

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A commentary devoted to the exposition of a single chapter of the New Testament is an unusual phenomenon. But Mark 13 is an unusual chapter. It has proved to be the most controverted passage in the Gospels. Owing to the complexity of its problems, critical works and commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels are unable to do more than provide a cursory treatment of them.

The present work has been undertaken at the repeated suggestion of readers of Dr. Beasley-Murray's compendious work, *Jesus and the Future*, on the history of criticism of Mark 13 and its theology. It was felt desirable to have a full-scale commentary on the chapter in the light of the many-sided contributions to its understanding made during the last century.

In order to orientate the reader to the problems involved, an introduction is supplied, giving a brief conspectus of attitudes adopted to the Discourse and the author's conclusions concerning them. A detailed exposition of the Greek text of Mark 13 follows. An endeavour is made to state fairly the problems of the text as they arise and to enable the reader to reach just conclusions in respect to them.

While the exposition is written with the historical situation in mind, the abiding significance of the Discourse for the Church of all ages becomes apparent.

A COMMENTARY ON
MARK THIRTEEN

A COMMENTARY
ON MARK THIRTEEN

BY

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY

M.A., M.Th., Ph.D.

LONDON

MACMILLAN & CO LTD

NEW YORK · ST MARTIN'S PRESS

1957

*This book is copyright in all countries which
are signatories to the Berne Convention*

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY LIMITED
London Bombay Calcutta Madras Melbourne

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED
Toronto

ST MARTIN'S PRESS INC
New York

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

IT was with no little hesitation that I undertook the writing of this commentary. Having issued a work devoted to the criticism and theology of Mark 13,¹ I felt that I had adequately expressed myself concerning that section of the Gospels. Several senior colleagues, however, intimated to me their desire to see an exposition of the Eschatological Discourse based on the research embodied in my larger book. That the work was undertaken at all, and that it has seen the light of day, is due entirely to the persuasive encouragement of the Rev. Professor G. D. Kilpatrick of Oxford. He has been kind enough to read the MS. and to make numerous suggestions, especially in regard to the text of the Discourse, but also on matters of interpretation. Under no circumstances should he be identified with the viewpoint maintained in the following pages, nor be blamed for the demerits they may reveal; his help has been an act of disinterested Christian charity. I have to thank also the Rev. Professor C. F. D. Moule of Cambridge for his kindness in reading the MS. and for helpful observations made in regard to it. My colleague Dr. Claus Meister of Rüslikon, Zürich, was good enough to read the proofs for me and thereby to spare the reader needless pain by eliminating errors that had eluded me in the Greek text. The Rev. J. J. Brown, B.D., of Erith, Kent, has again placed me in his debt by giving of his time to prepare indices to the book. To these friends I express my gratitude.

I was at first inclined to issue the commentary without an introduction, since there appeared to be no need to rewrite my earlier book. On consideration of the fact that I had provided in that work no summary of the critical issues raised by the Discourse, it seemed worth while to supply a brief statement of them here and to indicate the positions I had reached in respect to them. For detailed discussion on such matters, reference should be made to that volume. In this way it is hoped that the two works will serve to supplement one another, although this book is an independent work.

¹ *Jesus and the Future, an Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13, with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory*, Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London 1954.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. THE AUTHENTICITY OF MARK THIRTEEN	I
2. A COMMENTARY ON ST. MARK'S GOSPEL, CHAPTER THIRTEEN	19
DETACHED NOTE ON THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION OF THE <i>ΒΛΕΨΥΓΜΑ ΕΡΗΜΩΣΕΩΣ</i> .	59
INDICES	119

THE AUTHENTICITY OF MARK THIRTEEN

THE criticism of Mark 13 has had a long history, the decisive turn to which was provided by Timothy Colani. He gathered up earlier discussions and laid down lines for subsequent criticism for generations to come.¹ It will be most convenient to consider first his treatment of the Discourse, then the evidence adduced by later writers in support of his contentions, and lastly considerations which appear to justify a more positive approach to the chapter.

Colani believed the bulk of Ch. 13 to be unauthentic on the following grounds.

(i) The Discourse does not answer the question of the disciples as to the time of the ruin of the temple (v. 4). A comparison of the three Synoptic Gospels shows that the limits of parallelism extend to v. 32. This saying supplies an excellent answer to the question addressed to Jesus. The intervening passage (5-31) accordingly is an interpolation.

(ii) The interpolated Discourse presents the classic threefold division of Jewish apocalyptic and has even preserved the very terms, *αἱ ὠδῖνες* v. 8, *ἡ θλίψις* vv. 19, 24, *τὸ τέλος* vv. 7, 13. 'We have here a very complete summary of the apocalyptic views spread among the Jewish Christians of the first century, such as we know them by John's book.'²

(iii) The clause in v. 14, 'Let the reader reflect,' refers to the contents of the Discourse, not to the book of Daniel, of which no mention has been made. The Discourse therefore was never spoken. It was written from the first.

(iv) The predictions in vv. 6-13 reflect actual historical events, while that which is prophesied concerning the 'abomination of desolation', with its accompanying terrors, never took place. It would seem that we have a *vaticinium ex eventu* as far as v. 13 and genuine prophecy from v. 14 onwards. The further suggestion lies to hand that the Discourse emanated from a time when the fall of

¹ *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son Temps*, 1864.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

Jerusalem appeared imminent, perhaps immediately prior to the siege of the city.

(v) Most fundamental of all, the outlook of the Discourse reflects that of the Jewish Christian Church, not that of the historical Jesus. "To demonstrate the unauthenticity of this fragment, it could suffice to establish that it contains the eschatology of the Jewish Christians, since in any case . . . Jesus could not have shared their opinions."¹ In Colani's estimate Jesus rejected the eschatological view of his Jewish contemporaries and replaced it by one of organic development of the Kingdom. The notion of a parousia with power both contradicts this new note in his teaching and is incompatible with his true humanity.² Moreover the discourse attributes to Jesus a near-expectation of the End, an intolerable idea to the Christian Church. This whole complex of thought has nothing in common with the historical Jesus. The document embodying it is a late compilation and is probably to be identified with the oracle, mentioned by Eusebius, bidding the Jerusalem Christians to flee from the doomed city.

Carl Weizsäcker immediately adopted Colani's hypothesis and developed it in a significant manner.³ Colani had been content to divide the Discourse into three scenes, 5-8 *αἱ ὠδῖνες*, 9-13 *ἡ θλίψις*, 14-31 *τὸ τέλος*. Weizsäcker recognised that the presence of authentic elements in the chapter (notably the parable of the fig tree, 28 f.) raised the problem of the limits of the apocalyptic source used by the compiler; he solved it by stressing the threefold division mentioned by his predecessor: the three scenes originally consisted of 7-8, 14-20, 24-27; to these were added an introduction concerning false prophets (6), repeated between the second and third groups (21-23), a parabolic epilogue (33-37) and warnings concerning persecution which lasts till the Gospel is taken to the nations (9-13). The further suggestion that this 'Little Apocalypse' was found in the Book of Enoch (on the ground that v. 20 and Ep. Barnabas 4.3 use the same source) need not detain us, since it was manifestly an erroneous speculation.

Of considerations not touched on by Colani, the following are paramount.

(vi) The Little Apocalypse was seen by Wendt to be concerned with wars and natural calamities; its watchword is flight, its assurance that of divine preservation from the worst (God 'shortens'

¹ Op. cit., p. 205.

² Op. cit., p. 251.

³ *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, 1864, pp. 121 ff.

the times); the authentic sayings, believed to be an independent discourse, deal with trials occasioned by faith in Jesus, their watchword is endurance, their assurance that of divine aid and final salvation though death be suffered. Whereas the apocalypse is tied to the first century and has little value for today, the genuine discourse is truly religious and has abiding worth.¹

(vii) Jesus, in the estimate of some scholars, saw no period between his death and resurrection on the one hand and parousia on the other; the Discourse accordingly cannot be authentic, since it is set in the interval between these two moments of redemption. This is the conviction of Albert Schweitzer and his followers;² it was tentatively set forth by C. H. Dodd,³ and by R. H. Lightfoot,⁴ but subsequently abandoned by both; it has been more lately espoused by C. K. Barrett⁵ and by J. Jeremias.⁶

(viii) The setting of the Discourse is believed to betray its artificiality. 'The fiction of secret information corresponds to the apocalyptic style,' said Hölscher.⁷ C. H. Dodd agreed.⁸ K. L. Schmidt⁹ and Lohmeyer¹⁰ thought that the representation of Jesus seated on a mountain is intended as a purely symbolic feature.

(ix) The language of the Discourse is deemed to reflect a dependence on the LXX. This creates a presumption that it was originally written in Greek (so V. H. Stanton, with hesitation).¹¹ T. F. Glasson, approving, urged that such a 'patchwork of Old Testament testimonies' as is found in 24-27 can hardly be attributed to Jesus.¹²

Of these nine objections to the Discourse, those listed as (iv) and (v) have received most attention in recent times. In particular, the conviction has become widespread that the Abomination prophecy mirrors either contemporary events or contemporary fears arising out of concrete happenings. Above all, attention has centred on the fifth point. Weizsäcker had already affirmed that our Lord's teaching as to his ignorance of the time and as to the

¹ *Lehré Jesu*, pp. 15-21.

² *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 387 n. 1.

³ *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 103.

⁴ *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, pp. 63 f.

⁵ *Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition*, pp. 154 ff.

⁶ *Parables of Jesus*, pp. 32 f., 44.

⁷ *Theologische Blätter*, July 1933, p. 193.

⁸ *Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, p. 61.

⁹ *Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 290.

¹⁰ *Evangelium d. Markus*, p. 268.

¹¹ *Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. II, p. 120.

¹² *Second Advent*, p. 187. So also A. M. Hunter, *St. Mark*, p. 125.

suddenness of his coming shows that 'He gave no apocalypse of the history of the future.'¹ In the eyes of a number of exegetes this has become the decisive issue: Jesus cannot have taught at one and the same time that the Kingdom comes 'without observation' (Lk. 17.21) and that it will be heralded by a succession of signs. The picture of his eschatological instruction in Q is characterised by restraint and sobriety, but Mk. 13 illustrates that 'restless reckoning of the future seen in contemporary Judaism'.²

On each of these matters there is something to be said from a different point of view. We will consider them in the order of their mention.

(i) The solemn asseveration of v. 32 is hardly suitable as a reply to the question, 'When will the temple fall?' In such a context of thought, language like this is not characteristic of Jesus and comes close to transgressing his own injunction, 'Let your word be simply "Yes" or "No"; anything more than this comes from the evil one' (Mt. 5.37). The situation is different if the parousia and Kingdom are in view and our Lord is endeavouring to deter the disciples from speculating on the date of his appearing. Moreover the discourse does answer the disciples' question: its first word βλέπετε is an answer, for they need to be on guard against spurious announcements of the End; all that follows is an answer, for the destruction of the temple is viewed as falling within the context of the judgments of the End. On the interpretation of the βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως adopted in the commentary, v. 14 constitutes a specific sign in relation to the ruin of the temple, though not of the End itself.³

(ii) The threefold division of the chapter into αἱ ὠδῖνες, ἡ θλίψις, τὸ τέλος is plausible, but the conclusion to draw from this is not clear. The young Holtzmann had already suggested that the chapter conveniently divides into ὠδῖνες 5-13, θλίψις 14-23, τέλος 24-27.⁴ Colani, as we have seen, modified this to read ὠδῖνες 5-8, θλίψις 9-13, τέλος 14-27. But this is unsatisfactory, for if it be a question of terms, 14-20 as surely deal with θλίψις as 9-13, while 24 ff. separates itself from that which precedes it by the remark that the parousia occurs μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην. Further, 5-6 relate

¹ Op. cit., p. 552.

² Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, p. 170, echoing Weiffenbach, *Wiederkehrungs-gedanke Jesu*, p. 175.

³ See the comment on v. 14. For the relation between the Fall of Jerusalem and the End of the Age, see *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 199-205.

⁴ *Die synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*, 1863, pp. 95, 235 ff.

to similar phenomena to 21-23 and can hardly be placed in a wholly different group. Thus, in one respect or another, each of the three divisions is incongruous with the text.

Weizsäcker sought to avoid these difficulties by restricting the apocalypse to passages which certainly relate to the three themes, viz. 7-8, 14-20, 24-27. This savours a little of cutting the cloth according to pattern and then showing surprise that the suit fits so well. Even so, all is not well. Taking the last first, the term *τέλος* does not occur in the section to which it belongs, but is found in 7. It is also found, however, in 13, which Weizsäcker recognised as an authentic utterance of Jesus; *τέλος* then is not a specifically Jewish apocalyptic term. And what does *ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος* do but endure *θλίψις* till the parousia brings the *τέλος*? The *ὑπομένειν* here, of course, has reference to enduring suffering for the sake of the Gospel, but the idea of *θλίψις* as such and a *τέλος* for redemption is unmistakable. Why it should be thought that either term is suspicious on the lips of Jesus it is not easy to see, for *θλίψις* = the very common *תָּוֶבֶן* and *τέλος* = *תָּוֶן*. Inasmuch as 14-20 is related to the distress of Jerusalem, and so to the prediction of v. 2, and the distress must of necessity *precede* the End of the age, there is nothing specifically pertaining to Jewish apocalyptic, as distinct from the authentic eschatology of Jesus, in the mention of these two subjects and terms here and in their present order.

In regard to 7-8, I forbear to press the consideration that the expression *ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων* may be a gloss, disturbing the poetic structure of the passage (so Lohmeyer; I think he may well be right). The items mentioned fall wholly within the prophetic tradition and could not of themselves give rise to the hypothesis of an independent apocalypse. In Jewish apocalyptic writings the *ὠδίνες* are not separated in time from the *θλίψις* suffered by the people of God, but both are coincident; here the former are regarded as characteristic of the times and are not regarded as an immediate sign of the End (*οὕπω τὸ τέλος*, v. 7).

The division of three is itself uncertain, as is manifest as soon as Weizsäcker's analysis is challenged. Wendling set the fashion for a number of critics by defining the apocalypse as 7-8, 9a, 12, 13b-20a, 24-27, 30; this involves a fourfold division, since 9a and 12 do not fit into the category of 7-8 or of 13b ff.¹ Hölscher adopted a similar analysis (7-8, 12, 14-20, 24-27); he abandoned the division on the basis of apocalyptic terms and propounded

¹ *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums*, pp. 155 ff.

another, employing the categories of immediate past, immediate present and immediate future, said to be common in current apocalypses.¹ Can we be sure, however, that 7 ff. relate to an immediate *past*? This assumption depends on equating the apocalypse with those of the contemporary Jewish pattern, which is the point to be proved. The section entitled 'immediate present', 14-20, in reality refers to something expected to materialise in the immediate future; but this is distinguished from the section headed 'immediate future', 24-27. A nomenclature that distinguishes an immediate present=immediate future from an immediate future would never have been proposed were it not dictated by the desire to fit the discourse into the framework of Jewish apocalyptic. Neither is it certain that the climax of the document, 24-27, is anticipated to occur in the *immediate* future!

On the whole it would appear that this attempt, begun in a demonstrably mistaken fashion by Colani and continued by dubious means since, ought not to be offered as serious proof for substantiating a serious hypothesis in relation to the Gospel tradition.

(iii) The clause in 14 δ ἀναγνώσκων νοείτω is generally regarded as a comment from the pen of the evangelist, or of the writer of the source used by him, drawing attention to the importance of what is here said and bidding the reader to be clear about its reference. Loisy objected that this is 'an artificial and mechanical conjecture'.² I do not see why he should so regard it. We have adequate precedent, if such were needed, in Mk. 7.19, where almost every exegete recognises that the clause καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα is an insertion of the evangelist; the preceding words of the Lord he rightly perceived to be of significance to his Gentile readers and he drew the inference lest the latter should miss it. The clause in 13.14 is less explicit but it is inserted in a similar spirit. Loisy added the observation, 'As we have other reasons to admit that this apocalyptic description is not originally a discourse of Jesus, it is more natural to attribute it to the *first* redaction.' If that is a reasonable deduction, and I would not contest it, we are equally entitled to affirm, 'As we have other reasons to admit that this apocalyptic description is originally a discourse of Jesus, it is more natural to attribute it to a *later* redaction.' That is to say, no inference as to the origin of the discourse can be drawn from this clause.

¹ Op. cit., pp. 196-197.

² *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, vol. I, p. 421.

(iv) The presence of *vaticinia ex eventu* in the Discourse can be neither proved nor disproved. Ultimately the question depends on one's attitude to the phenomena of prediction generally in the Biblical revelation and in the teaching of Jesus in particular, but on a lower level there is no doubt that the difficulty has been exaggerated through failure to take into account the influence of the Old Testament upon the descriptions of Mk. 13. With regard to the former aspect, B. W. Bacon urged that the abstract possibility of Jesus foreseeing events of the future should not enter into consideration; the ordinary rules for predictive utterance and transmission should be followed in the Gospels without partiality, as in other apocalyptic documents.¹ On such a basis a good deal of the chapter falls under suspicion. Indeed, that is *meiosis*, for not much of it can be shown to be unrelated to first century events. The prophecy of 1-2 must go; 5-6 must go, 7-8 and 9-13. If 14 ff. relate to the catastrophe of Judaism suffered under the Romans, most of that section is suspect (note especially the parallel between the language of 19 and that employed by Josephus concerning the fall of Jerusalem; see the commentary *ad loc.*). 21-23, being parallel to 5-6 and capable of referring to Messianic pretenders in the broad sense, similarly come under the axe. Only 24-27 can be left, since manifestly the *parousia* has not yet happened. Alternatively, the suggestion might be preferred that words of Jesus have been re-written in the light of events that had lately occurred; in that case the attempt to recover the authentic originals becomes a matter of pure speculation, and we are not in a much better situation.

Over against this conclusion one may ask whether, even on the basis of scientific criticism, it is necessary to reduce Jesus to the stature of the average man. Is He to be granted no insight into the spiritual conditions of his people, and whither they were drifting? There is excellent reason for accepting the evidence in the Gospels that Jesus spoke of a judgment to fall on Israel and its city and temple (see the commentary on v. 2); accordingly, no *a priori* objection can be raised against 1-2 and 14 ff. The anticipations recorded in 7-8 need no contemporary events for their inspiration, since the occurrence of wars, famines and the like is a standing part of prophetic and apocalyptic expectation.² The section 9-13

¹ *The Gospel of Mark, its Composition and Date*, pp. 69 ff.

² This was urged as long ago as Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, vol. 3, pp. 103 ff., citing in agreement Paulus, Fritsche, De Wette. So also Eduard Meyer: 'The preliminary signs and the catastrophe are described entirely with the familiar features of

similarly requires no further presupposition than a conviction on the part of Jesus that a period of time would elapse after his departure from the world and before the End, since evangelistic activity on the part of disciples could expect no warmer reaction from the religious and civil authorities than that called forth by the work of their Master.

Even on this minimum view of Jesus, therefore, the contention that considerable tracts of Mk. 13 consist of *vaticinia ex eventu* is seen to be dubious. If to the considerations already adduced a respect for the testimony of the Gospels to Jesus be added, its likelihood shrinks to negligibility.¹

(v) The assertion that Mk. 13 represents Jewish-Christian eschatology and that Jesus could not have assented to it is the fruit of a radical criticism of the Gospels and no little misunderstanding of what they actually teach. Colani eradicated all messianism and futurist eschatology from the authentic teaching of Jesus as alien to his mind. This position would be admitted by few scholars of repute today but an adequate discussion of it cannot be undertaken here.² There can be little doubt that Colani, writing in the mid-nineteenth century, was too much dominated by the new views of evolution and progress and still more by the contemporary struggle with the agnostics, who found potent ammunition in the eschatology of the Gospels. He stated that the attribution to Jesus of the parousia belief would make him 'a humble and sweet precursor of a violent and terrible Messiah'; it would imply that 'in dying he hoped that God would exterminate quickly his enemies in a supreme combat and that He would establish him as king of a vast empire of which Jerusalem would be the capital'. 'Will one

Judaism, drawn from Ezekiel and Daniel and the eschatological insertions in Isaiah. There is no hint of current events (as the destruction of Jerusalem) reflected in the Discourse.' *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. 1, p. 127.

¹ At this point I might well be charged with being 'unscientific', and in part the charge would have to be admitted. I cannot pretend to be writing this book apart from faith, nor do I expect any to read it but men of faith. It is an instance where faith has something to say to rational criticism, for the postulate that Jesus was the Incarnation of God has consequences for His sense of vocation and grasp of its results in the sphere of history. His conviction of being the Redeemer and Judge of men was not applied in a vacuum, nor was it thought of solely in terms of the world beyond time and space. It is related to men of this world. One need not be a Docetist to realise that the fellowship between the Father and the Son must have had results in the intellectual life of Jesus. Where their limits lay it is beyond our power to declare.

² The volume *Jesus and the Future* was intended as an aid to the elucidation of this very problem. For an excellent treatment of the messianic elements in the Gospels, see William Manson's, *Jesus the Messiah*. The best critical assessment of the eschatological teaching of the Gospels, wherein incidentally its substantial authenticity is maintained, is W. G. Kümmel's *Verheissung und Erfüllung*.

find in the religious teaching of Jesus', he asked, 'a single line that does not contradict explicitly or implicitly such a point of view?'¹ No, one will not. But can one find such a representation of the parousia in any passage of the Gospels? And is the adjective 'sweet' a fit one to describe the Lord of the Gospels, advancing to accomplish the redemption of the world? This opposition of the sweet Jesus over against the violent and terrible Messiah is a rhetorical exaggeration which does injustice to all strands of the evangelic tradition. If Colani was right in thinking that the Gospels as we have them contain a good deal of *Jewish Christian* eschatology, then it must be sharply differentiated from contemporary *Jewish* eschatology. But where did this eschatology, so un-Jewish in its Christocentric emphasis, originate? With the disciples, or with Jesus? The evidence points in the latter direction. If Jewish-Christian eschatology be defined as a realistic eschatology that embraces the parousia of the Son of Man, the future judgment, Kingdom and resurrection, then every tradition of the teaching of Jesus reveals the presence of that outlook in His thinking. Such passages as Mk. 14.62, Lk. 17.23 f. (parousia); Mk. 9.1, 14.25, Mt. 6.10 (kingdom); Mk. 8.38, Lk. 10.12, 11.31 f. (judgment); Mk. 12.24 ff., Lk. 14.14 (resurrection), presume an eschatology basically akin to that of Mk. 13. A criticism that would eradicate all these sayings outstretches the limits of reasonableness.

I am not certain that it is necessary even to go outside Mk. 13 itself to establish the substantial authenticity of its viewpoint (as distinct from that of its individual utterances). Mk. 13.28-29, 32 taken together suffice to show that our Lord taught his disciples to have regard for signs of the End, the date of which is unknowable. The significance of these two short passages in conjunction with each other appears to have been overlooked in recent discussions. Their genuineness is beyond question,² and their meaning tolerably clear. Admittedly some critics apply the Fig Tree parable to the contemporary situation, not to one lying in the future; but the structure of the parable seems to me to demand the opposite interpretation.³ When Menzies affirms that the parable 'belongs to that strain in Christ's teaching in which he deprecates the Jewish eagerness for signs, and maintains that to the discerning,

¹ Op. cit., pp. 146-147.

² The eschatological content of v. 32 would in no wise be diminished if one leaned towards the view that its latter phrases had been modified by later Christological speculations. See the commentary ad loc.

³ See the commentary on vv. 28-29.

and to those who believe in God's rule, no signs are necessary to teach them where they stand',¹ I stand in perplexity. How could Jesus, while yet employing sobriety of language, have conveyed to his disciples the prudence of observing 'signs of the times' more clearly than he has done in this parable? If such be admitted, as it is by most critics and exegetes, the juxtaposition of the parable with v. 32 is significant. It shows unmistakably that Jesus, like Paul in 1 Thess. 5 and the Seer of Revelation, conceived of an Advent both heralded by signs and yet incalculable. This conclusion still stands even if it be held that the collocation of sayings here is accidental, due to the evangelist or his source, for their meaning is not determined by their precise context. Do they reflect different moods in our Lord's mind? Then he could stress now one aspect of the End, now another. Or did they proceed from an established attitude of our Lord towards the End? I think the latter the more likely. In any case, the two aspects of the End must be held together as inseparable elements of Christian expectation of the future.

(vi) The question whether Jesus uttered the discourse, either in whole or in part, on this occasion is bound up with the wider problem of his private instruction to the disciples. In the eyes of some, any representation of our Lord withdrawing from the crowds to teach his closest followers is a sign of unauthenticity. Yet it seems arbitrary to assert that Jesus never gave direction to his disciples apart from his public teaching or that, if he did, none of it has survived in the tradition whose formation they did much to influence. Presumption surely lies in the other direction.

Admittedly the importance of the question can be exaggerated, for it concerns the framework of the Discourse rather than its content. We may legitimately be more confident in respect to the latter than to the former, as is the case with most of the recorded discourses of Jesus. If the chapter has been made to conform to the apocalyptic style of secret instruction delivered on a mountain, it could nevertheless convey a reliable tradition of our Lord's teaching. The really significant factor in this question of context is that the chapter presupposes the closing period of the life of Jesus, when the hostility of the Jewish leaders was so plain that a violent death at their hands seemed unavoidable and had become basic to his thought; the consequences of this for his own faithful community and for his nation demanded attention, and they receive it

¹ *The Earliest Gospel*, pp. 240-241.

here. One day or another in this period of our Lord's life would not make much difference to the total outlook involved, and few of the sayings in the chapter would be radically affected by a separation which yet recognised this affinity of context. It so happens that the rooting of the discourse in the prediction of the temple's overthrow (v. 2) is plausible, and the drift of what follows is consonant with the question of the disciples. We should require stronger reasons than have been given to accept the suggestion that resort has been here made to an apocalyptic fiction.

To what extent the discourse is a unity and to what extent composite is another matter and the problem admits of no final answer; for a fuller discussion of the questions involved I would refer the reader to what I have written elsewhere.¹

¹ Op. cit., pp. 205-212. I would take the opportunity here of disclaiming the view that *Jesus and the Future* was written to prove that Mk. 13 was spoken by Jesus precisely in the form in which it has come down to us. I had no such purpose and do not believe the proposition to be demonstrable. I wrote to show that the contents of the discourse have high claim to authenticity, which is a different matter. I pointed out that the discourse must either be an expansion of what Jesus spoke in explanation of Mk. 13.2 or was spoken on one occasion and reproduced in a fragmentary condition through casual quotation (hence its disjointedness). 'Between these alternatives no final decision seems possible,' I stated, but expressed the hope that the latter alternative would not be dismissed as impossible. It is scarcely to be inferred from this that the book was written to demonstrate the rightness of the alternative. It is the tradition that is of importance, not the form of its preservation.

Yet I still consider that the report that Jesus gave instruction of this kind on the Mount of Olives during his last week in Jerusalem to be worthy of serious consideration. Professor Moule drew my attention to the article by Johannes Munck, '*Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique*' (in the Festschrift for Maurice Goguel, *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne*, Paris 1950), which had escaped my notice. Munck was concerned especially with Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders at Miletus (Acts 20) and with relevant parts of 1 and 2 Timothy and 2 Peter. The form of these can be paralleled with O.T. examples of a patriarch or Israelite leader giving his parting message to his family and people; compare e.g. the speech of Jacob in Gen. 47-50; of Joshua in Josh. 23-24; of Samuel in 1 Sam. 12; of David in 1 Chron. 28-29; and the whole book of Deuteronomy as the last utterances of Moses. Of the numerous examples in Jewish apocalyptic the Assumption of Moses, and above all the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, are noteworthy. Munck draws the conclusion that in late Jewish literature a Farewell Discourse had established itself as a literary form (op. cit., p. 157). In the Gospels the records of conversations at the Last Supper in Lk. 22.21-38 and Jn. 13-17 invite comparison, as also the records of the Commission of the Risen Lord in the resurrection narratives. Munck abstains from including Mk. 13 in this category, apart from the closing parable of v. 34. Stauffer would remedy this omission. In Appendix VI of his *N. T. Theology* he has independently given a detailed analysis of this literary genre and has grouped Mk. 13 along with other reviews of the future, including Jn. 14.29, 16.4, 12 f., Acts 1.3 ff.

On this matter two observations need to be made. First, Munck himself is at pains to point out that the establishment of a literary form of this kind need in no way diminish the historicity of similar scenes described in the N.T. If such a literary genre had become common, it would be natural to imitate it (presumably, he would imply, in life as in literature). I should think that this would particularly

(vii) The mention of the context of thought of Mark 13 calls to mind the fundamental presupposition of the chapter, viz. that a period of historical development lies between the death and resurrection of Jesus on the one hand and his parousia on the other. But did Jesus reckon with such a period in his thinking? The evidence seems strongly to support the view that he did. (a) What has already been written concerning the fig tree parable and v. 32 implies an interval between the resurrection of Jesus and the end of the age: ὅταν ἴδῃτε ταῦτα γινώμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις appears to relate to future events, not to happenings in the present (still less to developments lying in the earlier ministry of Jesus, finding their fruition in the present); both signs and climax are distinguished from the moment of speaking. (b) The sayings concerning 'this generation', notably Mk. 13.30, give the impression that the anticipated event will occur neither in the immediate future nor at a remote point of time. An interval of restricted length is to occur. (c) The contrast between ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, which is linked regularly with the denouement, and μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, associated in Mark just as regularly with the resurrection of Jesus, suggests that the events so qualified are differentiated from each other and belong to different periods. (d) Above all the sayings referring to the fate of Israel and of Jerusalem indicate a lapse of time between the death of Jesus and the tribulation of the nation. In Lk. 13.1-5, 6-9 are recounted warnings of a disaster that will fall if the people do not manifest a change of heart. The possible has become actual in Lk. 17.31 (=Mk. 13.15-16), where perils resulting from an invading army are in mind (not a necessity to be prepared for the coming of the Son of Man, as some maintain). Of this coming overthrow Mk. 13.2 speaks, with which must be

apply to such a record as that of Paul's meeting with the Ephesian Elders, which could not be dismissed on the ground of literary affinity with apocalyptic models. Secondly, it is significant that the instruction of Jesus on the future of his nation and disciples has not been set in the Upper Room, nor on an unspecified mountain in the post-Resurrection era, but at a prior point of time, in connection with the declaration of a judgment upon the temple and when sitting on the Mount of Olives, opposite the temple, on his way to his place of lodging. The simplest reason for the discourse being given such a setting is that it happened so and that the memory of the occasion survived. (I owe this observation to Professor Moule.) If this is conjoined with what is written in *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 205-212, it will be seen that the case for a discourse of Jesus having been uttered at this juncture is strong. This does not settle how much of Mk. 13 belongs to the original discourse, but it is of importance to recognise the likelihood that Jesus spoke of the future of Jerusalem and its people just before his arrest and death. It has significance for the topic immediately to be discussed, whether Jesus anticipated a period of history after his death and before the consummation of the Kingdom of God.

conjoined 13.14 (the Abomination saying) and 13.17-18. Whatever may be thought of the precise wording of these sayings, it is unjustifiable to reject their import; they testify to the conviction of Jesus that the people, city and temple would suffer outrage leading to unspeakable ruin. There is no warrant in any of these utterances for conjecturing that Jesus supposed that this catastrophe would occur at the same time as His death or as its immediate sequel. Jesus went to Jerusalem to die for His people, not to initiate their massacre. The predictions of the doom of the city and people appear to relate it to both the historical (secular) order and the eschatological drama of the End. The destruction and terror will be caused by armed forces, presumably those of Rome, and their ravages will fall within the judgments of the last times. It is important to note that in Mt. 23.34-35 the contemporary generation is to experience the final wrath in virtue of its filling up the measure of the iniquity of history, and this completion of the sins of the fathers is to consist in the persecution and murder of the Messiah's emissaries, as the fathers murdered the prophets before them. Strangely, it is not the killing of the Messiah that is regarded as the last straw, but the persecution and doing to death of those he sends. The presumption lies to hand that the Messiah has already gone when their mission is performed and their rejection endured. Such is the interpretation of Luke (11.49) and Matthew, whose echo in v. 34 of Mt. 10.23 shows that he sets both sayings in the same context. (e) Mk. 9.1, 13.9-13 most naturally find their significance in a similar setting. C. K. Barrett would refer them to the crisis which Jesus was to meet (cf. Mk. 8.34 ff.), the consolation being given that some at least would survive the persecution and enter the immediately inbreaking Kingdom.¹ On the contrary, the tribulation of the disciples in 13.9-13 is related to the tribulation of the nation (13.12 f., 14 ff.) as in Mt. 23.34 ff.; the emphasis in Mk. 9.1 lies not on the escape from violence but on the certainty of the Kingdom's coming within a lifetime. Just as Mt. 23.34 f. speaks of the distress of disciples, followed by the abandonment of the temple by God (23.37 f.) and the coming of the Lord to the penitent nation (23.39), so Mk. 13 describes judgment coming upon temple and people, consequent upon persecution of the disciples, culminating in the appearing of the Son of Man. If the construction of this scheme is the work of the two

¹ Such appears to be the conclusion Mr. Barrett wishes to be drawn, see *Expository Times*, LXVII, No. 5, p. 144, n. 2.

evangelists, or of their predecessors, at least it seems to inhere in the material at their disposal, and no other solution does such justice to it.¹

(viii) Wendt's contrast between the two supposed discourses of Mk. 13 has long since been abandoned, chiefly on account of the improbability that two discourses are here to be traced. That our Lord should inculcate different attitudes in respect to the Jewish state and his own community is to be expected. There was no necessity for the disciples to perish through misguided attachment to the doomed city (still less through a confidence in its inviolability); martyrdom for the Gospel's sake was another matter. Since the original question concerned the fall of the temple, guidance concerning their attitude to the Jewish polity was needful, for the disciples lived in it and had no thought of separating from it. On the other hand, their duty to witness to Jewry and to the Gentiles was also in our Lord's mind; his declarations on this theme were equally to be expected and apposite.

