

## CHAPTER TEN

### DID JESUS DELIMIT HIS EXPECTATION OF THE PAROUSIA?

In this chapter we pose the third of our questions (cf. p. 107). We seek an answer by enquiring into the authenticity of those sayings which are often taken as expressing a delimited hope (Mk. 9, 1. 13, 30; etc.); if they seem to be authentic, then we enquire further into their possible original meaning.

#### *Mark 9, 1*

Although the authenticity of this verse has been recently very much under fire, many modern scholars accept it as a saying of Jesus<sup>1</sup> and indeed there seems insufficient reason for regarding it as anything but authentic.

Many<sup>2</sup> argue that this is a word of comfort composed in a time when belief in the near approach of the End was beginning to wane,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 386; Rawlinson, *Mark*, p. 116; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 27; Schniewind, *Markus*, p. 212; Schlatter, *Markus*, *ad loc*; Lohmeyer *Markus*, pp. 217f.; Flückiger, *Ursprung*, p. 117; Morgenthaler, *Kommendes Reich*, p. 53; Cullmann, *Early Church*, p. 150; Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 285f.; Michaelis, *Verheissung*, pp. 34f.; and in *Wikenhauser Festschrift*, pp. 111f.; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 89; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 226; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 144; Streeter, in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 429f.; Guy, *Last Things*, pp. 80f.; Ridderbos, *De komst*, pp. 427f.; Manson, *Jesus*, p. 70; Dodd, *Parables*, pp. 53f.; Beasley-Murray, *Mark 13*, p. 108; and *Future*, pp. 183f.; Swete, *Mark*, p. 175; Duncan, *Son of Man*, p. 182; Glasson, *Advent*, p. 112; Walter, *Kommen*, p. 96; Nicklin, *Gleanings*, p. 346; Manson, *Teaching* p. 278; Hunter, *Mark*, p. 91; Johnson, *Mark*, p. 153 (possibly).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 128; Bornkamm, in *In Memoriam*, pp. 116f.; Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 131ff.; Marxsen, *Markus*, *ad loc*; Percy, *Botschaft*, p. 177 (tentatively); Fuchs, in *V.F.* 1947-8, pp. 76f.; Conzelmann, *Mitte*, pp. 95f.; Branscomb, *Mark*, p. 159; Menzies, *Earliest Gospel*, p. 173; (Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 27, n. 28, adds K. Kundsinn *Das Urchristentum*, 1929, p. 15; Guignebert, *Jesus*, pp. 333f., is not certain; Loisy, *Marc*, *ad loc*, and Hauck, *Markus*, p. 106 think the saying originally forecast that all would live to the Parousia and that Mk.9, 1 has been modified because some disciples had already died. Percy, *Botschaft*, p. 177 n. 2, rightly comments, 'eine solche bewusste Änderung einer so deutlichen Aussage mutet aber an sich weniger wahrscheinlich an.'

for it speaks of a *delay* of the Parousia, whereas 'Jesus, who expected it to come if not before his death at least very shortly after, could scarcely have deferred the Coming, as he does here, to a time when most of his disciples would have died, as was evidently the case when this was written'.<sup>1</sup> However, most who arrive at such a conclusion are working with a radical redactional-critical methodology<sup>2</sup> which in this case assumes that no delay prior to the Parousia was anticipated by Jesus or the earliest disciples, whereas this is precisely the point in question, not to be assumed. They also maintain that the saying speaks definitely of a delay, which is questionable.<sup>3</sup>

If this were a community saying, it is difficult to imagine how exactly it originated:<sup>4</sup> although Matthew and Luke alter Mark here,<sup>5</sup> we have no evidence that the early church (or Mark himself) felt free to create sayings prefaced with the solemn asseveration *αμην λέγω ὑμῖν*.<sup>6</sup>

On the other hand, it is sometimes argued in favour of authenticity, 'the fact that this prediction was not realised must have caused such serious difficulties that they would hardly have been created.'<sup>7</sup> This, however, is no answer to the criticism just mention-

<sup>1</sup> Menzies, *Earliest Gospel*, p. 173.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. above chapter 5, pp. 68f.; cf. Cullmann, in *T.L.* I, 1958.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 125f.

<sup>4</sup> Michaelis, in *Wikenhauser Festschrift*, p. 116, poses the question. Bornkamm, in *In Memoriam*, pp. 118f., says I Thess. 4, 15 shows how such prophecies were put into the mouth of the Lord. But, in fact, Paul uses this device ('for this I say by the word of the Lord') to differentiate what is really of the Lord—whether by tradition or by direct inspiration—from his own advice; cf. also I Cor. 7, 6; 12; 25; 40.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 128ff. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 239.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. above chapter 7, esp. p. 98; it is important that without exception *αμην λέγω ὑμῖν* is found throughout the N.T. only as introducing a word of Jesus and was apparently not current in the early church, not even in its prophetic pronouncements (cf. e.g. I Cor. 15, 51; I Thess. 5, 1f., II Pet. 3, 3; etc.) Certainly Matthew appears to favour the phrase as an introductory formula (31x; cf. Lk. 6x, Mk. 13x, Jn. (doubled) 25x), but this may be due to more careful preservation (rather than invention) prompted by his Jewish-liturgical interests (cf. M'Neil, *Matthew*, p. xviii; Kilpatrick, *Origins*, p. 77). The omission of *αμην* in Mtt. 12, 31; 26, 29; where the Markan parallels have it suggests, surely, that Matthew was not casually adding the clause wherever he fancied. Luke's infrequent usage could well be due to his concern to remove Jewish formulae; cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 227.

