

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship* (TSF) *Bulletin* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_tsfbulletin\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin_01.php)

The statements above in paragraph (ii) are, on the other hand, not essentially theological statements, but fairly clearly borrowed from the hyperbolic court style of the ancient Near East,<sup>57</sup> which is not without its parallels in more recent times. 'You are the fairest of the sons of men' (45: 2) is a statement neither of theological reality nor of royal ideology. It shows only that kings of Israel, like most kings anywhere, have had around them obsequious courtiers. Nor can we infer from 21: 4 ('He asked life of thee; thou gavest it to him, length of days for ever and ever') that immortality was an element in the Hebrew ideology of kingship, any more than we can claim that 22: 6 ('I am a worm and not a man') proves that Israelite kings were sub-human. There are indeed some statements of this type where we find a blend of oriental court style and of theological affirmation, e.g. 2: 8, where the

<sup>57</sup> Cf. S. Mowinckel, 'General, Oriental and Specific Israelite Elements in the Israelite Conception of the Sacral Kingdom', in *La Regalità Sacra. The Sacral Kingship* (Studies in the History of Religions, IV; Leiden, 1959), pp. 283-93.

ascription of universal dominion to the king depends partly on the theological truth of Yahweh's universal lordship, and partly on the conventions of courtly language.

On the whole, however, what we have in the Psalms is a religious understanding and appreciation of the essentially secular institution of kingship.<sup>58</sup> Perhaps there is a danger in using the categories sacred and secular in reference to Israelite society and thought, but it seems to me less than that of understanding the king essentially or primarily in religious terms (divine, sacral, charismatic, sacerdotal). To answer our original question, it is true that the Psalms do preserve a distinctive ideology of kingship (though it is not so picturesque as some scholars have thought), but it is only one perspective on the kingship, which is amply attested in the historical books as a secular institution impinging on the realm of the sacred at many points, but moving in a sphere of bureaucracy, diplomacy, and justice which was not specifically religious.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. R. N. Whybray, 'Some Historical Limitations of Hebrew Kingship', *CQR* 163 (1962), pp. 136-50.

## Recent study of Mark 13: Part 1

David Wenham

*In 1954, Dr G. R. Beasley-Murray provided a magisterial survey of discussion of the so-called 'little apocalypse' theory of Mark 13. Twenty years afterwards it is appropriate that a fresh attempt be made to survey this exceedingly complex area of Gospel study. In this article, Dr Wenham gives a characteristically lucid account of several recent books dealing with Mark 13, and if the survey itself appears lengthy and detailed, the books concerned are even longer and more detailed (and, in some cases, much less lucid). Dr Wenham was Secretary of the TSF until last year.*

### A. Introduction

Mark 13 is a chapter of great importance for the Christian believer and of great difficulty for the New Testament scholar. It contains the longest connected discourse of Jesus recorded in Mark's Gospel, and it probably also contains more critical problems than any other single chapter of his Gospel! The problems may be grouped under three headings:

#### a. *The problem of its meaning*

First, what does the chapter mean as it now stands? How did the evangelist intend us to understand it? Under this heading, there are first general questions about the structure and thrust of the chapter. How does

it divide up, and how are the different parts related to each other? Is the chapter primarily intended to be apocalyptic instruction about the end time, or is it meant first and foremost to warn and encourage the Christian disciple?

Then there are particular questions:

1. When the disciples ask in verse 4 about 'all these things' (*tauta . . . panta*) which are to be accomplished, are they asking only about the fall of Jerusalem which has been mentioned in verse 2, or are they asking also about Jesus' 'parousia and the end of the age' as in the parallel verse in Matt. 24: 3?

2. What is the 'abomination of desolation' of verse 14? The phrase comes from the book of Daniel (*cf.* 9: 27, 11: 31, 12: 11); but what does it refer to in its Marcan context — to events connected with the fall of Jerusalem, or to what? The fact that the neuter noun *bdelugma* (abomination) has a masculine participle *hestékota* (standing) with it suggests to many people that the abomination is a person in some shape or form.

3. What is the implication of the phrase 'let the reader understand' in verse 14? Who is reading what? And what is he supposed to understand? Some think that the reference is to the book of Daniel from which the phrase 'abomination of desolation' is taken. Others have thought that in chapter 13 Mark is borrowing

material from an earlier 'apocalyptic broadsheet', and that this phrase comes from there. Others again think that the evangelist is here referring to his own Gospel, and that he is urging his reader to think about and to understand the point that he is making.

4. Is the language in verses 24 to 25 about the disturbances in the heavenly bodies to be taken literally, or as metaphor drawn from the Old Testament and used to describe political or other earthly events?

5. Is the coming of the Son of man referred to in verses 26 and 27 to be interpreted as the second coming of Christ or in some other way (*e.g.* of the fall of Jerusalem)?

6. When verse 30 says that 'all these things' will happen within a generation, what is included in 'these things'? Does the verse mean that Jesus' coming will be within a generation, or only that the signs of his coming (the 'these things' of verse 29) will be seen in a generation?

7. Verse 32 says that no-one knows about 'that day or hour'. But what 'day' or 'hour' is meant? Is it the day within the generation when 'all these things' will happen (verse 30)? Or is it another day?

#### b. *The literary history and origin of the chapter*

A second group of problems concern the literary history and origin of the material in Mark 13. How much of it is pre-Markan? What sources did Mark have? Does all of it or any of it go back to Jesus?

The relevant points that need discussing under this heading are:

1. How does the Marcan version of the discourse relate to the Matthean and Lukan versions (Mt. 24 and Lk. 21)? If Matthew and Luke had independent sources to draw on at this point, how do the different accounts relate to each other?

2. Some of the material in Mark 13 has parallels in the Synoptic Gospels outside Matthew 24 and Luke 21. For example, some of it is paralleled in the 'Q' sections of Matthew and Luke. How does Mark's version of these sayings compare with the other versions? Has Mark perhaps brought together a number of independent sayings from different sources?

3. The teaching in Mark 13 has some similarity to that found in 1 and 2 Thessalonians. Does it seem likely that Paul knew the Marcan discourse before it was incorporated into Mark?

