

Andrews University

## Digital Commons @ Andrews University

---

Dissertations

Graduate Research

---

2011

### The Influence and Use of Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels

Reimar Vetne

Andrews University, [vetne@andrews.edu](mailto:vetne@andrews.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Vetne, Reimar, "The Influence and Use of Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels" (2011). *Dissertations*. 160.  
<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/160>  
<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/160/>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact [repository@andrews.edu](mailto:repository@andrews.edu).



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library  
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by  
not duplicating or distributing additional copies  
in any form without the author's express written  
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

ABSTRACT

THE INFLUENCE AND USE OF DANIEL  
IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

by

Reimar Vetne

Adviser: Jon Paulien

# ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE INFLUENCE AND USE OF DANIEL IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Name of researcher: Reimar Vetne

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Jon Paulien, Ph.D.

Date completed: July 2011

Scholars have always been aware of influence from the book of Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels. Various allusions to Daniel have been discussed in numerous articles, monographs and commentaries. Now we have for the first time a comprehensive look at all the possible allusions to Daniel in one study.

All the cases are discussed and given an assessment of either 'no allusion', 'uncertain allusion', 'possible allusion', 'probable allusion', or 'certain allusion'.

After reviewing the most common terminology and methodology used in scholarship in the area of literary influence (ch. 1), the bulk of the cases are discussed one by one in the following chapter (ch. 2), except those dealing specifically with the 'Son of Man' (ch. 3), the Olivet Discourse (ch. 4), and the 'Kingdom of God' (ch. 5). A

concluding chapter summarizes the findings and shows some specific themes where the book of Daniel has influenced the Synoptics.

The result of this study is that Daniel has shaped the language and phraseology of many sayings in the Gospels to a larger degree than many of us have thought, and that a fresh understanding of the Synoptic Jesus' strategy for kingdom-building appears.

Andrews University  
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE INFLUENCE AND USE OF DANIEL  
IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

A Dissertation  
Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

by  
Reimar Vetne  
July 2011

© Copyright by Reimar Vetne 2011  
All Rights Reserved

THE INFLUENCE AND USE OF DANIEL  
IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

A dissertation  
presented in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Reimar Vetne

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

---

Faculty Adviser,  
Jon Paulien  
Professor of Religion - Theological Studies

---

Director, PhD/ThD Program  
Tom Shepherd

---

P. Richard Choi  
Associate Professor of New Testament

---

Dean, SDA Theological Seminary  
Denis Fortin

---

Richard M. Davidson  
J.N. Andrews Professor of Old Testament  
Interpretation

---

Jacques B. Doukhan  
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis

---

David L. Turner  
Professor of New Testament  
Grand Rapids Theological Seminary

---

Date approved



To my parents Øystein and Ruth  
For your generous moral and financial support

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	ix
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Chapter	
I. METHODOLOGY .....	4
What Literary Influence Is. ....	4
Relevant Terms .....	7
'The Use Of' .....	7
'Influence' .....	8
'Intertextuality' .....	8
Scholarship on Methodology .....	10
Hermerén .....	11
Tintner .....	16
Stendahl .....	19
Gundry .....	20
Paulien .....	21
The Terms I Will Use .....	24
II. GENERAL CASES .....	25
§2 Gabriel Visiting Zechariah (Luke 1:10-22) .....	25
Implication of Allusion .....	27
§3 Gabriel Visiting Mary (Luke 1:26-38) .....	28
Implication of Allusion .....	29
§7 Conception of Jesus (Matt 1:18-21) .....	30
§8 The Wise Men and Herod (Matt 2:1-3) .....	30
§9/12 Keeping These Things in Her Heart (Luke 2:19, 51) .....	32
§20 The Devil's Offer (Matt 4:8-10; Luke 4:5-8) .....	33
Implication of Allusion .....	35
§32 The Time Is Fulfilled (Mark 1:15) .....	35
§35 Teaching with Authority (Matt 7:29; Mark 1:22; Luke 4:32) .....	37
§62 The Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:10-13) .....	38
Implication of Allusion .....	41
§107 Least in the Kingdom (Matt 11:11; Luke 7:28) .....	41

§109/181 Revealing Deep and Hidden Things (Matt 11:25-27; Luke 10:21-22) . . . . .	43
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	46
§117/188 By the Finger of God (Luke 11:20). . . . .	47
§123 Mystery of the Kingdom (Matt 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10) . . . .	49
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	51
§128/209 Parable of a Large Tree (Matt 13:32; Mark 4:32; Luke 13:19). .	52
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	58
§131+133 Fiery Furnace (Matt 13:42, 50) . . . . .	59
§131 The Righteous Will Shine (Matt 13:43). . . . .	62
Implication of the Last Two Allusions . . . . .	64
§137 The Most High God (Mark 5:7; Luke 8:28). . . . .	65
§161 The Transfiguration (Matt 17:1-9; Mark 9:2-10; Luke 9:28-36) . . .	66
§172 Forgive Seventy Times Seven (Matt 18:21-22). . . . .	72
§180 Apocalyptic Vision (Luke 10:17-20) . . . . .	73
§201 Little Flock Will Receive the Kingdom (Luke 12:32). . . . .	75
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	76
§221 Sound of Music (Luke 15:25) . . . . .	76
§237 Praying for Mercy (Luke 18:13). . . . .	77
§255 + 300 Eternal Life (Matt 19:29; 25:46; Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30); §281 Resurrection (Matt 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40); §347 Those Asleep Were Raised (Matt 27:52) . . . . .	77
§275 Say to This Mountain (Matt 21:21; Mark 11:23). . . . .	79
§278 The Crushing Stone (Matt 21:44; Luke 20:18) . . . . .	80
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	83
§336 Political Plot (Luke 23:2). . . . .	83
§351 Sealing the Grave (Matt 27:63) . . . . .	84
§352 Clothing White as Snow (Matt 28:3) . . . . .	87
§364 All Authority in Heaven and on Earth (Matt 28:18-20). . . . .	89
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	93
III. 'SON OF MAN' SAYINGS. . . . .	96
Introduction . . . . .	96
Dan 7:13-14. . . . .	99
'Son of Man' and the Parables of Enoch . . . . .	103
§43 Authority to Forgive Sins (Matt 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24) . . . . .	108
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	111
§46/111 Lord of the Sabbath (Matt 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5). . . . .	112
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	115
§78 Expect Persecution (Matt 5:10-12; Luke 6:22-23). . . . .	115
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	116
§107 Friend of Sinners (Matt 11:19; Luke 7:34) . . . . .	116
§118/197 Forgiveness of Blasphemy (Matt 12:31-32; Mark 3:28-29; Luke 12:10) . . . . .	117
§119/191 Greater Than Jonah (Matt 12:38-42; Luke 11:30-31). . . . .	118
§131 Parable of Harvest (Matt 13:24-30, 37-43) . . . . .	119

Implication of Allusion . . . . .	120
§158 Who People Think the 'Son of Man' Is (Matt 16:13; Mark 8:27; Luke 9:18) . . . . .	120
§159, 164, 262 Passion Predictions (Matt 17:22; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22 et al.); §263 Must Give His Life as Ransom (Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 22:27); §331 Must Take Place (Matt 26:54) . . . . .	121
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	127
§160 Coming with the Angels in Glory (Matt 16:27; Mark 8:38-9:1; Luke 9:26); §196 Acknowledge before the Angels (Matt 10:32; Luke 12:8-9) . . . . .	127
Implication of Allusion . . . . .	130
§255 Kingdom and Thrones (Matt 19:28; Luke 18:29-30; 22:28-30); §300 Judging from His Glorious Throne (Matt 25:31-46) . . . . .	131
§292 Coming in the Clouds with Power (Matt 24:30-31; Mark 13:26-27; Luke 21:27) . . . . .	133
§332 Sitting at the Right Hand of Power (Matt 26:64; Mark 14:62) . . . .	136
Implication of Allusions . . . . .	138
Meaning of 'Son of Man' in the Synoptics . . . . .	139
Hermeneutical Problems . . . . .	139
Modern Illustration . . . . .	141
Examples of Misuse . . . . .	147
Mark 10:45 . . . . .	148
Matt 8:20; Luke 9:58 . . . . .	149
IV. ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE . . . . .	152
Principle: Jesus Had a Precise Eschatology . . . . .	153
Example: Matthew 11 . . . . .	154
Example: Matthew 13 . . . . .	156
Principle: Jesus Asked Us to Read Daniel Together with His Discourse .	158
History of Scholarship on the Discourse . . . . .	161
Traditional Understanding: Two Mountain Peaks . . . . .	162
Mid-nineteenth Century: Rise of the Little Apocalypse Theory . . . .	164
Late Nineteenth Century: Developing the Little Apocalypse Theory .	166
Early Twentieth Century: Eschatological or Not . . . . .	168
Recent Proposals . . . . .	169
The Prophecy in Daniel 7 . . . . .	171
Content of the Prophecy . . . . .	171
Temporal Interpretation of the Prophecy . . . . .	173
The Prophecy in Daniel 9 . . . . .	176
Abomination of Desolation . . . . .	176
Content of the Prophecy . . . . .	179
Temporal Interpretation of the Prophecy . . . . .	186
The Smaller Scope of Daniel 9 . . . . .	187
The Structure of the Eschatological Discourse . . . . .	188
Richard Davidson's Proposal . . . . .	189

Davidson's Proposal Aligned with Daniel 9 and 7 . . . . .	197
The Disciples' Question (Matt 24:3; Mark 13:4; Luke 21:7) . . . . .	198
Wars (Matt 24:4-8; Mark 13:5-8; Luke 21:8-11) . . . . .	201
Proclaiming the Good News of the Kingdom (Matt 24:14; Mark 13:10). . . . .	206
Abomination of Desolation (Matt 24:15-20; Mark 13:14-18; Luke 21:20-24a) . . . . .	208
Persecution (Matt 24:9-13; Mark 13:9-13; Luke 21:12-19); The Great Persecution (Matt 24:21-22; Mark 13:19-20) . . . . .	209
Deception (Matt 24:4-5, 23-28; Mark 13:5-6, 21-23; Luke 21:8). . . . .	215
Jerusalem Trampled during Times of the Gentiles (Luke 21:24b) . . . . .	217
Celestial Signs (Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24-25; Luke 21:25-26) . . . . .	218
'Son of Man' Coming in Power (Matt 24:30-31; Mark 13:26-27; Luke 21:27-28) . . . . .	218
Summary . . . . .	219
 V. KINGDOM OF GOD . . . . .	 221
Kingdom of God in the Old Testament . . . . .	221
Timing of the Kingdom . . . . .	222
Expansion Strategy of the Kingdom . . . . .	224
Kingdom of God in Daniel . . . . .	228
Timing of the Kingdom . . . . .	229
Expansion Strategy of the Kingdom . . . . .	229
Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels . . . . .	233
Timing of the Kingdom . . . . .	233
Expansion Strategy of the Kingdom . . . . .	235
§288-89 Kingdom against Kingdom (Matt 24:6-13; Mark 13:7-13; Luke 21:10-19) . . . . .	239
§51 Blessed Are the Persecuted (Matt 5:3-12; Luke 6:20-23) . . . . .	239
§160 Suffering and Serving (Matt 16:24-27; Mark 8:34-38; Luke 9:23-26); §166 True Greatness (Mark 9:33-35); §263 Not Lording over People (Matt 20:20-28; Mark 10:35-45; Luke 22:24-27) . . . . .	240
Previous Cases . . . . .	241
Summary . . . . .	245
 CONCLUSION . . . . .	 246
 BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 254

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Parable of a Large Tree: Verbal Parallels . . . . .	56
2. The Transfiguration: Murphy-O'Connor's Proposal . . . . .	66
3. Davidson's Outline of Matthew 24 . . . . .	192
4. Accumulated Table of 'Probable' and 'Certain' Allusions . . . . .	247
5. Accumulated Table of 'Possible' Allusions . . . . .	248

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ANTJ	Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATSDS	Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series
AUSDDS	Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BINS	Biblical Interpretation Series
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series

CC	Concordia Commentary
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica
<i>CQR</i>	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>DDD</i>	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i>
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ITC	International Theological Commentary
IVPNT	InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series
<i>JATS</i>	<i>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KBANT	Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament



LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NA <sup>27</sup>	Nesle and Aland, eds., <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27th ed.
NAC	New American Commentary
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NT	New Testament
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OT	Old Testament
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra pagina
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
StPB	Studia post-biblica

SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
Theo	Theodotion
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

## INTRODUCTION

Like many other Jews at the turn of the Common Era—the Qumran community, Philo, Josephus, the Rabbis—Jesus and the Gospel writers took the task of understanding and interpreting the Scriptures seriously. In this study we will look at the role and influence the biblical book of Daniel had for Jesus and the Synoptic writers.

We know that within the eschatologically oriented community at Qumran, Daniel was a popular and influential book. With eight extant copies of Daniel,<sup>1</sup> and quotes and allusions to content in Daniel in several of the community's own writings,<sup>2</sup> Daniel ranked right after the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and the Psalms in importance among the biblical books.

After Weiss and Schweitzer most scholars have considered the Synoptic Jesus to be quite eschatologically oriented (debating not whether he had any, but what kind of eschatology Jesus taught—realized, imminent, distant future, or something else entirely).<sup>3</sup> We would not be surprised therefore to find frequent footprints of Daniel in the teaching of Jesus, and so many scholars have. The explicit citation of Daniel in Matt 24:15 has received much attention in the literature,<sup>4</sup> several essays have surveyed Daniel in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 2:573-85.

<sup>2</sup>Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:329-67.

<sup>3</sup>There are of course still some who argue for a non-eschatological Jesus. See the summary of this debate in ch. 5 on the 'Kingdom of God' (pp. 233-4 below).

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden, the

Gospels,<sup>5</sup> and shorter and longer works focused on Daniel in a specific section of the Gospels.<sup>6</sup>

The question then is not *whether* Daniel has influenced the Synoptic Gospels, but *how much*. It is time to get a comprehensive look at the influence and use of Daniel in Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

A quick note about what this study does not attempt. 'Jesus' in this study refers only to the portrait of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, not a historical-critical reconstruction of him. My personal view is that we can count the Synoptic Gospels as quite reliable summaries of his teaching. When we find references to phrases and theology from the book of Daniel on the lips of Jesus, it is in my view more likely that it

---

Netherlands: Brill, 1967), 47-49; Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par* (Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1966); David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse* (Gospel Perspectives 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 175-218; and most commentaries.

<sup>5</sup>E.g., Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ed. John J. Collins; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 90-112; Craig A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:490-527; Hans K. LaRondelle, "Christ's Use of Daniel," in *Creation, Life, and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan* (ed. Jiří Moskala; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2000), 395-416.

<sup>6</sup>E.g., Hubert Frankemölle, "Die Offenbarung an die Unmündigen: Pragmatische Impulse aus Mt 11,25f," in *Chancen und Grenzen religiöser Erziehung* (ed. Johannes Thiele and Rudolf Becker; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1980); Werner Grimm, *Jesus und das Danielbuch: Jesu Einspruch das Offenbarungssystem Daniels (Mt 11,25-27; Lk 17:20-21)* (ANTJ 6; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984); Jane Schaberg, *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b* (SBLDS 61; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981); idem, "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions," *NTS* 31 (1985): 208-22; Benedict T. Viviano, "The Least in the Kingdom: Matthew 11:11, Its Parallel in Luke 7:28 (Q), and Daniel 4:14," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 41-54; Werner Zager, *Gottesherrschaft und Endgericht in der Verkündigung Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur markanischen Jesusüberlieferung einschließlich der Q-Parallelen* (BZNW 82; Berlin: Gruyter, 1996).

originates with the historical Jesus than the early church and evangelists. My view on this issue of historicity is not significant for this study, however. This is a literary study, not a historical one. Historians are invited to take the results of this study and assign some of the influence of Daniel to Jesus of Nazareth and some to the early followers who wrote about him.

The first chapter about methodology looks at the most common terms and methodologies for this special kind of literary comparative work—the use and influence of the OT in the NT. I will summarize the approaches we have seen in this field during the last couple of decades, and define the terms I will use in this study.

Chapter 2 makes up the bulk of the dissertation. I will there evaluate case by case the many allusions to Daniel that have been suggested by scholars—except those dealing with the term 'Son of Man' (reserved for ch. 3), the Olivet Discourse (ch. 4), and the 'Kingdom of God' (ch. 5). The number of suggested allusions to Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels is larger than I anticipated at the outset of my research, but I will take a critical look at the suggestions and try to determine the solid references from the imaginary ones. Hopefully my judgments will be somewhat sound and sober so that the accumulated pile of the more probable allusions will be useful when we reach the end.

Chapters 3 to 5 will look at the use and influence of Daniel on the 'Son of Man' phrase, on the eschatological discourse in Matt 24 and parallels, and on the concept of the Kingdom of God.

After that, when the time comes to summarize all the findings, it is not impossible that one will reach the conclusion that Daniel's impact on the Gospels is larger than most of us have thought.

## CHAPTER I

### METHODOLOGY

#### **What Literary Influence Is**

During the last thirty years the study of literary influence and intertextuality has grown massively in biblical scholarship and in the study of literature at large. Writers are always influenced by authors before them, and sometimes consciously allude to or quote previous literature. Studies have flourished on literary influence in Ancient Greco-Roman writings,<sup>1</sup> in the field of English literature,<sup>2</sup> and beyond.<sup>3</sup> Some authors contribute to clarifying methodology and terminology; many look for specific cases of influence in particular authors.

This has been a very fruitful area of NT scholarship, since the Jewish Scriptures (OT) were held to be important authoritative writings for the early Christian writers. It is no longer possible to produce commentaries, do exegesis or write on the theology of

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Lowell Edmunds, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001); Ellen Finkelpearl, "Pagan Traditions of Intertextuality in the Roman World," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (ed. Dennis R. MacDonald; Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001), 78-90; Christopher D. Stanley, "Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE," *NovT* 32 (1990): 48-78.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981); Kenneth Muir, *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1978).

<sup>3</sup>Carmela Perri et al., "Allusion Studies: An International Annotated Bibliography, 1921-1977," *Style* 13 (1979): 178-225.

certain NT books without dealing with how the author was influenced by and was using the Scriptures of Israel.<sup>4</sup>

A good example of the rapid speed of development can be seen in the twenty years that have passed since Jon Paulien wrote his study on the seven trumpets of Revelation.<sup>5</sup> At that time few systematic efforts had been made to draw up a methodology and a set of terminology for tracing OT allusions in the NT. Before Paulien could write an interpretation of Rev 8 and the literary allusions to the OT therein, he had to work out his own set of methodological principles.<sup>6</sup>

Ten years later in an influential essay, Stanley Porter praised the growth of the 'Use of the OT in the NT' field, but lamented the lack of precision in methodology and terminology used by scholars.<sup>7</sup> He suggested some useful ground rules, but admonished above all that authors spell out their own methods and terms before presenting their particular findings.

Today the field of OT in NT must be declared mature—mature not in the sense

---

<sup>4</sup>Compare for instance the very scattered references to the OT in Bultman's study on Jesus with the importance Jesus' reading of the OT has in Wright's reconstruction. Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951); Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).

<sup>5</sup>Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12* (AUSDDS 11; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1988).

<sup>6</sup>"The more I studied the trumpets and read the literature on Revelation, however, the more I became concerned about the lack of systematic method in the study of the book. . . . The passage of time has seen the issue of method take center stage [in this dissertation] and the interpretation of the trumpets assume a secondary role." Ibid., ix.

<sup>7</sup>Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79-96.

that all authors who write in this area use precise methods or terms as Porter recommended, but mature in the sense that a lot of methodological groundwork has already been done. Anyone who now wishes to go straight into their particular intertextual findings can do so just by pointing to a previous scholar's method, or quickly define one's terms.

A sense of maturity can also be seen in the *focus* of 'OT in NT' works, which has moved gradually from more text-technical groundwork of detecting versions of Scripture quoted or edited,<sup>8</sup> to overviews of the use of *one* OT book in NT,<sup>9</sup> towards discussing the theological impact and message of this intertextuality.<sup>10</sup> My dissertation certainly deals with those latter questions: How much is Daniel used in the Gospels, and how does that *help us understand* the sayings of Jesus?

The rest of this chapter reviews the most useful guidelines proposed for how to distinguish the probable allusions from the less probable, and the common terms used by the scholars in this field.

---

<sup>8</sup>Like much of Menken's invaluable scholarship, some of it collected in Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2004). Robert Gundry's early dissertation is another great example: *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1967).

<sup>9</sup>See the recent volumes in the series "The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel," such as Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, eds., *The Psalms in the New Testament* (London: T & T Clark, 2004); *Isaiah in the New Testament* (2005); *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (2007); *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament* (2009).

<sup>10</sup>See the many short but highly stimulating 'theological use' sections throughout Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), or see how Hays argues that the OT allusions in Paul will affect our interpretation of the apostle. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989).



## Relevant Terms

### 'The Use Of

Several overall terms have been used for the type of work I am presenting in this dissertation. For a long time '*The use of <blank> in <blank>*' or similar was common,<sup>11</sup> and is still widely used today (including in the title of this dissertation).<sup>12</sup> The approach

---

<sup>11</sup>Gregory K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984); Matthew Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 1-14; Thomas Louis Brodie, "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17.-24," *NTS* 32 (1986): 247-67; Bruce Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time* (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1984); E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957); James M. Efird, ed., *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960-61): 297-333; Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1967); Richard S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew* (Basel, Switzerland: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969); Helmer Ringgren, "Luke's Use of the Old Testament," *HTR* 79 (1986): 227-35; Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).

<sup>12</sup>Gregory K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); idem, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); J. Daryl Charles, "Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-material as Part of a Literary Strategy," *NTS* 37 (1991): 130-45; Joel B. Green and Richard B. Hays, "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers," in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (ed. Joel B. Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 222-38; Hans K. LaRondelle, "Christ's Use of Daniel," in *Creation, Life, and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan* (ed. Jiří Moskala; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2000), 395-316; Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79-96; Emerson B. Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels* (BINS 63; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2003); Klyne R. Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues* (ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 209-29.

under this heading is very often author-centered, looking for deliberate textual references that the author expected his audience to recognize.

### 'Influence'

Another term for our type of inquiry was borrowed from the larger field of literary studies: '*Literary influence*' or '*Influence of <blank> in <blank>*'.<sup>13</sup> It is still used in NT scholarship, but it has not become the most widespread.<sup>14</sup> 'Influence' is a more general and flexible term than 'use of' and can often include discussions of an author's unconscious use of language and content from an earlier author in addition to deliberate allusions and quotes. The approach is still author-centered (as opposed to audience-centered—how the reader perceives or does not perceive the influence and reference to an earlier writing).

### 'Intertextuality'

The term 'influence' never became as popular as did the term 'intertextuality'.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>A. Owen Aldridge, "The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature: A Symposium," *Comparative Literature Studies* (1963): 143-52; Haskell M. Block, "The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature," in *Influx: Essays on Literary Influence* (ed. Ronald Primeau; Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat, 1977), 74-81; Ihab H. Hassan, "The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes Towards a Definition," in *Influx: Essays on Literary Influence* (ed. Ronald Primeau; Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat, 1977), 34-84; Göran Hermerén, *Influence in Art and Literature* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975).

<sup>14</sup>Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979); Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ed. John J. Collins; Hermeneia 27; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 90-112; Gregory J. Riley, "Influence of Thomas Christianity on Luke 12:14 and 5:39," *HTR* 88 (1995): 229-35; Ben Witherington III, "The Influence of Galatians on Hebrews," *NTS* 37 (1991): 146-52.

<sup>15</sup>"The word 'intertextuality' has become common coinage among biblical scholars. Critics who once spoke of 'sources' now speak of an author's intertextual use of traditions." Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality," in *The Old Testament in the New Testament:*

Coined by Julia Kristeva in French in the late 1960s,<sup>16</sup> it was adopted by many in literary studies, including from the 1980s onwards many in biblical scholarship.<sup>17</sup> Few however use the term in the sense that Kristeva intended, as a post-structural contribution to philosophy of language (for Kristeva *intertextualité* referred to any kind of language use, not just text-based, where one set of meaning or symbols met another). The term is used by most writers for literary influence between works of literature of any kind. It does not even have to be on the level of authorial intention. Some studies on 'intertextuality' are

---

*Essays in Honour of J.L. North* (JSNTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 15.

<sup>16</sup>Julia Kristeva, *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Seuil, 1969). The English translation is Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (trans. Thomas Gora; New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

<sup>17</sup>Mark E. Biddle, "Ancestral Motifs in 1 Samuel 25: Intertextuality and Characterization," *JBL* 121 (2002): 617-38; Daniel Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1990); George Wesley Buchanan, *Introduction to Intertextuality* (Mellen Biblical Press Series 26; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994); Sipke Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen, The Netherlands: J. H. Kok, 1989); Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997); Danna Nolan Fewell, ed., *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1992); Jacob Neusner, *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1987); Johannes C. de Moor, ed., *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1998); Steve Moyise, ed., *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North*; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Tobit, Genesis, and the Odyssey: A Complex Web of Intertextuality," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (ed. Dennis R. MacDonald; Studies in Antiquity & Christianity; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001), 41-55; Jon Paulien, "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 5-22; Wiard Popkes, "James and Scripture: An Exercise in Intertextuality," *NTS* 45 (1999): 213-29; Yohan Pyeon, *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

audience- or reader-oriented: how all readers bring their own background, presuppositions, and history of reading with them to a text.<sup>18</sup>

Among biblical scholars the term intertextuality is used with such diverse meanings that either the term should cease being used in our field, or biblical scholars should define at the outset exactly what kind of intertextual study they are attempting.<sup>19</sup>

*In this study I will primarily use the terms 'allusion' or 'influence', and the task will be to look for (1) Jesus' and the Gospel writers' deliberate use of Daniel, and (2) how Daniel has influenced their language and theology.*

### **Scholarship on Methodology**

A large number of terms are currently in use by NT scholars for the different types of literary influence. Porter's compilation from recent literature includes:

Citation, direct quotation, formal quotation, indirect quotation, allusive quotation, allusion (whether conscious or unconscious), paraphrase, exegesis (such as inner-biblical exegesis), midrash, typology, reminiscence, echo (whether conscious or unconscious), intertextuality, influence (either direct or indirect), and even tradition, among other terms.<sup>20</sup>

The next section discusses some of the recent attempts at drawing up a systematic set of methodology and terminology for establishing literary influence. A useful mental grid to have when we approach these proposals are a few main categories (in increasing order of contact): coincidental resemblance (no influence), unconscious echo, conscious allusion, quotation, exegesis, rewritten scripture, and translation.

---

<sup>18</sup>Moyise calls these audience-oriented studies 'postmodern intertextuality'. Moyise, "Intertextuality," 33-40.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 16; Porter, "Comment on Method and Terminology," 84-5.

<sup>20</sup>Porter, "Comment on Method and Terminology," 80.

The first two categories (coincidental resemblance and unconscious echo) are outside the scope of this dissertation. *This study focuses on probable authorial intent, that is, references to Daniel that it is likely that Jesus or the Gospel writers deliberately made and expected their audience to pick up* (conscious allusion and quotation). The category of 'exegesis' will be of interest to us in chapter 4 since the eschatological discourse in Matt 24 and parallels might be a deliberate exposition of Dan 7 and 9.<sup>21</sup>

### Hermerén

Fine arts scholar Göran Hermerén proposed some useful definitions and conditions for influence. He begins the first chapter with the basic formula "X influenced Y with respect to *a*,"<sup>22</sup> and defines X and Y as entities of persons (an individual or a group), a person's production (writing or art work), or a person's actions.<sup>23</sup> *a* is the property of Y that is different from what it otherwise would have been due to the influence of X. In a literary work *a* can be any part of its form or content, like single words, phrases, style, structure, imagery, theme, or idea.<sup>24</sup>

Regarding the word 'influence' in his formula Hermerén makes several distinctions, an important one for our study being between direct and indirect influence: Y was influenced by X versus Y was influenced by Z who was influenced by X.<sup>25</sup> In our

---

<sup>21</sup>So Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par* (Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1966).

<sup>22</sup>Hermerén, *Influence*, 11. Italics in quotations is always original.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, 14-27. The latter category (influencing someone's actions) is outside the scope of literary criticism and this investigation (for instance, that the book of Daniel influenced Jesus to do certain things that are not recorded in any writing).

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, 11-14.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, 32-42.

case the distinction would be between Jesus or the Gospel writers being influenced by reading the book of Daniel directly versus them being influenced by listening to some contemporary teachers who were influenced by Daniel, or reading literature that was influenced by Daniel.<sup>26</sup> One does not exclude the other. It is conceivable that Jesus or the Gospel writers were influenced both directly by reading the book of Daniel and indirectly by being exposed to a lot of thinkers and literature that were also influenced by Daniel.

Hermerén suggests a number of terms to be used when scholars discuss influence, of which the most relevant for this study is the following (in ascending order of similarity between X and Y).<sup>27</sup> A 'parallel' is the proper term when there are similarities between parts of X and Y but no causal connection (influence) exists, that is, that the similarities are due to coincidence. A 'source' is where the author of Y got an idea for Y when he read X, but expressed it quite differently. There are similarities between parts of Y and X, but they are not obvious or easy to detect. A 'paraphrase' or 'borrowing' occurs when the author of Y consciously took a way of expressing an idea from X but made some changes or additions to it. The similarities between parts of Y and X are stronger here than for the previous term.<sup>28</sup> An 'allusion' is a specific kind of borrowing where the author of Y wants to make the influence obvious and intends his reader to think about X, possibly also that he wants the reader to know that he intends so. "If the artist did not consciously or

---

<sup>26</sup>E.g., Second Temple apocalyptic works like *I Enoch*, which would raise the necessary question of whether *I Enoch* is influenced by Daniel, or Daniel by *I Enoch*, or whether there is any influence between them at all.

<sup>27</sup>Hermerén, *Influence*, 50, 62-68, 75-78. Hermerén uses works of art as examples for most of these terms, so I have adapted his definitions to the field of literature where needed.

<sup>28</sup>Hermerén limits paraphrases to same-medium influence, while borrowings can happen between different media, like a sculpture borrowing from a painting, or a speech borrowing from a writing.

unconsciously want to make beholders think of the work in question, then he did not allude to it."<sup>29</sup> A 'copy' is an attempt at more or less faithful reproduction (complete similarity) of all or parts of X. In the field of literature a more common term for this (when only a part of X is reproduced) is a 'quotation'.

In his second chapter Hermerén discusses various conditions that must be fulfilled before one can propose that influence exists in a particular case. The first is a temporal requirement. "If X influenced the creation of Y with respect to *a*, then Y was made after X with respect to *a*."<sup>30</sup> So if we have sufficient evidence to conclude that Y was produced before X, then influence is not possible. In our case, we know that Daniel was produced before Jesus lived and the Synoptic Gospels were written, so influence is not impossible on this ground.

The second requirement Hermerén calls contact. "If X influenced the creation of Y with respect to *a*, then the person who created Y was familiar with X, at least in the respect *a*."<sup>31</sup> This contact can be either direct or indirect. "To say that a person has had direct contact with a poem or a novel is analogously to say that he has at least once read the poem or the novel in question."<sup>32</sup> If the contact is indirect, it means that the author of

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 77.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., 157.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 164. Hermerén's compact language of formal logic might require a few readings to comprehend. Translated to this study we might for instance say that in order for the book of Daniel (= X) to have influenced the phrase 'Son of Man' (= *a*) in the Synoptic Gospels (= Y), then Jesus or the evangelists must have been familiar with the content of the book of Daniel, at least ch. 7 which contains the vision about a son of man. If there is no contact—if the content of Dan 7 was not familiar to them—then we cannot talk about influence from Daniel.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., 166.

Y has not personally read X but has read or been in contact with other people or works that have directly or indirectly been in contact with X.

So do we know whether the Gospel writers or Jesus had been in direct contact with—personally read—the book of Daniel? The answer is: Yes. In Matt 24:15 the book of Daniel is mentioned by name, and we have no reason to believe that this refers to anything else than the canonical book of Daniel. Hermerén's criterion of contact is fulfilled in our case.

Another condition Hermerén spends considerable space discussing is that of similarity. "If *X* influenced *Y* with respect to *a*, then *X* and *Y* are (noticeably) similar with respect to *a*."<sup>33</sup> This seems to me to be an untrue statement as a universal principle. It is easy to imagine an author being influenced by another work in a negative way, deciding to make their own work deliberately different. Influence can lead to dissimilarity. However, as a method of *detecting* influence between writings, similarity is surely a more safe way to go than dissimilarity.

In other words, if the Gospel writers disliked the book of Daniel and were embarrassed by its content, then it would be hard to discover that negative influence. If Jesus or the Gospel writers strongly disliked or disagreed with something in Daniel, they could have avoided referring to the book just as easily as openly criticizing it. Fortunately that is not our task. The Synoptic Jesus is positively recommending us to read Daniel so we know at the outset that Daniel was both read and enjoyed by those responsible for the Gospel sayings. We can expect to find positive influence from Daniel in the Gospels.

How then do we evaluate the strength of the similarity? Hermerén believes this will always be a subjective judgment.

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 177.



Especially in literary studies, the use of comparative methods often gives an impression of exactness. The situation is not much different in studies of the history of art. In particular, this is true when fragments of a poem or novel by one author are printed next to fragments of a poem or novel by another author in order to show the similarities. . . . However, this impression of exactness can sometimes be very deceptive.<sup>34</sup>

One procedure Hermerén suggests is experimental, asking a group of readers to compare the two writings and record their impressions. The reaction we should look for "might be paraphrased by: 'How similar with respect to a! How striking!' when X and Y are presented to them."<sup>35</sup>

What methods can be used to measure subjective similarity and to decide whether a person notices that X and Y are similar with respect to *a*? The problems raised by the criteria of similarity proposed here are very intriguing, and it may appear difficult to arrive at a satisfactory solution. At any rate, there does not seem to be a simple, clear, obvious, nontrivial and true answer to these questions. But the problems are not insoluble. Gösta Ekman and other psychologists have studied estimations of similarity experimentally and found that the intersubjective agreement is surprisingly large.<sup>36</sup>

Another more analytical and qualitative procedure is for the scholar to make a list of the various similarities seen between X and Y, and describe these in terms of precision, extensiveness, and frequency. 'Precision' refers to the exactness or strength of the similarity. If a ten-word phrase is found identical in X and Y, it would be a more precise similarity than if the phrases are somewhat synonymous but only a couple of identical words are used. Or a similarity in structure (order) is more precise the higher the number of consecutive units it has (A-B-C-D-E-F is a more precise similarity than A-B-C, and A-B-C-D is a more precise similarity than A-C-B-D). 'Extensiveness' refers to the

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 196.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 197.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 199-200. His reference to Ekman is H. Geisler and G. Ekman, "A Mechanism of Subjective Similarity," *Report from the Psych. Laboratory, Stockholm University* (Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm University, 1958), 65.

number of respects or levels in which the works are similar, like verbal (same words or phrases), style/choice of vocabulary (formal vs. colloquial, personal vs. impersonal, symbolic vs. literal, geographical dialect vs. mainstream, etc.), structure/order, theme, idea, etc. *X* and *Y* have a more extensive similarity if we find verbal parallels as well as in structure/order than if we find parallels only in structure. 'Frequency' is the sheer number of similarities irrespective of their precision or extensiveness.

Hermerén reminds us of the subjective nature of the procedure. "Again, it is important to be aware of the danger of doing quasimathematics."<sup>37</sup> It is not possible to draw up universal rules for the necessary precision, extensiveness, or frequency. This will vary from case to case. It will always be something of a subjective task.

Hermerén points out that only relevant similarities should count in the estimation, meaning that ideas that are widespread in the society where *Y* was produced do not count, nor forms of expression that at that time are common to writing in general or the genre *Y* belongs to. The more common property *a* is, the less likely it is that *Y* has been influenced by *X* in this respect.

In our case this condition means that we should not only look for similarities between the books of Daniel and the Gospels, but also check the similarities we might find against other writings in use in the first century A.D., as these could also explain the data.

Tintner

From the general theory and methodology of Hermerén, let us move to some examples from English literature. Adeline Tintner has published several works on Edith

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., 207.

Wharton and Henry James. In *Edith Wharton in Context*<sup>38</sup> she discusses how Wharton was influenced by her friend and colleague James, and by other contemporary authors.

In the first three chapters Tintner argues that Wharton and James wrote each other in as characters in some of their novels. For instance, in *The Hermit and the Wild Woman* Wharton created a story with various elements from her own personality and life as a basis for the main female character, the Wild Woman, and Henry James as a source of inspiration for the Hermit. Tintner argues against another Wharton scholar, R. W. B. Lewis, who sees Wharton's supposed extramarital lover Walter Berry as the Hermit.<sup>39</sup>

In ch. 7 Tintner argues that Wharton was influenced by one of Henry James' short stories when she wrote a chapter in a novel. "Chapter 9 in Edith Wharton's *The Custom of the Country* (1913) bears a striking resemblance to Henry James' 'Julia Bride,' a tale first published in magazine form in *Harper's Magazine*, March-April 1908. Since James was Wharton's house guest in Paris from April 24 to May 9 she undoubtedly read it as a courtesy, especially since they read each other's work when it appeared."<sup>40</sup>

In ch. 11 the possible influence of George Gissing's *New Grub Street* (1891) on Wharton's *The House of Mirth* (1905) is considered. Tintner points to verbal similarities. "The key to the fact that Edith Wharton was influenced by New Grub Street lies in the repetition of Gissing's phrase 'the relatively poor'," a phrase that was "apparently original with Gissing."<sup>41</sup> Tintner then compares similarities in theme and plot between the two

---

<sup>38</sup>Adeline R. Tintner, *Edith Wharton in Context: Essays on Intertextuality* (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1999).

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, 9-15. Lewis published and annotated Wharton's *Collected Short Stories* in 1968.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>41</sup>*Ibid.*, 111.

works, and finally presents biographical information that makes it likely that Wharton was familiar with *New Grub Street* (a requirement for influence).

Because she lived for two weeks in the same house as James and had a tendency to talk constantly with him about literature, one may conclude that he encouraged her to read or reread Gissing's work. Also, since she read everything that James wrote at this time, she undoubtedly knew his "London Notes" in *Harper's Weekly* (summer 1897), in which he mentioned how "ever since reading *New Grub Street*" he had "a persistent taste for his works."<sup>42</sup>

A last example will be taken from Tintner's twelfth chapter, where she states that "Edith Wharton had a curious and serious literary relationship with F. Marion Crawford, the American popular novelist who lived in Italy."<sup>43</sup> The chapter sets out to show the influence of Crawford's *The Heart of Rome* on Wharton's *The House of Mirth*. Both novels were published in 1903, so the first issue to resolve is the temporal requirement, that Wharton's novel was not made before Crawford's. "It seems highly likely that he would send her the next volume he produced in the following year [1903], *The Heart of Rome* . . . [although] there is no mention of it in any of Wharton's published correspondence. In the summer of 1903, Edith was probably working on *The House of Mirth*."<sup>44</sup> Then she discusses the evidence for and against direct contact—whether Wharton had actually read Crawford's novel. Finally she discusses similarity in characters and plot.

There are various elements in *The House of Mirth* that show a remarkable resemblance to some of those in *The Heart of Rome*, only with the appropriate sociological differences that would exist in a novel about New York society as contrasted to one about Roman society of the period. Here is outlined the basic plot of

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 114.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., 116.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 117.

*The Hearty of Rome*, and readers of Wharton will see immediately its connection with *The House of Rome*.<sup>45</sup>

It seems that Tintner's method is not unlike Hermerén's. She takes time showing that requirements of timing and contact are fulfilled, often using extensive biographical information. Then she discusses various aspects of similarity, which vary considerably from case to case. Sometimes Tintner finds verbal similarity (a specific phrase in common), sometimes similar plot, characters, or theme. The similarities are presented, and the readers invited to evaluate Tintner's theses of influence.

#### Stendahl

We now move to some examples from the field of biblical studies. In 1954 Krister Stendahl's doctoral dissertation from Uppsala was published under the title *The School of St. Matthew, and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Stendahl asks how we can trace the influence of previous writings (in Stendahl's case, the entire OT) in the document at hand (Matthew).

Stendahl limits his study to a specific type of influence, that of quotations. "We are confining our actual investigation to strict quotations, by which we mean partly those passages introduced by a formula, and partly those which, although lacking such formula, are nevertheless conscious quotations, judging from the context, or which agree verbatim with some passage in the O.T. in its Greek or Hebrew form."<sup>46</sup>

When Matthew consciously and deliberately makes the reader aware that a quotation is coming, the question of influence is of course settled. When Matthew does not warn the reader, but we nevertheless find phrases that 'agree verbatim' with parts of

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid.

<sup>46</sup>Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 46.

the OT, how many words are needed to call it a quote? Stendahl acknowledges that this is a valid question, but does not discuss it at length. "The question of where to draw the line between quotations and allusions is a problem in itself."<sup>47</sup> From the examples Stendahl uses in his book, it seems that we need verbatim agreement for at least six to seven words to constitute a quote.

Stendahl's work is important for the specific cases he looked at, and for being quite early in the wave of OT in NT studies that has appeared. His contribution to methodological precision is negligible, however, because he spent little time defining his terms or explaining his methodology.

#### Gundry

A decade later Robert Gundry published his doctoral dissertation with an almost identical title as Stendahl's.<sup>48</sup> Part of the justification for his work Gundry finds in Stendahl's choice not to deal with the less obvious influences, that of OT allusions.

A re-examination of the OT quotations in Mt is needed because of the neglect in past examinations of the allusive quotations, [and] because of our present knowledge from the Dead Sea Scrolls that allusive quotation of the OT was a conscious literary practice.<sup>49</sup>

An allusive quotation rather reflects the language and phrase-forms with which the writer is most familiar and in which he habitually thinks—all the more so in the case of Jewish authors, whose education from childhood was steeped in OT lore. One might almost say that allusive quotations are more revealing than formal quotations, for "the least direct allusion testifies to the firmest grasp and appreciation of a subject."<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 145.

<sup>48</sup>Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., xi.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., 3. Gundry quotes C. Taylor, *The Gospel in the Law* (Cambridge, 1869),  
xxi.

Gundry goes on to discuss his method for tracing what he has now called 'allusive quotations':

Deciding whether an instance of verbal parallelism between OT and NT really constitutes an allusive quotation often presents a delicate task. There is no rule of thumb which will fit all cases. Certainly it is not adequate to require a certain number of parallel words or merely to follow the lists of OT quotations and the boldfaced type in critical editions of the Greek New Testament, commentaries, and other works on the subject, which differ among themselves anyway. In general, the procedure here followed has been not to require a certain number of words, but to require that recognizable thought-connection exists between the OT and NT passages.<sup>51</sup>

Gundry's contribution is to be among the first to give attention to allusions (not just quotations), and for his detailed case studies of these. Once more, however, we would have liked to see an explicit methodological discussion of how Gundry detects allusions.

#### Paulien

A major work on the literary influence of the OT on the book of Revelation is Jon Paulien's 1987 dissertation, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and the Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*.<sup>52</sup> We find here a useful survey of previous contributions towards a methodology of tracing OT usage in Revelation,<sup>53</sup> before Paulien attempts to draw up his own proposal, which includes suggestions of terminology as well as procedures for evaluating the influence.<sup>54</sup>

Paulien has found it useful to employ the term 'citation' for the cases where the

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., 4-5.

<sup>52</sup>Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12* (AUSDDS 11; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1988).

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 100-118.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., 165-94.

author attempts to reproduce his source verbatim and gives his reader the reference to where it is found. 'Quotation' is similar to a 'citation' except that the reader is not given the reference. 'Direct allusions' is not an attempt at verbatim reproduction; the author might rephrase the source according to his purpose, but both the writer and reader are also here supposed to know the source of the influence (and the reader is supposed to take his mind back to the text and context of the source of the allusion). It is a "conscious reference to previous literature."<sup>55</sup> "The author assumes that the source literature is familiar to the reader and that the reader can import from the context of the source those insights which enhance his appreciation of the work he is reading."<sup>56</sup> Finally an 'echo' is a case of unconscious influence, where the author uses an expression without being aware of its origin. It is still useful for the reader to know the origin or at least the meaning associated with the expression, but he is not supposed to import the wider context of the source (if that is traceable) since that was not in the (influenced) author's mind.

Regarding his procedure for evaluating possible 'direct allusions' and 'echoes' Paulien divides the material we need to evaluate into external evidence and internal evidence. (Paulien does not give a methodology for dealing with quotations and citations, since they are much more obvious to trace, and are lacking in the book of Revelation.)

External evidence includes the biographical information we have about the author, his reading habits and writing procedures from sources outside the document under investigation. For a biblical author like John this is very scant, but we can assume that he was "familiar with roughly the same canon of the Old Testament that can be

---

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., 175.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., 177.



found in today's critical Hebrew text, and that he held these works in particularly high esteem."<sup>57</sup>

The internal data are where the scholar must concentrate the efforts. First a list of parallels is gathered from previous scholarship, like commentaries and the margins of critical Greek NT texts. Then each case should be examined for what Paulien calls verbal parallels, thematic parallels, and structural parallels. About detecting verbal parallels he writes:

We define a verbal parallel as occurring whenever at least two words of more than minor significance (articles and minor conjunctions are excluded) are parallel between a passage in Revelation and a passage in the Septuagint or other first-century Greek version. These two major words may be coupled together in a phrase or may even be separated, provided they are in clear relationship to each other in both passages of the suggested parallel. Verbal parallels are discovered by placing the text of Revelation side-by-side with the potential source text. Wording that is exact or similar is underscored, and the potential relationship between the passages is assessed on a preliminary basis.<sup>58</sup>

The higher number of identical words, the stronger the probability of influence is.

A thematic parallel is a similarity of thought or theme. The idea or concept is the same in the two works, but the wording is different. If the context also is the same, it strengthens the probability of influence.

A structural parallel is one of order. The author is "lifting whole sections and following them in general, even though the exact wording may not be followed."<sup>59</sup> This Paulien considers to be the strongest evidence of influence.

Finally, we are to estimate the exclusivity of the parallel. The more common the parallel is in the literature of its time, the less likely the influence is from our proposed

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 187.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., 179-180.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., 184-5.

source. "Where a given parallel is unique in prior literature, the likelihood that John is directing our attention to that particular passage is correspondingly increased."<sup>60</sup>

### **The Terms I Will Use**

Agreeing with Porter that you as the reader deserve to know the vocabulary I plan to use, I hereby declare that I will follow the nomenclature proposed by Paulien. His—and my—terms for the different categories are (in descending order of probability of influence) 'certain allusion', 'probable allusion', 'possible allusion', 'uncertain allusion', and 'no allusion'.<sup>61</sup>

The texts of Daniel that I will compare the Synoptic Gospels with are the Hebrew and Aramaic 'Masoretic Text' (MT) as found in *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, and the Greek versions 'Septuagint' (LXX) and 'Theodotion' (Theo) as found in Rahlfs'. *Septuaginta*. For our purposes, the MT, LXX, and Theodotion between them fairly represent the probable texts of Daniel in existence in the first century.<sup>62</sup>

Now we should be ready to start the search for Danielic influence in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. We will go through the three Gospels in parallel, story by story.

---

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., 186.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., 193, 235.

<sup>62</sup>The most extensive textual work on the Greek versions of Daniel has been done by Tim McLay, who concludes that "generally speaking, it was found that OG [Old Greek] and Th [Theodotion] were translating a text virtually identical to MT," and "the available evidence indicates that Th is an independent translation of Daniel." Tim McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 242. See also Olivier Munnich, "Texte massorétique et septante dans le livre de Daniel," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship Between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 93-120.

## CHAPTER II

### GENERAL CASES

#### §2<sup>1</sup> Gabriel Visiting Zechariah (Luke 1:10-22)

Our first pericope for discussion is in the words of the narrator. The angel Gabriel (גַּבְרִיֵּאל, Γαβριήλ) appears by name in two books of the Bible: Daniel (8:16; 9:21) and Luke (1:19, 26). Although Gabriel appears in other Jewish non-canonical writings,<sup>2</sup> nowhere are the thematic similarities in the stories as strong as here.

Both in Daniel and here Gabriel's appearance happens at the time (ὥρα) of a sacrifice (Dan 9:21; Luke 1:10), both men who encounter Gabriel become afraid (Dan 8:17; 10:7-11; Luke 1:12), Gabriel tells the men not to be afraid but rather to be joyful since their prayers are about to be answered (Dan 9:20-22; Luke 1:19), a great prophecy for Israel is to be explained or fulfilled (Dan 8:17; 9:24; Luke 1:16), and then the men enter a trance or are rendered speechless (Dan 8:18; 10:16-17; Luke 1:22).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>All pericope numbers are from Kurt Aland, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (8th ed.; Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1987). Most English Scripture texts in this dissertation are from the Revised Standard Version (RSV) since that is the translation used in Aland's Synopsis. For the book of Daniel the English texts are my own literal translations of the LXX, Theodotion, and Masoretic in order to show more precisely the commonality or difference between the versions of Daniel and the Gospels.

<sup>2</sup>*1 En 9:1; 10:9; 20:7; 40:9; 54:6; 71:8; 1Q 9:14-16; Life of Adam and Eve 40:3; "Angels" in Raphael Jehudah Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder, eds., The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 48-50.*

<sup>3</sup>Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 270-71; John McHugh, *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975), 25-6. See also NA<sup>27</sup> (margin).

Many commentators find the two appearances of Gabriel so similar that Luke must be trying to make a conscious allusion here.

The angelic tradition in the Lukan infancy narrative may reflect Daniel.<sup>4</sup>

The information supplied in Lk 1,19 that the angel's name is Gabriel has led virtually all commentators to connect the account of John's annunciation, and 1.12,19 in particular, with the book of Daniel, generally seeing in Luke's account apocalyptic overtones.<sup>5</sup>

There can be no doubt that in his description of Gabriel's appearance Luke intends to evoke the atmosphere of Daniel.<sup>6</sup>

A whole series of clues suggest that Zechariah's experience is to be compared to that of Daniel to whom Gabriel announces the eschatological events. Already here the appearance is at the time of the evening sacrifice (Dan 9:20–21); in Luke 1:13 it is connected with prayer (Dan 9:20); the fear of Luke 1:12 matches that of Dan 8:17; 10:7; ὄπτασία, "vision," in Luke 1:22 is found six times in Dan 9–10 (Theod.); both in Luke 1:20, 22 and Dan 10:15 the visionary is rendered mute.<sup>7</sup>

Der danielische Einfluß zeigt sich in Lk 1-2 immer wieder. Am deutlichsten in der sogenannten Zacharias-Apokalypse (Lk 1,5-23).<sup>8</sup>

Le début de Luc fasse allusion à la prophétie de Daniel.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Craig A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 523.

<sup>5</sup>Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 75.

<sup>6</sup>Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, 270.

<sup>7</sup>John Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20* (WBC 35A; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1989), 29.

<sup>8</sup>Johannes Riedl, *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu: Die Heilsbotschaft von Mt 1-2 und Lk 1-2* (Biblisches Forum 3; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), 56.

<sup>9</sup>René Laurentin, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964), 45. Other commentators who also see an allusion to Daniel here: Mark Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2* (JSNTSup 88; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 42; John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976), 56-7; Michael Douglas Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 211; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 71; Arthur A. Just, *Luke 1:1-9:50* (CC; St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1996), 57;

I must agree. The mention of Gabriel alone is not sufficient to determine an allusion (Gabriel was a familiar angelic figure at the time), nor is by itself the occurrence of fear or trouble of speaking by the man that receives the visit (also common at angelic visits). The total accumulation of parallels however gives us a basis to be reasonably sure that Daniel is in the background: the name of Gabriel, speechlessness, the hour of sacrifice, and the context of prophetic fulfillment.

Conclusion: probable allusion.

### Implication of Allusion

What might be Luke's reason for including this allusion to Daniel? Since the arrival of Gabriel in Daniel leads to an explanation of God's grand prophecies for Israel, the reader of Luke is likewise led to expect a narrative of prophetic significance. Gabriel is a figure for big occasions, the revealer of grand prophecies.<sup>10</sup> "That it is the eschatological messenger from the book of Daniel also underlines the fact that the promise of salvation is coming now to its fulfillment."<sup>11</sup> "Gabriel, in both Daniel and Luke, symbolizes the renewal of God's involvement among his people."<sup>12</sup>

---

Jonathan Knight, *Luke's Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1998), 72; David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel, "Luke," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 59, 255; John Michael Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology* (Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 27; David A. S. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 30.

<sup>10</sup>John J. Collins, "Gabriel," *DDD* 338-9; Carol A. Newsom, "Gabriel," *ABD* 2:863.

<sup>11</sup>Coleridge, *Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 42.

<sup>12</sup>Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 255.

Luke seems to be fueling the fires of anticipation among his readers. This is no ordinary biography. This is the fulfillment of Israel's fondest hopes.

### §3 Gabriel Visiting Mary (Luke 1:26-38)

Here Gabriel appears for the second of two times in Luke and in Scripture outside of Daniel. What was said about Gabriel above, applies here too.

Gabriel is sent<sup>13</sup> to Mary with a message rich with prophetic messianic language, like receiving "the throne of his father David" (v. 32), which most commentators see alluding to general OT expectations of the Messiah's future rule, or even explicit texts like 2 Sam 7, Ps 89, Isa 7 and 9.<sup>14</sup>

There is one phrase in Gabriel's mouth that is of additional interest to us. NA<sup>27</sup> suggests that "τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος" ("of his kingdom there will be no end," Luke 1:33) is alluding to the prophecy about the 'Son of Man' in Dan 7: "ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ διαφθαρήσεται" ("his kingdom will not be destroyed," Dan 7:14) and "ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ βασιλεία αἰώνιος" ("his kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom," Dan 7:27).<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Already the phrase "the angel Gabriel was sent" alerts John Nolland to listen for allusions to the book of Daniel in this pericope. "'Was sent' (v 26) is the first of a series of echoes of Dan 10:11–12 in vv 26–30. Like Daniel, both Zechariah and Mary receive messages about end-time events from Gabriel." Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20*, 58.

<sup>14</sup>Darrell L. Bock, *Luke Volume 1: 1:1-9:50* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 112-7; R. Alan Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1995), 51; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1981), 1:338; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 37; Leon Morris, *Luke: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 3; Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1988), 80; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 260. For instance, 2 Sam 7:12-13 was an important messianic text at Qumran; cf. 4Q174 (4Flor) 10-13.

<sup>15</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> (margin). "His kingdom will never end. This may be an allusion to Isa 9:6 (LXX) or to Dan 7:14." Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (NAC 24; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman,

Nebuchadnezzar utters a similar phrase in Dan 4: "ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεάν" ("his authority [is] an eternal authority, and his kingdom to generation and generation," Dan 4:34 Theo).

The verbal parallels are extensive, and the phrases must be considered synonymous. As we will see during the course of this study, Daniel chs. 4 and 7 are a source of frequent borrowing in the Gospels. The presence of heavenly beings further strengthens the connection. Just like an angel (cf. Dan 7:16) explains the prophecy of Dan 7:14 for Daniel, so Gabriel repeats and explains the same prediction to Mary.<sup>16</sup>

If we should not label this a quote, we should certainly follow NA<sup>27</sup> here and consider this as a possible allusion to Daniel in a collage of OT messianic texts.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

In case this is a conscious allusion to Daniel (among other texts), then once again Daniel is in the background when Jesus is connected to a kingdom motif. A child is born who is going to be a king, with a kingdom which will never cease. Luke's Gabriel combines the Davidic-Messianic theme with a well-known phrase about the 'Son of Man' in Dan 7.

---

1992), 84. "His kingdom will never end: This statement is a succinct summary of Israel's messianic hopes (see Mic 4:7; Dan 2:44; 7:14)." Craig A. Evans, *Luke* (NIBCNT 3; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1990), 29.

<sup>16</sup>Freed describes the language of this pericope as typical of Jewish ideas as found in Isa 9:6-7 and Dan 7:13-14, but without arguing that Luke directly refers or alludes to Dan 7. Edwin D. Freed, *The Stories of Jesus' Birth: A Critical Introduction* (St. Louis, Mo.: Chalice, 2001), 61. In light of the identical phrase just discussed, that is being unnecessarily cautious.

## §7 Conception of Jesus (Matt 1:18-21)

Irenaeus suggests that Dan 2:34, "a stone was cut without hands," is a prophecy regarding the incarnation—that Joseph would have no part in the conception of Jesus.<sup>17</sup> However one interprets this verse in Daniel, there is little to suggest that Matthew here shared and conveyed that understanding. There are no verbal parallels between Dan 2:34 and Matt 1:18-20—no mentioning of "without [human] hands" or any other phrase we might recognize from Daniel.

This gives me an opportunity to clarify, if anyone should be in doubt, that this study is not attempting to interpret prophecies in Daniel and point to fulfillments in the Gospels. We will *only* look for evidence that Jesus or the Gospel writers were interpreting or alluding to or being influenced by Daniel. This study is not about the book of Daniel: It is about how Jesus and the Synoptic writers received Daniel.

Conclusion: no allusion.

## §8 The Wise Men and Herod (Matt 2:1-3)

In all of Scripture the word μάγοι occurs in plural only here in Matt 2:1 and in Daniel (1:20 Theo; 2:2; 4:7 Theo; 5:15 Theo).<sup>18</sup> Since Daniel has the only OT occurrence of μάγοι, the likelihood of Matthew bringing the reader's attention to Daniel must be considered.<sup>19</sup> If Matthew wants to bring a biblical book to mind, it can only be Daniel as μάγοι is otherwise an unknown term in Scripture.

---

<sup>17</sup>Ireneaus, *Haer* 3.21.6-8; Jane Schaberg, *The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives* (San Francisco: Harper, 1987), 187.

<sup>18</sup>Freed, *Stories of Jesus' Birth*, 97. The singular form μάγος is found in Acts 13:6-8.

<sup>19</sup>Though outside the literary scope of this dissertation, it has been suggested that if there were real historical μάγοι coming to Bethlehem from the East, then they might have been aware of the prophetic work of Daniel and believed some prophecy was about to be fulfilled in Judea. H. W. van der Vaart Smit, *Born in Bethlehem: Christmas as It*



Can we find other parallels to strengthen the connection? There is a verbal parallel between king Herod's reaction and those of Babylon's king Belshazzar in Dan 5. Paul Hinnebusch points out that "'terrified' (*etarachthe* in the Greek of Daniel) is exactly the same word used by Matthew for describing Herod's and his counselors' fear of the King of the Jews."<sup>20</sup> There are, however, no μάγοι in Dan 5, and no ἐταράχθη in Dan 2.

Dale Allison has an alternative explanation worth pondering, that Matthew wants to remind us of Moses instead of the magicians of Daniel since there existed in the first century traditions about Moses' birth being predicted by magicians: "Given all the other parallels in Matthew's infancy narrative to the extra-biblical traditions about Moses, is this fact not more noteworthy than the use of μάγοι in Dan 2, a chapter otherwise without influence on Matt 2?"<sup>21</sup>

To Allison's question one might respond, why not both Moses and Daniel (as in "§161 Transfiguration" below)? On its own merits I find an allusion here to Daniel's magicians and Belshazzar's fear uncertain and will rate it as such. Seen together with pericopes at the end of Matthew that have more certain allusions to Daniel (see §352 and §364 below), we might want to be open to the idea that Matthew wanted to begin his book with Danielic themes as well.

Conclusion: uncertain allusion.

---

*Really Was* (trans. Thomas R. Milligan; Baltimore, Md.: Helicon, 1963), 88-9. See also Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, 167-70; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (WBC 33A; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1993), 27; Theodor Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Wuppertal, Germany: Brockhaus, 1984), 94-5.

<sup>20</sup>Paul Hinnebusch, *St. Matthew's Earthquake: Judgment and Discipleship in the Gospel of Matthew* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant Books, 1980), 37-8.

<sup>21</sup>Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 311.

### §9/12 Keeping These Things in Her Heart (Luke 2:19, 51)

Manuel Miguens has pointed out some verbal parallels between Mary's reaction to Jesus' behavior in the temple and Daniel's reaction after the nightly vision in ch. 7.<sup>22</sup> Mary "kept all these things in her heart" ("διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς," Luke 2:51). Daniel "kept the things in my heart" ("τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου συνετήρησα," Dan 7:28 Theo). The words "μα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ" and "ῥῆμα" are the same in Daniel and Luke, plus a similar verb based on the *τήρεω*-stem. NA<sup>27</sup> lists this as an allusion.<sup>23</sup>

An almost identical expression is made by Mary after the visit of the shepherds and angels earlier in Luke 2. "ἡ δὲ Μαριὰμ πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς" (v. 19). NA<sup>27</sup> lists Dan 7:28 as an allusion here as well. Robert Stein points to another story in Daniel where the same expression is used. In ch. 4 Nebuchadnezzar "kept the words in the heart" ("τοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ συνετήρησε," Dan 4:28 LXX). Stein only points out the parallels, however, without suggesting it to be an allusion.<sup>24</sup>

The heart is a center of thoughts and emotions in most cultures and languages, and keeping some words 'in the heart' is not at all unusual (e.g., Gen 37:11). Luke's Mary has just used the same idiomatic expression as Daniel happened to have used. We have

---

<sup>22</sup>Manuel Miguens, *The Virgin Birth: An Evaluation of Scriptural Evidence* (Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1975), 130-31. Others who see the parallel to Daniel (though not necessarily influence): Bock, *Luke Volume 1*, 222-3; Culpepper, "Luke," 66; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:413; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 113.

<sup>23</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> (margin).

<sup>24</sup>Stein, *Luke*, 110.

no reason to believe that Luke is trying to make a connection to Daniel here or was even influenced by Daniel's language.

Conclusion: no allusion.

### **§20 The Devil's Offer (Matt 4:8-10; Luke 4:5-8)**

The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness is found in all three Synoptic Gospels, but only Matthew and Luke have the details of the three specific tests. Luke has the most extensive version of the Devil offering Jesus world dominion: "To you I will give all this authority and their glory; for it has been delivered to me, and I give it to whom I will" (Luke 4:6).

Dominic Rudman has pointed out Luke's extensive parallels in this temptation-story with the narrative portions of Daniel.<sup>25</sup> Several times in Daniel the notion of God delegating authority over the world to a human king is expressed. In Daniel ch. 2 we find that "You, O King, are the king of kings, to whom God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, the strength and the glory. . . . He has given them into your hand and has caused you to rule over them all" (Dan 2:37-38).

Verbal similarities here with Luke include the word "glory" ("δόξα," Dan 2:37 LXX, Luke 4:6), "the world" ("οἰκουμένη," Dan 2:38 LXX; Luke 4:5) and "hand over" ("παράδίδωμι," Dan 2:38 LXX; "δίδωμι," Dan 2:38 Theo; both "παράδίδωμι" and "δίδωμι," Luke 4:6).

In Daniel ch. 4 we read similarly that "the Most High is ruler over the realm of mankind, and bestows it on whom he wishes. . . . Seven periods of time will pass over you until you recognize that the Most High is ruler over the realm of mankind and

---

<sup>25</sup>Dominic Rudman, "Authority and Right of Disposal in Luke 4.6," *NTS* 50 (2004): 77-86.

bestows it on whomever He wishes" (Dan 4:17, 32). In ch. 5 the Babylonian king Belshazzar delegates some of his authority to Daniel with similar language (vv. 16, 29).

Rudman believes that these examples "suggest that Luke was familiar with the court stories of Daniel, and that he used ideas expressed in those stories to provide a theological backdrop to Jesus' confrontation with Satan."<sup>26</sup>

George Nickelsburg sees an allusion to power and kingdom in Daniel ch. 7: "Satan's offer to give Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and their glory or power is phrased in the language of Dan 7:14."<sup>27</sup> Francois Bovon finds the combination in Luke of 'glory' with 'authority' bringing Daniel to mind: "Luke's expansion of the Q version of the saying becomes a linguistic parody of divine inspiration: the redactional addition is reminiscent of Dan 4:31 (LXX); 7:14; and Luke 10:22."<sup>28</sup>

Craig Evans makes no mention of the parallels between Luke and Daniel of handing over power and glory, but interestingly points out verbal parallels with Daniel in Matthew's temptation story: "falling down to worship." Just like Daniel's friends were ordered to fall down and worship ("πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃ, " Dan 3:6,10,15 LXX + Theo) the giant image, so Jesus is told to fall down and worship the Devil ("πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς" in Matt 4:9; just "προσκυνήσῃς" in Luke 4:7).<sup>29</sup>

In my judgment Rudman, Nickelsburg, Bovon, and Evans are correct in seeing allusions to Daniel. Not only are there extensive verbal parallels, but the contexts are the

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 80.

