

The Eschatological King and His People of Jews and Gentiles

Response to Mark S. Kinzer,
“The Present and Future Jewish King”

Bernard Mallmann

THE “JEWISH FLESH,” which for Karl Barth is the historically decisive category for Jesus,¹ is for Mark Kinzer equally decisive for the glorified Christ. Jewish flesh has enduring significance in the state of glory. Mark Kinzer supplies the inquiry into the historical Jesus with an eschatological orientation. To maintain this thesis, he must assume a strong continuity between the order of creation and the order of redemption. An important pointer already lies therein: With the thought of Kinzer, Christian theology, and especially Christology, has the painful thorn in its own flesh, not to succumb to the Marcionite temptation to decouple protology from eschatology, but to think through both from the actual center of Christology,² and to affirm the canonical unity of the Old and New Testaments.³ Only if the two-in-oneness of the Christian Bible is taken seriously in its theological sense does the thesis gain plausibility that Jesus not only was the King of the Jews but also remains so as the Exalted One.

What the title on the cross of Jesus says historically⁴ refers in historical retrospect to Jesus’ sending. Just as the title of king is a term expressing mutual relationship between king and people, so the term “sending” can only be understood as relationship. As a “real symbol” of the Heavenly Father, Jesus understands his sending first to the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt 10:6); his sending is a manifestation of the pro-existence of Jesus which has its outworking in the sending “for the people of Israel” and in which he displays his authority as Messiah.⁵ Because in him true deity and true humanity come together, he can reveal the Father in order to gather his flock. What comes to expression in the sending of Jesus is therefore nothing else than the absolute theocentricity of his being, which legitimizes him as the Messiah of God. A sending-Christology has theocentricity as its core, inasmuch as his pro-existence can be again interpreted doubly: The “for the people” dimension is to be thought together with Jesus’ orientation “for God.”

The *homoousios* of divinity must, however, also apply to the *homoousios* of humanity if his historical life is to be understood as a revelatory “real symbol.” Only in this doubled sameness of being can his sending be understood as kingship for the Jews. Here, it has significance for Judaism as well as for Christianity as *signum rememorativum*, *demonstrativum*, and *prognosticum*.⁶ With Jean-Marie Lustiger, Mark Kinzer repeatedly refers to the fact that Jesus as a Jew embodies the whole people of Israel.⁷ In his life as the hidden and revealed King of the Jews, he realizes the calling that is given and promised to Israel. He embodies the life and the promissory history without falling away from the will of God, which finds its expression in the Torah, in the process. His kingship can further be interpreted as a kind of *recapitulatio* of the history of Israel, which corresponds to the kingship of YHWH, which he wants to establish for his people (*rememorativum*). As a present sign (*demonstrativum*), the kingly rule of Jesus realizes itself in the fact that the particular election of Israel always carries with it a universal mandate. When Jesus confesses in the Gospel of John that his kingdom is not of this world (cf. John 18:36), it is implied that the Old and New Testaments carry a surplus of promises in themselves, which still await the ultimate fulfillment in the kingdom of God (*prognosticum*).

The revelation of the Father in the sending of the Son is, however, not an action that lies outside of the election and promise of Israel, but can, if the Son truly reveals the Father, only be conceived of in the covenant history of Israel. The Son does not reveal a second covenant of God that would stand alongside the covenant with the chosen people. Jesus as King of the Jews is the one who is deeply rooted in the covenant history of Israel and who identifies with the promise of God in his sending: Jesus, the King of the Jews is in his life the concretization of the covenant history of God with humanity and

the eschatological revelation that God is faithful to his promise and will fulfill it.⁸ With this, the theological basis is withdrawn for every mission to the Jews. The only mission to Judaism is the sending of the Son to the people of God, whom he chose in order to enter into his covenant with them—a covenant, however, into which Israel and the nations are gathered.⁹ Judaism believes in the God for whom the King of the Jews wants to bear witness in truth. That is why there can only be dialogue with Judaism about the Word of God (), who has, as the content of his sending, the confirmation of the covenant for Israel.

