

NEW TESTAMENT REVISION NOTES

LUKE – CONTENTS

- Introduction
The birth of John the Baptist foretold
The birth of Jesus foretold
Mary visits Elizabeth
Mary's song
The birth of John the Baptist
The birth of Jesus
The shepherds and the angels
Jesus presented in the temple
The boy Jesus at the temple
John the Baptist prepares the way
The baptism and genealogy of Jesus
The temptation of Jesus
Jesus rejected at Nazareth
Jesus drives out an evil spirit
Jesus heals many
The calling of the first disciples
The man with leprosy
Jesus heals a paralytic
The calling of Levi
Jesus questioned about fasting
Lord of the Sabbath
The twelve apostles
Blessings and woes
Love for enemies
Judging others
A tree and its fruit
The wise and foolish builders
The faith of the Centurion
Jesus raises a widows son
Jesus and John the Baptist
Jesus anointed by a sinful woman
The parable of the sower
A lamp on a stand
Jesus' mother and brothers
Jesus calms the storm
The healing of a demon possessed man
A dead girl and sick woman
Jesus sends out the twelve
Jesus feeds the 5000
Peter's confession of Christ
The transfiguration
The healing of a boy with an evil spirit
Who will be the greatest
Samaritan opposition
The cost of following Jesus
Jesus sends out the 72
The parable of the Good Samaritan
At the home of Martha and Mary
Jesus' teaching on prayer
Jesus and Beelzebub
The sign of Jonah
The lamp of the body
Six woes
Warnings and encouragements
The parable of the rich fool
Do not worry
Watchfulness
No peace but division
Interpreting the times
Repent or perish
A crippled woman healed on the Sabbath
The parable of the mustard seed and yeast
The narrow door
Jesus' sorrow for Jerusalem
Jesus at a Pharisee's house
The parable of the great banquet
The cost of being a disciple
The parable of the lost sheep
The parable of the lost coin
The parable of the lost son
The parable of the shrewd manager
Additional teachings
The rich man and Lazarus
Sin, faith, duty
Ten healed of leprosy
The coming of the kingdom of God
The parable of the persistent widow
The parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector
The little children and Jesus
The rich ruler
Jesus again predicts his death
A blind beggar receives his sight
Zacchaeus the tax collector
The parable of the ten minas
The triumphal entry
Jesus at the temple
The authority of Jesus questioned
The parable of the tenants
Paying taxes to Caesar
The resurrection and marriage
Whose son is the Christ
The widow's offering
Signs of the end of the age
Judas agrees to betray Jesus
The Last Supper
Jesus Arrested
Peter disowns Jesus
The guards mock Jesus
Jesus before Pilate and Herod
The crucifixion
Jesus' death and burial
The resurrection
On the road to Emmaus

Jesus appears to the disciples
The Ascension

LUKE 1 – DIRECTOR

Form

Film - Narrative criticism, bricks and mortar. Film has common script but change presentation. Not content but perspective differs, e.g. changes of scene, lab to exotic and variation in Greek related. Songs. Less OT than Matthew, less Aramaic than Mark.

Genre - Pervo – ancient novel to edify and entertain. Actually histories did this (Josephus). Claim to eyewitness involvement gives authority.

Aim: explain the story behind Paul's arrest to God fearers (Tyson) "reassure" re Jewish pressure, also uncertainty on end times - also keep credible with Jews. Evidence, no explanation of Jewish aspects compared to Mark. But also Jews/Gentiles e.g. genealogy goes back to Adam and not to Abraham as in Matthew, Elijah/Elisha ministry in Nazareth.

Themes

Bock - 4 issues to convey to reader: (1) Salvation – how could Gentiles be God's people equally to Jews (2) How can God be working if Jews react negatively (3) How can person and teaching of crucified Jesus fit in – how has he an influence if Ascended (4) What means to respond, in community, how to live till his return. Seeks to put the reader inside the action and challenge to respond (e.g. Mary).

Underlying themes can all link to audience, (a) reversal in Day of Lord – and before e.g. rich man and Lazarus 13:30 first last. Status to be overturned. (b) universality material on Gentiles e.g. centurion (c) some "good people" misunderstand God e.g. Peter (d) Holy Spirit, but CG sees as character not subject, especially with them at decisive times (e) Social concern (poor, relationships in community) and restoration to community. Rich and woes in Sermon on Plain – attacks complacency. Also, women, prayer, joy, family, Son of Man.

Bock – Jesus control over events, not surprised at death – disciples need to pray, watch be ready – Luke seeking to shape evangelism in his church? Setbacks in Christian lives should not bother.

Conzelmann – Luke sees Jesus as middle of history, parousia yet to come. Gospel of what Jesus began to do – "working out" in Acts. Other Gospels, Jesus as end of history.

Design

Luke designed Gospel and Acts together. Introductions to Theophilus. Sweep, back to Rome from backwater of Empire "How church moved Judaism to Rome". Common themes in Luke Acts: healing, travel to Jerusalem – Rome, Slaying of Jesus and Stephen. Also prologue and Ascension. Ascension unique to Luke – link with Acts. Handing over Jesus and Paul to Romans.

Anchorage in Roman history – references to dates and well-known figures. Anchorage in Roman history, diminishing time past – 60, 30 years ago. And link politics and balance of power

Anchor Christianity in Jewish history – e.g. Exodus and temptation, grafted on and Stephen's speech. Prophecies. Keep up with God's innovations, law, temple, Jesus. But move to time of Gentiles.

Structure

Hence initial focus on John who gradually fades as Jesus grows showing latter's superiority (space in text). Parallels for John and Jesus – God's intervention, heavenly visitor, question and reply to angel, message about birth, future, name – fulfilment of scripture. And nationalistic songs. "Start wrong way so right way gets clearer." Social concern so includes John's preaching on that. Also baptism. But mainly fame harnessed to prepare people for Jesus.

Shift from nationalistic Israelite songs of Mary and Elizabeth to Nazareth – disappoint

Messianic hopes, focus on Gentiles, beginning shift backwater to mainstream. But not so blatant e.g. omit “house of prayer”. OT promises at start, revised to NT promises at end – Jesus as fulfilment of God’s plan for salvation of all people and witnesses called, responses/obedience needed, divine dei link to Gentile fate, destiny.

Comparison of Gospels shows omit initial Capernaum ministry to go straight to Nazareth (much later in Matthew and Mark and no Isaiah 61). Focus on the **plan of God** – regal and prophetic. Echoes Isaiah 61 in reply to John the Baptist. Suffering servant later “numbered with the transgressors”. Plan features – it is necessary. God teaches in narrative e.g. from transfiguration (“departure”) that crucifixion not a mistake – correct disciples. (Luke learns from Mark). Vindication at end for example fulfilling exaltation prophecy at trial.

