JETS 53/4 (December 2010) 673–96

EXILE AND RESTORATION FROM EXILE IN THE SCRIPTURAL QUOTATIONS AND ALLUSIONS OF JESUS

DOUGLAS S. MCCOMISKEY*

I. INTRODUCTION

The subject of exile and restoration from exile in the teaching of Jesus has received much attention in recent days. Fundamentally, the question is whether Jesus considered the Jews of his day still to be in the very exile imposed initially by the Babylonians and Assyrians. However, the biblical data is not straightforward since Jesus never explicitly states this. He does nonetheless frequently quote, allude to, and employ themes from relevant prophets. Either he, in midrashic fashion, is applying to his contemporaries passages and themes that were actually fulfilled years earlier, or he, in something of a pesher fashion, is directing them at people he considers to be their divinely intended, primary target audience (or a subset thereof). If the latter, the question remains: what proportion is midrashic and what proportion is pesher? Perhaps both occur. Another obstacle lies in our path. If Jesus and many of his fellow Jews believed that the nation was still in exile, he would not need to state this explicitly, presuming this was common ground. But the resulting rhetoric might generally be vague to those today who are unsure about, or unaware of, this assumption.[1] It would appear as though Jesus was merely likening their state to that of exile, or something even less than this. Scholarly opinion is swinging in favor of the position that Jesus and his fellow Jews held this common ground. Indeed, some scholars find exile and restoration from exile everywhere in the NT, yet probably due to overinterpretation.[2] However, perhaps a majority of scholars, including Brant Pitre, still

* Douglas McComiskey is professor of New Testament and chair of postgraduate studies, Ridley Melbourne, 170 The Avenue, Parkville, VIC 3052, Australia.

[1] J. M. Scott provides Second Temple Jewish evidence of both a stream that believed that Jews in Palestine were still in exile and a stream that believed the contrary ("Restoration of Israel," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* [ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993] 796–99).

[2] Some consider N. T. Wright an example, though he has contributed much that is now somewhat broadly accepted (*The New Testament and the People of God* [Christian Origins and the Question of God 1; London: SPCK, 1992]; and N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* [Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996]). See his critics in Carey C. Newman, ed., *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999). Rikki E. Watts sees restoration (the Isaianic new exodus) as the central theme and governing structural principle of the entire Gospel of Mark (*Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* [WUNT 88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997]) and David W. Pao does the

hold that the exile ended at the return of a few thousand Jews, as narrated in Ezra and Nehemiah.[3] Pitre qualifies this, suggesting that "the exile" should be considered two exiles, that of the ten northern tribes and that of the two southern ones, with only the northern tribes still "expelled" in the time of Jesus.[4] One difficulty for both positions (exile of both Judah and Israel concluded in the era of Ezra-Nehemiah, or only that of Judah) is that many of the passages on the gathering of the exiles, at the close of exile, have Israel and Judah gathered *contemporaneously*, and often in conjunction with messianic activity.[5] Consequently, the "return" in Ezra-Nehemiah is perhaps only the commencement of a lengthy process of restoration, or perhaps a failed return.[6] A further difficulty for Pitre is that the northern tribes *could* have returned under Cyrus, but they *would* not, except a small few. They were no longer "expelled." Yet, because very few returned, they were universally considered to be still in exile. In other words, exile may be viewed as concluded for a group when they actually return and not simply when they are able to return. This is certainly consistent with several key OT passages where restorative

---

same for Acts (*Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* [Biblical Studies Library; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000]). Watts, too, has been criticized for overinterpretation (see T. R. Hatina, "Exile," *Dictionary of New Testament Background* [ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000] 350), and Pao shares much the same weaknesses.

[3] Brant Pitre is a recent, vigorous proponent of this. Countering N. T. Wright, he states, "there is little support in the Second Temple literature for the contention that Jews living in the land of Israel considered *themselves* to be still in exile: i.e. that the Babylonian Exile had not ended" (*Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005] 35). He believes that the Babylonian exile indeed had ended, but not the Assyrian one. Unfortunately, apart from some attention to Daniel, he provides no thorough examination of the relevant OT texts, many of which appear to depict a prolonged gathering from exile that extends at least to the advent of the Messiah. Although wise in focusing on Second Temple Jewish texts dating between 200 BC and AD 30, he never actually demonstrates that few if any texts support the idea "that Jews living in the land of Israel considered themselves to be still in exile," and he does not discuss the targums from that period.

[4] Ibid. 31–40.

[5] See, e.g., Isa 11:10–16; 27:2–13; 43:1–7; 49:5–6; Jer 3:18; 23:1–8; 31:1–40; Ezek 37:15–28; Zech 8:1–13; Amos 9:9–15, in their broader contexts. Furthermore, the passages that limit the subjugation under Babylon to seventy years (Jer 25:11–12; 29:10; Zech 1:12; 7:5; Dan 9:2; 2 Chr 36:21) do not preclude the idea that the return of exiles depicted in Ezra-Nehemiah is at best the mere beginning of the gathering that preoccupies these prophets. Indeed, Jer 29:10–14 stipulates the necessary condition of turning to God before he would gather and restore; see J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 547–48; and F. B. Huey, Jr., *Jeremiah, Lamentations* (NAC 16; Nashville: Broadman, 1993) 253–54. Such turning occurred periodically and in small numbers from Cyrus to Jesus (e.g. the returnees in Ezra/Nehemiah), so the greater gathering was yet to occur. Actually, Jeremiah fixes the gathering and restoration in association with the inauguration of the "new covenant," 29:10–31:34, and Zechariah envisions the true end of the returnees' feeble efforts at restoration to be accomplished by the "Branch" (3:8; and 6:12 in their literary contexts), the Messiah. On the Branch being the Messiah, see Thomas Edward McComiskey, *Zechariah* (The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary 3; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998) 1077–78, 1113–14.

[6] See Charles L. Feinberg's analysis of Jer 29:10–14 (*Jeremiah* [EBC 6; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986] 254–55). This passage pictures the return under Ezra-Nehemiah as only part of a worldwide gathering of Jews that extends far beyond the initial return from Babylon.

return is contingent on willingly turning to God (e.g. Deut 30:1–10; Jer 3:14–18; 15:1–21; 29:10–14; cf. Isa 9:13; Ezek 20:39–44; Hos 3:1–5; 7:1; Zech 1:1–6). Interestingly, this potentially allows a category of people who physically return but are not being restored by God. These might not be valid returnees from exile. For that matter, it appears that the returnees in Ezra-Nehemiah perhaps considered themselves still exiles, calling themselves slaves in the Promised Land (Neh 9:36; cf. Ezra 9:9). An additional difficulty for Pitre's position is that it appears that the prophets could view the Assyrian exile as historically merging into the Babylonian exile and becoming one since the technical terms for exile (גלות; גלה) are only used in reference to the latter. Our goal here is to explore briefly Jesus' theology of exile and of restoration from exile as reflected in his quotations of and allusions to the OT. Our contention is that Jesus considered the Jews in Galilee and Judea who were not his followers still to be in the exile as defined in the OT simply because the true return had only begun at the commencement of his ministry.

II. ANALYSIS OF JESUS' OT QUOTATIONS AND ALLUSIONS THAT RELATE TO THE EXILE

Craig Evans delineates several ways in which exile theology forms part of the foundation for Jesus' teaching and actions.[7] However, his evidence is generally indirect and based somewhat on supposition. We shall build on this foundation by examining numerous other Gospel passages that appear to exhibit, perhaps more directly, the (restoration from) exile theme.[8]

1. *Mark 1:14–15 (Isaiah 9).* One very important passage occurs at the inception of Jesus' public ministry. Mark tells us that ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λέγων ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel'" (1:14–15; par. Matt 4:12, 17).[9] Although not a quotation, the allusion

[7] Hatina provides a useful summary of Evans's argument:

> Jesus' appointment of the Twelve, which may suggest the reconstitution of the twelve tribes of Israel; the request for a sign from heaven (Mk 8:11–13), which may reflect the signs promised by messianic pretenders; Jesus' appeal to Isaiah 56:7 during the demonstration in the temple (Mt 21:12–13 par.), which, when the oracle of Isaiah 56:1–8 is in view, indicates that Jesus chastises the religious leaders for neglecting to live up to the eschatological expectation; Jesus' allusion to Zechariah 2:6 (Heb v. 10) in Mark 13:27, which recalls the gathering of God's people; and Jesus' criticism of the Jewish leaders (Mt 11:21–23 par.), which appears to threaten judgment of exile. (Hatina, "Exile" 350)

[8] We will not attempt to determine the authenticity of every quotation by using the standard criteria, which would consume valuable space. For those readers who adhere to the general or strong reliability of the Gospels on these matters, this aspect of our methodology should pose no problems. For those who question the authenticity of some or many of Jesus' words in the Gospels, this section of the article is valuable as an investigation into the depiction of Jesus' exile theology by the Gospel texts.

