

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

Walker Fund

JOURNAL

OF

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXVIII

Part I

1909

The Apocalyptic Chapter of the Synoptic Gospels

BENJ. W. BACON

THE thirteenth chapter of Mark with its parallels in Mt. 24 and Lk. 21 is the crucial factor for the dating of these writings, a vital question for the history of our faith.

Modern gospel criticism claims at least one great admitted result: the dependence of Matthew and Luke upon Mark. Most critics would add also the mutual independence of Matthew and Luke. Both of these having surely employed our Mark, study of their date from internal evidence resolves itself primarily into a study of the composition of this chapter of Mark. Moreover, in any case of divergence by Matthew or Luke from the Markan form the burden of proof will rest upon him who claims priority for the divergent form. *Coincident* divergence from Mark of these *ex hypothesi* independent evangelists, as soon as it passes the degree which can be accounted for by independent modification of the pattern for grammatical, stylistic, or doctrinal reasons, will stand as evidence for the priority of the Matthæo-Lukan form. The unknown source (X) in this case will be antecedent to all three. But what form must we attribute to it? If the divergence is a matter of small details, X will repre-

sent simply an earlier text of Mark than ours. One such common source of Matthew and Luke besides Mark is now generally recognized and designated Q, or the *Logia*. But we are speaking of variations not assignable to Q. It is, of course, possible that even our best text of Mark should here and there present the later reading. Here textual variation can easily account for so minute a difference as the plus of the single word *εὐθέως* in Mt. 24 29. *Εὐθέως* is a typical Markan word, and one which in the context of Mk. 13 24 would be peculiarly exposed to scribal cancellation at an early period, for the same reasons which led Luke at this point (Lk. 21 25) to forsake the Markan form and use widely divergent paraphrase. It is, therefore, very precarious reasoning to argue from this single word, wherein Matthew has not even the support of Luke, for the priority of the Matthæan form of the discourse as a whole. Or again, somewhat more extensive difference might be accounted for without surrender of the general principle of Matthæan and Lukan dependence, by the supposition of a common source employed by all three. But what sort of a common source? One may resort to an *Ur-Markus*, a Logia source (RQ), or a wholly unknown writing (X). Of this third type is the theory resorted to by a very large number of critics, perhaps a majority, to account for the plus of Matthew in 24 20, "Pray that your flight (Mk. "it") be not in winter, *nor on a Sabbath.*" This form, like the *εὐθέως* in v. 29, is supposed to be more archaic than the Markan, and the more archaic (?) tinge thus imparted to the Matthæan form of the apocalypse is made part of the argument to support the theory which has enjoyed a period of some forty years' popularity, of a separate "*Flugblatt*," or apocalyptic brochure, incorporated by Mark at this point of his gospel, and supposed to be independently accessible to Matthew, if not to Luke also. This theory has the advantage (?) of relieving Jesus of responsibility for certain utterances more characteristic of those who think that the kingdom comes with observation and cry, Lo, here; lo, there, than of him who declared its nature to be inward. It also appeals romantically to those

who would like to trace a connection with the "revelation" which according to Eusebius "was vouchsafed to approved men among the people of the church in Jerusalem before the war, commanding them to leave the city and to dwell in a certain town of Perea called Pella."¹ But why multiply hypotheses? We have already evidence in other parts of Mark sufficient to prove in the judgment of many critics, including the present writer, the systematic employment of the Q source, that collection of discourses common to Matthew and Luke sometimes identified with the Logia of Papias' Elder. Certain parts of this same chapter give exceptionally strong evidence of dependence upon Q. Surely it is reasonable to look to Q before calling into existence a new source to account for the divergencies of Matthew and Luke from Mark in discourse material. And besides Q we have the Pauline apocalypse of 2 Thess. 2 and Daniel as known sources of Mark before resorting to the unknown. Indeed, the *apokalyptisches Flugblatt* theory has never commended itself to the present writer as either called for by the phenomena of the text, or as probable in itself; at least in the usual form of its enunciation. So then, as possible modes of accounting for exceptional cases of apparent priority in the dependent gospels both textual variation and the theory of an ulterior common document must be admitted to consideration, though the burden of proof must rest on him who appeals to them as exceptions to the general rule.²

It is the object of the present paper to show two things: (1) That the occasion for the *apokalyptisches Flugblatt* theory is either slight or non-existent. (2) That the apoca-

¹ *HE*, III, v. 3.

² Paul Drews ("Untersuchungen zur Didache" in *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* V. 1904, p. 72 f.) presents a modified form of this *apokalyptisches Flugblatt* theory, finding evidence in $\Delta\delta$. xvi, of the use of a Jewish written form of eschatological teaching common to $\Delta\delta$. and Mark. Seeberg (*Die Didache des Judentums u. d. Ur-Christenheit*, 1908, c. 3) still further modifies this into an element of the current Jewish and Christian missionary "diatribe" or kerygma. The use of such an element of current kerygma would hardly be any longer distinguishable from dependence on the unwritten conventionalized and stereotyped forms of the current teachings of "judgment to come."

lyptic chapter of the Synoptists is in general structure a composition of our own canonical second Evangelist followed without the use of extraneous sources by Matthew and Luke, and as such affords the means of dating both this and the dependent gospels of Matthew and Luke with reasonable probability.