<sup>7</sup> Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 27; cf. Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 144; Schniewind, *Markus*, pp. 121f.

ed for, as Bornkamm<sup>1</sup> and others<sup>2</sup> reply, the saying would prove difficult only for the *later* generation. Besides, the argument is founded upon the view that the verse was necessarily an embarrassment, whereas evidence of this is lacking.<sup>3</sup>

The most that we are justified in saying is that there are no compelling reasons against authenticity. But this does not mean that the verse is evidence that Jesus held to a delimited Parousia hope. In the first place, the context given in the Synoptics may well be the original one, Jesus himself referring to the Transfiguration (as we suggested the context indicates).<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, if the context is secondary the expression *γεύσονται θανάτου* may have had a metaphorical meaning (ruled out as it stands only by the context).<sup>5</sup> There is insufficient reason for agreeing with Taylor<sup>6</sup> that this reflects Jesus' *early* view of an imminent Parousia, or for agreeing with Schwietzer's view.<sup>7</sup> We can only say that the pericope appears to be authentic, and does not necessarily delimit the date of the End.

#### *Mark 13, 28f., 30. par*

The authenticity of vv. 28f., 30 par. cannot be discussed without a comment on the authenticity of the discourse as a whole. The history of the Little Apocalypse theory<sup>8</sup> has been exhaustively recounted by Beasley-Murray.<sup>9</sup> Many regard such a theory as laudable,<sup>10</sup> whilst others, though not accepting necessarily the idea

<sup>1</sup> In *In Memoriam*, pp. 116f.

<sup>2</sup> Grässer, *Problem*, p. 133; Conzelmann, *Mitte*, p. 95, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Michaelis, *Verheissung*, p. 35, argues that the application by the early Fathers to the Transfiguration was an embarrassment solution (cf. Ramsey, *Glory*, p. 132; Klostermann, *Markus*, p. 85); but, as suggested above (chapter 8, pp. 125ff.) the context supports such an interpretation.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8 pp. 125ff.

<sup>5</sup> The phrase could be used metaphorically; cf. *S.-B. Kommentar* I, p. 751 and above, chapter 8, p. 127.

<sup>6</sup> *Mark*, p. 386; cf. Guy, *Last Things*, p. 80.

<sup>7</sup> *Quest*, pp. 357ff.; Cf. Barrett, *H.S.G.T.*, pp. 156f.

<sup>8</sup> Put forward by T. Colani, *Jesus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, 1864; and W. Weiffenbach, *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, 1873.

<sup>9</sup> *Future*, chapters 1 and 2.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Moffatt, *Introduction*, p. 209, who counts it a 'sententia recepta of synoptic criticism'; Streeter, in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 179ff. Bultmann, *Geschichte*, pp. 129f.; Hauck, *Markus*, p. 153; Klostermann, *Markus*, pp. 131f.; Hölscher, in *T.B.* XII, 1933, pp. 193ff.; Grant, *Earliest Gospel*, p. 62; Redlich, *Mark*, pp. 29f.; Glasson, *Advent*, p. 76; Dibelius, *Fresh Approach*, pp. 119ff.;

of a Little Apocalypse, regard the chapter with varying degrees of scepticism.<sup>1</sup> The main arguments against authenticity are as follows:

i. That the discourse is out of character with Jesus' teaching elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> But the contents of the chapter can, in fact, be paralleled considerably.<sup>3</sup> Further, the discourse *form* is not necessarily a sign that the *contents* are unauthentic.<sup>4</sup>

ii. That it is internally inconsistent, v. 32 and the emphasis on a sudden End being (it is said) out of keeping with the idea of preceding 'signs'.<sup>5</sup> But signs encouraging watchfulness and expectancy are capable of being held in tension with the idea of suddenness.<sup>6</sup>

iii. That the apparent privacy of the teaching is a mark of secondariness.<sup>7</sup> Against this, however, we must notice how suitable private instruction is in the case of material of an apocalyptic character (if not an 'apocalypse'): <sup>8</sup> other sayings appear to have been spoken in private,<sup>9</sup> and in this particular case one might well expect some caution and privacy—'Apart from other considerations, it would have been indiscreet for Jesus and his followers to discuss in the open the anticipated ruin of the temple, involving as it did that of the city and nation also'.<sup>10</sup>

Rawlinson, *Mark*, pp. 180f.; Branscomb, *Mark*, p. 231; Goodspeed, *Life*, pp. 186f.; Bacon, *Mark*, pp. 121f. Hunter, *Mark*, *ad loc.*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 152f.; Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 119f.; Lowrie, *Mark*, pp. 469f.; Major, in *Mission and Message*, pp. 159f.; Guy, *Last Things*, p. 58f.; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 98; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 285; Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, I, pp. 296f.; Fison, *Hope*, p. 126; Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 636f.; Menzies, *Earliest Gospel*, p. 233; Blunt, *Mark*, p. 242; Manson, *Teaching*, p. 261; Dodd, *Parables*, p. 52; Duncan, *Son of Man*, p. 179; Johnson, *Mark*, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Manson, *Teaching*, p. 262; G. Barth, in *Überlieferung und Auslegung*, pp. 56; Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 102ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Beasley-Murray, *Mark* 13, p. 9; and cf. Lightfoot, *Gospel Message*, p. 54, who traces parallelism between ch. 13 and chs. 14-15 (similarly M. Barth, *Augenzeuge*, pp. 125ff.); Busch, *Zum Verständnis, passim*; Michaelis, *Verheissung*, pp. 22f.; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 151 Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 389.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Mk. 4, for example. Cf. Beasley-Murray, *Future*, p. 205 (contrast Glasson, *Advent*, p. 78).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 523; Guy, *Last Things*, pp. 59f.; Branscomb, *Mark*, pp. 231f.; Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 102f.; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 127.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. above, pp. 133f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Hölscher, in *T.B.* XII, 1933, pp. 193f.; Dibelius, *Fresh Approach*, pp. 119f.; Major, *Reminiscences*, p. 43; Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 61.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. esp. Rowley, *Relevance*, pp. 109f.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Daube, 'Public Pronouncement and Private Explanation in the Gospels', in *E.T.* LVII, 1946, pp. 175ff.; Beasley-Murray, *Future*, p. 205; Turner, in *New Commentary*, *ad loc.*; and cf. Mk. 4, 10; 7, 17; 9, 28; and 10, 10.