[9] All English Bible quotations are from the NASB unless otherwise stated.

is certainly to Isaianic concepts, using Isaianic terminology.[10] We shall first note that some of the correspondences in an attempt to determine whether a specific period in Isaiah's salvation-historical framework is in view. Mark tells us that Jesus enters Galilee (1:14). Strikingly, Isaiah prophesies that the people of Galilee who are walking in darkness will see a great light (9:1–2; 8:23–9:1 LXX).[11] This is striking because Galilee is mentioned only six times in the OT (Josh 20:7; 21:32; 1 Kgs 9:11; 2 Kgs 15:29; 1 Chr 6:76; and Isa 9:1), and the references in the historical books have no prophetic referent. In fact, Matthew makes the connection to Isa 9:1–2 explicit (4:12–17). A further connection with Isaiah is evident in the Markan introduction to Jesus' pronouncement. Jesus is said to preach "the gospel of God." Watts observes that "In the Hebrew Scriptures and the LXX, the theological use of the verbal form (בשר, εὐαγγελίζω) occurs almost twice as often in Isaianic NE [new exodus] contexts as in the rest of the OT. Because the NT's use of the verb appears to be dependent on that of the OT, a number of scholars hold that the Isaianic Near Eastern horizon is also determinative for the meaning of the substantive as it is utilized in the NT."[12] In that the LXX and MT uses of the nominal forms בשורה, "(good) tidings," and εὐαγγέλον, "good news," do not carry the same theological force as the verbal forms, Watts argues for a Palestinian provenance for the NT theological use of the nouns. This is unnecessary since the NT authors would hardly have been restricted by (or aware of) this apparent OT distinction. Regarding Mark's assertion that the gospel is "of God," in Isa 61:1 the prophet declares that "the Spirit of the Lord God" (אדני יהוה, κυρίου) is upon him . . . to bring good news" (לבשר, εὐαγγελίσασθαι). Indeed, the evangelist may not have incorporated Isa 61:1 into his usage of Isaiah 9 as we have just suggested, but the possibility is interesting and lends some support to our case.[13]

When we return to the words of Jesus in Mark 1:15, the links to Isaiah focus back on Isaiah 9, having been introduced by the reference to Galilee in Mark 1:14. Jesus says, πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς, "The time is fulfilled." I contend that Jesus is speaking of the effective completion of the time described in Isa 9:1 (8:23 LXX), a period of disgrace for Zebulun and Naphtali indicated by כעת הראשון, "former time" (ἕως καιροῦ, "for a time"), in other words, exile.[14]

[10] Rikki E. Watts argues this persuasively, but concludes that the background is specifically the tradition underlying *Tg. Isa.*, basing his argument on key terms (and concepts) in the targum that have correspondence with terms in Mark 1:15 (*Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* 96–102). However, there are equally good correspondences with the MT of Isaiah (some of which are mentioned above), and these are clustered more and within fewer passages, probably making the appeal to *Tg. Isa.* less useful.

[11] The LXX renders the MT quite poorly in these verses, presuming the MT is the correct *Vorlage*.

[12] Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark* 96.

[13] R. T. France and Robert A. Guelich believe that Jesus is cast as the messianic herald of Isa 52:7 and 61:1 (*The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002] 90–91; and *Mark 1–8:26* [WBC 34a; Dallas: Word, 1989] 43, respectively).

[14] For the view that this is a reference to the northern deportation, see John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 239–40; and J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1993) 99–100. The restoration is described as האחרון, "later." *Tg. Isa.* makes exile explicit (גלי).

Note, however, that the kingdom that apparently overcomes the exile is ruled by the Messiah, and "There will be no end to the increase of His government" (המשרה ולשלום אין־קץ לסרבה; Isa 9:6).[15] The idea of increase seems to imply a period of conquest before the kingdom is all-encompassing. Guelich poses a challenge. He suggests that καιρός is not "an expanse or period of time," as is commonly held. He continues, "The verb πεπλήρωται thus has its redemptive historical connotation of 'fulfillment' or 'coming to pass' rather than 'completion.' Instead of announcing a period of time reaching its conclusion, Jesus announces the coming to pass of a decisive moment in time," the entry of the kingdom.[16] There is ample evidence, however, that καιρός can indeed refer to "an expanse or period of time."[17] Delitzsch demonstrates that, with the Hebrew wording (כעת הראשון), "The prophet intentionally indicates the time of disgrace . . . would extend over a lengthened period."[18] Accordingly, since in the NT πληρόω always refers to completion of a period of time when it refers to time,[19] Jesus, in Mark's estimation, must mean that some commonly known period of time is completed, and that time is most likely the aspect of the exile described in Isa 9:1. Therefore, Jesus considered the inception of the kingdom of God at the beginning of his ministry to coincide in some sense with the close of the exile.[20]

R. T. France objects to this conception of the kingdom of God, stating

> that βασιλεία is essentially an abstract noun referring to the 'rule' or 'kingship' of God, the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ should not be read as a term with a single specific referent, whether a time, place, event, or situation. It is therefore not appropriate to ask whether 'the kingdom of God' is past, present, or future, as if it had a specific time-reference like 'the day of Yahweh'. God's kingship is both eternal and eschatological, both fulfilled and awaited, both present and imminent. . . . To declare that God's kingship has come near is to say that God is now fulfilling his agelong purpose, rather than to point to a specific time or event which can be defined as either already present or still future, but not both.[21]

Certainly, βασιλεία in the Gospels does refer to "rule" or "kingship," and God's kingship is eternal, but this does not rule out that Jesus could refer to a temporal aspect of that kingship. Indeed the kingdom is likened to planting seed (Mark 4:26–27; 30–31), it is said to be coming (Mark 9:1; 11:10), and one can wait for it (Mark 15:43). These images suggest a beginning. Furthermore,

[15] See also F. Delitzsch, *Isaiah* (trans. James Martin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, repr. 1982) 254.

[16] Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26*, 43.

[17] See H.-C. Hahn, "καιρός," *NIDNTT* 3.833–39; and "καιρός," BDAG 497–98. A few examples are Isa 8:23; Jer 11:12, 14; 50:16; Ezek 16:8; Dan 2:8, 9, 21; 11:13; Matt 13:30; Mark 10:30; 11:13; Luke 8:13; 18:30; Acts 13:11; Rom 3:26; 8:18; 11:15; 1 Cor 7:5; Gal 4:10; Eph 1:10; 5:16; and Heb 9:9.

[18] Delitzsch, *Isaiah*, 243.

[19] John 7:8; Luke 21:24; Acts 7:23, 30; 9:23; 13:25; 19:21; and 24:27. For a partial list, see the several examples in BDAG ("πληρόω," 827–29). Watts notes much the same for πληρόω and מלא in the LXX and MT (*Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*, 101).

[20] It is interesting that Isaiah, concerned with the Assyrian exile in chapter 9, depicts restoration from both the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles as essentially concurrent in chapters 8–11, both involving the Messiah.

[21] France, *Gospel of Mark* 93.

if Jesus' conception of the kingdom is related in any sense to Daniel 7, then it likely has a starting point, given the back-to-back sequence of kingdoms in Daniel with the kingdom of God being the final. Consequently, we may still picture the beginning of what Jesus meant by the "kingdom of God" as temporally linked to the end of the exile.

Regarding ἤγγικεν, "has come near" (Mark 1:15), although it is a notoriously difficult word to interpret in Jesus' statement, in the above chronological scheme it may imply a transition period for full closure of the exile and full conquest of the kingdom. Naturally, this would extend from the incarnation to the parousia.

There are further links between Mark 1:15 and Isaiah 9. In verse 7 of the latter, the Messiah reigns over the "kingdom" of David forever, the Lord of hosts accomplishing this. Although not certain, it would be a short step for Jesus to consider this the "kingdom of God." In Isa 9:8–10:4, the prophet lists God's future acts of judgment against Israel, punctuating with the refrain, "Yet for all this, his anger is not turned away, his hand is still upraised," and in verse 13 stating, "Yet the people do not turn back [שׁוּב] to Him who struck them, Nor do they seek the LORD of hosts."[22] שׁוּב is the common word for the concept of repentance in the MT.[23] The section indicts Israel for lack of repentance. Then, following a section on God's judgment of Assyria, Isa 10:20–23 explains that, after judgment on Assyria, "a remnant will return [שׁוּב], the remnant of Jacob, to the mighty God." In that the return is to God and not to the land, repentance is probably the thought rather than return from captivity.[24] Therefore, if Jesus is basing his proclamation of Mark 1:15 on Isaiah 9, then his appeal for repentance is to the "remnant of Jacob." Regardless of whether one argues that this remnant returned prior to the incarnation, Jesus appears to understand the remnant to be those who repent and believe the gospel in response to his preaching. Following another section on the judgment of Assyria (Isa 10:24–34), the Messiah, earlier described as reigning over his kingdom (Isa 9:7), now called "the stem of Jesse," gathers the repentant remnant into his kingdom (Isa 11:1–16).[25]

Bringing all of this together, in Mark 1:15 Jesus declares that the prophesied period of exile is ending as the kingdom of God is beginning. To enter the kingdom, one must become part of the remnant of Jacob by returning to God (repentance) and believing that the Isaianic good news of extravagant restoration is now being fulfilled in Jesus.

