Study Three: Euangélion

1. “Evangel” had a history prior to these writings.
   a. The question is whether Jesus Christ belongs to or brings the gospel. (p. 117)
   b. This also leads to the question whether the “gospel of Jesus Christ” is objective or subjective.
      i. NT writings were later termed “Gospel” to contrast with “Law” (OT) but this is irrelevant to deciding the intent of the evangelist.
      ii. This sharp dichotomy should not be set up because Paul intends both objective and subjective senses (in agreement with Friedrich).
   c. The relation between generic “Gospel” and its application to the individual writings must be kept distinct.
      i. Mk 1:14-15: Jesus proclaims gospel but does not identify “gospel” as a book.
      ii. Mt 1:1: uses Βίβλος.
      iii. Mk uses only the noun εὐαγγέλιον, but Lk only uses the verb (and never in passages parallel to Mark’s use of the noun). (p. 118)

2. Analysis of the Synoptic Findings (p. 119)
   a. A comparison of synoptic passages shows that εὐαγγέλιον did not appear in the original Mark (in agreement with Friedrich).
      i. Mk 8:35: ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον is almost literally reproduced in Mt 16:25 and Lk 9:24 but without the καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον.
      ii. Mk 10:29: ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον
         1. Lk 18:29: ἔνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ
         2. Mt 19:29: ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὄνόματός μου
         3. Thus, Bultmann cannot be correct in positing Luke as the original source for the saying. Mark is being used as the source. (p. 120)
      iii. Mk 13:10: καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (p. 121)
         1. Mt 10:18: ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ
         2. Lk has no parallel but it should be noted that Lk 21:12 has the phrase used in Mt 19:29: ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὄνόματός μου
      iv. Mk 14:9: ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὁ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται εἰς μισθώσιν αὐτής
         1. Lk: lacks the parallel.
         2. Mt 26:13 adds the typical τοῦτο and modifies with ἐν instead of εἰς (p. 122)
      v. Mt uses “gospel” as a “speech complex,” which moves it away from speaking and toward a speech.
         2. He inserts it into a speech complex, adding τοῦτο (24:14, 26:13).
   b. Mk is probably introduced the term into tradition and setting it over the whole tradition. (p. 124)
1. 1:1, 1:14-5 are generally recognized as indicating this.
   ii. 8:35, 10:29 have additions within the verses themselves.
   iii. 14:9 is obscure but it is probably the work of Mark and not the previous tradition.

c. Mk attaches “gospel” to his work in a way that some of his successors did not adopt.
   i. Matthew’s usage is independent.
   ii. Luke’s avoidance has been deemed by Harnack as not “purely accidental.”
       (p. 125)

3. Mark’s Point of View (p. 126)
   a. Mk’s use of noun in the absolute sense (without modification) is paralleled only in Paul (who also uses it in other sense), which indicates Mk’s proximity to Paul.
   b. It is often pointed out that Mk’s formulation is influenced by primitive Christian missions terminology, but what is more striking is that Mk puts gospel in Jesus’ mouth (1:14-5). (p. 127)
   c. 8:35, 10:39: literary-critical analysis shows Mk added to original ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ the phrase καὶ τὸν ἐκαγγέλην.
      i. Καὶ is epexegetical.
      ii. Mk extends the original phrase with missionary vocabulary to show that the Lord is present in the gospel and who suffers/sacrifices does so for the sake of the Lord. (128)
      iii. He eliminates historical distance while retaining the historical reference. (p. 129)
   d. 13:19-10: Jesus is the content of the gospel in that he is preached—it is not persecuted who proclaim but the Holy Spirit in them.
   e. 14:9 has a motif of remembrance which is interpreted in terms of representation.
   f. Interpreting the gospel from Mk’s own time, we can say the Risen Lord is the author of the gospel which has him as its content.
      i. Thus, the similarity between gospel and Galilee is indicative of a gospel with intensive consolidation. (p. 131)
      ii. Unlike Harnack and Johannes Weiss, the relation of Ἄρχη to εὐαγγέλιον is not the beginning of the work, but rather the εὐαγγέλιον must be traced to before John the Baptist with the Ἄρχη of OT prophecy. (p. 132)
   g. Mk’s καιρὸς (fixed date) is opposed to Paul’s χρονὸς (paradox of here and future). (p. 134)
      i. Proclamation was the form history of the tradition before Mk. Mk does not reproduce proclamation nor does he make a Vita Jesu. (p. 135)
      ii. The gospel which Mk writes is his commentary on the term “gospel” which Paul leaves (for the most part) unexplained. (p. 138)

