

EVOCATIO DEORUM AND THE DATE OF MARK

JOHN S. KLOPPENBORG
john.kloppenborg@utoronto.ca
The University of Toronto, Toronto ON M5S 1H8, Canada

The date of the Gospel of Mark is generally set a few years either side of the destruction of the Second Temple on the 9th of Av, 70 C.E.¹ The grounds

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Gabrielle Gustafsson for providing me with a copy of her Uppsala dissertation, to Eve-Marie Becker for a pre-publication copy of her *Habilitationschrift*, and to William E. Arnal (University of Regina), Dan Bahat (Ben Gurion University), Scott Brown (University of Toronto), Eve-Marie Becker (Universität Erlangen), Leslie Hayes (Claremont Graduate University), and Ian Henderson (McGill University) for helpful comments and criticisms. A version of the paper was read at the 2004 annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies, University of Winnipeg.

¹ A few much earlier dates have been proposed: Charles Cutler Torrey argued that Mark 13:14 refers to Caligula's proposed desecration of the temple and concluded that it must have been penned before Caligula's assassination in January 41 C.E. (*Documents of the Primitive Church* [New York/London: Harper & Brothers, 1941], 31–33); similarly Günther Zuntz, "Wann wurde das Evangelium Marci geschrieben?" in *Markus-Philologie: Historische, literargeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium* [ed. Hubert Cancik; WUNT 33; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984], 47–71). On the belief that Peter came to Rome in 42 C.E. (Eusebius, *Chronikon*; see *Die Chronik des Hieronymus VII of Eusebius Werke* [ed. R. Helm; GCS Eusebius 9; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1956], 179) and following Clement's view that Mark composed the Gospel while Peter was alive, J. A. T. Robinson speculates that the Gospel was written ca. 45 C.E. (*Redating the New Testament* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976], 112–17; similarly Willoughby C. Allen, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* [Oxford Church Biblical Commentary; London: Rivingtons, 1914], 5–6). Adolf von Harnack conjectured that Mark should be dated prior to the death of Paul on the grounds that Luke, supposedly Paul's companion, knew Mark's Gospel: "Tradition asserts no veto against the hypothesis that St Luke, when he met St Mark in the company of St Paul the prisoner, was permitted by him to peruse a written record of the Gospel history which was essentially identical with the gospel of St Mark given to the church at a later time; indeed, the peculiar relation that exists between our second and third gospel suggests that St Luke was not yet acquainted with St Mark's final revision, which, as we can quite well imagine, St Mark undertook while in Rome" (*The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels* [New Testament Studies 4; London; Williams & Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911], 133). This would put Mark in the 50s. Bo I. Reicke argues similarly: the Synoptic predictions about the destruction of Jerusalem do

for this dating vary. Earlier commentators tended to place considerable stock in the patristic testimony, which claimed that the author of the Second Gospel was a companion of Peter, which in turn implied a date for the Gospel either during Peter's lifetime or shortly after his death—in any event, before 70 C.E.² More recent scholarship has insisted on internal evidence of date, with attention mainly falling on Mark 13. There is no strong tendency apparent: although perhaps the majority hold that Mark looks back on the destruction of the Second Temple,³ a few recent commentators, usually combining patristic testimony with internal evidence, hold that Mark ought to be placed shortly before 70 C.E.⁴

not betray knowledge of the actual events; and if Acts is dated ca. 62 C.E., then Mark (Matthew and Luke) should be dated before 62 C.E. ("Synoptic Prophecies on the Destruction of Jerusalem," in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren* [ed. David E. Aune; NovTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1972], 121–34, here 133–34). This early date is followed by Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 1041–42. N. H. Taylor, who argues that Mark 13 was formed during the Caligula crisis (in 40 C.E.), holds that Mark was not composed later than 62 C.E. ("The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Transmission of the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse," *HvTSt* 59, no. 2 [2003]: 283–311).

² E.g., Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes* (London: Macmillan, 1952), 31–32 and the authors cited there. More recently, E. Earle Ellis dates the Gospel between 50 and 60 C.E. on the strength of patristic testimony ("The Date and Provenance of Mark's Gospel," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* [ed. Frans Van Segbroeck et al.; 3 vols.; BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992], 801–15).

³ E.g., Adolf Jülicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Janet Penrose Ward; London: Smith, Elder, 1904), 324; James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (3rd rev. ed.; International Theological Library; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1918), 227; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (THKNT 2; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), 25; Nikolaus Walter, "Tempelzerstörung und synoptische Apokalypse," *ZNW* 57 (1966): 38–49, here 43; Rudolf Pesch, *Naherwartung: Tradition und Redaktion in Markus 13* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968), 218–23; John R. Donahue, *Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 10; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973), 131–32; Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (rev. English ed.; trans. Howard C. Kee; Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 98; Philipp Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* (De Gruyter Lehrbuch; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 347; Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (HTKNT 2; Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1976–77 [2nd ed., 1977–80]), 1:14; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (EKKNT 2; Zurich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978–79), 1:34–35; Walter Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (ÖTKNT 2; Gütersloh: Mohn; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979), 61; Dieter Lüthmann, *Das Markusevangelium* (HNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 6; Joel Marcus, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *JBL* 111 (1992): 460. Morton Smith puts the Gospel ca. 75 C.E. on the basis of Mark's reports of conflict with the Pharisees, which Smith argues reflects the period after the revolt when reorganized Pharisaic groups came into conflict with the Jesus movement (*Jesus the Magician* [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978], 29, 155).

⁴ William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 17–21; Martin Hengel, *Studies*

The pertinence and reliability of patristic testimony are much in question, but in any event do not take us back much earlier than Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus at the end of the second century.⁵ The best place to begin is with the internal references. Several texts are routinely cited that point to a *relatively* early dating, but none of these permits us to narrow down the date to one side of 70 C.E. or the other. Mark 9:1 and 13:30 predict that some of Jesus' contemporaries will live to see the *parousia*, predictions that, given a mean life expectancy of forty years, would point to a date not too much later than 70 C.E. Such indications of date are not very strong, however, since Matthew, usually dated in the 80s, has taken over the two Markan predictions almost unchanged. If Matthew was able to tolerate failed or obviously failing predictions, then so might Mark.⁶

Likewise, details such as the explicit naming of Alexander and Rufus as the sons of Simon of Cyrene (15:21) or Mark's unelaborated references to "the high priest" (14:53) and Pilate (15:2), in contrast to Matthew and Luke, who identify the high priest as Caiaphas (Matt 26:3, 57; Luke 3:2) and Pilate as "the governor" (Matt 27:11; Luke 3:1), presuppose an audience that does not need explanations for these persons.⁷ Or again, Mark's presentation of Jesus' opponents,

in the Gospel of Mark (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 1–30; Robert Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26* (WBC 34A; Dallas: Word, 1989), xxix–xxxii; E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989), 16–21.

⁵ Patristic references are divided between reports that Mark wrote while Peter was yet alive but that Peter did not endorse the Gospel (Clement, *Hypotyposeis* in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.5–7; Clement, *Adumbrationes ad. 1 Pet.* 5:13 [ANF 2:573]) and those which claim that Mark was written after Peter's death (Anti-Marcionite Prologues; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3.1.1 [*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.8.2–4]), with Clement's Mar Saba letter to Theodore holding that Mark composed a first edition while Peter was in Rome, and a second "more spiritual Gospel" after his death (Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973], 446). The genesis of these confused reports appears to be attempts to reconcile the fact that a Gospel associated with Peter was in circulation, but without any collateral tradition of Petrine endorsement (Clement in *Hypotyposeis* in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.15.1–2 contradicts the statement in 6.14.5–7 by claiming that Peter became aware of Mark's work "by revelation" and "authorized the scripture for concurrence in the churches"). The connection between Mark and Peter, however, goes back to Papias's "elder" (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15), though Papias says nothing of the circumstances under which Mark wrote, and it is not even clear that Papias's "Mark" is the Second Gospel. It is not clear that the connection between Peter and Mark is based entirely on inferences drawn from 1 Pet 5:13, whose pseudepigraphical status renders any conclusions highly precarious. But the unlikelihood of any direct connection between Peter and the author of the Gospel of Mark is manifest once one considers the unflattering manner in which Peter is depicted in Mark's Gospel. For a careful discussion of the patristic evidence, see C. Clifton Black, *Mark: Images of an Apostolic Interpreter* (Studies on Personalities of the New Testament; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

⁶ Moffatt, *Introduction*, 212.

⁷ Hengel, *Studies*, 9.

which, unlike Matthew's account, distinguishes between scribes and Pharisees (Mark 2:15) and, unlike Matthew (3:7; 16:1), restricts the Sadducees to the environs of Jerusalem, reflects a greater awareness of the religious topography of Judea prior to the first revolt.⁸ These data, however, point only to a *relatively* early date for the Gospel and do not permit any greater precision.

The key texts for the dating of Mark come down to Mark 13:1–2, the prediction of the temple's total destruction, and Mark 13:14, the cryptic remark about "the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not stand" (τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ).