4. There are possible signs in Mark 13 which may indicate a composite origin for the chapter. For example, there is a tension throughout the discourse between exhortation in the second person plural and information and instruction in the third person. Could this reflect the fact that Mark has brought together different types of material in the single discourse? Another possible indication of this is his verse 10, which stands rather awkwardly between verses 9 and 11.

5. It has been argued that the quotations and echoes of the Old Testament in Mark 13 reflect the Septuagint or Greek Old Testament rather than the original Hebrew. If this is so, it is relevant to the question of the literary history of the material, as also is the claim that there are definite Semitisms in the chapter.

6. Certain parts of the discourse and its setting (verses 1–4) are strongly Marcan in vocabulary and style. This suggests to some that Mark was wholly responsible for these sections and that he was not here drawing on sources.

7. Many scholars have regarded the apocalyptic teaching of Mark 13 as more in keeping with the ideas of first century Jewish apocalyptists than with Jesus' message; Jesus opposed the seeking of signs and taught that the kingdom would come unexpectedly. This point, if accepted, would be of importance in any discussion of the origin of the material in the chapter.

#### c. *The Christological problem*

The last problem with the discourse that has worried people is a Christological one. If, as Mark appears at first sight to suggest, Jesus taught that the Son of man would come and that the present age would end in a generation, then apparently he was mistaken. The Son of man has not returned in nineteen and a half centuries, let alone in one generation, and the world has gone on much as it always went on. For the Christian this must be a major problem: could the one he worships as the Son of God have been wrong on such a matter? Doesn't this disprove the Christian claim for Christ?

There are at least three possible ways out of the Christological difficulty: one is to say that in fact a mistake of this sort is unimportant — that it reflects Jesus' humanity and does not undermine his divinity. The second is to deny that the second coming is included in Mark 13: 30 in 'all these things' that are to happen in a generation. If the *tauta panta* are only the signs of the parousia, not the event itself, then there is no Christological problem. The third is to deny that the saying goes back to Jesus at all. These second and third escape routes take us back to the first and second type of problem mentioned above — the question of the meaning of Mark 13 and the question of the literary history of the chapter.

The fact that the Christological problem is closely tied up with the questions of meaning and literary history helps to explain the great interest that Christian scholars have shown in these questions. In their desire to vindicate Jesus, they have explored numerous possible explanations of the puzzling words in verse 30 and of the chapter that is its context. Such an apologetic purpose in study may have led some to make curious suggestions about the chapter, and it would be criticized by certain scholars today as 'unscientific'. But it is almost inevitable that a Christian who is faced with the sort of Christological problem that Mark 13 appears to present will search for some solution to it; and it is

a fallacy to suppose that a person's Christian commitment will automatically distort his or her approach; in fact it ought to have the opposite effect, since the Christian scholar is committed to honesty and truthfulness in his studies as much as in anything else.

### B. Study of the discourse up to Beasley-Murray

The history of the quest for an adequate explanation of Mark 13 was carefully chronicled by G. R. Beasley-Murray in his work on *Jesus and the Future*.<sup>1</sup> This is a basic book for anyone studying Mark 13 and the history of its interpretation. The aim of this article is not to go over the same ground as is covered by Beasley-Murray, but to describe a few of the contributions that have appeared since his book was published. It may, however, be helpful to draw attention to some of his main points.

Beasley-Murray begins his history by describing the argument of D. F. Strauss to the effect that Jesus was mistaken over the date of the parousia. Scholars reacted variously to his argument, explaining, for example, that Jesus looked forward to a threefold parousia (a spiritual parousia shortly after his death, a historical revelation of his sovereignty after his death, and a literal parousia) and that the early church confused the three elements in Jesus' expectation. But perhaps the most important reaction from the point of view of later research was that of T. Colani.

Colani maintained that the teaching of most of Mark 13 was quite contrary to the tenor of Jesus' teaching as a whole. Jesus, in Colani's view, did not proclaim an eschatological kingdom or expect himself to return as future Messiah; he was, rather, the humble, loving teacher, for whom the kingdom was a present reality, being synonymous with his own doctrine and way of life. There would be no violent breaking-in of the kingdom at the end; the gospel of the kingdom would spread gradually throughout the world. It is not surprising that Colani with this understanding of Jesus' teaching claimed that Mark 13:5–31 was an interpolation reflecting the views of first-century Jewish Christians, not Jesus' views at all. Colani suggested that Jesus' real answer to the disciples' question about the time of the destruction of the temple was to be found in the saying of verse 32, where Jesus professes ignorance of the day and the hour, and in the verses that follow. Verses 5–31 were, Colani thought, a tract — the so-called Little Apocalypse — written in a time of persecution shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, and it was to this tract that Eusebius was referring when he spoke of the Christians fleeing to the city of Pella in response to a prophetic oracle. Colani's main argument for his view was that the eschatology of the Little Apocalypse is different from that of Jesus; but he noted also that the three Synoptic Gospels run parallel only as far as Mark 13:32, and he explained

the phrase 'let the reader understand' in verse 14 as deriving from the earlier tract.

Colani's view of Jesus' teaching would be accepted by few, if any, today; and Beasley-Murray argues that his theory reflects more the then current suspicion of the sort of supernaturalism found in Mark 13 and his desire to save Jesus from a mistaken opinion than a careful analysis of the text. But, although that may well be the case, Colani's theory has in one form or another remained a widely held explanation of Mark 13, and Beasley-Murray proceeds in his book to discuss the various developments and modifications of his basic theory.

Whereas Colani had regarded the Little Apocalypse as a single document, many of his successors argued for a more complex situation. He had followed earlier scholars in dividing the Apocalypse into three sections: verses 5–13 describe 'the beginning of the birth pangs' (*archē ödinōn*) — false prophets, wars and persecutions; verses 14–23 describe the terrible distress (*thlipsis*) that will precede the end; and verses 24ff. describe the *telos*, the end events. Some of Colani's successors, while accepting the threefold division, noted that the apocalyptic description is mixed in with exhortation to Christians, e.g. in verses 9–13, 21ff., 28ff. This sort of material could be thought of as added material, perhaps even as a separate discourse, warning Christians not to be over-excited at the imminent end and urging patience on them; and, although the apocalypse might not go back to Jesus, the hortatory material could be genuine.

