

THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TERM

PAROUSIA

by

J. CHARLES HAY

Thesis presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
of the University of Edinburgh in the Faculty of Divinity

August 10, 1962



Just at the time when the outline for this thesis had been determined and the work begun I had the disturbing privilege of reading the manuscript for chapter eight of James Barr's book 'The Semantics of Biblical Language' (1). In this chapter, entitled 'Some Principles of Kittel's Dictionary', Kittel is charged with pursuing a history of concepts by means of a dictionary of words. The pursuit of a history of concepts is of course recognised as quite valid, but not by means of the lexical method of the TWNT. This raised some questions in my own mind about the approach that I had adopted for this thesis. I had before me the article on 'parousia' by A. Oepke (2), which in some measure does merit the criticism made by James Barr (3). I also had before me the research of P. L. Schoonheim published under the title 'Een Semasiologisch Onderzoek Van Parousia' (4), which, as the title suggests, confines itself in large measure to a strictly linguistic analysis of the problem. It did not seem to me however that either quite answered the questions uppermost in my own mind: why did so many of the New Testament writers judge this term equal to the task of giving expression to the concept of the coming of Christ, and what is its relationship to that concept. With some hesitation I would suggest that Oepke failed in part because he was too much concerned with the larger concept of the coming of God to man, and Schoonheim because the task of

(1) Since published by the Oxford University Press, 1961.

(2) 'Theolisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament', Band V: Lieferung 14, pp. 856-869.

(3) Although not to the same extent as his article on ἀποκαλύπτω

exegesis was made subservient to his linguistic analysis. In saying this of course I do not want for a moment to depreciate the value of either of these works. The latter especially I found to be most helpful. But the problem of the relationship of the word to the concept still remained, and great care had to be taken that the method by which these questions might be answered did not fall prey to the criticisms offered by Barr.

That the word itself cannot be equated with the concept of the coming of Christ is indicated by the fact that it is used on several occasions in a completely non-eschatological sense. It is not therefore strictly speaking a technical term for the coming of Christ, and does not bear the full weight of that concept. In using the term the New Testament writers chose a word - not a concept (5). Yet it was a word chosen because of the particular way in which it had been used on previous occasions. Because of this particular usage in the past they thought it appropriate for the task assigned it in their expression of theological truth. Hence in my research I have taken account of its etymology, and I have examined as exhaustively as possible its uses in all available sources prior to and outside of the New Testament. I have also examined two terms with which it is associated in the New Testament: the term ἐκίφνεια and the background for the term ἡμέρα . The term ἐκίφνεια was of great

(4) Aalten, 1953.

(5) See James Barr, p. 210.

interest because it would appear at first sight to be more closely related to the concept of the coming of Christ than the term 'parousia', and yet the majority of the New Testament writers judged otherwise. This term therefore was examined in the hope that if the reason for their preference for 'parousia' could be found, some light would be thrown on my quest. The conceptual background in the Old Testament for the term ἡμέρα was examined not only because in the New Testament it is used in the same context as 'parousia', but because the concept of the coming of Christ in the New Testament is rooted in the Old Testament idea of the Day of the Lord (6). This examination made available all possible shades of meaning of the term in pre-New Testament usage. Against that background all the passages in the New Testament where the term appears - especially in an eschatological sense - were subjected to what I hope is proven to be a thorough exegesis. It was by means of the exegesis that I hoped to find the answers to the questions asked above. The results, at least with respect to this term, have left me outside either the Cremer or the Deissmann lexicographical traditions (7). With respect to the term 'parousia' I see no evidence of the 'language-moulding power of Christianity' - a phrase of Schleiermacher quoted by Cremer. Nor can I accept the

(6) I judged it valid to examine the conceptual background for this term in the O.T., because in a peculiar way it does embrace the O.T. concept of the Day of the Lord. Its use in this way cannot be explained etymologically.

(7) See James Barr, *ibid.*, p. 238 ff.

facile equations of Deissmann with respect to this term. And yet the results have convinced me that the reason for its use by the Biblical writers is found in prior secular usage; that it does bear a peculiar relationship to the concept of the coming of Christ; and that there is no semantic equivalent in English for this term which is capable of conveying that relationship. I trust that the following study will both support and explain these conclusions.

May I at this point be allowed to express my thanks to my advisors, Prof. James S. Stewart of New College, and Prof. Alan Barr.

(ii) Epiphaneia and Cognates in the Canonical Books of the LXX	23
(iii) Epiphaneia and Cognates in the non-Canonical Books of the LXX	72
(iv) Epiphaneia in the New Testament	74
(v) Perousia and Epiphaneia in Josephus	76
B. The Day of Jubilee	78
A. Note on the Day of the Messiah	86
I. Perousia in Matthew 24	88
1. The Attitude of Jesus to Signs	88
(A) Mark 8.11-12, Luke 11.16, 29-32, Matthew 12.38-42	94
(B) Luke 12.54-56, Matthew 16.1-4	96
(C) Luke 17.30, 31	101
(D) Mark 13.4, Matthew 24.3, Luke 21.7	104
II. The Character of the Signs at Mark 13	108

Table of Contents

Introduction	ii
Table of Contents	vi
<u>I.</u> Etymology	1
<u>II.</u> Parousia in the Secular References	7
<u>III.</u> The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	36
A. Non-eschatological	36
B. Eschatological (The Testaments XII Patriarchs)	38
<u>IV.</u> Cognate Terms	63
A. EPIPHANEIA	64
(i) Epiphaneia in the Secular Sources	64
(ii) Epiphaneia and Cognates in the Canonical Books of the LXX	69
(iii) Epiphaneia and Cognates in the non- Canonical Books of the LXX	72
(iv) Epiphaneia in the New Testament	74
(v) Parousia and Epiphaneia in Josephus	76
B. The Day of Yahweh	78
A Note on the Day of the Messiah	85
<u>V.</u> Parousia in Matthew 24	86
1. The Attitude of Jesus to Signs	94
(A) Mark 8.11-12, Luke 11.16,29-32 Matthew 12.38-42	94
(B) Luke 12.54-56, Matthew 16.1-4	99
(C) Luke 17.20,21	101
(D) Mark 13.4, Matthew 24.3, Luke 21.7	104
II. The Character of the Signs of Mark 13	108

(A) Mark 13.5-8: The False Emissaries of Christ, the Threats of Wars, and the Natural Disasters	108
(B) Mark 13.9-13: The Persecution of the Disciples and the Universal Mission	113
(C) Mark 13.14-20: The Abomination of Desolation and the Need for Sudden Flight	121
(D) Mark 13.21-23: False Christs and False Prophets	129
(E) Mark 13.24-27: Cosmic Disturbances and the Parousia	131
(F) Mark 13.28-29: The Parable of the Figtree	139
(G) Mark 13.30-32: The Time of the Parousia	140
111. The Primary Intent of the Discourse, as Evidenced by its Imperatives	147
IV. Additions to Matthew's Discourse from Q	156
(A) Matthew 24.26-28 = Luke 17.23-24,37: The Day of the Son of Man	156
(B) Matthew 24.37-41 = Luke 17.26-27, 34-35: The Days of Noah	160
(C) Matthew 24.42-44, Luke 12.39-40: The Watchful Householder	162
(D) Matthew 24.45-51 = Luke 12.42-46: The Faithful and Wise Servant	166
V. Additions to Matthew's Discourse from M	169
(A) Matthew 24.10-12 and 24.14b: The Persecution of the Disciples and the Universal Mission	169
(B) Matthew 24.29 and 24.30: The Parousia of the Son of Man	171
(C) Matthew 25.1-13: The Parable of the Ten Virgins	173

(D) Matthew 25.14-30 (Luke 19.12-27): The Parable of the Talents	178
(E) Matthew 25.31-46: The Parable of the Last Judgment	184
Conclusion	189
<u>VI.</u> Parousia in the Pauline Letters	195
(A) Parousia in the Thessalonian Epistles	195
1 Thessalonians 1.9-10	196
1 Thessalonians 2.19-20	199
1 Thessalonians 3.11-4.2	200
1 Thessalonians 4.13-18	202
1 Thessalonians 5.1-11	214
1 Thessalonians 5.23-24	218
11 Thessalonians	220
11 Thessalonians 2.1-12	225
The Eschatology of the Thessalonian Letters and Apocalyptic	235
(B) Parousia in 1 Corinthians 15	239
(C) The Non-eschatological references	248
<u>VII.</u> Parousia in the Non-Pauline Letters	252
(A) Parousia in the Epistle of James	252
(B) Parousia in 1 John	259
(C) Parousia in 11 Peter	266
Conclusion	276
Bibliography	285

It would seem that the study of the
 present of the world of the world. Yet
 it is with some doubt that I am. This condition can
 be avoided. One is the other champion director of the
 struggle of a great deal of knowledge. The
 other is the living world of the world. The philologist
 are quite prepared to accept the partial viewpoint arrived
 in the study of roots. For example, begins his
 work as Greek Etymology with such an analysis.

ETYMOLOGY

"The word is a science that has
 acquired, and is gradually acquiring, much of the
 reputation of that of Etymology."

Many labours have been bestowed upon this science since he
 wrote those words. Not to recall into the past, as writers
 have, must inevitably lead to some kind of compromise with
 uncertainty. It is the latter of these two sciences however
 that has given us greatest cause for hesitation. S. Elphinstone
 Albutt is an author of books on natural subjects, and there-
 fore perhaps should not be quoted as authority that his etymology
 his first work of concern. He has, however, written with an
 accuracy on the subject of Etymology.

"In scientific prose words should be used as
 carefully as symbols in mathematics: there are few
 true synonyms in nature literature, none perhaps;
 words have not only their own meanings, but carry
 upon them also many chances and likelihoods of new
 uses which blend inevitably in our sentences."

He concludes this theme later in the page with

- (1) G. Curtius, Principles of Greek Etymology, English
 Translation, J. S. Wilkins, Book 1, p. 1.
- (2) S. Elphinstone Albutt, Notes on the Composition of
 Scientific Papers, p. 2.

I. ETYMOLOGY

It would seem most logical to begin this study with the pursuit of the roots of the word now under consideration. Yet it is with some hesitation that I do so. This hesitation has two sources. One is the rather uncertain character of the findings of a great deal of etymological research, and the other is the living nature of most words. Most philologists are quite prepared to admit to the partial guesswork involved in the tracing of roots. Curtius, for example, begins his work on Greek Etymology with such an admission.

"One who takes in hand a science that has acquired, and deservedly acquired, such an ill repute as that of Etymology...." (1)

Many labours have been bestowed upon this science since he wrote those words, but to reach into the past, as philology does, must inevitably lead to some kind of compromise with uncertainty. It is the latter of these two reasons however that has given me greatest cause for hesitation. T. Clifford Allbutt is an author of books on medical subjects, and therefore perhaps should not be quoted on matters that lie outside his first area of concern. He has, however, written with discernment on the subject of Etymology.

"In scientific prose words should be used as carefully as symbols in mathematics; there are few true synonyms in nature literature, none perhaps; words have not only their stem meanings, but carry upon them also many changes and tinctures of past uses which blend inevitably in our sentences." (2)

He continues this theme later in the same work.

- - - - -

- (1) G. Curtius, 'Principles of Greek Etymology', English Translation, A. S. Wilkins, Book 1, p.1.
- (2) T. Clifford Allbutt, 'Notes On The Composition Of Scientific Papers', p.9.

"Although...from the origin of a word we may draw many a tint of thought and fancy, or throw various side-lights on meaning, yet meaning may be put out of scale, or lie under false reflections, if etymology be too much regarded. It is a common and a tiresome error to suppose that the meaning of a word is to be governed by its etymology. Even on its invention a word may be derived awkwardly or ineptly; but however apt in origin, words must grow or drift with the things they signify, and thus become endued with ever new and cumulative content. To hold us to the bald etymology of a word is the pedantry of a plain man, or of the half-educated man, who has not regarded the growth of a word." (3)

The theme of this thesis is of course a recognition of the truth of this extensive quotation. The danger however lies in the temptation to let the etymology of the word, once discovered and stated, pursue it wherever it may be found, and thus obscure the particular shade of meaning that belongs to the word in each use. Perhaps, if the temptation is known, it may more easily be resisted, and etymology may play its proper part.

Παρουσία is a feminine noun formed on the feminine singular participle παρουσία from the verb πάρειμι. It has three roots: the root verb εἶμι, the prefix πᾶρα and the formative suffix ἰα.

1. εἶμι

Curtius gives the following as the root of εἶμι :
 Rt. ἔε εἰ-μί (Aeol. ἐῖ-μι = ἔσμι). 3 sing. ἔσ-τί, εὖ-εσ-τώ (well-being), ἔσ-θ-λό-ς excellent, εἶ-ῶ-ς good.
 Skt. as-mi sum, as-ti est, s-at being, good, su- (prefix)= εὖ, sv-as-ti-s well-being. -Zd. ah-mi sum, ac-ti, anh-u lord, world". (4)

(3) *ibid.* p.84-85

(4) *ibid.* p.468-9

Wright states simply:

" εἶμι Dor. ἦμι, Lesb. ἐμμί =
Skr. ásmi, Indg. esmi..". (5)

Brugman writes:

" éś-mi, 'I am' 1st. pl, s-mēs : Skr. áś-mi
s-más, Armen. em Gr. εἶμι Lesb. ἐμμί ". (6)

Frisk, a much more recent researcher, has found no reason to change the above conclusions. Under the heading "root" he has written:

" εἶμι, εἶ....., ἐστί = ásmi, ási". (7)

While C. D. Buck, another contemporary investigator, has written in similar vein:

"Grk. εἶμι, Aeol. ἐμμί (esmi) 3 sg.
ἐστί Skt. as-, 1sg. asmi..". (8)

I am again indebted to Curtius for the meaning of this Sanskrit root.

"The Skt. as-u-s breath of life, asu-ra-s living, and âs, âs-ja-m mouth which is quite parallel to Lat. ōs make it almost certain that the physical meaning of this very ancient verbal substantivum was breathe, respire. According to Renan 'de l'Origine du langage' p. 129 (ed. 4 me) the Hebrew verb. subst. haja or hawa has the same fundamental meaning. The three main meanings are probably developed in the following order: breathe, live, be.The distinction of this root from the synonymous bhu Gr. φῦ ..a distinction traceable in many languages - suits this view. Rt. as denotes, like respiration, a uniform continuous existence: rt. bhu on the other hand denotes becoming. Hence the two rts. supplement each other, so that the former is used exclusively in the durative forms of the present stem, the second especially in the tenses which like the aor. and the perf. denote an incipient or completed process of becoming (ε-φῦ-ν, πἔ-φῦ-κα Lat. fu-i). (9)

-
- (5) Joseph Wright, 'Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language', p.39
 (6) K. Brugmann, 'Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages', Vol. 1V, p.52. English Translation R. S. Conway and W. H. D. Rouse,
 (7) Hjalmar Frisk, 'Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch' p.463
 (8) C. D. Buck, 'A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages'. Chicago, 1949. p.635
 (9) ibid. p.468

2. παρὰ

Etymologists are by no means as agreed on the root of παρὰ as they are on the root of εἰμί. Robertson has summed up the confusion in the following words:

"Delbrück does not find the etymology of παρὰ clear and thinks it probably is not to be connected with parā (Sanskrit) which means 'distant'. Brugmann connects it with the old word purā like Latin por-, Gothic faura, Anglo-Saxon fore (cf. German vor). Giles thinks the same root furnishes παρὸς (gen.), παρὰ (instr.), παρὰ (dat.), περί (loc.). He also sees a kinship in these to πέραν, πέρα, πρόσ." (10)

Curtius is in open disagreement with Delbrück:

"Skt. -parā like parēna, bears the plainest marks of being an instrumental, which we must always assume to be the case with παρὰ." (11)

Moulton and Howard agree with Brugmann.

"It answers to Skt. purā, 'before' in time and place." (12)

On the meaning of παρὰ however, there is general agreement.

"In meaning παρὰ and πρόσ do not differ essentially, save that παρὰ merely means 'beside', 'alongside' (cf. our 'parallel'), while πρόσ rather suggests 'facing one another', an additional idea of contrast. This oldest meaning explains all the later developments." (13)

Moulton and Howard give 'close to', 'beside', as the oldest Greek meaning. They write further that there are some fifty-three or fifty-four verbal compounds with παρὰ in the New Testament, with the simplest of these expressing the idea of 'beside', 'close to', while others express the thought of

(10) A. T. Robertson, 'A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research', Nashville, 1934, p. 612.

(11) Curtius, op.cit. Vol. 1, p. 334

(12) M. & H., op.cit. Vol. 11, p. 319, A Grammar of New Testament Greek

(13) A.T.R., op.cit. p. 613

motion, calling to mind the thought of παρά with the accusative. It is of interest to note that they state that the idea of 'intimacy', 'speaking to the heart' may also be suggested by this prefix, cf. παρακαλέω, παραμυθέομαι. This meaning is evident in the use of παρουσία by some of the classical writers (see below page 12 f.). (14)

Curtius gives 'beside', 'close to' as the elementary meaning of παρά. He writes:

"From the fundamental meaning 'by the side of', which if viewed in relation to motion gives the other meanings 'towards', 'beyond', 'past': the various signification of the particles here brought together, may be derived". (15)

3. suffix ία

Nouns with this suffix are for the most part abstract nouns. Moulton and Howard state that such nouns are formed in one of two ways: from adjectives in ιος (ἐλευθερία from ἐλευθέριος, σωτηρία from σωτήριος), or

"straight from nouns, or from adjectives in -ος without the intervention of an adjective in -ιος, e.g. σοφία, ἀγγελία.....",

or from compounds, e.g. φιλαδελφία (16)

Buck and Peterson state the matter somewhat confusedly:

"Abstracts in -ία do not always designate a quality or condition. Not infrequently they suggest action, being secondarily associated with a verb, e.g. φιλία 'friendliness': φίλος 'friend' became 'love' when connected with φιλέω similarly σωτηρία 'rescue', κατοργία 'villany', ἀγγελία 'message'." (17)

(14) M. & H. *ibid.* pp. 319, 320

(15) Curtius, *op.cit.* Vol. 1, p. 334

(16) M. & H. *op.cit.* Vol. 11, p. 338

(17) C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, 'A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives', p. 120

They continue with greater clarity:

"The conglutinate $-\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ (cf. $-\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ above) took part in the development of $-\iota\acute{\alpha}$ without showing any other distinctive peculiarities than that it was favoured particularly in compounds, which was due to its origin from nouns in $-\tau-$, $-\tau\eta\varsigma$, and $-\tau\omicron\varsigma$, which themselves were more often derived from compounds.....However, after Homer, derivatives in $-\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ from simple words were also common". (18)

Jannaris writes quite simply that nouns in $-\iota\acute{\alpha}$ may either place the emphasis on the action, especially if derived from verbs, or on the abstraction, (19) a suggestion that perhaps affords very little assistance, and Brugmann also admits that such nouns are 'often' abstracts. (20)

Subsequent investigation will show that all of the above statements made about nouns with this suffix are true of $\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$. There are occasions when in its use the emphasis lies on action, e.g. when it is used with the meaning 'arrival'. The meaning 'presence' which it often possesses represents a part-way house between a 'verbal substantive' indicating action and the complete abstraction involved in the meaning 'comfort' which on occasion would be a suitable translation.

(18) *ibid.* p. 120

(19) A. N. Jannaris, 'An Historical Greek Grammar, Chiefly of the Attic Dialect', 1897, pp.287,288

(20) Brugmann, *op.cit.* Vol.11, p. 473

The term 'parousia' is used in various senses in the New Testament. Some of the illustrations of its use are listed below. The term is used in the Gospels to denote the coming of the Son of Man, the return of the Greek apostles, through the prophetic writings, the words, inscriptions and notices, the monuments and inscriptions of the Fathers. Merely to list these quotations chronologically would be a tedious process, and therefore in the last part of this study they are grouped together in the several shades of meaning.

'PAROUSIA' IN THE SECULAR REFERENCES

For the most common meaning is that of 'presence', pointing back to the original sense of *παρουσία* 'presence', the this sense of the term leads to coincide with the pre-hellenistic and hellenistic literary writings.

Strabon, Geographia (1924)

ἡ παρουσία τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία

"The presence of the city is the presence of the people" (1)

Herodotus (1912)

ἡ παρουσία τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία

"But when the night, with the presence of good." (2)

Strabon, Geographia (1924)

ἡ παρουσία τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία

"I know it too, but when the hour shall arrive..." (3)

(1) Strabon, *Geographia*, Loeb Classical Library, Heinemann, English Translation Arthur S. Way.
(2) Herodotus, *Historiae*, the Greek text is taken from the Loeb Classical Library, the English Translation is by Lewis Campbell, Heinemann in English Verse.
Where suitable, the English translation for each of these quotations is taken from the English text of the Loeb Classical Library. Where the translation is not literal enough for the purpose of this thesis, another translation is found, or indicated, or my own is substituted.

II. SECULAR USE

The term παρουσία is by no means a common one in the non-Biblical sources. Some eighty-five illustrations of its use are listed below, and these exhaust all the resources available to me. They cover the period from Aeschylus, the oldest of the Greek dramatists, through the Hellenistic writings, the papyri, inscriptions and ostraka, to, although not including, the writings of the Fathers. Merely to list these quotations chronologically would be a tiresome process, and therefore in the interests of variety and clarity they are grouped to correspond to the several shades of meaning of the term.

By far the most common meaning is that of 'presence', pointing back to the original sense of παρά 'alongside', 'by'. This sense of the term tends to dominate both the pre-hellenistic and hellenistic literary writings.

Euripides, Hecuba 1005

τί δῆτα τέκνων τῶνδε δεῖ παρουσίας

"What needeth then the presence of my sons?" (1)

Hecuba 227

γίγνωσκε δ' ἀλήτην καὶ παρουσίαν κακῶν τῶν σῶν

"But know thy might, thine imminence of woes." (1)

Sophocles, Electra 1251,

ἔξοιδα, παῖ, ταῦτ' ἀλλ' ὅταν παρουσία φράζη

"I know it too, but when the hour shall strike..."(2)

- - - - -

- (1) Euripides, Hecuba, Loeb Classical Library, Heineman, English Translation Arthur S. Way.
- (2) Sophocles, Electra, The Greek text is taken from the Loeb Classical Library, the English Translation is by Lewis Campbell, 'Sophocles in English Verse'. Where suitable, the English translation for most of these quotations is taken from the English text of the Loeb Classical Library. Where the translation is not literal enough for the purpose of this thesis, another translation is found, as indicated, or my own is substituted.

Sophocles, Fragments, No. 459,

τῶν ἐγγύς ὄντων τὴν παρουσίαν

"their presence being near" (3)

Thucydides, History, VI. 86.3,

οἷδε δὲ οὐ στρατοπέδῳ, πόλει δὲ μείζονι τῆς
ἡμετέρας παρουσίας ἐποιοῦντες ὑμῶν, αἰεὶ
τε ἐπιβουλεύουσι

"whereas these Syracusans, in hostile proximity to you, not with a mere army in the field, but a city greater than our present force, are always plotting against you..." (4)

Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae, 1049,

τίς ἐρὸν οὐκ ἐπόψεται πάθος ἀμέγαρτον ἐπι
κακῶν παρουσία

"Who will not regard my suffering, wretched in the presence of mine enemies." (5)

Plato uses παρουσία, with but one exception, in its simplest meaning of 'presence'.

Plato, Gorgias, 497, E.,

τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς οὐχὶ ἀγαθῶν παρουσία ἀγαθοὺς
καλεῖς, ὅσπερ τοὺς καλοὺς οἷς ἂν κάλλος
παρῆ

"...do not call good people good owing to the presence of good things, as you call beautiful those in whom beauty is present." (6)

The Sophist 247 A,

ΖΕ. 'Ἄλλ' οὐ δικαιοσύνης ἔξει καὶ παρουσία
τοιαύτην αὐτῶν ἐκάστην, γίγνεσθαι, καὶ τῶν
ἐναντίων τὴν ἐναντίαν

"And do they not say that each soul becomes just by the possession and presence of justice, and the opposite by the presence of the opposite." (7)

-
- (3) Sophocles, Fragments, Ed. by A. C. Pearson, Vol. 11, p.114
 (4) Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, L.C.L., E.T. Charles Forster Smith.
 (5) Aristophanes, Thesmophoriazusae, L.C.L. E.T. B.B. Rogers.
 (6) Plato, L.C.L., V, p. 433, E.T. W.R.M. Lamb.
 (7) Plato, L.C.L., II, p. 374, E.T. H. N. Fowler.

Lysis 217 B,

τὸ μῆτε κακὸν ἄρα μῆτ' ἀγαθὸν φίλον γίγνεται
 τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ διὰ κακοῦ παρουσίαν

"Thus what is neither bad nor good becomes a friend of the good because of the presence of evil." (8)

Lysis 217 E,

'Ἄλλ' ὅταν δῆ, ὦ φίλε, τὸ γῆρας αὐταῖς ταῦτὸν
 τοῦτο χρῶμα ἐπαγάγη, τότε ἐγένοντο οἰόνπερ
 τὸ παρὸν, λευκοῦ παρουσίᾳ λευκαί

"But when, my dear boy, old age has cast that same colour upon them, they have then come to be of the same sort as that which is present - white through presence of white." (9)

It is of some relevance to note that within the immediate context of this last quotation there are eight compounds of παρεῖμι ; παρεῖη, παρούσης, παρόν, παρῆ, παρόν,

παρῆ, παρόντος, παρόντος,

all with the idea of 'presence'.

Lysis 218 C,

φαμέν γὰρ αὐτὸ, καὶ τὴν κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ
 κατὰ τὸ σῶμα καὶ πανταχοῦ, τὸ μῆτε κακὸν
 μῆτε ἀγαθὸν διὰ κακοῦ παρουσίαν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ
 φίλον εἶναι

"For we say that, in the soul and the body and everywhere, just that which is neither bad nor good, but has the presence of bad, is thereby friend of the good." (10)

There are six occasions when Aristotle finds use for παρουσία , three of which have the now familiar meaning 'presence'.

(8) & (9) Plato, L.C.L. p. 50 & P. 52 E.T. W.R.M. Lamb.

(10) Plato, L.C.L. Vol. V, p. 154 E. T. W. R. M. Lamb.

Aristotle, Physica, 2, 3, 195 a 14

Ἔτι δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐστίν· ὁ γὰρ παρὸν
αἴτιον τοῦ δε, τοῦτο καὶ ἀπὸν αἰτιώμεθα,
ἐνίοτε τοῦ ἐναντίου, οἷον τὴν ἀπουσίαν τοῦ κυβερνήτου τῆς τοῦ
πλοίου ἀνατροπῆς, ὅθ' ἦν ἡ παρουσία αἰτία τῆς
σωτηρίας

"Again, the same cause is often alleged for precisely opposite effects. For if its presence causes one thing, we lay the opposite to its account if it is absent. Thus if the pilot's presence would have brought the ship safe to harbour, we say that he caused its wreck by his absence." (11)

Meteorologica IV. 382 a, 33-35

ποιεῖ μὲν θερμῶ καὶ ψυχρῶ, τὸ δὲ πάθος ἢ
ἀπουσία ἢ παρουσία· θερμοῦ ἢ ψυχροῦ

"the two properties by which action takes place are heat and cold, and the qualitative effect is produced either by the absence or presence of heat or cold." (12)

Eudemian Ethics 1217 b. 5,

...τὸ ἀγαθὸν φ' ὑπάρχει τὸ τε πρῶτον εἶναι τῶν
ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τὸ αἰτίῳ τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦ
ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι

"..the Absolute Good is that which has the attributes of being the first of goods and of being by its presence the cause to the other goods of their being good." (13)

The final reference within this group in the pre-hellenistic is found in

Demosthenes, Against Aristocrates, 163

...καὶ πάντες οἱ τοῦ Κότυος παῖδες, τῶν δὲ
πραγμάτων κύριος, διὰ τὴν παρουσίαν, καὶ τὸ
δύναμιν ἔχειν ὁ Χαρίδημος ἐγγεγόνει

- (11) Aristotle, L.C.L., 1, Bk.11, Ch.111, 195 a 14.
(12) L.C.L., English Translation H.D.P. Lee. Note ἀπουσία
and παρουσία in juxtaposition here.
(13) L.C.L., Aristotle, The Athenian Constitution. The
Eudemian Ethics, on Virtues and Vices, English
Translation H. Rockham.

"...and all were the sons of Cotys, and Charidemus had got control of affairs, because he was on the spot and had a force at his back." (14)

There is also found in the classical Greek a number of references where the meaning is simply 'arrival'. Here the idea of 'motion towards', that is inherent in the use of παρά with the accusative, is very much in evidence. These two uses are of course very closely related, for the idea of arrival can very readily ease over into that of presence, and in many cases either word would be a suitable translation.

Sophocles, Ajax, 540

τί δῆτα μέλλει μὴ οὐ παρουσίαν ἔχειν

"Then why is his coming thus delayed?" (15)

Electra 1103-4

τίς οὖν ἂν ὑμῶν τοῖς ἔσω φράσειεν ἂν ἡμῶν
ποθεινῆν κοινόπουν παρουσίαν

"Would one of you announce to those within the auspicious advent of our company?" (16)

Euripides, Alcestis 629-30

οὐτ' ἤλθεσ εἰς τὸν δ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ κληθεὶς τάφον,
οὐτ' ἐν φίλοισι σὴν παρουσίαν νέμω

"Not bidden of me to her burial comest thou, nor count I thine the arrival of a friend." (17)

Alcestis 209

ἀλλ' εἶμι καὶ σὴν ἀγγελῶ παρουσίαν

"But I will go and make your presence known." (18)

- - - - -

(14) L.C.L. English Translation J. H. Vine.

(15) Sophocles, L.C.L. English Translation F. Storr, Liddel & Scott, sub voce παρουσία. παρουσίαν ἔχειν = παρῆναι

(16) *ibid.*

(17) L.C.L. English Translation Arthur S. Way. L.C.L. translates παρουσία by 'presence'. Either is possible, but the presence of ἤλθεσ persuaded me to take the liberty of changing it.

(18) L.C.L. English Translation Arthur S. Way. Either 'presence' or 'arrival' would be suitable here.

Thucydides, Bk.1, 128.5

Βυζάντιον γὰρ ἐλὼν τῆ προτέρᾳ παρουσίᾳ μετὰ
τὴν ἐκ Κύπρου ἀναχώρησιν

"For having taken Byzantium on the former visit
after the return from Cyprus..." (19)

Two quotations from Demosthenes emphasize this sense of
'arrival' or 'visit':

Demosthenes, Exordia, 1448.1

τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῆς τύχης ὀξεΐας ἔχει τὰς μεταβολὰς
καὶ κοινὰς ἀμφοτέροις τὰς παρουσίας

"For the dispensations of Fortune exhibit sharp
reversals and impartial visitations to both sides." (20)

Exordia, 1443.1

δεῖ δὲ πράξεώς τινος τὸν λέγοντα φανῆναι
σύμβουλον, δι' ἣν καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ' ἀγαθοῦ
τινος ὑμῖν ἔσται παρουσία

"And it is the duty of the speaker to show him-
self the advisor of some course of action through
which the gain of some real benefit shall after-
wards accrue to us." (21)

There is however yet another possible stratification of
meaning. In this classification the thought of physical pre-
sence is very obvious, yet something more is clearly implied.
The emphasis appears to be on the good that results from that
presence; good understood in terms of aid, or comfort, or per-
haps simply companionship. (22) In each case of course the
'presence' referred to is that of persons.

Aeschylus, Persae 169, 5 c. B.C.

Ὅμμα γὰρ δόμων νομίζω,
δεσπότου παρουσίαν

(19) L.C.L. Greek Text only.

(20) L.C.L. English Translation N.W. and N.T. DeWitt.

(21) *ibid.*

(22) cf. πάρεσιμι, 'to be present so as to help'. So Aeschylus,
Persians, L.C.L. E.T. H.W. Smyth: ὄδε τις πάρεσιν αὐτοῖς
ἀνδροπληθεῖα στρατοῦ "Hast then thine army such a multitude
of men?"

"For the light of the house I deem to be the presence of its lord." (23)

The analogy here indicates quite clearly that the presence of the king is of greater comfort than the presence of wealth.

Sophocles, Electra 948,5 c. B.C.

παρουσίαν μὲν οἶσθα καὶ^{σὺ} που
φιλῶν ὡς οὕτις ἐστίν

"From friends, thou knowest now as well as I,
we cannot look for succor." (24)

This of course is a fairly free translation, but nonetheless provides a clear indication of the meaning. (25)

Euripides, Alcestis 606, 5.c. B.C.

ἀνδρῶν^σ φεραίων εὐμενῆς παρουσία

"O kindly presence of Pheraeian men." (26)

Plato, Phaedo 100 D., 5 c B.C. λ

ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλο τι ποιεῖ αὐτὸ καλὸν^η ἢ ἐκείνου
τοῦ καλοῦ εἴτε παρουσία εἴτε κοινωνία ὅπη
δὴ καὶ ὅπως προσγενομένη

"...that nothing else makes it beautiful but the presence, or communion, (call it what you will) of absolute beauty, however it may have been gained." (27)

Here παρουσία is virtually equated with κοινωνία, and of course in the New Testament κοινωνία, involving as it does fellowship between Christian and Christian, and Christian with his Lord, becomes a great source of strength to those who share in it.

Aristotle, in the 'Ethica Nicomachea', seems to use παρουσία with this meaning exclusively.

(23) L.C.L. E.T. Herbert Weir Smith.

(24) L.C.L. E.T. E.T.F. Storr.

(25) R.C. Jebb, 'The Tragedies of Sophocles', has translated παρουσία by 'support'. cf. the N.T. use of παρά-κλητος and παρά-κλησις. Both παρέιμι and παρακαλέω lend themselves very readily to this natural transition from the concrete to the abstract.

(26) L.C.L. E.T. Arthur S. Way.

(27) L.C.L. E.T. Harold N. Fowler.

1X 5, 1167 a, 6, 4 c. B.C.

ἀλλ' ὅταν καὶ ἀπόντα ποθῆ καὶ τῆς
παρουσίας ἐπεθυμῆ (28)

"But whenever even absent one is anxious and longs for his presence."

1X 10-11, 1171 a 28,

καὶ ἡ παρουσία αὐτῆ τῶν φίλων ἡδεῖα
καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς δυστυχίαις -κίς

"Also the mere presence of friends is pleasant both in prosperity and adversity." (29)

The context to the above leaves no doubt whatever about the meaning of our word. Aristotle is trying to understand the nature of the help that friends by their presence afford. Immediately preceding the above quotation he writes:

"Sorrow is lightened by the sympathy of friends. Hence the question may be raised whether friends actually share the burden of grief, or whether, without this being the case, the pain is nevertheless diminished by the pleasure of their company and by the consciousness of their sympathy". (30)

1X 11, 1171 b 13,

ἡ δ' ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις τῶν φίλων παρουσία
τὴν τε διαγωγὴν ἡδεῖαν ἔχει καὶ τὴν
ἐννοιαν ὅτι ἡδονταὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ
ἀγαθοῖς

"In prosperity again the company of friends sweetens our hours of leisure, and also affords the pleasure of the consciousness of their pleasure in our welfare." (31)

And his logical conclusion:

-
- (28) παρουσία could mean either 'arrival' or 'presence' here, but ἀπόντα is perhaps best paralleled by 'presence'.
 (29) L.C.L. E.T. H. Rockham.
 (30) ibid.
 (31) L.C.L. E.T. H. Rockham.

LX 11, 1171 b 27,

ἡ παρουσία δὲ τῶν φίλων ἐν ἅπασιν αἰρετὴ φαίνεται

"The presence of friends therefore seems desirable on all occasions."

Certainly the references above are too few to lead to the conclusion that this has become a technical use of the word, but they do illustrate how easily the word itself could carry with it the idea of aid and comfort.

From the rather scanty material available, there is little sign of any significant change or development in the meaning of *parousia* in the literary koine. Four examples have been found where the idea of physical presence does full justice to the word.

Polybius, XXIII. 4, 1 c. B.C.

καὶ τῆς μὲν Φιλίππου καὶ Ῥωμαίων παρατριβῆς ἐπὶ πολὺ προβαινούσης ἐπίστασις ἐγενήθη κατὰ τὸ παρὸν διὰ τὴν τοῦ Δημητρίου παρουσίαν

"The friction between Philip and the senate was becoming very acute when for the present it was thus arrested by the presence in Rome of Demetrius." (32)

Diodorus Siculus has found good use for *parousia*:

X 3.2

τοσαύτη δ' ἦν ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ λόγοις πειθὴ καὶ χάρις, ὡς καὶ τῆς πόλεως σχεδὸν ὅλης ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπιστρεφούσης καθ' ἡμέραν ὡσπερὶ πρὸς τινος θεοῦ παρουσίαν

"And there was such persuasion and charm in his words that every day almost the entire city turned to him, as to a god present among men..." (33)

- - - - -

- (32) The Histories of Polybius, L.C.L. E.T. W.R. Paton. The context here illustrates the movement from arrival to presence.
- (33) L.C.L. Vol. 4 p. 54. In this context *parousia* has some affinity to ἐπιφάνεια. E.T. C. H. Oldfather.

1V. 24.1

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα διελθὼν τὸ Λεοντίνον πεδίον...
 πρὸς δὲ τοὺς τιμῶντας αὐτὸν, οἰκειῶς διατιθε-
 μενος ἀπέλιπε παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀθάνατα μνημεῖα
 τῆς ἑαυτοῦ παρουσίας

"After this Hercules, as he passed through the plain of Leontine,.....to show his affection for the man who honoured him he left behind him there imperishable memories of his presence." (34)

Plutarch, Camillus, XXXIV. 2 (1/11 c. A.D.)

καὶ πυρὰ πολλὰ καύσας διεσήμηνε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
 παρουσίαν

"and then by lighting many fires (he) made known his presence there." (35)

More examples were found of 'parousia' in the sense of 'arrival'.

Polybius has provided five examples:

111.41.1

τὰ μὲν οὖν κατὰ Κελτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἕως
 εἰς τὴν Ἀννιβου παρουσίαν ἐν τούτοις ἦν
 καὶ τοιαύτην εἰλήθει διέξοδον

"The condition and course of Celtic affairs from the outset up to the arrival of Hannibal were such as..."

111.41.8

ὁ δὲ Πόπλιος, διασαφὴ θέντος αὐτῷ παρεῖναι
 τοὺς ὑπεναντίους, τὰ μὲν ἀπιστῶν διὰ τὸ
 τάχος τῆς παρουσίας

"Publius, when the arrival of the enemy was reported to him, being partly incredulous owing to the rapidity of the advance..."

111.45.3

διασαφῆσοντες τῷ στρατηγῷ τὴν παρουσίαν τῶν
 πολέμιων

(34) L.C.L. E.T. C.H. Oldfather. cf. 1 Cor.11.24 εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν

(35) L.C.L. E.T. Bernadotte Ferren. The context here indicates that the meaning could be 'arrival'.

(Afterwards the Romans carried their pursuit close up to the Carthaginian camp, turned, and hastily rode off) "to report to the consul the arrival of the enemy".

XVII.1. 48.3,4

ἵνα μὴ δοκῆ τοῖς καιροῖς ἐφεδρεῦν ἀποκαρδοκεῖν
τὴν Ἀντιόχου παρουσίαν

"...that they might not think he was watching for his opportunity and looking forward to the arrival of Antiochus."

XXI.1. 10.14

οἱ δ' Ἀχαιοὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀνέφερον καὶ τῆς πρότερον
παρουσίας ἅμα τῆς Μάρκου τοῦ Φολουίου καὶ τῆς τότε
περὶ τὸν Καικίλιον

"The Achaeans attributed both the former visit of Marcus Fulvius and the present one of Caecilius..." (36)

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Bk. 1, 45.4 1 c B.C.

βοῦμαι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς Αἰνείου παρουσίας
εἰς Ἰταλίαν

"But also concerning the arrival of Aeneas in Italy, I wish..." (37)

Diodorus Siculus uses *parousia* on four occasions with the same significance as *ἐπιφάνεια*. (38)

1.29.2

καὶ τῆς θεοῦ δὲ παρουσίαν εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν,
γεγονυῖαν κατὰ τοῦτους τοὺς χρόνους παρα-
δεδοσθαι κατὰ λόγον.....ὁμολογεῖν δὲ καὶ
τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ὅτι βασιλευντος Ἐρεχθέως
καὶ τῶν καρπῶν διὰ τὴν ἀνομβρίαν προφανισ-
μένων ἢ τῆς Δήμητρος ἐγενέτο παρουσία πρὸς
αὐτοῦς καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ σίτου

"And the tradition that an event of the goddess into Attica also took place at that time is reasonable.....And the Athenians on their part agree that it was in the reign of Erechtheus, when a lack of rain had wiped out the crops, that Demeter came to them with the gift of grain."

- (36) L.C.L., Polybius, The Historian. E.T. W.R. Paton. Re.XVII. 48.3,4 cf. Rom. 8.19. ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαρδοκία, τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν οὐρῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται
- (37) L.C.L. E.T. Ernest Gary.
- (38) L.C.L., 'Diodorus of Sicily', E.T. C.H. Oldfather.

It is obvious that it is a manifestation of the goddess in terms of ἐπιφάνεια that is indicated by the above.

In 1V.3.2 there is another reference to

"...the god who reveals himself to human beings" and the phrase is ποιεῖσθαιἐπιφανείας.

This is followed five lines further on by

1V.3.3

τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας κατὰ συστήματα θυσιάζειν τῷ θεῷ
καὶ βακχεύειν καὶ καθόλου τὴν παρουσίαν ὑμνεῖν
τοῦ Διονύσου....

"...while the matrons, forming in groups, offer sacrifices to the gods and celebrate his mysteries and in general extol with hymns the presence of Dionysius."

The juxtaposition of these phrases indicate that 'parousia' is clearly being used here with the meaning of ἐπιφάνεια .

In the literary koine therefore the meaning of 'presence' or 'arrival' predominates, with the additional meaning of the manifestation of a god or goddess. There is no example to be found of 'parousia' carrying within it the idea of aid or comfort.

But the literary Hellenistic world had no monopoly on the use of 'parousia'. The inscriptions and the papyri have given clear indication that rich and poor alike (including, as we shall see, some who were trying to get richer and others who were trying just as hard to keep from getting poorer), rulers and military men and business men, and even nagging wives, have found a place for it in documents of many kinds.

Many of these do no more than illustrate further a meaning made familiar through classical and hellenistic references already studied.

Two letters of Mithridates the Great to Leonippus, offering rewards for the apprehension of Chaeremon of Nysa, 88/7 B.C.(39).

No. 73

νῦν τε τῆ[ν] ἐ[μῆ]ν παρουσίαν ἐπιγνοῦς τοὺς
[τε υἱ]οὺς Πυθόδω[ρ]ον καὶ Πυθίων[α] ἐξέθετο
καὶ αὐ[τὸς πῆ]φευγεν...

"...and now learning of my proximity has removed to a place of safety his sons Pythodorus and Pythion and has himself fled..."

No. 74

...νῦν τε τὴν ἐμὴν παρουσίαν πυθό[μενος] εἰς
τὸ τῆς Ἐφεσῖας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν καταπ[έφυγεν]

"...now, learning of my proximity, he has taken refuge in the temple of the Ephesian Artemis."

P.Lond. 904. 11.35 Edict of Vibius Maximus A.D. 104

This edict is concerned with a house to house census which required the presence of the inhabitants in their homes. Hence it is addressed to all those who are absent.

Φῆστω ἐπάρχω[ι] εἴλης, ὃν ἐπὶ το[ῦτῳ] ἔταξα,
οἱ καὶ τὰς [ὑ]πογραφὰς οἱ ἀποδ[εῖ-]ξαντες
ἀναγκ[αίαν α]ὐτῶν τὴν παρου[σίαν]

"Festus, praefectus alae, whom I have appointed for this purpose, from whom those who have shown their presence to be necessary..." (40)

P.Oxy.1. 118.32 3 c. A.D.

This is from a letter from Saras and Eudaemon to Diogenes containing instructions to have a boat sent for their conveyance, and making other requests.

οὐδὲν γὰρ ὄφελος ὑστερησάντων τῶν χρειωδῶν
τῆ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ

"It is no use if a person comes too late for what requires his presence." (41)

- - - - -

(39) C. Bradford Welles, 'Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period', Yale University Press, 1934.

(40) L.C.L. 'Select Papyri', A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar.

(41) B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, 'The Oxyrhynchus Papyri'.

P.Oxy.VI. 903.15 4 c. A.D.

Grenfell and Hunt have the following note about this document:

"This singular document is an elaborate indictment of a husband by his wife, who gives a circumstantial account of the former's violent or insulting behaviour, extending over a considerable period of time.....The present document, which is unaddressed, was presumably a kind of affidavit used in proceedings taken against the husband."

καὶ ὤμοσεν ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ
τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ

"And he swore in the presence of the bishops and of his own brothers" to the effect that he will no longer hide his keys from her, nor hinder or insult her.

Six interesting examples have been found of 'parousia' being used in business documents, with the meaning 'presence', but in an almost technical formula.

B.G.U. No. 1127, 18 B.C. Verkauf einer Goldgiesserei Alexandrien.

This document is concerned with the sale of a gold-foundry, for which apparently a down-payment has already been made. A change of ownership will not take place, however, until full payment will be made. Then the change will take place automatically:

μηὶ προσδενθῆντι τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας

"his presence is not needed". (42)

B.G.U. No. 1129, 13 B.C. Verkauf eines Ackers Alexandrien.

The object of this deed of sale is a field, sold by one Protarchus to a buyer called Trypho. When Trypho has paid the full price, then the field becomes his, according to the same

- - - - -

(42) 'Aegyptische Urkunden Aus Den Koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden', Vierte Band, Berlin, 1912.

formula:

...ους [μη] προσδενθέντι τῆς τοῦ Πρωταρχ(ου)
παρουσίας (43)

P.Tebt. 322 a 30 f. Division of Property on Account of a
Beer Shop. 46 A.D.

This will states that the three persons named shall not have any power over the property "either to sell it or to mortgage it or leave it to anyone else or otherwise dispose of it under any pretext.....

ἀλλὰ τοῦτους κυρίους εἶνε καθ' ὧν καὶ ἔχειν
αὐτοὺς τὴν ἐξουσίαν πωλεῖν καὶ ὑποτίθεσθαι
καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐξαλλοτριεῖν καὶ μισθοῖν τρώ-
πῳ ᾧ ἂν ἐρῶνται, μὴ προσδουμένων τῆς τοῦ
Ψύφως τοῦ καὶ Ἀρποκρατίωνος καὶ τῆς Τετου-
σίρεως τῆς καὶ Διονυσίας παρουσίας κατὰ μη-
δεμίαν παρεῦρεσι(ν)

"....but they (the heirs) shall have control over it, and shall have the power to sell and mortgage and alienate and lease it in any manner they may desire, not requiring the presence of Psuphis, also called Harpochration, and Tetosiris, also called Dionusia, under any pretext." (44)

And the same formula is used at the close of this will,

P.Tebt. 322 a 42 46 A.D.

where the wife of the author gives her consent to its terms, by which the heirs shall have full control over the property:

...μη προσδουμένων τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας

"..not requiring my presence."

P.Oxy. XI. 2134.26 A.D. 170. Registration of a Deed of Mortgage.

This document represents an application by a creditor for the registration of a loan made on the security of some land. This document reads:

- - - - -

(43) B.G.U. *ibid.*

(44) 'Michigan Papyri' Vol. V. Papyri from Tebtunis, Part 11, ed. by E. M. Husselman, Arthur E.R. Boak, & W.F. Edgerton.

" (and) whenever you please it is lawful for you to make your claim to the mortgage and to the said arurae through the property record office of the Hermopolite nome

μη προσδεηθῆντι παρουσίας [μο]υ μηδὲ
συνεπιγραφῆς

not requiring my presence or concurrence."

P.Oxy. 111.486.15 A.D. 131. Petition to the Epistrategus
and Praefect.

This papyrus concerns a dispute between one Dionysia and Serapion over the ownership of some land. These two were ordered to appear before the praefect at Alexandria to settle the matter. Dionysia put in an appearance but not Serapion. Dionysia, convinced that she could be more useful at home, petitioned for permission to return.

ἐπι]ει οὖν ὁ ἀντίδικος [ο]ὕδ᾽ νῦν παρέστιν
ἢ δὲ [κα-τασπορὰ ἐπείγει ἢ ἐπιμ[ε]λεια
τῶν ὀπὸ τοῦ ποτ[α]μοῦ παρασεσυρμένων
χρήδει μου τῆς παρουσίας]

"Since my opponent even now is absent and the time for sowing is imminent and the repair of what has been swept away by the river requires my presence."

In several other examples however it is used with the meaning 'arrival' or 'visit'.

P.Par. 26, B.C. 163-2. Petition from the Serapeum Twins.

This petition contains the complaints of two sisters, who were attendants in the Serapeum. This entitled them to an allowance of oil and bread. In B.C. 164-2 this allowance was withheld, and several petitions were sent to King Ptolemy Philometer and Queen Cleopatra on the occasions of their visits to Memphis. This is one such petition.

Διὸ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιμελητὰς ἐλέμπομεν τοὺς
ἐχόντευσσομένους καὶ ὑμῖν. καθ' ὅς ἐποεῖσθ' ἐν
Μέμφει παρουσίας, ἐνεφανίζομεν ὑπὲρ τούτων

"Wherefore we both sent repeatedly to the supervisors persons to petition on our behalf, and laid information on these matters before you, on the occasion of your visits to Memphis." (45)

SIG 2. 324.14 Before 50 B.C. Niceratus' Approach to Olbia.

οἰμενοῖς γὰρ τῆι ἑαυτοῦ παρουσίᾳ τοὺς ὄχλους
εὐφυλαντοτέ[ρ] - ο[υ]ς ἔσεσθαι, μετὰ τῶν
οἰκετῶν [κ]αὶ τῆς μαθηκοῦσης ἀκολου-θείας
παραγενόμενας αὐτόθι προεφύλασσε

"For expecting at his arrival the crowd would not be difficult to watch, coming near with the members of the household and the followers, he established a guard at the place." (46)

P.Flor. 332.5 2 c. A.D. From Eudaemonis to Apollonius.

This is a letter from a mother to her son. Apparently she is somewhat afraid while her son is absent.

Εὐδαιμονίς Ἀπολλωνίωι τῶι υἱῶι χαίρειν.
οὐ λανθάνει σε ὅτι δίμηνος σήμερον ἐσ-
τάλην(πρὸς) τὸν ἀτακτὸν Δισκῶν μὴ ἐκδεχ-
όμενον σοῦ παρουσίαν

"Eudaemonis to her son Apollonius greeting. You do not forget that two months ago to-day I went to see the intractable Discas as he would not await your arrival." (47)

P.Oxy. XLV. 1764.10 3 c. A.D. Incomplete Letter to Pindarus.

This letter expresses the impatience of the writer(s) with a calf-butcher, whose company they expect for the purpose of a valuation, but

ἔθετο σήμερον εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ
ἀξιολογώτατου καλπου(ρ)νίου

"which he postpones daily until the arrival of the most noble Calpurnius".

- (45) G. Milligan, 'Greek Papyri', p. 12.
(46) G. Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.
(47) 'Select Papyri', L.C.L., 1., No. 114. p.307. A.S.Hunt and C.C. Edgar.

P.Oxy.XIV.1668.25 3 c. A.D. Letter of Charmus to Sopratius.

Although the reference is obscure, it would seem that the recipient of this letter must have committed some offence that had made a temporary exile necessary. His presence however is now required to help settle some kind of wage dispute. He can apparently return with impunity since the praefect had granted an amnesty.

πολλὰ γὰρ Ἀννοῆ παρατρεῖβεται ἀναβάσει
καὶ τὴν ὑμῶν παρουσίαν ἐγδεχόμεθα, ἵνα
μὴ ἀλόγως ἀποστῶμεν

"For Annoe is much worn out with her journey, and we await your presence, that we might not withdraw without reason."

The following is included with some hesitation, since it is obviously a reflection of N.T. use, rather than a preparation for it. It does however unite in a very unique way ordinary secular usage and the special meaning that it has in the N.T. with reference to the coming of Christ. It is taken from Deissmann. It is a petition of the small proprietors of the village of Aphrodite in Egypt to the Dux of the Thebaid, and is dated 537-8 A.D. Twice they express their eagerness at his coming:

ἐκδέχομεν...οἶτον οἱ ἐξ Ἄδου παραδοκοῦντες
τὴν τότε τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ ἀενάου θεοῦ παρουσίαν

"..as they watch eagerly from Hades for the future parusia of Christ the everlasting God", and
καὶ εὐχῆς ἔργον ἡμῖν ἐστὶν νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας
ἀξιωθῆναι τῆς κεχαρισμένης ὑμῶν παρουσίας

"It is a subject of prayer with us night and day to be held worthy of your welcome parusia." (48)

(48) A. Deissmann, 'Light from the Ancient East', p. 377 (1910). He has taken it from Jean Maspero, 'Etudes sur les papyrus d'Aphrodite', Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archeologie orientale, T. VI, Le Caire, 1908. cf. Greek of Rom.8.19.

Only one example has been found in which 'parousia' might be used interchangeably with ἐπέφανεια .

SIG 111. 1169.34

This is an account of a cure effected by Asklepios. The subject of the cure is a woman afflicted by worms, Sostraka by name. She had been carried to the temple of Epidaurus in hope of help, but to no effect. After leaving the temple she met a man 'with a handsome countenance' who cut open her abdomen and removed some two baskets full of worms. Then follows

συνράψας δὲ τ[ᾶν γ]αστέρα καὶ ποιήσας ὑ[γιᾶ]
τᾶν γυναῖκα τᾶν τε παρουσίαν τᾶν αὐτο[υ]
π]αρενεφάνισε ὁ Ἄσκληπιός

"After he had stitched the abdomen and made the woman well again, Aesclepius signified his presence clearly."

There is however a large group of papyri in which 'parousia' is found where it is given a meaning quite different from anything we have yet found. We have seen many examples of its use with reference to the visit or arrival of travellers of many kinds. It is not surprising therefore when we find it used for the visit of people of state made to various parts of their country. But then visits of important people are not casual affairs. Preparations must be made, and preparations usually cost money, and money for this purpose usually comes out of the pockets of the people. Such preparation may only involve a state dinner and the most that might be required would be contributions of various kinds of food. On the other hand, if the visitor were important enough, and the visit long enough, then on occasion special taxes might be levied. It can be seen readily enough that in process of time the 'parousia' of an official was equated with the taxes and preparations necessary for such a visit. That such a growth in the meaning of the word, and that such a meaning was attached to it, can to some extent at least be seen from the following.

Sammelbuch 6724.5 257/6 B.C.

This is a letter from one Zoilos to a Zenon, seeking to ascertain whether or not a certain Apollonius is coming to visit him.

...εἰ παρ' ἡμῶν ἄγει τὴν ἑορτήν, ὅπως τὰ πρὸς
τὴν [παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ?] παραμενασώμεθα καὶ μὴ
ἐξαίθνης ἀπαράσκεινοι καταληφθῶμεν Ἐρρωσο
φ

"...if he is coming to take in the festival, so that we might prepare the things for his coming, and we shall not be suddenly found unprepared". (49)

- - - - -

(49) F. Bilabel, 'Sammelbuch Griechischen Urkunden aus Ägypten', Berlin und Leipzig.

Sammelbuch 6992.8 252 B.C.

On the recto of this papyrus is a letter to Zenon from Phantias. In it Phantias asks Zenon to prepare a billet for him, since he is presently feeling very tired. On the verso is the following:

[Ἔτους λ]δ, Παχῶνας κβ. φανίας Ζήνωνι [πε]ρι
τῆς παρουσίας τῆς αὐ[το]ῦ εἰς φιλαδέλφειαν

".....Phantias to Zenon, concerning his visit to Philadelphia".

BGU 1197.11-12 (Band 4) 4 B.C. Eingabe betreffs der Syntaxis.

καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ Λινῆ καὶ Κόμα κωμῶν [ι]γερούς
μὴ λαμβάνοντες τὰ ὑποκείμενα αὐτοῖς ἐντ[ρ]έχ-
οντες τὰ τῷ ἡγεμόνι Τυρρανίῳ ἀπεικορίσαντο,
ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ σου παρουσίαν πρὸς
καλ[ὸ]ν ποιο[ῦ]μεν

"And the priests from the villages of Lina and Coma, not being subject to them (but) turning to the governor Tyrranius have been excused, but we are preparing in time for your coming with regard to what is good."

In the papyri that follow there is an even more marked transition in the meaning of 'parousia'. These are for the most part accounts of various kinds. The information these accounts supply is limited, since they are too fragmentary to lend themselves to certain interpretation, or even translation.

"No class of Ptolemaic documents is more difficult to interpret than these private memoranda, full as they are of abbreviations and new words and expressions; and few of the following texts fail to supply a number of puzzles of which the solution can only be found in the discovery of new material." (50)

Nonetheless, the witness they do bear to this change in the meaning of 'parousia' is impressive enough.

- - - - -

(50) Tebtunis Papyri, Vol. 1. p. 472 f.

Sammelbuch 111. 6276.6 225/4 B.C. Official Disposition.

Ἡρακλ(ε)ίδης Κλείταρχωι χαίρειν Πρὸς τὴν
Δωσιθέου μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως παρουσίαν καλῶς
ποιήσεις ἀποστείλας χῆνας σιτευ[τά]ς ε

"In preparation for the visit of Dositheus (who is) with the king you will do well to send fatted geese."

P. Grenf. XLV. b 2 264 or 227 B.C.

This note is concerned with the preparations for the visit of Chrysippus, a διοικητής. Grenfell and Hunt suggest that it is quite likely that all such officials of the central administration had the right to make such demands on official visits.

Ἀ[π]εννε[ύς] Ἀσκληπιάδει χαίρειν [κα]θότι σ[ὺ]
ἐτοιμάκαμεν ἔ]γγραφας, ἐτοιμάκαμεν ἐπὶ τὴν παρ-
ουσίαν τὴν Χρυσίππου[τοῦ ἀρχισωματο] φυλακίος
καὶ διοικητοῦ λευκομετώπου δέκα, χῆνας ἡμέρους
π[έν]τε, ὄρνιθας πεντήκοντα

".....just as you have written, we have prepared for the visit of Chrysippus, the chief bodyguard, ten white birds(?), five geese daily, fifty hens." *same/*

P. Petr. 39 e 3 c. B.C.

α (στεφανου ια < ἡ
αλλου παρουσιας ? (β

This is a text of very uncertain interpretation. Mahaffy and Wilcken do not quite agree on its interpretation. Mahaffy (51), admitting readily to conjecture, guesses that it is a "list of taxes paid to orphans", and interprets *parousia* as referring to property. He comments further:

"We find *στέφανιον* used in Pap. 42 of the Louvre for gratification (in money), so that possibly *α/στεφανου* may mean a national present to the

(51) 'Flinders Petrie Papyri', ed. J.P. Mahaffy with the later assistance of J.G. Smyly. The quotation is from p. 130.

king on his accession, which, though voluntary in theory, was really collected by the tax-office. While the small gift to a private man might be called **στεφανιον**, the national gift would naturally be called **στεφανος** ".

Wilcken separates **αλλουπαρουσιας** which he claims is unintelligible and suggests instead **ἄλλου** (scil. **στεφάνου**) **παρουσίας**, and interprets

"for another Kranz, which was presented on the occasion of the visit of the King". (52)

Either way this papyrus seems to illustrate the very close association between the king's visit and the additional costs involved. (53)

B.G.U. 1495.2 (Band VI) 3c. B.C.

Under the title 'Expenditures on the occasion of an important visit' the following list of such things as 'a full-grown pig' and '600 loaves of bread':

Λιβ Ἐπειθ κα ἠτολεμαί[ου]
παρουσίας δέλφαξ τ φ πισος

P. Tebt. 1.182 Late 2 c. B.C.

An account of payments for various purposes, including 3000 for **φροφήτου παρουσί(ας)**

P. Tebt. 1. 116.57 2 c. B.C.

Σαρ(πίωνι) καὶ Ἡρω(νι) καὶ Πτο(λεραίωι)
υἰῶι μαχί(μοις) βα(σιλικοῦ) γρ(αρματέως)

"For Sarapion and Heres and Ptolemy, armed guards of the royal clerk at the visits of the king, of olive oil.....of travelling expenses..."

-
- (52) Ubrich Wilcken, 'Griechische Ostraka I, 1899 Leipzig and Berlin, Buch, pp. 274-76.
- (53) Deissmann, 'Light', p. 373, has compared this with 1 Thess. 2.19 and 2 Tim. 4.8. Certainly this is an interesting possibility, but the parallel might well be presented with a little less of the element of certainty, in view of the doubtful nature of the text.

W.O. 1481 Buch 11. 2 c. B.C. (Br. Mus. 25751)

refers to the expenses of the visit of the queen.

Ἔτους (// ἀνι ι ζ
 λόγος παρου(σείας) τῆ(ς) βασιλ(ίσσης)
 εἰς τράπεζα(ς) τῆ(ς) πολη (54)

P. Tebt. 1. 121. 95 112 B.C.

lists '2 of bread' with reference to the visit of Dioskourides.

(τάλαντον) α' Γ
 Διοσκουρίδου παρουσίας
 ἄρτων ζεύ(γη) ω,

B.G.U. 1233.5 Band VI. 2 c. B.C.

The title for this document is 'Official Account over the expenditure for the visit of a king'.

...νυρις ἐτο[ο]μάζεσθαι πρὸς τὴν
 τοῦ βασιλέως παρουσίαν γράμματα
 οὓς δεήσει[ἀ]π[ο] κατασταθῆναι χά(ρτας)

"...that there be prepared for the visit of the king accounts, papyrus rolls, which he shall need to be returned". (55)

As we have already noted, this repeated coupling of taxes and expenses with the visit of the dignitaries was common enough to lead virtually to the equation of 'parousia' with the actual expenses and lists of requirements. Hence παρουσία ποιεῖσθαι^{ρρ} became a technical term for the making of such lists.

Dittenberger, Inscriptiones Selectae, 1. 139. 10 146 B.C.

This document contains a complaint from the priests at Philae about the way in which the numberless officials

(54) U. Wilcken, 'Griechische Ostraka', Zweites Buch.

(55) This is taken from Band VI. 'Papyri Und Ostraca Der Ptolemäerzeit', W. Schubart und E. Kuhn.

(military commanders and overseers and governors and royal secretaries and chiefs of police etc. etc.) compel them to supply them with all necessary expenses for their travelling, so much so that not enough supplies are being left to make the proper sacrifices.

καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ ὑπηρεσία ἀναγκάζουσι ἡμᾶς
παρουσίας αὐτοῖς ποιεῖσθαι

"...and the remainder of the attendance force us to make up the travelling expenses for them.."

Dittenberger adds a note:

"A little more uncustomarily παρουσίαν ποιεῖσθαι is used, not with the same force as παρεῖναι, but so that it signifies 'to execute that which the παρουσία required' ". (56)

H. Van Herwerden agrees with him almost verbatim:

" παρουσίαν ποιεῖσθαι means to furnish all things for them which their presence demanded". (57)

Edwin Mayser, also with reference to this selection from Dittenberger, states that here 'parousia' is used in the sense of "furnishing that which the parusia costs". (58)

Perhaps the best and certainly the most complete illustration of the practice of levying taxes to pay for the visit of officials is seen in

P. Tebt. 1. 48. 14 B.C.113. Petition to the Komogrammateus.

Smyly has introduced this familiar papyrus thus:

"A petition addressed to Manches by the komarch and πρεσβύτεροι τῶν γεωργῶν of Kerkeosiris concerning an assault. These officials had undertaken to collect 1500 artabae of corn from the γεωργοὶ by a certain date, in addition to an extra levy of 80 artabae in connection with the approaching visit of

-
- (56) Dittenberger, 'Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae'.
 (57) H. Van Herwerden, 'Lexicon Graecum', sub voce παρουσία
 (58) E. Mayser, 'Grammatik Der Griechischen Papyri Aus Den Ptolemäerzeit'. p. 126.

the king (Soter 11). While engaged in collecting the corn at the village threshing-floor the petitioners were set upon by a number of persons, headed by one Lycus, and driven away. On the next day they bring the offenders before some official, but at this point the papyrus breaks off." (59)

...καὶ προσεδρευόντων διὰ τε νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας
μέχρι τοῦ τὸ προκείμενον ἐκπληρῶσαι καὶ τὴν ἐπι-
γεγραμμένην πρὸς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως παρουσίαν ἀγορὰν π..

"...and we have been working day and night to make up the aforesaid amount and also the 80 artabae of wheat for the supplies imposed in connection with the king's visit."

Deissmann has commented on this passage:

"Are not these Egyptian peasants, toiling day and night in expectation of the parusia of their saviour king, an admirable illustration of our Lord's words (Luke 18.17) about the elect who cry day and night to God, in expectation of the coming of the Son of Man". (60)

Some doubts may be permitted however about the happiness of the analogy. It is surely fairly evident that these 'Egyptian peasants' were none too pleased at the incessant toil demanded of them by the approaching royal visit.

A further illustration of the difficulties involved in raising the necessary impositions arising out of the visit of a king is seen in

Dittenberger, Syll. 1. 495. 84-89 3 c. B.C.

