

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

**University of Birmingham Research Archive**

**e-theses repository**

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

**2<sup>nd</sup> of 2 files**

**Chapters IV to VI  
and References**

**THE DATE OF MARK'S GOSPEL**  
**A Perspective on its Eschatological Expectation**

by

**Hyun Chul Won**

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Birmingham

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Theology and Religion  
School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion  
College of Art and Law  
University of Birmingham  
November 2009

## CHAPTER 4

### MARK'S ESCHATOLOGY AND MARK 13:1-23

In the previous chapter I mentioned two things as a conclusion: One is that Mark 13 is eschatology which has an apocalyptic character. The other is that the eschatology in Mark 13 expects the end of the world and not merely the end of the existing world order.

In this chapter I will deal with Mark 13 itself. The verses of Mark 13 will be closely studied and they will be compared with similar texts in the Old Testament. As has been mentioned in chapter II, Mark 13 has tended to have been assumed as *vaticinium ex eventu*. This was caused by some verses in this chapter, such as Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple (13:2), and which has become one of the major reasons to date Mark's gospel after A.D. 70.

It is necessary to examine Mark 13 itself in order to discern the validity of such an approach to in understanding of Mark's date.

## 1. PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON MARK'S ESCHATOLOGY

During the last century, many scholars have paid attention to Mark's eschatology. Some of them have used this theme to determine Mark's date. In this section the views of several scholars' will be dealt with.

### 1.1. Benjamin W. Bacon

In *The Gospel of Mark* published in 1925 Benjamin W. Bacon deals with the Mark's eschatology; the so called 'Little Apocalypse.' He compares Mark's eschatology with those found in the Pauline and synoptic literature. In Paul's letter he sees a similar eschatological view to that found in Mark: Namely, Paul's 'Little Apocalypse' and Mark's *Shiqqutz* prophecy.

He concludes that the reason for the similarity in these New Testament writings' derived from their source. This means that Mark, Paul, Matthew, and Luke shared some common sources.<sup>1)</sup> These sources were circulated before A.D. 40 as the written or oral traditions.<sup>2)</sup> These traditions were adapted by the authors of the synoptic gospels and Paul. The important thing to note from this argument is that they did not leave their traditions unchanged.

---

1) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925), 88-92, 318.

2) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 63, 79, 318-319.

Mark does not appear to differ from this tendency. Within redaction-criticism, it has been accepted as a fact that the evangelist changed and adapted his source when he wrote the gospel. On this matter Theodore J. Weeden contends that Mark used the traditions which were separately transmitted.<sup>3)</sup> As a result, as we have them now, each author changed their common traditions as they wanted to. According to Theodore J. Weeden, this common source was the Danielic prediction of a profanation of the temple.<sup>4)</sup>

For Benjamin W. Bacon the apocalyptic core of Mark 13 is firstly modified to be a signal of Jesus' second coming. Later it is secondarily adopted and modified.<sup>5)</sup> He argues that Paul would foresee that there could be a conflict caused by the emperor-worship which would result in conflict with Jewish and Christian monotheism.<sup>6)</sup> In addition, contrary to Paul, Mark seemed to know of the national catastrophe in A.D. 70. Whereas Mark explicitly expected the fall of Jerusalem, according to Benjamin W. Bacon, Paul makes no mention of it.<sup>7)</sup> These differences between the synoptic gospels and the Pauline letters could be explained by the different dates of these books. He concludes:

---

3) Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 2-3; Étienne Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark* (London: S.P.C.K., 1963), 6.

4) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 97-98.

5) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 319.

6) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 97.

7) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 97-98.



The original form of the primitive "revelation" can therefore be dated with very great probability in 40 A.D. The Pauline modification is independently fixed at 50 A.D. The further Markan modification is certainly later than 70 A.D., but earlier than either Matthew or Luke.<sup>8)</sup>

In this explanation, he takes into consideration the process that the traditions were developed and the author's role which caused the differences between the books. However, a question arises.

He concludes that, because Mark and Paul show differences in their eschatology, Mark's gospel and Paul's letters were written at a different time. However, this does not appear probable.

Benjamin W. Bacon supposes that Paul did not know of the destruction of Jerusalem and Mark, contrary to Paul, appears to have known it. Although this understanding leads him to the conclusion that these two books were written at a different time, it is, in fact, not certain whether Mark already knew this historical fact, because, in Mark 13, there is no explicit or clear evidence to show Mark's acknowledgment of the catastrophe of Jerusalem.

Rather, some eschatological concepts which are in Mark 13 look almost the same to those found in some of the Pauline letters; for example, the Lord's second coming (Mark 13:26 // I Thessalonians 4:16a) and the imminence of the Last days (Mark 13:30 // I Thessalonians 4:15).<sup>9)</sup>

---

8) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 319-320.

9) c.f. II Thessalonians 2:3 // Mark 13:5. According to David Wenham, although in these two verse the different verbs are used, their ideas are the same. *Gospel Perspectives*

However, it is true that there are differences in between the Pauline letters and Mark's gospel, but Benjamin W. Bacon's assertion cannot explain all of these common themes.

## 1.2. George R. Beasley-Murray

The common themes or contents between Mark's gospel and the Pauline letters are well listed by George R. Beasley-Murray. A few decades later than Benjamin W. Bacon, in 1954, George R. Beasley-Murray researched the relationship of the theology which is found in Mark 13 with that of the other writings of New Testament.<sup>10)</sup> He was particularly concerned with their eschatology. He compared Mark 13 with the Pauline letters, especially I & II Thessalonians. In these two Pauline letters he identified equivalent verses to every verse of Mark 13, which made him suppose that there was a very close relationship between these two authors' writings. He observes,

. . . the entire eschatological passages of I and II Thessalonians reflect the spirit of the eschatological discourse. In II Thessalonians we can see the idea of each section of the discourse reproduced in Paul's language, and in the case of 13.14ff., 21ff., 24ff., 32ff., there appear to be contacts of diction as well as of thought. Contrary to what is frequently expressed, the

---

*II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 350.

10) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and The Future* (London: Macmillan, 1954), 226-243.

idea of I Thess. 4.15-17 is in at least one cardinal respect closer to the spirit of the discourse than II Thess. 2.<sup>11)</sup>

As seen above, Benjamin W. Bacon concluded, that Mark was written later than the Pauline letters on the assumption that the differences of these two books were caused by the different time of them. George R. Beasley-Murray also reaches a similar conclusion from a different perspective: by examining parallels between the eschatology of I and II Thessalonians and that of Mark 13. He assumes that the similarities of these two author's eschatology were caused by the dependence of one on the other. Nevertheless, because I and II Thessalonians themselves can not explain all of Mark 13, the addition of an existing Christian tradition and Q were also taken into consideration.

There can be little doubt on whose side dependence lies, the eschatological discourse or Paul. II Thess. 2 does not give the whole of Mk. 13, but Mk. 13, helped out by Q, can account for all I and II Thessalonians and a good deal else in Paul. Hölscher was right in suggesting that the 'Little Apocalypse' with Christian additions could account for II Thessalonians, only he did not allow sufficiently for the extent of these 'additions,' nor rightly estimate the nature of the 'Little Apocalypse.'<sup>12)</sup>

For him, there should be a time gap between I and II Thessalonians and Mark 13 in order to allow for this process of accumulating

---

11) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and The Future*, 233.

12) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and The Future*, 234.

additional Christian material. Thus, his conclusion is that Mark 13 must be later than I and II Thessalonians.

George R. Beasley-Murray's supposition can be seen to clearly explain the similarity between I and II Thessalonians and Mark 13. However, the very next year another explanation was suggested by John C. Fenton.

### 1.3. John C. Fenton

In 1955, John C. Fenton published his research on the Pauline letters and Mark. He starts his research from the perspective that the gospels contain deeper meanings which cannot be recovered with much certainty, although they also present surface meaning.<sup>13)</sup> According to him, to understand these deeper meanings, it is necessary to know "the experience and development of the church in the period between the ministry of Our Lord and the time when the gospels were written."<sup>14)</sup> For him, the experience and the context of the church were chiefly represented to us by the Pauline letters.<sup>15)</sup> Consequently, he looks for similarities between Mark and Pauline letters.

---

13) John C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark,' *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. by Dennis E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 89.

14) John C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark,' 90.

15) John C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark,' 90.

In his comparison he chooses six themes to compare Mark's gospel with Pauline letters<sup>16)</sup> and in the each theme he identifies numerous similarities, (as did George R. Beasley-Murray).

However, John C. Fenton explains these similarities in a different way. Whereas George R. Beasley-Murray argues for a dependence of Mark 13 on I and II Thessalonians with help of Q and the addition of later Christian tradition, John C. Fenton concludes that these similarities are caused by their being chronologically close to one another.

Although there were great differences among the Christians at this time, as the Pauline Epistles show, yet the nearness in time of the two writers to one another may have contributed something to their similarity of outlook.<sup>17)</sup>

Therefore, *pace* the above two scholars, he can make the gap between the Pauline letters and Mark's gospel narrow. Although he does not determine the specific date of the second gospel, he actually places the date of Mark 13 to around the time of the early Pauline letters.

#### 1.4. James G. Crossley

Recently in *The Date of Mark's Gospel* (2004) James G. Crossley looks at Mark's attitude to the Torah when he seeks to determine the date of the second gospel. He commences his study from the recognition

---

16) The six themes are like this; (1) Fulfilment, (2) Hiding and Revealing, (3) Defeat and Victory, (4) Jesus is Lord, (5) Faith and Discipleship, (6) the Future.

17) John C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark,' 111.

that there were some challenges to Torah observance during the 40's of the first century.

It can therefore be argued that by the second half of the forties CE at the very latest there were certain Christians, both Jew and gentile, prepared not to observe certain parts of the biblical Torah, most notably the food laws.<sup>18)</sup>

He states that such cases are found in the other New Testament books, such as Matthew, Luke and also Paul, although the evidence is not certain.

Paul may have accepted that the Torah was no longer valid soon after his vision . . .<sup>19)</sup>

However, in Mark's gospel, Jesus was always obedient to the biblical law. He argues that, "Mark always portrays Jesus observing biblical law."<sup>20)</sup> This difference between Mark and the other authors' attitude to the biblical law leads him to a certain hypothesis:

Thus if a gospel passage shows signs of these extremely important debates [on the observation of the Torah] in early Christianity it may be argued that the given gospel was written in the light of such disputes, although precision on this basis alone is near impossible. . . . The other side of this

---

18) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 266 (London: T& T Clark, 2004), 157.

19) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 157.

20) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 192.

kind of argument is that if a gospel does not show such signs then it is possible that it was written before such disputes.<sup>21)</sup>

According to this assertion, he concludes that Mark was earlier than the Pauline letters, because, whereas there was a tendency not observe the biblical law in Paul and Matthew, there was no such tendency at all in Mark. Therefore, according to him, Mark was written in the mid of 40's and no earlier than the mid to late 30's<sup>22)</sup>

Although his approach to Mark's date, using the biblical law in Mark's gospel, looks ingenious, some problems have emerged with his study. Firstly, he looks at the different attitudes toward the biblical law found in Mark and the other New Testament authors: and detected that whereas Mark's Jesus was obedient to the biblical law, the law is challenged in the other New Testament books. It is true that there are such differences among these books. However, in his consideration the purpose or intention of New Testament authors are not taken into account. Paul and Mark were writing in different contexts. Therefore, it is possible that when Paul needed to mention the biblical law, Mark might not have needed to do so. Namely, the different context of different authors can cause different concerns. These different concerns can produce different writings.

---

21) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 159.

22) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 207-209.

Secondly, James G. Crossley supposes that the Jesus of Mark was Torah observant. However, it is not clear that the Markan Jesus was, as John Painter notes, "painstakingly Torah observant."<sup>23</sup> In Mark 7:1-23 some Pharisees and teachers of the law asked Jesus why his disciples did not wash their hands before eating. In Mark 10:1-12 some Pharisees asked Jesus whether divorce is lawful or not. Actually they might have expected Jesus to say that this was lawful or that was, however, Jesus declined from saying which one is lawful. Mark's emphasis is, in my view, not on the observance of the law but on the recognition of the real meaning of the law.

As we can see in Matthew 5:17, Matthew's Jesus emphasized the law (νόμος): "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets, I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them." Contrary to Matthew, there is no such idea at all in Mark. In this gospel the word 'νόμος' is never used, (which is normally used to refer to the Law in Matthew); whereas in the other gospels this word is often used (in Matthew 8 times, in Luke 9 times, and in John 13 times in various form).

Although James G. Crossley's study raises some problems which require answers, his ingenious method for dating Mark's gospel by using attitudes to the law in the gospels was a good attempt.

---

23) John Painter, "Review: The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity" *Review of Biblical Literature* 1 (2006), 3. It is available at [http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4577\\_4907.pdf](http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4577_4907.pdf) as well.



To conclude, all the scholars who have been mentioned above have tried to date Mark's gospel. All of them assume, as other scholars have also done, that the gospel reflected the context of the period in which it was written. However, instead of examining the historical events relevant to Mark's text, these scholars attempt to identify textual similarities and differences between it and the other New Testament books, especially some of the Pauline letters. They find several similarities between Mark and the Pauline letters and, but also some differences as well. Explaining these similarities and differences, they have suggested several possible dates for Mark's gospel.

## 2. IN THIS STUDY

My purpose in this study is to date Mark's date as many scholars have already attempted. In line with some scholars mentioned above I will be concentrating on Mark's eschatology, especially in Mark chapter 13. However, I do not want to try and identify a particular event in the history of the mid first century which could be behind this text. Rather I will search for the same or a similar eschatological thought which expressed in Mark 13 other New Testament books.

For this purpose, I have first dealt with some scholarly opinions (see previous Chapter) that suggest that Mark's eschatology in this chapter is not related to the Last Days, but to the change of the age or the political system of the world. As I have shown above, it is more

probable to see Mark 13 as Mark's own eschatological work. I will demonstrate that Mark 13 is expressing those things which will occur in the future when the relevant texts are examined.

There are three aspects in which the eschatology in Mark 13 can be addressed in relation to the dating of Mark's gospel.

First, some eschatological ideas of Mark 13, such as the imminence of Jesus' second coming, were derived from Jesus himself. As we can see in Mark 9:1 and 13:30ff, Mark's Jesus claimed that he would return immediately, within the contemporary generation. Some scholars argued that this expectation arose not from Jesus but the early church.<sup>24)</sup> Although it is not the purpose of this study to determine its origin, it can be said that, whether it is derived from Jesus or the early church, the expectation of imminent return of Jesus began after Jesus' resurrection or later.<sup>25)</sup>

Second, some eschatological ideas were not constant and underwent synchronic change. For example, if Mark expected an imminent parousia, this could not be remained for a long time, especially as a finite (although unspecified) time frame was given, 'within this generation' in Mark 13:30. Consequently, it is entirely plausible that this expectation would

---

24) Marcus J. Borg, "The 'End-of-the-World Jesus,'" *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 214. cf. Barry S. Crawford, "Near Expectation in the Sayings of Jesus," *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 101/2 (1982), 243-244.

25) Vincent Taylor, "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark xiii," *Expository Times* 60 (1949), 95; cf. Charles K. Barrett, *New Testament Eschatology*, *Scottish Journal of Theology* 6 (1953), 150-151.

modified, as the time passed without any sign of prophetic fulfillment. This means that, during the middle of the first century, there would have been a natural process of change in their expectation of the Jesus' coming. In addition, it would not necessarily take a long time for that change to occur. Because of the phrase 'within this generation,' the period could not be longer than the time of a generation; around 30-40 years.

Third, Mark did not merely record what he received when he wrote his gospel. Even though he might have written his gospel, using the traditions that were being circulated, he could edit and redact his sources to fit his purpose. Étienne Trocmé observes:

Mark is not the work of a mere compiler. The fact that his language and style are simple and straightforward makes no difference.

Everything inclines us to believe that the writer of Mark composed his Gospel to meet the needs of the Church of his day. It is even plain that he wishes to combat certain ideas and persons whose influence he finds harmful.<sup>26)</sup>

Thus, in Mark 13 what we can find is the final form which resulted from Mark's environment which urged him to frame his sources in their present form. This means that Mark 13 might not represent any other period other than the period in which he wrote his gospel.

---

26) Étienne Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 6; Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark*, 2-3; William Telford, *Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 151; Robert, M. Fowler, *Loaves and Fishes: The Function of the Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 54 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1981), 5-42.

As we have seen above, Mark's expectation of Jesus' imminent return was caused by the events of his resurrection and his ascension, which then underwent a period of change within a comparatively short time span. Such an expectation may therefore be also expressed in some of the other books in New Testament.

In this chapter and next chapter I will closely examine Mark 13 verse to verse in order to see understand exactly what Mark is saying in this chapter. Through this study it could be shown again that the future expectation in Mark 13 is eschatological and it will be considered what Mark is actually saying.

### 3. MARK 13

#### 3.1. 13:1-4; The Destruction of the Temple? or the Last Days?

As I have shown in the previous chapter, it is widely accepted that Mark 13 is describing not a political shift, but an eschatological catastrophe. However, if we take into account that Jesus' eschatological discourse in Mark 13 starts with the dialogue of Jesus and his disciple(s) (1-4),<sup>27)</sup> another new question arises.

In this dialogue when Jesus and his company were coming out from the temple, one of his disciples points out to him the magnificence

---

27) The authenticity of the verses 1-2 has, for a long time, been the subject of debate. See, George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), 383-384.

of the temple: (1) Then Jesus predicted the fate of the temple; (2) When they were on the Mount of Olives, four of his disciples came to him; (3) and asked about the time and the signs of it; (4). When we see it, it looks like that, in this dialogue, Jesus is talking about the fate of the temple. However, the subject, is in fact persecutions, wars and the rumor of the wars, false prophets and false christs and the cosmic catastrophes which appear to be related to the end of the world. At first glance the question and answer do not seem to be related. Walter E. Bundy insists that, "This opening passage of the address is not a reply to the questions which are supposed to have provoked it. The questions were impersonal, but the reply is personal, 'in my name.'"<sup>28)</sup> consequently, according to some scholars, it has been considered that the first question ("when will these things happen?") is left unanswered. John Bowman suggests:

The first question of v.4 is not really answered. Because Jesus according to the Petrine Mark tradition is not a calculator of Ends (or Time Periods).<sup>29)</sup>

Therefore, (as shown in the previous chapter), for long time many scholars have not considered this to be an eschatological discourse, although nowadays there is general agreement that this chapter is related to, not only the destruction of the temple, but also to the Last Days itself.

---

28) Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955), 460.

29) John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 242.

The conversation between Jesus and his disciple(s) (1-4) and the discourse, which has been considered as apocalyptic, given by Jesus (5-37) come together in this chapter, i.e. the apocalyptic discourse. Namely, in the present form of the gospel, the later part is the Lord's answer to his disciples' question, "When will these things happen? And what will be the sign . . .?" (4) However, actually the content of the discourse which follows these questions does not actually look as if that is the case. According to Archibald M. Hunter, in this discourse Jesus gave an answer which, "instead of developing the prophecy, maps out in apocalyptic detail the events which will lead up to the end of the world."<sup>30)</sup> Mark began the long discourse which was related to the future, using the disciples' question.<sup>31)</sup> Robert H. Gundry also suggests:

Already Jesus is ignoring the four disciples' question by predicting events that will not signal the immediate destruction of the temple. In fact, he will continue to ignore both its destruction and the time of its destruction in favor of detailed predictions concerning other events.<sup>32)</sup>

Morna D. Hooker also believes that in this conversation Jesus is saying something more than discussing the fate of the temple. However,

---

30) Archibald M. Hunter, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, Torch Bible Commentary (London: SCM Press, 1949), 121

31) He is using the question of the four disciples as a platform from which to speak on a variety of topics dealing with the future. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 738. Morna D. Hooker, *A Commentary on The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 305.

32) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993), 738.

she holds a slightly different understanding of these events. Whereas Robert H. Gundry contends that Jesus ignored his disciples' question, she argues that, for the disciples (and Mark's readers) the destruction of the temple meant more than simply the destruction of their religious centre.

. . . for though the temple is not referred to in the discourse (except for an oblique reference in v.14), its fate was inevitably linked with that of Jerusalem. Moreover, for Mark himself, as we have seen in chapter 11, the temple was a symbol of the nation, its destruction the result of Israel's wickedness, and part of the nation's punishment. For Mark it would have been entirely natural to move from one theme to another. It is true that the discourse moves beyond the destruction of Jerusalem to the parousia and the End of all things, but it is clear that these events are understood to belong together, so that one heralds the other.<sup>33)</sup>

On this matter, Willi Marxsen asserts that Jesus' answer is given in the verses 5-13.<sup>34)</sup> He argues that, when they addressed their question to Jesus, the four disciples already had in mind, not only the destruction of the temple, but also the Last Days themselves. It is, then, possible to interpret verses 5-13 as being related to the Mark's own time and verse 14 onwards as describing the future. His assumption is probable when it

---

33) Morna D. Hooker, *A Commentary on The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 305-306.

34) He said, "Strictly speaking, the answer must begin with a saying on the temple and then deal with the final events. But this again indicates that vss. 5-13 still deal with the evangelist's own time. Sayings on the 'future' begin only at vs. 14." *Mark the Evangelist* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1969), 178.



is considered that there appears to be Mark's redactional intention within these verses, although we cannot know what this intention is.<sup>35)</sup>

J. Dupont agrees that this discourse's purpose is to provide an answer to the disciple's question in verse 4b; however, actually "it is concerned with the events of the end."<sup>36)</sup> George R. Beasley-Murray concurs with this position. He looked at the plural pronoun in verse 4. The fact that, in the question, instead of the singular pronoun, the plural pronoun was used indicates that this question was related to not only the destruction of the temple.<sup>37)</sup> He argues that although it has an "immediate reference to the ruin of the temple,"<sup>38)</sup> this question rather shows the assumption that temple's destruction should be a part of events.<sup>39)</sup> He insists that the question which looks like a simple question about the destruction of the temple was, especially in a Jewish setting, not about

---

35) On this matter Desmond Ford rightly said, "Probably this question can never be settled one way or the other." Even though redaction criticism can not be sure what Mark's intention was, it is possible for us to suggest many possible explanations.

36) J. Dupont, "La ruine du temple et la fin des temps dans le discours de Marc 13," in *Apocalypses et Théologie de l'espérance*, LD 95 (Paris, 1977), 207-270. cited from George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 217.

37) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 386. also Vincent Taylor said, "ταῦτα points back to the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple, and, taken by itself, ταῦτα πάντα has the same meaning. But as the chapter now stands, ταῦτα πάντα appears to point forwards, . . .," *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 2nd edition (London: Macmillan, 1966), 502. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 393.

38) George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1957), 27.

39) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 386.



the destruction of that temple itself, but relating to “a knowledge of events that will warn the faithful when the catastrophe may be expected, and so to escape its horrors.”<sup>40)</sup> On the same line, Craig A. Evans thought that ταῦτα in the disciples’ question implies the expectation that the destruction of the temple could not happen alone; it will occur alongside the other upheavals.<sup>41)</sup> He also looked at the fact that Mark did not use a singular pronoun to indicate the destruction of the temple but, instead, used a plural which does not match a single event. According to him, when Mark wrote these verses, he also had other events in mind.<sup>42)</sup>

Werner Kelber has examined the setting of this chapter and divides verses 1-4 into two scenes; the background of the one being the temple, and the background of the other being the Mount of Olives (which was opposite the temple).<sup>43)</sup> He believes that, although they have a different background, these two scenes both focus upon the temple.<sup>44)</sup> He also suggests that, ταῦτα relates to the forecast of the destruction of the temple, while ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα relates to the Last Days.<sup>45)</sup> Therefore, for him, the latter indicates the events illustrated in verses 5-27.

---

40) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 386-387.

41) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 303.

42) Craig A. Evans, *Mark*, 303.

43) Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 111.

44) Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*, 112.

45) Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*, 113.

William A. Such agrees with Werner Kelber. He urges that, whereas in the first half of verse 4 the singular noun τὸ σημεῖον refers to the event of the destruction of the temple, the second half of verse 4 points to verses 5-37.

. . . τὸ σημεῖον (v.4b) indicates the destruction's significance in respect to the cosmic frame and Mark's perspective which is grounded in v.14. Thus the second clause (v.4b) is the key in essentially widening the perspective of v.4a and setting up vv.5-37: ταῦτα (v.4a) broadens to ταῦτα πάντα (v.4b), ἔσται (v.4a) expands to συντελεῖσθαι (v.4b) — broadening the locale of the question.<sup>46)</sup>

Robert H. Gundry argues against the view that ταῦτα πάντα means more than the destruction of the temple. For him, it could not refer to the events in verses 5-27, because: (1) Jesus has yet to tell these events; (2) Mark has yet to write about these events; (3) although Mark himself knew what he would write next, ταῦτα πάντα could not refer what did not come yet.<sup>47)</sup> Therefore, Robert H. Gundry argues that ταῦτα πάντα does not link these two events (the destruction of the temple and the

---

46) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation in the Gospel of Mark: Its Historical Reference in Mark 13:14 and its Impact in the Gospel* (Lanham/New York/Oxford: University Press of America Inc., 1999), 21.

47) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 736-7. There are six reasons actually. The remainders are: The presence of a possible antecedent in v2 combines with the just-mentioned nonsensical reading to prohibit a prospective ταῦτα . . . πάντα, "all these things that you are about to speak of."; A prospective understanding would imply, without evidence, the disciples' prescience that Jesus was going to predict many more events; 'Opposite the Temple' favors a back-reference to his prediction of destruction for the temple, whereas the following verses will say nothing more about that destruction.

Last Days). Rather, this plural pronoun refers to the multiple buildings of the temple complex.

However, this is not clear. In verse 4, the disciples asked the Lord two questions, "what is the sign of this thing?" and "when will these things happen?" They had already heard about the destruction of the temple in verse 2. It means that the destruction of the temple is single incident for them, though there are multiple buildings, because they concerned not on the number of the building but on the fate of them. Therefore, although, in their question, they mention the temple in the plural, buildings, οἰκοδομαί, οἰκοδομάς, it is unclear whether ταῦτα πάντα, (as Robert H. Gundry argues), referred to the buildings themselves.

In my view, it is more natural to see this plural pronoun, ταῦτα πάντα, refer to other things than the buildings themselves. If Jesus' disciples questioned to him, keeping his saying in verse 2 in mind, their question could relate to the fate of the temple itself. If this is the case, it is more reasonable to read that they asked the process of the destruction of the temple.

Futhermore, Robert H. Gundry overlooks the fact that Mark did not write down every saying of Jesus in his gospel and did not record it at the moment when it was spoken. It is true that in verse 4 Mark is not yet referring to the Last Days. However, this cannot be a reason for us to think that this plural pronoun does not refer to the following verses. The author was not a machine which has to receive single unit of data, one by one at one time. When he started to write his gospel, Mark's

author already knew everything which he wanted to write down in his gospel. Mark kept Jesus' saying about the temple and the Last Days in his mind, although he had not yet written it down.

As the scholars mentioned above show, although in the dialogue of verses 3-4 we can see the disciples' question relating to the destruction of the temple,<sup>48)</sup> it has been widely accepted that this question and Jesus' answer to it is about the Last Days; the parousia.

In Jewish history the temple was destroyed twice. The first temple (built by Solomon) was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 587. The second temple (built by Zerubbabel) was demolished by Herod who wanted to build one of the largest temple in the Roman Empire and after its erection was destroyed by Titus in A.D. 70. Whereas the first (Solomonic) temple and the third one (Herod's) were destroyed by the hand of pagans, the second one (built by Zerubbabel) was not. Therefore it is not necessary to see views on its demolition in the same context with the other two cases.

However, it is difficult to find any Jewish expectation that associates the end of the world coming with the destruction of the first temple. There is only the hope for the restoration of their kingdom by God. However, the destruction of Herod's temple might have been considered as an event which would bring about the end of the world.

---

48) As Werner Kelber assumes, it is possible to think that this question already contains not only the destruction of the temple but also the Last Days.

There are two things to be considered to explain the reason which gave rise to such a difference in expectation.

One is that there was no expectation of the end of the world when the first temple was destroyed because, in the Old Testament period, there was no eschatological expectation which expected the end of the world.<sup>49)</sup> This was because (as has been considered in the previous chapter) an expectation of the end of the world only began to appear after the Exile which gradually grew. It is, therefore, possible during the first century that those present would have associated the end of the world in the relation to the destruction of the temple. This is because, by this period, their eschatological idea had become more developed.

The other point is that the destruction of the second temple occurred after Jesus' first coming and his ascension. It has to be, therefore, remembered that there was an expectation of Jesus' second coming, as we can see in Pauline letters. Paul believed that Jesus' second coming was foretold by Jesus (II Thessalonians 4:15). Although it is not easy to determine whether Jesus actually spoke the word recorded in Mark 13, it is certain that Mark wrote it as a saying of Jesus and in

---

49) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, translated by G. W. Anderson (Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 125; Ernest Benz, *Evolution and Christian Hope: Man's Concept of the Future from the Early Fathers to Teilhard de Chardin*, translated from German by Heinz G Frank (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1965), 1-2; George B. Caird, "The Christological Basis of Christian Hope," *The Christian Hope*, Theological Collections 13 (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), 9-24; Bob Becking, "Expectations about the end of Time in the Hebrew Bible: Do They Exist?" in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*, edited by Christopher Rowland and John Barton, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 43 (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 44.

an environment that expected Jesus' second coming to be imminent. Therefore the expectation of first century Christians was not the same to those that of the Jews who lived in the sixth century B.C.

On this matter Simon Goldhill states:

The third Temple, according to orthodox Jews, will be built only when the Messiah comes, and when God orders it; for many Christians this will herald the Second Coming. For both groups it will mark the End of Days.<sup>50)</sup>

In this statement the third Temple is not the one built by Herod. Simon Goldhill continues, "So Herod's Temple is always known as the second Temple."<sup>51)</sup> Therefore in this circumstance for the first century Christians the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 can be a signal for the parousia of Jesus; namely the End of the Days. If this is the case, for Mark and his readers the destruction of the temple could not be an isolated event. Thus, when they heard about the temple's fate, they might also have expected other events (such as the parousia) as well.<sup>52)</sup>

Furthermore, we have to consider that Jesus' prophecy about the destruction of the temple was not strange or new to Jews at all.<sup>53)</sup> This

---

50) Simon Goldhill, *The Temple of Jerusalem* (London: Profile Books Ltd., 2005), 59.

51) Simon Goldhill, *The Temple of Jerusalem*, 59.

52) J. Dupont, "La ruine du temple et la fin des temps dans le discours de Marc 13," in *Apocalypses et Théologie de l'espérance*, LD 95 (Paris, 1977), 42. Cited by George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 217.

53) John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 240. Nicholas T. Wright even said, "It is the sort of thing that many sectarian Jews of the time might well have thought or said." *Jesus*, 344.

had already been proclaimed by some of the Old Testament prophets, such as Micah (3:12) and Jeremiah (26:6) (e.g. Amos 9:1, "crush the capitals," Isa 5:5f., "its wall shall be trodden down," 64:10f., "Zion has become a desert"). Could similarities in language (where it relates to the destruction of the temple) are found in both the Old Testament tradition and in Mark's gospel mean that Mark is thinking along the same lines as the prophets?

Firstly, it is worth considering the reason for the prophecy about the destruction of the temple and the holy city. For Micah and Jeremiah, the reason for the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem was because of; sins committed against God, disobedience to God, not keeping the law and not listening God's prophets (Micah 3:10-11; Jeremiah 26:4-5). Therefore, Micah's and Jeremiah's prediction about the temple and Jerusalem is a punishment for their sin. For Mark, the temple became the centre of those who oppose Jesus.

The Temple was the apogee of a system which the Marcan Jesus challenged and its destruction would mark the end of an Age. It was in the Temple that all His opponents in the preceding scenes (Mark 11:15-19; 11:27; 12:40) are gathered, and each in some way, Priest, Scribe and Pharisee centre round the Temple with its sacrifices, its offerings, its system of purifications is the application of the Law.<sup>54)</sup>

---

54) John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 241. cf. Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*, 111. Kenneth Grayston, "The Study of Mark XIII," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 56 (1973-74), 371.



Therefore, it has been suggested that this is the reason for the temple being destroyed. Nicholas T. Wright notes, "Like Josephus, he [Mark] claimed to see that destruction was inevitable, and interpreted it as divine judgment for Israel's present wickedness."<sup>55</sup> It is the moment that "the time has come" (Mark 1:15).

Secondly, the relationship between the destruction of the temple and the Last Days should be considered. In Micah the destruction of the temple and the city is followed by their restoration in glory (Micah 4).<sup>56</sup> In Jeremiah, there is no mention of any restoration. Mark's case is no different from these two Old Testament traditions. However, it is more certain that, when Mark speaks about the temple's fate, he expected the Last Days as well.

Nevertheless, contrary to these things mentioned above, there are also some notable differences between the Old Testament prophets and Mark 13. The first concerns the *hearer* of the prediction. Micah and Jeremiah both proclaimed the message of the judgment of God to those who had betrayed him and who would receive his judgment if they did not repent (Jeremiah 26:3). However, in the case of Mark, the message was not given to those who were outside Jesus' circle of disciples and who would experience the worst of the troubles (Mark 4:11, to those on the outside everything is said in parables). Even they had no chance to

---

55) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus*, 344.

56) Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, Word Biblical Commentary 32 (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1998)



repent (cf. Mark 4:12). Mark 13 was given to those who listened to Jesus and would follow his teaching.

The purpose of the prediction was, therefore, also different. In the Old Testament, it was proclaimed in order to make the hearer repent from their faults. Contrarily, in Mark the prediction was given to the hearers in order that they may escape from the impending difficulties (Mark 13:5, 14, 18), or to encourage them to overcome them (Mark 13:9, 13).

It is probable that the prologue of the discourse (the prediction of the destruction of the temple) follows the Old Testament prophets' tradition. In addition, Timothy Colani believes that the events which are in this chapter are not specific to Mark, rather they were widely spread among the first century Jewish Christians.<sup>57)</sup> Bo Reicke also expresses a similar idea. When examining the lamentation in Luke 19:43-44, he suggests:

This lamentation is based on Old Testament descriptions of the punishment and destruction of Jerusalem, a very ancient topic corresponding to well-known traditions of the Orient and often found in Hebrew and Jewish prophecy . . . The details of the prediction simply coincide with things which always happened when a town was besieged, and of course such events were also referred to by the old prophet . . . .

---

57) George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 1. He said that this chapter presented "a very complete summary of the apocalyptic views spread among the Jewish Christians of the first century, such as we know them by John's book." It is cited from Colani, *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son Temps*, 2d ed. (Strasbourg, 1864), 204.

There is no reason to doubt that Jesus was familiar with and followed up this line of thought, although the prediction quoted above was possibly translated and colored by different tradents and eventually fixed by the evangelist in the period between the death of Christ and the formation of the Gospel.<sup>58)</sup>

If this understanding is acceptable, it is also probable that the hearers who heard the warnings about the temple would also have recognized that the Last Days were getting close. Therefore, it is possible to say that, although Mark's author interpolates this prologue in order to provide a setting for this discourse,<sup>59)</sup> it nonetheless accomplished its own eschatological role effectively.

### 3.2. 13:5-37; Structure of Mark 13

Rudolf Pesch lists the opinions of a number of scholars' on the structure of Mark 13 in his book *Naherwartungen*.<sup>60)</sup> He then divides Mark 13 into three main parts (5b-23, 24-27, 28-37). According to him, the first part comprises verses 5b-23, which has a chiastic structure: verse 5b-6 and 21-22 warn of false messiahs and false prophets, 7-8 and

---

58) Bo Reicke, 'Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem,' in *Studies in New Testament and early Christian literature: essays in honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, edited by David Edward Aune (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 122.

59) Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington: University Press of America, Inc., 1979), 19.

60) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13* (Dusseldorf, Patmos, 1968), 74-77.

14-20 are related to the war and the rumors of the war, 9-13 forms the centre of this section. Rudolf Pesch believes that this concentric structure is designed to emphasize the situation faced by the first century Christians who are under the persecution.<sup>61)</sup> The second part, although it does not directly refer to the urgency of the parousia and is apparently different from the other two main parts, at the same time, it does carry a message of consolation.<sup>62)</sup> The third part is divided into two subsections. βλέπετε, at the beginning of verse 33 is also a sign of this division.<sup>63)</sup> As a result, he concludes that such a structuring of Mark 13 proves this chapter "als ein kunst-und wirkungsvoll komponiertes Gebilde."<sup>64)</sup>

Dean B. Deppe (as Rudolf Pesch shows) also identifies a fivefold chiastic structure in this passage. (1) 5-6: Beware of false messiahs; (2) 7-8: Beginning of birth pains; (3) 9-13: Persecution; (4) 14-20: Tribulation; (5) 21-23: Beware of false messiahs. According to him, this fivefold chiastic structure is Mark's favorite method to emphasize certain themes in his gospel.<sup>65)</sup>

---

61) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 80-81.

62) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 81.

63) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 81.

64) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 82.

65) Dean B. Deppe, "Charting the Future or a Perspective on the Present?: The Paraenetic Purpose of Mark 13," *Calvin Theological Journal* (2006), 92-94; Jan Lambrecht also shows the same idea in his *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung* (Rom: R p stliches Bibelinstitut, 1967), 173.

Contrary to these two scholars' understanding, William A. Such examines the word, τὸ σημεῖον, in verse 4. According to him, this word functions as an introductory word to introduce the series of events described in verses 5-27.<sup>66)</sup> He argues that the word that corresponds with this word is, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. Both take the form of a neuter singular.<sup>67)</sup> He believes that verses 5-13 are syntactically written to 'peak' at verse 14.<sup>68)</sup> The Last Days are triggered in verse 14. Then, in the following verses 15-27, a series of events, which are dependent upon the sign, are listed.<sup>69)</sup> Therefore, William A. Such argues that Mark 13's structure is not concentric or chiasmic, but rather is climactically structured.

Verses 5-13 develop climactically to v.14 where the tone of the discourse changes. From vv. 14bf. the severity of events is predicated upon the appearance of τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως.<sup>70)</sup>

Verse 14 is not the only the climatic peak point in Mark 13. William A. Such suggests that the unfolding events triggered in verse 14 develop into a peak again in verse 26.

The hinge point is v.14 which functions as a crescendo sign launching the end-time program. In the heightened parallelism of vv.21-27 over vv.5-13

---

66) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 19.

67) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 20.

68) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 19.

69) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 30.

70) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 36.

a second peak is reached (v.26). The two key texts (vv.14, 26) mirror each other with v.26 being the heightened parallel, that is, the accentuated overturning of all v.14 counsels: . . .<sup>71)</sup>

Robert H. Gundry, when he examines verses 5-23, also argues against Rudolf Pesch. He asserts that, (as does William A. Such), this chapter does not contain concentric structure: "Things build up toward a goal rather than revolving around a centre."<sup>72)</sup> He suggests that the intention of Mark was not to show the situation of the first Christians but to demonstrate Jesus' ability to predict; his supernatural power.

The fact that there is a change of thought in verse between verse 23 and verse 24 shows that Rudolf Pesch's division of this chapter is probable. However, his identification of a concentric structure in Mark 13 is not probable. Rather, Robert H. Gundry's conclusion that instead of the contents of this chapter being concentric, goal directed is more satisfactory. This will be dealt with below and in the next chapter.

In this study I divided verses 5b-37 into two sections: 5b-23,<sup>73)</sup> and 24-37. One of the reason for this division is that at the end of each section there is an utterance by Jesus to conclude his sayings (which are grouped according to their origin): 23: *προεῖρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα.* and 37: *ὑμῖν*

---

71) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 37.

72) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 756.

73) David Wenham concurs that 13:5-23 is a section, as many scholars agreed with. "“This Generation will not Pass...”: A Study of Jesus' Future Expectation in Mark 13," in *Christ the Lord*, edited by Donald Guthrie (Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1982), 127-150, in 127.

λέγω πᾶσιν λέγω, γρηγορεῖτε. This is especially the case with verse 23 which acts as a break point in this discourse.<sup>74)</sup> In the former verse, Jesus addresses everything to his disciples in advance, while in the latter verse the word 'wake up' is given to his disciples. Although he does not use the same word (προεῖρηκα in verse 23, λέγω in verse 37), he focuses on the fact that Jesus says something about the Last Days to his disciples (or the readers of the gospel).<sup>75)</sup> Using similar phrases in verses 23 and 37, he concludes the two sections of the discourse which are related to each other and also to the Last Days.

The other reason to divide this chapter into two sections is the contents of each part. Actually verses 5-37 are closely related to the questions posed in verse 4. In this verse, as I have shown above, Jesus' disciples ask him two questions, which he answers in verses 5-37. Although it will be clearer by the end of next chapter (after I have looked at all the verses in Mark 13), in my view, Jesus answers one question before verse 23 and then other question after verse 24. On this matter Kenneth Grayston explains it clearly:

There are two questions: (i) πότε ταῦτα ἔσται and (ii) τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα; imply several phenomena, not simply the Temple's destruction. Hence, either the questions look forward to answers that Jesus

---

74) David Wenham, "This Generation," 128.