Those who have followed Colani have differed widely among themselves as to what in Mark 13 belongs in the Apocalypse and as to what might go back to Jesus. Perhaps the most important argument convincing many of the inauthenticity of the apocalyptic material has been that they have regarded it as contrary to Jesus' teaching. Colani's views of Jesus' teaching are not widely accepted, but Bultmann speaks for many when he maintains that the calculations about the time of the end found in Mark 13 are contrary to the spirit of Jesus' teaching as it is found, for example, in Luke 17:20, 21, 'The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; nor will they say, "Lo, here it is!" or "There!" for behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you.'

This argument has also appealed to many of those like Dodd and Kümmel who, while rejecting the idea of a Little Apocalypse behind Mark 13, have accepted that the chapter is an amalgam of genuine sayings of Jesus and others that derive from Jewish or Christian prophetic sources. Beasley-Murray in his survey of scholars in this category comments that verses 14–18 have been found the most difficult verses to accept: some, such as Bacon and Manson, have seen in at least the wording of the passage a reflexion of the situation in AD 40, when the Roman emperor Caligula ordered a statue of himself to be erected in the Jerusalem temple; a less popular alternative view has been that the reference may be to the setting up of imperial standards in Jerusalem by Pilate in AD 19.

<sup>1</sup> Subtitled *An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13, with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory* (Macmillan, London, 1954).

There have been a considerable number of 'attempts to vindicate the eschatological discourse', as Dr Beasley-Murray calls them, *i.e.* attempts by those who ascribe all of the discourse to Jesus to explain its problems. There are not a great many recent advocates either of the position that the discourse refers exclusively to events that still lie in the future or of the view that it refers to events that all lie in the past (*e.g.* of the view that the whole of Mark 13 was fulfilled in AD 70). Most people have maintained that the prophecies of the chapter have been fulfilled in part, but in part still remain to be fulfilled. Beasley-Murray categorizes their views under five headings: (a) Some have maintained that the destruction of Jerusalem is a prefigurement of the end and that both are in mind in Mark 13. Beasley-Murray objects to this view on the ground that there is no evidence for it in the text and no evidence suggesting a long interval between some of the events described and others. (b) Some have argued that two authentic prophecies of Jesus have been merged in one. In the first discourse Jesus looked forward to a near fall of Jerusalem, in the other to the end at an unknown time. Advocates of this view point to the Gospel sayings which suggest a delay in the parousia, and they explain that the two discourses were easily combined, since in the Old Testament the judgment of Israel was conjoined with that of the Gentiles; and in any case the destruction of Jerusalem was the first act of world judgment.

(c) A third view is that chapter 13 is a description of the whole Christian era and that, despite appearances, it is a mistake to think of everything described happening in a short period. The *tauta panta* which were to happen in a generation were only the beginning of the sorrows, and the end events would not come until the gospel was preached in the whole world. The strongest argument against this view in Beasley-Murray's opinion is the existence of the parallel verses in Matthew 10:23 and Mark 9:1, which suggest a coming of the Son of man soon, not after a prolonged interval. (d) A fourth explanation is that the prophetic perspective brings close together events that may be widely separated. Just as in a picture distant mountain peaks that may really be far from each other look close together, so in the discourse of Mark 13 the parousia seems to follow on immediately from the abomination of desolation and the destruction of Jerusalem. This view has its attractions, and yet to explain that prophets characteristically feel distant events to be near does not really eliminate the difficulty. (e) A fifth way out of the problems is simply to regard Mark 13 as a composition made up of a number of isolated fragments.

Having outlined these five possible ways of vindicating the discourse, Beasley-Murray goes on to look at some more recent attempts at dealing with the problems. He claims that from about 1930 scholars rejecting the Little Apocalypse theory have tended to accept that Jesus did expect a near end and also that Mark 13 is to some extent composite. But they have stressed that Jesus was not so much concerned to speculate

about future dates — he knew that this was in his Father's hands — as to encourage his followers to see the eschatological significance of the present — of his life, death and resurrection. The real intention of his teaching about imminence was to bring home to people the significance of the present.

After concluding his review of the history of the study of Mark 13, Beasley-Murray looks at a number of crucial issues raised, explaining his own viewpoint. He examines, first, the view that the teaching on signs of the end in Mark 13 contradicts Jesus' teaching about the suddenness of the end and the need for watchfulness, and he concludes that there is no necessary contradiction. Precisely the same tension is to be found in Paul's writings and in the book of Revelation. Jesus certainly rejected mathematical speculation, but by teaching his followers to recognize the signs of the times he encouraged them to endure. Beasley-Murray looks then at the question of the expectation of a near end ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels. He pronounces all attempts to explain the word *genea* as meaning anything other than 'generation' as failures, and he concludes that there is no way out of the conclusion that Jesus did expect the end within a generation. He denies that this conclusion discredits Jesus: Jesus was not omniscient, and the truth and divine authority of his spiritual and religious teaching is unaffected by what may be regarded as a human error. In 13:32 Jesus admits the limitations of his own knowledge, and verse 32 may be seen as qualifying all that goes before, including verse 30.

Beasley-Murray goes on to argue that Jesus did foresee the period of the church and a delay in the parousia (though not a very long delay). And he says that the destruction of Jerusalem was seen by Jesus as a part of the end woes and the end judgment. He sees no reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the Marcan setting of the apocalyptic discourse, and, although he agrees that some sayings in Mark 13, *e.g.* verses 15 and 16, may have been added into the discourse, he is not impressed with the arguments suggesting that the Marcan discourse as a whole is composite. The discourse in his view is both prediction of the future and moral exhortation, not one *or* the other; and although Jesus does not mention his death in the course of it, it is in Beasley-Murray's view presupposed. The apocalyptic in the discourse is not characteristically Jewish, though the teaching in it shares a common Old Testament background with Jewish writings; the central presupposition of the discourse is distinctively Christian, namely the person of Jesus as an eschatological figure. Beasley-Murray favours the view that Matthew and Luke may have known independent versions of the discourse and also that Paul was familiar with it; and he argues that the first Christian decade contains all the circumstances to encourage the compilation and issuing of the discourse. He is unconvinced by the arguments that the discourse contains Septuagintalisms that tell against its Semitic origin, and he argues on the contrary that the positive indications of a Semitic original are considerable.