1. *In general structure the apocalypse of Mk. 13 is the composition of the evangelistic Redactor himself (RQ), in principal dependence on Q, the Pauline Epistles, and the Old Testament.*

Notoriously it is not the general habit of our second evangelist, whom for convenience we may designate "Mark," to compose such discourses of Jesus as appear in Q. The process of agglutination exemplified in Q is carried much further by Matthew than by Luke, though less skilfully. But Mark falls behind both. Nothing save systematic design can explain the extreme disproportion in this Gospel between narrative and discourse material. *Mark is a consistent Paulinist in presenting the person of Christ in preference to his precepts as the essential message of the gospel.*³ The question "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" he answers not by the Sermon on the Mount, but by the example of Jesus as He leads the twelve the way to martyrdom. Yet in two well-known and conspicuous instances, ch. 4 and ch. 13, even Mark has yielded to the growing disposition toward agglutination. The significant feature of both these agglutinations, a feature which at the same time completely explains the exception to Mark's usual practice, is their *eschatological* character. Both discourses, the parables of the Kingdom (ch. 4) and the apocalypse (ch. 13) are esoteric, the former addressed to the inner circle of Jesus' spiritual kin (§ 7-83) to the deliberate exclusion of "them that are without" (4 11-12), the latter to the

³ Let the reader simply subtract from Luke and Matthew what they have borrowed from Mark, and note the character of the remainder! He will have then some idea how broad the distinction was, which is attested in the primitive tradition quoted by Papias from "the Elder," between Mark as a gospel of "both sayings and doings," and mere *syntagmata* of the sayings.

still more exclusive circle of the four disciples first called (13 3-4).⁴

Manifestly a Pauline gospel of the *person* of Christ could not stop with the description of how Jesus "humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." It must by still greater necessity proclaim the triumph, the Coming of Jesus in His kingdom. And since within the lifetime of Jesus this could only appear in the form of prophecy, the one exception to Mark's rule of subordinating discourse is that he aims to make unmistakable Jesus' divine assurances of the Coming of the Son of Man in His kingdom, with power and great glory.

But perhaps it may be asked: In what way does the Markan group of Parables evince an eschatological aim? In answering this question we must distinguish between the intrinsic bearing of the parables themselves and the selection, order, and adaptation made by Mark. As Jesus uttered them, the parables would seem to be simple vindications of His preaching of the glad tidings of the kingdom to the publicans and sinners, the *'am ha-areq.* Signs from heaven are not given. True; but God, who makes the mustard plant grow from the tiny seed, can work His greatest work unseen. Tares are in God's field. True; but He is no impatient farmer to thrust in the sickle before the time. Much of His good seed is wasted in the sowing. True; nevertheless the crop is sure. Such is the original bearing of Jesus' teaching. The exordium of the parable of the Mustard Seed and the advancing complexity of the thought from this through that of the Patient Husbandman to that of the Sower, sug-

⁴ Matthew and Luke agree in eliminating this feature. We should not infer that their form is the more original from which Mark has diverged, but conversely. Just as both Matthew and Luke soften the esoteric representation of Mark in ch. 4, so here. When the "little apocalypse" appeared for the first time the need was felt by its author, as in the case of the apocalypses generally, of accounting for its being hitherto unknown (cf. Mk. 9 1). The need is met by the representation of 13 3-4. Of these four disciples three at least had already suffered martyrdom and the fourth (Andrew) was probably long since dead. In the case of Matthew and Luke the need is no longer felt. The apocalypse had already become part of the current tradition of the teaching. Matthew and Luke therefore drop this Markan trait.

gests that if they actually formed a group before Mark, it was in this order. But the purpose to which the evangelist Mark applies his selection of three parables is quite different. First and foremost, the preaching in parables is to him a proof of the Pauline doctrine of *the hardening of Israel*. This is that which Isaiah had spoken against them, "God gave unto them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see and ears that they should not hear." Jesus, he declares, spoke in riddles intelligible only to the inner circle of His spiritual kindred in order that to "those without" it might be fulfilled which was written by the prophet: "Speak unto *this people* that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand, lest haply they should turn again and be forgiven." The parables for Mark are a *prediction of the fate of unbelieving Israel*. Hence the setting after the Choosing of the Twelve⁵ and Denunciation of the Scribes, and the saying on Spiritual Kindred. Hence also Mark changes the order which originally placed the Mustard Seed first (cf. v. 30) and the Sower last (cf. vv. 10 and 13). Mark puts first the contrast between fruitful and unfruitful soils, because he applies the parable of the Sower to the hardening of Israel, as *Ep. Barn.* applies it, reverting to the direction to Jeremiah, "Sow not upon thorns (the Jews), break up the fallow ground (the Gentiles)." Next in order Mark puts the parable of the Tares—omitting all that related to unworthy adherents⁶ and retaining only the contrast between the time of waiting and the "sending forth of the sickle." Lastly he puts the Mustard Seed, giving it

⁵ Mark has the setting employed by Q for the Sermon on the Mount, viz., the Multitude, Choosing of the Twelve, Ascent into the Mountain, the last quite purposeless, for Jesus simply descends again. He expands this setting, however, by adding from Q the Denunciation of the Blasphemy of the Scribes and the saying on Spiritual Kin, and substitutes the *Parables for the Sermon*.

⁶ For Matthew the chief point. He even adds (13 30-33) a separate interpretation to make sure of his favorite application against the "workers of lawlessness" (cf. 5 19, 7 21-22, 24 11. 12). The special bearing against Paulinistic antinomians is due to redaction by "Matthew," but the authenticity of the warning against unworthy adherents is guaranteed by parallels such as Mt. 13 47-50, 22 11-14, Lk. 14 28-33. Mark's omission belongs to his Paulinistic *tendens*.

a Danielic touch at the close in the allusion to the nesting of the birds of heaven in its branches. The sayings which Mark interjects in 4 21-25, winding up with "He that hath (*i.e.*, the Christian community) to him shall be given; and he that hath not (*i.e.*, the Jewish) from him shall be taken away even that which he hath" are also applied eschatologically. They are taken to refer to the Coming of Christ to judgment. The fact that the eschatological sense is forced upon the material by the evangelist, as appears from his changes of wording from the Q form, makes it all the more strikingly characteristic of him. As arranged and applied by Mark, the three parables of the kingdom of God convey to Jesus' kindred after the spirit "the mystery of the kingdom of God," which is hid from his kindred after the flesh. The three contrasts of the fruitful *vs.* the unfruitful soil, the time of growth *vs.* the time of reaping, and the least becoming greatest, express it. To one who looked back after the catastrophe of 70 A.D., the conveyance to the Twelve of this "mystery of the kingdom" would be a strong corroboration of the general contention of the evangelist.

If now we turn to the Eschatological Chapter, distinctively so-called, and consider its general structure, this also will be found to reflect similar aims and interests on the part of this same Pauline, anti-Jewish evangelist (RQ).

