

ECCE HOMO:  
THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM AS THE RESTORATION OF HUMAN VICEGERENCY  
Dan G. McCartney

Jesus proclaimed that the Kingdom of God (or Kingdom of Heaven) was at hand. In Rabbinic literature, "kingdom of heaven" was equivalent to "God reigns" (cf. *TDNT* 1.571). Many studies on the Kingdom of God have shown that the kingdom that Jesus proclaimed is not a geographical sovereignty or an ethical advance caused by human submission to God; it is the rule or dynamic reign of God, the earthly exercise of his sovereignty.<sup>1</sup>

In what way was the reign of God only then "at hand"? Those same studies also show that in the OT God is *already* king, not only of Israel (Judg 8:23, 1 Sam 8:6) but of the whole earth (Ps 22:28: for dominion belongs to the Lord, and he rules over the nations; cf. Amos 9:7, Dan 4:17). His sovereign power is as much at work in the OT time as later. "The Lord has established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom rules over all." (Ps 103:19; cf. also the so-called "enthronement" Psalms, 47, 93, 96, 97, 99).

On the other hand there is also an OT expectation of a *future* manifestation of the sovereignty of God. Obad 21: "the kingdom *shall be* the Lord's." Dan 2:44: God shall set up "a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, nor shall its sovereignty be left to another." So how can the OT say God's sovereignty is already absolute, and yet still expect a future reign of God? How can Jesus proclaim that the kingdom of God is near or has arrived, implying that previously it was not near or present?

The answer usually given is that when the reign of God arrives, God exerts his sovereign rule to fulfill his promises by subduing oppressive and unjust evil powers in the world and establishing righteousness and peace on earth.<sup>2</sup> The cross and resurrection and the sending of the Spirit have brought OT promises to fulfilment. Nevertheless, there are still evil powers in the world, there are still oppression and injustice, and there is little peace on earth. So the question "In what sense does the kingdom begin with Jesus" becomes even more demanding. In what way is God's sovereign rule now exercised that it was not exercised before the coming of Jesus?

We should seek a solution by referring to Jesus' sovereignty. In the resurrection and ascension Jesus *receives* sovereignty, which assumes that in some sense he did not have it previously. Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father *now* (Acts 2:32-36). He has *now* received the name that is above every name (Phil 2:9-11). But in what way was he not sovereign earlier? Was not the eternal Son, the Second Person of the Trinity, sovereign from the beginning?

The answer to these latter questions is that Jesus received the kingdom as a *human*. Before his incarnation, the eternal Son was not a man, and thus did not rule as a man. Philippians 2 for example speaks of the preincarnate Christ as equal with God. However, Christ only received the "name above every name" and the homage of every knee and tongue after, and as reward for, his

incarnation, suffering, and death. Similarly Col 1:15-20 speaks of Christ as the first-born of all *creation* because all things were created in him, etc., but he is the head of the *church* because he is the "first born from the dead . . . having reconciled to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross." Similarly, in Heb 2:9 Jesus was "made for a little while lower than the angels" *so that* everything might be subject to him, he being crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death. And Rom 1:3-4 speaks of Jesus being appointed Son of God in power, which, as J. Murray pointed out,<sup>3</sup> is not a declaration of his eternal sonship but his instatement *as man*<sup>4</sup> to the position of sovereignty.

This exaltation of Jesus as man suggests some explanation for our first question, as to the way in which the "reign of God" has now come where it was not here before. The coming of the kingdom, the arrival of God's sovereign reign, is not a reinstatement of God's sovereign exercise of power to accomplish his purposes (which was always true). The arrival of the reign of God is the *reinstatement of the originally intended divine order for earth, with man properly situated as God's vicegerent*.<sup>5</sup>

To defend this thesis, I will look first at the connection of the concept of divine rule (the reign of God) and the vicegerency of man in the OT, and then see how the person and work of Jesus in the NT fulfilled that vicegerency. This is hardly a comprehensive look at all the relevant passages, but I trust it will be enough to convince the reader that this reinstatement of human vicegerency in the person of Jesus is indeed the arrival of God's reign.

### 1. *The Old Testament*

God created Man according to his image (Gen 1:27-28). As we see from Gen 5:3, imageness is linked to sonship. Man as image means Man as *son*, and the son of God is a king. Consequently, included as one function of this imageness was Man's *dominion* (Gen 1:28). God's rule of earth was, in the original order of creation, accomplished through the agency of man's vicegerency. When Man fell, he spoiled his vicegerency; man was cast out of the garden, and the earth was no longer compliant in its subjection to him.

The restoration of man's vicegerency began with God's covenants with the patriarchs. The idea of covenant as vassal treaty implies that God is suzerain king<sup>6</sup> and that those with whom he makes covenant are subordinate kings. A significant aspect of the covenant with Abraham is the promise of *dominion* over the land. Abraham and his seed are to be restored to a sovereignty under God as overlord.

In the Davidic theocracy, a typological and imperfect human vicegerency was reinstated as partial fulfilment of the promise to Abraham. The king of Israel was anointed on Zion as the son of God (Ps 2:7; 89:27f.). In spite of the imperfection of Israel's kingship, it reminded God's people of

the proper eschatological state of affairs, and it pointed toward a future when David's greater Son would rule a perfect kingdom as God's vicegerent (Ps 80:17 - But let thy hand be upon the *man* of thy right hand, the *son of man* whom thou hast made strong for thyself! Cf. 2 Sam 7:14). Therefore, the throne of David can also be called the royal throne of Yhwh (1 Chron 28:5, 29:23, 2 Chron 9:8). When the son of David rules on Zion, the reign of God is properly upon the earth.

Many psalms carry through this notion of human vicegerency. Three of these particularly develop this theme, and are applied to Jesus in the NT:

*Psalm 2* as already noted makes reference to the "Lord's anointed" as representative vicegerent for the sovereign Lord. Yhwh installs his vicegerent on Zion, declares him to be "Son," and gives the ends of the earth as his dominion. Though this is typologically fulfilled in David and Solomon, even they did not have the extensive and total sovereignty depicted here, and thus the NT quite properly understands the Psalm as referring ultimately to Jesus the Anointed Man (Heb 1:5).

*Psalm 8* begins with an exultation in God as creator and sovereign, and expresses astonishment that God should even pay attention to man. Not only does God pay attention, he "crowns" him and gives him dominion over this creation. This Psalm is cited and developed in 1 Corinthians 15:27 and Hebrews 2:6-9: although we do not yet see humanity in total dominion, we do see the representative Man already crowned.

*Psalm 45* is identified in its title as a wedding song, apparently for the king. Here too, the hyperbolic expressions point beyond whoever the original king in view was, stressing that this king stands in the place of God, placed there by God for dominion over the world. Hebrews also quotes this Psalm in its development of Jesus as fulfilling the role of God's vicegerent (Heb 1:8-9).