### C. Study of the discourse after Beasley-Murray

In our survey of some recent study of Mark 13 after Beasley-Murray, we shall be looking at six books all published in the last ten years.

#### A. L. Moore

A. L. Moore's *The Parousia in the New Testament*<sup>2</sup> is a careful and valuable study of all the evidence in the NT which suggests that the early church expected the end within a brief limited period of time, and so it covers much more than Mark 13. Moore argues against the view that the early church expected the parousia to happen necessarily very soon. His treatment of the chapter deserves a brief description.

Moore differs from Beasley-Murray first in his rejection of the claim that Jesus' supposed mistake about the time of the end can be regarded as an unimportant human error. Moore points out that Mark 13:30 (like 9:1 and Mt. 10:23) is introduced by the solemn 'Truly I say to you', and he asks why we should rely on any of Jesus' sayings and teaching, if we are led to believe that he was mistaken in this solemnly introduced saying.

But he differs from Beasley-Murray also over the interpretation of the phrase *tauta panta* ('all these things') in the same verse. Beasley-Murray argued that the events of verses 24 to 27, including the coming of the Son of man, must be included in the *tauta panta* of verse 30 that are to happen in this generation; but Moore disagrees. The *tauta* in verse 29 are the signs of the end, not the end itself, and the same meaning must be given to the word in verse 30.

He suggests that verses 30 and 32 may be reconciled if the structure of chapter 13 is understood. The discourse, he explains, which is introduced by the question in verse 4, is about the end and its date and about the signs of the end and their dates. Thus the first section, verses 5–23, with its warnings about false prophets at the beginning and end of the section describes the signs of the end; verses 24 to 27 describe the end itself; verses 28 to 31 discuss the time of the signs, and verses 32 to 37 discuss the time of the end. Beasley-Murray maintained that verses 30 and 32 are referring to the same events: in verse 30 Jesus says that they will come within a generation; but in verse 32 he denies knowledge of their exact timing. Moore maintains that verse 30 is referring to the signs of the end, whereas verse 32 is referring to the end itself; and against Beasley-Murray he argues (a) that the demonstrative *ekeinēs* would be superfluous on Beasley-Murray's interpretation and (b) that the phrase *ekeinē hē hēmera* is a characteristic expression of Jesus for the last day, echoing as it does OT language about the day of the Lord. Moore's over-all position on Mark 13 is a conservative one. He finds the arguments against the authenticity of the

chapter and of particular verses, e.g. verse 32, unconvincing.

#### L. Hartman

In the same year as Moore's book, a work was published in Sweden that is concerned more directly with Mark 13. The first part of Lars Hartman's *Prophecy Interpreted: The Function of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13 Par.*<sup>3</sup> is devoted to an analysis of certain Jewish apocalyptic texts. The author traces out characteristic patterns in the texts, and he shows in particular how the apocalypses frequently have an extensive and elaborate OT base. From this starting-point he proceeds to examine Mark 13; in it he finds numerous echoes of the OT and especially of the book of Daniel. (Some of the most obvious echoes are: *dei genesthai* (Mk. 13:7 // Dn. 2:28), *to bdelugma tēs eremōseōs* (Mk. 13:14 // Dn. 9:27; 12:11), *thlipsis, hoia ou gegonen toiautē ap' archēs ktiseōs hēn ektisen ho theos heōs tou nun* (Mk. 13:19 // Dn. 12:1), and *ton huion tou anthrōpou erchomenon en nephelais* (Mk. 13:26 // Dn. 7:13, 14). Hartman was not the first to note such parallels as these, but his distinctive conclusion on the basis of these and other texts is that the main part of the apocalyptic discourse is based on a coherent exposition of or meditation on those texts in Daniel that are said to be for the time of the end.

Having reached this provisional conclusion he proceeds to search for other Danielic links in the discourse, and sure enough he finds them all over the chapter (sometimes much less convincingly than at other times. See, for example, his pp. 163–4, where he finds a Danielic background to the 'shortening of days' by postulating a mix-up of consonants in the Hebrew text of Dn. 12:1). So Hartman's provisional conclusion is confirmed: the basis of Mark 13 is a midrash on various passages from the book of Daniel.

Since the hortatory or parenetic material in Mark 13 has Danielic precedent, as well as the apocalyptic descriptive material, Hartman considers that this will have been in the original midrash. An exception is the section at the end of the Marcan discourse (13:33f.), which was added to the midrash at some point. An examination of Paul's teaching in 1 and 2 Thessalonians convinces Hartman that Paul knew the postulated pre-Markan midrash, and on the basis of this and the evidence gleaned from elsewhere he offers a tentative reconstruction of the history of the tradition.

He finds nine separate steps in the story: (1) it starts with a midrashic nucleus based on Daniel, chapters 7, 8, 9 and 11; and the verses in Mark 13 going back to this nucleus are 5b–8, 12–16, 19–22 and 24–27. It tells on the one hand of the activities of the antichrist (which include the appearance of false Christs, the abomination of desolation and false prophecy) and on the other hand of the parousia of the

<sup>2</sup> Published by Brill, Leiden, 1966. Moore argues against the widely held view that the early church expected the parousia to come necessarily very soon.

<sup>3</sup> *Coniectanea Biblica*, NT series 1, Gleerup, Uppsala, 1966.

Son of man. It also encourages the Christians to endure. (2) At the second stage, the sayings urging watchfulness and comparing the coming day to the thief in the night and to the snare, were added on. (3) Then, thirdly, the church began to differentiate the different activities of the antichrist. Instead of regarding all his various activities as aspects of the same thing, they began to 'historicize'; in other words to regard the false prophecy, the appearance of the abomination, *etc.*, as separate stages in a historical process; and they began to relate these things to their own experience. (4) At the fourth stage sayings about persecution (*e.g.* verses 9 and 11) were added. (5) An important fifth step was taken when someone linked the apocalyptic discourse with sayings of Jesus about the fall of Jerusalem for the first time. This reinterpretation reflected no doubt a situation where Christians were becoming estranged from Jews and Judaism; Christians concluded that the Jews were under the wrath of God because of their rejection of their Messiah. (6) Mark took the process a stage further by making the discourse a response to a question about the fall of Jerusalem and by making the fall one of the events of the end time. (7) As a result of the church's missionary work Mark 13: 10 with its reference to evangelizing the whole world was added. (8) Matthew's version represents the penultimate stage: in his version the discourse has undergone some reinterpretation in a sort of scribal school. (9) Luke too has modified Mark, using some non-Marcan material. He eliminates the obscurity about the abomination of desolation, and he separates the fall of Jerusalem from the end time — the latter being pushed back.

