

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

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This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties.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.

1st of 2 files

Introductory material and chapters I to III

**The remaining chapters
and the bibliography
are in an additional file**

DEDICATED

to

My beloved father and mother,
Seungbin Won and Chungim Won (Yoon),
for their prayer and encouragement
and above all their endless love

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to find a date and general context for Mark's gospel. Scholars are in general agreement that this is the earliest of the gospels, and thus of key importance for our dating of the other Synoptics and valuable for New Testament chronology generally.

The focus of my study is Mark 13, the so-called 'eschatological' passage of Mark. Unlike other scholars, I have concentrated less on trying to locate a single set of historical circumstances against which to date it. While it is true that Mark is not a mere copy-and-paste compiler of transmitted traditions, and that his editorial work is likely to reflect the circumstances in which he worked, I argue that existing scholarly attempts at identifying these circumstances have failed to produce a firm consensus.

Rather, I attempt to locate Mark's eschatology within the context of evolving early Christian eschatological expectations as found in other New Testament documents, for which more secure datings have been proposed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Most of all, I am grateful to my father who always trusts and supports me and my mother who always prays and encourages me to overcome everything that I have met.

I came to have an interest in the topic of Mark's date when I was doing M.A. at University of Birmingham in 2001-2002. This thesis is indebted to my three supervisors: to Mark Goodacre who led me to build up the idea, to Paula Gooder who helped to see what I did not recognize, and above all, to Philip Burton who supervised me with the boundless hospitality and a warm care and concern. I am really grateful to them.

I am grateful to Dr. Richard Goode who read my thesis and corrects my English as a friend.

Above all, I want to thank my wife, Jeehyun, for her being with me. She always supports me with love and shares everything with me. I could overcome many difficulties with her limitless love and encouragement. I am also grateful to my children Eunju, Eunjin, and Wooseok who are the angels for me. Although I did not look after them properly, because

of my research, they are bright and integrity. I especially thank to my son, having a disease, he always makes me smile.

I am grateful to my brothers, Hyundu and his wife, Hyunkyung, Hyunjun and his wife, Jungyeol, for their sincere prayer, encouragement, and their willing financial support.

I want to extend my thanks to my brothers who had shared and are sharing many things in Christ at Birmingham, Rev. Dohyun Kim, Rev. Changsun Whang, Rev. Changwhan Kim, Rev. Bongdo Choi, and my dear Jipsanim Yumi Yeo, Eunyoung Yoon, Yunjun Jung, Segak Oh, Hyunjin Oh and the church members who I have met in Birmingham Korean Church for their prayer and concern. I was not lonely and my heart was relieved under their warm friendly love and prayer.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgment	iii
Table of Contents	v
Chapter I: Introduction	1
1. The General Tendency in the Study of Mark's Date	1
2. Problems	5
3. Presuppositions	6
4. Scope and the Method of Study	7
Chapter II: Mark's Date in Previous Studies	11
1. External Evidence	12
1.1. Anti-Marcionite Prologue	14
1.2. Irenaeus	22
1.3. Clement of Alexandria	27
1.4. Conclusion	29
2. Internal Evidence	31

2.1. Earlier Date: Caligula Crisis Around A.D. 39-40	35
2.2. Jewish War	40
2.2.1. What happened?	41
2.2.2 Meaning	45
2.2.2.1. The possible meaning of the victory over Cestius	45
2.2.2.2. The possible meaning of the return of Vespasian	51
2.2.2.3. How to interpret these two incidents	52
2.3. Later Date: Jewish War Around A.D. 66-70	53
3. Conclusion	64
Chapter III: Mark 13	67
1. Eschatology and Apocalypse	71
1.1. Eschatology	71
1.1.1. Terminology	71
1.1.2. Various Eschatologies	74
1.2. Apocalypse	84
1.2.1. Terminology	84
1.2.2. Origin of Apocalypticism	90
1.2.2.1. Prophet Tradition	90
1.2.2.2. Jewish Wisdom Tradition	95
1.2.2.3. Foreign Influence	98
1.2.2.4. What does the Apocalypticism come from?	101
2. Mark 13: Political Eschatology?	102
2.1. Recent Researches	109
3. Conclusion	131
Chapter IV: Mark's Eschatology and Mark 13:1-23	133
1. Previous Research on Mark's Eschatology	134
1.1. Benjamin W. Bacon	134

1.2. George R. Beasley-Murray	137
1.3. John C. Fenton	139
1.4. James G. Crossley	140
2. In this Study	144
3. Mark 13	147
3.1. 13:1-4; The Destruction of the Temple? or the Last Days?	147
3.2. 13:5-37; Structure of Mark 13	161
3.3. The First Half: Verses 5-23	166
3.3.1. Warning and the Signs (5-8)	166
3.3.2. Signs: Tribulations (9-11)	175
3.3.3. Signs: Broken Relationships (12-13)	180
3.3.4. Signs: Abomination of Desolation (14-20)	183
3.3.5. Signs: False Christs and False Prophets (21-23)	200
4. Conclusion	203
Chapter V: Mark 13:24-37	205
1. When is the Day?	206
1.1. What will happen in the Last Days (24-27)?	207
1.1.1. Prelude of the Event (24-25)	209
1.1.2. The Event: The Coming of the Son of Man (verses 26-27)	214
1.1.2.1. The Authenticity of the Son of Man Title	215
1.1.2.2. Where does the Son of Man come from?	221
1.1.2.3. What does the Son of Man refer to?	223
1.1.2.4. Why does the Son of Man come?	229
1.1.3. What does the Coming of the Son of Man mean?	231
1.2. Two Parables: When will these things happen? (28-37)	232
1.2.1. The Fig Tree Parable (28-29)	234
1.2.2. Meaning of the fig tree parable	246
1.2.3. What he wants to say (30-36)	248
1.2.3.1. It is very close	248

1.2.3.2. The day and hour	259
1.2.3.3. The parable of the house holder	266
1.2.4. The Warning to All (37)	271
1.3. Conclusion	272
Chapter VI: What Do the Other Books Say?	274
1. Other Books in the New Testament	274
1.1. Purpose	274
1.2. Criteria	276
1.3. Selection	279
1.3.1. The Similarity of the Contents.	279
1.3.1.1. The imminence of the Last Days is seen in:	280
1.3.1.2. The unknowableness of time when the Last Days would be is in:	284
1.3.1.3. Summary	287
1.3.2. The Plurality of the Products by the Same Author	288
1.3.3. The Authenticity of the Books	288
1.3.3.1. 1 Corinthians	289
1.3.3.2. 1 Thessalonians	290
1.3.3.3. The Petrine Letters	291
1.3.3.4. Summary	295
1.3.4. The Accuracy of the Date of the Books	296
2. Chronology	296
2.1. 1 Thessalonians	296
2.2. 1 Corinthians	300
2.3. Philippians	302
2.3.1. Ephesus	304
2.3.2. Caesarea	308
2.3.3. Rome	311
2.3.4. The Date of Philippians	313
2.4. Summary	313

3. What do they say?	315
3.1. 1 Thessalonians	315
3.1.1. 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18	319
3.1.2. 1 Thessalonians 5:1-11	326
3.1.3. Summary	334
3.2 1 Corinthians 15:50-53	335
3.2.1. What does the text say?	335
3.2.2. Summary	341
3.3. Philippians 1:21-23	341
3.3.1. What does the text say?	341
3.3.2. Summary	348
4. Conclusion	348
Chapter VII: Conclusion	352
1. Summary	352
2. Possibilities	355
3. Problems to be answered	357
4. Explanations	359
4.1. Mark 13 as an already formulated tradition	359
4.2. The Similarity between Synoptic Gospels	363
5. Conclusion	367
Bibliography	369

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. THE GENERAL TENDENCY IN THE STUDY OF MARK'S DATE

At the beginning of the twenty-first century Augustine Lobo states that “historically little can be said about the author, date, place and the community of the second gospel.”¹⁾ Nevertheless, the majority of scholars believe that Mark was written around the time of the destruction of temple and the Jerusalem in A.D. 70, although various opinions have been voice concerning its precise date.²⁾

1) Augustine Lobo, “Background of the Author of the Second Gospel: The Current Debate,” *Vidyajyoti Journal of Theological Reflection* 70 (2006), 103.

2) For example, Adolf Jülicher, “Markus im NT,” *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 12 (1903), 20; Burnett H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Dates* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1924), 485-494; Samuel G. F. Brandon, “The Date of the Markan Gospel,” *New Testament Studies* 8 (1960), 126-141; Dennis E. Nineham, *The Gospel of Saint Mark* (London: Penguin Books, 1963), 41-42; 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), 149; Josef Schmid, *The Gospel*

During the last century many scholars have emphasized the role of Mark as author. Augustine Lobo also states:

During the first half of the twentieth century, the traditional view on Mark's gospel became less popular, especially when in 1901 W. Wrede came out with a conclusion that Mark's gospel was a product of theology, in which Jesus was presented as divine. Therefore, Mark is not a reliable historical source. Wrede's theory of the 'Messianic Secret' (the hidden identity of Jesus) opened a door for critical reflections on Mark's gospel. . . . Accordingly, in the first half of the twentieth century Mark's gospel was considered as compilation of traditional material put together in a redactional setting.³⁾

According to Mark (Cork: The Mercier Press, 1968) 14–15; Werner H. Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and A New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 112–113, 117; Norman Perrin, *The New testament: An Introduction* (New York/Chicago/San Francisco/Atlanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1974), 149; Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 97–98; Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, New Century Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, 1976), 24–26; Howard C. Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1977) 100–101; Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 1–28; Morna D. Hooker, *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St Mark* (London: A. & C. Black, 1991), 8; Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader understand* (Minneapolis, Fortress Press: 1991), 96; John R. Donahue, "The Community of Mark's Gospel," 817–838, in *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 821; Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 258; John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: Xpress Reprints, 1993), 16–17; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 37–39; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), lxiii; John Kilgallen, "Exegetical Notes on Mark 13:1–8," *Expository Times* 118 (2006), 33–34.

3) Augustine Lobo, "Background of the Author," 93.

As Augustine Lobo notes, many scholars accept the view that Mark is a creative author. Étienne Trocmé contends that Mark is not a mere compiler: “Everything inclines us to believe that the writer of Mark composed his Gospel to meet the needs of the Church of his day.”⁴⁾ Robert T. Fortna also states, “. . . editorial work that is to some degree creative in that it represents ‘the conscious reworking of older materials in such a way as to meet new needs.’”⁵⁾ In the case of Ernest Best, although he states that it should be difficult for Mark to greatly alter the traditions, he does admit to the possibility of alteration in Mark.⁶⁾ Willem S. Vorster even urges, “Mark created an image of events and personages in the life of Jesus in order to communicate something to his readers.”⁷⁾ Larry Perkins contends that Mark himself would be a source of the comment, and he put some of his narrative constructions on the lips of his character.⁸⁾ These tendencies expressed in the views of these scholars – which try to see Mark as a writer and not just a compiler – plays an important role in determining the date of Mark and has been key in the

4) Étienne Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark* (London: S.P.C.K., 1963), 6.

5) Robert T. Fortna, ‘Redaction Criticism,’ *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume*, edited by Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 733.

6) Ernest Best, *The Gospel as Story* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983), 113, 121

7) Willem S. Vorster, “Literary Reflections on Mark 13:5-37: A Narrated Speech of Jesus,” in *The Interpretation of Mark*, edited by William R. Telford (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985), 269-288. 272.

8) Larry Perkins, “‘Let the Reader Understand’: A Contextual Interpretation of Mark 13:14,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16.1 (2006), 96.

way that Mark's gospel has been dated to around the time of the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem.

According to this understanding, because Mark edited the material he presents in his gospel while being influenced by the situation in which he found himself, the gospel of Mark can be said to be coloured by its literary context. Therefore, if one is to carefully read Mark, it is possible to reconstruct the situation of Mark.

Recent scholars believe that they can identify an atmosphere of crisis which makes them recall the catastrophe in A.D. 70. This tendency is well stated by James G. Crossley: ". . . numerous redaction and modern literary critical approaches claim Mark deliberately edited or creatively invented many aspects of his gospel to reflect events surrounding the Jewish-Roman war."⁹⁾

Since, even though this dating is based upon the presupposition that there is a crisis in Mark, especially in chapter 13,¹⁰⁾ there is no explicit reference to any of the corresponding events at all. This means that it is also possible to date the gospel to some other critical event. For example, John A. T. Robinson argues that Mark was written around A.D. 42 during the crisis caused by Caligula's attempt to erect a statue of

9) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 1.

10) Robert H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 208-209; Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1969), 168; Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and A New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 117.

himself in the temple in Jerusalem.¹¹⁾ Although the number of scholars who support the early date is small (compared with those who support the later date), it is undeniably a possibility.

2. PROBLEMS

However, although most scholars support one or other of these dates, there are several things to be considered. The dating of Mark's gospel is mostly based upon the assumption that it is possible to reconstruct Mark's situation, using Mark's gospel. Therefore it is worth considering whether this assumption is in fact correct, particularly as some scholars (such as John R. Donahue), deny the appropriateness of this approach. John R. Donahue goes so far to suggest that, "there is no consensus on the setting of Mark."¹²⁾

Most scholars argue that they can detect a crisis in Mark 13 and that they believe that this crisis reflects either the Jewish War or Caligula's attempt to erect his statue in the temple of Jerusalem. However,

11) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976), 106-117; John Wenham, *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991), 223, 238; Edward E. Ellis, "The Date and Provenance of Mark's Gospel," in *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 801-815; Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 136-137; M. Eugene Boring, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy & the Gospel Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 240; James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 159.

12) John R. Donahue, "Windows and Mirrors: The Setting of Mark's Gospel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (1995), 2.

it is worth considering whether there is a crisis in Mark 13. If there is such a crisis in Mark, it is then necessary to consider the character of that crisis. We must ask: whether the author expected it (in the future), or whether he was undergoing it at the time of writing (the crisis is in the author's 'now'), whether he had already experienced it (in the past), or whether he uses it in order to refer to an event which is to happen in the narrative's future (the crisis in the general meaning). Depending on which position we take, the possible date of Mark can differ. Therefore, in this study, the question of whether there was such crisis is key and, if there was, what was the relationship between that crisis and the historical events mentioned by scholars. Through these questions it is possible to date Mark's gospel.

3. PRESUPPOSITIONS

In this study I will keep two things in mind which most scholars have assumed: one is that Mark did actually write Mark's gospel and was not simply a compiler who just 'copies and pastes' many traditions, but that he worked as a redactor who edits his traditions for his own specific purposes; the other is that, because the author must be influenced by his situation, it is highly possible that the extant Mark's gospel was altered or redacted by the author.¹³⁾

13) Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 2-3; Norman Perrin, *The New testament*, 143; Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in*

Furthermore, if in Mark's gospel his situation was reflected and if Mark's role was not just to 'copy and to paste' the traditions, it should be possible to expect that other authors also did the same thing as Mark. If there is anyone who wrote a book contemporary with Mark's gospel, 'we might expect, other things being equal, to find the same eschatological expectation as Mark's, because it also reflects the same situation as the Markan author.

Therefore, if it is possible to identify such books among books of the New Testament, and if it is possible for us to date them, we should be able to compare them with Mark to deduce Mark's date.

4. SCOPE AND THE METHOD OF STUDY

For this study Mark 13 is the most important chapter, because Mark's eschatological expectation will be dealt with in this study to see Mark's circumstance, and because it is believed that Mark's eschatological expectation is well illustrated in this chapter.

In this study, comparing Mark and the other New Testament author's eschatological idea, I will attempt to date Mark's gospel. There are several scholars, such as Benjamin W. Bacon and John C. Fenton,

Context (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 125. Contrary to this view Ernest Best argues that, although there is a alteration when Mark writes this gospel, it is not so great. To invent any pericopae is not probable for him, because of his community. *The Gospel as Story*, 113, 121. Martin Hengel also agrees with Ernest Best. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM Press, 2000), 87.

who consider Mark's eschatology in relation to the Pauline letters.¹⁴⁾ However, Benjamin W. Bacon presupposes that Mark 13 was written after the crisis of A.D. 70. Consequently, for him, the similarity between Mark and the Pauline letters is caused by Paul's influence on Mark. This presupposition will be rejected in this study, because such a supposition does not stand on the basis of the texts themselves.

In Chapter 2 the methodology of this thesis will be considered. The traditional method to date Mark's gospel, using internal and external evidences, will be dealt with in this chapter. In addition this chapter will also consider several historical events as possible backgrounds of Mark's gospel. Because many recent scholars tend to date Mark's gospel before or after the Jewish War, this chapter will examine this historical event and its possible influence. This will allow us to examine the limits of this traditional approach and identify problems with this methodology.

Because the traditional method of dating Mark's gospel is problematic, I will use Mark 13 where Mark's eschatological idea can be clearly identified. Thus, in Chapter 3, the character of Mark 13 will be carefully examined. However, it must be noted that it is not intended to propose a reconstruction of Mark's situation through Mark 13. Rather, it is the actual eschatological ideas of Mark which will be considered.

14) These two scholars' research will be considered in Chapter 4. However, in fact, John C. Fenton does not show the date of Mark's gospel. He only mentions that there is little gap between Mark 13 and Pauline letter. John C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark,' *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. by Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 111.

In order for this to be achieved, we have to consider whether Mark 13 is eschatological or an apocalypse. This is because Mark 13 has been called the 'little apocalypse' for more than a century. Consequently, in this chapter, I will deal with not only eschatology but also apocalypse. In addition, it has to be considered whether Mark 13 is related to the Last Days, because in recent studies a new understanding of this chapter has emerged. Several scholars challenge the traditional view that the theme of Mark 13 is in fact about the Last Days. They deny that Mark 13 related to the Last Days. After the character of Mark 13 has been made a little clearer, it should be possible, in Chapter 4 and 5, then to examine Mark 13.

In these chapters (4 and 5) the contents of Mark 13 will be carefully considered. In the latter part of Chapter 4, verses 3-23 of Mark 13 will be studied. One of the most frequently raised problems will be dealt with there: the Markan Jesus' answer to his disciples in verses 3-4. Mark's method concerning how he dealt with the tradition which had been transmitted to him will also be considered.

In Chapter 5, Mark's eschatological expectation, which can be found in verses 24-31 will be examined. This will provide a basis for the identification and selection of eschatological traits.

In Chapter 6, I will turn to the other New Testament books. In this study, I want to compare Mark's eschatological expectation with those found in other New Testament books. Therefore it is necessary to

select the appropriate books which contain similar eschatological ideas to those considered in Chapter 5. Therefore, in Chapter 6, I will suggest several criteria needed to identify the appropriate books, which will then be used to select several key texts.

The final Chapter, concludes with a comparison of Mark's eschatological expectation with those of other New Testament authors. This will be followed by the proposal of a possible explanation.

CHAPTER 2

MARK'S DATES IN PREVIOUS STUDIES

For many years various scholars have tried to estimate the date of Mark's gospel. They have used lots of materials and methods to determine it, every word of the gospel has been closely checked. As a result of such studying, many hypotheses have appeared. However, none of these offer a conclusion which is widely accepted.

Recently some scholars have tended to date Mark in relation to the Jewish War, A.D. 66-70. Some of them suggest that it was written during the Jewish War,¹⁾ while others contend that it was written after the Jewish War.²⁾ However, no one can say that even this dating

1) Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), lxiii; Martin Hengel said that it is not necessary to suppose that the catastrophe of 70 was reflected in Mark's gospel. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 13, 16; John Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976), 16-17.

conclusively stands on evidence. It is nothing more than reasonable assumption, compared to the others. Furthermore there are many scholars who attempt to date Mark's gospel in different way.

In this chapter I will survey the different ideas proposed by scholars relating to the date of Mark along with the evidence which is cited by various scholars to support their view. There are two kinds of evidence used to support Mark's date: external evidence and internal evidences. I will deal with the external evidence and then the internal evidence.

1. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

It could be the Patristic writings that might be considered when anyone wants to know Mark's date. Since they are our earliest evidences, these materials actually have been often mentioned. However, it is not easy to accept their witnesses as they say, because they are, above all, not written to show Mark's date itself.

One of the most famous evidence is seen in *Adversus Haereses* III written by Irenaeus, it will be dealt with below in detail. In this book

2) Adolf Jülicher, "Markus im NT," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 12 (1903), 20; Norman Perrin, *The New testament: An Introduction* (New York/Chicago/San Francisco/Atlanta: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1974), 149; Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and A New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 117; Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 258; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 37-39.

it looks possible for us to find a clue to suppose Mark's date. Irenaeus said,

After their (Peter and Paul's) death/departure (μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον) Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, handed on (παραδέδωκεν) his preaching to us in written form...³⁾

However, although in this phrase Irenaeus said that Mark handed on Peter's preaching in written form after Paul and Peter's departure,⁴⁾ even this phrase itself's aim is not what to say about the exact date of Mark. On this matter John Chapman said,

He[Irenaeus] is simply explaining that the teaching of four of the principal Apostles has not been lost, but has been handed down to us in writing.⁵⁾

As John Chapman said, Irenaeus' intention was not to show Mark's date, rather he wanted to show that the apostles' teaching was maintained without any loss. Actually there is no single statement which explicitly mentioned Mark's date. If he wanted to say the exact date, he might do it in more obvious way rather than using such ambiguous expression.

3) Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III.1.1. cited from Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocaryphorum et patrum adhibitis editit* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1963), 549.

4) Martin Hengel emphasizes the relationship between Mark and Peter, when he explains the date of Mark. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*, 87.

5) John Chapman, "St Irenaeus on the Dates of the Gospels," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1905), 564.

Apart from Irenaeus' we have several more pieces of external evidence. I will deal with some of them. However, it has to be remembered that they also were not written to specify Mark's date. This means that we cannot find any direct or explicit witness on Mark's date in these materials. Furthermore sometimes such traditions contradict each other, creating confusion.

However, although this earlier evidence may not be reliable, it is necessary to know what they said and how they are being treated by recent scholars. In this chapter, I will survey these traditions, not to reach some conclusion, but to understand the points that are being disputed.

