In that sense, ‘day’ cannot be restricted to a ‘unit’ of time with definable limits. Rather, ‘day’ and ‘night’ in the Bible are identified with time itself.

While the language of covenant is absent from Genesis 1:3-5, it is in the creation of ‘the light’ (ArAh) that we may possibly locate the inception of God’s covenant with the day and the night attested in Jeremiah 31:35-36 and 33:20-26. The coming into being of ~Ay and ~hLy on a daily basis seems to be a perpetual response to the first utterance of creation: ArAh (Gen 1:3). In Genesis 1, ~hLy presupposes Ar Ak v. 6, 9, 11, 14-15, 24). When God ‘said’, things came into being. Thus, ‘[a]nd there was evening and there was morning, a day’ seems to be an appropriate response to the statement, ‘Then God said, “Let there be light”’. It is indeed ‘the light’ (ArAh) that

472 Cf. 4 Ezra 6:38-40. ‘I said, “O Lord, you spoke at the beginning of creation, and said on the first day, ‘Let heaven and earth be made,’ and your word accomplished the work. And then the Spirit was hovering, and darkness and silence embraced everything; the sound of man’s voice was not yet there. Then you commanded that a ray of light be brought forth from your treasuries, so that your works might then appear”’ (Emphasis added). Due to the late first century dating of 4 Ezra [see Charlesworth, Old Testament Pseudepigrapha], this passage will not be considered in this study as part of the plausible Jewish background of Mark 1:15.

473 For the different uses of the term ~hLy in the Bible and in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Brin, Time in the Bible, 78-92, 332-38.

474 Cf. John 1:5 where ‘life’ is defined as ‘light of man’ in Jesus: kai. h' zwh. he to. f w / j  twh and wovn.

475 This logical connection is broken in verses 20-21 in which God ‘said’ (v. 20), and then the often repeated ‘and it was so’ (ArEy: v. 21).
becomes ‘day’ (אָבֶָּב). Thus, the very first utterance of creation underscores God’s commitment to give day and night in their time (Jer 33:20).

Secondly, the refrain אַהֲרָבְּרִי אָבֵָּב (‘and there was evening and there was morning a day…’) presupposes God summoning ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ to come into being, marking the end and the beginning of ‘a day’ respectively. Even though ‘night’ is presupposed, the emphasis on this refrain seems to fall on the coming of ‘a day’ as the concrete manifestation of time.

Thirdly, the refrain אַהֲרָבְּרִי אָבֵָּב (‘and there was evening and there was morning day…’) in Genesis 1 establishes the cyclic pattern of time in the Bible (1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; cf. Eccl 3:1-8). Since ‘evening’ marks the beginning of ‘darkness’ and morning, the beginning of ‘light’ on a daily basis, this refrain implies God giving day and night in their appointed time. Separated as such, day and night are to follow each other as the rhythmic ‘fixed orders of heaven and earth’ (Jer 33:25). Cyclic time used to be associated with the Greek perception of time in contrast to a biblical linear time framework. From creation, however, it appears that cyclic time forms the most fundamental movement of time.

476 On the basis of this repeated refrain, most scholars discuss whether the ‘day’ in Israel begins with evening or morning. See Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 19.
477 See Boman, Hebrew Thought, 133-37. Boman refuses to use the term ‘time-cycles’ here.
478 See Brin, Time in the Bible, 156-57. See also VanderKam, Calendars, 4, 12-13.
479 See Aristotle, Physics iv.14; Cullmann, Christ and Time, 51-52; Delling, Zeitverständnis, 148. Cyclic view of time has often been the basis of secular attacks on the biblical view of time which is supposed to be primarily teleological. See Bull, ‘On Making’, 4. But see Barr, Biblical Words, 140, who observes the notion of cyclic time even in the Bible on the basis of Ecclesiastes 3. For a theological construction based on cyclic shape of time, see Ratzinger, Theology of History, 144-47.
480 See Boman, Hebrew Thought, 125. Boman clarifies that even if time is to be measured on a line, the circular movement of the sun about the earth will be used as a standard.
Fourthly, even though the cyclic rhythm of time is established by the occurrence of
the formula \( \text{~A y ð rq, b o ß -y hi y > w : ) b r< \[, î -y hi y > w } \), nevertheless ‘day one’, ‘day two’ and so forth,
flows irrevocably on to ‘the seventh day’ (y [i ê y b i V , h;  ~ A y æ -t a ). This pattern essentially
establishes, alongside the cyclic rhythm of time, an irreducible linear component.
The ‘seventh day’ provides a goal for the cyclic movement of time and therefore
lends the cyclic pattern of time a linear Sabbath-structure. Time does not flow to
nowhere but to God’s appointed Sabbath-rest.

Fifthly, the sun, the moon and the stars are given special function in relation to day
and night. From Genesis 1:14-19, several important features stand out in relation to
time.

(1) The sun and the moon are to maintain the distinction between the day and the
night (v. 14). This separation guarantees that the pattern of ‘day’ following ‘night’
will continue beyond the completion of God’s creation activity on the ‘seventh day’.

(2) The sun and the moon, moreover, function ‘for signs’ (tt eb). While ‘signs’ have
been variously interpreted,\(^{481}\) Boman observes that the word tt a here has the same
meaning as in Genesis 9:12 where, in context, another heavenly light, namely, the
rainbow, is designated as tt a.\(^{482}\) In an analogous sense, the sun and the moon are
‘signs’ (tt eb) signifying their function to separate ‘day’ and ‘night’. Just as the
rainbow is the sign guaranteeing God’s covenant with Noah, the sun and the moon
are ‘signs’ guaranteeing God’s gracious commitment to give ‘day’ and ‘night’ in

\(^{481}\) For instance, as ‘sights in the heavenly vault which were not normal’ [see Rad, Genesis, 54] or
\(^{482}\) See Boman, Hebrew Thought, 132.
their appointed time. Therefore, the appearance of the cycles of sun and the moon confirms God’s faithfulness to his commitment to separate ‘day’ and ‘night,’ giving each in their own appointed time (Jer 33:20).

(3) The sun and the moon also determine ‘seasons... days and years’. It is possible to understand the word for ‘seasons’ (רְדֵּס) here as a reference to the natural cycle of seasons. Literally, however, it refers to ‘appointed time’ set aside by God for his people, the special times of Israel’s religious festivals prefigured in creation by sanctifying the seventh day (Gen 2:2-3). These special times seem already presupposed in God giving day and night in their appointed time’ as indicated by the refrain אַהֲרָה הָעֵדֹת עַל יְמֵנּוֹ.

(4) Day and night are understood spatially as territories under the dominion (לַמֵּשַׁם) of the sun and the moon, the luminary sources of creation. Day can thus be perceived as the territory under the sun just as night is the territory under the moon (Gen 1:14-19). In that sense, the ‘day’ is primarily ‘time under the sun’ and not time for

---

483 Cf. Juh. 2:9, ‘The Lord appointed the sun as a great sign above the earth for days, Sabbaths, months, festivals, years, Sabbaths of years, jubilees, and all the times of the years’ (Emphasis added). That is, the appearance of the sun on a daily basis is the sign anticipating the coming of special times.
485 See Barth, Dogmatics III/1, 98.
486 Cf. Skinner, Genesis, 20. Boman approvingly refers to von Orelli who observes that spatial conceptions are gained more immediately from sense perceptions whereas temporal conceptions are formed indirectly with the help of spatial conceptions. See Boman, Hebrew Thought, 129.
487 The same notion of spatialized time occurs in Qumran. See 4Q408 1+1b 8-11. See Chapter 4.5.5 below for the discussion of this document. See also Philo, Opif 26: εἰς γὰρ αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ κόσμου κυρίασεν, εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κρατήρα τοῦ φαντασμοῦ. Philo attributed this view of time to the Stoics. See Philo, On Eternity 4. For different uses of the term וָיֶת in Qumran, see Brin, Time in the Bible, 332-38.
488 The way this phrase is used in the book of Ecclesiastes (some 26 times) could therefore mean time under the sun in contrast to time under the heavens. See Michel “‘Unter der Sonne’”, 96-98. “Time under the sun’ if it is a description of ‘die “normale, diesseitige” Existenz des Menschen” [see Michel, “Unter der Sonne”, 99] is essentially cyclic but, in the context of Ecclesiastes, the cycle ends in death. However, the acknowledgement that there is judgment awaiting all humanity in the future (Eccl 12:14) lends this primarily cyclic understanding of time an implicit horizontal direction with something to anticipate at the end. That is, time can be cyclic in pattern but we certainly do not end where we begin since creation gives way to judgment in the end. Cf. 4 Ezra 7:112-13; 12:34.
something. As we have seen in the previous chapter, the notion of time as ‘time for something’ has been held up as the prominent conception of time in Israel. From creation, however, time for something is but one aspect of time under the dominion of the luminary sources.

4.4. Summary: God’s Covenant with Time in the Old Testament

To summarize our findings about the intimate connection between time perceived in its cyclic course and the promise of the Kingdom of God.

(1) Time is fundamentally understood in creation as ‘day’ and ‘night’, derived from the ‘light’ of creation (1:3-5). Since day and night are identified with time, God’s covenant with day and night can be designated as God’s covenant with time.

(2) Day and night in creation are not to be restricted to a 24 hour unit. In creation day and night constitute the fixed order of light.

(3) Nevertheless, the rhythmic occurrence of day and night indicated by the refrain, ‘and there was evening and there was morning a day’ establishes the cyclic pattern of time. This refrain implies God’s covenantal commitment to give day and night in their time as they are separated by the sun and the moon.

Stone, ‘Coherence’, 336-37. Chilton observes the same pattern in musical time which he refers to as the ‘unrepeatability of exact recurrence’. See Chilton, Redeeming Time, 7. Chilton refers to two music theorists in connection with his observation: Tarasti, Theory of Musical, 289; Rahn, Theory for All Music.

489 The origin of the modern conviction that time is ‘time for something’ seems to be the philosophical thinking of Martin Heidegger. See Heidegger, Being and Time, 380.

(4) God’s daily fulfilment of his covenant with time manifested by the occurrence of day and night in their time becomes in the pre-exilic context the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring (Jer 33:20-26; cf. 31:35-36).

(5) The shape of time established in creation invariably bears a paradoxically cyclic-linear shape.\textsuperscript{491} That is, whereas the pattern of occurrence of day and night maintains the cyclic shape of time, the fact that ‘day one’, ‘second day’ and so forth of creation flows irreversibly to the ‘seventh day’ establishes a non-fluctuating linear shape of time. The ‘Sabbath rest’ of God on the seventh day\textsuperscript{492} is the ‘goal’ of the irreversible cycle of time beginning with ‘day one’ of creation. This linear flow of time lends history an intrinsic ‘Sabbath structure’.\textsuperscript{493}

With these observations in view, we shall turn now to explore the extent to which God’s covenant with time features in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple era in relation to the hope of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.

\textsuperscript{491} Contra the notion of ‘omnitemporal’ time in the Bible and Cullmann’s ‘curved linear’ framework of time. For ‘omnitemporal time’ see for example, Onuki, \textit{Heils}, 60-114. For Cullmann’s thesis, see Cullmann, \textit{Salvation}, 15; \textit{idem}, ‘Relevance’, 11: ‘In my new book, \textit{Le Salut dans l’Histoire}, I maintain this conception [i.e. linear time]; however, I correct it on one important point. I had formerly spoken of a straight line and a rectilinear development. Today I continue to say line, but I state curved line. For in redemptive history there are movements – resulting from the human revolt against the plan of God, resulting from sin – which move in the opposite direction; but God is able to cause good to result from evil’ (His emphasis). This later modification of Cullmann’s view of time seems to have largely gone unnoticed in New Testament scholarship hitherto. See for example, Dunn, \textit{Theology}, 464-65.

\textsuperscript{492} It is indeed difficult to visualize a cyclic pattern with a horizontal thrust. A spiral pattern is perhaps a good way of perceiving it but still the spiral does not give due regard to the orderliness in which day and night constitutes the fixed order of the heavens and earth. To my mind, the wheels of a chariot are perhaps a better way of grasping the idea herein expressed. As the wheels go about in their cyclic movement, they carry the chariot forward and its rider to the destination the rider has in view. Interestingly, Ezekiel saw the throne of God that used to be housed in the Jerusalem temple coming towards the exiles across the Chebar river in a structure that strikingly resembles a celestial chariot (Ezek 1:15-21) with one in the likeness of man sitting upon the throne that the wheels carry (Ezek 1:26). Could it be possible to think of time as the imprints of the wheels bearing the throne of God as it carries God’s throne forward to its final establishment? As the wheels maintain their cyclic movement, they guarantee that the destination the rider has in view will eventually be reached. Interestingly, in \textit{1 Enoch} 72:5, the sun is said to ascend on a ‘chariot’ driven by the blowing wind (cf. \textit{1Enoch} 73:2; 75:3, 4, 8).

\textsuperscript{493} Cf. Koch, ‘Sabbatstruktur’, 403-30.
4.5. *God’s Covenant with Time in the Second Temple Literature*

Our aim is to examine whether time as the promise of Israel’s restoration under David’s offspring features in any significant way in these sources. The data are admittedly massive and therefore we shall restrict ourselves to the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the Apocrypha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo and Josephus. We shall examine these sources according to the following criteria.

(1) We shall observe whether cyclic-linear time features in these sources. More specifically, we wish to examine whether time as such, properly understood within the literary contours of the sources examined, is connected in any way to the hope of the restoration of Israel under the Davidic kingship or in any other related pattern of restoration.

(2) In addition to that, we shall keep an eye out for the role ascribed to the levitical priesthood in the restoration of Israel due to the place accorded to them in the fulfilment of God’s covenant with time, according to Jeremiah 33:20-26.

Before we turn to our sources, however, it is necessary to set forth a number of presuppositions that essentially shape our view of the Second Temple data analysed here.
4.5.1. Preliminary Considerations

Firstly, in the interest of avoiding the charge of parallelonia and, in view of God’s covenant with time being argued here as the most plausible Old Testament background for understanding Mark 1:15, we shall proceed by exploring possible construals of God’s covenant with time in the Second Temple literature. We have, however, analysed a number of studies that draw on linguistic parallels from the Jewish sources in order to ascertain the most plausible background of the time-word in Mark 1:15. It appears that the primacy of comparison of linguistic parallels with Mark 1:15 is partly necessitated by the traditional understanding of the perfect verbs, pepl hrw 태 and hggı̇ ke n. Since the perfect tense-form is traditionally defined as the completion of a past action the effect of which is experienced in the present, the logical interpretation of the term pepl hrw 태 is that of a completed action in the past with hggı̇ ke n its present effect. In actual fact, however, this way of construing Mark 1:15 is predicated on an inconsistent application of the traditional definition of

---


495 See under Chapter 4.2 above. In the Apocrypha, the notion of time fulfilment is variously attested (1 Esd 4:23-24; Tob 14:5-6; Wis 4:13-14; Sir 26:1-2; 39:28; 1 Macc 9:10 ‘time has come’; 1 Macc 12:1 ‘favourable time’). Similar to the Apocrypha, the notion of the completion of a designated period of time is widely attested in the Pseudepigrapha (1 Esd 4:23-24; Tob 14:5-6; Wis 4:13-14; Sir 26:1-2; 39:28; 1 Macc 9:10 ‘time has come’; 1 Macc 12:1 ‘favourable time’). The idea of the consummation of time is also scattered throughout the Qumran document (1 QapGen vi 9-12; 1QS vi 16-17:vii 21; viii 25-26; 1 Q28a i 12; 4QD Frg. 1a-b. 1.2; 4QD Frg 8, Col.1:6; 4QD Frg. 3, Col. 1:1-4; cf. 4QD Frg. 3, Col.2:21; 4QD Frg. 6, Col.4.19; 4Q265 Frg. 4.7; 4Q265 Frg. 7.17; 4Q171 1 ii 7-12; 4Q204 V. 5-7 (= 1En. 10:13-19; 4Q215a (4QTime of Righteousness) 4QTime of Righteousness); 4Q219 1:11-12 (Jub 21:1-2); 4Q252 ii. 2-5; 4Q256 xi 5a-b.13; 4Q270 1v 18-19; 4Q270 7 i 8-9; 1Q31 ii 3 (=1 QS v 20); CD-A 4.4-18; CD-A 10.1; 4Q266 1a-b.1-4; 4Q 301 3.8±l; 4Q 378 14.3 ±t; 4Q385a 13.2-4 ±v; 4Q385a 44.2-4 ±t; 4Q387a 3 ii 2-8, 10-12 ±v and ±m; 4Q390 1.6-10 ±t; 4Q394 3.7-2.3 ±v; 4Q416 1.11-14 ±v; 4Q463 2.2.3 ±t; 4Q535 2.5 (=4Q536 2) ±v; 11Q10 xxvii (=Job 36:7-16) ±v; 11Q18 15.2).

496 See our discussion of the perfect tense-form in Chapter 5.2.2.

497 ‘Realized eschatology’ seems to rest its case partly on the understanding that hggı̇ ke n refers to a ‘completed action’, that is, ‘the Kingdom is already here’. See Chapter 2 for our discussion.
the perfect tense-form to the two perfect verbs of Mark 1:15, pepl hrwtaí and hggíken.\textsuperscript{498} To be sure, the underlying biblical theological conviction of this particular construal of Mark 1:15 seems cogent. The coming near of the Kingdom of God is indeed an unsurpassed novum in history. Nevertheless, such assertions can be affirmed elsewhere but not here in Mark 1:15.\textsuperscript{499}

Secondly, even though the story of Israel’s future expectation as reflected in the Second Temple material appears diverse in its expressions, an underlying unity can be seen in Israel’s hope of restoration according to God’s covenant with David (e.g. 2 Sam 7:1-16; Psalm 89), and rooted in the biblical tradition of kingship.\textsuperscript{500} In recent times, a number of scholars have, to varying degrees, expressed a deep-seated scepticism regarding the persistence of messianic hope in Israel down to the period underlying the production of the Second Temple literature\textsuperscript{501} – and even during the time of Jesus.\textsuperscript{502} Consequently, while some critical historians no longer refer to a common Jewish messianic hope during the time of Jesus,\textsuperscript{503} others have argued that the messianic hope of Israel was probably dormant from the fifth century until the later part of the first century BC when it re-emerges as a Jewish polemic against the reign of Herod the Great.\textsuperscript{504}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[498] See our discussion under Chapter 5.3.
\item[499] See further discussions in ‘Excursus 2’ in the next chapter.
\item[501] See Charlesworth, ‘Messianology’, 35 for a summary of the major conclusions of this volume; Atkinson, ‘On the Use’, 106-23; Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty.
\item[503] ‘No member of the Princeton Symposium on the Messiah [in 1987] holds that a critical historian can refer to a common Jewish messianic hope during the time of Jesus’. See Charlesworth, ‘From Messianology’, 5. For a balancing viewpoint, see Knibb, ‘Messianism’, 165-84.
\item[504] See Collins, Sceptre and the Star, 49-73.
\end{footnotes}
However, Wright has helpfully addressed this scepticism by showing that messianic hope was maintained throughout the Second Temple period as reflected in Qumran, *Psalms of Solomon*, Josephus and some Jewish apocalyptic works.\(^{505}\) Hence, the view that messianic hope in Israel tends to recede for a considerable period of time only to be revived at the threshold of the first century AD can hardly be maintained in light of biblical and pseudepigraphical data. In fact, it has been pointed out that Israel’s hope for a supra-historical messianic figure is already present in the books of *Enoch*, *Ezra* and *Baruch*.\(^{506}\) Moreover, it has been observed that the properties of a human and superhuman messianic figure are sometimes merged in many of the Jewish sources.\(^{507}\) Hence, the assertion that one can no longer claim that most Jews in the period prior to the first century AD were looking for the coming of the Messiah is somewhat precarious\(^ {508}\) and a ‘little misleading’.\(^ {509}\) With these contentions in view, let us turn to our sources.

4.5.2. *Time as Promise in the Apocrypha*

The notion of the cyclic-linear shape of time anticipating the restoration of Israel features implicitly in a number of incidents in the *Apocrypha*.

4.5.2.1. *1 Esdras*

The book of *1 Esdras* is most likely to have been written in the late second century BC. The book reproduces the content of 2 Chronicles 35:1-36:23, the whole of Ezra

---


\(^{508}\) This is one of the conclusions of The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. See Charlesworth, ‘From Messianology’, 35. Laato has however asserted the pervasive influence of the messianic hope expressed in Isaiah 11:2-5 in the Jewish background. See Laato, *Star Is Rising*, 9, 285-89. See also Horbury, ‘Messianism’, 51-63.

and Nehemiah 7:38-8:12. An implicit reference to God’s covenant with time occurs in 1 Esdras 4:33-34.

The earth is vast, and heaven is high, and the sun is swift in its course (τὰ οὐράνια τὰ ἱερὰ), for it completes the cycle of the heavens (τῷ οὐράνῳ κυκλῳ) and returns to its place in one day (ἐν οἷς διήνεμον). Is not the one who does these things great (οὐσὶ μέγις οὗτος)?

In context, this passage is employed as the point of departure for a discourse on the theme that ‘truth is great and stronger than all things’ (v. 35). In that sense, 1 Esdras 4:33-34 appeals to information which is common to the speaker and his audience as the ground upon which their attention is grasped. Several observations can be made regarding the cyclic course of time.

Firstly, the course of the sun in the heavens is referred to here as the ‘circuit of the heavens’ (τῷ οὐράνῳ κυκλῳ). Literally, it can be rendered as ‘the cycle of the heavens’. It underscores the observation that the sun comes and returns to its place daily on a cyclic course. In that sense, ‘circuit of the heavens’ is another way of expressing the cyclic course of the sun.

Secondly, the reference to the sun’s swiftness in its cyclic course implies the linear notion of time as ‘hastening on’ from the beginning to the end of the ‘circuit of the heavens’ (cf. 2 Esd 4:26-27). The ‘hastening on’ of time anticipates the coming of special times ahead in the linear flow of the cycle of time.
Thirdly, the ‘circuit of the heavens’ determines time manifested as ‘one day’. Each ‘day’ comes about therefore as the result of the sun’s completion of the ‘circuit of the heavens’.

Fourthly, admiration is expressed for the greatness of the power that maintains the ‘circuit of the heavens’ in its regularity. God is implied as the ‘great one’ behind the regularity of the ‘circuit of the heavens’. The greatness of God in maintaining the ‘circuit of the heavens’ forms the connection with the ensuing discourse on the theme of truth. That is, the regularity of the ‘circuit of the heavens’ essentially testifies to the truthfulness of God who maintained the sun in its motion daily, to give us ‘one day’ (*1 Esd* 4:34).

In this passage, God’s covenant with time is implied in the regularity of the ‘circuit of the heavens’ manifesting the underlying truthfulness of God. While there is no mention of the Davidic hope in connection with the circuit of the heavens, the significance of God’s truthfulness manifested in maintaining the circuit of the heavens would imply his truthfulness in every other aspect of his relationship with Israel including the covenants with their forefathers. The absence of the Davidic kingship may have struck the post-exilic community as the missing component in the restored Israel they were living in (cf. *Pss. Sol*. 17:21).\(^{510}\) Whereas the temple is established and the restored community is instructed in the Law under Ezra the chief priest and the levites in Jerusalem, Israel’s restoration would be fully accomplished only when the Davidic kingship is established.\(^{511}\) By implication, the circuit of the heavens

---

\(^{510}\) See our discussion of the *Psalms of Solomon* below.

\(^{511}\) For the resurgence of the messianic hope around the turn of the era, see under section 4.5.1 above.
heavens is to be maintained by God’s truthfulness until the restoration of Israel is fully realized.

4.5.2.2. Wisdom of Solomon

The *Wisdom of Solomon* was probably written during the latter part of the first century BC. The author affirms that God has granted him his thoughts and words.

Part of the knowledge God has given him is the ‘knowledge of what exists’:

> For it is he who gave me unerring knowledge of what exists, to know the orderliness of the world (συστασις κοσμου) and the activity of the elements; the beginning and end and middle of times (αρχην και τελος και μεσοπτυχια χρονων), the alternations of the solstices and the changes of the seasons, the cycles of the year (αιωνιον κυκλοφορια και αστρων οσκει) and the constellations of the stars (Wis 7:17-19).

This is probably the clearest passage in the *Apocrypha* in terms of juxtaposing the linear and the cyclic conceptions of time. Notably the linear component of time is indicated in the conviction that it has a ‘beginning’, an ‘end’ and a ‘middle’. This is asserted alongside the alteration of time caused by the rhythmic occurrences of the seasons and the cyclic course of the year and the stars. In context, this cyclic-linear supposition of time comprises the cosmic order (συστασις κοσμου). The knowledge of this cyclic-linear composition of time comes from God ‘the maker of all things’ who teaches the writer wisdom.⁵¹² As components of the ‘structure of the world’, they have been established by God in creation. While there is no reference to the covenant with time and the restoration of Israel or the Davidic kingship here, this

---

⁵¹² Cf. ἡ γαρ παντων τεκνιτις οἰκοδεσπότης τῆς σοφίας in *Wisdom* 7:21.
passage affirms the paradoxical cyclic-linear shape of time that we have observed in the creation account.

4.5.2.3. Sirach

We have seen that the ‘hastening on’ of time presupposes the cyclic course of the sun that produces ‘one day’ (1 Esd 4:33-34). In Sirach 36:10, the ‘hastening on’ of time is linked with the hope of the restoration of Zion: ‘Hasten the day (speuson kai ron), and remember the appointed time (mhsqht i or ki srmn), and let people recount your mighty deeds’. As the sun completes the circuit of the heavens daily (1 Esd 3:33-34), God is called upon to hasten on time in order to establish the ‘appointed time’. Literally, God is requested to hasten on time and remember ‘his oath’. The oath that God is summoned to remember is indicated a little later:

Crush the heads of hostile rulers who say, “There is no one but ourselves.” Gather all the tribes of Jacob, and give them their inheritance, as at the beginning. Have mercy, O Lord, on the people called by your name, on Israel, whom you have named your firstborn, Have pity on the city of your sanctuary, Jerusalem, the place of your dwelling. Fill Zion with your majesty, and your temple with your glory. Bear witness to those whom you created in the beginning, and fulfill the prophecies spoken in your name. 21 Reward those who wait for you and let your prophets be found trustworthy (Sir 36: 12-21. NRSV; [9-15 LXX]).

Here, the oath God is to remember is his words through the prophets about a time in which ‘the heads’ of Israel’s enemies will be crushed and God’s ‘first-born son’ will be gathered to their inheritance ‘as at the beginning’. This notion of the re-gathering of Israel is closely tied to Israel’s hope of restoration. The crushing of the ‘head’ of Israel’s enemies recalls the promise God gave Eve after the Fall (Gen 3:15).

See Fuller, Restoration, 38.
Hence, Israel’s inheritance ‘at the beginning’ most likely refers to Eden. In conjunction with the reference to Jerusalem and the sanctuary, it idealizes Israel’s future as a restored Edenic situation in a new Jerusalem (cf. Isa 65:17-18). The invocation of God’s mercy upon Israel as God’s ‘first-born son’ recalls the Exodus tradition, where Pharaoh is commanded to liberate Israel, God’s ‘first-born son’ (Exod 4:22-23). The writer is anticipating the re-gathering of Israel to a restored Jerusalem on the basis of God’s mercy. The restoration of Jerusalem is therefore the goal for which God is requested to ‘hasten on’ the time. While there is no mention of the Davidic kingship here, the cyclic course of time as the sun hastens on daily on the circuit of the heavens anticipates the re-gathering of Israel into their restored inheritance as its goal.

Sirach 48:10 builds upon ideas present in Malachi 3:22-23 (LXX) and notes that Elijah will return from heaven at the ‘appointed time’ (cf. 36:10) to ‘calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and to restore the tribes of Jacob (καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακώβ). In Malachi, Elijah is anticipated to return before the ‘day of the Lord’ which is a time of judgment. In Sirach, however, Elijah’s role is a nationalistic one, associated with the restoration of Israel which is expected to antecede the time of judgment. The outpouring of God’s wrath is to occur εἰς καιρὸν τῆς σφαγῆς (‘in the time of reckoning’. Sir 39:28).514

4.5.2.4. Summary: Time as Promise in the Apocrypha

In summary, the passages we have just considered from the Apocrypha seem to affirm the paradoxically linear-cyclic shape of time discernible in the creation narrative. However, while evidence is attested about the proximate connection between the cyclic course of time and its ‘hastening on’ towards Israel’s restoration, the role of the Davidic kingship in this restored Israel is not explicitly stated.

4.5.3. Time as Promise in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

Having argued that the most convincing background to Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 is found in God’s covenant with time, our aim here is to explore how this covenantal commitment with time is attested in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. More specifically, we wish to examine whether God’s covenant with time is associated in any way (either explicitly or implicitly) with the hope of the restoration of Israel. It has been widely acknowledged that even though materials in the Pseudepigrapha present many diverse ways of re-telling the Jewish Scripture there seems to be an underlying unity regarding the future of hope of Israel as reflected in these sources in terms of the vision of restoration.

4.5.3.1. Psalms of Solomon

One of the clear evidences from the two centuries before the turn of the era about the persistence of messianic hope in terms of Davidic kingship is found in Psalms of

---


516 Probably the most sustained defence of this view to date is found in Fuller, Restoration, 13-101. See also Scholem, ‘Towards an Understanding’, 1-36; Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 97; Talmon, ‘Biblical Visions’, 140-64; Neusner, Self-Fulfilling, 3; Fröhlich, ‘Beginning’, 91-104; Wright, New Testament, 268.
According to *Psalms of Solomon* 17:21, the Davidic kingdom will be restored in a time known to God alone:

> See, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David (τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν τὸν Δαυίδ), to rule over your servant Israel in the time known to you, O God (τὸν καίρον α游戏技巧 ὕψι ο’γεί).

The description of the achievements of the Davidic kingship in its immediate literary context strikingly resembles the depiction of Israel’s restoration in Jeremiah 33:14-26.  

> He will gather a holy people (Καὶ συνασεὶ λαὸν αἵ�όν) whom he will lead in righteousness; and he will judge the tribes of the people that have been made holy to the Lord their God. He will not tolerate unrighteousness (even) to pause among them, and any person who knows wickedness shall not live with them. For he shall know them and they are all children of their God. He will distribute them upon the land according to their tribes; the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them. He will judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness (κρίνει/λαοῦ καὶ εὐμηθεῖν αὐτῶν ὁ θεὸς). Pause. And he will have gentile nations serving him under his yoke, and he will glorify the Lord in (a place) prominent (above) the whole earth. And he will purge Jerusalem (and make it) holy as it was even from the beginning, (for) nations to come from the ends of the earth to see his glory, to bring as gifts her children who had been driven out, and to see the glory of the Lord with which God has glorified her (καὶ ἐξαν θν δώσει κυρίου ἑξῆς τὸν λαὸν αὐτῶν ο’γεί). And he will be a righteous king over them, taught by God (καὶ αὐτῶν βασιλείαν δι’ Καὶ αὐτούς διδάκτοις ὑπὸ Θεοῦ εἰς αὐτοῦ). There will be no

unrighteousness among them in his days, for all shall be holy, and their king shall be

Here, no attempt is made to connect this ‘time known’ to God and the cyclic-linear
shape of time that characterized God’s covenant with time in creation. However, this
passage does register the sovereignty of God in summoning the coming and going of
time (cf. 2 Bar. 48:2). Taking the ‘son of David’ to be the principal content of
Israel’s messianic hope, the time of his coming corresponds to the ‘day of choice’,
the day chosen by God (Pss. Sol. 18:6). This ‘day’ is often identified with the ‘end of
days’ (cf. 4 Ezra 12:32). It is anticipated that the messiah will establish his kingdom
before the Day of Judgment in which he will ‘judge peoples and nations in the
wisdom of his righteousness’ (Pss. Sol. 17:29; cf. 4 Ezra 7:26-39; cf. 1 En. 91:12-14).

The establishment of the restored Davidic kingdom, according to the Psalms of
Solomon, involves two main stages. The Davidic Messiah will gather his holy people
who had been driven into an exilic-wilderness (Pss. Sol. 17:16-17). Subsequently, he
will distribute the land to his restored people ‘according to their tribes’ (Pss. Sol.
17:28). Then comes the judgment of the ‘peoples and nations’ resulting in their
ingathering to a purified Jerusalem to ‘see the glory of the Lord’ (Pss. Sol. 17:30-31).

The absence of wickedness in this restored messianic kingdom of the son of David
not only harks back to the reign of Solomon, the ‘son of David’, when there was ‘no
Satan and no more Evil’ (יִבְשָׂא, 1 Kgs 5:18 MT; cf. Jub. 23:29; 50:5),

519 See Fuller, Restoration, 167.
it moreover identifies the time of the Messiah and his kingdom with the new creation when ‘sin shall no more be heard of forever’ (cf. *1 En.* 91:16-17).

In the light of the foregoing observations, the ‘time known’ to God during which the Davidic kingship will be restored seems to involve two dispensations: (1) The kingdom of the Davidic Messiah will be established in Israel to which he will re-gather his exiles to inherit their tribal land; (2) The restored kingdom will be extended to the ‘ends of the earth’ by means of his judgment of the nations during which a glorified Jerusalem will become the centre of the world (*Pss. Sol.* 17:31-32). To this glorified Jerusalem, the nations will ‘come from the ends of the earth to bring as gifts her (i.e. Jerusalem’s) children who had been driven out and to see [the Messiah’s] glory (*Pss. Sol.* 8:28; 11:3; 17:31).

This depiction of the glorified Jerusalem may be enriched from other parts of the Pseudepigrapha, where the restoration of Jerusalem is anticipated as occurring in the ‘period that is coming to remain forever’ (*2 Bar* 44:11-14). Moreover, it involves the restoration of God’s sanctuary in the midst of his people by God himself (*1 En.* 520

---

520 The evidence from 1 Kings 5:18 (LXX) seems to be foundational for the identification of Jesus as ‘the exorcist-healer Son of David’ in the Gospels, especially in Matthew (1:1, 20; 9:27; 12:22-23; 15:22; 20:30-31; 21:9, 15). Scholars have often resorted to Josephus *Ant.* 8.45, 47 as the evidence for such expectation. [See for example, Harrington, ‘Son of David’, 192-93]. However, given 1 Kings 5:17-18 (MT), Josephus is probably on the receiving end of a tradition deeply rooted in the historical setting of David and Solomon. As Solomon himself indicated, on the basis of David’s warfare, God put his enemies ‘under the soles of his feet’ (1 Kgs 5:17, LXX). Hence, the situation in which Solomon reigned had ‘no Satan and no more Evil’ (1 Kgs 5:18 LXX). The ‘strong man’ has been tied up precisely as Jesus indicated in the Gospels (Matt 12:29; Mark 3:27). In that sense, the depiction of a warrior-king-exorcist-healer ‘Son of David’ messiah who will purge Israel of wickedness as presented in *Psalms of Solomon* seems not to have been ‘radically redefined’ in the Gospels. [See Collins, *Jesus and the Messiahs*, 287-302; *idem*, ‘What Was Distinctive’, 92]. Rather, it is most likely to have been derived from the biblical tradition of the messianic ‘Son of David’. For a concise summary of the *Psalms of Solomon*’s depiction of the Davidic messiah, see Fuller, *Restoration*, 169.

This new temple results from God transforming the ‘ancient house’ to a ‘new house greater and loftier than the first one’ (1 En. 90:28-29). God’s people will be re-gathered from wherever they have been scattered to this new house (1 En. 90:32-33). More importantly, the restored Zion will become the dwelling place of God for he will ‘appear in the sight of all’ to reign upon Mount Zion from his sanctuary in the midst of his people (Jub. 1:26-29; cf. Isa 52:11-12; 48:20). In that sense, the ‘time known’ to God during which the Davidic kingship will be restored is expected to span until Jerusalem is purged and the ‘sanctuary of the Lord is created in Jerusalem upon Mount Zion’ (Pss. Sol. 17:30; Jub. 1:29; 4:26; 8:19; cf. Isa 65:17-24).

In summary, the depiction of Israel’s restoration under the Davidic Messiah (Pss. Sol. 17:32; cf. 18:5) confirms one important aspect of God’s promise to restore Israel in relation to his covenant with time delineated above. Just as God is committed to giving ‘day’ and ‘night’ in their appointed time (Jer 33:20), so also he is committed to establishing the messianic kingdom of David in its appointed time.

Two other passages in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha clearly account for the function of the cyclic-linear pattern of time established by God in creation in connection with the theme of restoration.

523 On the significance of this passage for the claims that Jesus would destroy the temple (Mark 14:58; John 2:19-20), see Gaston, No Stone, 114.
524 See Fuller, Restoration, 23-48.
525 See Rad, Theology II, 244-45.
526 See Scott, On Earth, 76-82.
4.5.3.2. 1 Enoch 72-82: The Book of Heavenly Luminaries

The Book of Heavenly Luminaries (1 En. 72-82)\(^{528}\) confirms several of the significant features of the dominion of light set forth in the inception of God’s covenant with time in creation (Gen 1:4-5, 14-19). 1 Enoch 72:1 establishes the timeframe for the function of the luminary structures of creation. They shall operate ‘unto eternity, till the new creation which abides forever is created’.\(^{529}\) To the righteous Enoch is granted the privilege of the revelation of ‘the nature of the years of the world unto eternity, till the new creation which abides forever is created’. This implies that the dominion of light established in creation by the creation of the sun and the moon will persist until the new creation. If the cyclic-linear nature of time is the promise of the establishment of the Davidic kingdom, then 1 Enoch 72:1 implies that the fulfilment of the promise of time will coincide with the new creation.

In this context, the sun is called the ‘great light’ (72:4) whose light is sevenfold brighter than that of the moon (cf. Isa 30:27) even though they are equal in size (72:37).\(^{530}\) Its movement during ‘the years of the universe’ is governed by the fixed order called the ‘first law of the luminaries’ established by God (72:36).\(^{531}\) Scrupulous observance of this ‘law’ is manifested in the sun going about in its cyclical course (72:27) riding on a ‘chariot’ driven by the wind (73:2). As the sun maintains this circular movement, the years are completed with precision (74:17). Together with the moon and the stars they ‘circulate in the chariots of heaven’ as they ‘rule in the face of the sky and are seen on the earth to be guides for the day and for the night’ (75:3. Emphasis added; cf. 75:8).

---

\(^{528}\) Aune dates this apocalypse as early as the third century BC. See Aune, ‘Idealized Past’, 148.


\(^{531}\) See Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 45. See also Argall, 1 Enoch and Sirach, 127.
Hence, all the luminary sources are maintained in the fixed order in which they rule the sky according to the command of God (75:3; 79:2).\(^{532}\) However, the sun determines the interval of the four seasons during the year (82:4). Above all, it is God who has the power to cause his ‘light’ to shine through these luminary sources (82:8). The fact that the fixed order of the luminaries is established according to the command of God guarantees not only that the functional significance of these structures will prevail but it also implies an underlying promissory character in their rhythmic accomplishment of that function indicated by the ‘first law of the luminaries’. This ‘law’ signifies the commitment God has made to maintain the luminary sources in that fixed order throughout the ‘years of the universe’ so that the years are completed with precision (82:6). The dominion of the luminaries guides the day and the night under God’s ‘first law of the luminaries’ according to their own time, so to speak, and thus guaranteeing that the circular course of time is maintained. In that way, the heavenly luminaries determine the ‘seasons, festivals, and months’, ‘years’ and ‘days’ (82:8-9).

The Book of Heavenly Luminaries is at least in part an interpretation of Genesis 1:14-19 as a polemic against an objection that emerged about the accuracy of the solar calendar (82:4-5; cf. Jub 6:36-38).\(^{533}\) This section of I Enoch (72-82) seeks therefore to give a theological justification from an eschatological perspective to the precision with which the solar calendar is operating since the beginning in creation until the new creation (cf. I En. 93:1-10; 91:11-17).

\(^{532}\) There is a second and third law of the luminaries which is related to the phases of the moon (I En. 73). See Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 45.

\(^{533}\) See Nickelsburg, I Enoch, 7. Nickelsburg, even though he acknowledges the polemic nature of the Book of Heavenly Luminaries, does not give due weight to it. See Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 46.
The idea that the heavenly luminaries ‘circulate in the chariots of heaven’ (75:3) offers a helpful image for grasping the seeming incompatibility of the cyclic pattern of time with its linear component. The horizontal flow of time is signified by the expression ‘years of the universe’ (72:35) which spans from creation until the ‘new creation’ (72:1; 91:16). While the wheels of the ‘chariots of heaven’ circulate in their rhythmic pattern, \(^{534}\) the celestial ‘chariots’ carry forward the sun and the moon until the ‘new creation which abides forever is created’ (cf. 1 En. 91:16-17). Several passages in the Pseudepigrapha indicate that, in the new creation, the sun and moon are finally replaced by the true heavenly luminary, the glory of God shining forth in the ‘day of the new creation’ (4 Ezra 7:38-43; Jub. 1:29; 1 En. 91:16; cf. Rev 21:23; 22:5).

In summary, the rhythmic pattern of the heavenly luminaries is linked to God’s covenant with time here in the recognition that the circular movements of the sun, the moon and the stars are fixed by God’s ‘first law of the luminaries’. Moreover, there is in principle a foundational supposition that the circular movement of the luminary sources guarantees that the ‘years of the universe’ will irreversibly flow on with consistent precision ‘till the new creation which abides forever is created’ (1 En. 72:1).

---

\(^{534}\)Perhaps underlying the perception that the heavenly luminaries are transported in their circular course repetitively is the Platonistic view that time is the ‘moving image’ of eternity. See Plato, *Timaeus* 37D – 42E; cf. Aristotle, *Physics* iv. 10-14.
4.5.3.3. *Sibylline Oracles* 3

In the *Sibylline Oracles* the cyclic course of time becomes the *medium* by means of which the anticipation of the restoration of Israel is maintained.535

>[A]s the cyclic course of time pursued its cyclic course the kingdom of Egypt arose, then that of the Persians, Medes, and Ethiopians, and Assyrian Babylon, then that of the Macedonians, of Egypt *again*, then Rome and bade me prophesy concerning every land and remind kings of the things that are to be. And God first put this in my mind: How many kingdoms of men will be raised up? The house of Solomon will rule first of all...’ (*Sib. Or.* 3:159-167. Emphasis added).536

Implicitly, the cycle of the kingdoms is a reflection of the cycle of time in which what has come to pass becomes the substance of future hope. Hence, the cycle of kingdoms begins with Egypt and then ends with ‘Egypt again’ (future) before the cycle finds a new beginning with Rome.537 However, the cycle that begins with Rome ends with the return of ‘[a]nother, great and diverse race, of Macedonia’, which is the kingdom that precedes Egypt in the previous cycle of kingdoms. A new beginning to the cycle of kingdoms is then brought about by God himself subsequent to his destruction of the Macedonians (*Sib. Or.* 3:174-175), who are identified with every kind of immorality (*Sib. Or.* 3:177-191).

---

535 Many have noticed in this cyclic rhythm a Stoic influence. See Flusser, ‘Four Empires’, 148-75; Lucas, ‘Origin’, 191. This is probably the basis of the occurrence in *Sibylline Oracles* 4, 5 and 8 of the legend of Nero’s return as an eschatological adversary at the head of the Parthian host. See Collins, *Sibylline*, 80-87. Collins, however, does not seem to recognize any significant contribution by the cyclic pattern of time in *Sibylline Oracles* 3 to the ‘expectation of radical and decisive change to be brought about by a king or kingdom’. See Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 35-55.


537 This accounts for the recognition of Sibylline Oracles’ provenance in Egypt. See Collins, ‘Sibylline Oracles’, 322.
According to the Sibyl, however, the ‘house of Solomon will rule first of all’ (Sib. Or. 3:167).\textsuperscript{538} Since Solomon’s reign comes first in the cycle of the kingdoms, the implication is that the cyclic pattern of the rise and fall of the empires guarantees the future restoration of the former glory of Solomon’s era ‘as time pursues its cyclic course’ (3:282-294). The view of history presupposed here is essentially cyclic since the end is what comes ‘first of all’ at the beginning.\textsuperscript{539}

In 3:218-294, the history of Israel is retold from a post-exilic viewpoint.\textsuperscript{540} It begins with ‘a race of most righteous men’ who came from Ur of the Chaldeans through the exodus (Sib. Or. 3:248) and moves on to the giving of the Law on Sinai (Sib. Or. 3:256-257). The next climactic event is the Assyrian exile and the desolation of Solomon’s temple (Sib. Or. 3:275-281).\textsuperscript{541} This is followed by the ‘seven decades of time’ in Babylonian exile (Sib. Or. 3:280). But then Israel is told that ‘a good end and a very great glory’ await them:

And then the heavenly God will send a king and will judge each man in blood and the gleam of fire. There is a certain royal tribe whose race will never stumble. This too, as time pursues its cyclic course, will reign, and it will begin to raise up a new temple of God. All the kings of the Persians will bring to their aid gold and bronze and much-wrought iron. For God himself will give a holy dream by night and then indeed the temple will again be as it was before (Sib. Or. 3:286-293. Emphasis added).

\textsuperscript{538} This emergence of Egypt after Solomon seems to be supported by the book of Kings where Egyptian dominance over Israel came during the reign of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon (1 Kgs 14:25-26).

\textsuperscript{539} This in fact is a view of history that constitutes the driving force for Thucydides and in some sense finds its way to Josephus. See Feldman, ‘Josephus’s Biblical’, 124. Cf. Cochrane, Christianity, 469-74; Berdayev, Meaning, 36-37.

\textsuperscript{540} Collins favors a Maccabean date for Sibylline Oracles 3. See Collins, Sibylline Oracles, 45.

\textsuperscript{541} In the Sibylline Oracles, the Assyrians and the Babylonians are equivalent. Cf. Sib. Or. 3:160. See Collins, ‘Sibylline Oracles’, 368.
The reference to the ‘certain royal tribe whose race will never stumble’ is almost certainly an allusion to Genesis 49:10 referring to the tribe of Judah to which David belongs. Moreover, the conviction that this royal tribe ‘will never stumble’ presupposes the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:15-16). The connection with the Davidic covenant is reinforced by the reference to the restoration of the temple in association with the establishment of the reign of the king whom God will send (3:290; cf. 2 Sam 7:12-13). Notably, however, neither David nor Judah is mentioned by name. Yet, it is the cyclic-linear course of time that eventually brings about the restoration of Israel under this God-sent king (3:289).

In this connection, there are at least six references that presuppose the cyclic movement of time in the *Sibylline Oracles* 3 – all of which occur in the context where Israel’s hope of restoration is described (3:50, 158, 221, 289, 649, 728). A passage which indicates this connection in the context of messianic hope is 3:649 where an international conflict is to occur ‘for many lengths of yearly recurring times’ immediately before ‘God will send a King from the sun who will stop the entire earth from evil war’ (3:652-653; cf. Ps 2:1-6). This ‘King from the sun’ is most likely to be the same person whom God will send at the ‘good end’ that awaits Israel (3:286). In both instances, this God-sent king fulfills God’s plan for temple restoration (3:286-290; 652-659). Temple restoration prepares the world for God’s judgment on the nations (3:295-618; 690-701) and the subsequent pilgrimage from ‘all islands and cities’ to the great eternal God in the Temple (3:716-731).

Interestingly, the structure of *Sibylline Oracles* 3:652-731 recalls Isaiah 60 where the ‘islands’ and ‘foreigners’ and ‘the nations’ – the ‘sons’ of Israel’s oppressors – will
surrender to Israel (Isa 60:9, 10, 11). In that connection, the ‘King from the sun’ may be identified with the re-establishment of Yahweh’s kingship in Zion as the ‘everlasting light’ of Israel (Isa 60:20; cf. 52:7) and not a reference to ‘Egyptian mythology which saw the king as an incarnation of the sun-god’. Thus, as time pursues its cyclic course it guarantees for God’s people the ultimate realization of ‘a good end and very great glory’ that is awaiting them in the restoration of God’s house to its former glory (3:282).

That the cyclic course of time anticipates ‘a good end and a very great glory’ signifies a fundamental linear component since ‘time presses on’ towards a ‘single goal’ (Sib. Or. 3:47, 50). This goal is identified with the ‘holy prince’ who ‘will come to gain sway over the sceptres of the earth forever’ when the ‘most great kingdom of the immortal king will become manifest over men... as time presses on’ (Sib. Or. 3: 46-50; Ps 2:9). We have seen that the notion of ‘time pressing on’ underscores the linear flow of time (1 Esd 4:33-34).

According to the Sibyl, the cyclic-linear course of time will persist until the ‘God who dwells in the sky rolls up the heaven as a scroll is rolled and the whole variegated vault of heaven falls on the wondrous earth and ocean’ (Sib. Or. 3:89-90;
cf. 1 En. 1-5; 90-105). This is a description of God’s judgment upon the nations (cf. 4 Ezra 7:40-43; cf. Ps 102:26-27; Heb 1:10-12). For in the Judgment Day, the cyclic structure of the universe will cease and there will be ‘no night, no dawn’ (Sib. Or. 3:89-90; cf. T. Mos. 1:18; 1 En. 26:1; 90:26; Rev 21:23; 22:5). In that sense, the cyclic course of time is no less than the medium through which Israel is enabled to look optimistically to the future on the basis of their glorious past and anticipates the coming time of restoration under the God-sent ‘King from the sun’ who will re-gather Israel around the new temple (Sib. Or. 3:702-704). Whereas several passages notably presuppose the Davidic hope, they stop short of specifying it. This makes better sense if this God-sent ‘King from the sun’ (3:652), who is ‘really the only one which tells of a messianic king’, is taken as the embodiment of the re-establishment of Yahweh’s eternal kingship in Israel as their ‘everlasting light’ when his ‘most great kingdom’ is ‘manifested over men’ (3:47-48).

4.5.4. Summary: Time as Promise in the Pseudepigrapha

In summary, the expectation that God will restore the kingdom of David in a time known to God alone (Pss. Sol. 17:21) appears to be the fulfilment of the promise set forth by God’s commitment to time to give day and night in their appointed time (Jer 33:20). Accordingly, the time of the restored Davidic kingship is closely connected to the hope of the Messiah. The Messiah is anticipated to restore the kingdom to Israel by re-gathering them as his holy people and re-distributing the land to them. Yet this restoration is eventually extended to include the ‘ends of the earth’ through the Messiah’s judgment of the nations. Subsequent to judgment, a purified and glorified Jerusalem becomes the focus of pilgrimage from the nations as they flock to

545 On the importance of the temple in Sibylline Oracles 3, see Collins, Sibylline Oracles, 44-47.
546 See Collins, Sibylline Oracles, 40.
Jerusalem to witness the glory of the Davidic kingdom. This vision of the restoration of Israel and of Jerusalem is amplified in other parts of the Pseudepigrapha to involve the restoration of God’s sanctuary upon Mount Zion (1 En. 91:16; 90:26; Jub. 1:17, 26-28; T. Mos. 1:18) on the ‘day of the new creation’ (1 En. 25:3; 72:1; 91:13-16; Jub. 1:26-29; T. Levi 5:2).

Given that the messianic reign of David is identified with Israel’s hope of restoration (Pss. Sol. 17:21) and the ‘day of the new creation’, the cyclic-linear course of time in The Book of Heavenly Luminaries plays the role of maintaining the ‘years of the universe’ on a regular basis with unparalleled precision until the ‘day of the new creation’. In the new creation, this function of the heavenly luminaries will be transferred to the glory of God and the cyclic rhythm of time will cease. The new creation is described as the time that ‘does not pass away’ (2 Bar. 44:11-14). In keeping with the hope of the restored sanctuary of God, the anticipation of the new creation lends the cyclic pattern of time its horizontal-linear component. While it is not explicitly indicated whether the cyclic course of time is a promise of the coming of the new creation, the writer of 1 Enoch 72-82 seems confident that the cyclic pattern of time will be maintained by the ‘celestial chariots’ that carry those luminary sources in their rhythmic patterns until the new creation. In the new creation, the linear component of time seems to be maintained but without its essential cyclic component (4 Ezra 7:39-44; Sib. Or. 3:88-92) since the luminary sources of creation will be replaced by the glorious splendour of God and the light of eternal life (1 En. 58:3, 6).
This anticipation of the restoration of Israel under the offspring of David is mediated by the cyclic-linear pattern of time in the *Sibylline Oracles*. According to the Sibyl, the ‘house of Solomon will rule first of all’ over the ‘kingdoms of men’ (*Sib. Or.* 3:165-166). As time pursues its cyclic course, the glory of this past kingdom will eventually be restored as Israel’s future hope. After the seventy year exile to Babylon, God will send a king to re-establish the Solomonic order of things and ‘raise up a new temple of God’ – and the ‘sons of the great God will all live peacefully around the Temple’ (3:702-703). God’s judgment comes after the new Temple is restored and Israel is re-gathered to Jerusalem and then ‘he will raise up a kingdom for all ages among men’ (3:767-768). To this kingdom, people from all nations will come with ‘incense and gifts to the house of the great God’ (3:772-774). A prince from the tribe of Judah is expected to reign in this restored kingdom.

Regarding the role of the levitical priesthood, it appears that none of the Pseudepigrapha gives prominence to the levites in the restored kingdom. Levi is given the priesthood but only until the consummation (*T. Levi* 5:2; cf. 4; 8:14; 10:2; *T. Reu.* 6:8) when a ‘new priest’ of anonymous origin is expected to be raised by God for the restored Israel. This priest will ‘shine forth like the sun in the earth; he shall take away all darkness from under heaven, and there shall be peace in all the earth’ in his days (*T. Levi* 18:4-5; *T. Jud.* 24:1). Since there is no mention of a successor, it seems that the priesthood of the ‘new priest’ will be perpetual. Moreover, he will include the nations in the scope of his priestly oversight for they shall be ‘illumined by the grace of God’ (*T. Levi* 18:8-9). 