Bucket theory: not chronological but streamlined, helps convey story. One bucket Galilee, one Jerusalem. In between chronological complexes birth, Caesarea Philippi and Transfiguration, and crucifixion. Helps geog sweep, Galilee, Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, ends of earth.

Travel and attitude in second bucket – less miracles and more parables. Teaching a new way to follow God and how distinct from existing one. Save the lost.

Gooding, metaphorical journey Galilee to Jerusalem, capital – road and journey motif cf. Matthew mountain. Trip to Jerusalem key addition to Mark, Matthew 5 sermons. Gives focus to crucifixion but not to exclusion of teaching (cf. Paul in Philippians 2). Only Luke says in transfiguration “they spoke of his departure, which he was about to bring to fulfilment at Jerusalem”.

Cleansing of temple CG as critique of Israel’s worship (and fig tree) not judgement and replacement (Wright).

Resurrection stories – role of women in all Gospels. Form of parallel as saw Jesus die unlike disciples – correct witnesses. And Luke’s particular focus? Resurrection and Ascension link Luke and Acts. Angel directs to Jerusalem not Galilee – streamlining. Emmaus story unique to Luke – misunderstandings and recollections. When breaks bread (Lord’s Supper) to be central. No record ate – ring of truth, cleared up separately. End of Gospel as beginning – Jerusalem, women, scripture.

LUKE 2 – MONEY, POOR, OUTCASTS

OT background (1) Poverty contrary to will of God; fellow humans he created in his image (Genesis 1:27). (2) Poor can be lazy as well as unfortunate (Prov 6:9-11) (3) God has no general preference for the poor, as a righteous person is normally prosperous (Prov 15:6) but (4) provisions in Law to aid poor so Israelites shall have no poor among them (Deut 15:4); equal distribution of land (Joshua 18); Jubilee (Leviticus 25); Sabbath year (Deuteronomy 15). (5) Experience of God’s blessing should lead to generosity and care for the poor (Deuteronomy 15:7-11). God identifies with the poor when they receive charity (Proverbs 19:17). Rich Jews to give alms. (6) Punishment for injustice ‘cows of Bashan’ (Amos 4:1-2) and lack of charity (Isaiah 58:5-10) (7) Just allocation of land to be restored by God himself in the latter days (Micah 4:4)

In Jesus’ day rich were high priests (religious power), Herodians (political power), landowners (exploit tenants), merchants (exploit debtors). Poorest – no means of production. Hard to maintain Law (taxes, kosher, prayer). “Poverty of righteous”.

Luke and poor

2 themes contribute – (1) Jesus and poor, and (2) Jesus and possessions in community.

Wealth can block divine mission of entering kingdom, need God's help. And link to status power and social privilege.

Jesus and poor

- (1) Jesus primary ministry was to be good news to the poor (**4:18**) as shown their equal value in the kingdom. Link to Jubilee (**4:16-21**) "release" and God's sovereignty over land lend to poor and forgive debts (**6:34**)
- (2) Luke's version of the Sermon on the Mount focuses on blessing those poor now and their oppression by the rich (**6:20-26**) while Matthew's looks at spiritually poor.
- (3) Warning about the rich man and Lazarus was based on Moses and the prophets.
- (4) Jesus' summary of the law - to love God and love your neighbour as yourself - puts charity as central for believers. Neighbour is defined very widely to be any suffering person, as shown by the Good Samaritan (**10:33**).
- (5) Jesus was poor by some measures – 2 doves for temple (**2:24**), dependence on support of others **8:1-3**
- (6) Curse on rich **6:24** if hold on to comfort. Rich fool as worldly prudence **12:16-21**
- (7) Poor come to banquet and rich do not **14:21**; reward if invite them **14:14**
- (8) Magnificat and God's concern, also John's teaching.

Jesus and possessions

- (1) Believers need to adopt his carefree approach to possessions not worrying (6:27), charitably identify with poor, trusting in God as he cares for nature (12:22-31) and loving fellow humans sell possessions and give to poor (**12:33**), "reward great" - kingdom. Guarantee God's hospitality by helping poor now - shrewd manager (**16:9**); invite poor to feasts (**14:14**). Give away surplus.
- (2) Wealth = security other than God. Salvation for the rich via charity to the poor; can't serve Mammon and God (16:13) due heart failure. Demonic power of wealth, also in Parable of Sower distract kingdom.
- (3) Not sharing implies distance from Jesus' "family" community rich young ruler 18:18. Social not just economic decision – and link to eschatological kingdom. The invitation is

to join a new community not just give money away alone (rich ruler). To not just aid relatives but all, as God welcomes them in his kingdom.

(4) Blow against client-patron system "if you give to those from whom you hope to receive in return" (**6:30**) – avoid control relationships. No better than sinners. Hence invite poor **14:14**. Lords Prayer debt and patronal friendship 11:4. Luke 22:25 "Gentiles Lord it over them".

Definition of poor - Oppression and helplessness. Wider than literally poor – those with low "ascribed status" (Eilberg Schwarz) factors over which person often has no control social labels (oppressed, hungry, poor, sinners); race sex age (children, women, widows, Samaritans, Gentiles); handicaps (maimed, blind, lame) jobs (beggar, shepherd, servant, soldier, tax collector) dishonourable status and exclusion. Inability to maintain inherited status (Malina). Jesus never preaches to poor per se but marginalized. Scapegoats for Israel's situation.

Salvation of "poor"

Green - Repentance: Levi and **Zacchaeus**, outsiders (sinners) welcomed in thanks to appropriate behaviour (feast, restitution). No security from wealth or respect of community before, now members of new community, "rejoin human race" receive kingdom; key verse "seek and save the lost" 19:10. (compare: **prodigal son, rich man and Lazarus** and rich young ruler). Lost sheep, coin, son. Contrast Pharisees banquet 14:15.

Table fellowship and sinners. Table as family, intimacy, solidarity, acceptance. Jesus raises up lowly and excluded – challenge to high status whether to join in. Acceptance and release for other low status; healing sick, women, children, Samaritans, shepherds in Nativity. Combined in case of woman with bleeding.

Theme of salvation as reversal, even rich man and Lazarus, Zacchaeus, and Eliz/Zech.

Demonic aspect of exclusion – healing of sick from misfortune and social consequences. Gerasene demoniac “not worn clothes or lived in a house”.

Not new law (see Max) – Peter still owns house etc. and rich women. Also reject Schweizer position. Wisdom teaching. Davids - “Ethic to be lived in light of eschatology” – kingdom here already “today fulfilled”, father cares for own, HS frees us to obey. But still voluntary decision. And anointing at Bethany – Jesus priority over poor.

LUKE 3 – WOMEN

Women’s low position in society, easy divorce, widows most vulnerable. Sole role wife and mother. Responsible for sexual temptation and sin, e.g. Josephus – women inferior and should be submissive. Proverbs on nagging wife and prostitute (but also wife of noble character – some synagogue rulers). Above analysis of outcasts applies.