<sup>27</sup>George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* 6:143. Bock and Marshall point out some similarities with Daniel, but do not go so far as to call it an allusion. Bock, *Luke Volume 1*, 378; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 172.

<sup>28</sup>Francois Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 143.

<sup>29</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 521. So also NA<sup>27</sup> (margin).

same: who has supreme authority and deserves to receive loyalty and worship. It is hard to think of a better back-story here from Scripture than the narratives of Dan 2, 3, and 4.

Conclusion: probable allusion.

### Implication of Allusions

Let us first ponder Luke's possible message with an allusion. The question of the ultimate source of authority over creation is explicit in both our texts from Dan 2-5 and Luke 4:5-7. Just like the Babylonian king mistakenly believed he had the ultimate authority and failed to give due honor to the Most High God, so also the Devil in the temptation story in Luke believes global dominion is his to use and to delegate. Jesus, like Daniel in ch. 2, has to point out that true worship and loyalty should be addressed to God only (Luke 4:8). By alluding to Daniel, Luke sharpens the focus on kingdom theology.

If Matthew also has an allusion to Daniel, then kingdom theology is also in focus here—specifically the spiritual struggle against enemies of God's rule. "If the Matthean form of the temptation is indeed an allusion to Daniel, then we may have present yet another indication that Jesus understood his great struggle with the powers of heaven in terms much influenced by Daniel."<sup>30</sup>

### §32 The Time Is Fulfilled (Mark 1:15)

The theme of "kingdom of God" ("ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ") and its possible influence from Daniel will be treated more fully in ch. 5 below. For now, let us look at the phrase spoken by Jesus: "the time is fulfilled" ("πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς").

Several commentators have pointed to the similarity with verses in Ezekiel and

---

<sup>30</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 521.

Daniel,<sup>31</sup> and some argue for influence:

Mk's choice of the term in 1,15 is greatly influenced by the LXX use of *καίρως* to mean God's time, particularly in its prophetic-apocalyptic colouring (cf. Ezek 7,12; Dan 2,21; 7,22).<sup>32</sup>

Jesus' sense of urgency appears to reflect, at least dictionally, if not also thematically, the language of urgency found in Daniel. . . . The idea that the "time has (finally) come" (Dan 7:22), that is, the "time of the end" (Dan 12:4, 9), seems to be the primary biblical backdrop lying behind Jesus' proclamation that the "time is fulfilled" and "the kingdom of God has come."<sup>33</sup>

*The time is fulfilled:* The idea is that God had from the beginning determined the length of time that must elapse before the coming of his kingdom, and that time is now up. Such beliefs were common in apocalyptic—see e.g. Dan 12:4 and 9 and cf. Ezek. 7:12.<sup>34</sup>

Maybe Jesus and the Gospel writers thought the ministry of Jesus was a fulfillment of a Danielic prophecy. That question is part of the overall venture undertaken in this study. Right now we must ask: Do we have enough thematic and verbal clues here to establish Danielic allusion in the Synoptic phrase "the time is fulfilled"?

There is just one parallel word to Daniel here, *καίρως*, a word that is also found in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and many OT books, many of which also refer to God's time of prophetic judgment (Gen 6:13; Ps 102:14; Jer 46:21 [26:21 LXX]; Ezek 7:7 [7:4 LXX]).

---

<sup>31</sup>Robert G. Bratcher and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1961), 37; Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 512; Christopher Stephen Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 1986), 205; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Bonnie Bowman Thurston, *Preaching Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 18.

<sup>32</sup>Scaria Kuthirakkattel, *The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry according to Mark's Gospel (1,14-3,6): A Redaction Critical Study* (AnBib 123; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990), 93-4.

<sup>33</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 512.

<sup>34</sup>Dennis Eric Nineham, *The Gospel of St. Mark* (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin, 1963), 69. "Jesus himself used the historicist method to interpret Daniel when he announced: 'The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand' (Mark 1:15)." Roberto Ouro, "The Apotelesmatic Principle: Origin and Application," *JATS* 9 (1998): 337.

While the suggestion for Danielic influence here is intriguing and should not be ruled out, we might be better off rounding down and weighing cautiously. The value of the phrase "the time is fulfilled" in establishing influence from Daniel is on its own not very high. We will encounter many stronger links to Daniel in this study.

Conclusion: uncertain allusion.

### **§35 Teaching with Authority (Matt 7:29; Mark 1:22; Luke 4:32)**

Jesus astonished his listeners by teaching with "authority" ("ἐξουσία"). In the LXX ἐξουσία is used primarily in the apocryphal literature.<sup>35</sup> In the books translated from the Hebrew Scriptures ἐξουσία is used predominantly in Daniel, especially ch. 7.<sup>36</sup> Joel Marcus finds this significant.

*Exousia*, moreover, is particularly associated with God's reassertion of his royal authority in the end-time; it is therefore no accident that it appears most frequently in the eschatologically oriented books of Daniel in the Old Testament and Revelation in the New. . . . Jesus' eschatological divine power, his 'authority,' is immediately contrasted with the impression made by the teaching of the scribes.<sup>37</sup>

The apparent reference of 'authority' in this pericope is to Jesus' teaching style—maybe more bold and assertive than that of some of the other rabbis.<sup>38</sup> A conscious link

---

<sup>35</sup>1 Bel 1:25; Esd 4:28,40; 8:22; Jdt 8:15; 1 Macc 1:13; 6:11; 10:6, 8, 32, 35, 38; 11:58; 14:4; 2 Macc 3:6, 24; 4:9, 24; 7:16; 10:13; 3 Macc 7:12, 21; 4 Macc 4:5; 5:15; 6:33; Sir 9:13; 10:4; 17:2; 24:11; 30:11; 33:20; 45:17; Tob 1:21; 2:13; 7:10; Wis 10:14; 16:13.

<sup>36</sup>2 Kgs 20:13; Ps 113:2; Eccl 8:8; Dan LXX 4:17, 27, 31; (4:31, 37); (5:4, 7, 29); 6:3; 7:12, 14 (3x), 26, 27 (2x); Dan Theo 4:3, 26, 34 (2x); 7:6; 7:14 (2x); 7:27; 11:5.

<sup>37</sup>Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 191. Cf. Meyer: "ὥς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων: as one who is invested with prophetic authority." Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. Peter Christie; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884), 173.

<sup>38</sup>This is the most common view among commentators. "What probably caused the reaction is that the scribes would teach from tradition, while Jesus would handle the

to Daniel in the choice of adjective is still very possible of course, but a verbal parallel of just a single word is not sufficient to establish it with any certainty, even though ἐξουσία is found primarily in Daniel of the canonical books.

If several possible pointers to Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels keep accumulating throughout this study, then each possible allusion strengthens each other. For now we notice with interest that the adjective used to describe Jesus is used heavily in the exact chapter of Scripture (Dan 7) from which the most commonly used term for Jesus is found ('Son of Man').

Conclusion: uncertain allusion.

## **§62 The Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:10-13)**

Daniel might not be the book most people think about when they recite the Lord's Prayer. Nevertheless three different proposals for allusions to Daniel have been offered.

First of all, Marc Philonenko has argued for influence from Dan 4 in the opening line of Matthew's version.<sup>39</sup> The parallels are found in king Nebuchadnezzar's final prayer to God, after having received his sanity back. MT reads

"וְדַאֲרִי אֶרְעָא וְכָל-דְּאֲרִי אֶרְעָא כְּלָה חֲשִׁיבִין וְכַמְצָבִיהָ עֶבֶר בְּחִיל שְׁמִיָּא"

---

text directly and independently." Bock, *Luke Volume 1*, 429. "There was a widespread respect for age. Thus it was important to cite authorities if one wished to obtain a hearing. But Jesus ignored this scribal commonplace. Where others appealed to authorities, Jesus simply said: 'I say unto you'." Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 184.

Gundry puts less emphasis on the teaching method: "The fact that Mark does not tell what feature of Jesus' teaching displays authority shows that the point lies in authority as such." Robert Horton Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 71.

<sup>39</sup>Marc Philonenko, "La troisième demande du 'Notre Père' et l'hymne de Nabuchodonosor," *RHPR* 72 (1992): 23-31. The only writer I have come across who has commented on Philonenko's suggestion is Viviano, who is positive to Philonenko's suggestion. Benedict T. Viviano, "The Least in the Kingdom: Matthew 11:11, Its Parallel in Luke 7:28 (Q), and Daniel 4:14," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 52.



("All the inhabitants of the *earth* are accounted as nothing, and he does what he *wills* with the host of *heaven* and the *inhabitants* of the earth," Dan 4:32 MT). The Theodotion text is quite close: "καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ὡς οὐδὲν ἐλογίσθησαν καὶ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ κατοικίᾳ τῆς γῆς" (Dan 4:35 Theo). There are three words here that are also found in the opening of the Lord's prayer: "γῆ" ("earth"), "οὐρανός" ("heaven"), and "θέλημα" ("will").

Philonenko agrees that this is not enough to constitute a quote. The Matthean Jesus has rather *transposed* the words of the Babylonian king into his context:

L'origine de la troisième demande du 'Notre Père' nous paraît donc devoir être trouvée en *Daniel* 4,32 (35). Point n'est besoin de s'étonner de ce réemploi étrange de l'hymne de Nabuchodonosor dans le 'Notre Père'. Il ne s'agit pas là d'une citation ou d'une allusion, mais d'une transposition dont il ne peut être assuré qu'elle soit parfaitement consciente, tant le texte de l'Écriture est intériorisé.<sup>40</sup>

Secondly, Brant James Pitre has recently (in a larger proposal for the importance of eschatological tribulation or 'messianic woes' in the theology of Jesus) suggested that the word 'temptation' in the Lord's prayer has a connection with Daniel. The phrase "lead us not into *temptation*" ("εἰς πειρασμόν," v. 13) refers "not simply to daily temptation but to the final time of 'testing' for the righteous that will precede the coming of the kingdom: in short, the eschatological tribulation."<sup>41</sup> His understanding of that tribulation builds partly on such passages as Rev 3:10, 1 Pet 4:12, and Dan 12:10.

---

<sup>40</sup>Philonenko, "La troisième," 30.

<sup>41</sup>Brant James Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement* (WUNT 204; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 147-8. "Over the course of the last century, it is this eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Prayer that has had the longer list of scholarly proponents. It has even worked its way into contemporary translations of the Bible, which diverge from the traditional rendering and translate the *peirasmós* petition as 'Do not subject us to the final test' (NAB) or 'Do not bring us to the time of trial' (NRSV), or 'Do not bring us to the test' (NEB)." Ibid., 149.

Other scholars who have taken the same eschatological reading of *πειρασμός* include Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 104-6;

One final piece of external support can be found in the Greek version of Daniel, in which the final "time of tribulation" (καιρός θλιψέως) is described as a period in which "many shall be tested (πειρασθῶσι), and purified, and tried by fire, and sanctified" (Dan 12:10 LXX). Taken together, Rev 3:10; 1 Pet 4:12, and Dan 12:10 not only provide strong linguistic parallels to the Lord's prayer, they also reveal a likely rationale for Jesus' instruction. The disciples should pray to be delivered, not just from daily temptation to sin, but from the final time of trial that would precede the dawn of the age of salvation.<sup>42</sup>

Pitre does not go so far as calling this a deliberate allusion to Daniel, but "strong linguistic parallels." Jesus, in his opinion, formed his model-prayer according to a worldview and prophetic outlook that belongs to Daniel.

A final link to Daniel at the end of the Lord's prayer is suggested by Craig Evans. The phrase found in some text traditions,<sup>43</sup> "ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοῦς αἰῶνας," "the kingdom and power and glory forever" (Matt 6:13), matches up with Daniel's speech to Nebuchanezzar: "דְּכִרָהּ אֱלֹהֵי אֲשֶׁר־בָּרַךְ אֶת־כְּלֵי־מַלְכוּתָא" (Dan 2:37 MT), "τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δόξαν," "the kingdom and strength and honor and glory" (Dan 2:37 LXX).

Evans comments: "The Greek version [of Daniel] represents diversity in translation and variants. The words attributed to Jesus, however, appear to reflect an

---

Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Vater-Unser* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946), 134-46; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* (4 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 2:301-2; Albert Schweitzer, *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis: Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901), 86; Nicholas Thomas Wright, "The Lord's Prayer as a Paradigm of Christian Prayer," in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 144-7.

<sup>42</sup>Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation*, 148.

<sup>43</sup>The NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus lists the following manuscripts as containing the phrase: K L W Δ Θ Π f<sup>43</sup> 28 33 et al. The following manuscripts do not: Ⲛ B D 0170 et al. None of the modern eclectic editions contain the phrase: Westcott-Hort, Nestle-Aland, the Greek base for the NIV, the SBL Greek New Testament. The only exception is the Robinson-Pierpont edition of the Byzantine tradition. Michael W. Holmes, *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), in loc. (apparatus).

independent rendering of the Aramaic, where two words for strength or power, **ܕܢܚܡܐ**, collapse into the single word **ܕܢܚܡܐ**.<sup>44</sup>

Can it be a coincidence that the beginning (Philonenko), middle (Pitre), and ending (Evans) of the Lord's prayer all have a string of words parallel to Daniel, or should we see influence from Daniel here? Each word on their own might not establish influence from Daniel. However, the cumulative number of matching words—heaven, earth, will, temptation/tribulation, power (in addition to 'kingdom' which will be discussed further in ch. 5 below)—together point towards a conscious allusion in the Lord's prayer.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

Like we saw in §20 above with the Devil's temptation concerning power and submission, Jesus seems to be interested in proper worship and one's attitude to higher authority. All power and authority belong to God alone, and here Jesus also puts that theme into his model-prayer given to his followers. If Jesus should borrow language from Scripture, Daniel chs. 2 and 4 are very appropriate places from which to do so. The kingdom is really God's kingdom.

#### **§107 Least in the Kingdom (Matt 11:11; Luke 7:28)**

This connection is proposed by Benedict Viviano, who argues for a "probable textual influence" of Dan 4:17 on Matt 11:11/Luke 7:28.<sup>45</sup>

Viviano believes that the Hebrew expression **"שְׂפֵל אֲנָשִׁים"** ("the lowest of men")

---

<sup>44</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 511.

<sup>45</sup>Viviano, "Least in the Kingdom," 53.

found in the Aramaic part of Daniel is a title and the basis for the Synoptic expression. Theodotion's "ἐξουδένημα ἀνθρώπων" ("that which is set at naught by men") and LXX's "ἐξουθεινημένω ἀνθρώπῳ" ("despised man") are not literal translations of the Aramaic, so Viviano argues that the Gospel expression "ὁ μικρότερος" ("the least") could be a rough translation of the Aramaic just like Theodotion and LXX are. The source of influence for the Synoptic phrase is, thus, not the Greek versions of Daniel but the Aramaic/Hebrew.

Viviano points out the similar contexts of the two passages: in both Daniel and Matthew/Luke the least are given the kingdom and the greatest passed over. In Daniel the 'greatest' is king Nebuchadnezzar, and in the Gospels it is John the Baptist. The 'least' in the Synoptics is interpreted by Viviano (in line with many early church fathers but less common among modern commentators) as referring specifically to Jesus and not the children of God or followers of Jesus in general.<sup>46</sup>

How should we evaluate this case? On its own the parallels between Matt 11:11/Luke 7:28 and Dan 4:17 do not seem strong enough to prove direct influence. The verbal parallel is weak. We only have a single expression that has roughly the same meaning in Hebrew (Dan) and Greek (Matt/Luke). The overall concept of God empowering or humbling whomever he wants might have influenced the theology of Jesus and the Gospel writers (the next pericope is a good example), but on its own merits there is too little evidence for a conscious allusion to Daniel in this specific pericope. If there is an OT text in the background here, we should probably rather look for it in the Elijah material to which John the Baptist is compared a few verses later (Matt 11:14).

I am not convinced of Viviano's identification of Jesus being "the least in the kingdom" either. I agree with Richard France's assessment: "There seems nothing to be

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., 44-6.

said for the common patristic view that the 'smaller (younger?) one in the kingdom of heaven' is Jesus, despite the advocacy of B. T. Viviano . . . who somewhat probably derives the terminology from Dan 4:17."<sup>47</sup>

Conclusion: uncertain allusion.

### **§109/181 Revealing Deep and Hidden Things (Matt 11:25-27; Luke 10:21-22)**

In this pericope Jesus praises his heavenly father for revealing the truth to some and hiding it from others. After being summoned to the court of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel uttered a similar statement (Dan 2:19-23). Several commentators have pointed out the similarities. Werner Grimm and Hubert Frankemölle go so far as to argue that Dan 2:19-28 is a *gegentext* to Matt 11:25-27.

Let us take a look. There are several verbal parallels. Identical words include to "give thanks" ("ἐξομολογέω"), "reveal" ("ἀποκαλύπτω"), "secret/hidden" ("[ἀπο]κρύπτω"), "know/make known" ("ἐπιγινώσκω/γνωρίζω"), "understanding/intelligent" ("σύνεσις/συνετός"), "wisdom/wise" ("σοφία/σοφός") and "give" ("[παρὰ]δίδωμι"). These are all "charakteristischen Vokabeln eines apokalyptischen Lobpreises."<sup>48</sup> Frankemölle summarizes:

In Dan 2,19-23 finden sich "alle (!) in Mt 11,25-27 grundlegenden Verba": preisen, offenbaren, verbergen (Dan 2,22 Theodotian: Verborgene), erkennen, übergeben (Dan 2,21.23 LXX/Theodotian:geben). Außerdem findet sich das Wort "dieses" (Dan 2,23 LXX), identisch mit dem Wissen und das Mysterion (Dan 2,19.27.28a LXX/Theodotian), vor allem aber findet sich auch der Gegensatz zwischen der

---

<sup>47</sup>Richard T. France, *Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 429.

<sup>48</sup>Werner Grimm, *Jesus und das Danielbuch: Jesu Einspruch das Offenbarungssystem Daniels (Mt 11,25-27; Lk 17:20-21)* (2 vols.; ANTJ 6; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984), 1:25.

angeblichen Weisheit der Weisen Babels (2,27 f) und der begründeten Weisheit Daniels (2,23.29-45).<sup>49</sup>

The themes of the two passages are also similar. Both Daniel and Jesus claim that God alone possesses true knowledge and wisdom and has the prerogative to reveal that understanding to whomever he wants. Both thank God for having received it and having been made a channel for this true knowledge. Furthermore, Grimm sees an ABBA structure in both passages, with (A) praising God and (B) giving reasons for the praise.<sup>50</sup>

Dale Allison has argued against Grimm and influence from Daniel with the point that 'hidden' and 'reveal' are not exclusively found in Daniel, and that Jer 31 also promises "the knowledge of God as an eschatological gift."<sup>51</sup> However, the high number of verbal parallels, together with a similar thematic context, makes this a stronger case for Daniel than Allison allows. Menken believes Isa 29:14 is the primary influence here, but he does not deny that Dan 2:20-23 has "exerted influence as well."<sup>52</sup>

Other commentators including Blomberg, Riedl, and Witherington have seen influence from Daniel and accepted Grimm's position. "Jesus praises God in wording reminiscent of Dan 2:19-23."<sup>53</sup> "Jesu 'Jubelruf' in Mt 11,25-30 dürfte stark von Dan

---

<sup>49</sup>Hubert Frankemölle, "Die Offenbarung an die Unmündigen: Pragmatische Impulse aus Mt 11,25f," in *Chancen und Grenzen religiöser Erziehung* (ed. Johannes Thiele and Rudolf Becker; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1980), 110-11. The phrase Frankemölle quotes is from Werner Grimm, "Der Dank für die empfangene Offenbarung bei Jesus und Josephus: Parallelen zu Mt 11,25-27," *BZ* 17 (1973): 253.

<sup>50</sup>Grimm, *Jesus und das Danielbuch*, 25.

<sup>51</sup>Dale C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 233.

<sup>52</sup>Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2004), 100.

<sup>53</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew* (NAC 22; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1992), 192.

2,20-23 beeinflusst sein."<sup>54</sup> "This passage is a deliberate echo of Dan 2:19-23 where another prophetic sage, Daniel himself, thanks God in a similar fashion for the wisdom revealed to him."<sup>55</sup>

I conclude with Grimm and Frankemölle and others that an allusion to Dan 2 must be intended. The parallels, both verbal and thematic, are too numerous to be coincidental.

We should also notice, with Benedict Green, some parallels to Daniel ch. 4. Jesus is addressing God as "κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς" ("Lord of heaven and earth," Matt 11:25/Luke 10:21), which is quite similar to Dan 4:17 LXX "τὸν κύριον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς" ("the Lord of heaven has authority over all in heaven and on the earth").<sup>56</sup> The phrase "κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ" exists *only* here in Daniel in the entire canonical Greek OT (and in Tob 7:17 in the Apocrypha). The expanded phrase "κύριον τὸν θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ" ("the Lord *God* of heaven") is found in Gen 24:3, Jonah 1:9, and Dan 5:34 Theo.

The phrase "Lord of heaven and earth" is in itself maybe too short to be considered an allusion to Daniel, but since it is found together with the "apokalyptischen

---

<sup>54</sup>Riedl, *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu*, 56.

<sup>55</sup>Ben Witherington III, *Matthew* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2006), 237. Others who see an allusion to Daniel here include Paul Beauchamp, "Paraboles de Jésus, vie de Jésus: L'encadrement évangélique et scripturaire des paraboles (Mc 4,1-34)," in *Les paraboles évangéliques: Perspectives nouvelles* (ed. Jean Delorme; Lectio Divina 135; Paris: Cerf, 1989), 167; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20* (Hermeneia; trans. Wilhelm C. Linß; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 163; Engelbert Neuhäusler, *Anspruch und Antwort Gottes: Zur Lehre von den Weisungen innerhalb der synoptischen Jesusverkündigung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1962), 19; Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 288.

Without arguing for an allusion, Kvalbein notes the distinctly apocalyptic language in these verses, which is typical of Daniel. Hans Kvalbein, *Fortolkning til Matteusevangeliet* (Oslo, Norway: Luther Forlag, 1998), 301.

<sup>56</sup>H. Benedict Green, *Matthew, Poet of the Beatitudes* (JSNTSup 203; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 115-6.

Lobpreises" which we saw above was a certain allusion to Daniel, we should not rule this one out.

Conclusion: certain allusion.

### Implication of Allusion

Both in Matthew and Luke Jesus' statement is given in a larger context of his mission—in Matthew in an answer about his identity given to John the Baptist, in Luke when he sends out the seventy-two on a mission trip ahead of himself. It comes immediately after Jesus' frustration with unbelief and rejection in Korazin and Betsaida. Just as Daniel in a hostile environment expresses thanksgiving for the safety and deliverance found in God's special prophetic revelation, so Jesus likewise takes comfort in the superiority of God's revelation that he sees himself bringing to the world. "Jesus' apparent subversion of Daniel's hermeneutic coheres with his social perspectives wherein he aligns himself against the ruling priests and professional scribes. These are the 'wise' in Jesus' day and they are Jesus' opponents. . . . The mysteries will only be revealed to the humble . . . not the proud and the arrogant."<sup>57</sup>

Prophetic expectations are now being fulfilled ("many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, and did not see it," Luke 10:24). The deep and hidden things that are now revealed seem somehow to be related to old prophecies. "If Jesus' prayer does allude to Daniel's prayer, and the verbal similarities suggest that it does, then it is likely that what Jesus understood to be revealed to him and to his followers was the same thing that Daniel had had revealed to him."<sup>58</sup> The text wants us to keep Dan 2 in our mind.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 513-4.

<sup>58</sup>Craig A. Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1995), 295-6.



### §117/188 By the Finger of God (Luke 11:20)

When Jesus was accused of casting out demons with the help of Beelzebub, Jesus argued that Satan would not be at war against himself. He was rather driving out the unclean spirits by the power of God. "If it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Luke 11:20). The parallel Matthean version has "by the Spirit of God" (Matt 12:28) instead of "by the finger of God." Chrys Caragounis has pointed to the handwriting on the wall in Dan 5 as a possible background for this "ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ" ("by the finger of God") expression.<sup>60</sup>

The phrases in the Greek of Daniel are "δάκτυλοι ὡσεὶ ἀνθρώπου" ("fingers like of a man," Dan 5:1 LXX), "δάκτυλοι ὡσεὶ χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου" ("fingers like the hand of a man," Dan 5:5 LXX) and "δάκτυλοι χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου" ("fingers of a hand of a man," Dan 5:5 Theo). Caragounis argues:

The context of the downfall of the kingdoms of evil, giving way to the kingdom of God, is thus even more appropriate to the theme of the Beelzebul controversy than the Exodus event. This becomes even more striking when we recall the role of the SM ['Son of Man'] both in Daniel and the Gospels in connection with the Kingdom of God, and the evil powers.<sup>61</sup>

Weighing against this suggestion is the fact that the word "θεοῦ" ("of God") is entirely missing in Daniel here. The only verbal parallel is the single word "δάκτυλοι" ("fingers"), which is not even in the same grammatical number as in Luke (singular in

---

<sup>59</sup>What about the Son imagery which appears here after the thanksgiving? Is that alluding to the Son of Man and Ancient of Days relationship in Dan 7 (Matt 11:27; Luke 10:22)? Hagner thinks not. He connects this rather with the "son of God" concept. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 319-20. Still, the Danielic expression is never far away in the Synoptics ("Son of Man" last used in Matt 11:19). See the extensive discussion about Son of Man in the next chapter.

<sup>60</sup>Chrys C. Caragounis, "Kingdom of God, Son of Man and Jesus' Self-Understanding," *TynBul* 40 (1989): 9-10.

<sup>61</sup>Caragounis, "Kingdom of God," 10.

Luke, plural in Daniel). Woods points out a possible weakness. "The argument of Caragounis . . . for Dan. 5.5 as a more appropriate background to Lk. 11.20 is not convincing. One of the strongest arguments against it is the lack of the expression 'finger of God'."<sup>62</sup>

Another OT text that commentators think might be alluded to here is Exod 8:19 (8:15 MT).<sup>63</sup> After Moses and Aaron had performed miracles in front of Pharaoh and his magicians, the Pharaoh admitted that "this is the finger of God" ("אֶצְבֶּעַ אֱלֹהִים הוּא", "δάκτυλος θεοῦ ἐστὶν τοῦτο"). The context here is quite similar to Luke: A supernatural event had taken place, and the question of whose power it should be ascribed to is the explicit issue. The verbal parallel is also stronger: Exod 8:19 has "δάκτυλος θεοῦ" while Dan 5 has only "δάκτυλοι." Woods concludes that "these combined narrative links strongly support Jesus as 'a prophet like Moses' powerful in *word* and *deed*, who thereby acts by the Exodus 'finger of God' at Lk 11.20 (cf. Exod. 8.19)."<sup>64</sup>

A third possibility is that Dan 5 itself contains an inner-scriptural allusion to "the finger of God" of Exod 8. Some commentaries on Daniel do hear an echo of Exodus.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup>Edward J. Woods, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 201; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 62.

<sup>63</sup>Darrell L. Bock, *Luke Volume 2: 9:51-24:53* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1079; Gerald A. Klingbeil, "The Finger of God in the Old Testament," *ZAW* 112 (2000): 409-15; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 323; Penney, *Missionary Emphasis*, 45; Woods, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*.

<sup>64</sup>Woods, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*, 242-3.

<sup>65</sup>Andrew E. Hill, "Daniel," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Daniel-Malachi* (ed. Tremper Longman and David E. Garland; rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 105; André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (trans. David Pellauer; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 96; Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2007), 184. Collins dismisses a connection with Exod 8 in Dan 5 since the latter never mentions that the hand belongs to God. John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 246.

Maybe Jesus wanted to point us to both OT texts. The expression "finger of God" in "if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" does not sound like regular everyday speech. Jesus' audience would likely have pondered if there was a scriptural precedence for such an expression.

The only verbal connection here with Daniel is the single word δακτύλῳ. Caragounis is however correct when he points us to the deep Danielic themes of kingdom, power, and judgement in the immediate and larger context of Luke 11:20. These themes are also highly present in the story about Pharaoh. We should not rule out the possibility that one or both of these well-known OT stories were on the mind of Jesus and his audience.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

### **§123 Mystery of the Kingdom (Matt 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10)**

In a story included in all three Synoptic Gospels, the disciples ask Jesus why he is teaching in parables. Jesus answered that "to you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside, everything comes in parables." The word for "secret" or "mystery" here—"μυστήριον"—is used only in this pericope in the Gospels, quite a bit by Paul and in Revelation,<sup>66</sup> and in the Greek OT *only* in Daniel (excluding apocryphal writings)—especially Daniel ch. 2.<sup>67</sup> Since the word exists nowhere else in the OT, we can probably consider it a special Danielic vocabulary.

---

<sup>66</sup>Rom 11:25; 16:25; 1 Cor 2:1, 7; 13:2; 14:2; 15:51; Eph 1:9; 3:3, 4, 9; 5:32; 6:19; Col 1:26, 27; 2:2; 4:1, 3; 2 Thess 2:7; 1 Tim 3:9, 16; Rev 1:20; 10:7; 17:5, 7.

<sup>67</sup>Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4:9. Apocrypha: 2 Macc 13:21; Jdt 2:2; Sir 27:16, 21; 22:22; Tob 12:7, 11; Wis 2:22; 6:22; 14:15, 23. See also 1QH (*Hodayot*) 1:21; 1QS (*Rule of the Community*) 9:17; 1 Enoch 68:5; 103:2.

Markus Bockmuehl and Raymond Brown have convincingly shown that the reference for the term in the Gospels is not to be found in Greek literature but in the Hebrew Scriptures, in other words in Daniel.<sup>68</sup> Many Synoptic commentators support influence from Daniel here,<sup>69</sup> including Bock, Evans, France, and Yarbro Collins:

Just as mystery in the Book of Daniel was revealed through divine insight into רִזְ (rāz), the Aramaic term for "mystery," so also with the parabolic mysteries in the Gospels. For Daniel, mystery is revelation that is present but not understood.<sup>70</sup>

Jesus' idea that the kingdom is in some way a mystery, whose presence and nature must be revealed by God, seems to be indebted to language and themes in Daniel.<sup>71</sup>

The Greek *mystērion*, which I have rendered by "secret," should probably be understood against the background of its use in Daniel 2:18–19, 27–30, 47 (LXX and Thdt) to translate the Aramaic *rāz*.<sup>72</sup>

This apocalyptic secret or mantic wisdom-riddle recalls the wisdom-riddle of Daniel 2.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup>Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 102, 223–5; Raymond E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968).

<sup>69</sup>Blomberg, *Matthew*, 215; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* (WBC 33B; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1995), 372; William J. Lunny, *The Jesus Option* (New York: Paulist Press, 1994), 75; Joel Marcus, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (SBLDS 90; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 45–6; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 533; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 305; Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*, 288; Harold Riley, *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1989), 46; Robert D. Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background in Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms* (AGJU 50; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 130.

<sup>70</sup>Bock, *Luke Volume I*, 730.

<sup>71</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 512.

<sup>72</sup>France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 511.

<sup>73</sup>Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ed. John J. Collins; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 105.

Although we are talking about the parallel of just a single word here ("μυστήριον"), since that word is a key theological term in both Dan 2 and in this Gospel pericope, and is used nowhere else in the OT outside Daniel, it is possible that we are correct to hear Daniel in the background of Jesus' statement. An alternative explanation would be that the word had become a common apocalyptic word in Judaism, and that Jesus had not picked it up from Daniel but from the larger theological environment of his day.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

In case the use of "μυστήριον" here is meant to allude to Daniel, it might sharpen our understanding of Jesus' statement in this verse about the kingdom of God and about the use of parables. Just like God had revealed his grand plan and prediction for world history to Daniel—that God's kingdom in the end would win out and the temporarily powerful human kingdoms would fail—so Jesus believes that his kingdom-mission would eventually succeed even though they were not universally accepted and understood now. "The 'mysteries' is to be taken in its apocalyptic sense as in Daniel 2—the purposes of God with respect to his kingdom."<sup>74</sup> And it was more than an analogy or parallel for Jesus. Jesus' 'kingdom of God' was exactly the same kingdom of God as had been revealed to Daniel. The 'mystery' in Dan 2 is the same as the 'mystery' in Jesus' teaching, because it is the same kingdom envisioned.

If Jesus points allusively to Dan 2 in his explanation for using parables, that could

---

<sup>74</sup>Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP 1; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 195.

mean that we should expect to see a couple of his parables containing images from this prophetic book. The next pericope is a possible case.

**§128/209 Parable of a Large Tree (Matt 13:32;  
Mark 4:32; Luke 13:19)**

In this kingdom-parable Jesus depicts a big tree growing up where birds could come and nest. This is one of the pericopes where there is almost a scholarly consensus that an OT text is used and alluded to.<sup>75</sup>

Virtually all exegetes have assumed that the passage alludes to the tradition in Ezekiel (17:23 and 31:6) and Daniel (4:10-12) of a great tree, beneath which the beasts find shelter and in the branches of which birds lodge.<sup>76</sup>

There is a clear reference to O.T. passages (Dan. iv.12; Ezek. xxxi. 6, xvii.23), where a tree sheltering the birds is a symbol for a great empire offering political protection.<sup>77</sup>

The citation mingles features from three OT passages where a king or his kingdom is symbolized by a great tree that provides shelter to birds and beasts.<sup>78</sup>

The debate is rather over which OT text it is. Some commentators think the primary background is the tree-parable of Dan 4:11-21:

The account of the birds roosting in the branches of the tree recalls Nebuchadnezzar's vision in Dan 4:12, 21.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup>Among the notable exceptions is John Dominic Crossan, "The Seed Parables of Jesus," *JBL* 92 (1973): 55: "If the allusion is to one of these texts [Ezekiel, Daniel, Psalms] or even to all of them one must admit that it is not a literal citation of any presently known source, and it is cited with little regard for the original context." See also idem, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Harper, 1973), 47; idem, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper, 1991), 276-8.

<sup>76</sup>George Raymond Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 123.

<sup>77</sup>Charles Harold Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1950), 190.

<sup>78</sup>Marcus, *The Mystery*, 203.

That Daniel 4 was in the mind of Jesus (and in the early gospel tradition) seems evident from the citation of Dan 4:9,19 . . . in the parable of the mustard seed.<sup>80</sup>

Die nächste Parallele liegt dazu in Dan 4,21 (Theodotian) vor.<sup>81</sup>

The last part of the parable seems to be a deliberate allusion to Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the tree. . . . Sensing this allusion, the Matthean evangelist adds that this shrub 'becomes a tree' (Matt 13:32), thus making the allusion to the tree of Nebuchadnezzar's dream more obvious.<sup>82</sup>

Other scholars argue rather for an allusion to Ezek 17:22-24<sup>83</sup> or 31:5-8,<sup>84</sup> or to Ps

---

<sup>79</sup>France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 526. France elaborates on the details of the parable: "This parable invites a comparison between the great but short-lived earthly empire of Babylon and the far greater and more permanent kingdom of heaven. The inclusion of all nations in that kingdom might be a bonus point for the sharp-eyed reader who knew the Daniel text and understood the birds as symbolic of the nations, but it is not emphasized." Ibid., 527.

<sup>80</sup>Viviano, "Least in the Kingdom," 52.

<sup>81</sup>Peter Wolff, *Die frühe nachösterliche Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes* (FRLANT 171; Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 76. See also George Wesley Buchanan, *Jesus: The King and His Kingdom* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1984), 212-3.

<sup>82</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 522. Other proponents of Daniel as the primary background text are John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (StPB 8; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1965), 13; George Wesley Buchanan, *Jesus: The King and His Kingdom* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1984), 212-3; R. Alan Cole, *Mark: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 2; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 155; Jeffrey B. Gibson, *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity* (JSNTSup 112; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 176; Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*, 288; Benjamin Willard Robinson, *The Sayings of Jesus: Their Background and Interpretation* (New York: Harper, 1930), 214; Hillyer Hawthorne Straton, *A Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 53; Crawford Howell Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1884), 39; Viviano, "Least in the Kingdom"; Wolff, *Die frühe nachösterliche Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes*, 76. This view seems to go far back; see references to medieval commentators who hear Daniel in this pericope in Stephen L. Wailes, *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 113.

<sup>83</sup>"Im Gleichnis vom Senfkorn liegt eine bewußtes Zitat aus Ez 17,23 MT vor." Franz Kogler, *Das Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und vom Sauerteig in seiner traditions geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (FB 59; Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1988), 163. So also Craig L. Blomberg, "Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 48; idem, *Matthew*, 220; Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC 34A; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1989), 251; Bernard Brandon Scott, *Jesus: Symbol-maker for the*

104:12.<sup>85</sup> A majority view among recent scholarship seems to be that this pericope borrows from a *combination* of Daniel, Ezekiel, and the Psalms—especially Daniel and Ezekiel.<sup>86</sup>

---

*Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 70; Rikki E. Watts, "Mark," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 155-8.

<sup>84</sup>David Syme Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 189.

<sup>85</sup>The best argument for Ps 104 being the primary OT background is presented in Maarten J. J. Menken, "The Psalms in Matthew's Gospel," in *The Psalms in the New Testament* (ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken; The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel; London: T & T Clark, 2004), 65-6.

In another work, however, Menken gives Daniel a larger role: "The precise source of the unmarked quotation is not immediately clear. Ps 103(104),12 LXX reads: ἐπ' αὐτὰ (i.e., the waters) τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσει; these words are a correct translation of the Hebrew עוֹף-הַשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׁכֹּן. The words ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ, however, suggest a relationship with Dan 4,12(9) or 4,21(18). . . . More remote parallels are Ezek 17,23, 31,6." Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 249-50.

<sup>86</sup>Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 134-7; Richard Bauckham, "The Parable of the Vine: Rediscovering a Lost Parable of Jesus," *NTS* 33 (1987): 84-101; Beasley-Murray, *Kingdom of God*, 123; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 379; Bratcher and Nida, *Handbook on the Gospel of Mark*, 150; Yarbrow Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 107; Dodd, *Parables*, 190; John R. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative, and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 37; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1017; Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1967), 35; Gundry, *Mark*, 230; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 386-7; Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Interpretation; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1993), 157; John Paul Heil, *The Gospel of Mark as Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York: Paulist, 1992), 111; Barry W. Henaut, *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4* (JSNTSup 82; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 258; Morna D. Hooker, "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)," in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 97; Larry W. Hurtado, *Mark* (NIBCNT 2; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989), 80; Jack Dean Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction-Criticism* (St. Louis, Mo.: Clayton, 1977), 81-2; Joachim Jeremias, *Rediscovering the Parables* (New York: Scribner, 1966), 22-3; Christoph Kähler, *Jesu Gleichnisse als Poesie und Therapie* (WUNT 78; Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 83; Simon J. Kistemaker, *The Parables: Understanding the Stories Jesus Told* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 53; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten* (NTAbh 13; Münster, Germany: Aschendorff, 1978), 212; Kogler, *Doppelgleichnis*; Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Evangile selon saint Luc* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1925), 385-6;



Neither Daniel, Ezekiel, nor the Psalm come close to being a quotation with several similar consecutive words. All three OT texts however include important elements of the image. Table 1 (next page) summarizes the data.

As we can see, only Matthew and Mark have the word "λάχανον" ("shrub"). None of the OT texts contain this word, unfortunately. If only one of them had contained this word, we might have settled our source-text there. So let us look at the rest of the table.

Daniel 4 has the most verbal parallels if we conflate the Synoptic material. Both "δένδρον" ("tree"), "πετεῖνὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ" ("birds of heaven"), the verb "κατασκηνώ" in Theodotion ("make nests"; LXX has another synonym for nesting), "κλάδοι" ("branches") and "σκιά" ("shade") are found in both Daniel and the Synoptics.

If we distinguish between the different Gospels, we see that Ezekiel comes closer to the Markan version (than it does to Matthew and Luke), since δένδρον is used in neither Mark nor Ezekiel (Ezekiel has two other words for tree—one of which determines

---

William L. Lane, *Gospel according to Mark* (NICNT 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 171; Eduard Lohse, *Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1974), 28; Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 258; Marcus, *The Mystery*, 203; idem, *Mark 1-8*, 330-31; Wilhelm Michaelis, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Zürich, Switzerland: Zwingli Verlag, 1948), 227; Nolland, *Matthew*, 551; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 334; Pheme Perkins, *Hearing the Parables of Jesus* (New York: Paulist, 1981), 86-7; Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper, 1967), 157; Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son*, 125-6; Brenda Deen Schildgen, *Crisis and Continuity: Time in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 82; Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 384-6; Phillip Sellw, "Oral and Written Sources in Mark 4.1-34," *NTS* 36 (1990): 234-67; Bertram Thomas Dean Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), 121; Richard Chenevix Trench, *Notes on the Parables of Our Lord* (Lafayette, Ind.: Sovereign Grace, 2002 [reprint; orig. 1852]), 110; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996), 423; Hans Weder, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern* (FRLANT 120; Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 129; David Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 54; Brad H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching* (New York: Paulist, 1989), 206.

TABLE 1  
PARABLE OF A LARGE TREE: VERBAL PARALLELS

Matt 13	Mark 4	Luke 13	Dan 4 LXX	Dan 4 Theo	Ezek 17	Ezek 31	Ps 104
a great shrub λάχανον	a great shrub λάχανον	-	-	-	-	-	-
a tree δένδρον	-	a tree δένδρον	a tree δένδρον	a tree δένδρον	a tree ξύλον, a cedar κέδρος	a tree ξύλον, a cedar κυπάρισ- σος	-
birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	every bird πᾶν πετεινὸν	birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	birds of heaven πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
make nests κατασκη- νοῦν	make nests κατασκη- νοῦν	made nests κατεσκή- νωσεν	make nests ἐνόσ- σευον	dwelled κατε- σκήνουν	rest ἀναπαύ- σεται	nake nests ἐνόσ- σευσαν	will make nests κατασκη- νώσει
branches κλάδοι	branches κλάδοι	branches κλάδοι	branches κλάδοι	branches κλάδοι	branches κλήματα	branches κλάδοι	rocks πετρῶν (MT branches עֲפָאִי)
-	in its shade σκιᾷ	-	shaded ἐσκίαζον	-	under its shade σκιᾷ	in its shade σκιᾷ	-

the type of tree, a cedar).<sup>87</sup> It has another Greek word for "branches," however, so Ezekiel is not as close as Daniel is to Mark.

Is the naming of the plant significant? Jesus calls the plant a "σίναπι" ("mustard") growing up to be a large tree. In both texts of Ezekiel the plant is explicitly a cedar-tree. Could Jesus have imagined that the seed metamorphosed from one type to another—a small mustard becoming a cedar? That would be one kind of miraculous image, well suited for his 'kingdom of God' theology. Or is Jesus' contrast just one of size—from smallness to greatness? We cannot know. I personally find a reference to Daniel slightly more likely than Ezekiel simply because it is an unnamed tree and not transforming from one plant genus to another.

Psalms 104 has no 'tree' at all. The Greek of Ps 104 has even an explicit non-botanical word for the place of nesting—"πέτρος" ("rock") rather than "κλάδοι" ("branches"). This latter detail could of course be due to the translating or copying process, as the MT of Ps 104 has "עֵצֵי" ("branches"), similar to the Gospels.

Although the Psalm has fewer words in common with the Synoptic parable, it does have two similar consecutive phrases: "birds of heaven" and "nesting." NA<sup>27</sup> considers "τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν" to be a quote from Ps 104:12. Since Daniel has another word for nesting here (same root but different form in Theodotion; different but synonymous word in LXX), it seems that for this specific word string the psalm is closer than Daniel is. Overall, however, the psalm has fewer verbal parallels than Daniel has (no tree, no branches in the Greek, no shade).

---

<sup>87</sup>"Matthew changes Mark's allusion to Ezek 17,23 and Dan 4.12,21 to Daniel's alone." Zeba Antonin Crook, "The Synoptic Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: A Test-Case for the Two-Document, Two-Gospel, and Farrer-Goulder Hypotheses," *JSNT* (2000): 42. "In Mark 4:32 it is most like Ezek 17:23, in Q Dan 4:18 (=4:21Θ). In any case, it is not a literal quotation." Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 258.

*Summa summarum*, we can see that Daniel has the most verbal parallels with Matthew, with Luke, and with the conflated triple-tradition. If however we look for the general meaning rather than the exact (Greek) words, and we accept an intended metamorphosis of tree type from mustard to cedar, then Ezek 17 and 31 come as close as Daniel does. Psalm 104 is more remotely connected as it does not explicitly contain a tree.

Daniel could have provided the elements of Jesus' parable by itself without the need for Ezekiel and vice versa. Scholars at large wisely point to both Ezekiel and Daniel as the scriptural background, and of the two we should grant Daniel a slight edge because Daniel's 'tree' requires less adjustment (or none) than Ezekiel's cedar tree requires in order to become a mustard tree.

Conclusion: probable allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

What could Jesus or the Gospel writers try to convey by alluding to Daniel (possibly together with Ezekiel) in this parable of the kingdom? In Dan 4 the tree that grew large represented pagan king Nebuchadnezzar, whose kingdom was indeed large and worldwide in his time. The true and real kingdom, however, is the kingdom of God that Jesus promoted. Although Jesus' movement and the reign of God in this world might seem small and insignificant at the time, just like a mustard seed, it would eventually become large.

The theme is . . . the contrast between the veiled kingdom in the present and its glorious future.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup>William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-97), 3:417.

So the kingdom of Christ in its beginning seemed humble and insignificant. Compared with earthly kingdoms it appeared to be the least of all.<sup>89</sup>

[The Kingdom of God's] principles of development are the opposite of those that rule the kingdoms of this world. Earthly governments prevail by physical force; they maintain their dominion by war; but the founder of the new kingdom is the Prince of Peace. . . . In His plan of government there is no employment of brute force to compel the conscience.<sup>90</sup>

While the tree of Dan 4 (Nebuchadnezzar) went from greatness to insignificance, the plant of Jesus' parable took the opposite direction, from seeming insignificance to greatness. Jesus might be setting up himself and the kingdom of God as the anti-Nebuchadnezzar, as the alternative to present-day kings and powers.

### **§131+133 Fiery Furnace (Matt 13:42, 50)**

Furnace as an image representing punishment is found in several places in the OT (Deut 4:20, Jer 11:4 "furnace of iron"; Isa 48:10 "furnace of affliction"),<sup>91</sup> but the phrase "furnace of fire" ("κάμινον τοῦ πυρός") appears in the entire Greek Bible (OT and NT) only in Dan 3 and Matt 13. And in both places the exact same verb goes with it—to "throw" someone into the furnace ("βάλλω").

Richard France and Craig Keener argue that the fiery furnace image in Matthew merely stems from agricultural daily life (burning chaff at harvesting or threshing) and do

---

<sup>89</sup>Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons* (Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1900), 77.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid.

<sup>91</sup>Charette argues that the furnace in Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and Isaiah has a different purpose (disciplinary) than it does in Matthew (eschatological judgment): "Whereas in those contexts the furnace is a metaphor for an ordeal which tests and purifies the people, here [in Matt 13] it has become a metaphor for the final destruction of the wicked." Blaine Charette, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel* (JSNTSup 79; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 146. That distinction might not be so clear or significant to all of us when we read the biblical passages.

not point to Dan 3.<sup>92</sup> Since the *contexts* in both Daniel and Matthew are not agricultural but that of judgment and punishment, executed at the order of Nebuchadnezzar and the 'Son of Man' respectively, it is probably sound to look for the source of the metaphor among eschatological literature and not just everyday farming language.

NA<sup>27</sup> thus considers Matt 13:42, 50 to be no less than a quote from Dan 3:6,<sup>93</sup> and Hagner points out that the phrase is "drawn nearly verbatim from Dan 3:6" and also labels it a "quote."<sup>94</sup> Menken likewise concludes that "the agreements between Matt 13:42.50 and Dan 3,6 show indeed that we meet here an unmarked quotation."<sup>95</sup> Although I reserve most of the 'Son of Man' discussion for the next chapter, Nolland points out that the presence of 'Son of Man' and 'kingdom' in the previous verse (Matt 13:41) mutually strengthens the Danielic influence here (v. 42). "For the fiery fate Matthew borrows language from Dn. 3:6. This may be to strengthen the allusion to Daniel in the previous verse."<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup>Richard T. France, *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 1; Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1985), 227; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 128-9.

<sup>93</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> (margin). Nestle-Aland also sees an allusion to the πῦρ of Dan 7:10 (a river of *fire* flowing out from the throne of the Ancient of Days) in Matt 5:22 ("whoever says 'you fool' is liable for hell *fire*"). That connection to Dan 7—just a single word—is too loose for us to be sure it is an allusion.

<sup>94</sup>Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 394.

<sup>95</sup>Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 270.

<sup>96</sup>Nolland, *Matthew*, 561. Others who support influence from Daniel here include: Charette, *Theme of Recompense*, 146-7; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:430; Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 522; Petri Luomanen, *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven: A Study on the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation* (WUNT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 132; Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 270; Morris, *Matthew*, 357; Barclay M. Newman and Philip C. Stine, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Matthew* (UBS Handbook Series; New York: United Bible Society, 1988), 433; John Henry Paul Reumann, *Jesus in the Church's Gospels: Modern Scholarship and the Earliest Sources* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 243; David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNTSMS 88; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 135; David

Although it might be a coincidence, yet another possible link to Daniel here is the phrase that this final fiery furnace will take place "ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος" ("at the end of the age," vv. 40, 49). συντέλεια occurs heavily in Daniel.<sup>97</sup>

Nickelsburg,<sup>98</sup> Walck, and Theisohn have argued that some of the imagery is also taken from the pseudepigraphical Parables of Enoch (*1 Enoch*). The combination of 'Son of Man' with "radiance of the righteous, the fiery fate of the condemned, and the angels being involved in carrying out the punishment" are all found in "*1 En.* 58:3; 39:7, cf. 38:4; 50:1."<sup>99</sup>

Es ist aber ebenso deutlich, daß die Formulierungen in den BR [Bilderreden] ebenso wenig mit denen von Mt 13,43 übereinstimmen, wie es bei Dan 12,3 und äHen 104,2 der Fall war. Am meisten Affinität zeigt noch äHen 39,7, wo jedoch der Vergleich mit dem Licht des Feuer gebraucht wird, und äHen 58,3, wo die Gerechten und die Sonne erwähnt, das Glänzen der Gerechten aber übergangen ist.<sup>100</sup>

We will see in the next section that the radiance theme is Danielic as well as Enochian, as is the fiery punishment, as we have just seen. What about angels being sent to carry out the punishment by gathering the tares, for burning? That might point more to *1 Enoch* than to Daniel. In Dan 7:10 thousands of angels are seen, and in the next verse

---

Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 60-62; Nathaniel West, *Daniel's Great Prophecy: The Eastern Question, The Kingdom* (New York: Hope of Israel Movement, 1898), 254.

<sup>97</sup>Dan 4:28, 34; 9:26, 27; 11:6, 13, 25, 27, 40; 12:4, 7, 13. Brad H. Young, *The Parables: Jewish Tradition and Christian Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1998), 293.

<sup>98</sup>Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* 6:144.

<sup>99</sup>Leslie W. Walck, "The Son of Man in Matthew and the *Similitudes of Enoch*" (Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame University, 1999), 268.

<sup>100</sup>Johannes Theisohn, *Des auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (SUNT 12; Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 197.

(v. 11) fiery punishment takes place. The author of *I Enoch* seems to have taken much from Dan 7, and perhaps expanded and clarified this role of the angels. We can thus imagine that Jesus could have done likewise. There is no direct evidence in the Synoptics that Jesus or the Gospel writers were directly influenced by *I Enoch*, like there is to Daniel (Matt 24:15). But we cannot rule out that they might have read the *Similitudes of Enoch* or heard oral traditions from it.

Let me summarize. It is more likely than not that Jesus or Matthew took the imagery of the fiery furnace in these two parables from Dan 3. Categorizing it as some do as a 'quotation' might be asking too much from just a three-word phrase—'throw', 'furnace', 'of fire', but it is probably safe to consider it an allusion. Influence, direct or indirect, from *I Enoch* is also a possibility for some of the details (the role of the angels).

Conclusion: probable allusion.

### **§131 The Righteous Will Shine (Matt 13:43)**

"Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father. He who has ears, let him hear" (Matt 13:43). The words "righteous" ("δίκαιος") and "shine" ("ἐκλάμπω") are found in both Matt 13:43 and Dan 12:3 (Theo; LXX has the synonym "φαίνω" for shining). The word "ἐκλάμπω" is common in ancient Greek literature,<sup>101</sup> but is only used here (in Matthew and Daniel) in all of the Greek Bible—and is even found in the exact same verbal form.

The contexts in Daniel and Matthew are identical: the final eschatological destiny of mankind. Daniel 12:2-3 is not just any random text about that destiny. It is probably

---

<sup>101</sup>Walter Bauer et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (3rd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 305; Henry George Liddell et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 511.



the strongest OT attestation about life after death.<sup>102</sup> If Jesus wanted to reuse commonly known poetic phrases about the eternal rewards, then borrowing from Dan 12 is as obvious as you can get it.

If I am correct above (§131+133 Fiery Furnace) believing that the image describing the fate of the wicked in the previous verse was taken from Daniel, it is not surprising to find that the consequence for the righteous here might be phrased in Danielic language as well. A large number of commentators have found precisely that.

The Apostle says the same thing as Daniel, taking this thought from his prophecy.<sup>103</sup>

The expression 'the righteous will shine' is a Matthean manipulation of Daniel 12.3 (Theodotian).<sup>104</sup>

Another allusion to Daniel is possible (Dan 12:3).<sup>105</sup>

The allusion is to Daniel 12:3 LXX, somewhat shortened by omitting *hoi synientes*.<sup>106</sup>

Die Beschreibung des Lohns der Gerechten dürfte von Dan 12,3 beeinflusst sein.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>"There is virtually unanimous agreement among modern scholars that Daniel is referring to the actual resurrection of individuals from the dead, because of the explicit language of everlasting life. This is, in fact, the only generally accepted reference to resurrection in the Hebrew Bible." John J. Collins, *Daniel*, 391-2. "The text which became central for much later Jewish thought on this subject is Daniel 12.2-3. . . . Virtually all scholars agree that it does indeed speak of bodily resurrection, and means this in a concrete sense." Nicholas Thomas Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 3; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 109. "Daniel 12:2 is the clearest OT text that teaches the resurrection of good and bad alike at the final judgment." Blomberg, "Matthew," 75.

<sup>103</sup>Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 10.3 (*ANF* 10:415).

<sup>104</sup>Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus*, 100.

<sup>105</sup>Nolland, *Matthew*, 561.

<sup>106</sup>Donald A. Carson, "Matthew," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelin; 12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 8:327.

<sup>107</sup>Peter Fiedler, *Das Matthäus-evangelium* (Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), 267.

The allusion compresses the two clauses of Dan 12:3 into one by drawing οἱ δίκαιοι from the second clause.<sup>108</sup>

Finding influence from Daniel in both the punishment clause and the reward clause in my opinion strengthens both. These are allusions to Daniel as thick as you can get them. Daniel 12 is the prime candidate for a source about the eternal rewards.

Conclusion: certain allusion.

### Implication of the Last Two Allusions

In three short verses (Matt 13:41-43) we find several phrases from Daniel: "fiery furnace," "son of Man,"<sup>109</sup> "righteous will shine," plus repeated use of the keyword 'kingdom' which is implicitly and explicitly a major theme in Daniel.<sup>110</sup> In addition to this increasing the probability of each case (increases the likelihood that Jesus and Matthew had Daniel in mind here), together they inform us of Jesus' understanding of the kingdom and of final events. He obviously found inspiration and wisdom in the stories and prophecies of the old prophet who, while living under Gentile dominion, knew that God would one day turn wrong things right again.

Human fiery furnaces and brutal uses of power shall one day be replaced by the

---

<sup>108</sup>Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 138. See also his *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 274. Other scholars who see an allusion to Dan 12 here include Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives* (CBQMS 30; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1998), 85; John Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 86; France, *Matthew*, 227; France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 537; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 394; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; New York: Doubleday, 1977), 309; Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Scribner, 1963), 84; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," 144; Reumann, *Jesus*, 187; Wenham, *Parables*, 60.

<sup>109</sup>See the next chapter below.

<sup>110</sup>Again, previewing the discussion in ch. 5 below. A fifth possible link to Daniel is συντέλεια ('end').

rescuing 'Son of Man' who will establish an everlasting kingdom where God's righteous will shine forever. If Jesus wanted to point us to Daniel's worldview through his own parables, it is hard to see how he could have done it better without outright citing Daniel.

### **§137 The Most High God (Mark 5:7; Luke 8:28)**

In the story of the Gerasene demoniac, Jesus is addressed by the unclean spirit as "υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου" ("Son of the Most High God"). Since Josephus this expression has been considered a non-Jewish way of addressing God.<sup>111</sup> "That the spirit describes God as 'Most High' reflects the polytheism of the demoniac and of the pagan territory in which the story takes place."<sup>112</sup>

Some Gospel commentators refer to the book of Daniel as an example of this Gentile speech.<sup>113</sup> The phrases in the Greek Daniel are "οἱ παῖδες τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν θεῶν τοῦ ὑψίστου" ("servants of the Most High God," 3:26 [LXX v. 93]), "οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου" (3:26/93 Theo), "ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὑψιστος" ("the Most High God," 4:2 Theo).

The phrase is not used exclusively in Daniel however (see Gen 14:19-20, Ps 77:35), and we should therefore consider it a general religious term for a deity. No scholars, as far as I can see, have suggested that this phrase here in Mark and Luke was meant as an allusion to Daniel. At most they point to Daniel as a parallel example.

Conclusion: no allusion.

---

<sup>111</sup>Josephus, *Ant.* 16.6.2; Bock, *Luke Volume 1*, 772.

<sup>112</sup>Gundry, *Mark*, 250. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (SBLMS 25; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 106.

<sup>113</sup>Hurtado, *Mark*, 82-3. So also Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (New York: Harper, 1960), 101-2.

**§161 The Transfiguration (Matt 17:1-9;  
Mark 9:2-10; Luke 9:28-36)**

A story rich with OT themes is Jesus' transfiguration on the mountain. Most scholars see parallels with the stories about Moses in the book Exodus. A few point to Dan 10 as the primary source of structure and vocabulary, including Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. See table 2 for his tabulated English parallels.

TABLE 2  
THE TRANSFIGURATION: MURPHY-O'CONNOR'S PROPOSAL

Matthew 17	Daniel 10
<sup>2</sup> <u>his face shone like</u> the sun . . .	<sup>6</sup> <u>his face shone like</u> lightening . . .
<sup>6</sup> When the disciples <u>heard</u> this, they <u>fell on their faces</u> and feared exceedingly.	<sup>9</sup> When I <u>heard</u> the sound of his words, I <u>fell on my face</u> unconscious with my face to the ground.
<sup>7</sup> Jesus came and <u>touched</u> them, <u>saying</u> ,	<sup>10</sup> And behold a hand <u>touched</u> me, and set me trembling on my hands and knees. <sup>11</sup> And he <u>said</u> , "O Daniel, greatly beloved, give heed to the words that I speak to you, and <u>stand upright</u> , for now I have been sent to you." While he was speaking, I stood up trembling. <sup>12</sup> Then he said to me, " <u>Fear not</u> , Daniel . . ."
<u>Rise</u> ,	
and <u>have no fear</u> ."	
<sup>8</sup> But <u>lifting up their eyes</u> . . .	<sup>5</sup> <u>I lifted up my eyes</u> . . .
<i>Source:</i> Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "What Really Happened at the Transfiguration?" <i>BRev</i> 3, no. 3 (1987): 8-21.	

The verbal parallels here are numerous. They are however less impressive in the Greek than in this English rendering. The Matthean verb for "shining" in v. 2 ("ἐλάμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος") has no equivalent in Greek (LXX and Theo: "τὸ

πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὥσεί ὄρασις ἀστραπῆς") or Hebrew ("וַפָּנָיו כַּמְרָאָה בְּרָק").<sup>114</sup> Verse 6, "fell on their/my face," is expressed differently but with the same meaning in Matthew ("ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν") as in Dan 10:9 (LXX: "ἐγὼ ἤμην πεπτωκὼς ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν"; Theo: "τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν"). Verse 7, "touched," has the same verb but different tense in Matthew ("ἀψάμενος") as in Theodotion ("ἀπτομένη"), and a different verb from LXX ("προσῆγγαγέ," came near). The command to rise is expressed with a different verb in Matthew ("ἐγέρθητε") than in Daniel (LXX and Theo "στῆθι," from ἵστημι). Verse 8, "lifting" the eyes, is expressed with a cognate verb in Matthew ("ἐπάραντες," from ἐπαίρω) compared to Daniel (LXX and Theo "ῆρα," from αἴρω).

The interesting evidence here is the order of the actions more than the exact verbal phrases used to convey them (except for the lifting up of the eyes, which is out of sequence).

Murphy-O'Connor thinks that "the similarities between the texts are too numerous to be coincidence" and concludes that "Matthew deliberately chose this language in order to evoke in his readers the memory of a vision recorded in the Book of Daniel."<sup>115</sup>

Ulrich Luz also sees influence from Daniel here, but with significant editing by Matthew. "Matthew stylizes this vision in the way the apocalyptic seer in the Book of Daniel received revelation. After seeing the 'vision' and hearing the 'voice,' Daniel, full of

---

<sup>114</sup>"Die Wendung und *sein Angesicht leuchete wie die Sonne* findet sich ähnlich in Dan 10,6; Mt 13,43; 28,3; Offb 1,16." Reinhard Kratz, *Auferweckung als Befreiung: Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus (besonders Mt 27,62-28,15)* (SBS 65; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973), 22.

<sup>115</sup>Murphy-O'Connor, "Transfiguration," 12.

terror, 'falls on his face'; but the angel 'touches' him, 'wakes him up,' and says, 'do not be afraid' (Dan 8:16-17; 10:9-12, 16-19)."<sup>116</sup>

Seán Freyne, in an article comparing "the wise" of Daniel with the disciples in Mark, likewise hears echoes of Dan 10 here:

It is also noteworthy that in the central episode of the work, the transfiguration scene (Mk. 9:2-9)—a story that has features of a direct revelation to the disciples — clear echoes can be heard of one of Daniel's visions, that of a man dressed in white linen (Dan 10:1-8). The privacy of this experience, the utter confusion and dread of the disciples, their inability to understand the revelation and the order not to communicate it to others until after the resurrection event (9:9), all help to situate the episode within the framework of the revelatory process that we have discovered in Dan. on the basis of similar motifs.<sup>117</sup>

Donald Carson, without labeling it an 'allusion' (a term he does use elsewhere in his commentary), states that the scene brings Daniel to mind: "The effect of the Transfiguration on the disciples reminds us of Daniel (Dan 10:7–9 cf. also Deut 5:25–26; Heb 12:19). The visible glory of Deity brings terror, but Jesus calms his disciples' fears (cf. Mt 14:26–27; cf. Dan 8:18; 10:18)."<sup>118</sup> For Larry Hurtado the white clothes themselves are influenced by Daniel: "The reference to the dazzling white clothes (v. 3) is an allusion to Daniel 7:9, which is a description of a vision of God."<sup>119</sup>

Another serious attempt at linking Matt 17 with Daniel has been made by A.

---

<sup>116</sup>Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 398.

<sup>117</sup>Seán Freyne, "The Disciples in Mark and the Maskilim in Daniel: A Comparison," *JSNT*, no. 16 (1982): 15. Such 'echoes' of Daniel are however for Freyne not necessarily the same as literary dependence or influence. Freyne believes Daniel could have been a source of influence here, but he does not believe his single article has proven the case. He concludes: "We were not particularly concerned to establish whether the Markan pattern [its portrait of the disciples] had been directly influenced by that of Dan., but in fact a number of correspondences that were noted in passing might support such a hypothesis." *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>118</sup>Carson, "Matthew," 387. See also Nolland, *Matthew*, 703-5.

<sup>119</sup>Hurtado, *Mark*, 145.

Moses, who holds that Matthew joined Moses-typology from Exodus with the 'Son of Man' scene of Dan 7.<sup>120</sup> After the transfiguration Jesus labels what had happened to his disciples as a "ὄραμα" ("vision," Matt 17:9), the exact same word used in the 'Son of Man' scene of Dan 7:13 (both LXX and Theo). Jesus even evokes the 'Son of Man' title: "Tell no one about the *vision* until after the *Son of Man* has been raised from the dead."

