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I

The existence of Mark xiii between chapters xii and xiv requires explanation. In some respects (as I shall argue later) it is unlike anything else in the gospel; and it could be omitted—as in practice many do omit it from their reading of Mark—without any obvious gap in either narrative or teaching. Indeed there would be a very impressive transition if the reader were to move immediately from xiii. 1-2, where Jesus speaks of the forthcoming destruction of the Temple, to xiv. 1 where the chief priests and scribes begin their plot to destroy Jesus.

Let us first look at the character of the chapters surrounding Mark xiii. When an armed mob arrested Jesus in Gethsemane, he protested against being treated as a revolutionary leader, and said they could have arrested him any day as he was teaching in the Temple (xiv. 49). Hence Mark had a tradition that Jesus had taught in the Temple, but it is probable (as elsewhere in the gospel) that he possessed scanty information about what he said there. Therefore he did his best with what was to hand. He used disparate material from a variety of original contexts and pressed it into service to display his own hostility to the Temple and gloom about its fate. In Mark xi-xii, two stories are firmly anchored to the Temple. One, near the beginning, is the so-called Cleansing of the Temple,2 though it is much more like an acted prophecy of its future desolation. The other, at the end, is the widow's mite, compared with which the massive revenues of the Temple are derided.3

So too are the religious leaders. Jesus had entered Jerusalem and created what must have looked like a revolutionary situation; but when challenged by the chief priests, the scribes and the elders (i.e. the Jerusalem sanhedrin) about his authority, he

---

1 The Manson Memorial Lecture delivered in the University of Manchester on 15 November 1973.
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refused to discuss it (xi. 27-33). When invited by Pharisees and Herodians to declare himself a revolutionary, he avoided the trap almost contemptuously. He said in effect "If they use Caesar's coinage, let them serve Caesar"; but added—what his questioners had not thought to mention—"Give God what is his". In Mark's story that is where the emphasis lies and in this context it must mean: the Jerusalem establishment and the Temple are not what God requires (xii. 13-17). The controversial encounter with the Sadducees, who were intimately related to the Temple priesthood, contains—as Mark uses it—an indication of what God does require. The pericope preserves a fragment of argument within Judaism concerning Pharisaic convictions about the coming resurrection. It is not germane to the teaching of Jesus as Mark elsewhere records it, and it does not seem specially appropriate or even natural in its present context. Moreover, it has often been remarked that the appeal to God's self-disclosure to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is an unconvincing scriptural basis for belief in resurrection. Perhaps, therefore, the pericope was included in Mark's polemical narrative to show Christians (who were what they were in virtue of Christ's resurrection) what sort of arguments the Sadducees would stoop to, and what reply Jesus would give: that God was not God of the dead Temple regime but of the living tradition of the fathers of Israel (xii. 18-27). The scribes too are under attack, though Jesus discriminated among them. One scribe agreed with Jesus that the primary commandments of the Torah are love for God and for neighbour; and he even volunteered the statement that these two are "much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices". Jesus thereupon marked him out as not far from the kingdom—and the questioners dared press the matter no further (xii. 28-34); so Jesus himself took the offensive by attacking the scribal doctrine of Messiah (xii. 35-37) and deriding scribal piety (xii. 38-40). This is all of a piece with the fig tree that is condemned and withers, and with the parable in which the vineyard is taken away and given to others.

That is all contained in Mark xi-xii. It is therefore not surprising that in Mark xiii. 1-2 Jesus predicted the total
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destruction of the Temple; nor that he was later accused before the Sanhedrin (though by incoherent witnesses) of plotting to destroy the Temple. But when we pass from Mark xii to Mark xiv, the Temple is no longer the centre of interest. It is there replaced by the priesthood. Throughout the passion narrative the chief priests (who have appeared previously only in the passion predictions) are the opponents of Jesus, sometimes with other elements of the great sanhedrin. They used one of his company for their own ends; they managed his arrest, pressed Jesus to incriminate himself, forced Pilate's hand, and even mocked Jesus as he was dying.