Jesus healing, acceptance of sinners, challenge of male devaluation. Willingness to touch women. Positive examples of women in teaching. Luke as a feminist? Scholer – “Luke shows greatest interest in Jesus’ relationship with women and their involvement in his life and ministry”

Proclamation

Mary, Elizabeth and Anna proclaiming salvation interpretation of Jesus’ birth by power of Holy Spirit (**only Luke**)
Proclamation of resurrection – men did not believe (**only Luke**).

Jesus’ attitude to women

Link to Elijah story woman, foreign, widow, object of special concern **4:26**
Healing and faith: 8:48 bleeding women helped by touching Jesus (unclean – restoration to community)
Healing: **13:10-7** 18-year crippled woman healed on Sabbath (Daughter of Abraham)
Raising dead **7:11:17** widow of Nain
Forgiveness/acceptance 7:36-50 ”your faith has saved you go in peace” only Luke sinful

Answer questions **11:27** "Blessed is the mother who gave you birth and nursed you."

Women as examples in teaching

Faith: prayer: **18:1** Persistent widow
Evangelism: **15:8** lost coin
Possessions 21:1 widows mite – piety and also protest against exploitative system.
Jesus himself looking on Jerusalem as hen 13:34

Women as disciples

Generosity: **8:1-3** women were helpers.
Discipleship: **10:38-42** Mary at Jesus feet as equal disciple and Martha - hospitality.
Mother and sisters hear Word 8:21
Crucifixion and resurrection.
Among 120 followers in Acts receiving Holy Spirit.

Women’s stories paired with men’s

2:25-38 Simeon and Anna in Temple
4:25-27 Elijah widow/Elisha and Naaman
7:36-50 Anointing by the **sinful** woman (forgiveness of sexual sin)/Simon Pharisee’s inhospitality. Salvation as reversal
8:40-56 Jairus request/woman bleeding (unclean and outcast)
11:31-32 Queen of South/men of Nineveh
13:18-21 Man plants mustard/woman stirs yeast – story of kingdom
15:4-10 man with 100 sheep/woman with 10 coins – evangelism and God’s love for lost.
17:34-35 2 in bed, 2 women grinding, 2 men in a field – faithful and faithless in coming kingdom
24:1-12 women to tomb/**men don’t believe**

So is Luke the feminist?

Mentions more women – Anna, Elizabeth, Joanna, Susanna. Many **unique accounts** as shown above. Genealogy of Mary. But the cast the eye out and the divorce lines are in Matthew, and Matthew and Mark note sexually immoral women enter kingdom. John has Samaritan woman and woman caught in adultery. CG – “**not feminist but context of wider interest in outcasts**”.

HERMENEUTICS – AUTHORIAL INTENTION

Alternatives

Responsible hermeneutics will focus on what the author meant. Not (1) what means to us (reader response) that allows “creating meaning” and relativising with gay, etc glasses [Note in 19th century sought to account for miracles via author’s conscious deception (accommodationists) or subconsciousness (mythophiles) but never in reader response.] or (2) text as independent entity divorced from author (New Criticism) as inanimate object can’t have a meaning in terms of intention and purpose.

Text as window to a world not a mirror facilitating own illumination.

Defining authorial intention

Hirsch – text means what author meant. 4 criteria for finding most probable interpretation: possible according to norms of language; accounts for each linguistic component; follow conventions for type of language and makes sense.

Biblical scholars: Kaiser – author’s intended meaning is what text means. Marshall – aim of hermeneutics to discover what text meant for intended audience. Exegesis is to interpret passage allowing for all features on own and in context, including historical and literary environment. Klein - Bear in mind text written at particular time in specific culture by person with personal framework of preunderstandings. Had an aim for specific audience. Vanhoozer – author is one whose action determines meaning of text – subject matter, literary form and communicative energy.

Examples – John “these are written so you may believe Jesus is Son of God”. Luke “orderly account”, 1 John “that you may believe...have eternal life”, Proverbs “for wisdom and discipline”

Typology of interpretation – Stein

- (1) Meaning “paradigm or principle that the author consciously willed to convey by the sharable symbols he or she used”. Understanding possible as author competent and uses norms of language of original readers – so use these to decode. As author willed meaning at particular time and place in history, meaning can never change.
- (2) Implication – sub meanings of text that legitimately fall under author’s willed paradigm or principle, whether aware or not” Ephesians 5:14 do not take into body substances causing to lose control. Not new meanings. Author would clearly “own them” if asked. Only discovered not created by interpreter.
- (3) Significance – “how the reader responds to the willed meaning of the author”. Acts 1:8 says go and witness, implications include talk to neighbour, significance is how we respond. Not cognitive but volitional. Note “application” is mix of implication to individual (cognitive) and significance (volitional) so misleading.
- (4) Subject matter – non-narrative is topic and meaning is specific teaching – narrative subject matter is events and meaning is author’s intention in teaching via subject matter.

Issues in authorial intention

- (1) Intention of author is basic to everyday communication. Milk bills, last wills, film director. Common sense approach to communication is that words express author’s intention. Goal of interpretation is to find what author of text meant. This is why we look at Paul’s other letters to analyse Romans and not other literature.
- (2) Admit different readers get different implications for a text. Meaning – author’s intention and significance – reader’s understanding applied to own situation. This is where need creativity. Hirsch – “what it meant versus what it means”. Link to definitions above - Stein “wider implications beyond authors intention” Ephesians 5:14 drunk on wine versus drunk at all.

(3) Authors intended action. Don't just state facts but do things. What has author tried to achieve through words of his text. "The bowl's empty"

(4) Author's intention and scriptures' inspiration – God author of all words is traditional view, later complementary – God sovereign over human act of authorship (Warfield's concursus). So includes what God and author meant. Caird – "no access to author except through recorded words and no access to God's words except through those claiming to speak in his name". So if try get more ultimate meaning than writer, it will be our own. Concursus assures reliability in expressing God's purpose.

(5) Authorial intention fits with idea of inspiration – can't say materials inspired, or diverse assessments of readers.

(6) Case against authors intention (a) some argue "intentional fallacy" as author's intention can't be fully discerned as in head. Only written text, often forgotten. But against this can distinguish what consciously willed (detectable) and what are mental acts in writing (not detectable). (b) Author may make mistakes, multi layered or hard to follow – may not frame correctly or put on paper what meant. But Divine inspiration and normal experience of writing suggests minor issue.