<sup>10</sup> Beasley-Murray, *Mark* 13, p. 25; cf. also *Future*, pp. 205ff.

iv. That Mk. 13, 14 (Mtt. 24, 15) reveals secondariness.<sup>1</sup> But this verse, if not authentic to Jesus,<sup>2</sup> is intelligible as a Markan editorial device,<sup>3</sup> or dark hint,<sup>4</sup> without supposing that Mark is referring to a written source.

v. That the discourse fits better the early church situation;<sup>5</sup> but only on *a priori* views of cleavage between Jesus and the early church's understanding <sup>6</sup> could this be an argument against authenticity.<sup>7</sup>

There therefore seems good reason for the judgement, 'that 13; 5-37 does give us substantially our Lord's teaching',<sup>8</sup> to which a number of scholars incline.<sup>9</sup> If we are not able to treat the chapter as an authentic discourse,<sup>10</sup> we certainly are justified in weighing

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 103; Major, *Reminiscences*, p. 43; Klostermann, *Markus*, p. 151; Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 78f.; Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 161f.

<sup>2</sup> J. Schmid, *Mark*, *ad loc.*; and Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 403, regard this as a possibility.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 403; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 341; Beasley-Murray, *Mark* 13, p. 57; Ridderbos, *De Komst*, p. 403.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Turner, in *New Commentary*, *ad loc.*; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 512; Schniewind, *Markus*, p. 163; Beasley-Murray, *Mark* 13, p. 57.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. e.g. Menzies, *Earliest Gospel* (aimed at soothing excitement) Streeter, in *Oxford Studies*, p. 180 (when delay was a problem, to encourage); Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 186f., (the early church building up its Parousia hope) (similarly Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 120f.; Dodd, *Parables* pp. 52f.); Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 640; Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 152f. Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 129; Klostermann, *Markus*, pp. 131f.; Fison, *Hope*, p. 126 (shows signs of re-interpretation of the primitive hope); etc.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. above chapter 3, p. 40; chapter 4, p. 56 and chapter 5, pp. 70f.

<sup>7</sup> Grässer, *Problem*, p. 153, n. 2, charges Beasley-Murray's 'uncritical' evaluation with not even asking if a pericope can be better explained as an early church composition. In his Commentary, *Mark* 13 p. 8, n. 1, Beasley-Murray seems to have noted the charge and answers, 'I cannot pretend to be writing this book apart from faith, nor do I expect any to read it but men of faith . . .' The task of the exegete is obviously under discussion, and a radical difference must exist between those who understand exegesis as attempting to make sense of the N.T. witness, and those who regard it as constructing early church history and thought.

<sup>8</sup> Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 390.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Beasley-Murray, *Future*, pp. 172ff.; *Mark* 13, pp. 17f.; Michel, in *Z.s.T.*, 1932, pp. 625ff.; Schniewind, *Markus*, pp. 132ff.; Burkitt, *Beginnings*, pp. 63f.; K & S Lake, *Introduction*, p. 32; Cranfield, in *S.J.T.* VI, 1953, pp. 189ff.; Allen, *Mark*, pp. 163f.; Turner, in *New Commentary ad loc.*; Stonehouse, *Matthew and Mark*, pp. 113f.; Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine*, p. 48; *Gospel Message*, p. 54; Lagrange, *Marc*, pp. 334f.

<sup>10</sup> As Schlatter, *Markus*, *ad loc.*; Rowley, *Relevance*, pp. 109f.; Busch, *Zum Verständnis*, pp. 44f. (a farewell discourse); see Beasley-Murray, *Future*, pp. 205ff., and *Mark* 13, pp. 10f. (and the important note 1, p. 11.)

each pericope on its own merits,<sup>1</sup> allowing at least the possibility of authenticity.

Verses 28f. (which even Grässer<sup>2</sup> thinks could be authentic) can be understood as an exhortation to see in the calamities mentioned (vv. 5-23) an indication that the End (vv. 25-27) is near.<sup>3</sup> Or, discounting the context, vv. 28f. may have referred to some other crisis whose imminence could be indicated by certain signs. Feuillet<sup>4</sup> suggests that the parable pointed to the new world which would follow Jerusalem's destruction: but this seems unlikely, for as Kümmel<sup>5</sup> contends, 'the subject of ἐγγύς ἐστίν becomes completely nebulous' on this interpretation. Dodd<sup>6</sup> refers it to the present situation and its significance. It is true (as Dodd maintains) that ταῦτα γινόμενα, since it must refer to vv. 5-23 and not to vv. 24-27,<sup>7</sup> is slightly awkward, but this does not necessarily 'suggest that a parable is used by the compiler for a purpose for which it was not originally intended'<sup>8</sup> compilation itself being a sufficient explanation of the awkwardness.<sup>9</sup>

ἐστίν ἐπὶ θύραις, as Beasley-Murray notes<sup>10</sup> 'accords better with a personal subject',<sup>11</sup> and the context given to the parable in Mark 13 seems more likely than alternatives suggested. In *no case* is it possible to find here evidence of a delimited Parousia expectation.<sup>12</sup>

The same can be said of Mk. 13, 30 par. If v. 30 is an isolated

<sup>1</sup> With Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 98; Schniewind, *Markus*, p. 132; Beasley-Murray, *Future*, pp. 205f.; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 390; Lohmeyer, *Markus*, p. 267; Marxsen, *Markus*, p. 101; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> *Problem*, p. 152.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 408; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 139, 152.