The linking of God's kingship with the Davidic vicegerency continues in the writing prophets. The prophet who proclaimed Yhwh as king (Isa 6:5) also related Yhwh's kingship to that of the Son of David in 9:6-7.

For to us a child is born, to us a son is given; and the government will be upon his shoulder, and his name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there will be no end, upon the throne of David and over his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice . . .

This restoration of human vicegerency is effected by the anointing by the Spirit in 11:1-3:

The Spirit of the Lord will rest upon him, Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and fear of the Lord.

Vv 6-7 reflect restoration of harmony in the created order, particularly illustrated by man's restored sovereignty over the animal kingdom - "a little child shall lead them"; v.8 - "the sucking child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den." The little

child does not refer to Jesus, but it does illustrate the state of affairs under this restored dominion. Within the general picture of universal peace, humans, even children, will have dominion over creation.

The empowerment by the Spirit is why God's vicegerent is "the anointed one," the Christ. God is not himself the anointed king; he is the one who anoints. Anointing is appointment and empowerment to act in God's place. J. Gray observes: "Anointing was known in Egypt as a rite by which the authority of the Pharaoh was delegated to officials and to vassal kings in Syria in the 15th century, and it has been argued that it symbolized the strengthening of a person so anointed with special ability."<sup>7</sup> Later, the servant song of Isa 42 begins with that servant's re-establishing justice (*mishpat* - government) on the earth (42:4), which he does by the Spirit of God who has been put upon him (42:1).

The anointed servant of the servant songs Isa 42-53 stands in place of the anointed king prior to the exile. Many interpreters take the servant here to be corporate Israel. The use of singular verbs and pronouns is not incompatible with a corporate interpretation, nor are the apparently biographical details of the last song decisively antithetic to such an approach. Nevertheless, the fact that Israel, not the righteous sufferer, is the *recipient* of the benefit from the sacrificial redemptive suffering, indicates that something more than corporate Israel is in view as the servant of the Lord. Note particularly the contrasts between "him" and "us" in Chapter 53: V. 4 - he has borne our griefs . . . we esteemed him stricken . . . v.5 - he was wounded for our transgressions . . . v.6 - all we like sheep have wandered . . . v.8 - he was cut off out of the land of the living, stricken for the transgression of my ("his" according to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) people. Whether it is "my" or "his," the reference must be to Israel as God's people. Further, what would be the grave with the rich man, if collective Israel was in view? Nor can one appeal as J. Gray does<sup>8</sup> (292) to the idea that it is the *nations* who are speaking about righteous Israel in Isa 53, because in chaps. 51 and 52 Israel is the *recipient* of redemption, not the redeemer. And again, v.8 - it would hardly be "his" people, or "my" people if the nations were still speaking.

This is why many OT scholars who cannot accept that this is an actual prophecy of Christ suggest various other individuals as the servant of Isa 53.

The servant has been identified with Zerubbabel or Jehoiachin (so once Sellin), Isaiah of the Exile (so Gunkel, Mowinckel, Haller, Balla, Hans Schmidt and latterly Sellin), Jeremiah (so Sa'adya), and an unnamed rabbi who died in leprosy (so Duhm) . . . Nyberg . . . considered the possibility that the Suffering Servant may have been suggested by a succession of prophetic leaders, the element of suffering being perhaps emphasized by the tradition of the martyrdom of Isaiah of Jerusalem.<sup>9</sup>

The point is that the servant of Isaiah 42-53 cannot *only* refer to corporate Israel, but must point more ultimately to an individual. It is therefore instructive that in the servant songs, the return

of Yhwh as king on Zion (Isa 52:7) is bound up with the humiliation and exaltation of his "servant" (Isa 52:13). The restoration of God's kingdom is the restoration of his vicegerent's kingdom, just as the absence of the anointed king meant the absence of God's kingdom (cf. Jer 8:19f.: "Is Yhwh not in Zion? Is her King no longer there?").

Other passages in the prophets bear this out. Micah 4:7 also proclaims that in the future Yhwh will again be king on Mt. Zion. Micah too, a bit later in 5:1-5, expressed a messianic expectation. The hope of restoration of God's kingship is tied to the restoration of God's vicegerent as king. As Jesus reminded his disciples, Jerusalem is "the city of the great king" (Matt 5:34f).

Similarly, Jer 23:5-6 prophesies: "Behold the days are coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will dwell securely. And this is the name by which he will be called: 'The Lord is our righteousness.'" Again, the coming of the promised Davidic king is linked to the accomplishment of the promises of God's righteous reign. For God's reign to be complete, the Davidic king must be invested.

The book of Daniel is crucial for NT expectation. In Daniel 2 Nebuchadnezzar's dream is interpreted to show that the succeeding dominions of the world would be crushed by the "rock cut out but not by human hands," which is God's kingdom that will then grow to fill all the earth forever (Dan 2:34-35, 44-45). And in Dan 7:13-14 it is "One like a son of Man," the representative of humankind who appears before the Ancient of Days and receives dominion over the whole earth forever.

Why is this figure in Daniel 7 called "one *like* a son of Man"? Because he stands in contrast to the *beasts* mentioned earlier in the chapter. There is already a hint of deity, since he comes on the clouds, like Yhwh in Ps. 68:4, and the "like" indicates that this figure has human attributes, just as "like a son of God" in Dan 3:25 suggests divine attributes.<sup>10</sup>

As with Isaiah 53, this passage has also been interpreted as a reference to the corporate people of God.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, vv. 18 and 27 do speak of the *saints* of the Most High receiving the kingdom and possessing it forever.<sup>12</sup> There are however some differences between the vision of Dan 7:13 and the giving of dominion to the saints later in the chapter.<sup>13</sup> 7:13 is a vision of investiture by appearance before the "Ancient of Days," whereas 7:18, 27 is the promise of the saints receiving this kingdom that results from the destruction or judgment of the earthly kingdoms. Even if "one like the son of man" in 7:13 is parallel to the "saints of the Most High" of vv.18 and 27, it is still *the* son of man who properly qualifies as *the* holy one of the Lord in representation of his people.<sup>14</sup>

## 2. Intertestamental Development

In the intertestamental period, messianic kingdom expectation focused less on the reinstatement of a man as God's vicegerent, and more on the supremacy of Israel. Some of these, such as the

Assumption of Moses, when referring to the dawning of God's rule (chaps. 7-10) make no mention of a restored vicegerent, and only speak of God's subduing Israel's enemies and exalting Israel.