4. Further Development in the Major Gospels
      i. Christ and gospel are no longer identical.
      ii. Jesus is only bearer and proclaimer of the gospel.
      iii. The preaching Jesus of Mt contrasts the acting Jesus of Mk.
iv. The discourses of Jesus are gospels which Mt appropriates from Christian missions terminology. (p. 140)

v. Mt presents gospels in his book (1:1) and there is a historical framework in which they are arranged. (p. 141)

vi. Dibelius needs to recognize the development from Mk to Mt when he states: “The word ‘evangel’ is the name given to the preaching of salvation, and the earliest Christians made no difference between the preaching of Jesus and the preaching about Jesus.”

b. Lk distinguishes Jesus’ preaching from apostolic preaching.
   i. Time of Jesus has paradigmatic value as the “center of time.” (p. 142)
   ii. There is a distinction between the time of Jesus and the time of the church: verb in Lk, noun in Acts. (p. 145)

Study Four: Mark

1. The results thus far are hypotheses to be tested on the merits of their usefulness.

2. Mk’s situation is more complicated than Mt or Lk since it is harder to achieve consensus on his sources.

3. Mark 13: a Test Case in Scholarship (p. 151)
   a. Friedrich Busch, while correctly emphasizing the chapter’s unity, fails to properly use the methods of literary criticism and form history. (p. 153)
      i. In order to avoid the “verdict on authenticity,” “he stresses the evangelist and his work in contrast to historical inquiry.”
      ii. He wrongly attributes the intent of Lk to Mk. (p. 155)
      iii. He wrongly tries to keep in mind both the historical Jesus and the unity of Mk 13. (p. 156)
   b. Julius Schniewind, Busch’s teacher, finds the chapter has a structure with “decided progression” by exegeting the individual, isolated pieces. (p. 157)
   c. Marxsen notes it “will not do a priori to assume the kerygmatic motif is the evangelist’s (only) leading motif” because it would “obstruct our view to other features which may have been present and allow us to draw inferences regarding the community, the time, the author, etc.” (p. 158)
   d. Werner Georg Kümmel tries to prove with three groups of speeches that Jesus’ eschatological preaching is “in complete contrast to the apocalyptic world view.” (p. 158)
      i. Experiences of the Christian community (13:6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 21-3)
      ii. “Strictly eschatological sayings of Jesus” 13:2, 13:28-37 (p. 158)
      iii. Jewish-apocalyptic portions (13:7, 8, 12, 14-20, 24-7)
      iv. Marxsen finds this argument to be flawed.
         1. Both eschatological expectations and apocalyptic elements are within Mk’s community.
         2. Mk 13 contains nearly all the apocalyptic portions of Mk, but diverse eschatological elements are found elsewhere in Mk. Mk could have understood those eschatological elements on the basis of chapter 13, his unified portion. (p. 159-60)

4. Analysis of Mk 13
a. Within what is generally conceived to be Mk’s own composition, two groups of material separate automatically.
   i. Apocalyptic sections: verses 7, 8, 12, (13b?), 14-22, 24-7
   ii. Materials “from the synoptic tradition in the narrower sense:” 5-6, 9-11, 13a, 23, 28-37
b. Mark, according to Marxsen, would connect the parts thus:
   i. “A ‘Christian’ piece which he already found connected” (5-6, 9, 13a, 11, 23, 30-1).
   ii. “An individual saying (vs. 2), to which he prefixed the geographical and temporal frame of vs. 1”
   iii. “The apocalyptic leaflet”
   iv. “Further individual sayings from the tradition (vss. 10, 13b, 28-9, 32? 33-37)” (p. 162)
c. The contradictions between the discourse and the redactional introduction can aid interpretation.  (p. 165)