We have established that Jesus overtly communicated a restoration from exile theology, overt insofar as his audience was familiar with the Isaianic terms and concepts employed, especially in Isaiah 9. Naturally, it is the degree

[22] For the view that these acts are likely all future, see Oswalt, *Isaiah 1–39* 250–51.

[23] Victor P. Hamilton, "שׁוּב," *TWOT* 909–10; "שׁוּב," BDB 996–98; and "שׁוּב," *HALOT* loc. cit. See also Motyer, *Isaiah* 108.

[24] See also Motyer, *Isaiah* 117.

[25] Isaiah 11:1–16 certainly describes the messianic activity of Jesus, despite the apparently historical references to the conquest of Philistia, Edom, Moab, and Assyria (Isa 12:14–16). These references are metaphorical. See ibid. 120–27.

of familiarity with the verbal symbols used that largely determines overtness. Given both the messianic interpretation of Isaiah 9 in *Tg. Isa.* (which suggests that such an interpretation was commonly heard in the first-century synagogue) and the high apocalyptic and messianic tension at the time, we may presume that Jesus' audience was sufficiently familiar to make overt his proclamation of restoration from exile.

A few of the restoration from exile themes identified in Mark 1:15 above are found regularly in Jesus' scriptural quotations and allusions, as we shall see.

(1) Restoration is ultimately accomplished through Jesus.
(2) Restoration is a lengthy process involving different stages.
(3) The incarnate activity of Jesus is evidence that restoration is still in process.
(4) Jewish hardness, especially among the leaders, is further evidence that restoration is not complete.

At the conclusion of our discussion of each relevant quotation or allusion below, whichever of the above themes are present will be noted using the same numbering for easy comparison. Obviously, these themes may be tightly interwoven in a given passage and there may be some variation in the expression or focus of the theme from one passage to the next. Furthermore, themes three and four are related to theme two as subsets, yet they do receive specific attention in several passages and so are treated separately. Indeed, the reader may rightly identify one of these themes in a passage even though it is not identified here. This is in part an issue of threshold, how strong and clear a theme must be to consider it intentional and significant. Opinions will certainly vary. Certainly there will also be other theological themes than the four chosen for our discussion, and these will be noted throughout. We shall now examine Jesus' quotations and allusions individually and then draw the threads together.

2. *Mark 4:12* | | *Matt 13:13–15* | | *Luke 8:10 (Isa 6:9–10)*. I argue in detail elsewhere that the meaning of Jesus' quotation of Isa 6:9–10 in Mark 4:12 (par. Matt 13:13–15; Luke 8:10) is grounded in exile theology.[26] Three, perhaps four, of the above themes are represented. "To you has been given the mystery of the kingdom of God, but those who are outside get everything in parables, so that WHILE SEEING, THEY MAY SEE AND NOT PERCEIVE, AND WHILE HEARING, THEY MAY HEAR AND NOT UNDERSTAND, [LEST THEY] RETURN AND BE FORGIVEN" (Mark 4:11–12). Here a summary will suffice.

We must deal with some exegetical matters before moving to theology. Attempts have been made to soften the grammar, especially μήποτε +

[26] Douglas S. McComiskey, "Exile and the Purpose of Jesus' Parables (Mark 4:10–12; Matt 13:10–17; Luke 8:9–10)," *JETS* 51 (2008) 59–85.

subjunctive, which means "lest" with the sense "for the aversion of." Commonly, scholars propose the meaning "perhaps," or "otherwise," or they understand Jesus to mean that the Isaiah passage is suitably descriptive of his audience, though not predictive of them. The fundamental sense of this grammatical construction in every instance in the LXX is aversion. What is introduced in the μήποτε + subjunctive clause is considered disadvantageous, something to be avoided. In the large majority of cases, the text explicates action (to be) taken to avoid the disadvantageous possibility expressed in the clause, and where action is not explicated it is implied. In every case, μήποτε + subjunctive may be interpreted as having the meaning "for the aversion of." The *crux interpretum* of Isa 6:9–10 in the MT is the conjunction פֶּן ("lest"). We may say for פֶּן in the MT what we said for μήποτε + subjunctive in the LXX.[27] In every case, פֶּן may be interpreted as having the meaning "lest" with the sense "for the aversion of."[28] Aversion naturally excludes the possibility that in Isa 6:10 פֶּן means "perhaps" in the positive sense that Judah might repent and be healed. In fact, BDB, *TWOT*, and *NIDOTTE* never offer "perhaps" as a possible meaning.[29] According to the Hebrew wording of this passage, God simply does not want the people to repent. Isaiah's preaching empowered by God is the action that avoids the people's corporate repentance. It appears that the ultimate function of the hardening is to ensure that the exile, now ordained by God as the just punishment for Judah's sins, necessarily occurs. Interestingly, the same meaning holds true for possibly every instance of this grammatical construction in the NT, with 2 Tim 2:25 being an unlikely exception since it is probably μήποτε + optative.[30] Various other attempts are made to avoid Jesus saying that he wishes some not to be saved.[31] All of these efforts understand the words "be forgiven" as individually and spiritually salvific, yet in Isaiah they are not. There, they refer to national forgiveness that would remove the justification for exile. Indeed, the exile was punishment at the national level, with both saved and unsaved being taken into captivity. It seems likely that Jesus adopts a meaning virtually identical to the original meaning within Isaiah. The fundamental differences are that Jesus applies the passage to his own ministry and speaks the words at a different stage of salvation history. The first difference is significant. Jesus attributes an Isaianic character to his own preaching. Certainly the words of Isa 6:9–10 originally applied to the prophet Isaiah and, I would suggest, not to Jesus. Nevertheless, it is legitimate for Jesus to employ

[27] There are about 88 instances in the MT.

[28] BDB (pp. 814–15) lists the types of implied actions found in all the instances where an avoidance action is not explicit in the context. The example of Gen 26:9, among others, is provided; "for I said, Lest I die on account of her (to obviate which, Isaac had called Rebecca his sister)." When these are considered, one may reasonably translate every instance of פֶּן in the MT as "lest" in the sense of "for the aversion of."

[29] BDB, 814–15; Victor P. Hamilton, "פֶּן," *TWOT*, 726–27; and Allan Harman, "Particles," *NIDOTE* 4:1035–36.

[30] Matt 4:6; 5:25; 13:15; 15:32; 25:9; Mark 4:12; Luke 4:11; 12:58; 14:8, 12; 21:34; Acts 5:39; 28:27; and Heb 2:1. On 2 Tim 2:25, see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 996.

[31] See the major commentaries for summaries.

the quotation as a means of declaring that his preaching bears the identical function as that of Isaiah. Regarding the different stage of salvation-history, Isa 6:9–10 itself, especially in the broader context of the book, likely encompasses the messianic period.[32] If so, the temporal disjunction is insignificant, even non-existent, because God's word in the passage would be intended for rebellious Jews from Isaiah's day through to Jesus' day and probably beyond. Accordingly, Jesus' preaching had essentially the identical function and audience as Isaiah's, but occurred at a later time. If the view briefly described above is correct, most of the tensions with which interpreters of Mark 4:10–12; Matt 13:10–17; and Luke 8:9–10 struggle are resolved.

Several OT prophetic texts depict the exile as enduring until the advent of the Messiah, some of which are exemplified in Jesus' quotations discussed below.[33] Furthermore, as has been adequately demonstrated, many Second Temple Jews believed that the nation was still in exile.[34] This strengthens the possibility that Jesus is directly, and correctly, applying the exile theology of Isaiah 6 to his fellow Jews in the purpose of parables passages. Not only would his audience likely accept that the nation was still in exile, but the intended target audience of the prophetic texts, exiled Jews, exists uninterrupted to Jesus' day, making direct application of the texts by Jesus quite appropriate.

Much more could be said, but it seems reasonable to conclude on the above basis that Jesus viewed his preaching as having the identical function as Isaiah's, maintaining the same exile through divine hardening. Jesus did not want the nation forgiven because the divinely set period for exile was not yet concluded. If we take the concept of receiving "the mystery of the kingdom of God" (Mark 4:11) as equivalent to entering the kingdom, then Jesus' disciples and other followers are essentially returned from exile and in the kingdom, whereas the generic group called "those outside," representative of the nation, are still exiled. Accordingly, the preaching of Jesus both maintained the hardness and exile of the hardhearted Jews and enabled the individual Jew to exit exile by entering the kingdom through a faith response to Jesus. Three or four of the themes identified earlier are present here in Mark 4:12 and parallels.

