JESUS AND THE FUTURE

JESUS AND THE FUTURE

An Examination of the Criticism of
The Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13
with Special Reference to
the Little Apocalypse Theory

BY

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY

B.A., M.TH., PH.D.

LONDON

MACMILLAN & CO LTD

NEW YORK · ST MARTIN'S PRESS

1956

First Edition 1954
Reprinted 1956

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

To the two Churches
which I served as minister

ASHURST DRIVE BAPTIST CHURCH
ILFORD, ESSEX
and
ZION BAPTIST CHURCH
CAMBRIDGE

This book is gratefully dedicated

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

'MARK 13 is the biggest problem in the Gospel.' So begins A. M. Hunter's discussion of this chapter.[1] Anyone who has wrestled with its difficulties will agree with that verdict; it is borne out by the multitudinous solutions of the problems and the prevailing confusion in its exegesis. Embarrassment is experienced in all schools of thought in using it. Modern theologians largely feel compelled to ignore the discourse in their reconstructions of the teaching of Jesus. Preachers are aware of the predicament of the scholars; feeling incapable of solving the problems themselves, they neglect the material in their preaching. I cannot recall ever hearing a sermon preached on any verse of Mark 13. For practical purposes, the Synoptic Gospels are read without Mark 13, Matthew 24 and Luke 21; their omission from the New Testament would make little difference to the teacher and preacher.

Yet the Bible of the unlearned still contains the eschatological discourse. The ordinary believer is left to make what he can of the puzzle, without guidance from those who ought to help him. The effect is often disastrous. The Bishop of Birmingham told the Church Congress at Cambridge in 1910 that Henry Sidgwick became an agnostic because Christ foretold things which had not happened; E. C. Selwyn suggested that Mark 13. 30 must take a major share of responsibility for this collapse of faith.[2] Certainly the saying is often quoted by opponents of the Christian Faith. I have myself heard them expatiate on it in open-air demonstrations, and we shall see what effective use of it was made by Strauss and Renan.

In order to reach a responsible decision on this matter, and to satisfy my own mind, I set out to read everything of repute written on Mark 13 since 1864, the year when Colani made known the Little Apocalypse theory. I speedily discovered that I had embarked on an enormous task. The literature on the subject is immense. Every writer who has dealt with the life and teaching of

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1948, p. 122. The 'Gospel' = Mark, not the fourfold Gospel.

[2] *The Oracles of the New Testament*, 1912, p. 338.

Jesus has had his say on the eschatological discourse. It has been a happy hunting ground for scholars with a flair for ingenuity; every Gospel critic has made his own contribution; every commentator on the Synoptic Gospels has struggled with its mysteries. Moreover the literature on the subject does not commence with Colani; he did not initiate the discussion, but propounded a solution to a burning problem; the literature of his period and of the generation prior to him require to be taken into account.

Despite the difficulties of obtaining many of the nineteenth-century works, owing to their destruction in the war, I have striven to take cognisance of all important contributions to this subject, whether contained in critical, expository or theological literature. The importance of the issues at stake appeared to justify a detailed review of the criticism of the discourse in modern times.

In this conviction I am evidently not alone. In his latest treatment of the eschatological discourse Professor Dodd affirmed, 'Recent trends in criticism seem to call for a more radical reconsideration of the question than it has (to my knowledge) yet received.'[1] Such a review of the problems and of their solutions is here offered.

In order to convey a fair impression of the arguments of critics and exegetes, I have preferred to reproduce at length major discussions of the theme and omit those of less importance, apart from indicating where they may be found. While the book would be more easily read if chapters 2–4 were yet further shortened, the theological treatment of the discourse in Chapter 5 would be looked on with suspicion by not a few, who would feel that injustice had been done to the labours of many investigators.

It is possible that this treatment may be condemned by some as too cautious and by others as conceding too much to modern opinion. In none of my views can I claim to represent *Athanasius contra mundum*, but I have sought to give an honest answer to every question as it has arisen. If my solutions of the problems be found unsatisfactory, I shall be content for others to utilize the materials set forth for the building of a sounder edifice.

My warmest thanks are due to the Rev. Professor R. V. G. Tasker, M.A., B.D., of King's College, London, for his encouragement and help given to me while writing this book. He read each

[1] 'The Fall of Jerusalem and the "Abomination of Desolation",' *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. xxxvii, 1947, p. 47.

chapter as it was finished and made numerous suggestions, most of which were adopted. I owe a similar debt of gratitude to the Rev. J. J. Brown, B.D., of Erith, Kent, for his assistance at all stages of the production of the book, particularly for his kindness in offering to compile an index, which he has done with characteristic thoroughness. To the Rev. G. W. Rusling, M.A., B.D., I tender my thanks for his care in reading the final proofs.

The citations from C. C. McCown's *Search for the Real Jesus* on pp. 1, 18 are by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York; that from E. J. Goodspeed's *Life of Jesus* on p. 83 by permission of Harper and Brothers, New York; and those from F. C. Grant's *Gospel of the Kingdom* on pp. 31 f. by permission of the Macmillan Company of New York.

I should add that, in order to clarify the argument, I have made a liberal use of italics, often taking the liberty of introducing them into citations of other writers. I am not conscious of having distorted any quotations in doing this. It is my hope that others besides scholars, who need no such sign-posts, will read this book. An explanation at this point will save undue employment in the footnotes of the notice 'Italics mine'!

G. R. B.-M.

JESUS AND THE FUTURE

An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13

CHAPTER I

THE PRESUPPOSITIONS AND THE FORMULATION OF THE LITTLE APOCALYPSE THEORY

'No matter how original a scholar's imagination, no matter how penetrating and critical his judgment, society does far more of the writing of any book that lives than the author himself.'[1] However humiliating it may be to formulate such a principle, its justification scarcely requires demonstration. We can no more escape the influence of our cultural climate than men at the equator or in the Arctic regions can remain unaffected by their physical conditions. This seems plain enough when pointed out, yet in theological discussion it is rarely thought necessary to take account of the environment in which ideas are formulated and of the motives of their sponsors. A book is cited and a name mentioned in connection with an attractive theory; let it be endorsed by a few impressive authorities and it rapidly spreads; in due time it may be regarded as critically orthodox. But *how* did that theory come to be formulated? What precedents did it have in its own field, and what prompted the author to put it forward? Most significant advances in thought are the product of long processes, brought to an issue by a gifted man. Such is the case with Timothy Colani's theory that the Eschatological Discourse of the Gospels is built around the nucleus of an apocalypse of independent origin. It has been assumed that this hypothesis came out of the blue, like the image of Diana that fell from heaven to Ephesus; we have not paused to ask whether it may first have been thrown into the air

[1] C. C. McCown, *The Search for the Real Jesus*, p. 18

and why, if that did happen, Colani was ready to receive it. This question we desire to examine.

1. Criticism from D. F. Strauss to F. C. Baur

We must go back at least as far as David Strauss. The extent to which New Testament studies have been affected by this writer, both for good and ill, has been strangely overlooked in English-speaking countries, though his ghost still haunts the theological literature of Germany. No book concerning Christian origins had such an explosive effect upon the world as his *Life of Jesus*, published in the years 1835–1836; the scars inflicted on the edifice of the Church remain to this day, though their origin has been forgotten. The book created an immediate sensation and sustained for years its position as a focal point of controversy. 'During the year 1836 the *Tübingen Review* contained some four hundred pages of attack upon Strauss,' wrote McCown. 'Other theological and religious periodicals paid the book an equal amount of attention. . . . Nearly thirty years later a writer in the *Westminster Review* could say, "The name of Strauss has long been a bugbear in the English religious world. High Churchmen and Low Churchmen hush naughty children with the name of Strauss".'[1] Naughty children were not alone in their uneasiness at that name. For large numbers of scholars New Testament studies had been thrown into confusion; old positions were felt to be impossible, and a question mark had been set alongside everything formerly taken for granted. In the year that followed Strauss' *Life*, a German scholar declared that the result of this work was 'to turn into a problem the great evangelic history to an extent and with a completeness such as no earlier investigation had done'.[2] It is not without significance that the same abiding result was felt in Germany three generations later. In 1911 Wellhausen wrote, '*The Life of Jesus*, which formerly stood on the programme of theological literature and of theological lecture courses, has dwindled lately, under the silent influence of Strauss, to *Problems from the Life of Jesus*'.[3] We shall find reason to believe that Wellhausen himself came under that 'silent influence', in directions little suspected by him.

The issues raised by Strauss were fundamental to all aspects of Gospel criticism, and we are here concerned with one only, namely

[1] Op. cit., pp. 7–9.
[2] Cited by C. H. Weisse, 'Die Evangelienfrage', p. 1, from *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, March 1836.
[3] *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 79.

with his views on eschatology. For most scholars of that day the eschatology of Jesus meant the consideration of the discourses of Mt. 24–25; indeed, for a large part of the nineteenth century the eschatological question centred upon the problem of what to do with these chapters, notably with Ch. 24 (=Mk. 13). Here Strauss found a peculiarly vulnerable point in the armour of the orthodox, for the Second Coming of Christ seemed to be set in the context of his own age. 'It is impossible', Strauss wrote, 'to evade the acknowledgment that in this discourse, if we do not mutilate it to suit our own views, Jesus at first speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem and farther on, and until the close, of his return at the end of all things, and that *He places the two events in immediate connexion.*'[1] Such an admission naturally calls into question the reliability of the teaching of Jesus. 'As it will soon be eighteen centuries since the destruction of Jerusalem, and an equally long period since the generation contemporary with Jesus disappeared from the earth, while his visible return and the end of the world which he associated with it, have not taken place, *the announcement of Jesus appears so far to have been erroneous.*'[2]

Strauss reviewed the attempts to meet this difficulty. The 'mountain-peak' theory compared the crises of history with the summits of distant mountains that hide from view intervening distances; but if one is anxious to preserve the authority of Jesus, it will not do. 'We may here cite the appropriate remark of Paulus, that as one, who in a perspective externally presented, does not know how to distinguish distances, labours under an optical illusion, i.e. *errs*; so likewise in an internal perspective of ideas, if such there be, the disregard of distances must be pronounced an *error*; consequently this theory does not show that the above men did not err, but rather explains how they easily might err.'[3] The theory thus illustrates the nature of the error of Jesus, but it in no way absolves him from it. What, then, of the view that it is necessary to make men think that the end is ever at hand, in order to allow the belief to exercise its full moral influence upon them? Was it not necessary for Jesus to impress on men at least the probability of the nearness of the Second Coming, lest it find them unprepared? No, for that also incurs difficulties. 'One whose mind is in a healthy state conceives the possible to be *possible*, the probable as *probable*; and if he wishes to abide by the truth, he so exhibits them to

[1] *Life of Jesus*, vol. III, p. 95. [2] Op. cit., p. 85.
[3] Op. cit., p. 98.

others; the man, on the contrary, by whom the merely possible or probable is conceived as the *real*, is mistaken; and he who, without so regarding it himself, yet for a moral or religious reason so represents it to others, permits himself to use a pious fraud.'[1] On such a view, therefore, Jesus was either mistaken or a deceiver. Strauss does not mind which alternative is chosen; it satisfies him to be able to present the dilemma.

One last resort remains: is it not possible that the prophecy is unauthentic, composed by disciples to show the ability of the Master to predict coming events? Here Strauss speaks with two voices. It suits him to maintain the authenticity of the discourse, for he is anxious to prove the fallibility of Jesus. He accordingly agrees with those theologians who seek the origin of the prophecies, not in the events leading up to the fall of Jerusalem, which would make the whole prophecy a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but in the well-known predictions of Old Testament prophecy. Strauss is prepared to apply this even to the Lukan version of the discourse, though not without a sting in the tail: 'Even those particulars in which Luke surpasses his fellow-narrators in definiteness are not of a kind to oblige us to suppose either a *supernatural knowledge*, or a *vaticinium post eventum*.' The result is plain: that which Jesus predicted concerning Jerusalem and which came true is due to no superior insight, it is merely a collocation of Old Testament ideas; that which He predicted, but which did not happen, is due to a similar, but indiscriminate, use of the Old Testament. Alike in his true predictions and false ones, Jesus possesses no originality!

A different possibility, however, is hinted at by Strauss, the mention of which is fortunate since it reveals the source of his ideas. He cites the *Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist*, i.e. Reimarus, for the view that the idea of the Second Coming was due not to Jesus, but to his disciples: 'No promise, throughout the whole Scriptures . . ., he thinks, is on the one hand more definitely expressed, and on the other has turned out more flagrantly false, than this, which yet forms one of the main pillars of Christianity. And he (Reimarus) does not see in this a mere error, but a premeditated deception on the part of the apostles (to whom, and not to Jesus Himself, he attributes that promise, and the discourses in which it is contained) . . . *Such inferences from the discourse before us would inflict a fatal wound on Christianity*.'[2] Strauss makes no comment on this suggestion, it is enough to have provided another reason for shaking

[1] Op. cit., pp. 98–99. [2] Op. cit., p. 86.

the confidence of the orthodox. It did not occur to him that if the suggestion were true, it would have the effect of absolving Jesus from the great 'error', but neither did it occur to anyone else. His allegation stood forth with a pitiless clarity. It cut to the quick the theologians of his day. Jesus had been charged with a blunder of the greatest magnitude. Somehow the situation had to be retrieved. But what could be done? The suggested employment of the critical knife, inadvertently put forward by Strauss, was too violent for the mood of that day. The idea of a 'kenosis' of the Christ, by which it might be possible to admit the presence of an intellectual error in the Incarnate Lord, was not yet abroad. There seemed but one path left free: Jesus was accurately reported, in the main, but his conceptions were loftier than those of his contemporaries; his disciples had confused distinctions drawn by him and in their reports mingled the various elements of his teaching.

The first critical writer in whom this interpretation becomes plain is the noted Professor at Jena, C. A. Hase. His *Life of Jesus* was published in 1829; the second edition was issued in 1835, the year that saw the publication of the first part of Strauss' *Life*; a third edition appeared in 1840, and the English translation was made from this, corrected from the fourth edition. It will be instructive to compare what Hase wrote about the eschatology of Jesus (i.e. the Great Discourse) before Strauss' book came on the scene and what he wrote after its appearance.

Hase's earlier exposition is typical of that of many who did not appreciate eschatology in the raw and endeavoured to refine it for 'modern' taste. His summary of Mt. 24–25 commences thus: 'As He now sat on the Mount of Olives and looked down on the Holy City, his view of the future, proceeding from a very clear comprehension of the history of the world and from the deepest understanding of the kingdom of God, disclosed itself to the apostles in prophetic pictures . . . (viz. concerning) the destruction of Jerusalem, the ruin of the Roman Empire through the migration of the nations and the victory of Christianity. . . . He spoke as prophet in the highest sense of the term, i.e. as one who, in faith in the victory of the kingdom of God and in full consciousness of the present, hurrying on with a glance at his contemporaries, possessed of a presentiment as to the course of Providence, takes in at a glance the coming centuries according to his spirit and comprehends them with his plan.'[1] It is admitted that if Mk. 13. 32 (=Mt. 24. 36)

[1] *Leben Jesu*, 1835, p. 224.

were taken strictly it could be regarded as a revocation of previous definitions as to the time of the End (as e.g. Mt. 16. 28), but on the whole he thought that, 'in view of the generally attested prudence of Jesus, who . . . consistently respected the tranquil passage of history and of providence, the symbolic understanding of his prophecy is the most probable'.[1] The Second Coming is accordingly a symbolic representation of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom; the prophets had similarly portrayed the glory of the theocracy as a coming of Jahweh among his people.

In the third and fourth editions of his work, Hase considerably modified his views. In the preface he stated that the alterations had been mostly occasioned by Strauss' *Life* and the literature occasioned by it. The greatest benefit he had evidently received from his sceptical contemporary was a measure of realism in interpreting eschatological language. All that had appeared in the earlier editions about Jesus' disclosure of the course of world-history was excised. Still more significantly, his former interpretation of Mk. 13. 32 was withdrawn and the presence of a time limit was frankly recognised in the sayings of our Lord: 'Ascribing to God the sole knowledge of the day and hour, he nevertheless fixed his return during that generation.'[2] But that Jesus could have held the hope of his coming in any literal sense is strenuously denied: 'Since Jesus from the first had elevated the national notion of a Messiah to a religious idea which could not be injured by his death, he did not need to frame out of visions of a pretended prophet[3] *the fantastic hope of such a pretended return.*' The view is reiterated more strongly that the Second Coming is simply the victory of Christ's kingdom.[4]

Three notable features are involved in these modifications of Hase's : (1) the 'tranquil passage of history and of providence' disappears, to be replaced by an acknowledgment of an eschatological view of history; (2) the limitation of the time interval constituted by 'that generation' is admitted; (3) the notion of a Second Coming is rejected as 'fantastic'. The battle over the 'enthusiasm' of Jesus has begun.

The tendencies apparent in the discreet Hase came to full expression in the writings of C. H. Weisse, who first plainly demonstrated the priority of Mark. He wrote two books, both of which,

[1] Op. cit., pp. 225–226. [2] Op. cit., E.T., p. 201.
[3] Dan. 7. 13. This characterization of Daniel is taken from C. H. Weisse, see p. 8.
[4] *Life of Jesus*, E.T., pp. 201–202.

though separated by a distance of eighteen years, were prompted by the Strauss controversy. In regard to Mk. 13, the fundamental principle of interpretation enunciated by Weisse was that in this discourse we have material, authentic in itself, but uttered on various occasions and with varied needs in mind; the duty of criticism is to consider each segment of tradition by itself. In advancing this contention, in which he anticipated Lohmeyer by a full century, he found few followers owing to his unwise use of it. He divided Mk. 13 into vv. 1–20, 21–23, 24–27, 28–30, 31, 32–37. Each section was presumed to be originally independent, and to each he endeavoured to give 'a meaning worthy of the divine Speaker'. In regard to the first section, he denied that it related to the fall of Jerusalem (Luke has interpreted wrongly here); its real concern was the struggles and trials which the movement initiated by Jesus was to encounter generally. The counsel to flight in Mk. 13. 14–16 is accordingly interpreted as 'decisively to turn one's back on the old order, that has irremediably perished, and to seek salvation only in a completely new order of things'. The lament over mothers with children in 13. 17 refers to 'those who insist on being occupied with or still producing within (*erzeugen*) the old order'. The 'winter' of 13. 18 signifies 'a raw, barren time which yields no fruit for the spirit'.[1]

It is the parousia passage, however, that evokes the eloquence of Weisse. He insists that 13. 24–27 should never have been connected with the foregoing; the words are genuine, but the context is unauthentic. To retain it here is to destroy the meaning of the earlier passage. 'That which makes it difficult to attribute so quixotic an aberration (i.e. the Second Coming conception) to the exalted Master is not merely a so-called "Christian feeling" or "Christian consciousness" which, without clear insight into its reason and its justification, wishes to put forward a *mulier taceat in ecclesia*.'[2] It is the plain recognition that, as surely as a vine does not bear thorns or a fig tree thistles, even so certainly a spirit of such greatness as Jesus had preserved, even in the foregoing discourse, *cannot have degenerated to imagining such a fancy as only originates in a sick brain*. Out of the same mouth which announced the preaching of the Gospel in conditions of affliction and distress of every kind . . . it was impossible that in the next moment there could proceed

[1] *Die evangelische Geschichte, kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*, 1838, pp. 590–592.

[2] The citations and the Latin tag are both from Strauss.

an utterance constructed out of *the most narrow and superstitious belief in the symbolic saying of a fantastic book*, which ignorance or deceit had attributed to a renowned old prophet, and out of the most extravagant, half-insane imagination!'[1]

It is difficult to understand how a Christian scholar could bring himself to employ such unrestrained language regarding Gospel sayings, but it reveals how deeply he had been affected by the contentions of his opponent. What, then, is the meaning of Mk. 13. 24–27? 'He himself incontestably meant,' wrote Weisse, 'on the one hand the judgment which world-history carries out every day and at every hour, in which He as head and centre of history could name himself with perfect right as Judge, and on the other hand the judgment at the end of time, in regard to which, however, we dare not presume that Jesus represented himself in so external and sensual a form as subsequent Church doctrine has represented it'.[2] Most interpreters of the Gospels will admit that apocalyptic language should be accorded some latitude in interpretation, but Weisse has gone beyond what is reasonable. In his further book, issued in 1856,[3] the position is a little more soberly put, but there is no essential modification, save for the significant suggestion that Mk. 13. 1–20 is not a unit, but is composed of originally disparate fragments uttered on different occasions; the entire discourse, 13. 1–37, thus comes to be of that order. As an example of the later treatment of these isolated segments, we may cite Weisse's view of the 'abomination of desolation', 13. 14; removed from this context it is susceptible of a sense, 'more worthy of its exalted Speaker'; it represents the corrupt Jewish religion, and so corresponds to the condemnatory sayings of which Mark has preserved but few (Mk. 12. 38 f.).[4]

That Weisse revealed marks of genius is not to be denied, but they are disfigured here. It is the motive of his interpretation that is significant. He was impelled by the explicit desire to counter the teaching of Strauss, in particular to evade the mocking appeal to *a speedy coming of Christ in glory*. The very extravagance of his protestations must have afforded no little satisfaction to his opponent.

Between the publication of Weisse's two books appeared the celebrated work of F. C. Baur on the Gospels.[5] The critical spirit that Strauss had applied to Gospel dogma he applied to Gospel

[1] Op. cit., pp. 594–595. [2] Op. cit., p. 596.
[3] *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Studium.*
[4] Op. cit., pp. 171–172.
[5] *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, 1847.

documents. He had no hesitation in pronouncing the discourse of Mt. 24 as spurious. 'It is impossible that Jesus can have spoken as the evangelist makes him speak.'[1] This is proved by the Book of Revelation, in which the fall of Jerusalem plays no part at all. 'Of a destruction of Jerusalem the apocalyptist knows nothing.'[2] The prediction of the fall of Jerusalem in Mt. 24 is accordingly regarded as a *post eventum* prophecy and due to the evangelist. Baur is unique in dating the prophecy in the time of the Bar-Cochba rebellion, on the ground that no Messianic pretender after the death of Jesus is known before this man and that the 'abomination of desolation' suits best the erection of the statue of the Capitoline Jupiter by Hadrian on the site of the ruined temple. This becomes for Baur the one fixed point for the dating of the Gospels; he assigns Matthew to the period A.D. 130–134, and the other Gospels according to their supposed deviations from the first one.[3]

The argument, both in its comparison with the Book of Revelation and the exploits of Bar-Cochba, is most dubious. The reference to the second-century Jewish revolt is needless. Nor is there any necessity to relate the predictions of Mk. 13 to the events of the first century; if any should insist on so doing, it is still necessary to explain how the late 'compiler' could have omitted the events of A.D. 70 from his prophetic review. Further, since the temple had been destroyed sixty years before Hadrian's attack, Baur is forced to place Mt. 24. 1–3 earlier and to presuppose a gap thereafter, of which there is no hint in the text. It is not surprising that contemporary opinion did not take kindly to Baur's views, but their ventilation contributed to the atmosphere which made the later hypotheses possible.

2. Criticism from H. A. W. Meyer to T. Colani

From the time of Baur and Weisse to Colani the strictly critical treatment of the eschatological discourse remained in abeyance. It was a period in which a settled interpretation of the eschatology of Jesus gained currency. We see it clearly defined in the commentaries of H. A. W. Meyer, which exercised a widespread influence. In his commentary on Matthew[4] Meyer provides a summary of his views on this subject. Jesus spoke of his parousia in a three-fold sense. By it he meant: (1) the impartation of the Holy Spirit, which should

[1] Op. cit., p. 604.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 604–605.
[3] Op. cit., pp. 608–609.
[4] *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus*, 3rd ed., 853, pp. 409 ff.

happen shortly (Jn. 16. 16, *al.*), and did happen; (2) the historical revelation of his sovereignty and might in the victory of his work on earth, experienced immediately after his exaltation to the Father (cf. Mt. 26. 64); (3) his parousia in a literal sense for the resurrection, judgment, and the setting up of the kingdom. Confusion arose because Jesus used prophetic language in describing (1) and (2), so that what he taught as to the impending entry of the *ideal* kingdom was mistakenly applied by his disciples to the appearance of the *final* kingdom; admittedly they were not to be blamed, in that Jesus used the latter as a foil to set off the former. In particular, 'Jesus had most definitely set the destruction of Jerusalem in the lifetime of that generation; and at the same time he had seen and proclaimed in prophetic symbol what could not be hidden from him, the connection in which the victory of his ideal kingdom would stand to this catastrophe: nothing was more natural therefore than that the further the time of the generation declined to its expiration, the more surely was the parousia awaited as occurring *immediately* after the destruction of Jerusalem. . . . Inevitably the form of the *expectation* reflected on the form of the *promise*; the ideal parousia and founding of the kingdom was identified with the real, so that the former was obliterated in the tradition and only the latter remained the object of expectation.'[1] By relating Mt. 24. 1–28 to the fall of Jerusalem and vv. 29 ff. to the various forms of the parousia, Meyer was able to explain satisfactorily the exegetical puzzle that had so distressed his contemporaries.

This interpretation was heartily adopted by H. J. Holtzmann[2] and by his master F. Bleek, whose exposition of the Gospels Holtzmann edited.[3] Bleek added to the threefold view of the parousia a strong emphasis on the misinterpretation of their Teacher by the disciples. He appears to be the first to call attention to the difficulty of reconciling teaching on the suddenness of the Coming of Christ, as given in Lk. 17. 22 ff., with the view of the Eschatological Discourse, wherein the Coming is preceded by signs. Variety of materials and varieties of comings smooth out for him the difficulty.[4]

Holtzmann worked on the assumption that the Eschatological Discourse was derived from Ur-Markus (i.e. a primitive version

[1] Op. cit., pp. 411–412.
[2] *Die synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*, 1863.
[3] *Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien*, 1862.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 357–369.

of Mark), and that therefore it is preserved best in Mark. His division of Mk. 13 was adopted by almost all subsequent exegetes: it narrates (1) *ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων*, the beginnings of the woes, represented first according to their 'world-historical' character, 13. 5–9, and next according to their significance for the development of the kingdom of God (the time of the mission), vv. 9–13 ; (2) *ἡ θλῖψις*, the tribulation, including the destruction of Jerusalem, vv. 14–23; (3) *ἡ παρουσία*, the coming of Christ, vv. 24–27. Divergencies in Matthew and Luke are due to editorial modification, a process particularly noticeable in Luke, who writes with the history of the Church, notably that of Paul, in view, and after the fall of Jerusalem (hence Lk. 21. 20–24 is wholly *ex eventu*). Holtzmann emphasises, nevertheless, that the original version contained in Ur-Markus gave 'genuine prophecies of Jesus, which were written down before the fulfilment had happened'.[1] The threefold view of the parousia is enunciated more simply than by Meyer; it is said to consist of: (1) the literal parousia at the end of the age; (2) the historical parousia, 'a series of evident historical acts of power'; (3) a spiritual coming, shortly to happen after the death of Jesus, 'a provable, energetic beginning of the realisation of God's kingdom'. Mk. 13. 30 is now in a misleading context and really relates to (2).[2] We shall see later that Holtzmann in his maturer years renounced this idea of the historical parousia; it requires mention here since it affected in no small measure the views of his generation.

The year in which Holtzmann's work on the Synoptic Gospels was issued witnessed an event which was to prove as decisive in this controversy as the appearance of Strauss' *Leben Jesu*. C. H. Weisse in his later volume had lamented that the promise of a new day in New Testament critical studies, apparently dawning with the publication of Strauss' book, did not come to fulfilment; the situation had remained disappointingly the same. The cause of this stagnation seemed to him to be that of fear; the old dogmatic system had been threatened, and it had evidently been felt safer to ignore the issues raised by the heretic. A 'conspiracy of silence' had been promoted within the theological world.[3] Weisse himself had attempted to break the silence by a positive contribution. He was aided in a startling fashion by the forcing of battle on the unwilling theologians by a romantic agnostic, whose charm captured the public imagination. Ernest Renan issued his *Vie de Jésus* in 1863

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 95, 235 ff., 405 ff.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 409–410. [3] *Die Evangelienfrage*, pp. 1–7.

and scored an immediate success. Of the influence of Strauss on Renan there can be no question; the former thinker was much the more original of the two. Renan said little that his predecessor had not provided for, but his style was far more appealing. His treatment of the eschatology of Jesus fundamentally agreed with that of his master, except that he recognised a development in Jesus' thought. The prime idea of the Lord throughout his ministry was felt to be the establishment of the kingdom of God. But sometimes in his preaching Jesus appeared to be simply a democratic leader, toiling for the emancipation of the poor and outcast; at other times he was the herald of the apocalyptic kingdom of Daniel and Enoch, while on occasions the approaching deliverance was conceived in purely spiritual terms. The three views in reality were but two, the temporal-eschatological and the spiritual; their coherence simultaneously in the mind of Jesus was the reason for his greatness. If he had been merely an apocalyptist he would have been forgotten, if only a puritan he would have failed.[1] Jesus gave no detailed prediction such as the Book of Revelation contains, yet Mk. 13. 32 shows that 'his declarations on the nearness of the catastrophe leave no room for any equivocation'.[2] This fundamental error shows that his system is discredited. 'The world, in continuing to exist, caused it to crumble. One generation of man at the most was the limit of its endurance. The faith of the first Christian generation is intelligible, but the faith of the second generation is no longer so. After the death of John, or of the last survivor, whoever he might be, of the group which had seen the Master, *the word of Jesus was convicted of falsehood.*'[3] Renan was generous enough to feel that Jesus should be pardoned for this unfortunate error. Perhaps the mistake was not his, but that of his disciples. If he did share the 'general illusion', at least it nerved him to a struggle which might otherwise have been too strong for him.[4] The same may be said of its value in inspiring his followers through the centuries. 'Let us not despise this chimera which has been the thick rind of the sacred fruit on which we live. This fantastic kingdom of heaven, this endless pursuit after a city of God, which has constantly preoccupied Christianity during its long career, has been the principle of that great instinct of futurity which has animated all reformers. . . . The idea of the kingdom of God, and the Apocalypse, which is the complete image of it, are thus in a sense the highest and most poetic expres-

[1] *Life of Jesus*, E.T., 1935, pp. 145–146.
[2] Op. cit., p. 147.
[3] Op. cit., p. 149.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 149–150.

sion of human progress.'[1] These are kindly words, no doubt, and are meant to soothe ruffled feelings, but they must have seemed to the orthodox like serpent's venom flavoured with vanilla. They stung contemporary theologians to indignant response, as the attacks of Strauss had done a generation before.[2]

The first of the Christian protagonists to arise was the gentle Daniel Schenkel. He himself had undergone a considerable change of views over the years, not without much heart-searching, and up to this point he had preserved a discreet silence. The sensation over Renan's *Life* compelled him to an answer, and in 1864 he issued his 'character study' of Jesus.[3] His views on the eschatology of our Lord were almost a return to those of Hase, a noteworthy coincidence in view of the relation of Hase to Strauss. Mk. 13 was to him 'the most impressive and powerful utterance that Jesus made'.[4] The prediction of the overthrow of the temple (Mk. 13. 2) is an expression of 'prophetic grief', although he knew that his own triumph was therein involved. That he announced it at all is proof that his Messianic vocation had nothing in common with Jewish hopes. Judaism was crippling the Jewish national life. The religions and culture of other nations were similarly enslaving their members. The new order therefore had to come about in a catastrophic manner. Jesus foresaw the course of history and warned his disciples to be faithful to the end. This 'end', however, was not the 'end of the world', of which he never spoke at all. 'He simply used that expression to indicate the conclusion of the earlier Jewish and heathen era, the final point of the so-called old world, after which the period of the kingdom of God, or as we express it, the Christian era, the new world, should follow.'[5] For this reason the preaching of the Gospel is regarded as an eschatological event; by means of it Jesus achieved his 'second coming' on earth. Naturally the disciples misunderstood his language. . . .

The one point of interest in Schenkel is his recognition that Jesus linked his own return with the fall of Jerusalem. 'All attempts to deny such a connection in apologetic interests are mere sophistry

[1] Op. cit., p. 151.

[2] Goguel tells us that Renan's *Vie de Jésus* created a greater sensation than that of Strauss and elicited a host of replies. Renan's book was as easy to read as that of Strauss difficult; consequently it was read by multitudes who were neither initiated into nor prepared for exegetical research. According to Girard and Monckel, up to the year 1923 the *Vie de Jésus* went through 205 editions in French and 216 in other languages. See Goguel's *Life of Jesus*, E.T., p. 50.

[3] *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, p. iv.

[4] Op. cit., p. 183.

[5] Op. cit., pp. 183–185.

and merit no refutation.'[1] If the Synoptists have rightly reported Jesus, then he has erred in this respect. If other evidence compelled us to accept their accounts, we would have to bow before it, but surely it is obvious that the notion of a glorious parousia is Jewish, not at all in the spirit of Jesus. 'If he had taught that, several years after his departure to the heavenly Father, he would come down from heaven to set up an external kingdom, he would then have acknowledged that theocratic misconception which he had fought throughout his entire life, i.e. *he would have opposed his own life's work and the goal of his vocation with an indissoluble contradiction.*'[2] Once again the hope of a speedy coming has proved a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to the theologian. That Renan should have been the man to set the stone in the path of the Church seemed to provide the greater reason for casting it away.

A champion now arises who is not content to remove this rock only; he orders the entire mountain to depart into the depths of the sea. Timothy Colani will have no half-measures. If timid predecessors are content to postpone or spiritualise the Second Advent of Christ, he will eradicate eschatology root and branch from the teaching of Jesus. Only so can the offensiveness of this doctrine be removed.

In dealing with the views of Colani and his book,[3] we beg a little patience on the part of the reader. Colani's name is indelibly associated with the 'Little Apocalypse' theory, but it is not sufficient to narrate his views on this matter alone. His treatment of the discourse of Mk. 13, unlike that of his predecessors, was not the starting point of his study of the eschatology of the Gospels but its conclusion; it forms the climax of his exposition of the teaching of Jesus and cannot be understood apart from this wider context. This we must examine.

The first major point which Colani sought to establish is that there is no connection between Jewish Messianism and the Gospel. The Jewish Messiah before the time of the Christian Church was always merely human, and the Jewish hope was always bound up with temporal and political aims. If one should cite the Son of Man against this contention, it is answered that he was a symbolic figure for the Israelite nation; and in any case the Son of Man

[1] It is worth while observing the strong language which theologians employ when they are sure they have an explanation of this datum!

[2] Op. cit., p. 280.

[3] *Jésus Christ et les Croyances messianiques de son Temps*, 1864.

ascends to heaven, according to Daniel 7, not *descends*.[1] The Similitudes of Enoch were composed by a Christian (perhaps a Gnostic); the Son of Man in that book is none other than Jesus, the Christian Messiah. So also the Messiah of 4 Esdras has borrowed features from the Christians' Christ. The revolts of A.D. 70 and 132, particularly the acceptance of Bar-Cochba's claims by Rabbi Akiba, show plainly that the Jewish Messiah was simply 'a hero of a political revolution'.[2]

For this reason Jesus avoided the application to himself of the term Messiah. The episode of Peter's Confession at Caesarea Philippi shows that Jesus could never have made a claim to be Messiah before that occasion. Nor did he think in such terms of himself. The preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth reveals it as the time when he felt himself called to be a prophet.[3] The defiant words 'I say to you', repeated five times in the Sermon on the Mount, are no more messianic than many an utterance of Luther's.[4] The call for sacrifice recorded in such passages as Mt. 10. 37 ff., is such as any champion of a noble cause would send forth.[5] 'Jesus could utter all these sayings without believing that he was the Messiah, purely in considering himself as a great prophet charged with initiating men into the kingdom of God.'[6]

The kingdom was first preached by Jesus as yet to come (Mk. 1. 14–15), but he soon taught that it had arrived, the watershed of the two periods being the conclusion of the ministry of John (Mt. 11. 11). It is no kingdom such as the Jews had anticipated; it is synonymous with his doctrine and way of life. 'The gospel, working invisibly but all powerfully, is the real kingdom of God which gradually extends itself over humanity.'[7] Note the term 'gradually'. There is no thought of a dénouement in this teaching, on the contrary Jesus 'substituted in his views of the future an organic development for the catastrophes of the apocalypses'.[8] It is impossible therefore that Jesus could have conceived of a time when he himself would bring his kingdom to victory and exercise universal sway. The whole life of Jesus is a contradiction of the Second Coming idea. 'Why should he return to earth? To triumph, when he hates success? To conquer by force, when he wishes to conquer by weakness and resignation? What? Would he be considered as his own precursor? *A humble and sweet precursor of a violent and*

[1] Op. cit., p. 20.
[2] Op. cit., p. 45.
[3] Op. cit., p. 125.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 85–86.
[5] Op cit., p. 86.
[6] Op. cit., p. 87.
[7] Op. cit., p. 125.
[8] Op. cit., p. 103.

terrible Messiah? Can one find in the religious teaching of Jesus a single line that does not contradict explicitly or implicitly such a point of view? It would be really absurd to attribute it to him.'[1] The blame for this attribution in the Gospels is to be laid at the door of the disciples, who applied to Jesus the traditional features of the Jewish Messiah.[2] It was Paul's contribution to the common stock of mounting errors to imagine Jesus as the Judge at the Last Day.

Statements in the Gospels purporting to teach an Advent of Christ in glory must therefore be eliminated. Either they are to be understood in a figurative sense or they are to be viewed as unauthentic, on the ground of their unworthiness of Jesus. Mk. 14. 25 e.g. is a 'saying impregnated with a materialism worthy of Papias'. To take Mk. 14. 62 literally would be to impute to Jesus an unsupported illusion.[3] The apocalypse of Lk. 17. 22 ff. deals solely with the ruin of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation: 'All the sayings to the contrary which try to relate this discourse to the coming of the Son of Man are necessarily glosses of the evangelist, glosses which have passed into the text and which miss the sense.'[4]

So we arrive at Mk. 13. In view of the foregoing discussion, no doubt need be entertained as to the treatment it must receive at Colani's hands. Every eschatological saying in the Gospels thus far has been eliminated by the twin methods of reinterpretation and the imperious pronouncement 'unauthentic'. In the discourse of Lk. 17 both expedients were employed, with emphasis on reinterpretation. Here that method is sparsely used; resort is had in the main to the other method. As the references in Lk. 17 to the parousia were said to be 'glosses', so the eschatological passage in Mk. 13 is regarded as an 'interpolation'. It is a rigid application of an undeviating principle, that of 'thorough-going non-eschatology'.

Colani notes that the limits of parallelism in the three synoptic Gospels extend to Mk. 13. 32 (Mt. 24. 36, Lk. 21. 33). These thirty verses 'constitute the entire discourse, to which each evangelist, but especially Matthew, adds other sayings which relate, in appearance at least, to the Coming of Christ'.[5]

The disciples, on being informed of the coming destruction of the temple, ask when it will occur. 'We expect a precise reply. But no; beginning with a long discourse, he starts off with words which

[1] Op. cit., pp. 146–148. [2] Op. cit., p. 144. [3] Op. cit., p. 195.
[4] Op. cit., p. 204. [5] Op. cit., p. 201.

suit well enough Matthew's unauthentic question, but not at all Mark's.' The section ends at v. 31, after which we read, 'As to that day and that hour, nobody knows anything of it, neither the angels, nor the Son, but the Father'. 'Is not that the direct reply to what he has been asked, viz. "When will it be?" In other words we have here *a great interpolation which extends from v. 5 to v. 31*. The primitive text is composed of the question of the disciples, "When will it be?" and the simple reply of Jesus, "I do not know," a reply followed by counsels of vigilance. . . . Nothing could be more simple, more natural, more evangelical than this original text.'[1]

As to the discourse proper, Colani adopts Holtzmann's division of the End-time into three periods, 'the sorrows of childbirth' *αἱ ὠδῖνες*, 'the affliction' *ἡ θλῖψις*, and 'the end' *τὸ τέλος*. 'Our discourse presents not only this division, but it uses precisely these three technical words. . . . 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. They are not the views of the Jews contemporary with Jesus, for the Messiah here descends from the heavens, as he will do much later in the book of Esdras. They are not the views of Paul and of the Catholic Church, for the Christ does not come to judge the living and the dead; he comes "to gather the elect", evidently with the intention of founding with them his kingdom. *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 (as we have seen) Jesus could not have shared their opinions.*'[2]

In one respect at least the compiler of the discourse has given himself away, 'Let the reader reflect.' The reader of what? Not of Daniel, for Mark does not mention him; it must refer to the discourse itself. Then it originally had not been *spoken* but *written*. 'We have under our eyes a short apocalypse by an unknown author, which the synoptics have taken for a discourse of Jesus and inserted into their compilations.'[3] As to its date, its origin among Jewish Christians, in a time of severe persecution which forces them to leave Judea, fixes the period clearly enough. It is the time immediately preceding the retreat of the Church of Jerusalem to Pella. Probably the 'oracle' which, according to Eusebius, commanded the Jerusalem Christians to flee, was precisely this discourse. We can see that it was written before the siege of the city, for that which is predicted from the 'abomination of desolation'

[1] Op. cit., pp. 202–203. [2] Op. cit., pp. 204–205. [3] Op. cit., p. 207.

passage onwards never took place, while what precedes is an accurate narration of events: to v. 14 therefore history is related, from v. 14 a prediction is given. It was composed probably a little before the Apocalypse of John (written in A.D. 68 according to Colani). Luke's version is a redaction of the discourse after the fall of Jerusalem and reflects its events.

It has seemed necessary to reproduce Colani's views at length, both on account of their intrinsic worth (it is notable how many ideas regarded as original to later writers were anticipated by him), and still more to show how completely his whole outlook influenced his interpretation of the Eschatological Discourse. Admittedly he adduced some plausible reasons to support his view, which will occupy our attention later, but most of them had been accounted for by earlier scholars. It is ironical, however, that stress should have been laid by this king of glosses and interpolations on the clause 'Let him that reads understand', Mk. 13. 14; it would be hard to find in the whole New Testament a better case than this for adducing the hypothesis of gloss! His real objection to the discourse has already been cited: 'It contains the eschatology of the Jewish Christians . . . Jesus could not have shared their opinions.' Colani had in fact so mutilated the Gospels that *his* Jesus could not have shared these views. But this is a Jesus of his own imagining, constructed on the basis of a horror of eschatology. For this reason above all Mk. 13 could have no place in Colani's expurgated New Testament; all lesser reasons are merely auxiliary, adduced to add plausibility to the main contention.

What was the cause of this aversion of Colani's to eschatology? C. C. McCown suggested that it was due to a reaction from the traditionalism of his day. 'If for no other reason, reaction against the excesses of pietistic Chiliasm, such as the great theologian Bengel had fostered in Wurtemburg and the uneducated farmer William Miller had excited in America, drove the 'modern' exegete to seek for some way out which would rescue Jesus from such unworthy associates.'[1] Doubtless 'pietistic excesses' would have been a contributory factor in forming the attitude of Colani and his like-minded contemporaries, though to bracket the sober Bengel with the unbalanced sectarian Miller is scarcely just to the former. Nevertheless, it was not the Chiliasts who were engaging the attention of theologians in the mid-nineteenth century in Europe; it was the agnostics, and if any name is to be singled out

[1] *The Search for the Real Jesus*, pp. 243–244.

at this juncture it will not be Bengel but Renan. It will have been noted how almost every writer considered by us has had some relation to Strauss or Renan. The scholars concerned explicitly mention one or the other of these two men, frequently in their prefaces when explaining why their books were written, and in the course of their expositions. We have seen how Strauss caused a change in Hase's views, how violently C. H. Weisse reacted to him, how Schenkel was moved to oppose Renan, etc. Is there any ground for thinking that Colani reacted to the latter in this way? Assuredly there is. If he does not polemise against Renan in the development of his argument, he does better by devoting the final chapter of his book to refuting the agnostic's views, particularly his eschatology. Demanding how it is that Renan has been able to secure so large a following, he concludes it is because the humanity of Jesus, which the Church had forgotten, had been laid bare once more by him. The Church should learn this lesson and 'cut out from the figure of the Christ the traits which are incompatible with this humanity taken seriously'.[1] In particular, the question of the Second Coming of Christ must be faced anew. 'Let someone tell me, without using flowery language, if he believes—seriously and in a literal sense—in a return of Jesus on the clouds to judge the living and the dead. . . . A man (and Jesus was a man) who legitimately attributes to himself this role, is he still our brother, subject to the same temptations as we, our pattern in the fight? Take care! If you succeed in carrying conviction that he really was our brother, *the legitimacy of such pretensions would be neither desirable nor believable*, and they would be viewed as M. Renan has viewed them, which is one stage worse.'[2] The mere mention of Renan's name here proves nothing, but the words immediately following on that passage should be particularly noted: 'Is it not time to impose silence on the sophistries of exegesis and to acknowledge that which leaps to the eye? Jesus, in the discourses which are attributed to him, does not announce in general that he will come again on the clouds of heaven—one day, in 2,000 years perhaps or in 100,000; he announces that he will return before the death of the persons present, that he will come again *immediately* after that Jerusalem will have been defiled. If the words which are placed in his mouth have any sense, they have this sense; and if they do not have it, it is because for theologians white means black and black means white. But for everyone who is not a sophist this

[1] Op. cit., p. 250. [2] Op. cit., p. 251.

dilemma poses itself categorically: *either Jesus is mistaken or these discourses are not from him.* The Christian Church cannot without disloyalty escape this dilemma.'[1]

This language is familiar to us by now. It is the language of Reimarus. It is the language of Strauss. It is the language of Renan. Two points are made: (1) the idea of an appearance of Jesus in glory is impossible, for it involves the thought of a man discharging divine functions; (2) He promised he would come *soon*, according to the documents, and he has not done so. It is the latter consideration here stressed, as it was that of Renan, following upon his predecessors. Surely it is no coincidence that immediately after the mention of Renan's attitude comes that extravagant dilemma, based upon the very point that Renan had striven to make. This dilemma has been provoked by the agnostics. They elected to regard Jesus as discredited. Colani could never do that. If it is a choice of Jesus or eschatology, what Christian could stay for one moment? He will choose Jesus and reject the discourses. And so Colani did.

It seems, therefore, that the following proposition requires to be faced by Gospel critics: *the theory of a Little Apocalypse in Mark* 13 *was not the product of a dispassionate analysis of the text; it was the last stage of a developing emotional reaction to a theological problem propounded by agnostics.*[2]

Lest it be thought that we do injustice to Colani, we would urge that this is no isolated phenomenon, but is observable both before and after him. What else can account for C. H. Weisse's passionate denials of eschatology, but an intense opposition to the views of Strauss? As he felt, so did a multitude of others. We will now go on to demonstrate a further proposition, in the light of which the above statement ought to be judged, viz. *that this chain of emotional*

[1] Op. cit., p. 252.

[2] It is, naturally, not claimed that Colani suddenly developed his views on eschatology when Renan's *Life* appeared, but undoubtedly it provided a spur to him and conditioned his treatment of the theme, in so far as he stressed those elements which seemed to him to rebut Renan's views. Colani was forty years of age when he wrote the book we have reviewed. His interest in the controversy roused by the agnostics dated from the commencement of his literary work. When he was but twenty-three years of age he wrote a prize essay on the principles and results of the apologetic developed against Strauss' criticism. Three years later he founded, and continued to edit, a journal for the 'new theology' of his day, in which his interest in Christology found frequent expression. It is significant that for the two years 1863–1864 he wrote a lengthy criticism of Renan's work. *His own book would have appeared immediately on finishing those articles.* See the article by Th. Gerold on Colani in *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 3, 1898, pp. 210–215.

reaction to these problems has worked continuously in the history of exegesis and abides in measure to this day. In order to present our evidence concisely and to avoid scattered references to it in our subsequent discussion, we will anticipate the course of our review and assemble the evidence at once.

3. The Fanaticism of Jesus

The 'villain of the piece' is Strauss again. The year of Colani's book saw the publication of his *Life of Jesus written for the German People.*[1] His former *Life* had been written for scholars, and was a full generation old. He now set down his views in more popular style, but how different was the mood! Years of strife had embittered his soul and the tone of the book showed it. In regard to eschatology, what had been hinted at earlier was now emphasised with utmost violence: the expectation of a Second Advent of Christ is regarded as sheer folly and the final proof of the falsity of Christianity. Writing of our Lord's teaching on his parousia he states: 'Such a thing as he has here prophesied of himself cannot happen to a man. If he prophesied the like of himself and expected it, then to us he is a *fanatic* (*Schwärmer*); if he uttered it of himself without any real conviction, then he was a *braggart and a deceiver.*'[2] Strauss anticipates the indignation of his readers: they may reply that the language of Jesus is purely symbolic, or even that he never spoke such things. Nevertheless, he insists, it must be recognised that Jesus may have said them and that he may have meant them seriously; in which case, 'However sourly it may be received by our Christian ways of thinking, *if it becomes established as historic fact, then our Christian ways of thinking must be given up.*'[3]

What makes Strauss feel so strongly that the Christian Faith cannot legitimately exist with its parousia teaching? He himself supplies an answer, and in more reasonable language. Apparently it is not the mistaken view of time which Jesus is regarded as maintaining. Strauss frankly admits that if Jesus truly distinguished between this present earthly existence and one to be lived in a future Kingdom of God, then '*it is irrelevant at which nearer or remoter point of time he removed this act*'; it would be but a human mistake for Jesus to have put the end nearer instead of further than he should.[4] The importance of this admission can hardly be

[1] *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet*, 1864.
[2] Op. cit., p. 236.
[3] Op. cit., p. 237.
[4] Op. cit., p. 242.

over-estimated. For the first time, at least in the modern debate, it has been recognised that this embarrassing matter of the *time* of the Second Coming is of no consequence; and it was put forward not by a theologian in defence of the Faith, but by its most relentless opponent. It is extraordinary that the theologians did not seize on this clue. Failure to recognise it had been responsible for most of the unrealistic interpretations of Biblical eschatology. On the other hand the same failure had been equally responsible for the attacks of Reimarus, Strauss in his earlier work, and Renan, to say nothing of the misunderstanding of Colani. The theologians had been given a rod with which to measure their own deficiencies, and then to beat the backs of their opponents; to their irreparable loss they declined it. They continued to be obsessed with an irrelevancy, wandering in every conceivable By-path meadow to avoid it, and to this very day the process continues. Naturally Strauss maintained a discreet silence as to the effects of this admission on his earlier writings, and in fact he conveniently forgot the admission when he wrote *Der alte und der neue Glaube* in 1872 (see below on Weiffenbach). The point he now stresses is the monstrosity of a man claiming the power to judge his fellows and introduce a new creation. Let him speak for himself: 'What gives us offence in all these sayings is simply the one factor that Jesus joined that wonderful transformation, the introduction of the ideal state of reward, on to his own person; that he should have claimed that he himself was that one who is to come with the clouds of heaven, accompanied by angels, in order to awaken the dead and to hold the judgment. To expect that for himself is something quite different from expecting it in a general sense. Whoever expects it of himself and for himself not only appears to us as a fanatic; we see therein an unallowable self-exaltation that a man (*and only of such do we speak here*) should let it get into his head to divide himself off from all others and set himself over against them as the future judge; in this respect Jesus must especially have forgotten that he once refused the predicate "good" as one allowable only to God.'[1] The position is now clear; the real offence in the doctrine of the parousia is that it unveils the glory of the divine Son. In this Strauss has but clarified the position of Colani as expressed above. It is a remarkable confirmation of the contention of William Sanday, made fifty years later, that 'The great point about apocalyptic, and the great value of its recognition to us at the present day, is that *it postulates*

[1] Op. cit., p. 242.

throughout a real manifestation of God upon earth, and not merely a teacher more eminent than the rest'.[1]

In comparison with the issue raised by Strauss over the 'fanaticism' of Jesus, the withdrawal of his former view that Mk. 13 was authentic is of small moment; to him in his present mood the whole discourse is contrived by Jewish Christians after A.D. 70, to put their Jesus on a par with the Old Testament prophets, especially with Daniel.[2] That allegation was speedily forgotten, but not so the charge of fanaticism. It shook his generation, and the next, and the one after that. Subsequent discussion of the eschatology of Jesus was affected by the accusation of Strauss to an extent that has never been recognised; never, that is, with the exception of one man, H. J. Holtzmann. Here the writer may be permitted to state that as this phenomenon dawned on him when reading the literature of this period, its total lack of recognition on the part of previous writers perplexed him. The question suggested itself whether he was misconstruing the facts, although they seemed unambiguous. Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 1897, set his mind at rest, for the great exegete had seen it. Holtzmann has a footnote, commencing on p. 326 of that book and extending over two more pages, in which he cites writer after writer to prove that the question of the 'Schwärmerei'[3] of Jesus has been the determining factor between the two parties in the eschatological debate. Those who wish to see how Holtzmann illustrates the point are referred to his book; the present writer will use his own store and continue beyond Holtzmann.

Next to Timothy Colani, the man who most popularised the Little Apocalypse theory is Wilhelm Weiffenbach, to whom the theory is sometimes mistakenly attributed. The first half of his work on the eschatology of Jesus[4] is concerned with the history of the critical interpretation of Mk. 13. He was an enthusiastic follower of Colani, and after portraying the developments of his theory in subsequent writers he suggested his own modifications. Weiffenbach makes it plain that his work has been called forth by

[1] 'The Apocalyptic Element in the Gospels', *Hibbert Journal*, vol. X, No. 1, p. 84.

[2] Op. cit., p. 240.

[3] It is difficult to give a satisfactory and consistent rendering into English of this word. Luther pronounced rival teachers of the early days of his Reformation as 'Schwärmer'. His biographer, Frantz Funck-Brentano, defines it as 'a word meaning *enthusiast, visionary and mountebank*, for which there is no precise English equivalent'. *Luther*, London, 1936.

[4] *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, 1873.

Strauss' charge as to the 'Schwärmerei' of Jesus. In the introduction to the book he gives a lengthy extract from Strauss' *Der alte und der neue Glaube*, expressing the sentiment observed in the above quotation from the popular *Life*.[1] To Weiffenbach the reputation of Jesus is at stake. He asserts: 'Should all attempts prove idle to protect Jesus from the objection of a perpetually unfulfilled promise to come again, then in our opinion there remains for any honest Bible-student only this one unambiguous confession—*Jesus has made a mistake in regard to his coming again, he is found in a state of self-delusion in respect to the consummation of the kingdom of God*! It is also evident, as already Keim, Weizsacker, etc., as well as Strauss in his way, have made clear, that the consequences of this thesis must be drawn absolutely and on all sides; before all else *the question must be faced whether*, along with that "necessary" confession, *the religious-moral greatness of Jesus remains unimpaired, and his position as Lord and Leader remains the same for our religious thought, faith and life*.'[2] Weiffenbach writes to propound a solution, whereby Jesus can be relieved of the promise: Jesus spoke of his coming again, but by it he meant his resurrection; the disciples misunderstood his language. That is the burden of his book. To identify the parousia with the resurrection, however, raises a difficulty: the parousia is said in the eschatological discourse to be preceded by *events following the resurrection*, affecting both the Church and the world; how are they to be accounted for on this view? One answer alone is possible: the eschatological discourse is spurious and misrepresents the teaching of Jesus. Hence a major portion of Weiffenbach's book has to be devoted to a detailed proof that Mk. 13 is composite. Once again, despite a long and tedious discussion of critical opinions, we are presented with an interpretation fundamentally based on an *a priori* argument, designed to meet the objections of the scoffers.

The sentiments of Strauss are expressed by Gustav Volkmar[3] in almost identical language, although the unbelief of the former was by no means shared by the latter. To him, as to Strauss, the concept of the parousia is bound up with that of a deified Christ and therefore unacceptable. Speaking of the presentation of Jesus in Matthew, he comments: 'So long as he was regarded as in this book, as one who was born Son of God, or a demi-god, such an

[1] That Holtzmann reproduces precisely this section of Strauss' book is presumably due to his dependence on Weiffenbach here.

[2] Op. cit., pp. iii–iv.

[3] *Jesus Nazarenus und die erste christliche Zeit*, 1882.

announcement of the hope can be sustained; a divine being can ascend to heaven or descend. But when the "divine Son" has become the Son of Man, born an Israelite, who became the Son of God in spirit after his baptism, this hope of the clouds of heaven can be explained as nothing else than a piece of fanaticism. Admittedly a certain amount of fanaticism can be taken for granted in any great man, and it is equally to be excused in Jesus in view of his sublimity in other respects. But this view savours more of an uncontrolled enthusiasm wafted in the air of fantasy than of a life on solid earth such as our documents reveal.'[1] Not surprisingly, in this writer's estimate the Kingdom of God is the community of those who respond to the preaching of Jesus and become God's children like him; by their consecration of the marriage relationship and unwearied toil they create a holy people, able by God's grace to bring in 'the victory of the true worship of God over all forms of idolatry and to unite the world in one divine kingdom of peace'.[2] In such a system there is as much room for eschatology as there is for an Incarnate Redeemer—none at all.

H. J. Holtzmann has already been cited as one who perceived the nature of the eschatological controversy revolving about the person of Christ. With clear insight he saw that Jesus attributed to himself a central place in the eschatological future, but he believed that this was offset by Jesus' preaching of a present kingdom, wherein alone his original and abiding message is to be sought. If anyone will look 'beyond the prospect of those earth-colours' (i.e. of the eschatological kingdom) to the advancement of man wrought in history through the preaching of the present kingdom, he will easily distinguish the permanent element in our Lord's 'prophetic fantasy' from 'the dissolving views of a purely idle fanaticism'.[3] Holtzmann, then, recognised an element of 'Schwärmerei' in Jesus, but refused all that was bound up with it. Beyschlag, on the other hand, equally recognising the issue at stake, rejected this interpretation.[4] The idea of Jesus coming to judgment is essential: 'It seals Christianity as the absolute religion.' If Jesus was simply a guide among other guides, or if he could merely initiate, but not finish, redemption, 'then certainly the very idea of his office as Judge of the world would be a fanatical presumption.' But if the Son is the true revelation of the Father, 'then

[1] Op. cit., pp. 154–155. [2] Op. cit., pp. 74–75.
[3] *Lehrbuch der neutestastamentlichen Theologie*, p. 337.
[4] *New Testament Theology*, 1895, from the German of 1891.

is Christ also the born judge of the world'.[1] Here we see contemporaries taking opposite sides on this issue, in full consciousness of what was involved. Beyschlag was not alone in the position he adopted. Paul Schwartzkopff[2] similarly defended Jesus against 'Schwärmerei' in his anticipation of a Second Coming. Whether Jesus was wrong or right in that expectation, it involves him in neither fanaticism nor self-exaltation. 'He recognised in himself the absolute Mediator of salvation, hence the perfected salvation must be mediated through his Person.' That Jesus described the Advent as taking place in divine glory is not surprising; it corresponds with the majesty of God revealed in the consummated kingdom. 'Self-exaltation would have been involved if he had ascribed that majesty to his own human ability. But as everywhere, he knew himself in this respect not as originator, but only as *mediator* and instrument of the execution of the divine plan of salvation.'[3] Fanaticism is therefore ruled out. The humility of Jesus and his spirit of self-sacrifice are plainly seen in the way he gave himself for the setting up of the kingdom: 'He whose cleanness of heart had ever preserved the purest sobriety of feeling, untouched by fantasy, found in the conception of his coming again in divine glory the manner worthy of God in which God himself should lead mankind to its highest goal through him.' If there is nothing fanatical in the conception of a new creation for the eternal state, neither is there anything fanatical in the thought of Jesus coming in a glorified spiritual body to the renewed earth.[4]

A return to Colani's views is observable in the French writer Albert Réville.[5] He stressed two points, the speedy Advent and the fantasy of the whole conception. 'The ancient exegetes never wished to recognise that if Jesus held the language which the evangelists attribute to him, he was gravely deceived in his outlook. . . . They had recourse to mystical applications, saying that this return is permanent in the heart of his believers, as if this idea had anything in common with the unique return, visible, at a fixed day, which is propounded to us. They have tried to represent this sudden coming of the Son of Man as simply the death which comes to greet us so often unexpectedly; as if there was any question of death in this description of the re-appearance of the Christ,

[1] Op. cit., p. 191.
[2] *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi von seinem Tode, seiner Auferstehung und Wiederkunft und ihre Erfüllung*, 1895.
[3] Op. cit., pp. 192–193.
[4] Op. cit., p. 193.
[5] *Jésus de Nazareth*, two volumes, 1897.

of which the *living* will be the witnesses. We admit that preachers can give this edifying turn to the synoptic apocalypse in their exhortations, but do not let us pretend that they are thus reproducing the real sense.'[1] The acuteness of this criticism can hardly be denied, but Réville will not stop here. If Jesus spoke as he is represented in the Eschatological Discourse, then judgment must be passed on him. 'Jesus would then have taken back in an imaginary future this theatrical and violent messianism which he had so flatly repudiated during his earthly life. He would only have adjourned the date, and in an intoxicating dream of grandeur, he would have contemplated the prospect of coming to inaugurate his dominion over the kingdoms of the earth and all their glory, with the traits of the heavenly emperor. After beginning by announcing essential religion, drawn from the conscience of religious humanity . . . he would have finished by giving it over to a mere chimera. If this is not impossible, we must assert that it is very strange.'[2] Réville not unnaturally does not wish to pass such a judgment on Jesus; accordingly he pronounces the eschatological discourse, and all in the Gospels that accords with it, as unauthentic.

The Syriac scholar A. Merx, whose commentaries we shall have occasion to notice later, by no means shared the presuppositions of Réville, but his attitude to 'Schwärmerei' led him to similar conclusions respecting the eschatological discourse. 'I do not understand', he writes,[3] 'what false interest for the written word, which moulds together the most common stock ideas of Jewish apocalyptic, makes theologians want violently to fix on Jesus a total mistake, where a little textual criticism and a little higher criticism are sufficient to enable us to see in Jesus *no self-deceiving Schwärmer but a Seer who knows the true forces of history clearly and makes them known.* And yet many theologians are pursued by the painful feeling that this pseudo-eschatology inserts into the wholesome picture of Jesus such unwholesome fantastic elements!'[4] His own view of the discourse leads him to accept that section in which Jesus warns his disciples against 'false messianic Schwärmerei' (Mt. 24. 4–6). The 'fantastic idea' that Jesus is the Son of Man who is to come on the clouds at the end is not to be put to his account, it is mere Jewish apocalypticism.[5] Here is involved a kind of modification of the Little Apocalypse theory which will

[1] Op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 314–316. [2] Op. cit., pp. 316–317.
[3] *Das Evangelium Matthaeus nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, 1902.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 354–355. [5] Op. cit., p. 355.

occupy us later; the earlier sections of that so-called apocalypse are accepted as authentic, the section dealing with the coming of the Son of Man is refused (i.e. Mt. 24. 29–31 || Mk. 13. 24–27). But on what grounds is the major part accepted and the later rejected? Fundamentally both decisions proceed from one and the same consideration, viz., the wish *to save Jesus from fanaticism*! In so deciding Merx will satisfy nobody.

Jülicher felt obliged to assign no small part of his contribution to the compendious volume *The Christian Religion*[1] to the aspect of fanaticism in the eschatology of Jesus. He affirmed that the 'inconcinnity' of our Lord's views on the Kingdom as present and future is reconciled in his Person, which belongs to both present and future; but he insists that Jesus 'cannot be made out, on this ground, to have been an apocalyptic Schwärmer, consuming himself in ardent longing'.[2] In his creative hands the old views are filled with a new content, but it is through the new spirit alone that the old have survived, consequently it is the new element that is of real worth. 'In the case of Jesus the serious man must choose between the admission of a new spirit full of new power, naturally claiming for itself the future, or a crazy self-exaltation that no eschatological enthusiasm excuses, a blinded understanding of his time that forbids any confidence in the judgment of so disappointing a man.'[3] Presumably the 'new spirit' primarily refers to the moral teaching of Jesus, by which his kingdom will claim the world, and that futurist eschatology as such is mere 'Schwärmerei'. Inasmuch as no one wishes to claim that Jesus' eschatology is separable from the rest of his teaching, the observation is not very helpful. If it is a negation of eschatology completely, then Jülicher must have his view and we have ours. Jülicher has occasion later to mention how deeply impressed he is with the wisdom of our Lord's counsel for his Church; it could not have been improved, even had he anticipated centuries of development, and it has stood the test of time. 'Therein lies the best proof how little his thinking was ruled by eschatological Schwärmerei.'[4] Most would agree, but we suspect that what Jülicher meant by 'eschatological fanaticism' is not what the Church as a whole would view as such.

The story is continued in the expositions of Julius Wellhausen, regarded by Creed as containing the germinal ideas of all subse-

[1] *Die christliche Religion*, Teil I, 'Die Religion Jesu und die Anfänge des Christentums bis zum Nicaenum,' 1906.
[2] Op. cit., p. 58.
[3] Op. cit., p. 59.
[4] Op. cit., p. 61.

quent exegesis of the Synoptic Gospels. Wellhausen, it will be recalled, paid tribute to the 'silent influence' of Strauss on the theologians of the twentieth century. He appears to have felt that the only way to rebut Strauss' charges was to tread in the path marked out by Colani: as far as the east is from the west, so far hath Jesus removed Jewish messianism from him. Jesus neither regarded himself as Messiah, nor did he predict an atoning death and resurrection. Accordingly, 'it can safely be asserted that if Jesus did not once speak beforehand to his disciples of his sufferings and resurrection, he certainly did not of his parousia. . . . He ought therefore to be relieved of the charge of fanaticism and false prophecy. In fact, he had nothing of an ecstatic Schwärmer in himself, not even of a prophet'.[1] The presence of 'Schwärmerei' in primitive Christianity cannot be denied; indeed, 'Enthusiasm begat Christianity, but it was the enthusiasm of the disciples, not the enthusiasm of Jesus'.[2] Wellhausen's argument is plausible only if its fundamental presupposition be accepted, that Jesus had no thought of a messianic mission. For most of us the evidence of the life and teaching of Jesus is too serious to warrant such drastic treatment of the sources as this demands.[3]

So far no mention has been made of our own British writers. Prior to the opening of this century there is nothing to say about them in this matter, for the eschatological controversy had no counterpart in this country until the work of Schweitzer revealed what had been transpiring in Germany. There is an interesting contact with this movement in L. A. Muirhead, the Presbyterian theologian. In articles and in his book *The Eschatology of Jesus*, 1904,

[1] *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, 1911, p. 96.

[2] Op. cit., p. 150.

[3] Wellhausen appends a curious footnote on p. 150 of his *Einleitung*, probably to counterbalance his citations of Strauss' earlier works, in which the latter had voiced his confidence that the teaching as to the Second Coming was the surest thing we know about Jesus. He quotes a letter of Strauss, written in 1862, and another in 1864, in which Strauss expresses hesitation to ascribe this view to Jesus, for 'It is difficult to imagine so much fanaticism alongside so much reasonableness'. In the second letter Strauss wrote that 'the crumb of the Second Coming' is too bulky for him to swallow—that is, he cannot accept the authenticity of this teaching attributed to Jesus—since 'that idea in my view stands quite near to madness'. As Wellhausen read these letters in Ziegel's biography of Strauss, he might have been candid enough to add what Ziegel himself said about this matter. The letters are given on p. 609 of the biography; on p. 684 Ziegel summarises Strauss' teaching in *Der alte und der neue Glaube*, in which the old assertions about the 'Schwärmerei' are vehemently renewed. Ziegel then comments: 'Thus the *eschatological crumb that eight years earlier he could not get down him, Strauss has now swallowed.*' The hesitation as to the 'Schwärmerei' of Jesus was a merely temporary aberration on Strauss' part.

he had defended the discourse of Mark 13 against the supporters of the Little Apocalypse theory. But he capitulated in his work, *The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testaments and Other Papers*, 1908. As Moffatt[1] draws attention to this convert to the critical theory, we should note the reason for the change: 'We are now disposed to accept the theory', wrote Muirhead,[2] 'on the ground that it offers an escape from the views in which our Lord appears to be entangled in the meshes, if not the trivialities, of Jewish apocalyptism.' Doubtless that is a common enough motive, but whether it is legitimate documentary criticism is another matter. The position is more closely stated by Muirhead in his summary of the main types of eschatological exegesis; he describes them as the pictorial view, represented by Haupt, the pronounced view, seen in Johannes Weiss, and the protective view. Of the last named he writes: 'It is meant to cover views of the eschatological phenomena of the Gospels that may be mutually so diverse as to have hardly anything in common but a repudiation of the exaggerations of the pronounced view. These views we may call protective in that *they guard a right and reverent sense of our Lord's sanity of mind, and equip us against the "neurotism" which mistakes the reflection of itself for the historic Jesus, and sees in his messianic consciousness what Strauss called a dosis of Schwärmerei.*'[3] From this point Muirhead proceeds to expound his fresh view of the eschatological discourse. It is surely not without significance that one of the first British scholars to expound the Little Apocalypse theory with conviction should do it in that context. The 'silent influence of Strauss' has entered fresh waters.

Latimer Jackson gave passing mention to this aspect of our subject when he defended the Jewish apocalyptists against the charge of 'Schwärmerei'.[4] He similarly refused to regard Jesus as a 'dreamer, the enthusiast of his day'.[5] This feature of eschatological controversy was not typical of British discussion, however, yet it finds a strange echo in recent years. T. F. Glasson in his work, *The Second Advent*, 1945, returned to the views of Colani, in a not dissimilar fashion as Martin Werner has followed in the paths laid out by Schweitzer, though naturally he has developed those views in the light of recent trends. The burden of the book is an attempt to

[1] *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed., p. 208, note 3.
[2] Op. cit., p. 125. [3] Op. cit., p. 120.
[4] *The Eschatology of Jesus*, 1913, p. 244. Jackson actually uses this word without translating it.
[5] Op. cit., p. 320.

prove that Jesus rejected *in toto* Jewish Messianism, which was solely of a this-worldly order, and that consequently Jesus had no thought of a parousia; that belief arose in the primitive Church through the application to Jesus of Old Testament texts relating to the theophanies of God. By an extraordinary coincidence Glasson commences his introduction with a quotation from T. H. Huxley: 'In his *Collected Essays*, T. H. Huxley refers to the view that Jesus foretold his speedy return to the earth in glory, and makes the comment: "If he believed and taught that, then assuredly he was under an illusion, and he is responsible for that which the mere effluxion of time has demonstrated to be a prodigious error".' Glasson returns to this citation later,[1] and proceeds to demonstrate its error by showing that Jesus never taught this doctrine. The parallel with Colani is striking. Like his predecessor, Glasson cites the atheist who must be rebutted; like him he adopts the method of denying entirely the authenticity of Jesus' teaching on the future kingdom and parousia, and pays careful attention to Mk. 13; like him he caricatures the orthodox belief in the Second Advent, as when he denies that Jesus was 'a distraught, wild-eyed apocalyptist shrieking out the vain message that millions now living will never die', as though the creeds of the Church set forth that view of Jesus! Like Colani, too, Glasson maintains that Jesus replaced Jewish apocalyptic by belief in the slow development of God's kingdom. In a scheme of this sort, there is no need to discuss whether Mk. 13 is authentic; indeed, it cannot be allowed to remain, for if Mk. 13 is authentic, this view cannot stand. In this case, as in all we have been reviewing, Mk. 13 is the victim, and the cherished hypothesis stands.

In recent American literature the attitude we have traced in earlier theologians makes an appearance in F. C. Grant's work, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, 1940. This writer combats the notion that Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah. In particular, the title Son of Man could not have been adopted by him. 'For any human being to identify himself with the Son of Man of the visions of Enoch, taken literally, and without reinterpretation, could suggest little else than an *unsound mind*—certainly not the supreme and unquestioned sanity of the Man of Galilee; yet of any "reinterpretation" or "spiritualisation" of the concept there is not one hint in the Gospels.'[2] The term Son of Man, and the identification of Jesus with the Messiah, are said to have arisen after his

[1] Op. cit., p. 10. [2] Op. cit., p. 63.

death. 'Only on some such hypothesis as this can we relieve the historical Jesus of intolerable contradictions and an unsupportable burden of unreality. *He was certainly no mad fanatic, no deluded pretender to a celestial and really mythical title, no claimant to a throne which did not exist,* no prophet of a coming Judgment, to be carried out by a heavenly figure seated on the clouds with whom he identified himself—which judgment never took place, never could take place.'[1] Grant concludes by suggesting (as N. Schmidt had done more than a generation earlier) that the term Son of Man entered Christian theology through Mk. 13, which once circulated without the reference to the parousia in v. 26, but which was sufficient to influence the rest of the Gospel tradition in this respect. . . .

It is extraordinary how this motif of 'Schwärmerei', with its accompanying extravagance of language, has persisted through the past four generations. The influence it has had on eschatological studies is incalculable, for the interpretation to which it gave birth became accepted in circles in which its presence was overlooked. This particularly applies to the Little Apocalypse theory, which was born of this horror of 'Schwärmerei', but which speedily forsook it parent. We recognise that to uncover the origin of this theory is no final proof of its mistakenness. Colani may have stumbled on a true discovery, even though his approach was reprehensible. Not all his successors were animated by the same spirit. Yet the fact remains that whatever may have been the subsequent history of this hypothesis, the claim that it was the impartial conclusion of an inexorable scientific criticism, in search of truth at all costs, can no longer be sustained. The majority of present-day New Testament scholars repudiate the assumptions on which this theory was erected. Perhaps it is time they scrutinised more carefully the structure itself. We propose, accordingly, to examine the subsequent developments of this hypothesis in detail, not in the lurid glare of controversies with agnostics, but with all the aids that criticism can give to us.

[1] Op. cit., pp. 67–68.

CHAPTER 2

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LITTLE APOCALYPSE THEORY

1. From C. Weizsäcker to W. Weiffenbach

The importance of Colani's criticism of the Eschatological Discourse was immediately recognised. From this time on, no major work on the theology of the Gospels, the criticism of the documents, or the Life of Jesus, could afford to neglect it. It was paid the compliment of instant attention by the Tübingen scholar Carl Weizsäcker in his extensive work on the Gospel history.[1] Colani had treated Mk. 13. 5–31 as a single document, forming in three scenes a self-contained Jewish-Christian apocalypse (vv. 5–8 the 'sorrows of childbirth', 9–13 the 'Affliction', 14–31 the 'end'). No further analysis was attempted by him. The problem of accounting for the presence of authentic sayings of Jesus within that document was neglected. The history of the criticism of Mk. 13 now becomes the record of the endeavours of Gospel critics to solve this problem as precisely as possible.