75) LLOYD GASTON argued that by these two verse show that the discourse is addressed to Christians and not just to the disciples. *No Stone on Another: In the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospel* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 63.

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.<sup>76)</sup>

### 3.3. The First Half: Verses 5-23

This section has been considered as a series of events which have been deliberately arranged by Mark. Charles E. B. Cranfield suggests that this section contains "characteristic marks of the time to point to the End."<sup>77)</sup> These 'characteristic marks' could be the signs of the End.

#### 3.3.1. Warning and the Signs (5-8)

The section begins with an imperative βλέπετε.<sup>78)</sup> On one hand, with βλέπετε μὴ, when one considers this word's usage, this word is usually used when the New Testament writers are warning the Christians of the early church.<sup>79)</sup> Therefore, that this instance reflects this tendency

---

76) Kenneth Grayston, "The Study of Mark XIII," 374.

77) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, 394.

78) George R. Beasley-Murray thinks that this is used to strengthen the meaning of the sentence (which is in verse 5b), without actually modifying the original meaning. *Jesus and the Last Days*, 390.

79) Matt. 24:4; Luke 21:8; Acts 13:40; I Cor. 8:9; 10:12; Gal. 5:15; Col. 2:8; Heb. 3:22; 12:28; II Jn. 8



within the first century and consequently does not indicate any special intention of the writer. On the other hand, as Rudolf Pesch believes,<sup>80)</sup> Mark places this term here as a redactional tool. Timothy J. Geddert is one of those who agree with Rudolf Pesch. According to him, Mark takes βλέπω to accomplish his own intention; to turn faith into 'sight' within the context of discipleship.<sup>81)</sup> When a reader reads this discourse, if s/he sees this imperative, they must pay more attention to the following verses. What is s/he to see? Taking this word, Timothy J. Geddert says, that Mark makes his reader see, not only the surface of events (the discourses and texts), but also that which is below them.<sup>82)</sup> To do this, Mark's Jesus begins to answer with this watchword<sup>83)</sup> at verse 5 and goes onward. At the end of this section Mark, using the same word again, emphasizes what he is saying in this section.<sup>84)</sup>

Then what should they have to 'see'? In verse 5b, the warning is given to 'you' (βλέπετε ... ὑμᾶς), however, in verse 6 Mark's Jesus refers to 'they' (πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται). It looks as if Mark is using several sources here. The verb πλανᾶω, which Mark also uses, is used in the apocalyptic

---

80) Rudolf Persh, *Naherwartungen*, 107.

81) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 59.

82) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 59.

83) Timothy J. Geddert thinks that for Mark, each use of the term appears to be intended to contribute to a carefully devised call for discernment concerning the realities which lie beyond the observations of the physical senses. *Watchwords*, 60.

84) Rudolf Pesch said that it is an inclusion with verses 5-6 and 21-22. *Naherwartungen*, 107-118.



situation.<sup>85)</sup> Therefore, it is probable that Mark used some apocalyptic material when he wrote this section.

There is, however, another explanation. It is said that this discordance could have occurred because the latter is not similar to the former (it is saying something different). In fact, whereas in verse 5b Jesus is talking about a special event (the deception) which his disciples will experience, in verse 6 Jesus explains why they must be cautious at the time of the deception.<sup>86)</sup> "Many will come in my name." That is why his disciples should 'watch.' Consequently, verse 6 is the reason of verse 5b. Many people have been attracted by this interpretation. In some latter manuscripts, a conjunction, γάρ, is placed between these verses.<sup>87)</sup>

They will come ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου and will claim that "ἐγώ εἰμι" Some scholars translate ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου as 'under my name'<sup>88)</sup> or 'with my name'<sup>89)</sup>. However, in this reading, a question raises: how can the one who comes under the name of Jesus (or 'with his name') say that "I

---

85) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung*, Analecta Biblica 28 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), 94.

86) John Kilgallen, "Exegetical Notes on Mark 13:1-8," *Expository Times* 118 (2006), 34. He said, "deception will happen, *because* (my own italic) many will come, using his name and saying 'I am.'" cf. Morna D. Hooker, *A Commentary on The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 307. cf. Robert H. Gundry said, this reading was the result of Mark's asyndeton. *Mark*, 737.

87) A, D, Θ, f<sup>1,13</sup>, 33 *et al.*

88) Bietenhard, *Theological Dictionary of New Testament*, 5.277 n.244.

89) Wilhelm Heitmüller, *In Namen Jesu*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 63.

am He?"<sup>90)</sup> It is problematic. Charles E. B. Cranfield lists two possible readings for this phrase.<sup>91)</sup> One is that 'they' are the false teachers. The other reading is that they are the false messiahs.<sup>92)</sup> However, the former reading is not acceptable because 'they' cannot say "I am he." Therefore, what is the 'name' here? In the gospels, when Jesus asks 'who am I,' the answer is not 'Jesus,' but his title, Christ (Mark 8:29). In addition, if we consider the verse 22, which says about the false christs and false prophets, it is probable to think that this 'my name' is the Christ.<sup>93)</sup> Furthermore in the first century it is highly possible that the false messiahs might be expected at any time.<sup>94)</sup> Therefore ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου does not mean 'on [the basis of] my name' or 'under my name,' rather it means that the deceivers will claim that they are the messiah who usurp his name.<sup>95)</sup> The pretender will say that, "I am the Messiah, the Christ."<sup>96)</sup>

---

90) cf. Morna D. Hooker, *Commentary*, 306. Here, she is arguing about those who pretend to have a Jewish background. The problem for her is that it is really necessary for such pretender to say that he is under Jesus' name.

91) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *St. Mark*, 395.

92) Charles E. B. Cranfield says that the false teachers claim in Jesus' name, whereas the false messiahs arrogate Jesus' title to themselves. *St. Mark*, 395.

93) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 737; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 292; Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark*, 77-78.

94) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 503.

95) Morna D. Hooker, *Commentary*, 306. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 737.

96) Josef Schmid translated this phrase 'with my name.' *The Regensburg New Testament: The Gospel According to Mark*, edited by Kevin Condon (Cork: Mercier Press, 1968), 235.

Then, where does it come from? Some scholars think that this phrase is not Jewish but an insertion from the early Christian tradition by Mark. Vincent Taylor says that this phrase is an addition which Christians added to a Jewish or Jewish-Christian source.<sup>97)</sup> Considering that there was a fanaticism or pneumatic excitement within the Christian community, Hugh Anderson<sup>98)</sup> and Theodore J. Weeden<sup>99)</sup> suggest that the false messiahs arise from within the Christian community. Robert H. Gundry expresses a similar idea, arguing that this deceiver would arise within the Christian community.<sup>100)</sup> Willi Marxsen asserts that this verse is of Christian origin which had already been formulated.<sup>101)</sup> Because of the situation of the church in the first century, this phrase is inserted here.

However, such an explanation is not certain. Morna D. Hooker rightly says that:

At this point it is well to notice that the many who are misled by these men are not necessarily members of the Church. We tend to assume that they are Christians, because the warning to the disciples in v.5 not to be misled (βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ) is echoed by the statement in v.6 that many ... will mislead many (πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν). In fact there is nothing to

---

97) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 503-4.

98) Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, The New Century Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, 1976), 292.

99) Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark*, 79-81. Edward Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, edited by Madvig (Richmond Va.: John Knox Press, 1970), 268.

100) According to him, "the warning to beware implies that the disciples might be deceived." *Mark*, 761.

101) Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 162,

indicate that the members of either of the two groups referred to as 'many' in v.6 are disciples: it is men and women in general who will be led astray by these false messianic claimants. . . . Moreover, if we read on, we will discover that the other disasters described in this first section are wars and 'natural disasters' (earthquakes and famines). These are certainly not in any sense troubles that come only to Christians; logically, then, we might expect this first trouble to be of the same character.<sup>102)</sup>

In addition, when we take into account the contents of the deception, this is much more probable. Considering that disciples ask a question to Jesus ("when will these things happen" and "what will be the sign,") and that Jesus is answering their question, the pretenders will deceive Jesus' disciples and what they will mislead his disciples about is time. The contents of the deception is about the time; "'when' and 'what' is the sign."<sup>103)</sup> As I have already mentioned, verse 5b (as Robert H. Gundry notes<sup>104)</sup>) is warning to Jesus' disciples not to be deceived. However, verse 6 is not the warning itself. It is the reason for the warning of which his disciples must be aware. Therefore, as Charles E. B. Cranfield asserts, it is not necessary to think that this verse comes from Christian hands.<sup>105)</sup> Morna D. Hooker contends that it is more probable to say that it is taken from a Jewish source, because she cannot

---

102) Morna D. Hooker, *Commentary*, 307.

103) John Kilgallen, "Exegetical Notes on Mark 13:1-8," 33-34; Morna D. Hooker, *Commentary*, 307.

104) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 761.

105) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *St. Mark*, 395.

find in it anything that is specifically Christian.<sup>106)</sup> However, she does not explain why she thinks so. On the contrary, among the early writings of the Christians it is possible to find such an expression; such as 2 Peters 2:28; 3:17; James 5:19. Therefore, in my view, although it is not necessary to reject the possibility of its Jewish origin, it is also better to be open to the possibility that it could have been taken from a Christian source.

In the next two verses (verses 7-8) we can see other elements for which the Jewish background is much more apparent. In verses 7-8 the war and the rumor of wars (7-8a) and the natural disasters (8b) are mentioned. These verses are neither the warning about the Last Days nor are they the sign of the end. However, these are the events that would precede it. Jesus comments on two things about these tribulations in verse 7 and 8: ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος and ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων ταῦτα. These things which will precede the Last Days do not indicate that it is the end but that it is the beginning of 'birthpangs.' In these two of Jesus' comments it is possible to see the intention of Mark. Willi Marxsen believes that the Jewish war is the background of this chapter.<sup>107)</sup> He thinks that this war makes Mark's readers fall into the false expectation.<sup>108)</sup>

---

106) Morna D. Hooker, *Commentary*, 308.

107) Willi Marxsen thinks that Mark surely expects the imminent destruction of the temple. in *Mark the Evangelist*, 168.

108) David Wenham also shows similar view on this matter. He says, "It is widely recognized by commentators that the function of the whole Marcan apocalypse was to cool down eschatological excitement, and this is also Paul's purpose in 2 Thessalonians." However, in the footnote he thinks that there are differences between the Gospels and II Thessalonians: in the Synoptics the excitement seems

But the phrase "the end is not yet" is a correction of apocalyptic expectation. This expectation does not await the end in an insurrection (vs. 7 does not deal with this at all) but in a raging war. The war has come; the community is living through it. Due to apocalyptic instruction, it might suppose it is experiencing 'the end.' It is just this idea which Mark rejects.<sup>109)</sup>

It is not necessary to accept that, as Willi Marxsen believes, the background of this chapter is the Jewish war. However, it is persuasive that this verse, "the end is not yet," is written to correct the false expectation on the end.<sup>110)</sup> If this is the case, a further question arises: why do they expect the Last Days at that moment? What makes them have such wrong expectation? As George R. Beasley-Murray assumed, did the Jewish War cause such expectation? Actually, although it is impossible to reconstruct Mark's circumstance entirely, it is possible to know that Mark's readers already, at least, know that these things should come before the end. George R. Beasley-Murray observes, "That the tribulation of the end will consist of war, famine, earthquake, etc. is repeated throughout the Old Testament prophets, . . . ."<sup>111)</sup> Also, in *Jesus*

---

caused by wars, persecutions and other events; in 2 Thessalonians the immediate cause seems to have been some sort of misunderstanding or distortion of Paul's teaching. *Gospel Perspectives II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 350. However, it is still dubious that Mark's background is the Jewish war.

109) Willi Marxsen, *Mark*, 173.

110) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, p.394. . . ., for Mark's intention is to correct current misunderstandings relating to events which were both happening and believed to be imminent, and which were regarded as portents of the end of the age.



and the Last Days, he suggests that "the language of v.7 is probably traditional, and echoes such passages as Jer 51:46 and Dan 11:44."<sup>112)</sup> Lloyd Gaston expresses a similar view on this verses: "It is true that we find a strong influence of the Old Testament in Vs 7-8a (Dn 11:44; 2:28; Is 19:2) and even a technical term from the later apocalyptic ("beginning of the pangs"), . . . ."<sup>113)</sup>

Furthermore, Mark does not use the singular form to illustrate these events but the plural. This means that Mark does not presuppose any specific event when he writes this verse. He understands that, in these verses, the troubles are the "generally representative list of disasters."<sup>114)</sup> Wars, rumors of wars, and the famines are not invented by Mark himself, but are rather the widely spreaded and accepted conceptions of the event which precede the Last Days.<sup>115)</sup> In this way, this is a "generalizing statement."<sup>116)</sup> Therefore, it is not wrong to say that the events mentioned in verses 7-8 are not the signs about which

---

111) He distinguishes Mark's case from the Old Testamental tradition. He continued, "but the apocalypticist goes further in his descriptions." *Jesus and the Future*, 177.

112) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 395. However, he presupposes that the Jewish war had already finished. "It is suggested that this had already taken place when Mark wrote: the war had been fought, the city taken, and the temple destroyed, and so an apocalyptic fever developed, fanned by false prophets.

113) Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 15.

114) Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," *Theology* 64 (1961), 99-107, in 101.

115) According to Morna D. Hooker, The disasters that Jesus foretells here are a necessary prelude to the Last Days, *Commentary*, 308. John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 242.

116) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 395.



Jesus disciples asked,<sup>117)</sup> however, they are the signs to show that the Last Days are about to begin.

### 3.3.2. Signs: Tribulations (9-11)

In this part, the atmosphere appears to change. In verses 5-8 Jesus refers to the deception, wars and the rumor of wars, conflicts between nations, and the earthquakes and famines. Although all these things are traumatic to experience, they are not directly related to Mark's readers. Such things would occur across the entire Empire.

However, verse 9 starts with Jesus' admonition "You must be on your guard." William L. Lane correctly identifies this situation.

The admonition to "take heed to yourselves" introduces a new perspective in the account. While in the preceding verses attention was concentrated on convulsions throughout the Roman world, in verse 9 it is focused upon the prospect of suffering of those who are addressed.<sup>118)</sup>

Thus the events which are traumatic are getting so close to the readers that they could also experience them. What is mentioned in these verses can be summarized like this: there is a warning: the readers will be handed over to the local council and they will be in a difficult

---

117) He says that 'these things' are to be interpreted as signs of the judging presence of God in that history which is moving to the end which he has purposed. *Jesus and the Last Days*, 398.

118) William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), 460-461.

situation, because of Jesus (9); instruction concerning what should be done: the gospel must first be preached to all nations (10); there is an exhortation: although they are arrested, they should not worry in advance about what to say because, instead of them, the Holy Spirit will speak (11). Among these three verses, the authenticity of the second verse (verse 10) has been often doubted. This is because its content does not naturally match the other two verses.

Willi Marxsen believes that, because the contents of verse 9 and verse 11 are directly connected, verse 10 must have been inserted by Mark in its place.<sup>119)</sup> Actually, when we take into account the content of each verse it is much clearer: in verse 9 it is said that you will be handed over and in verse 11 there is a exhortation for the ones who have been handed over (are delivered). Verses 9 and 11 both refer to the difficulties which the disciples will experience. In the light of this it would therefore not appear that the theme of verse 10 is related to the other verses.

Futhermore Dennis E. Nineham pays attention to a word which is commonly used in verses 9 and 11.<sup>120)</sup> It is παραδίδομι.<sup>121)</sup> In verse 9, the believers will be handed over (παραδώσουσιν) to the local councils and the

---

119) Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 175. Also, Vincent Taylor, "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13," *Expository Times* 60 (1948-49), 96.

120) Dennis E. Nineham, *Saint Mark* (Harmondsworth, Baltimore, Victoria: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963), p.347.

121) This verb is also used in verse 12. καὶ παραδώσει ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον

synagogues. Verse 11 describes the time when you will be “arrested and brought to (παραδιδόντες) trial.” Therefore, it looks as if these two verses have some kind of connection in their meaning.<sup>122)</sup>

Contrary to these scholars' position, a different interpretation has been suggested by George D. Kilpatrick.<sup>123)</sup> He argues that verse 10 is not an insertion and instead, he interprets verses 9 and 10 together<sup>124)</sup> with different punctuation,<sup>125)</sup> that is based on ancient texts.<sup>126)</sup> He also insists that πρῶτον, which has been considered to indicate “before the Last Days” in relation to verse 7, actually points to the order of the events: “*first* preach the Gospel, then after your arrest by the authorities,

122) Vernon K. Robbins said that the repetition of the word is Mark's own strategy to make a dramatic conclusion. “The Reversed Contextualization of Psalm 22 in the Markan Crucifixion: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis,” *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), pp.1161–1183. According to him, Παραδίδωμι (in Mark 15:1,10,15) is one of these strategies to make a dramatic conclusion (pp.1165–1167). If his thought is true, it is possible enough that Mark does the same thing in this passage.

123) George D. Kilpatrick, “The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13:9–11,” *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, edited by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp.145–158.

124) The important reason for him to interpret it this way is that, in chapter 13, Mark usually begins a sentence with a verb. George D. Kilpatrick, “The Gentile Mission,” 150–151. However, George R. Beasley-Murray said that there are enough examples which do not follow this pattern. *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, p.43.

125) According to him, his interpretation, which follows his own punctuation, is below:

Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς  
 παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς,  
 δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων,  
 σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.  
 δεῖ πρῶτον κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες κτλ.

126) He suggested some Old Latin texts and also he showed that Matthew followed this punctuation. “The Gentile Mission,” 151. cf. Morna D. Hooker, *The Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*, 310.

. . .”<sup>127)</sup> As a conclusion, for him, 13:10 means that the Gospel should be preached ‘only’ among the Jews in diasporas and synagogues which are spread around the world,<sup>128)</sup> —not before the Last Days, but before they are arrested. In this interpretation, the Gentile mission is entirely eliminated from Mark’s Gospel.<sup>129)</sup>

The merit of this interpretation is that we can keep the unity of these verses. However, it has not accepted by most scholars,<sup>130)</sup> because of some problems in George D. Kilpatrick’s argument. Firstly, as George R. Beasley-Murray argues, if we read these verses together (verses 9 and 10), this sentence, when compared with the others in Mark 13, becomes abnormally long.<sup>131)</sup> Secondly, it is crucial to understand the character of Mark 13. If we accept George D. Kilpatrick’s interpretation, the temporal adverb, *πρῶτον*, means just ‘before’ you are arrested. If this is the case, verses 9–11 lose all their eschatological atmosphere.<sup>132)</sup>

However, it is not necessary to suspect the unity of these verses. Although, as Willi Marxsen and Dennis E. Nineham suggest, verses 9 and 11 and verse 10 look as if they have no relationship, we may indeed be able to see a connection between these verses. In verses

---

127) George D. Kilpatrick, “The Gentile Mission,” 152.

128) In this context, ‘the world’ means the territory of the Roman Empire. cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 767.

129) George D. Kilpatrick, “The Gentile Mission,” 149.

130) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 310.

131) George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 43.

132) cf. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 311.

9 and 11, Jesus predicts that his disciples would be persecuted. The reason for their tribulation is for no other reason than their faith in Jesus. Because of their faith and the gospel which Jesus proclaims from the beginning of the gospel and his disciples should preach, they have to be persecuted.<sup>133)</sup> Although it has been considered as an isolated verse, verse 10 is not at all independent in its meaning.

Furthermore, in relation to verse 8, it is possible to assume that in these verses the presupposed war or tribulation is not the general war or tribulation. However, in verse 9 Jesus tells his disciples that during this tribulation they will be stand before the governors and kings on account of him. As I have mentioned above, at the fall of Jerusalem more than a million Jews were killed by the Romans.<sup>134)</sup> What is the reason for their death? It is not their faith in Jesus but their nationality. However, in this discourse, it is clearly articulated that the reason for the persecution, which they will undergo, is their faith in Jesus. It is difficult to say that the prediction in verse 9-11 reflects the situation of Jerusalem after the Jewish war, namely it is a *vaticinium ex eventu*. We will return to this matter at verse 14.

---

133) George R. Beasley-Murray, "Second Thoughts on the Composition of Mark 13," *New Testament Studies* (1983), 416. *Jesus and the Last Days*, 369, 399.

134) Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 78-84.

### 3.3.3. Signs: Broken Relationships (12-13)

In the previous verses we have seen that the tribulations would be drawing closer and that even the readers of Mark would experience them. The difficulties are already upon the readers. In these verses such persecutions were getting severer than before. At last, the persecution will break up family relationships and Christians will become a source of antagonism to their families.<sup>135)</sup> However, this antagonism is not caused by a general phenomenon of the society which has been brought by a universal disintegration of the family, rather this will be, according to Mark, caused by family members' confessing that Jesus is the Christ.<sup>136)</sup> Some scholars understand that these verses reflect the situation of the church or Christianity in the first century.<sup>137)</sup>

This antagonism will even expand to include a wider social range. Whereas in verse 12 it will occur within one's family, in verse 13 Christians will be hated by all. As opposed to the former (which will be dealt with later), this latter phenomenon has been considered as showing a specific historical event. Some scholars suggest that the background for these verses is the persecution of Christians during Nero's period.<sup>138)</sup>

---

135) Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 271.

136) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 405.

137) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 310.

138) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 509. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 406. Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 22-23. Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 21.

About the Neronian persecution, Tacitus reports: "They first arrested those who openly confessed and then on their evidence an enormous crowd . . . was condemned" (Tacitus, *Annals*, 15.44.4.). This situation is very similar to what is being described in verse 12; one brother delivers the other brother to be killed.<sup>139)</sup> In addition, the Neronian persecution is the "first mass killing of Christians" and there is no such similar event in the forty years before or the hundred after it.<sup>140)</sup> Therefore, it could be said that verse 12 reflects this event.

According to Martin Hengel, there is one more thing to be considered about the Neronian persecution. Tacitus also says that Christians should, *odium humani generis* (hatred of the human race). Martin Hengel believes that it appears to fit in amazingly well with Mark 13:13.<sup>141)</sup> These two reports support that verse 12 and verse 13 come from the Neronian persecution.

However, the interpretation of Martin Hengel on Tacitus' report about the Neronian persecution does not explain all of verse 12. Martin Hengel contends that the 'brother' is not part of the blood family unit but of the family of the church; as Matthew uses ἀδελφός of fellow believers (e.g. Matthew 18:15, 21). He is correct in the sense that there was such

---

139) Martin Hengel said that this is done not by blood family but the family of the church. One brother believer betrays another and hands him over to the executioner. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 24.

140) Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 23.

141) Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 23. Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 21.



a use of this term in the early church. However, this term in verse 12 (ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον) should be interpreted in the relation to the following two words (πατὴρ τέκνον). Although it is possible to suppose that there was a relationship of brotherhood in the early church, it is not so easy to explain the relationship between 'father' and 'children' (cf. 1 Corinthians 4:15). Robert H. Gundry contends, that, using these titles found in the family, Mark emphasized the severity of the coming persecution.<sup>142)</sup>

In my view, it is not necessary to think that 'brother' in this verse refers to the relationship found in the early church. Rather it indicates the relationship among the family unit, such as father and children.<sup>143)</sup>

Although many scholars (as Martin Hengel does) suppose that Mark writes these verses in reminiscence of the Neronian persecution, it does not mean that it is Mark's own creation.<sup>144)</sup> Actually, there is a parallel between verse 12 and the contents of Micah 7:6.<sup>145)</sup> Using the old traditions transmitted to him, Mark adapted them to his contemporary

---

142) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 740.

143) Mark 13:12, Brother will betray brother to death, a father his child. Children will rebel against their parents.

144) Martin Hengel also agrees that this verse's formulation is based on Micah 7:6 and the prophetic apocalyptic tradition. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 24. cf. Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 461.

145) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 310. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 311-312. Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 24. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 740.

apocalypse.<sup>146)</sup> However, verse 12 does not fit well with Micah 7:6. Micah declares, "a man's enemies are the members of his own household," there is no mention of death at all. We can see a closer parallel in 1 Enoch 100:1-2, which says, "in those days, the father will be beaten together with his sons, in one place; and brothers shall fall together with their friends, in death . . . for a man shall not be able to withhold his hands from his sons nor from (his) sons' sons in order to kill them. . . . From dawn until the sun sets, they slay each other." If Mark, at least, has these two traditions in mind, it is possible that he combined them to give us verse 12. If Mark did use these traditions as sources when he wrote this chapter, it could suggest that Mark 13 is not Mark's unique creation at all.<sup>147)</sup>

### 3.3.4. Signs: Abomination of Desolation (14-20)

In this section, the tribulations, once more, are getting worse. Until now, in spite of the persecution, the readers of Mark might have been able to stay in the place where they have lived. However, in this part, the tone has changed. It is the time to escape the tribulations.

---

146) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 510.

147) Walter E. Bundy says, "This sentence is a simple religious assurance which is so general and non-sectarian that it could be used by Jew and Christian alike." *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 462. Morna D. Hooker thinks that a similar idea is found in 4 Ezra 6.25 and 7.27. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 313. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 740.

Mark's Jesus warns the readers that they must urgently flee to the mountains.

This phrase (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) has been not only one of the most difficult to interpret in Mark's gospel, but also has attracted the most attentions as being the verse which is the key to interpret Mark 13.<sup>148)</sup> Especially the phrase τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, which means the 'Abomination of Desolation' or 'Desolating Sacrilege'<sup>149)</sup> and has been considered to come from the LXX of Daniel.<sup>150)</sup> It is clearer in the parallel verse of Matthew (24:15). Here, Matthew adds a clause to make the meaning of Mark's text clearer: τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ. Matthew attributes the name of the prophet, Daniel, from whom Mark borrows the contents of verse 14.<sup>151)</sup> According to Robert H. Gundry, the place "where he ought not [to stand]" is not vague because, the temple is mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, there is a reference to Judea in the same verse, and there is an allusion to Daniel which clearly indicates the temple.<sup>152)</sup> Therefore, when this text was

---

148) William A. Such, "The Crux Criticorum of Mark 13:14," *Research Quarterly* 28 (1996), 108.

149) Lloyd Gaston asserts that the original meaning of this phrase must have meant "such an 'appalling sacrilege' as occurred at the time of Daniel." He also said that it could involve "an idol set up in the temple." Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 24-25. According to George R. Beasley-Murray this phrase could connote both the profanation and destruction of the temple, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 357.

150) Morna D. Hooker assumes that this phrase refers to the Zeus' altar set up by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 B.C. *A Commentary on The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 314; Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 112; Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 741; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 317-318.

151) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 60.

heard, the reader would recall<sup>153)</sup> “the deeds of Antiochus Epiphanes, when he transformed the temple of Jerusalem into a heathen temple” and “such actions inevitably provoked resistance, war, and ruin.”<sup>154)</sup> The place where the Abomination of Desolation stands (where he ought not) is the temple.

Therefore this phrase has been used to refer to the sign for which the disciples had asked in verse 4.<sup>155)</sup> Hugh Anderson points out that the disciples ask for the sign, τὸ σημεῖον, in the singular, not in the plural.<sup>156)</sup> The disciples did not ask for, “a mapping out of the events of the end-time but for a single sign in their own midst that God's purpose is about to be consummated.”<sup>157)</sup> William A. Such looks at the same word (as Hugh Anderson does) and reaches the conclusion that τὸ σημεῖον, as we have seen above, in verse 4 refers to τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως in

---

152) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 741. Edward Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 272-273. However, Desmond Ford lists three possible places. They are the temple, Jerusalem, and the land of Palestine. *The Abomination of Desolation*, 170.

153) Craig A. Evans said that most Jewish readers at the time that Daniel was published would have recognized its meaning. *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 318.

154) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 357; Nicholas H. Taylor, “Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II. The Markan Eschatological Discourse”, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 62 (1996), 15.

155) As I have shown earlier, the events in verses 5-13 have also been widely accepted as the signs requested by the disciples. In this way, many scholars tried to identify to what these events refer. This phrase has become the most important to their attempts to date Mark 13 by a particular event,

156) Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*. 291.

157) In this sentence he may think that the disciples ask about the chronological order of the events.

verse 14.<sup>158)</sup> However, he suggests that, in verses 5-13, Mark actually records many of the events which will precede the end-time<sup>159)</sup> and that the actual answer to the disciples' question occurs at verse 14, where William A. Such believes it forms the climax.<sup>160)</sup> The sign in verse 4 has much wider meaning; namely, it refers not only to the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 but also to the end of the world.<sup>161)</sup>

Thus the second clause (v.4b) is the key in essentially widening the perspective of v.4a and setting up vv.5-37: ταῦτα (v.4a) broadens to ταῦτα πάντα (v.4b), ἔσται (v.4a) expands to συντελεῖσθαι (v.4b) -- broadening the locale of the question.<sup>162)</sup>

William A. Such develops his idea on the assumption that Mark was written after the Jewish War.<sup>163)</sup> Although he believes that it was written after the Jewish War and, although this view is widely accepted, he concedes that it is only the most probable among many possible positions.

---

158) It is William A. Such's understanding of Hugh Anderson's words, "The Significance of ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ in Mark 13:4," 134-135. Also in his "The Crux Criticorum of Mark 13:14," 95.

159) William A. Such, "The Significance of ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ in Mark 13:4," 134-135.

160) William A. Such, "The Crux Criticorum of Mark 13:14," 99. George R. Beasley-Murray said, "It would seem that we have a *vaticinium ex eventu* as far as v.13 and genuine prophecy from v.14 onwards." Though he does not use the term 'peak' as William A. Such, for George R. Beasley-Murray this verse can be a watershed in Mark 13.

161) William A. Such, "The Significance of ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ in Mark 13:4," 152-153.

162) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 21.

163) William A. Such, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 2, 6.

On the contrary "the sacrilege of desolation (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως)" has been used to date Mark's gospel. Apart from the event in A.D. 70, there are several other candidates which could relate to the event behind this phrase's. For example, John A. T. Robinson has suggested four events:<sup>164)</sup> (1) the destruction of the temple and the holy city in A.D. 70.<sup>165)</sup> In August 70, the sanctuary was destroyed and it was desecrated by sacrifices ordered by Titus to the Roman standard<sup>166)</sup> (2) the Caligula crisis has also been suggested as a more probable events with which to fit with this verse.<sup>167)</sup> Samuel G. F. Brandon said.

The striking parallelism between Antiochus Epiphanes' act of desecration and that which was threatened by Caligula must have been as apparent to the Jew of the first century as it is to us, so that no more fitting

---

164) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 17-19. This four events are also mentioned as relevant events to the sacrilege desolation by Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 318-319. Desmond Ford lists six possibilities in *The Abomination of Desolation*, 157-175.

165) Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 37-39; Robert A. Guelich, 'Gospel of Mark,' *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospel* (ed.) Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downer Grove, Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 514; William A. Such, "The Significance of ΤΟ ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ in Mark 13:4," *Irish Biblical Studies* 13 (1991), 134-135; Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 159-163; c.f. According to John A. T. Robinson, this verse cannot itself refer to the destruction of the sanctuary in August 70 or to its desecration by Titus' soldiers in sacrificing to their standards. *Redating the New Testament* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1993), 16.

166) John A. T. Robinson believed that this is not written before the event, because it is impossible that the prophecy was not shaped by the event. *Redating the New Testament*, 16-17.

167) Nicholas H. Taylor, "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part I", 101-124; "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II", 13-41.



identification of the Abomination of Desolation can be found prior to A.D. 70 than that of the image which the Roman tyrant planned to place in the sanctuary of the temple.<sup>168)</sup>

However, John A. T. Robinson pays attention, not to the event itself, but to someone who was behind this event. For him, it is Satan who is referred to as 'the lawless one' by Paul in II Thessalonians 2:1-12.<sup>169)</sup> (3) the Zealots occupied the temple temporarily in A.D. 66 and permanently in A.D. 68. They even appointed the high priest.<sup>170)</sup> In the nineteenth century, this occupation was regarded as being the relevant event behind this phrase.<sup>171)</sup> However, as John A. T. Robinson notes, it does not explain the order to flee to the mountains, because it would

---

168) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 107-108. cf. Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 24-25; Edward Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 272-273; Nicholas H. Taylor, "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II", 18-19; c.f. Gerd Theissen admits that this verse could reflect the situation in A.D. 40. However, he thinks that this tradition is a later interpolation. *The Gospels in Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 260.

169) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 16-17. c.f. Werner Kelber also says, "This singular event of violence breaks the rules of grammar. The *eremosis* was fulfilled in its most radical, literal sense, and the *bdelygma* was impersonated by Satan himself. Satan has taken possession of the holy temple." *The Kingdom in Mark*, 120. In addition Francis Dewar thinks, "Judas, though a member of Jesus' chosen band of twelve, the very nucleus of the church on earth, is nevertheless the instrument of Satan which profanes it: he is to be seen 'where he ought not,' i.e. among the twelve." "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," *Theology* 64 (1961), 103.

170) Whereas John A. T. Robinson says that this occupation of the temple by the Zealots is the abomination in *Redating the New Testament*, 18, for Craig A. Evans the event that the Zealots appointed the high priest is the abomination in *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 319.

171) Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 159-160.



have been too late for 'a pre-war flight.' Furthermore, it does not explain the use of the masculine singular, because, if it is the event that Mark has in mind, it would have been written after the event.<sup>172)</sup> (4) The desecration which was caused by the procurator of Judea, Pontius Pilate. He attempted to march into Jerusalem with the Roman soldiers and their ensigns (or standards).<sup>173)</sup> Jesus might have know about this event before he describes it in this verse.<sup>174)</sup> However, this explanation has not been accepted, because it is difficult to know with any certainty what actually had happened.<sup>175)</sup>

Among these incidents, many recent scholars tend to account for this verse with the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.<sup>176)</sup> However, this is not certain. And we can find several problems with this assumption.

Firstly, in Mark's gospel, there is scarcely any allusion to the destruction of the temple.<sup>177)</sup> If this phrase does indicate the destruction of the temple, it must have already been destroyed and for the Roman standard to have been erected in this place. The temple was demolished by order of Titus. However, in this verse, it is difficult to discern any feeling that the demolition had already taken place.<sup>178)</sup> On this matter,

---

172) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 18.

173) Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2.9.2-3. John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 18.

174) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 318.

175) Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 158-159.

176) Most recent scholars who date Mark's gospel after the destruction of the temple might display such a tendency. c.f. footnote 135.

177) Nicholas H. Taylor, "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II," 17-19.

Benjamin W. Bacon argues that Mark's silence about the temple's destruction should not be taken as a conclusive reason to date this chapter before the war.<sup>179)</sup> Although his argument is partly right, a question still remains.

If 'the sacrilege of desolation' refers to the destruction of the temple and the events which follow that destruction<sup>180)</sup> and if, as Robert H. Gundry says, this ambiguous phrase would have been clearer in its original place,<sup>181)</sup> why does Mark use an ambiguous expression instead of a clear one?<sup>182)</sup> Do Mark's implied readers understand, without any difficulties, what he means when they hear these words? The answer should be 'yes.' Namely, we can say (at least) that, although it is rather unclear for us, it must have been originally clear to the Markan 'implied readers.' Therefore, it is helpful to verify the context and meaning of this phrase.

As I have shown above, it is widely accepted that this phrase comes from Daniel.<sup>183)</sup> Although Rudolf Pesch argues that there are many

---

178) Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 295.

179) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 67.

180) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 357.

181) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 771.

182) Gerd Theissen says, "the 'desolating sacrilege' is not rightly understood until it is seen as a reason for flight." *The Gospels in Context*, 128.

183) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 357; Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 107; Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 24-25; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 296; Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 401.

cases which in the LXX, ἐρημώσεως indicates destruction,<sup>184)</sup> Robert H. Gundry argues against him and asserts that this term in Daniel means an abomination that causes horror.<sup>185)</sup> The closest verbal parallel for the 'sacrilege of desolation' is Dan 12:11. He contends that:

[Daniel's verses] speak only of stopping the regular sacrifices and setting up a profanatory object—they say nothing about the destruction of the temple—and Dan 9:26-27 appears to put the Abomination of Desolation before the destruction.<sup>186)</sup>

As Robert H. Gundry argues, there is a big gap in the meaning of the 'sacrilege of desolation' as used by between Daniel and that used by Mark, – if Mark used it to mean the destruction of the temple. However, there is no reason to suppose that there was any shift in the meaning of this term.<sup>187)</sup> If this is the case, Mark's original readers must have understood this term as Daniel used it.

Secondly, Gerd Theissen examines the difference between verse 7 (ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε) and verse 14 (ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε). According to him, the former is the report of an event which has already happened; so "the addressees already 'heard.'" However, the latter indicates that an event

---

184) Rudolf Pesch says, "In der LXX ist in allen außer zwei Belegstellen (Lev 26,34f.; Esr 1,55, wo vom Sabbatjahr gehandelt wird) und der allgemeinen Wendung von Ps 72,19 mit ἐρημώσις immer von der Zerstörung der Hauptstadt und des Tempels (Jer 22,5 auch des Königspalastes) die Rede." *Naherwartungen*, 143.

185) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 772.

186) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 741.

187) Nicholas H. Taylor, "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II", 20.

which has not yet happened, but it about to happen.<sup>188)</sup> Samuel G. F. Brandon expresses the same idea: "The verbal construction of verses 14-19 indicates that the presence of the Abomination is a future contingency and so likewise the advice and observations which follow apply to future action."<sup>189)</sup> Furthermore, Willi Marxsen suggests that the verses 14b-27 speaks of events which had not yet occurred but were expected to do so shortly.<sup>190)</sup> These scholars' reading (that "when you see . . . ." indicates the future incident) is quite probable. I think it will become clearer as we progress through our analysis.

Thirdly, if this verse presupposes the destruction of the temple, the clause, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, hardly makes any sense. If the author himself experiences the Jewish war, then he will surely know the procedure of the war, which do not allow the Jewish people in the holy city and in Judea to flee to the mountains.<sup>191)</sup> Because, on the one hand, as Martin Hengel says, "the chances of fleeing from the city, which are not mentioned in the text, had already become nil at that stage, since Titus had set up the *circumvallatio* round the city."<sup>192)</sup> Whilst

---

188) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 131. According to George R. Beasley-Murray, Colani also believes this. George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd., 1957), 1.

189) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 107.

190) Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 184.

191) Robert A. Guelich, "Gospel of Mark," 514.

192) Martin Hengel even says, "the majority of the numerous refugees from Galilee and Judaea who sought refuge in Jerusalem perished in the city, and the rest became prisoners of Rome." *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 16-18. John A. T. Robinson,

on the other hand, Jerusalem in which the temple stands is on the mountain,<sup>193)</sup> making it impossible to follow the imperative to flee to the mountains in the literal sense of the words.

Therefore, if the prediction in verse 14 is a *vaticinium ex eventu*,<sup>194)</sup> so that ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε is an retrospective imperative for an event that has already happened, Mark would not give the inconsistent instruction to flee to the mountains.

Among the two events, the destruction of the temple and the Caligula crisis, I think, the latter reflects, comparatively well, the context of this text.<sup>195)</sup> Therefore, it is more probable to think that this verse might have been written between these two events, between A.D. 40 and A.D. 66.

As I have suggested above, if this phrase is related to any specific historical event, the Caligula crisis is the most probable.<sup>196)</sup> Edward Schweitzer comments on this view:

---

*Redating the New Testament*, 18. c.f. Edward Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 273.

193) Willi Marxsen, *Mark The Evangelist*, 182; George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 412.

194) Ched Myers argues that this is an example of *ex eventu* prophecy, which characterizes so much apocalyptic literature. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York, Maryknoll, 1990), 336.

195) Samuel G. F. Brandon says, "First there is the cabalistic reference to the Abomination of Desolation. The striking parallelism between Antiochus Epiphanes' act of desecration and that which was threatened by Caligula must have been as apparent to the Jew of the first century as it is to us, so that no more fitting identification of the Abomination of Desolation can be found prior to A.D. 70 than that of the image which the Roman tyrant planned to place in the sanctuary of the temple." *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 107-108.

196) Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 25.

In Daniel 9:27, "The Awful Horror" designates the pagan altar which was erected at that time upon the altar of burnt offering in the temple courtyard. The discussion which follows clearly indicates that here in Mark 13:14 the term refers to a person. Perhaps the seer expected a sacrilege similar to what Caligula planned when he ordered his statue to be set up in the temple.<sup>197)</sup>

But, assuming that he knew Daniel, it is not necessary to think that Jesus did not speak these words.<sup>198)</sup> It is uncertain whether the procurator Pilate's attempt was accomplished or not.<sup>199)</sup> However, if there was such an attempt, it is unlikely that Jesus did not know of it.<sup>200)</sup> Consequently, it is undeniable that Jesus, who already knew the Daniel tradition and of Pilate's attempt, could use draw upon this term for his prediction.<sup>201)</sup>

Therefore, what is the meaning behind the order to flee to the mountains? Willi Marxsen assumes that the place to which those who have seen the Abomination of Desolation should flee is Galilee and there they should await the coming of the Son of Man.<sup>202)</sup> However, it is unlikely to think that this instruction refers to Galilee. Against him,

---

197) Edward Schweitzer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 272-73.

198) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 320.

199) Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation*, 158.

200) As we can see in Luke 13:1-2, Jesus was not isolated from his contemporary events caused by this procurator.

201) Lloyd Gaston says that it could have been made by the early Christian prophets, *No Stone on Another*, 25.

202) Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 182-189.

Edward Schweizer argues that it is impossible for Mark to say 'flee into Galilee,' because "that is where the war between the Jews and the Romans began."<sup>203)</sup> Even if we can admit that it was possible to escape from Jerusalem after Titus had placed a siege around the city, to comply with this order, they would have had to go to the place where the war had begun. In my view, it is improbable that Mark's Jesus would have given such an inadequate instruction.

However, because people who are in Judea cannot flee to the mountains, it is more conceivable that this instruction is not an actual order which was intended to have been followed or one that was given to someone at a particular time and place.<sup>204)</sup> In addition to this, the motif to flee into the mountains is known not only of the Maccabaeen era<sup>205)</sup> but is present throughout the whole Old Testament tradition.<sup>206)</sup> Ched Myers asserts, "Mark's plea was probably patterned after the sudden departure for the hills in 1 Maccabees 2:28. But again he subverts the original discourse: . . . ."<sup>207)</sup> According to him, whereas in the 1 Maccabees they are fleeing to the mountain not to escape the

---

203) Edward Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 272-273.

204) If my view above is correct, because this order is given before the Jewish war, the impossibility of escape is caused by the location of Judea not by the siege of the Roman legions.

205) II Macc 5:27; I Macc 2:28. Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 17. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 315; Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 108.

206) Gen. 19:17ff.

207) Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 336.



persecution but to organize resistance, in Mark they are called to abandon the holy city.<sup>208)</sup>

This image of Mark's abandonment of the holy city lies closer to the story of Lot and his family in Genesis 19:17 who abandoned the city to escape the judgement of God in Sodom, rather than the Maccabean flight.<sup>209)</sup> Furthermore, in verse 16, the warning *μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω* recalls Lot's wife.<sup>210)</sup> The scene of Lot's escape from Sodom is more closely fits the text. Lot and his family were heard, "Flee for your lives! Don't look back, and don't stop anywhere in the plain! Flee to the mountains or you will be swept away! (καὶ ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἐξήγαγον αὐτοὺς ἔξω καὶ εἶπαν σώζων σώζε τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχὴν μὴ περιβλέψῃς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω μηδὲ στῆς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ εἰς τὸ ὄρος σώζου μήποτε συμπαραλημθῇς)" (Gen. 19:17ff) This can be especially seen in the use of the imperative, 'not to turn back,' and concerns Lot's wife, who turns back to become a salt pillar (Gen. 19:26) while she flees to the mountain.

---

208) Robert H. Gundry explains this difference between Maccabees and Mark. *Mark*, 773. Also Ched Myers has the same view. *Binding the Strong Man*, 336.

209) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 357, 412; Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 25; Vicky Balabanski, *Eschatology in the making: Mark, Matthew and the didache* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 89; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 315; Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 17; Benjamin W. Bacon, "The Apocalyptic Chapter of the Synoptic Gospel," 12; Craig, A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 321.

210) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 315; Benjamin W. Bacon, "The Apocalyptic Chapter of the Synoptic Gospel," *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 28 (1909), 12. In Luke 17:28-29 he explicitly mentions Lot's wife to warn his readers. Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 346.

This tradition would also have been well known to Mark. Therefore, as Ched Myers asserts, the order to flee into the mountains could have been used as a symbolic expression, recalling this tradition.<sup>211)</sup>

Therefore it can be said that verse 14 appears to be founded on the basis of a tradition found in Genesis 19:17. In addition to this, it is possible to assume that this tradition was also used in a later tradition which is in Daniel. If this is the case, it is not necessary to think that either the Abomination of Desolation or the command to flee into the mountains is associated with a specific historical event.<sup>212)</sup> Not only might the Caligula crisis have triggered the account recorded in Mark's gospel (because there was still fear that it could be happened again by his successors),<sup>213)</sup> but the other incident mentioned above could also have been the cause which prompted him.

Mark develops his narrative in verses 7-14. To do this, he uses two methods; firstly, he chronologically arranges the events. David Wenham correctly observes that:

There is obviously some sort of crescendo, as we move from the general disasters of war, famine, etc. (v. 8) to the disciples' sufferings (vv. 9-13) to the desolation of Jerusalem and the unparalleled disaster (vv. 14-20). . .

---

211) Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 335-336.

212) Nicholas H. Taylor supposes that this command reflect the Caligula crisis. "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II", 22. However, it is not necessary to suppose that this was composed just after this crisis, because it can be recalled anytime after this crisis.

213) Vicky Balabanski, *Eschatology in the making*, 89.

. But despite these observations it is hard to avoid the conclusion that there is some chronological progress within the section (vv. 5-23).<sup>214)</sup>

Mark's second method was to arrange this part so as the events escalate the atmosphere: from weaker to severe, from a distant peril to one which affected the family, and from general events to those affecting the Christians.

In verses 7-8 war, earthquake, and famine occurred in no specific area (cf. *κατὰ τόπους*). Therefore, even though these disasters could kill large number of people at a one moment, the readers do not feel the imminent danger of these disasters. They just hear the news of them in these verses. In verses 9-11 the danger comes closer. They are in danger of being delivered up and may be beaten, however, they are still alive. It gets worse, so that in verses 12-13, there is a mention of death caused by conflict within their (the Christian readers of Mark) own family. The serious danger is being realized. However, it is not the end yet (7: *οὕτω τὸ τέλος*) and they who endure until the end (13: *εἰς τέλος*) will be saved. Finally, in verse 14, the sign is seen. In verses 15-20, the danger is too close and too severe and they can no longer stand to be witnesses (10). They have to flee into the mountains (14).

From verse 15 to verse 20, Mark warns his readers what they have to do during the Last Days in detail. In these verses, we can find the urgency of the incident described in verse 14, where in verses 15-

---

214) David Wenham, "This Generation will not Pass . . ." 128.

17, Mark alludes to “a sudden invasion or uprising.”<sup>215)</sup> Ched Myers states that “the notion to fleeing without time to pack possessions” reflects the situation of the wartime refugees.<sup>216)</sup> For him verses 15-16 does not allude to the sudden cosmic intervention; rather it simply indicates that Mark writes these verses “from the standpoint of the countryside.”<sup>217)</sup> In these verses, however, it is not a matter of where the place is, because Mark appears not to want to refer to the place; whether in the holy city or in the rural districts. Furthermore, the details in these verses do not fit the events of the 60s and 70s.<sup>218)</sup> Here, he just draws upon traditions which were well known and which could articulate his ideas about the Last Days;<sup>219)</sup> the urgency of those days.<sup>220)</sup> As Charles E. B. Cranfield says, these verses (15-16) vividly show the need for haste.<sup>221)</sup> Therefore, it is not necessary to think that this urgency is caused ‘by some horror in Jerusalem,’ rather than ‘by the parousia of the Son of Man.’<sup>222)</sup>

---

215) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 315.

216) Charles E. B. Cranfield also believes so. *The Gospel According to St Mark*, 403.

217) Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 336. Walter E. Bundy also thinks that it reflects not Jerusalem but the rural districts. *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 464.

218) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 321; Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 16-17.

219) Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 17.

220) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 321.

221) Charles E. B. Cranfield also believes so. *The Gospel According to St Mark*, 403.

222) Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 464.

In such an urgent situation, which is illustrated in verses 15-16 "the women who are pregnant and who nurse infants" should meet great difficulties when they flee into the mountains. They cannot drop their burden and run.<sup>223)</sup> For them, even including the women who are pregnant and who nurse infants, this time will be most difficult. Verses 15-17, therefore, show the urgency of the time when the Abomination of Desolation is standing where it should not be.

However, although the listener should urgently flee from their house, their field and their city, the tribulation which will follow is so severe (19) that no one would be able to bear it, if God does not shorten it (20).

### 3.3.5. Signs: False Christs and False Prophets (21-23)

With the verses 5b-6 the verses 21-22 have been considered as an *inclusio*, because these two parts deal with the deception.<sup>224)</sup> Jan Lambrecht, in particular, compares, not only the contents of these two parts, but also their vocabularies and shows that they share many common aspects.<sup>225)</sup> These verses have been considered as a reiteration

---

223) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 322.

224) Kenneth Grayston, "The Study of Mark XIII," 375; Dean B. Deppe, "Charting the Future or a Perspective on the Present?" 92-93; John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 242; Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 79.

225) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 173. He also thinks that verses 5-23 is a redaction made by the evangelist who wants to show the answer to the question in verse 4.

of the previous warning concerning the people who will deceive many.<sup>226)</sup> However, it has to be considered that there are several differences between these two parts.

Firstly, the deceivers are different from the deceivers who are in verse 6. In verse 6, (as mentioned above), many would come and claim that they are the messiah and usurp his name. These are the false christs, who are also found in verse 22. However, Mark includes others to this verse. They are false prophets (ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται). Here, they will not come alone. They will rather accompany with the false christs.<sup>227)</sup> Their influence is stronger than before, because the false christs are not alone. It seems that the deception in verse 22 is severer than the one in verse 6.

Here we can also find another difference. The false christs and false prophets are not just duping the people with their words. They will perform signs and miracles to deceive. This does not appear in verse 5-6.<sup>228)</sup> In the Old Testament tradition the combination of 'signs and wonders' is not particularly strange.<sup>229)</sup> Using this well know idiom, Mark warns his reader that this deception will be severer, because those deceiving are equipped with more powerful and attractable methods.

---

226) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 112, Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 297.  
Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 466.

227) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 744; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*, 317; Craig A. Evans, *Mark*, 323.

228) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 778.

229) Craig A. Evans, *Mark*, 323. (Deut. 28:46; 29:3; 34:11; Isa. 8:18)

Thirdly, the object of the deception has been changed. In verse 6, it is said that the deceivers will deceive πολλούς. This is not a specific group. On the contrary, in verse 22, the false christs and false prophets will not deceive just πολλούς. Mark makes it clear who is the target of such deception. They are τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς; 'the elect.' Robert H. Gundry understands that the phrase, 'if possible,' is placed here to emphasize the danger or deception, and it means that the elect, who are the true disciples, will not be succumb, even though they perform the signs and wonders.<sup>230)</sup>

However, if we consider what Mark actually wants to say here, this does not make sense. When it is taken into account that the atmosphere has escalated (as I have shown above), since the war and the rumor of the war are heard, this verse also portrays that the deception is getting severer and that the target group is getting smaller, narrowing down to a specific group; the elect. The signs and wonders which might be performed by the deceivers shows that their challenges would be severer than before. According to Mark, it would be so serious and strong that even the elect could be led astray. Then, finally Mark writes what he wanted to say here; this things might happen, if they do not watch out.

Consequently, it is possible to say that, whereas in verses 5-6 the deception is not so serious, it gets steadily more serious during the

---

230) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 744, 778.



later part of the first half of this chapter. The time has passed and the situation has changed. The situation is much more difficult than before.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

In this first half of the chapter 13 we can say three things as a conclusion of Chapter IV.

Firstly, Mark 13, as with other parts of his gospel, was not Mark's unique creation. The author of Mark drew upon various traditions and sources which were familiar to his contemporaries. They included both the Old Testament traditions and the Jesus traditions. Although he did not write down every source that he had, he mainly depended on the sources. Therefore some of his ideas can be found in other contemporary writings.

Secondly, this part is written in chronological order.<sup>231)</sup> As we have seen above, whereas some scholars assume that this chapter was written without considering the chronological order, it is in fact chronological. Mark carefully arranged the events which would happen in the Last Days. According to him, the difficult events would first occur in a distant place, and it get ever closer. At last, it would come upon the people who read Mark's gospel. Verses 5-8 describe how the events

---

231) David Wenham, "'This Generation will not Pass . . .': A Study of Jesus' Future Expectation in Mark 13," in *Christ the Lord*, edited by Donald Guthrie (Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1982), 129.

were heard as a rumor, however, from verse 9, the events would be experienced by the readers themselves. The one who experiences these difficulties were 'you' not 'them.'

Thirdly, in this part, we can find some escalation of mood which makes the reader feel the events that he narrates are getting closer and severer.<sup>232)</sup> The arrangement of the events in the latter half of this chapter makes the reader expect something was about to happen. Therefore, William R. Telford correctly states:

This catalogue of catastrophes reaches its climax in the words of 13:26 where the reader is told "then (tote) they will see the Son of Man coming in (the) clouds with great power and glory."<sup>233)</sup>

Mark appears to have elaborately arranged his sources in order to make his readers reach the climax which is revealed in the latter half of the chapter.

---

232) David Wenham, "'This Generation will not Pass . . .,'" 129. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 756.

233) William R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical analysis of the cursing of the Fig Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1980), 217-218.

## CHAPTER 5

### MARK 13:24-37

In verses 5-23 Jesus listed several things which would occur before the Last Days. In this section Jesus answered one of his disciples' questions, what the sign is. As we have considered in the previous chapter, these verses seem to deal with the phenomena which are related to the Last Days. These do not seem to come from Mark himself but from the old traditions, including Old Testament. With Jesus' saying that the "things that will precede the end and that might arouse false eschatological expectation" Mark finishes the first section of the discourse.<sup>1)</sup>

---

1) David Wenham, "'This Generation will not Pass . . .': A Study of Jesus' Future Expectation in Mark 13," in *Christ the Lord*, edited by Donald Guthrie (Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1982), 128. cf. William L. Lane thinks that verse 23 completes the answer to the question which is in verse 4. *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B.

These events in the first section can also be seen to parallel some Old Testament traditions.<sup>2)</sup> In this way, Mark is showing that the moment when such events occur indicates that the Last Days are getting close. He arranges his materials in chronological order.<sup>3)</sup> All the verses of the first half of Mark 13 are deliberately arranged so as to direct the reader to the later part, verses 24–37, which contains the details of the Last Days themselves. This second part is where Jesus answers the other question posed by his disciples.<sup>4)</sup>

## 1. WHEN IS THE DAY?

In the second part, Mark's Jesus says two things: the time of the Last Days (when are the Last Days?) and the character of the Last Days (how are they coming?).<sup>5)</sup> In these verses there are two things to be considered: one being the celestial events and the Son of Man's coming (24–27) and the other being the two parables (the fig tree [28–29], and the doorkeeper [35–37]).

---

Eerdmans, 1974), 473.

2) I have dealt this matter in the previous chapter.

3) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 330. Taking a wider perspective, the event described in the first half might happen first, which is then followed by the event shown in the second half.

4) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 405.

5) David Wenham, "Appendix A: Mark 13:24–27 not the Second Coming?," in *Christ the Lord*, edited by Donald Guthrie (Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1982), 127–150, in 138.

### 1.1. What will happen in the Last Days (24-27)?

After Mark describes the signs which will occur before the Last Days (in verses 5b-23), he begins to give an answer to the disciples' questions (found in verse 3-4).<sup>6)</sup> Verse 24 begins with *ἀλλά*. According to Alan H. McNeile,<sup>7)</sup> this conjunctive (*ἀλλά*) "adds a note of encouragement: the tribulation will be terrible but the parousia will follow it at once." As he notes, these verses have been considered as referring to the Last Days.<sup>8)</sup> Verses 24-25, especially, seem to act as a prologue to them.<sup>9)</sup> If we accept that the events in Mark 13:1-23 are chronologically arranged, the Last Days (verse 26, Jesus' second coming) will come with (or just after) the celestial events (24-25).

In these verses Mark is describing three events: (1) the celestial events (verses 24-25, referring to the Sun, the Moon, the stars, and the heavenly bodies) (2) the coming of the Son of Man (verse 26) (3) and his work to gather the elect (verse 27). This part has been considered as imagery of the Last Days and that the coming of the Son of Man forms

---

6) Allan McNicol, "The Lesson of the Fig Tree in Mark 13:28-32: A Comparison between Two Exegetical Methodologies," *Research Quarterly* 27 (1984), 193-207, 201. However, in these verses Mark shows several things which will occur before the parousia itself. In verse 24-25 Mark illustrates the scene of the parousia.

7) Alan H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan, 1915), 352.

8) William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 447; Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung* (Rom: Rāpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1967), 179.

9) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 176. He said, "Nun ist aber in den vv. 24-25 das Vorspiel der Ankunft von V. 26 Beschrieben."

the core of the last event.<sup>10)</sup> The events which are illustrated in these verses have been understood to be, not only the climax of the eschatological drama, but also the conclusion of the previous half of this chapter.<sup>11)</sup> Therefore, this chapter has to be interpreted by the “culminating paragraph on the Parousia in vv.24–7.”<sup>12)</sup> However, there has been (as considered in chapter 2) a challenge to this interpretation.<sup>13)</sup>

Now it is, therefore, necessary to address two questions which arise from these verses in order to interpret the whole chapter. The first concerns the character of these verses, which show the celestial portents (darkening of the Sun and the Moon and the falling of the stars from sky) and the coming of the Son of Man to gather the elect. According to Vincent Taylor, “the celestial portents are common features in apocalyptic writings.”<sup>14)</sup> Are these verses, then, describing an apocalyptic phenomenon?

---

10) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 406.

11) Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels: An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955), 467. Also Dennis E. Nineham says, “The climax of the whole apocalyptic drama is here described in language almost entirely derived from the Old Testament.” *The Gospel of St Mark*, The Pelican New testament Commentaries (Middlesex/New York/Victoria: Penguin Books, 1963), 356. cf. Morna D. Hooker, “Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?” in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 162–163.

12) John A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming: Introduction* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 118.

13) Thomas R. Hatina, In his article, he argues that these verses are not describing the apocalypse, but rather they were written as paraenesis. “The Focus of Mark 13:24–27: The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6 (1996), 43–66.

14) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 2nd edition (London: Macmillan, 1966), 517.

or is it, as some scholars argues, describing another actual historical event?

The second question concerns the identity of the Son of Man. Many things related to the interpretation of this term have been argued over last century. Although, as a result, many possible theories have been suggested, there remains no consensus among the scholars.<sup>15)</sup> To understand these verses these two questions have to be answered.

### 1.1.1. Prelude of the Event (24-25)

Concerning the first question, the traditional view, maintained until now by many scholars, is that the celestial portents (in verses 24-25) foretell the parousia and the final event.<sup>16)</sup> However recently (as shown in chapter 3), this interpretation has been challenged by some scholars, such as; Marcus J. Borg, Nicholas T. Wright, Richard T. France and so on .<sup>17)</sup>

---

15) Geza Vermes express it: "The debate is still in progress and the battle is not yet won." He has used this expression from 1978 ("The 'Son of Man' Debate," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 1 [1978], 27) to 2003 (*Jewish in His Jewish Context*, [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003], 88).

16) Thomas R. Hatina says about this tendency of the scholars: "there appears to be unanimous agreement by those who hold this view that vv. 24-27 predict the parousia and the final judgment," "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 50.

17) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God*, vol. 2 (London: S.P.C.K., 1996); Richard T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and his Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971), 139-148; *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002).



Thomas Hatina argues that these verses are not related to an apocalypse, stating that he cannot find any apocalyptic characteristics in them.<sup>18)</sup> He believes that the genre of Mark 13 is not apocalyptic but a paranesis. Consequently, he finds it improbable to think of it relating to the Last Days. Rather he contends that this chapter foretells the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70.<sup>19)</sup> He also says:

Prophetic statements in parenetic material are primarily concerned with historical events, and find their fulfillment in the experiences of those who survive the teacher or patriarch giving the exhortation. Likewise in this narrative, the Markan Jesus is applying the prophecies of imminent suffering and chaos to his disciples.<sup>20)</sup>

In addition, he thinks that similar prophecies to those found in verses 24-27 can also be found in the Old Testament books, such as Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Amos.<sup>21)</sup> Because of this continuity, he asserts that when Mark's readers (or audiences) read (or heard) these verses (the darkness of the Sun, Moon, and stars) they recognized these verses

---

18) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27: The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6 (1996), 43-66. in 47. The point that Thomas Hatina says is partly correct. Actually the apocalyptic character is hardly found in this chapter. I have mentioned it in the previous chapter.

19) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 44.

20) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 48.

21) Morna D. Hooker thinks that the confusion of the historical with the supernatural is often found in Old Testament. *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its use in St Mark's Gospel* (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), 150.

as being part of a series of Old Testament prophecies.<sup>22)</sup> This is especially applicable to Amos' prophecy concerning the destruction of the sanctuary, caused by the people's sin (Amos 8:9). He suggests that it "closely resembles the prophecy in Mic 3:6, 12 where the destruction of both Jerusalem and the Temple are also metaphorically described using the imagery of darkness."<sup>23)</sup> If so, for Mark's implied readers (or audiences), they "may have understood the coming of the Son of Man as a reference to divine judgment upon Jerusalem and the Temple establishment." This means that these celestial events should be understood as occurring at the end of one age which leads to another, and is not about the end of history.<sup>24)</sup> Thomas Hatina's position, that the concept of the darkness of the celestial bodies comes from the Old Testament<sup>25)</sup> and that this universal catastrophe indicates the divine judgment of God, is probable.<sup>26)</sup>

However, if the darkening of the celestial bodies is related to the destruction of the temple, a question arises: if verses 24-27, as Craig A.

---

22) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 44.

23) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 56-57.

24) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 57.

25) Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," *Theology* 64 (1961), 104. William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 474-475. Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001). 348; Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its use in St Mark's Gospel* (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), 158-159; John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 247.

26) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 2nd edition (London: Macmillan, 1966), 517.

Evans suggests,<sup>27)</sup> describe the destruction of the temple, what are the things listed in verses 5-23 saying about? If verses 24-27 are related to the destruction of the temple, verses 5-23 should therefore describe those events which had occurred before the temple's destruction. However, as even Craig A. Evans himself pointed out, many of the details in these verses do not agree with the actual historical events. In addition, many scholars accept these verses as relating to general eschatological phenomena.<sup>28)</sup>

Some scholars have also looked for other explanations. Ben Witherington III suggests that the "signs in the heavens are commonly associated in the OT with the Day of the Lord (Isa. 13:10; 34:4; Ezek. 32:7-8; Joel 2:10, 31; 3:15; cf. Rev. 6:12-14; 8:12)."<sup>29)</sup> Edward Adams also expresses a similar view: "It is true that none of the Old Testament texts on which Mark 13:24-25 draw concern the coming of God. Rather they are about the day of the Lord."<sup>30)</sup> However, it is not certain that the day of the Lord can be related to the coming of God to earth.

---

27) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 328.

28) Archibald M. Hunter, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (Kent: Staples Printed Ltd., 1949), 124; Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," 101; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, The New Century Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, 1976), 292; George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), 395

29) Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 347.

30) Edward Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel," *Tyndale Bulletin* 56.2 (2005), 57.

Ben Witherington III contends that, “signs in the heavens are commonly associated in the OT with the Day of the Lord.”<sup>31)</sup> Edward Adams, although makes a distinction between the terms, ‘the Day of Lord’ and ‘the coming of God,’ reaches the same conclusion. Edward Adams appears not to assume that the coming of God is to be naturally expected in the Day of Lord. Rather, he looks to the verb σαλεύω which meant ‘shaking’ (verse 25).<sup>32)</sup> According to Edward Adams, this verb is not found in those Old Testament passages which are considered to be related to verses 24-25.<sup>33)</sup> However, as George R. Beasley-Murray notes, it is a standard term in Old Testament descriptions of theophanies.<sup>34)</sup> He argues that “the theophany is always from heaven to the world of human-kind.”<sup>35)</sup> Jan Lambrecht also suggests that the shaking of the celestial bodies were caused by the superior power of the Son of Man.<sup>36)</sup> Although he does not explicitly mention the relationship between shaking of the celestial bodies and the coming of the Son of Man, he seems to suppose that the shaking of the celestial bodies would be caused by the theophany.<sup>37)</sup> Furthermore, by Mark’s time, in Jewish pseudepigraphal

---

31) Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 347.

32) Edward Adams, “The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel,” 57.

33) Edward Adams, “The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark’s Gospel,” 57.

34) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days* (Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993), 424; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 328.

35) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 430.

36) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 183.

37) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 176.

texts, the images of cosmic darkening was usually related to the end of history (e.g. *2 Apoc. Bar.* 32:1; *1 Enoch* 1:3-9; 102:1-3; *Sib. Or.* 3:80-92; 675-81; *T. Mos.* 10:5).<sup>38)</sup> In this view, it is most probable that, as Edward Adams believes, this verb strongly indicates the idea of God's coming.<sup>39)</sup>

In this view, Jan Lambrecht correctly states that, "Nun ist aber in den vv. 24-25 das Vorspiel der Ankunft von v. 26 Beschrieben."<sup>40)</sup>

### 1.1.2. The Event: The Coming of the Son of Man (verses 26-27)

In these two verses, Mark records what will happen following the celestial catastrophe (verses 24-25); the Son of Man will come upon clouds and he will send angels to gather the elect from the four winds (verses 26-27). This event will not be hidden,<sup>41)</sup> since Mark's Jesus teaches that men will see his coming (καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον) (verse 26). This event is also mentioned in Mark 14:62, when Jesus answers the high priest's question. Here, he uses the second plural 'you' will see (ὄψεσθε), which means that it will be done overtly, in public.

To interpret this verse, several questions have usually been asked: (1) Was the phrase 'the Son of Man' used by Jesus himself? (is it

---

38) Edward Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel," 56.

39) Edward Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel," 57.

40) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 176. Also Craig A. Evans says that verse 26-27 is the conclusion of verses 14-25, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 303.

41) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 406.

authentic); (2) Does it come from Daniel 7 or some other source? (its origin); (3) To whom does the term 'the Son of Man' refer in Mark 13:26? (its meaning); (4) What is the purpose of his coming in the same verse?; and so on.

#### 1.1.2.1. The Authenticity of the Son of Man Title

The first question is related to the authenticity of this verse. Many scholars have argued about this matter for a long time and its authenticity has been suspected.<sup>42)</sup> Some scholars who suspect its authenticity have thought that this term derived from other sources, such as the Jewish apocalyptic tradition,<sup>43)</sup> or that it was created by the early church.<sup>44)</sup> Consequently, this term, especially when it is related to apocalyptic sayings, has sometimes been rejected as being inauthentic.<sup>45)</sup>

---

42) Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic tradition*, translated by John Marsh, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963); Heinz E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, translated by Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1963); Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

43) R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic tradition*, 122; Heinz E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, 35-36.

44) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 517; Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 123; A. J. B. Higgins, *The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 39 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 79; Norman Perrin, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 10-22.

45) They thought that only the non-apocalyptic sayings could be authentic. In his article Edward Schweizer insisted that the parousia sayings were created by a Jewish-apocalyptic group in the early church, "The Son of Man Again." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962), 259-260.

Heinz E. Tödt argues that, "The saying in Mark 13:26f. is alien to Jesus' own teaching in so far as no authentic saying of Jesus refers to a scriptural saying concerning the Son of Man, whether it be Dan. 7:13f. or any other apocalyptic passage in the scriptures."<sup>46)</sup> Such saying sources were drawn upon by the early church (or the evangelists) and were placed in their present positions. However, only the suffering Son of Man was not the invention of the early church. Nevertheless, Thomas Kazen argues that its use in the Old Testament traditions shows that it was already formulated before the gospels.

Jesus responds to a scriptural reference concerning Elijah, with another reference to the suffering of the Son of Man. This tradition does not necessarily result from a fusion of various sonship, prophet and servant motifs from the Hebrew Bible, but may simply reflect a collective understanding of the Son of Man in Daniel.<sup>47)</sup>

Although he assumes that this term was already formulated in the Old Testament traditions, he believes that it was not used by Jesus, but that it was attributed to him by the early church.

Experiences of his resurrection and continued spiritual presence modified their vision of the kingdom and triggered a re-interpretation in which

---

46) Heinz E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, 35. cf. Morna D. Hooker said that it is much more reasonable to think that this term comes from Daniel, "Is the Son of Man problem really insoluble?" 18.

47) Thomas Kazen, "The Coming Son of Man Revisited," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5 (2007), 167.



exalted and coming Son of Man sayings were understood as promises of a future fulfilment of Jesus' kingdom vision through his personal return.<sup>48)</sup>

John Ross also refers to this tendency in the early church: "There is a tendency for the evangelists to put this term, the Son of Man, on Jesus' lips."<sup>49)</sup>

A further reason to think that this term was not authentic is that it was always used in gospels always by Jesus in the third person. Delbert Burkett states:

Third-person speech referring to Jesus would be most natural if someone other than Jesus were speaking not *as* him but *about* him. The simplest explanation of the third-person language is therefore that it represents the language of the church speaking about Jesus.<sup>50)</sup>

Delbert Burkett also suggests another reason why this term could come not from Jesus but from the early church.<sup>51)</sup> He looks at the fact that, except for Acts 7:56, outside the gospels there is no other instance of its use.<sup>52)</sup> He suggests that it is drawn from the Palestinian Christian tradition.

---

48) Thomas Kazen, "The Coming Son of Man Revisited," 173.

49) J. M. Ross, "Son of Man," *Irish Biblical Studies* 13 (1991), 189.

50) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 39.

51) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 123.

52) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 50-56.

While most of the New testament represents the legacy of Hellenistic Christianity outside of Palestine, the Gospels and the early chapters of Acts retain traces of Palestine tradition.<sup>53)</sup>

Because Delbert Burkett views all of Jesus' sayings as being inauthentic, he argues that this term has been attributed to Jesus by Palestinian Christianity

However, the assumption that this term comes from Daniel 7:13 and has been adopted by the early church has been challenged by some scholars.<sup>54)</sup> Maurice Casey contends that this term should not be the reason to suppose that there is a relationship between Mark 13 and Daniel 7:13.<sup>55)</sup> Furthermore, he challenges Delbert Burkett's conclusion that the absence of the Son of Man saying in other New Testament writings is a reason to think that it was created by the early church. Maurice Casey asserts that this idea is based upon a misunderstanding of the situation of the first century church. Delbert Burkett's position can only be correct if Palestinian Christianity was an entirely isolated sect who could keep its tradition exclusive. However, this is actually not the case. From the early period, people from this community (or church)

---

53) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 123.

54) Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's reading of the Gospel* (London: Collins, 1973), 185-186; William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 476; Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and influence of Daniel 7* (London: S.P.C.K., 1979), 157; Ragnar Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972), 248.

55) Maurice Casey, *Son of Man*, 157.

could visit other communities (or churches) outside Palestine (cf. Acts 11:19–20, 23; 21:10; Galatians 2:1, 11). Consequently, even if this term did first belong to Palestinian Christianity, it would not have remained exclusive to it for long.

In addition, if this term was used as a title for Jesus, it is highly unlikely that it was exclusively preserved only in Palestinian Christianity. As we can see from Acts and the Pauline letters, the early church period of Palestinian Christianity influenced Hellenistic Christianity.

Whereas Delbert Burkett's explanation can possibly explain the lack of the term in the earlier writings of New Testament, it cannot explain their omission from the later writings.<sup>56)</sup> Therefore, the fact that the early church did not use this term cannot be used as evidence that it was created by the early church. Nevertheless, it could indicate that this term was not widely accepted as a messianic title.<sup>57)</sup>

Some scholars accept the possibility that the Son of Man saying was authentic.<sup>58)</sup> George R. Beasley-Murray states that it could have been used by the historical Jesus, although he concludes that it was not an *ipsissima verba* of Jesus.<sup>59)</sup> Differing slightly from his position, Morna

---

56) Ragnar Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972), 254.

57) Morna D. Hooker argued that, "Is the Son of Man problem really insoluble?" 158–159.

58) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 387–390. Brian M. Nolan, "Some Observations on the Parousia and New testament Eschatology," *ITQ* 36 (1969), 294, 296. Ragnar Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," 244, 264. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last days*, 432.

D. Hooker believes that it was unlikely to have been created by the early church.<sup>60)</sup> However, she does not appear to think that all the Son of Man sayings were authentic. For her, the eschatological sayings are likely to be the authentic words of Jesus, because, for the other sayings, it is possible to identify their *Sitz im Leben* in the faith of the early Church. It is also possible to trace the process of their attribution to Jesus.<sup>61)</sup> Consequently, according to her, all the sayings (except the eschatological sayings) have to be attributed to the early church.<sup>62)</sup>

However, although this question has been researched by many scholars, the argument is set to continue into the future because we do not have sufficient evidence from which to make a firm conclusion.<sup>63)</sup> At this stage, it is, therefore, difficult for me to conclude on the authenticity of the term, the Son of Man.

Now it has to be remembered, as Jan Lambrecht notes, that Mark used this term here.<sup>64)</sup> Although it is not clear whether Jesus used it or the early church created it, it is certain that Mark used it, in

---

59) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last days*, 432.

60) Morna D. Hooker, "There is no sign of a creative 'Son of Man' theology in the Church; and the pattern which we have discovered in the Marcan sayings suggests that they are more coherent, and therefore less likely to be the accidental products of the community, than is often supposed." *The Son of Man in Mark*, 183.

61) Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 182–183.

62) Morna D. Hooker, "Is the Son of Man problem really insoluble?" 158–159.

63) Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 78. Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 123.

64) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 179.

several places, as if they were the authentic words of Jesus. The more issue is the way that Mark uses it to refer to someone. This is the next question to be dealt with.

#### 1.1.2.2. Where does the Son of Man come from?

Various explanations have been suggested by many scholars. One is that this term was used as a title. They believe that it was created or designed to express a christological meaning. Therefore, as Delbert Burkett and Thomas Kazen assert, it was created or developed by the early church.<sup>65)</sup> Norman Perrin believes that it was drawn from traditions prior to Mark which Mark adapted and used it for his own purpose,<sup>66)</sup> in order to correct an alternative christology.<sup>67)</sup> He not only redacted and developed such traditions, but also created new traditions to reach the heart of his christology.<sup>68)</sup> He concludes that all the Son of Man sayings in Mark are the Markan creations.<sup>69)</sup> To sum up, initially, the Son of Man was not a christological title, however, Mark incorporated this term in his work where it developed into a christological title.<sup>70)</sup> Therefore, this term

---

65) Norman Perrin, "The Use of *(Para)didonai* in Connection with the Passion of Jesus in the New testament Postscript," *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 103, 121; Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 122-123.

66) Norman Perrin, "The Use of *(Para)didonai* . . .," 117.

67) Norman Perrin, "The Use of *(Para)didonai* . . .," 112-115.

68) Norman Perrin, "The Use of *(Para)didonai* . . .," 116.

69) Norman Perrin, "The Use of *(Para)didonai* . . .," 113, 21.

70) Norman Perrin, "The Use of *(Para)didonai* . . .," 115.

can be understood to be used by Mark as a specifically christological title in his gospel.

Delbert Burkett concurs, suggesting that this term functions as a general title for Jesus as the Christian Messiah.<sup>71)</sup> The basis for his insistence is Norman Perrin's hypothesis. According to Norman Perrin, the fact that there are four groups of the Son of Man sayings (earthly, suffering, exalted, and the coming Son of Man) and that in all these four categories the term Son of Man appears, indicates that "those who used this term felt it to be an appropriate messianic title for Jesus at any stage of his career."<sup>72)</sup>

In his recent article, Thomas Kazen suggests another explanation. He argues that this term was used by those Christians who kept the suffering Son of Man (which came from the Daniel tradition) in mind.<sup>73)</sup> The tradition of the suffering Son of Man, which is mentioned in these verses might "reflect a collective understanding of the Son of Man in Daniel."<sup>74)</sup> According to him, this term was revised by Jesus' disciples following his death and resurrection. After these events, the Danielic tradition was re-interpreted so that its former collective meaning was

---

71) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 122.

72) Delbert Burkett. *The Son of Man Debate*, 122.

73) Thomas Kazen believed that this understanding of the Son of Man could explain the Elijah saying in Mark 9:11-13. "The Coming Son of Man Revisited," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5 (2007), 167.

74) Thomas Kazen, "The Coming Son of Man Revisited," 167.

replaced by its application to Jesus.<sup>75)</sup> Thomas Kazen's thought is almost the same as Delbert Burkett's.<sup>76)</sup>

In these three scholars' views, although there are a few differences in detail, they all agree that it was used as a title by the early Christian community and, therefore, they do not accept the authenticity of the term. However, there is a problem to be solved: if it was used as a title for Jesus, why was it not used in the other New Testament books (except for the gospels and Acts)?<sup>77)</sup> Because further examination will overlap with the question relating to what this title refers to, it will be considered below.

#### 1.1.2.3. What does the Son of Man refer to?

Contrary to the view that the Son of Man was used as a title by the early Christian community, some scholars, who accept its authenticity, insist that this term was used by Jesus to refer to himself; Johannes Weiss is one of them. According to Johannes Weiss, it is not simply a term for self-designation, it was later chosen for a special purpose.<sup>78)</sup> Using this term, Jesus implies that he will be the Son of Man. According to Johannes Weiss, Jesus' use of this title seems to be a claim, rather

---

75) Thomas Kazen, "The Coming Son of Man Revisited," 172-173.

76) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 50-56.

77) This question has been dealt with above when the authenticity of this term has been addressed.

78) Johannes Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1971), 118.



than an actual self-designation.<sup>79)</sup> For him, it is, therefore, a natural process: "Jesus *is* a prophet. But he is to *become* the Son of Man."<sup>80)</sup>

Joachim Jeremias also expresses the same idea. However, instead of investigating the purpose of the title (as Johannes Weiss did), Joachim Jeremias considered of Jesus' use the term Son of Man in the third person. According to him, Jesus distinguished between himself and the Son of Man.<sup>81)</sup> This distinction is not between the two separate figures, however, but between his present state and the future state of exaltation.<sup>82)</sup> Jesus, therefore, believed that he would *become* a Son of Man when the kingdom of God would be completed in the future.<sup>83)</sup> This view has been followed by some scholars.<sup>84)</sup>

However, if this view is correct, a question arises. In the use of the term, how many times does the term relate to the future? There are actually some 'the Son of Man' sayings which are used in the eschatological context (for example, Matt. 16:28; 19:28; 24:30, 33, 37, 39, 44; 25:31; 26:64; Mark 13:26, 29; 14:62; Luke 9:26; 21:27; 22:69

---

79) Johannes Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*, 119.

80) Johannes Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*, 120.

81) Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 266-267.

82) Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 276.

83) Johannes Weiss, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*, translated by Richard Hyde Hiers and David Larrimore Holland (London: SCM Press, 1971), 118, 120.

84) Frederick H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (London: SCM Press, 1967), 355-358; Rudolph Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion*, translated by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1938), 201-219; Andrew J. B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964), 199-202.

etc.). However, it can not explain 'the Son of Man' sayings which are referring to the present.<sup>85)</sup> Furthermore, as Morna D. Hooker argues, there is no instance in which Jesus explicitly states that he would become the Son of Man.<sup>86)</sup>

Others suggest another reference for this word in the connection to its origin. As often mentioned, they contend that this term derives from Dan 7:13, where the Son of Man was used as a representative of a community.<sup>87)</sup> In this verse, it did not indicate an individual but a community, namely Israel. It is collectively interpreted. William Sanday argues that, because at the time of Jesus this term was not very widely current, his hearers probably did not understand its meaning correctly.<sup>88)</sup> In this context, Jesus did not have the Danielic Son of Man in his mind when he used this term, rather he had in mind Psalm viii.<sup>89)</sup> As the Son of Man in the Psalm viii denotes 'man,' 'in the sense of Humanity,' when

---

85) For example, Matt. 8:20 // Luke 9:58 in these verses Jesus said about his present situation.

86) Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the term "Son of Man" and its Use in St. Mark's Gospel* (Montreal: Macgill University Press, 1967), 188. Also in the same book she insists that it could not refer to himself, but to someone else who is supernatural. 182.

87) Thomas W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, edited by Matthew Black (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962), 128; Thomas Kazen, "The Coming Son of Man Revisited," 143-144; Vincent Taylor, "The 'Son of Man' Sayings Relating to the Parousia," *Expository Times* 58 (1946/1947), 15. Charles F. D. Moule, *The Phenomenon of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1967), 90.

88) William Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1908), 126-127.

89) William Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 127.

Jesus uses this term “he must have regarded himself as in some manner representing Humanity.”<sup>90)</sup> Vincent Taylor believes that, before Caesarea Philippi, Jesus applied the Son of Man to himself, however, later he re-interprets it “in terms of the idea of the Suffering Servant.”<sup>91)</sup> When he, at last, stood before the high priest and answered his question, it was the divine community that was in his mind.