I am not implying that this account is probable or historically fair; but simply that this is Mark's story—which ends with the tearing of the Temple veil (xv. 38). In a very powerful way it suggests that Mark liked neither Temple nor priests; and one wonders all the more why this indictment was interrupted by chapter xiii. These considerations lend some support to the views of Rudolf Pesch, which he came to independently on stylistic grounds, that Mark xiii was introduced at a later stage into the gospel by the same author who composed the rest.¹

II

We therefore turn to the intrusive chapter and note first its basic structure.²

1-2 In response to a disciple's comment, Jesus predicts the total destruction of the Temple. These verses belong to the previous chapter for they round off the hostile presentation there recorded.


In familiar Markan fashion, a private explanation is introduced in answer to a request from the original group of disciples (i. 16-19). There are two questions: (i) πότε ταῦτα ἐσταῖ; and (ii) τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλη ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα; both ταῦτα and πάντα imply several phenomena, not simply the Temple's destruction. Hence, either the questions look forward to answers that Jesus will give in subsequent verses, and so are an entirely artificial introduction to the discourse; or they refer back to the series of ominous indications of the Temple's fate in chapters xi-xii. The questions are taken in reverse order: (i) the sign is dealt with negatively in 5-23, and (ii) the time is taken up in 28-37.

Indications that can easily mislead, but in fact are not signs of the final events.

Deceptive claimants to speak for Jesus.

Reports of fighting.

Persecution of Christians.

The onset of fighting.

False claimants to be Christ.

When these groups of verses are given such titles (which are not entirely adequate), the section looks like a symmetrical arrangement whereby 5-6 correspond to 21-23, 7-8 correspond to 14-20, and 9-13 stand by themselves. All these verses suggest experiences that seem to demand the response: "We cannot go on like this. This must be the end".

But it is not the end. None of the dreadful things that human beings can do to one another, nor their impotence

1 In principle, ταῦτα could be translated "this" (as RSV) with reference to the Temple's fate, and ταῦτα πάντα could refer to the variety of phenomena associated with the End. But this does not correspond to Markan usage. ταῦτα appears fourteen times. In four places the plural reference is explicit (ii. 8, viii. 7, x. 20, xiii. 8). In the pericope about authority, ταῦτα indicates a number of high-handed actions that Jesus had done (xi. 28, 29, 33). In vi. 2 it refers to his wisdom and mighty acts; and in vii. 23 πάντα is added. The clearest evidence is in xiii. 29, 30—ταῦτα in 29 is expanded in Semitic fashion by ταῦτα πάντα in 30. Cf. V. Taylor, The Gospel according to St. Mark (London, 1952), p. 502; C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel according to St. Mark (Cambridge, 1959), p. 407.
before natural forces and political pressures is the end. The final things are determined by the appearance of the Son of Man. Hence the obscurely glimpsed indications of signs in heaven, the parousia and the gathering of the elect.

28-37 The question of the time is now dealt with. There are two parables and three sayings, asserting that the time is near but not precisely disclosed. Therefore the only instruction that can be given—and it is given emphatically three times—is "Watch" (reflected in the three-fold plea that the inner group of disciples should watch in Gethsemane xiv. 34, 37, 38).

III

In Mark xiii we have a unique speech of Jesus, composed of 39 sentences. There is no other continuous speech in Mark with more than 6 sentences. The sayings of Jesus are usually one or two sentences in length; occasionally 5 (iv. 21-33, x. 5-9) or even 6 (viii. 34-38). It seems that Mark lacked a technique for recording, composing or writing down long speeches. When therefore we encounter an uninterrupted speech of 39 sentences, we are likely to conclude that the chapter was not composed by Mark, and was therefore pre-Markan.

If now we examine the sayings of Jesus recorded in Mark apart from chapter xiii, we find announcements, imperatives, questions, meshalim, and parables. All these forms occur in Mark xiii, with one striking exception: there are no questions.

Number of logia according to forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>in Mark (excluding xiii)</th>
<th>in Mark xiii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>announcements</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperatives</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Contrast two other Markan discourses, both of which are constantly interrupted. iv. 3-32: 3-9 parable/10 new scene 11-12 commentary/13 "and he said to them " 14-20 interpretation/21 " and he said to them " 21-23 meshalim and demand for attention/24 " and he said to them " plus mashal/26-29 " and he said " plus parable/30-32 " and he said " plus question. vii. 6-23: 6 " and he said "—Isaiah's prophecy applied to opponents/9 " and he said "—Moses and Korban/14 change of audience 15 new subject/17 change of scene/18-19 question, pronouncement and editorial comment/20 " and he said "—summary in hellenistic style.
In Mark xiii the proportions are about the same as in the rest of the gospel, except for the total absence of questions. Elsewhere questions occur commonly in conflict situations. Hence it may be concluded that Mark xiii, wherever it came from, was composed not for apologetic purposes but for the instruction of Christians. It was devised (and presumably written, in view of xiii. 14—though that is not the only possible interpretation of the verse)¹ to help Christians come to terms with certain experiences and to understand them in the light of the gospel they proclaimed.