I. Mark 13:14

The significance of Mark 13:14 for dating is made particularly difficult to gauge owing to the facts that (a) the verse is reusing a much older topos, and that (b) there is a strong possibility that Mark himself has redacted an earlier apocalypse of which Mark 13:14 was a part. The phrase τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως is clearly indebted to Dan 9:27, where Daniel described the erection of an altar to Ba'al Šamayim or Zeus Olympos by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167 B.C.E. (cf. 1 Macc 1:54–56). The author of this portion of Mark 13:14 is not rehearsing the events leading to the Maccabean revolt, but instead reuses Daniel's phrase to anticipate some event in his immediate future or to recall an event just past. The description of the θλίψις in the next verses (13:15–20) makes clear that the events in question will be far more terrible and destructive than those following Antiochus's desecration of the sanctuary, and rather than Maccabean-style resistance, the author advises flight (οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη).

Several authors have argued that the reference to the "abomination of desolation" betrays knowledge of the events of August 70 C.E. S. G. F. Brandon put the case most trenchantly, arguing that while the parenthetical comment "let the reader take note" is designed to direct the reader's attention to a specific event, no such event matching Mark 13:14 is known to have occurred in Judea prior to 70 C.E.⁹ Brandon accepted the thesis that Mark used an apocalyptic tract containing a prediction of the desecration of the temple (13:14), probably sparked by Caligula's plan to erect a statue of himself in the temple. Caligula's assassination on January 24, 41 C.E. ended the crisis for the moment. But the memory of the incident lived on, and the continued Roman occupation of Judea would have raised the constant apprehension of a repetition of the threat to the sanctity of the temple. Mark's parenthesis suggests that the temple was

⁸ *Ibid.*, 9–10.

⁹ S. G. F. Brandon, "The Date of the Markan Gospel," *NTS* 7 (1960): 126–41, here 133.

desecrated, and the only event that qualifies, according to Brandon, occurred in August 70, when the victorious legionaries of Titus erected their standards in the courtyard of the temple, sacrificed to them, and acclaimed Titus as *imperator*.¹⁰ Brandon rightly points out that legionary standards were cult objects that bore the images of the gods and the emperor and hence constituted an abomination when placed in the courtyard.¹¹ Finally, Mark's curious use of the masculine participle ἐστήκως (in place of the expected neuter) makes sense, given the fact that it was Titus himself who stood in the courtyard.¹²

¹⁰ Josephus, *J.W.* 6.316: "The Romans, now that the rebels had fled to the city and the sanctuary itself and all around it was aflame, carried their standards into the Temple (court) and setting them up opposite the eastern gate sacrificed to them, and with rousing acclamations hailed Titus as *imperator* (αὐτοκράτορα). Brandon adds that Mark's account of the tearing of the temple veil (Mark 15:38) is unlikely as the creation of the early followers of Jesus, who were loyal to the temple rather than hostile to it and would not have created a story that linked Jesus' death to the destruction of the temple ("Date," 131–32). Josephus, however, indicates that curtains or tapestries from the temple formed part of the spoils taken to Rome (*J.W.* 7.162). It can be added that according to *J.W.* 6.388–91, Phineas ben Thebuthi, one of the priests, handed over to the Romans various sacred items, including the veils and vestments of the chief priests (τὰ καταπετάσματα καὶ τὰ ἐνδύματα τῶν ἀρχιερέων) and the "scarlet and purple kept for the necessary repairs of the veil of the temple" (πορφύραν τε πολλὴν καὶ κόκκινον, ἃ πρὸς τὰς χρεῖας ἀπέκευτο τοῦ καταπετάσματος). The Babylonian Talmud *Git.* 56b contains the legendary account about Titus: "This was the wicked Titus who blasphemed and insulted Heaven. What did he do? He took a harlot by the hand and entered the Holy of Holies and spread out a scroll of the Law and committed a sin on it. He then took a sword and slashed the curtain. Miraculously blood spurted out, and he thought that he had slain himself, as it says, 'Your adversaries have roared in the midst of your assembly, they have set up their ensigns for signs' [Ps 74:4]." Brandon suggests that for Markan Christians, "from seeing in the ruin of the Jerusalem Temple a divine proclamation of the abrogation of the vaunted spiritual superiority of Judaism, it was natural for the eye of faith to see further that this event had been anticipated by the Crucifixion—hence the Roman tearing down of the Temple veil must have been anticipated by the rending of that veil on the earlier and more awful occasion." Further Christian references to the tearing of the veil are found in interpolations in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *T. Levi* 10:4; *T. Benj.* 9:4.

¹¹ 1QpHab 6.3–5: "Its interpretation [Hab 1:16a]: they [the Kittim] offer sacrifices to their standards and their weapons are the object of their worship." Tertullian remarks polemically (*Apol.* 16): *sed et Victorias adoratis . . . religio romanorum tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa jurat, signa omnibus diis praeponit*. "But you also worship victories. . . . The camp religion of the Romans is all through a worship of the standards, a setting the standards above all gods." On archaeological evidence of the use of weapons as objects of worship, see Ian Haynes, "Religion in the Roman Army: Unifying Aspects and Regional Trends," in *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion* (ed. Hubert Cancik and Jörg Rüpke; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 113–26.

¹² Similarly, Lüthmann, *Markusevangelium*, 222: "So wird vom Kontext des Markusevangeliums her nach [vv.] 2 und 7f. auch hier an die Zerstörung der Stadt und des Tempels zu denken sein: Jesu Voraussage erfüllt sich in der Gegenwart der Leser des Markusevangeliums. Gemeint ist mit dem 'Greuel der Verwüstung' in der mask. Form der römische Feldherr oder sein Heer als der 'greuliche Verwüster.'" G. R. Beasley-Murray (*Jesus and the Future: An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13* [London: Macmillan, 1954], 255–58) originally supposed that the reference was to Pilate's attempt to introduce standards into Jerusalem

Against this, Martin Hengel raised two important objections. First, the perfect participle ἑστηκώς “points more to the beginning of a permanent state of affairs associated with a specific person.” In fact, Titus left the temple area quickly, entering the upper city in September 70 (J.W. 6.409), and after the razing of the city departed for Caesarea Maritima and then Caesarea Philippi (J.W. 7.20, 23). Second, Hengel points out that Mark 13:14a is presented as a sign that ought to provoke flight (Mark 13:14b–17). But a summons to flee upon seeing the abomination of desolation would have made little sense if directed at those inside Jerusalem,¹³ since Titus had by that time erected a circumvallation wall. Josephus’s account, moreover, indicates that after the Romans breached the third and second walls, desertion and flight were just as likely to end in death and slavery as in escape, especially for Jews of little means.¹⁴ The summons to flight makes just as little sense if it is directed at the inhabitants of the Judean hills, whose land by that time had already been overrun. It should be noted additionally that by the time Titus occupied the Temple Mount, it would be impossible for anyone but Roman troops to “see” (ἴδητε, 13:14) a person standing in the court of the temple, since Mount Scopus was occupied by Legio V Macedonia, XII Fulminata, and XV Apollinaris, and the Mount of Olives was the camp for Legio X Fretensis.¹⁵ To these arguments Gerd Theissen adds:

it is improbable that a flight that has already occurred is being concealed here in the form of a *vaticinium ex eventu*. In that case, we would tend to expect a prophecy formulated in the future tense: “But when the desolating sacrilege stands where it should not stand, those in Judaea *will* flee to the mountains.”¹⁶

Thus, it seems unlikely that Mark 13:14 was specifically formulated with Titus’s desecration of the temple area in view, since it so poorly fits the details.¹⁷

(Josephus, *Ant.* 18.55–57; *J.W.* 2.169–70), but now, citing Lührmann, states: “I would not now adhere to this interpretation, but I do see the association of the Roman army with its idolatrous ensigns as significant” (*Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse of Mark 13* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993], 415 n. 112).

¹³ Pesch suggested that since Judea is already in the hill country, the original reference in 13:14b is for those *in Jerusalem* to flee, and that Mark changed this to Judea, since his congregation did not live in Judea (*Naherwartung*, 139–49). In his later commentary, Pesch argues that οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ was in the pre-Markan apocalypse since “es [handelt] sich um eine Weisung der Jerusalemer Gemeinde (die ihre Flucht nach Pella vorbereitet) an die judenchristlichen Gemeinden Judäas (im Umkreis Jerusalems)” (*Markusevangelium*, 2:292).

¹⁴ See Jonathan J. Price, *Jerusalem under Siege: The Collapse of the Jewish State 66–70 C.E.* (Brill Series in Jewish Studies 3; Leiden/New York/Cologne: Brill, 1992), 135–41, 293–97.

¹⁵ The hill to the south, Jebel el-Mukabber (“the Hill of Evil Council”) is too distant from the Temple Mount to permit a viewer to see a person standing on the platform.

¹⁶ Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 132.