(7) Author's intention and canon – Glenny: "must read texts in light of canon" as well as human author as Hosea out of Egypt called my son. (What are the limits?) NT writers are not finding "single original meaning" but could be (a) original author intended multilayered e.g. Isaiah's birth of saviour fulfilled in short and long term, or literal and spiritual. Prophecy. Klein – can have different applications but not multiple meanings except rare cases like John 3:3 (b) Holy Spirit can give new insight going beyond exegesis – OK for inspired Matthew but not uninspired us. God after all took part in original writing. (c) Original author had further implications or consequences (d) Later author creative exegesis going beyond original "pesher" – Biblical prophecies written for own time Isaiah 61 by Jesus; and "midrash" linking Bible together by discovery of "typological patterns, echoes,

rhythms of repetition". Acts 2:25-34 "typology" – discovery of correspondence due to unchanging character of God's working 1 Pet 3:20 Noah and baptism "reader response reading of OT". OT seen as forward looking.

(8) Concept of "sensus plenior" God's intention going beyond author's, especially in prophecy. Stein – not essential for non prophetic, and even in prophetic, no access to God's meaning. So best to stick to single meaning, and allow there to be implications e.g. Hosea's paradigm that God would not leave Israel in bondage but return to promised land – as Israel so Jesus.

Practical issues

Russell – evangelicals often confuse meaning and significance leading to interpretative relativism and primacy of preachers. In fact should stick to separation implying only one valid meaning - which is most likely one in passages immediate context (found by tracing books argument, reading commentaries, history etc.). If don't do work get wrong meaning, emphasis, application. And have existential and human centred view (meaning from life by personal choice) and not God centred. Must confront today's context with Bible's. Gospel not something for our progress and fulfilment but we need to give selves for its progress and fulfilment (fulfilled indirectly).

What we need to do – understand history Bible and language. Take account of church history of interpretation. But also workable in life of believers and conforms to theology.

Why can't Holy Spirit speak through Bible today as prophecy, like for NT writers? Link prophecy to Jesus has to override overt authorial intention. Barth and Bible as channel of revelation weakens link to author.

HOLY SPIRIT IN BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

Hermeneutics of concern to evangelicals as commitment to inerrancy and authority of Bible. Background not divine dictation but concursus - partnership as with grace and freewill – genuine authors who wrote what God wished “what Scripture says, God says” (Warfield) - God and humans work together. “Confluently” Humans write freely but God prepares for task via life story – providence and superintendence. So need to understand human and divine aspects. Holy Spirit available to help in process. How?

Bible texts

1 Cor 2:6: “The Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God.”

1 Cor 2:12-3 “We have not received the spirit of the world but the Spirit who is from God, that we may understand what God has freely given us. This is what we speak, not in words taught us by human wisdom but in words taught by the Spirit, expressing spiritual truths in spiritual words [RSV to those who possess the Spirit].”

The text seems to be about receiving the Gospel message with the help of the Holy Spirit’s guidance. The question is whether it is applicable solely to hearers of the message or the preacher as well as he prepares the message.

John 14:26: “But the Counsellor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you.”

This is a question of understanding and correctly reporting the words of Jesus (everything I have said) and also extending into other areas that God intends the disciples to know (teach you all things). The latter especially can be used for charismatic readings of Scripture.

John 16:13: “But when he, the Spirit of truth, comes, he will guide you into all truth. He will not speak on his own; he will speak

only what he hears, and he will tell you what is yet to come.”

Context is of preparation of the disciples for Jesus’ death, resurrection and ascension. Holy Spirit is the spirit of prophecy (what is to come) and of understanding (making it known to you).

Theologians evangelical to charismatic

Fuller – Spiritual message rejected not by lack of understanding but by lack of willingness. (Uses 1 Cor 2:14 “The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned”.) Cannot hate something without knowing it. To natural man, spiritual things understood but regarded as false. So Holy Spirit’s role is to change heart of reader so loves message although latter just conveyed by historical grammatical data. Meaning doesn’t come from Holy Spirit that can also be discerned by atheist. Difficulty is in step from description to application.

Zuck – Spirit works through word of God (doesn’t add as God breathed – sufficiency of scripture); but our interpretation unlike inspiration of writers not infallible. Spirit doesn’t let anyone see truths not evident to others. Agrees with Fuller some unregenerate may understand but not apply to heart. Illumination – show what means and persuade of truth. Interpretation not solely for elite but should not neglect their work. Need for spiritual devotion for interpretation but also study – doesn’t make study superfluous. Use study helps but seek new as well. Can’t ignore common sense and logic (“spirit of truth”). Nor need to fill gaps between text and hearer (language, culture, geographical, literary). Need effort. Some parts of Bible remain unclear. So need salvation, spiritual maturity, diligent study, common sense/logic and dependence on spirit.

Wallace: See 1 John 2:20, 27: “But you have an anointing from the Holy One, and

all of you know the truth.” “As for you, the anointing you received from him remains in you, and you do not need anyone to teach you.”

Does the presence of the Holy Spirit in the believer leads to a right understanding of the Word of God? Context (contrast with non believers) suggests only conviction of key truths of faith such as resurrection, salvation, Christ’s humanity and deity and not individual texts. John is teaching. Still need interpretative process – and many matters of scripture such as age of universe and dispensationalism. Need for balanced view of corporate and historical illumination – not let strangle but not ignore either (previous work of Holy Spirit).

Erickson – doctrine of illumination – Holy Spirit makes possible understanding of Scripture he inspired. Assumes only one level of understanding, which is grammatical exegetical. John 14 texts show work of Holy Spirit relative to cognitive, and for all Jesus’ followers, Caesarea Philippi not revealed by man but Father and 2 Cor 4:3 “Gospel is veiled to those perishing”. And all of faculties corrupted by sin. So the problem of the unspiritual person is not just lack of desire to understand scripture but also lack of understanding per se. Shouldn’t see as all or nothing but some understanding by Holy Spirit. Holy Spirit may give deeper understanding complementing exegesis and not conflicting. Hence the preacher needs the Holy Spirit to give him the meaning of the text. Spirit gives insight of meaning in text if not information per se. Deeper understanding of meaning that is there like telescope/microscope. Tutor not lecturer. See biblical view have (a) physical perception, (b) cognition by “organs of soul” and (c) “eyes of heart” and spiritual perception”

Quicke - modern texts on preaching such as suggest first draft of a sermon is done without reference to notes but with the Holy Spirit’s illumination and these latter are only used later as a cross check. But Quicke

assumes the preacher has a seminary education i.e. general background.

Pinnock – meaning can be enlarged through dialogue with the text. Abolition of slavery and arriving at a fuller interpretation of what writers meant. Agrees with extending and enlarging. Must be a “possible interpretation”.

Ellington – emphasis on experience/revelation in forming doctrine for Pentecostals.

Stibbe – 3 approaches of charismatics (1) conservative evangelical (historical criticism to exegete meaning of texts) (2) subjective postmodern approaches (3) open to objective and subjective (reader response). Original meaning and prophetic significance.