(1) Restoration is accomplished ultimately through the kingdom inaugurated by Jesus. (This is merely implied.)

[32] Motyer, *Isaiah* 78–80.

[33] See also, e.g., Isa 6:9–13; Isa 11:10–16; 32:9–20; Jer 23:1–8; and Mic 2:13. I understand that OT references to exile when in conjunction with messianic activity are usually taken as metaphorical, but there is strong reason to view many, if not all, as literal.

[34] See Wright, *People of God* 268–72, 299–301; and Wright, *Victory of God* xvii–xviii, 126–27, 203–4. For similar views, see Scot McKnight, *A New Vision for Israel: The Teachings of Jesus in National Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Hatina, "Exile"; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel," *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God* (ed. Carey C. Newman; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999) 77–100; Daniel G. Reid, "Jesus: New Exodus, New Conquest," *God is a Warrior* (ed. Tremper Longman III and Daniel G. Reid; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995) 91–118; and James M. Scott, ed., *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

(2) Although the exile still continues, a new phase of restoration begins as individuals receive citizenship in the kingdom.
(3) Just as Jesus' preaching has the same function as Isaiah's, maintaining the exile while calling the remnant out, so the restoration is still in process.
(4) Jesus notes the hardness of the people and quotes an Isaiah text that places the duration of this exilic hardness into the messianic period, indicating that the restoration is not complete.

Two other quotations of Jesus focus on the first theme, that restoration is accomplished ultimately through Jesus. A third has this theme, but it is subordinate to another. We now turn to these passages.

3. *John 6:35–51 (Isa 54:13).* In John 6:35–51, Jesus expounds on the idea that he is the bread of life. He has come from heaven to receive all who are given to him and to provide them eternal life, raising them up at the last day. In response to grumbling over this, Jesus quotes Isa 54:13 saying, "It is written in the prophets, 'AND THEY SHALL ALL BE TAUGHT OF GOD.' Everyone who has heard and learned from the Father, comes to Me." (John 6:45). As noted earlier, Isaiah 54–55 pictures Israel as restored from exile,[35] apparently both kingdoms. One of the great blessings of that restoration is that of being taught by God (Isa 54:13). But restoration does not happen to all those in exile, as Isaiah 55 demonstrates. There, a call to "come" is issued, and a response is required. Interestingly, several of the images Jesus employs in John 6:35–51 are drawn from Isa 55:1–3, which in Isaiah almost immediately follows the text that Jesus quotes. These include being called by God (out of exile), eating bread that satisfies and provides spiritual life, and listening in order to hear the call and to come. It appears that Jesus is saying much the same thing to his audience. They must be called by God and come to the caller (Jesus). They will receive bread in Jesus that satisfies and produces spiritual life. They will be taught by God. The first of our four themes is present.

(1) Essentially, Jesus is saying that full restoration from exile occurs through faith response to his call.

This theme is also found in the next passage.

4. *Luke 22:37 (Isa 53:12).* In the intimate scene of the Upper Room, having just spoken to the disciples of their authoritative place with him in the kingdom (Luke 22:29–30), Jesus quotes Isa 53:12, "AND HE WAS NUMBERED WITH TRANSGRESSORS" (Luke 22:37). We must understand Isaiah 53 in the light of chapters 51–52. Scholars commonly hold that Isa 51:1–52:12 is primarily addressed to and is primarily about the exiled Jews of

[35] See Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 413.

Isaiah's period, Assyrian/Babylonian.[36] A dramatic shift occurs at 52:13, where a messianic figure appears whose description continues through 53:12. Many commentators identify this figure with Jesus.[37] Regardless of whether the transition from a focus on the exiled Jews to the Messiah occurs at 52:13 or at 53:1, we must ask what literary function the new section has as a development of the preceding section. Grogan sees the preceding section as building to a suitable climax for the new section on the Messiah, but does not delve further into the relationship.[38] Oswalt characterizes the new section as an "announcement of the means of salvation" that was merely described in the preceding section.[39] If these views are correct, then the messianic figure of the new section is the climactic resolution to the exile of the Jews in the preceding section. In other words, the return from captivity is not heralded as the final resolution to the exile, but rather the salvific ministry of the Messiah. When Jesus applies Isa 53:12 to himself, he engages this literary relationship between the two sections and declares himself to be the salvific personage who *ultimately/fully* restores God's people from their exile.[40] The references to the new covenant in Luke 22:20 and the kingdom of God in 22:16, 29–30 suggest that Jesus had the sequence exile-restoration in mind, the very sequence in Isaiah 51–53 (62). In fact, Isa 52:13–62:12 is replete with the themes of new covenant and divine kingdom as aspects of the resolution to the exile. Naturally, in this Last Supper context, Jesus' impending death would be in view, which wonderfully coheres with the redemptive themes of Isaiah 53. As with the last quotation, the first of the four themes is present, and something of the second.

(1) Jesus is the salvific personage of Isaiah who ultimately/fully restores God's people from their exile.
(2) Restoration involves the Messiah and a new kingdom (of God), not just some mundane rejuvenation.

5. *Mark 13:26* || *Matt 24:30* || *Luke 21:27; and Mark 14:62* || *Matt 26:64 (Dan 7:13)*. The next set of parallel passages include theme one, but emphasize theme two more. Jesus quotes Dan 7:13 in the Olivet Discourse,

[36] See the exegeses of G. W. Grogan, *Isaiah* (EBC 6; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986) 293–97; Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 333–73; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66* (WBC 25; Waco, TX: Word, 1987) 210–18; and others. Edward J. Young sees the church as the primary referent of Isa 52:7–12 (*The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66* [NICOT 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972] 329–34), which suits our argument but is not required by the text.

[37] For example, Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 377–408; Grogan, *Isaiah* 300; and Young, *Isaiah 40–66* 334–36. Some scholars see a secondary or primary reference to Israel as the servant. Watts attempts to demonstrate that the description is of Darius. He raises several interesting parallels but resorts to special pleading on the more salvific sounding verses. See Watts, *Isaiah 34–66* 228–33.

[38] Grogan, *Isaiah* 300.

[39] Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 375.

[40] Darrell L. Bock rightly notes that Jesus is not bound by the typical Jewish interpretation of Isaiah 53 in his day of an exalted messianic figure and a suffering nation (*Luke 9:51–24:53* [BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996] 1748).

Mark 13:26 (par. Matt 24:30; Luke 21:27), and later at his trial before the Sanhedrin, Mark 14:62 (par. Matt 26:64); "you shall see THE SON OF MAN SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER, and COMING WITH THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN.'"[41] Naturally, the book of Daniel has the exile as an important thematic substratum, being written to exiled Jews. Although the sequence of kingdoms envisioned in Daniel 7 does not explicitly mention exile, the vision pictures oppressive empires, beginning with Babylon, that are essentially anti-God. The fourth kingdom, which most commentators identify with the Roman Empire, is specifically said to war against the saints (Dan 7:21).[42] We must wait until chapter 9 to find prophecy that relates more directly to the exile. That chapter in fact provides, in the enigmatic verses 24–27, a chronological framework that describes the state of the Jewish nation during the period of the four kingdoms of chapter seven. We will therefore turn our attention there for a moment.

Thomas McComiskey argues for a reading of 9:24–27 that avoids the chronological difficulties of the messianic positions.[43] He views the "anointed one" of verse 25 as Cyrus and the "anointed one" of verse 26 as the Antichrist. If so, the time span covered by the prophecy is from Daniel's time through the final desolation of Jerusalem under the Antichrist, which incorporates the period of the four kingdoms. McComiskey writes, "The total scope of seventy weeks in Dan 9:24 may thus be understood to be the time frame in which Israel's apostasy will continue until it is ended in the ultimate act of desolation perpetrated by Antichrist."[44] This apostasy is that which caused the exile in the first place. McComiskey notes the place of the exile in this scheme.

> The exile, in which Daniel was living, was understood by Isaiah to be a means of atoning for Israel's transgressions. Thus, the words 'to atone for iniquity' may be understood to present the long weeks of Israel's desolations as a means by which the land was to be purged from the devastating effects it suffered because of Israel's sin.[45]

He continues,

> the *šābu'îm* [weeks] are not conceived of as marking precise chronological periods in this view. Rather, they comprise an answer to Daniel's prayer in that they confirm an end to the exile, but they depict a longer period of time, described as a 'troubled time,' in which Jerusalem's desolations would continue. Daniel thus learned that the return from the exile would not herald the dawn of the kingdom when Jerusalem would be granted respite from her long turmoil. There was yet a vast span of time that would be marked by the ultimate of des-

[41] Daniel 7 is of great significance to Jesus since his understanding of the title "Son of Man" surely has some dependence on it.

[42] Stephen R. Miller exemplifies well the argument that the fourth beast is the Roman Empire (*Daniel* [NAC 18; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994] 200–201, 213).