Neither do the Qumran materials make any connection between the expected reign of God and a messiah. Messianic expectation is absent in the only Qumran document that deals with reign of God, the War scroll (1QM xix.8, xii.3, x.12, xvii.8).<sup>15</sup> The "king of kings" (xiv.16 as reconstructed from 4QM<sup>a</sup>) and the "king of honor" (xii.8) refer to God. However, vi.6 does link God's "regaining" of the kingdom to his exercise of power through the holy ones of his people (presumably the sectaries).

A few texts of this period (*Pss. Sol.* 17, *1 Enoch* 89-90, *T. Jud.* 22:2f, 4 Ezra 13:35-50) still speak of the Messiah as the one who would bring about the reign, who reigns in God's kingdom on earth. For example *Pss. Sol.* 17:1-4: "Lord you yourself are our king forever . . . The kingdom of our God stands forever . . . You Lord have chosen David as king over Israel and you have sworn to him concerning his descendants for all time, that his kingdom should not cease before you."

One pseudepigraphal text portrays *Moses* as enthroned as God's vicegerent presently ruling over the universe. The *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian<sup>16</sup> apparently picked up on the OT vicegerency theme and applied it not forward to a coming figure, but back to Moses.

However, in most intertestamental texts the reign of God is considered nationalistically, as God's exaltation of Israel over the nations, and little mention is made of a restored human vicegerency.

### 3. *New Testament Developments*

The NT claims that Jesus fulfils the OT expectation of the restoration of human vicegerency. Perhaps the clearest indication that the restoration of humanity's vicegerency is a key theme in the eschatological plan of God is in Hebrews 2, which refers to the eighth Psalm's understanding of man's designated position as sovereign over creation, and then notes that

In putting everything under him, God left nothing that is not subject to him. Yet at present we do not see everything subject to him (man), but we see Jesus . . . now crowned with glory and honor . . .

That Hebrews is viewing this subjection as eschatological is clear from v.5: "it is not to angels that he has subjected *the world to come*." It is also clear that this eschatological restoration of human rule is proleptically fulfilled by Jesus Christ, who represents all redeemed humankind in achieving this dominion. Jesus, the representative man, has been given dominion, and thus man's vicegerency is representatively restored.<sup>17</sup> A major emphasis of these early chapters of Hebrews is to show that Jesus is fully a human being and is thereby properly qualified to represent man (cf. esp. 2:10-18).

Not only in the second chapter of Hebrews, but also earlier in the citations of the royal Psalms in Chapter 1, the theme of Jesus as the king and ruler of earth is clear. Although the citations,

especially as they are presented in Hebrews, clearly imply the deity of Jesus, they certainly call to mind the identification with the human Davidic king who is the original subject of most of the citations.

This eschatological reign of Jesus as representative man is not only found in Hebrews. Although the Gospels do not directly speak about anything like a "restoration of human rule" through Jesus Christ, an examination of Jesus' teaching and preaching shows that this restored rule of humankind through the representative man does lie behind the arrival of "the kingdom of God" which Jesus announces. In fact, as is evident from what follows, the theme is even more evident here than in either the OT or the intertestamental literature.

Jesus is anointed by the Holy Spirit following his baptism. The descent of the Spirit upon him was accompanied by God's declaration of his Sonship, in words reminiscent of Psalm 2 and Isaiah 42, which was an appointment to vicegerent rule. Thus, the coming of Jesus the king is the coming of the reign of God.<sup>18</sup>

#### *i. Jesus' Actions and Teaching*

All that is recorded of Jesus' deeds and teaching in the Gospels elucidates his message of the expected near arrival of God's sovereign reign. This is often noted now in various works on the coming of the kingdom (see note 1); here we want specifically to note how these elements also point to that reign as the reinstatement of human sovereignty in the person of Jesus Christ.

##### *(a) Proclamation*

A special characteristic of Jesus' words about the kingdom of God was that he *announced* it.<sup>19</sup> The *proclamation* of the reign of God is uncharacteristic of all contemporary material.<sup>20</sup> Jesus' announcement of the arrival of the reign of God is also his claim to instate it as God's anointed vicegerent. In Luke, his preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth specifically lays claim to the anointing of Isaiah 61 (Luke 4:16-21), which passage of course details the sovereign functions that the anointed one would perform.

##### *(b) Exorcism*

Throughout the Galilean ministry in the synoptic Gospels, Jesus casts demons out by the Spirit of God, and this is a sign that "the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Matt 12:28, Luke 11:20). This is one of the clearest statements of Jesus that the kingdom has already arrived (ἐφθασεν rather than the more usual ἤγγικεν). When Jesus as man, empowered by the Spirit, exercises authority over the demons, the proper vicegerency of man under God is restored. Jesus did what Adam should have done; he cast the serpent out of the garden.

##### *(c) Healing*

Healing too is associated with the reign of God (Luke 9:1-6, Matt 9:35, 10:1, 9-11, Mark 6:6-12), because disease, like demon possession, was a disruption of the proper order of creation with man over creation. "Healing thus implied the victory of the Divine King in the cosmic conflict and Creation as an aspect of the imposition of His government."<sup>21</sup> The proper order of man over creation was being restored.

*(d) Power over nature*

Especially noteworthy here is Matt 8:27 - "What sort of man is this that even the wind and the sea obey him?" Although the disciples can see very well that Jesus is a human being, it is also clear that Jesus is exercising divine authority over the elements, even as the Lord is said to do in several Psalms (18:15, 65:7, 89:9, 107:29). Here is demonstrated that Jesus, a man, exercises vicegerency over nature.

*(e) Shepherd Imagery*

J. Jeremias<sup>22</sup> notes that when Jesus called himself Shepherd, he was probably using a kingly image. As Gray points out,

Ps. 100 is probably an enthronement psalm, Israel is the flock which God shepherds, and the shepherd is well known in royal texts from the ANE as a figure for the king. So in Israel the king as shepherd (Mic. 5:4) is appropriately the vicegerent of the Divine King, the Shepherd of Israel. Thus in the prospect of restoration after the Exile God's servant David, that is a prince of David's line, is declared to be a shepherd over His flock (Ezek. 34:23). This passage is moreover explicitly quoted by Jesus in His declaration that He was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mt. 15:24ff) with particular reference to Ezek. 34:15.<sup>23</sup>

*(f) Time limit pronouncements*

The restoration of vicegerency to the man Jesus Christ is thus the "coming of the kingdom of God." This may explain the so called "time-limit" pronouncements such as Mark 9:1 (Luke 9:27): "There are some standing here who will not taste death until they see the kingdom of God come with power." The disciples witnessed the ascension, and thus saw complete dominion restored to the Man; they did see the reign of God come with power. Similarly, Matt 10:23: "You will not complete the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes." Whether or not these particular texts are to be understood in this way, the exaltation of the Son of Man to kingship at the right hand of the Father *is* surely a coming of the kingdom in power. The restoration of the Man to vicegerency is the coming of the kingdom. Even the statement to the Sanhedrin that "you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven" is a reference to Jesus' coming restoration to vicegerency, whether that is understood as its partial fulfilment in AD 70 or its total implementation at the close of history. At least some members of the Sanhedrin witnessed that vicegerency both positively in the growth of the church and negatively in the dissolution of their own power in the

judgment of the destruction of Jerusalem,<sup>24</sup> and all will be compelled to submit to it at the last judgment (Phil 2:10-11).