Weizsäcker recognised at least some of the sayings in Mk. 13. 5–31 as genuine; he particularly cites the parable of the fig tree, 13. 28–29. The problem of authentic or not authentic was solved by stressing the threefold division of the chapter, mentioned above;

[1] *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte*, 1864. I do not know on what authority von Dobschutz, writing in 1910, could state: 'It was in the year 1864 that Colani and Weizsäcker, *one independent of the other*, came to the conclusion that this is not the report of an original sermon of Jesus, but a composite work.' (*Eschatology of the Gospels*, pp. 85–86.) Both Weiffenbach, who wrote his detailed survey of the criticism of Mark 13 as early as 1873, and Busch in the only book devoted to the consideration of Mark 13 since that date (*Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie*, 1938), make it plain that Weizsäcker depended on the impetus provided by Colani and attempted to define the original source more closely. The above citation from von Dobschutz hints that he inferred the independence of Weizsäcker on Colani because both writers issued their books in 1864. I have not been able to trace the precise dates of the appearance of these two works, but since Colani's book went through a second edition in the same year, it is plain that the first edition must have appeared *early* in 1864. For a similar example of the ability of a book to rouse immediate response from writers already engaged on their research we may cite Haupt's *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, 1895. Both Paul Schwartzkopff (*Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*) and Arthur Titius (*Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*) devoted considerable attention to Haupt's views in their books, *both* of which appeared in 1895.

the passages which plainly set forth this division, vv. 7 f., 14 ff., 24 ff., presumably make up the actual apocalypse. To this group has been attached an introduction concerning false prophets (v. 6), repeated between the second and third groups (21–23), a parabolic epilogue (33–37), and warnings concerning persecution which must last till the Gospel is preached to the heathen (9–13). It is a neat analysis, and to it most recent commentators have returned, after half a century or more of variations.[1] Weizsäcker differed from Colani in thinking that the discourse emanated from *Jewish*, rather than Jewish-Christian, sources. The objective description of the 'Son of Man' prophecy of vv. 24–27 seemed to demand a Jewish origin. So also did the Jewish standpoint apparently observable in vv. 14 ff., with its scruples concerning the Sabbath; and most important of all, the mention of the 'Abomination of Desolation' presupposes the continuance of the temple, not its destruction. With that in mind Weizsäcker was greatly interested in a 'citation' of Enoch in the Epistle of Barnabas, which he read as follows: 'The last offence is at hand, concerning which the scripture speaketh, as Enoch saith, "For to this end the Master hath cut the seasons and the days short, that his beloved might hasten and come to his inheritance" ' (Bar. 4.3). The likeness of this to Mk. 13. 20 is striking. Weizsäcker concluded that the Little Apocalypse, which he had distinguished within Mk. 13, had come from the source quoted by Barnabas, viz. the apocalypse ascribed to Enoch.[2] The date of the Synoptic apocalypse must be prior to A.D. 70, as there is no hint of the fall of Jerusalem in Mk. 13. Weizsäcker seeks to mitigate the offence of his view by suggesting that there is no reason why Jesus should not have made use of such writings, as may be seen in the citation from Enoch concerning the fruitfulness of the vine and wheat in the Kingdom, attributed by Papias and Irenaeus to Jesus. The circulation of this logion explains how easily this apocalypse was ascribed to the Lord.[3] Nevertheless, the teaching of Jesus as to his ignorance of the time and the suddenness of his Coming shows that 'Jesus himself gave no apocalypse of the history of the future'.[4]

Weizsäcker applied himself again to this matter in his later work, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church* (1886, E.T. 1895). In this he withdrew his former contention that the Little Apocalypse was of Jewish origin, for it would seem that it was addressed

[1] *Untersuchungen*, pp. 121–122.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 135–136.
[3] Op. cit., pp. 128, 551.
[4] Op. cit., p. 552.

expressly to *disciples*, to whom the scruples for the Sabbath would apply equally as to Jews. The exodus of the Christians had not yet taken place; 'they still lived as Jews in Jerusalem.'[1] The triple division of the apocalypse is a common feature of Jewish-Christian eschatology, as may be seen in the three woes of the Book of Revelation, Rev. 9. 12, 11. 14. The first subject there is also war, the second the distress of Jerusalem; under the third the end can alone be understood. The consequence of this change of opinion should be noted, for it is often overlooked, since Weizsäcker's earlier work was republished in the present century and he is still known by the opinions expressed therein. The change of view automatically removes several objections earlier expressed, particularly the supposed reference to Enoch; it can hardly be imagined that a Book of Enoch was written for the benefit of first generation Christian disciples in Jerusalem, and still less that 'Barnabas' was the only Church writer to know of it. Indeed, Weizsäcker had wrongly construed the quotation from Barnabas, as the editors of that Epistle unanimously recognise. The punctuation usually adopted simply makes Enoch concur with the Scripture: 'The last offence is at hand, concerning which the scripture speaketh, as Enoch saith. For to this end the Master hath cut the seasons and the days short, that his Beloved might hasten and come to his inheritance.' Whether this is a free rendering of Mk. 13. 20, as Weiffenbach later believed, is not easily determined, for the motives in the two statements are quite different. In any case there is no ground for imagining the dependence of Mk. 13 on the Ethiopic Enoch; no such statement can be found in the book that has survived under that name. It is a fair instance of the kind of suggestion adduced for proving the 'Jewish' origin of Mk. 13, which, however, is not easily demonstrated if by that designation we mean 'Jewish', in distinction from 'Jewish-Christian'.

We cannot forbear noting that Weizsäcker's later comparison of the triple division of Mk. 13 with Rev. 9–11 is as unfortunate as the comparison with Barnabas. The threefold woes of Rev. 9–11 are quite different from the descriptions of Mk. 13. The first woe affects the *abyss*; the second the loosing of the 200,000,000 horsemen, not Jerusalem; 10. 1–11 is an interlude, having no direct connection with the three woes; the third woe is left for description until 16. 17–21, with the further unveiling in Chapters 17–19, and denotes the destruction of anti-Christian civilisation. Such a

[1] Apostolic Age, p. 23.

scheme has no contact with Mk. 13; like many other comparisons, its impressiveness disappears upon investigation. When Weizsäcker's contentions are weighed carefully, the one plausible feature in them is the 'contradiction' between Mk. 13. 32 and the chapter in which it is set. That we may leave for later consideration.

A more brilliant investigation of Mk. 13, which nevertheless would have been impossible without Weizsäcker's work, was that of Otto Pfleiderer.[1] To him the Eschatological Discourse is the key to the eschatology of Jesus. Assuming the threefold division of Mk. 13 announced by his predecessors, 5–13, 14–23, 24 ff., he adjudged each section to contain two subdivisions: 7–8, 14–20, 24–27 describe world-events that affect the nations and natural life and constitute an apocalypse; 9–13, 21 ff., 28 ff. warn Christian believers of threatening dangers and exhort them to faithfulness. In the apocalypse, 14–20 form the *central* act, a Jewish catastrophe; the cosmic scenes of 7–8, 24–27 form the *introductory* foreground and *concluding* background respectively. Against Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer argues that this apocalypse is Christian, for Jewish Christianity also observed the Sabbath, and, still more decisively, Jewish apocalyptic does not know of a Messiah coming from heaven, nor of the Messianic use of the term Son of Man (here Pfleiderer clearly depends on Colani). It is altogether likely that the Little Apocalypse was composed in the troubles of the seventh decade, prior to the fall of Jerusalem, and that the Abomination of Desolation relates to the murderous acts of the Zealots. In support of this Pfleiderer cites Josephus, who said of the Zealots, 'Their blood alone was a defiling of the sanctuary,'[2] and in his appeal to them urged, 'Is not the city and the whole temple full of the corpses of those you have murdered? God thus, God himself it is who brings on this fire to *purge* the city and temple through the Romans'.[3] This apocalypse is identical with that 'oracle' mentioned by Eusebius as commanding the flight of the Christians from Jerusalem, for Eusebius referred to it as a command δι' ἀποκαλύψεως δοθέντα πρὸ τοῦ πολεμοῦ.[4] The portents of the closing section of the Apocalypse are to be explained as those in the Book of Revelation; they supply a cosmic background for the initiation of the sovereignty of Christ with his elect, rather than the end of the universe.

[1] 'Über die Composition der eschatologischen Rede Matt. 24. 4 ff.,' in *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1868.

[2] *Wars of the Jews*, 4, 3, 12. [3] Op. cit., 6, 2, 1. [4] *Ecclesiastical History*, 3, 5.

Having thus dealt with the sayings that constitute the Little Apocalypse, Pfleiderer seeks an explanation of the other series Mk. 13. 9–13, 21 ff., 28 ff. Whereas an observable sequence of thought enables us to divide the apocalypse into beginning of sorrows, tribulation, climax, no such progression is discernable in the other series. Not only are they a heterogeneous group, but by their insertion into the other series the original progression is obscured and confusion is produced. For example, after the characterisation of 7–8 as the beginning of sorrows, the 'then' of v. 9[1] should introduce the real distress and v. 14 the end, but it is not so; similarly 14–20 narrate a quite short time of tribulation (v. 20), yet v. 10 speaks of an indefinitely long period in which the heathen are evangelised; the same feature is seen in a comparison of 24 ff. with 21 ff., for v. 24 speaks of something that happens 'immediately' (so Matthew) after the distress of 14–20, yet 21 ff. obtrude another indefinite period of delay; finally we note that whereas 24–27 describe the end, we are taken back into the period of signs once more by 28 ff.

The conclusion from this is 'irresistible'; not only are the two series of sayings distinct, not only is the second series unrelated, it has been interpolated into the first series to check the immediate temporal succession of its members, i.e. *to retard the swift course of the apocalyptic process described therein*. There is the key to the understanding of the entire composition.[2] The eschatological discourse has been drawn up by Mark, as the Pauline addition of 13. 10 shows, with a view to tempering the impatient expectation of an immediately impending parousia. A worldwide preaching of the Gospel was not contemplated by Jesus, as Mt. 10. 23 proves. 'The "immediately" of the apocalypse (Mt. 24. 29) was tempered first by the addition of genuine eschatological sayings of Jesus, and then by the introduction of the universalism taught by Paul, the realisation of which postulated a longer time for the development of Christianity than had been anticipated in the eschatological reckoning of primitive Christianity.'[3]

It is curious that while Weizsäcker in later years modified his original view that the Little Apocalypse was Jewish and came to

[1] Pfleiderer worked on the basis of Matthew's version of the discourse and Matthew 24. 9 begins with *Τότε*. The genuine text of Mk. 13. 9 does not do so, although in some Western authorities, including D, it is assimilated to the Matthaean text. We have let Pfleiderer's reference stand, so as not to prejudice the issue as to which version is original, and in any case the contention is possible without the time indication.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 144–146.

[3] Op. cit., pp. 148–149.

regard it as Jewish-Christian, Pfleiderer performed the opposite *volte face* and subsequently considered the presumed Jewish-Christian document to be Jewish.[1] The chief reason prompting this change was a fresh consideration of the Abomination of Desolation, Mk. 13. 14. The most natural interpretation of that enigmatic phrase is now considered to be one akin to its original use in Dan. 9. 27, 12. 11, where it refers to the setting up of an idol in the Temple. Nothing of the kind took place during the war under Titus, yet the event nearly happened in A.D. 40, when Caligula commanded his own statue to be erected in the Temple. The order was not carried out, but Mommsen is cited as saying, 'Since that fateful decree (of Caligula), the anxiety never ceased that another Caesar would command the same thing'. The whole situation is now plain to Pfleiderer: the abomination has not been set up, according to 13. 14, but *it nearly was erected*, and 13. 14 ff. reflect the fears of the country populace of Judea, who were ready to fly to the mountains when the next, and successful, attempt was made. 'In the circles of the country populace, for whom this saying was given, the introduction of the same was vividly feared, and precisely this fear was maintained in those years of growing Jewish fanaticism before the destruction of Jerusalem.'[2] Pfleiderer suggests that Mk. 13. 24–27, the coming of the Son of Man, could have been derived directly from Dan. 7. 13; the fact that it is not a Christian description is seen in the lack of suggestion that the Son of Man is the *crucified* Jesus (cf. Rev. 1. 7). This Jewish Apocalypse was probably written in the seventh decade. How, then, did it come to be adopted by the Christians? The answer lies in its approximation to Christian eschatology; it came so near their own hopes, they could not ignore it. 'The simplest thing was *to change the Jewish apocalypse into a Christian one through the addition of such exhortations as seemed fitting for the Christians of that time.*' The chief requirements were to warn the Christians against popular leaders who sought to win them to the Jewish national movement (vv. 5 f., 21 ff.), and to prepare them for persecutions, which in reality contributed to the spread of the Gospel and the coming of the end (vv. 9–13, 28 ff.). 'So the Christian editor sets over against the fanatical Jewish Messianic hope the exhortation to patient waiting, courageous testimony and faithful suffering in the service of the Lord Jesus, *whose coming in any case was to be hoped for shortly, within the lifetime of the present generation.*'[3] This is all very interest-

[1] *Das Urchristenthum*, 1887. [2] Op. cit., pp. 403–405. [3] Op. cit., pp. 405–406

ing and it contains some plausible features now widely accepted; but what becomes, on this scheme, of the brilliant explanation of the Christian interpolations, set in the apocalypse to retard the apocalyptic process? There is no place for it, for now Christian and Jew alike expect the End soon, only for different reasons. Pfleiderer thus has silently abandoned the view which was the main inspiration of his earlier contribution to the subject. Yet as in the case of Weizsäcker, fate has decreed that the retraction in *Das Urchristenthum* should be forgotten by posterity, and that the view Pfleiderer abandoned should become, in a modified form, generally adopted. The specific notion of the 'Christian interpolations' as a brake on the apocalyptic wheel was forgotten, but the intention of the evangelist as allaying the impatience of ardent believers was destined to become the normal view, through the advocacy of Johannes Weiss.

The most detailed examination that our chapter was to receive for fully sixty-five years was that of Wilhelm Weiffenbach, whose work began with a review of the criticism of Mk. 13 to his time.[1] He, too, accepted Pfleiderer's analysis of the Little Apocalypse, together with the reason adduced by him for the evangelist's insertions between its members, viz. the retarding of the apocalyptic process. He admitted, however, that this latter consideration does not suffice to account for all the facts.[2] To the sections Mk. 13. 7–8, 14–20, 24–27, Weiffenbach added vv. 30–31, which join on to 24–27 very well. 13. 30 declares that 'everything', i.e. in the apocalypse thus defined, will happen in the contemporary generation, especially the final dénouement at the parousia. To give assurance on this point v. 31 is added by the apocalyptist as a 'ceremonious concluding-formula, confirming the truth of the prophecies'.[3] This means, of course, that the apocalypse is not anonymous, as had hitherto been supposed, but deliberately *pseudonymous*; that need occasion no surprise, for apocalyptists 'love to conclude their prophecies with solemn formulas of conclusion and confirmatory endings that impart assurance'.[4] That the apocalypse cannot have proceeded from Jesus is obvious, for (i) it is a characteristic representative of that 'restless calculating of the future on the part of the later Jews and Jewish-Christians', such as we see in Daniel, Enoch, Ezra, the Sibyls, the Ascension of Moses, the Revelation of John; (ii) the first two sections of the Little Apocalypse, 7–9a, 14–20, are

[1] *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, 1873.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 133–134.
[3] Op. cit., pp. 152–153.
[4] Ibid.

merely historical facts in an apocalyptic disguise, i.e. they are history written as prophecy; (iii) all the features of this apocalypse can be paralleled in Jewish eschatology and are demonstrably derived from it. The one exception to this judgment allowed by Weiffenbach is the expectation of a near return of Jesus as Son of Man (v. 26), which can be abundantly paralleled in the authentic teaching of Jesus and which does not fit in with the fundamental scheme of the apocalypse.

As to the insertions between the members of this document, Weiffenbach regards 9b–13 as authentic and given on one occasion, apart from v. 10 which intrudes into the flow of thought but which is, nevertheless, a genuine saying; he rightly observes that Pfleiderer's objection that a world-wide evangelism does not fit an early expectation of the parousia is nullified by Paul, who held to the latter and is credited by Pfleiderer with originating the former idea. If Paul could do that, why not Jesus?[1] Vv. 21–23 cannot be genuine in their present form, for Jesus had no special knowledge of future events; Weiffenbach will accept v. 22 if we amend it (cf. v. 6) to *πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν*, which is comprehensible on the lips of Jesus and which the Evangelist will have filled out in the light of events.[2] The parable of the Fig Tree (28–29) is 'a characteristic and significant expression of the well-attested, spontaneous and thoughtful view of nature that Jesus held; because of this and because of its simplicity and clarity, it carries the stamp of genuineness and originality in itself'.[3] 13. 32 clearly refers to the parousia, the terms 'day' and 'hour' being synonymous, in accordance with their normal use to denote the time of the end. The exhortations in 33–37 well fit on to this confession of the ignorance of Jesus as to the date of the parousia; their relation to this coming is so plain, 'only pure arbitrariness can overlook it'.[4]

Weiffenbach follows Keim in regarding the prophecy of the temple's destruction, 13. 2, as authentic, because in fact the temple buildings were not demolished but burned, so that 'everything combustible went to ashes, but the stones remain standing; actually only the walls and the gates of the city were "thrown down" after Jerusalem's capture'.[5] This assertion has been repeated by expositors to the present day, but it will subsequently be shown[6] that the temple was both burned *and* demolished. It is fortunate, how-

[1] Op. cit., pp. 137–138. [2] Op. cit., pp. 142–144. [3] Op. cit., p. 149.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 157–162. [5] Op. cit., p. 166. [6] See Appendix 1.

ever, that exegetes thought that Jesus predicted this wrongly, for at least the point of departure of the discourse could then be allowed to him!

13. 5–6 are regarded as the same as 22 and are interpreted accordingly. Since they have nothing to do with 13. 2 ff., their function is to provide 'an improvised temporary bridge which binds two sharply separated river banks, the one side being vv. 2–4 (destruction of the temple and the question about the πότε and σημεῖον of the same), the other side vv. 7 f. (apocalyptic description of international wars and natural calamities)'.[1]

Pfleiderer had maintained that the 'insertions' 5–6, 9–13, 21–23 were wholly disconnected. Weiffenbach, however, relates them to the introduction 1–4 and the conclusion 28–29, 32, 33–37. Is it right to regard all these as fragments haphazardly thrown together? No, he replies. While the synoptists diverge widely in their disposition of the Evangelic material generally, 'in the eschatological discourse they agree in a most decided manner, in the sequence and on the basis of a very definite and tenaciously strong oral and written tradition, which energetically forbad any violent departure'. This agreement extends to locality, sequence and content of the discourse. Without laying it down dogmatically, therefore, Weiffenbach thinks it likely that the 'unapocalyptic' sections of Mk. 13 form a discourse originally given by Jesus on the Mount of Olives, as related by the evangelists.[2] This position of Weiffenbach became the basis of Wendt's investigation and through him became widely adopted.

It remains to note Weiffenbach's conclusions as to the value of this interpretation of Mk. 13. He cites with approval Pfleiderer's estimate of the Discourse as the 'key' to most of the other eschatological sayings of Jesus and states how he proposes to use it. 'Our guiding point of view in the employment of that key is that everywhere we meet with similar apocalyptic ideas and formulas as those in our "little apocalypse" we shall account them as unauthentic and without hesitation deny them to Jesus; we except the one idea, discovered by us to be decisively genuine, that of the near and personal Second Coming.'[3] From that view-point Weiffenbach considers the other eschatological sayings of Jesus, in order finally to show that what Jesus meant by the parousia was simply his resurrection. Of this procedure Schweitzer characteristically wrote: 'In the end Weiffenbach's critical principle proves to be merely a

[1] Op. cit., pp. 167–168. [2] Op. cit., pp. 180–182. [3] Op. cit., pp. 190–191.

bludgeon with which he goes seal-hunting and clubs the defenceless Synoptic sayings right and left. When his work is done you see before you a desert island strewn with quivering corpses!'[1] If this does not settle the question whether these sayings deserved to be other than 'corpses', at least it does not give confidence in the method by which their execution was determined.

2. From G. C. B. Pünjer to H. H. Wendt

The next few years are barren as to productive ideas on the Discourse. G. C. B. Pünjer wrote a good review of the problems entailed, without shedding much more light on them.[2] Renan in his work on the Antichrist[3] gave an account of the origin of Mk. 13 more 'bizarre' than the apocalypse he saw behind it. Adopting the Little Apocalypse hypothesis he seems to have set the rest of the chapter to the credit of the 'presidents' of the infant Church, the whole account reflecting contemporary incidents.

Gustav Volkmar's view of Mk. 13 is conditioned by his reading of the story of primitive Christianity as a struggle between the Peter and Paul parties; the Revelation of John was written on behalf of the former party in A.D. 68, the Gospel of Mark came to the defence of Paul shortly after.

Volkmar reads the eschatological discourse as a sustained polemic against the author of Revelation, and analyses it accordingly: 'The whole discourse cries out, *Have care*! (i) vv. 5–9, *Have care* above all for bold and ensnaring proclamations of the future by alleged emissaries of Jesus Messiah like the author of the Book of Revelation! Cf. Rev. 1. 1–3, 9–19. (ii) *Have a care for yourselves* in respect of your commission to preach the Gospel to all, though you suffer for it! (iii) vv. 14–23, 24–27, *Have especial care, you Christians of Judea*, lest in the last distress anyone makes you trust in Jerusalem, as Rev. 14. 1 ff. suggests, and thereby leads you to expect a parousia on earth; (iv) vv. 28–32, Learn finally to judge the time of the end rather from what God tells you in creation (28 f.), than from apocalypses that give boasting calculations in the name of Jesus Christ and his angel!'[4] Constructions of this kind are ingenious and intriguing, but we can scarcely be asked to take them seriously.

Despite the immensity of his learning, H. J. Holtzmann added

[1] *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 231.
[2] 'Die Wiederkunftsreden Jesu', in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1878, pp. 153 ff.
[3] *L'Antéchrist*, 1873, E.T., 1890. [4] *Jesus Nazarenus*, p. 280; cf. pp. 281–288.

little to the discussion on the Eschatological Discourse. He was unwise enough in his *Introduction* to commit himself to the view that the words 'Let him that readeth understand', Mk. 13. 14, suffice to identify the entire discourse with the 'fly-leaf' of the Jewish War, referred to by Eusebius.[1] He agrees with Volkmar that the terminus *a quo* for the composition of Mark, on the basis of that of Ch. 13, is A.D. 73.[2] With Weiffenbach he inclines to regard Mk. 13. 30–31 as the conclusion of the Little Apocalypse, and that the latter is characteristic of 'the restless reckoning of the future seen in contemporary Judaism'.[3] He subscribes to Pfleiderer's idea that Mk. 13. 10 serves to put back the over-rapid world-clock of the apocalyptist.[4] In his textbook on theology he concludes his discussion on the Little Apocalypse by affirming, 'There are few hypotheses which, in their fundamental features, have proved to be so unavoidable and have experienced such illuminating confirmation.'[5] The real value of his work is the supreme honesty with which he approaches the whole question of the eschatology of Jesus. He castigates exegetes, traditionalist and liberal, who handle this matter 'as if they were dealing with a professional solution of a prize question set on *the quickest and most elegantly executed elimination of all eschatological motives*'.[6] The chief concern appears to be 'to preserve the Hero of the evangelic history from the Jewish world view, with its materialistic hopes for the future, and to deprive him of the most obvious point of departure in this respect'. From this viewpoint he severely criticises the effort to interpret the parousia as a 'world-historical' process, although he himself had expounded it as a younger man; not only is it 'as far removed as possible from the whole construction of Biblical pictures of the End', it cannot stand alongside well-attested parousia sayings like Lk. 17. 23–25 f., parousia parables like Lk. 17. 26–35, and especially the classic saying as to the thief in the night, Lk. 12. 39.[7] It is strange that Holtzmann, with his candid perception of the anti-eschatological motives of his contemporaries, did not perceive that this 'unavoidable' hypothesis of a Little Apocalypse is the most notable of all instances of this same tendency.

[1] *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1885, p. 362
[2] Op. cit., p. 363.
[3] 'Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament', *Die Synoptiker*, 1889, Mk. 13. 31.
[4] Ibid.
[5] *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 1897, p. 327, n.
[6] Op. cit., p. 325. Holtzmann has in mind the German practice of setting essays on specified subjects by way of contest, the winner gaining prize money.
[7] Op. cit., p. 315.

With H. H. Wendt we return to the main line of development of the Little Apocalypse theory.[1] He builds directly on Weiffenbach's distinction of two discourses in Mk. 13, defining the Little Apocalypse as 7–9a, 14–20, 24–27, 30–31, and the authentic discourse of Jesus as 1–6, 9b–13, 21–23, 28–29, 32–37. He proposes to transfer vv. 21–23 before 9b–13, as the connection is thereby improved. Three reasons are adduced for separating the two discourses and assigning them to different sources: (i) the nature of the views expressed therein, and (ii) their worth, differ widely; (iii) the coherence of each group is destroyed through their combination. These points are elaborated by Wendt with persuasive power. Under (i) he contrasts the nature of the impending evils described in each discourse. One tells of temptations which Christians alone will experience, and that because of their faith in Jesus; their persecutors appear to be Jews, who try to make them apostatise; warnings are given to enable the disciples to overcome their temptations; their consolation is no promise of escape from trial but of divine aid for their proclamation and assurance of final salvation after endurance of the worst (13b). The other discourse, on the contrary, is concerned with distant wars and natural calamities; they affect Christians only in so far as all men are involved in them; the watchword is not endurance but flight, so that counsel is given to the Christians to enable them to escape the affliction; their consolation is an assurance given of divine preservation from the worst affliction, since God for their sakes will shorten the period of trial. The second point (ii) has in mind the practical application of the discourses to the Church generally. The first group of sayings is thoroughly religious and therefore has an enduring value. The second group lacks any Christian orientation; its provisions and demands are so bound up with specific outward conditions that nothing permanent can be extracted from them. Point (iii) is confined to the different reference of ταῦτα, 'these things', in vv. 29 and 30: in v. 29 it cannot refer to the parousia of vv. 24–27, nor to 21–23 which are *ex-hypothesi* displaced, but to the temptations narrated in 5–6, 21–23, 9b–13; in v. 30 it presumably refers in the first place to the parousia of 24–27 or to the whole description 7–9a, 14–20, 24–27. Wendt places much weight on this distinction; it appears to be sufficient proof that the authentic sayings formed a discourse ready to Mark's hand and that he merely combined it

[1] *Die Lehre Jesu*, 1886. In the E.T. of this work Wendt entirely recast his material and omitted what he had written on the Eschatological Discourse.

with the Little Apocalypse; how otherwise would he have used in v. 29 the term ταῦτα which manifestly cannot relate to the immediately preceding context in which it is set? If it originally referred to the temptations of the genuine discourse all is explained; the faulty reference is due to Mark's separating the two discourses and combining them into one.[1]

Probably the Little Apocalypse theory has never been more attractively stated than by Wendt. The force of his contentions depends on the great assumption that the two series of sayings thus distinguished were at one time connected wholes, an assumption we have yet to examine. While deferring the matter for a time, we would point out that Wendt did not help his case by laying so much stress on the use of ταῦτα in v. 29; while it is true that it is unnatural to relate 'these things' in this verse to the climax of 24–27, who is to deny that it can refer to *all* that precedes that paragraph? On what grounds can one insist that it must refer to 9b–13 but not to 14–20? The distinction is possible only because the Little Apocalypse has already been delimited on the basis of what Jesus could not have said; but this is a circuitous argument.

On one aspect of the discourse Wendt made a significant contribution which had wider repercussions than he realised. His belief that one of the two discourses of Mk. 13 was authentic caused him to face the question, How does the genuine group of sayings relate to the question asked by the disciples in 13. 4? He gave two answers: (i) the disciples were assured that precisely the experience of these trials will be the sign of the nearness of the coming of Christ. In the nature of the case, these supply only a relative, not a precise definition of the time of the end, and on this uncertainty the renewed exhortation to remain in a state of preparedness is based (32–37); (ii) the question had been framed in this way because Jesus had earlier made statements which appeared to show a connection between the destruction of the temple and the judgment which would accompany the glorious appearing of the Messiah; the fresh establishment of this connection was part of the new revelation which Jesus imparted in this answer; so that 5–6, 21–23, 9b–13 *give a real answer to the question as to the signs of the catastrophe*, 28–29 underline that fact, while 32–37 answer the question as to the *time* of the same.[2] These two answers given by Wendt are admirable, but how did he fail to notice that they answered the two major objections voiced against the authenticity of Mk. 13? The

[1] Op. cit., pp. 15–21. [2] Op. cit., p 13.

two most frequently posed questions, in our day as in Wendt's, are: (i) How can a sudden coming be reconciled with one announced by signs? (ii) How can the discourse be related to 13. 1–4, seeing that it deals with a different subject? Wendt supplied a reasonable answer to both objections. It is ironical in the highest degree, and thoroughly in keeping with the strange course of this controversy, that *the writer who supplied the most convincing exposition of the Little Apocalypse theory at the same time destroyed the foundations on which it was built.*

3. From W. Baldensperger to E. Wendling

The blow struck by Wendt at the foundations of the critical theory of Mk. 13 was unperceived by his contemporaries and the Little Apocalypse theory was now entrenched. W. Baldensperger did not feel it necessary to discuss the matter in his treatment of the eschatology of Jesus.[1] For him, the fact that Mk. 13 is a free composition is not to be contested; it consists of two sayings groups, one of which is similar to the Rabbinical expositions of the signs of the end and so is unauthentic.[2] Bousset in all his writings accepts the theory, though not always ostensibly for the same reasons. In his book on the Antichrist he insists that to interpret Mk. 13 aright, 'the first thing to be done is to get rid of all interpretations based on current events'. That is to say, we are not to presume that the excitement raised by the Caligula episode could create the idea that the Antichrist would sit in the temple of God; this figure is simply the old Dragon-foe of God, who storms the abode of God in heaven and ejects God from his sanctuary, as Rev. 13. 6 shows(?).[3] Mk. 13. 14 ff. is therefore 'a fragment of some apocalypse of the Antichrist'.[4] The utmost that Bousset would allow to the influence of the scare due to Caligula is that it revived the memory of the old tradition. This estimate was reversed in a later writing, in that Bousset came to think that the idea of Antichrist enthroned in the temple of God was due to the precedent of Caligula's command to erect his own statue in the temple.[5] On such a reading, it is no longer likely that Mk. 13. 14 ff. represents an old 'Antichrist document', resurrected *for* the occasion, since the very core of it has been created *by* the occasion. If Bousset still

[1] *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit* 1888.
[2] Op. cit., p. 146, n. 1.
[3] *The Antichrist Legend*, 1896, pp. 163–166.
[4] Op. cit., p. 214.
[5] *Die Religion des Judentums*, 3rd ed., 1926, p. 256.

thought that this passage described the 'rule and reign of Antichrist',[1] his only evidence is later Christian writings, which ought not to be adduced to prove an *earlier* and *foreign* origin for Mk. 13.[2] Bousset evidently regarded the rest of the chapter as the product of the Christian community, it conflicts with the 'inmost nature' of Jesus.[3]

The chief features in Albert Schweitzer's construction require but brief mention by us. In his view the sending out of the Twelve as narrated in Mt. 10, was 'to set in motion the eschatological development of history, to let loose the final woes, the confusion and strife, from which shall issue the parousia, and so to introduce the supra-mundane phase of the eschatological drama'.[4] Mt. 10. 23 shows that Jesus did not expect the mission of the disciples to be completed before his own translation and parousia took place. The failure of this expectation caused a change in his views; he became convinced that his vocation was to bear the messianic woes in his own person that the kingdom might come in power. 'He had thought to let loose the final tribulation and so compel the coming of the kingdom. And the cataclysm had not occurred. . . . That meant—not that the kingdom was not near at hand—but that God had appointed otherwise in regard to the time of trial. . . . God in his mercy and omnipotence had eliminated it from the series of eschatological events, and appointed to him, whose commission had been to bring it about, instead to accomplish it in his own person.'[5] This was the secret revealed by Jesus to the disciples at Caesarea Philippi. A difficulty arises for this interpretation in that *after* that revelation, Jesus spoke of the necessity of his *disciples* to bear their cross and take their share of suffering. Schweitzer is unabashed: Mark has wrongly placed that paragraph, with the ensuing narrative of the Transfiguration; they together belong to the era before his decision to die, and so should have *preceded* the Confession. This cool piece of modifying the data to fit the conclusion is given by Schweitzer in a footnote, and he proceeds to the following observation: '*For the same reason the predictions of suffering and tribulation in the Synoptic Apocalypse in Mark* 13 *cannot be derived from Jesus.*'[6] Apart from a passing notice of Colani's theory

[1] Ibid., p. 255.
[2] For the evidence adduced by Bousset, see *The Antichrist Legend*, 143 ff. 163 ff., 213 ff.
[3] *Jesus*, 1906, pp. 121–122.
[4] *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1910, E.T. of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, 1906, p. 369.
[5] Op. cit., p. 387.
[6] Op. cit., p. 387, n. 1.

on p. 225, this is the sole reference Schweitzer gives to the contents of Mk. 13 in his entire work. Obviously *none* of the reasons adduced by Colani against the authenticity of the eschatological discourse would have been acceptable to Schweitzer, but he could no more receive it than Colani could; it would have ruined his scheme if it had been allowed to remain. Such arbitrary treatment of our sources stands self-condemned. The same attitude to the chapter is adopted by Martin Werner, Schweitzer's exponent and disciple. His book on the origin of Christian doctrine[1] commences with a lengthy vindication of 'thorough-going eschatology', as providing an adequate basis for a history of doctrine, but it contains no discussion of Mk. 13. Whereas Werner is at pains to demonstrate that Mt. 10 is a historically situated unity, the question is not raised as to whether Mk. 13 might be considered as such. The detailed treatment of the one source and the ignoring of the other would be puzzling and irritating, were it not for the plain fact that on Werner's scheme, Mk. 13 must not even be considered, for the two views cannot subsist together. Where one's own belief and Mk. 13 clash, so much the worse, evidently, for Mk. 13.

Very different is the treatment accorded to this chapter by E. Wendling in his discussion as to the origin of Mark.[2] Admittedly he provides no fresh ideas about the apocalyptic document; its existence is taken for granted, and it is defined as 7–8, 9a, 12, 13b–20a, 24–27, 30. Wendling's interest lies in the other sayings in the discourse, and he painstakingly discusses each one. The change of scene between 1–2 and 3–4 is 'naturally not original'; the second situation is conditioned by the necessity of giving privacy to the eschatological discourse; it must be due to the Evangelist. The questions raised in v. 4 ask (i) the point of time, (ii) the sign, when the great event will take place. The discourse proper does not answer them, but they find an answer in the two parables of 28–29 (=the sign), 33 ff. (=the time). Wendling therefore suggests that the original source of Mark (Ur-Markus) contained the sayings group 1–2, 33, 28–29, 34–36, a little 'discourse'. The rest of the sayings are added by the Evangelist and mainly come from the 'Logia'. The treatment accorded them by Wendling is not always illuminating. 5b–6, for example, are repeated in 21 f.; both passages are said to have a common pattern which the Evangelist has al-

[1] *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, 1941.
[2] *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums*, 1908, pp. 155 ff.

ready used in 9. 38 f. (!). 21–23 are freely composed by the aid of 7–8, as a comparison will show:

7. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε . . . μὴ θροεῖσθε	21. ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ . . . μὴ πιστεύετε
8. ἐγερθήσεται . . .	22. ἐγερθήσονται . . .[1]

As the two uses of ἐγείρομαι in these passages are quite distinct the parallelism is not very impressive, and we were probably never intended to see any. Of the group 9–13, 9a, 12, 13b have already been assigned to the Little Apocalypse, leaving 9b–11, 13a. These find a close parallel in Mt. 10. 17–20, except that Mk. 13. 10 is only represented in Mt. by the phrase εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς; 'clearly' the Markan saying is an expansion of this and must therefore be eliminated as an addition of the Evangelist's own composition. 9b and 11 will then come from Q.[2] As to Mk. 13. 31, 32, Wendling points out that οἱ λόγοι as a designation of sayings of Jesus occurs only in two previous places, both being additions of the Evangelist, 8. 38, 10. 24. Verse 32 is an appendix, the οὐδείς οἶδεν anticipates οὐκ οἴδατε of 33, 35; it is based on Mt. 11. 27 and I Thess. 5. 1 f. The final analysis of the chapter thus appears to be:

Ur-Markus: 1–2, 33, 28–29, 34–36.
Little Apocalypse: 7–8, 9a, 12, 13b–20a, 24–27, 30.
Additions of Evangelist: 3–4, 5–6, 21–23, 9b, 11, 10, 13a, (19?), 20b, 31, 32, 37.

We are not sure whom to admire most, Mark for putting together his discourse out of such materials, or Wendling for discovering how he did it. We suspect that Mark would have handed the bouquet to Dr. Wendling.

4. From A. Loisy to J. Moffatt

With Loisy we enter upon a period of more sceptical criticism, an attitude towards the text of the Gospels by no means confined to Mk. 13. Loisy perceives that the eschatological discourse has a function of its own in its setting in the Gospel; it serves 'to show the significance and essential importance of the life of Jesus, to correct by anticipation the horror of his death, as the resurrection mitigates it afterwards. . . . In this sense it could be said that a synoptic gospel could no more be conceived without the discourse on the parousia than the Johannine gospel without the discourse

[1] Op. cit., pp. 157–8. [2] Op. cit., pp. 155–157.

after the supper'.[1] But the discourses in both cases are the result of wishful thinking, not of historical reminiscence. Loisy implies that no discourse of any kind was given by Jesus on this occasion; from this time on we scarcely hear of Wendt's authentic 'discourse' combined with the Little Apocalypse. Loisy himself strikes deep in his demonstration of the unauthenticity of the discourse as it stands. (i) The setting is suspect: if the Evangelist represents it as delivered to four disciples only, it is because he knows it had no place in the primitive tradition; he is conscious of attributing something to Christ unknown in earlier years, consequently he 'has not dared directly to present it as the teaching of Christ'.[2] (ii) Fundamentally the discourse is neither a conversation, nor a short address to the disciples, nor a public utterance, but a written document, as v. 14 shows. To regard the clause, 'Let the reader understand', as an insertion of the Evangelist, calling attention to what is written so as to be prepared for the occasion, is 'an artificial and mechanical conjecture'. '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.'[3] (iii) The request of the disciples is not *en rapport* with their situation shortly before the crucifixion, but rather with the preoccupations of believers who, *fifty years later*, were forced to reconcile the delay of the parousia with what Jesus had said of its imminence. (iv) The belief of Jesus in the imminence of the end is irreconcilable with the view that it will be preceded by signs: 'Instead of the flash of light which spreads in an instant through all the earth, instead of the Judge who in an instant ravishes to himself the righteous and abandons the wicked to their destiny, it is the divine King who, after a long series of preliminary signs, comes to look on the earth in its ruins, using the celestial spirits to search for the elect.'[4] This habit of exegetes, to exaggerate the meaning of a passage they do not like, has been observable from Weisse onwards in our studies; if Loisy really thought that a fair representation of Mk. 13. 24–27, then we understand Loisy better than we do Mark. The Little Apocalypse is defined as 6–8, 12, 13b–14, 17–19, 22–23, 24b–27, 30–31. It will be observed that it has now become more fragmentary. Loisy, like Holtzmann before him, has recognised that vv. 15–16 cannot be attributed to a Jewish apocalypse, for they occur in

[1] *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, 1908, vol. II, p. 393.
[2] Op. cit., p. 398, *Évangile selon Marc*, pp. 366–367.
[3] *Ev. Syn.*, p. 421. [4] *Marc*, pp. 380–381.

Lk. 17. 31, so that no longer can 14–20 be regarded as a connected whole. But 20 itself is a Pauline idea, consequently that must be omitted from the 'apocalypse'. What remains is not a very satisfactory document, as Loisy seems to realise. How can an independent writing commence with v. 6? It is an impossible beginning. Loisy therefore suggests 'Since the description commences a little brusquely by the announcement of false Messiahs, *that which prepared for this announcement in the source was probably not a suitable item to reproduce in the Gospel*'.[1] The flight to the mountains in v. 14 is also very briefly narrated, 15–16 being unrelated to it, so we must presume that the Evangelist has here shortened his source again. Indeed the flight to the mountains is quite unmotived; if the whole world is engulfed in the final catastrophe, what is the use of running off to mountains? Apart from the soundness or otherwise of Loisy's interpretation, we should note that we have here moved to a different level of discussion as regards the Little Apocalypse. The long chain of argument initiated by Weizsäcker and continued in his followers had the purpose of demonstrating that the Apocalypse embedded in Mk. 13 was *self-contained*, revealing itself to be a *complete* description of the end, based on the usual division of Jewish apocalypses. Loisy now recognises that the element of 'completeness' cannot be sustained, and he must needs call on further hypothetical clauses to explain *the incomplete extracts given in Mk.* 13!

The view, represented by Wendt, that the destruction of the city and temple will occur at the end of the age is reproduced by Loisy, with even plainer contradiction than with the former writer. Of the disciples' question, 13. 4, he states: 'The question has a double object; he is asked when the end will come and by what sign its imminence would be recognised. As the ruin of Jerusalem, the end of the world, the glorious manifestation of the Messiah, and the great judgment are bound up in the apocalyptic belief of the earliest time, no special indication is asked for each one of these eschatological items.'[2] How can Loisy, in the light of that, proceed to comment on 13. 5 ff.: 'In view of the character of the introduction (i.e. the privacy of the discourse), there is no need to be surprised that *the discourse of Jesus is not in direct and natural relation with the question posed by the disciples*'?[3] If the end of Jerusalem is bound up with the end of the age, and all that ushers it in, then the discourse is certainly related to the disciples' question. Loisy must

[1] Op. cit., p. 369. [2] *Ev. Syn.*, p. 399. [3] Op. cit., p. 407.

have forgotten what he had already written. To complete this summary we should notice that Loisy classed 28–29 as belonging to the evangelic redaction; 32 is an apologetic statement, justifying Jesus for having announced as imminent a coming which had not taken place at the time when the Gospel was composed; 33–37 is a mixture of elements from various sources, not blended together. The only sections of the chapter certainly to be ascribed to Jesus are vv. 9bc, 11, 15–16, 21, a meagre harvest for such toil.

From the latest of Loisy's published works, we infer that even this harvest must not be garnered. To explain his latest ideas on Mk. 13 it will be necessary to digress. Loisy lays it down, 'with the minimum risk of error,' that Jesus was 'the prophet of a single oracle', like John the Baptist, and that oracle was 'Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand'.[1] After the death of Jesus the belief arose among his followers that he was the Messiah about to return; their ideas turned wholly on eschatological anticipations of his coming, they were not interested in his earthly life. Thus the parousia was 'the essential object, if not the unique object, of faith'.[2] Not unnaturally, all the instruction concerning this event, the 'eschatological catechesis' as Loisy calls it, was represented as given by *the immortal Christ in heaven*. 'It was only at a later period that this teaching was antedated and thrown back into the life of the Christ on earth, and . . . his exaltation as Messiah was treated in the same manner.'[3] A clear instance of this transfer of events is seen in the account of the Transfiguration, which was originally represented as a resurrection scene, as the Apocalypse of Peter shows. Similarly the discourse on the last things was originally regarded as a communication of the Risen Christ.[4] The manner of its transfer, to the earthly ministry, however, was complicated. The eschatological catechesis threw up, towards the end of the first century, the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen as a piece of anti-Jewish polemic; it was eventually pushed back into the earthly life of Jesus to serve as the last discourse of Jesus in Jerusalem. From this position it was ousted by the eschatological discourse, evidently regarded as a more suitable conclusion to the ministry of Jesus. That the first draft of Mark's gospel did not know this discourse is plain: for one thing, its existence conflicts with the original use postulated for the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (!); for another, Mark represents it as given in secret and on the Mount of

[1] *The Origins of the New Testament*, 1950, p. 289.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 313–314.
[3] Op. cit., p. 313.
[4] Op. cit., p. 53.

Olives, just as the Apocalypse of Peter places it in this setting after the resurrection. 'We have equal ground for believing that the artificial introduction to the Book of Acts contains the rudiments of a similar discourse with the scene set exactly as in the Apocalypse of Peter. Thus *our hypotheses are not groundless imaginations; they are inductions as solid as the matter permits of.*'[1] Did this last assertion proceed from an uneasy conscience? Be that as it may, we must take leave of Loisy until we deal with the Apocalypse of Peter, save to add one observation: despite the late date assigned to Chapter 13, Loisy is still convinced that it contains a Jewish apocalypse, dating probably from the time of Caligula.[2] Evidently it is believed that the 'abomination' prophecy demands an historical event for its occasion; if, on such a view, we can point to an event in the lifetime of Jesus that will equally account for the 'abomination' prophecy, the nucleus of these sayings must logically be put back still further. This possibility will later be explored.

In Wellhausen, Loisy found an help meet for him. Wellhausen's fundamental view of Jesus, that he was a teacher, claiming to be neither Messiah, nor Son of Man, who gave no instructions as to his coming death, nor dreamt of his resurrection and second coming, naturally affected his view of Mk. 13. He could no more assent to the authenticity of this chapter than Schweitzer, although their views had no other point of contact. At least Wellhausen is willing to provide two reasons for his views, and his manner of stating them is worth noting. First, if 1–2 are authentic, as they are in essence, then 3–37 are not, for in the former the temple is destroyed, in the latter it is merely desecrated.[3] This desecration, however, is only temporary and partial. 'In the Jewish prophecy taken over, Jerusalem is oppressed most severely, but is rescued finally "out of this tribulation" at the appearance of the Son of Man; there is no mention of the destruction of the temple, and the meaning will be as in a 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.*'[4] As in the case of some of the exegesis we have earlier met with, we grudge no admiration at such ingenuity, but it remains difficult to understand why it was thought relevant. The interpreting of Mk. 13. 14 by means of Rev. 11. 1–2 would not have been dreamed of were it not

[1] Op. cit., pp. 298–299. [2] Op. cit., p. 97.
[3] *Das Evangelium Marci*, 1909, p. 100.
[4] *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*, p. 97.

that the former is regarded as belonging to a Jewish apocalypse; their situations are totally different. The second count against Mk. 13 from Wellhausen is that 'it sets forth the scheme of Jewish eschatology built on Daniel'.[1] But a significant limitation is set to this likeness to Jewish apocalypses: 'The form of address with "You" is not Jewish; by this the "beholding" is changed into teaching and stripped of all apocalyptic frippery. For it belongs to the form of real Jewish apocalypses that the *seer* himself, who receives the revelation, is addressed, whether by God or an angel of God, or that he recounts with an "*I*" what he has been permitted to see and hear.'[2] If this be so, why must one assert with Wellhausen, that the greatest part of 13. 3–27 is 'purely Jewish'? Does it not leave open the possibility that the echoes of Daniel, and of the Old Testament generally, in Chapter 13 may have been derived directly and not mediated through Jewish apocalyptic sources? Those who believe that Jesus used the title Son of Man, and that it is not wholly unrelated to Dan. 7. 13, will not be so inclined to scout that possibility as Wellhausen did.

The Little Apocalypse receives an extension from Wellhausen to include 7–8, 12, 14–22, 24–27. The intermediate verses 5–6, 13, 23, are 'Christian', but naturally not from Jesus, for they all presume the messianic status of Jesus; though 9–11 are not closely defined, the same presumably applies to them, certainly it will to 10. What of the prologue and epilogue of the discourse? 1–2 contain at least authentic *ingredients*; the prophecy was not spoken to disciples alone, 'that appears to me to be a toning down of the saying'; the real occasion and prophecy is given in Mk. 14. 58, which brought the condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrin: 'With the prophecy of the destruction of the temple, he placed the knife in the hands of his enemies.'[3] That means that the entire setting of 13. 1–4 is a fiction of the Evangelist. 28–29 are due to a misunderstanding; the tree of 28 is that of 11. 11–14 (the cursed fig tree), of which Jesus simply said that that withered tree will not, as the Jews think, revive again, but will always remain dry, i.e. the hope of a reconstituted Zion in its old splendour will never be fulfilled. In 11. 18 Jesus thus rejects the Jewish hope, in 13. 28 he is made to take it over, while v. 29 has changed the meaning entirely.[4] 30 attaches to 28, being spoken before A.D. 70 with the Jewish hope in mind. 31 refers to the consolation of having Jesus' words, even though he

[1] *Ev. Marci*, p. 100.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Op. cit. p. 99.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 106–107.

has departed. 32 is suspicious in view of its antithetic 'the Father and the Son'. The whole section 32–37 presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem, for the disciples no longer wait for Christ to come there.[1] Thus all that remain to us from Ch. 13 are two sayings poorly handed down (2, 28), one scarcely recognisable (28), both in their wrong context. As to the soundness of the method by which that result was obtained we pass no further comment.

The Jewish scholar C. G. Montefiore follows closely in the steps of Loisy and Wellhausen. He does not give his own views at length, he is frankly not interested in the chapter, for like many liberal Jews he has an aversion to apocalyptic writings; in the main he reproduces Loisy's arguments from *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, interspersed with some from Johannes Weiss that by no means give an accurate reflection of Weiss' position. His mood will be gathered by the following statement: 'This apocalyptic oration is, as a whole, certainly unauthentic. Much of it is built upon the familiar lines of Jewish apocalypses from Daniel onwards. It has very slight interest for us today, and little or no religious value. . . . How much of the oration from 5 to 37 goes back to Jesus is very doubtful. Verse 32 seems most likely to be authentic. As regards the rest, the portions which are of Jewish origin, or of Christian origin, or lastly, which proceeded from the mouth of Jesus, can never be distinguished with certainty. The oldest parts, representing the original Jewish apocalypse, may be 7–8, 14–20 and 24–31. Christian editors, including the Evangelist, will account for what remains. It is even questionable whether any part was said by Jesus of what we now possess.'[2] With reference to the last sentence, it should be noted that in the second edition of the commentary the earlier estimate of v. 32 is modified and doubts are expressed as to its authenticity. Montefiore affirms that as the chapter is of little or no religious value, it is not worth discussing the question of its origin. Nevertheless, he offers one reason for rejecting its genuineness: Loisy is cited with approval that the view-point of the discourse is inconsistent with Jesus' teaching on the suddenness of the coming of the kingdom,[3] and he agrees that it is the strongest argument against its authenticity. Curiously enough, when commenting on 28–29 he opposes Weiss' (earlier) view that a contradiction exists between 29 and Lk. 17. 20, as also between 30 and 32: 'Both points of view', he writes, 'were current in the oldest Church,

[1] Ibid. [2] *The Synoptic Gospels*, 1909, first edition, p. 299.
[3] Op. cit., p. 301.

and perhaps even both were combined side by side in the mind of Jesus. Signs were important, and yet not too important. Too much stress must not be laid on them. In the last resort the precise hour was unknown and unknowable.'[1] How did Montefiore reconcile that statement with his citation of and agreement with Loisy, as mentioned above? Presumably he did not perceive the necessity to do so. Once more we see the spectacle of a scholar demolishing his own case for the Little Apocalypse hypothesis.

James Moffatt gave a very well-documented account of the discussion concerning Mk. 13, at least on the critical side, but he added little on his own account.[2] He declared: 'The details of the reconstructed apocalypse are not quite certain, but its general contour is unmistakable; it parts, as a *whole*, readily from the context and forms *an intelligible unity*, whatever were its original size and aim.'[3] As to the limits of the document, 'If the introductory passage Mk. 13. 5–6 is added, probably Mk. 13. 21–23 should also be incorporated'; that would make the apocalypse to consist of 5–8, 14–27, a very considerable section of the chapter. On that score, we are not surprised that Moffatt feels that the little apocalypse forms 'an intelligible unity'; he has only omitted 9–13 from the body of the chapter! On the other hand, if one keeps to the more orthodox critical view and defines the apocalypse as 7–8, 14–20, 24–27, how can one be so sure that 'it parts readily from its context', when one is not certain of the context of 7–8, nor where 14–20 ends or 24–27 begins? And what if, as is almost certain, 14–20 be not an original unity? It is one thing to assert that certain portions part readily from their context, it is another thing to claim that together they form an original whole. Moffatt may have felt himself justified in making his celebrated statement, 'This hypothesis of the small apocalypse . . . is now a *sententia recepta* of synoptic criticism',[4] but whether he should have made it so confidently is questionable.

5. From B. H. Streeter to R. H. Charles

B. H. Streeter's exposition of the eschatology of the Gospels seems to have oscillated between hostility and sympathy. His two contributions to the Oxford *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 1911, advocate debatable positions, mainly directed against a serious view

[1] Op. cit., p. 306.
[2] *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 1911, third edition, 1918, pp. 207 ff.
[3] Op. cit., p. 207.
[4] Op. cit., p. 209.

of the evangelic material on eschatology. He was responsible for a curious error in respect of Mk. 13; he wrote, 'Mk. 13 dominates the eschatology of the Second Gospel, and through him that of the two later Gospels, which so largely depend on Mark, especially that of Matthew. *It is the citadel of the extreme eschatological school of interpretation*'.[1] This presumably refers to Schweitzer and his sympathisers, but we have noted that such exegetes could not accept Mk. 13 and retain their own views. C. H. Turner perpetuated this mistake in his commentary on Mark.[2] Streeter repeated the older view that the Little Apocalypse is 'a *complete* and *carefully articulated* apocalypse of the conventional type', a view which we have seen reason to question. On this basis, however, he feels that this apocalypse can be interpreted on exactly the same lines as ordinary Jewish apocalypses: it is pseudonymous, like the rest of such writings; it embodies older materials; it reflects a series of recent events, viz. famines, earthquakes, wars, Paul's sufferings and testimony before rulers, the activity of the delators in Rome who betrayed Christians, and above all the fall of Jerusalem which had recently taken place.[3] The conviction that the end of the world was about to occur is said to be the motive for the writing of this apocalypse, to encourage the faithful who have endured such fearful sufferings, lest they be led astray by false Christs at the eleventh hour. 'The lengthy and elaborate character of the apocalypse of Ch. 13 shows the importance assigned to it by the author—naturally, if *the end of the world is coming in a few months*, details on that subject are of surpassing interest.'[4] While Streeter adduces the usual objections to Mk. 13, in an appendix on this matter he makes plain the real basis of his views: he is convinced that there may be discerned within the New Testament a twofold evolution of eschatological thought, proceeding *pari-passu*; the line from Paul to John starts from crude eschatology to its virtual elimination, the line from Q to Matthew travels from vague eschatological conceptions to sheer apocalypticism, and in this process Mark stands half-way. Since 'vagueness and reserve are the characteristic notes of the apocalyptic sayings of Q', Mk. 13 is condemned, with its concrete view of the end of the world coming in a

[1] Op. cit., p. 425.
[2] *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, Part III, p. 102.
[3] Op. cit., pp. 179–181. Streeter follows the example of many earlier exegetes and explains the wars, famines, etc., from contemporary experiences as narrated by the historians of the day.
[4] Op. cit., p. 428.

few months.[1] The same thing, however, applies to Mk. 8. 38, 9. 1, 14. 62, 'the last being particularly unreliable since it comes from a version of the trial circulated by the enemies of Jesus'.[2]

This view was modified in Streeter's essay in *Foundations*, 1912. While still adhering to his belief in the development of eschatology in Q, Mark, Matthew, he admitted, 'The conclusions I was then inclined to draw from it were, I now think, somewhat too sweeping'.[3] He feels that the authenticity of sayings like Mk. 13. 30, Mt. 10. 23, 24. 34 cannot be denied without grave risk of losing the historical character of the Gospels altogether.[4] Mk. 13, nevertheless, is still unauthentic. From this position Streeter did not move, and in his work on the Four Gospels the sympathy with eschatology which showed itself temporarily in *Foundations* disappears. He seems to have been peculiarly susceptible to the views of other writers; we note, for example, the ready way he took up Charles' dubious idea that the Book of Revelation was written in the belief of an impending invasion of the Roman Empire by the Parthians led by Nero redivivus; Streeter thought that the Gospel of Matthew was written with the same fear in mind,[5] a most improbable suggestion. In the case of Mk. 13 he seems to have become aware, since writing his earlier essays, that Bousset had written a book on the Antichrist, and again he takes up that writer's ideas with enthusiasm. He admitted he had been mistaken in thinking that Mk. 13 was written after the fall of Jerusalem, and that the author had written with that event in mind; he now recognises that the abomination of desolation is a personal Antichrist who will sit supreme in the temple of Jerusalem till he is destroyed by the Christ at the parousia.[6] There is no need to date the Little Apocalypse about A.D. 70, for the same doctrine appears in II Thess. 2. 'I would venture the suggestion that it, or something very like it, was known to Paul, and was accepted by him, too, as an authentic utterance of Jesus. That at any rate would explain the teaching about the Man of Sin in II Thess.'[7] The admission is noteworthy. If Paul in the earlier days of his ministry knew the contents of the Little Apocalypse, we are taken back to the primitive period of Christian history; how is it that a *pseudonymous* writing, attributed to Jesus as to some worthy of the distant past, has been able to arise so soon and gain so widespread a circulation? And what of the multitude of

[1] Op. cit., pp. 425–426. [2] Op. cit., pp. 429–530. [3] *Foundations*, p. 112, n. 2.
[4] Op. cit., p. 113. [5] *The Four Gospels*, p. 523.
[6] Op. cit., p. 462. [7] Op. cit., p. 493.

'contemporary events', such as wars, famines, earthquakes, etc., of which the apocalypse is supposed to be the reflection? Streeter seems to have forgotten about them. Yet he still maintains that Mk. 13. 9–13 reflect Paul's persecutions, delators in Rome, etc.[1] If we are to put these ideas together we reach the remarkable conclusion that the pseudonymous author of the Little Apocalypse was a better prophet than Jesus. For his prognostications, according to Streeter's earlier writings, were so impossibly accurate, they must be *vaticinia ex eventu*. On this changed view they were written before the events took place, so they must be regarded as real predictions, although they came true. But the predictions of 9–13, generally ascribed to Jesus, must not be allowed to him *because* they came true! Naturally Streeter did not intend to imply such an absurdity. Nevertheless, this phenomenon is continually met with in our investigation: a writer lays down uncautious views and realises later that some modification is necessary; the change is made, in oblivion that thereby his earlier positions are rendered intolerable. We suspect, however, that when the implications of the reflection of Mk. 13 in II Thess. 2 are realised, the Little Apocalypse theory will encounter heavy seas.

R. H. Charles revised his Jowett lectures on eschatology in 1913, and left all students on the subject in his debt for the resultant work.[2] That the first edition of the book had appeared prior to 1900 probably accounts for his continued adherence to Wendt's view that Mk. 13 contains two separate discourses, the one directed to persecuted disciples, the other to Jews facing the tribulation of Judea. As always, Charles is very emphatic; the representation of the Advent as a sudden, surprising event, and that which views it as preceded by admonitory signs are declared to be 'mutually exclusive'. The two discourses of Mk. 13 badly contrast with each other: 'Whereas faithfulness unto the death of the body is required from the disciples in one source, in the other they are exhorted to pray that the attack on Jerusalem, which is the beginning of the end, may not be in the winter, lest they should suffer bodily discomfort!'[3] A lengthy list of parallels between the Little Apocalypse and the Jewish Apocalypses is provided, together with a few Old Testament passages charitably thrown in, to demonstrate the derivation of the former from the latter. The identification of the

[1] Op. cit., pp. 493–494.
[2] *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, 1st ed., 1899; 2nd ed. 1913.
[3] Op. cit., p. 381.

fall of Jerusalem with the parousia in Mk. 13 is the final proof that the discourse is unauthentic, for 'Christ often prophesies his parousia in connection with his death and resurrection, but the destruction of Jerusalem invariably by itself'.[1] Unfortunately, none of these considerations may be left as they are. We are not quite sure what Charles means by the first point, for later on he states: '*Certain signs were to precede it* (the parousia), such as persecution of the disciples and their condemnation before Jewish and heathen tribunals, 13. 9–13. This persecution, moreover, was conceived as lasting continuously from the founding of the Church to the parousia. The experience of Christ was to be likewise that of his disciples, Mt. 10. 24–25, Jn. 15. 20.'[2] Then how can a 'sudden' coming and one preceded by signs be 'mutually exclusive'? Is it that the signs of persecution extend throughout the Christian dispensation? But the wars, earthquakes, etc., similarly extend through the Christian era. Or does Charles take exception to the specific prediction about the 'abomination' and the flight which follows? That, too, is a groundless objection if the prophecy relates to the fall of Jerusalem, for Charles accepts 13. 1–2 as authentic. It would seem that the real offence is contained in v. 18, where Jesus descends to the apparently trivial concern that the apocalyptic event should not happen in cold weather. Doubtless Jesus would not descend to this level, but no careful reader of Mk. 13. 14–20 imagines he did. 'Pray that it may not happen in the winter': even Bengel realised that something more than temperature was involved here when he defined χειμών as 'winter, or cold and *tempestuous* weather'. It is the heavy rains in view here, that turn the wadis into impassable torrents and make flight from danger difficult, if not impossible.[3] If an exhortation to flight in face of impending slaughter be granted as reasonable, 13. 17 ff. is hardly pandering to comfort. The relation of Mk. 13 to Jewish writings, whether canonical or non-canonical, must be left for the present, as also the relation between the fall of Jerusalem and the parousia, but Charles's statement of the latter cannot go unchallenged. How did this most deeply versed scholar in eschatological thought come to say that Jesus *often* predicted his parousia in connection with his death and resurrection?[4] The greatest difficulty in interpreting our

[1] Op. cit., p. 384. [2] Op. cit., p. 385.

[3] Schlatter translates χειμών as 'the rainy season'. *Das Ev. nach Matthäus*, p. 356.

[4] Charles, of course, was writing on the eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels and was not considering the Fourth Gospel. But since writing the above we can

Lord's eschatology devolves upon the fact that, in the Synoptic reports at least, he never once plainly did this. Lk. 17. 25 comes near to it, but the resurrection is not there mentioned. Mk. 14. 62 is better, but unfortunately it is not unambiguous. On the other hand, if Mt. 23. 38–39 be preserved in true sequence, *we have the desolation of the temple connected with the parousia.* Finally, if we add that Charles in one place defines the Little Apocalypse as 7–8, 14, 17–20, 24–27, 30–31, but when reproducing it for the reader includes 14–20 as a whole,[1] we shall find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that his exposition of Mk. 13 is not the most careful piece of writing he produced in his long years of labour.

In view of the importance attached to Charles's writings, we must not overlook his references to our subject in his commentary on Revelation. Like other commentators on the Book of Revelation, Charles does not fail to be impressed with the parallels to be observed between Mk. 13 and Rev. 6. He sets them out in columns, to show the likenesses more plainly.[2] Two points emerge, first that as Rev. 6. 7 f. makes 'pestilence' to be one of the plagues, and only Luke's version of the discourse contains that item, we see contact with Luke rather than Mark and Matthew; on the other hand, the dénouement apparently combines Mark's and Luke's versions. To Charles this indicates that John knew the original Little Apocalypse and used *it*, rather than the Gospels. But a difficulty is raised by the fifth 'plague' of Rev. 6, for it presumes that *persecutions of the saints were mentioned in the Little Apocalypse*, and in that document there are none! Charles solves the problem thus: 'In this Little Jewish Apocalypse so far as it is preserved in the Gospels there is no reference to the persecution of the faithful. But since in the Psalms, Daniel and late apocalyptic literature this is a constant subject of complaint to God, *it cannot have been wanting in the original form of the Little Apocalypse.*'[3] Can one find a better example of *petitio principii*? Observe the presuppositions of this argument: (i) Charles sees close parallels between portions of Mk. 13, Lk. 21 and Revelation; he assumes on the basis of the Little Apocalypse theory that John would know them *as* the Little Apocalypse rather than embodied in the eschatological discourse, for *if* such an apocalypse

answer our own question. It is plain that he is citing Schwartzkopff, *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, 1895, pp. 160–161, where the same assertion is made in similar language and the same counter-suggestion is given.

[1] Op. cit., pp. 381, 382–383.

[2] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, vol. I, p. 158.

[3] Op. cit., p. 159.

existed John would be sure to know it.[1] (ii) Rev. 6 makes persecutions of the faithful an integral part of the last distress; as the other 'plagues' are taken from the Little Apocalypse, presumably this one will be no exception; then the original Little Apocalypse contained a section on the persecution of the faithful. Such a view implies both that John knew a longer version of the Little Apocalypse than the Evangelists knew, and that the Evangelists or their source cut out the original references to persecution in order to replace them by other references to persecution. A very curious procedure if the Little Apocalypse was taken to be an authentic utterance of Jesus! Why make such a conjecture, when the desired element is already contained in the discourse? And what becomes of the original view of Charles, that the Little Apocalypse was only concerned with political events, and the Christian discourse with suffering disciples? We see here precisely the same phenomenon of contradiction perceptible in Streeter's writings. Admittedly all Charles's difficulties fall away if one supposes that John knew the eschatological discourse as we have it now; but that would provide further evidence that the entire discourse gained wide circulation at an early date, and another of the supposed 'proofs' of the Little Apocalypse disintegrates on examination. It has also to be explained how the Little Apocalypse disappeared so completely from circulation among the Churches, and how on the other hand the eschatological discourse could gain so wide an acceptance at an early date if it was largely unauthentic.

6. From E. Meyer to F. Hauck

The work of a historian on Christian origins is always viewed with interest and respect; that of Edward Meyer has been accorded more than ordinary attention.[2] His specialised training, however, does not find much scope in Mk. 13. It is significant to note, after what we find in Charles, that Meyer should affirm, 'The preliminary signs and the catastrophe are described entirely with the familiar features of Judaism, *drawn from Ezekiel and Daniel as well as the eschatological sections in Isaiah*'.[3] Where Charles, understandably enough, is anxious to bring in his beloved apocalypses, Meyer is content to see the influence of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, this was hardly said to inspire confidence in the Little Apocalypse; perhaps we should have laid emphasis on the term 'entirely', for

[1] Charles makes this last point on p. 159 of his commentary.
[2] *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 1921, vol. I. [3] Op. cit., p. 127.

Meyer thinks that Jesus did not use the Old Testament in this manner. The only other instances of Jesus directly citing the Old Testament, apart from occasions of exposition, are said to be Mk. 4. 12 (=8. 18), 7. 6, 9. 48, 12. 10, 14. 27. The discourse, accordingly, is 'an eschatological tract about the coming world-judgment and the question as to the point of time of the parousia', and since this question of the time of the Advent, particularly its delay, was characteristic of the interests of the early community, 'it is quite clear that this whole proclamation has nothing to do with the historic Jesus, but is a product of the first generation of the Christian community, whose fortunes are prophesied'.[1] That means, of course, that not only the Little Apocalypse is of alien origin, but the section concerning the disciples in the rest of the chapter is unauthentic. To Meyer that position is inevitable, since we have insufficient data on which to base the true teaching of Jesus. 'That Jesus, like all Old Testament prophets, also spoke of the future, of the impending overthrow of earthly things and of the setting up of the kingdom of God, no one will doubt; but how he thought of that can no longer be known; it is completely overgrown by the development of Christian views. . . . What Mark offers us in Ch. 13 is the tradition which formed itself in the narrow circle of the leaders of the primitive community, and is laid in the mouth of their Messiah on the ground of the expectations which they had fastened on him.'[2] The date is determined by such considerations as absence of mention of the conflict with Rome in the sixties, and of the struggle with the empire as reflected in the Revelation; while the heathen mission is quite unimportant in this group. 'This circle is still ruled wholly by Jewish ideas; Judaism and Jerusalem with its Christian community stand in the middle point dominating all. Here the composition must have arisen, probably in the fifties, or at the latest about the time of the persecution in which James the Lord's brother fell as an offering.'[3] It is of value to be told by this eminent historian that, unlike many theologians, he cannot trace the situation of the Roman Christians in Mk. 13, and that the situation presupposed is that of the Palestinian Church. But what of this denial of the authenticity of the chapter *in toto*? It raises the question whether Jesus anticipated an interval between his death and Second Coming; if he did, the denial that he could have made provision for his disciples in that period is unreasonable, and unlike what we would have expected of him who spent so much time

[1] Op. cit., pp. 126, 129. [2] Op. cit., p. 129. [3] Op. cit., p. 130.

in training the Apostles for their ministry. To that issue we shall return later. We are not convinced that there are no means for discovering what our Lord really taught about his Advent; the sources for the teaching of Jesus are not wholly unreliable, and in the end it may be found that we are more at fault than the documents that instruct us.

Following on E. Meyer, and basing himself on his conclusions, A. Piganiol gave careful consideration to the date of the Little Apocalypse.[1] Meyer's date, in the fifties or at the time of the death of James in 62, is taken to be the *terminus ad quem*. 'The *terminus a quo* is furnished by the beginning of the persecution of the Jews against the Christians', i.e. the end of Tiberius's reign, the persecution reaching its climax in the death of Stephen. The real clue to the point of time at which the apocalyptist stood is the past tense used in Mk. 13. 19–20: 'If the Lord *had not shortened* the days no flesh would have been saved, but for the sake of the elect whom he chose he *did shorten* them.' Clearly then, at the moment of writing, this event had already happened. The time can only be that of Caligula's threat to erect his statue in the temple. It will be recalled that when the order was first made known, the Roman commander Petronius was persuaded by the Jews to write to Caligula in the attempt to dissuade him from his purpose. 'It is precisely during this crisis that the redactor of the synoptic apocalypse held his pen. 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," 13. 18). . . . When the anguish was at its height, the magnanimous decision of Petronius "shortened the days".' According to Schurer, this took place in November A.D. 40.[2] Nevertheless, the jubilation of the Jews was short-lived; Caligula repented of his decision and two months later announced his intention of making a voyage to Syria. The Jews were in dread. Caligula sent an order to Petronius to kill himself. Fortunately for Petronius, Caligula was murdered, and the news of the emperor's murder reached him before the fateful message. Piganiol agrees with Spitta that II Thessalonians may well have been composed in this period of anxiety: 'We believe that the apocalyptic passage (in II Thess.) is contemporaneous with the discourse of the parousia (Mk. 13), and that it

[1] 'Observations sur la date de l'apocalypse synoptique', *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, 1924.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 247–248.

was written in the midst of Jewish Christians among whom Paul then found himself.' The apocalypse of Mk. 13 was *written* (*ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω*) by a Jewish Christian and presented as a prophecy of Christ, in the conviction that the first act of the drama was finished and the rest was speedily to come. 'It should be considered as the most ancient document of Christianity; it shows us the spirit of the Jewish Christians less than ten years after the death of Christ.'[1]

This interpretation of Piganiol's, attractive though it be, has certain serious defects: (i) it assumes that to issue a document in the light of events for which it is relevant means that it must be composed by the aid of those events; this is unnecessary, and is the vitiating assumption of a good deal of present-day form criticism. (ii) It assumes that it was natural for a Christian in Palestine in the year A.D. 40–41 to compose a writing in the name of the historic Jesus, in distinction from a revelation of the Risen Lord, and equally natural that such a document would gain widespread currency in the presence of the apostles. The former supposition is highly questionable, and the latter, since the document claims to be addressed to the four leading apostles, asks too much. (iii) It assumes that every element in this prediction reflects events that have happened, for the phenomenon of prediction is inadmissible. This all too commonly accepted canon of criticism is rigorously applied by Piganiol: verses 7–8 are said to relate to the war between the Arabian Aretas and Herod Antipas, the strained relations between Parthia and Rome, Caligula's expedition to Germany in A.D. 40 and his intended visit to Syria in 41; Luke's replacement of *ἀκοὰς πολέμων* 'rumours of wars', by *ἀκαταστασίας* 'disorders', reflects the troubles following Nero's death. As an example of the false prophets, mentioned in 13. 22, Bar-Jesus is cited, who withstood Paul (Acts 13. 6). And so the process continues. This method surely is erroneous; it overlooks the precedents of Old Testament prophecy, the influence of which was never stronger than in the first century of our era; and it forgets the existence of 'prophets' in the New Testament community (Eph. 4. 11), the greatest example of whom was our Lord himself. If these three assumptions of Piganiol are called in question, the force of his conclusions is dissipated, in so far as they are intended to prove that the apocalypse of Mk. 13 was *created* by the circumstances of A.D. 40–41.

The question of the relation of the evangelic material to the

[1] Ibid.

circumstances of the primitive community was given special attention by A. E. J. Rawlinson, both throughout his commentary on Mark, and specifically as it applied to the problems of our chapter. To him the entire gospel is both 'a record of the story of Jesus . . . and a message addressed to the contemporary Church'. His aim as an expositor was therefore twofold: (i) to show the significance of a saying or event in the setting of our Lord's life; (ii) to show the significance of this material to the Christians of Rome for whom the gospel was written.[1] As to Mk. 13, Rawlinson cites Luke's words, 'Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which were coming on the earth' (21. 26), as a description of the period in which Mark wrote. 'It is intelligible that in such terrible circumstances the Church clung to and cherished the tradition of the Saviour's apocalyptic words.'[2] The substance of Mk. 13 is a message for the contemporary Church, introduced in the form of instruction given privately to a group of disciples, so conforming to the common pattern of apocalypses as well as to the other 'esoteric' passages in Mk. 4. 10 ff., 8. 17 ff. 'Though this may hold good as regards the *arrangement, setting and adaptation* of the discourse in its present form, it does not follow that its *contents* may not represent substantially our Lord's own general outlook upon the future, or that it does not contain a good number of sayings which are authentically his.'[3] Apart from these 'authentic' sayings (e.g. on persecution, 13. 9–13), Rawlinson is generous in his estimate of the extent to which the discourse represents 'substantially our Lord's general outlook upon the future', for the general drift of the discourse is evidently regarded as correct: 'It is probable that, looking upon future in terms of prophetic symbolism, his mind passed beyond the immediate to the ultimate future, in such fashion that the coming doom of Jerusalem was thrown (as Bishop Gore expresses it)"upon the background of the final and universal judgment".'[4] The representation of the parousia in v. 26 is also believed to be authentic. Rawlinson's objection to the discourse appears to be that instead of indicating generally the nature of this age and the climax to which it is heading, it purports to provide a map of the future; that cannot be reconciled with the professed ignorance of Jesus in 13. 32, the unexpectedness of the end assumed in 13. 35–37, and our Lord's refusal to provide signs when demanded, 8. 11–12. 'It is not surprising that the hypothesis first

[1] 'St. Mark', *Westminster Commentaries*, 1925, p. xviii.
[2] Op. cit., p. 178. [3] Op. cit., p. 179. [4] Op. cit., p. 180.

suggested by Colani in 1864, viz. that a sort of independent apocalypse of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin has been combined in this chapter with genuine sayings of our Lord, has found wide acceptance among critics even of a generally conservative type. The passages which it is reasonable to assign to such a document are three, viz. vv. 7–8, 14–20, 24–27. . . . Assuming that these three passages really did at one time form parts of a separate document, which has come to be wholly or partly incorporated in the Gospels, it is more probable that the document in question was of Jewish-Christian than of purely Jewish origin (as Colani supposed).'[1] Rawlinson thinks that the advice in 13. 14, 'Let the reader understand', cannot be taken as evidence of a written apocalypse, but is a remark added either by Mark or the original apocalyptist.[2] 13. 30–32 may be authentic, but if so they were probably spoken on more than one occasion.

We have reproduced Rawlinson's views because they are typical of most English commentators. Probably he numbers himself among the 'critics of a generally conservative type', as compared with scholars like Wellhausen, Loisy, Bultmann. He believes the drift of Mk. 13 is correct, that Jesus prophesied the fall of Jerusalem, the persecution of his disciples, the dénouement at the Advent, on the background of which the disaster of Jerusalem is set. What, then, has he to do with Colani? It would seem that to the Bishop, as to most, Colani is but a name attached to a theory, but his works he has not read. Colani did not believe in the Little Apocalypse theory in the form apparently imputed to him by Rawlinson, and he certainly did not regard 13. 3–31 as composed by a Jew; that section was rejected fundamentally on the ground that it represents Jewish-Christian eschatology, which differed from the beliefs both of Jesus and of the Jews. Most of the grounds on which Colani based his theory were explicitly repudiated by Rawlinson; the chief exception is the feeling that Mk. 13 presents us with a map of the future, and that we believe to be a misconception. One element of the discourse on which Colani did not dwell is rejected by Rawlinson, the view of Antichrist in 13. 14 ff. Jewish apocalyptic tradition is said to have viewed Antichrist either as a God-opposing tyrant (as in Revelation) or a seductive agency, the incarnation of Beliar (as in II Thess.). 'It is probable that the roots of the conception are to be found ultimately in the (originally Babylonian) legend of the battle of God with a dragon-like

[1] Op. cit., p. 181. [2] Op. cit., p. 188.

monster, of which traces are to be found in various parts of the Old Testament.'[1] We have yet to discuss the significance of the 'abomination of desolation' in 13. 14, but we must not be misled by premature reflections on the origins of eschatological conceptions. If it be true that the Antichrist of Jewish apocalyptic is adumbrated in the Babylonian goddess Tiamat, it is equally true that the Messiah who destroys her is adumbrated in the god Marduk. On what basis do we preserve the concept of Messiah and reject that of Antichrist, if it be merely a question of origins? The myth of the destruction of Tiamat by Marduk, as all know, was told to account for the creation of the universe by Marduk. Do we reject the idea of the creation of the universe by the mediation of Christ because it is adumbrated in this myth? Zimmern paralleled *every* element of Christology in Babylonian mythology, from the Virgin Birth to redemption by death and resurrection and the final victory at the parousia. On the basis of the attitude adopted by Rawlinson in this *one* matter only, he rejected the *whole* Christological scheme as mythological.[2] Admittedly, the relation between Biblical eschatology and the mythologies of the nations with which Israel came into contact is no easy matter to settle, but it will not do to take one isolated element and deal with it in this fashion. It goes to the roots of our Faith, and it demands a treatment commensurate with the problems involved. When it is dealt with on that scale, it may be that Oesterley's contention will be justified, that the myths of Oriental religions are part and parcel of yearnings native to the human heart and as such integral elements of 'natural' religion, or general revelation.[3] Meanwhile, we note that Rawlinson's belief in the irreconcilability of an Advent preceded by signs with one that is sudden is an insufficient basis on which to construct a Jewish-Christian apocalypse in Mk. 13.