To appreciate just the sense our evangelist intends, it is of some importance to note the setting and circumstances he describes. We observe first of all that the chapter concludes a period; in fact it is so placed as to mark the close of Jesus' public ministry. After it follows immediately the story of the betrayal and crucifixion. It forms for its own part the conclusion to the great series of debates in the temple in which Jesus puts to silence successively Pharisee, Sadducee, and Scribe, and after declaring the exaltation of the triumphant Christ by quoting Ps. 110, begins a denunciation of the scribes consisting of a brief extract from the Woes of the Q source. It is true that the touching incident of the Widow's Mite is interjected at this point, without

intelligible logical connection. Apparently it is introduced only *apropos* of the charge that the scribes devour "widows' houses." But the paragraph fails to appear in Matthew, which here follows Mark with extreme closeness, and may therefore be due to interpolation from Luke, with whose "special source" the incident has peculiar affinity. At all events, whether we regard 12 41-44 as textually original or not, the clear connection of the Eschatological Chapter is with the series of debates against the Jews, which begins with Jesus' entry into the temple and expulsion of the traders with the declaration "Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?" but ye have made it a den of robbers." It is "as he was going forth from the temple," so our evangelist reports, and as "his disciples said unto him, Master, behold what manner of stones and what manner of buildings!" that he gave utterance to the prediction on which all the Eschatological Discourse is hung. Jesus, we are told, as he turned his back upon that faithless generation, and took his final departure from their desecrated shrine, predicted its utter overthrow; not the mere burning of the superstructure of porticos and sanctuary, which were consumed against the orders of Titus in the final assault which ended the siege, but the *demolition* of the great "stones" — the massive masonry still visible as one "goes forth" at the gates, some of whose blocks now *in situ* measure 28 feet in length by five or six in height and thickness. This *demolition* was carried out by express order of Titus after the occupation of the fortress, and must have required no small expenditure of both time and labor.⁸

⁷ "For all the nations" is a Markan supplement from Jer. 7 11, Pauline as usual. The parallels have the original antithesis in its purity "a house of prayer," "a den of robbers."

⁸ Josephus, *War*, VII. 1. 1. Thus the Eschatological Chapter of the second half of the Gospel shows itself a pendent to the eschatological group of parables in the first half. When the opposition in Galilee has reached its culmination in 3 6 with the plotting of the Pharisees with the Herodians against Jesus' life, he withdraws, chooses out from the multitude his group of disciples and commits to them the "mystery of the kingdom." Now in Judæa, similarly rejected, he utters to the inner group the detailed prediction of the judgment.

The saying, Mk. 13 1, 2, on the demolition of the temple, I have said, forms the link on which our evangelist has suspended his whole apocalypse. No one will suspect Mark of here resorting to fiction. But have we any adequate reason to regard the saying as other than an adaptation and assimilation to the event of that saying on "destroying the temple" so well attested in Mk. 14 58, 15 29, and Joh. 2 19, and reëchoed throughout the epistolary literature of the New Testament? The object of that saying is not indeed to predict specifically the demolition effected by Titus, but to lift the mind religiously by contrasting the permanence of the "house not built with hands" with the impermanence of even the solid buildings of Herod. Mark himself has left traces in two other contexts of acquaintance with the saying in this form. The saying, "Destroy this temple [built with hands] and in three days I will build another [without hands]" is, in fact, one of the antitheses so characteristic of Jesus' principle of inwardness. The allusions imply that it once stood in the narrative Mark follows. A few Western authorities even add after Mk. 13 2 "and in three days another shall arise without hands," betraying at least the consciousness that the saying must have once stood at this point, if not giving evidence of its actual survival. If then we may regard the prediction of the demolition (not burning) of the temple in Mark 13 2, as simply the evangelist's accommodation and assimilation of this well-known saying to the event, the proceeding will be highly significant of the kind of adaptations we must expect in the discourse introduced by it.

The general structure of the "little apocalypse" appended by Mark to the saying on destroying and rebuilding the temple is the conventional threefold division of the apocalypses generally.⁹ Paragraph *a* beginning after the *mise en scène* in the question of the four intimates on the Mount of Olives of vv. 3-4, is self-designated "The Beginning of Travail." It includes vv. 5-8. Even advocates of the *apokalyptisches Flugblatt* theory admit that vv. 9-13,

⁹ See Drew, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

appended to this paragraph after the summary ἀρχὴ ὁδίων ταῦτα, must be regarded as the evangelist's supplement. They consist of two elements: (1) In vv. 9-11 a prediction of persecution and promise of the Holy Spirit as Paraclete or Advocate before *earthly* tribunals, substantially identical with the Q saying in Mt. 10 17-22. 34-36 = Lk. 12 11. 12. 51. 53 = Joh. 16 1-13.¹⁰ (2) In vv. 12, 13, a warning of discord in the family and promise of salvation for him who endures to the end, of O. T. origin. V. 12 is taken from Mic. 7 6; v. 13 is paralleled in 2 Esdr. 6 25.¹¹ R's hand is easily traceable in the first addition (vv. 9-11) in the adaptation of the saying by the words "ye shall stand before governors and kings" to the actual experience of Paul,¹² and in the addition in v. 10 of the warning that "the gospel must first be preached to all nations," another Pauline trait.¹³ The second addition (vv. 12, 13) is itself characteristic. In the social anarchy of his own time, specifically perhaps the persecutions and the delatores, R sees the day of Jerusalem's "visitation" as described by Micah: "The godly man is perished out of the earth, and there is none upright among men, they hunt every man his brother with a net. . . . The son dishonoreth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house." It is a kind of apocalyptic obverse to the Elijan turning of the hearts of fathers to children and children to fathers. V. 13 a re-

¹⁰ The Q parallels appear in these earlier apocalyptic sections of Matthew and Luke. The same sayings reappear *a second time* in the adaptation of the Markan apocalypse made by these later evangelists in chapters 24 and 21 of Matthew and Luke respectively. However, the Markan form is sometimes found in the Q context and conversely.