<sup>4</sup> In *R.B.* LVI, 1949, pp. 82f.; cf. Sharman, *Son of Man*, pp. 98f.; Jones, in *Scripture*, IV, 1949-51, pp. 222ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Promise*, p. 21, n. 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Parables*, p. 137 n. 1 (in agreement with his treatment of the parables in general; cf. above, chapter 4, pp. 64f. appended note); cf. Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 96; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 71; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 520; B.T.D. Smith, *Parables*, pp. 90f. (other authorities cited by Beasley-Murray, *Mark* 13, p. 95): Hunter, *Mark*, p. 125 suggests the interval between death and resurrection.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 132f.

<sup>8</sup> Taylor, *Mark*, p. 520.

<sup>9</sup> Beasley-Murray, *Future*, p. 211 (similarly Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 407f.) contends that the structure of the discourse explains the apparent awkwardness.

<sup>10</sup> *Mark* 13, p. 97.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Jam. 5, 8; Rev. 3, 20 and the general O.T. usage.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the discussion above chapter 8, pp. 132ff.

unit<sup>1</sup> then there is no necessity to take ταῦτα πάντα as a reference to the End coming within the generation<sup>2</sup>. Grässer<sup>3</sup> objects on the grounds that the End is the important theme, but of course, taken out of context v. 30 is removed from such criticism. Depending on the original context, it might refer to the destruction of Jerusalem and the events leading to it,<sup>4</sup> or to the preceding events only,<sup>5</sup> or perhaps to something entirely different!

If the context is retained<sup>6</sup> it is hardly a 'word of comfort composed in days of disappointment',<sup>7</sup> for we have no evidence that the early church was prepared to compose such a saying,<sup>8</sup> and besides, the context demands that ταῦτα refers to *signs*.<sup>9</sup> It appears that Jesus may well have predicted here that the contemporary generation must experience all the preliminary signs and therefore could expect the End at any moment. But this does not mean that he held to a delimited expectation, only rather that he had that undelimited near-expectation which we have seen to have characterised the early church.<sup>10</sup>

*Mark* 14, 25 par.

Concerning the exegesis of this verse, nothing need here be added to the discussion above.<sup>11</sup> The only question here is whether we have to do with a genuine word of Jesus or not.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 130; Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 128f.; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 60; Branscomb, *Mark*, p. 239; Manson, *Sayings*, p. 333; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> So Michaelis, *Verheissung*, pp. 30f.; This is the effect given by Robinson *Coming*, p. 86 (cf. Glasson, *Advent*, p. 79) in dismissing Mk. 13, 24-27 as unauthentic.

<sup>3</sup> *Problem*, pp. 128f.; cf. Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 60.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Feuillet, in *R.B.* LVI, 1949, pp. 82f.; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 521; Flückiger, *Ursprung*, p. 116; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 348; Jones, in *Scripture*, IV, 1949-51, pp. 222ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Sharman, *Son of Man*, pp. 98.

<sup>6</sup> The context is objected to by Rawlinson, *Mark*, p. 192; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 523; Manson, *Teaching*, p. 262; on the grounds that it is said to be difficult to reconcile Mk. 13, 30 with Mk. 13, 32. But cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 133ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Grässer, *Problem*, p. 128; Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 130; Branscomb, *Mark*, p. 239.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, p. 180.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 132ff.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, p. 160. So Stonehouse, *Matthew and Mark*, p. 113; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 409; Barth, *C.D.* III/2, pp. 601f.; Contrast, Beasley-Murray, *Mark* 13, p. 101; Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 60f. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, *ad loc*; Manson, *Jesus*, pp. 65f.; Marxsen, *Markus*, pp. 132f.; Hadorn, *Zukunft und Hoffnung*, p. 95; Cullmann, *Early Church*, pp. 150f.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 136ff.

Bultmann<sup>1</sup> has suggested that vv. 22-25 are added by Mark to an older tradition and that these verses are 'nicht in erster Linie aus dem Glauben, sondern aus dem Kult . . . erwachsen', through hellenistic cultic practice.<sup>2</sup> The question as to which version is to be preferred cannot be discussed here,<sup>3</sup> but v. 25 (Mtt. 26, 29; Lk. 22, 18) remains substantially unaffected. In view of the imagery of a feast as type of the joys of the righteous in the Old Testament and post-Old Testament literature,<sup>4</sup> and the strong Semitic flavour of v. 25,<sup>5</sup> it is most unlikely that the saying stems from a non-Palestinian source, and it can certainly be authentic.<sup>6</sup> There seems to be no adequate reason why the interpretation suggested above (chapter 8, pp. 137f.), containing an undelimited Parousia hope, should not go back to Jesus himself.

*Mark* 14, 62 par.

Not a few critics regard the whole scene of the Sanhedrin trial as fictitious.<sup>7</sup> Two main reasons are given:

The first is that no sympathetic eye-witnesses would have been present.<sup>8</sup> Yet 'this fact does not necessarily discredit the account, since knowledge of what happened, even if we allow for the absence of a biographical interest, must have been available'.<sup>9</sup> Further, the

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte*, pp. 285f., 301, 333.

<sup>2</sup> He continues, 'Vielmehr hat V. 22-25, die Kultlegende aus hellenistischen Kreisen der paulinischen Sphäre, offenbar ein Stück verdrängt, das als organische Fortsetzung von V. 12-16 das Paschamahl schilderte.' (*Geschichte*, pp. 285f.)

<sup>3</sup> Cf. esp. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, pp. 72ff.; Kümmel, *Promise*, pp. 30ff.; Manson, *Jesus*, pp. 134ff.; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, p. 175. (who cites further authorities, notes 1 and 2).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Words*, pp. 110f.; S.-B. *Kommentar*, IV, pp. 1144ff.; Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 331f.; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 547.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, pp. 125f.; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 547.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 547; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 381; Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 427f.; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, p. 71, pp. 118f.; Percy, *Botschaft*, p. 175; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 175f.; Rawlinson, *Mark*, pp. 204f.; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 82; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 92, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. esp. Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*; Blinzler, *The Trial of Jesus*, throughout this section. For the view cited, cf. Taylor, *Mark*, authorities cited p. 644 n. 1; Bultmann, *Geschichte*, pp. 290f.; Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 172f.; Dibelius, *Tradition*, p. 213.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. esp. Dibelius, *Tradition*, p. 213; Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 291; Grässer, *Problem*, p. 172; Tödt, *Menschensohn*, p. 33.