Jean-Marie Lustiger illustrates this with the kingship of Jesus. In doing so he recalls that Jesus' kingly dignity is not first ascribed to him at the cross but already in the account of the adoration of the Magi (Matt 2:1–12), who ask about the “newborn king of the Jews.” The former Parisian cardinal, Jew and Catholic, reads the pericope in the logic of the contrast between Jesus as king and Herod as king. Jesus is the actual king of Israel, not Herod, who presents himself as the supposed king of Israel and does not recognize Jesus' sending. The sin of Herod is, according to Lustiger, that he “refuses Israel's Election in order to claim it for himself, to set himself up in place of Israel. The king given by God is his enemy since Herod has made himself king and usurped God's place with his people.”¹⁰ The sin of the Gentiles, into which Christian confession can also fall back, is the denial of the election of Israel, in which Jesus not only lives but is at the same time the “real symbol” of this election. Faith in Jesus as the Christ must therefore include respect for the enduring and given election of Israel. Jesus is the God-appointed and God-confirmed king, who lives out, opens, and confirms this election. For Christianity, this can mean not just self-critically working through replacement theology, but also revising “structural supersessionism”¹¹ in all theological treatises and clearly naming the enduring significance of the Jewish flesh of Jesus.

Moreover, the confession of Jesus as the “King of the Jews” has *ecclesiological* consequences. If one takes the title “King of the Jews” seriously in a theological sense, then the Church has the task of testifying kenotically to the kingly rule of God. An ecclesiology is thus to be spelled out kenotically, in that the Church lets herself be integrated into the sending of Jesus' own kingship in which the kingly rule of God breaks through.¹² In the constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium* 8, the Second Vatican Council describes the relationship of the Church of Jesus Christ to the Catholic Church with the term *subsistit in*—“is actualized in.” This rules out a rigid, absolute identification, as it was still firmly written with *est* (“is”) in Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, and the concept of the Church is expanded. The privative term *subsistit in* expands the Church of Jesus Christ and deprives her of a usurpative appropriation.¹³ Analogously, the kingship of Jesus will also have to be interpreted in the analogy of this “one complex reality” (cf. *LG* 8). The kingship of Jesus will not consist in a visible people of Judaism or of Christianity but in the togetherness of both entities. However, the kingship of Jesus as “one complex reality” itself has to be put into perspective again in such a way that it does not limit itself solely to Judaism or Christianity or to both entities.

Lumen Gentium 8 introduces the Christological “no weak analogy.” Just as divine and human nature come together in Jesus Christ, so the togetherness of “the earthly Church and the Church enriched with heavenly things” can be understood as Church. The kingdom of Jesus “which is not of this world” (John 18:36), is also historically “one complex reality” in which Judaism and Christianity come together. However, this can only be interpreted as standing together in the sense of “undivided and unmixed.” It is the reality of the King of the Jews, “who united the two parts and tore down the dividing wall of hostility in his flesh” (Eph 2:14). Yet it remains an open question what exactly the *ecclesia ex circumcisione* means in her connection to the *ecclesia ex gentibus*, and which ecclesiological place she can occupy without ecclesologically usurping Judaism.¹⁴ The kingdom of Jesus, which is not identical with the Church, is, in the person of Jesus as King of the Jews, the spiritual bond between Judaism and Christianity.¹⁵