(g) *Johannine pronouncements*

John loves irony, and often records words of people who inadvertently give testimony to the truth. The most famous example is Caiaphas' unwitting prophecy about one man dying for the people. That irony is also apparent in Pilate's presentation of Jesus in 19:5 where he says "Behold, the man." The irony is even more clear later in v 14 where he again presents Jesus and says sarcastically "Behold, your king." John records these because he sees the truth that is unwittingly conveyed. Jesus *is* "the Man" who is, unbeknownst to Pilate, the King indeed. When the Jews reject Jesus, claiming no king but Caesar (19:12) they cut themselves off from the Kingdom of God, because they have rejected Jesus' vicegerency which is that Kingdom. John also notes Pilate's refusal to change the sign that reads "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews."

ii. *Jesus' Use of "Son of Man"*

All but the most skeptical critics now recognize that Jesus used the term "Son of Man" as a self designation. But the phrase is so controversial regarding its meaning and important as an indication of Jesus' claim to be God's vicegerent that it requires special treatment.

It seems likely that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a literal rendition of Aramaic *bar nasha*, which would be more idiomatically translated as simply ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "the man."<sup>25</sup> Note the parallelism in Ps 8:4 and 144:3 where "man" and "son of man" are equivalent. But we already noticed that Hebrews 2 picks up on the "son of man" of Psalm 8 and applies it to the representative "Man" whose vicegerency is already restored on behalf of his people. "The Man" means more than just "a human being."

Furthermore, the more idiomatic translation of "the man" would obscure the connection to Daniel 7, which is also in Jesus' mind, as we see from Mark 14:62, etc. Still, if we think of "The Man" as the meaning of Jesus self-referential term, it emphasizes his understanding of himself as representative of humanity,<sup>26</sup> a "second Adam" to use Paul's language (Romans 5, 1 Corinthians 15).<sup>27</sup> Probably it is as a representative that Ezekiel is called "son of man" throughout Ezekiel. This would point out too Jesus' implicit self identification as a prophet, but it appears that the force of the phrase is a *status* as the representative Man.

One of the earliest recorded instances<sup>28</sup> of Jesus' use of the phrase is in Matt 9:6 [= Mark 2:10] - "The Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins." This definitely places Jesus in the position of God's *human* vicegerent *on earth*, (note Matt 9:8, where crowds glorified God "who had given

such authority to *men*")<sup>29</sup>. On the other hand, neither the Messiah in current expectation nor the "Son of Man" in Enoch is said to forgive sins, for, as the Pharisees rightly perceived, only God can forgive sins. Thus, the exercise of *this* authority also entails a claim to the prerogatives of deity.

"The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath" is another bold expression of vicegerency that hints as well at divine prerogatives (Mark 2:28, Matt 12:8, Luke 6:5). If this is a *human* lordship it explains the connection to the preceding statement "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." As R. Guelich pointed out, the authority of the Son of Man in v.28 is rooted in the creation order of v.27.<sup>30</sup> Sabbath rest was instituted according to Exodus 20 in reflection of the creation pattern; man images God by his reflection of the pattern. So the weekly Sabbath is a reminder to man of God's suzerainty, and man's subordinate vicegerency. It reminds man that he is in God's image. "The Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath" entails that the Sabbath is returned to its proper place as gift rather than burden, a reminder to man of his high calling, not his enslavement.<sup>31</sup>

This idea was not wholly absent from Judaism. *Jub.* 50:9 describes the Sabbath as the day of holy rule. To announce that the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath may have meant that God's holy rule has come in the exaltation of Son of Man, and the eternal Sabbath is in some sense already here. It may however be wise not to press this, since the evidence is thin.

Of course, authority over the Sabbath is not license to abuse the Sabbath, any more than authority over the creation is license to abuse creation. Beasley-Murray relates hearing C.H. Dodd

draw attention to the possibility of understanding Mark 2:28 in relation to man's appointment to bear rule over the earth. He was particularly interested in the way Psalm 8 expounds man's sovereignty over God's creatures and in the use of the psalm in Hebrews chapter 2. The psalmist marvels at the way God is mindful of man and cares for the son of man, giving him dominion over all the works of his hands--the collocation of the three terms is notable. The psalmist further details one by one the "works" over which man has been given dominion; it is in this light that Dodd understood Jesus' words concerning dominion 'also over the sabbath,' for as Son of Man, Jesus viewed himself as the representative man to whom rule is given.<sup>32</sup>

Since the Sabbath served among Jews as anticipation of the rule of God, such an understanding fits vv 27 and 28 of Mark 2 together. The claim to "the Man's" lordship of the Sabbath is not separate from the claim that the Sabbath was made for Man.

After the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus uses the phrase "Son of Man" more frequently, though here it becomes more and more conjoined with his death and resurrection, as well as the consummation and judgment. Manson<sup>33</sup> thinks that the "righteous remnant" is the idea which links the strands of "Son of Man" theology in the Gospels, namely the Son of Man, servant of the Lord, righteous sufferer of the Psalms, and messiah. Certainly there was a concept of representative redemptive suffering in the intertestamental period. 4 Maccabees, for example, has a highly developed idea of a righteous remnant whose suffering redeems Israel. Following the lengthy

expansion of the 2 Maccabees story of the death of Eleazar and his sons, 4 Macc 17:20-22 informs the reader:

These then, having consecrated themselves for the sake of God, are now honored not only with this distinction but also by the fact that through them our enemies did not prevail against our nation, and the tyrant was punished and our land purified, since they became, as it were, a ransom for the sin of our nation. Through the blood of these righteous ones and through the propitiation of their death the divine providence rescued Israel.

But neither 4 Maccabees nor any other Intertestamental document identifies the redemptive sufferer with Messiah or Son of Man. It seems that no one linked all these until Jesus did. It was shocking that the coming vicegerent of earth who would restore the order of human sovereignty under God should also be the sufferer. Always before, the suffering was to create the pre-conditions necessary for the coming of the Messiah / Son of Man,<sup>34</sup> and thus the Reign of God.