As to the relative worth of the two strands of instruction, it is always a difficult undertaking to separate out what is deemed of secondary importance in the Gospels. Sometimes the most locally conditioned saying can be of significance for the teaching of Jesus (e.g. Mk. 7.15), and even those of lesser importance are needful if we would gain a balanced understanding of his total view. In reality, the most contested section of Mk. 13, its central passage beginning with v. 14, is far from insignificant. The *βδέλυγμα* saying reflects the attitude of Jesus both to the nation that suffers this fate (God will not intervene to save it) and to the instrument which carries out the judgment (in this respect it is of the order of Antichrist). The pity of Jesus for helpless women is revealed in v. 17, a solicitude extended to his community and even to his people as a whole, v. 18; the finality of Israel's judgment is implied in v. 19, and the consciousness that God is the Lord of this particular history, as of all history, in v. 20. These items require to be taken into account in any assessment of our Lord's message. It is one thing to single out key utterances of Jesus as providing the clue to his life and teaching; it is another to discard others as of doubtful value. It becomes us rather to listen to what Jesus says from within his historically conditioned environment and seek to grasp the implications of it all.

¹ See further the excellent discussion of this problem in W. G. Kümmel's *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, pp. 15 ff., 41 ff.

(ix) I have already given a discussion on the linguistic problems of Mk. 13.¹ It was there maintained that the evidence does not support the view that the language of the chapter has been determined by use of the LXX. What I have written in this commentary on the origin and meaning of the phrase τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως will require the recognition that this term comes from the LXX if it is authentic in its entirety here; since however the meaning of the phrase is wholly determined by the Hebrew original מַמְשֵׁן פִּקְשָׁן the 'horrifying abomination', and this significance does not attach to the Greek translation, it is likely that the saying in which it is found was first given in a Semitic tongue.

(x) The foregoing observations have been concerned with objections to the authenticity of Mk. 13; their ventilation suggests that they are less cogent than appear at first sight. We must now consider two further criticisms of the criticism, one negative and the other positive.

The former relates to the difficulty of determining the precise limits of the source thought to lie at the basis of the Discourse. Moffatt declared that the contours of the earlier apocalypse are unmistakable, that it parts as a whole from the context and forms an intelligible unity.² So far from this being so, a review of the efforts of critics to reconstruct the apocalypse reveals that every verse of the chapter has been included in it and every verse has been omitted from it. To Weizsäcker's analysis of 7-8, 14-20, 24-27 Weiffenbach added 30-31.³ Wellhausen regarded these two verses as late Christian additions and included instead v. 12.⁴ Montefiore increased it to 7-8, 14-20, 24-31.⁵ Moffatt himself, with hesitation, thought it might have included 5-8, 14-27.⁶ N. Schmidt lengthened it to 5-32, regarding it as taken from the book entitled in Lk. 11.49 as 'The Wisdom of God'.⁷ J. A. MacCullough brought in the last part of the chapter by setting it forth as 7-8, 24, 26-27, 32-37, though he regarded it as a coloured reproduction of an authentic original.⁸ With this should be compared A. T. Cadoux's analysis of the chapter into two sources, a Gentile, 5-7, 9-13, 28-31, and a Palestinian, 8, 14-27, 32-37, the

¹ Op. cit., pp. 246-250.

² *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 207 ff.

³ *Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, pp. 152 f.

⁴ *Ev. Marci*, pp. 100 f.

⁵ *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 299.

⁶ Op. cit., pp. 207 ff.

⁷ *The Prophet of Nazareth*, pp. 85 f.

⁸ *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 5, p. 383.

latter being a doublet of Mk. 8.38-9.1.¹ Bacon showed some independence by including the introduction in the original apocalypse, 3-8, 14ab, 18-27,² but E. W. Barnes declared the entire chapter to be a Jewish tract in which no word of Jesus was preserved.³ Against these tendencies to expand the Little Apocalypse, some have inclined to make it shrink. Both H. D. A. Major⁴ and E. J. Goodspeed⁵ have reduced its compass to 14-20; David Smith restricted it to 14-19,⁶ Otto Holtzmann to 14-18, v. 10 also coming from another hand.⁷ Since, however, it is now generally allowed that 15-16 are authentic words of the Lord, being reproduced in Lk. 17.31, the description 'little' is certainly appropriate to such an apocalypse. Indeed, the term apocalypse cannot be retained for such a scrap of tradition.

But can the term be employed on any reconstruction of the source? Has it even a show of completeness on any of the popular analyses (excluding those which make it embrace the entire chapter)? Loisy found himself involved in this problem. He defined the apocalypse as 6-8, 12, 13b-14, 17-19, 22-23, 24b-27. The very fragmentariness of this document made him realise that it is no 'intelligible unity', as Moffatt thought. For example, it was clear to him that no independent writing could begin by the bald announcement of v. 6; he suggested therefore, "That which prepared for this announcement in the source was probably not a suitable item to reproduce in the Gospel."⁸ Similarly v. 14 in his analysis stands alone; the evangelist must have shortened his source at this point also. This is a virtual admission that the thread of consistency is lacking from this document. When the apocalypse is removed from its present context we are left with a collection of isolated fragments; since they cannot have been so composed, we must postulate another discourse, like Mk. 13, from which they were taken.⁹ The theory on such a basis is reduced to a *reductio ad*

¹ *The Sources of the Second Gospel*, pp. 224 ff.

² *The Gospel of Mark, its Composition and Date*, pp. 121 ff.

³ *The Rise of Christianity*, pp. 136 f.

⁴ *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, pp. 158 ff.

⁵ *A Life of Jesus*, pp. 186 ff.

⁶ *The Days of His Flesh*, 8th ed., p. xxxi.

⁷ *The Life of Jesus*, pp. 456 f.

⁸ *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, p. 421.

⁹ It is doubtful that C. C. Torrey took note of Loisy's dilemma, but precisely the same conclusion as that drawn above is set forth by him in his discussion of the Discourse. "This most impressive body of early Christian prediction is "an intelligible unity" only when it stands in the place which it now occupies, as an integral part of the great discourse. Without such a framework as this it is perfectly incomprehensible. It would be necessary to suppose another chapter,

absurdum. More cautiously W. G. Kümmel adduces a like conclusion: 'No possibility exists of demonstrating an original *literary* connection between the supposed ingredients of this apocalypse,' he writes, 'so that the hypothesis of a connected apocalyptic basis of the chapter is hardly satisfactorily founded.'¹ A document whose beginning, middle and end cannot be defined, which is without connection except in the setting of the coherent discourse from which it is abstracted, has a tenuous existence. It would seem more in accord with the facts to recognise frankly that it never was.

Positively it should be observed that the Discourse has two features which distinguish it from the common Jewish apocalypses, viz. its lack of specifically apocalyptic traits and its warning insistence on spiritual alertness.

Colani described vv. 5-31 as 'a true apocalypse where nothing essential to this kind of composition is lacking' and aligned it with the Book of Revelation.² On the contrary, a comparison of the Discourse with the Revelation reveals that, while their ideas are similar, their mode of expression greatly differs. In the writing of John we meet with a lavish use of symbolic figures, visions and auditions, angels and demons in vast profusion (two hundred million demons in Rev. 13.14 and angels by the billion in Rev. 5.11!), dragons and stars that are alive, cosmic warfare in which heaven and hell are locked in mortal combat—a canvas as wide as the universe, overwhelming in its magnificence and calculated to befog every uninitiated reader. No such phenomena are presented in Mk. 13. For this reason, as is well known, Torrey consistently refused the name Apocalypse to it: 'In the thirteenth chapter of Mark there is no indication of any special revelation, no mystery in the language (except in v. 14), none of the characteristic apparatus of the vision, nothing even to suggest knowledge received from heaven for the purpose in hand. Whatever may be

exactly like ch. 13, from which this great section was transferred' (*Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 16).

¹ *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, 2nd ed., p. 91. It should be noted, in passing, that recent independent analyses of Mk. 13 have ignored the Little Apocalypse theory, or drastically modified it. T. W. Manson e.g. apportioned the chapter to three sources, a Jerusalem prediction (1-4, 14-20), one portraying persecution for the disciples (5-8, 9-13) and a prediction of the End (24-27, 28-31); on this scheme each of the three sections of the Little Apocalypse has been assigned to a different source. *Mission and Message of Jesus*, pp. 615 f. See also the further reconstruction offer by V. Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 636 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 202. With this equating of Mk. 13 with Revelation, contrast the view of Volkmar, who endeavoured to demonstrate that the Marcan Discourse was written as a polemic against the Book of Revelation. *Jesus Nazareus*, pp. 280 ff.

thought of the material of the chapter, or conjectured as to its composition, there is nothing in any part of it that can justify the use of the term "apocalyptic".¹

Along with this absence of apocalyptic imagery should be remarked the reserve in respect of apocalyptic elements of expectation. No mention is made e.g. of the great apostasy, the triumph and subsequent destruction of Antichrist and his hosts, the felicity of the elect in the age of bliss, neither is any hint provided concerning the rebuilding of the temple and city of Jerusalem in the new age. As Johannes Weiss said, 'Utmost concentration on the chief matters—that is the signature of this apocalypse.'²

Utmost concentration—and utmost earnestness. The hortatory nature of the Discourse has been noticed by many critics. In particular the frequent employment of imperatives in an unbroken chain through the Discourse is striking. There is no other apocalyptic writing known to me which contains so high a proportion of admonitions and in which instruction and exhortation are so completely interwoven. E. C. Selwyn thought it likely that the original words of Jesus possessed this feature even more than the reduced report of them which Mark gives: 'A strong, robust moral and practical bent was the main feature of the original discourse.'³ Wellhausen also recognised that this was not Jewish.⁴ Professor Dodd accordingly prefers to term the Discourse a *Mahnrede* in apocalyptic terms rather than an apocalypse proper.⁵

If to these positive characteristics of the Discourse we add, as I have endeavoured to show that we may, its congruity with the eschatological teaching contained in the other evangelic sources; and if, as E. F. K. Müller urged, the total design of the Discourse shows specifically Christian points that cannot be explained by an external editing of a Jewish basis; then the question must be faced whether this is not 'a new building on an original foundation which must be attributed to Jesus himself'.⁶

The commentary that follows, while taking into account other views, is written in the conviction that that conclusion is right and that the lessons to be learned from this tradition of the Words of the Lord are of abiding worth.⁷

¹ Op. cit., pp. 14-15.

² *Das Älteste Evangelium*, p. 281.

³ *The Oracles in the New Testament*, p. 327.

⁴ *Evangelium Marci*, p. 100.

⁵ See *Jesus and the Future*, p. 100, and for a longer treatment of this question, pp. 212-216.

⁶ *Realencyclopädie f. protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd. ed., vol. 21, p. 264.

⁷ For a consideration of the theology of Mk. 13, see *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 172-226.

A COMMENTARY ON ST. MARK'S GOSPEL, CHAPTER THIRTEEN

1. *Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λέγει
αὐτῷ εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. Διδάσκαλε,
ἴδε ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί.*

On departing from the temple, an unnamed disciple draws the attention of Jesus to the immensity of the stones of which the building was composed and to the structures themselves (Mt. and Lk. have generalised: in Mt. the disciples as a group show Jesus the buildings; according to Lk. 'some were conversing'). The mention of the circumstance is not irrelevant, for since Jesus was at this moment on his way out of the temple he could give no more than a terse reply to the disciple; it was a hint of the burden on his mind, but this was not the occasion for discussing it.

This apparently innocent introduction, bound up as it is with v. 2, provides us with peculiar difficulties. The exclamation of the disciple, 'What huge stones! And what huge buildings!' if interpreted as due to admiration of them, is regarded by some as suspect, since the disciples must have seen the temple on many occasions, notably at the feasts. Accordingly Easton, Bultmann, Lohmeyer and others consider the verse to have been composed in order to supply a setting for the prediction that follows in v. 2. The issue is not one of the first magnitude, but this scepticism is scarcely justified. The disciples were, after all, Galileans, not Judeans, and were visitors to the city, not inhabitants. They would never quite lose their sense of wonder when in the massive precincts of the temple. It is noticeable how Josephus, in his descriptions of the temple, reiterates the astonishment produced by the contemplation of its magnificence (see especially *Ant.* XV, xi.3 ff), and he draws particular attention to the walls and to the stones of which they were constructed. The mention of their size is incidental (25 cubits long, 8 high and 12 broad) but he is loud in his adulation of their appearance ('that front was all of polished stone, insomuch that its fineness, to such as had not seen it, was incredible, and to such as had seen it, was greatly amazing'). That this is no exaggeration is attested by Rabbinical tradition; Herod, after plating the temple proper with gold, wished to cover the whole building with it, but the Rabbis were so struck by the appearance of the yellow, blue and white

marble that they said, 'Let it alone, for it is more beautiful as it is, since it has the appearance of the waves of the sea' (Sukka 51b, 3). In that same context the dictum of a Rabbi is recorded, 'He who has not seen the Temple in its full construction has never seen a glorious building in his life'. It is rarely understood that both in size and splendour the temple at Jerusalem was probably the most imposing edifice of contemporary civilisation. Dalman compares it with other famous Greek buildings: 'It measured approximately 480 by 300 metres, whereas the famous Altis of Olympia was only about 210 by 170 metres large, and the Acropolis of Athens 240 metres long and only in the middle as wide as 120 metres. The sanctuary of the Jews was twice as large' (*Sacred Sites and Ways*, p. 286). This takes no account of the heightened impression of immensity conveyed by the huge pile of stone blocks on which it was built. The hill on which the temple stood declined by degrees towards the east side of the city, but the other side was precipitous. Herod started at the bottom of the hill and laid rocks together, binding them with lead 'till it proceeded to a great height, and till both the largeness of the square edifice and its altitude were immense'. The foundations of the temple and this solid mass of rock thus apparently formed one continuous structure, so that to view the temple from beneath was to receive an impression of staggering proportions. We do not wonder that Josephus declared that the temple wall was 'the most prodigious work that was ever heard of by man'. Nor is it surprising that the average Jew conceived the temple to be impregnable and that it would last into the messianic era as a perpetual dwelling for the eternal God.

In view of this I do not think it unnatural that a Galilean pilgrim, still a comparatively young man, should have spoken to Jesus in a tone of awe concerning the temple structure, even though he had visited it from time to time in his life. I was born in London and am familiar with its sights. Nevertheless a matter of months before writing these lines I commented to a fellow-Londoner on the splendid appearance of Bush House as we were approaching it from Kingsway; we pass it many times in a year, yet the response from my companion was equally warm. How much more comprehensible is the situation of the disciples in the shadow of the temple at Jerusalem!

It should be mentioned, however, that an ingenious solution of the problem here discussed has from time to time been put forward and could well be true. The immediately preceding context in Mt. is the Lamentation over Jerusalem, with its cry, 'Your house is abandoned (to you)' (Mt. 23.37 f.). The 'house' may be either the city (cf. Jer. 22.5) or the temple (cf. Jer. 26.6), but in either case the temple is involved, and the occasion must be the eschatological woes that threaten to engulf Israel (Mt. 24.35 f. implies that the judgment that is to fall on Israel within the contemporary generation will sum up in

its severity the requital of all the wrong of history from the dawn of time—'from the blood of Abel'). Matthew intends us to understand that these words were spoken at the same time as the incident we are considering. He has omitted Mark's account of the Widow's Mite in order to make the connection of thought clearer. The disciple's words may then be understood as a protest to Jesus or an expression of incredulity: 'How could such an impregnable and glorious building as this be abandoned to the heathen and suffer ruin at their hands!' So interpret H. A. W. Meyer, Swete, Zahn, Schlatter; Bultmann, though rejecting the historicity of v. 1, inclines also to see the context of thought of v. 2 in Mt. 23.35 f., 37 f. (*Geschichte d. syn. Trad.* p. 36). This would undoubtedly give point to the disciple's observation, and the reply of the Lord would then be a sharp affirmation of his previous utterances. The difficulty of this interpretation lies in the uncertainty that Mt. 23.35 f., 37 ff. were uttered on the day in question. Luke places the Lament over Jerusalem at a considerably earlier date (Lk. 13.34 f.); yet it is hard to deny that Mt.'s position is more plausible, for the solemn declaration of Mt. 23.39 (= Lk. 13.35) suits the expectation of the parousia far better than a visit to the city at the Feast of Tabernacles. More formidable is the consideration that, while the interpretation is likely in Mt., it could not be extracted from Mk., on whom Mt. presumably depends; here again, it is open to submit that Mt. has followed an independent tradition. In face of the uncertainty of the issue, I decline to adopt this view and leave the issue open. In any case the utterance of the unknown disciple is quite comprehensible; it is arbitrary lightly to set aside Mk.'s tradition as fictitious.

2. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶ, Βλέπετε ταύτας
 τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε
 λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ.

Βλέπετε may introduce either a question, 'Are you looking at these buildings?' or a statement, 'You are looking at these buildings. Nevertheless, I tell you. . . .' In either case the fascination of mere size, the external glory of Judaism, is corrected. Mt. has increased, rather than diminished this impression by his brief *βλέπετε ταῦτα πάντα*; (the *οὐ* is perhaps a late insertion; it is omitted by D, L, X, 33, 700 al, OL, OS, Memph, Arm, Iren. lat., Orig. lat., Jerome). The prophecy, 'Not a stone will be left on a stone here, all will be thrown down,' makes explicit the previous intimations of impending judgment on Israel. The abandonment of the temple, spoken of in Mt. 23.38, almost certainly implies its subsequent ruin; here, no doubt as to the Lord's meaning remains.

The context, both in the mind of our Lord and in the chapter, is eschatological. While the expectation of a new temple in the age to come was common, to the popular messianic belief it would have taken the form of a glorifying of the present temple, similar to the anticipated beautifying of Jerusalem. The prophecy of doom in Mic. 3.12 had either been forgotten or regarded as fulfilled. To the average Jew of the time of Jesus, the presence of God was too much bound up with the temple to think of that event happening again, while the judgment on the Gentiles overshadowed all thoughts of judgment on Israel (attacks on Jerusalem by aliens in the End time come in a different category). Jesus stood in the traditional prophetic attitude to Israel in declaring the impending overthrow of the temple. It will not have been political sagacity that led him to this overwhelming conviction so much as insight into Israel's position before God; and if he envisaged Roman legions as perpetrating the deed, it would have been as agents of the judgment of God on an impenitent nation rather than as ruthless overlords crushing foolish rebels. 'The announcement of the destruction of the temple is not that of a disaster but a chastisement' declared Goguel (*Life of Jesus*, p. 403). Jerusalem's overthrow takes its place as one of the judgments of the End.

Another viewpoint is hinted at in the larger saying of Mk. 14.58:

the old system is finished and is to be replaced by another of a higher order; in the new age of the Spirit there is no room for the old covenant with its sacrifices and cultus, hence the old temple must pass away. This is complementary to the eschatological aspect and is in no contradiction to it.

The last sentence would not be admitted by some exegetes. Loisy described v. 2 as a 'lifeless' version of the more 'brilliant' oracle of Mk. 14.58 that was never fulfilled (so also Colani, Wellhausen, Dodd, S. G. Brandon). The Church is believed to have been embarrassed by the latter saying, which represents Jesus as threatening to destroy the temple; subsequent tradition reduced the original logion to the form preserved in our text. More radically still, Mk. 14.58 itself has been dismissed as unauthentic, on the ground that the hostility to the temple implied in it cannot be reconciled with the concern for the temple manifest in our Lord's cleansing of it from the traders' defilements. This latter contention is scarcely tenable. On the one hand, the prediction of the temple's overthrow is directed primarily against the nation, for whose sin the judgment is to fall, rather than against the temple itself, which symbolised the presence of God among His people (so Klostermann). On the other hand the temple cleansing was more than a reformer's act, based on zeal for the purity of the Lord's house; it was an exercise of messianic authority, implying among other things the necessity for a drastic revision of the worship of God's people (the *beasts* were driven out as well as the traders); this was the view of the Fourth Evangelist, who saw the inner relation of the word about the new temple with the cleansing and so placed them together as a sign of the nature of the redemption of Christ (Jn. 2.13 ff., see Hoskyns ad loc. and E. F. Scott, "The Crisis in the Life of Jesus").

C. H. Turner moved in an opposite direction in proposing that v. 2 be considered as the original of Mk. 14.58. He thought it likely that after the challenge to the religious authorities presented in the temple cleansing Jesus would have been shadowed by spies and eavesdroppers, who heard him utter this saying as he was leaving the temple. On this basis Turner at first was even prepared to accept as original the addition to Mk. 13.2 in D *καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλοις ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν*, but he subsequently retracted this opinion (J.T.S. XXIX, p. 9).

It seems best, nevertheless, to regard our saying and Mk. 14.58 as independent. To postulate a confusion between the two is to involve also a confusion of traditions regarding the resurrection and parousia of Jesus, which, on other grounds, I do not believe the documents generally permit; the 'three days' belong consistently to the former, while the latter and its preceding judgments (among which the ruin of the temple is to be numbered) belong, with equal

consistency, to a more distant date within 'this generation'. Our logion is linked with other predictions of judgment on the city and nation (e.g. Mt. 23.35 f., 37 ff., Lk. 13.1 ff., 19.41 ff., 23.28 ff., to say nothing of the parabolic material), and is limited to the fate of the temple by the occasion of its utterance. The positive element in Mk. 14.58, corresponding to the expectation that the Messiah would build a new temple, may be assumed in this passage (Schniewind), but with a different outcome: the former is related to it much as the present Kingdom is related to the consummated Kingdom; the Church of the Risen Redeemer has replaced the shrine of the old covenant, and the glorified Church of the End will fulfil the ancient hope of a new temple wherein God will manifest Himself to His people (Rev. 21.9-22.5).

The attempt made in D to express the neglected positive element in this saying has been mentioned above. If ἄλλος of the addition is provided with an antecedent in this sentence, instead of being related to the ναός of Mk. 14.58, it would have to refer to λίθος; this recalls Dan. 2.34, the smiting stone which becomes a great mountain (the Kingdom of God). The sense thereby yielded is remarkably pertinent, but the known character of D hardly allows us to regard the addition as authentic; it must be regarded as due to the influence of Mk. 14.58 and Jn. 2.19.

Lohmeyer presses καταλυθῆναι to signify the destruction of every individual stone; this is needless, 'thrown down, demolished' adequately translates the term. But was the temple, in fact, so destroyed? The assertion, first made as far as I can see by Weiffenbach for apologetic reasons (to demonstrate that the logion is not a *vaticinium ex eventu*) and repeated through the years (e.g. by Holtzmann, Loisy, Goguel, V. Taylor), viz. that the prediction was not literally fulfilled, since the temple was not demolished but *burned down*, cannot be substantiated. Josephus certainly relates how the Roman soldiers set fire to the temple, despite the efforts of Titus to prevent them (*Wars*, VI, iv.5-7), but in his description of the desolating of the city he makes explicit mention of the temple: 'As soon as the army had no more people to slay or plunder, because there remained none to be the objects of their fury . . . Caesar gave orders that they should now demolish the entire city and temple, but should leave as many of the towers standing as were of the greatest eminence', this latter point being made in order to 'demonstrate to posterity what kind of a city it was, and how well fortified, which the Roman valour had subdued' (VII.i.1). Thus the temple was both burned and demolished so as to become an utter ruin. Without doubt a writer composing the prophecy after the event would have made mention of the fire also. It would seem that on no grounds can exception be taken to the language of this saying, which was fulfilled with fearful exactness.

3. *Καὶ καθήμενου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν
κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐπρώτα αὐτὸν Πέτρος
καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας.*

The prophecy of v. 2 had been spoken to a single disciple (*βλέπεις*), but it is reasonable to infer that the whole group of disciples was present and heard it. The unambiguity, even vehemence, of the declaration must have shocked them. They did not venture to question the Lord at once. Apart from other considerations, it would have been indiscreet for Jesus and his followers to discuss in the open the anticipated ruin of the temple, involving as it did that of the city and nation also. After the breach with the authorities, made irreparable by recent events, a report of such a conversation could have supplied excellent evidence with which to charge Jesus as an agitator.

At this point we must presume a period of silence, at least as between Jesus and the Twelve, for it was a considerable walk from the temple to the Mount of Olives. Possibly Jesus himself provided the opportunity that the disciples were seeking; their anxiety to speak with him must have been patent, and he also had more to communicate to them in view of their own implication in the coming catastrophe, and in the circumstances to which it would form the climax. Halting at the ascent of the mount he sat down, the prospect of the temple before him. The view must have quickened the impulse of the four disciples and provided an obvious opening for their request for further enlightenment.

Just as v. 1 has been regarded as a secondary setting for v. 2, so this statement, along with the next verse, has often been interpreted as fictitious, created to provide an introduction to the following discourse. Lohmeyer saw a revelatory significance in the situation, since decisive acts of God and premonitory revelations take place on mountains (Mk. 3.13 f., 9.2 ff., Mt. 5.1 ff., 28.16 ff.), and according to Zech. 14 the Mount of Olives is to be the scene of the apocalyptic judgment. K. L. Schmidt also compares the early Christian representations of Jesus sitting with his disciples on a mountain height; he would regard *καθήμενου αὐτοῦ* as meaning 'as he sat enthroned'. These, and related contentions are discussed in 'Jesus and the Future', pp. 205-210. Here it is sufficient to note that the setting is entirely natural, both in respect of the desire of the disciples to learn more of

the mind of their Master on this matter, and the topographical situation, for Jesus had to traverse the Mount of Olives in order to reach Bethany, where he was staying (Mk. 11.11 ff.). Moreover, the fact that Andrew was included with the three intimate friends of the Lord is surely historical reminiscence (note how he is yet separated from his brother, owing to the close association of the others). It is true that Lk., by his omission of the record of the departure from the temple and the approach of the four disciples, gives the impression that the scene is still laid within the temple, but this is surely due to editorial revision for the sake of brevity rather than a challenge to Mk.'s representation; the contents of the discourse will have prompted the evangelist, or his source, to take its privacy for granted (so C. C. Torrey, *Our Translated Gospels*, p. 133).

Whether or not the four disciples acted as a deputation for the rest of their fellows, as Swete suggested, it is impossible to say, but the circumstance that *these* four went is fortunate, since they of all the group were most fitted to grasp the instruction now given and, when the time came for it to be passed on to the later community, were best in a position to declare it.

4. Ἐιπὸν ἡμῶν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται,
καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα;

The question is set in parallelism; its twofold nature therefore is in form, not in content. The second clause brings out what is latent in the first, but with an added sense of climax throughout:

πότε—τί τὸ σημεῖον
ταῦτα—ταῦτα πάντα
ἔσται—μέλλῃ συντελεῖσθαι.

From this we see that the eschatological nature of the prediction is grasped by the disciples at once; it is not confined to the second clause. The plural ταῦτα, though having immediate reference to the ruin of the temple, implies that it will be no isolated event but one of a series of extraordinary happenings; nor is that surprising, for 'such a catastrophe could not be supposed to come by itself' (V. H. Stanton). Similarly πότε, unless it envisages an actual date or period of years, necessitates an answer in terms of events that must come to pass, i.e. σημεῖα (so Klostermann: 'One cannot give an answer to the πότε without mentioning signs'). Yet σημεῖον is in the singular. If this implies the desire to know a single portent that should enable the disciples to recognise indubitably the nearness of the end, the Abomination prophecy of v. 14 would seem particularly to answer the question. Loisy, however, interprets σημεῖον as signifying 'the whole facts which must serve as the immediate introduction to the great Advent' (Ev. Syn., p. 397); in that case the entire discourse that follows comprises the answer, and certain key features may be held to have crucial relevance.

On this interpretation the wording of the question is strictly *en rapport* with the prophecy of v. 2. But is it ethically so? That is, *ought* the disciples to have asked this question, or are they here departing from the trust that leaves the future with God and giving way to merely natural curiosity? That the latter element was not absent from their minds is not to be denied, yet the situation demands sympathy on our part. These men were Jews. The temple symbolised their own religious life, although they were disciples of Jesus. Jerusalem was the city of their dreams, as of all their nation. They were part of the people to be engulfed in the calamity. The

vast structure, to them so obviously indestructible except by supernatural intervention, lay before their eyes. An overthrow accomplished by God could occur only in connection with the *συντέλεια*, when the Messiah, whose apostles they were, would enter on his reign. And all this was to happen in *their* time! From every point of view therefore, these men were implicated in the prophecy, both in the events presumed to accompany the catastrophe and in those that were to follow. It is not to be wondered at that they wanted to know more of these things. However much we wish that the disciples had better understood their Lord in his latter days, we must not rob them of their right to behave as men of flesh and blood, possessed of a normal emotional life.

Whereas it is generally agreed that *πότε ταῦτα ἔσται* must relate to the temple prediction, there are not a few exegetes who believe the second clause to be framed in view of the supposedly unauthentic discourse that follows (e.g. Klostermann, Rawlinson, V. Taylor). On this basis Menzies maintained that the question must be interpreted in the light of the answer which is returned to it, hence that it is nothing less than a request for a complete unveiling of the future. Against this, the nature of the parallelism of the two clauses, to which attention was drawn above, seems adequately to account for the language, and there is no need to resort to this exaggerated estimate of the question (so H. A. W. Meyer, Holtzmann, Zahn, Creed, Strack-Billerbeck, etc.). The status of *πάντα* is uncertain. It is omitted by Lk. and Mt., and from Mk. in W Δ Θ 209. 13. 229. 255. 435. 565. 579. 184 (k), Syr. sin. It could be due to a later scribe, motivated by the contents of the discourse; but its omission is perhaps better accounted for by its awkward position, which later led to its transposition before *ταῦτα* in many MSS. (D E F S U V X Y Φ Ω etc.) and before *συντελεῖσθαι* in others (A G H K M Y Γ Π (Σ) Syr. pesh. hl. Cop. Aeth. Arm. etc.). If it be retained, its omission by Lk. may be due to his simplifying the question; and Mt.'s rewriting of the second clause is at least consonant with the presence of *πάντα* in his text of Mk., if not demanded by it.