This is an inscription from Albia, which tells of the embarrassment facing the governors of the city when they discovered that the king had already encamped on the edge of the city and they were without the funds needed to provide

(59) 'Tebtunis Papyri', Vol.1, pp.154-5. Ed. by B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt, and J.G. Smyly, 1912.

(60) Deissmann, op.cit. p.374.

him with an appropriate welcome. However, the day was saved through the generosity of a wealthy citizen called Protogenes, who gave them 900 pieces of gold to make up their lack.

τοῦ τε βασιλέως Σαίταφάρνου παραγεν(ομεν) ορένου
εἰς τὸ πέραν ἐπὶ θεραπείαν, τῶν δὲ ἀρχόντων
συναγαγόντων ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν τε παρουσίαν ἐμ-
φανισάντων τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ διότι ἐν ταῖς
προσόδοις ἐστὶν οὐδέν, παρελθὼν Πρωτογένης
ἔδωκε χρυσοῦς ἑνακοσίους

"And the King Saitapharnes, having drawn near on the other side awaiting attendance, and the leaders when they had called together an assembly made known the arrival of the king, and since there was nothing in the public treasury, Protogenes when he had come forward gave 900 gold coins.."

P. Tebt. 1. 253 96 or 63 B.C.

This consists of three incomplete columns of an account.

The third column begins

ἔτους ιη Επειφ η παρουσί(ας) τῶν
παρὰ τοῦ συντακίου

The reference is to the arrival of the tax-collectors, together with an enumeration of the items involved; wine, bread, etc.

Ostrakon Louvre 9004.3 A.D.19

This is a very cryptic and incomplete ostraca which cannot be interpreted with certainty. Wilcken suggests (with some hesitation) that it may be a receipt about a contribution (ὑπὲρ τιμῆς (πυροῦ)) that was made in connection with the visit of Germanicus to Thebes. Part of the text reads ὑπὲρ τιμῆς (πυροῦ) τοῦ ἐν θη (σαυροῦ?) σ.....ε.....μ.ου εἰς παρ- ουσίαν Γερμανικοῦ 4 Καίσαρος ῥυπ(αράς) δραχμῖς)

- - - - - (61)

(61) This is taken from U. Wilcken and L. Mitteis, 'Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde', No. 413, p. 490. Erste Band.

And a text of apparently similar content and of equal uncertainty is

Ostrakon Brit. Mus. 16467 33 A.D.

entitled Ein Besuch des Flaccus in Theben, which seems to contain a reference to the provisions made from the storehouse for the visit of Flaccus

οὐ ἔλαβες ἀπὸ θησαυ-ροῦ εἰς
τὴν παρουσίαν Φλάκιος ἡγήμων (62)

That this habit of demanding from the local citizens the necessary prerequisites for such visits often lead to abuses may be seen from the following:

Sammelbuch 1. 3924 19 A.D.

There is no Greek available for this reference.

"Germanicus Caesar, son of Augustus, grandson of the god Augustus, proconsul says: in regard to my visit, already hearing that there has occurred (a public requisition of ships) and cattle and facilities for entertainment (ξενίας) and dwellings are being seized by force and the people amazed. I considered it necessary to make it clear that I do not want either a ship to be seized by anyone or an ass, except according to the order of Baibius my friend and secretary, nor lodgings to be compelled." (63)

It is clear however that the practice did continue for some time, and quite likely the abuses continued with it.

Sammelbuch 4425. 7.17 2 c. A.D.

παρουσίας Γεμέλλο[υ...] τ ()
(ἑκατοντάρχου), ὅτε εἰς
Μέμφιν ὑπηγα[γε

"For the visit of Gemellus, the Hecatontarch, when he went to Memphis."

(62) *ibid.* No. 414, p. 491.

(63) F. Preisigke *Sammelbuch 1.*

P. Ryl. 627.115 A.D. 317 or 324.

'Travel Accounts: Lists and Accounts for the Outward Journey' - a rough draft, containing a reference to the wine apparently required for the military.

[ὄμ]οί(ως) ἐπὶ τῆ παρούσῃ τῶν
 ὄφ(φικιαλίων) του ἡγεμ(ονος)
 κνίδ(ιον) [ὄμ]οί(ως) Ἡαννονίω (64)
 στρατιώτ(η) οἶν(ου)

Dittenberger Sylloge 11. 905.5 359 A.D.

This final document contains an order from J. Publius Ampelius asking that some officials be appointed to determine the amounts required to pay for the activities for which they were responsible. They will know what is required.

...ἔγνωτε μὲν καὶ ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ παρουσίᾳ τῆ
 πάντων γενομένης διατυπώσεως καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ
 τούτοις πραχθέντων ὑπομνημάτων

"..you know however already from the list made out in connection with the visit and all the notes made beside them."

We have already drawn attention to the readiness with which Deissmann sees the parallels between this latter meaning of 'parousia' and its use in the New Testament for the second coming of Christ, and the eager expectation of the church for that coming. We have also noted that the parallelism leaves a little to be desired, since the one 'parousia' is awaited rather grudgingly in the light of the costs imposed, and the other is awaited with joyful anticipation. It is plain however that any final judgments here must wait upon the examination of the passages in the New Testament.

- - - - -

(64) Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library. Vol. 1V, Documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine Periods.

There are two main classes of apocrypha: those which are included in the canon of the Old Testament, and those which are not. The former are the books of the Apocrypha, and the latter are the Pseudepigrapha. The Apocrypha are the books of the Old Testament which were not included in the canon of the New Testament. The Pseudepigrapha are the books which were not included in the canon of either the Old or the New Testament.

1. The Apocrypha

1.1. The Apocrypha

THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

The Apocrypha are the books of the Old Testament which were not included in the canon of the New Testament. They are the books of the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha. The Apocrypha are the books of the Old Testament which were not included in the canon of the New Testament. The Pseudepigrapha are the books which were not included in the canon of either the Old or the New Testament.

and there was a consensus throughout all the ages, for the canon was fixed long before the birth of Christ. (1)

2. The Pseudepigrapha

The second book of the Apocrypha is dated roughly about 150 B.C. In this section we are told that the book is an appeal from the king, the king's son, to the king's subjects, and of the king's son to the king's subjects. The book is the work of the king's son.

But the king's son is not the king's son, but the king's son's son. The king's son's son is the king's son's son's son. The king's son's son's son is the king's son's son's son's son.

1. H. H. Charles, 'The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament', Vol. 1, 1913, N.Y., by A. S. Mesley. Curiously enough, the word 'apocrypha' is used in the New Testament in a different sense from the sense in which it is used in the Apocrypha. In the New Testament, 'apocrypha' is used to mean 'hidden' or 'secret', and is used in the sense of 'hidden' or 'secret' in the New Testament. In the Apocrypha, 'apocrypha' is used to mean 'hidden' or 'secret', and is used in the sense of 'hidden' or 'secret' in the Apocrypha.

111. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

These two non-canonical sources afford almost no help in our attempt to understand the use of the term 'parousia' in the New Testament. Outside of the 'Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs' it is used only four times, and in each case in a completely non-eschatological sense.

A. Non-Eschatological.

Judith 10.18

R. H. Charles places this book in the last part of the second century B.C.. The immediate reference is to the reaction to the news that Judith was being brought into the camp to make her report to Holofernes.

καὶ ἐγένετο ^{πάσῃ} συνδρομὴ ἐν τῇ ἐπι~~τῇ~~ παρεμβολῇ,
 διεβοήθη γὰρ εἰς τὰ σιηνώματα ἡ παρουσία
 αὐτῆς

"And there was a concourse throughout all the camp, for her coming was noised among the tents" (1)

2 Maccabees 8.12

The second Book of the Maccabees is dated roughly about 130 B.C. In this section we are told that Ptolemy, in response to an appeal from Philip, has sent Nicanor to offset Judas' successes, and of the plans of the latter that eventually lead to the rout of Nicanor.

τῷ δὲ Ἰουδα προσέπεσεν περὶ τῆς τοῦ
 Νικάνου ἐφόδου καὶ μεταδόντος τοῖς συν
 αὐτῷ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ στρατοπέδου

(1) R.H. Charles, 'The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament', Vol. 1, 1913, E.T. by A.E. Cowley. Curiously enough, on five other occasions when the meaning 'presence' is required, it is the substantive πρόσωπον with a preposition that is used (10.12, 13, 15, 11.5, 16). Possibly 'parousia' is used in this instance because it is the idea of 'coming' that is stressed.

"Now when Judas was informed of Nicanor's inroad, and when he had told his followers about the arrival of the host..." (2)

2 Maccabees 15.21

This is another reference to Nicanor's expedition.
 συνιδῶν ὁ Μανναβαῖος τὴν τῶν πληθῶν παρουσίαν...

"...Maccabaeus, surveying the horde in front of him..." (3)

3 Maccabees 3.17

This book is probably to be dated near the end of the last century B.C., although this is a matter of some conjecture. The reference is contained in a letter from King Ptolemy IV Philopator (222-204 B.C.) to his generals and soldiers in Egypt, complaining about the insincerity of the welcome afforded him by the Jews.

οἷδὲ λόγῳ μὲν τὴν ἡμετέραν
 ἀποδεξάμενοι παρουσίαν

"seemingly they welcomed our presence..." (4)

There is one other possible reference in 'The Apocalypse of Baruch', XXX, 1, which R.H. Charles has translated:

"When the time of the Advent of the Messiah is fulfilled..." (5).

R. H. Charles insists that the Syriac word which he has translated 'Advent' is an ordinary rendering of παρουσία. This however is much too conjectural to be of any assistance in our quest.

There is a variant for Neh. 2.6 which substitutes the word

- (2) R. H. Charles, *ibid.* E.T. James Moffat.
- (3) R. H. Charles, *ibid.* E.T. James Moffat.
- (4) R. H. Charles, *ibid.* E.T. C.W. Emmet.
- (5) R. H. Charles, 'The Apocalypse of Baruch', tr. from the Syriac, London, 1896, p. 56.

παρουσία for πορεία . While this reference does not belong under the above heading, it is not of enough significance to merit one of its own, so we have slipped it in here. The variant reads:

Ἔως πότε ἔσται ἡ παρουσία σου,
καὶ πότε ἐπιστρέψεις

"..for how long shall thy journey be, and when wilt thou return?" (A.V.) (6)

As we have already noted, there is no help here that is not already available from the secular sources. There remains only the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Since it is used here in an eschatological context, we have devoted a whole section to this work.

B. Eschatological.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

'Parousia' makes its appearance twice in the Greek versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; in the Testament of Levi 8.15 and the Testament of Judah 22.2,

T.L. 8.15

Ἡ δὲ παρουσία αὐτοῦ ἀγαπητῆ ἔστιν ὡς
προφήτης ὑψίστου ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ
τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (1)

T.J. 22.2

ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ,
ἕως τῆς παρουσίας θεοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης (2)

Since the context in each case is eschatological in character, its use in the Testaments is of great importance for our study.

(6) The variant is found only in Codex Alexandrinus. Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus have πορεία .

(1) h, β - e, A ; c, e παρρησία = a corruption of παρουσία ?

(2) β - q add τοῦ before θεοῦ ' ' not found in A .

Just how important, however, is determined by the date we assign to this interesting work. If we accept it as a member in good standing of the Pseudepigrapha, then we may regard its use here as a preparation for its use in the New Testament; if we look upon it as a post-New Testament creation, then more than likely its use here is but a reflection of its use in the New Testament. The answer of course is determined by several factors.

1. Origin, Date, and Purpose.

The part played by R. H. Charles in the dating of the Testaments is familiar to all who are even casually acquainted with this work. In his 'The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', published in 1908, and in his English edition of the same year, he sought to prove that this book was written originally in Hebrew, by a Pharisee devoted to the Hasmonean line of priest-kings, somewhere between 109 and 106 B.C., and dedicated to the Hasmoneans. His claim of a Hebrew original rests on his analysis of the existing MSS. He tried to show that they represent two families of MSS., which he designated α and β . These two families in turn are derived from two Hebrew recensions of an original Hebrew text. (3). He finds support for this thesis from three directions:

- (i) from purported Hebraisms in the Greek text (4)
- (ii) from an examination of the late Hebrew Testament of Naphtali, and
- (iii) the Aramaic and Greek fragments of the Testament of Levi.

(3) The Greek Versions of the Test. Xll Patr. pp. xix-xxii, xxxii-xxxix.
 (4) *ibid.* xxiii-xxxii.

After a careful comparison of the Hebrew T. Naphtali and the Greek T.N. Charles is convinced that they are not related to each other, but he does suggest that the

"Hebrew text is based directly or indirectly on the primitive Hebrew text from which the Greek text was translated" (5).

A similar examination of the Aramaic and Greek fragments of Levi leads him to three conclusions:

(a) that the Aramaic is a translation and not an original work, but that it is not a translation of the Greek.

(b) the Greek is a translation and not an original work but it is not a translation of the Aramaic.

(c) neither is it derived from the Greek Testaments, but rather from a Semitic original, which was Hebrew rather than Aramaic, and which was

"part of a work which formed a common source both of the Testaments and of the Book of Jubilees" (6).

The exactness with which Charles dates the Testaments is due to his interpretation of T.L. 8.15.

"To one of the Maccabean high priests of this period prophetic gifts are assigned by our text (T.Lev.8.15), in conjunction with the functions of kingship and priesthood (8.14). Now, in all Jewish History, from Moses to the Christian era, the triple offices of prophet, priest, and king were ascribed only to one man, i.e. John Hyrcanus." (7)

When he combines this with what he takes to be a reference to the destruction of Samaria in T.Lev. 7.2, he is able to arrive at the limits of 109 and 105 B.C.

- - - - -

- (5) *ibid.* lxvii. Eng. Tr. 1908. Charles regards the antipathy to Joseph evident in the Hebrew T.N. as indicating that it is further removed from the original than the Greek text, since in the Greek Testaments Joseph is always regarded with favour. See below p. 42. n. 15.
- (6) *Test. XII Patr. Translation.* pp. lxxix-lxxx.
- (7) *ibid.* lii.

Charles' analysis of the Greek MSS. was not long left unchallenged. J. W. Hunkin repudiated the greater part of his claims at this point (8). Where Charles postulated two Greek translations of two Hebrew recensions of one original Hebrew text, Hunkin was able to demonstrate that behind the Greek versions there is but one original Greek text from which all others are derived. This of course leaves no room for the two Hebrew recensions, but does not necessarily eliminate the possibility of a Hebrew original. To this Hunkin was prepared to admit:

"There is a considerable amount of evidence in favour of the supposition that the Testaments were originally written in Hebrew." (9)

He is equally convinced however that

"...the Jewish original, whatever it was, cannot be recovered by the scissors and paste method which Dr. Charles recommends" (10).

Thus Dr. Charles' promotion of an original Hebrew text for the Testaments remained as a fairly universally accepted dictum of subsequent studies until the publication of M. De Jonge's 'Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs' (11). De Jonge accepted in the main Hunkin's analysis of the Greek MSS., including his rejection of the two Hebrew recensions, but went beyond him in rejecting Charles' claim of a Hebrew original. Where Charles argued from the existence of Hebraisms in the Greek text, De Jonge insisted that the composite nature of the Testaments "make it impossible to give a general theory

- - - - -

(8) J. W. Hunkin, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', J.T.S. XVI, 1915, pp.80-97.

(9) *ibid.* p. 96

(10) *ibid.* p. 96

(11) M. De Jonge, 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', Assen 1953.

concerning the original language of the book" (12). From his examination of the late Hebrew T.Naph. he agreed with Charles that "the present Heb. T.Naph. is clearly not the original from which the Greek Testament is derived. Nor is it possible to regard the Greek Testament as the source used by the author of the Hebrew Testament" (13), for the reason that "The two Testaments show very few literal agreements and each of them possesses much material which is not found in the other one" (14). He suggests further that the two go back to a common source. His analysis of the visions of the Greek T. Naph., chapters 5 and 6, and the Hebrew T. Naph., chapters 2-6, lead him to the conclusion that the Hebrew Testament of Naphtali is closer to the original than the Greek (15).

From his examination of the Aramaic and Greek fragments of a Testament of Levi De Jonge is led to agree with Charles that neither is a translation of the other, but that rather we must "assume the existence of a document from which the Greek as well as the Aramaic fragments have been derived" (16).

(12) *ibid.* p. 163 n. 5

(13) *ibid.* p.53

(14) *ibid.* p.53

(15) De Jonge's analysis of these two Testaments is given on pp. 54-60. He claims that vision 1 in T.N. 5 is unintelligible, and is given in a more complete and intelligible fashion in the Heb.T.N. 2-3. So also the respective accounts of vision 11 in T.N. 6 and the Heb.T.N. 4-6. In both visions in the Heb.T.N. the role assigned to Joseph is both consistent and unfavourable. He is regarded as the source of all the trouble and is seen to be the ultimate cause of Israel's downfall (Heb. T.N. 7.4-6). The role of Joseph in T.N. is however quite inexplicable. De Jonge suggests that this indicates "that the author of the Testaments wanted to avoid everything unfavourable in connection with Joseph". (*ibid.* P.56) This change in attitude to Joseph (in the Greek Test.Naph.) was the work of the Christian author of the Testaments, who, using other sources that praised Joseph, had to bring the T.Naph. into line at this point. Hence the enigmatic character of the reference to Joseph in the vision of the Greek Test. Naph. (*ibid.* p.57). See above p. 40 n.5.

(16) De Jonge, *ibid.* p.130

He disagrees with Charles however in insisting that this document was written not in Hebrew but in Aramaic (17), although he is prepared to admit that this Aramaic document may go back to a Hebrew original (18), but that it is unlikely that it is a direct translation of the same (19).

It will be seen from the above that De Jonge has arrived at two primary sources, one for the Greek T.Naph. and the late Hebrew Test. Naph., and one for the Aramaic and Greek fragments of the T.Levi. He calls these Original Naphtali and Original Levi (20), and is convinced that these two sources never did belong together.

"The great dissimilarity between the fragments of the Jewish Testament of Levi and the Hebr.T.Naphtali makes it unlikely that these ever belonged to one document before they became separated." (21)

He concluded therefore that

"it is very unlikely that Jewish Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs ever existed. Indeed, our Christian author seems to have been the first to bring a Testament of Naphtali and other relevant material together in order to write a Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs". (22)

De Jonge finds further support for this conclusion from an examination of the parallels with Patristic literature, and it is from this comparison also that he arrives at a date for the Testaments.

"The only conclusion which we are able to draw with reasonable certainty is that the Testaments, because they contain notions which seem to be generally accepted in the time of Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian, and are not found earlier, were

- - - - -
- (17) De Jonge, *ibid.* p. 130
 (18) " " p. 130
 (19) " " p. 131
 (20) " " p. 39 and 53
 (21) " " p. 57
 (22) De Jonge *ibid.* p. 57. See also p. 71 for a possible source of the haggadic material which makes up the bulk of the Testaments.

written about 200 A.D." (23)

It is of great interest to note that since the publication of De Jonge's thesis additional evidence has come to light, and that evidence gives support to it. The caves at Qumran have borne their collective testimony and that testimony is heavily slanted in favour of De. Jonge's conclusions. There have been found in Caves I and IV fragments of an Aramaic Testament of Levi. The text of these fragments is longer than the Greek text of the T. Levi, and is identical with the Aramaic fragments to which reference has already been made, which Charles suggested came from a Hebrew original, and which De Jonge claimed came from an Aramaic original. Moreover the Greek additions to the Testament of Levi (24), which Charles also claims came from an original Hebrew, have been found in Cave IV, and in Aramaic, with the second of these additions corresponding to the Geniza manuscript. (25)

In addition to the above, a Hebrew Testament of Naphtali has also come to light at Qumran, lending some further support to De Jonge's theory of an Original Naphtali from which the present Testament is derived. Thus there has been found confirmation of the existence of two separate Testaments of Naphtali and of Levi, on the basis of which, according to De Jonge, the Testaments were constructed. There has not been found, however, any trace "of the Hebrew or Aramaic archetype which some scholars have assumed to be the basis for our present Greek text" (26). While this is an argument from silence, it is still significant in the light of

(23) *ibid.* p. 125

(24) See R.H. Charles, 'The Greek Versions', pp. 247-253

(25) J.T. Milik, 'Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea', 1959. Translated by J. Strugnell. p. 34.

(26) *ibid.* p. 34.

what has been found (27). In the light of what has and has not been found therefore Milik writes:

"Accordingly, we would be willing to ascribe to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs an origin analogous to that of the Book of Enoch. A Jew or Jewish-Christian of the first or second century, using and adapting such Testaments as were already in circulation would have completed an analogous set of Testaments for all the Twelve Patriarchs. That these, as we have them, all came from one author can be seen from the repetition in each of the same literary form.... Other elements bear a Christian stamp, and since they cannot easily be considered as interpolations, they suggest a Christian rather than a Jewish origin for the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." (28)

11. The Contents

The contents of the Testaments may, in general, be grouped under two headings: the ethical and the eschatological. The former may include the narrative portions, which for the most part have no other purpose than to illustrate the ethical. The latter includes the reference to the future apostasy of the tribes, the promise of the Messiah from Levi and Judah, and the obviously Christological passages. (29)

There is little doubt that from the author's viewpoint the ethical teachings form the most important part of the book.

- - - - -

(27) cf. J.T. Milik in a review of De Jonge's book in R.B.LXII, 1955, p.298. "étant donné l'extrême richesse et variété de ceux-ci, l'origine préchrétienne et palestinienne de cet apocryphe semble de ce fait pratiquement exclue."

(28) J.T. Milik, 'Ten Years of Discovery..' pp.34-35.

See also Frank Moore Cross, 'The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies', London, 1958, p. 149 n.6. "...it seems increasingly clear, from provisional examination of the documents of Cave IV, that those views are correct which insist that the received editions of 1 Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs came from Jewish-Christian hands which supplemented and re-worked (rather than merely interpolated) Essene traditions".

(29) De Jonge, *ibid.* p. 83 f., has grouped these in a most helpful fashion.

There are many obvious parallels with both Jewish and New Testament teachings. (30) Charles, of course, looks upon the ethics here outlined as a real preparation for the New Testament emphases, and is quite convinced that both our Lord and St. Paul must have known these writings. (31) As might well be expected, De Jonge regards them as in the main stemming from the teachings of the New Testament.

Our concern, of course, is with the eschatological passages. Indeed, for the most part, we may limit ourselves still further to the specifically Messianic and Christological passages, although on occasion the promises of future apostasy may throw light on these two.

One of the very noteworthy features of the Testaments is the many references to the Messiah, or Messiahs, or salvation, that are to come from the tribes of Levi and of Judah. Only two of the Testaments omit any reference to this (32). R. H. Charles in spite of this has managed to excise all references to the Messiah who is to come from Judah. This he is constrained to do because of his insistence that the Testaments were written in praise of the Hasmonean line. Accordingly he views all references to the Messiah from Judah as first century additions.

- - - - -

(30) De Jonge, *ibid.* p. 119 suggests that it is difficult to make a clear distinction between haggadic and Christian material. A similar problem occurs in early Christian documents like the Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas, and even in the Epistle of James.

(31) Charles, *ibid.* English Text. pp. lxxviii- xcix. See also A.W. Argyle, 'The Influence of the Text. XII Patr. upon the N.T.', *The Expository Times* Vol. 63, pp. 256-258, and A. Plummer, 'The Relation of the Test. XII Patr. to the Books of the N.T.', *The Expositor*, 1908, 7th. Series, VI. pp. 481-91.

(32) T. Zebulun and T. Asher.

"For some thirty or forty years the hope of a Messiah from Judah was abandoned in favour of a Messiah from Levi. But with the breach of Hyrcanus with the Pharisees this hope was abandoned, and so we find that in the first century additions the hope of a Messiah from Judah reappears." (33)

His arguments for this wholesale excision however are based not on textual grounds but on those already pre-supposed, i.e. that since the Testaments were written in praise of the Hasmoneans therefore all references to a Messiah from Judah must be later additions. This kind of argument needs other support to break the circle, and Charles is unable to provide it.

Beasley-Murray, on the other hand, has argued that what we really find in the Testaments is the promise of not one but two Messiahs.

"...the Davidic Messiah to function as king in the Kingdom of God, the Levitical Messiah to act as priest" (34).

He finds support for this in the 'clear and unambiguous' reference of T.Reub. 6.5-12, together with the individual references to the Messiah from Judah in T.Jud.24.1, 17.5-6, 22.2-3, and the T.Dan 5.4-12. Additional testimony is found in T.Levi 2.11, T.Naph. 8.2-3, T.Sim. 7.1-2, T. Jud. 21.1-5, T. Naph. 5.1-8, 6, and the T. Jos. 19. Thus referring to T. Sim. 7.1-2 he writes:

"This last quotation seems to show without doubt that the salvation which God will introduce in the last days, presumably including both a redeeming act and the settled state of the Messianic kingdom, will be through the agency of two distinct persons, a High

- - - - -

(33) R.H. Charles, 'The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English', Oxford, 1913, II, p. 292 f.

(34) G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'The Two Messiahs in the Test. XII Patr.', J.T.S. XLVIII, 1947, pp. 1-12.

Priest from Levi and a King from Judah. There is no question of interpolation here nor can one person alone be in mind; the two Deliverers come from two tribes and have distinct functions to perform". (35)

Certainly there is both precedent and parallel for this idea of the two Messiahs. Some have seen at least a strong hint of it in Isaac's blessing of Levi and of Judah in the Book of Jubilees. (36) The Fragments of a Zadokite Work contain fairly explicit references, although the references are to a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel. There is however room for doubt as to whether it is one or two Messiahs who shall come. (37) Additional light is gained from the findings at Qumran. Thus 1 Q S ix.10-11 speaks of "...the coming of a Prophet and the anointed ones (meshihe) of Aaron and Israel", and 1 Q Sa ii.11-22, which contains the description of the eschatological banquet with its outline of the order of precedence, speaks of the priest who is head of the whole congregation of Israel, and of the Messiah of Israel. The priest is generally assumed to be the equivalent of the Messiah from Levi, since he takes precedence over the Messiah of Israel. (38)

- - - - -

(35) *ibid.* p.8

(36) R.H. Charles, 'The Book of Jubilees', tr. from the Ethiopic Text, London, 1902, xxxi.13 f.

(37) The 'Admonition', Z.xix.33-xx.1, the 'Laws', Z.xii.23-xiii.1. R.H. Charles, 'Eschatology', p.283, interprets these as references to the two sons of Mariamme and Herod i.e. Alexander and Aristobulus, and finds in this further support for his promotion of John Hyrcanus. H.H. Rowley, 'The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls', p.41 dismisses this idea as 'patently fantastic', and suggests instead "The community of the sect itself is described in the Manual of Discipline as 'a house of holiness for Israel...and a house of unity for Aaron. The sect itself therefore represents Israel and Aaron, and the title of the Messiah has reference to the character of the sect, and not to his personal descent. The Messiah who shall arise from Aaron and Israel is thus the Messiah who shall arise from the sect.."

(38) Karl Georg Kuhn, 'The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel', in 'The Scrolls and the N.T.', ed. by K. Stendahl, 1958, ch. IV. p.57, "The entire passage shows us with complete certainty the concept of the two Messiahs: (1) the Messiah of Aaron, the high priest and head of the entire congregation of Israel, and (2) the Messiah

There is further reference in the Damascus Document, which on three occasions speaks of the Messiah of Aaron and of Israel (12.23, 14.19, 19.10) and in 20.1 speaks of the future appearance of the Messiah of Aaron and from Israel. (39) F. F. Bruce has drawn together three passages from the 4 Q Testimonia in which he finds expectation of a coming prophet, a coming king, and a coming priest. (40) The prophet is the one of whom Moses spoke in Deut. 18.18, the promise of a king is based on Num. 24.15-17 (41) and the promise of a priest is based on Deut. 33.8-11. Bruce thinks that it is very likely that the king thus expected is to be equated with the Messiah of Israel, and of course the priest is the Messiah of Levi. (42)

The evidence then from the Qumran caves seems to strengthen the claim of those who insist that the Testaments hold forth the promise of two Messiahs, and thereby betray their Essene origins. That there are parallels here with the Qumran literature is of course not to be denied, but it has not yet been proven beyond reasonable doubt that the Testaments themselves look specifically for two Messiahs. Indeed, in order to arrive at his conclusion, Beasley-Murray has to reject some significant passages as

- - - - -

(38) cont'd. - of Israel, the political leader, subordinate and second in rank to the former". And on p. 58, "...it is even now more obvious that the Test. XII Patr. belong to the cycle of the Essene writings."

(39) Kuhn, *ibid.* pp. 58, 59.

(40) F.F. Bruce, 'Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts', London, 1960, pp. 47-55.

(41) cf. T. Levi 18.3.

(42) Kuhn, *ibid.* p. 63, with specific reference to 1 Q § ix.11, writes of "...the three different heroes of redemption, who were to stand side by side in the Eschaton: (1) the new prophetic lawgiver, (2) the 'Messiah of Aaron', the new high priest out of the tribe of Levi, and (3) the 'Messiah of Israel', the new king out of the tribe of Judah".

non-Messianic: e.g., T. Dan 5.9-11.

"And there shall arise unto you from the tribe
of Levi and of Judah the salvation of the Lord;
And he shall make war against Beliar,
And execute an everlasting vengeance on our enemies." (43)

Beasley-Murray claims that the activities that are described in verses 10 and 11 are performed not by the Messiah but by God. Thus if verse 9 is joined to verses 10-13 then the subject of verse 9, i.e. the Lord, remains the same throughout. Therefore 10a remains in virtual isolation, and leaves us with the promise of, presumably, two Messiahs. But this is surely very doubtful exegesis. In verse 9 the subject is in the verb, but in verse 10 the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is emphatic, and has every appearance of referring to the salvation that comes from Levi and Judah, or at least to the one who brings salvation from Levi and Judah. Moreover, if Beasley-Murray is correct, then one would expect a reflexive pronoun in place of the substantive 'lord' in verse 11.

T. Levi 18.10-12

"And he shall open the gates of paradise,
And shall remove the threatening sword against Adam.
And he shall give to the saints to eat from the
tree of life,
And the spirit of holiness shall be on them.
And Beliar shall be bound by him,
And he shall give power to his children to tread
upon the evil spirits."

This passage of course is commonly taken as a description of

- - - - -

(43) Charles, 'Greek Versions of the Test. XII Patr.', p. 138, n. 85. "I have bracketed $\text{Iou\delta\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota}$ as an interpolation, for if it were original we should have $\text{\varphi\upsilon\lambda\omega\upsilon\upsilon}$ and not $\text{\varphi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma}$." However, Beasley-Murray has pointed out, quite rightly, that there is precedent for this apparent grammatical faux pas, e.g. T. Naph. 8.2, where the text reads "Do ye therefore charge your children that they be united to Levi and to Judah; for through Judah shall salvation arise unto Israel, and in him shall Jacob be blessed", but Charles has changed this to 'through them' and 'in them'. cf. also John 1.35. Moreover in v. 7 reference has already been made to Levi and to Judah. See here Beasley-Murray, *ibid.* p. 5.

Messianic activity, but Beasley-Murray claims that the subject of v. 13, i.e. the Lord, is also the subject of verses 10-12. Therefore "the whole passage declares the works of God". (44) But again a reading of the whole of chapter 18 can only lead to the obvious conclusion that the subject of the chapter is the 'new priest' whom the Lord is to raise up, and he it is who will perform all the deeds listed in this chapter.

Moreover, in two of the passages which Beasley-Murray has chosen to provide support for this suggestion of the two Messiahs, it is very clear that the 'Lord' is the subject in each case:

T. Levi 2.11.

"And by thee and Judah shall the Lord appear among men,
Saving men of every race".

T. Naph. 8.2,3.

"Do ye also therefore charge your children that they
be united to Levi and to Judah;
For through Judah shall salvation arise unto Israel,
And in Him shall Jacob be blessed.
For through his tribe shall God appear dwelling among
men on earth...."

The teaching of the Testaments then on the theme of the Messiah or Messiahs is not as clear-cut as Beasley-Murray claims. Nor, for that matter, are the parallels with the Qumran literature as real as they are apparent. That the Testaments reflect the Essene teaching on the subject of the two Messiahs may be true enough, but it would appear that this is at best only a starting point for them, and they go beyond that to a kind of synthesis, in which the Messiahs from Levi and from Judah (or rather from

(44) Beasley-Murray, *ibid.* p. 5.



Aaron and from Israel) become one person, through whom the Lord is to bring salvation.

T. Sim. 7.2.

"For the Lord shall raise up from Levi as it were an High-priest, and from Judah as it were a King God and man, He shall save all the Gentiles and the race of Israel."

T. Gad 8.1-2.

"Do ye also therefore tell these things to your children, that they honour Levi and Judah, for from them shall the Lord raise up salvation to Israel."

T. Jos. 19.11-12.

"Do ye therefore, my children, observe the commandments of the Lord, and honour Levi and Judah; for from them shall arise unto you the Lamb of God..."

T. Ben. 11.2.

"And there shall arise in the latter days one beloved of the Lord (hearing his voice) of the tribe of Levi and Judah..."

T. Levi 8.11-15 is a very difficult passage indeed, and it will receive more attention below, but it would seem to indicate that the expectation of a Messiah from Levi and Judah does, in the mind of our author, merge into one person, for the third office into which the seed of Levi is to be divided turns out to be a king that shall arise out of Judah.

We are of course familiar with the New Testament description of the Christ as one who fulfils in his own person the three-fold office of prophet, priest, and king. Although there is nothing in the New Testament about the Messiah who is to come from Levi or Judah, or from Aaron and Israel, yet it is apparent that he does represent the fulfilment of this Essene hope, in a way quite outside the thinking of the Essene teaching itself.

Hence W. D. Davies can write:

"Thus Jesus came to combine in a striking manner in his one Person the three persons anticipated by the Sect, and elsewhere. He became for the Church the Prophet, Priest, and King". (45)

And Kuhn has drawn to our attention the passage in Eusebius which refers to the way in which the three offices of Jesus as 'the Anointed One' are foreshadowed in (1) Aaron, the high-priestly 'Anointed One' mentioned in Leviticus 4; (2) in the successor to Moses' political leadership, Joshua; and finally (3) in the 'anointed' prophets. These three functions, according to Eusebius, are now united in the Person of Jesus Christ. (46) We would suggest that such a view is evident in the work of the author (would editor be a better term?) of the Testaments, although he is by no means as explicit. (47) This of course takes us a step beyond Messianism to Christology. Is there evidence for a Christology in the Testaments? We would suggest that there is, and that this evidence comes from two directions:

A. from the so-called Christological interpolations.

Those passages in the Testaments which are obviously Christological are too numerous to enumerate in detail. Charles, with consistent regularity, has excised them from the text, or has in effect done so by the expediency of bracketing them and in his notes dismissing them as manifest interpolations. De Jonge has examined these projected interpolations, both of Bousset and Charles, and has found the

- - - - -

(45) W. D. Davies, 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins', Religion and Life, 26 (1957), p. 262.

(46) Kuhn, *ibid.* p. 64 . The reference is to Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, 1,iii.

(47) De Jonge deals with the Christology of the Test. on pp. 125-128.

textual support for their claims in almost every case singularly weak. (48) My own examination reveals that Charles has suggested altogether some thirty-three interpolations involving Christological references; 15 have no other basis than the fact that they are Christological (49), four of these omissions find support from individual manuscripts which ordinarily Charles is not disposed to take too seriously (50), five find only partial support for omission from a comparison with A (51), three find full support from comparison with A (52), two find fairly good manuscript support (53), and at least three out of the four remaining are really only emendations made to bring the text into conformity with his presuppositions. (54)

There is therefore almost no support from the text for the wholesale excision which Charles has suggested. This of course does not mean that interpolations have not occurred at some stage in the development of the Testaments, but it does mean that these passages belong in the text which is at our disposal, and that therefore they are not interpolations in that text. In this text therefore it is clear that the author (or editor) did look for a Messiah who should come through Levi and Judah, and that he thought of him in these specifically Christological terms.

B. from the major Messianic passages; T.Levi 18, T.Jud. 24, T.Levi 8.

The two passages constituted of T.Levi 18 and the T.Judah 24 have many parallels and may therefore be grouped together for

- - - - -

(48) De Jonge, *ibid.* pp. 31-36.

(49) As examples of Charles' rather arbitrary procedure see his notes on T.Levi 16.3-4, 18.9, T. Dan 6.9.

(50) The MSS. are a, e, b.

(51) T.L. 2.11, T. Judah 24.4, T.Ben. 3.8(2 refs.), 9.3-5.

(52) T. Ben.10.7 (3 refs.) This of course presupposes the superiority of A at this point.

(53) T. Zeb.9.8-9 (2 refs.)

(54) T. Reub.6.8, T.Levi 4-2, T.Issachar 7.7. But Charles' emendation for T.Jos. 19.8 does make more sense out of the passage.

the purposes of comparison with the New Testament. As we have already seen, Charles interprets these passages as hymns in praise of John Hyrcanus. As we might expect, De Jonge interprets them in Christological terms. (55) Certainly the parallels are obvious:

T. Levi 18:	T. Judah 24:	N.T.
vv. 3-4	v. 1	Mt. 4.12-16 (56)
vv. 6-7	v. 2	Mt. 3.16-17, Mk. 1.9-11, Lk. 3.21-22, Jn. 1.31-32 (57)
v. 12		Lk. 10.19-20 (58)
	v. 1	2 Cor. 5.21

Matthew Black has introduced further evidence to indicate the Messianic character of Levi 18 (and presumably thereby T. Jud. 24). (59) He sees great significance in the phrase 'with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac' (v. 6), and asks the question, "What did Abraham say to Isaac?". The answer of course is found in Gen. 22.8, 'My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering'. Abraham is here acting in complete obedience to the God who had demanded from him a readiness to sacrifice even his own son. Black goes on:

"There can be no doubt that the voice of the Father to His Messiah in Levi 18, a voice like Abraham's to Isaac, is the voice of parental authority calling for the obedience of a beloved son to the point of complete readiness to offer himself in sacrifice. The allusion to priestly sacrifice is natural in the Test. Levi, but it is that kind of sacrifice about which we read in the New Testament only, in particular in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The thought

- - - - -

(55) *ibid.* pp. 89-91.

(56) The basis for these passages seems to be Num. 24.17. *c.f.* also T. Zeb. 9.8.

(57) These are the obvious parallels in the Testaments to the baptism of Christ. Charles himself admits to this

(58) Charles, in his *Eng. ed. of the Test.*, p. lxxxiii, has drawn attention to the close parallel in the Greek text.

(59) M. Black, 'The Messiah in the Test. Levi 18'. *Expository Times*, LX, 321, 322. 1948-49.

of Isaiah 53 may not be far from the author's mind. The words are unmistakable in their allusion as is the deliberately composite quotation in the Synoptic story of the Baptism, where the Son, the Messiah of Ps.2.7, is also the one in whom God is well-pleased. (Is.42.1)

"It may be in view of this that we ought to regard Levi 18 as entirely Christian. If on the other hand the poem is Jewish and pre-Christian, then we have a valuable piece of evidence for the existence in pre-Christian Judaism for an idea which later developed into a central Christian doctrine." (60)

If this were an isolated phenomenon in a markedly Jewish document, then perhaps not quite so much could be made of a phrase which in such a context must remain almost wholly enigmatic. But the many parallels which we have seen above between the Testament's description of the Messiah and the New Testament description of the Christ does lend weight to Black's suggestion.

Two more chapters remain to be considered. These are T.Levi 8 and T.Judah 22, which provide the immediate context for the parusia sayings of the Testaments.

Test.Levi 8 places many stumbling blocks in the way of the interpreter. It describes the initiation of Levi into the priesthood in two ways: vv. 2-3 in terms of investiture, and vv. 3-10 both in terms of a ritual preparation and of investiture. (61) There are some parallels here with the Book of

- - - - -

(60) J.R. Porter, in a reply to Black's article, Expository Times, LXI, 1949-50, p.90, has rejected this idea on several counts, but chiefly on the basis that Dr. Black's suggestion "is quite alien to the whole tenor of ch. 18. The chapter is entirely concerned with the exaltation and triumph of the Messiah... (which has) nothing in it resembling Is.53.7". But this seems to ignore the fact that priesthood itself is set against the background of atonement. cf. references in O.T. n. 63 below.

(61) T.W. Manson, 'Test. XII Patr.', Miscellanea Apocalyptica III, J.T.S. XLVIII, 1947, pp.59-61, suggests that since the initiation in vv.4-10 demands the undoing of the investiture in vv. 2-3, it must therefore be a Christian interpolation. But such consistency perhaps cannot be demanded of this kind of work.

Jubilees, but they are thin parallels and not very helpful. (62) More help is gained from the Old Testament accounts of the institution of the Levitical priesthood. (63) There is no doubt that these Old Testament passages form the basis of this passage. (64) But there are elements here that open the door to the possibility that something more is in the author's mind than the institution of the Levitical priesthood. The garments themselves are given a significance which is not attached to them in the Exodus account, but which rather is very reminiscent of some New Testament lists of specific Christian virtues. (65) Moreover the order for the initiation is different from that of Exodus 29; in the latter the washing is followed by the anointing, and in the former the reverse is the case. The administration of bread and wine has heightened the suspicion that what we really have here is the description of the initiation of Christians into the membership of the church. (66) T. W. Manson has seen in the order of the ritual here, i.e. anointing, washing with pure water, the administration of bread and wine, and clothing with a holy and glorious robe, a correspondence with the initiation of members into the Syrian Church. (67) Thus this two-fold description of the institution of the Levitical priesthood could

(62) Book of Jubilees 32.1,3,9.

(63) Exodus 28.4,36-38,42-43, 29.5, Lev.16.14

(64) Charles, 'Test. XII Patr.' Eng. ed. pp.42-43 notes

(65) Charles, *ibid.* Greek Text.

T. Levi 8.2 τὴν στολὴν τῆς ἱερατείας, καὶ τὸν στέφανον τῆς δικαιοσύνης, καὶ τὸ λόγιον τῆς συνέσεως καὶ τὸν ποδῆρη τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πέταλον τῆς πίστεως καὶ τὴν μίτραν τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ τὸ ἔφους τῆς προφητείας

(66) T. W. Manson, *ibid.* p. 60. The use here of τὸ ἅγιον is a reminder of Didache 9.5 and Mt. 7.6, where the Eucharist may be referred to. "It is hardly possible not to see in the words of our text an allusion to Holy Communion."

(67) *ibid.* p. 59

be taken as a type of the privileges of the Christian as a priest of God, and of his initiation into the membership of that church within which his priesthood is exercised.

T. Levi 8.11-15 has already been given some consideration. (68) Charles sees v. 12 as referring to Moses, v.13 to Levi, and v. 14 to John Hyrcanus. De Jonge sees v. 12 as referring to Abraham. This interpretation stems in part from the fact that all the texts but α have some form of πιστεῦω . (69). Thus the κληῆρος of Abraham is seen in the fact that he is the father of the faithful. V. 12 points to the Levitical priesthood (70), and the new priest then is Jesus Christ. V. 15 therefore is a description of Jesus Christ:

"And his presence (71) is beloved, as a prophet of the Most High, of the seed of Abraham our Father."

De Jonge therefore concludes:

This conception is very similar to that found in St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians and elsewhere. Judaism, which observes the law, goes back to Moses, the Christian Church exalts Abraham, as the first believer (Rom.4, Gal.3). The law is only an intermediary period (Gal.3.19). We can also think of the Epistle to the Hebrews, according to which the Aaronitic priesthood is abolished by the new High Priest, who belongs to the tribe of Judah (Heb.7.14)." (72)

T. Judah 22 is a small chapter holding forth the promise of the Messiah in the midst of the anticipated downfall of Israel. The sins, the divisions, and the wars of Israel lead to its eventual destruction until the salvation of Israel comes.

- - - - -

(68) above p. 52

(69) $\beta \zeta = \delta \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \upsilon \sigma \alpha \varsigma$, $A^a = \omicron \iota \pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \upsilon \sigma \omicron \upsilon \iota \nu$. A^b Κρῖος (καὶ ὁς)
 ἐπίστευσε

(70) Cf. Levi 17 describes the gradual degeneration of the Lev. priesthood until it ceases, and in 18.1 a new priest arises, whom we have already interpreted in Christological terms.

(71) παρουσία . See below p. 61 n. 76

(72) De Jonge p. 46

Here, however, this salvation that comes is in effect equated with the appearing of the God of righteousness (ἕως τῆς παρουσίας θεοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης), through whom Jacob and the Gentiles will rest in peace. (73) It is to be noted that ch.23 repeats with renewed emphasis the promise of Israel's coming apostasy, with the destruction that is to follow, again until "the Lord visit you" (ἐπισκεψῆται κύριος ὑμῖν) (74) Then follows ch. 24 with the Christological references which we have already considered.

One more factor needs to be considered, i.e. the language in which the coming of God, or of the Messiah, is expressed in the Testaments. An examination of these terms indicates that they are widely used to describe the coming of God in Christ in the New Testament.

Test. XII Patr.

N.T.

φαίνω

T.S. 6.6

Mt. 24.27,30

τότε δοθήσεται πάντα τὰ πνεύματα
τῆς πλάνης εἰς καταπάτησιν καὶ οἱ
ἄνθρωποι βασιλεύουσιν τῶν πονηρῶν
πνευμάτων
T.Ben. 10.7.9
,β, . Τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀναστήσομεθα
ἕκαστος ἐπὶ σκήπτρον ἡμῶν προσκυν-
οῦντες τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν [τὸν
ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα ἐγμορῶν ἀνθρώπου ἐν
ταπεινώσει.....Καὶ τότε κρινεῖ πάν-
τα τὰ ἔθνη [ὅσα οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς φανέντι]

Mt. 24 forms the context for the παρουσία of Christ

In v.27 it is used in conjunction with παρουσία

(73) Charles brackets καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη because A omits.

(74) Charles adopts this reading in his Greek version.

(β) B.A, 5' have ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς κύριον

ὄραω

T.L. 2.11

Καὶ διὰ σοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἰουδα ὀφθί-
σεται Κύριος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις

Luke 9.36
John 20.18,25,29
1 Cor.9.1
1 John 1.1,2,3

T.N. 8.3

Διὰ τοῦ σιγηπτρου αὐτοῦ ὀφθῆσεται
ὁ θεὸς [κατοικῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις]
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

κατοικῶ

T.L. 5.2

Καὶ εἶπέ μοι Λενί, σοὶ ἔδωκα
τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς ἱερατείας ἕως
ἐλθῶν κατοικῆσω ἐν μέσῳ
τοῦ Ἰσραήλ

Mt. 4.13-16
Christ fulfils Isaiah's
prophecies about those
in darkness seeing a
great light.

T.N. 8.3

(see immediately above)

ἐπισκοπή α ἐπισκέπτομαι

T. Ben. 9.2 (b) c, β, 5'

...καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἕως οὗ ὁ
ὑψιστος ἀποστείλῃ τὸ σωτήριον
αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ μονογενοῦς
προφήτου

Mt. 25.36-43

ἐπισκέπτομαι

T. Ash. 7.3

"Ἐως οὗ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐπισκέψηται
τὴν γῆν....

Lk. 1.68,78

T. Jud. 23.5

"Ἐως ἂν ἐπισκέψηται κύριος
ὑμῖν

ἀνατέλλω α, α ε ϛ, A, S

T. Zeb. 9.8

Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν
αὐτὸς κύριος

Mt. 4.16 b

ὁ

Heb. 7.14 a,

2 Peter 1.19 b

There is no question but that the language of the Testaments used to describe the coming of the Messiah or the appearance of God on earth is also the language that the New Testament uses for the same purpose. Although this testimony cannot be regarded as decisive, because the language is also common to the Greek world, nonetheless it does add some weight to the interpretations we have given above to the Messianic passages.

There are also references in the Testaments to the presence of God, which results from the coming or visitation of the Messiah, or of God. These too are of interest in the light of the vocabulary that is used.

- T.L. 3.7 προσώπου κυρίου
 3.9 ἀπὸ προσώπου
 4.2 τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
 18.5 τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου
 T.J.25.2 ἄγγελου τοῦ προσώπου

Thus in every case where the presence of God is described, πρόσωπον is the word that is used. (75) All of these are found in the two Testaments in which παρουσία is found. But in those two instances where παρουσία is used instead of πρόσωπον, it is the coming of God or of the Messiah that is indicated. (76) Thus the author's exclusive use of this word to point to the coming of One whom we have already interpreted in terms of Jesus Christ clearly indicates a New Testament usage.

- - - - -

(75) Three of these instances refer to the 'angel of his presence', a fairly common expression that seems to have been derived from Is.63.9.

(76) Hence T.Lev.8.15 would be better tr. "And his coming is beloved.."

It is of interest to note that A. Plummer, commenting on the many parallels that Charles has drawn between the Testaments and the New Testament, is prepared to go beyond Charles in suggesting not 90, as does Charles, but over 100. (77) This he feels clearly indicates the dependence of one on the other. He notes also that the majority of the parallels are with Matthew, especially those that have to do with sayings of our Lord. (78) This convinces him that it is the writer of the Testaments who has done the borrowing. He finds the explanation for the predominance of Matthaen material in the immense popularity and influence of Matthew in the early church. He finds further support for this in the fact that the one Pauline passage that appears verbatim in the Testaments is from the earliest of the New Testament writings. (79) This of course would also help to explain the paucity of references to the Testaments in the Fathers, which influence one would expect to see in abundance if it had the impact on the New Testament which Charles claims.

Matthew, of course, is alone among the Gospels in his use of 'parousia', and in the Thessalonian epistles it is used five times.

(77) A. Plummer, 'The Relation of the Test. Xll Patr. to the Books of the N.T.', Expositor, 1908, 7th. Series, VI, pp.481-91.

(78) He claims there are twice as many in Mt. as in the other three, i.e. thirty in all.

(79) 1 Thess. 2.16

Ἐφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ
ὀργὴ (+ τοῦ θεοῦ, DEFG
ἡλια, υνεγ. ἱσι(.)εἰς τέλος

T. Levi 6.11
Ἐφθασε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ
τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τέλος (α)

(R.H.Charles, Eng. Ed. p. LXXXV.)

There are two parallel terms of great significance in the New Testament to which serious consideration must be given:

1. *παροικία* (parochia) and 2. *παροικῶν* (parochon).

The first of these terms, *παροικία*, is of great importance for three reasons:

1. It is closely associated both in meaning and in usage with *παροικῶν* in the New Testament.

2. In secular usage *παροικία* signifies a place of residence virtually identical with *παροικῶν*. This is very apparent in quotations from *Diogenes Laertius*, pp. 17-19 above, in which *παροικία* is used in the same sense as *παροικῶν*.

COGNATE TERMS

3. Especially in N.B. IV.3.3 and IV.3.4, where both terms are used with reference to Demeter's manifestation to man, *παροικῶν* possesses the same meaning as *παροικία* (see N.B. IV.3.3).

4. Josephus appears to use *παροικία* and *παροικῶν* interchangeably with reference to the appearance of God (see N.B. IV.3.3).

These usages at least suggest the possibility that the term *παροικῶν* with reference to the coming of Christ in the New Testament might have its roots in its affinity with *παροικία*.

This possibility will receive further attention later in the thesis, but in the meanwhile some investigation must be made of this term. This investigation, while not

The term *παροικῶν* is found in a variant reading in Luke 21.7 B and in Acts 21.22 B. Acts 7.52 is the only place where it occurs with certainty, cf. also 1 Clem. 17.1, Polya. ad Rom. 1.1, Iren. adv. Haer. 1.11, and the third cent. text of Luke 78.

IV Cognate Terms

There are two parallel terms of great significance in the New Testament to which serious consideration must be given; the terms ἐπιφάνεια and ἡ ἡμέρα . (1)

The first of these terms, ἐπιφάνεια , is of great importance for three reasons:

1. It is closely associated both in meaning and in usage with 'parousia' in the New Testament.

2. In secular usage παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια are on occasion virtually synonymous. This is very apparent in the quotations from Diodorus Siculus, pp.17-19 above, in which ἐπιφάνεια is used with the same significance as παρουσία , and especially in D.S. 1V.3.2 and 1V.3.3. where both terms are used with reference to Demeter's manifestation to men. ἐπιφάνεια possesses the same meaning in SIG 111.1169.34 (p. 25).

3. Josephus appears to use παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια interchangeably with reference to the appearance of God (see below pp. 76-77).

These usages at least suggest the possibility that the use of 'parousia' with reference to the coming of Christ in the New Testament might have its roots in its affinities with ἐπιφάνεια . This possibility will receive further consideration later in the thesis, but in the meanwhile some investigation must be made of this term. This investigation, while not

- - - - -

(1) The term ἐλευσις is found as a variant reading in Luke 21.7 D and in Lk. 23.42 D. Acts 7.52 is the only place where it occurs with certainty. cf. also 1 Clem.17.1, Polyc. ad Phil.6.3, Iren. adv. Haer. 1.ii, and the third cent. Acta Philippi, 78.

exhaustive, is thorough enough to provide the basis for the examination of such a possibility.

A. 'Επιφάνεια

(i) 'Επιφάνεια in the secular sources.

W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich have written concerning ἐπιφάνεια :

"As a religious technical term it means a visible manifestation of a hidden divinity, either in the form of a personal appearance, or by some deed of power by which its presence is made known". (2)

Research of a similar nature to that made with respect to 'parousia', although admittedly not quite so extensive, has provided ample illustrations for this definition.

(1) Diodorus Siculus 1, 25.3&4

This is a commentary on the goddess Isis, who (according to Diodorus) was regarded by the Egyptians as the discoverer of many health-giving drugs, and to be greatly versed in the science of healing.

διὸ καὶ τυχοῦσαν τῆς ἀθανασίας ἐπὶ ταῖς
θεραπειῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μάλιστα χαίρειν, καὶ
κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους τοῖς ἀξιοῦσι διδόναι βοηθήματα,
φανερῶς ἐπὶ δεικνυμένην τὴν τε ἰδίαν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ
τὸ πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργετικόν

"..consequently, now that she has attained immortality, she finds her greatest delight in the healing of mankind, and gives aid in their sleep to those who call upon her, plainly manifesting both her very presence and her beneficence towards men who ask her help."

Following on the above Diodorus goes on to relate the many witnesses to her concern for the sick and to her power of

(2) ' A Greek-English Lexicon of the ^N δ.T. sub voce ἐπιφάνεια

healing, so that

"practically the entire inhabited world is their witness, in that it eagerly contributes to the honours of Isis..."

...διὰ τὴν ἐν^{ταῖς}θεραπειᾶς ἐπιφάνειαν

"...because she manifests herself in healings".(3)

(2) Diodorus Siculus, Book 11, 47.6

In a description of the island of the Hyperboreans, reference is made to the visit of Apollo to the island every nineteen years, at which time he dances the night through.

κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ταύτην τὸν θεὸν

"...at the time of the appearance of the god.." (4)

(3) Plutarch's Lives, Vol. 11, Themistocles XXX.3

This reference is concerned with the appearance of Rhea, or Cybele, Magna Mater (Mother of the Gods), to Themistocles to warn him of a threat to his life. She appeared (φανείσθαι) to him in a dream to warn him, and later in gratitude Themistocles built a temple in Magnesia in her honour.

...καὶ θαυμάσας τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς θεοῦ..

"...because he was amazed at the epiphany of the goddess..." (5)

(4) Dionysius of Halicarnassus 11, 68.2-4

This is a description of the life of the vestal virgins who serve the goddess Vesta, and of the way in which the goddess manifests herself to save those virgins falsely accused of impurity.

Πάνυ δ' ἄξιον καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἱστορῆσαι τῆς θεᾶς, ἣν ἐπεδείξατο ταῖς ἀδίκως ἐγκληθείσαις παρθένοις

- - - - -

(3) 'Diodorus of Sicily', L.C.L. E.T. C.H. Oldfather, vol.1

(4) Ibid.

(5) L.C.L. E.T. Bernadotte Perrin

"However, it is also worth relating in what manner the goddess has manifested herself in favour of those virgins who have been falsely accused."

This is followed by a kind of theological apology directed at those who scorn such manifestations of the gods. Those, however, who are still convinced of the reality of the god's concern as manifested by these deeds on man's behalf,

οὐδὲ ταύτας ὑπολήψονται τὰς ἐπιφανείας εἶναι ἀπίστους

"...will not regard these manifestations as incredible".

Having related to accounts of such manifestations, he concludes:

ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ἐπιφανειῶν τῆς θεᾶς ἔχων ἔτι πολλὰ λέγειν καὶ ἄλλα

"But though I have yet many other things to say concerning the manifestations of this goddess..." (6)

(5) The Inscriptions of Cos No. 391 (p.281)

Ἐ]νιαυτοῦ πρώτου τᾶς
[αί]λου Καίσαρος, Γερμανικ-
οῦ υἱοῦ, Γερμανικοῦ Σεβα-
στοῦ ἐπιφανείας, δαμα-
ρχεῶντος Σέξτου Ποπιλλίου[υ
...υἱοῦ, Ροῦφου, φιλο-
καίσαρος]μου

Paton and Hicks have written concerning the above:

"The emperor is Caligula, and the praenomen may have been erased. His accession is called an 'epiphany' because he wished to be regarded as an incarnate god." (7)

(6) Letter of Attalus III to Pergamum, Oct.5, 135 B.C.

This contains instructions to the 'council and people of Pergamum' concerning homage and honour to be paid to Zeus Sabazius, who is described as 'our comrade and helper':

- - - - -

(6) L.C.L. E.T. E. Cary

(7) W.R. Paton and E.L. Hicks, 'The Inscriptions of Cos'

"whom we decided because of his manifestations of divine power (διὰ τὰς ἐξ αὐτοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας)
to enshrine in the temple of Athena Nicephorus". (8)

(7) O.G.I.S. 763.19

κοινῆτε καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν πρὸς ἑκάστην τῶν πόλεων
εὐνοϊκῶς διακειμένους καὶ πολλὰ τῶν πρὸς ἐπιφάνειαν
καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων συνατασνευάζων ἑκάστην

"Publicly and privately I was kindly disposed toward each of your cities and had joined in furnishing a great deal of honour and glory."

(8) O.G.I.S. 233.36

This is a description from Magnesia describing the report of the priests of the Seleucidae to the royal assembly.

ἀπελοψίσαντο διὰ πλειόνων τῆν τε τῆς θεᾶς
ἐπιφάνειαν

"...spoke for some time of the appearance of the goddess."

(9) O.G.I.S. 383.1-10

This is a description of the great king Antiochus Epiphanes, and includes the statement:

...διαδήματοςἀφιέρωσα μεγάλων δαιμόνων
ἐπιφανείαις

"...I consecrated a diademfor the appearances of the great divinities.."

(10) Arrian, Epictetus 111, 22.29

ὅταν δι' αὐτὰς τὰς ὑπατείας καὶ τὴν δόξαν
καὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἀθλιώτερον οἴωνται καὶ
ἐπικινδυνότερον ἔχειν

"when they think that their condition is more wretched and dangerous because of their consulships, and their own reputation, and their prominence." (9)

(8) Welles, 'Royal Correspondence'. On page 336 in a note on this use of the word the author states: "This is a term parallel to δύναμις and ἐνέργεια, though properly the form in which the god's power showed itself".

(9) 'Epictetus, The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual and Fragments', E.T. W.A. Oldfather, 11, p.141. Douglas S. Sharp, in his book 'Epictetus and the New Testament', pp.9-10, writes: "We notice that δόξα is used in the New Testament sense of 'glory', 'brightness', and not in the classical sense of 'opinion', 'reputation' ", and so he translates: "Whenever on account of the Consulships themselves and their glory and splendour...".

The adjective ἐπιφανής may be used with reference to the epiphany of a god, or as an adjective with the sense of illustrious.

(11) Herodotus 111, 27

This is concerned with the appearance of Apis (whom the Greeks called Epaphus) to the Egyptians.

"...there appeared (ἐφάνη) in Egypt that Apis..."

and he goes on

"at which revelation (ἐπιφανέος) straightway the Egyptians donned their fairest garments..."

and by way of explanation to Cambyses the Egyptians told him

"that a god, who had been wont to reveal himself (φανεῖς) at long intervals of time, had now appeared (ἐπιφαίνεσθαι) to them". (10)

There is a play on the word in

(12) Polybius XXVI, 1.1

where ἐπιφανής is found in the 'Fragments of Book XXVI (174-72 B.C.), headed 'Affairs of Antiochus Epiphanes'.

Πολύβιος δ' ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν καλεῖ αὐτὸν Ἐπιμανῆ καὶ οὐκ Ἐπιφανῆ διὰ τὰς πράξεις

"Polybius in his twenty-sixth Book calls him Epimanes (the Madman) instead of Epiphanes owing to his conduct." (11)

(13) Diodorus Siculus, 1, 17.2

This is a reference to Osiris' successful attempt to teach men how to cultivate the vine and sow wheat and barley,

(10) L.C.L. E.T. A.D. Godley

(11) L.C.L. E.T. W.R. Paton

hoping thereby to encourage men to give up their savagery and become civilized. This did take place, and it is stated that

"because of the delight which they take in the foods which were discovered, (men) have honoured those who introduced them, ὡς ἐπιφανεστάτους θεοῦς τατιμημέναι as gods most illustrious" -

(12)

(ii) 'ἐπιφάνεια and Cognates in the Canonical Books of the LXX

'ἐπιφάνεια as a substantive appears only twice in the canonical books of the Septuagint, and here it affords us little help.

(1) Amos 5.22

...καὶ σωτηρίου ἐπιφανείας ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐπιβλέψομαι

"...and the peace offerings of your fatted beasts, I will not look upon".

(2) 2 Kings 7.23 (2 Sam.7.23)

...τοῦ ποιῆσαι μεγαλῶσύνην καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν

"...and doing for them great and terrible things". (13)

The verb ἐπιφαίνω is much more common. It is used fourteen times, and with but two exceptions, it has either direct or indirect reference to God's self-disclosure.

(3) Genesis 35.7

ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐπεφάνη αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς

"..because there God had revealed himself to him".

(12) L.C.L. 'Diodorus Siculus', Vol. 1. E.T. C. H. Oldfather

(13) This use of the substantive is parallel to the common use of the adjective with reference to the day of the Lord. See below p. 71. Here it translates the Heb. Niphal participle

תִּיָּצַדְתִּי .

(4) Deut. 33.2

καὶ εἶπε, Κύριος ἐκ Σινᾶ ἦκει,
καὶ ἐπέφανεν ἐκ Σεῖρ ὑμῖν

"And he said, the Lord came from Sinai,
and dawned from Seir upon us."

(5) Jer. 36.14

καὶ ἐπιφανοῦμαι ὑμῖν

"I will be found by you".

The benediction of Numbers 6.25 is repeated eight times, mostly in the form of a prayer that implores God's blessing. This formula is not identical with an epiphany in the ordinary sense of the term, and yet the emphasis lies in the result of the divine epiphany; i.e. the divine blessing.

(6) Numbers 6.25

Ἐπιφάναι Κύριος τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ
σέ, καὶ ἐλεῆσαι σε

"The Lord make his face to shine upon you,
and be gracious unto you". (14)

(7) Daniel 9.17

This repeats the formula presented above, but in this instance the prayer of Daniel is on behalf of the temple, that the temple, now desolate because the Lord has forsaken it, may once more experience his presence. The use of the verb at this point is reminiscent of Josephus' use of the substantives ἐπιφάνεια and παρουσία with reference to the divine presence. (15)

(14) ἐπιφαίνω translates the Heb. נִתְחַלַּק 'to become

light' and in the Hifil 'to give light', 'to make shine'.

See also Psalms 30.17 (31.16), 66.2 (67.1), 79.4, 8, 20
(80.3, 7, 19), 117.27 (118.27), 118.135 (119.135).

(15) See below pp. 76-77

...καὶ ἐκίφανον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὸ ἅγισμά σου τὸ ἔρημον

"...cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary which is desolate."

Two further examples reflect the more common use of the adjective to describe the character of the day of the Lord. (16) God will manifest himself in terms of wrath and judgement.

(8) Zeph 2.11

Ἐπιφανήσεται Κύριος ἐπ' αὐτούς

"The Lord will be terrible against them."

(A S' has the adjective ἐπιφανής)

(9) Mal. 1.14

καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπιφανές ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι

"...and my name is feared among the heathen." (17)

The adjective ἐπιφανής is used on five occasions to describe the messenger of God, the day of the Lord, or the character of the divine activity. (18)

(10) Judges 13.6 A

This is a description of the 'angel of God' who appeared to the wife of Manoah.

καὶ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ὡς εἶδος ἀγγέλου θεοῦ φοβερόν (A = ἐπιφανής) σφόδρα

"..and his countenance was like the countenance of the angel of God, very terrible".

(11) 1 Chronicles 17.21

..τοῦ θεῆσθαι αὐτῷ ὄνομα μέγα καὶ ἐπιφανές

"...making for thyself a name for great and terrible things.."

(16) See below p. 78 ff.

(17) Two other examples of its use are both found in Ezekiel but neither refers to any form or divine self-disclosure. Ezek. 17.6 and 39.28.

(18) ἐπιφανής usually translates the Heb. niph'al participle of the verb חָתַח 'to be fearful', 'to cause astonishment or awe', usually with respect to some manifestation of God.

Both Joel and Malachi use ἐπιφανής to describe the character of the day of the Lord.

(12) Joel 2.11

διότι μεγάλη ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου,
μεγάλη καὶ ἐπιφανῆς σφόδρα

"..for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible".

Joel 2.31

...πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν
μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ

"(The sun will be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood) before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes".