The ultimate roots of Jesus' self-designative use of "Son of Man" are of course still debated, but even a half century ago Ned Stonehouse could say, "For some fifty years there has been a remarkable consensus of opinion supporting the judgment that the message concerning the Son of Man, and to a slightly lesser extent the kingdom associated with his coming, is derived from, or finds its ultimate Biblical background, in the Book of Daniel."<sup>35</sup> This solidity of consensus has only been strengthened by the more recent work of C.C. Caragounis<sup>36</sup> and S. Kim.<sup>37</sup> In the section on OT expectation of restored vicegerency we noted that Daniel 7:13-14 depicts "one like the son of man" who comes on the clouds and receives dominion. The most clear and certain indication that Daniel 7 is the background for Jesus' use of the phrase is of course Mark 14:62 and pars. It is noteworthy that here there is not only a link to Daniel 7 but also to Psalm 110:1 in the words "sitting at the right hand of power." "The right hand of power" was the position of the vicegerent, the co-regent. Jesus informs his unbelieving hearers that they would in some way witness his vicegerency and experience his sovereign dominion.

All these lines of testimony to Jesus as the focal point and embodiment of the reign of God are linked to the restoration of human vicegerency in his person as well. But if it is *human* vicegerency that is restored, why is it called *God's* kingdom or reign? It is called God's reign because the *proper created order of his sovereign rule on earth is with man as vicegerent*. The kingdom of God is given to Jesus (Luke 22:29-30) and thus becomes *his* kingdom, the kingdom of the Son of Man (Matt 13:41).

But in John 18:36, does not Jesus say "my kingdom is *not* of this world"? Indeed, but what does the "of" mean? Since "kingdom" does not mean "location of jurisdiction" Jesus' statement cannot mean "my kingdom is not geographically located in this world." It must mean either "my kingdom does not have its *source* in this world," or else more broadly, "my kingdom does not principally *pertain to* this geo-political world." Jesus was not denying that his sovereignty extends to this world. He did

not say "My kingdom does not extend to this world." The point is that the restoration of man's sovereignty in the designation of Jesus as king does not have its source or derive its power from this world. His servants had no need to fight, because God's reign, that is, the reestablishment of proper human vicegerency in Jesus, comes by God's power, not human power.

The ancient enmity is between the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of God (Matt 12:26). Satan expresses this ancient enmity by his enmity to man (Gen 3:15). By dethroning man on earth, Satan thought to dethrone God's reign on earth. That Christ the Man has defeated the rule of Satan means that the proper reign of God is restored.

### *iii. Other New Testament Authors*

This theme of Jesus' restored human sovereignty is not exclusive to the Gospels and Hebrews. It is reflected on and applied in other NT books.

#### *(a) Acts*

In some ways the book of Acts can be understood as the story of how the church assumes the mantle of Jesus as God's collective vicegerent in his kingdom, but of course the church's power is always rooted in Jesus' exaltation. In Acts 2, the Holy Spirit anoints the disciples as he anointed Jesus, whereupon they, like Jesus, begin to preach the arrival of the kingdom in power, using eschatological language of the OT. The coming of this eschatological kingdom is, according to Peter's speech, brought to completion in that "God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ." (2:36) The disciples now share in the healing and exorcising power as well (2:43, 3:7, etc.), which is always explicitly in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth (4:10), because God has raised him from the dead, and made the stone which the builders rejected the capstone or cornerstone (4:11).

Peter later tells Cornelius' household that "he is the one whom God appointed as judge of the living and the dead." God's sovereignty in judgment of creation is given to Jesus God's vicegerent, and as the people acknowledge that sovereignty of Jesus, they are given the Holy Spirit (10:42-46).

The sole use by the church of the title "Son of Man" occurs in Stephen's speech, who sees the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God. The reference to "standing" rather than sitting as in other references to Jesus' exaltation is probably because of the intercessory work of Jesus as advocate, but his position "at the right hand" indicates his co-regency with God his Father. For a *man* to stand in this place is revolutionary; it suggests Daniel 7 has already occurred, and that the Son of Man is no longer *coming* to receive dominion, but has already received it.

#### *(b) Paul*

Paul also acknowledges that now Christ rules the kingdom. With the subjugation of the cosmic powers and principalities (Col 2:15, Eph 4:8-10, cf. Eph 1:20-22), the proper vicegerency of the man

Jesus Christ is restored. Paul's understanding of Christ as the anointed man who rules as God's vicegerent is particularly made clear in 1 Cor 15:24-28:

Then comes the end, when he delivers the kingdom to God the Father after destroying every rule and every authority and power. For he must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. "For God has put all things in subjection under his feet." But when it says, "All things are put in subjection under him," it is plain that he is excepted who put all things under him. When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to every one. (RSV)

The kingdom or reign is given to Jesus, until the end when he has completely accomplished his vicegerency, and presents it to the Father, which will occur at the occasion of his final appearing (cf. 1 Tim 4:1). Notice that Paul also quotes Psalm 8, which refers to God's exaltation of *man*, putting all things under his feet. Paul understands Christ to be the representative man, through whom Psalm 8 is already fulfilled (cf. the discussion below on Hebrews 2).

Thus the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Christ are the same entity (Eph 5:5, 21), not only because Christ is God, for as God Christ has always reigned with the Father. It is because Christ is now a *man*, and as man rules as human vicegerent.

(c) *1 Peter*

1 Pet 3:18-22 is of course one of the most difficult and debated passages in the NT. I prefer the understanding of W. Dalton,<sup>38</sup> who, following Gschwind<sup>39</sup> and many others, identifies the "spirits in prison" as having reference to evil angels, but understands the "going and preaching" as Jesus' declaration of victory over the angels at the occasion of his ascension. But whatever the solution to v 19, v 22 presents Jesus as having been given authority over angels, principalities, and powers, resurrected and exalted in heaven. The use of the term *πορευθεις* here certainly refers to his ascension since the "going" is *into heaven*, and results in his sitting at the right hand of God. Further, his exaltation is as a man. 3:18b (put to death with respect to flesh but made alive with respect to Spirit) is parallel to 4:6 (be judged according to men with respect to flesh but live according to God with respect to spirit), and 4:6 refers to *human* experience. And of course the passage as a whole is about the believer's identification with Jesus, based on his identification with us. This too is the re-establishment of The Man's vicegerency over creation, even the angelic powers.

(d) *Revelation*

Finally the book of Revelation carries the restored reign of the Son of Man to its fulfillment and reflects on its meaning. As in Paul, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Christ are the same reign. The song of Rev. 11:15 concludes: "the kingdom of our Lord and of his anointed one [i.e., his vicegerent] has come over the whole world, and he will reign forever." The great war in Revelation is between Satan and the warrior king Jesus, who represents his people.

4. *Vicegerency and Christ's People*

The NT speaks not only of the restoration of *Jesus'* vicegerency; if Christ's inauguration of the kingdom is the restoration of human vicegerency, then the participation in the kingdom by believers is also a restoration of *their* vicegerency.