The interest of B. S. Easton's exposition of the eschatological discourse[4] centres on his conviction that Luke's version of the discourse is independent in the main of Mark's. Lk. 21. 5–9 he regards as coming from Luke's special source (L) with some Marcan insertions.[5] 21. 10–36 is also mainly independent: 'Verse 11 differs so much from Mark that "contacts" and "common omissions" are illegitimate terms; in fact, from this point down to v. 29, Luke

[1] Op. cit., p. 187.
[2] *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, Schräder-Zimmern, 1903, 370–396.
[3] *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, 1909, pp. 216–219.
[4] *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 1926. [5] Op. cit., p. xxiv.

agrees with Mark only in occasional sentences.'[1] Easton describes Lk. 21. 20–24 as 'the form Mark's "Little Apocalypse" took in southern Palestine'.[2] The date of Luke's version is determined by the consideration that the Gospel as a whole was written *c.* A.D. 55–65, 'when the "rich" were enjoying undisturbed power, rather than a time when the visitation of the Roman conquest had fallen on them';[3] 21. 12–19 is placed earlier, however, since it is 'a prediction of persecution in the Palestinian community, with a promise of preservation from the death sentence; through the aid of the Son of Man the disciples would always emerge victorious in their struggles with the Jewish courts. This is an accurate reflection of conditions in Palestine *c.* A.D. 50; there were many persecutions (I Thess. 2. 24 f.), but practically no martyrdoms'.[4] On this basis Luke's version is earlier than Mark's, for Easton thought that Mk. 13 was bound up with the Fall of Jerusalem.[5] Our views on the validity of this method of treating a Gospel document purporting to give predictions have already been expressed in our discussion of Piganiol's work. But Easton's view of the independence of Lk. 21 is of first importance.

Vincent Taylor's study of Luke appeared in the same year as Easton's commentary.[6] His position was remarkably similar to that of Easton. He differed from the latter in regarding Lk. 21. 5–11 as derived from Mark's discourse, but 21. 12–19, 20–36 are believed to be non-Markan passages containing Markan 'insertions' in vv. 16 f., 21a, 23a, 26b–27, 29–33. It is unnecessary to summarise the discussion by which this result is reached, but Dr. Taylor's comments on these 'Markan insertions' into Lk. 21. 20–36 are noteworthy. They are said to be 'no patchwork or mosaic, but a well-articulated whole'.[7] The passages in Mark from which they are taken, 13. 19–20, 22–23, 27, 32–33 'constitute a compact body of thought which gives definite tone and meaning to the Markan discourse. Unlike the four passages which St. Luke has undoubtedly taken over, these passages are not fringes and cuttings; *they are of the very pattern of the Markan fabric; they make it what it is*'.[8] This is interesting, for Dr. Taylor presumably accepted at this time the usual analysis of the Little Apocalypse, 7–8, 14–20, 24–27.[9] If vv.

[1] Op. cit., p. 310. [2] Op. cit., p. 311. [3] Op. cit., p. xxviii. [4] Op. cit., p. 311.

[5] *Christ in the Gospels*, 1930, p. 4: 'The phenomena of Chapter 13 tie us up to a time close to the Fall of Jerusalem; this is almost universally acknowledged.'

[6] *Behind the Third Gospel, A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*, 1926.

[7] Op. cit., p. 113. [8] Op. cit., p. 116.

[9] So in his book *The Gospels, A Short Introduction*, 1930; in the fourth edition this is stated on p. 57.

19–20, 22–23, 27, 32–33 constitute 'a compact body of thought', what are the grounds for omitting 22–23, 32–33 from the Little Apocalypse when 19–20, 27 are included? Alternatively, what are the grounds for assigning 19–20, 27 to that source, when they are of a piece with 32–33, which no writer has ever assigned to the Little Apocalypse, nor indeed could well do? We are far from denying the contention of Dr. Taylor, that Luke's version is independent of Mark and that the omissions by Luke are of the same stamp, but we fail to see how one can maintain this hypothesis and that of the Little Apocalypse at the same time. Later we shall see that this distinguished scholar has since repented of both views, in that he rejects the Little Apocalypse theory and assigns the one 'compact group' of sayings to *three* different groups.

The sole reason adduced by F. Hauck for his adherence to the Little Apocalypse theory is that the discourse gives partly objective prophecy (in the third person, hence the ἐκλεκτοί of 20, 22, 27) and partly exhortation to disciples (in the second person).[1] He believes the 'apocalyptic groundwork' to be 7–8, 12, (13b?), 14–22, 24–27. In contrast to Rawlinson's view he writes: 'It is to be admitted that the apocalyptic basis, despite its strongly Jewish colouring, maintains the spirit of Jesus in its reserve in depicting the future, its lack of Jewish world-sovereignty ideas and all feeling of hatred and revenge. The tendency of Ch. 13, despite all tension of thought as to the great hope of the End, is directed more to holding back extravagant views as to the near expectation of the End.'[2] Other interesting contributions of Hauck on the understanding of Mk. 13 will be considered later.

7. From R. Bultmann to G. Hölscher

In considering the views of Rudolf Bultmann, readers will no doubt be more interested to learn what he accepts rather than what he rejects; for Bultmann to receive a Synoptic saying as authentic is something of an event. Alas, the event does not occur in this chapter. Without any reason being offered, it is laid down that Mk. 13. 7 f., 12, 14–22, 24–27 are 'apocalyptic words which formed a connection even before they were worked up by Mark, who preserved them essentially intact'.[3] 5 f., 9–11, 13a, 23 are Christian additions, connecting the Little Apocalypse with the person of

[1] 'Das Evangelium des Markus', *Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 1931, p. 153.
[2] Op. cit., p. 154.
[3] *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 2nd ed., 1931, p. 129.

Jesus and introducing 'predictions' concerning historic events and the mission and persecution of the Church. This satisfactorily deals with 5–27. As to the parable of the Fig Tree, Bultmann is not sure: at one point he seems to think v. 28 is possibly authentic, and 29 a mistaken application;[1] at another he expresses doubt concerning both verses—28 f. could very well derive from Jewish tradition.[2] 30 may be a variant of 9. 1, but it is also possible that it originally formed the conclusion of the Jewish apocalypse (with 32?). 31 is a Christian formation. 32 is perhaps a Jewish saying, apart from the Christian conclusion; with 30 it could have formed the end of the Jewish apocalypse.[3] 33–37 are to be compared with Mt. 15. 1–13, Mk. 9. 1, etc., as Christian compositions that express the Christian view of the person of Jesus.[4] Returning to the beginning of the discourse, 1–2a is a scene composed for the prophecy 2b, its form therefore is determined by the wording of 2b.[5] As to 2b, Bultmann cannot make up his mind whether to accept it or not. At one time he writes: 'With regard to the prophecy of the destruction of the temple, 13. 2, there exists at least the possibility that it was first put in the mouth of Jesus by the community.'[6] Later, in kinder mood, he states: 'The temple saying (in the wording of Mk. 13. 2?) may *perhaps* be considered as a word of Jesus, *even if with reserve*.'[7] 13. 3 is placed alongside 4. 11, etc., as a secondary question of disciples, composed to give life and interest to apophthegmata.[8] Thus every verse of Mk. 13, with the *possible* exception of 2b, is judged to be unauthentic. The same treatment is accorded to the great majority of the other 'prophetic and apocalyptic words'. What is the ground for this attitude? Partly it is due to Bultmann's sceptical attitude towards the evangelic traditions generally. Nevertheless, a motive is supplied in his book *Jesus*, where he affirms that Jesus repudiated all apocalypticism. 'It should be noted that he neither depicts the punishments of hell nor paints elaborate pictures of the heavenly glory. The oracular and esoteric note is completely lacking in the few prophecies of the future which can be ascribed to him with any probability. In fact, he absolutely repudiates all representations of the kingdom which human imagination can create when he says, "When they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven" (Mk. 12. 25). In other words, men are forbidden to make any picture of the

[1] Op. cit., p. 187. [2] Op. cit., pp. 132–133. [3] Op. cit., p. 130.
[4] Op. cit., p. 134. [5] Op. cit., p. 36. [6] Op. cit., p. 132.
[7] Op. cit., pp. 135–136. [8] Op. cit., p. 71.

future life. Jesus thus rejects the whole content of apocalyptic speculation, as he rejects also the calculation of the time and the watching for signs.'[1] It is easy to assert that Jesus rejects all apocalyptic speculation, but it is an ambiguous statement. If by 'apocalyptic speculation' is denoted an imaginative description of the varied departments of heaven and hell and their respective inhabitants, then Jesus certainly dissociated himself from it. But can we rightly affirm that the significance of Mk. 12. 25 is the forbidding to make any picture of the future life? What of the symbol of the Messianic feast, used more than once by Jesus (Mt. 8. 11, Mk. 14. 25)? More important, the burden of Jewish apocalypses was the passing of this transient age of imperfection and the coming of the new age of eternal glories; that fundamental conviction Jesus shared, and he based his message on it. This coincidence of belief is not surprising, for it was the hope of revealed religion as given in the books of the Old Covenant. The supreme difference between Jesus and his predecessors lies in his connection of the new age with his own person and activity: in his person and ministry the kingdom was present, in his parousia it would be consummated. Bultmann's edifice in reality is founded on one consideration: Jesus warned against all calculations—Luke 17. 20–21.[2] The great question therefore is: May we rightly describe Mk. 13 as 'calculation'? We hope to show that it is impermissible to view it as such.

Maurice Goguel struck out in a new way in his exposition of the thought of Mk. 13.[3] He admitted that while the view of the parousia in Lk. 17. 20 ff., instantaneous as a flash of lightning, differed from that in Mk. 13, 'this fact, taken by itself, would not force us to regard the Synoptic Apocalypse as non-authentic'; the thought of Jesus may have oscillated on this matter. Similarly, the 'artificial character' of the connection between 13. 1–2 and the discourse proper does not prove the latter unauthentic, for the link may be editorial.[4] For Goguel the decisive consideration lies in the date of Luke's version: Lk. 21. 24 can have been written only between A.D. 66–70, i.e. from the outbreak of the Jewish revolt to the beginning of the siege, while it was still possible for people inside the city to depart; and *Luke's version of the discourse is primitive.* The primacy of Luke's version is demonstrated by the following points: (i) the entire setting of the events of the last week in Jeru-

[1] *Jesus and the Word,* 1935, p. 39, from the German of 1926.
[2] Op. cit., p. 40.
[3] *The Life of Jesus,* 1933, 425 ff.; from the French of 1932.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 425–426.

salem is better in Luke than in Mark: the story of the barren fig tree in Mark is a transformation of an aetiological myth, as Schwartz has shown, so that the division of days by means of it is wrong; Lk. 21. 37 shows that Jesus spent more than one week in Jerusalem. (ii) Luke's version of the discourse is purely Jewish, Mark has altered it to gain a more general significance (cf. the mention of 'all flesh' in Mk. 13. 20). (iii) Luke has not the motive, so obvious in Mark, of quietening the impatience of believers, yearning for the parousia; this motive characterises a late period. (iv) The 'abomination of desolation' has nothing to do with the events of A.D. 40, for that crisis was temporary; in Mark it is simply a traditional apocalyptic idea and has no definite reference. 'Thus the earliest form of the Synoptic Apocalypse is found in Luke, and this form dates from the period which preceded the siege of Jerusalem.'[1] Mark's version appeared in a time when it was realised that the fall of Jerusalem was not the sign which preceded the parousia. Matthew presumably used a copy worked over by Mark. There is nothing specifically Christian in the apocalypse, probably it is of Jewish origin.

Goguel is not alone in championing the priority of Luke. Neander had done it a century earlier and others have followed suit since, but we can scarcely be satisfied with the manner of his establishing the point nor with the conclusions he draws from it. The employment of Schwartz's reconstruction of the fig tree narrative in Mk. 11. 12 ff. and the parable in Mk. 13. 28 f. is unfortunate; in our estimate the theory is fantastic.[2] It is quite true that Luke's version is 'purely Jewish', but is there a more Jewish phrase than 'all flesh' in Mk. 13. 20? It is a Semitism and is as applicable to Palestine as to the universe; the context must decide its meaning. If it be true that Mark's version has a subsidiary aim to quieten excessive apocalyptic ardour, does that of necessity prove a late date? Goguel cites Mk. 13. 32, omitted by Luke, to prove that it does, but most critics think that Luke's omission of Mk. 13. 32 shows that *his* version is later than Mark's, being actuated by dogmatic motives. In short, we cannot admit that Goguel has proved his case. That Luke's version was prior to Mark's cannot be established on the basis of the composition of Mark after A.D. 70. The question of priority rests solely upon what is considered to

[1] Op. cit., pp. 427–428.

[2] See the article 'Der Verfluchte Feigenbaum', in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1904.

have been the original form of the 'abomination' saying. As it happens, neither version demands a late date and neither is impossible on the lips of Jesus. Once again we see an exegete rejecting as insufficient all the usual reasons for proving the Little Apocalypse theory, and adducing another which, nevertheless, appears improbable on examination.

The Old Testament scholar G. Hölscher took a hand in the debate and produced an article, now widely quoted.[1] Goguel had commented on the apparent change of attitude on Jesus' part towards the temple, in that Jesus one day cleansed the temple and shortly after prophesied its destruction: in the former case he had attempted reform, in the latter he despaired of it.[2] Hölscher began at this point and affirmed that this change of attitude showed the prophecy of destruction to be unauthentic; it played no part in the trial before the Sanhedrin (Mk. 14. 55–64), the account of which is legendary; Mk. 13. 1–2 is a *vaticinium ex eventu*.[3] Verses 3–4 are composed to link the public declaration of 1–2 to the discourse 5 ff.: 'The fiction of secret instruction . . . corresponds to the apocalyptic style.' 13. 14 shows that the text rests on a literary basis. The composite nature of the discourse is revealed in its mixture of 'traditional material of Old Testament-apocalyptic eschatology' with references to 'the concrete fortunes of the later Christian community'; that means, of course, that the entire discourse is spurious. Hölscher makes this plain in his subsequent exposition. The Little Apocalypse is 7–8, 12; 14–20; 24–27. Other material is 'Christian formation', e.g. 21–23 refer to the many prophets mentioned by Josephus as arising in the years A.D. 44–66; 'all that follows v. 27 is "rubble" (Geröll), composed by Mark as the conclusion of the discourse.[4] Any specifically Christian element is lacking in the discourse. The whole derives from Daniel.' Like others, Hölscher divides the Little Apocalypse into three scenes, but after the example of Jewish apocalypses he relates them to the three tenses: the first scene, 7–8, lies in the immediate past; the second scene, 14–20, represents the immediate present, for the Danielic prophecy of the 'abomination' is about to be fulfilled—the vagueness of the language is due to the danger of the times ('one lays one's finger to the mouth and speaks only in gentle allusions'); the third scene, 24–27, lies in the immediate future. The situation in which one has to speak so discreetly is betrayed by 13. 14; one epoch alone in the

[1] 'Der Ursprung der Apocalypse Mark 13', *Theologische Blätter*, July 1933.
[2] *Life of Jesus*, pp. 402–403. [3] Op. cit., p. 193. [4] Op. cit., p. 197.

first century A.D. suits such language, that of A.D. 40. In Daniel the 'abomination of desolation' is a word play on the name Jupiter Olympios, whose statue Antiochus erected in the temple; the reference is manifestly similar in Mk. 13, the 'abomination' is the statue of Caligula that everyone anticipated was about to be placed in the temple. This is the situation presumed in II Thess. 2, where the Emperor 'sits in the temple of God', naturally *in figura*; the prophecy is fully explained by the Little Apocalypse, 'with perhaps certain Christian additions like 13. 21 f., 32–37'.[1] The date of the Markan Apocalypse is thereby demonstrated to be between the winter of 39/40 and that of 40/41, more exactly between Spring and Autumn, Mk. 13. 18 (!).

It is apparent that many elements in this exposition depend on perilously subjective criteria. If Hölscher believes that 1–2 is a prophecy after the event, and the account of the trial before the Sanhedrin fictitious, we can but express our disagreement. The idea that the prediction of the ruin of the temple contradicts the attitude of Jesus when he cleansed it is very questionable. The view that passages like 9–13, 21–23 are based on the experiences of the Church, is also unnecessary; Jesus knew that his disciples could not expect better treatment from the Jews than he himself had received, and he could have warned them of what lay ahead. Apart from dogmatic differences, however, Hölscher seems to have been inconsistent in three respects: (i) While he regards 13. 14 as proof that the Little Apocalypse was originally a written document, he also states that the offending clause could be a 'marginal gloss'.[2] If the latter statement be true, the former is not; one cannot have it both ways. (ii) It is a very subtle use of language to distinguish between an 'immediate present' which relates to the setting up of the abomination in a very short time, and an 'immediate future' which relates to the time after; most people would describe the former as well as the latter as 'immediate future'. The only motive for making such a distinction is the *a priori* view that as the extracted Little Apocalypse may be divided into three, and many Jewish apocalypses may be divided into past, present and future sections, this one must also reveal the same structure of thought. This is the Procrustean method in a new guise. (iii) It will not have escaped the reader's attention that II Thess. 2, on Hölscher's view, needs as its presupposition the Little Apocalypse 'with perhaps certain Christian additions like 13. 21 f., 32–37'. This learned exegete

[1] Op. cit., pp. 199–200. [2] Cf. op. cit., pp. 195, 197.

seems to have forgotten that he had earlier stated that 13. 21–23 reflects events of the years 44–66; we usually date the Thessalonian letters in the year A.D. 50! Still worse, he appears to have overlooked that 13. 28–37 were described as 'rubble', added by *Mark* to round off the discourse, who *ex hypothesi* wrote *after* A.D. 70. Apart from these instances of forgetfulness, it surely is not without significance for the whole theory we are discussing that Paul is believed to have known, before the year A.D. 50, the Little Apocalypse, not in its presumed raw condition but with at least 'certain Christian additions like 13. 21–23, 33–37'. Hölscher has already lumped together 28–37; there is therefore no reasonable objection to Paul's knowing the Little Apocalypse plus 21–23, 28–37. That leaves only 1–6, 9–13. As 6 is closely parallel to 21–23, there is no reason to deny that to the 'Christian additions'. We know that Hölscher refuses the authenticity of 1–2, but in this he has almost all Christendom against him; the only ground he can adduce for Paul's not knowing it is that Paul did not mention it in II Thess. 2, which is slender proof indeed. We differ from him as to 9–13, though 12 is included in the Little Apocalypse, and must be allowed to regard these verses as possible to Jesus. 3–5 will go with any early version of the discourse. If, therefore, Hölscher's view be accepted that II Thess. 2 presumes the existence of the Little Apocalypse plus Christian additions, we can see no valid reason for denying the probability that Paul knew the discourse of Mk. 13 substantially as we now have it.

8. Recent Interpretations

The remaining expositions of the Little Apocalypse can in the main be dismissed briefly. The one significant consideration adduced by T. F. Glasson, not thus far dealt with, is the belief that strong influence of the Septuagint can be traced in Mk. 13, especially in vv. 24–27.[1] V. H. Stanton raised the same matter, and its importance demands a careful examination of the text of Mk. 13 and of the LXX parallels; that will be undertaken later. H. A. Guy accepts the usual analysis of Mk. 13, but he admits that the incorporated apocalypse has been thoroughly subordinated to the Christian view; all is related to the Christian message and is used as a genuine prophecy in contrast to the work of the 'false prophets', of whom the reader is warned, 13. 22. 'The whole concludes with a prophetic exhortation to watch, 13. 37—a genuine instance of

[1] *The Second Advent*, 1945, pp. 185–187.

παράκλησις, found also in Paul (I Thess. 5. 6) at the conclusion of a somewhat similar passage.'[1] It is difficult to reconcile Guy's adherence to the Little Apocalypse theory when he follows C. H. Dodd in adducing 13. 14–19 along with Lk. 17. 31, 34 f., 37, as examples of sayings apparently containing an eschatological reference, which nevertheless 'were originally intended to relate to the coming political and religious disaster'.[2] By classing Mk. 13. 14–19 with extracts from the Q apocalypse, Guy undoubtedly gives the impression that they are authentic sayings of Jesus; are we to presume, then, that the Little Apocalypse was composed from authentic sayings of Jesus mistakenly applied? It would seem unlikely that this writer has intended this inference.

B. T. D. Smith,[3] G. S. Duncan,[4] S. H. Hooke[5] and R. Heard[6] all regard Mk. 13 as combining genuine sayings of Jesus with unauthentic material, but they all adhere to the confusing habit of referring to the *entire* discourse of Mk. 13 as 'the Little Apocalypse'. It is desirable that this term be retained for its traditional designation of a group of sayings within Mk. 13 regarded as of independent origin, seeing that the vast majority of New Testament critics have stamped it as a *terminus technicus* in this restricted sense.

Of the critics just named, the most interesting treatment of Mk. 13 is that of R. Heard, whose exposition takes us back to the theme of our first chapter. The prime consideration that Heard would have us bear in mind is the non-fulfilment of the parousia promise: 'It must either be accepted that Jesus is rightly recorded in the Synoptic Gospels as having taught of his early return in glory and the accompanying judgment—*and that he was mistaken*, or it must be shown that his teaching was from the earliest days misinterpreted and transformed.' Heard adopts the latter alternative.[7] The error dates from the resurrection: 'When one misunderstanding—that the Messiah would not die—had been removed, it was replaced by another, that his departure was only for a short while, and that the establishment of the kingdom was to be on lines expected by the apocalyptists.'[8] In proof of this thesis Acts 1. 7 is adduced, with the consideration that the interpretation of the kingdom as present is uncommon in the epistles generally. Two influences

[1] *New Testament Prophecy*, 1947, pp. 108–109.
[2] *The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things'*, 1948, pp. 60–61.
[3] *The Gospel according to S. Matthew*, 1927, pp. 182 ff.
[4] *Jesus, Son of Man*, 1947, p. 179.
[5] *The Kingdom of God in the Experience of Jesus*, 1949, p. 62.
[6] *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 1950, p. 249.
[7] Op. cit., p. 247.
[8] Op. cit., p. 250.

combined to encourage the primitive error, the study of the Old Testament and the rise of Christian prophecy. With the former influence account must be taken of the apocalyptic writings, which exercised a widespread influence in still further adapting Christian teaching on the End to current Jewish conceptions. The latter influence was of great service, but 'it was peculiarly fitted to spread in the Church a confusion of ideas about the coming of the end', owing to the freedom of utterance granted to the prophets and their recognised authority. Mark 13 itself represents 'an adulteration of Jesus' teaching far beyond that which might be expected of Peter'; presumably we are to see the influence of the prophets in this passage. Heard suggests that 13. 14–20 (and the rest of the Little Apocalypse?) is a development of the authentic prophecy of the doom of Jerusalem, amplified in the light of Old Testament prophecy and first-century experience.[1] After dealing thus with Mk. 13, pronouncing Mt. 10. 23 and Mk. 14. 62 as unauthentic and interpreting Mk. 9. 1 of the coming of the Spirit, it is said, 'The apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus, *if such a view of the Gospel evidence is accepted*, is reduced to small proportions.'[2] Naturally! If such a treatment of the Gospel evidence were meted out generally, the teaching of Jesus on any subject would be reduced to 'small proportions'.

Among other criticisms that might be made we draw attention to the following: (i) Such a text as Acts 1. 7 cannot prove that the disciples *invented* the belief in the early coming of the kingdom; it merely shows they cherished it still after the resurrection. The mention of their hopes concerning Israel shows that they had not grasped our Lord's teaching concerning the Church and the nations, but it should be observed that our knowledge of the teaching of Jesus that militates against their view is due to their preservation of it. This is sound testimony to the faithfulness of the disciples in preserving words of the Lord which they did not really understand and with which they had not come to terms. (ii) If 'realised eschatology' is not in the Pauline and Johannine writings, it is nowhere in the New Testament. Of this C. H. Dodd has surely written sufficiently. (iii) The sole proof that Jewish apocalypses were read avidly by early Christians is the Epistle of Jude, one of the latest books of the New Testament. As we know that the Old Testament was authoritative for the Church, the burden of proof that the same applied to Enoch, etc., rests on those who assert it.

[1] Op. cit., pp. 56, 253. [2] Op. cit., p. 249.

(iv) The rejection of all elements in New Testament eschatology derived from the Old Testament cannot be squared with our Lord's attitude to the Old Testament, notably with Mt. 5. 17. (v) The early Church knew the inspiration of the Spirit in fuller measure than most generations since; the proof of that is its production of the New Testament, which was possible in no subsequent generation. It is conceivable that the gift of inspired utterance, in the name of that same Holy Spirit, was the means of the greatest distortion of the teaching of Jesus that ever took place; but there will be a large number of dissentient voices to that proposition.

(In addition to the above writers, the following may further be named as adhering to the Little Apocalypse theory: T. Keim, *History of Jesus of Nazara*, 1881, vol. 5, pp. 225 ff.; S. Davidson, *The Doctrine of Last Things contained in the New Testament*, 1882, pp. 16 ff.; A. Jacobsen, *Untersuchungen über die synoptische Evangelien*, 1883, pp. 57, 75 ff.; E. Vischer, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1886, pp. 5 ff.; A. Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1901, pp. 232 ff.; P. W. Schmiedel, article 'The Gospels', *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1901, vol. 2, cols. 1857, 1887 f.; D. H. F. von Soden, *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*, 1905, pp. 71 ff.; L. A. Muirhead, *The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testaments*, 1908, pp. 124 ff.; A. S. Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, 1909, p. 120; P. Wernle, *The Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus*, E.T. 1907, pp. 106 ff.; V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, 1909, pp. 115 f.; E. von Dobschutz, *The Eschatology of the Gospels*, 1910, pp. 88 ff.; C. W. Emmet, *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, 1911, pp. 57 f.; C. W. Emmet and L. Dougall, *The Lord of Thought*, 1922, pp. 289 f.; E. W. Winstanley, *Jesus and the Future*, 1913, pp. 205 ff.; J. Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 4th ed., 1913, pp. 224 f., 334 ff.; A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1915, pp. 343 ff.; P. A. Micklem, 'St. Matthew', *Westminster Commentaries*, 1917, pp. 288 ff.; W. Manson, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, 1918, pp. 65, 167 (doubtful); *The Gospel of Luke*, 1930, p. 235; W. H. Cadman, *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, 1923, pp. 98 f.; A. F. von Gall, *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ*, 1926, pp. 476 f.; W. Lowrie, *Jesus according to St. Mark*, 1929, pp. 465 ff.; J. Newton Davies, 'Mark', *The Abingdon Commentary*, 1929, pp. 1014 f.; A. W. F. Blunt, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1929, pp. 72, 235 ff.; J. M. Creed,

The Gospel according to St. Luke, 1930, p. 252.; H. K. Luce, 'The Gospel according to S. Luke', *Cambridge Greek Testament*, 1933, pp. 319 ff.; G. Guignebert, *Jesus*, E.T. 1935, pp. 343, 389 ff.; M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, 1936, pp. 119 ff.; *Jesus*, E.T. 1949, pp. 71 ff.; J. Héring, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue*, 1937, pp. 91 f.; F. B. Clogg, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 1937, pp. 206 ff.; P. Gardner-Smith, *The Christ and the Gospels*, 1938, pp. 175 ff.; W. F. Howard, *Christianity according to St. John*, 1943, p. 78; F. C. Grant, *The Earliest Gospel*, 1943, pp. 62 ff.; A. M. Hunter, 'The Gospel according to Saint Mark', *Torch Bible Commentaries*, 1948, pp. 122 ff.; S. H. Hooke, *The Kingdom of God in the Experience of Jesus*, 1949, pp. 62 f., 131 f.; E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 4th ed. 1950, pp. 131 ff.)

CHAPTER 3

OTHER THEORIES CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF MARK 13

DESPITE the ready and widespread adoption of the Little Apocalypse theory from the time of its inception, there has been a steadily increasing number of New Testament critics from the close of the nineteenth century onwards who, while not able to accept the genuineness of the eschatological discourse, have either declined the popular alternative or seriously modified it. Amongst this group are to be found scholars with the widest range of theological thought and critical attitudes to the Bible. Some of the views proceed from highly individual beliefs about New Testament origins, but most are products of wrestling with difficulties raised by the Little Apocalypse theory, and from these we shall learn much.

1. FROM A. MEYER TO J. KLAUSNER

Arnold Meyer, pioneer in Aramaic origins, must be classed with the former group. He thought that the compilation of the New Testament was a very lengthy process, in which the Gospels underwent drastic modifications. 'At the turn of the first century we have to suppose a living movement, a fresh, carefree handling of the transmitted material, which was stamped in ever-new coinage according to the necessities of the time and passed on from hand to hand. . . . Such a time was not minded to distinguish too anxiously between the logia of the Lord walking on earth and of the exalted Lord.'[1] In his view, the term *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* 'Son of Man' did not penetrate the gospel tradition until after A.D. 170. That was the time when every man 'translated as well as he could', to use Papias' words, the Aramaic Gospel, and that was the time when 'Greek-speaking Christians . . . edified themselves with prophecies "from the Lord" like Mt. 24 and compared them with Daniel'.[2] Since the latter reference to Daniel is held to explain the abomination passage, and as the estimate of Jesus as the heavenly Son of Man arose together with it at this time, there is no question of an

[1] *Jesu Muttersprache*, 1896, pp. 70–71. [2] Op. cit., p. 100.

old apocalypse being adopted in Mk. 13; the whole structure will be due to a late compilation of materials drawn from various sources. In comparison with this view the Little Apocalypse theory was rather conservative.

The attitude of Réville to eschatology has been mentioned in the first chapter.[1] It will be recalled that he believed it was impossible for Jesus to have adopted eschatological views without denying his entire teaching. The parousia instruction is said to have arisen through disciples linking the progress of the kingdom with the activity of Christ: 'When it became axiomatic for his followers that he was the messiah of God, the triumph of his cause became thereby inseparable from that of his person. . . . The one could be taken, and was taken, for the other.'[2] This identification of the triumph of Christ with that of the kingdom is said to have led to the introduction of apocalyptic categories into the teaching of Jesus (why it should have done so is not made clear), and that brought about a modification in the basis of our Lord's conceptions. 'It is impossible to make the separation of that which is authentic from that which is not in these apocalypses of the synoptics. It is only certain that the arrangement, the course, the systematisation of these predictions do not belong to Jesus himself and cannot pretend to the same authenticity as his truly original and personal teachings.'[3] This, of course, applies equally to the 'Q Apocalypse' of Lk. 17. 20 ff. as to Mk. 13 and every other saying wherein the messianic relation of Jesus to the kingdom appears.

Oscar Holtzmann believed that Jesus agreed with a good deal of contemporary eschatological thought. Consequently, 'In its essential features . . . this discourse of Jesus (Mk. 13. 6–37) may be thoroughly genuine, even though in certain parts it has been very much recast.'[4] The 'recasting' spoken of by Holtzmann concerns vv. 10, 14–18. The former passage cannot be reconciled with the assumptions of Mt. 10. 23, nor with the behaviour of the apostles in the first seventeen years of the Church's existence; the latter is too precise to fit the idea of a tribulation during the last days. 'If, however, we excise the verses mentioned, as being additions from another hand, all the rest of the discourse would fit in very well with the point of time at which Mk. 13. 3–5 represents it to have been spoken.'[5]

[1] pp. 26 f. [2] *Jésus de Nazareth*, 1897, vol. II, p. 322. [3] Op. cit., p. 325.
[4] *The Life of Jesus*, 1904, from the German of 1901, p. 456.
[5] Op. cit., p. 457.

The division of opinion as to Mk. 13. 10 seems to be unrelated to the question of a Little Apocalypse, and the attitude of critics to its authenticity is in no way determined by their views of the larger issue. 13. 14–20 has certainly provided the biggest stumbling-block of the discourse for many, and is usually regarded as the heart of the Little Apocalypse. David Smith at first found that section, or rather 13. 14–19, impossible to accept,[1] but he retracted this view when he came to write *The Disciple's Commentary on the Gospels*.[2] To H. D. A. Major the Little Apocalypse *is* 13. 14–20. His objections to Mk. 13 solely concern this passage.[3] 13. 5–13 are assigned to the earliest stage of Christian history, 24–27 are formed to answer the question as to when Jesus may be expected back again.[4] E. J. Goodspeed adopts a similar position, save that he accepts the authenticity of the situation of Mk. 13 and of the whole chapter apart from 9–13, 14–20.[5] 9–13 are held to reflect the experiences of the early believers, 14–20 relate to the circumstances of the Jewish war of A.D. 66–70. As Goodspeed, like Major, also refers to 'the probable presence of a little apocalypse in ch. 13',[6] we must presume again that vv. 14–20 represent that apocalypse. In view of the great likelihood that Mk. 13. 15–16 are authentic sayings of Jesus (Lk. 17. 31), 'little' is an appropriate description of the apocalypse that remains! It is impossible to retain the term for such a fragment.

The Syriac scholar A. Merx will be remembered as one who objected to attributing anything savouring of 'fanaticism' to Jesus.[7] By 'fanaticism' he meant the expectation of a future world-sovereignty of the Jews. Far from holding such a hope, Jesus taught the disciples to anticipate wars, persecutions, world-wide preaching of the Gospel, and above all the destruction of Jerusalem. To the announcement of this destruction vv. 14 ff. as truly belong as 1–2; the former passage is clearly Christian: 'The Jews *sought* the place (Jerusalem) as a protecting bulwark, the Christians should *forsake* it, that was Jesus' previsionary direction.'[8] Merx placed v. 14 in a wholly new light by his demonstration that all the Syriac authorities

[1] *The Days of His Flesh*, 1905, 8th ed., 1910, p. xxxi.
[2] Published 1928, p. 387.
[3] 'The Gospel according to St. Mark', in *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 1937, pp. 158–160.
[4] Op. cit., p. 160.
[5] *A Life of Jesus*, 1950, pp. 186–189.
[6] Op. cit., p. 15.
[7] pp. 27 f.
[8] *Das Evangelium Matthaeus nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, 1902, p. 355.

for the text presume the reading *ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου—ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω—τότε κτλ*, 'whenever you see the sign of the abomination which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, let the reader understand, then . . .' Merx himself believed the original reading to be shorter, viz. *ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν*, 'Whenever you see the sign of the abomination, then let those in Judea flee.' The discussion of this text must be left till later, but it will be seen that if the defining term *ἐρημώσεως* be not original, the *βδέλυγμα* may be viewed in a less rigid way than is customary. Hence Merx felt fully justified in retaining the 'offending' passage. The limits of authenticity in the chapter, so far as he is concerned, are not explicitly declared, but one gathers from the exposition that he accepted 1–22 and refused 24–27, with 28 f. if the parable relates to the Second Coming. In connection with Merx's view as to the acceptability of 13. 14 ff., we may notice that of H. J. Schoeps; in his important work on Jewish Christianity he maintains the view that Mk. 14. 58, 15. 29, Acts 6. 13, and presumably Mk. 13. 2 are all falsely reproduced; the *primitive* form of the logion is Mt. 24. 15(=Mk. 13. 14). He regards the 'preserved command of Jesus', Mt. 24. 15–28, Mk. 13. 14–23, to be the basis of the oracular command referred to by Eusebius and so authentic.[1] Evidently, we have not heard the last of Mk. 13. 14!

It may occasion some surprise that the noted Roman Catholic scholar Père M. J. Lagrange falls to be considered here, but honesty makes it impossible to include him among the defenders of the integrity of Mk. 13, honesty on his part, doubtless, as well as on ours. Lagrange wrote a lengthy article on the thought of Mk. 13[2] in which he compared the structure of the discourse with that of Old Testament prophecies. 'With them we recognise that the thought follows a kind of rhythm. One stanza is opposed to another stanza, then a third stanza takes up again the thought of the first, while the fourth attaches itself to the second.'[3] In our discourse that parallelism is seen to perfection; read in such a manner it yields two parallel discourses, one dealing with the ruin of the temple, 6–18, 28–31, the other with the coming of the Son of Man, 19–27, 32–37. The discourses may be said to follow the same theme, as may be seen in the following table:

[1] *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, 1949, pp. 264–265, 444.
[2] 'L'Avènement du Fils de l'Homme' *Revue Biblique*, 1906.
[3] Op. cit. pp. 391–392.

Discourse on the Ruin of the Temple		*Discourse on the Coming of the Son of Man*
1.	The time of distress	
6–8		19–20
2.	How disciples are to behave	
9–13		21–23
3.	The catastrophe	
14–18		24–27
4.	The parables	
28–31		32–37

Nobody will maintain that Jesus gave such a discourse in one breath; the arrangement is due to the Evangelist, as in the case of the Sermon on the Mount. It is important, nevertheless, to note that the premonitory signs in the world and in the Church are wholly concerned with the fall of Jerusalem, the parousia comes without warning.[1] What of the authenticity of these discourses? The agreement between the three Synoptists as to the first discourse is so perfect, and it conforms so well to the theme indicated, that 'there is no room for doubting its authenticity'.[2] Not so the second. Lagrange had already pointed out that if 24–27, with 19–20, were read separately they would be regarded as a Jewish apocalypse; they are merely a conglomeration of citations.[3] He now adds that these sections at least do not belong to the new and original teaching which Jesus opposed to the old tradition. It resembles the Assumption of Moses rather than the Sermon on the Mount; 'from the purely critical point of view it is very doubtful that Jesus pronounced this apocalypse.' On the other hand, it is to be admitted that Jesus did speak of his coming and the last judgment somewhat in this manner, it therefore remains possible that Mark 'blocked' the varied sayings.[4] The main point that Lagrange is concerned about, however, is not so much the authenticity of these verses as to show that the two discourses are quite separate; in that case Jesus did not set his coming within the contemporary generation, 28–31 refer to the discourse on the ruin of Jerusalem.

One admires the ingenuity of this scheme and the expertness with which it is advocated. The motive, of course, is the commendable one of saving Jesus from predicting an early return, and Lagrange went as far with the critics as a Roman Catholic scholar could. The great obstacle in the way of accepting this interpretation

[1] Op. cit., pp. 402–403.
[2] Op. cit., p. 408.
[3] Op. cit., p. 388.
[4] Op. cit., p. 409.

is the difficulty of making the parable of the fig tree, 28–30, refer to the fall of Jerusalem, the more so in that Luke provides as subject for Mark's ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις, *the kingdom of God* (Lk. 21. 31). Lagrange is compelled to interpret Luke's language of the era after A.D. 70: 'What is a chastisement for "this people", and what opens a new period for the nations, is for the disciples a deliverance and even the *reign of God*.' The same interpretation is placed upon Lk. 21. 36: the 'redemption' that is nigh is the new era of emancipation from the Jewish tyranny.[1] This is surely desperate exegesis and does not square with the candour elsewhere shown by Lagrange. If the alleged 'parallelism' breaks down in the last and most significant member of the series, it is doubtful if it ever existed. Nevertheless, the same lines of exposition here outlined are followed in Lagrange's commentaries on the Gospels.[2] We may note, finally, that the objection of extreme brevity already brought against the Little Apocalypse viewed as 13. 14–20 applies equally to the view that it consisted of 19–20, 24–27, the more so because of the doubtful procedure of separating 19–20 from 14, 17–18.

The Jewish scholar Joseph Klausner as a young man interested himself in the eschatological ideas of his forebears and wrote a doctoral thesis on the subject.[3] As a Jew and an expert in apocalyptic, it would be expected that his views on the eschatology of Jesus would have peculiar value; on examining them, however, one confesses to a sense of disappointment. Klausner regards Mk. 13. 1–8 as authentic; of 7–8 he writes, 'The description is very like that of the "pangs of the Messiah" in various Talmudic Baraitas.'[4] He asserts in regard to 9–27: 'The majority of scholars incline to the opinion that these nineteen verses are an apocalyptic document not earlier than the Destruction of the Temple; this apocalyptic character is plainly shown by the words, "Let him that readeth understand." ' The connection of this document with the period of the fall of Jerusalem is inferred from the 'descriptions' of persecutions

[1] Op. cit., pp. 406–407.

[2] In Lagrange's commentary on Mark (*Évangile selon Saint Marc*, 1911) the 'unauthenticity' of 13. 24 ff. is stated with admirable tact. The difference of language used by the three Synoptists enables him to say, 'We do not know exactly the precise terms Jesus used. If it is quite evident that the prophetic discourse has been written by Luke in a special way and with understanding of the events that have happened, Mark has been able on his side to adopt traditional terms, useful for describing great catastrophes, for expressing the thought of Jesus.' This statement, it will be noted, carefully side-steps the question whether the 'citations' of 24–27 once formed a separate Jewish apocalypse.

[3] *Die messianischen Vorstellungen des judischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten*, 1904.

[4] *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1925, p. 322.

suffered by the disciples and in particular to the reference to the flight of the Christians of Jerusalem to Pella. In addition it is mentioned that the section contains many details derived from the Old Testament, and apocryphal writings, relating to the 'pangs of the Messiah', similar to those in the Baraitas; and there are traces of primitive Judaistic Christianity, e.g. Matthew's addition concerning Sabbath observation (24. 20). 'It was impossible in Jesus' mouth; Jesus only foresaw the "pangs of the Messiah" without which there could be no "Days of the Messiah", and he saw the kingdom of heaven "nigh, even at the doors". . . . The disciples must therefore prepare themselves to meet the great day, the day of redemption, which was to come, as the Talmud also declares, "without the knowledge of men" (Sanh. 97a).'[1] The force of this argument is not apparent. We will overlook the curious statement that most scholars regard 9–27 as an apocalyptic document; there had not been, to our knowledge, a scholar prior to him who had separated 7–8 as authentic and 9–27 as a solid block of apocalyptic and unauthentic teaching.[2] But how does contact with the description of Messianic birth-pangs in the Baraitas illustrate the *authenticity* of 7–8 and demonstrate the *unauthenticity* of 9–27? We suspect the calling up of Jewish parallels is not always with the best of motives; in the case of v. 32, as of the ethical teaching of Jesus generally, it is to prove that Jesus was not ahead of some of his fellow-Jews in his apparently original statements; in the case of 7–8, which Klausner must have known are unwelcome to many critics, it brings Jesus down to ordinary Jewish levels; in the case of 9–27 it shows that his followers were in the same state. The remark about the Sabbath is said to have proceeded from Jewish-Christians and not Jesus; yet Klausner distinctly states elsewhere that Jesus 'observed the Sabbath and washing of hands—it was against his disciples that complaints were made on these scores',[3] i.e. Jesus was more particular about the Sabbath than his disciples were. In his chapter on 'The Jewishness of Jesus', Klausner accepts all the elements of Streeter's document M as genuine, passages which many critics are inclined to attribute to these same 'Jewish-Christians' whom, for this one occasion only, Klausner invokes. If we separate 9–13 from 14–27, as most critics do, the

[1] Ibid.

[2] The closest parallel we have found to Klausner's view is that of S. J. Case, whose biography of Jesus appeared five years after the original Hebrew edition of Klausner's book.

[3] *Jesus of Nazareth*, 1925, p. 363.

presumed authenticity of 7–8, and of the parousia hope, will have repercussions distinctly in favour of the reliability of 14–27.

2. From B. W. Bacon to R. H. Lightfoot

Few men have paid such close attention to Mk. 13 as B. W. Bacon. The care with which he treated the passage merits a full exposition of his method of analysis. At the outset it is necessary to remember that Bacon's interest in Mk. 13 lies not in its eschatological teaching, but solely in its utility as a means for dating the Gospel of Mark, hence it is discussed by him in a book devoted to the consideration of the composition and date of this gospel.[1] We may mention in passing that this aspect of Mk. 13 causes every book written on the documents of the New Testament to reckon with the chapter; it seems to be the one passage in the gospel offering a clue to its date. The problem is immediately raised as to how one is to use the data of this chapter in such a connection. The answer depends on one's theological presuppositions. If there is room within one's *Weltanschauung* for predictive prophecy, then Mk. 13 yields no clues at all, for the fulfilment in history of certain of its statements, say 9–13 relating to the fortunes of the disciples, gives no indication as to when those predictions were made. If that kind of phenomenon appears to one unreasonable, then the occurrence of events mentioned in such a chapter as this provides a *terminus a quo* for its composition. This is Bacon's position, and he states it most strongly. 'If the foreknowledge of Jesus and the exactitude of the record are placed sufficiently high, no amount of evidence in the record of acquaintance with known events will prove a subsequent date, for no room at all is left for alteration by adjustment to the event. But such dogmatic assumptions are no longer permissible. Either the ordinary rules for predictive utterance and transmission must be followed, as in other documents; or it must be frankly admitted that dates for the gospel record are not established by critical methods, but are assumed without verification.'[2] As an illustration of the amount of prescience Bacon will allow, or not allow, to Jesus, we may cite his treatment of Mk. 10. 35 ff., the prophecy of the fortunes of James and John. Bacon states his view thus: 'Let us not deny the abstract possibility that Jesus might have foreseen this martyr fate of the two brothers. . . . The critic must measure relative probabilities. The real question is whether if we found the narrative in any other uncanonical writing,

[1] *The Gospel of Mark: its Composition and Date*, 1925. [2] Op. cit., p. 69.

we should not say at once: "Here is plain evidence that the writer knew of the martyrdom of James in 42 and probably that of John also." The inference may perhaps be avoided if we make special rules for canonical writings not applicable to others. But the cost is too high. If we claim exemption from the ordinary rules of criticism, we must consent to renounce critical authority for whatever date we finally assume.'[1] The lucidity of the statement is commendable, but for most Christians it is unacceptable. To them, and the writer numbers himself with them, the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is not a piece of outworn theological lumber, but a phenomenon to be reckoned with. Link that inspiration with the incarnate Son of God and the situation is even more serious. We do not claim that Jesus possessed omniscience in the days of his flesh, but we refuse to set so narrow a limit to the revelation of God in him as Bacon demands. We therefore willingly affirm that if the *only* means of dating the Gospels is by declaring every prediction a *vaticinium ex eventu*, then no means of dating them exists. This may be felt to be a prejudiced way of commencing a review of Bacon's exposition of the growth of Mk. 13, but from our point of view we are compelled to protest that this learned scholar has set out with an attitude that vitiates his whole method: if every prophecy is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, then the only task necessary for the investigator of the eschatological discourse is to date its various sections; and that is precisely what Bacon is concerned to do.

In fairness to our author, we must admit that he does devote a few lines to the character of Mk. 13. In his view, its unauthenticity is obvious by its blatant use of signs of the End; it is precisely the kind of horoscope against which Jesus warned his disciples, a 'Lo here, Lo there' prophecy. Speaking of v. 14 in particular he asserts: 'If we were asked to name a passage which, by its contradiction of authentic utterances, as well as by its manifest inferiority to the moral plane of the Master, might be set down as the least worthy of acceptance within the limits of Synoptic tradition, it might well be the section which includes this verse as its climax.'[2] This is strong language, but it is mystifying, for if it means what it appears to mean, the reference is to the section leading up to 13. 14. Does the reader agree that 9–13 is wholly unworthy of Jesus? Or 3–8? Or 1–2? We imagine that not even Bacon's sympathisers will agree with him in this estimate of the material he deals with.

[1] Op. cit., p. 71. [2] Op. cit., p. 62.

The crux of his argument lies in his view of v. 14. It is impossible, so far as he is concerned, to deny that this statement is coloured by the events of A.D. 40; to do so would involve a literary miracle (i.e. a relatively true prediction), yet it would make Jesus responsible for an unfulfilled prophecy, since the temple was destroyed before the 'profanation' took place. This argument is circular, for it presumes that a profanation of the kind threatened in A.D. 40 was originally meant, that therefore the prophecy emerged out of that kind of a situation, and fault is found with the oracle because that profanation did *not* happen! It is not contemplated that something different may have been intended when the prophecy was spoken. Nevertheless, Bacon takes his stand with Torrey, that the oracle of v. 14 emerged from the crisis of A.D. 40.[1] A witness of this is seen in II Thess. 2. 1–4, which Paul cites as an independent oracle, adding on his own account the exposition which follows.[2] It is to be observed that Paul has no reference here to the destruction of Jerusalem; he has never heard of such a prediction coming from Jesus. It belongs to a later stage of development.[3] Paul is solely concerned with the deeds of Antichrist as foreshadowed in the document he cited: 'We may accept this result, Antichrist was born under Caligula in A.D. 40. The earliest appearance of the doctrine is in our present Pauline Little Apocalypse.'[4] The years passed by without the dreaded profanation taking place. The prophecy continued to circulate among the Christian communities. Mark had to do his best with it. His version is manifestly not the original prophecy, but 'an adaptation of the primitive tradition to meet the inconvenient fact that by a second unexpected development (i.e. the burning and subsequent demolition of the temple) it had become forever impossible to experience a literal fulfilment of the expected culmination of the "mystery of iniquity".'[5] This presumes Mark to have written after the desolation of the temple, naturally, for 13. 1–2 prophesies it! As there was no temple in which the man of lawlessness could sit, Mark had to make him do something else. By interpreting the 'profanation' as the destruction of the temple, instead of Antichrist's session within it, Mark was able to link the apocalyptic sayings to the prediction of Jesus as to the temple's ruin.

Mark himself was responsible for drawing up the eschatological

[1] Op. cit., p. 61.
[2] Op. cit., p. 85.
[3] Op. cit., pp. 88–89.
[4] Op. cit., p. 94.
[5] Op. cit., p. 102.

discourse. His method was exactly the same as in his earlier discourses, that of attaching to a dominant saying a series of loosely connected logia on related themes and representing them to have been delivered to the disciples (cf. 4. 10 ff., 7. 17 ff.).[1] The sources used by Mark in the discourse itself are mainly two, Q and the Little Apocalypse. To Q are assigned most of 9–13, 15–16; to the apocalypse belong 3–8, 14, 18–27; 14*c* and 17 are derived from Lk. 23. 29–31(!). The mere statement of this analysis gives no idea of the process by which it is arrived at. In the Q extracts 9*a* and 11 = Lk. 12. 11–12, to which 9*b*–10 were added in the light of the events of the Christian mission; 12–13 = Lk. 12. 51–53, but were misapplied by Mark to the delators; 13*a* is from historic events (cf. I Pt. 5. 9), 13*b* from Dan. 11. 35, 12. 1 (cf. Lk. 12. 7); 15–16 = Lk. 17. 31, but it originally applied to the parousia expectation. If it is remembered that 14*ab* is from the Little Apocalypse, 14*c*, 17 from Lk. 23. 29 ff., the section Mk. 13. 9–17 is a most extraordinary mosaic. And that is how the incorporated apocalypse was put together. It is a conglomerate of Old Testament reminiscences, passages of Paul's own composition and Christian prophecies cited by Paul, themselves often based on the Old Testament. No Old Testament critic ever dissected a passage so minutely as Bacon apportioned out Mk. 13. Some passages are provided with a double derivation, e.g. v. 20 is stated to be a quotation from Enoch, cited in the Epistle of Barnabas, 4. 3; elsewhere it is a reminiscence of Rom. 9. 28, itself due to the influence of Is. 28. 22.[2] The *idea* of 13. 14–23 is said to have been taken from Lk. 12. 54 ff., but how Bacon's distribution of his material between Q and the apocalyptic source squares with that we are not told. The whole scheme condemns itself by its very complexity. Nobody ever wrote an extended discourse in this way, and we cannot imagine Mark piecing together this jig-saw puzzle out of such minute and unrelated fragments. With this judgment Hölscher is in agreement.[3] If we add to these considerations the unlikelihood that Mark made any use of Q, and the false attitude to prophecy lying at the basis of Bacon's work, it will hardly be claimed that this reconstruction, brilliant though it be, lays serious claim to probability. Though he has impressed many with his linking of Mk. 13 with the events of A.D. 40

[1] Op. cit., p. 121.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 131, 122; the reference to Isaiah is presumably to Is. 10. 22–23 rather than 28. 22. The alleged quotation from Enoch has already been met in Weizsäcker's work, the Paulinism is doubtful.

[3] *Theologische Blätter*, July 1933, p. 199.

and those of A.D. 70, Bacon has found none to follow him in his analysis of the chapter.[1]

Robert Eisler makes many references to Mk. 13 in his lengthy book on Jesus and the Baptist, but he nowhere treats of the whole chapter. For him, as for B. W. Bacon, Mk. 13. 14 is the chief clue to its date, but he reverts to patristic interpretation in seeing therein a reference to Pilate's setting up the imperial standards in Jerusalem. The indignation of the Jews at Pilate's action is reflected in the statement of Jerome, evidently based on information from his rabbinic instructors, that Pilate placed in the temple an image of Caesar.[2] Eisler explains that the misunderstanding was due to the fact that small medallions in relief, with portrait-heads of the emperor, were affixed to the soldiers' standards; Pilate had not solemnly erected these medallions in the temple, but simply planted the standards in the ground. It is unlikely that one was placed in the temple itself; the standard concerned would have been that of the unit stationed in the Antonia, but as the Jews regarded the castle as within the sacred precincts of the temple, they would feel that even this measure constituted a profanation.[3] It was on the wave of indignation that swept Palestine that Jesus rose *in the year* A.D. 19. To him this act was the sign of the end, hence his preaching began with the clarion call, 'The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand, repent and believe the good news' (Mk. 1. 15).[4] Eisler is not prepared to say whether the prophecy as we now have it in Mk. 13 goes back to Jesus or whether it was compiled in the similar period of excitement in the days of Caligula. Eisler's view has been neglected, partly because of its position in a book which has not found favour, and partly because of his use of it as a means of putting back the date of the ministry of Jesus. Nevertheless, it illustrates the possibility that the popular application of the Danielic 'abomination' to the Roman power reaches back *twenty years before the Caligula episode*, which alone, in the view of many exegetes, could have occasioned Mk. 13. 14.

[1] H. Branscomb has essentially followed Bacon's procedure in taking the Caligula episode and the fall of Jerusalem to be the root of Mk. 13, though he declines to assign any specific portion of the chapter to an independent apocalypse. 'The Gospel of Mark', *Moffatt New Testament Commentary*, 1937, pp. 231 ff. A. T. Olmstead walks in the same path, except that he places the composition of the discourse between A.D. 66–70 instead of after the fall of Jerusalem: *Jesus in the Light of History*, 1942, pp. 252 ff.

[2] τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως potest . . . accipi . . . de imagine Caesaris, quam Pilatus posuit in templo (on Mt. 24. 15.).

[3] *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, E.T., 1931, pp. 314–315.

[4] Op. cit., p. 313.

Rudolf Otto gave the theological world some penetrating expositions of leading eschatological utterances of Jesus. Unfortunately, he did not provide us with a full exposition of Mk. 13; he merely gave a few hints as to its interpretation. Our starting point must be his opposition to the current interpretation of Lk. 17. 20, which sees its point 'solely in the rejection of calculating omens'. Passing over the detail, we note how he relates it to Mk. 13: 'In regard to the future kingdom, Here and There, i.e. local determinations, did have their place even for Jesus. The future kingdom had a thoroughly external aspect; it was to come with flaming lightning, with the appearance of the Son of Man, his angels, and the heavenly tribunal. . . . And even the parateresis, as attention to the signs which indicated his coming and from which his temporal nearness was to be read, Jesus not only did not reject but expressly summoned men to it by referring to the blossoming of the branches of the fig tree, from which the nearness of summer should be noted (Mk. 13. 28 f.). . . . That is a paratereisthai, i.e. a paying attention to signs of every kind regarding the future kingdom.'[1] Otto stresses the prophetic element in Jesus' teaching. Jesus spoke of the Messianic woes coming on both the world generally and on his followers. He prophesied of wars waged by Rome and of a crisis in the political situation of his own people, as former prophets of Israel had done. 'The gift of prophetic divination known in ancient Israel emerged anew in Christ. Like them (the prophets) he prophesied the Fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple. His prophecy like theirs rested on knowledge of and insight into the politically ominous situation of Jerusalem and a menacing and aggressive world-power, and yet it was not based on considerations of probability, nor did it arise from a rational calculation.'[2] What, then, could Otto possibly have against Mk. 13? One point only, that just as the utterances of Israel's prophets were expanded, so were those of Jesus: 'As with the prophecy of the ancient prophets, so his own prophecy became the instigation and starting point of later additions; later prophecies were put forth under his name as had been the case with theirs.'[3] If that is intended to apply to Mk. 13, as in the context it must, it requires a careful hand to separate within the chapter the authentic from the unauthentic elements, at least, with Otto's presuppositions in mind. He has asserted that

[1] *The Kingdom of God and Son of Man*, E.T., 1938, from the German of 1934, pp. 132–133.
[2] Op. cit. pp. 60, 357–358. [3] Ibid.

Jesus prophesied (i) Jerusalem's fall, (ii) convulsions in the world of men and nations, (iii) trials for believers, (iv) the manifestation of the Son of Man with his angels, (v) the character of i–iii as signs of the end. The only elements within Mk. 13 that cannot come under these categories are the warnings against false prophets and christs, 5–6, 21–23, which Otto would surely have received, and the warnings of the distress in Judea, 14–20, themselves not forming a unity. Had this esteemed critic been pressed, it is not impossible that he would have admitted that 14–20 were particularly in his mind, though he would have been ready enough to assent that 15–16 are unexceptionable, and with his views one fails to see how he could have objected to 19. In any case, Otto's contribution to our understanding of Mk. 13 is valuable and will be recalled when we discuss the theology of the chapter.

In a writer like Hugh Martin we see coming to expression a tendency in recent British writers to view the eschatological discourse as a collection of authentic sayings badly transmitted. He looks on Mk. 13 as 'a collection of kindred sayings, as for example Matthew collects parables together in ch. 13. Attempts to build up chronological sequences of events on the basis of these verses are, therefore, to say the least of it, precarious'.[1]

T. W. Manson gives us a similar view more emphatically expressed. The 'Little Apocalypse' of Mk. 13, he believes, probably circulated before Mark wrote, for the matter contained in it was of vital interest to the churches. 'In compiling such a document the writer would naturally incorporate such sayings of Jesus as he supposed to refer to the coming manifestation of the kingdom in power. Any or all of these sayings might well be genuine utterances of the Lord, but by the way in which they were put together a new total effect would be created, which might be quite different from anything which Jesus meant to say. This, as a matter of fact, is what appears to have happened in Mk. 13.'[2] Manson's chief complaint against the present distribution of sayings in the discourse is that its picture does not square with that given in Q and in Paul; the discourse describes the signs of the end, the other authorities represent it as wholly incalculable, and the two views are irreconcilable. It is noted that 13. 32–37 would form a good answer to the question of v. 4; if that was the original connection, the resultant idea would correspond with that of Q and Paul. This

[1] *The Necessity of the Second Coming*, 1928, p. 40.
[2] *The Teaching of Jesus*, 1931, p. 261.

is, of course, the mode of argument used by Colani when he separated off 5–31 as an interpolated discourse, but unlike Colani, Manson definitely states: 'Mk. 13 is a compilation containing genuine utterances of Jesus, but the way in which the sayings have been arranged is such as to give a wrong impression of his eschatological teaching.' To substantiate the authenticity of the material, parallels are adduced from the other teaching of our Lord to passages of the discourse, notably to Mk. 13. 11 f., 14–20, 27.[1] In practice, however, this position means that the chapter 'cannot safely be used as a starting point in an enquiry concerning what our Lord had to say about the consummation of the kingdom'.[2]

By the time this exegete had written his commentary on the sayings-traditions of the Gospels, his views on Mk. 13 had considerably developed; the simplicity of the above representation was abandoned for one much more complicated.[3] After a careful comparison of Mk. 13 and Lk. 21, it is concluded that the latter represents a separate tradition of the discourse, and is not simply Luke's modification of Mk. 13. If the Little Apocalypse (=Mk. 13. 5–31) was circulated before its incorporation into Mark, it may have influenced the formation of the Lukan material into its present shape: 'This would be the more likely if, as Hölscher maintains, the substance of Mark's Little Apocalypse (7 f., 12, 14–20, 24–27) was composed in A.D. 40 under stress of the threatened profanation of the temple of Caligula.'[4] By considering what sections of the discourse best link together, and on the basis of what is peculiar to Luke, Manson analyses the discourse into three constituents, which in Mark are as follows:

(i) A Jerusalem prediction: 1–4, 14–20.
(ii) Persecution for the disciples: 5–8, 9–13.
(iii) A Prediction of the End: 24–27, 28–31, (32–37?).

It will be observed that on this scheme each of the three sections of the normal 'Little Apocalypse' is assigned to a different source, a drastic modification of that theory! Manson further agrees with the group of critics that considers Luke's version of the abomination passage to be prior to Mark's; it is presumed that Jesus predicted the distress of Jerusalem as in Lk. 21. 20–24, and that that prophecy was modified in the light of the Caligula episode of A.D. 40 so as to include a reference to the expected fulfilment of Daniel's

[1] Op. cit., p. 262. [2] Op. cit., p. 263.
[3] *The Sayings of Jesus*, Book II of *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 1937.
[4] Op. cit., p. 617.

prediction; the result was Mk. 13. 14 ff.[1] On this basis it is reasonable to suppose that the answer of our Lord to the disciple's question as to the time and sign of the temple's ruin is contained in Lk. 21. 20 ff.: 'It will happen when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies.' The threefold analysis of the discourse shows that it is a complexity of predictions concerning the fate of Jerusalem, the disciples, and the end of the world. The purpose of its composition will be found in comparing it with II Thess. 2; the latter utterance explains why the great redemption is delayed; Mk. 13 was issued to answer the questionings of the Palestinian disciples, and its burden is 'Be ready for the coming of the Lord at any time, but don't expect it yet'. Thus the only *new* feature of the discourse is 'not the matter, but the way in which it is put together, *the way in which persecutions of disciples and tribulations in Judea are used to push the final consummation into the future*'.[2]

Dr. Manson has put us in his debt by his exposition, but it is necessary to point out some debatable points in his argument.

(i) As others before him, this theologian has confused the situations in Palestine and Thessalonica: by his reference to the Palestinian Christians who 'had been waiting for the parousia for a matter of twenty years',[3] he gives the impression that the discourse was composed to allay doubts on the score that the parousia *had not* happened yet and they *need* not worry, whereas Paul was writing to show the Thessalonians that the parousia *cannot* happen yet and they *must* not worry! If Manson wishes to equate the two situations, as his language undoubtedly demands, then he must retract his earlier view that Mk. 13 contradicts Paul's eschatology; the two views are now confessed as identical. The question suggests itself: if Paul could expect a sudden parousia, though preceded by signs, are we sure Jesus could not do the same?

(ii) If Manson wishes us to take Hölscher's view seriously, then he himself has given us two different solutions of our problem: on Hölscher's idea, 'The substance of Mk.'s Little Apocalypse (7 f., 12, 14–20, 24–27) was *composed* in A.D. 40 under stress of the threatened profanation of the temple by Caligula.'[4] But Manson's own view rejects this link up of paragraphs and works on the basis that Luke's material was composed before A.D. 40, Mark's being a *modification* of it. Manson plainly states that, in his estimation, not only Mk. 13. 14 ff. and Lk. 21. 20 ff. are here involved, but the

[1] Op. cit., p. 621.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 628–629.
[3] Op. cit., p. 628.
[4] Op. cit., p. 617

whole discourse of Luke existed prior to A.D. 40.[1] We are not merely quibbling with words; on Hölscher's view the Little Apocalypse is *inspired* by the events of A.D. 40, in Manson's view it was *modified* by that event, and the two positions are very different.

(iii) If the version of the eschatological discourse preserved by Luke circulated prior to A.D. 40 and Mark's version immediately after, then we have two sources of the teaching of Jesus considerably earlier than Q. *Both* versions circulated while the apostles still worked in Palestine. We are prompted to ask: (*a*) if the date be so early, is it likely that the disposition of the sayings in the discourse is such as seriously to distort their real meaning? (*b*) if so, why was it given such prominence with the prime authorities on the spot to correct it?

(iv) Manson himself compares Mk. 13. 30 with 9. 1 as having a similar intent; yet the latter presumes a delay of some kind, for only 'some' will see the kingdom. Is not, then, the fundamental presupposition of the discourse possible to Jesus, since he anticipated (*a*) a period elapsing before the coming of the end, (*b*) persecution for his disciples, (*c*) the fall of Jerusalem?

(v) It is argued that Lk. 21. 20–24 is authentic and Mk. 13. 14 ff. secondary. This is questionable on one score alone. Lk. 21. 21*bc* looks very much like a reproduction of the Q saying Lk. 17. 31; in Mark (who probably did not use Q) it is preserved accurately, but in Luke's discourse *it is paraphrased to suit his context better*. That implies that Lk. 21. 20–24, despite its poetic structure, is a sayings group which by no means excludes the possible authenticity of the items in Mk. 13. 14–20 which it omits. While, therefore, we are grateful to Dr. Manson for his positive help, we cannot follow his negative assertions concerning the eschatological discourse.

Probably no writer has influenced contemporary thinking on eschatology, at least in the English-speaking world, so much as C. H. Dodd. It is not easy to gain an overall perspective of the views of this prolific writer in regard to our theme, partly because we suspect that some of his earlier views were put forward tentatively, and partly because, like most thinkers, there is discernible in his writings a certain crystallization of thought in the passage of time. In his determinative book on the eschatology of Jesus, *The Parables of the Kingdom*,[2] it is made plain that the *setting* of the discourse is regarded as unauthentic. Mark's practice, when desiring

[1] Op. cit., p. 629.

[2] First edition 1935, revised 1936; the citations are from the latter edition

to explain an important saying, is to introduce a private interview between Jesus and the disciples to elucidate it, and such is the case with Mk. 13. The saying requiring elucidation is the temple word, the function of the discourse is to reveal its true meaning. 'So far from having threatened to destroy the temple (Mark means), Jesus had predicted that after a long period of tribulation there would be a horrible act of sacrilege in the temple, and then would follow a great tribulation in Judea, and afterwards the final catastrophe in which the whole universe would collapse.'[1] It is thus part of his purpose to show that Jesus was not thinking of a merely historical event, an act which could be plotted; rather he prophesied the end of all things. As to the *content of* the discourse, Dr. Dodd gives three reasons for rejecting it as it stands: (i) it is 'inconsistent with the purport of his teaching as a whole'; (ii) it 'presupposes knowledge of events after his death'; (iii) it has been composed to explain the reason for delay in the Second Coming, just as II Thess. 2 was written with a similar purpose.[2] The first point presumably refers to the idea that Mk. 13 with its relating of signs of the end, is irreconcilable with the picture given us in Q of the suddenness of the end: 'After all the events forecast in Mk. 13. 14–25 it is safe to assume that people will no longer be eating and drinking, marrying and being married! The two accounts are inconsistent, and of the two we must certainly prefer that of Q.'[3] It is also perhaps not unrelated to the view, tentatively proposed, that Jesus conceived the end would come *very soon* after his death; combining Mk. 14. 62, the confession before the High Priest, with the sayings about the resurrection after three days, the interval would be very short indeed. Perhaps Jesus did not distinguish between his resurrection, ascension and parousia, but regarded them as 'three aspects of one idea'. That was probably the view of the primitive Church in its earliest history, and it only subsequently distinguished between the three events when the passage of time forced it so to do. Mk. 13 would fit in with the developed view, but not the primitive one.[4] The second of the three objections particularly applies to Mk. 13. 6–14. In this passage references to historical events of the fifties and early sixties of our era are believed to be present; the turbulent international situation, earthquakes and famines of the period, the persecution of Christians within and without Palestine. The

[1] Op. cit., pp. 61–62.
[2] *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 1936, 2nd ed., 1944, p. 38.
[3] *Parables*, p. 84.
[4] *Parables*, pp. 96–104; *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 33–37.

abomination passage may well be due to the Caligula scare. On the other hand, there are no references to events after A.D. 64—the Neronic persecution and the Roman war in Judea. The predicted sacrilege did not occur and the End did not come at the fall of Jerusalem. 'On the principles followed in dating apocalypses, the inference would be that the 'Little Apocalypse' (=Mk. 13 as a whole) belongs to somewhere about the year 60.'[1] The third objection need detain us little, beyond noting the belief that II Thess. 2 represents an afterthought of which Paul had earlier said nothing to this church: 'It is clearly the result of reflection upon the fact that the advent had been unexpectedly delayed.'[2]

Our views on the three objections raised by Professor Dodd have already been hinted at in earlier discussions, especially in the review of T. W. Manson's work, and need not be repeated. The question of the privacy of the discourse will fall to be considered in the chapter on the theology of Mk. 13. Meanwhile, if this view of the chapter is to be reconciled with what Dr. Dodd writes elsewhere about various elements within it, one presumes he must maintain the same distinction as A. E. J. Rawlinson, i.e. between the purpose to which the material has been subjected and the original intention of the sections viewed in isolation. The passage 14–20, for example, is regarded as more or less authentic; it fits well the idea of an invasion of Judea by Roman armies. 'The injunction, "He who is on the housetop must not come down to take up anything from his house, and he who is in the field must not turn to take up his coat", would admirably suit a supposed situation in which the quick-marching Roman armies are threatening Jerusalem; and the prayer that it might not happen in winter is appropriate to war conditions. In a purely supernatural "apocalyptic" tribulation summer or winter would matter little.'[3] More than this, it is admitted that Jesus may well have viewed and depicted the coming judgment on Jerusalem in similar fashion as the Old Testament prophets, hence that their use of an eschatological setting for such a judgment may have been employed by our Lord.[4] Even with regard to the fate of the disciples, Dr. Dodd elsewhere leaves room for the kind of prediction given us in vv. 9–13, in that he states: 'At the last he (Jesus) went open-eyed to death himself, *predicting further tribulations for his followers after his death.*'[5] In his latest publication both these sentiments are more

[1] *Parables*, p. 52, n. 1. [2] *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 31. [3] *Parables*, pp. 64–65.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 65–66. [5] Op. cit., p. 60.

strongly expressed: 'I cannot resist the evidence that *he saw the destined destruction of the temple at Jerusalem in a quite special relation to his own coming*, since it marked dramatically the close of the old era in religion, to make way for the new. . . . I see no reason to doubt that *Jesus did prepare his disciples for a time of troubles and give them guidance how to meet it.* Consequently he must have contemplated a further period of history after his departure.'[1] This means that the material of Mk. 13. 9–20, in its gist if not in its wording, is not so wide of the mark after all. A similar view is taken of the parousia pericope, vv. 24–27. In these same broadcast talks, Lk. 21. 25, Mk. 13. 24–26 are cited as an instance of prophetic language as to the Day of the Lord used in the New Testament; they are then referred to, apparently as words of Jesus in the following manner: 'As interpreted by Jesus himself, his total career on earth was the crisis in which the long-awaited kingdom of God came upon men. . . . But that is not the whole truth about what Christ taught. There are some mysterious sayings about the coming of the Son of Man which I have passed over too lightly. There are passages where we are told that before he comes there will be a breakdown of the physical universe. I said before that it would be absurd to take literally the language about the darkened sun and falling stars. All the same, we cannot easily dismiss the impression that the final scene is laid where the world of space, time and matter is no longer in the picture.'[2] One cannot resist the conclusion that these admissions mitigate in no small measure some of the earlier statements made by this scholar. At my request Professor Dodd very kindly clarified my understanding of his views in a private communication, in which he stated: 'I do certainly agree with recent critics who reject the idea that Mk. 13 is a Jewish apocalypse taken over with certain Christian additions. *For the most part I do not think it is an apocalypse at all. It is a Mahnrede*[3] *in apocalyptic terms*, and I think highly composite. . . . I should not care to draw the line dogmatically between what belongs to the earlier tradition and what the Evangelist (or his authority) has introduced. That a reference to the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds was contained in the earliest tradition of the sayings of Jesus seems to me certain from Mk. 14. 62. In 13.26 it occurs in a different, and as I think less historical, setting. The apocalyptic colouring given to it in verses 24–25 may have been drawn by the

[1] *The Coming of Christ*, 1951, p. 19.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 4, 16–17.
[3] A hortatory address.

Evangelist himself from Jewish apocalyptic sources, but I do conceive it to be quite possible that Jesus himself did in fact make use of such apocalyptic language: in that case certainly in a symbolic sense. . . .' It has seemed right to incorporate that quotation, for we do not wish to over-state the views held by Dr. Dodd. His final judgment on the matter was that while caution is needful in using the wording of Mk. 13, 'it is an extravagance of criticism to attempt to eliminate the whole of the apocalyptic and eschatological colouring from the primitive tradition of the sayings. . . . It would be as unsafe to leave this kind of material out of account as it would be to press every detail of it.' The caution of this statement is understandable, but it is probably more sympathetic to the general trend of Mk. 13 than some of our distinguished scholar's followers would allow. The conclusion would seem to be from all this that while there is a very considerable amount of authentic material in Mk. 13, the detail is not to be unduly pressed and the setting is suspect.[1]

R. H. Lightfoot is another example of a leading scholar who does not hesitate to modify his views where it appears to be necessary. Evidently the relation of Mk. 13 to the passion narrative is a matter that has long exercised his mind. He points out that the importance of the discourse is intensified if the passion narrative existed before it was taken up by Mark into his gospel, for then the discourse is seen as the climax of all that has gone before. Yet its independence of the passion is instructive: it suggests that 'at the time of the composition of this gospel the church had not yet found it possible to define satisfactorily the relationship between the crucifixion and the expected final consummation'.[2] As evidence of this, it is noted that 'the teaching of Mk. 13. 3–37 has no necessary connection with the facts narrated in the next two chapters. By means perhaps of traditional Jewish material, as well as by reflection on the Church's experience, the teaching set forth in this chapter with regard to what must come to pass before the glory is revealed is already permeated with the thought of suffering. But the climax is still the coming of the Son of Man; and in connection with this, there is no

[1] The above was written before I had seen Prof. Dodd's most recent discussion of the eschatological discourse, 'The Fall of Jerusalem and the "Abomination of Desolation" ' (*Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. XXXVII, 1941). The article is largely devoted to demonstrating the independence of Lk. 21. 20–24, which is believed to be a unity, while Mk. 13. 14–20 is viewed as a composite pericope. The Marcan discourse is described as 'a sequence of warnings, precepts, and predictions, some of which are doublets of passages occurring in other parts of the Gospels, while others readily separate themselves into typical units of tradition' (p. 47). The Little Apocalypse theory is explicitly denied (Ibid).

[2] *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, 1935, p. 94.

note of suffering'.[1] The implications of this statement as to the origins of the material of the discourse will not be overlooked: traditional Jewish material, the Church's experiences, and presumably authentic teaching occur in this chapter.

Dr. Lightfoot's book on Mark, written fifteen years later, has a chapter devoted to a solution of the problem which he had earlier posed.[2] No attempt is made to analyse the sources, they are not even mentioned. The main desire is to discover the significance of the discourse. Its chief characteristic is that it is 'designed by the evangelist as the immediate introduction to the passion narrative'; we are to remember in this story who it is of whom we read. Taking a hint from Hoskyns and Davey, that John enables us to understand Mark better, attention is called to the Johannine doctrine that the exaltation of the Son of Man is his lifting up on the cross, and that at that moment the world is judged and its prince cast out.[3] It is suggested that 'a comparison of certain passages in Mk. 13 with others in Mk. 14 and 15 will reveal an unexpected parallelism . . . between the apocalyptic prophecy and the passion narrative'.[4] A series of such passages is adduced: the term to *deliver up* or hand over is frequent in Ch. 13 of the Church, in Chs. 14–15 of Christ (cf. especially 13. 9 with Jesus before the Sanhedrin and Pilate); 13. 22 f. tell of attempts to make even the elect to *go astray*, in the Passion narrative all went astray, although only one failed completely, and he was not one of the elect; 13. 32–33 speak of the uncertainty of the *day and hour* that is impending, in Gethsemane Christ struggles to be reconciled to the fact that 'the hour has come'; the similarity of 13. 26 with 14. 62 is unique; the possibility that the passion will witness the 'judgment of this world' may account for the omission of all reference to the judgment in 13. 24–27.[5] It is not suggested that the prophecies of Mk. 13 receive their true fulfilment in the passion narrative, but (presumably) that the latter is seen as in some way a prior fulfilment of it; e.g. in reference to Mk. 13. 30, the Passion is felt to be 'a sign, a seal of assurance, and a sacrament of the ultimate fulfilment'[6] of the parousia. The Passion would then be an eschatological event, participating in the finality of the consummation for which it prepares. Without doubt that is good Pauline theology, as well as Johannine; it is worth noting the possibility that it may be Markan

[1] Op. cit., p. 104.
[2] *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, 1950.
[3] Jn. 12. 31 f.
[4] *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, 1950, p. 51.
[5] Op. cit., pp. 51–54.
[6] Op. cit., p. 54.

also. As to the materials of Ch. 13, not much light is thrown on them by these considerations, except that if there is anything specifically Jewish in them it has been very thoroughly subordinated to Christian ends. Mk. 13 is Christian—an essential part of the story of the Passion of our Lord.