1.1. Anti-Marcionite Prologue

According to John Wenham, the Anti-Marcionite Prologue is found in about forty manuscripts of the Vulgate. This has been considered to be written in A.D. 160–180, slightly earlier than the Irenaeus.⁶⁾ The Anti-Marcionite Prologue states this about Mark's date:

post excessionem ipsius Petri descripsit idem hoc in partibus Italiae evangelium (After the death of Peter himself he wrote down this same gospel in the regions of Italy).⁷⁾

6) John Wenham, *Redating Matthew, Mark & Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991), 139.

7) Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 548.

The most disputed point in this statement to date Mark's gospel is the first two words, *post excessionem*.⁸⁾

This phrase could be used as an euphemism. If it was used in this way, this sentence could be interpreted to refer to the death of Peter. Vincent Taylor was one of those who thought that this means 'death' of Peter.⁹⁾ If it does mean the death of Peter, it is natural to say that Mark was written after Peter's death. If this is the case, the only thing that we have to do to determine Mark's date is to know when Peter dies.

However, the place and time of Peter's death has been disputed. Many early traditions say that Peter had visited Rome at least once. For example, according to Eusebius, when Peter refuted Simon Magus, who claimed that he was God (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.13.3.), Peter was in Rome. Jerome also reported that Peter visited Rome in A.D. 42, the second year of Claudius (Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, I.). Eusebius also witnessed this in his *Chronicum*.¹⁰⁾ According to these traditions, it looks certain that Peter had visited Rome. Some traditions even state that Peter not only visited Rome, at least once, but also died there. Clement of Rome wrote:

8) John Robinson said that this Latin word originally have meant more than 'departure.' *Redating the New Testament*, 111.

9) Vincent Taylor read this phrase as 'after death,' *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1952), 3-4.

10) In his Latin version of this book Eusebius cited Jerome, ". . . in the second year of Claudius, Peter went to Rome to refute Simon Magus," from the introduction of *Chronicum*.

But not to dwell upon ancient examples, let us come to the most recent spiritual heroes. Let us take the noble examples furnished in our own generation. *Through envy and jealousy, the greatest and most righteous pillars [of the Church] have been persecuted and put to death.* Let us set before our eyes the illustrious Apostles. *Peter, through unrighteous envy, endured not one or two, but numerous labours; and when he had at length suffered martyrdom, departed to the place of glory due to him.* Owing to envy, Paul also obtained the reward of patient endurance, after being seven times thrown into captivity, compelled to flee, and stoned. After preaching both in the east and west, he gained the illustrious reputation due to his faith, having taught righteousness to the whole world, and come to the extreme limit of the west, and suffered martyrdom under the prefects. Thus was he removed from the world, and went into the holy place, having proved himself a striking example of patience (*First Epistle to the Corinthians, 5*).¹¹⁾

Although there is no comment on the manner of death and where it took place, this passage has our earliest eyewitness of Peter's death in Rome. Also Ignatius' letter to the Romans mentions Peter and Paul's death. Although it does not directly give any information on Peter's death, it describes the commandments which were given by Peter and Paul as if Romans, its readers, knew Peter very well and as if there were special link between Peter and them.

Suffer me to become food for the wild beasts, through whose instrumentality it will be granted me to attain to God. I am the wheat of

11) It is my own Italic.

God, and let me be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather entice the wild beasts, that they may become my tomb, and may leave nothing of my body; so that when I have fallen asleep [in death, ed. note], I may be no trouble to any one. Then shall I truly be a disciple of Christ, when the world shall not see so much as my body. Entreat Christ for me, that by these instruments I may be found a sacrifice [to God, ed. note]. *I do not, as Peter and Paul, issue commandments unto you. They were Apostles; I am but a condemned man: they were free, while I am, even until now, a servant.* But when I suffer, I shall be the freed man of Jesus, and shall rise again emancipated in Him. And now, being a prisoner, I learn not to desire anything worldly or vain (*The Letters to the Romans*, chapter 4).¹²⁾

Somewhat later, Tertullian's *Prescription Against Heretics* also mentions the death of Peter and Paul. In this statement, Peter endured a passion as his Lord already have done.

Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome, from which there comes even into our own hands the very authority (of Apostles themselves). How happy is its church, on which Apostles poured forth all their doctrine along with their blood, *where Peter endures a passion like his Lord's, where Paul wins his crown in a death like John's*, where the Apostle John was first plunged, unhurt, into boiling oil, and thence remitted to his island-exile. (*Prescription Against Heretics*, I 36)

12) It is my own Italics.

It may be argued that Tertullian's statement does not specifically refer to the death of Peter. However, Eusebius gives us the clearest eye-witness account of Peter's death: during the Neronian persecution (in A.D. 64). He describes the way of the death and place. He quotes from Origen's:

Peter appears to have preached in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia to the Jews of the dispersion. *And at last, having come to Rome, he was crucified head-downwards; for he had requested that he might suffer in this way.* What do we need to say concerning Paul, who preached the Gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and afterwards suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero? (*Church History*, III.1.2)

On the basis of these traditions, some scholars have thought that Peter died in Rome during the Neronian persecution.¹³⁾ According to Edward E. Ellis, Peter was martyred in the Neronian persecution after A.D. 64.¹⁴⁾ If this is the case, Mark's date could not be earlier than A.D. 65.¹⁵⁾

Contrary to this view, however, other scholars have insisted that Peter did not die in Rome.¹⁶⁾ They even argue that Peter never visited

13) Edward E. Ellis, "The Date and Provenance of Mark's Gospel," 801-815, *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 807; James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 8-9.

14) He thought that Peter was executed during Nero's persecution in A.D. 65-68.

15) Clement, bishop of Rome (AD 88-97), is the oldest one who mentioned these two apostles' martyrdom. However, he did not clarify the place and time.

16) Charles C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church* (New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1941), 10; Donald F. Robinson, "Where and When Did Peter Die?" *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 64 (1945), 255-267; Warren M. Smaltz, "Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?" *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 71 (1952), 211-216; Michael Goulder,

Rome at all in his life. They suspect the statements of Fathers, mentioned above.

As we can see, in *the Letter of Clement to Corinthians*, although their martyrdom was mentioned, the location and time of death are omitted. F. J. Foakes Jackson argues that the evidence of Clement and Ignatius are not reliable. According to him, it was not their intention to record Peter and Paul's death itself. Rather they showed their envy for the two apostles' martyrdom. Therefore, it is hardly to say that its witness is reliable.¹⁷⁾ Therefore, it should not be taken as an evidence for making a connection between Peter's death and Neronian persecution. According to F. J. Foakes Jackson, Clement of Rome was merely speaking of the death of two apostles. It does not mean that they were martyred in Rome or in the reign of Nero.

Warren M. Smaltz suggests that Peter died in Jerusalem rather than in Rome.¹⁸⁾ If this is correct, Peter's death was should be around A.D. 42, slightly earlier than the death of Herod Agrippa I.¹⁹⁾

Michael Goulder also argues against the traditional view which accepts Peter's death in Rome during the Neronian persecution. He suggests several reasons to suspect Peter's presence in Rome. (1) In

"Did Peter ever Go to Rome?", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57 (1994), 377-396.

17) F. J. Foakes Jackson, "Evidence for the Martyrdom of Peter and Paul in Rome," *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 46 (1927), 74-78.

18) Warren M. Smaltz, "Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?" 216.

19) Warren M. Smaltz, "Did Peter Die in Jerusalem?", 216.

Acts 15:7 Peter was active in Jerusalem, (2) in 1 Corinthians 9:5 Peter was mentioned by Paul. Contrary to these verses (3) in Acts 21:18 when Paul visited Jerusalem, Peter was never mentioned. If Peter was in Rome in this period, a question arises: (4) in the greeting of Romans (16:1-15) Paul never mentioned Peter. (5) In addition we can find Peter's presence outside Palestine in Galatians 2:11-14.²⁰⁾

He, therefore, concludes that Peter never been to Rome in his life. Rather he believes that Peter "probably died in his bed about 55 in Jerusalem."²¹⁾

However, Galatians 2:11-14 cannot be the reason to suspect Peter's presence outside Palestine. Rather it can be the clue to suppose Peter's presence outside Palestine. Furthermore, if Michael Goulder's argument is the case, Peter died around A.D. 55 in Jerusalem, it cannot explain Jerom's witness which said Peter's presence in Rome in A.D. 42 to debate against Simon Magnus.

In addition, the New Testament books mentioned by Michael Goulder do not tell everything about the early churches around the Mediterranean world.

Furthermore, rather than interpreting '*excessionem*' as referring to death, this Latin word could be read as 'departure.' If this is the case, it means the 'departure' of Peter and not the death of him. Mark was

20) Michael Goulder, "Did Peter ever Go to Rome?", 380-383.

21) Michael Goulder, "Did Peter ever Go to Rome?", 383.

written when Peter was still alive. In this case, we have to know when Peter was in Rome, because Mark was written after his departure.

Contrary to Michael Goulder, Thomas W. Manson believes that, although there is no clear mention about Peter's presence after A.D. 50,²²⁾ he might have visited Rome between A.D. 55–60.²³⁾ Thomas W. Manson has no certain evidence to support this assumption.²⁴⁾ However, as we have already seen above, several Fathers, such as Ignatius, Jerome, and Eusebius, do mention his stay in Rome.

In the same way in the Anti-Marcionite Prologue Mark's date might also read in a similar way as the meaning of 'post excessionem' and the time of Peter's death. The wording of the prologue makes it difficult to confirm which of the meaning are correct.

Furthermore, some scholars doubt the authenticity of this testimony. For example, John Wenham, contends that Mark's author, or at least one of his sources, just interpreted Irenaeus' idea as Mark was written after Peter's death.²⁵⁾ Consequently, this prologue should not carry great weight in the debate about the date of Mark's gospel.²⁶⁾

22) Thomas W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1962), 37–39.

23) Thomas W. Manson, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, 40.

24) John Robinson said that Manson's estimate seems merely to be a guess. *Redating the New Testament*, 111; James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 9.

25) As John Wenham himself argued, it is not certain whether this Prologue was influenced by Irenaeus or vice versa. *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 139. Related to this, James G. Crossley insisted that this prologue postdates Irenaeus. According to him, this prologue could be influenced by the Irenaeus. *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 9.

1.2. Irenaeus

Irenaeus has been mentioned by most scholars who have dealt with Mark's date. In his book *Adversus Haereses* he wrote:

Matthew composed his gospel among the Hebrews in their own language (τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ), while Peter and Paul proclaimed the gospel in Rome and founded the community. After their death/departure (μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον) Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, handed on (παραδέδωκεν) his preaching to us in written form...²⁷⁾

As we have seen in the Anti-Marcionite prologues, this statement also contains two words which can be interpreted in different ways.²⁸⁾ The one is ἔξοδον, and the other is παραδέδωκεν. ἔξοδον is equivalent to the Latin phrase in Anti-Marcionite Prologue, 'excessionem.' As the 'excessionem' was, it also could be translated as 'death'²⁹⁾ or 'departure.'³⁰⁾ In the Old Testament ἔξοδος appears 70 times in various forms, most of them referring to 'departure' or to 'go out.' Among the 70 cases, only Wisdom 7:6 is used to refer to the death of the evil and the righteous.³¹⁾

26) John Wenham, *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 140.

27) Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III.1.1.

28) Augustine Lobo, "Background of the Author of the Second Gospel: The Current Debate," *Vidyajyoti Journal of Theological Reflection* 70 (2006), 90.

29) John Chapman mentioned I Peter 1:15 as a case in which this word was used in the meaning of 'death.' "St Irenaeus on the Dates of the Gospels," 564.

30) Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 4th edition (Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 277.

However, unlike the Old Testament, the New Testament used ἔξοδος three times and all of them refer to death (Luke 9:31, Hebrew 11:22, 2 Peter 1:15). From the aspect of the frequency of the term (its majority use), it can be argued that it generally refers the departure or going out rather than to the death of some one.³²⁾ However, as I can see in its New Testament use, it can be used to refer to death.³³⁾ As it is possible to take the both meanings, we are left with two different interpretations of this phrase. The way we translate ἔξοδος will alter how we date Mark.

The case of παραδέδωκεν is different to that of ἔξοδος. Its meaning is generally accepted as to 'hand over,' 'deliver,' or 'hand down of oral or written tradition.'³⁴⁾ The problem lies not with its meaning, but with the object of this verb. Namely it is the question of whether the material was handed over orally or in the written form. Richard Bauckham contends:

. . . , for to "hand on" a tradition is not just to tell it or speak it and to "receive" a tradition is not just to hear it, handing on tradition "means that *one hands over something to somebody so that the latter possesses it,*"

31) μία δὲ πάντων εἴσοδος εἰς τὸν βίον ἔξοδος τε ἴση

32) On this matter, John Wenham argues that, although in New Testament this term refers to the death, it is not normal meaning of this term. *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 138–139.

33) John Wenham argues against this view. According to him, although in the New Testament it refers to death, however, it is not its normal meaning. *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 139.

34) Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 614–615.

while receiving a tradition means that one receives something so that one possesses it.³⁵⁾

As Richard Bauckham states, this verb (παράδιδωμι) can include both cases: transmission of oral traditions and the transmission of written material. Consequently the meaning of this verb also has an effect on how we should date Mark.

John Chapman reads the verb as 'handed down' in reference to written tradition. He interprets ἔξοδον as 'death' and παραδέδωκεν as 'handed down.' However, he does not consider that Irenaeus' use of these two words are directly related to one other. He emphasizes that Irenaeus did not write it to show the history of Mark, but was rather "simply explaining that *the teaching of the four of the principal Apostles has not been lost, but has been handed down to us in writing* [my own italics]."³⁶⁾ He argues:

It is obvious that 'after their death' has no connexion with 'in writing,' but that it goes with 'has handed down.' It is evidently implied that the preaching of Peter has been preserved to us *after* his death by being written down *before* his death.³⁷⁾

From this interpretation we can know two things; one is that the transmission of the tradition was achieved before Peter's death, and the

35) Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2006), 265.

36) John Chapman, "St Irenaeus on the Dates of the Gospels," 564.

37) John Chapman, "St Irenaeus on the Dates of the Gospels," 567.

other is that the tradition, which was transmitted, was not oral but a written one. Therefore, it can be said that Mark was written before its transmission to the Romans³⁸⁾ before Peter's death, namely earlier than the mid sixties.

Other scholars follow Chapman in reading *παράδεδωκεν* as 'handed down.' What has been handed down is not the oral tradition, but the written one. This means that the gospel was written before *ἔξοδον* of the two apostles. In the interpretation of *ἔξοδον*, however, they argue that it means the 'departure' of the two apostles. Edward E. Ellis notes that Irenaeus uses *θάνατος* to mean death rather than the term, *ἔξοδον*. He observes that Irenaeus used *θάνατος* 38 times in the same book.³⁹⁾ It might be possible that, although Irenaeus, who used *θάνατος* 38 times to mean death in the other part of the same book, suddenly used *ἔξοδον* to mean same thing, death. Whilst no one can say that it is entirely impossible. Edward E. Ellis reads *ἔξοδον* as 'departure.'

John Wenham's reading of it agrees with Edward E. Ellis. He suggests that *ἔξοδον* was an unusual word for death, as it usually meant 'departure.'⁴⁰⁾ Although its New testament use (in 2 Pet 1:15 and Luke 9:31) is to refer to death, it is not its more normal meanings.

Furthermore, Robert H. Gundry suggests another reason to support this interpretation.

38) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 7.

39) Edward E. Ellis, "The Date and Provenance of Mark's Gospel," 803-805.

40) John Wenham, *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 138-139.

. . . , the perfect tense of ἐγγράφως, "having written," and of παραδέδωκεν, "he had delivered," means that by writing, Mark delivered the things being preached by Peter before Peter's and Paul's *ξοδοῦν* (whatever this word means). Moreover, the present tense of the participle κηρυσσόμενα, "being preached," indicates that Peter was still preaching at the time Mark delivered Peter's subject matter by writing it.⁴¹⁾

Therefore, Edward E. Ellis, John Wenham, and Robert H. Gundry argue that Irenaeus' statement refers to the gospel of Mark as being transmitted to the Romans as a written form after the departure of two apostles, when they were still alive.

Augustine Lobo clearly demonstrates this view:

Hence, according to these translations the meaning of Irenaeus' text can be a 'transmission of Mark's gospel after Peter and Paul departed from Rome.' Therefore, Irenaeus is then speaking not about the death but about their departure towards a further missionary journey after the evangelisation in Rome, this is to say, after Paul's release in 63 CE and after an earlier visit and departure of Peter. Irenaeus' data do not reveal us a precise date/place of Mark's writing. It only tells us that Mark wrote while Peter and Paul were still alive. If we consider *exodon* as 'departure' we would think 63 CE as the earliest possible date for Mark.⁴²⁾

This interpretation would say that Mark was written when Peter and Paul were still alive. If this is the case, it naturally means that

41) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993), 1042-1043.

42) Augustine Lobo, "Background of the Author of the Second Gospel," 91.

Mark's gospel was written before the two apostles' departure. However, even so, it shows us little more than that Mark was written before Peter and Paul's departure; only its later limit.

It can therefore be seen that there are several interpretations of Irenaeus' statement. And that these interpretations are caused by the possible readings of the two words. Depending as to which of the meanings we attribute to each word, the date of Mark will be different. It is there difficult to conclusively date Mark's gospel, using Irenaeus as a witness.

In addition, as the authenticity of the Anti-Marcionite Prologue has been suspected, the historical worth of Irenaeus' statement also has been suspected.⁴³⁾

1.3. Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Alexandria left three comments related to Mark's gospel. Two of them are in Greek which are quoted by Eusebius, the other is preserved in Latin.

In Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* it is said that, when Peter knew of it [that Mark recorded Peter's word], he neither actively prevented nor encouraged the undertaking (ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλύσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι., Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VI. 14.6). If this tradition is reliable, Mark's gospel would have been

43) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 9. cf. John Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 139; Robert H. Gundry, *Mark*, 1043; Augustine Lobo, "Background of the Author of the Second Gospel," 103.

written when Peter could prevent or encourage Mark's author, namely when he was alive.

The other tradition, also in Eusebius, states this:

They say that, when the Apostle knew what had been done (γνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθέν φασὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον), the Spirit having revealed it to him, he was pleased with the zeal of the men, and ratified the writing for reading in the Churches (ἤσθηται τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ κυρώσαι τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔτευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις) (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.15.2)

This testimony also indicates that Peter knew about Mark's gospel. As we can see, the tense of the *πραχθέν* implies that Peter knew not just that this gospel was being written but that the work was accomplished.

Clement's other statement also implies that Mark wrote his gospel during Peter's lifetime. It suggests that Mark wrote the Gospel at the request of Caesar's knights, and that he wrote down what had been spoken by Peter when Peter was in Rome, preaching the gospel in public (*palam praedicante Petro evangelium Romae*).⁴⁴)

This tradition shows that Mark was writing the gospel while Peter was still preaching. Even though it is not clear in this latter testimony, there appears to be a little gap between Peter's preaching and Mark's writing. However, it is much clearer in the former two testimonies. Clement said, "when Peter knew what had been done (by

44) *Adumbrationes ad I Pet 5.13*, from Kurt Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 555.

Mark)" in the first and the second traditions the tense of knowing is past whereas the tense of writing is perfect. This suggests that Peter did not know Mark's writing of the second gospel till somewhat later.

As we have seen above, all traditions of Clement also show that Mark wrote the second Gospel when Peter was alive. However, Vincent Taylor does not accept the reliability of Clement's traditions in the light of the testimony of Irenaeus⁴⁵⁾ and the Anti-Marcionite Prologue, arguing that Clement's witnesses are contradictory to these other traditions.⁴⁶⁾

However, this contradiction could be the result of the interpretation of the word, ἔξοδος (excessionem in the Anti-Marcionite prologue). If it is read as 'death,' The Anti-Marcionite Prologue and Irenaeus' testimony, as Taylor contends, means that Peter's death is prior to the writing of Mark, which therefore makes these two traditions contradict Clement. On the contrary, however, if it means just the 'departure' of Peter, they are saying the same thing as Clement's two traditions: that Mark was written when Peter is alive.

1.4. Conclusion

Essentially the key point to determine Mark's date in these traditions lies in the meaning of ἔξοδος and its equivalent Latin word,

45) Vincent Taylor said like this in the thought of that not only Anti-Marcionite Prologue but also Irenaeus used the term ἔξοδος in the meaning of death. *Gospel according to St. Mark*, 6.

46) Vincent Taylor, *Gospel according to St. Mark*, 6.

'*excessio*.'⁴⁷⁾ However, it is difficult to decide its meaning definitely on the basis of the evidence that we have. The scarcity of evidence has led scholars to interpret them differently.⁴⁸⁾

Consequently, Martin Hengel rightly concludes in *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* after he deals with these external evidences:

Historically speaking, these traditions from the early church hardly take us further. . . . it does not give us a clear date. In other words, the time of the composition of the second Gospel must be inferred from the indications given by the second evangelist in his work.⁴⁹⁾

Therefore, it is now necessary to turn our attention to the internal evidence.

47) Also it is necessary to know when Peter had visited Rome, especially before A.D.50. John Robinson mentioned this matter in his book. "One must therefore be prepared to take seriously the tradition that Mark, at whose home in Jerusalem Peter sought refuge before making his hurried escape and whom later in Rome he was to refer to with affection as his 'son,' accompanied Peter to Rome in 42 as his interpreter and catechist and that after Peter's departure from the capital he acceded to the reiterated request for a record of the apostle's preaching, perhaps about 45." *Redating the New Testament*, 114; According to John Wenham, seven major works from nine which had been published from the beginning of the last century to his book supported the traditions which bore witness to Mark's earlier date. *Redating Matthew, Mark & Luke*, 146-172, especially 147.

48) Augustine Lobo, "Background of the Author of the Second Gospel," 91-93.