This was already hinted at in the OT. Psalm 8, for example, speaks of humanity in general as the recipient of dominion (v 6). In Daniel 7, after the vision of the representative "one like a son of man" receiving dominion, the "saints of the Most High" also obtain this everlasting dominion (v 18, 27).<sup>40</sup>

But it is particularly reflected on in the NT. This extension of vicegerency to Christ's disciples has a certain explanatory power when we look at the preaching of Jesus. It is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom to Jesus' *disciples* (Luke 12:32), just as he has given it to his son. Thus the eschatological beatitudes, "blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," and "blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth" speak of the restoration of human vicegerency. Actually, according to J. Dupont the first four beatitudes are in parallel pairs<sup>41</sup>:

CHARACTER:	1	poor . . . Kingdom of Heaven	3	meek . . . inherit earth
NEED:	2	mourn . . . comforted	4	hunger . . . satisfied

If Dupont is correct then "the meek will inherit the earth" is parallel to "to the poor in spirit belongs the kingdom." Thus, to have a share in the kingdom is also to inherit the earth. As we see in Paul, inheritance implies dominion. The meek and poor in spirit have a share in restored rulership over earth, and at least one result of the coming of the kingdom is that the meek acquire their heritage as vicegerents.

When Jesus compares the kingdom of God to a mustard seed, or to leaven in a lump, he seems to suggest that the kingdom of God *grows*. Of course, the sovereignty of God does not grow. The restoration of man as proper vicegerent under God, however, does grow. It begins with Jesus as the one Man being enthroned, and continues as humankind in him is restored to vicegerency. In that sense the reign of God can "increase."

Whether the kingdom of God in the conception of Jesus "grows" is subject to much discussion.<sup>42</sup> Kümmel is probably correct to maintain that Jesus saw the kingdom of God as present "only in his own person and his works" during his lifetime, but incorrect to suppose that Jesus "knew no other realization of the eschatological consummation." Jesus alone achieves the kingdom of God in his own vicegerency, exercised even before his exaltation (over the protests of the demons, who claimed that Jesus was anticipating his regency).

Ladd<sup>43</sup> agrees with Kümmel that the idea of the kingdom growing is not contained in these parables, because sowing and harvest in early Jewish and Christian literature symbolized not growth but supernaturalness. However, it is precisely *growth* that holds together the parables in Mk 4 and Mt 13. Yeast leavening whole lump is not a seed-harvest parable, but its resemblance is precisely

the *increase* of its effects. The Kingdom or Reign of God is not the church, but the Church does *enter* the Kingdom, and one can say that the Kingdom *creates* the church.<sup>44</sup> Certainly the parable of the dragnet envisions the Reign of God gathering numbers of people. In that sense, the reign of God increases in its extent as well as its effects.

This is also true with other kingdom parables. The treasure in the field and the pearl of great price demand big investment; the expectancy is a forthcoming sovereignty over the treasure and pearl.

This conception of the reign of God as human vicegerency explains how the reign of God is *taken away from* the chief priests and Pharisees and given to another nation (Matt 21:43). It is not that they are no longer subject to God's sovereign control, but that they have been disinherited from their vicegerency.

On the other hand, the disciples of Jesus are given sovereignty. He tells them, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom" and confers on them powers of binding and loosing. The parable of the talents assumes responsibility for delegated authority.

This is why the least in the kingdom is greater than John, the greatest prophet (Matt 11:11), and thus is by implication even greater than anyone (previously) born of woman. The least in the kingdom has his vicegerency restored to him. Perhaps this is even the clue to the enigmatic following verse, "From the time of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven is forcing its way (taking βιάζεται as middle) and the violent men are trying to seize it." The restoration of human vicegerency is proceeding ineluctably, and although they are not successful, violent men are trying to seize hold of it.<sup>45</sup>

The way in which this vicegerency is exercised is not quite what the world would expect. First, one must *receive* it like a child (Matt 18:3); it is not obtained by grasping or striving -- it is the *meek* who shall inherit the earth (Matt 5:5). Jesus gives the lead in the way he rules, by *servicing* the people he rules. Thus Mk 10:42-44: ". . . those regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them . . . [but] whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve . . ."

Further, right after Jesus gives his disciples "binding and loosing" power (Matt 18:19-20), he explains that this vicegerency is in imitation of the way in which the Father rules: as God forgives, so should his vicegerents forgive. (Matt 18:23-25).

Paul, perhaps even more than the Gospel writers, stresses the restoration of believers. According to Paul, mankind lost his vicegerency in Adam, but gains it again in Christ. In Romans 5:17, Adam's sin resulted in the "reign" of death displacing man, but through the one man Jesus Christ, those who have received the abounding of grace will *reign* in life. Similarly in 1 Cor 15:45: "The

first man Adam became a living being, but the last Adam became a life-giving spirit." Paul goes on to say in v.48 that "just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear<sup>46</sup> the image of the man of heaven."

Therefore Paul speaks of believers, not as perishable flesh and blood (v. 50) but as having put on the imperishable (v.53), as those who, unlike the unrighteous, are *inheriting* the kingdom of God (v.50; cf. 1 Cor 6:9f, Gal 5:21) and have "an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God" (Eph 5:21). Because we inherit this kingdom, our vicegerency is restored; we already are seated with Christ in heavenly places (Eph 2:6), which implies enthronement and rule.

This is of course because we are "fellow heirs with Christ" (Rom 8:17). Inheriting means coming into a position of ownership or sovereignty. Before inheritance, even the heirs are no better than slaves, although they are lords of the whole estate. But according to Galatians 4, Christians have come to their majority, and thus have inherited the estate. In this instance, it even means being no longer under the guardianship of the law. Just as the Son of Man was lord of the Sabbath as true vicegerent, so those in Christ are also in a certain sense "over" the law. The law is restored to a proper place *for* the Son of Man and his people.

Of course, for us the restoration to vicegerency is not yet fully here (cf. Heb 2). But it is our hope. "If we suffer we shall also reign with him" (1 Tim 2:12). Note Rom. 8:15-23:

You did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of sonship [i.e., kingship, because] . . . if we are children then we are heirs, heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ. . . .

As heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, we expect a time when the inheritance will be fully ours. This is why Paul regards "the sufferings of this present time" as "not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us" [or "in us"].

The creation waits in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed. For the creation was subjected to frustration, not by its own choice, but by the will of the one who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the [freedom of the glory] of the children of God. We know that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of childbirth right up to the present time. Not only so, but we ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait eagerly for our adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies.

As man's proper rule over creation was ruined by the fall in Gen 3, it will be restored at the occasion of our full adoption as sons.