3. From W. G. Kümmel to E. Lohmeyer

The importance of W. G. Kümmel's work does not appear to have been adequately recognised as yet in the English-speaking world; now that Cullman's *Christ and Time* has been translated, the omission may be rectified, for Cullman manifestly depends a good deal on the careful exegesis provided by Kümmel. That for which Cullman is particularly indebted to Kümmel, a demonstration that Jesus anticipated a historical period between his resurrection and parousia, we must leave for the present, although its bearing on our subject will be readily perceived.[1] Kümmel has perhaps come closer than any other exegete to a genuine synthesis of realised and futurist eschatology in the teaching of our Lord. We can certainly not charge him with an inadequate recognition of the importance of eschatology. Yet this very synthesis has tended to prejudice his view of Mk. 13. He begins his discussion of the chapter by criticising the position maintained by Busch, that Mk. 13 gives us no temporal succession of eschatological events; the frequent occurrence of notices of time in the chapter should dispel that illusion (see vv. 7, 8, 10, 14, 21, 24, 26, 27). 'However much Mark evidently wishes to proclaim his kerygma of the suffering Messiah in Ch. 13, so certainly has he also the purpose of setting forth a revelation of the eschatological events, their sequence, their significance, their dangers. Thereby he has utilised in full measure, though this is controverted, Jewish material.'[2] This is not to say that this Jewish material ever formed an independent apocalypse: it is too short and colourless; it is difficult to think of its gradual enlargement through Christian additions; no literary connection between its supposed ingredients can be demonstrated; in its midst is contained a fragment of Q (13. 15 f.). The 'Little Apocalypse' hypothesis is accordingly rejected. The discourse has been put together from isolated sayings or groups of sayings, and each has to

[1] *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, 1945, pp. 15–17, 41–48. In justice to Michaelis, it should be pointed out that he himself had done this with great care three years earlier in his work, *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung*; the establishment of this point is part of the thesis of the book.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 57–58.

be examined for itself.[1] On examination of 13. 6, 9, 11, 13, 21 ff. it is seen that they presuppose the situation of the Christian community; it is not impossible therefore that they may have been influenced by the experiences of the community. On the other hand, parallels for all these sayings can be adduced from 'the other Jesus tradition', so it is equally possible that they may be authentic, even if certainty is not always attainable.[2] In any case, 'we are dealing here with presuppositions which do not concern the real eschatological event, but which relate to the entire time before the real end-time occurrences. These sayings, then, have nothing to do with real apocalyptic revelation'.[3] Over against this, 7–8, 12, 14–20, 24–27 in no respect reveal the situation of Jesus or of the early Church, but give 'thoroughly Jewish-apocalyptic ideas'. Admittedly, this does not in itself prove that they do not go back to Jesus, for 'the entire eschatological conceptions of Jesus are naturally of Jewish origin'. The two counts against this material are the clause of 13. 14, 'Let the reader understand', which betrays a literary tradition, and still more its contradiction to Jesus' refusal to give 'apocalyptic exposition and signs of the end' (Mk. 12. 25, Lk. 17. 20 f.). It therefore represents 'primitive Jewish-Christian elements of tradition which Mark has utilised for the construction of his eschatological discourse, but which he has not interpolated into the remaining Jesus tradition'.[4]

The really significant item in Kümmel's indictment of these sayings is the second, which lies at the root of his interpretation of our Lord's eschatological teaching. Kümmel is not averse to eschatology. Mk. 13. 2, e.g., is regarded as reflecting the Old Testament-Jewish hope of a new temple in the messianic time, and so must be interpreted eschatologically, not historically. On the other hand, the great insistence of his book is that Jesus gave *eschatological proclamation*, not *apocalyptic instruction*. On this basis the significance of such a saying as Mk. 9. 1 is not the light it throws on the future, but the fact that that future is determined by the attitude adopted to Jesus *in the present*—or in the original context of the saying, by the attitude adopted to the *historic* Jesus. The significance of the proclamation by Jesus of the divine sovereignty accordingly is its *present* effect—God is at work in Jesus *now*. As Kümmel puts it in the closing paragraph of his book, 'The inner meaning of the proclaimed eschatological event lies not in the end of the world as such, in the in-breaking of the divine sovereignty as such, but in

[1] Op. cit., p. 58. [2] Ibid. [3] Op. cit., p. 59. [4] Op. cit., pp. 61–62.

the fact that the impending eschatological fulfilment causes the sovereignty of that God to become reality who now already makes his saving purpose to be realised in Jesus'.[1] There is force in this contention, not to say great insight. Yet it would be happier if Kümmel used his 'not . . . but . . .' in a Biblical sense and regarded the proclamation of Jesus to have its significance rather in its immediate repercussions on his Person than in its illumination of the End. Kümmel's thesis leads him to postulate, 'In Jesus the divine sovereignty has begun and in Jesus it will be completed'.[2] An admirable statement! But does it not contain a statement of *eschatological instruction* of the utmost importance? And does not that teaching divide Christianity into two camps, the liberal and the orthodox? It is impossible to make affirmations like Mk. 9. 1 without conveying 'instruction' and implying a whole world of thought; furthermore, affirmations of that kind will mean nothing unless it is believed that their presuppositions as to the future are true, at least fundamentally. If Jesus made claims about his own future and that of the kingdom of God, there would seem to be no reason why he should not have taken care in respect to the manner of his utterance about it, nor why he should not have given the kind of instruction about it which would have corrected the impoverished ideas of his disciples. In that case, the proposition 'not apocalyptic instruction but eschatological proclamation' becomes a question of degree rather than a concrete antithesis. If, on the other hand, Kümmel is contrasting our Lord's preaching on the End with the speculations of 'Enoch' and his kind, then without hesitation we agree that there is a world of difference between the two, and the proposition we are discussing could express the difference. It would be easy to show that Mk. 13, in particular, is not a reproduction of Enoch. But we do not think that Kümmel has this in mind. His contention would carry greater conviction if it could be shown that in the first series of sayings (6, 9, 11, 13, 21 ff.) the slant on the future was negligible, and that the second series (7–8, 12, 14–20, 24–27) had no practical value; neither view can be sustained. Admittedly Kümmel did maintain, in regard to the first series, that it has nothing to do with the real eschatological event, but merely describes the entire period before the End. This is an exaggeration; it does describe the period of the Church's testimony, but it is hard to resist the impression that it particularly speaks in relation to the conclusion to which the Church is heading. In the same way the second series deals not

[1] Op. cit., p. 96. [2] Op. cit., p. 95.

exclusively with the End; if persecutions are the lot of the Church in the present era, wars, etc., are the lot of the world through the same period; just as the former are expected to be intensified towards the End, so the latter. Naturally, 14–20, 24–27 stand in a separate category, but their practical value for the Church of the first generation cannot be denied; if 1–2 denote an authentic eschatological event and demand preparedness for it, the same implies to 14–20, 24–27. We conclude that Kümmel's positive contribution is of undoubted importance, but his denials must be themselves denied.

A further analysis of Mk. 13 is provided by Vincent Taylor, in which he withdraws his adherence to the theory of a Little Apocalypse, as popularly enunciated, and replaces it with another.[1] Against the notion of the incorporation of an independent apocalypse in Mk. 13 can be urged the fragmentariness of such a document and the diversity of its apparent sources. 'Only a very fragmentary apocalypse is suggested, which lacks such distinctive ideas as the casting down of Antichrist, the Judgment, the punishment of sinners, and the blessedness of the righteous. Can we call such a torso an apocalypse?' Of the group usually assigned to the Little Apocalypse, 14–20 do not belong to 7 f., 24–27, while 30 f. belong to yet another group of material. 'On the other hand, Colani's hypothesis is sound in suggesting that a foundation source, apocalyptic in character, lies at the basis of Mk. 13, and that it consists of a group of sayings.' Colani's mistake lay in not perceiving the complexity of the sayings-groups incorporated in the Chapter.[2] Dr. Taylor proceeds to define the sources apparently observable within the discourse as follows: *A.* 5–8, 24–27, Signs preceding the parousia; *B.* 9–13, Sayings on persecution; *C.* 14–23, The Abomination of Desolation; *D.* 28–37, Sayings and Parables on Watchfulness. 'Of these groups *A* and *C* have characteristic apocalyptic features, but only *A* can be called even a rudimentary apocalypse. Both groups may have existed as units of tradition before Mark wrote.'[3] Taking the paragraphs in order of appearance, *A* is felt to be a piece of apocalyptic prophecy with 'nothing which could not belong to a Jewish-Christian apocalypse, or to a liturgical poem, or even a nearly Christian sermon'; nothing, that is, except the intrusive phrase of v. 6 'in my name'. This latter phrase means 'under my authority', or 'claiming the power of my name', and so indicates

[1] 'The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13', *Expository Times*, vol. LX, No. 4, Jan. 1949. The substance of this article appears in his *Gospel according to St. Mark*, 1952, pp. 498 ff., 636 ff.

[2] Op. cit., p. 95.

[3] Op. cit., p. 95.

a disciple; but 'I am he' is a claim to be Jesus or the Messiah. Would any professed Christian claim to be Jesus or the Messiah? 'The phrase is an unsuccessful attempt to explain *A* as a prophecy of Jesus, and by its incoherence suggests that *A* is of a different origin.'[1] Of group *B*, 9–13, vv. 9 and 11 are preserved 'with relative fidelity', 10 is added by Mark, 12–13 reflect the evil conditions of the Church. 'The group appears to have been compiled in the Church at Rome at a time when the danger of a clash with the Imperial authorities grew nearer daily.'[2] Group *C*, 14–23, may not originally have been apocalyptic in character, it suits a description of a military investment. The phrase 'abomination of desolation', like the term 'Babylon' in I Pt. 5. 13 and Rev. 18. 2, may refer to Rome as the embodiment of Satanic power, i.e. as Antichrist (cf. Paul's 'Man of Sin'). If we may accept that in this section the words of Jesus shine 'through an apocalyptic haze', it is probably, with Lk. 21. 20–24, our Lord's answer to the question of the disciples, v. 4. Whether Mark replaced what Luke now has in 21. 20 by the phrase 'abomination of desolation', or whether Jesus himself used it, cannot be known with certainty; either alternative is possible. Group *D* adds exhortations to extend the relevance of discourse beyond the disciples to the Christians of Rome, it thus represents that Church's catechetical teaching.[3] The origin of the discourse is now apparent: Mark was 'attracted by *A*, which expressed his own convictions, and which he regarded as genuine prophecy. What course, then, was more desirable than to expand *A*, in line with its apocalyptic character, to insert within it at suitable points *B* and *C*, in the interests of the prevailing belief that definite signs would precede the End, and to add the sayings and parables of 28–37 in *D*?' The implication of this view is that 'not a little in Mk. 13 is secondary tradition, but on any valid interpretation of the chapter, this result is inescapable'. In the view of this theologian the *genuine* eschatological sayings of Jesus represent the person and ministry of Jesus as the fulfilment of the ancient eschatological hopes; by the process adopted in this interpretation of Mk. 13 'we detach from his shoulders . . . the glittering apocalyptic robe with which primitive Christianity clothed him, and with which he is still draped in popular Christian expectation'.[4]

Acknowledging the interest and value of this treatment, we must yet confess that the net result is to dismember the original Little Apocalypse and put its head and legs together, minus its torso;

[1] Op. cit., p. 97. [2] Op. cit., p. 96. [3] Op. cit., p. 98. [4] Ibid.

how well it walks, we are not sure. We suspect that the main reason for characterising section *A* (5–8, 24–27) as Jewish-Christian and *D* as the catachesis of Rome is to be rid of this 'apocalyptic robe', but whether the critical grounds are adequate is another matter. No reason is adduced for the Jewishness of 24–27. The one count against 5–8 is the use of the phrase 'in my name', an objection urged at least as long ago as by Weiffenbach.[1] The most exhaustive examination of that phrase ever offered, that of Heitmüller, led to the conclusion that the translation of ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι by 'on the ground or authority of my name' is inadmissible, and that in this passage it implies the requisitioning or claiming of the name of Jesus, more briefly 'with my name'.[2] In that case there is no ground for imagining that a Christian is here thought of as speaker, in fact 'with my name' excludes such a possibility on Heitmüller's interpretation. If Dr. Taylor's case in regard to his first source *A* falls to the ground, the force of his contentions is considerably weakened. Even the analysis is endangered, for presumably 28–32 can only be regarded as of different origin from 24–27 if one regards the latter as unauthentic. It is an obvious and quite legitimate step to isolate 9–13, but it is not so obvious or legitimate to regard them as reflecting the historic situation of the church in Rome under Nero. It is noteworthy that in source *C*, 21–23 are joined to 14–20; in view of the parallel of 21–23 to the Q apocalypse, Lk. 17. 23 f., it is likely that it has a purely eschatological reference; but such a reference in 14–20 is said to be 'secondary'. That again depends on the view taken of 13. 1–2, and of the 'glittering robe'. To us it is less the analysis that is at fault than the attitude adopted towards the eschatological categories reflected therein. The Church of the Ages has generally preferred to speak of the 'glorious' rather than 'glittering' robe, and therein lies the main difference between our reading of Mk. 13 and Dr. Taylor's; for we are not persuaded that the Church has been wrong in this respect.

In some respects E. Lohmeyer's treatment of Mk. 13 seems the most brilliant and provocative that we have met, although we cannot concur with it *in toto*. It is deeply to be regretted that he did not live to give to his commentary the revision he had planned.[3] We will follow his procedure of apportioning his remarks on the discourse into four sections. (i) Lohmeyer's fundamental convic-

[1] *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, pp. 168–169.
[2] *Im Namen Jesu*, p. 63.
[3] *Das Evangelium des Markus*, 1st ed. 1937, 2nd ed. with corrections added, 1951.

tion in regard to the discourse is that it is composed out of isolated sayings or sayings groups which in part already lay before Mark in a fixed literary form. There is no possibility of extracting from it a short Jewish apocalypse, but the attempt to do so has revealed that the discourse contains at least in equal proportion apocalyptic teaching and apocalyptic *parenesis* (exhortation, advice). With this feature is conjoined another significant phenomenon: the chief theme of the discourse, unlike that of apocalypses generally, is the coming of the Son of Man not in judgment on the world, but *for the 'gathering of the saints'*, i.e. for the formation of the eschatological divine community. To this major theme that of the abomination of desolation is subordinated, as also the related theme of false christs and prophets, while the third theme of martyrdom is strictly related to the first. From among all the rich diversity of apocalyptic ideas that meet us in other apocalypses a mere fraction is given us: 'The point of view that determines this selection is that of the building and continuance of the eschatological community of God. . . . It is therefore comprehensible that the apocalyptic parenesis receives a far greater space than the apocalyptic prophecy.'[1] (ii) The occasion of the discourse may be compared with that of many another Jewish apocalypse, e.g. the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: a 'man of God' sees his death near, speaks of coming things and gives last exhortations. This one is a farewell speech of Jesus, directed to the heirs of his work and preaching: 'The fruitfulness of his (Mark's) purpose is seen from the fact that the three other evangelists, each in his way, have developed the conception of such a farewell discourse more richly.'[2] The differentia of this discourse is that, instead of the disciples being spectators of the apocalyptic drama, they are part of it; they are bound up with it through suffering and martyrdom. 'The theological significance of this picture, only hinted at, is scarcely to be overestimated; for it makes even the life of the believers in this world era the theme of the apocalyptic event; it overcomes apocalyptic even while it affirms it and knows that it is set in the specific, still continuing historical existence.'[3] (iii) The discussion nowhere in Ch. 13 centres on Antichrist, not even in vv. 14–20. His only significance is that he appears in the holy place, through which act the place of eschatological glory is turned into its opposite. 'This prophecy belongs then actually to the series of sayings which speak of the eschatological destruction of the temple and therein break with Jewish tradition and the

[1] Op. cit., pp. 285–286. [2] Op. cit., pp. 286 and 267. [3] Op. cit., p. 286.

Jewish people.'[1] (iv) The elements of the discourse consist of Jewish tradition, sayings of Jesus and words of the primitive community. It is difficult to separate them, for they are united through the single conception of the nearness of the eschatological day. Yet it is a true picture of the Christianity of Mark's day: 'Its firm ground is "his words", its continual affirmation the sacred tradition, its inner condition, "watch and be ready" for martyrdom.'[2]

Despite the confessed difficulty of separating the discourse into its constituent parts, Lohmeyer essays to do it more thoroughly than any of his predecessors. The introductory section 1–5a is said to be composed for the purpose: 1 is a foil for 2, 3–4 follow the conventional notion of the fitness of a mountain for a divine communication. 5*b*–8 contain three disparate sayings of four lines each: the first, 5–6, is itself not a unity, being an adaptation of a Jewish apocalyptic notion in the light of the experiences of the primitive Church; the second, 7, is a word of consolation for a helpless yet peaceable people; the third, 8, describes apocalyptic signs in the non-Jewish world. 9–13 also contains three strophes of four lines each, but each strophe is concluded by an interpolated prose sentence (10, 11*b*, 13): each saying has a different origin and aim, but they are united by the superimposed conception of martyrdom. As to 14–27: 14 is from a Jewish apocalypse referring to Jerusalem, the phrase 'Let the reader understand' shows that a document is used, but how far it extends we do not know; 15–16 relate to inhabitants of a country town, for there is no reference to craftsmen; 17–18 relate to city dwellers, as their concern for the weather shows; 19–20 is not a prophecy, but a *report* of an event carried through by God, and is directly from an Aramaic source; 21–23 comes here curiously in view of its many pseudo-christs—how do they arise after Antichrist? Indeed, the contradiction is manifest within this little paragraph, for 21 speaks of *one* anointed who has been seen here and there, but 22 says *many* false christs and prophets will arise; 21 thus gives a false human opinion, what it says does not happen, 22 has a real event in view, but it is a deceptive one. In the last section the chief thing to note is that 28 f. answer the question, 'What is the sign?', and 30–32 answer 'When shall these things be'? The same complexity of composition is discernible in this group.[3]

[1] Ibid. [2] Op. cit., p. 287.

[3] The analysis of each paragraph is provided by Lohmeyer at the commencement of his exposition of each section, and so is scattered throughout the commentary on Ch. 13, pp. 267–285.

If the reader will check this analysis with the text itself, he will find it difficult not to feel that the genius of Lohmeyer has gone to excess here; it is atomism with a vengeance, if not nuclear fission. In all candour, how can any man justify the judgment that vv. 5–6 represent a Jewish apocalyptic saying, modified by the experiences of the primitive Christian community? It is groundless speculation and produces a needless scepticism, especially if we recall the circumstances of Jesus and his disciples in the midst of a Judaism charged with incipient Zealotism. The entire analysis of 14–23 set forth by Lohmeyer could be debated point by point. In particular, the comparison of 21 and 22 proceeds from the assumption that if it is possible to construe two adjoining statements in a contradictory fashion it is our duty to do so, rather than accept them at face value. Life would be very tiring if that principle were applied generally. We would further like to ask: When did it begin to be true of the Church that 'its firm ground was "his words", its continual affirmation the sacred tradition'? Only in Mark's day? If it goes back to early times, would it have been so very natural to confuse the striking warnings and encouragements of Jesus with odd apocalypses and utterances of Christian prophets? The possibility may be reckoned with, but probability points to the opposite conclusion. On Lohmeyer's arguments the key concepts of Mk. 13 should indicate not merely a Christian *redactor*, but a Christian *basis of redaction* all the way through: this confessed emphasis on the rapture of the Church and ignoring of lesser matters, this unusual 'parenetic' interest, more pronounced than the apocalyptic strain, this rejection of the temple coupled with the severe judgment on the favoured people in an eschatological context, does it point to Jewish sources and reflected Christian experience? Theoretically it could be reconciled with such a view, but again we say the probability does not lie in that direction. Since the discourse of Mk. 13, after all, is not on the lips of a Simon Zelotes but on those of Jesus, we have a right to let probability be our guide here. We are not concerned to deny the view that Mk. 13 may be derived from earlier units of tradition, whether shorter or longer, but we do ask for a more reasonable attitude to be taken to the compilers of this discourse. We are dependent wholly on our Evangelists for it, we have no independent materials on which to judge it. If the discourse goes back to a time prior to the Evangelists, then the unknown compiler had the more abundant material from which to select, and we need not presume he lost his powers of judgment

when he did so. Lohmeyer's exposition of the significance of the eschatological discourse is consonant with a lofty purpose and no small mind in the person responsible for putting it together; perhaps the great exegete would not have minded our thinking that his theological powers exceeded even his critical judgment! Of one thing we are sure; he has made the Little Apocalypse theory even more difficult of acceptance than it was before he wrote.

(Alternative expositions of Mk. 13, or modifications of the Little Apocalypse theory, will also be found in the following writers: T. K. Cheyne, Article 'Abomination of Desolation', *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1899, vol. I, cols. 21–23; Estlin Carpenter, *The First Three Gospels*, 1904, p. 197; N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905, pp. 85 f., 132 ff., 185, 230 ff.; P. Batiffol, *L'Enseignement de Jésus*, 1909, pp. 275 ff.; J. MacCulloch, Article 'Eschatology', *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 1912, vol. 5, pp. 382 f.; W. W. Holdsworth, *Gospel Origins*, 1913, pp. 111 f., 195; Latimer Jackson, *The Eschatology of Jesus*, 1913, pp. 41 f., 285 ff.; S. J. Case, *Jesus, a New Biography*, 1927, pp. 335, 425 f.; E. W. Barnes, *The Rise of Christianity*, 1947, pp. 136 f.; A. N. Wilder, *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*, 2nd ed., 1950, p. 36; J. H. Ropes, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 1934, pp. 9 ff., 28; A. T. Cadoux, *The Sources of the Second Gospel*, 1935, pp. 224 ff.; *The Theology of Jesus*, 1940, p. 188.)

CHAPTER 4

ATTEMPTS TO VINDICATE THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

As the Little Apocalypse theory is an endeavour to explain Mk. 13 by resort to critical analysis, the previous chapters have been devoted in large part to critical methods. The defenders of the authenticity of Mk. 13 in the main have sought to meet the difficulties by exegetical rather than by analytical methods, consequently it will be necessary in this chapter to pay more attention to questions of interpretation and theology.

The chief cause of perplexity in the eschatological discourse lies in the fact that statements concerning the end of the age are apparently intertwined with an event that for us has been removed to the distant past. No other prophecies of our Lord relating to the hope of his coming are tied in this manner to history. The difficulties of interpretation are unique as far as the Gospels are concerned, and perhaps that accounts for the unique treatment the prophecy has received at the hands of its would-be-interpreters. Strauss summarised the efforts of his predecessors and contemporaries to solve the problems of the discourse in terms of this time reference: they held either that the bearing of the discourse is entirely future, or that it is entirely past, or that it is partly past and partly future; in the last case, it was necessary either to deny that the two series of events were placed in immediate chronological succession or to maintain that Jesus took account of the intervening period. The belief that Mk. 13 relates solely to the future was held by certain Church Fathers, such as Irenaeus and Hilary, but they lived near enough the event to be ignorant of their mistake. The past reference involves the notion that the parousia took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, and few are inclined to risk this *tour de force*. Strauss quite enjoyed recounting the difficulties of those who tried to apportion the discourse between A.D. 70 and the end of the world.[1] It will be observed that the Little Apocalypse theory essentially was a revival of the view that the discourse referred solely to the future,

[1] *Life of Jesus*, vol. III, pp. 86 ff.

for it built on the assumption that it had nothing to do with the fall of Jerusalem and merely portrayed the end of the age. The attempt to refer the discourse to the past also enjoyed a new lease of life, in that not a few serious expositors espoused the view that the parousia took place at the fall of Jerusalem.[1] Most interpreters, however, have wrestled with the problem of how to apportion the chapter between the past and future.

1. The Prophecy of Jerusalem a Prefiguration of the End

One of the most obvious expedients was to regard the fall of Jerusalem as a foreshadowing of the end of the age. In view of the temper of the last century one would have thought that many exegetes would have adopted that line of interpretation; in reality hardly any did. Neander, in his refutation of Strauss, pursued this course, and perhaps succeeded better than his followers. He was one of the first to lay down an important canon of interpretation for Mk. 13, viz. that its scope was limited by the practical needs of the disciples. 'It was certainly far from Christ's intention', he wrote, 'to give them a complete view of the course of development of the kingdom of God up to its final consummation. He imparted only so much as was necessary to guard them against deception, to stimulate their watchfulness, and confirm their confidence that the end would come at last'.[2] This is a very different estimate of the discourse from that which sees it as a calendar of coming events, as many critics have assumed. In view of the increasing recognition by recent writers, like Vincent Taylor and Lohmeyer, that Mk. 13 omits more apocalyptic themes than it offers, it would seem that Neander had justification for this affirmation. The view of the future is characterised thus: 'When Christ in this discourse speaks of the great import of his coming for the history of the world, of his triumphant self-manifestation, and of the beginning of his kingdom, he betokens thereby partly his triumph in the destruction of the visible Theocracy, and its results in the freer and wider diffusion of his kingdom, and partly his second advent for its consummation. The judgment over the degenerate Theocracy, and the final judgment of the world, the first free development of the kingdom of God, and its final and glorious consummation, correspond

[1] See additional note 1 at end of this chapter.

[2] *The Life of Jesus Christ in its historical connexion and historical development*, 1st ed. 1837, E.T. from the 4th ed. 1853, p. 406.

to each other; the former, in each case, prefiguring the latter.'[1] We have not found this interpretation again until Plummer's commentary on Matthew reproduced it in brief. Commenting on the significance of the Fig Tree parable (Mt. 24. 32 f. = Mk. 13. 28 f.), he asserted: 'If the Day of Judgment is in any way included in it, it is as being *symbolised by the judgment on the guilty city*.'[2] A similar view is adopted by N. Geldenhuys in his exposition of Luke: the judgment of Jerusalem foreshadows the final judgment, so that Lk. 21. 20 = Mk. 13. 14 refers first to the Roman army, second to the appearance of Antichrist.[3]

This view proceeds from an act of faith; it can neither be demonstrated nor denied from other statements in the Gospels. Its major defect is the presupposition that the discourse was intended to cater for two events separated by a long stretch of time. Neander refuses to contemplate the possibility of Jesus being limited in his knowledge of time and Geldenhuys thinks Lk. 21. 24 implies a *series* of powers occupying Jerusalem. It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile such a prospect with the known attitude of Jesus to the future. The inter-relation of the two events must be explained by some other means.

2. Two Prophecies combined in one Discourse

More popular than the foregoing interpretation was the idea that the eschatological discourse is composed of two prophecies, one dealing with the fall of Jerusalem, the other with the final Advent, but both authentic. The view championed by Wendt was anticipated in principle by a full generation in the expositions of F. Godet. This writer found it difficult to accept the newly-propounded theory of the Little Apocalypse, especially in view of the necessarily widespread adoption of this apocalypse at a time sufficiently early for authoritative denials to be issued against it. To him, the hypothesis is 'nothing else than a stroke of desperation'.[4] Godet was indignant at the lower views of Jesus that motivated the critics of this chapter: 'Jesus called himself, and consequently either knew or believed himself to be, the future Judge of the Church and the world. In the former case he must be something

[1] Op. cit., pp. 406–407.
[2] *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1909, p. 328.
[3] *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, 1950, pp. 523, 533.
[4] *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, E.T. from the 2nd French edition of 1870, p. 274.

more than a sinful man—he can only be the God-man; in the latter he is only a fool carried away with pride. In vain will MM. Colani, Volkmar, and Keim attempt to escape from this dilemma. Genuine historical criticism and an impartial exegesis will always raise it anew and allow no other choice than between the Christ of the Church and the clever charmer of M. Renan.'[1] As to the interpretation of the discourse, Godet recalls the hints in our Lord's teaching that the parousia may be considerably delayed (e.g. Lk. 18. 1 f., Mk. 13. 35, Lk. 19. 12, Mt. 25. 5, 24. 14), yet this discourse gives a near date for the 'end' (Mk. 13. 30), and Mk. 13. 32 declares Jesus has no idea when the Advent will be. It is concluded that Mark and Matthew have mingled two discourses together, but that Luke has kept them apart. The confusion is natural, since the Old Testament prophets conjoin the judgment of Israel with that of the Gentiles; to some extent it is justified, for the destruction of Jerusalem is the first act of the world's judgment. 'The present epoch is due to a suspension of the judgment already begun—a suspension the aim of which is to make way for the time of grace which is to be granted to the Gentiles.'[2]

A similar result was reached by a different path in the case of W. Beyschlag.[3] The analytical solution of the critics had no attraction for him. 'That short apocalypse is a mere production of the critical imagination; no evidence of its existence can be found.' Like Godet he asks how so recent a Jewish prediction could have been immediately taken up in the circle that possessed a first-hand tradition of the Lord's words and circulated as from Jesus. 'The descent of the synoptic prophetic addresses is certified on as good authority as the parables of the kingdom or the Sermon on the Mount.'[4] Beyschlag feels that the difficulties of our discourse may be solved if we remember two things: (i) the imperfection of the prophet's view, (ii) the imperfection of the hearer's comprehension. In regard to the former, we are to realise that Paul's confession about prophecy and reality being related as a child's thought in comparison to a man's applies equally to Jesus (I Cor. 13. 9 ff.). Prophecy does not give the shape of future developments, it only provides ideal truth, and that in emblems, 'riddles' as Paul said. Prophecy yields to the seer ideal history 'evolved from the idea that the contrasts of good and evil, wheat and tares, must ripen

[1] Op. cit., p. 274. [2] Op. cit., p. 260.
[3] *New Testament Theology*, 1895, from the German of 1891.
[4] Op. cit., vol. I, p. 188.

in the world, and that when the opposition to God in the world has reached its climax, the judgment of God must break over it'.[1] This is excellent principle, but when we look at Mk. 13 we see more than ideal history, we see a very concrete Jerusalem and statements made about various kinds of people. Here the second of the above-mentioned factors comes in: the reporters did not grasp this aright, hence the discourse mixes up ideal history with what Jesus had prophesied of Jerusalem's fate. The contrast of Mk. 13. 30 and 32 makes this plain: the concrete statement about the generation that will not pass away naturally refers to what Jesus had predicted of the judgment on Jerusalem, the confession of his prophetic ignorance relates to the wider prophecy. That this is no mere conjecture is shown in the necessity of the Gospel to be proclaimed throughout *all* the world—which is 'the one real sign of the end'—and that this is the task of generations *after* A.D. 70, as well as before (cf. Mk. 12. 1–12, Mt. 22. 7). 'According to this the spirit of Jesus clearly saw beyond the near judgment of God on Judaism, not the immediate end of the world, but a *growing history both of the world and the Church*, the greatest fact of which should be the calling of the nations of the world to the kingdom of God.'[2] If it be asked how this is to be reconciled with the statements implying a parousia in the contemporary generation, the answer is given that the Advent of Jesus is a historical process (cf. Mt. 26. 64). 'Jesus comprehended the realisation of the kingdom of God, represented by the prophets as momentary (like a flash of lightning), rather as *a process of growth, a historical development*; and according to the same law he consciously viewed also the future completion of his work as a course of history, achieved not in a single act, but in an advancing series of acts.'[3] In seeking to estimate this unrealistic interpretation of the eschatological discourse, it is enough to point out the strange inconsistency of postulating that a prophet can only see *ideal* history, and that therefore when Jesus prophesies *actual* history, this must be separated from the *ideal* history of the discourse, which alone can be the subject of prophecy! If prophecy consists only of 'ideal truth . . . in emblem and image, or rather, in a changing series of images', how was Jesus able to speak at all of the overthrow of Jerusalem? Or if this was a case of actualising prophetic images, why should it be limited to one series only (relating to Jerusalem) and not to that which relates to the wider issues of world history?

[1] Op. cit., pp. 195–196.
[2] Op. cit., p. 198.
[3] Op. cit., p. 200.

We suspect that Victorian optimism contributed more to Beyschlag's outlook than Mk. 13.[1]

E. F. K. Müller, like Godet, dwelt on dominical sayings which imply a period of development before the End; these show that sayings relating to an impending coming of Jesus must refer to the judgment on Jerusalem; we are compelled to this conclusion if we compare Mt. 10. 23 with Mk. 13. 10, for the latter tells of the world-wide preaching of the Gospel before the End, the former says that not even Palestine will be evangelised before the 'coming'.[2] Moreover, 'it may be that the widely-spread faith of the Church in the immediate nearness of the End has helped to produce the mistaken formulation of these words. This belief perhaps also explains why the judgment on the people of God and then on the entire race, *which Jesus had only inwardly joined*, is similarly joined together in temporal proximity in the report (Mk. 13. 14 f., 24 f.).'[3] While we may not be persuaded by these views, we should not pass over Müller's acute criticism of Weizsäcker's presentation of the Little Apocalypse theory. He makes four points: (i) Despite individual parallels with Jewish-apocalyptic literature, e.g. in the messianic woes, the 'total-design' of the discourse shows specifically Christian points which cannot be explained by an external editing of a Jewish basis. (ii) Apocalypses of undoubted Jewish origin find it difficult to know how to connect the figure of the Messiah, who originally belonged to the 'this-worldly' circle of prophetic ideas, with later transcendent hopes. (iii) The theme of the history up to the parousia is the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus and personal decision for or against him, with which the predicted struggle stands in closest association; with that corresponds the picture of the end—history is concluded through the judgment of the Messiah and the gathering of the Elect about him. (iv) No rebuilding of Jerusalem after its destruction is contemplated. These considerations should show that we cannot be dealing with a Jewish, or even Jewish-Christian apocalypse in any exclusive sense. May it be a Christian one, pseudonymously attributed to Jesus? 'Then we face again the question whether this Christian eschatological system, despite numerous individual parallels to Jewish apocalyptic, does

[1] G. B. Stevens' exposition of the discourse closely followed that of Beyschlag: see his *Theology of the New Testament*, 2nd ed., 1906. His ideas in turn were largely repeated by H. A. A. Kennedy in *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, 1904, pp. 168–169, 172–173.

[2] *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 21, 1908, pp. 264–265.

[3] Op. cit., p. 265.

not reveal itself to be a *new building on an original foundation which must conclusively be attributed to Jesus himself*, even if the parousia discourse may not be regarded exactly as a historical report.'[1] This criticism anticipates the kind of approach to Mk. 13 made a generation later, yet we have never seen a reference to this article in any publication that has come our way. That fate is typical of more than one attempt of conservative critics to defend the eschatological discourse: they were ignored by the proponents of the new theory.

A striking variation of the view of two discourses in Mk. 13 recognises a Little Apocalypse within the chapter, with or without a second discourse, and boldly claims that the entire material is authentic. The two great names associated with this view are the father and son, Bernhard and Johannes Weiss. Bernhard Weiss took over H. A. W. Meyer's commentary and issued the sixth edition of that on the synoptic gospels in 1878 (we have used the eighth edition of 1892). Of Mk. 13 he wrote: 'The parousia discourse is the one greater discourse which Mark had completely repeated from the older source; he provided it with an historical introduction, vv. 1–5, a concluding exhortation, 32–37, as well as lengthened it through two interpolations, 9–13, 21–23.' The original source, therefore, must have been 6–8, 14–20, 24–31, the Little Apocalypse as usually constructed.[2] Weiss scarcely feels it necessary to discuss in his commentary the opinion of his critical contemporaries that the discourse thus laid bare is unauthentic. In his *Theology of the New Testament* he states what he considers to be the fundamental assumption of the discourse: 'Although the consummation of all things is not brought about in the natural way of historical development, it is nevertheless a condition of its commencement that the time has become ripe for it. As the Messiah could not appear upon the scene until the time was fulfilled (Mk. 1. 15), so, according to the divinely appointed course of the historical development, certain events must have taken place before he *returns*; and from these, as its foretokens, men can then discern the nearness of the divinely appointed moment of the consummation. Upon this fundamental thought of apocalyptic prophecy rests also the prophecy of Jesus regarding his return.'[3] As Godet thought that the destruction of Jerusalem was the first act of the world's

[1] Op. cit., pp. 263–264.
[2] *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lucas*, p. 213.
[3] *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, E.T. 1882 from the 3rd German ed. of 1879, pp. 149–150.

judgment, so Weiss affirmed of the tribulation of Mk. 13. 14–20: 'Since with this, the last great judgment of God already began, the day of the return must now immediately appear.'[1] But how are we to explain the 'immediately' (Mt. 24. 29)? In this matter we fear that Weiss hedged and hovered about in obvious perplexity. As his *New Testament Theology* is his only translated work, it is not apparent to the English reader, but Holtzmann noted it and with evident amusement pointed it out as follows (the references are to the German writings): 'Weiss abstracted from it (the discourse) the compensating judgment, "Jesus set his coming again in prospect for the current generation, even if the *point of time remained in the last resort always indefinable*" ' (*Neutest. Theol.*, p. 33). According to L.J., II, p. 286, 448 f., there lies in Mk. 13. 30 only a *hypothetical* prophecy, in Mk. 13. 32 an *absolute* prophecy. According to *Neutest. Theol.*, I, p. 193, "the two sayings cannot possibly have been said one after another", so that the first should be related to the end of Jerusalem, the second to the end of the world. The mixing of the two Ends is set, p. 194, to the reckoning of the misunderstanding of the *disciples*, according to par. 33*b*, "a peculiar view of the pedagogic wisdom of *Jesus*".'[2] It is unfortunate when one's writings are subjected to examination by an intellect so acute as Holtzmann's, but this citation will illustrate the difficulty of the time question in Mk. 13 and the necessity of candour when dealing with it.

In the writings of Johannes Weiss one feels the impact of a master-mind. It is unaccountable that so little of his work has been made available for English readers. Moffatt drew attention to the conversion of Muirhead to the Little Apocalypse theory as 'notable'.[3] It would have been more to the point if he had called attention to the far more significant conversion of Johannes Weiss from the Little Apocalypse theory to an acceptance of its general authenticity. The famous *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* contains little that bears on our discussion, save an expression of the viewpoint from which this writer never moved and which provided him with the key to Mk. 13. In his view, the description of the parousia, Mk. 13. 24 ff., with the parable of the fig tree, Mk. 13. 28 f., supplies for Mark at least the true context for Jesus' prediction of the fall of the temple: the Advent brings 'the break-up of the old

[1] Ibid.
[2] *Lehrbuch der neutestamentliche Theologie*, Band I, p. 328, n. 1.
[3] *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, p. 208, n. 3.

world, *which will then bury the temple also beneath its ruins*'.[1] This was the point of departure for his later investigations of the eschatological discourse. The most elaborate discussion of his views is given in the exposition of Marcan theology, *Das älteste Evangelium*. Herein we see the influence of Pfleiderer, noted earlier by us. The purpose of the discourse, like that of II Thessalonians, is to quieten feverish expectations of the parousia. 'The discourse as a whole does not give the impression that it is a flaming pamphlet of the twelfth hour. The concluding exhortations to watchfulness (33, 37) . . . rest on and draw their strength from this, that the delay ultimately is incalculable. The day and hour are not known (32), and therefore it is necessary ever to be watchful. An apocalyptic prophet who sees the signs fulfilled and the hour to have come does not speak in this way.'[2] This viewpoint is especially noticeable in v. 10, the necessity to preach the Gospel in all the world, but it is also contained in such an exhortation as vv. 5–6: 'Even if the community already had experienced something of this kind (i.e. the rise of deceivers), the prophetic character of this word nevertheless remains through the "many", πολλοί: there certainly had not been a mass appearance of pseudo-messiahs hitherto. Watch out then! Do not let such people set you prematurely in an excited condition!'[3] On the other hand, the opposite extreme must not be adopted, for the parousia is expected in the lifetime of the generation of Jesus. The general idea of the discourse excludes the possibility that the 'abomination of desolation' refers to the (past) activity of the Romans: 'It would be the complete opposite of the guiding purpose of the author if here suddenly the end was stated to be quite near, whereas just now the terminus was set back to the finishing of the mission work.'[4] On no account is this interpretation to be reversed by making 'Let the reader understand' mean 'Let the Church realise that the old prophecy is in process of fulfilment or has just been fulfilled'; νοεῖν can mean 'perceive, attend to', but in Mark it is used for 'understand', especially of a parable or secret (7. 18, 8. 17, cf. also Rev. 13. 18, 17. 9). In this passage it implies that the Danielic prophecy is intended in the words of

[1] *Predigt Jesu*, p. 32. The year in which this book was published, 1892, also saw the publication of the one article Weiss wrote in which he advocated the Little Apocalypse theory. It is contained in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1892, and we regret that we have not been able to procure it. From references to it in contemporary literature we gather that the analysis adopted more or less coincided with that advocated in his later writings; the change of view concerned the estimate of the relation of the 'apocalypse' to the thought of Jesus.

[2] Op. cit., p. 72. [3] Op. cit., pp. 73–74. [4] Op. cit., pp. 76–77.

Jesus. Meanwhile the fulfilment is outside the circle of view. Caligula had attempted it, but God had frustrated it. If Caligula had pointed the way of possible fulfilment, the how or the when is yet unknowable. 'Just as it is fundamentally false to ask in the exposition of II Thess. 2 what definite contemporary events Paul had in view with his description, so it is mistaken to ask Mark how he interpreted the βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως. 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.'[1]

What shall we then say of the setting of the discourse? More particularly, how do we relate the question of the disciples to what follows? Weiss answers: 'There is only one explanation here: only under one presupposition is the answer of Jesus not nonsensical, i.e. if the evangelist tacitly accepts that the temple can be destroyed only at the break-up of the old world, at the coming of the Messiah, at the setting up of the sovereignty of God. *The signs of the parousia are then at the same time signs for the ruin of the temple.*'[2] This, however, does not compel us to the view that the connection is original. Of the authenticity of the temple prediction, Weiss has no doubt, but it could well be an independent saying to which Mark has appended the following discourse. The introduction of the four intimate friends, occurring only in Mark, is probably editorial; they are brought in to give the discourse an appearance of secrecy, 'the old text of Mark gives it simply as a discourse to the disciples, i.e. as a piece of teaching for the whole community.'[3] Weiss now proceeds to attempt to define this 'old text of Mark'. By such considerations as that v. 21 is a doublet of 22, coming from Q; 7 is a comment on 8; 15–16 come from Q, etc., the foundational document is found to be vv. 8, 14, 17–20, 22, 24–25, *Mt.* 24. 30*ab*, 26–27, 30, 33. Weiss makes the further interesting conjecture that the original paragraph 9–13 is better reproduced in Mt. 10. 17–23, and that Mark took out Mt. 10. 23, replacing it with the statement about world-wide preaching, 13. 10; the whole paragraph would very well fit the document as analysed above and could have been an integral part of it, particularly if Mt. 10. 23 be put after Mk. 13. 13, thus:

He that endures to the end,
The same shall be saved.—

[1] Op. cit., p. 79. [2] Op. cit., pp. 72–73. [3] Op. cit., p. 274.

But whenever they persecute you in this city,
Flee into the next;
For truly I tell you, you will not finish the cities of Israel,
Until the Son of Man comes.—

But whenever you see the 'abomination of desolation'
Standing where it ought not,
(Let the reader understand)
Then flee into the mountains.

But woe to pregnant women and suckling mothers
In those days.
But pray that your flight may not happen
In winter or on the Sabbath.[1]

When Weiss came to write his commentary on Mark[2] he abandoned this suggestion and simply incorporated *9bcd*, 11 with v. 8 as preliminary signs of the end. We have mentioned the earlier view as a good example of the ease with which one can put together a plausible connection of sayings and then presume that the excellence of connection proves that it must have once existed!

Whence did this discourse originate? Let Weiss speak for himself: 'Whereas the hypothesis of a "little apocalypse" was earlier very widespread (I also have represented it), today the grounds for this view have become frail. While it was once found surprising that there should be in a discourse of Jesus conceptions related to those of Jewish apocalyptic, today many people will share my opinion that Jesus could very well have thought of the future according to the scheme of the prophecy of Daniel and of other apocalyptists. . . . If he spoke of the "coming of the Son of Man", then he used an apocalyptic conception generally recognised at that time; it is a strong conviction that at the end of the days, "the man on the clouds" must come. So also the "abomination of desolation", which is taken over by him, is an idea of firm dogmatic strength. It is laid down in prophecy and this prophecy must be fulfilled as all others. . . . Or what is meant if one demands in this direction "originality" from Jesus? Is it wished that he had given on these matters quite new and unheard-of explanations? We are thankful that he did not make the attempt to vie with the Jewish apocalyptists in depicting the end, but that in this respect he simply held to prophecy, or to what was delivered to him as such.

[1] Op. cit., pp. 278 ff.
[2] *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed., 1906.

He was satisfied with the cardinal features of the scheme: *utmost concentration on the chief matters—that is the signature of this apocalypse.*'[1] It is presumed, then, that Mark found this discourse as a Christian apocalypse and developed it through interpolations from the sayings source. To this view Weiss adhered in his later writings. In his latest book, posthumously published, he dealt with the problem of reconciling a view of the end as coming suddenly and as preceded by signs. The apparently contradictory belief, he points out, is not only to be seen in the sayings of Jesus, it runs throughout the New Testament. 'It unites two fundamental attitudes of the primitive Christian life: on the one hand the continual tension which is maintained and increased through constantly repeated exhortations to *watch* at all times, for on this rests in part the intensity of the religious and ethical enthusiasm; on the other hand, *the being bound to specified tasks.*'[2] While it may be felt that Weiss goes too far in some of his assertions, particularly in his relating Jesus so closely to the apocalyptists, there is much of value in his treatment of our theme. It is hard to understand why critics so frequently confine their quotations of his views to the negative aspects of his approach and overlook his positive contribution. Despite Weiss' well-known rejection of the element of 'privacy' in the teaching as recorded by Mark, it is a small step from his acceptance of the eschatological discourse to accepting the setting narrated by Mark.

The views of Shailer Mathews may be characterised as a fusion of elements from Johannes Weiss and Wendt. He takes over the latter's analysis of Mk. 13 into two discourses,[3] except that he removes the paragraph describing the parousia, 24–27, from the Jerusalem discourse and inserts it into that concerning the messianic consummation. Both discourses are authentic. 'Despite the objections of Wendt, both may safely be considered as coming from Jesus himself. That he expected the fall of Jerusalem is beyond question, and it has already appeared that he regarded his return as in some way susceptible to interpretation by apocalyptic figures.'[4] The great difficulty over this view has always been to explain why these two discourses have been combined in this way. Mathews suggests that a solution may be found in carefully noting the distinction between 'these things' of Mk. 13. 30 and 'that day'

[1] Op. cit., p. 281.
[2] *Das Urchristentum*, 1917, p. 97.
[3] The discourse on Jerusalem, 7–9*a*, 14–20, 24–27, 30–32; the discourse on the messianic consummation, 4–6, 9*b*–13, 21–23, 28–29, 32–37.
[4] *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*, 1905, p. 230.

of 13. 32: 'The two contrasted pronouns refer respectively to the fate of Jerusalem and the parousia of the Christ, and suggest that the two sets of material are in such a relation that *the one gives a basis for confidence in the other*.' In two respects the predictions of Jesus had proved terribly accurate: those concerning the fall of Jerusalem in the first discourse, which had been completely fulfilled, and those relating to the persecution of the disciples in the second discourse, which were in process of fulfilment through the contemporary policy of the Roman State. Both elements of the Lord's prophecies pointed to an early fulfilment of the rest. 'The generation within which all "these" events—i.e. the political—were to take place had not yet quite passed from the earth, and the woes which . . . were expected to precede the coming of Christ had already begun. Sustained by these fulfilments of Jesus' words as regards Jerusalem and their own persecution, the Christians who "read" might well "understand" and rest in supreme confidence that Jesus' prophecies of the coming of the kingdom would also be fulfilled.'[1] Mathews notes that if Jesus intended this correlation of the two discourses, then he must have connected in some way the fall of Jerusalem with his own coming. If he did not, we must still remember that the limit within which the messianic kingdom was to be established is expressly set within the contemporary generation (Mk. 9. 1, 14. 62, Mt. 10. 23). It is in accordance with these convictions that the apostolic churches ordered their lives and hopes.[2] Apart from this last statement, it will be noted that Mathews' interpretation rests wholly on the confessed belief that all the Evangelists wrote after A.D. 70, otherwise it could not be said that the 'Jerusalem discourse' serves as a guarantee for the accuracy of the other. This is a very dubious position, and if the date be contested, as it is by the majority of critics, the interpretation is invalid.

H. T. Andrews was more indefinite in his pronouncements on the discourse, but evidently accepted at least the hypothesis of two sources for Mk. 13.[3] He pointed out the striking fact that 'there is only one definite prediction of the parousia in the synoptics which has been transmitted in almost identical words by all three Evangelists, viz. the utterance in Mt. 24. 30, Mk. 13. 26, Lk. 21. 27.' Little wonder at the anxiety to be rid of Mk. 13! But, 'If the final

[1] Op. cit., p. 231. [2] Op. cit., p. 117.

[3] 'The Significance of the Eschatological Utterances of Jesus', *London Theological Studies*, 1911.

discourse of Jesus can be clearly proved to have been adulterated by a foreign admixture of Jewish eschatological ideas, why should we hesitate in supposing that other similar elements in the present records of the teaching of Jesus came from the same source'?[1] Presuming a general unwillingness to take the latter step, then even if sources are intermingled in the eschatological discourse, both should be taken as authentic. 'The hypothesis with regard to the Jewish origin of the "Little Apocalypse" is not, and cannot, be proved. There is no tangible evidence which warrants the conclusion that it could not have been an utterance of Jesus. The supposition that the prediction of the parousia in Mt. 24. 30 (Mk. 13. 26) is of Jewish origin is a purely gratuitous assumption and cannot be substantiated by sound argument.'[2] The apparent dogmatism in such a statement is due to our isolating it from its context. In fact, Andrews provides one of the most cogent demonstrations of the authenticity of our Lord's eschatological teaching that can be found in short compass. He alludes to a factor that should be obvious enough to us all but which is rarely recognised, that affinity with Jewish thought is a quite inadequate ground for rejecting dominical sayings. 'If we were to reject every utterance of Jesus which could be paralleled in Jewish Literature, and set up originality as the supreme canon of value, we should reduce his teaching to very small compass. We must not set up one standard for eschatology and another for ethics. Why, for example, should we reject Mt. 26. 64 on the ground of its likeness to Dan. 7. 13 and accept the teaching of Jesus with regard to forgiveness in spite of the fact that there is a very clear parallel to it in the Testaments of the Patriarchs?'[3] Two other points that affect our problem are: (i) the fact that our Lord's eschatological teaching represents the *climax* of his instruction, not an earlier conviction which died as his ministry progressed; (ii) that, further, it is bound up with sacred and solemn occasions, such as the transfiguration, the confession at Caesarea, the tense situation when the shadow of the cross was upon him in his closing days, the judgment hall of Caiaphas. 'The place which these utterances occupy in the gospel narrative, the sanctity that surrounds the occasions on which they were made, the sense of solemnity that enshrouds them, all go to prove that Jesus himself regarded them as amongst his most important deliverances. We cannot set them on one side without setting on one side what Jesus

[1] Op. cit., pp. 69–70.
[2] Op. cit., p. 73.
[3] Op. cit., p. 80.

himself regarded as being of primary significance.'[1] Is it not permissible to apply this observation to Mk. 13? The setting of the discourse is just such a solemn occasion: Jesus' conflict with the Jewish leaders is behind him, the conviction of the doom of the temple has been expressed, his own death is nigh; it was a fitting occasion for our Lord to give guidance to his followers. It should not go unnoticed that even if much of the discourse has been brought from other sources, everything in it presupposes the closing period of the ministry, the period of eschatological instruction. On the whole we must be grateful to Andrews for his contribution, even if we feel the hypothesis of two sources for Mk. 13 to be questionable.

3. A Continuous Description of the Christian Era

The view, remarked by Strauss, that Jesus 'noticed what is intermediate', between the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the age, is represented by a small group of exegetes, who read the eschatological discourse as a straightforward and continuous prophecy. The most notable of these is Theodor Zahn, but his views were, in measure, anticipated forty years earlier by a little-known writer, W. F. Gess.[2] This scholar protests against the assumption that the Evangelists had no compunction in attributing to Jesus words they knew he never said, and that they took undue liberties in editing the Lord's sayings. Having a special interest in Luke's version of the discourse, he singles out Lk. 21. 24 for mention: 'Many are now saying that Luke himself, of his own accord, has put these words into the mouth of Jesus. Seeing Jerusalem in ruins, the Jews driven out and waiting in vain for the coming of Jesus, he retouched the saying of Jesus in which the parousia followed immediately on the Fall of Jerusalem by this addition. . . . Now Luke certainly in v. 20 has set down another saying in the place of what had been handed on. But while he there explained the meaning of Jesus, here he would have suppressed it. That an Evangelist accorded himself such a liberty is improbable in the highest degree.'[3] Investigations of Luke's version of the discourse by B. S. Easton, Vincent Taylor and T. W. Manson in no small measure vindicate the attitude for which Gess here pleaded. His insistence on the

[1] Op. cit., p. 82.
[2] *Christi Zeugnis von seiner Person und seinem Werk*, 1870.
[3] Op. cit., p. 134.

importance of Lk. 21. 24 further led him to make an observation on Luke's eschatological interests worth pondering in the light of modern opinion on this matter: 'We meet in Luke alone the parousia saying of the girded loins (12. 35), of the yearning for a day of the Son of Man (17. 22), of the Nobleman (19. 12)—proof enough that *what Jesus had said of his coming again was for him a particular object of research* (1. 3). . . . The most natural view will be that 21. 24 is a genuine element of this discourse on the Mount of Olives which was *rescued from oblivion through this evangelist's diligence in research.*'[1] Here, then, is a clue to a right understanding of the discourse: Jesus anticipated a period between Jerusalem's fall and his parousia which he named 'the times of the Gentiles'; he also spoke of the universal preaching of the Gospel. Now in Mt. 22. 7 f., 21. 43 f., it is assumed that the preaching to the nations does not commence seriously till *after* the fall of Jerusalem. The times of the Gentiles will accordingly last a long time. Jesus could not possibly have placed his parousia immediately after the events of A.D. 70; and statements in the discourse which apparently link the two must be interpreted otherwise. In effect, therefore, Gess would solve the problem of Mk. 13 by inserting Lk. 21. 24 at v. 19: an indeterminate period is set between the fall of Jerusalem and the parousia, the discourse in the main runs a straight course through history.

Before commenting on these views, it will be to our advantage to consider Zahn's interpretation. The conservatism of this man of immense learning should not be over-emphasised. He argued strongly that Luke's account is secondary, in that it came after the events of A.D. 70, and represents an interpretation of the Lord's words in the light of history rather than a report. Similarly Mark's wording of the abomination passage represents an interpretation of the original, contained in Matthew's account, and reflects the circumstances of Caligula's threat to the temple.[2] The priority of the Marcan-Matthaean version of the discourse over against that of Luke is established for Zahn by the obvious relation of Paul's eschatology to the former. 'The common Christian view of the issue of history, as it appears in II Thess. 2, is historically incomprehensible without a strong support in the prophecy of Jesus, and such it finds in Mt. 15–28 = Mk. 14–23.' Further, it is unthinkable that Matthew and Mark changed the 'original' version of Luke

[1] Op. cit., p. 135.
[2] *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1909, vol. II, pp. 500, 157–9.

'out of love for eschatological ideas which did not originate with Jesus'.[1] The Little Apocalypse theory is dismissed as one which cannot be supported at any point by valid proofs.[2] For the interpretation of the discourse it is imperative to see that the 'abomination' passage has nothing to do with the events of the first century. Commenting on the clause 'Let the reader understand', Zahn characteristically writes, 'If the readers of this gospel had followed this exhortation, they would never have reached the idea that the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple in A.D. 70 was here meant. For Daniel has no such thing. Through the expression taken from Daniel he alludes to definite passages in the book, of which the plainest in expression and thought is Dan. 11. 30–39; this says nothing of a conquest and destruction of Jerusalem, but only of a removal of the regular cultus and desecration of the sanctuary through an anti-god world ruler. . . . Thus Jesus speaks not of a destruction of Jerusalem, but of an erection of a desecrating idolatrous abomination in the sanctuary.'[3] Since Zahn writes in the conviction that Jesus here gives a true prophecy, the reference of Mk. 13. 14 ff. is no longer to be regarded as lying in the past, but solely in the future. How is this justified? Like Shailer Mathews, he appeals to the fig tree parable, Mk. 13. 28 f. 'All these things' cannot include the parousia, as everyone recognises; but as little can it apply to the abomination passage. 'The idolatrous abomination, the last distress and the parousia are represented as acts, quickly following on one another, of a single drama, as the three chief moments of the world end, designated in Mt. 24. 6, 14 as τὸ τέλος. . . . In Mt. 24. 15–31 (Mk. 13. 14–27) it is not signs that are in question, but events which were known to the disciples partly from Daniel, partly from the earlier prophecies of Jesus as moments of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος.'[4] *'All these things' of the parable accordingly relates to Mt.* 24. 8, *Mk.* 13. 8; *the wars and famines, etc., comprehended under the phrase 'beginning of sorrows', include the events in Judea in the years* A.D. 66–70. Ultimately the ταῦτα of Jesus takes up the ταῦτα of the disciples' question, with the difference that 'the subjoined πάντα will comprise, in addition to the war leading up to the end of the temple, all that was described in Mt. 24. 4–14 (Mk. 13. 5–13), and in v. 8 was denoted by ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων.'[5] Zahn strengthens his interpretation by calling attention, as Gess

[1] *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, 1903, p. 651, n. 1.
[2] *Introduction to the N. T.*, vol. II, p. 588, n. 2.
[3] *Ev. des Matt.*, on 24. 15.
[4] Op. cit., p. 660. [5] Ibid.

had done, to the necessity for preaching the Gospel in all the world: 'According to Mt. 22. 7 ff. the preaching of the gospel takes a decisive turning to the heathen *only after the destruction of Jerusalem*. And between the judgment on the temple and the parousia, according to Mt. 23. 38 f., there is to be a time wherein the temple lies desolate, cf. Lk. 21. 24.'[1] With this in mind, the assertion, 'This generation will not pass till all these things happen' (Mt. 24. 34, Mk. 13. 30), must have the same reference as the fig tree parable and relate to the wars, etc., that include the fall of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the phrase 'that day' in Mt. 24. 36, Mk. 13. 32 is taken over from the Old Testament and denotes the Day of the Lord. Thus, there is no inconsistency in the mind of Jesus and no discrepancy in the prophecy. With such a result gained from the consideration of the discourse, we can now understand what Jesus meant when he spoke of his parousia as of an event which some of his contemporaries would experience (Mt. 10. 23, 16. 28, Jn. 21. 22): he was referring on these occasions to the fall of Jerusalem.[2]

This is a gallant attempt to maintain the integrity of the eschatological discourse, and it completely won over G. Wohlenberg, who reproduced the view of his master without deviation in his commentary on Mark.[3] One wonders, however, what Zahn would have had to say about this unnatural kind of exegesis had it been put forth in the interests of critical views. His limiting the reference of Mk. 13. 29 to vv. 7–8 is as arbitrary as the expedient of the Little Apocalypse advocates who insist that it *must* refer to vv. 9–13. It is possible that the 'abomination' prophecy is to be interpreted in the light of Dan. 11, but there are good grounds for holding that 13. 14–20 include the destruction of Jerusalem as following on the 'profanation'. If the destruction of the city is to be placed anywhere in the discourse, it is far more likely to be read in that passage than in vv. 7–8. Not even the appeal to a period intervening between the city's ruin and the parousia can obviate this interpretation, for *there is no valid ground for making the 'times of the Gentiles' extend through unknown centuries*, rather will it denote a short time, as we shall see later. Above all, the weakness of this view is apparent on considering the sayings above mentioned, Mt. 10. 23, Mk. 9. 1, etc. It is possible to make a plausible case for consistently equating the fall of Jerusalem with the coming of Christ and the kingdom of God, but it is hard to know how seasoned

[1] Op. cit., p. 663.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 663–664.
[3] *Das Evangelium des Markus*, 1910.

expositors in their heart of hearts can adopt that view, still less how they can adopt it for some occasions only. What unprejudiced person would imagine that when our Lord spoke about the coming of the Son of Man, or the coming of the kingdom of God with power, he was indicating perpetual 'wars and rumours of wars, kingdom against kingdom, earthquakes and famines'? We are compelled to regard this interpretation as a shift for plain thinking, a failure of courage in the face of awkward facts, and we regret that so great a scholar as Zahn lent his name to it.

4. An Application of 'Prophetic Perspective'

It will be evident that the majority of scholars who have wished to retain the eschatological discourse as genuine prophecy of Jesus have resorted to none of the previous views. Their simple answer to the problem of the discourse consisted in an appeal to the old conception of 'prophetic perspective'. This method appears to have originated with Bengel, long before the rise of criticism. He believed that while the disciples asked the Lord concerning the destruction of the temple and the parousia, without making a distinction, his answer treated of the two matters distinctly and separately, yet in order. Taking Mk. 13 as our basis (Bengel dealt with Matthew's version) the progression observed is: (i) concerning the temple and city, 5–6, 14; (ii) concerning the parousia and end of the world, 24–27; (iii) concerning the time of the temple's destruction, 28–29; (iv) concerning the time of the end of the world, 32. The difficulties of this view are apparent in the parousia passage, Mt. 24. 29 = Mk. 13. 24, but Bengel's treatment of this section reveals a candour which many a modern exegete could well emulate. Four things are noted about this saying: (i) The language of the discourse on the whole is strictly literal, therefore no exception is to be made here. (ii) The 'tribulation of those days' refers to Mt. vv. 19, 22 = Mk. vv. 17, 20, and it is indicated that the tribulation will be brief in duration. (iii) This tribulation affects the Jewish nation, and that of a single generation. (iv) The expression 'immediately,' εὐθέως, implies a very short delay, since οὔπω, 'not yet' (Mt. 6, Mk. 1) and Luke's οὐκ εὐθέως (Lk. 21. 9) are said of the short delay which must precede that tribulation; indeed, *Mk. 13. 24 excludes delay altogether.*[1] This is bold language from an orthodox theologian of the eighteenth century! Bengel anticipates

[1] *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, 2nd ed. 1759, E.T. 1857 from Steudel's edition of 1855, vol. I, pp. 417, 426.

his objectors: 'You will say, it is a great leap from the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the world, which is represented as coming *quickly* after it. I reply—A prophecy resembles a landscape painting, which marks distinctly the houses, paths, and bridges in the foreground, but brings together, into a narrow space, the distant valleys and mountains, though they are really far apart. Thus should they who study a prophecy look on the future to which the prophecy refers.'[1] Here is the genesis of the constantly repeated comparison of a prophecy with a mountain scene, whose peaks allow no idea of the nature and distance of the valleys between. It is a brave interpretation, but it still involves the theologian in difficulties. Strauss pointed out that this merely shows how easy it was for Jesus to err in questions of time; it does not abolish the error. And Bengel must have realised that, for he weakened and made concessions to contemporary convictions: 'The advent of our Lord *actually took place* (as far as its commencement was concerned, Jn. 21. 22) after the destruction of Jerusalem. . . .'[2] Still worse, he paraphrased the Lord's words thus: 'Concerning these things which will happen after the tribulation of those days of the destruction of Jerusalem, *the nearest event which at present it suits my condition to mention, and your capacity to expect*, is this, that the sun will be darkened, etc.'[3] That comes dangerously near to the view that Jesus knew better, but deliberately withheld the truth. It is unfortunate that Bengel should have lapsed in such a manner after so promising a beginning. Nevertheless, he had sowed a seed from which was to issue a great harvest.

Passing over a complete century we come to E. de Pressensé,[4] whose book on Jesus was written one year after Colani's. He gives no direct mention of the latter's work, but it is possible that his strictures on the anti-eschatological theologians may have it in mind. He protests against the idealism which restricts the operation of God's justice to the spiritual realm. 'Such a theory ignores the fact that evil has not confined itself within these bounds, but has stalked abroad boldly in the external world, as if its triumph there were assured and final; it has laid hold of the springs of natural and social life.'[5] Unless human history is to lose its moral character, we must assume that God will work his will *within* history. The great lesson of the eschatological discourse lies in its

[1] Op. cit., p. 427. [2] Ibid.
[3] Op. cit., p. 428.
[4] *Jesus Christ: his times, life and work*, E.T. 1879 from the 7th French ed.
[5] Op. cit., p. 439.

revelation that there are lesser as well as final judgments of God, and all are related. 'Every period has its own decisive event, and receives its own solemn sentence. These partial judgments foretell the great final judgment. . . . They are no sudden surprises of fate, or, to speak more correctly, no *coups d'état* of Providence, making violent assaults on liberty. No, nothing can better assure us of the value God sets on human freedom, than to see the history of society and of nature itself so suspended on moral decisions, that heaven and earth may be moved to carry out the awards of divine justice. We know no spiritualism bolder than this so-called materialism.'[1] In the discourse we see that the partial judgments lead on to final and decisive judgment, but no line of separation is drawn between the two. 'The destruction of the theocracy is confounded with those great final throes out of which will come forth the new earth wherein shall dwell righteousness. Prophecy gives its broad survey without perspective.'[2] Like Bengel, however, de Pressensé cannot leave the matter there. Probably unconscious of his imitation of the former, he asserted that the final judgment really commenced with the destruction of the faithless theocracy; that Jesus avowed subsequently his ignorance of times and seasons; and finally that the disciples applied to the parousia some sayings which referred only to the destruction of Jerusalem.[3] These three propositions are undoubtedly intended to soften the effect of the major contention, but the first and third are sops without taste. If the idea of prophetic perspective is to be taken seriously, considerations of this kind are superfluous.

C. A. Briggs wrote his study of 'the Apocalypse of Jesus', as he termed Mk. 13, after a prolonged study of the Messianic passages of the Old and New Testaments.[4] It is accordingly not without authority that he could write, 'The discourse of Jesus . . . is intermediate between the apocalypse of Daniel and the apocalypse of John. As it depends upon the former and advances upon the Messianic idea contained therein, so it is the prelude to the latter and the key to its interpretation.'[5] There is no cause for wonder that the 'apocalyptic' sections of Mk. 13 resemble in many respects Jewish apocalypses: 'This is because they all depend on the apocalypse of Daniel, and use the language of the judgment scenes of the

[1] Op. cit., p. 439. [2] Op. cit., p. 440. [3] Op. cit., pp. 440–441.

[4] This is embodied in his three volumes, *Messianic Prophecy*, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, *The Messiah of the Apostles* appearing in 1886, 1894, 1895 respectively.

[5] *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 132.

Old Testament prophets. There is no sufficient reason why Jesus himself should not have used the Old Testament in the same manner. We ought to expect that Jesus in his predictions would bridge the time between the apocalypse of Daniel and the apocalypse of John, and give an intermediate stage in the development of the apocalyptic prophecy, if, as we believe, these apocalypses give us genuine prediction.'[1] Briggs agrees with Weiss that the disciples' question, When shall *these things* be? implies not one event but a series of events; that is, the ruin of the temple is set in an eschatological context.[2] Mk. 13. 5–8 supply a *negative* answer as to the time of their coming to pass: 'the end is not yet.' The *positive* answer is contained in vv. 9–13; the gospel is to be preached to the nations and to the whole inhabitable globe, that the nations might be saved and not be condemned in the judgment of the world. 'This is the scope of the preaching of the gospel. Until this has been accomplished, the second Advent cannot come.'[3] This period of gospel preaching (the 'times of the gospel') is parallel to Luke's 'times of the Gentiles', but the former is spoken of from the point of view of the Jewish-Christians, the latter from the point of view of the Gentiles.[4] How is this related to Matthew's representation that the parousia happens 'immediately' after the Jewish tribulation? The prophets of the old dispensation help us. '*Εὐθέως* is certainly no stronger than the קָרִיב of Old Testament prophecy used in connection with similar advents to judgment. It represents that to the mind of the prophet Jesus, as to the prophets that preceded him, the Advent was *near*. It was near in the prophetic sense —that is, *the event was certain, but the time uncertain*.'[5] This, we fear, is a misuse of the concept of 'prophetic perspective'. It may be quite permissible to rationalise this phenomenon and relate the sense of immediacy to the feeling of certainty, but this is not to be imported into exegesis. When Briggs attempted to bring his interpretation of 'immediacy' into relation with his 'times of the gospel' he involved himself in grave difficulties. 'It would seem that while the preaching of the gospel may be to some extent parallel with the tribulation, it cannot be limited by that shortened time, but must extend beyond it and be parallel with the times of the Gentiles, which were certainly subsequent to the destruction of the holy city, and therefore intervene between the tribulation and the parousia, and must be covered by the expression *εὐθέως* of Matthew.

[1] Op. cit., p. 134. [2] Op. cit., p. 138. [3] Op. cit., pp. 141, 145.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 150–151. [5] Op. cit., pp. 155–156.

To take the εὐθέως strictly, or in any other way than the apocalyptic sense of the Old Testament advent scenes, is to introduce a glaring inconsistency between the two representations.'[1] This is asking too much of us. Could Briggs adduce any passage from the Old Testament or Jewish apocalypses which consciously equates the term 'immediately' with a period lasting for indefinite ages? It is one thing to show that prophets usually expect the Day of the Lord to be 'at hand', while history demonstrates that the times are in the Father's authority; it is another thing for them to conceive that it is *both* at hand *and* far off. We do Jesus no honour by attributing to him such an impossible attitude, and his language does not require it.

The problem of 'prophetic perspective' was wrestled with by Paul Schwartzkopff as by none before him.[2] He agreed with Weiffenbach and his successors that the prophecy of the fall of Jerusalem is quite separate from the exhortations to the disciples, but not that this requires a Jewish apocalypse for its explanation. If the connection between the two strains of prediction is not original, at least it is right in showing us that Jesus had subordinated the catastrophe of Jerusalem to the thought of his coming again: 'Thus the Lord's sayings which concern the coming again and the destruction of Jerusalem, *apart perhaps from Mk.* 13. 30 *and* 32 f., originally were never externally bound with each other.'[3] The exception made of Mk. 13. 30 and 32 is significant, for the advocates of the idea of two discourses in the chapter usually regard these two passages as the linch pin of their view. In all conscience Schwartzkopff could not do that, for he was convinced that Mk. 13. 30 cannot be whittled away by being referred to the fall of Jerusalem; it has to be placed alongside Mk. 9. 1, 14. 62, and Mt. 10. 23, all of which relate to the parousia. He seeks to demonstrate his point from the discourse; the disciples had asked concerning the time and signs of the ruin of the temple; all that Jesus relates concerning false prophets, natural phenomena, strife, persecution, distress in Judea, stands under the point of view of preliminary signs, headed up by the coming of the Son of Man. 'Since the second question as to the point of time has thus far not been answered at all, then *Mark must intend to give this answer in vv.* 29 *and* 30, introduced by the parable.'[4] If it be objected that this overlooks the admission

[1] Op. cit., p. 156.
[2] *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi, von seinem Tode, seiner Auferstehung und Wiederkunft und ihre Erfüllung*, 1895.
[3] Op. cit., p. 160.
[4] Op. cit., p. 166.

that two series of sayings are embodied in the discourse, it is observed that as the *signs* relate to the *parousia*, it is only natural to refer the statement of time also to the end. Luke shows clearly that the fig tree parable can only speak of the kingdom of God, we have no warrant for thinking otherwise of the statement that follows it.[1] A further consideration comes to the fore when we see that in Mt. 23. 31 ff. Jesus alludes to a fearful judgment of God on the murderers of the prophets in similar language as here: 'All this shall come upon this generation' (23. 36). This looks as though we are not dealing here with a destruction of Jerusalem taken by itself, but with a judgment of the last days.[2] Schwartzkopff does not immediately draw a conclusion from this parallel, but it implies an eschatological setting for the prediction of the temple's overthrow.

Whether this be so or not, we have to deal with the undoubted fact that in Mk. 13 it is represented that the destruction of Jerusalem and the coming of Christ have the same signs and same terminus: how is this to be explained? On two grounds, replied Schwartzkopff: the example of the prophets, and the teaching of Jesus concerning his speedy coming. 'According to prophetic analogy it is customary for a judgment over the enemies of God without and within Israel to precede the entry of the perfected kingdom, which the prophet as a rule sets in his own age. If now for the first Christians it was plain that Jesus also looked for the setting up of the perfected kingdom in his own time, they also knew, on the other hand, what on the basis of our prophecy Mk. 13. 2 cannot be doubted, that he had also prophesied the destruction of the temple along with that of Jerusalem. . . . Thus it lay wholly in the line of prophecy if the final judgment took place not long before the entry of the perfected kingdom.'[3] The inference from this can only be that the juxtaposition of signs relating to the end of Jerusalem and the end of the age, even if not originally proceeding from Jesus, must approximate to his view. In particular there is no ground for opposing Mk. 13. 30 and 32 as inconsistent. The prevailing view of the latter verse extracted from it a confession by Jesus as to his *absolute* ignorance of the time of the end: 'This interpretation appears now, in the face of our entire previous discussion, as impossible; this passage in and for itself clearly exhibits, in my opinion, only a relative ignorance of Jesus.'[4] In that case the confession of ignorance is quite consistent with a convic-

[1] Op. cit., p. 166.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 166–167.
[3] Op. cit., p. 173.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 177–178.

tion that the end would come within a generation. Schwartzkopff's further discussions as to the psychological and religious problems involved in this interpretation of our Lord's teaching cannot be considered here, since we are dealing with questions of exegesis. The influence exercised by him on the thinking of his generation was considerable, not the least being that which he evidently had on R. H. Charles.[1]

To return to the British scene from German theological speculation is to step into another world. The clamant voices of the European debate were caught by few ears in this country. Salmond's exegesis on Mk. 13 is simply a reproduction of Bengel's views. Jesus is said to reveal in his teaching the phenomena of Old Testament prophecy. 'Events which history shows to have been widely separated are brought together in what is described as *prophetic perspective* or "timeless sequence", or in *causal* connection, or as if *the one formed part of the other*. . . . In his eschatological discourses Christ recognises, as Old Testament prophecy did, the partial and preliminary manifestations of the kingdom as involving the final. . . .'[2] We believe that this is what is popularly termed having your cake and eating it: the sequence of historic crisis and final end is *timeless*, the one *causes* the other, the one is *part* of the other, the one is a *coming* of the other—there is not much that can be said after that! If there was excuse for Bengel in the eighteenth century, endeavouring to mollify wounded consciences by his revolutionary contention, the modern critic ought to do better than this.

William Sanday seems never to have made up his mind finally what to make of the eschatology of Jesus and of Mk. 13 in particular. He distinguished six kinds of predictions made by our Lord: they concerned (i) his death and resurrection, (ii) the fall of Jerusalem, (iii) the End of all things, (iv) the coming of the Spirit, (v) the spread of the Church, (vi) historical comings of Christ. The last was dubious, the first three certainly authentic. Difficulty arises through the linking in our sources of (ii) and (iii), and because it is stated in at least one passage that (iii) will occur within the contemporary generation. 'We know that it has not so taken place, and the great question is what we are to say to this. *Is it an error in one who has never been convicted in error in anything else?*'[3] A drastic

[1] The views of Schwartzkopff are also reproduced by Arthur Titius in *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, 1895.

[2] *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, 1st ed., 1895; 5th ed., 1903, pp. 244–245.