(13) Malachi 4.5

...πρὶν ἔλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου
τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ

"(And behold I will send you Elijah the prophet) before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes."

(14)

It is used on two other occasions to describe the character of the enemies of Israel: Zephaniah 3.1 and Habakkuk 1.7.

(iii) ἐπιφάνεια in the Non-Canonical Books of the LXX

2 Maccabees 2.21

The reference is to the appearances which came from heaven to those who fought against Antiochus Epiphanes and his son Eupator.

"and the appearances which came from heaven to those who strove jealously on behalf of Judaism, so that though few in number they seized the whole land and

pursued the barbarian hordes."

καὶ τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενόμενας ἐπιφανείας

2 Maccabees 3.24

This is the description of the manifestation of the power of God in terms of the appearance to one Heliodorus of a 'magnificently caparisoned horse, with a rider of frightening mien', and also appearing in this apparition were 'two young men, remarkably strong.....who stood on each side of him and scourged him continuously' (vv.25-26). The text is:

"...the Sovereign of spirits and of all authority caused so great a manifestation that all who had been so bold as to accompany him were astonished by the power of God".

ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης
ἐπιφάνειαν μεγάλην ἐποίησεν...

2 Maccabees 5.4

The reference is to an apparition that appeared over the city involving what would appear to be mock manoeuvres of ghostly warriors, all of which was interpreted as an omen of uncertain significance by those who saw it.

"Therefore all men prayed that the apparition might prove to have been a good omen"

διὸ πάντες ἠξίουσιν ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν
γεγενῆσθαι

2 Maccabees 12.22

This is a description of a manifestation of the deity on behalf of Judas, which enabled them to overthrow their enemy.

"But when Judas' first division appeared, terror and fear came over the enemy at the manifestation to them of him who seeth all things.."

ἐπιφανείσης δὲ τῆς Ἰουδοῦ σπεύρας πρώτης.....
ἐπιφανείας.....ἐπ' αὐτοῦς.....

2 Maccabees 14.15

This is a more general reference to the God who (as above) continually manifests himself to his people.

"..they...prayed to him who established his own people forever and always upholds his own heritage by manifesting himself."

.....μετ' ἐπιφανείας.....

(iv) ἐπιφάνεια in the New Testament

In the New Testament ἐπιφάνεια is used only once by Paul and on five other occasions it is used exclusively in the Pastoral Epistles.

Paul found use for it in 2 Thessalonians 2.8, where he links it with παρουσία . The reference is to the destruction of the 'lawless one', which destruction will be effected 'by his appearing and his coming - τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ . This has all the appearance of a tautology, for the distinction, if any, is very difficult to discern. (19)

The Pastorals have used ἐπιφάνεια where Paul would likely have used παρουσία . Of the five references here, one is used to indicate the incarnation, and the remaining are eschatological.

2 Timothy 1.10

The grace of God has now been manifested

- - - - -

(19) A and G write with respect to its use in 2 Thess. 2.8 that it is pleonastic since both words have the same technical sense, 'the appearance of his coming'.

It is of interest to note that ἐπιφάνεια as used in the secular references to describe the 'manifestation' of a god or goddess does not really indicate the god's appearance, but rather his manifestation in terms of intervention, in miraculous fashion, in human affairs. It is evident however that Christ's coming is clearly indicated here, in view of 2.2,3.

"through the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ"

διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ

1 Timothy 6.14

This is set within the context of an exhortation.

"I charge you to keep the commandment unstained and free from approach

μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Κυρίου
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (20)

2 Timothy 4.1

The command to faithfulness in the teaching and preaching task is again given an eschatological footing.

"I charge you in the presence (ἐνώπιον) of God and of Jesus Christ who is to judge the living and the dead, and

τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ

2 Timothy 4.8

The thought of the Day of the Lord is here linked with that of the coming of the Christ. The element of judgment is still in evidence, insofar as Paul expects that the kind of faithfulness which he has displayed will bring the kind of reward that all those who are prepared for his coming have a right to expect.

"Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, will award me ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, and not to me only, but also to all who have loved τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ."

Titus 2.13

The grace of God has led them to renounce irreligion,
and

(20) cf. 1 Thess. 5.23

"to live sober, upright, and godly lives in this world, awaiting our blessed hope,

καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ " (21)

It must be noted that in all these references in the Pastoral Epistles, with the exception of 2 Timothy 1.10, the reference to the coming of Christ provides the eschatological context for the challenge to a righteous life. Indeed the term ἐπιφάνεια as used in these letters seems to approximate more closely the use of ἐπιφάνεια and παρουσία in Josephus, or the use of παρουσία in Matthew 24 and in the other New Testament writings where it appears.

(v) παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια in Josephus

These passages from Josephus are of some importance for two reasons: 1. These two terms are used interchangeably with reference to virtually identical phenomena. 2. They are used with reference to the appearance of God on Mount Sinai and his manifestation in the sanctuary. The account of Exodus would appear to form a backdrop for the use of παρουσία in the New Testament.

Josephus, Antiquities, 111. 80.

This is a description of Moses' meeting with God upon Mount Sinai - a meeting that preceded the giving of the decalogue.

...καὶ κεραυνοὶ κατενεχθέντες ἐδήλουν τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οἷς Μωϋσῆς ἤθελεν εὐμενοῦς παρατυχόντος

"...and thunderbolts hurled from aloft signified the advent of God propitious to the desires of Moses." (22)

(21) cf 1 Cor. 1.7, Phil. 3.30,31, Heb. 9.28.

(22) E. T. H. St. J. Thackeray, L.C.L. If one may assume that Mt. Sinai was not the divine dwelling place, but simply the place of God's manifestation, then this παρουσία must be looked upon as an advent of God. The parallels between this passage in the LXX and 1 Thess. 4.13-17 are very marked:

Josephus, Antiquities, 111.203

ἀλλ' ἐπεξενώθη καὶ κατεσκῆνωσε (ν ἐξέν) τῷ ναῷ
 τοῦτω. τὴν δὲ παρουσίαν οὕτως ἐποίησεν.....
 ἡ δειψὸς δὲ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δρόσος ἔρρει καὶ θεοῦ δηλοῦσα
 παρουσίαν τοῖς τοῦτο καὶ βουλευμένοις καὶ πεπισ-
 τευκόσι

"He came as their guest and took up his abode in this sanctuary. And it was on this wise that he made his entry.....but a delicious dew was distilled therefrom, revealing God's presence to those who both desired it and believed it." (23)

Josephus, Antiquities, 1X. 55

The reference is to Elisha's prayer to God to reveal his power and his presence to his fearful servant.

παρακάλει τῷ διακόνῳ πρὸς τὸ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν
 εὐελπίθ' ἄρσος ἐμφανῶσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν
 καὶ παρουσίαν, ὡς δυνατὸν

"...besought (God)...to reveal, so far as was possible, His power and His presence to His servant, in order that he might take hope and courage". (24)

Josephus, Antiquities, 111. 310

This refers to the efforts of Joshua and Caleb to reassure the Israelites following the report of the spies about Canaan. But where one would expect Josephus, on the basis of the above passages, to use παρουσία, he uses ἐπιφάνεια.

(22) cont'd.

LXX
 φωνῇ τῆς σάλπιγγος
 ἤχει μέγα (19.16)
 διὰ τὸ καταβεβημέναι
 ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸν θεὸν
 ἐν πυρὶ (19.18)

1 Thess.4.13-17
 ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ

καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ

(23) H.St.J. Thackeray, *ibid.* The parallel passage is Exod.40.34-35. This is the work of P, for whom without doubt God's dwelling place was heaven. cf. here R. Clements, 'The Divine Dwelling-Place', unpublished Doctor's Thesis, University of Sheffield, Chapter 8, 'The Contribution of the Priestly School'. In the LXX account it is the idea of the divine glory (δόξα) that dominates. Clements regards this ἑπιφανεία as the key word in the Priestly theology of the divine activity. The 'glory' of God is the primary way in which God reveals himself to man.

(24) H.St.J. Thackeray, *ibid.* The parallel passage in the LXX is 11 Kings 6.15 ff. This same combination of παρουσία + δύναμις is found in 11 Peter 1.16.

παρῆν δ' ἡ νεφέλη καὶ σᾶσα ὑπὲρ τὴν σικηνὴν
 ἐσημαίνε τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ θεοῦ

"Then there appeared the cloud which, resting above the tabernacle, signaled the presence of God" (25)

B. The Day of Yahweh

The term in Q that parallels Matthew's 'parousia' is ἡ ἡμέρα . This term, with varying predicates, is by no means confined to Q, but is used very extensively in all the Synoptics, in the Fourth Gospel, the Johannine Epistles and the Apocalypse, the Pauline letters, the Pastorals, James, 2 Peter, Hebrews, Jude, and Acts. There is no question but that the background for this term is that of the 'Day of the Lord' in the Old Testament, and some investigation of that concept is demanded. Its relevance to the use of the term 'parousia' by Matthew will be considered in the closing chapter of the Thesis.

The origin of the concept of the Day of Yahweh is uncertain. Many of the older commentators tend to trace it to the day on which Yahweh manifests himself in the storm. On that day he is the wielder of thunder and lightning; i.e. the means of destruction. He is then the "...devastator who shatters the powers opposing him". (1) It is not a long step from this to the later idea of the Day of Yahweh as that Day on which he would destroy Israel's foes. S. Mowinckel, on the other hand, looks for its origin in the cultic celebration of the New Year Festival.

- - - - -

(25) H. St. J. Thackeray, *ibid.* The parallel passage in the LXX is Numbers 14.10 and here again it is the δόξα which manifests his presence.

(1) Jewish Encyclopedia sub voce. See also H.W. Robinson, 'The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament', London, 1956, p.105.

"Because on every day of Yahweh in the festival the people experience his coming, which guaranteed victory over enemies, deliverance from distress and the realization of peace, good fortune, and favourable conditions, and therefore, when the people were in distress, they would long for the coming days of Yahweh which would bring the 'change of fortune'." (2)

A third suggestion comes from G. von Rad. Since the Day of Yahweh involves the rise of Yahweh against his enemies, and since the conflict is expressed in the imagery of battle, he suggests that "It derives from the tradition of the holy wars of Yahweh, in which Yahweh appears personally to annihilate his enemies". (3)

Whatever its origin may be, there is little doubt that its history is a long one, for, however it may be interpreted, the term was current even in Amos' day. The pattern of its development seems relatively clear. Originally it was the day on which Yahweh would rise to vindicate Israel. Thus from the beginning the element of judgment is present, but at the beginning this

(2) S. Mowinckel, 'He That Cometh', Oxford, 1956, p.132. On p.132, note 5, Mowinckel credits this idea to Holscher, 'Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie', p.12 f. Mowinckel claims that Amos 5.18 cannot be used as a starting point for an investigation of the meaning of the Day of Yahweh as ordinarily conceived; i.e. as some day in the future, for the Day of Yahweh at this time still referred to the cult at the New Year Festival, when Yahweh manifested himself. On the other hand G. von Rad, in an article on "The origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh" in J.S.S., Vol. 1V, No. 2, p. 105, note 1, rejects this interpretation of Amos 5.18, on the ground that Amos 5.18-20 has no connection with 5.21-27, "...for the individual speech units in Amos are in thematic respects in no way attuned to each other". Norman H. Snaith, in his 'The Jewish New Year Festival', London, 1947, gives a qualified approval to Mowinckel's claim (which he traces to Volz, 'Das Neujahrstfest Yahwes', S.15). He thinks both Mowinckel and Volz are right insofar as they suggest that the Day of the Lord "rose out of the celebration of the autumnal harvest feast and the ideas of the change of fate that were connected with it". (p.73)

(3) G. von Rad, 'The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh', Heidelberg Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol.1V, No. 2, April 1959, p.104. von Rad tries to curtail the number of passages that are to be interpreted as referring to the Day of Yahweh. These are Isa. 2.12, 13.6,9, 22.5, 34.8; Jer. 46.10; Ezek. 7.19, 13.5, 30.3; Joel 1.15, 2.1,11; Amos 5.18-20; Ob. 15; Zeph. 1.7,8, 14-18; Zech. 14.1.

judgment is directed against the enemies of Israel. (4) To the contemporaries of Amos the relation of Israel to Yahweh was not primarily an ethical one but a natural one. (5) It was this falsely based confidence that from the beginning was the object of the prophetic attack. So Amos regarded it as a day of judgment directed chiefly against Israel (6). Isaiah sees the day of Yahweh as directed mainly against Judah. (7) Isaiah does leave room for a remnant, and his disciples never quite give up this faith that there is hope for God's people. (8) Von Rad goes so far as to refer to this idea of judgment directed against the people of God, leading to their destruction, as an 'interlude' in the history of the concept, since the later prophets returned to the idea that Yahweh's day will mean salvation for Israel. (9)

With the exile, however, this emphasis on the doom of Israel and Judah was modified by the hope of restoration. After 587 the task of prophecy was now positive and constructive. It aimed at encouraging repentance and maintaining hope. "...the glorifying

- - - - -

(4) Cf. Isa.9.4; 13.6; Ezek.30.3.

(5) Cf. Amos 3.2. "Israel's duty was to worship Yahweh, and Yahweh's duty was to protect Israel". R.H. Charles, 'Eschatology', p.85. A further reflection of this idea is evident in Hab.1.4,13. Habakkuk thought of Israel and Assyria as related to each other in terms of the righteous (P' T S) and the wicked (W O 7), *ibid.* See also Isa. 26.10; Ps.9.5,17; 10.2,3,4; 58.10; 68.2; 125.3.

(6) Amos 3.2,11,12; 5.1-3,5,18,27; 6.7; 7.11; 9.4,9-15. See also Hos. 10.8; 13.16.

(7) Isa. 1.10-17,21-26; 2.19-21; 3.1-15; 5.18-24; 28.14-22; 29.1-4; 30.8-17; 31.3-4. Micah 3.12 emphasizes mainly the doom of Jerusalem.

(8) S. Mowinckel. See Mic.7.7; Zeph.3.9-11a; Nahum ; Hab.; Isa.10.5-19,27b-34; 14.27-29; 17.12-14; 29.1-8; 30.27-33; 31.5-9; Zeph.2.13-15; Mic.4.8-13; 4.13-5.5.

(9) G. von Rad, *ibid.*

of Israel in the world for the honour of Yahweh's own name, so that all the nations might own him as the only true God". (10) There is however no return to the idea that Israel can expect the blessing of Yahweh automatically. Always the emphasis is on an Israel purified. Jeremiah and Ezekial tend to emphasize individual rather than national judgment. (11) Out of this therefore a righteous congregation was to emerge to form the basis of the Messianic kingdom. Thus the restoration centred around the concept of a purified Israel. (12)

In the post-exilic period the idea of the day of Yahweh virtually replaced that of the Messianic kingdom. This kingdom is initiated not so much through judgment as through the missionary labours of Israel. This idea is found in the servant songs of Isaiah (13), where the servant is the pious remnant of the people. They have been chosen of God to a special kind of service; i.e. the conversion of mankind to the worship of Yahweh. Therefore the function of the true Israel is a missionary one.

It can be seen from the above that this understanding of the day of Yahweh is not eschatological in the strict sense of the term. Indeed S. Mowinckel goes so far as to suggest that "Israel's religion did not originally have an eschatology. It was pre-eminently a religion for life in this world, realistic, sturdy, robust". (14)

(10) Mowinckel, *ibid.* p. 137. So also R.H. Charles, *ibid.* p.100 f.

"Its object is to prepare the way for the eternal Messianic kingdom in which all the nations shall participate."

(11) Jer. 3.13 f. 9.24; 24.5,6,7; 31.33,34; 23.7,8; 25.15-24, 27-33; 36.6-10. Ezek. 6.8f; 7.16; 11.19; 14.13f; 18.4f; 33.18; 39.28.

(12) Jer. 23.7,8; 23.5,6; 24.5,6; Ezek. 11.17-21; 36.25-32; Nah. 1.15; Hab. 1.4. R.H. Charles regards the destruction of the state as responsible for this individualism. So from henceforth "the eschatology of the individual becomes a factor in the eschatology of the nation".

(13) Isa.42.1-4; 49.1-6; 50.4-9; 52.13-53.12.

(14) *Ibid.* p.130. For a 'contra' view see A.B. Davidson, 'Eschatology', A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, I, p.736a.

The earlier prophets were concerned about the historical situation. The destruction of Israel for them did not signify the end of history. The transformation that the day of Yahweh might bring, whether through judgment or through restoration, was always wrought from without history.

"It denotes the day in which Yahweh will intervene in the course of human history, so as supremely to reveal his power and his purpose....the Old Testament expectation is essentially of an intervention from without, not of an evolution from within". (15)

Yet at the same time God's action is always within history. Therefore in describing it Mowinckel prefers a term borrowed from Toynbee, i.e. 'futurism'. (16) When and how then does eschatology arise? Mowinckel suggests three reasons:

1. When this faith is "confronted with the brutal reality of history" (152) it begins to assume an other-worldly character. So, for example, in Deutero-Isaiah we see

"...the severance of the future hope from historical reality, from the contingent, from any causal connection with circumstances, so that it assumes an absolute character". (17)

Only this, Mowinckel claims, really deserves the epithet 'eschatological', for this takes on the character of finality, of an eschaton. There is nothing beyond the kingly rule of God so expressed. (18)

- - - - -

(15) H.W. Robinson, 'The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament'. Robinson adds at this point: "In this it resembles the New Testament expectation of the second Advent".

(16) So also von Rad, *ibid.* p. 106.

(17) *Ibid.* p. 154.

(18) See Gen. 49.1; Num. 24.14; Deut. 4.30; 31.29; Isa. 2.2; Jer. 23.20; 30.24; 48.47; 49.39; Ezek. 38.16; Hos. 3.5; Mic. 4.1; Dan. 10.14. All this represents a return to the original state, which Mowinckel sees as further evidence of the origin of the day of Yahweh in the New Year Festival. "To that age there is consciously applied in eschatology that fundamental principle which was inherent in connection with the New Year Festival". p. 262 Cf. Epistle of Barnabas 6.3 'Behold I make the last things like the first'.

2. The linking of the Old Testament future hope with the dualistic view of the world (263). This is characterised by the concept of the two ages; this age and the age to come. (19)

3. The third factor is the one that really determines the shape of eschatology in the Old Testament and in Judaism. This is theological reflection on the prophetic hope. It was this that gave birth to apocalyptic. (20) These 'disciples of the Prophets' borrow the terms used to describe the this-worldly hope of restoration and apply them to the 'last days'. The prophets, for example, wrote of the downfall of Israel and Judah in terms of this or that specific historical power. But after successive subjugations, and especially after occupation by Rome, many who followed them began to see that

"the empires that had dominated the world....were but successive embodiments of one great ungodly and unrighteous power, the heathen world in its implacable enmity to the true God and his will for mankind". (21)

Out of this also comes a change in the conception of God's judgment. It is no longer thought of in terms of a judgment directed against individual nations in accordance with their relationship to Israel. Rather it is described in terms of a great final assize, with God sitting on the throne. (22)

Connected with both the above conceptions is that of the final

(19). The terms are $\text{h}\bar{\text{a}}\text{-}\text{'}\text{ol}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m haz-zeh}$ and $\text{h}\bar{\text{a}}\text{-}\text{'}\text{ol}\bar{\text{a}}\text{m hab-b}\hat{\text{a}}$ tr.
 $\text{'}\text{o ai}\omega\text{v o}\text{'}\text{t}\text{o}\text{c}$ and $\text{'}\text{o ai}\omega\text{v m}\acute{\text{e}}\lambda\lambda\omega\text{v}$

These are two different ages, each with its own time and character. See Volz, 'Eschatologie', pp.64 ff. G.F. Moore 'Judaism', Cambridge, 1927, ll, pp.378 ff.

(20) Mowinckel defines apocalyptic as revealed theology with eschatology as its centre, p.266. Cf. also R.H. Charles, 'Eschatology', p.120. "The forecasts of these prophets (i.e. some of the later post-exilic prophets) do not as a rule stand in living relation with the present and its needs, but are frequently the results of literary reflection on former prophecies".

(21) G.F. Moore, 'Judaism', ll, 331-2. Moore calls this the 'unitary' view of history.

(22) Dan.7.9-14; Enoch 90.20-27.

tribulation. This represents the eschatologising of the idea already evident in the prophets, that of the final attack on Jerusalem. (23) It is from this period, when Old Testament prophecy had developed into apocalyptic, that one sees many of the ideas that are later reflected in the New Testament eschatology: the idea that this age is doomed to destruction, since it belongs to the cosmic powers of evil, which powers will eventually bring wickedness to its climax; the emphasis on signs, such as the failing of the powers of nature, cosmic disturbances, failure of the sun and the moon etc. (24) There will be rebellion and war, with all men at strife with their fellows. (25) All these constitute the throes of the Messianic age, (26) which are really the last struggle of the satanic powers against God. (27) This is followed by the divine victory, the resurrection, and the judgment, (28) and the creation of a new heaven and a new earth. The idea of a new heaven and a new earth emphasizes the Jewish refusal to spiritualize completely.

(23) Zech 4-14; Ezek. 38-39; Dan. 7.21,22; 12.1; Joel 3.1-2.

(24) 2 Esdras 5.4-6,8,50-55; 6.16,21 f., 24; 2 Bar. 27; 32.1;

1 Enoch 8.2; 99.5; 100.11; Jub. 23.18,25; Sib. 2.154 f.,

164 f.; 3.538 f., 633, 796-806; Josephus B.J. 6.285 ff.; Apoc.

Abr. 29f.; Rev. 6.12 ff.; 11.6; 2 Macc. 5.2f. See also Volz,

'Eschatologie', pp.155 f.

(25) 1 Enoch 99.4,8; 110.2; 2 Esdras 5.1-5,9; 6.24; 9.3;

2 Bar. 25.3; 48.32f.; 70.2 f., 5 f.; Jub. 23.19; Sib. 3.633ff.;

Dan. 12.1; Mark 13.8. See Volz Esch. 2, pp.153 ff.

(26) Mt. 24.8. See also Weber, 'Jud. Theol'. 2, pp.350 f.,

Bousset, Relig. 2 pp.286 f., Volz. Esch. 2, p.147, Strack-

Billerback 1, p.950, 1V pp.974 ff, Moore 'Judaism,' 11.p.361.

(27) Dan. 12.1; 1 Enoch 90.16-18; 2 Esdras 13; Test. Jos. 19;

Sib. 111, 663 ff.; Rev. 12.7-9; 13-17; 19.19. Volz. Esch. 2,

pp.147-63.

(28) Dan. 7.9,11,12.

"Thus the new aeon means existence in a re-created world, in which everything evil and imperfect has been destroyed, and which has become spiritually and morally what it was immediately after creation". (29)

A Note re the Day of the Messiah

Mowinckel pp.302 ff.

Mowinckel refers to the idea current among the apocalyptists that the Messiah could be known only through his Messianic acts. Such an idea he sees reflected in the New Testament in such passages as John 2.17 f.; 7.3 f.; 14.22; Acts 1.6. Before such acts he is really only 'Messias designatus' (303). This idea that the Messiah is 'known' or recognized only through his mighty acts is related to the Old Testament ideas with respect to Yahweh's epiphany, in that "He makes himself known (nōda^c cf. Ps. 48.3; 76.1,2) revealing His character, through his glorious appearing and his mighty kingly acts". (p.303). The day of the Messiah is of course the day on which the Messiah comes to accomplish these revelatory acts (2 Esdras 13.52). Mowinckel claims that in the New Testament this term appears as the day of Jesus Christ. (1 Cor. 5.5; Phil.1.6,10; 2.16; 2 Thess.2.2). This term is related to and rises out of the older concept of the day of Yahweh.

(29) Mowinckel, *ibid.*, p.275.

THE TERM 'PAROUSIA' IN MATTHEW 24

The problems relating to the Synoptic Gospels are many and varied. The attempts to solve these problems however are almost always born of the same desire; to discover whether or not the discourse substantially represents the mind of Christ. In this in view the exegetes therefore concentrate on the twin problems of unity and source. The unity of matter is the main factor of these twin problems is not noticed by a corresponding unity in the answers suggested; on the contrary they range all the way from the suggestion, made by many, that this is a Jewish

- V -

THE TERM 'PAROUSIA' IN MATTHEW 24

From the viewpoint of this thesis however, these two questions are not of equal importance. The question of source, asked to determine whether or not the discourse, or any given part of it, comes from Jesus himself, or is a creation of the primitive Church, is not of primary concern to this thesis, although obviously it would be difficult to ignore. The question of the unity of the discourse, as it stands in Matthew especially, is of great importance to this thesis. The reason for this can be stated simply; the term under consideration is Matthew's term, and not the term we are concerned with what he meant by it; why he thought of it as a suitable term to express what he assumed to be the mind of Christ on this subject. Hence we are dealing here primarily with the mind of the evangelist, rather than with the mind of Christ.

The History of the Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels has been written by G. E. Beasley-Murray in Jesus and the Future, London, 1956. This book covers the period from the publication of G. Dalman's Jesus Christ et les Synoptiques Messianiques in 1878 to 1956, and including, the author's own investigation.

THE TERM 'PAROUSIA' IN MATTHEW 24

The problems relating to the Synoptic Apocalypse are many and varied. The attempts to solve these problems however are almost always born of the same desire; to discover whether or not the discourse substantially represents the mind of Christ. With this in view the exegetes therefore concentrate on the twin problems of unity and source. The unity of motive in the examination of these twin problems is not matched by a corresponding unity in the answers suggested; on the contrary they range all the way from the suggestion, made by many, that this is a Jewish Apocalypse ineffectually baptized at the hands of the primitive church to the opposite suggestion that this discourse as it stands is truly representative of the mind of Christ (1).

From the viewpoint of this thesis however, these two questions are not of equal importance. The question of source, asked in order to determine whether or not the discourse, or any given part of it, comes from Jesus himself, or is a creation of the primitive church, is not of primary concern to this thesis, although obviously it would be difficult to ignore. The question of the unity of the discourse, as it stands in Matthew especially, is of great importance to this thesis. The reason for this can be stated simply; the term under consideration is Matthew's term, and therefore we are concerned with what he meant by it; why he thought it to be a suitable term to express what he assumed to be the mind of Christ on this subject. Hence we are dealing here primarily with the mind of the evangelist, rather than with the mind of Christ,

(1) The history of the interpretation of the Synoptic Apocalypse has been written by G.R. Beasley-Murray in 'Jesus and the Future', London, 1956. This book covers the period from the publication of T. Colani's 'Jesus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps' down to, and including, the author's own investigation.

and the attempt to analyse the sources, beyond Matthew's use of Mark, Q, and the material peculiar to his account of the discourse, is not as helpful to our quest as his use of the materials given in the above sources, and the pattern of development which he imposes upon them. (2)

That the word itself is of importance to Matthew is obvious from the use to which he puts it. The discourse itself is introduced by this term, and it appears at three other crucial points in its development (3). In the eyes of some therefore it indicates the main thrust of Matthew's editorial policies (4), and indeed without doubt it does bear much of the weight of his eschatological emphasis. The word itself therefore as used by the evangelist is closely related to the claim, often made, that Matthew 'heightens' the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus. This is an assumption commonly held, and illustrated from Matthew's Gospel with apparent ease. F.C. Grant, in writing of the theology of the first Gospel, states baldly:

"It is a theology born of apocalyptic eschatology, as the full context clearly shows.....A comparison of this Gospel with the others makes it clear that Matthew has heightened the effect of many a saying, has added new editorial touches and new material which gives the impression that Jesus' teaching was primarily and thoroughly apocalyptic-eschatological".

A little later he continues:

(2) T.W. Manson, 'The Teaching of Jesus', 1935, p.247, with a view to the non-Biblical sources of apocalyptic, writes: "It does not help our comprehension of the apocalypses when we learn that this idea or that term is ultimately borrowed from Babylonian mythology or from the theology of Zarathustra, any more than it helps our understanding of a Beethoven Symphony when we hear that the theme of this or that movement is borrowed from an old folk-song. The significant thing is not whence the composer has got his material, but what he has done with it. And in the apocalypses what we require to understand is what the writer does with his materials, and what kind of hope for the future emerges from his speculations as a whole". This at least will be our aim with respect to Matthew.

(3) Mt. 24,27,37,39. All three passages are from Q.

(4) So Henry Burton Sharman, 'The Teaching Jesus about the Future', p.139, with reference to Matthew's use of the terms *ἁρῶσις* and *συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος* in 24.3. "He is concerned to represent the disciples as enquiring of Jesus a complete eschatological programme". See also T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.72.

"But it is impossible to believe that the teaching of Jesus was as thoroughly 'apocalyptic-eschatological' as Matthew presupposes". (5)

J.A.T. Robinson is even more severe in his appraisal of Matthew's re-interpretation of Jesus' eschatological teaching. This heightening of the apocalyptic is a charge which Robinson lays at the door of the primitive church, but he makes Matthew bear a large share of the guilt.

"But what the early Church did was precisely to make this translation of the eschatology of Jesus into the thought-forms of apocalyptic. It is a process which can be traced throughout the development of the Synoptic tradition and which reaches its climax in the Gospel of Matthew. The eschatological language of Jesus is increasingly referred not to the historical crisis and climax of his ministry, but to a point beyond it, and to certain highly mythological occurrences expected after a gradually lengthening interval. As in Judaism earlier, the indissoluble unity between the ethical and the eschatological is severed. The 'ethics' of Jesus come to be separated out, detached from their eschatological setting, and adapted to the ordered life of the Church. In the same way, the eschatological elements are assembled and schematized to provide a map for the future and a programme for its hope." (6)

The issue which is raised here takes us beyond the immediate concern of this thesis. However, the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew represents the climax of the apocalypticizing process of which the evangelist stands accused, and the issue must therefore be faced at least within the limits of this chapter.

Matthew, in the question that introduces the Synoptic Discourse, links the term 'parousia' with the subject of signs (24.3). Any consideration of this latter subject leads very quickly to

(5) F.C. Grant, 'The Gospels', London, 1957, pp.151-2. It should be added that F.C. Grant does credit Matthew with a practical rather than a speculative concern with apocalyptic. The above judgment, however, still stands.

(6) J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', London, 1957, p.98. See also B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', London, 1951, p.521 ff., H.A. Guy, 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things', London, 1948, pp.24-38, T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.71ff., 'The Work and Words of Jesus', London, 1950, p.101, *by A.M. Hunter.*

another problem that lies at the very heart of this discourse; i.e., the problem of suddenness and signs. The way in which the Parousia is here associated both with the swiftness of the event and the fact that it is preceded by signs has caused great uneasiness among almost all commentators, and has led to many attempts to resolve this apparent contradiction (7). Moreover, it is the emphasis on signs that causes the greatest embarrassment. This is a favourite concern of the typical apocalypticist, and most are loathe to lay such a concern at the feet of Jesus (8). W.G. Kümmel, for example, charges that this emphasis on signs

"forms an irreconcilable contrast with his refusal to search for apocalyptic enlightenment and for premonition of the end" (9).

Such a claim, of course, is by no means new. R.H. Charles made it long before. The Synoptics, he wrote, present us with two mutually exclusive accounts; on the one hand the Advent will take us by surprise (Mk.13.33-36, Mt.24.42-44, Lk.12.35-40, Mt.25.1-12, 24.37-41 -cf.Lk.17.26-36), and on the other hand it will be hailed by a succession of signs

"which are unmistakable precursors of its appearance, such as wars, and earthquakes, and famines, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the like" (10).

W. Bousset voiced a similar opinion at about the same time:

"The great majority of the prophecies in the thirteenth chapter of St. Mark and its parallels are probably only the product of the Christian community....It was contrary to his inmost nature to give such a detailed picture in all its stages of the events of the Last Day; he was no painter of the colossal" (11).

(7) For a survey of this problem and suggested solutions see G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Future', pp.172-183.

(8) Although few protest as vehemently as T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.136: "The bearing of Jesus is not that of a distraught wild-eyed apocalypticist shrieking out the vain message that millions now living will never die...." Surely no such suggestion is made even by the most literal interpretation of Mark 13 and parallels?

(9) W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', London, 1957, p.103.

(10) R.H. Charles, 'A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life', London, 1913, p.379. With his usual readiness, Charles excises vv.7,8,14-20,24-27,30,31, from the text.

(11) W. Bousset, 'Jesus', New York, 1906, p.121f.

Bousset is convinced that the emphasis on the sudden and unexpected nature of the end is truly characteristic of the mind of Christ. M.-J. Lagrange also regarded this juxtaposition of suddenness and signs as posing a very serious literary problem.

"That the awaited coming should be preceded by signs in the sky and yet be sudden and brilliant, one cannot conceive. But one can scarcely understand that an account composed from a single source would give him these two aspects without distinguishing them. It is however what Matthew has done. One recognizes therefore a mixture which he has carefully avoided by placing in different circumstances the coming, instantaneous and surprising, then the coming preceded by terrible signs. For the critic there is no doubt that one of these themes has been added to the other by Matthew in uniting two distinct traditions." (12)

Lagrange regards the references to the signs as constituting the insertion.

T.W. Manson, more recently, has developed this a little further. He has seen this contradiction as existing between Mark's account of the Apocalypse and the document Q. The Synoptic Apocalypse contains a description of a series of events: the destruction of the Temple, wars, earthquakes, famines, persecutions, false Messiahs and false prophets, and finally the coming of the Son of Man. But in the Q account (Lk.17.22-37)

"we find a picture of mankind going about their ordinary business, occupied with the daily routine of merchandise and matchmaking, eating and drinking. The masons are on the scaffolding; the farmer is at work in the fields; the women are grinding meal. Suddenly the Day is upon them".

And Manson continues:

"These two pictures are irreconcilable. Our authorities are divided: Q, L, and Paul against

(12) Le P.M.-J. Lagrange, 'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu', Paris, 1923, pp.455-6.

the Little Apocalypse. Moreover, the Marcan account is divided against itself. For the concluding sayings (Mk.13.32-37) agree with Q, L, and Paul against what has gone before" (13)

The point made above might appear to be unnecessarily burdened with these fairly extensive quotations. But the point is an important one, and the quotations form a necessary background for the investigation that is to follow. For, strangely, the term 'parousia', which by some is made to bear the weight of Matthew's taste for apocalyptic, is by Matthew linked with both the emphasis on signs and the emphasis on suddenness. We have already noted that in the introductory question it is linked with the subject of signs. This, in the eyes of many, brings it into poor company from the very beginning, and therefore renders it suspect. And yet, on the three other occasions when it is used in the discourse, it is linked not with the signs that precede the end, but with the suddenness with which the end comes. It is used in Matthew 24.27 in that passage from Q which emphasises the sudden and visible character of the Parousia, and again in vv.37 and 39 (once more from Q) with reference to the unexpected nature of its coming. The term 'parousia' therefore, rather than being associated with that apocalyptic element which so many commentators would like to discard, actually forms a connection between these two apparently irreconcilable elements in the Synoptic Apocalypse.

(13) T.W. Manson, 'The Teaching of Jesus', Cambridge, 1945, pp.261-2.

See also Guy, 'The Last Things', p.60, A.E.J. Rawlinson, St. Mark, London, 1927, p.181. Of course, not all agree that these two elements are irreconcilable. So J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium Nach Matthäus', p.239: "Und die Erwartung, dass alles sehr nahe sein könne und dennoch bestimmte Zeichen für das Ende erst eintreffen müssen, steht auch sonst in der Überlieferung hart nebeneinander (1 Kor.15.51 f. mit V.23f.; 1 Thess.5.2 mit 3.4; 2 Thess.2.3 ff. mit 1.5 ff.) Beides entspricht der Tatsache, dass das Ende lediglich von Gottes Plan abhängt. Er lässt die Zeiten und, was in ihnen geschieht, sich entfalten und erfüllen; und er allein weiss Zeit und Zeitpunkt; nah und schnell wird das Ende herinbrechen (s.z. Mk.9.1; 13.7f.,30-32)".

This surely gives us cause to doubt the usual presuppositions that are attached to this word; i.e. that it does bear the weight of Matthew's heightening of apocalyptic, and is therefore itself associated with the usual apocalyptic liking for signs. Indeed, it may even call into question the usual presuppositions about Matthew's tendency to apocalyptic, especially as apocalyptic embraces the theme of signs.

There is one other factor that should be considered by way of introduction. The question that is asked is linked with the theme of signs. It is therefore commonly assumed that Jesus proceeds to answer the request of the disciples in the terms asked. But surely there is ample precedent in the Gospels for the opposite assumption; i.e., that our Lord might well answer the questions but not in the terms asked (14).

It is our intention therefore to investigate these doubts in the following way:

1. an examination of those passages in the Synoptics that throw some light on Jesus' attitude to signs. This in turn should assist us to discover the kind of answer one might expect Jesus to give to the disciples' request for signs.
2. an examination of the Marcan account of the Synoptic Discourse (assuming it to be the primary source for Matthew 24), to see what kind of signs are offered in answer to the disciples' request.
3. an examination of the imperatives of Mark 13 to see what light they shed on the primary purpose of the Discourse.

(14) e.g. Lk.11.13 f., Mk.12.13-15, Mt. 22.27f., Jno.14.8f. and see especially the questions asked about signs, pp.94-104 below.

4. an examination of the use that Matthew makes of those passages from Q that have been incorporated into his Discourse.

5. an examination of those terms and passages that are peculiar to Matthew.

It is hoped that through the above program of investigation we shall discover exactly what Matthew had in mind when he made use of this peculiarly Greek term in a peculiarly Hebrew context.

In addition, by which he seeks to explain the meaning of the sign of Jonah, is an editorial gloss (15). The same charge has been made against Luke's addition, but without a corresponding unanimity of opinion (16).

Mark has given an emphatic 'no' to the request for a sign (17). However, the Q addition in Matthew and Luke refers to the sign of the prophet Jonah. This is a relatively enigmatic statement which is clarified somewhat by an addition [Mk. 11, 31-32 + Mt. 12, 41-42], in which we are told that Jonah and his message are the only sign granted the Ninevites, and Solomon and his wisdom were the only sign granted the Queen of Sheba. The meaning therefore seems to be that the only sign that will be granted the questioners by Jesus is Jesus and His message. These are self-authenticating (18).

1909 See O. J. Cadoux, 'The Historic Mission of Jesus', London, 1941, p. 153: "...a clearly unhistorical Christian fancy provided by Mark"; W. G. Kimmel, 'Promise and Fulfillment', p. 68: "...an un-
 1910 See also V. Taylor, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1959, and Sherman K. Johnson, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1960.

1911 See O. J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p. 153, approves; J. M. Creed, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', repudiates this text.
 1912 The word is a Semitic asseption equivalent to Q.N., meaning in effect, "God punish us if...". See E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus Evangelium'. See also V. Taylor, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1959, and Sherman K. Johnson, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1960.
 1913 See T. W. Manson, 'The Sayings of Jesus', London, p. 90, V. Taylor, 'Mark', O. J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p. 153, T. H. Robinson, 'St. Matthew', W. G. Kimmel, 'Promise and Fulfillment', p. 68, agree in substance with the above, although he understands the element of judgment in the message of Jesus as the 'sign'; as Jonah preached repentance immediately before the judgment so also Jesus preached

1. The Attitude of Jesus to Signs

(A) Mark 8.11-12, Luke 11.16,29-32, Matthew 12.38-42.

The saying of Mark 8.11-12 is repeated by Matthew and paralleled by Luke, with an addition from Q (Lk.11.29 - Mt.12.39). Luke has one further addition (v.30), and Matthew's peculiar contribution is v.40. It is generally agreed that Matthew's addition, by which he seeks to explain the meaning of the sign of Jonah, is an editorial gloss (15). The same charge has been made against Luke's addition, but without a corresponding unanimity of opinion (16).

Mark has given an emphatic 'no' to the request for a sign (17). However, the Q addition in Matthew and Luke refers to the sign of the prophet Jonah. This is a relatively enigmatic statement which is clarified somewhat by an addition (Lk.11.31-32 = Mt.12.41-42), in which we are told that Jonah and his message are the only sign granted the Ninevites, and Solomon and his wisdom were the only sign granted the Queen of Sheba. The meaning therefore seems to be that the only sign that will be granted the questioners by Jesus is Jesus and His message. These are self-authenticating (18).

(15) So C.J. Cadoux, 'The Historic Mission of Jesus', London, 1941, p.153: "...a clearly unhistorical Christian fancy provided by M or m"; W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.68: "...an unnatural parallel between Jonah and Jesus, foreign to Jesus' original saying; T.H. Robinson, 'St. Matthew'.

(16) C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.153, approves; J.M. Creed, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', repudiates this text.

(17) εἰ is a Semitic assertion equivalent to $\bar{\text{O}} \bar{\text{N}}$, meaning in effect, "God punish me if....". So E. Klosterman, 'Das Markus Evangelium'. See also V. Taylor, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1959, and Sherman E. Johnson, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1960.

(18) So T.W. Manson, 'The Sayings of Jesus', London, p.90, V. Taylor, 'Mark', C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.153, T.H. Robinson, 'St. Matthew'. W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.68, agrees in substance with the above, although he understands the element of Judgment in the message of Jesus as the 'sign'; as Jonah preached repentance immediately before the judgment so also Jesus preached

Whatever may have been the original reference of this enigmatic sign of Jonah, it seems clear, from the context given these texts, that the editors had something more than the above in mind. Surely the refusal of a sign, which in Mark is absolute, and in Q is qualified by the offer of the sign of Jonah, must be understood against the background of the signs already offered to those who can discern them. Mark, for example, in 8.1-10 has recounted the miracle of the loaves and fishes. With this miracle in mind, Mark has Jesus warn the disciples against the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod (v.15). This immediately brings to their minds the thought of bread, and leads to the comment, "We have no bread" (v.16), thereby revealing their failure to understand what Christ has just said. This lack of comprehension provides Jesus with the grounds for His rebuke (vv.17,18), which calls to mind the miracle just performed; i.e. he rebuked them because they failed to understand the significance of the miracle which they had just seen, as a sign bearing witness to Him. It is against the background of this miracle, interpreted as a sign to the disciples, that Mark places the Pharisees' request for a sign (19)

A different kind of miracle forms the background for these sayings in Luke 11.29f. Here is an exorcism miracle well-attested

- - - - -

(18) (cont'd.)---- repentance immediately before the judgment.

"Jesus, the preacher of judgment, is therefore the sign that will be given to this generation." So also S.E. Johnson, 'St. Mark', J.M. Creed, 'St. Luke', refers to J.H. Michael's idea in the Journal of Theological Studies, XXI (Jan. 1920), p.146f., to the effect that 'Iwvā is a very early corruption of 'Iwāvov. Hence the original saying referred to the sign of John the Baptist. He sees Mark 11.27f. as a confirmation of this idea.

(19) This conversation is recorded by Matthew immediately following a comment on the subject of signs (Mt.16.1ff., see below p.99 ff.). This procedure is reminiscent of the Johannine habit of using a miracle as a 'text' for a discourse on some aspect of Christ's Messianic vocation; e.g. John 6.1-14, -the miracle of the loaves and fishes - which is followed by the demand for a sign that would authenticate His claim, which in turn is followed by the sermon on Jesus as the Bread of Life.

by both Mark and Q (20). As in Mark it is one of the most important signs of the divine ἐξουσία of the Christ, so in Q, as used here by Luke, it becomes a sign that in Christ the Kingdom of God has come (21). It is doubtless not without significance that Luke has inserted the request for a sign (v.16) into the midst of his account of the exorcism, when of course one would expect it as the introduction to the comment on the theme of signs (v.29ff). In this way Luke indicates that Christ's healing of the possessed is a sign for those with eyes to see (22). The same context is given this request for a sign in Matthew (12.22-32), where it is separated from the comments on signs only by vv.33-37, whose theme Matthew doubtless felt was quite relevant to the context, continuing as it does the judgment on the Pharisees and leading up to the judgment on the contemporaries of Jesus.

There is one other factor to be considered here. The three accounts differ in the list of the questioners; Mark has the Pharisees demanding a sign from heaven, Matthew joins the scribes with the Pharisees, and Luke refers to them simply as ἄλλοι . In His answer, however, Jesus sweeps them all into the phrase ἡ γενεὰ , and adds the adjective πονηρὰ (Lk.11.29). Matthew is even more severe and describes ἡ γενεὰ as

- - - - -

(20) So W. Manson, 'Jesus the Messiah', London, 1943, p.39

(21) The text reads "Ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ . φθάνειν in classical Greek means 'to anticipate' someone; i.e., to get before him, and so be there before he knows. In Hellenistic Greek (in the aorist especially), it denotes the fact that a person has actually arrived at his goal. Hence this verse "expresses in the most vivid, forcible way the fact that the Kingdom of God has actually arrived". C.H. Dodd, 'The Parables of the Kingdom', New York, 1936, p.43, n.l. So also W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', who interprets it as indicating that the Kingdom of God had already begun in Jesus' activity, so that Jesus "provokes the presence of the eschatological consummation and... therefore stands at the centre of his eschatological message"; and he concludes: "It is the meaning of the mission of Jesus, when announcing the approach of the Kingdom of God, to make the future at the same time already now a present reality". pp.108-109.

(22) So J.M. Creed, 'St. Luke'.

πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλῖς (Mt.12.39). There seems little doubt that He means by this the whole contemporary generation of Judaism (23), and what He has to say about this generation, as we have seen, is far from complimentary. Why this harsh judgment? The answer in large measure lies in the attitude in which they approached Him, and the suspicion with which they viewed His claims. This attitude is evident here in the repeated use of the word *πειράζοντες* (Lk.11.16, Mt.16.1, Mk.8.11). This indicates that they were not making an honest endeavour to discover who He was, or how valid were His claims. Their inability to see the deeds already done as signs of His Messianic calling, was proof that they were not really looking.

The evangelists give us some hint of the kind of sign they wanted. They looked for a *σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, which presumably would be the kind of action, dramatic and spectacular, that would set him apart as a worker of wonders, and as standing in true apocalyptic tradition. Thus they attempted to dictate the terms by which he was to authenticate Himself, and those terms involved signs of an apocalyptic nature (24).

- - - - -

(23) So E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium': "Aber 8.39,9.19, 13.30 zeigen, dass sonst immer die ganze zeit-genössische Generation der Juden gemeint ist, die Jesus sich als einheitliche Masse gegenüber sieht....", p.86

(24) S.E. Johnson, 'St. Mark', p.142, refers to the Rabbinic commentary 'Pesikta Rabbati', which "taught that the Messiah, when he came, would stand on the roof of the Temple, and those who doubted would see a light from heaven streaming over him (Strack-Billerback, i, 641). The revolutionary Theudas promised signs to those who followed him (Josephus, Ant.xx.5.1). Jesus' opponents have in mind not such signs as he has already done, but an audible or visible sign from heaven". See also V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

Reginald H. Fuller, 'The Mission and Achievement of Jesus', London, 1956, states: "It is difficult to know in what sense a sign is demanded and in what sense a sign is refused". That is, one cannot tell whether the request was for a sign involving cosmological phenomenon in terms of the usual Jewish apocalyptic or a sign that would authenticate Jesus' present claims. (p.38) It appears more likely that they wanted a sign of the former type for the latter purpose. Fuller also states that Jesus refused the request for a sign because He would not perform miracles that drew attention to

Jesus' attitude to signs cannot therefore be regarded as completely negative. His miracles were signs, at least to those with the eyes to see them as such. This in part is the reason why He refused to accede to the Pharisees' request; a sign had already been granted (according to Mark the sign was the miracle of the loaves and fishes, and according to Matthew and Luke it was the act of exorcism), and they had refused to acknowledge it as a sign pointing to the proof of His claims - indeed, in the exorcism narrative, they had used the miracle as proof of their falsity. Moreover, they were not really interested in finding that for which they apparently sought, since the request itself was rooted in insincerity. And finally, the kind of sign they

- - - - -

(24) (Cont'd.) --- Himself. But this is not quite in accord with the facts. The miracles were signs pointing to Himself, as the One through whom and in whom the Kingdom had come. He once refused to perform miracles that certainly would have drawn attention to Himself on the ground that such a miracle, performed for its own sake, was a tempting of God (Mt.4.3ff., Luke 4.1ff.). Jesus' miracles were directed to human need; i.e. the miracles were performed because the situation demanded such a deed that compassion might be expressed and the need met, but once performed the miracles were signs pointing to Jesus as the One in whom the Kingdom had come. Therefore there is no ground for Fuller's statement that Jesus' refusal of a sign in Mark 8.11 "...does appear to prove conclusively that He refused to interpret them as signs of an already exercised Messiahship" (p.39). He is much closer to the truth when with reference to Mark 6.5 he states that "...such acts of power apart from their subordination to the kerygma would lie outside the scope of His mission" (p.90), assuming, of course, that His healing ministry is part of the kerygma. If I may borrow a phrase of Fuller's and use it in a little different sense than he intended, Jesus' miracles were not 'independent displays of divine power' calling attention to themselves, but displays of divine power directed toward human need and pointing to the Christ as the One in whom God's kingdom had broken into history.

B. Harvie Branscomb, 'The Gospel of St. Mark', London, p.139, has yet another explanation for His refusal. "His refusal may very likely have rested on the knowledge that He could not perform miracles at will - a fact even Mark betrays - and His unwillingness to tempt God by endeavouring to give a demonstration of His power." This fails to take into account the two factors already alluded to: the motive in asking and the kind of sign demanded.

wanted, common to apocalyptic and offered by would-be Messiahs, was completely foreign to the mind and spirit of the Christ (25).

(b) Luke 12.54-56, Matthew 16.1-4

It is generally agreed that the section in Matthew 16.1ff., beginning with Ὁψίας γενομένης and down to the end of v. 3, is not genuine (26). If this be so then Mt.16.1,2a,4 is left as a doublet of Mt.12.38-39.

The saying however remains in Luke, and in Luke it is given an eschatological setting. Here in the twelfth chapter is a group of sayings gathered together by Luke probably because they do have an eschatological reference. Here are sayings on the eternal consequences of affirmation or denial of Jesus now (vv.8-10), the watching servants (vv.35-40), faithfulness and unfaithfulness and their consequences (vv.42-48), and the divisions that result from His coming (vv.51-53). These all point to the fact that the present is a time of crisis, and the crisis has its focal point in the presence of Christ and men's

- - - - -

(25) The parable of Dives and Lazarus, Luke 16.19-31, further illustrates the futility of signs as a method of persuasion. That Jesus' attitude to signs was not completely negative is further evidenced by other references which deal with the theme of signs, even although the term itself has not been used and no specific request for signs has been given. So Mark 2.6-10, where His ἐξουσία to forgive sins is testified to by His power to make the paralytic walk. Q also emphasises that Christ's words and works are signs of His divine vocation; e.g., Jesus' answer to the question of John's disciples (Mt.11.4-6 = Lk.7.22-23), and His judgment on the impenitent cities of Galilee (Mt.11.21-24 = Lk.10.13-15). "In every one of these Q passages it is the mighty works done by Jesus αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γινόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν that leave men without excuse for not acknowledging in Jesus a revelation of God transcending all earlier revelation." W. Manson, 'Jesus the Messiah', pp.36-37.

(26) So M.-J. Lagrange, 'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu', p.315: "L'omission s'appuie sur 436 X Γ 13 124 157 onze autres, syrsin.-cur., sah. boh. (en majorite) arm". See also A. Plummer, 'St. Matthew', A.H. McNeile, 'St. Matthew', T.H. Robinson,

relationship to Him. But where in the previous saying on signs (Lk.11.29ff.), the emphasis was on the fact that with the coming of Christ the Kingdom had impinged on history, the saying in this chapter seems to emphasise that Christ's presence now is a sign that the Kingdom will shortly be consummated. To this His contemporaries appear to be blind, and they are rebuked because they can read the signs involving the coming weather, but are quite insensitive to the signs of the coming Kingdom.

"The work of Jesus is the sign of the time. From it they ought to infer that the Kingdom of God has come upon them and that the final consummation is near." (27)

It is of interest to note that W.G. Kümmel couples this saying with Mark.13.28 (28). This latter reference indicated to him that Jesus expected the consummation to be imminent and that He also expected it to be announced by premonitory signs. Jesus therefore rebukes His disciples (v.41ff.) and His contemporaries (v.54ff.) because they can understand the meaning of signs in the natural world but cannot interpret the events of the present as signs of the Kingdom.

"Therefore Jesus wishes the present to be understood as a pointer to the imminent eschatological consummation." (29)

- - - - -

- (26) (Cont'd.) --- 'St. Matthew', W. Allen, 'St. Matthew'.
 T.W. Manson, 'The Sayings of Jesus', p.121, states that
 "the Lucan form of the saying agrees with the facts in Palestine, where the rain comes from the west....and the wind from the east and south is accompanied by heat-waves". B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', pp.241ff., on the basis of Strack-Billerbeck i.737, claims that Rabbinical weather-sayings are concerned with cloud and wind, not with the appearance of the sky at sunset.
 (27) T.W. Manson, 'The Sayings of Jesus', p.121.
 (28) The saying about the fig-tree. He regards this as a detached saying. See 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.22.
 (29) Ibid. p.22.

But it is most doubtful that these two references can be linked in this way. The signs of the Kingdom that are rooted in His presence and His works are quite different from the 'signs' of Mark 13 - a fact for which we hope to marshall sufficient evidence in the pages that follow. One can only say at this point that Jesus did regard His Person and His work as a sign of the presence of the Kingdom and of the nearness of its consummation.

(C) Luke 17.20,21

This is generally regarded as a detached saying, so that its original reference, and therefore also its original meaning, is very difficult to ascertain (30). However, we do have the mind of Luke on this problem, and he may prove sufficient guide for the purpose of this thesis.

The question asked by the Pharisees would appear to have a different intent than those previously discussed. In the references above the requests for signs sought proof of a particular kind for the claims Christ made for Himself. Such signs, however, were already in evidence for those with eyes to see -- although not of the kind requested. But on this occasion the request was for a sign that would give warning of the coming of the Kingdom of God; i.e., tell when it would come. Such a coming, in the view of the Pharisees, and indeed in the view of most of those whom they

- - - - -
 (30) So M. Dibelius, 'From Tradition to Gospel', London, 1934, p.162. V. Taylor, 'The Formation of the Gospel Tradition', London, 1933, p.69. T.W. Manson, 'The Teaching of Jesus', feels that it may belong to Q. He suggests that Matthew omitted it because it is not in line" with his stress on the catastrophic aspect of the apocalyptic hope", p.123. So also B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.290. But is it any more in line with Luke 17.23? See also W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.32.

represented, would certainly be 'with observation'. By means of such signs attempts beyond number had been made to calculate when the Kingdom would come, and it was with such a possibility in mind that the request was made (31).

The answer which Jesus gives to this request centres around two phrases which are indicative of the significance of this saying: The first is the phrase μετὰ παρατηρήσεως παρατήρησις means 'to observe', 'to watch for' (32). The second phrase, ἐντὸς ὑμῶν has provided the grounds for a long debate, since it may be translated either 'among you' or 'within you' (33). Since the choice cannot be made on the basis of language alone, the key would seem to lie in the context. The context would appear to settle the matter very

(31) G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Jesus and the Future', pp.175-178, gives an excellent review of the kind of signs expected, and of the attempts made to calculate the date of the consummation on the basis of these signs. See also George Foot Moore, 'Judaism', Cambridge (U.S.A.), 1927, Vol. 11, pp.351 ff., and Strack-Billerbeck, 'Kommentar zum Nuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash', Munich, 1922, Vierter Band, Zweiter Teil, p.977ff.

(32) G. Dalman, 'The Words of Jesus', p.144, traces it to [ὁ], having the same meaning of 'to observe', 'to watch for', but also the meaning 'to wait for'. "Consequently, it is only the context of our Lord's saying that can determine the precise meaning in which [ὁ] is used. And the context favours 'to watch for', 'to be on the lookout for.' "...the Hellenistic word παρατηρήσις, which is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible designates observation especially of premonitory signs and symptoms." W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.32. A. Plummer, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', points out that παρατηρεῖν occurs in both the New Testament and in the LXX, and in medical writers it occurs of the watching of symptoms of a disease.

(33) G. Dalman, 'The Words of Jesus', Edinburgh, 1909, p.145: "Thus there are two possible options for Luke 17.21,22. The reading is either [ὁ] and this meant 'among you'; or else [ἐν] with the sense of 'within you'". So also W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.33, n.50. One of the strongest arguments for the translation 'within you' comes from Luke's frequent use of ἐν μέσῳ to express the idea 'among' (2.46, 8.7,10.3, 21.21, 22.27,55, 24.36), which might lead one to expect this phrase here if this was his meaning. While this linguistic usage is a break from custom on Luke's part, the theological thought expressed in the term 'within you' would be a break from custom on Christ's part, and therefore one must weigh these two factors and make the choice.

quickly, and that in favour of the translation 'among you', since it seems highly unlikely that Jesus would have referred to the Pharisees as those 'within whom' the Kingdom dwelt. But then, since it is doubtful that this was the original context, the saying may not originally have been prompted by the Pharisees' question, nor the answer directed to them. It is thus that Dalman argues, and therefore he feels free to choose the meaning 'within you' (34). The fact remains however that Luke was well aware of Jesus' attitude to the Pharisees (35), and it seems unlikely that he himself would be responsible for such a discrepancy, or that he would have allowed such a discrepancy to stand in his use of his source. Moreover, the argument that ἐντός ὑμῶν emphasises the inner and spiritual character of the Kingdom, which is not open to external observation, is not in agreement with what the evangelists have already said about the miracles as signs - and very obviously external signs- of the presence of the Kingdom. The context therefore does favour the interpretation 'among you' (36).

- - - - -

(34) "What Jesus had in view in this utterance was the unseen genesis of the theocracy caused by the 'Word' and its effectual working, as the latter is set forth in the parables of the Sower (Lk.8.4ff.), the Grain of Mustard-seed, and the Leaven (Lk.13.18ff.). Such an inner advent of the sovereignty of God realised itself in all those to whom the teaching of Jesus had access." Dalman, *ibid.* p.146. Kümmel accepts the validity of Dalman's argument while favouring the translation 'amongst you', *ibid.* pp.33-34.

(35) Luke 11.37-53, 18.10-14.

(36) It is so translated by C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.130, G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Future', p.174, A. Plummer, 'St. Luke', W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.34, M. Dibelius, 'From Tradition to Gospel', p.162, n.2, J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', London, 1957, p.72, interprets it as meaning that the Kingdom of God will "suddenly be in your midst". There is no ground however for such an interpretation.

Jesus' reply therefore is to the effect that they need not look for external signs of its coming of the kind common to Jewish apocalyptic expectation, for the Kingdom is already present, and the signs of its presence they have failed to see.

The theme of v.22ff., however, is the consummation of the Kingdom. Here indirectly at least the question of signs is involved (v.23 - see Mt. 24.24) - signs not of the presence of the Kingdom now but of its consummation. But again no signs are promised, and indeed by implication are rejected, for the consummation comes too quickly for signs of any kind to be of avail (37). Therefore those who purport to give warning of its consummation are to be ignored, for there will be no warning in terms of premonitory signs.

(D) Mark 13.4, Matthew 24.3, Luke 21.7.

Once again the number and personnel of the questioners vary from evangelist to evangelist. Mark has Peter and James and John address the question to Jesus, Matthew makes the disciples responsible, and Luke does not specify in any way. Mark and Matthew add the qualification $\kappa\alpha\tau' \textit{id}\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$. All three, however, place the question within the context of the Temple, and Jesus'

- - - - -

(37) See below p.156 ff. W. Manson, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', p.199, sees a contradiction between v.21, which excludes the possibility of a sign, and v.24, which includes one. "Possibly therefore in v.24 the Christian tradition is affected by apocalyptic ideas which it was the purpose of Jesus to discourage." But what kind of a sign is lightning? What kind of warning does it provide? Surely the analogy of v.24 only serves to corroborate v.21 rather than contradict it.

prophecy of its destruction (38). This prophecy of its destruction is found elsewhere in the Gospels (39), and although its original form cannot be ascertained with certainty, it appears to be firmly rooted in the primitive Christian tradition. There is no doubt that the sayings of Mt.23.37-39 = Lk.13.34-35 are eschatological in character, and the same may be said of Mark 14.58 (and presumably therefore also of Mark 15.29) (40). It may therefore be assumed with some degree of assurance that the same is true for those references to the destruction of the temple at the beginning of the Synoptic Apocalypse.

"Consequently Jesus did in fact think of the doom of the Jewish Temple as connected with the dawn of the Kingdom of God." (41)

Strack-Billerbeck claims that the question of the disciples presupposes that a period of distress will precede the Messianic Kingdom, in which the Temple itself can sink in ruins (42). Matthew, of course, in the way in which he frames the question,

- - - - -

(38) Mark 13.2, Mt.24.2, Luke 21.6. ↑ ^{χειρῶν} D W it Cyp add καὶ δὲ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ This is probably due to the influence of 14.58 (see also John 2.19). G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'A Commentary on Mark Thirteen', New York, 1957, refers to Easton, Bultmann, Lohmeyer, who all regard the disciples' exclamation on the beauty of the Temple as artificial. He claims, however, that the disciples, as Galileans, could easily be lead to comment on the beauty of the Temple, and he refers to Josephus, Ant. XV.XI.3 ff. So also A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', p.182.

(39) Mt.23.37-39 = Lk.13.34-35, Mark 14.58, 15.29. cf. also John 2.19, Acts 6.14.

(40) So W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.101 n.46: "...for every Jew must have understood the prediction of a new temple building to be meant eschatologically, as a new temple building was expected from the messianic era". See also Amos N. Wilder, 'Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus', New York, p.51, n.26, and R. Otto, 'The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man', London, 1938, pp.61-2.

(41) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* pp.101-2.

(42) Strack-Billerbeck, *ibid.* on Mt.24.3.

leaves no doubt whatever about the connection between the destruction of the Temple and the consummation of the age (43).

The destruction of the Temple, therefore, and the question asked about the time of that destruction - even in Mark and Luke (as certainly in Matthew and with equal certainty in the body of the discourse in all three accounts) -, have an eschatological frame of reference. The question goes beyond the mere historical event to the eschatological events that are described in the body of the discourse (44). The question of the disciples therefore is of the same order as that of the Pharisees in Luke 17.20. They are not here concerned with signs as proof of His Messianic vocation. They were thinking of the consummation, and of the kind of signs that were expected to precede the consummation - signs of the kind that make calculation, and therefore also preparation of the kind directed toward the time of the event, possible. With signs of the presence of the Kingdom in His

(43) τῆς οἴης παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος

My immediate concern is with the latter phrase, since the meaning of the term παρουσία cannot yet be presupposed. This latter phrase is used by Matthew in 13.39f., 49, 28.20, and 24.3 (See also Heb.9.26). Dalman, *ibid.* p.155, refers to the phrase in Dan.12.4,

Υ Ρ Ν Ζ Τ Χ

LXX. ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας and Dan.12.13

Ω Ἰ Ἰ Ὡ Ὡ Ὡ Ὡ

LXX. εἰς συντέλειαν ἡμερῶν

See also Strack-Billerbeck on Mt.24.2. J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', p.52, claims that the phrase συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος does not necessarily involve a παρουσία, and refers to 1 Cor. 15.24-28, where the παρουσία occurs prior to the end. Matthew at this point has done no more than clarify the frame of reference of the Discourse.

(44) There is of course disagreement about the reference of the ταῦτα in Mark 13.4. So G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', states that it implies that the disciples realise that this is not going to be an isolated event. V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', claims that they refer to the destruction of the Temple exclusively, but that ταῦτα...πάντα refers to what follows. A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', confesses that 'these things' should refer to the destruction of the Temple, but probably refers to what follows. B.H. Branscomb, 'St. Mark', regards vv.3 and 4 as 'obviously editorial', intended to provide a setting for the discourse that follows. It is designed "to connect two units of sayings which deal with different themes, the one with the destruction of the Temple, the other with the end of the Age". p.233. But at least from the viewpoint of the editors these must not be separated. And the same might also be said of those who asked the question.

Person and His work Jesus is concerned, and such signs have already been granted. But signs of the consummation of the Kingdom, of the kind usually considered in Jewish literature, are repudiated without qualification. He has refused such signs both because of their nature and because of the reasons for the request. And yet He appears to answer the request of the disciples in the terms asked.

We have already noted the apparent contradiction between the emphasis on signs and the emphasis on suddenness (see above pp.88-92). If our claim, which we have sought to establish above, that He repudiated any request for signs of the kind that might help toward a calculation of the end, is accepted, then we are faced with another apparent contradiction in the answer that Jesus appears to give to the request of the disciples. It is our thesis that the resolution of these contradictions lies in the character of the signs that are given in the body of the Discourse.

depend in large measure on the significance of the proposition. Previous usage is helpful, but the word *κατα* is used in Matt 23:23 and 23:24 with the preposition *κατα*, and in vv. 25 and 26 with the preposition *κατα*. (45). The change in preposition may be assumed to have an effect on the meaning. It seems unlikely that the disciples asking these questions (receiving a little child, casting out devils, giving a drink of cold water) were in the position of being asked of Jesus. This would make no sense whatever. The answer to the question W. Manson suggests that if any contradiction is to be said it must lie in the interpretation of the word *κατα*, but I am not anxious to press the distinction. W. Manson, 'The Kingdom of the Heavens in the Gospels of the N.T.', J.T.S., p.177f.

11. The Character of the Signs of Mark 13

The primary question before us in our examination of the text of the Synoptic Apocalypse is this: does Jesus here answer the request of the disciples in the terms in which it was made; i.e., are the events herein described to be interpreted as signs that will give warning of the consummation and allow for calculation and preparation?