On the interpretation above offered, Mt.'s paraphrase of Mk. is not so misleading as is often maintained. The single article covering *παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος* shows that he also preserves a single question in parallelism, not one in triplicate; and since Mk.'s *συντελεῖσθαι* is a technical term for the events of the consummation, Mt.'s substitution of the noun *συντέλεια* is not erroneous. Schlatter adduces many parallels from Josephus for the use of *παρουσία* in respect of God's coming to the aid of His people on various occasions; he concludes that it arises from the frequent use of *παρεῖναι* and

συμπαρεῖναι for the saving presence of God; however that may be, it is likely that for Mt. it bears its quasi-technical sense of the Advent of Christ, and here is interpretative of Mk.'s language (as Mt. 16.28 in similar fashion interprets Mk. 9.1).

5. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς,
 Βλέπετε μὴ τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ.

The unexpected βλέπετε has evoked comment from earliest times. "Ἄλλο τοίνυν ἠρώτησαν, καὶ ἄλλο ἀποκρίνεται, noted Victor, 'They asked one question and he answers another.' The observation is nevertheless misleading. The conviction that God would fight for the Jews and deliver them from all enemies expressed itself, among other ways, by a tenacious belief in the inviolability of the sanctuary. This attitude, fundamental to Jewish nationalist eschatology, directly led to the calamity which Jesus had prophesied. The disciples were no less open to eschatological suggestion than their fellow Jews (cf. Mk. 9.11); an undisciplined desire on their part for signs of the End could lead them to give ear to false representations as to the temple, and the Messiah, and the End. Accordingly, 'Beware' is the first, and most needed, word spoken to them. It is also the last (v. 37), and it is dominant through all that lies between (vv. 7, 9, 11, 23, 33, 35, 37). The ethical purpose of the revelation is made clear at its commencement.

This aspect of the chapter has been admitted by critics of every school: cf. Volkmar, 'The whole discourse cries out, 'Take care!' (*Jesus Nazareus*, p. 280). Busch points out that the command is not peculiar to eschatological thinking; the exclusiveness of the first commandment makes seduction (πλανᾶν) and wandering astray appear as the comprehensive expression of sin amongst the elect people (*Verständnis*, p. 80).

For the moral purpose of this discourse, cf. *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 212-216, and note the sober comment of Bengel: 'We ought to inquire concerning future events, especially those of the last days, not for the sake of gratifying our curiosity but from a desire to fortify ourselves. All things in this discourse must be referred to firmness in acknowledging and confessing Jesus Christ, for the drift and object of the prophecy is to enforce this duty. . . . The beginning is prudence; the end, patience.'

6. Πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου
λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἰμι,
καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν.

'Many will come *claiming my name*, saying, *I am*'; i.e. they will arrogate to themselves both the powers and position which belong by right to Jesus alone; in declaring that they are what *he* is, they assume messianic functions. Although the words are capable of a narrower meaning, it is better, in view of the nationalistic spirit of the contemporaries of Jesus, to interpret them on broader lines and to think of messianic pretenders in the widest sense. Whereas the popular messianism hardly ever produced a claimant to the messianic office in the strictest sense, it both fostered and was nourished by men who asserted the possession of messianic authority or who regarded themselves as forerunners of the Kingdom. For such there was always a welcome among the populace. The more intense the religious feeling of the people, the more liable they were to be led astray by impostors. This proved eminently true of the period immediately following the death of Jesus, but it applied to his life-time also. He will not have forgotten the revolt led by Judas of Galilee in the name of God; moreover the turbulent sons of this man were his own contemporaries and probably were known among the people even at this time (two of them were crucified *c.* A.D. 46-48, a third was a leader of the 'Sicarii' shortly before the Jewish war). It was men of this kind who rent the nation asunder and led it to its final ruin, as Josephus recognised (*Ant.* 18.I.i.6: he traces a direct line from Judas to the ruin of the temple and speaks of the nation 'growing mad with this distemper'). The disciples are warned not to associate with these or kindred movements (μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν, Lk. 21.8); they know the true Messiah and the inescapability of the approaching judgment.

ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου has sometimes been rendered by 'on my authority', thereby rendering the sentence contradictory. 'He who legitimises himself through the ὄνομα of Jesus cannot at the same time claim the same ὄνομα, the messianic dignity' (Weiffenbach, *Wiederkunftsgedanke*, p. 169). Klostermann concurs with this position, but while he would strike out ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου as a Christian insertion,

Weiffenbach wanted to omit instead λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι on the same ground. Nevertheless the translation appears to be mistaken. Heitmüller adduces abundant citations from the Hebrew O.T. and LXX to show that ἐν and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί τως both represent אֲשֶׁר. "The two prepositions, according to their use in this connection in the LXX, do not betray a noteworthy distinction . . . ἐν and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί τως means, under, with the naming or invocation or proclamation of the name. ἐπὶ is therefore not to be translated 'on the ground or authority of'. 'The correctness of our explanation of ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι', continues Heitmüller, 'is confirmed by the text itself, viz. through the words λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι. Thus: "with the naming, requisition of my name". A short translation would be our "with my name" (*unter meinem Namen*), not, as is usually translated, "on the ground of my name" ' (*Im Namen Jesu*, pp. 44, 63).

Klostermann urges that if this interpretation be correct, Jesus could simply have said λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι, without using the offending phrase. Yet this weakens the sense, in that all reference to the 'name' is then omitted. It is not impossible that there lurks in this saying the contemporary belief in the power of a name, especially if we remember the exaggerated reverence for the name of God and the Messiah. Bousset points out that the avoidance of the name יהוה had the opposite effect to that intended; it became a magic name with powerful properties (according to Artabanus, when Moses whispered the secret name of God to Pharaoh, the latter fell speechless to the earth). Similarly the name of Messiah had a pre-existence attributed to it (En. 48.3), and to know that name was a privilege reserved for the elect ("There was great joy amongst them, and they blessed and glorified and extolled, because the name of that Son of Man had been revealed unto them", En. 69.26). The Gnostics later speculated much about the name of the divine Redeemer (see *Die Religion des Judentums*, pp. 263, 309). Jesus may have had in mind the use of his name, Messiah, or even his personal name, Jesus, by pretenders claiming great power by virtue of its possession. Something of this background may be presumed in the description of Simon Magus as 'The Power of God which is called Great'. This interpretation differs from that adduced by Holtzmann and C. H. Turner, that λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι represents a claim to be the Risen and Returned Jesus. The case of the Seven Sons of Sceva illustrates the possibility of using magically the name of Jesus with no thought of self-identification with him (see Lake and Cadbury on Acts 19.14 ff.). The divine quality of the name of the Messiah may be hinted at in the traditional sounding Ἐγώ εἰμι; cf. Ex. 3.14, Deut. 32.39, Is. 43.10 f., 52.6 f.

Mt.'s addition of ὁ χριστός after Ἐγώ εἰμι may therefore be regarded as a correct interpretation; but that it is interpretative, not

original, seems demanded by its omission in Mk. and Lk. and by the Biblical associations of the short phrase.

Lk.'s *καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν* seems to involve a separate claim from *Ἐγὼ εἰμι*, and may be made by different people. T. W. Manson may be right in thinking that it implies the *ψευδοπροφήται* of Mk. 13.22 (Mission, 617). It is difficult to believe that W. Manson is right in seeing *ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν* as the *interpretation* of *Ἐγὼ εἰμι*, and so regarding that latter clause as meaning, 'The Messiah has arrived' (Luke, p. 231). Even more remote is the conjecture of Loisy that the speaker is God, who warns against those who claim to be the Sent One of God (Mark, 369 f.).

Whether this statement represents a parallel tradition to vv. 21 f. or is a doublet of it cannot be determined with certainty; v. 6 is certainly similar to v. 22, but *Ἐγὼ εἰμι* has a quite different significance from the *Ἴδε ὠδε*, *Ἴδε ἐκεῖ* of v. 21. On the whole it is better to treat the sayings on their own merits and not attempt to combine them; they are not the only similar sayings in the discourse (cf. vv. 7-8, 12-13, 24-25). See further on v. 21.

7. Ὄταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων,
 μὴ θροεῖσθε,
 δεῖ γενέσθαι,
 ἀλλ' οὕτω τὸ τέλος.

The incidence of wars in the End time is common to all traditions of Jewish eschatology, reaching back to the prophetic denunciations of sinful peoples, including Israel as well as the Gentiles (see e.g. Is. 19.2, Jer. 4.19 ff., 6.22 ff., 49.1 ff., Dan. 7.21 f., Joel 3.9 f. and cf. 2 Chron. 15.6). The keynote of this utterance, however, is the *μὴ θροεῖσθε*, peculiarly appropriate in a context of the *θόρυβοι* of war (*θροεῖν* translates *רָזָז* in the LXX, *θόρυβος* mainly *רָזָז*, frequently associated with the tumult of armies). The needlessness of fear is grounded in the divine purpose, *δεῖ γενέσθαι*, working itself out in and through these troubles, and also in virtue of the fact that these are preliminary trials, not the End itself.

The latter two considerations materially affect our understanding of the saying. The wars of the intervening period, though not the sign of the End, are yet not accidental; nor are they merely pieces in the apocalyptic kaleidoscope, helping to make up the picture, nor elements in an arbitrarily determined chain of necessity; they express the *δεῖ* of prophetic vision (Dan. 2.28), comparable to the *δεῖ* of redemption (Mk. 8.31); in them is seen the divine judicial activity, God in sovereign power executing his purpose, working his way towards the foreseen *τέλος*. That the End is 'not yet' is vital to the disciples; events are to occur which affect them more intensely than national commotions. For us *οὕτω τὸ τέλος* provides a significant illumination as to the nature of the End: it does not come in a blood bath ('*Christus kommt nicht mit Krieg*', Schlatter). Contrary to the assurances of the charlatans who come *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου*, the Messiah is no warrior, whose advent occurs for the extermination of Israel's foes. How he executes judgment is not described (vv. 24-27 are silent on this aspect of the parousia), but the notion of a Messiah with sword in hand is excluded (see further the interesting observations in Schlatter's *Erläuterungen zum N.T., Matthäus* p. 352, *Briefe und Offenbarung d. Johannes*, pp. 313-314).

πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων are frequently interpreted as signi-

ying wars *near and far* (cf. Dan. 11.44 θ, ἀκοαὶ . . . παράξουσιν αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ), or wars *present and threatening* (cf. Jer. 4.19), definitions by no means mutually exclusive. Lohmeyer suggested that the phrase is peculiarly suitable to describe wars of other nations which yet involve the hearers in suffering; this was the unhappy experience of Israel for centuries through its position as a buffer state, wherein contending parties fought their battles; the interpretation is apt but must not be pressed, since the language is couched in general terms.

H. A. W. Meyer and Lagrange regard the τέλος as referring to the end of Jerusalem, rather than the end of the age, since the former is the subject of the prophecy and becomes central in the passage vv. 14 ff. This is grounded on a false estimate of the relationship between the anticipated fall of the temple and the end of the age; it is presumed throughout this chapter that both belong to the same epoch. τέλος represents, as in 1 Cor. 15.24, the Heb. קץ, which signifies the end of this age and the beginning of the age to come (see Strack-Billerbeck on Mt. 24.6).

8. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος
καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν.
ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους,
ἔσονται λιμοί.

ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

This saying expands the previous one in v. 7 and cites further signs of which it must be said ἀλλ' οὕτω τὸ τέλος. The γάρ creates an impression that the saying supplies the basis for v. 7, but at most we should regard it as providing an illustration of the latter (the originality of the conjunction is doubtful; it is omitted by W and some cursives). Some authorities add παραχαί after λιμοί (so A W X Y Γ Δ Θ Π Φ Ὡ Minusc. rell. q Syr. sin. pesh. hl. Geo. Orig. Mt.). Of this Westcott and Hort write, '(It was) inserted probably either for the sake of rhythm . . . or from an extraneous source, written or oral' (*Notes*, p. 26). The former alternative is perhaps the more likely. There is a noticeable affinity between the group of MSS. reading παραχαί and those that replace ἀρχή by ἀρχαί (so A E² F G H M S² V X Y Γ Π² Σ Ω fam. 1); it looks as though παραχαί was due to the presence of ἀρχαί in the text and arose either through confusion with it or through conjecture as to the missing term on the basis of it. Luke adds λοιμοί to Mk.'s λιμοί. Beyond Hippolytus and Epiphanius there is no textual authority for its inclusion in Mk. Field strongly inclined to accept it as genuine here and observed, 'λιμοί καὶ λοιμοί have been connected ever since Hesiod' (*Notes on the Translation of the N.T.*, p. 37). This latter consideration could, of course, operate the other way: Luke may have been influenced by this classical association to insert the term here and so restore the rhythmical balance. Yet λοιμός in the sense of 'pestilence' is a very uncommon term. It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament (in Acts 24.5 it = a pestilent fellow) and has no certain employment in the LXX (𐤋𐤓𐤕𐤕, pestilence, is commonly rendered in the LXX by θάνατος; the only instances of λοιμός in the LXX are due to confusion with λιμός). Its unusualness and the ease of mistaking it for λιμοί could have facilitated its omission here (there is a curious parallel in Jer. 38.(45) 2, where Symmachus has rendered 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤁𐤓𐤕𐤕 by ἐν λιμῶ καὶ λοιμῶ; LXX renders simply by ἐν λιμῶ and omits the

reference to pestilence). Its inclusion in this saying would complete its rhythmic structure, make it fall in line with O.T. prophecy and relate it closely with Rev. 6.8 ff. (see R. H. Charles, *Revelation*, vol. i, pp. 158 f., and *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 238 ff.). In the absence of clearer evidence, however, no final decision is possible.

Apart from the many parallels that can be adduced from the prophets for each individual item, we find war, famine and pestilence enumerated together as divine judgments in 1 Kings 8.37, Jer. 14.12, 21.7, Ezk. 5.12 (Ezk. 14.21 enumerates 'my four sore judgments, sword, famine, wild beasts, pestilence'). Earthquakes are frequently mentioned in connection with the End, cf. Is. 13.13, Hag. 2.6, Zech. 14.4. In the nature of the case these events are not exclusively associated with the *συντέλεια*, but since they habitually figure as divine chastisements, it is presumed that they will be intensified at the end of the age, when the issues of history become plain. For this cause the disciples must face these adversities in a spirit of patient endurance and not lose faith because of them. Busch pointed out that the Rabbis prophesied the advent of a famine so severe that the Torah would be forgotten by its teachers (b. Sanh. 97a). The inveterate tendency of men to complain against God when they encounter adversity, especially of the kind envisaged here, illustrates the need for the disciples to be prepared for it. *μὴ θροεῖσθε* is accordingly to be assumed also in this verse.

The last clause *ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα* raises problems of its own. It may be a marginal gloss incorporated within the text, for it stands outside the poetic framework and adds nothing to the progress of thought (unlike the opening line of the discourse proper, v. 5b). If it is authentic, we must beware of stressing too much the idea that birth pangs are followed by a 'happy event', that these troubles therefore have a cheerful aspect since they lead to the new age; the dominant application of the metaphor in the Old Testament stresses the elements of suffering and chastisement (see especially Deut. 2.25, Is. 13.6 ff., Jer. 6.24 ff., Mic. 4.9); only in one case does it clearly envisage a hopeful future, Is. 66.7-8, with the very uncertain support of Is. 26.17 ff., Hos. 13.13 f. In the position wherein the phrase occurs in this discourse the prevailing Old Testament signification appears to be in mind.

Is the phrase intended to recall the Rabbinical 'birth pangs of the Messiah'? Frequently it is so affirmed, and Oesterley (*Doctrine of the Last Things*, p. 129) traces it back to a mythological origin. Both contentions are possible, but they can hardly be regarded as compel-

ling. (i) It is a curious fact that no certain instance of the phrase 'pangs of the Messiah' in the plural can be found in Rabbinical literature (the plural would be $\text{חַבְלֵי שֶׁל מָשִׁיחַ}$, but the invariable form is $\text{חַבְלוֹ שֶׁל מָשִׁיחַ}$, in Aramaic $\text{חַבְלֵיהּ דְּמָשִׁיחַ}$). The possibility must be reckoned with that Jesus drew the idea independently from the prophets, as did the Rabbis themselves (so Lagrange; Strack-Billerbeck, I, p. 950). (ii) The mythological origin of the idea has been suggested by the opening vision of Rev. 12, where a woman (originally a goddess?) gives birth to a child who finally overcomes the dragon. The 'woes of the Messiah' are said to relate to *the period between the child's birth and his growth to manhood*, when he is strong enough to deliver creation from its enemy. Thus Gunkel, who first affirmed that this complex of ideas reflects the history of the Babylonian Marduk (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 271, 381-382), but later thought it might have been derived from Egyptian mythology (*Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis d.N.T.*, pp. 54 f.). In his view the period of birth pangs is the traditional three and a half years of Daniel and Revelation, and the *three and a half* is derived from the *four* beasts that rule this period, so characterising it as the world winter. The growth of the young god in three and a half or three years for the conquest of the dragon is the root of the traditional three days required for Christ's resurrection. The origin of the whole idea is said to be the mythological view of winter, during which time the sun god is eclipsed in power. The highly speculative, not to say fanciful, nature of this reconstruction contrasts poorly with the abundant references in the prophetic writings to the figure of a woman's labour pangs as representative of suffering. It has already been pointed out that most of the instances are non-eschatological, suggesting that the eschatological application of the figure arose from the earlier and more frequent use of it to denote sufferings of any kind, rather than that the reverse process took place.

The indubitable background of v. 8 in the Old Testament prophets similarly renders void the desire to derive the individual items from Jewish non-canonical apocalypses. Certainly, many parallels can be found (see Charles, *Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 382), but these, too, are due to the same Old Testament source. This may be readily seen in 4 Ezra 13.31, the closest parallel in this literature to our logion: 'One shall think to war against another, city against city, place against place, people against people, and kingdom against kingdom'; this statement, as for Mk. 13.8, is found in a combination of 2 Chron. 15.6, $\text{πολεμήσει ἔθνος πρὸς ἔθνος καὶ πόλις ἐπὶ πόλιν}$, with Is. 19.2 $\text{ἐπεγεροῦνται Αἰγύπτιοι ἐπ' Αἰγυπτίους . . . πόλις ἐπὶ πόλιν καὶ νόμος ἐπὶ νόμον}$ ($\text{מִמְלַכָּה בְּמִמְלַכָּה}$).

This same prophetic background of the passage rules out the 'contemporary-historical' interpretation, which explains the separate

items as post-eventum reflections of current events. It is possible to point to a host of wars suffered within the Roman Empire at this period, to the famine in the time of Claudius (Acts 11.28) and, the earthquakes at Colosse, Laodicea, Smyrna, etc., but the method is fundamentally false.

9. Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς.
 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια
 καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε,
 καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε
 ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.
10. Καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
 πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

βλέπετε invites comparison with its occurrence in v. 5b: there the disciples are bidden to watch others, viz. pretenders to messianic authority who will endeavour to *allure* them away; here they are bidden to watch themselves, for attempts will be made to *force* them to forsake their allegiance, and they may succumb to the pressure. On the other hand, to understand the warning as meaning, 'Whatever signs and terrors outside may be, the single duty is to care for oneself' (Lohmeyer), is to do injustice to the context, which also stresses the responsibility of the accused believer to testify fearlessly to his Lord. If the first thought is, 'Watch yourself lest you fall,' the second thought follows hard on, 'Watch yourself lest you fail (your commission).'

The persecution comes from two directions, from Jewish and from Gentile authorities. The attitude of the Jewish leaders to Jesus had reached crisis point at the time of speaking. Since his message had become offensive to them, the disciples could not expect a more hopeful response, either from them or from their Gentile overlords. The offence of the cross was to be experienced in its full bitterness. On all hands persecutions would arise *ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ*, i.e. on account of their attachment to Jesus and their proclamation of his evangel (cf. Mk. 8.23, 10.29, illustrating the inseparability of Jesus and his Gospel). Their trials would prove *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*, i.e. either as providing an evident proof of the power of the Gospel in the disciples or, more probably, as occasions for making known the good tidings; whether such testimony would result in the good of the hearers, or their condemnation, would depend on the reception given to the message.¹

¹ The precise significance of the phrase *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* is in dispute Strathmann (*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, IV, pp. 477 ff.) considers that *μαρτύριον* does not mean active bearing of witness but a piece of evidence; in the N.T. *εἰς μαρτύριον* with the dative refers to evidence against the people concerned

Making due allowance for the possibility that v. 10 may originally have had a different connection, one cannot fail to be impressed by the coherence of the association of ideas in its present setting. The apprehension of the apostles of Christ will turn out to the furtherance of the Gospel (cf. Phil. 1.12 ff.); their trials will provide opportunity for wider testimony. In such an atmosphere the Good News is to travel far afield, even to heathen areas, though ever under the cloud of persecution. $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ seems to possess a twofold significance. On the one hand persecution must not stop the proclamation of the word. The Gospel is to be preached at all costs, and judicial courts are to be viewed as providing audiences for the message. On the other hand, assurance is given that, despite all opposition, the Gospel *must* progress to the ends of the earth, for the divine purpose declared in the scriptures of the prophets will be fulfilled. Here is both exhortation and encouragement.

A certain ambiguity attaches to $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu$. Its temporal significance is denied by some, and it is translated 'above all': the chief duty of the apostles is to proclaim the Good Tidings. In this case there is no necessary condition to be fulfilled before the coming of the End, but a task is defined as a prime characteristic of this age (so Merx, Loisy, Lagrange, Michaelis). Nevertheless, while $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau\omicron\nu$ can have this non-temporal meaning, it is doubtful whether such a significance is to be traced in any passage of the Synoptic Gospels, least of all in Mk. (so emphatically Kümmel, *Verheissung*, 77 n. 220); here it most plausibly relates to the $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\pi\omega\ \tau\tilde{\omicron}\ \tau\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ of v. 7. To those who consider that nothing on earth can affect the coming of the consummated Kingdom, this is a hard saying, but to others

(so Mk. 1.44, 6.11, Jas. 5.3); in this verse, therefore, the phrase refers not to missionary preaching but to witness for the purpose of demonstrating the guilt of the judges (p. 507). Yet it is doubtful that one should insist that $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ in the N.T. *must* signify witness against those to whom it is offered; it seems e.g. a strained interpretation of Mk. 1.44 to make it mean that a priest's acceptance of a healing miracle of Jesus will afford evidence against the unbelieving people in the Last Judgment; a more positive purpose for the $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ would appear to be in mind here. Each case accordingly must be taken on its merits. Kilpatrick suggests that had Mk. intended clearly to imply a witness against the hearers in 13.10 he would have written $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \pi\rho\tilde{\varsigma}\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (on the analogy of 12.12 $\pi\rho\tilde{\varsigma}\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\eta\nu\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$, see *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 155). He himself considers that the sufferings of the disciples are an eschatological sign to the governors and kings, a testimony that the end is near. The connection of the saying with v. 11, however, seems to me to strengthen the presumption that it is the oral testimony of the disciples that is first and foremost in view. For an interesting parallel, compare the statement attributed to Paul in a like circumstance to these envisaged here, Acts 26.22, $\epsilon\tilde{\sigma}\tau\eta\kappa\alpha\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\tilde{\omega}\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omega$, $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\delta\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu\ \tilde{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \omicron\tilde{\iota}\ \pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\alpha\i\ \epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\i\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$, κ.τ.λ. See further C. E. B. Cranfield's excellent discussion of the matter in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 291 ff.

who believe that the coming of the day of God may be hastened (2 Pt. 3.12) it provides a spur to Christian service.

The authenticity, provenance and significance of these two verses are all sharply disputed. For a discussion of the view that v. 9 reflects the experiences of the primitive Church and v. 10 the theology of Paul, see 'Jesus and the Future', pp. 192 ff. These sayings are so closely related with other and well attested teaching of our Lord, there is no need to attempt to eliminate them. Lohmeyer approached the matter from another angle and argued that v. 9 reflects life in Jewish Ghettos of the Diaspora: antagonistic Jews are thrusting out their Christian compatriots, judging them in their synagogal courts or arraigning them before Roman authorities and Oriental petty kings. Yet the situation suits Palestinian conditions perfectly. Every Jewish city had its group of men appointed to judge; the synagogues were used for the administration of justice in minor matters and difficult cases were referred to the Jerusalem Sanhedrin (Josephus, Ant. IV. viii.14). While *ἡγεμόνες καὶ βασιλεῖς* is a general expression, *ἡγεμών* is used of the procurator of Judea in Mt. 27.2, Acts 23.24, and Mark himself described Herod Antipas as *βασιλεύς* (6.14). Schniewind notes that in Ps. 119.46 God's testimonies are confessed 'before kings', and that from the time of the Maccabees, legends and tradition are occupied with conflicts between the authorities of state and the 'pious'.

The interpretation of the sayings is bound up with the question of their correct punctuation and wording. Lk.'s *ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον* (21.13) presumes an original *εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν*, instead of Mk.'s *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*. It is tempting to adopt Lk.'s basis, but the issue is complicated by the version in Mt. 10.18, which not only supports Mk. but in effect runs together the end of Mk.'s v. 9 into v. 10: *ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*. It looks as though Mt.'s *καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* may be the original of Mk.'s *καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. It is further well known that an extensive textual tradition in Mk. appears to support Mt.'s version, continuing Mk.'s v. 9 into v. 10 and putting a stop after *ἔθνη*, thus: *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. πρῶτον (δὲ) δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*. (so W. Θ 108. 124. .27. 131. 157. c d ff g² i r vg (1 ms), Syr. sin, Cop. (Boh) Geo). This tradition was favoured by Burkitt, and his thesis has been elaborately supported by G. D. Kilpatrick (*Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, pp. 145 ff.). The matter is of sufficient importance to warrant careful examination.

Professor Kilpatrick draws attention to three linguistic features: (i) *κηρύσσειν* is regularly used with the dative for persons addressed, but *κηρύσσειν εἰς* in Mk. 1.39, Lk. 4.44 = 'preach in'; on the usual punctuation of v. 10 therefore we ought to translate, 'And the Gospel

must first be preached among all nations.' (ii) A similar usage in respect of *μαρτυρεῖν* and *μαρτύριον* can be demonstrated, so that if we conjoin v. 9 to v. 10 we must translate the phrase *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* as 'for a testimony to them and among all the nations'. (iii) An examination of the word order in Mk., including that of ch. 13, shows that the Evangelist preponderately places the verb first in a sentence. When punctuation is dubious, therefore, that which gives the verb an initial position is likely to be right. On this basis vv. 9-10 may be arranged as follows:

Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς.

*παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγάς,
δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων,
σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.
δεῖ πρῶτον κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,
καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς . . .*

Professor Kilpatrick concludes that the text need imply no more than a mission in the synagogues at home and abroad, and the idea of evangelising the Gentiles disappears from the text. If we regard *πρῶτον* of v. 10 as relating to the time prior to the persecutions of v. 9, the flow of thought is continuous: before this persecution on the part of the authorities arises the Gospel must be preached, and, when it does commence, they are not to fear, for the Spirit will give them aid (v. 11).

The plausibility of this interpretation is undeniable, in particular the linguistic data are impressive. Two factors provoke caution in respect of the latter. First, while it is true that the verb is frequently placed first in a clause in Mk. 13, the exceptions are sufficiently numerous to make any reconstruction on the basis of word order very tentative. On the usual reading of v. 9 we have a verb beginning a line (*παραδώσουσιν*) followed by two lines in which the verb is at the end. Something very like this is to be seen in v. 6 (*πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται . . . καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν*). Verse 25 is not dissimilar (*ἔσονται πίπτοντες . . . σαλευθήσονται*); it is a free citation from Is. 34.4, except that *σαλευθήσονται* has replaced an original *τακῆσονται* (due to Hag. 2.6?), and either Mk. or his source has removed the verb to the end of the sentence! Note also the position of the verb in the key sayings vv. 31-32. Secondly, when vv. 9-10 are read with the verbs at the beginning of the clauses, the lines become abnormally long in comparison with those that precede and follow. This is not a decisive objection, since vv. 9-10 may not be in their original context, but it does affect the contention that v. 11 continues the statement begun in v. 10. It would be helpful if we could determine whether the threefold *παραδώσουσιν* (v. 9), *παραδιδόντες* (v. 11), *παραδώσει* (v. 12) indicates an original unity of the paragraph or suggests why the sayings were

brought together; different critics will have different ideas about that problem.

It is more important to observe that if Professor Kilpatrick's reconstruction be favoured, and it is certainly attractive, his restricted interpretation of vv. 9-10 by no means follows. He would relate *πρῶτον* to v. 11, apparently understanding the drift of thought to be, 'In whatever place you find yourself, first preach the Gospel; then, after your arrest by the authorities, have no fear, for the Spirit will be your Inspirer.' We may compare Paul's experiences in his missionary witness and perhaps regard this as a positive counterpart to Mt. 10.23. But in that case v. 9 would more fittingly follow after vv. 10-11; the effect of this would be to throw emphasis on the phrase *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* and underscore the mission to the Gentiles. It seems to me that v. 10 comes as a more fitting climax to v. 9 and that *πρῶτον* has reference to the entire eschatological process, contrasting with *οὐπω τὸ τέλος* of v. 7 (such is the interpretation of Mt. 24.14 *καὶ τότε ἤξει τὸ τέλος*). In this context of thought the absolute statement, 'The Gospel must first be preached', is most naturally given a universal application. Not only is it unnecessary to restrict *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* to a ministry to Diaspora Jews, it seems to me an unnatural limitation. Paul, it is true, always began with Jews in Gentile cities, but that was part of his stratagem as a missionary to the Gentiles: 'To the Jew first, and also to the Greek' (Rom. 1.16). To say the least, Mk.'s words are capable of a similar interpretation, and they may demand a stronger one.

While certainty is unattainable, it would seem that v. 10, even in its pruned form, 'The Gospel must first be proclaimed', relates to a witness before all, albeit in circumstances of suffering, that the Good News of the Kingdom may penetrate everywhere before it comes in power among men.

The actual course of events in the Church of Jerusalem should not be made an objection to this interpretation of v. 10 (as though the slowness of the primitive community to undertake evangelism abroad proves that Jesus did not enjoin it). We have no evidence that the earliest Jewish-Christian believers were averse to Gentiles becoming Christians; the burning question for them was the *terms* on which Gentiles were to be admitted to the Church and how fellowship between the two groups could be maintained. This passage and that controversy have nothing to do with each other. Moreover the unwillingness of the Judean Church to take the Gospel to non-Jews should not be exaggerated, for Acts (1-12) records such preaching before the missions of Paul. Their policy in the matter of evangelism will have been affected by two considerations: first, a conviction that their own nation should be won before sending the Gospel to others; secondly, the belief among Jews generally (which they would probably

have shared) that the time for the conversion of the nations was the period immediately prior to the Day of the Lord. In this connection the observations of W. C. Allen are worth recording: 'Only the course of history led the Church to see the full force of these words. The Old Testament contains a good deal about the conversion of the Gentile world. But these passages did not prevent the Pharisees from supposing that the Gentiles who wished to participate in Israel's privileges must become proselytes and keep the Law. The earliest Jewish Christians would interpret Christ's words in the same way. . . . Only the lapse of history could throw a true light upon *all nations*' (*Mark*).

Accordingly on critical, historical and theological grounds, there appears to be no sufficient reason for refusing the authenticity and plain meaning of Mk. 13.10.

11. Καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες,
 μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε,
 ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ
 τοῦτο λαλεῖτε.
 Οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες
 ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

The disciples have been warned of trials that will demand their utmost vigilance and strength and of their responsibility for testifying to the world, a prospect that might well make them quail. They are now promised supernatural aid with which to meet the situation. They will not be alone in their ordeal. The Spirit of their Father (Mt. 10.20) will assist them in their testimony, that the Gospel proclamation, which is their only defence, may prove effective amongst their hearers. Consequently they are not to be in a condition of anxiety as they contemplate each occasion of trial: both the content of their ἀπολογία (τί) and the manner of its delivery (πῶς Lk. 12.11) will be subject to the Spirit's inspiration. In such circumstances, 'the preparation of the defence is less the drafting of an apology than a prayer' (Lagrange).

