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PREFACE

It is often difficult to convey to the reader the excitement which the author experiences in seeing new perspectives arise out of his research on the much-studied New Testament. That one also cannot convey the many disappointments involved when promising paths turn into dead ends is perhaps better for all concerned. The present study arose out of a series of connected questions, some of which could not be answered to the satisfaction of the author, but some of which led him to answers which surprised him greatly. Because of the surprise, hence the excitement. It is hoped that in the welter of detail and wide-ranging discussions the reader may sense some of the excitement too. New Testament scholarship is sometimes tedious, it is sometimes relevant to the church, but in addition it is also fun.

The present work was begun in Switzerland in 1957. It was completed in Minnesota in 1967. It is of course impossible to acknowledge all the teachers and family and friends who have encouraged and stimulated and supported me during these ten years. Apart from the dedication, it is possible to express my gratitude only to Professors Oscar Cullmann and Bo Reicke, who guided my study from 1954 to 1960 and who in 1967 accepted the work as a dissertation for the Theological Faculty of the University of Basle; to Professor Gerhard von Rad for a stimulating year at Princeton in 1960-61; to the editors of E. J. Brill, who accepted the work for publication; and to Macalester College, for a grant which helped make publication possible. To them and to all the others who cannot be named here, I am profoundly grateful.

Extended passages are given in my own translation, unless otherwise indicated. The abbreviations are the usual ones.

Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota

Lloyd Gaston

2 June 1969
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1. THE PROBLEM

After nineteen centuries of mutual polemic and an almost unbelievable history of persecutions, the church and the synagogue are in our time once more beginning to speak to one another as separated brethren of the one people of God. One very crucial historical event concerning which a common understanding has not yet been reached was the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70. Indeed, the bitter separation of the church and the synagogue can be traced back to the different attitudes taken toward this great catastrophe. The formative period of the Church had occurred just previous to this time in the decision for Gentile mission, and the formative period of the synagogue just afterward in reaction to it. The fall of Jerusalem is then not an event common to the history of both church and synagogue, and while for the one it represented a call to renewed obedience to the Torah, for the

---

other it became a sign of the rejection of the old Israel. Our present study will concentrate on the background of the Christian attitude to the fall of Jerusalem as this was expressed by Jesus and the first generation of the church before the event.

We can begin with the conclusions of the only two studies that have been devoted to this theme. H. Windisch 1 concludes: "Für die gläubigen Juden war die Vernichtung ihrer Stadt und ihres Heiligtums ein furchtbarer Schlag. Ein wichtiger Bestandteil ihrer Observanz, der Kultus, war damit unmöglich gemacht, ihre Hoffnungen, ihre Ansprüche, ihre Glaubensüberzeugungen waren vernichtet. . . . Den Christen bedeutete der Untergang der heiligen Stadt und ihres Tempels in erster Linie eine Bestätigung der Weissagung ihres Herrn und ein Strafgericht für die Kreuzigung ihres Herrn. Namentlich den Judenchristen wird er Schmerz bereitet haben, eine Gefährdung ihres Glaubens war er nicht." With respect to the generation before the fall, Windisch' conclusion is very questionable, but it is all too true for the later history of the church.

This is the conclusion reached by H. J. Schoeps: 2 "Dass der Untergang Jerusalems, die Zerstörung des Heiligtums, und die Zerstreuung unter die Völker als Strafgerichte Gottes über die Juden für die Kreuzigung Jesu anzusprechen seien, dieser ursächliche Zusammenhang ist wohl frühpatristisches Glaubensgut. . . . In dieser populären Form: Der Tempel der Juden wurde zerstört und die Juden mussten ins Exil, weil sie den Sohn Gottes getötet haben, reicht diese Überzeugung des christlichen Glaubens bis in unsere Tage." Our present study will attempt to investigate the question whether this widespread attitude has any basis in the first generation of the church, insofar as this is reflected in the synoptic gospels.


2 "Die Tempelzerstörung des Jahres 70 in der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte," Aus frühchristlicher Zeit, Tübingen, 1950, pp. 144-183, pp. 147, 150. As an indication of the attitude of the later church we can refer to J. Wetherall, The Destruction of Jerusalem, an absolute and irresistible proof of the divine origin of Christianity: including a narrative of the calamities which befell the Jews, so far as they tend to verify our Lord's predictions relative to that event. With a brief description of the city and temple, Providence (Miller and Hutchens), 7th American edition, 1818 (originally published London, 1805).
The destruction of the temple represented a major crisis for Judaism.\(^1\) At the same time it was not a crisis which could not be overcome. It will be helpful to distinguish at least three different important conceptions associated with the temple: the place of the presence of God, the place of the cult, and the sign of election. With regard to the first the expansion of the Old Testament Zion tradition had long since prepared the way for the conception that the Shekinah dwells with the people of Israel even apart from the temple. A story which shows both the problem and the solution with respect to the temple cult is found in ARN 4: When his pupil R. Joshua exclaimed at the sight of the temple in ruins, "Woe is us, for the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned is destroyed," Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai replied, "Do not grieve, my son, for we have a means of atonement which is like it, deeds of mercy (gemiluth chasadim), as the scripture says, 'For I desire mercy and not sacrifice.'" Atonement in Judaism always had presupposed *contritio cordis, confessio oris, restitutio operis*, and now that the actual *absolutio* was gone, equivalents to sacrifice could effectively if at first agonizingly be found.\(^2\) The real problem of the destruction of the temple lay in the question of election.\(^3\) Ever since the time of Antiochus IV, loyalty to Israel had been expressed in terms of loyalty to the temple.\(^4\) When the temple was destroyed, the church triumphantly claimed this as a sign of the rejection of Israel, and this was the major theme of discussion between church and syna-

---


\(^2\) Sacrifice was not the real issue, and it may even have continued on the site of the temple after the destruction; cf. K. W. Clark, "Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70," *NTS* 6 (1960), 269-280.

\(^3\) A very important study is B.W. Helfgott, *The Doctrine of Election in Tanaitic Literature*, New York, 1954. The question of election is also emphasized by Schoeps.

\(^4\) Cf. M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten*, Leiden, 1961. It was the temple, through the participation of all Israel in the temple tax, the ma'amadim and the great festivals, which held all the various groups together, in Israel and the Diaspora, as one people.
gogue in the second century.¹ Unfortunately, the present study cannot go into this whole controversy, but our concentration on attitudes to the fall of Jerusalem before the event may help to provide an important background for the later disputes.

It should perhaps be made clear at the outset that the present work has very few points of contact with the seemingly similar study of S. C. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church.*² Brandon tries to show the great importance of the fall of Jerusalem for the history of the New Testament church. While we can sympathize with his insistence on the importance of the problem, we cannot at all agree with his reconstruction of the history of the earlier period, which involves a revival of Eisler's thesis that Jesus was allied with the Zealots and the Tübingen thesis of a deep chasm between Paul and the Jerusalem church. On the whole, however, our interest will be in terms of the importance of the fall of Jerusalem in the exegesis of the synoptic gospels and not in the history of the early church. Two dissertations have been devoted to the theme of Jerusalem and the temple in the New Testament. The following will show how radically we will have to disagree with both. Townsend³ tries to show a veneration of the temple on the part of the first Christian generation, and de Young⁴ devotes a whole chapter to the theme of the rejection of Jerusalem

¹ Schoeps, *Religionsgespräch,* pp. 33f., lists as theses belonging "zum dogmatischen Bestand aller christlichen Kirchen" the following: "Die Auswäh lung Israels sei mit der Ablehnung und Kreuzigung des erschienenen Messias Jesus aus Nazareth auf die christliche Kirche übergegangen und die Kirche heisse nunmehr das wahre Israel. Die Straffolge für die Kreuzigung Jesu sei die Zerstörung des Tempels zu Jerusalem als Ausdruck für die von Gott her erfolgte Verwurfung des Volkes Israel, das ob seiner Verstockung unerlöst durch die Welt irren müsse bis zum Wiederkunft des Herrn."


² J. T. Townsend, *The Jerusalem Temple in New Testament Thought,* Diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1958. He concludes, p. 286, "It has been established that every writing, or tradition within a writing, which can be shown to stem from before the fall of Jerusalem indicates an acceptance by its author of the Jerusalem temple as God’s house and of its cult as a legitimate worship in which Christians as well as Jews have a share. Those writings, or parts of writings, which reflect the opinion of one who writes after the fall of Jerusalem reveal differing attitudes toward its Temple and cult; and in these attitudes can be seen various Christian answers to the question, "Why did God allow his temple to be destroyed?"

in the New Testament. If the first betrays a strong apologetic interest in the sacraments, the second involves a very uncritical use of New Testament texts. Our disagreement with both will become apparent in the body of the study.

In view of the great importance of the fall of Jerusalem, it is strange how seldom it should be mentioned in the New Testament. As Moffatt ¹ said over a generation ago, "We should expect that an event like the fall of Jerusalem would have dinted some of the literature of the primitive church, almost as the victory at Salamis has marked the Persae. It might be supposed that such an epoch-making crisis would even furnish criteria for determining the dates of some of the New Testament writings. As a matter of fact, the catastrophe is practically ignored in the extant Christian literature of the first century." There is no unambiguous reference to the fall of Jerusalem anywhere outside the gospels, ² and therefore our investigation will be restricted to them. Although our concern is not with problems of New Testament introduction, it may be that part of the reason for this surprising silence of the rest of the New Testament is to be found in the hypothesis that very few of the New Testament writings were composed after A.D. 70. ³ More relevant however is the fact that the New Testament was written primarily for Gentile Christians, for whom the fall of Jerusalem was not a relevant concern. ⁴ Only in the gospels do we have the tradition of the preaching of the Palestinian church, which must have spoken within Israel of the coming catastrophe. Of course this means that we shall be speaking of the fall of Jerusalem and the temple in terms of real predictions before the event, whereas scholarship has usually suspected that the synoptic predictions were vaticinia ex eventu. This will be one of the greatest problems of our investigation, and one which has not received sufficient attention. As Bultmann ⁶ says,

¹ An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1918, p. 3.
⁴ According to M. Simon, Verus Israel: étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire Romain, Paris, 1948, it was not even of concern to the Diaspora; therefore Simon really begins his important study with the period after A.D. 135.
"Die Weissagung von der Tempelzerstörung bedarf einer umfassenden Untersuchung."

2. Questions

A discussion of the fall of Jerusalem before the event in the synoptic gospels opens up at least three distinct and seemingly unrelated areas of New Testament theology. It is hoped that they will be of interest in themselves, even if their relationship to one another is not always clear.

a) The first is the connection of the fall of Jerusalem with eschatology, as this is expressed mainly in Mark 13. As an adequate form-critical discussion of this chapter has never been written, Chapter II will be devoted to this task. After this analysis we shall find that we are not at all able to answer the question before a number of special studies are made. In particular it will be necessary to discuss separately the question of the fall of the temple (Chapter III) and the fall of Jerusalem (Chapter IV). Accordingly, we shall not be able to suggest an answer to the eschatological question until the concluding Chapter V.

b) In discussing the fall of the temple it is important to understand the attitude of Jesus and the early church toward the temple altogether. Accordingly Chapter III will be devoted to the saying of Jesus Mark 14: 58 that he would destroy the temple made with hands and build another not made with hands. Here in particular a great many common misconceptions must be removed. Is the saying a genuine saying of Jesus? What is the background for the strange statement that the Messiah would destroy the temple? What could possibly be meant by "building" a temple "not made with hands"? The temple represented a) the place of the sacrificial cult, and b) the place of the presence of God. Discussion of the Christian understanding of these two important questions will occupy us in Chapter III.

c) Predictions of the fall of Jerusalem are found primarily in the Gospel according to Luke. What is their significance? What was the attitude of Jesus and the early church to the political situation of Israel in the first century A. D.? In order to answer these questions Chapter IV will be devoted to a special study of Luke-Acts. It is to be hoped that this chapter will contribute toward the understanding of Luke also apart from the question of the fall of Jerusalem.
d) After our investigation of these three disparate but crucial areas of New Testament theology, there will be a number of unanswered questions. Chapter V will attempt to discuss them and if possible to show the inner relationship of all that has gone before. This will mean that some of the chapter can be confined to a summary conclusion, while some fresh questions that have opened up (Son of Man, New Testament prophecy) will require more extensive discussion. Finally, we hope to show briefly how the major themes of the present study: eschatology, the temple cult, and judgment on Jerusalem, come together in the Gospel according to Mark.

The most important question of all goes beyond the bounds of the present study and can be answered only by implication. This is the question of the fall of Jerusalem as the rejection of Israel. A full discussion of this question would involve extensive study in the early patristic and Tannaitic period, but the synoptic material would be an indispensable background. We hope then at least by implication to answer a firm "No" to this question of whether the synoptic tradition teaches the rejection of Israel. If we have only provided the background for a further discussion between the church and the synagogue of the theme: fall of Jerusalem, and thus to have contributed in a small way to their mutual understanding, we shall be satisfied.
CHAPTER TWO

ANALYSIS OF MARK 13

There is perhaps no one single chapter of the synoptic gospels which has been so much commented upon in modern times as Mark 13. The history of its interpretation from D. F. Strauss to the present has been so well documented by G. R. Beasley-Murray that I may perhaps be excused from repeating it here. In spite of the great bulk of writing, however, discussion of this chapter has until now remained fruitless because of a failure to consider it from the point of view of form-criticism. The two main critical camps have been too much occupied with a polemic against each other even to consider the prehistory of the chapter, or rather their basic assumptions imply that there was no prehistory. On the one hand, writers such as Beasley-Murphy himself, who are primarily concerned with defending the genuineness of the chapter as a speech of Jesus, are not interested in the transmission of the material at all, except to maintain its faithfulness. On the other hand, the supporters of the little-apocalypse theory, in recent times represented by Hölscher and Bultmann, believe that a Jewish apocalypse has been provided with a few Christian additions and incorporated into the gospel tradition from outside, so that they are no longer concerned with it. Related to the first group are Schniedwind and Busch, who have given us perhaps the best writing on the chapter by emphasizing its place in the context of the gospel. Yet they are so concerned with correcting the abuses of the little-apocalypse theory that they

---

1 Jesus and the Future, 1954; this book has been followed by a detailed exegesis, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, 1957.
3 J. Schniedwind, Das Evangelium des Markus, NTD, 1958; F. Busch, Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie; Markus 13 neu untersucht, 1938.
remain on the defensive as far as the earlier tradition of the chapter is concerned—indeed, they refuse to discuss the question almost as a matter of principle. Other more recent writers on the question\(^1\) have realized the impossibility of a source criticism of the chapter, but they do little more than suggest that it is built up out of words of Jesus, (Jewish) apocalyptic elements, and sayings of the early church or Christian prophets. It is with tracing the prehistory of Mark 13 in detail that the present chapter is concerned.

That our task will be especially complicated lies in the nature of the material. If Jesus expected the world to continue to exist after his own death, then we may reasonably expect that he spoke to his disciples about this period. On the other hand, if the experience of the early church had any influence at all on the material transmitted, then this influence must have made itself most strongly felt in connection with predictions of the period through which the early church was actually living. The fact that Jesus was felt to be the Lord who had spoken in the Scriptures and who was still speaking to his church through the Holy Spirit complicates the problem even more. It is, however, a much too easy solution to brand all the gospel words which have an application to the life of the church as products of this church, a temptation to which Bultmann often succumbs, or to tend with Beasley-Murray to deny altogether the influence of the church's experience on the vital traditions she transmitted. Very often we will have to be content with a non \textit{liqueat} to this problem, to say as Isaac did of Jacob: the voice is the voice of the church, but the thought is the thought of Jesus. There are, however, some principles which can be followed, and part of our task will be to trace the history of the transmission of the material which is contained in Mark 13 if possible even back to its origin in the teaching of Jesus.

All discussion of the gospel tradition is rendered especially complicated by the necessity of moving simultaneously on several levels: that of the meaning of the gospel text as it stands in context, that of the teaching of Jesus as it is more or less accurately therein reflected, and that of the transformations of the tradition in the intervening period. While it is with the third of these levels that

we will here be most concerned, it is impossible to work on one level without constant reference to the others. While certain observations about the teaching of Jesus and the theology of Mark will be noted in passing, the implications of these observations will be deferred until a later point. The purpose of this chapter will have been achieved if at the end we are able to reconstruct a history of the tradition lying behind Mark 13. This will necessitate first a rather detailed examination of the present text, with enough reference to the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke to bring out the peculiarities of Mark. Indulgence must also be asked at this point for the assumption that Luke 21 contains an independent tradition to which verses from Mark have later been added.¹ A discussion of the theory of Proto-Luke will be found in Chapter IV, but an anticipation is necessary here at all points where light is thrown on the Markan version. We shall begin then with an examination of the present text of Mark 13, to be followed by form-critical considerations and a reconstruction of the earlier history of the material.

1. Analysis

Mark 13:1-4

1 And as he was going out of the temple one of his disciples said to him: “Teacher, see what great stones and what great buildings!”
2 And Jesus said to him: “You see these great buildings? There will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down.”
3 And while he was seated on the Mount of Olives, vis-à-vis the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew questioned him privately: 4 “Tell us, when will this be? and what will be the sign when all this is about to be completed?”

Verses 1-2 are an example of what Bultmann calls an apophthegma. Both Bultmann and Lohmeyer believe that verse 1 has been composed by Mark to provide a setting for the saying in verse 2. With the necessary reservations, this view is confirmed by a consideration of Luke 21:5-6, which I believe to be an independent tradition.

¹ The Lukan text minus the Markan additions is to be found in Luke 21:5-7, 20, 21b-22, 23b-24, 10-11, 25-28, plus the separate tradition in Luke 21:12-15, 18-19. The details underlying the assumption that this text represents a version of the apocalyptic discourse independent of Mark may be found in my article “Sondergut und Markusstoff in Luk. 21,” ThK 16 (1960), pp. 162-172.
“And when people were speaking about the temple, how it was adorned with beautiful stones and votive offerings, he said: ‘That which you see—days are coming in which there will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down.’” A comparison of the two versions shows that what was remembered was the striking prediction which Jesus made that “there will not be left here stone upon stone which will not be thrown down.” The fact that this saying was given a slightly different significance in different groups has led to the differences in the conception of the setting. Mark and Luke have no doubt given literary form to the tradition, but that a tradition was there is shown by the essential agreement of the two versions, although the only words they have in common are provided by the saying itself. The difference involved is whether this prediction of the destruction of the temple is considered eschatologically, as directed against the temple itself, which must be destroyed as part of the last judgment to make room for something else; or conversely whether this word is directed against the people of Jerusalem as a threatened judgment within history. In the former case we should expect the prediction to be made secretly as part of an apocalyptic instruction to the disciples, and this is what we find in Mark. In the latter case we should expect a prophetic Drohwort to the public, as in Luke. The usual explanation is that Luke is dependent for these two verses only on Mark, whom he has freely paraphrased, but the similarities and differences are much more readily explained if a saying of Jesus has been transmitted in two independent and disparate settings.¹

Verses 3-4 were recognized by K. L. Schmidt² as being a composition of the evangelist joining the saying against the temple with the following eschatological discourse. The fact that this revelation

---

¹ Luke did modify his source to agree more closely with Mark in 21:7, which is more appropriate to the following discourse to the disciples. This is a further indication that the conception of an address to the public cannot be an editorial modification of Luke but must come from his non-Markan source. Even in Vs 7 there are indications of this earlier understanding: so the non-eschatological γίνεσθαι and the address διδάξαλα, which is used 11 times in Luke but never by the disciples, for whom ιδίως or κόφες is reserved.

should take place on a mountain is significant, and even more so that it should be the Mount of Olives. Bultmann perversely thinks that the names of the four disciples may be original. We have here, however, probably only a case of the three pillar apostles (Galatians 2:9) or the three main disciples (Mk 5:37, 9:2, 14:33), with the addition of Andrew for a reason unknown to us. The question put to Jesus is not a double one, asking first about the fall of the temple, and then a question tailored to the following discourse, but a single question in parallel form. Already παρὰ refers to a complex of events, and συνελείψας is correctly interpreted by Matthew as συνελείπθη τοῦ κόσμου. It is assumed by the disciples, according to Mark, that the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the world are related, even simultaneous events.

Any discussion of the form-critical background of Mark 13:1-4 is greatly aided by the recognition of an independent parallel tradition in Luke 21:5-6, where the same saying is given in quite a different setting. This conclusion is supported by a third variant of the saying found in Luke 19:44, where Jesus addresses the city, saying that days will come when "they will not leave stone upon stone in thee" (οὐκ ἔρχονται λίθοι ἐπὶ λίθοι ἐν σοί). The correspondence of this saying with that found in Mark 13:2 and Luke 21:6 is so close that it is amazing that to my knowledge the parallel has never been noted before. The influence of Mark's setting, even when it has been recognized as secondary, has been so strong that commentators have found a parallel only with the temple saying Mark 14:58, in spite of the great verbal differences. The saying itself, however, contains no reference to the temple at all, and this should not be assumed from a setting in Mark which is recognized to be secondary. Whether the saying referred originally to the temple or to the city as a whole is a question which must be investigated in some detail. For the present it is enough to observe that the future of the temple or city involves Israel much more than the church, and that the form of the tradition which preserves a public setting,

---

3 Syn. Trad., p. 370.
4 A term he probably has from Dn 12:13; cf. further Test Levi 10; syrBar 59:8.
with the words of Jesus addressed to the people of Jerusalem, is therefore much more likely to be original. This has important consequences for our judgement of Mark 13:1-4. The writer of these verses retained from the original story only the saying itself! Everything else has been altered: the place of the following discourse, the questioners and the audience, and the nature of the question. These verses are, therefore, not to be used as a source for the life of Jesus, but with their apocalyptic presuppositions—the situation on the Mount of Olives, the select initiates who receive the revelation, and the question about the end of the world—they are very significant for the question of the traditions of the following discourse. Matthew in editing Mark has only made this apocalyptic setting clearer.

Mark 13:5-8

5 And Jesus began to say to them:
Watch that no one leads you astray.
6 For many will come (in my name) saying that “I am he” and they will lead many astray.
7 And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars do not be alarmed.
   For “this must take place,” but it is not yet the end.
   8 For “nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom.” There will be earthquakes in various places, there will be famines.
   These are the beginnings of the pangs.

Mark begins the section with his favorite pleonastic ἡξεκοπτο + inf.\(^1\) The natural way to continue verses 1-4, however, would be with ἀποκριθεὶς, to which Matthew has even changed Mark. Verse 5a looks very much like the introduction to a new section, and is perhaps a further indication of the fact that the following discourse once existed by itself and that the introduction has been later composed to provide it with a setting referring to the temple. It is significant that the first word of the discourse proper should be βλέπετε. This word runs like a Leit-motiv through the chapter, appearing again in verses 9, 23 and 33. The fact that it is not reproduced by Matthew or Luke in the latter three cases only underlines the importance of this word in Mark, and suggests that it had this importance even more in an earlier context than in the chapter

\(^1\) It appears 26 times in Mark, of which Matthew has taken over only 6 and Luke only 2. According to M. Black, Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 1954, p. 91, it is probably an Aramaism.
in which Matthew and Luke have read it. Verse 6 is difficult to understand and has led many advocates of the little apocalypse theory to suppose a Christian interpolation in a Jewish document. There is in fact an interpolation, or better a confusion between two conceptions, that of false prophets¹ ("in my name") and that of false Messiahs ("saying that 'I am he'").² Either conception is just as understandable in the primitive Christian context as in a Jewish apocalypse, but we cannot read both of them together, and if this chapter ever existed in a form in which it was not part of the gospel tradition, then the first phrase, being in the first person, must be secondary. Both Matthew and Luke seem to have read a γάρ in Mark, and it is very probable that this should be read along with AD itsyr al.³ Logically, the γάρ here is necessary, for it indicates the reason for the warning of verse 5. Verse 7a is again exhortation. It is conceivable that Daniel has influenced the formulation, with the mention of "wars and rumors of wars";⁴ in any case it is very appropriate to the situation in which Mark is supposed to have written, near the time of Nero's death. Verse 7b is an attempt similar to 2 Thes to dampen eschatological fevers by an appeal to an objective plan, on which we stand in but a preliminary stage. Verse 8 has often been thought a doublet of 7 in the third person, but it is not. As the γάρ shows, verse 8 is the proof-text for 7. The Roman church is in a period of universal upheaval, but they should know that this has been planned, for ... and here is quoted a well-known saying based on Isaiah 19:2,⁵ plus other prophetic signs of the woes of the last days. The paragraph closes with a remark which

¹ k reads here pseudoprophetae!
³ The case for γάρ in 7b is even stronger: Κε ADL itsyr.
⁴ Dn 11:44. As we shall see, it is probable that the Vs 14-18 were first formulated about the year A.D. 40, and it is conceivable that an earlier form of these Vs 5-8 were already then connected with the Caligula affair. This would give special meaning to the phrase about rumors of wars. Cf. Josephus, B.J., II, 187. Daniel (2:28) is in any case the source of the phrase in Vs 7b.
⁵ According to K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew, 1954, p. 79, this Vs comes from the MT of Is 19:2 only, which has been "targumized" by the church with no influence from 2 Chron 15:6 LXX.
in terms of an exhortation that this is only the beginning sums up
its apocalyptic content: the traditional birth-pangs of the Messiah.\(^1\)

We must raise once more the form-critical question. The backbone
of the paragraph is provided by the exhortation to watch and yet
not to anticipate the end too soon. As a basis for the exhortation
reference is made to apocalyptic commonplaces, but the latter are
only secondary supporting statements. We have here eschatological
paraclesis grounded in apocalyptic instruction, in the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{paraclesis (5b)} \\
gar — \text{ground (6)} \\
\text{paraclesis (7a)} \\
gar — \text{ground (7b)} \\
gar — \text{ground (8a)} \\
\text{paraclesis (8b)}
\end{align*}
\]

The eschatological paraclesis can be found already in the teaching of
Jesus in the parables of watchfulness, although as we shall see it
underwent constant actualization by the prophets of the early church.
With respect to the reasons given for the exhortation, it is not
enough to say that they represent apocalyptic commonplaces. It
is true that we find a strong influence of the Old Testament in Vs
7-8a (Dn 11:44; 2:28; Is 19:2) and even a technical term from the
later apocalyptic ("beginning of the pangs"), but the order in which
these events are described is not dependent solely on their present
subordinate function of supporting the paraclesis. The order: 1 false
prophets, 2 war, 3 earthquakes, and 4 famines, a pattern of four
woes just before mention of persecution (Vs 9ff), corresponds so
strikingly to the pattern found in Rev 6 that Charles\(^2\) has stated:

---

\(^1\) Even if this term is not to be found in the Rabbinic writings, where it is
always הָלַחְתָּה לַעֲשָׂי הָלַחְתָּה in the singular, for this difference lies rather in the
Greek language, which prefers δόλιας in the plural. These pangs were thought
of in Rabbinic theology to usher in the Messianic times, not the world-to-
come. Could the origin of this phrase in Christian theology possibly lie in a
mistranslation? Acts 2:24 speaks of Christ loosing the "cords of death",
a manner of speaking used also in Ps 116:3. Whether Luke turned to the
LXX (Ps 114:3), or misunderstood himself the Aramaic יָבוֹז, the result is
the introduction of the term δόλιας into the tradition, pangs which begin
with the death of Christ. Then Is 66:7 must have had a special significance
for the Christian: "Before she was in labor, she gave birth; before her pain
came upon her she was delivered of a son" (cf. Rev 12:3-5).