(A) Mark 13:5-8 : The false emissaries of Christ, the threats of wars, and the natural disasters.

The Apocalypse proper is opened with a warning - Βλέπετε ! (see below p.148). Unfortunately, it is not at all clear against what or whom the warning is issued. The clue lies in two ambiguous phrases in v.6: ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου and ἐγὼ εἶμι . Both these phrases have been extensively analysed, but certainty has eluded the conclusions of the analysts.

The meaning of the phrase ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί seems to depend in large measure on the significance of the preposition. Previous usage is helpful, but by no means decisive. The phrase is used in Mark 9.37 and 39 with the preposition ἐπὶ , and in vv.38 and 41 with the preposition ἐν (45). The change in preposition may be assumed to have no effect on the meaning. It seems unlikely that the persons doing these things (receiving a little child, casting out demons, giving a cup of cold water) were in the process usurping the name of Jesus. This would make no sense whatever with respect to the

(45) W. Manson suggests that if any distinction is to be made it must lie in the instrumental character of ἐν , but he is not anxious to press the distinction. W. Manson, 'The Ἐγὼ εἶμι of the Messianic Presence in the N.T.', J.T.S., 1947, p.137ff.

first and last of these activities, and it may be assumed that Jesus would not give His approval to anyone practising exorcism by usurping His name. The phrase therefore in this context would mean 'by His authority' or 'under His authority', or it might, especially in the first and last of these references, mean simply 'in accordance with His will', or 'in conformity with His mind' (46).

It is this usage that has lead E. Klostermann to insist that those who come thus claim for themselves the authority of Christ (47). Others, however, are prepared to go further, and they see this phrase as indicating that those who come are assuming to themselves the prerogatives of the name of the Messiah. This does not mean necessarily that they claimed the title for themselves, but that they assumed some of the Messianic functions (48). Matthew however goes one step beyond even this. His addition of the phrase $\acute{\omicron}$ Χριστός would seem to indicate that they actually claimed for themselves the title of the Messiah.

The second phrase is, if anything, even more difficult of interpretation. J. Schniewind, who rightly calls it a 'geheimnisvoll Spruch', finds its basis in the Old Testament

(46) See also Mt.25.31ff.

(47) E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium': " $\epsilon\pi\iota$ τῷ $\epsilon\mu\phi$ ὀνόματι" heisst nicht, sie führen denselben Namen wie ich, d.h. den Messiasitel.....sondern 'unter Berufung auf mich', 'auf meine Autorität hin' s.9.37,39" p.149. However, he regards the phrase as a Christian interpolation.

(48) So J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Markus', Göttingen, 1949, E.P. Gould, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark', Edinburgh, 1907, A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', A. Plummer, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', Edinburgh, 1916. The argument that such an interpretation is impossible on the ground that there were no such Messianic pretenders until the time of Bar Cochba in A.D. 132 is not decisive, for there were many who did assume to themselves some of the functions of the Messiah. So W. Sanday, 'The Life of Christ in Recent Research', Oxford, 1907, p.81: "But I imagine that from the time of the Maccabees to the time of Barcochba

(Exod.3.14, Isa.43.10f., 52.6f.), from whence it is borrowed and applied to the Messiah (49). This of course favours the interpretation given to ἐπιτῶ ὀνόματι μου to the effect that these were pretenders usurping the functions of the Messiah. W. Manson, on the other hand, has argued effectively, if not conclusively, that the phrase really means 'the Christ has come'; i.e. the Parousia has arrived. This equates it with the warning of 2 Thessalonians 2 (50). Whatever may be the validity of his arguments, such an interpretation would certainly fit the context.

However, the saying is too obscure to be interpreted with any degree of certainty. But even though certainty here must be denied us, the purpose of the warning is clear. The question about signs has brought to mind the overriding concern of many with the subject, and the proneness of many to heed such claimants, and the need to be on guard against all such. No matter how catastrophic the events that follow may be, they must not be stamped into thinking that now surely He will come. For any such interpretation of these events will only lay them open to easy deception.

The references to wars, uprisings, earthquakes, and famines in the following verses are all very common to apocalyptic

- - - - -
- (48) (Cont'd.) ---there was a Messianic background, or something like it, to every popular movement that swept over Palestine".
- (49) J. Schniewind, *ibid.* See also E. Lohmeyer, 'Das Evangelium des Markus', Göttingen, 1951, p.270.
- (50) W. Manson, *ibid.* Manson sees both the Synoptic Apocalypse and the Thessalonian Apocalypse as aimed at rescuing the church from a paralysis of excessive apocalypticism, and at keeping it orientated to its supreme task of missionary enterprise.

warnings (51). The specific historic references here may be to the troubles in Caligula's reign, or the famine under Claudius (Acts 11.28), or the earthquakes in Laodicea in A.D.61 and Pompeii in A.D.62, and of the campaigns in Corbolo in Armenia, or the generally disturbed state of the Empire under Nero.

The two phrases that hold the greatest significance for our purpose are ἀλλ' οὕτω τὸ τέλος (v.7), and ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων (v.8). The significance of the word τέλος in v.7 depends to some extent on one's view of the sources for the Synoptic Apocalypse. From the editor's viewpoint however there seems little doubt that even if the specific reference is to the fall of Jerusalem this for him includes all the events that are associated with it; i.e. the Parousia and the consummation (52). And of course the point is this: that even though these events are common in apocalyptic as designations of the End, yet the End is not yet. These are not therefore to be interpreted as signs that the Parousia is about to occur, and those who do so interpret them are to be rejected as in error. But although they do not designate τὸ τέλος, they are to be viewed as ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων (v.8).

(51) See Isa.19.2, Jer.4.19ff., 6.22ff., 49.1ff., Dan.7.21f., Joel 3.9f., 2 Esd.5.1-12, 6.18-25, 13.31, 15.16, Apoc. Bar.27.4-8, 70.2-10, Jubilees 23.16-25, Enoch 99.4-7, 100.1-6, Sib.Or.3.635, Rev.6.8, 11.13, 16.18, 18.8. War, famine, and pestilence are commonly regarded as divine judgments: 1 Kings 8.37, Jer.14.12, 21.7, Ezek.14.21, Isa.13.13, Hag.2.6, Zech.14.4. See also Paul S. Minear, 'Christian Hope and the Second Coming', Philadelphia, 1954, p.163ff., for an excellent resume of the theological significance of the earthquake in the O.T.

(52) So Strack-Billerbeck, 'Mattäus', I, 946; τὸ τέλος = Ἰ.?, 'Ende', 'Endtermin'. The earlier view identified Ἰ. with the end of the present Aeon and the beginning of the future world. So Dan.12.4. It was the post-Christian synagogue that separated the Day of the Messiah from the eschatological future world. So also W. Allen, 'St. Matthew', who interprets it as referring to the fall of Jerusalem, the consequent Parousia, and the consummation of

The word $\omega\delta\iota\nu$ here may mean quite simply 'woe', as in Acts 2.24 and 1 Thess.5.3. There is however a possible reference to the rabbinical phrase $\Pi' \omega' \eta' \lambda' \omega' \gamma' \lambda' \gamma' \eta'$, which is translated 'the woe of the Messiah'. This is found only in the singular. The reference is not to the woes that befall the Messiah but rather to the woes out of which the Messianic period is born (53). On the other hand the reference may be quite simply to the pain that accompanies child-birth, as representative of the agony of this period of distress. Whatever may be its specific reference, however, it is plain that such a term, against the background of the awesome events here described, would provide material for any apocalyptic who was anxious to proclaim that now is the End, and would certainly make all who were anxious for the End ready to listen to those who were prepared to proclaim it. But now is not the end - on the contrary, it is the beginning - the beginning of trouble and of sorrow. Therefore these events, however much they may take on the appearance of apocalyptic, are not signs of the kind requested - the kind that would enable one to calculate the time of the Parousia, and allow one to make the necessary preparations for it.

- - - - -

(52) (Cont'd.) --- the age. See also G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Mark Thirteen'.

(53) Strack-Billerbeck, *ibid.* See also George Foot Moore, 'Judaism', 11, p.361: "...that is, not the suffering of the Messiah himself, as has sometimes been erroneously explained, but the throes of Mother Zion which is in labor to bring forth the Messiah - without metaphor, the Jewish people". cf. Book of Jubilees 23.18,19. Apoc. Bar.27-29, where the travail pains of the Messiah are described in similar terms. cf. also Rev.12, where a woman gives birth to a child who finally overcomes the dragon.

(B) Mark 13.9-13: The persecution of the disciples and the universal mission.

This whole passage so closely parallels the experience of the primitive church, and especially St. Paul's Gentile mission, that some have called it into question on the ground that it reflects the experience of the church rather than the mind of Christ (54). Not all, of course, are prepared to agree with this judgment, but see it rather as having firm roots in the mind of Christ.

"But substantially the predictions of persecution are historical. Personal suffering anticipated by Jesus Himself. His knowledge of the fate of John and of many of the ancient prophets, and His forecasts of the fate of Jerusalem, not to speak of the opposition of the Jewish hierarchy, made it certain that His followers would be exposed to fierce persecution" (55).

But perhaps an even more cogent argument is advanced by G.R. Beasley-Murray, when, with reference to the suggestion that these predictions are the work of the primitive church, he asks:

"Does the same apply to the Q logion about being brought before magistrates, Lk.12.11f.? to the drinking of the cup of suffering by James and John, Mk.10.38f.? to the prediction of persecution by relatives, Lk.12.51f.? to the blessing of Mt.5.10f.? to the warning not to fear them that kill the body, Lk.12.4f.? to the warning of the consequences of denying Christ, Lk.12.9f.? to the declaration that the only way to save one's life is to lose it, Mk.8.35?.....If Jesus

- - - - -

(54) V. Taylor refers to Bacon, B G S 184, B.H. Streeter, Oxford Studies, p.181, R. Bultman, 'Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition, 2nd. ed. 1931, p.129, E. Lohmeyer, 'Das Evangelium des Markus, Göttingen, 1937. A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', and P.A. Micklem, 'The Gospel According to St. Matthew', London, 1917, both hint at this suggestion.

(55) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', p.507.

anticipated that his disciples would encounter hostility similar to what he himself endured, he could express it in no other ways than he adopted: authorities meant Jewish courts, Roman governors, and petty kings." (56)

There is however the suggestion by some that while these prophecies of persecution may have their roots in the mind of Christ, nonetheless there is in this section a heightening of the apocalyptic element inherent in these sayings. Mark is thus accused of adapting genuine sayings of Jesus in such a way that they form a suitable part of the apocalyptic discourse. The climax of this heightening of the apocalyptic element is usually taken to be the saying about family divisions, Mark 13.12, which is customarily set against the background of similar apocalyptic sayings on this same theme in the Old Testament and in Apocalyptic literature generally (57). While one may not quarrel with the claim that family disruption is a concept common to apocalyptic, one may however question the thesis that as used by Mark it gives evidence of his adaptation of genuine sayings of Christ to the apocalyptic emphasis of the thirteenth chapter. Such a doubt is raised by an examination of a parallel

(56) G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Jesus and the Future', p.194.

(57) V.12 is generally regarded as reflecting the thought of Micah 7.6: διότι υἱὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, θυγάτηρ ἐλασαστήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς, ἐχθροὶ πάντες ἀνδρὸς οἰκῆν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

This in turn is part of the common stock of apocalyptic expectations: Enoch 99.5, 100.1-2, Jub.23.19, 2 Esd.6.24, 5.9, 4 Ezra 5.9, 2 Baruch 70.3,6. V. Taylor is also disturbed by the universal form in which the hatred of the disciples is expressed (v.13). This of course assumes a universal mission, and about that he has some doubts. If it be accepted however that Jesus did conceive of a universal mission, then universal hatred would be a natural consequence, and even Matthew's addition of τῶν ἐθνῶν (24.9) would be merely a faithful interpretation, rather than a further development of Mark's universalizing tendencies. cf. his conclusion (in spite of his recognition of the general authenticity of 13.9,11) : "Mk.13.9-11 is progressively coloured by apocalyptic expectations".

reference in the Q logion, Mt.10.35 = Lk.12.52 (58). Matthew has placed this saying within the orbit of the commissioning of the twelve (Mt. 10.1ff.). This is a natural enough context for a saying that describes the effects of the preaching of the Gospel in terms of divided households, and in this respect it parallels the promise of persecution that follows immediately on the commissioning of the twelve. It should be noticed that eschatological references are by no means foreign to the context: the charge to the twelve is concluded with a reference to the final judgment (v.15), and the promise of the Father's concern closes with a reference to the eternal consequences of denial or affirmation now (vv.32-33). Luke has given this Q logion a different context; a context however that is much more eschatological in character. It is preceded by a warning to preparedness (v.35), and the parable of the servant awaiting his master's return (vv.36-39), a parable whose meaning is not left to doubt with the addition of the warning about the Lord's return (v.40). This is followed by the parable of the wise steward (vv.41-48), then the saying on the divisions that result from his coming, and then the comment on signs (vv.54-56). Thus this Q logion, in Matthew but especially in Luke, is given a thoroughly eschatological setting. In what way therefore, or on what grounds, can the claim be made that Mark has 'adapted' this saying to his apocalyptic usage? Indeed, in both cases the

(58) Mt.10.35,36: ἦθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Lk.12.52,53 ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν ἐνὶ οἴκῳ διαμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισὶν διαμερισθῶσονται, πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἴος ἐπὶ πατρί, μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατέρᾳ καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ τῇ μητέρᾳ, πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τῇ νύμφῃ αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τῇ πενθερᾷ.

emphasis is not on apocalyptic but on eschatology; i.e., obedience to Jesus Christ is given an eschatological context. The emphasis is on the consequences, both in the present and in the future, of loyalty or disloyalty to Jesus Christ. And divided loyalties are the inevitable present consequence of loyalty to him. This indeed is inherent in the Gospel itself.

"The coming of Jesus brings tension: it brings to sharpest issue the struggle between the Kingdom of God and the forms of evil. It compels men to take sides; and members of the same family may be in opposite camps." (59)

Thus, in spite of the apparent apocalyptic background, the persecutions and the divisions that result from the testimony of the disciples are not to be taken as signs of the kind requested, but are simply warnings about the consequences of following after Him.

But in case they are interpreted as signs of the kind requested, giving warning of the approaching Parousia, v.10 is inserted to forestall any resulting speculation.

There is no doubt that verse ten does appear as an intrusion in this section. The thought of verse nine leads quite naturally and logically to the theme of verse eleven, for the theme of verse eleven is linked both in logic and in experience to the theme of verse nine; persecution does intensify the divisions created by obedience to Christ (60). If the emphasis was intended to be on the preaching of the Gospel as a condition of the End, then it would be better to have placed it where

(59) T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', pp.120-121.

(60) "The scandal foreseen is one of the reasons for which Jesus must warn his disciples and encourage them. It is the natural result of persecution. Fear is a cause of fall (Dn.11.41) and it leads to betrayals...." M.-J. Lagrange, 'St. Matthieu', p. 460.

Matthew did; i.e. at the end of this section on persecution and family division. However, there is a possible alternate punctuation which would solve this problem and at the same time give a different interpretation to the text. According to this amended punctuation the division comes after ἔθνη , with the πρῶτον interpreted as referring to the preaching of the Gospel (61). Then the text would read: εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . This reading receives additional support from Matthew 10.18 (62.) The meaning therefore is: 'Before you are arrested and beaten and appear before rulers, the Gospel must be preached'. Such an interpretation removes two objections to the verse: it eliminates the preaching of the Gospel to all nations as a condition of the End, and the necessity of crediting the Gentile Mission to the mind of Christ (63).

(61) πρῶτον δε δεῖ W 0108. 124. 127. 131. 565 b c d ff g²
 i r' vg. (1 MS) Sy. ^{hesh.} Cop. ^{sc.} Geo. F.C. Burkitt,
 'Christian Beginnings', London, 1924, favours this reading, and suggests the meaning as: "These things must be, but the End is not yet. There will be troubles everywhere, as the Prophets have said. And don't think you will not suffer: you will be delated to the Beth Din, flogged in synagogues, have to stand your trial before Roman officials (ἡγεμόνων) and the Herods (βασιλέων), for my sake. So you will be a testimony to Jews and Gentiles. This painful period of delay must be, so that the good news may be proclaimed". p.147. This he sees as favouring a Palestinian outlook, rather than a world evangelization program. An additional argument has been advanced in support of this reading by G.D. Kilpatrick, in 'The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13' (an essay in 'Studies in the Gospels', ed. by D.E. Nineham, pp.145-158). Kilpatrick has examined the customary word order in Mark, and especially in Mark 13. In chapter 13 he discovered that the verb is placed first 48 times, in the middle 16 times, and at the end 19 times. Therefore the odds are three to one in favour of the verb being at the beginning of the sentence, which of course should give additional support to this second reading. Unfortunately, I am in no position, due to lack of experience in this field, to know whether these odds are large or small, but the argument does appear to me to be singularly inconclusive.

(62) εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

(63) G.D. Kilpatrick, *ibid.*, has suggested that μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς , referring as it does to the suffering of the disciples as one of the woes before the End, is a testimony to governors

The arguments for this punctuation, however, are by no means conclusive (64). Indeed, while Matthew may be quoted in support of this punctuation (Mt.10.18), he may not be quoted in favour of the interpretation given to it (Mt.24.14) (65). Therefore from the viewpoint of this thesis, seeking as it does the mind of Matthew on these texts, these two issues - the questions relating to Jesus Christ and the Gentile Mission, and the fulfilment of that Mission as a condition of the End - must still be faced, and in the light of the uncertainty of the arguments adduced in favour of the alternative punctuation, now might be the best time to face them. The most serious objections are advanced against the idea that Jesus ever promoted a mission to the Gentiles. Indeed, we are told the opposite (cf. Mt.10.6). Moreover, it is commonly argued that if Jesus had given approval to a Gentile Mission this would not have been an issue in the primitive church (66). And yet the arguments advanced on behalf of this view are by no means conclusive, and impressive lists of references from the Synoptics have been marshalled to show that universalism was very much to the fore in the mind of

(63) (Cont'd.) --- and rulers that the End is near. But how could it? A sign can only be a sign to those equipped to recognize it as such. How could governors and rulers interpret it as such?

(64) See C. F. Burney, 'The Poetry of our Lord', Oxford, 1925 p. 118f.

(65) See below p. 170.

(66) Cf. R. Bultmann, 'Jesus and the Word', London, 1925, p.46: "The humanistic concept of universality is wholly foreign to him"; and J. Klausner, 'Jesus of Nazareth', London, 1925: "Although our present Gospels, even the earliest of them, were composed at a time when the Christian Church was replete with religious ideas derived from neighbouring races, the fact nevertheless emerges that Jesus never even dreamed of being a Prophet or a Messiah to the non-Jews". (p.363); and A. Loisy, 'L'Évangile selon Marc', Paris, 1912, p.372: "The idea is probably due to the influence of St. Paul".

Christ, and that in this He reflected the same spirit evident in the Old Testament (67). One of the most significant references perhaps, combining within itself something of the universalism of the Old Testament, and pointing toward the universalism of Christ, is the reference to the Sign of Jonah (Q Logion Lk.11.30). C.J. Cadoux has written concerning this passage:

"Now Jonah is the only prophet of the Old Testament who is said to have been sent with a warning and saving message to the Gentiles; and the choice of him as a sign is indicative of the inclusive range of Jesus' appeal, just as his allusions to the Ninevites' repentance and the Queen of Sheba's docility are indicative of his hopes for the Gentile world" (68).

And indeed even those references that appear to exclude a universal mission, may in actuality be the foundation stones for such a mission.

"But there was in the Scriptures what might be called a 'prophetic particularism' and its ultimate aim was universalistic. It conceived of Israel as an instrument prepared and fashioned by God (Isa.49.2) to be 'a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (ch.49.6).....On the view that Jesus spoke to his people as a Church with a missionary task, and linked his own mission primarily to calling it to that task and equipping it to carry it out, we can understand why his appeal was limited to Israel. His mission was to call Israel to be God's servant indeed. His purpose was to call the people as a whole to undertake the universal task for which it was ordained." (69)

- - - - -

(67) cf. J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Markus', Göttingen, 1949, p.169; he finds universalism in such references as Isa.52.7, 61.1, 60.6, Psa.96.2,3, and claims these as the basis for the universalism of the N.T. So the "Messias der Träger friedevoller Worte, die allen Völkern gelten".

(68) C.J. Cadoux, 'The Historic Mission of Jesus', p.153. See also pp.147-162. cf. also Mk.11.17, Lk.19.46=Mt.21.13, Lk.4.25-27(L), (and from Q) Lk.7.9=Mt.8.10, Lk.13.28-30=Mt.8.11f. (and from M) Mt.5.13-16, Mt.25.31-46 (and from L) Lk.10.29-37, Lk.17.15-18, and Mt.21.31b. See also G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Future', pp.195-6, for additional arguments for the idea of a universal mission.

(69) C.W.F. Smith, 'The Jesus of the Parables', Philadelphia, 1948, pp.140-141.

It must also be said that the argument that if Jesus had said anything specific about the Gentile Mission there would have been no issue over this matter in the primitive church is also far from conclusive. One must remember, for example, that He had much to say on the theme of adherence to Jewish legalistic practices, but there is evidence enough to the effect that much of what He had to say on this theme was not taken too seriously by at least some segments of the early church (70). Thus even when explicit reference is made to a specific theme it may not be fully understood nor faithfully applied in the later practice and experience of the church.

The text remains therefore, indicative of the mind of Christ, an apparent intrusion in this context, presenting us with a condition of the End. What then did Mark intend by this intrusion? What purpose does it fulfil? Does it fit into the usual apocalyptic emphasis on signs preceding the End; a sign that will give warning of the Parousia and thus allow for calculation and for preparation? If so, then what kind of a sign is this? Does it not come much closer to being a command to preach the Gospel - no matter what the price, regardless of the consequences for preacher or for hearer? They had asked for a sign of the End. Well, here was a sign for them - but its fulfilment was in their hands. Indeed, it may well be that it was inserted for the precise purpose of warning the church against the danger of assuming that the persecutions and the family divisions and the universal hatred - all familiar apocalyptic signs -, are to be taken as signs of the consummation.

- - - - -

(70) Cf. Mk.7.14-23 with the edict of the Jerusalem Council calling for abstention from blood and from things strangled, Acts.15.20. cf. also Mk.7.1-8, Mk.2.21-22=Mt.9.14-17=Lk.5.33-38.

Rather therefore than comforting themselves with the thought that now because of these sufferings the End will come, and waiting for it as the resolution of that suffering, they are to preach the Gospel. There is a task to be done, and when that is done then they may begin to think about the End.

(C) Mark 13.14-20: The Abomination of Desolation and the need for sudden flight.

The differences between Mark 13.14-20 and Matthew 24.15-22 are quite minor. The changes for the most part arise because of Matthew's attempts to explain Mark more clearly, or to improve on the composition (71). Matthew's account therefore is clearly of a secondary nature. Luke's changes however are of such a character that he has been accused of rewriting this section in the light of the events of A.D. 70 (72). And yet in spite of this there are those who are convinced that if Luke is not the more original he is at least using an independent

- - - - -

(71) e.g. Matthew has τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δαυιδ τὸ προφῆτου
 by way of explanation of Mark's enigmatic ὁ ἀναγινώσκων
 νοεῖτω cf. E. Klostermann, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus',
 Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen, 1950: "Daniel ist
 den Juden kein Prophet", and indeed only in the LXX does he
 appear as such. e.g. He substitutes the less enigmatic (although
 not wholly unenigmatic) ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ (v.15), for
 Mark's οὗ οὐ δεῖ (v.14). The ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ is
 not as explicit as it might appear, since it might mean simply
 Jerusalem (cf. 2 Macc.3.1f.), or even the Holy Land generally
 (So A.H.M'Neile, 'The Gospel according to St. Matthew'). e.g.,
 Matthew changes Mark's masculine participle ἐστηκότα to the
 more grammatical neuter participle ἐστὸς (Mk.13.14,
 Mt.24.16). e.g., Matthew omits Mark's μηδὲ εἰσελθᾶτω
 (Mk.13.15) and thereby permits the householder on the roof to
 descend from it, an action apparently denied him in Mark (Mt.24.17).
 (72) So B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.518. This idea is
 hinted at by Lonsdale Ragg, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke',
 London, 1922, and by Hans Conzelmann, 'The Theology of St. Luke',
 p.134. The strongest ground for this suspicion is of course his
 change of Mark's τὸ Βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως (Mk.13.14) to κη-
 λουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων (Lk.21.20). Ἱερουσαλήμ

source that does pre-date the Fall of Jerusalem (73), and still others have gone a long step further and argued that at this point Mark is dependent on Luke (74)

The primary question arising out of this section is the meaning of the τὸ Βδελύγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως of verse 14. This certainly has its roots in apocalyptic, and would appear to be the kind of sign sought by the disciples. This phrase is the Septuagint equivalent for $\text{בְּיָמֵינוּ יִפְּשֵׁן}$ in Dan.11.30, and $\text{בְּיָמֵינוּ יִפְּשֵׁן}$ in Dan.12.1. The key word here is the Hebrew בְּיָמֵינוּ , which may be used of the desolation of lands, as in Isa.49.8, and also of being awestruck, as in Jer.2.12. The phrase itself does seem to point in the direction of a destroying force (McNeile has translated it 'an abominable thing that layeth waste'), and yet the reference in Daniel is not to the destruction of the Temple but to its

(73) So C.H. Dodd, 'The Fall of Jerusalem and the Abomination of Desolation', Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. XXXVII, 1947, pp.47-54. cf. also A.H. McNeile, 'St. Matthew', who rejects the claim that Luke 21.20 is a description after the event referring to the flight of Christians to Pella since Pella was not in the mountains but at the foot of the eastern range.

(74) M. Goguel, 'The Life of Jesus', London, 1933, p.428, argues that 'the Jewish point of view of Luke' has been altered by Mark "in such a way that it would acquire a more general significance...". Moreover he regards Mark as attempting "to calm the impatience of the readers", an endeavour which to him "characterises a comparatively late period". He concludes: "Thus the earliest form of the Synoptic Apocalypse is found in Luke, and this dates from the period which pre-dates the siege of Jerusalem". C.J. Cadoux, however, prefers a more moderate position. "On the other hand it is not impossible that he is giving us, at least at this point, a more original form of the prophecy, the Marcan having been modified in view of Caligula's threatened desecration of the Temple in 40 A.D." 'Mission', p.275, n.3. T.W. Manson argues, on the grounds that the difference between Mark and Luke is almost complete (with the exception of two brief imports from Mark in Luke - Lk.21a and 23a), and that Luke's poetic structure here is intact, that it is more in accordance with the evidence to assume here "two independent versions of the pre-Markan 'Little Apocalypse'" (p.329). He too thinks that the Marcan version has been edited in the light of the events of A.D. 40 (especially since flight from a city is appropriate to a siege and not to a profanation of the Temple), and that "Luke gives the prediction in something like its original form" (p.330, 'Sayings of Jesus').

desecration. Hence perhaps the better rendering is 'The Abomination that causes horror' (75).

The original reference without question was to the idolatrous image which Antiochus Epiphanes erected in the Temple, thereby rendering the Temple ineffective as a place of worship (76). Unfortunately, Mark's reference is not as clear as that of Daniel, and many and varied have been the attempts to identify it (77). There are three suggestions that have received the greatest degree of support:

1. The attempt of the Emperor Caligula in A.D. 40 to place his statue in the Temple (See Josephus Ant.XVlll.8). It is not difficult to muster impressive support for this thesis: T.W. Manson, C.J. Cadoux, C.C. Torrey (78). The weakness in this claim lies in the fact that such a statue was never erected, due to the vehement protests of the Jews to Petronius, the legate of Syria, causing him to delay its erection, and the subsequent death of Caligula himself (79).

2. The Anti-Christ. This is a view with a long history. B.H. Streeter interprets the sentence in the Didache (Did.XVI.3),

(75) So G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', p.54. Beasley-Murray does not see these two interpretations as necessarily contradictory, since the presence of this horror destroyed the Temple as a place of worship. cf. 1 Macc.11, where the priest Matthias killed a Jew who approached the idol image, and then fled to the hills.

(76). See 1 Macc.1.54, 5.1, 6.7, 2 Macc.6.1-5.

(77) See G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', pp.59-72, for a history of the interpretation of this phrase.

(78) T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', p.329, C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.275, n.3, C.C. Torrey, 'Documents of the Primitive Church', New York, 1941, p.13ff.

(79) See M. Goguel, *ibid.* p.427, and J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Markus'. It has been suggested that Mark revised the original in terms of this enigmatic phrase during the period of uncertainty when the order was first issued, then withdrawn, then issued again, only to be frustrated in its fulfilment by Caligula's death. But the period of confusion was too short to allow for widespread circulation of the original document of such a nature that the mystery could not immediately be cleared up. So G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', p.64.

"and then the world-deceiver (κοσμοπλανής) shall appear as a Son of God; and shall work signs and wonders",

as indicating quite clearly that the author of the Didache understood the reference in Matthew to be the Anti-Christ.

"This is evidence that in Syria about A.D. 95 the Abomination was supposed to mean the personal Anti-Christ" (80)

Streeter agrees with this interpretation of Matthew, and he so interprets Mark. E. Klostermann accepts this interpretation ("Mark wird dabei an den Antichrist denken vgl. 2 Thess.2.3f.") (81) Most of the more modern interpreters who accept this interpretation do so on the basis of the combination of the neuter substantive (βδέλυγμα) and the masculine participle (ἐστηκότα). With this in mind J. Schniewind has no doubts on the matter:

"....damit ist sicherlich der Antichrist gemeint, der sich in den Tempel Gottes setzt und erklärt, er sei Gott" (82).

This is the primary basis for the interpretation of Streeter given above. He views Mark's use of a neuter noun, with the masculine participle, as intentional, indicating that the writer regarded the neuter substantive as the name not of a thing but of a person; i.e. the person of the Anti-Christ, who is to

"set himself up as supreme in the temple of the Jews, until the real Christ appears from heaven to destroy him" (83).

- - - - -

- (80) B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.519.
 (81) E. Klostermann, 'Das Markusevangelium', p.151
 (82) J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Markus'.
 (83) B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.493, cf. also B.H. Branscomb, 'St. Mark', who for the same reason translates: "When you see the Abominable One, who desecrates and destroys, standing where he has no right to stand, then let those in Judea flee to the hill". He too takes the reference as 'obviously' to the Anti-Christ (p.237).

3. To armies surrounding Jerusalem. Foremost among the contemporary exponents of this view is V. Taylor, who finds the key to the interpretation in the two cryptic phrases in Mark 13.13: ὅπου οὐ δεῖ and ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω (cf. 2 Thess.2.4 and Rev.13.18). He claims that these are made deliberately cryptic for the purposes of security. In any time of political upheaval it is wise to make the meaning virtually impossible of interpretation to the uninitiated - in this case the Roman authorities. It is not improbable therefore that τὸ Βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως and ὅπου οὐ δεῖ have replaced an original reference to armies surrounding Jerusalem and menacing the Temple comparable to Lk. 21.20,24, or that alternatively, both Mk.13.14 and Lk.21.20 are independent versions of the same prediction (84).

There is one further development of this last interpretation that must be given some consideration. It has been claimed that the reference is to the Fall of Jerusalem, but that this fall is to be regarded not in terms of 70 A.D., but as an event of an eschatological nature. This is the main thrust of C.H. Dodd's argument in the article to which reference has already been made (see p.122 n.73). Dodd claims that Luke's use of the term ἡ ἐρημωσις αὐτῆς in 21.20 is not necessarily dependent on Mark, since ἐρημωσις is not an uncommon word in the LXX, where it is used with reference to the doom of the Temple and the destruction of Jerusalem (85). This therefore was a

- - - - -

(84) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'. See also G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Future', p.256f., J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', p.75, Daniel-Rops, 'Jesus in His Time', E.T., London 1956, pp.354-5.
 (85) See Jer.4.7, 7.11,34, 22.25, 32.4, 51.6.

perfectly natural word for Luke to use in this context. Thus he regards Luke's account as a diverse form of an oracle about the destruction of Jerusalem stemming from the pre-canonical tradition (86), with its roots in the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. His conclusion therefore is:

"It appears then, that not only are the two Lucan oracles composed entirely from the language of the Old Testament, but the conception of the coming disaster which the author has in mind is a generalized picture of the fall of Jerusalem as imaginatively presented in the prophets. So far as any historical event has coloured this picture, it is not Titus' capture of Jerusalem in A.D.70, but Nebuchadrezzar's capture in 586 B.C. There is no single trait of the forecast which cannot be documented entirely out of the Old Testament" (87).

In some ways this latter interpretation does suit the ambivalence obvious in the text; the ambivalence between the historical and the eschatological. These warnings indicate a condition common to people under siege, and yet at the same time reflect eschatological portents of the consummation (88). Certainly the references in vv. 14b. 15 and 16 would apply to a flight necessitated by a sudden siege (89). On the other

- - - - -

(86) The same may be said for a parallel passage dealing with the fall of Jerusalem found in Luke 19.42-44, which is also regarded by some as coming out of the events of 70 A.D. The argument against this conclusion is that the events here described are commonplaces of ancient warfare. Moreover, they do not correspond fully with Josephus' account. For a comparison of the terms used to describe the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., see C.H. Dodd, *ibid.*, pp.50-51.

(87) C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* p.52, cf. also T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', p.330: "I am inclined to think that the original form of this oracle predicted the destruction of Jerusalem in general terms, and that in Mark and Luke we have two independent versions of the prediction".

(88) Cf. V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', who thinks that these sayings suggest war-time conditions, and yet writes: "...they are not incompatible with the coming of Anti-Christ provided (as in 2 Thess. and the Apoc.) his parousia is manifest in history". C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* and T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', p.330, also see these verses as reflecting war-time conditions, whereas A.H. McNeile, 'St. Matthew', implies that they are descriptions of preparations required for the coming of the Son of Man.

hand v.17 is often regarded as a possible apocalyptic addition, since the idea that the end-time will be especially hard on mothers and children is very common to apocalyptic forecasts (90). The first part of v.18 again could apply suitably to a specific historical situation (91), while v.19 brings us immediately into the context of apocalyptic (92), and the same may be said for v.20 (93). Thus the historical is set within the context of

- - - - -

(89) cf. J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', p.75, H.A. Guy, 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things', London, 1948, p.27: "The rest of the paragraph in all three Gospels does indeed seem more applicable to the circumstances of a siege than to the 'final tribulation' at the end of the age".

(90) e.g. 4 Ezra 6.21. V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', mentions this, and yet is forced to admit that in apocalyptic literature the emphasis is on "the bizarre, and monstrous and untimely births are described. There is nothing of this kind in 17f., on the contrary the pathos is restrained and the descriptions true to the conditions of war". cf. also Lk.23.29. He himself reflects the ambivalence of these verses when he goes on: "On the whole, it must be said that the hypothesis of apocalyptic colouring is not made out so far as 17f. is concerned".

(91) Hence the command to pray that the flight might not be in the winter. The immediate reference of v.18 is indefinite and may actually refer to the whole subject of θλίψις. Matthew has made it refer to ἡ ψυχή (24.20), and has added μηδὲ σαββάτω doubtless with a nod in the direction of the willingness of the pious during the Maccabean period to accept slaughter rather than fight on the Sabbath. cf. 1 Macc.2.31-38. Strack-Billerbeck, 'Matthäus', states that this represents an older view of the Sabbath, and that 1 Macc.2.39-41 tells of the decision of Mattathias to fight on the Sabbath when necessary. The Synagogue adopted this freer attitude toward the Sabbath.

(92) v.19 is an echo of Dan.12.1: ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα θλίψεως, οἷα οὐκ ἐγενήθη ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης

See also 1 Macc.9.27 and Ass.Moses 8. V. Taylor regards as "especially appropriate to describe the tribulations which were expected to precede the end". It is so used in Rev.1.9,7.14. Hence he writes: "This assertion is much too emphatic for a siege; it is clear that the thought of v.19 is eschatological".

(93) κολοβῶν means literally 'to amputate'. See 2 Kings 4.2, Dan.9.24, Enoch 80.2, Apoc. Abraham 29, Apoc. Zephaniah 128, the pseudo-Johannine Apoc.8. "By the 'shortening of the days', however, must be understood a definite period of time...", W. Bousset, 'The Antichrist Legend', p.219. cf. also S.E. Johnson, 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1960, who reflects Bousset at this point: "Behind this lies the concept of a fixed time, which God can nevertheless alter; cf.2 Baruch 20.1-2,83.1, Epistle of Barnabas 4.3, and the idea of the Restrainer in 2 Thess. 2". See also Strack-Billerbeck, 'St. Matthäus', sub.loce for this idea as a common apocalyptic concept.

the eschatological, and perhaps it might quite readily be assumed that these events are to be taken as a sign, in the usual apocalyptic sense, of the consummation. Two things however must be said about this assumption:

1. the emphasis in this section lies on the warnings issued on the need for immediate flight. The primary concern is for the welfare of those who read.

"These sayings are bound together by the thought of compassion for those fleeing from threatened destruction. In a season of panic, none are more distressed than pregnant and nursing mothers; for neither group is haste possible. Winter creates further anxiety, since torrents become barriers and lack of shelter at night an added misery." (94)

2. moreover, while there is no doubt that historic events are here set within an eschatological context, they are not signs of the kind requested by the disciples. Because of the eschatological nature of these events, and because they do bring to mind some aspects of apocalyptic thought, there will be some who will interpret them as signs of the parousia, but those who do are to be ignored, for they are here classified as

(94) G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', p.76. He also quotes with approval A. Schlatter: "He does not lament over the temple, but is concerned with the distress of men".

(94) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

(95) A. E. S. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark'.

(96) So V. Taylor, *ibid.* Also E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium', who regards vv. 21-33 as a Christian insertion based on the Q logion.

(97) So H. B. Swete, 'St. Mark': "...the word is probably a creation of the Evangelists or their Greek source".

(98) cf. Acts 2.19, 28.43, 4.30, 5.12, 6.3, 7.36, 14.3, 15.12, Rom. 15.19, 2 Thess. 2.2, 2 Cor. 12.12, Heb. 2.4.

(99) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

(D) Mark 13.21-23 : False Christs and false prophets.

There is an obvious parallelism here between v.21ff. and v.5ff. This has been attributed to the use of two different sources (95) or even to a redactional process (96). V.21 has some verification from Q (Mt.24.26f.=Lk.17.23f.) and may therefore with some caution be attributed to the mind of Christ. V.22 however, is highly suspect, largely because of the terms used (97). The term ψευδοχριστοι has a Christian ring about it (98), and the term τέρατα is used in the Synoptics only here in Mark but is very common in the Acts and the Epistles (99). The ideas too reflect the mind of the primitive church and the similarity with 2 Thessalonians is obvious. These factors have led V. Taylor to the conclusion that

"it illustrates the doctrinal and religious situation out of which both have originally emerged. Both reveal an apocalyptic outlook which is strange to the mind of Jesus". (100)

One cannot here deny with any degree of certainty that this passage does reflect the mind of the primitive church, and yet one may perhaps be permitted to doubt the certainty with which this is affirmed. The terminology to some extent does reflect the language of the church, but would it not be perfectly natural for that church to express the mind of Christ in the language current

(95) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

(96) A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark'.

(97) So V. Taylor, *ibid.* Also E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium', who regards vv.21-23 as a Christian insertion based on the Q logion.

(98) So H.B. Swete, 'St. Mark': "...the word is probably a creation of the Evangelists or their Greek source".

(99) cf. Acts 2.19,22,43, 4.30, 5.12, 6.8, 7.36, 14.3, 15.12, Rom.15.19, 2 Thess.2.9, 2 Cor. 12.12, Heb.2.4.

(100) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

in its midst? There is one other such warning expressed apart from this discourse (Mt.7.15), and it does reflect an Old Testament practice (101). But perhaps more serious, from the viewpoint of this thesis, is the charge of apocalypticism. The apocalyptic tendencies, here charged against the text, are actually in the text charged against those who work the signs and wonders, and who cry $\text{\textit{\u0399\u0394\u0395 \u0398\u0394\u0395 \u0391 \u0397\u03a1\u0399\u03a3\u03a4\u0399\u03a3, \u0399\u0394\u0395 \u0395\u039a\u0395\u03a9}}$. It is against these that the warning is issued, and to accuse the text of having apocalyptic characteristics is a little like accusing an anti-communist pamphlet of having pro-communist leanings.

Similar objection may be made to those who accuse these verses of interrupting the sequence of thought. This is a claim made, for example, by A.H.M. McNeile with respect to the parallel portion in Matthew who argues that vv.23-25 imply a further delay in the Parousia, a delay not warranted by the sequence of thought, which moves quite logically from the $\text{\textit{\u0398\u039b\u0399\u03a8\u0399\u03a3}}$ of v.21f., to the $\text{\textit{\u0395\u03a6\u0398\u0395\u03a9\u03a3 \u0394\u0395 \u039c\u0395\u03a4\u0391 \u03a4\u0397\u039d \u0398\u039b\u0399\u03a8\u0399\u03a3}}$ of v.29 (102). Thus the $\text{\textit{\u0398\u039b\u0399\u03a8\u0399\u03a3}}$ becomes what it is intended to be; i.e. a sign of the Parousia. But this is precisely the point of the insertion. One would expect the tribulations to be a sign of the Parousia, and this

(101) cf. Dt.13.1ff. (LXX.13.2) $\text{\textit{\u0391\u039d \u0394\u0395 \u0391\u039d\u0391\u03a3\u03a4\u0397 \u0395\u039d \u03a3\u0391\u03a9\u0399 \u03a0\u03a1\u039f\u0397\u0397\u0399\u03a3 \u0397 \u0395\u039d\u03a5\u03a0\u039d\u0399\u0391\u03a7\u0398\u0391\u03a4\u0399\u039c\u0395\u03a9\u03a3 \u0395\u039d\u03a5\u03a0\u039d\u0399\u0391\u03a9\u03a3 \u039a\u0391\u0399 \u0394\u0398 \u03a3\u0391\u0399 \u03a3\u0397\u039c\u0395\u0399\u03a9\u03a9\u03a9 \u0397 \u03a4\u0395\u03a1\u0391\u03a3}}$
 The Hebrew equivalent for $\text{\textit{\u03a3\u0397\u039c\u0395\u0399\u03a9\u03a9 \u0397 \u03a4\u0395\u03a1\u0391\u03a3}}$ is $\text{\textit{\u039d \u0399 \u0399}}$
 and $\text{\textit{\u039d \u0399 \u0399}}$. These two terms are often combined in the O.T.; e.g. Exod.7.9, 8.19, Isa.7.11,14, 38.22. For the difference between the two terms see Strack-Billerbeck, *ibid.* p.954.

(102) cf. E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium', who argues that no delay is implied since the false Christs etc. arise during the period of tribulation.

very expectation would make one a prey to false rumours, emanating from ψευδοχριστοι and ψευδοπροφηται . For this reason the warning is issued - do not be deceived, even when the claims are backed by signs and wonders. If this interpretation is accepted, then these verses give continuity to the thought, rather than interrupting it, and bear further witness to the main burden of the whole passage; i.e. that none of these events described here are signs of the kind that enable one to say of the Parousia - now it will come. And those who interpret them as signs of this kind are clearly labelled: ψευδοχριστοι and ψευδοπροφηται .

(E) Mark 13.24-27: Cosmic Disturbances and the Parousia

Among those who accept the theory of an original apocalyptic document behind this chapter, opinions vary on the place of this section in such a document. Vincent Taylor, for example, would include it in the original document (103), whereas J.A.T. Robinson, on the other hand, argues that this section is undoubtedly a later composition, and was not a part of the eschatological discourse from the beginning, but was incorporated into it at a later stage (104). Robinson's main argument for this claim is of some interest to this thesis, and it is stated briefly now for reference in the pages that follow. He argues that these verses interrupt the sequence of thought, and in effect make no sense whatever in this context.

- - - - -

(103) V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

(104) J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', p.119ff.

The ταῦτα of v.29 as the text now stands refers to the signs of v.24f. But in the light of the fact that this warning is issued with respect to the Parousia at the very moment of its occurrence there seems little sense in the advice of v.29. On the other hand, if these verses are extracted then we are left with a unit that is both coherent and sensible - a unit that answers the original question and (in accordance with the reference of that question) confines itself to historical events. His conclusion therefore is:

"Thus reconstructed, the discourse ceases to be an apocalypse in any proper sense of the term. It is rather a solemn warning in the manner of the prophets of the historical consequences of Israel's rejection and of the attitude which the faithful must adopt to them" (105).

Strangely enough, in spite of the apparent diversity of these judgments, the basis on which they are made is essentially the same in each case; this section reflects ideas very common to apocalyptic, and therefore there is great reluctance to credit it to the mind of Christ. W.G. Kümmel has stated this reluctance quite clearly:

"It is these texts (13.7,8,12,14-20,24-27) which are in the main ascribed to the Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse alleged to have been used; they deal with earthly and cosmic signs foretelling the end of the world, giving instructions on how to behave in the last days and finally describe the cosmic catastrophe, the heavenly appearance of the Son of Man and the gathering of the elect at the end of time. The texts reveal at no point the particular circumstances of Jesus or of primitive Christianity, but reproduce throughout Jewish apocalyptic conceptions" (106).

- - - - -

- (105) J.A.T. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', p.122. He notes also the change from the second to the third person in v.26.
 (106) W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.102.

We have already noted Robinson's comment to the effect that if these verses be deleted (together with others as indicated) then we are left with

"a solemn warning in the manner of the prophets of the historical consequences of Israel's rejection..".

But is it not precisely these verses (24-25) which provide "the solemn warning in the manner of the prophets..."? Robinson had previously dismissed them as "a pastiche of Old Testament allusions" (107). Old Testament allusions they certainly are, but that is hardly grounds for dismissal. On the contrary, it might well be the factor that holds the key to their significance, for these apocalyptic images are in almost every case inseparably intertwined with the theme of judgment - judgment pronounced upon the people of God by the prophets of God arising out of the fact that they had forsaken God. It is this close association of apocalyptic imagery with prophetic judgment that makes it seem very likely that this kind of terminology, as used in Mark, was not intended to be taken literally, but was rather intended to emphasise the reality of the divine judgment (108). E.P. Gould, on the

- - - - -

(107) J.A.T. Robinson, *ibid.* p.56.

(108) The texts that reflect the thought of vv.24-26 are: Isa. 13.10, 34.4, Ezek.32.7f., Amos 8.9, Joel 2.10, 3.3f., Jer.4.23, Zeph.1.15, Hag.2.6,21. See also 1 Enoch 80.4-7, 4 Ezra 5.4, Test.Levi 4.1, and in the N.T. 2 Peter 3.12, Rev.6.12-14. Of special interest is Isa.34.4:..πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις + πάντα τὰ ἄστροα, which translates the Hebrew כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְכָל־הַכּוֹכָבִים. The close association between this kind of imagery and the prophetic pronouncement of judgment is seen Isa.13.10 - a part of the prophecy of the destruction of Babylon by the Medes, Isa.34.4 is associated with the judgment of Edom. Ezek.32.7,8 with the judgment of Egypt, Amos 8.9 with the judgment of the northern kingdom, and Joel 2.30,31, 3.15 with the judgment of the nations in connection with the return from captivity of Judah.

strength of this association, concludes:

"...this language is intended to portray the greatness of the doom of such nations as come under the judgment of God. When He comes in judgment, the earth and even the heavens dissolve before Him. But it is needless to minimize these words into eclipses, or earthquakes, or meteoric showers, or to magnify them in actual destruction of sun and moon and stars. They are not events, but only imaginative portrayal of what it means for God to interfere in the history of nations" (109).

If then they are not to be taken literally, there can be no question about interpreting them as signs of the kind requested by the disciples, which would give warning of the consummation. However, whether they are to be taken literally or not, there is no doubt of their association with the theme of judgment in the Old Testament passages on which they are based, and it may reasonably be assumed that the thought of judgment is very much to the fore here. This is most suitable here, since the idea of judgment lies at the roots of the warnings to preparedness that follow (v.28ff.,33ff.), and indeed is expressed at least in terms of selection in v.27. Thus this passage reflects the Old Testament emphasis on the reality of the divine judgment rather than the typical apocalyptic interest in signs. And indeed even as signs, if such they are intended to be, they would fail to fulfil their function, for they are simultaneous with the Event to which they point. It is obvious that these kinds of cosmic events, even if they are to be taken literally, would not leave room for the kind of calculation and preparation which such signs are intended to stimulate.

(109) E.P. Gould, 'St. Mark'.

Indeed, it is this last factor that tends to invalidate the argument presented by Robinson as evidence that this section does not belong here (see pp.131-132). His claim that there is no sense in this kind of warning if the Parousia is upon them simultaneously with the warning unintentionally establishes the point of the passage while at the same time missing the point. Throughout this exegesis we have been trying to show that the 'signs' of Mark 13 are not signs at all in the terms requested, since they do not give warning that the Parousia is about to follow. On the contrary, those who so interpret them are labelled false witnesses, and they are to be studiously ignored. There is no such warning issued following vv.24-25, for such a warning is not needed, since the Parousia is simultaneous with the 'events' described - or, perhaps more correctly, these 'events' are themselves part of the Parousia.

This Event, which is the culmination of all that has hitherto been recorded in this chapter, is described in v.26. There seems little doubt that the background for this passage is Dan.7.13 (110). There has been some ambivalence among the exegetes about the direction in which the 'son of man' is going in this Danielic passage, but if we may assume that he is ascending to the Ancient of Days (111), then it would appear

- - - - -

(110) Dan.7.13: ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκτός, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο

(111) J.A.T. Robinson, *ibid.*, gives evidence that seems to leave the direction beyond dispute. He cites 1 Enoch 14.8 "which is either the inspiration (Glasson, pp.14-18, following Charles) or an imitation (H.H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp.75-79) of the scene in Dn.7.13, the idea of ascent is unambiguous: 'Behold, the vision clouds lifted me up...and the winds in the vision caused me to fly and lifted me upward, and bore me into heaven'." cf. also 1V Ezra 13.3: 'And I beheld, and lo! the wind caused to come up out of the heart of the seas as it were the

that in the Marcan description of the Parousia the direction has been reversed. Any consideration of this verse, however, must take into account the fuller text of Mark 14.62, Mt.26.64, Lk.22.69 (112). In addition to the quotation from Daniel there is one from Psalm 110.1. This latter quotation is used by all three evangelists, whereas Luke omits the one from Daniel. It is used moreover to emphasise the authority which belongs to the Christ, in marked contrast to His apparent helplessness in the presence of the Jewish authorities. It is, however, the addition in Matthew of ἀπ' ἄρτι and in Luke of ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν that gives rise to the greatest consternation among the exegetes (113). It is this emphasis on the immediacy of the divine vindication that has lead so many to find explanations in terms other than that of the Parousia - attempts which are certainly understandable, in the light of the difficulty inherent in the text (114) And yet one must always remember that throughout the Synoptics, to say nothing of the Epistles, there is an obvious emphasis on the immediacy

- - - - -

(111) (Cont'd.) --- form of a man. And I beheld, and lo! this man flew with the clouds of heaven'.

(112) The question whether or not Jesus actually accepted the Messianic title here is rendered ambiguous by the insertion, in θ &c, 565,700,1071, Arm. and Orig. of οὐ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.322, is inclined to accept the reading of fam. θ here as the true reading. He regards any such disinclination to accept the Messianic title as indicating a genuine utterance of our Lord. See also V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'. cf. also οὐ εἶπας in Matthew, and ὑμεῖς λέγετε in Luke.

(113) Both expressions render the same word in Aramaic; i.e. ^{ܠܝܘܒܝܢ} 'straightway, very soon, in the immediate future'. So C.C. Torrey, 'Documents of the Primitive Church', p.85. B.H. Streeter regards the phrases as "independent editorial insertions by Matthew and Luke...". *ibid.* p.321.

(114) cf. T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', pp.64-5: "The teaching and ministry of Jesus confirm the view that He faced the cross with the conviction that it was not defeat, but the gateway to His glory", and he adds that the two additions in Matthew and Luke, indicating immediacy, put the matter "beyond dispute". E.P. Gould, 'St. Mark', sees it as pointing to the

of the Parousia. It remains possible, therefore, that the apparent meaning of the text may well be the original meaning.

We have already noted that the quotation from Psalm 110.1 is not found in the reference in Mark 13. It is difficult to know why this is so. Perhaps the whole context in Mark 13 provides vindication enough, for the Parousia is set against the background of the disintegrating heavens and earth. The form of His coming also bears testimony to His divine authority. He comes ἐν νεφέλαις . There is some confusion here about the particular preposition that is used (ἐν , ἐπι , and μετὰ are all used in this text and its parallels), and no little discussion has centred around it (115), but surely G.R. Beasley-Murray is correct when he writes:

"...travelling with, or upon, or on the clouds is not a normal mode of locomotion",

and would necessarily indicate divinity or else "a close

- - - - -

(114) (Cont'd.) --- exercise of His Messianic power on earth from His position of authority in heaven; J.A.T. Robinson, p.57-58, reflects a similar view.

(115) ἐν is used in Mk.13.26, Lk.21.27; ἐπι in Mt.24.30, 26.64; μετὰ in Mk.14.62. Dan.7.13 has כּוֹמָ (= ἐν), which would be translated 'in the clouds'. Dalman thinks that this has been altered by a scrupulous scribe from לְכּוֹמָ (LXX tr. ἐπι) because the scribe knew that only God came upon the clouds. cf. Isa.19.1, Psa.104.3. W.O.E. Oesterley, 'The Doctrine of the Last Things', London, 1908, with reference to Daniel, emphasises that the choice of prepositions is deliberate, since the rule referred to, although divinely appointed, is nonetheless a human rule. The ruler in this coming kingdom is a human being. In this sense the phrase 'son of man' is synonymous with man. But perhaps C.C. Torrey, *ibid.* p.82-3, has caught the spirit of the passage better when he writes that there is no intention on the part of the evangelist of "making a verbal citation of the prediction of Daniel. It is, indeed, a direct and pointed allusion, but given only for substance without regard to the exact words of the prophet". And contra Dalman he writes further: "The fact that his Greek translation employs the preposition ἐπι (also in 26.64) neither shows the influence of the LXX nor that his text contained לְכּוֹמָ rather than כּוֹמָ ; it is merely a rendering according to the sense".

relation with the Deity" (116). And this emphasis on the divine authority of the One who comes thus is further heightened by the phrase *μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης* . Thus the helplessness of the universe is in contrast with the divine power and authority of the One who comes.

That authority, however, is evident not only in the form which it takes, but in the purpose of that coming. He comes to gather together *τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς* (v.27). This is a familiar Old Testament expectation (117), and it involves within it the idea of judgment. Such a choice must of necessity involve judgment (118), for it indicates a process of selection and rejection. The Old Testament passages in which this idea occurs are all set within the context of such a judgment. We have already noted that the theme of judgment becomes the dominating note in the conclusion to the discourse in Mark (see above p.134), and this climax forms the basis on which the appeals to preparedness are made. If therefore the disciples wanted signs of the Parousia of the kind that would enable them to prepare for it, they are here once more reminded of the necessity for preparation, even if they are given no answer in terms of the signs sought.

- - - - -

(116) G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', p.92. See also pp.91-92 for an excellent summary of the history of the interpretation of this passage.

(117) cf. Deut.30.4, Isa.11.11,16,27.12, Ezek.39.27, Zech.2.6-11, and also Tob.13.13, 14.1-7, Bar.5.5-9, 2 Macc.2.7, 1 Enoch 57, Psa. So. 11.3, 17.26, and 1 Thess.4.15-17, 2 Thess.2.1.

(118) cf. Matthew 25.31ff.

(F) Mark 13.28-29: The Parable of the Fig Tree.

Most commentators express doubt that this is the original context for this parable (119), but whether it is or not, it may still be deemed appropriate to the context. For one thing, the events described in the body of the discourse provide a quite adequate reference for the ταῦτα of v.29 (120). The parable therefore is a warning to recognise these events for what they are; i.e., as evidence that this is now the time of the End, and that therefore preparation, of the kind indicated in v.33ff., is demanded of all. Moreover, the subject of ἐστὶν (v.29), would appear to be the coming of the Son of Man in v.26. The subject implies that a singular event is in mind, and the primary single event of the preceding section is the coming of the Son of Man. Moreover, the analogy implies that the subject might be personal. It is the Son of Man who is nigh, even at the door (121).

(119) V. Taylor views the phrase Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συνῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν as an adaptation of the αὐτοῖς parable to the discourse. Luke's καὶ εἶπεν παραβολὴν is an even more obvious adaptation. See also C.H. Dodd, 'Parables', p.137, R. Bultmann, 'Jesus and the Word', p.30, M. Dibelius, 'Jesus', p.72, J. Jeremias, 'Parables', p.96, A.H. McNeile, 'St. Matthew'. (120) So V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', W.G. Kummel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.21, T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', p.333. A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', objects that the context is inappropriate to the parable because in Mt.24.31 (Mk.13.27) the End has come, and yet in Mt.24.33 (Mk.13.29) the πάντα ταῦτα indicates that the End is near. But the parable is not one of the events that precede the End, and therefore need not be included in any such sequence. Rather as a parable it outlines the significance that is to be attached to these events.

(121) W.G. Kummel's examination of the meaning of ἐγγύς lends weight to this interpretation: "...it denotes that an event will happen soon, by which is meant or presumed that it will not be a long time to wait before it happens". p.19ff. This of course is precisely the point of v.30. See also E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, 'The Riddle of the New Testament', London, 1931, p.115, and A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew'.

Thus the parable of the fig tree gives significance to all that has gone before. These events denote that the End is near. There is never any doubt about that through the whole discourse. Its nearness is emphasised in v.30 even further, for here the hearers are deprived of the delusion that they might live their present life to its completion and thus miss the Event that is so central to the warnings issued. The parables that call for preparedness continue the emphasis on this truth. And yet, although the End is near, none of these events can be interpreted as 'signs' of the Parousia, in the sense of giving warning of the time of the Event of the kind that would allow for calculation and preparation. Hence they are not signs of the kind requested by the disciples.

(G) Mark 13.30-32: The Time of the Parousia.

(1) V.30 : the sayings about this generation.

This saying has been a constant source of embarrassment to the church almost from the beginning - a fact which provides some evidence of its genuineness (122). The result has been many attempts to explain the text in such a way that the embarrassment itself is explained away. Most of such attempts

- - - - -

(122) The embarrassment received a new lease on life with the publication of David Strauss' book, 'The Life of Jesus' in 1835-36, who wrote of this prediction: "As it will soon be eighteen centuries since the destruction of Jerusalem, and an equally long period since the generation contemporary with Jesus disappeared from the earth, while his visible return and the end of the world associated with it, have not taken place, the announcement of Jesus appears so far to have been erroneous". This is quoted from p.85 of Strauss' book by G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Jesus and the Future', p.3.

concentrate on the meaning of ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς . In the long history of its interpretation the aim of many has been to extend or enlarge its frame of reference so as to relieve the Christ of the responsibility of having promised the Parousia within the lifetime of His contemporaries (123). The attempt is by no means over. J. Schniewind suggests that the reference is to the Jewish race (124); W. Michaelis suggests that it refers to the character of man that will not pass away, that character expressed in his perversity and faithlessness (125); E. Klostermann interprets it in terms of the future generation that will experience the tribulations of the preceding section (126). All these attempts, however, ignore the fact that in all other places where it is used in the Synoptics, it means quite simply the contemporary generation (127).

There is one other focal point in the text for the attempts to eliminate the apparent embarrassment; i.e. the phrase ταῦτα πάντα . So some have suggested that the reference is to the fall of Jerusalem (128). The fact

- - - - -

- (123) For an account of the history of this interpretation, see G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', p.99ff.
- (124) J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Markus'. See also F. Busch, 'Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie; Markus 13 neu untersucht, Gütersloh, 1938, p.133f.
- (125) W. Michaelis, 'Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung; Die Aussagen Jesus über die Nähe des Jüngsten Tages', Bern, 1946, p.30ff., quoted by W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.60, n. 128.
- (126) E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium'.
- (127) See Mt.11.16, 12.39, 41,42,45, 23.36, Mark 8.12, 8.38, Lk.7.31, 11.29,50, 17.25. cf. J.S. Russell, 'The Parousia', London, 1878: "It is demonstrable without any shadow of doubt that the expression 'this generation', so often employed by our Lord, always solely and exclusively to his contemporaries, the Jewish people of his own period" (p.85).
- (128) So T. Zahn, 'Introduction to the New Testament', 3 volumes, Edinburgh, 1909, Vol.3, pp.157-8, M.-J. Lagrange, 'Évangile selon Saint Marc', Paris, 1911.

remains however that certainly in this discourse (whatever have been the original references of the component parts), the fall of Jerusalem is of a piece with the consummation (129).

There are, moreover, other texts which at least in the hands of the evangelists provide support for the more obvious interpretation of the saying in Mark 13. Mark 9.1 (Mt.16.28=Lk.9.27) has caused if anything even more consternation than Mark 13.30. The phrasing in Mark 9.1 has encouraged C.H. Dodd to interpret this in terms of the Kingdom of God as present, to be manifested 'in power' at the resurrection (130). W.G. Kümmel however disagrees. He interprets ἕως ἃν ἴδωσιν as indicating quite clearly a future event. Since τὴν βασιλείαν is the direct object of ἴδωσιν, it follows that the coming of the Kingdom must also lie in the future for Jesus. He concludes therefore:

"It may be safely asserted that Mark 9.1 bears the meaning that some of Jesus' hearers will live to see the appearance of the Kingdom of God in the comparatively near future and therefore will not fall victims to death" (131).

- - - - -

(129) cf. A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', B.H. Branscomb, 'St. Mark', G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', H.B. Swete, 'St. Mark', T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', pp.333-334, W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.60, n.128. C.J. Cadoux has no doubts about the matter: "...we must insist that we have here a prediction of a special and spectacular coming of the Kingdom 'with power', sufficiently soon and sufficiently late for 'some' of the bystanders to live to see that this has happened". 'Mission', p.200. cf. also A. Plummer, 'St. Luke', and W.F. Arndt, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', St. Louis, Missouri, 1956, who see the fall of Jerusalem as a type of the final catastrophe.

(130) C.H. Dodd, 'Parables', p.53, n.1. He sees the perfect participle ἐληλυθῶσαν as indicating action already completed. Hence he translates: "There are some standing here who will not taste death until they have seen that the Kingdom of God has come with power"; i.e. "the bystanders are not promised that they shall see the Kingdom of God coming, but that they shall see that the Kingdom of God has already come, at some point before they became aware of it". It has also been pointed out to me by Prof. A. Barr that this involves a change in the meaning of ἴδωσι 'to see' to that of 'to realise mentally that'. L. and S. provide no examples of this under εἶδον.

Matthew 10.23 also provides additional evidence to the effect that in the mind of the evangelist the consummation must be expected soon (132). W.G. Kümmel gives this text its most obvious interpretation. On the ground that τελέσητε does not mean to come to an end of anything but to bring to an end, he claims that the saying

"declares that the disciples cannot fulfil it (the missionary task) with regard to their nation before the parousia appears" (133).

This is in accord with his previous conclusion:

"So Mt.10.23 confirms the conclusion already obtained that Jesus reckoned on the coming of the Kingdom of God and of the Son of Man in glory within the lifetime of the generation of his hearers" (134).

(131) W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.27. Matthew leaves no doubt about his understanding of the reference:
 ...ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν Υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ τοῦ (16.28).

See also E.P. Gould, 'St. Mark', who sees the promise fulfilled in the coming of the Holy Spirit; A. Plummer, 'St. Matthew', who thinks the saying must have originated in a misunderstanding of Christ's original words, and B.H. Branscomb, 'St. Mark', who looks upon the text as an attempt on the part of a "later teacher to encourage a generation whose faith in the coming of the end was beginning to waver".

(132) ἀμην, γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

There is some doubt about the authenticity of this saying. T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', p.182 feels that it "reflects the experience and expectations of the primitive Palestinian Church". J.A.T. Robinson appears to concur when he writes: "(these words) are best associated with the reign of terror associated with the fall of Jerusalem" (p.92). S. Sandmel, 'A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament', Cincinnati, 1957, p.154, doubts that this is an authentic word of Jesus. He argues that the author of the Gospel would have known that this was an unfulfilled prediction, and that he is really explaining that the end would come in his own day. C.J. Cadoux writes of this text that it "was almost certainly framed under the stress of the controversy between Paul and the Jerusalem-church". C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.303, n.2.

(133) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.62.

(134) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.14. A. Plummer, 'St. Matthew', interprets τελέσητε as meaning 'gone through', and suggests three possible meanings: 'you will not have preached in all the cities of Israel', or 'completely converted all the cities', or, with reference to 10.23, 'you will not have used all these cities as a place of refuge'.

Thus, in spite of the theological (or more specifically, the Christological) difficulty which such an exegesis suggests, it is impossible to avoid the interpretation given above (135). G.R. Beasley-Murray faces the problem with courage and with honesty when he writes:

"In this respect Mark 13 truly represents the mind of Christ. It does not reveal all that mind; it does not give all that Jesus spoke on the occasion described; but it is right in showing that Jesus did not know the ebb and flow of time and history. Its nature he knew; its End he knew; but not its extent" (136)

Given such an interpretation, its suitability to the context is obvious. The primary emphasis of this chapter lies on the nearness of the End with a view to encouraging the kind of preparation that takes full account of its unpredictability. They must be ready now, because the End is near. In a way beyond the reach of any previous saying in this chapter, this very controversial statement drives home to the hearers the inescapable character of this awesome Event.