[3] *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 1905 (=the article 'Jesus Christ' in vol. ii, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1899), pp. 152–153.

solution of the difficulty is to reject the apocalyptic element of our Lord's teaching. 'The chief means through which this is done has been the supposed discovery that in the discourse of Mk. 13 par. there is incorporated a "Little Apocalypse" of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin.'[1] If this passage is removed, one could account for the other sayings by supposing the disciples to have misunderstood their import, but the theory 'has not perhaps as yet been brought to any final solution'.[2] Meanwhile an attractive interpretation would make passages like Mk. 9. 1, which speak of the imminent kingdom, refer to the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost. These views are reproduced unchanged in Sanday's *Life of Christ in recent Research*, 1907 (pp. 53–54). In an article written on the subject in 1911 he despairs of a solution of the problem ever being reached. In regard to eschatology we must confess, 'It is impossible to say exactly what belongs to the Master and what to the disciple.'[3] This uncertainty reaches its peak point in respect of Mk. 13. Of the Little Apocalypse theory he writes: 'It would make not a little difference if we could be sure that this hypothesis was true. The verses under discussion concentrate in themselves all the more striking features of Jewish apocalypse; apart from them we should have but little evidence that our Lord adopted the more extreme and fantastic features of this branch of Judaism. *When it seemed that these features could be thus got rid of, the hypothesis by means of which the amputation was performed was eagerly welcomed, and from that time onward has been a generally accepted part of the liberal tradition.*' A candid confession of the kind of motive which made the Little Apocalypse theory so popular! He continues: 'But we must distinctly recognise that it is nothing more than a hypothesis. The proof of it is very far from being stringent. It is one thing to say that certain verses are detachable from their context, and another thing to infer that therefore they ought to be detached. For myself I fail to see how the decision can ever be final; if we accept the verses as an integral part of the discourse, we still cannot be sure that they are not an interpolation, but on the other hand, if we reject them as an interpolation, we can have no guarantee that they may not after all be genuine.'[4]

The same indefiniteness, and yet perception of the issues, characterised Sanday's discussion of the prophetic consciousness.

[1] Op. cit., p. 156. [2] Ibid.
[3] 'The Apocalyptic Element in the Gospels', *The Hibbert Journal*, vol. x, no. 1, 1911, p. 94.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 94–95.

'What measure are we to apply to it? Are we to measure it strictly by what was in the mind of the speaker? If we do that, then we have to allow that not a little Old Testament prophecy came far short of the reality. If we are to measure prediction by what it meant for the hearers, then the gap between prediction and reality would be greater still. If we measure prediction by that which the Spirit of God intended when it inspired the prophet, then history itself becomes the key to prophecy. But in the case of our Lord we know that he referred all things to the Father. To all his acts he annexed the condition: "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done".'[1] This is excellently stated and has bearing on our subject, but Sanday hesitates to apply it. In regard to what the Spirit inspires as to the End of the age, of course, the historical canon is scarcely adequate, it will be too late to pass any judgment on the prophet when that comes to pass. But to say that our Lord referred all things to the Father with the prayer, 'Thy will be done', only has bearing if that prayer stands in the background of his actual predictions of the future. Jesus prophesied as he prayed—subject to the Father's will. It so happens that the only explicit statement of our Lord, in the days of his flesh, that the consummation lies in the Father's hands is contained in Mk. 13. Instead of putting Mk. 13. 32 over against the rest of the chapter, what is there to prevent our reading the discourse with this as the silent presupposition of the whole?

W. C. Allen strangely neglected the critical problems of the eschatological discourse in his commentary on Matthew, but he gave them careful treatment in his commentary on Mark.[2] He rejected the Little Apocalypse theory as a 'serious indictment' of Mark, which would have repercussions on our view of the general reliability of his gospel. The major difficulty of Mk. 13 appears to be the likeness of its ideas to those of Jewish apocalyptic: but such parallels are not confined to Mk. 13. Conceptions like the kingdom of God, the Son of Man, the coming of the Son of Man in glory, life, the world to come, the resurrection, inheriting eternal life, the nearness of the kingdom, are all apocalyptic ideas, and yet form an integral part of our Lord's message and appear in the body of Mark's gospel.[3] The much-loved Q also has genuine eschatological teachings, such as Lk. 17. 22 f., 10. 12, 11. 31 f., 22. 30, which

[1] Op. cit., p. 108.
[2] 'The Gospel according to St. Mark', *Oxford Church Biblical Commentary*, 1915.
[3] Op. cit., p. 163.

imply the whole cycle of Gospel apocalyptic teaching; hence 'we have no right to question or deny that he who spake these words can have uttered the sayings recorded in Mk. 13'.[1] Allen deals very strongly with Streeter's contention of a double evolution in eschatology within the Church, one away from futurism, the other developing it. 'This extraordinary theory, that the tendency in the Gospel literature of the Church was exactly the reverse of the movement in its theology, can be nothing else but a perversion of the truth. It is only arrived at by constructing, by uncritical methods, as a first source of Gospel tradition a source Q which contains comparatively little eschatological material, and underestimating the value and significance of even that. The truth is that there are two aspects of religion which are present throughout the whole New Testament side by side, the thought of eternal life or of the kingdom as present, and the conception of it as future. . . . The ingenious manipulation of Gospel sources by which it is proposed to show that there has been an increasing fabrication of eschatological material in successive Gospel documents is unsound in method, and leads to a result so absurd that it must necessarily be untrue, viz. that the *Gospel writers were heading a counter-movement to the general drift of the Church's theology*.'[2]

How, then, are we to interpret Mk. 13? Partly as a conscious use of technical apocalyptic language of a pictorial type to express what is inexpressible in language, the consummation of history. 'If we are faced with the difficulty that he (Jesus) seems to have said that this coming would be immediate, we can but say that that is no reason for denying that he uttered the words in question. Better to say that upon this point he did not think well to reveal more than a prophet's insight into the development of the future, or to say that he wished each generation of men to watch and wait for him, than to tamper with historical evidence because it causes us difficulty and we cannot wholly understand it.'[3] With language like this constantly meeting us, it looks as though conservative critics were becoming more courageous in their thinking about this problem than their more liberal colleagues.

C. H. Turner gave typical expression to a modern conservative critic's view of Mk. 13.[4] He noted that the discourse was not part of our Lord's public teaching, it was a private talk with his most inti-

[1] Op. cit., p. 164. [2] Op. cit., pp. 165–166. [3] Op. cit., p. 167.
[4] 'The Gospel according to St. Mark', *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, 1928.

mate friends. 'There had been in more general discourse references to the Return—e.g. 8. 38, 9. 1—and our Lord did not hesitate to proclaim it before Caiaphas (14. 62); but *details about the indications which would precede it were not part of the Gospel*, and he only discussed them in confidence with some few of those who were to be his most trusted representatives, and at the very close of his ministry.'[1] Turner adopted the simplest analysis of the chapter: (i) the signs before the End, 5–23; (ii) the End, 24–27; (iii) the Moral, 28–37. He rejected any idea of modification of the discourse through the Church's experience and apparent fulfilment of our Lord's words: 'It cannot be said that there is any evidence of this.'[2] If the time perspective is wrong, that is part of the consequences of the Incarnation; in that respect, 'no Christian critic can speak more than tentatively and with reverent caution, and always with the recollection that the *ultima ratio* is the guidance of the Spirit in the Body of Christ. But it does not seem that we can exclude consideration of the possibility that the ignorance which our Lord attributed to himself was not merely academic, but *a real ignorance with real results*.'[3] That conviction of Turner's is shared by perhaps a majority of critics since his time, and there is no necessity to trace it in their writings.

5. A Composition of Isolated Fragments

The idea that the eschatological discourse was constructed from originally separate sayings was advocated, it will be remembered, by C. H. Weisse.[4] This view had been forgotten in the two generations that had elapsed since his time, but D. E. Haupt revived it, duly acknowledging his debt to Weisse.[5] He began by criticising Wendt's recent exposition of the Little Apocalypse, the two discourse theory. If Mark had taken over two separate discourses, it was a puzzle to know why he had mixed them so confusingly instead of reproducing them independently. It is not as though Mark had placed related items together; e.g. he has separated the two passages concerning false messiahs and false prophets (vv. 6, 21–23), and the position of the fig tree parable is ambiguous; it cannot possibly relate to its immediate antecedent. Pfleiderer's view, that the ingredients of the one discourse have been separated by the insertion of parenetic sayings, is also unsatisfactory; for the chief

[1] Op. cit., Part III, p. 102.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] See above, pp. 7 f.
[5] *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien*, 1895

feature of the distress is supposed to be the events of the Jewish war, yet the warning against false Christs *precedes* the distress instead of following it, and we know there was no crowd of Messiahs before A.D. 66. Haupt accordingly proposes the hypothesis that 'this discourse is in the fullest sense a mosaic work, composed from little pieces'.[1] The method adopted is that which we have seen in our account of Lohmeyer's exposition: each verse is examined and a demonstration provided that it does not suit its context. Mk. 13. 6 gives the impression of being 'an erratic block'; it owes its present position to a verbal contact with v. 5, the *βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ* of 5 is balanced by the *πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν* of 6. Verse 8 with its *γὰρ* should offer a ground for the statement of 7, but it simply repeats its substance. It is noted that Luke separates the two verses with the expression *τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, which points to a fresh source for the second statement. 9–15 need not be regarded as eschatological in nature; Matthew gives them in a different kind of context, showing that he found them elsewhere. The paragraph contains two parallel sections, each having a climax: 9*b*–11 tells of persecutions through governing powers, 12–13 of the same through relatives, and so generally; the former section gives the encouraging thought that persecution will not hinder God's kingdom, the latter is concerned only with the personal destiny of the disciples. 15–16 is repeated by Luke in a different context, Lk. 17. 31, but neither Evangelist has preserved the true context; Luke found the saying with the addition 'remember Lot's wife', and that occasioned the context in which he placed it, while in Mark it disturbs the flow of thought in 14. 17–18. Verses 19–20, unlike 14. 17–18, relate to a *general* catastrophe which none can escape, not a Judean invasion from which one should fly, cf. the *πᾶσα σάρξ* of v. 20. Verses 21–23 come from another context, for 24 harks back to 19–20, while Luke gives the passage (in part) in the Q apocalypse (Lk. 17. 23). Mk. 24–27 are allowed to remain, Lk. 26*a* could well be inserted in the midst of v. 25, while Lk. 28 would well round off the passage. That Mk. 28 f. comes from another source is shown in Luke's introductory clause *καὶ εἶπεν παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς* and in any case it does not suit the discourse. The softening of the fig tree's branches shows the kindly power of summer; a better parallel to the distresses that herald the kingdom would be the storms of spring! It is possible that this parable provides the answer to the disciples' question, v. 4; Jesus meant to say, 'When

[1] Op. cit., pp. 22–24.

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. Mk. 13. 32, on the other hand, comes from a context which speaks of the 'day' of the Lord.[1] An incidental conclusion from the above analysis will be that '*That presumed (Little) Apocalypse breaks in one's hands when it is examined more closely*'.[2]

Not all this discussion carries equal conviction, but it is admittedly less arbitrary than Lohmeyer's analysis. Had Haupt been more reasonable in his application of this result, he would probably have gained an immediate following. In reality, his purpose in conducting this analysis was akin to that of Weisse who first propounded it, viz. to rid Jesus of a 'materialistic' eschatology. The impossible interpretation of the fig tree parable, reproduced above, hints of what is in Haupt's mind.[3] He wishes to extend the parabolic method of Jesus' instruction to his eschatology. Insisting that it is impossible to express the supersensuous through sensuous, conceptual material, he maintains that Jesus did not attempt it; for the first time he reached the thought of the supernatural life in all its purity and in sharp distinction from everything relating to this world.[4] The only coming of which Jesus spoke is a continual coming, cf. Mt. 18. 20, 28. 20. Inevitably this view provoked opposition among Haupt's contemporaries and in rejecting his eschatology they rejected his criticism.[5]

F. C. Burkitt seems to have undergone a development in his views on the significance of our Lord's eschatology and of Mk. 13 in particular. Not that he ever embraced the Little Apocalypse theory. 'Both the general purport of the discourse and most of the single sayings seem to me, if I may venture to give an opinion, perfectly to harmonise with what we otherwise know of the teaching of Jesus.' But the literary form is different from the rest of Mark; it was probably not a composition of his own. 'The hypothesis that

[1] Op. cit., pp. 27–39. [2] Op. cit., p. 33.

[3] Haupt went astray in trying to make the *ταῦτα* of the application, v. 29, relate to something *within the parable*, an inexcusable procedure. Cf. Schwartzkopff, 'Logically it is absolutely demanded to understand by "this", since it signifies the compared object, something other than that with which it is compared', *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, p. 172.

[4] Op. cit., pp. 117 ff.

[5] See Schwartzkopff, *Weissaungen*, pp. 172–175; Titius, *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, pp. 141–145.

the eschatological discourse in Mk. 13 once circulated, very much in its present form, as a separate fly-sheet, explains the allusion to "him that *readeth*".[1] We gather that Burkitt at this time did not greatly desire to 'read'. 'The hope of the Second Coming of the Son of Man has faded with us into an unsubstantial dream. We are not expecting a new heaven and new earth—at least, not in our time.' Our best recourse is 'to accept the Coming of Messiah upon the clouds of heaven to gather together his elect from every quarter as the natural picture, the natural way of expressing faith and hope in the triumph of the good over evil, all that people mean nowadays by the vague word Progress.'[2] We hazard a guess that Burkitt, after writing this, was shaken not a little when reading Schweitzer. In an essay contributed by him to the volume of Biblical studies edited by Swete the emphasis is wholly changed. It is stressed that the modern doctrine of progress is the precise opposite of the convictions of the Gospels, and that that doctrine is less defensible than it used to be: 'There are not wanting indications that our race, like the ruling race in the time of the Antonines, is beginning to get tired.' While declining to enter upon apocalyptic prophecy on his own account he urges, 'If we really are confronted with disquieting signs of great and fundamental changes in the social and political system that has lasted so long, *it is the Gospel above all things that can reassure us*.'[3] Burkitt had begun to 'read'! Indeed, he had gone to another extreme. Believing the fundamental idea of apocalyptic to be the hope of a future kingdom of God, he writes: 'Without the belief in the Good Time Coming I do not see how we can be Christians at all. The belief in the Good Time Coming as the most important thing in the world, and therewith the duty of preparing ourselves and our fellow-men to be ready as the first duty and privilege of humanity—*this is the foundation of the Gospel*.'[4]

In an article published in 1929 Burkitt gave his maturest thoughts on the eschatological discourse.[5] The setting of the discourse seems to him singularly appropriate. 'What Mark puts down in Ch. 13 is in some of its main characteristics historical reminiscence and not

[1] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 1906, 3rd ed., 1911, p. 63.
[2] Op. cit., p. 179.
[3] *The Eschatological Idea in the Gospel*, Essays on some Biblical Questions of the Day by members of the University of Cambridge, 1909, p. 208.
[4] Op. cit., pp. 209–210.
[5] 'Jesus Christ, An Historical Outline', a contribution to *A History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, 1929. The article was re-issued separately with additions in 1932. The citations are taken from the later edition.

literary invention.'[1] This is so unlike the usual critical account that some explanation is required. 'I regard Mk. 13. 3–37 as a literary composition, *the literary composition of the Evangelist*. In it he has put together the Sayings of Jesus which he had about the future, just as in 4. 2–32 he has put together his store of Galilean Parables. I do not think that Mk. 13. 3–37, or the portions of it which are often called "the Little Apocalypse", ever had a separate literary existence before incorporation in the Gospel of Mark. Some of the single sayings may be genuine utterances of Jesus belonging to other occasions, others may be sayings never really said by Jesus.'[2] To this last class the word about the 'abomination' belongs, probably originating in the Caligula episode. 'But I am not thinking of these details. What I have in mind is the difference in tone between Mark 13 and the Galilean gospel which began and ended with "the kingdom of God is *at hand*". The burden of Mark 13 is, "*Wait*: do not be always imagining that the End is just coming. It will seem a long time to you, and you will have a hard time of it; but be firm and patient, and above all things be ready, and you will not lose your reward. . . ".'[3] Burkitt observes, 'These ideas fit curiously well with what we might fancy to be in the mind of a Prophet who had come up to Jerusalem to hasten the coming of the kingdom of God —and it had not come! It is just in this interval, between the action of Jesus and the action of the chief priests, when Jesus had abandoned Jerusalem, that this new conviction, that the End was not so near after all, would show itself'.[4] The background of this interpretation is the view that Jesus started with the belief that 'the kingdom of God should immediately appear'; the Gospel story is the narration of how Jesus came to realise that the time was not yet ripe and that he must die at Jerusalem as the condition for the coming of the new age. 'Jesus was fully persuaded that unless he did of his own initiative court failure and a violent death the new state of things, so ardently expected and longed for, would not arrive.' There follow the famous words of Schweitzer about Jesus taking hold of the wheel of the world to end history and being crushed by it.[5] It is clear, even without this quotation, that Burkitt has capitulated to Schweitzer, despite the modifications he has made in the latter's construction. In contrast to the advocates of the Little Apocalypse theory, Burkitt has accepted Mk. 13 at the cost of giving up the relevance of the earlier eschatology of Jesus, a

[1] Op. cit., p. 49. [2] Ibid. [3] Op. cit., pp. 49–50.
[4] Op. cit., p. 50. [5] Op. cit., pp. 18, 37–38.

position as unsatisfactory as the other. It is extraordinary that it should be thought that Jesus had adopted this new view about the delay of the End *during the last week of his life*. What of the sayings like Mt. 10. 23, Mk. 9. 1, which assume an interval between the death of Jesus and his parousia, the former also presuming a time of mission preaching for the disciples? What are we to make of the policy of Jesus in calling out and preparing for the building of the Church, if no thought had been taken of an interval between his death and coming again? In this matter it very much looks as though this most careful and competent scholar had not exercised his gift of incisive thinking in his customary manner.[1]

6. Recent Approaches towards a Synthesis

It will have become apparent that certain exegetes whose work we have considered combine more than one viewpoint in their interpretation of our discourse, although we have attempted to make clear their distinctive approach in each case. From about the year 1930, however, distinctions break down and a fair measure of agreement becomes manifest among the critics and theologians who reject the Little Apocalypse theory. It is more usually assumed than denied that Mk. 13 is composed of related material, some at least of which is drawn from other occasions than the situation presumed in the chapter. Most incline to accept the shortened perspective of Jesus as a factor to be reckoned with, however it is to be explained. On that basis there is a tendency to believe that Jesus in some way associated the fall of Jerusalem with his parousia. It then becomes easier to read the discourse as a fairly straightforward prophecy, even if it is expanded by other elements, and it is often felt that the discourse offers *aspects* of things to come rather than an unveiling of the future in quasi-historical order. One is tempted to make a division of expositions and characterise them as *theological* and *critical*, but that would be unfair to the theologians and critics alike. Nevertheless, we have come to the period when scholars have become more interested in the teaching of our Gospels than in their analysis, and this is reflected in the treatment of Mk. 13. We shall accordingly review in order of appearance the rest of the contributions to our study.

[1] The view that Mk. 13 contains sayings uttered on more than one occasion appears also in Swete's commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John. David Smith, in *The Disciple's Commentary on the Gospels*, pp. 390 f., makes the interesting suggestion that in Mk. 13 we have only *fragments of the discourse* given on the Mount of Olives, the scattered nature of which inevitably has created difficulties for us which did not exist originally.

We begin with a writer whose work on eschatology is generally considered to be of first importance, Gerhard Gloege.[1] Here we are confronted with a strictly theological treatment of our subject. Gloege does not once mention the Little Apocalypse, but his use of Mk. 13 shows beyond doubt that he accepts the discourse as authentic teaching of Jesus. He approaches it from the angle of his fundamental belief that to Jesus 'the conception of the sovereignty of God is *thoroughly dynamic*'. God is central to his thinking, revealing himself as 'the royally working world-will'.[2] '"*God ruled, rules, and will rule.*" That is the theme which perpetually sounds out in the most varied sayings-compositions of Jesus.'[3] Here is to be found the long-sought unity of present and futurist eschatology: 'If the conception of God is set with deliberate decision in the centre of the entire preaching, then that alternative in fact is surpassed and therewith antiquated; present and future completely concur on the ground of the New Testament view of the kingdom.'[4] In the present the inbreaking of the future is already given, the future is only the working out of what is already begun in the present. 'Neither is thinkable without the other, both moments are indissolubly bound with one another.'[5] With this clue in our hands, several characteristics of the eschatological discourse receive illumination. (i) The emphasis in the discourse falls on the final event, to which the whole leads. 'The parousia itself is . . . introduced or prepared for through terrestrial-cosmic signs and catastrophes (Mk. 13. 5–37 par.) of such proportions, that all statements about it must be looked on as hints of an intervention of God far surpassing the forms of expression.'[6] It is suggested that as the cloud at the Ascension (Acts 1. 9) signifies a *veiling* of the event, rather than a vehicle, so the description of the coming in the clouds denotes the 'sudden becoming-again-*unveiled*' of the invisible Kurios. Any exact prediction is lacking.[7] (ii) No detailed description of preliminary signs is afforded. 'Because the dynamic conception of God stands in the foreground and expresses itself in the unconditioned working of the Christ, Jesus' proclamation contains no particular information as to the individual stages of the powerful "unconditioned"

[1] The book by which he is generally known is his *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament*, 1929. The eschatological views expounded therein are conveniently summarised in a doctoral thesis published in the previous year, *Das Reich Gottes im Neuen Testament*.

[2] *Reich Gottes und Kirche*, pp. 56, 57.

[3] *Reich Gottes im Neuen Testament*, p. 11.

[4] *Reich Gottes und Kirche*, p. 109.

[5] Op. cit., p. 110.

[6] Op. cit., p. 178.

[7] Op. cit., p. 190.

event.' If the discourse be compared with Judaistic eschatology we see 'a modest silence as to all that could excite human curiosity'. And the same consideration applies to what follows the parousia. 'It is a plain mark of the prophecy of Jesus, that it ends at that point when he makes himself visible again to the community.'[1] (iii) The parousia is linked with the catastrophe falling upon Jerusalem, but not with the intention of affording a date for the disciples. This inter-relation of historical catastrophe and the end of history is due to something more than the nature of prophecy, which pushes temporally separated events on and into one another; it is part of that 'dynamic conception of the reign of God, which comprises present and future, *historical and final event*, and causes the end time to break in with the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ.'[2] A most important principle is involved here, not explicitly brought out by Gloege: the present era is an eschatological present, wherein the reign of God is manifest not alone in sovereign blessing, but in the exercise of sovereign judgment. The judgments of God belong not only to the end; they belong to the administration of God throughout the entire period between the resurrection and parousia. Otherwise expressed, *this era is necessarily characterised by signs*; the manifestation will be more apparent at the end, because that is the time of a special unveiling of the invisible God. In the same way, the 'eschatological' sufferings of the Church, if we may so term them, belong to the whole period as well as to the end, and to the end more than to the rest of the era. The reign of God is one, but the climax, as the initiation, particularly manifests it.

A not dissimilar outlook may be discerned in the work of H. D. Wendland.[3] He also does not provide a critical discussion of the discourse of Mk. 13, yet his unreserved use of it for our Lord's teaching on eschatology leaves no doubt as to his acceptance of its authenticity. Curiously enough, he always cites the discourse in its Matthaean version, perhaps because he often wishes to allude to Mt. 25 together with Mt. 24. In Wendland's view it is necessary to recall that the idea of the consummation contains a 'double polarity'. It reveals *final salvation and final judgment* on the one hand, and it is *personal and cosmic-universal* on the other.[4] On the former antithesis Wendland does not dwell; Mt. 25. 46 is cited, but

[1] Ibid. The last saying comes from Schlatter's *Die Geschichte des Christus*, p. 469.
[2] Op. cit., p. 191.
[3] *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus*, 1931. [4] Op. cit., p. 245.

we have already seen how it has frequently been a matter of wonder that Mk. 13 should contain no hint as to the lot of the reprobate. The second is more relevant to the discourse for it has bearing on the question of signs. 'If Jesus had given up the forms of expression for the universal-cosmic eschatology, the pictures of the catastrophies affecting mankind and the universe (Mt. 24. 6–8, 29–30 =Mk. 13. 7–8, 24–26), then *the universal horizon of the coming sovereignty of God would have been lost*, to which the world is contrasted as a unity and to which it is subordinated as a unity, and it would have threatened the omnipotent character of the God who comes to us.'[1] If Jesus held to the character of the messianic office respecting mankind, he must have held also to this universal-eschatological view; and he must have equally maintained the *personal* aspect, for the messianic community is gathered to him. 'This indivisible unity of personal and universal eschatology in equal absoluteness of conception denotes the dividing line over against a groundless apocalyptic speculation as to the form of the coming world and the appearance of God. It is characteristic that these two questions remain completely in the background in the discourse in Matthew. No single declaration as to the new world is given, and only the dealing of the Son of Man with mankind is depicted, not the dealing of God himself. *The personal-soteriological eschatology is the central thing*. The abundance of related questions and conceptions of Jewish eschatology is and remains excluded. All expectation is directed to the ethical decision: the coming of the Messiah, the judgment and the gift of life . . .'[2] In this connection Wendland cites Lutgert, 'Eschatology is only an object of the prophecy of Jesus in so far as it is the prophecy of redemption and should be a motive of behaviour'; he adds, 'In all these fundamental points the eschatology of Mt. 24 and 25 is completely one with the kingdom proclamation of Jesus'.[3] Like Gloege, Wendland stresses the view of the Church in the discourse. The apostolic commission is to gather the Church, not to set up the kingdom. It is a work of preparation. The consummation takes place 'when all peoples are gathered around the throne of the Son of Man, the elect are brought together from all four quarters of the wind and the righteous go into Life (Mt. 24. 31, 25. 32, 46).'[4] The Church of the present era must be distinguished from the perfected community

[1] Op. cit., pp. 245–246. The last phrase, Zu-uns-kommen Gott, is a play on Zukunft, the term for the Coming of Christ.
[2] Op. cit., p. 246.
[3] Op. cit., p. 247.
[4] Op. cit., p. 160.

of the discourse: 'The former can only be a preparation of the latter, in the same sense as we have spoken of a beginning of the End-time, a beginning of this end as the eschatological present. The kingdom of God gathers the men who belong to it through the word and work of Jesus and the disciples, but it only perfects the community through the judgment of the world.'[1]

J. Mackinnon rejected the Little Apocalypse theory on the basis of one consideration, generally neglected by critics: the discourse in the main echoes what Jesus had repeatedly taught in his intercourse with the disciples, *especially following upon Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi*.[2] From that time on Jesus dwells on the sufferings of the Son of Man, the persecutions of his disciples, and the coming of the Son of Man in glory (Mk. 8. 31 ff.). By an extraordinary coincidence the one monograph on Mk. 13 written in this century appeared not long after this book and announced as its major premiss *the similarity between Mk.* 8. 34 *ff. and the discourse.*

The volume issued by F. Busch[3] has exercised considerable influence in Germany and must be given careful consideration. This author first lays down the affirmation that Mk. 13 possesses a train of thought. The question of its originality and whether the individual sayings permit of being separated can only be settled if this prior fact is recognised. It is further to be acknowledged that 'the evangelist, when he wrote down the discourse, must have seen in its connection an unambiguous sense, even if he had welded together ingredients that were originally diverse'.[4] If we ask what this 'train of thought' is, we are told that it 'proceeds from the construction of the entire gospel'.[5] Peter's confession of Jesus' Messiahship is closely connected with the first announcement of the passion, and with the transference of the proclamation of suffering to the disciples also. Following Jesus now means carrying a cross. Confession of his name and proclamation of the gospel amidst persecution are part of the renunciation of life which gains the life of the age to come. On this discipleship amidst suffering rests the issue of the judgment which takes place at the coming of the Son of Man in glory (Mk. 8. 27–9. 1). The same conception is to be seen in the conversations following the scene at Caesarea (9. 30–32, 33–37; 10. 32–34, 34–45): the Lord's proclamations of suffering are not isolated preparations of the passion story, but

[1] Op. cit., p. 161. [2] *The Historic Jesus*, 1931, pp. 193 f.
[3] *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie; Markus* 13 *neu untersucht*, 1938. The book was written several years before its publication
[4] Op. cit., pp. 38–39. [5] Op. cit., p. 39.

form a whole with the exhortations to the disciples; they, too, must drink the cup of suffering with Jesus (10. 38). Looking at Mk. 13 from this angle, it will be observed that the discourse beginning at v. 5 corresponds to the whole of the Gospel: 'As truly as the confession of messiahship could not occur without proclamation of suffering, so little can the announcement of the parousia stand without developing the proclamation of suffering for the band of disciples. *Mk.* 13 *is an explication of Mk.* 8. 34.'[1] The chapter, coming as it does between Mk. Chs. 8–12 and 14 ff., is to be understood, like Lk. 22 and Jn. 14–16, as the 'Farewell Discourse' of Jesus, not in a biographical-historical sense, but as 'a factual construction which arranges in this place sayings relating to the significance of the cross for the disciples who remain behind, and to the confession and suffering of the community'.[2]

On this basis the section 5–23 may be interpreted in the light of such a saying as Jn. 16. 33, 'In the world you have θλῖψις.' 'There is no question here of premonitory signs which can be objectively established as symptoms of the End. . . . Here are meant temptations, which rob the disciples of the patience required for "watching".'[3] Consequently the reference of 29, 'Whenever you see these things happen . . .' is to the whole description of θλῖψις in 5–23, as v. 23 itself shows. 28 and 30 speak of conditions which are daily fulfilled for the Church since Easter and Pentecost. Clearly, then, the parousia passage, 24–27, must be separated from the foregoing as something new: 'after the tribulation' of v. 24 will answer the question as to 'When'. Matthew's εὐθέως has nothing to do with the fall of Jerusalem. 'In all that precedes and follows any calculation is refused, because the parousia comes in a flash, like lightning, surprising, contrary to expectation, in a sudden act, without a long drama such as Judaism knew. . . . The parousia and world-judgment take place without many stages and preliminary periods preceding the θλῖψις, they come εὐθέως.'[4]

Busch believes that the supreme motive of the Little Apocalypse theory is a weakened Christology. 'The first presupposition for the grounding of that hypothesis is the construction of a Christ who in every respect was adapted to the colourless features of a century whose representatives must needs perpetually call the artless, magnificent view of Mk. 13 "bizarre". If this presupposition, this prejudice is renounced, then all the reasons for the hypothesis tumble

[1] Op. cit., p. 48.
[2] Op. cit., p. 44.
[3] Op. cit., p. 50.
[4] Op. cit., p. 52.

down.'[1] By assuming that v. 4 does not fit 5 and that 30 and 32 contradict each other, 5–31 are removed as a disturbing interruption: 'That is, *one removes the roots from the tree and marvels then at its dryness*!' No agreement exists as to where the Little Apocalypse begins, where it ends, and what lies between. But an even graver mistake is the low estimate of Jewish apocalyptic thought subsumed in this hypothesis. Schniewind is cited as saying, 'We must free ourselves from the fancy that Jewish eschatology is a collection of absurdities.'[2] Yet such an exegete as Wellhausen looses Jesus from the world of his day and even distances him from Old Testament prophecy. 'The thesis of the Little Apocalypse in this its root is false.'[3]

We must surely be grateful to Busch for calling our attention to the parallel between Mk. 8. 34–9. 1 and the eschatological discourse: the association of the impending passion of Jesus, sufferings for disciples, and the heavenly kingdom that dawns with the parousia is fundamental to all that we know of the mind of our Lord in this closing period of his life. This remains, even if we admit that 8. 34–9. 1 is a compilation, for the context of the sayings, whatever the historic order of their utterance, must be the post-Caesarea period. It is probably healthy, too, to link the thought of the disciples' sufferings with those of the world in Mk. 13, since they together characterise the period between the resurrection and parousia. Nevertheless, we are not convinced that it is a just reading of Mk. 13 to deny that 5–23 partake of the nature of 'signs' of the End. The endeavour to do so leads to the virtual interpretation of Matthew's εὐθέως as 'suddenly', a procedure which is not open to us, while it makes impossible Mark's ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. If these expressions be regarded as interpolations of the Evangelists or their sources, at least it must be postulated that *they* regarded Mk. 5–23 as signs of the End; yet part of Busch's thesis lies in the appeal to take seriously the interpretation placed by Mark on the sayings! We shall probably pursue a sounder course if we regard the 'signs' of Ch. 13 as relating to the eschatological present, and to the End in particular. The denial of either aspect is of doubtful validity.

Our study is not without its lighter moments, as when one contrasts the attitudes towards the Little Apocalypse theory on the

[1] Op. cit., p. 54.
[2] Op. cit., p. 59. From the Introduction to A. Schneider's *Ges. Aufsätzen*, p. x.
[3] Op. cit., p. 59.

part of such critics as Holtzmann ('Few hypotheses have proved so unavoidable') and Muirhead ('If certainty belongs to any literary theory in the Gospels it may be claimed for this') with that of C. C. Torrey ('No scientific basis for it exists!'). Never has Mk. 13 been dealt with so trenchantly and confidently than by the last-named critic, perhaps because the issues had simmered in his mind for so long a time. Torrey's views on the Little Apocalypse were known as long ago as 1925 through B. W. Bacon, who modified them for his own purpose.[1] They were incidentally referred to in Torrey's *The Four Gospels*,[2] but not until the publication of his *Documents of the Primitive Church* in 1941 did he give a full-scale treatment of the chapter, at which time it was difficult for British scholars to procure the book owing to the progress of the war.

Torrey is always emphatic, but the explosiveness of a life-time's indignation comes to expression in this article. He first endeavours to demonstrate that Mk. 13 is not an apocalypse at all. 'The use of this term ("Little Apocalypse") applied to some part of the eschatological discourse contained in Mk. 13 and its parallels is one of the *curiosa* of Synoptic criticism.'[3] Technically, the word ἀποκάλυψις does not cover any or every statement of eschatological beliefs; it is a literary term connoting certain characteristic features of a well-defined type of writing. An apocalypse purports to contain a direct revelation of truths or coming events, disclosed by God through a vision or dream, usually by the mediation of angels, occasionally by the voice of the Most High himself. By the very nature of the scene and its accessories an atmosphere of mystery is created. '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 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".'[4] It should be noted that the features characteristic of apocalyptic literature in Mk. 13 enumerated by Colani all derive from half a verse—the abomination passage. Of that there is more to be said.

Torrey rightly challenges Moffatt's characterisation of the 'Little Apocalypse' as 'An intelligible unity': 'No one ever *reconstructed*

[1] In *The Gospel of Mark, its Composition and Date*, Bacon referred to unpublished communications given by Torrey to the Society of Biblical Literature in 1919 and elsewhere.

[2] 1933, especially pp. 261–262. [3] Op. cit., p. 13. [4] Op. cit., pp. 14–15.

the supposed apocalypse, or succeeded in exhibiting anything else than a mere fragment. And 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, exactly like Ch. 13, from which this great section was transferred!'[1] This assertion, of course, proceeds on the assumption that the Little Apocalypse is incomplete. It will be recalled that several critics realised its inadequacy as a document; that which Charles postulated in his commentary on Revelation comes very near what Torrey regards as the *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory. It is further maintained that the method of excising a coherent passage from a text, as Colani did, is fundamentally false. 'If any and every passage which can be excised from a document without leaving an obvious gap is therefore liable to be pronounced an interpolation, there is an end of sane criticism of authorship and composition.' Consequently Torrey makes bold to affirm, 'No scientific basis exists for supposing Mk. 13 to have been expanded by interpolation after it left the hands of the Evangelist, nor for regarding the great discourse as anything else than an original unity. . . . Every portion of this material is needed in its present place, no word of it could be omitted.'[2] This last sentence introduces us to Torrey's own reading of the chapter. The background presumed is that of Old Testament prophecy. There was an outline of events of the end familiar to all Jews through their reading of the prophets; a hostile army is to capture Jerusalem, and half of its inhabitants will be transported (Zech. 14. 2); tribulations will follow for 'a time, times and a half' (Dan. 12. 7); this interval will witness great missionary activity, to Israel and all the world, that Scriptures like Is. 45. 14, 49. 22 f., 66. 19 f., may be fulfilled; a final onslaught on Jerusalem will occur, accompanied by portents in heaven (Joel 2. 30 f., 3. 4) and the coming of the Messiah (Dan. 7. 13 f.), but by the hand of Yahweh Israel's enemies will be destroyed (Is. 41. 12 f., 45. 1, Hab. 3. 13). This background will have been in the disciples' minds when they asked, 'When will these things be?' They did not want new information, they simply wished to know how it could be realised that the Day is near and how long they had to wait. The request is partly answered, partly denied. Jesus confirms the programme of the prophets and applies it in many details, but declines

[1] Op. cit., p. 16. [2] Op. cit., p. 17.

to fix a date. The only element in the discourse that is unsuitable to Jesus is Mk. 13. 14*a*; this is due to the Caligula episode. If Jesus accepted the prophetic programme of the End, he will have uttered the prediction given in Lk. 21. 20 f., but we must have sympathy with the situation of the earliest believers. 'To the already numerous Christian communities in Judea and Galilee it is easy to see what the events of the years 39 and 40 and especially the edict of Caligula must have meant. Here at last was the realisation of their great hope and the triumph of their faith. . . . The Nazarenes saw before their eyes not merely the royal blasphemer desecrating the sanctuary, but the very *thing*, the "Abomination bringing Devastation", foretold as the beginning of the mysteriously numbered "days" or "times" which must elapse before the coming of the Messiah in the clouds of heaven. If ever in the world fulfilment of prophecy was recognised with certainty, this was the time. When all the circumstances are taken into account, it would be difficult to find in history, with all its astonishing coincidences, anything to match this instance . . .'[1] Jesus had given the indefinite sign from *Zechariah* about the surrounding of Jerusalem by armies. Mark, followed by Matthew, was impelled to insert the far more definite sign, the erection of Caligula's statue on the altar in the temple. 'Should not the fulfilment of *Daniel's* prophecy be mentioned? This must have seemed most important, for every reason. The evangelist gives a plain hint that he is editing: Jesus did not say to Peter, James, John and Andrew, "Let him who *reads* understand!" '[2] This event, therefore, occasioned, not the writing of the eschatological discourse, but its modification in the one point of the great sign. The Gospel of Mark was compiled for the purpose of evangelism and issued immediately—in Aramaic for Jews and in a Greek translation for Gentiles. When the expected clash was averted the work of evangelisation was postponed.

It may be freely admitted that this is the most persuasive presentation of the case for the influence of the Caligula affair on Mk. 13 that we have read. The distinction so plainly drawn between prophecy and apocalyptic, as it affects this chapter, can be overlooked by no one. The criticisms of the Little Apocalypse theory have no small weight. Yet the major premiss of Torrey's view leaves us with grave doubts: it presumes an interpretation of Old Testament prophecy which has to be read into Mk. 13; it is not there on the surface, and we are not at all sure that it reflects our

[1] Op. cit., p. 33. [2] Op. cit., p. 35.

Lord's usual manner of dealing with the Old Testament. This is illustrated by Torrey's interpretation of Mk. 13. 2, which closely follows that of Johannes Weiss: 'The conception of "new heavens and new earth" meant either a totally different world or at least the present world greatly changed in its physical features. Earthquakes will shatter and refashion it, Is. 13. 13, 24. 19 f. Mic. 1.4 . . . Jerusalem and the temple hill in particular will have a new form, Is. 2. 2, Joel 4. 18, Zech. 14. 8, Ezk. 47. 1 f. . . . This, of course, involved the wiping out of the present city of Jerusalem, and could have nothing to do with the impending conquest by the Romans.'[1] We cannot dogmatically affirm that Jesus did not hold this belief, but at least it will be granted that it reads a great deal into the language of Mk. 13. 2, more than we are warranted in doing. And Torrey has viewed the whole discourse in similar light. We must urge, as we have done before, that Mk. 13 is silent about any blotting out of multitudes about Jerusalem, and where silence is maintained we are not at liberty to fill in according to our own ideas as to the mind of the Author. In particular, this interpretation depends on the assumption that Luke's version is more original than Mark's as concerning the fate of Jerusalem: it is maintained that Lk. 21. 20 is *less* definite than Mk. 13. 14. Our final decision will partly depend on textual grounds, but at least it should not be forgotten that most exegetes have felt that Lk. 21. 20 is *more* definite than Mk. 13. 14 and bears marks of interpretation—whether innocent or otherwise is irrelevant for the moment. Our last word on this cannot be said without a detailed consideration of Mk. 13. 14, but meanwhile we have to admit that Torrey's interpretation in this respect is questionable.

The careful and exhaustive study of our Lord's eschatological teaching by C. J. Cadoux appeared in the same year as Torrey's work.[2] The measure of agreement between the two scholars is surprising, although their approach differed widely. Cadoux did not find it easy to imagine how Mark, writing at Rome, either could or would have incorporated in his book 'an alien document produced (*ex hypothesi*) in Judea, possibly within a few years of the time at which he himself was writing'. Neither was it plausible to imagine that the document was embodied in the Gospel after Mark had finished it. The parallels with the 'Little Apocalypse' in other Gospel passages have also to be taken into account. 'It seems on the whole preferable to explain such discrepancies as the chapter

[1] Op. cit., p. 20.

[2] *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, 1941.

contains partly by the natural tendency of Mark (as of the other evangelists) to put in close proximity to one another sayings originally spoken on different occasions, and partly to the tendency of the early Church to modify radically certain remembered sayings of Jesus and even to ascribe to him (without any dishonest intent) some sayings which in point of fact he never actually uttered."[1] Although Cadoux recognised the latter possibility, in practice he scarcely appealed to it in individual statements of the chapter. He admitted that critical uncertainty as to the origin and relation of the contents of Mk. 13 makes its use difficult; nevertheless he employed it in constructing our Lord's eschatological teaching, in the conviction that 'on the main point, its evidence is in line with that which is abundantly provided elsewhere'.[2] A possible modification of the original utterance is seen in Mk. 13. 14, where Luke may be following a more authentic tradition; if otherwise, Luke in any case 'is only making explicit what Mark expresses less concretely, and his operations cannot rightly be taken as discrediting his reports when no Markan parallel is in question'.[3] As against Streeter's view that Mark was referring in 13. 14 to the temple's desecration by Antichrist, rather than its destruction in A.D. 70, Cadoux asks, whether Mark would clearly distinguish between the two calamities if he was writing before A.D. 70. The persecution of disciples was a natural expectation for Jesus to hold, both in view of his own experience and the description of the sufferings of the saints in Daniel's vision of the Son of Man.[4] Such a persecution, as he probably foresaw, was to become the opportunity for wider missionary activity. While it is doubtful whether Jesus placed the fall of Jerusalem and his Advent in such close temporal proximity as we see them in the discourse, 'In the nature of things, we should expect some positive and definite relationship to have existed between the two anticipations, seeing that both arose out of Jesus' certainty that his enemies would encompass his death, and both were expected to materialise before the generation then living had died out.'[5] Even the element of privacy in the instruction of the disciples by Jesus fits in with the consistent phenomenon that almost all the Son of Man sayings concern Christ's redemptive mission and were spoken to the disciples, not to the public.[6] On the whole we feel that C. J. Cadoux had no great quarrel with Mk. 13 as a representation of the teaching of Jesus.

[1] Op. cit., pp. 11–12. [2] Op. cit., p. 292. [3] Op. cit., p. 275, n. 3.
[4] Op. cit., p. 101, 302 ff. [5] Op. cit., p. 318. [6] Op. cit., pp. 96–97.

H. H. Rowley provides a valuable discussion on Mk. 13 in his review of Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature. The problems of the chapter are approached from the angle of the phenomena of apocalypses generally. The question of authenticity, for example, is viewed in the light of the pseudonymity adopted in almost all these writings: 'If it (the discourse) does not really represent the teaching of Jesus, then it shares the pseudonymous character of so much apocalyptic work, while if it does represent his teaching, we have here at last a clear breach with that tradition.'[1] The discourse is not to be refused on account of the element of secrecy, since this feature is characteristic of apocalyptic, and does not necessarily entail the authenticity of its contents.[2] The unity of the chapter is to be viewed in a similar light, for apocalyptic writings are notoriously inharmonious, a fact which has often led to complicated analyses where they are not required: 'It seems wiser to recognise that the strictly logical integration of the elements into a whole is not characteristic of apocalyptic, and is not to be sought here.'[3] Rowley therefore concludes: 'I find no reason to deny that most of the material of this chapter consists of genuine utterances of Jesus, and if we had these utterances in their original setting, the transitions might be less baffling. Even the linking together of the Fall of Jesusalem and the end of the age may be due to him, who expressly disclaimed omniscience in this matter.'[4] It is precisely this confessed limitation of knowledge which distinguishes the discourse from apocalypses generally; for while Daniel endeavoured to indicate the time of the end exactly, Jesus declared that it was unknown to him.

It will be noted that Professor Rowley does not commit himself to accept the chapter as authentic in every respect. He finds one clear exception to the general reliability of the discourse in the abomination passage, Mk. 13. 14. That verse must be relegated to a later age since it relates to the fears inspired by the Caligula episode. Like B. W. Bacon, Rowley finds it difficult to believe that Jesus could foresee that Caligula would command his statue to be placed in the temple, but not foresee that it would not happen. Nevertheless, in so far as the discourse contains the utterance of Jesus, 'it may be understood to proclaim his certainty that a time of dire tribulation for Jerusalem lay in the not distant future, that a time of bitter persecution for his followers was before them, and

[1] *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 1944, pp. 109–110.
[2] Op. cit., p. 110, n. 1. [3] Op. cit., p. 138. [4] Op. cit., p. 139.

that the glorious kingdom to which the book of Daniel had looked forward was to come with divine power. He believed these things to be associated with one another, but expressly disclaimed any precise knowledge.'[1]

It would be difficult to find a more striking illustration of the recent change of attitude to Mark 13 than this defence of its authenticity *on the basis of its relation to Jewish apocalyptic*. The similarities and divergencies alike shed light on its problems and are believed to ease them, rather than increase them. The interpretation of the abomination of desolation may be found to be questionable, for we have already seen reason to believe that the connection with Caligula may not be so strong as was formerly thought, but to that we shall return later. Meanwhile we note the positive contribution to our study that we have found here.

Adolf Schlatter evidently regarded the discourse as an original unity, delivered on one occasion, though perhaps not retained in its completeness. The destruction of the temple, and of Israel, is linked with the end as 'a real member in the judgments of God which precede his kingdom'. The two events, however, concerning Jerusalem and the world are not o be confounded, there is a clear distinction between them in the course: 'He does not come at the destruction of Jerusalem, nor to bring the time of distress upon Israel. He does not appear as avenger of the sins committed against him. Their consequence must certainly be manifested, but that belongs to the course of earthly history and precedes his coming. Only after the time when Israel is trodden down does he put his appearing, but at the same time *after* it.'[2] The nature of the signs of this chapter is hinted at in the parable of the fig tree: whereas the disciples wanted an external definition, a calendar date, Jesus speaks on a different plane. 'He makes them consider that the course of history has its *inner* conditions. . . . They should not wish to define Jesus' coming with outward calculations, but pay attention to what God's providential rule creates before their eyes.'[3] Herein is given a clue for the time perspective of the chapter. Jesus had taken conjointly the disciples' lifetime with that of the world, for he was considering not them alone but the entire community that was to be. 'Those, however, whom Jesus has strengthened with the word, that this generation will experience all this, assuredly do not lament that Jesus' word has deceived them. . . *God's*

[1] O p. cit., p. 113.
[2] *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 7, p. 354. [3] Op. cit., p. 361.

providential rule is the sole true exposition for every prophecy, even for those of Jesus.'[1] Such a conclusion is in line with much else that we have considered, and indicates perhaps the direction in which a right solution of this problem is to be found.

O. Cullmann apparently takes for granted the authenticity of the eschatological discourse. His use of it and discussion of its problems are confined to the same two points of the nearness of the end and the nature of the signs.[2] The preaching of the proximity of the kingdom indicates that this nearness is bound up with Christ himself, with his person and action. If the kingdom is near, it is because it has been brought near (ἤγγικεν, Mk. 1. 15). The announcement of the nearness of the end, therefore, affects the nature of the present rather than the future. Its special insistence towards the close of the ministry of Jesus points to a relationship with his prospective death. Cullmann affirms, 'The essential element in the proximity of the kingdom is not the final date, but rather *the certitude that the expiatory work of Christ on the cross constitutes the decisive event in the approach of the kingdom of God.*'[3] In that case the entire time which elapses after the death and resurrection is the time of the end, and this conclusion cannot be affected by the delay of the parousia. It inevitably affects our reading of the signs of the end of which Mk. 13 speaks so much: 'Because the present time, admittedly extended over many generations, constitutes an eschatological unity, all these signs, which will be produced at the extreme limit of the present, belong *already* to the last phase in which we find ourselves since the resurrection of Christ.'[4] That is, since signs characterise the time of the end, they characterise the whole of this present era, for the whole is eschatological. Events which before Christ might have been deemed of no significance take on a new value, 'they bind together faith in the present and that in the future, without wishing to create opportunity for an illegitimate calculation'.[5] In this way the preaching of the Gospel to pagans becomes significant of the end; in each generation it is announced by the Church as a sign of the end which approaches.

Paul Althaus, in his most impressive treatment of eschatology, declines to discuss the critical questions raised in our discourse. 'It has been desired to deny this "little apocalypse" to Jesus, the community is said to have taken it over from Judaism. But this distinc-

[1] Op. cit., p. 363.
[2] See *Le Retour du Christ*, 1948, pp. 22 ff.; *Christ and Time*, 1951, pp. 84 ff.
[3] *Retour*, p. 27.
[4] Op. cit., p. 30.
[5] Op. cit., p. 31.

tion between Jesus and the first community, even if it were surer than it is, could have no significance theologically, i.e. for the comprehension of the primitive Christian gospel.'[1] Presumably Althaus trusts the primitive community to have handed on the teaching in the discourse reasonably well, for he uses it without qualification in his subsequent review of our Lord's eschatology. He believes that it is not possible to remove apocalyptic features from the tradition of Jesus' teaching, yet they acquire therein a different aspect from what we see in Jewish apocalyptic. 'Despite its apocalyptic features, Jesus' eschatological message in its fundamental points is completely unapocalyptic. The decisive thing is not what Jesus takes over from the apocalyptic material of Judaism, but the particular character of his eschatological message, which gives to everything a quite other tone.' The peculiar characteristics in mind are the emphasis on the nearness of the end, and the attitude towards signs. 'Everything apocalyptic in Jesus, and then in Paul, remains wholly in the bounds of the near expectation. It is true that Judaism also, in the succession of prophetism, in general expected the great turning point to be quite near. But the near expectation gains an earnestness unheard of in Judaism in the case of Jesus and primitive Christianity: "This generation will not pass . . ." (Mk. 13. 30). Therewith *all eschatological utterances gain the highest actuality*. They give no plan of the coming end-history, they prepare the living for the magnitude of the distress, the severity of the temptation. The stress lies alone on this preparation, not on a theoretic picture of the coming course of the world.'[2] The aspect under which 'signs' are viewed brings home a similar lesson: the community must observe signs of the times (Mk. 13. 28 f.), yet the end cannot be reckoned from such signs, it comes with incalculable suddenness (Lk. 17. 20 ff.); it has portents, but only the Father knows when it comes (Mk. 13. 32); believers must watch for signs, yet be prepared for it at every moment (Mk. 13. 35). 'Hence the near expectation is no dogma. It is limited through the secret of the Father, it stands under the precondition of his free decision. The livingness of God is above all portents. Alongside the predominating near expectation, therefore, the possibility can also be considered that the end will yet be protracted.'[3] This is why the primitive Church was able to surmount the lack of fulfilment of the hope of the immediate nearness of the end without shock: 'They

[1] *Die Letzten Dinge*, 5th ed. 1949, p. 271. [2] Ibid.
[3] Op. cit., p. 272.

were not so sunk in the near expectation that they did not recognise at all times in respect of it *the living God and the decisiveness of his freedom.*'[1] It is because of this stress on the 'actuality' of the various elements of our Lord's teaching on the end that Althaus makes the startling assertion, '*Eschatology must refuse to treat of the last epoch of history.*'[2] As a definition of the limits of eschatology that is extreme, but as a corrective to point us to the ethical intention of Christian teaching on the end it is salutary.

A similar view to that of Althaus is expressed in the commentaries of Julius Schniewind.[3] He approaches in the same way the question whether it is possible or necessary to distinguish a Jewish apocalypse within Mk. 13. 'It is more probable that the same thing applies here as in everything hitherto: a rich possession of Jewish hope is presupposed in the Gospel tradition, but it receives a new determination from Jesus. And the question which then arises, whether Jesus himself speaks here or his earliest community is not otherwise resolved than as in former cases: *each single word has such a stamp as is only possible from the reality* (signified by) "*Jesus*", *and therewith the question of "genuineness" becomes a question of secondary importance.*'[4] In practice Schniewind seeks to show the 'Jesus' stamp on the contents of the discourse by noting sayings in other strata of the Gospel tradition parallel to those of Mk. 13; while therefore the above statement could have been equally made by a scholar like Lightfoot, who hesitates to draw a line between what comes from Jesus and what from the community, in the case of Schniewind it is consonant with an attitude of practical acceptance of the authenticity of the discourse. He recognises that the chapter is as little unified as Mk. 4, and that therefore each saying has to be investigated on its own merits. From that an important conclusion is to be drawn in regard to the discourse: 'There is no question of looking on it as a programme of future individual events in their necessary sequence; rather something fundamental, something typical is said about the events of the world's end, and it will generally be seen that with that a comprehension and estimation of these sayings is immediately given.'[5] Like Althaus, Schniewind recognises the presence in Jesus of the expectation of signs together with the hope of a speedy end; his reconciliation of them is fundamentally the same: 'Both correspond

[1] Ibid. [2] Op. cit., p. 296.
[3] *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 5th ed. 1949; *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 5th ed. 1950.
[4] *Markus*, p. 166. [5] Ibid.

to the fact that the end solely depends on God's plan. He causes the times, and what happens in them, to be developed and fulfilled; and he alone knows the time and season.'[1]

As examples of the all but complete victory gained among conservative scholars by the view that Mk. 13 is a compilation of sayings, we may note that it is advocated by K. H. Rengstorf in his commentary on Luke,[2] P. Feine and J. Behm in their introduction to the New Testament,[3] and the Roman Catholic scholar Josef Schmid in his commentary on Mark.[4] The views of the last-named writer are interesting as showing how modern opinions on Mk. 13 are reflected in the Roman Church as elsewhere. But while it is recognised that the question of the disciples shows that they had in mind both the destruction of the temple and the end of the age, it is not admitted that Jesus held the same view. The discourse is divided into general warnings, 5–13, the judgment on Jerusalem, 14–23, 30, the parousia and the end of the world, 24–27, 32, with exhortations to the disciples, 33–37, and an assurance as to the truth of Christ's words, 31. The Holy See could not complain about that analysis.

Lest we be allowed to conclude our review on an optimistic note, providence has somewhat whimsically decreed that we should be called on to deal with a puzzle—Austin Farrer's, *A Study of St. Mark* (1951). The perspective point of the study, in so far as it affects Mk. 13, is declared to be that of 'Christ and his disciples, and St. Mark in the Holy Ghost'.[5] How the two points merge into one is not clear. It is insisted that the first is to be taken seriously. The prophecy is authentic, being presupposed in I and II Thessalonians. 'Christ proclaimed himself Son of Man, and supported the prophecy of his advent with that context in which Daniel had set it. According to Daniel, to be the Son of Man is to be the supplanter of Antichrist. The roles are inseparable. Christ made no special apocalyptic predictions. He simply affirmed the old prophetic images as they stood, and left the decoding of them to the action of God in future events.'[6] The purpose of this discourse, with its 'shadowy mysteries', its 'painted pictures on the clouds of prophecy' was to set out the relation between Christ's passion and the End, and to show that 'the destiny of the Church was the re-enactment of his passion and resurrection'.[7] It will be recalled that

[1] *Matthäus*, p. 239.
[2] *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 5th ed. 1949.
[3] *Einleitung in das neue Testament*, 1950.
[4] *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 1950.
[5] Op. cit., p. 361.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.

R. H. Lightfoot had treated of the relation between the eschatological discourse and the passion narrative; in his view the latter was represented as in some sense a prior fulfilment of the former, so that the passion is regarded as an eschatological event. Farrer's contention works in the reverse direction: *the discourse is a type of the passion*, the tyranny of Antichrist sets forth the historic sufferings of the Messiah. No doubt this appears to be topsy-turvy, but, it is pointed out, 'In the history of our faith, the image of Antichrist came first and the passion of Christ came afterwards. Long before Israel had heard of a suffering Messiah it had been accepted that Israel would go through great sufferings, a sort of national martyrdom, before the glorious days of Messiah come. The prophecy of Daniel is largely devoted to such a theme, and it is the prophecy of Daniel which gives its decisive shape to Christ's prediction on the Mount of Olives. When Christ began to speak of the sufferings of the Son of Man he appeared to be talking not of what Caiaphas or Pilate did, for they had not yet done it, but about the figures of prophecy. He was saying that *the Messiah would be first in the sufferings, as he would be first in the deliverance of Israel.*' From the point of view of Jesus before his death it was more natural to think of his sufferings as a summing-up of those which his Church would meet in the End time than to think of the latter as a second 'Calvary'. That is the same thing as saying that 'the images foreshadowing the tyranny of Antichrist were once the natural images of Christ's passion'.[1] In what ways does the discourse foreshadow the passion? The following are noted: (i) Mark's story of the death of Jesus runs from the Wednesday evening when Judas betrayed him till the Sunday morning of the resurrection, i.e. *three and a half days*! The sufferings of Jesus epitomise the future sufferings of his Church. (ii) This 'apocalyptic half-week' ends with the empty tomb; the discourse ends with the appearance of the Son of Man; the silence of the Evangelist on the joy of the resurrection appearances is matched by the silence of Jesus concerning the resurrection of the Church, the judgment, the consumated kingdom, etc. 'The apocalyptic prediction breaks off at the same point as the Gospel does, that is, with the end of the half week.' (iii) The last words of the discourse seem to draw a parallel between the disciples facing the imminence of Christ's passion and Christians facing the imminence of Antichrist's persecution: 'What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch.' (iv) The events preceding

[1] Ibid.

the passion reflect the conceptions of the discourse: 'On Wednesday evening *betrayal, the desolating abomination*, was set up in the true and spiritual temple of Christ's company. On Thursday at midnight the Eleven saw it *standing where it ought not*, within the very garden of Christ's prayer. "When ye see the abomination stand where he ought not", Christ had said, "then let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains, . . . and let not him that is in the field turn back to fetch his coat." When the disciples saw the abomination they were *in the field*, and they fled fast enough. And one of them, a young man, feeling the hands of the enemy upon his *coat*, left it to them, and fled without it. . . . The young man puts off his sindon and escapes alive. Christ is destined at this season to wear his sindon alone. The Arimathaean wraps him in it: it is his shroud.'[1]

So much for the relation of passion and apocalyptic. What of the precedents of the discourse? Farrer had said at the beginning of his discussion on Mk. 13 that its authenticity is demonstrated if he can show that it 'results from the imaginative process which produced the whole book, that it builds on what precedes and is built into what follows, and that it is the very stuff of the author's mind'.[2] We have seen in what manner the discourse is 'built into what follows', we must now look at the material on which it is builded. The relevant section of Mark is the parabolic discourse of 3. 20–4. 34. Farrer's contention is, 'The evangelist started with the Lord's predictive utterances in mind, shaped as they were in Danielic figures, and passing over the parabolic discourses in 3. 20–4. 34 took from them such points as could be applied to the matter of Christ's predictions'.[3] Compare, e.g., 3. 22–26 with 13. 8: 'His disciples will live to see ungodly power rising against itself, nation against nation, and *kingship against kingship*. They might well think that this is the *end* (v. 26), but it is not, it is only the beginning-pains of the world's travail. . . .' 3.28–30 speak of resistance to and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit by opponents of the Gospel; 13. 9–11 tell of the inspiration the Holy Spirit will give to the disciples facing opponents of the Gospel. 3. 31–35 narrate a family division, 13. 12–13 predict a more terrible condition of the same. In 4. 1–20 (especially 16–17) we read of those who break down through oppression and persecution, 13. 13–20 describe Antichrist's oppression. 4. 26–29 speak of one harvest, 13. 24–27 another. 4. 35–41 tell of a time when Jesus slept and the disciples were awake,

[1] Op. cit., p. 141. [2] Op. cit., p. 261. [3] Op. cit., p. 165.

fretfully; 13. 32–37 reveal a time when it will be right to keep watch and awake. It will thus be seen that the topics of the parabolic discourse are taken up into the eschatological discourse, so that they have one set of applications to the present and another to the future. 'Because both sets of applications can be made, it is possible to compose an apocalyptic discourse by running over the topics of the parabolic discourses with the pattern of Christ's prophetic doctrine in one's head.'[1]

If this be a true account of the origin of Mk. 13, then the 'imaginative process' by which it came into being certainly needed the Holy Ghost to bring it through, no merely human ratiocination could have achieved it. To us it seems more ingenious than convincing. The exposition of the discourse in relation to the passion is too allegorical to be possible; the last point in particular would have made even Origen uneasy. The comparisons between the parabolic discourse and Mk. 13 admittedly contain some striking features, but they are insufficient to demonstrate the desired thesis. If Mark formed the eschatological discourse by the aid of topics from the parabolic discourse, then either our Lord himself had repeated those former topics while seated on Mount Olivet and little else, or he had spoken at great length and Mark had deliberately reproduced a selected portion of the whole. Neither alternative seems likely. In so far as Mk. 3. 20 ff. and Mk. 13 speak of antagonism between the Christ and the forces of evil, there is bound to be some coincidence of topic and even of language. In lesser measure the same will apply to the narrative of the passion, except that here perhaps we have more justification for seeing a *general* parallel; the Son of Man in Dan. 7 suffers tribulation, it is echoed in Mk. 13, and the supreme instance of it is described in Mk. 14–16. It may be true that the eschatological discourse and the passion illuminate each other, but it is going beyond the evidence to make either the exposition of the other.

(In addition to the foregoing, the following writers also accept the authenticity of Mark 13 in their expositions: E. H. Plumptre, 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke', in Ellicott's *Bible Commentary*; S. R. Driver, article 'Abomination of Desolation' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 1, 1898, pp. 12 f.; G. Papini, *The Story of Christ*, E.T. 3rd ed., pp. 276 ff.; P.

[1] Op. cit., p. 167.

Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn*, 1901, pp. 118 f.; L. A. Muirhead, *The Eschatology of Jesus*, 3rd ed. 1906, pp. 41 ff., 117 ff., 128 ff.; article 'Eschatology', Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. 1, 1906, p. 529; F. J. A. Hort, *The Apocalypse of St. John I–III*, 1908, p. xiii; G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, E.T. 1909, pp. 179, 257, *Sacred Sites and Ways*, E.T. 1935, p. 265; E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, 1911, p. 244. N. P. Williams, *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 1911, pp. 416 f.; E. C. Dewick, *Primitive Christian Eschatology*, 1912, pp. 175 ff.; A. B. Bruce, 'The Synoptic Gospels', *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1912, pp. 294 ff.; R. F. Horton, *The Growth of the New Testament*, 1913, p. 193; G. Milligan, *The New Testament Documents*, 1913, p. 146; A. Plummer, 'The Gospel according to St. Mark', *Cambridge Greek Testament*, 1914, pp. 294 ff., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*, 5th ed. 1922, pp. 476 ff.; F. W. Worsley, *The Apocalypse of Jesus*, 1912, pp. 133 ff.; H. Monnier, *La Mission Historique de Jésus*, 2nd ed. 1914, pp. 222 ff.; E. C. Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament*, 1912, pp. 323 ff.; E. G. Selwyn, *The Teaching of Christ*, 1915, pp. 39 ff.; H. R. Mackintosh, *Immortality and the Future*, 1915, 2nd ed. 1917, pp. 44, 49; J. H. Leckie, *The World to come and Final Destiny*, 1918, pp. 36 ff.; A. C. Headlam, *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, 1923, pp. 14 f.; Lord Charnwood, *According to St. John*, 1925, p. 215; T. H. Robinson, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1928, p. 203; P. P. Levertoff and H. H. Goudge, 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew' in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, 1928, Part III, p. 190; A. G. Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, 1913, pp. 46 ff.; Sir E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, 1931, 3rd ed. 1936, pp. 109, 114 f., 136; F. Mauriac, *Vie de Jésus*, 2nd ed., 1936, pp. 227 ff.; K. and S. Lake, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd ed. 1938, pp. 31 f.; N. B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ*, 1944, pp. 113 f.; M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1946, cf. pp. 38 ff.; H. G. Wood, 'Mark', in Peake's *Commentary*, 1920, p. 196, expresses hesitation; W. Michaelis, *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung*, 1944, pp. 19 ff.)

Additional Note: The Parousia fulfilled at the Fall of Jerusalem

A considerable number of exegetes, including Beyschlag, Zahn and Lagrange, have given assent to the view that statements of our Lord, such as Mt. 10. 23, Mk. 9. 1, 13. 30, relating to a parousia

within a generation, have specific reference to the fall of Jerusalem. This resort has been compelled by the natural desire to save the inerrancy of Jesus, but in all other eschatological contexts the usual interpretation is adhered to. The inconsistency of this procedure is abolished by those bold spirits who regard the entire eschatological material of the New Testament as related to the epoch of A.D. 70. The most cogent application of their argument is directed to the eschatological discourse of Mk. 13. In his examination of this chapter, J. S. Russell made the following observations:[1] (i) Expositors ought not to produce 'double, triple, and multiple meanings, prophecies within prophecies, and mysteries wrapt in mysteries, where we might reasonably have expected a plain answer to a plain question'. (ii) If such theories had any truth, it is useless to imagine that the disciples could have even faintly comprehended the meaning of the discourse. (iii) While the question of the disciples is usually regarded as dealing with three different subjects, it clearly has only one in mind. (iv) The phrase *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* does not mean 'end of the world' as is commonly thought, but simply the termination of the Jewish age. (v) There is no hint in the discourse that Jesus passes from the doom of Jerusalem to the judgment of the world. Attempts to draw transition lines will not bear a moment's examination. Everything in the discourse can be satisfactorily related to the generation of the original disciples, including the evangelism of the world (Col. 1. 5 f., 23), in fact 'the whole passage is evidently addressed to the disciples, and speaks of what *they* shall see, *they* shall do, *they* shall suffer; the whole falls within their own observation and experience, and cannot be spoken of or to an invisible audience in a far distant era of futurity, which even yet has not appeared on the earth.' In short, the supreme contention is for the unity and continuity of the whole discourse: 'From the beginning of the 24th chapter of St. Matthew to the close of the 25th, it is *one and indivisible*. The theme is the approaching consummation of the age, with its attendant and concomitant events; the woes which were to overtake that "wicked generation", comprehending the invasion of the Roman armies, the siege and capture of Jerusalem, the total destruction of the temple, the frightful calamities of the people. Along with this we find the true parousia. . . .' (vi) The importance of the event which forms the burden of this prophecy must not be minimised. It is the

[1] *The Parousia, a Critical Enquiry into the New Testament Doctrine of Our Lord's Second Coming*, 1878, pp. 54–115.

consummation of the age, the abrogation of the Jewish dispensation. 'If it was fitting that the introduction of that economy should be signalised by portents and wonders—earthquakes, lightnings, thunders and trumpet blasts—it was no less fitting that it should go out amid similar phenomena—"fearful sights and great signs from heaven".' The siege of Jerusalem does not merely mark the closing scene in the annals of a nation, it has a relation to God and the human race. The changes wrought in this event include the full entry upon their heavenly inheritance by the saints of God (Rev. 14. 13), the replacement of Law by the Gospel, the one favoured nation by a covenant embracing all peoples, the dispensation of ceremonial religion by that of the spirit. 'It made a new world; it was "the world to come", the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα of Heb. 2. 5; and the magnitude and importance of the change it is impossible to over-estimate.'[1] (vii) The application to the fall of Jerusalem of language which seems to relate to the dissolution of the universe is explicable by reference to the Old Testament. 'Symbol and metaphor belong to the grammar of prophecy. . . . Is it not reasonable that the doom of Jerusalem should be depicted in language as glowing and rhetorical as the destruction of Babylon, of Bozrah, or Tyre?' Cf. Is. 13. 9 f., 34. 4 f.[2] (viii) Mk. 13. 30 should suffice to settle the interpretation of the chapter. 'One would reasonably suppose that after a note of time so clear and express there could not be room for controversy. Our Lord himself has settled the question. . . . We are placed therefore in this dilemma—either the words of Jesus have failed and the hopes of his disciples have been falsified; or else those words and hopes have been fully accomplished. One thing is certain, the veracity of our Lord is committed to the assertion that the whole and every part of the events contained in this prophecy were to take place before the close of the existing generation.' The conclusion is: 'We find but one parousia; one end of the age; one impending catastrophe; one terminus *ad quem*—"this generation".'[3]

The logical consistency of this view is admirable. It has the merit of facing plainly the great stumbling-block of an early parousia and of transforming it into the corner-stone of New Testament eschatology. Little wonder that it gained the assent of not a few gifted scholars.[4] Nevertheless, it is an impossible interpretation,

[1] Op. cit., pp. 56–65. [2] Op. cit., pp. 80 f. [3] Op. cit., pp. 113–114.

[4] Among others we may name Alexander Brown, whose exposition *The Great Day of the Lord* deeply impressed James Hastings (the latter thought its interpretation of the Book of Revelation the most satisfying that had appeared); D.

for it fails in several cardinal points. (i) Chiefly it overlooks that the New Testament expectation of the End of the Age and the Kingdom of God within a generation occurs also in the Old Testament. It was the normal expectation of a prophet that his visions of the End would be fulfilled within a measurably short time. It is hard to resist the impression that Isaiah looked for the end of the age with the fall of Assyria (Is. 7–9, 10–11), that Habakkuk looked for it to follow the overthrow of Babylon (Hab. 2. 2 f.), that Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah anticipated its coming at the close of the exile (Jer. 29–31, Ezk. 36, Is. 49, 51), and Haggai hoped for it when the temple had been reconstructed (Hag. 2). To shirk this conclusion by regarding *the* Day of the Lord as *a* day of the Lord—any act of judgment—is as inadmissible as the many evasions of the plain language of Mk. 13 which Russell and his followers so severely castigate. It was this consideration that turned Sanday from the idea of interpreting the parousia as historical comings; at his request Driver sent him a note on the significance of the 'Day of the Lord' in the Old Testament, the conclusion of which ran, 'I do not think that a succession of judgments is represented under this figure—except of course in so far as what the prophet pictured as taking place in a single day was in reality effected gradually'.[1] On the interpretation of Russell, the kind of thing which he postulated as happening in A.D. 70—the resurrection and the new age—should have happened at every epoch of which the Old Testament prophets spoke. (ii) The understanding of what the New Testament means by the new age and resurrection is unduly weakened on this theory. However true it be that the fall of Jerusalem finally freed Christianity from the shackles of Judaism, it is an optimistic reading of subsequent history to regard it as 'the world to come' of Biblical hope. We doubt very much whether the tortured Christians of the various Roman persecutions after A.D. 70 thought they were in the age of bliss, any more than we feel that we are in it now. The concept of 'resurrection' becomes simply one of a change of state in the heavenly realms; before A.D. 70 believers who died 'slept' in Christ, at A.D. 70 they entered his presence, from that time on dying believers pass straight into that presence without 'sleeping'. All this is gained from Rev. 14. 13, 'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth . . . '.

Lamont, *Christ and the World of Thought*, 1934; E. P. Gould, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark* (I.C.C.), 1896; A. Nairne, *The Epistle of Priesthood*, 1913.

[1] *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 154.

Quite apart from the question whether we ought to read in this verse *ἀπαρτί* 'surely', instead of *ἀπ' ἄρτι* 'henceforth', and so eliminate the idea of temporal significance,[1] this is a totally unworthy interpretation of the plain language of the New Testament, a subterfuge to bolster up an unhappy argument. It is inconsistent to criticise others for lack of realism, e.g. in regard to the plain reading of the time limitation in Mk. 13, if one is not prepared to use the same frankness generally. In this respect the supporters of the view we are discussing fail lamentably. (iii) The dilemma presented, that Jesus is either without authority at all or the whole of Mk. 13 was fulfilled within a generation, is unreal. If it were to be pressed, the Bible would have to be rejected as a whole, for the same kind of outlook on the future is presupposed in at least the greater part of it. But the discussions we have outlined on the shortened perspective of the Biblical writers should have sufficed to show the falsity of this view. (iv) The interpretation of the parousia as taking place at the fall of Jerusalem proceeded on the assumption that the Book of Revelation was issued before that date, for the same theme is dealt with in that book as in Mk. 13. While no scholar can say without shadow of doubt that the Revelation was written in the reign of Domitian, neither can any overlook the fact that the majority of ancient and modern exegetes have concurred in placing it about A.D. 95. If that view be correct the whole exposition collapses.

We conclude that although the interpretation of the parousia as fulfilled in A.D. 70 explains some of the Biblical data, it is irreconcilable with its general import.

[1] A. Debrunner has drawn attention to the variant reading in the Chester Beatty papyrus at Rev. 14. 13, where the term *ναί* is omitted. He would link *ΑΠΑΡΤΙ* with the following *λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα* instead of the preceding *ἀποθνήσκοντες*, and recounts the suggestion made by Anton Fridrichsen to him that *ΑΠΑΡΤΙ* here ought to be read as *ἀπαρτί* and not *ἀπ' ἄρτι*. The saying then reads: *Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες · ἀπαρτί, λεγει το Πνευμα, ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται κτλ*, and the form of the sentence is comparable to that of Rev. 22. 20. See Debrunner's article, Über einige Lesarten der Chester Beatty Papyri des Neuen Testaments, in *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* XI, Lund 1947.

CHAPTER 5

THE THEOLOGY OF MARK 13 AND ITS RELATIONS TO OTHER WRITINGS

MANY advocates of the Little Apocalypse theory are willing to see in that supposed document some approximation to the authentic teaching of Jesus; such a view seems to be demanded by the early and widespread acceptance of the document as a genuine utterance of Jesus. Moffatt, for example, wrote, 'The incorporation of the small apocalyptic fly-leaf is an incidental proof not only of their (i.e. Palestinian Christians') outlook upon the situation, but of the basis which that outlook must have had in the authentic teaching of Jesus himself.'[1] An attempt will be made in this chapter to show that the teaching of the eschatological discourse approximates so closely to the otherwise attested teaching of our Lord as to preclude the necessity for postulating an extraneous origin for it. The chief features of the discourse will be considered not so much in their logical order, as in the order of their importance from the point of view of our study.

1. THE SUDDENNESS OF THE END AND ITS SIGNS

The difficulty of reconciling these two elements of eschatological expectation has been the chief stumbling-block in the way of accepting Mk. 13 as authentic. Rawlinson voices the opinion of many in saying: 'He (Jesus) professed no knowledge of the day or the hour (v. 32); he dwells in this very chapter on the unexpectedness of the End (vv. 35–37); he discourages elsewhere the demand for a "sign" (Mk. 8. 11–12); and yet Ch. 13, as it now stands in the Gospel, is very largely concerned with the mapping out, in considerable detail, of the premonitory "signs" and distinguishable stages of the last great eschatological drama.'[2] Manson further urged that the expectation of signs is irreconcilable with the teaching in Q and the Pauline letters,[3] and Kümmel asserted the same of its relation to Mk. 12. 25 and Lk. 17. 20.[4] Here, then, are stated

[1] *The Theology of the Gospels*, 1912, p. 44.
[2] *St. Mark*, p. 181.
[3] *The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 261–262.
[4] *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, p. 61.

the three chief grounds for rejecting the idea of premonitory signs: (i) Jesus refused to give Pharisees a sign when demanded; (ii) he spoke of the end as sudden and unexpected; (iii) he declared that the kingdom comes 'without observation'.

Before we venture any comment on these facts, we would ask that three more should also be considered: (i) Jesus denounced his contemporaries in strongest terms for *not* reading the signs already perceptible to discerning eyes; Lk. 12. 54–56; (ii) he uttered at least one unambiguous parable which invites attention to signs heralding the approach of the future kingdom, Mk. 13. 28–29; (iii) he described the coming of the consummated kingdom in terms implying its external manifestation, so that in some sense the kingdom comes 'with observation', Mk. 14. 62 ('*You* shall see', said to his judges). The problem is considerably more complex than is commonly represented. If we add that the apostle Paul and the seer of Revelation (note carefully I Thess. 5. 1 ff., Rev. 3. 3) expressed in the pages of *one* letter or book the *two* views, that Jesus comes suddenly and yet heralded by signs, we ought to make an effort to understand how they did it, and to ask whether this holding concurrently two such opposed views is really a piece of irrational apocalypticism, or whether it expresses a fundamental principle which cannot be surrendered.