\(^2\) R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of
St. John, ICC, 1920, Vol I, p. 159. Cf. further M. Rissi, "The Rider on the
"the conclusion that our text (Rev 6) is dependent on the Gospel accounts, or rather on the document behind them, seems irresistible." Luke 21:10f, with its mention of pestilence, is in some respects even closer to Rev, and it is probable that Luke is not dependent on Mark at this point but represents a third version of a common apocalyptic pattern. We see then that a rather complicated development lies behind this section of Mark.

Mark 13:9-13

9 But watch yourselves!
   A. For they will deliver you over to sanhedrins,
      and you will be beaten in synagogues,
      and you will be brought before governors and kings for my sake
      as a witness against them 10 and all the nations.
      (The gospel must first be proclaimed.)
   B. 11 And when they deliver you up and bring you to trial, do
       not be concerned beforehand what you will say, but speak that
       which will be given to you in that hour.
       For it will not be you who speak but the Holy Spirit.
   C. 12 And brother will deliver up brother to death and the father
       his child, and children will revolt against their parents and kill
       them. 13 And you will be hated by all because of my name.
       But he who endures to the end will be saved.

This section is an example of what E. G. Selwyn⁴ calls a "persecution-form" bracketed between two characteristic exhortations: βλέπετε in Vs 9a and the injunction to ὑπομένων in Vs 13b. The body of the section seems to be made up of three sayings on persecution joined by the catchword "deliver up", with the addition of clearly secondary elements. The sayings themselves represent a theme widespread in the early church, a fact which will be significant for our discussion of sources. For easier reference the most important parallels follow:

Matthew 10:17-23

17 But beware of men,
   For they will deliver you over to sanhedrins and they will
   scourge you in their synagogues; 18 and you will be led before
   governors and kings for my sake, as a witness against them and
   the nations.
   19 When they deliver you up, do not be anxious how or what
   you will speak, for it will be given to you in that hour what you
   shall say.

20 For it will not be you who speak but the spirit of your Father speaking in you.
21 And brother will deliver up brother to death, and the father his child, and children will revolt against their parents and kill them. 22 And you will be hated by all because of my name. But he who endures to the end will be saved.
23 When they persecute you in this town flee to the next,
for truly I say to you, you will not finish the cities of Israel before the Son of Man comes.

Luke 21:12-15, 18f

12 But before all these things they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to synagogues and prisons, leading you before kings and governors for the sake of my name.
13 It shall turn out for you as a witness. 14 Therefore put it in your hearts not to be concerned beforehand about replying in defense.
15 For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries will not be able to withstand or contradict. 16 And not a hair of your heads will be lost. 19 In your endurance you will save your lives.

Luke 12:11-12

11 When they bring you before synagogues and rulers and authorities, do not be anxious how or what you will reply in defense or what you will say, 12 for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that hour what you must say.

Matthew 24:9-14

9 Then they will deliver you over to tribulations and they will kill you, and you will be hated by all the nations because of my name.
10 And then many shall stumble and deliver up one another and hate one another. 11 And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray. 12 And because of the increase of lawlessness the love of many will grow cold. 13 But he who endures to the end will be saved.
14 And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed in the whole world as a witness to all the nations, and then the end will come.

It is usually held that Matthew has rolled his copy of Mark forward in order to copy Mt 10:17-22 from Mk 13:9-13, a rash act which he was to regret when he came to his chapter 24, for he was then forced to invent new material to keep from repeating himself. That it was the urge to avoid repetition, and the fact that there was a plentiful supply of parallel material to draw from, which led him to neglect Mark largely in his composition of Mt 24:9-14 can be readily admitted. It is only the first part of the supposition
which seems to be improbable and unnecessary. The Vss. in question have an excellent connection in Mt 10, where Matthew is collecting material dealing with the problems of the young missionary church. That he has an eschatological prospect at the end (10:23) is characteristic for predictions of persecutions. Mark however, by his position, emphasizes the eschatological element much more, for he is here considering persecutions only from the point of view of signs of the end. It is at least possible that Matthew is here not directly dependent on Mark, but that both have the same oral source in common.\(^3\) Already the fact that the three sayings are joined by the catch-word “deliver up” points to the situation of oral transmission, and the eschatological promise of consolation at the end, especially in Mt 10, is an indication of who the transmitters were and the use to which the sayings were put.

The situation in Luke 21:12-19 is much plainer. If we except Vs 16f, he has not a single phrase in common with Mark except εἰς μαρτύριον, and this is used in quite a different meaning! Lk 12:11f is much closer to the saying Mk 13:11, yet this surely does not represent any literary dependance. It is further to be observed that Lk 21:12-15, 18-19 is a literary unity with a uniform thought, one much less pessimistic than Mark. If it be objected that this prediction does not take enough account of the martyrdoms mentioned in Acts, one must say that Luke agreed and for this very reason added these two verses from Mark. In the original form of Luke we have therefore a parallel tradition to that of Mark, which can be compared in our form-critical analysis. But this is not all, for as we have mentioned there is another parallel in Q Lk 12:11-12. It is evident that sayings about persecution, including a promise of speedy deliverance, were especially treasured by the early church, and that we therefore are here dealing with the same set of sayings transmitted along several different independent lines.

Mk 13:9 does not show a significant variation in the several sources, but it is capable of being interpreted in different ways. The kings (cf Mk 6:4) and governors (Mt 27:2, Acts 23:24) can be understood of a Palestinian milieu, but on the other hand this verse describes the persecutions of, for example, Paul exactly.\(^8\) We know from many other sayings that Jesus predicted persecution for his


\(^8\) Cf. Lohmeyer, Mk, p. 272; Bultmann, syn. Trad. p. 129.
followers, and yet \textit{a priori} there is no other class of sayings we should expect to be more affected by the experiences of the transmitters. That this saying was in any case well known among the early Christians is shown not only by its being transmitted along four different channels, but also by the fact that it can be appealed to as a ground for watching, introduced by γάρ.\textsuperscript{3} The difficulty begins with Vs 9b: εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. The meaning of Lk 21:13 on the other hand is plain: the disciples will have opportunity to bear witness about Christ before the heathen, in accordance with the missionary program of Second Isaiah. The connection with the following is thus clear and logical in Luke, and we see that the μαρτύριον is to be understood as a successful ἀπολογία. Mark by adding αὐτοῖς\textsuperscript{8} seems to bring the phrase in a more concise form and to connect it more closely with the preceding, but actually he changes the meaning thereby. As Strathmann has shown,\textsuperscript{3} it can only be understood in the sense of Mk 6:11: the objective injustice inflicted on the Christians witnesses against their persecutors, who are thereby judged. This is a thought to be found elsewhere in the New Testament, but it has nothing to do with what is said by the Spirit through the disciples in Vs 11. We shall, therefore, suggest that Mt 10 and Mk 13 are secondary with respect to Lk 21.\textsuperscript{4}

It is generally agreed by modern commentators\textsuperscript{9} that Vs 10b is non-genuine and secondary in its context, but it is not always made clear what this could mean. To say that the saying could not

\textsuperscript{1} In all MSS but B syrsln pc. The phrase has of course undergone transformations in the course of its transmission, of which we can mention here the words ἡμεῖς ἡμῖν, which can be shown by a synoptic comparison to have been often added to the original tradition, cf. Mt 5:11 and Lk 6:22, Mt. 7:22 and Lk 13:26, and Mt 10:39 and Lk 17:33. We have already seen that the words "in my name" in Vs 6 are probably secondary.

\textsuperscript{2} And probably καὶ εἰς πάντα πάνω. This is the connection in the tradition of Mt 10:18. All of the ancient versions also understood Mk in this way, as did those Greek MSS which have inserted a & after πράτον: WΘαl. Cf G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mk 13:9-11," \textit{Studies in the Gospels}, ed. D. E. Nineham, 1955, pp. 145-158.

\textsuperscript{3} TWNT, IV, 511.

\textsuperscript{4} G. D. Kilpatrick, op. cit., has suggested the punctuation for Vs 9b-10 which we have adopted, which seems to make 9b clearer, or at least closer to the parallel in Mt. 10:18. But Kilpatrick then goes on to the impossible suggestion that Vs 10b is to be constructed with Vs 11, meaning that the gospel must first be preached before one can be arrested.

\textsuperscript{5} Lohmeyer, \textit{Mk}, p. 272; Taylor, \textit{Mk}, p. 507; Kümmel, \textit{Promise}, p. 84; Marxsen, \textit{Mk}, p. 119f; Harder, "Geschichtsbild", p. 78f; Conzelmann, "Geschichte", p. 218f.
be a word of Jesus brings us away from the point, for there are many reasons which can be brought forward to show that Jesus could have and probably did say something similar.\footnote{Cl. J. Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise to the Nations*, 1956, p. 22f, as opposed to B. Sundkler, *Jésus et les patiens*, 1937, p. 11.} The fact that this verse is not found in the Matthean and Lucan parallels is also not significant if we are right in our supposition that no literary dependence is to be postulated. Yet it cannot have been original in its present context, where it breaks the connection between Vs 9 and 11 and misunderstands thereby Vs 9. As it stands the verse is impossible. What does πρὸ τοῦ mean? Before the disciples are persecuted (Vs 9)? Before they are delivered up to trial (Vs 11)? The only meaning which makes sense is “before the end,” but this is simply not said by Mark. It is further a truism to say that the gospel must be preached before and not after the end; what is meant is that the end will not come until the gospel is proclaimed in the whole world, exactly what is said in Mt 24:14. It is impossible grammar but a sound instinct when Mk 13:10 is usually interpreted unconsciously as if it said the same as Mt 24:14, for this must, indeed, be the source of our verse. Jeremias,\footnote{op. cit., p. 23.} working on quite different premises, has come to the conclusion that Mt is closer to the original (Aramaic) form. It could be that an early scribe missed the thought of a world mission in Mk and inserted here a shortened form of Mt 24:14.\footnote{This was suggested by W. Bousset, “Wellhausens Evangelienkritik,” *Theol. Rundschau* 9 (1906), pp. 1-14, 43-51, p. 13; and by A. Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1906\textsuperscript{a}, p. 547.} But this very consideration shows us that the mission commission belongs in this chapter, and it is more likely that it was added earlier. If the Vs 9-13 were at one time part of the gospel tradition, handed down as words of the incarnate Christ, as in the parallels Mt 10 and Lk 12, nevertheless we have reason for believing that at one stage of the tradition they were part of a speech of the risen Christ. In this situation the thought of the world mission was positively required, and we shall suggest that at that time these words from the Matthean version were inserted into their present context. That they were inserted after Vs 9 is because μαρτυρίων was misunderstood, contrary to its natural meaning here, of a preaching of the gospel. Mk must also have understood the words in this way, but he took them over without alteration, so that we can
still see something of the complicated pre-history of Vs 9b-10.1

Mk 13:12 is an apocalyptic commonplace2 and is often cited as evidence that our chapter is based on a Jewish apocalypse. That this opposition between (Jewish) apocalypse and (Christian) gospel is not a legitimate one, however, is shown by the fact that this saying, which is based on Mic 7:6, is found also in Q, Lk 12:52f. The fact that not only a breaking up of family bonds is envisaged, but that it is explicitly said that they will deliver one another up to death is probably based on the experiences of the church in the Neronean persecution.3 Vs 13a is paralleled by Lk 6:22 (Q), Lk 1:71, and Jn 15:19f (cf I Jn 3:13), and is, so to speak, a necessary correlate of the final τὸ τέλος. If Jesus spoke about this, and there is good reason to suppose that he did, then this word too could have been spoken by him. Nevertheless, one cannot avoid the impression that this saying fits in more with a world in which the Christians were accused of an odium generis humani. 13b betrays more clearly the language of the church: αὐξημένη is not otherwise used in Mk or Q in this theological sense (cf Mk 16:16). It is further to be noticed that 13b is a statement belonging to the realm of eschatological parables (cf Act 14:22), and that in such a context a reference to the end and, so to speak, to the reward of the disciple’s ὠφεληθείη is positively required. On 12:12 is a close parallel if not the actual source of this saying.4

---

1 Lk 21:14f is a good example of the fact that his chapter 21 is on the whole not only independent of, but prior to Mk. It is generally agreed that the Lukan form of the Q saying Lk 11:20 “with the finger of God” is more primitive than Mt 12:28 “with the spirit of God.” By the same reasoning, “the Holy Spirit” in Mk 13:11 must be secondary to Lk 21:15, where Jesus himself gives the wisdom. In any case, Luke, with his interest in the Holy Spirit, would never omit it from his source, and it must therefore be admitted that he is not following Mark here; cf. the considered arguments of C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition, 1947, pp. 13ff. If the formulation in Luke is the more primitive, then Mt 10:20, with its unusual “Spirit of your Father”, will represent an intermediate position, on the way to the familiar “Holy Spirit” of Mk 13:11 and Lk 12:21. The idea expressed is the same in all parallels (cf. further 1 Cor 12:3), for that the “mouth and wisdom” which Jesus gives is equivalent to the gift of the Spirit is shown by Acts 6:10; 7:10; Lk 2:40 (μισθος μεγίστος); Eph 1:8; 4:10; etc.

2 Cf. 4 Es 6:2; Em 99:5; 100:2; bSanh 97a.

3 Cf. 1 Clem 6:1, “a great crowd of elect, who endured many outrages and tortures because of jealousy” and Tacitus, Ann. XV, 44 “deinde indicio eorum (scil: corrupti qui fatebantur) multitudo ingens... convicti sunt.”

4 Lk 21:18f, on the other hand, has quite a different meaning: Vs 18 is a
Although we are not at this point especially concerned with Mt, a few remarks on his text will be in order. We have surmised that in order to avoid repeating himself here, he has drawn on a similar tradition which he felt more appropriate to the context. He seems not to have understood the relation of a persecution to the discourse of Mk 13, and so he has substituted material whose eschatological reference is plainer. That this material belongs to a later stage of the tradition can be shown by the many parallels to his text, of which the most important is Did 16:2-3. We see that the tendency is away from practical instruction and eschatological exhortation to a more factual description of the condition of the church and the world at the end. Even more interesting from our point of view is the way in which sayings of Jesus have been brought closer into line with predictions of scripture, especially to the last chapters of Daniel. Just as the reference is explicit in Mt 24:15 (to Dn 12:11), so here 24:9 is probably influenced by Dn 12:1, 24:10 by Dn 11:41, and 24:13 by Dn 12:12, this latter already in Mk. If it is true that Mt 24:9-14 represents a later development of the tradition than Mk 13:9-13, then this has an important corollary. By the same principles, Mk must be a later development than Lk 21:12-15, 18-19.

What conclusions can be drawn from this section? First, in view of the many parallels in various parts of the gospel tradition, it seems clear that sayings of Jesus about persecution were not only of paramount interest for the early church, but also must have originated with Jesus himself. Second, if the order of development Lk 21 - Mt 10 - Mk 13 - Mt 24 be accepted, we can see how these sayings, which from the very beginning were meant of the persecutions of the last days, take on more and more an eschatological coloring. In Lk 21 it is there only by implication, but in Mt 24 it has almost replaced the element of persecution itself. This change has been brought about not only by an increased study of the scriptures and a more systematized description of the end time, but also by actual experiences of the church. Lk 21:18 must be called, if not an unfulfilled prophecy, at least a very misleading one—as Lk himself realized when he added Vs 16-17. This experience makes itself felt even more strongly in Mt (cf Heb 10:23ff, 1 Clem 5:2ff, etc), but

proverbial saying (Cf. 1 Sm 14:45; 2 Sm 14:11; Lk 12:7; Acts 27:34) which says explicitly that none will be killed, and Vs 19 refers not to martyrdom but to the successful outcome of the trials of the disciples.
already of Mk we can say: The church which transmitted these sayings has known persecution.

Mark 13:14-19,20

14 But when you see the “sacrilege of devastation” standing (sic! let the reader understand!) where it ought not, then those in Judea should flee to the mountains.
15 Let him who is on his house neither come down nor go in to take anything from his house, 16 and let him who is in the field not turn back to take his cloak.
17 But woe to the pregnant and nursing women in those days!
18 and pray that it not happen in winter!
19 For those days will be a “tribulation such as never has been from the beginning of creation” which God created “until now” and never will be.
20 And if the Lord had not shortened the days, no one would be saved. But for the sake of the elect whom he chose he shortened the days.

We come now to the most difficult section of the eschatological discourse, the one which has caused the most varied interpretations of the whole chapter. We are dealing with a prophetic oracle which attempts to see the fulfilment of an Old Testament text in concrete events of the present. While successive events change the understanding of the Old Testament and of the prophetic oracle itself once it has been given formulation, still the actual prophetic words are transmitted as accurately as possible, while they are understood in different ways. In the present case there is not only evidence of reinterpretation in the history of the transmission of the oracle, but there is also the tension introduced by its position in Mark 13. It is not at all clear that Mk 13:14ff was originally meant as an answer to the question of the disciples which begins the chapter, and already an old catena comments, “they asked one question, but he answered another.”¹ We shall, therefore, ignore for the moment the question and try to see what the answer means considered for itself.

It is clear that the reference to Daniel in Mt 24:15 only makes explicit what is already intended by the Markan text. As the whole sense of the passage is tied to a particular understanding of the Danielic phrase “sacrilege of devastation” (Dn 9:27, 11:31; 12:11), we must look closely at the shifts of meaning involved. In

¹ Quoted in Klostermann, Mk, p. 131.
December 167 B.C. Antiochos Epiphanes dedicated the Jerusalem temple to the Syrian "Lord of Heaven", Baal Shamem. According to 1 Mac 1:59, he set up a small βεβηλιστήριον on the burnt-offering altar before the temple, probably a stone fetish such as is found in contemporary Arab cults, but there is no evidence that he introduced a statue of himself or of any god into the temple. Daniel's choice of the words καταβολή to describe the sacrilege of Antiochos is based on the similarity to καταβολή λαθραὶ and is a cacophonemic way of referring to it. However, as understandable as this must have been to Daniel's contemporaries, his word choice was bound to cause a misunderstanding later, for καταβολή in the Old Testament normally means an idol. Thus we find that in the entire Jewish tradition, and in many of the church fathers, Daniel's καταβολή was interpreted as an idol, i.e. a statue set up in the temple. The LXX have added a further difficulty by their translation of καταβολή as ἐφήμωσις. The root καταβολή can mean either "to be desolate" or "to be appalled", and it is certainly the latter meaning that Daniel intended. As long as the context in Daniel is remembered, this mistranslation does not really matter, for during the time of the profanation the city was in fact "deserted" of all loyal Jews. Nevertheless, the natural meaning of ἐφήμωσις points to a destruction, and as soon as the connection with Daniel was no longer seen, this meaning was bound to come to the fore. It is likely that this fact accounts for the position of Mk 13:14, and so of the whole eschatological discourse Vs 5-37, in the context of the prediction of Vs 2. The shift in meaning of these two words is very significant for understanding the origin of the oracle. While the phrase βάλνγικα τῆς ἐφημώσεως, once brought into the Christian prophetic tradition, could easily be understood as a "sacrilege of devastation," no one thinking of a destruction from the very beginning would have made any connection with Daniel. The original use of the phrase must therefore have meant such an "appalling sacri-

---

5 The correct Greek translation should therefore have been from the root ἐκκένωσαν or ἐκσέρχεται (as in the LXX Jer 2:12; 18:16; Ezek 26:16; 27:35; et al.; but cf. Ez 9:3).
6 Cf. 1 Mac 1:38; 3:45 ('Παρεχόμεθα καὶ δοκεῖσθαι ὡς ἐφημωθεῖς'). G. Kittel, TWNT, II, 657, manages to interpret ἐφήμωσις in this sense.
lege” as occurred at the time of Daniel but also, in view of the usual meaning of יִפְסָא, probably involving an idol set up in the temple.

At what time would Daniel’s prediction of a profanation of the temple have been of interest to the early church? We must ask first in this cautious way, without any consideration of the “genuineness” of the oracle or of the interpretation required by the context. We do indeed know of such an occasion, in the attempt of Caligula to have his statue set up in the temple in A.D. 39-41.¹ Pignoli and Hölscher² have made this event the point of origin of the Jewish (Christian?) apocalypse they suppose to lie beneath Mark 13, and at least for the Vs 13:14-19, they are very persuasive. One can quite well think of these words being written during the time after Petronius had yielded to the petitions of the Jews and written to the emperor, while all Judea waited anxiously to see what the final decision would be. The writer does not expect the early death of Caligula and warns that when the statue is set up, then “they”³ should flee to the mountains, just as the Maccabees did, to prepare for guerrilla warfare.⁴ Vs 15-16 can be readily understood of the necessity for hurried flight,⁵ but the fact that we have a close parallel in Q Lk 17:31 must also be considered. Vs 17 can be understood in almost any context, but seems more likely of an historical than of an eschatological hardship. The prayer that flight may not be made necessary in winter, Vs 18, can be understood by the fact that suspense stood at its highest during the winter of A.D. 40-41, before the report of

² A. Pignoli, “Observations sur la date de l’apocalypse synoptique,” Rev. d’Hist. et Phil. Rel. 4 (1924), pp. 245-249; G. Hölscher, “Der Ursprung der Apocalypse Mk 13,” Zk. Bl., 12 (1933), col. 193-202. Knox, Sources, I, pp. 103ff, thinks that the reference of these verses to Caligula is quite plain, and also Marxsen, Mk, p. 122, thinks that this was their origin.
³ The Christians? The Jews? It is doubtful if a distinction can be made. We have only the fact that this Vs is in the gospel to make us think that it is of Christian origin. But is it then so inconceivable that at least a section of the Jerusalem church should have so sympathized with their fellow countrymen as to share their horror at Caligula’s attempt?
⁴ Cf. 1 Mac 2:23ff. Tacitus speaks of preparations for war even before the statue was to have been set up.
⁵ The Maccabees too had to leave all their property behind, cf. 1 Mac 2:28. “He and his sons fled into the mountains and left behind everything they had in the city.” The situation presupposed in Vs 15-16 is of life in a village. It is therefore not a question of fleeing the Anti-Christ in Jerusalem, but of preparation for war throughout the province—the Maccabees came not from Jerusalem but from Modein.
Caligula's death arrived.\(^1\) Vs 19 is again from Daniel (12:1), but with the significant addition: "and never will be." These words, which give the reason in a word of scripture for the imperatives of Vs 17-18, show that the original conception was not of the tribulation of the last days. As great as this \(\theta\lambda\iota\varphi\iota\varsigma\) will be, it is nevertheless not to be immediately followed by the end, for time will still go on, with the possibility of other, though lesser, \(\theta\lambda\iota\varphi\iota\varsigma\). It is to be noted that these words are not due to the quotation but have been added to Daniel by the author. The section was then originally not apocalyptic at all but was a prophetic oracle giving instruction for a specific historical situation through the actualization of the Old Testament prophet Daniel.

Verse 20 is quite different from the preceding\(^2\) and is part of the same apocalyptic\(^3\) conception we find in Vs 24-27. It not only cannot apply to the Caligula episode, but it also has demonstrably late elements, such as its un-Palestinian use of \(\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) (which Mt 24:22 has in the more Semitic passive), and technical use of the word \(\delta\iota\lambda\iota\chi\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota\), who are here suddenly introduced. On the one hand the point of view is narrowed to the Christians, and on the other it is widened to include "all flesh." The proper context of Vs 20 is not with the section now under discussion.

If it is correct that Mk 13:14-19 were especially meaningful to the church in the year 39-41 A.D., then the next question is whether or not they were created at that time. C.C. Torrey\(^4\) was compelled against his own inclination to admit that 13:14a was \textit{ex eventu statuae Caligulae}, but he supposed that this verse had been altered from an original prediction more like Luke 21:20. Everything else he thought quite understandable in the mouth of Jesus. Similarly, Beasley-Murray, who tries to defend the authenticity of the whole

---

\(^1\) Cf. B.J. II, 203: \(\chi\iota\pi\mu\alpha\sigma\vartheta\iota\varepsilon\mu\alpha\). To be sure the warning can have come from the summer of A.D. 40 in anticipation of the winter, as Hölscher, col. 201, thinks.

\(^2\) Piganiol thought Vs 20 to be an essential part of his argument because of the sudden use of the past tense, which he interpreted of the relief granted when Petronius hardened to the pleas of the Jews and delayed setting up the statue. But this would mean not a shortening but a lengthening of the days! The past tense is actually the Aramaic perfect, just as \(\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is \(\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\cdot\nu\kappa\iota\).\(^5\)

\(^3\) Cf. En 80:2; 4 Es 4:26; syrBar 20:1. Of course already the \(\theta\lambda\iota\varphi\iota\varsigma\) of Vs 19 is eminently apocalyptic, but it is in a quotation and need not have been so understood.

\(^4\) \textit{Documents of the Primitive Church,} 1941, pp. 13f.
chapter as a speech of Jesus, has to assume a modification in this verse. If Jesus was speaking of a concrete event, the reference can only be to Pilate's attempt to introduce Roman standards into the temple area,¹ and accordingly the original saying must have been "when you see the ensign of sacrilege, flee to the mountain."² Both of these attempts only emphasize the fact that the authenticity of Vs 14 in its present form cannot be defended as a saying of Jesus. The origin not only of Vs 14 but also of Vs 19 is clearly indicated by their dependence on Daniel, and they can have been formulated only at a time when Daniel's "sacrilege" became timely for the church, namely at the time of Caligula. Vs 15-16 on the other hand contain no allusions from Daniel and have a parallel in the Q tradition, Lk 17:31. This saying urging a hurried and unexpected flight seems strained also in the Lukan context of the coming judgment in terms of a midrash on the story of Lot and seems to have been an isolated saying. While the origin of the saying will be discussed in that context, it is enough to say now that it need not have originated in the Caligula crisis, even if the advice is very fitting for the situation threatened in A.D. 40. That we should find here in Mk 13:14-19 sayings of Jesus combined with an application of the Old Testament in such a way as to give an exhortation for a specific situation is typical for the early Christian prophets.

Because we have been concerned about the origin of this prophetic oracle, we have not yet discussed it in its Markan context. The one element which, while it can be interpreted of the affair of Caligula's statue, nevertheless points to a different understanding, is the use of the masculine participle ἀπερχόμενος to modify the neuter βασίλειον. This seems to refer to a personal Anti-Christ, who "takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God" (2 Thes 2:4). Mk could easily have written more about the Anti-Christ if he had wanted to do so, but he believed the oracle of Vs 14-19 to be a genuine prophecy, and he did not feel he could alter it. He could, however, interpret it, and we have learned from Q pHab that this interpretation could take the form of exploiting a grammatical irregularity or even creating one. Whether or not the original oracle

¹ Josephus, Ant. XVIII, 55ff.
² σημείων τοῦ βασίλειονος = γιγνόμενοι, the idolatrous standards of the approaching Roman army, Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, pp. 255ff. He supports his thesis by the reading of syrinx and the analysis of Merx, Das Evangelium Matthäus, 1902, pp. 341ff.
read correctly ἐστὶς, it is fairly certain that Mk thought of a person, and that he indicated this by means of the parenthesis “let the reader understand.” Marxsen says of the origin of this phrase: “in Betracht kommen zwei Möglichkeiten: das Danielbuch... oder aber das apokalyptische Flugblatt.” Conservative interpreters in general have chosen the first possibility, in harmony with Mt, and Klostermann, Lohmeyer, et al. the second. But there is surely a third possibility, and if we are to interpret the βδηγραφια of the Anti-Christ it is a strong probability, namely that these words are from Mk to indicate the significance of the grammatical anomaly. They are then similar to such pleading for understanding in connection with mysterious sayings as Rev 13:18; 17:9, and Barn 4:5f. We find often such a parenthesis in Mk, in which he briefly turns from the story he is telling to address his reader directly, to explain something to him or urge his understanding, cf 3:30; 7:3-4. 11b, 19b; 9:50b; 14:9; 16:4b, 8b, etc. It therefore seems probable that Mk is reinterpreting an already existing oracle.