(2) V.32: the saying about the Day and the Hour.

There is general agreement that this is not the original context for this saying (137), but that nonetheless the original reference was to the consummation (138). Evidence of this is found in the use of the phrase τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, a term commonly used in the New Testament with

- - - - -

(135) The Christological problem may of course be avoided either by ascribing this text to the primitive church, or by suggesting another context that might give a different meaning to the text.

(136) G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Future', p.204.

(137) cf. V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', who states that in spite of the connective δὲ there is "no reason to suppose it was originally spoken in this connection".

(138) V. Taylor, *ibid.* writes that its 'solemn nature' and the completeness of its denial "can hardly be intended to refer

reference to the Day of the Lord (139). Moreover, the idea that the 'Day' is known only to God is a typically Jewish conception (140).

Where v.30, however, has caused embarrassment to some exegetes, this verse has provided a shock to many others. The shock comes from the phrase οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός (141). It seems incredible that the Son should be denied this vital piece of information, and many have been the explanations offered, especially by the Fathers, to explain this ignorance on Christ's part (142). Its very offence, however, is evidence of its genuineness, for no Christian would have dared to pen such a comment (143). W.G. Kümmel has emphasised this when, with

- - - - -

(138) (Cont'd.) --- to an event like the destruction of Jerusalem, It must have been spoken with reference to the Last Judgment and the Parousia". cf. also T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.97, H.B. Swete, 'St. Mark', p.316.

(139) ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, Mk.14.25, Lk.21.34, 2 Thess.1.10, 2 Tim.1.12,18, 4.8; ἡ ἡμέρα Mt.25.13, 1 Thess.5.4; ἡ ἔσχατη ἡμέρα John 6.39,40,44,54. For the significance of the idea of the Day of the Lord see above p.78 ff.

(140) See Zech.14.7, Psa. Sol.17.23.

(141) The evidence for the omission of this phrase in Mt.24.36 is quite strong. It is omitted by δ^s L^w Δ et.al. minusc. pler. g.¹² r.² vg. sy^s ^{be} ^{ke} sa bo geo^A. See also A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', W.C. Allen, 'St. Matthew', and B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', pp.594-6. Luke also omits the saying completely, and in Acts 1.7 there is no reference to the Son.

(142) See G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', pp.105-110, and V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

(143) So A. Plummer, 'St. Matthew', p.306, A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', p.356, J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Markus', p.175, C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.33, V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

reference to the suggestion that this text was a creation of the primitive church for the purpose of explaining the delay of the Parousia, he wrote:

"...there was no need to create an even greater difficulty by ascribing to Jesus ignorance of the final date in order to remove the difficulty of the delay of the Parousia" (144).

If we may therefore assume that this is a genuine saying of Jesus, the problem arises of its relationship to v.30. There are those who are convinced that it contradicts specifically this previous saying, and it certainly gives every appearance of doing so. W.G. Kümmel presents this claim with clarity:

"Now there is no doubt a contradiction between the prediction of a concrete date for the coming of the Kingdom of God and the emphatic statement that this date could not be known" (145).

But is this contradiction not more apparent than real? Is it not rather very much a part of the total discourse? We have already noted that this whole chapter emphasises the nearness of the End. All these things, destruction of the Temple and the Parousia, take place within the limits of this generation. All the events previously recorded are 'signs' of this fact. But they are not the kind of signs that enable one to know the precise time; i.e. the day or the hour, for such knowledge is denied even the Son. Hence all who claim such knowledge are ψευδοχριστοι or ψευδοπροφηται.

Therefore because you know that this is the age of the End, and because you do not know exactly when that End is to take

- (144) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.44. cf. E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, 'Riddle', p.134, where it is suggested that the term 'Son' used with reference to Jesus emphasises his humiliation.
 (145) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.150. See also B.H. Branscomb, 'St. Mark' and V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

place, βλέπετε , ἀγρυπνεῖτε (v.33)!

This surely is the aim of the discourse.

111 The Primary Intent of the Discourse, as Evidenced by its Imperatives.

From the fifth verse to the thirty-seventh verse of this discourse, there are eighteen imperatives (146). The number of these imperatives, to say nothing of their content, is witness enough to the importance attached to them in this discourse, and the fact that these imperatives are repetitive in character, rather than detracting from that importance, only adds to it.

"The practical object of the Apocalyptic Discourse is seen in the note of warning with which it begins"(147).

Before any final judgment may be made about its apocalyptic character full account must be made of these imperatives. This is our task in this section, but before proceeding two things must be noted:

1. There is evidence throughout the discourse that the disciples face the ever-present danger of interpreting the events described in it as 'signs' that the Parousia and the consummation will follow immediately upon them. This renders them peculiarly susceptible to false rumours and false claimants.

2. The description of these events is terrifying enough to create a feeling of fear among them. This would be a perfectly

(146) These are: v.5 βλέπετε μή v.7 μή θροεῖσθε , v.9
 βλέπετε , v.11 μή προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλησῆτε , v.14
 φευγέτωσαν , v.15 μή καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθᾶτω ,
 v.16 μή ἐπιστρέψατω , v.18 προσεύχεσθε ,
 v.21 μή πιστεύετε , v.23 βλέπετε , v.28 μάθετε ,
 v.29 γινώσκετε , v.33 βλέπετε , ἀγρυπνεῖτε , v.35 and
 37 γρηγορεῖτε

(147) A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', pp.183-4.

natural reaction to these happenings that are depicted so vividly.

For this reason therefore two things are required: a warning, and assurance. Both of these are given in the imperatives (148). While these two elements are not kept completely separate, they do between them account for all of these imperatives. They are directed against the disciples' susceptibility to the claims of false witnesses - a susceptibility due to the tendency to interpret these events as 'signs' of the Parousia, and against the fear that is created by the events themselves.

The opening imperative, βλέπετε strikes a note that is to be repeated on several occasions throughout the discourse (149). The word itself takes its significance from that against which the warning is issued. In this case it is directed against those who come in the name of Christ, whose identity may be beyond exact determination, but whose intent is made plain in the μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ (150). A parallel formula is repeated in vv.21-23. There, instead of the βλέπετε, Mark has μή πιστεύετε (151), but the next verse includes πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν (152). In

(148) cf. G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary' 'Future', p.214:

"It is no horiscope. It is a warning to prepare for conflicts, public calamities, persecutions, false alarms, and the ruin of their own nation, but withal, to maintain faith and hope, with endurance".

(149) βλέπετε is used five times in the discourse.

βλέπετε μή is a colloquial usage found in the papyri. V.G.T 113. cf. also Mt.24.4, Lk.21.8, Acts 13.40, 1 Cor. 8.9,10.12, Gal.5.15, Col.2.8.

(150) ἀποπλανᾶν, ἀποπλανᾶω 'to cause to go astray',

found only here and in 1 Tim.6.10. πλανᾶν, πλανᾶσθαι, are used in a moral sense from Deut.4.19 onwards in the LXX, and so used by the N.T. writers exclusively. See H.B. Swete on Mk.12.27.

(151) Matthew has μή πιστεύσητε, which is better suited to a future situation. So A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium'.

this latter reference the warning receives added emphasis in the phrase προεἶρημα ὑμῖν πάντα , 'I have told you beforehand'. This phrase is regularly used of prophetic announcements. From all of this, therefore, even without certain knowledge of the specific historic reference, we can readily ascertain the intent of these two sections. In each case it is the vulnerability of the disciples that is the cause of concern and the reason for the warning. Why this vulnerability? It stems from the fact that the events here described will appear to them to be typical apocalyptic 'signs' of the kind they seek. But 'signs' of the Parousia they are not, and the primary thrust of the discourse is directed toward those who will be tempted to interpret them as such.

But, as we have seen, fear is also a natural reaction to this outline of the events that is given here. And so the first warning against the possibility of deception is followed immediately by a word of assurance in the face of the threats to security that lie in the events described. Hence they are told μὴ φοβεῖσθε (v.7) (153). Why was fear uncalled for? Because these events belong to the category of the things that δεῖ γενέσθαι . They fall within the divine purpose (154)

(152) The construction πρὸς τὸ with the infinitive indicates subjective purpose. So V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'. H.B. Swete, 'St. Mark', has 'with a view to misleading'. This construction appears nowhere else in Mark.

(153) φοβέω 'to cry aloud', and in cl. Greek, 'to raise an outcry. φοβεῖν translates ἰθὺς in the LXX. It is used in the LXX and in the N.T. in the passive only, 'to be alarmed', 'to be agitated'. cf. 2 Thess.2.2. See also H.A.A. Kennedy, 'Sources of New Testament Greek', p.126.

(154) See Mk.8.31, 9.11, 13.10, 14.31. For δεῖ γενέσθαι see Dn.2.28. This warning is common to all traditions of Jewish eschatology. See Isa.19.2, Jer.4.19ff., 6.22ff., 49.1ff., Dan.7.21f., Joel 3.9f., cf. 2 Chron.15.6.

The imperatives of Mark 13.9-13 are in a similar vein to 13.7. They are intended to prepare the disciples for what is to come, that they may know what resources are available to them in the face of such threats to their security, and that they may not readily surrender to these threats. The introductory warning, βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς, provides the link with what precedes, but it is not until verse 11 that we are told in what sense they are to take care to themselves: μὴ προπεριμῖνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε. They are to take heed to themselves, for they will be delivered up to courts, and councils, and governors and kings, but when they are delivered up, they are not to take heed to what they are to say on such occasions, for provision has already been made for that (155). Thus once more the disciples are forewarned, that they may know not only the trials that await them, but the resources through which they will be able to face them. But even worse is to follow; betrayals by one's own family, and universal hatred. Are not such things beyond endurance? Apparently not! And to make certain that they are not, a further promise is given: ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται (156).

(155) cf. O.T. roots for this idea of testimony as something given: Ex.4.1ff. So E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium'. cf. also Num.22.36, Jer.1.9. The Syntax also suggests an Aramaic background for this text. See M. Black, 'An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts', Oxford, 1946, pp.78-81. For a discussion of the possible secondary nature of the reference to the Holy Spirit see V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', p.508. See also B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', pp.280-281.

(156) See also Mt.24.13, 10.22b. cf. Luke's ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. cf. stress on this idea of ὑπομονή in the letters: James 1.3f., Rom.5.3f., 8.25, 1 Thess.1.3, 2 Thess.1.4, 3.5, Heb.12.1, Rev.1.9. See also Mt. 10.30, where the same promise is given within the context of the commissioning of the twelve. The meaning however remains the same: "...by their patient endurance of persecution, the disciples will win their souls for eternity", J.M. Creed, 'St. Luke'.

It is of significance that in this section the warnings are coupled with promises; the warning of v.9 is linked with the promise of v.11, and the warning of even greater threats to come, outlined in vv.12-13, is linked with the promise of v.13b. It would seem to be apparent that in this section the concern is not with a detailed blueprint of the future, but with the welfare of the disciples.

The imperatives of 13.14-20 have a very practical ring about them. When the event indicated by the Abomination of Desolation occurs - it is of course presumed that they will know what this cryptic reference means - then immediate flight is necessary, with no time to spare for personal belongings. Hence the imperatives: φευγέτωσαν, μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθᾶτω, μὴ ἐπιστρέψατω

And the element of practical concern is emphasised further in the προσεύχεσθε of v.18. Yet even here the imperatives, heightening as they do the sense of urgency in the face of the threat to their security, are coupled with the promise of v.20b: ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὐκ ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας (157). In spite therefore of the apparently apocalyptic character of this section, it seems once more, from the combination of practical warning and the indication of the divine awareness and concern, that the primary interest even of this passage is with the welfare of the disciples.

(157) cf. H.B. Swete, 'St. Mark': "The Lord answers the question τί το σημεῖον in reference to the end of the City and Temple, so far as an answer was needed for practical guidance."

It may be noted in passing that there are no imperatives in 13.24-27. The reason is apparent. Now there is no time for action on the part of those who have received the previous warnings, for all action is concentrated in God's hands. But even here - indeed, especially here - the promise is given (v.27). The 'elect', whoever they may be, and whatever may have happened to them, are 'gathered' at the Parousia. Thus is the promise of 13b fulfilled. In spite of the awesome character of the events herein described, in spite of their destructive capacities, the 'elect' are secure in Christ.

The parable of the fig-tree, vv.28-29, as we have already noted, reflects back on the discourse that has preceded, and points out the lesson to be learned. It is this parable, coupled with vv.30 and 32, that prepares the way for Mark's conclusion. Two things are emphasised; these events belong to the time of the End, but they do not indicate when the Parousia and its concomitants are to take place.

It is Mark's conclusion to the discourse, vv.33-37, that sheds the greatest light on its primary purpose. It has been suggested that the original discourse ended at v.32, and that "each evangelist rounded it off with appropriate material" (158). There is logic to this suggestion. The selection of the material and its adaptation in the discourse will help us to understand what the evangelist had in mind in this chapter. This of course is what we have been trying to ascertain throughout the whole of this exegesis. But it is the conclusion, more than any other part of the discourse, that will betray the

- - - - -

(158) So G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Commentary', p.111.

intent of the evangelist, for this is customarily the purpose of conclusions. He will therefore choose the kind of conclusion which will fulfil this purpose to best effect. Indeed, the parable itself bears evidence of the literary hand of the evangelist, and appears to be his own composition (159). It seems to combine elements of the parable of the Talents (13.34b, cf. Mt.25.15b and Lk.19.13), of the watching servants (13.34b and Lk.12.37ff.), and even of the Virgins (Mt.25.13) (160). The original of the parable seems to have been used greatly in the Synoptics and exhibits wide variations, and

"under the influence of the parousia motive, worked over and expanded" (161).

Thus, for example, the ἀνθρώπος ἀπόδημος of v.34 becomes the ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας of v.35, and the servants introduced in v.34, who are each given authority and responsibility, are immediately superseded in the same verse by the θυρωρός. The recognition of these diverse elements has led to attempts to reconstruct the original of the parable, and Jeremias has suggested the following:

(Mark 13.34b) the doorkeeper receives the command to keep

- - - - -

(159) cf. how Mark has used the Roman divisions of the night: ὄψε (6-9 p.m.), μεσονύκτιον (9-12 p.m.), πρωί ἀλεκοροφωνίας (12-3 a.m.), and πρωί (3-6 a.m.). Luke's are in accord with the ancient Hebrew divisions of the night. See Ex.14.24, Jud.7.19, 1 Sam.11.11, Lam.2.19.

(160) See also J.A.T. Robinson's 'Jesus and His Coming', pp.68-69.

(161) J. Jeremias, 'Parables', p.43.

watch, so as to open immediately when (Luke 12.36) the master returns from the banquet, for it is good for the servant if he (Luke 12.37a, 38) should be watching, regardless of the hour (Mark 13.35f.) when his master should return (162).

The original context of the parable also arouses curiosity. C.H. Dodd sees the subject of the warning as the coming seizure and crucifixion of Christ (163), and Jeremias sees it as a parallel to the appeal of Mark 14.38, "where he was thinking of the final πειρασμός ; the beginning of the eschatological tribulation, the attack of Satan upon the saints of God, whose incidence he expected would be ushered in by his passion" (164b).

The primary concern for this thesis, however, lies in this question: what light does this conclusion, with its imperatives, throw on Mark's understanding of the purpose of the discourse? And the answer is not hard to find, for it most effectively summarises its intent and indicates its purpose. The setting has already been established. There was no need for watchfulness if the Parousia and its concomitant events were not expected in the near future, or if they knew exactly when they were to take place. But it has been carefully established that it will be soon, but that these events do not tell exactly when, for that exact time is unknown. Therefore the only way to meet this situation

(162) J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.44.

(163) C.H. Dodd, 'Parables', pp.165-66.

(164b) J. Jeremias, *ibid.*, p.44

is in terms of ἀγρυπνεῖτε, γρηγορεῖτε (165).

For the man prepared in these terms 'signs' are of no consequence, for under no circumstances will that Event find him in the category of those who sleep.

(164) J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.44. J.A.T. Robinson, *ibid.* p.69f., follows Jeremias at this point. Both agree that in the hands of the church it was used to explain the delay of the Parousia, cf. v.36: δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσιν λέγω
 (165) ἀγρυπνεῖν (v.33) and γρηγορεῖν (v.37) are the verbs that are used here to give content to βλέπετε, cf. C.H. Dodd, 'Parables', p.155, n.1: in the meaning of ἀγρυπνεῖν and γρηγορεῖν here is not that of the English word 'watch' as currently used; i.e. with the sense of 'observe, look out for, be on guard', which would be the Greek θεωρεῖν, παρατηρεῖσθαι, φυλάττειν; but rather 'to keep awake, alertness'. it is of course the opposite of καθεύδοντας (v.36). cf. also Paul S. Minear, 'Christian Hope and the Second Coming', Philadelphia, 1954, "Wakefulness depends on doing his will, on serving man as he served them, on loving enemies, and on feeding his household. Watchfulness requires that they patiently accept their own Gethsemanes" p.135. cf. v.33: καὶ προσευχεσθε is added in Uncs.rell. Minusc. rell. VSS rell.

IV. Additions to Matthew's Discourse from Q.

(A) Mt. 24.26-28 = Luke 17.23-24, 37 :
The Day of the Son of Man.

Luke has introduced this section with a comment that is without parallel in the Gospels: Ἐλεῦσονται ἡμέραι ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε (17.22).

The exact meaning of this text is made difficult because of its reference to the μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . There are of course several possible interpretations of this phrase (166), but one that is attractive from the viewpoint of this thesis is that of C.C. Torrey in 'The Four Gospels' (167). He suggests that the text arises out of a misunderstanding of the Aramaic adverb 'lachda', which means 'very much', and which has been wrongly translated by the 'one'. Therefore the true meaning is: "You will greatly desire to see the day of the Son of Man"; i.e. the disciples will long greatly for the Parousia, and this longing will make them susceptible to false claimants (168). However,

- - - - -

(166) e.g., A. Plummer, 'St. Luke', suggests the possibility of taking the expression as a Hebraism, with the 'one' being used in the sense of 'first' (cf. Mt. 16.2 μίᾳ τῶν σαββάτων); i.e. the longing then would be for the first of the days of the Son of Man. e.g., W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.19: Luke has adapted the Rabbinical expression for the 'Days of the Messiah', e.g., J.M. Creed, 'St. Luke': of the days of the new age after the Messiah has been revealed.

(167) T.W. Manson, 'The Sayings of Jesus', p.142, quotes C.C. Torrey with approval.

(168) But this is rejected by R. Leaney in the article 'The Days of the Son of Man', Expository Times, Vol.67, 1955-56, pp.28-29. He claims that this would suggest that Luke translated the Aramaic without really understanding what he was doing. Leaney suggests that Luke really did know what he was doing, and that he was really contemplating a number of appearances of the Lord; the transfiguration (cf. v.24 is reminiscent of Lk.9.29), the light that shone around Paul in Acts 9.3, 22.11, 26.13, the transfiguration of Acts 1.11. cf. here the use of ἀστραπτουσα in 24.4.

whether or not this is correct, it is plain that both Luke and Matthew agree that the saying is addressed to the susceptibility of the disciples to false claimants. Luke has said so explicitly in v.22, and Matthew has described a situation in 24.15-22 which would naturally create such a longing. He has taken cognizance of this in vv.23-25, and he has reinforced this still further by this quotation from Q. Moreover, by this quotation from Q, he has given the reason why such claims, in spite of the proofs offered - or perhaps because of the proofs offered - are to be rejected (169).

The crux of this quotation from Q however lies in Mt.24.27= Luke 17.24, and in the metaphor therein used. The Parousia is as ἀστραπή . The point of the analogy is not quite as explicit as might first appear however; does it emphasise the clarity with which the Parousia occurs, or the swiftness? H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck are quite explicit. The point of the parable is not the suddenness of the coming of the Messiah, but the fact that when he comes his rightful sovereignty will be visible to all. This is a point rare in Jewish literature, where laborious persuasion on the part of the Messiah is required before recognition is granted (170). D.T. Zahn also denies that

- - - - -

(169) Matthew has elaborated a little in his use of Q here. T.W. Manson thinks that it is unlikely that these added sayings (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστίν, ἐν τοῖς ταπεινοῖς) come from Q, else Luke would not have altered them so as to read identically with Mark (Lk.17.23 Mk.13.21). He interprets them thus: "The Messiah is in the wilderness - the mobilization place of rebellions - don't go to join him; he is in the inner chambers - the place of intrigues and plots - put no trust in all of that" ('Sayings of Jesus', p.142). A.H. M'Neile suggests that the meaning is: whether the Messiah is proclaiming himself openly, or preparing in secret (cf. John 7.27), is of no consequence, for "no one who could be pointed out at a given place would be the real Messiah" ('St. Matthew').
 (170) Strack-Billerbeck, *ibid.* 1, 954. See also the note on the Day of the Messiah, p. 85 above.

the point of the analogy is the swiftness of the Parousia (for this point is made more effectively by the parable of the thief in the night v.43), but rather this saying is by way of anti-thesis to the Jewish expectation of a secret coming of the Messiah (171).

However, this does not appear to be valid ground for rejecting the idea out of hand. There is surely no reason why at least both suddenness and clarity might not be indicated by the metaphor. A. Plummer is prepared to read this two-fold meaning into the term.

"The final event would be sudden and everywhere visible; there would be no sending of tidings that it was on the way, or had begun in any one place. The Messiah would not lie hidden for a while and become gradually known; His appearance would at once carry conviction as to who He was, and there would be no need to learn this from others." (172)

But perhaps one may go a step further, and suggest that the weight of the analogy may be on the side of suddenness, rather than clarity (173). Luke's editorial work here would seem to indicate that this is the way in which he interpreted it. He has introduced this section by a question from the Pharisees about the time when the Kingdom of God should come (17.20, see above p. 101ff.). The question is obviously not concerned with the theme of clarity but with that of timing. Moreover the section immediately following (17.26ff.), with

- - - - -

(171) D.T. Zahn, 'Das Evangelium des Matthäus', Kommentor zum Neuen Testament, Band 1. So also in essence C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.274, and J.A.T. Robinson, 'Coming', pp.71-2.

(172) A. Plummer, 'St. Matthew', p.334. A.H. M'Neile quotes Plummer with approval, and E. Klostermann affirms both meanings in 'Das Markus-Evangelium'.

(173) A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', H.A. Guy, 'The N.T. Doctrine of the Last Things', p.30, both emphasise the idea of swiftness. T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.87, commenting on the analogies of the lightning, the thief in the night, the flood, and the reference to Sodom, writes: "The significance is in the

its reference to the days of Noah, emphasises the element of suddenness - a suddenness that finds people quite unprepared. And the theme of suddenness is continued through vv.31,34-36. Thus the whole context for the analogy in Luke is that of the swiftness of the Parousia, and the question of clarity does not seem to be under consideration.

Matthew has not made it quite so plain in his editorial work that the thought of swiftness is in the forefront of his mind. Nonetheless the evidence once more seems to be weighted on the side of this idea. He has preceded his quotation from Q by one from Mark in which the concern is with signs (vv.23-25). Signs apparently have been offered, effective enough to deceive even the elect. But when the Parousia occurs, there will be no signs of any kind, for it comes as lightning; without warning, without signs. Indeed, the very presence of signs is proof that the claims based upon them are false. Of course, it might be argued that here the emphasis is on the clarity with which the Parousia occurs, so that when it does take place there will be no doubt. But the signs offered are apparently so impressive that there will be no doubt in the minds of those who behold them. Deception therefore will be avoided if the disciples will understand that signs play no part whatever in the coming of the Parousia, for when it comes it comes without warning. If this is so, then Matthew here uses Q to reinforce his emphasis on the fact that preparation will be impossible; at least, preparation of the kind that depends upon warning signs.

- - - - -

(173) (Cont'd.) --- one thing they all have in common, a sudden crisis breaking into careless ease".

The saying in Mt.24.28 = Luke 17.37 has all the characteristics of a proverbial saying adapted by Q for his own purposes (174). Its precise significance is very difficult to determine. C.J. Cadoux's suggestion that it refers to the familiar eagle standards of the Roman troops is generally rejected (175). T.W. Manson claims that in the Old Testament the bird of prey is characterised by its swiftness (176). Certainly this would bring the saying into line with the thought of the context; i.e., once more the emphasis is on the theme of the swiftness with which the Parousia occurs.

(B) Mt.24.37-41=Lk.17.26-27,34-35 :
The Days of Noah (177).

The emphasis in this Q passage does not lie on the sins of the people, as is customary in prophetic literature, but on their complete indifference to the character of the days in which they were living. They were carrying on as usual in the face of the unusual (178). This indifference left them

- - - - -

(174) ὄρου ἐάν ἢ τὸ πῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί
 (Mt.24.28). The reference is not to eagles, but to vultures. cf. Job 39.30.

(175) C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.275. T.F. Glasson, *ibid.* pp.84-5, sees here a possible reference to Jer.7.33, where Jeremiah describes the national apostasy and the approaching desolation of the Temple. See also E. Klostermann, 'Das Markus-Evangelium', and J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus'.

(176) So Hab.1.8, 2 Sam.1.23, Jer.4.13, Lam.4.19.

(177) Some doubt has been expressed whether Matthew and Luke obtained this material from the same source. A. Plummer, 'St. Matthew', thinks these two passages, although identical in thought, are different enough in structure to suggest that they might have been taken from different sources. On the other hand W. Manson, 'St. Luke', B.H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p.287, Lonsdale Ragg, 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', all regard this as coming from Q. W.G. Kümmel bears indirectly testimony to the same effect: "Both these texts (Lk.17.26f.=Mt.24.37-39) completely correspond in their emphasis on the threatening and incalculable nature of the eschatological day with Jesus' attitude already familiar to us, so that there is no need to doubt their belonging to the oldest tradition". *ibid.* p.38.

completely unprepared for what was to come. Matthew, therefore, has inserted this quotation from Q at a most appropriate place. In v.34 he has stressed the imminent nature of the Parousia, and in v.36 he has stressed the wholly unpredictable nature of the Parousia.

"The end is certain, but the time is uncertain." (179)
Therefore the only kind of preparation that will prove equal to the situation is constant watchfulness.

The unexpected nature of the Parousia is heightened further by Mt.24.40-41=Lk.17.34-35 (180). There seems little doubt that this is the meaning here (181). The Parousia comes so swiftly that there is no room for last minute preparation. This is evidenced by the fact that those who presumably are 'prepared'; i.e. those who are 'taken', are engaged in their ordinary occupations, or else resting from them. Therefore questions relating to the when and the where of the Parousia

(178) cf. the imperfects in Luke 17.27, indicating a habit of mind: ἤσθιον , ἔπινον , ἐγάμουσιν , ἐγαρίζοντο

(179) A. Plummer, 'St. Luke'.

(180) Luke has separated these sayings from the passage about the days of Noah. J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, thinks that they were originally separate sayings. The differences between Luke and Matthew are obvious, if not important. Matthew has two men (εἰς εἰς) and two women (μία μία) at work, and Luke has two (δύο) - men or women, husband or wife, sleeping together. On the other hand they agree in detail in Mt. 24.41 and Lk.17.35. Mt.24.40 is paralleled in Luke by an additional verse that is found in D, U, and the Latin, Syriac, and Armenian versions: δύο[εσονται] εν [τω] αργω [ο] εις παραληφθησεται και ο ετερος αφεθησεται . This is omitted by A B Q R Aeth Copt Goth (So A. Plummer). It is generally felt that this is an import from Matthew, although T.W. Manson, 'Sayings of Jesus', p.146, thinks that it fits too well into the poetic structure of Luke not to belong there originally.

(181) Of course, some have interpreted it differently. cf. T.W.

Manson, *ibid.* p.146, and J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus', who suggest that these verses illustrate the way in which the Parousia cuts through all human relationships.

are of no consequence, for no matter when it happens, or where, the division takes place, and it takes place only on the basis of the kind of preparedness that leaves one ready no matter where or when, or on the lack thereof.

One thing more may be said here. The Parousia when it occurs involves judgment. Division of this kind can only take place on the basis of judgment. It would seem then that Matthew inserted this quotation from Q to emphasise the swift and wholly unexpected nature of the Parousia, and the necessity for the kind of preparation that need take no account of the when or the where.

(C) Mt.24.42-44, Lk.12.39-40 :
The Watchful Householder.

This is the first of the advent parables which Matthew has introduced from Q. Matthew's introductory formula leaves no room for doubt about his interpretation of the parable (182). Even without this formula, however, the application is made plain in v.44, and that application is identical with the one given it by Luke (12.40). And yet in spite of this agreement, stemming from a very early source, and exhibiting identity of order, language, and application, both C.H. Dodd and J. Jeremias



(182) Γρηγορεύετε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποῖα ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται . cf. Mark 13. 33,35. Luke has omitted any such introduction, and introduces the parable proper with τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε (Mt. ἐκεῖνο δὲ -). "...Jesus is characteristically appealing for a judgment from everyday experience". C.W.F. Smith, 'The Jesus of the Parables', p.249.

challenge the interpretation that the evangelists have given to it (183). Both these interpreters view the original reference of the parable as being to the impending crisis in Christ's ministry that issued in the Cross. Their conviction that the parable did not originally apply to the return of Christ is strengthened by the apparently unhappy nature of the analogy. C.H. Dodd at least finds ground for complaint in this. The parable refers to an unhappy event; i.e., a burglary, whereas the Parousia is a happy event. Hence he is more convinced than ever that the parable really had in mind the disaster involved in the persecution of the Christ and of his disciples that lay ahead, together with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. Thus he repudiates the process by which

"the parable becomes a summons to the leaders of the church, in view of the delayed parousia, not to sleep, and the burglar, by means of Christologizing allegorizing, becomes a figure of the Son of Man" (184).

Is it not a fact, however, that the unhappy nature of the Parousia, for those who are not prepared, is the precise point of most of these analogies? In each case it is the unhappy potential in the event that is stressed; the people who are not

- - - - -

(183) C.H. Dodd, 'Parables', p.168f., and J. Jeremias, 'Parables', p.39f. This is one of the five Parousia parables which Jeremias places among the crisis parables: the nocturnal house-keeper, the bridegroom arriving at midnight, the master of the house returning late from the wedding feast, and the nobleman returning from a journey. With respect to them all he writes: "It was the primitive church that first interpreted the five parables in a Christological sense and as addressed to the community, warning them not to become slack because of the delay of the Parousia". p.52. C.H. Dodd, however, is quite prepared to admit that "The parable therefore was applied to the advent-expectation at the earliest stage of the tradition to which Gospel Criticism can go back". p.168. cf. also J.A.T. Robinson, 'Coming', p.79.

(184) C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* p.140

prepared for the flood, the servant who does not invest the talents given in trust to him, the waiting servant who does not prove himself faithful, the virgins who are not prepared, and the people who did not pay heed to the needs of their neighbours(185). Indeed, it is difficult to see how a warning of any kind could be issued without stressing the unhappy consequences of ignoring it. This is certainly the aim of these analogies, and indeed of the whole discourse (186).

It is also a fact, of course, that the unexpected nature of the Parousia, with its consequent of good and evil, is firmly rooted in the Christian tradition (187). C.J. Cadoux rejects this suggestion about the original setting, on the ground that the crisis which these parables are supposed to have warned against was already present at the time of the warning itself, whereas

"the passages all suggest on the contrary a crisis near at hand but not actually present",

and therefore

"we can really have little doubt that these pictures were intended by Jesus to refer to conditions and duties of His disciples during the interval between his death and his parousia" (188).

- (185) cf. also Rev.3.3,16.15 where Christ is compared to a thief.
 (186) Paul S. Minear, 'Christian Hope and the Second Coming', p.132, stresses the 'happy' nature of the analogy, in that Christ plays the role of thief insofar as he "takes from men the treasure in which they have trusted, and he does this before they have become aware of the loss", and insofar as his coming "weighs on his scales the treasure we have stored, when he declares their permanence or evanescence". He quotes with approval S. Kirkegaard, who describes Christ as a "far more terrible robber" than any other, a robber who assaulted "the whole human race at the point where it is most sensitive; its desire for security and superiority". It was this that led to his death.
 (187) So C.J. Cadoux, *ibid.* p.313f., and J. Schniewind, *ibid.*
 (188) C.J. Cadoux, *ibid.*, p.314 and 313. Indeed, C.H. Dodd comes very close to admitting this himself. He points out that 1 Thess 5.2 indicates that Paul had access to a tradition that contained the parable with the same application. cf. also p.163, n.183 above. cf. also J. Schniewind, *ibid.*, re v.43: "aber pragt ein

C.J. Cadoux, however, has his own objection to the application as given in the parable; i.e., that it does not flow from the parable itself. The parable says in effect: 'be prepared, for the Son of Man will come when you are unprepared' (189). But is not this precisely what both Matthew and Luke have in mind? The Parousia belongs to the category of the unpredictable. It comes suddenly and it comes without warning. Therefore the only kind of preparation possible for such an unexpected visit is unceasing watchfulness, of the kind indicated by $\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ (v.42) and $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\iota$ (v.44). The thief comes at an unknown hour, therefore one cannot protect the house and its goods in terms of specific preparation of the kind that takes account of the hour of his coming (v.43). So also Christ comes like a thief, making the kind of preparation that is directed specifically at the hour of his coming quite impossible. C.W.F. Smith, although he does not apply this parable to the Parousia, has nonetheless expressed this same truth.

"Treated as a similitude in its own right, it suggests that the success of the thief depends upon the lack of warning. If he were expected, he would be unsuccessful. The unexpectedness of his design and descent upon the sleeping household makes constant vigilance necessary." (190)

(188) (Cont'd.) --- Bild, das für die gesamte urchristliche Verkündigung bezeichnend bleibt (1 Thess.5.2-4, Rev. 16.15, 2 Peter 3.10), das Bild vom Dieb..." .

(189) C.J. Cadoux, *ibid.* p.225.

(190) C.W.F. Smith, 'The Jesus of the Parables', p.249.

(D) Mt. 24.45-51=Lk. 12.42-46 :
The Faithful and Wise Servant.

The differences between Matthew and Luke are quite minimal here. Luke has substituted οἰκονόμος (12.42) for Matthew's δοῦλος (24.45). However, he slips back to the δοῦλος in vv. 43,45,46,47, so that it seems likely that δοῦλος was the original term (191). Luke's introduction takes the form of a question: Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, Κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας (12.41). This creates a difficulty, since the parable to which apparently the question refers is that of the thief in the night (Lk. 12.39-40), and the parable that follows does not answer the question (192). J.M. Creed has made a helpful suggestion; i.e., that the reference is not just to the preceding parable but also to the promises of v.37.

"Is this blessedness reserved for the apostles, or is it for all faithful disciples? In answer Jesus gives the warnings and promises especially appropriate to the apostles." (193).

Once again both C.H. Dodd and J. Jeremias strip this parable of its eschatological connotation (194). C.H. Dodd regards the opening question, τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος - , as providing the original meaning. The emphasis is not on the journey and the return of the master

(191) So J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.45.

(192) So T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.117.

(193) J.M. Creed, 'St. Luke'. See also C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.191.

(194) C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* p.158f., J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.145f. See also C.W.F. Smith, 'The Jesus of the Parables', p.253f.

("clearly no more than a necessary part of the dramatic scenery"), but on the theme of the discharge of responsibility. With this as its theme it was originally directed to the scribes and Pharisees. J. Jeremias concurs in this (195), and concludes that the parable therefore

"is to be seen to be one of his many stern words of warning to the scribes that the day of reckoning was at hand, when God would reveal whether they had been faithful to the trust committed to them or had abused it." (196)

But the primitive church saw in the delay of the master of the house an obvious parallel to the delay of the Parousia. Thus the servant represents the members (Matthew) or the leaders (Luke) of the Christian community.

The fact remains however that in Q, which Dodd is prepared to admit is as far back as we can go in the Christian tradition, this parable does have an eschatological reference. Very clearly Matthew so interpreted it, and placed it here in the discourse at a very appropriate place. The following factors make it appropriate:

1. the theme of the unexpected character of the return, already so familiar in Mark, and so obviously heightened by Matthew in his use of Q, is set forth once more in the terms of this parable.

2. the emphasis on the need of the kind of preparation that takes account of the fact that the master may return at

- - - - -

(195) He states that the $\chi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is not intended to emphasise the delay of the Master's return, but only to provide the opportunity for the testing of the servant.
 (196) J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.47.

any time is once again very much in evidence. The consequence of preparation (24.47) and the consequence of the lack of preparation (24.51), are made very explicit.

3. the theme of preparation is developed in this parable, in terms very similar to that of the parable of the talents. Indeed, for the first time in the discourse, some content is given to these terms $\gamma\rho\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\iota$; preparation is to take the form of the fulfilment of the responsibilities entrusted to them. This thought, as we shall see, is taken one step further in the parable of the talents, and is fully developed in the 'parable' of the last judgment.

It is difficult to see the precise function of these false prophets at this point. They do not appear to be false claimants to Messiahship, but they do presumably bring false tidings about the Messiah (196).

The essentially new element here is the reference to $\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ in v.12. This has been taken as a reference to the Anti-Christ of Dan.12.11 (197). Whether or not one inclines to this interpretation may depend on the interpretation one gives to 24.15 (see above p.121ff.). The context however does not seem to lend itself to such an interpretation. The idea of the increase of sin is not confined here to this phrase, but rather involves the events described under the heading of $\theta\lambda\iota\beta\iota\alpha$. The tribulation and the

(196) Several attempts have been made to identify these 'false prophets' who arose during the siege of Jerusalem. See also H.-J. Larrange, 'Saint Matthieu', A.H. W'ville, 'St. Matthew', and J. Schmeidler, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus', see here a reference to the false prophets who appeared after our Lord's death with reference to the 'coming conspiracy'. (197) cf. J. Schmeidler, *ibid.*

V Additions to Matthew's Discourse from M.(A) The Persecution of the Disciples and the Universal Mission.1. Mt.24.10-12

These three verses are peculiar to Matthew and seem to represent an enlargement of the theme of persecution. Elements of these three verses are found elsewhere in the Gospel of Matthew; v.10 is a generalization of 10.17f., and v.11 sounds a note already heard in 24.5 and repeated in vv.23,24. It is because he has already used these texts that he here inserts this summary in their place.

It is difficult to see the precise function of these false prophets at this point. They do not appear to be false claimants to Messiahship, but they do presumably bring false tidings about the Messiah (196).

The essentially new element here is the reference to τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν in v.12. This has been taken as a reference to the Anti-Christ of Dan.12.11 (197). Whether or not one inclines to this interpretation may depend on the interpretation one gives to 24.15 (see above p.121ff.). The context however does not seem to lend itself to such an interpretation. The idea of the increase of sin is not confined here to this phrase, but rather involves the events described under the heading of θλίψις. The tribulation and the

(196) Several attempts have been made to identify them. T.W. Manson, 'Sayings', p.241 identifies them as the false prophets who arose during the siege of Jerusalem. So also M.-J. Lagrange, 'Saint Matthieu'. A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', and J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus', see here a reference to the false prophets who appeared after our Lord's death with reference to the Judaising controversy.
(197) cf. J. Schniewind, *ibid.*

hatred which are directed to the followers of Christ constitute the $\tau\acute{o}$ πληθυνθῆναι τῆν ἀνομίαν . And the result of this multiplication of sin is described quite clearly in v.12b (ψ υγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν). Moreover neither of the terms used in the phrase has any necessary connection with the idea of the Anti-Christ; π ληθύνειν is frequently used in the LXX with reference to sin (198), and the term ἀνομία has already been used by Matthew (199). In effect therefore Matthew has done no more than develop, and that very slightly, the ideas already expressed in Mark; the persecutions directed against the disciples represent an increase in sin leading up to the fading of the love of some, but the ultimate salvation of those who endure. Thus the multiplication of sin does not as with Paul (2 Thess.2) become a condition of the End, but rather a prelude to 12b and 14.

2. Mt.24.14b (κ αὶ τότε ἤξει τὸ τέλος).

In this phrase Matthew seems to have eliminated all doubt about how the reference to the preaching of the Gospel to all the world is to be interpreted. The completion of this task does become in his hands a sign of the End. We have already noted, however, that even in Mark's account, assuming that it is to be regarded as a sign of the End, the emphasis lies on the task rather than on the sign (p.117ff.). If anything,

- - - - -

(198) cf. Isa.57.9, Jer.37.30, Dan.12.4.

(199) Mt.7.23, which is probably a quotation from Psa.6.8. The idea of the increase of sin is a common enough apocalyptic idea; cf. 4 Esd.5.2,10, Enoch 91.7. See also a quotation from Sotah 9.15, in H. Danby, 'The Mishnah', London, 1933, p.306: "...Children shall shame the elders, and the elders shall rise up before the children, for the son dishonoureth 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".

however, the element of command is heightened by Matthew. He has spoken of troubles, hatred, betrayal, false prophets, decreasing faith, and the need for endurance, even unto death. Yet in the midst of all this and in the face of all this the Gospel must be preached. Then when the task is fulfilled they can begin to think about the End (200).

J. Schniewind has emphasised the impossibility of conjecture on the question of 'when' on the basis of this kind of sign. Rather does this give promise that under no set of circumstances can the preaching of the Gospel be silenced.

"Das Beispiel des Paulus zeigt auch, dass unser Vers keine sichere Bestimmung über den Zeitpunkt des Endes ermöglicht. Wann und wie wirklich alle Völker das Evangelium, das Zeugnis Gottes (1 Kor. 2.1f., u. ä. St.) gehört haben, lässt sich nie sicher berechnen. Wann hätten wirklich alle 'gehört' (f.z. Mk.4.9; Mt.13.13-17), so dass die Volle Verantwortung sie trifft? Nur das Eine steht fest und geht auch durch die Apokalypse, das bis zur Endzeit die sieghaste Freudenbotschaft nicht verstummen kann. (Offb.10.7;11.1-6;14.6)." (201)

(B) The Parousia of the Son of Man

1. Mt.24.29 (Εὐθείως).

A.H. M'Neile has suggested that v.29 is the true sequel to v.22. Thus the $\theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\psi\iota\nu$ of v.29 is that of v.21, and "the climax of the Pangs (is) followed immediately by the End (202). In this sense therefore Mark's $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ (13.24) adds a note of encouragement. "The tribulation will be terrible, but the Parousia will follow at once." (202).

(200) This expectation of the nearness of the end did in fact provide motivation and inspiration to the early church. It is very evident that Paul's sense of urgency was born of this expectation: Rom.11.28, 15.19,23f., Eph.3.8-10. So J. Schniewind, 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus'.

(201) J. Schniewind, *ibid.* pp.241-2.

(202) A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew'.

Sensible as the above suggestion may appear to be, the fact remains however that Matthew does not have it following v.22, and it is this fact with which we must reckon here. It has here all the appearance of one of those temporal particles that tend to make this discourse a description in sequence of the future (203). And without doubt it is Matthew's word (204). Why then has he used it at this point? Perhaps the answer may be found in the direction of Matthew's attempt to heighten the swiftness with which the Parousia comes. We have already noted this in his use of Q, and the word here follows immediately upon one such quotation from Q (vv.26-28). The εὐθέως at this point thus conforms to the simile of ἀστραπή. This Event takes place so swiftly, so unexpectedly, that preparation aimed at the time of the Event is of no avail (205).

2. Mt.24.30 (τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου).

The origin of this idea of the 'sign' of the Son of Man in heaven may lie in that of the ensign (ἡ Ἰ LXX σημεῖον, σὺσσημον) which would be set up by Yahweh as a rallying point for his distressed people (206) In this sense therefore the σημεῖον would be something in the sky visible to all (207).

(203) See here W.G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p.97, where he lists the words denoting temporal sequence.

(204) Of this we can be reasonably sure, since Mark would certainly have used it had it been in any of his sources.

(205) C.A. Briggs, 'The Messiah of the Gospels', 1894, pp.155-6, (quoted by G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Future', p.134), has suggested that εὐθέως is no stronger than the לְפָנַי of O.T. prophecy. To prophets this indicated that the event was near. "It was near in the prophetic sense, i.e. the event was certain, but the time uncertain." Thus the sense of immediacy was to be equated with the feeling of certainty. There is however no precedent for the use of εὐθέως in this sense in the N.T.

(206) So A.H. M'Neile, *ibid.* See Isa.11.12, 18.3, 49.22.

(207) Strack-Billerbeck refers to Isa.60.1 where the light appears as a sign of the Messiah. See also P e sig R 36 (161 c), and Ezek. 32.7f, Joel 2.10, Amos 5.20, Zeph.1.15, Hag.2.6,21, Enoch

Such a reference at this point could at best only be a very cryptic one, and it makes greater sense to see here a reference to the coming of the Son of Man; i.e. the 'sign' is the coming (208). The sequence of thought therefore in Matthew represents a natural and logical development from the opening question. The disciples have asked for a σημεῖον of the παρουσία and of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος. What kind of sign did they want? A herald, who would proclaim quite clearly lo here, lo there? Such heralds would be forthcoming, but they would be a sure sign that the Parousia had not taken place (24.5,11,23,24,26). Do they wish a sign arising out of the historical situation giving them warning that history itself was about to come to an end? There would be many such signs in history: wars, persecutors, betrayals (24.6,7,9,10, 15-21). But these are not signs of the End (24.6,8,23,24). These things must be, but they are simply evidence of the difficulties facing them, of the hardships that must be endured; signs that flight and faith and obedience will be required of them. All these events of course may point to the present as the time of the End, but none are of the kind that will enable them to calculate when that End will occur. Only one such sign is of this nature, and that is the Parousia itself.

(C) Mt.25.1-13 : The Parable of the Ten Virgins.

There are in this parable signs indicating some dependence

- - - - -

- (207) (Cont'd.) --- 80.4-5, Test. Levi 4.1, 4 Esd.5.4, Ass. Moses 10.5, and also 2 Pet.3.12, Rev.1.7, 6.12f., Did.16.6, Peter's Gospel 10.3-9. See also W. Bousset, 'The Antichrist Legend', p.232f., for Patristic interpretations.
 (208) Strack-Billerbeck admits to this possibility. So also A.H. M'Neile.

on other parables in the Synoptics. The first nine verses of the parable appear to parallel the Q parable of the servants who wait for their Master (Lk.12.35-38), and the similarity between vv.11-12 and the metaphorical judgment in Luke 13.25-27 (Q) is very evident (209). This has led to the suggestion that the original parable stopped at v.10, and that what follows this represents an import from the Q parable (Lk.13.25-27) designed to give it its present eschatological application (210).

Moreover, the apparently allegorical character of the parable has created a reluctance on the part of some to credit it to the mind of Christ. Thus the reference to the bridegroom has given J. Jeremias ground for rejecting this as a parable originating with Christ,

"for the allegorical representation of the Messiah is completely foreign to the whole of the Old Testament and to the literature of later Judaism and first makes its appearance in the Pauline writings (2 Cor.11.2)" (211).

Is it not possible, however, that J. Jeremias is here guilty of imposing an allegorical interpretation upon the parable that is not inherent in the text itself? There is no more need to equate Christ here with the bridegroom than there is to equate the virgins with the church. The elements in the parable remain true to the parable without such a transfer of

- - - - -

(209) See C.W.F. Smith, 'The Jesus of the Parables', p.166, T.W. Manson, 'Sayings', p.242, A.T. Cadoux, 'The Parables of Jesus', p.70.

(210) So A.T. Cadoux, *ibid.* and T.W. Manson, *ibid.*

(211) J. Jeremias, 'Parables', p.4. He also stumbles over the $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ with which Matthew introduces the parable. He interprets this as referring back to the Parousia mentioned in 24.44 and 50 (cf. also 25.13). For this reason he feels it must be discarded. A.H. M'Neile, however, has established that $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ is a characteristic particle in Matthew which carries the reader to the next event in the narrative, without necessarily implying historical sequence. Matthew so uses it 61 times. It is virtually the equivalent of the Hebrew 'waw consecutive', which does not occur in Aramaic. Note on 2.7, pp.16-17.

identities (212). Assuming for the moment that the point of the parable, regardless of the original frame of reference, was the recognition and exercise of responsibility, then the details of the parable do not require such a transfer of identities as would be required by an allegory. It would be difficult to emphasise the exercise of responsibility without the absence of the one to whom account must be rendered. With this in substance W.G. Kümmel agrees:

"Yet this metaphor no more turns into a 'formation by the church completely overgrown with allegory' (Bultmann) than do the metaphorical words of the bridegroom which are paralleled in the metaphorical conclusion of the parables in Mark 4.29, Mt.12.13a, 24.51c=Lk.12.46b, Mt.25.30a, and which are thereby seen to be customary in Jesus' style" (213).

- - - - -

- (212) See C.W.F. Smith, *ibid.* p.25, for an excellent summary of the distinction between a parable and an allegory.
- (213) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.*, pp.57-8. See also p.178 below for the conclusion of this quotation, and also V. Taylor on Mark 2.19a, W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.*, p.57, n.3, and J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.42, n.82. The recognition of the above might have helped to avoid some rather extreme suggestions. T.W. Manson, 'Sayings', offers one such 'tentative' suggestion which displays an ingenuity in excess of the need. His suggestion is based in part on the addition of τοῦ νυμφίου in v.1, found in S B C W Φ K sa bo and τοῦ νυμφίου καὶ τῆς νύμφης in D θ λ it vg sy ^{5^{ae}}. This Manson interprets as referring to the Jewish idea of Israel as the bride of God, and he suggests that the Jewish-Christian Church adopted this idea to itself. So the bride is the true Israel (the Israel of the Patriarchs and the Prophets and the Jewish-Christians), and the ten virgins are the Gentile converts. The wise virgins in turn are those who accept the Jewish-Christian standard of conformity to the law, the foolish are those who do not. He finds further support for this in the fact that in the O.T. both lamp and oil are used as figures for the law (so Psa.119,105, Prov.6.23, Apoc.Baruch 59.2, 4 Ezra 14.20f.). For signs of a return to normalcy see the quotation from Manson on p. 178 n.218 below. The same judgment may be made on A.T. Cadoux's suggestion that the refusal of the five wise to provide for the five foolish from out of their resources was 'churlish'. This apparent churlishness leads him to suggest a corrective. "The parable shows that sometimes an act which looks like poor comradeship is more than justified when there are circumstances...where a compromise which might conserve the fellowship would be disloyalty to accepted duty and would lose the higher good of all." *Ibid.* pp.151-2. But such an apology is necessary only when the parable is interpreted as an allegory. See also C.W.F. Smith, *ibid.* pp.165-166.

Serious objection has also been made to the application as given by Matthew in the terms of v.13: γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν (214).

The objection stems from the fact that the command to watch fails to take account of the fact that all the virgins slept (215). This discrepancy provides the impetus to attempts to find an original application other than that given by Matthew. C.H. Dodd is content to group this with the parables of the waiting servants, the faithful and unfaithful servant(s), and the thief in the night, as a crisis parable.

"All the vivid dramatic detail is intended only to emphasise the folly of unpreparedness and the wisdom of preparedness - preparedness, as I take it, for the developments actually in process in the ministry of Jesus." (216).

Jeremias finds the original frame of reference in v.6, where the emphasis is on the sudden coming of the bridegroom, which parallels the sudden onslaught of the flood, the unexpected entry of the thief, and the unlooked for return of the master of the house.

"The common element of suddenness is a figure of the unexpected incidence of catastrophe. The crisis is at the door....Hence it was a cry of warning in view of the imminent eschatological crisis that Christ uttered the parable, and as such his audience understood it" (217).

- - - - -

(214) There is little doubt that this is Matthew's addition to the parable, probably from Mk.13.35-37. The only question is, does this application of the parable by Matthew represent a suitable application, or does it contradict its inherent thrust?

(215) So J. Jeremias, 'Parables', who thinks that this belongs originally to the parable of the Doorkeeper in Mt.13.35, and W.G. Kümmel, who rejects it as part of the original parable "especially as the parable summons not to watchfulness, but to preparedness".p.39f. So also A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', C.W.F. Smith, 'The Jesus of the Parables', p.166.

(216) C.H. Dodd, *ibid.*, p.172. cf. also T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.93, who sees in this parable a reference to the failure of Israel to recognize the crisis in her history engendered by the coming of Christ.

It seems to me, however, that the objection to Matthew's application on the ground that it ignores the fact that all slept, betrays a kind of literalism quite unusual in most of the exegetes who have voiced it. What is the antithesis between watchfulness and preparedness? Are they not one and the same? Or, to put it another way, does not Matthew's primary emphasis lie on the imperatives to watchfulness in the light of the unexpected nature of the Parousia, and do not the various parables describe the character and the content of that watchfulness? The Parable of the Faithful and Wise Servant (Mt.24.26ff.) defines watchfulness in terms of the fulfilment of present obligations. The Parable of the Ten Virgins is a reminder that watchfulness must take the form of preparedness that is exercised constantly. The Parable of the Talents (Mt.25.14ff.) describes watchfulness as the proper investment of God's gifts in His Service in recognition of one's accountability to Him. The Parable of the Last Judgment (Mt.25.31ff.) gives the fullest elaboration of its meaning; watchfulness is the recognition of our obligations to our contemporaries in acknowledgment of Christ's concern for all in need.

Thus the parable is of a piece with those that have preceded it and with those that follow; it stresses the unexpected nature of the Parousia and the kind of preparation that is required for it.

- - - - -

(217) J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.42. It was the phrase $\chi\rho\upsilon\iota\varsigma$ -
 $\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\nu\upsilon\mu\eta\iota\omicron\nu$ that gave the primitive church
 the idea of interpreting it as a parousia parable.

"On the contrary, it is rather a question of a parable urgently directing the hearer by means of its metaphorical features to a correct interpretation: the eschatological coming of the Son of Man is completely incalculable, but it is very near, therefore it is important to hold oneself in readiness for it.....It follows equally from all these exhortations to be on the alert and to be prepared that Jesus describes the coming of the Son of Man and therewith the entry of the Kingdom of God as possibly very imminent, and in any case pressingly near, although its actual date was completely unknown." (218)

(D) Mt.25.14-30 (Lk.19.12-27) : The Parable of the Talents.

These two parables are alike enough in their main thrust to lead T.W. Manson to suggest that

"the main outline of the story was already fixed before the M and L traditions took shape; and makes it probable that the parable, in its original form, goes back to Jesus himself" (219).

The differences in detail and development, however, are too great to allow for a common written source, such as Q (220).

If this conclusion be accepted, then the two parables - or rather the two diverging traditions in which the one parable appears - provide an interesting example of the respective editorial work of the two evangelists. And, surprisingly enough in the light of the accusations usually

- - - - -

(218) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.58. See above p.175 for the beginning of the quotation. T.W. Manson suggests finally (see above p.175 n.213: "What this original, and probably genuine, parable was like we have now no means of determining; but we may guess that its point was the necessity of being finally prepared for the coming of the Son of Man". *ibid.* p.245. Thus he sees the theme of the parable as "The qualification for entrance is readiness in all respects and at all times" (p.243). There is some further evidence for this conclusion. The two types of virgins correspond with the two types of slaves in 24.45f. (the fact that only one slave may be the object of observation here does not alter the parallel). Its theme is the same as the parable of the watchful householder of 24.43ff.; preparation at the last minute is impossible and must rather take the form of constant watchfulness. The 'wise' virgins of v.10 correspond in their attitude to the admonition of 24.44.

(219) T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.245. Also C.W.F. Smith, *ibid.* p.199.

levelled against Matthew, it is Luke who heightens the eschatological element in the parable. Luke quite specifically makes it an explanation of the delay of the Parousia in the face of the disciples' expectation of the nearness of the Kingdom (221). Moreover his parable gives evidence of certain allegorizing tendencies, very reminiscent of the 'parable' of the vineyard keeper (222). There are many therefore who are quite prepared to agree in substance with C.H. Dodd's conclusion:

"The eschatological motive has disintegrated the parable and replaced it by direct prediction" (223).

Similar accusations have been made against Matthew. Certainly the charge might be made with some confidence with reference to v.30. Here the transfer of identity, so characteristic of allegory, has taken place, and the merchant has become the Son of Man rendering judgment. The same charge may not be made with equal certainty with reference to vv.21 and 23, where the faithful servants are rewarded with the

- - - - -

(220) T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.313, and C.W.F. Smith, *ibid.* p.199.

(221) Lk.19.11. J. Jeremias, 'Parables', p.48, suggests that this text has some of Luke's literary characteristics, and is therefore definitely Lucan. Thus, according to Luke, Jesus sees that his disciples expect the Parousia immediately and he "instructs his disciples that the intervening period is to be a time of testing for them". See also A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew'.

(222) A.H. M'Neile, *ibid.*, has drawn out the allegorizing tendencies by a series of simple equations: King = Christ, far country = heaven, citizens = those who hated Christ, and the servants rewarded on his return = Christians.

(223) C.H. Dodd, 'Parables', p.173. cf. also A.T. Cadoux, *ibid.*, who quotes Julicher 11, p.488: "the first act of the returning king would have been vengeance and not petty monetary business with his slaves". Moreover, the resemblance between the development of this parable and a later historical incident involving Herod's division of his kingdom among his family, described in Jos. War 11.vi, sections 80-100, and paralleled in the Ant. XVII, viii.-xi, gives cause for doubt. See T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.313, and C.W.F. Smith, *ibid.* pp.201-202. Jeremias thinks that Luke's ἀρπάζει οὐκ ἔσθλας (21.21) belongs to the vocabulary of banking, and that the expression is a popular designation of a grasping person (p.48 n.8), which if true would give preference to Matthew's account. (cont.)

command to enter εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου . This has been taken as a reference to the Messianic banquet, but although the possibility must be allowed, the reference is too obscure for the charge to be made with certainty (224). And the ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθρὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (v.30b) is really only Matthew's traditional formula by which he closes these parables with an eschatological reference (225).

This has encouraged C.H. Dodd to claim that the parable is therefore linked to the final judgment only by v.30, which is "probably not part of the original parable" (226). He feels free therefore to look elsewhere for the original reference, and he sees the key to that in the emphasis on the cautious servant, who is guilty both of excessive caution and of a breach of trust. This indicates to him that the parable was originally applied to the religious leaders of Israel, who were concerned primarily with their own personal security and

- - - - -

(223) (Cont'd.) --- However, his claim that Jesus would not have compared himself to such a king ignores precedent well established; e.g. the thief in the night, etc.

(224) G. Dalman, 'The Words of Jesus', p.117: "Hebrew $\eta \eta \psi$ 'joy' is used especially for 'the joy connected with a festival' and therefore indicates that there is at least a veiled reference here to the Messianic banquet". So also J. Jeremias, and J. Schniewind, 'St. Matthew'. A.H. M'Neile, 'St. Matthew', rejects the suggestion.

(225) cf. Mt.8.12, 13.42,50, 22.13, 24.51. If this be true then Jeremias is only partly right when he wrote: "In both utterances (vv.21,23 and v.30) it is not an earthly merchant who is speaking but the Christ of the Parousia, who awards a share in the new age, and assigns men to eternal damnation" p.49. See also C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* p.153.

(226) C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* p.246.

with the law (227).

The fact remains, however, that even if the original reference was as outlined above, Matthew had to do very little with the parable to make it eschatological in character. Indeed, with the probable exception of v.30, the details of the parable are no more than would be required for the purpose for which Matthew uses it (228). Moreover, the very differences between Matthew and Luke, combined with their identity of setting and of aim, bear witness to the originality of the eschatological reference of this parable.

"Il serait etonnant que la tradition ait verse de deux facons differentes dans la meme allegorie, si elle n'etait suggeree par la parablolle elle-meme." (229)

Moreover, this parable suits the context given it by Matthew

- - - - -

(227) cf. his suggestion about the three-fold development of the parable: 1. the parable as told by Jesus, with the application as above; 2. its use to illustrate the general maxim of 25.29. It was at this stage that the tradition behind Matthew and Luke was fixed in tradition, and Matthew carries this stage a step further in that the amounts of money given to the servants are graded, in order that the parable "may illustrate the varieties of human endowments" (p.152); 3. the eschatological motive takes over and the parable becomes an allegory of the return of the Master. See also M. Dibelius, 'Jesus', Philadelphia, 1949, p.125, and C.W.F. Smith, *ibid.*, pp.205-6, whose interpretation parallels that of Dodd, and T.F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p.92. Jeremias claims that the original parable, with its emphasis on the cautious servant who made no use of the money entrusted to him, "favours the assumption that Jesus originally addressed the parable to the scribes" (p.50). See also J. Klausner, 'Jesus of Nazareth' London, 1925, p.376.

(228) Even Matthew's μετὰ δὲ πολὺν χρόνον (v.19), which Jeremias regards as part of the allegorical element, is necessary to allow time for the investments to bear dividends, and to allow for a time of testing. Presumably if the master had remained the servant would long since have been prodded into action. The reference to the parousia is obvious here, but it is also to be noted that the delay of the Parousia is a ".....retard qui ne change rien au devoir des disciples". Lagrange, *ibid.*, p.482. cf. also Luke 20.9, where a parallel phrase is used (ἀπεδημήσαν χρόνον ἰδνούς) without any reference to the parousia. See also Mark 12.1.

(229) M.-J. Lagrange, *ibid.*, p.480.

admirably, and carries forward the theme already developed, in terms of characters already well established. M.-J. Lagrange emphasises that the simple connective γάρ in v.14 is all that is required to establish the connection with what precedes, for that connection in thought is obvious; in 24.45 there is (or are) ὁ πιστὸς δουλὸς καὶ φρόνιμος ; in 25.2 the virgins were μωραὶ and φρόνιμοι ; and in 25.14 each of the δοῦλοι will prove himself to be either μωρὸς or φρόνιμος .

It may also be said however that not only are the connections obvious, but the development is both obvious and significant. We have noted that the eschatological discourse can be summed up in the warning of 24.42,44: γρηγορεῖτε ὅν ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ! This theme of watchfulness is developed in 24.45-51 in terms of the fulfilment of responsibility; in 25.1-13 in terms of the consequence attendant upon the readiness or the failure to watch. This parable of 25.14-30 tells us that watchfulness is in no way to be equated with idleness. It is not a passive waiting for the promised event, but rather the fulfilment of the responsibilities entrusted to them. As we shall see, the 'parable' of 25.31ff. outlines the nature of those responsibilities. Thus is the theme of watchfulness developed to its logical conclusion.

One more factor remains to be considered. The problem of interpretation here is complicated by the insertion of v.29 (Lk.19.26) (230). This is a detached saying which is given

- - - - -

(230) Luke has introduced this saying exactly as it is found in Mark, but Matthew has added περισσευθήσεται in both 13.12 and 25.29.

various contexts in the Gospels (231). Jeremias sees its insertion here just before the conclusion of the parable as an attempt by Matthew to point up his interpretation of the parable, and as a result

"the whole parable consequently assumes the character of an exposition of the nature and manner of divine retribution" (232).

But even if this be so its appropriateness for this purpose may be acknowledged. Where Mark has used this floating saying to illustrate the nature of the reception of the divine truth, Matthew has used it to illustrate the nature of responsibility; the fulfilment of responsibility now brings greater responsibility in the future, and the failure to fulfil responsibility now brings the loss of such responsibility as has already been given. Surely this represents a very exciting piece of editing on Matthew's part. He has emphasised that the present is not the time for calculating but for watching; watching is to be understood as the proper fulfilment of the responsibilities committed to man; failure in fulfilment of these responsibilities leads to their loss, and faithfulness leads to their increase. What better text with which to interpret, and to conclude, the Parable of the Talents?

- - - - -

(231) It is found in Lk.8.18 , Mt.13.12, and Mk.4.25. Mark has used it as a general reference to the reception of spiritual truth; the more willing one is to accept the truth, the more that truth will be vouchsafed to him. For a possible original meaning see V. Taylor, 'St. Mark', on 4.25, A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'St. Mark', and C.J. Cadoux, 'Mission', p.212.
 (232) J. Jeremias, *ibid.*, p.51.

(E) Mt.25.31-46 : The Parable of the Last Judgment.

This section is generally regarded as non-parabolic in form. Indeed, the only truly parabolic element in it is the simile of the sheep and the goats, and this forms but a small part of the total picture (233). There are here many parallels with the judgment scenes in the Book of Enoch, and the parallelism is strengthened further in the knowledge that in most Jewish accounts the Judge is always God, except in Enoch, where the Messiah (the Elect One) performs this office (234). Hence F.C. Burkitt concludes:

"In any case I must regard the Similitudes of Enoch as having consciously supplied the framework for the scene in Matthew" (235).

Complete dependence however there is not. In the first place the basis for this 'parable' has been too firmly established in the Synoptics. Again and again Christ is pictured as the Son of Man who comes in judgment (236). This gives

- - - - -

(233) So C.H. Dodd, *ibid.* p.85ff., J. Schniewind, *ibid.*, W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.92ff., T.W.Manson, 'Sayings', p.248f., J.A.T. Robinson, 'Coming' p.37, n.2.

(234) See Enoch 45.3, 51.3, 55.4, 61.6-63.12, 69.27. See also Zech.14.5. For a comparison see C.F. Burkitt, 'Jewish and Christian Apocalypses', London, 1914, pp.23-25, Strack-Billerbeck, IV pp.1199-1212, J.F. Moore, 'Judaism', II, pp.279-395.