[43] Thomas Edward McComiskey, *The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985) 18–45.

[44] Ibid. 34–35.

[45] Ibid. 35.

> olations. Antiochus was but an adumbration of this desolation to be wrought by antichrist.[46]

In the prophetic witness, the status of Jerusalem is an indication of the status of the exile. If the city is "desolate," then the people are exiled. The contention of the present article is that the captivity is one of several components of the exile and that the proportionately few (and generally unfaithful) "returnees" through to the time of Jesus do not constitute the final fulfillment of restoration prophesies about return.[47] In McComiskey's terminology above, the "exile" would be the captivity in our scheme, and the period of Jerusalem's desolations would be the exile with its protracted denouement. If this is a correct equation, and if McComiskey's reading of Daniel 9 is correct, then the ongoing desolations of Jerusalem, whatever Daniel means by them, from Daniel's day through to the Antichrist, imply an ongoing "exile" as we understand it.

Accordingly, Jesus' use of Dan 7:13 in reference to his second coming in Mark 13:26 (par. Matt 24:30; Luke 21:27), "Son of Man coming in clouds," could suggest that he viewed the parousia as associated with the fulfillment/conclusion of the "return" from exile. In other words, following (or connected with) the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds, the saints take possession of the kingdom upon their "return" (Dan 7:22).[48] Interestingly, the parables Jesus tells right after the quotation of Dan 7:13 (Matt 25:1–30; Luke 21:29–32) are kingdom parables, which reconfirms that Jesus had a kingdom orientation to his eschatology. Furthermore, the gathering of saints mentioned immediately after the Daniel quotation (Mark 13:27; Matt 24:31; Mark 13:27) is probably a gathering into or preparation for the consummated kingdom.[49] Certainly, this is consistent with the image of Matt 25:31–34 where, following the separation of sheep and goats (which appears to be immediately after the return of Christ with its associated gathering of the saints), the sheep inherit the kingdom. It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that Jesus may have viewed the eschatological events listed in this discourse, such as false messiahs (Mark 13:5–6, 21–22), oppression of his disciples by Jewish leaders (13:9), division within (Jewish) families (13:12), and the appearance of the "abomination of desolation," as exilic events brought to a close by the arrival

[46] Ibid. 41.

[47] To my thinking, the true return, the return of the faithful remnant, could legitimately be in *progress* over the time from Cyrus's decree to the advent of the Antichrist.

[48] Isa 9:7; Dan 2:44–45; 7:13–18, 21–27; Obad 21; and Mic 4:8 are the only passages in the prophets that explicitly refer to a "kingdom" of God to be established in the future. The Isaiah, Obadiah, and Micah passages each have exile or return from exile in their immediate contexts. For the idea of Christ's securing the kingdom for its consummation, see 1 Cor 15:23–28.

[49] The evidence that Carson and others produce to demonstrate that Jesus has the consummation of the kingdom at his physical return in mind is inadequately countered by N. T. Wright's set of assertions. See D. A. Carson, *Matthew* (EBC 8; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984) 505–6; and Wright, *People of God* 291–97. Wright's arguments against παρουσία referring to a physical return are linguistically weak, pointing only to favorable data and making crucial, unsupported assertions (e.g. it is simplistic to say without support that παρουσία "merely means 'presence'" and then depend heavily on this assertion, p. 463). Additionally, his arguments counter positions that are not the strongest; see especially pp. 284–85 and 462–64.

of the Son of Man in the clouds (Dan 7:21) and the reception of the kingdom by the saints. The context of Jesus' quotation of Dan 7:13 in Mark 14:62, where he answers the high priest's question, "Are you the Christ?," adds little to our discussion, but it does mesh with it. Jesus affirms his identity as Messiah, and hence the presence of the messianic age, by claiming that he is the Son of Man in Daniel 7 who will receive the everlasting kingdom when he comes in the clouds. Although I am convinced of the above arguments, the reader may be uncomfortable with the presumptions made about Jesus' presuppositions. The goal of our discussion of Dan 7:21 is merely to establish the reasonable possibility that Jesus held an underlying exile theology that he attached to his quotation of the verse.

Theme one is present, but the focus is on theme two.

(1) Jesus is the mysterious Son of Man of Daniel 7 who helps usher in the eternal kingdom and is given reign over that kingdom for eternity.
(2) Restoration from exile spans the duration of a plurality of earthly kingdoms and concludes with the eternal kingdom being given to the saints. The parousia ("coming in the clouds") and judgment are associated with the final stage.

We may now move to several passages that emphasize theme two. Several of these are paired with theme three and two of them with theme four. Since themes three and four may be viewed as subsets of theme two, we will discuss the remaining theme two passages in two groups: themes two and three, and themes two and four.

6. *Luke 12:53; Matt 10:35–36 (Mic 7:6).* Jesus quotes Mic 7:6 in Luke 12:53 and Matt 10:35–36, "For I came to SET A MAN AGAINST HIS FATHER, AND A DAUGHTER AGAINST HER MOTHER, AND A DAUGHTER-IN-LAW AGAINST HER MOTHER-IN-LAW; and A MAN'S ENEMIES WILL BE THE MEMBERS OF HIS HOUSEHOLD" (Matt 10:35–36). This verse in Micah resides in a passage that stipulates the grounds for the Assyrian exile.[50] Micah 7:4–6, specifically, expects deep family division to occur as a consequence of God's punitive visit (פקדתך, 7:4), namely the impending exile.[51] The passage that follows (Mic 7:7–20) anticipates restoration from that exile and forgiveness for the sins that demanded it.[52] In both Luke and Matthew, Jesus quotes Mic 7:6 to support his mission statement, "Do you suppose that I came to grant peace on earth? I tell you, no, but rather division" (Luke 12:51); "Do not think that I came to bring peace on the earth; I did not come to bring peace, but a sword" (Matt 10:34). In Matthew, the context is Jesus' instructions for the mission of the

[50] See Bruce K. Waltke, *Micah* (The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary 2; ed. Thomas Edward McComiskey; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993) 747–48; and Francis Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Micah* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 2000) 562–63.
[51] See Waltke, *Micah* 747–49.
[52] Ibid. 754–64.

twelve. One's response to Jesus, depicted as resulting in family division, determines one's relationship to and reward from God (Matt 10:31–42). Craig Evans, with little argument, suggests that the mission of the twelve to "go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," noted in the near context (Matt 10:6), fundamentally reflects exile theology. If Jesus is alluding to Jer 50:6, which is a text describing exile-worthy Israel, then Evans is probably right.[53] This apparent exilic context lends weight to the contention that Jesus intends the quotation from Micah to retain the exile theology attached to it within Micah itself.[54] In Luke, the context of the quotation from Mic 7:6 is a lengthy eschatological discourse within which Jesus states his mission on earth (Luke 12:49–53). Here, the chronological component of Jesus' eschatology provides further means to discern how he understands his connection to the passage in Micah. Just as in Micah, family division occurs in conjunction with God's visitation. For Jesus, this very visitation includes the incarnation (Luke 12:49–59), but also the parousia and the associated consummation of the kingdom, of which Jesus speaks earlier in the discourse. It appears, then, that he perceives himself as one who causes family division as expected by Micah in conjunction with divine punitive visitation, which in Jesus' scheme involves himself and culminates in the parousia.[55] Also in line with Micah who depicts Israel's restoration with kingdom language (e.g.

[53] Evans, "Continuing Exile of Israel" 91–93. His dependence on N. T. Wright to establish that the number of apostles (twelve), introduced emphatically to this passage in Matt 10:1, symbolizes the reconstitution of Israel is risky. Wright's argument is tenuous. He merely asserts, "The very existence of the twelve speaks, of course, of the reconstitution of Israel; Israel has not had twelve visible tribes since the Assyrian invasion in 734 BC, and for Jesus to give twelve followers a place of prominence, let alone to make comments about them sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes, indicates pretty clearly that he was thinking in terms of the eschatological restoration of Israel" (*Victory of God* 300). The logic is seriously weakened if first-century Jews still believed that they existed as "twelve tribes." Indeed, Acts 26:7 demonstrates that at least some did. Even if one challenges that Luke supplied the reference to twelve tribes in Acts, he likely would be reflecting Jewish terminology. The phrase "twelve tribes" in Jas 1:1, though referring to Christians, is further evidence. Wright has only established a possibility. In other words, "twelve" may simply symbolize Israel without the idea of restoration.

[54] Most NT scholars see Jesus as referring to his involvement in the fulfillment of a time of distress immediately preceding an eschatological restoration, but none explains the references to the Assyrian exile intimately entwined in the context (e.g. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28* [WBC 33b; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1995] 292; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Chapters 1–7* [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988] 220; and John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005] 440–41). Craig S. Keener recognizes the potential chronological disjunction and merely considers Jesus as expressing a traditional Jewish interpretation that varies from the original intent (*A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999] 330). None of these commentators considers the possibility that Micah's prophesied period of punishment (including 7:6) might extend even to the time of Jesus, removing any anachronism in Jesus' employment of the text. Quite interestingly, Jesus here applies a text about the Assyrian exiles to "returned" Babylonian exiles. It is as if he melds aspects of the two exiles together as though all Jews now come under the indictments of prophecies relating to both the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles.