Moses (the modern author) also points out a similar sequence of stages in the stories. In Daniel 'the vision' is followed by (1) the seer's reaction to it (Dan 7:15), (2) a request for explanation (7:16), which (3) is then given (7:16-27). In Matthew the disciples (1) react to what they have seen and heard (Matt 17:6-8), then (2) request more information about Elijah's coming (17:10), which Jesus then (3) gives them so they understand (17:11-13).<sup>121</sup> The presence of a cloud in both stories is also interesting.<sup>122</sup>

Yet another parallel to Dan 7 is the literary context in which Matthew has put the story of transfiguration. It is sandwiched between four 'Son of Man' sayings (before: Matt 16:27; 16:28; after: 17:9, 12). Moses summarizes: "It is notable that Matthew's transfiguration pericope (17.1-8) is preceded and followed by two Son of Man sayings. . . . These Son of Man sayings when taken together form a Danielic Son of Man *inclusio*, which has direct bearing on Matthew's theology of the transfiguration."<sup>123</sup> And again: "So

---

<sup>120</sup>A. D. A. Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy* (JSNTSup 122; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 85-160. For a double allusion to both Daniel and Exodus in the Transfiguration pericope, see also Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York: Orbis Books, 1988), 249-51.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid., 91. Blomberg also picks up on similarity of the disciples' reaction to what they have seen with Daniel's typical reactions. "The disciples' response to the heavenly voice (17:6) may have been inspired by Dan. 10:15-19." Blomberg, "Matthew," 56.

<sup>122</sup>"The unveiling of the cloud, perhaps an allusion to the coming of one like a human being on the clouds of heaven of Dan 7:13." Waetjen, *A Reordering*, 150.

<sup>123</sup>Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration Story*, 91.

in view of the strong Daniel 7 motifs in 16.28 and 27, and perhaps also in view of Matthew's distinctive description of τὸ ὄραμα (17.9), it is certainly possible that Matthew veiledly alludes to a Danielic Son of Man in 17.9."<sup>124</sup>

Although the sequence of parallels that Moses lists between Matt 17 and Dan 7 is even more general (not verbally exact) than Murphy-O'Connor's comparison with Dan 10, the explicit mention of 'Son of Man' four times (twice before the transfiguration, and twice afterwards as Jesus comments on the event) does constitute a possible combined allusion to Dan 7.<sup>125</sup>

Mark and Luke have fewer 'Son of Man' sayings surrounding their transfiguration stories, but they are present there also. In Mark the 'Son of Man' is mentioned one time before and two times afterwards (Mark: 8:38; 9:9; 9:12); in Luke one time before (Luke 9:26).

Let us now turn to some counter-arguments to a Danielic allusion in Matt 17. First of all, most scholars see a clear reference in the Synoptic story to Moses; by any judgment a far stronger link than to Daniel. Timothy Dwyer's list of parallels is as good as any: "the 'six days' (see Exod. 24.16), the mountain (Exod. 24.12), transfiguration (Exod. 34.29, 30, 35), tents (Exod. 25.9), Elijah and Moses, the cloud and the voice (Exod. 24.16)."<sup>126</sup>

However, does the clear allusion to Exodus and Moses preclude a link to Daniel?

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., 98.

<sup>125</sup>Against Davies and Allison who think these parallels are just a coincidence. "Our conclusion is that parallels are not always what they seem to be." Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 689.

<sup>126</sup>Timothy Dwyer, *The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup 128; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 139. Watts makes a similar comparison of Exodus to the transfiguration in Mark, and Pao and Schnabel in Luke. Watts, "Mark," 186; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 311.



Not necessarily. Mixing several OT allusions is not uncommon, as we saw in pericope §128 above (Ezekiel, Daniel, and possibly a touch from the Psalms). When Jesus called the incident an ὄραμα (vision), an almost exclusively Danielic term,<sup>127</sup> and invoked the 'Son of Man' phrase several times (the number varying between the Gospels), we cannot look to Exodus only. Exodus typology (Moses) is combined with Daniel's visions ('Son of Man'). Senior and Harrington believe that we have a dual reference (Exodus and Daniel) here:

In Matthew's version, the transfiguration account is a fusion of Pentateuchal traditions that portray Moses' ascent of Sinai and the dazzling theophanies that accompany the reception of the law (especially Exod 24 and 34) with apocalyptic traditions that anticipate the return of the triumphant Christ at the End of time (drawing especially on the visions of Dan 7 and 8).<sup>128</sup>

The transfiguration account (17:1-8) blends features from the Sinai theophany (Exodus 24) and the apocalyptic visions of the book of Daniel.<sup>129</sup>

Another possible counter-argument to an allusion to Daniel could be that the parallel sequence of events that Murphy-O'Connor found with Dan 10 and Moses found with Dan 7 are only typical sequences found in most apocalyptic visionary experiences or angelic visits. Perhaps the Synoptic pericope could have used the same sequence without influence from the book of Daniel?

Terence Donaldson has suggested a sound approach. The sequence of actions found in the transfiguration story should be considered as typical apocalyptic, but the book of Daniel has a lot of responsibility for that sequence being easily recognized as such: "the disciples' falling to the ground, their fear, Jesus' touch, the command to rise,

---

<sup>127</sup>Found in Isa 21:1, 2, 11; 23:1; Dan 2:7, 26, 28, 36, 45; 7:1(2x), 8:13, 15, 17, 26(2x); 9:24(2x); 10:1.

<sup>128</sup>Donald Senior, *Matthew* (ANTC; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1998), 195.

<sup>129</sup>Harrington, *Matthew*, 255.

the word of assurance, and their rising and looking about—is a typical apocalyptic pattern, seen perhaps most clearly in Dan 10.7-12."<sup>130</sup>

To sum it up, we should be open to Jesus and the Gospel writers making allusions in the Transfiguration story to both the book of Exodus and the book of Daniel. Both OT books spring to mind when we read this story; and they are possibly engineered with intention to do exactly that.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

### **§172 Forgive Seventy Times Seven (Matt 18:21-22)**

To a frustrated question from Peter about how many times he had to forgive someone who kept sinning against him, Jesus answered either "seventy times seven" or "seventy-seven times" (both meanings possible from the Greek "ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά"). These figures are of course the same as used in Daniel's prophecy about the time period before an anointed would come to end sin and bring in atonement (seventy sevens, "ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες," Dan 9:24). Should we see an allusion to Daniel's prophecy in Jesus' answer?

Two factors speak in favor of a link to Daniel. The two passages share the same theme of sin and forgiveness. The prophecy in Dan 9 is also alluded to elsewhere in Matthew (see particularly ch. 4 below), which increases the likelihood that Jesus could have had this prophecy in mind here.

What weighs against it is the lack of verbal agreement with Dan 9:24, and the existence of another OT text that corresponds completely with Jesus' saying in the Greek: "If Cain is avenged sevenfold, then Lamech seventy times seven" (Gen 4:24). The last

---

<sup>130</sup>Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (JSNTSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 149.

number here is verbally identical in Matthew and in the LXX, "ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά" ("seventy times seven"), although the MT reads "שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה" ("seventy seven times"). In addition to the presence of the exact same phrase in Greek for "seventy times seven," the parallelism with "ἑπτάκις" ("seven times") is also present. In other words, the formula 'not seven but seventy times seven' is found in both Genesis and Matthew, and is exactly the same in the Greek. Commentators as far back as Tertullian and Origen have been convinced of an allusion to Gen 4 here,<sup>131</sup> and modern scholars uniformly concur.<sup>132</sup>

Matthew's pericope fits thematically with the Genesis account as well. The murder done by Cain (and presumably Lamech) was a consequence of someone bearing a grudge and not willing to forgive his brother—the exact same implicit attitude Peter brought with him in his question to Jesus. So while Dan 9 might at first sight appear to be a candidate for an allusion, it is more likely that Matthew's Jesus had the Genesis account in mind.

Conclusion: no allusion to Daniel.

### §180 Apocalyptic Vision (Luke 10:17-20)

In a short pericope found only in Luke, Jesus shares with his disciples a vision he had experienced about Satan's fall. "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" (Luke

---

<sup>131</sup>Tertullian, *De orat.* 7; Origen, *Comm. on Mt* 14.5. References given in Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:793; Luz, *Matthew* 8-20, 466.

<sup>132</sup>Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), 199; Blomberg, *Matthew*, 281; Frederick Dale Bruner, *Matthew: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 2:236; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:793; Fiedler, *Matthäus*, 307; France, *Matthew*, 277; Hare, *Matthew*, 216; Harrington, *Matthew*, 269; Luz, *Matthew* 8-20, 465-6; Philip A. Micklem, *St Matthew: With Introduction and Notes* (London: Methuen, 1950), 184; Robert H. Mounce, *Matthew* (NIBCNT; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 177; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Nolland, *Matthew*, 754-5; Senior, *Matthew*, 211; Zahn, *Matthäus*, 584.

10:18). Several commentators point out that the verb "I saw" here is typical Danielic—*"ἐθεώρουν."*

Most of the OT occurrences are found in Daniel, especially ch. 7. Three instances of *ἐθεώρουν* are not related to receiving a vision: Josh 8:20, Ps 65:18, and Dan 3:27 (v. 94 in the LXX). Eight instances are related to receiving a vision, and all of these are in Daniel: 4:13; 7:2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 21 (v. 21 only in Theo).

Dabei stellt Lukas . . . Jesus mit Hilfe des Verbums *θεωρέω* in eine Tradition von apokalyptischen Sehern, wie sich auch im Danielbuch zu finden ist (vgl. Dan 4:10; 7.2 LXX).<sup>133</sup>

Although the introduction 'I saw' in the OT does not always indicate a vision of the future, the place where the introductory *ἐθεώρουν* occurs most frequently is in the book of Daniel, where the dreams and visions talked about point to future events.<sup>134</sup>

It is quite possible, even likely, that Luke was familiar with the repeated use of the imperfect *etheōroun* to introduce the visions of the prophet Daniel (Dan. 7:2,4,6,7,9,11,13). . . . Luke appears to regard Jesus' response to the seventy(-two) as the content of the revelation for which he subsequently (vv. 21-22) gives thanks; a vision report analogous to those given by the earlier prophet Daniel would admirably fit this revelatory context.<sup>135</sup>

A majority of scholars make no mention of a Danielic vocabulary here at all.

How shall we evaluate this case? The tone of the scholars quoted seems appropriate to me. None are claiming to prove a certain allusion to Daniel here: They are only being open to the possibility that Jesus or Luke could have had our prophetic book in mind. A single word is not much to hang an allusion on, but the word is in Daniel a highly loaded verb of prophetic importance.

---

<sup>133</sup>Dietrich Rusam, "Sah Jesus wirklich den Satan vom Himmel fallen (Lk 10.18)? Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Differenzkriterium," *NTS* 50 (2004): 102.

<sup>134</sup>Simon Gathercole, "Jesus' Eschatological Vision of the Fall of Satan: Luke 10,18 Reconsidered," *ZNW* 94 (2003): 153.

<sup>135</sup>Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 49.

Two other details in this pericope must be mentioned before we move on. The content of Jesus' vision—Satan falling from heaven—seems by most who comment on it to originate from Isa 14:12.<sup>136</sup> Jesus' final encouragement to rejoice since "your names are written in heaven" ("τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς," Luke 10:20) might have been inferred from one or more of the books Exodus, Psalms, or Daniel.<sup>137</sup> Daniel is thus a possible source for another detail of this Lukan pericope.

Conclusion (about the verb "I saw"): possible allusion.

### **§201 Little Flock Will Receive the Kingdom (Luke 12:32)**

Tucked away at the end of a comforting speech by Jesus is a phrase with Danielic overtones, as NA<sup>27</sup> and a few commentaries have pointed out. The phrase "fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to *give you the kingdom*" (Luke 12:32) mimics "the saints of the Most High *will receive the kingdom*" (Dan 7:18) and "the *kingdoms . . . will be given* to the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan 7:27). The same verb δίδωμι ('give') is used in both Luke 12:32 and Dan 7:27 (LXX and Theo). In Dan 7:18 the verb 'receive' implies the same 'giving' but from the viewpoint of the recipient. The noun βασιλεία is the exact same in both Daniel and Luke. It is further not hard to imagine that Jesus equates "the Most High" of Daniel with "your Father." Even Jesus' call to "fear not" parallels the fearful reaction Daniel had (Dan 7:15, 28).

Thus, the thematic and verbal parallels here between Daniel and Luke are too strong to be coincidental. NA<sup>27</sup> and Lukan commentators correctly consider this as an allusion:

---

<sup>136</sup>E.g., Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 318.

<sup>137</sup>Exod 32:32-33; Pss 69:29; 139:16; Dan 7:10; 12:1; David Crump, "Jesus, the Victorious Scribal-Intercessor in Luke's Gospel," *NTS* 38 (1992): 59; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 318.

The giving of the kingdom echoes that of Dan 7:13-14.<sup>138</sup>

Jesus' 'little flock' of the disciples constitutes the nucleus of 'the people of the saints of the Most High', Daniel's corporate Son-of-Man figure, to whom the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is to be given. The whole passage . . . has exercised a profound influence (humanly speaking) upon Jesus's understanding of his own mission and destiny.<sup>139</sup>

"To give you the kingdom" probably alludes to Dan 7:14, 27.<sup>140</sup>

Conclusion: probable allusion

#### Implication of Allusion

The one who repeatedly called himself the 'Son of Man', a figure prominent in Dan 7 (a topic to be discussed more in depth in the next chapter), appears in this pericope to identify "the saints of the Most High" of Dan 7 with his own group of followers, the "little flock." His followers will receive the 'kingdom' as promised to the saints in Dan 7.

#### §221 Sound of Music (Luke 15:25)

NA<sup>27</sup> suggests that Dan 3:5, 10, 15 could be an allusion that the Lukan Jesus is trying to make in Luke 15:25.<sup>141</sup> Just like there was music at the invocation to worship the image in Dan 3, so there is a sound of music coming from the house in Jesus' parable of the returned prodigal son. However, the presence of the Greek word συμφωνία ('music') is the only thing connecting these two texts, far from enough to establish the presence of an allusion.

Conclusion: no allusion.

---

<sup>138</sup>Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 980.

<sup>139</sup>Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1958), 87.

<sup>140</sup>John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1993), 694. See also Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 530.

<sup>141</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> (margin).

### §237 Praying for Mercy (Luke 18:13)

Another allusion suggested by NA<sup>27</sup> is found in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican praying in the temple.<sup>142</sup> Daniel's prayer in ch. 9 ("κύριε ἰλάσθητι," "Lord, show mercy," Dan 9:19 Theo) contains the same verb in the same verbal form as Luke's publican uttered ("ὁ θεός, ἰλάσθητί μοι," "God, show me mercy," Luke 18:13).

This verb is too general and common however to make any reader think about Dan 9 here.

Conclusion: no allusion.

### §255 and 300 Eternal Life (Matt 19:29; 25:46; Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30) §281 Resurrection (Matt 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40) §347 Those Asleep Were Raised (Matt 27:52)

I have gathered here several verses where Jesus talks about the rewards of the righteous. He uses expressions like 'eternal life' and 'resurrection', which quickly take our mind to Dan 12:2.<sup>143</sup> Going from Jesus' faith in a concept taught in Daniel, which now was commonplace in his time,<sup>144</sup> to establishing Daniel as the direct source for these phrases, is a harder task.

Several scholars think there is direct literary influence here:

The final phrase ['into eternal life' in Matt 25:46] agrees with the LXX, Theodotian, and the MT. That we should have another allusion to Dan 12 at the very end of the Olivet Discourse in Mt points to the unity of the Matthean version. That is, it shows

---

<sup>142</sup>Ibid. (margin).

<sup>143</sup>See the discussion on §121 above.

<sup>144</sup>Casey D. Elledge, *Life After Death in Early Judaism: The Evidence of Josephus* (WUNT 208; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (HTS 56; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006); Wright, *The Resurrection*, 129-206.

the inner connection of the latter part, peculiar to Mt, with that which Mt has in common with Mk, where allusions to Dan 11 and 12 abound.<sup>145</sup>

Jesus' promise that the wicked 'will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life' (Matt 25:46; cf. John 5:29; 11:24; Acts 24:15) probably echoes Daniel's anticipation of endtime resurrection.<sup>146</sup>

'Eternal punishment' appears only here [25:46] in Matthew, 'eternal life' in 19:16 and 29. The line in antithetical parallelism is based upon LXX Dan 12:2–3.<sup>147</sup>

This is a clear allusion to the eschatological promise of Dan 12:2. . . . From Daniel Jesus adopted the new idea of a double resurrection: of the righteous and of the wicked (Dan 12:2; John 5:28-29; Matt 25:31-46).<sup>148</sup>

The three-word phrase "into eternal life" ("εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον") is identical in the Greek version of Daniel (12:2 both LXX and Theo) and Matthew (25:46). Mark (10:30) and Luke (18:30) have "in the age to come eternal life" ("ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον"). Many are surprised to find out that "eternal life" (ζωή combined with αἰώνιος) is not used in the Greek OT except in Ps 133:3 "life unto eternity" ("ζωὴν ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος") and in Dan 12:2 (exact same form as in Matthew). The words for the destiny of the ungodly, however, are different in Daniel ("αἰσχύνῃ") and Matthew ("κόλασις").

Even though the theme and context are the same in Daniel and the Synoptics—the topic of eschatological rewards—there is no way to determine whether the influence here is from Daniel directly or from widespread discussions about life hereafter in Judaism.

The same must be said about the question of the use of the word "resurrection" (the noun ἀνάστασις, Matt 22:23-33; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-40; Daniel uses the verb

---

<sup>145</sup>Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 143.

<sup>146</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 522-3.

<sup>147</sup>Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:432.

<sup>148</sup>Hans K. LaRondelle, "Christ's Use of Daniel," in *Creation, Life, and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan* (ed. Jiří Moskala; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2000), 412, 416. See also NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Mann, *Mark*, 399.



form ἀναστήσονται) and the words "asleep" (different verb in Matt 27:52, κοιμάω, than in Daniel, καθεύδω) and "awake" (same verb used in Matt 27:52 as in Daniel, ἐγείρω).<sup>149</sup>

There is certainly an indirect influence from Daniel through common Jewish concepts of the afterlife into the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptics. But is there a direct link? There are some verbal parallels, a word here or there, but not enough to determine that Jesus or the Gospel writers borrowed directly from Daniel rather than used common theological terms in their time, from which Daniel earlier had been influential.

I mark these pericopes as 'uncertain allusion', on their own merits. In the overall picture that emerges in this study, however, it is of course interesting that Dan 12:1-3 is alluded to quite directly in other cases (e.g., §131 above). Seen together, the current pericopes could have been categorized as 'possible allusions'.

Conclusion: uncertain allusion.

### **§275 Say to This Mountain (Matt 21:21; Mark 11:23)**

This is an old suggestion to be quickly noted and laid aside. In a seventh-century commentary on Mark by a pseudo-Jerome the "mountain" in Mark 11:23 is seen as a reference to Dan 2 (pseudo-Jerome's commentary is put in italics by the editor): "Amen, I say to you, what whichever one of you will say to this mountain, *that is, to Christ, who is the mountain sprung from the stone cut without hands*."<sup>150</sup> The commentary might suggest that Jesus thought of himself as the mountain, and had Dan 2 in mind.

There are at least two problems with this suggestion. First of all it seems to go against the logic of Jesus' statement. Jesus is encouraging the disciples to have a big and

---

<sup>149</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> (margin) lists Dan 12:2 as an allusion in Matt 27:52.

<sup>150</sup>Michael Cahill, *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 87.

bold faith in the miraculous (Matt 21:21; Mark 11:22). Asking Jesus (if he is the 'mountain') to jump into the sea can hardly be considered praying for the miraculous. Secondly, there are simply no other clues to point us to Daniel outside the word 'mountain'. Most likely Jesus was just pointing to a hill in the background when he spoke this saying, and seems most naturally to have a literal mountain in mind.

Conclusion: no allusion.

### **§278 The Crushing Stone (Matt 21:44; Luke 20:18)**

A stone is used as a metaphor a couple of times in the Synoptic Gospels. Simon Peter is called a "πέτρα" ("stone") upon which Jesus will build his church (Matt 16:18); and in the vineyard parable those who do not receive the kingdom of God might be crushed by a falling "λίθον" ("stone," Matt 21:44; Luke 20:18).<sup>151</sup> Is this in one or both of the instances meant as an allusion to the falling stone in Daniel that crushed the statue and grew to a large kingdom?

Since another word for stone (πέτρα) is used in Matt 16 than in Dan 2, where Jesus seems to make a wordplay on Simon Peter's name, and since we can find no other verbal clues to point us to Daniel, the Peter-as-rock pericope has little value for our study.

The vineyard parable is another matter. Here support among scholars for an allusion to Daniel (together with the Psalms and Isaiah) is overwhelming.<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup>There is a textual issue in Matt 21:44. The entire verse is lacking in some of the older manuscripts, like Codex Bezae and 33 (NA<sup>27</sup> apparatus). Scholars are unsure whether the verse is an interpolation from Luke 20:18 or an omission as the eye of the scribe passed from αὐτῆς at the end of v. 43 to αὐτόν at the end of v. 44. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994), 47. In NA<sup>27</sup> the verse is printed in the text but inside square brackets. Michael Holmes includes it in the text (without brackets, which he uses very sparingly) of the *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition*. There is no textual uncertainty about the verse in Luke.

<sup>152</sup>Allen, *Matthew*, 232; Matthew Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 1-14; Blomberg, "Matthew," 73;

Let us sample a few of the comments:

The first part of this saying probably alludes to the stone of stumbling in Isa 8:14–15, whereas the second part is an adaptation of Dan 2:34–35, 44–45. The same verb is found in Luke 20:18 and Dan 2:44 (Theodotion): "will crush" (λικμήσει).<sup>153</sup>

The second half is very likely an allusion to another 'stone' passage, Daniel 2:34–35, 44–45.<sup>154</sup>

---

Günther Bornkamm, "λικμάο," *TDNT* 4:280–81; George Arthur Buttrick, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Harper, 1928), 221; Carson, "Matthew," 454; Richard J. Cassidy, "Luke's Audience, the Chief Priests, and the Motive for Jesus' Death," in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts* (ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper; New York: Orbis Books, 1983), 160; Charette, *Theme of Recompense*, 139; E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (WUNT 54; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991), 98, 135; idem, *Christ and the Future in New Testament History* (NovTSup 97; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 86; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1286; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 709; Hartman and di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 150; Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 152, 159–63; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 306; Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 183–6; Tremper Longman, *Daniel* (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 92–3; Luomanen, *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven*, 165; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 732; Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel according to Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1901), 218; James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1927), 49; Morris, *Matthew*, 544; Mounce, *Matthew*, 203; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001), 47; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Nolland, *Matthew*, 879; idem, *Luke 18:35–24:53* (WBC 35C; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1993), 953; C. Marvin Pate, *Luke* (Chicago: Moody, 1995), 380; Alfred A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke* (ICC; London: T & T Clark, 1896), 462; Robinson, *Sayings*, 256; Klyne R. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation* (WUNT 27; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983), 109–10; Stein, *Luke*, 495; Straton, *Guide*, 171; Frederick A. Tatford, *Daniel and His Prophecy: Studies in the Prophecy of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Klock, 1980), 48; J. Ross Wagner, "Psalm 118 in Luke-Acts: Tracing a Narrative Thread," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 171–2; Alexander Weihs, *Jesus und das Schicksal der Propheten: Das Winzergleichnis (Mk 12,1–12) im Horizont des Markusevangeliums* (Biblisch-theologische Studien 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003), 278; Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables*, 295.

A notable exception to the near consensus is Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 127.

<sup>153</sup>Yarbro Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 106.

There can be no doubt that Christ combined the stone symbolism of Ps 118:22 and Isa 8:14 with that of Dan 2:34, 45, when he declared to the Jewish hierarchy: "Everyone who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces, but he on whom it falls will be crushed." . . . Jesus was the first to apply the crushing Stone of Daniel 2 to himself. . . . He made a clear allusion to Dan 2:34-35, 44-45.<sup>155</sup>

Luke 20:18 probably does allude to Daniel 2. The 'without hands' saying in Mark 14:58, which alludes to the same Danielic passage, lends additional support to this probability.<sup>156</sup>

Luke quotes Ps. 118:22 with echoes of the reference to the stone of stumbling in Isa. 8:14-15, while the second part of the image derives from the stone in Dan. 2:34, the stone cut, not by human hands, from a mountain, which is later identified as an everlasting kingdom that crushes all other kingdoms (Dan 2:44-45).<sup>157</sup>

We can discern a still more precise context if we recall that in the *Book of Daniel*, which Jesus must have known, the Son of Man concept, so central for him, is connected with the conception of the Messianic "people of the saints," which brings to an end the world empires. In the same Book of Daniel (ch. 2:34 f., 44 f.) we read of a block of stone which is *interpreted to mean an empire* that will shatter all empires. . . . Already in Judaism this stone had been referred to as the Messiah. Still more important for our study, however, is the fact that the saying of Jesus in Luke 20:17f. certainly has in mind this passage of Daniel.<sup>158</sup>

There are several verbal parallels. The word stone (λίθος) is used in both Dan 2 and Matt 21/Luke 20. The verb used for "shall crush" in Matt 21:44 and Luke 20:18—*λικμήσει*—is the same word (and even verb form) used in Dan 2:44 Theo.

There is also a thematic parallel. In both Daniel and the Synoptic pericopes symbolic language about a stone is used to convey the message of inescapable destruction for some people contrasted with the indestructible nature of God's kingdom.

---

<sup>154</sup>Richard T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971), 98. See also idem, *Gospel of Matthew*, 817-8.

<sup>155</sup>LaRondelle, "Christ's Use of Daniel," 397-8.

<sup>156</sup>Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament," 514.

<sup>157</sup>Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 362-3.

<sup>158</sup>Oscar Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr: A Historical and Theological Study* (trans. Floyd V. Filson; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953), 191.

Although a stone is used as a symbol for God and his kingdom elsewhere in the OT (Ps 118:22; Isa 8:14; 28:16; 51:1; Zech 12:3), the image of a falling stone that crushes can only be a reference to Dan 2.

Conclusion: probable allusion.

### Implication of Allusion

The context of this parable in all Gospels is the growing resistance to Jesus by the Jewish leadership.<sup>159</sup> The message of the main vineyard parable itself, before allusion to the stone of Dan 2 is evoked, is that the managers of the vineyard (the national leaders) are bad stewards who rebel against the owner (God). Jesus tells them straight that he knows that they plot to kill him, and they know that he knows (cf. Matt 21:45; Luke 20:19). Jesus' use of the falling stone image from Dan 2 says a lot about his inner beliefs. Despite outer resistance by some, he is certain that he will eventually succeed. He might not be in a position of power right now, but he is sure that one day he will. It might appear as if the Jewish leaders had a choice whether to accept or reject him, but this is just an *apparent* choice. In reality it is not optional. Violent and power-abusing resistance to Jesus is just temporary. One day he, like the stone, will crush all persecution and set up an everlasting kingdom.

### §336 Political Plot (Luke 23:2)

A unique proposal about possible literary dependence by Luke on Daniel has been offered by Rebecca Denova. Some political enemies of Jesus accuse him before Pilate of

---

<sup>159</sup>Since it is not the vineyard itself but the violent and power-abusing tenants of the vineyard who are criticized and judged, I side with the growing number of scholars who see this parable as a criticism of the national *leadership* and not as a judgment on the entire Jewish people.

"perverting our nation, and forbidding us to give tribute to Caesar" (Luke 23:2). Denova asks whether borrowing has taken place from Dan 6:

The particulars of the 'false' charges and the trial of Jesus could also be drawn from the persecution of Daniel. In Daniel 6.4-9, the 'presidents and the satraps' plot to trap Daniel in the disobedience of an official decree, similar to the plotting of the chief priests and scribes in the Gospel. In both cases, the victim is accused of political crimes (cf. Lk. 23.2), and in both cases the ruler is under extreme pressure to convict: 'Then the king, when he heard these words, was much distressed, and set his mind to deliver Daniel; and he labored till the sun went down to rescue him' (Dan. 6.14). In Luke's version, Pilate sends Jesus to Herod in order to avoid condemnation, and then attempts three times (unsuccessfully) to release him.<sup>160</sup>

Denova offers no verbal parallels between Luke 23 and Dan 6, only a few general similarities in the plot. This plot can hardly be considered unique to Daniel or Luke. Stories of innocent people accused of political sedition and condemned by a reluctant ruler under heavy political pressure are unfortunately too common in the realities of political history, not to mention in fiction.

I must agree with Fitzmyer who had encountered a similar proposal: "To consider this episode as a Lucan effort to parallel Daniel's appearance before Darius and Cyrus or as a penetration of the Daniel-haggadah into the passion narrative is sheer eisegesis."<sup>161</sup>

Conclusion: no allusion.

### **§351 Sealing the Grave (Matt 27:63)**

In Matt 27:63 some chief priests told Pilate that Jesus had foretold that "after three days I will rise again." Jane Schaberg<sup>162</sup> and Scot McKnight<sup>163</sup> argue that the three-

---

<sup>160</sup>Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 152.

<sup>161</sup>Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1480.

<sup>162</sup>Jane Schaberg, "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions," *NTS* 31 (1985): 208-22. See also Allison who is pondering the possibility of Schaberg's suggestion, though without concluding. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:661.

day prediction here and elsewhere in the Synoptics has roots in the three-and-a-half-times prophecy in Dan 7:25. "'After three days' is part of a complex of Danielic allusions. . . . It may be shown in 4 *Ezra* 5.4 (cf. 14.11-13) that 'after the third (period)' became for some a way of referring to the beginning of the eschatological signs."<sup>164</sup>

However, three and a half times (even if interpreted as three and a half days) is not identical to three days. The numerous time-prophecies of various length in Daniel (three and a half times, 2300 evenings and mornings, seventy weeks, 1290 days, 1335 days) suggest that a more accurate meaning is intended in Dan 7:25 than Schaberg's rounding-off reading allows. The three and a half times is most likely referring to the same prophetic time period as the 1260 days of Dan 12. Three and a half times "is consistently taken to mean not three and a half days, but rather three and a half years, and hence 1,260 days or forty-two months (cf. 12:11-12; Rev. 11:3; 12:6,14)."<sup>165</sup>

If we wish to talk about influence from Daniel on the third-day prediction of Jesus, we can talk only about the influence of using a number in a foretelling of the future. The time prophecies in Daniel are of a much more 'eccentric' (odd numbers) and symbolic nature than the literal three-day prediction in the Gospels.

Conclusion: no allusion.

Another suggestion for Danielic influence in the same pericope concerns Jesus' grave.<sup>166</sup> Just like a stone was used to seal the lions' den in Dan 6, so likewise with the tomb of Jesus.

---

<sup>163</sup>Scot McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2005).

<sup>164</sup>Schaberg, "Daniel 7, 12 and the NT Passion-Resurrection Predictions," 211.

<sup>165</sup>Watts, "Mark," 177.

<sup>166</sup>Listed as an allusion in NA<sup>27</sup> (margin).

The brief pericope about the guard at Jesus' tomb after the request of chief priests and Pharisees (Matt 27:62-66), which only appears in Matthew, is probably an allusion to Daniel 6.<sup>167</sup>

Die Versiegelung des Grabsteins, d.h. wohl mit Hilfe eines über den Stein gezogenen Fadens, ähnlich wie Dan 6:17 LXX.<sup>168</sup>

Matthew's description of the stone and the seal offers another biblical echo, once more from the book of Daniel. In Daniel 6.17 (6.18 LXX) King Darius has a stone laid over the mouth of the lions' den, with Daniel inside it. . . . There is no mention of taking away the stone, let alone of angels and earthquakes. But someone as alert as Matthew was for biblical echoes can surely not have missed the allusion. Jesus goes to his grave as one who, like Daniel, has been faithful to Israel's god despite all the forces ranged against him; and, like Daniel, his god will vindicate him. He is, after all, the true 'son of man' who, as in the next chapter of the book of Daniel, is to be exalted after being apparently prevailed over by monsters.<sup>169</sup>

The sealing of the stone is reminiscent of the measures taken by the King when Daniel is thrown into the lions' den (Dan 6:17); Jesus can no more be held captive in death by the Jewish leaders than Daniel was by his enemies. Perhaps we have here the origins of the use of the figure of Daniel in the lions' den as a symbol of the crucified and risen Christ; such representations can be seen in the early Christian catacombs of Rome.<sup>170</sup>

How should one evaluate this suggestion? The verbal parallels are not very extensive. There are two words used in both Daniel and Matthew: stone (λίθος) and to seal (σφραγίζω). Placing a stone in front of a tomb was however a commonplace procedure when burying someone in a tomb, so the key vocabulary parallel between Daniel and Matthew is the single word 'seal'. That word in itself will not suffice.

Then there are some similarities in plot (theme) between the two stories of Daniel

---

<sup>167</sup>Jan Willem van Henten, "Daniel 3 and 6 in Early Christian Literature," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2001), 158-9.

<sup>168</sup>Erich Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HNT 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1927), 227.

<sup>169</sup>Wright, *The Resurrection*, 640.

<sup>170</sup>John P. Meier, *Matthew* (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1980), 358. See also Grundmann and Allison who point out the similarities without concluding with an allusion. Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (THKNT 1; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 566-7; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:655.



and Jesus being put in a cave, as N. T. Wright pointed out. They are both condemned to death by reluctant rulers who order that a stone be placed in front of the cave and the entrance sealed, and they both emerge victorious afterwards. The strongest evidence is probably John Meier's reference to early Christian paintings in Rome where Jesus' burial and resurrection is paralleled with Daniel's escape from the lions' den. Now we know that early Christians saw an allusion to Daniel in the tomb story of Jesus. That Matthew was the origin of this connection cannot be ruled out.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

### **§352 Clothing White as Snow (Matt 28:3)**

Only Matthew described the garment of the angel inside the empty tomb as "his garment white as snow" ("τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡς χιῶν"). The garment of Mark's young man (not an angel) is "a white robe" ("στολὴν λευκὴν," Mark 16:5), and Luke's two angels are dressed in "flashing clothes" ("ἔσθῃτι ἀστραπτούσῃ," Luke 24:4). Either the Synoptic writers utilized different sources here, and/or they deliberately edited and chose their descriptions.

It might therefore be of interest that the text of Matthew (only) is almost verbally identical to Daniel's description of the Ancient of Days in Theodotion ("τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ χιῶν λευκόν," Dan 7:9 Theo; cf. the same meaning but different wording in LXX: "clothing as snow," "περιβολὴν ὡσεὶ χιόνος").

The angel of Dan 10:5-6 is dressed in "linen," looks like "lightening" ("ἀστραπή"), and spoke with a "voice like a crowd." In Matthew the angel appeared after an earthquake and looked like "lightening" ("ἀστραπή," Matt 28:2-3).

Mt 28:2-3 describes the actual moment of the Resurrection in the imagery of the O.T. (Dan 10:5-6).<sup>171</sup>

Another allusion to Daniel 7 involves the angel of the Lord who rolls away the stone from the tomb of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. The angel is said to have clothing "white as snow" (Matt 28:3). This motif may have been borrowed directly from Dan 7:9 (Theodotion). Another possibility is that the motif had become part of (or reentered) the general oral apocalyptic tradition.<sup>172</sup>

'His clothing was white like/as snow' also echoes language from Daniel, but this time from the description of God in 7:9–10.<sup>173</sup>

The angel who comes to the tomb is described in the language of Daniel 7:9 and 10:6.<sup>174</sup>

Most scholars accept that this description of the angel consists of a combination of elements which the evangelist took from the book of Daniel. The motif of the lightning recalls the account of the angel in Daniel 10:6 . . . while the garment white as snow reflects Daniel's reference to the garb of the Ancient of Days in 7:9.<sup>175</sup>

Is the five-word-long phrase, "his garment white as snow," identical with Theodotion, evidence for Matthew deliberately alluding to Daniel? Or is this and other similar phrases we looked at just stock apocalyptic imagery of supernatural beings? Most likely Daniel has helped popularize these images in Judaism, but Yarbro Collins' indecision about a direct allusion here is a healthy position.

Conclusion: uncertain allusion.

---

<sup>171</sup>Riley, *Mark*, 197.

<sup>172</sup>Yarbro Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 109.

<sup>173</sup>Nolland, *Matthew*, 1247.

<sup>174</sup>David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel* (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 268.

<sup>175</sup>Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 143. See also Robert Funk, *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millennium* (San Francisco: Harper, 1996), 269; J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1926), 49; Hartman and di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 218; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin). Klostermann points out the parallels without arguing for influence. Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, 228.

### §364 All Authority in Heaven and on Earth (Matt 28:18-20)

In the final commission Jesus declares that "it has been given me all authority in heaven and on earth" ("ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς"), mentions "all nations" ("πάντα τὰ ἔθνη"), and promises the disciples support "all days until the end of the age" ("πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος").

Similar phrases about supreme power are found in several of Daniel's chapters. In Dan 4:17 the Lord of heaven "has all authority in heaven and on earth" ("ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς"). In Dan 7:13-14 the 'Son of Man' comes close to the Ancient of Days and then "authority is given him" ("ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία") and "all the nations" ("πάντα τὰ ἔθνη") will serve him, and he will never lose his kingdom.

The fullest discussion of a possible literary influence of Daniel on this pericope is found in Jane Schaberg's doctoral dissertation:

Matt 28:18-19 contains two words and a phrase, or five words, that are identical to Dan 7:14 LXX: ἐδόθη, ἐξουσία and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. The word order in Matt 28:18b and Dan 7:14 is identical: the aorist passive (ἐδόθη) is followed by the dative preposition (μοι in Matt 28:18b and αὐτῷ in Dan 7:14 LXX) and by the noun subject (ἐξουσία). Furthermore, there is a triad in 7:13 LXX: the Ancient of Days, one like a son of man and those standing by (οἱ παρεστηκότες) who are angels. There is also in both the LXX and NT passages a repetition of the word πᾶς: in Matthew πᾶσα ἐξουσία (v. 18), πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (v. 19), πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην and πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας (v. 20); in Daniel πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and πᾶσα δόξα (v. 14).<sup>176</sup>

Of thematic parallels to Dan 7 she mentions that both Dan 7 and Matt 28 contain a person who is at the same time both human and superhuman (in Daniel he is like a son of man [human], yet is worshiped, rides upon the clouds, and enters the presence of God; in Matthew Jesus is an earthly teacher of eleven disciples yet possesses cosmic powers). Both passages narrate a transfer of power after a struggle and victory (in Daniel the

---

<sup>176</sup>Jane Schaberg, *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b* (SBLDS 61; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 113.

fourth beast is conquered; in Matthew Jesus has risen from the dead). This transfer of authority affects all nations (in Daniel all nations serve the 'Son of Man', in Matthew all nations are to be made disciples of Jesus). Finally, both passages are eschatological (in Daniel the 'Son of Man' receives the everlasting kingdom; in Matthew Jesus promises his followers support till the end).

Although Schaberg has given the issue the most thorough treatment, others have pointed out an allusion to Dan 7 as well:

As we see, there is a clear verbal similarity between our passage and Dan 7:14. Given the prominent role Matthew ascribes to Jesus as the Son of Man and eschatological judge, it seems clear that verses 18-20 are influenced by Daniel's (Dan 7:14 LXX) description of how all power is delivered to the one who is like a son of man.<sup>177</sup>

Jesus' closing "Great Commission" of his apostles seems to allude to Dan. 7:14. Jesus, whose favorite title for himself throughout the Gospel has been "Son of Man," is given all authority on heaven and earth (Matt. 28:18), just as the Son of Man in Daniel's vision received an identical universal authority.<sup>178</sup>

[Matt 28:18b] is a citation of LXX Dan 7:14.<sup>179</sup>

Mt 28:18-20, of course, contains no explicit quotations. It is filled, however, with an implicit quotation of Dn 7:13-14 and an over-all formal allusion to Yahweh's commissioning of the prophets in the Old Testament.<sup>180</sup>

Die Menschensohnvision Dan 7,14: "ihm wird die Macht gegeben" klingt an im Offenbarungswort des Auferstandenen Mt 28,18: "Mir wurde alle Macht gegeben." Dies ist wohl nicht nur ein bedeutungsloser Anklang, sondern eine bewußte Bezugnahme.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>177</sup>Luomanen, *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven*, 202-3.

<sup>178</sup>Blomberg, "Matthew," 100.

<sup>179</sup>John P. Meier, "Two Disputed Questions in Matthew 28:16-20," *JBL* 96 (1977): 411, 413. See also idem, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt. 5:17-48* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 35-7.

<sup>180</sup>Peter F. Ellis, *Matthew: His Mind and His Message* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1974), 22.

<sup>181</sup>Karl Hermann Schelkle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (4 vols.; KBANT; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1973), 2:204.

In fact most interpreters have recognized in the pronouncement of v.18, together with the authority over 'all nations' which follows in v.19 and the promise of his presence 'to the close of the age' in v.20, and echo of Daniel 7:14. . . . Here we have a christological reshaping of the Daniel saying, the enthronement of the Son of Man.<sup>182</sup>

The evidence for a close relationship between the two texts Daniel 7:13f. and Matthew 28:16-20 seems overwhelming. Daniel 7:13f. is a text which Matthew has already cited in the trial scene with the high priest; there are strong verbal agreements in this later passage. Thematically the links between Matthew and Daniel 7 are developed quite fully. If this is not sufficient evidence for some measure of intertextuality, then it is hard to know how these should be handled.<sup>183</sup>

Robert Gundry and others believe that Matt 28:18 draws on Dan 4 also, combining Dan 7:14 and 4:17: "This double allusion produces a very fine contrast between Nebuchadnezzar, divested of his authority, and the Son of man, to whom all authority in heaven and upon earth is given."<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup>Richard T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 314. See also idem, *Gospel of Matthew*, 1112-3.

<sup>183</sup>John Kenneth Riches, *Conflicting Mythologies: Identity Formation in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 248. Riches lists the Danielic themes developed in Matthew: judgment (Matt 19 and 25), thrones (Matt 19:28), angels/heavenly court (Matt 25), coming (Matt 10:23; 24:27), the clouds of heaven (Matt 24:30; 26:64).

Others who support an allusion to Dan 7 here include Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*, 262-6; Hugh Anderson, *Jesus and Christian Origins: A Commentary on Modern Viewpoints* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 341; Carson, "Matthew," 595; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:678; Donahue, *Gospel in Parable*, 114; Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 176-7; France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 396; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 270-2; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 886; Harrington, *Matthew*, 414-6; Benjamin Jerome Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20* (SBLDS 19; Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1974), 129; Joachim Lange, *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Mattäus* (Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1973), 434; Amy-Jill Levine, *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14; New York: Mellen, 1988), 197-8; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Nolland, *Matthew*, 1264; Armin Wouters, "... wer den Willen meines Vaters tut": *Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis vom Handeln im Matthäusevangelium* (Biblische Untersuchungen 23; Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1992), 395-9.

Against an allusion: Bruce J. Malina, "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. XXVIII. 16-20," *NTS* 17 (1970-71): 89.

<sup>184</sup>Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 147. See also Green, *Matthew*, 156.

Luise Abramowski finds parallels to a third passage in Daniel: 12:13 LXX.<sup>185</sup>

Verbal agreement is found in the noun συντέλεια, which occurs more frequently in Daniel (twenty-three times) than in any other OT book, yet in the NT is found only in Matthew (five times) and Hebrews (once). Both Daniel and Matthew contain commissions to the audience of going out (the verb to depart in Dan 12:13, βαδίζω, though frequent in the LXX seems to have gone out of use in NT times and thus replaced in Matt 28:19 with πορεύομαι) and waiting for the end of the ages ("εἰς συντέλειαν ἡμερῶν" clearly synonymous with Matthew's "πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος"). Matthew thus ends his Gospel with strong parallels to the last verse of LXX Daniel.

I would like to suggest a fourth possible link to Daniel. We have seen that "authority" ("ἐξουσία") is a major concern in both Daniel and Matt 28:18-20. Another verse that is related thematically (though not verbally) is Dan 7:25 where the prophet is told that an enemy power would speak rebellious words against God and thus defy his authority: "He shall speak words against the Most High" ("καὶ ῥήματα εἰς τὸν ὑψιστον λαλήσει") and try to change God's "law" ("νόμον"). In Matt 28:20 Jesus explicitly tells his followers to expand his authority among the nations by "teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you" ("δάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν"). Authority, teaching, and commandments go together, and are an antidote to rebellion that speaks against God and his law.

To sum it up, the verbal and thematic parallels between Matthew ch. 28 and Daniel chs. 4 and 7 (and to some extent 12) are so numerous and strong that I believe that Jesus is not only influenced by Daniel but wants to direct our attention back to this book.

Conclusion: certain allusion.

---

<sup>185</sup>Luise Abramowski, "Die Entstehung der dreigliedrigen Taufformel—ein Versuch," *ZTK* 81 (1984): 417-46.

### Implication of Allusion

An argument against an allusion to Daniel in this pericope has come from no less a scholarly authority than Anton Vögtle, who has raised an interesting hermeneutical issue. Vögtle argued that since Dan 7:13-14 seems to depict the *parousia* of the 'Son of Man', or some kind of final eschatological judgment that ends the kingdoms of the world, then it cannot be significant for Jesus' commission speech. Jesus or Matthew would have known that the events of Dan 7:13-14 had not happened yet.

Würde Mt 28,18ff. im Verständnis des Evangelisten nun die Erfüllung von Dan 7,14 proklamieren, so müßte Dan 7,13 als bereits erfüllt gelten oder aber als bedeutungslos außer acht bleiben. Keine dieser beiden Möglichkeiten läßt sich mit Matthäus befriedigend vereinbaren.<sup>186</sup>

Few scholars have shared Vögtle's conclusion that Dan 7:13-14 could not be alluded to here. The overwhelming parallels with Daniel are simply too many. He has however raised an interesting question. Is alluding to a scriptural text the same as giving one's exegetical interpretation of it? Can Jesus be allowed to evoke language from the 'Son of Man' scene in Dan 7 for one theological or homiletical purpose without putting the entire content of Dan 7 on the table? There are several images from the 'Son of Man' scene in Dan 7 not present in this Gospel pericope. There are, for instance, no coming on the clouds of heaven and no receiving of glory in Matt 28:19-20. As one aptly remarked:

Vögtle has been justly criticized for not allowing the possibility that Matthew creatively reinterpreted the Daniel passage in order to present the post-resurrection commissioning as a proleptic *parousia*. . . . While Matthew may have made use of some Danielic language, he did not intend his closing pericope to be a fulfillment of Dan 7.13f.<sup>187</sup>

The correct approach must be to see which *elements* from an OT passage Jesus or

---

<sup>186</sup>Anton Vögtle, *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Beiträge zur Evangelienforschung* (KBANT; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971), 254.

<sup>187</sup>Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 176-7.

the Gospel writers at any one time are alluding to, and look for clues in their words or actions about how they understood those elements. To import all the elements from the OT passage (also those elements not mentioned in the NT story) might yield some interesting insights, but it might also incorrectly force meaning unto the OT reference not intended by the NT authors.

This principle will be highly relevant in the next chapter, where we will review the scholarly discussion about Jesus' 'Son of Man' sayings. Several scholars, as we will see, underestimate the influence from Dan 7 (despite the overwhelming verbal parallels in many pericopes) since a full import from Daniel's eschatological judgment scene is not applicable every time Jesus uses the term 'Son of Man'.

If we now listen again to Jesus' great commission, look only at the elements of Daniel that are explicitly echoed in Matt 28:18-20 (and leave out whatever Jesus did not repeat from Daniel), and we consider the historical context in Matthew (post-resurrection), what is the message we should hear? I propose that Jesus might be saying the following in the Great Commission: He considers himself to be the 'Son of Man' of Dan 7, that he now after his death and resurrection has received all authority in heaven and on earth from the Father, who is the Ancient of Days (v. 18). To help with the task of spreading that authority over all nations so they will all serve him, he enlists the help of his followers (v. 19). The main task is to reduce rebellion against Jesus' commandments among the nations—presumably the same as the law of the Most High in Dan 7—by carefully teaching the nations to obey everything he had commanded. Jesus will not stop supporting his followers at any time, for his kingship will never be taken away (v. 20).

The *gattung* of Matt 28:18-20 is more than just an enthronement scene. This is a statement of the political program of the new Government, who has gotten the authority from the Old Authority. (Lest anyone should think that the New Authority has different



rules than the Old, the authority-expansion program will explicitly be in the name of both the Father and the Son—and the Holy Spirit.) Highest on the agenda is 'authority' and 'obedience' among the nations. Interestingly, the tool for obtaining obedience is not brute force but to recruit and teach students who will recruit and train more students. This peculiar mission strategy will be discussed in depth in chapter 5 below.

## CHAPTER III

### 'SON OF MAN' SAYINGS

#### Introduction

I have saved the 'Son of Man' pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels for this chapter. The reason is that the term 'Son of Man' has spawned an enormous amount of scholarly discussion, possibly becoming the most discussed single issue within NT studies. Already in 1967 Morna Hooker commented that "no subject in the realm of New Testament scholarship has been more debated."<sup>1</sup> And the amount of interest has increased significantly since then. Many consider the secondary literature now too vast to digest and respond to. "The views expressed are legion and no single book on the subject can hope to deal with or even mention all of them."<sup>2</sup> The questions and issues concerning the use and meaning of the phrase 'Son of Man' are so complex, or at least the opinions are so strong that many long ago asked whether the scholarly situation was stuck and insoluble.<sup>3</sup>

Here are some of the main questions that have been on the agenda. First of all,

---

<sup>1</sup>Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term 'Son of Man' and Its Use in St Mark's Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1967), 3.

<sup>2</sup>Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation* (WUNT 38; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986), 1.

<sup>3</sup>Angus John B. Higgins, "Is the Son of Man Problem Insoluble?" in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honor of Matthew Black* (ed. Peter F. Ellis and Max Wilcox; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969); Morna D. Hooker, "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (ed. Ernest Best and Robert McLachlan Wilson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

what does the term 'Son of Man' refer to? Does it in the Synoptics mean simply "a human being," and thus, by itself can be used to refer to any person? Does the phrase refer to the speaker as a first-person circumlocution, as the phrase sometimes was used in Aramaic speech? Does it refer to the eschatological celestial figure of Dan 7?

Another question is whether Jesus used the term 'Son of Man' about himself or about someone else? If Jesus implied a Danielic celestial figure, did he refer to himself or did he expect another person to come and take that role?

Much of the investigation has dealt with the question of authenticity of the sayings. How did the historical Jesus use the term 'Son of Man'? Did he speak all the different 'Son of Man' sayings attributed to him in the Gospels? Did he use it only in a non-eschatological ordinary-human-being sense, while his followers invented the eschatological references? Or maybe he never used the term at all (that the term is entirely an invention of the early church)?<sup>4</sup>

For our purpose, tracing the influence of Daniel in the Synoptic Gospels, we can leave aside most of the discussion, particularly the question of authenticity—what the historical Jesus said or did not say related to the 'Son of Man'. Since we are looking not at the historical Jesus per se, but the Synoptic portrait of him, this will simplify the investigation. We will look at all the evidence found in the Gospels (without deeming any saying irrelevant for non-authenticity reasons) and try to see if the complete use of the 'Son of Man' sayings in the Synoptic Gospels makes sense (and, of course, how it relates

---

<sup>4</sup>Since the term 'Son of Man' is never used by anyone else in the NT except Jesus, the likelihood that it was never spoken by Jesus but invented by the early church is small. Why is it not more widespread in the NT then? Several took this view in the 1960s and 70s, however, that the early church invented the use of the phrase, including Angus John B. Higgins, *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 39; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

to the book of Daniel). If the composite use of the term 'Son of Man' does make sense, then we will leave it for another study to determine whether this unreduced, composite use of the 'Son of Man' is the product of one master teacher, or a group of early followers.

By taking the opposite route, as many have done, starting with issues of authenticity (did Jesus say *this* about the 'Son of Man?'), there is the subjective danger that the interpreter rules out any evidence that does not fit his preconceived ideas about Jesus.

Since Rudolf Bultmann<sup>5</sup> the 'Son of Man' sayings have often been presorted into three categories: (1) the future, eschatological, celestial 'Son of Man' sayings, (2) the earthly here and now 'Son of Man', and (3) predictions about the passion and resurrection of the 'Son of Man'. Let me sketch out a pattern of investigation found in not a few scholarly works. First one looks at all the future 'Son of Man' sayings and deems them unhistorical,<sup>6</sup> as Jesus (in the scholar's opinion) was too 'smart' or too 'ordinary' to consider himself a cloud-riding eschatological figure. Of course, one by-product of this is to weaken or remove the connection of 'Son of Man' sayings with the book of Daniel. Whatever saying sounds like the Danielic figure is then quickly dismissed from the investigation. The third category of passion-resurrection predictions could not have been said by Jesus either, as true predictions are *a priori* ruled out as either philosophically impossible or do not fit Jesus 'ordinary' self-identity. We are then finally left with just the earthly here and now 'Son of Man' sayings as historically spoken by Jesus. What did

---

<sup>5</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. Kendrick Grobel; 2 vols.; New York: Scribner, 1951), 1:30.

<sup>6</sup>E.g., Barnabas Lindars who *begins* his investigation into the term with this assumption. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

Jesus then mean by the term 'Son of Man'? Since he only used the term about his earthly, humble ministry here and now, he probably implied 'an ordinary man' whenever he used the phrase 'Son of Man'. The phrase 'Son of Man' in the Gospels now means 'an ordinary human being' (which is the literal meaning of the term).

Is this sound and objective scholarship? Is this not too much of circular reasoning, with the conclusion of Jesus' use of the term surprisingly similar to the *a priori* options allowed? I have not come across any scholar who denies that a verse like Mark 14:62 is an allusion to Daniel: "You will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." While some believe that the historical Jesus could not utter Danielic phrases like that, the Synoptic Jesus certainly did. In this chapter we will look at how the Jesus of the Gospels used the term 'Son of Man', how much he borrows from Daniel in each instance, and what he could have meant by the phrase.

Before we start, however, we will examine the text of Dan 7 itself. We will also look at a very Danielic-like 'Son of Man' figure in the pseudepigraphical *Parables of Enoch (Similitudes)*.<sup>7</sup>

### **Dan 7:13-14**

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a

---

<sup>7</sup>A few studies have also compared the use of the phrase 'Son of Man' in the Gospels with the use in the book of Ezekiel, where it has the literal meaning of 'a human being' and refers to the prophet Ezekiel himself; e.g., C. Hassell Bullock, "Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments," *JETS* 25 (1982): 27-9; William A. Curtis, *Jesus Christ the Teacher* (London: Oxford University Press, 1945), 138-9; Cameron Mackay, "Ezekiel in the New Testament," *CQR* 162 (1961): 6-7. However, there are no clear verbal parallels between Ezekiel and the Synoptics except that the phrase Son of Man is used about the protagonist, and the loose thematic parallel that Ezekiel a few times is asked by God to 'judge' people (Ezek 20:4; 22:2; 23:36; cf. Matt 24:30-31).

So while it is not impossible that the use of the phrase in Ezekiel might have influenced the use of the phrase in the Gospels, such influence is hard to trace without any significant verbal or thematic parallels outside the phrase 'Son of Man' itself.

son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed. (Dan 7:13-14)

There has been one important question about the interpretation of the 'Son of Man' in Dan 7 relevant for the Synoptic Gospels. Does this 'Son of Man' in Daniel symbolize an individual person, or a group of people? Verses 13-14 themselves seem to support an individual reference. One person is brought before the Ancient One and then receives glory and eternal dominion. The pronouns and verbs are all third-person *singular*.

This is all part of a prophetic vision, however, and different elements of the vision are symbols of larger entities. The beasts are references to kings or kingdoms. The little horn is a symbol of a power that steals God's prerogatives, changes God's law, and persecutes God's people (vv. 22, 25). It has thus been suggested that the 'Son of Man' is not an individual but a symbol of a large group. Verses 18, 21, and 27 have been suggested as interpreting the symbol 'Son of Man' as a reference to the *people* of God—Israel.

But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever. (v. 18)

Judgment was given for the saints of the Most High, and the time came when the saints received the kingdom. (v. 22)

And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them. (v. 27)

Sabino Chialá is one proponent of this view. "What happens in the vision, then, is the following: An old man appears who symbolizes the Most High, judgment is

pronounced on oppressors, and then a man who symbolizes the holy people approaches and is given everlasting dominion, honor, and kingdom."<sup>8</sup>

This view however is built on the assumption that vv. 18, 22, and 27 are explanations about the 'Son of Man' of vv. 13-14. They are not. First of all, while specific interpretations are often given in Dan 7 (like, a beast means this, a little horn means that), nowhere is a specific interpretation of the 'Son of Man' given. Presumably none was needed.

What is happening in Dan 7 is a dialogue back and forth between Daniel who sees a vision and an angel who interprets the vision for him. The outline of the dialogue is fairly plain and evident from the text:

Verses 2-16	Daniel
Verses 17-18	Angelic interpreter
Verses 19-22	Daniel
Verses 23-27	Angelic interpreter
Verse 28	Daniel

We notice that vv. 19-22 are part of Daniel's vision. He continues to describe things he sees, elements that he did not mention in the first round of vv. 2-16. Daniel sees the little horn crushing and defeating God's people. Being part of God's people himself, it was no wonder that Daniel might be interested in the outcome of all this. The angel reassures him that everything will be all right in the end. God will judge and his people will be rescued and eternally safe.

So back to the question about the relationship between the 'Son of Man' and the

---

<sup>8</sup>Sabino Chialà, "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 158. Other proponents of the collective interpretation include Morna Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 13; James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1927), 320.

saints. Are the two identical (the Son of Man being a *symbol* for the saints)? Or are they two separate entities (the Son of Man being an individual, distinct from the group of the saints)? Since one similar event happens to both the 'Son of Man' and to God's people—they receive the kingdom—it is *not impossible* to read the two as identical. It is just not necessary and seems a bit forced. If the 'Son of Man' is a symbol for a group of people, what about the Ancient One? The 'Son of Man' and the Ancient One are clearly parallel individual figures in vv. 13-14, and the most natural reading is to see them not as a collective symbol but as individuals. There are many things that happen to the Son of Man that do not take place with the holy ones.<sup>9</sup>

This has also been the most common reading from antiquity until the end of the nineteenth century. "The earliest interpretations and adaptations of the 'one like a human being,' Jewish and Christian alike, assume that the phrase refers to an individual and is not a symbol for a collective entity."<sup>10</sup> The LXX even seems to take the 'Son of Man' and the 'Ancient One' as one and the same individual.<sup>11</sup> John Collins' conclusion is sound: "The interpretation in Dan 7 equates the beast from the sea with kings or kingdoms, but it

---

<sup>9</sup>"If, however, the son of man is intended to be a corporate synonym for [the saints], one would expect a greater convergence. Only of the son of man is it said, for instance, that he came with the clouds of heaven, was led into the presence of the Ancient of Days, and that he, like the Most High, was worshipped (cf. Dan. 7:13-14, 27). He seems therefore to have a higher status than the holy ones." Martin J. Selman, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *TynBul* 40 (1989): 173. See also Klaus Koch, "Der 'Menschensohn' in Daniel," *ZAW* 119 (2007): 369-85.

<sup>10</sup>John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 306. A good historical survey demonstrating this is Arthur J. Ferch, *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven* (AUSDDS 6; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979), 4-39.

<sup>11</sup>"Ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες παρῆσαν αὐτῷ" (Dan 7:13 LXX). Lust thinks this reading is original and to be preferred over the MT. Johan Lust, "Daniel 7:13 and the Septuagint," *ETL* 54 (1978): 62-9.



does *not* say that 'the one like a Son of Man' is 'the people of the holy ones.' Rather, he receives the kingdom on their behalf."<sup>12</sup>

### **'Son of Man' and the *Parables of Enoch***

In *1 En* 37-71 (the *Similitudes* or *Parables of Enoch*) a messianic figure is called by various names: the Elect One, the Righteous One, the Messiah, and that Son of Man.<sup>13</sup>

The similarities with *Dan* 7 are striking.

There I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was like white wool. And with him was another, whose face was like the appearance of a man; and his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel of peace, who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, about that son of man—who he was and whence he was (and) why he went with the Head of Days. And he answered me and said to me, "This is the son of man who has righteousness, and righteousness dwells with him. And all the treasures of what is hidden he will reveal. . . . And this son of man whom you have seen—he will raise the kings and the mighty from their couches, and the strong from their thrones. . . . He will overturn the kings from their thrones and their kingdoms, because they do not exalt him or praise him, or humbly acknowledge whence the kingdom was given to them [*1 En* 46:1-5]."<sup>14</sup>

In those days I saw the Head of Days as he took his seat on the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened in his presence, and all his hosts, which was in the heights of heaven, and his court, were standing in his presence. . . . And in that

---

<sup>12</sup>John J. Collins, "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 217. Collins argues interestingly that the individual behind the term 'Son of Man' of *Dan* 7 is the angel Michael from *Dan* 10. *Daniel: A Commentary*, 309-10.

<sup>13</sup>*4 Ezra* (*2 Esdras*) also has several interesting 'Son of Man' paragraphs, but since it is almost universally held to have been written after Jesus and the Gospels, during the reign of Domitian, Jesus and the Gospel writers could not have been influenced by *4 Ezra*. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 275; Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras: Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (AB 42; New York: Doubleday, 1974), 129-30; Michael Edward Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 9-10. We will thus leave out *4 Ezra* from our discussion.

<sup>14</sup>George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 59-60.

hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, and his name, before the Head of Days. . . . He will be a staff for the righteous, that they may lean on him and not fall; And he will be the light of the nations, and he will be a hope for those who grieve in their hearts. All who dwell on the earth will fall down and worship before him [*I En* 47:3-48:5].<sup>15</sup>

And the Lord of Spirits seated the Chosen One upon the throne of glory and he will judge all the works of the holy ones in the heights of heaven, and in the balance he will weigh their deeds. And when he lift up his face to judge their secret ways . . . they will all speak with one voice, and bless and glorify and exalt and sanctify the name of the Lord of Spirits [*I En* 61:8-9].<sup>16</sup>

*The Parables* appear to mix the images of a deliverer found in the Psalms (Ps 2) and Isaiah (chs. 11, 42, 49, 52-53) with Daniel ch. 7. "[*I Enoch*] chaps. 46-47 leave no doubt that the figure is derived from Daniel 7, or, less likely, a common tradition."<sup>17</sup>

In the final chapter of *the Parables* the 'Son of Man' is revealed to be Enoch himself. "That angel came to me, greeted me with his voice and said to me: You are the son of man" (*I En* 71:14).<sup>18</sup>

Since this part of *I Enoch* has not been found among the Qumran writings, the issue of dating has become less certain—we have no certain 'latest date' to lean on as we would if it had been found among them. Due to the lack of findings in Qumran Josef

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 61-2.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., 78.

<sup>17</sup>George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* 6:139.

<sup>18</sup>Since Enoch, the narrator and implied author of the work, sees the 'Son of Man' in the vision earlier in the book (apparently as a figure other than himself), some scholars think ch. 72 might be a later addition not quite in line with the rest of the book. Collins, "Book of Parables," 219-20; Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," 140. Kvanvig and (less strongly) Sjöberg argue for textual integrity and Enoch being intended as the 'Son of Man' throughout the Parables. Helge S. Kvanvig, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 179-215; Erik Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im Äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1946), 188.

Milik proposed a late A.D. second- or third-century Christian composition,<sup>19</sup> but has received few followers for that position.<sup>20</sup>

Since the Qumran library cannot be expected to hold all Jewish works in existence at the time, and since we today do not even have in possession (and readable state) all the scrolls from Qumran, this absence is of little importance. "Cumulatively, perhaps we possess only about 10 to 20 percent of the manuscripts that were in the Qumran caves before, or in, June 68 C.E. Thus, the absence of identifiable fragments of the Parables of Enoch from Qumran is neither remarkable nor a viable reason for dating the composition."<sup>21</sup>

The current position among Enochic specialists seems to be that the book of the Parables was written in the late first century B.C. or the turn of the era.<sup>22</sup> In other words, it

---

<sup>19</sup>Josef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 89-98.

<sup>20</sup>Matthew Black, "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 160-62; John J. Collins, "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 111; Christopher L. Mearns, "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch," *NTS* 25 (1979): 360-69; James C. VanderKam, "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J. T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch*," *Maarav* 3 (1982): 85-97.

<sup>21</sup>James H. Charlesworth, "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 456.

