

SEARCH (/advanced-search/) LOGIN (/login/) **SUBSCRIBE** (/subscribe/)

()



Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen: The Resurrected Messiah, the Jewish People, and the Land of Promise by Mark S. Kinzer

By Akiva Cohen (<https://www.kesherjournal.com/author/akiva-cohen/>) | August 12, 2019

Reviewed by Akiva Cohen

Mark Kinzer has established himself as one of the most theologically articulate voices from within the community of Messianic Jewish scholars. His pioneering, provocative (in the best sense of the word), and sophisticated theological proposals have engaged a broad spectrum of issues, such as, Messianic Jewish identity, Oral Torah, eschatology,¹ ecclesiology, supersessionism,² and a dialogical engagement and respectful critique of Catholic dogma.³ Kinzer's most recent work, *Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen*, lays out his broad theological vision and understanding of the *euangelion*, the good news of Messiah Yeshua, based upon his reading of Luke and Acts.⁴

In his introduction, Kinzer notes how the essentially Jewish *ekkle_sia* had, within a century, become a largely gentile one and that the latter's reception of the *euangelion* transformed its message into one that no longer would have been "good news" to the Jewish people. Jerusalem's destruction was understood in a triumphalist manner that saw the role of the Jewish people as having ended in the flames of the city's conflagration. The future role of the Jewish people was downplayed and Jews seeking membership in the community of Yeshua's followers were required to shed their Jewish identity and praxis. Kinzer acknowledges that while the anti-Jewish rhetoric of the second-century is largely condemned in our time, few Christians connect Israel's election with their understanding of and proclamation of the gospel.

Having delineated this background, Kinzer sets out to present his vision of the *euangelion*, namely, the inextricable connection between Yeshua's death and resurrection and the eschatological destiny of the Jewish people. Furthermore—as indicated by the title of Kinzer's book—the prophetic outworking of Yeshua's death and resurrection is seen not only in corporate Israel's destiny but also in its connection to both the land of Israel and the city of Jerusalem. As Kinzer sets the table for his following discussion, he acknowledges the positive contribution of N.T. Wright, who has emphasized the connection between the story of Yeshua (the *euangelion*) and the story of Israel's eschatological reversal.⁵ Kinzer also notes, however, that while Wright's gospel may be good news for Israel, his understanding of Israel is a thoroughly deconstructed one, i.e., one that has shed its national identity and hence its intrinsic connection not only with the Jewish people but also with the land of Israel and the city of Jerusalem.

Chapter 1 sets out his basic thesis: “the *euangelion* of the Messiah, crucified and risen, is also the euangelion of Jerusalem, crucified and risen.” In this chapter Kinzer argues for a prophetic connection between the crucified and risen Messiah and the people of Israel and their inheritance of the land—the eschatological locus of Jewish liturgy and national hopes. Kinzer understands Messiah’s suffering and resurrection as imparting a redemptive character to Israel’s post-Destruction exile and suffering, namely, the promise of corporate renewal. He then proceeds to delineate the vision of Jerusalem in Luke-Acts and secondary Christian scholarship. Kinzer ends Chapter 1 by interacting with N.T. Wright’s highly influential return-from-exile theology. While Kinzer applauds Wright’s identification of the theme of an ongoing (Babylonian) exile in the New Testament, he takes issue with Wright’s understanding of Yeshua’s death and resurrection as ending Israel’s exile. Kinzer notes the ongoing theme of lament in Luke over Jerusalem’s destruction by Rome in 70 CE that will only end when “the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled” (Luke 21:24). Along with this verse, Kinzer notes the equally significant statement Yeshua makes after his resurrection in Acts 1:6–8, which does not question Israel’s national restoration, only its temporal locus (i.e., from the apostles perspective, now or later).⁶

In Chapter 2, Kinzer focuses on Jerusalem and the temple. Kinzer’s survey of the temple motif in Luke-Acts notes that Luke begins and ends in Jerusalem, and the narrative/geographical flow of Acts moves outward from Jerusalem and back to the holy city. Kinzer also notes the emphasis in Luke-Acts on the *tamid* (the continual daily offering) in conjunction with prayer as an accompaniment—not a substitute—to the daily offering. In addition, Acts portrays the post-Pentecost *ekkle_sia* as habitually praying in the temple precincts. Kinzer argues against the prevailing view that Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 represents an attack upon the institution of the temple, noting that Luke represents Stephen’s accusers—who claimed that he continually spoke “against this holy place” (Acts 6:13) as false witnesses. Kinzer presents a compelling interpretation of Stephen’s speech, not as a polemic against the temple, but rather as his affirmation of its divine origins in Mosaic law.