Already before Mark the passage had been given an apocalyptic reference, in spite of the contradictions thus introduced into the the material. After the passing of the Caligula crisis prophetic words were still transmitted, but the “appalling sacrilege” was now seen to be the sacrilege of the destruction of the temple, which would usher in the final act of the eschatological drama. Now Vs 15-16 in particular are quite out of place, not only because it is village life and not Jerusalem which is here presupposed, but even more because an injunction to flight implies a crisis within history and not the end. Even if such a tribulation “never will be” again

---

1 As in Mt 24:15, where there is no Anti-Christ. The construction ad sensum, Blass-Debrunner, § 134, 3, could after all refer to δ ἰδιαρτιας, the word Josephus uses of the statue.

2 That the reader should be urged to understand = ΠΣ is significant for the context of an eschatological mystery; cf. Dn 1:17; 2:21-23; 9:25; 12:31. Eph 1:8; 3:4; Rm 16:25-27; Col 1:9; 2:2. On the whole subject, cf. the thorough discussion by D. Daube, “The Abomination of Desolation,” The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, 1956, pp. 418-437. His attempt to understand the phrase as the apodosis of the διαγ = Θωρε clause, however, cannot be said to have succeeded.

3 Mk, p. 116, following the suggestion of Hultmann, TWNT, 1, 347. Regarding the present function of the phrase, however, he comes to the same conclusion as we do: “Gleichgültig aus welcher Quelle sie stammt, gleichgültig auch, was sie dort bedeutet hat, Mk denkt an die Leser seines Buches” (p. 125).

4 Is there any point in fleeing from the Anti-Christ? Even Lohmeyer is
(Vs 19), time will go on and it is not yet the final tribulation. Whatever the later interpretation, which will be taken up at another point, the oracle of Mk 13:14-19 had originally a quite different and specific reference.

Mk 13:21-23

21 And then if anyone should say to you: "see, here is the Messiah", "see, there," do not believe it.
22 For false Messiahs and false prophets will arise and will perform signs and wonders to mislead, if possible, the elect.
23 But you take care!
I have told you all beforehand.

Also the next section, Mk 13:21-23, shows the necessity of a *formgeschichtliche* analysis. If Anti-Christ has already appeared, then there is no room for further false Christs and false prophets.¹ The similarity to, but also the contrast with 2 Thes 2:9 is important: "The coming of the lawless one (N.B. sing.) by the activity of Satan will be with all power and with pretended signs and wonders." It has often been noted that Mk 13:21-23 is a doublet of 13:5f, but this is of significance more as an indication that these passages belong to the same tradition than it is a clue to a Markan composition.² The parallel is even closer to Lk 17:21, "nor will they say, 'See, here it is!' or 'There!'" and 17:23, "And they will say to you, 'See, there!' or 'See, here!' Do not go, do not follow them." to which can be added Mt 7:15 and the warnings against false prophets in the epistles. The form of the language points to the exhortation of the church, for it is the Christians who are being warned and not the disciples. It is further true that the Zealot movement did produce a number of false Messiahs and false prophets, and Mt 24:26 "in the wilderness" (cf Ant XX, 97 f) and "in the inner rooms" (cf B. J. VI, 285) are undoubtedly based on the event. Nevertheless, in view of the widespread belief of the early church that the warning came from Jesus, and with regard to the inherent probability, it forced to admit, *Mk*, p. 276, "Wohl ist es seltsam, dass der Aufenthalt in den Bergen vor dem Anti-Christ schützen soll."

² Thus Marxsen, *Mk*, p. 126, uses the doublet as a clue to understanding the division between past and future in the Markan conception. Taylor, *Mk*, pp. 502f, 515, following many commentators, would like to see thereby different sources indicated.
is possible that Jesus did in fact warn his followers about false prophets.

In any case, we are here concerned with the form of these sayings more than their content and origin, and they provide a perfect example in a compact form of the eschatological exhortation of the early church. First comes a warning to the Christians on a subject which was particularly pertinent. This warning is then grounded in an objective fact to which appeal can be made, introduced by γὰρ. The warning, and to some extent the prediction, go back to words of Jesus, but the actual formulation of the latter has been influenced by scripture and is phrased in the language of the church. Finally, we have the warning repeated in a general form: βλέπετε. Vs 23b is here difficult. We have already suggested that the first person in Vs 6 (“in my name”) and 9 (“for my sake”) was secondary, and that Christ was not from the beginning thought of as the speaker. If, however, later the perspective of the discourse was put back to the time of Jesus, some such saying as this was required. In common with Vs 37 it shows an awareness that it is really the Christians and not the disciples who are being addressed.

If Vs 21-23 are an example of exhortation, then it is clear that they are not a later interpolation, even if they are parallel to Vs 5f and even if they interrupt an “apocalyptic program,” for they belong to the same form-critical category as Vs 5f and undoubtedly to the same stratum in the history of our chapter. Nevertheless, Vs 24 would follow more naturally on Vs 20, and it may be that in one stage of the tradition this was the case. Vs 21-23a will then have been added, quite early, perhaps because of the Stichwort ἀκλαπτοί, which appears in Vs 22, but also before, in Vs 20, and afterward, in Vs 27.

Mark 13:24-27

24 But in those days, after that tribulation
the sun will be darkened,
and the moon will not give its light,
25 and the stars will be falling from heaven;
yea, the powers in the heavens will be shaken!
26 And then they will see “the Son of Man coming in clouds” with
great power and glory. 27 And then he will send the angels and

1 γὰρ seems to have been read by Mt and stands in all the MSS but KC.
2 13:2 says of a false prophet: καὶ δοῦναι σημείαν ἐπὶ τέρσῃ.
gather his elect from the four winds, from the end of the earth (to the end of the earth and from the end of heaven) to the end of heaven.

Vs 24 refers back to the tribulation in Vs 19, which has accordingly been understood in spite of 19b, "and never will be," as the last great woe before the end. After the final tribulation comes the final redemption—so much is clear, and Jesus could have said as much. Yet if there were any sayings of Jesus available telling of the coming of the Son of Man, the author of this section did not know of them, for the source of these sayings is the Old Testament. Given the belief that the Old Testament is inspired scripture and that Jesus is the Son of Man, this is not in itself an illegitimate undertaking. It all depends on whether or not the Old Testament has been correctly understood and applied, and this must be decided in every case for itself. We are here not yet concerned with whether or not Vs 24-27 represents the thought of Jesus, but with the question of their origin. I hope to be able to show that these Vs do not represent just an arbitrary collection of Old Testament texts but are the product of a well thought out theology. We must only try to read the Bible with the eyes of the early Christians and keep in mind the principles of contemporary Jewish exegesis.

The suggestion of Matthew that Daniel be read only makes explicit what is already implied by the use of the phrase "sacrilege of devastation." Someone has taken this advice, read, and thought to understand. In Dn 7 it is said that at the end of the fourth kingdom, which is the kingdom of Antiochus IV who had set up the sacrilege, there will come one like a son of man. Jesus, too, spoke of the coming of the Son of Man, and everything else follows from the belief, even if it is a mistaken belief, that Jesus applied Dn 7:13 to his second coming within a generation. The Son of Man thus comes to carry out the judgment of the great day of the Lord, as is implied in Dn 7:10 and 26, and the church knows already from the Old Testament what this day will be like. Indeed, there are a number of Old Testament passages in which the whole history of the church, from the coming of Christ to the end of the world, could be read. One such text is Joel 2-4, which we mention here because the passage about the signs in the heavens is cited in Acts 2:20.¹ After the trumpet call and the proclamation of the gospel

in Zion (2:1, κρύφατε), there follows a description of the day of the Lord and the judgment of Jerusalem (2:2-11), which ends with the darkening of sun, moon and stars.¹ Then there is another trumpet call, and the formation of the church (2:16),² followed by promises for the people of God (2:18-27). Joel 3, which must have been thought of as parallel to Chapter 2 and not subsequent to it, is the passage quoted in Acts, with the outpouring of the Spirit, the darkening of sun and moon, and the destruction of all of Jerusalem except for those "who call on the name of the Lord," those who have heard the gospel (εκαγγελιζόμενοι) and been called by the Lord. There follows in Chapter 4 the final judgment of the nations, including Edom (4:19), described as a wine-press and a harvest (4:13), where again sun, moon, and stars are darkened (4:15). One can see why, on the basis of Joel 2-4, the darkening of sun, moon and stars should be mentioned just after the tribulation which befalls Jerusalem. By the early Rabbinic exegetical principle of gezera shawa other passages could also be introduced. There are two sections of Isaiah which describe a darkening of the heavenly bodies in connection with judgment on Rome (Babel, Edom): 13:1-14:23 and 34:1-17. It is very probable that anyone meditating on the judgment of the nations, and especially of Rome, which should follow the destruction of Jerusalem, whether starting from Joel or not, would also reread or recall these passages. The result is Mk 13:24f, which owes something to Is 13:10, something to Is 34:4,³ and perhaps even something to Joel 2:10, 4:15.⁴ The fact that the author, however, did not intend to quote is shown by the fact that none of the reminiscences are accurate, and furthermore, he has written four lines of poetry, a parallelismus membrorum where the first three parallel statements are summed up in the fourth. The

¹ Those who execute judgement on Jerusalem are described as "a great and mighty people whose like has never been seen from the beginning nor will be after them throughout all generations" (2:2b). This would facilitate the connection of the final tribulation with the oracle composed at the time of the Caligula crisis, which says that such a tribulation "never will be" again (Mk 13:19b).

² συναγάγετε λαόν, ἀγάπατε ἐκκλησίαν, ἐκλέξασθε πρεσβυτέρους.

³ But not to the LXX, which did not have 4a (* in Origen). Vs 5 shows the context of the thought: "For my sword has drunk its fill in the heavens; behold, it descends for judgement upon Edom, upon the people I have doomed."

⁴ Where LXX reads φέγγος as in Mk, instead of φῶς as in Is 13:10. But this is doubtful.
author certainly had read Is 13:10 and 34:4, but when it came to writing these lines, he let them influence his language without actually citing either of them.

Vs 26, which is an interpretation of the saying of Jesus preserved in Mk 14:62, has been probably the point of departure for the whole passage. Daniel 7:13f has here clearly been understood to refer to the coming of the Son of Man from heaven to earth in the end times, an understanding which sets this passage apart from the rest of the New Testament, where Dn 7:13f is applied to Jesus' ascension rather than to his second coming.\(^1\) Also the end of the verse comes from Daniel, for the δύναμις with which the Son of Man comes is the ράχι of Dn 7:14 and the δύναμις his κράτος.\(^2\) Whether or not Dn 7:13f has been correctly understood, it is clear that the Old Testament is the sole source for the statements made here.

Vs. 27 again brings to mind several Old Testament passages without being an actual citation of any of them. The resemblance to the LXX of Zech 2:10 is only accidental, for the MT says just the opposite, Zech 2 is not otherwise quoted in the New Testament, and the use of the "four winds" to express universality is a commonplace. At the end of the verse, the author thought that a combination of the two common phrases "from the end of heaven to the end of heaven" (as in Dt 30:4) and "from the end of the earth to the end of the earth" (as in Dt 13:7) would express the superlative of universality. Most modern commentators, but also already Mt, disagree with him. More interesting than slight verbal parallels to isolated passages is the Old Testament source of the thought of this verse. Where is it said that the Son of Man can dispatch angels? Angels are mentioned in connection with him also in Mk 8:38, Mt 13:36, and 25:31, and it may very well be that the idea goes back to Jesus. But if so, he must have had some scriptural warrant for saying so. It could be assumed that the angels of Dan 7:10 were given to the Son of Man along with the kingdom, but where is this actual-

\(^1\) See below, pp. 384-392.

\(^2\) It is true that in the LXX δύναμις is usually the translation of לִפְשֵׁת or נָעַס, but the ideas of "power" and "authority" are not so far apart. We have perhaps evidence that the early church translated the קְצֵּי of Dn 7:14 with δύναμις in the late addition to the Lord's prayer, Mt 6:13b (cf. Did 8:2, 10:5): "for thine is the kingdom (βασιλεία = κύριον) and the power (δύναμις = κράτος) and the glory (δόξα = κράτος) forever," exactly what is said of the Son of Man in Dn 7:14.
ly said? Doeve\(^1\) suggests that it could be deduced by the principles of rabbinc exegesis from the MT of Zech 14:5, where it is said that "the Lord my God will come and all the holy ones with thee (דמע)."

Who is being addressed, if not the Son of Man? That Zech 14:5 was understood of the angels which will come with the Son of Man is shown by Mt 25:31, 1 Thes 3:13, Did 16:7f, and in Justin, 1 Apol 51, where Jeremiah (sic!) is quoted for the second coming: "Behold, as the Son of Man he comes in the clouds of heaven, and his angels with him." As for the gathering of the dispersed, it would be well to find a reference to this in a text which we know was important to the early Christians. This is true of the context of Zech 14:5, and it has the advantage of speaking of the gathering of the elect from the nations and not just from the Diaspora of Israel. Already in 9:9 we have the testamonium about the king on the ass; then follows "the blood of my covenant" (9:11) and the advent of the Lord with a trumpet call (9:14) to save the flock (9:16). After the mention of false prophets and the failure of the leaders of the people, these are punished (10:3, understood as the Zealots?). But from the flock will come the cornerstone (10:4), and the Lord will gather the dispersed: "I will signal for them and gather them in, for I have redeemed them... Though I scattered them among the nations, yet in far countries they shall remember me" (10:8b). In Chapter 12 we find the siege of Jerusalem (12:2-3), the pouring out of the Holy Spirit (12:10, cf 13:1), and the testamonium "they shall look on him whom they have pierced." In 13:7 we find the Vs which shows of whom the early church interpreted the pierced one and the flock: "Strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered." There follows a destruction of two-thirds of Israel, while one-third will be tested (13:9, cf 1 Pet 1:7) and saved. We come finally to Chapter 14, where after the fall of Jerusalem (14:2) as we have seen, the Lord will come with his angels (14:5), living water will flow from Jerusalem (14:8), and it is seen that among those gathered in will be the survivors of the nations (14:16).

If our analysis of these Vs 24-27 has been along the right lines, then it tells us something about the form-critical history of this section. If it is true that Vs 26 is based on a misinterpretation of Jesus’ exegesis of Dan 7, then it is clear that these words cannot be sayings of Jesus. Indeed, it is questionable that they ever intended

---

to be so before being put in their present setting in Mark. They represent rather a piece of Christian theology, based squarely on scripture, but also on an interpretation of Dan 7:13 which was thought to have come from Jesus. They deal further with a subject which was of the utmost importance to the early church, given the presuppositions of the author. To provide instruction and consolation for Christians faced with the early return of their Lord, he has searched the scriptures in the light of this situation and has expressed what he found there in memorable language.

Mark 13:28-30

28 From the fig-tree learn the parable: when you see its branch already become soft and it puts forth leaves, you know that the summer is near.

29 Thus you too, when you see this happening, know that it is near, at the gate.

30 (For the Lord says:) Amen, I say to you, this generation will not pass away before all these things happen.

The parable of the fig-tree is generally considered to be a genuine saying of Jesus,¹ but Knox rightly calls it in its present position "grotesque."² The only way one can interpret the parable in its context is to make τάσις refer back to the "signs" of Vs 5-23 and to supply as the subject of ἔγγειος ἐπιτιθεῖν the returning Son of Man of Vs 24-27. But quite aside from the fact that an understanding of Vs 5-23 as signs destined to give certainty to the coming parousia is questionable, it is impossible just to skip over Vs 24-27 in this fashion. Jeremias³ is, therefore, typical of most modern scholars when he seeks to interpret the parable independently of its context, whereby the point of comparison is then: the budding fig-tree — the signs of Jesus' ministry. He rightly points to the fact that the return of life to the fig-tree in the spring cannot be a sign of the suffering before the end, but rather of the anticipations in Jesus' life of the time of salvation. When Jeremias goes on to interpret the coming summer of the Messiah standing before the door, however, he lets himself after all be influenced by the context of Mk 13. The signs of Jesus' ministry in other passages, his answer to John

¹ Only E. Schwartz, "Der verfluchte Feigenbaum," ZNW 5 (1904), pp. 80-84, and Wellhausen, Mk, p. 196, seek to connect it with the fig tree of Mk 11:12-14 and interpret it as originating in the early church.
² Sources, p. 107.
³ Die Gleichnisse Jesu, 1956, p. 102.
the Baptist, Mt 11:4ff, the casting out of demons, Mk 3:27, Lk
11:20, the sign of Jonah with something greater than Jonah or
Solomon, Lk 11:29ff, Mt 12:39ff, etc., all point not to the Messiah
who is soon coming but to him who is already here. Jeremias was
thrown off the right track by the application Vs 29, and we must
consider whether or not this Vs was part of the original parable.
If we do not consider the context, we notice that: either ταῦτα has
no antecedent and ἔγγος ἔστιν no subject, or ταῦτα refers to the
tender twig and budding leaves, and it is the summer which is
near the gates. In the first case we must postulate a lost context,
but what? And why was the reference kept while the context was
lost? And in the second case, we must admit that Vs 29 only repeats
the thought of Vs 28 exactly and is therefore superfluous. Vs 28
alone, however, can stand very well as a complete parable, even if
it has undergone a few minor changes by being set in the second
person in accordance with its use here. Luke has given this parable
in spite of Mk its natural and correct application: when you see
the signs of my ministry, know that the kingdom is near, a saying
closely parallel to Lk 11:20. We can perhaps interpret the parable
a bit further without fear of falling into allegory: what aspect of
the kingdom does Jesus mean when he speaks of the θεράς? It is
possible that he is repeating the word-play of Am 8:2 between ἔρ
(= θεράς) and γῆ (= πλος), which would, however, assume that
this saying was spoken in Hebrew. Even if this pun was not in-
tended, however, the symbol of the harvest in the New Testament
is often used for the end in its aspect of judgment, Mt 13:39 “the
harvest is the close of the age,” cf. Mk 4:29, Mt 3:12, 13:30, Rev

1 Lohmeyer, Mā, p. 280, suggests that the opening may have read: ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ διάθεσις (but surely σωτήρ would be better?), and already the MSS evidence (BφDΑ) should tell us that γνωστεύω was the original reading, γνωστεύμενον being imported from Vs 29.

2 Is it possible that precisely this parable has been chosen because the understanding of “summer” here presupposed provides a contrast to the “winter” of the tribulation, Vs 18?

3 The Aramaic נְּפָר and נְּפָר do not permit this word play. It is of

4 course not only possible but even likely that Jesus spoke Hebrew, Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, 1931. But would he have told a parable in this language?

5 Should we so translate? Both θεράς and נְּפָר can have this meaning of

6 harvest, i.e. the product of harvesting, not the act (= θεραμοῦς, נְּפָר). But

7 even if we translate “summer”, it is summer in its aspect of harvest-time,

8 not heat or the like, which is envisaged.
14:15. It seems to me to express the sense of the parable better, however, if we think of the harvest as the Christian mission, as in Mt 9:37, Joh 4:35-38. The sense would then be: you see from my healings and casting out of demons that the scriptures which speak of the coming Kingdom of God are being fulfilled; so too those which speak of the gathering of the dispersed of Israel and the nations will also soon be fulfilled. If we admit such an interpretation, then there is a good connection to the preceding section.

In Vs 5-8, 21-23 we saw that the pattern was exhortation—γὰρ—ground in an accepted dogma, whether a word of Jesus or the Old Testament. Here the pattern is reversed: saying of Jesus (parable)—application and exhortation, whereby the second person of exhortation has influenced the parable too. The application begins with οὕτως, as in Mt 13:40, 49, 18:14, 35, Lk 12:21, 20:16, etc. and continues with the imperative, as in Mk 4:9, 23, Mt 25:13, Lk 10:37, verses which are in every case secondary.¹ If Vs 29 stems from the hand who added the genuine parable Vs 28 after Vs 24-27, then many things can be explained. The subject of ἔγγυς ἐστον will be the Θεοῦς, interpreted as the gathering of the elect, which in context is identical with the coming of the Son of Man. The argument that εἰ ὁ Θεοῦς must imply a personal subject, as in James 5:9, is not a valid one, for in the only other use of the phrase to imply temporal nearness, Acts 5:9, the subject is impersonal, πληθα.² Nevertheless, the interpretation “he is near” for “it is near” is a very natural one in view of Vs 26 beside 27. The author has changed the meaning of the parable insofar as the budding tree now stands for the great tribulation which heralds Christ’s coming—the ταῦτα is very awkward, but if this is what he wanted to say, it could hardly have been helped. Perhaps we now also have an explanation for the καὶ ὃμοιος, which implies a contrast to another group. In analogy to Vs 37, it is emphasized here that not only the disciples, the first hearers of the parable, but also the contemporary Christians are meant.

Vs 30 has also been made part of the application, as the retrospective πάντα ταῦτα shows.³ But just because the application to the

² Rev 3:20 is not analogous, for there Christ is not near but at the door.
³ Mt has made this clearer by adding πάντα to the preceding verse. It is argued by W. Michaelis, **Der Herr versieht nicht die Verheissung**, 1942, pp. 30f., and others that Vs 30 refers thereby only to the “signs” of 5-23 and not to the coming of the Son of Man, which is very unlikely and in any
parable is secondary, the saying itself does not have to be an invention of the church. Very often a parable is secondarily closed with a general application which is a free-floating genuine saying of Jesus —indeed the saying must be genuine to fulfil its purpose of giving dominical authority to a certain interpretation. We even find a saying beginning with "(Amen), I say to you" used in this manner Mt 5:26, 21:31, cf. Lk 14:24, 15:7, 10, 18:14. Already the formula "Amen, I say to you" is a sign of genuineness, but in this case we have an even greater confirmation in the parallels Mk 9:1, Mt 10:23. In all three cases we have Ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν (δείκνυσιν) ... φρεν all of this generation will have died ἐν (or μεταξύ ὑμῶν) the Son of Man (Mt) or the Kingdom of God (Mk, Lk) comes. In view of these close parallels, we must assume that Vs 30 is a parallel tradition of the same saying, and that it referred originally not to the preliminaries πάντα ταῦτα but to the coming itself. A genuine word of Jesus has been modified by its use in the interpretation of a parable to the situation of Mk 13. A difficulty arises only in the fact that this saying is brought in the first person, in a context which we have seen to be that of eschatological exhortation to the church. If some such phrase as λέγας γὰρ ὃς κρίνει ἔχει here, Mk would certainly have deleted it from his gospel. Vs 31-32, also words of Jesus, would then have been added later, at a time when the whole of Vs 5-30 was thought of as having been spoken by Jesus. In any case, this one saying of Jesus following the parable has attracted two more.

Mark 13:31,32

31 Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will not pass away.
32 Concerning that day or that hour no one knows, neither the angels in heaven nor the Son, but only the Father.

Few conclusions can be drawn from the form of these two sayings about the line of their transmission or when they entered the tradition of Mk 13. In view of the parallels in Mt 5:18, Lk 16:17, the saying in Vs 31 is surely genuine. The same is true of Vs 32, at least

case may not be used apologetically, for the parable certainly means that the harvest will follow very soon.

2 Cf. the use of γὰρ in the similar Mt 10:23; Lk 14:24.
in some form (Cf. Acts 1:7). There is no necessary contradiction between Vs 32 and 30, as the parables on watchfulness presuppose both that there is something to watch for, and that one must watch, not knowing exactly when. Nevertheless, there is a difference between such a presupposition and writing both sayings side by side, and it cannot be denied that Vs 32 seems to be a gentle polemic against a possible misunderstanding of Vs 30. It is, therefore, probable that these sayings were not always joined to Vs 30 and the parable of the fig-tree. Even if they were added after Vs 5-27 were understood as being spoken by Jesus, nevertheless they are admirably suited to the eschatological exhortation of the chapter. Vs 31 assures the hearers of the authority of Jesus for the prediction of an early end, but even more of the fact that he will endure beyond the end for their salvation. Vs 32 is also in accord with the chief emphasis of the chapter in discouraging apocalyptic fever, cf. Vs 7, 8b, 13b.

Mark 13:33-37

33 Take heed, watch and pray!
   For you do not know when the time is. 34 Like a man gone abroad, having left his house and given his servants authority to each his own work, and he commanded the doorkeeper to watch.
35 Watch therefore, for you do not know when the lord of the house comes, whether at evening or at midnight or at cockcrow or at dawn. 36 Lest when he come suddenly he find you sleeping.
37 What I say to you I say to all: watch!

The chapter ends with a section of pure pænecesis, again in the form: exhortation-γερ-ground, which is very important for our investigation. Almost every phrase can be paralleled on the one hand in the language of the New Testament epistles, but on the

3 For the absolute use of “the Son” here, cf. O. Cullmann, Christologie des Neuen Testaments, 1957, p. 295. One argument which is often given for the genuineness of this saying is not however valid. Jerome said of it: “gaudet Arios et Eunomius quasi ignorantia magistris” (quoted in Klostermann, Mh., p. 138), but we have no evidence that this passage was an embarrassment before the Arian controversy. Irenaeus quotes it adv. Haer. V, 28, 6 against the gnostics to prove the ignorance of the Son, as does Tertullian adv. Prax. 26 (cf. de anima 33).

2 This explanation according to the function of the saying is surely better than that of a mechanical Stichwort association ad vocem παράρχεις, as is proposed by Klostermann, Mh, p. 138 and Taylor, Mh, p. 319.
other hand also by the parables of watchfulness. It is the parables
which are most important in a discussion of origins, for it seems
that both the exhortations of the epistles and this section of Mark
echo the language of parables without being such themselves.
Jeremias would like to find traces of a parable of the doorkeeper
here and in Lk 12:35-38, but he must admit that it is “besonders
stark zersagt.”\(^1\) It may be that he is right, but we have not the
fuller form of this parable to be able to make a comparison. Jeremias
admits that Vs 33 and 37 are “Rahmungsverse” and that the second
person in Vs 35-36 is secondary. But he must also admit that the
words “It is like a man going on a journey” come from the parable
of the talents (Mt 25:14) and that “he put his servants in charge”
comes from the parable of the faithful and wise servant (Mt 24:45).
This means that all that is left of the supposed original parable are
the words: “and commands his doorkeeper to be on the watch,”
precisely the trait that is lacking in the Lucan parallel!\(^2\) It is then
more likely that we have here not a separate parable, transmitted
as a saying of Jesus, but an example of the parenetic of the church
which is itself derived from the language of the parables. Quite
aside from the close parallels in the secondary applications in Mt
24:42 and 25:13, the statement “for you do not know when the
time is” could stand as the conclusion of any of the watchfulness
parables. Here the function of the statement is to draw the moral
of the saying of Jesus in Vs 32: Watch, for no one knows when the
day and the hour will be, not even the Son.\(^3\) The interpretation of
Vs 34 as a self-contained parable is difficult, and it is more probable
that we have in a short metaphor the general situation of watchful-
ness sketched, in language which reminds of two, or perhaps three
full parables. Already Vs 35 leaves the parable form for a direct
exhortation again. 35a is little more than a repetition of Vs 33. A
comparison with Lk 12:37 shows that the \(\kappa\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\varsigma\varsigma\ \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\varsigma\) may be
the house-master of a parable, but Lohmeyer’s suggestion of the
“Lord of the church” is not impossible; parable and application

\(^1\) Gleichnisse, p. 45.