<sup>22</sup>A good summary of recent discussions on dating with a majority of scholars holding to a late first century B.C. or early A.D. first century is found in David W. Suter, "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). One alternative position is Kvanvig who argues for a very early date of *the Parables*, making Dan 7 influenced by *1 Enoch* rather than the other way around. Helge S. Kvanvig, "Henoch und der Menschensohn: Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7," *ST* 38 (1984): 101-33; idem, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian*

was composed after the book of Daniel (irrespective of sixth- or second-century dating) and before Jesus preached and the Gospels were written.

An important question for us is: If the *Book of Parables* existed before Jesus, could some of the 'Son of Man' sayings in the Gospels have been influenced by the Enochian material rather than (or in addition to) Daniel? Nickelsburg has argued that the combination of Noah and the Flood story with the 'Son of Man' in Matt 24:26-27, 37-39; Luke 17:22-37 is borrowed from *1 En* 48:7; 62:7.

Nickelsburg argues: "Although the comparison with lightning recalls the heavenly setting of the scene in Dan 7:13-14, the association of judgment with the 'Son of Man' and the analogy of the days of Noah parallel the Enochic form of the tradition, for which the flood/final judgment typology is commonplace."<sup>23</sup>

In Mark 13:26-27 Nickelsburg sees influence from *1 En* 51; 61:2-5; 62:14-15. "Although the judicial function described in *1 Enoch* is not explicit, the influence of that tradition is suggested by two elements not found in Dan 7. Certain unnamed persons 'will see' the 'Son of Man', who will send angels to gather 'the chosen ones'."<sup>24</sup>

Do these examples from *1 Enoch* that Nickelsburg gives require influence from Enochian tradition, or could Jesus have developed these sayings and phrases himself from the OT material in Genesis (Noah) and Daniel ('Son of Man')? I think it is premature to settle that issue at this time. A lot of scholarship on Jewish Second Temple period writings including *1 Enoch* has been produced during the last decades, much of

---

*Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 601.

<sup>23</sup>Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," *ABD* 6:142.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.*, 144.

which has not yet been sufficiently digested and evaluated for its possible significance for understanding the historical Jesus and the Gospels.<sup>25</sup>

My current position, which informs this study, is that these examples from Nickelsburg and others open the door for the possibility that Enochian themes and concepts could have been available to Jesus either through direct reading or from oral theological discussions in the Judaism of his day. On the other hand, it cannot be disproven either that Jesus could have developed these exhortations and images himself from the biblical Noah narrative and Dan 7.

In a match between the books of *1 Enoch* and Daniel there is no doubt that Daniel by far is the heavyweight and default source of influence on the Gospels. The factors are many. The book of Daniel is explicitly cited by Jesus (Matt 24:15), while *1 Enoch* nowhere is. The number of near-quotes and allusions to Daniel is high (as shown in this study), while the established allusions to *1 Enoch* in the Gospels so far are few. Most scholars date all the parts of *1 Enoch* later than Daniel (no matter their dating of Daniel), so Daniel has at the time of Jesus had a longer history of assimilation and influence in Judaism. Daniel had long before Jesus achieved authoritative status in mainstream Judaism,<sup>26</sup> a position *1 Enoch* never received. We know the Scriptures were the focus of

---

<sup>25</sup>A good example of attempts in this direction is Leslie W. Walck, "The Son of Man in Matthew and the *Similitudes of Enoch*" (Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame University, 1999). Walck is often overly positive to Enochian allusions in Matthew, seeing too many cases of influence and giving too few arguments for his judgments. However, this is probably what we should expect at this pioneering stage of 'Pseudepigrapha-in-NT' scholarship, and more detailed investigations building on the works of Walck and others will likely flourish in the years ahead.

<sup>26</sup>Functionally Daniel had canonical status more than a hundred years before Christ, although not all historians allow the term 'canonical' before the first extant 'canonical list' documents are found. "The book of Daniel was widely accepted as a reliable and authoritative document by the end of the second century B.C.E. (The term 'canonical' is anachronistic for this period)." Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 72. See also Klaus Koch, "Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel*:

much scribal attention and learning in Judaism; the influence of writings like *I Enoch* is hard to determine.

These are some reasons for the focus and preference for Daniel in the present chapter. While the 'Son of Man' is indeed a prominent figure in *I En* 37-71, its influence on the Gospels is unsure while that of Daniel is established beyond doubt. As a default position I will assume Dan 7 to be a more likely source of influence (on Jesus and the Gospel writers) for 'Son of Man' sayings than *I Enoch* is.

Let us now proceed to look at the pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels containing the phrase 'Son of Man'.

#### **§43 Authority to Forgive Sins (Matt 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24)**

Before healing the paralytic in Capernaum, lowered by his friends through the roof, Jesus proclaimed forgiveness of sins to the paralytic. This startled some of the crowd, as forgiving sins is a divine prerogative (Mark 2:7par), so Jesus made another strong statement and then healed the man: "But that you may know that the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins. . ." (Matt 9:6; Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24).

'The son of man' clearly refers to Jesus in this verse, as it was his authority to give absolution for sin that was in question. The suggestion by Julius Wellhausen that the phrase 'son of man' here means humanity in general<sup>27</sup> makes no sense in a biblical theological setting. The prerogative to forgive all humans is God's. Jesus is not saying

---

*Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 2:421-46.

<sup>27</sup>"Natürlich ist die Meinung nicht, daß jeder Mensch die Befugnis hat, Sündenvergebung auszusprechen, sonder daß Menschen die Befugnis haben können," as if that should make better exegetical sense, or be any more in line with biblical or Jewish thought. Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci: Übersetzt und Erklärt* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1909), 16.

that any human being has authority to forgive sins, but that he himself—as the 'Son of Man'—has that right. "The scribes are right in saying that God alone has power to forgive sins. If Jesus claims authority to do so, then it is because he—and he alone—shares the divine prerogative."<sup>28</sup>

Walter Wink's reading of this story that Jesus knew that God alone had authority to forgive sins, but had appointed all men the privilege of dispensing forgiveness to others on God's behalf, is only slightly more intelligible. "Why then does Jesus say that the Human Being [son of Man] forgives, instead of God forgiving . . .? Apparently the Human Being is authorized to act on God's behalf."<sup>29</sup> "Any person who knows that God forgives sins has the authority to declare another person's sins. They would know this ostensibly because they had experienced it."<sup>30</sup> However, this reading is very unlikely from the context. The scribes had clearly understood that Jesus claimed to have personal authority to forgive sins. They considered Jesus' words as blasphemous, as God alone can forgive. Jesus does not then correct their false impression by saying that every human being that has been forgiven by God has this right to pass on divine forgiveness to others (Wink's theology). Rather Jesus backs up his claim to have divine authority to forgive with his supernatural power to heal. "What is easier: to say to the paralytic, Your sins are forgiven, or to say, Get up, take your mat and walk?" (Mark 2:9). The assumed answer to Jesus' rhetorical question is of course: Neither are easy to say—unless you have special

---

<sup>28</sup>Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 84.

<sup>29</sup>Walter Wink, *The Human Being: Jesus and the Enigma of the Son of the Man* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 80.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, 78. So also George S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man* (London: Nisbet, 1947), 148; Alan Hugh McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1928), 116-7.

powers. Jesus wanted to prove his divine authority by displaying divine power. If Jesus meant that every one of us have authority to forgive sins, his choice of action-proof to back up the claim should rather have been something all of us are capable of doing. The uniqueness (not universality) of the claim is matched with the uniqueness (not universality) of the action that proves who has authority to forgive.

The only possible way to read the phrase 'Son of Man' in this pericope is as a title Jesus applies to himself only. Many commentators see significant parallels to Dan 7 in addition to just the term 'Son of Man'.<sup>31</sup> Authority is obviously a strong theme in both.

Caragounis points out that there are four main ideas in this Synoptic verse: 'authority', 'Son of Man', 'forgive sins', and 'upon the earth'. Three of these are found verbally identical in Daniel: ἐξουσία, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς:

A comparison of this logion with the MT, the LXX, and Θ of Dan 7:14 reveals that the first, second and fourth of these ideas obtain in the latter passage as well. What is more, the comparison shows that the three ideas are collocated in Mk 2:10 par. in exactly the same way as in Dan 7:14. In both texts it is said that a) *The Son of Man* b) *has power* c) *on earth* (to do certain things).<sup>32</sup>

The only element not explicitly mentioned in Dan 7 is the authority to forgive sins. The 'Son of Man' in *1 En* 37-71 similarly has authority over the earth, but that is in the capacity as judge and ruler, not as (explicitly) a forgiver of sins.<sup>33</sup> We can either consider this addition a creative development by Jesus—a right he learned elsewhere that he possessed (from other experiences or reading other portions of Scripture). Or we can

---

<sup>31</sup>Dan 7' is often a shorthand in this chapter for the 'Son of Man' scene in Dan 7:13-14.

<sup>32</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 188.

<sup>33</sup>Leslie W. Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 315-6.



see it as a natural extension of what is implicit in Daniel. "It would be idle to argue that the Danielic 'SM' does not have the right to forgive sins, because that right is not explicitly mentioned in Dan 7. If he has the absolute power over all peoples, that of forgiving sins may safely be considered as being included."<sup>34</sup> "In the present verse Jesus' ἐξουσία involves both right and power. Matthew will probably have thought of Dan 7:13–14, where the Son of man is given authority by the Ancient of Days."<sup>35</sup>

With those three phrases in verbal parallel with Dan 7, we can safely conclude that this Synoptic verse is "an evident allusion to Dan 7:14."<sup>36</sup>

Conclusion (in addition to the use of the term 'Son of Man'): certain allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

This pericope makes a great contribution to the self-identity and mission of the Synoptic Jesus. He understands the Danielic 'Son of Man' as having, while looking like a human figure, divine attributes and authority. While Dan 7 has an *eschatological* and *heavenly* judgment scene, Jesus exercises his authority in the 'fresh' manner of forgiving sins and healing in a *present* and *earthly* setting. The 'Son of Man' gets—in a heavenly scene—authority over the people of the earth. Jesus considers himself to be this 'Son of Man', takes that authority and exercises it right now.

---

<sup>34</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 189. So also George H. P. Thompson, "Son of Man—Some Further Considerations," *JTS* 12 (1961): 203-9.

<sup>35</sup>William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-97), 2:93.

<sup>36</sup>Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," 144. Yarbro Collins is not as convinced: "In [Mark] 2:10 and 28, the association of the phrase 'Son of Man' with Dan 7:13 and its messianic connotation are not explicit." Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ed. John J. Collins; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 97.

Christologically speaking, in drawing on the exalted human figure who in Dan. 7 participates in God's authority, Mark's Jesus likewise claims exactly that to which the scribes have objected: he not only has but also will exercise Yahweh's authority "upon the earth." Where he is, God is. In Dan. 7 and in the Similitudes of *1 Enoch* this authority meant judgment on the nations and sinners . . . At the outset of Mark, Jesus' exercise of the Son of Man's authority means, instead, forgiveness and healing.<sup>37</sup>

The Son of Man, who according to Dan 7:13–14 will be enthroned in heaven to share God's sovereignty over all peoples, is already during his earthly ministry (hence the addition of "on earth," in distinction from his future heavenly sovereignty) authorized to dispense God's forgiveness. The forgiveness of sins as such was not, of course, a part of Daniel's vision of the authority of the Son of Man. Jesus is not expounding Daniel 7, but boldly extrapolating from that vision to make a claim for his present status.<sup>38</sup>

Does this mean that Jesus did not believe that he (also) had a future judging and punishing function as 'Son of Man'? We cannot know from this pericope, but we will look at that question in §131 and §300 below.

#### **§46/111 Lord of the Sabbath (Matt 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5)**

One Sabbath day Jesus and his disciples had an encounter with some Pharisees about the proper way of celebrating the Sabbath. The disciples had plucked and eaten some heads of grain. While the theological arguments on either side are not entirely clear, we can presume that this activity looked too much like work for those Pharisees who had objected, while for Jesus and the disciples Sabbath keeping was a lot about celebrating God's provision (like David and his men had enjoyed the bread from the temple).

Jesus' speech ends with the statement that "the Son of Man is Lord even of the

---

<sup>37</sup>Rikki E. Watts, "Mark," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 138-9.

<sup>38</sup>Richard T. France, *Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 347.

Sabbath" (Matt 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5), and in Mark is preceded with "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27).

Scholars who see the 'Son of Man' as a general term for humanity do so here also.<sup>39</sup> The phrase then would mean something like "mankind is lord of the Sabbath" or "any human is lord of the Sabbath." Settling a debate about proper Sabbath observance with such a statement makes little sense, unless one wishes to see a unique instance of an antinomian Jesus. Morna Hooker is correct that it is "improbable that Jesus would have declared that mankind in general could dispense with the Mosaic law."<sup>40</sup>

The only possible reading of Jesus' statement is that he—as 'Son of Man'—is the Lord of the Sabbath. The Lord (Yahweh) had instituted the Sabbath at creation (Gen 2:2-3). There are scriptural texts Jesus would have read about this day, calling the seventh day of the week "a Sabbath to the Lord your God" (Exod 20:10) in remembrance of the Lord's act of creation. "In six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it" (Exod 20:11). The Sabbath was repeatedly called "the Lord's day." "I gave them my sabbaths, as a sign between me and them, that they might know that I the LORD sanctify them " (Ezek 20:12; see also Exod 16:25; 31:13; Ezek 20:13).

If Jesus saw himself with divine authority as the 'Son of Man' of Dan 7, it is only natural that he would include lordship of the Sabbath as part of it.

There is also another thematic link to Daniel ch. 7 that I would like to point out, which was explained in more detail to Daniel later in the vision (Dan 7:25). Daniel saw a

---

<sup>39</sup>E.g., Maurice Casey, "Culture and Historicity: The Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2:23-28)," *NTS* 34 (1988): 17-9; Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man*, 147-8; Wink, *Human Being*, 69-73.

<sup>40</sup>Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 94.

human enemy usurping God's authority: "he shall speak words against the Most High" ("καὶ ῥήματα εἰς τὸν ὑψιστον λαλήσει"), even trying to change God's "law" (νόμον). We saw in pericope §364 (Matt 28:20) in the previous chapter that Matthew would end with Jesus explicitly telling his followers to extend his authority among the nations by "teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" ("διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν"). Authority, teaching, and commandments go together, and are an antidote to a human power who speaks against God and his law.

It is not only inconceivable that a first-century Jewish rabbi would teach that "any man is Lord over the Sabbath" ('Son of Man' meaning 'any human being'). It would make Jesus proclaim the exact opposite message of Dan 7, where it was a specifically human power (Dan 7:8) usurping God's authority as lawmaker (Dan 7:11, 21, 25) who is stopped, judged, and removed (Dan 7:11, 25-26). Casey's and Wink's Jesus (who grants any human being the freedom to decide over and dispense with the Sabbath) ironically ends up with a son of man who does exactly the opposite of the law-enforcing, rebellion-subduing 'Son of Man' of Dan 7.

When Jesus in this pericope calls himself "Lord of the Sabbath," it is precisely because he, with his divine authority as 'Son of Man' and no one else, has the right to utter statements about God's law.<sup>41</sup> While there are no verbal parallels to Daniel in this pericope (outside the term 'Son of Man' itself), the thematic parallel of 'lawmaker authority' both here and in Daniel ch. 7 is interesting.

Conclusion (outside the use of the term 'Son of Man'): possible allusion.

---

<sup>41</sup>The Fourth Gospel is outside the scope of this study, but the author of John 1:3 considered Jesus to be the Creator-Lord himself. Thus Jesus would also be the proper *recipient* of attention and worship in the weekly 'let us celebrate our Creator' day (Gen 2:3; Exod 20:11; John 1:3). Then Jesus could most appropriately be called the 'Lord of the Sabbath'.

## Implication of Allusion

If I am right in hearing Dan 7:25 together with vv. 13-14 in the background of this Synoptic saying (which it certainly is in §364, previous chapter), it strengthens our understanding of the mission of the Synoptic Jesus as very authority focused. The mission of the 'Son of Man' is to exercise his authority on earth in a way that enhances God's Kingdom and God's law as the basis for that Kingdom. Jesus wanted to make sure that God's law, including the Sabbath in this case, was properly understood.<sup>42</sup>

### **§78 Expect Persecution (Matt 5:10-12; Luke 6:22-23)**

In Luke's version of the Beatitudes, Jesus tells his followers to expect, and to stay loyal during tough circumstances such as hatred and persecution "on account of the Son of Man" (Luke 6:22). Matthew has "on my account" (Matt 5:11). It is hard to say exactly what the historical Jesus said. Maybe he said both, during his energetic preaching ministry. The *combined* witness of Matthew and Luke makes for an interesting speculation about Danielic allusion, however.

Luke has the reference to Dan 7:13-14 with the title 'Son of Man'. Receiving "the Kingdom" (both Luke and Matt) is a prominent theme in Daniel, as we will look at in ch. 5 below, including in Dan 7 itself (Dan 7:14, 18, 22, 27). Matthew also has the phrase "those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake" (Matt 5:10). Persecution by a non-righteous, arrogant, law-changing power is exactly what God's people in Dan 7 would go through (Dan 7:21, 25). Jesus reassures his followers however that after a lot of persecution everything *will* turn out all right (Matt 5:12; Luke 6:23), just as it does in Dan 7 (Dan 7:14, 18, 22, 27).

---

<sup>42</sup>Jesus engaged in Sabbath-interpretation debates elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels, also when there is no specific appeal to his authority as 'Son of Man' (Matt 12:10-14; Mark 3:1-6; Luke 13:10-16; 14:1-5).

Let us ponder the reward phrase in the Synoptics a little. "Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven" (Matt 5:12). "Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy, for behold, your reward is great in heaven" (Luke 6:23). With 'Son of Man' and 'persecution' just mentioned, could this be an allusion to Dan 7? Persecution is seen elsewhere in the OT; and Jesus himself mentions that this often happened with the prophets (Matt 5:12; Luke 6:23). But the promise that a reward has been appointed in heaven reminds us a lot of the heavenly scene in Dan 7. There is no other OT text similar to it. I will not rule out Dan 7 as a source of influence here.

Conclusion (in addition to the term 'Son of Man'): possible allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

There is no doubt that Dan 7 is a very faith-building chapter, especially if you are suffering for being loyal to God. We have repeatedly seen how Jesus found his self-identity and mission from Dan 7. Now it seems that this prophetic chapter could also be a source for his optimism and certainty to carry out that mission, and for recruiting people to his task. It is prophesied in Dan 7 that persecution and hardship is only temporary for the 'Son of Man' and those on his side. Worse is the outcome for God's opposition. While they might temporarily enjoy power, and use it to fight against God's Kingdom, they will be judged and their power eventually be taken away.

#### **§107 Friend of Sinners (Matt 11:19; Luke 7:34)**

"The Son of man has come eating and drinking; and you say, Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Luke 7:34, almost identical in Matt 11:19). This is one of several instances where the term 'Son of Man' appears to be just a self-referential term. Jesus uses it about himself since he believes he is the figure from Dan 7, while apparently not pointing at this time to other elements of Dan 7.

Robert Stein and Yarbro Collins comment: "Whether in the original setting it was used by Jesus as a circumlocation for 'I' is uncertain, but for Luke the title 'Son of Man' refers to the person described in Dan 7:13."<sup>43</sup> "In most of the 'Son of Man' sayings in the Synoptic Sayings Source, the origin of the name in the interpretation of Dan 7 is still apparent. In [Luke 7:34/Matt 11:19] the phrase is used simply as one of several ways of referring to Jesus."<sup>44</sup>

Let us remind each other to be careful with the logic. Examples like Luke 7:34, where there appears to be no ties to Dan 7 outside the phrase 'Son of Man', are not proof that Jesus did not get the phrase from Dan 7. The burden of proof is the other way around: If we want to dismiss that Jesus got the phrase 'Son of Man' from Dan 7, we have to demonstrate a lack of allusion to Dan 7 in *all cases*. If we find just a few such instances of certain influence from Dan 7, then the connotation and meaning of all the 'Son of Man' in the text are affected.<sup>45</sup> We should then grant the Synoptic Jesus the freedom to use the term about himself in other circumstances than those directly related to the content of Dan 7. Jesus saw himself both as a friend of sinners (not an explicit theme in Dan 7) and as the 'Son of Man' (explicit in Dan 7), and combines them in the saying in this pericope.

Conclusion: no allusion except for the term 'Son of Man'.

### **§118/197 Forgiveness of Blasphemy (Matt 12:31-32; Mark 3:28-29; Luke 12:10)**

Here is a difficult statement found in all three Gospels, which we fortunately do

---

<sup>43</sup>Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (NAC 24; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1992), 233.

<sup>44</sup>Yarbro Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 97.

<sup>45</sup>See my discussion on this issue of methodology below (pp. 139-151).

not have to interpret right now. "Everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but the one who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven" (Luke 12:10). We simply want to ponder: Is there any link to the book of Daniel?

'Blasphemy' is not a common word in the OT. The same Greek verb βλασφημέω as used in the Gospels occurs in Isa 52:5 ("continually all the day my name is despised"), in Isa 66:3 ("he that gives frankincense for a memorial, is as a blasphemer"), in Ezek 35:12 ("I, the LORD, have heard all the revilings which you uttered against the mountains of Israel"), and in Dan 3:29 ("Any people, nation, or language that blasphemes against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego," v. 96 LXX). Related occurrences of the word ὀνομάζων are found in Lev 24:11, 16 ("and the Israelite woman's son blasphemed the Name . . . when he blasphemes the Name, shall be put to death").

The Holy Spirit is not a prominent theme in Daniel either. Daniel 5:11-14 Theo is the closest we can come to "the spirit of God" (πνεῦμα θεοῦ).

There is thus no particular tie to Daniel here, and no verbal link to Dan 7 (outside of the term 'Son of Man'). One could perhaps argue—although I have not seen anyone try to—that the activities of the little horn in Dan 7 are blasphemous in nature. The text uses other words however (the words spoken are big and boasting); and there is no Spirit of God here or any indication that different divine authorities could forgive different kinds of blasphemy differently.

Conclusion (outside of the term 'Son of Man'): no allusion.

### **§119/191 Greater Than Jonah (Matt 12:38-42; Luke 11:30-31)**

Asked to show some more miraculous signs, Jesus answered that no more sign except "the sign of Jonah" would be given. Matthew (not Luke) spells out what that sign



would be. "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt 12:40).

This does not sound like much for a tie-in to Dan 7, except that Jesus then continues to talk about the judgment, a prominent theme in Dan 7. "The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here" (Matt 12:41).

Yarbro Collins argues that this fits well with the role of eschatological judge found in Dan 7:

The implication is that not only will the wicked see that Jesus has been vindicated, they will discover that he has an exalted role as the agent of God in the process of the eschatological judgment. This role may be that of advocate in the heavenly court, but it is more likely that of eschatological judge. The Ninevites and the queen of the South will play the role of witnesses in the judgment, a role that makes that of the Son of Man as advocate (a kind of witness) somewhat superfluous.<sup>46</sup>

The phrase "arise at the judgment" clearly takes us beyond the book of Jonah and the judgment theme there. Jesus uses his title from Dan 7 here. The question is: Does he have the rest of the chapter of Daniel in mind? With no more than two phrases from Dan 7, 'Son of Man' and 'judgment' (no other details about the judgment scene of Daniel seem to be repeated here), I would only say that an allusion to Daniel cannot be ruled out. We will see other judgment pericopes with stronger parallels to Daniel below.

Conclusion (outside of the term 'Son of Man'): uncertain allusion.

### **§131 Parable of Harvest (Matt 13:24-30, 37-43)**

We looked at this pericope in the previous chapter.<sup>47</sup> We found two strong allusions to Daniel in this parable: the "throwing into the furnace of fire" is influenced by

---

<sup>46</sup>Yarbro Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 100.

<sup>47</sup>Pp. 59-62.

Dan 3, and "shine like the sun" by Dan 12. Together with the phrase 'Son of Man' from Dan 7, this parable has numerous strong links to the book of Daniel.

### Implication of Allusion

This pericope gives a lot of information about the role of the 'Son of Man'. He has a kingdom,<sup>48</sup> and he has several different tasks to perform concerning that kingdom.

Walck points out three roles at three different points in time:

The Son of Man, identified as the sower of good seed, has a role of sowing the word of God, or God's kingdom, on earth. Secondly, the Son of Man has the role of ruling over an interim kingdom before the final judgment when God's kingdom comes fully into being. And thirdly, the Son of Man has the role of judging in that final judgment, and of sending out the angels to root out the causes of evil and all evildoers.<sup>49</sup>

### **§158 Who People Think the 'Son of Man' Is (Matt 16:13; Mark 8:27; Luke 9:18)**

In Matthew Jesus asks the disciples "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" (Matt 16:13). In Mark and Luke the question is "Who do men say that I am?" (Mark 8:27; Luke 9:18). After getting a round of answers, Jesus in Matthew then asks for the disciples' opinion: "Who do you say that I am?" (Matt 16:15). Clearly the 'Son of Man' is a title Jesus uses about himself and not about a third person. A general term for 'any human being' does not make sense either. Jesus does not appear to be engaging in a philosophical discussion about the nature of man (as in, "Who do people say that a human being is?").

Might there be allusions to Daniel other than the phrase 'Son of Man' here? After Peter has shared his faith that Jesus is "the Messiah, the Son of the living God" (Matt

---

<sup>48</sup>"The interpretation is notable for its explicit teaching that the Son of Man has a kingdom (v. 41; cf. v. 38). This teaching is probably based on Dan 7:14." Yarbrow Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 98.

<sup>49</sup>Walck, "The Son of Man in Matthew and the *Similitudes of Enoch*," 266.

16:16), Jesus starts talking about 'the kingdom'. "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (v. 19). There is probably no specific influence from Daniel in this pericope. Craig Blomberg thinks the statement "almost certainly is based on the identical metaphor in Isa. 22:22: 'I will place on his shoulder the key to the house of David; what he opens no one can shut, and what he shuts no one can open'."<sup>50</sup>

Conclusion (outside the term 'Son of Man'): no allusion.

**§159, 164, 262 Passion Predictions (Matt 17:22; Mark 8:31; Luke 9:22 et al.)**  
**§263 Must Give His Life as Ransom (Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 22:27)**  
**§331 Must Take Place (Matt 26:54)**

There are three rounds of passion predictions in all three Gospels. The first prediction is found in Matt 16:21, Mark 8:31, and Luke 9:22. The second is in Matt 17:22, Mark 9:31, and Luke 9:44. The third is in Matt 20:18-19, Mark 10:33-34, and Luke 18:31-33. In all occurrences (except Matt 16:21, where the narrator speaks) it is Jesus who gives the predictions about suffering, death, and resurrection—and always referring to the 'Son of Man'.

In another later pericope—Matt 20:28, Mark 10:45, and Luke 22:27—Jesus' death is described as something that "must happen" and will be a "ransom" for people. In Matt 26:54 we find the rhetorical question, "But how then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that it *must be so*?" The necessity of Jesus having to suffer and die seems clear.

Here is the question for us: Is a suffering 'Son of Man' a concept found in Daniel? Many do not think so, finding no suffering 'Son of Man' at all in Dan 7, or in any part of Daniel for that matter. What happened, they reason, was that Jesus rather combined the

---

<sup>50</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, "Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 55.

powerful and majestic figure of Dan 7 with the suffering servant of Isa 53. When Jesus described his future eschatological role, he borrowed mainly from Daniel. When he spoke of his suffering phase, he borrowed from Isaiah and other OT texts.

The word for 'suffer' in the Gospels (πάσχω) was used infrequently before the first century and is rare in the LXX. It is used in Amos 6:6 to translate  $\text{הִלָּח}$  (to become weak or ill or in pain), and occurs three times in Isa 53 (vv. 3, 4, 10).<sup>51</sup> The servant of Isaiah is explicitly said to suffer on behalf of the people (53:4-5), even be killed (53:8-1), which is similar to what Jesus said about himself. "The Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45).

Jésus employait l'expression "Fils de l'homme" dans deux contextes très précis: l'évocation des grandes scènes de la fin des temps, inspirée de la description de Daniel, et l'annonce de sa passion, le titre de "Fils de l'homme" assumant alors la figure du Serviteur souffrant d'Is., 53. L'expression est donc en parfaite situation en Marc, 8,31 et 8,38.<sup>52</sup>

In sum, Mark 8:31's prediction of suffering, while not inconsistent with Dan. 7, draws primarily on Isa. 53:4-10, Ps. 118:22, and probably Hos. 6:2.<sup>53</sup>

Mark has combined Isaianic and Danielic material here to speak of the vocation of the Son of Man to suffer and ransom many.<sup>54</sup>

We should certainly grant Jesus the freedom to combine scriptural images from different books that he saw applied to himself. The suffering servant of Isa 53 (with the rejected cornerstone of Ps 118) has likely contributed to Jesus' belief about his inescapable suffering and death.

---

<sup>51</sup>Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* (WUNT 88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 263-4.

<sup>52</sup>Jacques Dupont, *Les Béatitudes* (3 vols.; EBib; Bruges, Belgium: Abbaye de Saint-André, 1958-73), 1:241-2.

<sup>53</sup>Watts, "Mark," 177.

<sup>54</sup>Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 290.

Other scholars argue the opposite case, that there *is* a suffering servant in Dan 7—not an explicit suffering role of the 'Son of Man' in Dan 7, but an indirect connection through the extensive suffering of God's people in that chapter. This is often made by scholars who see the 'Son of Man' not as an individual but as a symbol of Israel. Since the 'Son of Man' then refers to the people of God, the 'Son of Man' logically is suffering in Dan 7 in all those verses where God's saints are persecuted. Let us take the time to listen to the full argument, here presented by Hooker:

The Son of Man can—and will—suffer when his rightful position and God's authority are denied: this is the situation in Dan. 7, where the "beasts" have revolted against God and have crushed Israel who, as Son of Man, should be ruling the earth with the authority granted by God. . . . If we now turn to the saying in Mark 8.31, and ask how the Son of man there can suffer, the answer will be the same: he can—and will—suffer, if men set themselves up against God and reject the claims of the one to whom he has given authority. . . . The rejection of Jesus by the authorities is described here as a future necessity but, in fact, it has already taken place; scribes and Pharisees have already refused to accept his claim to God-given authority; Pharisees and Herodians have already determined to kill him.<sup>55</sup>

As we saw above in the treatment of Dan 7,<sup>56</sup> the view that the 'Son of Man' in Dan 7 is a symbol of Israel is a forced and unlikely reading of the text. The 'Son of Man' has almost universally been read from antiquity to modern times as an individual person. There is no indication that Jesus ever took it as a corporate symbol either. He always attributes the term to one individual: himself.

Thus while God's people will suffer, it does not follow that the 'Son of Man' will have to do the same. There is certainly no suffering Ancient of Days in Dan 7, other than

---

<sup>55</sup>Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 108-9. So also Charles Kingsley Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson* (ed. Angus John B. Higgins; Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1959), 13-5; Christopher Stephen Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 1986), 373-4; John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1993), 513-4.

<sup>56</sup>Pp. 100-103.

perhaps on a sympathetic emotional level. Watts' comment is apt: "The wrinkle in this neat solution is that while the 'holy ones' suffer (7:21, 25) before gaining the Kingdom (7:22, 27), Dan. 7 speaks only of the exaltation of the 'Son of Man' (7:13-14)."<sup>57</sup>

Another more successful attempt to connect the suffering predictions with Daniel is made by Caragounis. We will take the time to listen to larger portions of his argument. He acknowledges allusions to the suffering servant in Isa 53, but argues that this chapter cannot account for all the phrases in the Synoptic passion predictions:

παρεδόθη and θάνατον are sufficient to connect the suffering sayings with Isa 53 and to bring the concept of the Servant into relation with that of the Son of Man. But at the same time it should be recognized that this text fails to account for the other important elements in the passion sayings. We are thus forced to conclude that though Isa 53 can explain some elements in the sufferings sayings, it cannot account adequately for the phraseology of these sayings.<sup>58</sup>

A significant amount of the language comes from Dan 2 and 7, Caragounis argues. One such phrase is 'δεῖ' or 'δεῖ γενέσθαι' ('must take place'). 'δεῖ γενέσθαι' occurs in the entire Greek Bible only in Daniel (the prophecy to Nebuchadnezzar: Dan 2:28, 29, 45), in Matt 26:54 (when Jesus relates that he must go to his death as prophesied in Scripture), in the eschatological discourse (about future events to take place: Matt 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 21:9), and in the book of Revelation (1:1; 4:1; 22:6). In other words, it is found only in the apocalyptic material of the Bible where divine revelation gives insight to what will with certainty take place. 'Δεῖ' by itself is found in other places in the LXX, but only in Daniel is it used in the sense of God's will for what must happen.

The Danielic δεῖ, originally denoting the necessity of God's will with regard to the occurrence of historical events demanded for the accomplishment of his purpose, becomes for Jesus the inexorable *must* of divine necessity in reference to his own role and place as Son of Man in that divine purpose. Here we reach bedrock. By means of this innovation, the traditional nature and function of the SM is widened to include

---

<sup>57</sup>Watts, "Mark," 175.

<sup>58</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 197.

that which according to Jesus' conviction is God's call to humiliation and suffering as the necessary preliminary to exaltation and glory. In this Danielic δέι, we have the key to Jesus' view of his mission expressed by the phrase δέι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.<sup>59</sup>

In another publication the same year, Jane Schaberg had arrived at the same conclusion as Caragounis. "The δέι may be an allusion to Dan 2.28,29 (LXX and Theodotian), 45 (Theodotian), where δέι signifies conformity with an apocalyptic eschatological regularity."<sup>60</sup> John Nolland and Adela Yarbro Collins likewise believe the necessity of Jesus' death is indebted to Daniel:

For Luke the necessity of Jesus' suffering (cf. 13:33; 17:25; 24:7; Acts 17:3) is the necessity to fulfill the divine will and purpose. The influence of the language of apocalyptic is probably present here [Luke 9:22] (cf. Dan 2:28 LXX).<sup>61</sup>

The use of the term δέι ("it was necessary," lit., "it is necessary") implies a theological interpretation of the events mentioned in [Mark 8] v. 31. Its usage here recalls Daniel's speech to Nebuchadnezzar [Dan 2:28].<sup>62</sup>

Let us return to Caragounis who has more in store. Another phrase he suggests can only be accounted for with Danielic influence is "into the hands of men." In the second prediction we read that "the Son of man will be delivered into the hands of men" ("υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων," Matt 17:22; Mark 9:31; Luke

---

<sup>59</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 198-9. See also idem, "Kingdom of God, Son of Man and Jesus' Self-Understanding: Part II," *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 235-6.

<sup>60</sup>Jane Schaberg, "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions," *NTS* 31 (1985): 208-22. So also NA<sup>27</sup> (margin). Bennett argues that while δέι in his view might not be a conscious allusion to the book of Daniel, Daniel had nevertheless made the word into a theologically loaded word communicating "God wills it," usually in a prophetic context: "It belongs specifically to apocalypticism . . . the things which 'must happen' are most often disastrous. The theological emphasis of this assertion is to strengthen the faithful in times of frightful suffering. . . . The reader is to understand that the sufferings of Jesus were a crucial part of the eschatological drama." W. J. Bennett, "'The Son of Man Must...'," *NovT* 17 (1975): 129.

<sup>61</sup>Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 465.

<sup>62</sup>Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 403.

9:44). In the third passion prediction, "the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death and hand him over to the Gentiles" ("ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται," Matt 20:18-19; Mark 10:33; not exact but similar in Luke 18:32). This is verbally parallel with Dan 7:25 LXX where the saints will be "given into the hand" of the little horn ("παραδοθήσεται πάντα εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ"). Caragounis explains:

Here we meet with an idea of παραδοθήσεται which is much closer than that in Isa. 53:12 to the παραδοθήσεται of the suffering sayings. In Isa 53:12 παρεδόθη is used of the Servant's being delivered up to death, whereas the suffering sayings demanded a being delivered up to the power of authorities. This is precisely what we find in Dan 7:25. The saints are delivered to the power of the beast: they are defeated (7:21) and decimated (7:25) by the little horn. Thus Dan 7:25 not only supplies a perfect parallel to the usage of παραδοθήσεται in the suffering sayings, which is absent from Isa 53, it also explains the phrases εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων . . . and τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.<sup>63</sup>

Another possible text that Caragounis does not mention, and it generally has not received as much attention as it probably should, is Dan 9:26-27. Here—right in the book of Daniel—is a prophecy about a Messiah who is going to be cut off or die: "An anointed one shall be cut off" (יִכָּרֵת מְשִׁיחַ, 9:26). Since we know that Dan 9 has Jesus' attention in the eschatological discourse in Mark 13par (see the next chapter),<sup>64</sup> it is worth pondering if it could have contributed along with Isa 53 to Jesus' idea about his passion. One Synoptic commentator who has pondered this possibility is Carrington:

Now Jesus certainly accepted the title of Messiah in [Mark] xiv. 62, and combined it with the symbolism of the Son of Man of Daniel vii.23, who comes with the clouds of heaven and receives the Kingdom from God; but it looks as if he also took into account the death of the Prince-Messiah in Daniel ix. 26, 27, since he made use of those verses in his apocalyptic.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 199.

<sup>64</sup>Pp. 152-220.

<sup>65</sup>Philip Carrington, *According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 183.



My own evaluation of all this is that allusions to Daniel in the passion predictions have been established. There is no direct portrayal of a suffering 'Son of Man' in Dan 7, and the 'Son of Man' is not a corporate symbol for the suffering people of God. Jesus rather found his mission of rejection and death from such Scriptural texts as Isa 53 and Ps 22, together with Dan 9, and combined them all with his role as the 'Son of Man' figure from Dan 7. What Jesus also found in Daniel was a sense of divine purpose of history, thus, the language he borrowed from Dan 2 that certain things *must take place*. And the language about suffering and being delivered up to the hands of anti-godly powers influenced the phrases about the 'Son of Man' being handed over to powers.

Conclusion: probable allusion.

#### Implication of Allusion

We have seen that Jesus in the Synoptics has a strong sense of mission (furthering the Kingdom of God) and of authority. He repeatedly alludes to the most majestic figure of the OT (who is not explicitly said to be Yahweh): the 'Son of Man' of Dan 7. We also see that Jesus understood this powerful mission and authority and exaltation to include suffering and laying aside his power and his life. Yes, suffering service is the way to establish God's rule on earth.

#### **§160 Coming with the Angels in Glory (Matt 16:27; Mark 8:38-9:1; Luke 9:26); §196 Acknowledge before the Angels (Matt 10:32; Luke 12:8-9)**

In Mark and Luke Jesus warns that "whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of man also be ashamed, when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26). In Matthew it is rendered "For the Son of man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay every man for what he has done" (Matt 16:27). Despite

the difficulty of the following verse (Matt 16:28), this verse seems clearly to refer to the parousia.

In a somewhat similar pericope in Luke Jesus says that "every one who acknowledges me before men, the Son of man also will acknowledge before the angels of God; but he who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God" (Luke 12:8-9; cf. Matt 10:32).

Regarding the first pericope (§160), coming with the glory of the father with the angels, the parallels with Dan 7 have been pointed out by many scholars.

The combination of the "coming of the Son of Man," the glory (Dan 7:14) of the Father (cf. "Ancient of Days," "Most High" [Dan 7:9, 13, 22, 25]), and the holy "angels" (cf. the hosts of Dan 7:10, and the "holy ones" of Dan. 7:22, 25, 27; cf. Zech 14:5) is generally agreed upon to point to Dan. 7.<sup>66</sup>

[Mark 8:38] clearly alludes to Dan 7:13.<sup>67</sup>

The latter formulation ['when he comes in the glory of his Father'] apparently refers to Dan 7:13 f.<sup>68</sup>

The influence of Dan 7.13-14 on both Mark 8.38 (and par.) and Mk 9.1 (and par.) is recognized by scholars.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup>Watts, "Mark," 184.

<sup>67</sup>Yarbro Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 98.

<sup>68</sup>Evald Lövestam, *Jesus and 'This Generation': A New Testament Study* (ConBNT; Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995), 56.

<sup>69</sup>A. D. A. Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy* (JSNTSup 122; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 92-3. Others who see an allusion to Daniel here: Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:674; France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 396, 637-8; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 375; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Black's New Testament Commentaries 2; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993), 210; Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 166; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 693-4; Jan Lembrecht, "Q-influence on Mark 8:34-9:1," in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus: Mémoire Joseph Coppens* (ed. Joël Delobel; BETL 59; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1982), 287; Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A*

The second pericope (§196), the 'Son of Man' acknowledging someone before the angels of God, appears to also describe the final judgment. Hooker, Caragounis, and Allison find this dependant on Daniel:

In both cases the scene is one of judgment and vindication, and in both cases the imagery appears to be derived from Dan. 7. . . . The fact that the Son of Man "comes" in glory points to the time when the judgment is pronounced in his favour and he assumes authority to judge others.<sup>70</sup>

Both sayings have one and the same theme: the confession of Jesus on earth as a condition for the SM's confession of his confessors before God and his angels at his exaltation. The connections with Dan 7:13f. are so obvious that it is unnecessary to belabour the point: the Son of Man, the Father (i.e., the Aged One), the presence of angels, the theme of judgment and of acknowledgment or rejection make these texts a clear and conscious echo of the contents of Dan 7:9-14,27.<sup>71</sup>

We must entertain the likelihood that Q 12:8-9, like other Jewish and Christian texts, alludes to Dan 7:13-14 and its context. Like Daniel 7, the Q saying (i) concerns the last judgment, (ii) has as its central figure the Son of man . . . , (iii) depicts this figure as being "before" the divine court, (iv) sets the stage with angels, and (v) speaks to a situation of persecution. There is also the supporting fact that the Markan parallel (8:38), with its combination of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἔλθῃ, and δόξῃ, certainly recalls Dan 7:13-14.<sup>72</sup>

This is one of the many certain allusions to Daniel in the Synoptics that few scholars dispute. Not only is the term 'Son of Man' taken from Dan 7. Several themes from that chapter are present.

Conclusion (in addition to the term 'Son of Man'): certain allusion.

---

*Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York: Orbis Books, 1988), 248-9; Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 485 (for Mark 8:38); C. Marvin Pate, *Luke* (Chicago: Moody, 1995), 209; Ronald A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 199.

<sup>70</sup>Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 119.

<sup>71</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 209.

<sup>72</sup>Dale C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 130-31. See also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:215; Humphrey Carpenter, *Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 62.

## Implication of Allusion

We saw in our first 'Son of Man' pericope in this chapter<sup>73</sup> that Jesus understood the power of the 'Son of Man' to include divine authority to forgive sins. As we saw in the parable of the harvest earlier<sup>74</sup> the 'Son of Man' had three sequential roles to play: "sow" the kingdom, ruling over an interim kingdom, and judging and punishing at the final judgment. It might be more than a coincidence that the allusions get stronger and the parallels more numerous with Daniel ch. 7 when Jesus zooms in on the role of the final judgment.

### **§255/313 Kingdom and Thrones (Matt 19:28; Luke 18:29-30; 22:28-30) §300 Judging from His Glorious Throne (Matt 25:31-46)**

The rest of the pericopes we will look at in this chapter are, for most scholars, quite obviously influenced by Daniel, and will be discussed rather briefly. In a majestic saying (§255) about the rewards of loyalty to him, Jesus evoked the imagery of thrones and judgment. "Truly, I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt 19:28). Just as Jesus has received a kingdom, he assigns it to his followers. "I confer a kingdom on you, just as my Father has conferred one on me, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Luke 22:29-30).

Although there are OT precedents for God judging from his throne (Ps 9:4-9) or putting someone on a throne (Job 36:7; Ps 132:11), even thrones in plural (Ps 122:5),<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup>Pp. 108-12.

<sup>74</sup>P. 120, see also pp. 157-8.

<sup>75</sup>Pao and Schnabel argue for Ps 122 as the primary allusion in Luke 22:30, with the possibility open that Dan 7 could also be in mind: "In [Luke] 22:30b, 'You will sit on

the strongest allusion here is to Dan 7, possibly with some direct or indirect influence from *I Enoch*.

We cannot exclude the possibility that Jesus knew this exegetical tradition on Dan 7:9 and alluded to it.<sup>76</sup>

There is no question that Luke 22:30 (//Matt 19:28) is based on Daniel 7 and Psalm 122.<sup>77</sup>

19:28 has almost certainly been influenced by Dan 7:9–27.<sup>78</sup>

The scene pictured in Matt 19:28 is reminiscent of Daniel 7, where God grants kingly power (*malkūtā*) to his people (Dan 7:14, 27).<sup>79</sup>

In another pericope (§300), unique to Matthew, is a parable about the last judgment where the 'Son of Man' on his throne (also called "the King," v. 34) will separate people like a shepherd separates his own sheep from the goats; some go to his right, some to his left. The parable is probably borrowing images from many OT books.<sup>80</sup>

---

thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' recalls the imagery of Israel's tribes and of thrones in Ps. 122:4-5: '... For there the thrones for judgment were set up, the thrones of the house of David.' ... Jesus' statement may also allude to Dan 7:9-18, a text that describes the bestowal of the kingdom upon the Son of Man and the 'saints of the Most High.' David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel, "Luke," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 384.

<sup>76</sup>Marius Reiser, *Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in Its Jewish Context* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 261. In the conclusion to his book Reiser is even more certain of an allusion to Daniel: "In the promise to the twelve there is a reference to the throne scene in Dan 7:9." Ibid., 309.

<sup>77</sup>Craig A. Evans, "The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24-30," in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983), 170.

<sup>78</sup>Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:56.

<sup>79</sup>Joel Marcus, "Entering into the Kingly Power of God," *JBL* 107 (1988): 671. Marcus also sees a parallel here to Obad 21. Other scholars who see influence here from Daniel include Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew* (NAC 22; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1992), 301; Nolland, *Matthew*, 799-800.

<sup>80</sup>See Blomberg, "Matthew," 87-90.

The opening scene—with the 'Son of Man', glory, angels, and throne—is certainly an allusion to Dan 7. "When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations" (Matt 25:31-32).

Daniel 7 is generally acknowledged to be a source for this image of the Son of Man upon the throne; however in Daniel 7, while thrones are mentioned, and while the court is said to be sitting in judgment, neither the one like a son of man nor the court is said explicitly to be seated on thrones. Only the Ancient of Days takes a seat on his throne. On the other hand, *1 En.* 69:27-29 does explicitly portray the Son of Man as sitting upon a throne, and furthermore, the throne is said to be the throne of glory.<sup>81</sup>

The most striking echo of Old Testament theophany is in the frequent allusion to Daniel's vision of the judgment scene where the 'one like a son of man' appears (Dan 7:9-14). . . . Jesus, the Son of Man, has assumed the sovereignty predicted for him in Daniel 7:14, and is seen as occupying the very throne of God the judge.<sup>82</sup>

We clearly have an echo of the thrones of Dan 7:9, the appearance of the "son of man" in Dan 7:13, and submission of the nations in Dan 7:14.<sup>83</sup>

An allusion to Dan 7:13-14 seems likely.<sup>84</sup>

The two most significant indices to Jesus' keen awareness of the great apocalyptic scene of Daniel 7 are, first, his references to the thrones for the court of judgment (Dan 7:9-10) in Matt 19:28 = Luke 22:29 and, second, the "little flock" saying in Luke 12:32, where the motif of transferring to the disciples a share in royal dominion is derived from Dan 7:27.<sup>85</sup>

Conclusion: certain allusion.

---

<sup>81</sup>Walck, "The Son of Man in Matthew and the *Similitudes of Enoch*," 287.

<sup>82</sup>Richard T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 311. See also idem, *Gospel of Matthew*, 396, 742-3.

<sup>83</sup>Craig A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 522.

<sup>84</sup>Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 138. See also Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:433.

<sup>85</sup>Ben F. Meyer, "Appointed Deed, Appointed Doer: Jesus and the Scriptures," in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 172. Others who see an allusion to Daniel here: Yarbrow Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 97; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on*

**§292 Coming in the Clouds with Power (Matt 24:30-31;  
Mark 13:26-27; Luke 21:27)**

We will look more closely at the Eschatological discourse (Matt 24; Mark 13; Luke 21) in the next chapter. "And then they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then he will send out the angels, and gather his elect from the four winds, from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven" (Mark 13:26-27). Again influence from Daniel is evident, possibly with some added details (gathering from the four winds) from Zechariah or the tradition behind *Similitudes*. NA<sup>27</sup> (margin) considers this (and the next pericope §332) as *quotes* from Dan 7. Support in scholarship for Danielic influence here is universal. Here are a few examples:

The "Son of Man" saying itself is clearly based on Dan. 7,13, though it is by no means a direct quotation.<sup>86</sup>

When false messiahs have been proclaimed, the son of man will appear on clouds, as predicted in Dan 7:13-14, but coming from heaven, with the power and glory he has received there (Dan 7:14). Although the judicial function described in *1 Enoch* is not explicit, the influence of that tradition is suggested by two elements not found in Daniel 7. Certain unnamed persons "will see" the son of man, who will send angels to gather "the chosen ones" (cf. *1 Enoch* 51; 61:2-5; 62:14-15).<sup>87</sup>

The first part of the statement is universally understood to be a close allusion to Dan. 7:13-14, and the second part to be a combined allusion to Zech 2:6 . . . and Deut 30:4.<sup>88</sup>

---

*the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 818; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," 6:142; Nolland, *Matthew*, 1024-34; Pate, *Luke*, 427; Martin Petzoldt, *Gleichnisse Jesu und christliche Dogmatik* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983), 73; Christopher Rowland, "The Book of Daniel and the Radical Critique of Empire: An Essay in Apocalyptic Hermeneutics," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 462; Frederick A. Tatford, *Daniel and His Prophecy: Studies in the Prophecy of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Klock, 1980), 114.

<sup>86</sup>Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 158. See also idem, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 319.

<sup>87</sup>Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," 6:143.

<sup>88</sup>Watts, "Mark," 227.

The wording has been derived from Dan 7,13.<sup>89</sup>

Unzweifelhaft liegt in zweiten Teil des Satzes eine Anspielung auf Dan.7,13f vor.<sup>90</sup>

The apocalyptic Son of Man saying in 13:26 is a clear allusion to and interpretation of Dan 7:13.<sup>91</sup>

Conclusion: certain allusion.

---

<sup>89</sup>Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2004), 220.

<sup>90</sup>Matthias Kreplin, *Das Selbstverständnis Jesu: Hermeneutische und christologische Reflexion—Historisch-kritische Analyse* (WUNT 141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 165.

<sup>91</sup>Yarbro Collins, "Influence of Daniel," 98. Other scholars who see an allusion to Daniel here include William F. Albright and Christopher S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 26; New York: Doubleday, 1971), 298; Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), 258-9; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark* (New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 288, 298; Roberto Badenas, "'The Sign of the Son of Man in Heaven' (Matthew 24:30): An Adventist Perspective," in *Christ, Salvation, and the Eschaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle* (ed. Jiří Moskala et al.; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2009), 317; Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981), 471; Blomberg, "Matthew," 88-9; Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 132-7; John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (StPB 8; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1965), 242, 247-9; Robert G. Bratcher, ed., *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (UBS Technical Helps Series; New York: United Bible Societies, 1987), 10, 17, 23; Cilliers Breytenbach, "Das Markusevangelium, Psalm 110,1 und 118,22f: Folgetext und Prätext," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997), 212; Steven L. Bridge, *'Where the Eagles Are Gathered': The Deliverance of the Elect in Lukan Eschatology* (JSNTSup 240; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 134; Edwin K. Broadhead, "Reconfiguring Jesus: The Son of Man in Markan Perspective," in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, Volume 1* (ed. Thomas R. Hatina; LNTS 304; London: T & T Clark, 2006), 19; James A. Brooks, *Mark* (NAC 23; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1991), 215; Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 210-12; Carrington, *According to Mark*, 283; Carpenter, *Jesus*, 62; Donald A. Carson, "Matthew," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelin; 12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 8:212, 505-6; Warren Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives* (CBQMS 30; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1998), 184; Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 615; Hans Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1969), 134; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:361-2; E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (WUNT 54; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991), 108; James R.



---

Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 403; Evans, "Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke's Scriptural Apologetic," in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 181; Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979), 131; France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 396-8, 817-8, 923-4; Leonhard Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. John E. Alsup; 2 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 1:183; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 740; Ezra P. Gould, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St Mark* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1922), 251; Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1967), 52-4; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14-28* (WBC 33B; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1995), 710; Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Interpretation; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1993), 279-80; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP 1; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 338; John F. Hart, "A Chronology of Matthew 24:1-44" (Th.D. diss.; Grace Theological Seminary, 1986), 187; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; New York: Doubleday, 1977), 83; Thomas R. Hatina, *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative* (JSNTSup 232; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 331, 364; John Paul Heil, *The Gospel of Mark as Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York: Paulist, 1992), 265-6; Hurtado, *Mark*, 221; Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (New York: Harper, 1960), 245; Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 189-96; William L. Lane, *Gospel according to Mark* (NICNT 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 474-6; LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies*, 35-6; Walter L. Liefeld, "Luke," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelin; 12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 8:1022; Judith Lieu, *The Gospel of Luke* (Peterborough, UK: Epworth, 1997), 171; Tremper Longman, *Daniel* (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 198; Gerd Lüdemann, *Jesus after Two Thousand Years: What He Really Said and Did* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus, 2001), 91; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21-28* (Hermeneia; trans. James E. Crouch; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 201; Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (ed. John Riches; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982), 10; Elliot C. Maloney, *Jesus' Urgent Message for Today: The Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 121, 125; T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1949), 241; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis*, 164; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 266; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 304; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 610; Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 326; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Nolland, *Matthew*, 984-5; Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 378; Pate, *Luke*, 407-8; Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 288; Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper, 1967), 173, 184-5; Harold Riley, *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1989), 157; Karl Hermann Schelkle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (4 vols.; KBANT; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1973), 2:204; Eduard Schweizer, "The Son of Man Again," *NTS* 9 (1963): 257; Michael B. Shepherd, "Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man," *WTJ* 68 (2006): 107-8; Stein, *Luke*, 525; Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 178-9, 212-4; Tatford, *Daniel*, 114, 219;

### **§332 Sitting at the Right Hand of Power (Matt 26:64; Mark 14:62)**

In his trial before the Sanhedrin, the high priest asks Jesus if he considered himself to be the Messiah. In Matthew and Mark he clearly answers positively. "The high priest asked him, 'Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?' And Jesus said, 'I am; and you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven'" (Mark 14:61-62).

There appears to be two OT texts used here in Matthew and Mark in a conflated allusion, or almost quotation.<sup>92</sup> They are Dan 7:13 and Ps 110:1. The Psalms reads: "The LORD says to my lord: Sit at my right hand, till I make your enemies your footstool" (Ps 110:1). Luke 22:69 however alludes only to Ps 110 and not Daniel.

Once again scholarship is in universal agreement on the influence from Daniel on Matthew and Mark here.

Ps 110:1 is embedded within the quotation from Daniel. The reason for this appears to be that the 'lord' of Ps 110:1 was too indefinite a term, and hence was substituted by SM of Dan 7:13.<sup>93</sup>

In combining Dan. 7 and Ps. 110, Mark's Jesus reflects his consistently messianic Son of Man self-understanding.<sup>94</sup>

Daniel 7:13 is cited in Mark 14:62.<sup>95</sup>

---

Nicholas H. Taylor, "Interpretation of Scripture as an Indicator of Socio-Historical Context: The case of the Eschatological Discourses in Mark and Q," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997), 465; Crawford Howell Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1884), 66.

<sup>92</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> (margin) considers this a *quote* from Dan 7. So does Walck: "quoting Dan 7:13 and Ps 110:1." Walck, "The Son of Man," 327.

<sup>93</sup>Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 203.

<sup>94</sup>Watts, "Mark," 234.

<sup>95</sup>Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis*, 164.

The reference to "the Son of Man . . . coming on the clouds of heaven" is drawn almost verbatim from Dan 7:13.<sup>96</sup>

[Mark 14:62 is] the closest parallel in the gospel to Dan. 7.13, and so provides the strongest support for the belief that the New Testament use of the term "Son of man" is derived primarily from that chapter.<sup>97</sup>

Conclusion: certain allusion.

---

<sup>96</sup>Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 800.

<sup>97</sup>Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 163. Further support for Danielic allusion here includes Richard Bauckham, "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?" *JSNT* 23 (1985): 31; George Raymond Beasley-Murray, "The Kingdom of God and Christology in the Gospels," in *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 32; Ernest Best, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology* (2nd ed.; SNTSMS 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 87; Blomberg, "Matthew," 93-5; Joseph Bonsirven, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. S. Tye; London: Burns & Oates, 1963), 15; Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 290-91; Bratcher, *Old Testament Quotations*, 11, 17; Robert G. Bratcher and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1961), 465-6; Breytenbach, "Das Markusevangelium," 213; Edwin K. Broadhead, *Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 118; Brooks, *Mark*, 243; Randall Buth, "A More Complete Semitic Background for *bar-anas*, 'Son of Man'," in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 154; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 187-8; Carson, "Matthew," 212-3, 555; R. Alan Cole, *Mark: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 2; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 313; Yarbrow Collins, *Mark*, 705; Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, 135; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:520; Charles Harold Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1950), 91; Sharyn E. Dowd, *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel* (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2000), 139, 154; James D. G. Dunn, "'Are You the Messiah?' Is the Crux of Mark 14:61-62 Resolvable?" in *The Historical Jesus: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies* (ed. Craig A. Evans; 4 vols.; London: Routledge, 2004), 3:279-81; Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 447; E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 262-3; Peter F. Ellis, *Matthew: His Mind and His Message* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1974), 96; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 451; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1981), 1462; France, *Gospel of Matthew*, 396, 1028; David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel* (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 257; Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 587-8; Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, 1:183; Hartman and di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 219; Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 332, 368; Gould, *Mark*, 279; Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 362; Larry W. Hurtado, *Mark* (NIBCNT 2; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989), 254; Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (New York: Harper, 1960), 245; Carl R. Kazmierski, *Jesus, the Son of God*

## Implication of Allusions

Towards the end of the Synoptic Gospels we encountered a large number of eschatological Judgment-scene 'Son of Man' sayings that had strong ties to Daniel outside the term 'Son of Man' itself. Much imagery in Dan 7 was alluded to and almost quoted:

When the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations.

And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory.

---

(Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1979), 171; Kreplin, *Das Selbstverständnis Jesu*, 167; Lane, *Mark*, 537; Joachim Lange, *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Mattäus* (Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1973), 232-3; Lieu, *The Gospel of Luke*, 189; Dieter Lührmann, "Markus 14.55-64: Christologie und Zerstörung des Tempels im Markusevangelium," *NTS* 27 (1980-81): 463; Ulrich Luz, "The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ," *JSNT* 48 (1992): 17; Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 220, 222-3; Robert H. Mounce, *Matthew* (NIBCNT; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 247; Nickelsburg, "Son of Man," 143; Nolland, *Matthew*, 1128, 1132; idem, *Luke 18:35-24:53* (WBC 35C; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1993), 1109; Pate, *Luke*, 439; Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, 173; Alfred A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke* (ICC; London: T & T Clark, 1896), 518-9; Robert D. Rowe, *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background in Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms* (AGJU 50; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 132, 306; Rowland, "Daniel and the Radical Critique of Empire," 462; Joseph N. Sanders, *The Foundations of the Christian Faith: A Study of the Teaching of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Criticism* (London: A & C Black, 1950), 90; Jane Schaberg, *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b* (SBLDS 61; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 270-77; idem, "Mark 14.62: Early Christian Merkabah Imagery?" in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament* (ed. Joel Marcus and J. Louis Martyn; JSNTSup 24; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989); Schelkle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2:204; Schweizer, "The Son of Man Again," 257; Shepherd, "Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man," 109-10; Donald Senior, "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 31; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997), 110; Frank Stagg, *New Testament Theology* (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1962), 311; Stein, *Luke*, 570; Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (ANTC; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1996), 307-8; Walter W. Wessel, "Mark," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelein; 12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 8:769; Witherington, *Mark*, 385; Arie W. Zwiep, *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology* (NovTSup 87; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 148.

And then he will send out the angels, and gather his elect.

You will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.

No one can credibly argue that these sayings as we find them in the Gospel narratives are not strongly influenced by Dan 7. And no one does either, to my knowledge. The phrase 'Son of Man' cannot mean 'any human being' here. These verses are obviously allusions to (or even quotations of) Dan 7:13-14.

### **Meaning of 'Son of Man' in the Synoptics**

Let us go back to where we started this chapter. Understanding the intended reference and meaning of the term 'Son of Man' has been extensively debated in NT scholarship, possibly more than any other single issue in the Gospels. Unfortunately a lot of it has failed to appreciate how human language works.

#### **Hermeneutical Problems**

James Barr once found it necessary to remind biblical scholars that individual words are always found within a context that shapes and narrows the meaning of that word.<sup>98</sup> Two of his complaints are worth mentioning.

While a single word can have a range of potential meanings, inside a specific sentence and context the possible meanings are far fewer. Unless the author was deliberately being ambiguous, only a single meaning is the correct one in that sentence. Reading multiple *potential* meanings of a word into a sentence, when the word was never meant to be ambiguous, is an 'illegitimate totality transfer'.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup>James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

<sup>99</sup>"The error that arises, when the 'meaning' of a word (understood as the total series of relations in which it is used in the literature) is read into a particular case as its sense and implication there, may be called 'illegitimate totality transfer'." Ibid., 218.

Barr further lamented an overemphasis on the historical meaning of a word (etymology). Knowing the literal or historical or original meaning of a word is useful but should never be the final judge of the meaning of a word in a specific case. All words occur in a context that shapes the meaning.<sup>100</sup>

Even though Barr's monograph contained little more than 'common sense' about how human language works, it was a wake-up call for many biblical scholars. Kittel's lexicographical work (*TDNT*) was particularly severely criticized, and not a few defenses and counterattacks against Barr took place from the criticized. When the dust had settled and scholars got a chance to think it over, Barr's insights have been more or less accepted.

I believe posterity will come to judge much of the 'Son of Man' discussion as equally eccentric and unsound. Many of the 'son of man as a human being' proponents have produced arguments and interpretations at odds with the nature and function of human language. Few of us in the 'Daniel' camp (or 'Christological term' camp) deny that the phrase 'a son of man' could and did in many cases (incl. Ezek) have the meaning of 'a human being', 'a human one'. No harm is done admitting that this is the original, literal, or foundational meaning of the phrase.

The problem arises when scholars from the 'human being' school claim that the literal meaning of the phrase is the *only* possible one. Lexicography becomes the master and not the servant, so to speak. Many creative but unsound interpretations have been put forth twisting and forcing Jesus' sayings. Just like we should not read the entire scene of

---

<sup>100</sup>"It is just this assumption of authority which is most damaging where etymological associations are allowed to do the work in interpretation that should be done by semantics on the basis of actual usage." Ibid., 159.

judgment and glory into every 'Son of Man' sentence from Jesus, so equally should we refrain from squeezing a theology of humility and humanity into all the pericopes.

I will show a few examples from Maurice Casey and Walter Wink where they commit these mistakes. First, however, allow me to illustrate with a rather prolonged modern fictional story.

### Modern Illustration

Since scholarship has debated whether the phrase 'Son of Man' in the Synoptic Gospels was meant *literally* ('a human being') or had received meaning through widespread familiarity with the *symbol* of the 'Son of Man' figure in the prophecies of Dan 7 and become a title (signifying something like 'the powerful and celestial one'), let us imagine an analogous modern-day debate. Let us say there was a leader of a local criminal gang in Chicago today who, the rumor said, had taken the nickname 'Scarface'. Journalists in the *Chicago Tribune* began discussing what the meaning of this could be. A little googling quickly revealed that Al Capone had been known by this nickname in the 1930s, since his face was marked from an unsuccessful knife fight. Did our gang leader aspire to be as powerful and notorious as Al Capone? Most journalists around the table agreed that, if the phrase meant anything, it must be a reference back to the notorious figure of the 1930s. They were in Chicago, after all.

Just when this common-sense understanding was about to reach consensus, however, a young journalist wanted to display some critical thinking: "'Scarface' could not possibly allude to Al Capone, because 'scarface' does not mean 'mafia boss'. It only means 'the ugly one with a scarred face'. Look right here in Webster's dictionary! If the gang leader today was called 'Jack the Ripper', *then* it could imply power and strength and cruelty. 'Scarface' implies no such thing," said the young sharp mind.

The discussion took off. "Let us do a survey of how many people in Chicago associate 'Scarface' with 'powerful mafia boss' or 'Al Capone'," said a senior staff member. "If 'Scarface' is not a well-known term, then we can dismiss any allusions to Capone."

