

Annual Moore College Lectures 1977

F. F. Bruce: *The Time Is Fulfilled*

Lecture 1: *The time is fulfilled*

1977-09-06

(00:00) Thank you Mr Principal for your very kind words of greeting and welcome. (00:04) It's a particular pleasure to me to be delivering this first lecture with you as the chairman, for I well recall the first occasion on which we met, over 36 years ago think, at a conference in Austria [?], which was a very momentous conference because that was the conference which launched the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research and which took the first steps towards the acquiring [of the] Library [?] and Centre for Research, which we know in the form of Tyndale House in Cambridge. (00:42) It's also a pleasure to meet Dr Obaryan [?] again, and to recall the happy the time that we spent with him during his years of study in Manchester and also to meet many other friends [and] members of the faculty of this college and others. (01:00)

The general subject of these lectures will be the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New.

(01:08) The provisional title for the whole lecture course is I think promised beforehand by the prophets; (01:14) I have no doubt that my enterprising publisher will think up a much snappier title for publicity purposes, so you needn't be surprised whatever the title of the forthcoming book may be, (01:28) but the titles of the individual lectures will I think remain as they are, and the title of tonight's lecture is *The Time is Fulfilled*. (01:38)

According to Mark's record, Jesus began his Galilean ministry after John the Baptist was delivered up, and the burden of his preaching was "the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God hath drawn near; repent and believe ... the news". (02:00) These words express, among other things, a conviction that an ardently desired confirmation, long since foretold (02:10) [?] ... [?] (02:22) of his ministry of word and action, temptation and passion, which it introduces. (02:29) In a different context, the announcement might have quite a different meaning. (02:34) Judas the Galilean, a generation earlier, and the Zealots who planned the revolt against Rome, a generation later, might well have announced their programs in very similar terms. (02:49) Judas the Galilean, according to Josephus in AD 6 proclaimed a new philosophy, something that no previous religious teacher in Israel had proclaimed. (03:02) According to him, it was impermissible for the people of God, living in His land, to pay to a pagan overlord tribute exacted on themselves or on the land. (03:16) At an earlier day, when a Syrian or Babylonian conqueror imposed tribute on Israel or Judah, the prophets taught that their imposition of such tribute must be accepted as a divine judgement on the people for unfaithfulness. (03:35) And when, after the return from exile, the Persian kings and their successors exacted tribute, the tribute seems to have been regarded as a price well worth paying for the peace and religious freedom which the imperial power ... [?]. (03:56)

Why did Judas the Galilean not take the same line as the prophets had taken? (04:02)

Because, according to Josephus, Judas and his adherents had an unshakable passion for liberty, having come to the conviction that God is the only governor and lord. (04:16) This may be interpreted to mean that, in Judas's view, a new order had been introduced which was

marked in a special and unprecedented manner by the kingship of God. (04:32) The questions should be carefully considered, if Judas had reached the conclusion that the time had come, as foretold in the book of Daniel for example, for the God of Heaven to set up a kingdom which would never be destroyed but which would endure forever. (04:51) The setting up of this kingdom meant the supersession of Gentile world dominion; (04:58) therefore, whatever validity such dominion might have had in earlier days, that validity had now come to an end. (05:09) For the holy people of the most high, who, under God, were to exercise authority in this new and eternal kingdom, to continue to acknowledge pagan rulers or pay them tributes was a contradiction in terms, (05:27) if it was not indeed high treason against Israel's true and only king. (05:34) So Judas's new philosophy may be understood. (05:40)

The situation becomes clearer, sixty years later, when the thinking behind the revolt of AD 66 is said, by both Jewish and Roman writers, to have been stimulated [?] by an oracle in the Jews' sacred writings which foretold that, at that very time, world dominion would fall to a man or men from Judea. (06:08) With quite impressive unanimity, Josephus, the Jewish historian, Tacitus and Suetonius, Roman historians, tell of this oracle; (06:21) they take it quite seriously: they indicate that it stimulated the leaders of the revolt to initiate the rebellion, (06:33) but they agreed further, that really they were misled, because the oracle pointed not to a Jew or Jews but, said they, to Vespasian, commander in chief of the Roman forces charged with the suppression of the Judean revolt. (06:51) Vespasian with his sons, Titus and Domitian, acceded to the imperial power. (06:58) Now it might not be surprising to find a Roman historian, like Tacitus and Suetonius, putting this interpretation upon the oracle; (07:07) the astounding thing is that the Jewish historian Josephus quite seriously came to the conclusion that Vespasian was the person to whom the oracle referred: (07:21) when the oracle spoke about world dominion coming to a man in Judea it was to the commander in chief of the Roman forces in Judea. (07:29)