---

548 One senses the hand of a Christian interpolator intruding with these sections in the book. In fact, it has been pointed out that *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* of which *Testament of Levi* forms a part, is of Christian origin. If this supposition can be substantiated then the contribution of the *Testament of*
4.5.5. *Time as Promise in Qumran*

Relative to the Second Temple sources just examined, probably the most distinctive notion of time expressed by the Dead Sea Scrolls is the understanding of time in spatial terms.\(^{549}\) Against the insistence that the usage of the verb *al min* the Jewish background implies the meaning ‘to fulfil’ presupposing the completion of a designated period,\(^{550}\) *4Q525* 14 ii 13 (cf. *4Q177* 3:10), asserts that God ‘will fill your days with goodness (*hknw bwb al nw*)’.\(^{551}\) Moreover, in Qumran, there is a reference to the ‘day’ as the ‘territory’ (*lbk*) upon which the dominion of the sun is exercised (*4Q408* 1+1b 8-11; cf. *4Q427* 2+3 ii 6). These evidence caution against the insistence that the notion of the fulfilment of time implies the completion of a specified duration.\(^{552}\) Several other passages in Qumran indicate an awareness of a fixed order of day and night which is preserved until the consummation of time.\(^{553}\)

Admittedly, the hope of restoration in terms of a Davidic messiah as reflected in the Qumram sources is expressed in a variety of ideas.\(^{554}\) Nevertheless, there is an underlying unity in the diversity of expressions of the hope of Israel’s restoration, grounded on several observations: (1) All hopes of restoration seem to be pointing to a this-worldly fulfilment on the national level within the physical universe of the

---


\(^{551}\) See Brin, *Time in the Bible*, 199-201.

\(^{552}\) See, for example, Moule, ‘Fulfilment Words’, 317. For a summary of usages of *pl hroun* in LXX, see Ernst, *Pleroma*, 25-26.

\(^{553}\) On the consummation of time in Qumran, see Brin, *Time in the Bible*, 271.

Land of Israel and the city of Jerusalem.\(^{555}\) The hope of the restoration in Qumran is also linked to the messianic expectation of the common Judaism of the last century BC of which a Davidic messiah plays a crucial role.\(^{556}\) Since Qumran considered other Jews and especially the temple establishment in Jerusalem to have erred, they were led to believe that they were living in the last days (\(\text{תִּמְנָח יְדֵי רֹאֶה} \)) – a wicked age before the dawn of the golden messianic age.\(^{557}\) With these introductory remarks in view, let us turn to the Qumran sources in order to explore the possible role that time assumes in relation to the sect’s hope of restoration.

4.5.5.1. 4Q427

In 4Q427,\(^{558}\) we find that the day as the ‘dominion of light’ and night as the ‘dominion of darkness’ are regulated by the ‘laws of the great luminary’ (\(\text{תִּכְנָמָת וֹאְךָּא} \)) (4Q427 2+3 ii =1QH xx 6). These ‘laws’ (\(\text{נְאִמָּה} \)) determine that darkness will withdraw just before dawn comes as they follow each other in their cyclic course established by the word of God in the beginning (1QH xx 6-7). In the Qumran documents, this reference to the ‘laws of the great luminary’ is the closest we get to an indication of a covenantal arrangement with time that God had established in creation. There is, however, no attempt to link this fixed order to the expectation of the restoration of Israel. Nevertheless, the ‘laws of the great luminary’ govern the cycle of time; its ‘birth’ and ‘foundation’ when the day ‘enters’ are determined by God. The inception of this covenantal arrangement is traced to the

---

555 See Talmon, ‘Restoration’, 205.
557 See Talmon, ‘Waiting for the Messiah’, 115-17; Milik, *Ten Years*, 84-85; Rietz, ‘Concept of Time’, 233-34.
558 This is a fragmentary copy of 1QH xx 4-10 where the text discussed here under 4Q427 (also known as 4QHodayot) is derived.
situation before creation to the ‘God of knowledge’ planning the created order (\(1QH^{16}\)) xx 9-11).

What is determined by the ‘laws of the great luminary’ on a daily basis, however, is analogously related to the events anticipated at the end of time. At the end of time, according to Qumran, the ‘fullness of the kingdom’ will once more fill the earth as the ‘period of darkness’ passes away (\(\text{Sf w } \#\text{i q rbf} \ldots\) and the ‘period of light’ will arrive (\(\text{ab rvah } \#\text{qwy}\)) in order to rule forever (\(4Q462\) 1 8-10 (=\(4Q467\); \(1QS\) x 1). In this analogous sense, the withdrawal of darkness at the ‘birth of time’ in the dawn of each new day, in keeping with the ‘laws of the great luminary’, anticipates the final triumph of the ‘period of light’ represented by the day over the ‘period of darkness’ represented by the night. In \(4Q462\), the arrival of the ‘period of light’ is identified with the restoration of God’s people from a ‘second’ slavery to Egypt (\(4Q462\) 1 13).

4.5.5.2. \(4Q216\)

A re-telling of the account of the fourth day of creation is found in \(4Q216\) vi 5-10 (= \(Jub\) 2:7-12) in which the sun functions to regulate not only day and night by separating them (cf. \(4Q299\) 5 2-4) but also for bringing about ‘sabbaths’, ‘the months, the feasts, the years, the weeks of years and the jubilees and for all the cycles of the years’ (=\(Jub.\) 2:9).\(^{559}\) This is most likely to be an allusion to Genesis 1:14 and the anticipation of ‘fixed times’ in Israel (cf. \(4Q423\) 5.4-7). The establishment of the sun and the moon on the fourth day of creation to determine the

\(^{559}\) \(4Q216\) is a copy of \(Jubilees\) and is actually known as \(4QJubilees\) which is a work not originated in the Qumran community but was found in its library. That the work was found in Qumran indicates that it may have contributed in an important manner to their conviction about time.
coming and going of ‘fixed times’ and ‘special times’ tend to anticipate God’s ‘appointed time’ during which he will bring about the final restoration of his people.

4.5.5.3. 4Q408

In 4Q408 1+1b 8-11 (cf. 4Q427 2+3 ii 5-11), morning signifies the appearance of the ‘dominion of light’ over ‘the day’ which is its ‘territory’ ($\text{vag}$ and the evening signifies the appearance of the dominion of darkness (v. 8; cf 4Q286 1 ii 9-13). In the morning the Qumran community rises to praise God in their work and in the evening they rest from their work in order to do the same when they see the stars. The cycle of time therefore dictates the appointed time for praise in the Qumran community. God is particularly praised for the goodness of the light provided by the sun during the day and by the stars at night. As in the creation account, ‘day’ is the territory ($\sim\text{my vag}$) of the ‘dominion of light’. \footnote{For the different uses of the term $\text{nv}$ in the Qumran Scrolls, see Brin, *Time in the Bible*, 332-38.} In that sense, ‘day’ is understood as a territory under a dominion – the ‘dominion of light’. \footnote{Cf. Koch, ‘Geheimnis’, 41.} Under the dominion of light, ‘day’ becomes the time for praise in the Qumran community. Here, the function of the cyclic pattern of time relates to the present but not the future. Nevertheless, if God’s appointed time is expected on a daily basis then, Qumran’s daily offering of praise is anticipatory of the time in which they shall praise God when he rises to shine forever in restoring the ‘sons of light’ and destroying the ‘sons of darkness’.

4.5.5.4. 1 QS

In 1 QS x 1-5, the beginning of the day, the beginning of the evening, the beginning of the seasons as they go about in their rhythmic rotation are signs signifying the
opening of God’s ‘everlasting mercies’ (line 4; cf. 4Q408 1 8-11). The beginning of each cycle of the circular course of time as governed by the dominion of light (the sun and the moon) affirms the faithfulness of God (line 4, 16; dsx; cf. 4Q299 5 2-4). Here the *beginning* of each cycle of nature, whether it is day and night, months, seasons, years, even of cultic years such as the seventh year period, signifies the ‘opening of [God’s] everlasting mercies for the beginnings of the seasons in every future age’ (line 4).

Literally, it signifies ‘his eternal mercies for the beginning of appointed times in every future period’ (hjhn #q l wb yd (wmywrl ~l y wdsx). That is, the coming of every appointed time in the future is an indication of God’s everlasting mercies bestowed upon his people. However, appointed times are guaranteed under the sun and the moon functioning according to the ‘laws of the great luminary’ (4Q427 2+3 ii 6; cf. 1QS x 10). If the beginning of the day and seasons signifies the opening of God’s everlasting mercies upon his people then each new day and season foreshadows the decisive embodiment of God’s mercy in the destruction of evil and the restoration of his people.

4.5.5.5. 4Q385

In 4Q385 3. 2-5, the notion of time as ‘hastening on’ towards a specified goal presupposes not only the cyclic and linear shape of time but, more importantly, God’s sovereignty *over* time:

And the days will pass rapidly until [all the sons of] man say « Are not days hastening on

---

562 This is probably an allusion to Lamentation 3:22-23.
(וָנָה -יְהוָה) so that the children of Israel can inherit [their land?]» And YHWH said to me «I will not shun your face, Ezekiel; see, I measure [time and shorten] the days and years […] a little, as you said to […] [For the mouth of YHWH has said these things] […]

God’s sovereignty over time is herein confirmed by the fact that he can both ‘lengthen’ (1QS iv 7; 1QM i 9; 1QH v 22-24; 4Q416 iii 19; 4Q418 137 2-5; 4Q426 1 i 1-4; cf. Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16; Eccl 7:15) and ‘shorten’ time so that his purpose may come to pass when he wishes (cf. QpHab vii 7; Mark 13:20; Matt 24:22).

Notably, the goal of the ‘hastening on of days’ (וָנָה -יְהוָה) is to arrive at the restoration of God’s people to their land.⁵⁶³ The return from the exile is linked to the consummation of the era (cf. 4Q462 1 13) and the end of the seventy weeks of years predicted by Daniel (cf. 1 QpHab ii 7:1; 4Q180 1 i 1-4).⁵⁶⁴ In that connection, the supposed cyclic-linear course of time anticipates the restoration of Israel to their land at the consummation of the era. Here, we are summoned to appreciate each day as an anticipation of its coming.

4.5.5.6. 4Q496

In 4Q496 i 2+1. 3-5, as time is ‘hastening on’, a ‘time of calamity’ and suffering is anticipated to immediately precede the arrival of Israel’s restoration to their land described as the arrival of ‘perfection of eternal redemption’ (וָנָה יִתְבָּאֶר נִבְגָּד הָאָד).⁵⁶⁵ According to the Qumran framework of time, this time of redemption coincides with the time when the ‘sons of justice shall shine to all the edges of the earth’. They shall

⁵⁶⁴ See Grabbe, ‘End of the Desolations’, 67-72. This is perceived to be coinciding with the ‘fullness of time’ (Eph 1:10; Gal 4:4). Scott identifies this time with the second exodus under the ministry of Jesus. See Scott, *Adoption*, 121-86; *idem*, ‘For As Many’, 217-21.
⁵⁶⁵ The keywords discussed here has been supplied by the editors from 1QM but is discussed here in relation to its context in 4Q496.
go on ‘shining up to the end of all the periods of darkness; and in the time of God, his exalted greatness will shine for all the eternal times, for peace and blessing, glory and joy’ (4Q496 i 3 7-9). In combination with our observation on 4Q385 above, these passages reflect different ways of restating the hope of Israel’s restoration to their land as the goal towards which time is hastening on.

4.5.5.7. 4Q252

The restoration of David’s kingdom is guaranteed, according to 4Q252 v 1-7, on the basis that God has given him the ‘covenant of the kingdom of his people’ (הַתָּוַד הָמְרֵב הַרְתִּי). This passage seems to be the only one among the extant Dead Sea Scrolls that explicitly identifies a future Davidic king as the ‘messiah.’

The ‘covenant of the kingdom’ here is most likely to be an allusion to the Davidic covenant (2 Sam 7:14-16). The time during which the Davidic kingship will be established is referred to as the ‘end of days’ (~יְמִהְיָה יָרָפָב) (4Q161 8-10 iii 18-22) which, in this context, is a future time. God’s activities in history, according to the Qumran sect, are divided into the ‘first things’ which God does in their ‘right time’ (~הֲדֹלְקָה יָרָפָב הָרָפָא) and the ‘final things’ which God does in their ‘appointed periods’ (~הֲדֹלְקָה יָרָפָב הָרָפָא) (Mas 1k i 1-7 =4Q402 4.10-15). The ‘end of time’ (תִּיוֹרְפֶּה יָרָפָב) is included in the ‘final things’ which is a period expected to be marked by Israel’s large-scale turning to God (4Q 397 14-21.12-14 (=4Q398 14-17 i; 4QMMT C 1-17); cf. 4Q398 11-13. 3-4; 4Q398 14-17 i 4-8; 14-17 ii 6; 4Q399 ii

566 Other passages identify the future messiah as the “branch of David” (4Q161; 4Q285; 4Q174 1-3 i 1-9). This probably underscores the profound influence of Isaiah 11:1-4 in depicting the messianic hope not only of the Qumran community but also of Second Temple Judaism. Isaiah 11 is clearly presupposed in Psalms of Solomon, 4Q161; 4Q285; and 1Q28b.

567 Cf. 4Q174 1-3 i 10-13.
If the ‘end of time’ and the ‘end of days’ are ways of referring to the time of the restoration of the Davidic kingship, then a mass conversion of Israel is anticipated to be one of its distinctive marks (cf. Rom 11:25). In the broader Jewish expectation, however, a time like that is anticipated to signify the advent of the prophet Elijah (cf. Mal 3:22-23 LXX; Sir 48:10).

4.5.5.8. *4Q174*

The ‘end of time’ is moreover the time during which God will establish for David the ‘house’ which he promised in 2 Samuel 7. Notably, David’s house is identified with the eschatological temple (*4Q174* 1 i 21 2 1-7, 10-13). This ‘house’ is described as the ‘sanctuary of man’ (~da vdm). The precise meaning of this expression is a vexed issue in Qumran scholarship. However, in view of God’s promise to David (2 Sam 7:12-14), and the sectarian nature of the Qumran community who saw themselves as the ‘sanctuary of the last days’, the ‘sanctuary of man’ is likely to be a reference to the ‘house’ God promises to establish for David which is identified with God’s eternal sanctuary (line 3; cf. Exod 15:17-18) and the place of rest for David and his people (line 7; cf. 2 Sam 7:11). The meaning of the term ‘house’ (tvp) here refers primarily to people and location (cf. *11QMelch*). Moreover, the ‘son’ who is the ‘branch of David’ is identified with the ‘hut of David’ who ‘will arise to save Israel’ in the ‘last days’ (lines 11-12).

---

568 It is possible to think that Jesus identifies the fulfilment of time with the ‘end of time’ and therefore sees the necessity of exhorting his audience towards ‘repentance’ in Mark 1:15. If the ‘end of time’ has arrived, then to continue in unrepentance seems to be entirely inappropriate. On the meaning of time in terms of tylx see the various positions advocated in the debate in Talmom, ‘Significance’, 795-97.

569 For the various positions advocated in this debate, see Wise, ‘Temple of Adam’, 107-110; Hafemann, ‘Spirit of the New Covenant’, 185.

570 See Gärtner, *Temple*, 16-46; Cf. Pate, *Communities*, 44-51.
This refers to a person rather than a location. In this connection, the term functions more precisely in its literal meaning as ‘a person representing a community’ (= son = Branch of David = hut of David). This supposition is strengthened by the observation that in Amos 9:11 the ‘hut of David’ is a collective term referring to Israel. Moreover, in 4Q174, the reference to the ‘midrash of the blessed man …’ (lines 14-19) affirms that persons rather than location are envisaged. Thus as the ‘temple of man’, the ‘son’ (= branch of David = hut of David) represents God’s people who will be incorporated to his sanctuary, the ‘hut of David’. Hence, the end-time sanctuary God promised to David seems primarily to be a people-space constituting the re-gathering of God’s people to God himself transcending location.

The connection between the Qumran community and the expansion of David’s restored ‘hut’ as people rather than location is attested in 4Q265 2 4-5 (cf. 1 QM xix 4-5) where Isaiah 54:1-2a is cited:

Sing, O barren one (who) did not bear; burst into song and shout, you who have not been in labour. For more will be the sons of [the desolate one than the sons of her that is married, says Yahweh.] Enlarge the place of [your] tent, [and let the curtains of your habitations be stretched out; do not hold back.

---

571 See Fuller, Restoration, 177.
572 ‘h’ appears in line 16 as the interpretation of vyah in line 14.
573 See Hafemann, ‘Spirit of the New Covenant’, 185. See also Wise, ‘Temple of Adam’, 109. See also Werman, ‘God’s House’, 314-17. In Acts 15:16, James interprets the Gentiles’ becoming believers through receiving the Holy Spirit in terms of Amos 9:11-15 as the ingathering of God’s people to the ‘tent of David’. If James’ interpretation of this passage is in line with that in 4Q174 then the -da vdm can be identified with the restored ‘hut of David’ as the one sanctuary of people gathered to God through the gospel of Jesus Christ. That is, in both Qumran and the New Testament, God’s end-time temple is intimately associated with the ‘house’ God promised to David which is primarily a people-space. See Barrett, ‘Paul’, 62-63.
Here, the expectation is that God’s community-sanctuary, the restoration of David’s fallen ‘hut’ will ‘be stretched out’ incorporating more sons to ‘the desolate one’.

4.5.5.9. \textit{11QMelch}

The restoration of God’s sanctuary in Zion seen in terms of the restoration of Israel is tied to the expectation of the messiah in \textit{11QMelch} (=\textit{11Q13}) lines 15-25. This passage is an exposition of Isaiah 52:7. The ‘mountains’ in Isaiah 52:7 are interpreted as the prophets; the ‘messenger’ is the ‘anointed of the Spirit’ \((\text{xwm})\) prophesied in Daniel 9:25 who announces salvation to ‘Zion’, ‘to comfort the afflicted’ which is Israel in exile. The messenger’s message is the announcement, ‘Your God reigns’ which is explicated as the instruction ‘in all the ages of the world’ \((-\text{lwh ycq lwh})\). ‘Zion’ refers to God’s people regardless of their geographical location. In fact, ‘Zion’ is the ‘congregation of the sons of justice’ \((\text{qdch ylb lk tlf})\). ‘Your god’ is ‘Melchizedek’ who manifests God’s reign in the liberation of God’s people from the power of Belial on the ‘day of peace’ \((-\text{lwh ajw})\).\footnote{The identity of ‘Melechzedek’ in \textit{11Q13} is a vexed issue in scholarship. See for example, De Jonge and Van Der Woude, ‘11Qmelchizedek’, 301-26; Van De Water, ‘Michael or Yhwh’, 75-86. De Jonge and Van De Woude argue that Melchizedek is a warrior figure parallel to the archangel Michael who functions as God’s servant. Van De Water argues that it points to a ‘divine intermediary’ figure. However, the rabbinic sources from which his view is derived are probably later than the Scrolls. It seems likely that the title ‘Melchizedek’ in \textit{11Q13} is derived on the basis of Jeremiah 23:6 and 33:16 as a description of the way in which God will exercise his coming reign upon his ‘afflicted’ people. He will be a ‘king of righteousness’ whose righteousness will be manifested specifically in liberating ‘Zion’ from the power of ‘Belial’.}

Melchizedek) who comforts his people by liberating them from the enslaving power of Belial (cf. 4Q385a 44 2-4; = 4Q387a 3 ii 2-8, 10-12) implies a connection. We have seen that the messianic ‘branch of David’ will ‘save Israel’ by defeating their enemies (4Q174 1 i 17-19; cf. 4Q161 2-6 ii 1-25). The liberated congregation is the restored Zion which is identified here with the ‘congregation of the sons of justice’ who will establish the new covenant. Hence, the ultimate goal of God’s activity envisaged here is the restoration of the Zion-community by means of a messianic agent which is precisely what his covenant with time establishes, according to Jeremiah 33.

4.5.5.10. 1 QS ix. 11 and the Messianic Hope of Qumran

We have argued that the anticipation of the fulfilment of God’s covenant with time in the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring seems to play a significant role in the messianic expectation of Qumran. A passage that has confused Qumran scholars for some times now is 1QS ix 11. It says, ‘They shall depart from none of the counsels of the Law to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts, but shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed until there shall come the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel’. Several issues emerge from this passage in scholarly discussions.

(1) Collins maintains the view that this passage indicates that ‘binary messianism of priest and king, Aaron and Israel’ represents the normative messianic expectation at

---

576 See Fuller, Restoration, 178.
Qumran rather than the hope of a single messianic figure.\textsuperscript{579} Collins finds the scriptural underpinning for this expectation in a series of biblical passages strung together in \textit{4Q175}. To be sure, he acknowledges the uniqueness of the expression ‘the messiahs of Aaron and Israel’ in \textit{IQS} ix 11, but argues that even passages which clearly indicate the same hope in the singular – ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (\textit{CD} xii.23; xiv.19; xix.10) – may also presuppose two messiahs rather than one. Collins observes that several passages in Qumran anticipate the presence of an eschatological priestly figure of authority equal to or greater than that of the Davidic messiah (e.g. \textit{IQSa}; \textit{4QpIsa}; \textit{CD} vii.18; \textit{4Q174} i. 11). He concludes therefore that there is ‘impressive evidence that the Dead Sea sect expected two messiahs, one royal and one priestly’ – the biblical precedence of which is found in Zechariah’s ‘two sons of oil’.\textsuperscript{580}

(2) On the basis of the evidence that there are more texts in Qumran that speak of ‘a messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ some have deduced that dual messianism is the exception rather than the rule.\textsuperscript{581} Perhaps the strongest evidence to this effect is found in \textit{CD} xiv 18-19 where the reference to the coming of the messiah of Aaron and Israel is followed by the singular verb \textit{rpky} (Pi. ‘he will atone’). This implies a messianic figure with a priestly status.

On the basis of the observation that more passages in Qumran occur in the singular it seems more plausible to argue that the expression ‘the messiahs of Israel and Aaron’ is a scribal error. In that sense, the supposition of a dual messianic hope in Qumran


\textsuperscript{581} See Wise and Tabor, ‘Messiah at Qumran’, 60-65; Abegg, ‘Messiah at Qumran’, 125-44. For the general objections to this view, see Collins, \textit{Sceptre and the Star}, 79.
should be argued, as Collins does, from passages that imply this notion and not primarily from *IQS* ix 11.

The attractiveness of the dual messianic hope of Qumran, however, lies in its supposed correspondence with the historical setting of the post-exilic community, reflected, for example, in Zechariah 4:14.\(^{582}\) As a possible re-interpretation of messianic passages as such (cf. Jer 33:17-26; Num 3:33; 25:10-13; Lev 6:15) *IQS* ix 11 does not seem to be a deviation from mainline messianic hope in Israel. In fact, it recalls the historical situation of King David where the proximity of the palace and the tabernacle on Zion often enabled the king to exercise supervision over the affairs of the priests (e.g. 2 Sam 8:17 = 1 Chr 18:16; 2 Sam 20:25-26; 1 Kgs 4:2, 4-5).\(^{583}\) In that sense, the binary messianic hope of Qumran tends to heighten the expectation of Israel’s restoration by envisaging the future in terms of the return of the Davidic order (*4Q174* i. 10-13; cf. Amos 9:11; cf. Jer 23:5-6; 33:17-26; Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24, 27).\(^{584}\) While this passage affirms that Israel’s hope of restoration is messianic and Davidic, there is no explicit connection made here with God’s covenant with time.

4.5.5.11. Summary: Time as Promise in Qumran

In summary, the understanding of the paradoxically cyclic-linear course of time in the Qumran community seems nowhere connected to the promise of the restoration

---


\(^{584}\) In *4Q174* i.10-13, the Qumran writer interprets the Davidic covenant in 2 Samuel 7:10-12 in terms of the hope of Amos 9:11. That is, the ‘house’ that God promised to raise up for David will become God’s ‘sanctuary of people’ in the last days constituting the raised ‘hut of David’ established in Zion in order to save Israel.
of Israel through David’s offspring. Nevertheless, several important observations can be made regarding the role of the cyclic-linear pattern of time in Qumran:

(1) The cyclic-linear pattern of time is maintained by a covenantal arrangement described as the ‘laws of the great luminary’ which determine the fixed order in which ‘day’ follows ‘night’ consecutively separated by morning and evening.

(2) The beginning of every conceivable cycle of nature (days, months, years, seasons, and even cultic special times), is a constant reminder of the opening of God’s eternal mercies to his people in the provision of time.

(3) The cyclic pattern of time essentially determines for the Qumran community their time for praising God in the morning and in the evening for the goodness of light that God provided through the sun during the day and by the stars at night.

(4) While the cyclic pattern of time does not promise the restoration of Israel, its daily operation in accordance with the ‘laws of the great luminary’ does indeed foreshadow in an analogous manner the final triumph of the ‘sons of light’ in the ‘period of light’ in the appointed time of God. In the ‘period of light’, the ‘sons of darkness’ will be surrendered to eternal destruction and the ‘period of darkness’ brought to its completion as God arises to shine forth for all eternity in his ‘appointed time’ (אֲדוֹן). Hence, the cycle of ‘day’ following ‘night’ will come to its conclusion when the ‘sons of light’ triumph over the ‘sons of darkness’ in the ‘appointed time of God’.
The cyclic rhythm of time guarantees the coming of ‘fixed times’ in the community. These ‘fixed times’ foreshadow the ‘appointed time of God’ and the ‘end of days’ during which the restoration of the house of David as the ‘sanctuary of man’, the ‘congregation of the sons of justice’, will be established as the restored Zion.

4.6. Time and Promise in Philo

Perhaps the single most important body of material from the Second Temple Period for our understanding of the development of Christianity in its first and second centuries is the Philonic corpus. However, the observation that ‘Philo has not been used half enough’ in New Testament scholarship seems to be confirmed, especially in relation to Philo’s conception of time. For even though there are no penetrating discussions of the nature of time in the manner of, for example, St. Augustine’s *Confessions* book XI, a consistent view of time is discernible throughout. In Philo, the cyclic course of time appears to occupy a prominent place. Firstly, cyclic time expresses the will of God that Nature is immortal:

For God willed that Nature should run a course that brings it back to its starting-point, endowing the species with immortality, and making them sharers of eternal existence. For the sake of this He both led on the beginning speedily towards the end, and made the end to retrace its way to the beginning (*Opif.*, 44).

This cyclic course of Nature is observable in the natural cycle of plants:

587 For Philo on Time, see Runia, *Philo*, 222-25.
588 It should be noted, however, that Philo uses the term χρόνος rather than καιρός for describing his understanding of time. The distinction between these two terms for time is irrelevant for the consideration of the notion of time in the biblical data. See our discussion under Chapter 8.4.1.
For it is the case both that the fruit comes out of the plants, as an end out of the beginning, and that out the fruit again, containing as it does the seed in itself, there comes the plant, a beginning out of an end (wj ah et el ouj arch) (Opif. 44).

Secondly, the cyclic course of time determines the seasons for the crops to produce their yield and thus ensure that there is plenty to feed humanity (Praem. 102). The regularity of the seasons for sowing and reaping crops is Nature’s way of guaranteeing the sustenance of the world.

Thirdly, cyclic time perfects everything. That is, it takes everything to the end which is once again its beginning (Opif. 59). Noah, for example, is both the end and the beginning of our race as God renews creation with the flood (Abr. 46).

Fourthly, the rhythmic movement of the sun determines the way in which time may be measured in terms of days, months and years (Opif. 60). In that light, day, months and years are measurable units of time.

However, Philo does not define the notion of time in connection with this cyclic pattern of Nature. Rather, time is viewed as the space or interval generated by the world’s movement:

Time … is a measured space determined by the world’s movement (poi gar di asthna thj tou/ kosmou kinsevi estin o’cranoj) and since movement could not be prior to the object moving, but must of necessity arise either after it or simultaneously with it, it follows of necessity that time also is either coeval with or later born than the world (Opif. 26).
Since time is the measure of the world’s movement, it is impossible to imagine that time exists without the world. In fact, time, according to Philo, is the consequence of the creation of the world (Op. 26; Leg. 2). For Philo, therefore, it is unorthodox to think that God is subjected in any sense to time (Decal. 58).

Interestingly, in Philo, the creation of light, which, as we have seen, is foundational for the origin of time in Genesis, seems to have no real connection with the notion of time. Nevertheless, ‘light’ and ‘darkness’ are seen as adversary forces that must be kept apart in order to prevent them from a ‘perpetual clash’ (Opif. 33). In order to hold them back from each other and thus to prevent them from assaulting each other in their ‘never-ceasing’ rivalry for mastery of the universe (Opif. 33), God separates them with boundary-markers:

These barriers [between light and darkness] are evening and dawn. The latter, gently restraining the darkness, anticipates the sunrise with the glad tidings of its approach; while evening, supervening upon sunset, gives a gentle welcome to the oncoming mass of darkness. (Opif. 34).

The placing of evening and dawn as barriers between light and darkness provides ‘measuring-rules and patterns’ (Opif. 34) for day and night:

When light had come into being, and darkness had moved out of its way and retired, and evening and dawn had been fixed as barriers in the intervals between them, as a necessary
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589 Cf. Plato, Timaeus 37D. On the relation of Philo’s conception to time to Plato, Runia observes that ‘Philo ...is greatly, if not exclusively, indebted to the Timaeus’. See Runia, Philo, 222.
consequence a measure of time was forthwith brought about, which its Maker called Day…

(Opif. 34-35).

The focus here seems to be similar to that in Qumran where the light of dawn causes the retreat of darkness. 590

For Philo, however, the cyclical course of time proves that the cosmos is eternal: 591

A clear proof that the earth retains its vigour continually and perpetually at its height is its vegetation, for purified either by the overflow of rivers, as they say is the case in Egypt, or by the annual rains, it takes a respite and relaxation from the weary toil of bearing fruit, and then after this interval of rest recuperates its native force till it reaches its full strength and then begins again to bear fruits like the old and supplies in abundance to each kind of living creature such food as they need (Aet. 62).

Nevertheless, the cycle of plant fruitbearing which proves the immortality of the world is sustained by unalterable laws and statutes of God (καὶ υἱοὶ οἱ ζωής. Opif. 61). That the regularity of time is governed by an immutable legal arrangement established by God is proximate to the description of God’s covenant with day and night as constituting the ‘ordinances of heaven and earth’ in Jeremiah 33:25.

These unalterable laws guarantee the return of the natural cycle to its beginning. Notably, immortality in Philo is the rhythmic ever-returning to the beginning of things at the end. Hence, the plant-cycle begins with fruit-bearing and finishes with

590 The measurement of the space of time is often attributed to Aristotle in the development of the notion of time in Greek philosophy. See Aristotle, Physics iv. 10-14.
591 On the imperishability of the world, see Plato, Timaeus 38c2-3.
fruit-bearing once again. Between the beginning and the end is an ‘interval of rest’ which allows the plant to regather its ‘native forces’ and then ‘begins again’ at the end with fruit-bearing (*Leg.* 6).

This cycle of Nature as reflected in plants underlies Philo’s reference to the ‘circuits of the sun and moon’, on which summer and winter and the changes of spring and autumn depend. The regularity of this cyclic movement, according to Philo, maintains the earth’s yearly cycle (*Opif.* 45). God is ‘like a charioteer grasping the reins or a pilot the tiller, He guides all things in what direction He pleases as law and right demands standing in need of no one besides: for all things are possible to God’ (*Opif.* 46). Interestingly, whereas the direction of the movement of time depends on what pleases God, a specific goal for the flow of time is not mentioned. However, Philo’s conviction that God directs time where he pleases implies that God may be driving the ‘chariot of time’ towards a final destiny. Several passages seem to point in this direction.

Philo recognizes that time is divisible into three modes: the past, the present and the future. The future is *nēloントοι suneστυν* (*Sacr.* 47). Here, there is an expectation of time to come in the future. He interprets the reference to ‘next year’ in Genesis 18:10 as a reference to eternity which is the ‘life of the world’ (*Mut.* 267). When God promises Sarah a time in which she will have a son, the time of the fulfilment of that promise is ‘real time’ (*ο’ αληθης αυτοι αν ειναι τον ροι* *Mut.* 264). The notion of a ‘real time’ expressed in the fulfilment of God’s promise indicates that Philo viewed

---

592 *ο’ αληθης* here implies ‘the truthfulness’ of God in fulfilling the promise to Sarah.
time in relation to God’s faithfulness to his promise. In fact, *Mut.* 265 indicates that for Philo God is allegorically understood to represent God (τὸν ὄγον καὶ ρόν).

Actually, Philo looks forward to eternity as οὐτε παρὰ ἥλιον οὐδὲν οὔτε μετέχει (avl a nonon uf est ἴκεν) (*Deus.* 32). Eternity is ‘only present’ and not past or future since the cycle of time ceases in eternity when the purified state of creation is accomplished. Ironically, while Philo is eagerly expecting ‘eternity’ as the days and years and seasons flow on in their rhythmic way, eternity is merely a return to the beginning, to the perfection of all things in the creation of God. Nevertheless, there seems to be no hint of universalism in Philo’s concept of time since, on the basis of Numbers 14:9, time is viewed as ‘departing’ the ‘wicked’ and ‘walking amongst’ the virtuous just as God did (*Mut.* 265-266). In fact, the virtuous, after death, exist in a mode of being in which time is dissolved (διε ὑπὸν οἵ ε ὁμοί. *Abr.* 23) so that they may be encountered by the living virtuous.

In summary, the essential features of time as reflected in Philo’s works include the following:

(1) God regulates time according to the immutable rules that he had set forth in creation (*Opif.* 61). Philo’s observation of these immutable rules implies that a fixed order, not unlike God’s covenant with time, governs the cyclic pattern of time.

(2) It is God’s will for time to be cyclic. This is observable in the ‘circle of the sun and moon’ produced by the movement of the earth. Moreover, it is God’s will that sustains this cyclic pattern in Nature.
(3) The cyclic pattern of time is regulated by the ‘circuits of the sun and moon’ (*Opif.* 45) driven by God according to his will like a ‘charioteer’. It is impossible, according to Philo, to conceive of time apart from this circuit.

(4) The cyclic course of time guarantees, according to Philo, the immortality of the cosmos. This is observed, for example, in the way a tree begins with a seed and finishes with a seed to produce another tree.

(5) For Philo, however, time is defined as ‘a measured space’ produced by the motion of the earth (*Opif.* 26). In order to square this definition of time with the predominantly cyclic component of his view of time, the ‘measured space’ of time would seem to curve upon itself as it moves from the beginning to the end where it begins again.

For Philo, therefore, the linearity of time is subordinated to the cyclic flow of time. In other words, the linear component of time is merely an interval between the beginning and the end, as cyclic time moves ironically back to eternity in the beginning, thus maintaining the immortality of the cosmos. In eternity, there is no past, present or future since the motion of the earth ceases and thus so also does cyclic time. On the contrary, the paradoxical cyclic-linear view of time which we have isolated as the biblical view of time does not envisage a return to the beginning
but the arrival at the end, which, according to Jeremiah 33:17-26, is the restored kingdom of David’s offspring.  

4.7. Time and Promise in Josephus

In Josephus, the distinction between the two Greek words for time appears to be maintained consistently throughout. That is, the term *chrono* seems to be reserved for indicating *durative time* whereas *kairos* denotes *punctiliar time*. This function of *kairos* dictates its role as a narrative time-indicator throughout Josephus.

Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the use of words for time in Josephus is their personification. Hence, even though time is given for a particular purpose, it can be ‘grasped by hand’ (*Ant.* 19. 113). Time, moreover, ‘carries’ death with it and brings upon the conclusion of one’s life (*Ant.* 12. 425). Nevertheless, time can encourage someone who is confronted by death (*J.W.* 7. 358). On its own, time can make decisions for people. So, for example, time allows for certain things to happen (*Ant.* 14. 358). Time can decide victory in battles (*J.W.* 7. 194). As the ‘surest test of truthfulness’ (*Ag. Ap.* 2.279), time can either affirm or frustrate prophecies (*J.W.* 1.180).
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596 Variously indicated by the phrase *kat’ ei ther ton kai ron* or *kat a touton ton kai ron*. See *Ant.* 1.194; 4.226; 5.352; 6.49, 213, 271; 6.292, 297; 7.21; 8.330; 9.239; 10.1; 11.89, 304, 313; 12.18, 196; 13.103, 284, 365, 419; 14.9, 388; 15.425; 16.335; 17.89, 224; 18.1; 20.17, 169, 179, 189, 211; *J.W.* 1.218, 231, 443; 2.309; 4.374; 7.41, 79; *Life* 1.112, 216, 271, 373, 390, 398; *C. Ap.* 1.136.
More pertinent to Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15, the notion of time as the arrival of the ‘right moment’ or the ‘right time’ is attested in various ways but not in a manner proximate to Jesus’ statement. It is, for instance, denoted as Καιρός ιδιού εικόνα (Ant. 11:171-72). In context, this phrase indicates that the return from Babylonian exile ‘is its own time’ (= the right time) for temple restoration. Probably implied here is a reference to time’s concurrence with the will of God. Apparently, the ‘right time’ is an event’s ‘own time’ (καιρός ιδιού). The conception of time as ‘time for something’ is clearly expressed as a pointer for the arrival of the ‘right moment’ (ἀρά καιρός J.W. 1.649; cf. Ant. 19. 113). In this form, it bears the meaning of time as ‘an opportunity for doing something’. Hence, there is a time for revenge (J.W. 1. 649) just as there is a time for aspiring to be king (J.W. 2.55).

However, the specific ‘now’ as the ‘right time’ or ‘opportunity’ is more pointedly designated by expressions such as οὔτως ἡν ο καιρός (J.W. 3. 494), ἥκειν νῦν καιρός (J.W. 7. 323), νῦν καιρός (J.W. 2.55), ἐν χείναις ἰλεον καιρόν (Ant 13. 395; 15. 42; Life 1.39). In Titus’ campaign against Jerusalem, for example, the arrival of the time for the destruction of Jerusalem is emphatically indicated as οὔ-ἡν ο καιρός (J.W. 3. 494). Josephus’ usages of these expressions to indicate the arrival of the ‘right time’ implies their availability as linguistic choices to Jesus. That these ways of speaking about the arrival of a special time are not represented in Mark 1:15 underscores the uniqueness of Jesus’ announcement.

The term θερμαί is attested once and, more importantly, in the context of the fulfilment of prophecies regarding the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (J.W. 6. 110). In this connection, Josephus singles out Daniel as distinct from other
prophets since he not only prophesies but also determines the time for prophecy to occur (Ant. 10. 267).

Regarding the restoration of Israel, Josephus is in fundamental agreement with the Jeremiah tradition that predicts seventy years as the duration of the Babylonian exile (Jer 25:11; 29:10; cf. J.W. 5. 389). Moreover, Josephus indicates that Israel’s mission in returning from the exile is to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem (Ant. 20. 233). Interestingly, time after the exile is temple restoration’s ‘own time’ (Ant. 11. 171-72). The term $\textit{apokatastasis}$ only appears twice in Josephus and in both occurrences the restoration of Israel after the exile is envisaged (Ant. 11.63, 98). Similarly, the corresponding verb, $\textit{apokatasthrw}$, occurs seventeen times – all in relation to various aspects of temple restoration. In other words, for Josephus, time itself confirms that the return from exile is the right occasion for the restoration of Israel manifested in rebuilding the temple.

The significance of the temple in the post-exilic restoration of Israel is highlighted in two important events that relate to the hope of Israel’s restoration and indicate Josephus’ peculiar view of time.

Firstly, the ascendance of Vespasian as Roman emperor is viewed as the fulfilment of Israel’s hope that one of their fellow countrymen would become the ruler of the world ‘at that time’ (J.W. 6.312-15). For Josephus, this prophecy essentially
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598 It has been pointed out that after his capture by the Romans, Josephus viewed himself as ‘a Jeremiah redivivus’. See Cohen, Josephus, 233.


601 Cf. Tacitus, Hist 5, 13; Suetonius, Vesp 4, 5.
motivates the outbreak of the rebellion against Rome. The Old Testament prophecy behind this expectation is either Numbers 24:17-19\textsuperscript{602} or Daniel 7:13-14\textsuperscript{603} or 9:24-27\textsuperscript{604} or perhaps more likely, a composite mixture of all of these passages in a manner similar to Mark 1:2-3. Notably, in Jesus’ historical setting, there seems to have been a heightened expectation that the kingdom will be restored to Israel ‘at that time’ (cf. Mk 1:15//Act 1:6).

Secondly, the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem by Titus’ army is, for Josephus, ‘all [things] fulfilled’ (pān pēpl hō wēt aì J.W. 6.110).\textsuperscript{605} The scope of fulfilment here more specifically includes ‘all things’ that God had predicted about the destruction of the temple. In fact, the destruction of the temple is notably the realization of the ‘records of the ancient prophets and that oracle which threatens this poor city’ (J.W. 6.109). The prophetic oracles envisaged by Josephus are not specified. However, the destruction of Jerusalem is couched in language that alludes to Malachi 3:1-4, as the coming of God’s purifying judgment on ‘his temple and exterminating a city so laden with pollutions’ (J.W. 6.110). In that sense, Josephus views the destruction of the temple from a theocentric perspective\textsuperscript{606} as the fulfilment of prophecy.\textsuperscript{607}

Josephus’ perception of the destruction of Jerusalem and, more specifically, of the temple in AD 70 as the ‘fulfilment of all things’ appears to imply a cyclic view of history. Historically speaking, the threats God had spoken against Israel and against

\textsuperscript{602} See Hengel, Zealots, 240.
\textsuperscript{603} See Hengel, Zealots, 238 referring to E. Norden (1913) who propagated such a view.
\textsuperscript{604} See Wright, New Testament, 313.
\textsuperscript{605} The meaning of this expression of course relates to the filling of the temple with the corpses of dead bodies which in the light of J. W. 6.109 is the fulfilment of the prophecies about the destruction of God’s people.
\textsuperscript{606} See Attridge, Interpretation, 183.
\textsuperscript{607} See Schiffmann, ‘Restoration’, 261.
the temple through the prophets were meant to have been fulfilled in the Assyrian
\( (\text{Ant. 9.278-280; cf. 2 Kgs 17:4) and the Babylonian exile (J.W. 5.390; Ant. 11.133).} \)
Indeed Josephus recognizes the position of these events in Israel’s past (cf. \text{Ant. 9.280}). However, his conviction that the same prophetic oracles given as warning for Israel about disasters that were fulfilled through Assyria and Babylon, were also applicable to his contemporary setting, more particularly, in the destruction of the temple by the Romans, reflects an underlying belief in the re-cycling of past events.
In fact, it has been pointed out that Josephus may well be driven by the dictum of Thucydides (1.22.4) that ‘whoever wishes to have a clear view of the events which have happened and those which will some day, in all human probability, happen again in the same or similar way’ will find his history useful.\(^{608}\)

Thus, if the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple is the ‘fulfilment of all things’ with which God had threatened Israel in the past, then dormant beneath the surface is an underlying hope, on the basis of the same prophecies regarding Israel, for its future restoration. However, regarding the hope of the future restoration of Israel Josephus is prepared to be ambiguous. For instance, in his interpretation of Daniel 2:44-45 regarding the ‘stone’ that would destroy even Rome, he took shelter behind his calling as a ‘historian’ rather than a ‘prophet’ \( (\text{Ant. 11.210).} \)\(^{609}\)

In summary, for Josephus, there is an implied linear flow of time constituting times and opportunities for events to occur. This is reflected by the predominant usage of the term \text{kaiροj} throughout his work. Yet, the general course of history itself, according to his account, appears to be cyclic – reverting to the past as its future

\(^{608}\) See Feldman, ‘Concept of Exile’, 167-68.
goal. Thus, time flows on from the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple by the Babylonians, to the exile, to the return from exile and the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple in post-exilic times. Yet, history re-cycles back to that beginning with the prophetic threat of impending disasters upon Jerusalem re-applied to the Romans, and then to the coming of destruction upon the city and the temple and thus finds itself standing under God’s judgment, relying once more on the prophetic hope of restoration as a purified temple-city state.

If this observation of Josephus’ view of time is cogent, then his conception of time is not fundamentally different from that of Philo – a predominantly cyclic view of time. In that sense, it is the opposite of the paradoxically cyclic-linear time we have derived. The end goal of the cyclic-linear time-flow is not a return to the beginning but, as we have seen, restoration under David’s offspring. On the other hand, for Josephus, as it is for Philo, time flows on to a goal but the goal lies in the past where the flow of time is to begin again. If a thoroughly cyclic view of time is characteristically Greek in its orientation, then Josephus seems to have been more successful than Philo in incorporating it as an interpretive scheme for understanding history in terms of Israel’s Scriptures.

4.8. Summary: Time as the Promise of the Kingdom in Its Jewish Background

We have argued that the background for Jesus’ announcement Pepl hwrwtaí o’kai roj kai hggig ken h’basileía touqeu is most likely to be found in God’s covenant with time. Accordingly, God committed himself to giving ‘day’ and ‘night’ in their appointed time as the promise of the restoration of his kingdom under David’s

---

⁶¹⁰ See Lindner, Geschichtsauffassung, 143.
offspring. From the creation account, we have observed that time may be defined as the condition in which God’s purposes in creation are manifested (cf. 4 Ezra 6:40). Time, moreover, is paradoxically cyclic-linear in shape. Time is essentially cyclic as established by the refrain, ‘and it was evening and it was morning [a] day...’ Nevertheless, time is also fundamentally linear because it flows irreversibly from ‘day one’ to the ‘seventh day’, God’s rest.

This cyclic-linear framework of time is confirmed in the covenant with Noah. We have seen that just as the rainbow signifies God’s covenant of grace to Noah and his descendants, so also the sun and the moon are signs of God’s commitment to give day and night in their time on a daily basis. In Jeremiah (33:17-26), the specific goal of God’s covenantal commitment to the cyclic course of day and night is unfolded. Accordingly, the daily fulfilment of God’s commitment to give ‘day’ and ‘night’ in their appointed time is the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.

This hope of the restoration of Israel under a restored Davidic kingship is, according to the Psalms of Solomon, the hope of the establishment of Israel under the Lord’s Messiah. There seem to be two stages involved in this anticipated restoration. The first stage will be the re-gathering of God’s holy people from exile to Israel in which the land, having been purged of all unrighteousness, will again be re-distributed to them according to their tribes. This will be followed, however, by the Davidic king’s judgment of the nations which will result in the ends of the earth coming in numbers to a purified and a glorified Jerusalem in order to serve the restored Israel and its king. Interestingly, the restoration of Israel under the Davidic Messiah will occur in a
time known to God alone (Pss. Sol. 17:21). That the time of the kingdom is known only to God presupposes that the cyclic course of time will be maintained until the arrival of that time of restoration.

That the cyclic course of time will be maintained until the realization of God’s goal for creation is reflected in helpful imagery of the cyclic-linear shape of time found in The Book of Heavenly Luminaries (1 En. 72-82). There, the sun and the moon are described as driven on celestial chariots in their cyclic movements that produce days, months and years, with precision. This cyclic course must be maintained until the new creation. On this basis, time is likened to a chariot. While its wheels turn on their cyclic rhythm, it carries forth the chariot to the goal which has been determined for it by God.

In the Sibylline Oracles 3, the cyclic pattern of time is the medium by means of which the re-establishment of past kingdoms can be anticipated. This recurring pattern whereby past kingdoms are expected to return in the future forms the basis for the hope that the past glories of Solomon’s kingdom, being the first and foremost of the kingdoms, will be restored in the end. Its restoration will be realized in the restoration of the temple to which God’s people will be re-gathered.

611 The reference to a time known to God for the restoration of Israel under the Davidic Messiah in Psalms of Solomon 17:21 is the most likely background of Jesus’ acknowledgement in Acts 1:7 that the time for the restoration of the kingdom to Israel is known to God alone.

612 The notion of time as a ‘chariot’ is reflected in one the Tongan hymns (Hymn #533, in Ko e Tohi Himi ‘a e Siasi Vesiliana Tau’ataina ’o Tonga) composed by Dr James Egan Moulton who was a missionary to Tonga from 1865 to 1907.

In Qumran, this new temple is a ‘sanctuary of people’ that will be liberated by the messianic ‘king of righteousness’ from the power of Belial, their cosmic foe. Interestingly, in Qumran, the cyclic pattern of time is governed by a covenantal arrangement, namely, the ‘laws of the great luminary’. These ‘laws’ determine that night will withdraw before the dawn of day. According to the Qumran documents, the opening of each new day testifies to the greatness of God’s mercy to his people. In that sense, the dawn of each new day anticipates the appointed time of God during which the sons of light will completely defeat the sons of darkness and thus shine forth to eternity.\(^6\) Hence, the cyclic pattern of time tends to foreshadow the victory of light over darkness when God will through his messianic agent finally restore Zion by liberating it from the enslaving power of Belial.

The contribution of Philo and Josephus to this discussion is by way of showing us alternative ways in which the cyclic and linear components of time can be related. In Philo, even though God governs time like a charioteer, there is a sense of uncertainty regarding the goal to which God is driving the chariot of time. In order to square his definition of time as ‘measured space’ resulting from the motion of the heavens and the cyclic rhythm he observes in Nature, it seems that the space of time curves upon itself as it flows from the beginning to the end, which, in a predominantly cyclic timeframe, is the beginning. In Josephus, the cyclic shape of time has become an interpretive framework for reading history in terms of Israel’s Scripture. The cyclic pattern of time allows the past prophetic warnings to Jerusalem to be reapplied to the situation of Israel under the Romans. Yet, Josephus is deliberately reticent about the restoration of Israel. Thus, for Josephus, the cycle of time implicates the temple’s

\(^6\) On this cosmic antithesis between light and darkness as an extension of Israel’s national hope, see Scholem, ‘Towards an Understanding’, 6.
destruction but not its final restoration. Implicitly, there is an underlying hope for a more purified temple resulting from God’s judgment of Jerusalem by the Romans. But perhaps Josephus was looking for Vespasian, rather than God, to bring that finality about, since, according to Josephus, Vespasian was the fulfilment of Israel’s messianic hope.

4.9. Implication of God’s Covenant with Time For Understanding Mark 1:15

We have argued that the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring is promised by the daily fulfilment of God’s covenant with day and night. We have traced the origin of this covenant to the act of creation itself. On the basis of Jeremiah 33:17-26, we observed that the covenantal arrangement evinces a promise-fulfilment structure, where each fulfilment becomes another promise which awaits further – and final – fulfilment. That is, God’s daily commitment to give day and night in their appointed time is the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring which still awaits final realization. This conception, of God’s ‘covenant with time,’ helps to illuminate the inner relation between the time-word and the kingdom saying in Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15, Πέλαγε τῷ ὄχλῳ ὁ σφαγή, ἔλεη γὰρ τὸ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Notably, it is time (ὀχρόν) itself as a unique conceptual category that is fulfilled and not Scripture. In Mark 1:15, the fulfilment of time is intimately tied to the coming near of the Kingdom of God. We may therefore paraphrase Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 provisionally as,
Time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is coming near.

4.10. Jesus and God’s Covenant with Time

While God’s covenant with time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is not explicitly mentioned or alluded to by Jesus or the apostles, there are good reasons to suppose that Jesus was familiar with Jeremiah 33:20-26 where this connection is explicitly made.

Firstly, it needs to be asserted that absence of literary connection does not diminish the possibility of influence at the conceptual level. The example that immediately springs to mind here is the notion of the ‘Kingdom of God’. It is widely acknowledged that the even though the phrase is absent in the Old Testament, the concept is latent where the kingship of God is discussed. In fact, Bright has shown that the notion of the Kingdom of God pervasively shaped the overarching structure of Israel’s history as presented in the Old Testament. Underlying this insight is the phenomenon of semantic change employed by a number of scholars in tracing the Old Testament provenance of certain aspects of Jesus’ teaching. This phenomenon argues that the absence of direct linguistic parallels should not be considered sufficient grounds to disqualify possible allusions. In that sense, that Jesus and New Testament writers did not cite Jeremiah 33:20-26 directly is no sufficient reason for refuting the interpretation of Jesus’ time-word proposed in this chapter.

---

615 See also ‘Excursus 1’ below.
617 See Bright, Kingdom of God.
618 See Watts, ‘Jesus’ Death’, 127.
Secondly, perhaps more to the point, the passage that outlined God’s covenant with day and night in relation to the promise of the restoration of Israel, namely Jeremiah 33:20-26, occurs in the textual vicinity of the ‘new covenant’ passage in Jeremiah 31. We have indicated that even the notion of the covenant with time is already presupposed in Jeremiah 31:35-36. In fact, the person and work of Jesus is interpreted by some of his contemporaries in terms of the prophets and amongst those, Jeremiah is specified as the one of whom Jesus’ ministry is most reminiscent (Mark 8:28; Matt 16:14). We may not know of course the degree of familiarity with Jeremiah suggested in this view of Jesus. Nevertheless, there is sufficient indication here that Jeremiah’s message contributed in some significant sense to the view of Jesus’ ministry at least amongst some of his contemporaries and would have been part of the ‘Scriptures’ Jesus expected them to know in order to rightly interpret his teaching about the hope of the resurrection (cf Mark 12:24). Hence, the underlying influence of the notion of the new covenant in Jesus’ re-interpretation of the Passover on the night of his betrayal (Mark 14:24; cf. Matt 26:28; Luke 22:20) reflects the likelihood of Jesus’ familiarity not only with the passage from Jeremiah 31 but also of the entire message of Jeremiah.

Thirdly, the intimate connection between time and the restoration of the Kingdom of God to Israel seems to be part of the dominical tradition. Immediately before Jesus’ ascension, the disciples asked him, ‘Lord, are you in this time (καιρός) and at this time (κρόνος) restoring the Kingdom to Israel?’ (Acts 1:6). The traditional distinction between the two terms for time (καιρός and κρόνος) cannot be maintained on the basis of their usage in the New Testament (e.g. Acts 1:7; 3:20-21). More importantly, the

619 See Burns, ‘Two Words for “Time”’, 22.
disciples seem to have anticipated the ‘time of the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel’. In his reply, Jesus affirms the connection between time and Israel’s restoration: ‘It is not for you to know the seasons or times (cronou h’ kai rouj) which the Father has determined by his own authority’ (Acts 1:7). The times of the final restoration (cronwn apokatassew j pantwn, Acts 3:21), according to Acts, will occur when the Messiah returns. In that sense, the fulfilment of time Jesus announces inaugurates the restoration of Israel as an ongoing dynamic until its final realization.