As Peter in Acts 2 should be prophetic in a seven fold manner, (1) based on experience of the Holy Spirit’s leading to a given Scripture at a given time and circumstance; (2) use of analogy with the overall theme of Scripture “this is that” – but care may ignore original meaning and make large claims re fulfilment so need say “illustration”; (3) done in a community and for a community – interaction sharpens interpretation, and to reflect shared experience; (4) focused on Christ – test of truth value if draw nearer; (5) eschatologically based; (6) emotional and not purely bookish, albeit not sacrificing emotional coherence; (7) practical and hence directed to achieving an active response (“so what test”). He seeks to be in balance between the fixed meaning of text and contemporary spiritual significance for faith community. Notes risks of gnosticism (spiritual interpretations losing moorings in history); experimentalism (allowing experience to guide in naïve way) or subjectivism (individualistic, absurd).

Ezekiel - indicative of four waves of spiritual revival. Was he stretching the text too much? Taking too much authority. Was it prophetic or original context or both?

Underlying Stibbe's view - role of the Holy Spirit in hermeneutics should be to illuminate the text at a deeper level, not eradicating the original meaning but building upon it. This is how NT writers used the OT, as Matthew using Hosea "out of Egypt I called my son" and Peter "this is that" from Joel in his Acts 2 speech.

So we are allowed to use OT in un-exegetical ways? Or leave it to inspired NT writers? Cessationist? Possible test does what is understood contradict the rest of the Bible "God told me to steal" compared with 10 Commandments. Treat like spiritual gift – test against others. By the Holy Spirit, and the history of Scriptural interpretation (including NT use of the OT) we can detect when an interpretation is way off track.

Lyons – against Stibbe - community of Spirit will find it hard to reject charismatic interpretation despite 1 Cor 12:10, as subordinate to leader and lack confidence. Worry about drift from orthodoxy. Prophecy may lack biblical authority. How to know it is Holy Spirit and not some other spirit.

Barth – Bible becomes word of God in one's experience – risk of subjectivity?

Practical issues

Purely intellectual approach is needed to anchor a charismatic approach which otherwise becomes purely subjective, losing moorings in history and mystical. We use a translation when we read Scripture. But one must be able to be radical at the Spirit's prompting, not least using some of the NT analogies of the OT (e.g. where Jesus calls his body the temple). Hermeneutic to see background of text. We should note that Holy Spirit call speak quietly as well as "noisily". Holy life.

We need to seek the Holy Spirit's guidance in preparing sermons as well as in apologetics. He guides us even as he guided Peter in his Pentecost sermon. We have a responsibility to be very careful in using new or unusual interpretations of Scripture,

but they should never be ruled out entirely either. We also need to guide congregation in interpreting Scripture. Holy Spirit and hermeneutics to be key aspects of being a Christian.

Prophecy - There is a logic that if the Holy Spirit directed the writing of the Bible then we need his help to interpret it correctly. Also we are repeatedly urged to prophesy, in Joel-Acts as well as Numbers 11:29 and 1 Corinthians 14:1 task of Holy Spirit and needs a basis in God's word.

All Bible texts need applying to the world of today which requires assistance of the Holy Spirit to be done aright. On the other hand, we need to be cautious in claiming prophecy is being fulfilled, as it should only be directly related to the end times. There is a need for discernment in assessing prophecy (1 Cor 12:10).

DID JESUS MAKE A BREAK WITH LAW?

Background conflict of Pharisees' holiness paradigm (separate from impurity to save Israel Lev 19:1 "be holy as I am holy") and the mercy paradigm (save lost not isolate Luke 6:35 "be merciful as I am merciful").

Evidence endorses Law

- (1) Tassel on garment, synagogue, temple tax
- (2) Requires leper to obey law and see priest
- (3) Law as guide e.g. rich man and Lazarus, rich young ruler. – but then tells to sell goods going beyond law, i.e. baseline.
- (4) Criticised misinterpretation of law e.g. hate enemy – tradition not Law.
- (5) When goes beyond Law (murder) doesn't infringe it. Interpretative extension to include intention (also Josephus).
- (6) Moses never commanded divorce or vengeance just limits – Jesus limits to zero and highlights God's creative ordinance for marriage in Genesis.
- (7) Obey scribes and Pharisees, Matthew 23 irony meaning opposite but still support Law.
- (8) Matt 5:17 "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them."

Evidence broke with Law

- (1) Healing on Sabbath = deliberate flouting to highlight authority to transcend? Or matter of interpretations, not laborious, didn't arise at trial.
- (2) Burying father and honour parents, but likely long in future, Luke 9.
- (3) Clean and unclean foods Mark 7, issue washing of hands and evil in heart, Marks addition came later (Peter/Paul)
- (4) Grain fields claims right to profane Sabbath as David did in time of need, and also do the Levites in temple. Lesser Law of Sabbath gives way to greater Law on temple service.
- (5) Critical of oral law for casuistic literalness that denies the heart and purpose of law. Love God and neighbour is God's

demand. See Corban and help for parents for example.

Theologians on Sermon on Mount – presented by Matthew with Moses parallel in mind.

Max Turner on fulfil "Bring into being that which was promised in Law and Prophets." Ideal of righteousness and relation with God hope to be given in future if not now. Consistent with prophecy ended with John. So Christian obeys OT commandments insofar as they come to fulfilment in Jesus' teaching, but as mediated through Jesus' instructions which fulfils everything Law and Prophets has to say. Righteousness is obedient conduct flowing from faith – i.e. not just from OT but from Jesus' instructions that fulfil Law. Consistently, Moo prefers bring out God's eschatological purposes in Law.

Wright – Immediate followers to behave as if kingdom present. And must involve renewal of heart. Sermon on the Mount linked to New Covenant in the sense of renewal of the heart going along with the renewal of covenant (Jeremiah 31:33). Question is of an outer and inner state that is evil throughout (while appearing clean) and one that is renewed throughout. Makes sense if we see Jesus as a prophet of the New Kingdom. True renewal must include a cure for hardness of heart. See comment on divorce and clean drinking vessels. New heart is shown by following commands in the Sermon on the Mount "challenge for Israel to be Israel". Shift holiness to mercy, love neighbour and enemy.

Sees antitheses as exegesis of the beatitudes – this is what you do if you are pure in spirit, meek, peacemaking, pure in heart, hungering for justice. Link to forgiveness, and not to join resistance movement. Creative non-violent resistance – to offer the right cheek implies active affirmation of equality to aggressor. Following alternatives leads to disaster (house on sand = temple).

(1) Wright is wrong in the ministry of Jesus as disciples remained recalcitrant (“let’s not get married”). Jesus’ ministry didn’t at the time fulfil the Sermon – Gospels don’t record “new communities”. But with coming of Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the disciples set up a community that indeed appeared to behave much in line with the Sermon (e.g. sharing goods).

(2) Runs contrary to the idea either that Matthew edited the Sermon to fit his own context, or that it is a universal ethic. Wright may be trying too hard to fit into his mould or the problems for Israel of 1st century.