The decisive thing here will be in what way the kingship of Jesus stands in relation to the Old Testament kingship of YHWH. Are two different reigns spoken of here? Or is the kingship of Jesus integrated into the kingship of YHWH? Or is the latter even represented by the former and historically concretized by it? For Rabbinic Judaism, the kingdom of God is present in the praying of *Shema Yisrael*.¹⁶ The person praying opens himself to the kingdom of God and concretizes it in the doing of the Torah,

through which YHWH becomes present in his people. But the expectation nevertheless remains that this kingdom will become universal and extend to the whole of creation. The kingdom of Jesus will need to be read in such a way that it clarifies and at the same time eschatologically universalizes the kingdom of YHWH in a singular way. On the cross, Jesus concretely realizes the obedience with respect to the Torah, in that here the love of God and neighbor is revealed as the content of his sending. Through his pro-existence on the cross for all human beings, he opens the kingdom of God for all human beings. The “*Christi*” [“kingdom of Christ”] in John 18:36 may not, however, be equated with the “ ” [“kingdom of God”] of the Synoptic tradition,¹⁷ but rather displays an eschatological-sacramental orientation. His reign will be for those whom he gathers in “spirit and truth” (cf. John 4:23–24). The Johannine concept of incarnation culminates on the cross and is the moment of history universalized “in Christ.”

Faith in Jesus as the King of the Jews is an eschatological faith, and as such is messianic in character. However, the decisive and enduring question is whether, from an eschatological point of view, all of Judaism will confess Jesus as their king. In this regard, Mark Kinzer cites a passage from Robert W. Jenson:

Can there be a present body of the risen Jew, Jesus of Nazareth, in which the lineage of Abraham and Sarah so vanishes into a congregation of gentiles as it does in the church? My final—and perhaps most radical—suggestion to Christian theology . . . is that . . . the embodiment of the risen Christ is whole only in the form of the church *and* an identifiable community of Abraham and Sarah’s descendants. The church and the synagogue are together and only together the present availability to the world of the risen Jesus Christ.¹⁸

Judaism and Christianity together await the messianic kingdom that the coming Messiah ushers in. Jesus as the king of the Jews, who not only represents the kingship of YHWH but incarnates it, opens the kingdom for his people as the servant king. The confession that Jesus’ reign does not mean a messianic earthly theocracy is an expression of the strict monotheistic faith of Jesus, which must be the foundation of any Christology.¹⁹ Faith in Jesus, the King of the Jews, is faith in the God of the promise: “Faith in Christ is consistent faith in God.”²⁰ In the kingly rule for which the Son of God takes responsibility, there is no connection between throne and altar, neither does it culminate in the deification of the political ruler. For the Johannine testimony of Jesus as the King of the Jews, he is not only a forerunner and herald of this kingdom of God, but he is bound up with this kingly rule, as he and the Father are one (cf. John 10:30), so that it is the one reign that binds Father and Son together.

The reign of God is indeed not *from* this world, but it is in the world, in that it becomes present there. “To the extent that people hear the voice of the shepherd ([John] 10:3), or as the Book of Revelation says, ‘follow the Lamb wherever he goes’ ([Rev] 14:4), the kingship of Christ realizes itself in the hearts of his own and they are ‘in the truth.’”²¹ Christianity is thus placed in solidarity with Judaism, and the Church is “bound together in a messianic community-of-the-way with the Jews”²² or, as Jean-Marie Lustiger expresses this, with “freely given reciprocity.”²³ This dimension of the “messianic community-of-the-way” of the Jewish people and Christians will have to take into view more strongly the Feast of Christ the King, which liturgically recalls the eschatological kingship of Jesus.²⁴ When the liturgical texts say that Christ is the King of all creation, and at the same time also Head of the new creation, this underscores the relative character of Jesus’ kingship in relation to the eschatological consummation.²⁵ The Christology of King Jesus only does justice to its explosive nature as King of the Jews when this kingship is read in relation to the theocentricity of the consummation. The kingly rule of God is the kingly rule of Jesus, which the Jewish Messiah Jesus has definitively established,²⁶ and toward which the “messianic community-on-the-way” is traveling.