Chapter 3 focuses upon the perspective of Luke and Acts concerning the Jewish people. Kinzer understands the theology of Luke-Acts as preserving the covenantal status of “genealogical-Israel,” and its mission in this world in spite of its corporate rejection of Messiah. Kinzer argues against the common reading of Acts, in which Jewish opposition to Yeshua causes Paul to “go to the gentiles”—interpreted as Israel’s exclusion.

Kinzer discusses the significance of Luke 21:24 and Acts 1:6–7, and highlights their connection with Acts 3:19–21. The former passage, Luke 21:24, shares in common with Acts 3:19–21 the words until, and the times, and the latter passage, Acts 1:6–7, shares in common with Acts 3:19–21 the words/themes, times, and restore/restoration. Kinzer notes that the implication of these verses is that, “the return of Jesus will initiate the end of Israel’s [the Jewish people’s] exile,” and Messiah’s return, “will occur only after, and as a consequence of, the faithful response of his own flesh and blood to his words and person.”⁷ Armed with the aforementioned hermeneutical foundation, Kinzer proceeds to challenge key texts often appealed to by interpreters “who argue that Luke and Acts nullify Jewish covenantal identity for those outside the *ekkle_sia*.”⁸

In Chapter 4, Kinzer discusses the Jewish people and the Torah—their national constitution, making his case for his central thesis in this chapter: since Luke-Acts affirms the covenantal identity and eschatological hopes of the Jewish people, we should expect that they also affirm the Jewish way of life founded upon the Torah. Kinzer proceeds to expose the weakness of the traditional “ecclesial exegesis” of Luke-Acts on this topic. He first discusses the latter’s traditional reading of Acts 10–11, Peter’s dream of the heavenly voice commanding him to eat non-kosher animals. Ecclesial exegetes have generally understood this passage as an abrogation of Israel’s ceremonial food laws and a redefinition of Israel’s corporate covenantal identity. Acts 15 is the second text employed by ecclesial commentators as showing the demise of the “Jewish Church” and its replacement by a gentile, Torah-free-Church, independent of the Jewish people and their “out of date” laws. Kinzer emphasizes the need to read these two pivotal passages in their broader narrative context and through the lens of Luke’s infancy narrative. Kinzer understands Luke’s depiction of individual Jews in the infancy narrative as not simply a nostalgic link to the “Old Testament” but rather Luke’s intentional description of

Israel's central characteristic: a Torah observant people who embrace the hope for their redemption, and the redemption of both Jerusalem and the land of Israel.

Kinzer then sets out to demonstrate the coherence of Luke's presentation of the infancy narrative with the practice of both Yeshua and his disciples. He proceeds to note the programmatic nature of Luke 16:16—"The law and the prophets were in effect until John came; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and everyone tries to enter it by force." Kinzer notes that the NRSV translation of this verse interpolates the phrase "were in effect" into the simple Greek preposition, "until," thus interpreting the Torah (i.e., its ritual requirements) to be obsolete. That, however, can hardly be reconciled with the following verse (16:17), "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one stroke of a letter in the law to be dropped." Kinzer notes the exegetical calisthenics carried out by commentators in their attempts to reconcile the latter verse with the former. It is far easier, and hermeneutically sounder, to allow v. 17 to interpret v. 16. Yeshua's teaching on the kingdom (rule) of God is thus seen as supplementing the law and the prophets by re-centering them upon himself and its true intent.