¹⁷ Joel Marcus (“Jewish War,” 454–55), who argues for a date of Mark after the end of the

It is possible, nevertheless, to assert a post-70 date for Mark by arguing that Mark was using a pre-Markan apocalyptic tractate or apocalypse in the composition of Mark 13, consisting of at least vv. 6–8, 12–13, 14–22, 24–27. On this view, the anticipation of an “abomination of desolation” originally referred to an anticipated *desecration* (rather than destruction) of the temple, as it did in the case of Daniel, and was inspired either by the Caligula episode¹⁹ or by a more general apocalyptic topos of the appearance of an anti-Christ (e.g., 2 Thess 2:4). In the wake of the destruction of the temple, however, Mark reused this apocalypse, interpreting τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως now as the destruction of the temple itself.²⁰ In order to sustain this dating, it is also necessary to invoke the supplementary hypothesis that Mark barely edited his pre-Markan apocalyptic source, not bothering to adapt its details to what he knew of the events of 70 C.E. Indeed, Pesch argues that Mark’s was a conservative

war (p. 460), nonetheless suggests that the “abomination of desolation” refers to the occupation and defilement of the sanctuary by Eleazar b. Simon (*J.W.* 5.5–10, 98–104). He cites a number of expressions of horror at the Zealot’s defilement of the temple: *J.W.* 4.182–83, 201, 388; 6.95. While it is difficult to judge just what events an apocalypticist might take to be a fulfillment of Danielic prophecy, it is unclear how Mark’s description of the “abomination of desolation” *standing* (ἑστηκώς) where it ought not could convey the defilement of the sanctuary by human blood that Josephus describes.

¹⁸ E.g., Pesch (*Naherwartung*, 207–18), who posits a three-part Jewish (not Jewish-Christian) flyleaf, consisting of (I) vv. 6, 22, 7b, 8, 12, 13b; (II) vv. 14–20a [18 is uncertain]; and (III) vv. 24–27. Later Pesch posited a pre-Markan Jewish-Christian apocalypse containing vv. 7–9, [10], 11–13, 14–22, 24–31 (*Markusevangelium*, 2:266–67). Pesch is influenced by Ferdinand Hahn (“Die Rede von der Parusie des Menschensohnes, Markus 13,” in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle* [ed. Rudolf Pesch and Rudolf Schnackenburg; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1975], 240–66), who included vv. 7–8, 14–22, 24–31 and possibly 9–13 in a pre-Markan Jewish-Christian apocalypse.

The positing of an independent apocalypse goes back to Timothée Colani (*Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps* [2nd rev. and augmented ed.; Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1864], 201–3), who argued that Mark 13:5–31 was an independent Jewish-Christian document used by the Synoptics. His thesis was adopted (with various modifications) by Carl Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen, und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung* (Gotha: Rudolf Besser, 1864), 120–22; Otto Pfeiderer, “Über die Composition der eschatologischen Rede, Mt. 24, 4ff.,” *Jahrbuch für Deutsche Theologie* 13 (1968): 134–49; Hans Hinrich Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1886 [2. Aufl. 1901]), 15–21; Gustav Volkmar, *Die Evangelien: Oder, Marcus und die synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten Text, mit historisch-exegetischen Commentar* (Leipzig: Ludwig Friedrich Fues [R. Reissland], 1870), 542; Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci übersetzt und erklärt* (2nd ed.; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1909), 99–107, and many others. This thesis is elaborately defended by Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 128–65.

¹⁹ This view is at least as early as A. Piganiol, “Observations sur la date de l’apocalypse synoptique,” *RHPR* 4 (1924): 245–49.

²⁰ E.g., Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:292: “Im Kontext von V 2 und der ersten, red[aktionellen] gebildeten Jüngerfrage von V 4 deutet Markus V 14 auf die Tempelzerstörung selbst.” Pesch does not explain how Mark’s ἑστηκότα would make sense in this context.

editorial policy throughout the Gospel,²¹ allowing him (apparently) to tolerate elements that did not clearly fit the events to which he wanted to refer.

The disadvantages of this solution mount, however, when one considers Mark's inclusion of the wish that the events leading to flight "not occur during the winter" (13:18). This fits well the Caligula crisis, which was escalating during the summer and fall of 40, just before the onset of the winter rains, but it hardly fits the events of August 70 C.E.²² Thus, once again it would be necessary to posit a negligent editor, who missed the fact that the desecration of the sanctuary by Titus and its subsequent destruction occurred before the winter of 70 C.E. This is certainly possible—the redactors of the Gospels elsewhere are guilty of clumsy editing²³—but it is not an entirely happy solution. Since both Matthew and Luke were quite capable of alleviating the tensions created by vv. 14 and 18 when read in a post-70 situation, it is odd that a post-70 Mark could not or did not.²⁴

Without abandoning the advantages of positing a pre-Markan apocalypse to account for the anachronistic reference to flight in winter,²⁵ several authors

²¹ *Ibid.*, 2:267.

²² Lloyd Gaston (*No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* [NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970], 25, 61), citing G. Hölscher ("Der Ursprung der Apokalypse Mk 13," *ThBl* 12 [1933]: 193–202, here 201), dates the pre-Markan apocalypse to the winter of 40 C.E., and Mark to slightly before 70 C.E. Theissen (*Gospels in Context*, 161), though he dissents from a pre-70 dating for the Gospel, agrees with Gaston's dating of the pre-Markan apocalypse: "The composition of the synoptic apocalypse would thus be dated to the year 40 C.E. We can limit the date even further: it would be in that period when the erection of one or several statues of the emperor in the temple was threatened. . . . Whether the threatened desecration of the temple was generally known at harvest time in May (Philo) or at the time of sowing in October–November (Josephus), in either case the winter was inexorably approaching. Thus, the plea that the flight not occur in winter is understandable because it is especially difficult to secure food at that time of year."

²³ Mark S. Goodacre, "Fatigue in the Synoptics," *NTS* 44, no. 1 (1998): 45–58, www.ntgateway.com/synoptic/articles.htm.

²⁴ While Mark treats the events of 13:14–20 as either in the immediate past or immediate future, Matthew makes it clear that 24:15–22 (|| Mark 13:14–20) belongs to the more remote future: it follows the full evangelization of the nations (24:14). Moreover, Matthew treats τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως as an event foreseen by Daniel (τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου), and though he expressly indicates that this desecration will occur ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ (on the destroyed Temple Mount?), nothing suggests that he has the actual destruction of the temple by Titus in mind.

Luke, by contrast, completely historicizes the prediction, treating it as a prediction of Titus's destruction of Jerusalem: he refers to the encircling of Jerusalem (21:20); he changes τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως to ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς (scil. Jerusalem), drops ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, so that the prediction is *limited* to the destruction of Jerusalem; to the warning to flee to the hills, he adds καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρεῖτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν to stress the danger within the city (21:21); and he omits the reference to winter (since presumably he knew that the final assault occurred in the summer).

²⁵ The warning about flight during winter also has a thoroughly pragmatic aspect. Pesch draws attention to another way of accounting for the reference to the winter (*Markusevangelium*,

have alleviated the tensions created by vv. 14 and 18 by arguing that Mark was composed prior to 70 C.E. Accordingly, for the author of Mark, the expectation of a desecration of the sanctuary, either by the installation of a pagan altar similar to that used by Antiochus IV Epiphanes or by a cult image such as that planned by Caligula, was yet unrealized, but under the circumstances of an impending threat by the Romans, scarcely an unrealistic apprehension. The fact that Mark 13:14, in contrast to Luke, stresses not the destruction of Jerusalem but the desecration of the sanctuary, and the fact that Mark preserves the advice to flee, might imply a date relatively early in the revolt, probably before Titus's arrival in Jerusalem in Xanthikos (March/April) of 70 (Josephus, *J.W.* 5.40–49), and certainly before the erection of the circumvallation wall in Daisios (May/June) (*J.W.* 5.499–511), after which time flight would be nearly impossible.²⁶ Hengel dates Mark as late as winter 68/69 to winter 69/70, that is, before Titus's arrival in Jerusalem but in an atmosphere of speculation about a Nero *redivivus* who might desecrate the temple and inaugurate a period of messianic woes.²⁷

But we are faced with a dilemma. Thanks to Mark 13:1–2, the overall framing of Mark 13 emphasizes the destruction of the temple, and it is this framing that in turn makes it possible to read 13:14–20 as a reference not merely to the desecration of the temple but to its complete destruction. The theme of the destruction of the temple is far from a footnote to Markan thought, but pervades much of Mark 11–15.²⁸ It first appears in the Markan unit formed by bracketing the disruption of the temple (Mark 11:15–19) with the cursing of the barren fig tree (Mark 11:12–14, 19–21), a construction that implies doom for the temple. John P. Heil observes:

The Marcan audience realizes that the temple, like the fruitless fig tree, is condemned to destruction for failing to attain its purpose to be a house of prayer for all peoples. They must adopt Jesus' attitude toward the temple by rejecting it as a den of robbers, just as he has rejected it and left it twice with his disciples.²⁹

2:293–94): Josephus tells of Jewish refugees from Gadara attempting to flee east of the Jordan in 68 C.E. who were prevented from fording the Jordan because it was swollen from winter rains; they were slaughtered there by the pursuing Romans (*J.W.* 4.433–36). Similarly, Gundry, *Mark*, 743.