(Translated by John David Martin, James Earle Patrick, and Wayne Coppins from the German: “Der eschatologische König für das eine Volk aus Juden und Heiden. Antwort auf Mark S. Kinzer”)

1. Cf. Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik IV/1: Die Lehre von der Versöhnung* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1953): 181—“The Word became—not ‘flesh,’ man, humiliated and suffering man in some sort of general sense, but Jewish flesh” [“Das Wort wurde – nicht ‘Fleisch,’ Mensch, erniedrigter und leidender Mensch in irgendeiner Allgemeinheit, sondern

jüdisches Fleisch.”]. In addition, Helmut Hoping, *Jesus aus Galiläa. Messias und Gottes Sohn* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2019); Jan-Heiner Tück, “Beschneidung Jesu. Ein Zeichen gegen die latente Israelvergessenheit der Kirche,” in *Beschneidung Jesu. Was sie Juden und Christen heute bedeutet*. Mit einem Geleitwort von Walter Kardinal Kasper, ed. Jan-Heiner Tück (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2020): 27–61.

2. Even the Gospel of John underscores an anti-Marcionite and gnostic reading when it says: “My kingdom is not *from* this world []” (John 18:36). Gnostic texts such as the Acts of Pilate write “My kingdom is not *in* this world,” implying a separation of the world and the kingdom of Christ. On this, cf. Ignace de la Potterie S.J., *Die Passion nach Johannes. Der Text und sein Geist*, trans. Hans Urs von Balthasar (Einsiedeln: Johannesverlag, 1987): 71.

3. On the canonical unity of the Old and New Testaments, see Bernard Mallmann, *Dekanonisierung des Alten Testaments? Rückfragen an Notger Slenczka aus Sicht katholischer Theologie* (Studien zur systematischen und spirituellen Theologie, 57; Würzburg: Echter, 2021): esp. 304–507.

4. On the historicity of the cross title, see Martin Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels,” in *Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie. Vier Studien*, ed. Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 138; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001): 1–80, at 48–60. See further de la Potterie, *Die Passion nach Johannes* (see note 2), 61–89; Klaus Berger, *Wozu ist Jesus am Kreuz gestorben?* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998): 14–17.

5. Cf. Thomas Söding, “‘Für das Volk.’ Die Sendung Jesu und die Hoffnung Israels,” in *Streifzug Christologie. Vergewisserungen nach der Shoah*, ed. Helmut Hoping and Jan-Heiner Tück (Quaestiones Disputatae, 214; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2005): 73–124. Gerhard Lohfink shows that the Lucan double work is about nothing else than the gathering of the people of Israel. The individual audience groups, the temple, and individual persons serve as representatives of the whole people, to which the message and teaching of Jesus applies. In this connection, there is a continuity between the pre-Easter hearers of Jesus and the post-Easter community. Cf. Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels. Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 39; Munich: Kösel, 1975). The Church thus arises from the people of God. Luke does not introduce the Church until Acts 5. Cf. Lohfink, *Sammlung* (see above), 56: “For Luke, the Church is not an entity that is simply there on the day of Pentecost but a reality that must first come into being, and that has really come into being for the first time at the moment when a large part of Israel has gathered around the apostles and disciples of Jesus.” [“Die Kirche ist für Lukas nicht eine Größe, die am Pfingsttag einfachhin da ist, sondern eine Wirklichkeit, die erst noch entstehen muß und die erst in dem Augenblick wirklich entstanden ist, als sich ein großer Teil Israels um die Apostel und Jünger Jesu gesammelt hat.”] With the Stephen pericope, the separation between believing Israel as Church and unbelieving Israel as Judaism emerges. Only after this does Luke transfer the term to the Church. Just as God himself created his people in the Old Testament, so in parallel, the Church is created anew by God out of the Gentile Christians (cf. Acts 18). But: “In the sense of Luke, one must probably even formulate it like this: *the true Israel is only arrived at when the gentiles have been brought into the fellowship of God’s people*. But that means: There is only one ; this is at the same time the gathered after Pentecost *and* the that comes in addition in the time that follows” [“Im Sinne des Lukas muß man wohl sogar so formulieren: *das wahre Israel ist erst dann erreicht, wenn die Heiden in die Gemeinschaft des Gottesvolkes eingebracht worden sind*. Das heißt aber: Es gibt nur einen , dieser ist zugleich der nach Pfingsten gesammelte und der in der Folgezeit hinzukommende ”]—*ibid.*, 60.