Mt.'s τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν is to be preferred to the more stereotyped phrase in Mk. and Lk. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, not alone because of its unusualness but because of its appropriateness to the situation. 'They themselves will not give answer to their judges', wrote G. C. B. Pünjer, 'but the Holy Spirit:—which remarkably well agrees with what Jesus says of himself, that he speaks and does nothing of himself but only what his Father in heaven wishes' (*Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1878, p. 171). Most authorities in Mt. and Lk. replace Mk.'s τί by πῶς ἢ τί. Streeter thinks that this agreement is due to textual assimilation, since in Mt. 10.19 πῶς ἢ is omitted by a b k Syr. sin. Cyprian, and in Lk. 12.11 ἢ τί is omitted by D 1 157 O. L. Syr. sin and cur. παραδιδόντες is omitted by b, ff.; that may be due to carelessness or good taste, for only one verb is needed here and it is omitted in Lk. 12.11. Mk.'s text may have been filled out by assimilation to Mt. (παραδώσιν), but if that be so it is not improbable that Mt. may have preserved the original, for the idea of παραδιδόναι binds together the paragraph vv. 9-13 (9, 11, 12).

It has been strongly argued by C. K. Barrett (The Holy Spirit in

the Gospel Tradition, pp. 131 ff.) that the form of this saying in Mk., Mt., and Lk. 12.11 f. is secondary and that Lk. 21.15 has preserved the original: not the Holy Spirit but Jesus himself will come to the disciples' aid in distress, *ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν ἣ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι ἢ ἀντεπεῖν ἅπαντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν*. The chief ground for this preference is that Lk., who normally shows a greater interest in the work of the Holy Spirit than the other evangelists, would not have omitted a reference to the Spirit in a source he deemed sound and substituted for it another version (cf. Lk. 11.20, where his 'finger of God' is generally preferred to Mt.'s 'Spirit of God', Mt. 12.28, for the same reason). In any case the passage speaks only of an exceptional and occasional spiritual aid in particular circumstances, which is very far from what the Church believed about the Spirit in apostolic times. This exposition is part of an argument designed to show that Jesus did not foretell the gift of the Spirit to the Church and that for a very compelling reason: Jesus anticipated the triumph of the Kingdom to follow immediately on his death and resurrection. 'He did not prophesy the existence of a Spirit-filled community, because he did not foresee an interval between the period of humiliation and that of complete and final glorification. He did not distinguish between his resurrection and parousia, and accordingly there was no room for the intermediate event, Pentecost' (op. cit., p. 160).

The present writer has attempted elsewhere to demonstrate that Jesus anticipated a period between his resurrection and parousia (see *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 191 ff., also W. G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, pp. 58 ff.). While the question of probability in deciding between two versions of a saying necessarily involves an element of doubt, most critical commentators believe that Lk. 21.15 is a paraphrase of the Markan original. Lk. has already utilised the Q form of Mk. 13.11 (Lk. 12.11 f.) and therefore would not feel a paraphrase out of place here. Either he or his source here appears to have had in mind the promise to Moses and Aaron, *ἐγὼ ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα σου καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβιβάσω ὑμᾶς ἃ ποιήσετε* (Ex. 4.15) as well as the related tradition concerning Stephen in Acts 6.10, *οὐκ ἔσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει*; it will be noted that the latter saying combines the motives of both Mk. 13.11 and Lk. 21.15, a significant procedure if Luke himself is responsible for the wording of the Lk. 21 and Acts 6 passages, for it would indicate that he was consciously adapting the tradition by the use of terms that appealed to him. Inasmuch as the operations of the Risen Lord and the Holy Spirit were often identified in the primitive Church, such an interchange of terms ought not to be regarded as surprising.

Barrett is not alone in regarding the logion as referring to excep-

tional circumstances and therefore to an intermittent ministry of the Spirit: Vincent Taylor has also urged that the saying has in mind an occasional endowment by the Spirit for critical times, and Lohmeyer deduced from it that only the martyr is the bearer of the Spirit. It is possible to exaggerate the abnormality of the situation in mind. There is no reason for imagining that Jesus thought of these occasions as rare; they were to be the rule. This kind of environment for the proclamation of the Gospel was to continue until the End. Whatever success might attend the testimony of the disciples, Jesus seemed to have no illusions as to the constancy of opposition to it. If then the disciples were to be perpetually in need of the aid of the Spirit, they were to rest assured it would be given. Moreover Jesus avowed that his mighty works were done by the power of the Spirit (for this purpose Mt. 12.28 and Lk. 11.20 are identical in meaning), and we have no reason to imagine that he believed these visitations of the Spirit were occasional; as little would he anticipate that the bestowal of the Spirit on his disciples after his resurrection would be spasmodic. The gift of the Spirit is here related to the situation Jesus has been describing; it would be fallacious to argue that consequently he envisaged the Spirit's gift being limited to these occasions. In the Johannine discourses the fourth Paraclete saying speaks of the testimony of the Spirit only to the world (Jn. 16.5-11), the fifth saying tells of his witness solely among the apostolic group (16.12-15); the third could be interpreted as including both kinds of testimony (15.26). We may therefore regard it as an accident, due to the limitation imposed by the aspect of the future under discussion, that the ministry of the Spirit to the disciples themselves is omitted here. Some such view as this seems demanded by the real relation presupposed by Jesus between his crucifixion-resurrection and the coming of the kingdom, and the expectation of the *general* diffusion of the Spirit in that kingdom (Joel 2.28 ff., 'I will pour out my Spirit on *all flesh . . .*').

12. *Καὶ παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον
καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον,
καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς
καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς.*

The family is the foundation of society. Widespread division within this fundamental unit can only mean universal disruption; consequently the break-up of society is nowhere more vividly represented in the prophets than by their description of parent and child, friend and friend, brother and brother in mutual antagonism (cf. Is. 3.5, Jer. 9.4, Ezk. 38.21, Mic. 7.6). It is 'the worst of the End-time woes' (Lohmeyer). Jesus saw a fulfilment of this prophetic theme in the closing days of his own ministry. Micah had expressed the thought in terms of rebellion of children against parents:

*υἱὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα,
θυγάτηρ ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς,
ἐχθροὶ πάντες ἀνδρὸς οἱ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.*

But Jesus set forth the hostility as mutual, in terms yet more poignant:

*ἔσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν ἐνὶ οἴκῳ διαμεμερισμένοι,
τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισίν,
διαμερισθήσονται, πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί,
μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατέρα καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα,
πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νυμφὴν αὐτῆς καὶ νυμφὴ ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.*

(Lk. 12.52 f.)

What had already become observable in the days of his ministry Jesus saw as a phenomenon increasing in intensity and in application in the period between his resurrection and parousia. The disciples would be denounced by their own relatives. Schlatter points out that the passionate despicability with which Jews scorned traducers shows that the division here pictured has gone to the limit and is totally irreconcilable: hence *θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς* (cf. Ezk. 38.21b, *μάχαιρα ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἔσται*). Whereas the prophets had seen this simply as a sign of anarchy, Jesus reveals its root in the rejection of himself as God's Messiah. Earlier he had affirmed, *οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν*

(Mt. 10.34); more simply it is now said that the division will be *διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου* (v. 13). Herein is seen a grim reversal of the hyperbolic saying of Jesus as to the necessity of 'hating' one's nearest kin, and even one's own life, in order to be a disciple; what Jesus had spoken of in a relative sense the believer will experience with deadliest venom.

The saying is commonly regarded as a piece of purely Jewish apocalyptic, taken over here in view of the experience of these sufferings within the primitive Christian community (Wellhausen, Loisy, Lohmeyer?). Yet it is eminently suitable on the lips of Jesus. On the one hand he himself had already known the bitterness of estrangement in his own family (Mk. 3.21, 31-35, Jn. 7.5); in face of the developments since those days, and standing in the shadow of the cross, he could well have universalised his experience. On the other hand, there was growing in Judaism at the very time of speaking a temper akin to this described here. Josephus characterises the adherents of the 'fourth philosophy', the Zealots, as men without regard for the lives of their closest associates: 'They do not value dying any kinds of death, nor indeed do they heed the deaths of their relations and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man Lord' (Ant. XVIII, i, 6). Israel was to drink to the full the appalling effects of that creed. Modern missions among the heathen can quote abundant instances of infliction of death for discipleship unto Christ, and among no peoples is ostracism for Christ's sake more acute than in Mohammedan and orthodox Jewish circles.

Menzies notes that, contrary to this unhappy picture, the dawn of the age to come will witness a restoration of the family bond and of natural relations among men (Mal. 3.1, 4.5-6, Mt. 17.11 ff., cf. Lk. 1.17).

13. Καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων
 διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου.
 ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος
 οὗτος σωθήσεται.

The opposition of unbelieving kinsmen to followers of Jesus is shared by the unbelieving world. The conflict against the representatives of the Christ becomes general. Why should this be so? Certainly not in virtue of a doctrinaire apocalypticism (woes must precede the end, therefore Christians must expect them). In the N.T. suffering and the kingdom of God are inextricably bound together, so that he who would be heir of the latter must be prepared to embrace the former (cf. *διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, Acts 24.22—note the *δεῖ!*). The nexus between suffering and participation in the community of the Son of Man is not accidental but rooted in the very being of that community. It came into existence through obedience to the call of the rejected Messiah and by virtue of his sacrificial death. The rebellion of the world against God expressed itself in the murder of the Son of God; the community that stands by him must needs be the object of the same hostility. Yet the Son did not flee from it, but in love for the world suffered at its hands; if his own would share his spirit they must also share his passion. The key to the passage is *διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου*, for the Name of Jesus is the shame and the glory of Christians. To avoid the shame is to lose the glory. 'As the Christ became the Creator of the Church only through suffering and the death of the cross, so the Church also can remain the community of the Christ only if it accepts its own suffering', wrote Gloege. 'No stone of the "house" can know another destiny than that meted out to the Christ as the corner- and foundation-stone. The sufferings of the "Head" necessarily draw the sufferings of the "Body" and its members after it. What the Christ as the primary element of the Church suffers, the Church nowhere and never can be spared' (*Reich Gottes und Kirche*, pp. 338-340).

If however the unity of Christ and his followers entails a unity with him in his destiny, suffering is but preliminary to glory: *ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας . . . οὗτος σωθήσεται*. This salvation is not alone a

negative deliverance from evils experienced but a participation in the Kingdom; it is 'life, divine sovereignty, resurrection' (Schniewind). Hence the 'endurance' cannot signify mere continuance to the end of the age, as though that would automatically secure entrance into the next; it is endurance in the confession of the Name (H. A. W. Meyer), the opposite of Mt.'s πολλοὶ σκανδαλισθήσονται (Mt. 24.10). The paraphrase in Lk. 21.19 is therefore not misleading:

ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

The Lucan insertion καὶ θριξὲς ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται (Lk. 21.18) is difficult, coming after the assertion, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν (v. 16). Expositors have chiefly taken one of two alternatives, either that v. 16 relates to a few martyr-apostles and v. 18 the church as a whole (a view adopted by scholars as different as Godet, J. Weiss and Loisy) or that v. 18 assures the disciples that they will not suffer spiritual loss (Zahn, Lagrange, Creed, the former two adding the suggestion that the bodily resurrection may also be in mind). While the latter view would harmonize well with the evangelist's intention, one ought not to overlook that the language is elsewhere uniformly used of literal bodily preservation (as in Acts 27.34 and the O.T. passages 1 Sam. 14.45, 2 Sam. 14.11, 1 Kings 1.52, from which it is plain that we are here dealing with Semitic proverbial speech). If we feel that both the foregoing interpretations are unsatisfactory, we must conclude either that the saying is secondary (always the easiest way out of a difficulty!) or that it has lost its original connection. The use of the Q saying, ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἠριθμημένοι εἰσὶν (Mt. 10.30, Lk. 12.7) is instructive from this point of view, for in its context it must have the force, 'Not one hair of your head shall fall to the ground *without your Father*' (so T. W. Manson). Despite the opposition of Klostermann, therefore, it would seem that, in this setting, Bengel's comment on οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται in Lk. 21.18 is justified: 'shall not perish, namely, *without the special providence of God*,—without its reward, before its time'.

The nature of the τέλος has also been disputed by commentators. Lagrange maintains that it has nothing to do with the end of Jerusalem and the world, and that it must mean the end of the believer's life; so Klostermann, who translates εἰς τέλος 'right up to the last offering'. Dalman on the other hand holds that the phrase = the Heb. עַד הַסֵּף לְעַד , which in Dan. 12.13 LXX is translated by εἰς συντέλειαν ἡμερῶν, and the Aram. עַד הַסֵּף לְעַד , which in Dan. 7.26 LXX becomes ἕως τέλους (*Words of Jesus*, p. 155). So also Schniewind regards τέλος as 'a coined expression for the last day'. If the view of the perspective of the chapter maintained in this commentary is right,

there is little need to differentiate between the two meanings; they have a similar force, since the end is looked for 'soon'. With this accords Lohmeyer: 'The conception of the end comprises here both the end of men and nations at the day of God's wrath, and the end of the pious who seals his steadfastness right up to the death of the martyr.'

14. Ὄταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως
 ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ
 —ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω—
 τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη.

Accepting the text as it stands, the problem arises as to the identity of the βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, a phrase which has perplexed commentators in a similar fashion as the enigmatic 666 of Rev. 13.18.

Undoubtedly the Christian understanding of the phrase has been misled by the natural meaning of ἐρήμωσις and by the connection of this verse with the prophecy of doom in v. 2. The expression translates the Heb. מַשׁׁוּׁוֹת פִּקּוּשׁ, which occurs with variations in Dan. 9.27, 11.31, 12.11, but which should probably be identical in each case. מַשׁׁוּׁוֹת is used of the desolation of lands (e.g. Is. 49.8) and of being awestruck (Jer. 2.12). Most exegetes agree that the latter meaning is here in mind and that we should translate the Hebrew phrase, 'The Appalling Abomination', or 'The Abomination that causes horror'. Charles speaks of the LXX translation, reproduced in our text, as 'an impossible rendering', and Wellhausen asserts that it is 'completely misleading and conveys neither the sense of Daniel nor that of the Gospel' (Ev. Marci). This is perhaps too strong. The misunderstanding has been largely due to the citation of the phrase out of its context, for the LXX rendering of the parallel expression in Dan. 8.13 מַשׁׁוּׁוֹת שִׁמְעָה, 'The Appalling Sin', by ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐρημώσεως shows that the translators knew fairly well what was in mind: they took מַשׁׁוּׁוֹת in the sense of desolating the temple so as to be bereft of its worshippers (an interpretation of the phrase which G. Kittel has himself adopted, *Theol. Wörterbuch z.N.T.*, vol. 2, p. 657: 'The pious visitors must avoid it on account of the Abomination, hence it has lost its meaning'). It would seem, however, that the פִּקּוּשׁ causes, not desolation, but horror.

The origin of the phrase is indubitable since Nestle's article in ZATW, 1883. It is a contemptuous equivalent of מַשׁׁוּׁוֹת שִׁמְעָה, pronounced according to the transliterations of Philo of Byblus as Baal Shamem, The Lord of Heaven, and was identified with the Greek Zeus (the Syriac of 2 Macc. 6.2 actually translates Ζεὺς

'Ολύμπιος by בַּעַל שֵׁמֶשׁ). 'Baal' was replaced by רִיקוֹשׁ , 'abomination', just as in earlier times the same name had been replaced by בִּזְיוֹן , 'shame' (cf. the replacement of Meribaal by Mephibosheth in 2 Sam.; in Jer. 11.3 the doublet $\text{בַּעַל שֵׁמֶשׁ} \parallel \text{בִּזְיוֹן}$ is reproduced in the LXX by Baal alone). But what has Zeus Olympius to do with Daniel? In 1 Macc. 1.54 ff. it is recorded that the agents of Antiochus Epiphanes $\text{ᾠκοδόμησαν βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον. καὶ ἐν πόλεσιν Ἰουδα κύκλω ᾠκοδόμησαν βωμούς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θυρίδων τῶν οἰκῶν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἐθυμίων}$. Here $\text{βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως}$ is plainly equated with a βωμός , and many commentators have insisted on limiting its use in Daniel to this profaning altar. On the other hand the most common use of רִיקוֹשׁ in the O.T. is for an idol; Rabbinic tradition regarded the Danielic רִיקוֹשׁ as an idol; and C. C. Torrey cites Josippon's 'History of the Jews' as declaring it to be a matter of common knowledge that Antiochus set up images of himself in many places as objects of worship (Documents of the Primitive Church, p. 26). Since in any case altars and idols in heathenism went together, it is likely that Antiochus had both an image of Zeus Olympius and a heathen altar erected on the great altar of the Jewish temple. This would best account for the occurrence of רִיקוֹשׁ here, and the wave of horror that must have come over the people (רַעֲוָה); Cheyne further pointed out that this interpretation accords well with the didactic narrative of Nebuchadnezzar's image in Dan. 3 (En. Bib. vol. i, 21 ff.).

In view of this meaning in Dan. 9.27, etc., it is clear that the expression has by itself no thought of the temple's destruction but purely of its desecration. The Abomination horrifies. The term implies 'the transformation by Antiochus Epiphanes of the sacred temple at Jerusalem into a heathen one' (Ginzberg, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. i, pp. 80-81). But it still stands as a building. What, then, did Jesus intend by the phrase? The common extension of meaning given to O.T. passages in the N.T. forbids an insistence that our Lord's use of the expression must be identical with that in the Danielic passages; and in any case by this time it may well have become proverbial (Johannes Weiss suggested that the additional clause 'Let the reader understand' has the effect of setting the phrase in inverted commas). On the other hand there is no reason to imagine that Jesus was involved in the ambiguities of the Septuagintal rendering; רִיקוֹשׁ would have conveyed to him primarily the notion of desecration, if not also of idolatry. While it

is unnecessary to make v. 14 contradict v. 2, it is equally unnecessary to insist that the two statements are identical. Probably we should see in the appearance of the Abomination the major sign that leads to the subsequent destruction of the temple: an appalling desecration of the temple takes place which leads to its ultimate ruin (so Hauck, 'It brings desecration, not destruction, hence opens the beginning of the *θλίψις*').

If we further ask what kind of a desecration could have been envisaged as having such results, the variety of replies, of which some account is given below in the detached note, may well lead to sympathy with Schlatter's conclusion: 'We dare not in an arbitrary fashion define more closely such a word of prophecy. Any prophecy has its limits and cannot say everything; we must not broaden it ourselves. It was sufficient for Jesus to say to the disciples that the sanctuary that is now the pride of the whole nation will be fearfully desecrated and given up to desolation. How it will happen, they will see when it happens' (*Erläuterungen zum N.T.*, Matthäus). But of all the hypotheses put forward, the one actually favoured by him seems to meet the complex evidence best of all: 'A Roman army with its heathen insignia and worship and its mania for destruction would suit these words' (*ibid.*). The images of the emperor on the eagle standards made them an object of abhorrence to the Jews, since they were objects of worship. From the account recorded by Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII., v.3) of the Jews meeting the legate Vitellius with the request that he would not march his army through their land because of the images on the ensigns, and his compliance with that request, it is plain that the idea that these ensigns were a common sight in Palestine is mistaken; unless the images were removed, their association with the Emperor cult made their presence in the Holy Land intolerable. Josephus records an even more significant event (*Ant.* XVIII. iii.1): Pilate, ten years prior to the utterance of our saying, set Jerusalem in an uproar by introducing into the city ensigns with the offending images. Eisler, following the narrative in the *Halosis* of Josephus, notes that only one image was said to have been taken into the army quarters; it is to be inferred that the cohort stationed in the castle of Antonia brought with it one of the standards, which the bearer would have struck into the ground (*The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, pp. 312 ff.). The castle was situated on the temple mount and was therefore regarded as falling within the temple precincts. This action would have been viewed by the Jews as a profanation

of the temple. When it became known to the people they flocked in multitudes to Pilate at Caesarea to ask him to remove the offence. The governor attempted to deny their request, but in the end he had to choose between initiating a massacre, with unpredictable consequences, and removing the standards; he chose the latter course. If one standard could create such an intensity of feeling, it is clear that the prospect of the Roman power at some future date forcibly occupying Jerusalem, and setting up its idolatrous insignia in or about the temple, could only be the prelude to war to the death; and the end of such a war could not be other than extremity of desolation for the Jews. That Jesus anticipated such a disaster for his nation is clear from other passages, earlier referred to (e.g. Mt. 23.35 ff., Lk. 13.1 ff., 19.41 ff., 23.28 ff.). It was an anticipation springing fundamentally from his spiritual insight. Its expression in the manner here inferred is not unworthy of him and is harmonious with his other teaching.

ὁ ἀναγνώσκων νοείτω has caused an astonishing amount of discussion. More than any other single factor it has given rise to the view that this chapter is unauthentic: it is urged that the unknown apocalyptic writer has here nodded, forgetting that such an exhortation is inappropriate in the mouth of Jesus *speaking* (so Colani and a multitude of followers). Weizsäcker, followed by Wellhausen and Bruce, interpreted the note as advice to the reader of the community (ὁ ἀναγνώσκων) to explain the meaning of the βδέλυγμα to the hearers (Apost. Zeitalter, p. 362). The Catholic expositor J. Schmid regarded it as a word from the Lord himself to read the book of Daniel with care. More probably it is a parenthesis of the evangelist, either drawing attention to the fresh and significant application of the Danielic phrase (McNeile, Busch, etc.) or appealing to the reader to look beneath the surface, since what is said is less than what is meant, just as in Rev. 13.18 attention is called to the secret of the number of the Beast, ὃδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν. ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου. ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν.

The concluding exhortation τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη is thought by some to recall that Mattathias and his sons fled to the mountains at the time of the profanation instigated by Antiochus (1 Macc. 2.28). Schniewind preferred to view it as an application of the flight motif, common in prophetic anticipations of the Day of the Lord since Amos 5.19 f., and noticeably affected

by Gen. 19.26 (cf. Is. 15.5, Jer. 49.8, especially Jer. 4.29, Ezk. 7.16). Others who think of this as a late document incline to see in it a reminiscence of the prophetic oracle which led the Jerusalem church to flee from the doomed city across the mountains to Pella (see Eusebius, H.E. III, ch. 5). Perhaps it is simplest to recall Neh. 8.14 f., 'They found written in the law . . . that they should publish and proclaim in all their towns and in Jerusalem, "*Go forth to the hills and bring branches . . .*"' (LXX ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸ ὄρος). From the occurrence of ἡ ὄρεινῆ for 'hill country' in Lk. 1.39 and the Protevangelium of James, Dalman concluded that the district about Jerusalem was called ἡ ὄρεινῆ (*Sacred Sites and Ways*, pp. 52 f., where Pliny is cited to the same effect, *Hist. Nat.*, v. 14, 70). On this view the call is for the inhabitants of Jerusalem and its neighbouring towns to escape by hiding in the hill country. Refuge is not to be taken within the Holy City. They that are without should not enter it, and they that are within should flee from it. The temple, contrary to popular sentiment, is not inviolate, but is about to be given over to heathen outrage.

NOTE ON THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION OF THE ΒΔΕΛΥΓΜΑ ΕΡΗΜΩΣΕΩΣ

IT is striking to observe how the interpretations of the *βδέλυγμα* prevailing at the present time were all suggested in the earliest stages of the critical discussion.

1. *Caution in identification*

Weiffenbach urged that too much stress should not be laid on the Daniel passages, since in the period of the composition of our Gospels *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως* would be a mysterious and incomprehensible phrase, the subject of as varied and divergent interpretations as it is nowadays (*Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, p. 126). In this he was followed by Johannes Weiss, who believed it fundamentally false to ask what Paul had in mind in 2 Thess. 2 and how Mark interpreted the *βδέλυγμα*: 'He does not interpret it. He only says that a horrible desecration of the temple must have taken place before the end can come. The interpretation is pure apocalyptic theory; he simply imparts here a still unfulfilled prophecy of Jesus' (*Das Älteste Evangelium*, p. 78). While that may be true of Mark it can hardly be allowed that to Jesus this was a matter of mere apocalyptic theory; he himself must have had something more definite in mind and stronger reasons for setting it forth than its inclusion among the tenets of an apocalyptic tradition.

2. *A Desecration*

Colani himself appears to have been responsible for setting modern critics on the track of interpreting the *βδέλυγμα* as a profanation, but he did so in terms of impassioned disgust. 'Let me put this question', he urged. 'This Jesus, who believed himself greater than the temple, Jesus, whom the idolatry of the Jews for their sanctuary filled with indignation, Jesus who had just said with a kind of joy little disguised that there would not remain of it a stone on a stone, Jesus who one day cried, "I will destroy it"—could *he* have attached such importance to the profanation of these

stones and of this timber?' (*Jésus Christ*, p. 206). Polemics apart, Colani had clearly distinguished between the profanation spoken of in v. 14 and the destruction declared in v. 2. Weizsäcker followed up the hint with more restraint; he considered that the Abomination passage, which presupposed the continuance of the temple, lay incongruously alongside the prediction that the temple must fall, and included this with other indications that the Discourse comes from a Jewish source (*Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, 1864, p. 125). Keim, in evident dependence on his predecessors, became more explicit: 'In accordance with the prediction of Daniel, he (the author of the apocalyptic discourse) feared only a heathen desecration of the temple in the manner of Antiochus or Caligula, and counselled Jews and Christians, in face of this horror, to migrate from Jerusalem and Judea, and to await upon the hills the speedy redemption of the immediately returning Messiah' (*Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, iii, p. 238). A basically similar interpretation was advocated by Zahn and by Schlatter (in *Der Evangelist Matthäus*). Wellhausen, however, pursued a slightly different path; if the Messiah's coming is awaited in this period of profanation, it must be for the deliverance of his sanctuary: 'It does not end in annihilation, despite all. After the grievous tribulation and desecration, Jerusalem and the temple will finally be rescued and the Diaspora led back thither' (*Ev. Marci*, p. 103). Later he suggested that the meaning of the passage is identical with that of 'the remarkable fragment of the Apocalypse of John (11.1-2), that the temple, perhaps with the exception of the outer forecourt, will not fall in the power of the heathen' (*Einführung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 97). Bousset went a stage further in this direction and adduced our passage with Rev. 11.1 f. as together providing instances of the preservation of prophecies in the New Testament concerning the *indestructibility* of the temple (*Religion d. Judentums*, p. 113, n. 1). It is not natural to draw such an inference from the saying in question, neither is it necessary to presume an irreconcilable opposition between it and the prophecy of v. 2. It is preferable to adopt the interpretation given above, that the desecration leads finally to the destruction of the temple: in Bengel's words, 'The abomination of profanation was followed by the abomination of desolation', a right sentiment, despite its impossible linguistic basis! Calvin had anticipated this view, in regarding the abomination as a profanation leading to the ruin of Israel's temple and government (*Harmony of the Evangelists*, ad

loc.). His language concerning the *βδέλυγμα* is obscure, but the note on it in his commentary on Daniel makes clear his belief that the profanation consists in the continuance of the temple cultus after the abolition of sacrifices by the death of Christ; that may be good theology but it can hardly claim to be good exegesis. Lohmeyer more truly caught the authentic spirit of the saying in a note added for the second edition of his commentary on Mark: 'This event changes the sanctuary, which hitherto was the sole and true place of God and his worship, into the place of devilish triumph and of the final destruction.' On such a basis we may admit with Austin Farrer that here, if anywhere, in the discourse, an answer to the disciples' question in v. 4 is provided, but not, as he urged, that the saying conveys the simple idea of the temple's destruction (see *A Study in St. Mark*, pp. 362 ff.). The prediction explicitly concerns a desecration. The further note of destruction is implied in the nature of the desecration and the context in which it is set.

3. *The Zealots*

To the question, 'What desecration had such consequences?' a popular answer in the nineteenth century was, 'The abominable deeds of the Zealots during the siege of Jerusalem'. This view was persuasively expounded by Pfeleiderer in his article, *Über die Composition der eschatologischen Rede, Mt. 24.4 ff., Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie*, vol. XIII. He brought together three citations from Josephus' *War of the Jews* indicating a contemporary belief that the Zealots incurred the divine wrath on the sanctuary by their pollutions and thereby fulfilled prophecy. In IV.iii.12 the internecine strife of the Jews within the besieged city is described and it is said, 'As for the dead bodies of the people, their relations carried them out to their own houses; but when any of the Zealots were wounded, he went up into the temple and defiled that sacred floor with his blood, insomuch that one may say that it was their blood alone that polluted our sanctuary'. In IV.vi.3, after portraying the evil deeds of these men, Josephus commented, 'There was a certain ancient oracle of those men, that the city should then be taken and the sanctuary burnt, by right of war, when a sedition should invade the Jews, and their own hands should pollute the temple of God. Now, while these Zealots did not [quite] disbelieve these predictions, they made themselves the instruments of their accomplishment'. A further reference to this oracle and to the prophetic scriptures is made by Josephus in a speech to the

beleaguered Jews: 'They foretold that this city should be then taken when somebody shall begin the slaughter of his own countrymen. And are not both the city and the entire temple now full of the dead bodies of your countrymen? It is God therefore, it is God himself who is bringing on this fire, to purge that city and temple by means of the Romans, and is going to pluck up this city, which is full of your pollutions' (VI.ii.1). Pfeleiderer did not imagine that these events fulfilled the prediction of Mk. 13.14, but considered that the latter was written at this time and reflected contemporary convictions. In this he was followed by Weiffenbach, Keim and Pünjer (see particularly the last named writer's article in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1878, p. 166). In Britain the view was espoused by W. L. Bevan (*Smith's Dictionary*, art. 'Abomination') and Alford, but the prediction was regarded as dominical. It was adopted by H. W. Fulford in Hasting's *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (art. 'Abomination') and is represented today by the Roman Catholic scholar J. Schmid (*Das Ev. nach Markus*). The chief support of this contention as put forth by the British writers is the belief that פְּקִידָה is used not of idolatry in the abstract but of false worship adopted by Jews (e.g. 1 Kings 11.5, 2 Kings 23.13, Ezk. 5.11); the argument is scarcely justifiable, for it ignores the derivation of פְּקִידָה from פְּעֵל שָׁמַם with its indubitable allusion to the altar and image of Antiochus. This view should now be abandoned as incompatible with the evidence.

4. An Idol

(a) *The Statue erected by Hadrian.* The tradition that the βδέλυγμα was an idol strongly entrenched itself in the early centuries of Christian thought and was the common view of the Jews. The Mishnah contains the following statement: 'Five misfortunes befell our fathers on the 17th day of Tammuz and five on the 9th of Ab. On the 17th day of Tammuz the tables (of the Law) were shattered, the daily offering was discontinued, a breach was made in the city and apostomos burned the scroll of the Law and placed an idol in the temple. . . .' The Rabbinical comment on this runs, "'Apostomos burned the scroll of the Law.'" This is a tradition. "And placed an idol in the temple." Whence do we know this? It is written, And from the time that the continued burnt-offering shall be taken away and the detestable thing that causeth appalment set up . . .' (*Taanith* 4.28b). The language is obscure, and to judge from further remarks of the Rabbinical commentator the actual

course of events was imperfectly remembered, yet it is clear that The Danielic $\Upsilon\eta\psi$ in the Jewish view was an idol. But when was this idol set up? The answer depends on the identity of 'apostomos'. Schlatter thought it a corruption for apostatis, the apostate being R. Elisha b. Abuja (c. 120 A.D.); the idol in the temple will then be either the statue of the Capitoline Jupiter erected by Hadrian on the site of the demolished temple or the founding of the temple of Zeus on the same spot. This interpretation was known to Jerome (*Comm. in Ev. Matt.*) and was championed by Baur, who dated the passage from that time (and the Gospels from a later! see *Kritische Untersuchungen ü.d. kanonischen Evangelien*, p. 606, and for Schlatter's view, Strack-Billerbeck I, p. 196). It is questionable however, whether the emendation should be adopted. Ginzberg, after a full discussion on the matter, concluded that Apostomos was a nickname for Antiochus Epiphanes and therefore that the Mishnaic passage related to the deeds of Antiochus himself, not to those of a later date (*Jewish Encycl.* II, p. 21).