Paul's idea of the reinvestiture of man may also lie behind the unusual use of the "coming with the clouds" motif in 1 Thess 4:17, where *believers* are caught up in the clouds with Jesus. As Jesus the Son of Man appeared before the ancient of days to receive dominion, believers appear before Jesus to receive dominion. I share the view that the "meeting" (*απαντήσις*) here is to escort the Lord back to earth as ruler,<sup>47</sup> not to accompany Jesus back to heaven. As Jesus' reign is fully manifested, those in him are fully invested. Even if it does mean returning to heaven, believers then appear with

Jesus before God, to receive dominion in and with Jesus. Herein lies the true solution to the situation in Daniel where first the representative "one like a son of man" receives dominion, and then the saints of the most high receive it.

Other NT books also carry this through. Implicit in Heb 2:5-9 is that, although now we see only Jesus with everything in subjection to him, there is an expected time when humankind in general will have such dominion. Similarly 12:28 says that believers should have hope, because they are or will be receiving<sup>48</sup> "an unshakeable kingdom." This undoubtedly recalls Daniel 2, the kingdom that cannot be removed, and again marks believers as co-sovereign with Jesus, who has already "sat down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Heb 12:2).

Revelation, dealing as it does with redemptive history right up to the consummation, witnesses to mankind's restoration to full vicegerency. Believers are a kingdom and priests (Rev 1:6, 5:10), and the book concludes with the observation that believers will all *reign* with Christ upon the earth (22:5; cf. 5:10 and 20:4-5).

### 5. Conclusion

Although this summary has been cursory, we have seen that the "coming" of the kingdom of God that is expected in the OT involves a reinstatement of humanity to the proper position of vicegerent, exercising the reign of God on earth. This vicegerent reign is imminent, indeed is already here, in the preaching and actions of Jesus and the testimony of the Evangelists. It is already here, in even greater measure though not yet in its fulness, in the preaching of Paul and the other apostles, as they proclaim Christ's exaltation and his receiving of dominion as the anointed king, God's Son. It is also growing as the vicegerency of The Man is given to Christ's elect ones, the saints of the Most High (Dan 7:18, 27), who are also anointed by the Holy One (1 Jn 2:20) who thus already reign with Christ in heavenly places (Eph 2:6). Finally, at "that day" the vicegerency of all who are in Christ will be fully realized, and the reign of God will be all in all.

### NOTES

1. Cf. e.g. H. Ridderbos, *The Coming of the Kingdom* (Philadelphia: P&R, 1962); G. E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1964) 126; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 74. Beasley-Murray traces the observation that the kingdom is dynamic rather than territorial to A. Schlatter, *Die Geschichte des Christus* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1923) 51, 140, 144-45.
2. Cf. G.R. Beasley-Murray, "The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus," *JETS* 35 (1992) 19.
3. J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 10.

4. The term "man" here is generic, like the Greek *anthropos* or the German *Mensch*. Unfortunately, this term has come to be seen as denoting specifically a male human, compelling us to use words like "humanity" or "people" to avoid implying exclusion of humans who are not male. But the words "humanity" and "people" focus on the plurality rather than the singularity which we wish to stress here, and "human" or "human being" stress the quality rather than the identity. Also, I know of no other term that can as easily capture both the notion of generic humanity and the singular representational character of "The Man" Jesus Christ.
5. This is not just a reinstatement of the original pre-lapsarian order, but the original order brought to fulfillment. It is thus an advance over the Adamic state.
6. Cf. W. Eichrodt, *The Theology of the Old Testament* [2 vols.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961] 1.194-202.
7. John Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God*, (Edinburgh: T&TCLark, 1979) 274, n1. Cf. E. Kutsch, *Salbung als Rechtsakt im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*, (BZAW 37; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963).
8. J. Gray, *Reign*, 292.
9. Gray, *Reign*, 292, n.67. The TgIsa understands the servant of Isa 53 as the individual Messiah, but is embarrassed by the references to suffering, and translates in such a way that only Israel, rather than her Messiah, suffers. Even the Gk versions of Aquila and Theodotion take the Servant as Messianic.

Although Jeremias (in W.Zimmerli & J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* [Naperville: Allenson, 1965] 76ff.) thinks he finds rabbinic authority for the concept of a suffering Messiah, his references do not prove his case, and since the NT consistently indicates shock on the part of Jews at the idea that the Messiah should suffer (note the reacting of Peter after his confession, and of Jews in general in Acts) it seems likely that they had trouble with Isa 53. The Qumran sectaries do of course understand their "Teacher of Righteousness" as a sufferer, but demonstrate no certain trace of an idea of a suffering Messiah, or any connection of the Messiah with Isa 53. With regard to the sensational but highly dubious reading of 4Q Serek Milhamah (4Q285) by H. Eisenman, who finds therein a reference to a slain Messiah, cf. M. Bockmuehl, "A 'Slain Messiah' in 4Q Serekh Milhamah (4Q285)?", *TynBul* 43:1 (1992) 155-169.
10. Cf. Phil 2:7-8. That he was "in the likeness of men" does not mean he was a non-human who simply *appeared* to have human characteristics; it means he was a human with genuine human attributes. Cf. G. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43; Waco: Word, 1983) 87.

11. E.g. J.A. Montgomery, *Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927) 304, 317-324.
12. Many scholars now identify the "saints" or "holy ones" of the Most High in v.18 as not God's people but angels, and thus the "one like a son of man" is a great angel that looks like a man, perhaps Michael who fights for Israel. But cf. the discussion of Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom*, 29-35. Certainly 7:27 identifies the saints as God's people.
13. Cf. E.J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) 155.
14. Again, cf. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom*, 33.
15. Cf. M. Lattke, "Zur jüdischen Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Begriffs der 'Königherrschaft Gottes'" in *Gegenwart und kommender Reich* (ed. P. Fiedler & D. Zeller; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975) 9-25, translated in B. Chilton, "On the Jewish Background of the Synoptic Concept 'The kingdom of God,'" in *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (ed. B. Chilton; London: SPCK, 1984) 72-91, esp. 82-83.
16. The work is preserved in Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica* IX.28,2-4; 29,5-16). For critical text and translation, cf. P.W. van der Horst, "Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist," *JSJ* 34 (1983) 21-29.
17. This is true even if Hebrews does not mean to say that *all* things are yet under Jesus feet (cf. 1 Cor 15:24-28).
18. Note here Lk 17:21 - the kingdom of God is among you". This could be a reflection of Zeph 3:15, "The King of Israel, the Lord, is in your midst." The reign of God is amidst even the Pharisees with whom Jesus was speaking, in that the human king was there. Vicegerency was restored in Christ.