(235) F.C. Burkitt, *ibid.* p.25. Strack-Billerbeck 1.973f., has recorded one difference that is of no great consequence; i.e., the angels are often pictured in Jewish literature as being in attendance upon God at the judgment, but there is no record of angels accompanying the Messiah.

(236) See Mk.8.38 and parallels, 13.26 and parallels, 14.62 and parallels in Q = Lk.12.40, Mt.24.44; in M: Mt.10.23, 25.31; in L: Lk.18.8, cf. also Lk.17.24, 26, 30 (Q). See also Mt.13.41, 16.27, 24.31, 13.49 (as parallels to this idea of the net with every kind of fish see 7.19-23, 24-27, 8.11f., 10.32f., 12.36f., 13.30, 40f., 22.12f., 24.40f., 46-51, 25.10-12), Mt.19.28. See also J.A.T. Robinson, *ibid.*, p.55.

ground enough for assuming that it might well reflect the mind of Christ. But there is more than this. The basis upon which judgment is exercised is completely foreign to all apocalyptic (237) but is of a piece with much that has already been said on this theme in the Gospels (238). The concern of the 'parable' therefore is not with the apocalyptic framework, but with the theme of judgment, and more especially, with the basis on which judgment is exercised (239). One may therefore agree with Kümmel:

"For after all what distinguishes our passage is not only the standard for judgment, foreign to all Jewish tradition, but also the small part played by the setting as well as the nature and extent of the punishment or reward assigned. The significance of the description is clearly not to throw light on eschatological proceedings, but to teach what is a matter of life and death for men to do in face of the impending judgment, and also to display the central significance of the person of Jesus when men's actions are examined at the last judgment. In that case Mt.25.31ff. is certainly not an indication that Jesus' eschatological message is concerned with apocalyptic instruction, but on the contrary a proof that his proclamation of the imminence of the judgment and the Kingdom of God does not derive its significance from apocalyptic revelation" (240).

- - - - -

(237) So F.C. Burkitt, *ibid.*, p.25: "The description of the Judgment in Enoch is complete in itself; it is the imagined end of the kingdoms of the world, whose rulers are judged for their failure to discover and pay homage to the true God (63.4,7-9). In a word, they are condemned for being Gentiles". cf. also Joel 3.2,12.

(238) Mt.18.10,14, Lk.9.48, Mk.9.36,37.

(239) The apocalyptic element seems as incidental to the theme of the 'parable' as is the actual parable of the sheep and the goats which forms its basis. cf. the parable of Dives and Lazarus, which is expressed in apocalyptic terms, but the form of expression is quite incidental to the theme.

(240) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.*, p.95. See also T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.249. J. Jeremias, *ibid.*, p.144, quotes Manson with approval.

This leads us then to the theme of the 'parable'; i.e., the basis on which judgment is exercised. One preliminary question must first be asked; upon whom is judgment to be passed? The answer is given in terms of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (25.32) (241). Unfortunately, this reference is not as clear as might appear, and commentators are divided. W.G. Kümmel and J. Schniewind are quite certain the church is to be included in this judgment (242). On the other hand, T.W. Manson and A.H. M'Neile are just as certain that the church is to be excluded (243). There is really no final basis on which the question may be settled. It is the church that is being warned all the way in this discourse about the need for preparedness, and presumably judgment is required to determine who are and who are not prepared, in the terms of the present parable. On the other hand, the 'elect' are given promise of their security in Christ (24.31).

The primary question however has to do with the basis on which judgment is exercised. The answer to this question depends in part on the meaning of two important terms in the text: ἀδελφός and ἐλάχιστος in vv.40 and 45 (244).

(241) cf. Dan.12.2, Enoch 11.1, Test. Ben.10, Sib.4.178-190, 4 Esd. 7.32, 14.35.

(242) W.G. Kümmel finds proof of this in the πάντα τὰ ἔθνη itself, and in the phrases οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου and οἱ δίκαιοι (vv.34,37). J. Schniewind refers to Rom.2.9-16, 25-27, 2 Cor.5.10f., Rom.14.10f., 1 Cor. 3.11-15, 9.27, Lk.10.30-37. He writes: "for the Jew will not be exalted above the heathen, nor godly above the ungodly, nor the apostle above the simple Christian".

(243) T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.250; Matthew's use of ἔθνος suggests that all the Gentiles are meant here. True Israel is "covered by the concept of the Son of Man, interpreted as the Saints of the Most High. A.H. M'Neile, *ibid.*, repudiates the translation 'ye blessed of my father' for οἱ εὐλογημένοι and suggests instead 'ye blessed who belong to my father'. For the genitive see 1 Cor.3.23.

(244) See here W. Sanday, 'The Life of Christ in Recent Research', p.128.

It has been suggested that ἀδελφός in Matthew's hands is a term designating a Christian (245). But surely this could not be said of Mt.5.22, 5.23f., 47, 7.3-5, 18.15,21, 25.40. Here the meaning is obviously simply 'neighbour'. In this sense therefore ἀδελφός must refer to those who are in need (246). The term ἐλάχιστος is a little more elusive (247) Who are these 'little ones'? The most obvious answer is that they are children. But then such a text as Mt.18.10 does not seem to make the most sense with such an interpretation. Why should the disciples need a warning about despising a child? It has also been taken as a synonym for disciple. But then the judgment of Luke 17.2 is out of all proportion. Does it not make greater sense if all these texts be interpreted in terms of the 'poor' of the first beatitude (Mt.5.3) or the ὁ μικρότερος of Lk.9.48. Thus the word becomes appropriate for all - Christian and non-Christian, Jew and Gentile, who are described in v.35 as the hungry, the thirsty, the stranger, the naked, the sick, and the imprisoned. It is thus a question of the attitude "of all those who have been reached by the Gospel message toward all sufferers" (248) This of course seems to make the basis of judgment a matter of one's attitude to those in need rather than one's attitude to Christ (249). This would then appear to be a contradiction of Mk.9.36-37, where the deed required

- - - - -

(245) So W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.84, n.96. See Acts 9.5.

(246) So J. Schniewind, *ibid.* J. Jeremias also interprets the word in this way when he seeks the original meaning of the parable.

(247) See Mk.9.42 = Mt.18.6 = Lk.17.2, Mt.10.42, 18.10,14.

(248) W.G. Kümmel, *ibid.* p.94.

(249) So Kümmel, Schniewind.

is performed ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνῳματι μου (250). And yet the contradiction is perhaps more apparent than real, for in both cases Christ identifies himself with the need of 'the child'. It is his solidarity with human need that makes their acceptance of a 'little child' an acceptance of him. So also in 25.31ff. It is His identification with man in his need that makes an act of helpfulness done to such a man an act done to Him, and similarly neglect of such a man neglect of Him.

"The heathen have met me in my brethren, he who has shown love to them has shown love to me, the Saviour of the poor" (251).

It is this emphasis on the solidarity of Christ with those in need, and the obligation which this imposes upon the disciples of Christ, that most distinguish this 'parable' from all its apparent predecessors in apocalyptic.

"In the whole range of Jewish apocalyptic, the awful and transcendent Messiah is never pictured as a Being of human love and sympathy. The Lord seems to carry on the thought of Isa.53 (which He interprets Messianically) from His passion and death to His glory; He will not only suffer as the Representative of His nation, but when invested with His cosmic functions will identify Himself with all sufferers." (252)

Here then is a fitting conclusion to the theme of preparedness. Here is its final definition. One is prepared to meet the Christ at His Parousia and at the Judgment when in recognition of His solidarity with man in his need man gives himself in service to that need.

- - - - -

(250) For the significance of this phrase see V. Taylor, 'St. Mark'.

(251) J. Jeremias, *ibid.* p.145. cf. also Schniewind: "Es ist Gottes eigene Werk (Eph.2.10) schon die Werke dessen, der die Wahrheit tat, ohne Jesus noch zu kennen, sind 'in Gott getan' (p.254). cf. T.W. Manson, *ibid.* p.251: "The answer of the King brings out clearly the solidarity of Christ and His brethren".

(252) A.H. M'Neile, *ibid.*, on Mt.25.40.

Conclusion

In this section we have examined the term 'parousia' in the light of its context in Matthew and his sources to see if it does bear the weight of his apparent concern with apocalyptic, especially as apocalyptic relates to the theme of signs.

Our examination of Mark, Matthew's primary source, has led us to doubt the common assumption that it is at this point an apocalyptic discourse outlining a series of signs leading up to the End. While there is much about the language that is apocalyptic in tone, nonetheless it is made very clear throughout the discourse that these events are not signs of the kind that would correspond to the disciples' request. They do not give advance notices of the Parousia in such a way that the time of its occurrence could be calculated, thereby allowing for preparation of the kind that takes account of the hour of the event. The opening section of the discourse (vv.5-8), in spite of the apocalyptic roots of the language employed, does not describe an event or events upon which calculation may be made, for it is stated quite specifically that the end is not yet (v.7), but on the contrary, these represent a beginning - the beginning of a period of trial (v.8). Indeed, this section, by its warning in vv.5 and 6, has already anticipated the possibility that some will be prepared to calculate the time of the Parousia on the basis of these events, and so any such claims are immediately set aside. The section on the persecution of the disciples and the universal mission (vv.9-13) proved to be concerned primarily with giving warning to the disciples of the difficulties

facing them, the price that must be paid for the preaching of the Gospel, the resources that will be available for the task, and the promise of final salvation for those who endure. The passage on the Abomination of Desolation (vv.14-20) has all the appearance of apocalyptic and gives some apparent evidence of concern with signs. Yet its imperatives were all of a most practical nature, seeking to ensure the safety and security of the disciples. Moreover, if anyone should claim, on the strength of the apparently apocalyptic nature of the event indicated by this cryptic reference, that the Christ had come, he was to be labelled a false christ or a false prophet (vv.21-23). The Parousia itself is also described in apocalyptic terminology (vv.24-27), but it was noted that in the Old Testament that terminology was closely associated with the theme of judgment, and that it was there used to emphasise the awesomeness of the divine judgment. There is ample precedent therefore for viewing these cosmic events as a figurative way of describing the awesomeness of this event, setting forth by way of contrast the helplessness of the cosmos with the might and majesty of His coming. And indeed, even if these events were intended to be taken literally, they give no warning sign of His coming, for they are simultaneous with that coming. The parable of the fig-tree (vv.28-29) reflects back on the discourse, emphasising the nearness of the End, and the need to make due preparation for it. And in case any should think that preparation might be avoided because the End is far enough removed that they might live their life to its completion they are reminded

in most forcible fashion that escape by this means is impossible (v.30). Or if they should think that preparation might be postponed until the warning signs appear, this too will prove to be an illusion, for there is no way of knowing and no one who knows just when it might take place (v.32). Thus these events fail completely as signs of the kind that make calculation possible, and the disciples' question was not answered in the terms asked. The main thrust of the discourse was seen to be in the direction of the warnings issued and the promises made. The imperatives warn against those who, interpreting these events as signs, make false claims about the realization of the End. They issue directives for the safety and security of the disciples. They hold out the promise of adequate resources for the trials ahead, and the final security of those who endure. But more than anything else, they stress the need to live the present as the time of the End, that when that End comes, wherever and whenever that may be, it will find them prepared.

If these conclusions are accepted, then the contradiction that is claimed to exist between the Marcan discourse and the document Q is seen to be more apparent than real. There has never been any doubt that Q itself finds no place for the apocalyptic concern with signs. On the contrary, it emphasises the sudden and unexpected nature of the Parousia, which leaves no place for the kind of preparation that awaits the warning sign. And Matthew, who stands accused as the friend of the apocalypticist, has used Q with telling effect to develop the non-apocalyptic character of his Marcan source. With great skill

he interweaves his Q quotations with Mark's material so as to elaborate and develop that material. He conjoins the Marcan warning about false tidings of His coming with the Q warning against the same (Mt.24.23ff.), and gives added strength and content to that warning through the Q simile of the lightning. Pre-occupation with signs of any kind is thus made out to be a characteristic of those who would mislead, for when the Parousia occurs it will, like lightning, give no warning of any kind, thus making the kind of preparation that is directed to the time of the Event quite impossible. The Q reference to the days of Noah and to the divisions that occur at His coming, stressing as they do the wholly unpredictable character of that coming, are made to follow quite logically the assurance that no one - not even the Son - can give advance warning of this Event. The Q parable of the thief in the night (vv.42-44) both repeats and develops this theme; the Parousia belongs to the category of the wholly unpredictable, and therefore preparation of the kind that is directed toward the hour of His coming must be of no avail. The only adequate preparation is that which finds a man ready no matter what the hour. The Q parable of the faithful and wise servant takes the theme one step further; for the first time some content is given to the meaning of preparedness, in terms of the fulfilment of present responsibilities. In this way Matthew has used Q, intermingling it with the Marcan material, to emphasise and develop the main theme of the discourse; the need to live now in such a way that when the Parousia occurs, in spite of its wholly unpredictable

character, one will be prepared for it.

Matthew has also used his own material to emphasise and develop this theme of preparedness. He contributes very little apart from Mark and Q to the main body of the discourse, but what he does contribute serves to stress the danger that comes from those who would interpret these events as signs giving warning of the Parousia. Where Mark has warned against them, he repeats that warning without alteration. He borrows from Q to add further testimony to that effect. And to make sure that there will be no misunderstanding he inserts an added warning of his own (24.11). Thus four times in the discourse he warns against the apocalyptist. His additions at the conclusion of the discourse are concerned with warnings about the need and the meaning of preparedness. His parable of the virgins serves as another reminder that preparedness, to be effective, must be constant. In the light of the parable of the talents preparedness is seen to be not a passive waiting of the Parousia, but rather the willing investment of God's gifts in His service. And the 'parable' of the last judgment forms a most fitting conclusion to the whole discourse, serving as a more than adequate summary of all that Matthew has been trying to say through his skilful interweaving of Material from Mark, Q, and his own peculiar source; preparedness for the Parousia must take the form of concern - exercised now - for the needy of the world with whom Christ has identified Himself.

If therefore, the term 'parousia' must bear the burden of

Matthew's particular emphasis, it is not the burden of an apocalyptic concern with signs but of an eschatological concern with the present. We must therefore disagree quite thoroughly with J. A. T. Robinson's judgment (p.88) and make the opposite judgment; the 'indissoluble unity between the ethical and the eschatological' is NOT severed by Matthew, but is rather bound together all the more firmly. And the judgment which he made about the prophets over against the 'apocalyptic' discourse may be made quite specifically about the evangelists with respect to that discourse, and all the more pertinently made about Matthew:

"They were concerned with the End, not for providing a map of the future, but for supplying a criterion for the present" (253).

This is the significance of the term 'parousia as used by Matthew.

(253) J. A. T. Robinson, *ibid.*, p. 94.

4. The 'Parousia' in the Thessalonian Epistles

There is no doubt that the thought of the Parousia occupies a large place in Paul's Thessalonian correspondence. The number of times that the term itself appears is clear indication of that (3). And even that does not tell the whole story, since there are other references to the coming of Christ where this particular term is not used (2). There is moreover clear indication that the thought of the Parousia was prominent in the original teaching of the Apostle at Thessalonica.

- VI -

THE TERM 'PAROUSIA' IN THE PAULINE LETTERS

The Thessalonian Epistles, which are the product of his preaching there, will be the source of his use of the Parousia (2,19-20). The prayer of 3,13 is set within the context of his review of that teaching as given in chapter 2, and there is no doubt that the verses of 4,13-15 and 5,1-11 arise out of previous teaching given on this subject (5). Moreover the prayer of 5,23 is related to the holiness about which he had already been writing and for which he prays so fervently. Nor is there any doubt that the problem with which he deals in 2 Thessalonians 2,1-12 has its roots in that original teaching.

This of course arouses our curiosity about the content of that original instruction on the theme of the Parousia. What did he teach there on that subject? That part did not descend

(1) 1 Thessalonians 2,19; 2,24,4,25,5,2; 2 Thessalonians 2,1,2,3
(2) 1 Thessalonians 1,10; 2,1-12; 3,1-2; 4,13-15; 5,1-11
2 Thessalonians 2,1-12; 2,13-17; 3,1-5
(3) cf. the number of occurrences of the term in 1 Thessalonians 2,19; 2,24,4,25,5,2; 2 Thessalonians 2,1,2,3; 3,1-5
(4) cf. 2 Thessalonians 2,1-12; 2,13-17; 3,1-5
(5) cf. 2 Thessalonians 2,1-12; 2,13-17; 3,1-5

A. The 'Parousia' in the Thessalonian Epistles

There is no doubt that the thought of the Parousia occupies a large place in Paul's Thessalonian correspondence. The number of times that the term itself appears is clear indication of that (1). And even that does not tell the whole story, since there are other references to the coming of Christ where this particular term is not used (2). There is moreover clear indication that the thought of the Parousia was prominent in the original teaching of the Apostle at Thessalonica. His first reference to that teaching includes the Parousia as one of its central emphases (1 Thess.1.9-10). The Thessalonian Christians, who are the product of his preaching there, will be the source of his joy at the Parousia (2.19-20). The prayer of 3.13 is set within the context of his review of that teaching as given in chapter four. And there is no doubt that the themes of 4.13-18 and 5.1-11 arise out of previous teaching given on this subject (3). Moreover the prayer of 5.23 is related to the holiness about which so much has already been said and for which he prays so fervently. Nor is there any doubt that the problem with which he deals in 2 Thessalonians 2.1-12 has its roots in that original teaching (4).

This of course arouses our curiosity about the content of that original instruction on the theme of the Parousia. What had he taught them on that subject? What part did that teaching

- - - - -

- (1) 1 Thessalonians 2.19, 3.13, 4.15, 5.23, 2 Thessalonians 2.1, 8, 9.
 (2) 1 Thess. 1.9, 10, 5.1-11 (cf. 5.2 ἡμέρα Κυρίου), and 2 Thess. 1.6-10 (cf. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ of v.10).
 (3) cf. the *περὶ τῶν κοιμημένων* of v.13 in chapter 4, and the *περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν* of 5.1.
 (4) cf. 2 Thess. 2.5. See below p. 225 ff.

play in the life and faith of that primitive church? What need was he seeking to satisfy by means of this teaching - apocalyptic instruction, or the necessary motivation for Christian faith and practice? The answer, or answers, to these questions can only come from an examination of the relevant passages, and to that we now proceed.

1 Thessalonians

1.9-10.

We are immediately linked with Paul's visit to Thessalonica through the ninth verse. Here Paul makes reference to the character of his ministry among them (5). He then proceeds to the result of the preaching of the Gospel in the manner indicated (6), and that result is three-fold: conversion (ἐπεστρέψατε), the service of God (δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι), and the expectant waiting for His Son (ἀναμένειν τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν) (7). It is doubtful if these three can properly be separated one from the other. Certainly the conversion has no reality

- - - - -

(5) The words ὁποῖαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς do not refer to the friendly reception accorded the evangelistic team, but to the manner in which the Gospel was preached among them. Presumably 2.1-12 may be regarded as an elaboration of these words. ὁποῖαν introduces an indirect question, and is rare in the N.T. See Acts 26.29, James 1.24.

(6) πῶς indicates more the fact than the manner of their turning (Rigaux).

(7) ἐπιστρέφω is frequent in Acts of Gentiles turning to God. In the LXX it quite often translates the Hebrew . In the N.T. it may be used with reference to a physical movement (Mt.12.44) or a moral movement (Mt.10.13). Luke uses the verb quite often; in the Gospel 7 times, and in Acts 12 times. Paul uses the verb 3 times (twice with πρὸς - here and in 2 Cor.3.16, and with ἐπὶ in Gal.4.9). The verb does not indicate a conversion of the soul, which is best indicated by μετανοέω , but rather a positive movement from something to something. So B. Rigaux, 'Saint Paul, Les Epitres aux Thessaloniens', Paris, 1956. The use of this verb would seem to indicate that the congregation was made up primarily of Gentiles.

apart from the service and the hope (8). These last two however are quite often separated from each other. But are they independent entities? Can each stand on its own feet?

What, for example, does it mean to serve God? What instructions had Paul given them with respect to that service? Some part of the answer at least must come from the remainder of this Epistle. And in fact the answer does come in large measure from the fourth chapter. Here is a clear reference to previous instruction (9), and to the content of that instruction. They had previously been instructed on the subjects of moral purity (4.3-8), brotherly love (4.9-10), and work (4.11-12) (10). Doubtless this is by no means an exhaustive review of his teaching while he was among them, nonetheless these references are clearly indicative of the content of that teaching, and of what it means to serve the true and living God. Instructions on such subjects as these for the benefit of converts from paganism might well be expected, in view of the notorious immorality of much of that pagan culture, and in view of the usual attitude of the well-born Greek to work. Thus service to God involved at least these three factors: moral purity, brotherly love, and diligence in work.

These Thessalonian Christians were also instructed to wait expectantly for God's Son from heaven. Indeed this may be regarded as the specifically Christian emphasis in these

- - - - -

(8) "Elle se caracterise encore par un service et par une esperance." Charles Masson, 'Les Deux Epitres De Saint Paul Aux Thessaloniens', Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament, Neuchatel and Paris, 1957.

(9) cf. the ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν

of 4.1.

(10) cf. the καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν

of 4.11.

instructions (11). But what does it mean to wait expectantly? Neither epistle seems to answer this question, except in a negative way. It does not mean that they were to down tools and wait in idleness for that coming (1 Thess.4.11-12, 2 Thess. 3.6-12), and it does not mean that they were to wait so eagerly that they would become a prey to easy deception (2 Thess.2.1-12). But what does it mean in a positive way? Must we assume that the Epistles give no answer to this question? The answer appears to be in the affirmative - unless perhaps we approach the matter in a different way. Why do we assume that the instructions on the themes of moral purity, brotherly love, and diligence in work, relate to the service of God only and not equally to the expectant waiting of His Son from heaven? If this alternate assumption can be supported, then of course the expectation of the Parousia is related to the moral purity, brotherly love, and diligence in work. There is, I think, evidence enough in the passages dealing with the subject of the Parousia to indicate that this is so (12).

Before proceeding to an examination of the other Parousia passages, however, there is some further light to be shed on the aim of Paul's teaching on the Parousia from this passage.

- - - - -

(11) So Gottlieb Lunemann, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the N.T., 'The Thessalonians', edited by H.A.W. Meyer, translated by P.J. Gloag, Edinburgh, 1880.

(12) Donald E. Wallace, 'The Hope of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ', unpublished M.Th. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1952, claims that the grammatical construction indicates that 'to serve' and 'to wait' "should be found in proper balance in every Christian life". But what does this mean? What constitutes a proper balance? Does the excessive apocalypticism of some of these Christians described in 2 Thess.2.1-12 represent an imbalance? Or does it represent a complete misunderstanding of what it means to wait?

The One for whom the Thessalonian Christians are to wait is described as 'Jesus, our Deliverer from the wrath to come' (13). There seems little doubt that behind this stands the concept of the Day of the Lord, and that for the encouragement of the Thessalonian Christians Paul here emphasises that for them that Day will be a day of deliverance. This promise was intended to promote steadfastness among them (14) in the face of the persecutions and the difficulties that they were experiencing. For the present the Christian experiences tribulation, but at the Parousia the tribulation ceases and judgment descends on those who refuse to obey (15).

2.19-20.

The immediate context for this Parousia passage is Paul's expressed desire to visit the Thessalonian church (vv.17-18). There seems to have been some suggestion from the direction of that church that Paul was not really very concerned about them, and that this lack of concern was the reason for his failure to visit them. On the contrary, he asserts vigorously, he was very anxious to visit them, and on more than one occasion had made the attempt. And why should he not have been anxious to visit them - for at the Parousia they will be the primary source of pride for him (16). And the cause of that pride will be the standard of faith and faithfulness to which they have attained (17).

- - - - -

(13) For the O.T. use of ὀργή see Isa.2.10-22, Zeph.3.8ff. See also Book of Jubilees 24.30, Secrets of Enoch 44.2, Sir 5.7. cf. also Rom.3.5,5.9,9.22,13.4. cf. also Zech.1.15.

(14) 1 Thess.2.14-16, 3.2-5,3.13,5.11. cf. also Mark 13.9-13 and parallels.

(15) So B. Rigaux, *ibid.*

(16) For the use of στεφανος here see P.Petr.39 e, 3 c. B.C., above p.28.

(17) See 1 Thess.3.6-10 (especially v.8), and 4.9-10. Of course, he very quickly points out that there is room for improvement (4.1ff.)

This text, with its context, leaves little doubt that Paul is bringing the faith and practice of the Thessalonian Christians within the context of the judgment expected at the Parousia. He has already given promise of the deliverance they have a right to expect at the Parousia (1.10). Nonetheless there is nothing automatic about that deliverance - for diligence is required of those who would face that event with confidence (3.13,4.1,5.6). Thus the promise is given with assurance with a view to their encouragement, but nonetheless the promise is never allowed to become an excuse for slackness of any kind - moral, spiritual, or even physical. On the contrary the promise itself becomes the basis for greater diligence in these areas. The service to which they have been called, which constitutes one of the primary marks of their conversion, is thus placed within the context of the Parousia. To practice their faith with steadfastness and in fortitude is in effect to await the Son from heaven.

3.11-4.2.

The term 'parousia' occurs here within the context of a prayer uttered by the apostle on behalf of his Thessalonian converts. The prayer itself (vv.11-13) has a three-fold petition: that God might bring the apostle and his companions directly to them, that their love might abound for one another and for all, and that their hearts might be made firm. The aim of this prayer is made quite explicit: that they might be holy and blameless at the Parousia of the Christ (18). In

(18) This is the aim of the πλεονάζει and the περισσεύει of v.12. So G. Lünemann, *ibid.*, and Charles J. Ellicott, 'St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians', London, 1866.

effect the first and the third petitions here amount to the same thing, since doubtless he is anxious to be with them in order that he might give strength to their faith. This is indicated in the purpose for which he sent Timothy in his place (3.1-3). And the prayer for brotherly love - a matter that gives cause for both praise (3.6,4.9-10) and exhortation (4.11) - is brought within the range of the expectation of the Parousia and the need to be prepared for it (19).

"Une fois de plus, la perspective du jugement imminent est un motif puissant de perfectionnement moral, parce que motif de consecration a Dieu (20)."

I think however that it is possible to bring the Christian virtues taught originally to the Thessalonian Christians by the apostle - and looked for once again in this Epistle - even more firmly within the context of the Parousia motif. The chapter that follows deals with aspects of Christian duty that Paul has already taught them (21). This teaching had dealt with the three themes of moral purity (4.3-8), brotherly love (4.9-10), and the place of work in the Christian community (4.11-12). The link between this review of previous teaching on the theme of Christian conduct and the prayer of 3.12-13 is found in the use of $\lambdaοιπὸν οὖν$ in 4.1 (22). It is the addition

- - - - -

(19) "Only those whose love inspires purposes that are blameless in the sphere of holiness will find the day of the Lord a day not of wrath (1.10,2.16) but of salvation (5.9)." So J.E. Frame, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians', the I.C.C. Commentary, Edinburgh, 1912.

(20) C. Masson, *ibid.*

(21) That this chapter does constitute a review of previous teaching is made clear by the $\text{ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν}$ of 4.1, the τίνας παραγγελίας of 4.2, the $\text{καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν}$ of 4.11, and the $\text{περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων}$ of 4.13.

(22) Elz. Matt. here read τὸ λοιπὸν , but this is rejected by all the authoritative MSS. (see here G. Lünemann). He suggests that the τὸ arose from the last syllable of the preceding

of οὖν to the λοιπόν that establishes a definite connection with what has gone before. C.J. Ellicott translates this 'furthermore then' and continues:

"In consequence of, and in accordance with the issue prayed for the in the preceding verse; the οὖν having here its collective force, and introducing an appeal to the Thessalonians on their side, grounded on what the Apostle had asked in prayer for them from God..." (23).

Thus not only the prayer that aimed at their holiness and faultlessness, but the instructions on moral purity, brotherly love, and diligence in work which bespeak the character of that holiness and faultlessness, are all brought within the orbit of the Parousia. Are we not therefore compelled to interpret the instruction to wait for God's Son from heaven (1.10) in these terms? To wait expectantly is to live according to these instructions. Thus the Parousia motif does not stand on its own feet. It was taught within the context of Christian faith and practice. The teaching on this theme was not intended to provide apocalyptic instruction, but to produce the kind of lives that would enable them to stand before God in holiness at the Parousia.

4.13-18.

The problem in the minds of the Thessalonian Christians that gave rise to this section is clearly indicated by the

- (22) (Cont'd.) --- αὐτοῦ . οὖν is omitted by B* but this might have been due to the preceding οὖν .
- (23) C.J. Ellicott, *ibid.* cf. also G. Lünemann, *ibid.*: "(the οὖν) represents what follows as an inference from the preceding and especially from 3.13". So also E. Frame, *ibid.*, and C.F.D. Moule, 'An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek', Cambridge, 1953. cf. also Rom.12.1 and Eph.4.1.

περί τῶν κοιμηθέντων of v.13 (24). They were concerned about the fate of those who had died before the Parousia. J.E. Frame has stated the question simply and clearly:

"Will the Christians who die before the Parousia be at the Parousia on the same level of advantage with the survivors?" (25)

Paul in his previous teaching on the subject of the Parousia apparently had not dealt with this particular problem (26).

It is not at all surprising that such a question should have been asked. This was a matter of some concern in apocalyptic literature. The general concensus of opinion expressed in these apocalyptic works was that there is great advantage to being alive at the coming of the Kingdom. 2 Esdras 13.24 presents that point of view quite succinctly:

"Know this therefore, that they which be left behind are more blessed than they that be dead" (27).

- - - - -

(24) See also 4.9 and 5.1.

(25) J.E. Frame, *ibid.*

(26) B. Rigaux notes the suggestion that 4.13-5.11 represents an interruption in the sequence of thought here. This suggestion stems from the fact that there has been no preparation in the text for either of the questions dealt with in 4.13-18 or 5.1-11, and that the theme of work dealt with in 4.12 is resumed in 5.12. However these themes are by no means unrelated. B. Rigaux has himself suggested that the emphasis on fraternal relationships in 4.9-10 could easily lead to thoughts of the dead brethren. J.B. Lightfoot, 'Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul', p.62, sees the problem of 4.11-12 related to the problem of 4.13: "The restlessness which agitated the church in Thessalonica and led to the neglect of occupations of daily life were doubtless due to their feverish anticipations of the immediate coming of Christ". Certainly there would appear to be some connection between their restlessness and their idleness in 2 Thessalonians. cf. 2 Thess.2.1-12 and 3.6-12. Moreover the assurances given in 4.17-18 and 5.11 are calculated to provide the encouragement to steadfastness which, according to 3.2-3, they have need of. Doubts about the matters dealt with in these two sections would certainly lead to wavering and uncertainty among the Thessalonian Christians.

(27) See also Dan.12.12, Ps.Sol.17.50, Ass. of Isa.4.15, 2 Esd. 5.41, 11 Bar.11.6f.

Paul's answer to this enquiry given in 4.13-18 may have proven satisfactory to the Christians at Thessalonica - but it has not pleased many of their more critical successors. His apparent appeal to apocalyptic thought has given cause for alarm (28). F.C. Bauer was not the first to express alarm in the face of this appeal to apocalyptic, but he did so effectively and doubtless encouraged others to do the same. While admitting that in some aspects this section from Thessalonians agrees with 1 Corinthians 15, nonetheless

"it goes far beyond what is taught there, and gives such a concrete representation of these transcendent matters as we never find in the Apostle" (29).

An even stronger comment is made about the second Epistle (which Bauer insists comes from the same pen and therefore reflects the views of the same author), which he claims shows a liking for apocalyptic detail that gives evidence of

"a belief entirely preoccupied with Rabbinical questions" (29).

E. J. Pratt, with specific reference to the apocalyptic imagery of 4.16, has written disapprovingly:

"Oriental eschatology, as a whole, was continually developing this lurid background, and Paul's treatment is but a clipping from the picture" (30).

B. Blake, commenting on the growth that he sees to be apparent in Pauline eschatology, wrote:

"....apocalyptic appears in his earliest writings as a limiting and hindering factor, which was to be laid aside when he reached a fuller comprehension of the essential teaching of Jesus in its

(28) See above pp.87-91.

(29) F.C. Bauer, 'Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ', London, 1875, Vol.11, pp.89 and 91. Of course, Bauer rejects the Pauline authorship of both these Epistles, and this is but part of the argument that he uses to support his claim.

(30) E.J. Pratt, 'Studies in Pauline Eschatology', Toronto, 1917, p.129.

spiritual fullness" (31).

W.F. Howard has also expressed doubts about the value of the apocalyptic elements in Paul's theology as expressed in the Thessalonian letters, but he is convinced that in his later Epistles he left behind the 'outworn symbolism' of the Thessalonian eschatology (32).

These references deal with a question that takes us beyond the limits of this section (33), but since it is this section, together with 2 Thessalonians 2.1-12, that give rise to these objections, and since we want to examine it against the background they provide, we have quoted them at some length. It must of course be admitted immediately that echoes of Old-Testament and even inter-testamental apocalyptic are heard quite clearly (34). Nonetheless there are some things

- - - - -

(31) B. Blake, 'The Apocalyptic Setting of the Thessalonian Epistles', The Expositor, series LX, vol. lll, 1925, pp. 126-139. This quotation is from p.127. His comment on 2 Thessalonians is even more devastating: "He had not yet emancipated himself from the hurtful influence of apocalyptic, with its earthly and unspiritual conceptions of the truth". p.135.

(32) W.F. Howard, 'The Message of the Epistles. 1 Thessalonians', Expository Times, XLIV, 1932-33, pp.357-362. In all fairness however it must be noted that he also wrote: "Pauline eschatology is less concerned with the trumpet blast, and the clouds of heaven, than with the risen Christ and His power to prepare His faithful servants for the crowning experience of rejoining Him that they may forever be with the Lord". p.362. cf. also A.M. Hunter's reference (in Interpretation, Vol.VIII, April, 1954) to C.H. Dodd's description of the Parousia in the Thessalonian letters as "painted in colour from the crudest palette of Jewish eschatology".

(33) See below pp. 235.

(34) See above pp.131-138. cf. also Joel 2.1, Ex.19.16,17,18. Isa. 18.3, 27.13, Zech.9.14, Psa.Sol.11.1, Psa.47.5, 4 Ezra 6.23.

The term ἀρχάγγελος is unknown in the O.T., but cf. Dan.

12.1: ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ μέγας (ἰϛϛϛ ϛ ψ)

See Strack-Billerbeck III, p.635. The κέλευσμα is classical. J.E. Frame has suggested that the ἐν is the ἐν of attendant circumstances, and that the last two clauses, which are joined by καί, are really exegetic of the first. Hence he suggests: "At a command, namely, at an archangel's voice and at a trumpet of God".

that must be said about this description of the Parousia and the apocalyptic parallels that are so often emphasised.

One must note in the first place that while there are parallels with apocalyptic literature both within and without the Old Testament, nonetheless the most obvious parallel is the description of the meeting between God and Moses on Mount Horeb (35). And if this be so then the term apocalyptic may be applied to this source only with some reservation. It is hardly surprising that Paul should find here a pattern for the event he is trying to describe, and indeed it is hard to imagine him doing so in any other terms.

There is also the question about the literalness with which this description is to be interpreted. A discussion of this theme has already been given (see above p.131 ff.), and little more need be said here. We need only the reminder that this must at least remain an open - and always relevant - question. It may however be noted in passing that the terms here used are indicative of authority - and it is with a note of authority that Paul seeks to provide the necessary assurance

- - - - -

(35) Exodus 19.16-20. So C.A. Briggs, 'The Messiah of the Apostles', New York, 1895, p.88: "...they (the theophanic signs of this passage) are modelled after the Theophany on Mt. Horeb". cf. also the εἰς ἀπάντησιν of 4.17 and the εἰς συνάντησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ of Exod.19.17. C. Masson, *ibid.*, quotes from J. Dupont, ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ : L'Union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul. Première partie, p.73: "L'ἀπάντησις = l'accueil que les chrétiens feront au Seigneur descendant du ciel 'reproduit et reporte a la fin des temps l'accueil que les Israelites avaient fait a Dieu lors de sa descente sur le Sinai' ". From p.59 of Masson. B. Rigaux, *ibid.*, also agrees: "Cette theophanie a certainement inspire l'apocalyptique et directement ou indirectement Saint Paul". p.234

to these Thessalonian Christians (36).

"Ce n'est pas de l'histoire avant l'histoire. Ils procedent d'une grande pensee. Pour sur, Jesus reviendra..... Cette puissance de Dieu, cette rouaute du Christ contrastent avec la misere de ce monde au regne la mort, mais font d'autant plus ressortir la grandeur et le bienfait de la promesse chretienne: nous serons toujours avec lui" (37).

But perhaps the most important thing to be said to those who accuse the Apostle of undue apocalypticism is that he, unlike the typical apocalyptist, does not attempt to give a detailed picture of the End, but seeks only to answer in as satisfactory a way as possible, the particular problem which faces him here. Think of the questions which are raised by this answer, which are left not only without an answer but completely unrecognized: are the heathen raised with the believers, and if so what happens to them? When does judgment take place and are Christians involved in that judgment? In what direction do they go after they have met the Lord in the air? In what state are the dead in Christ prior to the Parousia (38)? The fact that he has not answered such questions

- - - - -

(36) e.g. ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου is a possessive genitive; i.e. a voice such as an archangel uses. Surely this is intended to indicate authority. cf. also E.J. Bicknell, 'The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians', (Westminster Commentaries), London, 1932, "The trumpet is a natural symbol for a summons that is sudden, unescapable, and full of meaning".

(37) B. Rigaux, *ibid.*

(38) Even the use of κοιμᾶσθαι does not help us here. While it is common in the LXX (Gen.47.30, Deut.31.16, 2 Kings 7.12, 1 Chron.17.11, 2 Macc.12.44f., 4 Ezra 7.32. cf. also Jub.23.1,36.18, Ass. Moses 1.15, 10.14, Apoc. Bar.11.4, Test XII Patr. Jos.20.4. It is also common in classical literature as a euphemism for ἀποθνήσκειν. See H.A.A. Kennedy, 'St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things', New York, 1904, p.267ff., and B. Rigaux, *ibid.*, p.529. Even an R.C. scholar like B. Rigaux repudiates any idea that the term indicates an intermediary state, and indeed goes so far as to add: "...toute son eschatologie est centree sur la resurrection des corps." *ibid.* p.532.

as these - questions that are intimately related to the subject at hand - is surely clear indication that he was not interested in presenting a complete picture of the End in accord with the usual apocalyptic approach. And indeed it may well indicate that Paul himself had no great interest in apocalypticism of this kind, and the fragmentary nature of his answers, not only here but in all his eschatological references to the events of the End, bear witness to the fact that he had not worked out a systematic scheme of those events (39). If this be so then one might go so far as to

- - - - -

(39) This may be said in spite of the claim made by Albert Schweitzer: "That the Apostle expresses his views about the future world in disconnected fragments, apparently distributed fortuitously through the text, does not show that it was not clear and consistent in his own mind, but exactly the opposite. The eschatological remarks come in so naturally and without appearing to need explanation just because this whole set of conceptions was to the Apostle so long familiar and self-explanatory, that he can draw on it whenever he wishes as easily as an educated European uses the multiplication table". Quoted from 'Paul and His Interpreters', London, 1912, p.60. One is tempted to ask, rather facetiously perhaps, if that means that he wrote his letters to the Galatians and to the Romans on the theme of justification by faith because he had not previously worked out a comprehensive view in his own mind. If he had worked out such a comprehensive eschatological view, and held to it over a long period of time, he would doubtless have imparted it in all its fullness to his congregations. And yet there seemed to be an uncommon number of questions and misunderstandings about eschatology among those same congregations. E.J. Bicknell may be closer to the truth when he states: "It is difficult to harmonize his teaching here with that given for instance in 1 Corinthians 15 and 11 Corinthians 5, because on each occasion he develops certain thoughts to deal with particular situations. He is not giving teaching about the future life for its own sake. He is dealing with false ideas that need correction. He expounds his own belief so far as the circumstances demand, but no farther". Commentary, pp.47-8. So also H.A.A. Kennedy, *ibid.*: "It is highly improbable that St. Paul ever worked out the picture in its minutiae. He simply made use of the traditional imagery belonging to a theophany" (p.190 n.1), and he continues: "Evidently, apart from the Old Testament reminiscences, St. Paul was not concerned about framing an imaginary scene, in which the events of the day of the Lord would group themselves harmoniously" p.192. It is interesting to note that this failure on the part of the apostle to fill in the details has been a source of disappointment to some. B. Rigaux, while admitting that Paul here deals only with the essentials ("que, vivants et morts, nous soyons avec le Seigneur, toujours") nonetheless continues: "On

say that the Parousia and its concomitant events are not even in the forefront of his mind as he writes thus to the Thessalonians. He is thinking primarily about the doubt and the uncertainty and the wavering of these Christians that result from their uncertainty about this matter, and therefore he provides the instruction on this theme that he thinks essential in order to remove the doubt and strengthen their faith and their witness. His aim therefore is entirely practical. He does not answer questions that are not asked, nor try to anticipate the questions that might arise out of the answer he now provides, for this is not the systematic presentation of end-time events by a man absorbed in apocalyptic, but the reply of a pastor, by as direct a route as possible, to a problem in his congregation. And it should hardly surprise us, or shock us, if one like Paul found that answer in terms reminiscent of the Old Testament descriptions of the divine-human encounter (40).

- - - - -

(39) (Cont'd.) --- voudrait que l'apotre redise et explique encore. Paul sent qu'il s'agit d'une tristesse grave. Il n'a pas tout dit.....(but) il developpe comment et pourquoi la joie doit prevaloir. On sera bien sur tous avec le Christ" p.528. J.E.Frame makes the same acknowledgment ("It is obvious that vv.10-17 do not pretend to give a detailed description of the parousia"), but then goes on to supply what is lacking: "Of the points not mentioned, we presume that Paul would admit the following: the assembling of the saints; the redemption or transformation of the body, (Rom.8.23, 1 Cor.15.51, Phil.3.31); and the judgment on all men (Rom.14.10, 2 Cor.5.10) without the resurrection of the wicked.....It is probable that after the meeting of the Lord in the air, the Lord with his saints goes not to earth but to heaven....". It is perhaps not irrelevant to note that Frame cannot resist the temptation to fill in the details, where Paul could, even in the face of an obvious opportunity. Rather unintentionally Frame gives weight to our claim that Paul's concern is that of the pastor and not that of the apocalypticist.

(40) Hence G. Masson has summed up the matter effectively: "L'expression est d'une sobriete remarquable, qui ne concede rien a la curiosite et se distingue avantageusement des descriptions de l'apocalyptique juive". *ibid.*, p.60.

If the preceding is accepted, then the issue is clarified and we may be enabled to see that which is essential in Paul's answer. And the essential is found in Paul's conclusion (17b), the premise upon which that conclusion is based (14a), and the thread of thought that connects the conclusion with the premise.

His premise is the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (14a). What follows that premise constitutes an inexact apodosis. The οὕτως καὶ would lead one to expect a reference to the resurrection of the believer on the strength of Christ's resurrection. Instead we are told that if we believe that Jesus died and rose again then we must believe ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἄξει σὺν αὐτοῖς (41). And without doubt this inexact apodosis is quite deliberate. His theme here is not the resurrection of the believer, but the unbroken continuity of the believer with Christ. Thus the τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ and the σὺν αὐτοῖς constitute the connecting links with the Parousia. Thus it is not the hope of the resurrection of the believer that Paul holds out by way of assurance, but the fact that, on the basis of the death and resurrection of Christ, in life or death or Parousia, there is no separation from Him.

The thought of continuity therefore is emphasised in the phrase τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. This is a rather enigmatic text (42), and certainty about its precise

(41) ὁ Θεὸς - the article for emphasis. This is common where God is made the author of the resurrection of Christ: 1 Cor. 6.14, 2 Cor. 4.14.

(42) There is some question about whether διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ is to be taken with κοιμηθέντας or with ἄξει. The former is generally favoured because it maintains the parallelism of the sentence and because it corresponds to the οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ of v.16. cf. also the οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ of 1 Cor. 15.18. For the use of διὰ here see C.F.D. Moule, *ibid.*, p.57. Kirsopp Lake, 'The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul', London,

meaning must remain just beyond our grasp, but there can be no doubt about its aim; i.e., in life or death, there is no separation from Christ. It is not at all surprising that one who thinks of the Christian's life as a life in Christ (Gal.2.20, Phil.1.21) should also think of his death as a death in Christ. Hence B. Rigaux could write:

"Mourir par le Christ n'est pas plus difficile à expliquer que vivre par le Christ, car ce n'est pas l'acte de mourir qu'il faut envisager, mais l'état de mort dans lequel on est entre" (43).

This continuity of thought is maintained in the phrase οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ (v.16) (44), which again, although enigmatic in character, emphasises the failure of death to effect a separation between the believer and Christ.

The conclusion therefore is not only based firmly on the original premise, i.e., the death and resurrection of Christ, but represents the very logical conclusion to the whole thread of thought in this passage, besides which all else becomes virtually incidental. The conclusion is: καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν Κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα (v.17). This represents the goal of the whole passage, leads us to the heart of his teaching here about the Parousia, and becomes the source of the assurance which he seeks to give the Thessalonian Christians. In this sense then F.C. Porter caught the real meaning of the

- - - - -

(42) (Cont'd.) --- 1914, p.88, regards this as a reference to Christian martyrs. This makes the *διὰ* instrumental with a vengeance.

(43) B. Rigaux, *ibid.* p.537.

(44) B. Rigaux refers to J. Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte*, in *Beiträge z. Förderung christlicher Theologie*, t.XLV, fasc.2., Gutersloh, 1951, who connects the ἐν Χριστῷ with the ἀναστήσονται rather than οἱ νεκροὶ. Here again 1 Cor.15.18 (and cf. also v.22) provide some precedent for rejecting this. Moreover this phrase provides the proper contrast with οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι.

passage when he wrote:

"Personal fellowship with Christ, and to this end likeness in nature to Christ, constitute the real meaning of the coming of the Lord to Paul. It is impossible to read his letter and still suppose that the physical descent of Christ, the shouting and sound of the trumpet of God, the bodily rapture of Christians into the space between earth and heaven, are original with Paul or of any essential importance to him. To be forever with the Lord is his hope..." (45).

And B. Rigaux has voiced the same opinion:

"L'esperance chretienne est d'etre toujours avec le Christ.....l'essentiel du message pauline in reste: nous serons avec le Christ.... Il y a dans l'emphase du πάντοτε attire en tete, une note de triomphe mais surtout de consolation et de joie profonde" (46)

- - - - -

(45) F.C. Porter, 'The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of St. Paul', J.B.L. XLl, 1922, pp.183-204. This quotation is from p.201.

(46) B. Rigaux, *ibid.* p.550. Charles Masson, *ibid.*, refers to Bornemann, v.Dobschutz, Dibelius, Lueken, Frame, Oepke, who interpret the promise of eternal fellowship with Christ as indicating an intimate spiritual union with Him. He refers to the variant in Vaticanus which has ἐν Κυρίῳ in place of σὺν Κυρίῳ, which leads one to suspect that the author of that correction regarded the ἐν Κυρίῳ as rendering better than σὺν Κυρίῳ the idea of intimate spiritual union with Christ. But Masson rejects this interpretation on the ground that more than spiritual union is involved here, for the believers accompany Christ to earth and share with Him in His reign there. He refers with approval to Jacques Dupont's claim (see note 35, p.206), that when the expressions σὺν Κυρίῳ and σὺν Χριστῷ are used with an eschatological reference they always carry the idea of participation in the events which follow the Parousia, i.e. the reign and glory of the Master (Dupont p.55). In support of this claim Dupont cites Mt.13.43, 25.34, Rom.5.17, 8.17, 1 Cor.4.8, 15.23-8, 2 Tim.2.12, Apoc.5.10, 20.4-6, 22.5. But these texts provide doubtful support for this thesis. The ones from Matthew are both taken from parables, and it is very doubtful if an eschatological scheme can be based on the parabolic form. The apocalyptic form also provides a doubtful foundation for a literal interpretation. Apart from 1 Cor.4.8 (which is really an irrelevant reference) there is some support to be found in the remaining Pauline references, and in 2 Timothy 2.12, but the emphasis in these passages is intended to draw the contrast either with the Christian's state before and after Christ, or with his present state now and the one he will enjoy hereafter. The reference in 1 Cor.15 is to the reign of Christ and not to the reign of the believer with Christ. Indeed in this reference there is a limit set on that reign of Christ. Therefore Masson's claim that the goal here promised is the believer's share in the reign of

And to all of this the closing exhortation provides a fitting conclusion Ὡστε παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις (v.18). He has written all of this περι τῶν κοιμημένων to the end ἵνα μὴ λυπηθῆτε .

The assurance that the living and the dead stand on an equal footing at the Parousia, and that both shall be forever with the Christ, becomes for them all the source of encouragement and comfort that should strengthen the wavering and produce steadfastness. Once more it is the pastor and not the apocalypticist who speaks.

And in conclusion one should not fail to note how thoroughly Christological is this whole passage. The basis, as we have noted, is the death and resurrection of Christ. The goal is to be 'with' Christ. The continuity is maintained 'through' Christ. And when that Event takes place, it is αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος who comes.

- - - - -

(46) (Cont'd.) --- Christ on earth goes beyond the point of the passages quoted above, and it certainly goes beyond the point of this passage in Thessalonians. The fact remains that Paul does not tell us what it means to be 'with' Christ hereafter, as he does not tell us what it means to be 'in' Christ during the state of death. One cannot therefore try to supply what Paul either neglected - but more likely deliberately refused - to supply, i.e., a full-scale outline of the events of the last Day. He has but one purpose here; to answer their enquiry in terms that will provide the necessary assurance, and beyond that he does not go. This is of no little importance in the light of the accusations made against him concerning his undue apocalyptic tendencies. Paul has himself shown greater restraint than many of his commentators - most of whom - indeed all of whom - would themselves repudiate any charge of apocalypticism.

5.1-11.

The introductory statement in this section differs from that of the previous one, since there he addressed himself to their ignorance, but here to their knowledge (47). One cannot help but wonder about the source of that knowledge. Did it come from the lips of the Apostle, or from some document extant and known to them - such as Q? Certainly the many points of contact, both linguistic and conceptual, make the latter idea possible. It seems likely however that Paul himself would have something to say on this subject when he was among them, although of course this does not exclude reference to such a document (48). However, this may be said with certainty, that although they had this information, they did not understand all its implications, and therefore some further enquiry had been made of the Apostle (49). This was a very natural subject of enquiry, since their knowledge that Christ would come 'as a thief' would create some question about the way in which preparation might be made for it (50). This might well be a cause of anxiety. As they were worried about the place of the dead at the Parousia, so they were worried about their own place at the Parousia if its unexpected

- - - - -

(47) So James Denney, 'The Epistles to the Thessalonians', The Expositors' Bible, New York, and E.J. Bicknell, *ibid.*

(48) The use of ἀκριβῶς here, in spite of E.J. Bicknell's claim, does not necessarily support the case for a written document. Its use in Acts 18.25 with reference to the teaching of Apollos indicates only the character of his teaching. G. Milligan, 'Commentary', may be closer to the truth when he suggests that this word means that Paul had stressed this subject in his teaching at Thessalonica, and that perhaps the actual words of Christ, on the basis of such a document, had been quoted to give authority to this teaching.

(49) Once more περὶ is taken as indicating a specific enquiry.

(50) See above pp.106-107.

character should find them unprepared.

Paul's reply to their enquiry is two-fold: he confirms the correctness of their knowledge of its unexpected character, but assures them that this holds fear only for those who, unlike themselves, are unprepared; and he exhorts them to remain as they are - morally and spiritually prepared for that event.

In vv.2-3 Paul emphasises the suddenness of the Parousia, and the threat which that poses for those who, wilfully ignoring the promise of his coming, are therefore unprepared (51). It comes *ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ* (52), and *ὡσπερ ἡ ὄδῃν τῆ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχοῦσῃ* (53). That both these analogies stress its unexpected character is made unmistakable in what follows: *ὅταν λέγωσιν Εἰρήνην καὶ ἀσφάλεια, τότε αἰφνίδιος αὐτοῖς ἐπίσπεται ὄλεθρος* (54). And for those unprepared its suddenness can mean only 'sudden destruction' (55)

"Precisely at the time when man fancies himself in the greatest security, the advent will occur" (56).

- - - - -

- (51) Those who wilfully ignore the Day are the subject of *λέγωσιν*. 'They' are not clearly identified, and perhaps Paul intends them to realise that there is always the possibility that some who should know better might stray into that category. Hence the exhortation of v.6ff.
- (52) For the Synoptic parallel see above pp.162-165. The *ἐν νυκτὶ* is peculiar to this passage. It is generally assumed that this is the source of the belief in the early church that the Parousia would occur at night.
- (53) Charles Masson, *ibid.*, claims that the Messianic woes are in mind here, but this is doubtful. The emphasis is on the unexpected character of the event.
- (54) The *Εἰρήνην καὶ ἀσφάλεια* is reminiscent of Ezek. 13.10. cf. also Lk.17.26f. = Mt.24.37f.
- (55) 'All of a sudden destruction' or 'sudden destruction', depending on whether *αἰφνίδιος* is to be taken as an adverb or an adjective. The meaning of *ὄλεθρος* cannot be determined with certitude. The idea that it means separation from Christ fits the context, since for those who are prepared the Parousia promises life with Christ. And yet the threat of separation from Christ would hold no terror for those who live without Him now.
- (56) G. Lünemann, *ibid.*

And the result is not left in doubt:

'they shall in no way escape'.

In vv.4-5 however Paul emphasises the fact that the suddenness of the Parousia should hold no terror for those to whom he writes (57). That Day holds terror only for those whose indifference creates a false sense of security - a false sense of security which it will rudely shatter. But to them it holds not a threat but a promise. And so the contrast is established - a contrast that is expressed in terms of darkness and light, night and day (58). Those who deliberately ignore the promise of the Parousia belong to the darkness and to the night. But believers belong to the light and to the day. What follows constitutes a very subtle change in the application of the metaphor. The Day comes like a thief - but it does not overcome them like a thief, for they are prepared for its coming (59). Then having assured them that they need not fear because they are prepared, he exhorts them to make sure that they remain prepared (60). And that preparedness is stated first negatively ($\mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$), and then positively in terms of $\gamma\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$ (61) and

(57) $\delta\epsilon$ is adversative. The $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is emphatic. A D E F G, al., Vulg. It. Chrys. have $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma\ \eta\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$. This latter order throws emphasis on the $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$.

(58) The contrast is perhaps suggested by the term $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ in v.2. The omission of the article here would appear to indicate the technical character of this term, although the Receptus has the article, and it might well have been absorbed in the η of the following $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$.

(59) J.E. Frame, E.J. Bicknell, G. Milligan all suggest that the metaphor has undergone a transformation at this point. So Frame translates: "That the day should surprise you as thieves are surprised"; i.e. by the day. But what respectable thief would allow himself to be surprised by the day?

(60) $\text{Οὐκ ἔσπεν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σιότους}$ of v.6 marks the transition to the hortative. Note the change from $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (vv.4-5a) to $\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (vv.5b-10). $\alpha\rho\alpha\ \omicron\upsilon\nu$ introduces three hortatory subjunctives: $\mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, $\gamma\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$, and $\nu\eta\phi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$.

νήφωμεν . But these terms are themselves developed further in v.8 ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν, ἐνδυσάμενοι θώρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ περινεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας (62) Thus watchfulness is here understood in terms of the three primary Christian virtues: faith, hope, and love. He has already commended them for their possession of these virtues (1.3), and has also already exhorted them, within the context of two previous Parousia passages (3.12-13, 4.3,11) to continue and increase in these virtues. Hence if they continue in these virtues they now possess they will be ready at all times for the Parousia, and there is therefore no need for them to know the exact time of this event. To wait for His Son from heaven therefore is to develop these virtues that increase preparedness for the Parousia of that Son. And if all this is not enough by way of assurance, they need only remember that God has appointed them not to wrath but to salvation (v.9).

The conclusion of the discussion takes them back to both the premise and the goal of the previous passage (4.13-18). The foundation of their hope, as we have seen, was the death and resurrection of Christ (4.14). Its goal is eternal fellowship with Christ (4.17b). Both the premise and the goal are here repeated (v.10) (63). For this further reason therefore

(61) For the use of γρηγορέω in the eschatological discourse see n.165 p.155 above.
 (62) ὄντες has a slightly causal force here: 'because we are of the day'. νήφωμεν is apparently taken as representative of all three verbs in v.6.
 (63) There is no parallel for this metaphorical use of γρηγορέω, but καθεύδω as indicative of death is found in the LXX: Ps.87(88).6, Dan.12.2, 2 Sam.7.12. ἄρα does not belong with σὺν αὐτῷ but with ζήσωμεν . So G. Lunemann, *ibid.*, and C.J. Ellicott, *ibid.*

the knowledge of the exact time of the Parousia is unimportant, since neither life nor death can separate them from Christ. And the concluding exhortation is reminiscent of 4.18, with the addition of a favourite Pauline metaphor - οἰκοδομεῖτε (64).

Thus once more the context for the idea of the Parousia in this passage is not apocalyptic - but concern for the spiritual welfare of this church. By means of it he provides them with a source of comfort and a motive for Christian living.

5.23-24

This is an appropriate prayer with which to close this first letter, for it sums up the appeals that have been made already (65), and provides additional assurance that at the Parousia the Thessalonian Christians, by virtue of the divine initiative and faithfulness, will be found ready. He has given them assurance, and he has exhorted them on the strength of that assurance, but now

"from these several injunctions the Apostle turns in characteristic fashion to the Divine power in which alone they can be fulfilled" (66).

The opening sentence brings the Divine power into focus (67), and the last sentence (v.24) leaves no doubt about the final result. The One who has initiated the whole process will bring it to completion. And all that is said in between does

- - - - -

(64) See 1 Cor.3.16, Eph.2.20ff.

(65) cf. 4.13, 5.6,11, 4.2-12, 5.12-22. So B. Rigaux, *ibid.*, p.594: "Tous ces elements vont etre repris, ramasses dans une priere".

(66) G. Milligan, *ibid.* So also B. Rigaux, J.E. Frame, C. Masson, C.J. Ellicott.

(67) Ἀὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς . δὲ is slightly adversative, as if Paul had said: "I have exhorted you to ethical consecration, and to the things that make for peace, but God Himself is the only power that can make the exhortation effective". So J.E. Frame. cf. 1 Thess.3.13 and 2 Thess.2.16,17.

little more than emphasise the totality of the sanctifying process. He prays that God may sanctify them 'wholly' (68), and in the remainder of the prayer he simply elaborates on this thought (69). Indeed even the 'divisions' in the human personality that are expressed here are probably only intended to emphasise the totality of the sanctifying process (70). Thus on that day when any lack of spiritual wholeness will become manifest (2.19, 3.13, 1 Cor. 3.13) they will have no cause for fear, for then God's faithfulness will be evident in their preservation. Thus once more the context for a Parousia passage is the spiritual preparedness of the Thessalonian Christians.

- - - - -

(68) ὁλοτελεῖς occurs only here in Biblical Greek, indicating "to which nothing belonging to its nature is wanting". So G. Lüdemann. ἀγιαζεῖν is rare in Paul (Eph. 5.26, Rom. 15.16) 1 Cor. 1.2, 6.11, 7.14) but common in the LXX. (Exod. 31.13, Lev. 11.44, 21.8, Ezek. 37.28). See B.F. Westcott, Hebrews, p. 346f.

(69) Thus the ἀγιασάαι is explained by the ἀμέμπως
 ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, the ὑμᾶς with τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ
 ὁλόκληρον. So J.E. Frame.

(70) The question is often asked at this point whether Paul thinks of the human personality as a dichotomy or a trichotomy. For an excellent discussion of this question see B. Rigaux, *ibid.*, pp. 596-599. It seems apparent that this problem is not in the forefront of his mind here. He is only trying to emphasise the all-inclusive nature of the sanctifying process. G. Milligan quotes from Jowett: "St. Paul is not writing a treatise on the soul, but pouring forth from the fullness of his heart a prayer for his converts". cf. in Lev. 21.17-23 ὁλόκληρος is used to describe the wholeness required of Levitical priests before ministering at the altar. See also Ezek. 15.5. See also R.C. Trench, 'Synonyms of the New Testament', London, 1876, p. 71ff. It is here related to the three substantives.

11 Thessalonians

Before proceeding to an examination of the one Parousia passage in this letter some attention must be given to its authenticity. If the term had been used here in exactly the same way as in the first letter, then perhaps this problem would not be immediately relevant. But, as we shall see, the term is for the first (and only) time in these Epistles associated with the subject of signs, and the suggestion that 11 Thessalonians is not Pauline would readily explain that change. Therefore while no attempt can be made to solve the problem - an admittedly impossible task on the basis of existing information - its terms should at least be before us.

There are two primary reasons for the serious doubts that have been cast upon the Pauline authorship of this letter; the first is the variation in eschatological emphasis as represented by 1 Thessalonians 5.1-11 and 2 Thessalonians 2.1-12, and the second is the strange combination of similarity in style, outline, contents, and language, combined with the noticeable difference in the tone.

The discrepancy between 1 Thessalonians 5.1-11 and 2 Thessalonians 2.1-12 is glaring enough to be obvious even to the most casual reader; the former stresses the suddenness of the Parousia and the fact that it comes without warning, and the latter emphasises the signs that precede the Parousia. This has convinced many that the two letters could not have come from the same pen, but must have been written by someone with the first letter in front of him as he wrote (71).

- - - - -

(71) For a history of the argument, see J.E. Frame, *ibid.*, pp.40-45, T. Zahn, *ibid.*, Vol.1, pp.247-255, G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Jesus and the Future', pp.181-183.

Further support for this claim was found in the contents of this second apocalyptic passage. The account of the lawless one was identified with the legend of 'Nero Redivivus', with the Restrainer identified as Vespasian and the Apostasy related to the wickedness of the Jews in their war against the Romans (72). This latter argument is usually regarded as being disposed of by Bousset's work on the Antichrist, and also by R.H. Charles' book on 'The Ascension of Isaiah', both of which give clear proof of the existence of the Antichrist idea well before the rise of the 'Nero Redivivus' myth. The former argument is generally countered in terms of the differing situations to which the two letters are addressed. F.C. Bauer seems to have set the tone for this reply:

"It is perfectly conceivable that one and the same writer, if he lived so much in the thought of the Parousia as the two Epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways" (73).

F. Spitta, who unlike Bauer was prepared to accept the Pauline authorship of both letters, also made use of this argument.

"Accordingly no conclusion can be drawn from the fact that in 1 Thessalonians the suddenness of the Parousia is made known, while in 11 Thessalonians its calculability (Berechenbarkeit) is declared. It happens that the two various sides of the parousia conception are applied in the letters, in each case that one being emphasised

- - - - -

(72) This claim was promoted by Kern, 'Ueber 2 Thess. 2.1-12' (See J.E. Frame, *ibid.* p.40) and taken over by F.C. Bauer, *ibid.*, p.324 ff. On the strength of this Kern postulated an apocalypse, consisting of 2.1-12, written between 68-70 A.D., with the preface and the conclusion borrowed from a genuine letter of Paul. This had led to some conjecture about possible authorship of this second letter; e.g. Sylvanus (F.C. Burkitt, 'Christian Beginnings') and Timothy (F. Spitta, *ibid.*).
 (73) F.C. Bauer, *ibid.*, p.93. The argument may be used here even although Bauer rejects the Pauline authorship of both letters.

which befits the necessity of the community" (74).

There is however one feature of this now traditional answer which I find disturbing. This readiness to stress at one and the same time suddenness and signs, a characteristic of apocalyptic literature, is assumed to be also a characteristic of Paul's eschatological emphasis (75). It is said by way of resolution of this apparent, incompatible element in the Apostle, that the Day only comes as a thief to those who, from wilful carelessness, are ignorant of the signs, but to those who know the signs that Day will find them prepared.

"Those who watch will be able to observe the signs and be ready; those who refuse to watch will be caught unprepared" (76).

But we have tried to show that in neither the Synoptic passages nor in 1 Thessalonians 5.1-11 is this meaning given to watchfulness and preparedness. In neither case is watchfulness thought of in terms of looking for signs of the end. Indeed this is precisely the kind of watchfulness that is discouraged, for the only effective kind of watchfulness is that quality of life which leaves one prepared no matter when

- - - - -

(74) F. Spitta, 'Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums', Erster Band, 1893, pp.129-130, quoted by G.M. Beasley-Murray, *ibid.*, pp.181-2. The same argument has been used by F. Godet, 'Introduction to the New Testament', Edinburgh, 1894, pp.167,168, J. Moffatt, 'The Expositor's Greek Testament', Vol.IV, The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians, p.13, London, 1910, J.E. Frame, *ibid.*, p.44, and E.J. Bicknell, *ibid.* p. xxviii. G.M. Beasley-Murray, p.182, has noted the readiness of these commentators to grant to Paul what they denied to Christ, i.e. the right to emphasise both suddenness and signs. See above pp.89-91.

(75) It is assumed also with respect to the eschatological discourse in the Synoptics. cf. T.Zahn, *ibid.* p.253. Our answer to this has already been given.