Now we may be sure that, whatever the oracle meant, it did not point to Vespasian and the other Flavian emperors. (07:38) But, first of all, what **was** this oracle? (07:42) We may think of Jacob's blessing of his son Judah, in Genesis 49, (07:50) "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah nor the ruler's staff from between his feet until he comes to whom it belongs, and to him shall be the obedience of the people". (08:02) Perhaps **that** was the oracle referred to. (08:06) The sceptre of this prophecy was identified in some quarters, in the Qumran community for example, with the sceptre in that oracle of Balaam which foretells how a star shall come forth out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel. (08:26) These words we know were associated in Jewish thought with the overthrow of Gentile overlords throughout the whole New Testament period, (08:38) and in earlier decades and later decades too we have the witness borne to this interpretation of the blessing of Jacob in the Qumran literature, in the Qumran rule of war, some time before the beginning of the Christian era, (08:57) and we have the further witness in the second Jewish revolt against Rome, the Bar Kokhba revolt as it is called, in AD 132; (09:09) in fact Bar Kokhba, literally son of the star, was the name given to the leader of the second Jewish revolt, because he was identified by some leading rabbis with the star out of Jacob foretold by Balaam in Numbers 24 verse 17. (09:29) The oracle of Balaam is perhaps not so appropriate to the situation with which we are concerned, the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, (09:41) as is Jacob's blessing of Judah, since Balaam's

oracle makes no explicit reference to Judea. (09:49) But Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius emphasised that the dominion of which the oracle spoke was to be manifested at that very time. (10:04) Now there is no time indication in Jacob's blessing of Judah in Genesis 49; (10:12) there is no time indication in Balaam's oracle in Numbers 24. (10:17) Indeed oracles which appear to specify the exact time of the fulfilment with any precision are not common in the Old Testament, (10:26) but Josephus knows one example. (10:29) Daniel, he says, in common with other prophets, foretold future events but, unlike other prophets, he also foretold the fixed time at which those events would take place. (10:44) In Daniel, it might be said, were conjoined the two forms of divine communication which, according to the exegetical principles of the Qumran community, were usually separate. (10:58) According to the Qumran commentators, God gave the ancient prophets knowledge of what He was going to do, but He withheld from them knowledge of the time at which He was going to do it. (11:12) It was the impartation of this last knowledge to the teacher of righteousness, the first organiser of the Qumran community, that put into his hand, and therefore into the hands of his followers, the key to unlock the meaning of the Old Testament prophecy. (11:30)

Josephus appeals to Daniel's vision as evidence that God has a concern for human affairs and reveals to his servants not only what must come to pass but when it must come to pass. (11:45) And, in saying that, Daniel may well have had in mind prophetic gifts which he claimed for himself. (11:52) The gifts which enabled him, as he believed, to discern in Vespasian the predicted ruler of earlier oracles and the coming prince of Daniel's oracle of the seventy weeks, the seventy sevens of years. (12:07) Perhaps Josephus honestly, but mistakenly, thought that the anointed prince of Daniel 9 verse 25, actually a Jewish leader, (12:19) and the coming prince of the following verse, verse 26, actually a destroyer of the holy city and sanctuary (12:27) – Josephus probably thought that these two were one and the same personage, whom he identified with Vespasian. (12:37) But what is even more important is that, quite clearly, both Daniel and other Jewish leaders reckoned, about the middle of the first century AD, (12:49) that Daniel's seventy weeks were on the point of being fulfilled. (12:53) Josephus deplores the misguided interpretation, as he thinks it, put upon the oracle by those Jews who found in it their chief inducement to go to war, because they took it to portend the triumph of their own race. (13:12)

An investigation of the interpretation, of reinterpretations, of Daniel's oracle of the seventy weeks, just before and during the first century AD, (13:25) would be a rewarding research project. (13:28) The traditional Jewish chronology, set out in the tractate Seder Olam, (13:34) that is the chronology according to which the years from the creation of the world are **still** reckoned in the official Jewish calendar (13:43) – that chronology is one surviving example of the interpretation which makes the seventy weeks, the seventy sevens of years, (13:53) expire with the Roman destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem. (13:59) But such a research project, interesting as it would be in itself, would make only a marginal contribution to the understanding of the New Testament. (14:10)

