

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php

Towards an understanding of the "Kingdom of God" *

David Hill

"The most certain historical datum about Jesus' life is that the concept which dominated his preaching, the reality which gave meaningfulness to all his activity, was 'the Kingdom of God' " . /1 "The central aspect of the teaching of Jesus was that concerning the Kingdom of God.... all else in his message and ministry serves a function in relation to that proclamation and derives its meaning from it" /2 . Assertions similar to these (from Jon Sobrino and Norman Perrin) could be found in any of a vast range of books - small and large, scholarly and popular, investigative and impressionistic - which are concerned with Jesus' message and ministry. It is indeed an opinio communis that the reality to which his proclamation points, whether it be by direct announcement, by parabolic illustration or by actions and behaviour, is "the Kingdom of God": the authenticity of that announcement and of many of the parables of the Kingdom is assured (for those who require the assurance) by their notable ability to survive the application of the critical criteria employed in establishing the historical trustworthiness of traditional Jesus-material preserved in the synoptic gospels. For this amount of unanimity we may be grateful: I wish there was similar unanimity as to what it is concerning which we are unanimous. What does, or more accurately perhaps, what did "the Kingdom of God " mean? That is not an inappropriate question for the exegete to ask. Even if one stresses (to the point of over-emphasis) the "symbol" character of the phrase, one must still try to say something about that which such a powerful "symbol" symbolizes: and if we are of the opinion (rightly, in my view) that "the Kingdom of God" locution did not possess or function with an unalterably fixed meaning by which all who used it had to abide, nevertheless its possible significances are limited to a fairly precise range - King/ruling/Kingdom notions associated with the God witnessed to in the Biblical tradition. I observe in passing that the phrase "Kingdom of God" on Jesus' lips cannot have signified something utterly unheard of and new, for he did not explain it to any audience; he must have assumed that they had some knowledge of its meaning; on the other hand, the locution cannot on Jesus' lips have had an unmistakably clear and obvious significance: if it had, then

would he have spent such effort in illustrating or giving glimpses, as it were, into it?

If I had cited at the outset (of this lecture) Jeremias' affirmation that "the central theme of the public proclamation of Jesus was the kingly reign of God" I would have indicated one important and widely agreed step towards understanding "the kingdom", namely that the word (malkūt in Hebrew, malkūthā in Aramaic) does not denote a realm in the spatial sense, or a territory, but rather "kingship", "reign" or perhaps better "sovereign rule". This interpretation of basileia - which goes back to Dalman /4 and beyond (to B. Weiss and K.G. Grass) - is almost universally accepted, but R. Schnackenburg /5 and S. Aalen /6 have both proposed that the rendering 'kingdom' rather than 'reign' is more appropriate for texts which speak of entering into the basileia. However, the observation that the idea of entering into "life" (Mk 9.43 par.) is quite intelligible without our having to make the spatial factor explicit by translating hē zōē as "the sphere of life" makes it implausible that language about entering the malkūthā of God requires a sharply defined change of meaning from "kingly rule" to "the place over which God reigns". Professor Aalen's own suggestion that basileia designates "house", runs into even more serious difficulties than does "reign": a house is constructed or built; it does not "draw near" or "come"! And the very significant parallelism between the second petition of the Lord's Prayer and the synagogue's Kaddish (Let your reign come // May he (God) let his reign reign) certainly favours "kingly rule" over "house". It should be noted that some of those who are certain that he basileia tou theou does not denote a place or community ruled by God claim that the rendering "reign" or "kingship of God" is too abstract /7: the malkūthā is neither a spatial nor a static concept, they assert, but is a dynamic concept denoting quite concretely the reign of God in action, the activity of God as king, and this reality might be expressed (though rather clumsily) by "the ruling of God" or "the ruling activity of God". This is an insightful refinement, as we shall see later, though the language of Ps. 145 should have never allowed it to be in doubt: there "the kingdom of God" (which is "the dominion of God") is combined with "his mighty deeds", his "great work" (vs.11-13). Let us now clear away another matter: the priority of the