²⁶ Price, *Jerusalem under Siege*, 127–35, 143.

²⁷ Hengel, *Studies*, 28.

²⁸ See Werner H. Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 111–13; Donahue, *Are You the Christ?* 103–38; Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 290–97; Timothy J. Gedder, *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology* (JSNTSup 26; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 113–47; Scott G. Brown, “Mark 11:1–12:12: A Triple Intercalation?” *CBQ* 64 (2002): 78–89.

²⁹ John P. Heil, “The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark,” *CBQ* 59 (1997): 76–100, here 78.

A direct threat against the temple is attributed to Jesus at his trial (14:58) and, given the anti-temple theme developed in 11:12–21; 13:1–2; and 14:58, it is hard to read the comment about the tearing of the temple veil at Jesus' death (15:38) as anything but an ominous sign portending the judgment of the temple by God and its eventual destruction.³⁰ The connection that Mark draws between Jesus' fate and the fate of the temple can be seen also in his editing of the parable of the Tenants, in which the narrative of the death of the "beloved son" is connected with the destruction of the wicked tenants, who act like the λησται of Mark 11:17 (cf. 14:48) and whom Mark identifies with the priestly elite of Jerusalem (Mark 11:27; 12:12), that is, with those who were killed during the First Revolt. Other anti-temple themes appear in Mark's treatment of the question about the greatest commandment, where Jesus' scribal interlocutor states *περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ θυσιῶν* (12:33) and is congratulated for this; in Jesus' commentary on the rapacity of the scribes (whom Mark associates with the temple), who consume the "houses of widows"; and in the contrasting panel picturing the widow whose quadran is worth more *coram deo* than the large sums contributed by others to the temple. Obviously Mark's economics, if fully enacted, would have been disastrous for the operation of the temple.

Although component units of Mark 11–15 are undoubtedly early, Mark's framing of these chapters appears as a retrospective account that provides an aetiology of the events of 70 C.E. Nevertheless, the particulars of Mark 13:14–20 fit better with a pre-70 date than with a date after 70. If precedence is given to the framing of Mark (11:14–12:44) 13:1–37 (14:1–15:39) and it is accordingly dated after 70 C.E., we are then obliged to treat Mark as a rather careless redactor who did not bother to adjust the particulars of the discourse to fit the events to which he wished the predictions of vv. 14–20 to refer. Within the fabric of Mark 11–15 it is Mark 13:1–2, the explicit prediction of the dismantling of the temple, that conveys the clearest impression of knowledge of the events of August 70—hence the retrospective cast to Mark's account. Thus, weight of a decision about the dating of Mark falls on an evaluation of the significance of Mark 13:1–2.

II. Mark 13:1–2

Mark's *chria* in 13:1–2, containing Jesus' response to an expression of wonder at the grandeur of the Herodian temple, forecasts the total destruction of

³⁰ The uses of *ἐσχίσθη* (*passivum divinum*) and *ἀπ' ἀνωθεν ἕως κάτω* point to God's judgment and action. The conjunction of *σχίζειν* and the confession of Jesus as "son of God" (15:39) recall the baptismal scene (1:9–11). The veil of the temple had the heavens depicted on it, and thus Mark's tearing of the heavens at the baptism anticipates the later tearing of the veil.

the temple. It is this chria that allows Mark 13:14 to be read as an oracle not about the desecration of the temple, as it might be in isolation, but about its destruction,³¹ something that becomes patent in Luke's editing of Mark. The key question is: Does Mark 13:2 betray knowledge of the destruction of the temple by Titus?

Whereas one can perhaps resolve tensions between Mark 13:14–20 and a post-70 date for the composition of Mark by appealing to Mark's clumsy use of pre-Markan materials, this is not an option with Mark 13:1–2. There are ample signs of Mark's editorial hand.³² Moreover, Mark 13:1–2 is rarely if ever ascribed to the putative pre-Markan apocalypse, which is normally thought to have begun at Mark 13:5.³³

The fact that the framework of the chria concerns the buildings of the temple, but that Jesus' saying, βλέπεις τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ, speaks only of the demolition of large buildings has encouraged the thesis that the original saying of Jesus (13:2b) is a variant of Luke 19:44, which concerned the destruction of the city rather than the temple specifically. On this view Mark has converted a more general prediction into one concerning the temple.³⁴ At this point it is not necessary for me to referee the debate concerning the origin and authenticity of Mark 13:2 or its relationship to Luke 19:42–44, Mark 14:58, John 2:19, or Acts 6:14, although at the end of this article I will suggest a connection with Q 13:35a.³⁵ What is clear

³¹ Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 64: “[Mark] has managed to give a completely new interpretation both to the saying of Jesus in Vs 2 and to the oracle concerning the appalling sacrilege in Vs 14ff. Whereas the original oracle spoke of the desecration of the temple, the later prophetic discourse referred to the destruction of Jerusalem as the herald of the last great tribulation of the end times. Mark gives his source quite a different aspect when he makes it refer by virtue of its position to the destruction of the temple” (emphasis original).

³² See Jan Lambrecht, *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse* (AnBib 28; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967), 89–91; Frans Neiryneck, “Marc 13: Examen critique de l'interprétation de R. Pesch,” in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. Jan Lambrecht and G. R. Beasley-Murray; BETL 53; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Gembloux: Duculot, 1980), 397–99.

³³ See n. 18 above. Pesch believes that Mark 13:1–2 was not part of the pre-Markan apocalypse, but part of a pre-Markan passion source that began with 13:1–2 and continued with 14:1–2. Thus, Mark used the chria about the temple (13:1–2) in his passion source as the occasion to insert the apocalyptic discourse into his Gospel (*Markusevangelium*, 2:268–72).

³⁴ Gaston argues that Mark secondarily applied the tradition preserved in Luke 19:44 (concerning the city) to the temple (*No Stone on Another*, 242, 424). “If Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai and Josephus and Jesus ben Hananiah could threaten the destruction of Jerusalem, there is no reason why Jesus could not also have done so. Thus there is no reason why Mk 13:2 should not be considered a genuine saying of Jesus, as long as it is recognized that it, like its parallel Lk 19:44, was directed against the city as a whole as a part of a political judgment” (pp. 424–25).

³⁵ Lars Hartman distinguishes between two variants of the saying (*Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 Par.*

at this point is that whatever ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς might have meant in its putative pre-Markan context, in Mark the “buildings” in question are those of the temple, and the prediction concerns the destruction of the temple specifically.³⁶

The problem presented by Mark 13:2 is not simply that it forecasts the destruction of the temple. The Tanak contains various predictions of the destruction of the temple or the ruin of Jerusalem, including the Deuteronomistic threat that if Israel is unfaithful, “this house will become a heap of ruins; everyone passing by it will be astonished” (1 Kgs 9:8).³⁷ *1 Enoch* 90:28–30 predicts the removal (“folding up”) of the temple as a necessary preliminary to the establishing of a new city and temple;³⁸ Yohanan ben Zakkai is said to have pre-

[ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966], 219–20): Mark 13:2 and Luke 19:44 treat only the destruction of the temple/city, while Mark 14:58; 15:59; John 2:19; and Acts 6:14 present a longer two-part form. Hartman thinks that both versions could have “existed side by side from the beginning.” Jacques Dupont rejects any connection between Mark 13:2 and Mark 14:58 and argues that “le vrai parallèle de Mc 13,2 se trouve en Lc 19,44” (“Il n’en sera pas laissée pierre sur pierre (Mc 13,2; Luc 19,44),” *Bib* 52 [1971]: 301–20); Luke 19:44 is not literarily dependent on Mark 13:2 but belongs to the source from which Luke took 19:43–44b, while Mark 13:2 is not the redactional work of Mark. Dupont raises, but does not answer, the question of whether the Markan version (destruction of the temple framed in the passive) or the Lukan version (destruction of the city, by enemies) is the more original. John R. Donahue argues that Mark 14:58 joins two originally separate sayings, a threat against the temple (and related to Mark 13:2; Q 13:34–35) and a second that spoke of the building of another *naos* (*Are You the Christ?* 107–9).

³⁶ Beasley-Murray argues that the distinction that Gaston makes between 13:2 and Luke 19:44 does not hold: “[I]t may be doubted that Mark 13:2 related originally to the ruin of the city rather than the temple, and that such importance attaches to the issue as Gaston has implied, since neither city nor temple could be destroyed without the other. It is worth observing, nevertheless, that both Luke and Mark explicitly relate the word of Jesus to the stones of the temple, and Gaston is insistent that Luke is independent of Mark in this respect” (*Jesus and the Last Days*, 286).

³⁷ See also Amos 9:1: “I saw the LORD standing beside the altar, and he said: ‘Smite the capitals until the thresholds shake, and shatter them on the heads of all the people; and what are left of them I will slay with the sword; not one of them shall flee away, not one of them shall escape’”; Mic 3:12: “Therefore because of you Zion shall be plowed as a field; Jerusalem shall become a heap of ruins, and the mountain of the house a wooded height”; Jer 7:13–14: “And now, because you have done all these things . . . ¹⁴therefore I will do to the house . . . as I did to Shiloh”; 26:4–6: “You shall say to them, Thus says the LORD: If you will not listen to me, to walk in my law which I have set before you . . . ⁶then I will make this house like Shiloh, and I will make this city a curse for all the nations of the earth. . . .”