\(^2\) Is it possible that the doorkeeper has been added because \(\epsilon\iota\iota\ \theta\omicron\rho\alpha\varsigma\) in Vs 29 has been interpreted of the returning Lord and the correlate of
the Lord standing at the door is a doorkeeper who will watch to open?

\(^3\) But also: watch, for he will come in your lifetime, cf. Vs 29, 30. “Watch
and pray” is read by the majority of MSS (all but BDit). Just as likely as
the fact that this verse has been assimilated to Mk 14:38 is that Mark is
there deliberately imitating this passage.
have been so mixed that one cannot say for sure. 35b uses the Roman division of the night into four watches and is thus later than Lk 12: 38 with the Jewish three divisions. Vs 36 is true both of the situation of the 10 virgins (Mt 25:5f) and of the exhortation of the early church.

The conclusion, "what I say to you I say to all," is very important for the question of the origin of the whole chapter, for it betrays a knowledge of the fact that the content of the discourse is not consonant with its having been spoken by Jesus to only four disciples. It is perhaps an indication that the discourse was not originally transmitted as words of Jesus, and that this Vs was, therefore, added by Mk when he incorporated the chapter into his gospel.

2. Form and Function of Mark 13

It is generally agreed that Mark 13 does not represent a verbatim account of what Jesus may have said to his disciples on the Mount of Olives during Wednesday afternoon of Passion Week. This chapter is unique in the gospel of Mark as the only long speech, as distinguished from the collection of sayings in Chapter 4, put into the mouth of Jesus. This does not mean that Jesus could not have spoken to his disciples about such subjects at that time or that no word here can be authentic, but the fact remains that we have to do with a composition of the church, which must be considered first as such. No one would maintain that Mark has simply invented everything out of his own head, nor, in view of the close connections between many verses, does it seem that he has been the first to unite sayings floating separately in the oral tradition. The chapter has a pre-history, and it is this which we must now investigate.

It is surprising that we should find ourselves here on practically virgin ground. Bultmann has taken over the little apocalypse theory, which he thinks excuses him from any investigation of an oral tradition, and K. L. Schmidt and Dibelius have no discussion of the body of Mk 13 at all. This attitude can be justified only if it is true that Mark has taken over a written document which is extraneous to the Christian tradition. A study of our chapter would then properly belong in the framework of a discussion of late Jewish apocalyptic literature. It would beg the question completely, however, to begin with Colani's assumption that apocalyptic and thus much of Mark 13 is foreign to the early Christian Church. Since
Mark is a Christian writing, it would seem much more fruitful to attempt to understand him against a Christian background, to seek to conclude from the form of the chapter as we have it something of the function the different elements of the tradition may have had in the life of the church. It is not enough just to atomize the chapter into a series of disconnected verses, “aus verschiedenen Quellen,” as Lohmeyer constantly says. The problem is to trace the history of the joining of these themes.

The overall literary form of Mark 13 is that of a farewell discourse, to be developed more fruitfully in John 14-17 and Luke 22:21-38, in which a great man gives instructions to his followers just before his death.¹ From such Old Testament origins as Gen 49, Jos 23, 1 Sam 12, Dt as a whole and especially Chapter 33, the form developed into its fullest extent in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In the New Testament we find it also in Acts 20:17ff, 1 and 2 Tim, and 2 Peter. It is in the nature of a farewell discourse to unite predictions of the future with directions for the conduct of the disciples for the time when their master will be no longer with them, and this is one of the primary characteristics of Mark 13. What is, however, essential for a farewell discourse is that it take place just before the death of the beloved master, and this is the case with Mark 13 only by virtue of its position in the gospel. But if it is true, as we have surmised, that Mark is not alone responsible for the composition of this chapter, but that he took it over more or less in its present form, then we must investigate only the content. Here we find no indication at all of the situation of a farewell discourse, for it has long puzzled commentators that Jesus predicts everything but his own imminent death.²

If we seek to determine the setting for apocalyptic teaching in the life of Jesus aside from our chapter, the early church gives but one answer: in the mouth of the risen Christ. The widespread conviction of the early Church³ that Jesus gave special instructions to his disciples after his resurrection is based partly on such passages as Acts 1:2 ἐντελέχειας τοῖς ἄποστολοις and perhaps Mt 28:20 δόξα

---


² Busch, synopt. Eschatologie, p. 44, who calls Mk 13 an “Abschiedsrede” overlooks this fact.

³ Justin, Ἀπολ. 50, 67; Dial 53, 106; Origen, cont. Cels. 5:58; Tertullian, Apol 21; Cyprian, quod idola 14, etc.
From other passages we learn something about the content of this instruction. "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth" (John 16:12f). Why can the disciples not bear to hear these many things? Is it because they have not yet the assurance that Jesus has risen from the dead, which will comfort them in the coming troubles? Peter says in Acts 10:42: "And he (scil. the risen Christ, cf. verses 40f) commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that he is the one ordained by God to be the judge of the living and the dead." According to this statement, it was from the risen Christ that the disciples heard about the second coming. Is this not the only situation in which Christ can speak of his coming again? The disciples did not even understand the necessity of his death; can they have been given instructions about a second coming before Christ's death and resurrection? The commandment to preach to the Gentiles aside from Mark 13:10 is always in the New Testament given by the risen Christ (Mt 28:19, Mk 16:15, Lk 24:47, Jn 20:22, Gal 1:16). In Lk 24:45 (cf. verses 27, 32, 44-47), "Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures," we see that the risen Christ was thought to be a source of Christian midrash, and even if this was already true of the incarnated Christ, the use made of the Old Testament in Mark 13 takes on a new light. The closest parallel in the New Testament to the type of material contained in Mark 13 is undoubtedly the book of Revelation, which is a revelation of the risen Christ. "The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave him to show his servants what must soon take place" (1:1, cf. 1:12f). If we could think of Mark 13:5-37 being spoken by the risen Christ, then many of its characteristics could be explained, especially the fact that there is no mention of the death of Christ, which is simply presupposed. If we maintain that this chapter once circulated as such, it is not just because of the general kind of material it contains, but also because of some very close parallels.

Martin Dibelius in his analysis of the literary forms of early Christianity spoke of "Evangelien-Offenbarungen," in which the risen Lord, in answer to a question of one of the disciples, speaks of the future of the world. He then says later of Mark 13, "So bildet diese Apokalypse eine Art Vorläufer zu den Evangelien-Offen-
barungen" and "Dieser synoptischen Apokalypse hat man nach Rahmen und Art wohl die zwei bis drei Menschenalter später entstandene Petrus-Apokalypse an die Seite zu stellen." If Dibelius does not draw the logical conclusion from these observations, it is only because he is blinded by the little apocalypse theory. It is worthwhile to quote the beginning of the Apocalypse of Peter which he mentions as a close parallel:

1. And when the Lord was seated upon the Mount of Olives, his disciples came unto him (Mt 24:3). And we besought and entreated him severally (= καὶ ἔδρασαν) and prayed him, saying unto him: Declare unto us what are the signs of thy coming and of the end of the world (24:3), that we may perceive and mark the time of thy coming and instruct them that come after us. . . And our Lord answered us, saying: Take heed that no man deceive you (24:4), and that ye be not doubters and serve other gods. Many shall come in my name, saying: I am the Christ (24:5). Believe them not (24:23), neither draw men unto them. For the coming of the Son of God shall not be plain; but as the lightning that shineth from the east unto the west (24:27), so will I come upon the clouds of heaven (24:30) with a great host in my majesty. . . . 2. And ye, take ye the likeness thereof from the fig tree; as soon as the shoot thereof is come forth and the twigs grow, the end of the world shall come (24:32-33).

This short passage is enough to show that the Apocalypse of Peter is dependent on the synoptic apocalypse, in the form in which we find it in Matthew, but he seems to have known a tradition which puts it in the mouth of the risen Christ on the Mount of Olives. The Epistola Apostolorum takes the form of a dialogue with the risen Christ, just before his ascension. The syriac Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi is also such a dialogue, which contains, along with church canons, the question of Peter and John,—"Domini, dic nobis signa

1 Ibid., p. 94.
3 That the Apology of Peter is a discourse of the risen Christ, and that it is the ascension which is described in terms of the transfiguration, cf. A. von Harnack, Texte und Untersuchungen, IX, 2, 1893, p. 50.
4 C. Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung, 1919; Hennecke-Schneemelcher, Bd. 1, pp. 127ff. Because the introduction to the Coptic text seems to imitate Mt 28, Schmidt speaks of an "apokalyptischen Rede Jesu an seine Jünger in Galiläa," but the ascension at the end would indicate rather the Mount of Olives.
finis (mundi),"¹ which is followed by instructions of Jesus based on Mark 13. The gnostic Pistis Sophia consists of teachings of Jesus to his disciples on the Mount of Olives just before the ascension, and this situation is in general popular among the gnostics.² It is also probable that the so-called Gospel according to the Egyptians, and even more the newly found Gospel of Thomas, which begins: "These are the secret words which Jesus the living one (β ζων = the resurrected Christ) spoke . . .", are collections of sayings of the risen Christ.³ Finally, we even have evidence for the risen Christ predicting the fall of Jerusalem. The ending of Mark, according to W (the Freer Logion) contains the words: "(Satan has fallen) but other terrible things are near; also for those who sinned in that I was delivered unto death, in order that they return to the truth and sin no more..." Lactantius, in the Divine Institutes, IV, 21, says of the risen Christ:

But he also opened to them all things which were about to happen, which Peter and Paul preached at Rome; and this preaching being written for the sake of remembrance became permanent, in which they both declared other wonderful things, and also said that it was about to come to pass, that after a short time God would send against them a king who would subdue the Jews, and level their cities to the ground, and besiege the people themselves, worn out with hunger and thirst. Then it should come to pass that they should feed on the bodies of their own children, and consume one another. Lastly that they should be taken captive, and come into the hands of their enemies, and should see their wives most cruelly harassed before their eyes, their virgins ravished and polluted, their sons torn in pieces, their little ones dashed to the ground; and lastly, everything laid waste with fire and sword, the captives banished forever from their own lands, because they had exalted over the well-beloved and most approved Son of God.⁴

Lactantius speaks of a writing in Rome. Could it be that he has seen an expanded form of the original of Mark 13?

² Pistis Sophia, c. 2 (Hennecke-Scheuemelcher, I, p. 177); cf. further the Gospel of Bartholomew IV, 1 (p. 366), the Gospel of Mary (p. 251f), the Apocryphon of John (p. 235), the Sophia Jesu Christi, where the Mount of Olives is interestingly located in Galilee (p. 171), the Acts of John 97-102 (Hennecke-Scheuemelcher, II, pp. 157ff), the Apocalypse of Paul (II, p. 566).
⁴ This statement has been quoted at length (from the translation of Fletcher in the ANF) as an example of what a true vaticinium ex eventu of the fall of Jerusalem looks like, as opposed to Lk 21:20ff.
Some of these parallels might seem too remote to indicate that the immediate source of Mark 13 ever circulated as an independent document. Much more important, however, is Acts 1:6-12, which could be understood as a summary of a tradition parallel to Mark 13, as instructions of the risen Christ on the Mount of Olives. There the disciples ask a question very similar to that of Mark 13:4, and receive as an answer: “It is not for you to know times or seasons which the father has fixed by his own authority,” a parallel to Mark 13:32. There then follows the promise of the Spirit and the command to preach the gospel, all that was necessary for the purpose of the writer of Acts, but no more. But that Acts knows that the post-resurrection instruction was fuller than what is here quoted, is shown by Vs 2: ἐντελεχέως.

The idea that Mk 13:5-37 was originally conceived to be a discourse of the risen Christ has apparently been only suggested by A. Loisy and Strather Hunt. Loisy says: “Si Marc fait dire la prophétie sur le mont des Oliviers, c’est que sa source immédiate la présentait comme une instruction du Christ montant au ciel, c’est-à-dire exactement dans les conditions où l’Apocalypse de Pierre présente une révélation analogue.” If we can accept this and that Mark knew the original setting, then many elements in Mk 13:3-4 can be explained. The fact that the discourse takes place on the Mount of Olives is then full of meaning. ἔξω is a standard phrase in such situations, cf. Irenaus, adv. Haer. I, 25, 5. As for the disciples who ask, we can compare Clemens Alex., “After the Resurrection the Lord gave the tradition of knowledge to James the Just and John and Peter, these gave it to the other apostles, etc.” Because “words of the Lord” could also be considered words of Jesus, Mark has inserted a discourse of the risen Christ into his gospel, making it refer to the destruction of the temple by connecting it with the saying in Vs 2, but in composing the introduction, preserving enough of the original situation that we can still see

---

1 Which also seems to have belonged to a post-resurrection context; cf. Mt 28:20; Lk 24:49; Mk 16:17f; Jn 20:22.
2 B. P. W. Strather Hunt, Primitive Gospel Sources.
3 Les Origines du Nouveau Testament, 1936, p. 320, cf. p. 56, 104. It is of course in connection with his idea of the transition of the primitive “catéchêse eschatologique” into the “catéchêse évangelique.”
4 In Eusebius, H.E., II, 1, 4. Why Andrew is also named as a middleman in Mark we cannot say, any more than we can say why he is named along with John and Peter as an interrogator in the Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, ed. Rahmani, p. 147.
his source. But what is the origin of this discourse of Christ on the Mount of Olives?

The traditional solution to the problem of Mark 13 is to postulate a Jewish apocalypse with Christian additions. It is, of course, even more possible for this to have been the case if we are dealing with instructions of the risen Christ than if the material always belonged to the gospel tradition. The difficulty comes only in deciding which verses would have originally belonged to this Jewish apocalypse. In his extensive review of the little apocalypse theory, Beasley-Murray\(^1\) has shown that every verse has at one time or another been included in such an apocalyptic source, and every verse has been omitted from it. Accordingly, this attempt to find a connected Jewish apocalypse has today been largely abandoned. The so-called "Christian additions" can be found in the most varied forms throughout the whole chapter. There is simply no criterion of why one way of taking a selection of verses from this chapter and trying to fit them into a connected source should be better than another. Is it then possible to speak of "Jewish apocalyptic elements" which have been incorporated? The procedure of removing all sayings which refer to some specific characteristic of Christianity and saying that the remainder must be Jewish is not one to be scientifically recommended. Anyone proceeding in such a way would reflect his own dislike of apocalyptic and prejudice against Judaism, and he would also, of course, beg the whole question. A more objective approach would seek the origins of the chapter among transmitters of the Christian tradition, without writing off any portion because of modern antipathies toward the content.

A further question is whether or not Vs 5-37 as they stand, without trying to extract a special source, could be called an apocalypse. Lohmeyer, who thinks they can be so called, was nevertheless forced to remark:\(^2\) "Am auffälligsten ist, dass das Thema des Welt- und Völkergerichts, mit der Gestalt des Menschensohn seit Dan 7 verbunden, hier völlig fehlt." But this is not all that is lacking. The Apostolic Constitutions, VII, 31f, is interesting in this respect, as showing what belongs to a proper Christian apocalypse.

Be watchful for your life. Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning, and be ye like unto men who wait for their Lord,

---

when He will come, at even, or in the morning, or at cock-crowing, or at midnight. For at what hour they think not, the Lord will come; and if they open to Him, blessed are those servants, because they were found watching. For He will gird Himself, and will make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. Watch, therefore, and pray, that ye do not sleep unto death. For your former deeds will not profit you, if at the last part of your life you go astray from the true faith. For in the last days false prophets shall be multiplied, and such as corrupt the word; and the sheep shall be changed into wolves, and love into hatred; for through the abounding of iniquity the love of many shall wax cold. For men shall hate, and persecute, and betray one another. And then shall appear the deceiver of the world, the prince of lies, whom the Lord Jesus shall destroy with the spirit of His mouth, who takes away the wicked with His lips; and many shall be offended at Him. But they that endure to the end, the same shall be saved. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and afterwards shall be the voice of a trumpet by the archangel; and in that interval shall be the revival of those that were asleep. And then shall the Lord come, and all His saints with Him, with a great concussion above the clouds, with the angels of His power, in the throne of His kingdom, to condemn the devil, the deceiver of the world, and to render to every one according to his deeds. Then shall the wicked go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous shall go into life eternal, to inherit those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, such things as God hath prepared for them that love Him; and they shall rejoice in the kingdom of God, which is in Christ Jesus.

This section is based, of course, on Didache 16, but the additions are interesting as coming almost all from the New Testament. They are all part of the early Christian expectations, but where in Mark 13 do we hear of the growing lawlessness and apostasy, of the destruction of Anti-Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, the punishment of the wicked, and the bliss of the elected? When all these elements are lacking, can we still speak of an apocalypse?

The most recent attempt to find a systematic apocalyptic program in our chapter is that made by G. Harder. His exegesis is ingenious, but much too forced at a number of points. Thus, after the Anti-Christ is seen standing in the temple, the Christians should flee for their lives, at the same time that the followers of Anti-Christ are streaming into Jerusalem. This will be a time of great

---

1 "Das eschatologische Geschichtsbild der sogenannten kleinen Apokalypse Markus 13." *Theologia Viatorum*, 1932, pp. 7ff.
suffering for those fleeing, for Anti-Christ will try to stop their flight into the desert, just as Pharaoh tried to stop the Israelites and the dragon tried to stop the woman in Rev 12. The purpose of this flight is the separation of the forces of good and evil, so that the latter can be concentrated in one place and be destroyed. According to Harder, the destruction of the forces of Anti-Christ by a river of fire coming down from heaven upon Jerusalem, and the imprisonment of Anti-Christ in Gehinnom must have once stood between Vs 20 and 24, instead of the present Vs 21-23. Then Christ will appear in the heaven directly over the destroyed Jerusalem and send out his angels to gather his elect back to the holy city. Then from Zion, the highest point of the earth, they will be translated to the highest point of heaven, to the place of the blessed. It is possible, of course, to give a number of parallels from late Jewish apocalyptic to support every one of these points, and especially those to Revelation are impressive, but all this is simply not in the text of Mark 13.

Even if we do not have to do with a complete apocalypse, have we at least here the apocalyptic type, in the sense that the chapter describes a succession of coming apocalyptic events, even if the program is not complete? Kümmel has laid great stress on the number of temporal expressions: not yet (Vs 7), beginning (8), first (10), then (14), and then (21), after (24), and then (26), and then (27). This list is quite impressive when seen out of its context, but it is not at all true to the context of the chapter. We find only two periods of time envisaged, the present (Vs 5-13) and the near future (Vs 14-27). Some of the expressions Kümmel finds important only say that the present is not the end ("not yet," "first"), but only the "beginning" of the woes. The rest refer to the future in contrast to the present—"then" = "in those days" (Vs 17, 19, 20, 24). At only one place is a chronological succession indicated, when it is said that the second coming will be "after" that tribulation. Marxsen would also divide the chapter into Vs 5-13 which describe

---

1 Vs 21-23 will then have been added after A.D. 70 as part of the delay of the destruction of Anti-Christ, for the fight between truth and falsehood must be carried out further.
2 ἄνευ ἀπετύχθης. This strange exegesis is to be found already in Lohmeyer, Mk, p. 279, and has been adopted but the locale changed to Galilee in Marxsen, Mk, p. 126.
3 Promise and Fulfillment, p. 97.
4 Mk, p. 121.
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the situation of the present, and Vs 14ff. which concern events which for Mark were still in the future. It is a relapse into older categories when Conzelmann\(^1\) prefers the opposition between historical (Vs 5-23) and apocalyptic (Vs 24-27), which he even calls the "Schlüssel für die Gliederung der Darstellung."\(^2\) It is, however, doubtful whether such a distinction would have been understood by Mark, or that he would separate the coming supernatural "kosmische Katastrophe" from the historical tribulation of the destruction of the temple. The real division is, as Marxsen maintains, only that between present and future. It is, therefore, very misleading to speak of an apocalyptic program, which must be contrasted to an eschatology of suddenness as in Lk 17.\(^3\)

It is also misleading to speak of signs, as does the question in Mk 13:4.\(^4\) If an early Christian had wanted to know the approximate date of the parousia, would he have gotten any help from our chapter, aside from the universal New Testament feeling that it would be soon? He could learn that it would occur after the great tribulation, but so immediately afterwards that the tribulation could not be called a sign, but rather a part of the end itself, and too late to help him. It is not said that after the beginning of the tribulation there will be 3½ times, or 2,300 evening-mornings, or 1,335 days, or anything of the kind. And there is absolutely no indication as to when this great tribulation will begin, except that it is "not yet" and that the author obviously thinks that it will be soon. In short, there is nothing in this chapter to eliminate the need for watching, which implies that the expected event will be in the lifetime of those watching, but sudden and at an unexpected time. Wellhausen\(^5\) thought that Mk 13:32 was intolerable in an apocalypse, in that it eliminates all possibility of fixing the date of a program, and he is probably right. But there is no contradiction between this verse and the rest of Mark 13. "In the thirteenth chapter of Mark there is no indication of any special revelation, no mystery in the language (except in Vs 14), none of the characteristic apparatus of the vision, nothing even to suggest knowledge

---

1 "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mc 13," ZNW 50 (1959), pp. 210-221.
2 ibid., p. 215. Cf. the distinction made by C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, 1936, pp. 31f. between "historical" and "supernatural."
3 T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, 1931, drives this distinction rather far and seeks thereby to discredit Mk 13 in favor of Q.
4 Note that in Mk 13:22 it is the false Messiah who gives signs.
5 Das Evangelium Marci, ad loc.
received from heaven for the purpose in hand. Whatever may be thought of the material of our chapter, or conjectured as to its composition, there is nothing in any part of it that can justify the use of the term 'apocalyptic'.

F. Busch has come much closer to an understanding of our chapter when he calls it an explication of Mk 8:34, a "Mahnrede zur ὑπομονή im θαλάσσα." As W. G. Kümmel has put it, the function of the chapter as a whole is to give "eschatological promise, not apocalyptic instruction." This understanding of the general framework of Mark 13 in terms of the eschatological exhortation of the church rather than as the incorporation of a foreign apocalyptic "Flugblatt" has today become more common. For example, C. H. Dodd now says: "I 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 that it is an apocalypse at all. It is a Mahnrede in apocalyptic terms, and I think it highly composit." Cf. further E. Lohmeyer: "Sie (viz. die Rede Mk 13) ist nicht nur apokalyptische Lehre, sondern in mindestens gleichem Masse apokalyptische Paränese"; J. Schmid: "Sie will nicht apokalyptische Belehrung bieten sondern ist eschatologisch motivierte Paränese"; H. Conzelmann: "Das vorherrschende Interesse liegt nicht, wie die Frage vermuten lassen könnte, bei der apokalyptischen Darstellung, sondern bei der richtigen Einstellung auf das Kommende, also bei der eschatologischen Paränese." The phrase "not apocalyptic but parenetic" has become almost a commonplace.

These insights concerning the overall purpose of the chapter are confirmed by a closer consideration of the form of the various sayings. Already Wellhausen recognized one of the primary character-

---

1 C. C. Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church, 1941, p. 144f. To be sure, Torrey thought that this chapter, with the exception of Vs 14a added in A.D. 40, could have been spoken by Jesus, which seems improbable. But his remarks as to the general character of Mk 13 still hold true.

2 synopt. Eschatologie, p. 48. But even he has to recognize, p. 51, "Vs 24-27 hebt sich aus der ganzen Mahnrede heraus."

3 Promise and Fulfillment, p. 88.

4 In a private communication to Beasley-Murray, quoted Jesus and the Future, p. 100.

5 Mk, p. 285.


7 "Geschichte und Eschaton," p. 214.

8 Mk, p. 107.
istics of our chapter: "Nicht jüdisch ist aber auch die Anrede mit Ihm, wodurch die Schau in einfache Lehre verwandelt und allen apokalyptischen Firlefanz abgestreift wird. Denn zur Form der richtigen jüdischen Apokalypsen gehört es, dass der Seher selbst, der die Offenbarung empfängt, anerkannt wird... oder dass er im Ich-stil erzählt, was er hat schauen und hören dürfen." And yet Vs 5-37 contain 19 imperatives! It is the fact of the duality of the apocalyptic and parenetic elements which has continually been a temptation to find an apocalyptical source, to which Christian parenetic had been added. But this is to approach the problem from the wrong side: the framework of the discourse is provided by the parenetic, to which apocalyptic elements have been "added."
The characteristic words are βαίνεις (Vs 5, 9, 23, 33) and γρηγορεῖτε (34, 35, 37). It is easy enough to separate the hortatory elements, Vs 5b, 7a, 8b, 9a, 13b, 21, 23, 28-29, 33-37, from the apocalyptic elements, Vs 6, 7b, 8a, 14-20, 22, 24-27, a division which very nearly corresponds to the formal distinction between second and third person. It should be clear that this separation of different "elements" has nothing to do with literary criticism in the sense of looking for "sources", for neither series is capable of standing alone. We are only trying to isolate special characteristics of the chapter in order to determine the original function. If this characterization as parenetic with apocalyptic elements is allowed, two questions arise: who is being addressed in this exhortation? and how are the apocalyptic elements joined to this?

To answer the second question first, we shall recall the characteristic word γὰρ. The importance of this word would have been noticed long ago, were it not for the unfortunate fact that it is missing in several places from the Nestle text, even though it is required by a synoptic comparison and is well attested. γὰρ appears at the beginning of Vs 6, 7b, 8, 9b, 11b, 19, 22, 33, and 35. With the exception therefore of the longer sections 14-18 and 24-27, every apocalyptic element is attached to its context by a γὰρ. The apocalyptic is therefore not an independent element in our text, but exists here only to provide the ground for the exhortation. Far from being the main point, it is always presupposed as something known, from which the speaker argues further to the consequences the hearer.¹

¹ In the section Mk 8:34-38, which goes progressively from exhortation to
When we examine the references to the parousia in the epistles to the Thessalonians, for example, we find the same situation, that apocalyptic is given in a parenetic context as a ground, joined with γὰρ. In 1 Thes 4:13ff, Paul exhorts the young church in regard to the problem of those having died before the expected consummation. They should not sorrow about the dead (13), for (γὰρ) God will raise them (14). We know that God will raise them, for (γὰρ) as the Lord said... and a description of the parousia follows (15-17). Therefore, exhort (παρακαλεῖτε) one another with these words (18).

We see here very explicitly that apocalyptic is to be used for paraclèsis. Again in 2 Thes 2:1ff the situation is an overly excited apocalyptic atmosphere, which Paul calms (1-3a), and then he gives the ground for his exhortation: for (διὰ) the man of lawlessness is not yet revealed (3b-4). You know this (5-6), for (γὰρ) the mystery of Anti-Christ is already at work (7). To take another example, Didache 16 begins: watch, for (γὰρ) you do not know the hour; meet often together, for (γὰρ) the whole time of your faith will not help you, if it is not perfected in the end time. For (γὰρ) lawlessness will increase... and there follows the apocalyptic section proper. It is important to notice that the phrase introduced by γὰρ is always a reference to something known and accepted, whether scripture, or a word of Jesus, or an established part of the kerygma, for otherwise the argument would have no power. We see therefore that the main function of Mk 13 is to provide eschatological exhortation, and that the “apocalyptic instruction” is introduced only to provide the ground for this exhortation.