49) In his book Martin Hengel actually argued that the one of the external evidences, the testimony of Papias' is reliable. However, he did not assure that only the external evidences could be the reason to date Mark's gospel. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 7. In the other book he

2. INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Unlike the external evidence, almost all scholars consider that it is more reliable to use Mark's text itself to determine its date, because the old traditions which mention Mark's date fail to supply any certain or reliable evidence.⁵⁰⁾ Therefore all the scholars who have tried to determine Mark's date have thought that it is necessary to base it on a close research on Mark's text.⁵¹⁾

However, in Mark's gospel there is not enough explicit evidence to show its date conclusively.⁵²⁾ In addition it is also not easy to find the proper texts in Mark's gospel, there is no special word or verse to indicate the historical context of Mark. Thus, scholars have turned their attention to the thirteenth chapter of Mark, because they believe that in this chapter they can identify Mark's context; the so called Markan *Sitz im Leben*.

Consequently, out of the whole of the gospel, it is chapter 13 that is considered most likely to throw light on the time at which it was written. Theodore J. Weeden contends:

. . . what other evidence is there in the Gospel to support this description of the Markan *Sitz im Leben*?

50) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 18

51) Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 7; James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 18.

52) Adolf Harnack, *The Date of The Acts and of The Synoptic Gospels*, 130.

Mark 13 provides such support. Unlike the rest of the Gospel, in which the focus is primarily on the events in Jesus' life, in chapter 13 the attention is centered primarily on the post-Easter life of the early community. If Mark were going to give insight into his own community, though he might express it elsewhere through his redactional treatment of his "life-of-Jesus" material, he could express it more easily and in more transparent fashion in material whose chronological reference falls within the time of his own community.⁵³⁾

Actually this view has been widely accepted by most scholars. They have tried to see Mark's context through this chapter, because they consider that this chapter acts as a window which allows a close view of the historical environment at the time of writing.⁵⁴⁾ Mark 13, thus, has

53) Theodore J. Weeden, "The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59 (1968), 150-151, reprinted in *The interpretation of Mark* edited by William R. Telford (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 94.

54) Werner Kelber said, "What comes to expression in the apocalyptic speech must be of ultimate concern to Mark. At issue, we shall see, is the very crisis which gave rise to the gospel composition, the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple." *The Kingdom in Mark*, 110; Joel Marcus, "The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark," *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 111 (1992) 441-62; Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1969), 168; Robert A. Guelich narrows down it. According to him, Mark 13:14 is the most proper text to determine Mark's date, 'Gospel of Mark,' *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed.) Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Downer Grove, Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 514; Norman Perrin said, "But more important than any of these references is the apocalyptic discourse in 13:3-37, which is certainly addressed directly to Mark's readers and must be held to mirror their situation." *The New Testament*, 149; Howard C. Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1977) 147. However, socio-literary reading is not interested in reconstructing the traditions 'behind' this text. Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (New York, Maryknoll, 1990), 324.

been most frequently and commonly used to explain Mark's situation.⁵⁵⁾ Some scholars have even thought that, through this chapter it is able to reconstruct the situation when Mark's gospel was written. Consequently because they believe that Mark's gospel, especially chapter 13, implicitly reveals Mark's literary context, they have tried to reconstruct it. Dwight N. Peterson argues that:

It is in Mark 13 that the Markan present most directly intrudes into Mark's narrative, in a way different from and more pronounced than that in any other place in Mark. So it is here that we get the clearest view in the Gospel of Mark's concerns and the concerns of his opponents . . . Chapter 13 of Mark has been taken by many interpreters to provide the most direct access we have to the circumstances of the production of Mark.⁵⁶⁾

Most scholars try to identify the historical event which is presented as prophecy in Mark 13 and they then attempt to reconstruct Mark's actual situation. This means that they believe that there was a particular historical event or crisis in the Markan period. Joel Marcus' utterance in his commentary illustrates this tendency very well. According to him, there are several clues to determine Mark's date in Mark chapter 13. He suggests that the destruction of the Temple (1-2), the

55) This chapter has been argued since Timothy Colani suggested some problems on its authenticity. George R. Beasley-Murray summarized Colani's points and argued on them in his book, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London, Macmillan: 1957), 1-18.

56) Dwight N. Peterson, *The Origins of Mark: The Markan Community in Current Debate* (Leiden, Brill: 2000), 42-43.

Abomination of Desolation(14), and the flight to the mountain (14) are the most promising data by which to date Mark's gospel.⁵⁷⁾

In Addition to these three events mentioned by Joel Marcus, other signs announced in Mark 13, such as the war and the rumor of wars (13:7-8); preaching gospel to the gentiles (13:12); persecutions on the Christians (13); Abomination of Desolation and flight to the mountain (14) etcetera may also be read as reflecting actual events which occurred in Mark's period. Some scholars have even suggested that these things were not recorded here as just predictions of Jesus on the Last Days but reveal the historical situation of Mark's gospel.⁵⁸⁾

As a result of this presupposition, two historical incidents have been mentioned by most scholars as the event which might be described in Mark's gospel. One is the Caligula crisis in A.D. 42, and the other is the Jewish War in A.D. 66-73. Both can be seen as being critical events for the Jewish people. If we take the former date, Mark can be dated around A.D. 40. However, this has not been supported widely. If the latter is the case, the date of Mark should be fixed to the 70's of the first century. Although the supposition that Mark 13 is related to the Jewish war, it is not certain whether it was written before the destruction of the temple or after it.⁵⁹⁾

57) Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 37-38.

58) It does not mean that they do not accept Mark 13 as Jesus' own word, whether as a whole or part of it. Mark could have written down Jesus' own word, however, this is not the concern of this thesis (although I believe that it is). It is important to establish whether Mark wrote down these things here to fit his needs.

Willi Marxsen suggests that Mark 13 was written as a prediction of the fate of the temple and Jerusalem just before the fall of Jerusalem.⁶⁰⁾ Consequently, Mark's date should be placed between A.D. 66 and A.D. 70. However, others assume that the prediction in this chapter is *vaticinium ex eventu*.⁶¹⁾ For them Mark 13 could not be earlier than the fall of Jerusalem. The later dating is divided again into the 'pre-70' and 'post-70.'

2.1. Earlier Date: Caligula Crisis Around A.D. 39-40

Gaius Caligula was the third emperor of the Roman Empire and the successor of Tiberius (*Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII, 224). During his reign there was a serious crisis in Palestine. This crisis arose in Jamnia during the winter of A.D. 39-40. In this small town the Greek minority erected an altar of the imperial cult. The Jews destroyed it claiming that it contravened their Law. The emperor Gaius Caligula was indignant at the Jewish action in refusing to pay the honour due to the emperor.⁶²⁾

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

60) Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 170; Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 298. Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 335; Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001) 341; William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), 453.

61) Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*, 112. Theodore J. Weeden, "The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel," 157.

62) Josephus said Gaius' indignation was caused by Apion's accusation. *Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII 8:1. However, Philo's witness is slightly different from Josephus.' Even in Josephus' two writings we can find some discrepancies. E. Mary Smallwood said that

He, therefore, commanded the new legate of Syria, Petronius, to set up his own statue in the temple of God at Jerusalem, in the Holy of Holies.

If the Jews did not accept this command and continue to resist the emperor's command, Petronius should enforce the edict by force of arms (*Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII 8:2). He marched to the Ptolemais with two legions.⁶³⁾ In Ptolomais ten thousand Jews came to him in demonstration of their opposition to the desecration of the temple. Such demonstration took place once more in Tiberias later (*Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII 8:4). The Jews stayed there for forty days, even though that was the time of sowing. They declared that the Roman legions should kill all of them before emperor's command was carried out. Since Petronius noticed that it was impossible to erect the statue without great slaughter, he wrote a letter to Gaius to report the situation in which a revolt could be expected and suggested the withdrawal of the command (*Jewish Antiquities*, XVIII 8:6). While Petronius hesitated in Palestine to carry out emperor's command, King Agrippa petitioned Gaius to withdraw his command. At last Gaius conditionally withdraws his command.

According to Philo, however, this was not the end of the crisis. In his account of the events, Gaius later changed his mind for an

Philo's version might be regarded as preferable to Josephus,' because Philo was a contemporary of this event. *The Jews Under Roman Rule* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 174.

63) Whereas in *Jewish Antiquities* he mentioned two legions, in *Jewish War* Josephus said that the number of Legions was three. *Jewish War* II.10.1. cf. Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 146.

alternative scheme. He planned that he would visit Jerusalem with the statue already made in Rome and that he would erect it in the temple without any prior warning to the Jews (*De Legatione ad Gaium*, 337-338). However, this scheme could not be carried out, because he was assassinated on 24 January 41 (A.D.). By this assassination the crisis which developed in A.D. 39-40 was over.

The Caligula Crisis has been the preferred possible historical event relevant to Mark 13, and has been often mentioned by scholars. One of them, Gerd Theissen looks for the relationship between these signs and the incidents which appeared in A.D. 39-40. Among these signs listed in verses 5-8, he suggests that the warning against the deception (5-6) was not related to any special event, rather it reflected the many false teachers and prophets who had already appeared, as there were some cases which could be referred to "messianic figure."⁶⁴

Therefore, for Gerd Theissen, these verses are not particularly useful in determining a specific situation. Rather the wars and rumors of wars (in verses 7-8) is more important for him as a means of identification. He suggests that this war, and the rumors of war, relate to the war between the kings of Galilee⁶⁵ and Perea and the king of the Nabateans.

64) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 153.

65) Actually Herod Antipas has the title of 'tetrarch.' However, Gerd Theissen points to two incidents, the first is that among Herod Antipas' Aramaic-speaking people he was called 'king,' the other is that Josephus calls the tetrarchy of Lysanias βασιλεία. *The Gospels in Context*, 153.

This war was not only between kingdom and kingdom, but also gave rise to the rumors of the wars.⁶⁶⁾

Such an assumption, he contends, is supported by the enigmatic expression, 'Desolating Sacrilege' (in verse 14). Whereas other verses in Mark 13 are too general to identify an exact date, το βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως could present key evidence by which to date Mark.⁶⁷⁾ The term βδέλυγμα is generally connected with idolatrous practices.⁶⁸⁾ According to Gerd Theissen, the only event that fits this expression concerns the cult of Zeus Olympios.⁶⁹⁾ Many scholars agree that το βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως reflects the religious persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes in B.C. 168-167,⁷⁰⁾ when the statue of the pagan god, Zeus, to which had been placed by him in the holy of holies was replaced with a statue of the emperor, Gaius Caligula.

The call for the flight to the mountain (13:14), in Gerd Theissen's view, was not a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but a genuine appeal.⁷¹⁾

66) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 152-155.

67) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 27.

68) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 158. James G. Crossley verified its usage in detail. According to him, this word could mean the worship of foreign gods, defiling the Temple, perceived immorality such as sexual deviancy, unclean foods, and wrong sacrifices. *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 27.

69) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 159.

70) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 157; Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925), 56; George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days: An Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993), 357-358.

71) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 161.

Therefore, for him it is not necessary to look for any equivalent historical event for this verse. Consequently for him, everything in verse 14 relates to the near future. The other thing which he pays attention is the gentile mission in verse 10. In this period there was a watershed in the Christian mission. According to Gerd Theissen, there were two missions. Michael Goulder's contends on this matter that:

There were two missions: the one is the Jerusalem mission headed by Jesus' central disciples, Peter, James and John, and by Jesus' family, his brothers James, Jude and the others, and the Pauline mission, headed by Paul, with centres first at Antioch, later at Ephesus in western Turkey, and finally in Europe.⁷²⁾

A tension existed between the two missions which developed into a split. Gerd Theissen argues that during the Caligula crisis this crisis led to the first step toward a separation between Jews and Christians, although the acceptance of the gentile mission was later, A.D. 40-50.⁷³⁾ He explains how many verses of Mark 13 correspond to actual events in history. However, he fails to match every incident in Mark 13 with the event in history. In his book *The Gospel of Mark* Benjamin W. Bacon explained these differences. According to him, Mark did not want to record an exact correspondence between prediction and fulfilment, but that he only tried to record the historical utterance correctly.⁷⁴⁾

72) Michael Goulder, *A Tale of Two Missions* (London: SCM Press, 1994), 6.

73) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 164.

Gerd Theissen also suggests that if it were possible to trace the traditions behind Mark 13 back to the situation in the year A.D. 40, and if he places them correctly, he is able to see the prehistory of Markan text.⁷⁵⁾ For Gerd Theissen, the process to find the relevant events to the verses in Mark 13 is the means to understanding Mark's social circumstances.

Such dating can place Mark's gospel at an early time, around A.D. 40. However, it can be no more than a possible date of Mark's gospel, because there is no overwhelming evidence to support this view.

2.2. Jewish War

Besides the Caligula Crisis, another event relevant to Mark 13 is the Jewish war, which broke out in A.D. 66 and ended in A.D. 70.⁷⁶⁾ Many scholars have tried to determine a relationship between this incident and Mark 13. Some have suggested that Mark was written when the Jewish War was imminently expected, whereas, others supposed that Mark was written following it (as a *vaticinium ex eventu*). In this section I will examine the Jewish War and, then the possible dating of Mark in the relation to the war.

74) Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, 61.

75) Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context*, 165.

76) Actually there were three fortresses that were still in rebel hands: the Herodian forts of Herodeion, Masada and Machaerus. Martin Noth, *The History of Israel* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958), 441.

2.2.1. What happened?

Josephus described Gessius Florus, the procurator appointed by Nero, as being the direct reason for the war (*Jewish War*, II.11.1). He favoured the Greek and ignored Jews. This tendency displayed not only by Gessius Florus but also by Nero. Consequently, the Greek people began to mock Judaism itself.⁷⁷⁾ Even Gessius Florus took seventeen talents from the Temple in Jerusalem 'for Caesar's use' (*Jewish War*, II.14.4). Because of Gessius Florus' wrongdoings and his instigation to rise up in arms against Rome,⁷⁸⁾ Josephus characterised his greedy and wicked character in his *Jewish War* (II.14.2). Finally, when Cestius, the legate of Syria, came to Jerusalem, no fewer than 3 million Jews came to him to cry out about Florus' misdeeds (*Jewish War*, II.14.3). However, Florus deceived the legate, and prepared a plot to conceal the enormities of his wrongdoings (*Jewish War*, II.14.3; xx.16.1).⁷⁹⁾

Gessius Florus' wrongdoings and his ignorance of the Jews provoked the revolt. However, it was not the only reason for the revolt. As Samuel G. F. Brandon observes, in *The Fall of Jerusalem and The Christian Church*, the main reason was Rome's failure to understand the religious sensibilities of the Jews.⁸⁰⁾

77) Simon Dubnov, *The History of the Jews: From the Beginning to Early Christianity* (New York/London: South Brunswick, 1967), 767.

78) Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, 436.

79) The events leading up to the war is illustrated in Josephus' *The Jewish War*, II 14.1.-16.5.

At the beginning of the conflict, King Agrippa came to Jerusalem and tried to persuade the people to abandon their resistance. However, his attempt failed (*Jewish War*, II.16.5). The rebels claimed that they were not fighting against Rome, but against Gessius Florus (*Jewish War*, II.16.5). Nevertheless, it did not turn out as they said, rather they were already against Rome.

After King Agrippa's speech (which did not pacify the rebels), the High Priest tried to defeat the rebels by the force. At his request, King Agrippa sent 3,000 horsemen (*Jewish War*, II.17.4-5). However, they were not enough to overcome the rebels. After the King's soldiers were defeated, the seditious faction succeeded in occupying the fortress of Antonia (*Jewish War*, II.17.7). According to Josephus, they slew the Roman army, who were in the fortress, even though they had already surrendered and laid down all their weapons (*Jewish War*, II.17.10).⁸¹⁾ From this time, the Jews were up in arms everywhere (*Jewish War*, II.18.1-8).

The next phase of the war was started by Cestius' campaign. In the autumn of A.D. 66 Cestius marched into Palestine with a legion of soldiers (and other auxiliaries) and took many of the cities (*Jewish War*,

80) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), 155; Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 422-430; Martin Noth, *The History of the Jews*, 430-431.

81) Josephus reported that there was only one survivor; the Roman general who promised to be a Jew, and be circumcised.

II.18.9-11). The inhabitants of those cities were slain, including the women and children. Cestius' army reached the suburb of Jerusalem during the Feast of Tabernacle (*Jewish War*, II.19.1). Although, in the beginning of the war, he had encountered some difficulties in his battle against the Jews (*Jewish War*, II.19.2), this time, his men reached the heart of the rebellion without great difficulty. The Roman legion threatened the rebels, who retreated to the inner city and into the temple (*Jewish War*, II.19.4). Finally, the Roman legion reached to the gate of the temple and prepared to set it on fire. The rebels were put in great fear of their lives by the approaching of their enemy. Some of them even ran out of the city (*Jewish War*, II.19.5-6).⁸²⁾

However, at that very moment, something which no one could have expected happened. Cestius suddenly withdrew from Jerusalem (*Jewish War*, II.19.7).⁸³⁾ He abandoned the temple and the city. During this withdrawal, Cestius lost around six thousand soldiers of the twelfth legion in the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, A.D. 66 (*Jewish War*, II.19.9). Although there was no record to explain Cestius' action, Josephus reported that, "If he had continued the siege a little longer, he had certainly taken the city (*Jewish War*, II.19.6)."

This was Jews' first encounter with their enemy during the Jewish War (A.D. 66). The victory over Cestus Gallus was enough to

82) cf. Martin Noth, *The History of the Jews*, 435.

83) Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 328.

make them prepare for a new phase. Accordingly, they fortified many of the cities and villages in Galilee and Samaria in order to defend their land from further Roman invasion and they organized their defences (*Jewish War*, II.20.3-8). In this way, they prepared for a full-scale war against the Roman Empire.

After the battle between Cestius' army and the Jews, Nero appointed Vespasian as a commander to pacify the east of the empire. (*Jewish War*, III.1.2) In the spring of A.D. 67, Vespasian marched to Galilee with three legions and numerous auxiliaries and the cities in Galilee were taken by him one by one (*Jewish War*, III.6).⁸⁴⁾ By the winter of A.D. 67-68, all of Galilee had fallen into Roman hands. By the spring of A.D. 68, the whole area around Jerusalem was under his control and, for a while, he prepared to seize it (*Jewish War*, IV.9.1.). It was at this time that Vespasian heard the news of Nero's death (*Jewish War*, IV.9.2).⁸⁵⁾ Following this news of Nero's death, he postponed his expedition against Jerusalem while he waited to see who would replace Nero as Caesar (*Jewish War*, IV.9.2).

Finally the empire was transferred to Galba, Otho and then Vitellius. On the 1st July A.D. 69, Vespasian was proclaimed emperor in Egypt and then in Palestine and Syria. Finally, in the summer of A.D. 70,

84) He entered Palestine with three legions and a strong body of auxiliary troops. Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, p.161.

85) Nero was assassinated on 9 June 68 A.D. This news would have reached Vespasian within two months. Consequently, the lull in fighting must have occurred, at least, before the winter of 68.

he arrived in Rome to take power. After he was proclaimed as emperor, he ordered that his eldest son was to continue the attack on Jerusalem. In May 70, during the Passover festival, Titus marched to Jerusalem with his army (*Jewish War*, V.2.1). It took only four months for Titus to take Jerusalem.⁸⁶⁾

2.2.2 Meaning

The Jewish War had continued for four years, from A.D. 66 to A.D. 70. At last the Roman army had destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple. However, during this war, there were two remarkable incidents which should be carefully considered. The first is Cestius' retreat and the other is the delay of Vespasian's expedition against Jerusalem.

2.2.2.1. The possible meaning of the victory over Cestius

The Jews experienced victory over the army of Roman Empire. However, this victory was not caused by their power or strategy, rather, according to Josephus, it happened suddenly, although he does not clearly state the reason for the Roman army's retreat.⁸⁷⁾

Scholars have suggested various possible explanations for Cestius' retreat. According to E. Mary Smallwood, Cestius' withdrawal

86) Titus marched on the beginning of May (Josephus, *War.*, V. 3.1) and took Jerusalem on 26th September (Josephus, *War.*, VI. 10.1.).

87) Mordechai Gichon, "Cestius Gallus' Campaign in Judaea," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 113 (1981), 56.

was for the military reasons: the lateness of the season, the lack of a siege train, the danger of counter-attacks by rebels and the fear that the offer to open the gate was a trap.⁸⁸⁾ Simon Dubnov also expresses a similar militaristic view for the retreat: Cestius was convinced he could not capture Jerusalem with his small force. Winter approached and getting supplies to his troops was growing difficult.⁸⁹⁾

However, these explanations are not very satisfactory. Samuel G. F. Brandon argues that it does not make sense, because, even if the season was late, they had already reached to the gate of the temple and were preparing to set fire to it (*Jewish War*, II.19.5-6).⁹⁰⁾ Consequently, it is unreasonable to think that he would have changed his mind in such a situation.

Martin Goodman suggests a different explanation. According to him, Cestius might have thought that he had achieved his purpose, which was to demonstrate to the Jews that he had enough power to defeat them.⁹¹⁾ This could explain the sudden retreat of the Roman army. This could also explain his slovenly retreat through which he lost his legion.

88) E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 297; Mordechai Gichon, "Cestius Gallus' Campaign in Judaea," 56.

89) Simon Dubnov, *History of the Jews*, 774. Mordechai Gichon, "Cestius Gallus' Campaign in Judaea," 56.

90) Samuel G. F. Brandon rejects this explanation, because the Roman legion's advance was rapid and, when Cestius ordered retreat, his men had actually already reached the gate of the Temple. *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 159, n.4.

91) Martin Goodman, *Roman and Jerusalem*, 14.

However, this raises several questions. Firstly, as we can see in Josephus, Cestius had already lost 515 soldiers in the first battle (*Jewish War*, II.19.1-2). Even if he originally had an intention to demonstrate his power against the rebels in Jerusalem, it would have been difficult for him to accomplish following his defeat in battle. Rather, his defeat would have encouraged the Jews showing them that they could defeat and overcome the Roman army.⁹²⁾ Consequently, if that was his intention, he would have failed from the beginning of his operation.