One other unusual feature of this chapter is of great importance. It contains four temporal clauses followed by imperatives:

7 ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσῃς πολέμους . . .
11 καὶ ὅταν ἠγωσσόν ύμᾶς παραδείδοντες . . .
14 ὅταν δὲ ἔδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα . . .
21 καὶ τότε ἐὰν τις ύμῶν εἴψῃ . . .

Since τότε ἐὰν has the same meaning as ὅταν, we have four prospective situations for which specific instructions are given. Now it is true that temporal clause plus imperative is a common device for giving instructions—either general rules of behaviour (as in Luke xiv. 8, 10-13 ; xvii. 10) or ritual regulations (Matthew vi. 2, 5, 6, 16 ; Luke xi. 2). In Mark it appears elsewhere only once, as a ritual rule (xi. 25). As a means of providing for specific situations, it is found nowhere else in Mark—and in Matthew and Luke only in passages closely related to Mark xiii.²

These four temporal clauses suggest that this part of the chapter was composed when the outbreak of war was expected, when Christians would be denounced as traitors, when the Gentile invader would again defile the Temple as formerly Antiochus had done, and when a Jewish guerrilla leader might set himself up as war leader and messiah. From our knowledge

¹ Pesch, op. cit. pp. 144 f.
² Mt. x. 19 = Lk. xii. 11 correspond to Mk. xiii. 11. Mt. x. 23 is an extension of the same perilous situation.
of Jewish history in the first century A.D., this is a fairly familiar situation, though it cannot easily be identified with a particular crisis in the fifty years after the death of Jesus. Such circumstances could well have been expected at almost any time before the Jewish revolt, perhaps especially in the period of the Roman procurators A.D. 44-66.

The late Professor Brandon, for a variety of reasons, placed the gospel after A.D. 70. It was written, he thought, to dissociate the Christian movement from the Jewish cause. In particular, Mark xiii was intended to calm apocalyptic fever in the Church at Rome, stimulated as it had been by the Roman army’s success in Palestine and its subsequent triumph in the capital.1 This view has gathered support. According to Pesch,2 for example, enthusiasts introduced into the church from outside took the destruction of Jerusalem as a sign that the End was imminent. Against these false prophets Mark conducted his polemic by transferring sayings first uttered with apocalyptic meaning to a persecution context. For example xiii. 12, 13b concerned with strife within families and universal disapproval was originally a phenomenon of the End time derived from Micah vii. 6-7; Mark converted it into an “experience of persecution.”3

Now the observation that Mark xiii, or some phrases in the chapter, were intended to lower the apocalyptic temperature may well be correct. But the suggestion that the apocalyptic fever was produced by the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 is unconvincing for two reasons. First, the situation presented by the four temporal clauses already mentioned in no way corresponds to the situation after A.D. 70, indeed they set the scene of a dramatic episode before the Jewish revolt at a time when the likely outlines of a conflict could be discerned though the actual clash had not yet developed. Second, the placing of Mark xiii between chapters xi-xii with their hostility to the Temple and chapter xiv with its hostility to the priesthood must mean that, when Mark wrote, Temple and priesthood were still a threat to Christians and a cause of resentment. These considerations place the gospel, including chapter xiii, firmly before A.D. 70.

Moreover, xiii. 14, "Let those in Judaea flee to the mountains", ties the discourse to the church in Judaea, not to the church in Rome. Marxsen, it is true, attempts to remove this reference by the remark that those in Judaea already live in the mountains. He presumably implies that nobody would tell them to "take to the hills"—which is precisely the thing that hill-dwellers have always done in times of danger. Marxsen, of course, is attempting to support his conviction that Mark was written for a Galilean Christian community, experiencing the bitter tension between extremists associated with John of Gischala and moderates led by Josephus. That would place the writing of Mark at the beginning of the Jewish revolt. This is less objectionable than a date after A.D. 70, though the situation envisaged in Mark xiii is still not sufficiently definite to be identified so precisely.