Fourthly, the connection between time and the hope of the restoration just mentioned is evident in post-New Testament writings. Aspects of the cyclic-linear notion of time which we have observed in creation are employed independently in 1 Clement, Epistle of Barnabas and in the Shepherd of Hermas to highlight the hope of the bodily resurrection. Clement observes the resurrection in the cyclic pattern of night and day: ‘Day and night declare to us a resurrection. The night sinks to sleep, and day arises; the day [again] departs, and the night comes on’ (1 Clem. xxiv). In the Shepherd of Hermas, the cyclic pattern of the seasons foreshadows the resurrection and the judgment to come. Accordingly, the present time is ‘winter’ for believers since the glory that is yet to be theirs is not manifested in themselves but is dwelling with sinners, just as in winter all trees shed their leaves and thus living and dead trees are indistinguishable. But in the world to come, believers will enjoy their ‘summer’ and the unbelievers ‘winter’, since dead trees will be burnt as wood (Herm Sim. iii. 3-4). Barnabas for his part interprets the seven-day creation pattern in terms of Psalm 90:4 as six thousand years in which ‘all things will be finished’. The seventh day therefore corresponds to the return of Jesus in order to ‘destroy the time of the wicked man and judge the ungodly’ (Barn. xv). Notably, if the cyclic pattern of time
declares the resurrection in advance (*1 Clement* and *Hermas*), the irreversible flow from ‘day one’ to the ‘seventh day’ in the creation narrative affirms the linear structure of time hastening on to its goal in the judgment and the resurrection (*Barnabas*). These incidental evidences imply an underlying influence of the notion of God’s covenant with time in the apostolic and post-apostolic tradition.

Collectively, the foregoing observations register the probable familiarity of Jesus and the apostolic tradition underlying the New Testament with the notion of God’s covenant with time as the promise of Israel’s restoration and thus its possible influence on the way Jesus’ announcement about time and the Kingdom of God is made in Mark 1:15.

---

620 For the connection between resurrection and restoration, see Chapter 7 below.
5. JESUS’ UNDERSTANDING OF TIME IN MARK 1:15: EXEGETICAL-THEOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

5.1. The Grammatical Structure of Mark 1:15

Having argued that the most likely background of Mark 1:15 in the Jewish literature is the notion of God’s covenant with time, in this chapter and the ensuing chapters we shall focus upon Mark 1:15 as an interpretive ‘window’ through which Jesus’ view of time may be explored and analysed. In this chapter, our aim is to determine through grammatical and syntactical analyses the intimate way in which the fulfilment of time as the promise of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom is viewed by Jesus. In what way does Jesus view the fulfilment of time as the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring in relation to the coming near of the Kingdom of God? To provide an adequate response to this question, we shall first of all draw on current developments in the study of Greek verbal aspect of the perfect tense-form in order to determine what is envisaged by the perfect verbs πεπληρωται and ἠγγίκηκα in Mark 1:15. Subsequently, we shall draw on contemporary discourse analysis categories in order to determine how best to understand the intimate way in which the phrase Πεπληρωται ο’καιροι is syntactically connected to the phrase ἡ ἡγγικὴν ἡ βασιλεία του θεοῦ in Mark 1:15.

---

621 On the text as “window”, see Malina, Windows, 158-161; Donahue, ‘Windows’, 3-4; Krieger, Window, 3-4, 66; Petersen, Literary Criticism, 19; Schneiders, Revelatory Text, 113.
622 The current development outlined below has been largely initiated by the independent efforts of Stanley E. Porter (1989) and Buist M. Fanning (1990). For a concise summary, see their respective contributions in Porter and Carson (eds), Biblical Greek, 26-45 and 46-62. A brief historical background to this new development is provided by Carson, ‘An Introduction’, 18-25.
For the ensuing discussion it is helpful to set out the structure of Mark 1:15 as follows:⁶²³

1:15a. kai legwν ǒ i
1:15b. Pepl hrwtai o kairoj
1:15c kai hggik en hbasileia tou qeou
1:15d. metanoute kai pisteue eintw evangelw

This structure will be utilized in identifying different parts of the passage discussed in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

5.2. Some Exegetical Reflections

The conjunction kai in 1:15a clearly links the rest of the verse 15 to verse 14 by functioning explicatively indicating that the announcement in verse 15 is the content of to evangelion tou qeou (v. 14).⁶²⁴ Kai with legwν in verse 14, moreover, functions as a ‘speech-introducing formula’⁶²⁵ for Jesus’s proclamation in verse 15.⁶²⁶ The occurrence of ǒ i underscores this introductory emphasis functioning as ǒ i recitativum.⁶²⁷ Mark 1:15b and 1:15c therefore contain the central message of Jesus’ proclamation which has been identified in 1:14 as the evangelion tou qeou. This latter phrase is probably best taken in its objective sense as the ‘gospel about God’ on the basis of the citation from Isaiah in verses 2-3 even though its subjective

⁶²⁵ See Licht, Storytelling, 103.
⁶²⁷ See Mussner, ‘Die Bedeutung’, 259; Cranfield, Mark, 62; Guelich, Mark, 43.
sense (‘gospel from God’) should not be ruled out prima facie. The content of Jesus’ gospel message points to God as the agent behind the activity denoted by the perfect verbs in 1:15b and 1:15c.

5.2.1. Remarks on the ‘Passive Voice’ in \( \text{pepl h\text{\'}r\text{\'}w\text{\'}t\text{\'}ai} \)

The occurrence of the verb \( \text{pepl h\text{\'}r\text{\'}w\text{\'}t\text{\'}ai} \) in the passive voice indicates in practical terms that the grammatical subject (\( \text{o\'kai\text{\'}r\text{\'}oj} \)) is being acted upon by an ‘unspecified agent’. It has been widely recognized that the passive voice has the special function of shifting the emphasis to the action imposed upon the grammatical subject which, in Mark 1:15, is \( \text{o\'kai\text{\'}r\text{\'}oj} \). The usage of the passive voice is far more frequent in the New Testament especially in relation to the fulfilment formula which implies God’s involvement while leaving unmentioned his name out of reverence.

Here in Mark 1:15, God is the ‘unspecified agent’ in the action denoted by the verb \( \text{pepl h\text{\'}r\text{\'}w\text{\'}t\text{\'}ai} \). He actualizes ‘fulfilment’ upon the grammatical subject (\( \text{o\'kai\text{\'}r\text{\'}oj} \)).

A number of significant observations on Jesus’ view of time can be made on this basis.

Firstly, since God is the ‘unspecified agent’ acting upon the grammatical subject (\( \text{o\'kai\text{\'}r\text{\'}oj} \)), the gospel Jesus heralds is fundamentally theocentric. In the passive voice, the term \( \text{pepl h\text{\'}r\text{\'}w\text{\'}t\text{\'}ai} \) signifies the definitive pattern of God’s involvement in \( \text{o\'kai\text{\'}r\text{\'}oj} \).

---

628 See the discussion in Dautzenberg, ‘Die Zeit’, 76-91; Lagrange, *Marc*, 15. For a subjective reading of this phrase, see Cranfield, *Mark*, 62.
629 Lemcio believes that this apparent God-centeredness in Jesus’ preaching affirms that the content of the Gospels faithfully present the past of Jesus and not the ‘present’ of the church as Form critics perceived the content of the Gospels. See Lemcio, *Past of Jesus*, 32.
630 See Jannaris, *Historical Greek*, 359.
631 See Porter, *Idioms*, 64.
The meaning of the verbal stem from which *peplhrwtaioi* is derived, the verb *plhrw*, is primarily 'to fill' or 'make full' in purely spatial connotation. Delling observes that this spatial focus is maintained throughout the New Testament, with few exceptions. In that spatial sense, *o kairoj* as the promise of the kingdom, is the ‘space’ to be ‘filled’ by God. By proclaiming the fulfilment of the promise of time, Jesus is thereby announcing the ‘filling up’ of the space of time with the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.

Secondly, the grammatical subject of the phrase *peplhrwtaio o kairoj*, namely, *o kairoj*, ('the time'), is probably best understood as reality in its totality embracing both spatial and temporal dimensions. Here, the definite article *o* functions as a monadic article in order to identify *kairoj* as a ‘one-of-a-kind’ noun. That is, *o kairoj* is not just any specified quantum of time but rather ‘the time’ as a unique phenomenon.

---

635 See Jackelén, *Time*, 74. “God is the One acting in time”. This not so apparent involvement of God in Jesus’ message answers what Pannenberg regards as the “first question” of Christology, namely, Jesus’ unity with God. See Pannenberg, *Jesus*, 36. It also satisfies what Dahls long ago lamented as the neglected factor in New Testament theology, namely, God. See Dahls, ‘Neglected Factor’, 157-163.

636 See Delling, *plhrw*, 290. See also Hübner, *plhrw*, 257; Marcus, ‘Time’, 50; Kilgallen, *Mark*, 32. Delling proposes that the application of the spatial connotation to Romans 13:8 and Galatians 5:14 produces an absurd meaning. Thus, he suggests the meaning ‘to correspond to a requirement’ or ‘to fulfill a norm’ for the occurrence of cognates of *plhrw* in these passages. See Delling, *plhrw*, 293.

637 Arnobius (c. 297 A.D.) describes ‘time’ as ‘a certain space measured off in the unending succession of eternity’. See Arnobius, *Against the Heathen* ii. 29. Commenting on the occurrences of the ‘fulfilment formula’ in Matthew 1:22, Schlatter affirms that the image is that of a word that remains “empty” until “filled” by the occurrence of the predicted event. See Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 21. Cf. Isa. 55:11. See also Moule ‘Fulfilment Words’, 315. For a literal application of this definition to Mark 1:15, see Kilgallen, *Mark*, 32.

638 On the idea of time as ‘space’, see Philo, *Opif* 26: *epi gar diasthmati tou košmu kinsew ejt im o oronoj*. See also Philo, *Aet.*, 4-5; 52-62.

639 See Pannenberg, ‘Biblical Understanding’, 10. Cf. Mell, ‘Die Entstehung’, 212. Most treatments of this verse attempt to give a definition of *kairoj* in relation to whether it denotes a “punctiliar” or “durative” concept [see for instance, Kuthirakkattel, *Beginning*, 93-94]. However, in line with the presupposition that lexis must be determined partly from gloss and partly from context we shall let the Aktionsart of the verb *peplhrwtaioi* (which as we shall see below is ‘durative’) decide the nature of *kairoj* in this case. See Lee, *History*, 155-166, 186; Porter, *Studies*, 65-67.

640 See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 223-24. Even though the category ‘well-known’ could be a possible choice in this case, since *o kairoj* appears to be ‘a well-known object that has not been mentioned in
constituted of day and night occurring in the cyclic-linear pattern in keeping with God’s covenant with time.

Thirdly, the term \textit{pep}l hrw\textit{ai} signifies the definitive shape of God’s involvement in \(\text{o` kai r}o\), and thus assumes the role of the \textit{regulating} principle of time.\footnote{Cf. See Jackelén, \textit{Time}, 74 following Delling, \textit{Zeit und Endzeit}, 54. See also Mueller, ‘Approaches’, 300-312; Bebbington, \textit{Patterns}, 43, 68, 116. Marcus Aurelius speaks of an “all-directing logos” guiding the inevitable natural cycle. See Aurelius, \textit{Meditations}, 4.46.} Jesus therefore views the cyclic-linear flow of time as directed by ‘fulfilment’ in terms of the actualization of God’s involvement in creation. The idea of time as directed by an overarching guiding principle is not new.\footnote{Holwerda summarizes John Calvin’s view of eschatology as ‘not concerned just with the final momentary events of history, but with the dynamic force moving at the core of human history here and now, giving history its meaning and its destiny’. See Holwerda, ‘Eschatology and History’, 134. A similar position though independently derived is proposed by the present study.} Kant has proposed that ‘nature’ directs the flow of time as its regulating principle. A more narrowed form of this proposal appears in Hegel who posits the ‘human intellect’ as the guiding principle of time and history. Marx, on the other hand, insists that the ‘human labouring power’ is the force that shapes and directs history.\footnote{See Montgomery, \textit{History}, 18.} Jesus’ distinctive contribution in this respect, as represented in Mark 1:15, is to assert ‘fulfilment’ as the definitive shape of God’s unfolding involvement in time.

5.2.2. The Meaning of the Perfect Tense-Form in \textit{pep}l hrw\textit{ai} and \textit{hggiken}

Having observed that Jesus’ announcement, \textit{pep}l hrw\textit{ai} \(\text{o` kai r}o\), denotes the decisive way in which God is involved in the cyclic-linear flow of time, we wish
now to focus more pointedly on the meaning of perfect verbs *pepl hρwta* and *hggikên* in order to discern the ‘sort of activities’ depicted in them. Does Jesus employ them to explain events completed in the past, unfolding in the present or expected in the near future? We have seen that in the history of the interpretation of Mark 1:15, the meanings of the perfect verbs *pepl hρwta* and *hggikên* play a significant role. Here, we shall draw on the current scholarly development in the study of Greek verbal aspect in order to provide a more satisfying response.

The meaning of the perfect tense remains a vexed issue among grammarians.⁶⁴⁴ Traditionally, the perfect is defined as ‘the *continuance* of a *completed action*’.⁶⁴⁵ This definition of the perfect tense-form has been prevalent for more than a century and a half.⁶⁴⁶ Although grammarians have tended to emphasize one or other of these features, the basic understanding of the perfect tense as a combination of a completed action and its resulting state has generally been preserved.⁶⁴⁷ However, it has long been recognized that this traditional understanding of the perfect tense lacks the all-embracing explanatory power that could accommodate all occurrences in the Greek literature.⁶⁴⁸ Most Greek grammarians would therefore acknowledge occurrences of exceptions to the rule in Greek texts that cannot be adequately explained by the notion of a past action with a present continuous effect. Yet, this anomaly is readily

---

⁶⁴⁴ “Exactly what role the perfect plays in the verb systems of the various Indo-European languages has long been a matter of dispute”. See Lloyd, *Anatomy*, 117. Even with new approaches to the Greek language, the Greek perfect “remains one of the verbal system’s most difficult problems”. See Evans, ‘Future Directions’, 206.


⁶⁴⁷ Some have stressed the completed action part of the traditional definition. Others tend to place the emphasis on the state resulting from such action. See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 252.

⁶⁴⁸ See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 256.
subsumed under references to different functions of the perfect tense in the text. Alternative paradigms for understanding the perfect tense-form have therefore been suggested.

5.2.3. Current Developments in Verbal Aspect Regarding the Meaning of the Perfect

However, not until the past two decades or so has a paradigm shift been accomplished through independent groundbreaking studies by Stanley E. Porter and Buist M. Fanning. It is beyond the scope of this study to give an extensive account of the history of this development. Nevertheless, a representative sketch of its background will be sufficient for our purposes.

5.2.3.1. Kenneth L. McKay

The groundwork for this paradigmatic shift is believed to have been laid out in a series of studies by McKay. McKay claims that the Greek verbal system has virtually no temporal reference. He defines the perfect as the ‘state or condition of the subject of the verb, as a result of a prior action but most often with comparatively

---

649 This in fact remains the practice of standard Greek textbooks on all levels. See, for instance, the pertinent sections in Wallace, *Greek Grammar.*
650 Extensive literature can be found in the bibliography of works such as the respective volumes by Porter and Fanning mentioned above and even more recently, T. V. Evans. See below.
652 See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect.*
653 For a concise history of this development, see Carson, ‘An Introduction’, 18-25. There are two observable trends in this current development. On the one hand are studies such as Evans who offers a thorough assessment of the theory already proposed from the raw data of the Greek language and on that basis has set forth suggestions toward the modifications of existing views. See Evans, *Verbal Syntax.* On the other hand, are those who simply seek to substantiate a proposed theory such as that by Porter through its application to the New Testament. See for instance, Decker, *Temporal Deixis* who set out to test Porter’s theory through application to Mark’s Gospel. See also Wallace, *Greek Grammar* who dedicated his work to Fanning as his “best teacher”.
655 See McKay, ‘Use’, 45. He claims that the imposition of temporal value on the Greek verbal system has been the result of an illegitimate transference of the basic temporal assumptions in Latin and English verbal systems to Greek. This is a problem that can probably be observed in Comrie’s treatment of the perfect. See also Comrie, *Aspect,* 52-65.
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little reference to that of the action itself'.\textsuperscript{656} This definition is supplemented with two further modifications. Whilst McKay wishes to maintain stativity as an aspectual value of the verbal subject,\textsuperscript{657} he claims that the stativity expressed by action verbs is noticeably different from the process expressed by their imperfective forms.

This is observed in two important ways: (1) The new condition of the grammatical subject resulting from the operation of the perfect verb renders it either responsibly blameworthy or praiseworthy but there is no implication of continuing action;\textsuperscript{658} (2) In many respects the perfect of a stative verb has the same implicature as that of an imperfective verb, implying the continuation of stativity either as an intensification of the verbal idea or as an inbuilt reference to the commencement of the state or both.\textsuperscript{659}

5.2.3.2. \textit{Stanley E. Porter}

Porter, for his part, follows McKay in affirming the stativity aspectual value of the perfect tense-form. But whereas McKay makes concession to the non-temporal assignment of Greek verbs, Porter insists upon it. It is not that Porter wishes to do away completely with ‘time’ as a grammatical category. Rather, Porter maintains that Greek speakers have other means at their disposal by which to grammaticalize

\textsuperscript{656} See McKay, ‘On the Perfect’, 296. This shows a latter development from a previous instance in 1972 in which he defines Greek perfect aspect simply as an expression of “a state or condition consequent upon an action”. See his ‘Syntax’, 47. McKay seems to have adopted the position expressed here as far back as 1974. See McKay, \textit{Greek Grammar}, 138. The 1972 (and even his latter) definition seems to bear a striking resemblance to the Blass-Debrunner definition of the perfect upheld by many New Testament Greek grammarians as a combination of the aorist and the present denoting ‘the continuance of completed action’. See Blass and Debrunner, \textit{Greek Grammar}, 175. Cf. Porter, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 252; Wallace, \textit{Greek Grammar}, 573.


\textsuperscript{659} See McKay, ‘On the Perfect’, 296-97.
temporal concerns. These are referred to as deictic markers and temporal references. Porter’s strong emphasis on the non-temporal value of the Greek verbal system is the most radical as well as the most objectionable element of his theory. In general, Porter maintains that the perfect tense-form grammaticalizes the speaker’s conception of the verbal process as a state or condition of the ‘whole situation’. Whether a ‘prior action’ is alluded to or exists at all as a semantic component of the perfect tense-form is no longer an essential part of the encoded semantic import of the perfect verb, but rather a matter to be discerned from lexis interaction in context.

5.2.3.3. Buist M. Fanning

Whilst McKay and especially Porter have collectively engineered a radical departure from the traditional view of the perfect tense, Fanning tries to harmonize the new paradigm with the old. He defines the Greek perfect as ‘a complex verbal category’ which combines three elements. Firstly, there is the Aktionsart feature of the stative situation which is modified as ‘a state or condition resulting from the occurrence denoted by the verb’. Fanning insists that as Aktionsart, stativity is not therefore an aspect separate from the traditionally held ‘perfective’ and

---

661 See McKay, ‘Time and Aspect’, 209-228. McKay’s assessment of Porter is unprejudiced: ‘While I feel sure that [Porter] is wrong in some points and I prefer to disagree with him on others, I accept much of what he has expounded with such thoroughness and look forward to having it by me as I continue my preparation, long delayed, but still progressing, of my aspectually based syntax of the verb in NT Greek’ (p. 228). Picirilli claims that the issue of time is one of the key unresolved issues in which Porter and Fanning are divided. Whilst McKay and Porter insist upon the non-temporal significance of the tense of verbal forms, Fanning is equally certain that there is at least a secondary meaning of time in the indicative mood and to a certain extent in the participles. See Picirilli, ‘Meaning’, 543. Decker has convincingly demonstrated from Mark’s Gospel the theoretical and practical plausibility of Porter’s insistence on the non-temporal value of the Greek verb. See Decker, *Temporal Deixis*, 62. Cf. Picirilli’s assessment of Decker in Picirilli, ‘Meaning’, 543.
664 See Fanning, *Verbal Aspect*, 119-120.
‘imperfective’. Secondly, he retains the role of the ‘prior action’ in the semantic encoding of the perfect verb. Thirdly, there is the verbal aspect summary viewpoint concerning the occurrence implicated in the reference made by the perfect to a prior occurrence. Fanning claims that contextual factors may result in varying degrees of emphasis in understanding the perfect tense but some allusion to all three elements is normally preserved. While Fanning is correct in attributing to stativity of the perfect verb the status of Aktionsart rather than aspect, his three-fold definition is essentially vague on the application level.\(^{665}\)

5.2.3.4. Trevor V. Evans

In a study of the verbal syntax in the Greek Pentateuch, Evans insists against the separation of the perfect tense as a distinctive aspectual category of its own. Evans wishes to maintain the stativity value of the perfect tense-form as a semantic property but suggests that its ‘grammatically realized meaning seems clearly akin to the meaning of the imperfective aspect’.\(^{666}\) Evans’ view that the perfect belongs to the imperfective aspect constitutes a radical departure from McKay and Porter.\(^{667}\) Since the aspectual significance of the perfect tense is more akin to the imperfective aspect, its occurrence signifies that the encoded event is in process.\(^{668}\) Evans summarizes his view of the perfect tense-form as follows:

I accept with Porter that the perfect essentially expresses stativity, but agree with Fanning that this is to be understood as an Aktionsart value, not an independent aspect. I believe Fanning is


\(^{666}\) See Evans, \textit{Verbal Syntax}, 30. In support he cites Szemerényi: ‘If the Greek perfect expressed as state resulting from a past action (e.g. he has completed the process of dying = he is dead), then it is quite clearly, normally, a representative of the imperfective aspect, and not a different kind of thing’. See Szemerényi, ‘Origin of Aspect’, 10.


correct in identifying in the perfect stem-form the force of one of the two basic aspects, but consider the aspect manifested to be the imperfective, not perfective. Thus, the perfect is for me essentially a stative imperfective form, marked for non-past time in the indicative mood. 669

5.2.3.5. Constantine R. Campbell

Since Campbell’s view of the perfect tense-form plays a significant role in our analysis of Jesus’ time conception based on Mark 1:15, we shall try to understand his contribution to verbal aspect in more detail. Campbell’s proposal concerning the perfect tense builds upon Evans’ findings but with some important modifications. 670 He begins with an extensive survey of the traditional positions including those just mentioned. 671 He finds that McKay’s treatment of the perfect as always denoting the stativity of the subject and never the object fails to ‘provide an adequate outcome in all cases’. 672 Porter’s theory moreover is immensely vague in its attribution of stativity to the ‘whole situation’. 673 These deficiencies call for an alternative proposal. This supplies a context for appreciating Campbell’s contribution to the current discussion on Greek verbal aspects. His view of the perfect tense-form can be summarized as follows:

Firstly, Campbell insists against the McKay-Porter paradigm that stativity cannot be a separate verbal aspect but is best regarded, following Evans and Fanning, as an

669 See Evans, ‘Future Directions’, 206. His emphasis.
670 See Campbell, ‘Verbal Aspect’. This has been published as Verbal Aspect, the Indicative. I am drawing on both the unpublished thesis and the revised published version in this analysis since some of the relevant information for our analysis seems to be missing in the book.
671 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 162-75. On dealing with grammatical and linguistic aspects of the biblical languages, there is a tendency amongst grammarians to be substantially lengthy in their treatments of the subject so that pragmatists and those whose interest in these matters is confined merely to pedagogical and practical concerns are severely hindered in achieving their objectives. At the risk of being unfair to otherwise helpful accounts of New Testament Greek on the elementary level a comparison of textbooks on the ‘concise’ end of the spectrum, such as Wenham, Elements and, on the other extreme, Mounce, Basics will serve to prove the point.
672 Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 169.
673 Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 170.
Aktionsart. He argues that, ‘the perfect indicative does not semantically encode stative aspect’. Secondly, Campbell demonstrates from various Greek documents (both biblical and extra-biblical) that the perfect tense-form occurs primarily within discourse. As such, the perfect immediately aligns itself with the present indicative.

Thirdly, the striking overlap of the perfect and the present tense in discourse contexts strongly suggests that they share the same verbal aspect. Campbell observes the usage of the perfect within discourse in Greek indicates that the most likely semantic aspectual value of the perfect is that of imperfectivity.

Fourthly, the present and the perfect can be distinguished from their patterns of usage in two ways: (1) Within discourse, the perfect occurs on ‘an even more exclusive level’ than the present indicative; (2) Since statistically speaking within a direct discourse, the present occurrence far outweighs that of the perfect, the present can thus be distinguished from the perfect as the ‘dominant discourse tense-form’.

Fifthly, the stativity encoded in the perfect tense-form of stative verbs is best accounted for not merely as an aspectual quality (so Mckay, Louw and Porter) but

---

674 See Campbell, ‘Verbal Aspect’, 265; idem, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 174.
675 Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 174-75; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 246. His emphasis. This is the fundamental point in which Campbell differs from Evans. Cf. Evans, Verbal Syntax, 31; idem, ‘Future Directions’, 206.
676 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 175-78; idem, ‘Verbal Aspect’, 247-59. See also Evans, Verbal Syntax, 158-163; Porter, Verbal Aspect, 246; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 296-97.
677 Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 184; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 260.
678 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 186; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 264. See also Evans, Verbal Syntax, 30, 147; idem, ‘Future Directions’, 206.
679 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 187; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 264. His emphasis.
680 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 187; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 264.
rather as Aktionsart (so Fanning). From an aspectual viewpoint, most stative verbs are best expressed by the imperfective since they denote occurrences taking place ‘internally as they unfold’ without explicit references either to their beginning or ending. The beginning or ending of the encoded verbal idea are to be derived rather from ‘deictic indicators in context’. 681

**Sixthly**, the distinction between the perfect tense-form as possessing an imperfective aspectual value and other tense-forms in the same category (namely, the present and the imperfect indicative) is accounted for by *spatial* categories. The present tense is consequently viewed as having the spatial value of ‘proximity’ while the imperfect tense possesses that of ‘remoteness’. 682 Relatively, the perfect indicative is understood as semantically encoding ‘heightened proximity’. That is, it engenders a ‘*closer* than regular’ spatial relationship between the event or action and the speaker itself. 683 The scope of the speaker’s viewpoint is therefore ‘more defined’ since he or she becomes ‘more intimately aware’ of the portion of the event or action in his or her immediate proximity. 684 This proximate relationship of the speaker to the event depicted by the verb implies that the occurrence becomes ‘more dramatic’ from the viewpoint of the speaker. This implies that the speaker is so bound to the event itself that he or she is drawn in to partake in it and actually experiences it in a more than regular manner.

**Finally**, the semantic value of heightened proximity delineates two possible pragmatic implicatures for the perfect tense-form: (1) The *intensive* use of the

---

681 See Campbell, ‘Verbal Aspect’, 266.
682 See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative*, 196.
683 See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative*, 197; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 278.
perfect; and (2) the prominent use of the perfect. The heightened proximate viewpoint of the speaker expressed in the perfect means that the action or event appears ‘more intense in character’. Given its imperfective aspectual quality the event denoted by the perfect may be understood to have a progressive intensification dynamic. This implicature also accounts for the occurrences of lexically stative and dynamic verbs. In other occurrences, the appropriate pragmatic implicature of the perfect indicative is that of prominence where it indicates the ‘degree to which an element stands out from others in its environment’.

5.2.4. Application of Campbell’s Perfect Tense-Form Paradigm to Mark 1:15

Since Campbell’s view engages earlier proposals and seems to offer a more coherent synthesis of previous inquiries into the meaning of the perfect tense-form, we shall apply his findings to Mark 1:15. Admittedly, when it comes to application, the perfect tense-form remains ‘the most problematic’. Nevertheless, on the basis of Campbell’s proposal just delineated, the following observations about Jesus’ view of time can be made from Mark 1:15.

---

685 See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative*, 201.
686 See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative*, 201. In this insight, he quotes Burton approvingly: “The Perfect is sometimes used in classical Greek as an emphatic or intensive Present”. See Burton, *Syntax*, 38.
687 See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative*, 206; ‘Verbal Aspect’, 290.
689 Our observations at this stage are only tentative since they are restricted merely to the semantic aspectual value of the verbal occurrences in Mark 1:15. A more complete account will have to await the consideration of lexical semantics in context in Chapter 6. On the role of deictic markers in Mark’s Gospel, see Decker, *Temporal Deixis*, 63-90.
Firstly, the verbs pepl hrwtai and hggi ken exhibit stativity as Aktionsart. As such, ‘fulfilment’ and ‘coming near’ may be perceived as ‘kind of actions’ actualized upon their respective grammatical subject, namely, o’kair oj and h’basileia tou geou.

Secondly, since the semantic import of the perfect tense-form is more akin to the imperfective than the stative, the verbal idea denoted by the verbs pepl hrwtai and hggi ken is not the result of a completed past action. Rather, they denote non-past dynamics currently unfolding in the present time, the completion of which remains anticipatory. Hence, for Mark 1:15 to be read as a ‘stative Aktionsart’ in the light of Jesus’ earthly ministry, it denotes that ‘fulfilment’ and ‘coming near’ are not states that have been arrived at which is continuous at present – that is precisely the traditional misunderstanding of the perfect tense-form. Rather, in the context of Jesus’ ministry narrated in Mark, and in view of the rest of the New Testament, ‘The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is near’, as stative Aktionsart denotes events unfolding at the present time the consummation of which is still anticipated.

Thirdly, since the relation of the speaker to the event encoded in the verbs pepl hrwtai and hggi ken is that of heightened proximity, it implies the observability

691 See Campbell, Basics, 106-7; Cf. Evans, Verbal Syntax, 30-31; idem, ‘Future Directions’, 201.
693 Porter asserts that essential to his theory is that the Greek speaker conceived of verbal ideas as a process which was grammaticalized in one of three ways in accordance with the aspectual choice of the speaker. See Porter, ‘In Defence’, 32. See also idem, Verbal Aspect, 88.
694 Here, we are drawing on Campbell’s translation of Mark 1:15. See Campbell, Basics, 107.
695 Campbell in a personal correspondence with the present author (5th May 2006) affirms his position as follows: ‘My point is that imperfective aspect is the natural aspect with which to express stativity (as an Aktionsart value) and therefore the perfect will often be “stative” but imperfective aspect allows it to not be stative too (which it isn’t in some cases)’.
of the ‘inside phases’ (to borrow from Meyer696) of the inscribed event.697 However, a more detailed analysis of the inside phases of the activity encoded in pepl hrwt ai and hggiken must be derived from the interaction of lexis and deictic markers in the literary context of Mark 1:15.698

Fourthly, as a feature of the aspectual value of the Greek language, the events denoted by pepl hrwt ai and hggiken in the perfect tense-form are intimately viewed from the perspective of Jesus, the speaker in Mark 1:15.699 According to Campbell, the grammaticalization of the event in the perfect depicts a ‘closer than regular proximity’ to the event. This implies that, for Jesus, the fulfilment of time and the coming near of the Kingdom of God are dramatic events unfolding in his proximity. In actual fact, Jesus is so proximate to the denoted events that he is actually involved in their unfolding.700

Fifthly, the pragmatic implicatures exhibited by pepl hrwt ai and hggiken according to Campbell’s theory of the perfect tense-form are those of prominence and intensification.701 Prominence implies that the events denoted by the perfect verbs in

696 See Meyer, “The “Inside””, 157-72. Here we are drawing an implication of Campbell’s ‘heightened proximity and imperfective’ model for the perfect tense-form.
697 Cf. Comrie, Aspect, 41-42. Campbell does not favour the term “inner structure” but rather “pragmatic implicature” or “Aktionsart”. I am indebted to a personal correspondence from Campbell (18th of May 2006).
698 Cf. Porter, Verbal Aspect, 259.
699 Cf. Porter, Verbal Aspect, 88; Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 84-85. See also Porter, ‘In Defence’, 31-34.
700 Campbell draws on the analogy of the “parade” to illustrate the distinctions between the ‘present’ and the ‘perfect’ tense-forms. In the ‘present indicative’, the speaker is a spectator watching the parade passing in front of him. For the ‘perfect’, the speaker is a spectator taking a more ‘proximate’ position, a ‘closer than regular’ vantage point from which he views the parade as it unfolds. See Campbell, ‘Verbal Aspect’, 276-89; idem, Basics, 19-20. Cf. Porter, Studies, 45-46 referring to Murphy, Aspectual Usage, 21. Jesus’ intricate involvement in the actualization of the verbal ideas expressed in Mark 1:15 means either that Campbell’s analogy tends to break down in this particular application to Jesus or that we have to understand Jesus speaking as a ‘parader’.
701 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 206.
Mark 1:15 tend to ‘stand out from others’ within the narrative. In that sense, the two perfect verbs in Mark 1:15 should be appreciated as exhibiting occurrences of equally prominent status. Consequently, it is neither helpful nor appropriate to highlight the verb ἀναπληρώται as the central issue in Mark 1:15 at the expense of the term πεπληρωτείν.

Sixthly, since the implicature of the two perfect verbs in Mark 1:15 includes intensity as a pragmatic implicature, it heightens the anticipation that the outworking of Jesus’ earthly ministry as the actualization of the coming near of the kingdom will intensify, in keeping with this central message. Campbell defines the intensive implicature in terms of viewing an unfolding parade where the closer proximity of the reporter implies a more defined and a more intimately awareness of the portion of the parade that he is closer to. In Chapter 7, we will show that a more defined and more intimate viewpoint of the encoded verbal action includes specifying not only the various stages of its progression but also the possible degrees of its intensification. In application to Jesus’ statement in Mark 1:15, this implies that Jesus’ ministry as the actualization of the fulfilment of the promise of time and the coming near of the kingdom will exhibit ways in which the encoded events are progressively intensifying.

---

702 Campbell, Basics, 111; idem, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 206.
703 Cf. Wright, Jesus, 471.
704 See Campbell, Basics, 110; idem, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 201. Cf. Ernst, Markus, 49; Lane, Mark, 65; Schmidt, Mark, 46; Rust, Towards, 176.
706 See Campbell, Verbal Aspect, the Indicative, 201.
5.2.5. Summary

To summarize, the imperfective aspectual value of the verbs *pepl hwr tAI* and *hgi kEn* in the perfect tense-form implies events unfolding in the present time and not the past.\(^707\) In that sense, the terms *pepl hwr tAI* and *hgi kEn* could be better understood as denoting ‘fulfilment’ and ‘coming near’ as non-past dynamics *in progress*.\(^708\) That is to say, from the ‘closer than regular’ perspective of Jesus as the speaker of Mark

---

\(^707\) We have argued that the meaning of *o' kairçj* in Mark 1:15 is the ‘totality of time’. See under sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2.1 and 5.2.2.

\(^708\) The position derived from Jesus here can be more sharply defined if it can be distinguished from two related views on time and history. Perhaps the theologian who has consistently thought through the implication on the meaning of history of the Christ-event is Wolfhart Pannenberg. He understands the promise of God as the history-enabling principle (to which the Deuteronomist contributes the “Law” as its controlling principle) and the faithfulness of God as the power which connects the ‘past’ to the ‘present’. In his schema, Jesus is viewed as the ‘proleptic’ in-breaking of the ‘end’ of history. Therefore, Jesus must not be perceived as the “end” of history (so Bultmann and Fuchs), neither is he the “mid-point” of history (so Schliermacher and Cullmann). Jesus, according to Pannenberg, is the “revelation” of history; more specifically, Jesus is the *meaning* of history as the totality of the revelation of God. See Pannenberg, *Basic Questions*, 15-80; *idem*, *Faith*, 68-77; Pannenberg (ed), *Revelation*, 125-158. While Pannenberg speaks of the “promise” as a general governing principle of history with no apparent specification of its content, Jesus in Mark 1:15 appears to identify the history-controlling principle, at least in his present, as *fulfilment* specified, as we have argued, in relation to God’s covenant with time which is the promise of his kingdom. In that respect, ‘time’ is the promise which is now being ’filled up’ progressively with the establishment of God’s kingdom. If indeed, as Pannenberg asserts, the ‘revelation of God is the defined goal of the present events of history’ [see Pannenberg, *Revelation*, 131] then what is envisaged by Jesus in Mark 1:15 is the activity of God whose guiding principle is the fulfilment of his covenant with time which, as we have seen in the previous chapter, is the establishment of the kingdom. Thus, the proof of Yahweh’s divinity must not await the revelation at the end, in the fulfilment of the promises but is rather endorsed all along the temporal continuum until the end as events of history are shaped ultimately by the fulfilment-principle. See Berkhof, *Christ*, 210-213. The second position which we must consider is that of Jürgen Moltmann. Both Moltmann and Pannenberg draw on Gerhard von Rad’s insight on the significance of the promise as the history-generating principle in Israel emanating from the ‘succession account’ of David. See Rad, *Theology* II, 80-125; 410-419. Cf. Heschel, *Israel*, 128-131. See Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 95-124. While Moltmann affirms that the promise is in fact the history-generating principle, his schema regarding “fulfilment” is ultimately anthropocentric and viciously cyclic. See Moltmann, *Theology as Eschatology*, 1-50; *idem*, *Coming*, 293-295. Claus Westermann is probably more precise in this respect with his specification of the promise as an “event”: ‘That which is promised in the Bible is not essentially and not primarily the content of the promise, but it is event. The promise is event, and the fulfilment is event’. See Westermann, ‘Remarks’, 133. In accordance with Jesus’ proclamation of the “gospel of God” in Mark 1:15, it appears that the fulfilment-principle is the history-shaping factor in the events unfolding in his ‘present’. If we were to agree with Karl Barth that God has “time for us” (in the ‘present’) then this ‘time’ is indeed the ‘present’ during which the fulfilment of God’s covenant with time is progressively manifested in the coming near of his Kingdom of God. This is explicitly his “time for us”. See Barth, *Dogmatics* II/1, 608, 611-12; III/1, 67-68, III/2, 526.
1:15, ‘fulfilment’ is the governing principle of the events unfolding in time (ο' καιρο).\(^{709}\)

In the light of our findings in the previous chapter and this present chapter, we may provisionally paraphrase Mark 1:15 in the following way:

Time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is progressively coming near.

We shall revise this paraphrase of Jesus’ central proclamation at the end of this study.

5.3. The Syntactical Relationship of 1:15b and 1:15c

In the previous sections, we observe that from a grammatical perspective, the phrases πεπληρώτατος ο’ καιρό (1:15b) and ἥγγικεν ἡ βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ (1:15c) signify ongoing processes unfolding in the present time. Moreover, the denoted verbal activities grammaticalized in the perfect tense-form are of equal semantic value. However, on the basis of the consideration of the usage of the perfect tense-form in Mark 1:15, we can hardly determine the manner in which the events denoted by the perfect verbs are related as indicated by the conjunction καί. In this section, therefore, we shall examine the way in which the events denoted by the perfect verbs in 1:15b and 1:15c are tied together in the light of their syntactical relationship. If the verbs πεπληρώτατος and ἥγγικεν indicate events unfolding in the present time, how are

---

\(^{709}\) Consider some of the more influential construals of the ‘present’ time according to Mark 1:15. See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 88; Dechow, Gottessohn, 68; Klein, ‘Prüfung der Zeit’, 378; Kelbers, Kingdom, 40; Robinson, Problem, 61. Contra Harvey, Jesus, 90.
they related? Are they independent simultaneous events? Are they dependent but consecutive events? Are they dependent simultaneous events? Or are they independent consecutive events? The syntactical relation of these two phrases has been hitherto described in various ways in biblical scholarship as consecutive, conditional, resultative, synthetic parallel or even non-relational.

5.3.1 Consecutively Arranged Events

Some think that the two phrases are mutually exclusive. Ambrozic, for instance, thinks that ‘[g]rammatically and stylistically the two statements are alike… the first [i.e. \textit{pepl h\textit{r}w\textit{t}ai o` kai r\textit{oj}}] looks backward, while the second [i.e. \textit{h\textit{ggi ken h\` basi le a tou\` qeou\j}] looks to the present and the future’.\footnote{See Ambrozic, \textit{Hidden Kingdom}, 21-22.} This line of thinking is also evident in Barth’s assertion that ‘the phrase \textit{pepl h\textit{r}w\textit{t}ai o` kai r\textit{oj}} is undoubtedly meant to describe an absolutely unique event marking an end and a new beginning in time’.\footnote{See Barth, \textit{Dogmatics}, III/2, 460. See also Meyer, \textit{Aims}, 129.} This new historical epoch does not begin \textit{as a result of} the first. Rather, the two events are consecutively arranged one after the other.\footnote{Cf. Anderson, \textit{Beginning}, 95.} The basic inconsistency in this proposal (as in most views we shall consider below) lies in understanding the perfect verbs in Mark 1:15 (\textit{pepl h\textit{r}w\textit{t}ai} and \textit{h\textit{ggi ken}}) in accordance with the traditional definition. We have seen that the traditional understanding of the perfect is fraught with problems and that newer paradigms derived from the study of Greek verbal aspects better explain these deficiencies.
5.3.2. Conditional Syntactical Relationship

A second position is represented by Macintosh who argues that the phrase, \( \text{pepl h\'rwtai o' kairoj} \), merely indicates the condition for the more central event, namely, \( \text{h\'ggi ke n h' basileia tou/geou} \).\(^{713}\) In other words, the phrase, \( \text{pepl h\'rwtai o' kairoj} \), is simply a time indicator highlighting that the more central event, namely, \( \text{h\'ggi ke n h' basileia tou/geou} \), is taking place. This supposition is represented by the paraphrase, ‘the time has come’\(^{714}\). Once again, this interpretation subscribes to the traditional understanding of the perfect tense-form referring to a past event with present continual effect but one in which the emphasis clearly falls on the past event rather than on its continual effect. However, Campbell and Evans, as we have seen, have convincingly demonstrated that the perfect tense-form properly belongs to the imperfective verbal aspect. In that sense, both perfect verbs of Jesus’ announcement denote a ‘non-past’ activity.\(^{715}\)

5.3.3. Resultative Syntactical Relationship

Gundry, following Söding, affirms a resultative relation of 1:15b and 1:15c.\(^{716}\) Accordingly, the phrase \( \text{h\'ggi ke n h' basileia tou/geou} \) is the inevitable result of the statement, \( \text{pepl h\'rwtai o' kairoj} \). This suggestion is remarkably similar to the view advocated by Ambrozic,\(^{717}\) namely, that the verb \( \text{pepl h\'rwtai} \) in the perfect denotes a completed action in the past, the result of which is continually experienced in the present as the kingdom’s coming near. Again, this construal of the syntactical

---

\(^{713}\) See Macintosh, ‘Fulfilment’, I: 626.

\(^{714}\) See New Century Version of the Bible (‘the right time has come’); Moffatt’s Translation; Goodspeed’s Translation; Jerusalem Bible; New English Bible (‘time has come’); New World Translation (‘the appointed time has come’); New Living Translation (‘at last the time has come’); Good News Bible (‘the right time has come’); Eugene Peterson’s Translation. The Message (‘Time’s up’).

\(^{715}\) See the discussions above.

\(^{716}\) See Gundry, Mark, 66; Söding, Glaube, 142-149. Cf. Marshall, Faith, 34-56.

\(^{717}\) See also Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 81; idem, ‘Die Bedeutung’, 257.
relation between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c relies upon the traditional paradigm of the perfect tense-form but in a manner contradictory to the view advanced by Macintosh. That is, the emphasis here leans rather heavily on the present continuous effect of the past action depicted by the verb πεπληρώτα. In connection with the position advocated by Macintosh, this serves to demonstrate the problem of the inconsistency of interpretation of Mark 1:15 in the light of the traditional definition of the perfect tense.

5.3.4. Synthetic Parallel Correlation

A number of scholars characterize the syntactical relation between these two phrases as a synthetic parallel correlation. Marcus, for instance, asserts that the relationship here is not the ‘parallelism of identity’ where both phrases point to one and the same activity. Rather, on the basis of synthetic parallelism, the secondary phrase (ὡς ἐν ἡ δολοφονία τοῦ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ) serves merely to sharpen the primary phrase, πεπληρώτα οὗ καίρον. Geller has, however, observed that synthetic parallelism as a semantic analytical category is an ‘essentially useless category’ because of the discernibly contradictory ways in which it is often applied.

Now if the term parallelism, even though it be qualified by prefixing the adjective synthetic, be applied to lines which, though synthetically related to one another, are connected by no parallelism of terms or sense, as well as to lines which are connected by parallelism of terms or

718 See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 81; idem, ‘Die Bedeutung’, 257; Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom, 73; Marshall, Faith, 35. The argument is based on the deduction that if the time before the kingdom has been completed as indicated by the perfect tense of πεπληρώτα then the time for the kingdom has begun.

719 See Marcus, ‘Time’, 62 n. 25. See also Kugel, Biblical Poetry, 51.

sense, then this term (synthetic) parallelism, will really conceal an all-important difference under a mere semblance of similarity.\textsuperscript{721}

Based on the findings of Gray, Geller argues that synthetic parallelism refers primarily to the rhetorical category of ‘list’.

To be sure, an underlying parallelism is discernible in the syntactical relation between the two phrases in Mark 1:15b and 1:15c. But in the light of Geller’s analysis, it would be better rather to explicate what was traditionally described as synthetic parallels with a linguistic paradigm that more accurately represents such relation. We shall try to implement this below.

5.3.5. \textit{No Syntactical Relation as such Between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c.}

Some scholars see no important syntactical relation between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c. Conzelmann, for instance, suggests that the two phrases in Mark 1:15b and 1:15c are loosely connected side by side.\textsuperscript{722} In other words, the meaning of Mark 1:15 would be unaffected even if the phrase \textit{pe\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\varsigma\xi\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\omicr...
5.4. An Alternative Proposal to the Syntactical Relation of Mark 1:15b and 1:15c

We have seen that Geller raises serious doubt about the usefulness of synthetic parallelism as a descriptive category. His findings seem to necessitate looking for new ways of accounting for what has been hitherto observed as possible parallel inter-relation between linguistic units. Nida and his South African colleagues have proposed ‘repetition’ as an alternative descriptive strategy.\(^\text{726}\) This seems to be a more suitable category for the classification of traditional parallelism. In any case, it seems that parallelisms are in fact repetitions – usually with apparent grammatical or structural variations – but a repetition nonetheless.\(^\text{727}\) As defined by Greenstein, parallelism is ‘the repetition of syntactical pattern’.\(^\text{728}\)

In Mark 1:15, the syntactical parallel relation between 1:15b and 1:15c may be represented as the repetition of two linguistic units of strikingly similar grammatical structure. Both 1:15b and 1:15c begin with perfect verbs (\(\text{pepl hruwtai} \) and \(\text{hggiken} \)) each followed by an articular grammatical subject (\(\text{o`kairoj} \) and \(\text{h`basiela tou/qqou} \)) joined by the conjunction \(\text{kai} \), Geller classified the analytical category of ‘parallelism’ under the rubric ‘grammatical paradigms’.\(^\text{729}\) By way of putting to the test Geller’s grammatical paradigms, we shall expound the syntactical relationship between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c through the categories he proposed.

5.4.1. Mark 1:15b and 1:15c as a Concrete-Abstract Grammatical Paradigm

Geller proposes the ‘concrete/abstract-abstract/concrete’ grammatical paradigm as one descriptive category amongst many that may account for observable parallel

\(^{726}\) See Nida \textit{et al} (eds), \textit{Style}, 23-33.

\(^{727}\) See Nida \textit{et al} (eds.), \textit{Style}, 24.

\(^{728}\) See Greenstein, ‘Parallelism’, 44.

\(^{729}\) See Geller, \textit{Parallelism}, 31-42.
relationships in linguistic units. According to this paradigm, the primary phrase is either the ‘abstract’ for which the secondary functions as its ‘concrete’ form or vice versa. Applied to Mark 1:15, 1:15b fits the criterion of being the abstract phrase for which 1:15c provides the concrete form. While both phrases can quite possibly be abstractive in nature, the statement \( \text{pepl hrwtai o’kairoj} \) seems more deeply entrenched in the abstract realm than \( \text{hgiiken h’basil eia tou qeou} \) since time itself is generally recognized as an abstract phenomenon.

The phrase \( \text{hgiiken h’basil eia tou qeou} \) therefore concretizes the abstract notion denoted in the phrase \( \text{pepl hrwtai o’kairoj} \). It is possible of course to regard the Kingdom of God’s coming near as an abstract notion. However, since Mark’s presentation of Jesus begins with the assertion that Jesus is the ‘Son of God’ (1:1) – a title traditionally associated in Israel with the Davidic King (2 Sam 7:14; Psalm 2:7), it seems more appropriate to think of the phrase \( \text{hgiiken h’basil eia tou qeou} \) as the concrete component. In relation to our findings in the previous chapter, the coming near of the kingdom as concretely unfolding in the ministry of Jesus is the dynamic of the fulfilment of the promise of time, the beginning of the restoration of Israel under the Davidic kingship. In that sense, Gellers’ grammatical paradigms seem better able to model the syntactical relationship between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c.

### 5.4.2. Mark 1:15b and 1:15c as Featuring an Organic Linguistic Tie

A second way of describing the syntactical relationship between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c which helpfully amplifies their abstract-concrete connection is through

---

731 See the classifications of Dahood, *Psalms III*, 411.
732 On ‘time’ as an abstract semantic class, see Nida *et al* (eds), *Style*, 75.
discourse analysis paradigms. Reed draws on ‘linguistic cohesiveness’ as an appropriate category for analyzing New Testament discourses. Linguistic cohesiveness deals with how individual lexical items fit together producing a theme in writing. This observation is particularly important for the consideration of the syntactical connection between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c. According to Reed, there are two types of cohesive ties under the category of linguistic cohesiveness; organic and componential ties. Organic ties are concerned primarily with conjunctive systems. Componential ties on the other hand are deployed to describe meaningful relationships between individual linguistic components.

Since πεπληρώσεις τοῦ καιροῦ (1:15b) and ἡ μοίρα τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (1:15c) are connected with the conjunction καὶ, it seems fitting to evaluate their relation under organic ties. Reed isolates two functional systems under organic ties, namely, the taxis system and the expansion-projection system. The syntactical relation between 1:15b and 1:15c seems to correspond to an expansion by elaboration organic tie where ‘the secondary clause (or phrase) expands upon the primary by “elaborating” on it (or some portion of it), that is restating, specifying, commenting or exemplifying’.

---

733 See Reed, ‘Cohesiveness’, 28-46. Reed acknowledges his indebtedness to two important works on the cohesive quality of linguistic discourse: Halliday, Introduction; and Halliday and Hasan, Cohesion.
734 See Reed, ‘Identifying Themes’, 75-101. See also Nida et al (eds), Style, 46.
735 See Reed, ‘Cohesiveness’, 33.
736 See Reed, ‘Cohesiveness’, 34. According to Reed’s categorization, the conjunction καὶ, belongs to the subcategories ‘extension’ and ‘enhancement’. The choice of ‘elaboration’ over these subcategories here is driven by the understanding of the relationship between the primary and the secondary phrase in Mark 1:15 that has been argued in Chapter 4, namely, that the ‘fulfilment of time’ as the promise of Israel’s restoration is actualized in the coming near of the Kingdom of God. This will be developed more fully in the rest of this study, especially in Chapter 7.
This implies that 1:15c (\(h\gamma i\; k\epsilon n\; h^\prime\; b\alpha s\epsilon i\; a\; t\acute{a}\; t\gamma \nu\; \varphi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\)) expands on 1:15b (\(p\epsilon p\; h\rho\nu\tau\alpha i\; o\; k\alpha i\tau\omicron\)) by specifying the manner in which \(p\epsilon p\; h\rho\nu\tau\alpha i\; o\; k\alpha i\tau\omicron\) is actualized. In that light, the phrase \(h\gamma i\; k\epsilon n\; h^\prime\; b\alpha s\epsilon i\; a\; t\acute{a}\; t\gamma \nu\; \varphi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\) specifies what \(p\epsilon p\; h\rho\nu\tau\alpha i\; o\; k\alpha i\tau\omicron\) actually means. Consequently, rather than the two phrases being a loosely connected side by side arrangement, as Conzelmann observes,\(^{737}\) it is more appropriate to understand them in a semantically subordinated relation. The second phrase is subordinated to the first; that is, \(h\gamma i\; k\epsilon n\; h^\prime\; b\alpha s\epsilon i\; a\; t\acute{a}\; t\gamma \nu\; \varphi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\) functions to identify what is meant by \(p\epsilon p\; h\rho\nu\tau\alpha i\; o\; k\alpha i\tau\omicron\) in concrete terms.\(^{738}\)

Since 1:15b and 1:15c depict equally important events, it could also mean, in keeping with Reed’s linguistic coherence strategy, that 1:15c is to be read as an expansion of 1:15b. That is, \(h\gamma i\; k\epsilon n\; h^\prime\; b\alpha s\epsilon i\; a\; t\acute{a}\; t\gamma \nu\; \varphi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\) specifically explains the dynamic denoted by \(p\epsilon p\; h\rho\nu\tau\alpha i\; o\; k\alpha i\tau\omicron\) by interpreting the primary phrase and thus asserting that the dynamic of time fulfilment is an ongoing process coalescing with the process whereby the Kingdom of God is progressing towards its full realization. Against Weiss’ view that there can be no different ‘stages’ of the Kingdom’s coming,\(^{739}\) it seems more appropriate to speak of the Kingdom coming near in distinctively ever intensifying temporal phases corresponding to the linguistic properties denoted by \(p\epsilon p\; h\rho\nu\tau\alpha i\) and \(h\gamma i\; k\epsilon n\) in the perfect.\(^{740}\)

\(^{737}\) See Conzelmann, Jesus, 68.
\(^{738}\) Cf. Nida et al (eds), Style, 99.
\(^{739}\) See Weiss, Proclamation, 73-74. See also Conzelmann, Jesus, 70.
\(^{740}\) See our discussion in Chapter 7.9.2 below. See also Meyer, “‘Phases’, 25-39. Conzelmann is highly skeptical that a ‘temporal sequence’ can be established from the oldest strata of the Synoptic tradition. See Conzelmann, Jesus, 41. His argument of course reflects the redactional coloring of his view where the Gospel writers are conceived of as theologians deliberately rearranging traditional materials to reflect their own theological interests. However, the summary account of Jesus’ earthly ministry in Acts indicates there was indeed a historical underpinning to the whole enterprise of writing Gospels even if kerygmatic interests permeated the final products. See Dodd, History, 59-60; idem, Apostolic Preaching, 87; Barnett, ‘Story and History’, 38.
5.4.3. *Mark 1:15b and 1:15c as Featuring a Co-referential Componential Tie*

There is a second kind of cohesive tie that may prove helpful for further improving our grasp of the syntactical relation between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c. This is the *co-referential* componential tie. Componential ties are concerned with meaningful relationship between individual linguistic components. One way in which a meaningful relationship is established between linguistic units is co-reference. This refers to cohesive ties between items of the same conceptual or grammatical identity.