<sup>9</sup> Taylor, *Mark*, p. 563; cf. also Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 439; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 50.

lack of biographical detail suggests faithfulness of compilation.<sup>1</sup> It is, surely, entirely credible that a member of the Sanhedrin later recounted the facts; either a sympathiser (if πάντα in v. 64 is not pressed),<sup>2</sup> or a later convert.<sup>3</sup>

The second objection is that Mark places the scene at night<sup>4</sup> though such was, apparently, forbidden.<sup>5</sup> However, we cannot say with certainty that the rules embodied in Tractate Sanhedrin (c 200 A.D.) applied at the time of Christ.<sup>6</sup> Further, it may well be that Mark is describing an informal, preliminary sitting of the Sanhedrin,<sup>7</sup> rather than merely duplicating a second form of the same narrative.<sup>8</sup> It is inherently probable that hasty counsel should have been taken in such a situation, immediately prior to the feast, with the Sanhedrin anxious to avoid a disturbance.<sup>9</sup> Perhaps John's expression in Jn. 18, 13 'to Annas πρώτον' supports this.<sup>10</sup> Grässer<sup>11</sup> objects to this because a definite judgement is given. But of course, the point of the enquiry would be to come to a definite decision, and Taylor<sup>12</sup> rightly notes that they only concluded (v. 64) that he 'was worthy of death' (ἐνοχον εἶναι θανάτου), which is a decisive basis for action without necessarily being a legal sentence.

In any case, illegal trials have been known before and since, and it is possible that even if the regulations (Sanhedrin iv-vii) were in force, the account is still essentially accurate.<sup>13</sup> The same may be said concerning all the apparent irregularities.<sup>14</sup> The desire

<sup>1</sup> Taylor, *Mark*, p. 563, speaks of 'artless details . . . characteristic of an eye-witness'; but artless details would, surely, also occur in free composition.

<sup>2</sup> With Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 398; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 439.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 565; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 50; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 439.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. v. 53. Mtt. 26, 57; contrast Lk. 22, 54; 66. Bultmann, *Geschichte* p. 291; Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 172f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. San. iv-vii. Danby, *Mishnah*, pp. 386f.; S.-B. *Kommentar*, I, pp. 1020f.; Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, I, p. 352; Barrett, *Background*, pp. 179ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Rawlinson, *Mark*, pp. 217f., following Danby, in *J.T.S.* XXI, pp. 51f.; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 645.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 440; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 50.

<sup>8</sup> As Bacon, *Mark*, p. 200; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 646 suggest; contrast e.g. Williams, in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 406ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Mk. 11, 18; 1, 12; 14, 2; Lk. 22, 6; Jn. 11, 47ff.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Mark*, p. 646; Barrett, *John*, *ad loc.*, takes the expression simply as an indication of Annas' lasting influence.

<sup>11</sup> *Problem*, pp. 172f.

<sup>12</sup> *Mark*, p. 645.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, I, p. 351.

<sup>14</sup> See Rawlinson, *Mark*, pp. 218f.; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 645.

to remove Jesus and yet avoid a disturbance could provide adequate motive. Therefore we conclude that there is not sufficient ground for rejecting the trial scene outright.<sup>1</sup>

There are three other main attacks upon the authenticity of Mk. 14, 62 par in particular. First: Grässer<sup>2</sup> regards the verse as suspect because, he maintains, it presupposes a delay of the Parousia which contrasts (he says) with Jesus' view. He suggests it was composed in its present form by first-generation Christians when the delay was a problem and yet hope in an imminent coming had not been given up. This *a priori* criterion is, surely, unsatisfactory;<sup>3</sup> in any case we have found<sup>4</sup> no temporal delimitation here, only the conviction that Jesus is *no longer* to appear in the lowly role of the Servant, but is next to come in glory. On Grässer's premiss, might one not expect that the early church would have created something *more* encouraging and definite? But the matter of a delay, contained in 14, 62, can hardly be made the criterion of authenticity or unauthenticity, since it is the matter of an interval which is under discussion.

The second objection is that the idea of Christ's exaltation is early church theology<sup>5</sup> and this verse is said to be a reading back of such a theology into historical events. To be sure, one central feature of the earliest confessional statements is Christ's present Lordship,<sup>6</sup> but this conviction is never expressed in terms of the 'Son of Man'. The only occurrence of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the determinate form outside the gospels, Acts 7, 56, speaks of exaltation; but the image is that of standing (ἑστῶτα) and is probably prompted rather by the idea of welcoming the martyr than by the theme of Lordship.<sup>7</sup> The indeterminate occurrences do not support Grässer's view: Heb. 2, 6 (quoting Ps. 8, 4f.) refers to man in general:<sup>8</sup> Rev. 1, 13 purports to describe a vision and is an unique picture: Rev. 14, 14 depicts the exalted Lord *at the opening of the*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Héring, *La Royaume*, pp. 111f.; 120; Taylor, *Mark*, pp. 563f.; Cranfield, *Mark*, pp. 439f.; Dodd, *Parables*, p. 91, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Problem*, pp. 175f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, chapter 5, pp. 70f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, p. 138.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 174f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Cullmann, *Confessions*, pp. 58f.; Cranfield, in *Essays in Christology*, pp. 83f.; Cullmann, *Christology*, pp. 195ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Williams, *Acts*, p. 112.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Arndt-Gingrich, *Lexicon*, p. 843.

*Parousia scene*. Hence Lohmeyer<sup>1</sup> rightly says that there is 'no later analogy'<sup>2</sup> and that this supports the authenticity of Mk. 14, 62.