Harvey – Jesus was constrained and could not oppose Law as make trial too easy. Jesus as a “charismatic interpreter” of the Law in light of the dawning reign of God and as a messianic teacher. “Law no longer necessarily applies in exactly same way.” Sermon on the Mount reflects moral teaching of the Ancient World, from wisdom tradition. It links in turn to the idea Kingdom was present with Jesus and we should live as if it is present. Sermon seeks to inculcate an attitude not legislate a Law; emphasis through exaggeration; appeal to what is sensible and prudent; and style is autonomous statement and not explanation.

Indeed, aphorisms are (i) characterised by generality and look at motivation (ii) emphasise through exaggeration (cf. plank in the eye) (iii) appeal to good sense (wise sensible and prudent) (iv) autonomy –self-authenticating. While many of these apply, notably the eyeless Christians, Jesus is unusual in appealing to poor and not to rich (e.g. having to carry soldier’s pack). He transfers legal wording to moral field (e.g. in anger with brother)

(1) Classing the Sermon as aphoristic wisdom helpful as emphasises that these are **not issues we will be judged for**. Focus on reward implies a link to the “crowns” of Paul. Allows Law to be obeyed in the Spirit and the Heart and not in terms of calculation as to how much is needed to be godly. Law itself can only provide a baseline – need higher moral standards.

(2) Still break from idea of a fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets so is not entirely satisfactory. May be preferable to say that Jesus interprets the Law and thus confirms it. Danger focus on wisdom will weaken commands since no explicit divine warrant for obeying proverbs.

(3) Proverbs can contradict one another so are dangerous as guides to conduct.

(4) Traditional function of Wisdom literature is bring in common sense to the law rather than radical interpretation. Jesus unlike wisdom doesn’t endorse prevailing wisdom but challenges it.

(5) If Sermon described as Law or rules, people will feel guilty – or not good Christians - for not obeying them. But need to keep challenge of Jesus’ teaching and seek for ways to apply it. Early church didn’t follow Sermon precisely – Paul’s letters less radical as he has understood what Jesus was aiming at – wisdom oriented culture.

(6) Omits Jesus’ key issue of self denial for disciples, exemplified by his own sacrifice.

(7) Requires judgement (wise as a serpent) as when Jesus did not turn the other cheek, also linked to a prohibition from active rebellion that is involved in Jesus’ vision of the Kingdom. Love enemies as God does.

Ancient theologians, Augustine saw as New Law based on love, which supersedes Old Law, based on fear. **Aquinas** – Law of Bondage versus Law of Liberty. Some discontinuity in each case; relates to old as tree contained in a seed. **Calvin** sees as true Law of Moses and continuity. Jesus is a faithful expounder of Moses law; whereas the ceremonial law is no longer applicable for Christians, the moral law (i.e. the 10 commandments) is universally valid and the civil law (i.e. the regulations of the land of Israel such as the Jubilee) need interpreting for today in the light of the moral law and not discarding. Also Reformers disagreed with Anabaptists who said Moses law abrogated by it and Christians should never be violent, swear oaths etc. thus opting out of secular government. **Luther** any Law is no longer applicable since Jesus’ death allows God’s grace to exempt us from the

Law. The sermon only reminds us of grace since we cannot fulfil it and always sin. It “awakens knowledge of sin”. An alternative is to presuppose grace and forgiveness and then see the sermon as the demands for true discipleship. Note that it could apply to disciples rather than all mankind (the crowds).

Modern theologians: (1) **Bacon** – sermon not legalistic but prophetic. It was Matthew in his view who added the exceptions to divorce etc. that made “Laws” workable. (2) **Jeremias** – not a complete law but “symptoms and signs” of what happens when God’s reign breaks into the world and overcomes the devil. (3) **McKnight** – See Jesus as Messianic prophet. Not based on a law code but on relations to God, self and others. Shows how God’s actions and word should set the tone for human actions (love your enemies). Call is to respond to God’s love and forgiveness with love and forgiveness for others as also Lev 19 provisions. Love in Hebrew tradition is elective, responsive and leads to obedience. Based on active mercy and love for enemies and not just toleration. (4) **Davies** – Jesus shows what sort of attitude he expected and how his demands surpass the Law without contradicting it – letter of the law does not give life (for those poor in spirit, pure in heart and full of mercy). Sermon gives implication of “perfect conformity to God’s will.” Purity of motive not outward observance. Note focus on reward for observing Jesus’ demands – but only reward at resurrection for doing good out of uncalculating goodness of heart that expects no earthly reward (extra mile). Jesus sought people who would be good and not just do good – enjoy goodness and see as own reward – end as person who enjoys God.

Is Law the appropriate category for describing the Sermon on the Mount anyway?

We have seen theologians thought so. Western tradition is that material called Law should be applicable in all circumstances for all people (community), with a prescribed

punishment for disobedience. Cover the exceptions. Has to be externally verifiable whether it has been observed – e.g. can’t action in court against anger. Tell tale is that Sermon is not expressed as thou shalt not. In principle could be actionable, e.g. not going 2 miles, not giving cloak. But e.g. love enemies is very general to be Law. But Leviticus spells out a general law – we can challenge concept of western law since Hebrew Law can include general exhortations.

Worrying about clothing, pray for persecutors, etc also not law. Nor is anything in Chapter 7, except love your neighbour which is a summary. High percent that is not legal. We could at most say it is the spirit of the law and not the letter. People are to consider their dispositions that could lead them to law breaking – issue of ethics – and be merciful. On the other hand, Sermon on the Mount is not inconsistent with the Law, it just further restricts what can be done.

On the other hand, the sermon does summarise the Golden Rule – a lens through which to view the law. Also some of the Sermon has been adopted as Law such as the proscription on divorce.

Is the Sermon on the Mount intended to give universally applicable rules to govern Christian living? (New Law)

Augustine and Chrysostom saw as “perfect pattern for life of all Christians”. In contrast **Schweitzer** – interim ethic in light of coming kingdom – not applicable to later generations since apocalypse has not arisen. **Luther** – Law applies to church life but in secular sphere (official position and authority) common sense (natural law) to prevail. **Catholics** – only for clergy. **Dispensationalists** – for Kingdom of God so is irrelevant for now as Jews refused it – comes into force when Jews accept it. **New Testament scholars** only for his disciples. Spiritualised? Not all sell possessions? Luke 22:36 – rules that apply to mission no longer apply and you can carry sword? But

Matthew and Mark **universalise teaching** – e.g. in Mark crowd takes up cross, Matthew only disciples. Conclude does apply to all Christians.

Pastoral problems - people like Tolstoy who tried to live up to Sermon came to despair (Tolstoy suicide). Much harm done pastorally in church by this. Origen castrated himself. Eyeless Christians.