According to Reed, co-referential ties may be *exophoric*, in which information is either located in the ‘context of situation and of culture’ (= the external culture which makes possible the proper understanding of the text).\(^{741}\) Alternatively, co-referential componential ties may be *endophoric*, in which case information is located within the language of the discourse itself. That is to say, items in a self-contained linguistic unit could refer to the surrounding text either *anaphorically* (=referring to information in the preceding broader discourse unit) or *cataphorically* (= referring to information or linguistic elements following the discourse).\(^{742}\)

The linguistic components of Mark 1:15b and 1:15c seem to exhibit a co-referential endophoric componential tie. Taking 1:15b and 1:15c as depicting events of equal semantic importance, the verbs *pepl hrwt ai* and *hggiken* presuppose linguistic components in their surrounding literary context. Here, the crucial question concerns the limits of this ‘surrounding literary context’ within which we shall determine linguistic components presupposed by these verbs.

---

\(^{741}\) Reed is indebted to Malinowski for these terms. See Reed, *Discourse Analysis*, 13.

\(^{742}\) See Reed, ‘Cohesiveness’, 37.
On the one hand, we may adopt a more limited literary surrounding thus restricting ourselves to Mark’s Gospel alone. The composite citation of Scripture in Mark 1:2-3, however, indicates that the Gospel as a finished product is constructed upon a literary network consisting of the Jewish Scriptures.\(^{743}\) In the previous chapter we argued that Jesus’ announcement, \(\text{περὶ \ χριστῶν τοῦ \ βασιλείαν τοῦ \ θεοῦ} \) anaphorically refers to the promise of time. God’s commitment to giving day and night in their appointed time promises the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring. In Mark 1:15, the fulfilment of the promise of time is viewed in terms of the coming near of the Kingdom of God. Hence, cataphorically, Jesus’ announcement anticipates the ultimate realization of the promise of the restoration of Israel in terms of the Kingdom of God.\(^{744}\) We shall explore the ultimacy of the vision of Israel’s restoration in terms of the Kingdom of God in the ensuing chapters.

5.5. Summary

In summary, the syntactical relationship between Mark 1:15b and 1:15c can be described as one in which both the phrase \(\text{περὶ \ χριστῶν τοῦ \ βασιλείαν τοῦ \ θεοῦ} \) (being the primary phrase) and \(\text{γεγίνετο \ βασίλεια τού \ θεού} \) (as the secondary phrase) amicably signify the same reality. In grammatical terms, the primary phrase denotes the abstract notion the concrete manifestation of which is depicted by the secondary phrase. From a discourse analysis perspective, this implies that the secondary phrase provides an expansion-by-elaboration of the primary phrase. The occurrence of a co-referential


\(^{744}\) Reed notes that studies in language typology suggest that ‘anaphoric indexicality’ is universally preferred over ‘cataphoric indexicality’ because ‘anaphora refers back to what is already known and cataphora to a (potentially) uncertain future’. In other words, anaphora establishes the more ‘reliable sign relationship’. See Reed, *Cohesiveness*, 37 n. 16. Hence, the final realization of the Kingdom of God is a cataphoric reference of Mark 1:15 since it is indeed part of the New Testament discourse of which Mark forms an integral element.
componential tie in the syntactical relation of Mark 1:15b and 1:15c enhances this picture by intimately connecting Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 to the entirety of the biblical database as its ‘co-text’. In that connection, the term ρεπληρώταται, as we have seen in the previous chapter, anaphorically refers to God’s commitment to his covenant with time. On the other hand, the verb ἁγιάζει cataphorically anticipates the ultimate realization of the promise of time in the arrival of the Kingdom of God.

In the light of the syntactical relation of Mark 1:15b and 1:15c just considered we may revise the aforementioned paraphrase of Mark 1:15 in the following way:

**Time as the promise of the restoration of Israel** is fulfilled and **this in other words is manifested in the Kingdom of God progressively coming near.**

**Excursus 1: On the Absence of the Time-word in the Other Synoptics**

Since this study accords a prominent status to the announcement Ρεπληρώταται ὁ καιρός in Mark 1:15, it is necessary to inquire into the possible reasons for the absence of this phrase in Matthew and Luke.\(^{745}\) It ought to be noted that from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge, terminological absence does not imply the nonexistence of concept.\(^{746}\) In fact, if terminological attestation alone was to be the proper ground for abstraction of biblical themes, a number of crucial thematic connections would have in effect been overlooked. The ‘Kingdom of God’, for

---

\(^{745}\) The underlying presupposition here is similar to that discussed in Chapter 4.3.1 where the uniqueness of Jesus’ time-word does not rule out the observation that there are parallel expressions in the New Testament and even in the Second Temple Period. But the way Jesus’ statement is arranged linguistically is truly unique in the sense that an exact reproduction, as far as this study is concerned, is absent elsewhere in the sources examined in Chapter 4.

\(^{746}\) See Rosner, “‘Written for Us’”, 83. Talmon adopts the same logic in his attempt to establish the presence of eschatological concepts in the Old Testament even though the Greek word ἐσχάτος γεία has no exact Hebrew equivalent. See Talmon, ‘Eschatology and History’, 163.
instance, is not widely attested in the Old Testament. Yet in the Gospels it features as the central theme of Jesus’ proclamation. The truth of the matter is that whereas attestation is lacking throughout the Old Testament, the Kingdom of God has been shown to be a central integrating theme of the entire document. Similarly, whereas the time-word in Mark 1:15 is not explicitly attested in other Synoptics, the concept is present but expressed in slightly different forms.

In Matthew’s gospel, the dynamic depicted in πέπληρωται ὁ καιρός seems to underlie Jesus’ identification with Ιμμανουήλ, ‘God-with-us’ (Matt 1:23). In the Old Testament, ‘God with us’ was a reference to the temple as God’s dwelling place. As ‘Immanuel’, Jesus is thereby identified as God’s earthly dwelling place. In the Old Testament, it was a concrete space represented by the Tent of Meeting in the wilderness and the Temple in the Promised Land. In Jesus, therefore, the temple assumes a person-as-space notion.

Since Jesus is identified as the ‘Son of David’ in the opening of Matthew’s Gospel (1:1), time as the promise of the restoration of David’s throne is therefore fulfilled since, recalling Jeremiah 33:20-26, God’s faithfulness to his covenant with day and night is the promise of Israel’s restoration under David’s offspring. In that light, Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 of the fulfilment of God’s covenant with time is manifested as the establishment of God’s dwelling place in the midst of his people in Jesus. The unfolding event denoted by the occurrence of πέπληρωται and ἡγιασμένος in the perfect tense-form is, according to Matthew, Jesus as God-with-us confronting

747 See Bright, Kingdom, 10; Goldsworthy, Gospel and Kingdom, 48-50.
the world (cf. Matt 12:28) and subsequently through his disciples’ missionary presence in the world (Matt 18:20; 28:20; cf. 16:18).

In Luke, on the other hand, the non-past dynamic encoded by the time-word in Mark 1:15 is compacted in the term ‘today’ in Jesus’ proclamation: \(\text{Shn\,on\,pepl\,hr\,wt\,ai\,h\,graph.\,aui\,h\,an\,to\,j\,wai\,n\,um\,n.}\) (Luke 4:21).\(^{748}\) Here, the non-past character of the dynamic denoted in \(\text{pepl\,hr\,wt\,ai\,o\,kai\,roj}\) features more prominently. ‘Today’ is the present time during which ‘the fulfilment of these scriptures’ (i.e. the scriptures identifying Jesus’ mission with Isaiah 61:1) is taking place. ‘Today’ assumed a more escalated form in its occurrence in Jesus’ statement from the cross: \(\text{An\,h\,n\,so\,l\,egw(}\,shn\,on\,met\,\,am\,ou\,esh\,\,en\,tw\,par\,adei\,sw\,\,}\) (Luke 23:43, ‘Truly I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise’). On the cross, the ‘today’ of gospel preaching seems to have given way to the ‘today’ of being \(\text{en\,tw\,par\,adei\,sw}\). In summary, even though the exact wording of the time-word in Mark 1:15 is not clearly attested in other Synoptic Gospels, the concept is present. It has merely assumed various linguistic guises.

**Excursus 2: The Status of the Argument From Greek Verbal Aspect**

The view of time attributed to Jesus and delineated in this chapter heavily relies on the application of Campbell’s paradigm of the perfect tense-form. But what if Campbell’s findings on the nature of the Greek perfect verb may be flawed at a number of important points? What if Campbell’s paradigm regarding the aspectual implicature of the perfect tense-form is found wanting? Should this study then suffer

\(^{748}\) See France, *Mark*, 91.
the same fate?  There are at least two ways in which we may counter this possible challenge.

Firstly, we have attempted to show that Jesus’ view of time is derived primarily by analyzing the biblical plot-line through the conceptual ‘lenses’ afforded by Mark 1:15. The theological construct that results from this attempt is not therefore based solely on the semantic properties of individual lexical items as such. In other words, the theological import of isolated linguistic elements in Mark 1:15 is derived through a complex network of interactions between lexical semantics in the canonical context of the biblical data. Consequently, the ultimate shape of Jesus’ view of time is derived not on the basis of an individual lexical item but rather on the basis of its interaction with the grammatical and textual network within which those individual items make their distinctive semantic contribution.

Hence, even though Campbell’s theory of the perfect verb is crucial for the analysis of Jesus’ conception of time on the basis of individual lexical items such as πεπλήρωσεν and ἠγγίκεν, the essential theological contribution of such lexical items to the reconstruction of Jesus’ view of time only finds its proper place in relation to other linguistic considerations in the biblical data. These considerations include Mark 1:15’s interaction with the broader Markan text as well as the canonical biblical framework.

749 Since the publication of his PhD Thesis, Campbell has produced two more books on verbal aspect in biblical Greek. See Campbell, Basics; idem, Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative.

750 This has been the hallmark of philological attempts at ascertaining the meaning for Mark 1:15. As Kelber puts it, ‘The basic deficiency of this approach lies in their failure to come to grips with the semantic significance of words in their contextual settings’. See Kelber, Kingdom, 9. Cf. Nida, ‘Contextualist Approach’, 289-98; idem, Lexical Semantics, 2.

751 See Reed, ‘Cohesiveness’, 29. The terminology probably comes from Halliday.
Secondly, even if the notion of ‘fulfilment’ as a non-past dynamic cannot finally be established on the basis of Campbell’s perfect tense-form paradigm, the narrative of Jesus and its extension in the Acts of the Apostles as well as in the remainder of the New Testament is unambiguously cast in the promise-fulfilment correlation.\(^{752}\) Paul, for instance, speaks of the gospel as promised beforehand ‘in the holy Scriptures’ about God’s Son (Rom 1:1-4).\(^{753}\) Hence, the promise-fulfilment correlation appears to be of paramount importance to New Testament writers in their evaluation of the coming of Jesus.

Thirdly, perhaps the most distinctive element of our findings thus far, regarding Jesus’ view of time from Mark 1:15, is that the semantic encoded value of the perfect verb does not refer to an event completed in the past, neither is the phrase merely a special time-indicator highlighting the more pivotal event taking place, namely, \(\text{h} \text{ggi ke n} \text{ h} \text{ b} \text{a} \text{s} \text{i} \text{l} \text{e} \text{i} \text{a} \text{ t} \text{o} \text{u} \text{ q} \text{e} \text{o} \text{u} \text{l}\). Rather, the phrase \(\text{pep} \text{l h} \text{rw} \text{tai} \text{ o} \text{kai} \text{roj}\) denotes an ongoing non-past dynamic which, as we have seen, is manifested specifically as the \(\text{h} \text{ggi ke n} \text{ h} \text{ b} \text{a} \text{s} \text{i} \text{l} \text{e} \text{i} \text{a} \text{ t} \text{o} \text{u} \text{ q} \text{e} \text{o} \text{u} \text{l}\) That the kingdom’s ‘coming near’ is an ongoing process\(^{754}\) has in fact been proposed, elaborated and defended by Otto,\(^{755}\) Jeremias,\(^{756}\) Ladd\(^{757}\) and Beasley-Murray\(^{758}\) amongst a host of other scholars.\(^{759}\) But whereas they

---

\(^{752}\) See Kümmel, *Promise*, 155.

\(^{753}\) Even if this portion of Paul’s letter represents a pre-Pauline Christian confession. [see Poythress, ‘Romans 1:3-4’, 180-83; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 5. For a more cautious consideration of this supposition, see Moo, *Romans*, 45 n. 31], it would simply strengthen the point elaborated here, namely, that the understanding of ‘fulfilment’ as a continuous dynamic embodied in Jesus’ earthly career and even in the early church was a concept obtained at a very early stage of the development of early Christianity’s Christological perspective.

\(^{754}\) See especially our discussion of Jeremias’ view in Chapter 2.1.4.


\(^{756}\) See Jeremias, *Theology*, 98; *idem*, *Parables*, 159; *idem*, *Prayers*, 107; Merklein, ‘Reiches Gottes’, 136-42; Strack-Billerbeck I, 181-82.


\(^{758}\) See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom*, 71-107, 338-44.

\(^{759}\) Beasley-Murray traces the development of viewing the kingdom of God as a dynamic activity of God from Adolf Schlatter through G. Gloege and W. Trilling amongst others. See Beasley-Murray,
derived their views primarily from theological deductions on the basis of the biblical data, what we hope to accomplish in this study is at least to offer a confirmation of their insight from a biblical theological approach drawing more pointedly on Jesus’ gospel proclamation in Mark 1:15 stressing the theological importance of the time-word, ψευδήσει τό ὁλοκροί as crucial for understanding Jesus’ message about the nearness of the Kingdom of God.

**Excursus 3. On the Possibility that Jesus Proclaimed the ‘Gospel of God’ in Greek**

Since Greek verbal aspect deals primarily with author’s or speaker’s viewpoint, its application to the study of Jesus’ teaching would eventually lead to the question of whether Jesus ever spoke in the Greek language. The present study, as we have indicated, consists of an extended examination of (Mark’s report of) Jesus’ proclamation in Mark 1:15. The grammaticalization of Jesus’ statement could be taken as Mark’s faithful translation of an original statement in Aramaic made by Jesus. Given that the authenticity of Mark 1:15 is now widely accepted there seems to be no good reasons for supposing that Mark mistranslated Jesus’ utterance. What then of the possibility of Jesus grammaticalizing this announcement in the Greek language as well (i.e. beside Aramaic)? Are there reasons to suppose that Jesus knew Greek and was even compelled to use it on occasions in his kingdom proclamations which, of course, include Mark 1:15?

---


Although Jesus and his disciples almost certainly would have spoken Aramaic as their mother-tongue, and possibly knew Hebrew,⁷⁶¹ there are lines of evidence to suggest that they also spoke Greek.⁷⁶² While not denying the Aramaic hypothesis,⁷⁶³ Porter has set forth a strong case for the possibility of Jesus speaking Greek at least on the conversational level. Porter finds support for his proposal in the widespread use of Greek in first-century Palestine;⁷⁶⁴ on the basis of the role of Greek as the lingua franca of the Roman Empire; the linguistic and cultural character of lower Galilee during the first century; the linguistic fact that the New Testament has been transmitted in Greek from its earliest documents; a diversity of epigraphic evidence; significant literary evidence and several significant contexts in the Gospels that give plausibility to the hypothesis that Jesus spoke Greek.⁷⁶⁵ On this basis, not only has Porter argued for the possibility of Jesus knowing and speaking Greek but he has moreover proposed a new criterion for authenticating Jesus’ words from the Gospels, namely, the ‘Greek-language criterion’.⁷⁶⁶ According to Porter:

---

⁷⁶¹ See Porter, *Criteria*, 131 n. 9 and the literature cited therein. Porter notes that the use of Hebrew in first-century Palestine is a subject of ‘considerable debate’. It ought to be noted moreover that even though Latin, the ‘official language’ of the Roman Empire may have been spoken in first-century Palestine, there is no significant evidence for Jesus and his disciples conversing in Latin. On the use of Latin, see Fitzmeyer, ‘Languages’, 129-33.

⁷⁶² It should be said that even amongst many of those who argued for Aramaic being the mother-tongue of Jesus, the concession is made to the possibility of Jesus speaking in Greek as his second language. See for example Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, 1-37; Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 16 n. 1; Fitzmyer, ‘Languages’, 126-62.

⁷⁶³ See Porter’s reply to Maurice Casey on this point in Porter, ‘Excursus’, 164-80.

⁷⁶⁴ See Porter, ‘Did Jesus’, 139-71; *idem*, ‘Use of Greek’, 123-54. See also Taylor, ‘Did Our Lord’, 91-95. Taylor was responding to the assertion of the Aramaic hypothesis by James Young’s article on the language of Christ in the *Hastings Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* published in 1906.

⁷⁶⁵ See Porter, ‘Did Jesus’, 204; *idem*, ‘Use of Greek’, 128; *idem*, *Criteria*, 140-41.

⁷⁶⁶ The criticism of Porter’s criterion by Bird seems to be predicated on Bird’s view of the literary nature of the Gospels. If we were to hold the view that the Gospels reflect various strata of traditions compiled by a later redactor (as Bird does) then Bird’s objection to Porter’s criterion is sustainable. However, if the trustworthiness of the Gospels as historical evidence is allowed, as has been recently argued in works such as those of Blomberg and Bauckham, then Porter’s criterion seems viable. The point is that many of the differences between Porter and Bird are due to their underlying ideological presuppositions. See Bird, ‘Criterion’, 55-67.
The purpose of this Greek-language criterion is to determine if there are definable characteristic features of various episodes that point to a Greek-language based unity between the participants, the events depicted, and concepts discussed. That is, on the basis of the events depicted and words recorded by the participants, the question is asked whether the probability would be greater that Greek would have been the language of communication used between Jesus and his conversation partners, or not.⁷⁶⁷

Some of the questions that emerge from Porter’s proposal for the purposes of the present analysis are: Are there definable characteristic features of the episode in Mark 1:14-15 that point to a Greek-language based unity between the participants, the events depicted and the concepts discussed? Since Jesus came to Galilee to proclaim the ‘gospel of God’, is there a greater probability that Greek would have been the language of communication used between Jesus and his audience? Are there good reasons to suppose the propriety of addressing the Galilean public in Greek as well as Aramaic?

We observe three factors from the immediate context of Mark 1:14-15 that point in the direction of the probable employment of the Greek language in Jesus’ proclamation here.

(1) In verse 14, we are told that ‘Jesus came to Galilee’. Since Jesus’ audience is specified in geographical terms, we can inquire as to whether ‘definable characteristic features’ point to a ‘Greek-language based unity’ between Jesus and his Galilean audience. The extent of the influence of the Greek culture in Galilee is a

disputed area of research in scholarship.\textsuperscript{768} Even though some have argued that the impact of Greek culture in Galilee was negligible,\textsuperscript{769} it is nonetheless quite illegitimate to think that Galilee was secluded from the penetrating influence of the Greek culture – and that Jesus grew up in cultural isolation.\textsuperscript{770} Archaeological evidence, though provisional in nature, suggests that Galilee was a centre for import and export as well as general trade in the first century.\textsuperscript{771}

According to Mark, Jesus ‘came from Nazareth in Galilee’ (1:9), might have owned a house in Capernaum (2:1; cf. 9:33), and spent a sizable portion of his earthly ministry in Lower Galilee around the cities of Nazareth and Capernaum.\textsuperscript{772} Nazareth, even though a town of only 1600 to 2000 people in the first century, was located overlooking the Via Maris – one of the busiest trade routes in ancient Palestine, a route that connected Damascus to the Mediterranean. Moreover, Capernaum was a city that largely based its economic gains on the fishing industry and was located near Tiberias where the population was probably even more bilingual than the population of Jerusalem (cf. Acts 6:1). These observations do not, of course, suggest that Galilee was overrun at all times with travellers from across the empire. But geographical and social factors would have pressured Galileans to acquire first-hand knowledge of the \textit{lingua franca} of the Roman Empire – the Greek language, at least at the conversational level.

\textsuperscript{769} See Chancey, \textit{Greco-Roman}, 42; Ostmeyer, ‘Armenhaus’, 147-70.
\textsuperscript{770} The highly influential thesis that Jesus’ disciples were extremely ignorant and remained impregnable to elements of Greek culture that had penetrated first century Palestine is attested in Renan, \textit{Life}, 184-93. See also Fitzmeyer, ‘Languages’, 127-29. For evidence of continual usage of Aramaic in Palestine, see Kitchen, ‘Aramaic of Daniel’, 31-79.
\textsuperscript{772} On the extent of Lower Galilee, see Meyers, ‘Cultural Setting’, 694.
A basic acquaintance with the Greek language is at least not inconsistent with what is known of Jesus and his initial Galilean followers.⁷⁷³ Jesus’ involvement in the carpentry trade in Nazareth (6:3) implies that he would have acquired basic knowledge of Greek in order to converse with customers. In fact, Greek words relating to carpentry with no adequate equivalent in Aramaic are known.⁷⁷⁴ Similarly, knowledge of Greek would have been required by Peter and his brother Andrew as well John and his brother James who, according to the immediate context of Mark 1:15, were engaged in the fishing industry when Jesus called them (1:16-20).⁷⁷⁵ Moreover, Levi, the tax-collector would have had a good command of the Greek language in order to discharge duties associated with his government position (2:14).⁷⁷⁶ All this suggests that Jesus’ coming to Galilee places him in a bilingual, possibly multi-lingual setting.

(2) If Jesus’ Galilean audience were bilingual or possibly multi-lingual, which language would have been more suitable for Jesus to use in his public teaching? The propriety of language usage in a multi-lingual background seems to be related to the settings in which Jesus met his audience, as well as the demographic profile of the crowd. In Mark’s Gospel, Jesus’ teaching and healing ministry in Galilee are conducted in two prominent settings – the synagogue (1:21, 39; 3:1; 6:2) and ‘beside the sea’ (1:16; 2:13; 4:1; 5:21; cf. 3:7; 5:1; 6:34).⁷⁷⁷ The immediate context of Mark

⁷⁷³ See Argyle, ‘Greek Among the Jews’, 88.
⁷⁷⁴ See Argyle, ‘Greek Among the Jews’, 88-89.
⁷⁷⁶ See Porter, Criteria, 154.
⁷⁷⁷ The setting ‘beside the sea’ in Mark is specified in 1:16 as ‘beside the sea of Galilee’ but in other instances, it is not specified (2:13; 4:1; cf. 3:8). Other settings include, the ‘house of Simon’ (1:29), Jesus’ house in Capernaum (2:1; 3:20; cf. 9:33), house of Levi in Capernaum (2:15), villages, cities, countryside and the marketplace in the land of Gennesaret (6:53-56), region of Tyre and Sidon (7:24),
1:15 indicates that ‘beside the sea’ is the most likely setting for Jesus’ gospel proclamation especially since in 1:16-20, we are told Jesus ‘passed by along the Sea of Galilee’. There is no record of Jesus teaching ‘beside the sea’ on a previous occasion. But that Simon and his brother Andrew and James and his brother John accepted his call suggests that they might have heard Jesus’ proclamation once or possibly several times previously in the setting ‘beside the sea’ where they would spend most of their time as fishermen. Hence, on the basis of Mark 1:14-20, ‘beside the sea’ is the setting where fishermen and most probably their customers would have gathered regularly.

Notably, it was ‘beside the sea’ that Jesus met Levi, the tax-collector (2:13-14). Mark 3:8 gives us the composition of the crowd that gathered to Jesus ‘beside the sea’. They include people ‘from Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem and Idumea and from beyond the Jordan and around Tyre and Sidon’ where knowledge of Aramaic seems less likely. How could people from these regions possibly hear about Jesus if the news was not passed on to them by travellers from those regions who may have heard Jesus ‘beside the sea’ on previous occasions (cf. 1:28; cf. v. 45)? If then the news of Jesus reached them via people from their regions who had heard Jesus in Galilee but who were less likely to have known Aramaic, then it is not unthinkable that the language Jesus used to address crowds ‘beside the sea’ was a language other than Aramaic.

---

778 Porter argues for the probability of Jesus communicating with Levi in the Greek language due to the brevity of Jesus’ words. See Porter, *Criteria*, 154, 158-59.

That is to say, unless it can be demonstrated that acquaintance with Aramaic was widespread covering regions beyond the Jordan such as ‘Idumea’ and ‘around Tyre and Sidon’, it seems reasonable to assume that Jesus was able to speak directly to the people of these regions in the language spoken by very many, namely, Greek. Interestingly, Mark 4:1-34 indicates that the content of Jesus’ teaching ‘beside the sea’ is consistent with the main theme of Mark 1:15, namely, the Kingdom of God. Thus, if the crowd ‘beside the sea’ in 4:1 presupposes the same audience composition in 3:8, then it is perhaps reasonable to suppose that Jesus’ proclamation of the message of the kingdom ‘beside the sea’, almost certainly from 3:8 onwards, would have been made in the Greek language or even in both Aramaic and Greek in order to ensure the message is heard by a wider audience.

(3) The final observation that indicates the possibility of a Greek version of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 lies in the significance of his message, namely, the ‘gospel of God’. It has of course been widely recognized that this passage represents a programmatic summary of Jesus’ message of the kingdom. In 1:38-39 we are told that Jesus insisted on preaching throughout Galilee, for this was his mission. We may speculate on the basis of the centrality and the summary nature of his announcement in Mark 1:15 that this was a principal theme – perhaps the principal theme – of his preaching throughout Galilee. Thus, Mark 1:15 may well have been

---

780 See Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek*, 27. However, on the occasion described in 3:8 there is no indication that Jesus taught this mixed crowd. We are told that the crowd was attracted to Jesus because of his healing ministry. Nevertheless, the likelihood that he taught this crowd can be observed from his request that a boat be prepared for him ‘because of the crowd’ (3:9). In 4:1, Jesus got into a boat and taught the crowd. In that light, Jesus’ healing ministry ‘beside the sea’ in 3:8 presupposes the he also taught the crowd.

781 Perhaps even the incentive for writing the accounts of Jesus’ earthly ministry in Greek for a wider audience with mixed language capabilities, came from seeing Jesus in action. On the Gospels written for a wider audience, see Bauckham, ‘For Whom’, 9-48.

782 See Chapter 1.

spoken on more than one occasion and, as we have seen above, elaborated in various forms including parables (4:1-34). Mark 1:15 moreover seems to undergird the message Jesus commissioned his disciples to proclaim throughout Galilee (6:12). Thus, even if the initial proclamation of Mark 1:15 ‘beside the sea’ was made in Aramaic, the occasion in 3:8 and possibly 4:1 seems to warrant Jesus using a language other than Aramaic to address a crowd with mixed language capabilities.

(4) Incidental evidence of the degree of familiarity of Jesus and the apostles with the Greek language comes from the fact that two of the earliest followers whom Jesus called from the setting ‘beside the sea’, namely Levi (= Matthew) and John, wrote accounts of Jesus’ life in the Greek language. Despite widespread arguments to the contrary, the authorship of the Gospels of Matthew and John can still be maintained. Regardless of the level of proficiency in Greek exhibited in these Gospels, the fact that they wrote in Greek indicates that amongst Jesus’ followers – especially those of his initial audience drawn from ‘beside the sea’ (most probably as a result of hearing his programmatic announcement in Mark 1:15) – some may have

---

784 Perhaps the fact that the disciples are sent particularly to enter ‘a house’ (6:10) presupposes the predominant use of Aramaic; that is, given that it was unlawful for a Jew to visit anyone of ‘another tribe’ (אָדָם του לֹא הָאֱלֹהִים Acts 10:28).

785 James and Peter also wrote their epistles in Greek but the authorship of their accounts is often disputed. See Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek*, 1-21. James, in particular, wrote his epistle in a polished Greek that has left scholars sceptical that such literary ability would be found in a countryman from Galilee. But what if we are wrong about our presupposition about Galilean countrymen in the first-century? What if the Greek of James’ letter indicates that Galilean countrymen Jesus called to be his disciples were properly schooled in the conventions of Greek language in Galilee if not under Jesus himself? It seems that the problem lies in our prejudices about ‘countrymen from Galilee’ rather than the likelihood that James can write Greek well. Hengel has adduced evidences for the widespread establishment of Hellenistic schools in Palestine and their pivotal role in disseminating Greek cultural values. See Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 65-83. See also Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1: 271-78.

acquired a knowledge of the Greek language that went beyond bare conversational ability.\textsuperscript{787}

But if John and Peter were ‘unschooled men’ (\textit{anagwpoi agrammatoi}, Acts 4:23), how can we account for their ability to write in Greek? The observation that these men ‘were with Jesus’ (\textit{sun tv\(\acute{n}\) h\(\acute{s}\)ou h\(\acute{s}\)an}) appears to suggest more than mere association with a well-known figure. For if the wisdom of Jesus was remarkable to the people of his ‘hometown’ (6:1-2) and even to the religious elite in Jerusalem (12:13, 34; cf. Luke 2:47),\textsuperscript{788} is it not reasonable to entertain the possibility that such wisdom would have included the knowledge and use of the Greek language in gospel proclamations (cf. 3:14)?\textsuperscript{789} In a recent article, Lee has pointed to evidence in Mark’s Gospel of Jesus evincing a greater familiarity with the formal aspects or linguistic features of Greek syntax than formerly supposed.\textsuperscript{790} Moreover, in comparing Jesus’ usage of parables and literary conventions of his time, Vegge claims, ‘The literary form of the parables and the conscious invention of them in teaching, show Jesus as one who fully mastered the literary forms developed in the schools of his time...’.\textsuperscript{791} A possible objection to insights such as those of Lee and Vegge is that the level of Greek literacy attested from Jesus in the Gospels may well be the product of the transmission process of the Jesus tradition. But it would indeed be counterintuitive – if not extraordinary or unprecedented – if students in a school tradition disseminated a teaching where the words and style of the founding teacher were unrecognizable.

\textsuperscript{788} On the education of Jesus on the elementary level, see Riesner, \textit{Jesus als Lehrer}, 228-38; Meyer, ‘Temple’, 258.
\textsuperscript{789} Vegge observes on the basis of the works of first-century rhetoricians such as Theo and Quintilian that to speak well in the first-century public arena involves scrupulous training in how to read and write well. See Vegge, ‘Literacy of Jesus’, 20-21.
\textsuperscript{791} See Vegge, ‘Literacy of Jesus’, 29.
To sum up: as aforementioned, we may take Mark 1:15 (as this study does) as Mark’s faithful translation of an Aramaic equivalent that is thus far, non-existent. On the other hand, given the evidence we have in Mark 1:15, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Jesus may have actually uttered this announcement also in the Greek language. The difficulty of course remains in differentiating between the Greek of Jesus’ sayings and the Greek of the gospel writer. Until a ‘criterion’ is developed to resolve this tension, the Greek hypothesis needs to be cautiously employed in Historical Jesus Research.

6. THE BEGINNING OF THE FULFILMENT OF TIME

6.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, we saw that on the basis of the perfect verbs in Mark 1:15 (pepl hrovTai and hggiken), the fulfilment of time as the promise of Israel’s restoration is viewed by Jesus as the coming near of the Kingdom of God.793 In this chapter, our aim is to isolate from deictic markers in the immediate literary context of Mark 1:15, the point of inception of the fulfilment of the promise of time. That is, we wish to inquire as to when God began to bring about the restoration of Israel which Jesus proclaimed in Mark 1:15.

6.2. Determining the Beginning of the Fulfilment of Time

Jesus’ announcement, Pepl hrovTai o’ kairoj kai hggiken h’ basileia tou qeou/ appears to presuppose a prior action that set in motion the unfolding of God’s fulfilment intervention in time.794 This prior event, as we have seen in the previous chapter, is no longer semantically encoded in the perfect tense-form. Rather, it has to be determined from lexical semantic interrelations in the immediate context of Mark 1:15.

Pesch has pointed out that the beginning of the gospel is to be identified with Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God in 1:14-15.795 On the basis of Pesch’s observation, the beginning of the gospel and the beginning of the fulfilment of time seem to be closely tied to one another. In Mark, Jesus’ identity is often tied

---

793 Cf. Van Unnik, ‘Der Ausdruck’, 301.
794 See McKay, Syntax, 31.
intimately to the gospel (8:35; cf. 8:38; 14:9). In fact, so intimate is this connection that Jesus is identified as both ‘the herald and the content of the gospel he proclaims’. That the gospel Jesus proclaims involves the message of the fulfilment of the promise of time in the coming near of the Kingdom of God suggests a common point of inception for the gospel and the fulfilment of time. We propose that the conjunction between the beginning of the gospel and the beginning of the fulfilment of time is to be found in Jesus’ coming from Nazareth (1:9). The theological significance of Jesus’ coming from Nazareth is underscored by Mussner:


Indeed, John the Baptist proclaims: Er catai oniscu arej mou oqisw mou and Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee (Mark 1:9) as its fulfilment. In that light, Jesus’ advent from Nazareth signifies that new time ‘after’ John is now beginning to take effect. It is both the beginning of the gospel and the beginning of the fulfilment of time as the promise of Israel’s restoration.

6.3. The Beginning of the Fulfilment of Time

The scholarly discussion focuses not so much on the beginning of the fulfilment of time but rather on the significance of the phrase, Varch tou eanggel jou. Here, we

797 See Kuthirakkattel, Beginning, 91.
798 See Kuthirakkattel, Beginning, 89.
799 This point has already been proposed by Kingsbury arguing that the ‘time of fulfilment’ is the ‘end-phase of history’ and is to be called the ‘time of the gospel’ beginning with John the Baptist. See Kingsbury, Mark’s Gospel, 73.
shall briefly survey the scholarly landscape of this discussion with the view that it may help indicate an event, more fitting than our own proposal, to mark the beginning of the fulfilment of time. Two trends of thought can be isolated from current Markan scholarship; their respective adherents may be described as: (1) Those who analyze the phrase ‘the beginning of the gospel’ as a *Gattungsbegriff* in which the focus is on what significant role it plays as a literary structural marker in relation to the rest of Mark, and; (2) Those who analyze ‘the beginning of the gospel’ as a *Geschehenbegriff* by identifying it with an event in the immediate literary and historical context in Mark 1.

6.3.1. *Consideration of the *archē* Begriff as Gattungsbegriff*

A summary of the various proposals relating to *Archē tou euaggelion* as *Gattungsbegriff* are as follows: 801 (1) The position held by the overwhelming majority of commentators is that *Archē tou euaggelion* is the title of Mark’s Gospel; 802 (2) The phrase provides thematic information about the whole Gospel; 803 (3) ‘The beginning of the gospel’ is the overview of Mark 1:1-15; 804 (4) It is a reference to the beginning of the narrative of the events that follow – an *initium* or *incipit*; 805 (5) It is a combination of all of the above; 806 (6) It is the beginning of the history of God’s activity. 807

806 See Marcus, *Mark*, 145.
It seems, however, that the term *arch,* in the phrase *Arch tou euaggel iou* is not so relevant to the consideration of whether this phrase functions as a *Gattungsbegriff.* Rather, it is the term *euaggel iou* that introduces a possible new literary *Gattung* in Mark 1:1. The term *arch,* on the other hand, consistently maintains a temporal overtone in Mark, signifying a point of inception in time identifiable with an event. Hence, we shall turn to determine the event that indicates the beginning of the gospel which, as we are proposing here, is also the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise of time.

6.3.2. Consideration of Some Proposals for the *arch*Begriff as Geschehenbegriff

Several proposals have been advanced in the attempt to identify the event that constitutes the beginning of the gospel.

Firstly, a considerable number of Markan specialists follow Turner in affirming, on the basis of verse 4, that John the Baptist is in fact the ‘beginning of the gospel’. Turner arrived at this observation by reading Mark 1:1 and 1:4 in direct continuity and regarding 1:2-3 as parenthetical. However, in the light of the composite citation in verses 2b-3, John the Baptist is meant to be seen as ‘eine Prophetie auf Jesus hin’. John anticipates the coming of Jesus in two ways. His own baptism

---

808 See Becker, *Markus-Evangelium,* 112.
810 Cf. Tolbert, *Sowing,* 243: “Few scholars support the view that ‘the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ’ is to be found in the coming of John the Baptist…” But see below.
812 See Pesch, ‘Anfang’, 141. See also Wink, *John the Baptist,* 17. See also Weiss, *Proclamation,* 82.
was only εἰς αἱματικάν which is probably best translated as ‘in view of the forgiveness of sins’.\textsuperscript{814} Jesus is the one who has the authority to offer the forgiveness of sins which John’s baptism merely anticipates (2:6, 10). Moreover, John’s message, Ερερέται οἷς σκόπετε ἄραν οπίσω οίκου (v. 7), is, as we have seen, strongly anticipatory of the statement, ἥξιον θάνατος in 1:9.

Secondly, Mussner suggests that the beginning of the gospel may be viewed in the light of the death of Jesus. The baptism of Jesus under John the Baptist, according to this view, is to be perceived in parallel correlation as a foreshadowing of a new beginning in the resurrection of Jesus.\textsuperscript{815} To be sure, a new beginning is marked by Jesus’ resurrection in that it foreshadows the general resurrection of believers (9:12-13; cf. 1 Cor 15:20). However, the theme of baptism is specifically taken up by Jesus later on in Mark as a symbolic reference to his own death and that of his disciples (10:38).\textsuperscript{816}

Thirdly, Robinson combines the baptism and temptation of Jesus as the beginning of the ‘last hour… of the Christian history’.\textsuperscript{817} Robinson’s observation is based on an assumption associated with the oral transmission of the Gospel tradition that presupposes an event prior to Jesus’ public appearance. This prior event makes possible Jesus’ earthly ministry by serving as its fundamental basis and theme. Robinson identified this prior action with the Spirit’s descent during Jesus’ baptism

\textsuperscript{813} See Wink, \textit{John the Baptist}, 2. See also Pesch, ‘Anfang’, 141; Marxsen, \textit{Mark}, 33; Martin, \textit{Mark}, 66.
\textsuperscript{814} See Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 46.
\textsuperscript{815} See Mussner, ‘Gottesherrschaft’, 97. Strauss locates the beginning of Jesus’ messianic consciousness which is also the beginning of his earthly ministry ‘after the baptism of Jesus by John’. See Strauss, \textit{Christ of Faith}, 72. Schleiermacher, on the other hand, denies any significance of the baptism for Jesus’ ministry. See Schleiermacher, \textit{Jesus}, 156.
\textsuperscript{816} See Cranfield, \textit{Mark}, 338.
\textsuperscript{817} Robinson, \textit{Problem}, 32. See also Conzelmann, ‘Anfang’, 200 n. 21.
guiding him subsequently to the temptation. The problem here is that Jesus’ coming from Nazareth identifies him with the ‘Son of God’ of 1:1, which his baptism serves only as confirmation.

Fourthly, Feuillet proposes that the beginning of the gospel is the whole narrative of Mark 1-16 as the beginning of the early church’s missionary activities.\(^{818}\) This view is based on Pesch’s observation that Mark’s Gospel is the result of the ‘time of Jesus’, which is supposed to have been understood by the Markan community as the ‘Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi’.\(^{819}\) However, while Pesch’s reading does indeed recognize the temporal significance of the statement in 1:1,\(^ {820}\) it does not exhaust the meaning of arch, in 1:1.\(^ {821}\) An analysis of the uses of arch, in headings of extra-biblical works has established that the term only refers to the immediate introduction of a literary work or the actual beginning of the main section. Thus, it seems unlikely that Arch tou euaggeliou Vhsou Cristou is intended to encompass the whole Markan narrative.\(^ {822}\) Moreover, Pesch’s reading runs the risk of reducing the entire ‘Time of Jesus’ narrated in the Gospels to a geometrical point in time.\(^ {823}\)

Fifthly, in an extensive survey of the intimate relation of Mark’s Gospel to first century historiographical conventions, Becker suggests that the arch tou euaggelio may be identified with the destruction of the Temple in AD 70.\(^ {824}\) It may be true that the destruction of the temple left an indelible imprint on the thinking of the earliest

\(^{818}\) See Feuillet, ‘Le “Commencement”’, 163-72.

\(^{819}\) See Pesch, ‘Anfang’, 144; idem, Markusevangelium, 75; Donahue, “‘Mark’”, 904; Keck, ‘Introduction’, 367.

\(^{820}\) Cf. Delling, arch, 479, 481.

\(^{821}\) See Boring, ‘Beginning’, 52.

\(^{822}\) See Guelich, ‘Beginning’, 8; Tolbert, Sowing, 243; Aune, New Testament, 17. For arch,embracing the entire narrative in its scope, see Kingsbury, Mark, 56.

\(^{823}\) This charge can also be levelled against Cullmann’s temporal scheme in which Christ is the ‘mid-point’ of history. See Cullmann, Christ and Time, 83. Cf. Jackelén, Time, 86-89.

\(^{824}\) See Becker, Markus-Evangelium, 99.
believers and their Jewish counterparts. However, its supposed influence on the composition of the Gospels remains highly speculative. Jesus does not seem to attach to the temple’s destruction the significance that modern New Testament scholarship is prepared to allow. Temple destruction appears in Jesus’ statement, ‘Destroy this Temple’ (John 2:19). However, we are told that he was not referring to the Jerusalem temple but to his body (John 2:21). In that sense, temple destruction is only important to Jesus insofar as it is understood in terms of his death.

In summary, neither John the Baptist nor Jesus’ baptism nor Jesus’ death nor the temple’s destruction, nor even the beginning of the early church’s missionary activities, fits neatly as constituting the beginning of the gospel and of the fulfilment of time as the promise of the restoration of Israel.

6.4. The Beginning of the Fulfilment of Time as ἡ ἁγιάται Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρητῆς τῆς Γαλιλαίας

Having surveyed the proposals regarding the beginning of the gospel/beginning of the fulfilment of the promise of time and their weaknesses, we turn now to argue in a more formal way that the beginning of the gospel (1:1) and the beginning of the fulfilment of time (1:15) corresponds to the event described as ἡ ἁγιάται Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρητῆς τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

---

826 We should expect that an event like the fall of Jerusalem would have dined some of the literature of the primitive church, almost as the victory of Salamis has marked the Persae. It might be supposed that such an epoch-making crisis would even furnish criteria for determining the dates of some of the New Testament writings. As a matter of fact, the catastrophe is practically ignored in the extant Christian literature of the first century’. See Moffatt, Introduction, 121-123; Gaston, No Stone, 1-7.
827 See Gaston, No Stone, 479. On our discussion of Mark 13:2, see Chapter 7.5.3.4.
828 See Gundry, Mark, 32. For αρχ, as “fundamental principle”, see Feuillet, ‘Le “Commencement”’, 167.
Nazarēth thē Galilēai (1:9). To do so, we shall draw attention to deictic markers from the immediate context of Mark 1:15 in order to show that the advent of Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee signifies the beginning of the dynamic denoted by Jesus’ announcement, Pēplē hērēται o’kairōj.

6.5. Deictic Markers in Context Pointing to Mark 1:9 as an årchē Begriff

Decker has helpfully summarized the various categories of deictic markers as well as their usages in Mark. Since Decker’s work is groundbreaking in its attempt to apply to the biblical data the view that deictic markers bear the temporal assignment of verbs, we wish to draw upon his categories in order to show the temporal significance of Jesus coming from Nazareth. Here, we shall confine ourselves to Mark 1:1-15 as the literary unit that constitutes the more immediate context of Mark 1:15.

6.5.1. Personal Deixis as Temporal Markers Mark 1:1-15

Personal deictic markers, according to Decker, include personal identifications of participants in the narrative which function as temporal markers. In Mark 1:1-15, the following lexical elements seem to belong in this category:

Hsai tē twpōsū thē (1:2)

This scriptural reference connects the ‘gospel of Jesus Christ’ (1:1) to God’s purpose in the past: ‘Gott hat schon vor langer Zeit kundgetan und demnach längst

830 See Decker, Temporal Deixis, 63-90.
beschlossen, was sich jetzt ereignet’.

The citation from ‘Isaiah the prophet’ in 1:2-3 specifies the chronological sequence of events constituting ‘the gospel of Jesus Christ’. Accordingly, a ‘messenger’ will be sent to prepare the ‘way of the Lord’. This preparatory phase heightens the expectation of the event that must immediately take place, namely, the Lord’s coming. Jesus’ coming from Nazareth in Galilee (1:9) fulfills the Isaianic prediction about the Lord’s coming in 1:2-3. Hence, we can locate the ‘beginning of the gospel’ and of the fulfilment of the promise of time, according to Mark, with Jesus’ advent from Nazareth.

\[\text{\textit{egenet o twannhj}} (1:4)\]

The ‘occurrence’ of John is presented as the more immediate past of the gospel that begins in Jesus. It substantiates the Isaianic prediction of the messenger who was to be the ‘way-preparer’ for the Lord. Again, it is meant to heighten the expectation of the long-awaited coming of the Lord that must immediately come to pass. John’s ‘occurrence’ is profoundly anticipatory: ‘The Baptist is regarded only as a prophet of Jesus’. Jesus points to John the Baptist as the Elijah ‘who must come first’ (Mark 9:12-13; cf. Mal 4:5; Matt 11:14), the appointed herald of the impending ‘day of the Lord’. In that sense, John’s coming is not the beginning of the gospel but foreshadows the ‘beginning of the gospel’ and the fulfilment of the promise of time.

---

832 See Haenchen, Der Weg, 39.
833 See Haenchen Der Weg, 39.
834 See Louw and Nida, Greek-English Lexicon, 158.
From a narrative perspective, the coming of Jesus is an event of the past.\textsuperscript{837} The reference to Jesus in Mark 1:9 is the second time Jesus is mentioned in Mark. Despite Dibelius’ claim that Mark does not prepare his readers for the coming of Jesus,\textsuperscript{838} John’s appearance is, according to Isaiah the prophet, the necessary preparation required for Jesus’ coming. Hence, the expression \textit{hōqen 'hsoj} corresponds to the Lord’s coming for which John’s ministry functions as the Lord’s ‘way-preparer’.\textsuperscript{839} It is therefore the beginning of the new historical epoch which Mark describes as the ‘beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ’ (1:1); this is \textit{also} the beginning of the fulfilment of the the promise of time in the coming near of the Kingdom of God.

6.5.2. \textit{Social Deixis as Temporal Markers in Mark 1:1-15}

Decker’s second category of deictic markers that helps confirm our case for 1:9 as the beginning of the fulfilment of time is that of ‘social deixis’. Social deixis includes social identities or relationships between participants or others mentioned in the narrative as temporal indicators.\textsuperscript{840} In Mark 1:1-15, several linguistic elements seem to satisfy this criterion and refer us to 1:9 as the beginning of the gospel and of the fulfilment of the promise of time in the kingdom’s coming near.

\textsuperscript{837} This study concurs with Lemcio’s thesis (over against the long-held conviction of classical Form and Redaction critics that the events unfolding in the Gospels are polemics against contemporary in-house theological conflicts between early Christian communities) that the evangelists set out to produce an account distinguishing Jesus’ time from their own time. See Lemcio, \textit{Past of Jesus}, 16. For a representative of the position against which Lemcio is defending his thesis, see Bornkamm, ‘Stilling of the Storm’, 52-53; Bultmann, \textit{Theology}, 34, 92.

\textsuperscript{838} See Dibelius, \textit{Tradition}, 231.

\textsuperscript{839} Mauser speaks of Jesus’ coming to John in the wilderness as analogous to Israel’s exodus to the wilderness. See Mauser, \textit{Christ}, 96. Swartley focuses on usage of the term ‘way’ in Mark 8:27-10:52 and argues that Mark presents the ‘way of discipleship (suffering on the cross)’ as leading to the (Promised Land) Kingdom of God. See Swartley, ‘Structural Function’, 82.

\textsuperscript{840} See Decker, \textit{Temporal Deixis}, 55.
John’s identity as o`bap	izw can be regarded as bearing social as well as theological significance. The expression o`bap	izw signifies what John – ‘the one who baptizes’ – was doing.\(^{841}\) In the light of the citation in 1:2-3, however, John’s baptism, as we have seen, functions as the necessary preparation for the coming of the Lord.\(^{842}\) The anticipatory overtone of John’s ministry implies that he did not see himself as a new beginning but essentially as awaiting the new beginning (cf. John 1:21-23). In fact, his proclamation of a baptisma metandi aj ej af esi anartw (1:4) truly anticipates tij dunatai avienai anarti aj (2:6, 10).\(^{843}\) That person is specified when hiqen thsouj apo Nazaret thj Galilai aj (1:9).

:Erce	ai o`iscuro teqj mou oquis mou (1:7)

In the narrative flow in Mark 1:1-15 this proclamation identifies Jesus as the ‘stronger one’.\(^{844}\) The word erce	ai in combination with oquis mou here anticipates the Lord’s coming in keeping with the composite citation in 1:2-3.\(^{845}\) With this announcement, John implicitly affirms the central belief of Israel’s eschatology: Yahweh is to come as Lord.\(^{846}\) Hence, hiqen thsouj (v. 9) not only fulfills John’s proclamation of the ‘stronger one’ coming after him but also identifies that ‘stronger

\(^{841}\) See H. Thyen, ‘BAPTIZMA’, 132 n. 3.
\(^{842}\) See Haenchen, Der Weg, 41.
\(^{843}\) This is markedly one of the major distinctions between Jesus and John maintained in Acts. See Lemcio, Past of Jesus, 18.
\(^{844}\) Thyen notes that o`iscuro teqj is a Jewish circumlocution for the divine name. See Thyen, ‘BAPTISMA’, 136 n. 15. On the identity of the ‘coming one’, see Dunn, ‘John the Baptist’, 50-52; Allison and Davies, Matthew, 313-14; Webb, John the Baptist, 219-306. In accordance with the ‘coming stronger one’s’ mission to baptize with the Holy Spirit, we are reminded of Ezekiel 36 where it is the Lord himself who promised to do so to his own people. This connection with Ezekiel is also reasserted in the tearing of the heavens in Mark 1:10. See Cranfield, Mark, 53.
\(^{845}\) See Cranfield, Mark, 48.
one’ as ‘Jesus Christ Son of God’ (1:1) and ‘Lord’ (1:3). As the fulfilment of the coming of the ‘stronger one’, Jesus’ coming from Nazareth marks a new beginning.

Su áo’u nò (1:11)

The statement confirms 1:1 and indicates that Jesus came from Nazareth as the Son of God (1:9; cf. 2 Pet 1:16-17). The temporal overtone of this declaration lies in its background in Psalm 2:7. Accordingly, the day of the enthronement of Israel’s king is the day in which he becomes the ‘son of God’. His enthronement marks the beginning of a new time, namely, ‘today’ under his reign. In Psalm 2, the ‘today’ of God’s king implies an everlasting duration (cf. Luke 4:16; Heb 3:13; 4:7). If the announcement of Jesus’ sonship in his baptism is the confirmation of the ‘today’ of his kingship, then his coming from Nazareth ‘in those days’ distinctly marks a new beginning in world history.

---

847 See Gundry, Mark, 37; Warfield, ‘Divine Messiah’, 393-94.
848 Probably, it also anaphorically confirms 1:1. See Gundry, Mark, 37. On Jesus’ deep consciousness of being the Son of God, see Bruce, Time is Fulfilled, 24-25. See also Drane, ‘Review’, 74-75. Cf. Kingsbury, Matthew, 40-127. Kingsbury argues for the centrality of the ‘Son of God’ title in Matthew’s presentation of Jesus and that its content is found in the title ‘Son of Man’. However, Hill has argued that the content of ‘Son of God’ in Matthew (more apparent than in Mark) is to be found in Jesus’ exemplification of the Servant, Ebed Yahweh. See Hill, ‘Son and Servant’, 2-16. For Marshall, on the other hand, what Hill asserts reflects a latter Christological development. In Mark, ‘Son of God’ is more originally an expression of his uniquely personal relationship with the Father as reinforced by the qualifying adjective agaphtoj. See Marshall, ‘Son of God’, 336. The same connection is also maintained by Bretscher, ‘Exodus 4, 22-23’, 306.
849 On the significance of the background in Psalm 2 on this passage, see Marcus, Way, 76.
850 See Mowinckel, Psalms, I: 115-16. He argues that Israel adopted it from the Babylonians.
851 The expression ‘today’ occurs in the version of Jesus’ baptism according to the Gospel of the Ebionites. See Aland (ed), Synopsis, 27. See also Justin Martyr, Dialogue 88, 3.8. On the background from Psalm 2, see Mowinckel, Psalms I, 53.
852 Cf. Philo, Fug. 1. 57: to dvayaudj orona aiwhoj h’ shrmeron. See Delitzsch, Psalms, I: 96. Delitzsch finds the original context of Psalm 2 in 2 Samuel 7. For the temporal provenance of ‘Today’ in the Psalms, see Ricoeur, Figuring the Sacred, 179. This appears to be maintained as the understanding of ‘Today’ in the New Testament (Heb 4:7). The importance of ‘Today’ in Hebrews is enforced by understanding what God has done in Jesus Christ “yesterday”. See Filson, ‘Yesterday’, 30-35. Contra Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 67; Kraus, Psalms I-59, 132.
There is an inherent ambiguity in this statement which has often hindered the realization of its full temporal import. Whilst it implies some kind of relationship between Jesus and the wild animals it fails to indicate whether such a relationship is to be viewed affirmatively or negatively.\textsuperscript{853} However, some exegetes\textsuperscript{854} have pointed out that there is an implicit Christological point being made here which connects the ministry of Jesus to the Old Testament. The strong scriptural provenance of Mark 1:1-15 implies that this statement is yet another allusion to the Isaianic eschatological vision. Isaiah predicted that the messianic age will be signalled by the restoration of the Edenic harmony between humanity and the animals (e.g. Isa 11:6-8; 65:25):

Wenn Jesus also Gemeinschaft mit den Tieren hält und von den Engeln bedient wird, ist er in der vorliegenden Erzählung als der neue Adam dargestellt, der die Versuchung Satans als der mit Gottes Geist ausgerüstete Sohn bestanden hat und das Paradies für die Menschen zurückgewinnt, die messianische Zeit heraufführt, Gottes Herrschaft.\textsuperscript{855}

The reference to the waiting of the angels upon Jesus further corroborates this contention. This fellowship with animals could of course be an inevitable consequence of Jesus’ presence in the wilderness. However, its mentioning in Mark’s account is probably due to its intimate connection with the big picture of God’s cosmic purposes outlined in Isaiah. Hence, Jesus’ fellowship with wild animals in the wilderness implies that Jesus’ coming from Nazareth in Galilee (1:9) inaugurates a ‘new quality of time’ in line with the newness predicted by Isaiah. That all things have been subjected to Jesus as the ‘new Adam’, even the angels (cf. Col 1:15; Heb

\textsuperscript{853} See Bauckham, ‘Jesus and the Wild Animals’, 20-21.
\textsuperscript{854} See the discussion in Pesch, \textit{Markusevangelium}, 96.
1:5-14), underscores a new beginning in Jesus, a new beginning that resembles the harmonious experience of Adam and the wild animals in Eden.