Hartman's thesis is an interesting one, and many of his suggestions and observations, for example about the combination of apocalyptic description and exhortation in Daniel, deserve notice. But his over-all thesis and his reconstruction of the history of the traditions behind Mark 13 are, as he himself admits, very speculative. The present reader is provoked to ask two main questions about his work: (1) Although no-one can doubt that the discourse in Mark 13 has been greatly influenced by the OT in general and by the book of Daniel in particular in its ideas no less than in its language, is the evidence sufficiently strong to establish that the discourse is and was intended to be a midrash on OT passages? It may be possible to find, as Hartman does, all sorts of links between Mark 13 and Daniel; but some of the links are rather tenuous, and others may well not be significant. It is hard to be sure when an echo or allusion is significant and when it is just a case of an overlap of thought or language of the sort that could hardly be avoided. (2) Very much connected with the last point is a question about Hartman's tendency to dismiss as secondary elements in the discourse those phrases that do not have clear OT background (*e.g.* specifically Christian phrases). If it was firmly established that the discourse was an exposition of passages in the book of Daniel and nothing more, then this procedure might possibly be acceptable. But even if one were to accept a view quite

close to Hartman's, could one assume that the author of the midrash would not have expanded and reapplied his source material in a way not immediately suggested by strict exegesis of that source? Might not a Christian exposition of passages from Daniel include the sort of Christian phrases that Hartman excludes?

#### *J. Lambrecht*

Jan Lambrecht's book, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung (The Redaction of the Marcan Apocalypse: Literary and Structural Analysis)*<sup>4</sup> is the first of two detailed studies of Mark 13 by Roman Catholic scholars that we shall be looking at.

Lambrecht begins his study with an examination of the context of Mark 13 (in fact of 10: 32–14: 7). On the basis of this he concludes that Mark is a careful theological editor, not just a collector of stories, and that Mark 13 fits well into its surrounding context. He then launches into a verse by verse analysis of the chapter. It would be an impossibly lengthy and laborious process to summarize the whole of Lambrecht's discussion; but it may be worth trying to explain some of his conclusions.

#### *Verses 1–4*

In his examination of verses 1 and 2 Lambrecht makes the following observations: (a) The form of verse 1 is paralleled in Mark 11: 20–21, which suggests that the same redactor is responsible for both passages. Mark 13: 1 could be a literary construction designed to lead from the preceding context into verse 2. (b) Verse 2 is slightly awkward and repetitive at the end. The phrase 'which will not be pulled down' (*hos ou mē kataluthē*) is superfluous in the sentence 'there will not be left one stone on another which will not be pulled down'. (c) The verse has parallels in John 2: 19, where Jesus says, 'Destroy (*lusate*) this temple, and in three days I will raise it up', and in the Q saying, 'Behold, your house will be forsaken' (*idou aphietai humin ho oikos* — Mt. 23: 38 // Lk. 13: 35). Lambrecht argues that there is reason to think that Mark knew the context of both the Johannine and the Q sayings, and he concludes that the whole of 13: 1–2 is a Marcan construct, 2b being Mark's replacement for the Johannine and Q sayings.

Verses 3 and 4 he finds equally Marcan. There is Marcan style; *e.g.* the teaching of a small group of disciples in private has parallels elsewhere in Mark (though the number four is unusual). Then in verse 4 there are further difficulties in construction, which Lambrecht regards as something distinctively Marcan: the difficulty in verse 4 is in the wording, since according to Lambrecht the words *sēmeion* and *mellē* naturally suggest a sudden future event, whereas the words *tauta . . . panta* and *sunteleisthai* suggest a long drawn out process. The word *sunteleisthai* ('to be accom-

<sup>4</sup> *Analecta Biblica* 28, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome, 1967.

plished') is not found elsewhere in Mark, and Lambrecht takes it to be an echo of Daniel 12: 7, which speaks of 'all things being accomplished' (note, *tauta panta* again). He claims that this OT background to the phrase shows that the disciples' question of verse 4 is not solely about the destruction of the temple; what in fact 'all these things' are comes out later in Mark 13, and Mark deliberately uses the Danielic phrase to lead into the discourse.

Lambrecht is not impressed with the argument of those who defend the historicity of verses 1 to 4 by appealing to the historical probability of what is described; a good narrator will always aim to sound probable. He is impressed, on the other hand, with the evidence which points to a Marcan origin for the section. Even at this early stage, it may be worth commenting that his arguments, though ingenious and complicated, seem to the present reviewer unconvincing. There is certainly — and not surprisingly — evidence of Marcan style in these verses; but neither the argument about the supposed awkwardness nor the evidence of the Johannine and Q parallels seems cogent: the awkwardness is not really so awkward, and the parallels are not very close. Lambrecht's conclusions seem speculative.

#### Verses 5–8

Verses 5 and 6 warn of false prophets coming 'in my name' and 'saying that I am he'. Lambrecht takes it that 'saying that I am he' defines 'in my name', and he does not see 'I am he' as the OT formula for God used here as a Messianic title; it is used rather in a straightforward sense as in 6: 50; 14: 62. He notes that the verses presuppose that Jesus' coming was expected; 'all these things' about which the disciples ask in verse 4 is seen therefore to include the second coming and not just the fall of Jerusalem.