Kinzer discusses Israel's obligation to observe the Sabbath as a central example of her national vocational calling. Yeshua's attitude towards healing on the Sabbath, as acknowledged by all the Gospels, constituted one of the main ways that his teaching was perceived to be controversial by his opponents. Kinzer notes the way that Luke—more than Mark or Matthew—emphasizes Yeshua's central activity as teaching, the synagogue as the locus of that activity, and the Sabbath as the characteristic time in which his teaching took place. Luke's Gospel, unlike Mark and Matthew, begins with two Sabbath scenes, the first of which emphasizes the release of the Jubilee year, itself based upon the Sabbath pattern. Kinzer ends this chapter by revisiting the two key texts (Peter's dream in Acts 10, and the Jerusalem Council's decision in Acts 15), mentioned at the outset of this chapter, that are often appealed to as putative evidence that the Torah's requirements are no longer binding for Jewish (and of course non-Jewish) disciples of Yeshua. Before undertaking his defense, however, he deals with several texts that implicitly express a dismissive attitude towards the Torah.

Kinzer's discussion of Peter's vision in Acts 10 notes that older commentators, such as F. F. Bruce, understood this vision as an abrogation of Israel's food laws, hearkening back to Mark's parenthetical statement of Yeshua's teaching in Mark 7:19b, ("Thus he declared all foods clean.")⁹ Peter recounts that after the Spirit had bidden him to go with Cornelius's (gentile) messengers, it dawned upon him that the clean animals in the vision represented Jews and the unclean animals represented the Gentiles. To "go" with Cornelius's friends, ultimately meant to enter into table-fellowship with them; the issue was not about food but about relationships. When in Jerusalem, his critics' issue focused upon his association with "uncircumcised men" (Acts 11:3).¹⁰ The heavenly voice that challenged Peter, and his subsequent explanation of the event, both indicate that God was dealing with Peter's attitude towards associating with Gentiles whom God had (now) declared "clean."

The second key text discussed by Kinzer is that of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1–29) and especially the council's official decree (15:19–21, 23–29) in response to the insistence of some zealous believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees that (male) gentile disciples should be required to be circumcised and (all Gentiles) should obey the Law of Moses. The council's response was that gentile disciples need to observe only four practices: that they "abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from fornication" (15:29b). Kinzer notes that the dominant Christian understanding of the council's decision was that gentile believers were free from the demands of the Torah and that only for the sake of Jewish scruples, gentile believers should accommodate their weak consciences. Kinzer notes the seminal role played by Jacob Jervell since the publication of his commentary on Luke in 1972.¹¹ Jervell argued that the four decrees of the council derived from Leviticus 17–18, which relate to the stranger who sojourns among the Israelites. Thus, the Council, rather than freeing the Gentiles from the Torah, bound them to it, as its injunctions pertain to Gentiles—regardless of any contact, or lack thereof with Jewish disciples. Kinzer further notes that when Paul arrives in Jerusalem in Acts 21 and is instructed by James (Jacob) to demonstrate his faithfulness to Torah, Luke's readers should not be surprised since Acts 21 simply

makes explicit what was implicit in Acts 15, namely, that if gentile disciples should observe the Torah, how much more should Jewish disciples.

In Chapter 5, Kinzer shifts from an exegetical analysis of the prior chapters' themes in Luke-Acts to his theological reflections of divine action in history based upon his prior exegesis. This chapter also discusses how the *ekkle_sia* of the second century severed the Lukan euangelion from the life of the Jewish people rooted in the land of Israel. Kinzer begins his reflections in this chapter by asking two foundational questions that cry out for answers in light of his prior chapters.

How should a disciple of Jesus assess the history of the Jewish people and its tradition, which developed in apparent opposition to the messianic claims of Jesus? And what are we to make of the history of the *ekkle_sia* and its tradition, which developed in apparent opposition to Jewish claims concerning the covenant, the land, and the messianic hope?¹²