However, this interpretation also has a weakness. Although the Danielic Son of Man actually represents humanity (Israel), in Mark’s gospel there was no single case which the Son of Man refers to a specific community. Rather, it appears to refer to an individual: Jesus himself.<sup>92)</sup> Furthermore, it is not quite certain that this term came directly from Daniel.<sup>93)</sup> If this is the case, this position may be severely undermined.

---

90) William Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 127–128. cf. T. W. Manson had similar idea, however, instead of the Psalm he looked at the Ezekiel. “The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels,” 124–125.

91) Vincent Taylor, “The ‘Son of Man’ Sayings Relating to the Parousia,” 15. cf. Matthew Black said that actually there are several Son of Man sayings before the Caesarea Philippi instance. He explained that it was caused by the ambiguity of this term. Not all listener would have understood it. “Unsolved New Testament Problems: The ‘Son of Man’ in the Teaching of Jesus,” *Expository Times* 60 (1948), 35.

92) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 37. For example, when the high priest asked to Jesus, “Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?” Then Jesus answered in 14:62 that “I am,” “And you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven.” In this dialogue the High Priest and Jesus are referring to Jesus, himself; it would be unlikely that they were discussing anyone else here.

93) Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s reading of the Gospel* (London: Collins, 1973), 185–186; Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and influence of Daniel 7* (London: S.P.C.K., 1979), 157; Richard Bauckham, “The Son of Man: ‘A Man in My Position’ or ‘someone’?” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985), 28. Differently to this view, some scholars suggest that this Daniel tradition is

A different interpretation has been suggested by Geza Vermes.<sup>94)</sup> He believes that, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, was not a genuine Greek idiom.<sup>95)</sup> Because this term would have made little sense in Greek, he believes that, "Its origin could be Aramaic."<sup>96)</sup> According to him, this term in Aramaic could be used to refer to the speaker himself. In addition, he notes that it was curious that the Son of Man in the gospels is derived from Daniel 7:13. He argues that, "The only possible, indeed probable, genuine utterances were sayings independent of Daniel 7 in which, in accordance with Aramaic usage, the speaker referred to himself as the Son of Man out of awe, reserve, or humility."<sup>97)</sup> The sayings which are

---

a redaction by the evangelist. Ragnar Leivestad "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972), 248. J. A. Emerton, "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1958), 227; John J. Collins, "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992), 464-465.

Contrary to the view that the Son of Man was not derived from Daniel, some scholars argued that it should be come from this apocalyptic book. Morna D. Hooker, "Is the Son of Man problem really insoluble?" 166; Barnabas Lindars, "Response to Richard Bauckham: The Idiomatic Use of Bar Enasha," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985), 38-39; Christopher Tuckett, "Recent Work on the Son of Man," *Scripture Bulletin* 12 (1981), 18. Matthew Black, "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus," *Expository Times* 60 (1948), 032-036, in 32.

94) Actually since this view has been suggested by Théodore de Bèze in 1557, it continually raised by some scholars. Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate*, 82-85.

95) Geza Vermes, "The 'Son of Man' Debate," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 1 (1978), 19; "The Present State of the 'Son of Man' Debate" in *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1983) 89-99, also on the same title in *Jesus in His Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 81-90. Christopher Tuckett, "Recent Work on the Son of Man," *Scripture Bulletin* 12 (1981), 14.

96) Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 162; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1994), 91.

97) Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 185-186.

apocalyptic were added by Jesus' disciples later.<sup>98)</sup> He therefore argues that the Son of Man sayings, which were authentic, indicates that Jesus himself used this term circumlocutionally.

Maurice Casey affirms that, although it was not certain what this term meant,<sup>99)</sup> Jesus used it to refer to himself. He suggests the following reasons to understand its use in this way:

The term occurs very frequently: it is found in all Gospel sources—Mark, Q the separate traditions of both Matthew and Luke, John, and some non-canonical traditions: the early sources attribute it almost exclusively to Jesus himself: it is not normal Greek, a fact which we can explain only if it originated as a translation of the Aramaic expression *bar nash* or *bar nasha*: and the early church did not use it in any of its confessions nor in any New Testament epistle.<sup>100)</sup>

As he observes, in Mark's gospel, when we read this phrase as 'I,' the meaning of what is said in each verse is clear. In my view, this reading looks to be the most probable one for this phrase.

---

98) Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 186. cf. Ragnar Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," 248; Maurice Casey, *Son of Man*, 165; Edward Adams, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel," 49.

99) Maurice Casey argues that this term could refer to 'man' in general, if it is an Aramaic term, however, in the Gospels it could not be used like this. *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1991), 47.

100) Maurice Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, 46-47.

#### 1.1.2.4. Why does the Son of Man come?

Examining the purpose of the coming of the Son of Man, Thomas Hatina believes that the texts from which these verses might derived are relate to the judgment not the salvation.<sup>101)</sup> It is true that in Dan 7:13-14 there are hints of judgment. According to Raymond E. Brown, for “one like a Son of Man was brought into the heavenly court where the books are opened that will decide the fate of the great kingdoms represented by the beasts (7:10c).”<sup>102)</sup> Morna D. Hooker expresses a similar view on this matter. She assumes that Daniel 7 is about judgment, and that Mark is also describing a judgment scene before God. She says:

. . . ∴ the revelation of the Son of Man is synonymous with judgment: for all who have rejected Jesus this means disaster; but for those who have been faithful it means vindication.<sup>103)</sup>

She also notes that it is widely assumed that the judgment is the ‘obvious characteristic of the Son of Man.’<sup>104)</sup>

---

101) Thomas R. Hatina said, “My focus in this section is not to engage in the stimulating and seemingly perpetual discussions on the identity or the origin of the Son of Man; instead my interest is limited to the function of the Son of Man in Mark 13:26 in light of Dan 7:13.66 In particular, I will attempt to show that Mark’s implied audience may have understood the coming of the Son of Man as a reference to divine judgment upon Jerusalem and the Temple establishment.” “The Focus of Mark 13:24-27,” 52.

102) Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1994), 94.

103) Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 157.

104) Morna D. Hooker, “Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?” 162.



If she is correct, it has to be clear: what is the judgment? Morna D. Hooker believes that Mark 13 was describing the judgment which resulted from the failure of Israel to respond to Jesus.<sup>105)</sup> However, she suggests that the judgment was the destruction of the temple and the holy city.<sup>106)</sup> Through this event, Israel lost their everything, including even their faith. However, if, as has been seen in the previous chapter, the events are presented in chronological order, the Son of Man will come after the destruction of the temple and the holy city. When the Son of Man comes, the temple is already destroyed and the Abomination of Desolation will stand where it ought not to be. This means that Jesus' coming and the destruction of the temple and the holy city (which are considered as a judgment) are chronologically separated. Therefore if, as Morna D. Hooker argues, the destruction of the temple and the holy city are judgments, does the coming of the Son of Man yet another judgment for those who had already lost everything?

Consequently, if the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem can be taken to be judgments, it is unlikely that the Son of Man will come to judge. Rather, it is more probable to think that he will come in order to gather up his elect. This is explicitly mentioned in verse 27. Here, Mark describes the work of the Son of Man: to send his angel to gather the elect who have come through the terrible tribulations. Therefore, it is a

---

105) Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 152.

106) Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 151-159.



natural conclusion that verses 26-27 are also referring to their salvation, rather than about the judgment. It is worth noting George R. Beasley-Murray's statement that, in this verses, there is "no mention of the Son of Man as an executor of the divine wrath."<sup>107</sup>) In addition, there is, in fact, no mention about the 'book' which appears in Dan 7:10. It has to be remembered that the only thing which is mentioned by Mark is that the Son of Man will come with power and glory and he will then send his angels to gather the elect.

### 1.1.3. What does the Coming of the Son of Man mean?

Mark says that the coming of the Son of Man will occur after (with) the celestial catastrophe. About this event it is possible to say several things.

Firstly, the Son of Man's coming is the conclusion and climax of the tribulations (illustrated in verses 14-23) and the celestial catastrophe (verses 24-25). Craig A. Evans observes that:

Jesus has taught his disciples that following the unprecedented tribulation of vv 14-23 a series of heavenly portents will take place signaling the glorious and powerful coming of the 'Son of Man.'<sup>108</sup>)

Secondly, when Morna D. Hooker questions Geza Vermes, she suggests two problems.<sup>109</sup>) One of them concerns an explanation for the

---

<sup>107</sup>) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 430.

<sup>108</sup>) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 330.

preservation of the term. However, in my view, it is natural that it would have been preserved, because, being an Aramaic term, it would have been very familiar to Jesus' contemporaries (whose mother tongue was Aramaic). Therefore, it is rather unlikely to suppose that any particularly special effort was needed to preserve this term.

Thirdly, when it is translated into Greek, however, it is possible that there was no suitable equivalent in the Greek language for it and so they chose to translate it literally.

Fourthly, Mark wanted to write about Jesus' coming in order to save his followers, rather than about the one who looked like a Son of Man in the Danielic vision (who is contrasted with the beasts). Most scholars have a presupposition that Mark 13:26 is related to Daniel 7. However, this is not yet conclusive.

Fifthly, for Mark, the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem were not seen as the judgment on the temple authorities who were against Jesus. In this verse, the tribulations and the catastrophes would occur at the end of history, when the Son of Man, who is Jesus himself, would come to save his elect.

## 1.2. Two Parables: When will these things happen? (28-37)

Following Mark's Jesus speaking of the coming of the Son of Man, in the second part of the second half of Mark 13 three themes are dealt

---

109) Morna D. Hooker, "Is the Son of Man problem really insoluble?" 157.

with through the use of two parables. This part has been considered to be a weaving together of many sayings which were originally separate.<sup>110)</sup> The reason they have been gathered together in this part is that all these sayings are related to the general theme of watchfulness.<sup>111)</sup> If this is the case, it could mean that there are certain elements concerning Mark's intention can be identified here. It also means that these three themes reveal his intention. Therefore, it is necessary to examine these themes in order to understand what Mark want to say in Mark 13.

In my view the three themes can be identified like this: (1) the closeness or imminence of the Last Days, whether it refers to the day of destruction of the temple, or to the kingdom of God (verses 28-31), (2) that no one knows the days or hour (verse 32), and (3) is the need to for watchfulness (verses 33-36).<sup>112)</sup> The last verse of Mark 13 concludes with the saying to keep watch.<sup>113)</sup>

Furthermore, these themes appear to be related to the question of Jesus' disciples. In verses 5-23 Mark's Jesus speaks about the events

---

110) Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (Middlesex/New York/Victoria: Penguin Books, 1963), 358. Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 190-191. Soo-Am Park, *The Function of Mark 13 in Mark's Gospel* (Seoul: The Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary Press, 1993), 103.

111) Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 358.

112) Charles E. Carlston divided these verses into three parts: a parable (fig tree, 28-29), three sayings (30-32), another parable (the Waiting Servants, 33-36). *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*, 191.

113) Charles E. Carlston also said that verses 28-37 have not only a common theme but also a common catchwords. *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*, 191.

as the signs which would occur before the coming of the Son of Man (26). However, he does not answer the question concerning the time of the day until verses 28-37.<sup>114)</sup>

This part begins with the fig tree parable.

### 1.2.1. The Fig Tree Parable (28-29)

The image of the fig tree has appeared in Mark twice, in chapter 11, just before Jesus entered the temple (11:12-14), and very next morning (11:20-21). Here Mark's Jesus wanted to pick some figs, because he was hungry. However, he found no fruit, only leaves, and he cursed the tree: "May no one ever eat fruit from you again." (11:14) After this incident, he entered the temple in order to cleanse it (11:15-17). The next morning, when Jesus had passed by the fig tree again with his disciples, Peter saw that it withered. He then, remembered what his master had said to the fig tree the previous day. He said, "the fig tree you cursed has withered!" (11:21b) These two incidents were woven together to make an *inclusio* structure. It has been understood that by using the *inclusio* structure, Mark intended to show the relationship between the fig tree incident and the cleansing of the temple. It is therefore possible to interpret the cleansing of the temple by the fig

---

114) William L. Lane thought that in these verses Jesus responded to his disciples' question when the destruction of the temple would be fulfilled, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 478.

tree incident.<sup>115)</sup> The so-called withered fig tree of chapter 11, has consequently been considered as an act of judgment against the temple.

Ben Witherington III<sup>116)</sup> argues that, in Mark 13:28, Jesus was talking about an event which could be understood as a sign to indicate that something was about to happen. He believes that it could *only* be the destruction of the temple.<sup>117)</sup> Therefore, this parable could be only interpreted in the light of the incident of the withered fig tree of chapter 11.

In the connection with this incident in chapter 11 the parable in 13:28 has been interpreted. Some suggest that this verse is a contrast to the fig tree incident in 11:20. For example, William Telford believes that the fig tree in verse 28 is a counterpoint to another fig tree withered in Mark 11:20f: whereas in Mark 11 the withering fig tree implies the fate of Jerusalem, which is cursed, in Mark 13 the fig tree represents the Christian community, which is blessed.<sup>118)</sup> Ched Myers views this parable

---

115) Werner H. Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 99-102, 124-125. Mary A. Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 267. Soo-Am Park, *The Function of Mark 13 in Mark's Gospel*, 208.

116) Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 348

117) Robert H. Stein, *Difficult passage*, 105. Soo Am Park, *The Function of Mark 13 in Mark's Gospel*, 208-209. Werner H. Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*, 100. William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: a redaction-critical analysis of the cursing of the fig-tree pericope in Mark's Gospel and its relation to the cleansing of the temple tradition* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 217. Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York, Maryknoll, 1990), 345. Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001), 348.

118) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 217. Brian J. Incigneri also sees a contrast within these two incidents. *The Gospel to the Romans: The*

in a similar way, however, he argues that in these two incidents, because both fig trees were in leaf, the relationship between them is not one of contrast but continuity.<sup>119)</sup> Whereas they express differences in the detail of interpretation, they both closely link the fig tree incident in chapter 11 with the fig tree parable in chapter 13.

Timothy J. Geddert admits, as many scholars do, that there is a connection between the fig tree incident and the fig tree parable. However, contrary to this view, he points out that “few commentators have considered the possibility that two complementary events are being alluded to, the first of which brings forth God’s wrath and his judgment, the second of which furthers his eschatological purposes and prepares for the final Day.”<sup>120)</sup> In this way, he argues:

We are left with two options—either we abandon the idea there is any intended co-ordination between the two uses of fig trees, or we abandon the idea that ‘these things’ (corresponding to the fig tree’s greening) refers to the destruction of the temple per se.<sup>121)</sup>

He suggests that the former option offers a more plausible way to interpret it and believes that there is certain intentional relationship between the fig tree incident and the fig tree parable.

---

*Setting and Rhetoric of Mark’s Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 307.

119) Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 345.

120) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 249–250.

121) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 250.

According to him, as we can see in the relationship between the parables in chapter 4 and the miracles in chapter 5-8, and the relationship between parables at the end of chapter 13 and the Jesus' passion, it would be characteristic of Mark to use a parable to give "special lessons to be learned from an event of Jesus' life."<sup>122)</sup> He finally concluded:

Mark has used both 'temple' imagery (one destroyed and another built) and 'fig tree' imagery (one withered and another turning green) to symbolize the way in which God sets aside unfaithful leaders and rebuilds with Jesus and his followers. It will be the responsibility of the post-resurrection disciples to bear fruit, the very thing Israel's leaders did not do.<sup>123)</sup>

In Timothy J. Geddert's view it is plausible to think that the fig tree parable alludes not only to the judgment of the temple and the holy city (as the fig tree incident of Mark 11 did), but also to the Last Days.

There is one more thing to be considered. He understands that the fig tree imagery in Mark 11 and 13 contrasts each other; one withered and another turning green. However, he underestimated the fact that, in the fig tree parable of Mark 13, Mark's Jesus did not pay any attention to the turning green of the tree at all. His concern was the sign of the summer, which is illustrated by the appearance of sprouting leaves. This is all what is said here.

---

122) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 250.

123) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 251-252.



However, it is quite curious to suppose that there is such connection between the incident in Mark 11 and the parable in Mark 13.<sup>124)</sup> It is certain that in these two paragraph the image of the fig tree figured as important.<sup>125)</sup> However, in my thought, it is not probable that because these two paragraphs feature the same material (the fig tree), they are necessarily closely connected. This is because there are several different things to be considered when we interpret these two paragraphs.

Firstly, Jesus' concern is not same in these two stories. In Mark 11, Mark illustrated a leafy tree (verse 13) which has no fruit. Jesus, who saw the leafy fig tree and tried to get some fruit, failed to get any from it. So he cursed it, because of its fruitlessness. Although the leaves were the main reason which caused Jesus to expect some fruit, that is all. Afterwards Jesus did not pay any attention to the leaves themselves. The reason for the curse on the fig tree is its fruitlessness. Therefore, in this incident, the leaves are not Jesus' concern at all. The Jesus was concerned only with its fruitfulness.

Contrarily, Mark 13, Mark's Jesus does not refer to the leaves nor the fruit at all.<sup>126)</sup> A fig tree which is in leaf is not even mentioned,

---

124) Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*, 192. In footnote 7 he said about the fig tree which has been used in Old Testament. In addition, the dry fig tree is a sign of desolation, Judgment, etc. (Is. 34:4; Jer. 8:13; Hos. 2:12; Joel 1:7, 12; Hab. 3:17; Hag. 2:19), the budding fig tree a sign of God's blessing (Joel 2:22; Zech. 3:10).

125) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 250.

126) 13:28 "As soon as its twigs get tender and its leaves come out, you know that summer is near."

rather, it is the sprouting of leaves that are mentioned. Timothy J. Geddert states, “. . . both deal with fig trees and in both the tree stands in leaf. . ..”<sup>127)</sup> Whereas, the former is correct, the latter is not true. The fig tree in the parable of Mark 13 is just starting to sprout. There is no leaf yet. Mark’s Jesus does not refer to the leaf. Therefore, it is not at all Jesus’ concern whether the tree is leafy or not.

Secondly, the things to which the parable refers is not same to the things which to which the story in Mark 11 refers. In Mark 11, a cursed unfruitful fig tree represents the unfruitfulness of the God’s people.<sup>128)</sup> The fig tree is cursed because it did not bear any fruit. Similarly, God’s people, who also did not bear any fruit, will experience the judgment of God. Therefore, the fig tree symbolizes either a group of people who rejected Jesus or a building in which they gathered. William R. Telford, in my view, correctly argues that Mark wanted to show the fruitlessness of Israel using this leafy tree.<sup>129)</sup> The destruction of the temple and the holy city in A.D. 70 meant that God’s plant (Israel) had been withered.<sup>130)</sup> This interpretation is quite acceptable. However, it is possible to interpret this in this way only in Mark 11.

---

127) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 250.

128) According to Ben Witherington III, the fig tree in Mark 11 is an symbol of the people of God. It should be kept in mind that this withered fig tree is a symbol for God’s judgment on Israel. *The Gospel of Mark*, 348, 352.

129) William Telford paid attention to the Old Testament passages in which a fig tree appeared. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 128-163.

130) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 163.

In Mark 13 it is said that when the sprout appears, it is the time when summer comes. Richard T. France says that in this verse the sprouting of leaves is the harbinger of summer which is the season of the early fig harvest. He suggests that the leaves could be seen to indicate the sure promise that fruit would follow. Even he says that if that promise was not fulfilled, woe should be given to the tree.<sup>131)</sup> It is correct that summer was the time to expect fruit and, as we can see in Mark 11, Jesus cursed the fig tree which bears no fruit. However, I would suggest that in Mark 13, the only concern of Mark's Jesus is not the leaves (which are the sign of future fruit) but the sprouting of the leaves which, are in themselves the sign of summer. It is not necessary to suppose that this summer must be connected to the harvest. In this way, I would argue that Richard T. France's interpretation goes too far. Rather, in this parable, Mark's Jesus wanted to show the timing of the event (when will something happen?), not the event itself (the fact that the leaves sprout?)

Thirdly, some scholars remind us that, in Mark's gospel, Jesus refused to give any signs.<sup>132)</sup> They believe that, in Mark 13 Jesus also rejects his disciples' request to give a sign concerning the time when the things about which he taught would occur. In my view, from this event which is in Mark 8 it is not reasonable to use it as a clue to interpret

---

131) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002), 537.

132) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 256-257.

the fig tree parable in Mark 13. In Mark 8, Jesus obviously rejected his opponents' request to present a sign from heaven, but this was because it was requested by them in order *to test him*. They want to test Jesus' authority. Furthermore they belonged to the outer group, who doubted Jesus' authority and did not accept him.

Contrary to this, in Mark 13, the disciples (who comprised the inner group) asked for a sign not to test Jesus but to know when the things taught by him would happen. They wanted to know what Jesus taught them because, although they listened to what he said, they could not fully understand it. They needed more explanations. As we can see in the gospels, Jesus privately explained the meaning of his teaching to his disciples. Therefore, it is possible for them to have expected from Jesus a more detailed explanation.

Fourthly, in Mark 11, the fig tree exhibits a false sign; the leaves without any fruit. Contrary to this false sign, in Mark 13, as Craig A. Evans contends, the fig tree indicates the correct time. In other words, the tree of Mark 13 shows an accurate sign. It can be therefore seen that these two fig trees have entirely different roles in their contexts.

One may wonder if the parable of the Fig Tree relates in some way to the cursing of the fig tree in Mark 11:12-14, 20-21. The cursed fig tree had produced leaves, thus indicating the approach of summer and the possibility of early figs. But as it turned out, this fig tree offered a false sign and so did not teach the lesson of the fig tree in the parable of the Fig Tree.<sup>133)</sup>

Fifthly, as I have mentioned above, the only thing which is common to Mark chapters 11 and 13 is a fig tree. However, this might not be particularly significant. Some scholars point out, most trees in Palestine are evergreen. Therefore the fig tree is one of only a few deciduous trees from which it is possible to detect the sign that summer is coming.<sup>134)</sup> Furthermore, because it is a common tree in this area, and everyone would know about it, no other explanation would be needed.<sup>135)</sup> Therefore, when Mark's readers were told about this tree, they could easily visualize it as they could see them every day around their houses and orchards. These facts furnish us with possible reasons why we should not think that Mark would have specifically intended that his readers to associate this tree with the one referred to in Mark 11.<sup>136)</sup>

This suggests that the fig tree parable, in Mark 13, has not been placed here to show the temple's fate as the other fig tree incident in Mark 11 does.<sup>137)</sup> Examining with Jesus' saying, which follows the

---

133) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 334.

134) Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*, 192. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 320. George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 94. R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 537. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, revised edition (London: SCM Press, 1972), 119.

135) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 746. William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 132

136) Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, translated by John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963)

137) Richard T. France argued that this parable is about the destruction of the temple, because the disciples asked a question related to the temple. Therefore, the fig tree parable, which shows the timing of the event, is surely referring to the destruction of the temple. *The Gospel of Mark*, 539.

parable, is helpful for understanding its meaning. After Jesus taught the fig tree parable, he instructs, “when you see these things happening, you know that it is near, right at the door (13:29).” Jesus indicates that something would be happening, and that ‘these things’ were to be taken to be the signs for it.

In this verse, two pronouns are used; ‘these things’ and ‘it.’ However, it is not clear what they refer to.

Dennis E. Nineham contends that, in this verse, ‘these things’ refers to all the events which are mentioned in verses 5-27 (including the Son of Man’s coming) and ‘it’ refers to the end of the world. He believes that, if ‘these things’ do not include verses 23-27, it means that the fig tree parable is not originally related to the end of the world at all.<sup>138)</sup>

William L. Lane states that the thing (‘it’) which is at the door is related to the desolation of sacrilege, which is in verse 14. He believes that the words in verse 29, “when you see these things happening,” recall the words in verse 14, “when you see the appalling sacrilege.”<sup>139)</sup> He concludes that the fig tree parable naturally refers to the destruction of the temple and the holy city. If he is correct, the desolation of sacrilege (verse 14) must be the last thing which will occur. However, as I have argued in the previous chapter, the desolation of sacrilege of verse 14 cannot be the last event. It could not be the climax of Mark 13. Rather,

---

138) Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 359.

139) William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 479.

it is more probable to see the desolation of sacrilege as being only one of the signs for the events which will occur during the Last Days.

Allan McNicol argues that 'these things' are not related to the Son of Man.<sup>140)</sup> According to him, this phrase should be interpreted in the light of the disciples' question of verse 4, ταῦτα, ταῦτα . . . πάντα. These phraseological parallelism has to be considered. If so, for him, these things must be interpreted in relation to the question posed in verse 4 (the fate of the temple). Although he is correct in reading it this way, it is, however, impossible to deny that, in this chapter (especially in the very verses where 'these things' appear), eschatological events are mentioned, such as coming of the Son of Man. It is true to say that Jesus' discourse begins with the disciples' question about the fate of the temple, however, Jesus also goes on to talk about other things which are related to the Last Days. Therefore, although the question is about the destruction of the temple, the answer is about it and also includes other matters associated with the Last Days.

Morna D. Hooker argues that verses 24-27, especially the coming of the Son of Man, refers to the 'it;' the climax for which they are waiting.<sup>141)</sup> For her, it is impossible that 'these things' includes coming of the Son of Man.<sup>142)</sup> As we have seen above, in verses 5-23

---

140) Allan McNicol, "The Lesson of the Fig Tree in Mark 13:28-32," 200-201.

141) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 320.

142) George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 101.



many troubles, which has been listed, would precede the 'it' (the climax). William Telford also believes that verse 26 is the climax of the discourse.<sup>143)</sup> He contends, as does Morna D. Hooker, that 'these things' cannot be the events listed in verses 26-27, because "the Parousia of the Son of Man is the end itself." Therefore, 'these things' in verse 29 can refer to the events which are listed in the first half of the chapter.<sup>144)</sup> David Wenham also states that 'these things' refer to the troubles which are mentioned in verses 5-23.<sup>145)</sup> According to him, 'these things' in verse 29 could not refer to the events which are in the immediately preceding verses of 24-27.<sup>146)</sup>

Consequently, 'it' (which follows 'these things') should be understood refer to the last thing. In Mark's gospel this climax (the coming of the Son of Man) appears along with the celestial catastrophe of verses 24-27.

---

143) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 218.

144) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 217.

145) David Wenham, "'This Generation will not Pass. . .,'" 133. Robert H. Gundry also showed same view, however, for him these things referred to the events in verses 14 and onward. *Mark*, 746, 792. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 335. William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 448, 478. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 407-408.

146) David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*, Gospel Perspectives vol. 4 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 327. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 792. George R. Beasley-Murray argued, "Mark will have expected his readers to recognize that the *tauta* must represent forerunners of the end and not the end itself." *Jesus and the Last Days*, 436.

### 1.2.2. Meaning of the fig tree parable

The key point for understanding the meaning of this parable has been considered to be related to that which the fig tree parable refers. If this parable, as some scholars believe, is interpreted in the light of the fig tree incident of Mark 11,<sup>147)</sup> it could be understood that this parable refers to the fate of the temple and the holy city. However, if there is no connection between this parable and the fig tree of Mark 11,<sup>148)</sup> we have to look in a different place to find its meaning. The reasons which are listed above show that it is problematic to accept the idea that this parable is connected to the fig tree incident in Mark 11.

In this chapter, this parable looks to be of entirely different nature from the material which it precedes.<sup>149)</sup> However, as Morna D. Hooker says, as a redactor Mark intentionally placed this parable here because he thought that this parable expressed the same theme as that found in the other parts of the Mark 13.<sup>150)</sup> Therefore, it is worth considering its location in this chapter.

---

147) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 217. Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 345. Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 249-250. Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 348.

148) Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*, 92. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 320. George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 94.

149) Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 468.

150) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 320.

Mark deliberately sets this parable directly next to Jesus' teaching on the parousia in verses 24-27: the celestial catastrophe and the coming of the Son of Man. This parable is demonstrating the relationship between the signs in the first half of this chapter and the final event (the coming of the Son of Man).

As we have considered in the previous chapter, responding to his disciples' two questions, (when the event would happen and what was to be the sign), Mark's Jesus answered them. In the first half, he tried to show the signs which would precede the final event. All the troubles are arranged to build to the climax.<sup>151)</sup> The tribulation is getting close and will be getting more intense. Following all the troubles, the celestial catastrophe will be seen and, at last, the Son of Man will come. This is found in verses 24-27. In this part, the Markan Jesus answers one of his disciples' questions (what is the sign?) and then he answers the other question<sup>152)</sup> (when will this thing happen?). This question relates to the timing. Johachim Jeremias notes that the focus of this parable concerns the timing of the harvest-time.<sup>153)</sup>

However, Jesus could not say anything about the time because, as he concedes in verse 32, he did not know when that day would be. That is all that he could say.

As the fig tree incident in Mark 11 is interpreted in relationship to the cleansing of the temple (which neighbors it), it is natural to

---

151) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 218.

152) William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, 218.

153) Johachim Jeremias, *The Parable of Jesus*, 119.

interpret the fig tree parable in relation to its neighboring text: the eschatological appearance which occurs before it. It is worth considering Craig A. Evans' comment on this verse:

In its present context, the parable of the Fig Tree serves to illustrate the need for watchfulness and provides assurance that the disciples, if watching carefully, will perceive the signs that indicate that the end time is fast approaching.<sup>154)</sup>

In verses 24-29 Mark describes the Last Days. He then continues in the next verses (30-36) by exhorting his readers.

### 1.2.3. What he wants to say (30-36)

#### 1.2.3.1. It is very close

In his preceding verses, Mark writes of several signs which would precede the End. He then reports Jesus' teaching on the time of the Last Days:

I tell you the truth, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened. Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away. (Mark 13:30-31)

Here we can find one of Mark's eschatological characteristics. In this verse, Mark's Jesus teaches that all these things should be accomplished within his (contemporary) generation.

---

<sup>154)</sup> Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 333.

Some scholars do not believe that this verse occurred in the original text.<sup>155)</sup> Rudolf Bultmann argues that verse 30 was originally connected to verse 27.<sup>156)</sup> Norman Perrin believes that the verse was a product of early Christian apocalypticism and he contends that it was inserted by Mark later.<sup>157)</sup> Contrary to this view, Rudolf Pesch insists that this verse was entirely created by Mark. Mark did not just insert what was before him, but he created it.<sup>158)</sup> Although this argument originally concerns the authenticity of this verse, it also provides us with another meaning. Whether it was inserted or created, Mark must have had a specific reason for its insertion or creation, because, as Rudolf Bultmann notes, this section has been placed here, along with other material, by Mark.<sup>159)</sup>

Now I want to identify exactly what is Mark's intention. Above all, it has to be kept in mind that Mark placed these verses just after the fig tree parable which indicates the relationship between the signs (verses 5-23) and the coming of the Son of Man (verses 24-27).<sup>160)</sup> To

---

155) According to Allison A. Trites, this attempt has failed, because it has been shown that both, in terms of word frequency and of grammar, the whole passage is thoroughly Marcan in character, 'Generation,' *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, edited by Colin Brown (Devon: The Paternoster Press Ltd., 1976), 36.

156) Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 123.

157) Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1967), 200.

158) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13* (Dusseldorf, Patmos, 1968), 181-187.

159) Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 123.

understand these verses it is necessary to know two things. The first is the meaning of 'all these things,' and the other is the reference of 'generation.'

Whereas, in verse 29, Mark had already used 'these things,' in verse 30, he now adds to this phrase one more word ('all'). As I have argued above, 'these things,' in verse 29, has been considered to indicate the events which are described in verse 5-23. However, 'all these things' in verse 30 does not have consensus what it refers to. Accordingly, some scholars believe that 'all these things' in verse 30 also refer to those same things mentioned in verse 29; namely the events in verses 5-23 which could be signs of the parousia.<sup>161)</sup>

Contrary to this view, Werner G. Kümmel suggests that this interpretation is the result of overlooking the fact that these two phrases which are in verse 29 and in verse 30 are actually refer to the same thing. Other scholars also express the same view as Werner G. Kümmel. They believe that 'all these things' in verse 30 refers not only to the verses 5-23, but also to the verses 24-27, the coming of the Son of Man.<sup>162)</sup> George R. Beasley-Murray contends that this verse relates to

---

160) George R. Beasley-Murray pointed out these verses' location when he interpreted the meaning of this verse. *Jesus and the Last Days*, 448.

161) William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 478. David Wenham, "'This Generation will not Pass . . .'" 133-4. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 409.

162) Evald Lövestam, "The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.," *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980), 403-404. and *Jesus and 'this Generation': A New Testament Studies*

the prophecy of verse 2 and the signs in the discourse relate to it (including the coming of the Son of Man).<sup>163)</sup> This reading is more probable than the understanding that it refers to only verses 5-23. Its location could be a persuasive reason to think so, because this verse follows just after verses 24-27, which describes about the coming of the Son of Man.

In my view, in this verse Jesus is talking about the whole discourse, including the coming of the Son of Man. When he answers his disciples' question, he teaches about the tribulation (verses 5-23) and the Last Days (verses 24-27). In the fig tree parable, Jesus states that we could know when the Last Days would come because those things included in verses 5-23 are the signs of the events listed in verses 24-27. Just as we can tell that the summer is close when we see the leaves sprouting on the fig tree, the events described in verses 5-23 will act as the signs of the events described in verse 24-27.

The phrase, 'this generation (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη),' has been the subject of dispute. There have been several interpretations of it.<sup>164)</sup> Some scholars believe that it denotes the nation as, "in all other sayings of Jesus in which the expression occurs."<sup>165)</sup> Therefore, this saying could

---

(Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell International, 1995), 81-82; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 300. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 335.

163) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 449.

164) Earle E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (Melbourne: Nelson, 1966), 246-247.

165) Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 60-61



indicate that the Jewish nation would not perish until the end. Werner G. Kümmel observes that this view has been expressed by Julius Schniewind, and M. Meinertz.<sup>166)</sup> However, in other verses in which this term occurs it is highly unlikely to read it as denoting 'nation.' For example, in 8:12, the Pharisees asked Jesus for a sign from heaven. Jesus answers them with sigh, "why does *this generation* look for a sign, . . . no sign to *this generation*." In this verse, Jesus uses 'this generation' to refer, primarily, to the Pharisees who asked for a sign from heaven and secondly it to those who rejected him. It is inaccurate to say that the phrase here denotes 'nation,' "as in all other saying of Jesus in which the expression occurs."<sup>167)</sup> It is, therefore, improbable that Jesus who have used 'this generation' to mean the nation; Israel.

Other scholars think that it denotes 'the type' of people; especially those who are faithless and perverse.<sup>168)</sup> Evald Lövestam is one of them. He has researched the usage of this term in the Old Testament, ἡ γενεά's relevant word הָדוֹר, and in the New Testament.<sup>169)</sup> According to him, though דּוֹר in the Old Testament is elastic in its purport, it is usually used in a positive way which related to God's

---

166) Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 61. He mentioned: Julius Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Göttingen: Bandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1933), 167; Max Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testamentes* I, (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1950), 61.

167) Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 60-61

168) Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 61. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 790.

169) Evald Lövestam, "The ἡ γενεά αἰῶν Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.," 405-411.

people: “דור צדיק, ‘the generation of the righteous’ in contrast to the evildoers (Ps 14:5): for example, דור בניך, that is the ‘generation’ of God’s children (Ps 73:15): דור דרשו, i.e. the ‘generation’ of those who seek the Lord (Ps 24:6).”<sup>170)</sup> However, in the period of post-Old Testament, this term came to refer to those people who were faithless and wicked.<sup>171)</sup> Because of their unfaithfulness, a warning has to be given to them and they would then finally be punished. Such a tendency was continued in the New Testament. This term is almost always found on Jesus’ lips.<sup>172)</sup> In most of these cases, this phrase has a pejorative and negative meaning (in Matthew ‘γενεά’ is used with πονηρός καὶ μοιχαλὶς and ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη).<sup>173)</sup> Even in Luke 17:25 it is said that the Son of Man would suffer by this generation (πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.). Evald Lövestam concludes that, as with the other cases found in the rest books of New Testament, there is no reason not to suppose that this phrase also carries the same meaning.<sup>174)</sup> His research is valuable for understanding the concept of the phrase in

---

170) Evald Lövestam, “The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.,” 405.

171) Evald Lövestam, “The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.,” 406.

172) Matthew 12:39, 45; 16:4; 17:17; 24:34; Mark 8:12, 38; 9:19; 13:30; Luke 9:41; 11:29, 30; 21:32 etc. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 444. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 335.

173) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 335. Evald Lövestam, “The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.,” 409–410.

174) Evald Lövestam, “The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.,” 412.

biblical tradition. Surely in the New Testament (and especially the gospel) tradition, this phrase refers to the wicked and the faithless.

Two questions then arise. If, as Evald Lövestam argues, in the New Testament this phrase, in most cases, has a pejorative and negative meaning, does it refer to the whole of mankind or to a specific group of people? Furthermore, is 'this generation' in Mark 13:30 also used to convey this negative meaning?

According to Evald Lövestam, in the Old Testament, its relevant term, דֹּר, usually related to the people of God; in other words to special group of people and not the whole of mankind.<sup>175)</sup> They must be a chosen people who seek for and follow God's will. With some adjective phrase or additional explanation, such as 'of the righteous,' 'of God's children,' 'this generation' refers to the one who distinguished them from those others who do not follow God's will. In the New Testament, ἡ γενεά also does not refer to the whole of mankind. They are the people who are in contrast to God's people of the Old Testament. Christopher M. Tuckett argues that, in the Q tradition, 'this generation' refers to those who "failed to respond to the different messengers and messages given to it by Jesus and John."<sup>176)</sup> Although those who reject Jesus may outnumber those who accept him, they would still not constitute the whole of mankind.<sup>177)</sup>

---

175) Evald Lövestam, "The ἡ γενεά αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.," 405.

176) Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 177.

In addition, whereas in the Old Testament **גוי** is used to distinguish God's people from those who are not the people of God, in the New Testament **ἡ γενεά** is used in the context to refer to those who are not God's people as distinguished from those who are. Mary A. Tolbert also argues that Mark always used this term in a negative sense. This is the reason for her to conclude that, in Mark's gospel, this generation "refer not to the disciples or first followers of Jesus, but rather to the present evil tenants who control the vineyard and harrow the faithful."<sup>178</sup>

However, I would suggest that this conclusion is the result of missing of one thing. In fact in the gospels, **ἡ γενεά** is not used alone when it is to convey a negative sense. An adjectival phrase or additional explanation is added to indicate the negative character of this generation. The examples of the former are found in Matthew 12:39 (**γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλίζ**); 12:45 (**γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρᾷ**); 16:4 (**γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλίζ**); 17:17 (**ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη**); Mark 8:38 (**ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ**); 9:19 (**ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος**); Luke 9:41 (**ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη**); 11:29 (**ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρά**). The examples of the latter are found in Matthew 12:41, 42 // Luke 11:31, 32 (the generation which did not repent); Mark 8:12 // Luke 11:29 (the generation who sought a sign); Luke 16:8 (the generation of which son is distinguished from the son of

---

177) Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*. 300. Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 199.

178) Mary A. Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 268.

light). Christopher M. Tuckett shows that these expressions are also found in the Old Testament.<sup>179)</sup>

Consequently, in this respect, it is not necessary to accept the idea that the meaning of ‘generation’ has altered. Therefore, I would argue that it is probable that ‘the generation’ does not possess the meaning of wickedness and faithlessness at all, rather its context reveals its negative meaning.

Steven M. Bryan notes that Jesus’ usage of ‘this generation,’ generally conveys pejorative meaning. However, he was curious about whether this phrase in Mark 13:30 also carries this same sense.<sup>180)</sup> Although, as mentioned above, γενεά normally has an additional adjective or explanation to convey the pejorative sense, in this verse it is used alone. There is no adjective and its context is not negative at all. Although the same word is used, its use is different. This means that when we read the phrase ‘this generation,’ it is not necessary to assume that it convey a negative meaning.

It is worth mentioning here Robert H. Gundry who notes that, although in other contexts this phrase could be interpreted as a wicked generation, however, in this instance, the meaning of ‘this generation’ is Jesus’ contemporaries.<sup>181)</sup> I would suggest that it does not matter whether

---

179) Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 198.

180) Steven M. Bryan, *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 81.

181) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 790. William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 480.

they are wicked or not. Furthermore, in these verses, Mark places this phrase on Jesus' lips. This means that, when Mark's readers read it, they would scarcely have thought about their own contemporaries, rather they would have considered it as referring to Jesus' contemporaries; because, for them, it was spoken by Jesus and not by Mark. Mark, as a redactor, surely know this. If he really wants to emphasize the negative meaning of this phrase, he would have added an adjective, as other writers did. Furthermore, if this is the case, it is not necessary for us to think that there existed a big gap between Mark's readers and Jesus' contemporaries.

Therefore, it is a much more natural interpretation for this verse: Jesus taught that the parousia (the coming of Jesus) would occur before all his contemporaries die. This does not contradict Mark 9:1.