Kingdom of God" over "the kingdom of heaven" (hē basileia ton ouranon) in Jesus' diction. Both have the same meaning (for "heaven" is merely a paraphrase for God), but since, as Jeremias notes /8, "the term 'kingdom of heaven' appears for the first time in Jewish literature half a century after Jesus' ministry, with R. Johanan ben Zakkai C. AD 80", it is most improbable that this was the form of expression used by him: malkūthā' de'laha is his presumed Aramaic speech-form. /9 But what would that have meant to his hearers? Since it is never explained, its basic intelligibility must be assumed. Jeremias is therefore correct in asserting that "if we are to understand the sayings of Jesus which deal with the basileia, it is extremely important that we should know what ideas the people of his time associated with the expression 'reign of God' ". /10 Investigation, however, reveals that the expression was not a common speech-form in pre-Christian times. A survey of the relevant literary materials - though they need not necessarily include all instances - yields the following results.

(A) The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT provide some references to God's lordship, usually over Israel, cast in the form of "thy kingdom" or "his kingdom", but there is only one which contains a virtual equivalent of hē basileia tou theou, and that is Psalms of Solomon 17.3 which says "The kingdom of our God is eternal over the nations in judgment" and that assertion, like the others, does no more than make precise a widespread aspect of OT belief. Now the absence from the apocalypses in the inter-testamental literature of the phrase "the kingdom of God" is, in my view, very significant. It was, and in some circles still is, a common presupposition that the "kingdom" locution is of apocalyptic provenance, yet here in the very materials where one would expect to find it, materials which often deal with the End-time and the messianic age, the precise phrase "the kingdom of God" is not found. /11. The apocalyptic character of Jesus' kingdom concept - which has been assumed as a matter of course since Schweitzer's famous study - is therefore questionable, even on the presupposition that we know exactly what "Jewish apocalyptic" meant to and for Jesus. And that is far from certain or agreed. When we recall that over fifty years ago Bultmann asserted that Jesus rejected "the whole content of apocalyptic speculation"

/12 and that just a few years ago Norman Perrin was writing, with reference to the kingdom, that "the difference between Jesus and ancient Jewish apocalyptic is much greater than Bultmann will allow", /13 we may be permitted to suggest that the term "apocalyptic" - as applied to Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom - is virtually emptied of all content. The value and propriety of its continued use in this connection is open to serious question. Be that as it may, apocalyptic usage does not provide sufficiently exact parallels to Jesus' kingdom-locution for it to be considered as the direct source of the dominical phrase.

(B) Secondly, what do we learn from the rabbinic passages which are from time to time introduced to illumine the kingdom concept? These are too late for their assumed parallels to be conclusive for interpretation. In the main this rabbinic evidence is limited to the stereotyped phrase like "to take the kingdom of heaven upon oneself" which means "subject oneself to the divine order", "obey God", even "to repeat the Shema" or "become a proselyte". /14 T.W. Manson was impressed by this evidence in the exposition of the kingdom in terms of divine authority accepted: "the claim on God's part to rule, and the acknowledgement on man's part of that claim, together constitute the actual kingdom". /15 However appealing it may be to invoke personal relationship to God as a dimension of the kingdom's significance, especially when that dimension is completely fulfilled in Jesus, we simply have to acknowledge the fact that dependence on rabbinic allusions to "the kingdom of the heavens" for the explication of Jesus' speech-form cannot be upheld. Perrin was correct in asserting that references in classical Rabbinic literature cannot be used with any certainty to establish first century diction: he was also correct in agreeing with Johannes Weiss /16 that the kingdom of God is solely and only the activity of God; ideas about its realisation or manifestation in human experience through acceptance or obedience only compromise the genuine "otherness" of the Kingdom.