Kinzer then mines Luke-Acts for the principles that should guide reflection upon the above questions with an emphasis upon the divine *Boule_* ("counsel," or "purpose"). Gamaliel's speech in Acts is seen as a foundational expression of Luke's view of divine action. Gamaliel states (in Acts 5:38b–39a), "if this plan (*boule_*) or this undertaking is of human origin, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them." Kinzer emphasizes a point he has made earlier, namely, that he understands Gamaliel's statement to be not only a vindication of the apostles but also of the Pharisees—whose authority increased after the Destruction. In the same manner his statement serves as a condemnation of the Sadducees, whose authority diminished with the destruction of their power base, that is, the temple.¹³ Kinzer notes the interest that the author of Luke-Acts has taken in the Pharisees—both inside and outside of the *ekkle_sia*, and their striking commonality with, and openness to, Yeshua and his apostles. Most prominent among the Pharisees described by Luke is Gamaliel the elder, whose grandson took such a prominent role in the post-Destruction reshaping of Jewish praxis, and set in motion a family dynasty of community leaders. Kinzer thus sees in Luke's post-70 setting a strong engagement by the author of Luke-Acts with both the Pauline and the Pharisaic traditions—each of which was growing in influence.

Kinzer then discusses his understanding of the "fractured *euangelion*" in the post-Lukan era, in which he sees the reception-history of Luke-Acts by the *ekkle_sia* as only partly successful. On the one hand, the anti-Pauline Marcionism was successfully resisted (the Hebrew Bible remained canonical), but on the other hand, the prophetic euangelion met a mixed reception. The earthly Jerusalem and the land of Israel were considered insignificant along with the enduring covenantal status of the Jewish people and their national constitution, the Torah. This de-Judaization of the euangelion resulted in a loss of the *ekkle_sia*'s expression of her Jewish heritage and a loss of a bilateral communion of Jews and Gentiles.¹⁴ Kinzer then makes a claim which has far-reaching implications: "[t]he very elements of the prophetic *euangelion* that the *ekkle_sia* had abandoned were preserved as central components of the Jewish worldview."¹⁵ Those components listed by Kinzer are: the Torah as Israel's national constitution embodying her eschatological hope, "the centrality and messianic significance of the land of Israel, Jerusalem, and the Temple Mount, and the irrevocable bond between the God of Israel, the Messiah of Israel, and the genealogical descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."¹⁶ Kinzer understands the fractured people of God as a result of each side rejecting what the other preserved; the post-Destruction gentile *ekkle_sia* preserved the apostolic witness to Yeshua and the Jewish people preserved their post-70 core components listed above. Kinzer then discusses the implications of God's divine counsel applied to modern Jewish history.

In Chapter 6 Kinzer applies his theological reflections concerning the relationship of the Lukan euangelion to the modern phenomena of Zionism and the Messianic Jewish movement. Kinzer begins by exploring the relationship between Zionism and Jewish tradition and then offers his critique of the former. I will not summarize Kinzer's historical overview of religious, cultural, and political Zionism but rather focus upon his response to that history which is readily available elsewhere.¹⁷ Kinzer's response takes up his central premise, the prophetic euangelion—which envisions an eschatological restoration of the Jewish people to the land of Israel and seeks to weigh the significance of the

modern restoration of the Jewish people to the land. He asks if this restoration could be the outworking of the divine *boule_ē* in history. Whereas traditional Jewish eschatological hopes envisioned the arrival of the Messiah before Israel's restoration to the land, our historical vantage point (as disciples of Yeshua) requires us to assess the opposite order. Kinzer takes up the common objection that the modern State of Israel could not be fulfilled prophecy because the regathered nation has not returned in repentance and (renewed) faith in God. Those who deny the possibility that the modern State fulfills some measure of prophetic fulfillment are quick to note its basically secular character, and, like other nations, her acts of injustice. Kinzer notes that there are two strands of prophetic teaching concerning Israel's return, the Deuteronomic strand, which requires repentance before restoration, and the strand reflected in Ezekiel's (chapter 36) emphasis upon God's unilateral act of restoration for his name's sake.¹⁸ Kinzer then takes up a series of five questions pertaining to Zionism.

He begins his list of rhetorical questions by asking:

1) Whether or not the modern State signals the beginning of the redeemed order of the world. He answers in the affirmative but cautions that when the regathered self-governing-national-presence is too closely aligned with the political entity, one should see discontinuity with the prophetic euangelion.¹⁹

2) Whether the modern state needs to retain sovereignty over the land it currently controls. Since he understands the modern state to be, at most, a preliminary sign of the messianic kingdom, he does not believe that territorial concessions—obviously made with prudence concerning security concerns—would be a hindrance to the arrival of eschatological fulfillment, which transcends the current political order.