"But it is right here in Google," said another. "Maybe not everyone in Chicago knows that Al Capone had that nickname, but probably enough did so that both rivals and followers got the message that our drug lord had big plans!"

During the next hour of heated discussion Al Capone made both an exit and re-entry into the debate. Some believed the issue was insoluble, while others believed they had the final solution. The truth of it is, of course, that neither the dictionary meaning of a 'scarred face' or the level of popularity the phrase had among Chicagoans would determine what our gang leader meant by the phrase. The human mind is a creative thing. If the gang leader had wanted to be thought of as an Al Capone-size criminal, then the freedom to make that association was his.

It turned out, in our fictional story, that the gang leader *had* made the connection to Al Capone on several occasions. "Just you wait, guys," he had said. "One day you will see me, Capone, rule this city! Scarface will make you guys rich!"

For most of us this piece of information is enough to settle it. A couple of connections made between 'Scarface' and 'Capone', and we all know that this guy had big plans and wanted to remind us of Al Capone.

Some still refused to see it. "He does not evoke Al Capone *all* the time! He often talks about himself as 'scarface' without mentioning Capone or the 30s! He is heard saying 'Scarface is gonna play some Playstation now,' so he cannot possibly imply Al Capone or 'powerful' with the phrase 'scarface'. He simply means that he is weak and ugly. Unless he says 'Al Capone' *every* time he says 'scarface', then we must treat the expression as a sign of humility and ugliness, not as powerfulness like Capone."



That is not how human language works, however. 'Scarface' does not only have to mean 'a scarred face', which is the literal meaning. It *can* be a symbol that communicates 'I am powerful as Al Capone'. And our gang leader does not have to talk about Al Capone on every occasion for us to get that point. He is free to substitute 'Scarface' for the first person pronoun as often as he wants and use it in everyday language. "Scarface will go shopping now." "Scarface wants to recruit new dealers now." "Scarface is gonna visit mamma now." The frequent use of the phrase in all kinds of criminal or not so criminal behavior does not remove the fact that he started using the phrase as an imitation of Chicago's notorious outlaw from the 1930s.

Here is the point: *Only* if our gang leader *never* made the connection between 'Scarface' and 'Al Capone' can the phrase keep its literal meaning. If the gang leader just once says, "I am Scarface, the Al Capone of Chicago's underworld," then that determines or colors all the rest of the times he calls himself 'Scarface'. From that point onwards, we know that he does not mean "I have an ugly, scarred face" or "I've been in a knife fight and lost," but that he means "I'm the powerful one." Even phrases like "Scarface is tired" or "Scarface is ugly" now means "I am the mafia lord of Chicago, but I'm tired now" and "I am the mafia lord in town, and I look ugly." It never means *only* "I have a scarred face."

This is where so much of modern scholarship has gone wrong on the issue of the 'Son of Man'. To demand that Jesus must talk about power and judgment and glory every time he uses the phrase in order for us to know that he got the phrase from Dan 7, is a logical fallacy akin to those Barr criticized. If Jesus wanted to convey that he was the prophetic fulfillment of the 'Son of Man' in Dan 7, or that he had characteristics or functions like that figure from Daniel, then Jesus must be allowed to hold that position without requiring him to evoke all of Dan 7 every time he says 'Son of Man'. Jesus must

be allowed the creativity of taking a prophetic symbol from his Scriptures and applying it to himself as a nickname or title,<sup>101</sup> whether or not he invokes the entire glorious judgment scene from Daniel every time. It is enough that Dan 7 is evoked a couple of times for us to know that Daniel is where he got his phrase, and that power, glory, and judgment are *part* of how he sees his own mission.

This is precisely what the Synoptic Jesus does. As we have seen in this chapter, the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels alludes to and even quotes the celestial scene in Dan 7 on several occasions, with himself as the obvious referent of the 'Son of Man'. And he extends the use of the phrase about himself into more mundane and humble situations than judgment and glory.

The phrase "Scarface is going shopping now," said by someone who had earlier given a speech about himself as the new Scarface and Capone of Chicago, communicates more of his self-identity and goals than the shorter phrase "*I* am going shopping now," yet it communicates less than an outright "I am Al Capone, I am going to rule this city, but right now I need to do some shopping." The message communicated is somewhere between these two. It is as if the use of 'Scarface' never puts Al Capone squarely on the table (except when he talks about Capone outright), yet Capone never completely leaves the room either. Speaker and audience might not consciously think of Al Capone every time. The use of the phrase becomes a habit. The primary function of the phrase is that of

---

<sup>101</sup>Contra Leivestad who allows modern scholars the creative powers to make 'Son of Man' a title derived from the figure in Dan 7, but finds it impossible that Jesus or the Gospel writers could have done so: "I am quite convinced today that the apocalyptic Son of man title is a modern invention. A Jewish Son of man title was completely unknown to Jesus and the primitive church." Ragnar Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *NTS* 18 (1972): 244. Whether or not it was already a recognized title in first-century Judaism is not the point here. Excluding even the possibility that Jesus could be creative and used it as a title for himself is methodologically unsound.

a first-person pronoun. Yet the connotation and undertone are always there for both speaker and audience.

For literary scholars and exegetes (who try to interpret the literary works Matthew, Mark, and Luke), the apocalyptic 'Son of Man' passages, where the Synoptic Jesus invokes the character of Dan 7, color and modify what the phrase 'Son of Man' means in all the other passages as well. 'Son of Man' means 'Jesus' or 'I', with a celestial image of power and judgment not always at the forefront, but never completely absent. Once 'Son of Man' is used as a nickname pointing to the prophecies of Daniel, the term inside the narrative world of a Gospel can no longer mean just 'a human'.

For historians (who try to reconstruct what the historical Jesus said and meant) the implication is likewise that unless one has already (for other reasons) judged *all* the 'Son of Man' sayings with echoes to Daniel as inauthentic, then 'Son of Man' is never just 'a human one'. Just one authentic allusion to Daniel is enough to shift the meaning of the phrase from the literal 'a human one' to implications (sometimes subtle, sometimes overt) of 'the powerful one'. Howard Marshall expresses it well: "My conclusion, then, is that Jesus could and did use the phrase **בֶּר אִנְשׁ (א)** to refer to himself as the Danielic Son of man but in such a way that the phrase could also function as a form of self-reference that would not necessarily carry this full connotation every time he used it and to all his hearers."<sup>102</sup>

What if, hypothetically speaking, all the 'Son of Man' sayings with ties to Daniel were removed as inauthentic, and we assumed that the historical Jesus used the phrase *only* in its literal sense of 'a human being'? That would be the equivalent of our Chicago

---

<sup>102</sup>I. Howard Marshall, "The Synoptic 'Son of Man' Sayings in the Light of Linguistic Study," in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry* (ed. Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva; JSNTSup 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 94.

gang leader using the phrase 'scarface' about himself without knowing that it had been a nickname for his predecessor Capone. Our crime boss might have chosen the phrase because he also literally had an ugly and scarred face.

In this scenario, of course, the sentence "Scarface is going shopping" does not communicate "I am the new Al Capone of Chicago, and now I am going shopping." It simply conveys, "I, the ugly-face, am now going shopping." The existence or non-existence of an Al Capone speech changes the *connotation* of the word 'Scarface' from 'one achieving power like Capone', to 'this face has scars'. The message which the gang leader communicates about himself changes.

What does not change is the *reference* of the word 'scarface', which would still be our gang leader whenever he used the word about himself. Here many Gospel scholars err again. We cannot make a universal theology of humility or ugliness out of our gangster's use of 'scarface'. "Scarface is going shopping" does not mean that the gang leader believes all ugly people or scar-faced humans should do a lot of shopping, or that shopping would make you scar-faced. That message would only be possible if the gang leader used the phrase 'scarface' not about himself but about a larger group, like his gang members or all Chicagoans, or all humans.

If Jesus said "a human one must suffer" or "a human one has no place to lay his head for the night," this could only be a universal speech about the lot of all humans as long as Jesus used 'Son of Man' to refer to all human beings and did not use it as a term about himself. We cannot have it both ways. If 'the human one' is a nickname Jesus used about himself, then all the sayings about 'the human one' refer to him. We cannot interpret him to say "all humans must do this or that," no less than we can read "all scar-faced people must go shopping" if "scarface is going shopping now" meant "I am going shopping, I who call myself the scarfaced one."

To make Jesus' sayings about 'the human one' refer to all human beings, we need another factor in place: all self-referring uses of 'Son of Man' must also be removed as inauthentic (at which point we are soon out of Gospel material to reconstruct any Jesus from). Unless Jesus *explicitly* includes other people—his disciples, humanity in general—as subject of his statements, we should not automatically assume that Jesus expects all humans to do all the things and be all the things he thought he should do and be.

Let us look at a few examples of these mistakes in the scholarly literature.

### Examples of Misuse

In his definitive treatment of the 'Son of Man' issue, Maurice Casey acknowledges that many of the Synoptic 'Son of Man' sayings are indeed allusions or quotes from Dan 7, including "obvious gospel texts such as Mt. 24.30 and 26.64."<sup>103</sup> He understands that many scholars have had "no difficulty in showing that some Son of man sayings in the Gospels are dependent on Dan. 7.13, for some of them really are. . . . For example . . . Mk 13.26//Mt. 24.30, where the use of Dan. 7.13 is indeed obvious."<sup>104</sup>

Conveniently enough, all these 'Son of Man' sayings influenced by Daniel are deemed inauthentic by Casey, giving him the license to interpret all the other uses of the phrase in the Gospels without considerations of the use in Daniel. Each saying should be treated on its own as if in a vacuum from the others, he believes. The term 'Son of Man' should be read only in its literal sense (in Aramaic). He can now turn the table on the scholars who look to Dan 7 as a source of significance, and chastise them for neglecting the literal sense of the phrase. "The downplaying of this Aramaic expression has

---

<sup>103</sup>Maurice Casey, *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem* (LNTS 343; London: T & T Clark, 2007), 17.

<sup>104</sup>*Ibid.*, 16.

remained a feature of interpreters who focus on Dan. 7.13 for their interpretation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου."<sup>105</sup> For Casey, the literal sense of the phrase is the only valid meaning whenever a full allusion to the judgment of Dan. 7 is not present (in which case the saying would be inauthentic anyway).

The 'benefit' of encountering each 'Son of Man' saying with a *tabula rasa* is the freedom it gives to interpret Jesus' exhortations rather creatively. Few NT scholars today are as knowledgeable about the literature and as proficient in the relevant original languages as Casey. Unfortunately, his hermeneutical methodology and understanding of how language functions are not as impressive. Two examples will suffice.

#### **Mark 10:45**

For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (Mark 10:45 RSV)

What is more, a/the son of man does not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life/soul as a ransom for many. (Mark 10:45 Casey's trans.)<sup>106</sup>

Since there is no allusion to the celestial judgment in power and glory of Dan 7 here, Casey treats the 'Son of Man' expression in this pericope in its literal sense of 'a human being'. He believes Jesus used the phrase to refer to himself, but without any connotations of the Danielic figure. Removed from its setting in the Gospels, what does this saying mean on its own for Casey? The saying says that Jesus thought he had to serve and die for others because he was a human being. But that is not all. Since all the disciples likewise are human beings, they should also expect to give their lives as a ransom for many.

---

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., 13.

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., 132.

Casey exegetes the verse: "The general level of meaning of the term בר (א)נש(א) further reinforces Jesus' assertion that they will share his fate, and it is clear that death is included. The general level of meaning [of 'a son of man'] is also sufficiently loose to include the other members of the twelve."<sup>107</sup>

This is an error akin to Barr's 'illegitimate totality transfer'. We cannot have it both ways in one and the same sentence. Unless the statement is spoken as a deliberate ambiguity (which Casey never argues for), then 'a son of man must serve and die' must either refer to Jesus, or it must refer to all human beings. We cannot say that the phrase "idiomatically refers primarily to the speaker [Jesus]"<sup>108</sup> and then sermonize the statement into a general call from Jesus to all human beings to suffer and die for others.

The illegitimacy of this approach is even clearer in the next example.

#### **Matthew 8:20; Luke 9:58**

Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head. (Matt 8:18 RSV)

Jackals have holes and the birds of heaven/the sky have roosts, and a (/the son of) man has nowhere to lay his head. (Matt 8:18 Casey)<sup>109</sup>

This is another 'Son of Man' saying without a full judgment scene of Dan 7, so Casey again feels free to interpret the phrase only in its literal sense of 'a human being'. At one point Casey concedes that the reference of the phrase is Jesus. "Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου often refers to Jesus alone. It can be so read here, and in that case the general meaning ['all of humanity' or 'any human being'] is lost."<sup>110</sup> This does not deter Casey

---

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., 134.

<sup>108</sup>Ibid.

<sup>109</sup>Ibid., 168.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., 178.

from having it both ways. "As often, *בר (א)נש (א)* is potentially problematic because it has a general level of meaning, referring to the scribe and the disciples, as well as a specific reference to Jesus."<sup>111</sup> Yes, without a context the term can have these two different meanings or references (and many more). In a specific saying, however, it cannot have all of the meanings at the same time. Thus Casey's final interpretation of the saying is hermeneutically dubious:

On the verge of a migratory phase of his ministry, Jesus was confronted with a potential disciple who promised to follow him wherever he went. Jesus responded with a general statement comparing the lot of human beings in such conditions, and therefore particularly the situation of himself and his disciples, including the scribe if he joined them, with that of jackals/foxes and birds.<sup>112</sup>

Walter Wink does the same 'illegitimate totality transfer' by importing into a specific sentence all the possible meanings which the phrase 'a son of man' ('the Human Being') can have if the phrase was without a literary context.

Jesus neither identifies with nor dissociates himself from the Human Being here. He can speak as if the Human Being were he, as if it were other than he, as if it included his disciples, or as if it included this prospective disciple. The title demands as much of them as it does of him. Here again we see indications that the Human Being could denote Jesus and, at the same time, have a collective meaning that took in those following Jesus' way.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup>Ibid., 177.

<sup>112</sup>Ibid. Notice how Casey must insert the modification "in such conditions" for his interpretation even to make sense. He knows full well that if "a son of man" in this saying has the meaning of "any human being," then the entire statement becomes nonsense. Jesus could hardly say it was the lot of humanity in general to live without shelter, worse off than animals.

<sup>113</sup>Wink, *Human Being*, 82. Wink's application of Jesus' saying further illustrates what can happen when a sentence is allowed to be detached from its literary context. Not since Bultmann have we heard Jesus speak as eloquently as a modern existentialist philosopher: "Insofar as Jesus, and others, live the existential uncertainty of the Human Being, they have incarnated it. Such incarnation can be the realization that we can live out of an interior center, secure yet flexible, capable of enduring tension, with a tolerance for ambiguity, anxiety, and conflict, traveling like turtles with our homes on our backs." Ibid.



It appears that biblical scholarship could use another stern lecture from the late James Barr.

In the next two chapters we will continue the evaluation of probable use and influence of Daniel in the Gospels along two lines. Chapter 4 looks at Jesus' timetable for the future, derived significantly as we will see from his close reading of Dan 7 and 9. Chapter 5 applies our cumulative findings so far to the issue of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God. As is well established and easily seen from the Gospel texts, the Kingdom of God was Jesus' own preferred meta-narrative and paradigm for his identity and mission. Not only did Jesus' preferred term for himself, the 'Son of Man', originate in Daniel, but the Synoptic Jesus drew liberally from Daniel for his eschatological timetable and for his kingdom-theology as well.

## CHAPTER IV

### ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

The time has now come to look at the Olivet Discourse—Matt 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21. This discourse about events to come is generally acknowledged to be full of references and allusions to the book of Daniel. Daniel is even mentioned explicitly in Matthew's version (24:15).

Lars Hartman has been criticized for calling the Discourse a 'midrash' or explicit exposition of Daniel.<sup>1</sup> I believe Hartman is closer to the truth than is generally recognized, although I interpret the meaning of specific elements of Daniel and the Synoptic Discourse differently than he does. Just like in the rest of this dissertation, few of the viewpoints and arguments in this chapter are uniquely mine. Issue by issue, there are usually scholars who have proposed similar ideas and interpretations. The way I put the pieces of the puzzle together into a specific understanding of the use of Daniel in the Discourse is however new. The Olivet Discourse is very difficult and highly debated, and

---

<sup>1</sup>The most thorough discussion to date of Daniel in the Eschatological Discourse is still Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par* (Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1966).

Hartman's proposal that Daniel is continually in the background of Jesus' discourse, almost like a commentary on Daniel, seems to be generally praised for establishing a connection between Daniel and the Discourse, but criticized for seeing too many connections and labeling it a 'midrash'. Pitre's comment is typical: "This point is clearly brought out in Hartman . . . although I do not share all of his views of how the book of Daniel functions in the Olivet Discourse." Brant James Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement* (WUNT 204; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 261.

I present my ideas here with a great degree of humility and tentativeness, greater than for the rest of this dissertation. I hope I can stimulate scholarship to explore the Discourse in new directions when we see how much Dan 9 and 7 have influenced it.

Before I can advance my proposal several arguments will have to be made and common fallacies in scholarship cleared away. I will first establish two foundational principles (that the Synoptic Jesus has a precise eschatology, and that he wants us to look to Daniel to understand it); then review some scholarly approaches to the Eschatological Discourse (and their various deficiencies); summarily exegete parts of Dan 7 and 9 (establishing a possible first-century reading of the prophetic book), and determine which 'abomination of desolation' in Daniel Jesus refers to in Matt 24:15par. Then, and not before, will we proceed with a paragraph-by-paragraph reading of the Olivet Discourse that puts both Daniel and the Discourse into a feasible whole.

Whether it was the historical Jesus or someone in the early church who is responsible for this use and exposition of Daniel in the Synoptic Discourse will not be discussed here. *What I do propose is that it is possible to read the Olivet Discourse as a coherent and logical view of the future, based on a certain reading of Daniel's prophecies that would have been natural and possible for a first-century apocalyptic-minded Jew.*

### **Principle: Jesus Had a Precise Eschatology**

I will analyze the Eschatological Discourse on the assumption that the Jesus which is described in the Synoptic Gospels held and communicated a precise and detailed understanding of events to come (like, "I know this event will happen, then this, then that, after which this will take place), as opposed to a vague and open eschatology (few details in the prediction), or no eschatology at all (no attempts to describe the future). I am not at

this point necessarily assuming that Jesus had a correct eschatology that has proven valid and true down the centuries, only that he had one and that it is a worthwhile endeavor to spend time looking for eschatological sayings and put them into a *system*.

As we will see shortly in the review of scholarly approaches to the discourse, not everyone believes that a coherent and detailed view of the future can be read out of Jesus' sayings.

#### Example: Matthew 11

In Matt 11:2-3 John the Baptist is in Herod's prison and wonders whether Jesus really is the messianic figure he had earlier believed Jesus was. "Now when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ, he sent word by his disciples and said to him, Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" The expression "one to come" was one of many ways of referring to the long-awaited anointed deliverer.<sup>2</sup> As we remember, John the Baptist had earlier predicted imminent doom and judgment on everyone in Israel who had not repented and prepared for the coming Day of the Lord:

But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming for baptism, he said to them, You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruit that befits repentance, and do not presume to say to yourselves, We have Abraham as our father; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. I baptize you with water for repentance, but he who is coming after me is mightier than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry; he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather his wheat into the granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire. (Matt 3:7-12)

---

<sup>2</sup>William David Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-97), 1:312-4, 2:241; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (WBC 33A; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1993), 300; Jan Lambrecht, "Are You the One Who Is to Come, Or Shall We Look for Another?" *The Gospel Message of Jesus Today*, *LS* 8 (1980): 121-2.

John's sermon is full of well-known images and scriptural references to the Day of Judgment, including Isaiah and Malachi.<sup>3</sup> "For behold, the day comes, burning like an oven, when all the arrogant and all evildoers will be stubble; the day that comes shall burn them up, says the LORD of hosts, so that it will leave them neither root nor branch" (Mal 4:1).

Here John was, a little while later, disappointed that the fire and judgment had not taken place. John was even in prison for preaching a message of truth and justice to an immoral king, and he was suffering while the evil king enjoyed his power. Where was the judgment that should reverse the unjust order? Was Jesus not the agent of God's judgment and reversal anyway? Had John been wrong about "he who is coming after me" (Matt 3:11)?

Jesus answers John's disciples with: "Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good news preached to them. And blessed is he who takes no offense at me" (Matt 11:4-6). Scholars generally agree that Jesus refers to a combination of texts in Isaiah, like 29:18-20, 35:5-6, and 61:1.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Dale C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 123-4; James D. G. Dunn, "John the Baptist's Use of Scripture," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 53; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction* (London: Continuum, 2001), 35; Volker Schönle, *Johannes, Jesus und die Juden: Die theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt. 11* (BBET 17; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1982), 65.

<sup>4</sup>Craig L. Blomberg, "Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 38; Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1967), 79, 207; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 301; Craig S. Keener, *Matthew* (IVPNT 1; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997), 213-4; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20* (Hermeneia;

What is noteworthy for our purpose here is that Jesus carefully alluded only to portions of Isaiah's prophecies, quoting some (the positive miracles) and leaving out something else (judgment, in italics below):

In that day the deaf shall hear the words of a book, and out of their gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind shall see. The meek shall obtain fresh joy in the LORD, and the poor among men shall exult in the Holy One of Israel. *For the ruthless shall come to nought and the scoffer cease, and all who watch to do evil shall be cut off.* (Isa 29:18-20)

The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted; he has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; to proclaim the year of the LORD's favor, *and the day of vengeance of our God*; to comfort all who mourn. (Isa 61:1-2)

It is generally acknowledged that apocalyptic fervor and eschatological expectations were common in Judaism of the time.<sup>5</sup> The Synoptic portrait of John the Baptist is that he had held and communicated certain detailed, explicit predictions about events that were soon to take place, and that Jesus had certain other explicit views. John referred to certain prophecies in Scripture that he thought would soon be fulfilled; Jesus referred to certain other prophecies, carefully sifting and highlighting specific texts.

#### Example: Matthew 13

We saw in the discussion of the parable of the harvest above that Jesus had at

---

trans. Wilhelm C. Linss; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 134; Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 91.

<sup>5</sup>John J. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); James C. VanderKam and William Adler, eds., *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (CRINT; Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996).

least a three-stage view of future events.<sup>6</sup> First is the parable itself, with my comments in square brackets:

The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a man who

[Stage 1: sowing the seed] sowed good seed in his field;

[Stage 2: enemy at work, owner managing the farm] but while men were sleeping, his enemy came and sowed weeds among the wheat, and went away. So when the plants came up and bore grain, then the weeds appeared also. And the servants of the householder came and said to him, 'Sir, did you not sow good seed in your field? How then has it weeds?' He said to them, 'An enemy has done this.' The servants said to him, 'Then do you want us to go and gather them?' But he said, 'No; lest in gathering the weeds you root up the wheat along with them. Let both grow together until the harvest.

[Stage 3: doing the harvest] And at harvest time I will tell the reapers, Gather the weeds first and bind them in bundles to be burned, but gather the wheat into my barn. (Matt 13:24-30)

When the crowd had left, Jesus explained the parable to his disciples:

[Stage 1: Jesus establishes the kingdom] He who sows the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world, and the good seed means the sons of the kingdom;

[Stage 2: Jesus' enemy is at work] The weeds are the sons of the evil one, and the enemy who sowed them is the devil.

[Stage 3: Jesus executes day of judgment] The harvest is the close of the age, and the reapers are angels. Just as the weeds are gathered and burned with fire, so will it be at the close of the age. The Son of man will send his angels, and they will gather out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers, and throw them into the furnace of fire; there men will weep and gnash their teeth. Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father. He who has ears, let him hear. (Matt 13:37-43)

---

<sup>6</sup>In its narrative context this parable looks suspiciously engineered to rebut the imminent eschatology of John the Baptist and other contemporaries (like the Essenes). David Flusser, *The Sage from Galilee: Rediscovering Jesus' Genius* (ed. R. Steven Notley; trans. Azzan Yadin; 4th ed; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 85-6; Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, 382; David Wenham, *The Parables of Jesus* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 62-3. Most commentators however see the address not as authentic but as answering a need in Matthew's community: to give encouragement in times of hardship and persecution. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:408.

It is important to notice that Jesus (in contrast to John the Baptist) does not believe that the day of judgment is a current event. It is not even around the corner. There will first be a period when the opponents of the Son of Man will be busy with evil activities, specifically sowing seeds that look like Jesus' seed. The apparent meaning is that some people who appear to be followers of Jesus and part of his kingdom-movement are actually not. To borrow language from the eschatological discourse (Matt 24par), one could say that Jesus expected false Messiahs and people who appeared to be followers of Jesus but were not. These false followers will however not be judged right away, in Jesus' time table: They will await the final Day of Judgment at a later stage.

These two examples are hopefully sufficient to establish that the Jesus we find in the Synoptic Gospels (at least in Matthew that we looked at) has a specific belief about events to take place and a certain sequence—a timetable. And he carefully uses Scripture references to communicate his eschatology, alluding to some verses and skipping others. Let us then attempt to analyze the Eschatological Discourse with the working hypothesis that the Synoptic Jesus might have *held and communicated a coherent and specific view of future events, an 'eschatological timetable'.*

### **Principle: Jesus Asked Us to Read Daniel Together with His Discourse**

Several of the enigmatic sayings in the Discourse will make more sense when we read them together with the book of Daniel. Actually, we are told in Matt 24:15 (with a direct citation) and Mark 13:14 (with an obvious quote, although without the reference) to listen to the Discourse with the book of Daniel in mind. This is another assumption behind my analysis that not everyone might share. The instruction to careful reading is often taken as a parenthetical remark by the evangelists (originating with Mark and taken



over by Matthew) to make us read *the Gospel* more carefully. "So when you see the desolating sacrilege spoken of by the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place, *let the reader understand*" (Matt 24:15).<sup>7</sup>

Brant Pitre has summarized well the arguments for Daniel and not the Gospel being the recommended reading.<sup>8</sup> First of all, while Mark has many parenthetical remarks

---

<sup>7</sup>Scholars who see the phrase about 'the reader' as editorial (i.e., Matthew or Mark referred to the Gospel text) include William F. Albright and Christopher S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 26; New York: Doubleday, 1971), 295; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP 1; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 339; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Black's New Testament Commentaries 2; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993), 314; Alan Hugh McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1928), 348; Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. Peter Christie; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884), 415; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 258-9; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 972.

Scholars who see the phrase as authentic (i.e., Jesus addressed readers of the book of Daniel) include John A. Broadus, *Commentary on Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1886), 486; Donald A. Carson, "Matthew," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelein; 12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 8:500; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:346; Robert Horton Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 481; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14-28* (WBC 33B; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1995), 700; Hans Kvalbein, *Fortolkning til Matteusevangeliet* (Oslo, Norway: Luther Forlag, 1998), 2:204; Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Evangile selon saint Luc* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1925), 462; Hans K. LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies of the Bible: The Biblical-Contextual Approach* (Sarasota, Fla.: First Impressions, 1997), 36-8; Richard C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Mark's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961), 575; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21-28* (Hermeneia; trans. James E. Crouch; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 195; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 603; L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents* (SJSJ 49; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1996), 39; Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1982), 704.

A third option is to see the phrase as editorial, but that the evangelist refers to the book of Daniel and not to his gospel, cf. James A. Brooks, *Mark* (NAC 23; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1991), 213; Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity* (New York: Knopf, 2000), 84.

<sup>8</sup>Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation*, 309-13.

to his readers, they are quite different from this one. They are usually explanatory in nature, and nowhere include a call to read something.

[Mark] tends to give interpretive or narrative comments (Mark 2:10; 3:30 [?]; 5:42; 7:19), translations of Aramaic or otherwise unclear expressions (Mark 5:41; 7:11; 7:34; 15:16, 22, 23), or explanations of Jewish belief and practice (Mark 7:3-4; 12:18; 14:12). These asides are always explicative; in no other instance does Mark directly call the reader's attention to "understand" something he does not actually *explain*.<sup>9</sup>

Nowhere does the narrator in Mark use the verb 'to read'. It is used exclusively by Jesus (Mark 2:25, 12:10, and 12:26).

The verb for "reading" (ἀναγινώσκω) only occurs three other times in Mark's Gospel, and in every instance it is found *on the lips of Jesus*, not the narrator. Even more striking, in all three cases, Jesus is doing exactly what he is doing in Mark 13:14: calling his *audiences'* attention to *the Scriptures*.<sup>10</sup>

Finally, not only is there a "lack of thematic congruence with Markan parentheses," there is a "strong case of coherence with other sayings of Jesus that have the same form"<sup>11</sup> right here in Mark 13:14-16:

Let the one who reads understand	ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω
Let those in Judea flee	οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν
Let him who is on a housetop not go down nor enter	ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω
Let him who is in the field not turn back	ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω <sup>12</sup>

So while it is not impossible that Mark (same goes for Matthew) meant his words "let him who reads understand" as a call to ponder his Gospel more carefully, as Pitre has

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., 310.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., 310-11.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 311.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

shown, it is far more probable that the phrase refers to a call from Jesus to read and understand the book of Daniel.

### **History of Scholarship on the Discourse**

Much of the discussion on the Eschatological Discourse<sup>13</sup> has dealt with the issue of *authenticity*: Which elements go back to Jesus, and which are the product of the early church and the Gospel writers? All the apocalyptic end-time imagery and cataclysmic events in the Discourse have made all the 'non-eschatological' Jesus-scholars suspicious of much of the material.

Another line of debate, not unrelated to the issue of authenticity, of course, has been to determine the *reference* of all the elements in the speech. What refers to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70? What refers to the Christian era? What is part of the eschatological tribulation, and what is the final judgment and the Parousia?

Every conceivable answer and combination of the variables is found in scholarship—from everything and nothing referring to the fall of Jerusalem, to everything and nothing about the final Day of Judgment and the Parousia. Not a few have given up separating the events and believe different historical events are intentionally left mixed up in the Discourse.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>This section is necessarily a very brief summary of some of the main issues of the debate in modern times. The best review of scholarship on the Discourse from the last 150 years is still George Raymond Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993). His review of scholarship (pp. 1-349) is more useful than his own proposed interpretation (pp. 350-475).

<sup>14</sup>"His [Jesus'] answer mixes the two events and their signs to such an extent that it is well nigh impossible to disentangle them. The result has been a chapter that has proven very difficult to interpret, at least as far as its details are concerned." George R. Knight, *Matthew: The Gospel of the Kingdom* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1994), 234.

### Traditional Understanding: Two Mountain Peaks

Since there appears to most readers to be references to both the Fall of Jerusalem as well as the Parousia in the Discourse, the statement that "this generation will not pass away until *all* these things have taken place" (Matt 24:34) has been puzzling. One solution has been to compare the Discourse with patterns of OT classical prophecy. Different elements of a single prophecy in the OT, which from a Christian viewpoint could be seen as referring to different events, are often found intermingled in the OT prophets.<sup>15</sup> Maybe the future events mistakenly looked like one incident to Jesus from his viewpoint (or to the Gospel writers), while in reality they were different events separated in time—just like two mountaintops can appear to merge into one from a long distance, although in reality and from a closer viewpoint clearly are different and distinct mountains.

Bengel (1763) used this 'mountain peak' argument about the immediacy of the Parousia after Jerusalem's Fall:

You will say, it is a great leap from the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the world, which is represented as coming quickly after it. I Reply—A prophecy resembles a landscape painting, which marks distinctly the houses, paths, and bridges in the foreground, but brings together, into a narrow space, the distant valleys and mountains, though they are really far apart.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>See the example above (pp. 154-6) where we noticed how Jesus connects some elements of Isaiah's prophecy to his own current ministry, and some not.

<sup>16</sup>John Albert Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament* (trans. James Bandinel; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1877), 427. A footnote by the editor J. Steudel amplifies: "Looking further forward, as in the landscape already alluded to, wherein at first sight all the parts might seem projected unto one plane. But the eye, which has gradually come to discern perspective, and to substitute, by the judgment, causes for the visible effects, learn to look further, and to separate by wide distances the foreground and background of the picture." Ibid.

This theory is fairly widespread also today, especially in theologically conservative circles. Here, in its classical expression, is how one recent scholar put it:

Therefore it is possible that Jesus did not separate the destruction of Jerusalem and the close of the age by his prophetic perspective. Of course, the imminent national destruction and the close of the age were two distinct events, separated by a long period of time. However, both events had much in common. Jesus probably blended the description of the two events in Matt 24:4-26. In the fall of Jerusalem the prophetic eyes of Christ saw a microcosm of the destruction of the world. Two lofty mountain peaks stand out on the eschatological horizon.<sup>17</sup>

A "two mountain peaks seen as one from the distance" concept can be useful in interpreting several prophetic sections of Scripture. But is it adequate in the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse? When Jesus states that "this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place" (found in all three Synoptics), it is hard to interpret that to include the "second mountain top" without improperly straining the language. The Parousia clearly did not take place to the generation that lived in the first century.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Ki Kon Kim, "The Signs of the Parousia: A Diachronic and Comparative Study of the Apocalyptic Vocabulary of Matthew 24:27-31" (Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1994), 95.

<sup>18</sup>There have been some attempts at interpreting "this generation" ("ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη") as something other than the generation contemporary with Jesus—like the human race, the Jewish people (Jerome), or Christian believers (Origin, Chrysostom, Eusebius). See William Hendricksen, *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973), 868; Evald Lövestam, *Jesus and 'This Generation': A New Testament Study* (ConBNT; Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995); Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, *Des Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 238; Julius Daniel Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 2; Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 244; Josef Schmid, *El Evangelio según San Lucas* (Biblioteca Herder: Sección de Sagrada Escritura 94; Barcelona: Herder, 1981), 450; Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 2; Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976), 299.

These attempts are however artificial and foreign to the text. We must agree with Nolland and Hagner: "Though his use of the term [γενεά] has a range of emphases, it consistently refers to (the time span of) a single human generation." Nolland, *Matthew*,

## Mid-nineteenth Century: Rise of the Little Apocalypse Theory

D. F. Strauss (1835), backed by E. Renan later (1863),<sup>19</sup> argued that the whole Discourse was authentic. Jesus put the Fall of Jerusalem and his return right after each other, and thus (1800 years later) clearly must be considered mistaken.

C. H. Weisse (1838) quickly tried to rescue Jesus by proposing a spiritual-allegorical interpretation.<sup>20</sup> So the first section was not about the fall of Jerusalem. The desolating sacrilege, fleeing to the mountains, and not looking back (Mark 13:14-16) were about turning decisively away from the old order of things and seeking salvation in the new order. The lament over mothers (v. 17) was about being occupied with the old

---

988-9. "The attempt to explain ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, 'this generation,' as the generation alive at the time of the parousia or more generally as the human race or people of God goes against the natural meaning of the phrase and makes the words irrelevant both to Jesus' listeners and to Matthew's readers." Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 715.

This is also the view shared by the majority of commentators, including Darrell L. Bock, *Luke Volume 2: 9:51-24:53* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1688-92; Larry Chouinard, *Matthew* (Joplin, Mo.: College Press, 1997), 431; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:367; Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT; Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1977), 568-9; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 335; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (THKNT 1; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 510; Robert Horton Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 747; Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Interpretation; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1993), 281; Keener, *Matthew*, 353; Kvalbein, *Matteusevangeliet*, 209; Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *Evangile selon saint Marc* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1920), 325; William L. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark* (NICNT 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 480; Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (3 vols.; EKKNT; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997), 3:443; Meyer, *Matthew*, 426; Alan Hugh M'Neile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1928), 354-5; Morris, *Matthew*, 612; David Turner, *Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 586.

<sup>19</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 2-5, 11-12. Many of the following nineteenth-century writings are hard to get hold of. Since many will probably start any investigation by reading Beasley-Murray's detailed discussion of these scholars, I will refer to the relevant pages in Beasley-Murray's survey where more details (incl. bibliographical) can be found.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 6-8.

order. The winter (v. 18) symbolized the "raw, barren time that yields no fruit for the spirit." The eschatological Parousia passage (vv. 24-27) is genuine and does refer to Jesus coming as a Judge at the end of history, but the context here is not genuine—it is not related to the Fall of Jerusalem. So Jesus was correct. The mistake is Mark's who had mixed the Parousia in with a non-authentic question from the disciples about the destruction of the temple.

F. C. Baur (1847) also considered the discourse inauthentic, including the prediction of the Fall of Jerusalem which was not (as Weisse held) a metaphor but was a literal although post-eventum prophecy made by the evangelist.<sup>21</sup> The abomination of desolation was Hadrian's erection of the statue of Jupiter on the site of the ruined temple sixty years after the destruction.<sup>22</sup>

H. J. Holzmann (1863) is important for being the first, according to Beasley-Murray, to call attention to the difficulty of reconciling Luke's suddenness of the coming (17:22-24; 21:31-36) with the preceding of signs (21:29-31).<sup>23</sup> Can the Parousia be predicted with signs beforehand, or does it come unexpectedly? Any interpretation of the Discourse has to deal with this issue.<sup>24</sup> Holzmann's division of the Discourse became influential: (1) the 'world-historical' aspect of the first woes (Mark 13:5-8) and the significance for the kingdom of God (vv. 9-13), (2) the tribulation including the Fall of

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 8-9.

<sup>22</sup>Those were the days when the writing of the Gospel was still argued to have taken place late in the second century A.D.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., 10-11.

<sup>24</sup>My view is on pp. 190-199 below.

Jerusalem (vv. 14-23), and (3) the Parousia (vv. 24-27). The prediction of Jesus was genuine prophecy, and the future Parousia was real.

T. Colani (1864) came up with the famous 'little apocalypse' theory.<sup>25</sup> His starting point was a non-eschatological this-worldly kingdom of God, as we often associate with nineteenth-century liberal Protestantism. "Why should he return to earth? To triumph, when he hates success? To conquer by force, when he wishes to conquer by weakness and resignation? What? Would he be considered as his own precursor? A humble and sweet precursor of a violent and terrible Messiah?" The eschatological elements in Mark 13 are thus inauthentic. The original saying consisted of the disciples' question of 'when will it be' (vv. 1-4) and Jesus answer 'I don't know but be alert' (vv. 32-37). Verses 5-31 are one big interpolation of inauthentic material, an independent written apocalypse that the evangelist cuts and pastes in here—the 'little apocalypse'.

#### Late Nineteenth Century: Developing the Little Apocalypse Theory

Much scholarly ink was from now on invested in testing and refining the borders of the inauthentic material of the little apocalypse.<sup>26</sup> The analyses of C. Weizsäcker (1864)<sup>27</sup> and O. Pfleiderer (1868)<sup>28</sup> were that the little apocalypse is found in Mark 13:7-

---

<sup>25</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 13-8.

<sup>26</sup>I will summarize just a couple of them. For a more comprehensive list of scholars who accepted and spread this theory, see the discussion in Beasley-Murray of H. H. Wendt (1886), A. Reville (French, 1895), A. Merx (German, 1902), A. Jülicher (German, 1906), L. A. Muirhead (British, 1908, though he had defended the authenticity of Mark 13 four years earlier), T. F. Glasson (British, 1945), and F. C. Grant (American, 1940). One who before Albert Schweitzer had defended an eschatological Jesus and the authenticity of the Synoptic apocalypse was P. Schwartzkopff (German, 1895).

<sup>27</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 32-5.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, 35-8.



8, 14-20, 24-27. Much of the rest was authentic and universal warnings from Jesus of being alert and being ready for persecution. W. Weiffenbach (1873) added vv. 30-31 to the little apocalypse.<sup>29</sup> Jesus' prediction in v. 2 that all the stones of the temple would be demolished was considered authentic by Pfleiderer (he believed it did not happen that way but that the temple was burned and the stones remained standing).<sup>30</sup>

M.-J. Lagrange (1906) made an interesting contribution that has not received the attention it deserves. He saw two distinct and parallel discourses in Mark 13: one dealing with the ruin of the temple (vv. 6-18, 28-31), the other dealing with the coming of the 'Son of Man' (vv. 19-27, 32-37).<sup>31</sup> He believed only the first was authentic, though not given in one setting but collected together by the evangelist. While I would not support the tradition-critical theory of two separate discourses, Lagrange's delineation of the material into the two topics of the temple destruction versus the coming of the 'Son of Man' is highly useful.<sup>32</sup> We should note that in this structure the 'signs' are all about the Fall of Jerusalem; the Parousia comes without warning.

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 38-41.

<sup>30</sup>Beasley-Murray's comment about Weiffenbach's admission of authenticity for something he believed was a false prediction is as sobering as it is sarcastic: "In reality the temple was both burned and demolished. It is fortunate, however, that exegetes thought that Jesus predicted this wrongly, for at least the point of departure of the discourse (i.e., v. 2) could then be allowed to him!" Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 39.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., 83-5.

<sup>32</sup>Richard Davidson has, independently of Lagrange, made the same delineations of the Discourse, and argued solidly for it textually. Richard M. Davidson, "'This Generation Shall Not Pass' (Matt 24:34): Failed or Fulfilled Prophecy," in *The Cosmic Battle for Planet Earth: Essays in Honor of Norman R. Gulley* (ed. Ronald A. G. du Preez and Jiří Moskala; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2003), 307-28. I will discuss Davidson's proposal in detail below (pp. 189-98).

## Early Twentieth Century: Eschatological or Not

Nobody created as much stir in NT scholarship in the first third of the twentieth century as Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer, who believed in a thoroughly eschatological-apocalyptic Jesus. Weiss (1892) converted from a little apocalypse believer to faith in the general authenticity of the discourse. "While it was once found surprising that there should be in a discourse of Jesus conceptions related to those of Jewish apocalyptic, today many people will share my opinion that Jesus could very well have thought of the future according to the scheme of the prophecy of Daniel and of other apocalyptists."<sup>33</sup> About the apparent contradiction between a sudden Parousia and one accompanied with signs, he pointed to the common tension of this in the NT.

B. H. Streeter (1911) introduced the 'personal antichrist' theory of the Discourse, but not from the outset of his scholarship. Streeter first argued for dating Mark after A.D. 70 because the predictions made about the Fall of Jerusalem were too accurate to have been made by Jesus. But later he reinterprets the prophecy of the abomination of desolation to be a personal antichrist who will sit supreme in the temple. Paul, in 2 Thess 2, knew of this pseudonymous little apocalypse (not made by Jesus but pretending to be) and believed it was authentic. Now that Mark 13 was no longer an accurate prediction of A.D. 70, Streeter could date Mark earlier.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>Johannes Weiss, *Das Markusevangelium*, quoted in Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 120.

<sup>34</sup>Concerning the interesting fact that Jesus was not allowed to make a prophetic prediction (about the Fall of Jerusalem), but an unknown writer was allowed to see into the future (predicting an antichrist), Beasley-Murray responds aptly: "How is it that a pseudonymous writing, attributed to Jesus as to some worthy of the distant past, has been able to arise so soon and gain so widespread a circulation? . . . We reach the remarkable conclusion that the pseudonymous author of the little apocalypse was a better prophet than Jesus." *Jesus and the Last Days*, 58.

Rudolf Bultmann (1931) occasionally accepted eschatological sayings in the Gospels as authentic (although he of course famously reinterpreted or 'de-mythologized' the sayings so they fit a 'modern' worldview). The Olivet discourse however contained little that went back to Jesus. Mark 13:7-8, 12, 14-22, 24-27 contain the little apocalypse more or less intact, and the rest is early Christian additions.<sup>35</sup>

C. H. Dodd (1935) was an influential writer on eschatology, and a fierce contender against Schweitzer and Weiss. Dodd rejected the little-apocalypse theory, and believed Mark 13 was not even an apocalypse, but a hortatory address dealing with eschatological topics. Eschatology for Dodd was of course mostly 'realized'.<sup>36</sup> Jesus saw his death, ascension, and Parousia as basically one event, but the church later distinguished the three. Mark 13 fits this developed view (so 'tampered with' by the early church), but Dodd was hesitant at drawing clear distinctions between the authentic and the edited material.<sup>37</sup>

### Recent Proposals

R. T. France (1971) believed most of the Discourse relates to the Fall of Jerusalem and not the Parousia. Judgments of doom on cities, and especially on Jerusalem, are part of the regular OT prophecies. The traditional application of Mark 13:26 ('Son of Man' coming on the clouds) is a misunderstanding of Dan 7:13 on the part

---

<sup>35</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931), 129.

<sup>36</sup>We will revisit Dodd in the next chapter about the 'Kingdom of God' (pp. 233-4 below).

<sup>37</sup>Charles Harold Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1950), 61-2.

of Jesus or the Gospel writer. In Daniel the 'Son of Man' is coming to God in heaven and is not coming down to earth, he argued.

R. Schnackenburg (1963) took the opposite view of France: The discourse is almost entirely concerned with the last things (events still future to us today). Jesus announced the coming of God's reign and of the 'Son of Man' for a near future, but without specifying the time, which is in the hand of God alone.<sup>38</sup>

With N. T. Wright (1996) it is back to seeing fulfillments in the first century. Absolutely all of the Discourse for Wright is about the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Even the coming on the clouds with power and glory is not about future eschatological events, but was fulfilled by Jesus two millennia ago.<sup>39</sup>

As this survey of scholarship on the Olivet Discourse has shown, the interpretations among scholars are many and the challenges we face are hard. The immediate impression most readers get when they read the biblical text itself is that some of the Discourse is about the Fall of Jerusalem in the first century. Other sections appear equally strongly to be about a future Parousia.<sup>40</sup> If events two millennia apart are mentioned in the same sermon (as they are found in the final Gospel material), how

---

<sup>38</sup>Rudolf Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom* (New York: Herder, 1963).

<sup>39</sup>Nicholas Thomas Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 635; idem, *Luke for Everyone* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 254-6. On Wright's views about eschatology see also n. 26 on p. 234 below.

<sup>40</sup>"Chapter 24 poses great problems for the interpreter. It begins by talking about the coming destruction of the temple (which was to take place in A.D. 70 as a result of the Roman repression of the rebellion of A.D. 66), but by the end of the chapter it seems clear that the scene has moved to the parousia, the final 'coming' of the Son of man." Richard T. France, *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 1; Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1985), 333-4.

should we understand a verse like "this generation will not pass away till all these things take place" (Matt 24:34)? Is Jesus to blame for this mistake? Did the Gospel writers express this clumsily (at best) or erroneously (at worst)? Or is there a way of reading the Discourse that logically and exegetically makes sense? We will come back to these questions further on.

Our minds have now been reminded of the material found in Matt 24 (and parallels), and what some of the scholarly debates have dealt with. Let us now take a look at some chapters in the book of Daniel, since many have seen Daniel as a background text for the Synoptic Discourse.

### **The Prophecy in Daniel 7**

A final preliminary step before we look at the text of the Eschatological Discourse is to quickly review the prophecies of Dan 7 and 9. Having those two chapters foremost in our mind is crucial, I suggest, to understand the Discourse correctly.<sup>41</sup>

#### **Content of the Prophecy**

The sequence in Dan 7 moves a lot back and forth, as Daniel first sees a vision (7:2-14), gets a first quick explanation (vv. 17-18), recapitulates himself (vv. 19-20) and apparently is shown more details (vv. 21-22), and receives a second longer explanation (vv. 23-27). If we try to rearrange these verses into a sequential order, it will probably look something like this:

1. Four beasts appear—lion, bear, leopard, wild beast (vv. 2-6), which are explained as four different, probably consecutive, kingdoms (v. 17).

---

<sup>41</sup>The two strongest references to the OT in the Discourse are Dan 7 (Matt 24:30) and Dan 9 (Matt 24:15).

2. The fourth beast is particularly important and gets extra attention: It is extraordinarily strong, with iron teeth, and crushing and trampling (vv. 7, 19). This is explained as a kingdom that is different and expanding further than the previous three kingdoms (v. 23).

3. The fourth beast has ten horns (vv. 7, 20, 24), of which three were pulled out and replaced with a stronger and very different horn—a horn that was human-like and spoke boastfully (vv. 8, 20) and even made war against God's saints (v. 21). These ten horns are explained as ten kings or kingdoms (v. 24), three kings are removed by the new one (v. 24) which exceeds the previous in its wickedness (v. 24). This new level of wickedness is explained as speaking against God, changing God's times and law, and persecuting God's saints for a specific length—three and a half prophetic times or years (v. 25).

4. A heavenly judgment scene takes place with the Ancient of Days on the throne (vv. 9-10), which results in the execution of the wicked little horn (vv. 11, 26) and removal of the power of all the beasts (v. 12), whereupon the 'Son of Man' approaches the Ancient of Days (v. 13) and receives eternal glory and kingship over all nations of the earth (v. 14). The result of this is that God's saints receive and possess the kingdom for ever and are never persecuted again (vv. 18, 22, 27). This positive final outcome for God's saints seems especially important in the vision, for it is the only detail that is repeated in *every* portion of the chapter: in the initial vision (v. 14), in the first quick explanation (v. 18), in Daniel's second display of the vision (v. 22), and in the second longer explanation (v. 27).

*My thesis below is that Jesus took this timetable of Dan 7 and explained it in his Eschatological Discourse.*

## Temporal Interpretation of the Prophecy

We will look at Jesus' statements in the Discourse further down, but is it possible before we turn to the Gospel texts to make an educated guess of where in the timeline of the prophecy of Dan 7 Jesus might have placed himself (if at all)? While the literature on Daniel is vast,<sup>42</sup> most of it is of little use for us since the theory that Daniel is an allegory of second-century-B.C. events is (with the exception of Porphyry) a modern phenomenon.<sup>43</sup> As we saw in the previous chapter, several writings including *1 Enoch* (*Similitudes*) saw the coming of 'Son of Man' of Dan 7:13-14 as a future event.<sup>44</sup> The evidence points to the fourth kingdom of Dan 2 and 7<sup>45</sup> as the point in the prophecy where the interpreters saw themselves. Josephus seems to argue that the fourth kingdom

---

<sup>42</sup>Among the leading commentaries today are Robert Andrew Anderson, *Daniel: Signs and Wonders* (ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984); Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel* (TOTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1978); John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); John Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word Books, 1989); Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; New York: Doubleday, 1977); André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (trans. David Pellauer; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979); Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002); James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1927); Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965); Choon Leong Seow, *Daniel* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2003).

<sup>43</sup>Pitre's criticism, that much of traditional scholarship on Daniel has limited value as long as it remains overly preoccupied with second-century-B.C. events, is bold but not inappropriate. He calls for a new attempt in scholarship to let Daniel be "*read as an eschatological prophecy* (as a first-century Jew would have) and not as an allegory of second-century political events (as most modern scholars do)." Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation*, 401.

<sup>44</sup>E.g., *1 En* 46:1-5; 47:3-48:5; 61:8-9, quoted on pp. 103-4 above.

<sup>45</sup>The four kingdoms of Dan 2 are obviously meant to be the same as the four beasts in Dan 7. "Commentators all agree in giving identical interpretation of ch 2 and 7." Montgomery, *Daniel*, 283. So also Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 99, 152, 277; Hartman and di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 208; Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 123; Lucas, *Daniel*, 77, 188.

of Dan 2 was the Romans and that the stone kingdom was a future power that would remove the Romans.<sup>46</sup>

In the fifth vision in chs. 11-12 of *4 Ezra*, a symbolic vision of an eagle is given where different parts of the bird's body represent different time periods or kings.<sup>47</sup> The vision itself is in ch. 11, and the interpretation is given in ch. 12. This writing is clearly meant as an interpretation and elaboration of the book of Daniel. In *4 Ezra* 12:11-15 the eagle is said to be a more detailed prophecy of the fourth kingdom in Daniel. First "twelve kings will reign, one after another" (*4 Ezra* 12:14), then another eight kings (v. 20), of which the last two will reign until the end (v. 21), when three more kings will appear (v. 23). Then a lion will appear—God's Messiah—and make an end of the eagle with its many kings. This eagle, explained by Ezra to be the fourth kingdom in Daniel, is interpreted by most scholars as the Roman Empire.<sup>48</sup>

The first chapter of the *Epistle of Barnabas* appeals to the reader to consider the seriousness of the "present circumstances" because "the last stumbling block is at hand" and cites the fourth beast and the ten horns of Dan 7:27.<sup>49</sup> Irenaeus likewise interpreted

---

<sup>46</sup>Josephus words it implicitly for (probably) political reasons: "Daniel did also declare the meaning of the stone to the king but I do not think proper to relate it, since I have only undertaken to describe things past or things present, but not things that are future; yet if anyone be so very desirous of knowing truth, as not to wave such points of curiosity, and cannot curb his inclination for understanding the uncertainties of the future, and whether they will happen or not, let him be diligent in reading the Book of Daniel, which he will find among the sacred writings" (*Ant.* 10:210).

The translators behind the Alexandrian LXX certainly saw the Romans prophesied in Daniel. The "ships of Kittim" in Dan 11:30 are translated as "Ρωμαῖοι".

<sup>47</sup>A good translation is James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1:548-51.

<sup>48</sup>Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 196.

<sup>49</sup>*Epistle of Barnabas* 1:1-5, in Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 279, 281.



the fourth kingdom of Dan 2 and 7 as the present-day Roman empire and believed that Rome in his (Irenaeus') future was going to be divided up into smaller kingdoms, as suggested by the iron mixed with clay (Dan 2) and the ten horns of the fourth beast (Dan 7; Rev 13).<sup>50</sup> Tertullian asked his readers to pray for the stability and unity of the Roman empire in order to delay the prophesied breakup of Rome and thus the coming of the antichrist.<sup>51</sup>

Eusebius followed the other early Christian writers in identifying the four kingdoms of Dan 2 and 7 as Assyria/Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome.<sup>52</sup> Cyril, the fourth-century bishop of Jerusalem, claimed that the interpretation that the fourth kingdom was Rome was a well-established tradition in the church. "The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall surpass all kingdoms. And that this kingdom is that of the Romans, has been the tradition of the Church's interpreters."<sup>53</sup> Jerome took the prediction-fulfillments a step further, claiming that the time of the break-up of Rome, as he saw predicted in Dan 2 and 7, had begun to take place in his time.<sup>54</sup> He refuted the proposal by the pagan anti-Christian philosopher Porphyry that Daniel should

---

<sup>50</sup>Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, book 5, ch. 26, in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1885 [reprint 1989]), 1:554-5.

<sup>51</sup>Tertullian, *Apology*, ch. 32, in Roberts and Donaldson, eds., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 3:42-3.

<sup>52</sup>Eusebius, *Church History*, 1:6, in Paul L. Meier, *Eusebius: The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999), 35. See also Eusebius, *Proof of the Gospel* 8:2; *Selections from the Prophets* 3:45.

<sup>53</sup>*The Catechetical Lectures of S. Cyril*, 15:13, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd series, 7:108.

<sup>54</sup>Jerome, *Commentary on Daniel*, 2:40, in Gleason L. Archer, ed., *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958), 32.

have been written in the second century as an after-the-events-took-place narrative about Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>55</sup>

More names could be mentioned, but this should suffice. All the evidence we have from Jewish writers like Josephus and the author of *4 Ezra* through the unified voice of the early church, its historians and scholars of the formative years, was that early interpreters considered the four empires of Dan 2 and 7 to be Babylon through Rome. The "now" in prophecy they saw as the fourth beast. The ten horns (and thus the boasting little horn that persecuted, the heavenly judgment, and the receiving of the kingdom by God's saints) belonged to the future.

This does of course not prove that the Synoptic Jesus shared this view, but it will serve as a useful hypothesis to be tested. When we look at the text of Matt 24 par below we will check if this view has explanatory power for this enigmatic Discourse.

### **The Prophecy in Daniel 9**

Another prophecy of Daniel that lies behind Jesus' Eschatological Discourse is the seventy weeks at the end of ch. 9. The most obvious reference point is the "abomination of desolation" (Matt 24:15; Mark 13:14) mentioned in Dan 9:27.

#### **Abomination of Desolation**

The phrase in Mark is "τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως" ("the abomination of desolation," Mark 13:14), while Matthew also has the explicit reference to Daniel: "τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου" ("the abomination of desolation which is spoken by Daniel the prophet," Matt 24:15).

---

<sup>55</sup>Jerome, *Commentary on Daniel*, prologue; in Archer, ed., *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, 15-6.

The MT of Dan 9:27 has "כְּנִיף שְׂקִיּוֹצִים מְשֻׁמִּים" ("upon the wings of abomination of desolation"). The Greek texts we have (both LXX and Theodosian) read "ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων" ("upon the temple an abomination of desolations"). Noticeable differences between the Masoretic and Greek texts here are "wings" (MT) versus "temple" (Greek) and the singular "desolation" (MT) versus plural "desolations" (Greek). We saw above that the Gospel texts had "desolation" in singular, equivalent to the MT.

There are two other "abomination of desolation" phrases in Daniel (Dan 11:31; 12:11), so there has been a lot of discussion about which of these three "abomination" texts in Daniel is referred to in the Gospels.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps all three refer to the same event and can be considered sources of Jesus' quotation. If Luke has captured the meaning correctly when he rewrites the abomination of desolation as Roman armies surrounding and destroying Jerusalem (Luke 21:20 comes in the sequence of the discourse where the abomination of desolation occurs in Mark 13:14 and Matt 24:15), then the only "abomination of desolation" in Daniel that is explicitly set in a context of a destruction of a city is the one in Dan 9:26-27. So whatever we make of the other two instances (Dan 11:31 and 12:11), the one in 9:27 must at least be considered on the mind of the Synoptic Jesus. Ford correctly concludes that Dan 9:27 is the primary reference in the Gospels.

It is obvious that 11:31 and 12:11 are secondary references, dependent upon the prior usage of 9:27. Even more significant, however, is the fact that Christ is referring to the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the only case in Daniel where the שְׂקִיּוֹצִים מְשֻׁמִּים is specifically linked with the destruction of the holy city is in Dan. 9. . . . We conclude that Christ encompasses all the allusions of Daniel in his reference, but that He thinks particularly on 9:27.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>Although slightly dated, the best introduction to the debate is still Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979).

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., 154.

There is universal agreement in scholarship that Matt 24:15 and Mark 13:14

allude to or quote from the book Daniel.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>E.g., Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 295; Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912), 255-6; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark* (New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 288, 296; Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981), 467-8; Blomberg, "Matthew," 86; Günther Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (trans. Irene McLuskey and Fraser McLuskey; New York: Harper, 1960), 94; John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (StPB 8; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1965), 241, 245; Brooks, *Mark*, 212; Carson, "Matthew," 500; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:345; Keith D. Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount: Mark 13 and the Gathering of the New Community* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998), 107; James R. Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 395-6; Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 317; France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 911-2; Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 84-5; Ezra P. Gould, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St Mark* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1922), 246; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (THKNT 1; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), 505-6; Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, 48; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 698-700; Hare, *Matthew*, 278; Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 336, 339; John F. Hart, "A Chronology of Matthew 24:1-44" (Th.D. diss.; Grace Theological Seminary, 1986), 73; John Paul Heil, *The Gospel of Mark as Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York: Paulist, 1992), 263; Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 315; Larry W. Hurtado, *Mark* (NIBCNT 2; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989), 215-6; Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 199; Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 466; LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies*, 35; Gerd Lüdemann, *Jesus after Two Thousand Years: What He Really Said and Did* (Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus, 2001), 90; Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 195; Elliot C. Maloney, *Jesus' Urgent Message for Today: The Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 114-5; Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27B; New York: Doubleday, 2009), 889; Allan Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel according to Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1901), 236; Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark*, 259; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 386; Morris, *Matthew*, 603; Robert H. Mounce, *Matthew* (NIBCNT; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 223; Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York: Orbis Books, 1988), 326; NA<sup>27</sup> (margin); Barclay M. Newman and Philip C. Stine, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Matthew* (UBS Handbook Series; New York: United Bible Society, 1988), 740; Nolland, *Matthew*, 969; Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 288; Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "The Jesus-Tradition and Idolatry," *NTS* 42 (1996): 417; Crawford Howell Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1884), 64-5; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Luke* (New Testament Guides; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 18;

Following the format of my two previous chapters, this allusion to Daniel must be categorized as a 'certain allusion'.

### Content of the Prophecy

Let us take a look at the text of Dan 9:24-27 like we did with ch. 7 above, just to refresh the prophecy in our mind before we come to the Synoptic Discourse.

Seventy weeks are decreed concerning your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint a most holy. (Dan 9:24)

The prophecy is set in the context of a time period of seventy weeks, which is universally understood as seventy weeks of years (70 x 7 years).<sup>59</sup> The reason scholars usually give for this day-for-a-year reckoning is that Daniel in the beginning of ch. 9 prays to God about the seventy-year prophecy in Jeremiah (25:11-12; 29:10), which in Chronicles seems to read as ten Sabbath-year cycles (2 Chr 36:20-22). Ezekiel (4:6) is another example of day-for-a-year reckoning in prophetic literature. We are thus talking about a prophecy of 490 years. During or after that time, a Messiah will appear, sin will be dealt with, and 'atonement' and 'eternal righteousness' provided.

In the next verse (v. 25) there is some intriguing and complicated math. The seventy weeks (490 years) are divided into subunits of seven weeks, sixty-two weeks,

---

Rikki E. Watts, "Mark," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 223-4; Walter W. Wessel, "Mark," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelein; 12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 8:748; Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 345.

<sup>59</sup>Baldwin, *Daniel*, 168; Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 352; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 257; Hartman and di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 244; Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 178, 195; Lucas, *Daniel*, 229; Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel* (NAC 18; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 258; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 372-3; Porteous, *Daniel*, 139-40; W. Sibley Towner, *Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1984), 141.

and one week. The MT and its accents can be read in two different ways concerning the timing of the Messiah's arrival: The anointed one will come either after seven weeks (cf. NAB) or after seven plus sixty-two weeks (cf. NIV):

Daniel 9:25-26a (NAB): Know and understand this: From the utterance of the word that Jerusalem was to be rebuilt *Until one who is anointed and a leader, there shall be seven weeks.* During sixty-two weeks it shall be rebuilt, With streets and trenches, in time of affliction. After the sixty-two weeks an anointed shall be cut down.

Daniel 9:25-26a (NIV): Know and understand this: From the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem *until the Anointed One, the ruler, comes, there will be seven 'sevens,' and sixty-two 'sevens.'* It will be rebuilt with streets and a trench, but in times of trouble. After the sixty-two 'sevens,' the Anointed One will be cut off and will have nothing.

The Masoretic accenting has an *'atnāḥ* after "seven weeks," suggesting some kind of reading pause between "seven weeks" and "sixty-two weeks:"

עַד-מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעָה וְשִׁבְעִים שָׁנִים

Much scholarly ink has been spent on deciding whether this *'atnāḥ*-pause here is to be understood as a major disjunctive, or as a non-disjunctive emphasis. The accent can perform both roles. If the former, it would be the equivalent of an English full stop (cf. NAB).<sup>60</sup> If the latter, it lets the two numbers be read together as one unit (cf. NIV).<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup>So Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 355; Hartman and di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, 250-51; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 229; Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 188; Lucas, *Daniel*, 243; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 378-80; Porteous, *Daniel*, 142; Seow, *Daniel*, 148.

<sup>61</sup>So Baldwin, *Daniel*, 170-71; Jacques B. Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study," *AUSS* 17 (1979): 1-22; Tremper Longman, *Daniel* (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 227; Miller, *Daniel*, 262; William H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy* (ed. Frank B. Holbrook; Daniel & Revelation Committee Series 3; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 75-118; Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2007), 355; Edward J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 205.

The most common function of the *'atnāḥ* is to break up a verse into two sentences (disjunctive function). It can however also have a non-disjunctive function, as seen in, for instance, Dan 8:20 ("the ram which you saw with two horns [*'atnāḥ*] the kings of Media and Persia"), Dan 9:2 ("I Daniel understood by the books [*'atnāḥ*] the number of the years"), Gen 1:1 ("In the beginning God created [*'atnāḥ*] the heavens and the earth"); Gen 22:10 ("And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife [*'atnāḥ*] to slay his son"), Exod 38:29 ("the bronze from the wave offering was seventy talents [*'atnāḥ*] and two thousand and four hundred shekels"), and Num 1:46 ("they were a total number of six hundred and three thousand [*'atnāḥ*] and five hundred and fifty").<sup>62</sup>

The last example from Num 1:46 clearly shows that an *'atnāḥ* inside a string of numbers does not have to imply a full stop and the beginning of a new sentence.

Since the presence of an *'atnāḥ* by itself does not finally determine the way this verse should be read, the wider context and structure of the prophecy must be considered. The ancient versions (Theo., LXX, Syr., and Vulg.) read the two numbers together,<sup>63</sup> so this increases the likelihood that Jesus or the Gospel writers would have understood the text the same way.