The next question we have to answer is that of those being addressed in the second person. In the situation in Mark, it is of course the four disciples with Jesus. But when we observe Vs 37 we see who is meant: it is not the original disciples who are being told to keep on their guard, but the contemporaries of the author. This author is not however Mark, for the chapter did not originate as eschatology, every sentence is connected to the preceding one by γὰρ, Vs 35, 36, 37, 38.

1 The passage that follows, Vs 8-12, is characterized by καὶ τότε as Mk 13:14 by διὰ... τότε and Mk 13:24 by ἄλλα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ταῖς ἡμέραις, for both go beyond what is required by the situation.

2 γὰρ is regularly used to give the ground for an assertion or exhortation; cf. Blass-Debrunner, § 452. It is common in introducing quotations from the OT, being used by Paul for example Rm 4:3, 9; 9:9, 15; 10:5, 11, 13, 16; 11:34; 12:19; 13:9; 14:21; 1 Cor 1:19; 2:16; 3:19; 9:9; 10:26; 14:21; 15:27, 45; 2 Cor 6:2; 8:21; 9:7; Gal 5:14.
part of the gospel tradition. We have surmised that Mark probably took over the bulk of the discourse Vs 5-37 as sayings of the risen Christ on the Mount of Olives and composed his introduction accordingly. If this is true, then we have to ask about the source of the post-resurrection discourse, which has been indicated more by the general situation than by the actual form of the sayings. Except for the introduction in Vs 5a, there is no indication that Jesus is the speaker of most of the chapter, and the form-critical affinities of the material seem to show that he could not be so. These verses would not at all be out of place in one of the epistles, and they definitely do not belong from the very beginning in a gospel, or even in the mouth of the risen Christ. They are rather prophetic paraclesis and can be thought of as a "sermon" delivered probably to a group of Christians in Rome in the sixties of the first century. If so, it is not at all like such an ancient homily as 2 Clement, for these words are spoken with prophetic authority. They can, however, be compared with the sermons of Acts, where we find a combination of the kerygma with parenetic and midrash.

But in this case, where the Sitz im Leben is not mission preaching but exhortation in an eschatological context to Christians, we find no kerygma as such. The development we have suggested, from a prophetic saying (cf. 1 Cor 15:51, μορφήν) to a prophetic "word of the Lord" (cf. 1 Thes 4:15-17) to a message of the risen Christ (cf. Rev 1:3) to words of the incarnate Jesus, is one which can be seen elsewhere in the New Testament.\(^1\) We must now ask the question as to the carriers of this tradition.

It has long been customary to speak of two lines of tradition in primitive Christianity, kerygma and didache. The first, which is thought to be best represented by Mark, has affinities with the Rabbinic haggada, which related primarily ma'asim. The second, represented by Q, is similar to the Rabbinic halakha, which transmits debarim and meshalim.\(^2\) I would like to suggest for the Sitz im

---

\(^1\) Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Die Verzögerung der Parousie," In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer, 1951, p. 118f. As Tertullian, de resurrectione carnis, 22, says, "prophecies were the Lord's own word."

\(^2\) Cf. L. Bauck, "The Gospel as a Document of the History of the Jewish Faith," Judaism and Christianity, 1958, pp. 41-136. The analogy cannot be pressed too closely, however, because in contrast to the rabbinic tradition, the Christian haggada is of a normative character. Also the material known as Q is much more closely related to Aboth than to the rest of the Mishnah, and its real formal affinities are with the wisdom literature.
Leben of Mk 13 a third line of tradition, akin to the apocalyptic traditions of Judaism. To suggest that we should look among the early Christian prophets for the transmitters of our chapter is not to make a startling discovery, and yet Mk 13 seems never to have been considered consequently from this point of view.\footnote{Bo Reicke, “A Synopsis of Early Christian Preaching,” The Root of the Vine, 1953, pp. 128-160, pp. 155ff, has suggested the connection without carrying it out in detail.}

If it was the function of an apostle to give the κήρυγμα to the church, of the teacher to give διδασκαλία, then the function of a prophet was to give παράκλησις. It is said of the prophets Judas and Silas, Acts 15:32, that they “exhorted (παρακάλεσαν) the brethren with many words and strengthened them.” It is said in 1 Cor 14:3, “He who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement (παράκλησιν) and consolation (παραχωμόθεν).”\footnote{But if this is paracesis, Stählin has said (TWNT V, 820, 46f), “Die Träger des christlichen Trostes sind zunächst die Propheten der nt. lichen Gemeinde.” This is what lends an inner probability to the attribution of Hebrews to Barnabas, the “son of exhortation” (παρακλήσεως) by Tertullian, F. Dibelius, K. Bornhäuser, etc.}

A short example of this exhortation is found in Acts 14:22, where Paul and Barnabas were “strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting (παρακαλοῦντες) them to continue in the faith, and saying that through many tribulations we must enter the Kingdom of God.” The primary function of the Christian prophet was therefore paracesis in the situation of the tribulation of the last days before the coming of the Kingdom. The double meaning of this word shows what is included: on the one hand ethical exhortation, an imperative, and on the other hand consolation, the ground for exhortation, an indicative. The Christian must endure the tribulation and persecution of this world, because of the promise of the Kingdom, which will be manifested in the near future. Paul exhorts the Thessalonians “a) to lead a life worthy of God, b) who calls you into his kingdom and glory” (1 Thes 2:12). In this sense 1 Peter is a prophetic writing, and Hebrews is even called a “word of exhortation (παρακλήσεως), 13:22.”\footnote{“Urchristliche Propheticie ist die aus Inspiration herausgegeborene Rede charismatischer Verkündiger, durch die der Heilsplan Gottes mit der Welt}
ing of paraclesis comes to the fore, that of giving the objective ground for enduring and hoping. The so-called predictions of the Christian prophets are to be seen in this light. On closer examination it will be seen that early Christian prophecy fits into the general pattern of post-exilic prophecy, which could be characterized as charismatic exegesis. Thus the ground for the exhortation, the apocalyptic statement proper, is usually found to be a prophetic midrash of the Old Testament in the light of the present situation, as we have seen in Mk 13:14-20, 24-27. "Whatever was written before was written for our instruction (διδασκαλίαν), that through steadfastness (ὑπομονής) and the exhortation (παρακλήσεως) of the scriptures we might have hope" (Rm 15:4). The present situation, in the light of which the prophets searched the scriptures, can be characterized as a time of tribulation before the coming redemption. According to 1 Pet 1:10f, the result of searching the scriptures was knowledge about "who" and "when", the "sufferings unto Christ and the subsequent glory." Paul and Barnabas travelled in Asia Minor "strengthening the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to remain steadfast in the faith, and saying: through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). Mk 13 is an example of this kind of paraclesis, in which the disciples are exhorted to stand fast in the present tribulation and to watch for the coming consummation.

We have seen that the framework of Mk 13 is provided by an eschatological paraclesis and have surmised that this paraclesis was addressed to the situation of a congregation of early Christians. If this is the case, we should expect to find similar exhortations to watch and stand fast in the literature of the New Testament which is directed directly to the situation, and when we turn to the epistles, we are not disappointed. A consideration of parallel passages in 1 Pet, James, Eph, and Col had led Carrington to include the rubrics Vigilate and State in his reconstruction of the primitive catechism he supposed to underlie many sections of parenetic in the epistles.

und der Gemeinde wie auch der Wille Gottes im Leben des einzelnen Christen bekannt wird." (G. Friedrich, TWNT VI, 849, 38ff).

1 Cf. below, pp. 433-441.
2 For the translation, cf. E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 1958, p. 136. Even if the reference is to OT prophets, their activity is seen in the light of NT prophecy.
Selwyn has pointed out difficulties in this conception, principally the strongly eschatological context in 1 and 2 Thes and Romans, and he has suggested as a common source not catechism instruction but a persecution-torah, the exhortation of early Christian prophets to a situation of persecution. Selwyn mentions among the common phrases found: persecution has been foretold and you should not be alarmed but rather rejoice, for it indicates that deliverance is at hand. Therefore be wakeful and sober and stand firm.

A consideration of the most important passages will show very clearly the common language involved:

But concerning the times and seasons, brethren, you do not need for us to write to you. For you know very well that the day of the Lord comes like a thief in the night. When they say, "Peace and security," then suddenly destruction will come on them like pangs come on a pregnant woman, and one will not be able to escape. But you, brethren, are not in the darkness that the day should surprise you like a thief. For you are all sons of light and sons of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness. Therefore let us not sleep like the rest, but let us keep awake and sober. For those who sleep at night, and those who are drunk are drunk at night ... Let us be sober and put on the breastplate of faith and love for a helmet the hope of salvation. For God has not destined us for wrath but to obtain salvation .... Therefore exhort one another and build one another up. (1 Thes 5:1-11)

But concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ ... we beg you, brethren, not to be quickly shaken in mind or alarmed ... Let no one deceive you in any way, for first the rebellion must come and the man of lawlessness be revealed .... Do you not remember that when I was still with you I told you this? .... Therefore, brethren, stand fast. (2 Thes 2:1-15)

And all this knowing the time, that already now is the hour for you to wake from sleep; for salvation is now nearer to us than when we first believed. The night is advanced, the day has come near. Let us put off then the works of darkness and put on the armor of light; let us behave seemingly as in the day, not in revelling or drunkenness ... (Rm 13:11-14)

Be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand .... For our struggle ... is with the world rulers of this darkness .... Stand therefore and ... put on the breastplate of righteousness and ... the helmet of salvation ... praying at times in the Spirit, and to this end keep awake. (Eph 6:10-18)

1 1 Peter, pp. 439-458.
The end of all things has come near; therefore be sane and sober for prayer. (1 Pet 4:7)

Be sober, be awake. (1 Pet 5:8)

Therefore be patient, brethren, until the coming of the Lord ... You also be patient, strengthen your hearts, for the coming of the Lord has come near. (Jas 5:7-9)

We can add one last extract, which clearly belongs with the above passages from the epistles, but which comes from the Gospel of Luke, as his ending to the eschatological discourse:

Watch out for yourselves lest your hearts be heavy with dissipation and drunkenness and worldly cares, and that day come on you suddenly like a snare ... But watch at all times, praying that you may be strong to escape all these things which are going to happen and to stand before the Son of Man. (Lk 21:34-36)

The origin of this language, not in the tradition of sayings of Jesus, but in the eschatological paraclesis of the church, leads us to posit something similar for the frameword of Mk 13. C.H. Dodd says about the eschatological discourse: “The burden of the paraenesis here is closely similar to that of the eschatological section of the catechesis, and its style, though not identical, is sufficiently similar, and sufficiently unlike the prevailing style of some other parts of the Gospels, to warrant the belief that some relation existed between them at an early stage of the formation of the tradition.”¹ Let us consider once more the parenetic framework of Mk 13:

Watch that no one leads you astray. (5b)
And when you hear of wars and rumors of wars do not be alarmed. (7a)
These are the beginnings of the pangs. (8b)
But watch yourselves. (9a)
But he who endures to the end will be saved. (13b)
And then if anyone should say to you: “see, here is the Messiah”, “see, there”, do not believe it. (21)
But you take care! I have told you all beforehand. (23)
From the fig tree learn the parable: when you see its branch already become soft and it puts forth leaves, you know that the summer is near. Thus you too, when you see this happening, know that it is near, at the gate. (28-29).

Take heed, watch and pray! (For you do not know when the time is...) (33)

Watch therefore, (for you do not know when the lord of the house comes...) (35a)

What I say to you I say to all: watch. (37)

Printed in this fashion, without the objective grounds for the exhortation, which we have seen were attached to the framework by a γὰρ, it is clear where the form-critical affinities of this material lie.

In our discussion of the exhortation in Mk 13:33-37, we have already suggested that the origin of this paracletic language of the church is to be sought in the parables of watchfulness. As is well known, these parables are among the most difficult to trace back to a situation in the life of Jesus, for they show the most influence of their transmission by the early church. Not only has the general situation of watchfulness influenced the church's paracesis, but this very language of the church has in its turn also influenced the telling of the parables, as can be seen in such secondary applications as Mt 25:13 ("Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour"). Nevertheless, the essence of these parables goes back undoubtedly to Jesus,¹ and it is here that we can see the origin of the paracesis of the early prophets. Mk 13:33-37 occupies a place midway between the synoptic parables and the exhortation of the epistles. Thus γρηγορεῖν (cf. μὴ καθίσται, ἁγρυπνεῖν, βλέπειν) in Vs 35 and 37 can be paralleled in the parables of Mt 24:43; Lk 12:37, 39, and on the other hand in the paracletic passages 1 Thes 5:6, 10; 1 Pet 5:8; Rev 3:3; 16:15; Acts 20:31. In the similar section Lk 21:34-36, we find the image of the thief, which comes from the parable Mt 24:33; Lk 12:39, and develops into the mere expressions of 1 Thes 5:2, 4; 2 Pet 3:10; Rev 3:3; 16:15. One could well suppose that the expressions "like a snare" Lk 21:35, and "like birthpangs", 1 Thes 5:3 (cf. Jn 16:21), are are also remnants of fuller parables.

The function of this exhortation, in the situation of the parables as in the paracesis of the church, could be summed up in the words

¹ They are consequently assigned completely to the situation of the church only by E. Grässer, Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte, 1937, on which cf. O. Cullmann, "Parusieverzögerung und Urchristentum," ThLZ 83 (1958), pp. 1-12.
of Mk 13:13b, "He who endures to the end will be saved." There are thus two elements involved, the σωφοτερια, the endurance, patience of the disciples, which means that they should not expect the end too early; and the fact that they can endure all tribulations because the end will come to deliver them and take vengeance on their oppressors. The emphasis of the exhortation, however, is on the first part, on enduring the tribulation. It can be grounded in the sufferings of Jesus (2 Cor 1:5; 1 Pet 4:13), or in the fact that these sufferings have been predicted (1 Thes 3:4; 1 Pet 2:21; Acts 14:22). The situation can be seen in Paul urging the Thessalonians "not to be quickly shaken in mind or alarmed...to the effect that the day of the Lord has come" (2 Thes 2:2). When that day comes, it will come suddenly, but until then: endure and watch.

This tradition of eschatological exhortation has left its mark in several places of the gospel tradition. It can be observed especially well in Mk 13, where as we have seen it provides the framework of the whole chapter. But it is also probable that the parables of Mt 24-25 were transmitted in this context, which can be seen by the secondary applications using the language of the prophets. In some cases parables have been reapplied to this purpose, although the original meaning was quite different. Thus Lk 18:1-8 is probably but a variant of the more general parable Lk 11:5-8. Just after the discourse against the Pharisees in Mt 23 follows the eschatological discourse, and this connection is also to be found in Luke, where after 11:37-12:1 there follows a body of eschatological exhortation in 12:2-12, (22-34), 35-46. It may very well be that this section of Luke has had a history similar to that of Mk 13, and that these words were once part of a prophetic discourse and only afterwards put into the mouth of Jesus. Finally, the material in Jn 14-17 has also at one time been transmitted by prophets, and it provides parallels to every verse in Mk 13, but now it appears under a specifically Johannine impress.

1 Interesting is the parallel of Lk 12:41 ("Peter said, 'Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for all?'") to Mk 13:37 (Jesus said, "what I say to you I say to all.").
3. The Genesis of Mark 13

It is sometimes useful at the end of a long analysis to attempt a synthesis, if only to provide a summary of what has been said. It is of course much easier to distinguish various elements in a composition than to explain how, and when, and by whom they came to be put together. The reconstruction of the history of Mk 13 which follows will therefore be largely hypothetical. The mere attempt, however, acts as a check on the correctness of our previous analysis, for we should at least be able to imagine how it might have happened.

We have suggested that there was a prophetic tradition in early Christianity, Christian prophets who treasured words of the head of their prophetic school and who searched the scriptures to be able to interpret these "words of the Lord" to the situation of their contemporaries. It is in such a group that we have to think of the tradents of our material. We have seen that the core of Mk 13 is the unfulfilled oracle of Vs 14-19, which has its origin sometime between the winter of A.D. 39/40 and the winter of 40/41. The injunction to flee, which uses words of Jesus from a midrash on Lot, is here adequately motivated. It is of course possible that the oracle, which has nothing specifically Christian about it and seems to address all Judea, may have been originally the utterance of a Jewish prophet. This hypothesis brings more difficulties than it solves, however, for we would then have to explain how it is that a Jewish prophet is using words of Jesus (Vs 15f), or conversely how it is that words of a Jewish prophet were able to enter the Christian tradition at two different points, here and in Q. The simplest supposition then is that these words were from the beginning the work of Christian prophets. This "word of the Lord" was not simply discarded when it failed of fulfillment, nor did it find the convenient explanation of the "restrainer" of 2 Thes, but it was handed down among the prophets and thought to have its fulfillment in the future.

The original oracle referred to a situation similar to that of the time of Daniel: a desecration of the temple resulting in war and great hardship. The oracle was then reapplied to refer to the fall of Jerusalem. Because Jesus had spoken of a decisive event which was to happen at some time during the lifetime of those who witnessed his death, and because he was also known to have predicted the fall of Jerusalem, these two events were combined, and the
oracle of A.D. 40, now interpreted of the coming catastrophe in Jerusalem, was expanded by the addition of Vs 20, 24-27, telling of the early parousia. That these verses do not agree with the intention of Jesus is shown by the fact that the exegesis of Dn 7:13ff presupposed is quite a different one from his. Given the presupposition of the author, however, we found that these words were the result of a careful examination of Old Testament scripture. It may have been that they were once part of a longer Christian apocalypse, but we have no way of knowing. In any case, the author seems to have known nothing of the Anti-Christ, although the idea lies near enough at hand for anyone thinking of the Son of Man in terms of Dn 7.

The next stage in the tradition, whether in Judea or Rome one cannot say, was the inclusion of this oracle in the exhortation of a Christian prophet. This covered essentially Vs 5-13, 21ff, and perhaps 33-36. That the original oracle has been included in a discourse with a slightly different function is shown by the difference in form involved. Vs 14-20, 24-27 were therefore not composed by the author of the exhortation, but taken over en bloc. There was, however, a good reason for using the oracle, for it had prophetic authority, and it suited the purpose of the exhortation to have its climax in a promise of the parousia. Just as in Vs 5-8 the exhortation is followed phrase for phrase by an objective ground, so the description of the near parousia provides the objective ground for the whole discourse. Nevertheless, it was essentially the parousia alone which was interesting in this context, and not the Vs 14-19, which have been included only because they were already attached to the parousia, and which were by now far removed from their original function. We have the case of an author quoting more than necessary to make his point, with the extraneous context later assuming more importance in the interpretation of the whole than was intended.1

The hypothesis of a further step before the material of this chapter came to Mark was perhaps unnecessary. It may have been that Mark has taken up Vs 5-27 directly from the prophetic tradition and made the additions to the end of the chapter himself. But for

1 Cf. 1 Thes 4:16-17, where the only part of the "word of the Lord" which was necessary was that part concerning those still alive at the parousia (cf. P. Nepper-Christensen, "Das verborgene Herrnwort," Stud. Theol. 19 (1965), pp. 136-154.); or cf. 1 Cor 15:3-7, where it was really only necessary to cite the resurrection (cf. H. W. Bartsch, "Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Cor 15:3-11," ZNW 55 (1964), pp. 261-274).
the sake of the setting indicated in Vs 3-4, we have assumed that at one stage in the tradition our chapter was conceived as being words of the risen Christ spoken on the Mount of Olives.

However this may be, after the prophetic discourse was thought of as having been spoken by Jesus—and indeed many of its words were based on actual saying from the gospel tradition—then the verba Christi in the rest of the chapter, Vs 28-37, were added. We have surmised that they were attached gradually to the discourse, first Vs 28-30, then 31 and 32, and finally 33-36. It may be that these latter Vs 33-36 were already a part of the prophetic discourse, but because they are at the end it is also possible that they were added last. These additions to the chapter were not just loosely attached, but they were composed in the light of what had come before them, which gives a unity to the whole chapter. Although the situation had changed from a discourse of a prophet to a discourse of Jesus, the function of the chapter as eschatological exhortation remained the same.

We come finally to the contribution of Mark.\(^1\) Vs 23 and 37, which show that it is the Christians who are addressed and not just the disciples, are perhaps from him, although they also could have belonged to the prophetic discourse.\(^2\) It is also possible that Mark has added the night-watch in four parts in Vs 35b. He has also made a slight but very significant change in Vs 14, which he has interpreted not just of the great tribulation at the fall of Jerusalem but of a manifestation of the Anti-Christ. When we consider the use made of Daniel in Vs 14, it is an interpretation which lies near at hand and could have been made by anyone. That it was first made by Mark is shown by the fact that it depends on the phrase "let the reader understand." It was therefore first in a written document that the grammatical peculiarity of ἐστήκεν was created or exploited, and we have no evidence that the tradition of our chapter was ever written before Mark.

Mark's most important contribution to the eschatological discourse, however, one which has mislead interpreters down to the present, is provided by the setting of the whole discourse as an

\(^1\) For the Markan understanding of the chapter as a whole, cf. below, pp. 477-479.

\(^2\) The additions of "in my name" in Vs 6 and "for my sake" in Vs 9 could have come at any time since the discourse was put into the mouth of Jesus up to as late as it is still possible for the interpolation of a copyist to get into all our MSS.
answer to a question concerning the destruction of the temple. He has managed thereby to give a completely new interpretation both to the saying of Jesus in Vs 2 and to the oracle concerning the appalling sacrilege in Vs 14ff. Whereas the original oracle spoke of the desecration of the temple, the later prophetic discourse referred to the destruction of Jerusalem as the herald of the last great tribulation of the end times. Mark gives his source quite a different aspect when he makes it refer by virtue of its position to the destruction of the temple.¹ This shift in accent raises questions which must be discussed in some detail, questions concerning a) the destruction of the temple, and b) the destruction of Jerusalem.

¹ "Erst Markus redet nun von einer tatsächlichen Zerstörung," Marxsen, Mkt, p. 113.
CHAPTER THREE

JESUS AND THE TEMPLE

It truly lies in nothing other than the nature of the material that we have postulated such a complicated development behind Mark 13. How could it be otherwise when the transmitted sayings contain predictions of Jesus concerning the time of the transmitting church, and when the transmitters had the authority of prophets? Now we must attempt to penetrate through the writings of the church to the situation of Jesus himself. What did Jesus say 1. with respect to the future of Jerusalem, and 2. with respect to the temple? It is methodologically advisable to consider these two questions separately, for we cannot assume a priori that they belong together. We shall therefore first investigate the attitude of the early Christians, and hopefully arrive at Jesus’ own attitude, concerning the temple as the location of the cult and the dwelling place of the Shekinah, and not merely as one exceedingly important part of the city of Jerusalem. Only against this background can we go on to speak of the destruction of this temple.

Did Jesus predict the destruction of the Jerusalem temple? Is the saying previously examined in Mark 13:2 a genuine saying of Jesus? Most scholars answer this question affirmatively, and they further

---

interpret the saying eschatologically, in accordance therefore with the context Mark gives it. We must now test the validity of this often presupposed but seldom examined common opinion. We shall be not so much concerned with the genuineness of the saying as with the question of the original reference. We must question whether or not Mark interpreted it correctly when he gave it the setting of Mark 13:1-4. Indeed, we have already concluded that the saying itself, "There will not be left here stone upon stone that will not be thrown down," is a genuine saying of Jesus. What is now at issue is the reference to the temple, which is not part of the saying itself but which has been read into it even by those who recognize the setting to be secondary. We have already made reference to the very similar saying Luke 19:44, "They will not leave stone upon stone in thee," a threat directed not against the temple, but against the city of Jerusalem. It is, of course, possible that two similar sayings were spoken on two different occasions with two different objects; but it is much more probable that only one version is original in the situation of Jesus, while the other has been modified by the tradition. It is usually said that the "political" conception of Luke is secondary to the "eschatological" one of Mark, and this will be investigated in Chapter IV. Now we have to ask whether or not it is probable that Jesus could have directed these words against the temple, or whether it is more likely that the original reference was to Jerusalem as a whole.

The prediction of Mark 13:2 is usually discussed in connection with another saying which occurs in the context of the trial of Jesus. Bultmann, for example, discusses Mark 13:2 together with Mark 14:58 (Matt. 26:61), Mark 15:29, John 2:19 and Acts 6:14 as different formulations of one single tradition.³ It is, however, very doubtful


¹ The determination that this section is a composition of the evangelist (cf. above, pp. 10-13) does not necessarily mean that he does not use it in accordance with the intention of Jesus. This must be determined in our present investigation.

² Most sharply by Kümmel, Promise, p. 101, n. 47.

³ He has a predecessor in the ancient church in the western text, where
that Mark 13:2 belongs here at all. This saying, which as we have seen does not even mention the temple, has at the most one word in common with Mark 14:58, καταλλήλων καταλλάχω, and the construction of the sentence is quite different. Mark 13:2 is a prediction, or better a threat, formulated in the passive voice. All the other passages on the other hand have two members, which refer clearly in active form to the destruction of the temple in the first and, with the exception of Acts 6:14, mention the building of a new temple in the second. It is with this latter saying that the present chapter will be concerned.

It appears in its simplest form in the mouth of mockers under the cross, who throw into Jesus' face an apparently well known saying: "You who destroy (καταλλάχων) and build (εἰκοσμοῦν) in three days the temple" (Mk 15:29 = Mt 27:40). The participial formulation is due to the construction of the sentence, but otherwise the formulation is simple and lacking any additional interpretation by the evangelists, which will help us in discussing the other passages.

At the trial of Jesus before the High Priest false witnesses arise who declare against Jesus: "We have heard him say: I will destroy this temple which is made with hands and in three days build another which is not made with hands" (Mk 14:58). Before we come to the saying itself, there are three preliminary questions to be discussed: 1. the problem of the historicity of this trial altogether, 2. the sense in which the witnesses are called "false," and 3. the particular interpretation of Mark.

The grave historical difficulties which the synoptic accounts of this trial give to anyone considering it in the light of Jewish jurisprudence are well known.¹ Many of them can be avoided when we assume that the Sanhedrin was not involved at all but rather only the High Priest and his counsellors.² This more informal hearing occurred

---


² So A. Büchler, Das Synedrium in Jerusalem und das grosse Beth-Din in der Quaderhammer des jüdischen Tempels, Wien, 1902; J. Z. Lauterbach,
not at night but in the morning (Lk 22:66, Mk 15:1) for the purpose of formulating a charge against Jesus to make to the Roman authorities (Lk 23:2). For our purposes, however, the literary considerations are much more important. Bultmann¹ considers the entire section Mk 14:55-64 to be a secondary insertion. He points out in addition that Vs. 57-59, which contain the statement concerning the temple, are a further secondary addition to their present context, being a doublet to Vs. 56: “for many testified falsely against him² and the testimonies did not agree.”³ The episode of the false witnesses with the temple saying, then, being an insertion in an insertion, was not only not a part of the oldest passion story, but did not even originally belong in the individual story of Jesus’ trial before the High Priest.