Secondly, following the first battle, according to Josephus, Agrippa tried to persuade the Jews to desist from fighting against the Roman army. So he sent Borceus and Phebus to Cestius who were well known to Romans. Agrippa believed that Cestius would have mercy on them. If Cestius' intention was still just to demonstrate his power (even though he had lost more than five hundred soldiers in the first battle), he would have shown mercy on the ambassadors. However, Phebus was killed by him before Phebus had uttered a word and Borceus was wounded (*Jewish War*, II.19.3).

Thirdly, as Samuel G. F. Brandon noted above, the Roman army had almost reached the gate of the temple and had prepared to set fire to it. Therefore, he almost reached to the heart of Jerusalem. If his intention was purely a demonstration of his power, it was not necessary

92) Josephus, *The Life*, 24-25.

for him to penetrate so deeply into Palestine. To threaten the Jews in this way meant that he risked losing his men.

Fourthly, if his purpose was not to defeat his enemy, but to demonstrate his power, he would have needed to prepare his route of retreat from Jerusalem following his demonstration. However, this he did not do so. As a result, he lost almost his entire legion while he retreated. It is possible that he was a very experienced leader who did not take proper decisions and did not fully appreciate the risks of his strategy.

Consequently, it is possible that it was the original intention of Cestius to demonstrate his power in order to subjugate the Jews when he marched to Jerusalem. However, it is difficult to accept that he would have continued with this strategy following his unexpected defeat. As we have seen, his strategies for attacking the holy city indicate that he intended to attack and destroy Jerusalem and not simply to demonstrate his power.

For the Jews, their victory over Cestius' army was highly significant. It would not have been seen as a mere victory, but it would have conveyed a far deeper meaning for them. Until the Roman legions withdrew, they would have never expected that they could defeat them. Some have even tried to open the gate to them. However, even though they were afraid of the Roman army, their enemy suddenly started to run away from their city and country. Josephus states that Cestius' legion nearly captured Jerusalem at that moment. However, the result of the battle was entirely different. The Jews were able to pursue them even to

the Antipatris and they killed almost the entire legion (*Jewish War*, II.19.9). In addition, they took weapons and engines.

It was a great victory that Jews had never expected. They witnessed that, even though they did not possess enough power to confront the Roman army, before their eyes the well trained Roman elite troops suddenly ran away. Samuel G. F. Brandon also suggests that the number of the rebels, when Cestius advanced into Jerusalem, was not so great. However, in Vespasian's expedition, its size was getting much larger.⁹³⁾ Because of this victory over the Roman legion of Cestius, the number of rebels increased. In this situation, whether they joined the rebels or not, all the Jews attributed the recent events to the intervention of God.

When Samuel C. F. Brandon addressed a few more explanations suggested by many scholars, he concludes that there must be another reason. However, he contends that Josephus, intentionally or unintentionally, did not mention, or chose to omit it.⁹⁴⁾ Josephus states, "but it was, I suppose, owing to the aversion God had already at the city and the sanctuary, that he was hindered from putting an end to the war that very day" (*Jewish War*, II. 19.6.). Consequently, it is not certain whether Josephus omitted the real reason intentionally or unintentionally. However, if he did omit the real reason of the Romans' retreat and attributes the events as

93) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 159, n.4.

94) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 159, n.4.

being the intervention of God, it is possible to say that he viewed this victory over Roman legion as not belonging to Israel but to God.

In addition, this victory encouraged the seditious faction. As Martin North notes, the rebellion that had been started with fresh enthusiasm had met with an initial success.⁹⁵⁾ The daily sacrifice for the emperor was stopped and the sacrifices from foreigners were not accepted. Such pious decisions were linked to the victory over the pagan elite army. This must have encouraged them enough to confront Roman Empire. After this battle, the moderates joined in the war against Rome.⁹⁶⁾

Although many of the peace-party now abandoned Jerusalem 'like a sinking ship,'⁹⁷⁾ it should be taken into account that the battle aroused a range of responses. Although some were negative (as with the case of the Peace party), others were more positive. Samuel G. F. Brandon rightly argues that the withdrawal of Cestius (and the victory over him) is "the miracle of Sennacherib's army . . . ; Yahweh in some mysterious way had saved his shrine and turned the triumph of the

95) Martin Noth, *The History of Israel*, 435.

96) Valentin Nikiprowetzky, "Josephus and the Revolutionary Parties," in *Josephus, the Bible and History* (edited, Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 230.

97) E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 298. According to her, the people who ran away from the city was the peace-party, however, it is not certain whether they really ran away because they did not want to be involved in the war or because they were threatened by the rebel. Josephus called them the 'most eminent of the Jews' and also the commander of king Agrippa's force was mentioned (Josephus, *War.*, II. 20.1.). Not all of them, but some of them could be fled from the city not to be killed.

heathen into the ignominy of retreat"⁹⁸⁾ and that it "must also have recalled the miraculous success of the Maccabees against a previous 'ruler' of Syria, because the pass at Beth-Horon was the very site of Judah Maccabee's defeat of the army of Syria."⁹⁹⁾

2.2.2.2. The possible meaning of the return of Vespasian

In Vespasian's expedition, which began a year after Cestius' defeat, we can also see a similar thing occurring. As with the case of Cestius' retreat, for a time, it would have filled the Jews with relief and made them think about God's intervention. Vespasian, who took command of all the other regions of the Judae and Samaria within a year, suddenly stopped his expedition and returned to Alexandria (*Jewish War*, IV.11.5). The return of Vespasian was also an unexpected one. The Jews must have been astonished and hardly believe what had happened front of their eyes.

In the same way that Cestius suddenly retreated without any special reason, Vespasian also returned to Rome. However, in this case, the Jews might have known the reason for his return; the death of Nero, who had ordered this war. There followed a pause in hostilities, which lasted for a year, until Titus, Vespasian's son, once again advanced. This must have reminded the Jews once again to expect further help from God. Samuel G. F. Brandon cites Adolf von Schlatter who suggests that

98) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 160.

99) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 160.

Vespasian's "cautious campaign, in which so little spectacular progress was made, had the effect of stimulating and strengthening the hope of the insurgent Jews that Yahweh was concerning himself with the safety of Zion."¹⁰⁰⁾

2.2.2.3. How to interpret these two incidents

The Jews who experienced these two incidents could have thought that they were under the protection of God, at least, until Titus advanced towards Jerusalem. Commenting on this, Ched Myers suggests that there must have been a certain conviction that "Only Yahweh could have worked not one but two miracles to save the holy city!"¹⁰¹⁾ This is a likely reaction during this period in Jerusalem. Samuel G. F. Brandon also argues, "And thus from their exultation over the defeat of Cestius and from the slackening of Roman efforts in 68-69 there grew the unshakable confidence in the ultimate success of their cause and they could regard with calm equanimity the gradual encirclement of the Holy City by the forces of the heathen."¹⁰²⁾

This event really encouraged Jews. They thought of God when they saw these two incidents. Their belief in God's intervention for them,

100) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 163. He cited Adolf von Schlatter from *Geschichte Israels von Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian* (Stuttgart: Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1906) 332.

101) Ched Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 329.

102) Samuel G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 164.

which caused this victory over Roman army, must have been firmly rooted. It is possible that, as a result, they had the intention to oppose the Roman Empire and to make them prepare for the Roman army's further invasion upon their country.

The Jewish War has usually been considered to be related to Mark 13. As I have noted above, most scholars who dated Mark's gospel before or after the Jewish War have thought that the feeling of 'imminency' found in Mark's gospel has been caused by the expectation of the war. However, the situation of Mark found in chapter 13, does not correspond with the actual situation. Mark 13 illustrated the tragic situation so far, in that it describes "no stone will be on the other." This implies that the holy city would be destroyed. However, as we have seen above, the Jews in Jerusalem were in fact encouraged by the victory over the Roman legion, at least, until the moment when the city destroyed. It is curious that such a pessimistic saying was written in such an optimistic situation.

2.3. Later Date: Jewish War Around A.D. 66-70

One of the oddest things in the New Testament is that, even though there is not a single explicit reference to the Jewish war and the destruction of the temple, that so many scholars (for such a long time) have assumed that the Synoptic Gospels were influenced by it. Those scholars who follow the later date actually prefer to interpret Mark 13 in

the light of the Jewish War.¹⁰³⁾ There are two positions for dating Mark's gospel; whereas one dates it to before the Jewish War, the other places it after it.¹⁰⁴⁾ Actually, as Robert A. Guelich observes in his commentary, the larger debate surrounding Mark's date centres on whether it was written before or after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.¹⁰⁵⁾

Before the Jewish war, the situation in Judaea appeared to be one in which everyone was expecting a severe war in the near future (as we have seen above). This would have especially been the case following the battle between Cestius' army and the Jews. Although they had defeated the Roman legion, many people would have expected a real and severe war with Roman Empire. We can see such an attitude in Josephus' autobiography.

He [Cestius] came indeed, but in the engagement which ensued was defeated with great loss. This reverse of Cestius proved disastrous to our whole nation: for those who were bent on war were thereby still more elated and, having once defeated the Romans, hoped to continue victorious to the end.¹⁰⁶⁾

103) Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, Word Biblical Commentary 34A (Dallas, Word Books: 1989), xxxi; Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader understand* (Minneapolis, Fortress Press: 1991), 96.

104) Joel Marcus looked Mark's date from as early as 69 to as late as 74-75. *Mark 1-8*, 39.

105) Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, xxxi. However, Martin Hengel argued that the announcement of the complete destruction of the temple in Mark 13:2 in no way presupposes the catastrophe of 70. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 16.

106) Josephus, *The Life*, 24-25.

In this work, Josephus describes the disaster which he foresaw as the result of the Jewish victory over Cestius. It was certain that Rome would send a new expeditionary force to Jerusalem to overcome Jewish rebellion. A brutal war was surely to be expected in this situation.

Howard C. Kee assumes that Mark 13 reflects this period. The reason he believes that it was written before the Jewish war is the imprecision of the narration of the scene describing the destroyed temple and Jerusalem and the imminence of the crisis.

The lack of precision in the prophetic description of the fate of Jerusalem in Mark 13, while not conclusive evidence, points to its having been written prior to the events which it depicts. Since there is no reason on the grounds of style or content to suppose that someone other than the author of the rest of Mark has composed the apocalyptic section in its final form, and since the sense of urgency pervades the whole gospel, Mark probably assumed its present form in the late 60s.¹⁰⁷⁾

On the basis of two points he asserts that Mark's gospel was written just before the fall of Jerusalem. According to him, the atmosphere of imminency found in Mark's gospel would have reflected Mark's situation in which he faced the imminent destruction of Jerusalem.

This could provide a satisfactory setting for Mark's date. Certainly, from the middle of A.D. 66 to the middle of A.D. 70 (with the exception of the winter of A.D. 66-70), Roman legions had pitched their

107) Howard C. Kee, *Community of the New Age*, 100-101.

camp in their territory and, later, even in front of Jerusalem. The supremacy of Rome made the outcome look inevitable. In this situation, it is possible to feel the imminency referred to by Howard C. Kee. It is a theory which has been considered a possible one.

However, if it is taken into account that the Jews defeated Cestius' Roman legion, the answer is different. Although Vespasian's Roman legions conquered, with little difficulty, the Jewish cities one by one, Mark's author, who had seen the retreat of that legion from God's city, might have expected God intervene once again as in the case of the battle against Cestius, even at the last moment. This means that Vespasian's approach to Jerusalem might not have had such devastating effect upon the author of Mark. This should not be ignored, when we think about Mark's date in the relation to the Jewish war.

According to Robert A. Guelich, other reasons to ascribe this dating are the 'Abomination of Desolation' in Mark 13:14 and the warning 'to flee into the hills,' as they do not fit the situation after the war.¹⁰⁸⁾ However, the presupposition that Mark's imminency reflects the Jewish War does not, I think, provide enough reasons for us to accept it. There is no single verse in Mark 13 which explicitly shows that this chapter is related to the Jewish War. Although verse 14 has been considered to describe the situation of that period,¹⁰⁹⁾ it could just as well be referring

108) Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, xxxi-xxxii.

109) Robert A. Guelich said that the only relevant data in Mark may come in 13:14, when read against the historical background of the Jewish War of A.D. 67-70. 'Gospel of

to other crises. Many have accepted that it draws upon Daniel, whose literary context has been thought to be similar to that of Mark's. Although it is possible to interpret this verse in this way, it is far from certain.¹¹⁰⁾

Furthermore, many recent scholars express a different opinion on this matter. This is exemplified by Joel Marcus' question: "is this an event that he and his readers know that it has already happened, or is it merely one that they anticipate will occur very shortly?"¹¹¹⁾ Recently, some scholars have preferred to follow the former rather than the latter; although this dating of Mark 13 is a problematic in that it rules out the possibility of genuine prophecy *a priori*.¹¹²⁾ There are several reasons to suppose Mark's later date of being after the destruction of the temple.

Adolf Jülicher suggests that there was time for the tradition to have developed following Jesus' death. He argues that it took a number of decades for the material in the Gospel to arrive (through the inter-

Mark,' 514. In the case of Joel Marcus he added one more verse, verse 2, as the most promising data to determine Mark's date. *Mark 1-8*, 37.

110) It is worth listening to Gerd Theissen's comment on this verse. "But if Mark wanted to say that, why does he not refer more specifically to the Old Testament (as in Mk 1:2; 7:6-7; 11:17, and elsewhere)? Furthermore, there is nothing in Daniel about flight, and yet this fleeing is the necessary consequence, when one correctly understands the appearance of the 'desolating sacrilege'! A reference to Daniel would only confuse the readers of Mk 13:14. The only thing that is certain is that the appeal for understanding in Mk 13:14 refers to the figure of the 'desolating sacrilege' in the text itself." *The Gospels in Context*, 128.

111) Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 38.

112) Adela Y. Collins, "Mark 13," *The Four Gospels 1992*, edited by F. Van Segroeck (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1992), 1127.

weaving of authentic reminiscence and pious legend) at the finished texture which makes us so amazed in the Gospel of Mark.¹¹³⁾ Therefore, for him, there needs to be a period of time to elapse in order for this process to be completed before Mark can write them down in his gospel.

However, Martin Hengel argues against his position:

The mixtures of 'authentic reminiscence and pious legend' could even develop in the lifetime of a hero. According to him, we need not to assume that the gospel has to undergo a few decades' developing process.¹¹⁴⁾

Rudolf Pesch's *Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13* is one of the most significant works to propose the date of Mark as being post A.D. 70. Rudolf Pesch asserts that Mark 13 presupposed the situation of Mark's community, "in der angesichts der Tempelzerstörung und auf Grund eines apokalyptischen Flugblattes eine falsche, apokalyptisch-berechnende, schwärmerische Naherwartung aufgekommen war."¹¹⁵⁾ The Last Days had not come, even though the temple had already been destroyed. However, the travails of the Last Days' had already started.¹¹⁶⁾ He argues that Mark 13's situation was after the Jewish war.

113) Adolf Jülicher, "Markus im NT," 20.

114) Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, 11.

115) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), 235.

116) Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartungen*, 236.

Several years after Rudolf Pesch in his book, *The New Testament: An Introduction: Proclamation and Parenesis, Myth and History*, Norman Perrin also suggests that the major part of Mark 13 is *vaticinium ex eventu*.¹¹⁷⁾ Norman Perrin attempts to understand Mark 13 as apocalyptic literature. According to him, as we find in other apocalyptic literature, Mark's author wrote down something which had already occurred as if it was a prophecy. However, he considers that Mark 13 is different to other apocalyptic literature; although it does contain some apocalyptic elements (13:24-27).

Werner Kelber is also one of those who dates Mark to after A.D. 70.¹¹⁸⁾ Werner Kelber takes a similar position to Rudolf Pesch when he considers Mark 13 as having been written in order to calm down his community's false enthusiasm. He argues that Mark was written to calm down the misconstrued eschatological enthusiasm which was caused by the Jewish war. He contends:

Mark corrected it [misconstrued eschatological enthusiasm] by setting the coefficient of a new framework of time. Therefore for him, the [Jewish] war was not meant to inaugurate the Kingdom. It merely launched the 'beginning of the woes.'¹¹⁹⁾

117) Norman Perrin, *The New Testament*, 149.

118) Werner Kelber said, "in all probability it is ex post facto that Mark accords the war experiences a proper place in history. Writing in the aftermath of the destruction of Jerusalem, he is looking back upon the Roman-Jewish War of A.D. 66-70," *The Kingdom in Mark*, 117.

119) Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*, 117.

In addition to this, Werner Kelber believes that Mark's author used the historical events or his war experiences for his own purpose, an idea which is also found in Rudolf Pesch.¹²⁰⁾

Werner Kelber's thought can also be found in David Wenham's position. David Wenham suggests that the function of Mark's apocalypse was same as Paul's purpose for writing II Thessalonians, which was to cool down eschatological excitement. The only difference between Mark's apocalypse and II Thessalonians is the reasons which caused such excitement: whereas, in Mark, it was the war, persecutions and other events, in II Thessalonians some sort of misunderstanding or distortion of Paul's teaching gave rise to a misplaced excitement.¹²¹⁾ Therefore, these scholars have dated Mark after the Jewish war because they understand Mark's purpose was to calm down the false eschatological excitement.

However, there is another reason which, I think, might provide a more fundamental reason to make them think that it was written following

120) For Werner Kelber Mark 13 was written to correct contemporary Christians' misunderstanding on the Last Days which was caused by the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem. "His repudiation of a misconstrued eschatology extends beyond the crisis of Jerusalem to the war and its identification with the *eschaton*. The prophets in whom we had recognized the leaders of the eschatological misconceptions must have been active already during the war years which climaxed in the fall of Jerusalem and its temple. Retrospectively Mark corrects their prophecies by setting the coefficients of a new framework of time (13:7d, 8d). The war was not meant to inaugurate the Kingdom—it merely launched the 'beginning of the woes.'" *The Kingdom in Mark*, 117.

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

the destruction of the temple. Because the prophecy of Jesus in Mark 13:2 looked to be correspondent to the historical event that occurred in A.D. 70 in Jerusalem, it has been treated as a spurious prophecy. Adela Y. Collins says:

one must ask whether the prophecy placed on the lips of Jesus in v.2 corresponds so precisely to historical events that one must conclude that Mark was written after 70.¹²²⁾

On the basis of these reasons (mentioned above) there has been a recent tendency to date Mark to after the destruction of the temple. However, if we can examine these reasons from a different angle, we are able to challenge this recent tendency.

First of all, it does not seem fair to jump to the conclusion that Mark 13 was written after the Jewish war simply because the prophecy in Mark 13:2 appears to correspond with actual historical events. As Adela Y. Collins argues, in the case of Amos and Jeremiah we can find some prophecies which correspond precisely to the historical events in so far as we can reconstruct them.¹²³⁾ Furthermore, the prophecy about the destruction of the Temple was not unique for Mark. John Bowman observes that Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the temple is in the line of Old Testament prophets, like Micah (Mic. 3:12) and Jeremiah (Jer. 7:14 and 26:6).¹²⁴⁾ There are not only some examples of the real

122) Adela Y. Collins, "Mark 13," 1127.

123) Adela Y. Collins, "Mark 13," 1127.

prophecy on the future in Old Testament, but some of the prophecies specifically describe the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem. Thus, one should not automatically assume that the prophecy in Mark 13:2 was not genuine prophecy.

The fact that Mark contained the prophecy on the destruction of the Temple should not be a reason for us to think that it reflected the historical event. It is possible to say that the only thing which we can say, at this stage, is that Mark's author wrote down this verse, because he already knew that this prophetic saying was attributed to Jesus when he wrote his gospel – whether it is before or after the destruction of the Temple.

Besides those scholars mentioned above, many others also follow this dating of Mark for a number of different reasons. Although there are many theories related to Mark's date around 70's, all of them, have a common presupposition. Namely, they assume that Mark is closely related to the Jewish War. The assumption has been that Mark was written under the influence of this war. To many who insist on dating Mark to around A.D. 70, this is no longer just one of a number of possibilities, but has become an uncontested fact.

On this subject, John Robinson observes that, “. . . the chronology of the New Testament rests on presuppositions rather than facts;¹²⁴⁾ . . . What seemed to be firm datings based on scientific

124) John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 240.

evidence are revealed to rest on deductions from deductions."¹²⁶⁾ While many scholars have tried to find Mark's time in the relation to the Jewish War, almost all of them have not explained their reasoning. Werner G. Kümmel comments about this phenomenon:

Since no overwhelming argument for the years before or after 70 can be adduced, we must content ourselves with saying that Mk was written ca.70.¹²⁷⁾

After a survey of recent gospel criticism, James G. Crossley notes,

Modern critical approaches to gospel studies have been extremely influential in reinforcing the consensus that Mark was written sometime around the Jewish war. However, these arguments tend to be too speculative to be convincing and all too often rest upon numerous unfounded assumptions.¹²⁸⁾

It is now possible to be content with this result, as Werner G. Kümmel states (and many scholars agree with him), however, it is impossible to say that this is the most probable answer, because there

125) John Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 2; D. A. Carson, Douglas J. Moo, Leon Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1992), 96-99.

126) John Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, 3.

127) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1978), 98.

128) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 81.

are several things that need to be considered to date Mark's gospel. Furthermore, one must always especially keep in mind the fact that this date has not been fixed upon firm ground.

3. CONCLUSION

As we have seen above, there are many explanations and hypotheses relating to the dating of Mark's gospel which, uses both external and internal evidence. Although some of the external evidence clearly points to a specific time as Mark's date, almost all of them are considered to be unreliable. In addition, even some of the external evidence is contradictory.¹²⁹⁾

It is, therefore, a reasonable method to identify Mark's literary context from the data contained which are in Mark 13. Furthermore, various hypotheses which are related to the Markan context have actually been proposed. However, because of the insufficient evidence, they have not been widely accepted yet.

As an example, we can think about Mark's community. Through the researches which have been conducted during the last century (especially since the late 1960's), various communities which are supposed to have existed have been described by many scholars.¹³⁰⁾

129) *Anti-Marcionite Prologue* and Irenaeus' *Adversus Haerese III* are contradict to the witness of Clement of Alexandria which is quoted by Eusebius in *History Ecclesiastica*.