(b) *An Image introduced by Titus.* In Patristic times it was commonly thought that the $\beta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$ related to a statue introduced by Titus into the temple enclosure; e.g. Theophylact, *In Ev. Marci*, defines the $\beta\delta. \acute{\epsilon}\rho.$ as $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \tau\eta\nu \pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma. \beta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \epsilon\iota\delta\omega\lambda\omicron\nu \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota.$ These words are repeated in the *Scholia Vetera in ev. sec. Matt.*, and substantially in Euthymius Zigabena, *Comm. in Matt.* The tradition probably arose from a recollection of Titus planting standards bearing Caesar's images in the Temple area.

(c) *The attempted profanation of Caligula.* The foregoing interpretation may have provided the needful impulse to Pfeiderer for propounding a further solution of the problem which was to become widely influential. Realising that the Danielic passages involved the introduction of an idol into the temple, and not being able to find trace of a comparable desecration under Titus, he abandoned his former view and suggested that the sole event that could have inspired such language was Caligula's attempted introduction of his statue into the temple at Jerusalem. There was no question of the saying being produced in the fateful year 39-40 A.D., but rather the events of that time produced the fear that another Caesar would achieve what Caligula had failed to do. 'The Jewish country folk in the villages . . . in vv. 14 ff. are commanded to fly to the mountains, with allusion to the terrifying spectre that at that time was perpetually agitating Jewish fantasy, the prospect of a fresh

desecration of the temple after the fashion of the earlier occurrences and intentions of Antiochus Epiphanes and of Gaius Caesar' (*Das Urchristenthum*, p. 404). Pfeleiderer dated the appearance of the apocalypse, of which this forms the crucial part, in the seventh decade of the first century. His view of the *βδέλυγμα* was adopted by Holtzmann (*Die Synoptiker*), Schmiedel (*En. Bib.* II, 1857), Menzies (*The Earliest Gospel*) and J. Weiss (*Das Älteste Evan.*, p. 78).

Since apocalypses are usually dated as emanating from the crises they reflect, it was inevitable that someone at length should suggest that the *βδέλυγμα* prediction arose during the anxious days precipitated by Caligula's threat. The suitability of the occasion for such an oracle cannot be contested. The crisis was brought about by an unfortunate series of events. When Agrippa visited Alexandria in A.D. 38 the mob demanded that a statue of Caesar be placed in the synagogue; on permission being given by Flaccus, riots ensued and deputations went to Rome, headed by Philo for the Jews and Apion for the Alexandrians. While they were there an altar of Caesar was destroyed by Jews in Jamnia. Caligula was furious and ordered his statue to be placed in the temple at Jerusalem. Petronius marched to Judea with three legions, but was prevailed on by the Jews to write to Caligula and ask for a reversion of the order. Agrippa happened to be in Rome at the time and asked Caligula for his friendship's sake to comply with the petition. The Emperor did so, then repented of his weakness. He sent an order to Petronius to kill himself and had a statue prepared in Rome which he intended to take to Jerusalem. Before he could execute his plans he was murdered. The suspense in Palestine during this time can easily be imagined (see Josephus, *Wars*, II.x.1 ff.). Piganiol maintained that the past tenses of Mk. 13.19-20 show that a breathing space had been granted at the time of writing: the Lord *has shortened* the days! This suits exactly the situation wherein Petronius had given way to the entreaty of the Jews and written to Caligula, asking for a revocation of the demand. The apocalyptic writer held his pen in his hand at this momentous hour. 'The Jews did not remember having traversed days of such mortal anguish. It seemed the winter would not pass before the temple had been profaned ("Pray that these things may not happen in the winter," v. 18).' Piganiol further suggested that the apocalyptic passage in 2 Thess. 2 was written at the same juncture, when Paul was among Jewish Christians (*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie*

religieuses, 1924, pp. 247 f.). In this conclusion he was followed by Hölscher (*Theologische Blätter*, July 1933, pp. 193 ff.).

A variation of this view was maintained by C. C. Torrey in several works and was most fully expounded in his *Documents of the Primitive Church*, pp. 13 ff. He held that the variant of our passage in Lk. 21.20 was original, since it accorded with the scheme of the End in the O.T. prophets. The modification of the Lucan saying in Mk. and Mt. was produced by the Caligula episode, as an evident fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy; the clause, 'Let the reader understand,' is a hint from the evangelist that the original prediction is being edited. The discourse was transcribed and the Gospel of Mark compiled at once in order to prepare people for the impending End.

In his dating of the Gospel of Mk. Torrey is followed by no one, but his belief that Mk. 13.14 is a modification of the Lucan original has been widely adopted. Levertoff and Goudge described the Marcan saying as a Christian Targum, which substituted for what Jesus really said (Lk. 21.20) what his followers understood him to have meant, the language being dictated by the Caligula affair (*A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, III, p. 192). T. W. Manson (*Mission and Message of Jesus*, pp. 621 f.) and C. J. Cadoux (*Historic Mission of Jesus*, 275, n. 3) also consider Luke's saying to have been modified by Mk. in the light of this crisis. B. W. Bacon made Torrey's starting point the basis for a complete genealogy of the Abomination sayings. Working from the assumption, 'Antichrist was born under Caligula,' he regarded 2 Thess. 2.1-4 as a Pauline refinement of Jewish expectations inspired by the excitement of this time. Two facts occasioned Paul's own interpretation, (a) his idea of a spiritual conflict in the heavenlies, hence he looked for a manifestation of Beliar instead of a material Shiqqutz, with a diabolical imitation of redemption instead of a profanation of the earthly temple, and (b) the End did not arrive with the Caligula crisis. Mk.'s version was due to a second like disappointment, viz. the non-appearance of the parousia after the fall of the temple; his Shiqqutz is the personal Antichrist yet to come (N.B. the masc. ἐσσηκότα). Mt. speaks of the profanation occurring in a holy place: he has in mind the desecration of the synagogue in Caesarea which precipitated the rebellion of A.D. 70. Lk. reflects his tendency to introduce predictions of the fall of Jerusalem consequent upon its disregard of the Lord's warning to repent (see *The Gospel of Mark, its Composition and Date*). It is a very ingenious, very intricate and

very improbable hypothesis. It is the culmination of the method, manifest in Pfeiderer, which pins down a prediction to a likely event and then insists that on this account the saying must be *ex eventu*. Baur's reference of the *βδέλυγμα* to Hadrian's statue has seemed to most an impossible suggestion, but the difference between him and his successors is purely that of a date, the method is the same as that of Pfeiderer. The study of the Gospels, including Mk. 13, should show us that Jesus was no ordinary apocalypticist, whose utterances are to be judged as on a par with the multitudinous pseudonymous tracts of this time. While our passage can be violated to look like pedestrian eschatological dogma, it is susceptible of a more natural and worthy explanation.

5. *Antichrist*

From earliest times the *βδέλυγμα* has been identified with Antichrist, owing in large part to the influence of 2 Thess. 2.1-4. Hippolytus sets the two passages side by side as obviously parallel, while Irenaeus virtually puts Paul's language into the mouth of Jesus (*Adv. Haer.* XXV). Jerome mentions Antichrist as possibly in mind in this passage yet adds, 'Abominatio . . . idolum nuncupatur . . . Desolationis, quod in desolato templo atque destructo idolum positum sit.' Victorinus, in his commentary on Revelation, develops this hint of Jerome's by conjoining Mk. 13.14 with Rev. 13.14 ff.: 'He shall cause also that a golden image of Antichrist shall be placed in the temple at Jerusalem and that the apostate angel should enter and thence utter voices and oracles. . . .' It will be found in subsequent literature that expositors in fact hover between interpreting the *βδέλυγμα* of the person of Antichrist and of an image representing him. Cheyne thought it plain that in both Mk. 13.14 and 2 Thess. 2 a statue is meant. 'It was believed that by spells a portion of the divine life could be communicated to idols, so that the idol of the false god was the false god himself.' He also linked the two passages with the *θηρία* of Rev. 13, all three being derived from the apocalyptic dragon, which in turn is but the Hebraised version of the mythical dragon Tiamat (*En. Bib.*, 21 ff.). This of course echoes the contentions of Gunkel and Bousset. Following on the researches of Gunkel in his *Schöpfung und Chaos*, Bousset urged with regard to Mk. 13.14, 'The first thing to be done is to get rid of all interpretations based on current events.' The idea of Antichrist sitting in the temple of God cannot be due to the Caligula scare; it goes back to the old creation myth. The monster

of the sea had in primeval times warred unsuccessfully against the God of heaven, but in the last days it was to rise again and contend in a heaven-storming battle with God. The language of Mk. 13.14, 2 Thess. 2.1 ff., Rev. 13.1 ff., presupposes a variant of the myth in which the dragon storms the heavenly abode of God ('blasphemes') and successfully ejects Him from his earthly sanctuary, seating himself in the temple at Jerusalem (see *The Antichrist Legend*, pp. 164 ff., where the variant is further traced in Asc. Is. 4.11, 'His image shall he set up before his face in all the cities'). Gunkel himself elaborated these ideas further in his *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis d.N.T.* He identified the three and a half times of Daniel and Revelation with the time of the *βδέλυγμα*. Indeed, he urged, once it is recognised that the chaos monster lies at the back of the opponents of God in Daniel and Revelation it should readily be seen that *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως* is simply a mysterious name for the monster and as such can hardly be improved on (Op. cit. p. 81, n. 2). Here we must pause. Admittedly the term *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως* would be a fitting name for the chaos monster, but it has already been demonstrated that its origin is rooted firmly in the history of Antiochus Epiphanes and has no connection with these mythological speculations (it will be granted that the origin of the Redeemer myth which Antiochus applied to himself is at this point irrelevant). Like much else of *religionsgeschichtliche* reconstruction, the idea is good but it happens not to be true. Similarly Bousset's elaborations of this theme hang by gossamer threads. It cannot be overlooked that all his proof texts for Mk. 13.14 ff. as representing 'the rule and reign of Antichrist', conceived on a mythological basis, come from later Christian writings. Moreover, he himself reversed his earlier judgment concerning the illegitimate use of contemporary events in eschatological interpretation and urged that the idea of Antichrist enthroned in the temple of God was due to Caligula's threat to the Jerusalem temple (*Religion d. Judentums*, 3rd ed., p. 256). That international mythology has played a large part in the fitting out of Antichrist with his equipment can hardly be doubted, but the relevance of these researches to the interpretation of Mk. 13.14 has yet to be demonstrated; we are dealing with firmer ground here than the watery wastes of Tiamat.

In the present century a majority of exegetes and critics have assented to the belief that the *βδέλυγμα* represents the Antichrist, and among Continental scholars this view is almost universally

adopted. It has become a tradition to be accepted and no longer a matter for discussion. Yet the supports with which the interpretation is buttressed are uncommonly weak. Busch supposes that *ὁπου οὐ δεῖ* of v. 14 is essentially the same as the *ἐγὼ εἶμι* of v. 6; it represents 'the stepping into the place of God, the satanic imitation of the revelatory ways of God' (*Zum Verständnis d. syn. Eschatologie*, p. 93). The comment is interesting but it rests on an identification of Mk. 13.14 with 2 Thess. 2.4 and does not arise out of the Marcan context. Lohmeyer considered that the revelation of Antichrist in the temple must be thought of as a great illuminating beacon, since how else should men know of his presence and the necessity to flee? The difficulty is a real one but the solution is hardly natural. In the context of this chapter—and our saying must not be removed from it—it is doubtful that the traditional doctrine of Antichrist is intended to be understood at all. Despite the centuries old equation of Mk. 13.14 with 2 Thess. 2.3-4, the identification exaggerates the facts. In 2 Thess. 2.4 the adversary (i) opposes and lifts up himself against every one called God or an object of worship, (ii) so that he sits in the sanctuary of God, (iii) proclaiming that he is God. The first point clearly adapts what is said of Antiochus Epiphanes in Dan. 11.36 ff.; the second denotes either the tendency or the actual achievement of Antichrist; if the third clause is explanatory of the second, the meaning is that Antichrist's tendency is towards self-deification, and the sitting in the temple is purely figurative language; if it advances on the second clause, then the temple of God must be regarded as the heavenly temple from which Antichrist rules—possible if the *ἄνομος* be a demon but difficult if, as seems likely, he is viewed as a man. The former view suits better the human aspect of the *ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας*. There seems no reason to introduce into Paul's language any reference to the temple at Jerusalem. The most that can be said, then, is that this passage extends the idea of Mk. 13.14 and fills it out from Dan. 11. More probably it should be viewed as a parallel conception, with the kind of contact inevitable in view of Paul's almost certain knowledge of the eschatological discourse. This means that 2 Thess. 2.4 should not be used for the elucidation of Mk. 13.14.

On the other hand, it would be possible to align the *βδέλυγμα* with the Antichrist doctrine if, with Althaus, it be recognised that in the N.T. this doctrine is fluid, possessing a variety of forms and above all has what he terms 'immediate actuality' (*Die Letzten*

Dinge, p. 283). That is, the concept of a power at work against God is applied to forces operative in the contemporary situation; the idea illuminates the present, it does not impose on it a programme. From this point of view Lagrange is ready to admit the Antichrist doctrine here, recalling that in Jewish apocalypses Antichrist is often conceived as a conqueror, and in particular that Pompey, after his profanation of the temple, is actually named the dragon in *Psalms of Sol.* 2.29. Vincent Taylor similarly grants that this passage is not incompatible with the idea of Antichrist's coming, 'provided that his parousia is manifest in history'. He compares the term βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως with the use of 'Babylon' for Rome in 1 Pt. 5.13, Rev. 18.2, the implication lying to hand that the Roman might is the embodiment of Satanic power, i.e. Antichrist (Comm. on Mk. and *Expository Times*, vol. LX, no. 4, art. *The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mk.* 13).

6. *The Roman Army*

It will be at once obvious that the historic tradition of the βδέλυγμα as related to the Roman power about to destroy Jerusalem by no means excludes the previous interpretations. The earliest witness for this identification is Luke himself, in his version of Mk. 13.14: ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυκλομένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων Ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γινώτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. Whether or not this version is due to Lk. himself, and whether, in the words of Swete, he has been 'taught by the event', it is hard to resist the conclusion that it is explanatory of Mk., and not vice versa. While it is true that *Mk.* might have substituted an obscure apocalyptic phrase for a plain statement, lest open reference to Rome be construed as treasonable (Vincent Taylor), that consideration can hardly have applied to Jesus. On the principal of *difficilior lectio potior*, and in view of Lk.'s avoidance of terms unintelligible to Gentile readers, it is reasonable to accept the priority of Mk. over Lk. and regard the latter as providing his readers with an interpretation of the βδέλυγμα.

Once more we find this view represented in the Fathers. Chrysostom writes of the βδέλυγμα: μοι δοκεῖ τὰ στρατόπεδα λέγειν, similarly Pseudo-Chrys. and Augustine. Volkmar ingeniously supported this interpretation by reading ἐστηκότα as a neuter plural, 'the fulfilment of which is to be understood in a plurality of desolating things, i.e. of desolating armies' (*Jesus Nazarenus*, p. 285). That will not do, however, for the participle is most natur-

ally to be taken as a masc. singular (for a similar instance of Mk.'s ungrammatical change of genders, cf. 6.29, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦλθον καὶ ἤραν τὸ πτώμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ. so *K.W.T.*; most MSS. correct to αὐτό). The usual form in which this view has been presented is that of Swete's, who writes: 'The defining gen. ἐρημώσεως limits us to an outrage which was the prelude of national ruin, a crisis corresponding in effect if not in circumstances with the invasion of Antiochus' (so also Edersheim, A. B. Bruce, A. Farrer, etc.). Against this it has been shown that the βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως must be regarded primarily as a desecration of the temple. For which cause the modification of this view such as is presented by Bengel seems to be nearer the mark: the βδέλυγμα is 'the Roman army . . . the standards of which they (the Jews) held in abomination as idols, since the Romans attributed divinity to them'. So also Salmond, J. S. Russel, Schlatter, and above all Merx.

In *Jesus and the Future* I sought to justify this view, as set forth in the main exposition above, by closely following and developing Merx's reconstruction of the text in his commentary, *Das Ev. Matthäus nach d. syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*. Briefly the points are as follows: (i) regarding Mt.'s version of the βδέλυγμα logion as original, Merx and Streeter accepted the omission of ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ in Syr. sin, 1424 as original. (ii) The Syriac tradition generally presupposes τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος; for τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. (iii) In d, i, Syr. sin, Pesh., the plural τὰ ὄρη is read as singular, montem, ܒܝܘܬܐ. (iv) ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω is admittedly an addition by the evangelist. (v) οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν may well have replaced an originally direct exhortation, φεύγετε (so Hauck, Lohmeyer). On this basis the original saying of Jesus will have run:

ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος φεύγετε εἰς τὸ ὄρος.

On such a reconstruction it is natural to interpret the βδέλυγμα as standing in close relation to the Roman army approaching Jerusalem, especially since σημεῖον = ܒܝܘܬܐ, 'ensign', and is frequent in Josephus for the Roman standards to which the images of the emperor were affixed.

I still consider this restoration of the text to be plausible, for if a statement of this kind concerning the βδέλυγμα ever circulated alone, without the additional ἐρημώσεως, it would be a temptation hard to resist to conform it to the well-known Danielic phrase.

On the other hand, it is admittedly hazardous to set the Syriac tradition over against the mass of textual evidence, and it always remains possible, as Dr. Heinrich Greeven suggested to me, that we are here dealing with an *Erleichterung* of the original text on the part of Tatian. This reconstruction must therefore be regarded as tentative. The essential interpretation, nevertheless, stands, even if the received text be allowed to remain. Lagrange affirmed that even though we do not accept the Syriac reading it points to the correct understanding of the passage.

Since Pilate's attempt to maintain standards within Jerusalem, or more particularly one standard in the temple precincts, forms an illuminating background for this interpretation of the saying, it should be noted that the memory of his blunder seems to have lingered on, not merely for decades but even for centuries. Jerome included among possible interpretations of the *βδέλυγμα* this desecration of the temple by Pilate: 'Potest autem simpliciter aut de Antichristo accipi, aut de imagine Caesaris, quam Pilatus posuit in templo . . .' (Comm. on Mt.; the words are repeated verbatim by Bede in his exposition of Mark). It is likely that Jerome learned of this event from his Jewish teachers while in Palestine. Still more remarkable is a statement of Theophylact in his commentary on Mk. After identifying the *βδέλυγμα* with the statue brought into the city by its conqueror, he remarked, *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος, τὰς τοῦ Καίσαρος εἰκόνας νύκτωρ εἰς τὸ ἱερόν ἀγαγὼν, πολλοῦ θορύβου τῷ πλήθει ἐγένετο αἷτιος. ἔκτοτε ἤρξατο καὶ ὁ πόλεμος καὶ ἡ ἐρήμωσις τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ.* Theophylact must have had reason for this extraordinary linking of Pilate's action with the Jewish war and fall of Jerusalem. It was surely no unfounded speculation, yet the narrative of Josephus by itself would not have suggested the idea. On the lowest estimate it points to the continued memory of the Jewish indignation on that occasion, with perhaps the existence of elements of tradition that have since escaped us.

In conclusion it may not be amiss to draw attention to the embarrassment caused to later Christians by the cult of the idolatrous ensigns. Ethelbert Stauffer narrates that during the Diocletian persecution a veteran's son, Maximilian, was ordered to join the army. He refused, saying, 'I am a Christian, and I cannot do anything blasphemous.' The governor asked him, 'What blasphemies have soldiers to perform?' The young man merely replied, 'You know yourself what they have to do.' For his obstinacy he was put to death. Stauffer commented, 'No doubt Maximilian was thinking

of the camp cult of the imperial standards, which was part of the soldier's military duties.' From the same source comes the story of a Christian soldier Dasius who refused to participate in the Saturnalia. When commanded to fall down before the sacred images he declined and was sentenced to death. 'Before him walked a ministrant with a vessel of incense, part of the camp cult. Well-meaning comrades tried to persuade him, at the eleventh hour, to offer incense for the emperors. Then "the blessed Dasius seized the vessel and scattered the incense to the winds, trampled on the shameful and sacrilegious images of the blasphemous emperors, and made the battle sign of the adorable cross of Christ on his brow, through whose power he stood firm against the tyrants"' (*Christ and the Caesars*, pp. 258-260). One can perceive in this narrative the burning indignation of the Church in regard to this cult and the loathing aroused by the emperor's images. If Christian converts from heathendom could feel so strongly against these idolatrous emblems, it is certain that Jews, with their ancestral horror of idolatry, would view them with no less detestation and would perish rather than acknowledge them.

It would seem a just conclusion that the traditional language of the book of Daniel, the Jewish abhorrence of the idolatrous Roman ensigns, attested in the reaction to Pilate's desecration, and Jesus' insight into the situation resulting from his people's rejection of his message, supply a sufficient background for this saying, and that from this point of view it is congruous with the other teaching of our Lord.

15. Ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος
 μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω
 τι ἄραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ.
16. Καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν
 μὴ ἐπιστρεφάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω
 ἄραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

The urgency of flight is illustrated by a two-fold prohibition against entering one's house under any circumstances. A man on the roof-top, whether resting (1 Sam. 9.25) or working (Josh. 2.6), praying (Acts 10.9) or on the look-out (Is. 22.1), must not descend by the inner staircase into the courtyard to bring out valuables from his house; nor should anyone occupied outside return home, even for his cloak. At the appearance of the *βδέλυγμα* not a moment must be lost if life is to be preserved. The peril is imminent. Destruction is at hand.

This saying is found in Lk. 17.31, in a context describing conditions at the parousia; some suppose it to be the true reference of the logion. Loisy, interpreting v. 14 solely of a profanation, cannot see the necessity for such haste as this, nor, since no man has wings, how one can escape from the roof without first descending;¹ all is explained if an instantaneous parousia is being awaited. McNeile expresses similar ideas in more sober vein: 'Neither the leisured man on the roof nor the field labourer must attempt to save their property; they must be ready to meet the Son of Man bereft of everything.' This interpretation is less natural than that which relates the saying to flight from an army threatening to destroy the capital city. Although Jesus constantly exhorts to preparedness for the Advent, he never appeals to his followers to stand still and wait for it; the returning Lord should find his servants busy in their vocations. Since v. 17 follows well on v. 14 it is possible that the original source did not contain vv. 15-16 and that the saying was originally independent of context. Its position in Lk. 17.31 is due to its apparent reminiscence of the escape of Lot from Sodom (Gen. 19.17), hence its appropriateness to the exhortation *μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ* (Lk. 17.32), following hard on a comparison of the day of the Son of Man with the day of Lot (Lk. 17.28 ff.). Mk. has certainly placed the logion in a right kind of context, even if not the original one.

¹ This is of course a misunderstanding. The man is not to descend into the courtyard *τι ἄραι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας*, but is to flee by the outer staircase into the open.

Loisy was not the first to perceive the difficulty of a man on the roof-top apparently bidden not to come down from it; later scribes have affected the textual tradition in their efforts to make the text read more smoothly. After *καταβάτω* is added *εἰς (ἐπὶ) οἰκίαν (αὐτοῦ)* by A D W θ etc. fam 1, fam 13, fam θ cursives al. pler., OL, vg, Syr. sin, Syr. hl, Aeth, Arm, Aug. Its inclusion removes the ambiguity of the saying and possibly improves its flow, but it is difficult to see why it was omitted by the Alexandrian authorities (\aleph B L Φ etc.). Moreover *μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω* is omitted by two of the cursives which have the addition (245, 435) and by c k Aug semel, evidently for the same reason which led to the insertion of the earlier phrase, viz. to secure a smoother reading. If the usual text be retained it is perhaps best with Lagrange to regard *μηδέ* as equivalent to *καί* consecutive.

Wellhausen remarked that we have here to do with a whole nation, and indeed with Jews in the country, not with a few Christians in Jerusalem and with their flight to Pella. The contention is uncertain. If the saying was earlier independent it could have been addressed to the people generally; in the contexts in which it is set by Mk. and Lk. disciples are primarily in mind. Perhaps we need not press the distinction, for the counsel applies to all that will take heed. As far as the disciples are concerned, it should be noted that the exhortation to flight in no way conflicts with the call for sacrifice to the death such as is issued in Mk. 8.34 ff. Jesus demanded the utmost renunciation for His Name and Gospel, but not for identification with the nation in its hour of doom. Faithfulness to Israel has a limit: there is no need to perish with them. When the wrath comes on them to the uttermost, the disciples should flee. This is consonant with the attitude of our Lord revealed in the mission charge (Mt. 10.14-15).

From the point of view of exact exegesis, it should be observed that the man on the roof need not be resting, nor *ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν* working. A roof-top was used for storing dried fruits and vegetables and for studying the Law (see Strack-Billerbeck I, p. 952). Dalman (*Jesus-Jeschua*, p. 101) noted that in Mk. 15.21 Simon of Cyrene came *ἀπ' ἀγροῦ* before 9 a.m., when no one goes home from work in the field. 'What it really means is that he came from *outside the city*.' In Heb. חַוְּלָה means 'the free country, the heath' (cf. Gen. 24.63, 27.3, Is. 40.6, 55.12); the Targum renders it חַוְּלָה , 'outside', in Gen. 3.1, 6.14. In this saying, accordingly, Dalman would have us render *ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν* as 'he that is outside', whether working in the fields or pursuing some other object. It is perhaps simpler to translate *ἀγρός* as 'country-side', a meaning which would suit Mk. 15.21, and which would accord with Dalman's prime contention. Luke's phrase *ἐν ταῖς χώραις* probably has this intention (= 'in the country'). As in the case of the *βδέλυγμα* saying, Lk. (or his source) has interpreted the original logion by expansion; his second clause, *καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς*

ἐκχωρείωσαν seems intended to apply the preceding clause in the first place to Jerusalem (the contrast with the third clause becomes meaningless if *αὐτῆς* is made to relate to *Ἰουδαία*): those in the city should hasten from it and those in the country should not enter it (for refuge).

17. Οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις
ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.
18. Προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος.

These sayings are bound together by the thought of compassion for those fleeing from threatened destruction. In a season of panic, none are more distressed than pregnant and nursing mothers; for neither group is haste possible. Winter creates further anxiety, since torrents become barriers and lack of shelter at nights an added misery. If Mt.'s text be original, as it may well be (see *Jesus and the Future*, p. 229), the occurrence of the event on a sabbath would be most serious of all, for the question whether to break the Law and escape, or keep the Law and die, would offer a tormenting dilemma, especially for heads of families. In the atmosphere of war for the faith, the choice of the Maccabaeian martyrs, who perished rather than fight on the Sabbath (1 Macc. 2.32 ff.) would be that of many, for the Scribal tradition had both hardened and extended its influence since that day (see Strack-Billerbeck I, p. 953, for an example of a Rabbi who in A.D. 110 dared not counsel flight on the Sabbath). To spare his followers perplexity in a time when hesitation might prove fatal, and out of pity for the common people of his nation, Jesus bids the disciples to pray that it might not happen on a Sabbath. Schlatter rightly remarks, 'He does not lament over the temple, but he is concerned over the distress of men' (*Matthäus*, ad. loc.).

The insertion in v. 18 of ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν as subject of γένηται, supported chiefly by the Koine text, and of μηδὲ σαββάτω after χειμῶνος in a few minuscules, is clearly due to assimilation to Mt. ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν may or may not be authentic reminiscence in Mt., but since the event and the flight would coincide, there is little need to discuss whether ἡ θλίψις is better than ἡ φυγὴ. It is impossible to settle finally whether μηδὲ σαββάτω is original or due to Mt.'s Judaizing influence. The former view is generally viewed as the more likely (so Haupt, Holtzmann, J. Weiss, Merx, Loisy, Klostermann; Lagrange and Swete with hesitation). Lk.'s addition, which has taken the place of v. 18 (ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄργη τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, Lk. 21.23) reminds us that Jesus is speaking of something that concerns his own nation alone, not the universal Church of the Resurrection.

While he opposed the extreme Sabbatarianism of the Scribes, he respected the Sabbath as an institution and did not direct its abrogation; he could well have sympathised with sincere adherents to the Scribal view in their distress, despite his rejection of its basis.

The Jewish apocalyptic notion that the last days will see women producing monsters, and abortions of three months that will dance (2 Esd. 5.8, 6.21) should be adduced here only in order to contrast such an outlook with the sobriety and compassion of Jesus (contra Rawlinson and Blunt). A. B. Bruce spoke of v. 17 as 'a touch worthy of Jesus, sign mark of genuineness'. A peculiar Rabbinical parallel, to the sentiment here expressed is afforded in *Tanch.* 55a. A celebrated teacher suffered toothache for thirteen years, during which time no woman died in giving birth to child and no pregnant woman had an abortion; i.e. his bearing of pain was vicarious. By the agency of R. Chijja, the prophet Elijah laid his hand on the teacher's mouth and cured the toothache; whereupon R. Chijja lamented, 'Woe to you women that give birth in Israel, woe to you that are pregnant in Israel!' (Strack-Billerbeck I, p. 952). The reason for adducing this curious fancy is the light it throws on the Jewish attitude to expectant mothers; if a great Rabbi's suffering helps anyone, it relieves mothers about to give birth, for they need relief most. So with Jesus; when he thinks of the last agonies of his nation, his sympathy is directed to the most helpless of women.

The severity of flight in winter is reflected in another Rabbinic passage, *Tanch.* 156b. (In his contemplation of the departure from Jerusalem at its overthrow) 'God said, "If they go out in the cold they will die." What did he do? He waited and caused them to go into exile in the summer' (Strack-Billerbeck, I, p. 952). In our passage, however, the thought of a decree of God is absent; the disciples are to *pray* that God will prevent the distress from occurring in the stormy season. This reveals an attitude, as Haupt and Lohmeyer recognised, quite different from apocalyptic determinism.

19. Ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψις,
οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη
ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως [ἦν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς] ἕως τοῦ νῦν
καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται.

The distress is described in language drawn from Daniel's portrayal of the last tribulation, Dan. 12.1 (Theodotion is nearer Mk. than is the LXX: ἔσται καιρὸς θλίψεως, θλίψις οἷα οὐ γέγονεν ἀφ' ἧς γεγένηται ἔθνος ἐν τῇ γῆ ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ ἐκείνου). This in turn echoes repeated assertions as to the severity of the Egyptian plagues in the book of Exodus (Ex. 9.18, 24; 10.6, 14; see especially 11.6, ἔσται κραυγὴ μεγάλη . . . ἥτις τοιαύτη οὐ γέγονεν καὶ τοιαύτη οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται). The connection is not unsuitable in view of the frequent representation of the End as a second Exodus (e.g. Is. 51.9 ff., Jer. 23.7 f., Ezk. 20.34 ff., Mic. 7.15 ff.); the trials prior to the End are compared with those preceding the deliverance from Egypt (cf. Rev. chs. 8, 16). The association must not, however, be pressed for the language seems to have become proverbial. Josephus employed it on at least three occasions to emphasise the terrible nature of the sufferings of the Jews in their war with the Romans ('The misfortunes of all men, from the beginning of the world, are not so considerable as they were,' *Wars*, Proem. 4; 'Neither did any other city ever suffer such miseries . . . from the beginning of the world,' *Op. cit.* V.x.5; 'The multitude of those that therein perished exceeded all the destructions that either men or God ever brought upon the world,' *Op. cit.* VI.ix.4). This may be felt to justify not only the words of Jesus here, but his solicitude for the disciples and the urgency of his commands. Plato also has a similar expression in *The Republic*, οὔτε γὰρ γίγνεται, οὔτε γέγονεν, οὔτ' οὖν μὴ γένηται (6, p. 492 E). In view of these citations, it does not seem permissible to press the language here to make it yield a reference to the subduing of primeval chaos at creation (Schniewind) or to an extended period of history after Jerusalem's fall (Levertoff and Goudge); by the use of traditional language Jesus describes an unprecedented time of suffering, to be followed in due time by the 'rest' of the Kingdom.