This observation is important for the problem of the false witnesses, for now we need not be misled by historical considerations. It may well be that a saying against the temple was important in Jesus’ condemnation,⁴ but the passage Mk 14:57-59 is in no sense a direct report of what happened. We therefore do not need to trouble ourselves with the insoluble problem of the sense in which the witnesses did not agree,⁵ for this detail has its origin in the


¹ syn. Trad., pp. 290ff. Writing from an entirely different point of view, Taylor agrees with him, for the ancient Roman passion story which he reconstructs (Mark, pp. 653-664) also does not contain these verses. Cf. further M. Dibelius, Botschaft und Geschichte, Bd. I, Tübingen, 1953, pp. 248-257; Goguel, Life, pp. 511f; T. A. Burkill, “St. Mark’s Philosophy of the Passion.” NT 2 (1958), 245-271.

² Cf. Vs 57: “some stood up and testified falsely against him.”

³ Cf. Vs 59: “and even so their testimony did not agree.”

⁴ Speaking for this conclusion is the fact that the same accusation is found Mk 15:29 in a different strand of tradition, and perhaps even the partially parallel case of Jesus son of Ananias, who was brought before the Roman governor for speaking against the temple (but was then released as a politically harmless maniac), Josephus, B. J. VI, 303ff. For the view that the temple saying was important in Jesus’ trial, cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, The Trial of Jesus, Oxford, 1953, pp. 10-13. More important perhaps are the arguments against it; that the independent Lucan passion tradition (cf. below, pp. 248-249, and Bultmann, syn. Trad., p. 291, “das mutmassliche Fehlen der Nebenquelle des Lukas”) and Johannine passion tradition (cf. C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1963, pp. 88ff) know nothing of a temple saying in connection with this hearing.

⁵ On the face of it the remark is absurd, for if witnesses really did conspire to give false testimony, then of course they would make sure that they agreed
general report of Vs 56. This qualification of the witnesses as false provides an important indication of the context in which the saying was transmitted to Mk and shows how it could be inserted at this point, but it can hardly be taken to mean that Mark only wanted thereby to deny that Jesus had said such a thing. The early church was accused again and again of opposition to the temple, in the case of Stephen (Acts 6:13f), Paul (Acts 21:28) and all the apostles (Evan. Pet VII, 26). It appears that this saying in Mk 14:58 was important in the anti-Christian polemic of the time of Mark and has for this reason found a place in his account. Just as it is probable that it is the church and not the historical Jesus who is accused of blasphemy for calling a crucified one "the Son of the Blessed," so it is the later anti-Christian witnesses who were using a supposed saying of Jesus against his followers who are here characterized as false.

Goguel thinks that a genuine saying of Jesus was much too radical for the early church, and that it was therefore weakened in the various accounts. But how does he know that a saying against the temple would be objectionable to the Christian congregation? It is supposedly one weakening of the force of the saying when Mark lets it be spoken by "false witnesses," and another when he "spiritualizes" the saying through the addition of the words χειροποιητός / διευρυποιητός. These words are, of course, familiar terms from the early Christian catechesis on the theme "temple" (cf. Acts 7:48; 17:24, Heb 9:11, 24) and are widely recognized to be additions of the evangelist here. They could weaken the saying by interpretation, as could the characterization of the witness as false weaken it by denial; but both motifs together could not operate simultaneously, for they work against each other. If the saying were really objectionable to Mark, he could have simply omitted it, instead

with one another. Matthew recognizes this absurdity and so removes the notice about the disagreeing testimony and does not call the witnesses false. We must beware of historizing "explanations" such as that of J. A. Kleist, "The Two False Witnesses (Mk 14:55ff)," CBQ 9 (1947), 321-323, who finds the disagreement in that one witness would have said Jesus would destroy, the other that he would build the temple. The often repeated conception of Hoffmann, "Wort Jesu," p. 131, that the witnesses were false because they said Jesus would destroy the temple, whereas in fact he had only predicted its destruction by others, also rests on a misunderstanding of the text.

of taking all the trouble of adding it to a story which did not originally contain it. But since he has added it, it must mean not only that he knew the saying from the Jewish polemic, but that it was very important to him for its positive content. The additions do not weaken the saying but clarify it; that is, they bring out the original meaning of what Mark thinks is a genuine saying of Jesus. Even if Mark first learned of this saying from opponents of the church who used it negatively, still it was very important to him in its positive content.

Mt 26:61 reads, "I can (δῶσω) destroy and in three days build the temple of God." Contrary to Goguel, there is also no weakening in the "I can." If it were objectionable to Matthew to ascribe the destruction of the temple to Jesus—and what reason do we have for thinking so?—would it be less objectionable to ascribe to him the possibility? In fact, we have here only a translation variant,¹ whereby as so often in such cases, Matthew comes closest to the supposed original. In any case, it is only in the version of Matthew, where it is a question of the authority of Jesus, that there is any plausible transition to the following Messianic question.² That Mark chose the future form is perhaps an indication that he is more interested in the destruction of the temple than Matthew. With respect to the other differences in the saying as it is found in Matthew and Mark, we can for the present be content with the observation that they agree with the tendencies of the two evangelists. Mark wants to emphasize the difference between old and new, as we saw with the contrast "made . . . not made with hands," and, accordingly, he calls the temple to be built "another" and speaks disparagingly of "this" temple. Matthew, on the other hand, who wants to emphasize the continuity between old and new, says αὐτῶν and speaks of the "temple of God".

The Fourth Gospel contains the temple saying in connection with the cleansing of the temple in somewhat different form: "destroy


² Cl. M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen, 1933³ p. 199. Perhaps Mark intended the same thing with his emphasized έγώ.
(λόσετε) this temple, and in three days I will raise it (ἐγείρω)” (Jn 2:19), and the evangelist adds as explanation: “he spoke of the temple of his body” (2:21). This explanation is also the reason for the differences. Ἐγείρων can refer to the erection of a building like ὁμοθετίως, but the word is used more frequently for the raising of Jesus (cf. Vs 22). Also, the imperative λόσετε does not represent by any means the original form of the saying, but is used because of the Johannine interpretation, where a statement in the first person would be impossible. Since the verbal form has been chosen primarily for this reason, it is not an ironical invitation, and it is also not used in a concessive sense, but it is rather future: “You will kill me, and then…” Thereby a favorite evasion of the difficulties posed by Mt 14:58 has been cut off. Whatever the case in the early church, it is very objectionable for many today to ascribe to Jesus the destruction of the temple, and therefore they prefer the imperative form of Jn 2:19. But even if the Johannine interpretation should be the correct one, it does not represent the original form of the saying.

The version in Acts 6:14 is less important for our present purposes, for here the saying is cited at third hand. “False witnesses” accuse Stephen of speaking against temple and law in that he says, “This Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place and change the customs Moses gave us.” Here again we have a construction in two members, and it is at least conceivable that the second accusation might be a polemic twisting of Jesus’ statement about the new temple. The whole weight lies, however, in the first accusation, and one has the

---

1 Bultmann, Johannes, p. 88; Ph. Vielhauer, Oikodome, Karlsruhe, 1949, p. 64.
impression from the following speech that it might very well be justified, that Stephen could have said exactly that. In any case, we see once more that a saying of Jesus was known in the early church, which the Jews constantly used in their anti-Christian polemic, but in which the church (except for Stephen!) was also interested for its positive content.

It is not completely valueless to try to reconstruct the original form of the saying which lies behind all the variants: καταλόγοι (or better: ἡμεῖς) τὸν ναὸν τούτον καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἡμέρας οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῶν. This saying poses so many difficulties that we will not be able to give a satisfactory explanation until the end of this chapter.

We recall once more the background of the saying, that its appearances on the lips of anti-Christian witnesses (Mk 14:58, Acts 6:14) or mockers (Mk 15:29) is an indication of its transmission in Jewish polemic and its use in a negative sense. On the other hand, Mark and John are interested in the saying for its positive content: they accept the saying made by accusers of the church but interpret it in a different sense, of the eschatological congregation or of Jesus' resurrected body. These two different uses to which the saying was put have produced a certain tension in the saying itself which is all too often ignored by interpreters.

Hoffmann finds it "ein zu phantastisches Gedanke" (p. 131) that Jesus really wanted to destroy the temple, or even that he had urged the Jews to do so (Jn 2:19). Not only are these conceptions "Phantastereien" (p. 133), but also the rebuilding in three days is "etwas stark Phantastisches" (p. 134). Therefore, Hoffmann weakens the first statement by bringing in the saying Mk 13:2, so that Jesus only predicted a future destruction as divine judgment without ascribing to himself any part in the destruction. The second statement is also only a prediction of the new temple in the new aeon, for the Kingdom of God is "die Verklärung aller irdischen

---

1 Mk 14:58; Jn 2:19; Acts 6:14.
2 Mk 14:58; 15:29; Jn 2:19. διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν would be better Greek, but there is no real difference in meaning.
3 or ἑλλοῦ, but Mark emphasizes the difference, and both Mt 26:61 and Jn 2:19 read ἁρών. A similar reconstruction is found also in Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 326, and W. Hahn, Gottesdienst, p. 56.
4 "Wort Jesu".
5 "Man wird also nicht daran zweifeln dürfen, dass Jesus die Zerstörung des jüdischen Tempels bezeichnet, aber sich selbst hat er darin schwerlich als καταλόγοι bezeichnet," "Wort Jesu," p. 131.
Verhältnisse" and must, therefore, include all of the rites of the law including those of the temple. "Die Erfüllung der Gesetzesvorschriften setzt aber eine Art von Tempelkultus auch für die Erwählten des neuen Gottesreiches voraus. Die Paschallämmer müssen geschlachtet werden." (p. 135.) We have seen that it is illegitimate to interpret the first half of the saying through the use of Mk 13:2 or Jn 2:19. As for the rites of the future temple, it is this which seems to me "fantastic."

Bultmann\(^3\) is more careful but offers essentially the same explanation. The first possibility that he considers\(^2\) is that the saying is an expression of the Jewish expectation of a new Temple in the messianic age, with emphasis on the building and not destruction. Bultmann cannot then understand why the saying should have been offensive to anyone or why Jesus should be the subject of this future building. He, too, has been misled by the application of the impersonally formulated saying in Mk 13:2.

It is characteristic of almost all interpreters (Lohmeyer is the exception) to put all the weight of their interpretation on the second half of the saying. The destruction was only predicted, as a judgment or perhaps only as a necessary precondition, while Jesus' claim is restricted to building the new temple.\(^3\) Nevertheless, if the first statement is considered at all, since it speaks of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, the second statement must also refer to a literal temple. Jeremias, after attempting to demonstrate a connection between the coming of the Messiah and the building of the new temple, is to say the least ambiguous when he says: "der Tempel wird zerstört werden (vgl. Mk 13, 1 par), aber nach der Zerstörung des Tempels wird Jesu Parusie und der Bau des himmlischen Tempels, der verklärten Gemeinde, erfolgen."\(^4\) Plooij sees correctly that the first statement really does speak of Jesus destroying the temple but then he goes on to interpret the second statement in an entirely different sense: "Jesus wished to abolish entirely the Temple and the service of sacrifices and all it includes; in its stead a new spiri-

\(^1\) syn. Trad., p. 126f; cf. Johannes, p. 88.
\(^2\) For the second, the origin of the saying in the same mythology as that of the Mandaean Book of John 76, cf. below, p. 153f.
\(^3\) What really lurks in the minds of many was stated clearly by Delling, Gottesdienst, p. 27: the saying about the destruction of the temple means that "die jüdische Frömmigkeit ist im Abbruch begriffen." This is of course illegitimate.
\(^4\) Weltvolkendung, p. 39f.
tual Temple was to be erected” as described in 1 Pet 2:4f. If the new temple represents the familiar image of the Christian congregation, it is difficult to see why the Jerusalem temple would first have to be destroyed or to conceive of Mark implying that this spiritual temple was not built until after the year A.D. 70. On the one hand, it is impossible to interpret the temple in the second half of the saying differently from the first half, where it refers to the physical Jerusalem temple. Yet, on the other hand, it seems clear that Mark at least did intend to refer to the Christian community. This contradiction is part of the tension resulting from the double use to which the saying had been put in its transmission.

Before we can determine the sense in which Jesus might have said these words, we have to answer three questions. The first concerns his attitude to the cult, not only in the new aeon but also in the present. The question is whether or not the characterization of Goguel is accurate that Jesus “n’a pas conçu l’idée d’une religion sans culte,” and that therefore, “il a nécessairement dû envisager l’établissement, aux temps messianiques, d’un sanctuaire nouveau.” This will be examined in section 1, and since we can proceed only by implication, the attitudes of the early church to the temple cult must also be presented.

The second question deals with the first half of the saying Mk 14:58, concerning the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. We shall try to establish a background for such a saying in Jewish apocalyptic and the viewpoint of the early church, and then on the basis of this background and Jesus’ attitude to the cult developed in section 1, seek to determine whether or not Jesus is likely to have said he would destroy the temple made with hands. Finally, section 3 will deal with the second half of the saying Mk 14:58, investigating the background in the Jewish tradition and the teaching of the early church concerning the spiritual temple, to determine whether or not Jesus is likely to have said that he would build a new temple not made with hands. Basic to both discussions will be the question of the temple cult in the gospels, to which we now turn.

4 Vie de Jésus, p. 491.
I. The Temple Cult in the Gospels

The detailed study by Hans Wenschkewitz\(^1\) remains for many still the most important work on this problem, even if his presentation is dependent in many respects on his own spiritualized conceptions and the Qumran finds have rendered much of his work obsolete. Wenschkewitz treats the question of Jesus' attitude to the cult as a special case of his attitude to the law as a whole, which, following Schmitz, he understands as at once a "conservatism" and a "radicalism."\(^2\) To be sure, in the course of his investigation Wenschkewitz is several times found to qualify this apriori. At about the same time, Branscomb\(^3\) stated the same position in the Anglo-Saxon world and it has become quite general. It is, however, questionable whether Mt 5:18 ("not one jot or tittle") can carry so much weight and even more whether the temple cult is to be seen only as a subdivision of the law. E. Lohmeyer, on the other hand, has not been misled by the supposed subordination of the cult to the law, and he has come to quite different conclusions.\(^4\) He has tried to show the basic opposition of Jesus to the cult, at least in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. The majority view, however, remains that of Schmitz and Wenschkewitz. In view of the unmistakable anti-cultic references, one is forced to postulate a dialectic of Jesus and the early church which will unite the anti-cultic references with Jesus' loyalty to the law. Typical is the frequently cited statement of Schrenk,\(^5\) "Der ganze synoptische Aufriss rechnet bei Jesus immer mit beidem: mit der Bejahung des Tempeldienstes als des von Gott bestimmten Weges der Verehrung Gottes und mit der Überlegenheit des Christus über den Tempel." We shall begin with the second half of this statement and try to demonstrate a definite anti-cultic polemic in the tradition lying behind the gospel

---


\(^2\) Spiritualisierung, p. 89, quoting O. Schmitz, Die Opferanschauungen des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments, Tübingen, 1910, p. 197.


\(^5\) TWNT, III, 241f, in Sperrdruck.
according to Mark. Then we shall examine the evidence behind the first half of the statement, not only in the witness of several gospel passages to Jesus but also in the actual practice of the Jerusalem church as far as this can be determined. Only at the end of our investigation will we be able to conjecture what Jesus’ own attitude must have been.

Lohmeyer\(^1\) maintains that only three sections in Mark are concerned with cultic questions: 1:20-3:6; 7:1-23; 11:1-15:40. That there is otherwise little interest shown in the Jerusalem cult should not surprise us, for the gospel, even if it uses traditions of the Aramaic speaking Jerusalem congregation, was written in Greek, presumably largely for Gentile readers. Indeed, Lohmeyer’s list is undoubtedly much too encompassing. What interests us here is the coincidence that Lohmeyer’s list agrees very closely with a list of the controversy stories which Albertz discovered in Mark 2:1-3:6; 11:15-17, 27-33; 12:13-37. It is to this collection that we now turn.

It is commonly recognized that Mark 2:1-3:6 is a pre-Markan collection of controversy stories.\(^2\) The purpose of the collection as a whole was to explain the reason for Jesus’ death, to answer the question of Jewish hostility, a problem which could have arisen only in a Jewish-Christian environment. The purpose of the individual stories was to provide authoritative answers to concrete problems of the Jewish-Christian church in controversies with their non-Christian neighbors: the church’s claim to forgive sins, table fellowship with the cultically unclean, fasting, and keeping the Sabbath. We have here an important witness to the position of the early church in those practices which were a matter of controversy between Christians and Jews.

A second group of controversy stories is found in Mark 11-12.\(^3\) D. Daube has shown that the questions concerning tribute to Caesar, the resurrection, the great commandment, and David’s son correspond to a Rabbinic pattern of four questions and answers,\(^4\) a

---

\(^1\) Kultus, chap. II.


\(^3\) Albertz, pp. 16-36; Taylor, p. 101; Beare, p. 211.

subtlety which is a strong indication of a pre-Markan arrangement. It may be that we can go further, and show that if these two collections did not at one time form a unity, at least they stem from the same tradition. It is extraordinary that the Herodians should be mentioned in both 3:6 and 12:13 as being in alliance with the Pharisees, a confederation which would have been historically possible only during the reign of Herod Agrippa.\textsuperscript{1} We have then in these two groups of controversy stories an exceedingly important witness to the early church, since they form a collection (or two collections) put together as early as the years 40-44 A.D. They represent our primary source in discussing the cultic attitudes of the earliest church.

The controversy story proper in the story of the healing of the paralytic (Mk 2:1-12) lies in the verses 5b-10a concerning the question of forgiveness.\textsuperscript{2} "Who can forgive sins but God alone?" is the attitude common to all of Judaism,\textsuperscript{3} but he has graciously given in the Torah the way by which he forgives: on the basis of previous repentance through the daily and private sacrifices and especially through the rites of the Day of Atonement. But here stands a layman in the place of the whole sacrificial system when he claims for himself the authority not only to heal, but also to mediate forgiveness; or more, not only to mediate like the cult, but in God's place to forgive. Here is more than the temple. One cannot, of course, press the argumentation to mean that the power to heal necessarily includes the power to forgive. The healing is a sign and in no sense a proof. The only "proof" that can be given for Jesus' authority is the scriptural one, namely, that the Son of Man "has been given authority and glory and kingdom" (Dn 7:14). This authority has been given according to Mt 28:18 on the basis of Jesus' death and exaltation. Further, the strange phrase about the Son of Man having authority on earth seems to suggest a contrast

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. B. W. Bacon, "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark," \textit{JBL} 39 (1920), 102-112. He is followed by Lohmeyer, \textit{Markus}, p. 67, n. 2; Knox, \textit{Sources}, p. 8; P. Winter, \textit{On the Trial of Jesus}, Berlin, 1961, p. 128. Matthew and Luke could not understand these Herodians and so in all but one case omitted them. It is extraordinary how Bultmann too ignores them: "die Gegenr... sind erst in dem sekundären Vers (Mk 3:) 6 als die Pharisäer (sic!) bestimmt worden" (syn. \textit{Trad.}, p. 54).

\textsuperscript{2} So Bultmann, \textit{syn. Trad.}, p. 12ff, and most others.

\textsuperscript{3} Cf. G. F. Moore, \textit{Judaism}, Vol. I, p. 535. According to Billerbeck, \textit{Kommentar}, I, 495, it is not said even of the Messiah that he could forgive sins.
to the exalted Son of Man in heaven. The Son of Man here must then refer to the body of Christ the Church, to whom has been given the authority to forgive (Jn 20:22f, Mt 16:19; 18:18), as is shown by the editorial modification of Mt 9:8, “God has given such authority to men.” It is after all only with such an implication that the controversy story would serve to answer a problem of the transmitting congregation vis-à-vis Judaism. As such the story clearly reflects the early Christian community, making claims which put it in competition with and in opposition to the temple cult.

The cultic background of the story of Jesus eating with tax-collectors and sinners, Mk 2:15-17, is indirect. The program of the Pharisees was to eat, pray, and study in a condition of Levitical purity, voluntarily to submit themselves as laymen to regulations originally referring only to the priests. The question of cleanness comes to the fore especially in the matter of table fellowship, and, therefore, the Gentile mission of the Church is bound up with this question of Levitical purity. The Pharisees, even those within the Church (Ac 11:3), accused the early Christians of having profaned themselves by eating with the unclean, thereby rendering themselves ineligible for participation in the temple cult. The answer given by this story, that Jesus has come to call the sinners, to invite them to eat with him, contains distinctively cultic claims. The unclean come to Jesus, not to the temple, for the banquet, and they are purified by him, not by sacrifice, to enable them to take part in it. The whole distinction between clean and unclean, as well as all cultic means of removing uncleanness, are here radically abolished. Whether or not this was Jesus’ intention, it is definitely the point of this story. That we have not read too much cultic presupposition into the story is shown by the version in Matthew, where in 9:13 the saying, “I desire mercy and not sacrifice” (Hos 6:6) is cited.

1 Aside from the collective interpretation of the Son of Man began by T. W. Manson, cf. Bultmann, syn. Trad., p. 13f.
2 Cf. below, pp. 13ff.
3 Cf. Gal 2:12; Acts 10-11. The connection there made between unclean men and unclean food is therefore not as absurd as Haenchen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 307, thinks.
4 What is meant is undoubtedly the messianic banquet; cf. J. Jeremias, Jesus’ Promise to the Nations, London, 1958, pp. 59ff. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 56, compares the αἰδώς in the parables of the banquet, e.g. Mt 22:3. That Luke understands the calling as “to repentance” shows that he is thinking not of the eschatological banquet but of the conversion-agape; cf. B. Reicke, Diakonie, Fastfreude und Zelos, Uppsala, 1951, pp. 215ff.
This can only mean in this context that God desires the mercy shown by Jesus when he calls the unclean to himself, and not the sacrifices which can only be carried out by participants who are in a state of Levitical purity. For Jesus has come to call the unclean. The Pharisees should learn from Jesus’ action the meaning of the Hosea citation: however it was originally meant, now it has become an exclusive opposition between Jesus and the temple.

The controversy story Mk 2:18-20 concerning fasting does not really have anything to do with the temple cult. The point of the story, differing from Mt 6:16ff which tells the Church how to fast, is to justify the complete non-fasting of early Christians, and in this sense only could be called anti-cultic. It is perhaps significant that Mark has added the sayings about old and new at this point, for whatever they originally meant, they express quite well the attitude of these controversy stories to all questions of the old religion.

The argumentation in the story of the disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath Mk 2:23-28 is very confused. What does the Sabbath have to do with David’s action in the temple (the shrine of the ark)? We must begin once more with the form critical insight that the purpose of this story is to justify the actual Sabbath freedom of the early Church (“his disciples”). We must further give full force to

---

3 Only if the assumption of S. Zeitlin, Who Crucified Jesus?, is true, that the fast in question was one of the four days commemorating the destruction of the first temple, would there be a connection with the temple cult: namely that there is no need to fast, for a new and better temple is here; cf. Zech 8:19.

8 As difficult as Vs 20 is, it cannot mean to restrict non-fasting to the lifetime of Jesus, so that the point of the story would then be to justify the later fasting practice of the church, as Baltmann, syn. Trad., p. 171; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 60; Jeremias, TWNT, IV, 1996, maintain. Quite aside from form-critical considerations which show that it was not the practice of Jesus but that of the church which is at issue (“your disciples”! Vs 18b), H. J. Ebeling, "Die Fastenfrage (Mark 2.18-22)," Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 108 (1937-38), 387-396, points out that the early church was by no means living in a time of mourning when their Lord was taken from them. To refer the expression “in that day” to the practice of fasting on Good Friday (Lohmeyer) is impossible, for this practice cannot be traced earlier than Irenaeus (Euseb. H.E. V, xxiv, 12) and weekly fasting came even later (Did 8:1 refers to two days per week). On the difficulties of referring this saying to any known practice of the church, cf. K. Th. Schäfer, "... und dann werden sie fasten, an jenem Tages' (Mk 2, 20 und Par)," Synoptische Studien A. Wiikenhausers dargebracht, München, 1953, pp. 124-147. In view of the eschatological associations of "in that day" (= ΚΑΙΡΑΣ ΔΥΣ), perhaps the best understanding would be that they would not fast until the day of judgment, i.e. never (cf. perhaps Mt 5:18, “till heaven and earth pass away”).
the ἀστε which shows that the last sentence "so the Son of Man is lord also of the Sabbath," is meant to be the conclusion of a logical demonstration. If the story is to fulfill its purpose this must mean that the "Son of Man" is the Church as well as Jesus, just as in 2:10, although, of course, the freedom of the Church is grounded in the freedom of her Lord. But how does this freedom of Jesus follow from the story about David?

The comparision begins with the statement of Dn 7:14 that the Son of Man was given the kingdom by God. David too received a kingdom from God, but the kingdom of the Son of Man is incomparably greater. According to the Midrash, it was on a Sabbath that David ate the bread of the presence and gave it to his followers, without being reprimanded for it in the text of 1 Sm 21:1-7. Now if this was allowed for the lord of the kingdom of Israel, how much more must it be allowed for the Lord of the whole creation, who according to Ps 110 is also David's Lord. "Therefore, the Son of Man is Lord also (και) of the Sabbath." This argument is, however, not quite satisfying, for the David story really concerns the eating of the bread of the presence, "which it is not lawful for any but the priests to eat," which seems much more important than the unexpressed incidental fact that it occurred on the Sabbath. Has the story been secondarily applied to the Sabbath, whereas originally it referred to the temple and the Church eating bread like the priests the temple bread? Is it possible that the reaping itself has a cultic significance? Or, is one member of the thought process simply presupposed, namely, that the temple halacha is more important than the Sabbath halacha, so that the point would be: when David could set aside the temple law, how much more does his Lord stand over the less important Sabbath law, a double Qal wahomer? All of this is simply not stated in the Markan story, which makes no sense as it now stands.\(^1\)

---

1 Cf. Böllner, *Kommentar*, I, 618f, and especially B. Marmelstein, "Jesu Gang durch die Saatfelder," *Angelas* 3 (1930), 111-120, who points out how essential this unexpressed circumstance is to the argument. This midrashic assumption was perhaps suggested by the fact that the bread of the presence was renewed on the table on the Sabbath (Lev 24:5-9).

\(^2\) "Moreover the reaping overrides the Sabbath" (Men 10:9). What is meant is the reaping of the first fruits of the harvest, Lev 23:10, on the second day of Passover even if it fell on a Sabbath. Is the thought behind the action of the disciples that they are priests in the new temple? In any case they are not motivated by hunger, contra Bultmann, *syn. Tradv.*, p. 14.