6. For the terminology, cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III^a, Q.60, Art.3, on the conception of the sacraments that encompasses the past, present, and future.

7. Cf. Mark S. Kinzer, *Searching Her own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish People, and the Identity of the Church* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015): 12–16.

8. Mark Kinzer emphasizes that Jesus does not replace the covenant history of Israel but truly realizes it, which he shows at the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan. Cf. Kinzer, *Searching Her own Mystery* (see note 7), 95–99.

9. For this, cf. Christian Rutishauser, “Christian Mission to the Jews Revisited: Exploring the Logic of the Vatican Document ‘The Gifts and Calling of God Are Irrevocable,’” *Studies in Christian–Jewish Relations* 14.1 (2019): 1–16. See also Christian Rutishauser, “‘Ungekündigter Alter Bund’ und ‘Heil für alle Völker in Christus’ – Katholische Glaubenssätze im Widerspruch?,” in *Christlichen Glauben denken. Im Dialog mit der jüdischen Tradition*, ed. Christian Rutishauser (Forum Christen und Juden, 15; Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2016): 93–109, at 99: “The one God from Mount Sinai lets his Jewish Messiah become the light and salvation of the world and, through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, makes it possible for God-fearing gentiles to enter into the covenant with God as well. There should arise one covenant in Christ, one people from Jews and gentiles.” [“Der eine Gott vom Berg Sinai lässt seinen jüdischen Messias zum Licht und Heil der Welt werden und ermöglicht es durch die Ausgießung des Heiligen Geistes den gottesfürchtigen Heiden, ebenfalls in den Bund mit Gott einzutreten. Es soll ein Bund in Christus, ein Volk aus Juden und Heiden entstehen.”]

10. Jean-Marie Lustiger, *The Promise* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007): 34. For the interpretation of Matt 2:1–12, see *ibid.*, 49–57.

11. R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996): 31–32.

12. Cf. Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels” (see note 4), 58: “Yet Jesus is for him [John the Evangelist; *author’s note*]—much more than with Mark—not only Son of Man and Messiah, but at the same time as such the true ‘king of God’s people Israel’ (John 1:49; 12:13; cf. also 11:52), i.e., the Son who is one with the Father and is sent by him into the world. Therefore in him, the kingly rule of God and that of Christ merge—they are identical (John 3:35; 18:36–37)” [“Jesus ist für

ihn [den Evangelisten Johannes; *Anm. d. Verf.*] dabei – viel mehr als bei Markus – nicht nur Menschensohn und Messias, sondern zugleich als solcher der wahre ‘König des Gottesvolkes Israel’ (Joh 1,49; 12,13; vgl. auch 11,52), d.h., der vom Vater in die Welt gesandte gottgleiche Sohn. Die Königsherrschaft Gottes und die Christi fallen bei ihm daher zusammen: Sie sind identisch (Joh 3,35; 18,36f.).”]

13. Cf. Jan-Heiner Tück, *Römisches Monopol? Der Streit um die Einheit der Kirche* (Theologie kontrovers; Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 2008).

14. Cf. Mark S. Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism: Redefining Christian Engagement with the Jewish People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2005): 151–79.