The final argument against authenticity is that the early church is said to reflect its own Christology here. Tödt<sup>3</sup> maintains, '... die Formulierung des Menschensohnspruches in Mk. 14, 62 der nach-österlichen Gemeinde zuzuschreiben ist, die mit Hilfe der Schrift das Verhör Jesu vor dem Synedrion schilderte und dabei ein besonderes Interesse an dem Verhältnis der christologischen Würdeprädikate zueinander hatte'. Tödt maintains that Jesus is represented as openly declaring his authority and status.<sup>4</sup> However, it is significant that an air of ambiguity remains even here: this is particularly the case in Mtt. 26, 64, σὺ εἶπας and Lk. 22, 70 ὑμεῖς λέγετε (cf. Lk. 22, 67f.) which, while assenting<sup>5</sup> nevertheless suggest vagueness.<sup>6</sup> It is possible, too, that we should read σὺ εἶπας ὅτι (with θ f 13 pc) in Mk. 14, 62.<sup>7</sup> In any case the immediate insistence upon the term 'Son of Man', although the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Εὐλογητοῦ was mentioned (v. 61) suggests that despite the clear affirmation ('Εγὼ εἶμι) there is still veiledness.<sup>8</sup> Tödt also holds<sup>9</sup> that authentic 'Son of Man' sayings are not composed of Old Testament quotations in the manner of Mk. 14, 62, par. He contrasts Lk. 12, 8f., Mtt. 24, 27; 37, 39 (authentic) with Mk. 14, 62; 8, 38; 13, 26f. This criterion of evaluation is, however, open to question. First, the early church's relative non-usage of the term Son of Man tells against the argument, particularly since in vv. 60-62 the term 'Son of Man' (with apparently conscious intention) is introduced over against the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Εὐλογητοῦ.<sup>10</sup> Secondly, if Mk. 2, 28 par., for example, is a comment of the evangelist or his

<sup>1</sup> *Markus*, pp. 330f.; followed by Manson, *Jesus*, p. 115; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Percy, *Botschaft*, p. 226, n. 2 disputes, but on inadequate ground.

<sup>3</sup> *Menschensohn*, p. 34; cf. also Branscomb, *Mark*, p. 280.

<sup>4</sup> *Menschensohn*, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Blass-Debrunner, *Grammar*, p. 260.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, p. 102; Swete, *Mark*, *ad loc.*

<sup>7</sup> So Taylor, *Mark*, p. 568; cf. Wilson, in Peake's *Commentary* (new edition), pp. 816f.; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 444 (possible).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, pp. 102, 129; contrast Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, p. 78; Lagrange, *Marc*, p. 462; Goodspeed *Problems*, pp. 64f.

<sup>9</sup> *Menschensohn*, p. 33.

<sup>10</sup> Robinson, *Coming*, p. 57, n. 2, rightly comments, 'If something like Mk. 14, 62 is not authentic, then it is hard to see how it entered the tradition...'

source, as seems likely,<sup>1</sup> we have a clear case of an early christian 'Son of Man' saying *not* composed of Old Testament quotes (cf also Mtt. 12, 32). On the other hand, there is much to be said in favour of the authenticity of sayings which *are* a pastiche of quotations or allusions (cf e.g. Mk. 4, 32-Dan. 4, 12; 21, Ezek. 17, 23; 31, 6), and this applies to Son of Man sayings too, for the grounds on which the authenticity of Mk. 8, 38 par. (cf. I Enoch 61, 8; 10. 62, 2)<sup>2</sup> and Mk. 13, 26 (cf. Is. 13, 10; Zech. 12, 10f., Dan. 7, 13f.)<sup>3</sup> is challenged are inadequate. It is important to notice that of all the Son of Man sayings in the gospels it is precisely those which speak of his future glory which contain Old Testament (or Pseudepigrapha)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rawlinson, *Mark*, p. 34; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 220; Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> Many—cf. esp. Glasson, *Advent*, pp. 74f.; Sharman, *Son of Man*, p. 12; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 384; Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 54f.—think the Q saying (Mtt. 10, 32 = Lk. 12, 8) original and this to be a later interpretation. Robinson's arguments are a) that God is represented as Father of the Son of Man, so that Son of Man and Son of God are identified in an unparalleled manner: but cf. Iersel, *Der Sohn*, p. 115, n. 1 and b) that the Q saying speaks of Son of Man as Advocate, whereas here—in accordance with early church theology—he is represented as judge. But cf. I Jn. 2, 1; Heb. 7, 25 etc., which suggest that the early church still held to the idea of Jesus as advocate. Moreover, as Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 45, and Schniewind, *Markus*, *ad loc* (cf. also *Nachgelassene Reden*, p. 11) note, the Q saying in dissolving the ambiguity of the Son of Man has the marks of secondariness over against Mk. 8, 38.

<sup>3</sup> Glasson, *Advent*, p. 185f.; and 'Mark 13 and the Greek O.T.' in *E.T.* LXIX, 1957-8, pp. 213ff.; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 57, contend that the vv. 25-27 are unauthentic because two of the quotations apparently depend on the LXX rendering for their significance (there can be no difficulty in occurrence of LXX language *as such*, which can be explained as assimilation). Thus:—

Mk. 13, 25 from Is. 34, 4. Hebrew reads *וּגּוּלוֹ כַסְפֵּר הַשָּׁמַיִם* 'the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll'. Whereas LXX reads *καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα κατὰ πτερὰ* 'and all the stars shall fall'. Mark clearly is assimilated to the LXX version: but the point is not changed—it remains that of the dissolution of the cosmic structure! Mk. 13, 27 alluding to Zech. 2, 6: Hebrew reads 'For I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heaven. Flee from the land of the north . . .' LXX renders 'From the four winds of heaven will I gather you'. But (in answer to Glasson) the context of Zech. 2, 6 is clearly one of gathering—Glasson (*Advent*, p. 187) seems to think the Hebrew speaks of an injunction to scatter, whereas it speaks of gathering the scattered. Further, 'he shall gather together his elect from the four winds', is reminiscent not only of Zech. 2, 6 but also of Deut. 30, 3f., Jer. 32, 37; Ezek. 34, 13 and 36, 24—all of which speak of gathering scattered people; it may well be *this* general picture which Mk. 13, 27 depicts, coupled with the phrase 'the four winds' from Zech 2—a convenient short phrase for the longer passages in the other references listed.