³⁸ *1 Enoch* 90:28–30: “And I stood up to see until they folded up that old house and carried off all the pillars; and all the beams and ornaments of the house were at the same time folded up with it; and they carried it off and laid it in a place in the south of the land. And I looked until the lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than that first, and set it up in the place of the first which had been folded up; all its pillars were new and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first, the old one which he had taken away, and all the sheep were within it.” On this, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (ed. Klaus Baltzer; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 404–6.

dicted the destruction of the temple by Vespasian, although this is part of a post-70 aetiology of the establishing of a rabbinic academy at Yavneh (*Lam Rab* 1:31);³⁹ and Josephus relates the story of a peasant, one Jesus ben Ḥananiah (Ananias), who for nearly seven and one-half years proclaimed the ruin of the city and the temple, beginning at Sukkot in 62 C.E. and continuing until he was killed by a ballista fired by Titus's troops (*J.W.* 6.300–309).⁴⁰ The problem with Mark 13:2, rather, is the specificity of the prediction: οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον. The fact that this seems to correspond so precisely to what occurred invites the conclusion that it was formulated (or reformulated) *ex eventu*.

According to Josephus, Titus ordered

the whole city and the Temple to be razed to the ground . . . and all the rest of the wall encompassing the city was so completely leveled to the ground as to leave future visitors to the spot no ground for believing that it had ever been inhabited. (*J.W.* 7.1, 3)

This is an exaggeration of course. As is well known, not all of the temple platform was destroyed—probably because dislodging the top courses created a rubble fill, at least on the southwestern and southern parts of the platform, which eventually prevented more ashlar from being pried off. Thus, it might be argued that if Mark 13:2 refers to the entire temple complex, the very fact that Jesus' prediction was not literally fulfilled is an indication that it was not composed with the events of August 70 in view.⁴² This argument, however,

³⁹ According to this tradition Vespasian granted Yavneh to Yohanan following the latter's acclamation of him as *imperator*: "R. Yohanan b. Zakkai came out and went among the soldiers of Vespasian. He said to them, 'Where is the king?' They went and told Vespasian, 'A Jew is asking for you.' He said to them, 'Let him come.' On his arrival he exclaimed, 'Vive domine Imperator!' Vespasian remarked, 'You give me a royal greeting but I am not king; and should the king hear of it he will put me to death.' He said to him, 'If you are not the king you will be eventually, because the Temple will only be destroyed by a king's hand'; as it is said, 'And Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one' [Isa 10: 34]."

⁴⁰ Josephus (*J.W.* 6.301) reports his oracles as φωνὴ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς, φωνὴ ἀπὸ δύσεως, φωνὴ ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, φωνὴ ἐπὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ τὸν ναόν, φωνὴ ἐπὶ νυμφίους καὶ νύμφας, φωνὴ ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν πάντα, "a voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the sanctuary, a voice against the bridegroom and the bride, a voice against all the people."

⁴¹ Josephus, *J.W.* 7.1, 3: κελεῦει Καῖσαρ ἤδη τὴν τε πόλιν ἄπασαν καὶ τὸν νεὼν κατασκάπτειν . . . τὸν δ' ἄλλον ἅπαντα τῆς πόλεως περίβολον οὕτως ἐξωμάλισαν οἱ κατασκάπτοντες, ὡς μηδεπώποτ' οἰκηθῆναι πίστιν ἂν ἔτι παρασχέιν τοῖς προσελθοῦσι.

⁴² Sanders and Davies argue that Mark's prediction is technically inaccurate and therefore cannot be *ex eventu*: "The temple was destroyed by fire, and many of the stones remained standing—some can be seen to this day. Here we probably have a genuine prediction, not a fake one written after the fact, since it did not come true in a precise sense" (*Studying*, 18). Later they concede that Mark may have been written after 70 C.E., but in that case, one would have to suppose that Mark had only heard of the destruction of the temple but knew nothing of the details of the destruction;

seems needlessly pedantic. Titus's destruction of Jerusalem was thorough and Josephus's own statement suggests that Mark 13:2 would have served as a generally credible summary of what occurred. And if Mark 13:2 refers to the temple proper, as Theissen has urged,⁴³ the prediction is perfectly accurate.

The key question that this article asks is whether, and under what circumstances, an observer of the events *prior* to destruction of the Second Temple might reasonably surmise that the fate of the temple was that it be razed. Schmithals excludes this possibility entirely:

Does the narrator anticipate the destruction of the Temple, or does he look back on it? The latter is more probable; for the *total* destruction of the Temple of which verse 2 speaks corresponds more naturally to the reaction of the Romans after the capture of Jerusalem *that could not be foreseen*. . . . Accordingly the narrator is writing in or shortly after 70 CE.⁴⁴

Joel Marcus's contention is similar:

Although, admittedly, far-sighted people in the late sixties of the first century might have been able to guess that the Temple would be destroyed, the precision of the "prophecy" in 13:1–2 indicates that it has been written after the event.⁴⁵

Brandon supplies a possible logic for the creation of 13:1–2:

From the abundant evidence which we have that the *Urgemeinde* continued to worship in the Temple it would appear that the repudiation of the charge that Jesus threatened to destroy it [Mark 14:58] must have come from those original Jewish Christians of Jerusalem. This then being the received tradi-

"or possibly he knew and chose not to change the prediction that 'not one stone would be left on another'" (p. 21). But see n. 44 below, for Nikolaus Walter's response.

⁴³ Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 259: "The restrictive ὅδε could be a hint that only the buildings of the temple platform, but not its foundation walls, would be destroyed. . . . The prophecy has been refined *ex eventu*." Pesch regards ὅς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ as a "Verdeutlichung des *vaticinium* Jesu *ex eventu*" (*Markusevangelium*, 2:271): "Die Vorhersage ist jetzt so deutlich, daß man vermuten kann, der Evangelist habe schon Kenntnis von dem gehabt, das JosBell VII, 1, 1 (§1) so überliefert ist. . . ."

⁴⁴ Schmithals, *Markus*, 558 (my translation; emphasis added). Walter stresses the complete agreement between Mark's prediction and the events of August 70 C.E., rejecting any attempt to distinguish between what occurred (destruction by fire) and Mark's prediction, which implies dismantling (Schleifung): "Aber bald darauf [the burning of the Temple] gab Vespasian [sic!] den Befehl, Stadt und Tempel zu schleifen (bell. VI 250–266), der sogleich, also noch im Jahre 70, durchgeführt wurde. . . . dem Zustand, der sich Ende des Jahres 70 darbot, entspricht die Beschreibung in Mc 13,2 durchaus" ("Tempelzerstörung," 42). It is also now clear from excavations at the southwestern corner of the Temple platform that the ashlar were pried loose and toppled down from the platform, landing on *clean* Herodian pavement, which can only have occurred in 70 C.E., not subsequently. [I owe this observation to Dan Bahat.]

⁴⁵ Marcus, "Jewish War," 460.

tion for the author of Mark, he duly recorded it. Since he thus had the authority of the *Urgemeinde* for dissociating Jesus from a hostile attitude to the Temple, why did he then risk misunderstanding by attributing to Jesus the prophecy of xiii.1–3?² There seems to be but one answer, and it has the merit of corresponding remarkably to the situation indicated by our other considerations. When the author of Mark wrote, the destruction of the Temple was “news”; indeed for the Christians of Rome, as we have seen, the most impressive of “news.” In the circumstances, for such a writer, it would surely have been difficult to believe that this signal event had gone unreported by the Lord Jesus. Therefore, since eschatological hopes had been influenced by it and had to be dealt with in his work, a Dominical anticipation of the ruin of the Temple would clearly best introduce the subject.⁴⁶

Hengel, however, who dates the Gospel to the year of the Four Emperors, after the suicide of Nero and before Titus’s assault on Jerusalem, argues, “Mark 13.2 in no way presupposes the catastrophe of 70. Mark may have formulated this sentence simply in view of the threatening situation in Judaea from the time of the sixties by using early tradition stemming from Jesus himself.”⁴⁷

Hengel’s defense of a pre-70 date is based on the contention that there existed an “eschatological tradition about the καταλύειν of the temple”⁴⁸ even though apart from *1 En.* 90:28–30 and Josephus *J.W.* 6.300–309 the evidence is not copious.⁴⁹ He also points to a succession of political threats to the temple’s existence that would have raised the apprehension that the temple might well be destroyed: the Seleucid general Nicanor’s threat to “level the precinct of God to the ground and tear down the altar” (2 Macc 14:33); the advice proffered to Antiochus VII Sidetes to “take [Jerusalem] by storm and wipe out completely the race of the Jews”—which presumably would involve the destruction of the city and the temple;⁵⁰ and the burning of the porticoes of the temple by Roman troops as they suppressed disturbances that followed Herod’s death (Josephus, *Ant.* 17.259–64).