6.5.3. Locational Deixis as Temporal Markers in Mark 1:1-15

Locational deictic markers take the spatial location of the narrative characters to be functioning as temporal markers. Several expressions in Mark 1:1-15 seem to belong to this category and thus highlight the convergence of the beginning of the gospel and the beginning of the fulfilment of time in Jesus’ advent from Nazareth in Galilee.856

This deictic expression affirms the location of John’s ministry and his role as the messenger and the ‘voice’ that were to predict the Lord’s coming, in accordance with Isaiah the prophet. In Isaiah,857 the wilderness is specified as the place in which the preparation for the Lord’s coming is expected to unfold (40:3).858 Thus, John’s appearance ‘in the wilderness’ fulfils the preparatory stage for the coming of the Lord (1:2-3). It thus anticipates a new beginning with the coming of Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee.

856 See Decker, Temporal Deixis, 55.
857 This tendency is evident in Qumran: ‘And when these become members of the Community in Israel according to all these rules, they shall separate from the habitation of ungodly men and shall go to the wilderness to prepare the way of Him; as it is written, Prepare in the wilderness the way of …, make straight in the desert a path for our God’ (1 QS 8.12-14, Vermes’ Translation). See also Vermes, ‘Eschatological’, 479-494; Dunn, ‘John the Baptist’s’, 45.
858 In Mark, the ‘wilderness’ is moreover the place for the temptation of Jesus under Satan (1:12). It is quite possible for these to be two different geographical locations. See Haenchen, Der Weg, 64.
This expression indicates the location where the preparation for the Lord’s coming is in progress according to ‘Isaiah the prophet’. The Jordan River reinforces the identification of John with the Elijah to come since it is there that the old prophet had been taken up to heaven and therefore heightens the anticipation of the ‘restoration of all things’ associated with the mission of the Elijah to come (Mark 9:11-12). That ‘all the Judean region’ and ‘all the Jerusalemites’ came to be baptized under John serves to indicate that ‘all Israel’ has now undertaken the preparation required for the Lord’s coming which, according to Mark, is accomplished in Jesus’ coming from Nazareth (1:9). From a narrative perspective, Jesus’ coming ‘from Nazareth of Galilee’ to John in the Jordan signifies that John’s role as the messenger of the Lord has now been accomplished. After Jesus’ baptism, John gradually fades into the background reappearing only when we are told that he is arrested (1:14). The account of John’s death will have to await another time in the plot (6:16-29). Hence, from a narrative viewpoint, Jesus’ coming from Nazareth in Galilee is the point at which John’s ministry begins to pale into insignificance as Jesus’ ministry assumes centre stage – as the fulfilment of the promise of time begins to take effect.

859 On the theological significance of the ‘wilderness’, see Mauser, Christ, 96 who traces parallels between Israel’s wilderness history and the wilderness theme in Jesus’ life and ministry especially in Mark. Similarly, Fuller, Mission, 85-86.
861 The concept of paį and its cognates in this context is therefore meant to be construed in its more ‘rigorous’ sense. See Johnston, Use of Paį, 183. Cf. Lohmeyer, Markus, 15-16, 20. See also Mauser, Christ, 94.
Behind this celestial voice is the description of the heavens being ‘torn apart’ – an expression which is derived from the prayer in Isaiah 64:1 – for God to ‘tear open’ the heavens and descend for the restoration of Israel. In keeping with the literary context of Isaiah 64, the Spirit’s descent which accompanies the voice from heaven in Jesus’ baptism indicates the coming of God in response to the prayer for restoration. Watts has pointed out that the future hope of Israel as expressed in the Isaianic matrix which lies behind Mark’s Gospel is the return of ‘Yahweh’s actual presence’ to Israel. Hence, the voice from heaven confirms that God’s King has now appeared in the scene of history to bring about the restoration of Israel. Jesus’ coming from Nazareth in Galilee therefore marks the coming of the Lord’s actual presence to Israel in order to inaugurate the restoration of his people.

6.5.4. Discourse Deixis as Temporal Markers in Mark 1:1-15

Discourse deictic markers include expressions deployed in the narrative to refer to some other elements of the narrative. In Mark 1:1-15, several linguistic elements appear to function in this capacity and thus indicate that Mark 1:9 signals the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise of time in the coming near of the Kingdom of God.

---

864 See Watts, ‘Consolation’, 33.
While Matthew uses a fulfilment formula, while in Mark 1, the same theological import is expressed by the term  \textit{egeneto}. Two conceptual dimensions seem to be embraced by  \textit{egeneto}. Firstly, the event that came to pass in the first century context is an occurrence invested with historical and theological meaning. Secondly and more importantly, for Mark the events depicted occur strictly in accordance with what God had predicted in the Holy Scriptures through Isaiah the prophet. John’s ‘occurrence’ in the wilderness (1:4) corresponds to the messenger sent before the coming of the Lord. Thus, Jesus’ ‘occurrence in those days’ coming from Nazareth in Galilee (1:9) marks the beginning of a new time in the realization of the expectation of the Lord’s coming.

\textit{ex dei naij taij hinei naij} (1:9)

This prepositional phrase is frequently used as a general temporal expression in the New Testament. In the context of Mark 1:1-15, it introduces a new actor into the narrative. It locates this new actor’s beginning during the ministry of John the Baptist and thus occasioned continuity and discontinuity in the narrative in line with Isaiah’s expectation cited in Mark 1:2-3. ‘In those days’ underscores that a new beginning (discontinuity) occurs during John’s fulfilment of the role of the Isaianic messenger (continuity). Indeed, it has been pointed out that this phrase ‘in those days’ functions in a discourse as a temporal point of departure. What is new ‘in those days’ is the appearance of Jesus coming from Nazareth.

---

865 For an extensive discussion of the use of ‘fulfilment formula’, see Prabhu, \textit{Formula Quotations}, 46-63.
867 See France, \textit{Mark}, 75.
Although this adverb does not seem to acquire temporal force in this context, its occurrence introduces ‘a dramatic new phase within an episode’.  

In the literary context of 1:1-15, δύναμις highlights the immediate transference of the narrative emphasis from John to Jesus. John’s ministry may well have continued even after Jesus’ baptism, as attested in John’s Gospel (3:23-32). However, the immediate transference of the narrative spotlight to Jesus from 1:9 onwards in Mark’s story indicates that the raison d’être of John’s ministry has come to pass precisely at the point in which Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee. From that point onwards, John must “decrease” and Jesus must “increase” (John 3:30).

6.5.5. Temporal Deixis

Decker maintains that the grammaticalization of temporal relationships of events relative to the encoding time is what constitutes temporal deixis. The largest category of temporal deictic indicators consists of prepositions and temporal adverbs such as ‘today’, ‘yesterday’ and so forth. In Mark 1:1-15, the following represents temporal indicators which point to the coming of Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee as the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise of time and the restoration of Israel.

---

869 See France, Mark, 76.
870 See Decker, Temporal Deixis, 74.
871 See Decker, Temporal Deixis, 52-59.
pro. prōswpou sou (1:2)

This phrase acquires a spatial connotation in its original context in Exodus 23:20. Here in Mark, however, it assumes a temporal connotation.\textsuperscript{872} It confirms that the Lord’s messenger will chronologically precede the Lord’s coming. In that sense, the appearance of the messenger is not the long-awaited new beginning anticipated in Isaiah. His role rather is to signify the impending arrival of the central event – the Lord’s coming, and to prepare the historical scenery for its inauguration. This is also confirmed from the connection of the composite citation in Mark 1:2-3 with Malachi 3:22-23 (LXX). Elijah the prophet is expected to appear before the coming of the ‘day of the Lord’. Jesus affirms that John the Baptist is indeed the ‘Elijah to come’ (Mark 9:13). In that connection, Jesus’ advent from Nazareth in Galilee marks the beginning of a new time, namely, the ‘day of the Lord’.

eij afesin ahamtiwh (1:4)

The importance of this phrase in Mark 1:1-15 lies in the fact that it signifies that John’s ministry is anticipatory.\textsuperscript{873} His baptism functions to promise the forgiveness of sins which Jesus alone has the authority to bestow on anyone (Mark 2:6, 10).\textsuperscript{874} In that sense, John was really announcing a baptism with a view to the forgiveness of sins.\textsuperscript{875} The forgiveness of sins he anticipates begins to be realized when hi-qen Whsouj apo Nazarēt thj Galilai (1:9).

\textsuperscript{872} Cf. Lane, \textit{Mark}, 46; Decker, \textit{Temporal Deixis}, 89; Caragounis, \textit{Greek}, 228.
\textsuperscript{873} See Thyen, ‘BAPTISMA’, 132.
The central message John proclaimed is that the ‘stronger man’ is coming after me, not in a spatial sense but in a temporal sense. John himself, as we have seen, was anticipating the ‘stronger one’ coming after him. In most of its occurrences in Mark, \(\text{o\pi\sw\tau}\) denotes a spatial idea.\(^{876}\) Mark 1:7 is the exception. Here, \(\text{o\pi\sw\tau}\) takes a temporal meaning.\(^{877}\) Viewed from an historical-eschatological perspective, the Lord who is expected to appear after the messenger is fulfilled in Jesus’ coming from Nazareth. This sequence is moreover confirmed by the use of \(\text{meta}\) in verse 14. Consequently, to insist that John is the beginning of the gospel and therefore of the fulfilment of time (Mark 1:15) seems misleading.

\(\text{meta. de paradóçhōtai tón twannhν}(1:14)\)

In the New Testament, \(\text{meta}\) followed by an infinitive almost certainly bears the temporal meaning, ‘after’.\(^{878}\) Its occurrence in Mark 1:7 affirms that the ‘stronger man’ coming \(\text{o\pi\sw\tau}\) John is not to be understood as John’s ‘follower’ but rather in chronological sequence with him.\(^{879}\) Jesus is indeed the stronger man to whom John pointed and thus ‘chronologically speaking Jesus really did begin his ministry only after John’.\(^{880}\) While there appears to be an overlap in their ministries (John 3:23-36), in Mark, however, this overlap is downplayed as the narrative focus is shifted to Jesus from 1:9 onwards. Even though Jesus’ public appearance in Galilee to proclaim

---

\(^{876}\) 1:17, 20; 8:33, 34; 13:16. This is its usual though unexceptional meaning in other literature too. See Gundry, \textit{Mark}, 37. Gundry takes the spatial meaning of \(\text{o\pi\sw\tau}\) as primary here in 1:7 and hence asserts that John meant Jesus to be his follower or disciple. See also Trumbower, ‘Role of Malachi’, 34. Cf. Dodd, \textit{Historical Tradition}, 272-74; France, ‘Jesus the Baptist’, 104. But this makes it rather ridiculous for John to suppose that the ‘stronger one’ will be his follower. See Dibelius, \textit{Tradition}, 230.

\(^{877}\) See Taylor, \textit{Mark}, 156.


the gospel only occurs after John’s imprisonment, he (i.e. Jesus) has taken the narrative spotlight beginning with his coming from Nazareth.\textsuperscript{881}

Although Jesus’ appearance in Galilee (1:14) may fit the criterion of being the beginning of the fulfilment of time and therefore of the gospel, such a contention does not stand closer examination.\textsuperscript{882} The gospel of God which Jesus announced in Galilee seems already to be in Jesus’ possession when he came from Nazareth. In that sense, the beginning of the proclamation of the gospel not only to Israel (1:14-15) but also the whole world (13:10) seems to coincide with the appearance of Jesus ‘in those days’ coming from Nazareth.\textsuperscript{883} Jesus’ appearance in Galilee in 1:14 presupposes a previous incident in which Jesus had received the gospel which he is heralding. Behind Jesus’ public appearance in Galilee (1:14-15), stands his baptism (1:9-11), which confirms that Jesus had already obtained the gospel when he came from Nazareth in Galilee. Hence, his coming from Nazareth better functions as the beginning of the gospel and therefore of the fulfilment of the promise of time in the restoration of Israel.\textsuperscript{884}

6.6. \textit{Summary}

In this chapter, we have argued that the beginning of the gospel (1:1) coincides with the beginning of the fulfilment of time. On the basis of the current development in Greek verbal aspects we have shown that from interaction of lexical semantics in the context of Mark 1:1-15, the event most likely to be qualified for this new beginning

\textsuperscript{883} \textit{Contra} Schneider, ‘Die Himmelfahrt’, 170.
\textsuperscript{884} Throughout this chapter, we have demonstrated that John is to be properly regarded as the preparation for the new beginning in Jesus. See Bultmann, \textit{Jesus}, 26; Haenchen, \textit{Der Weg}, 42; Thyen, ‘BAPTISMA’, 133 n. 6.
is Jesus’ advent from Nazareth in Galilee (Mark 1:9). Mark indicates, probably on the basis of the pre-existence of Jesus, that Jesus came from Nazareth as the ‘Christ the Son of God’ (1:1). In that light, Jesus’ baptism serves as a confirmation of what was already Jesus’ status. Thus, his coming from Nazareth is the beginning of the dynamic denoted in Jesus’ announcement, \( \text{Pepi hwtai o’kai roj kai haggiken h’basileia tou’geou’} \) This dynamic, in keeping with our findings in Chapter 4, is the manifestation of the fulfilment of the promise of God’s covenant with time which is the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.

\[885\] Interestingly, the pre-existence of Jesus seems to form a crucial part of the Petrine tradition that underlies Mark’s Gospel. Ellis observes that 1 Peter 1:18-21 and 3:18, 22 appear to be ‘pre-formed traditions’ constituting of two confessional hymns. See Ellis, *Making*, 135; Gundry, ‘Verba Christi’, 336-50; Grudem, *First Epistle of Peter*, 23; Cf. Moule, ‘1 Peter’, 1-11; Elliot, ‘Rehabilitation’, 248; Michaelis, *1 Peter*, lxvi; *Contra* Best, ‘1 Peter’, 102, 111 who denies any connection between 1 Peter and the gospel tradition in Mark, see pp. 102, 111.
7. JESUS’ CONCEPTION OF TIME IN MARK 1:15. OBSERVATIONS FROM MARK’S GOSPEL

7.1. Introduction

So far, we have argued that God’s covenant with day and night (= his covenant with time) offers the most intelligible background of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15, Πέπληρωτεν ο’καὶ ῥοῖ̄ καὶ ἥγηκεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν θεῶν. More importantly, we have observed that the fulfilment of God’s covenant with day and night on a daily basis by giving them in their appointed time – what we have referred to as the promise of time – guarantees the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.

In Chapter 5, we saw that syntactically speaking, Jesus’ time-word (Πέπληρωτεν ο’καὶ ῥοῖ̄) is the abstract notion, the concrete manifestation of which is the coming near of the Kingdom (ἡ γίγνεται ἡ βασιλεία τῶν θεῶν). In that connection, the hope of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring is to be realized in the coming near of the Kingdom of God in Jesus’ ministry. In the previous chapter, we identified, on the basis of grammatical considerations, that the beginning of the fulfilment of God’s covenant with time is Jesus’ advent from Nazareth in Galilee (1:9). In this chapter, we wish to examine the broader ‘horizon’ of Jesus’ view of time and its corresponding ‘inside phases’ in order to explore the way in which the fulfilment of God’s covenant with time is unfolded in Jesus’ ministry, more particularly, in relation to his proclamation of the coming near of the kingdom.

Several remarks about the terminology employed in this chapter are in order. ‘Horizon’ includes the ‘boundaries of one’s field of vision, of all that one knows and
In relation to Jesus, the horizon of his view of time consists of a beginning, an ending and a set of consecutively arranged events constituting the ‘inside phases’ between those boundaries. For the sake of consistency, we shall refer to the beginning of Jesus’ horizon of time view as the ‘alpha-boundary’ and to its ending as the ‘omega-boundary’.

Between these boundaries of Jesus’ horizon of time view are the dynamic situations we refer to as the ‘inside phases’.

Having identified the horizon of Jesus’ time conception, we shall then explore how the fulfilment of the promise of time in the restoration of Israel begins to be manifested in Jesus’ ministry, especially in relation to his death. Moreover, with reference to the inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time we shall test Campbell’s hypothesis that by grammaticalizing linguistic items in the perfect tense-form, intensity is one of its implicatures.

In Chapter 5, we saw the significance of according prominence as an implicature of the perfect verbs in Mark 1:15. In this chapter, we shall explore the degree to which intensification of the ‘sort of activities’

---

886 See Meyer, ‘Orientations’, 19. According to Meyer, ‘horizon’ involves the ‘products of my life-history’. It focuses primarily on readers and the possibilities in their lives. Readers can shift from one horizon to another when they realize the inability of their current ‘horizon’ to accommodate a new and irresistibly persuasive truth or value. Meyer’s understanding of ‘horizon’ is not far removed from that of Gadamer. According to Gadamer, ‘horizon’ is the standpoint from which a speaker views the world. See Gadamer, *Truth*, 400. In applying this ‘horizon’ concept to Jesus, therefore, two presuppositions are envisaged. (1) We are drawing on the humanity of Jesus as narrated in Mark for his ‘horizon’ of time view. (2) The horizon of Jesus’ view of time assumed some form of limitation, as Jesus himself acknowledged, for example, in Mark 13:32. Nevertheless, doctrinally speaking, such peculiarities of Jesus’ humanity do not subtract from his divinity.

887 These terminologies are inspired by Jesus’ words in Revelation 22:13.

888 We prefer to use the term ‘phase’ and ‘inside phase’ here, following Meyer, instead of the more popular term ‘stage’ or ‘stages’ in order to emphasize the underlying linguistic underpinning of this study. That is, since the perfect verbs peal hrtwai and nqjke n denote an ongoing dynamic, in Comrie’s words, ‘a situation that is extended in time’, a ‘phase’ refers to ‘a situation at any given point of time in its duration’. In that sense, the term ‘phase’ as a descriptive label for the distinctive stages of Jesus’ ministry tends to retain the dynamic nature of Jesus’ ministry. See Comrie, *Aspect*, 48. See also Meyer, ‘“Phases”’, 25-39.

889 See Chapter 5.2.2 and 5.2.3.
(Aktionsarten) denoted by these verbs may be represented in the inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time conception that encompass his ministry.\textsuperscript{890}

7.2. Problems with Attempts to Determine ‘Phases’ of Jesus’ Ministry

In Jesus scholarship, attempts at determining the distinctive ‘inside phases’ of Jesus’ ministry have been hindered by the outworking of several key presuppositions:

(1) The conviction that Mark does not clearly set forth the eschatological teachings of Jesus or of earliest Christianity.\textsuperscript{891} In response, we shall show that Jesus’ eschatological teachings narrated by Mark most probably reflect its earliest reception in connection with the first century Jewish expectation as represented by the teaching of the scribes (9:11-13).

(2) The supremacy of historical critical approaches which deny the possibility of chronological sequencing as a principle of arrangement underlying the final form of the Gospels.\textsuperscript{892} The form-critical approach is notable in this regard for its severing of the connection between the Gospel accounts and the historical reality of Jesus.\textsuperscript{893} However, events narrated in the Gospels are best explained by reference not to the early church, but to the historical reality of Jesus.\textsuperscript{894}

\textsuperscript{890} See Campbell, \textit{Verbal Aspect}, 201-7.
\textsuperscript{891} See Conzelmann, ‘Preasent and Future’, 27.
\textsuperscript{892} See Schmidt, \textit{Place}, 43-44. For a concise summary of this development featuring all the main players, see Vorster, ‘Kerygma/History’, 88-89. The objection raised by redaction and form critical emphasis to any clear structural division in Mark has been reasserted in the narrative emphasis that insists that Mark lacks a clear overall structure but instead consists of forecasts, echoes, and repetitions with variations resulting in a type of narrative that meets the need of a listening audience. See Dewey, ‘Mark as Interwoven’, 221-36; Malbon, \textit{Narrative Space}, 142-51; \textit{idem}, ‘Echoes and Foreshadowings’, 214. Cf. Hooker, \textit{Mark}, 15-16; Dowd, \textit{Reading Mark}, 2; Nineham, \textit{St Mark}, 29; Kee, \textit{Community}, 62-64, 74-76; Gundry, \textit{Mark}, 1045-49. An objection to this view is found in Williams, ‘Mark’s Gospel’, 505-25.
\textsuperscript{893} See Benoit, ‘Reflections’, 11-45.
\textsuperscript{894} See Sanders, \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, 18; Wright, \textit{Jesus}, 86; Dunn, \textit{Jesus}, 174; Hengel, ‘Gospel as Kerygma’, 143.
(3) The scepticism towards the authenticity of the extended material about the beginning of Jesus’ earthly ministry attested in John’s Gospel.\(^{895}\) This scepticism was fuelled by the conviction that the fourth Gospel is more concerned with theology than with history.\(^{896}\) Recent studies have, however, made a good case that the Fourth Gospel belongs to the historical and biographical genre.\(^{897}\)

(4) The view that Jesus’ and the early Christians’ theological and eschatological perceptions underwent a thorough revision due to the crisis supposedly arising from the *Parusieverzögerung*.\(^{898}\) However, that Jesus’ sayings regarding the end of the world as occurring within his generation (9:1; 13:32) are reported with no hint of embarrassment in Mark would indicate that perhaps our view of the ‘end’ needs to be revised to fall into line with what Jesus might have meant.\(^{899}\)

(5) The belief that Jesus did not espouse a personal view of the eschatological future is another factor that has hindered attempts to explore the horizon of Jesus’ view of time.\(^{900}\) This view seems to have been sustained by scepticism about the connection between the historical Jesus and the reality narrated by the Gospels. However, if, as we have indicated,\(^{901}\) the Gospels are to be taken as theologically interpreted

---

\(^{895}\) See Meyer, “Phases”, 25.
\(^{896}\) See Schweitzer, *Quest*, 87; Bornkamm, *Jesus*, 14; Barrett, *St John*, 141-42.
\(^{899}\) See, for example, Stone, ‘Coherence’, 333-47. Cf. Fukuyama, *End of History*, xii.
\(^{901}\) See Chapter 1.6.
historical narratives, then a case can be argued for Jesus espousing a distinctive view of the future in contradistinction to that advocated by his contemporaries.

7.3. The Need for a Fresh Look at the Evidence

Since each of the presuppositions that often prevented the exploration of the horizon of Jesus’ view of time has been questioned, it is necessary to reconsider the evidence. This re-evaluation is assisted by the fact that Campbell’s newer paradigm of the ‘heightened proximity imperfective’ perfect tense-form promises to make sense of the data for resolving the puzzling issue of time in reference to the coming near of the Kingdom of God in Mark 1:15.902

In addition to this newer approach, several ‘old’ insights necessitate a fresh exploration of the horizon and the inside phases of Jesus’ conception of time on the basis of Mark 1:15. Manson many decades ago observed that what has been long overdue in Gospel studies is ‘a return to the study of the Gospels as historical documents concerning Jesus of Nazareth, rather than as psychological case-material concerning the early Christians’.903 Against the form-critics, Manson maintains that the Gospels should be taken seriously as ‘evidence for the events they purport to describe and in the first instance as evidence for these events rather than for the states of mind of first-century Christians’.904 Manson’s observation is independently supported by Dahl:

903 See Manson, ‘Quest’, 8. A discussion of the transmission role of ‘eye witnesses’ is found in Nineham, ‘Eye-Witness’, 13-25; 243-52. See also Dunn, Jesus, 177-79 who uses the category of ‘witnessing as remembering’ but still refuses to establish the crucial role of eye witnesses. See further Dunn, ‘On History’, 483-84.
904 See Manson, Studies, 10. See Morris, Problem, 8.
Certainly it is also an important and indeed the first task of the New Testament scholar to interpret the Gospels in their present form as literary and theological documents. The urgency of this task has often been neglected by critical theologians, and it is valuable that we have in our generation been called upon to pay attention to it.905

Dahl’s insight on interpreting the Gospels ‘as literary and theological documents’ concurs with Dodd’s view that the Gospels essentially consist of history and its interpretation.906 Dodd’s position of course begs the question as to whether the traditioning process, that spans from the historical reality of Jesus to the final form of the Gospels, ‘changes the direction’ of the earlier material. Given the uniqueness of the historical reality of Jesus of Nazareth, there seems to be a better ground for accepting that the interpretation of the events narrated in the Gospels was imposed upon the eyewitnesses by the extraordinary character of the reality of Jesus itself. In that sense, the historical reality of Jesus has to be ‘big’ enough to explain the beginnings of Christianity and the way the early church had remembered Jesus.907 Recently, the immediacy of Jesus’ presence to the memory of his earliest followers908 has been advocated by the works of Dunn,909 Hurtado910 and Schüssler-Fiorenza.911

906 See Dodd, History, 107; idem, Gospels as History, 23; idem, ‘Appendix II’, 247. See also Habermas, Verdict, 20. Even in the historical setting more proximate to that of the Gospel writers, Josephus indicates that in first century Palestine, writers knew the distinction between authentic history and fabricated accounts. See Josephus, Ant. ‘preface’. 1-2. Cf. 2 Pet 1:16.
907 See Manson, ‘Fourth Gospel’, 121-22; Dunn, Jesus, 174; Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 18; Wright, Jesus, 86.
908 See Tilley, ‘Remembering’, 3-35. For the existence of the core group of Jesus’ disciples, see Meier, ‘Circle of the Twelve’, 632-72; Robinson, ‘How Small’, 97.
909 See Dunn, Jesus, 253-54; idem, New Perspective on Jesus, 77-78. It must be noted, however, that Dunn still reflects the persistent scepticism about the Gospels as eyewitness accounts. See Jesus, 241. See also the reviews of Dunn’s work by Morgan, ‘James’ Dunn’s’, 1-6; Gregory, ‘Oral and Written’, 7-12 and Dunn’s response in the same Volume of Expository Times.
910 See Hurtado, Lord Jesus Christ, 53-64.
911 See Schüssler-Fiorenza, In Memory, 151-54.
If the Gospel tradition was remembered by ‘eye-witnesses’ whose memories of Jesus were preserved through the worshipping communities of the earliest believers it seems more likely that those Christians not only knew the difference between the pre-resurrection and the post-resurrection settings but were also successful in their intention of faithfully retelling the pre-resurrection story of Jesus in its post-resurrection setting.\textsuperscript{912}

The concern to treat the Gospels as evidence to the historical reality of Jesus is foundational for Bauckham’s recent attempt to establish the essential function of the Gospels as eye-witness testimony:

\begin{quote}
I suggest that we need to recover the sense in which the Gospels are testimony. This does not mean that they are testimony \textit{rather than} history. It means that the kind of historiography they are is testimony. An irreducible feature of testimony as a form of human utterance is that it asks to be trusted. This need not mean that it asks to be trusted uncritically, but it does mean that testimony should not be treated as credible only to the extent that it can be independently verified.\textsuperscript{913}
\end{quote}

Collectively, these contributions may not overturn the entrenched scepticism regarding the historical value of the Gospels. To be sure, the relationship of the Gospels to the historical Jesus will almost certainly continue to dominate scholarly discussion since the position just outlined is not universally endorsed. Nevertheless, the aforementioned scholarly insights express a concern for a frequently undermined aspect of Gospels scholarship and one that is adopted in this study, namely, the


\textsuperscript{913} See Bauckham, \textit{Jesus}, 5. See also Greenleaf, \textit{Testimony}, 11-58. Several reviews of Bauckham’s \textit{Jesus and the Eyewitnesses} can be found in \textit{Nova et Vetera} 6:3 (2008): 483-528. See also Bauckham’s response on pp. 529-42.
consideration of the Gospels in their final form as testimony to the historical reality of Jesus of Nazareth. Even if one is sceptical about the possibility of retrieving Jesus’ view of time from the Gospel materials, the result of this investigation may be treated as Mark’s report of Jesus’ view of time. After all, it is through Mark’s account that we arrive at Jesus’ utterance analyzed in this study.

Now, to consider the Gospels as reliable testimony for the historical figure of Jesus requires that we must acknowledge the fragmentary character of the evidence at our disposal.⁹¹⁴ This awareness, however, needs not confine us to an absolute scepticism that demands the abandonment of any such quests to reconstruct the historical Jesus from historical sources.⁹¹⁵ ‘Like any other part of history, the Jesus who lived in first-century Palestine is knowable only through the evidence that has survived.’⁹¹⁶ Meyer and Wright⁹¹⁷ have demonstrated that through the disciplined interaction of the scholar’s critical faculty and the biblical text under investigation, it is possible to retrieve an adequate picture of the past.⁹¹⁸ On that basis, it seems probable to retrieve an adequate picture of Jesus’ horizon of time conception and its distinctive inside phases from Mark’s Gospel without assuming that such a reconstruction of the past is exhaustive in any way.

7.4. Jesus’ Awareness of Cyclic Time

In keeping with the definition of ‘horizon’ set forth in the outset of this chapter, Jesus’ horizon of time must include all that he is aware of about time insofar as it is accessible through Mark. In Chapter 4, we argue that, on the basis of Mark 1:15,
Jesus views time in line with God’s covenant with time as day and night in their cyclic rhythm but also in their linear progression towards the goal which is the restoration of Israel through the establishment of the Kingdom of God.\footnote{See Chapter 4 above.} Thus, in attempting to recover the broader horizon as well as the inside phases of Jesus’ view of time from Mark, we wish to begin by inquiring as to whether Jesus displays some measure of awareness of cyclic time and its derivative notion, the ‘time for something’.\footnote{Cf. Tillich, ‘Kairos’, 194.}

The evidence from Mark shows that Jesus possesses a firm grasp of the basic units of cyclic time.\footnote{Concerning the Jewish calendar, see Herr, ‘Calendar’, 834-64 and the literature cited therein.} He seems to be at home, for instance, with the division of the night into four ‘watches’, namely, the ‘evening’, ‘midnight’, ‘the rooster crows’ and ‘dawn’ (13:35; 14:30). Jesus also knows the cycle of time in terms of ‘night and day’ (4:27) as well as the division of daytime into ‘hours’ (14:37; cf. 13:11; 14:35, 41). In addition, Jesus also displays knowledge of seasons and signs of seasons. For example, he is familiar with the experience of the nearness of summer being foreshadowed by the fig tree’s twigs getting tender and fig leaves beginning to bud (13:28). Moreover, being accustomed with the horticultural surroundings of Palestine, Jesus understands that farmers grow their crops with ‘the harvest’ in view (4:29; cf. 12:2).

Having grown up with pious Jewish parents (cf. Luke 2:41), Jesus is also particularly attentive to that aspect of cyclic time called appointed times for special events.\footnote{See Chapter 4.3.3 above.} He recognizes the Sabbath as a special time and its implications (even though he...}
regularly refuses to conform to the expectations of the religious authorities regarding what was considered lawful on the Sabbath. Cf. 2:23-24; 3:4). The Passover Feast, especially the last one he celebrated with his disciples, seems to have been particularly important to Jesus since he made proper preparations so that he and his disciples could partake in it (14:13-15).

It also appears that Jesus espoused the derivative view of time as time for something. Yet, Jesus seems to understand this phenomenon of time as time under the Scriptures; that is, time in which the event-content has been foreordained by the Scriptures. The imprisonment of John (1:14), for instance, did not merely happen because it was the ‘right time’ for Herod to arrest John but happened according to the Scriptures (9:13). Jesus moreover speaks not only of the ‘hour’ of his disciples’ persecution (13:11) but also of the impending ‘hour’ of his own suffering (14:35, 41; cf. 2:20) in language that strongly resonates with Isaiah 53: ‘behold the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of sinners’ (14:41; cf. Isa. 53:12). In fact, Jesus has already foretold his ‘hour’ in relation to the ‘days’ during which he shall be removed from the midst of his followers (2:19-20). Yet, this ‘hour’ is predetermined by the Scriptures (9:12). This foundational role of the Scriptures in specifying events during Jesus’ mission leads Meyer to the following conclusion:

---

923 Jesus’ awareness of cultic times is discernible in John’s Gospel in his attendance at a number of Jewish religious festivals in Jerusalem (cf. John 2:13; 5:1; 7:10; 10:22; 12:12).
924 Cf. Malbon, ‘Mythic Structure’, 107-109 where the result of Jesus’ action on the Passover week is the interpenetration of ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ time. The distinctions Malbon employs appear to be anachronistic when read into Jesus’ religious situation. The Judaism of Jesus’ day, at least of the Pharisees as reflected in the New Testament, seems to have been governed by the ‘sacred’ cycle of time with the Jewish Sabbath at the summit.
925 Ratzinger observes that ‘time is not just a physical phenomenon’ since ‘there is also movement in the realm of the heart, of the spirit’. See Ratzinger, ‘End of Time’, 10.
Our conclusion is that Jesus, in the consciousness of election to a climactic and definitive mission to Israel, sought and found in the scriptures the specifications of God’s eschatological deed and the specifications of his own role as the chosen instrumental doer of that deed. By ineluctable logic these scriptures could not, in Jesus’ view, fail to find fulfillment in the drama of his own mission and its swiftly approaching climax – the ordeal and its resolution. All the scriptures must find fulfillment, whether in the now of his mission or in the rapidly approaching ordeal and final triumph.\(^\text{926}\)

In that sense, for Jesus, it seems that the time for something to occur is time dictated under ‘God’s eschatological deed’, the specifications of which are found in the Scriptures.

In summary, the evidence marshalled here, even though incidental, is sufficient to show that the horizon of Jesus’ time conception includes an underlying awareness of the cyclic dimension of time, of night-time’s division into ‘watches’ and daytime’s division into ‘hours’, of Sabbaths and appointed times for festival. For Jesus, this cyclic pattern of time seems to be time under the dominion of the Scriptures.

7.5. *The Horizon of Jesus’ Understanding of Time*

Having observed the cyclic dimension of Jesus’ horizon of time conception, we shall now turn to analyze the overarching structure of the linear component of his horizon of time. In order to do so, we shall look upon Jesus’ teaching in Mark through the interpretive ‘window’ provided by Mark 1:15 with the following objectives in view: (1) To identify the boundaries of Jesus’ horizon of time and their respective constituent events; (2) To determine events that constitute the distinctive inside

\(^{926}\) See Meyer, ‘Appointed Deed’, 73
phases of Jesus’ ministry within the horizon of his understanding of time; (3) To explore how the promise of time as the restoration of Israel is realized in the ministry of Jesus; (4) To examine whether there are indications of intensification\textsuperscript{927} in the ‘dynamic situations’\textsuperscript{928} represented by these inside phases.

7.5.1. Identifying the Limiting ‘Boundaries’ of Jesus’ Horizon of Time Conception

To begin with, we wish to establish what constitutes the beginning and the end of Jesus’ horizon of time conception. Recall two important points that elucidate the necessity of the undertaking in this section. Firstly, in Chapter 5, we saw that the beginning of the dynamic situation encoded in the perfect verbs \texttt{pepl hrwta} and \texttt{hggiken} in Mark 1:15 is Jesus’ advent from Nazareth in Galilee (1:9).\textsuperscript{929} This event functions as the beginning of the fulfilment of the promise of time as the restoration of Israel. Secondly, in Chapter 4, we have made the connection between Jesus’ view of time in Mark 1:15 and God’s covenant with time, the beginning of which can be traced to creation. By way of testing our finding there, we wish now to inquire into the beginning or the beginning of the horizon of Jesus’ conception of time in Mark.

7.5.2. The Alpha-Boundary of Jesus’ Horizon of Time

On two occasions in Mark, Jesus indicates his awareness of creation as the beginning or what we shall refer to here as the alpha-boundary of his horizon of time. Firstly, in addressing the Pharisees on the issue of marriage and divorce, Jesus refers to the

\textsuperscript{927} In Chapter 7.9 below, we shall show that Campbell’s definition of ‘intensification’ implicature (see Campbell, \textit{Basics}, 110; \textit{idem}, \textit{Verbal Aspect, the Indicative}, 201), in conjunction with his notion of a more defined and intimate viewpoint applied to Jesus as the speaker of Mark 1:15 does indicate the intensification of the action denoted in the perfect verbs in the context of Mark’s Gospel. Following Comrie, a ‘dynamic situation’ is viewed as a situation that is maintained by continually subjecting it to a ‘new input of energy’.

\textsuperscript{928} See Comrie, \textit{Aspect}, 49. Regarding Mark 1:15, the ‘new input of energy’ is supplied by the constant presence of the figure of Jesus.

\textsuperscript{929} See Chapter 6.4.
creation of male and female (10:6). Secondly, when Jesus was speaking of events that foreshadow the end of the world, he referred to ‘days of distress’ qualitatively unequalled (13:19). Creation is therefore the event that constitutes the alpha-boundary of Jesus’ horizon of temporal consciousness.  

7.5.3. The Omega-Boundary of Jesus’ Horizon of Time Conception

Jesus also speaks of the end or what we shall refer to here as the omega-boundary of the spatio-temporal continuum. But whereas Jesus can indicate with certainty the alpha-boundary of his horizon of time conception in creation, when he speaks about its omega-boundary, numerous events appear to constitute its semantic import. These include the general resurrection, the world to come and eternal life, the coming of the Kingdom of God and the return of Jesus.  

7.5.3.1. Omega-Boundary Event 1: General Resurrection

The first end-event for our consideration is related to Jesus’ confirmation of the Pharisaic belief in the general resurrection (cf. Acts 23:8; John 11:24) against the Sadducees ‘who say there is no resurrection’ (12:18; cf. Acts 23:8). The resurrection motif features not only in Jesus’ prediction of his death (8:31; 9:31; 10:34) but also in Jesus’ discussion with his disciples subsequent to the transfiguration (9:11-13). In the transfiguration, Jesus implicitly affirms the scribes’

---

930 John 17:24 poses an alternative ‘alpha boundary’, namely, ‘before the foundation of the world’ but as indicated in the beginning of this chapter, our discussion here is limited to Mark. A broader approach to Jesus’ view of time in the Gospels will have to consider John 17:24 as relevant.
931 On the question regarding the nature and position of the ‘end’ in the Jewish eschatological scheme, see Stone, Features, 83-97.
expectation of the general resurrection as the end-time event (9:12). Jesus explains the nature of resurrection existence by saying that ζησίν ὑμῖν ἀγέλατε ἐν τοῖς ουρανοῖς (12:25). On the basis of Isaiah 52-53 and Daniel 12, it has been pointed out that the general resurrection of the dead will be the ultimate realization of Israel’s hope of restoration.

7.5.3.2. Omega-Boundary Event 2: The ‘World to Come’

Related to the general resurrection of the dead as the event constituting the end in Jesus’ horizon of time conception is Jesus’ assertion about the celestial character of the resurrection existence. Jesus’ remark about the nature of resurrection existence establishes a point of contact with his teaching on the ‘world to come’. Jesus contrasts τὸν αἰώνιον τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον with ὃν τοῦ καιρού τούτου in the context of his teaching about the destiny of discipleship (10:17-31). ‘In this present world’ the disciples’ lot includes persecution alongside the manifold this-worldly benefits to be experienced by following Jesus. In the ‘world to come’, however, the disciples’ blessing is ‘eternal life’ (10:31). For Jesus, the ‘world to come’ is futuristic. The reference to the resurrection existence as angelomorphic in nature seems to correspond to ‘eternal life’ as the mode-of-being-in-the-world-to-come.

---

933 These are most likely Pharisaic scribes due to their belief in the resurrection. See Wright, Resurrection, 190-200.


935 In surveying the occurrence of the notion of the ‘age to come’ in Jewish literature, Hill and Ladd independently conclude that the earliest attestation of the notion is that found in Jesus’ teaching. See Hill, Greek Words, 187; Ladd, Jesus, 86 n. 35. Cf. Stone, Features, 47-71.

936 The term αἰῶν is probably better understood here in its spatial sense (as ‘world’. Cf. Mark 4:19//Matt 13:22) since it presupposes the future as a transformation from the present world to the resurrection order of existence (see below). While the term ‘world’ does not deny a possible temporal dimension for the ‘world to come’, it does not highlight it either. If Revelation 21:1-5 represents the believers’ experience of eternity, then it appears to be a spatial experience – an experience of being in the ‘dwelling place’ of God – rather than being in the ‘endless time’ of God. For the meanings of the term αἰὼν, see Sasse, αἰὼν( αἰῶνος, 197-209.

937 On angelomorphism, see Fletcher-Louis, ‘Revelation’, 249-54.
In the ‘Last Supper’, Jesus declares, *ouk eite ouv nth. piw ek tou/ genhnatoj thj ampel ou ejw thj hneraj ekei nthj of an autow. piw kai non e thj basileaj tou/ qeou/* (14:25). Several observations can be made here about the Kingdom of God constituting the omega-boundary of Jesus’ horizon of time conception.

Firstly, Jesus indicates that the Kingdom of God lies in the future. Whether this assumes the more immediate future or a lengthy duration of time is not absolutely clear from this passage. What is clear is that the kingdom is not yet.  

Secondly, since the Kingdom of God lies in Jesus’ future, it is identifiable with the ‘world to come’ and therefore with the end of Jesus’ horizon of time. The interchangeable usage of terms such as ‘life’, ‘eternal life’, ‘entering the Kingdom’ and ‘world to come’ in Mark (cf. 9: 45, 47; 10:23, 24, 25, 30) consolidates this observation.

Thirdly, the imagery of drinking wine anew in the kingdom presupposes the eschatological messianic banquet which is an image of the end, rendered more graphically in other parts of the New Testament (Matt 8: 11-12; 22:1-10; Luke 13:28-30; 14:12-24; 22:29-30 [cf. Matt 19:28-29]; Rev 19:5-10). In Mark, this notion is reflected in connection with the wedding feast (2:19-20) and the feeding narratives (6:33-45; 8:1-9).

---

938 This view is consistent with Mark in which sayings such as Matthew 12:28 and Luke 11:20 that identify the kingdom’s already present in Jesus’ exorcism are notably absent.

Fourthly, the connection between ‘that day’ (ἡ ἡρά] ἑκένη) and the coming kingdom has prevailed in Jewish eschatology in the idea of the day of Yahweh. The ‘day of Yahweh’ (or simply ‘that day’) sums up the great transformation, when God comes and restores his people, and assumes kingly rule over the world. On the basis of this passage (i.e. Mark 14:25), Lohmeyer distinguishes between ‘diesem eschatologischen Anfang’ in the Last Supper and ‘jenem eschatologischen Ende’ on ‘that day’ thus indicating that the kingdom, along with the general resurrection, the world to come together constitute the omega-boundary of Jesus’ horizon of time conception.

7.5.3.4. Omega-Boundary Event 4: Destruction of This Age and Its Restoration

Another passage that points to an event that constitutes the end is Jesus’ statement: Βλέπε, πείται τοις μεγαλοίς οικοδόμοι τῆς ουσίας αὐτῶν. αὐτοι δὲ τίς κατάλυσιν αὐτῶν (13:2). Caird and Hurst insist that this utterance is a prediction of the impending destruction of the Jerusalem temple by the Romans in 70 AD. This, however, is a minimalistic interpretation of it. As Pesch has pointed out, ‘Der jüdische Krieg und die Tempelzerstörung können nur die “Nähe” des Endes anzeigen, aber nicht die Endvollendung selbst’. Moreover, Weiss argues the case from the opposite direction, namely, that ‘the breakup of the old world … will bury even the temple in its ruins’. Indeed, several observations from Mark 13 and its relation to the broader context of Jewish end-time expectation indicate that the

---

940 See Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 145.
944 See Weiss, *Proclamation*, 93.
destruction Jesus is envisaging with the statement \( \text{ouvmn. } \text{at} \text{regh} \text{wde} \text{liq} \text{qei} \text{liqon} \) will be of cosmic proportions, and not simply that of the temple.

Firstly, Jesus is leaving (cf. \( \text{ekpor euomenou} \)) the temple when his disciples express their amazement at \( \text{tautaj tj negal aj oikodomaj} \). This implies that ‘these great buildings’ were in the disciples’ field of vision from the Temple Mount (13:1). The issue depends on one’s choice of reading strategy for the statement, \( \text{Kai.} \) \( \text{ekpor euomenou autou/ek tou/i} \text{erou} \) (‘As he came out of the temple’). France reads it metaphorically as echoing Yahweh’s departure from the temple as attested in Ezekiel which sanctioned the temple’s destruction. \(^{945}\) However, if this was Jesus’ declaration of a decisive break with the temple establishment then it does not account for the intention set forth in his cleansing of the temple, namely, that the temple is to function as a ‘house of prayer for all the nations’ (11:17). It has been pointed out that whereas the temple’s sacrificial function was rendered obsolete by Jesus’ death, its function as a ‘house of prayer for all the nations’ may have been preserved. \(^{946}\) Thus, an exclusively metaphorical reading of Mark 13:2 fails to do justice to the text.

On the other hand, we may take the fact that Jesus ‘was going away from’ (\( \text{ekpor euomenou} \)) the temple to imply that the temple was behind his horizon of vision. In that sense, he and his disciples were probably looking towards the geographical span of the city of Jerusalem. \(^{947}\) If the temple was the object of the disciples’

\(^{945}\) See France, \textit{Mark}, 495. See also Schweizer, \textit{Mark}, 267. For other adherents of this view, see Evans, \textit{Mark 8:27-16:20}, 297.

\(^{946}\) Cf. Sanders, \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, 76; Hengel, ‘Between Jesus and Paul’, 23-24. This seems to explain the continuing significance of the temple to early believers (e.g. Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:20, 42; 21:26; 25:8).

\(^{947}\) Evans seems to realize this point but concedes that Jesus and his disciples have already arrived at Mount Olives before the disciples’ expression of amazement was heard. See Evans, \textit{Mark 8:27-16:20}, 297. To be sure, when Jesus began the discourse in verse 3, they were already on the Mount of Olives.
admiration, it would seem more natural for their astonishment at its magnificence to have been expressed as they were approaching the temple when they first arrived in Jerusalem.⁹⁴⁸ However, if Jesus and his disciples were leaving the temple it becomes more plausible to think that they were looking towards Jerusalem. In that sense, Mark 13 is a prediction of the end of Jerusalem which of course includes the temple in its scope. Nonetheless, the emphasis does not lie on the temple per se.⁹⁴⁹

Secondly, given the eschatological significance of Jesus’ discourse in Mark 13,⁹⁵⁰ a point that is probably implied is the eschatological status of the temple Mount. The temple Mount is often referred to in the Old Testament, especially in eschatological discourse, as the highest point on the earth (e.g. Isa 2:1-4; Mic 4:1-2)⁹⁵¹ and is frequently identified with Zion and Jerusalem.⁹⁵² On that basis, the whole world is meant to be visible from Mount Zion and Mount Zion is meant to be seen in all its glory by the whole world.⁹⁵³ Bolt has pointed out that the disciple’s statement about the quality of the buildings in view seems to draw on the ‘inviolability of Zion

---

⁹⁴⁸ See Collins, ‘Eschatological Discourse’, 1126. Hooker notes this possibility but does not make much of it since she takes the ensuing discourse to be about temple destruction. See Hooker, Mark, 303.

⁹⁴⁹ It may be that ‘the temple’ is, by synecdoche, ‘Jerusalem’ given the theological freight already established by the Old Testament especially in relation to the Zion tradition. This observation finds further support in the context in which the phrase ouk altresousin 11ç f i t i v o n di, 11ç f i t i v o n en soi, appears in Luke. It occurs in the context of Jesus’ weeping over Jerusalem’s ignorance of its ‘time of visitation’ and the impending destruction that it would have to suffer in consequence (Luke 19:43-44). Gundry interprets the terms 11ç f i t i v o n and 11ç f i t i v o n en soi in the disciples’ statement of amazement to be references to dimensions of Herod’s temple. See Gundry, Mark, 735. See also Lane, Mark, 451. See further Barnett, Servant King, 248. On the Zion tradition, see Ollenburger, Zion, 15-19; Webb, ‘Zion’, 65-84.

⁹⁵⁰ The term ‘eschatological’ here implies that Jesus was speaking about the ‘end-time’.


⁹⁵² See Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 78; McKelvey, New Temple, 15; Childs, Myth, 87.

motif’. Hence, it seems plausible that when Jesus replies to his inquirers, ‘Do you see these great buildings?’ (13:2) he may have envisaged the whole world since he is speaking about τῶν τε, τῶν (13:7, 13). If the eschatological significance of the temple Mount is presupposed here, then the scope of the destruction Jesus predicted for Jerusalem most probably transcends the geographical boundaries of Jerusalem.

Several signifiers in Mark 13 support a broader-than-Jerusalem dimension of the destruction Jesus predicted: (1) The Son of Man’s coming in the clouds issued in an event that includes the totality of the cosmos, namely, the ingathering of the elect ἀπ’ ἀκρου γῆς ἐξ’ ἀκρου οὐρανοῦ (13:27); (2) The ‘rumours of war’ (13:7) and the scope of natural disasters (13:24-25) foreshadowing the end transcend the geographical boundaries of Jerusalem and envisage a wider audience witnessing the ‘signs of the end’.

Two further observations from the broader biblical framework affirm the cosmic dimension of the end Jesus predicted in Mark 13: (1) The prediction of the judgment of the world in the judgment of Israel – as Jesus does here – is a pattern already established in the prophets (e.g. Ezek 25-32; Amos 1:1-2:16); (2) If the ‘very high mountain’ of the temptation (Matt 4:8) presupposes the temple Mount then its cosmic significance as the point from which ‘all the kingdoms of the world and their splendour’ can be viewed is probably implied in the disciples’ astonishment at ‘these great buildings’ in their field of vision. In view of these considerations it seems likely that while the end of Jerusalem and the temple is envisaged in Mark 13, Jesus’ focus

954 See Bolt, ‘Narrative Integrity’, 72.
955 See Gnilka, Markus II, 200-20; Pesch, Markusevangelium II, 302; Evans, Mark 8:27-16:20, 329.
is the catastrophic end of ‘this present world’ as foreshadowed by the impending end of Jerusalem.956

Thirdly, the phrase $\text{λιθολιθοσκαθείν}$ (‘stone upon stone’) is probably a proverbial description of the building technology of the time. That stone was a foundational building material in biblical times is evident in the Old Testament (cf. 1 Kgs 6:7; Amos 5:11; cf. Deut 27:5; 2 Sam 5:11; Hag 1:4). Moreover, on the basis of Mark 12:10-11, ‘stone’ seems to be the foundational building material at least of the temple (cf. Hag 2:15). But Jesus’ statement $\text{ταύτα τά μεγαλά κόσματα}$ (13:2) in connection with $\text{λιθολιθοσκαθείν}$ may well have included all the buildings in Jerusalem.957 This is implied in one of Luke’s usage of $\text{λιθολιθοσκαθείν}$ where the reference is not only to the temple but to Jerusalem (Luke 19:44).958 This usage of the phrase to refer to all the buildings in Jerusalem implies that it may have been understood as a general reference to buildings wherever one can find them. In that sense, it seems likely that ‘stone upon stone’ is a description of ‘great buildings’ of Jerusalem representing this present world. The belief that the temple is a symbol of the ‘whole world’ is known to be in extant in the literary sources of the time.959 If this is so, then the term $\text{δε}$ (‘here’) in Jesus’ statement (13:3) should not be confined to Jerusalem and to the temple alone. Rather, its scope should include everywhere where a ‘stone upon stone’ structure may be found. The cosmic dimension of the destruction Jesus is predicting is more lucidly expressed in Matthew where Jesus’

956 Cf. Augustine, see Chapter 3.4.7 above.
957 Important buildings in Jerusalem that could have been visible to the disciples from the Temple Mount include the House of Herod Antipas, the Palace of Herod and the Palace of Pilate as well as the House of Caiaphas and the Fortress of Antonia. See Kilgallen, *Holy Land*, 164; Safrai, ‘Temple’, 865-907.
958 Luke usage of $\text{λιθολιθοσκαθείν}$ in 21:5 seems to point to the temple.
taulaj taj negal aj olkodonaj (13:2) is interpreted as taula panta (‘all these things’). Matt 24:2). That is to say, wherever there is ‘stone upon stone’ (= buildings), it will not be left here; (wale); that is, here in this present world, without being destroyed. Hence, the expression lipoj epi ligon in combination with the term kat al uqhi indicates that Jesus, in Mark 13:2, is predicting the total disintegration not only of ‘these great buildings’ within their scope of vision but of ‘all things’ in this present world.

However, if the cosmic destruction predicted in Mark 13:2 is read in the light of Jesus’ utterances about the ‘resurrection’, the ‘world to come’ and the ‘Kingdom of God’ as references to the omega-boundary of Jesus’ horizon of time conception, then the destruction in view is not terminal but transformational. It seems to function as the purifying transformation of ‘this present world’ into the resurrection order of the world to come. In other words, the end of which Jesus speaks is not the absolute dissolution of space-time. What Jesus has in view may be tantamount to a purifying judgement in which the transformation of this present world into the world to come and the resurrection order will be accomplished.

---

960] It could be argued of course that taula panta is an anaphoric refering to ‘all the buildings of the temple’ to which the disciples had drawn Jesus’ attention in Matthew 24:1. But that is less likely given that Matthew has dropped the exact wordings used in Mark - taulaj taj negal aj olkodonaj, and opted for taula panta which represents a broader concern than merely ‘all the buildings of the temple’.

961] See Hengel, Studies, 128 n. 88; Bolt, ‘Narrative Integrity’, 74.