The influence of the book of Daniel on the New Testament is deep and pervasive, (14:17) but the seventy weeks have made little impression on it. (14:21) But what I'm trying to emphasise here is that Jesus' proclamation of the imminent advent of the Kingdom was made in this kind

of context, (14:36) in a situation in which the minds of people were filled with this sort of expectation. (14:42) When Jesus proclaimed “the time is fulfilled”, it is improbable, to put it mildly, that he meant that the full tale [?] of the seventy weeks had now come to an end. (14:56) Some of his hearers may have understood him in this sense, although there is no evidence that they did so. (15:03) There are, nevertheless, unmistakable echoes of the book of Daniel in the form and content of Our Lord's proclamation, (15:13) and, in the eschatological sensitivity of the situation in which he made that proclamation, many of his hearers must have been aware of these echoes. (15:26) For example, the very terms of the announcement “the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God hath drawn near” may well have reminded some of his hearers of the words of Daniel 7 verse 22 “the time came for the saints to receive the Kingdom”. (15:45) But, whether or not it reminded them of that precise text, the general implication of the announcement was plain. (15:54) The time had come when the God of Heaven was to inaugurate the indestructible Kingdom, which would supersede all other forms of world dominion. (16:05) The difference between his announcement and an announcement such as Judas the Galilean and his spiritual heirs might have made in similar terms lay in the difference between Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God and theirs. (16:23) And this difference ... [?] ultimately the difference between his conception of **God** and theirs. (16:31)

When the imprisoned John the Baptist sent his messengers to ask Jesus if he was the coming One after all or if they had to look for someone else, (16:44) he was perhaps disturbed by the discrepancy between the purifying judgement by wind and fire, which he had said the coming One would execute, and the ministry in which Jesus was actually engaged. (17:00) When Jesus told John's messengers to go back and tell their teacher what they had seen him do and heard him say (17:10)—the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good news preached to them—(17:22) he knew that John would recognise the fulfilment of those prophetic words of Isaiah 25 and similar scriptures which foretell how, on the day of God's saving action, (17:37) the eyes of the blind shall be opened and ears of the deaf unstopped, then [sic] shall the lame man leap like a hart and the tongue of the dumb sing for joy.(17:49)

Above all, the proclamation of the good news to the poor or afflicted was a sign that the year of the Lord's favour had come. (18:01) According to the announcement of the spirit-anointed speaker at the beginning of Isaiah 61, (18:08) which, as we are told in Luke chapter 4, Jesus chose as his text and applied to his ministry in his programmatic sermon in the synagogue of Nazareth.[sic] (18:21) No wonder then, that John the Baptist was encouraged with the blessing invoked by Jesus on the one who re[fuse]d [?] to think that Jesus had let him down. (18:34) Jesus was indeed the coming One; John had not been mistaken. (18:39)

The enemy which Jesus confronted and challenged in his ministry was not the Roman occupation but the spiritual power of darkness, the dominion of Satan. (18:56) “If I, by the finger of God, cast out demons,” he said “then the Kingdom of God has come upon you.” (19:05) The proclamation of the advent of the divine Kingdom stirred up specially hostile activity in the realm of evil which felt its dominion threatened. (19:17) The superior power of the Kingdom of God was seen in the release of those whose minds and bodies were held in spiritual bondage. (19:28) Jesus not only proclaimed but effected liberty to the captives and

release to the enchained. (19:37) In doing so, he knew himself to be the agent of the Father, who desired the well-being, not the suffering, of his children. (19:48)