¹¹ While 2 Esdras is probably about a decade later than Mark, dependence on a Christian writing by this profoundly Jewish author is of course insupportable. The coincidences must be explained either by connection with a common root of conventional eschatology, or by later Christian interpolation. The fact that 2 Esdr. 6 25 reproduces Mk. 13 15 b *in the connection* of vv. 12, 13 a = 2 Esdr. 6 25 suggests Christian interpolation.

¹² Compare Acts 22-28 and the similar adjustment in Mk. 6 29, and contrast the Q form.

¹³ Rom. 11 25.

peats the prediction of persecution of v. 9, even employing the formula *διὰ τὸ ὄνομα μου*. Matthew gives it twice (Mt. 10 22 = 24 9), but we need hardly seek a special source for it. V. 13 b is equally undistinctive. Its ultimate source is doubtless Dan. 11 35, 40; 12 4. 9. 12. 13. But we find this general promise of salvation to those who "endure to the end" repeated in every apocalypse, whether Jewish or Christian. It is no more distinctive here than in James 1 12, or Rev. 13 10, or 2 Esdr. 6 25, but is a commonplace of every encouragement in time of persecution or suffering. In Mt. 10 22 we have it in a Q context, but in Markan form. In 24 13 it is repeated. In Lk. 21 19 conversely the context is Markan, but the form of the saying is independent, reminding us rather of Heb. 10 36. 39. The fact that Matthew has preferred the Markan form in both contexts (Mt. 10 21. 22 = 24 9-13) is all that stands in the way of our assigning it to Q. There is nothing in paragraph *a*, accordingly, outside vv. 5-9 a, which requires the assumption of an external source. If there is occasion in this first portion of the apocalyptic discourse of Mark for the *Flugblatt* theory, it must be found in vv. 5-9 a. These verses we reserve for later consideration.

b. In vv. 14-23 we have the second paragraph of the apocalypse, from which, however, it is customary to deduct vv. 21-23 as the evangelist's addition. The preceding verses (14-20) have been well described as containing the Culmination of Woes. Such is the rôle our evangelist probably intends for them, though he himself refers to the situation described simply as "that Tribulation" (v. 24). The technical terminology of apocalypse would probably describe it as the *תְּבִילֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ* or "Birthpangs of Messiah," a phrase probably familiar to Mark, since in v. 9 he employs its Greek equivalent *ἀρχὴ ὀδύνης*, "beginning of the birthpangs."¹⁴ The difference between this "great tribulation" and the convulsions of nature and of peoples in vv. 7-8 is that while

¹⁴ In Acts 2 24 there seems to be a confusion between *תְּבִילֵי* and *תְּבִילָה* in Ps. 18 8. The "birthpangs" (*תְּבִילֵי*) of Messiah are the "cords" (*חבלים*) of death.

those were general and world-wide, this is specific and local. It falls upon "those that are in Judæa." But even after deduction of vv. 21-23 there remains a recognizable admixture of material alien to the context and derivable from the sayings. The warning introduced in vv. 15-16 is found in Luke in the Q context (Lk. 17 31. 32). There, however, it is not so much a warning to swift and unimpeded flight, as a warning not to think of earthly goods, as did Lot's wife when the judgment fell upon the cities of the Plain. Here as a warning to instant escape it is visibly out of place and inappropriate, since not the unescapable judgment of God is in question, but merely the horrors of terrestrial war, which after all left time enough to descend from the housetop, or to return from the field for a garment. Moreover, the exclusion of vv. 15. 16 leaves the connection of v. 14 with vv. 17 ff. better than before. We may therefore probably eliminate vv. 15, 16 from consideration, as an addition from Q. Indeed, it is only vv. 14. 17-20 which are commonly reckoned to the *Flugblatt*. Vv. 21-23 are generally admitted to be the evangelist's supplement; for, as already noted, they simply repeat the warning of vv. 5. 6 against the *πλάνη*; and this, as we saw, is found twice in the dependent Gospels, once in the Q context (Mt. 24 26. 27 = Lk. 17 23-25), a second time in another (Mt. 24 23-25 = Lk. 17 20-22). Matthew characteristically interjects three verses (24 10-12) in his first employment of the saying, to give it specific bearing against the antinomian heresiarchs. Mark shows his idea of its application by appending vv. 22. 23, which accommodate the saying to a sense agreeable to 2 Thess. 2 9. Warning against the false miracles of Antichrist is one of the commonplaces of the Antichrist legend,¹⁵ and forms a stereotyped element of Pauline eschatology (2 Thess. 2 9 1 Tim. 4 1 2 Tim. 3 8; cf. Rev. 13 13-15). The fact that Mark applies the saying of Jesus against the observers of portents is not a reason for postulating an extraneous source. In paragraph *b* we have left, accordingly, as possible *Flugblatt* material only the warning to "those in Judæa" to flee to the mountains when

¹⁵ Cf. Rev. 13 12-14.

they see the Danielic "abomination of desolation," together with the description of the "great tribulation" in vv. 17-20. These we may take up later for a little closer scrutiny as regards their origin.

c. There remains the third and final paragraph of the alleged *Flugblatt*, vv. 24-27, a typical and characteristic description of the Parousia, or Coming of the Son of man, after the Danielic pattern. The "parable of the fig tree" which follows, with the saying on not knowing the day or hour and the exhortation to Watch, attached to a confused mixture of the parable of the Steward with that of the Talents, are too manifestly adaptations of sayings independently known from Q, to be classed as belonging to the *apokalyptisches Flugblatt*.

There remains accordingly, by general consent, a very compact, three-fold discourse, which, if anything in Mark, must represent the supposed "leaflet," literally a "leaflet"; for the three paragraphs of four, five, and four verses respectively (vv. 5-8; 14. 17-20; 24-27) could easily be written on the obverse and reverse of a single papyrus leaf of the usual size.