962] See Weiss, Proclamation, 92-96; Merklein, ‘Untergang’, 349-60. Cf. Jeremias, who understands the ‘three days’ of the resurrection tradition in connection with Jesus’ mission for the restoration of Israel not to be fulfilled in the resurrection of Jesus, but rather with the parousia when the ‘house built without hands’ will be established. See Jeremias, ‘Die Drei-Tage-Worte’, 220-29. See also Meyer, ‘Jesus and His Mission’, 118.
7.5.3.5. Omega Event 5: Jesus’ Return

As to the time of the transformation from this world to the world to come, even though it is unknown, it seems to be specified by Jesus with the end (τοῦ ἐπιστήμου, οὗ καίρος ἐστὶν) [περὶ οὗ κυρίῳ θύ ό Και χὰ ἔρεται (13:32, 35) or what has come to be known as Jesus’ parousia. In recent scholarship there appears a tendency not to see an anticipation of the parousia in Jesus. Wright and France are two eminent scholars often identified with the non-parousia interpretation of Mark 13. While Wright denies Jesus any concern for the parousia, France, however, observes a change of direction in the narrative structure of Mark 13 beginning in verse 32. On that basis, France argues that whereas passages such as Mark 8:38; 13:24-27; 14:62 (traditionally put forward as references to the parousia) do not refer to the parousia, Jesus’ return is anticipated in Mark 13:32-37. We shall evaluate the Wright-France position below, but France’s view regarding the parousia seems to find support in the evidence. It makes sense of Matthew’s version of the discourse in Mark 13 where the disciples’ question which introduces it refers to the parousia and the suntelēa tou' aiwhoj (Matt 24:3). The main difficulty with attempting to establish the parousia on the basis of Mark 8:38; 13:24-27 and 14:62, is that, in context, these passages speak of an event that would occur during Jesus’ generation (9:1; 13:30; 14:62). Even 13:24-27, as we shall see below, by no means refer to

---

963 The appearance of οὗ καίρος here cannot assume the same meaning that we have argued for its usage in Mark 1:15 [see Chapter 4] since in context, οὗ καίρος in Mark 13:32 is clearly defined as the ‘the time... when the Lord of the house comes’. Such identification is absent in Mark 1:15.

964 See Bolt, Cross, 95-97; idem, Defeat, 254-68; Carroll, ‘Parousia, 5-45; Marshall, ‘Parousia’, 194-211. Perhaps the most thorough treatment of this topic is that by Moore, Parousia, 175-256.


966 See Wright, Jesus, 339-66.

967 See France, Mark, 504, 541-43.

968 See the response to Wright and France in Adams, ‘Coming’, 48-60.

969 See France, Mark, 541-46. See also Cranfield, Mark, 410-11; Contra Lightfoot, ‘Connexion’, 50-54.

970 Even Adams’ arguments in the ‘Coming of the Son of Man’ are marred by the lack of attempt to put these passages in their immediate context.
temple destruction.\(^{971}\) This event is not the end (τοῦ τέλους)\(^{972}\) but the crucial sign that the end is ‘near at the very gate’ (13:29). Rather, the end corresponds to πότε ο’ καιρός εστίν which corresponds to πότε ο’ Κυρίος θύει ωκεν ἐκεῖ, in the parable in Mark 13:34-37.

7.5.4. Summary

In summary, in accordance with the definition of ‘horizon’ set forth in the beginning of this chapter as including the ‘boundaries of one’s field of vision’, and of all that one knows and cares about, we have observed that the alpha-boundary of Jesus’ horizon of time is creation. On the other hand, the omega-boundary of his horizon of time conception is the end (τοῦ τέλους) which Jesus predicted in Mark 13. The end entails a purifying judgment in which the present order of creation will be transformed to the resurrection order of the world to come when Jesus returns. In the resurrection order, God’s people will be transformed to the glorious likeness of celestial beings, albeit in bodily form, as they receive eternal life. Moreover, it is in the world to come that Jesus will drink wine anew in the Kingdom of God.\(^{973}\)

7.6. Events that Constitute the ‘Inside Phases’ of the Horizon of Jesus’ View of Time

Having determined the alpha (ἀρχή) and the omega (τέλος)\(^{974}\) boundaries of Jesus horizon of time, we shall turn now to consider the distinctive inside phases between

---


\(^{972}\) See Bolt, *Cross*, 96-97.

\(^{973}\) In a survey of the ‘telos conception’ among Greek philosophers, Delling finds that the ‘end’ is derived from the observation of the end of natural processes. In striking contrast, the δόξα γεωργίας is the goal of God’s salvation activity in the New Testament. See Delling, ‘Telos-Aussagen’, 26, 31.

\(^{974}\) The term τέλος is employed in this study to indicate that the ‘end’ in view, in line with Jesus’ prediction in Mark 13:7, 13 (cf. 3:26), involves the transformation of ‘this present world’ to the ‘world to come’. Interestingly, the disciples’ question that leads to Jesus’ response in Mark 13 5-27 is expressed in Matthew as an inquiry regarding ο ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος παρασκευαστήκατε καὶ συντελεῖτε τοῦ
these two boundaries. As indicated at the outset of this chapter, by ‘inside phases’ we are envisaging consecutively arranged ‘dynamic situations’, extended in time within the boundaries of Jesus’ horizon of time just delineated.975

7.6.1. ‘Inside Phase’ Event 1: Son of Man Coming in the Clouds

A convenient way of getting into this discussion is Jesus’ prediction of the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds (8:38; 13:26; 14:62) since it tends to connect the beginning of the fulfilment of time in Jesus’ coming from Nazareth (1:9) with the end (το τέλος) which he predicted in Mark 13. Two important questions specifically relate to this issue in New Testament scholarship: (1) Who is the Son of Man? (2) When is he coming in the clouds? Weiss976 and Bultmann977 have maintained that during his earthly career, Jesus did not see himself as the Son of Man but that he would become the Son of Man when the kingdom comes.978 But as has been rightly pointed out by Marshall, ‘there is no evidence that Jesus expected the coming of some Messianic figure other than himself’.979

---

aiwhaj (Matt 24:3). If this is the earliest interpretation of τέλος then it fits neatly with Mark’s account. Notably, Jesus does not use the term σταυρον when speaking about the ‘end’ in the Gospels. 975 See Comrie, Aspect, 49. For an attempt at determining the chronology of Jesus’ life, see Meier, Marginal Jew I, 372-409. 976 See Weiss, Proclamation, 82, 114-29. Cf. Schweitzer, Kingdom of God, 106. 977 See Bultmann, Theology, I: 33; idem, Synoptic Tradition, 151-52. Cf. those who maintained a distinction between Jesus and the Son of Man in the Gospel tradition. See Tödt, Son of Man, 185-209; Collins, ‘Origin’, 391-407; idem, ‘Influence of Daniel’, 92; Fuchs, ‘Zeitverständnis Jesu’, 367. 978 See also Tödt, Son of Man, 310-11; Fuller, Foundations, 34-43; Hahn, Titles. 979 See Marshall, Origin, 73. For the scholarly debate, see Donahue, ‘Recent Studies’, 485. Dodd, moreover, affirms that Jesus’ identification with the Son of Man ‘belongs to an extremely early stage of the tradition’. See Dodd, Parables, 89.
7.6.1.1. Jesus’ Usage of the Son of Man Title

On the meaning of the title Son of Man, it is beyond the scope of the present study to enter the massive literature dealing with this issue.\(^{980}\) Our starting point in this discussion, rather, is the observation that Jesus’ self-identification with the Son of Man arises from his adopting of the vision of Daniel 7:13-14\(^{981}\) – a view that is now widely accepted.\(^{982}\) Moreover, we concur with Manson\(^{983}\) and Kim\(^{984}\) in the view that the figure of the Son of Man in Daniel 7, based on its identification with the ‘saints’, implies Jesus’ solidarity with his people, God’s end-time people (cf. Dan 7:13; Ps 80:17). Admittedly, this position does not account for all occurrences of the ‘Son of Man’ title in the Gospels. Nevertheless, it is consistent with the observation that most of the Son of Man sayings in Mark place emphasis in Jesus’ representative suffering and death (8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33-34, 45; 14:21a, 21b, 41).\(^{985}\) Jesus of course shows


\(^{981}\) The background in Daniel 7:13-14 does seem to capture all the usages of the Son of Man title by Jesus in Mark. Notably, the Daniel 7 Son of Man figure is a glorious figure who reigns over the world. To be sure, Jesus’ usage of the Son of Man in Mark features this glorious dimension of the title (8:38; 13:27; 14:62). More prominently, Jesus uses the Son of Man title in relation to his suffering (8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14:41). But even this later component (i.e. suffering) seems presupposed in Daniel 7:9-12 in the judgment of the ‘beasts’ and the removal of their dominion and moreover in the suffering of the ‘saints’ (Dan 7:21-22). The exception seems to be Jesus’ usage of the title in relation to his authority to forgive sins (2:10).

\(^{982}\) See Evans, ‘Defeating Satan’, 161 and the literature cited therein.

\(^{983}\) See Manson, *Teaching*, 311-36; *idem, Son of Man*, 123-45. A concise summary of Manson’s position can be found in Higgins, ‘Son of Man’, 120-21. Vermes, though insisting that the title is a circumlocution, nonetheless views its usage in Daniel 7 as a collective reference to the saints of the Most High, the historical Israel. See Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 169-70. Cf. Casey, *Son of Man*, 24-25; Hooker, *Son of Man*, 11-30; Rowe, ‘“Son of Man”’, 92-93.

\(^{984}\) See Kim, ‘Son of Man’, 72-73. Although Kim is aware of the basic similarities between his view and that of Manson, he distances himself from Manson in the latter’s failure to see the vicarious significance of Jesus’ identification with God’s remnant. See Kim, ‘Son of Man’, 99 n. 1.

\(^{985}\) The title ‘Son of Man’ appears about fourteen times in Mark and most of them occur in the second half of the Gospel (i.e. 8:27 onwards). Eight of these sayings (8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14:21a, 21b; 14:41) are related directly to the suffering of the ‘Son of Man’. See Guelich, ‘The “Christ”’, 8. *Contra Burkett, Son of Man*, 49. Cf. Meyer, ‘Orientations’, 12; Dalman, *Words*, 135-39.
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awareness that the ‘one like a Son of Man’ in Daniel 7 denotes one who must triumph and be revered (10:45). But he wishes to teach ‘a different view of the Son of Man from that which was at the time commonly accepted: not, as you might think, or do think, to be served, but to serve’. For Jesus, the Son of Man’s service is that of suffering on behalf of the ‘many’ (10:45; 9:12; 14:21). Thus, in Jesus, the ‘Son of Man’, is ‘the representative of God’s eschatological people, [and] the Son of God who represents the sons of God’.  

7.6.1.2. Jesus as the Representative Son of Man

As the Son of Man, therefore, Jesus corporately represents the ‘elect’ he gathered around himself as his followers (Mark 1:16-20; 3:13-19). By following Jesus, they constitute his ‘family’ (3:34-35). In that corporate manner, they establish the Kingdom of God’s realm as a people-space. Interestingly, the theme of participating in God’s family through Jesus is tied to being incorporated into God’s temple in the Petrine tradition that supposedly underlies Mark (1 Pet 2:4-5; cf. Eph 2:19-20). Consequently, it has been pointed out that the usage of the titles ‘Son of Man’...
God’ and ‘Son of David’ in Mark has to do with Jesus’ mission for temple restoration (cf. 1 Chr 17:12; Zec 6:12; Exod 15:17).  

On this basis, Beale maintains that Jesus and his disciples constitute the ‘beginning form’ of God’s end-time temple. In that sense, the incorporation of Jesus’ people to himself may be conceivable in spatial terms. The incorporation of believers into Jesus implies that the identity of the disciples is absorbed in Jesus’ identity in such a way that Jesus is welcomed if his followers are welcomed and rejected in their rejection (cf. 8:38; 9:40-41). It is a relationship that could be envisaged as one in which Jesus’ story graciously includes that of his people. Thus, on the basis of its background in Daniel 7, Jesus as the Son of Man identifies himself with his people and incorporates them to him through discipleship.

7.6.1.3. The Son of Man’s Coming in the Clouds: Some Scholarly Discussions

In relation to the issue of when the Son of Man comes in the clouds, its intrinsic connection with Jesus predicted in Mark 13 and its significance for identifying the inside phases of the horizon of Jesus’ conception of time calls for special consideration. Traditionally, the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds is

---


993 See Meyer, ‘Orientation’, 12; idem, ‘Temple’, 217-19; Clowney, ‘Final Temple’, 171; Edwards, ‘Jesus and the Temple’, 204-7. In a survey of statements about temple builders in the Ancient Near East in comparison with the biblical data, Hurowitz concludes: ‘All passages mentioned here [i.e. about temple builders in the Ancient Near Eastern traditions] express the expectation that the person called upon to build a temple for his god will place the needs of the deity above his own personal comfort, and will spare no effort until the construction of the divine residence is completed’. See Hurowitz, ‘Appendix 2’, 325.

994 See Bauckham, ‘Future of Jesus Christ’, 214. This is a sound corrective for Rowe’s supposition that as representative figure, the Danielic ‘Son of Man’ cannot be messianic. See Rowe, “Son of Man”, 92-93. Kim and Bauckham have shown that it can. See Kim, ‘Son of Man’, 72-73.

995 For a critical reconstruction of the ‘Son of Man’ title, see Perrin, Modern Pilgrimage, 23-40; idem, Rediscovering, 164-73. For a critical appreciation of Perrin, see Collins, ‘Influence of Daniel’, 92-93.
understood to be a reference to the return of Jesus.\footnote{See Lane, \textit{Mark}, 476; Wenham, ‘This Generation’, 127-28. Cf. Weiss, \textit{Proclamation}, 84-92; Cullmann, \textit{Salvation}, 147 n. 1; Pesch, \textit{Markusevangelium II}: 303-304; Lohmeyer, \textit{Markus}, 279; Caroll, ‘Parousia’, 5-45; Marshall, ‘Parousia’, 194-211; Adams, ‘Coming’, 39-61; Bock, ‘Trial and Death’, 123} Cullmann, for instance, insisted that as soon as the Son of Man figure is identified with Jesus of Nazareth or even if Jesus identified himself with the Son of Man then his eschatological coming becomes a coming \textit{to the earth}.\footnote{See Cullmann, \textit{Salvation}, 225-26; \textit{idem}, ‘Die Hoffnung’, 378-402.} The most pressing problem with this interpretation, as we have indicated above, is that Mark 13:30 specifies that the coming of the Son of Man would take place in the lifetime of Jesus’ contemporaries.\footnote{See Bolt, \textit{Cross}, 95.} Despite this problem, the view that Mark 13:24-27 points to the return of Jesus is still represented among present-day commentators.\footnote{See for example, Beasley-Murray, \textit{Jesus and the Last Days}, 430; Bock, \textit{Jesus}, 345-46; Benedict XVI, \textit{Jesus}, 327-28; Collins, \textit{Mark}, 615.}\footnote{See Bolt, \textit{Cross}, 94-95, n. 19. Bolt helpfully documented this view from Hippolytus’ \textit{Commentary on Daniel} 4.11 down to John Calvin.}\footnote{See France, \textit{Jesus and the Old Testament}, 139-48; \textit{idem}, \textit{Mark}, 503. The Son of Man’s coming in the clouds as ‘transportation from earth to heaven’ has been traced to the ante-Nicene Fathers. See Bolt, \textit{Cross}, 94-95 n. 19; Glasson, \textit{Second Advent}, 4-7, 61 and J. Munk, [‘La Vocation de l’Apôtre Paul’ \textit{Studia Theologica} 1, 1-2 (1947): 147ff]; cited in Manson, ‘Son of Man’, 126. It seems that the earliest interpretation of Daniel 7 in relation to the ‘Son of Man’ coming in the clouds is attested in John 6:62. See Collins, ‘Influence of Daniel’, 101. See also Robinson, \textit{Jesus and His Coming}, 44-45, 168.}

More recently, however, many have reasserted a view maintained by interpreters stretching from the church fathers who regarded Jesus’ coming in the clouds in relation to Daniel 7:13-14 as being fulfilled in his exaltation to heaven.\footnote{See Bolt, \textit{Cross}, 94-95 n. 19. Bolt helpfully documented this view from Hippolytus’ \textit{Commentary on Daniel} 4.11 down to John Calvin.} This view is advocated for example by France who, from an extensive survey of Jewish literature and their usage of Daniel 7, concludes that the Son of Man’s coming upon the clouds does not primarily refer to a coming towards the earth but rather a coming \textit{towards the heavens} to the ‘Ancient of Days’ to be made the eternal ruler of the nations.\footnote{See France, \textit{Jesus and the Old Testament}, 139-48; \textit{idem}, \textit{Mark}, 503. The Son of Man’s coming in the clouds as ‘transportation from earth to heaven’ has been traced to the ante-Nicene Fathers. See Bolt, \textit{Cross}, 94-95 n. 19; Glasson, \textit{Second Advent}, 4-7, 61 and J. Munk, [‘La Vocation de l’Apôtre Paul’ \textit{Studia Theologica} 1, 1-2 (1947): 147ff]; cited in Manson, ‘Son of Man’, 126. It seems that the earliest interpretation of Daniel 7 in relation to the ‘Son of Man’ coming in the clouds is attested in John 6:62. See Collins, ‘Influence of Daniel’, 101. See also Robinson, \textit{Jesus and His Coming}, 44-45, 168.} This observation seems most likely to fit in with the immediate context of the Son of Man sayings in Mark 13 where Jesus affirms that the Son of Man’s
advent in the clouds is to occur during his generation’s life time (13:30; cf. 9:1; 14:62). Arguably, all of Mark’s references to the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds should be understood in terms of Jesus’ exaltation to heaven (8:38; 13:26; 14:62). However, to indicate that the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds is fulfilled in Jesus’ exaltation begs the question as to what event constitutes the exaltation of Jesus. France and Wright have argued that Jesus was pointing to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple by the Romans in 70 AD. The cogency of their argument seems to depend on two assumptions: (1) The conviction that the Synoptic Gospels should be read in the light of the Jewish War of 66-70 AD; (2) The view that the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds is coterminous with the event that Jesus predicted in Mark 13.

Concerning the view that the Gospels, and more specifically Mark 13, contains prophecies regarding the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, Reicke and Gaston have shown that none of Jesus’ prophecies closely corresponds to what is known about the Jewish war and the destruction of Jerusalem. More importantly, the

1002 See Bolt, Cross, 95 n. 21. Even those who distinguish between these sayings (i.e. 8:38; 13:26; 14:62) do acknowledge that the same details are implied in them all and could thus point to one and the same event. See, for instance, Collins, Mark, 615. Cf. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Last Days, 427-29.

1003 See Wright, Jesus, 343-46, 360-65; France, Mark, 533. Cf. Hatina, ‘Focus of Mark 13:24-27’, 63-64. This view has a long history even though it has never been more than a minority opinion. See Adams, ‘Coming’, 40 n. 9. See also Mann, Mark, 528; Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 81; idem, Studies, 139-54; Caird, Jesus, 20-22.


1005 Cf. Wenham, ‘This Generation’, 127-28. Even though France agrees with Wright that the destruction of Jerusalem is in view in Jesus’ Mark 13 discourse, he maintains that the parousia is implicated from verse 32 onwards. See France, Mark, 501-3; idem, Divine Government, 73-82. Wright on the other hand, denies any such reference to the parousia in Mark 13. See Wright, Jesus, 341-42.

1006 See Reicke, ‘Synoptic Prophecies’, 121-34; Gaston, ‘Theology of the Temple’, 40. The most consistent critique of Wright on this point comes from Allison, ‘Jesus and the Victory’, 126-41. See also Evans, Mark 8:27-16:20, 289-92, 316-17; Gundry, Mark, 750-85; Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Last Days, 407-408; Hengel, Studies, 16-20; Pitre, Jesus, 294-301.
view that the destruction of the Jerusalem temple is supposed to have been predicted by Jesus seems to be maintained in New Testament tradition as a statement of ‘false witnesses’ about Jesus (Mark 14:58; 15:29; Acts 6:14). The one passage in which an explicit prediction of the destruction of the temple by Jesus is to be found is in John 2:19 but this, as we have maintained, is a reference to the destruction of Jesus’ temple-body, and not the Jerusalem temple (John 2:21). Even Mark 13:1-2 cannot primarily be taken as prediction of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple since, as we have argued, Jesus is more likely to be envisaging the destruction of the cosmic order as foreshadowed by the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple (cf. 2 Bar 32:1-7). This is not to deny that the temple may be in view, since the destruction of Jerusalem involves the temple – but to confine the meaning of Jesus’ statement in Mark 13:2 to the destruction of the temple introduces the problem of attaching greater theological significance to an event in Jewish political history rather than to Jesus’ death and resurrection.1007

On the view that the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds is coterminous with the end of the world, we have seen that τὸ τῆς οἳδος Jesus had in view is not the absolute dissolution of the spatio-temporal order but is more analogous to a purifying transformation of this present world into the world to come when Jesus returns (cf. 1 En. 80:2-8; 72:1).1008

The identification of the coming of the Son of Man with the τῆς οἳδος in Mark 13 appears to be predicated on the interpretation of the term ταύτα γίνομενα (‘these things’) in 13:29 and ταύτα πάντα in 13:30. The issue here can be stated as follows:

1007 See Bolt, Cross, 96.
1008 Cf. Wright, Jesus, 342-43, 363-64.
Does the *tautā panta* in 13:30 refer only to the events of verses 24 to 27, and is the verse saying the same sort of things as 9:1? Or is the *tautā panta* of verse 30 the same as the *tautā ginōmena* in verse 29, with both referring to the events described from verse 5 through to 27?  

Wright and France read the *tautā* in these verses as reference to events constituting ‘the days of distress’ (*ai’mēra kēnai qiyyj*) which Jesus predicted would immediately precede the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds (13:5-23). The phrase *eunēv kēnai taisei* (*in those days*) in 13:24, according to this view, functions as a discourse marker indicating the beginning of a new temporal phase in Jesus’ ministry foretold by the natural signs (v.24b-25) during the ‘days of distress’. The occurrence of another chronological marker in 13:26 (*kai.tote*) can then be taken either to be referring to the ‘in those days’ of 13:24 or to the beginning of a new temporal phase with the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds (13:26).

Wright and France refer to the new beginning in verses 24-25 as the beginning of the end which is actualized in verse 26 when the Son of Man appears in the clouds. However, the *tēqi* predicted by Jesus, according to their view, is the end of the religious order represented by the Jerusalem temple. Their argument is cogent insofar as it distinguishes the ‘days of distress’ and the ‘coming of the Son of Man’ as sequentially arranged events. Where it seems to go astray is in its identification of

---

1011 See Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 18.
the coming of the Son of Man with the end of the temple and Jerusalem. To be sure, the proposal that the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds will occur in the destruction of the Jerusalem temple tends to validate Jesus’ claim that the event of his coming will occur in his generation (13:30). However, as we have shown, there seems to be little evidence in Mark 13 that the destruction of the temple is the ultimate focus of the entire discourse.

An alternative reading can, however, be based on taking the term ταῦτα γινομένα (‘these things’) in verse 29 and ταῦτα πάντα (‘all these things’) in verse 30 to be references to both the ‘days of distress’ (13:5-23) and subsequently the events that include the Son of Man’ coming in the clouds (13:24-27). In that sense, the ταῦτα in verse 29 is anticipated by the εἴρηται ἡμέραι of verse 24. Moreover, the εἴρηται ἡμέραι in verse 24 appear to hark back to the εἴρηται ἡμέραι of verse 17 which includes both the ‘days of distress’ (v. 19) and the duration after ‘that distress’ (v. 24) during which the Son of Man appears in the clouds. Consequently, the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds is not τὸ τέλος but the decisive element of ταῦτα πάντα that foreshadows the imminence of the τέλος. That is to say, the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds corresponds to the ‘lesson from the fig tree’ indicating that ‘summer is near’ (13:28). The τέλος therefore corresponds to the arrival of summer.

1014 For Wright, this is what is implied in Jesus’ prediction that ‘these things’ will happen ‘within a generation’. See Wright, Jesus, 362.
It is the Son of Man’s exaltation in the clouds that heightens the expectation of the nearness of the end (Mark 13:29). It indicates that essentially the end ‘is near at the very gates’. This interpretation finds support in the parable of the doorkeeper. When the Son of Man is exalted in the cloud, then it indicates that it is ‘the moment for [believers] to wake from sleep since salvation is nearer to us now’ (Mark 13:33-37 cf. Rom 13:11). Hence, the taula of verse 29 and the taula panta of verse 30 encompass the series of events from verse 5 through to verse 27.

Augustine confirmed this reading from Matthew 24:33. He viewed the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds in terms of the church’s mission:

[The Son of Man will be seen coming, and he will send his angels, and from the four corners of the world, that is, from the whole world, he will gather his chosen ones. He does this in the whole last hour, coming in his members as if on the clouds, or in the whole Church which is his body, as if on a great cloud bearing fruit and increasing in the whole world, from the time he began to preach and say, Repent; for the kingdom of heavens has drawn near.]

Augustine rightly underscores the relevance of verse 26 for understanding verse 27. Immediately after (καὶ τοῦ) the enthronement of the Son of Man as the ruler of nations, he shall commission his messengers for the ingathering of the elect from the nations. In that sense, his coming in the clouds not only signifies that the end is ‘near at the very gates’ but also that the ingathering of the elect from all over the world is to begin. This ingathering of the elect alludes to the motif of the gathering of all the exiles of Israel from the ‘four winds, from (one) end of the world to the other’ (cf. Isa

---

1016 For France and Wright, the budding of the fig tree is fulfilled in the destruction of the temple. See France, Mark, 537; Wright, Jesus, 364.

1017 See Augustine, Letters 136-210, 199.45. Cf. idem, City of God 20.9.
It corresponds to the worldwide evangelization that Jesus predicted in 13:10 (cf. 14:9).

7.6.1.4. The Son of Man’s Coming in the Clouds: Jesus’ Exaltation Upon the Cross

Having shown that the Son of Man’s exaltation in the clouds does not correspond to the parousia or the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, we wish to propose that insofar as the evidence goes in Mark, the crucifixion is the point at which Jesus’ exaltation in the clouds (13:26-27) is realized (15:37-38; cf. 14:62). Several observations from the immediate literary context of Mark 13 lend support to Jesus’ death as his coming in the clouds (8:38; 13:26; 14:62).

Firstly, Mark is careful to indicate that the ‘chief priests along with the scribes’ (15:31) were amongst those witnessing the death of Jesus and thereby fulfilling Jesus’ prediction that they ‘shall see’ (cf. ὄψεσθε) his ‘coming with the clouds of heaven’ (14:62). Secondly, the centurion’s confession of Jesus’ sonship (15:39) echoes the declaration in the enthronement of God’s king in Psalm 2:7 and affirms what ‘no human has been able to confess but what the Father has already announced;

---

1018 See Collins, Mark, 615; Stone, Features, 387, 404.
namely, Jesus is God’s Son, the messianic king'.

Thirdly, in Mark there are notably no resurrection appearances of Jesus as in Matthew and Luke. The evidence to the resurrection in Mark is simply an empty tomb (16:6).

As far as Mark is concerned, the last time for Jesus to be seen in bodily form is on the cross. Hence, insofar as the evidence is drawn particularly from Mark, the resurrection of Jesus appears to function as the confirmation of Jesus’ exaltation upon the cross.

If therefore the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds according to Mark 13:27 happens upon the cross, then one expects that the series of events Jesus predicted in Mark 13 should correspond in some way to other events leading up to Jesus’ death.

From Mark 13:5-27, three main events are discernible leading up to the Son of Man’s coming in the clouds. The first is the ‘beginning of the birth pains’ (5b-13). This seems to be fulfilled in the ‘hour’ of Jesus’ arrest (14:41; cf. 13:32). The second event is the suffering (vv. 14-23) which begins with the setting up of the ‘desolating sacrilege’ (v. 14). In the passion narrative, this appears to correspond to the ‘many things’ Jesus suffered in his trial and eventually his crucifixion (15:16-24; cf. 8:31).

What else could be a greater act of sacrilege than the destruction of God’s Son in such a horrendous way? The third event occurs when ‘darkness came over the land’ during Jesus’ crucifixion (15:33) thus fulfilling the prediction about the darkening of the sun and the moon in 13:24-25.

---

1021 See Matera, *Kingship of Jesus*, 144.
1023 See Bolt, *Cross*, 96.
1024 Cf. Bolt, *Cross*, 101. Most commentators have tried to explain the ‘desolate sacrilege’ with events from Mark’s historical context but thus far, no satisfying interpretation has emerged. See Collins, ‘Eschatological Discourse’, 1134-36 and Bolt, *Cross*, 100 n. 36 for representative survey of opinions. For an extensive study of the meaning of to ἔβολε τὴν ἱδρυμανασσάω, see Ford, *Abomination*, 163.
Consequently, the death of Jesus corresponds to the Son of Man coming in the clouds (13:26; 15:37). In connection with Mark 13:28-30, the death of Jesus as his exaltation in the clouds is not the end of the world but the crucial sign that the end is near ‘at the very gates’ (13:28-29). Thus, 13:32-37 sequentially follows with the certainty of Jesus’ return as o’kurij th’olij and the uncertainty of its timing. \(^{1026}\)

Thus far, we have isolated creation as the omega-boundary of Jesus’ horizon of time view and his exaltation in the clouds upon the cross as signifying that the end, the omega-boundary of his horizon of time conception, is ‘near at the gates’.

7.6.2. ‘Inside Phase’ Event 2: Elijah Must Come First

The second event worthy of our consideration for determining the inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time conception is Jesus’ indication that the expectation of the ‘Elijah to come first’, before the general resurrection, has indeed been fulfilled by John the Baptist. The ‘Elijah to come’ is mentioned in Mark immediately after the Transfiguration (9:2-13) when Jesus speaks of his resurrection from the dead (9:9).

---

\(^{1026}\) This interpretation makes better sense of Matthew’s version of Jesus’ discourse in Mark 13 in which the question that initiates Jesus’ discourse is about the sign of the parousia and the end of the age (Matt 24:3).
The resurrection motif provokes his disciples’ inquiry about the scribes’ teaching that ‘Elijah must come first’ to restore all things before the general resurrection (9:10).\(^{1027}\) Jesus affirms that indeed ‘Elijah’ has come for the ‘restoration of all things’ but has suffered in accordance with the Scriptures (9:13).\(^{1028}\) Although John the Baptist did not seem to be conscious of it (John 1:21),\(^{1029}\) Jesus identified him with ‘Elijah’ (cf. Matt 11:14; 17:12-13).\(^{1030}\)

The disciples’ inquiry implies that the scribes espoused a timetable of end-time events leading up finally to the resurrection of the dead on the last day (cf. John 11:24).\(^{1031}\) According to that timetable, before the general resurrection of the dead ‘Elijah must come first’ for the restoration of all things (Mark 9:11-12).\(^{1032}\) This is probably an allusion to Malachi 4:6 (cf. Sir. 49:10) in which Elijah’s mission is to effect a heart-turning experience amongst God’s people. Jesus realizes this mission in John’s preaching of repentance.\(^{1033}\)

As their conversation unfolds, Jesus introduces an essential modification to the established sequence of end-time events advocated by the scribal tradition. He intimately connects the advent of Elijah with the coming of the Son of Man whose

\(^{1027}\) On the Rabbinic tradition that underlies this scribal conviction, see Clark, ‘Elijah’, 124-88; 231-32.

\(^{1028}\) The tradition concerning the expectation of Elijah to come first can be traced to the second century B. C. See Meyer, “‘Elia’”, 356-68; Clark, ‘Elijah’, 124-65; Alexander, ‘Targum’, 320-31. This observation is acceptable only if the evidence in Malachi 4:4-6 is excluded.

\(^{1029}\) On the possible interpretation of this passage, see Martyn, ‘Elijah’, 184-87.


\(^{1032}\) See Collins, Mark, 429.

\(^{1033}\) See Lohmeyer, Markus, 182; France, Mark, 359.
scripturally determined destiny is to ‘go through many sufferings and be treated with contempt’ (9:12). The confirmation that Elijah suffered a destiny foreordained by the Scriptures is probably a pointer to the unfolding of God’s plan both in the destiny of the Elijah to come and moreover in that of the Son of Man. Interestingly, Jesus introduces the Son of Man’s coming to suffer and to be vindicated as an event between the advent of Elijah and the general resurrection on the last day. In so doing, he effectively distinguishes between the Son of Man’s coming to suffer and the ingathering of the elect to the enthroned Son of Man as two distinct but mutually inclusive inside phases of his horizon of time. These two phases relate in that the Son of Man’s coming to suffer anticipates the Son of Man’s coming in glory and the latter presupposes the former.

7.6.3. The Inside Phases of Jesus’ Horizon of Time: A Summary

Let us summarize our findings thus far. We have obtained five consecutive inside phases comprising the horizon of Jesus’ time conception:

---

1034 For the expectation of the Elijah to come as a messianic forerunner, see Allison, ‘Elijah’, 256-58; Marcus, ‘Mark 9, 11-13’, 42 n. 2. Contra Faierstein, ‘Why Do the Scribes’, 75-86; Fitzmeyer, ‘More About Elijah’, 295-96, who maintain that such a connection can hardly be grounded on first century Jewish sources. We basically agree with Marcus that the structure of Καὶ πρὶν γραφῆται suggests ‘a contrast between the scripturally-based expectation that the returning Elijah will restore all things (9:12a) and the scripturally-based expectation that the Son of Man will suffer many things and be rejected (9:12b). See Marcus, ‘Mark 9, 11-13’, 46-47. However, the expectation of the Son of Man to come and suffer after the advent of the Elijah to come seems to constitute Jesus’ distinctive contribution to his Jewish contemporaries’ end-time expectations. See France, Mark, 358. That is, the disciples seem to concur with the scribes’ teaching that Elijah must ‘come first’ before the resurrection of the dead. In that sense, the ‘day of the Lord’, closely associated with the Elijah to come expectation in Malachi 3:22-23 (LXX) has been interpreted by the tradition the disciples received as the resurrection of the righteous (1 En. 22:13). See Collins, Mark, 429.

1035 See Marcus, ‘Mark 9, 11-13’, 46-47.

1036 See Robinson, Jesus and His Coming, 81. On Jesus’ usage of the ‘Son of Man’ title for both his earthly ministry and future parousia, see Marshall, ‘Synoptic Son of Man’, 335-51; idem, ‘Son of Man’, 775-81.

The first phase is the beginning in creation (P1). This phase, according to Mark, spans until the advent of Elijah who must come first to restore all things before the general resurrection (Mark 9:12). In this connection, creation foreshadows the restoration of Israel. In a broader biblical-theological framework, the Fall, and the Exile amongst many other important biblical events would be included in this phase. However, it is difficult to find any explicit reference to these events in Mark. Jesus seems to presuppose the Fall when he diagnosed the human heart as the source of evil intentions (Mark 7:21) and even in declaring the forgiveness of sins (Mark 2:5) but the connection is nowhere explicitly made in Mark. Even the presence of ‘Satan’, the ‘strong man’ whom Jesus identified as the enemy of God’s people (Mark 3:26) can be traced to the failure of Israel’s kingship to live according to God’s covenant. For, when King Solomon wholeheartedly followed the Lord, there was ‘no Satan’ in Israel (1 Kgs 5:18; LXX, MT). But when he turned after other gods, the Lord ‘raised up Satan’ (1 Kgs 11:14; LXX, MT). In that connection, restoration appears to have been promised in

---

1038 Admittedly, the expectation of the ‘coming kingdom of our father David’ in Mark 11:10 seems also to imply that Jesus’ audience may have entertained such a hope.
1039 The reason for Jesus’ death according to Mark is discussed in relation to the need for Israel’s restoration in sections 7.8.2.1-3 below.
the covenant with day and night in creation because God’s plan is to create a man in his own image who will rule the world and through whom godly offsprings are produced who will serve him in his kingdom (cf. Gen 1:28-31; 2:24-25; Mal 2:14-15; Rev 7:15). In creation, therefore, not only time is created in terms of day and night (Gen 1:3-5) but also ‘appointed times’ for worship are to be determined under the dominion of the sun and moon (Gen 1:14).

- The second phase therefore consists of the coming of Elijah for the restoration of all things (P2) which is fulfilled, according to Jesus, in the ministry of John the Baptist.\textsuperscript{1040}

- The third phase consists of Jesus’ earthly ministry as the Son of Man coming to suffer, die and to rise from the dead (P3). This phase begins with Jesus’ coming from Nazareth (1:9) and encompasses the earthly ministry of Jesus culminating in his exaltation in the clouds to the ‘right hand of the Mighty One’ upon the cross (14:62).\textsuperscript{1041} It inaugurates the restoration of Israel with the gathering of the Twelve from Israel.

- The fourth phase (P4) begins with the Son of Man’s resurrection as the confirmation of Jesus’ exaltation in his death and thus extended the restoration of Israel with the ingathering of the elect ‘from the four winds’

\textsuperscript{1040} Öhler thinks that the ‘restoration of all things’ is an expansion of Elijah’s work as attested in Malachi 3:24 and Sirach 48:10: ‘The\textsuperscript{pantà} in Jesus’ answer is combining the inner restitution from Mal 3:24 and the restitution of Israel from Sir 48:10’. See Öhler, ‘Expectation’, 465 n. 15.

\textsuperscript{1041} See Marcus, ‘Crucifixion’, 73-87; Vielhauer, ‘Erwängungen’, 167-68.
The Son of Man’s exaltation in the clouds indicates the closer than usual position of the **τέλος**. It signals that the gospel must be preached to all nations for the ingathering of the elect under the reigning Son of Man-Son of God, before **το τέλος** (13:10; 14:9).

- **τέλος** of the horizon of Jesus’ view of time remains in the future as the fifth and final phase (P5). It consists, as we have seen, of the destruction of ‘stone upon stone’ structures of this present world in the resurrection when Jesus returns. Even though graphic depictions of the Day of Judgment are not clearly tied to Jesus’ return in Mark as in Matthew, Jesus’ earthly ministry may be viewed in terms of the day of the Lord’s judgment. According to Malachi 3:22-23 (LXX), the day of the Lord is to be foreshadowed by Elijah’s coming – the prediction, according to Jesus, is fulfilled in John the Baptist (9:11-12; cf. Matt 17:11-13). The Jewish expectation of the resurrection that is to occur after the coming of Elijah is intimately tied to judgment (Dan 12:1-3; cf. John 5:28-29).

By the same token, judgment is presupposed in the world to come since the destiny that awaits all people is either to enter the Kingdom and enjoy eternal life or to be thrown into Hell ‘where their worm never dies, and the fire is never quenched’ (9:45-48). Hence, the destruction of this present world in **το τέλος** seems to involve a

---

1043 The scope of this ingathering (i.e. **από τον ουρανόν επι τό τέλος**) echoes Moses’ statement about Israel’s expectation of restoration after exile: ‘Even if you are exiled to the ends of the world (**από τον ουρανόν επι τό τέλος**), from there the LORD your God will gather you, and from there he will bring you back’. (Deut 30:4). See Robinson, ‘Israel and the Gentiles’, 16; Fuller, *Restoration*, 13-101; Evans, ‘Aspects of the Exile’, 316-27; Meyer, ‘Orientations’, 12.
1044 Many would argue on the basis of Mark 8:38 that Judgment is envisaged there. However, we have argued that this passage is fulfilled in Jesus’ exaltation in the clouds. In Mark, judgment is presupposed in 9:42-49. On the judgment in Jesus’ teaching, see Reiser, *Jesus and Judgement*, 206-301. Reiser’s data come mainly from Matthew and Luke. See also Wilson, *When Will These Things*, 66-80; Luz, ‘Son of Man’, 108-9.
purifying judgment in which the hope of Israel’s restoration will then be fully realized in the resurrection order of the world to come when Jesus returns.\textsuperscript{1046}

It is in \textit{to tē ἐλά} that believers will finally enjoy eternal life in the likeness of celestial beings inheriting the Kingdom of God (12:25).

Notably, the notion of the ‘overlap of the ages’ commonly employed to describe the present time seems absent from the horizon of Jesus’ time conception.\textsuperscript{1047} Jesus appears to be expecting the world to come and the kingdom in the future.

7.6.4. Jewish Eschatological Timetable as Reflected in Jesus’ Horizon of Time Conception

In order to consolidate the inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time just delineated, we shall turn now to determine the Jewish division of time which seems to have been espoused by Jesus’ contemporaries as represented by the scribes’ teaching in Mark (9:11).\textsuperscript{1048} We have observed that the Jewish belief about the future as maintained by the scribes in the time of Jesus involves the expectation that Elijah must come first to restore all things before the general resurrection of the dead (9:11-12; cf. Mal 4:5-6).

\textsuperscript{1046} This finds support in Acts, where the hope for the restoration of the ‘kingdom to Israel’ (\textit{apokatástasi 

\textsuperscript{1047} Contra Rust, \textit{Christian Understanding}, 126. Barth seems more insightful in this regard. For him, it is not primarily an overlap of dispensations that is occurring in the coming of Jesus but rather the provision of a conceptual ‘bridge’ specifically in the person of Jesus (which he refers to as ‘Jesus’ time’) to the Age-to-come. See Barth, \textit{Church Dogmatics} III/2, 462.

\textsuperscript{1048} The expression \textit{οἱ γραμματεῖς} in 9:11 (cf. 2:6) is not specified in relation either with the sects of the Sadducees or the Pharisees. However, the ‘scribes’ are specifically identified with the Pharisees in 2:16 (\textit{οἱ γραμματεῖς ὧν 

\textsuperscript{1049} Ant. 13.297). Since, the piece of tradition referred to in 9:11-13 comes not from Mosaic sources, the scribal teaching in view is likely to have come from the ‘scribes of the Pharisees’. See Roth, ‘Pharisees’, 63.
In that connection, the appearance of Elijah as the harbinger of the resurrection must have been identified with the expectation of the day of the Lord in the scribes’ tradition.\textsuperscript{1049}

Thus, according to the scribes’ timetable of end-time events, the ultimate event is the general resurrection of the dead. Elijah will appear to signify that this final event must soon take place. As to whether the scribes believe that other events would occur between the advent of ‘Elijah’ and the resurrection of the dead cannot be determined from the evidence in Mark. What is clear is that the principal content of the Jewish hope of the future as represented by the scribes’ tradition and endorsed by Jesus and his disciples is characterized by the resurrection on the last day (cf. Dan 12:2-3; John 11:24).

The essential place of the resurrection in the Jewish hope, as we have seen, is confirmed by Jesus against the Sadducees ‘who say there is no resurrection’ (12:18). The Sadducees seem to have erred in their assumption that the resurrection will be a recapitulation of this life all at once, resulting therefore in a \textit{simultaneity} of present and past.\textsuperscript{1050} According to that view of the resurrection, hostility would be expected between seven brothers who, through levirate law, had all married one woman since they would all simultaneously be present at the resurrection with the woman. Jesus’ corrective, as we have seen above, is to indicate that the resurrection of the dead is


\textsuperscript{1050} This cyclic view of time seems to be implicit in Herod Antipas’ conception of Jesus as John the Baptist raised from the dead (6:16) and therefore posing a threat to his guilty conscience. Cf. France, \textit{Mark}, 254.
not a recapitulation of present existence but a transformation into an entirely different order of existence, namely, the resurrection order of the world to come.

Jesus’ description of the nature of the resurrection existence in his response to the Sadducees fits in with the Jewish expectation of the resurrection order (cf. I En. 22:13). The question about the condition for inheriting eternal life indicates that, in Jewish thinking at the time, inheriting eternal life was in some measure associated with their hope of the resurrection (10:17). This connection is made more lucid in the ensuing discussion between Jesus and his disciples in which ‘entering the Kingdom’, ‘salvation’ and ‘eternal life’ are used interchangeably with ‘eternal life’ and the ‘world to come’ (10:23-30. Cf. 9:43-47).

This expectation of the general resurrection seems to be tied in to the expectation of the coming kingdom of David, especially amongst the crowd that accompanied Jesus to Jerusalem. In Ezekiel 37, the resurrected Israel will become one nation under the restored Davidic reign (cf. Pss. Sol. 17:21). This connection is implied in Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem (11:1-11// Matt 21:1-11// Luke 19:28-40// John 12:12-19).

Interestingly, it is the crowd that accompanied Jesus who were making the proclamation about the coming kingdom of David and not those in Jerusalem. Along the way to Jerusalem, this crowd must have heard about Peter’s confession of Jesus as the ‘messiah’ (8:30). They must have also seen Jesus’ acceptance of the ‘Son of David’ title from Bartimaeus and the healing that resulted (10:47-52). Almost certainly, they must have heard Jesus’ teaching about the Kingdom of God and saw the powerful demonstration of the kingdom’s power in Jesus’ miracles. The crowd

---

1052 The expectation that the Davidic kingdom will involve healing is found in Ezekiel 34:16.
therefore arrived at Jerusalem with heightened expectation about the coming of the kingdom of David their father. The crowd’s reference to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος κοιμάτων τοῦ Κυρίου (‘the one who comes in the name of the Lord’. 11:9) intimately ties Jesus to David (1 Sam. 17:45-46). In Psalm 118, this statement is utilized to address an individual arriving victoriously at the temple after a great battle with the Lord’s enemies.\footnote{1053}

That the hope of the Davidic kingdom was tied to the Jewish messianic expectation is implied in Jesus’ challenge to the scribes’ view of the messiah as being the ‘son of David’ (12:35-37). Jesus’ questioning of the scribes’ view indicates that, unlike the growing scepticism of contemporary biblical scholarship regarding messianic hope in first century Israel,\footnote{1054} the scribal authorities seemed to have maintained a hope in the messianic ‘Son of David’ (12:35; cf. 10:47).\footnote{1055} In that light, the coming kingdom of David seems likely to have been tied into the Jewish hope of the resurrection, at least by the scribes.\footnote{1056}

The foregoing discussion indicates that the background onto which Jesus’ horizon of time is to be projected is more complicated than Cullmann had supposed it to be.\footnote{1057}

That is, the scribes’ horizon of time spans from creation to the general resurrection of the dead. Admittedly, there were diverse views about the general resurrection

\footnote{1053} See France, Mark, 434. 
\footnote{1054} See section 4.5.1 above. 
\footnote{1055} See 4QFlor 1:10-11; Rogers Jr, ‘Davidic Covenant’, 463-64; Juel, Messiah and Temple, 79, 82. Cf. Marcus, ‘Mark 14:61’, 125-41. Marcus disputes Juel’s argument that ‘Messiah-Son-of God’, in Jesus’ context, was often taken to mean ‘Messiah-Son-of-David’ by arguing that ‘Messiah-Son-of-God’ was associated with a claim to divinity. However, the literary position of the accusation that Jesus claims to be a temple destroyer-restorer (14:58) and the high priest’s inquiry in 14:61 seem to favour the view that ‘Messiah-Son-of-God’ was tied more intimately to ‘Messiah-Son-of-David’ who, from 2 Sam 7 and 4QFlor, is expected to be the temple builder (4Q174 1 i 21 2. 1-13). 
\footnote{1056} For the diverse meaning of the term ‘end’ in the first century usage, see Stone, Features, 91; idem, ‘Coherence’, 333-47. 
\footnote{1057} This is also the verdict of Licht, ‘Time and Eschatology’, 178.
espoused within Jewish religious circles as represented, for instance, by the Sadducees and the Pharisees. Nevertheless, the mid-point between the beginning in creation and the general resurrection of the world to come, is the advent of Elijah (9:12; cf. Mal 3:23; Sir 48:10) and not the coming of the Messiah as Cullmann had thought.  

Having observed that Elijah’s mission is fulfilled in the ministry of John the Baptist (9:13; cf. Matt 11:14; 17:12-13), the event that must soon take place is the resurrection and the restoration of Israel under the kingdom of David. This explains the expectation of the predominantly Jewish crowd that arrived with Jesus in Jerusalem (11:9). The Jewish timetable of end-time expectation can thus be represented diagrammatically as follows:

![Figure 7.3. Jewish End-Time Timetable](image)

In the light of God’s covenant with time which we saw in Chapter 4, this timetable indicates that the fulfilment of time as the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring will be fully realized in the general resurrection.

---

1058 Cf. Justin Martyr in Chapter 3.4.1 above.  
7.7. Mark’s Reception of the Jewish Eschatological Timetable

Having explored the Jewish timetable of end-time expectations and Jesus’ distinctive contribution to it, we shall turn now to determine what may be perceived as Mark’s reception of the Jewish timetable in the light of Jesus’ horizon of time. At the opening of his Gospel, Mark attempts to align his Gospel with a composite citation of Scripture attributed to the ‘prophet Isaiah’ (1:2-3). The end-time program discernible from that citation consists of two consecutively arranged events. The decisive event is the Lord’s coming. But the immediacy of this central event is heralded by the Lord’s messenger who is sent to prepare the way of the Lord.

The significance of these events can be more sharply focused if projected against the Jewish timetable of end-time events just delineated. Mark appears to be in tune with the scribes’ expectation of Elijah to come first, prefiguring the resurrection. The Elijah figure, however, is identified with the divinely commissioned messenger of the Lord who is John the Baptist (1:4). This correspondence suggests that Mark is written with the conviction that the decisive events of the Jewish timetable of end-time expectation are now coming to pass (cf. ev gene, ne te to 1:4, 9). John appeared in fulfilment of the role of messenger of the Lord. But since John’s ministry accomplished Elijah’s ministry (1:14; 6:14-29), the present time of Mark is, in keeping with scribes’ expectation, the time expected for the resurrection to occur.

1061 For the expectation of Elijah as a messianic forerunner in Jewish hope, see Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, 8.4; 49:1; Klausner, Messianic Idea, 456; Mowinckel, He That Cometh, 299; Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar IV: 785-89; Jeremias, Hl $e %i, aj, 928-41. Robinson pointed out that that expectation of Elijah to come as the messianic forerunner is absent in earlier documents such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, Damascus Document and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. See Robinson, ‘Elijah’, 36-37. In that light, Mark 9:11 (and probably John 1:21) seems to be our earliest indication of the prospect of Elijah to come as the harbinger of the ‘resurrection’ in the Jewish hope.
1062 This identification is strengthened with the description of John’s outfit as ‘camel’s hair’ with ‘a leather girdle around his waist’ which strikingly resembles the prophet Elijah’s appearance in its historical context (2 Kgs. 1:8).
However, according to Mark, the point at which the scribes expect the general resurrection corresponds to the ‘beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ’.  

![Figure 7.4. Mark’s Reception of the Jewish End-Time Timetable](image)

Since the literary outline of Mark’s Gospel follows the apostolic kerygma, Mark’s reception of the Jewish end-time scenario just delineated is plausibly rooted in the apostolic tradition which in turn is traceable to Jesus himself (cf. Matt 11:14).

In summary, three conceptions of time are discernible in Mark. We have delineated Jesus’ horizon of time and, moreover, the Jewish timetable of future expectation as represented by the scribes.

---

1063 Just as the ‘the birthday of the god Augustus was the beginning of the good news for the world that came by reason of him’. See *OGIS* 458, primarily based on the Priene Inscription; ca. 9 BC. Cited in Evans, ‘Beginning’, 93.
1064 See Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, 7-35.
1065 See Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, 34.
Given that Mark was Peter’s interpreter, it is probable that the view of time reflected in the literary shape of Mark’s Gospel constitutes the version of Peter’s Jewish view of time (according to Mark 9:11) reconfigured by the significance of Jesus’ mission as the Son of Man (9:12).

---

The implication of this scenario for Mark 1:15 is that the fulfilment of time as the promise of Israel’s restoration under David’s offspring is realized in the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The dynamic of this fulfilment, however, embraces the distinctive phases of Jesus’ ministry as the ‘Son of Man’. It begins with Jesus’ advent from Nazareth to suffer many things and to die (1:9; cf. 10:45). Jesus’ exaltation upon the cross marks the beginning of the second phase of his ministry, namely, the ingathering of the elect to the enthroned Son of Man-Son of God. His exaltation on the cross also signifies that τοῦ τε λόγου is near at the gates’. Hence, the ultimate realization of time as the promise of the kingdom awaits the arrival of τοῦ τε λόγου. It is then that Jesus will drink wine anew in fellowship with his people in the Kingdom of God.

7.8. The Dynamic of the Fulfilment of the Promise of Time in Jesus’ Earthly Ministry

Having determined the horizon of Jesus’ view of time, we shall turn now to explore how the fulfilment of the promise of time in the restoration of Israel is realized in the inside phases that encompass Jesus’ ministry. Here, we wish to focus on two important elements of Jesus’ earthly ministry, namely, his making disciples and his death.

7.8.1. The Beginning Form of the Fulfilment of the Promise of Time: Restored Israel

In the Gospels, and this is therefore true of Mark, the ‘Twelve’ are singled out as the nucleus of the emerging people-space of the Kingdom of God (3:14, 16; 4:10; 6:17; 9:35; 10:32; 11:11; 14:17). Nevertheless, numerous others seem to have identified themselves privately with Jesus during the first phase of his ministry. There is, for
instance, the demon possessed man, ‘Legion’ (5:9) who, subsequent to his miraculous healing, went around the Decapolis and began to proclaim what Jesus had done for him (5:20). Moreover, the disciples found a man who although he did not accompany Jesus in his journey was nonetheless already casting out demons in Jesus’ name (9:38). The person in whose house the Last Supper was prepared most probably had made acquaintance with Jesus on a previous occasion (14:13). Then, there is Joseph of Arimathea who buried Jesus (14:43). These incidental evidences suggest that a considerable number of people who partake in the beginning form of the people-space of the kingdom were private followers of Jesus. Yet, the selection the ‘Twelve’ as the core group of Jesus’ disciples indicates that by recruiting people throughout his ministry Jesus is establishing the beginning form of the restoration of Israel.  

Even Jesus’ miracles can be explained in relation to the recruitment of people into the beginning form of the restoration of Israel. For a first-century Jew, Jesus’ healing would be viewed as restoring to membership in Israel those who, because of their physical illnesses, were thought to be ritually unclean.  