When Jesus spoke of God as Father, or spoke **to** Him as Father, he used the designation *Abba*. (20:01) The designation *Abba*—rather than the liturgical form, *Avinu*, our Father, by which God was addressed in certain synagogue prayers, or even the more personal, *Avi*, my Father—but [sic] *Abba* was the term which he used, the domestic word by which a father was known in the affectionate intimacy of the family circle. (20:28) And in speaking of God thus, Jesus appears to have been unique. (20:36) Now this has been questioned, but research so far as it has gone, research carried out in particular by the German scholar Joachim Jeremias, does seem to have established, in the light of our available knowledge, the uniqueness of the term *Abba* as applied to God by Jesus. (20:58) By means of this term, Jesus expressed his own sense of loving nearness to God, and his own implicit trust in God, (21:07) and he taught his disciples to use it too, and to look to God with the same trustful expectancy as children show when they look to their fathers to provide them with food and clothes. (21:22) Such an attitude to God is of the essence of the Kingdom of God. (21:29) It finds expression for example in the Lord's Prayer, where the disciples were taught to pray, almost in the same breath, (21:38) for the accomplishment of God's purpose in the world, and for their own daily bread, the forgiveness for their sins, and deliverance in the hour of trial. (21:48) May I say to prospective examinees that, if ever you find yourself confronted by the question “give a summary of Jesus' preaching about the Kingdom of God”, just call the Lord's Prayer to your mind and you'll find all the headings there. (22:07)

(22:11) So distinctive a locution of Jesus, and, following him, of his disciples, was this term *Abba*, that later the word passed unchanged into the vocabulary of Gentile Christians. (22:24) Paul, for example, assumes that *Abba* is as familiar to the Roman Christians, whom he did not know personally, as it was to the Galatian Christians who were his own converts and who presumably learned to use it from Paul himself. (22:44) If you remember, he emphasises that, when Christians call God *Abba*, that is a sign that they have received the spirit of God's Son, the same spirit as indwelt Jesus (22:59) – that is a sign that they have received the spirit of adoption, the spirit of sonship, the spirit that enables them to realise their new relationship as sons of God. (23:09) In the teaching of Jesus, those who render allegiance to the Kingdom of God, preeminently his disciples, are true children of this heavenly father, and manifested by reproducing his character. (23:27) As he is all embracing in his goodness, so must they be: “Be merciful, even as your father is merciful.” (23:37)

There was nothing essentially new in this; repeatedly in the Pentateuchal law it is made plain that the reason the people of God are taught to follow a certain way of life is that they may be holy as the LORD their God is holy, (23:55) and there is one place, where kind treatment of animals is enjoined, where the Targum, the Aramaic paraphrase of the Hebrew Pentateuch says something like this: “As your father is merciful in heaven, so must you be merciful on earth.” (24:14) But things that were incidental, either in the written law or in the traditional oral interpretation of that law, occupy a place of central emphasis in the preaching of Jesus. (24:31) The same lesson is driven home in a variety of parables illustrating the different aspects of the kindness and forgiving love of God. (24:39) Those in whose lives such qualities

are manifested are pronounced happy. (24:44) They are the people who really are to be congratulated, not the self-assertive pushers [?]. (24:50) Jesus' injunction to his disciples not to meet oppression with violent resistance but to repay evil with good were a far cry from the policy of Judas the Galilean and his followers. (25:04) The latter used their oppressors' [oppressor's?] weapons and attacked brute force with brute force. (25:11) The way of Jesus was actually a much more revolutionary way, and, in the end, it was to the way of Jesus, not to the way of Judas the Galilean, not to the way of the Zealots, that the Roman Empire capitulated. (25:25) By such teaching, together with the active ministry that accompanied it, Jesus showed the character of the Kingdom which he proclaimed. (25:36) But, while his works of mercy and power signify the presence of that Kingdom, he made it plain that the hope of the ages was not yet consummated. (25:48) During this ministry, the Kingdom of God was in course of inauguration. (25:55) It was realised up to a point, but only up to a point. (26:01) One day, within the lifetime of some of his hearers, the Kingdom of God would come with power. (26:09) The powers of the Kingdom of God were already at work in the ministry of Jesus, yet his disciples were encouraged to pray that the Kingdom might come. (26:20) But the consummated Kingdom would bear the same character as the Kingdom which was even now breaking in. (26:28) Some of his disciples imagined, that when it was finally established, they would be compensated by positions of authority for the privations and dangers which they were currently enduring for its sake. (26:43) On the contrary, said Jesus, the way to honour in the Kingdom of God was the way of service: the honour was not the compensation for the service; the service **was** the honour. (26:56) And he himself sets them an example, coming as he did not to receive service but to give it, and to crown that service by giving his life as a ransom for many. (27:12) In Origen's great words, Jesus was the *autobasileia*, the kingdom in person, for never was the way of the Kingdom more fully seen than in the him who said to his father "not my will but thine be done" and accepted the cross in that spirit. (27:32)