references.<sup>1</sup> But it is precisely in this sphere that we would expect such references or allusions. Where the present situation of the Son of Man is spoken of, there is no necessity to call in traditional imagery: but how else ought one to speak of heaven, of glory, of the End, but in traditional imagery? <sup>2</sup>

We conclude that there is no sufficient reason for counting Mk. 14, 62 par. unauthentic. Although on the interpretation offered above,<sup>3</sup> the argument from non-fulfilment<sup>4</sup> is ruled out, there is much to suggest authenticity; as a community saying it is not definite enough to be a word of comfort to waning hope, nor violent enough to be a word of vengeance on the persecutors of the Lord. Hence we take this verse as evidence of Jesus' own Parousia hope, but if the interpretation suggested above<sup>5</sup> is valid, there is once again no question of a delimited expectation, only the conviction that the lowliness of the Son of Man's present situation is no longer relevant: he is next to be seen (at whatever date) in his true glory.

#### *Matthew* 10, 23

The authenticity of this verse, much disputed,<sup>6</sup> is challenged on the following grounds:

a. It is said to be irreconcilable with Mk. 13, 10 (cf. Mtt. 24, 14, 10, 18, 29, 19) and the view that Jesus envisaged a future Gentile mission.<sup>7</sup> Actually, just for this reason Kümmel accepts its authenti-

<sup>1</sup> Although O.T. allusions or quotations *can* be used in Son of Man sayings referring to his present situation (cf. Lk. 1, 10; Mtt. 18, 11 in some Manuscripts, Ezek. 34, 16) and with reference to his coming Passion (cf. Jn. 3, 13; 14; Numb. 21, 8; 9., Mk. 10, 45? Is. 53) and the Parousia of the Son of Man can be spoken of (just *mentioned*) without reference to O.T. (or Pseudepigrapha) passages (cf. Mtt. 10, 23; 16, 28; 24-27; Lk. 17, 24), all the passages where the Parousia of the Son of Man is spoken of in any detail include O.T. (or Pseudepigrapha) references or allusions (cf. Mtt. 16, 27 = Mk. 8, 38 = Lk. 9, 26; cf. Lk. 12, 8; 10.—I Enoch 61, 8; 10. 62, 2. Mtt. 13, 41f.—Zeph. 1, 3; Dan. 12, 3. Mtt. 19, 28—Dan. 7, 9, 10. Mtt. 24, 29f., cf. Lk. 21, 27f., Mk. 13, 26f.—Is. 13, 10; Zech. 12, 10f., Dan 7, 13f., etc. Mtt. 25, 31—Zech. 14, 5. Mtt. 26, 64 = Mk. 14, 62 = Lk. 22, 69—Ps. 110, 1; Dan. 7, 13? Jn. 1, 51—Gen. 28, 12. Rev. 14, 14—Dan. 7, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, p. 406 (following Schlatter, *Matthäus*, p. 710).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above chapter 8, pp. 140f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Manson, *Jesus*, p. 115; Otto, *Kingdom of God*, p. 277; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 50.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 140f.

<sup>6</sup> Taylor, *Names*, p. 29, n. 1 says, 'probably the saying has suffered in critical estimation from the use made of it by Schweitzer . . .'

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e.g. Manson, *Teaching*, p. 221.

city,<sup>1</sup> though we suggest that this rather too readily dismisses Mk. 13, 10 par.<sup>2</sup> and the Gentile mission as a factor in Jesus' future outlook.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, there is not necessarily a conflict between Mk. 13, 10 par. and Mt. 10, 23. *Even in its present* context, the formal difficulty (v. 23 and v. 5 against v. 18) is capable of being reconciled;<sup>4</sup> taken out of context the formal difficulty need not even exist.

b. It is said that the verse fits the early church situation better.<sup>5</sup> But the formal difficulty in vv. 5, 18 and 23 supports authenticity, and Taylor more cautiously comments, 'it may well have been *re-interpreted* by Matthew in the light of the controversy regarding the Gentile Mission; but it is difficult to think that it was *invented* for this purpose.'<sup>6</sup>

c. It is said that the verse was invented as a word of comfort in the Parousia-delay 'crisis'.<sup>7</sup> However, in its present context the saying looks more like an admonition not to be slack in missionary zeal nor to sell one's life cheaply in view of the need for mission.<sup>8</sup> Surely free composition could conceive a less negative and less ambiguous 'comfort' than this?

d. It is said that since the verse delimits the End, it (with Mk. 9, 1. 13, 30 par.) is unauthentic, being contrary to Jesus' view.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Promise*, p. 85. Bultmann, *Theology*, I, p. 55, says this saying stems from the Jerusalem church justifying its restriction of its missionary work to Jews only.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. below, chapter 11, pp. 204ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Schlatter, *Matthäus*, *ad loc*; Flückiger, *Ursprung*, pp. 25f.; Beasley-Murray, *Future*, pp. 198f.; Jeremias, *Promise*, p. 40ff.; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 132ff.

<sup>4</sup> See above, chapter 8, pp. 143ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Manson, *Teaching*, p. 221; Cadoux, *Historic Mission*, pp. 292f. Sharman, *Son of Man*, p. 29; Glasson, *Advent*, p. 104; Duncan, *Son of Man* pp. 181f. (reflects the eager expectation of the Jewish-Christian church); Bultmann, *Theology* I, p. 42; Robinson, *Coming*, p. 80 (possibly); Kilpatrick, *Origins*, p. 122; Bammel, in *S.T.* XV, 1962, pp. 91f.