Then, in verse 31, Mark's Jesus explains the certainty of his words: "Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away." Some scholars believe that the 'my words' in this verse refer to the whole of his teachings in verses 5–30.<sup>182)</sup> Other scholars differ from this view and suggest that, in this verse, Mark's Jesus is referring to only that which he had spoken in the previous verse (verse 31).<sup>183)</sup>

---

Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 300. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 455. Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "The Destruction of the Temple and the Relativization of the Old Covenant: Mark 13:31 and Matthew 5:18" in *The Reader Must Understand: Eschatology in Bible and Theology* (Leicester: Apollos, 1997), 146.

182) Charles E. B. Cranfield, "Thoughts on New Testament Eschatology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982), 410. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 449. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 321–322. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 747. cf. Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 469.

Robert H. Gundry is the one who argues that 'my word' refers to the whole of the discourse. The reason for this position is the parallelism of phraseology between verses 27, 30 and 31. According to him, this parallelism "suggests that 'my words' does not refer to the statement," which is in verse 30.<sup>184)</sup>

In addition to this, Mark places this words on Jesus' lips to confirm his words' certainty. The thing that must be considered is what Mark wanted to actually say with this verse. If 'my words' only refer to verse 30, it could mean that Mark is not sure whether other sayings of Jesus will be fulfilled, but in just the previous verse, 'these things' must be accomplished before this generation passes away. However, as I have discussed, if 'these things' (in verse 30) refers to all that Jesus had spoken in the previous verses, it is much more natural to read 'my words' as referring to the whole discourse of Mark 13. Furthermore (as shown above), because this chapter is a response to the disciples' request (verse 4), Mark's readers would naturally accept this verse as being part of Jesus' answer. It is not reasonable to think that Mark intended to give the impression that Jesus' prediction may not be fulfilled. Although Mark does hint at the ignorance of Jesus concerning the day and the hour (verse 32), it is a different matter to suggest that his whole prophecy is insecure. Rather, using this verse, Mark's Jesus

---

183) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 336.

184) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 747.



confirms the certainty of all of his sayings, which have been recorded in the previous verses.<sup>185)</sup>

Therefore, it is possible to say that, in verses 30-31, Mark's Jesus is teaching about the nearness of the parousia.<sup>186)</sup> He does not point to any specific moment, however, he does imply that it is imminent. He also specified a time limit; That it would come within this generation. This is one of the characteristic of Mark's eschatology: the parousia would come before the present generation had passed away. This means that some of Jesus' generation (although not all of them), could survive the parousia. *It is very close or imminent.*<sup>187)</sup>

#### 1.2.3.2. The day and hour

After Mark's Jesus teaches of the closeness of the parousia (verses 30-31), he then moves to the second trait of his (Markan) eschatology. Although he confirms the sureness of his sayings on the closeness of parousia (13:31), he indicates that it is impossible to point to an exact time. The reason is given in verse 32: "no one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father."<sup>188)</sup>

---

185) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 449.

186) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 747.

187) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 107.

188) Because in this verse Jesus' ignorance is mentioned, its authenticity has been widely assumed. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 323. Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 228-229.

This utterance has caused another difficulty for scholars. In verse 30, Jesus teaches that parousia would occur within his generation. However, in verse 32, he says that no one knows the day and hour. This appears to be a contradiction.<sup>189)</sup>

To solve this difficulty, it is necessary to understand the meaning of “τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας.” Some scholars argue that this term, especially ‘that day,’ is a technical term which refers the Last Days. They suggest that this term is similar to the use of ‘that days’ in Old Testament, which refers to the ‘the day of the Lord’ or ‘the day of judgment.’<sup>190)</sup>

According to Charles E. B. Cranfield, in the Old Testament, ‘that day’ is an eschatological technical term. He said, “by τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης the day of the Parousia is clearly intended. In the O.T. ‘that day’ is an eschatological technical term.”<sup>191)</sup> Vincent Taylor also agrees that it is a technical term and he lists many examples, including the cases of New Testament uses.<sup>192)</sup> In this respect, he contends that this term was unlikely to refer to an event like the destruction of the temple. Rather it must refer to the Last Days themselves and not any specific historical

---

189) Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 470.

190) Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, 301. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 410-411. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 522. Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 360. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 323. John A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, 36-37, 86

191) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 410-411.

192) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 522.

event. For him, this verse is talking about the Day of Judgment. Dennis E. Nineham, who is in broad agreement with this view expresses a similar idea, only differing in that he sees that this term seems to have been a specifically Christian technical term for the 'Day of Judgment.'<sup>193)</sup> All these scholars assume that, originally, this saying was an independent one and related to the Day of Judgment.<sup>194)</sup> Mark placed it here suit for his purpose.

However, some scholars have sought another solution. They point to the possibility that these two verses do not refer to the same event. Brian M. Nolan also argues that, whereas the verse Mark 13:30 speaks of the imminent fall of Jerusalem, Mark 13:32 deals with the end of the world.<sup>195)</sup> Although he does not explicitly mention it, he assumes that its use in the verse was not as a technical term. In his reading there is no contradiction between these two verses because they refer to different events.

However, this position is not reasonable, because there is no reason to suppose that there is any change of theme in these two verses. As Dennis E. Nineham notes, it is possible that Mark used two independent

---

193) Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 360.

194) Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 523. Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 360.

195) Brian M. Nolan, "Some Observations on the Parousia and New testament Eschatology," *ITQ* 36 (1969), 298–299. Also see J. Winandy, 'Le logion de l'ignorance (Mc. XIII, 32; Matt. XXIV. 36).' *Revue Biblique* 75 (1968). 63–79. According to George R. Beasley-Murray, there were some more scholars who followed this view, such as E. Hout, M. J. Lagrange, W. Beyschlag. *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 107.

sources to create this part.<sup>196)</sup> In addition, it is also possible that these two sources, if there were such sources, had originally been used in entirely different situations. In their original context they might actually refer to different events.<sup>197)</sup> Brian M. Nolan suggests that, one refers to the fall of Jerusalem and the other refers to the Last Days.<sup>198)</sup> However, it does not mean that Mark also intended to retain the original meanings of these two verses. Consequently, although in their original contexts they might have referred to different events, Mark's use of them in chapter 13 makes it unlikely for us to think so, because he has not left any clue to reveal his intention behind his use of these verses.<sup>199)</sup> Although Brian M. Nolan's explanation is not impossible, it is not probable to apply this thought to these verses. To use his sources without any comment means that he had his own intention. Therefore, Brian M. Nolan's interpretation is not probable in the light of Mark's redaction.

Conversely, there is more probable explanation. Robert H. Gundry suggests that this term is not a technical term: "Because of its coupling with 'hour,' 'day' does not carry an eschatological connotation, as in 'the Day of the Lord.' Nor does 'hour,' as in 'the hour of the trial'

---

196) Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 358.

197) David B. Taylor, *Mark's Gospel as Literature and History* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 303.

198) Brian M. Nolan, "Some Observations on the Parousia," 298–299. see David B. Taylor. He discusses this verse, however, for him it was one of the many possibilities. *Mark's Gospel as Literature*, 303.

199) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 323.

(Rev 3:10).”<sup>200)</sup> According to him, this phrase, that day or hour, refers to just a point of time.<sup>201)</sup> He continues, “Rather, ‘day’ represents the smallest unit of time on the calendar, and ‘hour’ the smallest unit of time in a day.”<sup>202)</sup> Jan Lambrecht expresses a similar view to Robert H. Gundry. According to him, although it is possible to suppose that Mark’s readers might think of the ‘day of God’ of Old Testament, two problems arise. The first is that Mark placed ἡ τῆς ὥρας, the other is that in other places in Mark’s gospel the word ἡμέρα is not used as a technical term at all.<sup>203)</sup> Moreover, Robert H. Gundry lists three examples, 2:20, 4:35, and 14:25. According to him, in these three examples, this term has not been used as a technical term. I agree with his conclusion.

If Mark merely used this term, ‘that day’ in the sense of the Old testament, as a technical term, verse 32 may be just one of the many sayings in which ‘the day of the Lord’ or ‘the day of judgment’ has been mentioned. If this is the case, it would also mean that in this verse Jesus is referring to one of them rather than a specific event which is mentioned by Mark’s Jesus; such as the coming of the Son of Man in verse 27. If ‘that day’ referred to ‘the day of the Lord’ or ‘the day of judgment,’ as the Old Testament prophecies did, in this verse Mark’s

---

200) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 747.

201) According to Timothy J. Geddert, this term means not only the Last Days but also the passion of Jesus. *Watchwords*, 108.

202) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 747.

203) Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion Der Markus-Apokalypse*, 230-231.

Jesus admits that he does not know when 'the day of the Lord' or 'the day of judgment' would come. Then, a problem arises. If Jesus used the term, 'that day' as a technical term (to mean 'the day of the Lord' or 'the day of judgment'), this verse does not accord with the verse 30, because Jesus obviously taught that all the things which he mentions in the previous verses would be fulfilled within his contemporaries' life span. As has been shown, all these things are related to the Last Days which is equivalent to 'the day of the Lord' or 'the day of judgment.' Conversely, if we accept that 'that day or hour' indicates the specific and exact time of the Last Days, this problem could be removed. Therefore, although, there are many cases in which equivalents to this term can be found in the Old Testament, it is not necessary in this verse to suppose that Mark used it as a technical term.

As has been discussed above, it is more probable to see 'that day or hour' as a term used to indicate the precise point at which the last event would occur. In these verses (28-36), Mark's Jesus, who answer his disciples' second question ("what will be the sign that they are all about to be fulfilled?") is in fact answering their first question ("when will these things happen?").<sup>204)</sup> After Mark's Jesus answers the disciples' second question, in verses 28-30, Mark's Jesus teaches that it is certain that the

---

204) Thomas W. Manson thought that verses 32-37 may "represent the original answer of Jesus to the question put to him in verse 4." *The Teaching of Jesus*, 262 n. 1. However, against to this view, Craig A. Evans argued that Thomas W. Manson did not have a good reason to suppose that verses 5-31 is not an answer to the question. *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 340.

Last Days are very close. However, in verse 32 he also declares that it is certain that nobody knows the exact time. Therefore, in this respect, verse 30 is very consistent with the theme of ignorance concerning the exact hour.<sup>205)</sup>

In verse 33, Mark's Jesus again states that no one knows 'the time.' For Morna D. Hooker, the ignorance of Jesus, in verses 32-33, does not appear to be consistent with the previous paragraph which describes the signs of the End. She states:

This suggests that there are no signs to warn the disciples of impending judgment, and it is this which makes it difficult to reconcile this paragraph with the previous one, where there are said to be clear signs of the End.<sup>206)</sup>

I think Morna D. Hooker's interpretation is caused by confusing the signs with their (the signs') substance. The thing that Jesus does not know is, not the signs, but the exact time of the End. In verse 33, 'the time' (ὁ καιρός) is considered to refer to the same thing which is referred to by 'the day and hour' (τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας) of verse 32.<sup>207)</sup> It indicates the specific moment. In addition, the signs of the Last Days could only indicate the fact that the Last Days are very close.<sup>208)</sup>

---

205) Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative," 100. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 794.

206) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, 323.

207) David Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus Eschatological Discourse*, 24. n. 2. Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 349. see also Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 523. cf. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 340.

208) George E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism*



However, it could not point to the exact time when the End will come.<sup>209)</sup> Therefore, it is not necessary to think that there is inconsistency with the previous paragraph.

Rather, the fact that no one knows the exact time of the Last Days, although they are very close or imminent, makes the reader move to the other theme: the exhortation to watch. From verse 33, Mark's exhortation to keep watch is continued in the next parable.<sup>210)</sup> The one who recognizes the signs of the Last Days only knows that they are getting close. Since, however, s/he does not know the exact time, s/he has to keep watch.<sup>211)</sup> In coherence with this, Mark puts another parable into Jesus' mouth again.

#### 1.2.3.3. The parable of the house holder

As I have discussed above, to the first of the disciples' questions is answered directly in verses 28–33. However, the only thing that Jesus could say to his disciples is, not the exact time of the event, but the three characteristic traits of his expectation to the Last Days: (1) its closeness (28–30), (2) its certainty (31), and (3) everyone's ignorance

---

(London: S.P.C.K., 1966), 307.

209) About this matter in *Following Jesus* Ernest Best said, "Signs and portents are discussed but the final answer does not provide an exact time but dissolves into an assertion of ignorance (13.32, 33b, 35a) and a related exhortation to watchfulness (13.33–7)." 153.

210) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 337.

211) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 411. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, 340.

(32–33). After this, he tells them another parable to instruct them about what they have to do.<sup>212)</sup>

Rudolf Bultmann comments that this parable is not an organized composition.<sup>213)</sup> He seems to regard this parable as a Markan redactional work, especially, he believes, that verse 33 is the Markan editorial formulation. On the contrary, he allows the next two verses (verses 34–35a) to have come from an ancient tradition. He suggests that the second half of verse 35 is an allegorical expansion.<sup>214)</sup>

According to Joachim Jeremias, this parable shows that for the primitive Church the exhortation of watchfulness was very important. He states that this parable has been worked over and expanded under the influence of an expectation of the parousia.<sup>215)</sup> He assumes that the primitive church applied this parable to its own situation, awaiting the delayed parousia.<sup>216)</sup> He states the influence of the other related parables:

. . . ∴ the master's journey to a far country (ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος, 13:34) comes from the parable of the Talents, and the handing over of authority to the servants (13:34) comes from the parable of the Servant entrusted with Oversight.<sup>217)</sup>

---

212) David Wenham, *Gospel Perspectives II*, 28, 46.

213) Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), 119.

214) Rudolf Bultmann, *The History*, 174.

215) Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 53.

216) Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 55–56, 58.

217) Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 95.

Many scholars agree with Rudolf Bultmann that there is a typical expression of Mark in verse 33; βλέπετε.<sup>218)</sup> However, it is not possible to conclude that this parable is Mark's editorial work. It is certain, when Mark wrote this parable, that he edited it for his gospel. However, it does not mean that it is not a genuine saying of Jesus. Craig A. Evans suggests:

But what we have here looks for the most part like a genuine parable (beginning abruptly with ὥς, 'as' or 'like,' is typical of Jewish parables), prefaced, interrupted, and concluded with the exhortation to "watch!". . . But the eschatological discourse as a whole is coherent and probably does represent a substantial block of authentic dominical tradition.<sup>219)</sup>

The other matter mentioned is that this parable could be interpreted in relation to the appeal to watch in Gethsemane (Mark 14:38).<sup>220)</sup> Timothy J. Geddert lists four reasons to support this assumption: (1) no other texts in Mark can be paralleled so closely with either of these texts as these can with each other; (2) 'watching' (i.e., γρηγορέω) is not only restricted in Mark to these two texts, but is the keynote in both; (3) the threefold failure in Gethsemane to watch (14.37, 40, 41) is a fitting

---

218) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 195-196.

219) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 340; cf. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 469-471.

220) Robert H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St Mark* (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), 53; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 324; Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 90-91; Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," 100.

counterpart to the threefold injunction to do so (13:34,35,37); (4) 'sleeping in the crisis' is a vice rather than a virtue in both three texts but nowhere else in Mark.<sup>221)</sup>

However, these reasons are not on firm ground: (1) although it is possible for Mark to mention similar things, as we have seen in the fig tree incident and parable of fig tree, they do not refer to same thing; (2) and (3) it is certain that 'watching' is the keyword in both texts, as Timothy J. Geddert insists. This word is used differently in these two texts. In Gethsemane, the disciples of Jesus did fail to watch. It is clearer if we consider that it is used in contrast to *καθεύδω*. However, in Mark 13:34-37, it is used to admonish the readers to be ready to meet the very moment<sup>222)</sup> and not to fall into a state of spiritual torpor<sup>223)</sup>; (4) there are only three references to sleeping in Mark's gospel, except these two texts (the parable of the sower at 4:27, the report of Jesus' sleeping in the boat at 4:38, Jesus mentioning of the death of Jairus' daughter at 5:39). Only 4:38 can it be applied to a case of 'sleeping in the crisis.' Moreover, even this verse is not specific enough to indicate whether such sleeping is a vice or a virtue. Thus, it is not possible to read this parable and exhortation in Mark 13:34-37 in the light of the Gethsemane incident.<sup>224)</sup>

---

221) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchwords*, 91.

222) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 748.

223) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 472.

224) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 472.

In my view, this parable was given to the disciples by Jesus himself, although it is not known to us its exact original form. Mark's author used the tradition which came from Jesus: the imminence of the Last Days and the ignorance of the exact time. Then, in verses 34-36 he teaches his readers what they had to do as the people who expect the parousia of Jesus. It is the core of this parable.

If we take into account this aspect, the question can be removed. Joachim Jeremias states that it is not natural to travel in the night in the eastern world.<sup>225)</sup> However, it is not necessary to suppose that this parable must reflect actual life because, in the parable, exaggeration can be used for emphasis. If this is correct, we do not need to read this parable literally. Through this parable, Mark is concerned with the Last Days and emphasizes the suddenness of the coming of the Last Days as the return of the house holder.<sup>226)</sup> In this respect, Ben Witherington III, in my view, correctly says, "verse 35 makes explicit what verse 32 made implicit."<sup>227)</sup> In addition, this parable also teaches that, as the doorkeeper should watch out, so too must the readers and so they will be prepared for those days.<sup>228)</sup>

---

225) Joachim Jeremias, *The Parable of Jesus*, 54.

226) John Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (London: S.P.C.K., 1985), 68.

227) Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark*, 350.

228) William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 479. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 341. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 800.

In these verses, it is said that it will occur in the imminent future; although no one knows the exact time. Therefore, the ones who expect such an imminent event must be prepared.

#### 1.2.4. The Warning to All (37)

In verse 37, Mark's Jesus concludes his discourse with the instruction: "What I say to you, I say to everyone: 'Watch!'"

In the last verse, the warning to keep watch is extended to all.<sup>229)</sup> Whereas this discourse begins to answer the four disciples' question, now it is given to the 'all of you.' This could refer to the remainder of the twelve, Mark's readers, and the whole church throughout the Last Days.<sup>230)</sup>

Some scholars believe that this verse is a later addition that applies this discourse to the later Christians.<sup>231)</sup> However, it is also possible that Mark himself places this verse here for his own intention. Although the discourse begins with the question of the disciples, it actually addresses the Last Days. When Mark wrote his gospel, he redacted and rearranged his sources for his purpose. In this respect, it is

---

229) Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," 107. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 412. Morna D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark*, 324. Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 472. Ernest Best, *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Printing, 1981), 152-153; Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 54; John B. Trotti, "Mark 13:32-37," *Interpretation* 32 (1978), 412.

230) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 412.

231) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 342.

not impossible that Mark himself placed this verse here. As he extended the theme of the discourse from the temple's fate to the Last Days, he also extended this discourse's audience from the inner group of Jesus' disciples to the twelve, and then to his readers, and even to the whole of Christianity.

### 1.3. Conclusion

In this chapter and the previous chapter I have closely considered the text of Mark 13. As a conclusion, the three things below need to be remembered during this study.

First, although there have been many disputations concerning this chapter's unity, it is certain that Mark intentionally carefully organized his gospel. In Mark 13, the story flows to the goal, namely something that the author wants to say to his readers.<sup>232)</sup> As we have seen in the beginning of this chapter, the goal of the author was the coming of the Son of Man. In the process to reach this goal, Mark's Jesus answers his disciples' question: what is the sign of the day?

As I have argued in the conclusion of the previous chapter, Mark's author deliberately arranged his various sources in order to make his readers see the climax, which is the coming of the Son of Man, in verse 26-27.

---

232) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 756. He argued that Mark's goal in this chapter is to show Jesus' supernatural power.



After he writes what he wanted to say to his readers, he then, in verses 30-36, presents two important things that must be remembered by them.

Second, the answer to the other of the disciples' questions is here. To the question, when will the Last Days come, Jesus replies that it is very close. However, he does not give an exact answer to his disciples, such as a timetable. Rather he emphasizes just the imminence of the Last Days. He even teaches that the Last Days would occur within his contemporaries' own life span.

Third, Mark's author also emphasizes an ignorance of the exact time. He knew that the Last Days were very close. However, no one knows their exact time; not even the Son or the angels. In the following parable, he emphasizes the preparation of the readers, because, although the Last Days were very close, no one knows their exact time. Therefore, the readers should be always prepared for that moment.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **WHAT DO THE OTHER BOOKS SAY?**

In the previous chapter, it has been shown that in Mark 13 it is possible to see the eschatology of the author. In it, Mark is describing the Last Days and the signs which will precede them.

In this chapter, I will look at the other New Testament books in which reference is made to the same or similar things that are mentioned in Mark 13.

#### **1. OTHER BOOKS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

##### **1.1. Purpose**

In the previous two Chapters (IV and V) I have addressed Mark's eschatology as it is found in Mark 13. As I have argued in the conclusion of Chapter V, in verses 5-27 Mark's author adapted many Old

Testament traditions to show the signs of the Last Days. However, in verses 30 and 32 he does not use Old Testament traditions. These contain two statements (30, 32) and a parable (34-36) which show us the purpose of Mark 13.

In the earlier part of the chapter (5-27), Mark's author just lists many signs which must have been part of the traditions. In addition, it is important to note, the events which are described in this section are those which were believed to happen in the future as the signs of the Last Days. Therefore, it is not reasonable to look for a specific evidence of the literary and social context of Mark or clues through which to determine its date.

However, in the later part of the chapter (30-36) Mark's author gives instruction to his readers (who expected the Last Days) how they were to live through that period. Therefore, I would suggest that by understanding these verses it is possible for us to conjecture the situation of Mark's author. But this does not mean that I view this chapter as a window through which to see his time. In this chapter we only know that Mark's author was living in special circumstances which led him to think in a particular way and then to write it down in this chapter. I feel that this situation or circumstance can be found in verses 30-36.

My contention is that, if there was such a special situation, not only Mark's author but also the other authors of the New Testament might have been experiencing the same things and that they would have probably written

down similar things, because they would have shared, not only the circumstances of their writing, but also their experiences.<sup>1)</sup>

Consequently, I would like to look for those verses which contain the same (or a similar idea) to those found in Mark 13:30-36 among the other New Testament books.

If these passages can be found and that they express similar (or the same) eschatological traits to those found in Mark's gospel, it could cast additional light on the question of Mark's dating, even if, for the reasons set out below, it is not suggested that this approach will lead us to a single incontrovertible conclusion. In this hypothesis, I will look into the other New Testament books, with the exception of the other gospels.

For this purpose several books will be selected by the criteria which will be described below.

## 1.2. Criteria

Among the New Testament epistles we can find many phrases which are related to the Last Days. However, for this study it is not necessary to consider all the New Testament books. Here I will note several things which are needed in this study.

Firstly, the similarity of the contents must be considered. The reason that I am examining the other New Testament books is to

---

1) Charles K. Barrett said . . . , it is probable that in his [Paul's] day many Christians held views similar to those which have just been quoted from him., "New Testament Eschatology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 6 (1953), 144.

compare their eschatological traits with Mark's (as expressed in Mark 13). Therefore, above all, it is necessary to show that it is possible to detect similar eschatological traits to those of Mark.

As we have seen in the previous chapters, Mark presents two eschatological themes. The first concerns the timing of the parousia. According to Mark 13, it is very close and it is said to occur within a generation. Therefore, those New Testament books which also express this imminent expectation of the Last Days should be considered. The second is that the precise time of Last Days is not known; only God knows it.

If there is a book which contains such thoughts, it is highly possible that they were written during the same period, or at least they were experiencing the same or a similar situation. Therefore, in this chapter I will search for such thoughts in the other New Testament books.

Secondly, we must consider the plurality of works produced by one author. Although we might be able to find a book which contains the same eschatological traits to those of Mark's 13, if it is the only book written by that, it is not helpful in pinpointing the date of Mark's gospel. This is because, if we use only one book, we will only know the fact that the book's author shares the same eschatological traits with Mark's author.

However, although we have more than two books which contain the same eschatological thoughts to those expressed in Mark 13, there are several things to be considered.

If they contain the same eschatological thoughts, We can probably conclude that, because they were written at the same period and in the same situation, they shared same thoughts on the Last Days.

If these books were written by one author and, if it is possible to see any changes to those eschatological thoughts among that author's books, we can suppose that there occurred be a certain alteration to their literary and social context and that such an alteration prompted the author to modify his thoughts.

Therefore it is necessary to select books which are written by one author and which also demonstrate some differences in their eschatological thoughts. In addition, at least one of them should express the same attitudes to those of Mark 13.

Thirdly, the authenticity of the books must also be addressed. This is because, although some New Testament books (except the Pauline letters), contain the authors' name as their title, the authenticity of some of them has been doubted, In these cases, it will be necessary to exclude such books. Although the title of the two books may be the same, if one of them is considered as a genuine work and the other is not, if we use these books, we will not be able to make any meaningful conclusions. In this study, only those books which have been widely accepted as being authentic will be considered.

Lastly, the certainty of the date will also be considered. The purpose of this thesis is to discern the date of Mark's gospel. The method which is used in this study is to compare Mark gospel with the

other New Testament books, which are comparatively well dated. In determining the date of Mark's gospel, the more accurately dated books in the New Testament we have, the more precise in our dating of Mark we can get.

Therefore if, although a book contains exactly the same eschatological thoughts as Mark, its date is not clearly determined, it will not be considered in this study.

### 1.3. Selection

Following the criteria explained above, I will select which New Testament books to study, with the exception of the other gospels and Acts. This is because, as the date of Mark's gospel is not determined, the dates of the three gospels and Acts has accordingly are insecure. Therefore, in this chapter only 22 books will be considered.

#### 1.3.1. The Similarity of the Contents.

The books which has the same eschatological traits to those of Mark's author have to be selected. This means that we have to choose those books which are expressing the imminence of the Last Days (Mark 13:30) and that the exact time of the Last Days is unknowable (Mark 13:32).

Among the New Testament we can find thees eschatological traits in several of the New Testament books.



## 1.3.1.1. The imminence of the Last Days is seen in:

## a. 1 Corinthians 15:51

“Listen, I tell you a mystery: *We will not all sleep* (πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα), but we will all be changed”

In this verse, the term ‘sleep’ is used to refer ‘death.’ This term was not only a figurative expression to denote ‘death’ exclusively used by Paul, but was also well known metaphor for ‘death’ in the ancient world.<sup>2)</sup> In this verse, it matches especially well to the resurrection of the dead. When Paul used this term, he might have kept in mind a swift awakening of the dead. Therefore, Paul had the death of his contemporaries in his mind, when he wrote, “we will not all sleep.” However, he does not believe that only others ‘will’ not sleep.

In this verse, the verb is in the form of the first person plural (κοιμηθησόμεθα). Paul shows that he expected that ‘We’ (this might include Paul himself) will not die before the parousia. This expectation is almost same as Mark’s. As in Mark, it is said that the Last Days would come within the generation. In this verse, Paul expected that all of them, or at least some of them, may still be alive. Although Paul does not use the same phrases (such as, the within this generation), he appears to believe that some of them would live until the Last Days.

---

2) Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (London: A&C Black, 1972), 185; R. E. Bailey, “Is ‘Sleep’ the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55 (1964), 161–167; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 263.

## b. 1 Thessalonians 4:17

"After that, *we who are still alive* and are left will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. And so we will be with the Lord forever."

Paul describes the scene which would occur when the Lord returned. In this verse, he is convinced that he will survive until the parousia. When he writes, "we are still alive," Paul uses the first person plural pronoun. This means that, when Paul wrote this letter he believes that he should be one of those who will survive the parousia of Jesus. In his mind, the parousia will come soon and it would be within his lifetime. This expectation is different to Mark's statement in chapter 13. He expected an imminent parousia.

## c. 1 Peter 4:7

"*The end of all things is near* (Πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν). Therefore be clear minded and self-controlled so that you can pray."

In this verse the author clearly states that the end of all things was near. In his commentary, John H. Elliot argues that the imminence of the end accorded with the theme of judgment in the previous verse (1 Peter 4:5).<sup>3)</sup>

---

3) John H. Elliot, *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible 37b (New York/London: Doubleday, 2000), 744; Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978), 294-295.

According to Bo Reicke, 'all' refers to all those who were members of the community.<sup>4)</sup> In this reading, the end does not mean the Last Days, but the end of its readers. Bo Reicke assumes that this verse is the conclusion of verses 4:1-6. However, John Elliot argues against Bo Reicke and suggests that this verse is not the conclusion of the preceding verses, but the beginning of a new section. He contends that the 'all' (πάντων) refers to, not just those people but also to things, and that the phrase 'the end' (τὸ τέλος) refers to the eschatological end of the ages.<sup>5)</sup> In addition, the perfect tense of the verb, ἤγγικεν, connotes immediacy<sup>6)</sup> and the chronological nearness of the eschaton.<sup>7)</sup>

I would suggest that it is more natural to read this verse as John Elliot argues, if we consider, as Leonhard Goppelt observes, the other part of this letter focuses upon the future eschaton, the judgment and the coming of the Lord (1:4f., 8-12, 13; 4:13; 5:10).<sup>8)</sup>

#### d. James 5:8

"You too, be patient and stand firm, because *the Lord's coming is near* (ὅτι ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικεν)"

---

4) Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Anchor Bible 37 (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 120.

5) John H. Elliot, *1 Peter*, 744.

6) John H. Elliot, *1 Peter*, 745; Edward G. Selwyn, *The first epistle of Saint Peter* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1946), 214;

7) Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 294.

8) Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 294; Francis W. Beare, *The first epistle of Peter: the Greek text with introduction and notes* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947), 157-158.

James urges his readers that the coming of Lord is very close, when in the previous verse, he encourages his readers to be patient (5:7f, Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου). When he writes about the coming of Lord, he uses verb in its perfect tense ἤγγικεν. This verb is also used in Matthew 3:2, Mark 1:15 where John the Baptist and Jesus proclaim the nearness of the kingdom of God. As others of his time did, James declares that the coming of the Lord was imminent.<sup>9)</sup>

#### e. Revelation 22:12

“Behold, *I am coming soon* (ἔρχομαι ταχύ)! My reward is with me.”

For the seer John, the Lord clearly taught that he would come soon. There are more references to the coming of Jesus in Revelation 3:11, 22:7, 20. However, in this verse, it is not clearly stated how soon he would come. In fact it is not clear whether these verses are actually describing the imminence of the Last Days. Nevertheless, we can fairly safely assume the imminence of the Last Days because, as Donald Guthrie contends, the purpose of this books was to encourage its readers. Consequently, it is more reasonable to assume that a long delay was not expected.<sup>10)</sup>

---

9) C. Leslie Mitton, *The Epistle of James* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1966), 186–187; Sophie Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1980), 208–809; Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans/Leicester: Apollos, 2000), 30.

10) Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 814.

1.3.1.2. The unknowableness of time when the Last Days would be is in:

a. 1 Thessalonians 5:2

“for you know very well that the day of *the Lord will come like a thief in the night.*”

b. 1 Thessalonians 5:4

“But you, brothers, are not in darkness so that this day should surprise you *like a thief.*”

c. 2 Peter 3:10

“But the day of *the Lord will come like a thief.*”

d. Revelation 3:3

“But if you do not wake up, *I will come like a thief*, and you will not know at what time I will come to you.”

e. Revelation 16:15

“Behold, *I come like a thief!* Blessed is he who stays awake and keeps his clothes with him”

As we can see above, all these verses contain the same image, a thief. This noun, ὁ κλέπτης, used twelve times in the New Testament (six in the gospels, twice in 1 Thessalonians, once in 1 Peter, once in 2 Peter, twice in Revelation). Therefore, if we discount the gospels, we are

left with six cases and five of those six instances are found in the those books listed above. Only in 1 Peter 4:15 is this term not used in an eschatological context. All the other cases are used eschatologically. For Joachim Jeremias, the use of this term in eschatological context is the reason for us to believe that these sayings come from Jesus.

The symbol of the thief is frequently employed in early Christian literature, and since it is foreign to the eschatological imagery of late Jewish literature, we may infer that the passages in which it is found are based on the parable of Jesus.<sup>11)</sup>

In my view, Joachim Jeremias' argument is highly probable.

In its eschatological context, this noun is not used to describe the criminal activity of a thief, but to show the unpredictability of a thief's intrusion as a metaphor for the unknowableness of the time. Therefore, the real meaning of the 'thief' is to demonstrate the unexpected nature of the coming of the day (or the Lord), as expressed in Matthew and Luke:

If the owner of the house had known at what time of night the thief was coming, he would have kept watch and would not have let his house be broken into. (Matthew 24:43, NIV)

If the owner of the house had known at what hour the thief was coming, he would not have let his house be broken into. (Luke 12:39, NIV)

---

11) Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, revised edition (London: SCM Press, 1972), 50.

The image of the thief is used within the eschatological context in order to emphasize the unexpectedness of the time. According to Colin R. Nicholl, “the thief simile is used consistently in the New Testament to imply the unexpectedness and unwelcomeness of the Lord’s coming upon those who will be judged by it.”<sup>12)</sup>

Therefore, although there is no direct mention of the unexpectedness of the time, it is probable to understand that it is being alluded to in these verses, as we can see from its usage in the synoptic gospels. This term will be considered again in detail below.

As I have noted above, in some books, it is possible to find both eschatological traits of Mark 13, such as in 1 Thessalonians and Revelation. Contrary to these two books, the other books, 1 Corinthians, James, and 1 Peter, which express the imminence of the parousia do not mention the unknowableness of the time. However, although they do not explicitly mention it, it is possible to show that they do also share this view.

The first two books are written by Paul who believed that the Lord (1 Thessalonians 5:2) or the Day (1 Thessalonians 4:17) would come like a thief. Therefore, there is no reason to suppose that Paul’s thought in Corinthians would differ from that of 1 Thessalonians.

---

12) Ben Witherington III, *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2006), 134; Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: The English Text with Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), 152.



In 1 Peter 4:7 and James 5:8, the authors also do not mention the unknowableness of the time; in fact they do not refer at all to the time of the Last Days. In these verses, they exhort the imminent nature of the End (1 Peter 4:7) and the Lord's coming (James 5:8), but they do not comment on the time at all. It can be argued that if they did have any idea relating to the exact time of the Last Days, it would have been useful to them in persuading their readers. However, as they are quiet about this matter, one can conclude that they shared Paul's position (or even Mark's).

2 Peter 3:10 has no reference at all to the imminence of the Last Days, although its author does refer to the time being unknowable. Therefore, it will be excluded.

### 1.3.1.3. Summary

Following the first criterion, we can consider these verses (shown above). According to this criterion, only a few books among the New Testament cannot be considered in this study. They are 1 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians, 1 Peter, James, and Revelation.

In addition, it must be remembered that the books in which we cannot find these two eschatological traits can still be considered, if they have been written by the same author. This is because the author might have modified his views for some reason. It is impossible to find the same thought in some of books. Rather, if we can identify such a book, it is better to compare the views expressed in it with those of Mark.

### 1.3.2. The Plurality of the Products by the Same Author

In this study, I will attempt to detect change in the author's thinking. Therefore, as I have discussed above, for this study, at least two books written by one author are needed. However, it is not particularly hard to apply this criterion. In the New Testament, there are two authors whose names appear in the title of more than two books; excluding the Pauline letters. They are Peter and John.

However, as we have seen above, John's three letters do not meet the first criterion. This is because there is not one verse that expresses an expectation of an imminent parousia or the unknowableness of its time. Therefore, the authors who can meet both the first and second criteria are Paul and Peter.

### 1.3.3. The Authenticity of the Books

Among the books which can meet the two above criteria, I will deal with the Pauline letters first. The authenticity of some of them has been suspected by some scholars. Leander E. Keck argues that, "there are such fundamental differences among them that most scholars are convinced that some cannot have come from Paul."<sup>13</sup> This means that some of the Pauline letters are not accepted as being genuine. I will now deal with two Pauline letters here: 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians.

---

13) Leander E. Keck, *Paul and His Letters*, Proclamation Commentaries (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 3.

### 1.3.3.1. 1 Corinthians

The authenticity of 1 Corinthians is generally accepted by many scholars.<sup>14)</sup> Nevertheless, there is another problem. This letter has been the subject of a debate concerning its unity. According to Jean Héring, although he admits the authenticity of this letter, he identifies three problems: two contradictions, one occurring between chapter 4 (which relates the apostle's imminent arrival) and chapter 16 (which talks about his delay), and the other is between 10:1-22 (which shows "the rigorist attitude over the question of pagan sacrifices") and 10:23-11:1 (which "makes it a matter of concern for the weak") and a sudden change of theme in chapter 9, in which Paul abruptly vindicates his apostleship, although in the previous chapters it is affirmatively discussed.<sup>15)</sup> Because of these problems, he concludes that there were originally two letters that a later editor has subsequently combined to create its present form.<sup>16)</sup> If this is the case, it is difficult to verify its authenticity because, although some parts of this letter can be accepted as Pauline, the other part cannot be considered as being Paul's genuine work.

---

14) Charles K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2nd edition Black's New Testament Commentary (London: A & C Black, 1971), 11; Archibald Robertson, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 2nd edition ICC (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1914), xvi-xix; Jean Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, 2nd edition, translated from French by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), xii-xiii; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: a commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 2-4;

15) Jean Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, xiii.

16) Jean Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, xiv.

However, against this view, Charles K. Barrett argues that these contradictions and the abruption can not be the reason to suspect its unity. He contends that:<sup>17)</sup>

... the writing of the letter will have been spread over some time; it may well have been laid aside from time to time, and taken up again after an interval. A letter written in such circumstances may be expected to show occasional inconsistencies, and passages in which the same topic is looked at from different point of view.<sup>18)</sup>

He concludes that, "The integrity of I Corinthians is a question on which differences of opinion will no doubt continue to exist."<sup>19)</sup> Nowadays, many scholars agree with him and there is a wide consensus that the letter is a authentically Pauline.<sup>20)</sup>

### 1.3.3.2. 1 Thessalonians

Ferdinand C. Baur suspected the authenticity of 1 Thessalonians in the middle of 19th century.<sup>21)</sup> He suggested that several sections in 1

---

17) Charles K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 15-17

18) Charles K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 15.

19) Charles K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 17.

20) Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 4; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, Interpretation BCTP (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), 9; Anthony C. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical & Pastoral Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006), 26. cf. de Boer, "The Composition of 1 Corinthians," 240.

21) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 261; Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, xxxiii.

Thessalonians did not come from Paul.<sup>22)</sup> Because it exhibited such heterogeneous sections, its authenticity has been denied.

However, during the last century most scholars have begun to accept its authenticity.<sup>23)</sup> Nowadays, this book's authenticity is widely accepted by almost all scholars. Consequently, this letter is being regarded as Paul's genuine letter and its unity is also widely accepted.

Robert Jewett notes that:

While the early discussion involved both letters, a widely shared consensus has emerged in twentieth-century scholarship that 1 Thessalonians is an indisputably authentic letter, reflecting the earliest phase of Pauline writing. Problematic portions of the first letter are occasionally ascribed to an interpolator, but no one in the current scholarly debate doubts its authenticity.<sup>24)</sup>

### 1.3.3.3. The Petrine Letters

The two letters of Peter should now be considered. The author of 1 Peter introduces himself as "an apostle of Jesus Christ" (1:1f).

---

22) According to Werner G. Kümmel, these sections are 2:13-16; 4:1-8, 10b-12, 18; 5:12-22, 27., *Introduction*, 260

23) Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 5; William Neil, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, The Torch Bible Commentaries (London: SCM Press, 1957), 21-22; Arthur L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, New Century Bible (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1969), 7-10; Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 28; cf. Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, Word Biblical Commentary 45 (Waco: Word Books, 1982), xxxiv

24) Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, 3. Also look at the conclusion of chapter three, 46.

However, many scholars have suspected its authenticity for a long time.<sup>25)</sup> Charles. E. B. Cranfield supplies eight reasons of such a suspicion.<sup>26)</sup> One of the reason relates to the style of Greek used in this letter. He suggests that it is thought to be too good to have been written by Peter, the 'uneducated' Galilean fisherman (Acts 4:13).<sup>27)</sup> Bo Reicke explains that Silvanus, who is mentioned in 5:12, copied this letter when Peter dictated its contents; this could remove the obstacle in accepting it as genuine.<sup>28)</sup> Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin assume that it was the product of a certain group following Peter's death.<sup>29)</sup> Alfred R. C. Leaney suggests that 1 Peter is pseudonymous. For these scholars, the letter was written by someone else following the apostle's death.<sup>30)</sup>

---

25) John N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentary (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969), 30-31; David G. Horrell, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1998), 6-7; Charles. E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1960), 13-16; Alfred R. C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude: A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, A Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 12;

26) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 13-16.

27) Alfred R. C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude*, 7; John N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 31; Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 14.

28) Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude: Introduction, Translation, and Note*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 72; Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 14; Joel B. Green, *I Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2007), 10.

29) Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*, New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 90-94; Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995), 12.