[55] Joel B. Green simply figures that Mic 7:6 is not about Jesus without considering that the originally intended scope of the Micah text might be broad enough to include him (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997] 509).

Mic 2:12–13; 4:6–8; 7:8–13), Jesus envisages restoration (from exile) in the consummated kingdom, following the parousia. My contention is that Jesus believed the punitive visitation of God in the OT exile was continuing, with the added significance now of his own divine presence. Forgiveness of sin is available in Jesus, through whom one individually exits exile and enters the kingdom. The full restoration expected by Micah must be experienced only after the full period of punishment that extends from the OT exile through the judgment at the parousia.

(2) God's visitation, as in Micah, includes the incarnation, the parousia, and the associated consummation of the kingdom. Full restoration from exile occurs in the consummated kingdom following the parousia.
(3) With Jesus causing the division expected by Micah under the punitive visitation of God before full restoration, obviously restoration is therefore not complete.

7. *Matt 11:5 (Isa 35:5–6).* If Jesus' conception of eschatology and his place in it resembles the above description, then his quotation and application of several other OT exile passages may be seen as direct (referring to a single salvation-historical period extending from the captivity through the incarnation) rather than merely analogous (comparing his own salvation-historical period with that of the exile). One example is found after Jesus gives mission instructions to the twelve, when John the Baptist asks Jesus whether he is the "Coming One," the Messiah (Matt 11:1–3). Jesus responds (11:5) with a strong verbal allusion to, and perhaps a quotation of, Isa 35:5–6, "*the* BLIND RECEIVE SIGHT and *the* lame walk, *the* lepers are cleansed and *the* deaf hear, *the* dead are raised up, and *the* POOR HAVE THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO THEM." Oswalt believes that Isa 35:1–10 may encompass three or more separate concepts, "a literal return from [Babylonian] exile, a millennial kingdom, a spiritual condition to which these statements bear a typological reference, etc.," and that these concepts need not be entirely separate.[56] If, as argued in this article, the close of the exile is a process and not a punctiliar or brief event, then all three may legitimately be incorporated together. The physical return appears at the beginning of the lengthy process and is only anticipatory of things to come. Those who step out of exile through faith in Christ proleptically receive spiritual blessing akin to, but only a foretaste of, what will be. Finally, the kingdom is consummated, and Isa 35:1–10 is fully realized. In other words, the single intended fulfillment of the marvelous description of restoration from exile described in 35:1–10 may occur gradually or in stages such that there appear to be separate fulfillments that are in fact aspects of the one progressive fulfillment. If this is the case, then Jesus' application of verses 5–6 to himself may indicate the role of his healing ministry in the process of God fulfilling the promised restoration from exile.

[56] Oswalt, *Isaiah 1–39* 620–21. NT scholars unfortunately do not grapple with the presence of the exile theme in the immediate context, merely focusing on the messianic fulfillment of the quoted verses.

Certainly, John the Baptist is expecting a new phase to begin (Matt 11:3). As Young puts it, "The reference is not specifically to the miracles of healing that our Lord performed, although these miracles are themselves a part of the means by which the change is accomplished."[57] We may summarize the theology which covers two of our themes as follows.

(2) Return from captivity occurred many centuries earlier, and a new phase of restoration begins in the miraculous ministry of the Messiah.
(3) Jesus' miraculous ministry does not signify the finality of restoration, but it affirms the decisive progress of its fulfillment.

8. *Matt 11:10 (Mal 3:1).* It is worth simply noting at this point Jesus' quotation of Mal 3:1 in Matt 11:10 (par. Luke 7:27), "This is the one about whom it is written, 'BEHOLD, I SEND MY MESSENGER AHEAD OF YOU, WHO WILL PREPARE YOUR WAY BEFORE YOU.'" This quotation shortly follows the above quotation within the same scene. Since Malachi is postexilic, it is difficult to demonstrate decisively an exile theology. The prophet's focus lies on what some commentators call the "restoration" community. Nevertheless, it may be possible to identify exile theology in Malachi, but this would take more discussion than warranted for our purposes.[58]

9. *Luke 4:18–19 (Isa 61:1–2).* Themes two and three are also found in Luke's programmatic passage on Jesus' ministry, where Jesus summarizes the purpose of his ministry by quoting Isa 61:1–2 (LXX) in Luke 4:18–19, "THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IS UPON ME, BECAUSE HE ANOINTED ME TO PREACH THE GOSPEL TO THE POOR. HE HAS SENT ME TO PROCLAIM RELEASE TO THE CAPTIVES, AND RECOVERY OF SIGHT TO THE BLIND, TO SET FREE THOSE WHO ARE

[57] Edward J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 19–39* (NICOT 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 451.

[58] Some brief comment may be useful here but is put in a footnote because of its tentative nature. The exiles had returned not long before Malachi's ministry, but had already allowed religious and moral abuses (Douglas Stuart, *Malachi* [The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary 3; ed. Thomas Edward McComiskey; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998] 1252–55). Regarding the context of Mal 3:1, Mal 1:6–3:5 consists of oracles against the Jerusalem priests and the people of Judah because of their unfaithfulness to the covenant (Stuart, *Malachi*, 1249). In response to this wickedness, Malachi proclaims that the Lord will come to purify his people after a messenger appears (Mal 3:1b–5). The Lord's coming, taken as the incarnation (and presumably the parousia) of Jesus by the evangelists, will bring purity and restoration. (The language Malachi uses [e.g. 3:2–5, 7, 10–12; 3:17–4:4; 4:6] is similar to that which describes exilic punishment and restoration elsewhere [e.g. Zech 1:3; Neh 1:9; Lam 5:21; Ezek 34:26; Isa 5:24; 26:5–6; 43:1; 61:9; 62:4; Jer 30:17; 33:6]. See the numerous parallels observed in the major commentaries.) Accordingly, Malachi perhaps depicts important aspects of the exile as continuing. Although C. F. Keil does not explicitly state that the "exile" continued beyond the return from captivity, he notes that Malachi's audience reacted against God because the "fullness of salvation, which the earlier prophets had set before the people when restored to favor and redeemed from captivity, had not immediately come to pass" (*The Twelve Minor Prophets: Malachi* [Commentary on the Old Testament 10; trans. James Martin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, repr. 1977] 428). If this reading of Malachi is correct, then Jesus, by identifying John the Baptist with the messenger, declares himself to be the visitation of God in Malachi that brings purification and full restoration from exile.

OPPRESSED, TO PROCLAIM THE FAVORABLE YEAR OF THE LORD." Many commentators are tempted to see the Isaianic person who declares, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me" (Isa 61:1), as the Messiah.[59] When they turn to 61:4, "Then they will rebuild the ancient ruins," these commentators are forced either to see an abrupt transition back to exiled Israel, or to spiritualize the rebuilding so that it suits the messianic age.[60] It seems that there are fewer problems taking the speaker of Isaiah 61 as Isaiah, who is describing the message he was to proclaim to the exiled Jews. The language of verses 1–3 beautifully fits the prospect of return from captivity: "liberty to captives"; "freedom to prisoners"; "rebuild the ancient ruins." What drives many commentators from this is Jesus' co-opting the passage for himself—therefore, according to these scholars, it cannot refer to anyone else. To the contrary, what Isaiah said was true of himself *and* of Jesus. Although Isaiah probably meant it only of himself, Jesus was perfectly correct to apply the *words* to himself, perhaps in typological fashion but not likely in a predictive sense. History demonstrates that only some of what Isaiah prophesied in this chapter eventuated before the advent of Christ, such as, for example, some degree of freedom and liberty and some amount of rebuilding. At the same time, much was not fulfilled, such as, for example, the restored people enjoying the wealth of the nations, having great riches, possessing a double portion, experiencing everlasting joy.[61] What Isaiah prophesied need not have been fulfilled within a short time. If we view restoration as a unified process that begins with the first meager waves of returnees and continues through the messianic age, then both Isaiah and Jesus can legitimately participate in its proclamation. Importantly, Jesus can rightly declare, "Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (Luke 4:21). Isaiah could only participate in the early beginnings of restoration; Jesus could herald the final stage before completion.[62]

(2) Isaiah heralded the beginning of restoration and Jesus, many years later, heralds the final stage before completion.
(3) Jesus' preaching announces the final stage of restoration, but does not indicate its completion. The quotation is programmatic of his ongoing mission (which, of course, will culminate in full restoration).