Jesus appears to have envisaged his sacrifice and death as the means by which the limitations at present impeding the progress of the Kingdom would be removed. (27:46) "I have a baptism to undergo," he said "and how hampered I am until the ordeal is passed." (27:53) But his death would unleash the powers of the Kingdom of God and lead to the bestowal of blessing and liberation on a far wider scale than had thus far been possible. (28:06)

In whatever way Jesus envisaged the coming of the Kingdom with power, of which he spoke on the eve of his transfiguration, the early Christians appear to have associated it with his resurrection. (28:23) Paul speaks of him as having been appointed Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead, at the beginning of Romans chapter 1. (28:33) To Paul's way of thinking, Jesus had never been anything other than the Son of God; (28:38) but, whereas, during his ministry, and especially in his death, he was the Son of God in weakness, in resurrection he was alive by the power of God. (28:50)

(28:54) Jesus knew himself to be the Son of God, and that in no merely official or formal sense. He was intensely aware of a constant and peculiarly intimate filial relationship with God. (29:09) But he did not usually speak of himself in public as the Son of God. (29:16) His preferred self-designation was the Son of Man. (29:21) When he stood before the Sanhedrin, and the High Priest asked him point blank if he was the Messiah, the son of the blessed one,

(29:31) he replied in terms which probably meant “if this is the language which you insist on using, then my answer must be yes, (29:40) but if I were to choose my own language this is what I should say: ‘you shall see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Almighty, and coming with the clouds of heaven’”. (29:53)

(29:57) This is the last recorded occasion on which Jesus used the designation *the Son of Man*, and the context with which he supplied it indicates its source. (30:08) “You shall see the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven.” (30:13) In the vision in which Daniel foresaw the time when the saints of the most high would receive the Kingdom, the saints were associated, if not identified, with “one like a son of man”, (30:27) that is to say a man-like figure who came with the clouds of heaven into the presence of the eternal God, the ancient of days, (30:37) to receive from him the world dominion which had hitherto been wielded by pagan empires portrayed as wild beasts. (30:47) To the one like a son of man in the vision correspond the saints of the most high in the angelic interpretation which Daniel received. (30:59) Jesus appears to have identified his followers with the saints of the most high, as when he said to them “fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom”. (31:12) And, when he spoke of himself as the Son of Man, he appears to have meant **that** son of man or **that** one **like** a son of man (31:25) who, in the vision of Daniel chapter 7, receives the Kingdom. (31:30) And he promised them, that they would share that Kingdom with him, if they were prepared to drink his cup and be baptised with his baptism, that is share his suffering. (31:43)

But why should the son of man attain the Kingdom through suffering, or, to put the question in Jesus' own words, (31:52) how is it written concerning the son of man that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt? (31:59) It is true that, while suffering is not explicitly predicated of the one like a son of man in Daniel's vision, the saints of the most high whom he represents are assailed and, for a time, overcome (32:14) ...is true that, while suffering is not explicitly predicated of the one like a son of man in Daniel's vision, the saints of the most high whom he represents are assailed and, for a time, overcome (32:27) by the persecuting monarch who is depicted as the little horn. (32:33) Yet, in the gospels, there is such repeated insistence, from Caesarea Philippi onwards, (32:40) on the death by [death-time?] suffering of the Son of Man as something that is written, (32:47) that something more than an inference, however valid, from the oppression of the saints of the most high, in Daniel 7, is required to explain it. (32:57)

That Jesus regarded the necessity of the Son of Man's suffering as something written concerning him is plain. (33:06) “The Son of Man”, he said at the last supper, “goes as it is written of him”, and, in Gethsemane, he submitted to his captors with the words “let the scriptures be fulfilled”. (33:20) And, while this evidence is derived predominantly from the gospel of Mark, it is not confined to Mark's record. (33:29) There is a patently non-Markan passage in Luke, Luke 17, where Jesus speaks of the coming day of the Son of Man's manifestation and adds “but first he must suffer many things and be rejected by this generation”. (33:46) If it be suspected, as it sometimes is, that this is a Markan insertion into a non-Markan context, then let some material evidence for such a suggestion be produced. (34:01) I have met with none. (34:03) Nor should we overlook the independent Johannine

tradition in its distinctive idiom emphasising that the Son of Man must be lifted up, (34:15) an expression in which John the Evangelist combines at once the suffering and the glory of the Son of Man. (34:27)