In the Old Testament, God’s sacred space was located in the sanctuary of the Tent of meeting. Members of the priestly class with physical defects were prohibited from approaching God’s sanctuary (Lev 21:18-20; 22:14-15; cf. Deut 23:1-6; Isa 56:3; IQSa 2:3-11). Hence, to be healed from such defects is analogous to being restored to fellowship with God in his ‘sanctuary’ – a ‘sanctuary’ which, in Jesus’ ministry, consists of Jesus and his disciples. In summary, the first phase of Jesus’ ministry as the Son of Man coming to suffer and die is dominated by the recruitment of people primarily
from Israel to the beginning form of the restored Israel, the kingdom’s people-
realm.\(^{1070}\)

7.8.2. *Jesus’ Death in the Dynamic of the Fulfilment of the Promise of Time*

We have seen that in the Second Temple material, Israel’s vision of restoration is tied
intimately to the restoration of the temple.\(^{1071}\) One implication of this expectation is
that Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 indicates that the fulfilment of the promise of
time may be perceived as the ‘old temple’ being replaced by a ‘new temple’.\(^{1072}\) In
other words, temple restoration and the Kingdom of God’s coming near are
distinctive ways of referring to the restoration of Israel. We have seen that the first
phase of Jesus’ ministry (P3) culminates in his death. But why was it necessary for
the beginning form of the restored temple to be destroyed as in the death of Jesus
(8:31; 9:31; 10:33; cf. 14:58; 12:10-12; John 2:19-21)?\(^{1073}\) Admittedly, the question
of why Jesus has to die is a vexed issue in New Testament scholarship.\(^{1074}\)
Nevertheless, three observations may be derived from Mark about the necessity of
Jesus’ death in connection with temple restoration and therefore of the fulfilment of
the promise of time as the restoration of Israel.

7.8.2.1. *Jesus’ Death: Temple Restoration as Restoration of Israel*

The Jerusalem temple seems to have fallen under the curse pronounced on the former
temple in Jeremiah 7:11 due to the unfaithfulness of Israel’s leadership and therefore
must be destroyed (11:17). Many of course saw the destruction of Jerusalem in 70

\(^{1070}\) Gundry strongly argues for the identification of Jesus’ body as the temple in the Johannine
language of the ‘Father’s house’: ‘If then Jesus is initially the temple consisting of his corpse but a
corpse then raised from the dead in three days… the many abodes located in his Father’s house are

\(^{1071}\) See Chapter 4.5.4 above.

\(^{1072}\) See Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 77.


\(^{1074}\) See Dahl, ‘Crucified Messiah’, 31; Wright, ‘Jesus, Israel’, 75-95.
AD as the fulfilment of the particular judgment on the temple that Jesus symbolized with his temple cleansing activity (11:15-17). However, there are good reasons to dispute such a construal of the temple incident. As we have maintained, Jesus does not seem to have ascribed to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple the significance it often assumes in recent New Testament scholarship. Rather, in his temple cleansing activity, Jesus affirms that there is a higher goal in view for the temple, namely, that it is no longer to be a house of sacrifice for sins but rather to be a ‘house of prayer for all nations’ (11:17). No longer will sacrifice be essential as the means of accessing the presence of God. Jesus promises that people from all nations will be given direct access to God in prayer.

In the first century setting, the temple is often viewed as a symbol of the world. In that sense, Jesus’ cleansing of the temple prefigured the purification of the world by giving the nations equal status with Israel in the privilege of directly accessing the presence of God, on the basis of his redemptive death (10:45). That is, in order for the temple’s function as the ‘house of prayer for all nations’ to be fully realized, it must first undergo a purifying judgment. It is this judgment upon the temple that Jesus bears on the cross (cf. 14:58; John 2:19-21). The tearing of the temple curtain in Jesus’ death suggests that, precisely at the point of his death, the Jerusalem temple is rendered obsolete, at least in its function to offer sacrifice. At his exaltation in the clouds, Jesus’ death inaugurates the ingathering of the elect from the ‘ends of the

1075 For the outline of this position, see France, Jesus and the Old Testament, 227-39; idem, Divine Government, 78-80.
1076 See also section 8.4.2 below.
1077 Cf. Josephus, Ant. 3.180; cf. 3.123; B. J. 5.212-214; Philo, Mos. 2.80-81; Spec. 1.66-78.
1078 See B. Sunkler, ‘Jésus et les païens’, Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses 16 (1936): 462-99. Cited in Meyer, ‘Temple’, 265. It is a position that Meyer himself adopted in Early Christians, 64 but he has since then revised due to its dependence on a widespread identification of the temple with the world which he finds difficult to maintain. But see Levenson, Sinai and Zion, 123-24, 140; idem, ‘Temple’, 294-95.
1079 See Jackson, ‘Death of Jesus’, 25.
earth to the ends of heaven’ to him as the enthroned Son of Man-Son of God constituting the restored temple, the house of prayer for all nations. In that restored temple the elect gathered from all nations are indeed given the privilege of directly accessing the actual presence of God in the enthroned Son of Man (cf. Heb 4:14-16).

7.8.2.2. Jesus’ Death and the Recruitment of ‘Others’ to the Restored Israel

Another plausible explanation of the necessity of Jesus’ death in relation to Israel’s restoration may be found in the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (12:1-12). In this parable, Israel’s status as God’s vineyard (cf. Isa 5) is tied to their post-exilic mission as ‘builders’ of God’s end-time temple (Acts 4:11; cf. 2 Chr 36:23; Ezra 1:2-3). When Jesus applies the parable, the wicked tenants are identified with the ‘builders’ of Psalm 118 who rejected the ‘stone’ which, in the parable, corresponds to Jesus, the ‘beloved son’ (12:6). Hence, the destruction of the temple-body of Jesus is the result of his rejection by the wicked ‘builders’.

However, precisely at the point at which the builders reject the stone, the stone is revealed as the ‘corner stone’ (12:10; Acts 4:11). If the ‘tenants’ correspond to the ‘builders’, then the ‘vineyard’ corresponds to the ‘temple’ the restoration of which Israel was entrusted with in their return from Exile. The temple of Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 40-48) may well have become the model for the restored temple under Zerubbabel as implied in the measurements of the temple of Zerubbabel. See Meyer, ‘Temple’, 237; Jeremias, ‘Hesekieltempel’, 109-112.

See Chilton, *Galilean Rabbi*, 111-14; Evans, ‘Vineyard Parables’, 82-86 For arguments to the contrary, see Geddert, *Watchwords*, 120-21; Bolt, ‘Parousia, Temple’. Geddert and Bolt seem correct in what they affirm, namely, it is not primarily the Jerusalem temple’s destruction which is in view here, but they have strayed in what they deny, namely, that the parable is not ‘temple-centred’. The immediate literary context in Mark and the parallel between ‘tenants’ and ‘builders’ signify that temple concerns almost certainly lie behind the parable although it is the end-time temple that is in view and not the Jerusalem establishment. *IQS* viii.7-14 describes the faithful as ‘an everlasting plantation, a holy house… and the foundation of the holy of holies… the precious cornerstone’. Cf. *CD* 1:4-5. See also Watts, ‘Psalms in Mark’s Gospel’, 32-35; Marcus, *Way*, 119-25.
transfer the tending of the vineyard to ‘others’ (a[ι] j. 12:9). That is, the point in
which the ‘beloved son’ is rejected becomes the warrants for the recruitment of
‘others’ to be built upon the ‘corner stone’ which God has now established in Jesus
as the foundation of his restored Israel (cf. Rom 9:33; Heb 12:22; 1 Pet 2:4-5; Rev
14:1).\footnote{See Kee, Community, 113; Juel, Messiah and Temple, 205-6, 208.}

7.8.2.3. Jesus’ Death and the Restoration of ‘Many’ to the Enthroned Son of Man

Probably the most convincing explanation of the necessity for the death of Jesus is
found in 10:45 which, despite arguments to the contrary,\footnote{See Watts, ‘Jesus’ Death’, 125-26; Barrett, ‘Background’, 1-18; Hooker, ‘Use of Isaiah 53’,
Wright, ‘Servant and Jesus’, 280-83.} has been dubbed ‘a large
clean window into Mark’s thought’.\footnote{See Smith, ‘Darkness at Noon’, 335.} It is most likely that the Son of Man’s
coming from Nazareth in Galilee (1:9) underlies the ‘I have come’ sayings of Jesus
in Mark.\footnote{Cf. Schneider, \textit{a[\textit{a}]} \textit{\textit{c}o\textit{\textit{m}i}}, 668; Warfield, ‘Jesus’ Mission’, 513-586. \textit{Contra} Harnack, ‘“Ich bin
gekommen”’, 1-30; Gn1ka, Markus, 62; Ashby, ‘Coming’, 360-363. See also the discussion in Arens,
\textit{HLQON} – Sayings, 13-21. Arens nowhere indicates an awareness of Warfield’s lengthy treatment of
this theme.} In 10:45, however, Jesus specifies that his mission in coming from
Nazareth is to be a ransom \textit{on behalf of many} (\textit{\textit{a}nti} \textit{pol\i\i\i}).\footnote{See Pesch, \textit{Das Abendmahl}, 122-23. Cf. Mussner, ‘Gabe’, 250.} The idea of a
‘ransom’ (\textit{l\i\i\i\r\o\o\o}) is tied to the function of temple sacrifice as an exchange for the

In the flow of the biblical plot-line, it is progressively revealed that the temple has
not only become hopelessly inadequate for delivering this function (cf. Mal 1:7-9;
3:1-4) but has become a mere ‘shadow of the good things to come and not the true
form’ (cf. Heb 10:1-4). In that connection, Jesus’ death is conceivable as the offering of the perfect sacrifice that will accomplish for all time the function for which sacrifices were offered in the temple (cf. John 1:29, 36; Heb 10:14). For the ‘many’ who seek restoration to God by means of the forgiveness warranted by the temple’s sacrificial rites, Jesus sees his mission as that of becoming the ‘ransom’ in their place in order to secure the forgiveness that can no longer be procured through sacrificial rites officiated by a temple regime that has rejected the ‘beloved son’.

The death of Jesus therefore replaces the temple as the locus where God’s people could procure the forgiveness of their sins in order to be restored to God and thus draws ‘many’ not only from Israel but from beyond - to the restored Israel now established under the enthroned Son of Man in the presence of God.

7.9. *Intensification of the Kingdom’s Coming in the Distinctive ‘Phases’ of Jesus’ Ministry*

We wish now to explore whether some measure of intensification as an implicature of the two perfect verbs of Mark 1:15 (睥[]) and (-hover) is discernible throughout the inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time conception. As previously indicated, we aim to show that the application of Campbell’s category of ‘intensive implicature’ of the perfect tense-form to the perfect verbs in Mark 1:15, properly understood in the context of Mark’s Gospel and in the context of Jesus’ pre-resurrection and post-resurrection ministry, does indicate the dynamic intensification of the action denoted by the perfect verbs ([] and [hover]) and not just the

---

1087 Even if their unfaithfulness was not the reason for rendering the temple establishment obsolete, from Jesus’ perspective, the sacrifices offered therein cannot truly expiate sin. See Heb 10:4; cf. 1 Sam 15:22; Pss 40:6; 51:17.
1088 See Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the indicative*, 201-6; *idem, Basics*, 110.
1089 See under section 7.5 and Chapter 5.2.4.
strengthening of the verbal idea. A comparison of significant elements of Jesus’ ministry during the third (P3) and fourth (P4) inside phases of his horizon of time view, could enable us to determine whether an observable intensification has occurred in the dynamic of the fulfilment of time as the promise of the coming kingdom. Here, three indications of intensification are detectable in these two phases: (1) Intensification in Jesus’ role as the Son of Man; (2) Intensification in the scope of Jesus’ ingathering activities; (3) Intensification in the scope of people suffering for the kingdom.

7.9.1. **Intensification in Jesus’ Role as the Son of Man**

The characterization of Jesus as the Son of Man is progressively manifested in the outworking of the two phases of Jesus’ ministry. In the first phase (= third inside phase of Jesus’ horizon of time view), the Son of Man comes as the Son of God from Nazareth in Galilee (1:1, 9) ‘in weakness’ on a mission to be rejected, and die (8:31; 9:12, 31; 10:33). Mark 10:45 functions as a concise *Sammelbericht* of Jesus’ activity in the first phase of his ministry in keeping with the dynamic encoded in the perfect tense-forms *peplo ḥrẉtaːi* and *hggikən* in Mark 1:15. The Son of Man comes from Nazareth in Galilee not to be served but to serve throughout the regions of Galilee, culminating in Jerusalem where he must lay down his life as a ransom for many.

---

1090 See Figure 7.2 above.
1091 Jesus’ identification with Nazareth in Mark seems intrinsically connected to his rejection (1:24; 10:46; 14:67).
1092 Taylor refers to 10:45 as ‘one of the most important [verses] in the Gospels’. See Taylor, *St. Mark*, 44. See also Smith, ‘Darkness at Noon’, 335. Bolt affirms that it ‘provides a perfect summary of the servant’s vicarious death on behalf of many others’. See Bolt, *Cross*, 72.
In Mark, an underlying reason for Jesus’ death as the Son of Man according to the Scriptures (9:12; 14:41) is his rejection by the ‘builders’ of God’s end-time temple (12:10-12). Jesus’ rejection by the builders however is precisely the means by which God reveals him as the corner stone of the end-time temple ‘not made with hands’ (14:48; cf. 2 Cor 5:1-2).\(^{1093}\) In the second phase of Jesus’ ministry (= the fourth inside phase of Jesus’ horizon of time view), Jesus’ exaltation in the clouds and the ingathering of the elect, the crucified Son of Man is professed to be the Son of God ‘in power’ (15:39; cf. Rom. 1:4).

Hence, an intensification of the non-past dynamic denoted by the perfect verbs \(\text{pepl\ hrwt\ ai}\) and \(\text{hggiken}\) in Mark 1:15 is discernible in the characterization of the Son of Man’s identity in Jesus. In the pre-exaltation phase of his ministry (P3), Jesus is portrayed as the suffering and rejected Son of Man in weakness. In this death, the Son of Man, however, is exalted in the clouds to be enthroned at the right hand of the ‘Mighty One’ as the Son of God ‘in power’ (P4).

7.9.2. \textit{Intensification in the Scope of Jesus’ Ingathering Activities}

A second way in which the dynamic encoded in the perfect verbs \(\text{pepl\ hrwt\ ai}\) and \(\text{hggiken}\) is discernibly intensifying is evident in the scope of the recruitment process which Dodd identifies as part of Jesus’ activities right at the outset of his Galilean ministry.\(^{1094}\) We have seen that even though the Twelve constitute the foundation of the restored Israel, numerous indications are scattered throughout the Gospel of what might be labelled as ‘private’ followers of Jesus. By their incorporation to Jesus and the Twelve, they represent the beginning form of God’s end-time sacred dwelling

\(^{1093}\) See Ellis, ‘Eschatological Temple’, 60.
\(^{1094}\) See Dodd, \textit{Founder}, 126.
space. This beginning form, as we have seen, is recruited rather exclusively from Israel (cf. Matt 10:6; 15:24). The Gentiles, however, are not excluded from the scope of Jesus’ soteriological concern since he went as far as the territories of Tyre and Sidon populated mostly by Gentiles (7:24, 31). Yet, the focus of Jesus’ ministry appears to fall on the ingathering of the restored Israel drawn exclusively from Israel.

This dimension of the Son of Man’s recruitment activities is radically broadened, however, in the second phase of his ministry as the exalted Son of Man (P4). Subsequent to his exaltation upon the cross, ‘others’ from beyond the borders of Israel are gathered to the kingdom as the scope of the Son of Man’s ministry is extended to embrace απ’ ακρου γῆς ἐξ ακρου οὐρανοῦ (13:27). The elect are gathered into the Son of Man as the kingdom’s spatial dimension expands. It is interesting to note that Mark accords no place for the great commission for world evangelization after his resurrection (cf. Matt 28:18-20; Luke 24:46-49; John 20:19-22). It seems that for Mark, the disciples’ commission to evangelize Israel (6:6-11; cf. 3:14) essentially anticipates worldwide evangelization subsequent to Jesus’ exaltation (13:10; 14:9). Therefore, intensification in the fulfilment of the promise of time (in the restoration of Israel) is discernible in the two phases of Jesus’ ministry in terms of the opening up of the recruitment of people for the kingdom – from Israel to ‘others’ from the end of the earth.

7.9.3. Intensification in the Scope of People Suffering for the Kingdom

A third way in which intensification is denoted by the implicature of the perfect verbs παιδεύω and ἡγείκεω is discernible in the way suffering is predicted by

---

1095 Cf. Gnilka, Markus, II, 147.
Jesus. In the first phase (P3), Jesus alone seems destined to suffer rejection and death. His disciples are disappointed with this prospect to the extent that they consistently misunderstand him (8:31-32; 9:31-32; 10:32-34). On the basis of Zechariah 13:7, however, Jesus expects that even his closest associates will abandon him at the point at which his suffering is to begin (14:27) in Jesus ‘hour’ (14:41). Jesus’ hour, as we have seen, coincides with the Son of Man’s ‘day of distress’. It is the hour during which God will strike down the shepherd and disperse the sheep. The ‘sheep’ however are notably exempted from Jesus’ ‘hour’ of suffering and death. The Son of Man must first give his life as a ransom on their behalf (10:45; cf. 14:41). This is the lot of the Son of Man in the first phase of Jesus’ ministry (P3).

Jesus has, however, predicted that the ‘hour’ of the disciples’ suffering was coming (13:11; cf. 10:39). During the time of world evangelization, when the Son of Man has been exalted in the clouds, the disciples’ ‘hour’ of suffering will come when they will be persecuted (13:11), just as Jesus was (8:31-32; 9:31-32; 10:33) and even John the Baptist before him (1:14; 6:16; 9:13). Hence, even here, what Dodd identifies as a ‘controversy’ in the beginning of Jesus’ Galilean ministry which culminated in his suffering and death on the cross is, in the second phase of his ministry as the Son of Man (P4), extended in its scope to include his followers. Indeed, the pattern of kingdom blessings in ‘this present world’ includes persecution (10:30). But for the disciples, this awaits the second phase of Jesus’ ministry as the Son of Man in power. Thus, an intensification of the dynamic situation denoted by the perfect verbs pepl hrw ai and hggiken is also observable in the extension of the scope of persecution from the Son of Man’s suffering and rejection to the disciples’ suffering.

1096 See Bolt, Cross, 93.
1097 See Dodd, Founder, 127-28.
as they partake in the ingathering of the elect to restored Israel under the Son of Man.

In that sense, the hour of the disciples’ suffering (13:11-13) is foreshadowed in the hour of Jesus’ betrayal (14:41).

7.10. Mark 1:15d in relation to Mark 1:15b and 1:15c

In this chapter, we have seen that the fulfilment of time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is actualized as the coming near of the people-space of the Kingdom of God in process throughout the phases of Jesus’ ministry. On the basis of that observation, we wish to address the relation between Mark 1:15bc and 1:15d, the exhortation that seems to be directly drawn from Jesus’ gospel proclamation in Mark 1:15bc. We wish to affirm that the syntactical relation within Mark 1:15bc and 1:15d seems resultative. That is to say, in view of the fulfilment of time as the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring, the most appropriate course of action to undertake is repentance and faith.

In recent biblical scholarship, however, there have been a number of attempts to downplay the significance of repentance in Jesus’ teaching.

Firstly, some have argued that even though Jesus preaches the same message of repentance as John the Baptist did, he appears to have distanced himself from the Baptist’s conviction of the threat of the wrath to come as the appropriate basis for the

---

1099 For this division of Mark 1:15, see under Chapter 5.1 above.
1100 See Conzelmann, Jesus, 59.
necessity of repentance by preaching instead about the Kingdom of God.\footnote{See Goppelt, \textit{Theology}, 61; Meyer, \textit{Aims}, 129-30; Becker, \textit{Johannes der Täufer}, 106. For a brief discussion, see Webb, \textit{‘John the Baptist’}, 212. Other adherents of this view are cited in Reiser, \textit{Jesus and Judgment}, 201-2.} Hence, Jesus’ message of repentance is supposedly grounded more firmly on grace, so the argument goes, rather than on the fearful prospect of the coming wrath of God. This position seems to be based on a basic distinction between the message of Jesus and John which can hardly be maintained from the Gospel data.\footnote{For a concise discussion of the relationship between Jesus and John in current scholarship, see Webb, \textit{‘John the Baptist’}, 211-19. Einslin has argued the highly unlikely supposition that although Jesus and John the Baptist were contemporaries their path never crossed. See Einslin, \textit{‘John and Jesus’}. See also Haenechen, \textit{Der Weg}, 56-63.} It is true that at the outset of Jesus’ proclamation he adopted the Baptist message but with no apparent reference to the coming wrath of God. However, the extreme measure which Jesus demands upon his followers in order that they may ‘enter life’ and not to be thrown into Hell (Mark 9:42-50), rules against any such notion of the absence of concern for the coming of God’s judgment in Jesus’ proclamation of repentance.\footnote{Cf. Reiser, \textit{Jesus and Judgment}, 206-62; 316-20. Many would normally begin with the apocalyptic teaching of Jesus in their analysis of Jesus’ proclamation of judgment. See for instance, Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, 29-42. Manson foreshadows Reiser in refusing to follow consensus on this point. See Manson, \textit{Teaching}, 272-75; Reiser, \textit{Jesus and Judgment}, 203.} In that sense, the meaning of the ‘Kingdom of God’ concept that Jesus proclaims seems to include both salvation and judgment components if it is to be identified with the coming ‘day of the Lord’ as it seems to have been amongst the earliest believers (Acts 2:20; Rom. 2:5; 2 Pet. 2:10; \textit{I En.} 61:5-8).\footnote{See Manson, \textit{Teaching}, 140-41; Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, 29-42; Bornkamm, \textit{Jesus}, 93; Bultmann, \textit{Theology}, 6; Jeremias, \textit{Theology}, 122; Thiessen, \textit{Shadow}, 136. Cf. Sanders, \textit{Jesus and Judaism}, 116.} As Manson succinctly remarks, ‘Jesus speaks of the final consummation of the Kingdom, which lies in the future, as the “coming of the Son of Man” or as “the Day” or “Parousia of the Son of Man”’.\footnote{See Reiser, \textit{Jesus and Judgment}, 67.}
A second way in which the significance of repentance to the teaching of Jesus is undermined is through Schweitzer’s view that Jesus’ ethics properly understood are ‘interim’ ethics. Schweitzer, as we have seen, insisted that Jesus expected the imminent coming of God’s kingdom to materialize during the course of his earthly ministry.\(^{1106}\) Hence, Jesus’ ethics were directed to the sole purpose of preparing ‘those who belong to the last generation of mankind, and are prepared to give credence to his message, for entry into the Kingdom, thus making the most of the last moments of the present time order, between his announcement of the imminence of the Kingdom and its advent’.\(^{1107}\) This, according to Schweitzer, underlies Jesus’ predictions that before his disciples covered the entirety of the Jewish region on their mission during Jesus’ earthly ministry, the Kingdom of God would have appeared (Matt 10:23; cf. 16:28; Mark 9:1). With this imminent expectation in place, Jesus’ teaching on repentance finds relevance.\(^{1108}\) But since, according to Schweitzer, the kingdom did not come as Jesus had expected his teaching on repentance becomes irrelevant. The delay of the parousia resulted in the early church’s revision of its own existence and with that, the derivation of an accompanying set of moral teachings attributed to Jesus.\(^{1109}\) However, recent biblical scholarship has recognized that the delay of prophetic expectations of the end of the world is no crucial occasion for a complete revision of theological convictions.\(^{1110}\) This trend is best exemplified by the Old Testament prophets and the Qumran community where the non-fulfilment of

\(^{1106}\) See Chapter 2.1.1 above.


\(^{1108}\) See Schweitzer, Quest, 352. \textit{idem}, Kingdom of God, 74, 93. Schweitzer claims that the repentance proclaimed by John the Baptist was meant to be ‘a new way of thinking in the period of waiting for the Kingdom’. See also Weiss, Jesus’ Proclamation, 105-6 who paraphrases Mark 1:15 as ‘Repent because the Kingdom of God has drawn near’. His emphasis. But see Conzelmann, Jesus, 59-60.


prophetic expectations becomes the foundation for continuation of the proclamation of the predicted future prospect.

A third way in which Jesus’ teaching on repentance has been undermined in contemporary scholarship is represented by Sanders who argues that the novelty of Jesus’ message is found in the declaration that the wicked who heeded him would be included in the kingdom ‘even though they did not make restitution, sacrifice and turn to obedience to the law’.  

But Sanders seems to have not adequately considered the necessity of repentance in relation to the consequences Jesus predicted for those who would reject his call for repentance (Mark 9:42-50). As Stuhlmacher boldly asserts, ‘[t]hose who reject his call to repentance remain alienated from God and have to bear the consequences of their reserve themselves. Jesus teaches that these consequences will catch up with the unrepentant no later than on the day of judgment; see, for instance his declaration of woe over the two Galilean towns Chorazin and Bethsaida that reject him… Jesus’ call of repentance comes on the horizon of the approaching day of judgment’.  

These revisions of Jesus’ teaching on repentance are what might be referred to as a ‘low view of repentance’. Jesus, on the other hand, seems to be preaching what could be regarded as a ‘high view of repentance’. His teaching on the reality of Hell (Mark 9:42-45) and his warning that ‘no stone upon another’ will be left here (Mark 13:2), for example, are intended not merely to arrest a dispassionate admiration from his audience but also repentance and faith as the inevitable recognition that time as the

1111 See Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 207ff. What Sanders advocated here is precisely what Bonhoeffer registered under ‘cheap grace’. Cheap grace, according to Bonhoeffer, is offered when ‘no contrition is required, still less any real desire to be delivered from sin’. See Bonhoeffer, Cost, 37.

1112 See Stuhlmacher, Jesus of Nazareth, 17-18.
promise of the Kingdom of God will finally be realized and eternal life will be the blessing shared particularly by his followers in the world to come (Mark 10:30).

Hence, in understanding that the beginning form of the kingdom’s realm is constituted by Jesus and his core group of disciples, as we have argued, the necessity of repentance and faith is established as crucial for partaking in the blessings of the Kingdom of God. To enter God’s sacred space in the Old Testament, namely, the Holy of Holies, requires nothing less than moral, spiritual and even physical purity. Leviticus 12:27, for example, inveighs passionately against any member of the priestly class approaching God’s sacred space in the Holy of Holies with physical defects. Jesus’ teaching that entering the kingdom is assured on the basis of leaving everything and following him, according to Mark 10:21, determines the ‘new and living way’ into the Holy of Holies through his own body (cf. Heb 10:19). In other words, to follow Jesus is to be incorporated to his ‘body’ as the end-time temple of God. In that sense, discipleship implies a sharing in advance in the ‘divine identity’ of God, namely, eternal life.\textsuperscript{1113}

In the Old Testament, God’s sacred space, his throne-room sanctuary, was a static structure immovably situated in the Holy of Holies of the Jerusalem temple. In comparison, Jesus is the mobile sanctuary of God similar in nature to the tabernacle in the wilderness and to his glorious throne which the prophet Ezekiel saw approaching the exiles in Babylon (Ezek 1:4-28). In Jesus’ earthly ministry, God’s sacred space confronts his people in Israel and more importantly miraculously transforms many of them physically through his healing miracles and exorcisms and

\textsuperscript{1113} See Bauckham, ‘Throne of God’, 44; \textit{idem, God Crucified}, 45.
even through his teaching, ultimately culminating in his death on the cross. In the Old Testament, attempts to approach God’s sanctuary without strictly abiding by the covenantal requirements God had set forth in the midst of his people was met with death. The two sons of Aaron (Lev 10:1-3) and the incident at Pherez Uzzah (2 Sam 6:6) are examples that caution against approaching God’s sacred space on our own terms.

In that connection, repentance and faith fit into this sanctuary-paradigm as the purity requirements for entering and enduring within God’s sacred space by following Jesus. Just as in Deuteronomy 30:1-6, repentance and obedience are essential for Israel’s restoration to come about, so also here in Mark 1:15, repentance and faith are crucial for participating in the beginning form of Israel’s restoration. Repentance and faith are therefore Jesus’ summary of the purity requirements for participating in the beginning form of the spatial dimension of the restored kingdom. By following Jesus, disciples are firmly established in the dynamic of the restoration of Israel under Jesus as David’s offspring. This dynamic of restoration is manifested in the disciples’ lives as the imposition of extreme measures Jesus demanded in order to ensure entering life and avoid being thrown into the unquenchable fire of Hell (9:43).

7.11. **Summary: Jesus’ Conception of the Horizon of Time in the Light of Mark 1:15**

‘From creation through the exaltation of Jesus until his return in the end (tēlōj)’ is probably a concise summary of Jesus’ horizon of time conception which we have obtained from reading Mark through the interpretive window of Mark 1:15. Within this framework, there are five distinctive inside phases: (1) creation (P1); (2) the appearance of Elijah for the restoration of all things (P2); (3) the coming to Jesus
from Nazareth as the Son of God-Son of Man in weakness in order to die (P3); (4) Jesus’ resurrection as the confirmation of his exaltation in the clouds indicating that the end is very near and thus inaugurating the ingathering of the elect from the ends of the earth until (P4); (5) the end comes in Jesus’ return and this present world is destroyed in order to be restored in the resurrection and the world to come (P5).

The beginning in creation foreshadows the restoration of all things and the general resurrection on the last day. According to the teaching of the scribes in Mark, the event that would indicate the immediacy of the resurrection is the advent of Elijah for the restoration of all things. Jesus reveals that John the Baptist is the Elijah to come. As Elijah, John has suffered Elijah’s destiny, according to the Scriptures. According to the scribes’ teaching, the appearance of Elijah indicates that the event that must soon take place is the resurrection on the last day. Precisely, however, at the point in which the scribes expected the general resurrection, Mark asserts ‘the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God’ (1:1). The beginning of the gospel, as we have argued in the previous chapter, is also the beginning of fulfilment of the promise of time in the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring.

The dynamic of the fulfilment of the promise of time encompasses two inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time conception, namely, the third (P3 = first phase of Jesus’ ministry) and fourth (P4 = second phase of Jesus’ ministry) inside phases. Within these phases, the dynamic denoted by the perfect verbs in Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15, pepl hrwtai and hgi ken is actualized in the first phase when Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee as the Son of Man-Son of God in weakness in order to
suffer and to be rejected by the religious authorities of his day and eventually to give his life as a ransom for many (1:9, 10:45).

This phase is the beginning form of the restoration of Israel. With respect to Jesus’ ministry, it is characterized with the recruitment of people from Israel to Jesus and the Twelve constituting the beginning form of the restored Israel. The confession of his sonship at the point of his death by the Roman centurion signals, as we have argued, his exaltation as the Son of Man in the clouds to be given ‘an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away’ (13:26; Dan 7:14). His exaltation in death takes the dynamic of the fulfilment of time in the restoration of Israel to another level through the ingathering of the elect from the four winds of the earth. The ingathering of the elect indicates the extension of the restored Israel to ‘others’ beyond the borders of Israel.

Jesus’ exaltation in the clouds, moreover, indicates that the end must soon take place. The end (τέλος) of Jesus’ horizon of time conception, as we have seen, involves the destruction of this present world. However, this catastrophic event seems to involve a purifying destruction in the transition from the present world to the resurrection order of the world to come. In the world to come, the fulfilment of the promise of time will be fully realized. It is then that the elect will be seen to enjoy eternal life as celestial beings in the Kingdom of God (cf. Rom 8:23).

A comparison of significant elements of Jesus’ ministry as the Son of Man in the two phases of Jesus’ ministry (P3 and P4) affirms the outworking of intensification of the
action denoted by the verb as an implicature of perfect verbs in Mark 1:15.\textsuperscript{1114} In the first phase, Jesus’ focus seems restricted to Israel alone even though Gentiles are not excluded. Subsequent to his resurrection, however, his messengers are sent to gather the elect through gospel proclamation from the ‘ends of the earth to the ends of the heaven’. In that sense, whereas in the first phase (P3) the people-space of the Kingdom consisting of Jesus, the Twelve and disciples recruited exclusively from Israel, in the second phase (P4), an expansion of the restored Israel is envisaged in the ingathering of the elect from the ends of the earth.

Thus, the dynamic of the fulfilment of the promise set forth by God’s commitment to giving day and night in their appointed time is manifested as the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring not only in Jesus’ earthly ministry but more so, in his exaltation on his death as the enthroned Son of Man. In Mark 1:15, Jesus views the restoration of Israel in terms of the coming near of the Kingdom of God. The inside phases of Jesus’ horizon of time, as we have seen, indicate that the fulfilment of the promise of time as the coming near of the Kingdom of God is intensifying through a two-stage program: (1) The ingathering of the elect from Israel during Jesus’ earthly ministry constituting the beginning form of the restored Israel, and; (2) The ingathering of the elect from the ‘ends of the earth to the ends of heaven’ to the enthroned Son of Man-Son of God subsequent to his exaltation in the clouds. Nevertheless, the fulfilment of the promise of time in the coming near of the kingdom remains to be finally realized in the parousia when Jesus returns and the

\textsuperscript{1114} That is, it would be mistaken to read the intensive implicature in the perfect verbs in Mark 1:15 as mere strengthening of the verbal idea denoted in them because it would say that ‘time is completely fulfilled and the kingdom is fully come’ and that will utterly misrepresent Jesus’ statement in the light of the rest of the New Testament which indicates that time is not yet completely fulfilled (cf. Rev 10:6) and that the Kingdom of God has not fully come (cf. Acts 1:6-7; Rev 11:15). See further our discussion of Dodd’s ‘realized eschatology’ in Chapter 2.1.2.
present world is transformed into the world to come and the resurrection order of the Kingdom of God.
8. FROM JESUS TO PAUL: TIME CONCEPTIONS WITHIN A COMMON
ESCHATOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

8.1. Introduction
In the previous chapter, we demonstrated how the fulfilment of time as Israel’s
restoration is manifested in the two inside phases of the horizon of Jesus’ view of
time that embrace his ministry, namely, the third (P3) and fourth (P4) inside phases.
In the first phase (= P3), Jesus is recruiting his people exclusively from Israel. On
the basis of Jesus’ exaltation in the clouds, the ingathering of the elect from the ‘ends
of the earth to the ends of heaven’ is inaugurated in the second phase (= P4) which
spans to the end when Jesus returns. Notably, this ingathering of God’s people from
beyond Israel is in line with the post-exilic promise of Israel’s restoration.

In this chapter, we wish to examine the Pauline writings in order to ascertain whether
Jesus’ time-word (pepl hēwtaio kai roi) contributed to Paul’s understanding of time.

*How did Paul think of his own time? More specifically, how did Paul think of his
own time in relation to the unfolding story of God’s dealings with Israel?*

8.2. The Jesus-Paul Debate
Here, we immediately run into difficulties. In New Testament scholarship, many
have maintained that Paul’s message was his own formulation, not dependent on
Jesus’ proclamation. Jesus, for instance, focuses his proclamation on the
Kingdom of God. In Paul, however, the Kingdom of God seems to play a peripheral

---

1115 See Figure 7.2 above.
1116 E.g. Zec 10:8-10; Tob 13:3-10; 14:5-7; Jdt 5:17-19; 2 Macc 2:17-18; 1 En. 90:32-36.
1117 For a summary of past proposals, see Furnish, ‘Jesus-Paul Debate’, 17-50. Other works include,
Bultmann, ‘Jesus und Paulus’, 210-29.
role in relation to the message of justification by faith.\footnote{On the continuity between Jesus’ kingdom proclamation and Paul’s message of justification by faith, see Wenham, \textit{Paul: Follower of Jesus}, 160; Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 193-96.} A recent monograph on Paul claims that ‘after two hundred years of debate [,] the Jesus-Paul problem is still very inconclusive’.\footnote{See Yeung, \textit{Faith}, 10.} Two major party lines are represented in this debate, with a number of mediating positions.\footnote{For mediating positions, see for example, Dunn, ‘Jesus Tradition’, 155-78; Holtz, ‘Paul’, 380-93; \textit{idem}, ‘Jesusüberlieferung’, 17-30; Furnish, \textit{Jesus}, 64-65.} On the one side are those insisting on the resurrection of Jesus representing a ‘wall between the historical Jesus and Paul the apostle, separating one from the other’.\footnote{See Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 12; Yeung, \textit{Faith}, 10.} This view is advocated on the basis of the observation that almost nothing is said in Paul’s letters about Jesus’ life, teachings, and mission. Hence, it is often argued that Paul, not Jesus, is the true founder of Christianity.\footnote{See Wrede, \textit{Paul}, 179. Cf. Wilson, \textit{Paul}, 60, 73. Furnish traces the origin of this view to an article written by the Tübingen critic F. C. Baur in 1831 but the thinking that placed Jesus and Paul in opposition can even be tracked beyond Baur to the work of H. H. Cludius in 1808. Cludius, after surveying Paul’s letters, comes to the conclusion that Paul knows nearly nothing about the pre-Easter teaching of Jesus. See Yeung, \textit{Faith}, 5; Riesner, ‘Paulus’, 347. In the decades that follow, this thesis was asserted by Baur, Strauss and Wrede. See Furnish, ‘Jesus-Paul Debate’, 17; Yeung, \textit{Faith}, 5. On the other hand, it was strongly criticized by others including Gieseler; Ebrard, Paret, Harnack, Feine and Schlatter. See Yeung, \textit{Faith}, 5.} The other position is maintained by those who observe on the basis of various kinds of connections between Jesus and Paul that ‘there is no wall between Jesus and Paul, but only level ground between them’.\footnote{See Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 22.} These connections include the following:

• Paul’s supposed familiarity with the narrative framework of the story of Jesus.\textsuperscript{1125}

• Oral and/or verbal Jesus tradition transmitted either directly or indirectly to Paul.\textsuperscript{1126}

• Paul’s familiarity with topical themes that Jesus dealt with.\textsuperscript{1127}

• The “Hellenists” in Acts 6 as a theological ‘bridge’ between Jesus and Paul.\textsuperscript{1128}

• Paul’s familiarity with the “Christ of faith” of the early believers.\textsuperscript{1129}

• The messages of Jesus and Paul constituting an eschatological language-history.\textsuperscript{1130}

• A common pattern of evangelism discernible in both Jesus and Paul.\textsuperscript{1131}

• Continuity between Jesus’ mission and Paul’s mission.\textsuperscript{1132}

• Jesus and Paul as distinctive players in the eschatological drama of Israel.\textsuperscript{1133}

• Jesus and Paul relying upon the same ‘resource pool’ of Jewish Second Temple Literature.\textsuperscript{1134}


\textsuperscript{1129} See Kümmel, ‘Bultmann als Paulusforscher’, 192.

\textsuperscript{1130} See Jüngel, \textit{Paulus und Jesus}, 139-42. See also \textit{idem}, ‘Jesu Wort’, 82-100. But as Kasemann has observed, the problem with Jüngel’s approach lies in the uncertainty whether such a relationship can be drawn between Jesus and Paul. See Kasemann, ‘Review’, 185.

\textsuperscript{1131} See Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 1-10.

8.3. Between Jesus and Paul: A Synthesis

In summary, if indeed Paul did not encounter the earthly Jesus,\textsuperscript{1135} Paul might have received oral and written traditions, about the earthly Jesus and his proclamation of the Kingdom of God (e.g. 1 Cor 11:23; 15:1).\textsuperscript{1136} Possibly, amongst the tradition Paul received was Jesus’ time-word due to its intimate connection with Jesus’ central message of the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{1137} But having understood the story of Israel from the Holy Scriptures to have culminated in Jesus’ ministry (cf. Rom 1:3-4; Gal 3:8), especially in Jesus’ death and resurrection, it would seem logical for Paul to have understood the mission to the Gentiles as the most fitting extension of the story of Israel fulfilled in Jesus’ ministry.\textsuperscript{1138} In that sense, Paul’s knowledge of Israel’s story as ultimately fulfilled in Jesus seems to underscore the likelihood of his familiarity with the narrative framework of Jesus’ story represented in the Gospels.\textsuperscript{1139}

8.4. Possible Receptions of Mark 1:15 in the Pauline Corpus

Having proposed a hypothesis about the potential for continuity of Jesus and Paul with respect to their understanding of time, we shall turn now to examine passages from Paul that may assist in answering the two questions in the introduction to this chapter. Even though there are several other passages upon which we may draw for


\textsuperscript{1135} Barnett observes that ‘when Jesus first came up to Jerusalem as a public figure, Paul had been living in the city for more than a decade’. See Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 15, see also 30-32.


\textsuperscript{1138} See Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 99-117.

our investigation, we wish to focus on two passages from Paul, namely, Galatians 4:4-5 and Ephesians 1:9-10 where strict verbal similarity with Jesus’ time-word is evidently lacking but notional continuity is worth considering. Leaving aside Jesus’ view of time for the time being, our aim here is to exegete these passages in order to determine what Paul thinks about his own time, and, more specifically, how Paul perceives God’s involvement in his own time.

8.4.1. Galatians 4:4-5

But when the fullness of time had come (h = l q e n t o . pl h r w m a tou cr o nou), God sent his Son, born of a woman (genomenon ek gunai ko), born under the law (genomenon upo nonton), in order to redeem those who were under the law, in order that we might receive adoption (t h a t h n ui o p e s i an a p o l a b o v n e n).

Even though the term for ‘time’ here is cr o n o j, and in Mark 1:15 it is kai r o j, the traditional distinction between these two biblical words for ‘time’ can no longer hold on the basis of the biblical evidence. Hence, by first impression, there seems to be a notional connection between Galatians 4:4 and Mark 1:15 – both contain linguistic elements that denote the concept of time and its fulfilment.

---

1140 Wenham reconstructs Paul’s interpretation of Mark 1:15 on the basis of Rom 1:1-4; 3:21; 1 Cor 15:3-4; 2 Cor 5:17; 6:2; Gal 6:15. See Wenham, Paul: Follower of Jesus, 51-54; See also Yates, Spirit, 47; Bruce, Galatians, 194.
1141 It should be noted that when comparing Mark 1:15 to Second Temple Literature we did not consider notional similarity as relevant because our aim then was to determine a more plausible origin of Jesus’ time-word. Here, however, our aim is to examine possible interpretations of Jesus’ time-word in the New Testament tradition in order to test the consistency of the interpretation we have proposed in the previous chapters for understanding Mark 1:15.
Understanding Galatians 4:4-5 in the context of Paul’s argument in the rest of the letter is imperative. The conjunction δε connects verses 4-6 to the foregoing illustration in verses 1-2 indicating the beginning of a contrasting situation to that which Paul describes in the illustration in verse 1-2. According to the illustration, when ‘the heir’ of an estate is a minor, he is no more than a slave ‘even though he is lord of all’ (κυρίοις πάντων ἡμών). As a minor, the heir is subjected under the authority of ‘guardians’ and ‘managers’ until the time appointed for him by the father to receive the inheritance. It is not clear whether Paul is thinking here of the Jewish, Hellenistic or Roman system of inheritance. Nevertheless, his point is clearly expressed – while the heir is a minor (ο’κληρονομείς νήπιοι εστίν), he must be under custodial supervision until the time determined by the father. Being under supervision as such indicates immaturity, inferiority and slavery – a condition that prevents accessing the inheritance.

In Paul’s application of this illustration, he identifies the situation of the minor-heir under guardianship with that of being ὑπὸ ταὐτό χείλια τοῦ κόσμου ἡμᾶς δεδομένοι harking back to being ὑπὸ παιδαγωγοῦ (3:25), representing the


1144 Taking the participle ἡμῖν as concessive [See Longenecker, Galatians, 162], Scott convincingly interprets the expression κυρίοις πάντων in terms of the Abrahamic promise of the land as an eschatological hope that Israel will inherit and rule the world. See Scott, Adoption, 134.

1145 The prevailing scholarly opinions favour either Hellenistic or Roman law of testamentary guardianship. See Scott, Adoption, 122-26; Longenecker, Galatians, 163-64. Groundbreaking in this regard is Scott’s interpretation of 4:1-7 in terms of Israel’s experience in Egypt. See Scott, Adoption, 121-86. One wonders, however, how much of the Exodus narrative was familiar to Paul’s Gentile Galatian audience. In that respect, one can understand the insistence as represented, for example, by Dunn that a Roman system underlies Paul’s illustration in 4:1-2 despite the apparent inconsistency in its application in 4:3-6. See Dunn, Galatians, 210-11. See also Longenecker, Galatians, 163 and the literature cited therein.

1146 Paul’s application of this illustration is widely recognized to be problematic since it does not correspond completely with either Hellenistic or Roman law. See Hafemann, ‘Paul and the Exile’, 334; Scott, Adoption, 123-25. Paul’s obliqueness in the application of this illustration may be due to his attempt to cater inclusively for both Jews’ and Gentiles’ experience before and after the coming of ‘faith’.
designated function of the Law in the redemptive story.\textsuperscript{1147} The exact meaning of the phrase \textit{upō tā stoicēa tou' kōsmou} is unclear.\textsuperscript{1148} What is clear is that, it is parallel to being \textit{upō ahartian} (3:22), \textit{upō nōmen} (3:23), \textit{upō pai dagwgon} (3:25) and being \textit{upō epi tropeu)} (4:2).\textsuperscript{1149} Since, Paul includes himself in the situation \textit{upō tā stoicēa tou' kōsmou} (\textit{ouj wj kai. hmeij,} v. 3), it is likely that being \textit{upō tā stoicēa tou' kōsmou} depicts the universal condition under which Jews and Gentiles are enslaved before ‘faith’ arrives (3:22).\textsuperscript{1150} As Mussner observes, ‘Wenn der Apostel jetzt dafür \textit{upō nōmen} schreibt, zeigt das schon an, daß für ihn ein innerer Zusammenhang der Gesetzesherrschaft mit der Herrschaft der “Weltelemente” besteht’.\textsuperscript{1151}

Given the strong eschatological overtones of 4:1-7,\textsuperscript{1152} the genitive ‘of the world’ (\textit{tou' kōsmou}) in \textit{upō tā stoicēa tou' kōsmou} makes reasonable sense if taken in alignment with the \textit{ai wnoj tou' enestwtoj ponhrou} (1:4) and the ‘flesh’ (\textit{sarkoj}) as in 5:16-26. In that sense, to be under the ‘elemental spirits of the world’ is to be in a situation from which one needs to be rescued since those engaged therein deserve no place in the Kingdom of God (cf. 5:21).\textsuperscript{1153}

\textsuperscript{1147} See Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 192; Hays, \textit{Faith of Jesus}, 199.
\textsuperscript{1148} For a concise summary of scholarly interpretations of this phrase, see Arnold, ‘Returning’, 55-56; Scott, \textit{Adoption}, 157-61.
\textsuperscript{1149} See Cosgrove, \textit{Cross}, 75; Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 194.
\textsuperscript{1150} Scott argues for the exclusive reading of ‘we’ in verse 3 as referring to ‘Jewish Christians including Paul’. See Scott, \textit{Adoption}, 155. See also Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 193; Robinson, ‘Distinction’, 36-37. However, the interchangeable usage of ‘under sin’ (3:22), ‘under the Law’ (3:23), ‘under a supervisor’ (3:25), ‘under guardians and trustees’ (4:2), ‘under the elemental spirits of the universe’ in the span of only a few verses seems to make such an exclusive reading less likely. The inclusive overtone of Paul’s application of the illustration in 4:1-2 is taken up in the term \textit{apol abwmen} (4:5) which is amplified by the expression \textit{aste uoi}, in 4:6. Cf. Howard, \textit{Crisis}, 66-71. Those who prefer an exclusive reading must admittedly infer ‘some unexpressed step in thought’ in order to smooth out the seeming inconsistencies in their position. See Robinson, ‘Distinction’, 35.
\textsuperscript{1151} See Mussner, \textit{Galaterbrief}, 270.
\textsuperscript{1153} See Congdon, ‘Trinitarian Shape’, 242; Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 97-105.
In verse 4, the adverb δὲ introduces the contrasting situation to that ‘under the elemental spirits of the world’. This new situation is described as ἅλ κ ἐν τοῖς ἐλαχ. τοι/κραν. The import of δὲ implies that the new situation overlaps with the previous epoch. Thus, while the previous condition of inferiority prevails, the coming of the ‘fullness of time’ corresponds to the arrival of the appointed time predetermined for the heir to receive υἱοθεσία and to the coming of ‘faith’ indicating that believers are no longer under the Law’s custodian (3:23). Rather, they are justified ἐκ πιστεύ̃ (3:24). The ‘fullness of time’ therefore signifies that the minor-heir has become the rightful heir and claims the inheritance. To be sure, the Law plays a significant role in supervising the minor-heir before the coming of faith. But when Christ came, the Law’s function is fulfilled.

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the situation before the revelation of faith might be referred to as ‘time under the Law’. It is equivalent to the time during which a minor-heir awaits his father’s timing for the inheritance. In context, it refers to the period from the granting of the promise of inheritance to Abraham to its realization in the sending of the Son.

1154 The same contrasting sense occurs in the usage of δὲ ἅλ κ ἐν in 2:11.
1155 See Louw and Nida (eds), Greek-English Lexicon, 633.
1156 Here, ἐκ πιστεύ̃ δικαιοκρατήσῃ is probably meant to be taken as ἐκ πιστεύ̃ Ἡσου/Κριστου/δοχη το ἡ πιστεύ̃σιν. That is, both the faith of Christ and of the Christian are envisaged. See Hays, Faith of Jesus, 203; Howard, Crisis, 58.
By contrast, the situation under the fullness of time entails a status-transference event – from slavery to adoption as ‘sons’.\footnote{1160} This is accomplished on the basis of an act of redemption. The Son is sent in the ‘fullness of time’ \textit{[\textit{ha touj} upo nonten a\textit{eagorash}]}. Since the situation of all things (\textit{ta pant\textit{a}} 3:22) ‘under the Law’ and ‘under the elemental spirits of the world’ is an enslavement, a redemption is required.

The specifics of this redemption, however, are not clear in 4:5. Almost certainly, the story of the cross is envisaged by the term \textit{e\textit{agorash}} since Paul had spoken about it in 3:1.\footnote{1161} The emphasis, however, seems to be placed on the incarnation. The Son of God was sent in the fullness of time \textit{genomenon ek gunai koj} and \textit{genomenon upo nonten}. For Jesus to be born ‘under the Law’ most likely implies: (1) His identification with the situation under which all things are subjected ‘under the sin’\footnote{1162} and are therefore in need of redemption,\footnote{1163} but more importantly; (2) Jesus’ fulfilment of the requirements of the Law through his faithfulness to God’s promise (3:22; cf. Rom 5:18-19; Heb 10:7, 9)\footnote{1164} and thus enabling the promise of the Spirit to be given to believers (3:14, 22; 4:5-6; cf. \textit{T. Jud.} 24:3; \textit{Jub.} 1:23-24).\footnote{1165}

\footnote{1160} The term ‘sons’ is retained in our discussion despite its gender sensitivity since it primarily refers to a status before God as Father, and not gender. In context, the counter-mission to Galatia may have denied Gentile believers their status as sons of Abraham/sons of God on the basis of being justified by faith alone without circumcision. See the concise but helpful discussion in Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 144-56. See also Bird, ‘Justification’, 126-28.\footnote{1161} See Hays, \textit{Faith of Jesus}, 167.\footnote{1162} See Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 196.\footnote{1163} See Scott, ‘For as Many’, 219-21.\footnote{1164} See Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 196. On the faithfulness of Jesus, see Hays, \textit{Faith of Jesus}, 163-207; Howard, \textit{Crisis}, 57-58; Hunn, ‘\textit{PISTIS CRISTOU}’, 23-33; Gaventa, ‘Singularity of the Gospel’, 157; Congdon, ‘Trinitarian Shape’, 244. Depending on the context, it appears that the expression \textit{pistij Cristou} can be interpreted both subjectively and objectively. Both dimensions of the expression are important for the believers’ salvation. One way of positing the extent to which the believers’ faith is inseparably tied to Christ’s faithfulness is thus: ‘To be “righteoused by faith” is possible only through faith in Christ the faithful One, who is the God-given means of “access” to a “right” standing with God and to “peace with God”’. See Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 193.\footnote{1165} See Williams, ‘Promise in Galatians’, 720; Scott, ‘For as Many’, 219-20; Hafemann, ‘Paul and the Exile’, 350; Cosgrove, \textit{Cross}, 32.}
The significance of Jesus’ ‘becoming’ from a woman and ‘becoming’ under the Law is explicated in Romans 8:3; ο ὄγος τον εαυτου/ιön πενηγια εν ωμιωνατι σαρκι ahartiaj kai peri ahartiaj katekrinen thn ahartian en th| sarki,\textsuperscript{1166} By being sent ‘in the likeness of sinful flesh’ ‘under the Law’, Jesus is able to condemn sin in the flesh by his perfect obedience to the ‘just requirement of the Law’ (t. d kai wna tou’ nomou. 8:4 cf. Rom 5:18-19).\textsuperscript{1167} Thus, even though the cross may be presupposed in the term, \textit{eagorash} the emphasis seems to be placed on the whole narrative of Christ’s life – his perfect obedience unto death as the actualization of redemption.\textsuperscript{1168}

Having therefore accomplished redemption of ‘those under the Law’, a new status is received from God. The minor-heir now receives the promised inheritance, namely, adoption (thn uiqesian apol abwnen 4:5) as ‘sons’ of God (3:29; 4:6). Paul indicates that the believers’ adoption is the goal of their redemption. In that sense, redemption is the means whereby God gives ‘those under the Law’, and therefore ‘under sin’, a new birth into his family. Redemption is thus essential for receiving the new status – from minor-heirs under guardianship to rightful heirs of God’s inheritance. In 5:21, to be sons of God is to be entitled to a place in the Kingdom of God. Hence, to re-submit oneself as a believer ‘under the Law’ is by implication to forfeit one’s inheritance (cf. 5:3-4, 21).

This transference of status – from slaves to God’s sons – underscores the distinction between the dispensation before and during the fullness of time.\textsuperscript{1169} The epoch prior

\textsuperscript{1166} For the underlying parallel between Galatians 4:4-6 and Romans 8:3-4, see Dunn, \textit{Galatians}, 214.
\textsuperscript{1167} See Moo, \textit{Romans}, 483-84. Cf. Dunn, \textit{Galatians}, 216.
\textsuperscript{1169} See Hafemann, ‘Paul and the Exile’, 333.
to the sending of God’s Son is a situation under slavery – slavery under the elemental spirits of this evil world during which Jews and Gentiles were unsuitable to receive the promised inheritance.\footnote{Cosgrove describes the situation prior to faith as ‘non-access to the inheritance’. See Cosgrove, \textit{Cross}, 70.} In fact, all things (cf. \textit{ta panta}, 3:22)\footnote{We take the neuter \textit{ta panta} to refer to ‘the whole human situation’. See Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 180-81; Schlier, \textit{Galater}, 121-23. \textit{Contra} Hafemann, ‘Paul and the Exile’, 341-42.} were subjected to this situation in anticipation (cf. \textit{eij thn melousan pistin apokalufh ai}. 3:23) of the ‘coming of the faithful one’ (\textit{evposhj}) \textit{thi} \textit{pistej}. 3:24).