Lagrange thought that the employment of Dan. 12.1 here justified separating vv. 19-20 from 14-18, on the ground that the

latter refer strictly to the fate of Jerusalem, the former to the End of the age. Vincent Taylor also sees that this verse goes beyond a merely historical event and that it points to the final End; he therefore regards 19-20 as a homiletical expansion of the preceding paragraph. If the interpretation be adopted that the discourse sets forth the doom of Jerusalem as part of the final distress, the language of the saying, and its use of Dan. 12.1, is explained, since no change of viewpoint is involved.

The peculiarity of the language has caused various modifications in the textual tradition. *Γ* and some OL MSS. substitute *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις (ἐκείναις)* for *αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι*. 579 reads *ταύτη* for *τοιαύτη*, 11 and 892 omit it (the curious position of *τοιαύτη* after *γέγονεν*, instead of *τοιαύτη οἷα οὐ γέγονεν*, is probably due to Mk.'s use of Dan. 12.1, the original word order being preserved as far as possible). The tautologous *ἦν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός* is omitted by a formidable list of authorities (D. Θ. 27.565 A.C. ff. 1.k.n.r¹. Arm). The clauses certainly balance each other better without it, and for the sake of the poetic structure of the passage Lohmeyer was inclined to agree with the omission. On the other hand the next clause contains a similar instance of tautology (*τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξέλεξατο*), it is in keeping with Mk.'s style (cf. 7.13, 12.23), and is more likely to have been omitted by some copyists than inserted by an inventive scribe. Tentatively therefore the words should be retained.

20. Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν Κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας,
 οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ.
 ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὕς ἐξελέξατο
 ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας.

It has been said that the Jews had appointed 'a rendezvous for extermination' (Levertoff) in the events of A.D. 70. Such a prospect is seriously reckoned with by our Lord. The severity of the coming tribulation suggests the possibility, not only that the Jewish race may be in danger of extermination, but still more unthinkable, that the community of believers may be tempted to turn aside from constancy of faith. Jesus declares that, by the merciful intervention of God, the final distress will not outlast the powers of his people's endurance.

The shortening of the days has been explained in a variety of ways. Lagrange derived the thought from Dan. 9.24 Θ, *ἑβδομήκοντα ἑβδομάδες συνετηθήσαν* (so Lohmeyer). Others, including Wellhausen and Charles, have seen in it a favoured reduction of the traditional three and a half years (Dan. 12.7). Bousset has persuaded many that it is a common apocalyptic trait, and Klostermann urges that for this reason we should not rationalise it by referring to the three and a half years. While this may be true, it yet remains strangely difficult to adduce any unambiguous parallel of undoubtedly Jewish origin. Klostermann cites En. 80.2, 'In the days of the sinners the years will be shortened', but this idea represents the opposite of our text; the Enoch passage describes the perversion of the natural order by the sins of men, so that sinners will die sooner, while in our saying saints are preserved for salvation that they might live. Apoc. Abraham 29 ('He is testing those who have worshipped him of thy seed . . . with a view to shortening the age of ungodliness') is admittedly similar, but this passage comes from a section thought to be a Christian interpolation into the book (so Box). So also the parallels adduced by Bousset (*Antichrist Legend*, pp. 218 f.) all come from post-Christian works: e.g. the striking saying, 'Three years shall be those times, and the three years shall I make as three months, and the three months as three weeks, and the three weeks as three days, and the three days as three hours, and the three hours as three moments', comes from the very late Pseudo-Johannine Apocalypse, and seems to be a typical apocalyptic exaggeration of the idea of our text

A derivation of the saying from the O.T. is equally difficult. Bacon

sought it in Is. 10.22 f., 28.22 and quoted Rom. 9.28 as a similar application of those passages, but the contention is very doubtful (cf. Sanday and Headlam ad loc.). The most plausible precedent of the words is that cited by Busch, viz. the prophetic conviction that the distress of God's people lasts but a short time in view of the mercies that follow; e.g. 'For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee' (Is. 54.7). But is it necessary to trace a genealogy for every eschatological utterance of Jesus? An expectation of fearful disaster and a compassionate heart are sufficient presuppositions for this saying. If our Lord thought in concrete terms of an overthrow of Jerusalem by Roman might he would know that the struggle would not be ended in a night. Part of the anguish of the tribulation would be precisely its cumulation of blow on blow and the deprivation of hope when divine deliverance was withheld. The shortening of times could be simply in respect of the expectation of the sufferers who saw no end to their agonies. It is typical of our Lord's eschatological teaching that he is sure that God has his plan for a consummation, but equally sure that there is no unalterably fixed time-table of events: God will be moved by the necessities of his people to bring the climax more quickly than natural developments alone could do.

The question has been raised whether v. 20 fits the previous context. Lagrange stresses the significance of *πάσα σάρξ* as 'all men in the world' (= כָּל-בָּשָׂר); he contends that neither Jerusalem, nor the temple, nor Judea figure in this scene, and the faithful have fled to the mountains. On the contrary, nothing in the text suggests a change of reference or indicates that any place other than Palestine is in view. For a similar use of the terms in a sense comparable to that of this verse, cf. Jer. 12.12: "The sword of the Lord devoureth from the one end of the land even to the other end of the land; *no flesh* hath peace'. Moreover, the terms of the saying imply that although the 'elect' have fled to the mountain retreats they are not wholly removed from suffering; this too is compatible with the presuppositions of this chapter. Since Israel's sufferings are part of the woes of the End, the *σωθῆναι* here spoken of cannot be limited to mere physical survival through the trials but rather to a survival of faith which, whether it meets death or not, is worthy to share in the deliverance of the Redeemer. The period of wrath is shortened lest faith be crushed and hope die and confession be turned to denial. The standpoint is the same as that in v. 13: *ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται*.

The version of this saying in Mt., *εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν . . . διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται* is preferred by Merx and Dalman. The latter inclines to it because he thinks that Jesus did not apply to God any Aramaic name equivalent to *Κύριος*. Merx does so because Syr. sin in Mk. reads as in Mt., and the position of *Κύριος* varies,

suggesting that the noun is a *Wanderwort*. This is inconclusive evidence. If it be admitted, one of the Aramaisms of the saying disappears; but on any account its Semitic colouring remains.

It should be observed that Lk. 21.23a-24, whoever penned it, reads remarkably like a paraphrase of Mk. 13.19-20, in similar vein to the explanatory rewriting of Mk. 13.14 in Lk. 21.20. If Lk. has replaced Mk.'s shortening of the days by his *καιροὶ ἐθνῶν*, the latter phrase should not be violated to mean the times of the Gentiles' opportunity to enter the Kingdom (a fancy that perpetually reappears in the commentaries) but be kept within the same sphere of thought as the Marcan saying. It relates to the period of tyrannous Gentile domination over Israel and has more in common with the Danielic three and a half times than Rom. 11.25.

21. Καὶ τότε εἰάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ·
 ἴδε ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ,
 μὴ πιστεύετε.
22. Ἐγερθήσονται δὲ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφήται
 καὶ ποιήσουσιν σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα
 πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς.

During the circumstances of the last distress (τότε), rumours will be spread abroad, alleging the advent of the Christ. Since the Jews generally looked for a merely human Messiah (ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενήσεται, Trypho in Justin's Dialogue, 49), it was commonly believed that his advent would be in secret (see below). The language of v. 21 is consistent with the claim that the Messiah is about to be revealed in a specified locality, or that he has already appeared and awaits his people to gather to him. In the one case false prophets demonstrate by their powers that the long expected deliverance is to be effected by the impending advent of the Messiah; in the other their powers are intended to accredit the messianic status of actual personages for whom claims are made. The latter interpretation would conform with 2 Thess. 2.9 and still more closely with Rev. 13.11-17, where the False Prophet by his 'miracles' causes the world to worship the Beast.

If in v. 22 ψευδόχριστοι be omitted with D 124 i k, the function of the ψευδοπροφήται will have primary reference to the cries, 'See, the Messiah is here', 'See, he is there', of v. 21. If the common reading be accepted, as it is by most, it is best to regard the ψευδόχριστοι as practically a synonym for ψευδοπροφήται (so Klostermann). The distresses of the End give rise to a multiplicity of would-be-deliverers and charlatan prophets, whose activity but increases the miseries of the people. However compelling the proffered 'signs and portents', however persuasive the prophecies, the elect are exhorted to exercise discernment and encouraged to look for grace to resist. Despite the danger of deception, it is unthinkable that the chosen of God should be led astray; εἰ δυνατόν signifies confidence in the solicitude of God for them that love him (not an irresistible decree).

The language and thought of the passage reflects Deut. 13.1 ff., εἰάν τις ἀναστῆ ἐν σοὶ προφήτης ἢ ἐνυπνιαζόμενος τὸ ἐνύπνιον καὶ δῶ σοι

σημείον ἢ τέρας. . . . Just as Deut. 18.18 was interpreted of the future Messiah (or Messianic Prophet), so Deut. 13.1 was transferred to the future and the False Prophet anticipated in the End time (Schlatter). Even the doubling of *ψευδοπροφήται* with *ψευδόχριστοι* may have been influenced by this application of the Deuteronomic passage (note that in Deut. 13.1 the *προφήτης* is doubled by *ἐνυπνιαζόμενος τὸ ἐνύπνιον*).

The apparent repetition of the thought of v. 6 in vv. 21 f. has evoked comment. Loisy felt that this 'clumsiness' on Mk.'s part can be explained only by his possession of the saying in two traditions. It is not clear, however, that v. 21 does repeat v. 6. In the latter the claims to messianic status are made by the pretenders themselves, in v. 21 they are made by others, and it is not certain that we are to suppose that the Messiah has come on the scene at all. The two sayings may be regarded as different representations from different angles of a similar danger in the End time.

More clearly a close relationship is to be discerned between v. 21 and the Q saying Mt. 24.26 = Lk. 17.23.

Mt. 24.26

ἐὰν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν,
'Ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστίν,
μὴ ἐξέλθητε. 'Ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς
ταμείοις, μὴ πιστεύσητε.

Lk. 17.23

καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν,
'Ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, ἢ 'Ἰδοὺ ὧδε.
μὴ [ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ]
διώξητε.

If the three sayings are compared, it will be seen that Lk. is closer to Mk., but Mt. has preserved the parallelism better and his language reflects Jewish terminology and ideas better than the others. The difficulty lies in knowing how far to take it literally. Jewish tradition certainly associated the advent of the Messiah with the wilderness. Cf. Midrash Ruth 2.14 (132b): 'As the first redeemer (= Moses) acted, so will the last redeemer (= Messiah) act. As the first redeemer manifested himself and then hid himself again from them . . . so will the last redeemer manifest himself to them and again hide himself from them. . . . Whither will he lead them? Out of the land unto the wilderness of Juda, Hos. 2.16, "See, I will allure them and will lead them into the wilderness"' (Strack-Billerbeck I, pp. 86-87). The idea that the Messiah hides himself before manifestation possibly lies behind the question of the Baptist to Jesus, 'Art thou he that should come, or are we to look for another?' John was impatient at the delay in the emergence of Jesus from his 'concealment' (so Lohmeyer). But the contact with the idea that the Messiah will appear in the desert may be purely accidental. A. Meyer pointed out that Mt.'s ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ . . . ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις represents the Heb. antithesis *וְיִמְחַדֵּם בְּמִדְבָּר* found for example in Deut. 32.25, where the LXX translates

מִחֲדָרַיִם by ἐκ τῶν ταμείων. The phrase means no more than 'within and without'. Moreover מִחֲדָרַיִם is poetic for מִבַּיִת; and the phrase מִבַּיִת וּמִחוּץ is very common in this sense (see B.D.B. lexicon). Meyer also mentions that Onkelos has בְּרָא for מִחוּץ. In Mk. 4.10 Peshitta translates ἔξω 'those that are without' by לברא חוץ. חוץ of course, like בְּרָא can mean also a field, but such a phrase as מִבַּיִת וּמִחוּץ is applied to covering vessels 'within and without' (LXX ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν) with gold etc., where the literal meaning has no place (see e.g. Ex. 25.11). It would seem that here our Lord used the more poetic form, preserved literally in the Greek translation of the Aramaic tradition, and that there is no further contact with Jewish apocalyptic traditions than the idea of the hiddenness of the Messiah, which he repudiates. If this be so, Bousset's elaborate (and circuitous) arguments concerning this passage fall to the ground (see *The Antichrist Legend*, pp. 219 f., where the tradition of the Messiah's deliverance in the wilderness is excessively elaborated).

23. 'Υμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε.
προείρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα.

As in all the Scriptures, the assurance of God's care for his elect (implied in *εἰ δυνατόν*, v. 22) is not regarded as ground for presumption. 'Do you on your part take care. If the temptations of false prophets are strong enough to endanger the chosen of God, you will not be exempt. I have told you all these things in order that you may be fully prepared. Remain on the alert.'

The hortatory purpose of the discourse is apparent in this statement. Wellhausen thought it a Christian interpolation, but the utterance seems to contain no thought of assertion of authority or of the truth of what is revealed. The emphasis falls wholly on the responsibility now placed on the disciples: 'I have given you adequate warning of the trials ahead. There will be no excuse for failure on your part. Therefore maintain a watchful attitude continually.'

24. Ἄλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην
ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται,
καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς,
25. καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες
καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις [αἱ] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται.

In language wholly drawn from the prophets, Jesus portrays the familiar accompaniments of the Day of the Lord. The four members of the sentence are in parallelism and express the effects of the Day on the 'powers of the heavens', i.e. on the sun, moon and stars. It would seem that this awe-inspiring confusion in the heavens signifies less the transformation of the universe than a preparation for the coming of the Son of Man. Before his appearing the heavenly bodies lose their brilliance and become dark, so that the revelation of the glory of the Son fills the cosmos. It is the sole object of vision in heaven and on earth. When God steps forth for salvation the universe pales before him.

Of the many O.T. passages which could be cited here, Is. 13.10, 34.4 call for particular attention:

οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. . . τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσιν,
καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος,
καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς.

Is. 13.10.

καὶ τακῆσονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν,
καὶ ἐλινγήσεται ὡς βιβλίον ὁ οὐρανός,
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται ὡς φύλλα ἐξ ἄμπέλου,
καὶ ὡς πίπτει φύλλα ἀπὸ συκῆς.

Is. 34.4.

The latter passage is of particular importance, since both πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις and πάντα τὰ ἄστρα translate the Heb. [מַשְׁפָּה] אֲכָזָב-לָךְ. It is therefore unlikely that the δυνάμεις [αἱ] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (αἱ om. in W. 22. 253. K. δ) of our passage means anything other than heavenly bodies, rather than the firmament, or spiritual forces of the universe or the like. The phrase sums up the previous three clauses, exactly as in Deut. 4.19, where מַשְׁפָּה אֲכָזָב לָךְ includes the previous mention of sun, moon and stars.

The saying is commonly interpreted as implying the complete break-up of the universe (so Bousset, Loisy, Alien, Lohmeyer,

Schlatter, Schniewind, etc.). This is doubtful. If the O.T. passages here drawn on be consulted, it will be seen that no such view is present in any of them. Though apocalyptists admittedly often treat the poetic representations of the prophets with literalness, Jesus was not an apocalyptist of that kind. Even on the basis that he did share such a view, which is highly improbable, Titius rightly pointed out that the idea of falling stars in first century descriptions is not to be taken as meaning the destruction of the world, as Rev. 8.12, 12.4 make clear (*Jesus Lehre*, p. 143). Loisy's view, that the saying implies the gathering of the elect from the swirling chaos (v. 27) is grotesque and out of harmony with the passage. On the other hand, to interpret the language as purely figurative, symbolic of changes in Church and State (Salmond, Swete) does not do justice to its grandeur. Poetic expression is not to be confused with allegorism. The interpretation given above, that here is depicted the introduction of the glory and salvation of the Son of Man, before whom the shaking heavens veil their shining, is substantially that of Titius (*Ibid.*), Zahn (*Mt.*), Wohlenberg (*Mk.*), Briggs (*Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 155).

The note of time ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην is regarded by Lohmeyer as secondary, since it falls out of the poetic structure. He may be right; note *Mt.*'s εὐθέως which the Marcan ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις has replaced (but certainly before it came to the evangelist). If the line is retained, the suggestion of Volkmar is attractive, that Jesus prefixed this indication of time before his citation of the Scriptures, which are to be read as in inverted commas: 'After the tribulation of those days, the Scriptures will be fulfilled which speak in this manner; then the Advent will take place' (*Jesus Nazarenus*, p. 185). The implication as to the time is not to be watered down, as by Swete ('The destruction of the Jewish polity is regarded as the starting point of the era which will be ended by the parousia'); the tribulation is ended by the Advent.

Once again the Lucan version, 21.25-26, has the appearance of a re-writing of the Marcan, with additional elements which might well be genuine. His ἡχοὺς θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου is thought to be an echo of the chaos myth, implying the reversion of the world to primeval chaos (Dodd, *Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 105 f.). Though the language may ultimately be due to that source, Is. 17.12 lies nearer to hand, 'Ah, the uproar of many peoples, which roar like the roaring of the seas; and the rushing of nations, that rush like the rushing of mighty waters!' (the LXX is different, but it renders the last clause, καὶ νῶτος ἔθνῶν πολλῶν ὡς ὕδωρ ἠχήσει, see further C. C. Torrey, *Our Translated Gospels*, pp. 35 ff.).

26. Καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
 ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.
27. Καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους
 καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς (αὐτοῦ) ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων
 ἀνέμων,
 ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.

Against the background of a darkened heaven, the Son of Man is revealed in the Shekinah glory of God: he comes ἐν νεφέλαις. Clouds are not a characteristic feature of the Palestinian sky, a matter easily overlooked by Westerners. In the O.T. they are associated with the interventions of God and with his presence among men (W. K. Lowther Clarke linked the former aspect with the storm clouds, with which the name and character of Yahweh are connected, and the latter with the summer mists on the hill tops which dissolve in the rays of the sun, *Theology*, XXXI, pp. 63 f.). Most commonly the clouds are regarded as a vehicle on which God swiftly rides, for the execution of judgment (Is. 19.1) or for redemption (Ps. 18.12), but they also manifest his glory (Ex. 34.5) and yet veil it (Hab. 3.4, Ps. 18.11). The clouds with which the 'one like unto a son of man' comes to the Ancient of days (Dan. 7.13) serve as a vehicle, although they also hint of his heavenly origin (as against the origin of the bestial kingdoms from the abyss, Dan. 7.3). Although a heavenly figure, the son of man is wholly dependent on the gift of God's redemption; the evil powers are subdued and judged by God, after which the son of man, representing 'the saints of the Most High', receives the kingdom. The deepening of the Son of Man concept in the teaching of Jesus and his place in the Kingdom of God correspondingly demand that the wider associations of the O.T. theophanies be included in this passage. The clouds of his parousia unveil his hitherto hidden glory, which is the glory of God, the Shekinah; he is seen to be the eternal Son of God, sharing in the majesty and power of God. But he also comes in the clouds to effect the divine work of judgment and redemption. As in his ministry he exercised the powers of the Kingdom, banishing demonic agencies (Lk. 11.20) and bringing the grace of the divine sovereignty among men (Mt. 11.5), so his parousia witnesses the consummation of these activities: the Son

of Man calls the dead to judgment, confessing his acceptance of those faithful to him and banishing the faithless (Mt. 25.31 ff., Mk. 8.38, Mt. 10.32 f.), his Kingdom triumphs over all and is revealed in power (Mk. 9.1), and the vision of Satan's fall is brought to completion (Lk. 10.18). As in the case of his resurrection, the significance of the parousia lies in the sovereign operation of the Christ.

It is remarkable, however, that our passage is silent on all these issues and simply speaks of the gathering of the new Israel to the Son of Man. Yet this event is no isolated one but presumes the others, notably the resurrection and the conquest of evil. The selection of this feature is perhaps due to the subject in mind. The discourse took its rise from a prediction of the destruction of the temple. That event of necessity forms the crowning point of the judgment of the old Israel. The explication of the prophecy, accordingly, reaches its climax in a description of the Son of Man gathering the members of his new community into the consummated Kingdom. Jesus employs the language of the old dispensation, for his action fulfils the age-long dream of prophets. They had included in their portrayals of the future both the reunion of the scattered Twelve Tribes (e.g. Is. 60.4 ff.) and the assembling of the obedient nations to Yahweh in the glorified Jerusalem (e.g. Mic. 4.1 ff.). The union of the two groups into one, however, was never envisaged. The prophetic vision is taken up and fulfilled in this anticipation of a community drawn from the ends of the universe. The assembling of the new Israel and uniting them with himself is the supreme task of the Redeemer-Messiah; through it he becomes 'the Christ in his perfected absoluteness' (Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche*, p. 191). That the discourse should find its zenith at this point is a mark of its genuineness. However much we would like to know what happens to the destroyers of Jerusalem, and to the Jews themselves, it lies outside the parenetic purpose of Jesus to dwell on such matters. The goal of history is the union of God's people with his Son in the eternal Kingdom: that is all disciples need to know—in the first and in any other century.

From time to time, since criticism perceived the implications of the eschatology of Jesus, attempts have been made to set aside the traditional interpretation of this passage and its parallel in Mk. 14.62. On the ground that Dan. 7.13 describes not a descent of the son of man to earth but his ascent to God in heaven, Colani suggested that this is also the natural interpretation of Mk. 14.62; since Mk. 13.26 is

not susceptible of such a meaning it is plainly secondary (*Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, p. 20). This understanding of Dan. 7.13 and Mk. 14.62 was adopted by Holsten (*Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theologie*, 1891, p. 62), Appel (*Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu*, pp. 40 ff.), Wellhausen, who said that he received the idea from Smend (*Einleitung in d. drei Evangelien*, p. 86), Lagrange, Glasson (*The Second Advent*, pp. 64 ff.), Duncan (*Jesus, Son of Man*, pp. 176 ff.). Haupt agreed that Daniel had in mind an ascension but thought that Jesus meant by the symbolism his parousia (*Die Eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, p. 115), an interpretation adopted also by N. B. Stonehouse (*Witness of Mt. and Mk. to Christ*, pp. 252 f.). W. K. Lowther Clarke believed that if the Church had not received the traditional view of the Second Coming, the usual interpretation of Mk. 14.62 could not have gained currency, and applied the ascension idea also to our passage (*Theology*, XXXI, pp. 130 ff.). Dom Gregory Dix was persuaded by Clarke and expressed his view in the striking words, 'There is but *one* "coming", in the incarnation, in the Spirit, in the eucharist and in the judgment. And that is the "coming" of "One like unto the Son of Man" . . . to the Father. This is the end and meaning of human history, the bringing of man, the creature of time, to the Ancient of Days, in eternity' (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 262 f.). Most recently A. H. Curtis has seen in Mk. 13.26-27 a close equivalence to the vision of Dan. 7.13 ff.: 'Jesus and his own were the true fulfilment of the Daniel vision; as such he and they through Him shall come in the clouds of God-given glory before the Ancient of Days' (*The Vision and Mission of Jesus*, p. 184). Despite the fact that this view is becoming almost a new orthodoxy in Britain, I am convinced that it cannot stand, for: (i) no change of scene from earth to heaven is suggested in Dan. 7.9, the earthly sphere of imperial rule is in view all the time; (ii) the divine chariot is that described by Ezekiel, which served for the appearance of God on earth; (iii) no hint is given in Dan. 7 that the 'saints' are translated to heaven, there to rule over the earth; (iv) it is distinctly stated in Dan. 7.22 that the Ancient of Days *came*, i.e. to earth, for the purpose of judgment and deliverance (so Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 241, n. 2, Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed. p. 30, n. 1). Neither in Daniel nor in the teaching of Jesus is there any ground for thinking that our passage and Mk. 14.62 relate to anything other than a parousia to humanity on earth (for Mk. 14.62 see further J. E. Fison, *The Christian Hope*, p. 192).

The phrase *ἐν νεφέλαις* has caused some debate. Dalman, perceiving the implications of divine majesty in a coming *upon* (*ἐπι*) clouds, thought that the *ἐν* (= *ἐν*) of Dan. 7.13 had been altered by a scrupulous scribe from an original *ἐπι* (LXX translates *ἐπι*), for only God travels upon the clouds; Mk.'s *ἐν* = *ἐν* (*Words of Jesus*, p. 241). In this

he is followed by Oesterley, who believed that Jesus deliberately refrained from employing the term ἐπί = 𐤀𐤓 for the same reason (*The Last Things*, p. 148). The distinction cannot be maintained. In the Pentateuch it is frequently said that God descends ἐν νεφέλῃ (= 𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤀, see e.g. Ex. 34.5). Travelling with, or upon, or in clouds is not a normal human mode of locomotion (!); whatever the preposition, the idea would necessarily connote divinity, or at least a close relation with the Deity (so Lagrange).

μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης could be translated 'with a great host and with glory' (in Ezk. 38.15 the host of Gog is described as συναγωγὴ μεγάλη καὶ δύναμις πολλή); but the associated idea in Mk. 9.1, where the end is described as a coming of the Kingdom ἐν δυνάμει, probably indicates that we should interpret this as a 'most powerful and glorious revelation' (so Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung* p. 14).

The phrase ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ is difficult. It is hardly natural to interpret it, with Lagrange and Lohmeyer, of the highest point of earth (i.e. Jerusalem), from which the elect are taken to the highest point of heaven; it is equally dubious to think of it as the meeting place of the vault of heaven and the extremities of earth (McNeile). We appear to have here a combination of two formulae that express universality: ἀπ' ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (Deut. 30.4); ἀπ' ἄκρου τῆς γῆς ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς (Deut. 13.7). The synthesis of the two expressions is intended to make the widest possible application of the thought (Swete, Turner). While the language does not demand it, it is consistent with the idea that the living and the dead are united at the parousia: 'Heaven and earth are viewed as a unity; the entire κόσμος must give them up' (Wohlenberg).

With the mission of angels among the elect, Jeremias aptly compares Mt. 25.31 ff. (*Jesus als Weltvollender*, pp. 70 ff.), a reminder that in both passages we are dealing with matters which appeal to imaginative rather than rational processes.

Mt.'s citation of Zech. 12.10 f. καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς differs both from the Heb. and LXX but agrees with Rev. 1.7; it is possible that it has been imported into Mt. 24.30 from the passage in Revelation (so Bousset; Merx points out that the Greek text of Syr. sin did not know it, nor Origen). The reference to the 'sign of the Son of Man' has puzzled, and intrigued, the ages. Charles conjectured that it arose through a confusion of 𐤍𐤏 with 𐤍𐤏𐤍 (*Critical History*, p. 383, n. 4), and suggested that the original reading was :𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤍𐤏 𐤍𐤏𐤍. More probably the reference is to the 'standard' or ensign set up by Yahweh for the rallying of his dispersed people; cf. Is. 11.12, καὶ ἀρεῖ σημεῖον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη καὶ συναῖξει τοὺς ἀπολομένους Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ἰουδα. This thought is continued in the mention of the trumpet in Mt. 24.31 (cf. Is. 27.13). If the

βδέλυγμα of v. 14 has particular reference to the idolatrous ensigns of the Roman army, the mention of the ensign of the Son of Man here is exceedingly appropriate. In response to the question of the disciples (v. 4) Jesus gives two signs: the ensign of the hostile army will signalise the destruction of the city, the ensign of the Son of Man will herald the redemption of his people. The σημεῖον of the Son of Man most probably signifies the Shekinah glory with which he comes, a fitting counterpart to the impious ὄψις of the Romans. By this interpretation the frequently-held view that the σημεῖον is light (Meyer, Holtzmann) or the Messiah himself (Bengel, who compares Lk. 2.12, Schniewind, who compares Lk. 11.30, Bruce, Allen, Busch, Rengstorf) are subsumed in a larger conception. (For a review of earlier interpretations of the σημεῖον see Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend*, pp. 232 ff.).

The further addition in Mt. 24.31 of μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης very clearly links the saying with the day of resurrection, see 1 Thess. 4.16, 1 Cor. 15.52. It is possible that Paul knew this form of the logion; note that in 2 Thess. 2.1 he uses the noun ἐπισυναγωγή for the verb ἐπισυνάγειν, and with the same intention, viz. of representing a resurrection of the righteous dead and glorification of the living saints into a united fellowship with the manifested Lord.

28. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν
 ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς ἀπαλὸς γένηται
 καὶ ἐκφύῃ τὰ φύλλα,
 γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν·
29. οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα,
 γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις.

This 'beautiful and remarkably apposite Easter parable' (Keim), in contrast to the repeated warnings that have preceded, is essentially an antidote to despair. The emphasis in our Lord's instruction has fallen on warnings in face of national adversities and trials for faith, together with the necessity to maintain a witness amidst enmities and a watchfulness against deceivers. The issue of history in the parousia, with its prospect of unalloyed joy for the saints, is itself an encouragement to endurance. At this point the disciples are bidden to see in the very trials they experience the pledge of that desired consummation. The parable seems to speak of more than mere proximity, though that is writ large in its structure, as well as in its application. It conveys also the message of assurance, of confidence and of certainty. The fig tree is one of the few deciduous trees of Palestine, so that its budding is the more noticeable. Unlike the almond tree, which blossoms earlier but which may be overtaken by the returning cold, it gives an unerring sign of the arrival of spring. So surely as the disciples recognise in the fresh foliage of the fig tree the end of winter and approach of summer, so they are to view their own sufferings and the calamities of their nation as the sure sign of the approach of the new age, heralding the incursion of resurrection life into the wintry life of man.

The comparison of winter and summer, latent in the parable, tempts one to allegorise, but restraint must be exercised. Lohmeyer draws the lesson, 'The end time is the summer of the world time, the world time of the preceding stormy and fearful winter.' If any such thought be present in the parable, it should not go unobserved that the period of distresses in 13.6-23 signifies not winter but spring. As the sap quickens the withered branches of the fig tree, manifesting in advance the powers of summer, so the 'signs' of 13.6 ff. reveal the activity of the divine sovereignty, accomplishing its beneficent pur-

pose through the evil machinations of man (so Otto, *Kingdom of God and Son of Man*, p. 148, and Rengstorf, who writes on Lk. 21.30 f.: 'In the struggle for the Gospel . . . the outbreak of judgment upon Jerusalem and Judaism, the opening of heaven and the manifestation of the Son of Man Jesus—in all that he is coming in power and certainty').

Encouraged by the ease with which the parable separates from the context (N.B. Lk.'s transition clause, *καὶ εἶπεν παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς* 21.29), a group of scholars refer this parable to the crisis of our Lord's ministry and to the presence of the kingdom in his works (so C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 137, Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, p. 30, Dibelius, *Jesus*, p. 72, Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 96). Jeremias considers the parable unsuitable for relation to the adversities and woes of the End. 'The simile was intended by Jesus to direct the minds of his disciples not towards the horrors of the end of the age, but towards the signs of the time of salvation.' In this he was anticipated sixty years ago by E. Haupt (*Die Eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, pp. 27 ff.), who thought that the softening of the fig tree's branches indicated the kindly power of summer; a better parallel to the distresses that herald the kingdom would be the storms of spring. He paraphrased the parable, 'When you see the counterpart of this natural phenomenon happening in the realm of history, that is, the summer-like powers of the kingdom taking effect among men, then the temple and the covenant it symbolises are *ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ*.' These summer-like powers are the effects of the ministry of Jesus and the founding of the Christian Church. Jeremias has a more realistic view of eschatology than Haupt and believes that the Lord had in mind a crisis for the Kingdom that would find its consummation immediately after his death, and accordingly relates the parable to the ministry of our Lord. 'Consider the signs,' he interprets Jesus as saying, 'the dead fig tree is clothed with green, the young shoots sprout, winter is over at last, summer is at the threshold, those destined for salvation awake to new life (Mt. 11.5), the hour is come, the final fulfilment has begun.' Two obstacles lie in the way of accepting this interpretation. First, the language, both of the parable and of its application, has the future in mind: *ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν* (v. 28), *ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα . . . ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ θύραις* (29). Both the signs that herald the anticipated climax and the climax itself are yet in prospect. Secondly, it is by no means necessary for a parable to have an inner affinity with the situation illustrated, as the parables of the Unjust Judge and the Unrighteous Steward undeniably show. The illustration of a point at issue can be taken from a wholly different realm and still be valid. So here, the point of comparison does not lie in the equality of the powers on the one hand which bring forth summer and those which on the other introduce the Kingdom; nor even in simple

proximity, the nearness of the Kingdom being discerned in tribulations just as that of summer is from the budding of the fig tree. Schwartzkopff's contention, urged against Haupt's view, seems to me to be still valid, viz. that the chief point of the parable is 'the absolute certainty with which the disciples are to see the nearness of summer from the sprouting of the tree, and from the tribulations the nearness of the final kingdom for which they long' (*Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, p. 170).