(76) E.J. Bicknell, *ibid.*, p.xxvii. cf. also T. Zahn, *ibid.* p.253: "To those absorbed in the present earthly life the day of the Lord will come as a snare and the Lord as a thief. The disciples of Jesus are to watch...They are to give heed to the signs of the times which portend the end...".

the event takes place. It is one thing to argue that Paul did adapt himself to the differing situations, but it is something else again to say that this is representative of the apostle's total viewpoint, or that what he had been saying all along was that the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian was the ability to read such signs.

The objection to unity of authorship on literary grounds stems from the similarity between these two letters; a similarity that extends to outline, contents, and language (77). There is however a marked difference in tone between the two; the first gives evidence of the warm feeling the Apostle holds for his congregation, while the second seems to be more official and authoritative, manifesting a certain coolness toward that congregation. Moreover the very similarity arouses suspicion about the Pauline authorship, since it seems unlikely that Paul would write so soon again in order to say practically the same thing. Even the protestations of 2.2 and 3.17 are regarded as marks of a forgery (78).

- - - - -

(77) A.C. McGiffert, 'Encyclopaedia Biblica', Vol.4, col.5044, estimates that about one-half of 2 Thess. is virtually a reproduction of the first letter. For an excellent comparison of the two letters see B. Rigaux, *ibid.* pp.80-94 and 132-144. See also J.E. Frame, *ibid.*, pp.46-51. Frame himself does not so interpret this similarity. "In fact, apart from formal agreements in the main epistolary outline, the striking thing is not the slavish dependence of the author of 11 on 1, but the freedom with which he employs the reminiscences from 1 and incorporates them in original ways in new settings" (p.47). For an example of slavish imitation cf. the Epistle to the Laodiceans and the letter to the Philippians.

(78) Further objection to unity of authorship is found in the fact that the first letter was obviously sent to a Gentile church (1.9) while the second gives evidence of having Jews in mind. A. Harnack (see Frame p.42 for the reference) has laid claim to the existence of two churches at Thessalonica; one Jewish and one Gentile, with 1 being addressed to the latter and 11 to the former. He finds further support for this in the reading which he accepts for 2.13 (ἀπαρχήν B F G 35, al. Vulg. Ambr.), which he takes as a reference to the Jewish community. However,

The argument against this objection for the most part takes account of the fact that both letters were written within a very short space of time to the same congregation, and therefore similarity should not be surprising. The only new factor in the situation is the change in the character of the eschatological problem from that of some fearful people worried about their dead to that of some excessive apocalyptists who are convinced that the Parousia has already occurred. On a later occasion Paul was to state that repetition had some place in apostolic instruction (Phil.3.1), and here he was only putting into practice what he then put into a proposition (79).

"Hence he writes in substantially the same tone and along the same lines as before; anything he has to communicate is practically a restatement of what he had already taught orally (2.5,15), not a discussion of novel doubts and principles. If any change has taken place in the local situation, it has been in the direction of shifting the centre of gravity from fears about the dead to extravagant ideas entertained by the living. Hence, for one thing, the general similarity of structure and atmosphere in both epistles, and upon the other hand, the sharper emphasis in the second upon Paul's authority" (80).

(78) (Cont'd.) --- both letters are addressed to the Church at Thessalonica, and, as E.J. Bicknell (*ibid.*) has pointed out, for Paul to recognize such a division as valid would run counter to everything he had to say about the unity of the Body of Christ. Moreover the reading $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ (A D E K 4,5, together with all min., many versions and Fathers) makes greatest sense here, especially as the Thessalonian Christians were not the first to become believers, even in Macedonia (so G. Lünemann, *ibid.*). Since it can by no means be regarded as a *sine qua non* of literary analysis, such an elaborate and ingenious explanation seems hardly necessary.

(79) It has been suggested that Paul would have the original draft of his first letter in his possession, since his scribe would have sent a corrected copy to the congregation and kept the first copy. Hence Paul might well have read over the original draft before writing the second letter. See here A. Deissmann, 'Light', p.227f. So T. Zahn, *ibid.*, p.250, J. Moffatt, *ibid.*, p.14, and J.E. Frame, *ibid.*, p.53.

(80) J. Moffatt, *ibid.*, pp.11-12. Virtually identical arguments are advanced by T. Zahn, *ibid.*, p.245, and R.J. Knowling, *ibid.* p.25.

Moreover the suggestion that the second letter is the work of a forger familiar with the first letter and with the situation at Thessalonica requires some explanation of how such a forgery could be successfully perpetrated upon a congregation which knew the Apostle and his work so well. The answer would make the date of the second letter late enough to make such a deception possible - an answer that only leads to the question about how a forger, writing so long afterwards, could know that particular situation at Thessalonica so well. Indeed, the suggestion only raises more questions than it answers.

And finally, those who accept the Pauline authorship of 11 find further support in the external evidence, which is actually stronger for 11 than for 1. Indeed, even Marcion was prepared to accept it as authentic (81).

One may say therefore that there is more general agreement that Paul was responsible for both letters, and this is true especially for the more recent commentators. Nonetheless there are problems enough to leave the door ajar at least slightly to further investigation.

2.1-12

The term 'parousia' is used only three times in the second letter; twice with reference to the coming of the Christ, and once with reference to the coming of the man of

- - - - -

(81) For the external evidence see G. Milligan, *ibid.* p. Lxxvi, F. Godet, *ibid.*, p. 81, J. E. Frame, p. 39, R. J. Knowling, p. 24. See also J. Moffatt, *ibid.*, for a comparison of the vocabulary.

lawlessness. In our previous examination of the term in Matthew and in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians we have tried to show that the primary reference of this term was not to the usual apocalyptic concern with signs of the end, but rather with the way in which the promise of Christ's coming impinges upon the present, providing the present with motivation for Christian discipleship and with the necessary resources in terms of assurance and confidence. It would seem however as if we must here accept the fact that the term is linked quite specifically with one unmistakable sign of the end; i.e. the coming of the lawless one.

This is a concept with a very long history. It was nurtured in Jewish apocalyptic (82), developed greatly during the inter-testamental period when the concept was more and more personified (83), and eventually, to some degree at least,

- - - - -

(82) One cannot say here that it was 'born' in Jewish apocalyptic literature, since, according to the authorities, the concept was 'born' in the old Babylonian myth of the monster who opposed (so E.J. Pratt, *ibid.* p.137, on the basis of Bousset) or who will oppose (G. Milligan, *ibid.*, on the basis of H. Gunkel, 'Schopfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit,' Göttingen, 1895) the Creator, Milligan himself is rather sceptical about the extent of the influence of this original Babylonian myth on the idea in the O.T. In the O.T. itself there are traces of it in Psalm 2, Psalm 94, and of course in Ezek.38 and 39, with his description of the final attack of God and Magog upon God, and perhaps the most significant reference of all, there is Daniel's description of Antiochus Epiphanes in terms of the fourth beast in Dan.7.7,8,11,20,25, and also Dan.11.28,32,36. There is another stream of tradition that seeks to personify evil in terms of the wicked angel of Judaism - Belial or Beliar, לֹא יִשְׁרָאֵל is always rendered by ἀνόμημα (Dt.15.9), ἀνομία (2 Kings 22.5) or ἀποστασία (3 Kings 20 (21) 13 A). This is due to the erroneous Rabbinical derivation of the word from לֹא 'without' and יִשְׁרָאֵל 'yoke', i.e. one who will not accept the yoke of the law. So Milligan *ibid.*, and J. Moffatt, *ibid.*, 'Commentary'.

(83) cf. Book of Jubilees 1.20, Test.XII Patr. Reub.4.7,6.3, Levi 3.3,18.12. cf. also the Asc.Isa.4.2 where Belial is described as ἀγγελος της ἀνομίας (LXX ἀποστασία). cf. also 2 Esd. 5.1ff. where Belial is depicted as a truly Satanic being associated with the signs that ordinarily accompany the Antichrist (Milligan 162). There is a section in the Syb.Oracles, 3.60ff. where a description is given of the 'lying wonders' to be wrought

taken over by the early Christian Church. Thus it may be said that

"The *ἄνομος* expectation of 2 Thessalonians is, therefore, not the capricious invention of an individual, but only the expression of a belief which has had a long history, and which, at that time, was very widely spread" (84).

Moreover, coupled with this personification of evil that will be manifest in the latter days is the idea of a final apostasy, to which reference is made in 2 Thessalonians 2.3, and which is here made by Paul a necessary prelude to the coming of Christ. This too has had a long history in apocalyptic, and it is from that context that Paul embraces the idea (85).

(83) (Cont'd.) --- by the man of sin. This particular section of the Oracles is dated by Thackeray about 40-30 B.C. See Henry St. John Thackeray, 'The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought', New York, 1900, p.138f. J. Moffatt thinks that a 'Beliar-saga' is 'clearly traceable here', and he regards Beliar as a prototype for Paul's man of lawlessness. So also does C.H. Dodd, 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments', London, 1944, p.38. It seems to be taken for granted that in Eph.2.2 Paul is making reference to this Satanic being.

(84) H. St. John Thackeray, *ibid.*, p.137, who is quoting from H. Gunkel, *ibid.*, pp.221-225. cf. also 1 John 2.18,22.

(85) The term *ἀποστασία* is used in the LXX in Jos.22.22 to translate *‎*, indicating a revolt against Yahweh. It also appears in 3 Kings 20(21).13 (*ἀνδρες της ἀποστασίας*) and in 2 Chron.29.19 (with reference to the apostasy of Ahaz). See also Dan.8.12,23, 11.30,32, 1 Macc.2.15 and 1.43-53. The references in 1 Macc. are to the defection of the Jews under pressure from Antiochus Epiphanes. See also Enoch 22. Ethiopian Enoch 91.7. cf. the Book of Jubilees 23.14-23, 4 Esdras 5.1-2, Ass. Moses 5. The N.T. elsewhere has something to say about this as well; 1 Tim.4.1-3, 2 Tim.3.1-5, Acts 20.29-31, 2 Pet.2.1ff. See also Didache 16.4. B. Rigaux tells us that in the teachings of Qumran this idea is at one and the same time developed and restrained; developed because it occupies a large place in its teaching, and restrained because the apostasy was confined to Israel as the enemy of the sect. See here 1 Q p Hab,11,1-6; V111, 10, and the Doc. of Damas, 11,11-18; 1,20; V, 21; V111,19; X1X,5, 32. Hence he concludes: "C'est donc une tradition juive tres repandue de reserver une place importante a l'apostasie dans les prodromes de la fin". p.255.

The more immediate source for Paul's concepts is a little more difficult to identify. Doubtless there were different forms of this idea present at the time of writing (86), and some attempts have been made to link Paul with one or other of these more immediate sources (87). H.A.A. Kennedy's suggestion however seems to be in greater conformity with Paul's customary use of the more original sources in the Old Testament in the light of his own experience and contemporary events; i.e. that the Old Testament passages on this theme, especially those from Daniel, form the immediate background for what he has to write here. If these passages be conjoined with what is said in the Synoptic sources about false Christs and false prophets, and all these references looked at in the light of the way in which the Jewish nation had rejected the Messiah - and his emissaries - (1 Thess.2.14-16, 2 Thess.1.6-10), then it was only natural that Paul would expect the appearance of a false Messiah (88).

- - - - -

(86) cf. W. Bousset, *ibid.*, p.131: "Thus the legend went wandering about, ever assuming new aspects under the shifting conditions of the times".

(87) T. Zahn, *ibid.*, refers to F. Spitta's claim that Timothy, the alleged author of 2 Thessalonians, made use of an extant apocalypse; i.e. a Jewish apocalypse of the time of Caligula. Zahn himself claims that Paul was dependent on the many Christian prophets who surrounded him. cf. Acts.11.27, 13.1,2,4, 21.9-11. There is evidence that he valued these prophecies highly. cf. 1 Cor.12.10,28f., 14.1-39, Eph.2.20,3.5,4.11, Rom.12.6, 1 Thess.5.20, 1 Tim.1.18, 4.1,14. He suggests that the primary source might therefore be these prophets, and especially Sylvanus, who accompanied Paul on his journeys.

(88) H.A.A. Kennedy, *ibid.*, p.215. The language that Paul uses to describe the man of sin is certainly reminiscent of O.T. passages on this theme; for v.4a see Dan.7.7,11,20,25,11.36, 1 Macc.1.24. For v.8 see Isa.11.4, Dan.7.11,26, 8.25,11.45. For v.9 see Dan.8.25. For v.11 see Isa.19.4, Jer.4.10.

There is little doubt, however, that whatever the more immediate source these concepts which Paul is introducing here are not new. Apparently while with them Paul had given some explanation of these matters, and he makes reference to them now almost with a touch of impatience (89). This may explain why the references are somewhat cryptic, in spite of the fact that he is by no means spare in his description of the man of lawlessness (90). Therefore it is impossible to identify this man of lawlessness with any degree of certainty. There is some agreement that he comes from the Jews, although there is by no means unanimity of opinion (91). However,

- - - - -

(89) The ταῦτα of v.5 applies to the contents of vv.3,4; i.e., to the apostasy and the man of sin. The imperfect ἔλεγον would seem to indicate that more than one reference had been made to these things at that time. The use of the definite article before these terms also marks them as known concepts. T. Zahn, *ibid.*, wonders how they could have misunderstood about the Day if they had known about these things previously, and then suggests by way of reply to his own query that they had probably thought that the man of lawlessness had already come in the person of Caligula, and that Caligula's death (Jan.24,41) was the start of the Day of the Lord.

(90) cf. footnote 88, p.228 above. He is further identified as ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρούμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καθίσει, ἀποδεικνύοντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἔστιν Θεός

cf. Lk.13.17, Phil.1.28, J.W. Griffiths, '11 Thessalonians 2.4', *Expository times* L11, 1940-41, p.31, sees πάντα (v.4) as not a neuter plural, which he regards as grammatically impossible (since 'things' cannot be called gods), and σέβασμα as not necessarily governed by λεγόμενον and as not an appellation of a person worshipped, and therefore must refer to an object governed by the preposition ἐπὶ. So he translates "against every person who is called God or (every) thing which is worshipped".

(91) So H.A.A. Kennedy, *ibid.*, pp.210-211, R.J. Knowling, *ibid.* p.26, E.J. Pratt, *ibid.*, p.133, W. Bousset, *ibid.*, J. Moffatt, *ibid.* The arguments for this view are as follows: 1. the reference to the unbelieving Jews and the fate that awaits them in 1 Thess. 2.14-16; 2. the use of ἀποστασία, which strictly speaking can be applied only to Jews ("They had been the people of God, hence the logic of the term ἀποστασία" - Pratt, 153); 3. the connection of the Antichrist with the temple at Jerusalem. This argument has been called into question since the temple at Jerusalem is not positively identified, and one cannot be sure that Paul is not using the term here in a metaphorical sense. Thus such a commentator as Frame embraces a metaphorical interpretation ("The

there is a surprising degree of unanimity among those who identify the τὸ κατέχων (v.6) or ὁ κατέχων (v.7), for Rome figures almost exclusively among the exegetes (92).

- - - - -

(91) (Cont'd.) --- temple then is probably to be sought in heaven" p.257). But surely it is quite unlike the Apostle to introduce such an idea out of context in such an enigmatic way. When he does use the temple in a non-literal sense, it is quite plain that this is his intention (1 Cor.3.16f., 2 Cor.6.16, Eph.2.21). Moreover the definite article is used with the temple, a fact which would seem to indicate a known quantity; 4. the idea of a false Christ again makes greatest sense within the context of Judaism, since the term only has meaning within that context. Of course, Paul does not use this term here, but there seems little doubt that the man of lawlessness is to be thought of as a ψευδόχριστος or ἀντίχριστος (cf. ψεύδει in v.12). A false Christ is more likely to deceive the Jews. Moreover he here performs the function of a fore-runner of the Christ (cf. Lünemann, *ibid.*, p.210: "He is the forerunner of Christ's advent, and has, as the caricature of Christ, like Him an advent and a manifestation: he raises the power of evil, which exalts itself in a hostile manner against Christ and His kingdom, to the highest point; his working is diametrically the opposite of the working of Christ, and it is Christ's appearance which destroys him. Accordingly the opponent can be none other than the Antichrist...."). cf. also the δύναμις καὶ σημεῖοις καὶ τέρασιν of v.9 with Mt.24.24 = Mark 13.22. Hence Kennedy writes: "...it was natural that this demoniac power, which was opposed to God and all goodness, should be transformed into the idea of a false Messiah, which arises out of Judaism, which had rejected and crucified the true Christ, and appears among the Jews in Jerusalem, doing wonderful works, by the help of Satan, and ultimately seating himself in the temple of God". *ibid.* pp.210-211; 5. there is support for this in the Patristic tradition. So Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.*, v.25, i.30,32) and Hippolytus (*de Antichristo*, vi., xiv.). (See Moffatt p.16). However, both B. Rigaux and T. Zahn do not accept the fact that the antichrist springs from Judaism. Zahn's arguments are not too convincing. He argues that the opposition of the Jews had reached its climax and that now what was to be expected was their conversion, according to the promise of Rom.11. Moreover, he adds, Jesus for Paul was more than a Jewish Messiah. But Rom.11 was written after 2 Thess.2, and there is still 1 Thess.2.14-16 to contend with. And while Paul did regard Jesus as more than a Jewish Messiah, nonetheless Christ did come from the Jews, and Paul never lost sight of that fact, especially as it was the Jews who crucified Him. It is logical to expect that a false Messiah would also come from the Jews.

(92) So H.A.A. Kennedy, p.207ff., R.J. Knowling, p.26. G. Milligan, W. Bousset, p.130, H. St. John Thackeray, p.140, J. Moffatt, T. Zahn, p.229. The Empire is designated by τὸ κατέχων, the Emperor by ὁ κατέχων. Thus "the restraining power is an impersonal something, which nevertheless has complete embodiment in personal form". Zahn p.229. J. Moffatt explains how Paul could speak of the Empire's downfall: "The answer lies not so much in any contemporary feeling of panic or display, as in the

This lends additional support to those who see the man of lawlessness as coming from the Jews, since in Paul's own experience Rome fulfilled that function for him with respect to the Jews' opposition to his endeavours (93). But even as one cannot link the $\delta \kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$ with any given Emperor (94), so one cannot link the man of lawlessness with any identifiable figure in history, although it seems quite likely that Caligula provided him with his model (95).

Thus, without question, the term 'parousia' is given an unmistakable apocalyptic setting, and is linked with the subject of signs. There are, however, some things that should be said even in the face of this admission. The first, and most important, is this: this expectation of the antichrist is itself used as a warning against the excessive apocalypticism of the Thessalonian Christians. We have already noted the repeated warnings in the eschatological passages considered previously in the Synoptics against being deceived by false prophets and false christs. The Thessalonian Christians are proof of the need for such warnings, since they have fallen prey to such deception. They are convinced that the Day of the Lord is now present (96). Thus the description of the

- - - - -

(92) (Cont'd.) --- eschatological tradition, derived from Daniel, which was evidently becoming current in certain Jewish and Christian circles that the Empire represented the penultimate stage in the world's history", *ibid.* p.15. cf. 2 Esd.5.1ff., where mention is made of the destruction of the fourth kingdom, i.e. Rome. See H. St. John Thackeray, *ibid.* p.138. cf. also 11 Bar.39.7.

(93) cf. Acts 13.16ff., 17.6ff., and cf. Rom.13. Rev.17.5 represents a change in the church's view of Rome.

(94) "...there is no evidence that Paul...associated the breaking up of the Empire...with the death or deposition of any reigning emperor." T. Zahn, p.230.

(95) So C.H. Dodd, 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments', p.38: "It may well be...that the model who sat for this portrait of the Man of Sin was the mad Emperor Caligula..". So also T. Zahn, p.246.

apostasy and the man of lawlessness and the part these play prior to the Parousia becomes the means whereby Paul repudiates the excessive apocalypticism of these Thessalonians. These 'signs' of the Parousia are intended primarily not to give warning of its coming but to warn that it has not come. Thus this has not really changed Paul's fundamental perspective; that the Master will come, but when nobody knows. Therefore one must always watch and be prepared (97).

"The sole purpose of the eschatological passage is clearly to put a stop to the fanaticism to which the belief in the speedy consummation was giving rise" (98)

But it also is an attempt to put an end to the fear and uncertainty that is the inevitable product of this kind of excessive apocalypticism. He provides them with this account of the events that precede the end in order that they might not be unsettled nor unduly fearful (εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοῦς μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι 2.2)

(99). The unsettling effect of this apocalypticism was to be seen in their attitude to work and in their relationship to one another (3.6-13), and their fear no doubt originated in their uncertainty about their own position at the Parousia (2.13-14). All these disturbing factors he tries to eliminate in this passage; the account of the signs preceding the end offers clear proof that the Parousia is still to come, and

- - - - -

(96) ἐνέστημεν may be taken as indicating present time. cf. its use in Rom.8.38, 1 Cor.3.22, Gal.1.4, Heb.9.9. K. Lake, 'The Earlier Epistles', emphasises that ἐνέστημεν does not mean 'is imminent' but 'has come' (p.78), and J. Moffatt equates it with ὁ Κύριος πάρεστι ἐξαπατάω (v.3) is confined in the N.T. to the Pauline Epistles. cf. Rom.16.18, 1 Cor.3.18. Note the parallel idea in Mark 13.5 = Mt.24.4 = Lk. 21.8.

(97) So B. Rigaux, *ibid.* p.225.

(98) A.C. McGiffert, 'Encyclopaedia Biblica', Vol.4, cols.504lff., quoted by G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Jesus and the Future', p.182. cf. also F. Godet, *ibid.*, pp.167-8: "In the first, Paul had not said

they must continue to prepare themselves for that even in terms of diligence in work, and the promise of vv.13-14 provides assurance that the Day should hold no fear for them. Indeed, it will hold fear only for those who allow themselves to be deceived by the man of lawlessness (vv.10-12), and for the Deceiver himself (100).

"Celle-ci etant la consommation glorieuse opere des a present: elle donne la possession du salut et la participation a la gloire. Par le fait que l'eschatologie est deja en marche et que Jesus est Seigneur pour les vivants et les morts, ce n'est pas la date prochaine ou lointaine de la parousie qui compte, mais y arriver ἀμείπτως, sans tache, dans la saintete totale, objet de gloire pour le Messie. L'essentiel est de mourir par Jesus. Par la, Paul abolit toute speculation sur l'espace entre le temps present et la fin. Il se rattache a la perspective prophetique et la transforme. Pour les prophetes et les apocalyptiques, un evenement, fin de l'exil, restauration du temple, abomination de la desolation, furent colles a l'eclosion de l'ere messianique. Pour Paul c'est le salut meme dans in la religion nouvelle et la perseverance jusqu'a la mort qui se trouvent fondues avec la retribution finale. La question du temps intermediaire etait le secret de Dieu. Attendre, esperer, desirer, souhaiter, croire possible, oui. Croire la parousie presente, sortir de l'ordre etabli, cesser d'oeuvrer, comme si la date etait connue et l'organisation de la vie ecclesiastique et sociale inutile, e'tait l'erreur. Paul n'y a pas succombe. Le reste de la correspondance paulinienne continuera, avec des precisions nouvelles, la meme ligne et le meme enseignement" (101)

(98) (Cont'd). --- that the Parousia was imminent, but only that it would happen unforeseen by a world plunged in security, while Christians are constantly prepared for it by the life in the light which they have begun to live. In the second Paul, seeing the expectation of the day of the Lord rising in the church to the extent of producing a perturbation in the manner of life of a part of its members, gives a sign fitted to calm this morbid impatience. If the faithful ought not to cease watching because they know not the moment, on the other hand that moment must not be fixed so as to cease to act".

(99) cf. G. Milligan's comment: "Present tense...pointing to a continued state of agitation following upon a definite shock received". cf. also Mt.24.6, Mk.13.7.

(100) καταργέω is rare in cl. Greek and in the LXX, but it is used 25 times in the Pauline writings.

(101) B. Rigaux, *ibid.*, pp.226-7.

There is one more factor that must receive some attention before we leave this very difficult section. Paul uses the term 'parousia' not only with reference to Christ but also with reference to the lawless one. This indeed is hardly surprising, for a noticeable parallel is maintained between Christ and His work and the lawless one and his work. Thus we are told that this lawless one is already at work in terms of τὸ..μυστήριον....τῆς ἀνομίας (v.7) (102), even as the Christ who comes is already at work through the Gospel (cf. 1.9-10). Moreover the use of μυστήριον (vv.3.6,8) parallels the use of this word with reference to Christ (103). Thus even as the Christ in His present manifestation is hidden from those who do not believe, so also is the lawless one hidden from view. And as Christ's power and glory is made manifest at His Parousia, so the parousia of the lawless one makes manifest his present working. Thus

"the coming of the antichrist (has) the appearance of a caricature of the parousia of Christ, preceding the latter event" (104).

- - - - -

(102) The 'mystery of iniquity' is not to be identified with the person of the lawless one, "but the increased spirit of lawlessness which is an active force even in the present... but is to be revealed in the person of the lawless one". T. Zahn, p.251.

(103) See G. Milligan's note on ἀποκάλυψις pp.149-151. cf. also its association with μυστήριον in Rom.16.25.

(104) T. Zahn, *ibid.*, p.251.

The Eschatology of the Thessalonian Letters and Apocalyptic

C.K. Barrett, in an article on 'Jewish and Pauline Eschatology', has sought to outline the differences between Paul's eschatological emphases and those of apocalyptic (105). The primary characteristic of apocalyptic thought is its delineation of the two ages; this age and the age to come (106). The coming of the new age represents a complete break with the present one. There is no continuity of historical processes, for the coming of the new age "marks God's breaking into the historical sequence in fresh, unrepeatable, supernatural terms" (107). Paul, on the other hand, has largely overcome this dualism, in that for him the new age had already come through the Person and work of Christ. In this sense then the two ages exist side by side. Indeed, it would be more correct to say that they exist face to face. The final judgment remains for the apostle as with the apocalypticists (108), but it is more intimately related to the events taking

(105) Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol.6, 1953, pp.136-155.

F.C. Porter has an article with similar arguments entitled 'The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of St. Paul', J.B.L., Vol.41, 1922, pp.183-204.

(106) הַיָּמִין and הַיָּמִין. The first is characterised by revolt against God, and in the second God asserts his authority and punishes the wicked and rewards the faithful.

(107) Barrett, *ibid.* p.138. This does not mean however that apocalyptic has no concern with history. cf. F.C. Burkitt's reference to Daniel's 'philosophy of universal history', and his quotation from Edwyn Bevan's 'Jerusalem under the High Priest' (p.86): "the great Gentile kingdoms...are shown as phases in a world process whose end is the Kingdom of God". F.C. Burkitt, 'Jewish and Christian Apocalypses', p.7.

(108) cf. F.C. Burkitt, *ibid.* "The doctrine of the Apocalypses is the doctrine of the Last Judgment", p.2.

place now.

"The last judgment was the final event in history, and it would disclose the true character of men and the meaning of their existence; but this disclosure was already in part made in the Gospel" (109).

Thus the present was viewed eschatologically; the events in which one participated, the decisions one made, the relationships one established, were all to be judged in the light of the fact that Christ had come, and therefore the Kingdom had come, and therefore these were the last days.

"In short, Paul, like most other Jews of his day, conceived of salvation in eschatological terms, but for him the eschatological process had already begun. The 'last time', which was to define the meaning of the whole series, had been expanded into a complex whole including both the death and exaltation of Jesus, historical events which were fundamental to Paul precisely because he looked on them as not merely events within history but as eschatological events due to God's breaking into the world in love and judgment, and also his return in glory for final judgment, to inaugurate his reign" (110).

Do these judgments hold true for the eschatology of the Thessalonian letters? Surely without exception they are applicable. What he has to say about the Parousia is said in order to bring the present experience of the Thessalonian Christians within the orbit of the new age. He wants them to live their life now as those who belong to that new age, and he holds forth the promise of the Parousia to that end. Thus he appeals to it in order to encourage the Christian virtues of moral purity, brotherly love, and diligence in work (see pp.200-202 above). Their concern about the time of the

(109) Barrett, *ibid.*, p.146. cf. here John 3.18-21.

(110) Barrett, *ibid.*, pp.146-7. cf. also Porter, p.193: "...the age to come has already dawned for the Christian. Its powers he has already experienced, and its glories possessed".

Parousia provides him with an opportunity to emphasise that the present time is the time to prepare for that event; a preparedness understood in terms of faith, hope, and love (see above pp.217-219). But it is in his answer to their query about the state of the dead at the Parousia that places the greatest stress on the continuity between the present time and the future time for the Christian. Continuity, indeed, is the theme of this answer, for life, death, and Parousia are all described in terms of being in Christ and being with Christ (see above pp.210-213). And even in 2 Thessalonians, where the apostle stands accused of excessive apocalypticism, his primary aim is to turn the face of the Thessalonian church to present responsibilities (see pp. 231-233 above). F.C. Porter has written about Pauline eschatology in general in a way most appropriate to these passages: "

"...that which we hope for we already possess... Paul charges his disciples to become what in reality they are, to walk by the Spirit by which they live, and urges them to strive for the goal to which they are destined...There is scarcely any analogy in the literature of apocalyptic to the way in which Paul undertakes as man's own purpose and responsibility all that for which he also hopes from the purpose and manifest coming and act of God" (111).

This, then, is the frame of reference for Paul's use of the term 'parousia' in the Thessalonian Epistles (112). Paul

- - - - -

(111) *ibid.* p.204. cf. Barrett, p.145: "Christians, then, as far as they live in and by the Spirit, are partially anticipating the blessed life for which they still look, and hope, the more earnestly because they have already tasted its bliss.

(112) cf. our conclusion about the use of the term in Mt.24, pp.189-194 above: the burden that the term bears "is not the burden of an apocalyptic concern with signs but of an

does not use it within the framework of apocalyptic, but within the framework of the pastorate. He lacks the apocalypticists' curiosity about the details of the end, but he bears the pastor's burden for the spiritual welfare of his people in the present. Through the promise of the Parousia he seeks to provide the necessary motivation for effective Christian living in the present; offering comfort to the anxious, adequate resources to the fearful, and assurance to the doubting.

(112) (Cont'd.) --- eschatological concern with the present".

It is of interest to note at this juncture that E.E. Ellis, 'Paul's Use of the Old Testament', Edinburgh, 1957, finds only two 'near' quotations from non-canonical literature in all of Paul's writings: Enoch 62.4 (1 Thess.5.3) and Test. Levi 6.11 (1 Thess.2.16). He is convinced that neither involves a direct reference. F.C. Porter states that Paul has some 36 O.T. references introduced by the formula γέγραπται (or some variation thereof), with 9 from the Pentateuch, 16 from the Prophets, and 10 from the Psalms and Job. Other O.T. references without any such formula involve 34 from the Pentateuch, 33 from the Prophets (22 of these are from Isaiah), and 29 from the Hagiographa (with 24 of these from the Psalms). Thus there are no quotations from Daniel, only one from Ezekiel, one from Zechariah (the apocalyptic sections are ignored), and one non-eschatological reference in Joel. There is one allusion in 2 Thess.2.3-12 to Dan.11.36f. He concludes: "It is certainly an extraordinary fact that the Book of Daniel, which has so important a place in the Gospels and in Revelation, has practically no value for Paul in his search through the Scriptures", p.188.

B 'Parousia' in 1 Corinthians 15

The term 'parousia' occurs in that section of 1 Corinthians 15 in which the apostle gives an outline of the events that precede and follow the second advent. He has prior to this section already affirmed the fact of the resurrection of Christ by means of a parade of witnesses whose testimony is to be regarded as beyond dispute (vv.1-11). He has also demonstrated the consequences of denying the fact of the resurrection (vv.12-19). But at the beginning of this 'parousia' section he once more affirms the fact - doubtless on the basis of the witnesses already mentioned - and then proceeds to develop the consequents of that fact in terms of the Parousia and the resurrection of believers that attends the Parousia, which Event heralds the conquest of the last Enemy Death, and the subjugation of all things to God the Father through Jesus Christ.

There are two factors here which are most noteworthy in Paul's interpretation of the Parousia and its concomitant events: the first is the way in which the Parousia is rooted in the past event, and represents the culmination of a process now going on (1); and the second is the way in which the Parousia is linked with the resurrection of Christ in providing both a motive for Christian service and sacrifice and a goal for Christian faith and hope.

The Parousia of Christ is rooted in the fact of His resurrection (2). This is a fact that is not stated specifically by the

- - - - -

(1) On pp.235-238 above we have examined the way in which Paul's eschatology emphasises the continuity of the historical processes. For him the events of the end represent the culmination of these processes. This same emphasis is evident here.

(2) We have noted this also with respect to 1 Thessalonians 4.13-18. See above p. 210f.

apostle in the course of his argument, doubtless because he is not here concerned with the Parousia as an event in itself, but rather with that which attends the Parousia, namely the resurrection of the believers and the subjugation of all to God through the agency of Christ(3). The resurrection of the believers is however inseparably linked with the Parousia and this provides us with ground enough for the above claim.

The Parousia is linked with the resurrection of Christ - through the resurrection of believers - first by the term ἀπαρχή . The Christ who rose from the dead is here described as the ἀπαρχή τῶν κεν^μοιμένων (v.20.) The background for this reference is Lev. 23.10-11. Thus in practice on the sixteenth day of Nisam the first sheaf of the harvest was consecrated to God, and by this act the whole harvest was consecrated to God. Thus the whole harvest was involved in the offering of that first sheaf. (4) And the point of course is obvious. The resurrection of Christ is not in any sense an isolated event. Its significance lies in that of which it is a promise; the resurrection of the

(3) See above p. 209.

(4) Paul makes great use of this O.T. practice in a variety of references. In Rom.16.5 and 1 Cor.16.15 the term is used for the first converts of the Gospel in these places. The translation 'converts' in the RSV, V. and the New English Bible seems less than adequate, since it may be assumed that these first 'converts' were intended to be a pledge of more to come. The A.V. had translated simply 'firstfruits'. In Rom. 8.23 it is used with reference to the Spirit, whose indwelling is a 'pledge' of the resurrection of the body. In this sense it is virtually a synonym for ἀπαρχών . It is used with reference to Israel in Rom. 11.16, where - in a rather confusing way - Israel's acceptance by God gives promise of ever greater blessing to the Gentile church. It is used as a variant in 2 Thess. 2.13, and there refers to the Thessalonian Christians as first-fruits. But see footnote 78, p. 224 above. In James 1.18 again it is used of the Christians to indicate that they are the beginning of a new order in God's creation, and in Rev. 14.4 of the one hundred and forty-four thousand as the firstfruits 'for God and the Lamb'.

believers at the Parousia and the final and complete dominion of God. "Hence the Resurrection, of which His is the type and norm and pledge, initiates that glorious era which is decisive for the whole universe, in which God sees His aim attaining complete realisation"(5).

The concept of the two races, to which reference is made in vv. 21-22, again, indirectly, roots the Parousia in the resurrection of Christ. As in Rom. 5.12ff. it is used here to emphasise man's solidarity in sin and its consequences. Because of Adam's sin, in which we are all involved as members of his race, death has come as man's due reward. But now by virtue of the resurrection of Christ a new race of men had come into being, here described as those who are *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* (v.22), a race over which - by virtue of that resurrection - there hangs the promise of life in place of the threat of death - a promise which will be fulfilled at the Parousia. "Hence the risen believers are looked upon as a new family, a new class of lineage, if we may so, in the human race"(6).

(5) H.A.A. Kennedy, 'St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things', p. 235.

(6) H.A.A. Kennedy, *ibid.* p. 235. The range of reference for the second *πάντες* in v.22 is a matter of no little dispute. It has been argued that since the first *πάντες* includes the whole of humanity, the same must be true for the second *πάντες*. Additional support is sought for this universalism in 1 Cor. 15.28, Rom. 5. 12-21, and Eph. 1.10. The arguments to be marshalled against it, however, appear to be quite formidable: 1. the condition of entrance into these two races is quite different; all men by natural birth are members of Adam's race, but only those who have responded to the Gospel are members of the new race in Christ. This is a very consistent aspect of apostolic teaching; e.g., Rom. 6.5-11 makes it plain that union with Christ in His resurrection depends on union with Christ in His death, and in Rom.5.17 in the context of his reference to the two races those who share the benefits of Christ's resurrection are those who

The Parousia is again linked with the resurrection of Christ, this time quite directly, insofar as it marks the culmination of a process begun at the resurrection; the process of bringing all things into subjection to the authority of Christ (vv.24-28) (7).

- - - - -

(6) cont'd "Receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness". 2. the terms which Paul uses here are customarily reserved for believers. *κοιμασθαι* is never applied by Paul to other than believers, and the same may be said for *ζωοποιηθήσονται* (cf. vv. 36,45, and Rom. 8.11). Moreover the use of the phrase *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* in v.22 must indicate that the second *πάντες* refers to *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* of v.23 (see footnote 7below). "In these words there is no question as to the range embraced by the contrasted experiences .. the words of the clause are themselves sufficiently clear to prevent misunderstanding. All his readers know well enough what to be *ἐν Χριστῷ* meant for the apostle. That is the central note of his theology, the point on which everything hinges". So Kennedy, *ibid.* pp.310-311. In truth Paul is traditionally silent about the fate of the unbeliever. "Paul ne parle pas directement de ceux qui ne sont pas 'au Christ'; il suppose toujours, comme le cas normal, qu'un chrétien sera sauvé; et, pur les non-chrétiens, c'est l'affaire de Dieu de s'y reconnaître. "Le P. E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul, 'Première Épître Aux Corinthiens'*, Paris, 1956, p. 407. cf. also 4 Ezra 9.13: "Enquire not further how the ungodly are to be tormented, but rather investigate the manner in which the righteous are to be saved".

(7) There is another problem of major proportions arising out of this text - or imposed upon it, depending on one's exegesis. It has been suggested that this subjugation of hostile powers to the authority of Christ occurs between the resurrection of the just at the Parousia and the End (*τὸ τέλος*). This view is suggested by Hans Leitzmann, 'An Die Korinther 1.11', *Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament*, No. 9, Tübingen, 1949, C.T. Craig, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. 10, New York, 1953, and by A. Schweitzer, 'The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle', E.T. Wm. Montgomery, London, 1931, p. 94f. See E.B. Allo, p. 407, for a list of those who support or oppose this interpretation. Such an interpretation is linked with Rev. 20 (although in the Apocalypse only the martyred saints share in the reign of Christ). cf. 2 Esdras 7.26-30. This leads to the translation of *τὸ τέλος* as 'the rest', 'the remainder': "der Rest, der noch übrige letzte Teil der Menschheit bedeute". So Leitzmann. It necessitates also a doctrine of two resurrections; the resurrection of the just at the Parousia, and the resurrection of the remainder at the end of the Millennial reign. Indeed, Leitzmann finds here some support for universalism: "Sachlich wäre der

(7) cont'd) Hilfsgedanke zu ergänzen, dass die ungläubig Verstorbene im Jenseits, noch vor ihrer Auferstehung bekehrt würden, so dass auch sie ἐν Χριστῷ auferweckt werden könnten". Paul thus at this point is looked upon as enlarging the term ἐν Χριστῷ from its narrower (and mystical) meaning, and making it refer to the command whereby the non-Christian is raised to righteousness. Perhaps it should be said here that Leitzmann is prepared to admit that one does find in Paul the view that believers are lost (1 Cor. 1.18, 2 Cor. 2.15, 16, 4.3, Phil. 1.28, Rom. 9.22), and also that τὸ τέλος is used often with reference to the end of the world (1 Cor. 1.8, 10.11, Mt. 24.13, 14). A. Schweitzer, who lays the blame for the doctrine of the two resurrections at the feet of Paul ("In any case the creator of the doctrine of the two resurrections was Paul" - 'Mysticism' p. 94), claims that Paul is forced to postulate a change for the living at the Parousia because of this doctrine of the two resurrections, since both the dead and the living must enter that Messianic Kingdom "not as a natural being, however ideally enhanced, but as those who by a transformation have taken on the resurrection mode of existence, which is thought of as eternal ... Therefore he communicates it to the Corinthians as a mystery that they are not to enter the Kingdom as flesh and blood, but whether they are at the coming of the Kingdom alive or dead, they shall equally exchange the mortal mode of existence for an immortal one".

Once more it may be said that the arguments against this idea of the two resurrections with an intermediate Messianic reign are quite formidable: 1. εἶτα may certainly allow for an interval, but it is doubtful if it can be made to allow for an interval of the length contemplated here. Kennedy, *ibid.*, argues that εἶτα "by no means presupposes an interval of any duration between the preceding clause and that which it introduces", and by way of support refers to 1 Cor. 15.5, 6, 7, where both εἶτα and ἐπειτα can be made to refer to intervals for a few hours or even days at the most. The same may be said for their use in v. 7 of this same chapter. 2. there is abundant evidence that the reign of Christ has already begun; e.g., Rom. 14.17, Phil. 2.9, Eph. 1.19-23. Allo, *ibid.*, suggests that the present βασιλεύειν indicates that the exercise of authority by the Christ does not start at the Parousia, and T.C. Edwards, 'A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians', London, 1897, suggests that there is a Kingdom implied in the words οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and he continues: "The reign of Christ therefore is not a millenium of peace, but a perpetual conflict ending in a final triumph". H.A.A. Kennedy, *ibid.*, p. 329, writes: "He has left behind him the Messianic hope of Judaism. The rule of Christ has begun with His exaltation as Κύριος, Lord; He already sits on the throne, and His advent at the last is simply the culmination of His sway". 3. there is also evidence to suggest that judgment takes place at the Parousia, leaving no room for nor any point to a second resurrection. cf. 2 Thess. 1.7-10, 2.8, Rom. 2.5-10, and of course 1 Cor. 15.51ff.

In the course of this struggle, carried on between His resurrection and His Parousia, he subdues all the foes of God, here summed up in the categories ἀρχή and ἐξουσία and δύναμις (8). The last enemy that is to be destroyed is death - and that receives its death-blow at the Parousia, when the believers are resurrected (9). Then when His rule is absolute, it is given over to the One who alone may be absolute (10).

Thus oncemore we have seen how Paul eliminates the dualism that is so characteristic of apocalyptic literature by rooting the Parousia in the present and making it beyond question the final act in the divine activity that began with the coming of Christ.

The Parousia is also linked with the resurrection of Christ in providing a motive for Christian service and sacrifice and a goal for Christian faith and hope. One of the arguments that Paul has used against those who have denied the resurrection is the implications which such a denial would have for Christian faith and practice (vv.13-19). Without the resurrection preaching and faith are both κενός, and they are found to be false witnesses

(8) In themselves these terms do not necessarily indicate evil powers; e.g. Eph. 1.21, 3.10, Col. 1.16. But the use of τοὺς ἐχρούς in v.25 clearly identifies them.

(9) cf. how death is almost personified here; when 'he' is overcome, then Christ's victory is complete. See Isa. 25.8, Hos. 13.14, 4 Ezra 8.53, Rev. 20.14.

(10) This is a consistent Pauline theme. c.f. Eph.1.10, where it is stated that it is the divine intention "to sum up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) all things in Christ, the things in heaven and the things in earth". cf. also Rom. 11.36, Eph.4.6, and (with reference to Christ) Col.1.19,20. "...repeatedly we find St. Paul emphasising the fact that God, as Father, is both the source and the ultimate goal of all things". H.A.A. Kennedy, *ibid.* p. 339.

against God (11). Such a possibility would leave them of all men most to be pitied. This thought is carried forward into Paul's own personal experience in vv.30-32. His venturing on behalf of the Gospel is a futile exercise indeed if there be no resurrection. If Death still holds dominion then better by far to make the most of this life by fulfilling the body's wants and desires.

And yet not alone from the resurrection of Christ - but from the consequents of the resurrection; i.e., the Parousia and its concomitant events. If life is meaningless without the resurrection of Christ, then it might also be said that the resurrection of Christ is meaningless without the Parousia and the resurrection of the believers that attends the Parousia. Indeed, Paul takes it for granted that the one follows the other, and never gives a moment's thought to the possibility that the resurrection of Christ might have any meaning in and of itself. Thus the resurrection of Christ does not in itself provide the basis for Christian faith and practice, but rather the resurrection of the believers that occurs at the Parousia. "That Christ rose Himself as firstfruits is not enough to transform the present into the new, spiritual mode of existence.

(11) κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ may mean simply 'respecting' or 'about' God. But since the testimony of the apostles concerning the resurrection of Christ would be a deliberate falsehood about the divine activity if Christ is not risen, then it could be regarded as a witness against God. So T.C. Edwards, *ibid*, cf. James 3.14, Mark 14.56.

His second coming also in necessary."(12)

This factor receives additional emphasis in vv.51-56, where Paul is really answering the question asked in v.35. The Parallelism between this and 1 Thess. 4.13-18 is very noticeable, although the problem to be faced in each congregation was not identical. In Thessalonica the fear was that those who had died prior to the Parousia would not share fully in the rewards that attend the Parousia. Here the problem was: since flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom, how can those who are alive at the Parousia enter it? His answer is that all will be changed - and the terms used leave no doubt about the event that effects the change: ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι (v.52) (13). Thus at the Parousia, when the dead are raised and

(12) T.C. Edwards, *ibid.* It would perhaps be unwise to try to make too much of the phrase ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ. That it might be intended to emphasise some kind of involvement in that Parousia would not be surprising, in view of the usual Pauline emphasis on the believer's involvement in Christ's death and His resurrection and His life. Indeed, as we have seen, even the dead are 'in Christ'. T.C. Edwards claims that this phrase means more than simply 'at the time of His coming', but rather 'as a result of' His coming. "The manifestation of Christ's glory brings with it the manifestation of the glory of His people. At present our glory is hidden, because His is so". So H.L. Goudge, 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', Westminster Commentaries, London, 1926.

(13) cf. 1 Thess. 4.16 ff. T.C. Edwards, *ibid.*, comments: "nothing less can bring it to pass than the immediate operation of God's power", and he continues, with reference to the use of the trumpet imagery here: "... (it) signifies that this will be the last manifestation of God to men in this earthly condition". It may be noted that the order of events in the Thess. letter and in this letter is the same: the sudden summons, at which the dead are raised and the living are changed. It is therefore all the more difficult to understand the claim made by F.C. Bauer to the effect that 1 Thess. 4.13-18 'goes far beyond what is taught in' 1 Cor. 15 (See above p. 204).

the living are changed, the last enemy, Death, is destroyed (14).

And what should be the end result of all of this? The answer is made plain enough. 'Therefore' (15) do not let any denial of the resurrection rob your faith of its content or its power. Why? Because you know that the work you do, the service you render, the sacrifice you offer, will not be in vain. Without the resurrection of Christ and its consequences preaching is vain and faith is empty. But with it both preaching and faith are filled with meaning. Indeed, there is a sense in which the whole argument of 1 Corinthians 15 centres around the worthwhileness of present activity. And this present activity is worthwhile because the Parousia - with its promises - is as certain as the resurrection of Christ.

(14) v.55 is a quotation from Hos. 13.14. Paul has altered two words: for δίκη he has νίκος, and for ἄδη he has θάνατε .

(15) ὥστε is used commonly by Paul to drive home the practical and immediate result of his argument. cf. 7.38, 10.12, 14.39.

(16) See below p. 230, n. 3.

(17) So Robertson and Plummer, *ibid.*

C The Non-Eschatological References

Paul makes use of the term 'parousia' on five occasions without any eschatological context whatever. Although the uses to which he puts this term on these five occasions offer little to our understanding of the word, nonetheless the fact that he does use the term in these non-eschatological senses is not without some significance, as we shall see later in this thesis (16).

On four of these five occasions the term is used with reference to the significance of the presence, or absence, of certain people with Paul, or of Paul with certain congregations. The emphasis is on the comfort or the incentive that is gained from the presence or absence of the people concerned. Thus its use here is very reminiscent of the references from the classical literature on p. 12 f. above.

1 Cor. 16.17

χαίρω δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ Στεφανάου καὶ Φορτυνάτου καὶ Ἀχαιοῦ, ὅτι τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν.

"I rejoice at the coming of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus, because they have made up for your absence" (RSV.).

The emphasis in the context is on the significance of their arrival, or their presence, on the spirit of the Apostle. It has been suggested that 'parousia' is used here to draw attention to the official character of their visit (17). Certainly

(16) See below p. 280 .n.3.

(17) So Robertson and Plummer, *ibid.*

Paul regards their visit as official, insofar as he interprets their arrival as indicative of the concern of the Corinthian congregation for him. There is an antithesis between the ὑστέρημα and the παρουσία .

"The presence of these brethren supplied the want which the Apostle felt in consequence of his absence from Corinth" (18).

The term is used in identical fashion in

2 Cor. 7.6-7

ἀλλ' ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ Τίτου· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει ἣ παρεκλήθη ἐφ' ὑμῖν

"But God, who comforts the downcast, comforted us by the coming of Titus, and not only by his coming, but also by the comfort with which he was comforted in you..." (R.S.V.).

The news that Titus has brought the Apostle about the Corinthian congregation and its changed attitude to him is the source of the comfort that he gains from Titus' visit. The rift which had occurred between the pastor and his congregation - a rift arising out of a very sharp letter previously sent (19) - now shows signs of being healed (v.7). It is of interest to note that παρακαλέω is used twice here in relationship to the term 'parousia' (20).

- (18) T. C. Edwards, *ibid.* ἢ A K L have ὑμῶν τὸ ὑστέρημα; B C D E F G M P have τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα cf. here Rom. 1.11, 12, 1 Thess. 2.17.
- (19) Probably 6.14-7.1.
- (20) See above p. 12f., especially footnote 22.

Again in Philippians Paul makes reference to the aid and comfort which his presence might bring to that congregation:

Phil. 1.26

ἵνα τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
ἐν ἐμοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς
ὑμᾶς.

"..so that in me you may have ample cause to glory in Christ Jesus, because of my coming to you again" (R. S. V.)

Paul at this point is facing a dilemma; whether to 'depart' in order that he might be 'with Christ', or to 'remain' for their sake (vv.23-24). He decides that it is better for them that he 'remain', so that they might show greater progress in their faith. His 'parousia' therefore was to be the means whereby they might glory all the more in Christ (21).

Again in this same letter he uses the term with reference to the significance his presence might have for them in terms of their Christian faith and practice.

Phil. 2.12

Ὡστε, ἀγαπητοί μου, καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε,
μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ
μαλλον ἐν τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ μου

"Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, so now, not only as in my presence but much more in my absence, work out your own salvation....." (R. S. V.).

(21) ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is to be taken with περισσεύῃ and not with καύχημα. Their glorying is to abound in Christ Jesus. "The first ἐν notes the sphere in which their pride lives; the second the object in which it rests". So J. B. Lightfoot, 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians', London and Cambridge, 1873.

(22) It is difficult to know whether μὴ ὡς μόνον is to be taken with ὑπηκούσατε or κατεργάζεσθε. The New English Bible translation takes it with the former. The use of μὴ however would seem to favour the latter. ἀπουσία is a common antithesis for παρουσία.

Here however the Apostle is urging them to act independently of any incentive that might be afforded by his presence (22).

In a different category is Paul's use of 'parousia' in 2 Cor. 10.10.

ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενῆς καὶ ὁ λόγος
ἐξουθενημένος.

"...but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account" (RSV.).

The contrast is being drawn between the authority apparent in his letters and the lack of authority in his presence. Paul is anxious to point out that what authority he possesses is his because he belongs to Christ (v.7) and because he was the instrument of their spiritual rebirth (11.1). This authority of his however was intended not for their domination but for their edification (10.8). There is no particular significance to be attached to the term here. He has already used a variety of terms to express his presence or absence, and doubtless 'parousia' is used at this point simply by way of variety (23).

(23) παρὸν (v.2), ἀπόντες and παρόντες (v.12).

- VII -

THE TERM 'PAROUSIA' IN THE NON-PAULINE EPISTLES

A. 'PAROUSIA' in the Epistle of James

The term 'parousia' is used twice in the letter of James, in the passage 5.7-11. Here it is used within the context of the author's concern for his readers 'patience', 'endurance', and forbearance'. His appeal to the Parousia of Christ is made on behalf of specific needs among those to whom he writes.

It is of course quite impossible to reconstruct the situation to which this letter is addressed, since in both language and content it is of a most general nature(1). Rather than attempt to do this, we intend to examine the themes of patience, and forbearance in the light of the language used, in the hope that such an examination may throw some light on the content of the term 'parousia' and the use which the author makes of it.

1. The appeal for patience and endurance.

There are two words used here to express the attitude on the part of his readers for which the author hopes. These two are μακροθυμέω , with the substantive μακροθυμία and ὑπομένω , with the substantive ὑπομονή. These two are used together in Colossians 3.11. In his commentary on that Epistle J.B. Lightfoot makes the following distinction between

(1) This section has been ascribed by those who accept the theory, to the 'Letter of Jacob' which they claim forms the basis of this Epistle. On this basis therefore it cannot be regarded as the work of the Christian editor. This is an issue that lies beyond the scope of this thesis, but it may be said here that the appeal to the Parousia of Christ must at least be regarded as the work of the Christian editor. Thus even if, as has on occasion been stated, the concept underlying the term ὑπομονή is basically Stoic, it surely must become something quite different from that concept when it is rooted in the Christian understanding of the Parousia of Christ.

these two words:

"While ὑπομονή is the temper which does not easily succumb under suffering, μακροθυμία is the self-restraint which does not easily retaliate a wrong. The one is opposed to cowardice or despondency, the other to wrath or revenge --- while ὑπομονή is closely allied to hope (1 Thess. 1.3), μακροθυμία is commonly connected with mercy (e.g. Exod.24.6)". (2)

R.C. Trench has said the same thing a little differently.

" μακροθυμία will be found to express patience in respect of persons, ὑπομονή in respect of things. The man μακροθυμεῖ, who, having to do with injurious persons, does not suffer himself easily to be provoked by them, or to blaze up into anger (2 Tim.4.2). The man ὑπομένει, who, under a great siege of trials, bears up, and does not lose heart or courage (Rom.5.3, 2 Cor.1.6, cf. Clement of Rome, 1 Ep., Section 5)." (3)

μακροθυμία appears in the Apocryphal literature almost entirely with the meaning 'patience', although on occasion it is used as a synonym for ὑπομονή and clearly means 'endurance' (4). It maintains the meaning 'patience' in the canonical books of the LXX, where it may refer either to God or to man (5). It is used on several occasions in the New Testament of the patience of God in the face of the provocation afforded by man (6), and once of the patience of Christ (7). When in the New Testament it is used

- (2) J.B. Lightfoot, 'St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon', New York, 1892. They are also used in the same context in 2 Tim.3.11 and 2 Cor.4.4,6, and this same distinction would appear to be valid in both instances.
- (3) R.C. Trench, 'Synonyms of the New Testament', p. 191.
- (4) With the meaning 'patience' see Sir.5.11, Psa. Sol. 2.40, Test. XII Patr. Jos.10.1, 1 Macc.8.4. However in 4 Macc.1.11 it is used with the meaning 'endurance' where one would expect ὑπομονή, since the latter term is used in this book ten times with the meaning 'endurance'.
- (5) Of man-Prov.25.15, of God-Jer.15.15.
- (6) Rom.2.4, 9.22, 1 Peter 3.20, 2 Peter 3.15.
- (7) 1 Tim.1.16.

of the patience required of the Christian man it is intimately associated with the virtues of humility, gentleness, forbearance, charitableness, kindness, thus accentuating the idea of patience in the face of possible provocation(8). It would seem reasonable therefore to assume that in this passage the author of the Epistle of James is looking for the patience required in the face of the ordinary discords of human relationships and daily living(9).

ὑπομονή has several shades of meaning in the Apocryphal literature and in the Canonical books of the LXX. The primary meaning is that of 'endurance', especially in the face of external threat and persecution(10). There are several instances when it has more the meaning 'expectation' or 'hope'(11). These two meanings are not unrelated, since the one gives ground for the other. In the New Testament, where both the substantive and the verb are common, the meaning 'endurance' predominates. Indeed in most cases it is used, directly or indirectly, in relation to

- (8) 2 Cor.6.6, Gal.5.22, Eph.4.2., Col.1.11, 3.12, 2 Tim.3.10, Heb.6.12. In 2 Tim.4.2 it is used with this meaning in the context of the Christian hope.
- (9) J.H. Ropes, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James', New York, 1916, regards this as patience required in the face of the privations, anxieties, and sufferings "incident to the ordinary life of men".
- (10) It has this meaning exclusively in 4 Maccabees, where it is used ten times with reference to the courageous endurance of 'Eleazer, and the Seven Brethren, and the Mother', in the face of the tortures administered by the 'Tyrant'. cf. also Psa.38.7, Sir.16.13, 17.24.
- (11) This is especially noticeable in Jer.14.8 and 17.13. The root of the Hebrew is נָּוָה , with the substantive נִוְוָה , which has the meaning 'to wait', 'to hope'. cf. also 1 Chron.29.15, Job.14.19, Psa.9.18. 70.5. (Where in the LXX is used with ἐλπὶς), Sir.2.14.41.2.
- ὑπομονή

Persecution, either actual or potential (12). While in the New Testament it never has the meaning 'expectation' or 'hope' it is used quite extensively within the context of the Christian hope, and regarded as one of the primary fruits of that hope (13).

It is its association with persecution in both the non-canonical Jewish literature and in the New Testament that leads one to suspect that the mind of the author was not far removed from the thought of persecution when he wrote to his readers in this section. There is a parallel reference in 1.2-4 where ὑπομονή is used twice. This virtue, which is probably best translated 'steadfastness' at this point, is called for in the face of the πειρασμοὶ which beset the readers. Since this term may be used of external trials and of inner temptations to evil, it cannot really help to identify the factors that require ὑπομονή (14). Thus while one cannot rule out the possibility that the author is thinking of temptation in the ordinary sense of that term (15), nonetheless the usage outlined above makes it more likely that he was thinking of some form of external pressure that required steadfastness on the part of his readers.



- (12) cf. Lk.21.19, Rom. 5.3,4, 2 Cor. 1.6.7, 6.4, 12.12, 2 Tim. 3.10, Rev. 1.9, 2.2,3, 3,10, 14.12. The verb is used in connection with persecution in Mt. 10.22, 24.13, Mk. 13.13, 2 Tim. 2.10, 12, Heb. 10.32, 1 Peter 2.20.
- (13) It is used directly within the context of the Christian hope in Rom. 5.3,4, 8.24,25, 15.4,5, 2 Cor. 1.6,7, 1 Thess. 1.3, Heb. 10.36, and indirectly in Rom. 2.7, Col.1.11, 1 Tim. 6.11, Heb. 12.1. C. J. Ellicott, commenting on the combination of ὑπομονή with ἐλπίς in 1 Thess. 1.3, states that in some cases ὑπομονή seems to occupy the place of ἐλπίς. ὑπομένω is also used within the context of that hope in Mt. 10.22, 24.13, Mk. 13.13, 1 Cor. 13.7, 2 Tim. 2.10,12.
- (14) In the Old Testament πειράζω stands almost always for לָבַח and πειρασμός for the derivative לְבַח , which words are used for various kinds of trying, but especially of man by God and of God by man. So F.J.A. Hort, 'The Epistle of St. James', London, 1909. See also Lc. 22.28, Acts 20.19, Mt. 6.13, 1 Tim. 6.9.
- (15) Joseph Chaine, in his 'L'Épître De Saint Jaques', Deuxième Edition, Études Bibliques, Paris, 1927, sees the trials and temptations as emanating from the riches that are in evidence and the injustices that stem from them.

2. The appeal for forbearance.

It would appear from this letter that for reasons unstated its readers were in the habit of passing judgment rather too willingly one upon the other(16). The cause of their complaining (17) cannot be determined from the text(18), and, fortunately, is not required for our purposes. It is enough to note that the writer must appeal for a cessation of this mutual recrimination, and that he bases that appeal on the fact - and the nearness - of the Parousia.

Thus within the context of the term 'parousia' the writer of this Epistle appeals for steadfastness and patience in the face of trials and temptations, and for forbearance in place of censoriousness and judgment. In the process of making that appeal, he looks in two directions; to the past and to the future. His appeal to the past encompasses both the prophets and Job. It is the endurance and the patience of the prophets that provide him with the needed example(19). His appeal to the prophets

- (16) This issue is raised in 1.26, 2.12, 3.1-10,14, and especially in 4.11-12. In this last reference the writer accuses those who judge of setting themselves above the law, since the law forbids such activity. J.B. Mayor, 'The Epistle of St. James', London, 1897, comments: "Thus he who speaks against a brother virtually speaks against the law of brotherhood".
- (17) The verb is στενάζω, 'to groan against', 'to complain of someone'. cf. Heb.13.17.
- (18) B.S. Easton, in 'The Interpreter's Bible', suggests that it is probably the product of the hardship they are called upon to endure. The same suggestion is made by J.H. Ropes, *ibid.* For a similar comment on a previous passage see above p.32 note 60.
- (19) The new term here is κακοπάθεια, which might be translated either as 'hardship' or 'endurance'. J.H. Ropes translates "of hardship coupled with patience". For the cognate verb see 2 Tim.4.5. cf. also Mal.1.13, 2 Macc.2.26,27, 4 Macc.9.8.

follows a well-established pattern(20), and of course the steadfastness of Job was proverbial(21). The fact that the writer uses the prophets and Job as examples of endurance and patience under suffering has convinced some that this section is the work of a Jew, taken over and altered by a Christian Jew(22). But while there is no appeal to the Passion of Christ, there is an appeal to the Parousia of Christ(23), and that appeal takes account not only of the fact of the Parousia but of its nearness (24). This is regarded as ground for endurance, firmness of heart(25), and forbearance. It is the ground for patience and endurance and firmness of heart because it gives promise of vindication and reward for those who must now suffer trial and tempta-

- (20) cf. Mt.5.12, 23.34, Luk.11.49, Acts7.52, Heb.11.32. It is this that makes it unlikely that the writer has Christian prophets in mind, although the possibility cannot be dismissed completely. The phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου translates יהוה יהוה as in Mic.4.5, Dan.9.6 (Θ), or with ἐπί in place of ἐν, Jer.11.21, 20.9, cf. Acts4.17-18.
- (21) 'steadfastness' seems to be a more suitable translation, in the light of the usage outlined above, and in the light of the obvious impatience of Job. cf. Job.1.21, 2.10. J. Chaine, *ibid.*, suggests that ἠκούσατε is probably an allusion to the lectures and instructions of the synagogue.
- (22) e.g., B.S. Easton in the 'Interpreter's Bible'. One cannot but wonder why a Christian editor would not add such an appeal at this point, if it is to be assumed that a Christian writer would do so almost automatically.
- (23) J. Chaine comments here: "...aimait-il mieux parler de la gloire transcendante du Messie(2.1) ou de son retour triomphant(5.7-11) que de sa souffrance".
- (24) The use of ἠγγικεν here is especially reminiscent of Mt.24.33. cf. also Lk.21.28, Mt.3.12, Mk.1.15, Heb.10.25, 1 Peter 4.7, and cf. 2 Peter 3.4.
- (25) στήριξατε καρδίας is a common O.T. expression. It is יָצַד לְעַלְמָא in the Hebrew. Judges 19.5, Eccli.6.37, 22.16. cf. Psa.Sol. 16.12. cf. also its use with 'parousia' in 1 Thess.3.13.

tation(26). It is the ground of forbearance in place of judgment because swiftness in judgment now will mean swiftness in judgment on that day - and the Judge is at the door(27).

Thus the appeal to the Parousia of Christ in this letter conforms to an already well-established pattern. The writer's concern is not that of the apocalypticist with the future, but of the Pastor with the present. The appeal aims at providing strength for the demands of the present, and a motive for the creation of the right kind of relationship within the fellowship of the Church.

(26) This surely is the meaning of the analogy found in v.7. cf. Psa.126.5,6, Mt.13.30, 24.32, John 4.35 ff., 1 Cor.3.5-9, Gal.6.7, 2 Tim.2.6.

(27) "Even to the brethren the Coming is a warning as well as comfort and encouragement", J.B. Mayor, *ibid.* ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε is reminiscent of Mt.7.1 and Lk.6.37.

B The Term 'Parousia' in 1 John

The term 'parousia' occurs in the Johannine Epistles only in 1 John 2.28. Since the term is ordinarily associated with the more 'primitive' Christian eschatology, its presence in a body of literature which is characterized by a more 'spiritualized' eschatology seems somewhat surprising (1). The word which comes closest to it in meaning in the Johannine vocabulary is the word φανερώω (2). It is used by the author of the Epistle with reference to Christ's first advent in 1.2, 3.5,8, and 4.9, and with reference to His second advent in 2.28 and 3.2, and in a more general sense in 2.19 (3). This word is

(1) The problem of the authorship of the Johannine literature, and the related problem of the relationship between the Gospel and the First Epistle, lie beyond the scope of this thesis. Whether one accepts the conclusion of B. F. Westcott, 'The Epistle of St. John', London, 1883 ("The writing is so closely connected with the Fourth Gospel in vocabulary, style, thought, scope, that these two books cannot but be regarded as works of the same author" p. xxx), or that of C. H. Dodd, 'The Johannine Epistles', The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London, 1947 ("The simplest hypothesis, however, seems to be that the author of the Epistle was a disciple of the Evangelist and a student of his work" p. lvi), or whether one assigns the Epistle to the last decade of the first century or the first decade of the second century, will have little effect on our study of the term 'parousia' in this Epistle.

(2) This word is used nine times in the Gospel.