3) Whether the same applies to Israel's sovereign control over a unified Jerusalem. Based upon his prior comments that emphasize the provisional nature of the Jewish national presence in the land, while acknowledging the practical need for the State and Jewish life to continue to thrive in the city, Kinzer commends Martin Buber's emphasis upon ethical Zionism. For Kinzer, Buber's Zionism reflects a truer expression of the euangelion than inflexible national visions of sovereignty.

4) Kinzer then turns his theological telescope on the State of Israel's control over, and claim to ownership of the Temple Mount. He begins by recalling that the Lukan writings evince a reverence for the Temple Mount regardless of whether or not the temple stands upon it. Kinzer concludes that disciples of Yeshua should not advocate for its rebuilding before Messiah's return, nor advocate against its rebuilding in the event that it will be rebuilt without violating the rights of Muslims around the world.

5) Finally, Kinzer asks if the prophetic euangelion requires disciples of Yeshua to always support the State of Israel's policies and actions. Kinzer, not surprisingly, answers this question in the negative—he does not see unqualified support of the State as something imposed by the prophetic euangelion. He concludes his brief assessment by stating his conviction that the success of the Zionist movement, that is, the restoration of the Jewish people to their national homeland, “was providentially ordained by the divine *boule_ē*.”²⁰

Kinzer then turns to his theological appraisal of Messianic Judaism, which he understands to be, like Israel's connection to the land, a logical outworking of Israel's inextricable connection to Torah. His thesis is that Zionism and Messianic Judaism are linked by God's providential design, which leads him to offer a brief overview of their connection. Beginning in the seventeenth century, some Christians began to embrace a vision of a return of Jews to their ancestral homeland before the return of the Messiah. Jewish views of a return to the land began in earnest with the return to the land of disciples of the Vilna Gaon at the turn of the nineteenth century. During the same period, Jewish disciples of Yeshua began to form associations while remaining in their ecclesial communities. The pogroms of the late nineteenth century resulted in “the First Aliyah,” and not long afterward Theodor Herzl wrote *The Jewish State*, and held the First Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland. Kinzer acknowledges that neither Zionism nor Messianic Judaism represents the “end of the exile” for the Jewish people or the *ekkle_sia*, but he embraces the hope that the twenty-first century may yet see the

healing of the fractured people of God.²¹

In Chapter 7, the final chapter, Kinzer brings together the multifaceted implications of the restored prophetic euangelion. He begins by exploring the impact of this vision upon the euangelion and ecclesial teaching related to the Jewish people and the land. Kinzer briefly reviews the historical response of the gentile church towards the land and Jerusalem, a response which he sees as a platonic spiritualization. Jerusalem's holiness was disconnected from the Jewish people and their future restoration. The developments just mentioned that began in the seventeenth-century, however, gained momentum that culminated in nineteenth-century dispensationalist theology, which affirmed Israel's eventual restoration but gave no place to her present priestly vocation. Kinzer then notes the post-Shoah developments in Christian theology, especially those of the Catholic Church since the ground-breaking publication of *Nostra Aetate* in 1965. He notes the positive influence that has continued in the Catholic Church, but also the reticence of the Church's statements connecting the Jewish people with the land.

Kinzer completes chapter 7 with a summary of his previous chapters, focusing upon the overall coherence of their themes from the perspective of the canon, soteriology, ethics and theo-politics, and missiology. Kinzer understands the shape of the canon to be partly a response to the de-Judaized Marcionite canon. He notes the way that Yeshua "recapitulates the story of Israel, and only thereby recapitulates the human story."²² He then discusses how the prophetic euangelion speaks of Messiah's death, connecting his Israel-Christology with that of Jewish martyr theology—Yeshua's martyrdom differs from Israel's in degree but not in kind.