Rather, need to tell congregation we cannot be perfect as the Father is perfect. It gives an ideal that we should seek to adopt whenever possible because of and out of gratitude for the forgiveness we have due to Jesus' death. We can only attempt it with the help of the Holy Spirit and not in our own strength. It should develop over time as we become sanctified but is never complete on this earth.

This is consistent with Aquinas seeing it as “counsels” *albeit not just* for those who strive for perfection (“render eternal bliss more assured and expeditious”) as opposed to “commandments” of new law.

JESUS AND THE FUTURE OF GOD'S REIGN

Weiss and Schweitzer – “Consistently eschatological” All apocalyptic language about the end. Idea that Jesus predicted end of space and time in his lifetime and was wrong. Accepted apocalyptic framework. Or Barrett, resurrection/vindication brought about by coming of kingdom straight after his death, no time to form church.

Strengths – put focus on historical Jesus, and followed trend of apocalyptic writers. Does justice to urgency of Jesus’ message. Ethics “interim”. Weaknesses – not in line with Jesus as Son of God, essentially a failed revolutionary - in error. No account taken of inbreaking of Kingdom in Jesus’ actions, and Jesus’ updating of apocalyptic tradition, as he did the Law. Some argue they also misunderstood the apocalyptic tradition (not linked to end of world but fate of Israel).

Dodd – “Realised eschatology” kingdom already occurring in his ministry. He did say things were at hand, Luke 11:20 “If by Spirit I cast out demons kingdom upon you”. Also light under bushel, strong man, Isaiah 61. But ignores all apocalyptic.

Jeremias – “Inaugurated eschatology” beginning of imminent apocalyptic end. Jesus expected the End within his generation, which did not occur in an apocalyptic manner as expected (Mark 9:1 “some of those standing here..”). So Jesus mistaken in timing. Jeremias – if God can shorten time of persecution, he can lengthen it in mercy – depends on human response (fig tree and gardener). Could be metaphorical – 40 days and Nineveh will be destroyed. Peter and 1000 years. Jesus did not know all things.

NB Beasley-Murray – Jesus focus on inauguration of change for Israel, fulfilled in resurrection, Holy Spirit, Church, Jerusalem fall.

Ladd - Kingdom present and still to come. Jesus thought end was soon but set no limit.

Mark 9:1 refers to partial seeing of kingdom – transfiguration, Pentecost, fall of Jerusalem. Mark 13 is about temple but foretaste of the true apocalypse. Separation of the temple and the end – “these things” are the temple and link to the end is a prophetic digression, foretaste of End Time judgement like Joel’s locust plague. Raises questions why imminent watchfulness needed, preparation for day of Son of Man?

‘Historicist’ views (Borg, Wright) - Jesus apocalyptic language symbols for historical events changing Israel’s world and not end of cosmos. Apocalypse in Mark is poetic and metaphorical code for God’s historical judgement on Israel – resurrection, Spirit, church also. Show Jesus vindicated as Son of Man, fulfil Daniel 7, exalted to position of power.

Collins – view writers of apocalypse not anticipating end of space-time universe but change in world order.

Borg – language about changes in store for Israel and place in world “time of Gentiles”. Emergence of church as Israel is winnowed.

Wright - Isaianic New Exodus giving hopes of liberation – journey to Zion through desert (hopes e.g. songs in Luke) – miraculous provision in wilderness (Jesus’ exorcisms. Isaiah 61, grace to sinners and renewal of community – only partial etc.) – arrival in Jerusalem of Yahweh as king – exercise of God’s reign and restoration of Zion as light of nations (coming of Holy Spirit at Pentecost?) Luke 19:27 opponents of king to be killed. Or Passion as Passover.

Strengths – Consistency with the Biblical text, and the trend of OT prophecy in terms of the fate of Israel (Isaiah 13:10 Fall of Babylon). Transfiguration.

Weaknesses – treatment of the second coming – is it really metaphorical? What about day of judgement, new heaven and new earth. The OT does talk of an end in terms of “end of the world”, why should Jesus not follow this? At least in terms of a “Noah’s flood” style catastrophe? Kingdom has not come yet in terms of defeat of evil. Even in a historical sense, Daniel’s

prophecies went further, to the fall of Rome. Why should Jesus be so limited?

The Borg and Wright thesis.

The thrust of Jesus' ministry and message implied an imminent arrival of God's reign.

Explicit pronouncements of full disclosure of God's reign such as Mark 9:1, let your kingdom come in Lord Prayer. Return before towns of Israel.

Jesus prophesied imminent doom on unrepentant Israel in the form of catastrophic war with Rome.

Consistent with passages urging people to flee, Luke 17:31 as Christians did in AD 70. Some are ambiguous – Pilate and Galileans, tower of Siloam. Suffer at hands of Romans – Luke 19:41-46 – enemies will set up barricades, etc. Luke 21:6 stones of temple tumbled down. Most scholars feel are original. Link to conflict with Pharisees – holiness versus mercy paradigm, former leading to resistance to Rome.

Generation could be race. Is this *all* he prophesied? Fall of Satan. Gathering elect from 4 corners of world – of church – further vindication of Son of Man. Question of whether God's reign is identified with his ministry or something separate that he enacts as Ezekiel did (enact, symbolise and personify event). Note that at transfiguration talk was of new Exodus now.

Jesus portrayed the destruction of Jerusalem as God's great act of judgement.

Three sections in Matthew 24 – warnings, Jerusalem, last judgement. Judgement for ordained Messiah being rejected. Yes, and is an interesting point of view on parables of the king and subjects, master and servants etc. as return of God to Zion, but this is only the judgement of Israel. No Jew could see destruction of God's temple as something done by other than God. Romans as his agent. Disciples would then be able to see signs of the times.

There would also be a judgement of the whole world, as set out in Revelation.

Wright claims there is no evidence that the church would be judged, but this is not clear to me ("saved through fire"). Final judgement seen as some way off though. But Jesus did not judge temple only abuses (Bauckham)?

Jesus envisaged an undefined period of history beyond the fall of Jerusalem.

When you see the Romans coming, flee. Then you will be at liberty. Period beyond circling and destruction of Jerusalem. Money of over cautious given to others. Parable of wicked tenants, destruction of vineyard and a time beyond it – doesn't herald immediate end. Jerusalem and "time of the Gentiles" – till reestablishment of state of Israel? Fall of Jerusalem is not necessarily the End.

This is OK. But bear in mind that if the church is the new Israel then God is with them as he was in the temple for ancient Israel. As Holy Spirit?

Kingdom of God sayings referring to final judgement at the end of the world (if there are any) put this in some indefinite future.

Examples are cut off hand, more tolerable for Sodom, separation of sheep and goats. Not imminent.

He said he did not know the time. But note that the defeat of Satan was seen as already gained by the cross and consummated inevitably later.