15. “Jesus himself—the Messiah of Israel and the individual embodiment of the Jewish people—is the fundamental spiritual bond linking the Church to the Jewish people”—Kinzer, *Searching Her own Mystery* (see note 7), 18. See also Rutishauser, “Katholische Glaubenssätze” (see note 9), 99–100—“The Jewish Messiah has become the bridge between Jews and gentiles, and so the New Testament Scriptures recognize Jesus in a dual role: On the one hand, he is the King of the Jews who brings the way of salvation of the Jews to fullness and to its goal (Matt 5:18–19; Passion narratives). . . . On the other hand, Jewish messianism, an end-time phenomenon in dialectic transition in the New Testament, becomes both the Christology of the original Church from the Gentiles and the starting point of a new covenant for the nations. Thus, Jesus Christ as the incarnation of the Jewish way of salvation, becomes universal salvation for all nations, through the mysterious transition from Jews to Gentiles, from death to resurrection. Jewish messianism mutates into the Christology of the Church. What appears from a Jewish perspective to be the end of time and the fulfillment of the Law, becomes from a Christian perspective the beginning and wellspring of a new covenant history for the nations in the Church.” [“Der jüdische Messias ist zur Brücke zwischen Juden und Heiden geworden, und so erkennen die neutestamentlichen Schriften Jesus in einer doppelten Funktion: Einerseits ist er der König der Juden, der den Heilsweg der Juden zur Fülle und zum Ziel bringt (Mt 5,18f.; Passionsgeschichten). . . . Andererseits wird der jüdische Messianismus, ein Endzeitphänomen, im Neuen Testament in einem dialektischen Umschwung zur Christologie der Urkirche aus dem Heidentum und zum Ausgangspunkt des neuen Bundes für die Völker. So wird Jesus Christus als Inkarnation des jüdischen Heilswegs durch den geheimnisvollen Übergang von Juden zu Heiden, von Tod zu Auferstehung zum universalen Heil für alle Völker. Der jüdische Messianismus mutiert zur Christologie der Kirche. Was aus jüdischer Perspektive als Ende der Zeit und Erfüllung des Gesetzes erscheint, wird aus christlicher Perspektive zum Anfang und Ursprung einer neuen Bundesgeschichte für die Völker in der Kirche.”] Also, Rudolf Pesch, *Gott ist gegenwärtig. Die Versammlung des Volkes Gottes in Synagoge und Kirche* (Augsburg: Sankt-Ulrich-Verlag, 2006), 96.

16. Cf. also Hanspeter Ernst, “Reich Gottes im rabbinischen Judentum. Gegenwärtig in Israel und zukünftig in der Welt,” *Bibel und Kirche* 62 (2007): 109–112.

17. Cf. Volker Gäckle, “Das Reich Gottes im Johannesevangelium,” in *Das Reich Gottes im Neuen Testament. Auslegungen – Anfragen – Alternativen*, ed. Volker Gäckle (BiblichTheologische Studien, 176; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018): 179–92.

18. Robert W. Jenson, “Towards a Christian Theology of Judaism,” in *Jews and Christians: People of God*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003): 1–13, at 13 (emphasis original). Cf. also Jürgen Moltmann, *The Coming of God: Christian Eschatology*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996): 198—“The common focus of Jewish and Christian hopes is the coming of the Messiah to his messianic kingdom. Only the Christ of the Parousia will save ‘all Israel’ (Rom 11.26). The acceptance of all Israel will be ‘life from the dead’ (Rom. 11.15f.). Consequently, Israel’s Messiah must be the risen One” (emphasis original).

19. Cf. Rutishauser, “Katholische Glaubenssätze” (see note 9), 100.

20. “Christusglaube ist konsequenter Gottesglaube.”—Söding, “Für das Volk” (see note 5), 102.

21. “In dem Maß, als die Menschen die Stimme des Hirten hören (10,3) oder, wie die Apokalypse sagt, ‘dem Lamm folgen, wohin immer es geht’ (14,4), verwirklicht sich Christi Königtum in den Herzen der Seinen und sind sie ‘in der Wahrheit.’”—De la Potterie, *Die Passion nach Johannes* (see note 2), 74–75. However, de la Potterie understands the gathering of the sheep by the shepherd Jesus as the withdrawal of the Church from the Synagogue. Here the consequence of a “structural supersessionism” becomes apparent (cf. R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (see note 11), 31–32), in the fact that Israel’s heritage is not adequately appreciated in the theological structure of the reflections.