While Jesus no doubt had Daniel's vision originally in mind when he spoke of the Son of Man, the designation was sufficiently flexible for him to give it what meaning he chose. (34:40) There is no evidence that between Daniel's time and his own anyone used the expression *the son of man* to denote a figure of the future. (34:51) There is of course the son of man in the *Similitudes of Enoch*, but the *Similitudes of Enoch* are probably later than the other Enoch documents with which they have been translated, and may, well for all we know to the contrary, be later than Our Lord's time. (35:12) Had Jesus spoken of the Messiah, for example, he would have conjured up in his hearer's minds a variety of possibly conflicting pictures, none of which would have corresponded to his intention. (35:26) But when he spoke of the Son of Man, his hearer's response was rather "who is this son of man?" (35:35) And the answer to that question could be found only in what he said about the Son of Man. (35:41) Once curious phenomenon of some contemporary gospel criticism is an unwillingness to allow that Jesus spoke of the son of man, and, especially, an unwillingness to allow that he spoke of himself as the Son of Man. (35:56) This phenomenon is the more curious because it is found even in some scholars who insist on applying the most stringent criteria of authenticity to saying "ascribe to Jesus in the gospels" [?], (36:11) and first among these stringent criteria is what is called the criterion of dissimilarity. (36:18) According the criterion of dissimilarity, we can be reasonably sure of the authenticity of anything ascribed to Jesus if it is unparalleled both in Jewish records and in the usage of the early church. (36:34) The application to this criterion lies wide open to certain logical objections but we can leave these on one side for the present. (36:45) Here on the lips of Jesus we have this repeated locution, *the son of man*, unparalleled in Judaism, while its use on the lips of Stephen at the end of Acts 7 is the exception that proves the rule so far as the early church is concerned. (37:04) It is so far as the New Testament record goes a distinctive locution on the lips of Jesus, and, if we are to invoke the criterion of dissimilarity, as we are frequently urged to do, then the authenticity of the *son of man* saying seems to be established. (37:24)

When Jesus is recorded as speaking of the Son of Man's coming in glory, it is easy to link that with Daniel's vision, (37:33) but his emphasis on the Son of Man's death by [death-time?] suffering is best understood (37:40) if, in his mind, he fused the figure of the one like a son of man with the Isaianic servant of the LORD (37:48) who does expressly suffer many things and is despised and rejected by men. (37:55) It is not so fashionable nowadays to hold this view as it was thirty or forty years ago, but I remain persuaded that my Manchester predecessor, T. W. Manson, (38:08) was right not only in holding this view but also in insisting on a corporate dimension to Jesus' understanding of the Son of Man. (38:19) Jesus encouraged his disciples to follow the way of the Son of Man, (38:24) to take up their cross and come after him, to drink his cup and share his baptism. (38:30) In the event, indeed, he took up the cross for himself, drained the bitter cup, and endured the baptism alone. (38:39) But when in resurrection he regathered his scattered flock, it was to lay the same charge upon them once more, with greater assurance of their fulfilling it this time. (38:50) Simon Peter, who had first heard the call

“follow me” by the Galilean lake, heard it there again, (38:58) and this time there was no turning back, no thoughtless overconfidence, and no humiliating denial. (39:06)

There are in fact some indications that Daniel's “one like a son of man” with his associates was identified from the first, that is to say by Daniel himself, with the Isaianic servant. (39:20) Among the associates of the man-like figure in Daniel 7, that is to say among the saints of the most high, a place of distinction is given to those who are wise among the people, the *maskilim*. (39:36) It is they who bear the brunt of the persecution and by doing so procure deliverance for others as well as winning eternal glory for themselves. (39:46) When the new age dawns, it is those people—the *maskilim*, those who lead many to righteousness—who shine forever like the stars of heaven. (39:57) Now, the Hebrew verb, of which *maskilim* is the plural participle, appears in another form, but in the same conjugation, at the beginning of the fourth Servant Song of the book of Isaiah, Isaiah 52 verse 13, where God declares that his servant will deal wisely—the Hebrew verb there is *yaskil*, from the same root as *maskilim*—(40:23) and this is said of him – this is said of the servant at the beginning of the fourth Servant Song (40:29) – he is described towards the end of the song as making the many to be accounted righteous. (40:35) Two important points of context with the saints of the most high, particularly the *maskilim* in the book of Daniel. (40:45)