First, let us be clear that the refusal of Jesus to give a 'sign' to the Pharisees has nothing to do with our discussion. Their request is interpreted by Mark, surely correctly, as designed to trip up Jesus (Mk. 8. 11). They are not concerned with the coming of the kingdom. It is the authority of Jesus as a teacher that is in question, and he declines to grant their request, as he did in the case of Herod later. 'This generation will certainly not be given a sign' (Mk. 8. 12) refers to the kind of sign they wanted; signs of the relation of Jesus to the kingdom *have* been granted, and they are upbraided for not being able to perceive them.[1] The real difficulty lies in the significance of Lk. 17. 20 f., but it would be hard to find a more ambiguous saying of Jesus, and in the matter of its interpretation there is no room for dogmatism.[2]

[1] Lk. 12. 54–56. In the context wherein Luke has inserted this paragraph, the primary reference may be to the darkening political situation, see 13. 1 ff., 6 ff. If that be so, the saying is even more pertinent to our discussion, for the 'signs' would be of a similar order to those in Mk. 13. 7 f., 14 ff. But Mt. 11. 4 f. undoubtedly relates to the (miraculous) signs of the ministry of Jesus, by which John should understand the nature of the time—and of the Teacher.

[2] A brilliant interpretation, overlooked by expositors generally, but which would ease the difficulties of this verse, was given by A. Meyer in his *Jesu*

The view that *οὐ . . . μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* in Lk. 17. 20 means 'not externally', and makes the phrase a repudiation of all the 'futurist' eschatology elsewhere attributed to Jesus,[1] need not be considered. We ought not to interpret a saying in such a manner as to make it contradict every stratum of Gospel tradition preserved to us, when an equally straightforward interpretation obviates the necessity. A more popular reading of this saying paraphrases it as follows: 'No calculation or watching for signs will avail anything, nor will men be able to tell one another that it has appeared in this locality or that; for behold—before any can tell the news—the kingdom is in your midst: all in a moment.'[2] In this way the saying conforms to the following context and expresses the idea of a sudden coming, with the completest exclusion of premonitory signs. The weakness of such a view, however, lies in the necessity for interpolating something which is not there, 'all in a moment', as Winstanley put it, or some other expression to denote suddenness; without an interpolation of this kind the saying cannot be made to yield this meaning, which surely ought to suffice to show the falsity of this exegesis.[3] It would seem, despite the protest of Professor Dodd, that we ought to translate *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν* as 'among you', but with him consider the reference to be to the presence of the kingdom,[4] not, however, *in the hearts of men* but *in the person*

Muttersprache, p. 87. He held that *παρατηρεῖν* frequently represents the Aramaic נטר, the substantive of which is נְטִיר. *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* is then בְּנְטִיר, but that means 'secretly'. He compares Job. 4. 12, adduced by Levi: אתאמר בְּנְטִיר לותי פתגם, 'to me a word was spoken under observation', i.e. secretly (=Hebrew יְנֻגַּב, 'there stole to me'). The meaning of Lk. 17. 20 will then simply be, '*The kingdom of God does not come secretly*', which is the opposite of what the saying is usually taken to mean. It would suit both the view that the signs of the Kingdom are already manifest and that which regards it as suddenly to be revealed in the future. Héring, *Royaume de Dieu*, pp. 42–43, regards this explanation as the only satisfactory one that has appeared. Dalman, on the other hand, *W.J.*, pp. 143 f., doubts its likelihood, and translates בְּנְטִיר 'by lying in wait for'. As a possible alternative to בְּנְטִיר he suggests כְּדִנְטָרִין לֵהּ, 'if one lies in wait for it'. In view of the uncertainty of this kind of reconstruction, we have dealt with the text as it stands.

[1] So Dougall and Emmet, *The Lord of Thought*, pp. 264, 287.

[2] E. W. Winstanley, *Jesus and the Future*, p. 35. So also Bousset, *Jesus*, p. 78, n. 1; Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, vol. 2, p. 402; T. W. Manson, *Mission and Message of Jesus*, p. 596; Héring, *Le Royaume de Dieu*, pp. 42–43; Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der syn. Tradition*, p. 128.

[3] Such is the contention of Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche*, pp. 130–132.

[4] *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 84. Against Dodd's view, note that Ps. 87. 6 in the version of Symmachus reads *ἐντὸς νεκρῶν ἀφεθείς* where LXX has *ἐν νεκροῖς ἐλεύθερος*, proving that *ἐντός* can mean 'among'. P. M. S. Allen disputed this in *Exp. Times*, Feb. 1939, pp. 233–5; but in the same issue A. Sledd

and ministry of the Christ who stood there. We may then paraphrase, 'The kingdom of God requires no calculation of dates, nor is it to be searched for: look, it is in your midst!' By so rendering it, the saying is less concerned with 'observation' than with the presence of the desired kingdom, the stress is on 'Lo'. As Otto put it, 'The statement is by no means identical with rejection (of parateresis). It is meant to be confirmation: it is meant to give a fact whose consequence is—(*a*) that the apocalyptic methods of parateresis are not in place, and (*b*) that there can be no talk of a Here and a There. Evidently (*a*) and (*b*) both actually result *if he is speaking of the kingdom which . . . is already present in its first dawning*. If that were true, then indeed all parateresis would be foolish. And then also all talk of Here and There would be foolish, for the matter in question was not something relating to place or space, but something dynamic, in view of whose nature a Here and There is not applicable.'[1]

If it is objected that this is a questionable way of evading the force of *οὐ . . . μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*, and that the phrase represents a vital principle, at least we ought to bear in mind who were being addressed, viz. *Pharisees*. They had asked when the kingdom would come and Jesus replies *οὐ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*. It is surely relevant to recall that the Pharisees were convinced it *would* come *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως*, and that it could be *narrowly* calculated. If anyone wishes to understand why Jesus rejected the Pharisaic parateresis, let him read the forty pages of close type that make up the excursus on 'Preliminary signs and calculations of the days of the Messiah' in Strack-Billerbeck's commentary from the Talmud.[2] He will there read how that all time is divided into twelve periods, or ten periods, or seven periods, or four periods, or three periods; how the years are apportioned out in three groups of two thousand, or two of two thousand five hundred with one thousand for the Messianic kingdom; how by careful manipulation of Daniel's seventy weeks, particularly the last 1290 days, a *precise* date is fixed for the beginning of the Messianic kingdom; how it was supposed to come in A.D. 70 and how its tarrying was explained. The famous saying of Rabbi Ze'ira, *c.* A.D. 300, 'Three things come *unexpectedly*: the Messiah, a discovery, and a scorpion' (Sanh. 97*a*. 42),

made a strong case for the view that when the dependent genitive after *ἐντός* is in the plural, the phrase may mean *within the group*; it need not mean, and frequently cannot mean *inside of any member or members of that group*.

[1] *The Kingdom of God and Son of Man*, p. 132.

[2] *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Vierter Band, Zweiter Teil, pp. 977 ff.

is not at all representative of Rabbinical speculation. Some voices, it is true, were raised against the ceaseless calculations of the End. R. Jonathan (*c.* A.D. 220), for example, said, 'May the bones of the end-time calculators be scattered who, when the date of the End comes without the Messiah arriving, say, "*He will never come at all*". Rather tarry for him, as it is written, "If he delays, tarry for him" ' (Sanh. 97*b*, 25).[1] But it is clear from this that the calculations of the would-be-prophets must have created much mischief, far more amongst their fellows than in their own minds; the trend of the times, however, favoured them rather than their opponents. Unfortunately, the evidence on this matter, as in Rabbinical theology generally, is later than the fall of Jerusalem, but it shows without doubt that from that time on, the quest after the date of the end was eager and unabated; there is good reason to believe that it existed with at least equal strength before that time, and that the contemporaries of Jesus shared it.[2]

If the parateresis refused by Jesus related to this kind of speculation, we hope it will be granted that it has no bearing on the question of the origin of Mk. 13, for no trace of mathematical calculation lies in that document. The conviction that the end will come shortly, within a generation, is due to prophetic certainty and must not be confused with prophecy-mongering.[3] But as little does Mk. 13 agree with the spirit of Jewish Apocalypses as to the nature of the signs of the end. We advisedly use the term 'spirit', for as the Old Testament is the common source for Jewish Apocalyptists and New Testament speakers and writers, there are inevitably many contacts. Nevertheless, the way in which ancient prophecies are used is different. For example, our Lord certainly used Mic. 7. 6, compare Mt. 10. 34–36; in Mk. 13. 12 it is possible that we may also see the influence of Hag. 2. 22, Zech. 14. 13; but in En. 100. 1 ff. we have the saying in typical apocalyptic exaggeration:

[1] Op. cit., p. 1015.

[2] A tragic instance of false calculations of the End is mentioned by Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, 6, 5, 2: 6,000 women and children were burned alive by the Roman soldiers in the outer court of the temple. 'A false prophet was the occasion of these people's destruction, who had made a public proclamation in the city that very day, that God commanded them to get up upon the temple, and that there they should receive miraculous signs of their deliverance.'According to Strack-Billerbeck, this prophecy rested on an interpretation of the 70 weeks of Daniel whereby the End was made to fall on 9th Ab A.D. 70, a quite common calculation. See the volume of S.B. cited, p. 1003.

[3] It is, as Althaus puts it, Weissagung, not Wahrsagung. *Die Letzten Dinge*, pp. 267 ff.

And in those days in one place the fathers together with their sons shall be smitten,

And brothers one with another shall fall in death
Till the streams flow with their blood.

For a man shall not withhold his hand from slaying his sons and his sons' sons,
And the sinner shall not withhold his hand from his honoured brother;
From dawn till sunset they shall slay one another.

And the horse shall walk up to the breast in the blood of sinners,
And the chariot shall be submerged to its height.

That the tribulation of the end will consist of war, famine, earthquake, etc., is repeated throughout the Old Testament prophets, but the apocalyptist goes further in his descriptions. Either he apportions out the woes or he exaggerates them beyond measure. As an example of the former, consider II Bar. 26–28:

I answered and said: Will that tribulation which is to come continue a long time, and will that necessity embrace many years? And he answered and said unto me: *Into twelve parts* is that time divided, *and each one of them is reserved for that which is appointed for it.* In the first part there shall be the beginnings of commotions. And in the second part there shall be slayings of the great ones. And in the third part the fall of many by death. And in the fourth part the sending of the sword. And in the fifth part famine and the withholding of rain. And in the sixth part earthquakes and terrors . . .(text incomplete). And in the eighth part a multitude of spectres and attacks of the Shedim. And in the ninth part the fall of fire. And in the tenth part rapine and much oppression. And in the eleventh part wickedness and unchastity. And in the twelfth part confusion from the mingling together of all those things aforesaid. . . . Whosoever understandeth shall be wise. For the measure and reckoning of that time are two parts of a week of seven weeks.

For an example of imagination let loose on the conjuring of woes of the end, consider the well-known passage from II Esdras 5:

Behold the days come when the inhabitants of earth shall be seized with great panic. . . .
Then shall the sun suddenly shine forth by night and the moon by day;
And the blood shall trickle forth from wood, and the stone utter its voice:

The peoples shall be in commotion, and the outgoings of the stars shall change. . . .

And the earth o'er wide regions shall open, and fire burst forth for a long period:

The wild beasts shall desert their haunts, and women bear monsters.

And one year old children shall speak with their voices; pregnant women shall bring forth untimely births at three or four months, and these shall live and dance. And suddenly shall the sown places appear unsown, and the full storehouses shall suddenly be found empty.

Salt waters shall be found in the sweet; friends shall attack one another suddenly. . . .

Such are the signs I am permitted to tell thee; *but if thou wilt pray again, and weep as now, and fast seven days, thou shalt hear again greater things than these.*(!)

Comparison is often made between Mk. 13 and the Apocalypse of Peter, with the intention of bracketing the two works together. It would seem altogether more likely, however, that as the books of Enoch and his ancient friends have developed prophetic conceptions, so the Apocalypse of Peter has elaborated the eschatological discourse. Its signs of the end are presented in the same style as those we have quoted, but it goes a stage further. After the description of the parousia, an account of the torments of hell and the blessedness of paradise is provided. The pictures of hell are revolting to an extent of which no Jewish apocalypse is guilty. Punishments are made to fit the crimes, so that blasphemers hang by their tongues above unquenchable fire, women who plaited their hair to allure to fornication are suspended by their hair, adulterous men by their loins, murderers have venomous beasts as well as the fire, 'and their worms shall be as many in number as a dark cloud'. A pit of diarrhoea is reserved for certain offenders: for women who caused abortions, from whose children go lightnings that pierce their eyes; for parents who exposed their children, 'and the milk of their mothers flowing from their breasts shall congeal, and from it shall come beasts devouring flesh, which shall come forth and turn and torment them for ever with their husbands. . . .' We marvel that critics have ever persuaded themselves to place this document alongside Mk. 13 as coming from the same stock.[1] Why have they not seen that it is exactly because Mk. 13 does *not* contain these fantastic notions that the author of the Petrine apocalypse was

[1] 'The Apocalypse of Peter must probably be ranged alongside the Synoptic Apocalypse on account of its scope and nature.' Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, p. 121.

compelled to transform the Gospel document in order to make room for them? Does this not illustrate that the eschatological discourse as it stands cannot satisfy the usual apocalyptist, who must fill in what is lacking and give rein to his imagination? Again we repeat, if this is the kind of background presumed in Lk. 17. 20 f., it should not be cited as the authentic condemnation by Jesus of premonitory signs, nor as a final proof of the spuriousness of Mk. 13. He himself stood in the prophetic tradition, but we can understand that he revolted against these abuses of it.

What, then, is the significance of signs? If Jesus called attention to signs announcing the presence of the kingdom and, according to the parable of the fig tree, spoke of signs that should herald the triumph of the kingdom, he must have had good reasons for doing so. We have already mentioned the views of certain exegetes on this matter; signs reveal the universality of the coming sovereignty of God (Wendland), the eschatological nature of the present era (Cullman), and they remind the Church of its mission to the world (J. Weiss). Inasmuch, however, as the kingdom is one, whether present or future, perhaps the simplest procedure is to relate the signs of its consummation to the signs of its beginning. In the preaching of Jesus it seems that he regarded signs as an indication to his contemporaries (i) that the *kingdom had come* upon them, and (ii) as an incitement to *repentance* (Mt. 12. 28, Mk. 1. 15). The same dual implication of signs apparently attaches to the development and final victory of the kingdom; they unveil the divine *βασιλεία* and call for a moral response. The *sovereignty of God* is revealed in this era in the exercise of judgment (Mk. 13. 7 f.), and in the power of the Gospel (Mk. 13. 10); the end-time will reveal the consummation of that sovereignty in the victorious manifestation of the Messiah with His glorified community (Mk. 13. 24–27). It should be noted that Paul reveals exactly the same viewpoint in the Epistle to the Romans: Rom. 1. 18–2. 16 show the sovereignty of God in his present judgment on the world, heading up to the Day when he will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.[1] Rom.

[1] Compare Sanday and Headlam on *ἀποκαλύπτεται*, Rom. 1. 18: 'How is this revelation made? Is the reference to the Final Judgment, or to the actual condition, as St. Paul saw it, of the heathen world? Probably not to either exclusively, but to both in close combination. The condition of the world seems to the Apostle ripe for judgment; he sees around him on all hands signs of the approaching end. In the latter half of this chapter St. Paul lays stress on these signs: he develops the *ἀποκαλύπτεται*, present. In the first half of the next chapter he brings out the final doom to which the signs are pointing.' *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed., p. 41.

1. 16–17 declares the power of the Gospel to bestow upon men the saving power of the righteousness of God (a good working definition of the kingdom of God), while Rom. 11. 25 anticipates the day when the 'fulness of the Gentiles' is gathered. The difference between Romans and the eschatological discourse is mainly in form: the epistle gives theology and a concluding ethical application; Mk. 13 mixes eschatological statement with implied appeal, the *whole* having the purpose of *incitement to moral endurance*. Unlike the public preaching of Jesus, the eschatological discourse is directed to disciples only; hence the appeal to repentance is replaced by that to steadfastness. The revelation of signs, both in relation to world affairs, Israel's doom, and the experience of persecution, has an ethical aim rather than a didactic one, it reveals Jesus as Pastor rather than Teacher. His warnings apply especially to the community in Palestine, for their danger in Israel's distress was more acute than the situation of disciples in the outer world; they were in peril of not being able to discern wherein their path of duty lay.[1] Beyschlag accordingly wrote, 'For the sake of his growing church he dared not leave unexpressed (the warnings concerning Jerusalem's fate); for his desire was to detach the Church in spirit from the old national communion, and so preserve it in the decisive moment from being entangled in the nation's fate.'[2]

Here, then, in the moral sphere, we find the clue to reconciling the description of signs with the teaching on a sudden coming: the end will come with unexpected suddenness, it will take the ungodly unawares, for they do not know the issue of their distresses; the believer also does not know when the end will come, but *the understanding of the nature of the times will encourage him to endure steadfastly and not lose his crown.* Is not this implied in Lk. 17. 22 f.? Schwartzkopff believed so: 'In such times (of distress) they must have yearned for the end of the tribulation which should bring the coming of their Lord (Lk. 17. 22 f.). Then, however, it naturally came too slowly for them. The Lord had every reason, therefore, in regard to such times to exhort his own to continued patience, that they should not forfeit the salvation of their souls (Lk. 21. 19, Mk. 13. 20).'[3] In this position we see neither lack of reasoning powers nor mere repetition of incoherent and traditional apocalyptic motifs: it is the pastoral care of the Chief Shepherd for his

[1] Compare Nairne's belief as to the situation presupposed in the Letter to the Hebrews, *The Epistle of Priesthood*, Ch. 1.

[2] *New Testament Theology*, vol. 1, p. 202.

[3] *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, p. 180.

own, warning them at all costs to be both ready and strong to endure to the End.

Before concluding this discussion, it will be instructive to recall a critical inquiry which ran on very similar lines to that concerning Mk. 13. In 1801 J. E. C. Schmidt affirmed that II Thess. 2. 1–12 was a Montanist interpolation in that letter, on the ground of its discrepancy with I Thess. 4. 13–5.11; the latter represents a *sudden* parousia, the former a parousia preceded by *signs*. In 1839 the thesis was developed by Kern, who thought that the background of II Thess. 2 was the expectation of Antichrist appearing as Nero redivivus, the 'restrainer' was Vespasian and his son Titus, the 'apostasy' the wickedness of the Jews during the war with Rome. This unfulfilled prophecy belongs to the years A.D. 68–70 and could not have been written by Paul; it became the nucleus of a letter, being preceded by an introduction and followed by an exhortation drawn from the genuine letter of Paul. In this Kern was followed by a number of scholars, including Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Schmiedel and Wrede, who, however, progressively put the emphasis on the literary relationships of I and II Thessalonians. Wrede felt that differences of eschatology only had weight in connection with that of the literary dependence of II Thess. on I Thess.; with Hilgenfeld he placed the letter at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second. Finally Hollmann brought the argument back to eschatology, feeling that the other arguments were of less moment. The simple excision of II Thess. 2. 1–12 was too tame for the analytic bent of some critics: P. Schmidt regarded 1. 1–4, 2. 1–2*a*, 2. 13–3. 18 as genuine, the rest as expansion. Pierson and Naber found a pre-Christian Jewish apocalypse in 1. 5–10, 2. 1–12, 3. 1–6, 14–15.[1]

Naturally these analyses did not go unchallenged. Spitta urged that the conception of a parousia heralded by signs and one that is sudden is characteristic of apocalyptic thought and is not to be regarded as contradictory. The same tension is seen even in the familiar figures of Noah's Flood and the escape of Lot from Sodom, for Noah was advised beforehand, and by his building the ark gave warning to the world, while Lot pleaded in vain with his sons-in-law to flee from the destruction. 'Accordingly no conclusion can be drawn from the fact that in I Thess. the suddenness of the parousia is made known, while in II Thess. its calculability (Berechenbarkeit) is declared. It happens that the two various sides of the parousia conception are applied in the letters, *in each case that one being emphasised which befits the necessity of*

[1] For these details, see Frame's *Commentary on the Thessalonian Epistles* pp. 40 ff., and Moffatt's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 82.

the community.'[1] McGiffert adopted a similar position. Apart from the reconcilability of the two conceptions of the parousia, he urged: 'It can hardly be supposed that any one would venture to produce such a pseudonymous epistle during Paul's lifetime, or that it would find acceptance if he did. On the other hand, if Paul's first epistle gave rise to misunderstandings . . . we should expect those misunderstandings to have arisen *immediately*, not after an interval of many years, when the expectation expressed in the epistle was already at least partially discredited by Paul's own death. And if the fanatical abuse of his words appeared during his lifetime, it would be strange if he took no notice of it. *The sole purpose of the eschatological passage is clearly to put a stop to the fanaticism to which the belief in the speedy consummation was giving rise*.'[2] Frame added an even more important observation, so obvious that it is difficult to understand how it could ever have been overlooked: the natural inference from I Thess. 5. 1–4 is that the readers are acquainted with Paul's teaching that certain signs will herald the Day of the Lord. The apparently contradictory eschatological views thus stand in immediate juxtaposition in I Thessalonians. The different emphasis in the two letters is due to difference of situation: 'In 5. 1–11 Paul is not concerned with giving new instruction, either on times and seasons in general, or in particular on the suddenness of the coming of the day; he is interested solely in encouraging the fainthearted to remember that though the day is to come suddenly upon all, believer and unbeliever alike, it will not catch the believer unprepared, the tacit assumption being that the readers already know accurately about the times and seasons including, as II Thess. 2. 5 expressly declares, a knowledge of the premonitory signs. In II Thess. 2. 1–12 Paul is writing with the same fainthearted persons in mind and with the same purpose of encouragement, but he is facing a different situation and a different need. The fainthearted have become more discouraged because of the assertion, supported, it was alleged, by the authority of Paul, that the day of the Lord had actually dawned. In order to show the absurdity of that opinion, it became necessary for Paul to remind them of his teaching on premonitory signs.'[3]

It will be admitted that the parallel with the Little Apocalypse hypothesis is remarkable. Most critics today have been persuaded, in respect of the Thessalonian letters, by the kind of arguments adduced by Frame and others; it is curious that they have accepted in Paul what they have denied to Jesus. Perhaps the difference of situation

[1] *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, Erster Band, 1893, pp. 129–130.

[2] *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 4, cols. 5041 ff.

[3] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*, pp. 43–44.

between the first and second letters to the Thessalonians is more obvious, but is not the difference between, say, Lk. 17. 22 ff. and Mk. 13 also partly explicable on the same lines? The point cannot be pressed, for we do not know the background of the ingredients of the former discourse, but that of the latter discourse, in the main, is plausible. If Jesus gave any instruction to his leading disciples just before his death, it was natural to warn them of coming dangers, with impending consolation also, and to adapt his more usual form of teaching to the situation of his followers in coming days. However that may be, the concord between the representation of the End as coming suddenly and as preceded by signs ought to be accorded full recognition.

2. The Nearness of the End

In no section of our study is courageous thinking more required than in this. It has been regarded as 'among the most difficult questions of historical theology',[1] yet it has to be frankly admitted that the difficulty only exists for faith. Titius said of the sayings akin to Mk. 9. 1, 'The real *dogmatic* difficulty of Mk. 9. 1, etc., is not to be denied; *there is no room to speak of an exegetical difficulty*.'[2] To agnostics the issue is simple: Jesus was wrong in his prophecies, he is therefore discredited. We recall that on this ground Sidgwick felt compelled to abandon Christian faith. Christian believers shrink from admitting that their Lord was mistaken in a major item of his preaching and not unnaturally cast about to see if there is any other explanation of the Gospel material. It will have become clear to the reader that the present writer inclines to conservative views; he freely admits that on this matter he hesitated long before capitulating before the facts. Yet facts they appear to be and the Christian must come to terms with them; to resist what appears to be truth is to deny the Lord in whose interests it is done.

Let us briefly review the evidence. The parables of growth (Mustard Seed, Leaven, Seed growing secretly, etc.) are often considered to prove that Jesus thought of his kingdom as developing gradually over a long course of time. This is almost certainly a mistake. Easton said of these figures, 'We should naturally not overstress time elements in a parable, but we have at least the duty to note that there is no parable of Jesus' that compares the development of the present kingdom to the growth of an oak tree from an acorn; grain and mustard seed grow up in a few weeks, while leaven

[1] L. A. Muirhead, Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. 1, p. 532.
[2] *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, p. 145.

works overnight'.[1] Bultmann cites a parable similar to those of the Gospels from the Epistle of Clement, wherein the interpretation is provided by the author:

> 'O you fools, consider a plant, a grapevine for example. First, it sheds the old leaves, then the young shoots sprout, then leaves, then flowers, then the green grapes, finally the ripe grapes appear. *You see how quickly the fruit is ripe. Even so quickly and suddenly will God's final judgment come*, as the Scripture testifies: He will come quickly and will not tarry, suddenly will the Lord come to his temple, the Holy One for whom you wait.'[2]

There is no reason to imagine that the parables spoken by our Lord had a different meaning. Clement was still near enough the time of the apostles to feel it unnecessary to modernise them. The relationship of our Lord's teaching to the disciples requires to be taken into account also. We earlier cited the contention of Russell that in all that our Lord said of his advent and the end of this age he had the disciples in mind. This was recognised by Haupt: 'Everything said about the parousia and the events that precede it continually moves in the second person plural, hence the presupposition is that those addressed would live to see it; further, not in one single place is the possibility reckoned with that they all would die beforehand.'[3] This is underscored by the manner in which Jesus endeavoured to prepare the disciples for the coming of the Day: it presupposes not merely the possibility that he would come soon, but the probability, 'otherwise he could not have exhorted so urgently his own to watchfulness in all those sayings and parables, in order that they should not let themselves be surprised by the day of the Lord'.[4] With these are to be related the sayings apparently placing the end within the contemporary generation, Mk. 9. 1, 13. 30, 14. 62, Mt. 10. 23. It is true that it has been the custom of many to refer these sayings to Pentecost and the fall of Jerusalem, but we have noted how unsatisfactory such a procedure is. Strong language is used about this resort by more than one exegete. Robertson, in his Bampton Lectures, affirmed: 'To refer "the kingdom of God coming with power" to the first Pentecost, or to anything short of the Return of Christ, appears like flinching from the plain and inexorable reference of this group of passages.'[5] Guignebert wrote in

[1] *Christ in the Gospels*, p. 163.
[2] I Clem. 23. 4–5, cited by Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, pp. 36–37.
[3] *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, p. 138.
[4] Schwartzkopff, *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi*, p. 174. See also Michaelis, *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung*, pp. 5 ff.
[5] *Regnum Dei*, p. 71, n. 4.

a like strain although he believed the sayings unauthentic: of Mk. 9. 1 he said: 'If its genuineness be once admitted, it must be acknowledged that its meaning is entirely unambiguous', of 13. 30, 'It is idle to try and persuade ourselves that this verse also does not refer to the parousia but merely to the Fall of Jerusalem', while Mt. 10. 23 'confirms the force of the two already mentioned'.[1]

It is hard to deny the correctness of these observations. Mk. 9. 1 can scarcely refer to Pentecost, for Jesus said that only *some* of the bystanders should not die before the kingdom's triumph, implying that a number would die before the event. The same consideration excludes the transfiguration from possessing a vital relation to the saying, even though it be regarded as a divine confirmation of its ultimate truth. Matthew rightly paraphrases 'the kingdom coming with power' with an expression of the parousia hope, and we have given reasons for denying the fulfilment of that hope in the events of A.D. 70.[2] If Matthew has rightly interpreted Mk. 9. 1, there need be no hesitation to accept Mt. 10. 23, at least on the ground of the time factor; while almost all British exegetes refuse the authenticity of the latter saying, almost all Continental scholars agree in accepting it. Mk. 14. 62 presumes the same viewpoint consistently adopted by our Lord in addressing his disciples concerning the end: his judges themselves shall see his exaltation in glory at his parousia. 'Since this "seeing" can only have the meaning of personal experience, Christ here proclaims to his enemies, with the same significance as in the former places, the coming of the Son of Man in their lifetime.'[3] In view of all this, there seems no valid reason for denying a similar meaning to Mk. 13. 30. Attempts to avoid the plain meaning of the statement by referring 'generation' to the human race or the race of Israel, etc., must be regarded as unworthy evasions of a perfectly clear statement. Conservative expositors who have other ways of interpreting the eschatological discourse are even stronger in their rejection of this mode of exegesis than the critics. J. S. Russell e.g. writes on this verse: 'It is demonstrable without any shadow of doubt that the expression "this generation", so often employed by our Lord, always refers solely and exclusively to his contemporaries, the Jewish people of his own period. (He cites Mt. 23. 36, 11. 16, 12. 39, 41, 42, 45, Lk. 11. 50–51, 17. 25,

[1] *Jesus*, pp. 344–345.

[2] See Schwartzkopff, *Weissagungen*, p. 163; Titius, *Jesu Lehre*, p. 146; Michaelis, *Der Herr verzieht nicht*, pp. 34–43; Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, pp. 15 ff.

[3] Schwartzkopff, p. 64.

Mk. 8. 38—the total instances of the phrase in our Lord's sayings.) Can anyone believe that the assertion so solemnly made by our Lord, "Verily I say unto you . . ." amounts to no more than this, "The Hebrew race shall not become extinct till all these things be fulfilled"? Imagine a prophet in our own times predicting a great catastrophe in which London would be destroyed, St. Paul's and the Houses of Parliament levelled with the ground, and a fearful slaughter of the inhabitants perpetrated; and that when asked, "When shall these things come to pass?" he should reply, "The Anglo-Saxon race shall not become extinct till all these things be fulfilled"! . . . The bare supposition of such a sense in our Lord's prediction shows itself to be a *reductio ad absurdum.*'[1] We fear the same kind of stricture requires to be levelled at other explanations, such as that which interprets γενεά as meaning 'kind, species', i.e. men of unbelieving character like the Jews, even though it claims such respected names as Lohmeyer, Schniewind and Michaelis. The plain sense of the passage must be allowed to stand.

What are we to make of this expectation? Does it mean that Jesus is discredited, at least as regards the content of his prophecies, if not in his other teaching? By no means. We remember that even Strauss saw that if the fundamental belief of Jesus, as to the existence of a spiritual realm beyond this, be granted, then the question of date could be accounted as a merely human mistake. Baldensperger in a similar strain, wrote: 'This mistake is irrelevant, a purely formal one; it is not due to a lack in religious or moral consciousness (on the contrary, in this case it is too far driven!), but it is simply the objective proof that *religious perfection does not include omniscience.*'[2] Everything we know about Jesus points to the naturalness of his believing in a speedy coming of the End. We list the following points, which at least enable us to appreciate how it was that Jesus so consistently referred to the end of the age as occurring within a generation.

(i) *Intensity and certainty of prophetic convictions* invariably express themselves in terms of a speedy fulfilment. 'The media of time and space fail wherever a genuine prophetic message of divine reality is proclaimed,' affirmed Lietzmann.[3] 'Great religious geniuses, like all the greatest reformers, have but two words in their vocabulary, *now* and *here*,' said G. S. Hall.[4] Every Old Testament

[1] *The Parousia*, p. 85. [2] *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 148.
[3] *The Beginnings of the Christian Church*, p. 52.
[4] *Jesus Christ in the Light of Psychology*, p. 266, cited by H. A. Guy, *New Testament Prophecy*, p. 59.

prophet may be quoted as an example of the truth of these words, even if the latter statement has expressed the sentiment a little too strongly. No scholar who has studied the Old Testament prophets sympathetically will be prepared to say that they saw nothing; the coming of Christ and of his Church has in no small measure vindicated their message. Both Christ, and his Church in dependence on him, affirm that there is more to follow. The time perspective can as little discredit the message of Christ and his followers as it has that of the prophets who anticipated them. The more pronounced the conviction of the Lord, the more this observation applies to him. 'In times of intense thought we "can crowd eternity into an hour",' wrote J. A. MacCulloch. 'Christ's deeper knowledge and conviction of his position as Judge of men's thoughts and deeds took shape in his surface thoughts, mainly, though not always, in intense eschatological convictions, which . . . then assumed the form of an imminent and catastrophic parousia.'[1] The convictions, related as they are to our Lord's resurrection hope, were true, the perspective mistaken, but that is the least important element in them.

(ii) *The faith of our Lord in his Father's power* would confirm him in his natural prophetic consciousness. This insight is particularly associated with the writing of A. G. Hogg. 'Our Lord knew that with the Father all things were possible—that nothing could be too glorious for God. Would he not, then, have been *false* to his Father if he had counted an early consummation unlikely? Would he not have been contradicting the spirit of all Old Testament prophecy?'[2] This is a not unreasonable deduction from our Lord's teaching. His attitude to the future was not so much conditioned by an unqualified acceptance of the letter of Scripture as by complete confidence in the power and goodness of his Father to fulfil the hopes made known therein. That he sought to impart that same faith to his disciples is plain, nowhere more so than in the prayer he taught them. 'Thy kingdom come . . .' is to be prayed with a view to its fulfilment, for it lies in God's power to give it. Jesus had no reason to imagine that it would be withheld.

(iii) With this trust in God, some expositors would conjoin a similar *confidence in his followers*. This is denied by the entire Lutheran tradition of scholarship, but in so far as the coming of the kingdom is at all subject to the prayers of God's people and the

[1] *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 5, p. 384.
[2] *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, pp. 36–37.

spread of the Gospel, it is hard to deny this element in our Lord's expectation. This does not rob God of his initiative, but it does take the *moral* signs of the End seriously. As E. F. Scott said, 'He did not claim that men had themselves the power to bring in the Kingdom, or to determine the form or manner in which it would appear. As against the Zealots, with their reliance on political agitation, he was in sympathy with the Pharisees, who left the future deliverance solely to the good pleasure of God. But although he looked for a supernatural coming of the kingdom, he required that men should do their part. While trusting in God alone to accomplish His purpose, they could wait upon Him with fervent desire and longing. They could wrestle with Him in the power of faith till they prevailed on His will.'[1] In so far as the disciples of Jesus and the Church after them came short in faith, in prayer and in witness, in that respect they failed to vindicate the faith of Jesus in them, and delayed the kingdom.

(iv) *The significance of the messianic vocation of Jesus and of his redemptive work* would necessarily intensify in his mind the expectation of the nearness of the final kingdom. In his life and ministry the powers of the kingdom were at work, fulfilling the hopes of ancient prophecy. The supreme act whereby the powers of evil would be overcome and the kingdom would be released in power was about to be achieved. How then should the End not come soon? The realisation in our Lord's mind that he stood at the end of a long process of development, in the hour which prophets and kings earnestly desired to see, yet further increased his consciousness of the climactic character of his ministry. 'Exactly the *long* time of preparation, in connection with the circumstance that his *short* time of ministry had to suffice for the sowing, according to the will of God, necessitated that he expected the harvest to be not too far off, especially towards the end of his activity.'[2] This, combined with the critical importance of his redemptive death and resurrection, will also have thrown into prominence the gravity of the Jewish rejection and the inevitability of a speedy judgment upon the guilty nation. If, as we believe, the overthrow of Jerusalem was bound up with the judgments of the end, the two expectations would have reacted on each other.

(v) Mk. 13. 32 implies that *all the expressions of Jesus' confidence*

[1] *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, p. 144. See also Hogg, op. cit., pp. 42 f.; H. R. Mackintosh, *Immortality and the Future*, p. 146; L. Hodgson, *And was made man*, p. 74.

[2] Schwartzkopff, p. 184.

in the proximate coming of the kingdom stand under the decision of the Father's good pleasure. Undoubtedly the immediate sense of the saying defines the limits of Jesus' knowledge of the time of the end: it does not say that he knows nothing at all as to its coming; it affirms that it does not lie in his power to define it more closely. The ridicule and scorn poured upon that interpretation by a multitude of expositors, as though it were absurd for Jesus to claim to know in which generation the end would come but not the day, overlooks the fact that for Jesus there was only *one* generation in question, his own: he was simply stating the limits of his prophetic certitude in its relation to time. Nevertheless, the terms in which he made this confession imply that the Father's solitary knowledge of the day is due to its determination by him; he knows it because he introduces it when he sees fit. If the last word is with the Father, then all the words of the Son are subject to it, including the expressed conviction that this generation will not pass until all be fulfilled. The curious situation is here observable, that *a saying which implies the incidence of the End in a short time nevertheless leaves room for the correction of all statements that declare it will come shortly.* Michaelis believes that all utterances of Jesus as to the time of the End must be considered as provisional in the light of this saying, and that their non-fulfilment was itself provided for by it.[1] This leads directly to the next point.

(vi) The utterances concerning the near approach of the End have the same motive as those dealing with signs, viz. *the pastoral care of Jesus.* For their sakes he desired the time of testing to be short and for their sakes he urged them to be prepared for its speedy coming. This was seen as long ago as Titius,[2] but it is freshly urged by Michaelis, whose book deals at length with this theme: 'It is clear that the love which Jesus had for his disciples was in fact the sole motive to keep them ever on the watch and to emphasise to them that they should continually reckon only with the nearness, never with the remoteness of the last day.'[3] Exactly the same motive will also have led Jesus to warn his disciples to be prepared for delay, as in the eschatological discourse. From this point of view the Church can never afford to neglect the warnings of Jesus. It is because the Church has more or less banished from its belief in the near expectation of the End that Biblical eschatology has become remote and has completely lost ethical power. At best it is a

[1] *Der Herr verzieht nicht*, pp. 45 ff.
[2] *Jesu Lehre*, p. 147.
[3] *Der Herr verzieht nicht*, p. 17.

dogma to be believed, but it no longer inspires. Althaus wrote, 'The Church has been led out of the near-expectation of the New Testament. But it would be bad if the Church replaced the self-evident near expectation by a self-evident and unreserved far expectation.'[1] The conditional sentence ought to be replaced by an indicative statement; it has proved a bad thing that the Church has, for practical purposes, removed the Last Day to a distance. It has been content to hand over its living hope to the Marxists, to whom the expectation of a future kingdom is a driving force. Admittedly, the Church cannot pretend to a conviction that has proved untenable, but it should be clear on where it is going, remembering, to quote Althaus again: 'What in the first community lived as certainty moves us at all times as continuous possibility.'[2] When that becomes true of us again, eschatology will prove an ethical force and no longer a dead dogma.

(vii) The final point takes us back to our first: the prophetic feeling of certainty by itself is inadequate to comprehend the unique consciousness of Jesus; we believe we have a right to advance beyond this and say that *his conviction of the nearness of the victory was due to the clarity of that vision in his soul.* Streeter affirmed this in memorable words: 'The summits of certain mountains are seen only at rare moments when, their cloud cap rolled away, they stand out stark and clear. So in ordinary life ultimate values and eternal issues are normally obscured by minor duties, petty cares, and small ambitions; at the bedside of a dying man the cloud is often lifted. In virtue of the eschatological hope our Lord and his first disciples found themselves standing, as it were, at the bedside of a dying world. Thus for a whole generation the cloud of lesser interests was rolled away, and ultimate values and eternal issues stood out before them stark and clear, as never before or since in the history of our race. The majority of men in all ages best serve their kind by a life of quiet duty, in the family, in their daily work, and in the support of certain definite and limited public and philanthropic causes. Such is the normal way of progress. But it has been well for humanity that during one great epoch the belief that the end of all was near turned the thoughts of the highest minds away from practical and local interests, even of the first importance, like the condition of slaves in Capernaum or the sanitation of Tarsus.'[3] The vision of the End proceeded from the

[1] *Die Letzten Dinge*, p. 276. [2] Op. cit., p. 275.
[3] 'The Historic Christ', Essay in *Foundations*, pp. 119–120.

same Teacher who has given us his vision of God. That vision of *God* was seen most clearly in the cross and resurrection; by that same death and resurrection the *End* was brought nigh and its power liberated in the hearts of his followers. He who believes that will not find it hard to anticipate that the Son of God will, in the Father's time, reveal the glory of God in the consummated Kingdom of the End.

3. The Provision for a Period between the Resurrection and the Parousia

The 'near expectation' of Jesus has been interpreted in certain quarters as implying that the period between his death and resurrection would be negligible. A. Menzies, on the basis of the predictions of a return from the dead after three days, and Mk. 14. 25, 28, thought that an interval between Christ's death and the coming of the kingdom was excluded.[1] C. H. Dodd assented to this view, adding that the 'three days' in the predictions of resurrection and the restoration of the temple (Mk. 14. 58) belong to apocalyptic categories and derived from Hos. 6; with this would fit the avowal of Jesus that the Chief Priests would witness his speedy victory, Mk. 14. 62.[2] R. H. Lightfoot followed Lohmeyer in suggesting that Mk. 14. 28 and 16. 7 point to an expectation that the parousia would take place in Galilee immediately after the resurrection.[3] The interpretation of Schweitzer and M. Werner, in which the death, resurrection and parousia follow in immediate succession is even better known.

Had the eschatological discourse been taken seriously, none of these theories would have been possible, but the critical elimination of Mk. 13 was considered by all these scholars as something that could be taken for granted. On the other hand, the data of the previous section will as little fit this reconstruction. The parables of growth signify *some* lapse of time for development; the idea that

[1] *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 233.

[2] *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 103. It would seem that Professor Dodd has since modified this position; see above, p. 100.

[3] *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*, pp. 63–64. Lightfoot cites the ingenious parallel drawn by Lohmeyer between Test. Zeb. 9. 8 and Mk. 16. 7, illustrating how the words 'There ye shall see him' relate to the parousia:

Test. Zeb. 9. 8:	Mk. 16. 7:
ἐπιτρέψετε εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν	*προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*
καὶ ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε αὐτὸν ἐν	*ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε.*
Ἱερουσαλήμ.	

Lightfoot admits that this is precarious argument and contents himself by suggesting that Mark simply wished to hold together as closely as possible the supreme events of the ministry, death, resurrection and parousia, pp. 73–77.

the period of growth lies in the past and culminates in the present (of Jesus) seems nullified by the future reference of the fig tree parable ('Whenever you see these things happening . . .' must relate to coming days). Mk. 9. 1 and 13. 30 seem to presuppose that a number of years will intervene before the kingdom comes with power, not exceeding a generation but evidently not much less, for at least some (disciples?) will have died before the event. With this anticipation the sayings which imply the relative *distance* of the End from the time of Jesus are congruous; Kümmel cites Mt. 23. 38 f., Mk. 2. 18 f., 14. 25, 28 as belonging to this category,[1] Michaelis adds Mk. 12. 1 ff. (the Wicked Husbandmen) and Mt. 16. 18,[2] which Kümmel, however, rejects. Since Mk. 14. 28 has been so much called in question, we may cite Kümmel's verdict on it: 'There is no necessity to understand Mk. 14. 28 as a parousia prophecy, the interpretation of this verse in Mk. 16. 7 still remains the most probable. The text then yields, however, not the expectation of a narrow temporal connection of resurrection and parousia, but the hope that Jesus will appear after his resurrection to the disciples in Galilee; and this hope only possesses meaning if such an appearance reveals the heavenly life of the Crucified, while his appearance in heavenly glory at the parousia must be considered as an event still lying in the future.'[3] In the light of these considerations it is difficult to deny that our Lord's expectation of a period of historical development after his death and resurrection is as well attested as his conviction of a relatively near consummation of the kingdom; the two conceptions are complementary and cannot be divorced without injury to the wholeness of our Lord's teaching.

What, then, are the characteristics of this period? Before all else, as far as the disciples are concerned, a necessity to share the sufferings of Christ and the advancement of the Gospel amidst persecution. Rawlinson drew attention to Johannes Weiss' description of Mk. 8. 27–10. 45 as 'virtually an impressive sermon addressed to the reader. It enshrines in the guise of narration the kernel of a religious ethic appropriate to the martyr and missionary church of Nero's time', and he himself explains the origin of these chapters as a collection of 'sayings on renunciation, and on the nature of the Christian life as a *via crucis* for the disciple as for the Master'.[4]

[1] *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, pp. 15 ff., 41 ff.
[2] *Der Herr verzieht nicht*, pp. 18 f.
[3] Op cit., p. 44.
[4] *St. Mark*, pp. 108, 110.

While admitting the strong possibility that Mark wrote his gospel for the 'church of Nero's time', we need not infer that the relevance of this message was first seen in the seventh decade of our era; that strain of teaching would have been cherished by the disciples from the time they rejoiced to be deemed worthy to suffer disgrace for the sake of the name (Acts 5. 41). The community of believers in Palestine was a persecuted community at least from the days of Stephen, as Saul and many others ensured. For this situation Jesus took provision. He knew the pain of opposition from his own family (Mk. 3. 21, Jn. 7. 1 ff.), and warned his followers to expect the same (Lk. 12. 51 ff.). He must have realised that the mounting opposition of the authorities could not but be extended to the disciples after his death; if he warned those accompanying him to Jerusalem to be prepared for crucifixion (Mk. 8. 34), he had no illusions as to what was in store for them later. They must be prepared to drink his own cup (Mk. 10. 38 f.). And his cup was bitter, not least because of the hatred of the people he had come to deliver. In view of these considerations it is not difficult to believe that on the eve of his betrayal Jesus gave such counsels as Mk. 13. 9, 12–13, including the reference to the hatred of all men—all, that is, who rejected his message. It was Gloege's conviction that suffering is part of the ordained mission of the Church in the world. It is the reverse side of fellowship with Christ in glory (Rom. 8. 17, II Tim. 2. 11 f.); and it is therefore fitting that it should be stressed in an *eschatological* discourse. 'No stone of the "house" can experience another destiny than that which is meted out to the Christ as its corner- and foundation-stone.'[1] Jesus pronounced blessed all who shared this destiny with him (Mt. 5. 10 f.).

We are so used to envisaging the preacher's task amidst a sympathetic, or at worst indifferent, environment, that it requires an effort of imagination to realise that Jesus invariably associated evangelism with opposition. If Mt. 23. 34 f. was intended by him to apply to the mission of his disciples, he could scarcely have expressed more vividly his conviction that Gospel preaching was a dangerous occupation. The Q logion as to the aid of the Holy Spirit in the proclamation of the Word is set explicitly in the context of arraignment before judges (Lk. 12. 11 f., Mt. 10. 19 f.). It is thereby suggested that one of the chief methods of disseminating the Word would be through such testimony before courts of justice, held, of course, in synagogues in Palestinian towns, as well as in the

[1] *Reich Gottes und Kirche*, pp. 337, 340.

Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem. A moment's reflection will serve to show that no small part of the preaching in the Acts of the Apostles is represented as given in just such situations (Peter and John before the Sanhedrin, Acts 4. 8–21, 5. 29 ff.; Stephen in like circumstances, Acts 7; Paul addressing the Jerusalem mob, Acts 22; before the Sanhedrin, Acts 23; before Felix, Acts 24; before Festus, Acts 25; before Agrippa, Acts 26; in a Roman prison, Acts 28). The evangelism of despised Samaria and the first missionary efforts among the Gentiles were specifically connected with the persecution that arose about Stephen (Acts 8. 3 ff., 11. 19). Paul's missionary journeys are one long story of the planting of Churches amid severe suffering, of uproars, trials, intrigues, floggings, persecutions of them that believed.

It is commonly alleged that all this fits Mk. 13. 9 ff. so well, that that paragraph must *reflect* the history it foreshadows. Does the same apply to the Q logion about being brought before magistrates, Lk. 12. 11 f.? to the drinking of the cup of suffering by James and John, Mk. 10. 38 f.? to the prediction of persecution by relatives, Lk. 12. 51 f.? to the blessing of Mt. 5. 10 f.? to the warning not to fear them that kill the body, Lk. 12. 4 f.? to the warning of consequences of denying Christ, Lk. 12. 9? to the declaration that the only way to save one's life is to lose it, Mk. 8. 35? There are not wanting critics who are prepared to jettison every one of those sayings,[1] but few agree with them in so doing. If Jesus anticipated that his disciples would encounter hostility similar to what he himself endured, he could express it in no other ways than he adopted: authorities meant Jewish courts, Roman governors and petty kings. Plain speech suited Jesus better than vague allusions; he had no need to be ambiguous. The warnings given are in no sense fortune-telling. Hostility within the family circle and without was attested by Scripture and his own experience. When the message was proclaimed more widely increased opposition was certain to arise, even where success was most pronounced; the two reactions would proceed *pari passu*. There is no need to attribute undue pessimism to Jesus, but he had every reason to be a realist.

How far did Jesus anticipate his Gospel would travel before the End came? Mk. 13. 10 says that the *nations* will hear. Therein we are plunged into controversy once more, for Jesus is said never to have dreamed of that possibility. 'The humanistic concept of uni

[1] As Case, *Jesus, A New Biography*, pp. 407 f.; Guignebert, *Jesus*, 284 ff.

versality is wholly foreign to him.'[1] 'Jesus never even dreamed of being a prophet or Messiah to the non-Jews.'[2] The idea is 'probably due to the influence of Paul'.[3] The main reasons for this sceptical attitude centre upon the Jewishness of Jesus—he keeps the ceremonial law, observes the feasts, summarises the moral law like the Rabbis, declares it necessary to keep the commandments to enter into life, and confines his ministry to Jews; for full seventeen years his disciples followed his example and neglected the Gentiles.[4] These facts are not to be disputed, but they form only part of the picture.

We would present another aspect in the following observations. (i) Jesus certainly was 'Jewish' in his conduct. It would have been unnatural had it been otherwise. He could not have fulfilled his messianic vocation if he had overthrown his people's customs and the Scriptures of the Old Covenant. Hort long ago observed that to regard Jesus as cosmopolitan is to cut him off from all the historical circumstances of his Incarnation; he could fulfil the divine purpose in no other way than by observing the Law and ministering to Israel.[5] (ii) The Messiah must needs be the leader of his people. But the messianic concept of Jesus was not *exclusively* Judaistic. The self-chosen appellation of Jesus was not 'Son of David' but 'Son of Man', and in his use of that concept everything particularistic is excluded; it is fitted for application to the supra-nationalist community of Jesus.[6] (iii) The dominion of the Messiah-Son of Man was traditionally universal. Jesus preached that the kingdom had come with his ministry; did he imagine that Messiah's dominion would be confined to the *consummated* kingdom? The practical certainty that the reverse is true is demonstrated by the significance he attached to his death, which is never conceived to be for Jews only.[7] (iv) The Pharisees themselves were not against proselytising; Mt. 23. 15 presumes that Jesus knew of the enthusiasm of at least some about this practice. Was Jesus more narrow in his outlook than the Pharisees? (v) We have good grounds for believing that the Scriptures nearest the heart of our Lord were Is. 40 ff., the most universal writing in the Old Testament. Above all the task of the Servant, in whom he saw himself mirrored, was to be 'a light

[1] Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, p. 46.
[2] Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 363. [3] Loisy, *Évangile selon Marc*, p. 372.
[4] Klausner, op. cit., pp. 363 ff.
[5] *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 34, 37.
[6] So Fiebig, *Der Menschensohn*, pp. 78 f., 116.
[7] So Moffatt, *Theology of the Gospels*, pp. 68–69; Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, pp. 219–220.

of the Gentiles', God's salvation to the ends of the earth (Is. 42. 6, 49. 6). This element in his vocation would have been as gladly accepted as his vocation to die for the world. (vi) The message of Jesus was as contrary to particularism as that of his forerunner John. His renunciation of this prized element of Judaism would have made him as hated by the Pharisees as he was by the Zealots for refusing their excessive patriotism. This factor in the situation has been perceived by many critics,[1] but never has it been more strikingly demonstrated than by Klausner, who, by his condemnation of Jesus for non-nationalist tendencies, shows the same spirit as animated the Pharisees. He writes: 'The nation as a whole could only see in such public ideals as those of Jesus an abnormal and even dangerous phantasy; the majority, who followed the Pharisees and Scribes, the leaders of the popular party in the nation, could on no account accept Jesus' teaching. This teaching Jesus had imbibed from the breast of prophetic and, to a certain extent, Pharasaic Judaism; yet it became, on the one hand, the negation of everything that had vitalised Judaism; and on the other hand it brought Judaism to such an extreme that it became, in a sense, *non-Judaism*. Hence the strange sight: Judaism brought forth Christianity in its first form (the teaching of Jesus), but it thrust aside its daughter when it saw that she would slay the mother with a deadly kiss.'[2] Commenting on the same theme Klausner later asserted: 'He both annulled Judaism as the life-force of the Jewish nation, and also the nation itself as a nation. For *a religion which only possesses a certain conception of God and a morality acceptable to all mankind, does not belong to any special nation, and, consciously or unconsciously, breaks down the barriers of nationality*. This inevitably brought it to pass that his people Israel rejected him.'[3] Despite his repudiation of the Gospel traditions that refer to Jesus' hope for the nations—for Klausner would deny Jesus to the Gentile as well as the Jew—this writer has touched on the real issue: Jesus called on men to lose their life in order to find it. Jesus desired his people to rise to their prophetic calling and bring the nations to God. For this reason he devoted himself to ministry among them; he would give

[1] E.g. W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, p. 178; A. T. Cadoux, *The Lord of Life*, pp. 71 f.; Moffatt, *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 66; C. J. Cadoux thinks it is the reason for Jesus saying so little about his wider convictions—he would never have gained a hearing at all (cf. Acts 22. 21 ff., Paul was shouted down when he spoke of his commission to preach to the Gentiles); *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, p. 162.

[2] *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 376.

[3] Op. cit., p. 390.

them every opportunity, for the children *must* first be fed. If the nation would not accept their calling, then the Remnant must undertake it for them; his disciples must take his message to the obdurate nation and thence to the peoples beyond. The cost would be great; the way of the Messiah must be trodden by Messiah's followers, but though Jewish and Gentile authority resist, 'the gospel *must* first be preached'.

We have deliberately avoided the critical questions concerning Mk. 13. 10, for the major issue has to be settled first. Admittedly this verse has been regarded as an interpolation into the series 9, 11–13, but that is irrelevant, for neither is it certain that v. 12 originally followed v. 11; v. 10 could have been added in the same way as vv. 9, 11, 12, 13 were themselves conjoined to form a separate section. More serious is the view that v. 10 has arisen as an expansion of Mt. 10. 18, thus:

Mt. 10. 18.	Mk. 13. 9–10.
καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.	ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε . . . εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

B. S. Easton would account for Matthew's καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν as itself an addition to the original wording, more perfectly preserved in the Q saying Lk. 12. 11 f., but this is unlikely, for the Q saying has no direct reference to μαρτύριον. We cannot be sure that Matthew has not shortened Mark's version, especially if he read the saying as the early versions did, putting a stop after εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, and taking πρῶτον (δὲ) δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι . . . as an independent clause.

On the whole the most likely solution seems to be one hinted at by C. F. Burney; he thought that the phrase καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is a relic of a couplet which originally followed on Mk. 13. 9.[1] It is our conviction that Mk. 13. 10 contains yet more of that 'lost' couplet. For a tentative reconstruction of the kind of saying that may have originally been uttered by our Lord, see Note 2 in the appendix. Meanwhile we observe that in this context the phrase καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν by itself implies a mission beyond Palestine.[2] Certainly

[1] *The Poetry of Our Lord*, pp. 118–119. [2] McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 140.

the mention of Gentiles, apart from governors and kings, shows that this evangelism in the law courts is directed as truly to them as to Jews, which is a new feature as contrasted with the limitations imposed by Jesus upon himself. If Mk. 13. 10 really expands καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, it will presumably be an independent piece of tradition, attached to the former saying. It is not the only saying of this kind in this discourse. A good deal of the chapter is due to arrangement of sayings put together at the discretion of the editor; and if we are dependent upon him in this verse it is no more so than throughout the rest of the discourse. We have seen good reason to believe that the other sayings in this paragraph, 13. 9–13 fairly represent the mind of our Lord, even if they have been pieced together. If it be admitted that v. 10 also truly represents his views, we must either accept the verse as authentic or congratulate the editor on an astonishingly accurate piece of expansion! The former view is much the more probable. The omission of the saying by Luke is no argument to the contrary, for his version differs too widely from Mark's to allow it to be decisive. If necessary we should perhaps compare it with the Western 'non-interpolation' at Lk. 23. 34, 'Father forgive them . . .', a saying which needs no other attestation than its content.

The necessity of the proclamation of the Gospel under hazardous conditions before the end comes is attested by another saying, often set over against this one with the intention of denying the authenticity of the one or the other, viz. Mt. 10. 23: 'Whenever they persecute you in this city flee into the next; for truly I tell you, you will not complete the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes.' The two halves of the saying are sometimes regarded as independent, but if so they are cunningly put together. They form a coherent whole as they stand. The sense of τελέσητε should be noted; it means 'bring to an end' rather than 'come to an end' (Lk. 12. 50), i.e. to finish a task. 'The disciples cannot completely execute their missionary commission to their nation before the parousia occurs.'[1] To Kümmel this is decisive evidence that Jesus could not imagine the possibility of a mission to the heathen. On the contrary, if the time is short then *all* must hear in all lands, the Jews as the people of Messiah and the Gentiles for whom also he was sent. The Apostle Paul must have held a view very similar to this: on the one hand he agreed that the 'apostles of the circumcision' were appointed to preach to Israel; on the other hand his

[1] Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, p. 35.

own task was to take the good news to the Gentiles, for before the end arrives the 'fulness of the Gentiles' must come in (Rom. 11. 25); consonant with his expectation of a relatively near consummation, he believed that this commission was being well fulfilled (Col. 1. 6). In this there is nothing contradictory or strange, once the perspective of the primitive Church be adopted. And there is nothing incomprehensible in Jesus urging his disciples to this dual occupation—'To the Jew first, and also to the Greek'. Johannes Weiss may have been wrong in thinking that Mt. 10. 23 once formed part of the eschatological discourse, but there is little doubt that it could take its place alongside Mk. 13. 10 with perfect ease, providing that 13. 30 be taken seriously.[1]

4. The Doom of Jerusalem and the End of the Age

The problem of the relation between these two events has continually risen in the course of our investigation. Bound up as it is with the question of the time perspective, it constitutes a major difficulty of the discourse. If our inquiry thus far has achieved anything, it should not be necessary for us to consider either the identification of the fall of the city with the parousia, or the view that Jesus provided for milleniums between the two events. The two chief issues requiring to be faced are the extent to which the doom of the city is regarded as a political event, and its relation, in the mind of our Lord, to the consummation of the age.

The simplest solution of the problem is to affirm that only one of these two elements comes into view, and that the other is an importation, due either to the Evangelists or to our own lack of perception. V. G. Simkhovitch wrote a persuasive essay, widely influential amongst British scholars, setting forth the view that Jesus looked upon the impending ruin of the city as the inevitable result of the Jewish attitude to Rome. Of Mk. 13. 2 he wrote: 'I have always found that it takes an enormous amount of learning to get away from the most obvious and simple truth. So our modern theologians are explaining this statement eschatologically; that is, they see in it a prophecy of the end of the world. If it refers to the end of the world, what difference does it make whether that end is to come in the winter or in the summer? Such obvious misinterpretation of this text indicates a complete lack of understanding of

[1] From his conjoining Mt. 10. 23 and Mk. 13. 10 together, it would seem that Cullmann would not be averse to this interpretation; see *Le Retour de Christ*, pp. 24 f. The best discussion of our Lord's attitude to the Gentiles is given in C. J. Cadoux's *Historic Mission of Jesus*, pp. 136–162.

other texts. For indeed no understanding of the sayings of Christ is at all possible without at least a rudimentary insight into the historical background.'[1] The background alluded to is described as a tremendous tension in the mind of the populace between the years A.D. 6–70, the period of Roman domination of Judea. It is impossible to imagine that Jesus could close his eyes to the agonising problems of his people, either in his meditation or in his public teaching. His solution took the form of an appeal for the nation to respond to their vocation to be the light of the Gentiles, and in particular to love their enemy, Rome. For this the nation was not prepared. To the leaders it was dangerous talk. 'The Pharisees could probably have overlooked the heresies in Christ's religious teachings, as they overlooked those of the Sadducees. . . . The great and fundamental cleavage was constituted by Christ's non-resistance to Rome.'[2] The obduracy of the Jews caused Jesus to utter repeated warnings of coming desolation (Lk. 13. 1–3, 19. 41–44, 23. 28–31). In this light Mk. 13 should be read. 13. 2, 14–18 relate to an historical catastrophe, 9–13 the hostility which the disciples would share with Jesus when they preached his message. Verse 12 in particular describes the bitterness of the Zealots: 'For the God of their fathers and the freedom of their country they would unflinchingly sacrifice not only their own lives, but the lives of all who were dear to them. What doubt could there be how they were bound to view the teaching of Christ even if their own brother, their own child should profess it?'[3] Simkhovitch does not explain how he understands the eschatological language of the chapter. He declares his conviction that the kingdom, being an inward disposition, like all other elements of human understanding, is 'a matter of slow growth'.[4] Presumably he must view the language as symbolic, or unauthentic.

A similar interpretation of the predictions concerning the fall of Jerusalem is commonly accepted today in this country. C. H. Dodd points out that Mk. 13. 15–16 admirably suits the thought of quick marching Roman armies threatening Jerusalem; in such a context the prayer that it might not happen in winter is appropriate, but not in an apocalyptic context.[5] C. J. Cadoux would extend this interpretation to the woes pronounced on unbelieving Galilean towns (Lk. 10. 13 ff.) and to most of the 'Q apocalypse', Lk. 17. 22–37; sudden destruction by invading armies is well illustrated by

[1] *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*, 1921, p. 39. [2] Op. cit., pp. 40–41.
[3] Op. cit. p. 55. [4] Op. cit., pp. 82–83. [5] *Parables of the Kingdom*, pp. 64–65.

the catastrophes of Noah's Flood and the overthrow of Sodom. The link between the ruin of the Jewish capital and the coming in glory consists in the twin facts that both are to happen within a generation, and both are bound up with the Jewish rejection of Jesus.[1] T. W. Manson is more thorough-going than all. Complete severance of the events of A.D. 70 from eschatological prediction is expressed in his well known assertion: 'The ruthless suppression by a great military empire of an insane rebellion in an outlying part of its territory has as much—or as little—to do with the coming of the kingdom of God in power as the suppression of the Indian Mutiny.'[2]

All these views proceed on the assumption that the eschatological setting of the prediction of Jerusalem's destruction is false, and that the connection of the latter with events of the End is due to a misunderstanding of the disciples. Not only is the discourse proper set in a misleading context (between Mk. 13. 1–2 and 33–37); its two chief motifs are erroneously joined together. But it would seem that Mk. 13 is not alone in setting predictions of Israel's judgment in an eschatological context; it is especially plain in Mt. 23. 34 ff., and it is probably to be assumed in the woes on the cities, Lk. 10. 13 ff. It would seem that some link with eschatological conceptions must be admitted. The least offensive way of achieving this connection is to call in the Old Testament prophets as witness to the habit of describing earthly judgments in the language of celestial portents. We recall Selwyn's belief: 'It is the custom of the prophets, when they depict the woe which hangs over some city or nation, to give the historical event a cosmic setting. The fires of a Sodom or a Nineveh are seen against a background of mingled cloud and flame. . . .'[3] Hugh Martin described this language as 'richly coloured emphasis on the greatness of the event. The Fall of Jerusalem to the Jews was a Day of the Lord, a religious and national upheaval calling for vivid language.'[4] However comforting this interpretation may be, it overlooks the obstinate fact that the prophets did not look for *a* day of the Lord, their burden was *the* Day of the Lord. The doom of tyrant cities, as of the holy city, signified the passing of one age and the dawn of another. Consequently, exegetes who take seriously the eschatological background of the doom of Jerusalem tend to identify that

[1] *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, pp. 166–178, 318–320.
[2] *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 281.
[3] *The Teaching of Christ*, pp. 39–40.
[4] *The Necessity of the Second Coming*, p. 40.

event with the consummation of the age. Both Wendt[1] and Baldensperger[2] view the threatened judgment on Jerusalem as an integral part of the judgment executed by the Messiah at his coming: it was the Day of Judgment as it affected the Jewish nation. Johannes Weiss, we remember, accounted for the setting of the eschatological discourse by the conviction of the disciples that the end of the age entailed the end of this physical world, and that of the temple by way of consequence, but he hesitated to attribute this conviction to Jesus.[3] Where he hesitated Torrey affirmed.[4] Joachim Jeremias strengthened this view by linking it with the age-old conception that a new reign commences with a newly-consecrated temple: Mk. 13. 2 must be placed alongside Mk. 14. 58, Acts 6. 14. 'The Temple will be destroyed, but after the destruction of the Temple the parousia of Jesus will take place and the building of the heavenly temple, the glorified community.'[5] Jeremias interprets the conception in the light of Rev. 21. 22: the new world itself, comprising heaven and earth, is a single temple for the worship of God.[6] Schniewind in like manner meets the objection that Mk. 13. 14–18 does not suit an eschatological event by calling attention to Old Testament parallels: 'The flight motif itself belongs to the expectation of the last things; it is not permissible to think on any historical event. The time of Yahweh's judgment is always described thus: "Flee"!' Jer. 49. 8. (cf. Gen. 19. 26, Is. 15. 5, Amos 5. 19 f., Jer. 4. 29, Ezk. 7. 16).[7]

Here is a pretty dilemma! We suspect the reader will have not a little sympathy with the view expressed by Simkhovitch. Something, however, must be done with the eschatological background, for it is not permissible to blot it out. The problem is concentrated for us in one verse alone, Mk. 13. 14: the use of the term βδέλυγμα 'abomination' strikes immediately an eschatological note, but 'Flee to the mountains', despite Schniewind, does not signify that the mountains are about to collapse. Similarly 15–16, 17–18 presume solid earth, with not too much rain, it is hoped; but 19–20 use Daniel's language about the end of the age immediately prior to the resurrection (Dan. 12. 1). A similar juxtaposition of the two themes is apparent at the close of Mt. 23: 'Your house is abandoned unto you', cries Jesus (v. 38); a deserted temple means a deserted

[1] *Die Lehre Jesu*, pp. 622–623.
[2] *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 149.
[3] *Das älteste Evangelium*, pp. 72–73.
[4] *Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 20.
[5] *Jesus als Weltvollender*, pp. 39–40.
[6] Op. cit., p. 81.
[7] *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, p. 172.

city, and neither can continue if they are intended to be the temple and city of God (cf. Jer. 22. 5). This could be referred to a historic judgment, yet v. 35 indicates that this judgment, falling on the present generation, is to partake of finality, summing up in its severity the requital of all the wrong of history from the dawn of time ('from the blood of Abel . . .'). For this reason it is as misleading to compare the destruction of Jerusalem with the Indian Mutiny as it is to put the crucifixion of Jesus on the same level as that of the criminals on either side of him; outwardly they may be indistinguishable events, but in their significance for man and God they differ widely. Jerusalem's chief rebellion was directed against God, not Caesar; and in the tragedy that followed Rome played the lesser part. In the mind of Jesus this was no mere demolition, but a part of the judgments of God in the time of the End. But note—*a part, not the whole.* Despite assertions to the contrary, the logion of Mt. 23. 39 seems to be in a superior setting to that in Luke (13. 34 f.); it is almost certainly a parousia saying. If so, the *abandonment of the 'house' is separated from the parousia of Jesus by the repentance of his people.*

Here we must exercise caution. When was the house 'abandoned'? We have cited Jer. 22. 5 as a parallel to this saying, but Ezk. cc. 10–11 should also be considered; the temple is there abandoned by God as a judgment on the sinful people, but the desolation of the city delayed to come for some years. A similar delay can be presupposed in our text. Nevertheless, there is no thought of the nation repenting before the threatened judgment, otherwise the temple and the city would be spared. It is assumed that the repentance must be preceded by chastisement.[1] Admittedly there is no hint of a delay of the End in Mk. 13. 14 ff., but an interval between the destruction and the parousia is presupposed in Lk. 21. 24. Failure to understand the Biblical perspective of the End has caused this saying to be misinterpreted, as though it implied an interval of many years, or even centuries. On the contrary, the logion merely describes the well-known period of domination by forces opposed to the divine Rule, the 'time, times and a half' of Daniel and Revelation. Harnack asserted: 'St. Luke does not say how long the time of the triumph of the world-power and the slavery of the Jews lasts; but, as the parallel passages in the

[1] So Kümmel: 'Next to this eschatological punishment for the unbelieving Jews is set the present punishment: Jesus, who is appointed as Messiah, will be removed from men till they can greet the Messiah with a benediction, at which Jesus will then appear in glory.' *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, p. 47.

other gospel teach us, *he could only have thought of weeks or months.*'[1] In this Harnack has gone too far. So far as Luke was concerned he could have thought of three years. At least it will be admitted, however, that Lk. 21. 20–24, far from being composed in a different spirit from Mk. 13. 14–20, has the same fundamental viewpoint; the two accounts supplement one another.

The conclusion to be drawn is that Mk. 13 describes the fall of the temple, bound up with that of the city, in the context of the woes of the End. The destruction is related to the parousia, not merely because the two events must occur within a generation, but because the former is an integral part of the judgments of God that prepare for the latter. The fall of Jerusalem is an historical event, but not an *isolated* event; it is bound up with the distress of the nations. If we have rightly interpreted Mt. 23. 39, the discipline is expected to have a happy issue, to which Paul also alludes in the vivid saying, 'If their rejection be the reconciliation of the world, what shall their reception be but life from the dead?' (Rom. 11. 15). Mk. 13 is silent on what lies between the ruin of the city and the parousia of the Son of Man; it is enough for the connection between the two events to be established. 'Jerusalem destroyed, the curtain falls.'[2] In this respect Mk. 13 truly represents the mind of Christ. It does not reveal all that mind; it does not even give all that Jesus spoke on the occasion described; but it is right in showing that Jesus did not know the ebb and flow of time and history. Its nature he knew; its End he knew; but not its extent. Behind the fallen curtain, many an act of the drama of humanity was to be played. The intermediate scenes were hidden from his eyes, the last unveiled. Beyond desolation he saw restoration. When at last the curtain rises, the wonder of the closing scene eclipses the tragedy of the earlier acts. Even that is not played before us, we are given but a glimpse; no description of future blessedness is afforded, only an assurance of its coming. Though the drama continues, and the finale is yet to come, the word of hope is spoken by the Son of God himself; that is better than ten thousand panoramas from apocalyptic visionaries.[3]

[1] *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 121.

[2] A. B. Bruce, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 1, p. 296.

[3] The view that Mk. 13 represents the fall of Jerusalem as part of the woes preceding the End, rather than the End itself, is advocated by E. W. Winstanley, *Jesus and the Future*, pp. 31–32, 319–320; H. Monnier, *La Mission Historique de Jésus*, p. 266; H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 112–113; A. Farrer, *A Study in St. Mark*, pp. 361 ff.

5. Privacy of Teaching and Mk. 13. 3: Was the Discourse delivered as a Unity?

The value of the eschatological discourse is independent of the question as to when it was spoken and whether or not it is a fusion of separate sayings. All the discourses attributed to our Lord are in some measure compilations, usually effected through the expansion of an original nucleus of sayings. It is strange that the belief that Mk. 13 is composite should be regarded as a mark of its unauthenticity; no critic would think of using that feature as a yardstick for measuring the reliability of the discourses of Matthew and Luke. The matter has perhaps taken on a serious aspect through the representation that this address was given to a favoured group of disciples in private. To many critics that is a hall-mark of secondary redaction. 'The *fiction* of secret information', wrote Hölscher, 'corresponds to the apocalyptic style.'[1] K. L. Schmidt even maintained that the idea of Jesus seated on a mountain top when addressing his disciples has nothing to do with topography; as in the call of the disciples (Mk. 3. 13 ff.) and the transfiguration (9. 2 ff.), a supra-historical representation is in his mind: 'He who would understand the text in its original sense should consider the catacomb pictures and ancient Christian mosaics in which Christ in lofty solitariness, surrounded only by his twelve disciples or by a little selection of disciples, sits on a mountain height. . . . The καθημένου αὐτοῦ could almost be rendered, '*as he sat enthroned*'.[2]

There would, however, seem to be no reason for supposing that Jesus avoided sitting on his native hills of Judea and Galilee. It is also difficult to understand why a conversation of the Teacher-Messiah with his disciples should automatically be suspect. According to Mark, Jesus 'appointed twelve *that they should be with him*, and that he might send them forth to preach' (3. 14). Presumably their companying with him was for the purpose of learning. They could not preach without doing so. Were they never to be taught anything except by way of public address among the crowds? Must they never ask questions? And if they learned anything in this way from their Master, were they *never* to pass it on? Such questions seem to answer themselves. Our Lord's parabolic method of teaching would have perpetually raised queries in the disciples' minds and led them to seek more light on them, just as

[1] *Theologische Blätter*, July 1933, p. 193. See also C. H. Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 61.

[2] *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 290.

the gospels describe. That would extend to enigmatic sayings like Mk. 7. 15. The Jewish scholar David Daube affirmed: 'That Jesus should be represented as giving private instruction to his disciples concerning difficult or controversial problems is only natural.' He supported that view by citing parallels from Rabbinic sources in which statements publicly made by Jewish teachers were later explained to their disciples.[1] While the procedure cited does not cover Mk. 13. 2, it is sufficiently close to other instances of this practice to be relevant.

More than one New Testament scholar has pointed out that the teaching of Jesus was not uniform; he suited it to the audience addressed. T. W. Manson distinguished three strains in our Lord's proclamation: (i) that to Scribes and Pharisees, in the main polemical owing to their constant hostility; (ii) that to the crowds, whose capacities for learning were small, hence they received many parables; (iii) that to the disciples, to whom he gave his confidence and spoke without reserve.[2] Maurice Goguel made a similar division, describing the hearers as 'intimate friends who were called to become veritable fellow-workers, disciples in a less strict sense of the word, occasional hearers who needed to be won rather than strengthened in a nascent attachment, and finally adversaries'.[3] Naturally, hard and fast lines of distinction cannot be drawn, either between the groups or the instruction accorded them. A modern pastor, however, finds himself in a similar position: he will vary his mode of address when addressing an audience in a factory canteen and when preaching in his church; his evangelistic addresses will not precisely conform to his attempts to edify his congregation; his catechetical instruction will be distinct from all these; if he holds a preachers' class his manner and matter will be different again. The ministry of our Lord was richer than that of any of his followers, and we may be sure he knew how best to deal with each class of hearers. Nor must we fail to notice that in the latter part of the ministry Jesus gave more time than he had earlier done to the training of the apostolic circle. In this connection J. H. Ropes[4] called attention to the significance of Mk. 9. 30–31: after Peter's confession, Jesus passed through Galilee, and 'he would not that any one should know him, *for he was teaching his disciples*'. If Jesus knew what was ahead of him at this juncture, as

[1] 'Public Pronouncement and Private Explanation in the Gospels', *Expository Times*, April 1946, vol. LVII, no. 7.

[2] *The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 17–19

[3] *The Life of Jesus*, p. 307.

[4] *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 8.

is certain from his reply to Peter's acknowledgement of his messiahship, this was his most urgent task. For our subject, it is noteworthy that the chief item of instruction to the disciples appears to have concerned the necessity of Jesus' death, resurrection and parousia, with all that these would mean to his followers in the way of suffering and glory. Such matters could scarcely have formed part of his public preaching; they had to be communicated privately. When we turn to Mk. 13 we find that a large proportion of the chapter is of such a nature that only the disciples could have received it, while all of it was appropriate to their needs. That it was not in the style of the Sermon on the Mount is only to be expected. Jesus was here not even addressing the twelve; he was speaking to but four of them. C. H. Turner felt that this was a necessary clue to understanding the discourse: details about the trend of events prior to the parousia were no part of the gospel, and were discussed only with his most trusted friends.[1] Since so much of the address concerned the disciples personally and the situation in which the community of the future would be involved, it is credible that Jesus should have spoken in this way to these four and to them only.