(C) A few words suffice to deal with the evidence from Qumran. The phrase "reign" with reference to God occurs only three times in the Qumran corpus as known to us at present. Two of these (1QM 6.6 and 12.7) clearly denote God's sovereignty: the third (in the Supplementary Blessing to the Community Rule, IQSb 4.25f) speaks of the angelic-like

priestly service "In the temple of the reign" (b^ehēkāl malkūth) which presumably means the temple of the future when God's rule has been established in a new Jerusalem. There would seem to be very little illumination on Jesus' characteristic locution from the usage of the scrolls.

(D) We now come to a body of literature whose evidence has been rediscovered in the last few years, namely the Targums, and in particular the Targum to the latter prophets. Dalman had of course noted the relevant passages in the Targums to Isaiah, Micah and Zechariah, and Weiss referred to them also and expressed his agreement with Dalman that their kingdom diction avoided anthropomorphism and affirmed "the transcendence which stands out so clearly in the proclamation of Jesus" and that their understanding of the kingdom as the Selbsterweisung Gottes (the self-revelation or self-demonstration of God) was a significant common element in the Targums and the NT. /17 But Weiss was so concerned to interpret the "kingdom" in the categories of late Jewish apocalyptic that he failed to do justice to the significance of his own insights on the Targumic material. Fruitful work in this connection is now being done with the care and caution that are required in this complex area of investigation. The Targums, as extant, are later, probably much later, than the NT documents: nevertheless, it is likely that Targums, incorporating as they do the exegetical understanding and vocabulary of the communities in which they were used, achieved their present form as a part of the process which produced Mishnah, Midrash and Talmud, a process dedicated to the preservation and evaluation of tradition. Consequently, since Jesus must have heard oral targums uttered which drew upon or contributed to tradition, it is not unreasonable to suggest that he was familiar with language and speech forms now contained in the Targums and that he may even have come to know these speech forms in association with the biblical passages which they presently explicate. That this is not a matter of sheer speculation can be demonstrated if positive coherence can be shown to exist between NT diction and a Targumic passage; not just some vague, notional connection, but positive coherence which may be postulated only when there is a strong similarity in language which is not explicable on the supposition that the Hebrew and/or the Greek OTS have influenced the diction of the NT. If this similar language gives expression to the same thought or idea, then coherence

66

is established with reference to diction: but the substance of a rendering must be evaluated as well lest a deliberate rejoinder to Christian teaching be confused with a piece of possibly pre-Jewish translation-vocabulary or exegesis.

For example is it significant that in the Isaiah Targum the kingdom is "something" to be announced or preached, as it is according to the Gospels? /18 Yes, it is significant, because in none of the kingdom material in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha nor in any other relevant sources, is the kingdom proclaimed or announced. It would therefore appear that kingdom announcements (as distinct from announcements of salvation, destruction, Messiah's coming) are sui generis to the Targums (to Latter Prophets) and the NT. Now on eight occasions the Prophets Targums employ the phrase "Kingdom of God" or "Kingdom of the Lord" and that offers us a better linguistic parallel to dominical usage than anything so far found elsewhere; and those who have judiciously investigated this Targumic usage /20 agree that the "kingdom of God" locution there denotes the dynamic presence of God, God personally present and active. The "kingdom", in Targumic speech (especially in the Isaiah Targum), is not somehow separable from God nor is it simply a periphrasis for the verb "reign": it neither denotes an autonomous regime nor does it merely refer to the Lord's assertion of sovereignty: what is at issue is God's action, his very nature and being as God. For example, in the proclamatory utterances of Isaiah 40.9 and 52.7 the Masoretic text reads "Behold your God" and "Your God reigns" respectively: the Targum in both cases says "the kingdom of your God is revealed". Does that usage not signify more than what Dalman and Jeremias blandly call it, "a periphrasis for God as ruler"? What the Targumic evidence - and it must be admitted as relevant, if not determinative, for at least the announcement logia - permits us to suggest is that Jesus' phrase "the Kingdom of God" (malkuta d'elaha) had immediate and personal reference to God and his activity, and in particular - and this draws upon the interpretative insights found in other relevant material - God's activity in reigning or ruling.