Verses 5 and 6 have a parallel in verses 21 and 22, though there the false prophets do not claim to be Messiah themselves; there is also a further parallel in a Q verse, Luke 17: 23 // Matthew 24: 26. The closeness of the parallel — Lambrecht suggests as the original Q wording *erousin humin idou en tē erēmō estin, mē exelthēte. Idou en tois tameiois, mē diōxēte* — suggests to Lambrecht that Mark borrowed from Q in verses 21 and 22 and in verses 5 and 6 and he explains that these two parallel sets of sayings within the one discourse should not be thought of as doublet passages, but rather as forming an 'inclusio', i.e. a sort of verbal bracket, around the intervening material.

In verses 7 and 8 the question about the timing of the destruction of Jerusalem (the *pote* of verse 4) starts to be answered, though only negatively at this stage: 'the end is not yet' (verse 7), 'these are the beginning of the sufferings' (verse 8). Lambrecht differs from Hartman in not deriving *dei genesthai* ('this must take place') from Daniel; he sees in the *dei* a Marcan expression, and because of the style and the adaptation of the verses to the question of verse 4, he regards both verses as probably Marcan. Mark, he suggests, is trying to counter the expectations of those in his

church who expected the parousia in the immediate future.

#### Verses 9–13

The key to Lambrecht's observations on these verses is to be found in Matthew's parallel passage in 10: 17–22. Whereas many scholars have assumed that Matthew in his chapter 10 was borrowing from Mark 13, Lambrecht suggests that Matthew 10: 17–22 is taken from Q and that Mark knew and used the same Q passage.<sup>5</sup> Verse 10 of Mark 13 is seen by Lambrecht as a Marcan creation — there is characteristic Marcan vocabulary, *kēruchthēnai, prōton, dei*. The original Q source had *kai epi hēgemonōn kai basileōn stathēsesthe heneken emou kai tou euangeliou eis marturion autois kai tois ethnesin* (cf. Mt. 10: 18), and Mark expanded this reference to mission, his verse 10 picking up his verse 9 chiasmically.<sup>6</sup> So verses 9 to 13 are a Marcan adaptation of a Q passage; the passage is a unity held together by the repeated *paradidonai* and bracketed together by the parallel phrases in verses 9a and 13b.

#### Verses 14–20

In explaining the difficulties of this section, Lambrecht draws attention to how it fits within the whole structure of the discourse. The *hotan de* echoes verse 7, and verses 7 and 14 look back to the question of verse 4 about 'when these things will happen'. Since the question there is about the destruction of the temple, here, in the phrase 'abomination of desolation', the destruction of the temple must be in view: one might paraphrase: 'the abomination which is bringing destruction in the near future'. The masculine *hestēkota* ('standing') shows that a person is in view, and 'where it ought not to be' is the temple. (This is undoubtedly where the abomination stands in Daniel.) The phrase 'let the reader understand' is taken by Lambrecht to be a reference by the Marcan redactor to his own work; to see in it a reference to the book of Daniel is not so easy, since no clue is given to the reader that Daniel might be in mind; and it is unlikely that the phrase is a survival from some pre-Markan tract, since Mark might have been expected to eliminate the reference in taking the material over. But what is the reader of Mark supposed to understand? The nearest mysterious phrase is 'where it ought not to be', and Lambrecht regards this as the most likely reference.

Verses 15 and 16 have a Q parallel in Luke 17: 31 (compare the overlap with Mt. 24: 17f.), and Lambrecht thinks it probable that Mark took it from there. Then verse 17 marks a new departure, and in the following

<sup>5</sup> If Mark knew Mt. 10: 23, *ou mē telesēte tas poleis tou Israel heōs elthē ho huios tou anthrōpou*, this helps explain why he took over the Q material here and his use of *eis telos*.

<sup>6</sup> Verse 10 picks up verse 9 chiasmically according to Lambrecht:

- Verse 9 (a) *stathēsesthe heneken emou*  
 (b) *eis marturion*  
 (c) *autois*  
 Verse 10 (c) *eis panta ta ethnē*  
 (b) *prōton dei kēruchthēnai*  
 (a) *to euangelion*



description of the time of distress, Lambrecht sees Mark's hand in the expression 'in those days' and in the awkward 'those days will be distress' (*esontai hai hēmerai ekeinai thlipsis*). Verse 19b has strong links with Daniel 12: 1, and verse 20 contains some Semitisms (e.g. *ou . . . pas, pasa sarx*) and some non-Marcian expressions. On the other hand there are some Marcan expressions such as 'whom he chose' and verse 20 is parallel in structure to verse 13b. Over-all, then, on verses 14 to 20, Lambrecht concludes that Mark is responsible for the arrangement of the section, though he draws on some pre-Marcian source material.

#### Verses 21–23

As was seen earlier, Lambrecht regards these verses as drawn by Mark from a Q original; but Mark has adapted them, and verse 23 is explicable as wholly Marcan. *Humeis de blepete* ('take heed') picks up verse 5b; *proeirēka humin* ('I have told you beforehand') looks back to the disciples' request in verse 4, *eipon hēmin* ('tell us'); and *panta* recalls the same verse.

Looking back over the whole section of verses 5 to 23 Lambrecht sees it as a unity bound together by the warnings of false Christs and prophets in verses 5 and 6 and 21 to 23. In between these limits there are two sections introduced by *hotan*, verses 7, 8 and 14 to 20, and at the centre is a section on persecution, verses 9 to 13.

#### Verses 24–27

Lambrecht accepts neither the view that the language about cosmic disturbances should be taken as metaphorical description of political upheavals, nor the view that the upheavals of verses 24 and 25 should be thought of as preceding the coming described in verses 26 and 27; rather the coming causes the upheavals. (In support of this second point, he later observes the parallelism between verses 24 and 25 and verse 26; the reference in both sets of verses is to events in the heavens; the word *dunamis* occurs in both, and the glory of the Son of man's coming has some sort of parallel in the earlier reference to *phengos*. The OT background to verses 24 and 25 he finds in the book of Joel (2: 10, 11; 3: 4; 4: 15, 16) and in its description of the Day of the Lord, not in Isaiah 13: 10; 34: 4 where the idea of punishment is prominent.