130) Willi Marxsen supposed that this community situated in the Sea of Galilee, *Mark the Evangelist*, 172. Howard C. Kee also supposed that a community of which base was

They suggest that these were the communities that prompted Mark urged to write his gospel.

However, these communities remain speculative as we do not have any concrete evidence for their existence other than the assumptions of the scholars who describe them.¹³¹⁾ Richard Bauckham comments on this tendency for creating such imaginary communities: “Almost all contemporary writing about the Gospels shares the unargued assumption that each evangelist, . . ., wrote his Gospel for that particular church, with its particular situation, character, and needs at the forefront of his mind.”¹³²⁾

As a conclusion of this chapter, it is worth quoting David N. Peterson's statement:

But the fact so many readers of Mark 13 find so many different communities more or less clear to view causes one to be suspicious that chapter 13 might not, in fact, be such a clear window into the Markan

in rural and small-town southern Syria. *Community of the New Age*, 105. Augustine Lobo supposed that Mark was written not by an individual but by a Christian community, “Background of the Author of the Second Gospel,” 93. Many more scholars supposed Mark's community. William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark*, 447. Norman Perrin, *The New testament*, 77-78; Theodore J. Weeden, “The Heresy That Necessitated Mark's Gospel,” 150-151; Ernest Best, *The Gospel as Story* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983), 113, 121.

131) Dwight N. Peterson, *The Origins of Mark*, 128; Howard C. Kee also said, “the Markan community offers nearly no evidence of organization.” *Community of the New Age*, 152.

132) Richard Bauckham, “For Whom Were Gospels Written?” *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 10-11.

community after all, it must be noted that the community Myers constructs is utterly speculative. There is not a single shred of positive evidence outside the story Mark tells that such a group of people ever existed.¹³³⁾

133) Dwight N. Peterson said, "there is no single evidence of such communities." *The Origins of Mark*, 128.

CHAPTER 3

MARK 13

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the lack of internal and the inaccuracy of external evidence, mean that, although different hypotheses have been suggested, none of them are generally accepted.

Consequently, because neither the internal nor the external evidence is particularly helpful for reaching any decisive conclusion, concerning the date of Mark's gospel, I will examine Mark's concern of the future, his, so called, eschatology or apocalypticism. This subject has been dealt with by many scholars and has been used by them to determine the chronological setting of the gospel. However, they tend to assume that some of the verses in Mark 13 reflected the difficult situation which faced the Markan community. The underlying thought was that some of its contents could be connected with certain historical events. As we have seen in the previous chapter, most scholars consider

that Mark 13 represents a certain crisis, for example, the Caligula crisis or Jewish War (see the previous chapter). Because of this supposition, many scholars fail to consider alternative periods as possible dates for Mark's gospel other than the period when these two events occurred.

In this chapter I will deal with eschatology from a different perspective. I will try to establish what the eschatology of Mark 13 shows, rather than to identify specific events or crises which could correspond with the contents of this chapter. I will closely examine Mark's concern about the future, and pick up on Mark's eschatological traits. I will then consider other canonical authors' ideas on the future, especially the Pauline letters, which are comparatively well dated.

To do this, because of the material in chapter 13, I will deal with the eschatology and apocalypticism first. As M. Eugene Boring observes, "The most obvious prophetic feature of Mark 13 is its claim to reveal the events of the End Time and of the eschatological future."¹ Consequently, this chapter has been accepted as eschatology.² However,

1) M. Eugene Boring, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy & the Gospel Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 237.

2) Henry B. Swete, *The Gospel According to Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1927), 404; Charles. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 404-405; Morna D. Hooker, "Trial and Tribulation in Mark XIII," *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 65 (1982), 93; Joel Marcus, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 111 (1992), 447; Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993), 745; David E. Nineham, *Saint Mark* (London: Penguin, 1992), 343. George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days: An Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993), 422-427.

for the others, this chapter has been considered as an apocalypse because it contains several apocalyptically associated expressions, such as 'the Son of Man,' 'Abomination of Desolation,' that are found in Daniel which is widely accepted as an apocalyptic book of Old Testament. Thus, Mark 13 has been considered sometimes as an eschatological work and at others an apocalyptic work.³⁾

Therefore, it is necessary to make clear the meaning of; apocalypticism and eschatology. Thus in this chapter I will first deal with these two terms.

Following this, I will also examine in this chapter how we should understand the character of Mark 13. Traditionally, many scholars who thought that Mark 13 reflected its social and political circumstance supposed that the situation reflected in Mark 13 must be a very difficult one. In fact there are several verses which imply just such a difficult situation, describing: political and cosmic upheaval (8, 24-25), persecutions (9, 11, 13a), hopelessness (19), and tragic incidents (12, 17). Whatever these things are referring to (as I have mentioned in the previous chapter), it is due to such expressions and their dire descriptions, it has often been presupposed that, because Daniel was written under the

3) Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and A New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 1. However, there has been another views on this matter. Some scholars have thought that it refers not to the end of the world, but to the crisis experienced by Israel; the destruction of the Jerusalem and temple. See, Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God: vol. 2* (London: S.P.C.K., 1996); Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002).

persecution of the Antiochus Epiphanes IV, Mark 13 must also have been written in a difficult situation.⁴⁾

The traditional interpretation of this is that, because the situation (described in this chapter) is so hopeless, the Markan readers would no longer have any hope in this world, and that they should place their hope in the next world. The only hope offered in this chapter is seen as coming not from this world, but in next world which will arise from the coming of the Son of Man. In this way, Mark 13 describes what will follow the serious and tragic events: he who stands firm to the end will be saved (13b) and the Son of Man will come to collect the elect from the four winds (26-27). Because the series of events which are listed in Mark 13 have been accepted as specific historical events (which would occur at the end of the world), this chapter naturally has been accepted as eschatology, and even as apocalyptic writing.

However, against this traditional understanding on Mark 13, in the last century, an entirely different interpretation has been suggested by a few scholars, such as Nicholas T. Wright and Richard T. France. They rejected the traditional understanding that Mark 13 was describing the end of the world or a specific event in history. Rather, they insisted that it described only a political end which would be in the future. If they

4) George R. Beasley-Murray thought that Mark 13:6-13 reflected actual historical events in *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd., 1957), 1; Norman Perrin argued, "Apocalyptic discourse in 13:3-37, . . . must be held to mirror their situation." *The New Testament*, 149.

are correct and Mark 13 is not concerned with Mark's eschatological expectations it ceases to be relevant to this research.

Thus this chapter will also examine this recent interpretation made by Nicholas T. Wright and Richard T. France.

1. ESCHATOLOGY AND APOCALYPSE

1.1. Eschatology

1.1.1. Terminology

The term 'Eschatology' comes from Greek word *eschaton* which means 'the end.' This term was coined by protestant theologians in the seventeenth century. According to Arland J. Hultgren, it was used by the Lutheran dogmatician Abraham Calovius as a general heading at the end of his twelve-volume work (published in 1677) and, "under this heading he dealt with the topics of death, resurrection, judgment, and consummation."⁵⁾ George B. Caird also shows same understanding. According to him, until the nineteenth century the use of this term was restricted to the individual.⁶⁾

5) Arland J. Hultgren, "Eschatology in the New Testament: The Current Debate" in *The Last Things: Biblical & Theological Perspectives on Eschatology* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002), 67-89, especially in 68; John J. Collins, 'Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,' *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 2000), 330-337, 330.

6) George B. Caird, *New Testament Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 243.

In the nineteenth century the term began to be used to refer to the doctrines of the physical death of individuals, the intermediate state of the soul, and the promised resurrection of the dead at the end of the world.⁷⁾ Thereafter its use was extended “to cover biblical teaching about the destiny of the world and the working out of God’s purposes in and through his holy people.”⁸⁾ According to John J. Collins, it came to be widely used in biblical scholarship and “the range of this term has broadened over time to include any kind of teleology.”⁹⁾

Nowadays it is used to mean ‘the doctrine or science of the last things,’ or is related to the beliefs in ‘the last things.’¹⁰⁾ In detail, it refers to the teaching about events such as the parousia, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, heaven and hell.¹¹⁾ This term, “is concerned with ultimate expectations [of the end of the world or history of this world] and not simply with anything expected to happen in the future.”¹²⁾

Even though much attention has been paid to this theological theme, the importance of eschatology to New Testament studies had, in fact, been ignored for long time. This was because, for long time, the

7) E. Schüssler Fiorenza, ‘Eschatology of the NT,’ *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 271.

8) George B. Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 243.

9) John J. Collins, ‘Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,’ 330.

10) Arland J. Hultgren, “Eschatology in the New Testament,” 67.

11) I. Howard Marshall, “Slippery Words: Eschatology,” *Expository Times* 89 (1977-78), 264-265.

12) I. Howard Marshall, “Slippery Words: Eschatology,” 264-265

Bible had been used as a supplier of evidence for Christian dogmatic theologians.¹³⁾ However, since the end of the nineteenth century, when George B. Caird noted that “Biblical scholarship won its emancipation from Dogmatics,”¹⁴⁾ many scholars began to recognize its significance.

They realized the importance of eschatological language and recognized that it is not merely a peripheral element of the New Testament. It came to be viewed as a key element for understanding not only Jesus and his teaching, but also the theological perspective of the early Christian community.¹⁵⁾ It now recognised that it must not be overlooked when attempting to understand Jesus’ theology and his works as they appear in Gospels. The Gospels are considered as a record which contains eschatological fulfilment and are focused on the eschatological hope in the person of Jesus.¹⁶⁾ It can even be said that the New Testament is an eschatological product.¹⁷⁾

The last event is not merely one member of the series; it is the determinative member, which reveals the meaning of the whole. Such thinking inevitably assumes the reality of historical processes, and that they are

13) George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980), 243-244.

14) George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 244.

15) E. Schüssler Fiorenza, ‘Eschatology of the NT,’ 271.

16) D. C. Allison Jr., ‘Eschatology’ in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 1992), 206.

17) Clayton R. Bowen, “Why Eschatology?,” *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 44 (1925), 1-9. especially 2. Also Charles K Barrett said that the Biblical scholarly view of the Bible is a predominantly eschatological book. ‘Eschatology,’ 136-155. 136.

meaningful; in this, of course, it is fully consistent with Biblical thought as a whole; indeed, it might be said that the Biblical view of history derives its characteristic pattern from the fact that the Bible is a predominantly eschatological book. This is not to say either that the whole of the Bible is written from an eschatological standpoint, or that eschatological writing is not to be found outside the Bible; but the Bible is undoubtedly the classical field of eschatology, dominated as it is by the belief that the Judge of all the earth will do right, but that the right which He does will not necessarily be seen to be right until it is brought to a full end.¹⁸⁾

Arland J. Hultgren writes, "Within the current scene there is little debate around the question whether the New Testament is eschatological."¹⁹⁾ However, even though there is a consensus that all books in New Testament are related to eschatology and, approximately, a century has passed since this term first was appeared in the English dictionary (middle of the nineteenth century),²⁰⁾ it has still to be clearly defined.²¹⁾

1.1.2. Various Eschatologies

As mentioned above, eschatology is very important factor within the New Testament, and we can also find it within the Old Testament.

18) Charles K. Barrett, "Eschatology," 136.

19) Arland J. Hultgren, "Eschatology in the New Testament," 69.

20) According to Arland J. Hultgren, this term first was appeared in *The Oxford English Dictionary*, in 1884. "Eschatology in the New Testament," 68.

21) George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 243.

However, their eschatology are not the same. In fact, several kinds of eschatology appear to have developed.

George B. Caird identifies two kinds of eschatology in his book.²²⁾ One is a historical eschatology, which deals with the goal of history. The other is an individual eschatology which relates to the experiences of an individual death, judgment, heaven and hell, and their ultimate destiny.²³⁾ According to him, this second type does not appear in the Old Testament at all because the concept of afterlife developed only after this period. However, the latter is found within the New Testament, which was written after the idea of personal eschatology had formed and been accepted by most people. George B. Caird argues, "From these tentative beginnings [he thought that the problem of the dead who were martyred caused them to think about the after-life] belief in an after-life rapidly matured, until in New Testament times all except the Sadducees accepted it."²⁴⁾

Later, John J. Collins identified four kinds of eschatology: political eschatology, cosmic eschatology, personal eschatology, realized eschatology.²⁵⁾ According to him, political eschatology expects a definitive kingdom or other form of society.²⁶⁾ For example, in Isaiah the reign of

22) George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 243-245.

23) George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 244.

24) George B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 246.

25) John J. Collins, 'Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,' 330.

26) John J. Collins, 'Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,' 330.

“a shoot from the stump of Jesse” was expected in utopian terms. This is illustrated by Ernest Benz’s contention that:

The ancient Jewish concept of the fulfillment of salvation-history is dominated by the idea that, at the end of the history of the Jewish people, the Messiah, of the house of David, will come and establish the Kingdom of God. This messianic kingdom is secular, and its expectation therefore has a distinctly political character.²⁷⁾

Moreover, this is the only type of eschatology which can be found in the Old Testament²⁸⁾ because, when the Old Testament books were written, the belief in the afterlife was not yet developed enough.²⁹⁾ Thus, until late Judaism, only political eschatology could be found within Judaism. In this type of eschatology the concern is not about the end of the world or history. Because of this, Sigmund Mowinckel uses ‘future hope’ rather than ‘eschatology’ to refer Jewish hope.³⁰⁾ Of course, in later Judaism

27) 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.

28) George B. Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 243.

29) George B. Caird and L. D. Hurst, *New Testament Theology*, 243. Also in his article “The Christological Basis of Christian Hope,” *The Christian Hope*, (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), 9-24, in 21 and his book *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 244. Ernest Benz said that in later Judaism this thought had undergone a change. According to him, as a result of the contact of Judaism with the Aryan, Zoroastrian religion during the Persian exile the Jewish expectation of the End of time significantly changed. *Evolution and Christian Hope*, 4-5.

30) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, translated by G. W. Anderson (Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), 125. Bob Becking also said that there were no expectations about the end of time in the Hebrew Bible. “Expectations about the end of Time in the Hebrew Bible: Do They Exist?” in *Apocalyptic in History and*

their concern moved from future hope to eschatology, as we can see in Daniel.

John J. Collins views political eschatology as similar to George B. Caird's historical eschatology.³¹⁾ However, in the New Testament books it is not clear whether this eschatology exists or not. Although in the *Book of Revelation* we can find reference to a thousand-year reign on earth, the author does not present seek to present this as the final goal, rather he expected the destruction of the world, followed by the emergence of a new creation.³²⁾ In this aspect the eschatology which is in the *Book of Revelation* is close to cosmic eschatology.

Cosmic eschatology is generally found in apocalypses, such as the *Book of Revelation*. In this type of eschatology, the end of the earth, the destruction of this world and the old and new world are dealt with. In the Dead Sea scroll 1QH 11, there are a series of the events which constitute the Last Days: the land and the foundations of the earth shall be consumed (30), the mountains shall be burnt (31), the sea shall groan from the deeps of the Abyss (32), and the world's foundations shall stagger and sway (35).³³⁾ In Revelation 21:1, it is said, "Then I saw a

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.

31) George B. Caird listed two kinds of eschatology in his definition of the term, in *New Testament Theology*, 243. In his explanation, besides historical eschatology, he identified individual eschatology.

32) John J. Collins, 'Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,' 331-332.

33) Vermes Geza, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London/New York: Penguin Books, 1997), 262.

new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, . . .” As we can see from these two texts, cosmic eschatology is not separate from other eschatological thoughts. It usually (especially in the Jewish apocalypses) came with a political eschatology. John J. Collins explains this tendency: “cosmic eschatology complements or completes the traditional political eschatology.”³⁴⁾

Personal eschatology is related to the afterlife.³⁵⁾ According to John J. Collins, in this eschatology rewards and punishment are expected after one’s death.³⁶⁾ However, this eschatology did not appear in Old Testament. Although the Old testament does sometimes describe a place where the dead go, *Sheol*, it does not refer to heaven or hell.³⁷⁾ John B. Burns also insists that *Sheol* was “simply the final assembly-point of all humanity,” therefore “all men regardless of rank or moral worth went there.”³⁸⁾ Actually, whereas in Old Testament death itself is mentioned many times, no further attention was paid to the life after death.³⁹⁾

34) John J. Collins, ‘Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,’ 332.

35) This is also similar to George B. Caird’s individual eschatology. According to him, it is not easy to distinguish this eschatology from historical eschatology. *New Testament Theology*, 244.

36) John J. Collins, ‘Eschatologies of Late Antiquity,’ 332.

37) Some scholars, such as Robert L. Harris, insisted that *Sheol* refers, without exception to the grave. in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 892–893.

38) John B. Burns, “The Mythology of Death in the Old Testament,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26/3 (1973), 340.

39) However, some scholars, such as Desmond Alexander, have argued against this view. Desmond Alexander argued: “although Harris demonstrates that some descriptions of *Sheol* do resemble an ordinary grave, these same descriptions may also be equally

According to George B. Caird, however, personal eschatology emerged “as a by-product of a belief in a new age of world history dawning for the nation of Israel.”⁴⁰⁾

Joachim Jeremias proposes three incisive changes to the notion of personal eschatology following the Exile:⁴¹⁾ (1) as the first instance is shown in Is. 26:19, because of the concept of resurrection, the soul must not stay in the underworld forever; (2) *pace* John B. Burns (mentioned above), the idea that after death the righteous and the wicked would experience very different fates developed from the influence of Persian and Hellenistic ideas concerning retribution after death; (3) *Sheol* (ᾗδης) became a place of punishment for the soul of the wicked, because of the belief that the soul of the righteous went immediately to heaven after death where they waited for their resurrection. As a result, personal eschatology is concerned with death, resurrection, judgment, and both heaven and hell.

Realized eschatology was introduced by Charles H. Dodd in 1935 in his *The Parables of the Kingdom*.⁴²⁾ In it, he argues that Jewish usage of the phrase ‘the Kingdom of God’ did not only (in the one sense) refer to a present fact, because God’s will is revealed in the Torah and Israel

appropriate for the nether world.” “The Old Testament View of Life after Death,” *Themelios* 11/2 (1986), 43.

40) George B. Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 245.

41) Joachim Jeremias, ‘ᾗδης,’ *Theological Dictionary of New Testament vol.1*, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans; London: Eerdmans, 1964), 147.

42) Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1935).

was to be obedient to it, but also (in the another sense) refer to something to be revealed in future – because God was not yet accepted by the whole world as a king and that his kingship would be established over the whole world in that day.⁴³⁾ Charles H. Dodd contends that, in Jewish usage, ‘the Kingdom of God’ is the *eschaton*, or ‘ultimate.’⁴⁴⁾ However, this *eschaton* will be not revealed in future, because, as it is said in Matthew 12:28 and Luke 11:20, “the Kingdom of God has come upon you.” It is a fact of present experience.⁴⁵⁾ Futhermore, the tense of the verb, ἐγγίξειν, is often translated in the perfect tense (and is reflected in the English translations), ‘has come.’ This verse was key to his argument for the ‘realized eschatology’⁴⁶⁾

Charles H. Dodd observes, “In some way the Kingdom of God has come with Jesus Himself.”⁴⁷⁾ Therefore, he contends that, “the *eschaton* has moved from the future to the present, from the sphere of expectation into that of realized experience.”⁴⁸⁾ In John 15:24 it is said that the one who hears Jesus’ word and believes him who sent Jesus has eternal life. This verse expresses an eschatology in which the rewards

43) Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 35–36.

44) Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 36.

45) Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 43.

46) Clarence T. Craig, “Realized Eschatology,” *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 56 (1937), 19–20; Kenneth W. Clark, “Realized Eschatology,” *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 59 (1940), 367.

47) Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 45.

48) Charles H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, 50.

are already experienced in the present and not only at the end of the world.

In this understanding of eschatology, if the discourse in Mark 13 was given to his disciples (at least in the text), the events described in this chapter will happen in the future. As Robert H. Gundry notes, Jesus was warning about the future: “Already Jesus is ignoring the four disciples’ question by predicting events that will not signal the immediate destruction of the temple. . . . 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.”⁴⁹⁾ Therefore, in this chapter, we will deal with Mark’s eschatology.

Although many scholars agree with this interpretation, that Jesus was not speaking about the destruction of the temple (in answer to the question), but wanted to teach the disciples about the future,⁵⁰⁾ some scholars disagree that this chapter is talking about future events.

One such scholar is Thomas R. Hatina. He argues that in a stage prior to Mark’s adaption of the material found in chapter 13 it might have referred to the end of the world. However, he suggests that, at least, when Mark used these traditions they were used in different way. Thomas R. Hatina writes, “. . . the implied audience of the Gospel would

49) Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 738.

50) There has been a few disagreement on this matter. Some scholars have thought that it is eschatology. However, it is not the cosmic eschatology, but the political or realized eschatology. I will deal with this subject later in the thesis.

have understood these prophecies, composed of a series of references to the OT (Isa 13:10; 34:4; Dan 7:13; Deut 30:4; Zech 2:6), as pointing directly to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE and not to a future parousia or cataclysmic event that marks the end of the world."⁵¹⁾

According to Thomas R. Hatina, Mark used traditions which were originally eschatological in nature for a different purpose. Thomas R. Hatina argues "in my judgment the best option for Mark 13 is the genre of parenesis, or what is commonly called a 'farewell discourse,' which is characterized by ethical exhortation given by a leader of a community or a patriarch of a family who is facing imminent departure or even death."⁵²⁾ He contends that the genre of parenesis, rather than the genre of apocalyptic, is a better description of Mark 13:24-27 because this part appears to follow the structure of parenetic writings.⁵³⁾

Thomas R. Hatina has also considers ταῦτα πάντα in verse 30. According to him, ταῦτα refers to the whole discourse and not only to verses 24-27.⁵⁴⁾ If Thomas R. Hatina is correct in suggesting that Mark

51) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27: The Parousia, or the Destruction of the Temple?" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6 (1996), 43-44.

52) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 47; 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, 197; William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), 444. However, against this view, Robert H. Gundry has argued that there are more differences than commonalities between Mark 13 and those other writings which present this type of characteristic. see *Mark*, 751.

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

54) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 52.