But in the 60s Jerusalem was not being threatened by the Seleucids, and

⁴⁶ Brandon, “Date,” 135.

⁴⁷ Hengel, *Studies*, 16.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 15 (emphasis original).

⁴⁹ John K. Riches, “Apocalyptic—Strangely Relevant,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. William Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 249–50: “If Jesus predicted or threatened the destruction of the Temple, that would have been certainly striking and unusual, but not without precedent or subsequent exemplars.” The same applies whether or not Mark 13:2 is authentic; it is not a common prediction.

⁵⁰ Diodorus Siculus 34.1.1; Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Section of Humanities; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–84), 1:181–83.

so the old threats of Nicanor and Antiochus VII are not relevant. The last-mentioned incident involving the Romans was not a preplanned act against the temple but a spur-of-the-moment act of troops attempting to defend themselves. In general, Romans regarded themselves as the most pious people on earth; they respected cultic sites, even of their enemies and subject peoples and thought it a sacrilege to interfere with them. But under specific circumstances, temples could be destroyed systematically, not as part of the collateral or accidental consequences of conflict, but deliberately, and it is just such a destruction that Mark 13:2 has in view. It has to do with the Roman siege practice of *evocatio deorum*—the “calling out” of the tutelary deity or deities of a city prior to its destruction, the “devoting” of its inhabitants to death or, more usually, slavery, and the razing of its buildings and temples.⁵¹

The practice of *evocatio* was sufficiently well known and widespread to make it a reasonable surmise that any hostilities with Rome might well eventuate in the abandoning of the sanctuary by the deity and its consequent destruction. Thus, it is possible to imagine a pre-70 date for the creation of Mark 13:2. *Evocatio* as a *literary motif*, however, is usually retrospective, belonging to the historiographical techniques related to the recording of omens and portents.

III. *Evocatio deorum*

The earliest reported instance of *evocatio* concerns the Etruscan city of Veii, twenty kilometers north of Rome.⁵² The Romans, under the command of Marcus Furius Camillus, conquered the city after a long siege in 396 B.C.E. Just before the final attack, Camillus is reported to have prayed:

Under your leadership, Pythian Apollo, and inspired by your will, I advance to destroy the city of Veii and to you I promise a tithe of its spoils. At the same time I beseech you, Queen Juno, who dwells now in Veii, to come with us

⁵¹ As far as I am aware, the only scholar of Christian origins to mention *evocatio* is Hengel (*Studies*, 14), who rejects any connection between Mark 15:38 and the *evocatio* of the deity from the sanctuary.

⁵² On *evocatio*, see Georg Wissowa, “Evocatio,” *PW* 6:1152–53; Vsevolod Basanoff, *Evocatio: étude d'un rituel militaire romain* (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études: Sciences religieuses 61; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1947); Werner Eisenhut, “Evocatio,” *Kleine Pauly* 2:472–73; Joel Le Gall, “Evocatio,” in *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine: Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon* (Collections de la École française de Rome 27; Paris: Editions de Boccard, 1976), 519–24; Alain Blomart, “Die *evocatio* und der Transfer fremder Götter von der Peripherie nach Rom,” in *Römische Reichsreligion und Provinzialreligion* (ed. Hubert Cancik and Jörg Püpke; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 99–111; Hendrik S. Versnel, “Evocatio,” *Der Neue Pauly* 4:329; Gabriella Gustafsson, *Evocatio Deorum: Historical & Mythical Interpretations of Ritualised Conquests in the Expansion of Ancient Rome* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum 16; Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 2000).

when we have obtained the victory, to our city—soon to be yours too—that a temple appropriate to your majesty may there receive you. (Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 5.21.1–3)⁵³

Livy relates the legend that as Camillus's sappers were digging beneath the temple of Juno, they overheard the soothsayer tell the Veian king that whoever cut up the entrails of the sacrificial victim would obtain the victory and, hearing this, broke through, seized the entrails, and conveyed them to Camillus (though Livy describes this as a story more fit for the theater than it is to be believed [5.21.8–9]). After describing the looting of the city and the enslavement of its citizens, Livy adds that the temples were stripped and the cult images removed, "though more in the manner of worshipers than pillagers" (5.22.3: *sed colentium magis quam rapientium modo*) and that one of the young men charged with removing the image of Juno called out, "Will you go, Juno, to Rome?" to which the cult statue nodded assent. The statue was then borne to the Aventine where Camillus had commissioned a temple (5.23.7).⁵⁴

By far the most famous case of *evocatio* is the transfer of Juno Caelestis—probably identified with the Phoenician goddess Tanit—from Carthage to Rome at the conclusion of the Third Punic War (146 B.C.E.). The main historical sources for the war, Polybios and Appian, say nothing of an *evocatio*. But in the first century B.C.E. Horace knew of the tradition that the tutelary deities of Carthage had departed and alluded to it in his *Odes* 2.25–28:

25 Iuno et deorum quisquis amior
Afris inulta cesserat impotens
tellure, uictorum nepotes
rettulit inferias Iugurthae.

Yes, Juno and the powers on high
That left their Africa to its doom,
Have led the victors' progeny
As victims to Jugurtha's tomb.

⁵³ Livy 5.21.2–3: "*tuo ductu*" inquit, "*Pythice Apollo, tuoque numine instinc tus pergo ad delendam urbem Veios, tibiue hinc decimam 3 partem praedae uoueo. te simul, Iuno regina, quae nunc Veios colis, precor, ut nos uictores in nostram tuamque mox futuram urbem sequere, ubi te dignum amplitudine tua templum accipiat.*"

⁵⁴ Plutarch (*Camillus* 5.4–6.2) relates, again with skepticism, the tale about the sacrificial entrails and gives a version of Camillus's invocation of Zeus and the gods (but not the vow to Apollo or his evocation of Juno). He does, however, relate a story of Camillus himself, who, while sacrificing in the temple of Juno and "praying the goddess to accept of their zeal," heard the statue say in low tones that she was ready and willing. Dionysios of Halicarnassus (13.3) relates Camillus's promise of a temple and "costly rites" for Juno, and says that he then sent one of the most distinguished of the *equites* to remove the statue and when one of the young men asked the goddess if she wished to go to Rome, the statue "answered in a loud voice that she did."

Two fourth-century commentators also knew the tradition: Servius, in his commentary on the *Aeneid* (12.841–42),⁵⁵ and especially Macrobius, who gives an account of the *carmen* used by Scipio Aemilianus to “evoke” the tutelary god of Carthage:

To any god, to any goddess under whose protection are the people and the state of Carthage (*si deus si dea est cui populus civitasque Carthaginensis est in tutela*), and chiefly to you who are charged with the protection of this city and people, I make prayer and do reverence and ask grace of you all, that you abandon the people and state of Carthage, forsake their places, temples, shrines, and city, and depart therefrom; and that upon that people and state you bring fear and terror and oblivion; that once put forth, you come to Rome, to me and to mine, and that our places, temples, shrines, and city may be more acceptable and pleasing to you; and that you take me and the Roman people and my soldiers under your charge; that we may know and understand the same. If you shall so have done, I vow to you temples and solemn games (*si ita feceritis, voveo vobis templa ludosque facturum*). (Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 3.9.7–8)

After the prayer and vow were recited, the entrails of a sacrificial victim were inspected to determine whether the gods had accepted the invitation. Closely associated with the *evocatio*, says Macrobius, is another rite, the *devotio*, by which “cities and armies are devoted to destruction after the protecting deities have been evoked” (*urbes vero exercitusque sic devoventur iam numinibus evocatis* [3.9.9]). Famously, the *devotio* of Carthage left not one stone standing on another.

Although Macrobius is from the early fourth century C.E., he claims to have found these formulae in a book of Sammonicus Serenus from the Severan period, who in turn was said to have used an older book by a certain Furius, probably L. Furius Philius, consul in 136 B.C.E. and friend of Scipio Aemilianus, who prosecuted the siege of Carthage.⁵⁶ There are, nevertheless, several problems with Macrobius’s account that lead to the conclusion that the rite was not as fixed as he implies. The fact that there is no evidence of the cult of Juno Caelestis in Rome before the time of Septimius Severus led Georg Wissowa to regard Macrobius’s account as entirely legendary.⁵⁷ Others have argued that the tradition is essentially correct,⁵⁸ or, following Servius’s comment, hold that Juno

⁵⁵ Servius, *Aeneid* 12.841–42: *sed constat bello Punico secundo exoratum Iunonem, tertio vero bello a Scipione sacris quibusdam etiam Romam esse translata*, “but in fact Juno was exorated during the Second Punic War, and during the Third War was moved to Rome to her sacred precincts.”

⁵⁶ Le Gall, “Evocatio,” 521.

⁵⁷ Wissowa, “Evocatio,” 374.