The Son of man in verses 26 and 27 is shown by the context in Mark 13 to be the returning Jesus, and his coming is described in words echoing Daniel 7. However, the close parallelism between these verses and Mark 8: 38–9: 1 and 14: 26 shows that the redactor has been at work here. Lambrecht states: 'It is improbable that three such similar verses which are stylistically so alike all go back word for word to Jesus. The dependence of verse 26 on the Greek OT strengthens this doubt.' For these reasons he concludes that the verses are Marcan, a conclusion reinforced in his view by the presence of some probable Marcan expressions (such as the double time note at the start of verse 24) and by the fact that the passage is redac-

tionally connected to other parts of the discourse through the expressions *en ekeinai tais hēmerais* (verse 24) and *eklektous* (verse 27).

#### Verses 28–31

The difficult verses in this section are verses 29 and 30. To the question, 'Who or what is "at the doors" in verse 29?', Lambrecht answers that the preceding context and the expression 'at the doors' suggest that the reference is to the Son of man. The happenings — the *tauta ginomena* — which indicate his nearness cannot include what is described in verses 24 to 27, since that is all part of the end event. So the reference must be to the promised distress (*thlipsis*) and to what is described in verses 4 to 20. The fact that verse 29 is so much bound up with its context suggests that it is Marcan. The next verse, verse 30, has a close parallel in 9: 1 and also some sort of parallel in Matthew 23: 36; and the big question is: does the *tauta panta* include the events of verses 24 to 27 (i.e. is it broader than the *tauta* of verse 29?), and is the verse saying the same sort of thing as 9: 1? Or are the *tauta* of verse 30 the same as the *tauta* in verse 29? If so, 'this generation' may perhaps have a rather negative flavour and the whole verse may have the same force as Matthew 23: 36. Lambrecht suggests that Mark took the saying from a source with wording like that of Matthew 23: 36, which speaks of 'all these things' (i.e. all these judgments) 'coming on this generation' — the latter expression being used in the typical rather negative way normal in the NT — but that he restructured the saying on the lines of his 9: 1 in order to make a chronological point about the timing of 'all these things'. In the process, *genea* came to lose some of its negative flavour, and *tauta panta* to be rather broader than it was originally; so that in its present context it may be intended to include the end events of verses 24 to 27 as well as the distress preceding it. Later, Lambrecht goes on to add that Mark may have been influenced in his rewriting of the original saying by the Q saying found in Matthew 5: 18.

Behind verse 31 he finds yet another Q logion, namely Luke 16: 17 (cf. Mt. 5: 18); this may originally have read, 'It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one jot or tittle to fall from the law' (*Eukopōteron de estin ton ouranon kai tēn gēn parallthein ē iōta hen ē mian keraian pesein apo tou nomou*). Lambrecht agrees that Jesus could have said the same sort of thing twice, once about his own words and once about the law; but he looks for and finds signs of Mark being secondary in 13: 31 — the use of *hoi logoi mou* has a parallel in 8: 38 which is regarded as a Marcan redactional verse. He suggests that the association of the words 'heaven and earth', together with Mark's desire to stress the absoluteness of Jesus' prophecy, led Mark to form the new saying. It may be instructive to quote Lambrecht's explanation of Mark's procedure: 'Mark has to make the Q logion fit. He alters the construction by omitting *eukopōteron . . . ē*; the expression thus becomes more direct. He cannot begin anything with *to nomos* in this context, and he sees

himself obliged to create a new phrase. Over against the transience of all things he puts 'my words', the Marcan expression, which here summarizes all Jesus' spoken teaching. He takes from verse 31a the same verb, the same tense, mood and number. Both parts of the sentence are practically the same length; the *de* and *ou* make a sharp contrast.'

#### Verses 32–37

Verse 32 has regularly been regarded as offensive from a Christian point of view, since it ascribes ignorance to Jesus; and it has therefore been thought an authentic word of Jesus himself. Lambrecht finds this argument unconvincing, and he suggests that the saying could well be Marcan; his argument is that the saying could not stand on its own independent of the context in which we find it; it connects closely with the context either side, and the context is distinctively Marcan. The day referred to in the phrase 'that day or hour' is the day of the coming of the Son of man, as is made clear in what follows; it is the day referred to earlier in verses 24 to 27 and 29b. Lambrecht discusses the place of the demonstrative in the phrase 'concerning that day' (*peri tēs hēmeras ekeinēs*) and also the function of the added 'or the hour' (*ē tēs hōras*). He suggests that *hē hēmera ekeinē*, which refers back in context to verses 24 to 27, is probably a fixed formula taken by Mark from Q (though he finds no evidence to support the view that in Mark the phrase regularly has OT connotations). The added 'or the hour' was probably taken from the parousia parables that speak of 'not knowing the hour', and its function in verse 32 is to make clear that the point of interest in the verse is the question of the timing of the parousia, something that might not be immediately evident without it. The phrase could be paraphrased: 'But concerning the timing of that day . . .'.

In verse 34 Lambrecht identifies a number of difficulties: (a) the *hōs* construction is not used in the regular way; (b) the *kai* . . . *eneteilato* spoils the structure; (c) the *apodēmos* is awkwardly placed; (d) there is some tension between the idea of the master giving 'tasks' (*ergon*) and 'authority' (*exousia*); (e) there is perhaps some tension between the day-work of the servant and the night watching of the watchman. Lambrecht concludes from the unevenness of the whole section that Mark has brought together elements from different places; he has put them together in verses 34f., linking them editorially to what has preceded through phrases such as *blepete*. Noting the links between the Marcan sayings and various different parables (the Watchful Servants, Lk. 12: 35f.; the Thief in the Night, Lk. 12: 39f.; the Good and Bad Servants, Lk. 12: 42f.; and the Talents, Mt. 25), he suggests that Mark is here responsible for creating a secondary parable.

In Lambrecht's summary that follows his detailed examination of Mark 13, he draws attention to the chapter's place in Mark. He sees it as Jesus' last testament — his last revelation and warning — following on from his final break with the Jewish authorities

and his last warnings to the people. Much of the content of the chapter, according to his analysis, goes back to pre-Markan traditions (including notably Q), and much has close connections with the LXX; but a considerable amount of the material he also attributes to Mark himself. Lambrecht says that he sees no indication of a coherent tract lying behind the chapter and very little to suggest that much certainly goes back to Jesus.