<sup>6</sup> *Names*, p. 29. Robinson, *Coming*, p. 76 suggests (tentatively) that v. 23a embodies the 'oracle' referred to in Eusebius (*Hist.* III 5, 3) meaning 'if they persecute you in this city (i.e. Jerusalem) flee to the other (by pre-arrangement, Pella), but it seems rather unlikely that an administrative detail should be turned into a solemn directive of this nature.

<sup>7</sup> Grässer, *Problem*, pp. 18f., 137ff.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. esp. Michaelis, *Matthäus*, II, p. 93f.; Schniewind, *Matthäus ad loc*; Robinson, *Matthew*, p. 92; Calvin, *Harmony*, I, pp. 456f.

<sup>9</sup> I.e. a complete reversal of the position held by Schweitzer, *Quest*, pp. 357ff. (cf. also Burkitt, *Beginnings*, p. 138; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, p. 89.) So cf. e.g. Heard, *Introduction*, pp. 245f.; Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 520f.

But at least in its present context we doubt whether it delimits the End in the way suggested<sup>1</sup> (and this should not, in any case, be used as the criterion of authenticity<sup>2</sup>).

Some think that the non-fulfilment of this saying guarantees its authenticity;<sup>3</sup> but this argument rests on an understanding of the saying which we do not accept.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, not a few scholars accept its authenticity.<sup>5</sup> In its favour we repeat the point emphasised concerning Mk. 14, 62;<sup>6</sup> the early non-usage of the term 'Son of Man', and the entire lack of evidence that the early community invented sayings prefaced with the solemn introduction *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*.

If the saying *is* judged authentic, the question has to be asked, does it reflect a delimited hope in Jesus' outlook? In one sense, the interpretation suggested above *is* delimited—but the delimitation is conceptual, not chronological: i.e. 'you will not finish this work until . . .' rather than 'on or before the year "X" the Son of Man will come.' And it is not impossible that the original meaning has been retained by Matthew, even though he has imparted a new context to it. If the context is dismissed altogether, we cannot say with any certainty to what the saying referred. It is possible that the Resurrection was in mind,<sup>7</sup> and it is possibly significant that the verse does not say 'Ye shall see . . .'<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, as Robinson says, there is no 'suggestion that 10, 23 is to be referred to a different and earlier moment, say, than 16, 27'.<sup>9</sup> Though Barth thinks that the verse referred to the Resurrection *as a pro-*

(the heightening of Apocalyptic); Taylor *Names*, p. 29 rightly points out that compared with 13, 41; 19, 28; 24, 30 and 25, 31; Mt. 10, 23 is marked by simplicity and sobriety.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above chapter 8, pp. 143ff.

<sup>2</sup> Beasley-Murray, *Future*, p. 185, p. 198; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 64; Cullmann, *Early Church*, p. 151, accept the delimitation which they find in the saying, yet still accept its authenticity. It is simply inadequate to reconstruct Jesus' teaching by such radical surgical procedure.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Schniewind, *Matthäus*, *ad loc*; Jeremias, *Promise*, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. above, chapter 8, pp. 144ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. esp. Beasley-Murray, *Future*, p. 185; *Mark* 13, pp. 108f.; Manson, *Jesus*, pp. 64ff.; Taylor, *Names*, p. 29; Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, I, p. 150; Jeremias, *Promise*, p. 20; Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 156f.; Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 60ff.; Cullmann, *Early Church*, p. 150.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. above, p. 186f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Stonehouse, *Matthew and Mark*, p. 239; Barth, *C.D.* III/2, pp. 499f.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. above, chapter 7, pp. 105ff.

<sup>9</sup> *Coming*, p. 49, n. 1. cf. also Kümmel, *Promise*, p. 67.

*leipsis* of the Parousia, in the absence of any guidance to make this clear (contrast the case of Mk. 9, 1 where the context directs us) it cannot be at all certain that the Resurrection is intended. Besides the flight or mission throughout Israel would neither be feasible in the short interval before the Resurrection—so obviously so, as to rule the saying in this case rather pointless. Some<sup>1</sup> suggest that the saying referred in the first place to the fall of Jerusalem. But other references to the coming of the Son of Man do not support this interpretation<sup>2</sup> and the Christocentricity of the expression should be preserved.<sup>3</sup> Many wish to separate v. 23a from v. 23b,<sup>4</sup> but whilst this must remain a possibility, Beasley-Murray is perhaps more probably right in maintaining that the two parts 'form a coherent whole as they stand'.<sup>5</sup> If G. Barth is right that 'der ursprüngliche Sinn ist ungewiss',<sup>6</sup> the most we may say is that the verse does not force us to conclude that Jesus held to a delimited Parousia hope.

The discussion of this chapter has necessarily been rather negative and tentative. It appears that the Parousia in Jesus' outlook was *in some sense* near, but that evidence is lacking that he held to a delimited hope. In the following chapter, still somewhat tentatively, though, we hope, less negatively, we shall enquire into the nature of this nearness in the mind of Jesus himself.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Guy, *Last Things*, pp. 77f.; Addis, in *Oxford Studies*, p. 385; Lagrange, *Matthieu*, pp. 204f. (following Schanz, he also suggests 'La venue du Fils de l'homme commence à la résurrection et se termine avec la Parusie'); Robinson, *Coming*, pp. 91f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. esp. Mtt. 16, 28; 13, 41; 24, 30; 25, 31.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, chapter 7, pp. 104ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Bosch, *Heidenmission*, pp. 156f.; Streeter, *Four Gospels*, Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels*, *ad loc*; G. Barth, in *Überlieferung und Auslegung*, p. 94, n. 1; Manson, *Teaching*, pp. 221f. cf. above, p. 140.

<sup>5</sup> *Future*, p. 198; cf. also Bammel, in *S.T.* XV, 1962, pp. 8of.

<sup>6</sup> In *Überlieferung und Auslegung*, p. 94, n. 1.