⁵⁸ R. E. A. Palmer, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire: Five Essays* (Philadelphia: University

was “exorated” (“mollified”) during the Second Punic War and only transported after the third.⁵⁹ For my purposes the historicity of the *evocatio* at Carthage is less important than the fact that by the first century B.C.E. Horace took for granted that Juno had been evoked, and in the Augustan era Virgil concluded that the gods of Troy had departed (*excessere omnes*), prompting Servius and Macrobius to assume that they had been evoked, thus accounting for the downfall of the city and the eventual move of Aeneas to Carthage and thence to Rome:

When I saw them in close ranks and eager for battle,
I thereupon began thus: My men, vainly brave,
if your desire is fixed to follow me in my final venture,
350 you see what is the fate of our cause:
from every altar and protecting fire all the gods
on whom this empire was stayed, have gone forth (*excessere omnes*);
the city you aid is in flames. Let us die and rush into the midst of arms.
One safety the vanquished have, to hope for none.

Aeneid 2.347–54⁶⁰

Slightly later, the elder Pliny reports that the ritual of *evocatio* was described in the writings of Verrius Flaccus, who died during the principate of Tiberius. According to Pliny:

Verrius Flaccus cites trustworthy authorities to show that it was the custom, at the very beginning of a siege, for the Roman priests to call forth the divinity under whose protection the besieged city was (*evocari deum, cuius in tutela id oppidum esset*), and to promise him the same or even more splendid worship among the Roman people. Down to the present day this ritual has remained part of the doctrine of the pontiffs. (Pliny, *Nat.* 28.18–19)

The logic of *evocatio*, Pliny adds, also explains why the true name of the Roman tutelary deity was kept secret, lest some enemy “evoke” it, thus leaving Rome subject to destruction.⁶¹ Hence, whether or not Camillus or Scipio

of Pennsylvania Press, 1974), 47; Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price, *Religions of Rome*, vol. 1, *A History*; vol. 2, *A Sourcebook* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 1:111: “The genuineness of these documents [Macrobius’s *Saturnalia* 3.9.7–10 and his sources] has been questioned but there is no strong reason to doubt that these were the formulae used in the 140s B.C.; if so, it is very significant that the same group of nobles were reviving them, using them, and recording them in their writings.”

⁵⁹ Basanoff, *Evocatio*, 63–66.

⁶⁰ This is the text on which both Macrobius and Servius are commenting when they discuss the *evocatio*. Servius (*Aeneid* 2.351–52) explains: *excessere quia ante expugnationem evocabantur ab hostibus numina propter vitanda sacrilegia*, “*excessere*, because before the conquest, [the gods] were called out by the enemies to avoid terrible sacrileges.”

⁶¹ Both Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.9.3–5) and Servius (*Aeneid* 2.351) also discuss the protection of the

Aemelianus performed this rite, Roman writers in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. assumed that they had and believed the rite to be part of current siege practices.

Macrobius proceeds to report that his sources contained lists of other towns that had been “devoted,” that is, razed, once their gods were evoked: Stonii, Fregelae, Gabii, Veii, Fidenae, all from Italy; Carthage, Corinth, and many towns in Gaul, Spain, Africa, and other parts of the empire (*Sat.* 3.9.13). Nothing is known of Stonii—not even its location; but Fregelae was razed in 125 B.C.E. by L. Opimius,⁶² and both Horace (*Ep.* 1.11.7) and Propertius (4.1.34) use Gabii and Fidenae as examples of cities that were totally deserted. On Corinth and Carthage we are better informed: Carthage was destroyed so that, in the words of Orosius, not one wall in the city was left standing.⁶³ Two years earlier (146 B.C.E.) Corinth was razed to the ground by L. Mummius after it had joined the Achaean confederacy against Rome (Strabo 8.6.23). It remained deserted until its refoundation as a Roman colony in 44 B.C.E.

This list of towns that were “devoted” to destruction (and their temples destroyed) is impressive. But much less is said of the actual practice of *evocatio*—so little, in fact, that earlier scholars such as Georg Wissowa doubted whether it was practiced at all.⁶⁴ In contrast, Hendrik S. Versnel was convinced on both historical and theoretical grounds that

name of the Roman god. In the second century C.E. Sextus Pompeius Festus, who is also known to have epitomized the work of Verrius Flaccus, reports: “Foreign cults are those called, who either have been transferred after an evocation of the deities during the siege of the cities (*quae aut evocatis dis in oppugnandis urbibus Romam sunt conata*), or have been fetched in times of peace because of certain reasons, like the Magna Mater from Phrygia, Ceres from Greece, Aesculapius from Epidaurus; and these (cults) are celebrated in the same way as among those from whom they have been taken” (trans. Gustafsson, *Evocatio Deorum*, 43). See the discussion by Gustafsson; and M. Van Doren, “Perigrina sacra: Offizielle Kultübertragungen im alten Rom,” *Historia* 3 (1954–55): 488–97.

⁶² Hendrik S. Versnel, “Two Types of Roman *Devotio*,” *Mnemosyne* 39 (1976): 380.

⁶³ Orosius, *Adversus paganos*, 4.23: *diruta autem Carthago omni murali lapide in pulverem conminuto*, “Now Carthage was destroyed, every stone wall being reduced to dust.” Compare Appian, *Bellum punica* 135: οἱ Καρχηδόνοσ μὲν εἶ τι περιλοιπον ἔτι ἦν, ἔκριναν κατασκάψαι Σκιπίωνα καὶ οἰκεῖν αὐτὴν ἀπέειπον ἅπασι καὶ ἐπηράσαντο, μάλιστα περὶ τῆς Βύρσης, εἴ τις οἰκήσειεν αὐτὴν ἢ τὰ καλούμενα Μέγαρα: ἐπιβαίνειν δ’ οὐκ ἀπέειπον. ὅσαι δὲ πόλεις συμμαχήκεσαν τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐπιμόνωσ, ἔδοξε καθελεῖν ἀπάσασ. “They [delegates of the Senate] decreed that if anything was still left of Carthage, Scipio should obliterate it and that nobody should be allowed to live there. Direful threats were leveled against any who should disobey and chiefly against the rebuilding of Byrsa or Megara, but it was not forbidden to go upon the ground. The towns that had allied themselves with the enemy it was decided to destroy, to the last one.”

⁶⁴ Wissowa argues that the *evocatio* related only to the Etruscan and Latin cities and that the story of the evocation of Juno Caelestis was “apocryphal,” belonging to the Severan period (“*Evocatio*,” 1152).

every *devotio* of an enemy city—also that of Veii—was preceded by an *evocatio*. Therefore we cannot but conclude that the *devotio hostium* was definitely an ancient ritual, at any rate dating from far before 146 B.C., at least from about 400 B.C., and it is not probable that it was invented for the capture of Veii.⁶⁵

The discovery in 1970 of a granite block at Bozkir in the valley of the Çarşamba ten kilometers west of Zengibar Kalesi suggests that Versnel is probably correct, at least to the extent that the practice of *evocatio* was neither legendary nor had it fallen from use. The block is probably from a temple⁶⁶ and dates from 75 B.C.E., when the proconsul P. Servilius Vatia destroyed the Cilician town of Isaura Vetus (Sallust, *Histories* 2 fr. 87). The inscription reads:

SERVILIUS · C(aii) · F(ilius) · IMPERATOR
 hostibus · victeis · Isaura · vetere ·
 capta · captivéis · venum · dateis ·
 sei · deus · seive · deast · quoius · in ·
 tutela · oppidum · vetus · Isaura ·
 fuit *vac.* votum · solvit

Servilius, son of Gaius (Servilius), *imperator*,
 having conquered the enemies when Isaura Vetus
 was captured and sold the captives (into slavery).
 Whether it was a god or goddess who was protecting
 this town, Isaura Vetus
 (Servilius) fulfilled his vow.⁶⁷

The formula *sei deus seive deast quoius in tutela oppidum . . . fuit*⁶⁸ is the same as that quoted by Macrobius four centuries later in connection with the *carmen* used at Carthage (*si deus si dea est cui populus civitasque Carthagi-*

⁶⁵ Versnel, “Two Types of Roman *Devotio*,” 382–83. Similarly, Le Gall, who argues that every *devotio* of a town was necessarily preceded by the *evocatio* of its god (“*Evocatio*,” 524). “C’était [*evocatio*], bien au contraire, un rite banal du vieil arsenal religieux romain de la guerre, si banal que les auteurs n’y ont même pas fait allusion sauf dans les cas célèbres de Veies et de Carthage, pas plus qu’à d’autres, tout aussi courants, telle la lustration de l’armée au moment de l’entrée en campagne dont Tacite [*Ann.* 6.48.2] nous apprend incidemment qu’on la pratiquait encore en 37 ap. J.-C.”

⁶⁶ Alan Hall, “New Light on the Capture of Isaura Vetus by P. Servilius Vatia,” in *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik, München 1972* (Vestigia 17; Munich: Beck, 1972), 572: “The stone itself is a building block, and may have been part of an edifice which was promised in the vow.” Similarly, Le Gall, “*Evocatio*,” 523.

⁶⁷ *L’Année épigraphique* (1977) 816; *editio princeps*: Hall, “New Light.” See also Beard et al., *Religions of Rome*, 2:248.