An important reason to read the two periods as constituting one unit is that splitting them apart would demand two different Messiahs or two different appearances

---

<sup>62</sup>The best and most even-handed discussion of the function of the *'atnāḥ* in Dan 9:25 is found in Owusu-Antwi, which also provided this list of non-disjunctive examples. Brempong Owusu-Antwi, *The Chronology of Daniel 9:24-27* (ATSDS 2; Berrien Springs, Mich.: ATS Publications, 1995), 186-97.

<sup>63</sup>Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," 91. The LXX reads the numbers together also, but has the odd numbers "after the seventy-seven and sixty-two." Cf. Izak J. J. Spangenberg, "The Septuagint Translation of Daniel 9: Does It Reflect a Messianic Interpretation?" in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. Michael A. Knibb; BETL 195; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2006), 431-42.

of the same Messiah, as the NAB translation above shows. First one Messiah-Prince (מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד) would come after seven weeks (7x7 years), and then he would either return or another Messiah (מְשִׁיחַ) would appear after another sixty-two weeks (62x7 years). While not impossible, it seems slightly odd or artificial. A more probable reading is that one Messiah should appear at one specific point in time, and that this event is described several times throughout the prophecy of Dan 9. Hebrew literature in general and prophecies in Daniel in particular (cf. Dan 7 repeating the same sequence of events four times) tend to repeat important elements.

Jacques Doukhan has made an interesting structural analysis of the entire prophecy (Dan 9:24-27). Assuming the antiquity and superiority of reading the two time periods together, giving us several references to the same Messiah (as just discussed), an ABABAB pattern appears in the text alternating between references to the building of Jerusalem and the coming of an anointed one.<sup>64</sup>

A: Building of Jerusalem

<sup>25</sup>From the going forth of the word  
to restore and build Jerusalem

there shall be seven weeks

It shall be built again with squares  
and moat, but in a troubled time.

B: Coming of the Messiah

to the coming of an anointed one,  
a prince,

and sixty-two weeks.

<sup>26</sup>After the sixty-two weeks,  
an anointed one shall be cut off,  
and shall have nothing.

Thus it seems that forty-nine years after a decree to rebuild Jerusalem the building work would be completed, and after another 434 years a Messiah would come.<sup>65</sup> The fate of the

---

<sup>64</sup>Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9," 12-4.

<sup>65</sup>Two useful surveys of the different possible starting dates and ending dates of these time periods are Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 354-7, and Gerhard F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature*



Messiah then was to be killed ("cut off," "יִכָּרֵת," Theo. "ἐξολεθρευθήσεται," Syr. "killed").

There are not many explicit statements in the OT about an anointed one prophesied to be killed, but this is certainly one. The occasional comment in the literature that a personal Messiah is not possible here because that would make it unique in Daniel makes little sense.<sup>66</sup> There might not be a מָשִׁיחַ elsewhere in Daniel, but there is clearly one here.

Jesus then did not have to go only to the suffering servant of Isa 53 to utter his passion predictions. Daniel 9 fits equally well.<sup>67</sup>

Next follows a prediction about the destruction of Jerusalem.

---

*of Prophecy* (ed. Frank B. Holbrook; Daniel & Revelation Committee Series 3; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 3-63.

We do not know enough about what historical-chronological information about Jerusalem's history was available to scribes and interpreters in the first century, but one simple and straightforward possible interpretation of the starting date ("from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem") would be the decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem given by Artaxerxes I to Ezra in Ezra 7:12-26—around the year 457 B.C. 49 plus 434 years would then take us to A.D. 27, which is around the time the historical Jesus appeared on the public scene.

If Jesus or the Gospel writers had wanted to see Jesus as a precise fulfillment of the appearing Messiah in Dan 9:25-26 after "seven weeks and sixty two weeks of years," it would certainly have been possible.

<sup>66</sup>E.g., "From the time of the Old Latin translation onwards, this phrase has been given a messianic interpretation, and has been taken to refer to the anointing of 'a most holy one'. There is no basis for this in the text itself, nor in the book of Daniel as a whole, which has no explicit reference to a 'messiah'." "The 'messianic' interpretation faces three objections. 1. There is the lack of clear interest in a 'messiah' figure elsewhere in Daniel." Lucas, *Daniel*, 242-3. But clearly there are several explicit references to a Messiah right here in Dan 9:24-26, and the lack of it elsewhere in Daniel is immaterial.

Such lines of arguments cast doubt about the objectivity and soundness of much of biblical scholarship. When a biblical passage repeats a theme several times, it is taken as an indication of multiple authorship and poor work of a final redactor. When a theme is mentioned in only one place, it is dismissed for its lack of occurrence in other places.

<sup>67</sup>Brant Pitre is one of too few scholars who discuss seriously and at length the obvious possibility that Jesus might have taken the concept of a dying Messiah from Dan 9; see for example Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation*, 399-404.

The people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed. (Dan 9:26b)

We saw that the Messiah in v. 25 was called both Messiah and Prince, or maybe the combined title "a Messiah-Prince" (MT מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד, Theo χριστοῦ ἡγουμένου). Now in v. 26 a Prince shows up (MT נָגִיד הַבָּא, "the prince to come" or "the coming prince"; Theo τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τῷ ἐρχομένῳ) who will destroy both city (הָעִיר, τὴν πόλιν) and temple (הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, τὸ ἅγιον).<sup>68</sup> This can obviously not be the anointed-prince who brings in atonement and righteousness in v. 25. No Messiah would ruin the city and sanctuary. This is a destructive figure and must be read as an enemy of the Messiah (an 'anti-christ'). The destruction of the city and the temple will happen quickly ("with a flood"), then war and desolation will follow.

But he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week; and in the middle of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate, until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator. (Dan 9:27)

Someone, probably one of the two characters we have seen so far (either the good Messiah or the bad prince), will "strengthen the covenant." The OT knows only of one

---

<sup>68</sup>The modern tradition of seeing Antiochus IV Epiphanes here as the evil prince to come fails to correspond with the description in the text, since Antiochus IV interrupted and profaned the temple service in Jerusalem but he never came close to destroying the city. John Collins' comment on this detail is unusually (but understandably) brief: "*will destroy the city*: The Syrians did not demolish Jerusalem." Then Collins adds a clause that makes little historical sense: "but they made it desolate by the corruption of the cult." There is no evidence that the city was abandoned or desolated because of Antiochus' profanation of the temple service.

One could of course point to inaccurate history-writing here on the part of a pseudonymous author of Daniel, but that is dangerous for the entire scholarly project. Arguing first that Daniel must be written in the second century B.C. as an *ex-eventu* 'prophecy' because it fits the events of that period so astoundingly accurate, only to turn around and claim that it was not so accurate after all, begs the question whether other references than the mid-second century should be sought.

covenant, the one between God and his people (although the covenant is often "renewed" or called "a new covenant," Jer 31:31). There is no previous example of a false messiah or other bad character making a covenant in the OT, so we must assume that this covenant is a good one, that is, God's covenant with his people. Thus it follows that it must be the good Messiah who strengthens that covenant.

In the middle of the week, one of the characters will abolish sacrifices. This could theoretically be either candidate. It could be the work of the good Messiah, paralleling the work of bringing in atonement and eternal righteousness in v. 24 (i.e., the death of the Messiah being the final and ultimate sacrifice to end all sacrifices).<sup>69</sup> Or it could be conceived of as the work of the bad prince, going with the following phrase in the verse (the abomination of desolation).

The Messiah makes better sense in the context because it fits with the alternating pattern in these two verses between the good Messiah and the bad Prince continuing the ABABAB pattern.

A: Events related to Jerusalem

<sup>25</sup>From the going forth of the word  
to restore and build Jerusalem

there shall be seven weeks

It shall be built again with squares  
and moat, but in a troubled time.

B: The work of the Messiah

to the coming of an anointed one,  
a prince,

and sixty-two weeks.

<sup>26</sup>After the sixty-two weeks,  
an anointed one shall be cut off,  
and shall have nothing.

---

<sup>69</sup>John the Baptist of the Fourth Gospel seems to have such a concept (John 1:29), as did the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (10:1-14). Matthew might even have implied something similar with the description of the service of the Jerusalem temple malfunctioning exactly when Jesus died (27:51).

The people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed.

<sup>27</sup>He shall make a strong covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease.

And upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate

until the decreed end is poured out on the desolator.

Just like A earlier (vv. 25-26a) concerned Jerusalem, so it still does here in the latter part of the prophecy (vv. 26b-27). But now the city is not being built; now it is being destroyed by the people of the bad prince, also called the "abomination of desolation." Finally the desolator himself will be ended. This is described with a grammatical passive without a named agent (וְעַד-כָּלָה וְנִחַרְצָה תִּתֵּן עַל-שִׁמּוֹן), but conceivably either God or the 'good Messiah' is responsible for that part.

### Temporal Interpretation of the Prophecy

Can we say anything about first-century beliefs concerning the time when these events in Dan 9:24-27 had been fulfilled or would in the future be fulfilled? The prophecy about the death of the Messiah (v. 26) greatly simplifies our task. *In case* Jesus had pondered this prophecy of Dan 9:24-27 *and* saw himself as that Messiah that was to be cut off in order to bring in atonement and everlasting righteousness, then we can expect that he will also believe that after his death an evil power will come on the scene and destroy the city and the temple. There is a clear sequence of events here, even if one does not subscribe to my entire AB pattern. The death of the Messiah clearly precedes the destruction of the city and temple—the abomination of desolation. At some point in the future the desolator will be taken care of.

In other words, if Jesus saw himself as the dying Messiah of Dan 9, he would probably have believed that soon after his time the city of Jerusalem would be attacked

and fall. This, as we know, is exactly what the Synoptic Jesus sets forth in the Eschatological Discourse.

### The Smaller Scope of Daniel 9

Let me make one final observation on Dan 9, which is too seldom commented on in the literature. While I have several times above called the seventy weeks of 9:24-27 a 'prophecy', it is strictly speaking not a vision in itself but an angelic *explanation about* a vision. The prophecies of Daniel chs. 2, 7, and 8 are given to Daniel or the king in a dream or vision (Dan 2:3, 26; 7:2; 8:1). Daniel 9:24-27, however, is not a new vision but an explanation of a previously received vision, just like the intra-chapter explanations given by Daniel about the king's vision (ch. 2) and the explanations given by the angel about Daniel's visions (chs. 7 and 8).<sup>70</sup> Unlike the macro-historical century-spanning kingdom-replacing-kingdom visions of the rest of the book, 9:24-27 deals with only a *smaller* part of history.

To be more precise, while the longer visions of Dan 2, 7, 8, and 10-12 deal with *the nations and the world*, the seventy weeks of 9:24-27 deal only with the Jewish nation and capital. Daniel prays not about the fate of the world but the fate of his own people (vv. 1-19). The angel explicitly says that the seventy weeks are about "your people and the holy city" (עַל-עַמֶּךָ וְעַל-עִיר, v. 24). And that is also precisely what we find when the

---

<sup>70</sup>Dan 9:24-27 is apparently a further explanation about the vision of Dan 8. Dan 8:27 states that Daniel did not understand everything he had seen in the vision of ch. 8 (vv. 2-14), despite Gabriel's extensive explanation (vv. 15-26); and how Gabriel then returns and says "Daniel, I have now come to give you insight and understanding" (9:22). John Collins comments about 9:22: "*to impart understanding*: Compare 8:16, where Gabriel is instructed to make Daniel understand (הבין)." Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 352. "The new revelation that Gabriel brought to Daniel was meant to clarify some of the elements from the previous visions that were particularly hard for the prophet to understand." Stefanovic, *Daniel*, 353.

angel keeps talking (vv. 24-27). "The prophecy is focused on Israel and Jerusalem. It is not about wider history, unlike Dan. 7-8 and 10-12."<sup>71</sup>

While there are clear parallels between 9:24-27 and the rest of the prophecies of Daniel—like war and persecution of God's people—the *geographic and ethnic* scope is more narrow. Daniel 2, 7, 8, and 10-12 contain large universal prophecies of nations fighting nations, of persecutions of the faithful, of wicked powers. Daniel 9 deals with the same elements of war and persecutions but with Israel and the temple as its central concern. It is almost as if the events of 9:24-27 are a small-scale *type* of the larger universal fulfillments. The seventy weeks are like a miniature prophetic piece 'cut off'<sup>72</sup> from the larger prophetic scenarios of Daniel.

*When we come to the Synoptic Discourse then, we should not be surprised if Jesus talks about events related to Jerusalem when he alludes to Dan 9, and that he talks about larger historical issues when he alludes to Dan 7.*

### **The Structure of the Eschatological Discourse**

Now we can turn to the text of the Discourse itself and try to answer the question of its structure and interpretation, a question which has deservedly been a source of much puzzlement and debate. As we saw in the history of interpretation-section above, the crucial questions are: What, if anything, refers to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70? What, if anything, refers to the Christian era? What, if anything, is related to the Parousia? If, as it probably appears to most readers, the Discourse talks about more than one of these,

---

<sup>71</sup>Lucas, *Daniel*, 241.

<sup>72</sup>Which is incidentally the literal meaning of חתך: the seventy weeks are 'cut off' for the Jewish people and the holy city (9:24). Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 353; Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," 107-8.

should Matt 24:34 (and parallels) be read as a mistaken prediction on the part of either Jesus or the Gospel writer? "Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till *all these things* take place."

### Richard Davidson's Proposal

The best structural proposal to date of the difficult Olivet Discourse has been made by Richard Davidson in an essay that has not received the attention it deserves.<sup>73</sup> I will outline Davidson's position and arguments, and give my own reasons for finding it convincing (which includes Dan 7 and 9 having explanatory power over the more puzzling elements of the Discourse).

Davidson sees an ABABAB pattern in the Discourse, rooted in the opening verses with the disciples' question.

The key to unlocking the meaning of Matthew 24:34, and of the whole chapter, is located in the terminological pattern already set in the historical context of vss. 1-3. . . . Note that the disciples ask two basic questions—one regarding *tauta* "these things"—which from the previous context refer clearly to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the second regarding the sign of the Parousia (Christ's Second Coming) and of the *synteleia* "end" of the world/age. The disciples probably did not distinguish between these two events in their minds, but it is evident that Jesus draws a careful distinction in His Olivet Discourse, based upon the very terminology that He and the disciples had used. The term *tauta* "these things" consistently refer to events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem (we may label this "A"), and the terms *parousia* "coming" and *synteleia* "end" refer to events connected with the Second Advent of Christ (we may label this "B").<sup>74</sup>

All uses of the demonstrative adjective ταῦτα/τοῦτο ("these/this") are found in

---

<sup>73</sup>Richard M. Davidson, "'This Generation Shall Not Pass' (Matt 24:34): Failed or Fulfilled Prophecy," in *The Cosmic Battle for Planet Earth: Essays in Honor of Norman R. Gulley* (ed. Ronald A. G. du Preez and Jiří Moskala; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2003), 307-28.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, 310-11.

Davidson's proposed A sections (Fall of Jerusalem). The distribution of the demonstrative ἐκεῖνος (as in "*those* days") is more complex. Some are found in the A section, some in the B. The distribution is not random, however. Davidson points out that the word order is different when found in the A section (Matt 24:19) compared to the B section (vv. 22, 29).

While both vs. 22 and vs. 19 use the term "those days," there is a significant difference in the Greek word order. The "those days" of vs. 19 (which refer to the destruction of Jerusalem) are unique in placing the adjective "those" before the noun "days": *en ekainais tais hēmerais*. By contrast, the "those days" of vs. 22 (as well as vs. 29 ...), has the adjective "those" *after* the noun "days": *hai hēmerai ekeinai* (literally days-those). According to Greek grammarian C. F. D. Moule, such change in position of the demonstrative adjective in relation to its noun may be significant especially in the Gospels and Acts. This factor is extremely significant in Matthew 24. . . . There seems to be an intentional shift in word order [v. 22] to indicate a different period of tribulation than that connected with the destruction of Jerusalem [v. 19].<sup>75</sup>

Davidson is not the first to notice that 'those days' can in some contexts be an eschatological marker, "because 'that day' and 'those days' frequently carry eschatological content in the First Gospel (7:22; 9:15; 10:15; 11:22, 24; 12:36; 24:19, 22, 29, 36, 42, 50; 25:13; 26:29), and because there is OT precedent for such usage (Jer 3:16, 18; 31:33; 50:4; Joel 3:1; Zech 8:23)."<sup>76</sup>

As for the terms for 'end' used in the Discourse, Davidson argues that the word τέλος consistently refers to events regarding the Fall of Jerusalem and the end of the Jewish nation in the first century, while συντέλεια is the term for the end of the age.

Note that the term for "end" used here in vs. 6 is not *synteleia*, the word employed in vs. 3 to refer to the end of the world/age, but *telos*. Elsewhere in Matthew, the word

---

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., 316. The reference to Moule is C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), 122.

<sup>76</sup>Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:288.



*telos* "end" is never used with reference to the end of the age (see Matt 10:22; 26:58); rather the term for the "end" with reference to the "end of the age" (Second Advent of Christ) is always *synteleia* (see Matt 13:39, 40, 49; 28:20).<sup>77</sup>

Davidson's observations about the distribution of the key terms into the two sections hold true for Matthew, and more or less also for Mark and Luke. The only exception where Davidson's structure of Matthew does not carry perfectly over into Mark and Luke is in the disciples' question in Mark 13:4b and Luke 21:7b. Here the key word ταῦτα ("these things"), which should belong to the A section, is found in Mark and Luke in a sentence that in the parallel in Matthew deals with B (the Parousia). Davidson admits this in a footnote (he sets out to discuss the Matthean text only), and does not think this invalidates his proposal. "The overall structure of Jesus' discourse in this essay can be seen in all three Synoptic Gospels, but is clearest and most precise in the Gospel of Matthew."<sup>78</sup>

Table 3 (next pages) displays Davidson's structure of the Discourse in Matthew. I have for convenience added the parallel accounts in Mark and Luke. The Greek words Davidson discusses are included in square brackets.

Since Davidson's discovery that the key words in the Discourse help delineate the material into two sections is accurate for Matthew and almost so for Mark and Luke, what arguments could we raise against it? One serious contention could be that this structure is too neat and artificial to have originated with the ancient writers, that it is superimposed upon the text. Biblical scholarship is unfortunately full of examples of

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., 312.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., 310.

TABLE 3

DAVIDSON'S OUTLINE OF MATTHEW 24  
(MARK AND LUKE SHOWN IN PARALLEL)

MATTHEW 24	MARK 13	LUKE 21
<b>A: Question about the Fall of Jerusalem</b>		
<sup>2</sup> Then he asked them, You see all <i>these things</i> [ταῦτα], do you not? Truly I tell you, not one stone will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down. <sup>3</sup> When he was sitting on the Mount of Olives, the disciples came to him privately, saying, Tell us, when will <i>these things</i> [ταῦτα] be,	<sup>2</sup> Then Jesus asked him, Do you see <i>these</i> [ταύτας] great buildings? Not one stone will be left here upon another; all will be thrown down. <sup>3</sup> When he was sitting on the Mount of Olives opposite the temple, Peter, James, John, and Andrew asked him privately, <sup>4</sup> Tell us, when will <i>these things</i> [ταῦτα] be,	<sup>6</sup> As for <i>these things</i> [ταῦτα] that you see, the days will come when not one stone will be left upon another; all will be thrown down. <sup>7</sup> They asked him, Teacher, when will <i>these things</i> [ταῦτα] be,
<b>B: Question about the Parousia</b>		
and what will be the sign of your coming [παρουσίας] and of the end [συντελείας] of the age?	and what will be the sign that all these things [ταῦτα] are about to be accomplished [συντελεῖσθαι]?	and what will be the sign that all these things [ταῦτα] are about to take place?
<b>A: Events Up To, and Including the Fall of Jerusalem</b>		
<sup>4</sup> Jesus answered them, Beware that no one leads you astray. <sup>5</sup> For many will come in my name, saying, 'I am the Messiah!' and they will lead many astray. <sup>6</sup> And you will hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that you are not alarmed; for this must take place, but the end [τέλος] is not yet. <sup>7</sup> For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there will be famines and earthquakes in various places: <sup>8</sup> all these things [ταῦτα] are but the beginning of the birth pangs. <sup>9</sup> Then they will hand you over to be tortured and will put you to death, and you will be hated by all nations	<sup>5</sup> Then Jesus began to say to them, Beware that no one leads you astray. <sup>6</sup> Many will come in my name and say, 'I am he!' and they will lead many astray. <sup>7</sup> When you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end [τέλος] is still to come. <sup>8</sup> For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in various places; there will be famines. These things [ταῦτα] are but the beginning of the birth pangs. <sup>9</sup> As for yourselves, beware; for they will hand you over to councils; and you will be beaten in synagogues; and you	<sup>8</sup> And he said, Beware that you are not led astray; for many will come in my name and say, 'I am he!' and, 'The time is near!' Do not go after them. <sup>9</sup> When you hear of wars and insurrections, do not be terrified; for these things [ταῦτα] must take place first, but the end [τέλος] will not follow immediately. <sup>10</sup> Then he said to them, Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; <sup>11</sup> there will be great earthquakes, and in various places famines and plagues; and there will be dreadful portents and great signs from heaven. <sup>12</sup> But before all these things [τούτων] occurs, they

Table 3—*Continued.*

MATTHEW 24	MARK 13	LUKE 21
<p>because of my name. <sup>10</sup> Then many will fall away, and they will betray one another and hate one another. <sup>11</sup> And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray. <sup>12</sup> And because of the increase of lawlessness, the love of many will grow cold.</p> <p><sup>13</sup> But the one who endures to the end [τέλος] will be saved. <sup>14</sup> And this [tou/to] good news of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the world, as a testimony to all the nations; and then the end [τέλος] will come.</p> <p><sup>15</sup> So when you see the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, as was spoken of by the prophet Daniel, let the reader understand, <sup>16</sup> then those in Judea must flee to the mountains; <sup>17</sup> the one on the housetop must not go down to take what is in the house; <sup>18</sup> the one in the field must not turn back to get a coat. <sup>19</sup> Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days [ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις]! <sup>20</sup> Pray that your flight may not be in winter or on a Sabbath.</p>	<p>will stand before governors and kings because of me, as a testimony to them. <sup>10</sup> And the good news must first be proclaimed to all nations. <sup>11</sup> When they bring you to trial and hand you over, do not worry beforehand about what you are to say; but say whatever is given you at that time, for it is not you who speak, but the Holy Spirit. <sup>12</sup> Brother will betray brother to death, and a father his child, and children will rise against parents and have them put to death; <sup>13</sup> and you will be hated by all because of my name. But the one who endures to the end [τέλος] will be saved.</p> <p><sup>14</sup> But when you see the abomination of desolation set up where it ought not to be, let the reader understand, then those in Judea must flee to the mountains; <sup>15</sup> the one on the housetop must not go down or enter the house to take anything away; <sup>16</sup> the one in the field must not turn back to get a coat. <sup>17</sup> Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days [ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις]! <sup>18</sup> Pray that it may not be in winter.</p>	<p>will arrest you and persecute you; they will hand you over to synagogues and prisons, and you will be brought before kings and governors because of my name. <sup>13</sup> This will give you an opportunity to testify. <sup>14</sup> So make up your minds not to prepare your defense in advance; <sup>15</sup> for I will give you words and a wisdom that none of your opponents will be able to withstand or contradict. <sup>16</sup> You will be betrayed even by parents and brothers, by relatives and friends; and they will put some of you to death. <sup>17</sup> You will be hated by all because of my name. <sup>18</sup> But not a hair of your head will perish. <sup>19</sup> By your endurance you will gain your souls.</p> <p><sup>20</sup> When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near. <sup>21</sup> Then those in Judea must flee to the mountains, and those inside the city must leave it, and those out in the country must not enter it; <sup>22</sup> for these are days of vengeance, as a fulfillment of all that is written. <sup>23</sup> Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days [ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις]! For there will be great distress on the earth and wrath against this people; <sup>24</sup> they will fall by the edge of the sword and be taken away as captives among all nations.</p>

Table 3—Continued.

MATTHEW 24	MARK 13	LUKE 21
<b>B: Events Up To, and Including the Second Advent</b>		
<p><sup>21</sup> For then there will be great suffering, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now, no, and never will be.</p> <p><sup>22</sup> And if those days [αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι] had not been cut short, no one would be saved; but for the sake of the elect those days will be cut short. <sup>23</sup> Then if anyone says to you, Look! Here is the Messiah! or There he is! do not believe it. <sup>24</sup> For false messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce great signs and omens, to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. <sup>25</sup> Take note, I have told you beforehand. <sup>26</sup> So, if they say to you, Look! He is in the wilderness, do not go out. If they say, Look! He is in the inner rooms, do not believe it. <sup>27</sup> For as the lightning comes from the east and flashes as far as the west, so will be the coming [παρουσία] of the Son of Man. <sup>28</sup> Wherever the corpse is, there the vultures will gather. <sup>29</sup> Immediately after the suffering of those days [ὧν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων] the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven will be shaken. <sup>30</sup> Then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see 'the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven' with power and great glory.</p> <p><sup>31</sup> And he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.</p>	<p><sup>19</sup> For in those days [αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι] there will be suffering, such as has not been from the beginning of the creation that God created until now, no, and never will be. <sup>20</sup> And if the Lord had not cut short the days [τὰς ἡμέρας], no one would be saved; but for the sake of the elect, whom he chose, he has cut short the days [τὰς ἡμέρας].</p> <p><sup>21</sup> And if anyone says to you at that time, Look! Here is the Messiah! or Look! There he is! - do not believe it. <sup>22</sup> False messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce signs and omens, to lead astray, if possible, the elect. <sup>23</sup> But be alert; I have already told you everything.</p> <p><sup>24</sup> But in those days [ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις], after that suffering, the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, <sup>25</sup> and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers in the heavens will be shaken. <sup>26</sup> Then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory. <sup>27</sup> Then he will send out the angels, and gather his elect from the four winds, from the ends of the earth to the ends of heaven.</p>	<p>And Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.</p> <p><sup>25</sup> There will be signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars, and on the earth distress among nations confused by the roaring of the sea and the waves. <sup>26</sup> People will faint from fear and foreboding of what is coming upon the world, for the powers of the heavens will be shaken. <sup>27</sup> Then they will see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. <sup>28</sup> Now when these things begin to take place, stand up and raise your heads, because your redemption is drawing near.</p>

Table 3—*Continued.*

MATTHEW 24	MARK 13	LUKE 21
<b>A: Parable of the Fig Tree (Fall of Jerusalem)</b>		
<p><sup>32</sup> From the fig tree learn its lesson: as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near. <sup>33</sup> So also, when you see all these things [ταῦτα], you know that he is near, at the very gates. <sup>34</sup> Truly I tell you, this generation [ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη] will not pass away until all these things [ταῦτα] have taken place.</p> <p><sup>35</sup> Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.</p>	<p><sup>28</sup> From the fig tree learn its lesson: as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near. <sup>29</sup> So also, when you see these things [ταῦτα] taking place, you know that he is near, at the very gates. <sup>30</sup> Truly I tell you, this generation [ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη] will not pass away until all these things [ταῦτα] have taken place.</p> <p><sup>31</sup> Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.</p>	<p><sup>29</sup> Then he told them a parable: Look at the fig tree and all the trees; <sup>30</sup> as soon as they sprout leaves you can see for yourselves and know that summer is already near. <sup>31</sup> So also, when you see these things [ταῦτα] taking place, you know that the kingdom of God is near. <sup>32</sup> Truly I tell you, this generation [ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη] will not pass away until all things have taken place. <sup>33</sup> Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.</p>
<b>B: No One Knows the Time of the Parousia</b>		
<p><sup>36</sup> But about that day [τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης] and hour no one knows, neither the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. <sup>37</sup> For as the days of Noah were, so will be the coming of the Son of Man.</p> <p><sup>38</sup> For as in those days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark, <sup>39</sup> and they knew nothing until the flood came and swept them all away, so too will be the coming [παρουσία] of the Son of Man.</p>	<p><sup>32</sup> But about that day [τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης] or hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. <sup>33</sup> Beware, keep alert; for you do not know when the time will come. <sup>34</sup> It is like a man going on a journey, when he leaves home and puts his slaves in charge, each with his work, and commands the doorkeeper to be on the watch.</p> <p><sup>35</sup> Therefore, keep awake, for you do not know when the master of the house will come, in the evening, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or at dawn, <sup>36</sup> or else he may find you asleep when he comes suddenly. <sup>37</sup> And what I say to you I say to all: Keep awake.</p>	<p><sup>34</sup> Be on guard so that your hearts are not weighed down with dissipation and drunkenness and the worries of this life, and that day [ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη] catch you unexpectedly, <sup>35</sup> like a trap. For it will come upon all who live on the face of the whole earth. <sup>36</sup> Be alert at all times, praying that you may have the strength to escape all these things that will take place, and to stand before the Son of Man.</p>

*Source:* Richard M. Davidson, "'This Generation Shall Not Pass' (Matt 24:34): Failed or Fulfilled Prophecy," 307-28. Davidson discusses primarily Matt 24; I have for convenience added the parallel discourse in Mark and Luke. The Greek words Davidson discusses as structural indicators are included here in square brackets.

over-eager proposals that see structures and patterns around every corner. Too many structural proposals are in the eyes of the beholder only.<sup>79</sup>

Is this a valid objection here? Not in my opinion. First of all, Davidson builds his structure on the distribution of literal, exact terms. Too many of the weak structure proposals around argue for distribution of vague themes and topics only, not rooted in vocabulary. Secondly, the words around which he builds the structure are definitely key words for the topic of this Discourse. Demonstrative adjectives like "these" (closeness) and "those" (distance) are highly relevant when talking about the distance in time regarding future events. And the two words for "the end" (τέλος and συντέλεια) are hardly peripheral or insignificant in a Discourse that deals with eschatology.

Thirdly, Davidson's structure has explanatory power for a chapter that is among the most perplexing and debated in NT scholarship. Now the prediction by the Synoptic Jesus that "this generation will see all *these* things" (Matt 24:33; Mark 13:30; Luke 21:31) is read in its natural sense as referring to the first-century disciples, while all the verses so obviously referring to the Parousia (like Matt 24:27-31; Mark 13:24-26; Luke 21:25-27) do not have to be artificially interpreted as a first-century event like many have resorted to in order to get some consistency in their arguments.

There is a puzzling shift and apparent contradiction between Jesus' warning in the parable of the fig tree (Matt 24:32-35; Mark 13:28-31; Luke 21:29-33), where the careful observer should be able to read the signs of the times and know that a prediction is about to come true, and on the other hand a denial a few verses later that one can know the future (Matt 24:36-39; Mark 13:32-36; Luke 21:34-36). This apparent contradiction is

---

<sup>79</sup>For a critique of the subjectivity of structural proposals in biblical scholarship, see Christine M. Vetne, "Methodological Issues in Chiastic Research: A Study of Psalms 7 and 25" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2005).

solved in Davidson's proposal: Jesus is talking about two different things, A and B. While the imminence of "these things" (ταῦτα) that will soon take place can be understood by the watchful disciple (signs that Jerusalem is about to fall), no one can know the time of "that day" (τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης) when the Parousia will take place.

Considering the difficult nature of the Olivet Discourse, Davidson's proposal is the best one offered today.

#### Davidson's Proposal Aligned with Daniel 9 and 7

In my own research and thinking about the Eschatological Discourse, Davidson's proposal for structuring the chapter has been further strengthened while listening to the influence from and the use of Daniel. It has become my conviction that Jesus builds this Olivet Discourse section by section on his understanding of the details of the prophecies in Dan 9 and 7.

We saw above that a natural reading of Dan 9:24-27 was that a Messiah was to come at a specific point in time (after "sixty-nine weeks") and would be killed, and the city and sanctuary would be destroyed (termed an abomination of desolation) during a flood of war and destruction. Jesus explains this prophecy in the A section of the Discourse (Matt 24:14-20; Mark 13:5-18; Luke 21:8-24). Of the two clearest OT references in the Discourse, the A section is closed off with the one taken from Dan 9 (Matt 24:15; Mark 13:14; Luke 21:20).

Likewise I suggest that the B section of the Discourse is full of references to Dan 7. And at the end of section B comes the second clear-cut and obvious biblical reference in the Discourse: the coming of the 'Son of Man' on the clouds from Dan 7 (Matt 24:30; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27). Thus both the A and B sections of the Discourse end with clear

references to Daniel; the A section concludes with an allusion to Dan 9, the B section with an allusion to Dan 7.

We are also going to consider how the prophecies about Jerusalem in section A could be a small-scale type of the larger end-time prophecies of section B—just like Dan 9 was a small type 'cut off' from the larger universal prophecies in Daniel to deal explicitly with "your people and the city."

After all this groundwork has been made, we can now turn to my specific interpretation of the Eschatological Discourse and the use of Daniel in it.<sup>80</sup>

### **The Disciples' Question (Matt 24:3; Mark 13:4; Luke 21:7)**

In all three Gospels the disciples ask their question about the signs and the timing of future events after Jesus had remarked that the temple would in the future be destroyed (Matt 24:1-2; Mark 13:1-2; Luke 21:5-6). In Mark and Luke it appears that the temple's destruction is all they ask about. In Matthew the question also includes "the parousia and of the close of the age" (τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος). It is hard to know if that difference between the Gospels is significant (if Matthew materially expanded the question), or whether the original audience would have believed the destruction of the temple and the end of the age to be one and the same event (that Matthew expressed a detail that was already implicit in Mark).<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup>Since Hartman's *Prophecy Interpreted* is the most thorough discussion of the use of Daniel in the Eschatological Discourse, he will be a constant conversation partner in this section.

<sup>81</sup>Most commentators favor the latter. "Matthew's clarifying and christological 'your *parousia*' . . . and the nearly synonymous 'the end of the age' apparently explicate 'these things.'" "We do not here find one question regarding the destruction of the temple and another concerning the latter days." Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:337.



Hartman and several others see influence from Daniel in the disciples' question:

In the introduction to his version Mark makes Peter, James, John and Andrew ask (13,4): "Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign when these things are all to be accomplished?" (μέλλη ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα). This seems to be a conscious allusion to Daniel 12,7 on the part of the evangelist. In this passage Daniel asked (v. 6) how long would it be till the end, and the angel answered "that, when the shattering of the power of the holy people comes to an end, all these things would be accomplished" (LXX συντελεσθήσεται πάντα ταῦτα).<sup>82</sup>

For Hartman this allusion to Daniel then constitutes a reason to be on the lookout for Daniel in the rest of the Discourse.

A man who posed Daniel's question at the beginning of the Christian era could go to the Book of Daniel and there also find sayings as to what "all these things" were. . . . Above all the following sections from Daniel would presumably have come into the foreground, viz. 2,27-45 (Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image, and its interpretation), 7,2-27 (the vision of the four beasts, of the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man, and its interpretation) 9,22-27 (Gabriel interprets Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years' captivity), and ch. 11-12 (the *angelus interpret* speaks of the kingdoms of the north and south, of attacks on the people of God and of their afflictions and the final deliverance.<sup>83</sup>

One obvious, but important, observation Hartman makes is that several visions in Daniel describe similar events. "A man who meditated on these texts would find that they overlap to a great extent; they are all concerned with similar matters and on these points may complement each other."<sup>84</sup> We should thus expect to find the Synoptic Jesus intermingling allusions to different chapters of Daniel. "It would therefore be almost unnatural if these pericopes [in Daniel], which from the beginning were so closely associated with each other, were not also readily kept together in the exposition."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup>Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 145.

<sup>83</sup>*Ibid.*, 145-6.

<sup>84</sup>*Ibid.*, 146.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.*

Other scholars have similarly heard an allusion to Daniel in the question about "how long":

It is probable that the words of v. 4b ['all these things'] form an allusion to Dan 12,7.<sup>86</sup>

In the Marcan formulation of the question, the second clause resembles Dan. 12:7. When Daniel asked how long it would be to the end the divine messenger replied, "when the shattering of the power of the holy people comes to an end, all these things will be accomplished."<sup>87</sup>

For the question about when predicted events will take place cf. Dan 12:6–7 (cf. Dan 8:13); the noun *synteleia* in the disciples' question echoes the repeated use of that word in LXX Dan 12:6–7.<sup>88</sup>

It is hard not to agree with Hartman and others on these preliminary comments. The clear reference to Dan 9 ('abomination of desolation') in the Eschatological Discourse, as well as similar themes (prophetic-apocalyptic descriptions of the future), makes Daniel a natural background text for Mark 13 and parallels. The question is not if but to what extent Jesus refers to Daniel; the issue is which details in the Discourse allude to or borrow from Daniel.

Is the phrase in the disciples' question, "when will all these things be," borrowed from Dan 12:6-8 as Hartman and others suggest? The question about timing comes at important points in both Daniel (almost concluding the book) and in the Synoptic

---

<sup>86</sup>Peerbolte, *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study*, 29.

<sup>87</sup>Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 454-5.

<sup>88</sup>Richard T. France, *Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 347. Others who see an allusion to Daniel in the disciples' question include Blomberg, "Matthew," 86; Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount*, 101, 183; Heil, *The Gospel of Mark*, 259; LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies*, 34; Maloney, *Jesus' Urgent Message*, 111; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 870; Dale Miller and Patricia Miller, *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash on Earlier Jewish and New Testament Literature* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 21; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), 299; Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 326.

discourse (initiating the speech). It is almost as if the question is left hanging in Daniel and Jesus wants to pick up the thread some centuries later. "How long shall it be till the end of these wonders? . . . I heard, but I did not understand. Then I said, O my lord, what shall be the end of these things? He said, Go your way, Daniel, for the words are shut up and sealed until the time of the end" (Dan 12:6-9). The idea is intriguing that we are meant to pick up the question left hanging in the book of Daniel—that the following sermon will be an exposition and explanation of Daniel's prophecies.

On its own, this allusion to Dan 12 in the disciples' question is not stronger than 'possible'. Together, as I will discuss at the end of the chapter, a lot of these 'possible' allusions will cumulate to 'probable allusion' status.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

### **Wars (Matt 24:4-8; Mark 13:5-8; Luke 21:8-11)**

This section begins with Jesus warning the disciples against deceptions from future would-be-Messiahs (Matt 24:4-5; Mark 13:5-6; Luke 21:8). This warning is repeated in the B section further down in the Discourse (Matt 24:23-26 par), so we will look at possible Daniel allusions in the deception-warnings there.

"And you will hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that you are not alarmed; for this must take place, but the end is not yet" (Matt 24:6; Mark 13:7; very similar in Luke 21:9). There are no less than four elements in this verse that are potentially borrowed from Daniel: "wars and rumors of wars," "this must take place," "do not be alarmed," and "the end is not yet." Let us look at them one at a time.

In Matthew and Mark, Jesus explains to his disciples that they will hear about "wars and rumors of wars" ("πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων"); in Luke about "wars and insurrections" ("πολέμους καὶ ἀκαταστασίας"). That war between nations and powers is a

commonplace theme in Daniel is easy to notice for even the most casual reader. As we will see in the next chapter ('The Kingdom of God'), there is a prophetic description in Daniel of the frequency as well as the futility of war that is stronger than in the rest of the OT. The topic is found in every prophetic chapter. In ch. 2 nations upon nations arise and replace each other (war is implicit). In Dan 7:21 "the horn is waging war against the saints" ("τὸ κέρας ἐκεῖνο ἐποίει πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων"). In 9:26 there shall be "war to the end" ("ἕως τέλους πολέμου"). Daniel 11 contains constant battling between the north and the south. Christopher Mann lists Dan 7:21; 8:24; 9:26; 11:4-27 as allusions here.<sup>89</sup> Dale and Patricia Miller concur. "Mark's summary statement about wars and rumours of wars could have been his midrashic interpretation of Daniel, in which wars are predicted."<sup>90</sup>

The expression "this must take place" ("δεῖ γενέσθαι") by itself could indicate that Jesus had some 'prophetic certainty' about these wars. It is not unlikely that the phrase itself might originate with Daniel. The phrase "δεῖ γενέσθαι" occurs in the entire Greek Bible only in Dan 2:28 (LXX and Theo), in the Olivet Discourse (Matt 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 21:9), in Matt 26:54, and in Revelation (1:1; 4:1; 22:6). In other words, it is found only in the apocalyptic material of the Bible where divine revelation gives insight to what will with certainty take place.

Hartman takes the combination of warnings about wars together with the phrase

---

<sup>89</sup>Christopher S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27; New York: Doubleday, 1986), 500.

<sup>90</sup>Dale Miller and Patricia Miller, *The Gospel of Mark*, 299. See also Ford, *Abomination of Desolation*, 130. The opposite assessment is made by Kenneth Dyer who dismisses influence from Daniel as a "dubious connection" because "the rumours of war and other horrors (earthquakes, famines &c) are common in prophetic and apocalyptic literature." Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount*, 102.

"must take place" as proof of Danielic influence. "It is incontrovertible that the phrase 'this must take place' is related to Daniel."<sup>91</sup> Adela Yarbro Collins, Jane Schaberg, Michèle Morgen, and others are pondering the same idea.

The statement "It must happen" (δεῖ γενέσθαι) in v. 7c is an allusion to Dan 2:28–29 (OG and Theodotion) and 45 (Theodotion). This appropriation of Daniel implies that, from the evangelist's point of view, the events revealed in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, which "must happen" at the end of days, were only now occurring or about to occur.<sup>92</sup>

The δεῖ may be an allusion to Dan 2. 28,29 (LXX and Theodotian), 45 (Theodotian), where δεῖ signifies conformity with an apocalyptic eschatological regularity.<sup>93</sup>

Au verset 9 ('il faut que cela arrive'), renvoie à Daniel 2,28.<sup>94</sup>

Not everyone is equally convinced of a direct influence from Daniel. Beasley-Murray states that "it is wholly unlikely that Dan 2:28-29 is in mind in Mark 13:7; the phrase in question in all probability reflects current usage in the early Christian

---

<sup>91</sup>Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 149.

<sup>92</sup>Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 605.

<sup>93</sup>Jane Schaberg, "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions," *NTS* 31(1985): 211.

<sup>94</sup>Michèle Morgen, "Lc 17,20-37 et Lc 21,8-11.20-24: Arrière-fond scripturaire," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997), 317. Others who support an allusion to Daniel here include Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 288, 292; Blomberg, "Matthew," 86; Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 241; Ford, *Abomination of Desolation*, 112, 130; Hare, *Matthew*, 275; NA<sup>27</sup>; Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (New York: Harper, 1960), 213; Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 455; LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies*, 34; Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 192; Mann, *Matthew*, 500; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 876; David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel, "Luke," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 374. See also the discussion on the 'δεῖ γενέσθαι' phrase in §331 on pp. 124-7 above.

community."<sup>95</sup> Even if that is the case, however, extensive use of the phrase in the early church does not preclude Daniel from being the source of influence, and that a first-century audience would know that.

Jesus' admonition not to "be alarmed" about all these wars to come also has interesting ties to Daniel, although this is seldom discussed by commentators. Several times in Daniel either the king or the prophet is described as "alarmed" about information conveyed in a prophecy: 4:5 (the king); 4:19 (Daniel); 5:6 (the king); 5:9 (the king); 7:15 (Daniel); 7:28 (Daniel). The verb is always **ܠܗܝܠ** in the Aramaic and (συν)ταράσσω in Theodotion. LXX translates the concept with a variety of words and phrases. Theodotion's verb (συν)ταράσσω is never used in the NT. Matthew and Mark here have the verb θροέω (also used in Paul's prophetic warnings in 2 Thess 2:2), and Luke has πτοέω.<sup>96</sup>

We must ask whether it is a coincidence that Jesus tells his disciples not to be alarmed, the very reaction that always happened in Daniel (and in the Pauline epistle dealing with the Danielic prophecy, 2 Thess 2:2). I think not. I believe Jesus is alluding to the typical emotional reaction of the recipients of visions in Daniel, and he tells his listeners that they need not fear.

---

<sup>95</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 264. See also Dyer, *The Prophecy on the Mount*, 103.

<sup>96</sup>The emotional reaction of fearfulness is repeated in Daniel, the Synoptic Discourse, and 2 Thessalonians. As for the vocabulary difference, since (συν)ταράσσω is not used at all in the NT, it is possible that the word was not in use in the first century, or for other reasons was not considered suitable. Since 2 Thess 2, which is generally seen as influenced by Daniel also (e.g., Leon Morris, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* [TNTC 13; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984], 128), uses the same verb here for being alarmed as Matthew and Mark do (θροέω instead of Daniel's ταραάσσω), it strengthens the case that the concept of being alarmed was borrowed from Daniel, even though a different verb was used than in Daniel's Greek translations.

Finally, we have the phrase "the end is not yet." Hartmann argues strongly for Danielic influence also here:

If, however, we assume that Daniel inspired the war motif in this text, this assumption is immediately reinforced by the following points. The text goes on to say: 'but the end is not yet' (οὐπω [ἐστὶν + Mt] τὸ τέλος). We saw that in Dn 9,26 it was said that "to the end there shall be war."<sup>97</sup>

While Hartman goes on to show how the motif of war down through the centuries until the end is found in other chapters of Daniel as well, it is *only* in 9:26 that war is explicitly said to last all the way until the 'τέλος'. Jesus is thus probably making a reference here to Dan 9:26. The point being made in 9:26 is the very same as the point Jesus makes—that war is not a sign of the end since war will take place from 'now' and until 'the end'.<sup>98</sup>

We saw above that Dan 9:24-27 was a small prophetic unit dealing with Jerusalem and the Jewish people (as well as with the Messiah). When 9:26 describes "war until the end," it refers to wars occurring until the Abomination of Desolation, that is, until the end of Jerusalem. As we also saw above, Matt 24:6 and parallels are found in the section of the Discourse dealing with the events leading up to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. "The end is not yet" in Matt 24:6 refers to the end of Jerusalem and is in my opinion Jesus' direct exposition and application of Dan 9:26.

In the next verse (Matt 24:7a; Mark 13:8a; Luke 21:10) we have double repetitions of ἔθνος and βασιλεία: "Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against

---

<sup>97</sup>Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 149.

<sup>98</sup>Unfortunately, many Christian preachers down through the centuries have failed to see this point. Any new large-scale war is often presented as evidence that the end of the world is imminent. Jesus argued the opposite: War is a typical characteristic of history and is *not* a sign of the end.

kingdom." This is a continuation of the same theme of war and conflict seen in the previous verse. The vocabulary is significant. "Kingdom" (βασιλεία) is a prominent concept and word in the book of Daniel, occurring more than sixty times throughout the book. This is far more frequent than in any other OT book. The rising and falling of human kingdoms, and the supreme and lasting nature of God's kingdom, is a major motif in Daniel. The Synoptic Jesus regularly spoke about a 'kingdom' also—the Kingdom of God. The next chapter will discuss Jesus' possible borrowing of kingdom-theology from the book of Daniel. At this point we just make a note of the fact that yet another keyword from Daniel is found in the Eschatological Discourse, adding to the extensive accumulated influence from Daniel in this Synoptic chapter.

The predictions about famine and earthquakes at the end of the current section (Matt 24:7b-8; Mark 13:8b; Luke 21:11) are general OT themes, not Danielic.<sup>99</sup>

Conclusion: "wars and rumors of wars," "this must take place," "do not be alarmed," and "the end is not yet" are all probable allusions to Daniel.

### **Proclaiming the Good News of the Kingdom (Matt 24:14; Mark 13:10)**

In this verse Jesus predicts the success of his followers. "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world, as a testimony to all nations; and then the end will come" (Matt 24:14). Many scholars as well as the average reader have interpreted this as a prediction about global evangelism to take place just before the

---

<sup>99</sup>"See, for example, Dt 28,20 ff.; Is 13,4 ff.; Jr 4,19 ff.; 6,22 ff.; 4,20 ff.; 50,41 ff.; Ez 7,5 ff.; Jl 2,1 ff." Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 150. Hartman's conjecture about the use of these texts in the middle of an exposition of Daniel is probably correct: "These motifs would seem to have formed part of this context, not because the OT texts used gave occasion for it but because these OT motifs had come to occupy a relatively permanent position in the expectations of the distress that would prevail in the last days." Ibid.



Parousia. In Davidson's structural analysis of the Discourse we are, however, still in the A section about events before A.D. 70. In that case the Matthean Jesus makes a prediction that the message of Jesus' kingship would reach all of the first-century world before the Fall of Jerusalem would take place. The author of Col 1:6 seems to believe just such a spread of the gospel was taking place.

As for the meaning of "this gospel of the kingdom," recent NT scholarship has seen a stronger denotation of *God's reign* in the term 'gospel' (εὐαγγέλιον) than earlier scholars did, who associated the term with *God's system of forgiveness*.<sup>100</sup> We will come back to this topic in the next chapter on the relationship between Daniel and the Synoptic material concerning the Kingdom of God. Right now it might be of significance that king Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4 begins and ends his story with a proclamation to all the nations about God's kingship. "King Nebuchadnezzar to all peoples, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth: . . . How great are his [God's] signs, how mighty his wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation" (Dan 4:1-3). "Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor the King of heaven" (Dan 4:37). The global and universal nature of God's reign (not just national) is found elsewhere in the OT. In Daniel it is almost exclusively so (only ch. 9 is devoted to the nation of Israel). The God of Daniel is the Lord of history and nations.

Hartman has suggested other parallels between Daniel and Matt 24:14. In this statement about mission to all the nations, which is unique to Matthew (cf. Mark 13:10), we can see allusions to Dan 11:33 ("those among the people who are wise shall make many understand") and 12:3 ("those who turn many to righteousness"). Just like Matt

---

<sup>100</sup>Cf. the chapter "Herald of the King" in N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 39-62.

24:14 and Mark 13:10 are found in the midst of warning about persecutions to come, so also Daniel has a statement about the evangelistic work of God's people while experiencing persecutions and hardship.

It is a little strange to see that we may in fact find support in Daniel for this missionary logion, even in this particular section in Dn 11 which describes persecutions. Verse 11,33 says: "Those among the people who are wise shall make many understand" (מַשְׁכִּילֵי עַם יְבִינוּ לְרַבִּים). In Dn 12,3 they are called "those who turn many to righteousness" (מַצְדִּיקֵי הָרַבִּי). To interpret "the many" as "the whole world" was not difficult for the Biblical expositor of the time.<sup>101</sup>

Descriptions of missionary activities are found elsewhere in the OT (Gen 12:3; Deut 4:6; Zech 8:23). The combination of the theme of evangelistic proclamations with that of persecutions is, however, uniquely Danielic. We should not rule out a direct allusion to Daniel here.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

#### **Abomination of Desolation (Matt 24:15-20; Mark 13:14-18; Luke 21:20-24a)**

We looked at this verse earlier in this chapter,<sup>102</sup> and I concluded with virtually all commentators that the abomination of desolation is a certain allusion or even (in Matthew) citation from Dan 9:27. Jesus probably read out of Dan 9:24-27 that shortly after the Messiah (i.e., himself) would be cut off and killed there would be a period of "wars until the end" culminating with an "abomination of desolation." For the Synoptic Jesus this was a prediction of the Fall of Jerusalem. "So when you see the desolating sacrilege spoken of by the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place, let the reader understand, then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains" (Matt 24:15-16).

---

<sup>101</sup>Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 171.

<sup>102</sup>Pp. 176-9 above.

"When you see Jerusalem being surrounded by armies, you will know that its desolation is near. Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains" (Luke 21:20-21).

Conclusion: Influence from Daniel on the phrase "abomination of desolation" is explicit in Matthew and certain in Mark and Luke.

**Persecution (Matt 24:9-13; Mark 13:9-13; Luke 21:12-19)  
The Great Persecution (Matt 24:21-22; Mark 13:19-20)**

Both of these paragraphs, one found in the A section and one in the B section, deal with oppression. The A section paragraph has some substantial variations between the Gospels. In Mark and Luke royal courts and synagogues are involved in the persecution, and believers are promised that they will receive from the Spirit the words they will speak during trials. In Matthew the source of the opposition to come is not specified, nor is there any reference to help from the Spirit. The B section persecution (Matthew and Mark) is said to be greater than any other persecution in history.

There are verbal parallels to Daniel in the noun "tribulation" (θλίψις, Dan 12:1-2 LXX and Theo; Matt 24:9, 21) and the verbs "hand over" (παράδιδωμι, Dan 7:25 LXX [Theo δίδωμι]; Matt 24:9; Mark 13:9; Luke 21:12) and "being saved" (σώζω, Dan 12:1 Theo [LXX has ὑψόω 'be lifted up']; Matt 24:13, 22; Mark 13:13, 20).

NA<sup>27</sup> (margin) lists Dan 12:1 as an allusion in Matt 24:21 and Mark 13:19. Hartman, Hagner, and Beasley-Murray believe the word θλίψις functions as stock vocabulary for eschatological judgment, influenced by Daniel or possibly even quoting Daniel.<sup>103</sup> Donald Hagner believes Jesus is referring to the prediction in Dan 12:1 here: "Such a catastrophe could only be interpreted as an eschatological event, a repetition and

---

<sup>103</sup>Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 418-9; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 702; Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 150-51.

final fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel."<sup>104</sup> William Lane considers Mark 13:19 "virtually a citation of Dan. 12:1,"<sup>105</sup> Craig Blomberg holds that Matt 24 "verse 21 also alludes to Dan. 12:1, referring to a kind of distress or tribulation that has not happened 'from the beginning of nations' until that time."<sup>106</sup> Davies and Allison concur: "'The great tribulation, etc.' is from Dan 12:1."<sup>107</sup> Several others have detected a possible allusion to Dan 12:1 here as well.<sup>108</sup> Coupled with παραδίδωμι the case is strengthened.<sup>109</sup> It is very possible that Jesus tries to draw a composite picture of being handed over to or rescued from tribulation from the two chapters Dan 7 and 12.

The task of God's faithful to 'endure' persecution and await a future 'salvation' is

---

<sup>104</sup>Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 703.

<sup>105</sup>Lane, *Gospel according to Mark*, 471.

<sup>106</sup>Blomberg, "Matthew," 86.

<sup>107</sup>Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:350.

<sup>108</sup>Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 295; Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 288, 296; Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew*, 469; Blomberg, "Matthew," 86; Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 241, 246; Robert G. Bratcher and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1961), 409; Brooks, *Mark*, 213; Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 400; Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 322; Ford, *Abomination of Desolation*, 112, 131; Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 527; Susan R. Garrett, *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 153; Hare, *Matthew*, 278; Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 337, 340; Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 315-6; LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies*, 35; Lüdemann, *Jesus*, 90; Maloney, *Jesus' Urgent Message*, 116-7; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 896; Mark Kent Mercer, "An Historical, Exegetical and Theological Study of Daniel 11:2b-12:4" (Th.D. diss.; Dallas Theological Seminary, 1987), 226-7; Dale Miller and Patricia Miller, *The Gospel of Mark*, 304; Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 326; Nolland, *Matthew*, 975; Harold Riley, *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1989), 156; Toy, *Quotations in the New Testament*, 65; Wessel, "Mark," 749.

<sup>109</sup>Cristopher Mann lists "deliver you up" as an allusion to Dan 7:25. Mann, *Matthew*, 501.

also paralleled in Dan 7 and 12. Morna Hooker comments on the call to endurance in Mark 13:13 ("he who endures to the end will be saved"): "It is also worth noting that in the Greek version (Theodotion) of Dan. 12:12, the verb to hold out (ὑπομένω) is used to translate the Hebrew word meaning 'waits' in describing the faithful who survive until the End arrives."<sup>110</sup> Similarly, Joel Marcus points out the parallel use of the word for salvation: "The verb *sōzein* ('to save, deliver') also appears in Dan 12:1b, the second half of the verse that, as we have seen, is virtually quoted in Mark 13:19."<sup>111</sup> Endurance and final deliverance are major themes in both Daniel and the Discourse.

A few commentators have pointed out that thematic similarity between the mentioning of standing before kings and courts in Mark (13:9) and Luke (21:12) and the experience of Daniel and his friends. Philip Carrington, Dale Miller, and Patricia Miller comment:

'He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved', with which we may compare Daniel xii. 13. . . . The leading ideas of this passage are not new. They seem to owe something to the Book of Daniel, in which the young Jews are given supernatural spirit and wisdom to bear witness among the heathen. It supplies such phrases as: 'to stand before the king'; 'we are not careful to answer to thee'; 'in whom was an excellent spirit'; and so forth. The tradition of martyrdom in the primitive Church seems to have derived a great deal of comfort and inspiration from the the Book of Daniel.<sup>112</sup>

Mark may have used midrashic sources in Dan. 7.25, 8.24-25, and 11.30-32, each of which depict persecutions. . . . Dan 7.25 refers to saints who are given into the hand of an anti-godly king. Mark's midrashic inspiration for "you will stand before governors and kings for my sake" may have been the three youths' bravery in disobeying the king's interdict against worshipping God (Dan. 3.12-17). . . . Dan

---

<sup>110</sup>Hooker, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 313.

<sup>111</sup>Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 897.

<sup>112</sup>Philip Carrington, *According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 277.

11.32 ("people who know their God shall stand firm and take action") is another midrashic source for Mark's "he who endures to the end will be saved."<sup>113</sup>

How should we evaluate all these suggestions? The verbal parallels between Daniel and the persecution-paragraphs of the Synoptic Discourse are perhaps not as exact and extensive as we could have wanted. There is only a string of parallel individual words, sometimes the same in the Greek, sometimes synonyms. The prominence of the theme in both places makes up for it, however. The motif of persecution, trials, tribulation, and finally deliverance is prominent throughout all of Daniel, more pervasive and dense than in any other OT book. The same is true for the Synoptic Olivet Discourse. On their own, found as isolated paragraphs in the Synoptic Gospels, these sections about persecution would at least be categorized as possible allusions to Daniel (so that is my verdict below). Found within a Discourse filled with numerous other allusions and a citation to Daniel, it accumulates in my judgment to probable influence from Daniel.

Conclusion: "Tribulation," "hand over," and "saved" are possible allusions to Daniel, as well as the concept of standing trial in courts before kings and governors.

Another connection to Daniel in the persecution-material has been advanced by David Wenham. Matthew contains a prediction about apostasy which Wenham suggests might be influenced by a specific reading of Dan 12:4. "And then many will fall away, and betray one another, and hate one another. . . . And because wickedness is multiplied [πληθυνθήναι τὴν ἀνομίαν], most men's love will grow cold" (Matt 24:10-12). "But you, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, until the time of the end. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge [or 'evil'] shall increase" (Dan 12:4).

There are at least two major issues in the verse in Dan 12. The most significant is

---

<sup>113</sup>Dale Miller and Patricia Miller, *The Gospel of Mark*, 302.

the issue of a variant reading of the last word. The MT reads that "*knowledge* shall increase" ("וְתִרְבֶּה הַדַּעַת") and is followed by Theo ("πληθυνθῇ ἡ γνῶσις"). LXX however reads "unrighteousness" ("πλησθῇ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας"), possibly based on a *Vorlage* containing "הרעת" instead of "הדעת." Wenham believes the increase of unrighteousness in Matt 24:12 is influenced by a text of Dan 12:4 which contained the same prediction.

A small minority of English translations (Jerusalem Bible, NRSV) prefer the LXX reading here, and are supported by John Collins:

*And evil will increase:* The MT "knowledge" is supported by Theodotion and Jerome. . . . The emendation, however, involves only a very common corruption (ק to ד) and makes better sense of the OG ("the land is filled with wickedness"). Compare also 1 Macc 1:9, ἐπλήθυναν κακὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, which need not, however, be taken as an allusion to Dan 12:4.<sup>114</sup>

The majority of commentators and modern translations favor the MT "*knowledge* shall increase." Determining the best text here is however not necessary for our task. Wenham's argument for influence from Dan 12:4 in Matt 24:10-12 only needs "unrighteousness" to have been an available reading in the first century: "It is doubtful if the LXX is to be followed in this; but whether it is or not, the LXX is at least an early witness to an interpretation of Daniel 12:4 that brings us close to Matthew 24:12."<sup>115</sup>

Another significant issue in Dan 12:4 is the meaning of the phrase "many shall *run to and fro*" (MT "יִשְׁטָטְטוּ"). If one prefers the last phrase of the verse to read "knowledge shall increase," this phrase that immediately precedes it might be understood as a positive activity that generates the increased knowledge. If however the LXX reading of "evil" is to be preferred, this preceding phrase could rather be understood negatively,

---

<sup>114</sup>Collins, *Daniel*, 399.

<sup>115</sup>David Wenham, "A Note on Matthew 24:10-12," *TynBul* 31 (1980): 158.

as a wavering and apostatizing behavior that induces unrighteousness. This is precisely what the two Greek versions do. Theo (following MT or a text like it) has the positive prediction that "many shall be *taught* and knowledge shall increase" ("διδάχθωσιν πολλοὶ καὶ πληθυνθῇ ἡ γνῶσις"). LXX contains the almost opposite prediction that "many shall be mad"<sup>116</sup> and unrighteousness shall increase" ("ἀπομανῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῇ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας").

Wenham sees a thematic parallel here to Matt 24:10 ("and then many will fall away, and betray one another, and hate one another"). He writes: "It must be admitted that the verbal parallels are not very close or extensive, but the parallelism of thought is notable."<sup>117</sup>

He sets up the following comparison between Matthew and Daniel:<sup>118</sup>

Matthew	Daniel
24:10a 'And then will be offended many'	12:4 'Many will apostasize'
12 'And because of the multiplication of lawlessness, the love of many will grow cold'	'And evil will multiply'

How should we evaluate Wenham's interesting proposal? The first of the parallels (Matt 24:10a) is only thematic and not verbal, and is based on a specific interpretation of both the Hebrew and Greek words. The second parallel (Matt 24:12) has two identical words in the Greek (πληθύνω and ἀνομία), but is dependant on a minority variant reading of Dan 12:4 having been available to Jesus or Matthew. Without this uncertainty of the

---

<sup>116</sup>The verb 'ἀπομαίνομαι' does not occur elsewhere in the Greek Bible, but has the meaning elsewhere of "recover from madness." Henry George Liddell et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 209.

<sup>117</sup>Wenham, "A Note on Matthew 24:10-12," 158.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., 159.



text, it would be safe to classify this at least as a possible allusion. We are after all in the middle of an Eschatological Discourse in Matthew with numerous allusions to and even a citation of the book of Daniel. However, since we cannot know if Matthew or his source had the negative prediction of wavering and evil in their texts of Dan 12:4, we ought to remain unsure about influence from this specific verse.

Conclusion: "Fall way" and "unrighteousness shall increase" in Matt 24:10-12 are uncertain allusions to Dan 12:4.

### **Deception (Matt 24:4-5, 23-28; Mark 13:5-6, 21-23; Luke 21:8)**

Just like persecution and distress are found in both the A and B sections of the Discourse, so also are warnings about coming deception. Jesus warns his followers against deceptions from future false Messiahs (A section: Matt 24:4-5, Mark 13:5-6, Luke 21:8; B section: Matt 24:23-24, Mark 13:21-22) and against false prophets (A section: Matt 24:11; B section: Matt 24:24, Mark 13:22).

There are strong thematic parallels to Dan 7 here. Just like some in the Olivet Discourse would boast and blaspheme and claim to be God's Messiah and prophetic voice, so also the little horn of Dan 7 is full of boasting and blaspheming. "He shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand for a time, two times, and half a time" (Dan 7:25). In Daniel ch. 8 someone is clearly contending for God's own throne and authority. "It magnified itself, even up to the Prince of the host" (Dan 8:11).

We looked at a similar theme in ch. 2 above (pericope §364, p. 92), where Jesus emphasized that all authority belongs to him and that the disciples should teach people obedience to all of Jesus' teachings. Here in the Olivet Discourse there is no reference to

obedience and commandments per se, but another aspect of Jesus' kingly authority is challenged: someone is falsely claiming to be the Messiah or speaking on God's behalf (false prophets).

Since this parallel is only thematic and not verbal, I hesitate to classify any allusion to Daniel in these verses as more than just 'possible'. It is however the same power-usurping type of behavior found in Dan 7-8 that is warned about in the Synoptic Discourse. It might be more than a coincidence that the two most prominent characteristics of the antagonist in Dan 7 and 8—a *warlike persecution* against God's people and *assuming or replacing* God's authority—are exactly the same major threats Jesus warns against in this Discourse. Persecution and deception go hand in hand in both places. We should not rule out that Jesus is here influenced by the language of Dan 7 or 8, and even directly explaining the importance of that prophecy to his followers.