So far it has been taken for granted that the temporal location of Mark xiii corresponds to a historical situation experienced by the early Church. We are proceeding on the principle that the gospel material was remembered, preserved and perhaps adapted to meet the needs of Christians. The evangelists were writing to provide a theological understanding of the Church's position in the light of the remembered traditions of Jesus. The use of this principle can be justified by drawing attention to the imperatives that follow the temporal clauses.

7 When you hear of fighting, do not be disturbed.
11 When you are denounced, do not worry about your defence.
14 When you see the gentile sacrilege, clear out.
21 When messianic claimants appear, remain uninvolved.

The whole drive of this advice is that Christians are to preserve an attitude of detachment in the critical situation. That does not correspond to the situation (as Mark records it) in the lifetime of Jesus, or to the demand he made on disciples. Jesus plainly indicated the risk of being a disciple when on his way to

1 W. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist* (Nashville, 1969), p. 182. He seems to have picked the idea up from Lohmeyer. See Pesch, op. cit. pp. 145 f. Schweizer, op. cit. p. 273 speaks of "a panicky flight to the mountains (in Judea) and out into the open fields" and calls it "erroneous information about Palestinian geography". He does not justify this odd judgement.
Jerusalem, and offered the possibility of becoming involved. "Anyone who wants to come after me must deny himself, take up his cross and follow me" (viii. 34; cf. the promise to the sons of Zebedee x. 38-40). By contrast, Mark xiii presents a kind of neutrality for people experiencing great hardship, but not in any way surprised by what is happening. They could expect nothing better until the Son of Man came to gather the elect.

IV

It is now necessary to ask how far Mark xiii is an apocalyptic statement. For if the discourse was composed in response to the pressures of a particular historical situation, some of the language may be realistic rather than imaginative. Or, to go a step further, the author may be contemplating actual distresses and all-too-likely possibilities, not evoking unimaginable horrors. Does Mark xiii, then, show the standard pattern of apocalyptic writings?

Professor Koch recently listed eight motifs which he finds "distributed more or less equally throughout the various apocalyptists". We can use his motifs to test Mark xiii.

(1) The urgent expectation of the impending overthrow of all earthly conditions in the immediate future. The immediate future is implied by the parable of the fig tree (28-29) and by the references to "this generation" (30). Perhaps the overthrow of all earthly conditions is implied by the darkening of the sun and moon and the stars falling from their places (24, 25); but it is by no means obvious that events of the immediate future symbolized by the fig harvest (which is a welcome event) can refer to the alarming cosmic phenomena. A number of statements in fact postpone the final things (7b, 8e, 10).

(2) A cosmic catastrophe. Hence the same cosmic phenomena of 24-25, perhaps the reference to general conflict, earthquake and famine in 8, and the special severity of hardships in 19.

(3) The time of this world is divided into pre-determined segments. This is not present.

(4) Armies of angels and demons contend and intervene. There are no demons, unless the desolating sacrilege is done by a demonic figure. Angels gather the elect (27) and are ignorant of the appointed time (32).

(5) Beyond the catastrophe there is a paradisal salvation, the beginnings return in the last days, non-Israelites participate, and in Israel the righteous are separated from the ungodly. There is very little of that. The elect appear in 20, 22, 27, and the gentiles are evangelized in 10.

(6) God (or the Son of Man) ascends the throne, and the kingdom of God becomes visible on earth. The Son of Man comes on clouds (26).

(7) There is an eschatological mediator. Mark xiii goes out of its way to warn against such a person.

(8) In the new age, the condition of man and the world is glory. The Son of Man comes with great power and glory (26).