So we should provisionally conclude **kingdom of God sayings warning of imminent judgement probably all pertain to the envisaged historical catastrophe facing Israel and (especially) Jerusalem**. This is backed up by the sayings about the 'coming of/day of the Son of man' - which refer to Jesus' vindication in resurrection, Pentecost, the church and the judgement on Jerusalem.

Max – see Mark 13 – where Daniel 7 sees day of son of man is not his return to earth but his rise to be enthroned alongside God. Or at least vindication in resurrection and

lordship over church, New Jerusalem. Luke 17 – sees fall of Jerusalem as day of son of man in historicist terms. Son of man will be in his day. Stuff on flashes of lightning, grinding, one taken, etc. Mention of days of son of man. Why flee if it's the end of the world? Like Luke 19 where Jesus talks of fall of temple. Suggests that son of man and vigilance both covered by this explanation.

Max - admits Resurrection, Ascension, Spirit coming are all days of the Son of Man in terms of accepting rule. "Coming of Son of Man" is plastic term like the Kingdom. "From now on" you will see the Son of Man coming in power, see Matthew 26.

1 Thess 4:17 – does it mean rapture or going up to bring Jesus down. "Return of Jesus to Jerusalem." Divisions sprung on families by war. Those taken are in judgement and those who are left are OK?

The parables of the return of the master/king are then end of exile but unexpected and with judgement and not blessing. Reward to faithful servant (church) and punishment for unfaithful (Israel).

Not convinced by this – means so only if they are metaphorical. Why should it be vindication before God only and not return to earth if he is also to judge? Coming of the son of man is surely the last judgement. Link to Ezekiel? What about the sheep and goats? Does the Father come to judge?

So what problems does all this raise (if any)?

Allison counter case – Wright is wrong that Jesus expected end of space time universe, rather an event akin to the flood, recreate present world after destroys it in radically new form, ingathering of Israel, resurrection of patriarchs and saints would become angels, last judgement. Not yet come! Mark 13:24 sun darkened etc link to crucifixion, and to Joshua, meteorite showers. Literal events that are symbolic like "the White House" See also fire trumpet and earthquakes of Exodus 19:16. Wright wrong

to say option metaphor or end of universe. Paul expected Jesus to come on clouds, 1 Thess 4:17. And why does Wright not allow there to be a literal temple?

Seeing 2 Peter 3:10-13 as literal, as well as Revelation, so shows belief common.

If we still see evil in a troubled world, why have the end times already come?

Point is the return of God to his temple, return from exile and defeat of evil. Warning Israel about future.

Seems rather reductionist view.

Point (1) about Luke 12:35-38 is weak. Not particularly clear what type of return is envisaged. How is Jesus' death a "return" – do we mean the resurrection? Pentecost?

What is the presence of God in the temple?

What about the future hopes of Christians?

When is the New Jerusalem inaugurated?

Even Wright says "Jesus' sayings may have wider implications."

Was Paul misled by the Holy Spirit into taking another view?

What about Jesus' widespread discussion of Satan and the defeat of cosmic evil? Casting out demons? Is this just defeat of the current Israelite leadership?

Claim in Wright that second coming is a "post Easter innovation" and not Jesus' own teaching assumes that Jesus did not teach after his resurrection!

Loss of application of parables to Christians?

Shekinah was in the believers – they are the temple – after coming of Holy Spirit.

Mark 13 as foretaste of the end but not a rebuilding of the temple.

SON OF MAN

Did Jesus use it? (1) Semitic phrase over translated. Ben Adam as Psalm 8:4 “son of man that you care for him”. (2) Not used in NT other than Jesus except Stephen – church not interested suggesting Jesus. (3) Equally, if church had created son of man, disciples and crowd would have used it.

OT

(1) A man - common person, of no consequence: Job 25:6 “how much less man, who is but a maggot”

(2) Prophet to whom God speaks. Ezekiel 2:3 God said: "Son of man, I am sending you to the Israelites, to a rebellious nation that has rebelled against me"

(3) Heavenly figure. Daniel 7:13-14 “In my vision at night I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led into his presence. He was given authority, glory and sovereign power.

Theories

Vermes supporting non titular as (1) used by rabbis where reserve or modesty in self reference appropriate or desirable – can mean “I” (2) never used in OT for Messiah – Daniel is “like” a son of man just account of what saw. (3) Most synoptic passages non titular e.g. stressing Jesus’ humanity, humility and lowliness, such as Luke 9:58 “the Son of Man has no place to lay his head.” Matthew 11:19 “glutton and drunkard, friend of tax collectors” Caesarea Matthew 16:13 “who do men say the son of man is?” is “I” in Mark and Luke. Why ask if Son of Man messianic? (4) Clear Danielic ones are created by church.

Supporting titular, (1) passages like Mark 14:62 to Caiaphas clear references to Daniel clouds, glory, God’s side. Mark 8:38 also, “ashamed of him when comes in glory”. View this carries across to all Son of Man sayings. (2) No reason Jesus could not coin title himself, and some Jews saw Daniel

figure as individual not Israel. (3) Definite article comes to us suggesting title. Reveal and conceal as in parables so ambiguous to disciples. Dunn – Jesus started with the non titular then moved to titular when foresaw his fate. Avoid the preconceived ideas set out by the term Messiah. (4) Question why Son of Man applies also to earthly ministry suffering and death. Moule – figure represents Israel in Daniel 7 and is oppressed and persecuted before being exalted. So all cases authentic. Also authority already over Sabbath (Matthew 12:8) and over demons.

(5) Kim/Beasley Murray – understanding of Daniel was “elevation of God’s people embodied in their head (Son of God) in end times to heavenly throne”. (a) Friend of sinners and saving lost are Son of Man functions, reveal God’s reign (b) No where to lay head as Daniel’s figure faces rejection by man and moving on in mission. (c) So Mark 2:10 authority to forgive sins on earth, as Son of Man to whom will be given authority and judgement at end (Luke 17:30) also because (d) link to suffering servant representative suffering atones for Israel. Mark 10:45 “For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many””

More on **link of the mighty Son of God to the suffering servant in Isaiah.** Jesus said in Luke 22:37 “It is written: ‘And he was numbered with the transgressors’; and I tell you that this must be fulfilled in me. “ quoting Isaiah 53:12 Jesus says in He serves, he dies, he saves. Ladd – “In the same way as the kingdom is to grow secretly even as the evil age continues, Jesus as son of Man lives among men incognito, whose ministry is not to reign in glory but in humiliation to suffer and die for them”

Others - Jesus sees his ministry as **prophetic** such as Jonah in Luke 11:30 “For as Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites, so also will the Son of Man be to this generation” Jesus prophesies here as son of man the fall of Jerusalem, if the Jews did not repent, as took place only 30 years after his death. And he

sees himself like **Jacob**, establishing communication from earth to heaven; John 1:51 "He then added, "I tell you the truth, you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man." Also **establish communication between heaven and earth?** See also John 3:13 "No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven--the Son of Man."

Link to Second Adam?