Before we leave this section, a brief comment by David Pao and Eckhard Schnabel deserves attention as it strengthens the deception-parallel between Daniel and the Discourse. A unique addition in the Lukan warning against false messengers is their deception that "the time is near" (21:8). Pao and Schnabel believe this might be directly influenced by Dan 7:

Jesus' brief description of the false prophets' proclamation with the phrase "The time is near!" (*ho kairos ēngiken* [21:8]) possibly echoes Dan. 7:22. . . . The phrase "the time arrived" (LXX: *ho kairos edothē*; Theodotion: *ho kairos ephthasen*) does not use the same verb as in 21:8, but the apocalyptic context is similar: expressing Jesus' words with echoes of Dan. 7 sharpens Jesus' denial in 21:9b ("the end will not follow immediately"): his followers must not trust these false prophets.<sup>119</sup>

Conclusion: The warnings against deception are possible allusions to Dan 7-8.

---

<sup>119</sup>Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 374.

## Jerusalem Trampled during Times of the Gentiles (Luke 21:24b)

An interesting parallel to Dan 7 and 8 in the Lukan prediction of Jerusalem's fate, not discussed by Hartman,<sup>120</sup> is put forward by Richard Davidson.

Luke 21:24 clearly alludes to Daniel 7 and 8. The term *patoumenē* "trampled" in Luke 21:24 is from the same verbal root (*kata-*)*pateō* as in Daniel 8:10 (LXX) for the "trampling" *katapatēthē* of God's people (the "host") by the little horn power. Further, the term *kairoi* (times) of Luke 21:24 is precisely the same term as found in Daniel 7:25 (LXX), where the saints are given into the hand of the little horn "for a time [*kairos*], and times [*kairoi*] and half a time [*kairos*]." Thus Luke 21:24 brings together the prophecies of Daniel 7 and 8 concerning the time of the dominion of the little horn power over the saints, and by the intertextual linkage shows that these are equivalent to the "trampling" of Jerusalem and the "times" of the Gentiles.<sup>121</sup>

Just like the saying about 'trampling' might originate from Daniel, the prediction about its termination might also. David Pao and Eckhard Schnabel comment: "In regard to the fourth and final phrase in 21:24, 'until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled' (*achri hou plērōthōsin kairoi ethnōn*), the notion of a limit to apocalyptic sufferings recalls Dan. 8:13-14; 12:5-13."<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup>NA<sup>27</sup> lists Dan 12:7 as one of a large number of OT allusions in the margin of Luke 21:24b. Since, by the nature of the work, Nestle-Aland does not explain or justify their marginal references, it is hard to know exactly which part of Luke's verse that they see echoing Dan 12.

<sup>121</sup>Davidson, "'This Generation Shall Not Pass' (Matt 24:34): Failed or Fulfilled Prophecy," 317. Davidson goes on to argue for the same connection between trampling of the holy city and prophetic time units in Rev 11:2. See also John T. Baldwin, "Did Christ Predict That He Would Return in the First Century? Reflections on Luke 21:24b and Its Phrase 'Times of the Gentiles' in Historicist Perspective," in *Christ, Salvation, and the Eschaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle* (ed. Jiří Moskala et al.; Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2009), 342-4; LaRondelle, *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies*, 36.

<sup>122</sup>Pao and Schnabel, "Luke," 377.

On their own these parallels between Luke and Daniel might have been no more than coincidences. Adding to what is by now an extensive list of parallels between the Synoptic Discourse and Daniel, the verbal parallels of "trampling" and "times" as well as the concept of a limit to the trampling might very well be intended as allusions to the old prophetic book.

Conclusion: possible allusion.

### **Celestial Signs (Matt 24:29; Mark 13:24-25; Luke 21:25-26)**

Hartman correctly considers the darkening of the sun and moon and the falling of stars as general OT eschatological descriptions, not influenced by Daniel. "It is in keeping with the fact that the celestial phenomena which accompany this appearance are associated in the OT with theophanies on the Day of Yahweh."<sup>123</sup> Other scholars agree that Daniel is not the source here. "The OT passages from where these images derive, are Isa 13,10 and 34,4."<sup>124</sup> "References to Amos 8,9 or Dan 8,10 offer interesting parallels but these texts are not the source of Mk 13,24-25."<sup>125</sup>

### **'Son of Man' Coming in Power (Matt 24:30-31; Mark 13:26-27; Luke 21:27-28)**

The conclusion of the eschatological outline is a direct and unmistakable allusion to Dan 7. The 'Son of Man' will appear on the clouds with power. We looked at this phrase in the previous chapter, and I concluded (with a virtual consensus in scholarship) that this

---

<sup>123</sup>Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 157.

<sup>124</sup>Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2004), 218.

<sup>125</sup>Joseph Verheyden, "Describing the Parousia: The Cosmic Phenomena in Mk 13,24-25," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. Christopher M. Tuckett; BETL 131; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997), 539.

was a certain allusion to Daniel.<sup>126</sup> "In the centre of this section there is again a quotation from Daniel, that concerning the Son of Man's appearance with the clouds. The last main point in the group of pericopes from Daniel, that referring to the setting up of God's kingdom, has hereby been taken up."<sup>127</sup>

Most commentators correctly read the phrase in this Discourse as a reference to Christ's Parousia at the end of the age.<sup>128</sup>

Conclusion: certain allusion.

### Summary

We have explored in this chapter the possibility that the Synoptic Jesus has a specific prophetic view of the future—a basic timetable of events to come. The Messiah was to die, Jerusalem was to fall (section A), and in the end he himself as celestial Son of Man would judge the world (section B). War between nations, religious deceit by future false messiahs and prophets, and persecution of God's people would be characteristic of history all the way until the final judgment.

I suggest that this prophetic view was probably formed by Jesus' reading of the prophecies of Daniel, particularly chs. 9 and 7. The events up to the Fall of Jerusalem were particularly formed from his reading of Dan 9, while the events thereafter until the Parousia were particularly influenced by Dan 7. While Jesus taught that the imminence of the Fall of Jerusalem could be seen from events taking place as they approached (Jesus

---

<sup>126</sup>Pp. 136-9.

<sup>127</sup>Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 156.

<sup>128</sup>E.g., Bock, *Luke Volume 2*, 1686; Carson, "Matthew," 504-6; Gundry, *Mark*, 744-5; Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 714; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 330; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 776-7; Morris, *Matthew*, 610-11.

here directed the audience to read Dan 9), the timing of the Parousia was not to be known.

Jesus' reading of the persecutions and deceptions in Dan 7 as belonging to the future fits well with the common understanding of Daniel in Jesus' days: From the *Similitudes* through Josephus and *4 Ezra* and to early Christian writings like *Epistle of Barnabas*, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, it was normal to situate oneself in prophecy at the time of the fourth beast of Dan 7, with persecuting activities (like that of the little horn) belonging to their future.

In addition to Section A of the Discourse being a loose exposition of Dan 9 and Section B of Dan 7, we have seen several explicit verbal parallels between Daniel and the Discourse. The disciples' question of "how long will it be" and phrases in Jesus' answer such as "wars and rumors of war," "this must take place," "do not be alarmed," "the end is not yet," "trampling" and "times" are all possible or probable Danielic allusions. Section A even concludes with a quote from Dan 9 (the Abomination of Desolation) and Section B with a quote from Dan 7 (Son of Man coming in glory).

Lars Hartman's thesis that the Eschatological Discourse is a direct and conscious exposition of Daniel is still useful. Richard Davidson has shown us how the Discourse has textual markers dividing it into two parts (the Fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia), advancing scholarship on a highly debated and difficult chapter. This study humbly sits on the shoulders of both. As a result I believe we can see a Synoptic Jesus who is explaining the future for his audience with Daniel in hand. Both the prophetic outline as well as specific phrases in the Olivet Discourse are borrowed from Daniel.

## CHAPTER V

### KINGDOM OF GOD

The argument of this fifth and final chapter is that Daniel contains a unique approach to Kingdom theology among all the OT books, and that the Synoptic Jesus borrows substantially from it in his Kingdom of God preaching. I am not the first to suggest that the book of Daniel contributes in this area<sup>1</sup>—together with other OT books,<sup>2</sup> but I believe some nuances have been overlooked, and that Daniel's influence on the Gospels in this area has not been sufficiently recognized.<sup>3</sup>

#### **Kingdom of God in the Old Testament**

The reign and rule of God is certainly an important theme in the Hebrew Bible.

---

<sup>1</sup>Already Gustaf Dalman suggested that Jesus "borrowed the term 'sovereignty of God' as an eschatological designation from the Book of Daniel." Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* (trans. David Miller Kay; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909), 136. See also Craig A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 2:490-527; Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 279-330; David Wenham, "The Kingdom of God and Daniel," *ExpTim* 98 (1987): 132-4.

<sup>2</sup>"Particularly from Isaiah and the Psalms Jesus would have learned the basic truth that God as Creator has ruled, is ruling, and always will rule over his creation, be it obedient or rebellious." John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* (4 vols.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 2:244.

<sup>3</sup>For many of the insights in this chapter I am greatly indebted to Harald Giesebrecht (personal conversations and his seminars at Mattesonskolens Nyttårstreff, Norway, December 2002).

Whether it is the most important theme or not<sup>4</sup>—or whether a center of OT theology can even be located<sup>5</sup>—does not concern us here.

Let us first review two aspects of the nature of the Kingdom of God in the OT: The *timing* of God's Kingdom (Is it present/realized or is it future?) and the *expansion strategy* of the Kingdom (Is it corporate/government-based, or is it a movement of individuals?).

### Timing of the Kingdom

Yahweh is described as 'King' (מֶלֶךְ) forty-one times in the OT.<sup>6</sup> References to God's 'Kingdom' (מְלוּכָה and variations) are found nine times.<sup>7</sup> God's Kingdom is expressed through a verb on several occasions, like 'God reigns' (יְהוָה מְלִיכָה).<sup>8</sup> The Sinaitic Covenant, foundational to the relationship between God and the Israelites

---

<sup>4</sup>John Meier strikes a sound balance. "On the one hand, the imagery of God's kingship/kingdom is not a gigantic clasp that can bind the whole of the OT together, a great underlying theme that can provide the basis for a theology of the OT—à la the word 'covenant' in the work of Walther Eichrodt. The imagery connected with God's kingship is absent from whole parts of the OT; and in the books which it does appear, it is not the one dominant symbol that gives coherence to everything else. . . . On the other hand, the symbolism of God's kingship/kingdom does enjoy a widespread use throughout many strands of OT tradition. . . . It appears at pivotal moments in the OT story of God's dealings with his people Israel." Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 2:251-2.

<sup>5</sup>Some useful introductions include John Goldingay, *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2006); Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (4th ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 139-71; Walter C. Kaiser, *The Promise-Plan of God: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008); Bruce K. Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007).

<sup>6</sup>E.g., Ps 10:16; Isa 6:4; Zeph 3:15; Mal 1:14. See the entire list in Otto Eissfeldt, "Jahwe als König," *ZAW* 5 (1928): 89.

<sup>7</sup>1 Chr 29:11 (מְמֻלְכָה); Pss 22:29 (מְלוּכָה); 103:19 (מְלִיכוּת); 145:11, 12, 13 (מְלִיכוּת); Dan 3:33 (מְלִיכּוּ); 4:31 (מְלִיכּוּ); Obad 21 (מְלוּכָה).

<sup>8</sup>Esp. in the Psalms, e.g., Pss 47:8; 93:1; 96:10; 97:1; 99:1.



through all of the OT narrative, has been shown to be a royal covenant between a King and his people.<sup>9</sup>

What is the temporal description of God's reign in the OT? Is God already King, or is his Kingdom something that will come in the future? The answer appears to be both. There are many texts where Yahweh is King in the present without any time limitations: "For my eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts" (Isa 6:5). "The LORD is king for ever and ever" (Ps 10:16). "The LORD reigns" (Ps 99:1).

There are also texts where God's coming as a King is a future event:

A voice cries: In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. . . . And the glory of the LORD shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the LORD has spoken. . . . Get you up to a high mountain, O Zion, herald of good tidings; lift up your voice with strength, O Jerusalem, herald of good tidings, lift it up, fear not; say to the cities of Judah, Behold your God! Behold, the Lord GOD comes with might, and his arm rules for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his recompense before him. (Isa 40:3-10)

From the OT material we must therefore "conclude that the kingship of Yahweh relates to the future as well as to the past and present."<sup>10</sup> Yahweh was already the present Deity and the reigning King. Yet something about God's reign was not completely in effect. He was to come in a mightier sense in the future. The people had not yet seen everything their King would do for them. The glory, majesty, and excellence of God and his Kingdom would be manifested infinitely more powerful in the future:

For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former things shall not be remembered or come into mind. But be glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and be glad in my people; no more shall be heard in it the sound of weeping and the cry of distress. No more shall there be in it an infant that lives but a few days, or an old man who does not fill out his days, for the child shall die a hundred years old, and the sinner a hundred years old shall be accursed. They shall

---

<sup>9</sup>George E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955).

<sup>10</sup>George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 19.

build houses and inhabit them; they shall plant vineyards and eat their fruit. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat; for like the days of a tree shall the days of my people be, and my chosen shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labor in vain, or bear children for calamity; for they shall be the offspring of the blessed of the LORD, and their children with them. Before they call I will answer, while they are yet speaking I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and dust shall be the serpent's food. They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain, says the LORD. (Isa 65:17-25)

So concerning the timing of God's Kingdom, we must conclude that the OT testifies to a twofold vision. God is reigning over and blessing his people right now (the Kingdom is already realized, and gradually improving), yet a miraculous transformation of God's Kingdom awaited—often preceded by a judgment Day of the Lord—that had not yet been seen (the Kingdom is future, awaiting a cataclysmic judgment to usher it in). William Dyrness summarizes this duality well:

The means that God would use to lead his people to this place of rest sometimes were seen to involve destruction and judgment, sometimes construction and growth. . . .

The prophets often emphasized the cataclysmic nature of God's intervention when they spoke of the Day of the Lord (for example, see Amos 5). Here the emphasis is on the kingdom of God as a new creation springing directly from God's creative act. As Isaiah 43:19 puts it: "Behold, I am doing a new thing; now it springs forth, do you not perceive it?"

But even in this promise of Isaiah the second stream of thinking is present as well. That is, the future that God brings about will also be a perfection, a springing forth of what already exists. This line of thought implied that the kingdom might come about by peaceful means, that it was already present in the covenant that God made with his people and in the covenantal institutions. One day these forms would grow to perfectly reflect God's ideal.<sup>11</sup>

### Expansion Strategy of the Kingdom

Let us now turn to the *method* of establishing and expanding God's Kingdom. For the future version of the Kingdom, humans are given a very limited role. It is God

---

<sup>11</sup>William Dyrness, *Themes in Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1977), 227, 228.

himself, sometimes with and sometimes without a Messiah, who will intervene with cataclysmic and supernatural events<sup>12</sup> and bring in the new perfect world order.

The expansion strategy for the realized present Kingdom needs a few comments, however. In the biblical narrative, since the calling of Abraham (Gen 12-17) a lot of the mission of God for this world was bound up in the activities of Abraham and his descendants. "In you all the families of the earth will be blessed" (Gen 12:3). This missionary family/nation had a geographic home base. "To your descendants I have given this land. From the river of Egypt as far as the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen 15:18). The rest of the Pentateuch narrates the fulfillment of Yahweh's promise of making Abraham's descendants into a large nation, situated in their land, with himself as their God and king.<sup>13</sup>

A key part of the mission seems to be living out and modeling for other nations the superior ethical values and legal code of Yahweh.

Behold, I have taught you statutes and ordinances, as the LORD my God commanded me, that you should do them in the land which you are entering to take possession of it. Keep them and do them; for that will be your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, 'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.' For what great nation is there that

---

<sup>12</sup>Even when we acknowledge the poetic nature of much of the material, where it might be difficult at times to know which predictions are intended as supernatural cataclysmic events and which are metaphorical hyperbolic language about non-miraculous events, we do get the impression that the former is often the case. As Dale Allison and Peder Borgen point out, even an allegorical interpreter like Philo believed that literal, miraculous events were prophesied concerning the in-breaking of the future Kingdom of God, like the literal reconciliation and non-violence of animals. Dale C. Allison, "Jesus & the Victory of Apocalyptic," in *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999), 134; Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 262-4.

A highly useful discussion of the hermeneutics of metaphors in prophecies is D. Brent Sandy, *Plowshares & Pruning Hooks: Rethinking the Language of Biblical Prophecy and Apocalyptic* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002).

<sup>13</sup>David J. A. Clines, *The Theme of the Pentateuch* (JSOTSup 10; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978).

has a god so near to it as the LORD our God is to us, whenever we call upon him? And what great nation is there, that has statutes and ordinances so righteous as all this law which I set before you this day? (Deut 4:5-8)

It is often taken for granted and goes unnoticed, since the story of biblical Israel is so familiar to us, that the main missionary Kingdom-expanding strategy was corporate, national, and government-based ('theocratic')—as opposed to, for instance, an underground movement of believers with no political powers in the country where they lived.<sup>14</sup> The growth of the present Kingdom of God was tied up with, to a large extent coexistent with, the political Kingdom of Israel. God planned to rule not just through obedient and enthusiastic individual believers but through a state with political, legal, and economic power within the stipulations in God's Torah.

This strategy, according to the narrative of the OT, worked well for a long time, especially during the golden years of David and Solomon. In the period from Solomon to the sixth-century exile of Judah, the national political leadership (of both Judah and Israel) more often than not failed to follow the ethical and missionary blueprint. The faithful remnant was often found on the outside of power, like Elijah and the 7,000 steadfast. Yet in this pre-exilic period no permanent divine rejection of theocracy as the mission strategy is given. The hope of a righteous and powerful king in Jerusalem was kept alive.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>This corporate, national, government-based approach appears to be so self-evident that a large recent work devoted specifically to the mission strategy of the OT God does not even see the need to comment on it or ponder the alternatives. Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2006).

<sup>15</sup>This chapter does not depend on the historicity of the OT events. It is a discussion of canonical theology and not historical reconstruction. I want to establish the difference in 'kingdom-approach' between the book of Daniel and the rest of the Hebrew Scriptures.

The corporate government-based strategy was not relinquished even during exilic times when the political structures of Israel were demolished. The captivity and destruction of Jerusalem was seen only as temporary. The national corporate strategy would in the future—after a restoration—still be the method to establish and expand the reign of God.<sup>16</sup>

Here are a few selected texts from both pre- and post-exilic prophets about the continual role of the land, the nation, and the political institutions of Israel.

In that day I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen and repair its breaches, and raise up its ruins, and rebuild it as in the days of old. . . . I will restore the fortunes of my people Israel, and they shall rebuild the ruined cities and inhabit them.  
(Amos 9:11, 14)

Foreigners shall build up your walls, and their kings shall minister to you; for in my wrath I smote you, but in my favor I have had mercy on you. Your gates shall be open continually; day and night they shall not be shut; that men may bring to you the wealth of the nations, with their kings led in procession. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve you shall perish; those nations shall be utterly laid waste.  
(Isa 60:1-12)

For behold, days are coming, says the LORD, when I will restore the fortunes of my people, Israel and Judah, says the LORD, and I will bring them back to the land which I gave to their fathers, and they shall take possession of it. . . . the city shall be rebuilt upon its mound, and the palace shall stand where it used to be. (Jer 30:3, 18)

Thus says the Lord GOD: Though I removed them far off among the nations, and though I scattered them among the countries, yet I have been a sanctuary to them for a while in the countries where they have gone. Therefore say, Thus says the Lord GOD: I will gather you from the peoples, and assemble you out of the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel. (Ezek 11:16-17)

Alongside the portion set apart as the holy district you shall assign for the possession of the city an area five thousand cubits broad, and twenty-five thousand cubits long; it shall belong to the whole house of Israel. And to the prince shall belong the land on both sides of the holy district and the property of the city, alongside the holy district

---

<sup>16</sup>"It was out of the depths of despair during the Babylonian exile that the prophets spoke of a future restoration of God's kingdom in Judah, with Jerusalem once more as a holy capital." Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 2:246. "Certainly by the post-exilic period, speech about the land of Israel evoked a variety of emotions, for land symbolized much more than living-space. Specifically land was a cipher for a gift, a promise, a blessing, a life-style, and even revelation." Elmer A. Martens, *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 242.

and the property of the city, on the west and on the east, corresponding in length to one of the tribal portions, and extending from the western to the eastern boundary of the land. It is to be his property in Israel. And my princes shall no more oppress my people; but they shall let the house of Israel have the land according to their tribes. (Ezek 45:6-8)

Many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to entreat the favor of the LORD. Thus says the LORD of hosts: In those days ten men from the nations of every tongue shall take hold of the robe of a Jew, saying, Let us go with you, for we have heard that God is with you. . . . On that day living waters shall flow out from Jerusalem, half of them to the eastern sea and half of them to the western sea; it shall continue in summer as in winter. And the LORD will become king over all the earth; on that day the LORD will be one and his name one. (Zech 8:22-23; 14:8-9)

These should suffice as examples of the land-based and national-oriented Kingdom-growth strategy. The city of Jerusalem, the land, and the nation-state of Israel, with her religious and political infrastructure, were still projected (before, during, and after the exile) as the basis for expanding God's realized Kingdom in the world.

### **Kingdom of God in Daniel**

With this quick survey in mind, it is easier to notice the very different approach found in the book of Daniel—in one specific area. As we will see, Daniel has the same dual approach to the timing of God's Kingdom (it is both present and future), and it is still God (and the celestial 'Son of Man') who will bring about the glorious future Kingdom. However, the expansion strategy for the present Kingdom is radically different in Daniel than in the rest of the OT. The prominence of the Kingdom-theme in Daniel has been pointed out by many.<sup>17</sup> The unique contribution of Daniel in the *method* of establishing and expanding God's Kingdom has not always been sufficiently perceived.

---

<sup>17</sup>"The major burden of the book of Daniel is the tension and conflict between the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world." "Though previous revelation had made it clear that the Lord, creator of all things, was, is, and will be the King of kings and the Lord of lords, nowhere is this specified as clearly as in Daniel's dreams and visions. It is safe to say that it is in this very revelation that the theology of Daniel must be centered." Eugene H. Merrill, "Daniel as a Contribution to Kingdom Theology," in *Essays in Honor of J. Dwight Pentecost* (ed. Stanley D. Toussaint and Charles H. Dyer; Chicago: Moody, 1986), 217, 221. "The theme that is central to Daniel as it is to no other book in the OT is

## Timing of the Kingdom

For most readers of Daniel the most striking temporal description of God's Kingdom is probably as 'future'. Chapters 2, 7, and 12 describe how God will set up his Kingdom at the end of a series of human kingdoms, and that his Kingdom will thereafter be eternal.

Daniel 4 contains, however, a description of God as a present reigning King. After Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar for much of the chapter refuses to acknowledge God's power and authority, and glories in his own, he has learned his lesson by the end of the narrative. Nebuchadnezzar has experienced firsthand how God is a more powerful king than he is.

At the end of the days I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted my eyes to heaven, and my reason returned to me, and I blessed the Most High, and praised and honored him who lives for ever; *for his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation*; all the inhabitants of the earth are accounted as nothing; and he does according to his will in the host of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand or say to him, What doest thou? . . . Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor *the King of heaven*; for all his works are right and his ways are just; and those who walk in pride he is able to abase.  
(Dan 4:34-37)

So the emphasis concerning the timing in Daniel is on the future glorious Kingdom, but a present Kingdom of God is found in the book as well. This is the same binary description as we have seen in the rest of the OT.

## Expansion Strategy of the Kingdom

What is radically different in Daniel from the rest of the Hebrew Bible is the expansion strategy of God's present Kingdom. Both the historical narratives (chs. 1-6) and the apocalyptic visions (chs. 2, 7-12) convey the same message about political

---

the kingdom of God." John Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 330. See also Lourdino A. Yozon, "The Kingdom of God in Daniel," *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 19 (1978): 23-7.

power: It is *the enemies of God who use and abuse power*, not God's followers.<sup>18</sup> God is nowhere described as relying on a national state with its religious, legal, and political infrastructure—the default method in most of the OT. The Kingdom looks a lot more like an 'underground' movement of individual faithful followers. All power and earthly Kingdoms are portrayed as temporary, manmade, and very often evil and abusive. God is portrayed as the one who possess the *real* but *unrecognized* power. The recognized and exercised power belongs to humans, and it is consistently used for oppression and war.

You, O king, the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, and the might, and the glory. (Dan 2:37)

The sentence is by the decree of the watchers, the decision by the word of the holy ones, to the end that the living may know that the Most High rules the kingdom of men, and gives it to whom he will, and sets over it the lowliest of men. (Dan 4:17)

O king, the Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar your father kingship and greatness and glory and majesty; and because of the greatness that he gave him, all peoples, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him; whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive; whom he would he raised up, and whom he would he put down. . . . And you his son, Belshazzar, have not humbled your heart, though you knew all this, but you have lifted up yourself against the Lord of heaven. . . . This is the interpretation of the matter: MENE, God has numbered the days of your kingdom and brought it to an end. (Dan 5:18-19, 22-23, 26)

O king! Did you not sign an interdict, that any man who makes petition to any god or man within thirty days except to you, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered, The thing stands fast, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which cannot be revoked. (Dan 6:12)

As I looked, this horn made war with the saints, and prevailed over them. . . . He shall be different from the former ones, and shall put down three kings. He shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and

---

<sup>18</sup>As Gregory Beale has pointed out, the Qumran society seems to have found inspiration for their own future eschatological holy war from the violent battling among God's *enemies* in Dan 11-12: "It is apparent in 1QM 1 that Daniel 11-12 is considered prophetic from the writer's viewpoint and that he develops it in an interpretative manner in order to explain in more detail how this prophecy is to occur. This explains why in Daniel 11 Israel plays a passive role, but in 1QM 1 *actively* battles under divine leadership against the enemy." Gregory K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984), 65. Qumran was not able to find inspiration for a holy war from the description of the saints in Daniel, since the saints consistently refrain from war, violence, and force.



shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand for a time, two times, and half a time. (Dan 7:21, 24-25)

And after the sixty-two weeks, an anointed one shall be cut off, and shall have nothing; and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary. Its end shall come with a flood, and to the end there shall be war; desolations are decreed. And he shall make a strong covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one who makes desolate. (Dan 9:26-27)

And those among the people who are wise shall make many understand, though they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days. When they fall, they shall receive a little help. And many shall join themselves to them with flattery; and some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine and to cleanse them and to make them white, until the time of the end, for it is yet for the time appointed. And the king shall do according to his will; he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak astonishing things against the God of gods. He shall prosper till the indignation is accomplished; for what is determined shall be done. (Dan 11:33-36)

God is the one who has the power but does not want to use it—until the very end of the age. The human rulers believe they are the supremely powerful ones, and use and abuse their force against each other and against God, not recognizing their dependence on and inferiority versus Yahweh. Every other chapter is about the suffering and persecution of God's followers (chs. 1, 3, 6) and the temporary nature of the current powers who exercise that oppression (chs. 2, 4, 5).

Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible statehood and political power could—ideally—be used to display God's values and increase God's reign. In Daniel that hope is nowhere to be seen. Power is now only negative, and the task of God's followers is to remain faithful during oppression.

What then about Daniel ch. 9? Does not Daniel pray and hope for a return to the land of Israel, for the restoration of a Jewish state, for the rebuilding of a temple? Yes. But the answer given him by Gabriel is that even the rebuilding will take place during oppression (v. 25), and the restoration will only last for a little while. Once again the holy city and the sanctuary will be destroyed and its inhabitants suffer warfare (vv. 26-27).

This very unique portrayal of power has naturally led many scholars to speculate that the book of Daniel could have been written by members of a political resistance movement that currently was being defeated and suffered martyrdom.<sup>19</sup> Some have gone so far as to classify Daniel as 'pacifist' literature:

The Book of Daniel as a whole may rightly be viewed as a pacifistic manifesto of the Ḥasidim, which was composed and widely circulated to urge and encourage the faithful Jews to remain steadfast in the practice of the religion of their fathers during the brutal persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.<sup>20</sup>

Daniel has certainly been a great inspiration to political opposition movements in later history.<sup>21</sup>

The book of Daniel nowhere, either explicitly or indirectly, suggests that its readers should join an armed resistance movement or promote a political coup to set up another Kingdom in place of the current regimes.<sup>22</sup> It is rather God, and God alone, who

---

<sup>19</sup>I.e., the mid-second-century Maccabean movement. "For over a century now, a majority of scholars have held the view that the book as we have it came into being in the early second century in Palestine. Its primary purpose was to encourage the faithful Jews there to stand firm in the face of the Antiochene persecution." Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002), 313. A second-century dating is not without problems. The understanding of the function of power in the book of Daniel that has led scholars to point to this audience is however accurate.

<sup>20</sup>Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; New York: Doubleday, 1977), 43.

<sup>21</sup>Some examples are reported in (notice the title of the essay) Christopher Rowland, "The Book of Daniel and the Radical Critique of Empire: An Essay in Apocalyptic Hermeneutics," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 2:447-67.

<sup>22</sup>"The believers are not called to escapism or waiting passively for a deterministic course of history, but the perseverance in faith, obedience to the requirements of the covenant relation, praying, repenting, trusting in God and waiting for him, and carrying out one's responsibilities even in the sphere of the heathen ruling courts." Jacob Lewis Helberg, "The Determination of History according to the Book of Daniel: Against the Background of Deterministic Apocalyptic," *ZAW* 107 (1995): 286.

will one day overthrow all human kingdoms. If the book has a political message, it is trying to dissuade its readers from using any power or try to overthrow or set up any kingdom by force. Power is vain. Human power struggles are all futile, mostly evil, and only God at the end of the age will successfully set up an everlasting and righteous domain.

### **Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels**

We are now in a position to more properly situate the Kingdom model of the Synoptic Gospels. Regarding the timing of the Kingdom, do the Synoptics share the dual description of God's Kingdom as both present and future—like we saw in both Daniel and the rest of the OT? Or does the Synoptic material describe the Kingdom as only one of the two (as *either* present *or* future)? Regarding the missionary method of expanding the Kingdom, is the Synoptic Jesus espousing a strategy that is closer to that found in the majority of the OT writings, establishing a state with superior religious, legal, and political structures to demonstrate and model for the nations God's values and kingship? Or is Jesus closer to the unique perspective of Daniel where God's reign looks more like an underground movement without political power, consisting of believers who stand faithful to God amidst political persecution and demonstrating that while human regents might appear to be powerful, their power is only formal and temporary? Let us take a look.

#### Timing of the Kingdom

In light of the consistently two-fold description of the timing of the Kingdom in the OT—as both present and future—it is surprising to realize how much ink NT scholars

have expended over the same issue for the Gospels.<sup>23</sup> Was the Kingdom completely *realized* at the time of Jesus (C. H. Dodd),<sup>24</sup> or was it completely *future* (Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer)?<sup>25</sup> The best answer when surveying the Gospel data is *both*.<sup>26</sup> Some pericopes talk about a future Kingdom (e.g., Matt 6:10; 8:11-12; Mark 14:25; the second half of the Eschatological Discourse). Some sayings describe the Kingdom as already realized (e.g., Matt 12:28; Mark 1:15; Luke 17:20-21).

Regarding this temporal aspect of the Kingdom, the Synoptics have the same dual description as Daniel and the rest of the OT have. In one sense God's Kingdom is already here. In another sense, much regarding the Kingdom is yet to be fulfilled.

---

<sup>23</sup>There is an abundance of useful surveys of scholarship on the question of the nature and timing of the kingdom, incl. Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, eds., *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991); Mark Saucy, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus: In 20th Century Theology* (Waco, Tex.: Word Publishing, 1997); Benedict T. Viviano, *The Kingdom of God in History* (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988); Wendell Lee Willis, ed., *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1987).

<sup>24</sup>Charles Harold Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1950).

<sup>25</sup>Albert Schweitzer, *The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity* (London: A & C Black, 1968); Johannes Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God* (trans. Richard Hyde Hiers and David Larrimore; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1892; repr. 1971).

<sup>26</sup>Thus I place myself among the majority of scholars since Kümmel who sees both types of kingdom-timing in the Gospels, e.g., Werner G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung: Untersuchungen zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu* (ATANT; Zürich, Switzerland: Zwingli-Verlag, 1953); George Eldon Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (New York: Harper, 1964); Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 2:289-506; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *God's Rule and Kingdom* (New York: Herder, 1963).

A curious recent position is that of N. T. Wright, who works hard to convey that he believes in an eschatological Jesus, but then redefines the language of apocalyptic events to refer mostly to events that happened in Jesus' time. N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 443-74. A useful critique of Wright's understanding of apocalyptic language is found in Dale C. Allison, "Jesus & the Victory of Apocalyptic," in *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999), 126-41.

## Expansion Strategy of the Kingdom

A word of caution regarding terminology is appropriate before we proceed with this question. Notice that I have avoided vocabulary in this chapter like a 'physical' or 'earthly' Kingdom versus a 'spiritual' Kingdom. Such terms are quite commonplace in scholarship but not very helpful. While these terms are more sparingly used in OT studies, some biblical scholars and theologians use them when discussing the NT—probably unaware of the connotations that come with these phrases.

Here are two random examples of unfortunate use of these phrases, made by two authors who have, since they wrote this, modified their language:

By concentrating primarily on the earthly-political glory of the coming Messiah and His kingdom, to the neglect of the basically religious picture of the messianic mission and reign, rabbinic Judaism had come to expect a political Messiah. . . . Even Christ's own disciples had not understood the spiritual nature of God's kingdom or reign.<sup>27</sup>

The universal church, as the body of Christ, receives the fulfillment of all the kingdom promises (Gal 3:29), but it is a spiritual fulfillment in which ethnic and geographical (Israel-centered) language becomes universalized.<sup>28</sup>

There are several reasons why phrases like a 'spiritual kingdom' or 'spiritual fulfillment' are less than helpful. First of all, dividing life into 'physical' and 'spiritual' spheres is more appropriate when analyzing the ontology and political views of Greek philosophers like Plato, or later ecclesiastical debates between church and state. In all parts of Scripture, from poetry and proverbs through narratives to prophetic books and apostolic epistles, the religious or spiritual values of God are always projected as relevant for this physical world. God's instructions and commandments are always *both* 'spiritual'

---

<sup>27</sup>Hans K. LaRondelle, *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1983), 15.

<sup>28</sup>Richard M. Davidson, "Principles of Biblical Interpretation," unpublished class syllabus (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Theological Seminary, 2010), 94. In conversation Davidson points out that this syllabus is in a constant state of revision, every time the course is taught, and he has now abandoned the language of 'spiritual' vs. 'physical' kingdom as inappropriate terms for discussing the biblical material.

and 'physical,' addressing both our relationship with God and with fellow human beings, relevant occasionally for a future Kingdom or afterlife but always certainly applicable to a life obedient to Yahweh here and now in the present physical world. Jesus is portrayed as healing and meeting the needs of people of both the physical and spiritual kind, as if he believed they were interrelated. The future Day of the Lord will, in both OT and NT, remove evil powers of both spiritual and earthly/political nature, and establish a Kingdom of righteousness where earthly/physical/political persecution is removed and physical as well as spiritual transformation takes place.

2 Peter is typical of the biblical material:

But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, and then the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and the elements will be dissolved with fire, and the earth and the works that are upon it will be burned up. Since all these things are thus to be dissolved, what sort of persons ought you to be in lives of holiness and godliness, waiting for and hastening the coming of the day of God, because of which the heavens will be kindled and dissolved, and the elements will melt with fire! But according to his promise we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells. (2 Pet 3:10-13)

Notice how comprehensive and holistic both the present period of waiting as well as the future Day of the Lord are. The future Kingdom will involve transformations of the physical world (the elements and the earth will burn up and be renewed), and all 'non-physical' elements like evil and unrighteousness will disappear (righteousness will dwell). Until that Day comes, God's followers are supposed to live a life of holiness and goodness (hard to argue that this applies to non-physical things only, or only to physical things).

A second reason why such terms as a 'spiritual kingdom' should be avoided is that the writers who employ this language do not always believe in a completely 'spiritual only' kingdom anyway. There have been interpreters who believe that the domain of the Kingdom of God was the inner human heart only, that God had no intentions of one day

transforming the physical world or removing evil persecuting powers, that the Kingdom had nothing to do with the physical world, only with the piety and inner heart of the believer. Nineteenth-century liberal Protestant theology comes to mind here.<sup>29</sup> Unless this truly is one's understanding of the nature of the Kingdom of God—if one really has no concept of a future, literal Kingdom to come where physical and political evils are removed—it is best to avoid language about a 'spiritual kingdom only'.

Thirdly, when labeling the NT Kingdom concept as 'spiritual only' and 'not earthly' it is easy to unwillingly portray the views of first-century Judaism unfairly. The author of the quote above criticized Rabbinic Judaism for "concentrating primarily on the earthly-political glory of the coming Messiah and His kingdom, to the neglect of the basically religious picture of the messianic mission and reign." That remark is not entirely fair. In the OT as well as in Second Temple Jewish writings these two motives or spheres often go hand in hand. There were many who did not long for "earthly-political glory" *instead of* God's presence; rather the religious longing of many believers was for God to appear and dwell in their midst so evil and oppression would disappear. Things spiritual and physical go hand in hand.

On a different but similar vein, it is not very helpful either to compare an alleged 'ethnic' or 'national' or 'Jewish' nature of the Kingdom in the OT with a 'universal' nature of the Kingdom in the NT. God's Kingdom is consistently open to and trying to reach out to Gentiles throughout the OT. In its *nature* God's Kingdom has always been open and universal (from Gen 12:3 to Amos 9:7 and Zech 8:20-23).

---

<sup>29</sup>A good exponent for a true 'spiritual only' Kingdom of God among nineteenth-century liberal theologians is Adolf von Harnack and his *Das Wesen des Christentums*, published in English as *What Is Christianity?* (trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1957). Karl Barth's chronicling of this movement is still useful and vivid: *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History* (trans. Brian Cozens and John Bowden; London: SCM Press, 2001).

As an alternative to inappropriate categories for the Kingdom like 'spiritual' versus 'physical', 'religious' versus 'political', 'ethnic' versus 'universal'—since God's Kingdom always is portrayed as all of these—I suggest we talk more directly about the real issue. *The subject for discussion is God's mission strategy to expand his present Kingdom, particularly the use or non-use of national state institutions.* The interesting question is not what God's Kingdom *is* but what it *does* (how it was to expand itself).

We saw above that the land, state, and institutions of Israel were central to the mission strategy for most of the OT. Political power and national institutions, from land to temple to palace, were supposed to establish and expand God's reign. A notable exception was the book of Daniel, where national power was only portrayed as something negative, and all God's followers were described as powerless and oppressed.

What then is Jesus' view of the role of the state for God's mission? Is God's Kingdom to be promoted through a God-inspired and God-led state, or as a movement without formal political power? In the Synoptics the latter is always the case. The theocratic promise and program of so much of the OT narrative—about a just king installed by God reigning on the throne of Jerusalem and expanding God's Kingdom with a righteous use of political power—is not repeated anywhere in the Gospels. The followers of Jesus and members of God's Kingdom, contemporary with Jesus and future all the way until the Final Judgment, are only described as powerless. A return to theocracy as a mission strategy is never proposed by Jesus (a very 'loud silence'), and towards the end of the Synoptics (the Olivet Discourse) it is positively predicted to end, as the city and temple will fall.

On the following pages are some pericopes where I believe the anti-power influence from the kingdom-strategy of Daniel shines through ('probable' or 'certain influence').



**§288-89 Kingdom against Kingdom (Matt 24:6-13;  
Mark 13:7-13; Luke 21:10-19)**

Let us read a section from the Olivet Discourse again, although we discussed it in depth in the previous chapter. Now that we have contrasted the view of power and nation-states in Daniel with the rest of the Scriptures, do we now hear an echo of Dan 7 more strongly in Jesus' speech?

Then he said to them, Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be great earthquakes, and in various places famines and pestilences; and there will be terrors and great signs from heaven. But before all this they will lay their hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and prisons, and you will be brought before kings and governors for my name's sake. This will be a time for you to bear testimony. (Luke 21:10-13)

Some commentators reject the authenticity of this section about persecution arguing that its *Sitz im Leben* is that of the persecuted early Church and not the ministry of Jesus. However, Jesus is not talking only about immediate persecution to come upon his disciples. He is giving a programmatic statement about the life any member of the Kingdom of God might expect, drawn to a large extent on the kingdom-strategy in Daniel.

**§51 Blessed Are the Persecuted (Matt 5:3-12; Luke 6:20-23)**

The Beatitudes express the same view about which 'side of power' Jesus wanted his followers to be on.

Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God. Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so men persecuted the prophets who were before you. (Matt 5:3-12)

Blessed are you when men hate you, and when they exclude you and revile you, and

cast out your name as evil, on account of the Son of man! Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy, for behold, your reward is great in heaven. (Luke 6:22-23)

Which chapter in Jesus' Bible spoke about a future reward for the persecuted? The answer is: Daniel 7.

**§160 Suffering and Serving (Matt 16:24-27; Mark 8:34-38; Luke 9:23-26)**  
**§166 True Greatness (Mark 9:33-35); §263 Not Lording over People**  
**(Matt 20:20-28; Mark 10:35-45; Luke 22:24-27)**

When Peter in Matt 16 correctly recognized Jesus as the King of Israel ("σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς," v. 16), Peter quickly associated that role with *exercising* power and authority. When Jesus said it would involve persecution (as in Dan 7) and death (as in Dan 9), Peter objected. Peter had a different model of kingdom-building than Jesus had. Jesus had to clarify: "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. For whoever would save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life for my sake will find it. For what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life? Or what shall a man give in return for his life?" (Matt 16:24-26).

Jesus did not deny that he would one day exercise power, but that day (once again borrowed from Dan 7) was in the future: "For the Son of man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay every man for what he has done" (Matt 16:27).

Authority and leadership are currently not about *exercising power*. They are about *serving*.

And they came to Capernaum; and when he was in the house he asked them, "What were you discussing on the way? But they were silent; for on the way they had discussed with one another who was the greatest. And he sat down and called the twelve; and he said to them, If any one would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all. (Mark 9:33-35)

Jesus called upon his followers to "love their enemies"—even the Romans who

occupied them. They should pay their taxes to Rome happily (Luke 20:19-25), and serve any Roman soldier who needed help (Matt 5:41).

When John and James desired to rule over Israel from the left and right hand of Jesus, he had to tell them what the proper function of power was in his Kingdom. Jesus' concept sounds a lot like the suffering of the saints in Dan 7 and the suffering of the Messiah in Dan 9, and a direct refutation of the behavior of the various powers and horns in the visions of Daniel.

You know that those who are supposed to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (Mark 10:42-45)

Richard Hays' comment is insightful:

The continuing attempts of the disciples to scramble for position in a pecking order ([Mark] 9:33-34, 10:35-37) show that they have not yet grasped the nature of God's kingdom or of their calling. Those who are called into the community of Jesus' disciples are to be servants, and the pattern for this servanthood is definitely shown by Jesus, who came to give up his own life for the sake of others. . . . To be Jesus' follower is to share his vocation of suffering servanthood, renouncing the world's lust for power. Among "Gentiles," domination and self-assertion are the rule, but in the new community of Jesus' followers, another logic is at work.<sup>30</sup>

### **Previous Cases**

In the samples above the influence from Daniel can be seen in the kingdom-building strategy of Jesus, if not so much in the explicit language. Let us now review several cases we have looked at earlier where influence from Daniel was equally strong on the language as well as the concept of kingdom-expansion.

We have seen that pericope §109 (Matt 11:25-27) contains an allusion to Dan 2

---

<sup>30</sup>Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (San Francisco: Harper, 1996), 82.

(vv. 19-28). Both Daniel and Jesus claim that God alone possesses true knowledge and insight, and that he sees fit to give that to the weak and lowly, not to powerful kings.

Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever; to whom belong wisdom and might. He changes times and seasons; he removes kings and sets up kings; he gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who have understanding. (Dan 2:20-21)

I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes. (Matt 11:25)

In §128 (Matt 13:31-32; Mark 4:30-32; Luke 13:18-19) we found an allusion to Dan 4 (vv. 10-12). In Dan 4 the most powerful man on earth, king Nebuchadnezzar, was symbolically depicted as a large tree where animals and birds found rest in its shade. Due to his lack of humility and recognition of God's authority, Nebuchadnezzar the tree was cut down. In stark contrast, Jesus likens his own Kingdom to a tiny mustard-seed which does not appear to be much at the present stage, but which will grow and grow to become a large Kingdom. Jesus is the anti-Nebuchadnezzar with an anti-power strategy for growth. What appears to be insignificant and lowly right now will become large in the future.

With what can we compare the kingdom of God, or what parable shall we use for it? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when sown upon the ground, is the smallest of all the seeds on earth; yet when it is sown it grows up and becomes the greatest of all shrubs, and puts forth large branches, so that the birds of the air can make nests in its shade. (Mark 4:30-32)

Ellen White comments on the anti-power strategy of Jesus:

Without riches, power, or honor, how was He to establish the new kingdom? . . . Its principles of development are the opposite of those that rule the kingdoms of this world. Earthly governments prevail by physical force; they maintain their power by war, but the founder of the new kingdom is the Prince of Peace. . . . In His plan of government there is no employment of brute force to compel the conscience.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Ellen G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons* (Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1900), 76-7.

In §201 (Luke 12:32) Jesus told his followers to "fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Not only is "give you the kingdom" a phrase paralleled in Daniel only (7:18), the entire kingdom-building strategy is also influenced by Daniel here. Jesus' movement might appear small and insignificant right now. The followers are poor and weak and might lack resources for even the most basic needs. The followers have no political power or riches, and should not be concerned about it either. "For all the nations of the world seek these things" (Luke 12:30). Jesus' followers should be content to await the kingdom which the Father one day will give to the little flock.

It is not that Jesus finds material needs, sufferings, and persecution of no importance per se. It is not the politics of Jesus to leave evil oppressors in power forever and eternally remain a pacifist.<sup>32</sup> The question is once again one of timing. *One day* the 'Son of Man' will execute power and establish a physical Kingdom where righteousness dwells, oppressors are removed, and no one for ever will take the Kingdom away from them:

I saw in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man, and he came to the Ancient of Days and was presented before him. And to him was given dominion and glory and kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom one that shall not be destroyed. . . . But the court shall sit in judgment, and his dominion shall be taken away, to be consumed and destroyed to the end. And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; their

---

<sup>32</sup>John Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), is closer to grasping the mission strategy of Jesus than many other Gospel studies. Jesus, however, was not necessarily a strict pacifist (against the use of power and weapon by everyone), see Luke 22:36. The future role of Jesus as 'Son of Man' would certainly involve judgment and execution (Matt 13:41-42), a role not sufficiently described in Yoder's landmark study. As a method of expanding God's kingdom in the present age, however, Yoder is quite correct to say that wielding power over people had no role in Jesus' strategy. See also Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 595.

kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey them. (Dan 7:13-14, 26-27)

For the Son of man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay every man for what he has done. (Matt 16:27)

Then will appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. (Matt 24:30-31)

In the meantime, however, in the present phase of God's Kingdom, God and his followers will refrain from exercising power over people. God's kingdom-building strategy did in other parts of the OT include a proper use of national institutions—of land, temple, palace, and power. In Daniel and in the Synoptics that strategy has changed. The present phase of the Kingdom of God is that of an underground movement of oppressed and powerless people. Expanding the Kingdom is not to take place through national institutions (city, land, temple, formal power) but through followers serving and teaching.

All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age. (Matt 28:18-20)<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>John Riches has noticed the radicalness of Jesus' strategy in Matt 28: "With apocalyptic, this counter-cultural language also becomes the language of the disempowered and the subaltern, opposed to the language of the rulers. That we are here moving in the world of cultural resistance can be seen from the visions in Daniel which are echoed in Matthew 28:16–20. . . . What is being claimed here . . . [is] that the wisdom and virtues which 'belong' to the ruling elite are in fact to be appropriated by the 'little people', the marginalized and oppressed, 'the babes' (Matt. 11:25), and that they will be empowered, once Jesus's true authority is recognized and confirmed, to preserve and transmit his teaching throughout the world. It is a truly revolutionary claim." John Kenneth Riches, "Matthew's Missionary Strategy in Colonial Perspective," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Roman Imperial Context* (ed. John Kenneth Riches and David C. Sim; JSNTSup 276; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 136-7.

## Summary

We have repeatedly come back to Dan 7 during this study. Jesus' favorite self-identifying term ('Son of Man') is taken from this chapter of Scripture. The eschatological discourse had numerous strong allusions to this chapter. Again and again throughout the Gospels allusions to Dan 7 have appeared. So what is it about this prophetic chapter that intrigued and inspired the Synoptic Jesus so much? Perhaps our familiarity with Dan 7 might prevent us from seeing the big picture. If we hand the chapter to any new reader—maybe a cartoon-trained modern child—the essence of Dan 7 will quickly be pointed out to us: It is about power! The 'cartoon' that Daniel saw in his nightly vision was all about obnoxious, power-hungry, war-mongering, and boastful beasts. The worst of them all was the little horn who even had the audacity to stand up against the Almighty and persecute his followers. It is a movie about the extremity of human folly, raging war against the God of the Universe and hoping for victory, and of believing in one's own authority to change God's times and laws.

As a breath of fresh air the 'Son of Man' enters the scene. He is humble. He does not *take* power from anyone. He *receives* it from God. The 'Son of Man' does not "lord it over people." He sets people free.

Some of the images and symbols might be different in Daniel than in the Gospels, but it is as similar as you can get across two so different literary genres (apocalyptic cartoons versus a biographical narrative). And a sufficient amount of symbols, terms, and phrases are carried straight over from Dan 7 (and other parts of Daniel) to the Gospels so that it should be clear to us all that Daniel was important for Jesus. We must agree with David Wenham that a "potentially very important point of Danielic influence on the NT is in the 'Kingdom of God' concept."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Wenham, "The Kingdom of God and Daniel," 132.

## CONCLUSION

Substantial use and influence of the book of Daniel on the Synoptic Gospels have always been assumed and stated by most scholars. Now that we for the first time have taken a comprehensive look at all the possible allusions to Daniel in one study, we are better equipped to evaluate the *extent* of Daniel's influence. Exactly how often does Jesus allude to the prophetic book of Daniel? How much and in what areas did Daniel influence the theology and language that we find in the Synoptic Gospels?

Tables 4 and 5 (next pages) summarize my findings. This adds up to quite a substantial amount of use and influence of Daniel in the teachings of Jesus that appears in the Synoptic Gospels. While Daniel cannot rival the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and Isaiah and make it into the "first-century top three," it probably appears fairly high on the list after that.<sup>1</sup> We have seen how Daniel has influenced the language of many sayings in the Gospels, and how theological concepts like the Synoptic Jesus' self-identity, Jesus' understanding of future events, and Jesus' strategy for kingdom-building owe a lot to the book of Daniel.

It is probably not a coincidence that a large majority of the allusions to Daniel deal with the topic of the 'Kingdom of God', of the role and function of the 'Son of

---

<sup>1</sup>This study has of course not compared the use of Daniel in the Synoptics with that of other OT books. Craig Evans, however, based on his broad research in the use of the OT in the NT, reached the conclusion that "proportionately, this puts Daniel in the same category as Isaiah and the Psalms, the books most frequently quoted and alluded to in the New Testament." Craig A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; 2 vols; Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 2:490.



TABLE 4

## ACCUMULATED TABLE OF 'PROBABLE' AND 'CERTAIN' ALLUSIONS

---

§2-3 "Gabriel"	Luke connects his Gospel to 'grand prophecies' through Gabriel.
§20 "Devil's offer"	Verbal parallels as well as common authority/loyalty/glory themes are present.
§109 "Revealing the hidden"	In both Daniel and Matthew only God knows the deep and hidden things.
§128 "Large tree"	Jesus' parable directly alludes to the big tree in Dan 4. God's Kingdom might seem small now but will grow large
§131 "Fiery furnace"	The destruction of the wicked are described with an almost verbal quote from Dan 3.
§131 "Righteous will shine"	Also the fate of the righteous is described in terms taken from Daniel.
§278 "Crushing stone"	Jesus' vineyard/wicked tenants parable alludes toward the end to the crushing stone of Dan 2.
§364 "All authority"	Jesus' final gospel commission is a strong allusion to Dan 7 (almost a quote).
'Son of Man'	The term "Son of Man" is taken from Dan 7. Often it is used in other contexts than the event in Dan 7, but sometimes also directly alluding to the "coming on the clouds with power" of Dan 7.
Eschatological Discourse	Much of Matt 24par is taken from Dan 9 and 7, almost as a direct exposition of events prophesied in those chapters.
'Kingdom of God'	Daniel has had substantial influence on the anti-power expansion strategy for the present Kingdom of God.

---

TABLE 5  
ACCUMULATED TABLE OF 'POSSIBLE' ALLUSIONS

---

§62 "Lord's Prayer"	Parallels with Dan 2 and 4 of kingship and power exist in both beginning and end of the Lord's Prayer.
§117 "Finger of God"	Jesus establishes God's kingdom through "the finger of God," which is an unusual phrase that might allude to Exod 8 and Dan 5.
§123 "Mystery of kingdom"	There are parallels between Jesus' reason for talking in parables and the mysteries revealed to Daniel.
§161 "Transfiguration"	Possible allusion exists to both the book of Exodus and the book of Daniel, chs. 7 and 10.
§180 "Apocalyptic vision"	Jesus' phrase "I saw" might be taken from Dan 7 and other chapters in Daniel.
§255 et al. "Eternal life"	A belief in 'eternal life' and 'resurrection' was held by many Jews at the time of the common era, so these verses might not be influenced by Daniel; but then again, Dan 12 <i>is</i> the clearest OT text about the resurrection.
§351 "Sealing the tomb"	Early Christians saw a parallel between Daniel in the lions' den and Jesus' sealed grave. Perhaps that parallel was first pointed out by Matthew.

---

Man', about God's authority and sovereignty over humans, and about future events. There are many other themes and sayings in the Gospels not related to these specific issues, and interestingly few allusions to Daniel are found there.

This tells us that the book of Daniel played a specific role in the theological and spiritual formation of Jesus: Daniel gave Jesus a unique program and mind-set on the crucially important topic of his identity and mission. Daniel contributed for the Synoptic Jesus important values of humility and service over against power-play and power-abuse. It gave Jesus insight into future events. It provided a model and program for how the reign of God should be implemented, and how it should not be implemented.

That specific result has been somewhat of a surprise to me. I would not have initiated this research if I had not believed that Daniel was influential for Jesus and the Gospel writers. I was surprised, however, to see the extent of the role Daniel played for the Synoptic Jesus, and exactly on which topics and themes this prophetic book was influential.

So what are the implications of this study for biblical research? This has been a literary study on the three first Gospels. I hope both scholars and general readers of the Gospels can benefit from it. If the findings in this study are valid, we might consider the following implications for other areas of biblical studies as well.

Outside of Synoptic research, the most immediate relevance for this dissertation is of course the very field to which it belongs: the growing and maturing study of the use of Israel's Scriptures in the New Testament. As we have seen, there has not been a lack of interest in detecting allusions to Daniel. A large number of intertextual footprints of Daniel in the Synoptics have been identified and discussed over the years. Unfortunately, until now no one had collected all those possible allusions to Daniel in one comprehensive study. The analyses were all scattered around in various journal articles,

monographs, and commentaries. I hope it will be seen as useful and stimulating to have access to so many possible Daniel allusions in one place.

Although I have for the most part avoided direct discussions about the historical Jesus in this dissertation, using all the Synoptic material without assessing the authenticity of any of it, I hope the result of this investigation can be used by historians as well.

A common approach in historical Jesus research is to evaluate the authenticity of sayings and events in the Gospels individually. Each pericope is often assessed by itself according to how probable the historian deems each single saying or event to be. A weakness of this atomistic approach is that the accumulated portrait of Jesus that emerges might not be quite as historically probable as the researcher thought each item by itself was. Whatever else one holds about Jesus, all our ancient sources indicate that he was seen as a respected rabbi who expounded the Scriptures of Israel and was well within the boundaries of the multifaceted Judaism of his day. Some of the portraits of Jesus developed through an atomistic pericope-by-pericope approach, with no eye on the probability of the final picture that emerges, are not historically believable or probable.

Before historians begin evaluating the authenticity of the separate sayings we have discussed in this study, I suggest that we assess the overall probability that the real Jesus could have understood and used Daniel the way we have seen Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels does. This will necessarily involve the delicate issue of Jesus' self-identity. If we allow that Jesus of Nazareth *could* have thought of himself as the Messiah and the celestial Son of Man (which is a possibility that must be entertained; after all, that idea has to originate with someone), then the extensive use of Daniel by the Synoptic Jesus could very well reflect the historical Jesus.

Let me summarize that usage once more. As a teacher and devoted student of Scripture Jesus would have spent a large amount of time with Daniel (one of the more popular books in the Judaism of his day) which then colored his language on many occasions (ch. 2 in this study). Believing himself to be the predicted Messiah and 'Son of Man', Jesus used the latter phrase about himself on many occasions—as he spoke about the future Day of Judgment when he would receive the eternal Kingdom, as well as during his everyday activities (ch. 3). From Daniel ch. 9 (among other places) Jesus discovered that the Messiah (himself) had to die and that after some time Jerusalem would be attacked and destroyed. From Daniel ch. 7 he knew that many would appear in the future to attack God and God's law and take God's place, as well as persecute God's followers. He shared this understanding of the future with his disciples in the Olivet Discourse (warnings against future false teachers, false messiahs, and oppressors). Even if one does not believe in the possibility of genuine predictive prophecy, one is still not forced to judge the 'foretelling' aspects of the Olivet Discourse as inauthentic. Jesus simply got his understanding of these future events from Dan 9 and 7 (ch. 4 in this study). From the only OT book written under occupation which was free from any role of state institutions in God's mission, Jesus saw a Kingdom strategy that would fuel an underground movement of the oppressed and powerless (ch. 5).

The historian might not personally believe Jesus one day to be a celestial figure, or that Dan 9 truly predicted the Fall of Jerusalem. As a historian, however, one ought to realize that all these would be perfectly possible views to have for any first-century Jewish rabbi if he had read his Daniel extensively and believed he was the fulfillment of Israel's prophetic hope.

In the vast scholarly literature about the historical Jesus of the last two hundred years, including extensive discussions about how apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic Jesus'

worldview was, there is (except for the 'Son of Man' issue) curiously little discussion explicitly about how much Jesus could have been influenced by the book of Daniel and how he might have interpreted it. Considering the popularity and influence of the book of Daniel in Second Temple Judaism, especially in the more apocalyptic sectors, this lacuna in historical Jesus scholarship is unfortunate. I hope this dissertation can serve as a foundation and springboard for further discussions also in this field.

Some suggestions for research on the book Daniel might be made as well.

Twentieth-century academic scholarship on Daniel has focused particularly on two areas: reconstructing a hypothetical second-century *Sitz im Leben* of the book (historical studies), and comparing Daniel with Second Temple writings to understand and define the genre of Jewish apocalyptic literature (comparative studies). In my opinion (having read a good amount of the modern literature on Daniel for this study) too few serious attempts are made today at exegeting and interpreting the book of Daniel as we have it in order to extract its religious, theological, and ethical message—in the way other OT prophetic books (and all biblical books) are usually treated. Perhaps the problem for the interpreter has been that the many odd symbols and unusual language make Daniel a more difficult book to grasp. If that is the problem, I hope that the Synoptic Jesus can help us out and point us in a more fruitful direction. In the book of Daniel there are loud messages about deceit and truth, oppression and faithfulness, temporary power and eternal rewards. These were the important lessons from Daniel for Jesus.

Since the movement claiming to be Jesus' followers has too often been on the wrong side of deceit, power-abuse, and oppression (any introduction to Church History should do), this is something to think seriously about. Maybe the view of Martin Luther and many others before and after him, that the Christian Church looked a lot like the little horn of Dan 7, deserves more attention in Daniel commentaries again. The old reformer

had pointed out a discrepancy between ecclesiastical power-play and Jesus' and Daniel's view of power.

For scholars who enjoy a more hermeneutical puzzle, there is also the question of what normative value Jesus' specific interpretations of Daniel's predictions have for the modern-day follower. We have no evidence that Jesus saw any part of Daniel describing second-century B.C. events. There is unmistakable evidence that he saw much of Daniel to be fulfilled in his future—including the Fall of Jerusalem (Abomination of Desolation) and false teachers and persecutors to appear.

The book of Daniel has still a lot to give the curious and serious student.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalen, Sverre. "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 8 (1961-62): 215-40.
- . "St Luke's Gospel and the Last Chapters of 1 Enoch." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966-67): 1-13.
- Abegg, Martin, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999.
- Abramowski, Luise. "Die Entstehung der dreigliedrigen Taufformel—ein Versuch." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 81 (1984): 417-46.
- Adams, Edward. "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 39-61.
- Adler, William. "The Apocalyptic Survey of History Adapted by Christians: Daniel's Prophecy of 70 Weeks." Pages 201-38 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Ahn, Peter P. "The Distinctive Theological Vocabulary of Selected Jewish Apocalyptic Writings." Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1962.
- Aland, Barbara, ed. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1987.
- Albright, William Foxwell, and Christopher Stephen Mann. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- Aldridge, A. Owen. "The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature: A Symposium." *Comparative Literature Studies* (1963): 143-52.
- Allen, Willoughby C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*. 3d ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912.



- Allison, Dale C. "The Eschatology of Jesus." Pages 267-302 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus & the Victory of Apocalyptic." Pages 126-41 in *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*. Edited by Carey C. Newman. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Plea for Thoroughgoing Eschatology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 651-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Scriptural Allusions in the New Testament: Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls*. North Richland Hills, Tex.: Bibal, 2000.
- Anderson, Hugh. *The Gospel of Mark*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and Christian Origins: A Commentary on Modern Viewpoints*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Anderson, Robert Andrew. *Daniel: Signs and Wonders*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Andreasen, Niels-Erik. "The Advent Hope in Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 31-45 in *The Advent Hope in Scripture and History*. Edited by Viggo Nørskov Olsen. Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1987.
- Archer, Gleason L. "Daniel." Pages 1-157 in vol. 7 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Daniel—Minor Prophets*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958.
- Arnold, Bill T. "Old Testament Eschatology and the Rise of Apocalypticism." Pages 23-39 in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Edited by Jerry L. Walls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Arvedson, Tomas. *Das Mystrium Christi: Eine Studie zu Mt 11:25-30*. Uppsala, Sweden: Wretmans Boktryckeri, 1937.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

- Badenas, Roberto. "'The Sign of the Son of Man in Heaven' (Matthew 24:30): An Adventist Perspective." Pages 315-33 in *Christ, Salvation, and the Eschaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle*. Edited by Daniel Heinz, Jiří Moskala, and Peter M. van Bemmelen. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2009.
- Bailey, Daniel P. "The Intertextual Relationship of Daniel 12:2 and Isaiah 26:19: Evidence from Qumran and the Greek Versions." *Tyndale Bulletin* 51 (2000): 305-8.
- Baker, David L. *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of the Relationship between the Old & New Testaments*. Rev. ed. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1991.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Daniel*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1978.
- Baldwin, John T. "Did Christ Predict That He Would Return in the First Century? Reflections on Luke 21:24b and Its Phrase 'Times of the Gentiles' in Historicist Perspective." Pages 335-47 in *Christ, Salvation, and the Eschaton: Essays in Honor of Hans K. LaRondelle*. Edited by Daniel Heinz, Jiří Moskala, and Peter M. van Bemmelen. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reimarus and the Return of Christ Revisited: Reflections on Luke 21:24b and Its Phrase 'Times of the Gentiles' in Historicist Perspective." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 11 (2000): 295-306.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "The Background of Mark 10:45." Pages 1-18 in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*. Edited by Angus John B. Higgins. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1959.
- Barth, Karl. *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background & History*. Translated by Brian Cozens and John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 2001.
- Barth, Markus. "The Old Testament in Hebrews: An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics." Pages 53-78 in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper*. Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 26 (1986): 97-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Parable of the Vine: Rediscovering a Lost Parable of Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 84-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 23 (1985): 23-33.

- Bauer, Dieter. *Das Buch Daniel*. Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1996.
- Bauer, Walter, Frederick W. Danker, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Baumstark, A. "Die Zitate des Mt.-Evangeliums aus dem Zwölfprophetenbuch." *Biblica* 37 (1956): 296-313.
- Beale, Gregory K. "The Danielic Background for Revelation 13-18 and 17:9." *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980): 163-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 166. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of Daniel in the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse and in the Book of Revelation." Pages 129-153 in *The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. Edited by David Wenham. Gospel Perspectives 5. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Beale, Gregory K., and Donald A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Beare, Francis Wright. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.
- Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Kingdom of God and Christology in the Gospels." Pages 22-36 in *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Resurrection and Parousia of the Son of Man." *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1991): 296-309.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Second Thoughts on the Composition of Mark 13." *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983): 414-20.