Let us take the most recent, and, as it seems to me, least improbable form of the *Flugblatt* theory,¹⁶ and assume that we have here not an entire independent publication (for the matter is too brief and too commonplace to warrant independent publication), but simply Mark's excerpt of the eschatological ending of some didactic writing like the apocalyptic eschatological chap. xvi. of the *Didaché*. On this assumption we have a right to demand that the composition shall show an individuality of its own, distinguishable from the Markan context, especially if it be, as many maintain, of Jewish and not of Christian origin. It would not have been composed if its author had not had something to say, something outside the stereotyped commonplaces of Jewish-Christian apocalypses in general, something more than *vaticinia ex eventu* reflecting eastern history in 44 to 74 A.D., something besides the salient ideas of Pauline apocalypse, something besides sayings

¹⁶ See note 2, p. 3.

of Jesus and O. T. "prophecies." No new authorship need be sought for such, for all these are simply the ordinary material Mark elsewhere depends on. If nothing remains after careful analysis save material of this sort, we shall not be justified in departing from the known into the domain of conjecture. We shall grant of course that Mark is here departing from his usual rule of not reporting discourse; but not to a greater extent than in the corresponding chapter of the Galilean half of his Gospel, and with an analogous purpose and dependence on similar materials.

It will be worth our while, before we attempt to determine the question of sources, to glance at the elements thus set aside as constituting the *Flugblatt* material. They are not too long to print in full:

α^{δδ} Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ · ὁ πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου λέγοντες ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. Ἵταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθε · δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὕτω τὸ τέλος ἵ ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεῖα ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοὶ · ἅρχῃ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

β¹⁴ Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδελύγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη. ἵ οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχοῦσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. ἵ προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται χειμῶνος · ἵ ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι θλίψις, οἷα οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἤν ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς ἕως τοῦ νῦν καὶ οὐ μὴ γένηται. ἵ καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ · ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας.

γ²⁴ Ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, ἵ καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται. ἵ καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης. ἵ καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς [αὐτοῦ] ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.

I have reprinted the verses from the text of Nestle's edition, just as it stands, using the same heavy-faced type for material taken from the LXX, that we may see at a glance just how much more is to be deducted from our small remainder of material of unknown derivation on the score of O. T. extracts. Nestle's margin gives Is. 19 2 and 2 Chr. 15 6 as sources of the extracts in vv. 7 8; Dan. 9 27

and 12 4. 10 as sources of the reference to "the abomination of desolation" in v. 14; Dan. 12 1 and Joel 2 2 for the phrases in v. 19; Is. 13 10 and 34 4 for the description of the sidereal catastrophes of vv. 24-25; Dan. 7 13 for the coming of the Son of man on clouds, and Zech. 2 6 with Dt. 30 4 for the gathering of the elect from the four world regions. These are not verbatim extracts, but any one who compares the references will see that they are quite sufficient to account for the predictions covered, when the freedom of Mark in using the O. T. in modifying or supplementing sayings of Jesus is considered.¹⁷

Space would not permit the reprinting of the parallel sections of Matthew and Luke, but a comparison of any of the synopticons of Wright, Huck, or Hennecke will show that the coincident Matthæo-Lukan variations are here at a minimum. The parallels each add a *γάρ* after *πολλοί* in v. 6 and *δεῖ* in v. 7, and a *μεγάλη* after *θλίψις* in v. 19. Both correct the Semiticism *ἤρξατο λέγειν* in v. 5, but in different ways. Both have *δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν* as in LXX (Is. 34 4) instead of *δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* in v. 25, and *καὶ δόξης πολλῆς* instead of *πολλῆς καὶ δόξης* in v. 26. The proportion of coincident Matthæo-Lukan variation is on the whole somewhat less than in other parts of Mark, and not less explicable than elsewhere without recourse to theories of separate literary relation direct or indirect between Matthew and Luke.

As regards the important clause beginning v. 24, *Ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*, both parallels have altered Mark. Luke introduces before it the captivity of Israel and period of Jerusalem's being trodden down of the Gentiles. Matthew also effects a transformation in which the famous added *εὐθέως* is only one feature. Granting that our text represents the original Mark, we must leave it to the judgment of others whether in reducing the two clauses, *ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην*, to the single clause *εὐθέως μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων* Matthew was merely making one of his common stylistic improvements, without

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. Mk. 4 12, 7 6, 7, 12 10, 11, etc. Mark is full of LXX words and phrases, although he does not make so many formal citations as Matthew.

intentional change of meaning, or whether he was purposely altering the sense in favor of an earlier date for the parousia. If the latter, was he moved by loyalty to some apocalyptic writing whose authority outweighed for him the authority of Mark, or does the *εὐθέως* simply reflect his own warmer anticipations and brighter apocalyptic hopes? Both may be true; but as long as we have a known direct dependence on Daniel by Matthew in addition to his indirect dependence through Mark, it is illogical to posit an unknown *apokalyptisches Flugblatt* until we have decided in what light Matthew would view Dan. 12 11-13. It is certainly not inconceivable that his correcter interpretation of the abomination of desolation as an inanimate object (*ἑστώς*) "standing in a holy place," should carry with it the *εὐθέως*, in consequence of this definite Danielic limitation of "the time of the end" to 1335 days after.

Turning to the purely internal evidence of the Markan apocalypse itself, what indications have we of derived material? The keynote of the composition as a whole is struck at once in paragraph *a* (vv. 5-8) called "The Beginning of Travail." It is this: *Μὴ θροεῖσθε*, "Be not agitated." The command and its application are taken verbatim from 2 Thess. 2 1-10. As in Thessalonica, so among Mark's readers many were "disturbed" seeing the wrath come upon the Jews "unto the uttermost," "as though the Coming of the Lord were immediately impending." The question of the four disciples, "When shall these things (the demolition of the temple) be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" is so framed as to leave no doubt of the writer's object.¹⁸ Apocalyptic enthusiasm, so sure to be kindled by the startling events of 63-70 A.D., is to be quieted and restrained by the reported prophecy of Jesus. The motive, the very words, of this central exhortation, as we have seen, are Pauline to the core. But the