13:24-27 does not refer the end of the world at all, the whole chapter of Mark 13 must also be seen as not being related to the end of the world. Thomas R. Hatina concludes that Mark's author typologically reinterpreted Old Testament texts in order to describe another 'day of the Lord,' which was different from the previous one.⁵⁵⁾

Thomas R. Hatina's argument could connect disciples' question with Jesus' answer and avoids the contradiction between Jesus' prediction and its apparent unfulfilment. However, there are still several problems to be answered. As Craig A. Evans argues against him, there are too many things which do not accord with the actual events the occurred between Pentecost and the Jewish Revolt. Furthermore, there are also some things mentioned in Mark 13 which did not occur in the actual history.⁵⁶⁾

In addition, George R. Beasley-Murray's argument is worth considering. In the Old Testament, the description of a theophany was never described in association with the destruction of the universe at all: the Son of Man's coming does not mean the destruction of the world.⁵⁷⁾

Therefore, although in some respects Thomas R. Hanita suggests a possible interpretation, it is not appropriate to apply this to our interpretation of Mark 13.

Besides him, Nicholas T. Wright also argues that Mark 13 does not relate to the future, end of history. He interprets this chapter from

55) Thomas R. Hatina, "The Focus of Mark 13:24-27," 66.

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

57) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 425.

the perspective of political eschatology, thus for him Mark 13 describes the end of a government. Richard T. France takes a similar position to him. However, I will deal with his suggestion at the end of this chapter.

1.2. Apocalypse

1.2.1. Terminology

There is another term that we now have to consider, 'apocalyptic.' It is often used to mean something rather similar to eschatology. Sometimes it is even interchangeable with it.⁵⁸⁾ The term apocalyptic is similar to the eschatology, in that it is also concerned with the end of the world. Consequently, to many, the word apocalyptic is really little more than a particular kind of eschatology which was prevalent in the early Jewish and Christian traditions.⁵⁹⁾ However, such a tendency to interpret the term apocalyptic has caused some confusion⁶⁰⁾ as it is apparent that there are some differences.

58) Larry J. Kreitzer, 'Eschatology,' *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, edited by G. F. Hawthorne & R. P. Martin (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 253.

59) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: S.P.C.K., 1982), 25; Bernard McGinn also said, "Apocalypticism is a species of the genus eschatology, that is, it is a particular kind of belief about the last things—the End of history and what lies beyond it," in his *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York/Guildford: Columbia University Press, 1979), 3; Arland J. Hultgren, "Eschatology in the New Testament," 69.

60) Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End*, 3.

Furthermore, because there are, as Christopher Rowland notes, many varieties in the contents of apocalypses,⁶¹⁾ it is not easy to define apocalypse with any certain degree of precision. The term, apocalyptic, comes from 'apocalypse' which comes from Greek noun ἀποκάλυψις. It is also the title of the last book in the New Testament.

As we can see from the Apocalypse of the New Testament, its meaning is 'to reveal' or 'to unveil' the secrets. According to Charles K. Barrett, it refers to the unveiling of secrets about the 'other' age; the 'other' world.⁶²⁾ Walter Schmithals agrees with this understanding of the apocalyptic world view and adds that people only know this age, (old and present age) and the visible world, so called 'the age of woe.'⁶³⁾ The aim of the apocalypse is to reveal the divine mysteries which will occur in the future rather than now.⁶⁴⁾ However, this 'woeful' world is not all that the apocalypticists described. They also refer to the 'new age.' This 'new age' is a great and invisible age to come through God's activity when the

61) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 29; James D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1977) 310.

62) Charles K Barrett, "Eschatology," 138.

63) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement: Introduction & Interpretation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 20. According to him, "it is marked by sorrows and tears. Death rules in it. Discord and injustice fill it."

64) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 14, 17; Paul D. Hanson, 'Apocalypticism,' *The interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 29. However, this does not mean that the apocalypse is not at all interested in the present. Charles K. Barrett said, "the secrets in which apocalyptic deals are not simply secrets of the future—of the Age to Come; they include secrets of the present state of the heavenly world," "Eschatology," 138.

time will be fulfilled.⁶⁵⁾ Therefore it can be said that whereas eschatology is concerned about the last things or the Last Days, the apocalypse relates not only to the future, but also about the revealing (or unveiling) of that which is at the moment secret.

There is another confusion caused by two terms, apocalyptic and apocalypse. According to John J. Collins, 'apocalyptic' is used to refer to a world-view or a theology,⁶⁶⁾ and, according to Michael A. Knibb, it refers to a pattern of thought relating to the end of this age and the future destiny of man, or a pattern of thought which is by no means restricted to the apocalypses.⁶⁷⁾ However, it has actually been used without any clear definition. As a result, apocalyptic, according to John J. Collins, has often been considered as an entity which is not dependent on specific texts.⁶⁸⁾ And, according to Michael A. Knibb, the concept of apocalyptic has been broadened to cover so many different kinds of writing that it will cease to have any value.⁶⁹⁾

Furthermore, many scholars have begun to recognize that the wide range of world-views or thoughts could not correspond to what

65) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 21.

66) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1984), 1.

67) Michael A. Knibb, "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), 157.

68) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2.

69) Michael A. Knibb, "The emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses," 157.

actually appeared in the apocalyptic writings. Therefore, they defined the meaning of the terms.

Klaus Koch has also attempted to provide a definition of 'apocalypse' and 'apocalyptic.' He tries to distinguish these two terms through their denotations. According to him, apocalypse has become the usual term for the type of book, such as the 'book of Revelation.'⁷⁰⁾ Whereas 'apocalypse' can be defined comparatively easily as a term which refers to a type of book, the other term, 'apocalyptic,' is more complicated than apocalypse.⁷¹⁾ Klaus Koch defines 'apocalyptic' as:

It [apocalyptic] is applied not only to the common mental and spiritual background of the relevant late Israelite and early Christian writings but is used to characterize a certain kind of religious speculation about the future of man and the world.⁷²⁾

Apart from him, Charles K. Barrett also does not use the term 'apocalyptic' alone. In his article, "New Testament Eschatology," he uses 'apocalyptic' with 'eschatology,' the, so called, 'apocalyptic eschatology.'⁷³⁾

70) Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, trans. Margaret Kohl from German 1970, (London: SCM Press, 1972), 13; Michael A. Knibb, "The emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses," 157.

71) Michael A. Knibb suggested that this confusion could be avoided by avoiding the use of this term as a noun. "The emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses," 164.

72) Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 20. George E. Ladd also expresses a similar idea. However, differently from Klaus Koch, he only mentions it as a literary genre, which contains revelations (real or alleged) of the spiritual world and of the future kingdom of God. "Why Not Prophetic - Apocalyptic?" *Journal for the Biblical Literature* 76 (1957), 192.

73) Charles K. Barrett, "Eschatology," 136-155.

He uses this expression in contrast to the 'prophetic eschatology.' In the prophetic tradition, 'eschatology' refers to the 'last thing' which is seen as being continuous with the preceding events. Furthermore, it also shares the same nature as these events.⁷⁴⁾ Similarly Bernard McGinn suggests that the term, 'apocalyptic eschatology,' is used to distinguish the special teachings of the apocalypticists from the eschatology of the prophets.⁷⁵⁾

Therefore, in 'apocalyptic eschatology' the last term is different from and discontinuous with the bulk of the events in history which it concludes.⁷⁶⁾ John J. Collins follows Charles K. Barrett's denotation of this word and argues that more recent scholarship does not use 'apocalyptic' as a noun to refer to a world-view or a theology.⁷⁷⁾ John J. Collins, concurring with Klaus Koch, observes that recent scholarship denotes 'apocalypse' to a literary genre (Klaus Koch calls it 'type'). Furthermore, a combined term is used, 'apocalyptic eschatology,' rather than 'apocalyptic' on its own. However, this combined term cannot cover all the things which were denoted by the adjectival form. Consequently, he adds one more term, apocalypticism (to refer to the social ideology), to the two terms of Klaus Koch.

74) Paul D. Hanson also used this phrase to oppose the prophetic eschatology. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* in the meaning to oppose the prophetic eschatology. 10-11.

75) Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End*, 3.

76) Charles K. Barrett, "Eschatology," 138.

77) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2.

. . . and distinguishes between apocalypse as a literary genre, apocalypticism as a social ideology, and apocalyptic eschatology as a set of ideas and motifs that may also be found in other literary genres and social settings.⁷⁸⁾

Tom W. Willet presents the differences between ‘apocalypticism’ and ‘apocalyptic eschatology’: whereas “apocalypticism refers to the religious-social phenomenon which produced the apocalypses, apocalyptic eschatology refers to the particular type of eschatology which speaks of the consummation of history, as opposed to the prophetic concept of the coming new action of God within history.”⁷⁹⁾ In addition, he still uses ‘apocalyptic’ to cover all these three terms.⁸⁰⁾

However, to many scholars the term ‘apocalyptic’ still conveys almost the same meaning to the particular kind of eschatology which is prevalent in the early Jewish and Christian traditions.⁸¹⁾ Illustrative of this is in Ernest Käsemann’s association of ‘apocalyptic’ with the expectation of an imminent parousia.⁸²⁾ This term is actually used in relationship with the (imminent) end of the world. However, as John J. Collins notes, the definitions of “apocalypse” or “apocalyptic” should make no mention of eschatology,⁸³⁾ because, as Michael E. Stone suggests, not all the

78) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2.

79) Tom W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies*, 35.

80) Tom W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies*, 35.

81) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 25.

82) Ernest Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM Press, 1969), 109.

apocalypses include the concept of the imminent end is found (although, it is possible that most do. Consequently to be accurate, this thesis follows Charles K. Barrett and John J. Collins and uses the combined term, 'apocalyptic eschatology.'

1.2.2. Origin of Apocalypticism

1.2.2.1. Prophet Tradition

Many scholars agreed that apocalypticism sprang from the Israelite prophetic tradition.⁸⁴⁾ They assume that the impetus of apocalypticism was the Exile. As Christopher Rowland argues, "apocalyptic springs up when the disasters in which abnormal and superhuman forces are involved are imminent and when the attitude towards the present world situation is pessimistic."⁸⁵⁾ In Israel's traumatic situation, after the Exile, apocalypticism arose.

After the Exile, some of the Jews returned to Judea and Jerusalem. However, Israel's situation was not same to their previous one.⁸⁶⁾ There was no king. Although they had returned, they were still

83) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 10.

84) Paul D. Hanson, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," *Visionaries and Their Apocalypses*, edited by Paul D. Hanson (Philadelphia/London: Fortress Press/S.P.C.K., 1983), 37-58; Ulrich Simon, *The End is not Yet* (London: James Nisbet, 1964), 17-18; Marvin A. Sweeney, "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.

85) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 23.

under the oppression of Babylon; their temple no longer existed; and their glory looked as if it would never return. In this context Israel's life had to undergo a certain great change. Paul D. Hanson calls this situation a divorce of 'sacred' and 'secular.'⁸⁷⁾ Benjamin Uffenheimer contends that: "eschatology is completely detached from contemporary history, as these events will occur in the far future."⁸⁸⁾

In the prophetic tradition, although their situation was difficult. Israel expected a 'this-worldly' salvation. They expected that the kingdom of God would come. As we can see in Haggai and Zechariah, they still expected the restoration of the kingdom. For them "history is the vehicle of the kingdom."⁸⁹⁾ However, they recognized that the kingdom of God, in which they hoped, did not come. Haggai's and Zechariah's prediction did not come true as well. Their situation went from bad to worse. Consequently their traditional religious view had to be changed.⁹⁰⁾ They needed an explanation for the reasons as to why

86) Ulrich Simon, *The End is not Yet*, 16.

87) Thomas W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 2.

88) Benjamin Uffenheimer, "From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eschatology," *Eschatology: In the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, edited by Henning G. Reventlow (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 207.

89) George E. Ladd, "Why not Prophetic-Apocalyptic?" 193; Stanley B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth* (London: The Epworth Press, 1952), 46-54.

90) Frank C. Porter, "Prophecy and Apocalypse," *The Biblical World* 14 (1899), 36-41; John J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Environment," *Bulletin of America Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (1975), 34.

they had met with such a desperate situation. However, they could not find a satisfactory answer to this question. Benjamin Uffenheimer notes a strategy that they employed:

Their only way of activity was to calculate the time of redemption on the assumption that history is the playground of superhuman forces, which could accelerate or prevent the predestined date of final redemption. This passive attitude towards history was the prelude of spiritualistic flight from history and internalization of redemption as has become evident in early mysticism.⁹¹⁾

Those who expected the time of their restoration gradually changed their attitude to coming of the God's kingdom. On this tendency, Robert R. Wilson suggests, "Postexilic authors seem to have added apocalyptic material to earlier prophetic books such as Isaiah and Ezekiel. The increased use of apocalyptic images suggests that the prophets themselves were part of groups . . . presumably becoming more and more isolated from the central social structure."⁹²⁾

For this reason, in the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, and Ezekiel (who are the prophets) it is possible to find apocalyptic passages.⁹³⁾ For example, in Ezekiel 40-48 elaborate visions are used; as seen in

91) Benjamin Uffenheimer, "From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eschatology" 217.

92) Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 292.

93) Frank C. Porter, "Prophecy and Apocalypse," 37; John W. Bailey, "Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," *The Biblical World* 25 (1905), 30; George R. Berry, "The Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament," *JBL* 62 (1943), 12; Paul D. Hanson, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," 45; Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 194.

apocalyptic eschatology. However, this does not mean that the author of Ezekiel was an apocalypticist. Paul D. Hanson argues:

Whereas the increased use of the vision in general and certain details in the vision accounts in particular indicate that Ezekiel brings us to the threshold of apocalyptic, yet his ties to the prophetic tradition remain firm: Vision and reality are held together.⁹⁴⁾

As Paul D. Hanson observes in Ezekiel, some prophets began to show apocalyptic thoughts in their writings; a possible reaction to the changed situation following the Exile. Consequently, apocalypticism has been seen to have developed out of the Jewish prophetic tradition. Paul D. Hanson concludes:

(1) the sources of apocalyptic eschatology lie solidly within the prophetic tradition of Israel; (2) the period of origin is in the sixth to the fifth centuries; (3) the essential nature of apocalyptic is found in the abandonment of the prophetic task of translating the vision of the divine council into historical terms; (4) the historical and sociological matrix of apocalyptic is found in an inner-community struggle in the period of the Second Temple between visionary and hierocratic elements.⁹⁵⁾

However, a question arises from this position. Although, as Paul D. Hanson insists, it is possible that the apocalypticism derived from the prophetic tradition, however, it is also true that there are apparent

94) Paul D. Hanson, "Old Testament Apocalyptic Reexamined," 45.

95) Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of the Apocalyptic*, 29.

differences and discontinuities between the prophetic tradition and apocalypticism.⁹⁶⁾ John J. Collins lists several things which are lacking in the books of the prophetic tradition:

One is the interest in the heavenly world. Angels play some part in Zechariah, but scarcely any in the so-called visionary literature. Nothing in these books prepares for the mystical and speculative aspects of the Enoch literature. The eschatology too is rather different from the later apocalypses. . . . Life will be transformed, but it will still be distinctly this-worldly. . . . The conception is quite different from the expectation of resurrection or of the judgment of the dead as we find it in Daniel and *Enoch*.⁹⁷⁾

George R. Berry explains the reasons for such differences. It is worth fully citing his explanation here:

The apocalyptic literature of the Old Testament is the outgrowth of prophecy, but differs from it in important respects. Its fundamental outlook is different. Prophecy is the work of men whose feet were on the earth, who saw real conditions, and who expected coming events to be brought about through human agencies, working out the plan of God. The prophets were primarily preachers, giving their messages orally, and concerned with turning their hearers from the errors of their ways. Their chief work was preaching, and prediction was simply a part of that work. The apocalyptists were men whose heads were in the clouds, who expected the future to

96) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 24; Benjamin Uffenheimer, "From Prophetic to Apocalyptic Eschatology," 201-202.

97) John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 24.

come not as a development of existing conditions, but as something entirely new, brought about by God himself, not using human instruments, but intervening directly and catastrophically. They were writers, not preachers; they were not interested in the conversion of the people for whom the writings were intended, because they did not consider any such conversion necessary. Prediction with them was a primary interest. They were entirely pessimistic about present conditions; their only hope was in divine intervention.⁹⁸⁾

Because of these differences, other possibilities were suggested. One of them is that apocalypticism came from the Jewish Wisdom Tradition.

1.2.2.2. Jewish Wisdom Tradition

Gerhard von Rad⁹⁹⁾ disagrees with Harold H. Rowley's assertion: "that apocalyptic is the child of prophecy, yet diverse from prophecy, can hardly be disputed."¹⁰⁰⁾ He rejects a continuity between apocalypticism and prophecy. Rather he suggests that the Jewish wisdom tradition is closely related to the apocalypticism. His argument asserts on the hypothesis that knowledge is the most important factor in apocalypticism as it is in Jewish wisdom. Knowledge is far from the history of God's salvation and this knowledge should be real matrix of apocalyptic literature.¹⁰¹⁾

98) George R. Berry, "The Apocalyptic Literature of the Old Testament," 9.

99) Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 314-328.

100) Harold H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* (London: Lutterworth, 1947), 15.

He argues that Jewish apocalypse was recorded by the learned and that the pseudonymous authors of the apocalypses are actually presented as learned wise men; such as Daniel, Enoch, Ezra, Baruch, etc.¹⁰²⁾ This is similar to the Jewish wisdom literature that were produced by the learned scribes.

He also mentioned about the tendency that the concern of wisdom moved to the apocalypticism.

We understood Wisdom as the effort made by the people of Israel to grasp the laws which governed the world in which she lived, and to systematize them. In course of time this developed into a really encyclopedic science which applied itself not only to matters of natural philosophy but also to questions of history.¹⁰³⁾

This understanding of Wisdom means that he can argue that it is the matrix of apocalypticism. However, in this view it is not easy to solve the problem that in Jewish Wisdom literature there is no mention of *eschaton* at all. Apocalypticists thought that, because this world is evil and (a state which will only get worse),¹⁰⁴⁾ history could not be viewed as being the vehicle of the kingdom any more. Although they were

101) Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306.

102) Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 316.

103) Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 306.

104) Michael E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions*, 29; Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 80; George E. Ladd, "Why not Prophetic - Apocalyptic?" 197-198.

experiencing desperate circumstances, they could not do anything to overcome them. The only hope which they can have is in the future. However, there is nothing for them to do to usher its coming.¹⁰⁵⁾ It will be done by the omnipotent God. He will intervene into this evil world. They have to wait for his intervention.¹⁰⁶⁾ Fortunately they do not need to wait for long, because the coming of the new age and new world is imminent.¹⁰⁷⁾ It should be the end of this age or eon. Therefore, in apocalypse, the end of this age is the central theme. However, in Jewish Wisdom literature their concern is not the 'end.'

In addition, although Jewish apocalypticism arose from the tradition of the learned or wise men, it cannot be the reason for Gerhard von Rad's supposition. John J. Collins explains this:

There is no manifest relation between the "wisdom" expressed in the visions of Daniel or Enoch and the collections of sayings found in Proverbs or Ben Sira.¹⁰⁸⁾

105) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 40.

106) Walter Schmithals said that the apocalyptic way of looking at the world and at history is thoroughly pessimistic, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 40, 42.

107) According to Michael E. Stone, the authors of this literature [apocalypse] frequently wrote under the deep impression that the end of days was imminent. This attitude is not found in all the apocalypses, but is prevalent in many of them. Michael E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions*, 29; Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 37; Klaus Koch, "What is Apocalyptic? An Attempt at a Preliminary Definition," *Visionaries and Their Apocalypses*, edited by Paul D. Hanson (Philadelphia/London: Fortress Press/S.P.C.K., 1983), 25. George H. Shodde, "The Jewish Apocalypses," 100.

108) John J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Environment," 31.

John J. Collins suggests that there were other wisdom groups in Judaism, who might have written Proverbs and Ben Sira and is the reason why Gerhard von Rad's suggestion has been rejected by recent scholars.¹⁰⁹⁾

Christopher Rowland explains the reason for the common themes (such as dualism and determinism) in both tradition: "The similarity between Wisdom and apocalyptic lies in the fact that both concerned themselves with consideration of this world and the problems which human existence presented to man."¹¹⁰⁾

1.2.2.3. Foreign Influence

Another suggestion for the rise in apocalypticism is the foreign influence; such as the Persian, Iranian, Babylonian, Egyptian and Canaanite.

When dealing with Daniel as an 'apocalypse,'¹¹¹⁾ Martin Noth asserts that, the idea of four ages which were symbolized by four metals was similar to that found in the tradition of the Oriental empire.¹¹²⁾ Because there is no trace of such idea in the other Old Testament

109) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 204. Tom W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies*, 41.

110) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 205.

111) Actually he used not apocalypse but apocalyptic. *The Laws in the Pentateuch: and other studies*, translated from German by D. R. Ap-Thomas (London/Edinburgh: Oliver & Body, 1977), 196.

112) He said that the statue that was made from four kinds of metal was influenced by Iranian tradition. Martin Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, 198.

literature, it is safe to say that this idea did not derive from Israel's Old Testament traditions.¹¹³⁾ This imagery actually developed in the empires which came before the Roman Empire; such as Assyria, Persia, Mede, and Macedonia. Especially in Daniel, the author is reflecting the environment of the Babylonian empire. Martin Noth concludes:

The apocalyptic writings absorbed all sorts of material current at that time concerning the idea of world epochs and world empires, and perhaps too all sorts of material concerning symbols for historical manifestations and powers. But they considerably depleted this material and robbed it of its original content and real value by merely applying it to make the motley colouring and changeable nature of world history more vivid.¹¹⁴⁾

As I have mentioned above, Sigmund Mowinckel distinguishes 'the future hope' of early Judaism from 'eschatology' of late Judaism.¹¹⁵⁾ In early Jewish Judaism there was only 'the future hope.' Its character is political and this worldly and it presupposed the destruction of the nation.¹¹⁶⁾ Therefore this future hope expected eventual the restoration of the nation. The destroyed nation must be restored in the future at 'the day of Yahweh.'¹¹⁷⁾ Until this time, this hope of restoration was not eschatological. However, great events which the Jews experienced, under

113) Martin Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, 198.