Thus the marks of apocalyptic are scarce. They appear at a generous estimate, only in 8, 10, 19-20, 22, 24-27, 32—in 10 verses out of 34, and all 10 are in the third person. In contrast to this conclusion, many scholars ascribe apocalyptic qualities to a good deal more of Mark xiii. For example, Bultmann states (without argument) that 7, 8, 12, 14-22, 24-27 are a Jewish apocalypse taken over as a speech of Jesus, supplemented by Christian additions and vaticinia from the missionary and persecution experience of the Church.¹ This estimate is as old as Colani 1864, and has dominated discussion for a hundred years since Weiffenbach popularized the Little Apocalypse theory in 1873. Dr. Beasley-Murray tried to kill the theory in his book on Jesus and the Future in 1954;² but he failed. It still has vigorous life—as in the work of Dr. Pesch which has several times been mentioned.³ He presents the result of a detailed and ingenious analysis, and argues that there existed an

² G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, An examination of the criticism of the eschatological discourse Mark xiii with special reference to the Little Apocalypse theory, Macmillan, 1954. This is a comprehensive survey of study before the onset of redaction criticism.
³ Pesch, op. cit. pp. 207 ff.
apocalyptic pamphlet, on a normal papyrus leaf of average size. It originated in A.D. 40 and was given new actuality in the Jewish war of A.D. 66-70. It comprised the following verses: 6, 22, 7b, 8, 12, 13b-17, 18?, 19-20a, 24-27.

Anyone who reads this reconstructed text as Dr. Pesch prints it on page 209 of his book, or troubles to sort it out from a Greek Testament may perhaps feel the apocalyptic fever rising in him, but he is more likely to experience a drop in temperature. By itself, it is colourless, unexciting stuff. People of those days did indeed write and read very dull pamphlets—witness large sections of the Book of Enoch—but it is difficult to see why anyone should have gone to the trouble of taking this pamphlet, dividing it up, partly re-arranging it, supplementing it with sayings of Jesus and experiences of the Church, and intruding it into the lively and moving narrative of the last days of Jesus.

There are indeed scholars who take a rather different view of this presumed apocalyptic material. Professor Schweizer first separates 14-20 as the work of a Jewish or Christian prophet, prompted by the crisis of A.D. 40 or the prospect of the sixties. Verses 21-23 are linked to what goes before and what follows by the catchword "the elect", and is a warning from the writer's own time about false prophets and messiahs. What remains, namely 5-13 and 24-27, describes the events of the End time; these passages embody the results of studying the Bible for signs of the approaching end—such passages as Isaiah xiii and Amos viii which associate war with changes in sun and moon, or with an earthquake. This view of the future was attributed to Jesus because it was, after all, the glorified Jesus who gave such an insight into the Old Testament; and because it was impossible to speak adequately of Jesus unless he was shown to be Lord of the future, as far as the final consummation.¹

This general derivation from the Old Testament is made quite specific by Dr. Lars Hartmann,² though he does not isolate an apocalyptic set of verses in the manner of Bultmann and others.

¹ Schweizer, op. cit. p. 267.
He begins with a midrashic nucleus, based on passages from Daniel (ii. 31-45), vii. 7-27, viii. 9-26, ix. 24-27, xi. 21-xii. 4 (13). There is a sustained and coherent midrashic meditation on Daniel in the following verses of Mark xiii : 5b-8, 12-16, 19-22, 24-27 (with some doubt about 8b and 5a). The meditation does not follow the sequence of Daniel, and is supplemented by numerous Old Testament passages. The resulting material is partly apocalyptic (dealing with the Anti-Christ and the parousia of the Son of Man) and it is partly paraenetic. This mixture of apocalyptic and paraenesis distinguishes it from current Jewish apocalyptic. The midrash, which may go back in its earliest form to the private teaching of Jesus, was supplemented by sayings on watchfulness, passages linking it to a situation in the primitive Church (such as that presumed in 1 John ii. 18 ff.), sayings about persecution and so on.

These proposals for deriving the heart of the discourse from the Old Testament obviously contain correct and valuable observations; but, apart from the fact that they delimit the nucleus in different ways, it is difficult to see the principle on which the nucleus was organized or the process by which it received the various accretions. The same objection must be made to the work of Lambrecht¹ who entirely rejects the apocalyptic pamphlet as a source of Mark xiii. In his view, literary analysis of the discourse does not point to any large pre-Markan unit which Mark used or worked up. There was no previously existing structured apocalyptic source. The chapter is almost entirely due to the creative editorial work of Mark using short sayings of Jesus mainly derived from Q (2c, 5b-6, 9, 11-13, 15-16, 21-22, 28b, 30, 31, 32-36), together with verses modelled on the Greek Old Testament (4, 7, 14, 19, 26 from Daniel, 12-13 from Micah, 24-25 from Joel, and 27 probably from Zechariah). The remaining verses (1, 2a-b, 3-4, 5a, 7-8, 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 23, 37) for the most part are probably Markan creations. Even if this were persuasive (and some of the derivations seem questionable) questions still remain. Why use the material organized in this manner and not in some other? And what reason have we for thinking that the nucleus was this kind rather than that?