Note further that even if it be conceded that this parable was originally independent of its present context, the most natural interpretation of ταῦτα (29) is of preliminary signs, while the subject of ἐγγύς ἐστίν must in some way be related to the consummation of the Kingdom. With this conclusion W. G. Kümmel is in agreement (*Verheissung u. Erfüllung*, 2nd. ed., p. 15), but he appears to have overlooked the highly significant implication of this admission, viz. that from this saying it is demonstrable that Jesus anticipated a future consummation preceded by signs which intimate its certain approach. Kümmel himself has polemised against this view in his book and finds in it the chief stumbling-block to the authenticity of Mk. 13; in my view the parable demands the opposite conclusion, for it implies that on the occasion of its utterance Jesus had spoken of signs that should intimate the approach of the End. The parable authenticates the fundamental viewpoint presumed in the Discourse.

Lohmeyer regarded the introductory words of both 28 and 29 as explanatory additions (ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν . . . οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς) and suggested that the introduction could have run ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ δένδρω. . . . It is quite true that the phrase οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς creates the impression that the disciples are being compared with some other group; I cannot find another instance in the N.T. of οὕτως καὶ being used in this manner. If in v. 28 the reading γινώσκειται instead of γινώσκετε be adopted (with B^a D L W Δ Θ 13 348 28 66 201 479 480 692) the difficulty would disappear, the clauses would balance each other well and Lk. 17.10 would provide a perfect parallel. Turner and Klostermann adopt this reading, but it must be admitted with Swete that γινώσκειται may be due to itacism (this variant is adopted in v. 29 by A D L 28, where it is impossible) and in any case Lk.'s βλέποντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν γινώσκετε shows that he must have read γινώσκετε. While Lohmeyer's suggestion leaves the content of the parable and its application intact, in such loose Greek as appears in this chapter we ought perhaps not to press a redundant employment of καί. It is not impossible that οὕτως καί = the common [?] in which case καί will go with the whole sentence and not simply with ὑμεῖς.

ἐκφύη can be either present active transitive, as it is usually interpreted, or it can be a second aorist passive ἐκφυῆ, with φύλλα as sub-

ject, 'leaves are put-forth'. O.S. and many O.L. MSS. interpret in the latter fashion; it has the advantage of balancing the previous clause and keeps the same tense as γένηται, for which cause it is adopted by Moulton (*Grammar*, vol. 2, p. 264), McNeile, Lagrange.

ταῦτα in v. 29 has caused needless discussion through the difficulty of relating it to the immediately preceding context (i.e. vv. 24-27, describing the parousia). Apart from the assumption that this shows that the parable is misplaced, Zahn insisted on finding its application in vv. 7 f., where he placed the fall of Jerusalem; Lagrange also related it to vv. 7-14. It is more natural to assume that, in this context at least, ταῦτα refers to the signs of the End described in the entire section preceding vv. 24-27, with particular reference to vv. 14 ff. This involves the recognition that the Speaker has doubled back on his tracks, but such a procedure is not uncommon in this kind of instruction and quite natural in view of the fact that vv. 24-27 form the climax of the foregoing prophecy.

ἐγγύς ἔστιν ἐπὶ θύραις may be impersonal, or some subject such as ὁ καιρὸς, τὸ τέλος, ἡ συντέλεια could be assumed. Lk. is not mistaken in interpreting it as ἐγγύς ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Nevertheless, ἔστιν ἐπὶ θύραις accords better with a personal subject, cf. Jas. 5.8, which may be an echo of this saying. Perhaps the saying originally contained a reference to the Son of Man. (Hoskyns and Davey adopt this interpretation and compare Lk.'s interpretation here with his rendering of Mk.'s ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Mk. 10.29) by εἵνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk. 10.29); they add, 'Lk., like Mt., thought of the gospel more naturally as a whole set of ideas connected with the kingdom of God, whereas Mk. seems to have been occupied with the personal activity and authority of Jesus, and with the kingdom only because the rule of God was revealed in his concrete actions' (*Riddle of the N.T.*, p. 115).

A word should perhaps be added concerning Schwartz's essay on this parable, *Der verfluchte Feigenbaum (Zeitschrift für d. N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1904), since it is often cited by commentators. Wellhausen had asked, Why the fig tree? Why not the trees generally? The answer was, 'The fig tree, whose parable should be understood, must be a definite one, which all know, even that one which the Lord had cursed' (see Mk. 11.13 ff.). In developing this suggestion, Schwartz drew attention to the paraphrase in Syr. sin of ἐγγύς ἔστιν ἐπὶ θύραις, 13.29: ܒܫܘܠܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ i.e. ὅτι ἐγγύς εἰμι τῇ θύρᾳ. From this he concluded that the curse in 11.14 originally ran Μηκέτι ἔκ σου μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι (οἱ φάγεται) ἕως ἔρχομαι. Clearly, on this basis, 11.13 ff. is an aetiological narrative, which Schwartz explains as follows: Bethany was a very old, if not the oldest gathering point of such as 'waited for the Kingdom of God'. When they in the

morning went to the holy city and in the evening returned, they went past the withered fig tree. 'What had caused it to wither?' they asked. 'When the Lord walked on the first occasion from Bethany to Jerusalem', it was replied, 'he was hungry and went to the tree to refresh himself with some fruit. The tree gave none and the Lord pronounced the curse, "No man shall eat any fruit from thee till I come." When on the day after the Lord passed along that way again, the tree was withered to the roots; the Lord however, said to the disciples, "When the tree blossoms again, the harvest (*θέρος*) is before the door." 'And the believers', added Schwartz, 'looked each time they passed by to see whether any knosps showed!' Wellhausen was very pleased with Schwartz's development of his earlier conjecture. He made a minor modification in Schwartz's view: the local tradition of the reviving of the withered fig tree will have connected itself with the hope of Israel's national revival. Jesus will have said that the tree will *never* revive again but will always remain dry; i.e. contrary to Jewish belief, the hope of the reconstruction of Zion in its ancient brilliance will never be fulfilled. In Mk. 11.18 Jesus thus rejects the Jewish hope, but in 13.28 he is made to adopt it (*Ev. Marci*, p. 106).

I have reproduced these ideas of Schwartz and Wellhausen in the hope that no one will trouble to do so again. How Goguel could have been persuaded by them (*Life of Jesus*, p. 427) I cannot imagine; the mere statement of them appears to me to be their sufficient refutation, for they represent Gospel exegesis at its most degraded level. If this method of exposition were applied to the evangelic narratives generally, chaos would ensue. The reason that the *fig* tree was adduced, and not all the trees (despite Luke!), has already been made clear: it is the first reliable harbinger of summer among the deciduous trees, and the comparison requires no further elucidation. The parable is clear and apposite, both in its present context and in the wider setting of our Lord's teaching. Whatever be the solution of the problems presented by the narrative of Mk. 11.13 ff., this passage must be judged on its own merits.

30. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν
ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη
μέχρις οὗ ταῦτα πάντα γένηται.

This statement of our Lord's needs little explanation for its understanding. It simply requires grace to be received. The difficulty lies, as Titius said of Mk. 9.1, not in the realm of exegesis but in that of dogmatics (*Jesus Lehre v. Reiche Gottes*, p. 145). The saying provides a frame within which Jesus' teaching on the future of the Kingdom, and in particular his instruction in this chapter, can be set. "The entire proclamation of Jesus is burdened with the "now" of the near divine sovereignty", wrote Schniewind. In this respect our Lord was followed by the Church that knew him best, for it consistently hoped for an early parousia and a concomitant triumph of the Kingdom. The logion here, accordingly, should not be limited in its scope to a portion of the discourse but to all that has preceded it.

The discussion of this saying revolves about the interpretation of ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη and the reference of ταῦτα πάντα.

γενεά, which is formed from γίγνομαι, primarily denotes those descended from a single ancestor, a tribe, a race; then it comes to signify those born within the same period, a generation of contemporary men; finally a period of time occupied by a particular generation (see Bauer, *Wörterbuch z. N.T.*). It is noteworthy that the Heb. (and Aramaic) term גִּילְגָל, which γενεά chiefly renders in the LXX, has developed in the reverse way: its primary meaning is generation considered as a period of time; then men living in a particular generation; hence a posterity; finally a class of men (wicked, righteous and so forth; see the lexicon of Brown, Driver and Briggs). It was natural that when an endeavour was made to remove the embarrassment of this saying, resort should have been had to the primary meaning of the Greek term γενεά; Jerome interpreted it of the human race as a whole or the Jews in particular, while Origen and Chrysostom (appealing to Ps. 24.6) believed that it referred to the Church. Jerome's second alternative has gained a large number of votes in modern times, but it is doubtful whether γενεά occurs in this sense in any passage in the N.T. The sole instance cited by Bauer for this meaning is Lk. 16.8, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεάν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσιν, but this is a questionable interpretation of the passage. He

himself classes our saying, and all others that speak of ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆ, under the temporal heading. One wonders whether the tendency to interpret γενεά of nation is not due to a confusion of the employment of this term with γένος, which quite frequently bears this meaning in the N.T. The other interpretation, popular among German scholars, regards γενεά as possessing the sense of 'kind'. This, too, is a natural inference for Germans, since their word *Geschlecht* can bear such a meaning, but it is not natural for the Greek term (Liddell and Scott do not mention it), and it is not clear that any passage in the N.T. can be adduced for such a meaning (Büchsel offers as a solitary example the same verse quoted above, Lk. 16.8, *Theologisches Wörterbuch z.N.T.*, p. 661). It is, however, not good enough simply to discuss the meaning of γενεά, for this saying asserts something of ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆ, which is much more specific. In the passages in the N.T. in which the phrase occurs it seems indubitably to signify the contemporaries of Jesus (see Mt. 11.16, 12.39, 41, 42, 45, 23.36, Mk. 8.38, Lk. 11.50 f., 17.25). The same temporal sense applies to the O.T. examples of the phrase הַדּוֹר הַזֶּה (Gen. 7.1, Ex. 1.6, Deut. 1.35, Jud. 2.10; the one exception occurs in a different kind of context, Ps. 12.7: לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד מִן־הַדּוֹר זֶה לְעוֹלָם, which, significantly, LXX renders by διατηρήσεις ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, from which it is clear that the translators understood γενεά in the sense of contemporary generation of men). It is true that the Gospel references cited above speak disparagingly of ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆ. Büchsel is therefore justified in asserting, "This generation" is to be understood first of all in a temporal sense, but it always contains a *secondary* condemnatory significance' (Ibid.); it is nevertheless quite another thing to exalt the secondary implication to the primary meaning and to deny the obvious temporal sense (as in effect, Busch, Schniewind, Rengstorf, Michaelis; the last named, however, tells me in a private communication that he now inclines to the interpretation here maintained). Despite all attempts to establish the contrary, there seems to be no escape from the admission that ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆ here is to be taken in its natural sense of the generation contemporary with Jesus.

The force of these contentions has convinced most scholars. But many who so agree insist that ταῦτα πάντα here must be limited to the events leading up to and including the fall of Jerusalem. It is urged in support of this view that ταῦτα πάντα must have the same reference as ταῦτα in v. 29, which relates to signs of the End, not to the End itself (e.g. J. Schmid: 'If vv. 28 f. do not relate to vv. 24-27, then neither does v. 30. . . . The saying rather harks back to the question of the disciples as to the point of time of the destruction of the temple, v. 4, which forms the point of departure of the entire discourse.') Against this it must be said: (i) the addition of πάντα to ταῦτα makes it

impossible to limit the reference of the phrase to a part of the discourse only; it naturally includes vv. 24-27 as well as that which precedes them (so W. C. Allen, Lohmeyer). Lk. had already seen this, for he omits *ταῦτα* altogether (21.32), making *πάντα* to embrace the entire discourse. (ii) Even if one were to concede that *ταῦτα πάντα* here = the *ταῦτα* of v. 29 it would not help, for the fig tree parable teaches that the occurrence of the signs shows that the *End* is near; if the signs are to happen within the generation, the *End* is also expected to fall within the same period. (iii) The preceding exposition (see especially on vv. 2, 14 ff.) has shown that our Lord regarded the fall of Jerusalem, and its accompanying events, as part of the judgments of the *End*, therefore the time that witnessed the final distress would also see the final deliverance.

This is not the place to discuss at length the theological implications of this statement. In *Jesus and the Future* I instanced as factors which possibly helped to create this conviction within the mind of our Lord: (i) his knowledge that he was about to fulfil his vocation to redeem the world and that that redemption would initiate the kingdom to be consummated by his own return; (ii) the clarity with which he perceived the issues of history; (iii) his certainty of their accomplishment as narrated in this discourse; (iv) his confidence in the power of the Spirit in the Church and in his people's faithfulness to their commission in the world; (v) his pastoral care for his own (pp. 186 ff.). Of these factors the first seems to me to be the most important, for it brings with it the corollary that, since the Kingdom has been initiated through the cross and resurrection and moves on to its consummation, the 'last times' have arrived and the judgment is already being enacted according to our attitude adopted to the King-Messiah (see Kümmel, *Verheissung u. Erfüllung*, pp. 144 f.). To this must be added the knowledge of Jesus that Israel was hastening to its doom. It is clear that Israel's unbelief was a burden to him and that his rejection and impending death through their instigation, together with the fearful issues of their conduct, must have filled his mind at this time (see Lk. 19.41 ff., Mt. 23.37 f., Lk. 23.28 ff.). The linking of Israel's doom with the Day of the Lord was already given in the scriptures of the prophets. It is possible that the unassailable conviction Jesus had, that Israel was marching to a catastrophe that would engulf its religious and political life within a measurable time, gave precision to his prophetic intuitions of the *End*. To this extent the view that v. 30 relates to the fall of Jerusalem is true; its inadequacy is due to the failure to recognise the eschatological nature of the judgment on Israel. While allowance has to be made for the indeterminate factor presumed in Mt. 23.39, viz. the time in which Israel would find grace to repent, all the utterances of Jesus on this matter preclude the notion that he envisaged this as

requiring an age. The teaching is closely paralleled by Paul in Rom. 11.25 ff.

For the relation between this verse and v. 32, with the consequent qualification that the latter statement makes on this, see the notes thereto.

31. 'Ο οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται,
οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ παρελεύσονται.

The 'unheard-of earnestness' of our Lord's eschatological teaching (Althaus, *Die Letzten Dinge*, p. 271) calls forth an equally unheard-of declaration as to its authority: when heaven and earth are rolled up like a scroll, his words will abide with perpetual validity. A more impressive way of stating the imperishable value of his message could hardly be framed. While the statement is capable of application to the Gospel of Jesus generally, it both illumines and is illumined by the immediate context. The truth of the eschatological instruction just delivered (not the *date!* v. 30) is affirmed with utmost vigour: Jesus will come and complete his redemption. The Speaker is the Redeemer himself: he directs the eschatological process and will bring in the new creation; words uttered by him in this age will retain their validity in the next, for *his* word will introduce it and *his* word will determine who will enter it. 'In what he speaks everything is comprehended because *he* speaks it; he is the consummator because he is the teacher of these imperishable words, he is the teacher because he is the consummator' (Lohmeyer; see further Mt. 7.24, 25.31 ff., Mk. 8.38).

It is inevitable that Mt. 5.18 should be compared with this saying: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἄν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μίᾳ κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. . . . The emphasis in the Matthaean logion is positive; the law has validity while heaven and earth remain. What happens when heaven and earth do pass away? On this issue Jewish thought was uncertain. Since the Prophets and the Writings were thought to have been added on account of sin, their need would disappear in the age to come, for sin would not have place then. This conviction has repercussions on the Torah itself, for much of it contains regulations for dealing with sins; hence (according to the Tannaite R. Menachem) in the future all offerings will cease, except the offering of thanks (Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 245 ff.). In view of our Lord's treatment of the Law, especially his vocation to 'fulfil' it, it is not doubtful that he would have carried this thinking to its completion and asserted its abolition in the consummated Kingdom, as Mt. 5.18 implies. Over against that, his own words partake of divine permanence, for they are God's words accomplishing God's will (on the permanence of the words of God, cf. the Rabbinical

comment on the title of the Book of Jeremiah: 'If you be worthy, "the word of God", but if not, "the words of Jeremiah"'. And what is Jeremiah? He passes away and his words pass away. What is God? 'The living and abiding, and his words are living and abiding', *Pesikta Kah.* 13.116a, cited by Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus* ad loc.).

It is often asserted that the saying is unauthentic. Weiffenbach believed it to be a formal conclusion of the Little Apocalypse, certifying the truth of its teaching (*Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, pp. 150 ff.), and in this he was followed by Holtzmann and Loisy. Schwartzkopff regarded it as a gloss, modelled on Mt. 5.18, to encourage the Church to persist in its belief that the Lord would return in that generation, though the time was passing; ('Had he staked heaven and earth upon the certainty that his return, or even the destruction of Jerusalem, would take place in that generation, it would have displayed an undue self-confidence in his knowledge which could not but have tarnished his moral purity', *Weissagungen*, pp. 168, 183). A similar view is advocated by Vernon Bartlet, Bultmann, *Geschichte d. syn. Trad.*, p. 130, Vincent Taylor, without the same stress on v. 30. Against such views it should be said that the saying is at one with our Lord's representations that his decision reveals the will of God (cf. the implications of Mt. 5.21 ff.). It falls in with his commission to 'fulfil' the Law and Prophets in a revelation beyond both. Apart from Mt. 5.17, the tenor of the Sermon on the Mount and the authority presumed in Mk. 8.38 (even on the short reading of W) demand a relation of Jesus to the divine revelation closer than anything known in the old dispensation; if he had not been conscious of it, he could not have carried through his redemptive acts as he did. Whether Jesus uttered v. 31 immediately after v. 30 is more than we can say; it is possible that its immediate proximity to v. 30 is due to the common employment in the two sayings of the term *παρέρχεσθαι* (so Klostermann, Schniewind, Kümmel; cf. Mk. 9.49, 50 for a juxtaposition of sayings through the use of a common catch-word).

Kümmel (*Verheissung*, p. 53) rightly adduces this saying as an instance of the way in which Jesus subordinated apocalyptic categories to the central elements of his message; the new creation was a conception integrated within his eschatological message, but as a matter for speculation he does not appear to have further concerned himself with it.

32. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν,
οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός,
εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

The nature of the whole discourse is reflected in this saying: it was given for a parenetic purpose but contains theological presuppositions of far-reaching significance. The theological problem should not be allowed to obscure the purpose of the Lord in its utterance. The disciples' request for 'signs' of the End had been given in order that they might not be stumbled by the perils of the way nor surprised by the final revelation; through endurance they would attain to the glory of the coming age (5-27). The fig tree parable afforded the encouragement that their adversities would declare both the nearness and the certainty of the consummated Kingdom (28 f.). An assurance was added that theirs would be the time of the End (30) and that the promise of the Kingdom was surer than the continuance of the universe (31). They are now warned that knowledge of the time itself is hidden from the universe and belongs alone to the Father: οὐδεὶς οἶδεν . . . εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. The two certain features of the parousia are that it comes, and that man cannot know when it comes. From this results an imperative duty to watch at all times. The saying thus forms a transition from the description of the End to the concluding exhortations to watchfulness (33 ff.).

The authenticity of the saying, in whole or in part, has been widely contested. A. T. Cadoux objected that ὁ υἱός used absolutely does not belong to the universe of discourse that has ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as its centre, and that the declaration οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι makes it 'ridiculously unnecessary' for the next verse to say, 'for you know not when the time is'; he thought that the saying was originally a comment on this last phrase and was subsequently incorporated in the text (*Sources of the Second Gospel*, p. 226). In this, whether unconsciously or no, Cadoux followed E. Wendling, who suggested that the οὐδεὶς οἶδεν anticipates the οὐκ οἶδατε of vv. 33, 35, and that the logion was produced in imitation of Mt. 11.27, from which came the unusual ὁ υἱὸς . . . ὁ πατήρ (*Die Entstehung d. Marcus-Evangeliums*, pp. 164-165). Volkmar saw in it a polemic against the claim of John the Seer to know everything from the Son of God (Rev. 1.1, 11-19, 2.18) and from angels (Rev. 1.1-3, 17.7 ff., 22.6, especially 9.15, where

certain angels are said to be prepared for 'the hour and day and month and year'), which pretensions are all 'boasting calculations of the great End, even though they be given in the name of Jesus Christ and of the angel' (*Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 287-288). Wellhausen and J. Weiss regarded it as a product of 'Gemeindetheologie'. Bultmann saw in it a Jewish saying with a Christian addition, possibly forming originally the conclusion of the Little Apocalypse (*Geschichte d. syn. Trad.*, p. 130). Loisy followed in Bousset's steps in proposing that the saying was contrived as a piece of apologetic for the non-occurrence of the parousia: 'It seems that one wishes to justify Christ for having announced as imminent a coming which is seen to be delaying and of having marked the date. This date the angels do not know; Christ could have been ignorant of it also' (*Ev. Marc.*). Dalman more cautiously admitted the authenticity of the saying, but thought it probable that the ending *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ* should be regarded as an accretion, since it looks like a ready-made formula; it indicates the influence of Church vocabulary on the text (*Words of Jesus*, p. 194). This revulsion against the text is not modern; Ambrose attributed to the Arians the reference to the Son (*de Fide*, 5.8), a speculation which was adopted by Réville (*Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 312) though Merx thought the Monarchians more likely authors (perhaps Theodotus the Tanner?).

In the eyes of most exegetes the very difficulty of the saying constitutes a decisive objection to regarding it as a Christian formation or adaptation from earlier sources. As Kümmel expressed it, 'It was not necessary to create a yet greater difficulty, by ascribing to Jesus ignorance of the final End, in order to remove the difficulty of the delaying parousia' (*Verheissung*, 2nd ed., p. 36). It is admittedly doubtful procedure to support one contested statement by another more contested, but Mt. 11.27 ought not to be ruled out of court in the discussion of this saying. As Denney pointed out, we have a reference in each of our most primitive evangelic traditions (Mk. and Q.) to the absolute use of the Son and the Father, and 'if we do not know the language of Jesus and that of the primitive evangelic tradition through Mk. and the other document . . . we do not know anything about it' (*Jesus and the Gospel*, pp. 354 f.). It nevertheless is a dubious line of apologetic, with Lohmeyer, to justify the language by regarding the term *ὁ υἱός* as grounded in the idea *ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* because of the apocalyptic context here. Such evidence as the Gospels afford of the consciousness of Jesus seems to indicate that his filial consciousness was primary, and from that stemmed his consciousness of messianic vocation. The slender MS. evidence for *ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* here, instead of *ὁ υἱός* (four Latin Vulgate MSS., according to Legg) is small encouragement for the opposite view, while to speak of 'angels, Son of Man, the Father' as a kind of apocalyptic trinity is

grotesque (despite the adoption of this view of Lohmeyer by R. H. Fuller, *Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, p. 83). Without very strong evidence to the contrary, $\delta \nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ over against $\delta \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ means Jesus in filial relation to God. It is altogether characteristic of him to refer to his unique communion with the Father in terms involving humiliation, and it is of a piece with his conception that the glory of the Son of Man is qualified, and attained through the acceptance of the shame of the Suffering Servant (see further Hoskyns and Davey, *Riddle of the N.T.*, p. 134).

The relation of this verse with v. 30 is even more keenly debated. How, it is asked, can Jesus on the one hand assert that the contemporary generation will see the fulfilment of his words, and on the other that no man can know the time of the fulfilment? Most commonly it is answered that the two sayings refer to different events; v. 30 concerns the fall of Jerusalem and v. 32 the parousia (so Haupt, Beyschlag, Lagrange, etc.). I have already given reasons for denying that v. 30 can be restricted to the fall of Jerusalem, which in any case takes its place among the precursors of the End, so that, in my view at least, this resort can no longer be considered adequate. A number of scholars hold that the two sayings stand in irreconcilable opposition; the authenticity of one or other is then usually denied, but Kümmel considers both to be genuine, although in apparent contradiction. He cites Oepke's conviction, that the combination of tension and extension of hope in regard to the end is typical of all Biblical eschatology and has a pastoral end in view. He then adds, 'It must frankly be admitted that we cannot know how to reconcile these two types of prophecy; but that simply means that in one definite point of the conceptual forms of Jesus' eschatological proclamation no clear insight can be gained' (*Verheissung*, 2nd ed., p. 143). This is an honest position to adopt, yet I am still unable to persuade myself that it is necessary. Had Jesus stated, 'Of that Day no one knows,' or even, 'Of that hour no one knows,' it might be contended with reason that the term 'Day' (or even 'Hour') signified simply the Day of the Lord, as is common in the O.T. and N.T. In that case an unqualified statement would have been made which could be interpreted of a complete denial of knowledge of the time of the End (though this could not be insisted upon; strictly speaking such an assertion ought to mean that Jesus knew nothing of the Day itself i.e. of its nature, an impossible view in face of the rest of his teaching). That, however, Jesus did not say. 'That day *or* hour' carries the implication of a narrower limitation of time over against a broader period; indeed, it is hard to explain its use on any other basis.¹ If at

¹ This interpretation would be not lessened but rather perhaps fortified if instead of η the reading $\kappa\alpha\iota$ were to be adopted, as in \aleph D F S W Θ fam. 1, fam. 13, 28 565 700 al. plur., a g² i k q r^{1,2} aur. vg. Syr. sin & pesh Cop. sah &

the present time one were asked, 'Have you any idea when war will next break out in Europe?' and the reply were given, 'I do not know the day or hour', the presumption would be that one had an idea as to when it was likely without being able to define the time closely; or, even more naturally, that it would happen fairly soon but one could not say at what juncture. In fact, 'day or hour' does not suit a period felt to be remote; the terms are used within the context of a limited time. Schwartzkopff pointed out that any man who said, 'I cannot tell the day or hour in which France will perish' 'or 'in which the earth will become a mass of ice', would make himself appear ridiculous, for he would be grossly misapplying language that properly implies a precise expectation (*Weissagungen*, p. 178). Accordingly, despite the violent opposition expressed by some exegetes to the view that v. 32 defines an ignorance within the limitation mentioned in v. 30 (Beyschlag characterises it as 'insipid' and 'inconceivable in the mind of Jesus', *N.T. Theology*, vol. 1, p. 197; to Denney it is 'trivial, not to say grotesque', *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 355, to Hugh Martin 'unlikely to the point of absurdity', *Necessity of the Second Coming*, p. 36), it would seem to be a natural interpretation of the evidence, and, in opposition to Kümmerle, I cannot see that it attempts to know more than we can know (*Ibid.*). It seems to me that v. 30, Mk. 9.1, Mt. 10.23 and the persistent exhortations to be prepared for the coming of the End reveal an impressive consistency in the mind of our Lord; they are independent of changing moods and circumstances and, as Michaelis has urged, they 'must have proceeded from a quite clear fundamental attitude' (*Der Herr verzicht nicht die Verheissung*, p. 43). If, then, Jesus unwaveringly adopted a near expectation of the End, this logion cannot signify an unconditional ignorance as to its time, for that would postulate an intolerable inconcinnity in his mind; it must denote a limitation in his otherwise assumed knowledge. His prophetic intuition, fortified beyond that of any prophet, led him to the conviction of an early consummation, but beyond setting it within the bounds of the generation then living, he could not define the *καιρός* more closely. With this conclusion the language employed in Mt. 25.13, particularly in the context of the parable, is in full agreement: *Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν.*

Another saying, commonly adduced alongside this, may throw yet more light on v. 32: Acts 1.7 implies that the Father's solitary knowledge of the time of the End is due to its determination by him; the

boh Geo. Aeth. Arm. Iren. Epiph. Bas. Aug. Hil.). On the other hand it would seem that the distinction ought not to be pressed. Professor Kilpatrick pointed out to me that Mk. often uses *καί* where we might have expected *ἤ*, but when he does so *καί* = *vel* rather than *aut*; this has brought some confusion into the MS. tradition—see e.g. 4.17, 10.38, 10.40, 11.28, where *ἤ* is in each case read by most authorities but where, as in this verse, *καί* may well be original.

χρόνοι and the καιροί are in his hands. There is some justification therefore for the view that v. 32 implies a conscious submission on the part of our Lord to the Father's will in respect of his teaching on the nearness of the End. This is strongly urged by Michaelis in the work above referred to. It is also hinted at in Schlatter's exposition of this passage. He saw in Jesus two complementary attitudes; one derived from his consciousness of willing to do his Father's will and which would see no obstacle compelling a postponement of the End to distant times; the other bore the stamp of his filial obedience and readily subordinated itself to the sovereign will of the Father, leaving to him the decision of times (*Der Evangelist Matthäus*, p. 714). From this angle, Schlatter enunciated the dictum, 'God's providential rule is the sole true exposition for every prophecy, even for those of Jesus' (*Erläuterungen zum N.T., Matthäus*, p. 363). If Jesus recognised this, then even the most unambiguous of his utterances concerning the time of the End, including v. 30, Mk. 9.1, Mt. 10.23, must be regarded as standing under the implicit proviso *Deo volente*. The intense faith in God which fostered the expectation of a speedy consummation would as readily leave the final issue to God's good-pleasure.

As to the celebrated οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, most patristic commentators could not bring themselves to accept it at its face value and did their best to demonstrate that Jesus did, in fact, know the time of the End. (It is noteworthy that in cod. W, at the end of v. 33 after οὐκ οἶδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστίν, we find the addition εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱός.) Jerome, discomfited by the triumphant assertion of the Arians, 'He who knows and he who is ignorant cannot be both equal,' replied, 'Seeing that Jesus, that is, the Word of God, made all times (for "By him all things were made, and without him was not anything made that was made"), and that the day of judgment must be in all time, by what reasoning can he who knows the whole be shown to be ignorant of a part?' He cites Acts 1.7 and deduces therefrom, 'He shows that he knows, but that it was not expedient for the apostles to know, that, being in uncertainty of the coming of their judge, they should live every day as though they were to be judged that day' (*Comm. in Matt.*). This solution, more briefly stated by Augustine, 'The Son is said not to know because he does not make men to know' (*Lib. 83, Quaest. q. 60*, cited in the commentary of Aquinas on Matt.) became classic. Sometimes it was fortified by drawing a distinction between the human and divine elements in the consciousness of Jesus. Athanasius e.g. predicated the ignorance of his human nature (*in natura quidem humanitatis novit diem et hora, non ex natura humanitatis novit, Gregor. epist. 8.42*), while Calovius said that κατὰ κτήσιν Jesus was omniscient, but κατὰ χρῆσιν he did not have everything open to him ('in promptu', H. A. W. Meyer). In more modern times stress has been laid on the limitation of the messianic mission of

Jesus: 'He knows not because he had it not among his instructions to declare that day' (Bengel). That could be acceptable to us only if we added (what Bengel was unwilling to admit), 'And as true man he did not have it in his mind.' If, to use Lord Charnwood's picturesque terms, it did not come within the scope of our Lord's commission to 'lift the veil of futurity', this was in part because the veil existed also for him (see *According to St. John*, p. 223). It was part of his task to reveal the whither of humanity, for as the divinely instituted Mediator he was destined to bring men to the goal of their creation. For the final accomplishment of this work he awaited the word of the Father. That word was not spoken in his earthly life. It is significant that he declined to reveal it in his resurrection glory (Acts 1.7).

33. *Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε.*
οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστί.