10. *Mark 14:27* || *Matt 26:31 (Zech 13:7).* In Mark 14:27 (par. Matt 26:31), after leaving the Upper Room, Jesus quotes Zech 13:7 to the disciples as a prophetic preview of their response to his crucifixion saying, "You will all

[59] E.g. Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 562–65; Motyer, *Isaiah* 499–500; and Young, *Isaiah 40–66* 458–59.

[60] For the former, see Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 570–71. For the latter, see Motyer, *Isaiah* 499–501; and Young, *Isaiah 40–66* 461–62. Young argues that Isaiah could hardly accomplish the tasks described in verses 1–3 but this misses the statement of the passage that the prophet merely proclaims what God himself will accomplish.

[61] Bock notes that first-century Jews interpreted this passage as being about a new eschatological era (*Luke 9:51–24:53* 407).

[62] Note that Jesus stops short of quoting "the day of vengeance of our God" because this was yet to be fulfilled.

fall away, because it is written, 'I WILL STRIKE DOWN THE SHEPHERD, AND THE SHEEP SHALL BE SCATTERED.'" Many scholars consider the shepherd in Zech 13:7 to be Christ, the sheep to be Israel, and Jesus' application to the disciples as a foreshadowing of a larger occurrence, specifically the dispersion of the Jews at and after the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70.[63] Now, the closest explicit reference to the return from captivity is back in 8:7–8.[64] This among other factors has led nearly all commentators to see a strong disjunction between chapters 1–8 (First Zechariah) and 9–14 (Second Zechariah), with some positing an entirely different historical/political setting for Second Zechariah.[65] Several scholars however argue that the themes of 9–14 are based on and develop those of 1–8, and are the product of the same author.[66] Essentially, 1–8 expresses "a longing for the upheaval among the nations that will herald the long-awaited kingdom of God. If Zechariah 1–8 was originally a separate work, it would have possessed an unsatisfying conclusion, for the reader would be left wondering when and how this upheaval will occur."[67] Interestingly, chapter 8 depicts the return from captivity (8:7–8) merging into the messianic period of blessing (8:9–23) as though there was no span of time between them and as though the latter naturally followed causally and theologically as a resolution to the exile.[68] Chapters 9–14 flesh out the events within this post-captivity period and beyond.[69] This being the case, the events of 9–14 may be seen causally and theologically to follow from the return from captivity. Under this scheme, the gloomy events of 9:1–10 and 11:1–13:8 (including Jesus' quotation, 13:7) remain as unresolved consequences of exile awaiting the restoration described in 9:11–17 and 13:9–14:21. Zechariah 13:7, then (the striking of the shepherd and scattering of the sheep) should be seen as one of the several events under the realm of exile, and one that is resolved by the day of the Lord (chap. 14). The shepherd should be understood as the Messiah and the striking as his death.[70] So when Jesus directs Zech 13:7 at his disciples, taken with the larger context of Zechariah, it would convey the message that the disciples were in a period

[63] See, for example, Kenneth L. Barker, *Zechariah* (EBC 7; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985) 686–87; and McComiskey, *Zechariah*, 1223–24.

[64] Although the Babylonian captivity is referred to, e.g., in 2:7, all exiled Jews from both kingdoms are in view, 1:18.

[65] For example, Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 15–22.

[66] Most of these scholars accept the prophet Zechariah as the author. See McComiskey, *Zechariah* 1014–18; and Barker, *Zechariah* 596–97.

[67] McComiskey, *Zechariah* 1016.

[68] See the exegesis of the chapter in McComiskey, *Zechariah* 1136–57; and Barker, *Zechariah* 649–55.

[69] McComiskey demonstrates persuasively that Zech 10:10 is not a reference to the return of Israel to the land, but rather a reference to new covenant restoration (*Zechariah* 1184–85.).

[70] McComiskey, *Zechariah* 1223. McComiskey rightly views the sheep as referring to "the population of Judea in AD 70 when the Roman emperor Titus sacked Jerusalem." Jesus' application of the text to his disciples either would be analogical or would indicate that he considered the disciples a legitimate subset of the people intended by Zechariah. For a similar position, see Carson, *Matthew* 541.

of exilic consequence awaiting the final resolution found in the further work of the Messiah. We may summarize themes two and three as follows.

(2) The death of Jesus is an exilic event, even though the messianic era is well underway. This illustrates the gradual transition from exile to full restoration.
(3) Naturally, if the death of Jesus is an exilic event, then restoration is still in process.

11. *Mark 11:17* || *Matt 21:13* || *Luke 19:46 (Isa 56:7)*. Jesus quotes Isa 56:7 in Mark 11:17 (par. Matt 21:13; Luke 19:46), "And He *began* to teach and say to them, 'Is it not written, "MY HOUSE SHALL BE CALLED A HOUSE OF PRAYER FOR ALL THE NATIONS"? But you have made it a ROBBERS' DEN.'" Indeed, Jesus may be using the words of Isaiah out of their historical context merely to demonstrate God's ultimate desire for the temple, with which they had failed to comply. However, given Jesus' restoration theology and use of relevant texts as demonstrated above, this may be another instance of Jesus considering a prophetic text to be directly about his contemporaries. We shall pursue this line to see its results. Themes two and four are present. If Isaiah is read as a continuous text, as was probably done in Jesus' day, chapter 54 creates a backdrop for the following chapters. Isaiah 54:1–8 speaks of the return of the people from exile, and an extended section from 54:9 through at least chapter 56 describes what will/can be after that return.[71] In this light, the Gentile inclusion and proper function of the temple depicted in chapter 56 is to be characteristic of the period after the "return" described in chapter 54 (or in close association with it, the chronology of the chapters being less than obvious). When Jesus declares in Mark 11:17 that the Jewish leaders had kept God's house from being what Isa 56:7 prophesied it would be after the restoration, the implication seems to be that full restoration from exile has not yet occurred.[72]

(2) If this is truly a restoration theology passage, then its significance is simple. Even though there had been some physical return of exiles to the land, and the Messiah had already appeared, full restoration was yet future. Restoration occurs in "stages," or with some graduation.
(4) The temple under the hardhearted Jewish leaders was still less than it would be when restoration from exile was fully accomplished. This mismanagement is an indication that God had not yet revitalized corporate worship, as promised for the restored nation.

[71] For a somewhat similar evaluation of these chapters, see Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 413–15, 452–54. He would extend the section on restoration potential (as I put it, "what can be") through to the end of the book.

[72] In fact, the temple never achieved the cultic and spiritual status of the restoration prophesies. This either indicates that the temple will be restored and true worship rejuvenated sometime post-AD 70, or that the "house of prayer" in Isa 56:7 is symbolic of something other than the physical temple, perhaps akin to that in John 2:13–22 and 4:19–24. Motyer, while seeing the physical temple here, certainly stresses its spiritual symbolism (*Isaiah* 465–67). Bock implies something close to our point here (*Luke 1:1–9:50* [BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994] 1578).

12. *Mark 7:6–7 | | Matt 15: 8–9 (Isa 29:13).* Another instance of a quotation with the protracted exile/restoration theme (theme two) is Isa 29:13 (LXX) in Mark 7:6–7 (par. Matt 15:8–9), "And He said to them, 'Rightly did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written: "THIS PEOPLE HONORS ME WITH THEIR LIPS, BUT THEIR HEART IS FAR AWAY FROM ME. BUT IN VAIN DO THEY WORSHIP ME, TEACHING AS DOCTRINES THE PRECEPTS OF MEN."'" Although theme two is present, theme four is more the focus, as we shall see. Jesus states that Isaiah was prophesying about the Pharisees and teachers of the law whom Jesus was addressing (Matt 15:7). He *equates* his audience with the very people whose insincerity and influence, according to Isaiah, resulted in the devastation and exile under Babylon.[73] This equation of people across a vast span of time shows that the extent of the period of reference in Isaiah 29 is from the time of Isaiah to the time of Jesus.[74] Certainly the point of reference in Isa 29:17–24, which describes the divine solution to the people's hardness, is the messianic kingdom.[75] Although Isa 29:13 may only refer to Isaiah's contemporaries, the punishment, involving the loss of spiritual wisdom and intelligence (29:14), appears to continue until it is lifted when the messianic kingdom arrives. Since the punishment is intended essentially to worsen the spiritual plight of the people, the description of them in 29:13 would hold true as long as the hardening continued. Jesus' argument probably, then, presumes that if the insincerity that justified punishment in Isaiah's day continues uninterrupted (or at least shows itself regularly enough) through to Jesus' day, then the punishment itself continues, in some form, uninterrupted through Jesus' day. If Jesus surmised that Isa 29:13–14 was intentionally targeted by God (and Isaiah) at both Isaiah's countrymen and (even if secondarily) the Jewish leaders of Jesus' day, then some aspects of the corresponding punishments stipulated in Isaiah must apply to these Jewish leaders. The immediate consequence stipulated in the quotation itself is vain worship. If Jesus (and the Jewish leaders) held to the continuation of many aspects of the exile, then his quotation would naturally imply the exiled state of the Jewish leaders and would not be

[73] The immediate context of Isa 29:13 (29:1–16) does not explicitly mention exile but focuses on the destruction of Jerusalem and the spiritual blindness of its people. Captivity, however, is introduced in 28:13. (For the view that 28:13 refers to the captivity, see Young, *Isaiah 19–39* 280). So the reader knows in advance that Ariel's (Jerusalem) destruction, described in chapter 29, involves captivity. One might object that the leaders implied in Isa 29:13 are specifically those whose influence caused the *beginning* of exile, not its continuation. However, verses 9–12 introduce the idea of judicial hardening, and we know from Isa 6:11–13 that this likely extends to the appearance of the Messiah. We cannot therefore exclude the possibility that what was said of the people who caused the exile was intended also to describe people throughout the punishment.