¹ Lambrecht, op. cit. pp. 256-8.
One more recent attempt to discern the components of Mark xiii should be mentioned. Felix Flückiger divides the chapter into three sources; there are apocalyptic sayings in the third person; a Temple prophecy in the second person (1-4, 14-16, 18, 28-32) concerned with a temporary and local situation; and a group of missionary sayings also in the second person. These last comprise 5-6, 21-23 (with an editorial third person in 22), 7, 9-11, and 13. Apart from 10, it is difficult to recognize these as missionary sayings; but Flückiger’s distinction between second and third person sayings is instructive.

It is indeed true that a great deal of instruction can be gained from these recent studies, though the view of Mark xiii that will now be suggested does not coincide with any of them. Indeed it reverses the approach that has been customary for a hundred years. That of course is a rash undertaking; but since the common assumption of an apocalyptic nucleus for the chapter raises many problems and offers little prospect of further progress in understanding, it is worth while examining the possibility that the nucleus was of a different kind.

The proposal is that we should find the clue to understanding composition of Mark xiii in 5-23—particularly in the four passages (temporal clause plus imperative) that describe a situation in the primitive Church: the prospect of war, peril for Christians, sacrilege in Jerusalem and a messianic war leader. These statements, together with other statements that adhere to them, are in direct speech, usually in the second person plural though in three verses the style changes to the third person in Semitic manner without abandoning direct address. This body

2 Verse 14 begins with the second person δητε and continues with a third personal imperative φευγέτωσαν. Verses 15, 16 provide individual examples of the imperative, and 18 returns to the second person. (17 is in a different style—not an instruction but a lament.) Cf. a similar phenomenon in Mt. v. 3-10 (third person), v. 11-12 (second person) and the discussion in D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956), pp. 196 ff.; J. Dupont, Les Beatitudes (Louvain, 1958), pp. 273 ff.; also Mt. vii. 7 ff.
of statements has been supplemented by comments in the third person, very often from the general apocalyptic tradition. Hence the original nucleus would be something like this:

7 When you hear of wars and rumours of wars, do not be alarmed.¹

9 Take heed to yourselves; for they will deliver you up to councils; and you will be beaten in synagogues; and you will stand before governors and kings for my sake, to bear testimony before them.²

11 When they bring you to trial and deliver you up, do not be anxious beforehand what you are to say; but say whatever is given you in that hour; for it is not you who speak, but the Holy Spirit.³

14 When you see the desolating sacrilege set up where it ought not to be (let the reader understand), then let those who are in Judaea flee to the mountains;

15 let him who is on the housetop not go down, nor enter his house, to take anything away;

16 and let him who is in the field not turn back to take his mantle.⁴

18 Pray that it may not happen in winter.⁵

21 And then if anyone says to you, "look, here is the Christ!" or "Look, there he is!" do not believe it.⁶

23 Take heed; I have told you all things beforehand.

¹ The rest of 7 belongs to 8—an apocalyptic supplement, widening and generalizing a particular situation.

² Although 9 is in the second person throughout, it is likely that the original ended at αὐτῶν. The rest of the verse may have been composed to widen and generalize the Jewish setting and so to introduce 10.

³ The change of style marks 12-13 as an apocalyptic supplement, also preserved in Q. See Taylor, op. cit. pp. 509 f. who also provides reasons for excluding 13a despite its second personal style.

⁴ On 17, see p. 383, n. 2 and Taylor, op. cit. p. 513.

⁵ Verses 19-20 are a standard apocalyptic supplement about the final sufferings. See Taylor, op. cit. p. 514.