The exhortation latent in v. 32 is brought to overt expression in this saying: 'Watch!' The assurance that the End is not set in the far distance, coupled with complete uncertainty as to the time of its arrival, combine to throw a greater stress on the necessity for alertness than if one only of these two factors had been mentioned. *ἀγρυπνεῖτε* includes two ideas: the disciples should ever bear in mind that the day is coming and be awake to every intimation of its approach; they must further maintain spiritual alertness against all forms of temptation, lest they be unprepared to meet the Lord at his parousia. The contrary notion is expressed in v. 36, *μὴ ἐλθῶν ἐξαίφνης εὐρηγῆ ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας*, where the moral element is plainly in mind.

Neither Mt. nor Lk. records this saying, although Lk.'s *προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς = βλέπετε*, and his v. 36 begins with *ἀγρυπνεῖτε*. From this point the three reports of the discourse diverge, although in each case the conclusion exhorts to watchfulness; Mt. adds a long series of parables on this theme. It looks as though the original discourse ended with v. 32 and each evangelist rounded it off with appropriate material. The question arises whether Mk.'s conclusion originally related to watchfulness in view of the parousia, or whether some other crisis was in view. The similarity of v. 33 to Mk. 14.38, spoken in Gethsemane, is so clear that an early copyist inserted after *ἀγρυπνεῖτε* the words *καὶ προσεύχασθε* (of the Uncials only B.D. have escaped revision). It has been suggested that the crisis demanding alertness was not the relatively far off Advent, but the immediately impending attack on Jesus and his followers, which would provide a sore temptation to fail in faith (so. C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 164 ff.). The same significance would then attach to the parable that follows, unless it was originally addressed to the public, when it would exhort simply to preparedness for any development in the critical situation occasioned by the ministry of Jesus (Dodd, *Ibid.*).

This interpretation is possible only if it be conceded that the parables of the Virgins (Mt. 25.1 ff.), Talents (Mt. 25.14 ff.) and Watching Servants (Lk. 12.36 ff.) all refer to the same critical juncture, viz. the ministry of Jesus, for this parable is closely bound up with them. This procedure is dubious. Moreover the affinity of v. 33 to v. 32, which is almost universally conceded to have an eschato-

logical reference, is of no small consequence: βλέπετε is contained in the idea of v. 32; οὐκ οἴδατε answers to οὐδείς οἶδεν κ.τ.λ.; πότε ὁ καιρός τοῦ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας. It seems more plausible to relate a saying to its context, when it fits so well, than to adduce a hypothetical one, the application of which is doubtful. It is clear that Jesus did address his disciples near the close of his ministry concerning the period to follow upon his death and concerning the End of the age; during this interval the disciples were to experience a time of severe testing wherein they must maintain faith and loyalty to their tasks. This saying and the parable that follows are well suited to such instruction. If they were not spoken at this time, we should presume another occasion on which Jesus gave teaching as to his parousia. Since the gospels contain such material elsewhere, that is not improbable.

The composition of the parable in vv. 34-36 is more difficult. It seems to combine motives from the three parables above mentioned, the Talents, Watching Servants and Virgins, and its language can be paralleled in every respect (with 34ab cf. Mt. 25.14-15; with 34c-35a cf. Lk. 12.36-37; with 35b cf. Lk. 12.38; with 36 cf. Mt. 25.5). The suggestion lies to hand that the parable has been constructed from reminiscences of these parables. If that has happened, it must have occurred in the oral period; it is hard to imagine that any scribe would have constructed a piece like this from extant literary models (Schniewind regards the correspondences as characteristic of what may elsewhere be observed of the contacts between Mk. and Q., *Ev. nach Markus*, p. 176). The parable may then be regarded as a condensation of the three better-known stories. Jeremias suggests, as an alternative to this view, that we have a unitary parable which has been amplified in the course of transmission: if ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος of 34a and δοὺς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ of 34b be removed, as introducing alien features into the story, we are left with a core which consists of the parable of the Doorkeeper, who had received the command to keep watch (34b) and to open immediately as soon as his master, on his return from the banquet, should knock (Lk. 12.36); it would be well for him if his master should find him watching at whatever watch of the night he might return (35 f., cf. Lk. 12.37a). Professor Jeremias suggests that if this was spoken to the disciples, the parallel in Mk. 14.38 indicates that they were being warned of the final πειρασμός that was to begin with the passion of the Lord; if it was spoken to the crowds it would relate, like the parable of the Flood, to impending calamity; if spoken to the scribes, which is most likely of all, the lesson would be, Take heed that you be not found sleeping when the moment of crisis arrives! (*Parables of Jesus*, pp. 43 ff.). This reconstruction and interpretation are illuminating, and the former, in particular, may be right; it is

hard to believe that the interpretation is correct, for it depends on the view that Jesus believed that the consummation would follow without delay upon his death, a reading of the evidence which seems to me to be unsatisfactory (see *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 191 ff.). However we account for the formulation of these sayings, it seems undeniable that the crisis in view is that of the parousia.

A final decision on the origin of vv. 33 ff. is not attainable. Their formulation could certainly be due to their combination from different contexts, as suggested above. It is also not beyond possibility that Jesus himself employed the motives in this fresh setting, as he was accustomed doubtless to do in other respects in his public ministry. The question must remain open.

34. Ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος
 ἀφείς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ
 καὶ δούς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν,
 ἐκάστω τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορή.

The situation concerning the disciples and their absent Lord is as if (ὡς) a traveller, on going abroad, summoned his servants and assigned to each one appropriate authority (τὴν ἐξουσίαν) for a specified task (ἐκάστω τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ), and in particular he commissioned the porter to maintain a watch. Two separate ideas appear to be combined here: the traveller grants to each servant a privilege, by according him a share of authority within the household (τὴν ἐξουσίαν signifies either the extent of authority within the entire household as befitting each person, or, as Lagrange prefers, the autonomy granted to each, so that every man in a sense becomes his own master); corresponding to that privilege (ἐκάστω τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ is appositional), responsibility is laid on each for the discharge of a certain duty (ἔργον). Herein the parable reflects the state of affairs portrayed in the parable of the Talents (Mt. 25.14 ff.) and Pounds (Lk. 19.12 ff.). The inference is suggested that each Christian participates in such privilege and shares responsibility in the Church of God, but the thought is not developed. Attention instead is concentrated on one person who has a special task, the porter; his function is to watch both for the possible approach of marauders and for the return of the master, that he may be received with alacrity. Since this aspect alone is expanded in the application, we must presume that it is the burden of the parable. The function of the porter is shared by every disciple.

καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ is emphatic, 'and to the porter particularly he commanded . . .' (cf. καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ Mk. 16.7). The special mention of this servant caused Turner to suggest that Peter was here referred to primarily, and through him the rest of the apostles. The occurrence of the term θυρωρός in Jn. 10.3 in a pastoral context has led others to consider that the porter represents the apostles, and the servants the generality of Christians. There is, however, no warrant to think that the δούλοι do not also represent the disciples. The idea of a pastoral

function is absent from this passage; the disciples are addressed *qua* disciples, not as apostles set within a larger group.

ὤς is a Semitism, like ὡσπερ in Mt. 25.14 (ὡσπερ is actually read here by WΘΣ fam. 1 fam. 13 543 28 91 299 472 474 565). ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος should be compared with similar phrases like ἄνθρωπος ἔμπορος (Mt. 13.45), ἄνθρωπος οἰκοδεσπότης (Mt. 13.52) ἄνθρωπος βασιλεύς (Mt. 22.2); it should be translated by the simple term 'traveller'.

It has been observed that the construction of the sentence is imperfect. Either καί should be omitted before τῷ θυρωρῷ or ἐνετείλατο should be replaced by the participle ἐντειλάμενος. The roughness of style, however, is typical of Mk. (so Swete).

The foregoing exposition endeavours to explain the verse as Mk. wrote it and understood it. It will be recalled (as mentioned in the note on v. 33) that J. Jeremias wishes to maintain a strict consistency in the parable and accordingly excises ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος; the order to the doorkeeper to keep watch *during the night* is suitable if the master is attending a banquet (Lk. 12.36), but not if he absents himself on a long journey, for Orientals avoided night travel when possible; on similar grounds καὶ δὸς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν κ.τ.λ. is regarded as intrusive, for a householder who has merely gone off to attend a banquet has no need to assign special powers to his servants (*Parables*, pp. 43 ff.). There is force in this criticism, and if it were right the parable would run smoothly without any inconsistencies. On the other hand one cannot insist on this interpretation, for the command ἵνα γρηγορῇ does not necessarily imply the night watches only. A porter was employed where there was a communal courtyard and commonly had a dwelling built specially for him; his functions applied to the day as well as the night (as Jn. 10.3 indicates, cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVII. v. 2). But generally the porter was a slave, and slaves were notoriously sleepy. Strack-Billerbeck cite at this passage *Qid.* 49b, 35, "Ten measures of sleep came down into the world; the slaves took nine and all the rest of the world had one". Evidently there was good cause for the traveller to charge the doorkeeper to remain awake! The anticipated return of the householder during one of the watches of the night (v. 35) may itself be a secondary feature or afterthought, and not the main element of the parable as Jeremias holds. This is strengthened by the consideration that the whole of v. 35 after γρηγορεῖτε οὖν is parenthesis; the controlling thought leaps from the imperative to the warning of v. 36. Jeremias' view remains an interesting possibility, but I have felt justified in keeping to the Marcan framework of the parable.

35. Γρηγορεύετε οὖν οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ
 πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται,
 ἢ ὀψὲ ἢ μεσονύκτιον
 ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἢ πρωί,
 36. μὴ ἐλλῶν ἐξαίφνης
 εὖρη ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας.

The application of the parable is given in the main sentence, γρηγορεύετε . . . μὴ ἐλλῶν ἐξαίφνης εὖρη ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας. The parenthesis οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, κ.τ.λ., supplies a subsidiary reason for alertness: the κύριος τῆς οἰκίας (formerly ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος) will return at an unspecified hour of the night. Evidently an arrival in the day time is not envisaged. It is uncertain to what extent this element is controlled by the parable it explains. On the one hand it has affinity with those accounts in which the parousia is said to take place during the night (cf. Lk. 12.39 f., 17.34 f.). To Paul that suggested the notion that the interval before the End is morally dark, in comparison with which the New Age will be light (Rom. 13.11 ff., ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν). On the other hand it may be an extension of the parabolic form and, somewhat as v. 32, relate to a comparatively near or distant return after the master's period of absence ('comparatively', for a long night of history is out of harmony with the context, as is also the curious notion of Theophylact and others that the four ages of human life are here in view). If the parable borrows this motif from the narrative of the Watching Servants (Lk. 12.35 ff.), the mention of night will have no significance beyond the convenient divisions of time which it affords and the increased vividness gained thereby for the duty γρηγορεύετε (indeed, the latter term may have suggested the borrowing of this feature here).

Lohmeyer thought that ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας represented the one Lord of the Church, for which the term 'house' is a periphrasis, derived from the 'house of Israel' and common in the N.T. (e.g. Heb. 3.5). This is hardly to be received, for it over-allegorises the picture and depends on the identification of the δούλοι with the apostles, a view we have seen fit to reject. In any case it is better to regard the employment of the term κύριος τῆς οἰκίας as due to the parable mixing itself in the application, rather than vice versa (so B. Weiss).

In Lk. 12.38 three watches only of the night are mentioned, in accordance with the ancient Hebrew division of night (Ex. 14.24, Jud. 7.19, 1 Sam. 11.11, Lam. 2.19). Mk.'s four reflect the Roman division as popularly named (*ὄψέ* = 6-9 p.m., *μεσονύκτιον* = 9-12 p.m., *ἀλεκτοροφωνίας* = 12-3 a.m., *πρωί* = 3-6 a.m.). Israel Abrahams cites this passage, along with Berakthoth 3b, to illustrate that Roman usage had penetrated into Jewish customs (Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv, p. 767). *μεσονύκτιον* is an adverbial accusative, *ἀλεκτοροφωνίας* an ordinary genitive of time. The latter term is a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, but the point of time was important to the Jews. There is still a morning benediction in the Jewish liturgy to be recited at Cock-crow.

For *ἐξαίφνης* (A B X Y Π Σ Φ Ψ etc.) it is possible to read *ἐξέφνης* (K C D K L W Γ Δ Θ etc.). Nestle prefers the former, Westcott and Hort the latter. The element of unexpectedness implied in the term is, of course, spoken from the point of view of the servants in their pursuit or otherwise of duty; for the alert doorkeeper there is no threat, only pleasure at the intimation of his master's arrival. But unlike a homecoming in the day, a return at night allows of no warning. The element of surprise is ineradicable from the parousia expectation. Signs, like the fig tree, are an indication of promise, not a clock. Of that *hour* οὐδείς οἶδεν (v. 32). And more, ἢ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται (Lk. 12. 40). Hence the insistence on γρηγορεῖτε, here and in the final exhortation (v. 37).

37. "Ο δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσιν λέγω,
γρηγορεῖτε.

The discourse is addressed to a select group of disciples. Its burden is revealed in its first word. It sounds as a refrain in all its parts. It is now repeated as the last word.

But the command is not for apostles only. Through all that has been said there appears a concern of the Lord, not alone for his immediate disciples, but for the community which is to rise through their testimony. For this cause the Gospel is to go into all the world; on account of *his* name family division will become widespread; his followers are warned of Jerusalem's catastrophe, that they be not embroiled in the ruin of the Jewish polity; the elect must be preserved from deceivers; at the parousia they will be gathered into one from the end of earth and heaven. The whole address is directed to the needs of his people. Even in the concluding parable, the master's coming is related solely to them; not a hint is given concerning those without the Community. Conformable with this, the last word of the discourse is directed to the flock for which he is about to die. 'Because he will gather to himself God's entire community,' wrote Schlatter, 'his command to wait for him with watchful and prepared heart is not only given to his special messengers, but describes the Christian duty obligatory for all' (*Erläuterungen, Matthäus*, p. 362).

Accordingly, a trumpet call sounds out to all that love the Redeemer: γρηγορεῖτε. It appeals for hearts to be set wholly on him; for conduct befitting men who expect to be like him; for service with an eye on the gate; for endurance, whatever befall.

When the lines fall in pleasant places, γρηγορεῖτε.

If earth be engulfed in darkness, γρηγορεῖτε.

Since the hour is unknown, γρηγορεῖτε.

But as the day is sure, γρηγορεῖτε.

This word the first community took seriously. When their hour came, they were ready. In crises since that day it has shone like a lamp in the gloom. When darkness threatens again to overwhelm the world, let the Church heed the admonition of its Lord:

Ο ΔΕ ΥΜΙΝ ΛΕΓΩ
ΠΑΣΙΝ ΛΕΓΩ
ΓΡΗΓΟΡΕΙΤΕ.

INDICES

(a) AUTHORS

- Abrahams, I., 117
 Alford, H., 62
 Allen, W. C., 45, 87, 93, 101
 Althaus, P., 68 f, 103
 Ambrose, 106
 Augustine, 69, 109
 Appel, 91
 Aquinas, 109
 Artabanus, 32
 Athanasius, 109
- Bacon, B. W., 7, 16, 65, 80 f
 Barnes, E. W., 16
 Barrett, C. K., 3, 13, 13 n, 46 f
 Bartlet, V., 104
 Baur, F. C., 63, 99
 Bauer, W., 66 f
 Bede, 71
 Bengel, J. A., 30, 52, 60, 70, 93, 110
 Bevan, W. L., 62
 Beyschlag, W., 107, 108
 Blunt, A. W. F., 77
 Bousset, W., 32, 60, 66, 67, 80, 85, 87, 92, 93, 106
 Box, G. H., 80
 Brandon, S. G., 23
 Briggs, C. A., 88
 Bruce, A. B., 57, 70, 77, 93
 Büchsel, F., 100
 Bultmann, R., 19, 21, 95, 104, 106
 Burkitt, F. C., 42
 Busch, F., 30, 37, 57, 68, 81, 93, 100
- Cadbury, H. J., 32
 Cadoux, A. T., 15, 65, 105
 Calovius, 109
 Calvin, J., 60 f
 Charles, R. H., 37, 38, 54, 80, 92
 Charnwood, Lord, 110
 Cheyne, T. K., 55, 66
 Chrysostom, 69, 99
 Clarke, W. K. L., 89, 91
 Colani, T., 1 f, 6, 8 f, 17, 23, 57, 59 f, 90 f
 Cranfield, C. E. B., 41 n
 Creed, J. M., 28, 52
 Curtis, A. H., 91
- Dalman, G., 20, 52, 58, 74, 81, 91, 106
 Davey, N., 97, 107
 Denney, J., 106, 108
 De Wette, 7 n
 Dix, Dom G., 91
 Dibelius, M., 95
 Dodd, C. H., 3, 18, 23, 95
 Duncan, G. S., 91
- Easton, B. S., 19
 Edersheim, A., 70
 Eisler, R., 56
 Epiphanius, 36
 Eusebius, 2, 58
- Farrer, A., 61, 70
 Field, F., 36
 Fison, J. E., 91
 Fritsche, C. F. A., 7 n
 Fulford, H. W., 62
 Fuller, R. H., 107
- Ginzberg, 55, 63
 Glasson, T. F., 3
 Gloege, G., 51, 90
 Godet, F., 52
 Goguel, M., 11 n, 22, 24, 98
 Goodspeed, E. J., 16
 Goudge, H. H., 65, 78
 Greeven, H., 71
 Gunkel, K., 38, 66 f
- Hauck, F., 56, 70
 Haupt, E., 76, 77, 91, 95 f, 107
 Headlam, A. C., 81
 Heitmüller, W., 32
 Hippolytus, 36, 66
 Hölscher, G., 3, 5, 65
 Holsten, 91
 Holtzmann, H. S., 4, 4 n, 24, 28, 32, 64, 76, 93, 104
 Holtzmann, O., 16
 Hort, F. J. A., 36, 117
 Hoskyns, E. C., 23, 97, 107
 Hunter, A. M., 3 n
- Irenaeus, 66

- Jeremias, J., 3, 92, 95, 112, 115
 Jerome, 63, 66, 71, 99, 109
 Josephus, 7, 19, 20, 24, 28, 31, 42, 50,
 56, 61 f, 64, 70, 78, 115
 Josippon, 55
 Justin, 83
- Keim, J., 60, 62, 94
 Kilpatrick, G. D., 41 n, 42 ff, 108 n
 Kittel, G., 54
 Klostermann, E., 23, 27, 28, 31, 32,
 52, 76, 80, 83, 96, 104
 Kummel, W. G., 8 n, 14 n, 17, 41, 47,
 92, 96, 101, 104, 106, 107, 108
- Lagrange, M. J., 35, 38, 41, 46, 52, 69,
 71, 74, 76, 78 f, 80, 81, 92, 97,
 107, 114
 Lake, K., 32
 Legg, S. C. E., 106
 Levertoff, P. P., 65, 78, 80
 Lightfoot, R. H., 3
 Lohmeyer, E., 3, 5, 19, 24, 25, 35, 40,
 42, 48, 49, 50, 53, 61, 68, 70, 77,
 79, 80, 84, 87, 88, 92, 94, 96, 101,
 103, 106, 107, 116
 Loisy, A., 6, 16, 16 n, 23, 24, 27, 33,
 41, 50, 52, 73, 74, 76, 84, 87, 88,
 104, 106
- MacCullough, J. A., 15
 Major, H. D. A., 16
 Manson, T. W., 17 n, 33, 52, 65
 Manson, W., 8 n, 33
 Martin, H., 108
 McNeile, A. H., 57, 73, 92, 97
 Menachem, 103
 Menzies, A., 9, 28, 50, 64
 Merx, A., 41, 70, 76, 81, 92, 106
 Meyer, A., 84 f
 Meyer, E., 7 n
 Meyer, H. A. W., 21, 28, 35, 52, 93,
 109
 Michaelis, W., 41, 100, 108, 109
 Moffatt, J., 15, 16
 Montefiore, C. G., 15
 Moule, C. F. D., 11 n, 12 n
 Moulton, J. H., 97
 Müller, E. F. K., 18
 Munck, J., 11 n
- Nestle, E., 54, 117
 Nineham, D. E., 42
- Oepke, A., 107
 Oesterley, W. A. E., 37, 92
 Origen, 99
 Otto, R., 95
- Paulus, 7 n
 Pfeiderer, J., 61 f, 63 f, 66
 Philo, 54
 Piganiol, A., 64 f
 Plato, 78
 Pliny, 58
 Pünjer, G. C. B., 46, 62
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., 28, 77
 Rengstorf, K. H., 93, 95, 100
 Réville, A., 106
 Rowley, H. H., 91
 Russell, J. S., 70
- Salmond, S. D. F., 70, 88
 Sanday, W., 81
 Schlatter, A., 21, 28, 34, 49, 56, 60, 63,
 70, 76, 84, 88, 104, 109, 118
 Schmid, J., 57, 62, 100
 Schmidt, K. L., 3, 25
 Schmidt, N., 15
 Schmiedel, P. W., 64
 Schniewind, J., 24, 42, 52, 57, 78, 88,
 93, 99, 100, 104, 112
 Schwartz, E., 97 f
 Schwartzkopff, P., 96, 104, 108
 Schweitzer, A., 3
 Scott, E. F., 23
 Selwyn, E. C., 18
 Smend, R., 91
 Smith, D., 16
 Stanton, V. H., 3, 27
 Stauffer, E., 11 n, 71 f
 Stonehouse, N. B., 91
 Strack, H. L., 28, 38, 63, 74, 76, 77,
 103, 115
 Strathmann, H., 40 n
 Strauss, F., 7 n
 Streeter, B. H., 46, 70
 Swete, H. B., 21, 26, 69, 70, 76, 88, 92,
 115
 Symmachus, 36
- Tatian, 71
 Taylor, V., 17 n, 24, 28, 48, 69, 79,
 104
 Theodotian, 78
 Theophylact, 63, 71, 116
 Titius, A., 88, 99

- Torrey, C. C., 16 n, 17, 26, 55, 65, 88
Turner, C. H., 23, 32, 92, 96, 114
- Victor, 30
Victorinus, 66
Volkmar, G., 17 n, 30, 69, 88, 105
- Weiffenbach, W., 4 n, 15, 24, 31 f, 59,
62, 104
Weiss, B., 116
- Weiss, J., 18, 52, 55, 59, 64, 76, 106
Weizsäcker, C., 2, 3, 5, 15, 57, 60
Wellhausen, J., 15, 23, 50, 54, 57, 60,
74, 80, 86, 91, 97, 98, 106
Wendling, E., 5, 105
Wendt, H. H., 2, 14
Westcott, B. F. W., 36, 117
Wohlenberg, G., 88, 92
- Zahn, T., 21, 28, 52, 60, 88, 97
Zigabena, E., 63

(b) SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Genesis</i>		1 <i>Kings</i>		<i>Jeremiah</i> (continued)	
3.1	74	1.52	52	6.22 ff	34
6.14	74	8.37	37	6.24 ff	37
7.1	100	11.5	62	9.4	49
19.17	73			11.3	55
19.26	58	2 <i>Kings</i>		12.12	81
24.63	74	23.13	62	14.12	37
27.3	74			21.7	37
47-50	11 n	1 <i>Chronicles</i>		22.5	20
		28-29	11	23.7 f	78
				26.6	20
<i>Exodus</i>		2 <i>Chronicles</i>		34.4	43
1.6	100	15.6	34, 38	38.2	36
3.14	32			49.1 ff	
4.15	47	<i>Nehemiah</i>		49.8	58
9.18	78	8.14 f	58		
9.24	78			<i>Lamentations</i>	
10.6	78	<i>Psalms</i>		2.19	117
10.14	78	12.7	100		
11.6	78	18.11	89	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
14.24	117	18.12	89	5.11	62
25.11	85	24.6	99	5.12	37
34.5	89, 92	119.46	42	7.16	58
				14.21	37
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>		20.34 ff	78
1.35	100	3.5	49	38.21	49
2.25	37	10.22 f	81	38.21 b	49
4.19	87	11.12	92	38.15	92
13.1 ff	83 f	13.6 ff	37		
13.7	92	13.10	87	<i>Daniel</i>	
18.18	84	13.13	37	2.28	34
30.4	92	15.5	58	2.34	24
32.25	84	17.12	88	3	55
32.39	32	19.1	89	7.3	89
		19.2	34, 38	7.9	91
<i>Joshua</i>		22.1	73	7.13	89, 90 f
2.6	73	26.17 ff	37	7.13 ff	91
23-24	11 n	27.13	92	7.21 f	34
		28.22	87	7.22	91
<i>Judges</i>		34.4	87	7.26	52
2.10	100	40.6	74	8.13	54
7.19	117	43.10 f	32	9.24	80
		49.8	54	9.27	54, 55
<i>Ruth</i>		51.9 ff	78	11.31	54
2.14	84	52.6 f	32	11.36 ff	68
		54.7	81	11.44	35
1 <i>Samuel</i>		55.12	74	12.1	78 f
9.25	73	60.4 ff	90	12.4	52
11.11	117	66.7-8	37	12.7	80
12	11 n	<i>Jeremiah</i>		12.11	54
14.45	52	2.12	54		
		4.19	35	<i>Hosea</i>	
2 <i>Samuel</i>		4.19 ff	34	2.16	84
14.11	52	4.29	58	13.13 f	37

<i>Joel</i>		<i>Micah</i> (continued)		<i>Zechariah</i>	
2.28 ff	48	4.9	37	12.10 f	92
3.9 f	34	7.6	49	14	25
<i>Amos</i>		7.15 ff	78	14.4	37
5.19 f	57	<i>Habakkuk</i>			
<i>Micah</i>		3.4	89	<i>Malachi</i>	
3.12	22	<i>Haggai</i>		3.1	50
4.1 ff	90	2.6	37, 34	4.5 f	50

NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Matthew</i> (continued)		<i>Mark</i> (continued)	
5.1 ff	25	27.2	42	13.5 ff	1, 17
5.17	104	28.16 ff	25	13.6	16, 31, 43, 68, 84
5.18	103, 104	<i>Mark</i>		13.6 ff	1, 94
5.21 ff	104	1.39	42	13.7	34 f, 36
5.37	4	1.44	41 n	13.7 f	5, 7, 97
6.10	9	3.13 f	25	13.7 ff	6
7.24	103	3.21	50	13.8	36 ff
10.14 f	74	3.21 ff	50	13.9	40 ff
10.18	42	4.10	85	13.9 ff	7 f, 13
10.19	46	4.17	108 n	13.10	16, 40 ff
10.20	46	6.11	41 n	13.11	46 ff
10.23	13, 44, 108, 109	6.14	42	13.12	49 f
10.30	52	6.29	70	13.13	5, 51 ff
10.32 f	90	7.13	79	13.14	1, 4, 6, 13, 16,
10.34	50	7.15	14		27, 54 ff, 62,
11.5	89, 95	7.19	6		65, 66, 67, 68,
11.16	100	8.23	40	13.14 ff	69, 73, 93
11.27	105, 106	8.31	34	13.15 f	4, 14, 63, 67
12.28	47, 48	8.34 ff	13, 74	13.17 f	16, 73 ff
12.39	100	8.38	9, 90, 100,	13.19	13, 76 f
12.41	100		103, 104	13.19 f	7, 14, 78 f
12.42	100	8.38-9.1	16	13.20	64, 78 f
12.45	100	9.1	9, 29, 13,	13.21 f	2, 80 ff
13.45	115	9.2 ff	90, 92, 99,	13.23	83
13.52	115	9.11	108, 109	13.24 f	86
16.28	29	9.49 f	25	13.24 ff	87 f
17.11 ff	50	10.29	30	13.25	97
22.2	115	10.38	104	13.26 f	43
23.34 f	13	10.40	40, 97	13.28 f	89 ff
23.35 ff	21, 24, 57	11.11 ff	108 n	13.29	9, 94 ff, 100
23.36	100	11.13 ff	108 n	13.30	100
23.37 ff	13, 20, 21, 101	11.14 ff	26		12, 99, 107,
23.38	22	11.18	97, 98	13.31	108, 109
23.39	13, 21, 101	11.28	97	13.32	103 f
24.4 ff	61	12.12	98	13.32	4, 9 f, 105 f,
24.6	35	12.23	108 n		112
24.10	52	12.24 ff	9	13.33	109, 111 ff
24.14	44	13.2	5, 11, 12,	13.34	114 f
24.26	84		22-24, 27,	13.34 f	112
24.30	92		54, 56, 60	13.35 ff	115, 116 f
24.31	92, 93	13.3	25 f	13.37	118
24.35 f	20	13.4	25 ff, 100	14.25	9
25.1 ff	111	13.5	30	14.38	111, 112
25.5	112	13.5 b	37, 40	14.58	22 ff
25.13	108	13.5 f	4, 7	14.62	9
25.14	115			14.62 f	90
25.14 ff	111, 112, 114			15.21	74
25.31 ff	90, 92, 103			16.7	114

<i>Luke</i>		<i>Luke</i> (continued)		<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	
1.17	50	21.32	101	2	59, 64
1.39	58	22.21 ff	11 n	2.1	93
2.12	93	23.28 ff	24, 57, 101	2.1 ff	65, 66, 67
4.44	42			2.3 f	68
10.12	9	<i>John</i>		2.4	68
10.18	90	2.13 ff	23	2.9	83
10.29	97	2.19	24		
11.20	47, 48, 89	7.5	50	<i>1 and 2 Timothy</i>	
11.30	93	10.3	114, 115		11 n
11.31 f	9	11.1 f	60		
11.49	13, 15	13-17	11 n	<i>Hebrews</i>	
11.50 f	100	14.29	11 n	3.5	116
12.7	52	15.26	48		
12.11	46	16.4	11 n	<i>James</i>	
12.11 f	47	16.5 ff	48	5.3	41 n
12.35 ff	116	16.12 ff	11 n, 48	5.8	97
12.36	112, 115				
12.36 ff	111, 112	<i>Acts</i>		<i>1 Peter</i>	
12.37a	112	1-12	44	5.13	69
12.38	112, 117	1.13 ff	11 n		
12.39 f	116	1.7	108, 109, 110	<i>2 Peter</i>	
12.40	117	6.10	47	3.12	42
12.52 f	49	10.9	73		
13.1 ff	12, 24, 57	11.28	39	<i>Revelation</i>	
13.34 f	21	19.14 ff	32	1.1	105
14.14	9	20	11 n	1.1 ff	105
16.8	99, 100	23.24	42	1.7	92
17.10	96	24.5	36	1.11 ff	105
17.21	4	24.22	51	2.18	105
17.23	84	26.22	41 n	5.11	17
17.23 f	9			6.8 ff	37
17.25	100	<i>Romans</i>		8	78
17.28 ff	73	1.16	44	8.12	88
17.31	12, 16, 73	9.28	81	9.15	105
17.32	73	11.25	82	11.1 f	60
17.34 f	116	11.25 ff	102	12	38
19.12 ff	114	13.11 ff	116	12.4	88
19.41 ff	24, 57, 101			13	66
21.8	31	<i>1 Corinthians</i>		13.1 ff	67
21.13	42	15.24	35	13.11 ff	83
21.15	47	15.52	39	13.14	17
21.16	52			13.14 ff	66
21.18	52	<i>Philippians</i>		13.18	54, 57
21.19	52	1.12 ff	41	16	78
21.20	65, 82			17.7 ff	105
21.23 f	76, 82	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>		18.2	69
21.25 f	88	4.16	93	21.9-22.5	24
21.29	95	5	10	22.6	105
21.30 f	95				

NON-CANONICAL WRITINGS

<i>2 Esdras</i> (4 Ezra)		<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>		<i>Testaments of XII Patriarchs</i>	
5.8	77	2.29	69		11 n
6.21	77	<i>1 Maccabees</i>		<i>Assumption of Moses</i>	
13.31	38	1.54 ff	55		11 n
<i>Enoch</i>		2.28	57	<i>Epistle of Barnabas</i>	
	2	2.32 ff	76	4.3	2
48.3	32	<i>2 Maccabees</i>		<i>Protevangelium of James</i>	
69.26	32	6.2	54 f		58
80.2	80				