[74] That is, unless one sees typology, double fulfillment, or *sensus plenior* here. These theories, however, are unnecessary in this instance. For typological approaches, see France, *Gospel of Mark* 284; and Hagner, *Mathew 14–28* 432. Typology is unnecessary when the immediate context of Isa 29:13 is considered. See above where it is argued that Jesus' contemporaries are included within the discernable sense of Isaiah 29. Craig L. Blomberg says the situation of Isaiah's day is being "reenacted," but this seems not to account well for the unusually specific statement of Jesus, "ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἠσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν," "Isaiah prophesied of you hypocrites" (*Matthew* [NAC 22; Nashville: Broadman, 1992] 238–39).

[75] See Grogan, *Isaiah* 189–91.

anachronistic. The leaders would merely be a subset of a *chronologically* much larger group. Although not explicit, themes two and four seem plainly presumed by Jesus, the latter being strongest.

(2) Although a significant minority of Jews had returned to the land, the very obstinacy that initially warranted their exile was still present in Jesus' contemporaries. Such a state is not characteristic of full restoration, so an earlier stage must have obtained, implying a prolonged and sophisticated restoration process.
(4) Inherent in theme two, and more directly to Jesus' point (yet still secondary), is that Jewish hardness indicates a continuing state of exile.

13. *Matt 9:13 (Hos 6:6).* Jesus quotes Hos 6:6 in Matt 9:13, "But go and learn what this means: 'I DESIRE COMPASSION, AND NOT SACRIFICE,' for I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners." Theme four appears present in this instance, where Jewish hardness is evidence that restoration is not complete. This verse in Hosea is part of a passage that discusses the grounds for the Assyrian exile.[76] He quotes it to a Pharisee who challenges his eating with tax collectors and sinners. Interestingly, the mission statement that immediately follows, "For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners," may be an allusion to Isa 55:1–13 where God calls his people to return/repent and receive spiritual food, and this in the context of return from exile (55:12–13).[77] Indeed, Jesus may not intend a reference to exile in his quotation of Hos 6:6. He may simply be applying the basic sentiment of the words to a different context without dependence on the larger literary context in Hosea. However, if exile theology is fundamental to his thinking, he may expect the theme of exile in Hosea to adhere to this quotation as he draws it from the OT context and directs it at the Pharisee. Jesus quotes Hos 6:6 again in Matt 12:7 in response to the Pharisees' question regarding the legality of the disciples "harvesting" grain on the Sabbath. The thrust of both quotations of Hos 6:6 appears to be that the Pharisees are practicing the very things that condemned Israel to exile in the first place. This is more clearly the case in the first quotation and possibly also in the second.

(4) *Possibly presumed in Jesus' application of the quotation to the Pharisee, indicating pharisaic hardness, is that the nation remains in exile.*

The italics mark this statement as tentative due to our uncertainty regarding Jesus' intent. We will account for this uncertainty in our summary of Jesus' theology in the conclusion.

[76] See Thomas Edward McComiskey, *Hosea* (The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary 1; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992) 92; and Douglas Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah* (WBC 31; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987) 110–12.

[77] Most commentators view Isa 55:12–13 as referring to the return from exile. See, e.g., Oswalt, *Isaiah 40–66* 447–48; Watts, *Isaiah 34–66* 247; and Motyer, *Isaiah* 458.

14. *Luke 23:30 (Hos 10:8).* Another passage may imply theme four. As Jesus is being led to his crucifixion, he turns to those who are mourning him and, referring to the days ahead, quotes Hos 10:8, "Then they will begin TO SAY TO THE MOUNTAINS, 'FALL ON US,' AND TO THE HILLS, 'COVER US'" (Luke 23:30). Hosea 10:1–8 is about the impending captivity of Israel by the Assyrians.[78] McComiskey writes, "When this cataclysm occurs, the people will cry to the mountains and the hills to fall on them. This vivid motif depicts the wish of the people to escape the events of the coming captivity by perishing and thus ending their suffering."[79] Certainly, Jesus could use these words in reference to a new exile that was soon to begin, perhaps in conjunction with the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, or he could use merely the sentiment without concern for the theme of exile. That said, if Jesus believed that the restoration from exile had not yet been fully accomplished, then his quotation of Hos 10:8 could indicate that

(4) *the very same reaction to exile in Hosea's day was appropriate for those mourning Jesus because they were enduring the very same exile. The wickedness being expressed by the Jews as they lead Jesus to the cross is the same wickedness that originally led the people into exile.*

As earlier, the italics mark uncertainty as to whether this is Jesus' intention.

III. CONCLUSION

We have shown that Jesus at times plainly and intentionally integrates (restoration from) exile theology within his teaching through quotations of or allusions to the OT prophets. This forms a solid basis for the presumption that it is also integrated within teaching where it is less obvious. We have also attempted to clarify specific theological concepts communicated by Jesus through these instances. The final task is to draw the threads together for greater clarity. There is always a risk when merging separate theological statements because detail drops out, certain distinctions and nuances may be blurred, and the true balance of significance may be skewed in the process. Nevertheless, the obvious benefits of systematization justify the risks. Additionally, in this task it becomes further evident that there is conceptual overlap between the themes, albeit one that is natural and inevitable. The following is a systematic summary of the thematic points developed in the article.

(1) Full restoration of Jews from exile is accomplished gradually by entry into the kingdom of God through faith response to the call of Jesus, who is both the salvific personage of Isaiah and the "Son of Man" of Daniel who reigns eternally over the kingdom.

(2) Full restoration from the Babylonian (and Assyrian) exile (a loss of kingdom) is a process that began at the return from captivity under Cyrus,

[78] See McComiskey, especially on verse 6 (*Hosea* 159–70).
[79] Ibid. 170.

spans a plurality of earthly kingdoms, and is completed at the consummation of the kingdom of God. Isaiah and Jesus both heralded restoration, but effectively at opposite ends of the lengthy process. The death of Jesus is an exilic event, even though the messianic era is well underway. The process of restoration occurs in stages, beginning with the first returnees under Cyrus. A new stage begins in Jesus' messianic ministry when individual Jews may enter the yet unconsummated, supra-mundane kingdom of God, which is the resolution to their loss of kingdom. The final stage, full restoration, occurs after the parousia and final judgment.

(3) The incarnate activity of Jesus, including his miracles, his preaching (which divides people and has a hardening effect on hard-hearted exiles), and his death (which is an exilic event), all according to the prophets indicate that the final stage of restoration, the consummation of the kingdom, is yet future. It is all anticipatory and part of the punitive or restorative work of God.

(4) In that full restoration of the exiles involves divinely instilled spiritual vitality, pervasive Jewish hardness is further evidence that restoration is not complete. Jesus notes such indicative hardness in a variety of ways, such as directly attributing hardness to the people, condemning the mismanagement of the temple by the leaders, *and likening the wickedness of the Jews which drove him to the cross with that which originally justified the exile.*

The italics in point four above mark the only statement in our summary where, as noted earlier, we are uncertain that Jesus intended the idea. Any other uncertain statements are corroborated by what is certain and so do not appear in italics in the summary.

One final observation: Jesus uses texts on the Babylonian exile directly in reference to his southern kingdom audiences while sometimes also using texts on the Assyrian exile directly. He apparently sometimes applies Assyrian exile texts just analogically. This flexibility may reasonably be explained by the chronological concurrence in some of the prophets between the two restorations.

There is much further research that may ensue from the perspective taken in this article. Some of Jesus' parables and other teaching show consistencies with our understanding of restoration from exile. Several important texts throughout the NT also do, such as Romans 9–11. Certainly much further work needs to be done in the OT prophets. Scholars perhaps too easily disconnect prophetic material that relates to restoration from the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities from that which clearly relates to messianic activity and/or the new covenant period. All these should be reassessed to determine whether they best support the view that restoration of the Jews from the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities is a lengthy process beginning with Cyrus's decree and continuing through to the consummation of the kingdom of God, with restoration accomplished through personal faith in the Messiah.