¹⁸ "All these things" in v. 4 must not be interpreted as in the case of writers who avoid illogical prolepsis. In Mark it is constant. He has in mind already in v. 4 the phenomena about to be described in the ensuing discourse, and not merely the *κρῖμα* that is coming on the scribes (12 40) and the overthrow of the temple (13 2).

material basis is neither Pauline nor Mark's own. As already shown, it is a genuine Q saying repeated in more distinctive form at the end of paragraph *b* (vv. 21-23), and adapted by Matthew after his own peculiar fashion in 24 10-12. Here it is a warning against the false leaders called *γόητες* by Josephus, of whom the troublous times in 44-70 A.D. brought forth an ever-increasing, ever-wilder multitude. In Matthew it is a warning against antinomian *teachers* in the Church. No possible date assignable to the Gospel of Mark could fail to afford abundant occasion for making this immediate application of the sober teaching of Jesus and Paul. Hence vv. 7, 8 adduce nothing whatever beyond the application to be expected of a Pauline evangelist of 65-75 A.D. Jesus had spoken of the *πλάνη* (so at least Mark thinks) in saying, "Beware of those who say, Lo, here is the Christ, lo there." Paul had said, "Be not agitated, whether by saying (of the Lord), or by (apocalyptic) spirit, or by epistle as from us, as though the parousia were immediately impending." The *ἀποστασία* must first come. Mark adds as a confirmatory Scripture the passage Is. 19 2, with prefatory *γάρ*. The (Parthian?) wars and rumors of war, the uprisings of 66-70 A.D., the earthquakes at Laodicea and elsewhere, the famines (in the days of Claudius) he would have his readers understand are no more than general premonitory symptoms. The "agitators," the *γόητες*, will tell you, "This is 'the end.'"¹⁹ These are the tokens of the Coming." It is not so. "The end is not yet." These political, social, and subterranean convulsions are only the *ἀρχὴ ὀδύων*. The *γόητες* themselves are what should be expected among these premonitory symptoms, for the *πλάνη* and the *ἀποστασία* are surely to come according to Jesus and Paul. Therefore take heed not to be misled by them (*μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ*). The true signs of the end are the shaking not of earth but of heaven also.²⁰ This is the

¹⁹ Dan. 12 13.

²⁰ Heb. 12 28. 27. Cf. Rev. 12 7-12 and Lk. 10 18. 19. Spitta has shown, *Zur Gesch. u. Lit. d. Urchr.* III. 2 (1907), p. 187 f., that Satan's fall in fire from heaven is to be understood as a special peril to be resisted by the "authority" given to the disciples in v. 19.

proper feature of paragraph *c*. The true signs of the Coming are superterrestrial, because the war which precedes the Coming in triumph is a war in heaven, "not against flesh and blood, but against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places."²¹

The phrase ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων is doubtless a current phrase of apocalypse. But who will contend that a special document must be postulated to account for this? And what greater need is there for postulating a written source to account for the enumeration by a writer of *ca.* 70 A.D. of the physical, social, and political convulsions of the preceding forty years in O. T. phraseology as war, earthquake, and famine? Must Mark have a written source in order to tell his readers that these things are not the immediate precursors of "the end" as "agitators" declare? But apart from the Q sayings appended in vv. 9-13 to show that the period of evangelization and persecution throughout the world must first take place, paragraph *a* has nothing else to suggest a written source.

b. But surely, it will be answered, paragraph *b* is centred upon a distinctively novel and characteristic feature, derived neither from Jesus nor from Paul, the expectation of "the abomination of desolation" spoken of by Daniel the prophet "standing where he ought not."

If, then, this be something quite independent of the Pauline apocalypse which we have seen to dominate paragraph *a*, why have we the curious application of a masculine participle (ἐστῶς) to the predicted sign, when the Danielic original manifestly refers not to a person but to a thing? Matthew sees this plainly enough and conforms, after his wont, to the O. T. original, though he is careful to say "standing in a holy place," not "in *the* holy place" whose destruction had placed it forever beyond the reach of the dreaded profanation. This phenomenon in Mark of the change of gender cannot easily be explained without reference to 2 Thess. 2 3-10, and its reference to "the man of sin who exalteth himself against all that is called God, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." In Paul this is a pal-

²¹ Eph. 6 12.

pable application of Dan. 11 36-37. Mark too regards the "mystery of iniquity" as a personal being. Only "he" does not stand "in the temple of God," but indefinitely "where he ought not." The evidence of the use of this same Pauline chapter in the reference of paragraph *a* to the *πλάνη* of the last times and its warning, "*μὴ θροεῖσθε*," makes it doubly apparent that Mark is interpreting Danielic in the light of Pauline apocalypse. His pointed avoidance of the Pauline application to the temple is profoundly significant. The version of Matthew, with its stricter conformation to the O. T. letter, makes the motive more transparent. Mark wrote after the destruction of the temple had to all appearance made the prophecy of Paul forever impossible of fulfilment. By simply correlating Paul's doctrine of the Antichrist with Dan. 12 11, Mark now obtains a sense which to him, and to the reader whose penetration into this mystery of "scripture" he solicits, is completely satisfactory. The "abomination of desolation" spoken of by Daniel the prophet was not, as had so long been supposed, the idolatrous object erected in the holy place; *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω*. Let readers of the prophet take a deeper view.²² It refers to a personal being (*ἑστηκότα*), standing in the place which rightfully belongs to Another. This could be learned from Paul. However, the temple would not be, as both Daniel and Paul had assumed, the place of his manifestation. His coming would simply be "where he ought not."

Just what devastating personality Mark did refer to, human or superhuman, is not clear to the modern reader. Only two things are certain: (*a*) That the phenomenon concerns "those that are in Judæa", (*b*) that at the time of writing the temple was no longer available as the scene, whether of Paul's manifestation of the "man of sin," or of the Danielic "abomination of desolation." The substitution of "where he ought not" for *ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν* of Dan. 9 27 (LXX), and *εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* of 2 Thess. 2 4, shows that Mark is attempting to combine the two factors, the Danielic and the Pauline prediction, in the light of actual occurrences.

²² The exhortation also shows the influence of Daniel; cf. Dan. 12 10 b.