On the other hand, many exegetes now argue for the translation of ἔντος ὑμῶν originally proposed by C.H. Roberts ("The Kingdom of Heaven (Lk XVII.21)" *HTR* 41 [1948] 5ff): "the kingdom of God is *within your reach*." If this is the case, then the saying would mean that the restored human vicegerency is something which the hearers could participate in. Although the linguistic grounds for this latter may be stronger, it still appears to me that the previous saying, that the kingdom is οὐ μετὰ παρατηρέσεως "not with observation," in contrast to the Pharisees' desires to be able to predict it, fits much better with the idea that the kingdom has already come in the person of Jesus than that the kingdom is open to participation. Although some (e.g. H. Riesenfeld, "Le règne de Dieu parmi vous ou en vous? (Luc 17,20-21)" *Revue Biblique* 98 [1991] 190-198) argue that ἔντος ὑμῶν *cannot* mean "among you," J. Lebourlier ("*Entos hymon* - Le sens 'au milieu de vous' est-il possible?" *Biblica* 73.2 [1992] 259-262) has demonstrated from

Xenophon and especially from the literalistic translations of Aquila and Symmachus that ἔντος at least *may* have a distributive sense of "among," especially when Semitic sources are involved .

19. Cf. B. Chilton, "God in Strength", in *Kingdom* 130, n.2.

20. Cf. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribners, 1971) 32 n. 2.

21. Gray, *Reign*, 1 n. 1.

22. Jeremias, *NT Theology*, 96ff.

23. Gray, *Reign*, 325.

24. One could also include Mk 13:30/Matt 24:34 here, since in context of Olivet discourse, "all these things" may very well be the "these things" of v.4, i.e. the premonitory signs of the end (C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, [Cambridge: CUP, 1959] 409; Lane, *Mark*, [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974] 447f., 479f). In my view, which I have not here the time to justify, the judgment against Jerusalem of AD 70 is indeed a manifestation of Christ's sovereign rule (as is implied by Matt 23:37-38), and points to the ultimate judgment and total restoration of human vicegerency at the end of history (which I believe to be the focus of Mk 13:26/Matt 24:30).

25. Cf. T.W. Manson, *Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content* (2d ed., Cambridge: CUP, 1959) 212; also *TDNT* 8.401f.

26. The heady discussion among Jeremias, Vermes, and J.A. Bowker on whether and in what way *bar nasha* can be a self-reference bypasses the essential matter, that Jesus used it as a frequent and typical self-reference (unlike others for whom such use is rare), and invested it with eschatological significance. G. Vermes, "The Use of *bar nash* / *bar nasha* in Jewish Aramaic" in M Black, ed., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (3d ed., Oxford: OUP, 1967) 310-328; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* I:261 n.1; Bowker, "The Son of Man," *JTS* 28 (1977) 32.

27. K. Lake & F. J. Foakes-Jackson suggest (*Beginnings of Christianity*, I [London: Macmillan, 1920] 380) that Paul did not refer to "Son of Man" because he knew Greek too well, instead speaking of "the man" (as in 1 Cor 15 and Eph 2:13-18).

28. In John 1:51 Jesus tells Nathanael, who had called him Son of God and King of Israel that he will see angels ascending and descending on the Son of Man, but chronological linking between the Synoptics and John is difficult. Matthew places the saying about foxes having holes, etc, prior to the healing of the paralytic, but Mark and Luke do not record this saying.

29. Lake and Foakes-Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity*, 1:379, argue that the miracle constituted proof not "that he was divine, but that the claim to forgive sin was within human competence." To this I would say both no and yes. Forgiveness of sins could only be within human competence because Jesus "the Man" was also divine; no one can forgive offenses against someone else.
30. R. A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1989) 129. Unfortunately, Guelich assumes that "if 2:27-28 are taken as a unit, 'Son of Man' cannot function as a Christological title." This inference only occurs because he has not seen the connection between Jesus' messiahship and his representative manhood.
31. There may be implied here, as in the story of Jesus forgiving the paralytic, the theological conclusion that *only* one who was both divine and human could ever truly achieve vicegerency. At least this is true after the fall.
32. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*, 233.
33. *Teaching of Jesus*, 227.
34. Cf. M.D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: SPCK, 1967) 98-102.
35. *Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979 [orig. publ. 1944]) 251.
36. *The Son of Man* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).
37. *The Son of Man as the Son of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).
38. W. J. Dalton, *Christ's Proclamation to the Spirits* (2d ed.; Rome: PBI, 1989).
39. K. Gschwind, *Die niederfahrt Christi in die unterwelt* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1911).
40. The "saints of the most high" are now often regarded not as the people of God but as God's angels, like Gabriel in 9:21 or Michael of 10:13 (cf. note ?). But 7:27 is parallel, and there the saints are identified as the people of God. The dominion comes to the *people* of the Most High.
41. J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes: Le problème littéraire. Les deux versions du Sermon sur le Montagne et des Béatitudes* (2d ed.; Bruges: Abbaye de Saint André, 1958) 1:252f.
42. Cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment* (London: SCM, 1957) 124-140.
43. G. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 102.
44. Ladd, *Theology of the New Testament*, 113.

45. Admittedly, this involves taking βιάζεται in a positive way and βιάσται in a negative, but no solution is without problems. On this passage cf. the mercifully brief argument in D.A. Carson, "Matthew", in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Volume 8* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 265-268. Luther's idea of Matt 11:12 as the vigorous men (βιάσται) laying hold of the kingdom does not quite fit with the rest of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom. It is not vigorous or violent activity which appropriates the blessings of the kingdom; the kingdom is rather received by the poor in spirit. The verse could be taken as a reference to the futile attempts of Herod and his ilk to suppress the arrival of God's reign, in which case the βιάζεται could be understood passively as "suffers violence." But I would suggest that "the violent are trying to seize it" (reading a conative present) means that people like Herod try to obtain their vicegerency by force, which of course does not work because true rulership requires submission to God.

46. In contrast with the rather weakly attested future tense, P<sup>46</sup>, Ν, and a wide variety of other witnesses have the subjunctive: "let us bear". But the context is not hortatory but explanatory of the contrast between the present earthly and the future heavenly. Further, whereas Paul frequently tells his hearers to imitate Christ, the attainment to the *image* of Christ is always a result of the divine activity (Rom 8:29, 2 Cor 3:18). The variance should be explained not as a deliberate scribal change but as an error of the ear (long vs short o).

47. Following G. Milligan, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, (London: Macmillan, 1908). Thessalonica was a Roman city, and its citizens were no doubt sensitive to the Roman tradition of the royal town's leading citizens going out to meet a visiting monarch and accompany him back into the city (cf. Acts 28:15, where Christians from Rome meet and escort Paul into the city).

48. The present participle παραλαμβάνοντες is ambiguous with respect to the time of receiving.