\(^3\) Vs 27 brings a second argument, completely independent of the David
The version in Mt 12:1-8 is in any case not a distortion of Mark, but rather makes clear what Mark only presupposes and thus has better expressed the original meaning of the story. Here we find the link which was missing in Mark. The temple service allows work on the Sabbath (Num 28:9f, cf. Jub 50:10f), it "overrides" the Sabbath (Vs 5); Jesus and his Church¹ are more than the temple (Vs 6), and therefore they all the more override the Sabbath, are lord of the Sabbath. The halachic argument of Matthew is superior to the haggadic one of Mark,² although both argue for the freedom of Jesus and his followers over the Sabbath in terms of the temple cult. The quotation from Hos 6:6, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice," could in itself mean only that mercy is more important than sacrifice, which retains a subordinate significance. It is not the quotation as such but the manner of its use by Matthew which gives it here as in 9:13 a clearly anti-cultic meaning.³

As the healing of the man with the withered hand is not directly pertinent to our present investigation, we now turn to the second collection of controversy stories in Mark 11-12. The interpretation of the cleansing of the temple has been made especially complicated for us by the evangelists, who for their part attempted to give the story a particular interpretation by minor additions and by the context in which they have placed it. Further, a major source of misunderstanding is to be found in the usual designation "cleansing

¹ That the neuter μὴ ἄνθρωπος refers to the kingdom, cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, New York, 1938, p. 479, although there is little difference in meaning, for the church understood the kingdom to be embodied in Jesus. Again, the sense of the controversy requires the collective interpretation, for it is the "guiltless" (plural, Vs 7) who are accused and then justified.


of the temple", which is not warranted by the text at all and which presupposes an interpretation derived from Mal 3:1. The first step in understanding the story lies in the discovery by Al bertz that Mark 11-12 contains a collection of controversy stories: a) the cleansing of the temple together with the question of authority Mk 11:15-17, 27-33, b) tribute to Caesar Mk 12:13-17, c) the resurrection Mk 12:18-27, d) the great commandment Mk 12:28-34, and e) David’s son Mk 12:35-37. Different from the collection previously discussed Mk 2:1-3:6, it is here not so much a matter of the polemic of the early church — the disciples are not even mentioned—as of vehement and often astounding comment by Jesus on various burning issues of his own day. Although they were given form by the early church, we undoubtedly come closer to the historical Jesus in these five controversy stories than in any other narratives of the synoptic tradition. Because of Jesus’ majestic isolation from all contemporary Jewish factions, this collection was eminently suitable as an introduction to the passion story, even if the stories themselves contain no chronological indications; Mark had only to add a few verses, 11:18ff, 12:12, to make the connection explicit.

Mark also wrote at a time when the failure of Israel as a whole to respond to the gospel and the inevitability of the Roman war were obvious to all and agonizing for the Jewish-Christian church. As an attempt to explain these tragic events, he therefore inserted the parable of the wicked tenants 12:1-11, the sayings against the Pharisees 12:38-40, and the cursing of the fig-tree 11:12-14, 20-25. Although these additions will be discussed separately, it is important now to show how they have influenced Mark’s version of the cleansing of the temple. The story of the entry into Jerusalem Mk 11:1-11 ended in the temple, and it would have been appropriate to connect the story of the cleansing at this point, as Matthew has done. More important is the observation that the question about authority was once an integral part of the story of the cleansing

---

1 Thus J. W. Bowman, The Religion of Maturity, 1948, pp. 122ff, interprets.
2 It is possible but not likely that these sayings provided the conclusion to the collection of controversy stories, as Albertz, Streitgespräche, pp. 16ff, maintained.
3 This is not to say that the two were once organically combined as part of the same story of enthronement and cult-renewal, as Jeremias, Weltvollender, pp. 35ff, would have it, for as we shall see the cleansing story has nothing to do with reforming the cult.
of the temple, for a) only then could one speak of a controversy story, b) also Jn 2:13ff 18ff combines the two as part of a single tradition, and c) the question about authority is not self-contained, since the ποιησε in Vs 28 of necessity refers back to a concrete situation. We have now to ask why Mark wanted so much to enclose the cleansing of the temple between the two halves of the story of the cursing of the fig-tree that he interrupted the original connection of the former.1

An answer is suggested by a consideration once more of the dark hour in which this gospel was written. The Messiah of Israel had come and in spite of his legitimization by resurrection, Israel as a whole had not responded to him. Not only was the mission of the Jerusalem church discouraging in its results, but now the hopeless war against Rome was underway, and the promises of the Old Testament seemed forfeited. Some explanation had to be found for this outcome of the most recent past. In such a situation the fig-tree must have had a symbolic meaning for Mark, whatever the origin of this puzzling story is, for otherwise he would not have weaved it so carefully into his story shortly before the passion. The fig-tree represents Israel, as in the parable of Luke 13:6-9.2 The tree had not borne fruit, as the version in Luke still hoped, and now it is cursed. When Peter sees on the next day that the fig-tree was withered, this is but a description of the actual situation of Israel in the eyes of the evangelist. When we take this symbolic understanding of Mark into consideration, then we understand why the following isolated sayings on faith, prayer, and forgiveness should have been added at just this point. We can understand the hopelessness of Peter, apostle to the circumcized, and Jesus' answer, "Have faith in God". When it is not possible for the Gentiles to begin their

1 It seems to be a matter of conscious literary technique when Mark divides one pericope to insert another, for it is quite frequent in his gospel. The enclosed story receives thereby through its context, the divided pericope, a particular interpretation, as in the story of the woman with the flow of blood, Mk 5:25-34, where the surrounding story of the raising of Jairus' daughter, Mk 5:21-24, 35-43, emphasizes the role of faith to offset what was before rather a magical healing by contact. Or it might be that it is the surrounding story that is interpreted by the insert: cf. the light that Mk 14:3-9 throws on 14:1-2, 10-12, or Mk 3:22-30 on 3:20-21, 31-35. This technique was first commented on by E. von Dobschütz, "Zur Erzählungskunst des Markus," ZNW 27 (1928), 193-198, esp. pp. 197f.

pilgrimage to Mount Zion, then Zion will go to the Gentiles. This is of course not the meaning of the saying about faith which can move mountains as this is found in Q (Mt 17:20 = Lk 17:6, cf. 1 Cor 13:2), but explains the differences in the Markan version as well as its being inserted at just this point. It is in this light that Mark also wants the cleansing of the temple to be understood. He sees the cleansing of the temple as a proleptic sign of its destruction.

If Mark really understood the story as referring to the destruction of the temple, it remains to be seen if such an understanding has left its mark on the text itself as well as on the context. We can begin with the question of why Matthew and Luke have omitted the words “for all the nations” from the Isaiah citation. It is frequently to be observed in a synoptic comparison how the later gospels smooth over rather artless connections in Mark (“Nähte glätten”), omitting superfluous words and making a more unified narrative style. Traces of an earlier understanding in the tradition are only gradually removed, for whereas Matthew and Luke know a word or phrase only in the connection of Mark’s gospel, Mark himself sees the phrase also in the form of the tradition in which it came to him. Since it is difficult to understand why Matthew or Luke would find the words “for all the nations” objectionable, we might have here to do with just such a case. The present Markan text has to do with the opposition between “house of prayer” and “den of robbers”, and the nations are in fact rather superfluous and even obscure the intended contrast. Matthew and Luke were then only improving Mark’s story by omitting them, and we should see in the nations a trace of a pre-Markan understanding, while the

---


2 In a chain of tradition A — B — C, details from B which C modifies or eliminates because not in accord with the general tenor of B must have been very important in A, or B would not have kept them in the first place. Thus paradoxically what is least important for C was the most important for A. (There is an analogy for B keeping details from A. Films made from novels often seem to have scenes or characters which are superfluous to the story as portrayed on the screen; they are holdovers from the longer novel, in which connection they had real reason for existence).

3 That they should have omitted these words after A.D. 70 because the nations had destroyed their own temple, so Manson, *Jesus and the Non-Jews*, London, 1955, p. 12, seems quite far-fetched.

opposition house of prayer / den of robbers, Vs 17b, is a conception introduced for the first time by Mark. This is supported also by a consideration of the phrase σπέλαξη ηστήν, which comes from Jer 7:11, where it is a question of the destruction of the temple, and which in its present context probably should be translated “Zealot stronghold”.

A reference to the Zealots may well have suggested itself to Mark at this point because Jesus’ action was so understood by the people of Jerusalem, as we shall see. In the context of Mark, however, the saying refers clearly to the later occupation of the temple by the Zealots during the war with Rome (B.J. IV, 151), and because of this predicts its coming destruction. Vs 17b “but you have made it a Zealot stronghold” was therefore not part of the original story, to which we now turn.

The action of Jesus here reported is strange enough. That he would not allow anyone to carry a vessel (σκεδασμός) through the temple area goes beyond even the regulations of the Pharisees, for the prohibition in Ber 9:5 usually referred to in this connection speaks of staff, sandals, wallet, and dust on the feet but does not specifically mention a vessel at all. Also one does not see why the sellers of sacrificial animals and money changers should be driven out, for that they overcharged and were in this sense thieves is not indicated by a single word, especially not the word ληστής. Any interruption of their activities was at the most temporary and probably not even very extensive, for there is no action by the temple police and no such tumultuous scene as that of Acts 21:31ff. In contrast to the manner in which the Essenes would have cleansed the temple, beginning with the High Priest and continuing with a reform of the whole cult, Jesus cannot be seen here as a religious reformer, cleansing the temple of abuses. Jesus’ action can best be under-

1 So G. W. Buchanan, “Mark ii.15-19: Brigands in the Temple”, H.U.C.A. XXX (1959), pp. 160-177, after a careful study of ληστής and χάρτης in the NT, OT, and Josephus. He concludes (p. 176) that the Sitz im Leben of this phrase must be in the years 68-70 A.D. Rengstorff (TWNT, IV, 262ff) concludes that the word refers to the Zealots everywhere in the NT except 2 Cor 11:26 and in this passage, but he gives no valid reason for making an exception here. In any case the word, like the Heb פַּלְפָּל, does not mean thief but rather man of violence, murderer, brigand, bandit. It is therefore not possible to refer the expression to dishonest Temple sellers, as Taylor, Mark, p. 463, still attempts to do.

2 Klostermann, Mark, p. 131, also cites Josephus, c. Ap. II, 106, but this clearly refers to carrying vessels into the ναός, not through the λεπόν as is the case in Mark.

3 The story is understood as a reformation of the cult by Goguel, Parole,
stood as an acted parable, a symbolic action\(^1\) which is important not in itself but in what it signifies and which collects an audience for the following interpretation. The action would on the one hand show Jesus' zeal (cf. Ps 69:10 cited in Jn 2:17) and thus enhance his popularity with revolutionary circles, leading to the tribute-money question, and on the other increase the suspicions of the conservative circles which ultimately led to his condemnation as a Zealot. The motive for this particular action is undoubtedly to be found in Zech 14:21, where it is said that on the eschatological day of the coming of the Gentiles to Mount Zion 1. "every vessel in Jerusalem and Judah shall be sacred to the Lord of hosts" and 2. "there shall no longer be a trader (נמלק) in the house of the Lord of hosts on that day".\(^8\)

"And he taught" Vs 17,\(^8\) but as usual Mark does not tell us what Jesus taught but gives us only the text of his midrash. It is probable that the controversy story once led directly from Jesus' action to the question of authority, and that the teaching which in fact accompanied the action was based on Zechariah 14.\(^4\) Nevertheless the quotation of Is 56:7 at this point undoubtedly correctly indicates the tenor of Jesus' teaching and is of great importance for understanding the original meaning of his action. Lohmeyer has shown

---


\(^2\) So very convincingly C. Roth, "The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah XIV 21", *NT* 4 (1960), pp. 174-181. He points out that the Zealots on the other hand would have interpreted the ambiguous expression as "Canaanite", as part of their demand that the temple be cleansed of all heathen contact. On the significance of Zech 14 for this part of Mark, cf. R. M. Grant, "The Coming of the Kingdom", *JBL* 67 (1948), pp. 297-303.

\(^3\) The disconnected ἐξαγαγεῖν ἀνόικια shows perhaps that here an isolated saying has been added, cf. Goguel, *Pauvre*, p. 123. Bultmann, *syn Trad*, p. 36. It is worth considering that the words ἐξαγαγεῖν ἀνόικια in Mark are perhaps an indication of the use of a Redequelle where the individual logia were regularly introduced in a fashion similar to the Gospel of Thomas; cf. Mk 2:27f.; 4:2, 9, 11, 13, 21, 24, 26, 30; 7:14; 8:34; 9:1, 37; 10:11; 12:38. Could the title of such a collection have been ἡ Ἱερουσαλημ, cf. 4:2; 12:38?

\(^4\) John 2:14ff, while it maintains the connection of Jesus' action in the temple with the question on authority and while the connection with Zech 14 is even clearer than in Mark, knows nothing of a quotation from Isaiah but brings instead a testimony from Ps 69.
the way to a correct interpretation in his statement: "In der Reinigung des Vorhofs handelt es sich also nur mittelbar um ein Problem des bestehenden jüdischen Tempels, unmittelbar aber um das Problem der ‘heidnischen Völker’." Lohmeyer however puts too much emphasis on the fact that the action occurred in the so-called "Court of the Gentiles", for this designation and the ideas it suggests were unknown in antiquity. Old Testament texts referring to Gentiles in the temple mean of course the whole temple, and the idea in the back of many minds has only to be stated to be seen in its absurdity, namely that the commotion and noise of the outer court had to be suppressed so the Gentiles could pray there in peace, while the Israelites would offer sacrifice by themselves as before. Jesus refers to the eschatological coming of the Gentiles to the eschatological "temple", under quite transformed conditions.

We have seen that the original opposition was not house of prayer/den of robbers, and yet an opposition between eschatological prophecy and present conditions is definitely implied: it can be no other than house of prayer for the nations/house of sacrifice for Israel. Once again we must recall that Jesus' symbolic action occurs in the outer court, far from priests and sacrifices and the

1 "Die Reinigung des Tempels", ThBl 20 (1941), Cols 257-264, quotation Col 261.
2 The outer court is called in Hebrew מִבְּנֹת נָה (cf. Bik 3:4, Pes 3:5ff, Shek 7:2f, Sanh 11:2) and by Josephus πρωτόν ίερόν (B.J. V, 195) ἢιεβος ίερὸν (B.J. IV, 313) το κατ' ίερὸν (B.J. IV, 187) πρωτος πειραιος (B.J. IV, 204). I have not been able to trace the origin of the designation "court of the Gentiles", but that it is modern is stated also by Allen Wikgren in the Loeb edition of Josephus, Vol. VIII (1965), p. 202, note b. That the Gentiles may enter the outer court is occasionally mentioned, but only in a negative sense: that they may not pass the sōregh into the inner courts under penalty of death, cf. B.J. V, 194; VI, 124f; Ant XV, 417; Acts 21:26ff and the warning inscription found by Clermont-Ganneau. An excellent discussion of this prohibition is E. J. Bickerman, "The Warning Inscription of Herod’s Temple", JQR 37 (1946-47), p. 387-405.
4 That it is a question of the eschatological temple has been strongly maintained by Lohmeyer, Mk, p. 237; Reinigung, p. 257ff; Kultur, p. 47ff. Cf. Lightfoot, Mk, p. 63-66, Manson, Jesus and the Non-Jews, p. 11f, Sjöberg, Church, p. 77f, Kimmel, Verkehrung, p. 111.
5 Also Oesterley, DCG, II, p. 713, sees an anti-cultic tendency in this story. The opposition is of course not the modern distinction between spiritual prayer and material sacrifice, as Oesterley (p. 712) but also Wenschkewitz, p. 90, and Delling, p. 17, think.
temple building—in no sense can be he said to have “cleansed the temple”, not even for the future worship of the Gentiles. In the eschaton the Gentiles will come not to the outer court only but to the eschatological temple, which will be called a house of prayer and where there will be no more sacrifice.\(^1\) Jesus ignores the empirical temple completely, for the contrast is only implicit, but it is easy to see why Mark would have added the saying about the den of robbers and thus referred also to the destruction of the temple, and why John has included the temple saying in the framework of the cleansing story.

The anti-cultic implications of Jesus’ action in the temple are confirmed by a consideration of the controversy story concerning Jesus’ authority to do “this”, Mk 11:27-33. It is perhaps significant that it should be representatives of the temple\(^2\) who feel threatened (cf. 12:12) and so ask about Jesus’ authority. He replies in a familiar Rabbinic manner by a counter-question concerning the baptism of John. But what does John’s baptism have to do with Jesus’ action in the temple?\(^3\) John had appeared in the desert, and far from leading the people to the temple, the inhabitants of Jerusalem came to him (Mk 1:5). There he preached “a repentance-baptism leading toward (sic) the forgiveness of sins” (1:4). Of course the words quoted here have been given a specifically Christian formulation,\(^4\) and it is most improbable that John himself would have so designated his baptism. Nevertheless it was meant to prepare a purified and repentant people for the advent of the coming one, completely by-passing the rites of the temple. Purification through fire would result not from the fire of sacrifice but with the fiery baptism of him who is to come, and for the present John’s baptism with water supplants all temple sacrifice.\(^5\) If John had authority “from heaven”

\(^1\) This of course goes beyond the statement of Is 56:7, which speaks in the first half of the verse of the sacrifice of the Gentiles. Nevertheless there is good reason why the whole verse is not cited.

\(^2\) That the “elders” were mostly Sadducees, cf. Josephus, B.J. II, 411, and Jeremias, Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu, 1958, II, p. 90. It is of course most improbable that the Sanhedrin should be meant here.

\(^3\) It is once more E. Lohmeyer, Mt p. 242f, who has the merit of insisting that there must be more than a formal connection.

\(^4\) Cf. Acts 2:38. It is significant that Mt should have omitted the words “for forgiveness of sins” from his account of the Baptist only to insert them at the last supper, Mt 26:28.

\(^5\) That John’s baptism was meant as a surrogate for sacrifice, cf. Lohmeyer, Das Urchristentum. I Johannes der Täufer, esp. pp. 145-157, and cf. below, pp. 138f.
so to by-pass the temple and all expiation by sacrifice, then this same authority lay behind Jesus' actions contrasting house of prayer for the nations and house of sacrifice for Israel. Jesus' opponents seem to have recognized quite clearly the anti-cultic implications both of his present actions and of John's baptism.

The controversies concerning tribute to Caesar (Mk 12:13-17) and the resurrection (12:18-27), except that they show that Jesus agreed neither with the Zealots nor with the Sadducees, have nothing to do with cultic matters. The pericope concerning the great commandment, Mk 12:28-34, on the other hand, has added an anti-cultic reference even where it does not belong: the commandment to love is "much more than all burnt offerings and sacrifices" (33b). The question concerning the greatest commandment has of course nothing to do with sacrifice, as Matthew and Luke recognized in omitting these verses. This gratuitous disparagement of sacrifice was however not first included by Mark but belongs to an early stage in the transmission of the material, as the friendly relationship between Jesus and the scribe shows.⁠¹ Even if this polemic probably did not figure in the original discussion of Jesus, it represents an important corollary drawn by the earliest congregation from the great commandment (cf. Mt 9:13; 12:6).

The pericope concerning David's son, Mk 12:35-37, is so terse that it is very difficult to interpret. "How do the scribes say that the χριστός is the son of David?" Since by definition the Messiah is the son of David,⁠² it seems that we must understand the "Anointed" in a general sense. Jesus cites the beginning of Ps 110 to show that David speaks of a certain figure as Lord, a figure who therefore cannot be his son. Unfortunately the story does not indicate who this "Anointed" is if it is not the Messiah ben David. It is possible that the tradition meant the anointed priest "after the order of Melchizedek" from Vs 4 of the Psalm, which would bring this pericope into line with the anti-cultic tendencies of the other con-

¹ The conclusion of G. Bornkamm, "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe", Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann, BZNW 21 (1954), pp. 85-93, that the clear anti-cultic tendency of Vs 32f points to a Hellenistic origin rests on false conceptions about the attitude of the Palestinian church.

² This is not made sufficiently clear by Cullmann, Christologie, p. 132f. His discussion of the passage is however much more to the point than that of Lohmeyer, Galiläa und Jerusalem, p. 93, who finds the Son of Man indicated in opposition to the Messiah, or that of Bultmann, syn. Trad., p. 144, who reads a Son of God Christology into the passage.
troversy stories. The story would also fit in very well with the situation of the Jerusalem church, and even of Jesus himself, for as we have learned from Qumran the relative status of the priestly and kingly Messiahs was a matter of controversy. Jesus lays claim to Ps 110 as a passage referring to the eschatological priest rather than to the king, in agreement with Qumran. However, while this may very well have been the original point of the story, in its present form it is not possible to say with certainty what is really meant.

It is most significant that polemic against the temple cult should be found in precisely those sections of Mark which most probably stem from the Jerusalem church and which reflect actual controversies of this church. However, such polemic can also be found in other parts of Mark, perhaps most clearly in the story of the cleansing of a leper, Mk 1:40-45. This story has no connection with the preceding Vs 16-39, which encompass the events of a single day, placed at the beginning to represent the “day of the manifestation of our Savior Jesus Christ.” It serves rather as an introduction to the following controversy stories and may have been joined to them before it came to Mark. The story emphasizes very strongly not the healing (λατρεύω cf Lk 17:15) but the cultic purification of the leper (καθαρίζων 1:40, 41, 42, καθαρισμός 1:44). The two concepts are clearly distinguished: 1. the leprosy left him, and 2. he was made clean (Vs 42), but the emphasis is on the making and declaring clean (καθαρίζω). The law made no provision for the healing of “leprosy” but only for the return to cultic purity when the disease had been healed by a physician or simply disappeared (Lev 13-14). This purification could only be declared by a priest and was dependent

---


2 For the superiority of the priestly over the kingly Messiah in Qumran, cf. especially 1QSa. Unfortunately Ps 110 is not cited in the Qumran literature published to date.

3 R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark, 1950, p. 25. He thinks of the story of the leper as having programmatic significance here at the beginning, much like the wedding feast at Cana and the cleansing of the temple in Jn 2, and calls it an illustration of Rm 8:3 (p. 26). But the story is not about what the law can do in general but quite specifically is concerned with the problem of purification.

4 So Knox, Sources, p. 8; Beare, Earliest Records, p. 70; Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, pp. 37, 123ff.
on making the appropriate sacrifices (Neg 3:1). When here the leper is not only healed but cleansed, then the prescribed sacrifice no longer makes any sense. That the man is nevertheless told to go to the priest and offer his sacrifice does not contradict this, for Strathmann has conclusively shown that εἰς μαρτύριον σύντοξος must be translated "zum (Belästigungs-) Zeugnis gegen sie", i.e. the priests. Since the priests never claimed to be able to cure leprosy and since there can be no question of the faith or disbelief in a Jesus they have never seen on the basis of a miraculous cure about which they are not told (41a), this witness can only refer to the sacrifices. Jesus can (not only heal but) make clean, and the sacrifice the leper is told to make is therefore a witness against all purificatory sacrifice.

The whole question of Levitical cleanliness is of course a cultic one. The purpose of being in a state of cleanness is to enable one to participate in the temple sacrifices, but also the means whereby one becomes clean involve in most cases a sacrifice offered in the temple, along with a waiting period and purification usually with water. Whenever it is said that Jesus is able to make a person clean this is said in direct opposition to the sacrifices, as is exemplified in the story of the leper just discussed. It is the universal rule that while cleanness cannot be transmitted, uncleanness is always contagious by contact. It is then extremely significant that in the story just discussed it should be emphasized that Jesus touched the leper (Mk 1:41), and yet he did not become unclean, but on the contrary the leper was made clean. The same is true of the woman with a hemorrhage, whose Niddah has lasted twelve years, where the physical contact is strongly emphasized (Mk 5:27, 28, 30, 31). This tendency of Jesus confronting an unclean person without becoming himself unclean is brought out also in the story of the Gerasene demoniac, Mk 5:1ff, where the elements

---

1 TWNT IV, 509. This usage prohibits the usual conception that the story is meant to show Jesus’ loyalty to the (ceremonial) law, for it is strongly emphasized that the man has already been declared clean. Also in Lk 17:14 the lepers are declared clean before they go to the priests.

2 The subject of Vs 45 is still Jesus; the story is therefore not comparable to 5:20; 7:36. Cf. Klostermann, MK, p. 24.

3 Cf. Lohmeyer, Kaisus, p. 34.

4 Contact is of course a motif in many healing stories, cf. Bultmann, syn. Trad. p. 237f. The point is that this traditional motif is especially emphasized in cases of uncleanness.
of uncleanness are piled one upon another: 1. it is Gentile territory, 2. he has an "unclean" spirit, and 3. he lives among the tombs. In this same connection lies the fact that demons are so often called "unclean spirits" in the early tradition.\(^1\) Jesus as the Holy One of God (Mk 1:24) not only heals those who are possessed by driving out the demon but also purifies them of their uncleanness.\(^2\)

Finally, we come to a series of sayings in Mark 7 which seem to abolish the whole distinction between clean and unclean. The controversy story Mk 7:1-2a, 5-8 is interesting first of all in the situation presupposed: that Jesus' disciples, i.e. the Palestinian church, were accustomed to ignore the Pharisaic regulations of washing to eat in a state of ritual purity. In itself this says no more than that the early Christians were not Pharisees, and it is difficult to see how a controversy could have arisen unless further implications were involved. There is nothing controversial about eating with unwashed hands, unless the Christians thereby made the claim that they were nevertheless eating in a state of purity, a state brought about not by the temple and for the temple, but by Jesus for their own community. While this conception is given full expression only in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 15:3; 13:10 and probably 2:6 and 3:25), it must be presupposed also for the congregation which transmitted this controversy story. The answer of Jesus which justifies their action distinguishes between the commandment of God and the oral tradition in a general sense and thus is not as interesting for our present purposes as the specific situation which called it forth.

In Mk 7:15 Jesus\(^3\) says: "There is nothing outside of a man which by going into him can render him unclean; but that which comes out

---

\(^1\) This trait was not really understood by the evangelists, as the statistics show. In the later gospels δαιμόνια is much more frequent than πνεῦμα δαιμόνιον (Mt 11 to 2 times, Lk 23 to 5 times). In Mk each appears 11 times, but outside of the pericope Mk 7:24-30 δαιμόνια is never used in a concrete story but is found in summary statements. The tradition before Mk clearly preferred to speak of "unclean spirits", a conception which Mk and even more the later gospels no longer understood.