It is important not to misconstrue Kinzer on this pivotal point, which he draws and adapts from N.T. Wright's Israel-Christology—that Yeshua's atoning martyrdom delivers Israel from her spiritual exile. Kinzer is not proposing that Yeshua is the greatest of Israel's martyrs, but rather, as depicted in Hebrews 11:1–12:2, "the quintessential martyr in whom and through whom all other martyrs offer their witness to God."²³ Kinzer further sees in both Yeshua's death and Israel's suffering in 70 CE their respective proleptic suffering of the final tribulation.

Kinzer then summarizes the ethical and theo-political aspects of the prophetic euangelion, which he sees as inseparable from Israel's national restoration. At the same time, he reminds his readers that he distinguishes between Zionism as a national, moral, and spiritual movement and the modern State of Israel as the former's "flawed political instrument."²⁴ For the former, however, Kinzer argues there are substantial theological implications, especially with regards to land and territorial governance. Kinzer notes the near absence in recent scholarship of this material, territorial aspect of the euangelion. A landless euangelion, Kinzer argues, is no more tenable than a docetic, i.e. an immaterial, Messiah. The prophetic euangelion embodies both the message and ethics of the kingdom and the territorial realm of Israel's national restoration.

Finally, Kinzer discusses the missiological implications of the euangelion and asks the question of whether or not disciples of Yeshua should seek to evangelize their Jewish neighbors—emphasizing that ecclesial Jews have "an essential role to play as Jews."²⁵ Kinzer recounts his understanding of God's providence in allowing the ekkle_sia to fracture, and by doing so, providing a means by which the Jewish community preserved the essential elements of the prophetic euangelion abandoned by the gentile ekkle_sia. Rabbinic tradition and Zionism, Kinzer further argues, should also be viewed as expressions of God's providential design.

Returning to his rhetorical question concerning the missiological implications of the prophetic euangelion for the Jewish people, Kinzer refers to the recent work of Stuart Dauermann.²⁶ Kinzer concludes his presentation of the prophetic euangelion of *Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen* by noting its "proleptic and prophetic character" and hence its connection to Israel (the people and land) and Jerusalem-centered eschatology.²⁷ Finally, Kinzer notes the potential of the prophetic euangelion to heal both the ancient and modern schisms of the ekkle_sia—with Jerusalem as the locus of both her natural-born sons and daughters and those joined to them by faith in Israel's crucified and risen Messiah.

Kinzer has made an important and theologically rich contribution to recent post-supersessionist approaches to the New Testament. His reading of Luke-Acts is compelling. He draws from the best of recent scholarship on Luke-Acts—especially the seminal work of N.T. Wright, who reads the New Testament in terms of Israel’s return from exile as fulfilled in Yeshua’s life, death, and resurrection, and in the *ekkle_sia*. But, whereas Wright no longer attributes significance to genealogical Israel, Kinzer’s reading of Luke-Acts affirms the proleptic and prophetic significance of Yeshua’s death and resurrection for both genealogical Israel and Jerusalem.

Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen is an important work for Jewish followers of Yeshua, affirming their genealogical connection with corporeal Israel, their material connection with the land of Israel and Jerusalem, and their unity with the *ekkle_sia* of the nations. The implications of the prophetic euangelion affirm and enjoin Jewish disciples of Yeshua to express their devotion to God within the framework of a Torah-faithful life that embraces the return of the Jewish people to the land of Israel as an expression of the divine *boule_*.

Kinzer’s book is also an important theological statement for the *ekkle_sia* of the Gentiles, who can only come to their fullness when the fractured euangelion is restored to its fullness. Kinzer’s refined exegesis and exposition of Luke-Acts and his understanding of Luke’s theology vis-à-vis the return of the Jewish people to both Yeshua and the land deserves a wide readership. His nuanced understanding of Luke’s presentation of the prophetic euangelion and the implications of the restored Jewish presence—including Messianic Jews—in the land merits thoughtful reflection and response from Christian scholars. Kinzer has demonstrated that we are not limited to a false binary of eschatological paradigms wedded to right-wing political Zionism, or supersessionist interpretations that erase the identity or theological relevance of both genealogical Israel and historical Jerusalem. Kinzer should be commended for making theological space for readers of Luke-Acts to test his exegesis and theological reflections. No doubt, some will arrive at less enthusiastic appreciations for his overarching thesis and his application of the latter to tradition, soteriology, and missiology. Nonetheless, I believe that all who make the effort to read, understand, and apply his vision of a restored prophetic euangelion will be challenged, rewarded, and blessed to participate in the healing and fullness of the fractured people of God.