What then of his warning to "those that are in Judæa" to "flee to the mountains"? This is quite *ex post facto* as a matter of practical advice to a church which had already endured the catastrophe; but it is far from unavailing for the real purpose of Mark, which is (like that of Daniel and the apocalyptists generally) to give courage and confidence to obey his ultimate exhortation, in the light of predictions which appear to be already fulfilled. So far from having anything to do with the revelation which, as Eusebius reports, induced the church to flee to Pella, Mark has seemingly in mind flight to the dens and caves of southeastern Judæa, the immemorial resort of refugees from Jerusalem.²³ Pella lies below sea-level, on the slopes of the Jordan valley. The flight from Jerusalem (embellished, as we have seen, by a Q extract in vv. 15-16) and its hardships form the subject of the rest of paragraph *b*. The horrors of "Judæa" in 68-70 A.D. are reflected in it; but certainly the correspondence of these to what Mark read in Dan. 11 31-35 is reflected in it no less. To begin with v. 19, the very phraseology of his description of the "tribulation" of "them that are in Judæa" (he himself is elsewhere) is taken from Dan. 12 1. But take the LXX rendering of Dan. 11 31-35, the second of the two passages on the "abomination of desolations" and see if it is possible to conceive a Christian writer within the period to which Mark is assigned on any critical theory, who should *not* take into account this context in connection with the "tribulation" he was witnessing:

²³ καὶ σκέρατα ἐξ αὐτοῦ (the king of the north) ἀναστήσονται καὶ βεβηλώσουσι τὸ ἅγιον τῆς δυναστείας, καὶ μεταστήσουσι τὸν ἐνδελεχισμὸν, καὶ δώσουσι βδέλυγμα ἠφανισμένον, ²⁴ καὶ οἱ ἀνομούντες διαθήκη ἐπάξουσιν ἐν ὀλισθήμασι. καὶ λαὸς γινώσκοντες θεὸν αὐτοῦ κατισχύσουσι καὶ ποιήσουσι, ²⁵ καὶ οἱ συνετοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ συνήσουσιν εἰς πολλά, καὶ ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν βομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν φλογὶ καὶ ἐν αἰχμαλωσίᾳ καὶ ἐν διαρπαγῇ ἡμῶν. ²⁶ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀσθενῆσαι αὐτοὺς βοηθήσονται βοήθειαν μικράν, καὶ προστεθήσονται πρὸς αὐτοὺς πολλοὶ ἐν ὀλισθήμασι. ²⁷ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν συνιέντων ἀσθενήσουσι τοῦ πυρῶσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ τοῦ ἐκλείξασθαι καὶ τοῦ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἕως καιροῦ τέρας, ὅτι ἔτι εἰς καιρὸν.

²³ Cf. Heb. 11 37, referring to the hardships of the followers of the Maccabees.

To those who have observed the habit of our Mark to adapt *logia*, particularly *logia* known to us through Luke,²⁴ to his pragmatic purpose there will be nothing surprising in the suggestion that the woe of v. 17 upon child-bearing and nursing women "in those days," is nothing more than such an adaptation of the saying, "Weep not for me, ye daughters of Jerusalem, but weep for the things which are coming upon yourselves" (viz. in the destruction of Jerusalem) in Lk. 23 27-31. V. 18 reflects a sense of the fearful hardships undergone in the dens and caves of the wilderness of Judæa during the awful winter of 69-70 A.D. Matthew adds the explanatory ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν, and supplements with μηδὲ σαββάτω, which seems natural after the intercalated *logion* in vv. 15. 16, but is not Mark's meaning, and is the reverse of a trait of originality. That which would be specially hard to endure in winter (not "on a sabbath") is not the flight, but the period of homeless wandering. The reason given in v. 19 is the hardships of "those days," described, as already noted, in the language of Dan. 12 1. Only because of his introduction of the wrong subject (ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν) does Matthew's μηδὲ σαββάτω have room.

Lastly, Mark introduces in v. 20 the singular conception of the cutting short (*κολόβωσις*) of the days of Messiah's coming. This is doubtless related to the divisions of times in Daniel, the ultimate basis of all apocalyptic calculations of "the end"; but it belongs particularly, as I have shown elsewhere,²⁵ to the Enoch literature,²⁶ and is probably based on the Septuagint rendering of Ps. 102 23. The ultimate result, as in paragraph *a*, is that nothing whatever remains in vv. 14-23 for which there is the slightest occasion to seek a written source in an *apokalyptisches Flugblatt*.

But let us turn to paragraph *c*. This is a purely conventional description of the Coming, based on Is. 13 10; Dan. 7 13; Dt. 30 4; Zech. 2 6. If there is anything beyond these

²⁴ E.g. the parable of the Barren Fig Tree (Lk. 13 6-9) in the incident of the cursing of the fig tree in Mk. 11.

²⁵ *Zts. f. ntl. Wiss.* III. 4 (1902), pp. 280 ff.

²⁶ *Ep. of Barn.* 4 a.

stereotyped forms, it is the trait of the shaking of "the powers in the heavens,"²⁷ and the "gathering together of the elect," both of which are characteristically Pauline (1 Cor. 15 25-27; 1 Thess. 1 10; 3 13; 4 16; 2 Thess. 1 7; 2 1. etc.). The evangelist tells us (v. 24) that this universally expected and traditionally well defined and conventionalized event is to occur "in those days," and more closely defines his meaning by adding, "after that tribulation." Remembering that "that tribulation" is to his mind the one spoken of by Daniel the prophet, as introduced by the appearance of "the abomination of desolation," we should surely turn to "Daniel the prophet" if we wish to know his thought regarding its termination in "the end" which was still expected. Much has been said regarding the contrast of Matthew's *εὐθέως μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων* with Mark's *ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην*. We have endeavored above to point out how precarious is the endeavor to rest a case for the priority of Matthæan form on this single change of expression. It may be intended for nothing more than an improvement in style. But granting that the insertion of *εὐθέως* does imply in Matthew a different and more immediate expectation of the end than in Mark, what are we to infer from this? In general we may infer that even the later of the two writings—and present day criticism is almost unanimous in declaring this to be canonical Matthew—comes from a period not too long after "that tribulation" to enable the author (or compiler) to still express the hope that the coming will be "immediately" thereafter. But we must also ask more specifically, How is the extent of this "immediately" to be measured? There is but one mode of determination. We must judge by the basis on which the author rests his prediction. In Mark this basis is plain enough; he has his eye on the distresses in Palestine in 68-70 A.D. In Matthew it is not so plain. He has his eye, as elsewhere, primarily on O. T. scripture. We must go to "Daniel the prophet," if we would know precisely what he meant. Both evangel-