Now the character of this ruling action is not hidden or vague: the model for understanding this kingship is the OT model of kingship wherein sovereignty, whether it be God's or the king's, includes not only the obvious notions of

dominion and power but also ideas associated with holiness, the maintenance of stability on the cosmic or national level, the establishment of righteousness and justice and, in consequence of these, the defence and succour of the oppressed and needy. /22 On this model kingship is most characteristically exercised in the activities of creating unity and peace, of upholding loyalty and righteousness with necessary acts and attitudes of mercy, protection and salvation. That is what God reigning means and implies and that, I submit, is what "the kingdom of God" means, God (and that is where the emphasis lies) exercising sovereignty. Norman Perrin comes nearest to the view when he writes, "The Kingdom of God is the power of God expressed in deeds: it is that which God does wherein it becomes evident that he is king" , /23 though Perrin admits that it is impossible to express this in a single English word. Jeremias also acknowledges the importance of the aspect of Jewish usage we have been discussing when he remarks that the words "The Kingdom of God is near!" virtually mean "God is here - at the door, or already here". Confirmation of the basic correctness of the interpretation offered comes from the idiom of the Kaddish prayer of the ancient synagogue. This prayer, in Aramaic, was almost certainly in use at the time of Jesus and may have been known to him, since the first two petitions of the Lord's Prayer seem to be a modified version of it. A translation of the oldest text of the relevant phrases would run something like this: "Magnified and sanctified be his great name in the world which he has created according to his will. _ May he let his Kingdom reign (yamlek v1. yimlök malkuteh) in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel, even speedily and soon". "May he let his Kingdom (or 'reign') reign' obviously means "May God's reign be effectively established" or, in my terms, "May God exercising sovereignty be revealed and recognized". In talking about God's kingdom we are talking about something which is excitingly and grandly dynamic and "something" which, as we shall see later, has powerful eschatological significance as well.

But what is the "something" we have been talking about? Are we any closer yet to understanding the meaning and function of the phrase "the Kingdom of God" which I have been referring to as a dominican locution or speech-form and also trying to interpret? I must pursue this question

68

a little because of the importance of the last of Norman Perrin's three books on the Kingdom-theme, namely Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom. /25 Here Perrin demands that in the hermeneutical or interpretative process literary criticism should have its place alongside textual and historical criticism. Accordingly he asserts that "Kingdom of God" is not a conception (as generations of scholars have assumed) but a tensive symbol (i.e. a symbol with more than one referent), and he goes on to claim that the literary forms (parable, proverb etc.) and the language Jesus employed in proclaiming it were such as to mediate the reality evoked by that symbol, namely, the experience of God as king which finds effective interpretation in the ancient Jewish myth of God as kingly creator and kingly deliverer of his people.

Two observations on this analysis are in order. First, the understanding of symbol on which Perrin depends (Ricoeur and Wheelwright) regards a symbol as having a referent, as designating or symbolizing something other than itself: indeed, a symbol must have a literal meaning which points to a figurative meaning. /26 In these terms "kingdom of God" cannot be a symbol because it has no literal meaning to point to a symbolic one. On the other hand, "kingdom" or "reign" has a literal meaning and is a symbol for God's activity, but "Kingdom of God" is not a symbol. Perrin states that "kingdom of God" evokes the myth of God's acting as king: but this myth is not the symbol's referent. In fact, there is a sense in which the myth is qualitatively identical with the term "the kingdom of God". (I need hardly say that I am using "myth" to denote a story or complex of stories which human beings regard as demonstrations of the inner meaning and/or structure of the universe and of life). It could be argued that "kingdom of God" is not a symbol but a metaphor in which "kingship" is the concrete vehicle of meaning and "God" the means of indicating the transcendent, mysterious dimension: or one could say that "kingdom of God" is a micro-myth in relation to the more elaborate myths about divine activity, and as such it may evoke the larger myths but it does not symbolize them or anything else: rather it is something symbolized - in the myth, in narrative and in parable, as Perrin tacitly acknowledges when he refers to the Kingdom of God as the ultimate referent of the parable. The second observation is less technical: the kind of