He suggests that in a discourse of this length we might expect to find a conscious structure. This suggestion he proceeds to investigate. Verses 1 to 4 are introductory; the following discourse then divides into three — part 1, verses 5 to 23; part 2, verses 24 to 27; part 3, verses 28 to 37. The first and third parts correspond to each other, being advice on right attitudes; the second section is a short one and describes the second coming. We have thus an *inclusio* (a–b–a) form, the first and third parts bracketing the middle one; this impression is reinforced according to Lambrecht when it is seen how the expressions of verses 4 and 5 (*tauta, pote, tanta panta, blepete, etc.*) are picked up in the third part.

Part 1 (verses 5 to 23) is itself bracketed by verses 5 and 6 and verses 21–23, both sets of verses warning of deceivers; and Lambrecht finds that the rest of the part breaks down into a pattern:

a. <i>blepete</i>	5b, 6	Deceivers
b. <i>hotan akousēte</i>	7, 8	Wars
c. <i>blepete</i>	9–13	Persecutions
b. <i>hotan</i>	14–20	Wars
a. <i>blepete</i>	21–23a	Deceivers

Part 2 (verses 24 to 27) is characterized by an urgent style. And verse 26 with its description of the glorious parousia answers the darkness and fear of verses 24 and 25. Part 3 (verses 28–37) breaks into two, with verse 31 perhaps to be taken as a hinge verse in the middle. Lambrecht finds here again a chiasmic structure (a–b–b–a)

1. The sure coming about which you can know (*ginōskete*)
  - a. Fig tree parable and application (verses 28 and 29)
  - b. Explanatory sayings (verse 30)
2. The unexpected coming about which you cannot know
  - b. Explanatory saying (verse 32)
  - a. Parable and application (verses 33–36)

Lambrecht draws out various other stylistic features of the chapter, and concludes that, whatever the origin of his material, Mark has structured the discourse through and through. The most obvious sign of this is the a–b–a *inclusio* pattern which is found in parts 1 and 3 and in the discourse as a whole. The pattern as analysed by Lambrecht suggests that the description of Jesus' coming (verses 24 to 27) is the central element in the whole discourse; and yet the

thrust of the chapter in Lambrecht's view is directed more towards warning and encouraging the Christian disciple than towards giving apocalyptic information.

To reach any over-all assessment of Lambrecht's work is difficult. It contains a lot of detailed study, many acute observations, as well as convincing criticisms of views that often go unchallenged. But the impression remains that his own suggestions about the origins of the material in the chapter are speculative. Among the main features of Mark 13 that provoke him to speculate are (a) stylistic difficulties, (b) Marcan style, and (c) parallels in other parts of the Gospel tradition. But he seems to the present reviewer to

exaggerate some of the difficulties, too quickly to equate sayings in the Gospel tradition that are similar but far from identical, and too readily to assume that Marcan style means Marcan creation. His confidence in explaining the history of the Gospel traditions and the mechanics of Mark's redaction is impressive, but often doubtfully based. A further point to note is that his whole argument is cumulative: he argues that certain verses are secondary Marcan compilations on the ground that they make sense in the Marcan context, which he has earlier concluded to be secondary, and not elsewhere. Obviously this sort of argument holds only if the earlier conclusions are secure.

## A different dream: Jesus and revolution

Christopher M. N. Sugden

*Christopher Sugden, a former Chairman of the TSF and now a curate at St George's Church, Leeds, has been doing some research on Christianity and revolution. In the present article he offers an extended review and comparison of four recent books on the subject:*

G. Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (SCM Press, 1974, £2.10).

A. Richardson, *The Political Christ* (SCM Press, 1973, 90p).

M. Hengel, *Victory over Violence* (SPCK, 1974, £1.25).

J. H. Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus* (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1972, \$3.45).

'Imagine that all the population of the world were condensed into the size of one village of 100 people. In this village, 67 of these 100 people would be poor: the other 33 would be in varying degrees well-off. Of the total population, only 7 would be North Americans. The other 93 people would watch the 7 North Americans spend one-half of all the money, eat one-seventh of all the food, and use one-half of all the bathtubs. These 7 people would have ten times more doctors than the other 93. Meanwhile, the 7 would continue to get more and more and the 93 less and less.'<sup>1</sup>

Christians live in the village. The majority have homes in the better part but some inhabit the slums, especially in the Latin American quarter. There, wealth and poverty face each other across the street, and just up the road are the North Americans.

<sup>1</sup> *Who in the World?* ed. by Clifford Christians, Earl J. Schipper, Wesley Smedes (Eerdmans, 1972), p. 125. Quoted by Samuel Escobar, 'Evangelism and Man's Search for Freedom, Justice and Fulfilment', paper presented to the International Congress on World Evangelisation, 22 July 1974.

Latin American Christians live in an inferno of political, social and religious upheaval. Left-wing governments give way to right-wing military dictatorships, millions on the margins of poverty live in Calcuttas of the future. Pentecostalism spreads like fire among the shanty towns but its devotees have little social concern,<sup>2</sup> and the Roman Catholic church throws up the disturbing voices of Helder Camara and Camilo Torres. To students, Marxists seem to be more concerned than the Christian churches about food and justice.

What would the Good Samaritan do here? Would he continue to run his donkey ambulance, picking up the pieces after the fight? He would be following a tried and tested pattern. Would he concentrate on getting men to the inn on the side-lines to await a glorious time when it's all over? Or would he try to stamp out mugging on the Jericho road, whether the culprits are urban guerillas or city-slickers?

Increasing numbers of Roman Catholics in Latin America are becoming convinced that the third option is the true Christian stance. Camilo Torres argued that love must be effective and sealed his words with action. Helder Camara has become a world figure in speaking for the forgotten poor. Their colleagues have coined a new theological term, 'praxis', action. It is only by being where the action is that you can understand what God is doing. Now Gustavo Gutiérrez has produced a major theology of Christian social concern in a Latin American context.

*A Theology of Liberation* will dominate political theology for the rest of the decade. It is the *Jesus and the Zealots* of the seventies, but was written where the

<sup>2</sup> This is the conclusion of Christian Lalive D'Epina in his major sociological study of the Pentecostals in Chile, *Haven of the Masses*, Lutterworth, 1969.