\(^3\) That this is a genuine saying is generally admitted; cf. Taylor. Mk p. 343.
of a man is what renders him unclean.” This saying was evidently not immediately understood by the church. Mark calls it a “dark saying” (παραβολή, Vs. 17) and appends a series of explanations, 7:18f, 20–23, the sense of which is shown by the parenthetical remark 7:19b “thus declaring all foods clean”. Matthew has a different understanding: he connects this saying with the preceding and draws the conclusion: “to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man” (Mt 15:20b), a Halachah which does not contradict the written Torah.⁷ Again, if Jesus had spoken as plainly as Mark assumes, it would be hard to explain such passages as Acts 10 and Romans 14. Nevertheless it must be admitted that by implication at least Jesus really means by this saying what Mark says he means. This is of course important for Jesus’ attitude to the law,⁸ but even more for his attitude to the temple. The food laws are declared pointless in this saying and with them all other laws dealing with the distinction between clean and unclean. Since the purity laws existed only for the sake of enabling the people to approach the holy God in the temple cult, the saying Mk 7:15 renders the whole concept of the cult obsolete. “Wer bestreitet, dass die Unreinheit von aussen auf den Menschen eindringt, trifft ... die Voraussetzungen des gesamten antiken Kultwesens mit seinem Opfer- und Sünehnepraxis. Anders gesprochen: Er hebt die für die gesamte Antike grundlegende Unterscheidung zwischen dem Temenos, dem heiligen Bezirk, und der Profanität auf und kann sich deshalb den Sündern zugesellen.”³

We have seen that in the generally recognized oldest stratum of Mark, and to a lesser degree in other parts of his gospel, a definite anti-cultic polemic is quite evident. This is all the more significant because it does not correspond to Mark’s own attitude. Although this must be examined separately, already our more extended

---

² It renders the position of Schoeps, “Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz”, Aus frühchristlicher Zeit, pp. 212–220, very problematic. While the saying could be interpreted by Mt (cf. 23:23) as emphasizing one kind of defilement while not neglecting the other, thus not criticizing the Torah itself, it is very difficult to read Mk in this fashion.
discussion of the cleansing of the temple would tend to show that Mark's attitude was one of opposition to the temple rather than opposition to the cult. Cultic questions were relevant chiefly to the Jerusalem congregation, and the early collection of controversy stories we have examined shows that the cult was a matter of dispute between Christians and non-Christians in Jerusalem of the 40's. We now have to ask whether this polemical attitude is contradicted by other passages in the gospels. The commonly accepted dictum of Schrenk cited above says that "der ganze synoptische Aufriss rechnet bei Jesus immer mit beidem: mit der Bejahung des Tempeldienstes als des von Gott bestimmten Weges der Verehrung Gottes und mit der Überlegenheit des Christus über den Tempel." It could be that there is an ambivalent attitude, even a contradiction, in the synoptic tradition, that alongside the polemic also an affirmation of the cult is to be found. The question is whether or not the frequently cited texts really express this affirmation.\(^1\)

The most important expressions of a "conservative attitude toward the cult"\(^2\) are to be found, as might be expected, in the Gospel according to Matthew. It seems however that Matthew is "conservative" mostly in his language. The passage Mt 5:23f can not in any case be used to demonstrate that the early church participated in the temple sacrifices, for the main thrust of the passage does not concern sacrifice at all. "Now if you are offering your gift on the altar and there remember that your brother has anything against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go, first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift." This saying is included in a section Mt 5:21-26 having to do with the need for reconciliation and says in effect that this outweighs all cultic

---

\(^1\) E. Percy, *Die Botschaft Jesu*, p. 119, lists as passages showing the "positive Einstellung Jesu zum Tempel" Mt 5:23f, Mk 11:44, 11:15-19, Acts 5:14, and Mt 23:16-22. They are all discussed in the text. Schrenk, op. cit., p. 242, mentions in addition Lk 18:10-13 (Pharisee and Publican) and Mk 12:41-44 (the widow's gift), but quite aside from the fact that these are only examples, the first deals with prayer not sacrifice (cf. Lohmeyer, *Kultus*, p. 66), and the second concerns the devotion of the widow and not the purpose of her gift (cf. Delling op. cit., p. 17). For all the other passages where λέγων or ταλάντων appear, cf. Schmauch, op. cit. p. 94ff. They show neither a positive nor a negative attitude to the cult but are geographical termini. This is true even of passages Schmauch wishes to interpret in a negative sense, e.g. that Satan (Lk 3:9) or the Anti-Christ (Mk 13:14) can appear in the temple. For an opposition to the temple as such, cf. below, pp. 119-61.

\(^2\) So Hummel, op. cit. p. 78.
considerations. No actual sacrifice is envisaged at all, for the saying speaks as if the one offering sacrificed his gift on the altar, whereas in fact only the priest was permitted to approach the altar with the victor. Further, if one can at the last minute "remember" that one needs to be reconciled, then there is no inner connection between the sacrifice and the quarrel. "If your brother (any brother) has anything (anything at all) against you..." No one who has properly understood the saying would ever think of returning to the altar to continue his sacrifice. Couched in such general language, the saying, far from indicating an approval of sacrifice, does not say anything different from the Hosea word "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" quoted in Mt 9:13 and 12:6.

The situation in Mt 23:21 is similar, in that the context does not refer to cultic matters but to the validity of oaths, even mild oaths which do not mention God and therefore seem to avoid a violation of the commandment not to profane the name of the Lord. In fact, says Jesus, an oath by anything involved indirectly the name of God. This logic will be more apparent if we first examine the close parallel in Mt 5:34f: "Do not swear at all, neither by heaven, for 'it is the throne of God' (Is 66:1a), nor by the earth, for 'it is the footstool of his feet' (Is 66:1b), nor by Jerusalem, for 'it is the city of the great king' (Ps 48:3)". Heaven, earth, and Jerusalem all involve God, as is shown by the passages quoted. The argumentation in 23:20-22 is similar, even if there are no direct citations. "He who swears by the altar swears by it and by him who is above it; and he who swears by the temple swears by it and by him who dwells therein; and he who swears by heaven swears by the throne of God and by him who sits thereon." The altar, the temple, and heaven all involve God, as is shown by the common opinions quoted. Does this mean that Jesus shares these common opinions? This is doubtful in the case of the altar, but possible in the statement that God dwells in the temple. However, when we consider

---

1 In this sense it is comparable to the saying Mk 11:25 = Mt 6:14; cf. Did 4:14, Barn 19:12.
2 Yoma 8:9 is then not relevant. This must be emphasized against J. Jeremias, "Lass allda deine Gabe (Mt 5, 23f)", ZNW 36 (1937), pp. 150-154.
3 Cf. Augustine, de sermone domini in monte, I, 26.
4 This must be the meaning, even if the present text reads "by all which is on it", viz. the sacrifice, for the previous verse maintains quite correctly that it is the altar which sanctifies the gift. Cf. Manson, Mission and Message, p. 527, and Lohmeyer, Mt, p. 344.
5 Many texts have felt a difficulty here and have changed to "had dwelt".
that Matthew felt no contradiction to his view that the Shekinah
dwells in Jesus (cf. Mt 18:20 with Aboth 3:6), it would be very
precarious to build any great conclusions from this one passage.

The anti-cultic tendency which we must presuppose for the Jeru-
salem congregation to be able to account for the Marcan contro-
versy stories has not been contradicted by the two passages we have
examined in Matthew. This is also true of Luke. To be sure there
is no polemic in the third gospel to correspond to what we have
found in the first two, and we also find a very favorable attitude to
the temple.\footnote{Luke's attitude to Jerusalem and the temple will be discussed below, pp. 365-369.} This does not in itself mean a favorable attitude to
the cult, however, for the temple is seen in a heilsgeschichtliche
perspective as the center of the people of Israel. It is thus character-
istic that the stories of Luke 1-2 should all be centered around the
temple. The priest Zechariah has a vision while on duty in the
temple (1:8ff), Simeon is inspired by the Spirit to come to the
temple to see in the child Jesus God's promised salvation (2:27ff),
and it is said of Anna that she "did not depart from the temple,
serving (God) with fasting and prayer night and day" (2:37).
Nothing is even suggested of the daily sacrifices, for salvation is
here an eschatological and not a cultic matter, and the focus of
attention is on Jesus. In him the promise of the dwelling of the
Shekinah is fulfilled, and not in the temple.\footnote{Cf. Lk 1:35 "the power of the Most High will overshadow you" with Ex
40:35 "the cloud overshadowed (ἐμαύσιαξεν, ὠπο) the tent of meeting and
the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle (ἐστάσεται)."} The real significance
of the temple for Luke is shown in the story of the twelve year old
Jesus Lk 2:41-51. Jesus must be involved "in the things of his
Father" in the temple, which the story defines not as sacrifice but
as conversation with the teachers of Israel concerning the Torah.

The church which transmitted these stories was vitally interested
in the temple but not at all in the cult. Luke shares this interest
in the temple, even to the point of mentioning sacrifice, but it is
clear that he is so far removed from cultic concerns that he has no
real conception of actual sacrificial practice. Thus in 2:22ff Luke
assumes that Jesus was brought to the temple to "be presented
before the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord)" and to
"offer a sacrifice according to what is said in the law of the Lord",
whereas in fact a purificatory sacrifice was necessary only for the
mother and the first born was not redeemed in the temple.\(^1\) The other sacrifice Luke mentions is equally false, Acts 21:26f. It may well be that Paul offered a purificatory sacrifice when he returned to Jerusalem and also that he paid the expenses for the sacrifices of four Nazirites, but the manner in which the two are confused by Luke betrays a complete ignorance of cultic matters.\(^8\) Paul’s motive for these acts is quite clear, by the way, and does not imply approval of the cult but rather an expression of solidarity with Israel.\(^9\) In both cases Luke’s own uninformed interest tends to emphasize the fact that the church before him was not concerned with sacrifices at all.

Luke 24:50-53, a late summary of the situation in the first chapters of Acts,\(^4\) says of the disciples that "they were continually in the temple blessing God". This summary is not quite correct insofar as it implies that the book of Acts portrays the disciples praying in the temple. It was in the upper room that the disciples "devoted themselves with one accord to prayer" (Acts 1:14), and there that the prayer concerning the successor of Judas took place (1:24). The long prayer 4:24-30 occurred in a "place in which they were gathered together" (4:31), very probably a private house, as did also the prayer at the setting apart of the Seven (6:6). Also the summary 2:41-47 implies that the prayer occurred \(\text{τὸ λατρεύειν} (2:46),\) along with the breaking of bread and the fellowship and the teaching of the apostles. Nevertheless the same sentence which says that all of these things happened "in their homes" also says that the disciples were "day by day with one accord continuing steadfastly in the temple."

It is on these two summary statements that the universally held opinion that the early church continued to worship in the temple is based. Unconsciously it is part of the old view, which has been greatly modified in all other respects, that the early pre-Pauline church was only a Jewish sect with a few peculiar ideas about the person of Jesus of Nazareth.\(^6\) The fact of Jesus of Nazareth has

---

\(^1\) On the impossibility of the present text and a suggested reconstruction of the Proto-Lucan text, cf. H. Sahlín, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk*, 1945, pp. 243-246.


\(^4\) Cf. below, Chapter IV, p. 247, note 3.

\(^5\) Cf. e.g. Holtzmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, I, p. 421. The confidence with which the sacrifices of the early church were assumed is
proved to be decisive for the self-understanding of the church in other respects, however, and also this long cherished view must be reexamined. In the light of the Marcan controversy stories, stemming from the Jerusalem church, it is likely that the church from the very beginning abstained from any cultic activities within the temple. Apart from the summaries, there is one individual story in Acts where the validity of this hypothesis can be tested.

Acts 3:1 says that “Peter and John went up to the temple mount at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour.” It is usually assumed that they planned to participate in the prayers that accompanied the evening Tamid sacrifice, although this is not stated and plays no part in the following story. On the contrary, instead of praying they heal a man lame from birth and then preach to the assembled crowd, which might even indicate a contrast to the sacrifices which are simultaneously being performed on the altar.

The assumption that Peter and John were going to the temple to participate in the sacrifices also involves a question of geography: the location of the “Beautiful Gate”. Although such a name is unknown in the other sources, it is almost universally sought within the Soreq, to be identified with the Corinthian Gate at the entrance to the court of women (Josephus) or the Nicanor Gate at the entrance to the court of the Israelites (Mishna). This assumption involves Luke in a very serious error when he has Peter, John, and the healed lame man enter the Beautiful Gate only to arrive at the Portico of Solomon in the SE corner of the outer court (Vs 11). It is also assumed that in this particular passage ἤστημι must mean inner court,

1 Cf. e.g. W. G. Kümmel, Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus, 1943.
3 On the Beautiful Gate cf. K. Lake in The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 1933, pp. 497-486, and J. Duplacy, “A propos d’une variante ‘occidentale’ des Actes des Apôtres (III, 11)”, Revue des études augustiniennes, 2 (1956), pp. 231-242. In order to identify the Beautiful Gate with the Corinthian Gate of Josephus, Duplacy must assume that the Western text, which has the apostles come out again to enter the Portico of Solomon, is original. This is to let the tail wag the dog.
4 That Luke has telescoped his account and really meant that they went into the inner court and then came out again to the Portico of Solomon (so Reicke, op. cit. p. 65) is according to K. Lake, op. cit. p. 484 “obviously a counsel of despair.” On the Western reading, cf. previous note.
even if otherwise in Josephus and the New Testament it refers to the whole temple area, including the outer court. Only if the Beautiful Gate is identified with one of the entrances to the temple mount, perhaps as tradition says the Shushan or Easter Gate,¹ perhaps one of the Huldah Gates,² does the story make any geographical sense. That the gate in question must have been one of the outer gates³ is shown by the fact that the lame man had no access to the outer court of the temple at all: "A cripple's stool and its pads are susceptible to midras-uncleanness; and he may not go out with them on the Sabbath or enter with them into the Temple Court"⁴ (Shab 6:8b).⁵ We have therefore to picture the lame man as sitting by one of the outer gates, where he is healed by Peter and John and goes with them into the Portico of Solomon in the outer court. The story Acts 3:1ff says by no means that the disciples went into the inner courts at the time of sacrifice, and we can say no more about what their intention may have been except to point out what they actually did.

That the early church participated in the temple sacrifices can not be demonstrated by the early chapters of Acts; nevertheless the presence of the disciples in the temple is continually emphasized. Why did they go there if not to take part in the cult? The answer is suggested in the summary notice Acts 5:42, "And every day in the temple and in private houses they did not cease to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ." We even learn where this activity was carried out: in the Portico of Solomon (5:12; 3:11). In the story of the imprisonment of the apostles, the angel who frees them tells them to go to the temple and gives an explicit purpose: "Go and stand, speak in the temple to the people all the words of

¹ Cf. Mid 1:3, Kel 17:9, Ber 9:5. Par 3:6. This gate led directly into the Portico of Solomon. For the tradition cf. Duplicay, op. cit.
² These two gates on the south side were the ones most used and therefore most suitable for a beggar.
³ J. Jeremias, TNPIT III, 173, n. 5, at least leaves the possibility open" bei dem 'schönen' Tor an ein Aussentor des Tempels zu denken."
⁴ הַמְּתַחֵי = outer court, cf. 2 Chron 4:9.
⁵ trans. Danby. The same section allows a cripple to enter the temple court if he has a wooden stump or knee pads which allow him to move himself. The cripple in Acts 3:2 however had to be carried and so undoubtedly belonged to the other class. Cf. Jeremias, Jerusalem, IIIA, p. 33f. Other lame or blind persons are found in the gospels near but not on the temple mount, Jn 5:2ff, 9:2ff. The whole point of Mt 21:14 is that Jesus brings the blind and the lame into the temple area from which the law excludes them and heals them.
this life" (5:20). For the early church in Acts the temple is not the place of the cult but of proclamation, the national center of Israel to whom they are sent. We saw that the statement that the disciples prayed in the temple Lk 24:53 did not really summarize the individual stories of Acts; the summary statement Acts 5:42 is more appropriate when we look at what actually happened in the temple, for every concrete story which mentions the temple shows the disciples preaching: after the healing of the lame man 3:11ff, in the two speeches before the Sanhedrin 4:8ff; 5:29ff and probably on Pentecost 2:5ff. It was the custom to teach in the temple courts, as this was the only large open "village square" in Jerusalem. The disciples preached where the people were to be found coming together, for how else could all Jerusalem be filled with their preaching (5:28)? We find then in the book of Acts no justification for the claim that the early church was favorably disposed toward the temple cult, and the evidence we have extracted from the gospels has been confirmed.

Our investigation of the attitude of the early church to the temple cult has so far yielded two slightly different attitudes, neither of which can be called positive. On the one hand we have the polemic of the Marcan controversy stories, which has even been strengthened by Matthew. On the other hand we have the more conciliatory approach of Luke and Acts, which without implying approval of the sacrificial cult nevertheless emphasizes the solidarity of the early Christians with Israel, Jerusalem, and the temple. Are these two attitudes to be accounted for by postulating different groups in the early church or different times in which the traditions were formulated? It seems more likely that while the polemic shows the

1 Cf. Lk 2:46f, Jn 8:12ff, Josephus B.J. 1, 78, and A. Büchler, "Learning and Teaching in the Open Air in Palestine", JQR, n.s. IV, pp. 483f.

2 "Leipoldt (Gottesdienst, p. 21) a cependant, en s’appuyant sur Actes 2:46; 3:11; 5:12, 20, 42, soutenu que les Chrétiens célébraient leur culte particulier dans le Temple, spécialement sous le portique de Solomon. Mais les textes qu’il invoque se rapportent à la prédication missionnaire et non au culte proprement dit.”, M. Goguel, L’Eglise Primitif, p. 272.

3 It would be tempting to derive the hostility to the temple from Galilean Christianity and the friendlier attitude from Jerusalem, but Lohmeyer’s distinction (Galiläa und Jerusalem, 1936) cannot be upheld. For the antisemitic tendency often latent in this construction cf. A. Oepke, Gottesvolk, pp. 134-141, 183-187. Cf. also N. A. Dahl, Das Volk Gottes, p. 181ff.

4 It is true that Luke portrays the early church growing up in harmony within Judaism, and that he especially emphasizes the importance of the temple; cf. Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit, p. 125f, Haenchen, Apg., p. 565.
church in controversies forced upon it, the actual attitude of most early Christians will have been closer to the impression conveyed by Luke. This attitude can be shown most clearly in a story from Matthew's special material.

The story of the temple tax, Mt 17:24-27, can certainly not be used to show a pro-cultic tendency of the early church. On the contrary, the very fact that the story was transmitted witnesses to a tendency not to pay the temple tax. All who contributed to the expenses of the daily sacrifices also shared in the atonement these sacrifices effected, but there evidently were some who did not think this was necessary. To such Peter recalls that Jesus always paid the tax, and he transmits to the church Jesus' Halachah on this matter. The whole point of the story is to urge the congregation to pay the tax, even if they know they are free, so as not to give offense and to show their solidarity with Israel. The fact that the Christians as sons are free from the temple is not emphasized but only presupposed. Far from advocating this freedom, the story tries to limit it in the interests of peace with Israel. This attitude is typical of the whole Jerusalem church and even of Paul, which tends to explain why the attitude of the church to the temple cult was not made more explicit in Luke and Acts. From Mark and Matthew we can conclude that the subject was discussed only when it was forced on the church by their opponents, only when they were forced to explain their attitude of ignoring the temple cult completely.

The attitude of the early church can only be explained if it corresponds to the attitude of Jesus himself. Even if the polemical tone of some passages is to be attributed to the influence of later disputes, still the reason for these disputes must be seen in a practice the disciples learned from Jesus. That Jesus is said to

We shall maintain however that Luke contains a very important old tradition, and that what he emphasizes is already present in his material. Cf. below, Chap. IV.

1 Townsend, p. 93ff, reads out of the story the peculiar idea that the Christians could enjoy the advantages of the temple gratis!
2 The story was of course formulated in the period before A.D. 70, after which the tax was paid to the Romans (B.J. VII, 218); cf. Bultmann, syn. Trad. p. 34f.
4 Cf. Lohmeyer, Radus, p. 64f, Mt, p. 275, Oepke, p. 8.
have frequented the temple cannot be adduced as passages "die implicit eine Billigung des Kultus durch Jesus enthalten." The point of Jesus' teaching in the court of the temple (in the Portico of Solomon, Jn 10:23), like that of the apostles, is clearly expressed in Jn 18:20—he taught there "where all Jews come together", παρθένοις and not ἐν κρυπτῷ. In contrast to what is said concerning Jesus' custom with regard to the synagogue (Lk 4:16), it is never even suggested that Jesus participated in the temple sacrifices. The cleansing of the temple is especially important in elucidating Jesus' attitude, and therefore so much space was devoted to its analysis above: behind Mark's opposition to the temple Jesus' teaching was seen to be concerned with non-cultic matters. As far as we can tell, Jesus did not express himself for or against (but cf. Mk 7:15!) the temple as the place of the cult but simply ignored it. We will not understand the reason for this until we examine those gospel sayings which deal with a substitute for the temple. For the present Jesus' attitude can perhaps best be characterized as one of sublime indifference.

2. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE

The Gospel according to the Ebionites contained the apocryphal saying of Jesus: "I have come to destroy sacrifice". Lohmeyer accepts this saying as representing at least a correct understanding of Jesus' proclamation and compares it to his interpretation of the saying Mk 14:58, "I am come"—thus we can paraphrase—"to destroy the temple." This is the question with which we shall be concerned in this section: is Lohmeyer's paraphrase correct, i.e. does the saying "I will destroy this temple" really represent an intention of Jesus of the type of programmatic "I am come"

---

2 Wenschikwitz, op. cit. p. 89. Cf. Schrenk, op. cit. p. 242. Did Paul approve of Greek law and religion because he taught on the Areopagus?
3 Cf. Lohmeyer, Kultus, p. 86, Delling, p. 16, Moule, Worship in the New Testament, p. 13. While this is only an argument from silence, the silence becomes especially suggestive if the last supper was really a Passover meal—without a lamb!
4 Cf. M. Goguel, "Jésus et la tradition religieuse de son peuple", RHPR 7 (1927), pp. 154-175, 219-244, who argues that Jesus was completely indifferent to circumcision (p. 170), the Sabbath (p. 170f), ritual purity (p. 133ff) and sacrifices (pp. 220ff).
5 Cf. below, pp. 229-243.
6 Kultus und Evangelium, Göttingen, 1942, p. 78. ET p. 68.
sayings? In the previous section we sought to demonstrate an opposition to the Jerusalem cult in at least a certain tradition behind the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. We concluded with the suggestion that this represents more the polemic of the early Christian congregation than Jesus’ own attitude, which we characterized as a sublime indifference to all cultic questions. Should Lohmeyer prove to be right, however, we would have to revise this earlier suggestion and postulate a very deep interest in the cult on the part of Jesus, in order to account for his supposed opposition to the temple.

These two attitudes: opposition to the temple and opposition to the cult, are related but by no means to be confused, for they could be expressions of quite different conceptions. The latter is directed against the cult as such, which is seen no longer to represent the will of God so that that which it should have achieved is to be sought in quite different areas of religious expression. Such an attitude could eventually result in the demand that the vain but seductive temple services should cease, even that the temple should be destroyed. It is however much more natural to consider the antiquated temple simply as antiquated and to ignore it. An opposition to the cult as such would probably result in an indifferent attitude toward the temple. It is quite a different matter when the correct performance of the cult is taken seriously and the opposition is directed against current abuses. Then it may become imperative to “cleanse” the temple of profanations, to restore the proper cult, perhaps even to destroy the old in order to build a new purified temple. An opposition to the temple is much more apt to result from a high estimation of the cult resulting in an opposition to current cultic practices than from an opposition to the cult as such. On the other hand a thoroughgoing indifference in cultic matters would likely also be indifferent to the question of the continued existence of the temple. Opposition to the temple and opposition to the cult are at first to be found in inverse proportion to one another, and only after a period of frustration can one directly affect the other.

— One could compare the measures undertaken against pagan temples by Constantius.
— One could compare the attitude of the Christians of Asia Minor referred to by Pliny, Epistolarum, X, 96, when he says that the temples had been almost deserted and the sacrificial animals had met with but few purchasers.
— Something of this complex attitude whereby a high evaluation of the
The saying of Jesus, "I will destroy this temple and in three days I will build it" is an expression of opposition to the temple, which is to be destroyed, but also a high estimation of the cult, for the temple will be rebuilt. The two belong together, for the only reason for the destruction of the old must be because the sacrifices offered there were in some sense inadequate, and a new temple must be built to house the future perfected cult. One could very properly speak of a cleansing of the temple in this connection, for the old is purified, even destroyed, only to make way for the new. Jesus' intention of destroying the temple would then be only a necessary means to an end, the eschatological rebuilding of the temple in the age to come. In fact the saying Mk 14:58 is usually interpreted in this manner, even if not quite so explicitly. Whether this interpretation is correct remains to be seen.

The background of Jesus' statement is usually sought in the supposed apocalyptic expectation of a new temple. Typical of many is R. Bultmann: "schon vor der Zerstörung des herodianischen Tempels im Jahre 70 bestand die Hoffnung, dass die messianische Zeit einen neuen herrlicheren Tempel bringen werde." This statement has been accepted and quoted for years without ever being tested against the sources. The origin of the conception seems to rest on a pronouncement of Billerbeck and an impressive list of texts adduced by Bousset. Much more tenuous, but almost
as frequently quoted, is the assumption that the Jewish texts occasionally expect the Messiah to destroy and rebuild the temple.\footnote{ Cf. most recently Hummel, op. cit., p. 93, and cf. below, p. 147. ff.}
If, as we hope to show, the new temple was not an important part of Jewish eschatology before A.D. 70, and the Messiah was never expected to build it anyway, then some other explanation must be sought for the strange saying attributed to Jesus.

Because the destruction of the temple in Mk 14:58 is only a preliminary act subordinate to the building of the eschatological temple, this expectation must first be examined to see whether in fact it provides a background for the saying. Also the role of the Messiah in Jewish expectations concerning the temple must be questioned. Then we shall examine the opposition to the temple as such, as this is developed in the apocalyptic literature, Qumran, and the early church. Only then will we be in a position to explain the origin of Mk 14:58.

A. The Expectation of the New Temple

With the fall of the first temple in 586 B.C. the Heilsgeschichte of the Old Testament had come to an end. If anything further were to happen in Israel it would be only because God had determined to make a completely new beginning. This is essentially what the prophecy of Second Isaiah proclaimed, that God was about to elect his people all over again, that he would lead them in a new exodus, which will so far surpass the first exodus that it can only be described in terms of a new creation. In addition to these two traditions, Second Isaiah makes use of a third originally quite separate tradition; that of the new Zion.\footnote{ Cf. M. Noth, “Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition,” Gesammelte Studien zum AT (1937), pp. 172-187. On the one hand, “die vorexilischen Propheten reden in den messianischen Weissagungen nicht von Jerusalem” (p. 181); but on the other hand, “diese offenbar geringe Einschätzung von Jerusalem als Königsstadt steht nur um so bemerkenswerter gegenüber die Würdigung der Stadt als Stätte der göttlichen Gegenwart, wobei nur an das Heiligtum mit der Lade gedacht sein kann” (p. 182). The last part of the second quotation is an untested and it seems unwarranted assumption.} The new exodus will end not just in the promised land but quite specifically in the new Jerusalem. Not only is there no room in this picture of the glorious future for an Israeliite Messiah (the title is given away to Cyrus in 45:1),\footnote{ Cf. G. von Rad, Theologie des Alten Testaments, Bd I, pp. 54ff; Bd II, pp. 166ff; H. J. Krauss, Psalmen, pp. 342ff.} but it also seems...
that there is no room for a temple in the new Jerusalem. There are many occasions on which one would expect mention of the restoration of the temple service, so that this silence is indicative. The cult has been of no avail in the past (43:23f), and in the future God will forgive independently of any cultic mediation. The tradition of the ark was after all originally independent of the Zion tradition, which comes ultimately from pre-Davidic Jerusalem, so that the distinction between Zion and the temple is not an artificial one. It is important to note at the outset that it is possible to speak of the restoration of Israel in terms of the Zion tradition with no mention of the temple at all.

After Second Isaiah there was no new prophecy in Israel, for the message of all subsequent prophets is essentially actualization, that now, in their time, this prophecy from the exile is beginning to come true. Accordingly post-exilic eschatology, as this is found in such passages as Is 34-35, Joel 3, Zech 12-14, Ezek 38-39, Is 24-27, remains in the Zion tradition, and there is no mention of a rebuilding of the temple. The dwelling place of God on earth will not be the debir of the temple but the whole glorified city, which is described in increasingly mythological terms. Thus the streams of living water which will flow from Jerusalem have more to do with the mountain of paradise, the highest mountain of the world, than with the temple. Two contradictory conceptions concerning the Gentiles became part of the Zion tradition: one tells of the last great battle of all the nations against the holy city, and the other, sometimes combined with the first, speaks of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mount Zion, the center of God’s redemptive activity for the whole world. Zion is the place where God alone rules as king, and just as there is no room for a Messiah in such a vision of the future, so there is also really no need for the temple. As the holiness of God’s presence was transferred in the time of Solomon from the ark to the temple, so now from the temple to the city.

---

1 Is 44:28c is a secondary gloss meant to explicate the promise of vs 26, so the commentaries by Duhm, Marti, Cheyne, et al.