literary critical approach worked out by Perrin assists our present-day understanding of the phrase "Kingdom of God" rather than what it meant in the lip and on the lips of Jesus. Was Jesus, in his kingdom-proclamation using, or aware that he was using, a symbol which makes it inappropriate to ask whether in his teaching the kingdom was present or future or both? I don't know, but I do know that a purely literary insight about the language of the gospel cannot sustain a historical conclusion about Jesus' state of mind or intention. /27 But historical criticism may enable us to offer responsible suggestions about Jesus' meaning. If our investigation has been conducted correctly then I would want and feel able to say that the "Kingdom of God" locution or speech-form on Jesus' lips (whether we call it metaphor, micro-myth or symbol) was his way of declaring, affirming, witnessing to (by means of a contemporary reverential circumlocution) the fact (conviction, belief?) that sovereignty is exercised by God in his kind of way wherein justice and mercy mingle. If that is myth, so be it! It is Jesus' affirmation and acknowledgement of how things really are: "God reigning" is how (to use words from Schillebeeckx)"God manifests his being God in the world".

/28 That Jesus confessed: he gave glimpses - in story and in deed - into what the reality, the real happening-ness of "God reigning" would be like in actual experience (and these we shall consider in subsequent lectures): and he claimed that the "God reigning" state of affairs was related to himself and to people's attitudes to himself. Now that claim - the historicity of which very few if any NT scholars would deny; indeed it is one of the three points on which G. Aulen found remarkable agreement in his survey of research (cf. G. Aulen, Jesus in Contemporary Historical Research, Fortress and SPCK 1976 p3) - implies a great deal about Jesus' authority and therefore his identity. In announcing and embodying the good news of the kingdom, of "God exercising sovereignty" (for he did represent in truth what he proclaimed) Jesus fulfils a function which could be described as "mediator of salvation" - and this is quite independent of whether he accepted the title of Messiah or spoke of himself as Son of Man or even understood his death as the means of salvation.

To describe Jesus' intimate personal relationship to the kingdom is difficult, and language is certainly stretched if

one is to try to convey the understanding of "kingdom of God" I have been presenting. Some are satisfied to speak of Jesus as the bearer of the kingdom, but the word seems to imply or at least to suggest that what he bears is some thing: "inaugurator" of the kingdom is too limited by its temporal reference. Some are satisfied to say "representative" and I have already used "embodiment" but I am not content with that, nor indeed with "realisation". I have decided (at least for the time being) that the best term available is an old and little used one, "epiphany": its appropriateness is urged upon me by some remarkable sentences/phrases from the Pastorals.

Titus 2.11 "The grace of God has appeared -epephanē- bringing salvation to, perhaps making salvation possible for, all men." And a wonderful sentence from Titus 3.4 "When the goodness, the kindness (xrēstotēs) and the generosity or loving kindness (philanthōpīa) of God our Saviour appeared (epephanē)... he saved us." Of special interest is the use (admittedly in a rather awkward construction) of epiphaneia and basileia in 2 Tim 4.1, "in view of (or "in the name of" Jer.B) his (Christ's) appearing and his kingdom." In a very detailed investigation of the historical use and making of epiphaneia Dieter Lührmann argues convincingly that here the noun (and the verb) signifies more than "presence", "appearance", "manifestation": it has a dimension of meaning that may be regarded as taking it into the range of salvation vocabulary, for it indicates "intervention which brings help or assistance". /29 It is that kind of sense in which I wish to put forward "epiphany"/epiphaneia as the word which (for me) expresses best the relationship between Jesus and the "Kingdom of God", in accordance with my understanding of the latter phrase. "God exercising sovereignty", God's mode of being God, is manifested, makes a saving intervention into time (our historical time) in the person of Jesus. In him all that is meant by "God reigning" is encountered. That affirmation - which the texts will attest - is of extraordinary importance for NT christology. Other starting-points have been and still are used by scholars in their attempts to construct christology but I venture the opinion that the correct place to begin is here: in the life of Jesus, God's activity as king, "the way God reveals his being in the world", the God of Israel's godness, intervenes in history with its characteristic power, compassion and judgement.