30) Alfred R. C. Leaney, *The Letters of Peter and Jude*, 12; Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 16; Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on I Peter*, 48-52

The question of the authenticity of 1 Peter has not yet been resolved. Many scholars suggest different solutions and all of them possess their own strengths. However, none of them presents a sufficient reason to deny the authenticity of 1 Peter. Consequently, in this study it will remain as an open question.

The problem of the authenticity becomes more complicated with in 2 Peter. As 1 Peter was written in the name of Peter (1 Peter 1:1), 2 Peter begins with the introduction of the author in the name of Simon Peter (2 Peter 1:1, 12-18; 3:1-2). He also makes it clear that this is the second letter sent to the recipient (2 Peter 3:1).

However, contrary to the first letter, this epistle has long been doubted by most scholars.<sup>31)</sup> The problems raised by scholars are these: (1) if Peter, who was a fisherman of Galilee, was the author of 2 Peter, it is not easy to explain the Hellenistic colour of this letter.<sup>32)</sup> (2) There are great differences between the style and vocabulary of 1 Peter and 2 Peter.<sup>33)</sup> (3) According to some scholars, the contents of 2 Peter comes from Jude. Therefore, it is impossible that 2 Peter was written earlier

---

31) David G. Horrell, *The Epistles of Peter and Jude*, 136; Jonathan Knight, *2 Peter and Jude* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 15-16, 22.

32) Bo Reicke, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude*, 143-144. John N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 235.

33) Jonathan Knight, *2 Peter and Jude*, 22; James Moffatt, *The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Judas* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1945), 174; John N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 236. James Moffatt, *The General Epistles*, 174. Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 149. Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, 160.



than Jude, which has been considered to have been written no earlier than A.D. 80.<sup>34)</sup> (4) The witnesses of 2 Peter in the early church appear too late to believe that it was written by Peter himself —before the middle of the 60's of the first century.<sup>35)</sup>

Against this view Ruth A. Reese attempts to vindicate 2 Peter's authenticity. The existence of the scribe who wrote down Peter's dictation can help to explain the Hellenistic colour of this letter, as well as the differences in style and vocabulary between 1 and 2 Peter.<sup>36)</sup> The assumption of the existence of the source which was used by Jude and 2 Peter can obviate the argument that Jude must precede 2 Peter.<sup>37)</sup> The contents of this letter does appear to reflect the situation of the middle of the first century.<sup>38)</sup> Ruth A. Reese concludes:

So, where 1 Peter talks about God the creator as the one who initiates salvation through Jesus, 2 Peter points to the consummation of God's salvific work at the end of time. Likewise, 1 Peter focuses on Jesus' suffering whereas 2 Peter focuses on his triumphant return. In other words,

---

34) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 148. John N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 236. Andrew Chester and Ralph P. Martin, *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*, 138–139.

35) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *I & II Peter and Jude*, 148. Pheme Perkins, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, 160.

36) Ruth A. Reese, *2 Peter & Jude* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2007), 117–118; Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude: An Introduction and Commentar*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (London: The Tyndale Press, 1968), 16–22.

37) Ruth A. Reese, *2 Peter & Jude*, 118–119. Michael Green, *2 Peter and Jude*, 22–23. He also argues that 2 Peter's date is around middle of the first century, 36–40.

38) Ruth A. Reese, *2 Peter & Jude*, 117.

1 and 2 Peter together communicate a fuller theological understanding than either book could communicate on their own."<sup>39)</sup>

As we have seen above, the authenticity of the Petrine letters is still a matter of debate. Although there is a wide consensus that at least one of them (it might be 2 Peter) was composed or combined by one of Peter's school, other possibilities have been forwarded.

#### 1.3.3.4. Summary

As a result, in this study to reduce the possibility of any argument, I will exclude the Petrine letters. Thus, only Paul's two letters remain and here, one more of Paul's letter needs to be considered. As the first criterion notes, although, in a certain book, the apocalyptic traits cannot be found, if in that book we can find any trace of change to the author's thought, it is necessary to use that book in order to identify the way that author's thought has changed. Although in Philippians, Paul does not refer to the imminence of the parousia, he does not keep quiet about his future. Thus, it is useful to deal with such book in order to understand his thinking.

Consequently, for this study, I have selected one more letter of Paul. Therefore, the letters that I examine in this chapter are; 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and Philippians.

---

39) Ruth A. Reese, *2 Peter & Jude*, 121; Robert W. Wall, "The Canonical Function of 2 Peter," *Biblical Interpretation* 9.1 (2001), 64-81.

### 1.3.4. The Accuracy of the Date of the Books

The last criterion will be considered below when matters of chronology will be addressed.

## 2. CHRONOLOGY

As we can see above, only the Pauline letters meet the three criteria listed above. The last criterion relates to the accuracy of the date. Fortunately the Pauline letters are comparatively well dated. In fact, they are much easier to date than any other of the other books in the New Testament. I will consider their dates in the following section where the issue of chronology is examined.

### 2.1. 1 Thessalonians

1 Thessalonians is generally considered as one of the earliest books in the New Testament. Acts 18 supplies us with several clues by which to date this letter. In verse 1, Paul is shown to have left Athens and arrived at Corinth. In Corinth he meets Silas and Timothy, who were sent to Thessalonica by Paul when they were in Athens (1 Thess. 3:2). In Acts 18:5 their return from Macedonia is described. However, there is no further explanation about them and what they did. Contrary to this, in 1 Thessalonians 3:6, Paul writes two things: the first is that Timothy has returned from Thessalonica, and the second is that they have reported, to Paul, on the state of the church in Thessalonica.<sup>40)</sup>

At the beginning of this letter, (1 Thessalonians 1:1), the salutation mentions two names; Silas and Timothy. These two are also named in Acts 18:5. According to this verse, they had come from Macedonia,<sup>41)</sup> although there is no mention about what they did or brought from Macedonia. However, the situation described in Acts is very similar to that of 1 Thessalonians. Because of this similarity, these two passages, therefore, have been considered to illustrate same incident from a different perspective. Nevertheless, because of their different perspectives, their explanation cannot be exactly same.<sup>42)</sup> In Acts, its author, as a historian, records what had happened, whereas, in 1 Thessalonians Paul, as a pastor, records what he thought and what was important to him and his mission.<sup>43)</sup>

It is the most probable explanation for the differences between these texts, however, it does not offer any concrete evidence to show that these two texts are describing the same thing. In this respect Arthur L. Moore's comment is right. He notes that our intention to date 1 Thessalonians on the basis of the similarity between these two passages

---

40) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 257-260.

41) Arthur. L. Moore assumed that Timothy met Silas on the way to Paul, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, New Century Bible (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1969), 6.

42) As Gerd Lüdemann said, "Paul is writing not as a neutral historian but rather in response to accusations." This is true in other letters, including 1 Thessalonians. *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles (Studies in Chronology)* (London: SCM Press, 1984), 19-21.

43) Berverly R. Gaventa said that Paul's answer to the question of the Thessalonian church is not only theological but also pastoral, *Interpretation: First and Second Thessalonians* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1998), 62-63.

is to “enter in part the sphere of conjecture and impression.”<sup>44)</sup> Therefore, it has to be remembered that the dating of these three letters is not based upon concrete evidences, but the assessment of probabilities.

On this basis, scholars have paid attention to the tablets which have been found in Delphi, on which the name of Gallio is inscribed.<sup>45)</sup> This name is mentioned in Acts 18:12 and 17.<sup>46)</sup> This inscription is useful in pointing to a more exact date for 1 Thessalonians, because it can be dated by its contents: “This letter was written after Claudius had been acclaimed emperor for the 26th time.”<sup>47)</sup> Unfortunately, we cannot know the exact date of this acclamation. However, although it is not certain when the 26th acclamation took place, we do know the exact date of the next acclamation. It took place on 1 August 52.<sup>48)</sup> Therefore, it is clear that this letter must have been written before this date.

Considering all the acclamations which took place between A.D. 51 and 52, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor estimated the possible time of the 26th

---

44) Arthur. L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 7.

45) In this inscription the name of Gallio is found. ΝΙΟΣ ΓΑΛΛΙΩΝ Ο Φ[ΙΛΑΟΣ] ΜΟΥ ΚΑ[Ι]

46) Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, Word Biblical Commentary 45 (Waco: Word Books, 1982), xxxv.

47) Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1983), 150.

48) Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 150; Leon Morris, *The First and second Epistles to the Thessalonians: The English Text with Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), 25-26.

acclamation. According to him, it occurred sometimes between April of A.D. 51 and July of A.D. 52. During this time there were 6 acclamations, (the 22nd to the 27th). Among them the 22nd, 23rd, 24th acclamations took place in the 11th tribunician year of Claudius<sup>49)</sup>. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor believes that, in A.D. 51 there are eight months from April to November and in A.D. 52 there are only four months from April to July. If the six acclamations are spread in regular intervals, there would be four acclamations in A.D. 51 and two acclamations in A.D. 52. He, therefore, concludes that the 26th acclamation could take place in the spring of A.D. 52. If this letter was written in the beginning of A.D. 52, Gallio would have started his term of office in the middle of previous year.<sup>50)</sup>

In addition, we know that Paul had stayed in Corinth for eighteen months (Acts 18:11). Therefore, the term of Gallio's office must have overlapped with the period of Paul's stay in Corinth. The date of Paul's arrival at Corinth, therefore, looks earlier than that of Gallio's. Consequently, Paul may have arrived at Corinth at the beginning of A.D. 50 or the end of A.D. 49.

To calculate the exact date, it is necessary for us to look at Acts and 1 Thessalonians. In Acts, when Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, the Jews attacked Paul and brought him before the court because he had

---

49) 11th tribunician year of Claudius is from 25 Jan. 51 to 24 Jan. 52. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 151-152.

50) In fact there are two possibilities concerning Gallio's term of office. The one is A.D. 50-51 and the second is A.D. 51-52. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor chose the second possibility, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 158-159.

persuaded the people to worship God in a different way to that prescribed by the law (Acts 18:12–13). Paul underwent an ordeal because of the gospel. However, this incident is not mentioned in 1 Thessalonians at all. Therefore, it would appear that this incident had not yet happened when Paul wrote this letter.<sup>51)</sup> Consequently, it is probable (as most scholars accept) that 1 Thessalonians was written at the beginning of A.D. 50.<sup>52)</sup>

## 2.2. 1 Corinthians

After he left Corinth in A.D. 52, Paul visited Antioch for a while (Acts 18:22). He then returns to Ephesus (Acts 19:1). The first letters to Corinth has been considered to have been written in this period, because Paul himself mentions that he would stay on at Ephesus until Pentecost.<sup>53)</sup> However, there was more journey to be considered before his return to Ephesus. According to Acts 18–19, Paul once visited Ephesus for a while.<sup>54)</sup> He then left it in order to visit Caesarea and went to Antioch. He spent some time there, then, traveled from place to place throughout

---

51) Arthur. L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 7.

52) Leon Morris, *The First and second Epistles*, 26, Arthur. L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 6–7, William Neil, *St. Paul's Epistles*, 24, John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1993), 53, Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 257. cf. Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 11.

53) ἐπιμενώ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς

54) According to John A. T. Robinson, this visit may have lasted longer than a month. *Redating*, 42.



the region of Galatia and Phrygia (Acts 18:23). It would have taken some time to travel all these places. After all the journeys were complete, he finally returns to Ephesus (Acts 19:1). Paul informed the elders of the church at Ephesus that he had stayed there for three years (Acts 20:31).

However, it is uncertain whether these three years means exactly three years or roughly three years. When Paul arrived at Ephesus, he preached about the kingdom of God in the synagogue and, then he debated daily in the school of Tyrannus for two years (Acts 19:10). It might be two and a half years altogether.<sup>55)</sup> Although it is not clear to which one is referred, there could be at least a six month's gap.<sup>56)</sup> This could mean that he had stayed in Ephesus for between two and a half and three years. Consequently, if Paul left Corinth in A.D. 52, he must have arrived at Ephesus in the same year (A.D. 52). In addition to this, if we take into account his journey which he had made between his leaving Corinth and his return to Ephesus, he might have returned to Ephesus in A.D. 53.<sup>57)</sup> He then stayed there until A.D. 55.

However, although there is still a problem that there is a span of, at least, two and a half years, it is not easy to pinpoint a specific time within this period. The only clue we have is that Paul writes about his plan to stay in Ephesus until Pentecost (1 Corinthians 16:8).

---

55) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating*, 46.

56) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating*, 33.

57) Margaret E. Thrall, *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 10-11.

Therefore, Paul might have stayed in Ephesus, at least, until the Pentecost of 55. Furthermore, it does not look that as if this festival is not so far from the actual point of writing. If this is true, we can say that Paul wrote 1 Corinthians at the end of A.D. 54 or at the beginning of the A.D. 55 whilst in Ephesus.<sup>58)</sup>

### 2.3. Philippians

Philippians is one of the so-called 'prison epistles,' because some of their verses imply that Paul was imprisoned while he was writing them; such as ἐν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (1:7), τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι (1:13), πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (1:14), τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου (1:17).

In Acts we can find three different references to Paul being imprisoned: at the time of Paul's first visit to Philippi (Acts 16:23-40); the arrest in Jerusalem and then being jailed for two years in Caesarea (Acts 21:32-23:30); and Paul's voyage to Rome as a prisoner and his two years' detention in Rome (26:1-28:16).

Traditionally, Rome has been considered as the place where Philippians was written.<sup>59)</sup> However, for the last century several

---

58) Frederick F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London: Butler & Tanner Ltd., 1971), 25. Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 279.

59) Francis W. Beare, *A Commentary*, 15; Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians*, translated by A. W. Heathcote (London: Epworth Press, 1979), 15-16; Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 324; George B. Caird, *Paul's Letters from Prison: In the Revised Standard Version* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), 2-6; Markus Bockmuehl, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, Black's New Testament Commentary (London: A & C Black, 1997), 25-32; Stephen E. Fowl, *Philippians*, Two

questions have been raised. The most significant problem is 'the distance between Rome and Philippi.' According to the letter, Paul wrote at least one other letter before this one (Philippians 2:25a; 4:18). Therefore, he would have had to have made at least four journeys between the city in which Paul wrote this letter and Philippi.<sup>60)</sup> If he was in Rome, the distance between Rome and Philippi is around 800 miles. This could take more than a few months to correspond by letter. In addition, it is unlikely that he would have sent Epaphroditus, who was recently very ill, to such a distant city.

Second, in Romans, Paul discuss his plan to go to Spain following his visit to Rome (Rom 15:22, 28). However, in Philippians 2:24, Paul writes that he wants to go to Philippi. If the letter was written in Rome, this discrepancy must be explained.<sup>61)</sup>

Because of these problems, many scholars suggest alternative locations for this letter. The most widely supported city is Ephesus<sup>62)</sup>

---

Horizons New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 10.

60) Francis W. Beare, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 3rd edition (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973), 18.

61) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xxxviii; Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 325-326;

62) George S. Duncan, "A New Setting for St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians," *Expository Times* 43 (1931-1932), 7; Charles H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: II," *New Testament Studies*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 85-108; Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976), 36-57; Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians Philemon*, Abingdon New Testament Commentary (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), 24-31; cf. Jean-François Collange believes that Philippians was a combined letter. He insists that the front part (A and B) of the letter was composed in Ephesus and the latter part (C) was written a few years later, *The Epistle*, 19.

and the being Caesarea.<sup>63)</sup> Although these places have been considered as the origin of Philippians, they also have some problems.

### 2.3.1. Ephesus

Although there is no mention of Paul being imprisoned in Ephesus, it has been considered as a possible writing place for Philippians. Moreover, there are several indirect references to great troubles in Asia, or more specifically in Ephesus; such as Paul's comment, that he "fought with wild animals at Ephesus" (1 Corinthians 15:32). In addition, if it is taken into account that Acts does not record every imprisonment of Paul, it is not implausible to suppose that he was imprisoned there, but it was not recorded in Acts.<sup>64)</sup> We can see the possibility of Paul's imprisonment in many places in 2 Corinthians 11:23 which was written around A.D. 55. This is earlier than the second recorded imprisonment in Caesarea around A.D. 58. Therefore it is, at least, certain that Paul had been imprisoned in other unknown places.

Consequently, it is plausible to suggest that he was imprisoned in Ephesus. If this is true, we can find several advantages. It can explain Paul's

---

63) Cecil J. Cadoux, "The Dates and Provenance of the Imprisonment Epistles of St. Paul," *Expository Times* 45 (1933-1934), 473; Lewis Johnson, "The Pauline Letters from Caesarea," *Expository Times* 68 (1956-1957), 24-26; John A. T. Robinson, *Redating*, 57-61; Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xlii-xliv.

64) George S. Duncan supposes the possible setting of Paul's imprisonment. "A New Setting," 8; Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xxxix; Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle*, 17; Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 331.

desire to visit Philippi (Philippians 2:24). In addition, if Paul was writing this letter in Ephesus, it can also explain the frequent journey mentioned in it, because the distance from Philippi to Ephesus is not as far as that to Rome.<sup>65)</sup> According to Charles H. Dodd, if this letter was written in Ephesus, Philippians 1:13 accords with Paul's situation in Ephesus.<sup>66)</sup>

However, this view also raises other problems. It is regarded that the two terms, '*praetorium*' and 'Caesar's household' accord with the circumstances of Ephesus. 'Caesar's household' can refer to slaves or freedmen in the imperial service located in Rome, Ephesus or elsewhere.<sup>67)</sup> However, it is not certain whether the *praetorium* mentioned in Philippians 1:13 was in this city or not.

Frederick F. Bruce contends that, "there is no known instance in imperial times of its use for the headquarters of proconsul, the governor of a senatorial province such as Asia was at this time."<sup>68)</sup> If this is correct, the hypothesis of an Ephesian origin must be excluded. In addition Peter T. O'Brien also argues:

Ephesus was the capital of a senatorial (rather than an imperial) province, namely Asia, and there is no known instance of the governor's headquarters of such a province being called a *praetorium* at this time. Troops were not

---

65) Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle*, 17.

66) Charles H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: II," *New Testament Studies*, 96.

67) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xxxviii.

68) Frederick F. Bruce, *Philippians*, New International Biblical Commentary (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989), xxii.

normally stationed in senatorial provinces since they were ruled by civil authority.<sup>69)</sup>

However, Carolyn Osiek argues that, although *praetorium* and the household of Caesar are most explicable of Roman origin, it could also refer to the residence “of the governor of an imperial province, and the imperial civil service extended wherever there as significant Roman influence.”<sup>70)</sup> And she even suggests that it is used in the middle of the first century carried a much broader meaning: “not limited to a governor’s residence or military headquarters but even used to refer to a large house or palace of royalty or of an important person.”<sup>71)</sup> In fact, we can find this term in the other New Testament books, such as John and Acts. It means that the use of *praetorium* cannot be the conclusive clue to decide the origin of Philippians.

The other problem is that the fundamental basis of this hypothesis is not certain. The Ephesian imprisonment of Paul is not impossible. However, there is no positive evidence to support this hypothesis. Though Ralph P. Martin examines the evidences of the imprisonment of Paul in this city in his commentary, he concedes that they are unreliable.<sup>72)</sup> Paul’s reference to having “fought with wild

---

69) Peter T. O’Brien, *Commentary on Philippians*, 22; Bo Reicke also points out, “Asia was a senatorial province and was therefore ruled by civil authority; for this reason, no troops were stationed there.” “Caesarea,” 283.

70) Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians Philemon*, 28.

71) Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians Philemon*, 30.

72) Peter T. O’Brien, *Commentary on Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*,

animals at Ephesus” does not necessarily refer to the imprisonment of Paul in this city, because it is just a metaphor to explain the difficulties he encountered there.

In addition, it is not easy to explain why Paul is completely silent about the collection for the poor in Jerusalem. For Paul, this was one of the most important aspect of his ministry while in this city. Although he mentions it in all his letters written before this period, he makes no reference to it in this letter.<sup>73)</sup>

If he was imprisoned in Ephesus and faced the possibility of immediate death for his crime (Philippians 1:19, 20), it is strange that he did not use his right as a Roman citizen to appeal his case to the Emperor. In fact, he exercised this right in Caesarea (Acts 25:10).<sup>74)</sup> Peter T. O'Brien argues that, because Paul had already appealed to the Emperor, it was not necessary for him to exercise this right.<sup>75)</sup>

Although the Ephesian origin of Philippians are widely accepted, this view still has many problems. A further location has been suggested: Caesarea.

---

NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991), 22; Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians*, 48–50; Bo Reicke, “Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles,” translated by Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), 283.

73) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xxxix.

74) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xl; Peter T. O'Brien, *Commentary on Philippians*, 22.

75) Peter T. O'Brien, *Commentary on Philippians*, 22–23.



### 2.3.2. Caesarea

According to Ralph P. Martin, this hypothesis was first suggested by H. E. G. Paulus of Jena in 1799.<sup>76)</sup> The imprisonment of Paul in this city is recorded in Acts (Acts 21:32–23:30) and, if it was written in Caesarea, there is no problem in explaining ‘*praetorium*’ and ‘Caesar’s household.’ This is accords with Luke’s description in Acts 23:35 (κελεύσας ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ τοῦ Ἡρώδου). In addition, during the New Testament period, this palace was used “as the residence of the Roman procurator and as the headquarters of the Roman garrison in Palestine.”<sup>77)</sup> However, Frederick F. Bruce’s comment (cited above) can also be applied to this hypothesis, although, arguably, Judaea was a more troubled province than Asia.

The distance between Philippi and Caesarea can also be another problem. This is because the distance is greater than the distance between Rome and Philippi. Therefore, if distance is problematic for the Roman origin, the same will apply for this city as well.<sup>78)</sup> However, it is argued that the long distance should not be a problem, because the period of Paul’s imprisonment is also long enough to cover at least two return journey from this city to Philippi.<sup>79)</sup> If this is the case, the reason for which excluding Roman and Caesarean origin have been removed.

---

76) Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians*, 45.

77) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xli.

78) Charles H. Dodd does not even consider this possibility. “The Mind of Paul: II,” 85–108.

79) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xli.

In the letter to the Philippians we can feel the atmosphere of Paul being threatened with the martyrdom. However, in Luke's report of his Caesarean imprisonment this does not occur at all.<sup>80)</sup> Rather, Luke describes Paul as experiencing some freedom: "Felix ordered the centurion to keep Paul under guard but to give him some freedom and permit his friends to take care of his needs" (Acts 24:10).

On the contrary, Gerald F. Hawthorne argues that, in this city Paul was actually in danger of death several times.

. . . the Acts account make clear that Paul's life was in constant danger in Caesarea (cf. Acts 21:31, 36; 22:22; 23:30; 25:3, 24; 26:21), and that he was protected from death only because he was in Roman custody.<sup>81)</sup>

However, Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea is reported in Acts 24:23 and his departure from the city is described in Acts 27:1. Therefore, the account of his imprisonment in Caesarea is found in Acts 24:23 to Acts 26:32. Contrary to Gerald F. Hawthorne's argument, the danger of Paul's death is referred to only in 25:3. The danger of death in 21:31, 36, 22:22 occurred before Paul was imprisoned. The danger which Paul experienced is mentioned in Acts 25:24, when Festus asks for a reason to accuse Paul to Emperor and the other instance (in Acts 26:21) refers to Paul addressing Agrippa concerning what had happened

---

80) Peter T. O'Brien, *Commentary on Philippians*, 24; Markus Bockmuehl, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 30.

81) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, xliii.

to him in the past. One other verse (25:3) is not applicable to prove Paul's danger in Caesarea, because, in this verse, we can know that there was a plot to kill Paul. Furthermore, after this plot, Acts 25:11 states that Paul appealed to Caesar. This means that event must have occurred almost at the end of the Caesarean imprisonment of Paul. Therefore, it is difficult to find any proof that Paul was in danger of death in this city. Rather, we can only know that he was under the protection of the Roman soldiers.

On the contrary, in Philippians, Paul refers to his death several times (Philippians 1:20-23; 2:17; 3:10-11), during which reminds us of his martyrdom. Consequently, if Philippians was written in Caesarea, therefore, this does not correspond with the description found in Acts 24:10-25:12.

An other thing to be considered is that Caesarea is very close to Jerusalem, where Paul had recently delivered his collection for the poor. Caesarea is, in fact, his last stop before Jerusalem (Acts 21:8-15). There, they were welcomed by the brothers in Jerusalem (Acts 21:17ff). Paul mentions it again in Acts 24:17 when he vindicates himself in front of Felix. Not a great deal of time had passed since he had delivered the collection and met James and the elders. If Paul was imprisoned in Caesarea, in fact, he was captured in Jerusalem and then moved to Caesarea. Thus, it is natural that the Jerusalem Christians would have certainly known of his captivity and they would scarcely have ignored it. However, Paul makes no mention of the Jerusalem Christians.

Marcus Bockmuehl seeks to explain this matter. According to him, in several verses of Philippians, such as 1:15, 17; 2:20–21, he can see Paul's disappointment of the Jerusalem Christian leaders because of their selfishness.<sup>82)</sup> However, this is not at all plausible. I would suggest that the silence of Paul, concerning the Jerusalem Christians, was caused, not by the ignorance of the Christian leaders, but by the distance between Jerusalem and the place where Paul was imprisoned and wrote Philippians.

### 2.3.3. Rome

Every possible answer to this question raises its own problems. As I have discussed above, there are several objections to locating Rome as being the place where this letter was written, even though this city has traditionally been considered as its place of composition. However, it is possible to explain these objections.

The first one relates to the distance between Rome and Philippi. Because it is too great to make several journeys, it does not appear to accord with the statement found in Philippians. However, Paul's imprisonment in Rome lasted for, at least, two years (Acts 28:30). Although the distance between these two cities is great, it is not

---

82) Marcus Bockmuehl. *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 29.

impossible to make more than two return journeys during this period.<sup>83)</sup> Therefore, it does not rule out the assumption of a Roman origin.

The second objection is caused by Paul's plan to go to Spain following his visit to Rome (Rome 15:23) because, in Philippians, he writes that he planned to go to Philippi after he was to be free (Philippians 2:24). Francis W. Beare argues:

When Paul wrote Romans, he was a free man, and at the height of his powers; it would not be strange if after five years in custody he would no longer have the impulse to start new work in strange territory, . . .<sup>84)</sup>

As he mentions above, it is highly possible that Paul changed his mind. I would, therefore, suggest that the differences found in his plan should not be a reason to doubt the letter's Roman origin.

The other reason to question its Roman origin is that, when Paul wrote Philippians, he was not with Timothy.<sup>85)</sup> The absence of Timothy is supported by the fact that his name is never mentioned when Luke narrates the transportation of Paul and the other prisoners. However, this should not be a reason to deny Timothy's presence when Paul wrote this letter. This is because most scholars who agree with the Roman origin suppose that Paul wrote this letter at the end of his imprisonment in Rome. This means that Paul had already stayed for two years in Rome. If this

---

83) Francis W. Beare, *A Commentary*, 15; Peter T. O'Brien, *Commentary on Philippians*, 23; Bo Reicke, 284

84) Francis W. Beare, *A Commentary*, 19.

85) Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians*, 40.

is the case, it is unreasonable to think that Timothy never visited Rome to see Paul. Rather, it is highly probable that, although Timothy was not present at Paul's transport in Acts, he arrived at Rome, following Paul.

#### 2.3.4. The Date of Philippians

The date of the letter to the Philippians is closely related to the place of the writing, because this letter was one of the prison letters. However, all of his times of imprisonment are not reported in the Acts or the other books. Whereas traditionally Rome has been considered as the place of origin, recently, many scholars support the Ephesian origin, others the Roman origin, and the rest the Caesarean origin. Each of these hypothesis (as I have discussed above) have their strengths and weaknesses.

I have examined the location which have been suggested by many scholars. However, each hypothesis has its advantages and problems. It is not easy to say conclusively that a certain city was the place of writing. Nevertheless, in this study, I will follow the traditionally accepted hypothesis; that of the Roman origin. If this is the case, the date of this letter must be A.D. 61-62.

#### 2.4. Summary

As we have seen, the date of the Pauline letters can be organized as follow: (1) 1 Thessalonians was written at the beginning of

A.D. 50; (2) 1 Corinthians at the end of A.D. 54 or the beginning of A.D. 55; (3) Philippians in A.D. 62.

I have dealt with the several New Testament books above along the four criteria. Although there are several books which show the similar eschatological view to what we can find in Mark 13, some of them do not meet the need of the criteria.

Some of them, such as Revelation and James, do show the expectation to the imminent Last Days and the idea that no one knows the Last Days would come. However these books are the only book which is written by the author of the Revelation or James. Because they are the only book to show these authors' eschatological expectation, it is impossible to compare them with the other these authors' books. It means that it is also impossible to trace the process of the change of these authors' eschatological expectation.

In case of Peter's two letters there authenticity and date is not clearly defined yet. Although 1 Peters has been widely accepted as Peter's own work, 2 Peters are still rejected by many scholars. Therefore it is not proper to deal with these two books as a

Applying these four criteria, many New Testament books, such as James, 1 and 2 Peter, and James, are excluded. The only books which can meet these four criteria are Pauline letters. They show the similar eschatological expectation to Mark and these three books (1



Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Philippians) are widely accepted as Paul's work. In addition all of these books' date are well established.

Now I will consider the contents of these three books.

### 3. WHAT DO THEY SAY?

In this section, I will examine the texts which can meet the criteria above. I will look at their eschatological thoughts, paying special attention to see if there is any change between these letters; 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and Philippians.

#### 3.1. 1 Thessalonians

1 Thessalonians was written out of Paul's pastoral concern for the church. Because he traveled such long distances, he could not personally look after all the churches. In this situation, the most useful method for him to keep in contact was through letters which expressed his teaching and intentions to each of the churches. In his commentary, Abraham J. Malherbe defines this letter's character as being paraenetic.<sup>86)</sup> According to him, in this letter Paul used the paraenetic genre to accomplish his purpose; pastoral care.<sup>87)</sup> Therefore, this letter is not

---

86) Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York/London/Toronto/Sydney/Auckland: Doubleday, 2000), 81-86.

87) Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 85.

dogmatic but a paraenetic on order to make his converts, who were uncertain about their knowledge of life in the faith, and to assure what they have to know.<sup>88)</sup> On the contrary, 1 Thessalonians 4:13-5:11 delivers more doctrinal information.<sup>89)</sup> However, this does not mean that his concern has been changed. He is writing from pastoral concern, but because of the subject, he adopts a different tone.

After Paul left Thessalonica (in 49-50), he went to Corinth. While he stayed there, Timothy brought to him news from Thessalonica. As we have seen above, he wrote this letter immediately after Timothy and Silas' return from Thessalonica.<sup>90)</sup> The news which they brought him made Paul pleased.

But Timothy has just now come to us from you and has brought good news about your faith and love. He has told us that you always have pleasant memories of us and that you long to see us, just as we also long to see you. (1 Thess. 3:6)

Paul clearly states how pleasant it was to receive the news from the Thessalonian church. At least, in this text, it would appear that there were no serious problems in the church. However, in fact there was a certain problem and it was dealt with in verses 4:13-5:11.

---

88) Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 86.

89) Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 261.

90) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 260; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 71.

This section consists of two parts: 4:13-18 and 5:1-11. In the beginning verse of each part, Paul uses preposition *περί* (about) which indicates that Paul is writing about something about which he has been asked. He then provides his answer to the question of the Thessalonians. Robert Jewett explains the situation of the church of Thessalonica:

The discussion in 1 Thess 4:13-18 indicates the congregation was in a state of shocked dismay at the death of some of the members.<sup>91)</sup>

The use of the introductory formula "now concerning" in 1 Thess 5:1 indicates that the issue of the times and the seasons was one of the major concerns that Timothy reported on the part of the Thessalonians. . . ., that Paul may have been responding to a Thessalonian query, "Tell us precisely when the parousia is going to happen."<sup>92)</sup>

It is not necessary to think that this situation was caused by any special event, such as the visit of a false teacher who misled the Thessalonian church. It might be reasonable to think that it arose from insufficient information about such matters.<sup>93)</sup> Although Paul emphasized the imminence of the parousia in the second part, he had already taught it to them when he visited the Thessalonian church. However, he did not do it fully, because he did not expect that anyone would perish before the parousia. In this way Ernest Best states that, "The fact of resurrection

---

91) Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, 15.

92) Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, 96-97.

93) Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 95.

does not appear to have been doubted by the Thessalonians, still less opposed (as in Corinth), otherwise Paul would have reassured them and given fuller teaching.”<sup>94)</sup>

However, this does not mean that Paul tried to complement the lack of his teaching. As Robert H. Gundry notes, Paul wants to correct a disbelief that has caused sorrow over the fate of deceased Christians of the church in Thessalonica.<sup>95)</sup> He does not intend to give eschatological instruction to the Christian of Thessalonica, but to console those who were grieving.<sup>96)</sup> Paul’s intention is shown in his use of the imperative in verse 4:18 “Therefore encourage each other with these words” (“Ὡστε παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις”) and 5:11 “Therefore encourage one another and build each other up” (Διὸ παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἕνα).

In 1 Thessalonians 4:13, in which this matter is dealt, the theme of this letter suddenly changes to an eschatological one, although there is actually an eschatological atmosphere throughout the whole letter.<sup>97)</sup> In

---

94) Ernest Best, *A Commentary*, 181.

95) Robert H. Gundry, “The Hellenization of Dominical Tradition and Christianization of Jewish Tradition in the Eschatology of 1-2 Thessalonians,” *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987), 161.

96) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Messachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers Ltd., 1997), 65. Abraham J. Malherebe, “Exhortation in First Thessalonians,” *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983), 254. John Gillman, “Signals,” 268-269. Albertus F. J. Klijn, “1 Thessalonians 4:13-18 and Its Background in Apocalyptic Literature,” *Paul and Paulinism* edited by Morna D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (London: S.P.C.K., 1982), 68.

97) Ernest Best, *A Commentary*, 180.

this verse, Paul uses his own formula, “we do not want you to be ignorant about . . .” This was normally used when he changed from one topic to new one.<sup>98)</sup>

In 1 Thessalonians 4:13–5:11, two themes are addressed. Of course, Paul does not appear to have any intention to present these two eschatological themes from a theological perspective. However, he implicitly refers to two specific aspects: the first is that the Lord must come, and the other is that no one will know the exact time. Although these two themes are not explicitly mentioned in this section, they are included in this part.

### 3.1.1. 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18

*According to the Lord's own word, we tell you that we who are still alive, who are left till the coming of the Lord, will certainly not precede those who have fallen asleep.*

*(1 Thessalonians 4:15)*

In verses 4:13–18 Paul provides an answer to the question related to “those who fall asleep” before the parousia of Jesus and it expresses Paul’s earliest thoughts on this subject.<sup>99)</sup> However, it does not necessarily mean that this is his first discussion of this subject. Paul

---

98) Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles* (Studies in Chronology) (London: SCM Press, 1984), 213.

99) Joseph Plevnik, “The Parousia,” 199.

uses a formula to introduce a new subject in 1 Thess. 4:13, in order to address the eschatological issues. This is not new to the Christians of Thessalonica. They have already been instructed about how they would be with Jesus when he returns.<sup>100)</sup> They had expected the imminent parousia of Jesus. In addition, as it is seen in 1 Thess. 4:16b, Paul talks about the resurrection of the dead, which would occur at the moment when Jesus returned. This also does not appear to have been a new instruction given by Paul.<sup>101)</sup>

The Christians of Thessalonica already knew of these two subjects; the resurrection of the dead and the imminent parousia of Jesus. However, even though they already knew of these matters, they had not integrated these two events into one coherent picture.<sup>102)</sup> The community of Thessalonica expected that the parousia of Jesus would occur so soon that they would be able to meet Jesus while they were still all alive (1 Thess. 4:15).<sup>103)</sup> However, they had experienced the death of some of their members. Their deaths, occurring before the parousia, had caused a serious problem. This was because those who are dead could not be with Jesus when he returned. It is this situation in

---

100) Beverly R. Gaventa, *Interpretation*, 62.

101) Ernest Best, *A Commentary*, 181; John Gillman, "Signal of Transformation in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985), 270.

102) John Gillman, "Signals," 270-271.

103) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 81; Stephen S. Smalley, "The Delay of the Parousia," *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 83 (1964), 48; Joseph Plevnik, "The Parousia," 158; Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 309; William Neil, *St. Paul's Epistles*, 98.

which Paul who wrote this letter. Therefore, it is unlikely to suppose that Paul wanted to address these two subjects *per set*. For Paul, the resurrection itself is not his concern.<sup>104)</sup>

I will now examine in detail the text of 1 Thess. 4:13-18. In these verses Paul addresses the question related to those, among the Thessalonian church, who have died. Paul knew that the Thessalonians worried about the fate of their members who had died. Here he uses figurative word, such as 'sleep' instead of 'death.' The description of death as 'sleep' is a well known metaphor in the ancient world both to pagans and Jews.<sup>105)</sup> This expression also serves to weaken the effect of death because the one who hears the word 'sleep' can also associate it with awaking.<sup>106)</sup> Using the image of 'sleep' repeatedly in his letters (1 Corinthians 7:39; 11:30; 15:6, 18, 51; 1 Thessalonians 4:13, 14, 15, 5:10), Paul consoles and exhorts the Thessalonians.

In this exhortation Paul describes the scene of the parousia.

According to the Lord's own word, we tell you that we who are still alive, who are left till the coming of the Lord, will certainly not precede those who have fallen asleep. For the Lord himself will come down from heaven, with a loud command, with the voice of the archangel and with the trumpet call of God, and the dead in Christ will rise first. After that, *we who are*

---

104) John Gillman, "Signals," 271. A. F. J. Klijn, "1 Thessalonians 4:13-18," 68.

105) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 185; R. E. Bailey, "'Is "Sleep" the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?" 161-167; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 263.

106) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 185.



*still alive and are left* will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air. (1 Thess. 4:15-17)

According to Paul, after they who have fallen asleep have awoken, they who are “*still alive and are left*” will be caught up together with them. In this verse, it makes it clear that some are “still alive and are left.” In verses 4:15 and 17, the subject is first person plural, ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι. Frederick F. Bruce argues that:

The writers rank themselves with those who will live to see the Parousia, referring to them in the first person plural, whereas “those who have fallen asleep” are referred to in the third person.<sup>107)</sup>

If it is considered that this is a letter sent by Paul to the Thessalonians and that the writer is Paul and the readers are Thessalonians, it becomes clear to whom this pronoun refers: it is to Paul and the readers of Thessalonians who are still alive. Therefore, in this verse, it is very likely that Paul believes that he will survive until the parousia, at least, when he wrote this letter.

However, some scholars take a contrary view. Ernest Best contends that it is not necessary to read it in this way. He suggests that Paul always had in mind both possibilities: to survive the parousia and to die before it.<sup>108)</sup> Therefore, in this verse Paul does not claim that he will survive the parousia.

---

107) Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 99.

108) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 195-196.

Leon Morris also argues that, in Greek, this verse does not affirm that Paul expected to survive until the parousia. He suggests that the expression he uses may mean no more than, “those Christians who will be alive at that day.”<sup>109)</sup> Although Leon Morris concedes the possibility that, in Paul and his contemporaries thinking, the parousia would take place in their lifetime, he insists that Paul, in fact, did not explicitly say so. Leon Morris insists that it has to be borne in mind what is in 1 Corinthians; “By his power God raised the Lord from the dead, and he will raise *us* also.” (6:14) He believes that this verse shows that in Paul’s mind he classes himself with those who will be raised.<sup>110)</sup> Therefore for him, Paul apparently knew that he will die before Jesus’ return.

Like Leon Morris, Arthur L. Moore also express the same view.<sup>111)</sup> According to him, for Paul, ‘waking’ or ‘sleeping’ were real possibilities because he had already confronted such dangerous situations many times prior to the Thessalonian correspondence which could have resulted in the real possibility of being killed. Such possibilities are continuously referred to in the later letters (2 Corinthians 5:9; Philippians 1:20f; and Romans 14:8). Even Leon Morris reads the phrase, ‘we who are alive’ according to the expanded meaning. He believes that the first

---

109) Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: The English Text with Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), 142.

110) Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, 142.

111) Arthur L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 69-70.

person pronoun 'we' does not refer to 'you and I,' but rather refers to "those who are left until the coming of the Lord." He concludes:

To be sure, the perspective is that of someone who is certain that the Parousia could come at any moment (as 5.1-11 explains further), but it is not necessarily that of someone certain that he and his converts will definitely live to experience it.<sup>112)</sup>

However, for a number of reasons, it is not likely to be explicitly stated. Firstly, as I have discussed above, the pronoun, 'we,' is used in a form of first person plural. There is no reason to read it in the extended meaning.<sup>113)</sup> If it is not Paul and his contemporaries but just those people or Christians who happen to be alive at the time of the parousia (as Leon Morris argues), Paul would not have used the pronoun as a first person plural. If he really wanted to exclude himself and his contemporaries, it is more likely that he would have written 'they.' Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida state that the most natural reading of 'we' in verse 15 is to denote Paul and his contemporaries, including his readers.<sup>114)</sup>

Secondly, as Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida observe, the meaning of 'we' in verse 13 could be clearly defined by another pronoun, 'you,' (in verse 13).<sup>115)</sup> The other first plural pronoun 'we' (in verse 15)

---

112) Arthur L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 70.

113) Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letters to the Thessalonians* (London/New York/Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1976), 93.

114) Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook*, 100.

could be defined by another pronoun in the same verse which is in the form of the third person plural, 'those.' Paul uses this third person plural ('those') to refer to those who died (1 Thess. 4:15).<sup>116)</sup> 'We' is therefore used in contrast to 'those' who have fallen asleep. In Paul's thought, those who are already dead are clearly distinguished from those who are still alive, which include himself. Therefore, it is much more probable to say that, even though Paul does not intentionally refer his own survival, as we can see in verse 15 he apparently took it as a matter of course.

Thirdly, Arther L. Moore takes into account the later letters to support his argument. Because there are several verses in which Paul appears to suggest that he could die before the parousia, it is reasonable to read this verse in the same way. However, these latter letters, in fact, should not be used as the reason to support his position. This is because he overlooks the fact that, in Paul's mind the timing of the parousia was not fixed. Between his early letters and later letters there are differences.

Therefore, in this respect, Frederick F. Bruce rightly assert that, in Paul's earliest references to this subject (such as in 1 Thessalonians), he associates himself with those who will survive.<sup>117)</sup>

Concerning the origin of this verse, Ernest Best asks several questions in his commentary.<sup>118)</sup> However, this section of the study is

---

115) Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook*, 100.

116) Frederick F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1977), 309.

117) Frederick F. Bruce, *Paul*, 309.

concerned with the thought of Paul and not Jesus.’ As with the case of Mark, Paul reflected his own understanding and thoughts concerning his expectation of the parousia. Although Jesus teaches about these things while he was alive, because he did not indicate a specific time in the future for the parousia (Matthew 24:36; Mark 13:32), Paul has to interpret it according to his own situation and assumed a certain period of time, as Mark did. If Paul already knew of the gospel traditions concerning the time of the parousia (taught by Jesus), it would be natural for him to suppose that would occur within his own lifetime. This is the first theme which we can find in 1 Thessalonians: that the parousia of Jesus is imminent.

### 3.1.2. 1 Thessalonians 5:1-11

*for you know very well that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night. While people are saying, "Peace and safety," destruction will come on them suddenly, as labor pains on a pregnant woman, and they will not escape.*

*(1 Thessalonians 5:2-3)*

After exhorting his readers in the previous verses, Paul then encourages them again in the following verses, 1 Thessalonians 5:1-11. In the previous verses (4:13-18), Paul deals with the future events which will happen when the Lord returns. Then in verses 5:1-11, he addresses the timing of the parousia. Two themes appearing in these two texts are

---

118) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 190.

not dealt with in chronological order. Paul simply addresses these two themes which relate to the parousia in turn, but not in special order. What Paul is discussing here, in these verses, is not the catching up of Christians in the air (mentioned in the previous verses), but the parousia itself.<sup>119)</sup>

In verse 5:1 Paul talk about “the times and the dates” (Περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν) of the parousia. Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida distinguished the meaning of ‘χρόνος’ and ‘καιρός’. According to them, whereas these two terms originally have the meaning; “χρόνος refers to time as recorded by clocks and calendars and καιρός refers to the ‘psychological moments’ at which the time is ripe,” when they were used together, as in this verse, it is not necessary to distinguish their meaning.<sup>120)</sup> Making a phrase by using these two words, they simply refer to a point of time or the precise time of something.

Some scholars suggest that Paul and the Thessalonians would have known such usage of these terms. Ernest Best asserts that the two definite articles show that they are well-known to Paul and his readers.<sup>121)</sup>

The reference of these terms is ‘the things’ which are mentioned in the previous verse (4:15) and this verse (5:1). The meaning of ‘the

---

119) Ben Witherington III argues against this view in *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 144.

120) Paul Ellingworth and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translation's Handbook*, 105; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 288; Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 109.

121) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 204; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 288.

things' in verses 4:15 and 5:1 could be clear if we take into account the next verse (5:2). In this verse, Paul writes that the Thessalonians know very well when 'the Day of the Lord' would come (5:2). This was the reason why he states that it is not necessary for him to write about 'the times and the dates (5:1).' Although for the coming of the Lord (in verse 2) Paul uses a different expression from that used in verse 1, they are, in fact, saying the same thing, 'the parousia or the day of the Lord.'<sup>122)</sup>

In addition, it seems similar in its use and reference to 'that day or hour' (Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ἢ τῆς ὥρας) found in Mark 13. Whereas Mark's 'that day or hour' is not a technical term to indicate the day of the Lord, Paul's 'the times and the dates' does seem to be used as a technical term to refer the day of the Lord, or parousia.<sup>123)</sup> Therefore, Paul was continuously dealing with an eschatological theme in this section. However, this is not the first time for Paul and the Thessalonians to address matters concerning the day of Lord.

According to 5:1, the Thessalonians already knew about the time of parousia.<sup>124)</sup> Although it is not explicitly stated in 5:1 what from their knowledge took, it must have included the recognition that no one knows

---

122) Frederick F. Bruce said, "The Day of the Lord is an OT concept: it was the day when Yahweh would vindicate his righteous cause and execute impartial judgement." *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 109. Also Ben Witherington III takes the same view, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 146.

123) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 204; Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 109; Ben Witherington III, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 145.

124) Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair in Thessaoloinas: Situating 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 51.



the exact time of the parousia. As Frederick F. Bruce suggests that, whereas the Thessalonians wanted to know what is answered by Paul in verses 4:13-18, they already did know about the time of the parousia. According to him, Paul or the other missionaries had “already taught them the outline of events attending the day of the Lord.”<sup>125)</sup> Therefore, in 5:1-2, Paul reminds them that the time of the day of the Lord was not known. However, they wanted to know it precisely or ‘accurately.’ This is why Paul uses ‘very well’, ‘accurately’ (ἀκριβῶς), two terms which Paul uses only once here.<sup>126)</sup> Paul answers the question of the exact time of the day of the Lord in verses 2-4; that it would suddenly come as a ‘thief’ in the ‘night.’ Thus, in verse 2-4, Paul emphasizes that, although the Thessalonians questioned the exact date of the day, they, in fact, well knew that it would suddenly come.

Frederick F. Bruce observes that, “the figure of the thief in night occurs in Jesus’ teaching about the coming of the Son of Man and in prophetic utterances made in his name in the Apocalypse.”<sup>127)</sup> According to him, the reason is to illustrate the unexpected nature of the day of the Lord and for the church to be on the alert and not to be taken by surprise.

Therefore, using this same image of the thief, Paul asserts that not only is the time of the day of the Lord not known by anybody, but

---

125) Frederick F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 109.

126) Ernest Best, *Thessalonians*, 205.

127) F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 109.

that it will also come like a thief coming in the night. In the following verse, the labour pains are mentioned. In the Old Testament, these are used to refer to 'anguish and dismay.' However, there is no emphasis on suddenness.<sup>128)</sup> Consequently, here the image is used differently that in the Old Testament and in 5:3 the labor pains imply the suddenness of the day of the Lord.<sup>129)</sup>

Joseph Plevnik asserts that the figurative term, 'thief,' is related to the judgment of God in the day of the Lord. He explains why Paul used such negative terms in this verse. According to him, Paul was threatening his converts with the prospect of an eschatological judgment to underline the necessity of obedience.<sup>130)</sup> Christopher D. Stanley also expresses similar idea on these verses. He argues that "the diverse provenance of the few assured texts suggests that the image of Jesus returning 'like a thief' was a common motif in early Christian parenesis."<sup>131)</sup> According to him, this term is basically used to refer the suddenness of the day of the Lord<sup>132)</sup> and, in addition, he suggests, (as does Joseph Plevnik), that this metaphor was very effective means to "regulate the conduct of the

---

128) F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, 110.

129) William Neil, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, Torch Bible Commentary (London: SCM Press, 1957), 104-105; Howard I. Marshall, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* New Century Bible Commentary (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1983), 136.

130) Joseph Plevnik, "1 Thess 5, 1-11: Its Authenticity, Intention and Message," *Biblica* 60 (1979), 78.

131) Christopher D. Stanley, "Who's Afraid of a Thief in the Night?" *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002), 469.

132) Christopher D. Stanley, "Who's Afraid of a Thief," 471.

Thessalonian believers”<sup>133)</sup> especially for women,<sup>134)</sup> because, in the first century, the thief could damage poor people’s lives.<sup>135)</sup>

However, this view has been refuted by Colin R. Nicholl. Although he admits that the thief motif in verse 5:2 demonstrates a negative dimension of the simile, he suggests a different explanation to Joseph Plevnik’s and Christopher D. Stanley’s.

. . . that Paul strongly disavows the relevance of the thief simile (verse 4) and of divine eschatological wrath (verse 9) to the Thessalonian converts.<sup>136)</sup>

Primarily Colin R. Nicholl concedes that there is a negative dimension in this image, however, he thinks that it is not found in Paul’s thought, but in the Thessalonian Christians.’ Namely, the negative dimension of the day of the Lord was mentioned by the Thessalonian Christians who might have been worrying about their future. According to him, the Thessalonian Christians worried about their future because they thought that the judgment of God could be upon them when the day of the Lord comes.<sup>137)</sup> In this way, Colin R. Nicholl suggests that ἀσφάλεια in verse 3 has the same meaning to the Old Testament in revealing safety from the threat of divine wrath.<sup>138)</sup>

---

133) Christopher D. Stanley, “Who’s Afraid of a Thief,” 483.

134) Christopher D. Stanley, “Who’s Afraid of a Thief,” 485.

135) In John 10:10a Jesus actually said that “the thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy.”

136) Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair*, 52-53.

137) Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair*, 53-54.

In my view, Colin R. Nicholl's interpretation is a more natural reading than Joseph Plevnik's or Christopher D. Stanley's. There are several reasons to support this view. Firstly, the contents of 5:4-11 is not well match with the view that it is written to threaten its readers. In these verses Paul assures the Thessalonian Christians that they do not belong to the night or to the darkness (5:5) but already belong to the day (5:8).<sup>139)</sup> This means that Paul's purpose is to make his readers understand their present status. Therefore, there is no reason to think that Paul is threatening his readers at all; rather, he appears to persuade them in these verses. In this way, he makes his readers understand who they are and that they should live according to the ways of God (5:8).

Secondly, if these verses express Paul's intention (to regulate the Thessalonian Christians), it is too simple to threaten his readers. Paul refers to the wrath of God just once (in 5:9). However, even in this verse, he does not say that the wrath of God would come upon them (the Thessalonians) but that salvation would be given to the Thessalonians. "For God did not appoint us to suffer wrath but to receive salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Although the wrath of God is mentioned just once, in fact this theme of salvation through Jesus Christ is much more important than any other theme in this context. In addition, if Paul wants to threaten the

---

138) Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair*, 54.

139) Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair*, 57.

Thessalonians, the wrath of God, which is mentioned only once in this verse, is too weak to accomplish his purpose.

Thirdly, in 5:10, Paul declares, "He [our Lord Jesus Christ] has died for us." He then refers to both those who are awake and asleep. Paul appears to keep in his mind the question posed by the Thessalonians, which he had answered in the previous chapter (4:13-18).<sup>140)</sup> He continues to teach that they would live with Jesus. Here Paul encourages his readers that they would live with Jesus at the day of the Lord. Paul writes this letter not to warn the Thessalonians, but to encourage them to live in Christ; not as a prophet who declares the judgment of God, but as a pastor who looks after his congregation.<sup>141)</sup> In addition, as we can see in 5:11, the thing which Paul has wanted from his readers having been already done by them. This means that Paul is not seeking to ask anything new of them.

Therefore, because of these reasons, it is not reasonable to accept the idea that Paul intended to threaten the Thessalonians in 5:4-11, rather, in my view, he pays pastoral attention to them. He writes about how they should live as Christians who would participate in Christ's coming on the day of Lord. In this respect, Bruce N. Kaye correctly states that,

---

140) Colin R. Nicholl, *From Hope to Despair*, 67.

141) Ernest Best, *A Commentary*, 181.

The fact that in this passage the imperative clearly refer to ethical behaviour, but are expressed in terms taken from the eschatological imagery, is in line with the suggestion that Paul is here reminding the Thessalonians of material with which they were already familiar, but is applying it in a way that was perhaps new to the Thessalonians.<sup>142)</sup>

### 3.1.3. Summary

As I have discussed above, in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-5:11, Paul addresses two themes. The first concerns the imminence of the parousia. He believed that the Lord when he would return within his own lifetime. This expectation is no different from the one expressed in Mark's eschatology as found in Mark 13.

The other, is that he asserts that the time is not known by anybody. All that he could say about the time of parousia was that it would occur suddenly. This idea can also be found in Markan eschatology. The only response for believers to make is to be awake and sober.

This reflects Paul's eschatological thought during his early period, when he wrote the first letter to Thessalonians. However, his later thoughts differ from this . The next text is 1 Corinthians 15.

---

142) Bruce N. Kaye, "Eschatology and Ethics in 1 and 2 Thessalonians," *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975), 47-57. 49.

### 3.2 1 Corinthians 15:50-53

*Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed*

*(1 Corinthians 15:51)*

#### 3.2.1. What does the text say?

In chapter 15, it is possible to see Paul's thoughts about the Last Days. It must, however, be noted, that Paul seeks to address the resurrection of the believers, rather than discuss the signs or timing of the Last Days. Here he argues against his opponents in the Corinthian church. According to Paul, the Corinthian opponents claim that there is no resurrection of the dead (15:12).

Although there is an argument about whether Paul correctly understood the meaning of the statements made by his opponents in Corinth,<sup>143)</sup> it is certain that he insisted that the resurrection must be when the Last Days would come (15:22-24).<sup>144)</sup> For him, "flesh and blood could not inherit the kingdom of God, nor did the perishable inherit the imperishable." (15:50) For him, the resurrection is an inevitable

---

143) Alexander J. M. Wedderburn questions whether Paul properly understood the Corinthians or just misrepresented them. "The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV," *Novum Testamentum* 23 (1981), 240. cf. Walter Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth: eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen* (Göttingen: Bandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 148.

144) In the conclusion to his article, Alexander J. M. Wedderburn asserts that, although Paul's opponent could have felt that they were not properly understood by Paul, Paul's argument against them is understandable, even if not wholly satisfactory. "The Problem of the Denial," 241.



process to inherit the kingdom of God. Ralph P. Martin correctly observes that, “death is a precondition to new life.”<sup>145)</sup> However, Paul does not suppose that all humans should die when Jesus returns. So in verse 51a, he writes, “We will not all sleep (πάντες οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα).” Consequently, he has to discuss the fate of those who are still alive when Jesus come. They writes that they will be changed, “we will all be changed.” (15:51b)

Paul talks in this chapter of the living, the dead, and the resurrection, especially in the verse 51 where he uses πάντες, πάντες οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα. However, this clause can be translated in a number of ways. Anthony C. Thiselton lists three possible alternatives.<sup>146)</sup>

it could mean either (i) *none of us shall sleep*, i.e., the parousia will intervene before any believer dies; or (ii) *not all of us shall* (as some of us shall) *sleep*, i.e., the parousia will come in the lifetime of some of us; or (iii) *Not all of us humans shall sleep*, i.e., the parousia will interrupt human history at some point sooner or later (time unspecified).<sup>147)</sup>

Although there are several possibilities, the first is impossible, because Paul himself refers to those from the Corinthian church who have already died (15:29).<sup>148)</sup> I will reconsider the second view later.

---

145) Ralph P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984), 95.

146) see also, Charles K. Barrett, *The First Epistle*, 380–381

147) Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 1293.

Anthony C. Thiselton suggests that the third reading is most probable.<sup>149)</sup> This view has been supported by other scholars.<sup>150)</sup> Frederik W. Grosheide observes that πάντες refers to the church as a whole: all believers.<sup>151)</sup> However, before we can accept this view, two things must be considered: the first is that Paul is writing to the Corinthians in order to vindicate the resurrection, and the other is that Paul expects an imminent parousia. The fact that Paul expects the imminent parousia means that there is no reason for him to consider the long term future, more than a generation. An expectation of the imminent parousia would mean that his attention would be focused upon the period up until the parousia. Furthermore, in the situation in which Paul was writing to the Corinthian church (to argue against his opponents), it would not be natural for him to consider the future which could be further than a generation later. Rather, it is possible to read πάντες as 'human' when the readers recognize that the parousia has not come within the lifetime of the first generation. Consequently, the one who expects an imminent parousia and would be in a polemical situation

---

148) Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Corinthians*, 1293.

149) Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Corinthians*, 1294.

150) Jean Héring, *The First epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, trans. by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), 180–181; Anthony C. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 288.

151) Frederik W. Grosheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953), 392.

hardly feels that it is possible to pay attention to the remote future. Therefore, the third view cannot be seen to reflect Paul's intention.

The second view has to be considered. Anthony C. Thiselton argues that this view is usually associated with a theory of radical development in Paul's theology from an imminent eschatology (in the earlier letters) to a quasi-realized eschatology.<sup>152)</sup> It is true that Paul expected the imminent parousia. However, it is difficult to say that Paul's eschatology has been developed, because the difference between Paul's early thought and his later thought appears to be only about the timing of the parousia. Doremus A. Hayes argues that, because Paul's expectation of the imminent parousia was wrong, he emended his expectation:<sup>153)</sup> first he thought that the parousia would occur within his lifetime, however, later, he believes that he could die before it happens. In some respects, it can be argued that it is an evolution of Paul's theology.

I would suggest that, it closely reflects Jesus' teaching, because no one knows the exact date (even the son does not know, Mark 13:32), and Paul also does not know the exact date. In addition, because it is very close (as Jesus teaches in Mark 13:30), even though it could be delayed, Paul also teaches that it is near at hand. However, when

---

152) Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Corinthians*, 1293. However, because this is not the focus of this study, I will only deal briefly with the matter here.

153) Doremus A. Hayes, "A Study of a Pauline Apocalypse I Thess 4:13-18," *The Biblical World* 37.3 (1911), 164-166.

Paul is getting old and beginning to expect his own death, he suggests that he could actually die before the parousia. In this process, there is nothing to call a development, but simply an adjustment of the timing of the parousia. Therefore, William Neil correctly notes, "it is clear from references in Paul's later letters that his expectation of the speedy return of Christ was maintained to the end. . . . The only change that took place in Paul's thinking on this matter was that as he faced the prospect of death he doubted whether he himself would live to see the Parousia."<sup>154</sup>) Contrary to Anthony C. Thiselton, therefore, there is not a fair reason to exclude this view, in fact it would appear to be applicable to Paul's circumstance.

There are still two further possibilities. In this verse, it is not certain whether Paul expects to see the parousia or not. The central issue relates to the meaning of 'we' in verse 51. Does Paul use this term literally, to include himself? If this is the case, it means that Paul expects the parousia to occur within his lifetime. Hans Conzelmann argues for this reading for Paul's expectation of the parousia, as he did in 1 Thessalonians 4:17.<sup>155</sup>) However, it is also possible that 'we' includes Paul's addressee.<sup>156</sup>) If this is correct, it is difficult to determine whether

---

154) William Neil, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, The Torch Bible Commentaries (London: SCM Press, 1957), 84.

155) Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 288. Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 158. Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 274. David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2003), 742-743.

156) Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on*

Paul did expect to live until parousia or not. In this case, the first person plural pronoun, 'we,' could mean; that he will remain alive,<sup>157)</sup> and/or that there would be some Christians alive when Jesus return.<sup>158)</sup>

To determine the usage of this pronoun, it is useful to look for other instances. In Corinthians 6:14, Paul states, "he will raise us also." For some scholars, this suggests that Paul expected his death before the parousia.<sup>159)</sup> However, this cannot be a reason to think so, because, in this verse, the identity of 'us' is indeterminate.<sup>160)</sup> It is not certain whether it refers the dead or those who remain alive when Jesus returns.

Contrary to this verse, in verse 52, there is a clear distinction between the dead and the those who are alive: οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθήσονται ἄφθαρτοι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀλλαγούμεθα. Here Paul first explains the fate of the dead and then those who remain to see the parousia. This distinction enables Paul to clearly illustrate what would happen: the dead will rise from death, those remainings will be changed. According to Paul, he is

---

*the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC, second edition (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914), 376.

157) Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987), 800.

158) Ben Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 310.

159) Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: The English Text with Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), 142.

160) David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2003), 742-743. Frederick Fyvie Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1977), 309.

obviously includes himself with the latter group. This shows that he expected to be alive until the parousia.

### 3.2.2. Summary

Therefore, in 1 Corinthians 15 we can see that Paul retains similar views to those he expressed about the Last Days in 1 Thessalonians.<sup>161)</sup> As he shows in 1 Thessalonians 4, he expected an imminent parousia, which would occur in his own lifetime. However, he does not indicate an exact time. This is, because, as he wrote in 1 Thessalonians, no one knows the exact time.

In the first epistle to the Corinthians Paul clearly shows his beliefs about the time and the imminence of the parousia. These two aspects of the parousia are no different from that presented in 1 Thessalonians.

## 3.3. Philippians 1:21-23

*I am torn between the two: I desire to depart and be with Christ, which is better by far;*

*(Philippians 1:23)*

### 3.3.1. What does the text say?

In Philippians 1:21, Paul remarks that he has a choice between two things: either to live or to die. In the previous verse, he makes a

---

161) Stephen S. Smalley, "The Delay of the Parousia," 48.

contrast between death and life. These two things appear as pair to show his ambivalence to death or life, because of Jesus (1:21).<sup>162)</sup> Whether he alive or died, he is concerned only with Jesus. In contrast from the other two letters, (which has been considered above), there is no mention of the position of the dead (1 Thessalonians) or state of them (1 Corinthians) when the day of Lord arrives. Although Paul is not particularly wanting to expound upon his eschatological thoughts in this text, we can see what is implied in these verses. Because Paul does not explicitly present his views, we have to deduce his thought relating to the time of the parousia from his writing.

The most important verse in Philippians in which we can see Paul's thoughts as they relate to the Last Days, is Philippians 1:23. In this verse, Paul describes his situation as συνέχομαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν δύο. The verb συνέχομαι shows the magnitude of Paul's dilemma well. He is surrounded by two desires, which are referred in the very next verse. The contents of these two desires are in verses 23 and 24: the one is to "depart and to be with Christ" (τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι) and the other is to "remain alive in this body" (τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν [ἐν] τῇ σαρκί).<sup>163)</sup> Using this term, Paul reveals the stress that he feels with "two desires like two equally strong external forces pressing in on him."<sup>164)</sup>

---

162) Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians, Philemon*, 43.

163) Gerald F. Hawthorne pointed that there is no verb (to be) in Greek texts, however, he said that it is possible to supply it, *Philippians*, 44.

164) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 47.



Now it is necessary to know what Paul wants to say in this verse. Many scholars argue that Paul already faced death when he wrote the epistle to the Philippians.<sup>165)</sup> Charles Buck and Greek Taylor observe,

It is evident from these words that Paul's old confidence that he would live until the parousia was now gone. He had come face to face with what seemed to be the certainty of his own death, and although he was still able to hope that he might be spared, he had prepared himself to meet death, if it should come, in such a way as to bring honor to Christ.<sup>166)</sup>

As we have already seen, the imminence of the parousia is clearly stated in Paul's earlier letters (1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians). Therefore, if it is true that, in this verse, Paul is referring to his own death, it is also true that his expectation about the Last Days has changed.

On this matter, however, D. W. Palmer suggests a different view concerning the meaning of 'to depart.' Although he accepts that this phrase means the death of Paul, according to him, Paul regarded death as an exit to a better state. He supposes that Paul's present state was problematic and difficult to live.<sup>167)</sup> Therefore, Paul could say that "to die is gain (1:21)," because death brought a release from his earthly troubles.

---

165) Charles Buck & Greek Taylor, *Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of His Thought* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), 70; Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle*, 64-65; Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians, Philemon*, 43.

166) Charles Buck & Greek Taylor, *Saint Paul*, 70.

167) D. W. Palmer, "To Die is Gain" (Philippians 1:21), *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975), 218.

Realizing the likelihood of his own execution, Paul accepts his own death and say 'to die is gain.' However, it is not certain whether he actually faced imminent execution when he wrote this letter. In my view, Arthur J. Droge correctly argues that, "Paul's reflections on death do not arise from the fact that he faces imminent execution."<sup>168)</sup> If it is correct that Paul was not facing imminent execution, but was considering death as a release from all his suffering, the only thing that we can think is that he was contemplating suicide. Arthur J. Droge contends that Paul seriously contemplated suicide because of the many difficulties which he had already experienced and was undergoing.<sup>169)</sup>

However, this view has been rejected by N. Clayton Croy. He lists two reasons why we should not accept these two scholars' interpretation.<sup>170)</sup> The first is that it was not necessary for Paul to think of death as an escape from his sufferings, as he could make a vigorous, reasoned defense by his appeal to Caesar.<sup>171)</sup> The other is that Paul's dilemma is not a real one (as Arthur J. Droge supposes) but, according to N. Clayton Croy is an expression of Paul's rhetoric in reference to death.<sup>172)</sup> Therefore, Arthur J. Droge's assumption can be rejected.

---

168) Arthur J. Droge, "Mori Lucrum: Paul and Ancient Theories of Suicide," *Novum Testamentum* 30 (1988), 279.

169) Arthur J. Droge, "Suicide," 282-283.

170) N. Clayton Croy, "'To Die Is Gain' (Philippians 1:19-26): Does Paul Contemplates Suicide?" *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 122 (2003), 517-531, see especially 523-525.

171) N. Clayton Croy, "To Die Is Gain," 524.

Gerald F. Hawthorne argues that Paul did not premise his death in this verse. According to him, this verse is not related to the death at all.

But his musings were not due to the fact that he was actually facing the immediate possibility of death.<sup>173)</sup>

According to him, the reason that Paul wrote, "I desire to depart," is same to that which has been suggested by D. W. Palmer: he has lived as a servant of Jesus Christ. During his life, as a missionary or pastor, he experienced great tension, because of his oversight and concern for all the many churches which he had founded (2 Corinthians 11:28). In addition, he had been imprisoned several times without proper reason. However, Paul did not think about death. Rather he began to see the meaning of the life and death in a new way.<sup>174)</sup> Interpreting this verse in this way, Gerald F. Hawthorne removes the association between Paul and death.

This interpretation properly takes into account the difficulties that Paul had experienced; such as beating, shipwrecks, imprisonment, and many dangers (2 Corinthians 11:23-33). However, this view cannot explain several questions.

---

172) N. Clayton Croy, "To Die Is Gain," 524-529.

173) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 44.

174) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 44.

Firstly, this verse must be considered in its context. In Philippians 1:19-26, there are several references to life and death. In verse 20, Paul talks about life and death (διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου), in verse 21, he mentions them again (τὸ ζῆν' ἢ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν), in verse 23, although they are not explicitly referred to, Paul states that he is torn between the two (συνέχομαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν δύο). If we read it in this context, it is clear what the phrase 'the two' indicates. Paul is torn between life and death. After this he uses different terms instead of life and death; they are 'depart' (τὸ ἀναλῦσαι 23) and 'stay' (ἐπιμένειν 24). These are used to imply life and death. In this way, Paul writes of his desire to depart. It, therefore, looks more probable to read it as Paul is referring to his own death.

Secondly, Paul writes that after he departs this would, he would be *with* Christ (23). He uses only one article for describing two things, τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι. For him 'to depart' and 'to be with Christ' can not be isolated from each other.<sup>175)</sup>

If 'to depart' implies, not death, but just Paul's new way of understanding life and death, it is not easy to explain the very next phrase that he would be *with* Christ. In this verse, Paul states that having departed, he would be with Christ (σὺν Χριστῷ).

He eagerly longs 'to depart' because he believes that he would be with Christ. However, it is not congruent with Paul's understanding as expressed in his other letters. Paul often uses the expression 'in Christ'

---

175) Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 48.

(ἐν Χριστῷ) in his letters. Using this phrase, he shows that he already was in Christ. Therefore, for Paul, it was not necessary to eagerly long for a new way to see life and death, because he apparently knew that he was already in Christ.

Thirdly, in Greek, the metaphor 'to depart' often implies not just a spatial movement, but death.<sup>176)</sup> In addition, as N. Clayton Croy observes, this expression is a rhetorical technique used to imply death.<sup>177)</sup>

If these are correct, there is no reason to suspect the meaning of "to depart." Therefore, in this verse, Paul is referring to his death and the future following his death. It is worth paying attention to Charles Buck and Greek Taylor's comment:

His desire, he writes, is "to depart and be with Christ" (Phil. 1:23). In other words, he now believed, in his own case at least, that death would be followed by an immediate resurrection.<sup>178)</sup>

An immediate resurrection is mentioned several times in the other two letters; 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. Although, in these two letters, Paul apparently shows that he would be alive until the parousia, he does not forget to say that the dead will be resurrected at that moment. The resurrection of the dead is imminent as well.

---

176) Jean-François Collange, *The Epistle of Saint Paul*, 64; Gerald F. Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 48; J. Hugh Michael, *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1928), 57.

177) N. Clayton Croy, "To Die Is Gain," 529.

178) Charles Buck & Greek Taylor, *Saint Paul*, 70.

### 3.3.2. Summary

Comparing this verse with the previous letters (1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians), Paul's expectation appears to have changed slightly. In 1 Thessalonians, Paul states that he would see Jesus' return in his own lifetime. However, his thoughts on the timing of the parousia is not certain in 1 Corinthians. Then, in Philippians, it appears as if he did not expect to see parousia in his lifetime anymore. Whether he assumes martyrdom or execution, it surely shows that in Paul's thought, at least, the time of the Last Days has been delayed from that which is reflected in his earlier letters.

## 4. CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have looked for New Testament books which contain the eschatological traits which were identified in Mark 13: expectation of imminent parousia.

There are four books which have the expectation to the imminent of parousia (1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, 1 Peter and James). The unknowableness of the Last Days are explicitly mentioned in three books (1 Thessalonians, 2 Peter, Revelation).

Among these books, I have applied four criteria in order to select the appropriate texts with which to compare Mark 13. Of the possible books, I had to reject: 1 Peter because it is the only book written by its author, (although there is 2 Peter, however, its authenticity

was not accepted by the most scholars); Revelation is also the only book written by its author, therefore it is not possible to know whether there was any change on its eschatology as there is nothing to compare it with. As, a result, only two books are selected (1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians). They were written by one author (Paul) and they show his eschatological interests. As we have seen above, there is no any evidence to show that Paul's belief in the unknowableness of the Last Days underwent any change. In fact, it is not mentioned at all. However, concerning the imminence of the parousia, it is possible to identify that there has been some change in his thought.

I have added one more book, Philippians, to the two books selected, because it is helpful to let us have a full spectrum of Paul's eschatological expectation from his early period to his later period, although in this book we can not find any fo the eschatological traits which was seen in Mark 13. We are finally left with the three Pauline letters; 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and Philippians.

In these books, the expectation to the parousia can be seen to have undergone a change. As I have discussed above, when Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians, he obviously expected to survive until the parousia. In 1 Thessalonians 4:13-14, Paul addresses the Christians in Thessalonica about what would happen to the dead and to the people who grieved for the dead among them. The reason why he write such things is shown in verse 13: "we do not want you to be ignorant about those who fall asleep, or to grieve like the rest of men."



In the next verse, Paul writes that he and his readers believe “that Jesus died and rose again and so we believe that God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in him.” (1 Thessalonians 4:14) Here, Paul refers to the death of Jesus and his resurrection in relation to those who have died.

In the following verse, it is possible to know what Paul expects when he writes this letter.

According to the Lord’s own word, we tell you that we who are still alive, who are left till the coming of the Lord, will certainly not precede those who have fallen asleep (1 Thessalonians 4:15).

Here Paul expresses his belief that he will be alive until the parousia of the Lord. Furthermore, he would not be the only person who would survive the parousia, but that he would be one of many of his contemporaries who would survive. Paul uses the first person plural pronoun (ἡμεῖς) when he talks about those who will remain alive until the parousia of the Lord.

Paul’s expectation had not changed when he wrote 1 Corinthians. As he did in 1 Thessalonians, he first discusses the death of Jesus (1 Corinthians 15:12) in relation to the resurrection of those people who died before the parousia of the Lord. In this letter Paul mentioned the resurrection of those who died before the parousia of the Lord, in this letter, he teaches about the resurrection of the dead, because he knew that circulating the church there was wrong teaching which stated that

there would be no resurrection. Therefore, the purpose of mentioning the resurrection of the dead is different to 1 Thessalonians which was written to console the people who grieved for the dead. In 1 Corinthians Paul spared much more space for this subject than he did in 1 Thessalonians. In 1 Corinthians 15:51, he repeats what he had taught in 1 Thessalonians. Here, he uses the first person plural verb (κοιμηθησόμεθα) as he did in 1 Thessalonians. It clearly shows that the expectation in this letter corresponds well with 1 Thessalonians.

However, in Philippians, which was written approximately ten years later, a difference concerning the expectation of the Last Days can be detected. Contrary to his earlier expectations about the Last Days expressed in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians (as we have seen above), he appears to have begun to accept the possibility of his death before the parousia.

Therefore, in this chapter, we can identify how Paul's expectation to the future changed during the period between 1 Corinthians and Philippians (between A.D. 56 and A.D. 62).

## **CHAPTER 7**

### **CONCLUSION**

My research has examined the eschatological expectation expressed in Mark 13 and those of the other New Testament authors of the New Testament. I will now consider my conclusions. However, before I do this, I will briefly summarize the previous chapters.

#### **1. SUMMARY**

In Chapter 2 I looked at the various explanations which have been suggested by a number of scholars based upon internal or external evidence. However, it was found that such evidence is unsatisfactory as it is inconclusive. The witness of the traditions as well the suggestions of scholars are problematic. This is because the reliability of the traditions is often unclear and the scholars' assumptions on Mark's date do not have firm

ground on which to support them. Consequently, although many possible dates have been suggested, there remains no consensus among the scholars.

In Chapter 3 the character of Mark 13 is considered. It is remarkable that, although there are no apocalyptic traits which characterize in apocalyptic writings (and which have been identified as specific to the apocalyptic genre by many scholars), Mark 13 has been considered as an 'apocalyptic' work.

However, although it is not an apocalyptic work, it is not true that this chapter is not related to the eschatological expectation. A few scholars, such as Nicholas T. Wright and Richard R. France, argue that Mark 13 describes the political situation of the middle of the first century. Therefore, for them, it is not possible to identify any relationship between Mark 13 and an eschatological expectation. However, as have seen in Chapter 3, Mark is obviously describing the Last Days in Mark 13.

In Chapter 4 one of Jesus' answers to his disciples' two questions is considered: "what will be the sign that they are all about to be fulfilled?" In the first half of Mark 13 (verses 5-23), Jesus clearly lists the signs of the Last Days using the traditions of Old Testament.

Then, in the second half of Mark 13 (verses 24-37) Mark's Jesus gives an answer to the second question concerning when that 'day' would be. As it shown in Chapter 5, he explained to his disciples (who want to

know the exact date of the Last Days) that this is not known to anyone, including the angels and the son. However, he clearly indicates that it must be coming shortly, within his audiences' life time, or, at least, within the time of Mark's readers. Consequently, at the end of his discourse, Jesus emphasizes that everybody should be awake, because the Last Days were about to come suddenly and unexpectedly.

In Mark 13, the author seems to expect that the Last Days are very close, although it is clearly stated that no one can know their exact date. This has caused many scholars to assume that Mark's belief was rooted in a crisis which was either imminent or had already happened. However, it is remarkable that this perception is not unique to Mark. Such an understanding of the Last Days can also be found in other New Testament books. Several of the New Testament books were examined in Chapter 6 because it is possible to see in them (especially the Pauline letters) the same type of eschatological expectation that we find in the gospel of Mark.

Chapter 6 also shows that Paul's eschatological ideas does not seem to be constant and some differences concerning his expectation about the Last Days can be found in his letters. In his early letters, his eschatological ideas are clearly the same as Mark's: he expects that he will see the Last Days while he is still alive. However, in his latter letters this expectation is getting weaker.

The facts that we can know through this study are listed below.

1. Mark's two eschatological traits: (i) Mark expects an imminent parousia (ii) no one knows the date of the parousia.

2. This is not an idea which is unique to Mark – a very similar idea can be found expressed in some of Paul's early letters

3. We can identify some changes in Paul's eschatological expectation between his early and later letters.

Now it is time to consider what we can conclude from the similarities between Mark 13 and some of Paul's early letters.

## 2. POSSIBILITIES

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Mark's expectation concerning the timing of the Last Days is almost the same as those expressed by Paul in his early letters. How can this be explained? We can propose two possibilities: (i) that these (similar) expectations arose spontaneously but entirely independently in the two authors, or (ii) that the two authors were closely related, or that one of them influenced the other.

However, the first possibility cannot be supposed, because of several reasons. Firstly in the middle of the first century there should be a network of communities and there was a constant communication between the churches.<sup>1)</sup> As we can see in Paul's case, in the middle of

---

1) Richard Bauckham, "For Whom Were Gospels Written?" in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh:

the first century one church continuously corresponded with the another.<sup>2)</sup> As Paul did in his letters, they shared many things related to their belief in Jesus. Thus, it is hardly possible to suppose that there was an isolated community and New Testament books were produced to be read by the inner group.<sup>3)</sup>

Secondly this communication between churches could be often made, because of well developed and organized Roman road and shipping lanes. If we do not overlook these ancient transport systems, it is possible to understand the frequent journey made between the remote Churches.<sup>4)</sup> In the first century it is not difficult to make journey from one church to the another. As Paul did during his life as a Christian missionary, there were not only correspondences between churches, but visits in person. Therefore it is not natural to suppose that Mark's or Paul's eschatological expectation was isolated.

On the contrary, Mark, whoever is the actual author, must not be a eyewitness of Jesus, at least on several incidents, such as the incident of Jesus' transformation (9:2), the question of the four disciples (13:3).

---

T&T Clark, 1998), 44.

2) Rudolf von Harnack, *The expansion of Christianity in the first three centuries vol. 1*, translated by James Moffat (London: Williams and Norgate, 1904), 446-447; Richard Bauckham, "For Whom Were Gospels Written?" 38.

3) Loveday Alexander, "Ancient Book Production and the Gospels," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 100-101.

4) Michael B. Thompson, "The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 50-53.



Therefore, such Jesus traditions must be directly or indirectly transmitted to Mark by Jesus' disciples.<sup>5)</sup> Therefore, in my view, it is reasonable to suppose that Mark also did not write his gospel in an isolated situation altogether.

Although close and direct links with Paul and Mark cannot be proved, it is at least reasonable to suppose that Mark was writing for the same general audience.<sup>6)</sup>

### 3. PROBLEMS TO BE ANSWERED

This leads us to another two problems that must be answered before any conclusion can be considered.

One is the integrity and unity of Mark's gospel. Since Timothy Colani proposed his theory of the 'little apocalypse,' there has been a tendency to consider that the apocalyptic tradition was adapted by Mark. This means that Mark 13 is not Mark's own work, but a tradition which had already been formulated in its present form. However, this hypothesis raises another problem. It implies the possibility that Mark's gospel could have been composed by Mark at any period, because, if Mark 13 existed as a separate tradition, then Mark's gospel could be

---

5) William Telford, *Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 17.

6) Richard A. Burridge, "Gospel Genre and Audiences," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 144–145.

written any time after the 'little apocalypse' was formulated. If this is the case, it is therefore not necessary to suppose that Mark was written during the same period as Paul's letters. Rather, it could mean that the 'little apocalypse' might be formulated in Paul's period.

The other problem is that, if the similarities between Mark and Paul can be explained by the supposition that they were written contemporaneously, how can the similarity between the Mark's eschatological expectation in Mark 13 and that found in Matthew 24 and Luke 21 be explained?

Many scholars assume that these two gospels were written after the destruction of the Jerusalem. For example, Werner G. Kümmel dates Matthew between A.D. 80 and A.D. 100<sup>7)</sup> and Luke between A.D. 70 and A.D. 90.<sup>8)</sup> If these datings are correct, Mark's eschatological expectation which is almost the same as those found in Paul's early letters can also be found in the later New Testament books. Because Mark's eschatological expectation can be found in writings which are both earlier and later, it is therefore meaningless to use them as a means for dating his gospel.

---

7) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1975), 119-120.

8) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 150-151.

## 4. EXPLANATIONS

Before turn to the conclusion of this study, the answer to these two problems must be given.