(3) George G. Findlay, 'Fellowship in the Life Eternal', London, 1909, has perhaps stretched the point just a little when he suggests that the first half of the Epistle sets forth Christ's φανερώσις in terms of His first advent (cf. 1.2 ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη) and the second half sets forth His φανερώσις in terms of His second advent (2.28, 3.2 ἐὰν φανερωθῇ), but the suggestion does pay fitting tribute to the author's use of the word in his Epistle. One can agree however with his statement that "the first is that from which faith springs, the second is that to which hope looks; the first that which begins, the second that which completes the victory of God's light and love over human sin". p. 331-2. See above p. 235 ff., where an examination is made of the eschatology of the Pauline letters and apocalyptic.

indicative of the Johannine view of history and of eschatology, since the coming of Christ in His first advent made visible to men that which existed previously (4) and His second advent will make plain the position which believers now occupy before God (5).

"History is manifestation; each of its successive events being merely the emergence into visibility of that which already exists". (6).

The term 'parousia' may be made to share something of this meaning in this Epistle, at least indirectly. This becomes evident in 3.1,2, where - although the term *φανερόω* is used - the result of Christ's 'parousia' is stated. The author has emphasised the status which as believers they now occupy before God. They are now *τέκνα Θεοῦ*, and this fact is stressed with the addition of *καὶ ἐσθέν*, and repeated in v.2. It is also evident that the author thinks of this sonship primarily in ethical terms. The evidence for this is found in abundance throughout the Epistle (7), and is stated clearly in the immediate context in 2.29 and 3.3-10. And that sonship is recognizable in the fact that they do what is righteous (2.29).

(4) See 1.2, and John 1.1-18.

(5) See 3.2.

(6) Robert Law, 'The Tests of Life', Edinburgh, 1909, p. 315.

John deals with the theme of judgment in similar fashion. Judgment for him is something which takes place now on the basis of man's reaction to Christ. cf. John 3.18, 9.39, 12.47, and in 1 John judgment is based on the presence or absence of righteousness, 2.29, 3.4-10, 15, 17, 24, 4.6, 5.2, 3. Such judgment "in its essence...is self-revelation, self-classification, self-separation", Law, *ibid.*, p. 330. There is still a place for a future judgment, which makes manifest the reality of this present judgment. See 2.28, 3.2, 4.17.

(7) See especially 5.2, 18. cf. also 2.6, 9-11, 15, 3.14-19, 24, 4.7, 12, 16, 21, 5.3.

"The presence of righteous acts is the sure sign of the reality of the divine birth". (8).

These righteous acts bear witness to their relationship with the Father who is righteous. (9) Now it is this that will be made manifest at the Parousia. This sonship which the believer now enjoys, and which is made evident in a life of righteousness, will be brought to its completion. The believer, who now seeks the righteousness that is characteristic of the Father, will then realize that righteousness in all its fullness (10).

It may also be said that like the Johannine eschatology generally, the term 'parousia' is here stripped of all its more vivid concomitants. Here there is no mention of the cosmic events that ordinarily accompany it; the disturbances in the heavens, the trumpet summons, the dissolution of the heavens and the earth. We have already noted however that these

(8) B. F. Westcott, *ibid.*

(9) 2.29. The immediate reference of δίκαιός here is somewhat ambiguous. In the light of v.28 the reference would appear to be Christ. Difficulty is created however by the use of the phrase ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται, since the idea of being born of Christ is foreign to the New Testament, and certainly to this Epistle. cf. 3.9, 4.7, 5.1,4,18. Thus it is difficult to see the point in F. W. Brooke's argument that the reference here must be to Christ, since it is not 'antagonistic' to John's thought. One can only judge on the basis of the precedents established, and there is no precedent for it here. It is more reasonable to assume, with G. G. Findlay, *ibid.*, pp. 236-7, that "the writer makes the transition of subject subconsciously".

(10) So 3.2 ὁμοιοὶ αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα. John 17.24 may be the basis for this statement. cf. also Phil. 3.21, Col. 3.4. The most obvious reference for αὐτῷ is the Θεοῦ of the previous sentence. And yet this would be contrary to the main thrust of Biblical witness, since men do not look upon the face of God, but 'see' Him only through His manifestations. See Rom. 1.20, Col. 1.15, John 1.18, 14.9, 17.24. "Always in the New Testament it is the attainment of likeness to Christ, never to God, that stands as the splendid goal of Christian hope." So R. Law, *ibid.* p. 334, n.1.

more spectacular concomitants are not of primary importance even in those passages where they do accompany the term, and it is not surprising that in this context and with the writer's viewpoint they have been quietly dropped.

The term does however share in the more customary concomitants that have now become familiar:

1. It is here linked with the idea of the Antichrist and of the approaching end of the world (11). This is the first time that this term has been used in New Testament literature, although of course the idea itself has been prominent enough (12). Here the idea is 'spiritualized' insofar as it is identified with an attitude to the Person of Christ. It is associated with the lie that asserts that Jesus is not the Christ (13), and becomes personified in those who make this assertion, so that there is not just one antichrist but many. In this sense F. W. Brooke is correct when he states that

"The writer's business is with the reality to which the legend points; with the legend itself he has but little to do" (14).

This represents a very logical development of previous usage, since in the New Testament it is customarily associated with false teachers and false teaching, so that the term ἀντίχριστος

(11) 2.18, 4.3.

(12) See above pp. 226, footnote 82.

(13) 2.22, 4.3. This denial also constitutes a denial of the Father, according to 2.23. The basis for this latter statement is probably Mt. 11.27. 1 John 4.2,3 is reminiscent of Matthew's addition to the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi (Mt. 16.16). C. H. Dodd, *ibid.*, on the basis of this claims that the author is here "basing himself upon the common traditions of early Christianity, incorporating the teaching of Jesus Himself" (p.57). This denial of the sonship of Christ is more likely to be the Gnostic denial of the reality of the incarnation than the Jewish denial of the Messianic calling of Jesus.

(14) B. F. Brooke, *ibid.*, p. 79.

is appropriately linked with the terms ψευδόχριστος and ψευδοπροφήτης . It is also linked in both the Synoptics and in 2 Thessalonians with the approaching end of the world. There is no doubt that this is so for 1 John, for the Epistle itself

"is written in full and vivid view of the last things"(15).

2. In spite of the fact that these 'antichrists' herald the end, the time of the end still remains an uncertainty. This is implied in the use of the phrase ἐὰν φανερωθῆ̃ in both 2.28 and 3.2. The presence of ἐὰν with the subjunctive is not intended to imply doubt about the fact of His coming but uncertainty about the time of His coming (16). It is this uncertainty about the time that calls for diligence now (17).

"The conditions of the time have revived the prospect of the Lord's glorious return...The Christian man...will ask himself, 'What if the Lord should now appear? how should I meet Him, if He appeared to-day; with joy or grief, with shame or rapture'." (18)

3. And finally the hope of the Parousia here, as always, provides the primary impetus to moral and spiritual purity. This

(15) Robert Law, *ibid.*, p. 317.

(16) There is a possibility that ἐὰν φανερωθῆ̃ in 3.2, means 'if what we shall be is manifested', taking up the οὐκ ἐφανερώθη that precedes it. But the same phrase in 2.28, where the reference is clearly to Christ, provides the necessary precedent for interpreting it in this way here.

(17) cf. the καὶ νῦν of 2.28. This is not temporal, but rather shows the result of 2.18 ff. 'In the light of the fact that this is the last hour'. So Brooke, *ibid.* See John 17.5, Acts 3.17 7.34, 13.11, 20.22,25, 22.16, 26.6, 2 John 5.

(18) G. G. Findlay, *ibid.*, p. 233.

is expressed clearly in 2.28 and in 3.3; in 2.28 the nearness of the Parousia calls for renewed diligence in terms of μένεται ἐν αὐτῷ, which in this Epistle is understood largely in terms of doing what is right (19), and which provides the ground for confidence and eliminates any sense of guilt (20), and in 3.3 the hope of the Parousia, with the promise that attends it (3.2), demands of the believer that he ἀγνίξει ἑαυτὸν (21). This latter demand is probably based on the need for purification that is required at any special manifestation of God, like the people before God's manifestation at Mt. Sinai (Ex. 19. 10-11), or like the worshippers before the Passover (John 11.55). The emphasis here however does not lie on the fear of judgment - although this factor is not ignored - but on the promise that the Parousia holds (22).

"The possession of such hope is the strongest incentive to absolute purity...The Christian hope is incompatible with moral indifference" (23).

(19) The phrase ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην (2.29) is a characteristic description of the believer. For other texts see footnote 7 above.

(20) The word παρρησία occurs also in 3.21, 4.17, 5.14. παρρησία is found 13 times in the Johannine corpus, and the idea of boldness or confidence is its most prominent meaning. For its use in the LXX see Lev. 26.13, Job 27.10, Prov. 1.20, 13.5, 3 Macc. 7.12. It is of interest to note that the aorist σχώμεν is used, and Findlay interprets this as indicating that the confidence is experienced at the time of the Advent. The aorist of ἔχω in Rom. 1.13, 2 Cor. 1.15, 2.3, 2 Peter 2.16 seems to indicate not a continued state of mind but "an experience associated with some particular occurrence". So Findlay, *ibid.*, p. 235, footnote 1. ἔχω however have εσχάμεν. The μὴ αἰσχυνοῦμεν is reminiscent of Mk. 8.38 and Mt. 10.32-33. cf. Lk. 12.8-9.

(21) For ἀγνίξω see Exod. 19.10f., Num. 8.21, Jos. 3.5, 1 Es. 7.10. ἅγιος denotes purity maintained with effort. ἀγνός implies absolute and essential purity. God is called ἅγιος but never ἀγνός. Christ is ἀγνός because of His human experience. So David Smith, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. 5, 'The Epistles of John', London, 1910.

(22) "For Christ is our Judge, and Christ is the expression of the divine love, and if we dwell in love there is nothing to frighten us in the thought of seeing Christ (2.28, 4.14-18)". C. H. Dodd, *ibid.*, xxxv.

(23) F. W. Brooke. *ibid.*

One must therefore conclude that the use made of the term 'parousia' in 1 John is not essentially different from its use in Matthew or in Paul or in James. Certainly the external concomitants have gone, but these do not constitute the most important factor even in Matthew or Paul. And that which is basic to its meaning remains; the emphasis on the need for moral and spiritual preparedness in the light of the approaching end.

"The fact that he does speak of it (i.e., the 'parousia') in this way, though but once, and that he lays a solemn stress on the expectation, proves his agreement with the prevalent eschatology of the church",

and that the author was not just concerned with

"a spiritual coming of Christ and a moral and inward judgment effected by His word among men, so that the external Parousia and the great judgment-scene sketched in the Synoptic prophecies and in the preaching of St. Paul were transcended in his doctrine and became superfluous",

but that

"here the Apostle John contemplates the coming of the glorified Jesus to the world in judgment, just as explicitly and formally as did the Apostle Paul" (24).

(24) G. G. Findlay, *ibid.*, pp. 233-234.

C The Term 'Parousia' in 11 Peter

On the assumption that 11 Peter is a pseudepigraphal work written probably during the first quarter of the second century (1), it is our intention to examine its use in this letter to see in what way previous usage has been confirmed and crystallized by this date, and to see what new elements have been introduced.

(1) In spite of the attempts by the author to identify himself with the apostle (see 1.1, 1.14-cf. John 21.18-19-, 1.16-18, 3.1,15), there is fairly general agreement that Peter did not write this epistle. The arguments against the Petrine authorship can be stated briefly: 1. The Patristic references cast great doubt on its authenticity. See here J. E. Huther, 'Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of Peter and Jude', the Meyer N. T. Commentaries, Edinburgh, 1881, p. 260 ff., Charles Bigg, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude', I.C.C. Commentaries, Edinburgh, 1902, pp. 199-215, and Joseph B. Mayor, 'The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter', New York, 1907, p. lxvi ff. Huther concludes his examination of these references thus: "The result of an unbiased examination is, that in Ignatius there are to be found no references to 11 Peter; in Clemens Rom., Barnabas, and Polycarp, none in any way probable; in Justin Martyr, Hermas, and Theophilus, none certain; and further, that Irenaeus cannot be looked upon as a guarantee for the existence and authority of the epistle in the church" (pp. 265-6). 2. The differences in vocabulary and style in the two epistles bearing the name of Peter. C. Bigg, *ibid.*, has outlined these differences - and similarities - quite explicitly on pp. 224-232. He, of course, explains the differences in terms of a different amanuensis. 3. The fact that one of the primary aims of the epistle is to answer those who denied the fact of the Parousia itself (if the Libertines of chapter two are the scoffers of chapter three then this is the primary aim of the epistle). We have seen how the delay of the Parousia had caused difficulties before: in Thessalonica the death of some of Christ's contemporaries had raised problems about their fate, and in Corinth there were problems about the fate of the living at the Parousia, but in neither case is there any evidence of outright denial of the Parousia itself. This required a longer delay than that experienced at either Thessalonica or Corinth. This lapse of time is also indicated by the use of the term οἱ πατέρες in 3.4. In his commentary on this verse Mayor, *ibid.*, gives clear answer to those who would identify οἱ πατέρες with any other than the first generation of Christians. Mayor himself on the basis of this reference makes a most conservative estimate of the date of the epistle: "It implies, I

The subject of the Parousia is introduced by the author in order to answer those who had rejected the whole concept of the return of Christ. The first apparent reference to these scoffers is in 1.16, where he also makes use of the

(1 cont'd.) think, a date not earlier than the last decade of the First Century" *ibid.* cxxvi. J. W. C. Wand, 'The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude', Westminster Commentaries, London, 1934, identifies these scoffers with the Gnostics. According to Wand one of the first formulations of this denial was that of Basilides, who taught in Egypt and probably died between 125-130 A.D. He states further that 11 Peter's "bold assertion of a catastrophic eschatology would be an appropriate reply to his teaching, and in both place and time it would thus fit in with what we have already learned from external sources about the probable provenance of this epistle" *ibid.* p. 142. 4. The reference to Paul's writings in 3.16 which not only imply that by this time Paul's writings had been collected and distributed as a collection, but that in some way they were linked with 'the Scriptures'. For a discussion of the meaning of τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς see Mayor and Bigg on 3.16. It may be that Wand has gone as far as the text allows when he writes: "It is probable that we have here the beginning of the formation of a New Testament Canon", but even that demands a considerable lapse of time. But Bigg disagrees both with respect to the date ordinarily allowed for such a collection and with respect to their relationship to O.T. Scriptures. "There was nothing to prevent his getting every epistle that circulated in the church within a month or two after its publication" *ibid.* p. 241. 5. The knowledge of other N.T. writings that is indicated in the text: the reference to Peter's martyrdom in 1.12-15 seems to indicate a knowledge of John 21.18-19; the severity of his attitude to backsliders appears to reflect views held by the author of Hebrews (see Heb. 2.1-3, 6.4-8, 10.26-31); he assumes that his readers are acquainted with the Synoptic account of the Transfiguration (compare 1.17 with Mt. 17.5, Mk. 9.7, Lk. 9.35); and finally his use of Jude. This latter is of course a matter for great debate. For an able argument for the priority of 11 Peter see Bigg pp. 216-224, and for the reverse argument see Mayor's very detailed examination, pp. i-xxv. The above accumulation of arguments give weight to Mayor's conclusion: "We conclude, therefore, that the second Epistle is not authentic, but was written by someone who made use of the honourable name of Peter, as was done by others in the second century, with a view to commending to the Christian reader views which he regarded as important, and which he believed to be in accordance with St. Peter's teaching" *ibid.* cxxiv.

term 'parousia'. While he does not mention the scoffers directly, nor the fact of their scoffing, there is little doubt that he is seeking to contrast his own testimony to the δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν of Christ with the μῦθοι of the scoffers (2). The validity of his testimony is established by virtue of the fact that he, with the apostles, was an ἐπόπτης of the μεγαλειότητος of Christ (3). This is a witness not primarily to the reality of the Parousia but to the validity of the apostolic testimony to the Parousia. Those who were witnesses to the μεγαλειότητος of Christ at the Transfiguration can with authority bear witness to the δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν of Christ. Such witnesses as these could not be creators of μῦθοι. At the same time the Transfiguration can be regarded as a kind of 'foretaste' of the Parousia, inasmuch as the Transfiguration of Christ makes known his 'glory' (4), and the

(2) "Apparently the mockers of 3.3 spoke of the Christian hope of the glories to come as resting on fictitious prophecies". So Mayor, *ibid.* μῦθος is used often in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful Gnostic genealogies.

(3) The term is ἐπόπτης. This term was used in the Eleusinian mysteries of the initiate. αὐτόπτης is used in Lk. 1.2. cf. also the use of ἐποπτεύω in [Peter 2.12, 3.2.

(4) cf. 1 Peter 4.13, where the Parousia is described as ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης Χριστοῦ. It may be noted that the Transfiguration has been regarded by some as the fulfilment of the promise of Mark 9.1. For δόξα in conjunction with δύναμις see Mt. 24.30. "The power is that of the risen Christ, and this power is to be demonstrated with finality at the second coming". So A. E. Barnett, "The Second Epistle of St. Peter", in *The Interpreter's Bible*. The term μεγαλειότητος is used elsewhere in the N.T. only of the healing of the demoniac in Lk. 9.43.

voice from heaven either confirms the Old Testament prophecy respecting the Christ, or provides an additional, and more conclusive, testimony to His μεγαλειότης (5).

This problem of the scoffers is resumed again in the third chapter, where they are named (ἐμκοῖνται v.3) and the content of their scoffing clearly stated (v.4). The fact that the Parousia has not taken place provides them with the ground for their thesis: ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως (v.4b).

This thesis is thus placed over against the ἐπαγγελία of His coming, which ἐπαγγελία is here called into question (6). The author of this epistle comments in passing that the presence of such scoffers is itself a sign of the last days (7), and then, having stated the case, he proceeds to answer them.

(5) The prophetic word referred to is probably the whole O.T. witness to the Christ, rather than any particular prophecy. The problem here lies in the meaning of βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον. Does it mean that the voice from heaven at the Transfiguration authenticated the O.T. witness, or provided an additional, and more certain, testimony to the Christ? The RSV following the former interpretation, has "We have the prophetic word made more sure", and the KJV, following the latter interpretation, has "We have also a more sure word of prophecy". For an argument supporting the former, see Mayor, *ibid.*, and supporting the latter, see Bigg, *ibid.*

(6) In Jude 17 the predictions of the apostles involved the advent of scoffers. Here the predictions of the prophets and the commandment of Christ involve both the fact that scoffers will come and the fact that Christ too will come. That is, the predictions and the commandment take account of the fact that Christ will come and that there will be those who will deny that coming. This is reminiscent of 1.16ff., where both the promise of the O.T. and the experience of Christ provide the basis for the promise of His coming.

(7) ἐλεύσονται of course is future. It may be that here he is quoting from Jude 17. However, in v.5, when speaking again of the false teachers, he uses the present tense.

His first answer is aimed directly at the thesis of the scoffers. Their claim that all things continue unchanged from the beginning of creation is not in accord with the facts, for they have deliberately ignored the fact that the creation that was brought into being by the word of God was also by that word destroyed through the Flood (8). Therefore it cannot be said that all things remain the same from the beginning of creation. But the author is not quite through with this argument. The scoffers have emphasised the continuity of creation. He has shown that there is no continuity to creation - but only in the agent of creation; i.e., the word of God, which was also the agent of destruction, and which will be the agent of destruction of the world in the day of judgment. The only continuity therefore lies in the word of God, by which the cosmos came into being and through which it will be destroyed at the Parousia of Christ. Thus in a sense the very creation to which they have appealed is an additional witness to the reliability of the promise.

His second argument takes account of the impossibility of reckoning time according to the mind of God (v.8). This verse is obviously reminiscent of Psa. 90.4, and yet it goes beyond it. For Psa. 90.4 emphasises that God's measurement of time may be vaster than man's, but this verse states quite firmly that we have no way of knowing how God measures time, and therefore cannot possibly judge when the Parousia

(8) There is some doubt about the meaning of $\delta\iota' \omega\upsilon$ in v.6. The plural may refer to the $\epsilon\epsilon \upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ και $\delta\iota' \upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ or to the $\upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and the $\tau\omicron\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. There is however a possibility that the \omicron and the ω may have become confused, and the text would read $\omega\upsilon$. Min. 31 has this reading, and Mayor adopts it. The $\tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ of v.7 gives some strength to this reading.

is to take place (9). We know that when He comes He will come unexpectedly (10a), but we cannot tell when He will come, and therefore we have no right to speak of a delay, or of a non-fulfilment of the promise.

His third argument turns the apparent 'delay' of the Parousia to the divine advantage. This 'delay' is to be interpreted as a sign not of God's slowness but of His mercy (v.9). The Parousia is a fearful thing for those who are not prepared for it (vv.7,10), and therefore for their sake (10) he suffers man's scoffing and unbelief (11), in the hope that the 'delay' thus caused will provide time for repentance.

In his reply to the scoffers two emphases are seen which conform clearly to previous usage of the term 'parousia'.

There is here an emphasis on the sudden and unpredictable nature of the Parousia. We have noted this in our examination of 3.3. There is a sense in which not only the scoffers stand rebuked by this text, but also all who may attempt to set a time for the Parousia. All such attempts are doomed to disappointment, for the facilities for reckoning God's time are not given to man. Additional emphasis on the unpredictability of the Parousia is given in 10a, where the author makes use of

(9) The argument must be noted carefully: one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years is as one day. That is, God simply does not reckon time as we do. This text therefore cannot be interpreted as providing any support for the doctrine of Chiliasm.

(10) BCP boh. WH Treg. have εἰς ὑμᾶς ; A vulg. sah. syrr.
have δι' ὑμᾶς .

(11) The verb is μακροθυμέω . See above p. 245f.

the familiar figure of the thief (12). The lapse of time has shown very clearly the results of trying to predict what is essentially unpredictable.

There is also an emphasis on the moral and spiritual incentive provided by the promise of the Parousia. The exhortation of v.11 is based on the Parousia and the events that accompany it. Lives of holiness and godliness are the logical result of the dissolution of all things that takes place at the Parousia (13). Dissolution, however, is not the only accompaniment of the Parousia. There is also the promise of new heavens and a new earth (v.13) which also provides incentive for moral and spiritual purity (14). Thus the unexpectedness of the event itself (v.10), together with the threat which it holds to the unbeliever and the promise which it holds for the believer, provide all necessary incentive for repentance on the part of the unbelievers and lives of moral and spiritual

(12) See above p. 162.

(13) In 3.11 there is a variant reading; $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ in $\text{AKL syr } \rho$. vulg. boh. Ti. Treg., $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ in B + WH. Mayor adopts the former reading, and Huther prefers the latter. For a discussion of the significance of $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ see above pp. 201-202.

(14) The $\delta\iota\omicron$ of v.14 doubtless is intended to take into account the dissolution promised in v.11, but its immediate reference is to the promise of v.13.

purity on the part of the believers (15).

There is also, however, in this reply to the scoffers, two relatively new emphases in connection with the use of the term 'parousia'.

The first such emphasis is seen in the place that the author of 11 Peter gives to the dissolution of the cosmos that accompanies the Parousia (16). In 3.7 it is made part of the divine plan for creation (17), in 3.10 the destruction of the cosmos is linked in time with the Parousia (18), and in 3.12 the Parousia is made the cause of the destruction of the cosmos (19). This dissolution however is not an end in itself, for out of the dissolution comes the creation of new heavens and a new earth (v.13).

- - - - -

(15) If the scoffers of chapter 3 are the libertines of chapter 2 then the relationship between the hope of the Parousia and lives of moral purity is indissoluble. There are some indications that they are the same. 3.3 describes them as *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίαις ἐκτιθυίας ἀνῶν κορευόμενοι*. Jude's description of the libertines whom he attacks is identical (*κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐκτιθυίας κορευόμενοι* 18), although he omits the second clause which gives the content of their scoffing (11 Peter 3.4). Bigg, *ibid.*, p.258, regards the two as identical: "...it is quite certain that an Antinomian could not accept the doctrine of the second Advent as it was held by the Apostolic church". J.W.C. Wand, *ibid.*, agrees: "Some who realized that the Lord was not coming at once had jumped to the conclusion that He was not coming at all, and moral repercussions were soon felt. If there was to be no Parousia, there would be no Judgment, and therefore everyone could do what he pleased". However, it may be that their libertinism stemmed from their misinterpretation of Paul's emphasis on justification by faith, to which some reference may be intended in 3.16.

(16) vv. 7,10,11a, 12.

(17) *θησαυρίζω* may mean 'to treasure up' or 'to set apart'. cf. 4 Macc. 12.12. In 2.4,9, although the word is not used, the idea of reserving for judgment is present.

(18) *ἐν ᾧ* expresses the temporal relationship. So Mayor *ibid.*

(19) *δι' ἧν* expresses a causal relationship. So Mayor *ibid.*

It must be said immediately that there are traces of this idea in previous references where the term 'parousia' is used (20). Mt. 24.29 points in the direction of some kind of dissolution, and 2 Thessalonians 1.7 would appear to echo a similar idea. But in 11 Peter this idea is greatly developed, and it becomes in the hands of its author both a threat and a promise, giving incentive to repentance and to moral purity. This does take us a fairly long step beyond its earlier usage.

There is also a suggestion by the author of this epistle that lives of moral and spiritual purity may actually hasten the coming of Christ. This is the interpretation usually placed on the term *προσέδουρας* in v.12 (21). It may of course mean simply 'to desire earnestly' but there is ample precedent for the former interpretation (22), and the context seems to favour it. It has been suggested that there is some precedent for this idea in Mt. 24.14 (23), and in Acts 3.19f. Here however it is linked quite specifically with the term 'parousia', and seems to suggest that by this time it had become a settled concomitant of the thought of the Parousia. This idea follows quite naturally on the thought of the need for preparing for the Day of the Lord, and in process of time might almost automatically be associated with it.

(20) The idea of the passing away of the heavens is found in Isa. 34.4, 29.6, 30.30, 34.4, 51.6, 66.15,16, Joel 2.30, 31, Nahum 1.5,6). See also Heb. 1.10-12, Rev. 6.13,14. For antecedents to v.13 see Isa. 65.17-19 and 66.22. cf. also Rev. 21.1.

(21) This is the only occasion when *παρουσία* is used of the Day and not of a person.

(22) Mayor gives the following examples of this meaning: Esther 5.5, Sir 36.8, Deut. 32.25.

(23) See above pp. 170-171.

Thus we have seen that by the first quarter of the second century the term 'parousia' is being used with certain fixed connotations; an emphasis on the suddenness with which the event occurs and the impossibility of reckoning its time, and the need for preparation in terms of repentance and lives of moral and spiritual purity.

Of the several meanings of the term 'parousia' in the secular sources two in particular may be viewed as of special significance for its use in the New Testament:

1. It is used of the manifestation of a god or goddess to men. Nine illustrations were found of this usage. Josephus in particular uses 'parousia' with reference to God's manifestation on Mt. Sinai and His presence in the sanctuary. In this sense it is a synonym for ἐπιφάνεια, and indeed Josephus uses the two terms interchangeably.
2. It is used in the papyri of the visits of officials of various kinds whose arrival necessitated specific preparations. This indeed is the dominating usage in the papyri, some nineteen illustrations having been found. So much emphasis was placed on the preparations required for these visits that the term παρουσίαν ποιεῖσθαι became a technical term for them. There is also evidence that because such visits required preparations that were costly they were awaited not with anticipation but with distaste.

There is no light whatever thrown on its use in the New Testament from the LXX or the Pseudepigrapha.

The cognate term ἐπιφάνεια is used in the secular sources almost exclusively of the manifestation of the gods to men, and in identical fashion in the non-canonical books of the LXX. As a verb it is used in the canonical books of the LXX to describe God's appearance to men; on one such occasion it describes God's coming at Sinai, and on another His presence in the Temple; twice it describes the fearful

character of the Day of the Lord. The adjective ἐπιφανής is used in like fashion in Joel and Malachi to describe the awesome character of that Day. The substantive is used six times in the New Testament; once by Paul when he links it with the term 'parousia' in such a way as to make the two terms interchangeable, and five times in the Pastoral Epistles. Of these five, one refers to the incarnation, and the other four to the return of Christ. On one such occasion it is linked with the term ἡ ἡμέρα .

It is this latter term that Luke has used as a synonym for 'parousia' (1). This term has as its background the concept of the Day of the Lord in the Old Testament. Although the origin of this concept is uncertain, and its usage varies, nonetheless it does possess one consistent factor; i.e., the element of judgment. This at first was directed against the enemies of Israel, then against the people of God in the face of their disobedience, and then as a means of encouraging repentance and maintaining hope. Later developments introduced the idea of a climax of evil leading to God's final judgment and victory.

The context for Matthew's use of the term 'parousia' is the so-called apocalyptic discourse of chapter twenty-four. Our examination of his sources, and the way in which he used them, led us to the conclusion that he repudiated the usual apocalyptic emphasis on signs by means of which the Parousia

(1) cf. Luke 17.24,26,30. Matthew himself uses it in an eschatological sense in 7.22, 10.15, 11.22,24, 12.36, 24.36, 26.29. Mark uses it in an eschatological sense on two occasions. It is used by Luke on 13 occasions, and in the N.T. outside the Synoptics some 37 times.

might be calculated. Rather his aim was to emphasise the unpredictability of the Parousia, and the impossibility of determining its time. Because of this therefore one must make the kind of preparations that are directed not at the time of His coming, but to the fact that He might come at any time. He had other aims in mind in this discourse; he wanted to warn against being deceived by those who, because they interpreted the events outlined as signs of the end, would make false claims about His coming; to give directives for the safety and security of the Church; to provide assurance about the final security of believers. But above all else he wanted to stress the need to be prepared, and to explain what it meant to be prepared, and to emphasise the folly of unpreparedness. Thus the term 'parousia', in Matthew's hands, bears the weight of this emphasis on the unpredictability of the Parousia and the need to be prepared for it.

In his first letter to the Thessalonians Paul seeks to bring the faith and the practice of these believers within the context of the Parousia hope. By this means he tries to encourage them to lead the kind of lives that at the Parousia will be pronounced 'holy and blameless'. Their query about the state of the dead at the Parousia is answered with a view to encouraging steadfastness now. Their query about the time of the Parousia - made, doubtless, in the hope that knowledge of the time would enable them to make preparations of the kind aimed specifically at that time - was answered with an emphasis on its incalculability. This fact however poses a threat only for those who are unprepared. For the believer it holds a promise, so long as he remains prepared. And pre-

paration in this Epistle is described in terms of moral purity, brotherly love, and diligence in work. Those who practise these virtues are prepared no matter when the Parousia occurs, and therefore its time is of no concern to them. And even in 11 Thessalonians, where the term 'parousia' is given a more apocalyptic setting and is linked with the theme of signs, the emphasis still lies on the fact that the Parousia has not come, and therefore one must remain prepared for that coming.

In 1 Corinthians 15 the hope of the Parousia becomes a source of encouragement and an impetus to diligence in service, and the Parousia itself becomes a guarantee that the sacrifice and the service of the Corinthian Christians will not be in vain.

The author of the Epistle of James appeals to the fact of the Parousia and to its nearness in order to strengthen the endurance, the firmness of heart, and the mutual forbearance of his readers.

In the hands of the author of 1 John the term 'parousia' is stripped of its more vivid concomitants, but nonetheless it shares in the emphases that have now become familiar: the idea of the antichrist and the nearness of the end; the uncertainty of the time of the Parousia; and the need for moral and spiritual preparedness in the light of its nearness and its unpredictability.

The author of 11 Peter places special stress on the dissolution that accompanies the Parousia, and finds in this an added incentive to spiritual preparedness. He also suggests quite specifically that lives of holiness and godliness might

hasten His coming. Thus by the first quarter of the second century these factors have become fixed concomitants of the term: its suddenness, its unpredictability, and the need to be prepared.

Of the three terms considered in this thesis, there is no doubt that the term ἡ ἡμέρα would have the most immediate appeal to its Jewish readers. They would interpret it immediately in the light of the Old Testament emphasis on the Day of the Lord, and they would understand the demands that such an expectation would make on them in the present. Because of its connotations, it was a term readily adaptable to the New Testament expectation of the coming of Christ, and its use here would create some awareness of the demands that such a hope would make on them in the present. Indeed, it is the only truly technical term in the New Testament for the coming of Christ, since it is the only term that is used without a qualifying appellation. The term itself was expected to convey a great deal of the significance of Christ's coming (2). The term 'parousia' on the other hand, although used technically in the papyri without qualifying predicates for the lists required on the occasion of official visits, is never used without qualifying appellatives in the New Testament (3).

(2) This term is used without qualifying predicates by Lk.(2), Mk.(1), Mt.(2), John (3), Paul (2), The Pastorals (3), Heb.(1), 2 Peter (1). Luke has used the qualifying genitive 'Son of Man' 7 times, Paul has 'Christ' or 'Jesus Christ' 5 times, and implied it 4 times, and the 'day of Judgment' is used by Mt.(3), Paul (2), 2 Peter (2), 1 John (1), Jude (1). John has 'the last day' 6 times.

(3) It is not used without a qualifying genitive until Clement of Alexandria in the third century. Moreover it is used in the N.T. in a non-eschatological sense, which would seem to indicate that it was not regarded by the N.T. writers as a strictly technical term for the coming of Christ.

The term ἡ ἡμέρα however, so meaningful to the Jew, would have little significance by itself to the non-Jewish Greek speaking Christian. An alternative therefore was required.

The term ἐπιφάνεια would seem to qualify as a suitable alternative. Since it was used in secular sources of the manifestation of a god, and in verbal form in the LXX of God's manifestation to men, it might appear to qualify on all counts. And indeed it is used at least once by Paul, and in the Pastorals. And indeed if in the New Testament eschatology the emphasis was on the idea of divine manifestation, with all its more apocalyptic concomitants, this might well have been judged the more suitable term. And yet it never managed to attain to the stature of the alternative 'parousia' in the New Testament. Why then was 'parousia' judged by most of the New Testament writers to be more suitable?

It would appear to many that the answer lies in the way in which 'parousia' is used in the papyri of the visit of officials. The coming of some person of importance to a community, and the joyful anticipation of such a visit by the community, is seen as a parallel to the coming of Christ and the welcome awaiting Him at the hands of the Church. This is the equation which Adolph Deissmann has made, and most commentators have been content to accept it (4). The equation however is much too facile, for in the papyri such visits meant costly provisions and extra taxes, and therefore they

(4) e.g., P. M. J. Lagrange, 'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu', G. Milligan, 'St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians', M. Dibelius, 'An die Thessalonicher 1-11, An Die Philipper', Charles Masson, 'Les Deux Épîtres De Saint Paul Aux Thessaloniens', B. Rigaux, 'Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniens', J. Dupont, 'L'union avec le Christ', F. W. Beare, 'A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians'. p. 63.

were viewed with resentment rather than with joyful anticipation. Failure to provide for such visits meant at least embarrassment for those concerned, and doubtless on occasion much more than embarrassment. The parallel therefore does not hold - at least not in this way. We must therefore look elsewhere.

We have noted that the term 'parousia' has been used in secular sources as a synonym for ἐπιφάνεια . This brought it within the sphere of words suitable to describe such an event as the coming of Christ. But it was judged more suitable for this purpose than ἐπιφάνεια , since it had a connotation that ἐπιφάνεια lacked; it could be used to stress the need to prepare oneself for the coming of Christ. This stress on preparation is the primary characteristic of its usage in the papyri. It is also the primary characteristic of its usage in the New Testament. It is this that made it the most suitable substitute for the term ἡ ἡμέρα , and in its New Testament usage it really bears the weight of that term. Thus 'parousia' would best present to the mind of the Greek that which was inherent in the term ἡ ἡμέρα for the Jew; the coming of that for which preparation must be made.

It was for this reason then that the term was introduced into the language of the primitive church. It is impossible however to determine with equal certainty who was responsible for its introduction. Paul has been assigned responsibility by some commentators (5). This is a very reasonable conjecture,

(5) So Charles Masson, *ibid.* P. L. Schoonheim, 'Een Semasiologisch Onderzoek Van Parousia', 1953, suggests this possibility, p. 285.

since he was himself in large measure responsible for the attempt to interpret the Gospel to the Gentile world in terms which would be comprehensible to that world. Others prefer to give credit simply to the early Church (6). This too is understandable, although not really very helpful. Since three out of the four occasions on which the word is used in the first Gospel are in Q, it is also possible that the author of that work - or at least its Greek translator - introduced the term. Since this is the earliest source for the Gospels, and without doubt takes us as close to the life of Christ as possible, its origin here would explain its prevalence in the New Testament writings (7). This has suggested yet another chain of responsibility to my own mind. If one accepts the suggestion of A. Harnack that Matthew was responsible for Q (8), and if the Matthew of Matthew 9.9 is the Levi of Mark 2.14 and Luke 5.27, then as a tax-collector the Apostle would be well acquainted with the term 'parousia' and its relationship with the theme of taxes. But the chain is a very tenuous one, and since the original Q, if it was the work of Matthew, would have been in Aramaic, then one would have to explain how a Greek term would be found useful in an Aramaic work. Indeed, there is no evi-

(6) So B. Rigaux, *ibid.*, W. G. Kümmel, 'Promise and Fulfilment', p. 38, note 63, C. H. Dodd, 'The Parables of the New Testament' p. 83, footnote, T. H. Robinson, 'Jesus and His Coming', p. 78, T. F. Glasson, 'The Second Advent', p. 85, J. Dupont, *ibid.*

(7) P. L. Schoonheim, *ibid.*, p. 259, thinks that the term ^{ἐλευσίς} in Lk. 21.7, Codex D, is based on the Syriac, or even the Aramaic *mê'tîtâ*, and is therefore a more original tradition. But C. F. Burney, 'The Poetry of Our Lord', p. 88, argues for the priority of the Q passages in Matthew.

(8) A. Harnack, 'The Sayings of Jesus', *New Testament Studies*, tr. by J. R. Wilkinson, London, 1908, p. 247.

dence of any consequence upon which any but the most tentative assertions can be made in answer to this question. It does seem possible however that Antioch may have been the place of origin. The fact that it was the home of the first Gentile-Christian Church, the base of operations for Paul's missionary journeys and the scene of much of his labour, and the place where the church had to face the non-Jewish world and express its Gospel in understandable terms, makes it a very likely candidate. Moreover it has been suggested as the place of origin for both Q and the Gospel of Matthew (9). Again of course this suggestion, although it may be made a little more firmly than those respecting the individuals responsible, nonetheless can only be made tentatively.

But although one must speak in most uncertain fashion about the channel through which the word found its way into the New Testament, one may speak with confidence about the reason why this word was chosen to describe the coming of the Christ. More than any other Greek term then current it emphasised what the early Church above all else wanted to emphasise; the need to live now in the light of that coming, so that when He comes, one may be found prepared. What has been said about eschatology in general may be said about it in particular.

"God's future is God's call to the present, and the present is the time of decision in the light of God's future" (10).

(9) B. H. Streeter, 'The Four Gospels', p. 500 ff. Schoonheim also favours Antioch as the place of origin, p. 288.

(10) Gunther Bornkamm, 'Jesus of Nazareth', London, 1960, p.93.

Aegyptische Urkunden Aus Den Koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden (B.G.U.).

Aeschylus, 'Persae', Loeb Classical Library, E.T. H.W. Smith.

Albright W.F. , 'Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John', in 'Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology', edited by W.D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge, 1956.

Allen W., 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. I.C.C. New York, 1913.

Allbutt T. Clifford, 'Notes on the Composition of Scientific Papers', London, 1904.

Allo Le P.E.-B. 'Saint Paul, Première Épitre Aux Corinthiens', Études Bibliques, Paris, 1956.

Althaus Paul, 'Die Letztendige', Göttingen, 1933.

Apocryphal New Testament, translated by M.R. James, Oxford, 1924.

Argyle A.W. 'The Influence of the Testaments Xll Patriarchs upon the New Testament', The Expository Times, Vol.63, pp.256-258.

'Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q', Expository Times, LX, 1948-9, pp.318-320.

Aristophanes, 'Thesmophoriazusae', L.C.L., E.T. B.B. Rogers.

Aristotle, 'The Athenian Constitution, The Eudemian Ethics, on Virtues and Vices', L.C.L., E.T. H. Rockham.

'Meteorologica IV', L.C.L., E.T. H.D.P. Lee.

'Physica', L.C.L. Bk.11, E.T. P.H. Wickstead and M.Cornford.

Arndt W.F., 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', St. Louis, Missouri, 1956.

Arndt W.F. and Gingrich F.W., 'A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament', Cambridge, 1957.

Bacon Benjamin W., 'Studies in Matthew', New York, 1930.

Barnett, A.E., 'The Second Epistle of St. Peter', The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. Xll.

Barr James, 'The Semantics of Biblical Language', London, 1961.

- Barrett C.K., 'New Testament Eschatology: 1. Jewish and Pauline Eschatology', S.J.T. VI. 1953, pp.136-155, 225-243.
- Bauer F.C. , 'Paul - the Apostle of Jesus Christ', Vol. 11, Second Edition 1875, London.
- Beardslee W.A., 'Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul', S.B.T. No.31, London, 1961.
- Beare F.W., 'A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians', Black's New Testament Commentaries, London, 1959.
- Beasley-Murray G.R., 'Jesus and the Future', New York, 1956.
- 'A Commentary on Mark Thirteen', New York, 1957.
- Bicknell E.J., 'The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians', Westminster New Testament Commentaries, London, 1932.
- Bigg Charles, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude', Edinburgh, 1902.I.C.C.
- Bilabel Friedrich, 'Sammelbuch Griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten', Dritter Band, Berlin und Leipzig, 1926.
- Black Matthew, 'The Messiah in the Testament of Levi 18', Expository Times, LX, 1948-9, pp.321-22, and LXI, 1949-50, pp. 157-8.
- 'The Son of Man in the Teaching of Jesus', Expository Times, LX, 1948-9, p.32ff.
- 'An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts', Oxford, 1946. 1952
- Blake B., 'The Apocalyptic Setting of the Thessalonian Epistles', The Expositor, series LX, Vol.111, 1925, pp.126-39.
- Blass F., 'Grammar of New Testament Greek', E.T. Henry St. John Thackeray, London, 1898.
- Boisacq Émile, 'Dictionnaire Étymologique De La Langue Grecque', Heidelberg and Paris, 1916.
- Bornkamm Gunther, 'Jesus of Nazareth', London, 1960.
- Bousset W., 'The Anti-Christ Legend', E.T. A.H.Keane, London, 1896.
- 'Jesus', New York, 1906.
- Bowman John Wick, 'The Intention of Jesus', Philadelphia, 1948.

- Branscomb B. Harvie, 'The Gospel of Mark', Moffatt New Testament Commentaries, London, 1937.
- Briggs C.A., 'The Messiah of the Gospels', New York, 1894.
- 'The Messiah of the Apostles', New York, 1895.
- Brockington L.H., 'The LXX Background in the New Testament Use of $\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron$ ', in 'Studies in the Gospels', edited by D.E. Nineham, Oxford, 1955.
- Brooke A.E., 'The Johannine Epistles', I.C.C., New York, 1912.
- Brownlee W.H., 'John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls', Interpretation, Vol. IX, p. 71ff.
- Brownlow C., 'Parousia and Related Terms in the New Testament', unpublished Th.D. Thesis submitted to Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.
- Bruce F.F., 'Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts', London, 1960.
- 'Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls', London, 1956.
- 'Qumrân and Early Christianity', New Testament Studies, Vol. 3, Feb. 1956, p. 187f.
- Brugmann Karl, 'Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik der Indo-germanischen Sprachen', Strassburg, 1904.
- 'Elements of the Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages', E.T. J. Wright, London, 1888. 4 Vols.
- Buck C.D., 'A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages', Chicago, 1949
- Buck Carl and Petersen W., 'A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives', Chicago, 1944.
- Bultmann R., 'Jesus and the Word', London, 1925.
- Burney C.F., 'The Poetry of Our Lord', Oxford, 1925.
- Burkitt F.C., A Review of Dr. Charles' edition of the Testament XII Patriarchs, J.T.S. Vol. X, 1909, pp. 135-41.
- 'Jewish and Christian Apocalypses', The Schweich Lectures, London, 1914.
- 'Christian Beginnings', London, 1924.
- Burrows M., 'The Dead Sea Scrolls', London, 1956.
- Burton Ernest De Witt, 'Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek', Third Edition, Edinburgh, 1898.

- Bywater I., 'Aristotelis, Ethica Nicomachea', Oxford, 1890.
- Dalman Gustaf, 'The Words of Jesus', Edinburgh, 1902.
- Danby H., 'The Mishnah', London, 1933.
- Daniel-Rops, 'Jesus In His Time', London, 1956.
- David M. and Van Groningen B.A., 'Papyrological Primer',
Second English Edition, Leyden, 1946.
- Davies W.D., 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins',
Religion and Life, 26, (1957), pp.246-63.
- Dawson W.B., 'The Meaning of "Antichrist" in the Greek of
the New Testament', Evangelical Quarterly, XVI, 1944,
pp.71-73.
- Deane W.J., 'Pseudepigrapha', Edinburgh, 1891.
- Deissmann A., 'Light from the Ancient East', E.T. L.R.M.
Strachan, London, 1927.
- Deissner K., article 'Parousia' in Die Religion in Gesch-
ichte und Gegenwart, pp.978-82.
- De Jonge M., 'The Testaments XII Patriarchs', Assen, 1953.
- Demosthenes, 'Against Aristocrates', L.C.L., E.T. J.H.
Vine.
'Exordia', L.C.L., E.T. N.W. and N.T. Delbitt.
- Denny James, 'The Epistles to the Thessalonians', The Ex-
positor's Bible, New York.
- Dewick E.C., 'Primitive Christian Eschatology', Cambridge,
1912.
- Dibelius Martin, 'An die Thessalonicher 1-11, An die
Philipper', Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen,
1925.
- 'From Tradition to Gospel', London, 1934.
- 'Jesus', Philadelphia, 1949.
- 'Paul', edited and completed by W.G. Kümmel, Phil-
adelphia, 1953.
- Diodorus of Sicily, L.C.L., E.T. C.H. Oldfather, Vol.1.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, L.C.L., E.T. E. Gary.
- Dittenberger W., 'Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Select-
ae', 2 Vols., 1903, 1905. (O.G.I.S.)
- Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum', Vol.1, 1915, 11,
1917, 111, 1920. (S.I.G.)

- Dodd C.H., 'The Johannine Epistles', Moffatt New Testament Commentaries, London, 1947.
- 'The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments', London, 1944.
- 'The Parables of the Kingdom', London, 1942.
- 'Matthew and Paul', Expository Times, LVIII, pp.293-8.
- 'The Fall of Jerusalem and the Abomination of Desolation', Journal of Roman Studies, Vol.XXXVII, 1947, pp.47-54.
- Duncan G.S., 'Jesus, Son of Man', London, 1947.
- Dupont-Sommer A., 'The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes', London, 1954.
- Easton Burton Scott, 'The Epistle of James', The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. XII.
- 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', Edinburgh, 1926.
- Edwards T.C., 'A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians', London, 1897.
- Ellicott Charles J., 'St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians', Third Edition, London, 1866.
- Ellis E. Earle, 'Paul's Use of the Old Testament', Edinburgh, 1957.
- Euripides, 'Alcestis', L.C.L., E.T. A.S. Way.
- 'Hecuba', L.C.L., E.T. A.S. Way.
- Farrer Austin, 'An Examination of Mark 13.10', J.T.S., Vol. 7 (1956), pp.75-79.
- Filson F.V., '11 Corinthians', The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 10, New York.
- 'A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew', Black's New Testament Commentaries, London, 1960.
- Findlay G.G., 'Fellowship in the Life Eternal', London, 1909.
- Findlay J.A., 'The Book of Testimonies and the Structure of the First Gospel', The Expositor, VIII, 20, 1920, pp. 388-400.
- Fison J.E., 'The Christian Hope', London, 1954.
- Foakes-Jackson F.J. and Lake Kirsopp, 'The Acts of the Apostles', Part 1, Vol. III, The Text, edited by J. H. Ropes, London 1926, Vol.IV, Translation and Comment-

- ary, Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, London, 1933.
- Frame James Everett, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians', I.C.C., Edinburgh, 1912.
- Fuller Reginald H., 'The Mission and Achievement of Jesus', S.B.T. No. 12, London, 1956.
- Geldenhuis N., 'Commentary on the Gospel of Luke', New International Commentary on the New Testament, Grand Rapids, 1951.
- Gibbins H.J., '1 Thessalonians 2.6', Expository Times, XLV, 1902-3, p. 568.
- Giles P., 'A Short Manual of Comparative Philology', London, 1895.
- Glasson T.F., 'The Second Advent', London, 1945.
- 'Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology', S.P.C.K. Biblical Monographs, London, 1961.
- 'Mark 13 and the Greek Old Testament', Expository Times, Vol. 69, pp. 213-215.
- Godet F., 'Introduction to the New Testament' 1, Epistles of St. Paul, Edinburgh, 1894.
- Goodspeed E.J. and Colwell E.C., 'A Greek Papyrus Reader', Chicago, 1935.
- Goudge H.L., 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', Fifth Edition, Westminster Commentaries, London, 1926.
- 'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians', Westminster Commentaries, London, 1928.
- Gould E.P., 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark', Edinburgh, 1907.
- Grant F.C., 'The Gospels', London, 1957.
- Grässer E., 'Das Problem Der Perusieverzögerung in den Synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte', Berlin, 1957.
- Green F.W., 'The Gospel According to St. Matthew', The Clarendon Bible, Oxford, 1936.
- Grenfell B.P. and Edgar C.C., 'Select Papyri', L.C.L.
- Grenfell B.P. and Hunt A.S., 'Greek Papyri, Series 11', New Classical Fragments and Other Greek and Latin Papyri, Oxford, 1897.

- Grenfell B.P. and Hunt A.S. and Smyly J.G., 'Tebtunis Papyri', Vol. 1, 1912.
- Grenfell B.P. and Hunt A.S., 'The Oxyrhynchus Papyri', 1898-1920.
- Griffiths J.G., '11 Thessalonians 2.4', Expository Times, L11, 1940-41, p. 38.
- Guy H.A., 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things', London, 1948.
- Harnack A., 'The Sayings of Jesus', New Testament Studies 11, London, 1908.
- Héring J., 'La Première Épître De Saint Paul Aux Corinthiens', Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament, V11, Neuchatel/Paris, 1949.
- Hort F.J.A., 'The Epistle of St. James', London, 1909.
- Hoskyns E. and Davey N., 'The Riddle of the New Testament', London, 1931.
- Howard W.F., 'The Message of the Epistles: 1 Thessalonians', Expository Times, XLIV, 1932-33, pp. 357-62.
- Hunkin J.W., 'The Testaments X11 Patriarchs', J.T.S., XVI, 1915, pp. 80-97.
- Hunter A.M., 'The Work and Words of Jesus', London, 1950.
- 'The Hope of Glory'. The Relevance of the Pauline Eschatology, Interpretation, V111, 1954, pp. 131-140.
- Husselmann E.M., Boak E.R., and Edgerton W.F., 'Michigan Papyri' Vol. V, Papyri from Tebtunis. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. 27.
- Huther E.E., 'Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of Peter and Jude', Meyer New Testament Commentaries, Edinburgh, 1881.
- Jackson L., 'The Eschatology of Jesus', London, 1913.
- Jannaris A.N., 'An Historical Greek Grammar', Chiefly of the Attic Dialect, London, 1897.
- Jeremias J., 'The Parables of Jesus', E.T. S.H. Hooke, London, 1954.
- Johnson S.E., 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', Black's New Testament Commentaries, London, 1960.
- Josephus, L.C.L., E.T. H. St. John Thackeray, 9 Vols., 1926.
- Jülicher A., 'Die Gleichnisreden Jesus' 1, 1888, 11, 1899, Leipzig und Tübingen.

- Kennedy H.A.A., 'Sources of New Testament Greek',
Edinburgh, 1895.
- 'St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things',
New York, 1904.
- 'The Theology of the Epistles', New York, 1920.
- Kenyon F.G., 'The Palaeography of the Greek Papyri',
Oxford, 1899.
- 'Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum',
Oxford, 1891.
- Kilpatrick G.D., 'Ἐλζουσις in Acts 7.52', J.T.S.
Vol.46, 1945, pp.136-145.
- 'The Origins of the Gospel According to St.
Matthew', Oxford, 1946.
- 'The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13.9-11',
in 'Studies in the Gospels', Oxford, 1955.
- Klausner J., 'Jesus of Nazareth', London, 1925.
- Klostermann E., 'Das Markus-Evangelium', Handbuch zum
Neuen Testament', 3, Tübingen, 1926.
- 'Das Matthäus-Evangelium', Handbuch zum Neuen
Testament', 4, Tübingen, 1927.
- Knowling R.J., 'The Epistle of St. James', Westminster
Commentaries, Third Edition, London, 1922.
- 'The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ', London, 1905.
- Kümmel W.G., 'Promise and Fulfilment', S.B.T. No.23,
London, 1957.
- Lagrange Le P.M.J., 'Évangile Selon Saint Matthieu',
Paris, 1923.
- Lake K., 'The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul', Second
Edition, London, 1914.
- Law R., 'The Tests of Life', Edinburgh, 1909.
- Leaney A.R.C., 'The Days of the Son of Man. Luke 17.22',
Expository Times, Vol.67, 1956-7, pp.28-29.
- 'A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke',
Black's New Testament Commentaries, London, 1958.
- Lietzmann D. Hans, 'An Die Korinther 1.11', Handbuch
zum Neuen Testament, 9, Tübingen, 1949.
- Lightfoot J.B., 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians',
London and Cambridge, 1873.

- Lightfoot J.B., 'Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul', London, 1895.
- Loisy A., 'L'Évangile Selon Marc', Paris, 1912.
- Lünemann G., 'A Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians', edited by H.A.W. Meyer, E.T. P.J. Gloag, Edinburgh, 1880.
- Mahaffy John P., 'The Flinders Petrie Papyri', Part 11, Dublin-London-Edinburgh, 1893.
- Manson T.W., 'The Teaching of Jesus', Cambridge, 1935.
- 'Testaments XII Patriarchs: Levi VIII.', J.T.S., XLVIII, 1947, pp.59-61.
- 'The Sayings of Jesus', London, 1949.
- Manson W., 'Gospel of Luke', Moffatt New Testament Commentaries', London, 1930.
- 'Jesus the Messiah', London, 1943.
- 'The *Evo Epi* Of the Messianic Presence in the New Testament', J.T.S., 1947, pp.137-145.
- 'Eschatology', Four contributions by W. Manson, W.W.H. Lampe, T.F. Torrance, W.A. Whitehead, edited by W. Manson, Edinburgh, 1952.
- Masson Charles, 'Les Deux Épitres De Saint Paul Aux Thessaloniens', Commentaire Du Nouveau Testament, Neuchatel and Paris, 1957.
- Mayor J.B., 'The Epistle of St. James', London, 1897.
- 'The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter', New York, 1907.
- Mayser Edwin, 'Grammatik Der Griechischen Papyri Aus Der Ptolemäerzeit', Band 11, Berlin und Leipzig, 1926.
- McCown C.C., 'Jesus, Son of Man', A Servey of Recent Discoveries, Journal of Religion, 28, 1948, 1ff.
- McNeile A.H., 'The Gospel According to St. Matthew', London, 1915.
- 'An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament', Oxford, 1927.
- Metzger B.M., 'An Introduction to the Apocrypha', New York, 1957.
- 'Antioch-on-the-Orontes', The Biblical Archaeologist, Vol.XI, Dec.1948, No.4, pp.69-88.

- Meulenberg J., 'The Significance of the Scrolls',
Union Seminary Quarterly Review, Vol. XI, No.3,
March, 1956.
- Micklem P.A., 'The Gospel According to St. Matthew',
London, 1917.
- Milik J.T., 'Le Testament De Lévi En Araméen', Revue
Biblique LXII, 1955, pp.398-406.
- 'Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea',
S.B.T. No. 26, London, 1957.
- Milligan G., 'The Authority of 11 Thessalonians', The
Expositor, Ser. VI, Vol. IX, 1904, pp.430-450.
- 'St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians', London,
1908.
- 'Selections From the Greek Papyri', Cambridge, 1910.
- 'Here and There Among the Papyri', London, 1922.
- Minear P.S., 'The Christian Hope and the Second Coming',
Philadelphia, 1954.
- Moffatt J., 'Ethnic Parallels to the 1 Thessalonians',
Expository Times', XLV, 1902-3, p. 568.
- '1 and 11 Thessalonians', The Expositor's Greek
Testament, edited by W.R. Nicoll, Vol. IV, London,
1910.
- 'Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament',
International Theological Library', New York, 1911.
- 'Parousia', Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,
edited by James Hastings, Vol. IX, 1925, pp.636-7.
- 'The General Epistles, James, Peter, and Judas',
Moffatt New Testament Commentaries, London, 1928.
- Moore G.F., 'Judaism', Judaism in the First Centuries
of the Christian Era, Vols. 1 and 11, Cambridge,
1927.
- Moule C.F.D., 'An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek',
Cambridge, 1953.
- Moulton J.H., 'A Grammar of New Testament Greek', Vol.
1, Prolegomena, Edinburgh, 1908.
- Moulton J.H. and Howard W.F., 'A Grammar of New Test-
ament Greek', Vol. 11, Accidence and Word Formation,
Edinburgh, 1929.

- Moulton J.H. and Milligan G., 'The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament', Part III, London-New York-Toronto, 1919, Part VI, London, 1926.
- Mowinckel S., 'He That Cometh', E.T. G.W. Anderson, Oxford, 1956.
- Murphy R.E., 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Comparisons', Catholic Biblical Quarterly XVIII, 1956, pp.263-272.
- Oepke A., 'Παρουσία, Πάρεσις', Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Band V, Lieferung V., pp.856-869.
- Oesterley W.O.E., 'The Doctrine of the Last Things', London, 1908.
- 'The General Epistle of James', The Expositor's Greek Testament, London, 1910.
- Orchard J.B., 'Thessalonians and the Synoptic Gospels', Biblica, XLX, 1938, pp.19-42.
- Paton W.R. and Hicks E.L., 'The Inscriptions of Cos', Oxford, 1891.
- Plato, 'Gorgias', L.C.L., E.T. W.R.M. Lamb.
- 'Lysis', L.C.L., E.T. W.R.M. Lamb.
- 'Phaedo', L.C.L., E.T. H.N. Fowler.
- 'The Sophist', L.C.L., E.T. H.N. Fowler.
- Plummer A., 'Gospel According to St. Luke', I.C.C., Edinburgh, 1896.
- 'An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew', New York, 1909.
- 'The Relation of the Testaments XII Patriarchs to the Books of the New Testament', Expositor, Seventh Series, VI, 1908, pp.481-491.
- Plutarch, 'Camillus', L.C.L., E.T. Bernadotte Perren.
- Polybius, 'The Histories of Polybius', L.C.L., E.T. W.R. Paton.
- Porter F.C., 'The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of St. Paul', J.B.L., XL1, 1922, pp. 183-204.
- Porter J.R., 'The Messiah in the Testament Levi 18', Expository Times, LX1, 1949-50, p.90.
- Pratt E.J., 'Studies in Pauline Eschatology', Toronto, 1917.

- Preisigke F., 'Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyruskunden', Berlin, 1931.
- Ragg L., 'The Gospel According to St. Luke', Westminster New Testament Commentaries, London, 1922.
- Rawlinson A.E.J., 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', Westminster New Testament Commentaries', London, 1925.
- Rigaux B., 'Saint Paul. Les Épitres aux Thessaloniens', Paris, 1956.
- Robertson A.T., 'A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament', New York, 1908.
- 'A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research', Nashville, Tennessee, 1934.
- Robertson A. and Plummer A., 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians', Second Edition, Edinburgh, 1914.
- Robertson J.A., 'The Message of the Epistles: 11 Thessalonians', Expository Times, XLIV, 1932-33, p.407ff.
- Robinson H. Wheeler, 'The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament', Second Edition, 1956, London.
- Robinson J.A.T., 'The "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats', New Testament Studies, 11, 1956, pp.226-229.
- 'Jesus and His Coming', London, 1957.
- Robinson T.H., 'The Gospel of Matthew', The Moffatt New Testament Commentaries, London, 1928.
- Ropes J. Hardy, 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James', I.C.C., New York, 1916.
- Rowley H.H., 'The Relevance of Apocalyptic', London, 1947.
- 'The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls', Oxford, 1952.
- Russell J.S., 'The Parousia', London, 1878.
- Sandy W., 'The Life of Christ in Recent Research', Oxford, 1907.
- Sandmel S., 'A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament', Cincinnati, 1957.
- Schlatter A., 'Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament. Matthäus'. Stuttgart, 1900.
- Schniewand J., 'Das Evangelium nach Markus', Das Neue

- Testament Deutsch, Göttingen, 1949.
- 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus', Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Göttingen, 1950.
- Schoonheim P.L., 'Een Semasiologisch Onderzoek Van Parousia', Aalten, 1953.
- Schürer E., 'A History of the Jewish People', Div.1, Vol.11, Edinburgh, 1890.
- Schweitzer A., 'Paul and His Interpreters', London, 1912.
- 'The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle', London, 1931.
- 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus', New York, 1948.
- Sharman H. Burton, 'The Teaching of Jesus About the Future', Chicago, 1909.
- Diodorus Siculus, L.C.L., E.T. C.H. Oldfather.
- Smith D., 'The Epistles of John', The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol.V, London, 1910.
- Smith C.F.W., 'The Jesus of the Parables', Philadelphia, 1948.
- Snaith N.H., 'The Jewish New Year Festival; Its Origins and Development', London, 1947.
- Sophocles, 'Ajax', L.C.L., E.T. A.S. Way.
- 'Electra', L.C.L., E.T. A.S. Way.
- 'Fragments', edited by A.C. Pearson, Vol.11. Cambridge, 1917.
- Stendahl K. 'The Scrolls and the New Testament', New York, 1957.
- 'The School of St. Matthew', Copenhagen, 1954.
- Stewart J., 'A Man in Christ', London, 1935.
- Strachan R.H., 'The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians', Moffatt New Testament Commentaries, London, 1948.
- Strack H. and Billerbeck P., 'Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch', München.
- Vol. 1. 'Das Evangelium nach Matthäus', 1922.
- Vol. 3. 'Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und der Offenbarung Johannis', 1926.
- Streeter B.H., 'The Four Gospels', London, 1951.
- Swete H.B., 'An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek', Cambridge, 1900.

- Swete H.B., 'The Parables of the Kingdom', London, 1920.
- 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1920.
- Tabachovitz D., 'Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament', London, 1956.
- Taylor V., 'The Formation of the Gospel Tradition', London, 1933.
- 'The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mark 13', Expository Times, 1949, Vol. LX, pp.94-98.
- 'The Gospel According to St. Mark', London, 1959.
- Thackeray Henry St. John, 'The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought', London, 1900.
- Thucydides, 'History of the Peloponnesian War', L.C.L., E.T. Charles Forster Smith.
- Torrey C. Cutler, 'The Apocryphal Literature', New Haven, Connecticut, 1946.
- 'Documents of the Primitive Church', New York, 1941.
- Trench R.C., 'Synonyms of the New Testament', London, 1876.
- Vincent M.R., 'Word Studies in the New Testament', Vol. IV, New York, 1901.
- 'A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians', I.C.C., Edinburgh, 1897.
- von Dobschütz E., Deissner K., 'Parusee', in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, IV, 1930.
- von Rad G., 'The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh', Heidelberg Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol.IV, No.2, April, 1959, pp.97-108.
- Vos G., 'The Pauline Eschatology', Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1952.
- Vriezen Th.C., 'Prophecy and Eschatology', Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 1, Copenhagen, 1953, p.199.
- Wallace D.E., 'The Hope of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ', unpublished M.Th. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1952.
- Wand J.W.C., 'The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude', Westminster New Testament Commentaries, London, 1934.

Welles C. Bradford, 'Royal Correspondance in the Hellenistic Period', A Study in Greek Epigraphy. New Haven, Connecticut, 1934.

Brooke F. Westcott, 'The Epistles of St. John', London, 1883.

Wikenhauser A., 'New Testament Introduction', E.T. J. Cunningham, Freiburg, 1958.

Wilcken Ulbrich, 'Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien', Buch I und II, Leipzig und Berlin, 1899.

'Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit', Berlin und Leipzig, Band I, 1927, Band II, 1935.

Wilchen U. and Mitteis L., 'Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde', Band I, U. Wilchen, Leipzig und Berlin, 1912.

Wilder A.N., 'Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus', New York, 1950.

'The First, Second, and Third Epistles of John', The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. XII.

Williams C.S.C., 'A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles', Black's New Testament Commentaries, London, 1957.

Worsley F.W., 'The Apocalypse of Jesus', London, 1912.

Wright J., 'Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language', London, New York, Toronto, 1912.

Zahn D.T., 'Das Evangelium des Matthäus', Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Band I, Leipzig, 1905.

'Introduction to the New Testament', 3 Volumes, Edinburgh, 1909.

- B.G.U. 'Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Koeniglichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden. Berlin, 1909.
- E.T. English translation.
- I.C.C. International Critical Commentary.
- J.T.S. Journal of Theological Studies.
- L.C.L. Loeb Classical Library, W. Heinemann Co., London.
- O.G.I.S. 'Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae', edited by W. Dittenberger.
- S.B.T. Studies in Biblical Theology, S.C.M., London.
- S.I.G. 'Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum', edited by W. Dittenberger.
- S.J.T. Scottish Journal of Theology.
- T.W.N.T. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, edited by G. Kittel, Stuttgart.