Reflect on that and you will be on the way towards understanding Jesus' significance in his own terms and in terms of Christian faith as well.

Implicit in what has been said is the answer I would give to another of the major questions commonly asked concerning the kingdom, namely, is it present or future or both? If "the kingdom of God" is thought of as a reign or as a regime (even if only secondarily spatial) it makes sense to ask, Is it here yet? and if not, when will it be? And NT scholarship since Johannes Weiss (who called this "die unfructbare Fragestellung") has been trying to answer that kind of question, as the eschatology of Jesus has been variously defined as "consistent or thoroughgoing", (A. Schweitzer), "realised" (Dodd), "self-realising" (Jeremias) and probably most commonly "inaugurated" (i.e. commenced but not concluded or consummated). But if the results of our inquiry and interpretation are so far correct, then we are in a position to see that all talk about the kingdom being present or future, realised or inaugurated, is really talk about God's exercise of sovereignty and that is not limited by time nor appropriately subjected to our neat time categories of past, present and future. But because we have to speak within our limitations and because "the kingdom" is "God acting in his kingly way", we may apply any of our temporal dimensions to "kingdom" (for God has been, is and will be king), but we must realize that none of these can claim to be exclusively correct, only more appropriate in certain situations and contexts. When Jesus announces the kingdom, as in his first recorded words, the reference may and indeed must be taken as present. "God exercising sovereignty" has come (engiken - and I have the utmost difficulty in thinking that the Greek word means anything else); it is happening now. Jeremias' instinct concerning that verse is right, "What is being said is 'God is near...at the door...already here'". Again Jesus says (Lk 17.20f) in a much misunderstood text "The kingdom of God is entos humōn" which means, certainly not "within you" and probably not "among you" but, in accordance with a usage from the papyri, "in your hands", "within your grasp".

/30 Texts like these - and the number could be multiplied many times - already show that attempts to see "the Kingdom" in terms of a future regime, a political movement or a programme for social improvement are not only highly problematic as exegesis, but are in danger of putting an

Hill, Kingdom of God, IBS:3, April 1981

ideology (ancient or modern) in the place of repentance and faith. If the announcement of the kingdom is the announcement of the present-ness of God's exercising sovereignty as present reality has to be apprehended, acknowledged. But "the Kingdom" interpreted in terms of God's disclosure of his kingly activity can also be viewed as moving toward an irresistible climax in which he will be fully revealed and inaugurated by the power and compassion which manifest in action the nature of his sovereignty. It is interesting to observe that both Jesus' proclamation and the diction of the Targums understood "the kingdom" in all these dimensions: to assert one at the expense of the other two is to introduce a false systematization into their usage. The question as to when sovereignty or rule is asserted over a people or a territory (being based on the exclusivist time scheme) is inappropriate to the dominical insistence that "the Kingdom" is God exercising sovereignty, God's mode of being God. This we talk about best, not in terms of a time-sequence (for God is, has been and ever will be king) but in terms of the sight and experience of power that creates and renews, authority that judges and protects, justice that sifts and saves.

But in order to gain the sight and enter the experience - and the possibility of doing so is indeed good news - we too have to heed Jesus' words. "The Kingdom of God is here and now: repent and believe in the gospel." Believing in the truth of the kingdom's announcement and presence takes courage: committing oneself to the affirmation and letting it dominate one's life is even more demanding and thrilling. We like Jesus' first hearers find it very hard to let the control go and experience the radical excitement. We need to repent: we need to go back, as it were, and start all over again with a new attitude and outlook, a new goal, a new set of values. As I reflect on the message of Jesus found in the synoptic gospels, I become more certain that the call to "repentance" cannot really be distinguished from the call to discipleship. "Whoever does not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child will never enter it." Acknowledging, welcoming, accepting the disclosure of God's saving sovereignty requires the childlike (the beginner's) capacity to take on trust, to be surprised, expectant, open and demands willingness to take risks and be loyal. It sounds straightforward: but in fact it is deeply disturbing, even offensive, especially to the sophisticated and religious 73

people. "Blessed is the man who is not offended at or by me," said Jesus. Most people were offended, upset; most people did not repent: few, only a handful, followed and entered into the experience, the excitement, the joy and the demand, of the kingdom, the experience of sovereign grace, for that is but another way of saying "God exercising lordship, his kind of lordship, in the world".