But did he instruct them on *this* occasion? Did he utter the *whole* discourse then, or only a part of it? Or is the original address lost and Mk. 13 a compilation drawn entirely from other contexts? The answer is more difficult than is usually thought, for the data do not point in one direction. (i) There is no necessity to doubt that the prediction of Jerusalem's fall in 13. 2 is rightly placed. It is true that Bultmann considers v. 1 to be composed for the prophecy: 'The address of v. 1 sounds too much as though constructed for the purpose to provoke the professed prophecy.'[2] His fellow-form critic K. L. Schmidt, however, commented on v. 2: 'Here the place of utterance is firmly anchored in the saying itself.'[3] In that case we require to know whether the tradition that Jesus gave further teaching on the saying, in response to a question of his chief disciples, is a true one. There is every reason for assuming it to be genuine. For one thing, we *have* the tradition; it is not unfounded supposition. For another, the disciples' question is natural. To us the prediction is a matter for discussion; to them

[1] *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (A New Commentary on Holy Scripture), p. 102.

[2] *Die Geschichte der syn. Tradition*, p. 36. So also Wellhausen, *Evangelium Marci*, p. 99; Bacon, *Mark, its Composition and Date*, p. 178; Hölscher, op. cit., p. 146.

[3] *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 290.

it was a shocking revelation that ran counter to all their beliefs and appalled them beyond measure. One could say with confidence that these Jewish disciples of Jesus, with their natural patriotic pride, their inbred eschatological hopes and their belief that their Master was destined soon to assume his messianic authority, could not possibly have received this announcement calmly. They would naturally have questioned Jesus about it at the earliest moment. We may call it curiosity, but when a man's beliefs, cherished since childhood days, are challenged he naturally wants to know reasons for the demanded change. (ii) The topographical setting for the discourse is good. Despite the contention of Schmidt, Lohmeyer and others, that a prophetic utterance from a mountain is a purely apocalyptic or mythological trait, it cannot be overlooked that *Jesus had to traverse the Mount of Olives after leaving the Temple* in order to reach Bethany, and further that the view of the temple from that hill was unusually good. Schmidt contends: 'Between vv. 2 and 3 there lies a suture. How Jesus comes on the mount of Olives does not interest the narrator. Jesus sits *on one occasion* on this mountain.'[1] But Jesus spoke the saying as he was leaving the temple, about to go to Bethany via the Mount. If our belief that the disciples were amazed at the prophecy is right, it is natural to imagine them following Jesus, whether in silence or in animated conversation, endeavouring to puzzle out its significance. Ascending the mountain they would have seen the temple in the evening sun, resplendent with its flashing gold and gleaming marble walls. 'A shimmer of the ancient glory still lies upon the ancient sanctuary when viewed from the Mount of Olives,' wrote Dalman. 'To Jesus the view gave occasion to call the disciples aside, to sit down with them at the edge of the height and there to speak at length to them concerning the end which awaits not only this temple.'[2] Dalman momentarily forgot that the disciples made the first approach to Jesus on the subject, but the fitness of the situation remains. (iii) The setting in the ministry of Jesus is plausible. It is but two or three days at most before his death. His public ministry is over. Mark represents it as having ended with a series of encounters with the Jewish leaders in the temple, at the conclusion of which 'No one dared to ask him any more questions' (Mk. 12. 34), and Jesus left them with an enigma to settle (Mk. 12. 35 ff.). Burkitt comments on this: 'The greater part of the Wednesday and Thursday, then, was passed in retirement outside the City with a

[1] Op. cit., p. 290. [2] *Sacred Sites and Ways*, p. 265.

few chosen friends. I cannot but feel that there is a singular appropriateness when Mark tells us that this time of inaction and waiting was spent in talk about the future.'[1] It was not only 'appropriate' that Jesus should have so communed with them, it was urgently necessary. These were the last opportunities for instructing them. They needed to be prepared for opposition, yet they must see it in its right perspective. Their suffering would not be solitary. The powers of evil and brute force would be abroad, but the end was assured, and their cause was destined for triumph. This was excellently stated by J. Middleton Murry, who believed the discourse to be expanded by extraneous material, but the framework genuine: 'He leaves behind a band of followers; he is not certain of them, but on the whole he trusts them. They do not understand his teaching, yet they will be loyal to that in it which they do understand. They will suffer grievously for their loyalty, but perhaps they have learned enough of the nature of God the Father to endure steadfastly until the coming of the unknown Day when Jesus will return as his Deputy and Judge. So Jesus sought to animate his disciples with a courage not unworthy of his own, that they might endure through the interspace of tribulation before the unknown day of his coming as Messiah.'[2] The discourse, naturally, is more than warnings of opposition to disciples; but the entire contents affect them, especially the distress of Jerusalem and Judea, for they were a Palestinian community. Interestingly enough, the element in the discourse that has caused so much offence, the *eschatological* setting of the catastrophe of Jerusalem, is peculiarly fitting for this juncture of the life of Jesus. He would be more concerned with the *ultimate* end of things at this point than with merely historical episodes. Denney defended the authenticity of Mk. 14. 9, the prediction that his anointing by a woman would be proclaimed throughout the world, on the ground of the emotional reaction of Jesus to the woman's act: 'Anything which suddenly and deeply moved him seems to have opened to his mind the vast issues of his work—the devotion of this woman, or the faith of the centurion—which called up the vision of the multitudes who should come from the East and the West, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God.'[3] One recalls our Lord's utterance at the return of the Seventy from their mission (Lk. 10. 18), and the flash of vision opened up to him by the

[1] *Jesus Christ, An Historical Outline*, p. 49. [2] *The Life of Jesus*, p. 270.
[3] *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 357.

request of the Greeks to see him (Jn. 12. 31–32). Was not *this* such an occasion, with the temple over which he had pronounced sentence of doom shimmering in a haze of glory beneath his feet, his leading disciples beside him, and his whole life's work about to be brought to its destined climax in death? *There is no situation in the ministry of Jesus more fitted for the giving of a glimpse into the issues of history than this.* (iv) At least one item in Mk. 13 demands that an exposition of signs of the End should have preceded it, viz. the parable of the Fig Tree, vv. 28 f. This was noted by Latimer Jackson, but he had qualms about the authenticity of the chapter. He postulated that 'the parable was really preceded by a discourse, no longer recoverable, in which Jesus, predicting the destruction of the temple, had treated of the parousia in particular. The "he" (or the "it", of Mk. 13. 29) accordingly refers to the parousia of the *lost* discourse.'[1] Yet V. H. Stanton considered that Mark had good reason for including the apocalyptic document at this point: 'The author of our second gospel . . . may have been guided by genuine tradition as to a discourse of Jesus concerning things to come, which he addressed to his disciples when his public ministry had just been closed.'[2] If the tradition that Jesus delivered an eschatological discourse at the end of his ministry was genuine; if Mk. 13. 28–29 itself demands a discourse for which it forms in some sense a climax; if, as Jackson admitted, much of Mk. 13 is authentic reminiscence; and if it be agreed that the setting of Mk. 13 is the most suitable occasion of which we know for an eschatological discourse; it must be admitted that the case is strong for Mk. 13 containing at least *some* of the address delivered to the disciples on that occasion. (v) The question arises, *How much* of the discourse was delivered on the occasion represented by Mk. 13. 4 f.? Torrey's answer is unambiguous: no reason exists for regarding the discourse as anything else than an original unity; 'Every portion of this material is needed in its present place, no word of it could be omitted.'[3] In favour of Torrey's view is the excellence of the order of the chapter. A multitude of exegetes could be adduced for the judgment that the discourse is incoherent and hopelessly contradictory. But this does not conform to the facts. That the discourse does not follow a chronological order is admitted, but prophecies never do, except perhaps in *Old Moore*. We can see no confusion in

[1] *The Eschatology of Jesus*, p. 103.
[2] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, p. 121.
[3] *Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 17.

the warning of 13. 21 ff. following the description of tribulation; it is meant to apply to the distress therein described. That the fig tree parable, relating to signs, should follow the parousia passage is perfectly natural; it conveys an instruction after the outline just completed. Our interpretation of vv. 30 and 32 does not admit of their standing in irreconcilable contradiction. 33 ff. is parabolic and ought not to be dissected with the surgeon's knife. Torrey is justified in maintaining that the discourse is well constructed.

Nevertheless, this is not the whole story. Mk. 13. 9, 11–13 occur in almost identical language in Mt. 10. 17–22. It is not possible to give a final verdict on the question whether Matthew found this passage in a source other than the eschatological discourse, but presumption favours the supposition that he did. 13. 10 *may* have been inserted separately into this pericope. 13. 15–16 occur with verbal variations in Lk. 17. 31, and v. 21, in Lk. 17. 23, Mk. 13. 28–31 have often been regarded as separate logia strung together by catchwords (cf. *ταῦτα γινόμενα* of 29 with *ταῦτα πάντα γένηται* of 30; *παρέλθῃ* of 30 with *παρελεύσονται* of 31). 13. 33–37 have been similarly estimated (cf. *ἀγρυπνεῖτε* of 33 with *γρηγορῇ* of 34 and *γρηγορεῖτε* of 35. 37). Consequently the majority of critics including the most conservative of them, believe that the discourse is of composite origin. Yet one further factor must be taken into account: The major passages cited as contained in other gospels are in *obviously wrong contexts* in those gospels! Mk. 13. 9, 11–13 cannot have been spoken by our Lord on the occasion of sending out the Twelve; the sayings presuppose a severity of opposition nowhere met with at so early a stage in the ministry, and there was no likelihood of its being encountered by them at that time. Matthew has set this paragraph in Ch. 10, as he has other relevant sayings, in order to make the instructions as comprehensive as possible for the witnessing community of his day. Similarly Lk. 17. 31 relates to flight from an invading army; it manifestly belongs to the prophecy of Jerusalem's fall, yet it is set in a context describing the suddenness of the Second Advent. It is not as though it precedes or follows the description of the advent; it breaks the context in such a manner that many have interpreted it of the parousia, though this is most unnatural. The explanation which sees it placed here because of the reference to Lot's wife is probably correct; Luke or his source has 'agglomerated' exactly as Matthew. On the other hand, it is equally to be admitted that the saying as reproduced in Mk. 13. 15–16 looks very much like an insertion between vv. 14,

17, 18, for the group connects very well together; yet 15–16 deal with the same situation.

Two possible solutions of the problem suggest themselves: (i) the original discourse that followed 13. 3 has been expanded by sayings uttered on other occasions; (ii) the discourse was spoken on one occasion, but it was reproduced in a fragmentary condition, either through its narration at various times by the apostles or because it was too long to be remembered in its entirety. Between these alternatives no final decision seems possible. If (i) be adopted, the attempt to extract the original discourse by analysis should be discouraged; the unsatisfactory nature of the myriad number of analyses is such that it is unnecessary to add to their number. We hope that (ii) will not be considered to be out of the question; if our arguments are at all sound, it is not impossible that the apostles reproduced parts of this discourse at various times, even in odd sentences (which would account for the appearance of Mk. 13. 15–16 in Q), so that when a Christian teacher came to write up the discourse for the benefit of the churches he had to do his best with the fragments. If such be the case, the anonymous teacher seems to have achieved a very satisfactory result.

6. The Discourse as Paraclesis

It has been urged by a long line of critics that Mk. 13 presents a flat, unoriginal piece of apocalypticism. 'Its construction is on the conventional lines of apocalyptic,' said Streeter.[1] 'It has very slight interest for us today and little or no religious value,' decided Montefiore.[2] Blunt spoke of its 'elaborate and fantastic predictions', and regarded it as a 'map of the future', a 'horoscope of mankind'.[3] Over against these judgments we must set the consideration urged by an equally significant group of scholars, notably Lohmeyer and Vincent Taylor, that many customary features of Jewish apocalyptic are lacking in the discourse, for example, the great apostasy, the triumph and subsequent destruction of Antichrist and his hosts, and the felicity of the elect in the age of bliss. If the sole intention of this discourse was to reproduce conventional apocalyptic beliefs, its compiler could have read few apocalypses.

More important is the hortatory character of the discourse. Wellhausen, it will be remembered, admitted that the address with 'You'

[1] *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 189.
[2] *The Synoptic Gospels*, 1909, p. 299.
[3] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. 72, 237.

is not Jewish. 'It belongs to the form of real Jewish apocalypses that the Seer himself . . . is addressed, whether by God or an angel of God, or that he recounts with an "I" what he has been permitted to see and hear.'[1] Now this 'un-Jewish' element in the discourse is not confined to one or two sayings, or even paragraphs; it is consistently maintained throughout the chapter. From v. 5, the real beginning of the discourse, to the end, v. 37, there are eighteen imperatives, apart from the interjected clause 'Let the reader understand'. They are distributed as follows: 5 *βλέπετε*, 7 *μὴ θροεῖσθε*, 9 *βλέπετε*, 11 *μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε*, 14 *φεύγέτωσαν* (originally *φεύγετε*? See Note 3 in Appendix), 15 *μὴ καταβάτω, μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω*, 16 *μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω*, 18 *προσεύχεσθε*, 21 *μὴ πιστεύετε*, 23 *βλέπετε*, 28 *μάθετε*, 29 *γινώσκετε*, 33 *βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε*, 35 and 37 *γρηγορεῖτε*. Not surprisingly Lohmeyer maintained that the 'apocalyptic parenesis' receives a far greater space than the 'apocalyptic prophecy'.[2] But if that be so, it can hardly be maintained that the discourse is 'constructed on conventional lines'. For no other apocalypse can be adduced in which teaching and exhortation are so intermixed. Even II Thess. 2. 1–12 contains only an entreaty in vv. 1–2, followed by *two* imperatives in the rest of the apocalyptic section (vv. 3, 5).

The repetition of *βλέπετε*, 'Keep on the watch', must be observed, for here lies the answer to the frequent objection that v. 5 (and the discourse generally) has nothing to do with the question asked by the disciples. It is *vitally* related to the desire of the disciples, but in taking up their question Jesus directs attention to something of yet greater moment, viz. their own spiritual integrity. Zahn observed: 'The answer of Jesus, as so often happened, contains at the same time a correction of the viewpoint from which he was questioned. He applies himself immediately to the impatience which the disciples had earlier shown over the suffering that lay ahead (Mt. 16. 22 ff., Mk. 9. 32 ff.), and which they were now manifesting in respect of the distressing result of the conflict between Jesus and his nation; they wished to fly away and be removed into the glory of the kingdom. *In this impatience lies the danger that they may fall a prey to the deceptive announcements of his coming again.*'[3] It is odd that so many critics should have seen the affinity of vv. 6 and 21–23, and even considered them to be doublets, yet

[1] *Das Evangelium Marci*, p. 100.
[2] *Das Evangelium des Markus*, p. 286.
[3] *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, at Mt. 24. 4.

have overlooked how appropriate the warnings are to eschatological enthusiasts, such as the disciples were. They lived among a nation prolific in heralds of imminent deliverance, quasi-messianic leaders, and prophets who knew exactly when and where redemption was to appear. It was because the Jews *outside* the Christian Church gave ear to these deluded prophets of the End that the nation hastened to its doom in A.D. 70, torn into piteous factions by these very enthusiasts. The disciples of Jesus were, of themselves, no less prone to eschatological suggestion than their fellows (cf. Mk. 9. 11); such warning advice was of the utmost importance to their welfare and to the survival of the infant Church. *βλέπετε* was needed. They required to be aroused to their danger. Wohlenberg rightly commented, 'If the question of the disciples . . . by any chance arose from morally worthless curiosity, Jesus fashioned his prophetic address that it should produce above all *an awakening of conscience*.'[1] The repetition of the imperative mood effectively achieves that result in the discourse as it now lies before us. It is no horoscope. It is a warning to prepare for conflicts, public calamities, persecutions, false alarms, and the ruin of their own nation, but withal to maintain faith and hope, with endurance. 'This', affirmed Lord Charnwood, referring to the total situation, 'is of a piece with his special teaching elsewhere'.[2]

It was this kind of emphasis that lay at the heart of Busch's interpretation.[3] He maintained that Mk. 13 is not to be treated as eschatological revelation, at least not the heart of the discourse, 5–23; it is an 'explication' of Mk. 8. 34, the element of succession does not enter the picture. While he has gone too far in divorcing vv. 5–23 from the fundamental conception of 'signs' of the end, Kümmel has also, it would appear, over-reached himself in his rebuttal of Busch. He maintains that the chapter is intended to set forth 'a revelation of the eschatological events *in their sequence*'.[4] To this end he cites as marks of time *οὔπω τὸ τέλος* (7), *ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων* (8), *πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* (10), *τότε . . . φευγέτωσαν* (14), *καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ* (21), *μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν ἐκείνην* (24), *καὶ τότε ὄψονται* (26), *καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ* (27).

To place a string of time indications together like this is impres-

[1] *Das Evangelium des Markus*, pp. 330–331.

[2] *According to St. John*, p. 216.

[3] He explicitly noted the importance of the imperatives: 'Verses 5–37 repeat the same thought in modulated variations: *βλέπετε*! The almost monotonous repetition of this thought gives the chapter its character.' *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie*, p. 48.

[4] *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, pp. 57–58.

sive, but nevertheless misleading. We cannot overlook that Lohmeyer, purely on considerations of metre, agrees with those who look on ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων of v. 8 as a marginal gloss, and ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλῖψιν ἐκείνην in 24 as an explanatory phrase. In 14 the τότε is not relative to the progress of the discourse but to the sight of the βδέλυγμα: 'When you see the βδέλυγμα . . . then *flee*!' In v. 21 τότε probably *includes* the period of tribulation for Judea, described in 14–20. In v. 26 it relates the parousia of the Son of Man to cosmic disturbances, though inevitably it must come last in the events of the end, as it must also introduce the gathering of the elect (v. 27).

The time sequence is much reduced with this pruning. The end does not arrive with the incidence of public calamities, οὔπω; the gospel must be preached before the end, πρῶτον; the parousia and gathering of the saints will occur after, or in the midst of, heavenly portents. This is scarcely a map of the future, a chart wherein one can declare at any given point where one stands in the eschatological process. It indicates in general terms things that must come to pass before the conclusion of the age. Distress and gospel preaching are characteristic of the whole period. The one unmistakable sign in the discourse is that of the βδέλυγμα, v. 14; almost certainly it entails the destruction of the temple as the greater event comprehending the lesser. The *prior* occurrence of the judgment on Israel is an obvious necessity, but if we are allowed to interpret Mk. 13 by the aid of Mt. 23. 39 and Lk. 21. 24, the fall of Jerusalem is a sign that yet leaves the period before the coming of the Messiah uncertain.

On the whole, we will probably be most just to the discourse if we regard it as neither simple prediction nor unalloyed eschatological exhortation, but as a combination of both with emphasis on the latter. There is, for example, no imperative in 24–27, as there is none in the 'most authentic' statement, v. 32. We need not apologise for lack of imperatives where they are absent, it is their juxtaposition that is significant. This is the kind of thing Paul had in mind in his discussion on the function of prophecy in the Church; the true prophet ministers for 'edification, exhortation, and comfort' (οἰκοδομή, παράκλησις, παραμυθία), 1 Cor. 14. 3. The same principle could be extended, of course, to *all* instruction recorded by the Evangelists. The sayings of Jesus were valued because they came from him, the Son of God incarnate. As such they were accounted as words of life: 'People wanted to order their lives

according to them.'[1] The sayings of our discourse would be viewed in such a manner from the first. And for that reason they were given. 'The aim was not to foretell like a soothsayer,' wrote A. B. Bruce, 'but to forewarn and forearm the representatives of a new faith, so that they might not lose their heads or their hearts in an evil perplexing time.'[2] Edification, encouragement, entreaty are all bound up with the eschatological teaching of Jesus generally, and in this respect the eschatological discourse in no way falls short of the teaching contained in the other traditions.

7. The Discourse and the Death of Jesus

It has long been recognised that the discourse holds a significant place in the Gospel of Mark, in that it forms both a conclusion to the teaching ministry of Jesus and an introduction to the passion narrated immediately afterwards. The horror of the betrayal and execution is not minimised, but the proportion of the tragedy is changed. The cross for Jesus is the pathway to glory; he knows whither he goes, and the shadow of impending judgment falls upon the people that reject their king. Jesus is no helpless victim of intrigue, but the Lord advancing to his self-chosen destiny; his cross is less a martyrdom than a sacrifice. Through all the malice of men the purpose of God shines, illuminating the means by the splendour of the end in view.

This has been admitted by writers as different as Loisy and Dodd, Guignebert and Lightfoot, but the question as to whether this view corresponds with the mind of Jesus is answered differently. For Loisy and Guignebert the situation is wholly fictitious; Jesus held no such prospects before himself or the disciples. Even for writers who do not share the presuppositions of these critics, the doubtfulness of the situation in Mk. 13 arises by virtue of one strange omission: there is no mention of the death of Jesus in this discourse. How is this feature to be explained? If it be granted that some progress has been made in the discussions of this chapter, it ought to be possible to approach this from a positive angle, rather than with the desire of revealing a weakness in the Evangelist's presentation. The chief suggestion we have to make lies in the nature of the parousia hope: the idea of a coming of Christ, that is of the Christ who is Jesus, must entail the death and resurrection as a prior event. *Every parousia saying presupposes the death of Jesus.* It

[1] Dibelius, *Gospel Criticism and Christology*, p. 38.
[2] *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 1, p. 287.

is not necessary to mention it every time the coming is spoken of; it is an assumption that can be consistently made when once the prior fact is understood. In the situation implied when this discourse was uttered, the stage had been reached when such an assumption was possible. The counsel given to the disciples only makes sense if they have realised that in such times their Lord will be absent.

This is another instance where an effort of imagination is required to understand the teaching of our Lord. We are so used to viewing the eschatological instruction from a post-resurrection viewpoint that both the portentous nature and the uniqueness of this teaching are not always appreciated. We hear so constantly of the Jewishness of the parousia conception, we tend to overlook that the Gospel teaching in this respect is as unique as the idea that the Messiah must die; for the Messiah who is to come from heaven is the incarnate Lord of Nazareth, present with his people through the power of his resurrection. That is *not* Jewish, as Montefiore freely acknowledged.[1] It is so un-Jewish and has such wide repercussions on Christology, that to a writer like Wrede it is an impossible conception on the lips of Jesus. Wrede's statement of the issue bears so closely upon our problem that it is worth quoting *in extenso*. 'Any Jew could speak of the coming of the Messiah,' he wrote. 'But there is a great difference whether a third person so speaks or whether Jesus himself is the speaker. The "coming" is naturally to the earth. Jesus, however, speaks on the earth. Consequently the death which removes him from the earth is included in these prophecies. The evangelists have not thought about that; they give these words from their own standpoint, after the death of Jesus. . . . For us, however, there lies here an insuperable offence. Whether Jesus reckoned with the *possibility* or *probability* of his death does not come into consideration here. *For anyone who spoke like this, death was neither the one nor the other, it had become a foregone conclusion. It did not need to be mentioned any more when it came into view.* If Jesus had spoken in this way, he must have presupposed in the case of his hearers that they were so familiar with the thought, that they supplied without anything further the connecting link that is glossed over. A threat of Jesus before the judges that

[1] The two conceptions of 'a crucified Messiah, and a Messiah whose history should consist of two parts—the first part an ordinary human life ending in a shameful death; the second a later, yet unfulfilled appearance in heavenly glory' are 'both of them conceptions unknown to Judaism'. *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. I, p. xc.

he will come on the clouds of heaven admittedly appears comprehensible, if the execution was a determined fact; but the evangelists also make Jesus speak like this on other occasions.'[1] The scepticism of Wrede may not impress us, but the clarity with which he perceived the issue and stated it for us is notable. That Jesus should link his coming with his death when in the presence of his judges, and the sentence of death is about to be pronounced, is possible to Wrede. According to Mark, Jesus did the same when he shared a cup with his disciples several hours earlier: 'I will not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it in a new way. . . .' (Mk. 14. 25). The discourse was probably given twenty-four hours before that, following on an open breach with the Jewish authorities and with the city spread below him. Do not these events illuminate each other, especially when we remember that Gethsemane falls between them? In the Garden Jesus faced the issue with his Father for the last time and won his battle before it was fought. The distress of the prayer enabled him to be calm before the judges; he had received the sentence at other hands. The certainty of death of which Wrede speaks was therefore no fiction; it was the reverse side of the parousia hope and the way to it. At the table with the disciples it was the death side which was uppermost; in the court before his judges it was the heavenly aspect that filled his soul; and such was the prospect before him on the Mount of Olives.

We do not perhaps sufficiently remember that the close connection of death and victory are apparent in the two passages of the Old Testament most significant for the messianic consciousness of Jesus, viz. the Fourth Servant Song in Is. 53 and the vision of the Son of Man in Dan. 7. It may be allowable to see in the former a stress on the sufferings of the Servant and in the latter a stress on the triumph of the Son of Man; but the description of the Servant's sorrows is bounded on either side by stanzas celebrating his triumph, while the glory of the Son of Man is intended to hearten the 'people of the saints of the Most High' in their present distresses. If Jesus fused the two conceptions with that of the Davidic Messiah, as is probable, the twin ideas of death and glory must have been inseparable to him. The slowness of the disciples in grasping this association must not lead us to assume that there was confusion in our Lord's mind over it. An association that has become axiomatic does not always require overt expression. This may be illustrated

[1] *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901, p. 219.

in the group of sayings on the End preserved in Lk. 17. 22 ff. That the parousia is the chief theme of these sayings can hardly be contested with justice. It is to come upon the heedless with devastating suddenness, like the Flood of Noah and the overthrow of Sodom. Quite incidentally the passage contains one saying relative to the death of Jesus: 'But first he must suffer much and be rejected by this generation' (Lk. 17. 25). Its authenticity is contested and still more the correctness of its present position. A case can be made out for its interruption of the flow of thought in the context. Nevertheless, the wording of the saying is unusually vague, and there is no reference to a following resurrection; it can scarcely be a *vaticinium ex eventu*. From our point of view it is noteworthy as an occasion when our Lord made explicit the necessity of his death as a precondition of his parousia. The very lightness of the reference is significant; the passage would read almost the same without it. The statement merely makes explicit the background of the whole group of sayings, hence there is no need to do more than remind the disciples of it. If it is almost an accident that Lk. 17. 22 ff. contains an allusion to the sufferings of Jesus, it is to be accounted as equally accidental—and irrelevant—that Mk. 13 does not contain such a saying. The presupposition of both discourses is identical, and has had its sufficient explanation after Peter's confession and during periods of instruction since that event.

It should be noted that if the Parable of the Vinedressers is rightly placed by Mark, it will have been delivered earlier in the same day as the eschatological discourse was spoken (Mk. 12. 1 ff.). There is nothing improbable in that; on the contrary, there is good reason for accepting it as reliable tradition. It belongs to the period when the hostility of the Jewish leaders was at its height, and is most plausibly placed at the conclusion of our Lord's public ministry. Did he intend more than a hint in the representation that the Heir of the Vineyard was killed by the tenants? It is the conviction of Michaelis that 'after this parable even the opponents of Jesus knew that he expected his death'.[1] Admittedly the parable is contested by many critics, but as it provides another glimpse of the extent to which the impending End filled the mind of Jesus, as well as his readiness to speak plainly of the doom for which Israel was heading, it fits all that we know of him in the last days of his earthly life, and ought probably to be accepted. It will have served at least as a further reminder to the disciples of teaching given by

[1] *Der Herr verzieht nicht*, p. 26.

our Lord on the necessity of his suffering. The eschatological discourse would both strengthen that teaching and be the more comprehensible in view of it. If it is true, as William Manson wrote, 'We do not approach the parousia prediction rightly unless we come to it by way of Gethsemane and Calvary,'[1] the reverse is also true: it requires the vindication of the parousia to set Gethsemane and Calvary in their right context. The New Testament was written in that conviction. 'The sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow' is a fixed association of ideas, applying equally to the servant as to his Master; and that association goes back to the Lord himself.

8. Jesus and Judaism

The relationship between the teaching of Jesus and that of his Jewish contemporaries is not easily determined. Grounds exist for drawing quite opposite conclusions, and it is easy to stress one set of factors at the expense of others. Klausner has a chapter entitled, 'The Jewishness of Jesus', which is an exposition of a text provided by Wellhausen: 'Jesus was not a Christian; he was a Jew.' The correctness of the text is demonstrated by dwelling on the loyalty of Jesus to the Law of Moses, a loyalty embracing not only the moral law but the ceremonial laws, and by drawing attention to the declared purpose of Jesus to fulfil the law and prophets. The ethics of Jesus are similarly comprehended under the title 'Jewish': 'With Geiger and Graetz we can aver, without laying ourselves open to the charge of subjectivity and without any desire to argue in defence of Judaism, that throughout the gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be paralleled either in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, or in the Talmud and Midrashic literature of the period near to the time of Jesus.'[2] The truth of this statement can be verified by anyone who will consult Strack-Billerbeck's commentary on the New Testament. And yet it is misleading. That Jesus was a Jew in more respects than in birth is apparent, yet his crucifixion was instigated by Jewish leaders, and a modern Jewish teacher like Klausner is compelled to reject his teaching. The deceptive element in Klausner's statement will be clear if we turn to another section of his book, where he notes that the same claim was made a century earlier by Salvador: '*He finds the whole of the "Sermon on the Mount" in Ben Sira.*'[3] But how different

[1] *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, p. 163.
[2] *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 384. [3] Op. cit., p. 107.

is the tone of Ecclesiasticus from the Great Sermon! By no stretch of imagination could one equate the religion of Ben Sira with the revelation of Jesus. Klausner claims that Jesus sought for himself among the overwhelming mass accumulated by the Scribes and Pharisees the 'one pearl'; yet he also states that Jesus 'concerned himself with neither Halakha, nor the secular knowledge requisite for Halakha, nor (except to a limited extent) with scriptural exposition'.[1] There appears to be a contradiction here, unless we are asked to conclude that the entire teaching of Jesus was drawn from current oral tradition of Scribes known by everybody; but that is asking too much. Burkitt is nearer the mark in describing Christianity as 'Judaism *recreated*'.[2] It is the old faith reborn, or as Jesus expressed it, the fulfilment of law and prophets, the bringing of principles imperfectly revealed to their truest expression. The stumbling-block for Judaism finally proved to be the claim that this consummation of law and prophets, and the initiation of the promised kingdom, centred on a personal revelation, on the Redeemer-Messiah himself. For that claim he had to be removed.

The link between the religion of Jesus and contemporary Judaism exists in virtue of the adherence of both to the scriptures of the Old Testament. Whatever may be said of the freedom of Jesus in his dealing with those scriptures, it can scarcely be denied that they were the nourishment of his soul; on them he built as on an authoritative foundation. It is not simply that he cited texts; his revelation of God was rooted in that of the Old Testament. Gloege maintained that the dynamic conception of the kingdom in our Lord's proclamation was taken over from the prophets, and that the ultimate difference between Jesus and his contemporaries was the centrality of the conception of God in his thought; it was not one among others as with the Rabbis. 'With that hangs together a further fact, that the theological and scholastic idea (of God) when joined to the person of Jesus, stepped out of the world of learning into the world of real things and of human and natural conditions.'[3] In the same way one can discern the difference between Jesus' teaching of God and that of the apocalyptists: the author of the book of Enoch could also have spoken of God as 'Lord of heaven and earth', but only Jesus seemed to know him as '*Father*, Lord of heaven and earth' (Mt. 11. 25). The additional appellation

[1] Op. cit., pp. 389–390.
[2] *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, 2nd ed., p. 67.
[3] *Reich Gottes im Neuen Testament*, pp. 9–10; cf. *Reich Gottes und Kirche*, p. 57.

was distinctive because it was so vital. The few occasions on which God is mentioned as Father in the 'Sayings of the Fathers' illustrates the contention of Gloege that Jesus made central what to the Rabbis was of less importance.

The conception of the Messiah in our Lord's teaching agrees with what we have said about his teaching on the Father. That Jesus found his view of the Messiah in the Old Testament is undeniable, yet it is equally clear that it was a unique view. None other but the Son of God could have created it. It is not simply that he read the Servant Songs as part of the Scriptures, but that their content responded to his own intuitions as to the task of the Messiah, as truly as the vision of 'one like unto a Son of Man' found a similar echo in his breast. There was none other who could have made such a fusion of prophetic teaching, for he alone had the vocation to fulfil it. And not only to fulfil it in himself, but to gather a community with whom his own destiny was to be shared. Here we may recall what was earlier said about the uniqueness of the teaching on the return of the Son of Man; it is to be a *return*, not simply a *coming*. It would be interesting to know to what extent even the conception of a *coming* of the Son of Man was general in the Israel of our Lord's day. There is good ground for thinking that this was far less frequent than is commonly supposed. Héring considers that the opposition between the Jewish Messiah of the first century A.D. and the Danielic Son of Man was complete and that the thought of the *Messiah* coming on the clouds was inconceivable to the Jews of that time. He cites Klausner's view that the transcendent 'kingdom of heaven' cannot be identified with the messianic kingdom of popular expectation, and even more pertinently his belief that '*The people in their heart abhorred the Son of Man who did not take his part in the national sorrow*'.[1] It is therefore not to be taken for granted that a Jew would readily abstract Dan. 7. 13 and apply it to the expected coming of Messiah, as is sometimes postulated in connection with Mk. 13. 26. The spirit of Daniel is not to be identified with that of first-century Judaism. Busch points out that there is a more vivid hope in the canonical book than in the first-century A.D. Jewish writings. In Daniel, 'Judgment and salvation are united, as in the older prophets. The book unites the prayer of penitence, in face of the ruin of the nation, with sure hope in the God-given τέλος through faith in God's work in his kingdom. Not so in the post-canonical writings. . . . Hope turns to doubt. Faith

[1] *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue*, pp. 76 n. 1, 79, 87.

in the συντελεῖσθαι becomes a ground for anxious questioning which remains unanswered, cf. 4 Ezra and Apoc. Baruch.'[1]

Here we arrive once more at the question of how to relate the eschatological teaching of our Lord, and especially Mk. 13 to Jewish apocalyptic. It has already been emphasised that the basic hopes of Jewish apocalyptic, like the more popular Judaism of Jesus' day, were grounded in the Old Testament. Indeed, Old Testament prophecy itself issues in apocalyptic within the canon in the book of Daniel (with which we may compare, but not equate, such pieces as Is. 24–27, Zech. 9–14). Inevitably, therefore, the teaching of our Lord on the last things will have much affinity with that of the Jewish apocalyptists. Already, before the Old Testament canon closes, we see how prophetic terminology is tending to become stereotyped, notably in descriptions of the Day of the Lord. It is not surprising that Jesus should utilise its language in his eschatological teaching.[2] Yet this must not be exaggerated. Torrey is fully justified in insisting that we should not confuse an expression of eschatological anticipations with apocalyptic writing. A consideration of the characteristics of Jewish apocalyptic will speedily show this. Dibelius lists them as follows: (i) The writing of history as prophecy. (ii) Heavenly scenery, the description of God's royal and heavenly court and the like. (iii) Astronomical speculation, the stars, etc., being conceived as part of the celestial world. (iv) Animal symbolism, in which mythology and astrology play an important part. (v) Visionary character, by which the message is represented as mediated through an angelic deliverance or heavenly vision.[3] In this enumeration the phenomenon of pseudonymity is curiously omitted. None of these six (including the last) characteristics can be said to be present in Mk. 13. The first is sometimes alleged in vv. 9–13, but these are among the most usually accepted statements of the discourse, and at most it can only be fairly maintained that the wording has been affected. We have already drawn attention to the sobriety of description of signs in this chapter, as compared with what is to be found in the most popular post-canonical apocalypses. The similarities of *form*, to

[1] *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie*, p. 78.

[2] This use of the Old Testament is not confined to teaching on the parousia, but extends to all the moments of the redemption to be wrought by Jesus. Cf. the δεῖ Mk. 8. 31 with the γέγραπται of Mk. 9. 12, 14. 21, 14. 27. The significance of his death is stated by him at the supper (Mk. 14. 24) with a similar use of Old Testament phraseology as in Mk. 13. 26, while Mk. 10. 45 has been justly claimed to epitomise the thought of Is. 53.

[3] *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, pp. 114 f.

which Professor Rowley alluded, are basic to any description of the End, but the parallels which would set Mk. 13 in the class of genuinely apocalyptic writings are absent.[1]

Of greater importance is the contrast between the *content* of our Lord's eschatological teaching and that of the apocalyptists. Here we may recall our discussion on the stress placed by Jesus on the nearness of the End, an accent which falls equally on such passages as Mk. 9. 1, Mt. 10. 23, as on Mk. 13, neither more nor less. Althaus found in this 'unheard-of earnestness' an expression of the *actuality* presupposed in the eschatological teaching of Jesus: it is intended to prepare the present generation for the last event rather than instruct them about it.[2] Kümmel has essentially the same interpretation, except that he links it with the preaching of the presence of the kingdom and with the significance of Jesus for that kingdom. To him the chief import of Mk. 9. 1 lies in the future judgment entailed by the present attitude to Jesus. 'Here is plainly said what was certainly to be concluded from Lk. 17. 24, 26, that the relation to Jesus in the present is regulative for the decision that will be pronounced on a man in the final judgment. Therewith it is seen afresh that the eschaton is joined by Jesus to the present in a completely new way: the present is not only, as *any* present, the time when a man by his deeds prejudices the judgment that will meet him in the last Day; the present is itself already an eschatological, final time of decision, because in *this* present the man Jesus has appeared; each man is compelled to a refusal or recognition of him, and by it he determines beforehand for himself his judgment at the Last Judgment.'[3] On this basis the real meaning of the proclamation of the nearness of the End is the eschatological significance of the present through the presence of Jesus: that is, it is a reflection of the significance of Jesus himself. As Kümmel expresses it: 'Not apocalyptic instruction but mysterious yet unambiguous proclamation of the God at work in Jesus is the real meaning of the eschatological preaching of Jesus.'[4]

The excellence of this statement, and its undoubted importance, will be admitted, but it may be asked, 'What has this to do with

[1] Compare also the brief but vivid description of the characteristics of apocalypses in *Einführung in das neue Testament*, R. Knopf, H. Lietzmann, H. Weinel, 5th ed. pp. 147 f.

[2] 'The stress lies solely on this preparation, not on a theoretic picture of the coming course of the world.' *Die Letzten Dinge*, p. 271.

[3] *Verheissung und Erfüllung*, pp. 24–25.

[4] Op. cit, p. 65. A similar thought appears in Wendland, *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes*, p. 246.

Mk. 13?' Certainly Kümmel himself would feel that it is remote from the discourse. Yet the eschatological significance of the present may be as well perceived in Mk. 13 as in Mk. 9. 1, only the 'present' is assumed to be *the 'present' of the resurrection period.* It requires no straining of exegesis to see subsumed throughout this chapter the figure of the Christ, once manifested and about to appear. R. H. Lightfoot affirmed: 'In ch. 13 . . . the Lord upon the Mount of Olives, using language taken from the book of Daniel, tells four disciples of the final triumph, after unspeakable horrors, of good over evil, of salvation over destruction; and *in one way or another it is all connected with and hangs upon the person and manifestation of the Son of Man.*'[1] Lightfoot does not illustrate his contention, but it can easily be demonstrated by a glance at the chapter. The judgment on the temple, vv. 1–2, which is also the theme of the chapter, is a direct result of the impending death and resurrection of Jesus, viewed both from its redemptive and judicial aspects, and is part of the judgments of the End leading up to the coming of Jesus Messiah. The warning against credence in false Christs in vv. 5–6 is directly related to Jesus. The δεῖ of 7–8 is part of the divine necessity which conditioned the redemption of Jesus (Mk. 8. 31). 9–13 as a whole revolves about the person of Jesus; he is the one for whose sake distress is to fall upon the disciples and whose Gospel must yet go into all the world (cf. ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, v. 9, διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, v. 13, the latter explaining the intensity of opposition to disciples within and without the family circle). 14–20 we regard as bound up with the prediction of 2 as concomitant with and the occasion of the destruction of the temple. 21–23, like 5–6, again have to do with false representations of the coming of the Messiah whom the disciples know to be Jesus; v. 23 stresses the importance of the warning given by him. 24–27 describe the parousia of the Lord. 28–29 warn of its approach, 30–32 of its nearness yet indefinableness, with a solemn ratification of the truth of the words of Jesus. 33–37 exhort to watchfulness so as to be prepared for the coming of the 'lord of the house'. The whole chapter, we repeat, is bound up with 'the person and manifestation of the Son of Man'. What Kümmel asserts of the eschatological present, presumed in the nearness of the final end, Cullmann has already stressed as characteristic of this chapter, through its display of signs that apply to the whole period between the resurrection and parousia. One has to import very little into

[1] *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, p. 12.

Mk. 13 to see that it fits the rest of the eschatological scheme of Jesus, no more, in fact, than is required in a true understanding of Mk. 9. 1, 14. 25, 14. 62, each of which requires the whole outlook of Jesus for its right interpretation.

The conclusion we would draw from this discussion is that our Lord's teaching on the End of the age is related to the Judaism of his day through their mutual dependence on the Old Testament, but is divided from it through the significance claimed for the Person of the Messiah, who is the Bearer of the Kingdom, the Revelation of God, and is identified with himself. To this teaching the eschatological discourse makes its own contribution, harmoniously with the teaching contained in the other traditions of the Gospels.

9. The Relations of Mk. 13 to other Documents

i. Luke 21.

The common view among earlier critics saw in the Lucan version of the eschatological discourse a modification of the Marcan, due to Luke's editing. Holtzmann, in his earliest work on the Gospels, referred to the 'very free behaviour' of Luke in this chapter.[1] In Creed's view, the dependence of Luke on Mark here is 'not doubtful'.[2] B. W. Bacon said of Luke's version, 'From beginning to end it reads like one long *vaticinium ex eventu*.'[3] Burkitt agreed that Luke is secondary, but not unreliable: 'What concerns us here is not that Luke has changed so much, but that he has invented so little. . . . The wording of the speech is quite different—the wording, but not the general sense. For after all, the chief point is, that the general tenor of Lk. 21. 7–36 and Mk. 13. 4–37 is one and the same.'[4]

Over against this view there have never been wanting some to assert the priority of Luke over Mark. In the earliest days of criticism Neander took this view, and it is now affirmed by Goguel and T. W. Manson. The issue mainly depends on how one understands the 'abomination' passage, and here we concur with those who regard Luke as interpretative in this saying, even though his interpretation be according to the mind of Christ.

On the whole there is much to be said for the view that Luke's version represents an independent tradition of the discourse. In

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863, pp. 235 ff.
[2] *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, p. 252.
[3] *The Gospel of Mark*, p. 125.
[4] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. 2, p. 115.

support of this it can be urged: (*a*) that Luke does not normally edit his sources so drastically as the theory of his dependence requires; (*b*) the introduction, vv. 5–6, is better explained as due to Luke's (original) ignorance of the location of the discourse than his modification of it, for the address could not have been delivered to all and sundry; (*c*) 13–15 do not look like editorial modifications, especially the omission by Luke of a reference to the Holy Spirit, in whose activity he is specially interested; (*d*) 18–19 would scarcely be written by an editor after Neronic times; it is hard to conceive them appearing after the first severe outbreak of persecution about the time of Stephen's death; (*e*) 20–24 both depend on Old Testament scriptures and are poetic in structure; it is unlikely that Luke is responsible for this; (*f*) 28 reads like an authentic saying well placed; (*g*) we know that Luke had many independent sources in the construction of his gospel; if his passion narrative is to be numbered with these, as is likely, it strengthens the probability that the eschatological discourse similarly is derived from a source independent of Mark's.

It is impossible to be dogmatic on the matter, but the evidence seems to incline to the view that Lk. 21 came to the Evangelist before he read Mark's version. This conclusion would be strengthened if we could be sure, with Charles, that Rev. 6. 7–8 presumes a version of the discourse which included the λοιμοί of Lk. 21. 11.

ii. Matthew 24.

Since Matthew generally follows Mark in his Gospel, and his version of the discourse is manifestly closer to the Marcan than the Lucan, there should be no difficulty in attributing it to the editorial activity of the Evangelist, working on Mk. 13. Such is the view most frequently held. Streeter could find one point only in which Matthew appeared to be more original than Mark, the inclusion in v. 29 of εὐθέως over against Mark's ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. 'None of the other Matthaean variants have the slightest claim to be considered original.'[1] Bacon similarly affirmed, 'The assumption of any non-Marcan source save Daniel, to whom Matthew makes reference by name, is wholly gratuitous'.[2] The problem, however, is not so simple as these two assured dicta imply. Streeter later admitted that Matthew may have employed, together with

[1] *Oxford Studies*, p. 183. Streeter thought Mark's omission of εὐθέως was due to copyists.

[2] *The Gospel of Mark*, p. 65.

Mark 13, an independent version of the discourse containing certain textual variations.[1] Bacon finds it necessary to interpret Mt. 24. 15 of a historical profanation of the synagogue in Caesarea, at the outbreak of the Jewish rebellion, and to regard Mt. 24 as an adaptation of Mk. 13 to the book of Daniel, thereby detaching the discourse from the temple prophecy and making it refer exclusively to the end of the world.[2] In this interpretation he has been followed by few. In contrast to these exegetes Bernard Weiss,[3] Bousset,[4] Jülicher,[5] Moffatt,[6] and Hauck,[7] all maintained that Matthew is more original in his version of the discourse; while others believe that Matthew had access to other sources with which to correct Mark.

The matter is complicated through the employment by the first Evangelist in Mt. 10. 17–22 of the paragraph contained in Mk. 13. 9–13. The question arises whether Matthew transferred this pericope from the discourse found in Mk. 13, or whether he found it in another source; and if the latter assumption is correct, whether *Mark* inserted the pericope into his discourse where it did not belong, and whether Matthew omitted it from chapter 24 to avoid repetition. No certain answer can be given to these questions. On the whole it seems more probable that Matthew found the pericope in a separate source and included it in the Mission Charge than that he transferred it from Mk. 13 to that discourse.

A large group of critics attribute the section to Q.[8] This is unlikely, for there is no other contact between Mark and Q like this; and the one logion paralleled in Q, Lk. 12. 11–12 = Mt. 10. 19–20, Mk. 13. 11, happens to be reproduced in a more original form in Matthew's version; the first Evangelist speaks of τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, which is more likely on the lips of Jesus than the τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα of Mark and Luke. As we have already suggested that the pericope Mt. 10. 17–22 is historically better suited to the eschatological discourse than to the Mission Charge, we may con-

The Four Gospels, p. 264, n. 1.

[2] Op. cit., pp. 104–105.

[3] *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 8th ed., p. 219.

[4] *The Antichrist Legend*, p. 23.

[5] *Einleitung in das neue Testament*, 1894, p. 199.

[6] *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed., p. 208.

[7] *Das Evangelium des Markus*, p. 153.

[8] V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. 2, p. 116; Loisy, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, p. 413; Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, p. 311; Busch, *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie*, p. 22; Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord*, pp. 8–9, 120. Wendling traces Mt. 10. 17–20, 23 only to Q, *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums*, pp. 155–57. Montefiore thinks if this be correct—so much the worse for Q! *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. 1, p. 303.

sider that this sayings-group circulated freely, on account of its pertinence to the situation of the early Christians. This will not prejudice its position in Mk. 13; the presumption will be that Matthew found the pericope both in his version of the discourse and without a context, and that his inclusion of it in the earlier discourse determined his omission of it in the later one. This will also mean that the originality of Mt. 10. 19–20 cannot affect our view of the relation of Mt. 24 to Mk. 13, for we cannot tell whence the passage in the Mission Charge was derived.

The Q elements in the discourse can obviously be discounted, since they were incorporated by the Evangelist on the principle of conflating similar material (Mt. 24. 26–28 = Lk. 17. 23–24, 27; vv. 37–41 = Lk. 17. 26–27, 34–35; vv. 43–51 = Lk. 12. 39–40, 42–46). The hand of the editor could well be admitted in the addition of ὁ χριστός in Mt. 24. 5, to make the sense clearer; of τῶν ἐθνῶν in v. 9, words which are not found in Mt. 10. 22; and the wording of v. 14, which makes Mk. 13. 10 more explicit. On the other hand, if the Syriac tradition be followed in v. 15, the 'abomination' passage would seem to have been better preserved than in Mk. 13. 14, which may well have been assimilated to the Danielic prophecy before it reached Mark's hands.[1] The inclusion of μηδὲ σαββάτῳ in v. 20, despite all that is said about the Judaistic prejudice of the Evangelist, is more likely than its omission. It was relevant to the disciples; it would be more relevant to later Palestinian believers, whom our Lord could well envisage on this occasion; and it would be still more relevant to non-Christian Jews. If our Lord could think of the last named in his previous utterance (as surely he did, v. 19), he might compassionately have had them in his thought at this point. This need not determine the origin of the further additional phrase in v. 20, ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν, which may or may not be editorial. The εὐθέως of v. 29 certainly seems more *primitive* than Mark's phrase in 13. 26, even if we cannot be sure that either is *original*. The phenomena of vv. 30–31 will suit the atmosphere of these previous additions: the sign of the Son of Man, which so deeply fascinated early Christian exegesis, may be found to be more than exotic apocalypticism, for it balances in an extraordinary fashion the Syriac version of v. 14. There are textual grounds for believing that the citation from Zechariah may be imported from

[1] Zahn came to this conclusion without taking account of the textual variation, believing Mark's version to have been modified in the light of the Caligula crisis.

Rev. 1. 7, as Merx and Bousset thought.[1] If these variations are all due to Matthew's editing of Mark, he is to be congratulated on a most acute piece of re-writing. We suspect, however, that he had better grounds for his work than merely Jewish inclinations. This will reflect on our view of vv. 10–12; in all probability they come from the same source as the above readings, even if their present position in the discourse is due to Matthew. More dubiously the same may apply to the introductory question of v. 3, but there is less room for confidence here.

A decision which would meet with general assent is hardly possible, but we feel that the case for the employment by Matthew of another source in his version of the eschatological discourse is relatively strong, and certainly more plausible than the notion that he simply edited Mark's version according to taste. If that be so, we have three traditions of the eschatological discourse in our Gospels, not one as was formerly thought.

iii. Mark 13 and Q.

It has already been mentioned that a number of critics believed Mk. 13. 9–13 to be derived from Q. Blunt asserted that this dependence of Mark on Q here is 'generally agreed'.[2] Wendling extended the view by regarding Q as one of the three sources of the discourse; abstracting from the chapter what has come from Ur-Marcus and the Little Apocalypse, he attributed the rest to Q (vv. 3–6, 9*b*–11, 13*a*, 19?, 20*b*–23, 31, 32, 37).[3] Bacon went still further and held not only that 9–13 mainly consists of Q logia, but that 14–23 is a mixture of Q sayings with apocalyptic Scripture.[4] The reconstructions of the two last-named critics have not commended themselves to students of the Gospels generally, nor is it likely that the derivation of Mk. 13. 9–13 from Q will hold the field. The conviction is growing that Mark and Q are independent of each other, and that their contacts are due to the overlapping of Mark's sources with Q rather than his dependence on that document (or stratum).[5]

[1] See Merx's *Das Evangelium Matthäus in loco*, Bousset's *Offenbarung Johannis* on Rev. 1. 7.

[2] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 75. It is, however, just possible that Blunt is referring to Bacon's views.

[3] *Die Entstehung des Marcus Evangeliums*, p. 165.

[4] *The Gospel of Mark*, p. 124.

[5] The main objection to Mark's use of Q is the sparing manner in which he must have utilised it, to say nothing of his divergences from it. While Rawlinson in his commentary on Mark (p. xi) affirmed Mark's knowledge of Q, he later expressed the opinion that the two documents were wholly independent (*Christ in the Gospels*, p. 108). Wernle thought that Mark knew Q but scarcely employed

The main question in the matter of the relation of Mk. 13 to Q falls in the sphere of theology. How are their respective representations of the eschatology of Jesus to be correlated, if at all? The chief point of comparison has already been discussed: while Q dwells on the unexpectedness of the End, Mk. 13 delineates the signs heralding the End. We have found reason to believe that these two views are not contradictory but supplementary, and that in the main it is a question of emphasis. Much more fundamental is the agreement of Mark and Q on the chief emphases of our Lord's eschatology. Both sources indubitably represent the kingdom as a developing force, though not in the modern sense of a slowly evolving principle (Mk. 4. 26 ff., the Seed growing Secretly, Mt. 13. 31 f. = Lk. 13. 18 f., the Mustard Seed), and both describe its catastrophic conclusion (Mk. 13, Lk. 17. 22 ff.). It ought not to be overlooked that the figures of Noah's Flood and the overthrow of Sodom do not presume a world submissive to the Gospel at the End of the age, although their purpose is to illustrate the suddenness of the End rather than its character. The non-eschatological temper of Q has frequently been exaggerated, especially when unnatural methods of exegesis have been applied to Lk. 17. 22 ff. In reality, the eschatological view is as truly represented in Q as in Mark; it is only the presence of the eschatological discourse in Mark which gives the impression that the second Evangelist is far more concerned about eschatology than the compiler of Q. If account be taken of the parabolic teaching on this subject in Q (Lk. 12. 35 ff., the Watching Servants, Thief in the Night, Faithful Steward, Many and Few Stripes, Fire on Earth; Lk. 19. 11 ff., Parable of the Pounds?), together with other eschatological sayings (Woes on the Cities, Lk. 10. 13 ff., Condemnation of Jews by Queen of Sheba and Ninevites in the Last Day, Lk. 11. 31 f., the Strait Gate, Shut Door, Entrance of the Gentiles in the kingdom, Lk. 13. 24 ff.), and the probability that the compiler of Q *arranged* the Q apocalypse, whereas Mark simply *took over* the eschatological discourse, it will be seen that the former busied himself with eschatological teaching, at least as much as Mark did. The views of the two writers are not to be opposed, as has been the fashion so long: in respect of details they are complementary; and fundamentally they are united.

it, since a knowledge of it could be presupposed in his readers: *Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus*, p. 110. Good discussions of the problem will be found in A. T. Cadoux's *Sources of the Second Gospel*, pp. 13–14, and also in Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, pp. 186–191.

iv. The Pauline Epistles.

The older view of Paul's dependence on the eschatological discourse is well stated by Zahn, who considered that the 'common Christian view of the issue of history', as seen in II Thess. 2, is historically incomprehensible without an impetus from Jesus, such as is found in Mk. 13.[1] Kennedy further believed that Paul's acquaintance with Mk. 13 explains the general emphasis on the parousia in his writings.[2] Not unnaturally, critical uncertainty as to the origin of the eschatological discourse has reacted unfavourably on this view. Dodd believes that II Thess. 1. 7–10, 2. 3–10 are probably derived from a current apocalypse, whether Jewish or Jewish-Christian, and that the qualifications as to the nearness of the parousia introduced by Paul in this letter are an afterthought, of which he had said nothing in his preaching to the Thessalonians.[3] Streeter identified this apocalyptic document with the 'Little Apocalypse' embodied in Mk. 13,[4] but Bacon reversed the process and made Mk. 13 the development of the short apocalypse contained in II Thess. 2. 1–4;[5] the 'word of the Lord', reproduced in I Thess. 4. 15–17, was regarded by him as an utterance of a Christian prophet, believed to be inspired by the Risen Lord.[6] Bacon's mistake lay in confining the parallels between Mk. 13 and the Thessalonian letters to the short 'apocalypse' of II Thess. 2. 1–4 and the 'word of the Lord' in I Thess. 4. 15 ff. This was seen by Hölscher, who, it will be recalled, felt that II Thessalonians needed for its presuppositions the Little Apocalypse *with certain Christian additions like Mk.* 13. 21 f., 32–37.[7] To us that belief indicates an uncommonly close approach to the traditional view. Since this is a matter which cannot be discussed without reference to the text, we urge the reader to examine the parallels between the Thessalonian Letters and Mk. 13 as observable in the following passages:

I Thess. 4. 15–17	=	Mk. 13. 26–27, Mt. 24. 31.
,, 5. 1–5	=	,, 13. 32–33, Lk. 21. 34–35.
,, 5. 6–8	=	,, 13. 35–36 (cf. 33, 37).
,, 5. 4–10	=	,, 13. 22.
II Thess. 1. 3–5	=	,, 13. 9–13.
,, 1. 6–10	=	,, 13. 26–27.

[1] *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, p. 651, n. 1.
[2] *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, pp. 166–168.
[3] *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 38–39.
[4] *Four Gospels*, p. 493.
[5] *The Gospel of Mark*, pp. 88 ff.
[6] Op. cit., p. 83.
[7] *Theologische Blätter*, July 1933, p. 199.

II Thess.	1. 11–12	=	Lk. 21. 36.
,,	2. 1–2	=	Mk. 13. 26–27.
,,	2. 3	=	,, 13. 5, Mt. 24. 12.
,,	2. 4–6	=	,, 13. 14.
,,	2. 7	=	Mt. 24. 12.
,,	2. 8–12	=	Mk. 13. 22 (cf. Lk. 24. 11, Mk. 1. 36).
,,	2. 13	=	,, 13. 27 (cf. Lk. 21. 8).
,,	2. 15	=	,, 13. 23 (cf. v. 31).

It will be seen from a perusal of these parallels that there is no question of associating merely the abomination saying of Mk. 13. 14 with II Thess. 2. 1–14; the entire eschatological passages of I and II Thessalonians reflect the spirit of the eschatological discourse. In II Thessalonians we can see the idea of *each* section of the discourse reproduced in Paul's language, and in the case of 13. 14 ff., 21 ff., 24 ff., 32 ff., there appear to be contacts of diction as well as of thought. Contrary to what is frequently expressed, the idea of I Thess. 4. 15–17 is in at least one cardinal respect closer to the spirit of the discourse than II Thess. 2. The latter passage dwells much on the destruction of Antichrist, and in Ch. 1 the destruction of unbelievers is also mentioned; but I Thess. 4. 15 ff. is solely concerned with the relation between the parousia and the Church, which is the dominant theme of Mk. 13. 24 ff. We have already pointed out that I Thess. 5. 1 f. presumes prior instruction by Paul as to the 'times and seasons' that precede the coming of the Lord; to such instruction II Thess. 2. 5 will refer. It becomes difficult, consequently, to understand the position either of Professor Dodd or Professor Manson, that II Thess. 2 represents an afterthought or that Mk. 13 clashes with Paul's teaching. Paul's view of signs heralding the End is surely a settled item of his teaching. This is strikingly confirmed by an echo of the eschatological discourse in I Cor. 7. 26 ff., where Paul's advice on marriage is conditioned not merely by the 'near-expectation' of the End, but by an expectation of *a period of distress preceding it*. The whole paragraph echoes the sentiments of Mk. 13. 14–20. The tribulation is 'impending', *ἐνεστῶσαν*, and the time is 'shortened', *συνεσταλμένος*, cf. Mk. 13. 20; the married will suffer peculiar 'distress', *θλίψιν*, an echo of Mk. 13. 17; the Christian must therefore sit loosely to the ties of this world and be awake, for this world is on the point of passing away. It is an incidental point of interest that Paul applies the prophecy generally to believers in the Gentile world, an application made the

more easy in view of the universal significance of Mk. 13. 7–8, 24–27.

There can be little doubt on whose side dependence lies, the eschatological discourse or Paul. II Thess. 2 does not give the whole of Mk. 13, but Mk. 13, helped out by Q, can account for all I and II Thessalonians and a good deal else in Paul. Hölscher was right in suggesting that the 'Little Apocalypse' with Christian additions could account for II Thessalonians, only he did not allow sufficiently for the extent of these 'additions', nor rightly estimate the nature of the 'Little Apocalypse'. Paul's acquaintance with the eschatological discourse in a fairly complete edition will necessitate the hypothesis that it was in circulation before its incorporation in any of the Gospels and that it was compiled at a very early date.

v. The Fourth Gospel.

For a whole century it has been customary to contrast the eschatological discourse with the Upper Room discourses of the Fourth Gospel as though they represented the antitheses of religious thought. Schenkel believed that the Fourth Evangelist alone perceived the real meaning of the address delivered over against the temple, but through the versions in the Synoptics, 'the lucid, divine conceptions of the future which Jesus had were condensed into gross, earthly expectations', and the eschatological discourse gave rise to Chiliasm, 'a remnant of literalist faith and delusion in the religion of the Spirit and of Truth.'[1] In a work so recent as Streeter's *Four Gospels* there is no theological advance beyond that position. But there has been a perceptible change of emphasis in literature since Streeter. There is a greater readiness to apply to this Gospel the more realist method of exegesis that has been so fruitful in synoptic studies in the last two generations. Hoskyns and Davey cite Lagrange for the view that Jn. 15. 18–16. 4 originally belonged to the eschatological discourse of Mk. 13. It is part of a complicated theory concerning the construction of Jn. 13–17 which these authors find difficult to take seriously. Nevertheless, that such a view could be hazarded by a competent New Testament scholar suggests that the moods of Mk. 13 and Jn. 13–17 may not after all be so opposed.[2] Friedrich Büchsel suggests that the Upper Room Discourses have been composed from the material incorporated by the synoptists in their varied addresses and conversations; what they have reproduced on many occasions (the Mission

[1] *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, p. 188.

[2] Hoskyns and Davey, *The Fourth Gospel*, 2nd ed., p. 465.

Charge, Mk. 6. 6–13 par; the Address on Cross-bearing, Mk. 8. 34–9. 1 par; the second Address to Disciples, Mk. 9. 33–37 par; the Eschatological Discourse, Mk. 13, and other shorter pieces), John has put together in the farewell address of Jesus to his followers.[1] On such a view, naturally there will be many points of contact between Mk. 13 and Jn. 13–17.

It may be most convenient to consider the parallels under three heads: (i) concerning tribulation, (ii) concerning the Spirit, (iii) concerning the parousia.

(i) W. F. Howard has drawn attention recently to the large space devoted in the Johannine discourses to tribulations facing the disciples; he cites especially Jn. 15. 18 ff., 16. 1 ff., 16. 19 ff., 16. 32 f.[2] Of these, the first two paragraphs are most relevant:

> If the world hates you, you know that it has hated me before it hated you. If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you. Remember the word that I said unto you: A servant is not greater than his lord. If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they kept my word, they will keep yours also. *But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake*, because they do not know him that sent me. . . .
>
> These things have I spoken unto you, that you should not be made to stumble. They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour comes that *whoever kills you will think that he offers service unto God.* And these things they will do because they have not known the Father, nor me. But these things I have spoken to you, that when their hour comes, you may remember them, how that I told you. And these things I did not say to you from the beginning, because I was with you. (Jn. 15. 18–21, 16. 1–4.)

It is not surprising that Lagrange wished to include these passages in the eschatological discourse; they are in the same strain as Mk. 13. 9, 13*a*, and provide independent evidence, if such were required, that Jesus gave warnings like these to the disciples at the close of his life. We should note especially the phrase διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου in 15. 21, cf. Mk. 13. 13 and the ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ of 13. 9.

(ii) The Paraclete sayings have received fresh attention since Windisch propounded the view that they originally formed a unity and were only subsequently inserted into appropriate places within the discourses. It is an attractive view, though in the nature of the

[1] *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 138.
[2] *Christianity according to St. John*, pp. 114–115.

case speculative. Howard accepts it and draws attention to two features of the sayings: (*a*) they are eschatological in significance, for the possession of the Spirit is a pledge of the future inheritance, (*b*) *their general context is right, for they form part of the eschatological hope.*[1] That is to say, both the sayings on the Spirit and the Discourse in which they are found partake of an eschatological character, a great change of view from what was usual a generation ago. For our purposes, it should be noted that this instruction as to the ministry of the Spirit is represented as taking place after the departure of Jesus, supremely in connection with the witness of the disciples in the world. Of the five Paraclete sayings the two most relevant are 15. 26–27 and 16. 5–11:

> When the Paraclete comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, *he will bear witness of me; and you also bear witness, because you have been with me from the beginning*. . . .
>
> I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I do not go away, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you. And *he, when he comes, will expose the world* in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin because they do not believe on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and you no longer behold me; of Judgment, because the prince of this world has been judged. (Jn. 15. 26–27, 16. 7–11.)

The similarity of content, though not of language, between these two passages and Mk. 13. 11 is striking, for the witness of the Spirit is explicitly connected with that of the disciples in the former passage and is probably to be assumed in the latter. We note that Luke represented Paul's preaching in Acts 24. 25 as concerning righteousness, self-control and coming judgment; and Felix trembled under it! It may be sheer coincidence, but that is the kind of testimony envisaged in Mk. 13. 11, and the topics are provided in Jn. 16. 8 ff.

(iii) The sayings concerning the 'coming' of Jesus are notoriously ambiguous and have been variously interpreted. On the strength of Windisch's excision of the Paraclete sayings from the discourses, Howard follows those exegetes who interpret the sayings solely of the parousia.[2] This is unlikely, but there is no room for identifying the parousia with the coming of the Paraclete, as is so frequently done. The saying, 'Unless I go away, the Paraclete will not come to you' (Jn. 16. 7) is tautologous if the Paraclete is identified with

[1] Op. cit., p. 122. [2] Op. cit., p. 110.

Jesus, or if the coming of the Paraclete is meant to fulfil the promise of Jesus' coming; language could scarcely make the two 'comings' more distinct. There would appear to be a complexity of thought in this matter of the 'coming' of Jesus after his departure at death. In Jn. 16. 16 ff., 20–23, it seems incontrovertible that Jesus has his resurrection in mind, although the language deliberately recalls that of Old Testament eschatology: the coming of Jesus will initiate a new era of prayer for the disciples, and this is most naturally interpreted of the post-resurrection period. That suggests that we should interpret 14. 18 of a return in resurrection. In 14. 21 a mystic 'resurrection appearance' is promised to the individual believer, and in 14. 23 the same is assured under the figure of a parousia of the Father and Son, when the eschatological hope of the 'tabernacling of God' with men is to be fulfilled. 14. 2–3 must, however, relate to the parousia promise in its normal significance: Jesus has gone to prepare a dwelling for his followers, his Church, and at some time he will return to welcome them to the *μοναί*. This cannot relate to the resurrection, or to the gift of the Spirit, and nowhere else are we told in the New Testament that Jesus comes for his own at death. Again, it may be purely accidental, but the precise term (and tense) for 'welcome' in 14. 3 is employed in the Q apocalypse in relation to the parousia: *λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης (μιᾶς), ὁ εἷς παραληφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται. ἔσονται δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἡ μία παραληφθήσεται ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσεται.* Lk. 17. 34–35. The most natural interpretation of the saying in Jn. 14. 3 is to refer it to the coming at the End of the age, conceived, of course, as everywhere else in the New Testament, as taking place within a measurable distance of time; had the latter consideration been borne in mind, it is doubtful if the understanding of this verse as relating to death would have been so frequent. Considered as a parousia saying, it connects well with I Thess. 4. 15 ff. and Mk. 13. 26–27, for both these passages in differing ways describe the coming of the Lord for his own, that they might be with him. The toning down of eschatological figures fits in with the characteristics of the Fourth Gospel, but the essential meaning of the saying remains.[1]

[1] To insist, with Prof. Dodd (*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, 1953, pp. 403–6), that the sayings following Jn. 14. 3 must be viewed as the Evangelist's interpretation of the utterance seems to me as unlikely as the parallel belief that Lk. 17. 22 ff. must be viewed as the true explication of Lk. 17. 20–21. Nor does this view appear to me to take into account the complexity of the 'parousia' conception in Jn. 14–16 as alluded to above.

No one would attempt to equate the eschatological discourse with the Johannine discourses, and we have no intention of doing so. It is sufficient to show that the chief motif of the former is present in the latter, viz. the thought of the disciples witnessing to a hostile world by the aid of the Holy Spirit, amidst acute suffering, in the period between the death and resurrection of Jesus and the parousia. If the keynote of Jn. 13–17 is 'In the world you have tribulation, but be of good cheer, *I have overcome the world*' (16. 33), in Mk. 13 the stress is on the *future* victory. Both these characteristic emphases of the gospels are needed.

vi. The Book of Revelation.

The similarity between Mk. 13 and the New Testament apocalypse in respect of form and content scarcely requires mention. In both cases a witnessing Church in a hostile world is warned of trials and calamities ahead, and encouraged by the prospect of victory for its cause at the coming of Christ. The likeness extends to the purpose of their composition: the revelation given is in each case no mere textbook on eschatology; it is intended to inspire vigilance, determination and confidence.[1] Unlike the eschatological discourse, however, the Revelation makes no provision for delay before the breaking of the final woes upon the world; the stage is set for the last conflict, and the Church is summoned to meet it without flinching.

Apart from this fundamental likeness in message and presentation, close contact between Mk. 13 and the Revelation may be postulated in respect of Rev. 6, the vision of the opening of the sealed book of destiny. R. H. Charles has carefully examined the relations of the two chapters and presented a strong case for the dependence of Rev. 6 on the eschatological discourse, not, however, as reproduced in Mk. 13 alone, but as it is also given in Lk. 21.[2] The parallels are adduced as follows:

[1] It is not easy to understand how R. Heard could deny this purpose to the Book of Revelation: 'There is no "teaching" as such in Revelation . . . the main purpose of the book as a whole is the revelation of the future,' *An Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 242. Contrast the view of E. F. Scott: 'From beginning to end it is a sublime manifesto of faith in God.' The book is 'a trumpet call to faith', rousing the Church to a sense of its dignity and the significance of its sufferings, with an assurance of the certainty of victory for the forces of the spirit. *The Book of Revelation*, pp. 173 f.

[2] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, vol. i, pp. 158 f. J. Behm also draws attention to the parallels between the discourse and Rev. 6, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, p. 38.

Mt. 24.
1. Wars.
2. International strife.
3. Famines.
4. Earthquakes.
5. Persecutions
6. Eclipses of the sun and moon; falling of the stars; shaking of powers of heaven.

Mk. 13.
1. Wars.
2. International strife.
3. Earthquakes.
4. Famines.
5. Persecutions.
6. (As in Matthew.)

Lk. 21.
1. Wars.
2. International strife.
3. Earthquakes.
4. Famines.
5. Pestilence.
6. Persecutions.
7. Signs in sun, moon and stars; men fainting for fear of things coming on the world; shaking of powers of heaven.

Rev. 6.
1. Wars.
2. International strife.
3. Famine.
4. Pestilence.
5. Persecutions.
6. Earthquakes, eclipse of sun, ensanguining of moon, falling of stars, men calling on rocks to fall on them, shaking of powers of heaven, destroying winds (cf. Lk. 21. 25).

The fourth plague in Rev. 6. 7 f. is given as 'death and hades', but that is due to the common translation of מָוֶת by *θάνατος* in the LXX. The tables show that Rev. 6 reproduces, in picturesque fashion, the signs narrated in Mk. 13. 7–8, together with the item of pestilence mentioned in Lk. 21. 11; the cosmic signs of Mk. 13. 24 f. are described in closely similar language. The 'persecutions' are justly inferred from the presence of the martyrs beneath the throne, slain for 'the word of God and the testimony which they held', Rev. 6. 9 f.; the parallel with Mk. 13. 9, 13, and indeed the whole situation implied in that paragraph, is undeniable. That John should have omitted the central section Mk. 13. 14 ff. from his descriptions of the final woes is understandable, for the passage relates to conditions in Judea in the period of Jerusalem's devastation, an event twenty-five years earlier than the time of John's writing; moreover, his horizon was the *οἰκουμένη*, not Palestine. The sources of the doctrine of Antichrist in the Revelation lie elsewhere, although the idea of the 'abomination' in Mk. 13. 14 coincides with the fundamental view of the Seer that an anti-god power rages in the world. There is much clearer contact between the deceptive pseudochrists and prophets of Mk. 13. 22 and the false

prophet of Rev. 13. 11 ff., whose 'signs and portents' lead astray the world.

On the whole it seems to be a reasonable postulate that John knew the eschatological discourse and utilised it in the construction of Rev. 6. Charles' belief that John knew the 'Little Apocalypse' *with a section on the persecution of the saints* is unnecessary; the document identified with that Little Apocalypse already lies before us conjoined with a description of persecution, and the two together make up the bulk of the eschatological discourse as it has been preserved to us; to conjure up two hypothetical documents and overlook one actual document that fits the requirements is curious criticism. If the Seer knew our eschatological discourse, it will have been in a form slightly different from any preserved by our Evangelists and presumably more primitive, since it contained elements preserved alone in Mark and Luke respectively; that provides a confirmation of our view that the version in Luke rests on an independent tradition and is not a revision of Mark's, and further that the discourse circulated separately before any of our Gospels was written.

vii. The Apocalypse of Peter.

It would hardly have been necessary to discuss the relations of Mk. 13 with this document, were it not that several scholars of note have linked the two together. Dibelius connected the Petrine apocalypse and the eschatological discourse as similar in nature,[1] and Loisy thought that the original situation of the discourse has been preserved in pseudo-Peter, where it appears in a resurrection narrative.[2] Admittedly, the Petrine apocalypse is a comparatively early writing (James dates it in the early second century), but if the apostle Paul and the three Synoptic Evangelists (and the Seer of Revelation?) all knew the eschatological discourse in a fairly uniform version, why should it be thought otherwise in the case of the apocalypse under consideration? A brief glance at the contents of this document should suffice to show its dependence on the canonical discourse. We reproduce a part of the Ethiopic version for the convenience of the reader:[3]

> The Second Coming of Christ and Resurrection of the Dead (which Christ revealed unto Peter) who died because of their sins, for that they kept not the commandment of God their creator.

[1] *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, p. 121.
[2] *The Origins of the New Testament*, p. 299.
[3] The translation is that of James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 510 f.

And he (Peter) pondered thereon, that he might perceive the mystery of the Son of God, the merciful and lover of mercy.

And when the Lord was seated upon the Mount of Olives, his disciples came unto him.

And we besought and entreated him severally and prayed him, saying unto him: Declare unto us what are the signs of thy coming and of the end of the world, that we may perceive and mark the time of thy coming and instruct them that come after us, unto whom we preach the word of thy gospel, and whom we set over (in) thy church, that they, when they hear it, may take heed to themselves and mark the time of thy coming.

And our Lord answered us, saying: Take heed that no man deceive you, and that ye be not doubters and serve other gods. Many shall come in my name, saying: I am the Christ. Believe them not, neither draw near unto them. For the coming of the Son of God shall not be plain (i.e. foreseen); but as the lightning that shineth from the east unto the west, so will I come upon the clouds of heaven with a great host in my majesty; with my cross going before my face will I come in my majesty; shining sevenfold more than the sun will I come in my majesty with all my saints, mine holy angels. And my Father shall set a crown upon mine head, that I may judge the quick and the dead and recompense every man according to his works.

And ye, take ye the likeness thereof from the fig tree: so soon as the shoot thereof is come forth and the twigs grown, the end of the world shall come. (There follows an exposition, at Peter's request, of the parable of the fig tree, in which the parable is allegorised to make Israel the fig tree, and in which Lk. 13. 6 ff. is incorporated.)

The secondary nature of these extracts is evident from almost every sentence. The question of the disciples has become more complex, the prime desire apparently being to instruct the leaders of the Church that shall arise. The Lord's command not to be doubters and serve other gods presumes an atmosphere removed from Judaism. The description of the parousia similarly betrays later thought, notably the interpretation of the 'sign of the Son of Man' as his cross and his coming in light, both common ideas in patristic literature. That this version is nothing more than a development of the discourse of our Gospels seems clear also from the treatment accorded to the fig tree parable: for the parable has been turned into an allegory, in order to yield the beliefs of the writer. The discourse generally has become a treatise on the End and the realm of the dead, with the same end in view. We have no warrant for presuming with Loisy that the apocalyptist had access to a document more primitive than any in the canonical Gospels:

that idea is bound up with Loisy's view that all gospel teaching on the parousia is secondary and was originally represented as given by the Risen Lord.

We conclude that the address contained in the Apocalypse of Peter is a late development of the eschatological discourse preserved in the synoptic gospels, and is valueless for the determination of the original text.

viii. The Oracle of Eusebius.