Then, in addition to the repeated statement that the Son of Man must suffer, (40:52) Mark reports one saying of Jesus which has been thought by many to have especially close links with fourth Servant Song of the book of Isaiah. (41:00) That is the saying, already referred to, which concludes the incident initiated by James' and John's request for preferential treatment in the coming Kingdom. (41:11) “Even the Son of Man” said Jesus “did not come to be served, but to be a servant, and to give his life [as] a ransom for many.” (41:20) The link with the fourth Servant Song, with Isaiah 53, has perhaps been exaggerated by some, who have tried to find in the saying of Jesus something approaching a straight translation of certain expressions forthcoming [?] in the Song. (41:36) On the other hand, the link has been minimised, if not altogether denied, by some exceptionally able scholars. (41:46) Professor C. K. Barrett, for example, in a paper contributed to the memorial volume for T. W. Manson, found the antecedents of the [?] giving one's life as a ransom for many in the markers [?] of the Maccabeans' puzzle [circle?], (42:00) who prayed that their suffering might be accepted by God as an atonement for their fellow countrymen. (42:06) It might be added that the members of the Qumran community similarly believed that their devotion and privation would make an effective expiation for the Land of Israel, polluted as it was by ungodly leaders. (42:21) But there is no evidence that Jesus knew the second and fourth books of Maccabees, recent Hellenistic productions as they were, while there is ample evidence that he knew the Hebrew book of Isaiah. (42:34) The atoning efficacy ascribed to the martyrdoms in the books of Maccabees might itself owe something to the portrayal of the Isaianic servant, as the Qumran doctrine of expiation certainly does. (42:49) In any case, since Jesus insisted that the sufferings of the son of man were written concerning him, it is highly probable that he also found the ransom for many in the prophetic scriptures, (43:03) and where more certainly than in the picture [?] of the servant who makes his life a yoke offering and thus bears the sin of many. (43:12)

It is pointed out that in Luke's counterpart to the passage where the words I have quoted appear in Mark, Mark (10:45), the words about the ransom for many (43:27) – that, in Luke's counterpart, Jesus' words about the nature of true greatness and sovereignty addressed to the disciples in the upper room where he was among them as one who serves (43:41) – that in Luke's version there is no mention of ransom. (43:46) But Luke is not following Mark here and deliberately omitting the ransom clause; (43:52) he is following a source of his own, and conforming to the general outlook and style of his whole work. (43:59) What the other evangelists thought may be seen from, say, Matthew's addition of the phrase “for the forgiveness of sins” to the words of institution spoken over the cup at the Last Supper, or from John's report of the Baptist's proclamation of the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world, and, similarly, John's report of Jesus' own promise that he would give his flesh—that is to say himself, his life—for the life of the world. (44:34) The redemptive understanding of the death of Christ is not peculiar to Mark among the evangelists, (44:41) and, when, elsewhere in the New Testament, we find the same essential understanding in such widely disparate documents as the letters of Paul and the book of the Revelation, (44:52) the most adequate conclusion is that it goes back to Jesus himself. (44:57) The teaching is his, if the varying formulations are theirs. (45:04)

(45:08) When we speak of Jesus as coming when the time was fulfilled, we should not underestimate the degree to which he, by his ministry and sacrifice, **made** the time at which in fact he came the time of fulfilment. (45:24) Paul's words in Galatians 4, “when the time had fully come, God sent his Son”, have sometimes been illustrated by the argument that the world into which Jesus came was politically, culturally, and religiously, ready for his coming. (45:44) Now that is perfectly true, although, if the argument is pressed too far, it could involve a begging of the question. (45:53) It's perfectly true, but that's not what Paul means, (45:56) if we have regard to his context. (45:59) What Paul means is that, in the purpose of God, the time for his people to leave the leading strings of their infancy, their spiritual infancy, had now arrived. (46:11) And the arrival of that time was not only marked, but given actuality, by the coming of the one in whom they were to attain their spiritual majority. (46:23) Jesus does not passively [?] respond to the conditions which are ripe for his appearance; he takes the initiative, (46:33) and inaugurates, if he does not create, the fullness of time which he announces.