### 4.1. Mark 13 as an Already Formulated Tradition

Firstly, the fact that Mark 13 is not Mark's own work has to be addressed. It is true that the gospel writers drew on existing traditions. In this, Mark is not an exception and must surely have used those traditions which had been transmitted to him. However, as shown in the previous two chapters, his gospel also reflects his own thoughts. This is because he was not just a collector of those traditions, but also a compiler with his own ideas and who was influenced by his particular historical situation. If this is the case, Mark framed this tradition in its present location, because the contents of the chapter appears to reflect his thoughts. If the contents of the chapter do not make Mark content, it must be altered or excluded. Although no one can know whether Mark simply adapted the tradition whose contents were exactly same to his own, or whether he made some significant alterations to it in order for it to suit his purpose, it is certain that, in its present form, Mark's gospel reflects Mark's mind.

In this study I have considered two elements in Mark's eschatological expectations. One of them is that the Last Day was imminent. In Mark 13, he declares that it would come in his generation.

if this simply reflects the existing tradition (and is not specifically Markan), we can identify the date of the Mark 13 tradition, but not of Mark's gospel.

However, Mark 13 is not isolated from the other parts of the gospel, because almost the same eschatological expectation appears there too. In Mark 9:1, Jesus is recorded as teaching something similar when he states: "I tell you the truth, some who are standing here will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power (ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶν τινες ὧδε τῶν ἐστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει)" This recalls Jesus' saying in Mark 13:30, although the exact details differ. For example, in Mark 9:1 it is said that some of them who read this gospel will survive to see coming of the *kingdom of God*, and in Mark 13:30, the Markan Jesus teaches about the signs referred to in Mark 13:5–27 (including the coming of *the Son of Man*), would be completed before the generation of listeners would pass away.

It has been argued that Mark 9:1 does not say what Mark 13:30 is saying. Charles E. B. Cranfield<sup>9)</sup> and Ben Witherington III<sup>10)</sup> believe that the kingdom of God in Mark 9:1 is not related to the previous verse Mark 8:38 which speaks of the Son of Man. They suggest that it belongs

---

9) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 287–288.

10) Witherington, Ben, III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001), 262.

to the following verses (9:2–13) which describe the transfiguration of Jesus. Charles E. B. Cranfield contends, observing that Mark places 9:1 immediately before the precise dating (which is not seen outside this verse), that Mark “regards what follows as at any rate in some sense the fulfilment of the promise in that saying.”<sup>11)</sup> For them, therefore, Jesus’ prophecy in Mark 9:1 was accomplished in the very next verses Mark 9:2–13.

In addition, Timothy J. Geddert contends that the ‘Son of Man’ in Mark 8:38 is changed to the ‘kingdom of God’ in Mark 9:1.<sup>12)</sup> Thus, it is possible to read Mark 8:38 and Mark 9:1 as belonging to two independent traditions.

If this is the case, the possibility that there is any connection between the ‘Son of Man’ and the ‘kingdom of God’ is entirely removed.

However, several problems arise from this reading. Firstly, although in Mark 9:1, Jesus says that some of those who were present would see the coming the kingdom of God in power, however, the actual scene described in Mark 9:2–13 is not related to the coming of the kingdom of God in power. Morna D. Hooker argues, “it is not obvious how the transfiguration can be understood to be the coming of the Kingdom in power.”<sup>13)</sup>

---

11) Charles E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 289. cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 457.

12) Timothy J. Geddert, *Watchword: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 245.

Secondly, as Dennis E. Nineham argues, if Mark 9:2–13 is the fulfilment of Mark 9:1, after only six days has passed, it is rather unnatural to say that “some of you still alive it will be done.”<sup>14)</sup> In addition to this, Mark 9:1 is not only followed by the pericope of transfiguration (in Mark 9:2–13), the location of which has been considered in order to understand this verse in the light of these other verses, but also following Mark 8:38, which tells of the coming of the Son of Man. Therefore, Dennis E. Nineham argues that it is not necessary to read Mark 9:1 with Mark 9:2–13.

On the contrary, however, Robert H. Gundry argues that these two verses do show some connections:

The Son of Man's coming in 8:38 sets a consummative tone for the coming of God's rule in 9:1. The dual reference in 13:26 to coming in power and glory supports a conceptual (if not historically chronological) connection between the sayings in 8:38 and 9:1, and therefore a common reference to the consummation. To be sure, “the rule of God” (9:1) differs in phraseology and meaning from “the Son of Man”(8:38). But the shared verbal expression “come in . . .,” the similarity of the elements in which the Son of Man and God's rule come – viz., ‘glory’ and ‘power’ – and the combination of these elements in 13:26 point to different ways of describing the same event.<sup>15)</sup>

---

13) Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 212; Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (Middlesex/New York/Victoria: Penguin Books, 1963), 236.

14) Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 236.

In my view, this reading of Mark 9:1 is much more probable than the one suggested by Charles E. B. Cranfield and Ben Witherington III. If this is the case, in Mark's gospel we have another saying which expects the imminent Last Days. Consequently, there is no reason to deny Mark's unity. Although we admit that Mark may have adapted tradition and placed it in Mark 13, it might be true that Mark altered the tradition for his purpose or that the tradition expressed an eschatology that was no different from his expectation. Whichever one is true, Mark's expectation in an imminent parousia is not limited to Mark 13.

#### 4.2. The Similarity between Synoptic Gospels

The second problem is how to explain the similarity between Mark 13 and Matthew 24 and Luke 21. If Mark can be dated using the similarity between Mark's and Paul's eschatology, we must also consider the eschatological similarity between Mark and the other two synoptic gospels.

If Matthew and Luke were written at the end of the first century (after A.D. 70), as many scholars suppose, this similarity cannot be explained, because, as we have seen in Chapter 6, Paul's eschatological expectation seemed to have changed in the middle of the first century.<sup>15)</sup> Thus, if the

---

15) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Michigan: Grand Rapids, 1993), 468; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 212. cf. Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of St Mark*, 231-232, 236.



gospels of Matthew and Luke (which convey the same ideas about the Last Days that are found in Mark), were written at the end of the first century, it also means that Mark's eschatological expectation (which expects an imminent parousia) can be found at any time from the beginning of the Christian era to the end of the first century.

However, it has to be remembered that, as with the gospel of Mark, the dates of Matthew and Luke are not fixed on firm ground. It is commonly assumed that these two gospels were written at the end of the first century: that is Mark's date itself. Mark's gospel appears to have been known to the authors of Matthew and Luke. Because Mark was written after the destruction of the temple and the holy city in A.D. 70, it is generally argued that these two gospels cannot be earlier than Mark. Consequently, these two gospels cannot have been written earlier than A.D. 70. This assumption has been accepted by the most scholars.

As a result, almost all scholars, who date Matthew and Luke, depend on the relationship between them and the gospel of Mark. For example, concerning Matthew's gospel, Ulrich Luz states, "The terminus a quo is the origin of the Gospel of Mark and the destruction of Jerusalem (22:7)."<sup>16)</sup> And concerning Luke's gospel, Vincent Taylor states, "The

---

16) The meaning of 'change' is not development or evolution at all. In Paul's eschatological expectation the only difference is the timing of the parousia. Whereas at first he expected that he could survive the parousia, later he seemed to gradually accept his death before it.

17) Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, translated by Wilhelm C. Linss (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 92-93. William D. Davies also depends on Mark's date when he date Matthew.

[upper] limit is the time when St. Luke first read the Second Gospel [The gospel of Mark]."<sup>18)</sup>

Therefore, if the dates of Matthew and Luke are related to the date of Mark, when the date of Mark can be placed as early as Paul's earlier letters, it is possible for us to advance the date of Matthew and Luke before the destruction of the temple.

The other reason most often mentioned is that Matthew and Luke reflect the catastrophe in A.D. 70. Scholars usually quote several verses in Matthew and Luke, which have been believed to illustrate the scene of this event (cf. Matthew 22:7 and Luke 19:43; 21:20). For example, Werner G. Kümmel believes that Luke 19:43f portrays the action of Titus against Jerusalem.<sup>19)</sup> For him, therefore, Luke's prediction in Luke 19 is not a real prophecy but a *vaticinium ex eventu*.

Although it is possible to read Luke 19 as Werner G. Kümmel does, this view cannot be a reliable basis on which to suppose Luke's

---

*A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew: in three volumes* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 131; William D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, vol. 3, Commentary on Matthew XIX – XXVIII*, ICC (London: Continuum, 2004), 200.

18) Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926), 212–213; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, Anchor Bible (New York, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1979), 53; Jonathan Knight, *Luke's gospel* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998), 10. cf. see I. Howard Marshall, *The gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 34. Although he admit the relationship between Mark and Luke, he push all of these books date forward before A.D. 70.

19) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 150.

date to be after A.D. 70. This is because it is not certain that these verses actually refer to this catastrophe. In fact, in Matthew and Luke, we cannot find any direct and explicit expression related to this event at all. On the Lucan oracle, Charles H. Dodd correctly, in my view, argues:

The fact is that the whole significant vocabulary of both Lucan passages belongs to the language of the Septuagint, and is for the most part characteristic of the prophetical books; and what is still more to the point, several of these terms tend to recur alike in prophecies of the doom of Jerusalem and in historical accounts of its capture by Nebuchadrezzar in 586 B.C.<sup>20)</sup> .

As Charles H. Dodd argues, if we read Matthew's and Luke's gospel in the light of the fall of Jerusalem, there should be several things which do not match (as has been seen in Mark's gospel), concerning the actual details.<sup>21)</sup> In addition there is no reason for us to suppose that all prophecy are '*post eventum*,' as Michael D. Goulder argues.<sup>22)</sup>

Therefore, it is not necessary to read Matthew 22:7 in the light of the fall of Jerusalem.<sup>23)</sup> It means that the date of Matthew and Luke are not necessarily placed after A.D. 70.

---

20) Charles H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the Abomination of Desolation," *JRS* 37 (1947), 50.

21) William D. Davies, *A critical and exegetical commentary*, 131-132.

22) Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm vol. 2*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 20 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 690.

23) In fact he believes that this verse strongly implies a date after A.D. 70.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Finally we now have several results.

Firstly, as we have seen in Chapter 6, Mark's eschatological expectation is almost the same as those of Paul's in his early letters.

Secondly, in Paul's expectation of the parousia, we can detect some differences in its timing. As we can see in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, Paul states how he can survive the parousia and then that he cannot. If Paul's eschatological expectation concerning the timing of the parousia had undergone some change, it is not simply in his mind. Some of the Christians to whom Paul sent his letters were already familiar this type of eschatology. Paul obviously feels no need to provide any explanation in order to persuade his readers on this matter. This is important because Paul always seeks to persuade his readers when his thoughts or beliefs differ to those of his readers. Therefore, one can be confident to suggest that in relation to his eschatology Paul's teachings are not different to those of his readers.

Thirdly, the fact that the eschatological expectation in Mark 13 and Paul's early letters are the same can be a reason to suppose that Mark and Paul's early letters were written in the same period.

Unfortunately, this does not allow us to identify any specific time for Mark's date. However, it is possible to suggest a likely range of dates. As an upper limit, if it is true that the expectation on an imminent parousia was derived from the historical Jesus, such an expectation must

have appeared just after his death. The enigmatic phrase 'the Abomination of Desolation' also cannot be used as a clue to do this, because this phrase (as we have seen in Chapter 4), was used by Daniel to refer Antiochus Epiphanes. Consequently, this idea could have arisen at any time after Jesus' resurrection and ascension.

The only thing that can be considered is that there would have needed to have been a period of time in order for their theology to have developed. However, as John Robinson contends, this does not require such a long time.<sup>24)</sup> In addition, as we can read in Acts 2:14ff, after the experience of Pentecost, the disciples of Jesus began to preach and it would be remarkable if there had been no process for them through which to formulate the contents of their preaching.

The lower limit can be given by Paul. As we have seen in Chapter 6, it seems that there is a difference between 1 Corinthians and Philippians. If the dates of these letters are correct (A.D. 56 for 1 Corinthians and A.D. 62 for Philippians), Mark 13 cannot have been written later than A.D. 62.

Therefore, as a conclusion of this study, it is possible to suggest that Mark could have been written between A.D. 33 and A.D. 62, however, more evidence is needed in order to give the extreme termini within this period.

---

24) John Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976), 37-38, 116-117.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Edward, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel",  
*Tyndale Bulletin* 56.2 (2005), 39-61.

Aland, Kurt, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis  
evangeliorum apocalyphorum et patrum adhibitis edidit*  
(Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1965)

Alexander, Loveday, "Ancient Book Production and the Gospels", in *The  
Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel  
Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T  
Clark, 1998), 71-105.

Allison Jr., D. C., 'Eschatology' in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*,  
edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard  
Marshall (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 1992)

Alxander, Desmond, "The Old Testament View of Life after Death",  
*Themelios* 11/2 (1986), 41-46.

- Anderson, Hugh, *The Gospel of Mark*, The New Century Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, 1976)
- Bacon, Benjamin W., "The Apocalyptic Chapter of the Synoptic Gospel, Part 1", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 28 (1909), 130-149.
- Bacon, Benjamin W., *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925)
- Bailey, John W., "Jewish Apocalyptic Literature", *The Biblical World* 25 (1905), 30-42.
- Bailey, R. E., "Is 'Sleep' the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55 (1964), 161-167.
- Balabanski, Vicky, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Barrett, Charles K., "New Testament Eschatology", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 6 (1953), 136-155
- Barrett, Charles K., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2nd edition, Black's New Testament Commentary (London: A & C Black, 1971)
- Bauckham, Richard, "For Whom Were Gospels Written?" in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 9-48.



- Bauckham, Richard, "The Son of Man: 'A Man in My Position' or 'Someone'?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985), 23-33
- Bauckham, Richard, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006)
- Bauer, Walter, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other early Christian Literature*, 4th edition (Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000)
- Beare, Francis W., *The Epistle to the Philippians*, 3rd edition (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973)
- Beare, Francis W., *The First Epistle of Peter: the Greek text with Introduction and Notes* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1947)
- Beasley-Murray, George R., "Second Thoughts on the Composition of Mark 13", *New Testament Studies* 29 (1983), 414-420.
- Beasley-Murray, George R., "The Rise and Fall of the Little Apocalypse Theory", *Expository Times* 64 (1952-53), 346-349.
- Beasley-Murray, George R., *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd., 1957)
- Beasley-Murray, George R., *Jesus and The Future* (London: Macmillan, 1954)
- Beasley-Murray, George R., *Jesus and the Last Days: An Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993)

- Becking, Bob, "Expectations about the End of Time in the Hebrew Bible: Do They Exist?" in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*, edited by Christopher Rowland and John Barton, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 43 (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 44–59.
- Benz, Ernest, *Evolution and Christian Hope: Man's Concept of the Future from the Early Fathers to Teilhard de Chardin*, translated from German by Heinz G Frank (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1965)
- Best, Ernest, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (London: A&C Black, 1972)
- Best, Ernest, *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Printing, 1981)
- Best, Ernest, *The Gospel as Story* (Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1983)
- Betz, Hans D., "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism", *Journal for Theology and Church* 6 (1969), 134–156.
- Black, Matthew, "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus", *Expository Times* 60 (1948), 11–15.
- Bockmuehl, Markus, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, Black's New Testament Commentary (London: A & C Black, 1997)

- Borg, Marcus J., "An Orthodoxy Reconsidered: The 'End-of-the-World Jesus'", *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 207-218.
- Boring, M. Eugene, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy & the Gospel Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991)
- Borsch, Frederick H., *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (London: SCM Press, 1967)
- Bowen, Clayton R., "Why Eschatology?", *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 44 (1925), 1-9.
- Bowman, John, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (Leiden: Brill, 1965)
- Brandon, Samuel G. F., *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: SPCK, 1957)
- Brower, Kent E., "'Let the Reader Understand': Temple and Eschatology in Mark", *'The Reader Must Understand': Eschatology in Bible and Theology*, (Leicester: Apollos, 1997), 119-143
- Brown, Raymond E., *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1994)
- Bruce, Frederick F., *1 & 2 Thessalonians*, Word Biblical Commentary 45 (Waco: Word Books, 1982)
- Bruce, Frederick F., *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London: Butler & Tanner Ltd., 1971)

- Bruce, Frederick F., *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1977)
- Bruce, Frederick F., *Philippians*, New International Biblical Commentary (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989)
- Bryan, Steven M., *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Buck, Charles & Taylor, Greer, *Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of His Thought* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969)
- Bultmann, Rudolf, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, translated by John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963)
- Bundy, Walter E., *Jesus and the First Three Gospels: An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955)
- Burkett, Delbert, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- Burns, John B., "The Mythology of Death in the Old Testament", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973), 327-340.
- Burridge, Richard A., "About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences", in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 113-145.

- Cadoux, Cecil J., "The Dates and Provenance of the Imprisonment Epistles of St. Paul", *Expository Times* 45 (1933-1934), 471-473.
- Caird, George B., "The Christological Basis of Christian Hope", *The Christian Hope* (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), 9-24.
- Caird, George B., *New Testament Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994)
- Caird, George B., *Paul's Letters from Prison: In the Revised Standard Version* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976)
- Caird, George B., *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980)
- Carlston, Charles E., *The Parables of the Triple Tradition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975)
- Carson, D. A., Moo, Douglas J., Morris, Leon, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992)
- Casey, Maurice, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- Casey, Maurice, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1991)
- Casey, Maurice, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and influence of Daniel 7* (London: S.P.C.K., 1979)

- Chapman, John, "St Irenaeus on the Dates of the Gospels", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1905), 563-569.
- Chester, Andrew, and Martin, Ralph P., *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*, New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Clark, Kenneth W., "Realized Eschatology", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59 (1940), 367-383.
- Clifton, Black, C., "An Oration At Olivet: Some Rhetorical Dimensions of Mark 13", *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, edited by Duane F. Watson (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 66-92.
- Colani, Timothy, *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son Temps*, 2d ed. (Strasbourg, 1864)
- Collange, Jean-François, *The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Philippians* translated by A. W. Heathcote (London: Epworth Press, 1979)
- Collins, Adela Y., "The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13", *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 1125-1140.

- Collins, John J., 'Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,' *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 2000)
- Collins, John J., "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Environment", *Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (1975), 27-36.
- Collins, John J., "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism", *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992), 448-466.
- Collins, John J., *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984)
- Conzelmann, Hans, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975)
- Craig, Clarence T., "Realized Eschatology", *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 56 (1937), 17-24.
- Cranfield, Charles E. B., "Thoughts on New Testament Eschatology", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982), 497-512.
- Cranfield, Charles E. B., *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, The Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959)
- Cranfield, Charles. E. B., *I & II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1960)



- Crawford, Barry S., "Near Expectation in the Sayings of Jesus" *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 101 (1982), 225-244.
- Crossley, James G., *The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 266 (London: T& T Clark, 2004)
- Croy, N. Clayton, "'To Die Is Gain' (Philippians 1:19-26): Does Paul Contemplates Suicide?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003), 517-531.
- Davies, William D., and Allison Jr, Dale C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Vol. 3, Commentary on Matthew XIX - XXVIII*, ICC (London: Continuum, 2004)
- Deppe, Dean B., "Charting the Future or a Perspective on the Present?: The Paraenetic Purpose of Mark 13" *Calvin Theological Journal* (2006), 89-102
- Dewar, Francis, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark", *Theology* 64 (1961), 99-107.
- Dodd, Charles H., "The Mind of Paul: II", *New Testament Studies*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 83-128.
- Dodd, Charles H., *The Founder of Christianity* (London: Fontana Books, 1971)

- Dodd, Charles H., *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1935)
- Donahue, John R., "The Community of Mark's Gospel", *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 817-838.
- Donahue, John R., "Windows and Mirrors: The Setting of Mark's Gospel", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1995), 1-26.
- Droge, Arthur J., "Mori Lucrum: Paul and Ancient Theories of Suicide", *Novum Testamentum* 30 (1988), 263-286.
- Drury, John, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (London: S.P.C.K., 1985)
- Dubnov, Simon, *The History of the Jews: From the Beginning to Early Christianity* (New York/London: South Brunswick, 1967)
- Duling, Dennis C., 'Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven,' *Anchor Bible Dictionary* Vol. 4, edited by David Noel Freedman (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 1992)
- Duncan, George S., "A New Setting for St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians", *Expository Times* 43 (1931-1932), 448-457.
- Dunn, James D. G., *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1977)

- Dupont, J., "La ruine du temple et la fin des temps dans le discours de Marc 13", in *Apocalypses et Théologie de l'espérance*, Lectio Divina 95 (Paris, 1977)
- Dupont, J., *SGN CRISTWI: L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952)
- Ellingworth, Paul, and Nida, Eugene A., *A Translation's Handbook on Paul's Letters to the Thessalonians* (London/New York/Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1976)
- Elliot, John H., *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible 37b (New York/London : Doubleday, 2000)
- Ellis, Edward E., "The Date and Provenance of Mark's Gospel", *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 801-815.
- Ellis, Edward E., *The Gospel of Luke* (Melbourne: Nelson, 1966)
- Emerton, J. A., "The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery", *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1958), 225-242.
- Ernest Benz, *Evolution and Christian Hope: Man's Concept of the Future from the Early Fathers to Teilhard de Chardin*, translated from German by Heinz G Frank (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1965)
- Evans, Craig A., *Mark 8:27-16:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001)

- Fee, Gordon D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1987)
- Fenton, John C., "Paul and Mark", *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, edited by Dennis E. Nienham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 89–112.
- Fiorenza, E. Schüssler, 'Eschatology of the NT,' *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976)
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T., "The Destruction of the Temple and the Relativization of the Old Covenant: Mark 13:31 and Matthew 5:18", in *The Reader Must Understand: Eschatology in Bible and Theology*, edited by K. E. Brower & M. W. Elliott (Leicester: Apollos, 1997), 145–170.
- Ford, Desmond, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington: University Press of America, Inc., 1979)
- Fortna, Robert T., 'Redaction Criticism,' *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume, edited by Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976)
- Fowl, Stephen E., *Philippians*, Two Horizons New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005)
- Fowler, Robert M., *Let the Reader Understand* (Minneapolis, Fortress Press: 1991)

- Fowler, Robert M., *Loaves and Fishes: The Function of the Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark*, Society of Biblical Literature  
Dissertation Series 54 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1981)
- France, Richard T., *Divine Government: God's Kingship in the Gospel of Mark* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing)
- France, Richard T., *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and his Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971)
- France, Richard T., *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002)
- Frost, Stanley B., *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth* (London: The Epworth Press, 1952)
- Garland, David E., *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2003)
- Gaston, Lloyd, *No Stone on Another: In the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospel* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970)
- Gathercole, Simon, "The Son of Man in Marks Gospel", *Expository Times* 115 (2004), 366-371.
- Gaventa, Berverly R., *Interpretation: First and Second Thessalonians* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1998)
- Geddert, Timothy J., *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989)

- Gichon, Mordechai, "Cestius Gallus' Campaign in Judaea", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 113 (1981), 39–63.
- Gillman, John, "Signal of Transformation in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985), 263–281.
- Goldhill, Simon, *The Temple of Jerusalem* (London: Profile Books Ltd., 2005)
- Goodman, Martin, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Penguin Books, 2007)
- Goppelt, Leonhard, *A Commentary on 1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978)
- Goulder, Michael D., "Did Peter ever Go to Rome?", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57 (1994), 377–396.
- Goulder, Michael D., *Luke: A New Paradigm Vol. 2*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 20 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989)
- Goulder, Michael D., *A Tale of Two Missions* (London: SCM Press, 1994)
- Grayston, Kenneth, "The Study of Mark XIII", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 56 (1973–74), 371–387.
- Green, Joel B., *1 Peter* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2007)
- Green, Michael, *2 Peter and Jude: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (London: The Tyndale Press, 1968)

- Grosheide, Frederik W., *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1953)
- Guelich, Robert A., 'Gospel of Mark', *Dictionary of Jesus and Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downer Grove, Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992)
- Guelich, Robert A., *Mark 1-8:26*, Word Biblical Commentary 34A (Dallas, Word Books :1989)
- Gundry, Robert H., "The Hellenization of Dominical Tradition and Christianization of Jewish Tradition in the Eschatology of 1-2 Thessalonians" *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987), 161-178.
- Gundry, Robert H., *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993)
- Héring, Jean, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, second edition, translated from French by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: The Epworth Press, 1962)
- Hanson, Paul D., 'Apocalypticism,' *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976)
- Hanson, Paul D., "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment", *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971), 31-58



- Hanson, Paul D., "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined", *Visionaries and Their Apocalypses*, edited by Paul D. Hanson (Philadelphia/London: Fortress Press/SPCK, 1983), 37-60.
- Harnack, Rudolf von, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries vol. 1*, translated by James Moffat (London: Williams and Norgate, 1904)
- Harris, Robert L., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980)
- Hase, Carl A., *Life of Jesus: A Manual for Academic Study*, translated by James Freeman Clarke, 4th edition (Boston: Walker, Wise and Company, 1860)
- Hatina, Thomas R., "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27: The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6 (1996), 43-66.
- Hayes, Doremus A., "A Study of a Pauline Apocalypse I Thess 4:13-18", *The Biblical World* 37 (1911), 163-175.
- Hays, Richard B., *First Corinthians*, Interpretation, Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997)
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm, *In Namen Jesu*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903)

- Hengel, Martin, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM Press, 1985)
- Hengel, Martin, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM Press, 2000)
- Héring, Jean, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, translated by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (London: The Epworth Press, 1962)
- Higgins, Andrew J. B., *Jesus and the Son of Man* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1964)
- Hooker, Morna D., "Trial and Tribulation in Mark XIII", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 65 (1982), 78-99.
- Hooker, Morna D., "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 155-168.
- Hooker, Morna D., *A Commentary on The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991)
- Hooker, Morna D., *The Gospel According to St Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991)
- Hooker, Morna D., *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the term "Son of Man" and its Use in St. Mark's Gospel* (Montreal: Macgill University Press, 1967)

- Horrell, David G., *The Epistles of Peter and Jude* (Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1998)
- Hultgren, Arland J., "Eschatology in the New Testament: The Current Debate" in *The Last Things: Biblical and Theological Perspectives on Eschatology*, edited by Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002), 67-89.
- Hunter, Archibald M., *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, Torch Bible Commentary (London: SCM Press, 1949)
- Incigneri, Brian J., *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003)
- Jackson, F. J. Foakes, "Evidence for the Martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 46 (1927), 74-78.
- Jeremias, Joachim, 'ἁδης' *Theological Dictionary of New Testament Vol. I*, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans, 1964),
- Jeremias, Joachim, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1969)
- Jeremias, Joachim, *The Parables of Jesus*, revised edition (London: SCM Press, 1972)
- Jewett, Robert, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986)

- Johnson, Lewis, "The Pauline Letters from Caesarea", *Expository Times* 68 (1956-1957), 24-26.
- Jülicher, Adolf, "Markus im NT", *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 12 (1903)
- Käsemann, Ernest, *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM Press, 1969)
- Kaye, Bruce N., "Eschatology and Ethics in 1 and 2 Thessalonians", *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975), 47-57.
- Kazen, Thomas, "The Coming Son of Man Revisited", *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5 (2007), 155-174.
- Keck, Leander E., *Paul and His Letters*, Proclamation Commentaries (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979)
- Kee, Howard C., *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1977)
- Kelber, Werner H., *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974)
- Kelly, John N. D., *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, Black's New Testament Commentary (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1969)
- Kilgallen, John, "Exegetical Notes on Mark 13:1-8", *Expository Times* 118 (2006), 33-34.
- Kilpatrick, George D., "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13:9-11", *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H.*

*Lightfoot*, edited by D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 145–158.

Klijn, Albertus F. J., “1 Thessalonians 4:13–18 and Its Background in Apocalyptic Literature”, *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*, edited by Morna D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson (London: S.P.C.K., 1982), 67–73.

Knibb, Michael A., “The emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses”, *Israel’s Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter Ackroyd*, edited by Richard Coggins, Anthony Phillips, and Michael Knibb (London/New York/Sydney/Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)

Knight, Jonathan, *2 Peter and Jude* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)

Koch, Klaus, “What is Apocalyptic? An Attempt at a Preliminary Definition”, *Visionaries and Their Apocalypses*, edited by Paul D. Hanson (Philadelphia/London: Fortress Press/SPCK, 1983), 16–36.

Koch, Klaus, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, translated by Margaret Kohl from German (London: SCM Press, 1972)

Kreitzer, Larry J., ‘Eschatology,’ *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, edited by G. F. Hawthorne & R. P. Martin (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993)

- Kümmel, Werner G., *Introduction to the New Testament*, translated by Howard C. Kee from German (London: SCM Press, 1975)
- Kümmel, Werner G., *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1957)
- Lüdemann, Gerd, *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles (Studies in Chronology)* (London: SCM Press, 1984)
- Lövestam, Evald, "The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mark 13.30 parr.", *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980), 403-413.
- Lövestam, Evald, *Jesus and 'this Generation': A New Testament Studies* (Stockholm: Almqvist&Wiksell International, 1995)
- Ladd, George E., "Why Not Prophetic - Apocalyptic?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957), 192-200.
- Ladd, George E., *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1966)
- Lambrecht, Jan, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung*, Analecta Biblica 28 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965)
- Lane, William L., *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974)

- Laws, Sophie, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1980)
- Leaney, Alfred R. C., *The Letters of Peter and Jude: A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, A Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967)
- Leivestad, Ragnar, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man", *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972), 243-267.
- Lightfoot, Robert H., *The Gospel Message of St Mark* (London: Oxford University Press, 1950)
- Lindars, Barnabas, "Response to Richard Bauckham: The Idiomatic Use of Bar Enasha", *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985), 35-41.
- Lobo, Augustine, "Background of the Author of the Second Gospel: The Current Debate", *Vidyajyoti Journal of Theological Reflection* 70 (2006), 85-103
- Malherbe, Abraham J., *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York/London/Toronto/Sydney/Auckland: Doubleday, 2000)
- Malherbe, Abraham J., "Exhortation in First Thessalonians", *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983), 238-256.



- Maloney, Elliott C., *Jesus' Urgent Message for Today* (New York/London: Continuum, 2004)
- Manson, Thomas W., *The Servant-Messiah* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953)
- Manson, Thomas W., "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels", *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, edited by Matthew Black (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962),
- Marcus, Joel, "The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992), 441-462.
- Marcus, Joel, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1999)
- Marshall, Howard I., *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, New Century Bible Commentary (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1983)
- Marshall, I. Howard, "Slippery Words: Eschatology", *Expository Times* 89 (1977-78), 264-269.
- Martin, Ralph P., *Philippians*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976)
- Martin, Ralph P., *The Spirit and the Congregation* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984)
- Marxsen, Willi, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1969)

- McGinn, Bernard, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York/Guildford: Columbia University Press, 1979)
- McNeile, Alan H., *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan, 1915)
- McNicol, Allan, "The Lesson of the Fig Tree in Mark 13:28-32: A Comparison Between Two Exegetical Methodologies", *Research Quarterly* 27 (1984), 193-207.
- Meinertz, Max, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments I* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1950)
- Meyer, Heinrich A., *Kritische exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Göttingen, 1855)
- Michael, J. Hugh, *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1928)
- Mitton, C. Leslie, *The Epistle of James* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1966)
- Moffatt, James, *The General Epistles: James, Peter, and Judas* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1945)
- Moo, Dougals J., *The Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 2000)
- Moore, Arthur L., *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, New Century Bible Commentary (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1969)

- Morris, Leon, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians: The English Text with Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959)
- Moule, Charles F. D., *The Phenomenon of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1967)
- Mowinckel, Sigmund, *He That Cometh*, translated by G. W. Anderson (Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1956)
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1983)
- Myers, Ched, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York, Maryknoll, 1990)
- Neil, William, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, Torch Bible Commentary (London: SCM Press, 1957)
- Nicholl, Colin R., *From Hope to Despair in Thessalonians: Situating 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin, 'Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties,' in *Josephus, the Bible and History*, edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 216-236.
- Nineham, Dennis E., *Saint Mark* (London: Penguin, 1992)

- Nineham, Dennis E., *The Gospel of St Mark*, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (Middlesex/New York/Victoria: Penguin Books, 1963)
- Nolan, Brian M., "Some Observations on the Parousia and New Testament Eschatology", *Irish Theological Quarterly* 36 (1969), 283-314.
- Noth, Martin, *The History of Israel* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958)
- Noth, Martin, *The Laws in the Pentateuch: and other studies*, translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas (London/Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1977)
- O'Brien, Peter T., *Commentary on Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991)
- Osiek, Carolyn, *Philippians Philemon*, Abingdon New Testament Commentary (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000)
- Otto, Rudolph, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion*, translated by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1938)
- Palmer, D. W., "To Die is Gain" (Philippians 1:21), *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975), 203-218.
- Park, Soo Am, *The Function of Mark 13 in Mark's Gospel* (Seoul: The Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary Press, 1993)

- Perkins, Larry, "‘Let the Reader Understand’: A Contextual Interpretation of Mark 13:14", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16.1 (2006), 95–104.
- Perkins, Pheme, *First and Second Peter, James, and Jude*, Interpretation, Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995)
- Perrin, Norman, *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974)
- Perrin, Norman, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1967)
- Perrin, Norman, *The New Testament: An Introduction* (New York/Chicago/San Francisco/Atlanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974)
- Pesch, Rudolf, *Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968)
- Peterson, Dwight N., "Review: The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity", *Review of Biblical Literature* 1 (2005).  
[http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4248\\_4194.pdf](http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4248_4194.pdf)
- Peterson, Dwight N., *The Origins of Mark: The Markan Community in Current Debate* (Leiden, Brill: 2000)
- Plevnik, Joseph, "1 Thess 5, 1–11: Its Authenticity, Intention and Message", *Biblica* 60 (1979), 71–90.

- Plevnik, Joseph, *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1997)
- Porter, Frank C., "Prophecy and Apocalypse", *The Biblical World* 14 (1899), 36-41.
- Rad, Gerhard von, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965)
- Reese, Ruth A., *2 Peter & Jude* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2007)
- Reicke, Bo, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles", translated by Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, edited by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1970), 277-286.
- Reicke, Bo, "Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem", in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren*, edited by David Edward Aune (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 121-134.
- Reicke, Bo, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Anchor Bible 37 (New York: Doubleday, 1964)
- Robbins, Vernon K., "The Reversed Contextualization of Psalm 22 in the Markan Crucifixion: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis", *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segbroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1161-1186.

- Robertson, Archibald and Plummer, Alfred, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, The International Critical Commentary, 2nd edition (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914)
- Robertson, Archibald, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 2nd edition International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1914)
- Robinson, Donald F., "Where and When Did Peter Die?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 64 (1945), 255-267.
- Robinson, John A. T., *Jesus and His Coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine* (London: SCM Press, 1957)
- Robinson, John A. T., *Redating the New Testament* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1993)
- Rowland, Christopher, *Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: S.P.C.K., 1982)
- Rowley, Harold H., *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* (London : Lutterworth, 1947)
- Sanday, William, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1908)
- Schenkel, Daniel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu: ein biblischer Versuch* (Wiesbaden: Kreidel, 1864)



- Schlatter, Adolf von, *Geschichte Israels von Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian* (Stuttgart: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1906)
- Schmid, Josef, *The Regensburg New Testament: The Gospel According to Mark*, edited by Kevin Condon (Cork: Mercier Press, 1968)
- Schmithals, Walter, *Die Gnosis in Korinth: eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen* (Göttingen: Bandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956)
- Schmithals, Walter, *The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction & Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975)
- Schniewind, Julius, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Göttingen: Bandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933)
- Schweizer, Edward, "Son of Man", *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 79 (1960), 119-29.
- Schweizer, Edward, "The Son of Man Again", *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962), 256-261.
- Schweizer, Edward, *The Good News According to Mark*, edited by Madvig (Richmond Va.: John Knox Press, 1970)
- Schweizer, Edward, "Der Menschensohn", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 50 (1959), 185-209.
- Selwyn, Edward G., *The First Epistle of Saint Peter* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1946)
- Simon, Ulrich, *The End is not Yet* (London: James Nisbet, 1964)

- Smalley, Stephen S., "The Delay of the Parousia", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964), 41-54.
- Smaltz, Warren M., "Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1952), 211-216.
- Smith, Ralph L., *Micah-Malachi*, Word Biblical Commentary 32 (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1998)
- Stanley, Christopher D., "Who's Afraid of a Thief in the Night?" *New Testament Studies* 48 (2002), 468-486.
- Stein, Robert H., "N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God: A Review Article", *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* [44/2] (2001), 207-218.
- Streeter, Burnett H., *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* (London: Macmillan, 1924)
- Such, William A., "The Crux Criticorum of Mark 13:14", *Research Quarterly* 38 (1996), 93-108.
- Such, William A., "The Significance of TO SHMEION in Mark 13:4", *Irish Biblical Studies* 13 (1991), 134-154.
- Such, William A., *The Abomination of Desolation in the Gospel of Mark: Its Historical Reference in Mark 13:14 and its Impact in the Gospel* (Lanham/New York/Oxford: University Press of America Inc., 1999)

- Sweeney, Marvin A., "The Priesthood and the Proto-Apocalyptic Reading of Prophetic and Pentateuchal Texts", *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationship* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 167-178.
- Swete, Henry B., *The Gospel According to Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1927)
- Taylor, Nicholas H., "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part I. Social and Historical Reconstruction", *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 61 (1996), 101-124.
- Taylor, Nicholas H., "Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part II", *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 62 (1996), 13-41.
- Taylor, David B., *Mark's Gospel as Literature and History* (London: SCM Press, 1992)
- Taylor, Vincent, "The 'Son of Man' Sayings Relating to the Parousia", *Expository Times* 58 (1946/1947), 15-23.
- Taylor, Vincent, "Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13", *Expository Times* 60 (1948-49), 94-98.
- Taylor, Vincent, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 2nd edition (London : Macmillan, 1966)
- Telford, William, *Mark* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)

- Telford, William, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction -Critical analysis of the cursing of the Fig Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and Its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1980)
- Theissen, Gerd, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992)
- Thiselton, Anthony C., *1 Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical & Pastoral Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006)
- Thiselton, Anthony C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000)
- Thompson, Michael B., "The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation", in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 49-70.
- Thrall, Margaret E., *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965)
- Tödt, Heinz E., *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, translated by Dorothea M. Barton (London: SCM Press, 1963)

- Tolbert, Mary A., *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989)
- Torrey, Charles C., *Documents of the Primitive Church* (New York/London : Harper & Brothers, 1941)
- Trites, Allison A., 'Generation,' *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, edited by Colin Brown (Exeter: The Paternoster Press Ltd., 1976)
- Trocmé, Étienne, *The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark* (London: SPCK, 1963)
- Trotti, John B., "Mark 13:32-37", *Interpretation* 32 (1978), 410-413.
- Tuckett, Christopher M., "Recent Work on the Son of Man", *Scripture Bulletin* 12 (1981), 14-18.
- Tuckett, Christopher M., *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996)
- Uffenheimer, Benjamin, "From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eshcatology", *Eshcatology: In the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, edited by Henning G. Reventlow (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997)
- Vermes, Geza, "The 'Son of Man' Debate", *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 1 (1978), 19-32.
- Vermes, Geza, "The Present State of the 'Son of Man' Debate", in *Jesus in His Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 81-90. Also in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29 (1978),

123-134 and reprinted in *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 89-99.

Vermes, Geza, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospel* (London: Collins, 1973)

Vorster, Willem S., "Literary Reflections on Mark 13:5-37: A Narrated Speech of Jesus", *The Interpretation of Mark*, edited by William Telford (Philadelphia/London: S.P.C.K., 1985)

Wall, Robert W., "The Canonical Function of 2 Peter", *Biblical Interpretation* 9 (2001), 64-81.

Wedderburn, Alexander J. M., "The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV", *Novum Testamentum* 23 (1981), 229-241.

Weeden, Theodore J., "The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59 (1968), 145-158. reprinted in *The interpretation of Mark* edited by William R. Telford (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 89-104.

Weeden, Theodore J., *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971)

Weiss, Johannes, *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*, translated by Richard Hyde Hiers and David Larrimore Holland (London: SCM Press, 1971)

- Wenham, David, "‘This Generation will not Pass...’: A Study of Jesus’ Future Expectation in Mark 13", in *Christ the Lord*, edited by Donald Guthrie (Leicester, Inter-Varisty Press, 1982), 127–150.
- Wenham, David, "Appendix A: Mark 13:24–27 not the Second Coming?", in *Christ the Lord*, edited by Donald Guthrie (Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1982)
- Wenham, David, *Gospel Perspectives II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981)
- Wenham, David, *The Rediscovery of Jesus Eschatological Discourse*, Gospel Perspectives Vol. 4 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984)
- Wenham, John, *Redating Matthew, Mark & Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991)
- Wilson, Robert R., *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980)
- Winandy, J., "Le legion de l’ignorance (Mc. XIII, 32; Matt. XXIV. 36)", *Revue Biblique* 75 (1968)
- Witherington, Ben, III. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2006)
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995)



- Witherington, Ben, III. *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1992)
- Witherington, Ben, III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001)
- Wright, Nicholas T., *Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God, Vol. 2* (London: S.P.C.K., 1996)