The Church historian Eusebius records that shortly before the Jewish war the leaders of the church in Jerusalem received a command by divine revelation to leave the city.[1] Since the eschatological discourse also contains an exhortation to flight at the appearance of the 'abomination', there has been much speculation as to the relationship of this oracle to the discourse. Colani urged that the oracle was none other than Mk. 13. 5–31: 'It was circulated in the Church of Jerusalem and was accepted as a supernatural revelation of the glorified Christ.' Since the command to flee was regarded as urgent, and indeed would have been useless had the oracle been long in existence, we must set the date of its composition at this time.[2] In this view Colani has been followed by many, although there has been a tendency to restrict the contents of the oracle to Mk. 13. 14–20.[3]

The reverse interpretation has been taken by Zahn[4] and recently by H. J. Schoeps,[5] who regard the Eusebian oracle as an adaptation of the earlier discourse. It will perhaps be profitable to reproduce the saying in its context, that we may endeavour to judge of the matter for ourselves:

> After the ascension of our Saviour, the Jews, in addition to their wickedness against him, were now incessantly plotting mischief against his apostles. First they slew Stephen by stoning him, next James the son of Zebedee, and the brother of John, by beheading, and finally James, who first obtained the episcopal seat at Jerusalem, after the ascension of our Saviour, and was slain in the manner before related. But the rest of the apostles, who were harassed in innumer-

[1] *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 3, Ch. 5.
[2] *Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps*, p. 218.
[3] So C. H. Dodd, *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 65; David Smith, *The Days of his Flesh*, p. xxxi; H. D. A. Major, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 159; F. C. Grant, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 62; H. J. Schonfield, *Saints against Caesar*, p. 126. The last named thinks that the entire 'Apocalypse' may be intended.
[4] *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 159.
[5] *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, pp. 264–265.

able ways with a view to destroy them and driven from the land of Judea, had gone forth to preach the gospel to all nations, relying upon the aid of Christ, when he said, 'Go, teach all nations in my name.' *The whole body, however, of the church at Jerusalem, having been commanded by a divine revelation given to men of approved piety there before the war, removed from the city, and dwelt at a certain town beyond the Jordan, called Pella.* Here, those that believed in Christ, having removed from Jerusalem, as if holy men had entirely abandoned the royal city itself, and the whole land of Judea; the divine justice, for their crimes against Christ and his apostles, finally overtook them, totally destroying the whole generation of these evil-doers from the earth.

It seems apparent that Eusebius believed this oracle originated *after the departure of the apostles from Judea* and *just before the war* further, that this oracle was 'given by divine revelation to approved men', i.e. to *a group of men*, not to an individual. One can hardly infer from this that the elders of the Jerusalem church, on pondering the eschatological discourse, concluded that the time had at last arrived to carry out the injunction, given nearly forty years earlier, to flee from the city; much rather does it look like a revelation given through a Christian prophet in a gathering of 'approved men'. Whether this revelation itself was inspired through prior reflection on the prophet's part as to the Lord's prophecy cannot be known. It should not be overlooked that Eusebius himself repeats the story from Josephus, how one Jesus, the son of Ananias, at the feast of tabernacles four years before the war, cried out incessantly, 'A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the temple, a voice against bridegrooms and brides, a voice against all people.'[1] No amount of floggings appeared to be able to silence the man, and he continued his woes against Jerusalem till his death seven years later.[2] In a charismatic community, such as the Jerusalem church would still have been at this period, there is no need to regard prophets as expositors of eschatological texts; if a Jew like Jesus, son of Ananias, could be so convinced of the impending end of Jerusalem, a group of Christian prophets could easily arrive at the same conviction under the inspiration of the Spirit.

The connection of Mk. 13 with the oracle of Eusebius was first suggested with the discreditable intention of demonstrating the late appearance of the discourse. While it remains an interesting, if

[1] Op. cit., Book 3, Ch. 8.
[2] Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, 6, 5, 3.

remote, possibility that the oracle echoes the discourse, in the absence of further evidence it is better to presume no connection between the two prophecies.[1]

10. The Date of the Eschatological Discourse

After our résumé of critical opinion on the origin of Mk. 13, it will be no surprise to learn that the time of its genesis has been set in *every* decade of the first century except the opening one. Robert Eisler reckoned with the possibility that at least the abomination prophecy was inspired by Pilate's defilement of the temple area in A.D. 19, while it was fairly certainly used again in the Caligula episode of A.D. 40.[2] Torrey places the composition of the entire discourse 'very shortly after the death of the Messiah', whether prior to A.D. 30 or just after that year he does not make plain.[3] T. W. Manson sets the Lucan version in the fourth decade, the Marcan after A.D. 40.[4] Hölscher[5] and Piganiol[6] date the Little Apocalypse precisely in the year 40, during the period of anxiety over Caligula's threat. A time subsequent to A.D. 40 but prior to A.D. 70 is favoured by many, e.g. Burkitt,[7] Streeter,[8] Schmiedel.[9] 'Probably in the fifties' is Eduard Meyer's verdict,[10] while C. H. Dodd selects the year A.D. 60 or thereabouts.[11] The orthodox critical view regards the era of the Jewish war as the most probable date for the Little Apocalypse: Colani put it just before the war,[12] Vincent Taylor 67–69,[13] Menzies a few months before the fall of Jerusalem,[14] Knopf, Lietzmann and Weinel *about* the year 70,[15] von Soden,[16] Wernle,[17] and Jülicher[18] shortly after A.D. 70. Bacon decided for the late eighties,[19] N. Schmidt after Domitian's death.[20] Baur thought the Bar-Cochba revolt was in view in Mt. 24 and accordingly dated it *c.* 130–134,[21] while Arnold Meyer placed it *c.* A.D. 170.[22] This is by no means an exhaustive list, but merely

[1] So Keim, *The History of Jesus of Nazara*, vol. 5, p. 239; Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, p. 428; Busch, *Verständnis*, p. 128.
[2] *Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, p. 317.
[3] *Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 17.
[4] *Mission and Message of Jesus*, pp. 617, 629.
[5] *Theol. Blätter*, 1933, pp. 193 ff.
[6] *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, 1924, pp. 245 ff.
[7] *Jesus Christ*, p. 40.
[8] *Four Gospels*, p. 493.
[9] *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 2, col. 1857.
[10] *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. 1, p. 130.
[11] *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 52, n. 1.
[12] *Jesus Christ*, pp. 208–209.
[13] *Behind the Third Gospel*, pp. 123–124.
[14] *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 237.
[15] *Einführung*, p. 121.
[16] *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*, p. 83.
[17] *Sources of our Knowledge*, pp. 106–107.
[18] *Einleitung*, p. 199.
[19] *Gospel of Mark*, p. 325.
[20] *Prophet of Nazareth*, p. 230 ff.
[21] *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 609.
[22] *Jesu Muttersprache*, p. 100.

representative of the attempts that have been made to settle this elusive problem. Understandably enough, some critics have protested against the whole process whereby these conjectures have been arrived at, and have suggested that there is no means of knowing when the discourse was composed.[1]

Within limits we have sympathy with the last-named critics. We know the circumstances of *the delivery* of Jesus' original prophecy but there are no certain means of fixing a date for *the publication* of the discourse, unless we suppose that part of it is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, and that is questionable. There are, however, external indications of the *terminus ad quem* for the discourse. (i) Its independent use by the first three Evangelists shows it to be prior to the publication of them all; if the traditional date of Mark be correct, viz. A.D. 65–67, the discourse must have been circulating by that time. (ii) Its apparent employment by Paul when writing his letters to the Thessalonian church will bring the date to a period before A.D. 50, for those letters were probably written in the early part of that year. (iii) If it could be demonstrated that the masculine participle ἑστηκότα of Mk. 13. 14 was the product of a deliberate change from a neuter ἑστός (Mt. 24. 15), in the light of Caligula's threat, the discourse will probably have been in circulation prior to A.D. 40; but it must be admitted that neither the premiss nor the conclusion is sure, for the alteration could have taken place in the light of an anticipation for the future. It is more than possible that the words ἑστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ are a later addition to the original saying; they *could* have arisen through the events of A.D. 40, but they could as well be due to revision in the light of the text of Daniel.

It is disappointing to be compelled to acknowledge that we cannot know the date when the discourse first began to circulate. Admittedly, all the circumstances required to encourage the compilation and issue of the discourse were present before the first decade of the Church's existence had passed: persecution was common, the political situation was unsettled, and even electric by the year A.D. 39, and the Church's expectation of the coming of Christ was never brighter. It is a plausible suggestion that the discourse circulated widely during the terrible days of suspense aroused by Caligula; never would Christians more wish to know

[1] So Harnack, although he thinks pre-A.D. 70 necessary, *The Date of the Acts and Synoptic Gospels*, p. 126; Busch, *Verständnis*, p. 62; Hoskyns and Davey, *Riddle of the New Testament*, p. 245; Michaelis, *Einleitung*, p. 54.

what Jesus had taught of the End than in that epoch, but it has left no sure mark on the discourse. Nevertheless, if it was well known by the time Paul wrote his earliest letter, there is justification for the affirmation of Piganiol, even if we cannot be so precise as he in our dating: '*It should be considered the most ancient document of Christianity.*' With that we should be content.

11. The Language and Form of Mark 13

The Semitic character of the language of Mk. 13 has been noticed by many expositors. It has been opposed by some, notably Stanton, Glasson and Hunter, on the ground that many citations from the Septuagint are to be traced in the discourse. Stanton was cautious in his statements: 'It may *possibly* have been composed in Greek. The correspondences between some of its phrases and the LXX are more easily explicable if it was not a translation from Aramaic.'[1] He drew attention to Mk. 13. 14, 19, 24, 25, 27, especially the last verse. Glasson added to Mk. 13. 24–27, Lk. 21. 24. We must consider these in order.

The phrase *τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως* in v. 14 certainly echoes Dan. 9. 27, 11. 31, as Stanton says. It is doubtful, however, that *τῆς ἐρημώσεως* is authentic; if the original phrase was *τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος* there is no possibility of a citation from the LXX here (see Note 3 in the Appendix for the evidence).

Verse 19 employs the language of Dan. 12. 1. In the LXX this is rendered *ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα θλίψεως, οἵα οὐκ ἐγενήθη ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθησαν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης*. The diction of Mk. 13. 19, however, is closer to the translation of Theodotion (second century A.D.): *καὶ ἔσται καιρὸς θλίψεως, θλῖψις οἵα οὐ γέγονεν ἀφ' ἧς γεγένηται ἔθνος ἐν τῇ γῇ ἕως τοῦ καιροῦ ἐκείνου*. The rendering in 13. 19 could quite well be due to an independent use of the Hebrew text:

וְהָיְתָה עֵת צָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִהְיְתָה מֵהִוּת גּוֹי עַד הָעֵת הַהִיא

Verses 24 and 25 cite various passages in the prophets, the closest to Mk. being Is. 13. 10: LXX *σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς*. Again it is clear that the LXX and Mk. 13. 24 independently reproduce the Hebrew: חָשַׁךְ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ בְּצֵאתוֹ וְיָרֵחַ לֹא־יַגִּיהַ אוֹרוֹ . Stanton is mystifying in asserting that in v. 25 *πίπτοντες* agrees with LXX and

[1] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Part II, p. 120.

not the Hebrew of Is. 34. 4: LXX, *καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται ὡς φύλλα ἐξ ἀμπέλου*, Heb. וְכָל־צְבָאָם יִבּוֹל׃ In Mk. 25 the periphrastic *ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες* may well reflect an Aramaic rendering (so Lagrange). Whether the last phrase in the verse *καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται* reflects the first clause of Is. 34. 4 cannot be known with certainty: if it does, it is independent of the LXX, which renders וְנָמַקּוּ (=moulder away) by *τακήσονται*; similarly in other places which speak of the shaking of the heavens, such as Joel 2. 10, Hag. 2. 6, 21, LXX uses the term *σείω*, not *σαλεύω*. The case for the influence of the LXX in these two verses is decidedly weak.

The idea, as well as language, of 13. 27, *ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς* . . . is said to be due to the LXX of Zech. 2. 6, for the Heb. (2. 10: כִּי כְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם פֵּרַשְׂתִּי אֶתְכֶם) refers to the *scattering*, not *gathering* of Israel. Nevertheless, Kittel recommends that the LXX text be adopted instead of the M.T.; he substitutes מֵאַרְבַּע for כְּאַרְבַּע, and אָסַפְתִּי for פֵּרַשְׂתִּי. That could as well imply that the author of Mk. 13. 27 employed a pre-Massoretic text of Zech. 2. 6 as that he used the LXX; in view of the lack of proof of any use of the LXX in the previous citations, the former alternative is to be preferred. Thus *every instance of the alleged dependence of Mk. 13 upon the LXX has proved to be quite unlikely* apart from v. 14, which we have yet to examine.

The one exception to this judgment in respect of the discourse may perhaps be seen in Lk. 21. 24, *Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν*. Zech. 12. 3 LXX reads, *θήσομαι τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴμ λίθον καταπατούμενον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, which seems to misunderstand the idea of אֶבֶן מַעֲמָסָה, 'a stone carried as a load'. On the other hand, the connection with Zech. 12. 3 may be purely accidental, for *ἔσται πατουμένη* is a periphrastic future. The idea of Lk. 21. 24 is that of Dan. 8. 13–14: LXX, *τὰ ἅγια ἐρημωθήσεται εἰς καταπάτημα*, for which *θ* reads *συνπατηθήσεται* (cf. also Dan. 12. 7, and especially Ps. Sol. 17. 25, *καθάρισον Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν καταπατούντων ἐν ἀπωλείᾳ*). It must be admitted that the case is doubtful, but since the idea of Lk. 21. 24 is akin to that of the central prophecy of the discourse, as well as its starting point, the LXX of Zech. 12. 3 can scarcely be pressed.

Over against these uncertainties, the positive indications of Semitic influence in the discourse are striking. On account of their

number Hölscher believed the 'Little Apocalypse' to be a Greek translation of a Hebrew original, 'manifestly composed in rhythmical lines'.[1] H. J. Schonfield agrees with this view, and observes that the employment of Hebrew will have given added authority to the Apocalypse; he extends the limits of the Little Apocalypse to cover almost all Mt. 24. 4–42.[2] The notion of a Hebrew original is bound up with the belief that the core of the discourse from the beginning was a written document, and that Hebrew was adopted as the language of the Scriptures. If we presume the discourse to have been spoken before it was written, it will be more natural to assume an Aramaic original for it, the syntax of the two languages being closely similar. Such is the belief of most who recognise the Semitic background of Mk. 13.

Dr. Matthew Black notes that asyndeton, which is highly characteristic of Aramaic, is frequent in the Marcan sayings of Jesus, and in the discourse occurs in vv. 6, 7, twice in 8, 9, 15, 17. As it appears *four* times in the seven connected sentences of 6–9, he feels justified in looking on the paragraph as an instance of translation Greek.[3] In connection with v. 8, Charles viewed the occurrence of θάνατος in Rev. 6. 8 as the translation of the term מוֹתָא , which John read in the Aramaic 'Little Apocalypse' that lay before him: he adds, 'If he had the Little Apocalypse in Aramaic, we should have the explanation of this and other difficulties.'[4] Burney further notes the parallelism in this same verse.[5]

We have seen that Black regards v. 9 as a piece of translation Greek. Burney maintained that the whole paragraph, 9–13, with the exception of v. 10, reveals the Kina rhythm characteristic of Hebrew poetry. He further suggested that the εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς of v. 9 is a relic of another couplet, balancing that which precedes it in this verse; this opens possibilities for conjecture as to what relation the present v. 10 may stand to that 'lost' couplet. Verse 11 yields clear proof of an Aramaic background: the *casus pendens*, ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε, though not specifically a Semitism, is much more frequent in Hebrew and Aramaic than in Hellenistic Greek. Black also observes that in the Q version of the saying (Lk. 12. 12) ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ occurs as ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, which is a translation equivalent of

[1] Op. cit., p. 197.
[2] *Saints against Caesar*, pp. 123–125.
[3] *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, p. 42.
[4] *Revelation*, vol. 1, p. lxvi, n. 1.
[5] *The Poetry of Our Lord*, p. 118.

two similar Aramaic conjunctions, בהּ־שעתא 'in that moment, immediately' (in the Old Syriac = Mark's *εὐθύς*), and בהדיא שעתא, 'at that moment, then, thereupon'. It is thus fairly certain that v. 11 comes from an Aramaic original.[1]

A more Jewish piece of writing could scarcely be imagined than v. 14, with its Biblical terms and concepts; yet there is no Semitism in its grammatical construction, a fact which shows the limitations of this kind of discussion. Rather unexpectedly, 15–16 yield several indications of Semitic background: Vincent Taylor supports Lagrange's suggestion that the *μηδὲ* of v. 15 is the equivalent of *καὶ* in a consecutive sense, thus giving a Semitic flavour to the sentence; the parallelism should also be noted, and the asyndeton at the beginning of 15 if, with B, etc., the particle *δὲ* be omitted.[2] In D's text of v. 17 there is asyndeton, preserved in the Lucan parallel, 21. 23. Verses 19–20 have an unusual number of Semitisms: the tautology in *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἣν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός* is Semitic; *οὐ . . . πᾶσα σάρξ* is doubly a Semitism, *πᾶσα σάρξ* means 'all men', *οὐ . . . πᾶσα* means 'nobody'; *κύριος* without the article occurs only thus in Old Testament quotations; the tenses are in the past; *ἐκλεκτούς* presumes a Jewish background. Lohmeyer thought that the section was translated immediately from an Aramaic source,[3] a noteworthy view if we recall Bacon's endeavours to prove that v. 20 was dependent on Rom. 9. 28.

Verses 24–27 draw together various Old Testament citations, in which Lagrange singles out *ἔσονται . . . πίπτοντες* of 25 as an Aramaism; *ὄψονται* in v. 26 is regarded by Black as an impersonal plural, frequent in sayings of Jesus and employed in Aramaic instead of the passive voice. Burney also points to the existence of an (imperfect) parallelism in the paragraph. Verse 33 is very abrupt, 34 also has asyndeton, and its *καὶ* before *ἐνετείλατο* similarly suggests Semitic background here.

It will have been noticed that in the foregoing sketch considerable portions of each section of the discourse are included; 28–32 alone has not been represented, but that happens to be the least questionable part of the whole.

It is a point of interest to determine to what extent poetic form is present in the discourse. The judgment of linguists is apt to vary considerably; e.g. Burney singles out 9–13 alone as clearly poetic,

[1] So Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 508.
[2] See Vincent Taylor, op. cit., *in loco*.
[3] *Das Evangelium des Markus, in loco*; see also Lagrange, *Évangile selon S. Marc*, and V. Taylor.

and vv. 8, 24–27 as possessing parallelism and imperfect rhythm: 'the remainder is unmarked by the characteristics of Hebrew poetry.'[1] Hölscher affirmed that the whole 'Little Apocalypse' (vv. 7–8, 12, 14–20, 24–27) was originally cast into poetic form. Lohmeyer went all the way and declared that the entire discourse, from v. 5 to the end, was poetic; very attractively he set out the discourse in a series of stanzas. Admittedly it is not precise poetry, such as we associate with the term, but our suspicions would be roused if it were so. For this reason it is a questionable practice to excise with Burney an introductory clause like *βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς* in v. 9, on the ground that it does not fall into the parallelism of the following statement. If this is a spoken address, it is quite comprehensible that there should be breaks in the rhythm, for we presume that Jesus did not consistently talk in Kina. We may compare Paul's ability to use rhythmic periods in his speech, such as we see in I Cor. 13, but he does not maintain it with any regularity; in particular I Cor. 15. 42–49 presents a good example of two rhythmic sentences broken by a prose sentence (see Moffatt's translation, in which the poetic structure is shown).

These many indications of Aramaic origin in the discourse, and its quasi-poetic structure, materially affect our view of its reliability as a report of utterances of our Lord. Dr. Taylor rightly maintains that the presence of Aramaisms does not automatically authenticate the individual sayings of the discourse; it would be consistent with the Jewish milieu in which the presumed apocalyptic basis arose.[2] If, however, on other grounds the unity of these sayings with the genuine dicta of Jesus has been shown, the Aramaic background of the discourse will confirm our belief that the discourse is authentic.

[1] Op. cit., p. 118. [2] Op. cit., p. 638.

APPENDIX

The Authenticity and Scope of the Temple Prophecy, Mark 13. 2

This prophecy has often been regarded as a 'lifeless' version of the more 'brilliant' oracle, Mk. 14. 58, that was never fulfilled (Loisy: so also Colani, Wellhausen, Dodd). The Church is said to have been embarrassed by the original saying, which appeared to represent Jesus as the destroyer of the temple. This view can only be maintained on the ground of a confusion of traditions regarding the resurrection and parousia of Jesus, for the 'three days' belong consistently to the former; the latter and the judgments associated with it are removed to the more distant part of 'this generation'. This logion stands on its own feet. It is linked with other predictions of the judgment on the city, and is limited to the fate of the temple by the occasion of its utterance. The positive element in 14. 58, corresponding to the expectation that the Messiah would build a new temple, may be assumed in this passage; it is related to the former, 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 (cf. Rev. 21. 9–22. 5).

An attempt has been made by D to express the neglected positive element here by inserting *καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν*. If *ἄλλος* is made to refer to an antecedent in this sentence, instead of the *ναός* of Mk. 14. 58, it would have to relate to *λίθος*; cf. Dan. 2. 34, where it applies to the smiting stone which becomes a great mountain, i.e. the kingdom of God. Despite this remarkable coincidence, the known character of D hardly allows us to regard this addition as authentic; it will have to be regarded as due to the influence of Mk. 14. 58, Jn. 2. 19.

καταλυθῇ is needlessly pressed by Lohmeyer to signify the destruction of each individual stone; 'thrown down, demolished' adequately translates the term. But did this happen to the temple?

The curious assertion, first made by Weiffenbach for apologetic reasons (to demonstrate that it is not a *vaticinium ex eventu*), and repeated through the years, is still maintained, and that for the same reason, by V. Taylor (*Mark, in loco*): viz. that the prediction was not literally fulfilled, for the temple was burned down by fire. Josephus certainly describes how the Roman soldiers, beyond control by this time, fired the temple, despite the efforts of Titus to prevent them (*Wars of the Jews*, 6. 4, 5–7). Dr. Taylor cites Josephus as describing the subsequent desolation of the *city*, in such fashion that none would imagine it had been inhabited; but Josephus in this passage speaks explicitly of the *temple* also: 'As soon as the army had no more people to slay or to 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. . . .' (op. cit. 7. 1. 1). Thus the temple was both burned with fire and demolished so as to be utterly ruined. It is uncertain whether even the foundations that remain at the present time belonged to Herod's temple or to another period (see Lagrange *in loco*). While it is true that a writer composing a prophecy after the event would presumably mention the fire also, no exception can be taken to the language of Mk. 13. 2, which was fulfilled with fearful exactness.

Preaching before Judges and Gentiles: a Reconstruction of Mark 13. 9–10

The provenance of the passage is disputed. Apart from the view that it is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, Lohmeyer considers that it 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. Without denying that the language is applicable to such situations, it is even more suitable to Palestinian conditions. Josephus describes Jewish judicial practice: in *every* city seven men are to be appointed to judge, 'men such as have been most zealous in the exercise of virtue and righteousness. . . . But if these judges be unable to give a just sentence about the causes that come before them, let them send the causes undetermined to the holy city, and there let the high priest, the prophet, and the sanhedrin, determine as it shall seem good to them' (*Ant.* 4. 8. 14). ἡγεμόνες καὶ βασιλεῖς is a quite general expression, but it may

be noted that *ἡγεμών* is used of the Procurator of Judea in Mt. 27. 2, Acts 23. 24, and Mark himself earlier described Herod Antipas as *βασιλεύς* (6. 14). Schniewind further 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 in lively fashion with conflicts between the highest powers of the state and the 'pious'. Accordingly, opinion is now largely for admitting the Palestinian provenance of this passage.

Luke's *ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον* (21. 13) presumes an original *εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν*, instead of Mark's *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*; the difference of prepositions in Aramaic would be very slight and the meaning will not vary much, since the testimony is in any case borne by the disciples. Mt.'s *καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* after Mk.'s *αὐτοῖς* is more difficult. It perhaps represents Mk.'s *καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, v. 10. Burkitt favoured the extensive textual tradition which continues v. 9 into v. 10, puts a stop after *ἔθνη* and inserts *δὲ* after *πρῶτον* thus: *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.* (The stop is placed after *ἔθνη* in W.*θ*. 124, 108, 127, 131, 157, c d ff. g^2i r vg. (lms) Syr. s. Cop. bo. (pler) Geo. Arm. *δέ* is added in W.*θ*. 108, 124, 127, 131, 565, b c d ff. g^2 i r^1 vg. (1 ms.) Syr. pesh. Cop.^{sah}. Geo. *enim* is read in k Syr. sin. Geo.^{2}) The difficulty about this reading is that it completely destroys the poetic structure of the passage; on this ground Burney and Lohmeyer reject the saying, at least in its present form and in this context.

It will be recalled that Burney thought that Mt.'s *καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* represents a 'relic' of a further couplet after *ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ*. One wonders if the original saying resembled the following version:

παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια,
καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε,
καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε
ἕνεκεν [τοῦ ὀνόματός] μου.

εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν [γενήσεται,]
καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν [μαρτυρηθήσεται.]
πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
[πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν] τὸ τέλος.

The chief merit of this reconstruction is that it incorporates almost all Mk.'s version, modifying it only in one particular from Mt. 10. 18, and it embodies all that seems valuable in each tradition,

including Mt. 24. 14. The poetic form has been consistently maintained. It will be noticed that we have diverged from Burney by putting σταθήσεσθε in the third line of the first stanza, instead of the fourth line, and have adopted Mt.'s ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου instead of Mk.'s ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ. If the principle of *difficilior lectio potior* may be employed in a comparison of Gospel traditions, as well as in textual criticism, Lk.'s εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν claims priority over Mark, even if his ἀποβήσεται may be viewed as too literary. It has long been felt that Mt.'s καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν is a fragment of something larger, and that it implies a ministry of some kind to Gentiles (so McNeile); the difficulty has been to suggest something not too explicit and yet in keeping with the context; the simple addition suggested above appears to fit the requirements. The relative independence of πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον will account for the witness of the textual authorities above mentioned, although we reject the δὲ of W.θ., etc., as suspiciously like an example of dittography (cf. δεῖ), or as an insertion due to the fragmentary state of the text; contrary to Burkitt's judgment, the context as reproduced above will demand that the κηρυχθῆναι include preaching beyond Israel's borders as well as within them (see *Christian Beginnings*, pp. 145 f.). πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὸ τέλος has the idea, but not the precision, of Mt. 24. 14*b*, and it makes clear the eschatological significance of the Gospel proclamation. By retaining the connection of preaching to the Gentiles with testimony to persecutors the train of thought is not unduly broken; it becomes a natural development of the μαρτύριον given to Gentile rulers (ἡγεμόνες). The terms are purely general, precise statement is avoided. The supreme necessity of making known the Gospel is a natural thought for the Redeemer about to die for the world, in accordance with the Fourth Song of Deutero-Isaiah (Is. 52. 13–53. 12). If the saying in some respects digresses from v. 9, and the main thought is again taken up in v. 11, it is nevertheless a plausible digression and is rooted in the earlier statement.

The fragmentary nature of the entire chapter is illustrated in this saying: its importance caused it to be constantly cited apart from its context, so that it now survives in varied forms, from which the original can only be conjectured; yet despite this uncertainty the main idea is unmistakable.

We may finally note that the parallel saying to Mk. 13. 9 in Mt. 24. 9 begins with an obvious generalisation of the original saying, παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλῖψιν, and briefly summarises Mk. 13. 12

with *καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς*, concluding with Mk.'s v. 13*a*. *καὶ ἐσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων*. Mt. 24. 10–12 are perhaps derived from a different tradition of the discourse. Mt. 24. 13 repeats Mk.'s 13*b*, *ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται*.

The Abomination of Desolation: a Reconstruction of Mark 13. 14

Since the interpretation of this verse depends on the establishment of the true text, we must first endeavour to recover its original form.

The traditions in Mt. and Mk. have undoubtedly reacted upon each other. The addition in the Koine text of Mk., *τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου*, is manifestly due to assimilation to Mt.'s text. But Mt.'s has also suffered in like manner: *ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ* is omitted in Mt. by Syr. sin., supported by a cursive of fam. 1424; Merx and Streeter, independently of each other, suggested that the omission is correct (for the latter, see *F.G.*, pp. 519 f.). Still more important, it would seem that in Mt. 24. 15 the Greek text behind Syr. sin. did not read *ἐρημώσεως* after *βδέλυγμα*, but read *ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος*; this reading is presumed in the Syriac tradition generally, including the Arabic Tatian and Ephraem (so Burkitt, with hesitation, in *Evangelion da Mepharreshe*, and Merx). A large number of scholars recognise that *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω* is an addition to the original logion, whether due to the Evangelist or to an early copyist. More speculatively, *οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν* has perhaps displaced an original *φεύγετε* (Lohmeyer); the present text may be due to its repetition in quarters outside Palestine (Hauck), with perhaps an impetus towards the third person from v. 15. Finally, in place of *τὰ ὄρη*, d i read *montem*, as also Sin. syr., and pesh. (ܛܘܪܐ).

Tentatively the original text may be construed as:

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

With the text thus shorn of its interpretative additions, it will be at once perceived that there is no necessity to identify the *βδέλυγμα* with the שִׁקּוּץ שֹׁמֵם of Daniel. שִׁקּוּץ is a detestable thing, notably an idol (the Danielic phrase probably referred to an altar and image of Zeus, erected on the Jewish altar in the temple, hence the frequent modern identification of the *βδέλυγμα* here with Caligula's image, expected to be placed in the temple). The Sinaitic addition of *σημεῖον* (ܐܬܐ) opens up fresh possibilities, for *σημεῖον* translates also נֵס a standard or ensign; it is frequent in Josephus for *the*

Roman standards to which images of the emperor were affixed. Curiously, the incidents in which the offensiveness of these ensigns to the Jews is plainest both occur in the period with which we are concerned, one when Jesus was a young man, the other a few years after his death. When Pilate introduced Roman ensigns into Jerusalem, Jews came to him at Caesarea in multitudes to ask for their removal. On his initial refusal they came to him day after day with the same request. In his exasperation, Pilate on the sixth day surrounded the Jews concerned with soldiers, and threatened them with immediate death if they did not depart; whereupon they lay on the ground and bared their necks. He was forced to order the standards to be removed (Jos., *Ant.*, 8. 3. 1). A pleasanter incident occurred after Pilate's dismissal by the legate Vitellius. The latter was about to join battle with the Arabian Aretas and marched his men from Ptolemais through Judean territory. Jewish leaders met him with the request that he should not bring the army through their land, 'for that the laws of their country would not permit them to overlook those images which were brought into it, of which there were a great many in their ensigns; so he was persuaded by what they said, and changed that resolution of his, which he had before taken in this matter. Whereupon he ordered the army to march along the great plain, while he himself, with Herod the tetrarch, and his friends, went up to Jerusalem to offer sacrifice to God. . . '. (Jos., *Ant.*, 18. 5. 3). The latter incident is of importance, for Vitellius was marching his men through Judea, with no intention of approaching Jerusalem; the Jews could not bear the ensigns even in their land. It is clear that the belief that Roman ensigns were a common sight to Jews is mistaken; while they were associated with Caesar's images, their presence in Judea was intolerable.

Accordingly, if a time was to come when the notorious σημεῖον with its שִׁקּוּץ approached Jerusalem, it could only be with hostile intent; and in answer to the question of v. 4, it would signify the Roman armies marching on Jerusalem for battle, for an encounter that would result in the overthrow of Jerusalem and its temple. φεύγετε εἰς τὸ ὄρος said Jesus. There is no need to invoke mythology or history, whether of the Maccabees or of the subsequent Church at Pella, to explain this. In Neh. 8. 15 it is said that proclamation must be made in all their cities and in Jerusalem saying, *Go forth into the mount* (LXX 2 Esd. 18.15, ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸ ὄρος). From the occurrence of ἡ ὀρεινή with a similar meaning in

Lk. 1. 39 and the Protevangelium of James, Dalman concluded that the district of Jerusalem was called simply ἡ ὀρεινή (as Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, v. 14, 70; see Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways*, pp. 52 f.). Jesus then told the disciples to flee from the doomed city *into the surrounding country*.

In the above interpretation of τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ βδελύγματος we have taken βδελύγματος as a genitive of definition, the idolatrous ensign. It would be equally possible to regard it as a genitive of apposition, the sign which is the detestable thing, in which case σημεῖον = אוֹת (Aram. אָתָא), a sign of the end. The detestable thing could still be associated with the ensigns of the Roman army. It is also possible that its significance is intended to be wider and denote the Roman power generally; so Vincent Taylor, who compares the application of the name 'Babylon' to Rome in an apocalyptic sense (I Pt. 5. 13, Rev. 18. 2 ff.).

Only in the last-named sense could we justly read into this statement the common doctrine of Antichrist. It is easy to see how that doctrine could be made to harmonise with it, and how natural it was to make more explicit what Jesus had left unexpressed; hence the elaborations of the text into its present condition and the development in II Thess. 2. It is almost impossible to believe that the present text has been reduced to its proportions in the Syriac tradition, while it is quite comprehensible that expansion should have taken place.

Against the view that the βδέλυγμα originally meant a statue or an individual Antichrist is the urgency of the command to flight: how will it be everywhere seen (in Judea) that a statue has been placed in the temple or a man has there taken his seat? The suddenness and notoriety of the event is sharply emphasised in the succeeding verses. Lohmeyer presumes that Antichrist is thought of as assuming his power in an appearance of light, but this is an unsupported conjecture. The advance of an army through the country would necessitate the kind of haste envisaged in this context and would become speedily known.

If the text be read as in the common tradition, the activity of an individual Antichrist, at the head of an army, *may* be in view, but it is not certain. Even the masculine participle ἑστηκότα cannot be pressed, in view of the similar phenomenon in Mk. 6. 29, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ . . . ἦραν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ (so ℵ. W.). J. Weiss thought it wrong to ask how Mk. interpreted the oracle. Schlatter expressed a similar sentiment; noting the fitness of the language, both for a Roman army with its heathen insignia and a destructive Antichrist, he observed: 'We dare not define more closely

such a word of prophecy. A prophecy has its limits and cannot say everything; we must not extend it ourselves. It was sufficient for Jesus to say to the disciples that the sanctuary, 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' (Matthäus).

Similarly the much-abused exhortation *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω* does not require a knowledge of apocalyptic lore for its appreciation. Since there is no mention of Daniel in Mk., we should not presume a reference here to the interpretation of the prophecies of that book. The simplest meaning of the advice will be a request to look beneath the surface, for more is said than what appears (so Turner).

It will be obvious that Lk. 21. 20, on our view, must be regarded as an interpretation of the more original version of the saying contained in Mt. and Mk.; nevertheless, it is not a misleading exposition, and for the Gentile reader perhaps it was needful.

THE PAROUSIA AND SIGN OF THE SON OF MAN, MARK 13. 26

In the Old Testament God's 'coming' to earth is always with clouds, whether as a vehicle for executing judgment (Is. 19. 1) and redemption (Ps. 18. 12), or for manifesting his glory (Ex. 34. 5, etc.), and yet veiling it (Ps. 18. 11, Hab. 3. 4). The clouds with which the 'one like unto a son of man' comes to the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7. 13) will have been thought of chiefly as a vehicle, although they also hint of his heavenly origin; the deepening of the Son of Man concept in our Lord's teaching will correspondingly demand that the wider associations of the Old Testament theophanies be included in this passage. The clouds unveil the hitherto hidden glory of the Son of Man; he is now seen to be the eternal Son of God, sharing in the majesty of God, coming for the redemption of his people.

Dalman, seeing the implications of divine majesty in a coming *upon* (*ἐπί*) clouds, thought that the (עִם = *ἐν*) of Dan. 7. 13 had been altered by a scrupulous scribe from an original עַל (LXX tr. by *ἐπί*), for only God travels *upon* the clouds; Mk.'s *ἐν* = עִם (*W.J.*, p. 241). In this he is followed by Oesterley, who believed that Jesus deliberately refrained from employing the term *ἐπί* = עַל for the same reason (*Last Things*, p. 148). The distinction is extremely doubtful, for in the Pentateuch it is frequently said that God descends *ἐν νεφέλῃ* (= בֶּעָנָן, 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 (so Lagrange). *μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς κ. δόξης* could be translated as '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, is where the end 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, p. 14).

The authenticity of this verse has been questioned of late, on the ground that Dan. 7. 13 describes an *ascension* of the 'one like a son of man' to God, and that Jesus would have preserved its original meaning (as it is alleged to be in Mk. 14. 62; so Glasson, *Second Advent*, pp. 64 ff. The idea is not new. It is in Colani, *Jesus Christ*, p. 20; Holsten, *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theologie*, 1891, p. 62, cited by Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch N.T. Theologie*, p. 311, n. 1; Appel, *Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu*, pp. 40 ff., cited by Dalman, *W.J.*, p. 241; Wellhausen, who got it from Smend, *Einleitung in d. drei Evan.*, p. 86; Lagrange, on Mk. 14.62; Haupt, *Esch. Aussag.*, p. 115, who, however, thinks that Jesus changed the meaning so as to represent a parousia. Duncan, without referring to Dan. 7. 13, thinks Jesus meant by it an Ascent, *Jesus, Son of Man*, pp. 176–181). The interpretation is highly improbable, for (i) no change of scene is suggested in Dan. 7. 9, the earth 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) it is distinctly stated in Dan. 7. 22 that *the Ancient of Days came*, i.e. to earth; the Son of Man comes to him there to receive the kingdom *on earth* (so Dalman, *W.J.*, p. 241, n. 2; Rowley, *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed., p. 30, n. 1). Our Lord would have had no other thought in view than a parousia for the humanity of earth.

Mt.'s version, apart from its citation of Zech. 12. 10 f. (which may be imported from Rev. 1. 7, see pp. 229 f.), alludes to the 'sign of the Son of Man'. *φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ*. It is doubtful whether we should be rid of this by conjecturing a confusion of אֹת with אוֹת (so Charles, who suggested the original reading to have been יֵרָאֶה אֹת־בְּנֵי־הָאָדָם, *Crit. Hist.*, p. 383, n. 4). The reference is probably 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 συνάξει τοὺς ἀπολομένους Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τοὺς διεσπαρμένους Ἰούδα*: this thought is doubtless continued in the mention of the 'trumpet' in Mt. 24. 31 (cf. Is. 27. 13). If our interpretation of Mk. 13. 14 be right, the mention of the *σημεῖον* here is exceedingly appropriate: in response to the question of the disciples, 'When shall this be? And what shall be its sign?', Jesus gives two 'signs': the *σημεῖον*, ensign, of the invading army will signalise the destruction of the city; the *σημεῖον*, ensign, of the Son of Man will herald the

redemption of his own people. The σημεῖον of the Son of Man will most probably signify the Shekinah glory with which he comes, a fitting counterpart to the impious שָׁקוּץ on the σημεῖον of the Romans.[1]

This Generation and the End, Mark 13. 30

The two contested items in this saying are the meaning of ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη and the reference of ταῦτα πάντα.

Most possible interpretations of γενεά seem to have been advocated in the history of the Church, and almost all of them are still represented. Among those who deny the meaning of 'contemporary generation' here, the favourite alternatives are that ἡ γενεά = *the Jews* (Knabenbauer, Rengstorf) or *kind, species* (Michaelis, *Der Herr verzieht nicht*, p. 31; Schniewind). To Rengstorf this is a word of hope, for the Jews will not perish, despite their sin; they will survive to the last day; the saying is thus to be placed alongside Mt. 23. 39 (so Schniewind). Busch appears to derive the opposite mood from the text in holding that it = kind: the Messianic kingdom will not break in *after* a restoration of the Jewish people, nor will they perish by the way; they will persist in their unbelief to the very end (*Verständnis*, pp. 133 ff.).

Against these views it will suffice for most scholars to consult once more the passages in which the phrase ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη occurs on the lips of Jesus. Apart from parallels they are Mt. 11. 16, 12. 41, 42, 45, 23. 36, Mk. 8. 12, 38, Lk. 17. 25. In every case it does not seem doubtful that the meaning is *the contemporaries of Jesus*. If dogmatic considerations were not at stake, that conclusion would not be questioned, but Biblical exegesis must control Biblical theology, not vice versa. The close parallel to this verse in Mt. 23. 36 for most will remove doubts as to the meaning of γενεά here; it signifies the Jews living in the same age as Jesus.

Most recent scholars concur with this view. But Lagrange, Zahn, Wohlenberg, Plummer, and others, while admitting that ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη = the contemporary generation, limit the reference of ταῦτα πάντα to the fall of Jerusalem, whether that be considered

[1] It is tempting to concur with those expositors who identify the σημεῖον with the Christ himself—so Bengel, who compares Lk. 2. 12, Schniewind, who compares Lk. 11. 30, Bruce, Allen, Rengstorf. Still more pertinent to this view is Is. 11. 10: 'It shall come to pass in that day, that the root of Jesse, *which standeth for an ensign of the peoples* (לְנֵס עַמִּים), unto him shall the nations seek.' It is better, however, to offset one objective σημεῖον by another. Since the Shekinah is inseparable from the person of the Messiah, the view advocated above includes this alternative within itself.

as implied in vv. 5–13 (Zahn, Wohlenberg) or in 14–20 (as most). It is contended in support of this view that *ταῦτα πάντα* must have the same reference as *ταῦτα* in 29, which manifestly relates to signs only, not to the End described in 24–27 (Zahn, Michaelis, op. cit., pp. 30 ff.). This interpretation overlooks: (i) the eschatological nature of the fall of Jerusalem in the predictions of Jesus (vv. 2, 14–20); (ii) the unity of the process described in 5–23, which cannot be broken by assigning 5–13 to a period before or after 14–20; (iii) the fig tree parable teaches that the occurrence of the signs shows that the End is *near*, so that even if Jesus affirmed that only the signs would happen within a generation, he must have implied that the End would also be included in that period; (iv) Lk.'s version omits *ταῦτα* (21. 32); there is no possibility of limiting *πάντα* to a portion of the discourse in his case.

This saying, accordingly, takes its place with Mk. 9. 1, Mt. 10. 23, and the parables that urge the disciples to watchfulness.

The Unpredictability of the Parousia, Mark 13. 32

The primary significance of this saying seems to have been missed through the prolonged controversy over its Christological implications. The parable of the fig tree was intended to inspire encouragement by the thought that adversities declare the nearness of the End (28–29); the announcement of v. 30 further extended the ground of hope. That is now tempered by the sobering affirmation that the time of the End, including Jerusalem's desolation and the Lord's parousia, can be known by no man. The imperative duty of watchfulness is thereby implied. The emphasis of the saying falls on *οὐδεὶς οἶδεν*, not on *οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός*. The confession of Jesus of his ignorance not unnaturally has engaged the attention of theologians, but it is incidental to his purpose. He had no intention of defining the limits of his theological knowledge; rather he wished to underscore the impossibility of a man calculating the time of the End by adding that the angels do not know it, nor even the Son himself; that secret belongs to God alone. Whether 33 ff. rightly follow or not, only one conclusion can be drawn from this: *βλέπετε*!

So interpreted, this saying, often regarded as alien to its context, becomes livingly related to it. The parenetic interest, dominant throughout the discourse, is maintained, and the words fall naturally into the setting of the whole eschatological teaching of

Jesus. Their fundamental significance remains unchanged even if it be postulated, as by many, that v. 30 is misplaced, or that this saying is uttered in another context; it will still require to be related to the rest of our Lord's instruction, for it cannot be treated as though it is his only eschatological utterance. Such sayings as Mk. 9. 1, Mt. 10. 23, and the persistent exhortations to be prepared for the incidence of the End (as in the parables that follow) reveal a large measure of consistency; they are not determined by the mood of the moment, but, as Michaelis said, they 'must have proceeded from a quite clear fundamental attitude' (op. cit., p. 43). If, then, our Lord unwaveringly adopted a 'near-expectation' of the End, this logion cannot signify an unconditional ignorance as to the time of the End. It must denote a limitation in his otherwise assumed knowledge. He knows that the kingdom comes 'soon', but he cannot define the *καιρός* more closely. With this agrees his employment of the precise terms *ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα ἢ ἡ ὥρα*. In this context eschatological associations cannot but attach to them, but they do not constitute a natural way of expressing the Day of the Lord as such. *ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη* could represent it, or perhaps even *ἡ ὥρα* used absolutely; but in a nexus of this kind, with the conjunction *ἤ*, they seem to imply a tacit contrast with a more general knowledge assumed by Jesus.

Inasmuch as the Father's solitary knowledge of the time of the End is due to its determination by him (cf. Acts 1. 7), there is some justification for the view that this saying reflects our Lord's conscious submission to the Father's will in respect of his teaching on the nearness of the End. Admittedly, it is a latent, rather than explicit, conviction; but if it may be assumed as present to his thinking, it would mean that all such utterances as v. 30, Mk. 9. 1, Mt. 10. 23 are to that extent provisional. The intense faith in God which fostered the expectation of a speedy consummation would as readily accept the decision of God on that matter.

This interpretation both of the terms and purport of the saying seems to be strongly supported by Mt. 25. 13: *Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν*. Nevertheless, the attempt to reconcile vv. 30 and 32 is repudiated in strongest terms by some exegetes. To Beyschlag, such an interpretation of 'day or hour' is 'so insipid and so alien to the prophetic style' as to be inconceivable in the mind of Jesus (*N.T. Theol.*, vol. 1, p. 197). To Denney it is 'trivial, not to say grotesque' and practically incredible (*Jesus and Gospel*, p. 355). To Lagrange it reduces v. 32 to a confession that

Jesus knows nothing of any use. These expositors agree in relating v. 30 to the fall of Jerusalem and this verse to the End of the age. The expedient is valueless, however, as is shown in our comments on v. 30.

McNeile suggests that Jesus meant that he knew nothing concerning the *nature* of the Day of the Lord, rather than concerning its time. That is an impossible confession, in view of all that Jesus elsewhere spoke of that Day. He had much to say of its character and effects, as did the prophets. It is the *resulting conditions* on which he, as they, exercises reserve.

The one plausible alternative to the above exegesis seems to lie in regarding the saying as a virtual repudiation of all previous statements on the nearness of the End: so Goguel, who traces a development in our Lord's gradual shedding of eschatological ideas and believes this statement to imply a practical abandonment of eschatology (*Life of Jesus*, pp. 570 f.). Nevertheless, the ideas expressed in this discourse, quite apart from their setting, and Mk. 14. 25, 62 show this view to be untenable. If the saying is to be taken seriously, therefore, we must reject this alternative and interpret the words as an explicit limitation of knowledge elsewhere more generally stated.

The nature of our Lord's 'ignorance', and the struggles of th Church to come to terms with it, are adequately discussed in manuals on Christology. It can no longer be regarded as an assumed ignorance, or set down as something known to him, but outside the scope of his commission to reveal. It was a genuine limitation of his human consciousness, a matter not contained in the revelation of the Father to the Son (Swete aptly cites Jn. 8. 26, 15. 15).

The unique contrast in the terms ὁ υἱός and ὁ πατήρ has affronted many. Dalman (*W.J.*, p. 194) and J. Weiss (*Mk.*) regarded the two phrases as reflecting later Christian theology, interpolated into an originally Jewish saying; similarly Loisy (*Ev. Syn.*) and Bousset (*Kurios Christos*, p. 43 f.), who believed the motive to be Christian apologetic for the non-fulfilment of the parousia. Merx attributed them to the Monarchians (*Mt.*), Réville, like some Fathers, set them to the account of the Arians (*J.N.*, p. 312). A. T. Cadoux thought that the whole verse was a marginal comment on v. 33 (*Sources*, p. 226). Against all such views, the unparalleled offence of the saying shows its genuineness. It is characteristic of Jesus to set forth his unique relation to God in a

context of humiliation. In that respect he here provides us with a profound insight into the nature of his incarnation.

Rabbinical parallels to this saying, frequently referred to, are few. It is not characteristic of Rabbinism to assert that no one knew the day or hour of the End: to large numbers of Rabbis that was an absorbing problem, the material for the solution of which is provided in Scripture. The superiority of the knowledge of angels was, of course, taken for granted ('God does nothing without taking counsel with the upper Family', R. Jochanan, third century). Strack-Billerbeck offers one saying in which knowledge of the End is denied to angels (R. Schimeon, *c.* A.D. 250, explained Is. 63. 4 as 'To my heart I have revealed it; to the angels of service I have not revealed it'). In the nature of the case, the Jews could not think of the Messiah not knowing the day, for he was not to appear till its dawning. See *S.B.*, vol. 1, p. 961, vol. 4, pp. 1013 ff., and compare our remarks on pp. 175 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, W. C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew.* Edinburgh, 1907. 3rd edit. 1912. 'The Gospel according to Saint Mark with introduction and notes.' *Oxford Church Biblical Commentary.* London, 1915.

ALTHAUS, P., *Die letzten Dinge.* Gütersloh. (1st edit. 1922.) 5th edit. 1949.

ANDREWS, H. T., 'The Significance of the Eschatological Utterances of Jesus.' *London Theological Studies.* London, 1911.

BACON, B. W., *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date.* New Haven, 1925.

BALDENSPERGER, W., *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit.* Strassburg, 1888.

BARNES, E. W., *The Rise of Christianity.* London, 1947.

BARTLET, J. V., 'The Meaning and Task of Christology'. *The Lord of Life.* London, 1929.

BATIFFOL, P., *L'Enseignement de Jésus.* Paris, 1909.

BAUR, F. C., *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Kanonischen Evangelien.* Tübingen, 1847.

BENGEL, J. A., *Gnomon Novi Testamenti,* 2nd edit. 1759; E.T. from 3rd edit. of J. Steudel. Edinburgh, 1857.

BEYSCHLAG, W., *New Testament Theology.* Edinburgh, 1895. (German, 1891.)

BLACK, M., *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts.* Oxford, 1946.

BLEEK, F., *Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien.* Herausgegeben von H. Holtzmann. Leipzig, 1862.

BLUNT, A. W. F., 'The Gospel according to Saint Mark.' *The Clarendon Bible.* Oxford, 1929.

BOUQUET, A. C., *Jesus: A New Outline and Estimate.* Cambridge, 1933.

BOUSSET, W., *The Antichrist Legend.* 1895. E.T. London, 1896.
Jesus. E.T. London and New York, 1906.
Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. 3rd edit. Edited by H. Gressmann. Tübingen, 1926.

BRANSCOMB, H., 'The Gospel of Mark.' *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.* London, 1937.

BRIGGS, C. A., *The Messiah of the Gospels.* Edinburgh, 1894.

BRUCE, A. B., 'The Synoptic Gospels.' *The Expositor's Greek Testament.* London, 1912.

BULTMANN, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen. 2nd edit. 1931.

Jesus and the Word. London, 1935. *Jesus*, Berlin, 1926.

BURKITT, F. C., *The Gospel History and its Transmission*. Edinburgh, 1906. 3rd edit. 1911.

'The Eschatological Idea in the Gospel.' From the volume, *Essays on some Biblical Questions of the Day* by members of the University of Cambridge, edited by H. B. Swete. London, 1909.

The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus. London, 2nd edit. 1922.

'The Use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke.' *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Jackson and Lake, vol. 2. London, 1922.

Christian Beginnings. London, 1924.

Jesus Christ. An Historical Outline. London, 1932. (Reprint, with additions, of article in *A History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge*. London, 1929.)

BURNEY, C. F., *The Poetry of Our Lord*. Oxford, 1925.

BUSCH, F., *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie; Markus* 13 *neu untersucht*. Gütersloh, 1938.

CADMAN, W. H., *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*. Oxford, 1923.

CADOUX, A. T., 'The Historic Jesus.' In *The Lord of Life*. London, 1929.

The Sources of the Second Gospel. London, 1935.

The Theology of Jesus. London, 1940.

CADOUX, C. J., *The Historic Mission of Jesus*. London, 1941.

CARPENTER, J. ESTLIN, *The First Three Gospels, their Origin and Relations*. London, 3rd edit. 1904.

CASE, S. J., 'The Alleged Messianic Consciousness of Jesus.' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xlvi, 1927.

Jesus, A New Biography. Chicago, 1927.

CHARLES, R. H., *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. 1st edit. 1899; 2nd edit. 1913.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John. Edinburgh, 1920.

CHARNWOOD, LORD. *According to St. John*. London, 1925.

CHEYNE, T. K., Article 'Abomination of Desolation' in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 1, cols. 21–23. London, 1899.

CLOGG, F. B., *An Introduction to the New Testament*. London, 1937. 2nd edit. 1940.

COLANI, T., *Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps*. Strasbourg, 2nd edit. 1864.

CREED, J. M., *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. London, 1930.

CULLMAN, O., *Le Retour du Christ, espérance de l'Église, selon le Nouveau Testament*. Neuchatel, 1948.

Christ and Time. London, 1951.

CURTIS, W. A., *Jesus Christ the Teacher*. London, 1943.

DALMAN, G., *The Words of Jesus*. Edinburgh, 1909.
Jesus-Jeschua. London, 1929.
Sacred Sites and Ways. London, 1935.

DARBY, J. N., *Synopsis of the Books of the Bible*, vol. III. London. 3rd edit. 1877.

DAUBE, D., 'Public Pronouncement and Private Explanation in the Gospels.' *Expository Times*, vol. LVII, No. 7, April 1946. Edinburgh.

DAVIDSON, S., *Doctrine of the Last Things contained in the N.T.* London, 1882, pp. 4–31.

DAVIES, J. NEWTON, 'Mark.' *The Abingdon Bible Commentary*. Edited by F. C. Eiselen, E. Lewis, D. G. Downey. New York, 1929.

DENNEY, J., *Jesus and the Gospel*. London, 4th edit. 1913.

DEWICK, E. C., *Primitive Christian Eschatology*. Cambridge, 1912.

DIBELIUS, M., *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and early Christian Literature*. London, 1936.
Gospel Criticism and Christology. London, 1935.
Jesus. E.T. Philadelphia, 1949.

DIETERICH, A., *Nekyia: Beitrage zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse*.

VON DOBSCHUTZ, E., *The Eschatology of the Gospels*. London, 1910.

DODD, C. H., *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London, 1935, rev. 1936.
The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London, 1936. 2nd edit. 1944.
History and the Gospel. London, 1938.
'The Fall of Jerusalem and the "Abomination of Desolation".' *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. xxxvii, 1947.
The Coming of Christ. Cambridge, 1951.

DOUGALL, L., and EMMET, C. W., *The Lord of Thought*. London, 1922.

DRIVER, S. R., Article 'Abomination of Desolation', in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. Hastings, vol. I, 12–13. Edinburgh, 1898.

DUNCAN, G. S., *Jesus, Son of Man*. London, 1947.

EASTON, B. S., *The Gospel according to St. Luke. A critical and exegetical commentary*. Edinburgh, 1926.
Christ in the Gospels. The Hale Lectures, 1929–30. New York and London, 1930.

EDERSHEIM, A., *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. London, 1883. 2nd edit. 1884.

EISLER, R., *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*. London, 1931.

EMMET, C. W., *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*. Edinburgh, 1911.

FARRER, A., *A Study in St. Mark*. London, 1951.

FEINE, P., and BEHM, J., *Einleitung in das neue Testament*. Neunte Auflage. Heidelberg, 1950.

FIEBIG, P., *Der Menschensohn*. Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901.

FINDLAY, A. F., *Byways in Early Christian Literature*. Edinburgh, 1923.

FLEW, R. NEWTON, *Jesus and His Church*. London, 2nd edit. 1943.

FRAME, J. E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. Edinburgh, 1912.

VON GALL, A. F., **ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ** *Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur vorkirchlichen Eschatologie*. Heidelberg, 1926, pp. 476–477.

GARDNER-SMITH, P., *The Christ of the Gospels*. Cambridge, 1938.

GELDENHUYS, N., *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*. London, 1950.

GESS, W. F., *Christi Zeugnis von seiner Person und seinem Werk*. Basel, 1870.

GLASSON, T. F., *The Second Advent*. London, 1945.

GLOEGE, G., *Das Reich Gottes im Neuen Testament*. Borna-Leipzig, 1928.
Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament (Neutestamentliche Forschungen, herausgegeben von O. Schmitz). Gütersloh, 1929.

GODET, F., 'A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.' *Clarke's Foreign Theological Library*, 4th series, vol. XLV, 5th edit. (translated from the 2nd French edit. of 1870).

GOGUEL, M., *The Life of Jesus*. London, 1933. (Translated from *La Vie de Jésus*. Paris, 1932.)

GOODSPEED, E. J., *A Life of Jesus*. New York, 1950.

GRANT, F. C., *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. New York, 1940.
The Earliest Gospel. New York, 1943.

GUIGNEBERT, C., *Jesus*. (Tr. from the French.) London, 1935.

GUNKEL, H., *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*. Göttingen, 1895.
Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments. Göttingen, 1903, dritte Auf. 1930.

GUY, H. A., *New Testament Prophecy. Its Origin and Significance*. London, 1947.
The New Testament Doctrine of the 'Last Things'. London, 1948.

HARNACK, A., *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*. London, 1911.
'What is Christianity?' (*Theological Translation Library*, No. xiv.) London, 1901.

HASE, C., *Leben Jesu*. Leipzig, 1829. 2nd edit. 1835. 3rd edit. 1840. English Translation from 3rd and 4th editions, 1860.

HAUCK, F., 'Das Evangelium des Markus.' (*Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*.) Leipzig, 1931.

HAUPT, D. ERICH, *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien*. Berlin, 1895.

HEADLAM, A. C., *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*. London, 1923.

HEARD, R., *An Introduction to the New Testament*. London, 1950.

HEITMÜLLER, W., 'Im Namen Jesu'. (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, edit. W. Bousset and H. Gunkel.) Göttingen, 1903.

HÉRING, J., *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue*. Paris, 1937.

HOGG, A. G., *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*. Edinburgh, 1913.

HOLDSWORTH, W. W., *Gospel Origins*. London, 1913.

HÖLSCHER, G., 'Der Ursprung der Apokalypse Mk. 13.' *Theologische Blätter*, July 1933, Leipzig.

HOLTZMANN, H. J., *Die synoptischen Evangelien*. Leipzig, 1863.
Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Freiburg, 1885.
Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, erster Band, die Synoptiker. Freiburg, 1889.
Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie. Leipzig, 1897.

HOLTZMANN, O., *Leben Jesu*. Tübingen and Leipzig, 1901. E.T. *The Life of Jesus*, London, 1904.

HOOKE, S. H., *The Kingdom of God in the Experience of Jesus*. (The Colet Library of Modern Christian Thought and Teaching, No. 8.) London, 1949.

HORT, F. J. A., *Judaistic Christianity*. Cambridge and London, 1894.
The Apocalypse of St. John I–III. London, 1908.

HORTON, R. F., *The Growth of the New Testament*. London, 1913.

HOSKYNS, E. C., and DAVEY, N., *The Riddle of the New Testament*. 1st edit. 1931, 3rd edit. 1936. London.
The Fourth Gospel. 1940. 2nd edit. 1947. London.

HOWARD, W. F., *Christianity according to St. John*. London, 1943.

HUNKIN, J. W., *The New Testament, A Conspectus*. (The Colet Library of Modern Christian Thought and Teaching, No. 10.) London, 1950.

HUNTER, A. M., 'The Gospel according to Saint Mark.' *Torch Bible Commentaries*. London, 1948.

JACKSON, H. LATIMER, *The Eschatology of Jesus*. London, 1913.

JACOBSEN, A., *Untersuchungen über die synoptische Evangelien*. Berlin, 1883.

JAMES, M. R., *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford, 1924.

JEREMIAS, J., 'Jesus als Weltvollender.' (*Beitrage zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, Herausg. von A. Schlatter und W. Lutgert, Band 33, Heft 4.) Gütersloh, 1930.
Die Abendsmahlworte Jesu. 2nd edit. Göttingen, 1949.

JÜLICHER, A., *Einleitung in das neue Testament*. Freiburg und Leipzig, 1894.
'Die Religion Jesu und die Anfänge des Christentums bis zum Nicaenum.' (A Contribution to *Die christliche Religion*, Teil i, Abteilung iv of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, ed. by Paul Hinneberg, Berlin u. Leipzig.) 1906.

KEIM, J., *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara in ihrer Verkettung mit dem Gesammtleben seines Volkes.* vol. III. Zurich, 1872. E.T. *Jesus of Nazara*, London, 1881, vol. V, pp. 225–246.

KELLY, W., *Lectures on the Gospel of Matthew.* London, 1868.
An Exposition of the Gospel of Mark; ed. with additions by E. E. Whitfield, London and Glasgow, 1907, 2nd ed. 1927.

KENNEDY, H. A. A., *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things.* London, 1904.

KLAUSNER, J., *Jesus of Nazareth.* Jerusalem, 1922 (Hebrew); E.T. London, 1925.

KLOSTERMANN, E., 'Das Markusevangelium.' *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, begrundet von H. Lietzmann, Band 3. Tübingen, 4th edit. 1950.

KNOPF, R., LIETZMANN, H., and WEINEL, H., *Einführung in das neue Testament*, 5th edit. Berlin, 1949.

KÜMMEL, W. G., 'Verheissung und Erfüllung.' (*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des alten und neuen Testaments*, nr. 6.) Basel, 1945.

LAGRANGE, M. J., 'L'Avènement du Fils de l'Homme.' *Revue Biblique*, 1906, pp. 382 ff.
Évangile selon Saint Marc. Paris, 1911.

LAKE, K., and S., *An Introduction to the New Testament.* London, 1938.

LECKIE, J. H., *The World to Come and Final Destiny.* Edinburgh, 1918.

LEVERTOFF, P. P., and GOUDGE, H. L., 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew.' *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. C. Gore, H. L. Goudge, A. Guillaume. London, 1928.

LIETZMANN, H., *The Beginnings of the Christian Church.* E.T. London, 1937, revised 1949.

LIGHTFOOT, R. H., *History and Interpretation in the Gospels.* London, 1935.
Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels. London, 1938.
The Gospel Message of St. Mark. Oxford, 1950.

LOHMEYER, E., 'Das Evangelium des Markus', 2nd edit. 1951, Göttingen. (*Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer, 2 Band, 11 Aufl.)

LOISY, A., *Les Évangiles Synoptiques.* Ceffonds, 1908.
L'Évangile selon Marc. Paris, 1912.
The Origins of the New Testament. London, 1950.

LOWRIE, W., *Jesus according to St. Mark. An Interpretation of St. Mark's Gospel.* London, 1929.

LUCE, H. K., 'The Gospel according to S. Luke.' *Cambridge Greek Testament.* Cambridge, 1933.

MACCULLOCH, J. A., 'Eschatology', *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. 5. Edinburgh, 1912.

McCOWN, C. C., 'The Eschatology of Jesus Reconsidered.' *Journal of Religion*, vol. 16, Jan. 1936, Chicago.

McGIFFERT, A. C., 'Epistle to the Thessalonians.' *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 4, London, 1903.

MACKINNON, J., *The Historic Jesus*. London, New York, and Toronto. 1931.

MACKINTOSH, H. R., *Immortality and the Future*. London, New York and Toronto, 1915, 2nd edit. 1917.

McNEILE, A. H., *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*. London, 1915.

MAJOR, H. D. A., 'The Gospel according to St. Mark.' In *The Mission and Message of Jesus*. London, 1937.

MANSON, T. W., *The Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge, 1931.
The Sayings of Jesus. (Book II of *The Mission and Message of Jesus*.) London, 1937.

MANSON, WILLIAM, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*. London, 1918.
'The Gospel of Luke.' *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary*. London, 1930.

MARTIN, H., *The Necessity of the Second Coming*. London, 1928.

MATHEWS, S., *The Messianic Hope in the New Testament*. Chicago, 1905.

MAURIAC, F., *Vie de Jésus*. (Collection L'Histoire, E. Flammarion, Éditeur.) Paris, 1936; 2nd edit. 1936.

MENZIES, A., *The Earliest Gospel*. London, 1901.

MERX, A., *Das Evangelium Matthäus nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*. Berlin, 1902.
Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas nach der syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift. Berlin, 1905.

MEYER, A., *Jesu Muttersprache*. Freiburg u. Leipzig, 1896.

MEYER, ED., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 1. Band. Stuttgart un. Berlin, 1921.

MEYER, H. A. W., *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus*. Göttingen, 3rd edit. 1853.
Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas. Göttingen, 3rd edit. 1855.

MICHAELIS, W., *Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung; Die Aussagen Jesu über die Nähe des Jüngsten Tages*. Bern, 1942.
Einleitung in das neue Testament. Bern, 1946.

MICKLEM, P. A., 'St. Matthew', *Westminster Commentaries*, ed. W. Lock. London, 1917.

MILLIGAN, G., *The New Testament Documents, their Origin and early History*. London, 1913.

MOFFATT, J., *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, 1911, 3rd edit. 1918.
The Theology of the Gospels. London, 1912.

MONNIER, H., *La Mission Historique de Jésus*. Paris, 2nd edit. 1914.

MONTEFIORE, C. G., *The Synoptic Gospels*. London, 1909. 2nd edit. 1927.

MORGAN, G. C., *The Gospel according to Matthew*. New York, etc.

MUIRHEAD, L. A., *The Eschatology of Jesus*. London, 1st edit. 1904, 3rd edit. 1906.

'Eschatology.' *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, ed. J. Hastings, vol. 1. Edinburgh, 1906.

The Terms Life and Death in the Old and New Testaments, and other Papers. London, 1908.

MÜLLER, E. F. K., Article 'Wiederkunft Christi', in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 21, 3rd edit. Leipzig, 1908.

MURRAY, J. M., *The Life of Jesus*. London, 1926.

NAIRNE, A., 'The Epistle of Priesthood.' *Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh, 1913.

NEANDER, A., *The Life of Jesus Christ in its historical Connexion and historical Development*. London, 1853 (from 4th German edit., 1st edit. 1837).

OESTERLEY, W. O. E., *The Doctrine of the Last Things; Jewish and Christian*. London, 1909.

OLMSTEAD, A. T., *Jesus in the Light of History*. New York, 1942.

OTTO, R., *The Kingdom of God and Son of Man*. London, 1938 (E.T. of *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn*, 1934).

PAPINI, G., *The Story of Christ*. London, 1923.

PEAKE, A. S., *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*.

PFLEIDERER, J., 'Über die Composition der eschatologischen Rede, Mt. 24. 4 f.', *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, vol. XIII, 1868, Gotha.

Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren. Berlin, 1887.

PIGANIOL, A., 'Observations sur la date de l'apocalypse synoptique'; *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*. Strasbourg, 1924.

PLUMMER, A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (I.C.C.). Edinburgh, 1896, 5th edit. 1922.

An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew, London, 1909.

'The Gospel according to St. Mark', *Cambridge Greek Testament*. Cambridge, 1914.

PLUMPTRE, E. H., 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke', *A Bible Commentary for English Readers*, ed. by C. J. Ellicott. London, 1897.

DE PRESSENSÉ, E., *Jesus Christ: His Times, Life and Work*. London, 7th edit., 1879.

PÜNJER, G. C. B., 'Die Wiederkunftsreden Jesu' (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1878, Heft. 2).

RAWLINSON A. E. J., 'St. Mark'. *Westminster Commentaries*. London 1925.

Christ in the Gospels. Oxford, 1944.

REESE, A., *The Approaching Advent of Christ: An Examination of the Teaching of J. N. Darby and his Followers*. London, 1937.

REIMARUS, C. H. S., *Fragments from Reimarus*, ed. by C. Voysey. London and Edinburgh, 1879. (E.T. of *Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger, noch ein Fragment des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungennanten;* herausg. von G. E. Lessing. Braunschweig, 1778.)

RENAN, J. E., *La Vie de Jésus*. Berlin, 1863. E.T. London, 1935.

L'Antéchrist. Histoire des Origines du Christianisme, vol. 4, 1873. E. T. *The Antichrist*. London, 1890.

RENGSTORF, K. H., 'Das Evangelium nach Lukas.' *Das neue Testament deutsch*, herausg. von P. Althaus u. J. Behm, Teilband 3. Göttingen. 5th edit. 1949.

REVILLE, A., *Jésus de Nazareth*. Paris, 1897.

ROBERTSON, A., *Regnum Dei*. Bampton Lectures 1901. London, 1901.

ROBINSON, J. A. T., *In the End, God*. London, 1950.

ROBINSON, T. H., 'The Gospel of Matthew.' *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary*. London, 1928.

ROPES, J. H., *The Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge, Mass., 1934.

ROWLEY, H. H., *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*. London, 1944, 2nd edit., 1947.

RUSSELL, J. S., *The Parousia. A Critical Enquiry into the New Testament Doctrine of our Lord's Second Coming*. London, 1878.

SALMOND, S. D. F., *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*. Edinburgh, 1895. 4th edit. 1901, 5th edit. 1903.

'The Gospel according to St. Mark.' *Century Bible*. London.

SANDAY, W., Article 'Jesus Christ' in vol. II of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, 1899. Reprinted as *Outlines of the Life of Christ*. Edinburgh, 1905.

The Life of Christ in Recent Research. Oxford, 1907.

'The Apocalyptic Element in the Gospels.' *The Hibbert Journal*, vol. X, No. 1, 1911, London.

SANDAY, W., and HEADLAM, A. C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Edinburgh, 1895, 5th edit. 1902.

SCHENKEL, D., *Das Charakterbild Jesu. Ein biblischer Versuch*. Wiesbaden, 1864.

SCHLATTER, A., 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.' (*Schlatters Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, 1 Teil.) Stuttgart, 1947.

'Das Evangelium nach Markus und Lukas.' (*Schlatters Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament.*) Stuttgart, 1947.

SCHLINK, PROF. E., 'A Meditation on the Christian Hope.' *Ecumenical Review*, January 1952. Geneva.

SCHMID, J., 'Das Evangelium nach Markus.' *Das Neue Testament* herausgegeben von A. Wikenhauser und O. Kuss, Bd. 2. Regensburg, 1950.

SCHMIDT, K. L., *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*. Berlin, 1919.

SCHMIDT, N., *The Prophet of Nazareth*. New York, 1905.

SCHMIEDEL, P. W., Article 'The Gospels', *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. 2, cols. 1857, 1887–8. London, 1901.

SCHNIEWIND, J., 'Das Evangelium nach Markus.' *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*. 5th edit. Göttingen, 1947.

'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.' *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*. 5th edit. Göttingen, 1950.

SCHOEPS, H. J., *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*. Tübingen, 1949.

SCHRÄDER, E., *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. 3rd edit. revised by H. Zimmern, Berlin, 1903.

SCHWARTZ, E., 'Der verfluchte Feigenbaum.' (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*.) Giessen, 1904.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, P., *Die Weissagungen Jesu Christi von seinem Tode, seiner Auferstehung und Wiederkunft und ihr Erfüllung*. Göttingen, 1895.

SCHWEITZER, A., *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (von Reimarus zu Wrede, 1906). E.T. 1901, London.

SCOFIELD, C. I., *The Holy Bible*, with a new system of connected topical references to all the greater themes of Scripture, with annotations, revised marginal renderings, summaries, definitions, chronology, and index. Oxford, 1909. 2nd edit. 1917.

SCOTT, E. F., *The Kingdom and the Messiah*. Edinburgh, 1911.

'The Literature of the New Testament': Records of Civilisation, edited under the auspices of the Department of History, Columbia University. New York, 1932.

SELWYN, E. C., *The Oracles in the New Testament*. London, 1912.

SELWYN, E. G., *The Teaching of Christ*. London, 1915.

SIMKHOVITCH, V. G., *Toward the Understanding of Jesus*. New York, 1921.

SMITH, B. T. D., 'The Gospel according to S. Matthew.' *Cambridge Greek Testament*. Cambridge, 1927.

SMITH, DAVID, *The Days of His Flesh*. The earthly Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. London, 1905, 8th edit. 1910.

The Disciple's Commentary on the Gospels. London, 1928.

VON SODEN, D. F. H., *Urchristliche Literaturgeschichte*. Berlin, 1905.

STANTON, V. H., *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. Part II, *The Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge, 1909.

STEVENS, G. B., *The Theology of the New Testament*. Edinburgh, 1st edit. 1901, 2nd edit. 1906.

STONEHOUSE, N. B. *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ*. Philadelphia, 1944.

The Witness of Luke to Christ. London, 1951.

STRACK, H. L., and BILLERBECK, P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Munich, 1922.

STRAUSS, F., *Life of Jesus*, tr. from 4th German edition, 1846, vol. 3, pp. 82–111.

Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk Bearbeitet. Leipzig, 1864.

STREETER, B. H., *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by members of the University of Oxford.* Oxford, 1911.

The Historic Christ. Essay in Foundations. A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought. London, 1912.

The Four Gospels. London, 1924.

SWETE, H. B., *The Gospel according to St. Mark.* London, 1898. 3rd edit. 1909.

The Apocalypse of St. John. London, 1906. 3rd edit. 1909.

TAYLOR, V., *Behind the Third Gospel. A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis.* Oxford, 1926.

The Gospels, A Short Introduction. London, 1930. 4th edit. 1938.

'The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13.' *Expository Times*, vol. LX, No. 4. January, 1949, Edinburgh.

The Gospel according to St. Mark. London, 1952.

TITIUS, A., *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes* (vol. 1 of *Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit*). Freiburg and Leipzig, 1895.

TORREY, C. C., *The Four Gospels.* London, 1933.

Our Translated Gospels. London, 1937.

Documents of the Primitive Church. New York and London, 1941.

TURNER, C. H., 'The Gospel according to St. Mark.' *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, edit. by C. Gore, H. L. Goudge, A. Guillaume. London, 1928.

VISCHER, EBERHARD, *Die Offenbarung Johannis.* Leipzig, 1886.

VOLKMAR, G., *Jesus Nazarenus und die erste christliche Zeit.* Zurich, 1882.

VOLZ, P., *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba.* Tübingen und Leipzig, 1903.

WEIFFENBACH, W., *Die Wiederkunftsgedanken Jesu.* Leipzig, 1873.

WEISS, B., 'Evangelium des Markus' *Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, begrundet von H. A. W. Meyer, *Die Evangelien des Markus und Lukas*, 6th edit. 1878, 8th edit. 1892, Göttingen.

Biblical Theology of the N.T. 3rd edit. 1879. E.T. 1882, Edinburgh.

WEISS, J., *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes.* Göttingen, 1892.

Das älteste Evangelium. Göttingen, 1903.

'Das Markus-Evangelium.' *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, herausg. von Joh. Weiss. Göttingen, 1906 (2nd edit.).

Das Urchristentum. Göttingen, 1917.

WEISSE, C. H., *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium.* Leipzig, 1856.

Die evangelische Geschichte, kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet. Leipzig, 1838.

WEIZSÄCKER, C., *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte.* Tübingen, 1864.

The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. E.T. London, 1895.

WELLHAUSEN, J., *Das Evangelium Marci, übersetzt und erklärt.* Berlin. 2nd edit. 1909.

Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien. Berlin. 2nd edit. 1911.

WENDLAND, H. D., *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus.* Gütersloh 1931.

WENDLING, E., *Die Entstehung des Marcus Evangeliums.* Tübingen, 1908.

WENDT, H. H., *Die Lehre Jesu.* Göttingen, 1886.

WERNER, M., *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas.* Bern-Leipzig, 1941.

WERNLE, P., *The Sources of our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus.* London, 1907. (E.T. of *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu.* Tübingen.)

WILDER, A. N., *Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus.* New York. Revised edit. 1950.

WILLIAMS, N. P., *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by members of the University of Oxford.* Oxford, 1911.

WINSTANLEY, E. W., *Jesus and the Future.* Edinburgh, 1913.

WOHLENBERG, G., 'Das Evangelium des Markus.' *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* herausg. von T. Zahn, Band II. Leipzig, 1910.

WOOD, H. G., 'Mark.' *A Commentary on the Bible,* edited by A. S. Peake. London, 1920.

WORSLEY, F. W., *The Apocalypse of Jesus.* London, 1912.

WREDE, D. W., *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien.* Göttingen, 1901.

ZAHN, T., 'Das Evangelium des Matthäus.' *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* herausg. von T. Zahn, Band I. Leipzig, 1903.

Introduction to the N.T. Edinburgh, 1909. (From 3rd edit. of the German.)

INDICES

(*a*) AUTHORS

(*b*) SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Old Testament

New Testament

Non-Canonical Writings

(c) SUBJECTS

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO. LTD.
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, GLASGOW