Notes

1. Jon Sobrino, Christology at the Crossroads (Eng. Trans., SCM Press, London 1973), p42
2. Norman Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus (SCM Press, London 1967), p54.
3. J. Jeremias, NT Theology I: The Proclamation of Jesus, (Eng. Trans., SCM, London 1971), p96
4. G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus (ET, T & T Clark, Edinburgh 1902) p94
5. R. Schnackenburg, God's Rule and Kingdom (ET, Nelson, London 1963), p354f
6. S. Aalen, "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels", NTS, VIII (1961/62) pp215-40, espec. pp220ff.
7. N. Perrin, op.cit., p55; J. Jeremias, op.cit., p98; R. Schnackenburg, op.cit., p13.
8. J. Jeremias, loc.cit.
9. The Qumran texts confirm that in pre-Christian times there was no hesitation about using 'el or 'elohim. The synoptic gospels all place "God" on the lips of Jesus very frequently.
10. Jeremias, op.cit., p97
11. Cf. T.F. Glasson, "The Kingdom as Cosmic Catastrophe", Studia Evangelica III, part ii (ed. F.L. Cross): Texte und Untersuchungen 88 (Berlin 1964), pp 187-8; and more recently in the opening chapters of his Jesus and the End of the World, St Andrew Press, Edinburgh 1980).
12. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word (ET, NYork² 1958 from 1926 German edition) p39

13. N. Perrin, Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom (SCM, London 1976), p77
14. Cf. G. Dalman, op.cit., p98
15. T.W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge 1931) p131
16. J. Weiss, Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom (ET,SCM London 1971)
17. J. Weiss, op.cit., p74
18. Cf. P. Stuhlmacher, Das paulinische Evangelium I: Vorgeschichte, (FRALNT 95, Göttingen 1968) pp142-51
19. Isa.21,23; 31.4; 40.9;52.7; Ezek 7.7,10; Obad 21; Micah 4.7,8; Zech 14.9
20. Cf. B.D. Chilton, "Regnum Dei Deus Est" (SJT XXXI 1977, pp261-270 (to which I am here indebted); also his major study, God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom (Freistadt 1979); also Klaus Koch, "Offenbaren Wird sich das Reich Gottes", NTS XXV (1978-79) pp158ff
21. Jeremias, NT Theology I, p102
22. The so-called "royal" Psalms provide clear expression of the characteristics of genuine kingship as applied to God and to the Israelite ruler (actual or ideal); cf. espec. Pss 21, 45, 72.1-12 and 101
23. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, p55
24. Jeremias, NT Theology, p102
25. Fortress Press(USA) and SCM (London), 1976
26. Here I am in debt to Dan O. Via's review of Perrin's book in Interpretation XXXI (1977), pp181-3
27. Cf. Q. Quesnell's review of Perrin's book in CBQ XXXIX, 1977, pp 290-92. Mpte what Perrin says (p199): "In the last resort my option may not produce a result significantly different from a Bultmannian understanding of the eschatology of Jesus".
28. E. Schillebeeckx, Jesus: An Experiment in Christology (ET, Collins 1978) p141; note also the phrase "God's

Hill, Kingdom of God, IBS: 3, April, 1981 .

Lordship is God's mode of being God", p142

29. D. Lührmann, "Epiphaneia" in Tradition und Glaube (Festschrift for K.G. Kuhn, Vandenhoeck and Reprecht, Göttingen 1971) pp185-199.
30. Cf. A. Rüstow, ZNW (1960) and the Bauer/Arndt-Gingrich Lexicon, 2nd ed. sub voce (entos).