⁶ Verse 22 looks like an apocalyptic supplement. See Taylor, op. cit. p. 516. In any case it reflects 5-6 which must be the later introduction to the revised discourse. By excluding 7b, 8 (?9b), 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22 from the original nucleus—using largely the test of third personal style as an indicator—the amount of apocalyptic material discovered in section IV above has been extended by 5 verses. Cf. W. G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment (London, 1957), pp. 102 ff.
At this point the instructions must have ended and been followed by reassurances, namely the parable of the fig tree with its promise that the good time is near and relief is at hand (28-29)\(^1\) and the concluding encouragement to watch (33-35). These fairly simple instructions for an expected development of the actual situation of the Church advised non-involvement because the End was near. The Lord would soon be at the very gates. The advice is much the same as that given by Paul in 1 Corinthians: "those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it. For the form of this world is passing away" (1 Corinthians vii. 31). Those words were written in the early fifties of the first century, and possibly the same time is indicated for the original nucleus of Mark xiii.

At a later stage this instruction leaflet (as we may call it) was expanded. Each temporal clause was glossed by quotations or comments in the third person, largely from the apocalyptic tradition.\(^2\) Perhaps when the situation that had prompted the original instructions had ceased to be troublesome, or when such pressures had become more widespread and less localized, the pamphlet had been adapted to more general use. In addition to the glosses provided for the temporal clauses, the passage about cosmic signs, the Son of Man and the gathering of the elect was inserted between the instructions and the reassurances. The earliest confidence that the End was near as expressed in the parable of 28-29 (which had already attracted confirmatory glosses in 30-31) was modified by the statement that the precise time was unknown to angels and the Son, and was known only to God (32). The effect of these additions were to take a particular, limited threat to the Church's life and transform it into a matter of final importance. Consequently what the Church understands and decides to do in any particular time of

---

\(^1\) The oddness of 28-29 after the parousia description in 24-27 is well known. But 24-27 are the most obviously apocalyptic verses in the chapter. See Taylor (n. 5) pp. 517 ff. It is suggested that they were inserted between the instructions and the reassurances when the original nucleus was revised. Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (London, 1957), pp. 119-21; Cranfield, op. cit. p. 409.

\(^2\) For a different view of the conversion of a non-apocalyptic document into apocalyptic, see Robinson, op. cit. p. 127.
difficulty must not be a matter of expediency, a shift to handle the immediate necessity without considering the final end of the Church's existence. The sanctions by which the instructions for action are enforced have now become very powerful eschatological ones.

And now we can understand the last stage of the process by which chapter xiii became a part of the gospel. It is of course all too easy for the Church to imagine any temporary difficulty or any minor threat to its security as a sign of the End. This method of dealing with challenges, by elevating them to eschatological eminence, is dangerous unless it is used within the larger context of the Christian gospel. So Mark took the pamphlet with its apocalyptic supplement, provided it with a suitable beginning (5-6 a warning against alarmist interpretations), and inserted it into his story where the story itself would provide the most effective commentary on the worries that produced the pamphlet in the first place.

He tied the chapter in by numerous links. That between the encouragement to watch and the watchers in Gethsemane has already been noticed. More generally, he allowed the destroying sacrilege of xiii 14 to be seen in the context of his story about the Temple and what the chief priests did to Jesus. He allowed a parallel to appear between the instructions for flight and his report that after the arrest of Jesus "they all left him and fled" (xiv. 50). To Christians who might properly be worried about appearing before sanhedrin and rulers, he told how Jesus had behaved before Pilate and the Great Sanhedrin (including physical ill treatment xiii. 9, xiv. 65). The prompting of the Holy Spirit when Christians are on trial is perhaps represented by the fact that Jesus either refused to reply or spoke only the words of scripture. In his sole statement to

2 xiii. 9 uses δέχω (as of the envoys in the parable of the wicked husbandman xii. 3, 5); xiv. 65 does not. But the effect is the same—Luke uses δέχω in the parallel xxii. 63.
3 xiv. 61 no reply; xiv. 62 Dan. vii. 13 and Ps. cx. 1; xv. 2 συν λέγεις a refusal to plead; xv. 5 no reply; xv. 34 Ps. xxii. 1 (which is misunderstood xv. 35-36, as Christians must often have found with their own reliance on the Spirit).
the high priest he promised that they would see the parousia of the Son of Man (xiii. 26, xiv. 62). He linked the cosmic indications of the parousia to the crucifixion by stating that there was darkness over the whole land from the sixth to the ninth hour (xiii 24, xv. 33). Even the wars and rumours of war are there, for after all it was an army centurion that saw Jesus die and said "Truly this man was the son of God" (xv. 39).

By these means the crucifixion is seen in its full eschatological significance; and at the same time the eschatological expectations of the Church are controlled by the crucifixion.