That the fullness of time refers to a duration and not a punctiliar moment, as is often implied by commentators,\footnote{See Schlier, \textit{Galater}, 137-38; Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 194; Martyn, \textit{Galatians}, 389; Hoehner, \textit{Ephesians}, 219. Even Scott’s coherent reconstruction of Galatians 4:1-7 in terms of the exodus from Egyptian slavery implies that the ‘fullness of time’ is a geometrical point of transition signifying both the ‘completion’ of Israel’s time of Egyptian slavery and the beginning of the exodus. See Scott, \textit{Adoption}, 148; \textit{idem}, ‘For as Many’, 217-18.} may be inferred from the description of God’s sending his Son as being born of a woman and born under the Law in order to redeem those under the Law in 4:4. This is an appropriate summary of the Gospel narrative framework.\footnote{In this reading, the \textit{i} \textit{na} clause indicating the purpose for the sending of God’s Son is taken together with the previous statement about the Son’s birth.} In connection with the outpouring of the Spirit upon believers (4:6), it reminds us of the narrative framework of Luke’s two-volume work.\footnote{Cf. Barnett, \textit{Paul}, 9.} In that light, the fullness of time conceivably spans from the birth of Jesus to the day of Pentecost and even including the present time during which believers are adopted into God’s family.\footnote{\textit{Contra} Gaventa, ‘Singularity of the Gospel’, 149 and Martyn, ‘Events in Galatia’, 168 where the cross is more or less identified with the beginning of the fullness of time.} The fullness of time can thus be identified not only with the earthly ministry of God’s Son leading up to his death but also with his post-resurrection ministry through the outpouring of the Spirit. We may refer to this ongoing situation in the fullness of time, in contrast to the previous situation under the Law, as time
under the Son. Time under the Son entails the time during which those previously subjected under sin are redeemed and, moreover, are gathered from Jews and Gentiles to God’s family as ‘sons’ by means of adoption in Christ (3:24, 26, 29; 4:6).

Consequently, two epochs may be differentiated on the basis of Galatians 4:4-5. Hafemann, observes a ‘period of slavery’ and an ‘epoch of faith’. But, while the inception of the ‘fullness of time’, as we have seen, should be identified with the birth of Jesus, for Hafemann, on the other hand, the cross is the turning point. Similarly, Martyn and Gaventa maintain that the cross is the point in which the ‘old cosmos’ under the Law met its death. To be sure, we have seen that time under the Law and under sin encompass the epoch until the revelation of faith in Christ. However, this ‘old’ dispensation is not dead yet but persists even now for Jews and Gentiles outside of Christ. In the fullness of time, God’s Son is sent to open up a new destiny for all enslaved as such, through redemption and adoption into God’s family. Since the fullness of time encompasses the entire ministry of the Son including his birth, his death and resurrection, the sending of the Spirit and the adoption of believers, it seems appropriate to refer to this epoch as ‘Time under the Son’ or, in light of the Law-Spirit antithesis in 5:18, ‘Time under Spirit’. It is time during which believers are gathered to God’s family in order to inherit God’s kingdom, having been given a new birth on the basis of the redemption procured by Christ’s faithfulness.

---

8.4.2. *Ephesians* 1:9-10

For he has made known to us in all wisdom and insight the mystery of his will, according to his purpose which he set forth in Christ as a plan for the fullness of times (eij oikonomian tou' plhrwmati twv kai rwn), to unite under one head all things in Christ (anakef alaiwsaqi tā pantā en Cristw, things in heaven and things on earth.

The authorship of Ephesians is a subject of ongoing debate, with the majority of commentators disputing the Pauline authorship of the letter.\(^{1182}\) Personally, I am not persuaded by the arguments against Pauline authorship.\(^{1183}\) However, even if Ephesians is deutero-Pauline, it should not alter the result of the present inquiry since our interest lies in ascertaining grounds for claiming that Jesus’ view of time has influenced Paul or, in this case possibly, his followers in some significant way.

Ephesians 1:9-10 is part of a single sentence of praise, styled in the typical Jewish *berakah* (‘Blessed be the God who has...’) which stretches from verse 3 through to

---


verse 14. Paul’s praise is provoked by the endowment of believers ‘with every spiritual blessing in Christ’ (1:3). In Ephesians 1:9 the dimension of this spiritual blessing being singled out is the gnwrisaj hmin to.mustri on touqpehmatoj kata thn tou eudoki an autou. That the will of God is a ‘mystery’ implied that previously it was hidden but is now being disclosed. This mystery is ‘the heart of Paul’s message and has to do with the fulfilment of God’s plan of salvation in Christ here and now’.

Notably important in the relationship of verses 9 and 10 is the phrase ei j oikonotian tou pl hrmnatoj tw h kai rh n. The term oikonotia most probably refers to ‘the act of ordering or arranging, or administering’. The force of the preposition ei j is crucial for this definition of oikonotian: (1) Does ei j denote reference and thus, in relation to verse 9, ‘God purposed with reference to the administration of the fullness of the times…’? (2) Or does ei j denote purpose – that is, ‘God purposed in him for the administration of the fullness of times…’? (3) Or is ei j simply an indicator of time – ‘God purposed in (at that time of) the administration of the fullness of times…’?

The first and third options would make the sentence ambiguous. The second option is therefore to be preferred and the sentence should be read, ‘which [God] purposed in

---

1184 See O’Brien, Ephesians, 93. Barth discusses this section under the heading ‘The Full Blessing’. See Barth, Ephesians, 76-144. See also Lincoln, Ephesians, 8-44.
1185 See Bruce, Ephesians, 32.
1188 See Hoehner, Ephesians, 216-17. He prefers (3) but this option is only necessary if the ‘fullness of times’ refers to a future temporal epoch. We shall argue that this is not the case in the light of the overall argument in Ephesians.
him for the administration of the fullness of times’. The mystery of God’s will now revealed is a plan for the administration of the fullness of times.

The expression πληρωμα των καιρων in this connection denotes an undefined period of time during which this new mode of administration is to take effect. We shall say more on the specifics of this new manner of administration. This act of administration in the ‘fullness of times’ is described by the statement, ἀνακεφαλαίωσαν τα πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ τά ἐπί τοις ουρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπί τῷ θαλάσσῳ (‘to unite under one head all things in Christ, the things in heaven and the things on earth, in him’). A more fitting rendering, as we shall see below, is ‘to gather up into one body under one head’.

The significance of this statement lies in the meaning of the verb ἀνακεφαλαίωσαν which is only used elsewhere in the New Testament in Romans 13:9. There are three ways in which this key term can be defined: (1) The meaning of ‘to sum up’ or to bring the parts into a coherent whole underlies its occurrence in Romans 13:9; (2) Irenaeus uses it to mean ‘recapitulation’, ‘repetition’ or ‘renewal’; and (3) The term bears the meaning of ‘to head up’ underscoring the supremacy of Christ under which all things are being summed up. The second meaning is less likely in the

1189 See Barth, Ephesians 1-3, 86; Hendriksen, Ephesians, 85.
1190 See Bruce, Ephesians, 32.
1191 Hoehner distinguishes Galatians 4:4 and Ephesians 1:10 on the basis of the observation that in Galatians, ‘the fullness of time speaks of a particular point of time ‘whereas in Ephesians ‘the plural (καιρῶν) ‘appears to point to the fullness or totality of times or epochs of history’. See Hoehner, Ephesians, 219.
1192 Cf. Lee, ‘Unity in Israel’, 44.
1193 In the LXX, the term appears in Psalm 71:20 with the meaning ‘to gather together’ the prayers of David. See Hoehner, Ephesians, 219.
1194 See Lee, ‘Unity’, 44. Cf. RV (1881) ‘to sum up all things in Christ’; RSV: ‘to unite all things in him’.
1195 See Irenaeus, Against Heresies 1.10.1; McHugh, ‘Reconsideration’, 306-7; Hoehner, Ephesians, 220 n. 2; Best, Ephesians, 141.
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context of Ephesians 1:10. For God to ‘recapitulate’ his salvation plan implies that a prior saving plan had failed. The emphasis in Ephesians, however, seems to lie not on the failure of God’s saving plan for Israel but rather in the fact that the Gentiles can only be saved on the basis of God’s Heilsplan for Israel (2:11-21; 3:6). In fact, Ephesians demonstrates that the ‘mystery’ of God’s will is that Gentiles are to be co-heirs and co-sharers with Israel in God’s blessing (3:6). Thus, a combination of the first and third meanings is preferable. The emphasis seems to be placed on Christ’s supremacy, expressed as headship over all things which, in the rest of the letter, is exercised in the reconciliation of a new humanity constituting of Jews and Gentiles to God on the basis of his death (2:15-18).

Commentators often raised the issue as to whether this administration of the fullness of times under Christ is realized in the present, in the future or has nothing whatever to do with time. In the context of Paul’s argument in Ephesians, the summing up of all things under the supremacy of Christ seems most likely to be current in the present time, but not in a non-temporal manner as Lindemann contends. The reference in 2:7, to the aiwsin toij epercontaij (cf. 1:14, eij apoutrwsi nthj peripoihewj ; 1:21, eia twj melj ontj) offers a future limit for the ‘fullness of times’. Ernst captures this anticipation succinctly: ‘Das Ziel dieses

---

1197 Taking νυστάθμος as epegegetical explaining what is meant by the mystery. See O’Brien, Ephesians, 234-37; Barth, Ephesians, 336; Moule, Ephesian Studies, 113-14; Lincoln, Ephesians, 180-82.
1198 O’Brien observes that the notion of Christ’s headship cannot be maintained on the basis of taking the verb ἀνακέφαλω to be derived from the noun κέφαλή, See O’Brien, ‘Summing Up’, 213. See also Lincoln, Ephesians, 33. However, in the context of Ephesians, headship can hardly be denied to be implied in the ‘summing up of all things in Christ’ especially in connection with 1:22-23 and the analogy of Christ and the church in 5:23-24. Marshall puts it succinctly: ‘Somewhat awkwardly Christ is the head because other powers are placed beneath his feet!’ See Marshall, ‘Husband’, 170. See also Howard, ‘Head/Body’, 350-56.
1201 See Lindemann, Die Aufhebung, 96-99.
Prozesses ist der neue Himmel und die neue Erde, in den Kirche und Kosmos gemeinsam eingehen'.

A reasonable description of the summing up of all things under Christ may be found in 1:22, kai. aut ev ton kef al. h. uper pant a thl. eld. hsi a (cf. 4:15; cf. Heb 2:8-9).

Here, Christ’s headship may be viewed either in terms of his all-embracing dominion over the cosmos or from the perspective that he is the source of all things for his ‘body’, the believers (1:23; 4:15).

However, the significance of Christ’s supremacy in Ephesians may be broader than these definitions. The supremacy of Christ over all things seems particularly played out in the ingathering of Gentiles to partake with Jewish believers in the privilege of membership in God’s household (1:12-13; 2:11-19) and thus becoming God’s holy house (2:20-21).

In fact, this is Paul’s explanation of the mystery of God’s will: einai ta. ephe. sugk. hron. nia. kai. susswna. kai. summatoc. thl. epaggel. aj. en. Cristw/ thsou/ da. tou/ evaggel. iou (3:6). In the ‘past’, Israel was the first to hope in Christ (cf. touj. prohl. pi. ko. aj. en. tw/ Cristw/ 1:12), whereas Gentiles were those who were ‘apart from Christ...without hope’ (cf. cwrj. Crist. v). di. da. mh. en. conte j. 2:12). But now on the basis of Christ’s death (2:13) Gentiles are drawn near together with believers from Israel to be ‘fellow-heirs, fellow-body and fellow-sharers’ (3:6) in God’s family (2:11-19).
In all likelihood, this is God's purpose for the administration of the 'fullness of times'. It is to sum up all things \( \text{awake al ai wsasqai ta panta} \) in the cosmic order, (\( \text{ta epitoj ouranoj kai ta epi thj ghj} \) in Christ (\( \text{in twCristw} \)).\(^{1208}\) In view of 3:6, the semantic import of the expression \( \text{awake al ai wsasqai ta panta} \) may be broadened to include the ingathering of believers from Jews and Gentiles into God's household (2:11-19),\(^{1209}\) gradually becoming God's holy house (2:20-21).\(^{1210}\) Indeed, the 'administration of the fullness of times' described as the summing up of all things under the headship of Christ is manifested in the 'drawing near' to God's spiritual blessing of Jewish and Gentile believers on the basis of Jesus' death (2:13-18).

In that sense, God's purpose for the administration (\( \text{ej eikonian} \)) of the fullness of times involves the re-ordering of his household (cf. \( \text{ekei tou oou} \), 2:19). In the past, the Jews were those to have 'hope in Christ first' and Gentiles were hopeless without Christ. Now, in the revelation of the mystery of God's will in Christ, Gentiles are also given access to Israel's hope in Christ. Jewish and Gentile believers together become \( \text{e na kai non anqropon} \) (2:15). That is to say, the 'fullness of times' is time under Christ as head of God's household – a household re-arranged in terms of the 'one new humanity' comprised of Jew and Gentile believers\(^{1211}\) reconciled to God's blessing in the heavenly places on the basis of the cross of Christ (\( \text{dia tou staurou} \), 2:16; cf. 1:3).\(^{1212}\)

---

\(^{1208}\) On various understandings of the cosmic order, see Wright, 'Dialogue', 263. I take it that the cosmic order envisaged here involves both the supernatural and the natural order of things. Cf. Rom 8:38-39.

\(^{1209}\) John Chrysostom states that the meaning of the term \( \text{awake al ai wsasqai} \) is 'union' (\( \text{sunyai} \)). See Chrysostom, Eph 1:10 (PG 62:16). Cited in Hoehner, Ephesians, 220.


\(^{1211}\) See the discussion of this concept in Ernst, Pleroma, 154-62.

\(^{1212}\) Cf. Michaelis contention, followed by Ernst, that Ephesians 1:10 'muss von Kol 1, 20 her verstanden werden'. See Ernst, Pleroma, 197; Michaelis, \text{Versöhnung}, 26.
This ingathering of Jews and Gentiles under Christ probably underlies the occurrence of kairoj in the plural in the phrase tou/ pl hrmatoj twh kairwn.1213 In one sense, pl hrmatoj twh kairwn may be understood in terms of encompassing ‘all times’ whether conceived naturally, personally or cosmically. That is to say, all ‘times’ have become time under Christ.1214 Most probably, however, kairwn anticipates the ‘time of the Gentiles apart from Christ’ (cf. twf kairw deirimw Cristou/ 2:12) and the ‘time of the Jews to hope in Christ’ (cf. touj prohl pokaj an twf Cristw/ 1:12) converging in a new epoch, namely, the ‘fullness of times’ (pl hrmatoj twh kairwn) that is to be identified with the nuni. de en Cristw/ Vhsou (2:13).1215

Hence, the ‘fullness of times’ indicates the realization of the time of the Jews’ hope in Christ and of the Gentiles’ time apart from Christ. It is concretized in the ‘one new humanity’ consisting of Jews and Gentiles being drawn together on the basis of Jesus’ death to God’s family. The Jewish hope in Christ is realized in the cross of Christ. But the cross opens the gate of God’s blessing, so to speak, to the Gentiles who were outside the sphere of God’s blessing (2:13, 16). Thus, while the fulfilment of the time of Jewish hope is its realization in Christ, for the Gentiles, on the other hand, their hopeless plight without Christ is radically transformed by the manifestation of the mystery of God’s will in Christ, namely, that Israel’s hope was indeed the hope of Gentiles as well. This is the hope contained in the gospel message Paul proclaims (1:13; 3:6).1216

1213 Schlier simply equates pl hrmaw twh kairwn with pl hrmaw tou/ cronou. See Schlier, Galater, 137. Here, however, we attempt to understand the usage of the former phrase in its context in Ephesians.
Consequently, the ‘fullness of times’ refers not to the conclusion of a past time but to the time now in Christ Jesus (nun. e Crisw _HANDLE) where Gentile believers are drawn near together with Jews – those who were supposed to be near (2:17 toij egguj), to be co-sharers and co-heirs of God’s blessing in God’s family (2:19; 3:6). The ‘fullness of times’ implies, at least, that these two distinct times (of Jews and of Gentiles) find their realization in the revelation of the mystery of God’s will, namely, Jews and Gentiles are incorporated to God’s family by means of Christ’s death (2:13-16; 3:6).

In that sense, the ‘fullness of times’ does not conclude, abrogate or obliterate those past times since unbelieving Jews and Gentiles persist in those ‘past’ times.1217 Rather, ‘fullness of times’ offers those past times a new destiny – a destiny absorbed and transformed into the ‘time now in Christ’, the time of the ‘one new humanity’ reconciled to God’s household on the basis of Christ’s death. Thus, the ‘administration of the fullness of times’ is an ongoing dynamic situation sustained by gospel proclamation, the way in which Gentiles ‘apart from Christ’ join ‘those who were the first to hope in Christ’ as fellow-sharers in God’s spiritual blessing (1:12-13).

Whereas we saw in Galatians 4:4 that the point of separation between the past and the fullness of time is the birth of Jesus, here in Ephesians 1:10, the death of Jesus is the point of inception of the administration of the fullness of times.1218 We have seen that the phrase toij aiwšin toij epercontaij (2:7; cf. 1:14, 21) constitutes the

1217 Cf. Hafemann, ‘Paul and the Exile’, 348-49. Contra Barth who posits that a conclusion and a new beginning are envisaged by the expression ‘fullness of times’. See Barth, Ephesians, 88-89.
possible future limit of the current administration of the fullness of times. Thus, the
summing of all things in Christ in the fullness of times is to span from his death until
the world to come. In the world to come, the focus will converge upon the abundance
of God’s grace for believers (of Jewish and Gentile origins) during the administration
of the fullness of times (2:7; cf. 1 Cor 15:28).\footnote{See Cullmann, ‘Kingship’, 111-14. Cf. Dunn, ‘How New’, 375-76.} In the fullness of times, however,
the supremacy of Christ is demonstrated in the ‘restoration of humankind that has
been effected through the gospel, the “return” from the exile of sin and death’.\footnote{See Wright, Resurrection, 237.}

8.5. Summary: The Scope of Fullness of Time/Fullness of Times in Paul

The foregoing inquiry into how Paul viewed his own time yields the following
results:

(1) For Paul, ‘fullness of time’/‘fullness of times’ are not geometrical points in time
in spite of the occurrence of καιρός as the term for ‘time’ in Ephesians 1:10. The two
expressions (i.e. ‘fullness of time’/‘fullness of times’) represent distinctive emphases

\footnote{See Wright, Resurrection, 237.}
on describing the present time, as the time-span before the world to come. In other words, for Paul, his present constitutes the fullness of time/fullness of times duration.

(2) If taken separately, ‘fullness of time’ encompasses the earthly ministry as well as the present ministry of the exalted Lord. It defines its point of inception from the birth of Jesus (Gal 4:4-6; Rom 1:1-4) and spans through to the outpouring of the Spirit upon believers on the day of Pentecost and even encompassing Paul’s mission and the time until the world to come.1221 Paul’s inclusion of the earthly phase of Jesus’ ministry underscores the freedom Jesus has procured for Jew and Gentile by his faithfulness ‘under the Law’ and unto death (cf. Gal 5:1).

(3) ‘Fullness of times’ in Ephesians 1:10, on the other hand, identifies the cross of Christ as its point of inception in keeping with the emphasis in Ephesians on the revelation of the ‘mystery’ of God’s will through the gospel, namely, that Gentiles are co-sharers with Israel in their promises. That is, the significance of the cross underscores the post-exaltation phase of Jesus’ ministry where Jew and Gentile are now gathered to God’s family as the one new humanity in Christ.

(4) Since fullness of time/fullness of times represent different emphases on the ministry of Jesus, Paul’s characterization of the fullness of time/fullness of times may be referred to as Time under the Son of God. Time under the Son of God encompasses Jesus’ earthly ministry and his death and resurrection, upon which basis the ingathering of ‘sons’ through the adoption of the one new humanity to God’s family takes place. While the previous epoch before the coming of Christ may be

identified as Time under the Law and/or sin, the current epoch under the Son is time during which Jew and Gentile believers are gathered to God on the basis of Christ’s death.

(5) Even though the passages examined here do not refer to the Davidic connection of Jesus, the reference to Jesus as the ‘Son’ in Galatians 4:4 seems to presuppose this background. The language of ‘sending’ used here implies ‘Präexistenzchristologie’ but in relation to Jesus’ being ‘born of a woman’ shifts the emphasis to his incarnation. Paul is more explicit about this emphasis in Romans 1:3-4 – a passage which is conceptually parallel to Galatians 4:4 – where Jesus is described as genomenon ek spermatoj Davi id kat a. sarka. In that light, Jesus’ genomenon ek gunai koj in Galatians 4:4 can be understood in terms of his being the ‘seed of David according to the flesh’. As a result, the adoption of the new humanity from Jew and Gentile to God’s family during the Time under the Son may be perceived in terms of the ongoing restoration of Israel under David’s offspring. As Ciampa remarks: ‘This blessing is experienced under the reign of the promised Davidic king who, in person and through his people, brings about the originally intended universal reign of God over all creation in such a way that his glory is reflected in the entire universe’.

Two further implications of our exegesis are applicable to disputed issues in Paul’s theology:

1222 Cf. Mussner, Galaterbrief, 273.  
1223 See Ciampa, ‘History of Redemption’, 301.
(1) Our exegesis indicates that no discernible development occurs in Paul’s eschatology between the dates these letters were written, especially in relation to his understanding of time. We have seen that Paul’s usage of different terms for ‘time’ in Galatians 4:4 and Ephesians 1:10 reflects differences in emphases and not conceptual development. Thus, even though our conclusion is valid to one specific aspect of Paul’s eschatology, namely, his thinking about his own time, it may well be that any observable developments in his eschatological thinking are to be better accounted for on the basis of the different theological issues he was addressing in his letters.

(2) If ‘salvation history’ denotes the personal redemptive activity of God within human history in order to effect his eternal saving intention which finds its fulfilment in the ministry of Jesus culminating in his death, resurrection and eventual return, then our exegesis of Galatians 4:4 and Ephesians 1:10 has shown that this notion stands very close to the centre of Paul’s view of time. For Paul, time since the sending of Christ is fullness of time/s. It is time for the summing up of all things under the Son of God, David’s offspring, during which God is gathering people to his family from Jew and Gentile on the basis of Christ’s death.

8.6. From Jesus to Paul: Discernible Influence of Jesus’ Time-word on Paul

On the basis of the foregoing observations, we conclude that Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15 may well have influenced Paul, especially in relation to Paul’s

---

1224 This case bears more weight if Galatians is taken to be Paul’s earliest letter [see Barnett, Bircht, 206-10] and Ephesians as the work of Pauline disciples.
1225 For the various views regarding the development of Paul’s eschatology, see Mearns, ‘Eschatological Development’, 137-57; Longenecker, ‘Nature’, 85-95.
1226 See Yarbrough, ‘Paul and Salvation History’, 297. See also Ciampa, ‘History of Redemption’, 255.
1227 Cf. Kümmel, “‘Individualgeschichte’”, 142.
understanding of his present time as the time during which God’s restoration of his people is taking place. However, whereas in Mark the beginning of the fulfilment of time is identified with Jesus’ advent from Nazareth (Mark 1:9), for Paul, the point of inception of the fullness of time is the birth of Jesus. Since Paul’s audience in Galatians and Ephesians is predominantly Gentile, Jesus’ earthly ministry is mentioned only in relation to its purpose to redeem and to gather God’s people from the Gentiles to be co-sharers with Israel in the blessing of God’s family. In that sense, Paul seems to have understood his mission to the Gentiles in terms of the ingathering of the elect from the ‘ends of the earth to the ends of heaven’ to the exalted Son of God, in keeping with the characteristic of the second phase of Jesus’ ministry.

8.7. Fullness of Time/s and Fulfilment of Time

Given that Jesus’ time-word influenced Paul’s understanding of his own time, a comparison of these passages is most likely to deepen our understanding of how Jesus’ proclamation in Mark 1:15 is construed in them.

1228 Otherwise circumcision would have not been a crucial issue in the letter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Mark 1:15</th>
<th>Galatians 4:4-5</th>
<th>Ephesians 1:10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Πεπλήρωσεν τον πληρώματος του τόπου</td>
<td>οτι δε όντως το πλήρωμα του τόπου</td>
<td>εις γενομένην τον πληρώματος των καιρών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>και γεγονέναι το βασίλειον των οσιών</td>
<td>ειςησθεν ο γενομένης των οσιών</td>
<td>ανεκδόθη αισχορεία ο Κυριακός</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison is based on the underlying notional continuity between these passages which we have determined in the foregoing discussion. A number of significant items are remarkable.

Firstly, the fulfilment of time that Jesus announced (see Section A) corresponds to the coming of the fullness of time and the administration of the fullness of times in Paul. The linguistic elements of the notion of fulfilment of time in Galatians 4:4 and Ephesians 1:10 appear to presuppose an underlying knowledge of Jesus’ time-word and even an anticipation of the fulfilment of time. For this prior knowledge, either Paul is drawing on the Jesus tradition he received, or on the Scriptures that fostered such an expectation, or from both at once. In Chapter 4, we saw that the notion of the
fulfilment of time and God’s promise of the restoration of Israel under the messianic Davidic offspring are tied intimately to each other (Jer 33:17-26). The probability for Jesus and Paul to have known Jeremiah 33:17-26 is more likely than knowing such passages as 1QpHab vii 2, 13-14 and 2 Baruch 30:1 that speak of the notion of the fulfilment of time as coinciding with the establishment of the messianic kingdom. In fact, Paul alludes to and cites Scriptures from Jeremiah, and even the Jesus tradition contains reference to some of Jeremiah’s prophecy being fulfilled (e.g. Matt 2:18). Even though Jeremiah 33:17-26 is not cited directly by either Paul or Jesus, the likelihood of them knowing it appears stronger than passages from Qumran or the pseudepigrapha. Given Paul’s references to the time in relation to the fulfilment of God’s purpose for the salvation of his people (2 Cor 5:17, 19; Gal 6:15; Rom 3:21; 13:11, 12), it is likely that he may have received Jesus’ time-word in connection with Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom.

Secondly, the notion of the coming near of the Kingdom of God in Jesus’ proclamation (see Section B) is more pointedly identified with the activities and prerogatives of the Son of God as the Messiah in the Pauline passages examined. In comparison to Mark 1:15, therefore, the probability of the Pauline passages being post-resurrection interpretations of Jesus’ central proclamation is higher. From the above table of comparison, the coming near of the kingdom in Mark 1:15 corresponds to the sending of the Son in Galatians 4:4 for a specific mission – to redeem those under the Law in order that they may receive the promised Spirit. In other words, the coming near of the Kingdom of God is dynamically realized in the redemption and the adoption of children to God’s family. Membership in God’s

1229 For these other possibilities see Scott, Adoption, 161-62.
1230 Consider also our discussion in Chapter 4.10.
1231 See Wenham, Paul: Follower of Jesus, 52-53.
family guarantees a place in the Kingdom of God. In Ephesians 1:10, the coming near of the kingdom assumes a more realized (but not over-realized) universalistic pattern, namely, the summing up of all things under the supremacy of Christ. This all-embracing dominion of Christ over all things is dynamically realized in the ingathering of Gentiles and Jews to God’s family on the basis of Jesus’ death. In comparison to Mark 1:15, the ingathering of believers to God’s family is, in other words, the present dynamic of the coming near of the Kingdom of God.

Thirdly, the coming near of the kingdom embraces the redemption and subsequently the adoption of believers to God’s family. The earthly ministry of Jesus, in the light of Galatians 4:4, spans from his birth through to his death for the redemption of those under sin. Consequently, the adoption as ‘sons’ and the outpouring of the Spirit upon believers in Galatians corresponds to the summing up of ‘all things’ under Christ in Ephesians 1:10. In the light of the previous chapter, this stage corresponds to the ingathering of the elect from the ‘ends of the earth to the ends of the heaven’ subsequent to Jesus’ exaltation in his death (Mark 13:27). The ‘elect’, in the light of the Pauline passages, constitutes Jews and Gentiles.

In view of the foregoing observations on the influence of Jesus’ time-word on Paul’s understanding of his own time, it appears that the position advocated by Weiss in 1892, namely, that Jesus’ time-word was a Paulinism can hardly be maintained. Since Paul employs the notion of fullness of time/s in connection with the drawing near of both Jew and Gentile into the family of God, it seems most likely that Galatians 4:4 and Ephesians 1:10 are post-resurrection interpretations of Jesus’ time-

\[1232\] An over-realized eschatology seems to be maintained in some quarters of the Pentecostal movement. See for example the resources in Pastor Joseph Prince’s ‘Destined to Reign’ ministry. See https://www.destined2reign.com/onlinestore/p-1276 Destined-to-reign-softback.aspx.
word in Mark 1:15. In the previous chapter, we saw that the ingathering of people from outside Israel to Jesus is the peculiar feature of the post-resurrection phase of Jesus’ horizon of time conception. Moreover, Jesus’ conception of time is simpler than Paul’s. Given that, it is more likely that the former came first and gave rise to the latter on the principle that the more complicated and developed comes later.

8.8. Summary: Fullness of Time/s in Comparison with the Phases of Jesus’ Ministry

In the light of the passages considered here alone, a definitive word on whether Paul was influenced by Jesus is beyond our reach. Nevertheless, due to the intimate connection of the time-word with Jesus’ central proclamation of the kingdom, it seems plausible that the Pauline passages just considered may be seen as post-resurrection interpretations of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15. An underlying familiarity either with Jesus’ announcement or with the Jewish tradition anticipating the fulfilment of time seems to be presupposed in Galatians 4:4 and Ephesians 1:10.

The post-resurrection provenance of the Pauline passages seems far more evident when the Pauline passages examined are considered as possible interpretations of the expectation of the coming near of the Kingdom of God. In Galatians 4:4, it assumes the form of the redemption and adoption of believers into God’s family. In Ephesians 1:10, the coming near of the kingdom is realized in the cosmic supremacy of Christ over all things. These observations indicate that the Pauline passages evaluated here,

---

1233 Perhaps the conceptual parallels may event reflect that Jesus and Paul were familiar with the same biblical and Jewish traditions about what God would do in the fullness of time/s.
1234 See Weiss, Proclamation, 65, n.13. This view is maintained in recent scholarship, for instance, by Schenk, ‘Secundäre Jesuanisierungen’, II: 877-904.
1235 Perhaps a helpful analogy to this notion is the Synoptic problem where Matthew’s more developed Christology implies a later development than that in Mark.
despite their lack of verbal similarities with Mark 1:15, are most probably the earliest post-resurrection receptions of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15.

Rather than Paul influencing Jesus, it seems more likely that the Gospel writers, as well as Paul know the distinction between the pre-resurrection version of Jesus’ time-word and its post-resurrection interpretation as one finds in Paul. This can be seen in the distinctive ways in which they perceived the historical reality of Jesus Christ. As Lemcio observes ‘[n]ot one of the Evangelists merges Jesus’ era with the church’s or overlays the former with the latter’. The alternative is of course to suppose that Mark was fundamentally creative in working backwards from Pauline concepts to the derivation of Jesus’ words such as the time-word in Mark 1:15. But, in the light of the foregoing discussion, this is less likely since the continuity between Jesus’ time word and Paul’s development of it as we have observed is primarily notional and not verbal.

Nevertheless, whereas the focus in Mark seems to be placed on the pre-resurrection phase of Jesus’ ministry, in Paul we are being enabled to witness the specific manner in which the ingathering of the elect is currently conducted in the post-exaltation phase of Jesus’ ministry. In the light of Jesus’ exaltation, Paul seems to have viewed his own mission in terms of the ingathering of the elect to the exalted Son of God, under whose supremacy God has subjected all things, the things on earth and the things in heaven.

1236 See Lemcio, Past of Jesus, 16. For a representative of the position against which Lemcio is defending his thesis, see Bornkamm, ‘Stilling of the Storm’, 52-53.
9. CONCLUSION. TIME AS THE PROMISE OF THE KINGDOM

In conclusion, we would like to offer some specific reflections on the findings of this study and then draw implications in relation to the wider theological enterprise, followed by some thoughts on areas for further investigations.

9.1. The Findings of the Present Study

The findings of the present study indicate that the biblical notion of time is to be tied intimately to the vision of the restoration of Israel. Biblically speaking, time is no abstract philosophical concept. Rather, time is understood simply as day and night. Time came into being as a result of the very first utterance of creation, ‘Let there be light’. From that primordial light emerged ‘light’ and ‘darkness’ which were named ‘day’ and ‘night’. Day and night on ‘day one’ of creation should not be perceived as ‘units’ of time, for the sun and the moon were not yet created. This underlines the different ways in which ‘day’ is used in the Scriptures. Sometimes it can signify a long period of time or even an epoch as is often the case in the expression ‘day of the Lord’. Most often, ‘day’ in the Bible may signify a unit more fitting with the modern concept of a 24-hour day. But the meaning of the term ‘day’ in the Bible is not confined to the modern (or postmodern) understanding of time.

From creation, moreover, we find that time is paradoxically cyclic-linear in shape. It is cyclic in the sense that its coming into being is described in rhythmic manner by the expression, ‘and there was evening and there was morning, day x’. In Jeremiah 33:20-26, we find that this rhythmic pattern is maintained by God’s covenant with day and night. In that covenant God commits himself to day and night coming in their appointed time. However, an additional dimension of this covenant is given in
Jeremiah 33:20-26. The un-breakability of this covenant guarantees the restoration of Israel under the offspring of David. That is to say, the reason why day and night keep on following each other in the cyclic repetitive manner in which we experience them is essentially God’s promise of the restoration of Israel. We have argued that the relationship between God’s covenant with day and night and the restoration of Israel is one of fulfilment, becoming another promise, and thus awaiting further fulfilment. Hence, the daily fulfilment of God’s covenant with day and night is the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring which is still awaiting its final fulfilment.

Since time is biblically understood in terms of day and night, throughout this study we have chosen to refer to God’s covenant with day and night as his covenant with time. That God’s covenant with time maintains the cyclic pattern of time as the promise of a coming fulfilment indicates that time also possesses a linear dimension. The way in which the cyclic and linear dimensions of time inter-relate is discernible in the creation narrative. Whereas the expression ‘and there was evening and there was morning day x’ maintains the cyclic course of time, ‘day one’, ‘day two’ and so forth of creation flow irreversibly to God’s rest on the ‘seventh day’. This linear irreversible flow of time establishes a Sabbath structure for the biblical notion of time. It provides a kind of microcosm or template for the general pattern of God’s activity in time narrated in the rest of the Bible.

God’s covenant with time is made permanent explicitly with Noah (Gen 8:22). In Jeremiah 33:20-26 the ceaseless cyclic pattern of time established with Noah is spoken of in terms of its specific goal, namely, the restoration of Israel under David’s
offspring. Notably, in Jeremiah 33:20-21 a priestly class is expected to multiply in this restored kingdom. God affirms that he will increase the number of levitical priests under the restored Davidic kingdom. However, the notion of the restored kingdom being a kingdom of priests is a motif that plays a less important role in the anticipation of Israel’s restoration in the Old Testament and the Second Temple literature. In the reiteration of God’s covenant with time in relation to the restoration of Israel in Jeremiah 33:25-26, the predicted levitical priestly class is replaced by the ‘descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob’. It is for this reason that throughout this study we have spoken about the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring rather than of David and the levitical priesthood.

The anticipation of Israel’s restoration in connection with time is developed in some of the Second Temple Literature. Particularly important here are the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries*, *The Sibylline Oracles* and *The Psalms of Solomon*. A most helpful illustration of the paradoxical connection between the cyclic and linear dimensions of time is to be found in the *Book of the Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 72-82). There, we find that the sun and the moon are carried along their daily circular course by celestial chariots driven by the wind. This circular movement on a daily basis maintains the coming of each year with precision – a process expected to last until the new creation. In that sense, the destiny of the daily cyclic movement of time once again lies on the linear horizon of time, in the new creation. The cyclic-linear shape of time is thus illustrated by the wheels of the celestial chariots carrying the sun and the moon to their ultimate destiny. By means of the circular movement of the celestial chariots’ wheels, the ‘chariot of time’ presses on to its final destiny in the new creation.
An interesting connection can be made here with Daniel’s vision of the throne of the ‘Ancient of Days’. Daniel saw that God’s throne ‘was fiery flames and its wheels were burning fire’ (Dan 7:9; emphasis added). The implication is that the throne of God is a mobile unit. If his dominion is then established through the one like a son of Man (Dan 7:13-14), we could conjecture that the ‘wheels’ of God’s throne are to carry the Son of Man’s dominion to its ultimate destiny, which, according to Daniel, is the general resurrection (Dan 12:2-3). If the wheels of God’s throne correspond to time, then its circular movement corresponds to the coming of day and night in their appointed time which carries God’s dominion forward on the linear horizon towards the resurrection.

In the Sibylline Oracles 3, the cyclic pattern of time is the medium upon which the anticipation of the re-establishment of the kingdom of Solomon is maintained. This kingdom is described in the Psalms of Solomon as a messianic kingdom to which a purified Israel will be gathered first of all, before the nations will also flock to live under its dominion. This kingdom is the ultimate restoration of Israel after it has been scattered throughout the nations.

The notion of the final restoration of Israel in connection with time features in several documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls in relation to the final victory of the ‘sons of light’ over the ‘sons of darkness’. In 1QS x each new day marks the ongoing renewal of God’s mercy upon its community. The cyclic pattern of time is maintained by ‘laws of the great luminary’ (4Q427) which determine that day follows night in its regular course. However, the dawn of each new day foreshadows
the final victory of light over darkness in the consummation of all things. Each new day ‘hastens on’ to the ‘appointed time of God’ in which he will shine through over all darkness and the ‘sons of light’ will shine through with him. In that sense, day and night are cosmic symbols, forecasting ultimately the restoration of God and his people.

Jesus’ announcement of the fulfilment of time and the coming near of the Kingdom of God in Mark 1:15 takes on new significance when read in the light of the Jewish, both biblical and post-biblical, connection between time and the restoration of Israel. Our investigation has affirmed the important relationship between Jesus’ time-word and the kingdom-saying in Mark 1:15. Jesus’ time-word is most intelligible if read against the background of God’s covenant with time promising the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring. God’s covenant with time becomes, in Jesus’ announcement, the promise of the coming near of the Kingdom of God. In that sense, Jesus’ announcement of the fulfilment of time is the declaration of the fulfilment of the promise of Israel’s restoration. But Israel’s restoration is viewed in terms of the coming near of the Kingdom of God.

Moreover, our findings confirm that the fulfilment of time begins, according to Mark, with the advent of Jesus from Nazareth. On the basis of the recent development in Greek verbal aspect, we find that the perfect verbs of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15, namely, peplhwaí and híggiken, highlight ongoing intensifying dynamics of equal semantic significance. This insight from verbal aspect indicates not only that Jesus’ time-word denotes an event of equal semantic importance to that encoded in the kingdom saying in Mark 1:15, it moreover implies
that the time-word should no longer be treated merely as time-indicator or as pointing to the conclusion of a past epoch. Rather, Jesus’ time-word essentially underscores a non-past dynamic. Even if this newer paradigm of the perfect tense-form is still being assessed, we have shown that the interaction of lexical semantics in Mark in connection with the rest of the Scriptures produces the same result, namely, that the fulfillment of time is an ongoing dynamic to be ultimately concluded in the general resurrection.

Furthermore, on the basis of our syntactical analysis of Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15, we observe that Jesus’ time-word constitutes an abstract notion, the concrete manifestation of which is the coming near of the Kingdom of God. This observation is confirmed from discourse analysis. The announcement Πεπλήρωσεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and ἀνετέλεσεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ represent a co-referential componential tie in which both Jesus’ time-word and the kingdom saying are linguistic components signifying the same event. In other words, the fulfilment of time that begins with Jesus’ advent from Nazareth, according to Mark, is to be observable in the coming near of the Kingdom of God throughout Jesus’ ministry.

On the basis of an analysis of the horizon of Jesus’ conception of time, we find that his ministry essentially spans two inside phases (P3 and P4) before the coming of the end (τὸ τέλος) in Jesus’ return (P5). The third inside phase of Jesus’ horizon of time conception involves his coming to suffer many things and to die. Yet, precisely at the point of his death, Jesus is exalted in the clouds to be given dominion and therefore to gather his people from the ‘four winds’ of the earth. This is confirmed by

1237 See Figure 7.2 above.
the empty tomb in Mark as the evidence of Jesus’ resurrection. The words of the two young men in Jesus’ tomb may thus be taken as ‘He has been exalted (hgerch); he is not here’ (16:6).¹²³⁸

Whereas during the first inside phase of Jesus’ ministry his gathering of people to himself seems confined to Israel alone, on the basis of his exaltation in the clouds, the second inside phase of Jesus’ ministry consists of his messengers gathering the elect to him from the ‘four winds’ of the earth. This ingathering of the elect is consistent with the prediction of Israel’s restoration in Deuteronomy and in the prophets. Hence, time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is actualized in the dynamic of the horizon of Jesus’ conception of time. But the ingathering of people to himself is the beginning form of the realm component of the Kingdom of God as a people-space.

In accordance with our findings, the exaltation of Jesus in the clouds in his death cannot be perceived in terms of the parousia. Rather, his exaltation is like the branches of the fig tree becoming tender and putting forth its leaves signifying that summer is near. That is, Jesus’ exaltation in the clouds is the crucial sign that the end (tōtdq̄) is ‘near at the very gates’. However, the end remains in the future in the general resurrection and the world to come when Jesus returns. The language of judgment – even though attested in 9:43-49 – is not very prominent in Mark. Nevertheless, the entire ministry of Jesus may be identified with the dawn of the ‘day of the Lord’ in keeping with the Malachi connection at the opening of Mark.

¹²³⁸ It should be acknowledged, however, that even though hgerch is not the same as qhwyh our proposed reading here is based on the argument set forth in Chapter 7.
Similarly, the notion of the overlap of the ages is not present in Mark. In Mark, whereas those who may follow Jesus will obtain assurance of inheriting eternal life, Jesus is anticipating the coming of the Kingdom of God in the future. When Jesus returns in the resurrection and ushering in the world to come, the realm component of the Kingdom, which currently exists as a people-space, will become a people-in-territorial-space. God’s people will enjoy eternal life in the Kingdom. Hence, the dynamic of the coming near of the Kingdom is manifested in the dynamic of the fulfilment of the promise of time, not only as the dynamic reign of God but more specifically as the manifestation of the coming near of the spatial coordinates of the Kingdom – now as people-space but then, in the world to come, as God’s holy place.

When we come to Paul, we find a post-resurrection interpretation of the notion of the fulfilment of time, represented as the fullness of time/s in connection with the restoration of Israel. Notably, whereas in Mark the fullness of time/s begins with Jesus’ coming from Nazareth, in Paul it is the description of the dispensation that begins with Jesus’ birth, and includes his death and resurrection and the adoption of the new humanity, from both Jews and Gentiles, to the family of God under the supremacy of Jesus. Jesus’ death is precisely the point at which the Gentiles, who were without hope and outside Christ, are drawn near to be co-sharers with Israel in God’s blessing. The dispensation of the fullness of time/s may be perceived as time under the Son and under the Spirit since God’s will is to sum up all things – the things in heaven and the things on earth – under Jesus’ headship. Whereas the old dispensation persists for Jew and Gentile outside of Christ, the new humanity who is reconciled to God have experienced the blessing of the fullness of time/s in Christ.
They are given a new destiny, namely, the world to come and inheritance of the Kingdom of God. 

Since Paul talks about the adoption of the new humanity consisting of both Jews and Gentiles, during the fullness of time/s, we find that his perspective is a post-resurrection interpretation of Jesus’ time-word. His usage of the notion is consistent with the characterization of the second inside phase of the horizon of Jesus’ view of time (P4) where the elect are gathered from the ‘ends of the earth to the ends of the heavens’ by his messengers. In Paul, this ingathering of the elect is magnified as the adoption of the new humanity from Jew and Gentile to God on the basis of Christ’s death. 

Hence, Paul’s usage of the terminology of fullness of time/s is consistent with an interpretation of Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15 in the setting of the worldwide missionary activity of the early church. The restoration of Israel as the fulfilment of time is thus actualized in world evangelization. This dynamic is ongoing until the world to come. In the light of the foregoing discussion, therefore, Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 may be paraphrased as follows:

Time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is fulfilled and this is manifested in the Kingdom of God progressively coming near.

Clearly, our interpretation of Jesus’ programmatic announcement in Mark 1:15 is deeply indebted to the biblical understanding that God’s covenantal commitment to giving day and night (= time) in their appointed time on a daily basis is the promise
of time. \textit{Pepl h\varpi wta\i o\kai r\oj kai. h\varphi ki k\en h\basi l\e i a tou\q\e\ou\} indicates that this promise is to be actualized in Jesus’ ingathering of people to him from Israel and from the ends of the earth through gospel proclamation.

In actual fact, the proofs of an interpretative hypothesis indeed lie first in its power to bring the text to life,

to explain the data of the text coherently yet completely, naturally yet deeply, with a minimum of strain yet a maximum of detail, with what mathematicians call elegance – a blend of simplicity and richness. Without simplicity and naturalness, the suspicion will arise that the interpretation is being foisted on the text.\textsuperscript{1239}

Within the proper controls of the methodological procedure adopted in the present study, we have attempted to show that precisely such ‘a blend of simplicity and richness’ underlies Jesus’ announcement in Mark 1:15 if viewed in terms of God’s covenant with time as the promise of the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring manifested in the coming near of the Kingdom of God. Our hypothesis ‘saves appearance’ by explaining why Jesus did not simply announce that the ‘Kingdom of God is coming near’, but places a time-word before it. Moreover, our hypothesis serves to indicate why later redactors simply preserve Jesus’ time-word in the way we have it in Mark 1:15 and did not throw it away or replace it with other time-expressions that Jesus used in other contexts of his teachings.

\textsuperscript{1239} See Gundry, ‘New Jerusalem’, 254-55. See also Wright, ‘Jesus, Israel’, 78.
9.2. Implications of our Findings for a Biblical Theology of Time

Several implications of our findings are applicable for the discussion of the notion of time in the Bible.

(1) Methodologically speaking, this study has shown that a biblical theology of time requires an integration of various approaches to the lexical and grammatical elements of the biblical text. A combination of insights from semantic analysis, verbal aspect and discourse analysis are needed in order to grasp an adequate understanding of the text/s investigated. Moreover, the scope of the investigated data may be broadened to include the development of the themes of canonical documents in the resources of earliest Judaism consisting of the Apocrypha, Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Notably, the present study has found that the proper starting point for biblical theological reflection at least on the notion of time is the teaching of Jesus since his ministry characterizes the fulfilment of time.

(2) Contrary to the growing consensus in recent New Testament scholarship that underscores studying Jesus’ actions as a far better starting-point for an inquiry into the historical Jesus than studying isolated sayings, this study has shown that within the constraints of proper methodological considerations, it is still possible to investigate an aspect of the historical Jesus on the basis of a single logion. Recent scholarship seems to have developed various tools at our disposal, such as for example, verbal aspect, discourse analysis as well as narrative strategy, that have put us in a better position to engage in this undertaking than it was previously thought.

1240 See Wright, Jesus, 140-41; Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 4, 8; Meyer, Aims, 19.
However, the results will have to depend on how scholars organize these technical tools to fit the data.

(3) The findings of this study indicate that time in the Bible is to be viewed simply in terms of day and night. These are not primarily units of time. Rather, we have observed that day and night are given in their appointed time as a confirmation of God’s commitment to his covenant with time.

(4) The traditional antithetical relation between cyclic and linear time seems not to hold for the biblical notion of time. Our study finds that cyclic and linear time form the irreducible dimension of the biblical notion of time. In other words, they are mutually inclusive and not antithetical.

(5) Our findings implicate two modifications of Cullmann’s insight about the ‘already-but-not-yet’ eschatological tension in the present time: (i) This tension is to be viewed as particularly relevant to the believers’ experience only, and not in terms of a notion of an overlap of the ages (see below); (ii) The relationship between the ‘already’ and the ‘not-yet’ is asymmetrical, and not symmetrical, with the emphasis lying on the ‘not-yet’ aspect of the Christian hope.

(6) Our findings regarding time also confirm Cullmann’s insight, against James Barr, that despite its difficulties it is possible to study some aspects of the notion of time in the Bible without the constraints of philosophical theology, and moreover, that

\[1241\] That is, given that Jesus’ conception of time investigated in this study is regarded as a proper aspect of the notion of time presented in the Bible.
the notion of time can be investigated in the Bible and should not be thought of as exclusive to philosophical theology.

(7) Since time was created on the basis of the first utterance of creation, the inquiry as to whether God is inside or outside of time appears to belong primarily to philosophical concerns of which the authors of the Bible were quite unaware.

(8) This study also confirms Pannenberg’s thesis that time and history are to be taken as revelation. That is, the traditional distinction between ‘sacred’ and ‘secular’ history seems to prevent us from viewing time in its totality as an aspect of God’s creation. As an aspect of God’s creation, day and night, as we have observed, are given by God in their appointed time as promise, the fulfilment of which will be the ultimacy of history, namely, the resurrection and the world to come. In that relation, this study would add an important modification to Pannenberg’s thesis, namely, that time is the ongoing manifestation of God’s promise of the restoration of the world under David’s offspring, Jesus of Nazareth.

(9) It seems misleading to depict the overlap of ages, that is, of the new age as an historical epoch of its own, intervening in the present time. Our study confirms Barth’s view that a ‘bridge’ between this world and the world to come is presented in the person of Jesus Christ, and that this is not an overlap. Consequently, the experience of the eschatological tension between the ‘already’ and ‘not yet’ is not a time-bound experience since we are still in the old age awaiting the resurrection and the world to come. Rather, the tension in the believers’ experience is a derivative of their new destiny granted by means of their participation in the new humanity
adopted into God’s family on the basis of Christ’s death awaiting the resurrection and the world to come in the return of Jesus.

(10) Even though Jesus did not give a treatise on the topic of time in his teaching, the central theme of his proclamation, namely, the Kingdom of God, cannot be rightly understood if viewed in terms of a timeless conceptual framework. As the promise of the restoration of Israel, time is a crucial component for understanding Jesus’ vision of the Kingdom of God. In other words, this study affirms the essential place of ‘near expectation’ in Jesus’ kingdom proclamation against attempts by Fuchs, Linnemann, and Jüngel amongst others to downplay its significance. Time is given to us in terms of day and night until the Kingdom of God is finally realized.

(11) In the light of our findings that God is committed to giving day and night as his promise of the establishment of the Kingdom of God, then an essential biblical modification may be offered to Martin Heidegger’s being-towards-death. If time is to be appropriated subjectively, on the basis of the biblical view of time delineated in this study, then our experience of time should rather be perceived as being-towards-the-Kingdom-of-God or being-towards-Resurrection. This in fact should be believers’ mode-of-being-in-the-world. It underscores that day and night are given to us until the kingdoms of this world become the Kingdom of the Lord and his Christ.

9.3. Areas for Further Investigation

This study raises a number of areas for further inquiries.
(1) This study concentrates on the relation of Jesus’ announcement, \( \text{Peplhwtai o' kalorj} \) and \( \text{hgyken h'basileia tou'qeou'} \), but more work needs to be done on the relationship of this statement with the rest of Mark 1:15, \( \text{metanofite kai, pistueite en tw'euaggelw} \). Perhaps this study has indicated one way in which this relationship may be viewed. Since the fulfilment of time is manifested in the ongoing restoration of Israel, repentance and faith are the essential elements of the performance of the restored people of God. In that sense, the significance of repentance in the teaching of Jesus is to be maintained against recent objections against it in Jesus research.

(2) There needs to be further inquiry into the way in which the dynamic of Jesus’ view of time is carried out consistently through the narrative plot-line of Mark’s Gospel. Our reconstruction of the horizon of Jesus’ view of time from Mark, using Mark 1:15 as a window of interpretation, was based on the selection of relevant passages that may indicate something about Jesus’ conception of time from Mark. However, an independent case that may confirm our findings could be argued by following the narrative structure of Mark, observing how time as the promise of the restoration of Israel is actualized throughout the two main divisions of Mark (1:1-8:26 and 8:27-16:8).

(3) We have left untouched Jesus’ view of time reflected in his parables, especially the so-called ‘parables of growth’. In Chapter 2, we saw that in the heyday of form criticism, the parables used to be the major source for investigating Jesus’ view of time (so Robinson, Fuchs and Crossan). Hence, it would be an interesting and worthwhile inquiry to probe into Jesus’ view of time as represented in the parables in relation to the findings of the present study.
(4) The notion of Jesus as the temple needs to be investigated with specific reference to Mark’s Gospel. A recent inquiry has been made into the function of the temple in Mark’s narrative. But on the basis that Jesus and his disciples, according to our findings, are the beginning form of the sacred space of the Kingdom of God and that the vision of the world to come is portrayed in terms of a new temple (Revelation 21-22) then it seems that the notion of Jesus as the sacred place of God to which his people are gathered is presupposed throughout his ministry, especially in terms of discipleship.

(5) A study of the relationship of Jesus and Paul in terms of their broader views on time may enhance our understanding of the Jesus-Paul continuity (or discontinuity). The present study has focused specifically on Jesus’ time-word and its possible construal in Paul’s letters and affirms the continuity of Paul. Our conclusion in this regard needs to be tested from a wider approach to the biblical data on time from both Jesus and Paul.

(6) There needs to be an inquiry into the possible relationship of time and the restoration of Israel especially in relation to the vision of the end provided by the book of Revelation. Beale has pointed in the right direction in this regard by studying the development of the idea of the temple throughout the biblical data on the basis of its relationship to Revelation 21-22. Our inquiry has been restricted to Mark’s Gospel, more particularly, to Jesus’ time-word in Mark 1:15 and its possible reception in Paul’s letters. But an inquiry into the book of Revelation will be a

\[\text{1242 See Gray, Temple, 198-200.}\]
worthwhile undertaking in this connection due to its graphic depiction of the vision of the end. To be sure, this vision has been a minefield for all kind of religious enthusiasms about the connection between world history and the Bible. But if the ongoing dynamic since the first coming of Jesus and until his second coming is that of the fulfilment of time in the restoration of Israel under David’s offspring, then it would be instructive to explore how this vision is dynamically brought about in view of the vision of the consummation in Revelation.
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