114) Martin Noth, *The Laws in the Pentateuch*, 214.

115) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 125.

116) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 133.

117) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 145.

the oppression of other nations, rekindled in them a future hope. Of course, in this period, most people had a political and earthly expectation, nevertheless, the character of other-worldly, transcendent, and cosmic future hope permeated into their religious faith.¹¹⁸⁾ According to Sigmund Mowinckel, the hope of future restoration developed into an eschatology when Persian dualism was added to the hope of a future restoration.¹¹⁹⁾ He also emphasizes the importance of prophecy, arguing that the prophetic tradition acted as fertile soil for eschatology in later Judaism.

This understanding of the origins of Jewish apocalypticism explains its emergence in relation to political, social, and religious context of Israel. However, Paul D. Hanson argues against apocalypticism being derived from the Oriental traditions. He contends that, whereas in Judaism there was a tension between myth and history, in classical Mesopotamian tradition history was thought to reflect the mythic realm.¹²⁰⁾ He concludes that the apocalypse was not the “new baby of second century foreign parents.”¹²¹⁾

Walter Schmithals deals with the reasons for thinking about the Iranian influence on Jewish apocalypticism. He observes that, “whereas the

118) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 150-151.

119) Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, 266.

120) Paul D. Hanson, “Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment,” *Revue Biblique* 78 (1971), 31-41.

121) Paul D. Hanson, “Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment,” 32.

dualism, universalism and determinism are alien elements in Jewish thinking, they are affluence in the Iranian pattern of historical thinking.”¹²²⁾ However, he does not conclude that Jewish apocalypticism was derived from the Iranian for two reasons. The first is that, for Iranians, the life is not pessimistic but thoroughly optimistic.¹²³⁾ The second is that the Iranians did not expect an imminent end at all.¹²⁴⁾ In fact, he notes that future possibilities were entirely open.

1.2.2.4. What does Apocalypticism come from?

In the beginning of the sixth chapter of *The Apocalyptic Movement* Walter Schmithals argues: If one surveys the information that was given by the pertinent literature on the question of the emergence of apocalyptic, one has a difficult time getting one’s bearings in the abundance of arguments and attempts to explain its derivation.¹²⁵⁾ In my view this is true, because, above all, we have insufficient evidence, and many scholars naturally relied on a number of different hypotheses to understand the background of apocalypticism’s emergence.

Nevertheless, one thing that we can say is that Jewish apocalypticism appeared in Israel at a specific juncture in its history when its belief, which had been kept from the time of their ancestors was

122) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 118.

123) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 120.

124) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 121.

125) Walter Schmithals, *The Apocalyptic Movement*, 111.

being shaken by alien causes. Although on this matter many scholars agree, as we have seen above, there are still many disputes about the actual details which relate to its origin and the influences through which it was shaped. Consequently, it is not easy to conclusively say what caused the appearance of Jewish apocalypticism.

At this stage, I think, John J. Collins points to the most probable conclusion for the appearance of Jewish apocalypticism, when he states: "The major factor which caused similar parallel developments in the various traditions, and thereby constituted a common *Zeitgeist*, was the demise of the national monarchies throughout the Near East. This caused a disruption in the traditional order and therefore led to a loss of meaningfulness and to alienation."¹²⁶)

2. MARK 13: POLITICAL ESCHATOLOGY?

The phrase 'little apocalypse' has often been used as the name of this chapter, ever since it was coined by Timothy Colani. His description stems from the conversation between Jesus and his disciples in which we can find several phrases which are similar to those of apocalyptic writings; such as the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds (Daniel 7:13 and Mark 13:26), and the Abomination of Desolation (Daniel 9:27; 12:11 and

126) John J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Environment," 34; Hans D. Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," *Journal for Theology and Church* 6 (1969), 34; Tom W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies*, 43.

Mark 13:14). Timothy Colani's description quickly came to dominate scholarly opinion and has exerted an influence for an extraordinarily long period.¹²⁷⁾

However, contrary to this tendency, some scholars have recently suggested a quite different interpretation. According to them, although Mark 13 contains several apocalyptic themes (such as the messianic woes and cosmic disorders), these things do not conclusively indicate that Mark 13 is an apocalyptic work.¹²⁸⁾

Christopher Rowland argues against the view that Mark 13 is apocalyptic. He states:

There is no suggestion here that this eschatological teaching forms part of an apocalypse. Indeed, all we have is a succession of predictions about what is to come in the future. . . ., but the present form of the chapter makes it difficult to justify the description of it as apocalyptic. Rather than describe this chapter as an apocalypse it would seem to be more accurate to describe it as eschatological prediction in a form similar to the non-apocalyptic testament literature of Judaism.¹²⁹⁾

127) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 500.

128) Werner G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1957); George R. Beasley-Murray, "The Rise and Fall of the Little Apocalypse Theory," *Expository Times* 64 (1952-53), 346; Black, C. Clifton, "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), 67.

129) Christopher Rowland, *Open Heaven*, 43-44; Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 189.

Ben Witherington III also lists four reasons why it is not correct to call it an apocalyptic discourse. He notes that there is no otherworldly mediator, no visions of heaven or otherworldly tours, no great quantities of apocalyptic verbiage or images or notions and no date setting. Rather nowadays, as has said above, it is widely accepted that Mark 13 is eschatology and not an apocalypse.¹³⁰⁾

To understand Mark 13, there is another question. If Mark 13 was eschatological describing the End of the World, could it be asked when that time is?

Mark 13 starts with the prediction of Jesus about the temple. When Jesus and his disciples left the temple, one of the disciples points out to Jesus the magnificence of the temple (13:1). In reply Jesus predicts the fate of the temple (13:2), “Not one stone here will be left on another” (13:2). After Jesus sat on the Mount of Olives, opposite the temple, four of the disciples came to him and ask for the signs and the time of the fulfilment of Jesus’ prediction (13:3–4). Jesus answers the disciples’ question, saying that “this generation would certainly not pass away until all these things that he already said have happened” (13:30). Particularly because ‘coming of the Son of Man in cloud with great power and glory’ (13:26) is understood to mean the parousia of Jesus, this verse is considered as a prediction that his own second coming would

130) Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001), 336; Also Morna D. Hooker lists several features which do not appear in the apocalyptic literature, *Mark*, 299.

occur within the generation. In Mark 13 Jesus appears to say that he would come again within his (contemporary) generation. However, this did not actually happen. This problem has caused many disputes and, as a result, in order to explain it, many hypotheses have been formed. One of the ways to explain this problem is to question the authenticity of these sayings. In other words, some scholars do not accept that whole, or part of this chapter, was said by the historical figure of Jesus.

This tendency to question Mark 13's authenticity appeared from the middle of the 19th century. According to John A. T. Robinson,¹³¹⁾ since F. C. Baur questioned the authenticity of many New Testament books (which had been traditionally accepted), many scholars have followed him. In 1864 Timothy Colani suggested six reasons not to believe Mark 13's authenticity; the so called the 'little Apocalypse' theory.¹³²⁾ In this theory, he argues that there was no relationship between Jewish messianism and the gospel, because the messiah in the former was political, temporal and even merely human. Contrary to this, the Son of Man in Mark's gospel was an eternal, religious and godly figure. He concludes that Jesus' Son of Man was a symbolic figure for the Israelite nation, which is not the same as the Christian's expectation.¹³³⁾ He also

131) John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 3-4.

132) George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 1-2.

133) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 14. He cited it from Timothy Colani, *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son Temps*, 2d ed. (Strasbourg, 1864), 20.

believes that verse 26 shows its unauthenticity, because the verse describes the Son of Man descending from heaven to earth. However, this expresses an eschatology not of the Jew but of Jewish Christians.¹³⁴⁾ “It contains the eschatology of the Jewish Christians. . . . Jesus could not have shared their opinions.”¹³⁵⁾

Because of this discontinuity of thought, Timothy Colani rejects the idea that Mark 13, at least, came from historical Jesus’ mouth.

In response to this view another position has appeared, which tries to vindicate Mark 13’s authority. It belongs to the group of scholars who basically view Mark’s account as entirely authentic. According to them, although Jesus was not speaking about the parousia when he spoke of the heavenly Son of Man coming on clouds, the author of Mark’s gospel (or Jesus’ disciples who preserved Jesus’ sayings) understood it in a different way to the meaning intended by Jesus. One such scholar is Heinrich A. Meyer, who argues that Jesus’ disciples misunderstood their master’s saying. He suggests that this confusion by Jesus’ disciples arose because of the language which Jesus used to describe two thoughts: the imparting of the Holy Spirit (which was to happen shortly), and the historical revelation of his sovereignty and might in the victory of his work on earth, experienced immediately after his ‘ascension’ to the Father.¹³⁶⁾

134) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 16. Cited in Timothy Colani, *Jésus Christ*, 204-5.

135) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 17. Cited in Timothy Colani, *Jésus Christ*, 207.

A few years later, in 1860, Carl Hase published the *Life of Jesus*. In this book he first concedes the possibility that the saying about the return of Jesus within his generation was his own prediction. He notes that, “Jesus might predict the victory of his kingdom, as the prophets represented the rise of the theocracy as Jehovah coming among his people.”¹³⁷⁾ However, he continues, “to expect Jesus’ own return was a misunderstanding of the early church on the teaching of Jesus.”¹³⁸⁾ According to him, this misunderstanding “was occasioned by the fact that Jesus had left the theocratic national hope unfulfilled, which was therefore only postponed, so that the hope of the coming of the Messiah transformed itself into a hope of his return.”¹³⁹⁾ Therefore, what Jesus referred to was not about the parousia (his coming at the end of the world). Such understanding as appeared during Jesus’ saying was delivered and interpreted by the early church. In addition such notion had been elevated to a religious idea. He thought that this process was carried out by the church of the first century.

This understanding of Mark 13 has been continued by Daniel Schenkel. He questions what εἰς τέλος in Mark 13:13 meant. He insists

136) Heinrich A. Meyer, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Göttingen, 1855), 409, cited from George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*, 9.

137) Carl A. Hase, *Life of Jesus: A Manual for Academic Study*, translated by James Freeman Clarke, 4th edition (Boston: Walker, Wise and Company, 1860), 202.

138) Carl A. Hase, *Life of Jesus*, 203.

139) Carl A. Hase, *Life of Jesus*, 203.

that it was normally understood as 'the end of the world.' However, he argues that this was not what Jesus actually wanted to say. In fact, Jesus was talking about the end of the old world and the Jewish ritual period. This end should be followed by the new resurrection.

Und welche Vorstellung hat denn Jesus mit der Verkündigung des "Ende" verbunden? Man versteht meist unter diesem Ende das "Ende der Welt." Von einem solchen hat aber Jesus gar nicht gesprochen.¹⁴⁰⁾

According to him, in Jesus' view the period of the old world and the *theokratischen Gottesdienstes* should be finished. For him, there is no cosmic eschatology in Mark 13. This view is introduced by George R. Beasley-Murray in his *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*.

Another viewpoint is hinged at in the larger saying of Mk. 14:58: the old system is finished and is to be replaced by another of a higher order; in the new age of the Spirit there is no room for the old covenant with its sacrifices and cultus, hence the old temple must pass away.¹⁴¹⁾

140) Daniel Schenkel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu: ein biblischer Versuch* (Wiesbaden: Kreidel, 1864), 183-185. especially in 184-185. "Er gebrauchte jenen Ausdruck lediglich als eine Bezeichnung für den Abschluss der bisherigen jüdischen und heidnischen Völkerperiod, für den Schlusspunkt der sogenannten alten Welt, auf welche die Periode seines Gottesreiches, oder, wie wir uns ausdrücken, der christlichen Zeitrechnung, der neuen Welt, folgen sollte. Die Zerstörung Jerusalems und des Tempels, der Untergang des theokratischen Gottesdienstes, bildet auch wirklich die Scheidelinie zwischen einer alten untergehenden und einer neuen auftretenden Entwicklung des Völkerlebens."

141) George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 22-23.

George R. Beasley-Murray only introduces it as another view point from which to see Jesus' prediction on the temple's destruction in Mark 13:2. Although this position has not been widely accepted, this interpretation on the 'unfulfilled prediction' in Mark 13 has been revived by some recent scholars, such as Nicholas T. Wright and Richard T. France.

2.1. Recent Researches

Recently in his book, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Nicholas T. Wright expresses similar ideas to Carl Hase and Daniel Shenkel in the interpretation of Mark 13. First he posits above all the authenticity of Mark 13 arguing that there is no reason to suspect Mark's authenticity.¹⁴²⁾ He contends that its setting, its timing, its content, and its language are "characteristic of Jesus and utterly appropriate to the occasion."¹⁴³⁾ Accordingly, there is no reason, or need for him, to treat this passage as an early Christian apocalypse which Jesus could not (and would not) have spoken. He also rejects the view, which had been widely accepted by many scholars, that the verses from verse 5 onward are an insertion. He asserts that the language of this chapter does not come from the situation of Mark 13's author.

142) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 340.

143) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 340.

The language used here comes not from descriptions of battles and sieges in the field, but from scriptural predictions of catastrophic judgment on this or that city. Here, indeed, is the real shock of this passage. Just as before Jesus had used Tyre, Sidon, Sodom and other pagan cities as types of the judgment that was to fall on this or that town or village that had rejected him, so now, faced with Jerusalem and its rejection of his message, he chose imagery that had been used to describe the greatest pagan city of the Old Testament period. The destruction coming on YHWH's chosen city would be like that which fell on Babylon.¹⁴⁴⁾

The prediction about the temple and Jerusalem in Mark 13 is not unique one for the Jews in Mark's period. While many scholars think that the early church's theology is greatly reflected in this chapter, Nicholas T. Wright argues that the events surrounding the temple and Jerusalem's destruction could not have a theological significance at all.¹⁴⁵⁾ As Jeremiah grieved over the city, but could not avoid telling of its coming ruin, and as Josephus claimed to see that destruction was inevitable (and interpreted it as divine judgment for Israel's present wickedness) the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple could have been predicted. Furthermore, for Mark's author, who was probably familiar with the Old Testament tradition, it was possible to predict such events.¹⁴⁶⁾

144) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 340. Since Timothy Colani suggested the Little Apocalypse theory, many parts of Mark 13 have been considered as an insertion. George R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, 15–16.

145) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 343.

146) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 344.

It must also be noted that Nicholas T. Wright lists several reasons to support his idea: the meaning of the parousia as the arrival of someone who is not at the moment present;¹⁴⁷⁾ the term 'Son of Man' does not refer to a superhuman figure, and even 'parousia' (παρουσία) does not necessarily refer to a movement from the heaven to the earth at all, since it could also mean going and coming.¹⁴⁸⁾ Therefore, there is no legitimate reason to think that 'coming of Son of Man' refers to Jesus' parousia at the end of the world.¹⁴⁹⁾

Thus, according to him, Mark 13 was written not to warn Mark's readers to prepare for the parousia, but to reflect the traditions which promised YHWH's return to Zion.¹⁵⁰⁾ According to Richard T. France, Nicholas T. Wright's interpretation successfully and entirely rids Mark 13 of eschatological elements.¹⁵¹⁾ For Nicholas T. Wright, Jesus' apocalyptic language recorded in Mark 13 should not be read literally, but have a metaphorical meaning that describes this-worldly events.¹⁵²⁾ I will look more closely at the reasons that Nicholas T. Wright suggests: (1) Jesus could tell Mark 13 as is written in the Bible, (2) including the concept the coming of the Son of Man in clouds, the understandings related to the term

147) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 341.

148) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 361.

149) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 362.

150) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 651.

151) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 33.

152) Robert H. Stein, "N. T. Wright's *Jesus and the Victory of God*: A Review Article," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* [44/2] (2001), 207.

parousia are not same to what most scholars supposed, (3) the meaning of the kingdom of God.

First, contrary to the views of most scholars, Nicholas T. Wright argues that Mark 13 derives directly from Jesus himself. However, it has to be considered whether, in saying what he does, if Nicholas T. Wright has taken into account the authorship of Mark 13. It is certain that Mark's author wrote Mark 13 within his own particular situation. If he was not simply mechanically writing down what was inspired by God, it is probable that he would alter or edit his tradition. Even Ernest Best, who asserts that, "Mark worked the stories from the tradition were already known; it would therefore be hazardous for him to make great alterations in them, even more hazardous to invent new pericopae,"¹⁵³⁾ never denied possibility that Mark altered the traditions which he received. It is worthwhile to listen to Willem S. Vorster's words:

He selected and arranged his material in terms of order and space and it is he who decided on what each character will do or say and when. Even if Mark closely followed tradition and historical events, it was still he who created the image of a not too loquacious Jesus or disciples who lack understanding. When we read Mark's Gospel we are guided by his text through pro- and retrospection, gaps and indeterminacy, selection and organization, and the modification of expectations (cf. Iser, 1974,1978) to assign meaning to the image he created.¹⁵⁴⁾

153) Ernest Best, *The Gospel as Story* (Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1983), 113.

154) Willem S. Vorster, "Literary Reflections on Mark 13:5-37: A Narrated Speech of

It is from this point of view that James G. Crossley argues against Nicholas T. Wright;

Wright is a little unfair in dismissing the possibility of much of the material in Mark 13 being the result of the early church, as if this early church is some scholarly invention. In fact there are compelling reasons to believe that much of Mark 13 is secondary and therefore from the early church.¹⁵⁵⁾

Furthermore, if we take into account that it was written sometime after Jesus' death, it meant that the tradition underwent a process of transmission within the church. If this is the case, it is highly possible that these sayings were re-interpreted during this process. Robert M. Fowler's comment on the writer or redactor is worth mentioning:

Mark reserves for himself primarily the privilege of indirect speech. If he is to retain control over his own narrative, he cannot let it be taken over by his protagonist, no matter how highly he may think of him. Mark's Gospel remains fundamentally Mark's discourse and not Jesus,' and the true master of indirection in the Gospel is its implied author and narrator, not its protagonist. Readers have been accustomed to giving all of the credit for parabolic speech to the protagonist, which would probably please a master of indirection such as Mark, but that Mark's own use of indirection is masterful should now be brought to light.¹⁵⁶⁾

Jesus" *The Interpretation of Mark*, edited by William Telford (Philadelphia/London: S.P.C.K., 1985), 272.

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

Mark could not freely redact the traditions that he used and it is almost impossible for him to invent them, as Ernest Best has said. However, as we can see the way which the authors of the later gospels (Matthew and Luke) altered their traditions, it is not necessary for us to have to think that Mark's author had to rigidly write down the traditions which were transmitted to him. In this respect it is not appropriate to say that Mark 13 is what Jesus actually said. Whereas for Nicholas T. Wright it is reasonable to accept this chapter's authenticity, actually it is a mistake to entirely get rid of the influence of its writer.

Second, Nicholas T. Wright argues that when we read Mark, we have to consider 'the religious situation in the first century.'¹⁵⁷⁾ In Mark's gospel there is no single case in which the term 'parousia' is used. Whereas Matthew explicitly used this term (Matt. 24:27, 37, 39), Mark never used it in his gospel. In the Jewish concept, according to Nicholas T. Wright, it is not easy for the disciples, who are Jews, to think about the end of the space-time universe.¹⁵⁸⁾ He contends that, "the traditional conclusion which the second coming of Jesus is from heaven to earth at the Last Days came from the radical misunderstanding on the meaning of 'Son of Man' in the first-century Jewish expectation."¹⁵⁹⁾ His interpretation

156) Robert M. Fowler, *Let the Reader understand*, 183.

157) Richard T. France also said that we have to read this chapter in the context of a first century understanding of Prophetic and apocalyptic language. *The Gospel of Mark*, 503.

158) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 345.

159) Nicholas T. Wright insisted, "Mark 13 has been badly misunderstood by the

of this chapter is also based on the meaning of 'parousia.' He asserts that the meaning of 'parousia' as the "arrival of someone not at the moment present and especially used in relation to the visit 'of a royal or official personage.'" On this basis he argues that it does not indicate the second coming of Jesus, but, rather, what Jesus' disciples waited for, Jesus' enthronement in Jerusalem to be rightful king.¹⁶⁰⁾

The disciples *were*, however, very interested in a story which ended with Jesus' coming to Jerusalem to reign as king. They *were* looking for the fulfilment of Israel's hopes, for the story told so often in Israel's scriptures to reach its appointed climax. And the 'close of the age' for which they longed was not the end of the space-time order, but the end of the present evil age (*ha'olam hazeh*), and the introduction of the (still very this-worldly) age to come (*ha'olam haba*) - in other words, the end of Israel's period of mourning and exile and the beginning of her freedom and vindication. Matthew 24:3, therefore, is most naturally read, in its first-century Jewish context, not as a question about (what scholars have come to call, in technical language) the 'parousia,' but as a question about Jesus 'coming' or 'arriving' in the sense of his actual enthronement as king, consequent upon the dethronement of the present powers that were occupying the holy city.¹⁶¹⁾

In hellenistic terms, it is correct that Nicholas T. Wright mentions the meaning of this term, parousia. It had been used in relation

importation into it of ideas concerning the 'second coming' of God" in *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 340-341.

160) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 341-342.

161) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 345-346.

to the visit 'of a royal or official personage.' It is this aspect which is the basis for him to interpret Mark 13. However, Joseph Plevnik shows that this term was already used by Paul in a different meaning.¹⁶²⁾ According to him, Paul used this term more often for the 'coming of persons' than for the 'coming of the Lord.'¹⁶³⁾ In addition Joseph Plevnik points out Paul's use of this term. Paul used it when he talked about someone's coming.¹⁶⁴⁾ When he referred it to Jesus, he always used it with a qualifier, such as 'of the Lord' (I Thess. 4:15), 'of Christ' (I Cor. 15:23), 'of our Lord Jesus' (I Thess 2:19; 3:13), or 'of our Lord Jesus Christ' (I Thess 5:23).¹⁶⁵⁾

According to Joseph Plevnik's argument we have to consider two things. One is that the term 'parousia' is not used for just the coming of a royal or official personage, as Nicholas T. Wright and Richard T. France supposed. Therefore it should not be the reason for us to suppose that this word cannot be interpreted in light of the coming of the God's enthronement.¹⁶⁶⁾ The other relates to Paul's usage of the

162) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia: an Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1997), 4-10. In page 7 Plevnik also cited J. Dupont's *ΣΤΗΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ: L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1952), 49-73.

163) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 8.

164) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 4.

165) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 5.

166) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 341. Contrary to him, Richard T. France conceded that, at least, in two cases after Matthew 24:32, Matthew used 'parousia' to mean the coming of Jesus. *Divine Government: God's Kingship in the Gospel of Mark* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2003), 74.

word 'parousia' with a qualifier phrase, because it is also found in Matthew. Nicholas T. Wright insists that Matthew's 'parousia' does not refer to the end of the world, namely it should read as being different from Paul. However, in using this term, Matthew is similar to Paul in that he never used 'parousia' alone. In all cases Matthew used it with a qualifier, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Therefore it is not reasonable to think that Matthew, who used this word later than Paul (even in same pattern), used it in different way from Paul. In Matthew, I think, there is no reason to interpret 'parousia' as specifically denoting the coming of a royal or official personage. Instead, it is probable that he used it as Paul did; in referring to Jesus' second coming to earth. It also means that we do not need to interpret this word in the imperial meaning as Nicholas T. Wright supposed.¹⁶⁷⁾

Unlike Matthew, Mark never, in fact, used this term in his gospel. However, the fact that Mark never used 'parousia' should not be the reason to eliminate Mark's intention to refer to Jesus' second coming. In many New Testament books 'parousia' has been used to refer the coming of Jesus (I Cor 15:23; I Thess 2:19; I Thess. 3:13; I Thess. 4:15; I Thess. 5:23, James 5:7; II Pet. 1:16; I John 2:28),¹⁶⁸⁾ as Matthew did.

167) Joseph Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 8.

168) Ben Witherington III listed such usages of this word in, *Jesus, Paul and the End of the World* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 152-153. However, according to John A. T. Robinson, this term is not used conventionally by the New Testament writers until the middle of the second century A.D. *Jesus and his coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 17.

However, in other New Testament books a different term has been used to denote Jesus' second coming. For example, in I Cor. 11:26 and in Revelation 1:7 ἔρχομαι was used. In the letters to Timothy, ἐπιφάνεια was used when the author was talking about Jesus' second coming (I Tim 6:14; cd. II Tim 4:8). Thus we know that the New Testament writers did not use just one word to mean Jesus' returning.¹⁶⁹⁾ Consequently, the fact that Mark's author did not use, parousia, should not be taken as evidence of Mark's ignorance about this concept.

Nicholas T. Wright also suggests that Jesus' second coming was not a familiar concept for the Jews, including Mark.¹⁷⁰⁾ However, the idea of Jesus' second coming can be found in earlier writings than that of Mark (for example Paul). Therefore, I think, it is much more probable to say that Mark's author knew of the concept of the 'parousia' which was already familiar to Paul and to the other New Testament writers.

Nicholas T. Wright observes that in the first century and in Palestine, especially Judea, there was a branch of Judaism which did not contain eschatological ideas, such as the end of the world, imminent parousia etc. However, Nicholas T. Wright has underestimated the variety of Judaism. Actually, in the Bible we meet various sects who have different views from each other on a number of themes. Acts 23:18 describes one incident: the Sadducees taught that there is no resurrection

169) John A. T. Robinson also identified some more terms which referred to Jesus' coming. *Jesus and his coming*, 17-18.

170) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 345.

and that there are neither angels nor spirits, but the Pharisees acknowledge them all. Although they were Jews, they were very different in their views on some points. As Robert H. Stein argues (against Nicholas T. Wright), there was real diversity within Judaism among the widely scattered Jewish communities.¹⁷¹⁾ It is impossible to expect that all of them would express the same ideas. Some of them contained the ideas which can be found in Mark 13 and the others did not. Furthermore, although Nicholas T. Wright insists that the concept of the parousia of Jesus was strange to the Jews in the middle of the first century, in other New Testament books it is actually possible to find it; for example, we can find it in the Pauline letters (I Cor. 15:23, I Thess. 2:19, 3:13, 4:15, 5:23). Although he was born not in Judea (Acts 22:3), Paul was a real Jew (Phil. 3:4-6). He was an expert in Judaism. Nevertheless, he did not hesitate to accept the parousia of Jesus. How then should we explain Paul's attitude? Did not he know the tradition of Judaism? If we consider the religious situation of the first century, I think, we rather have to admit that there were a number of ideas, including parousia.

Nicholas T. Wright also argues that the delay of the parousia, or the return of Jesus did not cause a problem.¹⁷²⁾ According to him,

171) Robert H. Stein, "Nicholas T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God," 214. According to him, only ten percent of the Jewish population lived in Judea.

172) 1. Nicholas T. Wright argues that Jesus never mentioned his return. Rather, he has the image of 'the coming of YHWH' in his mind, which had been described in the Old Testament. Therefore, it is wrong to refer to the delay of parousia at this point.

because the Christians of the first century never expected the coming of Jesus, there was no reason for them to be disappointed by the delay of that coming. However, James G. Crossley rightly points out that in II Peter 3 it is possible for us to read about a problem that was caused by this delay. James G. Crossley suggests that the 'scoffers' mock' relates to those who scoffed at the Christians who were waiting for the parousia of Jesus.¹⁷³⁾ Moreover, in Paul's writings it is possible to sense his expectation that Jesus would come while he was still alive (I Cor 15:51) (within his generation). Then, is it more probable to say that there was an expectation for the return of Jesus? Furthermore, in Paul's thought, it is possible to detect that such an expectation had slightly changed. In his latter letters he expected that he would die before the parousia. As we can see, the case relating to Paul's expectation of the parousia, the delay of the parousia certainly caused some problems within the early church. Consequently, I think, therefore, that Nicholas T. Wright's assumption that there was no expectation for the return of Jesus is not entirely persuasive.

In addition, Nicholas T. Wright also contends that the concept of coming of Jesus on the clouds is different to that found in the Jewish traditions. Generally, this verse has been interpreted (as George R. Beasley-Murray notes), that he (the Son of Man) 'comes' from heaven to

Jesus and the Victory of God, 612–653, especially, 632.

173) James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark's Gospel*, 25–26.

accomplish God's purpose in the world at the Last Days.¹⁷⁴⁾ However, because the concept of the coming of Jesus (or anyone else) floating down to earth on a cloud was actually not familiar to the Jews of the first century and it was also un-Jewish for Mark's readers or hearers, they could not easily understand it or accept it. And, even for Jesus himself, it is not easy to make his hearers understand this concept.¹⁷⁵⁾ The Son of Man who will come in 13:26 has been considered to have been drawn from Daniel 7:13.¹⁷⁶⁾ He states, "the coming of the Son of Man is thus good first-century metaphorical language for two things: the defeat of the enemies of the true people of God, and the vindication of the true people themselves."¹⁷⁷⁾

However, here we can find a problem with Nicholas T. Wright's interpretation. In Mark's gospel this phrase is used fourteen times (2:10, 28; 8:31, 38; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 13:26; two times in 14:21, 41, 62) and all of them apparently referring to Jesus himself. This is especially the case when Jesus talks about his death and resurrection in three days (9:9, 31). In this saying, the one who will be killed and resurrected is the Son of Man. In fact the one who is killed and is resurrected is Jesus. Therefore, it is correct for Robert H. Stein to say that, "Clearly the

174) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*. 430. According to him, the purpose of the coming of the Son of Man is the achievement of salvation.

175) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 345.

176) George R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days*. 427

177) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 362.

Gospel writers see the 'Son of Man' as a title describing Jesus."¹⁷⁸⁾ Consequently, there is no reason to read the 'Son of Man' as a metaphorical word in 13:26. It obviously refers to Jesus himself.

Richard T. France observes, "if you read it in the context of first-century understanding of prophetic and apocalyptic language, the traditional exegesis is not at all so obvious."¹⁷⁹⁾ If we take into account the situation of the first century, according to him, the coming of the Son of Man does not indicate Jesus' eschatological coming (second coming).¹⁸⁰⁾ In Richard T. France's argument, the coming of the Son of Man has no eschatological aspect; rather it illustrates the situation of A.D. 70. For him, the destruction of the temple means (as already mentioned above) the beginning of a new phase and order.¹⁸¹⁾ He also asserts, as many scholars agree, that this phrase comes from Daniel 7:13. However, in Daniel's vision the Son of Man is coming not to earth but to the Ancient of Days. Similarly, the Son of Man in Mark 13:26 is not coming to earth, rather he is 'coming' to the throne of God.¹⁸²⁾ And the enthronement of Jesus takes place when the temple destroyed.¹⁸³⁾

178) Robert H. Stein, "N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God," 213.

179) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 503. It is similar to Nicholas T. Wright's "the religious situation in the first century."

180) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 502-503.

181) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 535.

182) Richard T. France referred to the 'one like a Son of Man' coming before the throne of God to be given universal and everlasting dominion. *The Gospel of Mark*, 534.

183) And according to Richard T. France, Daniel's vision of describes the transcendent power of God which puts an end to usurping 'powers of' humans and establishes the

Richard T. France suggests that this refers to Jesus.¹⁸⁴⁾ However, in contrast to the traditional understanding, Jesus comes not to earth, but to the throne of God in heaven.¹⁸⁵⁾ For him, therefore, the meaning of verse 26 is that Jesus will come to the throne of God in heaven when the temple is destroyed.¹⁸⁶⁾ He therefore believes that verse 27 illustrates the process which will occur following the Son of Man's enthronement. The *aggeloi* who will be sent by the Son of Man is not an angel in heaven but a missionary who will gather the elected.¹⁸⁷⁾ The expansion of the church, according to him, is caused by the Son of Man's enthronement.

This point raises a further question. In 14:62, Jesus replied to the high priest, "And you will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of the Mighty One and coming on the clouds of heaven (14:62)." It is necessary to look at the two verbs, 'sitting' and 'coming.' Richard T. France argues that one does necessarily not need to read these two verbs in chronological order.¹⁸⁸⁾ However, it does not appear to be reasonable to interpret these two verbs as he suggests. In Mark 13 *καὶ* is

final, universal sovereignty of the Son of Man. So, when the temple is destroyed, the Son of Man's 'power and glory' will be revealed for all to see. Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 535.

184) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 534–535.

185) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 534.

186) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 535.

187) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 536.

188) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 612.

used forty one times. In four of them they are used as to connect two verbs (6, 19, 27, 28) which are occurring at the almost same time. In these four examples the connective, *καὶ*, links the two verbs in chronological order.¹⁸⁹⁾ As Richard T. France notes, it is possible that a writer can use 'and' without considering the order of the event, however, in Mark 13 it is hardly probable to think that this is the case with this particular phrase. It is much more natural to read it in chronological order, as we can see in the other four cases. Therefore, it is natural, in my view, to read this verse as describing that the Son of Man, namely, Jesus, sits at the right hand of the Mighty One and then he will come on clouds of heaven.

If this is the case, we have to think about the place where the Son of Man might sit before he will come on the clouds. He should come from the place where he sits. Thus, as has been considered above, Jesus is at the right hand of the Mighty One. For Richard T. France when the Son of Man comes to earth, (and the temple will be destroyed), he must be coming from the right of the Mighty One. If this is correct, it is more reasonable to interpret 'the coming of the Son of Man' as not being to the throne of God (because he is already there),¹⁹⁰⁾ but to earth.

189) In verse 6 "the deceiver come and claiming that he is he, *and* then many are deceived." In verse 19 "when God created the world, until now *and* never to be equaled again." In verse 27 "he will send his angels and gather his elect from the four winds." In verse 28 "its twigs get tender *and* its leaves come out."

190) Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 100.

Furthermore, the expansion of the Church was not caused by the destruction of the temple, as Richard T. France insists, but rather it was caused by the persecution in Jerusalem (Acts 8:1).

Third, in their interpretation of Mark's gospel, Nicholas T. Wright and Richard T. France's understanding of the kingdom of God is worth considering.

Nicholas T. Wright reconsiders the meaning of the important phrase, 'the kingdom of God' in order to understand the gospels. He suggests that the kingdom of God is not something which will be established at the end of the world nor a place where saved souls go to live after death,¹⁹¹⁾ rather he contends that it is related to the kingship of God. He argues that, "When Jerusalem is destroyed, and Jesus' people escape from the ruin just in time, that will be YHWH becoming king, bringing about the liberation of his true covenant people, the true return from exile, the beginning of the new world order."¹⁹²⁾ For him, God's enthronement as the king of Israel is the meaning of the kingdom of God. Therefore, the kingdom of God does not relate to his realm but to his reign.

Richard T. France contends that the kingdom of God had already arrived when Jesus proclaimed the message of repentance in 1:15.¹⁹³⁾ He also suggests that βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is not the kingdom of God which will

191) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 202-203.

192) Nicholas T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 364.

193) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 30.

come to earth at the end of the world, rather it denotes the status of God's kingship being complete.¹⁹⁴⁾ Consequently, for him, there is no kingdom which will come to earth at the Last Days. It has already begun and it is just its final completion which will occur later. Moreover Richard T. France posit that even the verses 24–25, which have usually been considered to describe an eschatological universal catastrophic scene are not to read as a prediction on the Last Days.

It is the imagery of setting up a new kingship to replace the failed regimes of previous empires, and it is located not on the earthly scene but in the presence of God in heaven.¹⁹⁵⁾

Richard T. France contends that these verses describe the events of 'this-world,' using the metaphorical language. About the 'previous empire' he observes that:

194) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 30. It is generally accepted that the ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is not the spatial or territorial "kingdom of God." For example, Joel Marcus, in his commentary, stated, "a phrase that the King James translators rendered as 'the kingdom of God' but that most modern scholars have recognized is not so much the place where God rules as the fact that he rules or the power by which he manifests his sovereignty. . . ." *Mark 1–8*, The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 172. Also C. C. Caragounis said, "The primary meaning of the Hebrew *malekut*, Aramaic *malku* and Greek *basileia* is abstract and dynamic, that is, 'sovereignty' or 'royal rule.' This is almost always the case in the OT and Jewish literature when the term is applied to God." The meaning of this word as realm—a territorial kingdom—is secondary" "Kingdom of God," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospel*, edited by Joel Green, Scot Mcknight, I. Howard Marshall (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 417. e.g. Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (London: A&C Black, 1991), 55. Therefore if it is used in this way, Richard T. France's argument is probable. However, it is not certain whether Mark uses this word in this way.

195) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 534.

The word 'temple' has not appeared, but the imagery has powerfully conveyed to those who are familiar with OT prophecy the fundamental 'change of government' which is symbolized by the destruction of that now discredited building in Jerusalem and all that it represented. From now on it will not be the national shrine which will be the focus of the people of God, but the Son of Man to whom has now been given, as Dn. 7:14 predicted, an everlasting and universal dominion which embraces all nations and languages.¹⁹⁶⁾

As we can see above, for Richard T. France, 'the previous empire' indicates the old power structure which is based on the temple and its buildings which should be replaced by the reign of God. Therefore, he thinks that God uses the Roman Empire "to redraw the map of world politics, and the familiar structures of international affairs."¹⁹⁷⁾ As a result of this redrawing, God's reign is made manifest in this world.

But the dramatic collapse of the power structures is not the end of world history, but the beginning of a *new* and *better* phase, in which God's purpose will be worked out.¹⁹⁸⁾ [italics added for emphasis]

Richard T. France's understanding of the kingdom of God is not so different to that of Nicholas T. Wright, except that he sees the kingdom of God has already having come when Jesus proclaimed the message of repentance and good news (1:15).¹⁹⁹⁾

196) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 531.

197) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 533.

198) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 533.

Elliott C. Maloney also expresses a similar view on this subject. He bases his argument on the definition of the meaning of the 'gospel.' According to him, this term has two meanings: on the one hand, it echoes the Old Testament idea which proclaims the 'good news' of salvation of Israel; on the other hand, in the context of emperor cult in the Roman Empire, it also is used to announce the accession of a new emperor to the throne.²⁰⁰⁾ Elliott C. Maloney's understanding is based upon the second meaning of the gospel. Although it is possible that the term 'gospel' was used in the Old Testament background, as Richard T. France has argued, because Mark was writing in a different context to that of the Old Testament prophets, it might be the case that the word here is being used to convey a different idea.²⁰¹⁾

Therefore, the kingdom of God might be different to that which we have normally accepted. The kingdom of God is not the kingdom established on the earth. In the Gospel of Mark it is not a spatial kingdom at all, rather it is a state which is mysterious and hidden. It could be attained only by an individual's faith.²⁰²⁾ Consequently, Elliott C. Maloney's interpretation effectively dismisses the notion of an eschatological kingdom of God.

199) Richard T. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 30.

200) Elliott C. Maloney, *Jesus' Urgent Message for Today* (New York/London: Continuum, 2004), 46-47

201) Richard T. France, *Divine Government*, 2.

202) Elliott C. Maloney, *Jesus' Urgent Message for Today*, 69.

The scholars who are briefly mentioned above, although there are differences between how they understand the kingdom of God in detail, all express a common point. All of them view the kingdom of God as not being a spacial or territorial kingdom at all. Recently this idea has been accepted by many scholars.²⁰³⁾ However, the difference is that they do not equate the coming of the Kingdom of God with the end of the world. They assume that when the temple was destroyed and the holy city was captured in A.D. 70, the new phase began, namely kingdom of God came.

However, several questions are raised at this point. One relates to the interpretation of the kingdom of God as an aspect of the nation and concerns the Jewish expectation of the recovery of the Davidic kingdom. Contrary to their interpretation, in Mark's gospel, the kingdom of God is mentioned at an individual level. In several verses, Mark often uses the expression 'entering' the kingdom of God (9:47; 10:15, 23, 24, 25. cf. 12:34). This is extremely individual. In these verses it is hard to find any idea which deals with the Jewish national hope.²⁰⁴⁾

Furthermore, according to Josephus, the number of Jews who were slain by Titus when Jerusalem fell is above a million.²⁰⁵⁾ For

203) Dennis C. Duling, "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 4, edited by David Noel Freedman (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 1992), 49-69 (Especially page 50).

204) Robert H. Stein, "N. T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God: A Review Article," 213.

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

Nicholas T. Wright, Richard T. France, and Elliott C. Maloney, the destruction of the temple and the holy city is the event which initiates a new phase, the coming of the kingdom of God. If, as they believe, the kingdom of God came through the destruction of the temple, it is not possible to explain such tragic events caused by the fall of Jerusalem. Moreover should one interpret these events in such a way that the new phase necessitated the killing of so many Jews, for whom Jesus proclaimed such love (even as an enemy) Matt. 5:44?

In addition, although the temple was the very place in which all Jesus' opponents in Mark 11 and 12²⁰⁶⁾ are gathered²⁰⁷⁾ while he was alive, this changed. By the time of the Acts, the temple and Jerusalem had become important places for Christians: when a problem arose in Antioch, Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to discuss this matter with the apostles and elders in Jerusalem (Acts 15:2), Paul then delivered the decisions, reached at by the apostles and elders in Jerusalem (Acts 16:4), when Paul arrived at Jerusalem, they (who were in Jerusalem) always welcomed him warmly (Acts 15:4, 21:17).

In his article Nicholas H. Taylor clearly shows the Christians' temple-oriented attitude in the middle of the first century. He contends:

The Christians of Jerusalem, while inheriting the tradition of Jesus' proclamation of judgment on the Temple, nevertheless seem for the interim

206) Mark 11:15-19; 11:27; 12:40

207) John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 241.

to have accommodated themselves to the Temple-oriented society of Jerusalem. They may have frequented the Temple until shortly before its destruction.²⁰⁸⁾

Furthermore, as we can see in the Pauline letters, the mission to the Gentiles and the setting up of the churches outside Judea had already been vigorously done before A.D. 70.

3. Conclusion

Since Timothy Colani suggested the theory of a ‘little apocalypse,’ there has been a general tendency among scholars to accept this idea without much hesitation. However, as I have discussed above, Mark 13 does not have an apocalyptic character. Although it can be argued that it contains several apocalyptic expressions, such as the Son of Man, Abomination of Desolation, and the expectation of the imminent parousia, that is all. Except for those few phrases, the main material of Mark 13 are reflects more closely to eschatology.

George E. Ladd lists three reasons why Mark 13 should not be read as an apocalypse: (1) there is no use of apocalypticist’s teaching methods, (2) it does not use of apocalyptic literary techniques, (3) it does not use of the symbolic language of apocalypse.²⁰⁹⁾ In this chapter, Jesus talks about

208) Nicholas H. Taylor, “Palestinian Christianity and the Caligula Crisis: Part I. Social and Historical Reconstruction”, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 61 (1996), 118.

209) George Eldon Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom: The Eschatology of Biblical Realism*

the future with actual concrete descriptions rather than the mysterious imagery of apocalypticism; there is no riddle to be solved or and no symbol to be interpreted. Mark 13 is not an apocalypse.²¹⁰⁾ Rather, it is an eschatological work with some minor apocalyptic characteristics. Therefore, it is better to see the concern on the future in Mark 13 as one of eschatology.

Consequently, as Mark 13 is eschatology which concerns the future, its eschatological character has to be considered. As Nicholas T. Wright and Richard T. France argues, the eschatology in Mark 13 could be a political eschatology which concerns the fate of the nation and its government. There are several things which support this interpretation. However, as shown above, if we are to accept this reading, there are still more problems.

Therefore, in this study I will deal with Mark 13 as an eschatological work (as accepted by many scholars) and which looks towards, and expects, the end of the history and world.

(London: S.P.C.K., 1966), 311-312: cf. Vicky Balabanski, *Eschatology in the Making: Mark, Matthew and the Didache* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 70.

210) c.f. James D. G. Dunn contends that Jesus' preaching was apocalyptic in character. However, because of two features, his apocalypticism can be seen to be distinct from other contemporary apocalyptic writings. The first is that he did not draw up a calendar of the End. The second is that his expresses a clear note of realized eschatology. James D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 321.