²⁷ See note 21.

ists are presenting what they understand to be the teaching of Jesus and of Paul regarding the "time of the end" spoken of by Daniel the prophet, and are interpreting it in the light of their own recent experience. Therefore it is not so much the difference of three or four years more or less in the delay already experienced between the "great tribulation" and the parousia, which will affect their mode of presenting "the promise of his coming." It will be rather a difference in their mode of interpreting the promise of blessing at the end of 1335 days "from the time that the abomination of desolation is set up," in Dan. 12 11-13. Until we know what Mark understood by his personal "abomination of desolation," and Matthew by his impersonal object of like designation, and how each counted the Danielic 1290 and 1335 days, we have no trustworthy explanation of the phrases employed by each regarding the nearness of "the end." A further word on this point may be admitted later.

It is superfluous to show that no written source other than the stereotyped features of O. T. prophecy already cited, the Q saying on the lightning-like suddenness and universal visibility of the Coming (Mt. 24 27 = Lk. 17 24), and the teachings of Paul, are required to account for Mark's description of the Coming of the Son of man with clouds and the "gathering together of the elect." Even more manifestly than in the case of paragraphs *a* and *b*, which have really something specific and distinctive, would it be absurd to postulate a further written basis for paragraph *c*.

If, then, we have, as would thus appear, not an incorporated document of unknown origin in the apocalyptic chapter of Mark, but the editorial adaptation of certain well-known Pauline and evangelic material, after the manner and with the motives elsewhere exemplified on the basis of O. T. scripture, the results for the dating of Mark, and consequently of the dependent Gospels of Matthew and Luke, will prove of immense significance and value. Let us pass, therefore, without further delay to our second proposition.

(2) *The compiler of canonical Mark, who has constructed his apocalyptic chapter from Pauline, evangelic, and Old Testament*

data, shapes his construction with reference to the occurrences of 66 to 70 A.D., and therefore writes not earlier than 70-71, nor later than about 75 A.D.

The most convincing evidence for this proposition is a simple comparison of the Q eschatological complexes with the Markan. The fundamental distinction is this: In the Q sayings there is never any forecasting of particular historical events, such as "the great tribulation to them that are in Judæa," the appearance of "the abomination of desolation," or the like; nor is there the slightest attempt to connect the coming Day of the Lord with the overthrow of Jerusalem or the temple. Jesus simply preaches repentance, lest a fate like that threatened against Nineveh, Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, overtake an unheeding generation. The interest is simply ethical, not apologetic. It is Mark who transforms Jesus into the miraculous forecaster of the future, and Luke and canonical Matthew who carry the transformation further. The entire construction and motive of the "little apocalypse," from its connection, by means of a saying specially accommodated to make it appear to have been uttered *apropos* of a prediction of the *demolition* of the temple, to its interweaving of Danielic and Pauline apocalypse with sayings of Jesus anent the superterrestrial and incalculable nature of the Day of the Son of man, are apologetic in interest, aiming to prove Jesus' foresight of accomplished fact. They point to the period immediately after 70 A.D. as the time of its origin. In particular the accommodation of the language of Paul and of Daniel in v. 14, so as to permit of application of the prediction in some other way than to the temple, confirms the date suggested by v. 2. Moreover, the urgent endeavor to quiet messianistic enthusiasm and to insist that "the end is not yet," that wars, famines, earthquakes, even "the great tribulation to them that are in Judæa" are only precursors, not immediate signs, of the Coming, leads only to the same results; for we have many indications in Josephus and some in the fragments of Hegesippus, that the period from 63 to 70 A.D. was one wherein "many were led astray"; some "even of the elect."

Mark makes the contrast as conspicuous as possible between earthly portents, which merely belong to the period of patient endurance of persecution while the gospel is being "preached to all the nations," and signs "*in the heavens.*" Still, that he may not be too discouraging, Mark adds, after this warning that "the end" will not be until "the powers that are in the heavens are shaken," the consoling parable of the Fig Tree, and the assurance that "this generation shall not pass away until all these things be accomplished." This and the urgent exhortation to hourly watchfulness prove that even if the Matthæan *εὐθέως* be rightly wanting in v. 24, the sense is not materially different. Mark, as well as Matthew, lives in momentary expectation of the end. Both endeavor to apply the Danielic forecast of "the end" to their own times, Mark with greater dependence on Paul, Matthew with closer relation to the O. T. Mark obeys and echoes the Pauline injunction, "Be not agitated," and insists that "first must the gospel be preached to all the Gentiles"; yet his own limit for "the end" is only a few years after the demolition of the temple. Matthew expects it "immediately" after "that tribulation"; but realizing how intent he is upon the letter of scripture rather than the specific occurrences of his own time, we may well question whether "that tribulation" means precisely the same to him that it does to Mark, and does not include also the *θλίψις* of vv. 9-13. Certainly Dan. 11 31-37 could not fail to suggest a period of persecution *after* the profanation of the sanctuary, accompanied by a manifestation of the mystery of iniquity in a holy place. It is possible that Matthew connects this passage with the persecution of Domitian and his blasphemous claims of worship. At all events the single word *εὐθέως* inserted by Matthew in the prediction of Mk. 13 24 is too small a basis for the supposition of an earlier date. Both Gospels must have come into circulation within a decade or so after 70 A.D. The closer dating of the two must depend on their respective interpretation of the Danielic figure of the "abomination of desolation" and the 1290 or 1335 days which should elapse between its setting up and "the end."