1 Mark S. Kinzer, *Israel’s Messiah and the People of God: A Vision for Messianic Jewish Covenant Fidelity*, Jennifer M. Rosner, ed., (Eugene: Cascade, 2011).

2 Mark S. Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism: Redefining Christian Engagement with the Jewish People* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005).

3 Mark S. Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish People, and the Identity of the Church* (Eugene: Cascade, 2015)

4 Mark S. Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen: The Resurrected Messiah, the Jewish People, and the Land of Promise* (Eugene: Cascade, 2018). See also Mark S. Kinzer, “The *Besorah*, Jerusalem, and the Jewish People” in *Kesher* 34.

5 Kinzer makes reference to N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996); idem, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (London: SPCK, 2003).

6 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 46.

7 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 136.

8 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 137.

9 This traditional interpretation of Mark’s aside, has been challenged in recent scholarship.

10 Although it should be noted the accusation includes “eating with them,” which, presumably, Peter’s opponents would have suspected meant eating non-kosher food, (which relates to the *manner* of food preparation and its having not *being offered up to idols*—even if not explicitly unkosher, e.g. pork, etc.). This, however, is mitigated by

another point noted by Kinzer, namely, that Cornelius, as a Gentile god-fearer, would mostly likely have made the effort to accommodate Peter by not serving him food forbidden by the Torah.

- 11 Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972). Kinzer acknowledges the seminal role of Jervell's writings that challenged traditional readings of Luke-Acts that failed to properly interpret his theology within its Jewish cultural and scriptural context.
- 12 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 226.
- 13 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 226. See Kinzer's discussion and citation of these verses on pp. 230–31.
- 14 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 236, and n. 12, where Kinzer notes his articulation of a bilateral ekkle_sia in his *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 181–212.
- 15 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 236.
- 16 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 236.
- 17 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 240–49.
- 18 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 254. Kinzer also refers here Isaiah's similar eschatology in chapters 40–66.
- 19 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 255–57, which includes Kinzer's more nuanced articulation of this distinction and his praise of Martin Buber's vision for a "Zion" that served as a supporting structure for the spirit of the nation.
- 20 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 251–52.
- 21 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 270.
- 22 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 278, noting e.g., Yeshua's wilderness obedience during his temptation and his citation of verses from the book of Deuteronomy, clearly echoing Israel's narrative, but unlike Israel in his perfect obedience.
- 23 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 280, and Kinzer's references (nn. 13–15) to the work of N.T. Wright, and the latter's affirmation of Albert Schweitzer's view Yeshua's self-understanding—one in which he takes upon himself the messianic woes about to fall upon Israel.
- 24 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 284.
- 25 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 287, emphasis original.
- 26 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 288, for Kinzer's reference to Stuart Dauermann, *Converging Destinies: Jews, Christians, and the Mission of God* (Eugene: Cascade, 2017).
- 27 Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified*, 291.

About Kesher

Kesher is a journal of Messianic Judaism, published by the **Messianic Jewish Theological Institute** (<https://mjti.org>). Its purpose is to provide a forum for scholars, professionals and laity to address issues that impact contemporary Messianic Judaism.


Read More... (/contact/)


Subscriptions

- [Subscribe Now \(/subscribe/\)](#)
- [Account Login \(/login/\)](#)
- [Keshet Issues \(/past-issues/\)](#)
- [Advanced Search \(/advanced-search/\)](#)
- [Privacy Policy \(/contact/\)](#)
- [Terms & Conditions \(/contact/\)](#)

Contact

Question or comment? Write to us or use our online Contact Form link below.

Kesher
 P.O. Box 928004
San Diego, CA 92192

 [\(/contact/\)](#) **CONTACT FORM**
(/CONTACT/)

© 2019 Kesher Journal. All Rights Reserved. Site by LUNDMARK newmedia