5. Mark’s Point of View
   a. “A literary analysis thus indicates that Mark intends to present coherence throughout.”  (p. 167)
   b. Mk 13:2, 14:58, 15:29; Jn 2:19, Acts 6:14 show Mk is describing “an actual destruction” when before the sources referred to an abomination.
      i. The seam between v. 2 and v. 3 arises from his adaptation of the sources to reinterpret the temple as part of the end event.
      ii. 13:4 points backward to the destruction and then forward to the future—indeed, Lohmeyer notes “accomplish” is “almost a technical term for the final happening.” (p. 168)
      iii. The other Synoptists, lacking Mk’s sources, may then finish off the process of synthesizing by removing his seams.  (p. 169)
      iv. 13:2 is not necessarily a vaticinium ex eventu because Mk’s point of view here is not a historical one.  (p. 170-1)
      v. 13:7 is a correction of apocalyptic expectation as conditioned by Jewish prophecy, as Schniewind has correctly noted.  (p. 172-3)
      vi. 13:8 does not need to refer to the famine under Claudius (Acts 11:28) nor the earthquakes in Phrygia (61) and Pompey (63) because it is drawn from OT prophecy, as Klostermann noted.  This is the ἀρχὴ τῶν ὁδίνων.  (p. 173-4)
      vii. 13:9 is a warning for the Diaspora.  (p. 174)
      viii. 13:10 refers to testimony that will make the opponents guilty, as Strathmann noted. (p. 174-5)
      ix. 13:11 gives the promise that the Holy Spirit will speak rather than the Christians.  (p. 175)
      x. Contrary to Lohmeyer, Mk’s community is experiencing persecution and thus witness in front of a tribunal “is also a preaching of the gospel and, since it occurs before Gentiles, is a proclamation to them.” (p. 176)
      xi. 13:12 extends the persecution to family divisions, which was a common feature of the apocalyptic since Micah 7 as Wellhausen noted.
xii. 13:14 arises from Caligula’s order to P. Petronius to erect his image in the temple and the resulting Jewish agitation, possibly in the form of a leaflet that reached Mk, over the expected desecration of the temple. (p. 179)

xiii. 13:23 references the Danielic Son of man and places Galilee as a nexus between heaven and earth. (p. 186)

c. “Mark transforms apocalyptic into eschatology,” because for Mark the eschatological act has begun and the Parousia (in Galilee) is soon following. (p. 189)

6. Further Development in the Major Gospels
   a. Luke
      i. He omits Mk 13:10 because he is in the era of the Gentile mission which precedes the end. (p. 190)
      ii. 21:22-3 revises the persecutions which Mk 13:17-9 sees as the first step as being in the past, with the perspective of seeing things more clearly after the fact.
      iii. He not only breaks up “Mk’s consolidation, but he reads his source as a description of events in chronological sequence.” (p. 192)
      iv. Lk’s “apocalypse” therefore no longer speaks of “last things.” (p. 193)
      v. 21:24b introduces Lk’s own version of the temporal setting of the Parousia as purely future. (p. 193-4)
      vi. 21:29 advocates watchfulness but not imminent expectation of the Parousia, which is now for the whole earth and not an event in Galilee. (p. 194)
      vii. Lk, however, could mean γενεά as the Jewish race in the same way as Mk did. (p. 196)
      viii. Wellhausen was correct in saying Lk “brought the prophecy up to date after the original time for fulfillment had passed.” (p. 196)
      ix. Wellhausen was wrong to typify this as part of the apocalyptic in general, as Lk had to account for his own experience. (p. 197)
   b. Matthew
      i. Ch. 24 is oriented toward Mk 13 and would have required alteration because of the new situation.
         1. Johannes Weiss notes that only the introduction to the chapter (vv. 1-3) poses difficulties.
         2. 24:3 introduces a new discourse which treats the Parousia (only Mt actually uses the term) as at a future, unspecified date (p. 199)
      ii. “The epoch of mission with its persecutions is thus separated from the ‘epoch’ of the Parousia.” (p. 200)
      iii. Mt suppresses the imminent expectation of Mk while maintaining a temporal sequence. He uses juxtaposition rather than a Lukan “seam” between past persecution and future expectation. (p. 204)

7. Summary
   a. Mk is one sermon—ch. 13 is “a portion of it woven into the whole” where the “imminent expectation determines the tenor as a whole.”
   b. Mt is a “collection of sermons.” (p. 205)
   c. Lk is a historian. (p. 206)
Concluding Remarks
1. Mk’s conclusion contrasts sharply with Mt and Lk.
   a. In “this very conclusive inconclusiveness lies the goal of the entire Gospel.” (p. 209)
   b. Papias, corrected by form history, would have liked to established a link between Mk (and Mt) and the first generation eyewitnesses. He thus anticipates the results of Karl Ludwig Schmidt’s Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. (p. 211)
   c. Mk “ties together the two ‘strands’ of primitive Christian preaching: The Pauline kerygma and the (so-called) synoptic tradition.” (p. 216)