22. “zusammengebonden in einer messianischen Weggemeinschaft mit den Juden”—Erich Zenger, “Das Erste Testament als Herausforderung christlicher Liturgie,” in *Leseordnung. Altes und Neues Testament in der Liturgie*, ed. Georg Steins (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997): 11–28, at 28. Christian Rutishauser describes the relationship between Judaism and Christianity as “a dual people of God with a dialogical existence” [“ein doppeltes Gottesvolk von einer dialogischen Existenz”]—“Katholische Glaubenssätze” (see note 9), 109.

23. Cf. Lustiger, *The Promise* (see note 10), 99–102, here 101—“the pagans must recognize in Jesus the grace given to Israel, because they share in that grace; and Israel must welcome the hope manifested by the wonders that God accomplishes among the pagans. Thus, each group bears witness to the other that it is an unearned gift that it has received. It is this mutual recognition, this freely given reciprocity that is the object of our hope.”

24. Cf. also Regina Wildgruber, “Sackgasse oder Spur messianischer Weggemeinschaft? Der Christkönigssonntag im Lesejahr B,” *Bibel und Liturgie* 82 (2009): 45–55. For the Feast of Christ the King, see: Christoph Joosten, *Das*

25. Cf. Maria Neubrand, “‘Ein Volk aus Nichtjuden’ (Apg 15,14). Die bleibende Erwählung Israels und die Erwählung aus den Völkern im lukanischen Doppelwerk,” in *Das Heil der Anderen. Problemfeld: “Judenmission,”* ed. Hubert Frankemölle and Josef Wohlmuth (Quaestiones Disputatae, 238; Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2010): 289–310, at 308–310, here 308: “The definitive establishment of the Davidic-messianic kingly rule belongs to the Jewish–Christian future hope. For although, according to the testimony of the New Testament, Jesus is validly confirmed as Davidic Messiah through his resurrection and exaltation and installed in his rulership (cf. Acts 2:29–36; Rom 1:3–4), until his return the ultimate establishment of the hoped-for messianic rule and with it the kingdom of God ‘to the ends of the earth’ is, nevertheless, still pending (cf. Acts 1:6; 3:21)” [“Die endgültige Errichtung der davidisch-messianischen Königsherrschaft gehört zur jüdisch-christlichen Zukunftshoffnung. Denn zwar ist nach dem neutestamentlichen Zeugnis Jesus durch seine Auferweckung und Erhöhung als davidischer Messias gültig bestätigt und in seine Herrschaft eingesetzt (vgl. Apg 2,29–36; Röm 1,3f.), doch steht bis zu seiner Wiederkehr die endgültige Errichtung der erhofften messianischen Herrschaft und mit ihr das Reich Gottes ‘bis an die Grenze der Erde’ noch aus (vgl. Apg 1,6; 3,21)”].

26. Cf. Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels” (see note 4), 60: “The one who denies every messianic claim of Jesus can just as little provide a historically satisfying explanation for the execution of Jesus as s/he can for the emergence of early Christology and the massive transfer of the Messiah title to the Risen One, a title that was so closely connected to his person that it quickly became a proper name and circa ten years later gave to Christians their name which is still valid today.” [“Wer jeden messianischen Anspruch Jesu leugnet, kann die Hinrichtung Jesu so wenig historisch befriedigend klären wie die Entstehung der frühen Christologie und die massive Übertragung des Messiasititels auf den Auferstandenen, ein Titel, der so sehr mit seiner Person verbunden wurde, daß er rasch zum Eigennamen wurde und den Christen ca. zehn Jahre später ihren bis heute gültigen Namen gab.”]