- Beaton, Richard. *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Beauchamp, Paul. "Paraboles de Jésus, vie de Jésus: L'encadrement évangélique et scripturaire des paraboles (Mc 4,1-34)." Pages 151-70 in *Les paraboles évangéliques: Perspectives nouvelles*. Edited by Jean Delorme. Lectio Divina 135. Paris: Cerf, 1989.
- Beattie, Derek Robert George, and Martin J. McNamara, eds. *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 166. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Beck, Brian E. *Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke*. London: Epworth, 1989.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "Daniel 9 and the Date of Messiah's Coming in Essene, Hellenistic, Pharisaic, Zealot and Early Christian Computation." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1981): 521-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Early Traces of the Book of Daniel." *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2002): 75-82.
- Bengel, John Albert. *Gnomon of the New Testament*. Translated by James Bandinel. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1877.
- Bennett, W. J. "'The Son of Man Must...'" *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975): 113-29.
- Best, Ernest. *The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology*. 2nd ed. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Biddle, Mark E. "Ancestral Motifs in 1 Samuel 25: Intertextuality and Characterization." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 617-38.
- Black, Matthew. "A Bibliography of 1 Enoch in the Eighties." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 5 (1989): 3-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971): 1-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Son of Man." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 1 (1978): 4-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins." Pages 145-68 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament by the New Testament." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986): 1-17.
- Block, Haskell M. "The Concept of Influence in Comparative Literature." Pages 74-81 in *Influx: Essays on Literary Influence*. Edited by Ronald Primeau. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat, 1977.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Matthew*. New American Commentary 22. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Matthew." Pages 1-109 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, ed. *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke Volume 1: 1:1-9:50*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke Volume 2: 9:51-24:53*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Use of the Old Testament in the New." Pages 97-114 in *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews, and Robert B. Sloan. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Bolt, Peter G. *Jesus' Defeat of Death: Persuading Mark's Early Readers*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 125. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Were the Sadducees Reading? An Enquiry into the Literary Background of Mark 12:18-23." *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994): 369-94.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. F. L. Tye. London: Burns & Oates, 1963.
- Borgen, Peder. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 86. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997.

- Boring, M. Eugene. "Markan Christology: God-Language for Jesus?" *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 451-71.
- Bornkamm, Günther. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Translated by Irene McLuskey and Fraser McLuskey. New York: Harper, 1960.
- . "Likmao." Pages 280-81 in vol. 4 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Borsch, F. H. "Mark XIV.62 and I Enoch LXII.5." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967-68): 565-7.
- Bovon, Francois. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Bowman, John. *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Studia post-biblica 8. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1965.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- . *Sparks of the Logos: Essays in Rabbinic Hermeneutics*. The Brill Reference Library of Judaism 11. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- Bracht, Katharina, and David S. du Toit, eds. *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam: Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371. Berlin: Gruyter, 2007.
- Bratcher, Robert G., ed. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. United Bible Society Technical Helps Series. New York: United Bible Societies, 1987.
- Bratcher, Robert G., and Eugene A. Nida. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Mark*. UBS Handbook Series. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1961.
- Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: With an English translation, and with Various Readings and Critical Notes*. Repr., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1971.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. "Das Markusevangelium, Psalm 110,1 und 118,22f: Folgetext und Prätext." Pages 197-222 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Bridge, Steven L. *'Where the Eagles Are Gathered': The Deliverance of the Elect in Lukan Eschatology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 240. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Broadhead, Edwin Keith. *Mark. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Reconfiguring Jesus: The Son of Man in Markan Perspective." Pages 18-30 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels, Volume 1*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. Library of New Testament Studies 304. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Broadus, John A. *Commentary on Matthew*. Repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1990.

Brodie, Thomas Louis. "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17.-24." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 247-67.

Brooke, George J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 35-57 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 28. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1998.

Brooks, James A. *Mark*. New American Commentary 23. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1991.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.

Brown, Schuyler. "The Matthean Apocalypse." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 4 (1978): 2-27.

Bruce, F. F. *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Qumrân and Early Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955): 176-90.

Bruner, Frederick Dale. *Matthew: A Commentary*. 2 vols. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Bryan, Steven M. *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgment and Restoration*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- Buchanan, George Wesley. *Introduction to Intertextuality*. Mellen Biblical Press Series 26. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus: The King and His Kingdom*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer, 1984.
- Bullock, C. Hassell. "Ezekiel, Bridge Between the Testaments." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25 (1982): 23-31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophetic Books*. Chicago: Moody, 1986.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "History and Eschatology in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954): 5-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribner, 1951.
- Burkett, Delbert. "The Nontitular Son of Man: A History and Critique." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 504-21.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Buth, Randall. "A More Complete Semitic Background for *bar-anas*, 'Son of Man'." Pages 176-89 in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 154. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Buttrick, George Arthur. *The Parables of Jesus*. New York: Harper, 1928.
- Cahill, Michael. *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. *The Exegetical Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 4. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Text': A Terminological and Ideological Critique." Pages 43-68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and James H. Charlesworth. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Capshaw, Jeffery Lynn. "A Textlinguistic Analysis of Selected Old Testament Texts in Matthew 1-4." Ph.D. dissertation, Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2001.



- Caragounis, Chrys C. "Kingdom of God, Son of Man and Jesus' Self-Understanding." *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 3-23.
- . "Kingdom of God, Son of Man and Jesus' Self-Understanding: Part II." *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 223-38.
- . *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 38. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986.
- Carpenter, Humphrey. *Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Carrington, Philip. *According to Mark: A Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Carson, Donald A. "Matthew." Pages 3-599 in vol. 8 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- Carson, Donald A., and H. G. M. Williamson, eds. *It Is Written—Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Carter, Warren. "Are There Imperial Texts in the Class: Intertextual Eagles and Matthean Eschatology as 'Lights Out' Time for Imperial Rome (Matthew 24:27-31)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 467-87.
- . "Evoking Isaiah: Matthean Soteriology and an Intertextual Reading of Isaiah 7-9 and Matthew 1:23 and 4:15-16." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000): 503-20.
- Carter, Warren, and John Paul Heil. *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 30. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1998.
- Casey, Maurice. "Aramaic Idiom and the Son of Man Problem: A Response to Owen and Shepherd." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25 (2002): 3-32.
- . "The Corporate Interpretation of 'One Like a Son of Man' (Dan VII 13) at the Time of Jesus." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 167-80.
- . "Culture and Historicity: The Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2:23-28)." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 1-23.
- . "General, Generic and Indefinite: The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in Aramaic Sources and in the Teaching of Jesus." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 29 (1987): 21-56.
- . "Idiom and Translation: Some Aspects of the Son of Man Problem." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 164-82.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Jackals and the Son of Man." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 23 (1985): 3-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Method in Our Madness, and Madness in Their Methods: Some Approaches to the Son of Man Problem in Recent Scholarship." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 42 (1991): 17-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Solution to the 'Son of Man' Problem*. Library of New Testament Studies 343. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man Problem." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 67 (1976): 147-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- Cassidy, Richard J. "Luke's Audience, the Chief Priests, and the Motive for Jesus' Death." Pages 146-67 in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper. New York: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Catchpole, David. "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8." *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 255-65.
- Charette, Blaine. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Charles, J. Daryl. "Jude's Use of Pseudepigraphical Source-material as Part of a Literary Strategy." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 130-45.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Can We Discern the Composition Date of the Parables of Enoch?" Pages 450-68 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation." Pages 20-43 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Walter P. Weaver. *The Old and New Testaments: Their Relationship and The "Intertestamental" Literature*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1993.

- Chialà, Sabino. "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." Pages 153-78 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Chilton, Bruce. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- . "(The) Son of (the) Man, and Jesus." Pages 259-87 in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.
- Chilton, Bruce, and Craig A. Evans. "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures." Pages 281-335 in *Studying the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1994.
- Choi, P. Richard. "Abraham Our Father: Paul's Voice in the Covenantal Debate of the Second Temple Period." Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1997.
- Chouinard, Larry. *Matthew*. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, Mo.: College Press, 1997.
- Christensen, Jens. "Le fils de l'homme s'en va, ainsi qu'il est écrit de lui." *Studia theologica* 10 (1956): 28-39.
- Chronis, Harry L. "To Reveal and to Conceal: A Literary-Critical Perspective on 'the Son of Man' in Mark." *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 459-81.
- Clines, David J. A. *The Theme of the Pentateuch*. Journal for the Old Testament: Supplement Series 10. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978.
- Cole, R. Alan. *Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 2. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989.
- Coleridge, Mark. *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 88. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings." Pages 220-28 in *The Future of Early Christianity*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- . *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1996.
- . "Daniel 7 and Jesus." *Journal of Theology* 93 (1989): 5-19.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel 7 and the Historical Jesus." Pages 187-93 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament." Pages 90-112 in *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Edited by John J. Collins. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark and His Readers: The Son of God Among Jews." *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 393-408.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man'." *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 391-407.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to Leslie Walck." Pages 299-337 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 218-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. Forms of the OT Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." Pages 216-27 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 74-90 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gabriel." Pages 338-9 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1999.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." Pages 111-33 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Meaning of 'the End' in the Book of Daniel." Pages 91-8 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 54. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 50-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 448-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume 1—The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*. New York: Harper, 1969.
- Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1976.
- Coppens, Joseph and Luc Dequeker. *Le fils de l'homme et les saints du très-haut en Daniel, VII, dans les apocryphes et dans les nouveau testament*. Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia 3:23. Louvain, Belgium: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1961.
- Court, John M., ed. *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction*. London: SPCK, 2002.
- Craddock, Fred B. *Luke*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1990.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "4QTales of the Persian Court (4Q550<sup>A-E</sup>) and Its Relation to Biblical Royal Court Tales, Especially Esther, Daniel and Joseph." Pages 121-37 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- Crook, Zeba Antonin. "The Synoptic Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: A Test-Case for the Two-Document, Two-Gospel, and Farrer-Goulder Hypotheses." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 78 (2000): 23-48.

- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: Harper, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. New York: Harper, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Seed Parables of Jesus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 244-66.
- Crump, David. "Jesus, the Victorious Scribal-Intercessor in Luke's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 51-65.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr: A Historical and Theological Study*. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. "The Gospel of Luke: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 1-490 in vol. 9 of *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck. 12 vols. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1995.
- Curtis, William Alexander. *Jesus Christ the Teacher: A Study of His Method and Message Based Mainly on the Earlier Gospels*. London: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Translated by David Miller Kay. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909.
- Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1956.
- Davidson, Richard M. "Interpreting Old Testament Prophecy." Pages 183-204 in *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*. Edited by George W. Reid. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Testament Use of the Old Testament." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 5, no. 1 (1994): 14-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Principles of Biblical Interpretation." Unpublished class syllabus. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Theological Seminary, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'This Generation Shall Not Pass' (Matt 24:34): Failed or Fulfilled Prophecy." Pages 307-28 in *The Cosmic Battle for Planet Earth: Essays in Honor of Norman R. Gulley*. Edited by Ronald A. G. du Preez and Jiří Moskala. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical *tupos* Structures*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 2. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1981.

- Davies, Philip R. "Eschatology at Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 39-55.
- Davies, William David. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Davies, William David, and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-97.
- Davis, Philip G. "Mark's Christological Paradox." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 35 (1989): 3-18.
- Deines, Roland. *Die Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias: Mt 5,13-20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 141. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Derrett, John Duncan Martin. *The Ascetic Discourse: An Explanation of the Sermon on the Mount*. Eilsbrunn, Germany: Ko'Amor, 1989.
- deSilva, David Arthur. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Dines, Jennifer Mary. *The Septuagint*. Understanding the Bible and Its World. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Diop, Ganoune. "Innerbiblical Interpretation: Reading Scripture Intertextually." Pages 135-51 in *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*. Edited by George W. Reid. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 2006.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "A Report on the Pseudepigrapha Research Since Charlesworth's Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (2001): 179-207.
- Dittmar, Wilhelm. *Vetus Testamentum in Novo: Die alttestamentlichen Parallelen des Neuen Testaments im Wortlaut der Urtexte und der Septuaginta*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Doble, Peter. *The Paradox of Salvation: Luke's Theology of the Cross*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament in the New*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1950.
- Dohmen, Christoph, and Günter Stemberger. *Hermeneutik der jüdischen Bibel und des Alten Testaments*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1996.
- Donahue, John R. *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative, and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Recent Studies on the Origin of the "Son of Man" in the Gospels." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 484-98.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Doukhan, Jacques B. *Secrets of Daniel*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review & Herald, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9: An Exegetical Study." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 17 (1979): 1-22.
- Dowd, Sharyn Echols. *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel*. Reading the New Testament Series. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2000.
- Draisma, Sipke, ed. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Kampen, The Netherlands: J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Drury, John. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976.
- Duncan, George S. *Jesus, Son of Man*. London: Nisbet, 1947.
- Dunn, James D. G. "'Are You the Messiah?': Is the Crux of Mark 14:61-62 Resolvable?" Pages 272-289 in vol. 3 of *The Historical Jesus: Critical Concepts in Religious Studies*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London: Routledge, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John the Baptist's Use of Scripture." Pages 42-54 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Dupont, Jacques. "Le logion des douze trônes." *Biblica* 45 (1964): 355-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Les Béatitudes*. 3 vols. Etudes bibliques. Bruges, Belgium: Abbaye de Saint-André, 1958-73.



- Dwyer, Timothy. *The Motif of Wonder in the Gospel of Mark*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 128. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Dyer, Keith D. *The Prophecy on the Mount: Mark 13 and the Gathering of the New Community*. International Theological Studies: Contributions of Baptist Scholars. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998.
- Dyrness, William. *Themes in Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1977.
- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel according to Mark*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Edmunds, Lowell. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Efrd, James M., ed. *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millenium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. "Jahwe als König." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 5 (1928): 81-105.
- Elledge, Casey D. *Life After Death in Early Judaism: The Evidence of Josephus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 208. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 97. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke*. Rev. ed. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 54. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Ellis, Peter F. *Matthew: His Mind and His Message*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1974.
- Ernst, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1977.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1981.
- Evans, Craig A. "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom." Pages 490-527 in vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 25. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 3. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mark 8:27-16:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 34B. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Quest for Jesus and the New Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 163-183 in *Jesus, Mark, and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 214. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke's Scriptural Apologetic." Pages 171-211 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24-30." Pages 154-170 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders, eds. *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 154. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

- Evans, Craig A., and W. Richard Stegner, eds. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Evans, Craig A., and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- Ferch, Arthur J. "Commencement Date for the Seventy Week Prophecy." Pages 64-74 in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Daniel & Revelation Committee Series 3. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel 7 and Ugarit: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 75-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Son of Man in Daniel Seven*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 6. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1979.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfrid G. E. Watson. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Fewell, Danna Nolan, ed. *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Fiedler, Peter. *Das Matthäus-evangelium*. Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006.
- Filson, Floyd Vivian. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*. London: A & C Black, 1960.
- Finkelpearl, Ellen. "Pagan Traditions of Intertextuality in the Roman World." Pages 78-90 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by Dennis R. MacDonald. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Exegetical Imagination: On Jewish Thought and Theology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Midrashic Imagination: Jewish Exegesis, Thought, and History*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Fisk, Bruce Norman. *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "One Good Story Deserves Another: The Hermeneutics of Invoking Secondary Biblical Episodes in the Narratives of *Pseudo-Philo* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*." Pages 217-38 in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Another View of the 'Son of Man' Debate." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 4 (1979): 58-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960-61): 297-333.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 25. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Flender, Helmut. *Die Botschaft Jesu von der Herrschaft Gottes*. Munich, Germany: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968.
- Flint, Peter W. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pages 329-67 in vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Flusser, David. *Jesus*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sage from Galilee: Rediscovering Jesus' Genius*. Edited by R. Steven Notley. Translated by Azzan Yadin. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Ford, Desmond. *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel*. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Publishing Association, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *How Long, O Lord: An Introduction to the Book of Daniel*. Bloomington, Ind.: iUniverse, 2010.
- Ford, J. Massyngberde. "Zealotism and the Lukan Infancy Narratives." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 280-92.
- Fox, Michael V. "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 416-31.

- France, Richard T. *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 1. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Matthew*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Testament Prophecy and the Future of Israel: A Study of the Teaching of Jesus." *Tyndale Bulletin* 26 (1975): 53-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scripture, Tradition and History in the Infancy Narratives of Matthew." Pages 239-66 in *Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Edited by Richard T. France and David Wenham. Gospel Perspectives 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. "Die Offenbarung an die Unmündigen: Pragmatische Impulse aus Mt 11,25f." Pages 97-127 in *Chancen und Grenzen religiöser Erziehung*. Edited by Johannes Thiele and Rudolf Becker. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1980.
- Fredriksen, Paula. *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews: A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity*. New York: Knopf, 2000.
- Freed, Edwin D. *The Stories of Jesus' Birth: A Critical Introduction*. St. Louis, Mo.: Chalice, 2001.
- Frein, Brigid Curtin. "Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfillment." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 22-37.
- Freyne, Seán. "The Disciples in Mark and the Maskilim in Daniel: A Comparison." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 16 (1982): 7-23.
- Froom, Le Roy Edwin. *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation*. 4 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1950.
- Fuellenbach, John. *The Kingdom of God: The Message of Jesus Today*. New York: Orbis Books, 1995.
- Funk, Robert. *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millennium*. San Francisco: Harper, 1996.
- Garland, David E. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel*. Reading the New Testament Series. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2001.

- Garnet, Paul. "The Baptism of Jesus and the Son of Man Idea." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 9 (1980): 49-65.
- Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Gathercole, Simon. "Jesus' Eschatological Vision of the Fall of Satan: Luke 10,18 Reconsidered." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 94 (2003): 143-63.
- Geldenhuis, Norval. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Gibbs, Jeffrey A. *Matthew 1:1-11:1*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 2006.
- Gibson, Jeffrey B. *The Temptations of Jesus in Early Christianity*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 112. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Giesen, Heinz. *Herrschaft Gottes—heute oder morgen: Zur Heilsbotschaft Jesu Under der synoptischen Evangelien*. Biblische Untersuchungen 26. Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1995.
- Glasson, T. Francis. "The Reply to Caiaphas (Mark XIV. 62)." *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960): 88-93.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man Imagery: Enoch XIV and Daniel VII." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1977): 82-90.
- Goldingay, John. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Faith*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology: Israel's Gospel*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2003.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by John E. Alsup. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- Gordis, Robert. "Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 22 (1949): 157-219.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Quotations in Wisdom Literature." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 30 (1939): 123-47.
- Gould, Ezra P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St Mark*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1922.

- Goulder, Michael Douglas. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Psalm 8 and the Son of Man." *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 18-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Phasing of the Future." Pages 391-408 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "The Parables of Enoch in Second Temple Jewish Society." Pages 386-402 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Grant, Michael. *Jesus: An Historian's Review of the Gospels*. New York: Scribner, 1977.
- Grappe, Christian. "De l'intérêt de 4 Maccabées 17.18-22 (et 16.20-1) pour la christologie du NT." *New Testament Studies* 46 (2000): 342-57.
- Gräßer, Erich. *Der alte Bund im neuen: Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 35. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Gray, John, ed. *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979.
- Green, H. Benedict. *Matthew, Poet of the Beatitudes*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 203. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Green, Joel B., and Richard B. Hays. "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers." Pages 222-38 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Grimm, Werner. "Der Dank für die empfangene Offenbarung bei Jesus und Josephus: Parallelen zu Mt 11,25-27." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 17 (1973): 249-56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus und das Danielbuch: Jesu Einspruch das Offenbarungssystem Daniels (Mt 11,25-27; Lk 17:20-21)*. 2 vols. Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum 6. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Geschichte Jesu Christi*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary 34A. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1982.
- Gulley, Norman R. "Daniel's Pre-advent Judgment in its Biblical Context." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 2, no. 2 (1991): 35-66.
- Gundry, Robert Horton. *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 18. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1967.
- Hagner, Donald A. "Imminence and Parousia in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 77-92 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 1-13*. Word Biblical Commentary 33A. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 14-28*. Word Biblical Commentary 33B. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Matthew's Eschatology." Pages 49-71 in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*. Edited by Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. *Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 83. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Der Erzähler des Evangeliums*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985.
- Hannah, Darrell D. "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 94 (2003): 68-96.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1993.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Harkness, Georgia Elma. *Understanding the Kingdom of God*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1974.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *What Is Christianity?* Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1957.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra pagina 1. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Hart, John F. "A Chronology of Matthew 24:1-44." Th.D. diss., Grace Theological Seminary, 1986.
- Hartman, Lars. *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.* Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication." Pages 131-52 in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu*. Edited by M. Didier. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 29. Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot, 1972.
- Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. di Lella. *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible 23. New York: Doubleday, 1977.
- Harvey, Anthony Ernest. *A Companion to the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Book of Daniel Confirmed by the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 1, no. 2 (1990): 37-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks." Pages 3-63 in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Daniel & Revelation Committee Series 3. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Hassan, Ihab H. "The Problem of Influence in Literary History: Notes Towards a Definition." Pages 34-84 in *Influx: Essays on Literary Influence*. Edited by Ronald Primeau. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat, 1977.
- Hatina, Thomas R. *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 232. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: The Gospel of Mark*. Library of New Testament Studies 304. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

- Hauser, Alan J., and Duane F. Watson, eds. *The Ancient Period. A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Hay, Lewis S. "Son of Man in Mark 2:10 and 2:28." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970): 69-75.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*. San Francisco: Harper, 1996.
- Hays, Richard B., and Joel B. Green. "The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers." Pages 222-38 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Heger, Paul. "Qumran Exegesis: 'Rewritten Torah' or Interpretation?" *Revue de Qumran*, no. 85 (2005): 61-88.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Gospel of Mark as Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary*. New York: Paulist, 1992.
- Helberg, Jacob Lewis. "The Determination of History according to the Book of Daniel: Against the Background of Deterministic Apocalyptic." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 107 (1995): 273-87.
- Helyer, Larry R. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Henaut, Barry W. *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: The Problem of Mark 4*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 82. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Hendriksen, William. *New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002.
- Hengel, Martin, and Hermut Löhr, eds. *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 73. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994.

- Hengel, Martin, and Anna Maria Schwemer, eds. *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 55. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- Hengstenberg, E. W. *Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel and the Integrity of Zechariah*. Translated by B. P. Pratten. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1847.
- Henze, Matthias, ed. *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hermerén, Göran. *Influence in Art and Literature*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Herzog, William R. *Jesus, Justice and the Reign of God: A Ministry of Liberation*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2000.
- Higgins, Angus John B. "Is the Son of Man Problem Insoluble?" Pages 70-87 in *Neotestamentica et semitica: Studies in Honor of Matthew Black*. Edited by Peter F. Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Son of Man*. London: Lutterworth, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Hill, Andrew E. "Daniel." Pages 19-212 in vol. 8 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Tremper Longman and David E. Garland. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Hill, David. "'Son of Man' in Psalm 80 v. 17." *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973): 261-9.
- Hinnebusch, Paul. *St. Matthew's Earthquake: Judgment and Discipleship in the Gospel of Matthew*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant Books, 1980.
- Hoffman, Yair. "The Technique of Quotation and Citation as an Interpretive Device." Pages 71-79 in *Creative Biblical Exegesis: Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics Through the Centuries*. Edited by Benjamin Uffenheimer and Henning Graf Reventlow. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 59. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Hoffmann, Paul. "Der Menschensohn in Lukas 12.8." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 357-79.
- Hofius, Otfried. "Der Septuaginta-Text von Daniel 7,13-14: Erwägungen zu seiner Gestalt und seiner Aussage." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 117 (2005): 73-90.

- Holford, Charles Richard. "An English Translation of the Septuagint Daniel." M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1961.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Holmgren, Fredrick C. *The Old Testament and the Significance of Jesus: Embracing Change—Maintaining Christian Identity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Hooker, Morna Dorothy. *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentaries 2. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" Pages 155-68 in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by Ernest Best and Robert McLachlan Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)." Pages 79-101 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term 'Son of Man' and Its Use in St Mark's Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1967.
- Horsley, Richard A. "The Kingdom of God and the Renewal of Israel: Synoptic Gospels, Jesus Movements, and Apocalypticism." Pages 303-44 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Hubaut, Michel. *La parabole des vigneronns homicides*. Cahiers de la Revue biblique 16. Paris: Gabalda, 1976.
- Hubbard, Benjamin Jerome. *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 19. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.
- Hübner, Hans. "New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament." Pages 332-72 in vol. 1 of *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magne Sæbø. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "New Testament, OT Quotations in the." Pages 1096-104 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

- Hühn, Eugen. *Die Alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1900.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 59. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2006.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Mark*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 2. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989.
- Iersel, Bastiaan Martinus Franciscus van. *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 164. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Instone Brewer, David. *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 30. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.
- Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. New York: Scribner, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Prayers of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Rediscovering the Parables*. New York: Scribner, 1966.
- Jervell, Jacob. "Die Mitte der Schrift: Zum lukanischen Verständnis des Alten Testaments." Pages 79-96 in *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments—Einheit und Vielfalt neutestamentlicher Theologie: Festschrift für Eduard Schweizer zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by Ulrich Luz and Hans Weder. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Johnson, B. W., and Don De Welt. *The Gospel of Mark*. Joplin, Mo.: College Press, 1984.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra pagina 3. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Johnson, Sherman E. *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark*. New York: Harper, 1960.
- Jones, Geraint Vaughan. *The Art and Truth of the Parables: A Study in Their Literary Form and Modern Interpretation*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Just, Arthur A. *Luke 1:1-9:50*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1996.

- Kähler, Christoph. *Jesu Gleichnisse als Poesie und Therapie: Versuch eines integrativen Zugangs zum kommunikativen Aspekt von Gleichnissen Jesu*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
- Kähler, Martin. *Jesus und das Alte Testament: Bearbeitet und mit einer Einleitung versehen von Ernst Kähler*. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965.
- Kaiser, Walter C. *The Promise-plan of God: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Toward an Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago: Moody, 1985.
- Kampling, Rainer. *Das Blut Christi und die Juden: Mt 27,25 bei den lateinischsprachigen christlichen Autoren bis zu Leo dem Grossen*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 16. Münster, Germany: Aschendorff, 1984.
- Karris, Robert J. "Luke 23:47 and the Lukan View of Jesus' Death." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 65-74.
- Kazmierski, Carl R. *Jesus, the Son of God*. Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1979.
- Kee, Howard Clark. "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16." Pages 165-88 in *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Erich Gräßer. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew*. InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series 1. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997.
- Kelber, Werner H., ed. *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Kim, Ki Kon. "The Signs of the Parousia: A Diachronic and Comparative Study of the Apocalyptic Vocabulary of Matthew 24:27-31." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1994.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction-Criticism*. St. Louis, Mo.: Clayton, 1977.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Title 'Kyrios' in Matthew's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 246-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Title 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 193-202.
- Kingsbury, L. W. "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Rejoinder to David Hill." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 25 (1985): 61-81.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. *The Parables: Understanding the Stories Jesus Told*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.
- Kittel, Bonnie. *The Hymns of Qumran*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 50. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 13. Münster, Germany: Aschendorff, 1978.
- Klingbeil, Gerald A. "The Finger of God in the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112 (2000): 409-15.
- Kloppenborg, John S. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus." *Harvard Theological Review* 89 (1996): 307-44.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1927.
- Knight, George R. *Matthew: The Gospel of the Kingdom*. Abundant Life Bible Amplifier. Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1994.
- Knight, Jonathan. *Luke's Gospel*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Knowles, Michael. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthaean Redaction*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 68. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1986.
- Koch, Klaus. "Der 'Menschensohn' in Daniel." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 119 (2007): 369-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel." Pages 421-46 in vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.

- Koet, B. J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti auxilia 14. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Kogler, Franz. *Das Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und vom Sauerteig in seiner traditionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung*. Forschung zur Bibel 59. Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1988.
- Kowalski, Beate. *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes*. Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge 52. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004.
- Kraft, Robert A. "Daniel Outside the Traditional Jewish Canon: In the Footsteps of M. R. James." Pages 121-33 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 101. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2006.
- Kratz, Reinhard. *Auferweckung als Befreiung: Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus (besonders Mt 27,62-28,15)*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 65. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973.
- Kreplin, Matthias. *Das Selbstverständnis Jesu: Hermeneutische und christologische Reflexion—Historisch-kritische Analyse*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 141. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sēmeiōtikē: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969.
- Kümmel, Werner G. *Verheissung und Erfüllung: Untersuchungen zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zürich, Switzerland: Zwingli-Verlag, 1953.
- Kugel, James L., and Rowan A. Greer. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Kuthirakkattel, Scaria. *The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry according to Mark's Gospel (1,14-3,6): A Redaction Critical Study*. Analecta biblica 123. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990.
- Kuyper, Lester Jacob. *The Scripture Unbroken: A Perceptive Study of the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Kvalbein, Hans. *Fortolkning til Matteusevangeliet*. Oslo, Norway: Luther Forlag, 1998.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. "Enoch und der Menschensohn: Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7." *Studia theologica* 38 (1984): 101-33.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." Pages 179-215 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Throne Visions and Monsters: The Encounter between Danielic and Enochic Traditions." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 117 (2005): 249-72.
- Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. Translated by David Pellauer. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism*. New York: Harper, 1964.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Evangile selon saint Luc*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Evangile selon saint Marc*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Evangile selon saint Matthieu*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1927.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "'Are You the One Who Is to Come, Or Shall We Look for Another?' The Gospel Message of Jesus Today." *Louvain Studies* 8 (1980): 115-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Q-influence on Mark 8:34-9:1." Pages 277-304 in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*. Edited by Joël Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1982.
- Lane, William L. *The Gospel according to Mark*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lange, Joachim. *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Mattäus*. Würzburg, Germany: Echter, 1973.
- Lannert, Berthold. *Die Wiederentdeckung der neutestamentlichen Eschatologie durch Johannes Weiß*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen: Francke, 1989.
- Lapham, Fred. *An Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha*. London: T & T Clark, 2003.
- Larkin, William J. "The Old Testament Background of Luke XXII. 43-44." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978-79): 250-54.

LaRondelle, Hans K. "Christ's Use of Daniel." Pages 395-416 in *Creation, Life, and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan*. Edited by Jiří Moskala. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Old Testament Department, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. *How to Understand the End-Time Prophecies of the Bible: The Biblical-Contextual Approach*. Sarasota, Fla.: First Impressions, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Israel of God in Prophecy: Principles of Prophetic Interpretation*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1983.

Laurentin, René. *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II*. Paris: Gabalda, 1964.

Leishman, Thomas Linton. *The Interrelation of the Old and New Testaments*. New York: Vantage Press, 1968.

Leivestad, Ragnar. "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971-72): 243-67.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles*. Translated by David E. Aune. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987.

Lemcio, Eugene E. "'Son of Man', 'Pitiable Man', 'Rejected Man': Equivalent Expressions in the Old Greek of Daniel." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 43-60.

Lenski, Richard Charles Henry. *The Interpretation of St. Mark's Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961.

Levine, Amy-Jill. *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 14. New York: Mellen, 1988.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Liefeld, Walter L. "Luke." Pages 797-1059 in vol. 8 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

Lieu, Judith. *The Gospel of Luke*. Peterborough, UK: Epworth, 1997.

Lightner, Robert Paul. *The Saviour and the Scriptures: A Case for Scriptural Inerrancy*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978.

Lim, Timothy H. "11QMelch, Luke 4 and the Dying Messiah." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 90-92.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Holy Scriptures in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pesharim*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Re-enter the Apocalyptic Son of Man." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975-76): 52-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Response to Richard Bauckham: The Idiomatic Use of Bar Enasha." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 23 (1985): 35-41.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Die Endzeitrede in Didache 16 und die Jesus-Apokalypse in Matthäus 24-25." Pages 155-74 in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical—Essays in Honor of Tjitze Baarda*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 89. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 282. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Ljungman, Henrik. *Das Gesetz erfüllen: Matth. 5, 17 ff. und 3,15 untersucht*. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 1-5-6. Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1954.
- Loader, William R. G. "Apocalyptic Model of Sonship: Its Origin and Development in New Testament Tradition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 525-54.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Vater-Unser*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1946.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Apokalyptik und Christologie." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 62 (1971): 48-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie*. Theologische Wissenschaft 5. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1974.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Can We Reproduce the Exegesis of the New Testament?" *Tyndale Bulletin* 21 (1970).
- Longman, Tremper. *Daniel*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999.

- Lövestam, Evald. *Jesus and 'This Generation': A New Testament Study*. Coniectanea neotestamentica. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995.
- Lucas, Ernest C. *Daniel*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Lucas, Roger. "The Time of the Reign of Christ in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28 in Light of Early Christian Session Theology." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1997.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Jesus after Two Thousand Years: What He Really Said and Did*. Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus, 2001.
- Lührmann, Dieter. "Markus 14.55-64: Christologie und Zerstörung des Tempels im Markusevangelium." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980-81): 457-74.
- Luigi, Schiavo. "The Temptation of Jesus: The Eschatological Battle and the New Ethic of the First Followers of Jesus in Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25 (2002): 141-64.
- Lunny, William J. *The Jesus Option*. New York: Paulist Press, 1994.
- Luomanen, Petri. *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven: A Study on the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 101. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Lust, Johan. "Daniel 7:13 and the Septuagint." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 54 (1978): 62-9.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. 3 vols. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Fiktivität und Traditionstreue im Matthäusevangelium im Lichte griechischer Literatur." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 84 (1993): 153-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Intertexts in the Gospel of Matthew." *Harvard Theological Review* 97 (2004): 119-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 1-7*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 8-20*. Translated by Wilhelm C. Linß. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 21-28*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 48 (1992): 3-21.
- Lybæk, Lena. *New and Old in Matthew 11-13: Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 198. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- MacArthur, John. *Matthew 1-7*. MacArthur New Testament Commentary. Chicago: Moody, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 8-15*. MacArthur New Testament Commentary. Chicago: Moody, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 24-28*. MacArthur New Testament Commentary. Chicago: Moody, 1989.
- Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Mackay, Cameron. "Ezekiel in the New Testament." *Church Quarterly Review* 162 (1961): 4-16.
- Maddox, Robert. "The Function of the Son of Man according to the Synoptic Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968-69): 45-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982.
- Mæland, Jens Olav. *Riket er nær: Nytestamentlig bibelteologi*. Oslo, Norway: Lunde, 1976.
- Malina, Bruce J. "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. XXVIII. 16-20." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1970-71): 87-103.
- Maloney, Elliot C. *Jesus' Urgent Message for Today: The Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel*. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Mann, Christopher Stephen. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday, 1986.
- Manning, Gary T. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 270. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Manson, T. W. "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 34 (1951-52): 312-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1949.

- Marcus, Joel. "Entering into the Kingly Power of God." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 663-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gates of Hades and the Keys of the Kingdom (Matt 16:18-19)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 443-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 27A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mark 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 27B. New York: Doubleday, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark 9,11-13: 'As It Has Been Written'." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 80 (1989): 42-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 90. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Marsh, Clive, and Steve Moyise. *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction*. London: Cassell, 1999.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1965-66): 327-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in the Light of Linguistic Study." Pages 72-94 in *To Tell the Mystery: Essays on New Testament Eschatology in Honor of Robert H. Gundry*. Edited by Thomas E. Schmidt and Moisés Silva. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Martens, Elmer A. *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn. *God Cares*. 2 vols. Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1981-85.
- Mazich, Edward. "'The Lord Will Come with His Holy Myriads': An Investigation of the Linguistic Source of the Citation of 1 Enoch 1,9 in Jude 14b-15." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 94 (2003): 276-81.
- McArthur, Harvey K. "Mark XIV. 62." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957-58): 156-8.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Parable of the Mustard Seed." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971): 198-210.
- McCasland, S. Vernon. "Matthew Twists the Scriptures." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 143-48.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. "The Seventy 'Weeks' of Daniel against the Background of Ancient Near Eastern Literature." *Westminster Theological Journal* 47 (1985): 18-45.
- McConnell, Richard S. *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew*. Basel, Switzerland: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969.
- McHugh, John. *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975.
- McKnight, Scot. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A New Vision for Israel: The Teachings of Jesus in National Context*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- McLay, Tim. *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- McLean, Bradley H. *Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture in Early Christian and Jewish Writings through 180 C.E.* Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.
- McNeile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Macmillan, 1928.
- Mead, Richard T. "A Dissenting Opinion about Respect for Context in Old Testament Quotations." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963-64): 279-89.
- Meadors, Edward P. "The 'Messianic' Implications of the Q Material." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 253-77.
- Mearns, Christopher L. "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 360-69.
- Meier, John P. *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt. 5:17-48*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 4 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2009.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Two Disputed Questions in Matthew 28:16-20." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 407-24.
- Meier, Paul L. *Eusebius: The Church History: A New Translation with Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1999.
- Ménard, Jacques E., ed. *Exégèse biblique et judaïsme*. Strasbourg, France: Faculté de théologie catholique, Palais universitaire, 1973.
- Mendenhall, George E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Pittsburgh: Biblical Colloquium, 1955.
- Méndez-Moratalla, Fernando. *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 252. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 173. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 15. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Psalms in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 61-82 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Menzies, Allan. *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel according to Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1901.
- Mercer, Mark Kent. "An Historical, Exegetical and Theological Study of Daniel 11:2b-12:4." Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1987.
- Merklein, Helmut. "Die Auferweckung Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie (Messias bzw. Sohn Gottes und Menschensohn)." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 72 (1981): 1-26.
- Merrill, Eugene H. "Daniel as a Contribution to Kingdom Theology." Pages 211-25 in *Essays in Honor of J. Dwight Pentecost*. Edited by Stanley D. Toussaint and Charles H. Dyer. Chicago: Moody, 1986.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meyer, Ben F. "Appointed Deed, Appointed Doer: Jesus and the Scriptures." Pages 155-76 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.



- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by Peter Christie. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Zürich, Switzerland: Zwingli Verlag, 1948.
- Micklem, Philip A. *St Matthew: With Introduction and Notes*. London: Methuen, 1950.
- Miguens, Manuel. *The Virgin Birth: An Evaluation of Scriptural Evidence*. Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1975.
- Milik, Josef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- Miller, Dale, and Patricia Miller. *The Gospel of Mark as Midrash on Earlier Jewish and New Testament Literature*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 21. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.
- Miller, Stephen R. *Daniel*. New American Commentary 18. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- M'Neile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel according to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Macmillan, 1928.
- Mohn, Werner. "Gethsemane (Mk 14 32-42)." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 64 (1973): 194-208.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- . "The Reinterpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980-81): 656-72.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1927.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- Moor, Johannes C. de, ed. *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1998.
- Morgen, Michèle. "Lc 17,20-37 et Lc 21,8-11.20-24: Arrière-fond scripturaire." Pages 307-26 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Morris, Leon. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 13. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 3. Leicester, England: InterVarsity, 1988.
- Moses, A. D. A. *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Moulder, W. J. "The Old Testament Background and the Interpretation of Mark X. 45." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977-78): 120-27.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'The Son of Man': Some of the Facts." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 277-9.
- Mounce, Robert H. *Matthew*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 1. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality." Pages 14-41 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*. The Continuum Biblical Studies Series. London: Continuum, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Moyise, Steve, and Maarten J. J. Menken, eds. *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. Library of New Testament Studies 358. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *Isaiah in the New Testament*. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament*. Library of New Testament Studies 377. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel. London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_, eds. *The Psalms in the New Testament*. The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

- Müller, Mogens. "Er løsningen på 'menneskesøn'-problemet fundet? I anledning af Maurice Caseys nye 'menneskesøn'-bog." *Dansk teologisk tidsskrift* 71 (2008): 42-9.
- . *The Expression 'Son of Man' and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation*. London: Equinox, 2008.
- . "The Reception of the Old Testament in Matthew and Luke-Acts: From Interpretation to Proof from Scripture." *Novum Testamentum* 43 (2001): 315-30.
- Müller, Ulrich B. "Parusie und Menschensohn." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 92 (2001): 1-19.
- Münch, Christian. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu im Mätthäusevangelium*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 104. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Muir, Kenneth. *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Mulder, Martin Jan, and Harry Sysling, eds. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Munnich, Olivier. "Texte massorétique et septante dans le livre de Daniel." Pages 93-120 In *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*. Edited by Adrian Schenker. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Munoa III, Philip B. *Four Powers in Heaven: The Interpretation of Daniel 7 in the Testament of Abraham*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 28. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . "Jesus, the *Merkavah*, and Martyrdom in Early Christian Traditions." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 303-25.
- Murphy, Frederick J. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "What Really Happened at the Transfiguration?" *Bible Review* 3, no. 3 (1987): 8-21.
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. New York: Orbis Books, 1988.
- Myers, Jacob M. *I and II Esdras: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 42. New York: Doubleday, 1974.

- Myers, Thomas. *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel by John Calvin*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Neirynck, F. "The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark." Pages 123-75 in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits neotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*. Edited by Jean-Marie Sevrin. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 86. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, Kurt Aland, and Barbara Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 2006.
- Neugebauer, Fritz. "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii. 35-7 parr.) unter der Menschensohn." *New Testament Studies* 21 (1974-75): 81-90.
- Neuhäusler, Engelbert. *Anspruch und Antwort Gottes: Zur Lehre von den Weisungen innerhalb der synoptischen Jesusverkündigung*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1962.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Invitation to Midrash: The Workings of Rabbinic Bible Interpretation*. San Francisco: Harper, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Judaism and the Interpretation of Scripture: Introduction to Rabbinic Midrash*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Midrash Reader*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What Is Midrash?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Writing with Scripture: The Authority and Uses of the Hebrew Bible in the Torah of Formative Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Newman, Barclay M., and Philip C. Stine. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Matthew*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Society, 1988.
- Newman, Carey C., ed. *Jesus & the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1999.
- Newman, Robert C. "Daniel's Seventy Weeks and the Old Testament Sabbath-Year Cycle." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 16 (1973): 229-34.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Gabriel." Page 863 in vol. 2 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Nichol, Francis D., ed. *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: The Holy Bible with Exegetical and Expository Comment*. 7 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1978.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables." Pages 23-47 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Harvard Theological Studies 56. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in 1 Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel according to Luke." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978-79): 324-44.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Son of Man." Pages 137-50 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Tobit, Genesis, and the Odyssey: A Complex Web of Intertextuality." Pages 41-55 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by Dennis R. MacDonald. Studies in Antiquity & Christianity. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001.

Nickelsburg, George W. E., and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

Nineham, Dennis Eric. *The Gospel of St. Mark*. Westminster Pelican Commentaries. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin, 1963.

Niskanen, Paul. *The Human and the Divine in History: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.

Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 1:1-9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35A. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35B. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 18:35-24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary 35C. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1993.

Öhler, Markus. *Alttestamentliche Gestalten im Neuen Testament: Beiträge zur Biblischen Theologie*. Darmstad, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999.

- Olsen, Viggo Nørskov, ed. *The Advent Hope in Scripture and History*. Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1987.
- O'Neill, J. C. "The Silence of Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968-69): 153-67.
- Osburn, Carroll D. "Methodology in Identifying Patristic Citations in NT Textual Criticism." *Novum Testamentum* 47 (2005): 313-43.
- Otto, Rudolf. *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch*. München, Germany: Beck, 1934.
- Ouro, Roberto. "The Apotelesmatic Principle: Origin and Application." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 9 (1998): 326-42.
- Owen, Paul, and David Shepherd. "Speaking up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was *Bar Enasha* a Common Term for 'Man' in the Time of Jesus?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 81 (2001): 81-122.
- Owusu-Antwi, Brempong. *The Chronology of Daniel 9:24-27*. Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series 2. Berrien Springs, Mich.: ATS Publications, 1995.
- Pamment, Margaret. "The Son of Man in the First Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983): 116-29.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Theology and the Kingdom of God*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Pao, David W., and Eckhard J. Schnabel. "Luke." Pages 251-414 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *Luke*. Moody Gospel Commentary. Chicago: Moody, 1995.
- Paulien, Jon. *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Literary Allusions and Interpretation of Revelation 8:7-12*. Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 11. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Deep Things of God: An Insider's Guide to the Book of Revelation*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review & Herald, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 5-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What the Bible Says about the End-Time*. Hagerstown, Md.: Review & Herald, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Hermeneutics of Biblical Apocalyptic." Pages 245-70 in *Understanding Scripture: An Adventist Approach*. Edited by George W. Reid. Silver Spring, Md.: Biblical Research Institute, 2006.

- Peerbolte, L. J. Lietaert. *The Antecedents of Antichrist: A Traditio-Historical Study of the Earliest Christian Views on Eschatological Opponents*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 49. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1996.
- Pender, William Clark. "The Christological Interpretation of OT Stone and Rock Texts in the NT." Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1984.
- Penney, John Michael. *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 126. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2007.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. *Thy Kingdom Come*. Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1990.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Hearing the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Paulist, 1981.
- Perri, Carmela. "On Alluding." *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289-307.
- . "Allusion Studies: An International Annotated Bibliography, 1921-1977." *Style* 13 (1979): 178-225.
- Perrin, Norman. "Eschatology and Hermeneutics: Reflections on Method in the Interpretation of the New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 3-14.
- . "Mark XIV. 62: Then End Product of a Christian Peshar Tradition?" *New Testament Studies* 13 (1965-66): 150-55.
- . *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. New York: Harper, 1967.
- Petzoldt, Martin. *Gleichnisse Jesu und christliche Dogmatik*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983.
- Pfandl, Gerhard. *The Time of the End in the Book of Daniel*. Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series 1. Berrien Springs, Mich.: ATS Publications, 1992.
- Philonenko, Marc. "La troisième demande du 'Notre Père' et l'hymne de Nabuchodonosor." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 72 (1992): 23-31.
- Picirilli, Robert E. "Allusions to 2 Peter in the Apostolic Fathers." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 33 (1988): 57-83.
- Piper, Ronald A. *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Pitre, Brant James. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 204. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Plummer, Alfred A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. International Critical Commentary. London: T & T Clark, 1896.
- Polaski, Donald C. *Authorizing an End: The Isaiah Apocalypse and Intertextuality*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Popkes, Wiard. "James and Scripture: An Exercise in Intertextuality." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 213-29.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Porter, Stanley E., ed. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." Pages 79-96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- . *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Porton, Gary G. *Understanding Rabbinic Midrash: Texts & Commentary*. Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav, 1985.
- Powery, Emerson B. *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*. Biblical Interpretation Series 63. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- Prabhu, George M. Soares. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew*. Analecta biblica 63. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Pyeon, Yohan. *You Have Not Spoken What Is Right About Me: Intertextuality and the Book of Job*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.
- Ravens, David A. S. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . "The Setting of Luke's Account of the Anointing: Luke 7. 2-8. 3." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 282-92.
- Ray, Paul J. "Exegesis of Matthew 24:21-35: 'This Generation' and the Structure of Matthew 23-25." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 8 (1997): 206-17.
- Redditt, Paul L. *Daniel*. New Century Bible Commentary. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.



- Reiling, J., and J. L. Swellengrebel. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*. UBS Handbook Series. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1971.
- Reiser, Marius. *Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in Its Jewish Context*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. *Des Evangelium nach Lukas*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 3. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Gütersloh, Germany: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969.
- Reumann, John Henry Paul. *Jesus in the Church's Gospels: Modern Scholarship and the Earliest Sources*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Richardson, Alan. *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1958.
- Riches, John Kenneth. *Conflicting Mythologies: Identity Formation in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- . "Matthew's Missionary Strategy in Colonial Perspective." Pages 128-142 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Roman Imperial Context*. Edited by John Kenneth Riches and David C. Sim. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 276. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Riedl, Johannes. *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu: Die Heilsbotschaft von Mt 1-2 und Lk 1-2*. Biblisches Forum 3. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.
- Rienecker, Fritz. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Wuppertaler Studienbibel. Wuppertal, Germany: Brockhaus, 1984.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. "A Basic Code in the New Testament." Pages 911-6 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Riley, Gregory J. "Influence of Thomas Christianity on Luke 12:14 and 5:39." *Harvard Theological Review* 88 (1995): 229-35.
- Riley, Harold. *The Making of Mark: An Exploration*. Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 1989.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 227-35.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Vally Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 11-44 in *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*. Edited by Duane Frederick Watson. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Intertexture of Lukan Apocalyptic Discourse." Pages 45-68 in *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*. Edited by Duane Frederick Watson. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Robinson, Benjamin Willard. *The Sayings of Jesus: Their Background and Interpretation*. New York: Harper, 1930.
- Robinson, John Arthur Thomas. "The 'Parable' of the Sheep and the Goats." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955-56): 225-37.
- Robinson, Theodore H. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.
- Rogers, Ernest Eugene. "The Concept Kingdom in the New Testament: By Ernest E. Brown." M.A. thesis, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1952.
- Roloff, Jürgen. "Das Reich des Menschensohnes: Ein Beitrag zur Eschatologie des Matthäus." Pages 275-92 in *Eschatologie und Schöpfung: Festschrift für Erich Gräßer zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Edited by Martin Evang, Helmut Merklein, and Michael Wolter. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 89. Berlin: Gruyter, 1997.
- Roose, Hanna. "Sharing in Christ's Rule: Tracing a Debate in Earliest Christianity." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27 (2004): 123-48.
- Rothfuchs, Wilhelm. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 88. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969.
- Rowe, Robert D. *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background in Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 50. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.
- Rowland, Christopher. "The Book of Daniel and the Radical Critique of Empire: An Essay in Apocalyptic Hermeneutics." Pages 447-67 in vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Eschatology of the New Testament Church." Pages 56-72 in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Edited by Jerry L. Walls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10.6ff. and Jewish Angelology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 24 (1985): 99-110.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Rudman, Dominic. "Authority and Right of Disposal in Luke 4.6." *New Testament Studies* 50 (2004): 77-86.
- Rusam, Dietrich. *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 112. Berlin: Gruyter, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sah Jesus wirklich den Satan vom Himmel fallen (Lk 10.18)? Auf der Suche nach einem neuen Differenzkriterium." *New Testament Studies* 50 (2004): 87-105.
- Russell, David Syme. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Russell, James Stuart. *The Parousia: A Critical Inquiry into the New Testament Doctrine of Our Lord's Second Coming*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1887.
- Sabin, Marie. "Reading Mark 4 as Midrash." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 45 (1992): 3-26.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. Translated by William J. Short. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series* 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Saint, Hilary. *Sur Matthieu: Hilaire de Poitiers*. Translated by Jean Doignon. *Sources Chrétiennes* 254. Paris: Cerf, 1978.
- Sand, Alexander. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1986.
- Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. "The Jesus-Tradition and Idolatry." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 412-20.
- Sanders, Joseph Newbould. *The Foundations of the Christian Faith: A Study of the Teaching of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Criticism*. London: A & C Black, 1950.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1-13.
- Sandy, D. Brent. *Plowshares & Pruning Hooks: Rethinking the Language of Biblical Prophecy and Apocalyptic*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- Sappington, Thomas J. "The Factor of Function in Defining Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, no. 12 (1994).

- Satterthwaite, Philip E., Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, eds. *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Saucy, Mark. *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus: In 20th Century Theology*. Waco, Tex.: Word Publishing, 1997.
- Schaberg, Jane. "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 208-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 61. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives*. San Francisco: Harper, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark 14.62: Early Christian Merkabah Imagery?" Pages 69-94 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*. Edited by Joel Marcus and J. Louis Martyn. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Schelkle, Karl Hermann. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 4 vols. Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968-76.
- Schildgen, Brenda Deen. *Crisis and Continuity: Time in the Gospel of Mark*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 159. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1982.
- Schmid, Josef. *El Evangelio según San Lucas*. Biblioteca Herder: Sección de Sagrada Escritura 94. Barcelona: Herder, 1981.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *God's Rule and Kingdom*. New York: Herder, 1963.
- Schniewind, Julius Daniel. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 1. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 2. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Schönle, Volker. *Johannes, Jesus und die Juden: Die theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt. 11*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 17. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1982.

- Schröter, Jens. "The Son of Man as the Representative of God's Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q." Pages 34-68 in *Jesus, Mark, and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 214. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Gottes Reich, Jesu Geschick: Jesu ureigener Tod im Licht seiner Basileia-Verkündigung*. Freiburg im Breisgau, Germany: Herder, 1983.
- Schultz, Richard L. *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 180. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis: Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity*. London: A & C Black, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by W. Montgomery. Repr., Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 2. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man Again." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1962-63): 256-61.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus: Symbol-maker for the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "'Behold, He Comes with Clouds!'" *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958-59): 127-32.
- Secombe, David Peter. *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt (Serie B) 6. Linz, Austria: Albert Fuchs, 1982.
- Seeley, David. "Rulership and Service in Mark 10:41-45." *Novum Testamentum* 35 (1993): 234-50.
- Sellew, Phillip. "Composition of Didactic Scenes in Mark's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 613-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Oral and Written Sources in Mark 4. 1-34." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 234-67.
- Selman, Martin J. "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament." *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 161-83.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Messianic Mysteries." Pages 281-302 in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Senior, Donald. "Death of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Holy Ones (Matt 27:51-53)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 312-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case." Pages 89-115 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1998.
- Seow, Choon Leong. *Daniel*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Shea, William H. *Daniel: A Reader's Guide*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Poetic Relations of the Time Periods in Dan 9:25." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 18 (1980): 59-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27." Pages 75-118 in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*. Edited by Frank B. Holbrook. Daniel & Revelation Committee Series 3. Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.
- Shepherd, Michael B. "Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man." *Westminster Theological Journal* 68 (2006): 99-111.
- Shires, Henry M. *Finding the Old Testament in the New*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Matthew 22.13a and 1 Enoch 10.4a: A Case of Literary Dependence?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 47 (1992): 3-19.
- Sjöberg, Erik. *Der Menschensohn im Äthiopischen Henochbuch*. Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1946.
- Slater, Thomas B. "'King of Kings and Lord of Lords' Revisited." *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 159-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995): 183-98.

- Smith, Bertram Thomas Dean. *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937.
- Smith, Charles R. "The Book of Life." *Grace Theological Journal* 6 (1985): 219-30.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 27. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New." Pages 209-29 in *Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues*. Edited by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 2001.
- Snow, Robert. "Daniel's Son of Man in Mark: A Redefinition of the Earthly Temple and the Formation of a New Temple Community." *Tyndale Bulletin* 60 (2009): 305-8.
- Spangenberg, Izak J. J. "The Septuagint Translation of Daniel 9: Does It Reflect a Messianic Interpretation?" Pages 431-42 in *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 195. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2006.
- Sperber, Alexander. *New Testament and Septuagint*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1940.
- Spong, John Shelby. *Born of a Woman: A Bishop Rethinks the Birth of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper, 1992.
- Sproul, Robert Charles. *The Last Days according to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Staehelin, Ernst. *Die Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes in der Kirche Jesu Christi: Zeugnisse aus allen Jahrhunderten und allen Konfessionen*. Basel, Switzerland: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1951.
- Stagg, Frank. *New Testament Theology*. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1962.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE." *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990): 48-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44-58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stefanovic, Zdravko. *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise*. Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2007.
- Stein, Robert H. *Luke*. New American Commentary 24. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman, 1992.
- Steinmann, Andrews E. *Daniel*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 2008.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Stone III, C. F. "Allusion to Isa 11.10 LXX in Mark 10.42b." *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002): 71-83.
- Stone, Michael Edward. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Straton, Hillyer Hawthorne. *A Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "'One Like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days' in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 86 (1995): 268-76.
- Suhl, Alfred. *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh, Germany: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1965.
- Suter, David W. "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables." Pages 415-43 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Swaeles, R. "L'Arrière-fond Scripturaire de Matt. 21:43 et Son Lien avec Matt. 21:44." *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959-60): 310-13.
- Swartley, Willard M. *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Tasker, Randolph Vincent Greenwood. *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1947.



- Tatford, Frederick A. *Daniel and His Prophecy: Studies in the Prophecy of Daniel*. Repr., Minneapolis: Klock, 1980.
- Taylor, Nicholas H. "Interpretation of Scripture as an Indicator of Socio-Historical Context: The case of the Eschatological Discourses in Mark and Q." Pages 459-67 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1966.
- . "The Origin of the Markan Passion-Sayings." *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954-55): 159-67.
- Theisohn, Johannes. *Des auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditions-geschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohnsgestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 12. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Theissen, Gerd, ed. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "The Parousia in Modern Theology: Some Questions and Comments." *Tyndale Bulletin* 27 (1976): 27-53.
- Thomas, Kenneth J. "Torah Citations in the Synoptics." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977-78): 85-96.
- Thompson, George Harry Packwood. "Son of Man—Some Further Considerations." *Journal of Theological Studies* 12 (1961): 203-9.
- Thurston, Bonnie Bowman. *Preaching Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Tintner, Adeline R. *Edith Wharton in Context: Essays on Intertextuality*. Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Towner, W. Sibley. *Daniel*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1984.
- Toy, Crawford Howell. *Quotations in the New Testament*. New York: Scribner, 1884.
- Treiyer, Alberto R. "The Priest-King Role of the Messiah." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 7, no. 1 (1996): 64-80.

- Trench, Richard Chenevix. *Notes on the Parables of Our Lord*. Repr., Lafayette, Ind.: Sovereign Grace, 2002.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Luke*. New Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Present Son of Man." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 14 (1982): 3-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Q and the History of Early Christianity*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Scripture and Q." Pages 3-26 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovanensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovanensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Turner, David. *Matthew*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran." Pages 51-66 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDan<sup>a</sup>." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 268 (1987): 17-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDan<sup>b</sup> and 4QDan<sup>c</sup>." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 274 (1989): 3-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Leicester, England: Brill, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ortography and Text in 4QDan<sup>a</sup> and 4QDan<sup>b</sup> and in the Received Masoretic Text." Pages 29-42 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 573-85 in vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2002.
- Urassa, Wenceslaus Mkeni. *Psalm 8 and Its Christological Re-Interpretation in the New Testament Context*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998.

- Vaart Smit, H. W. van der. *Born in Bethlehem: Christmas as It Really Was*. Translated by Thomas R. Milligan. Baltimore, Md.: Helicon, 1963.
- van Buren, Paul M. *According to the Scriptures: The Origins of the Gospel and of the Church's Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- van Henten, Jan Willem. "Daniel 3 and 6 in Early Christian Literature." Pages 149-69 in vol. 1 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- VanderKam, James C. "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees." Pages 96-125 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- . "The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition." Pages 81-99 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J. T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch*." *Maarav* 3 (1982): 85-97.
- VanderKam, James C., and William Adler, eds. *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum III:4. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Verheyden, Joseph. "Describing the Parousia: The Cosmic Phenomena in Mk 13,24-25." Pages 525-50 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 131. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Vermes, Geza. *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1975.
- . *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd ed. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1973.
- . *Scrolls, Scriptures and Early Christianity*. Library of Second Temple Studies 56. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- . "'The Son of Man' Debate." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 1 (1978): 19-32.
- Vetne, Christine M. "Methodological Issues in Chiastic Research: A Study of Psalms 7 and 25." M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2005.
- Vetne, Reimar. "A Definition and Short History of Historicism as a Method for Interpreting Daniel and Revelation." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 14, no. 2 (2003): 1-14.

- Viviano, Benedict T. "Eschatology and the Quest for the Historical Jesus." Pages 73-90 in *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. Edited by Jerry L. Walls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Kingdom of God in History*. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Least in the Kingdom: Matthew 11:11, Its Parallel in Luke 7:28 (Q), and Daniel 4:14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000): 41-54.
- Vögtle, Anton. *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Beiträge zur Evangelienforschung*. Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.
- Wade, Loron. "'Son of Man' Comes to the Judgment in Daniel 7:13." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 11 (2000): 277-81.
- Waetjen, Herman C. *A Reordering of Power: A Sociopolitical Reading of Mark's Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Wagner, J. Ross. "Psalm 118 in Luke-Acts: Tracing a Narrative Thread." Pages 154-78 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Wailes, Stephen L. *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables*. Publications of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies 23. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Walck, Leslie W. "The Son of Man in Matthew and the *Similitudes of Enoch*." Ph.D. diss., Notre Dame University, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." Pages 299-337 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Walker, William O. "John 1.43-51 and 'The Son of Man' in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 56 (1994): 31-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as Applied to Jesus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (1972): 482-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 584-607.
- Wallace, Ronald S. *The Lord Is King: The Message of Daniel*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1979.

- Waltke, Bruce K. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007.
- Watson, Duane F., ed. *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark." Pages 111-249 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- Weder, Hans. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 120. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Weih, Alexander. *Jesus und das Schicksal der Propheten: Das Winzergleichnis (Mk 12,1-12) im Horizont des Markusevangeliums*. Biblisch-theologische Studien 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 2003.
- Weingreen, Jacob. *From Bible to Mishna: The Continuity of Tradition*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1976.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*. Translated by Richard Hyde Hiers and David Larrimore. Lives of Jesus Series. Repr., Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Weiss, Wolfgang. *"Eine neue Lehre in Vollmacht": Die Streit- und Schulgespräche des Markus-Evangeliums*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 52. Berlin: Gruyter, 1989.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Das Evangelium Marci: Übersetzt und Erklärt*. 2d ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1909.
- Wenham, David. "The Kingdom of God and Daniel." *Expository Times* 98 (1987): 132-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Note on Matthew 24:10-12." *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980): 155-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Parables of Jesus*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*. Gospel Perspectives 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Wenham, John. *Christ and the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Werblowsky, Raphael Jehudah Zwi, and Geoffrey Wigoder, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Wessel, Walter Weston. "Mark." Pages 603-793 in vol. 8 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- West, Nathaniel. *Daniel's Great Prophecy: The Eastern Question, The Kingdom*. New York: Hope of Israel Movement, 1898.
- Westermann, Claus. *The Old Testament and Jesus Christ*. Translated by Omar Kaste. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament*. Translated by Friedemann W. Golka and Alastair H. B. Logan. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Wheeler, Michael. *The Art of Allusion in Victorian Fiction*. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Whitcomb, John C. *Darius the Mede: A Study in Historical Identification*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- White, Ellen G. *Christ's Object Lessons*. Washington, D.C.: Review & Herald, 1900.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Desire of Ages*. Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1898.
- Wilkins, Michael J. *Matthew*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.
- Wiley, Patricia Tull. *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 161. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Willis, Wendell Lee, ed. *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Wilson, Robert Dick. *Studies in the Book of Daniel*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1938.
- Wink, Walter. *The Human Being: Jesus and the Enigma of the Son of the Man*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- Witherington, Ben. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus, Paul, and the End of the World: A Comparative Study in New Testament Eschatology*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2006.

- Wolff, Peter. *Die frühe nachösterliche Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 171. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Wooden, R. Glenn. "The Recontextualization of Old Greek Daniel 1." Pages 47-68 in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Library of Second Temple Studies 50. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Woods, Edward J. *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 201. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Wouters, Armin. "... wer den Willen meines Vaters tut": Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis vom Handeln im Matthäusevangelium. Biblische Untersuchungen 23. Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 1992.
- Wright, Charles H. H. *Daniel and His Prophecies*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1906.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2006.
- Wright, Nicholas Thomas. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Lord's Prayer as a Paradigm of Christian Prayer." Pages 132-54 in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke for Everyone*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 3. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What Saint Paul Really Said*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Wright, Terence R. "Re-Reading the Rabbis, Rewriting Scripture: Three Theoretical Approaches to Midrash and Literature." *Religion and the Arts* 4 (2000): 388-400.
- Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Young, Brad H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching*. New York: Paulist, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Parables: Jewish Tradition and Christian Interpretation*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1998.

- Young, Edward J. *The Prophecy of Daniel: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Yozon, Lourdino A. "The Kingdom of God in Daniel." *The South East Asia Journal of Theology* 19 (1978): 23-27.
- Zager, Werner. *Gottesherrschaft und Endgericht in der Verkündigung Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur markanischen Jesusüberlieferung einschließlich der Q-Parallelen*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 82. Berlin: Gruyter, 1996.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Repr., Wuppertal, Germany: Brockhaus, 1984.
- Zeller, Dieter. "New Testament Christology in Its Hellenistic Reception." *New Testament Studies* 46 (2001): 312-33.
- Zwiep, Arie W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 87. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 1997.