⁶⁸ That is, *si deus sive dea (est) cuius in tutela oppidum . . . fuit*. The orthographic variations are well known.

niensis est in tutela).⁶⁹ This coincidence of wording suggested to the original excavator that Servilius had performed a rite similar to the *evocatio*.⁷⁰

The nature of Servilius's vow is uncertain. There is no indication that the tutelary deity of Isaura Vetus—whoever it was—was promised a new temple in Rome or received one. The fact that the inscription is found on a block destined to be placed in a building (the back of the stone is undressed), suggests that Servilius had built a new temple to the deity at or near the site of the destroyed town.⁷¹ This observation led Gabriella Gustafsson, who has most recently commented on the practice of *evocatio deorum*, to conclude that the key element in the *evocatio* was not the transport of the deity to Rome, but

the necessity of dissolving the sacral bonds of the city to be conquered (and destroyed). In any case, the focus is on the *votum*, on the place to be conquered, and on the tutelary god of this place. An introduction into Rome of the deity in question should therefore not necessarily be regarded as a decisive element in a definition of *evocatio*. . . . In this perspective and with such a definition of *evocatio*, since the Isaura vetus inscription is the *only* known and reasonably certain trace of such a ritual, the inscription must be viewed not as support for the accurateness of other sources, nor as evidence for a “watering down” of the “traditional regulations” of the ritual (of which we know nothing). Instead, it should be regarded as an archaeological point of departure for the reasonable conclusion that the emphasis on destruction and conquest is correct and that the other sources have embroidered, theologically and historiographically, a ritual praxis that was perhaps well-known

⁶⁹ Compare also Pliny's formulation (above, p. 437). The formula *sive deus, sive dea* is studied by Jaime Alvar, “Matériaux pour l'étude de la formule *sive deus, sive dea*,” *Numen* 32, no. 2 (1985): 236–73.

⁷⁰ Hall, “New Light,” 572. Le Gall (“Evocatio,” 520) is more definite: “dans ces conditions il semble légitime d'admettre que l'opération à laquelle il a procédé devant *Isaura Vetus* a bien été une *evocatio* et pas simplement un rite analogue («similar») comme l'a suggéré le Professeur A. Hall.” Similarly, Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome: A History*, 133; eidem, *Religions of Rome: A Sourcebook*, 248. The most recent study, by Gustafsson (*Evocatio Deorum*, 61), affirms Hall's more cautious conclusion.

⁷¹ See Jörg Rüpke, *Domus militiae: Die religiöse Konstruktion des Krieges in Rom* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990), 164: “Im Verlauf der späten Republik kommt die Evozierung fremder Götter zum Stillstand. Die letzte, explizit als solche bezeichnete *evocatio*, die der Schutzgöttin Karthagos, führt nicht mehr zu einem Tempelbau in Rom. Das fast fünfundsiebzig Jahre jüngere Inschrift aus Isaura, unser letztes Zeugnis, erwähnt die Errichtung eines Tempels überhaupt nicht: Die *evocatio* ist zum gewöhnlichen *votum* geworden.” Beard, North, and Price offer a somewhat different account: in the late republican period the ‘evoked’ god or goddess was no longer promised a temple in Rome, but instead was promised one in what had now become Roman provincial territory (*Religions of Rome: A History*, 133–34). Gustafsson interprets this not as a relaxation of earlier practices, but as pointing to the fact that the *evocatio* was not a “strict and clearly regulated ritual” (*Evocatio Deorum*, 62).

to them but is unknown to us, a ritual practice that may well, for all we know, have varied considerably according to the particular situation.⁷²

IV. Evocatio and Mark 13:2

The foregoing has shown that the ritual of *evocatio* as part of the toolkit of Roman siege tactics was well known. Although it likely existed in varied forms and did not always involve the transport of the deity to Rome, it is attested both in Italy and the western provinces and also in the East, and it was well known in the early imperial period. The question now is whether it is at all relevant to an understanding of Mark 13:1–2.

To the modern ear the prediction that “no stone will be left standing on another” might sound simply like a matter-of-fact prediction of the fate of this grand piece of Herodian architecture or as a pronouncement of divine judgment of the temple, its priesthood, and the elite families who controlled it. But to the ancient hearer, as the above discussion has suggested, the destruction of a temple entailed the belief that the deity had departed, for in the words of Macrobius, unless the deity had departed, “the city could not be taken after all or . . . were the capture possible, [the Romans] held it to be an offense against the divine law to make prisoners of gods” (*Sat.* 3.9.2).⁷³

The notion that a temple could not be taken while the deities were present was not only a Roman belief, but is implicit and explicit in statements of the Tanak and Second Temple literature, which account for the destruction of the First Temple by the Babylonians by the belief that the deity had departed.⁷⁴ The prediction of Mark 13:2, then, is not a statement about real estate or architecture, nor is it merely an expression of divine judgment, although it is that too. Implicit in the prediction of a destroyed temple is the belief that the deity has or will abandon the temple, for it is only under these conditions that it could be destroyed.

⁷² Gustafsson, *Evocatio Deorum*, 80.

⁷³ Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.9.2: *quod aut aliter urbem capi posse non crederent, aut etiam, si posset, nefas aestimarent deos habere captivos*. Similarly, Servius, *Aen.* 2.351: «*excessere*» *quia ante expugnationem evocabantur ab hostibus numina propter vitanda sacrilegia*, “*excessere*, because before the conquest, [the gods] were called out by the enemies to avoid terrible sacrileges.” Livy’s account of the transport of Juno to Rome emphasizes the *pietas* of Camillus, while Appian’s account of the siege of Carthage points out that soldiers who participated in the looting of the temple of Apollo were punished by Scipio Aemelianus (*Bell. punica* 127, 133).

⁷⁴ See n. 81 below.

An Evocatio Performed by Titus?

Are a prediction of the utter destruction of the temple and the desertion by the divinity that this implies credible prior to the events of 70 C.E., or is it, as Schmithals has opined, something unforeseeable (“nicht voraussehbar”) before the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, and hence a post-factum rationalization of the destruction that Titus wreaked on the temple? The simple answer seems to be that Schmithals is mistaken: one can surmise that anyone who had knowledge of the practices of *evocatio* and *devotio* or knew of the fates of Carthage, Corinth, Isaura Vetus, and other cities that had been “devoted” could have concluded from the events, say, of 66–69 C.E., that the total destruction of the temple would not only be possible, but would be a nearly inevitable consequence of war. The same conclusion might have been drawn by someone such as Jesus ben Ḥananiah, who in the early 60s believed that conflict with the Romans was inevitable. The Synoptic Sayings Gospel Q, usually dated prior to the fall of Jerusalem,⁷⁵ has Jesus declare, ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν (13:35a), which, like Jesus ben Ḥananiah’s ravings of 62 C.E., suggests that the deity has abandoned, or is about to abandon, the temple. Thus, prior to the conclusion of the Second Revolt, we have expressions of a key element of the theology of *evocatio*, framed, to be sure, not from the standpoint of the conquering Romans but from the standpoint of certain Jews who were presumably anxious to raise warnings regarding the precarious political situation of Jerusalem in the early 60s and/or the conduct of the elite of Jerusalem, whom Q accuses of “killing the prophets” (Q 11:49–51; 13:34–35).

We do not know whether Titus performed the ritual of *evocatio* at the beginning of the siege, since neither of our two principal sources, Tacitus and Josephus, mentions this (Tacitus never mentions this ritual at all in his *Histories*). Nevertheless, both represent as a credible scenario that the siege proceeded on the supposition that the deity had abandoned the temple prior to August 70 and hence that a Roman victory was assured—the key element in the theology of *evocatio*.

This belief surfaces in Josephus’s account in several ways. First, just after the Roman capture of the second wall in May, Josephus describes himself exhorting the defenders to surrender and to recognize that “fortune had indeed from all quarters passed over to [Rome] and God, who went the round of the nations, bringing to each in turn the rod of empire, now rested over Italy” (J.W. 5.367). He recalls that “our forefathers”—presumably he means Jews under Herod the Great and his successors—though by far superior to the Romans,

⁷⁵ See John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 80–87, for a discussion of the dating of Q.

nonetheless submitted to Rome, knowing that “God was on the Roman side” (J.W. 5.371). Thus far, Josephus’s argument evokes only the notion of *providentia*. But he concludes much more dramatically, with the key element of the *evocatio*: “My belief, therefore, is that the Deity has fled from the holy places and taken his stand on the side of those with whom you are now at war.”⁷⁶ John of Gishala took the opposite view, even after the cessation of the *tamid* in early August, claiming that he did not fear capture, “since the city was God’s.”⁷⁷

According to Josephus’s account, Titus held the same view as Josephus: upbraiding John for polluting the sanctuary with blood, Titus declared that the deity had departed. Titus then invoked as a witness to his own innocence in this regard both his own ancestral gods and “any deity who watched over this place—for now I believe that there is none” (J.W. 6.127: καὶ εἴ τις ἐφεώρα ποτὲ τόνδε τὸν χώρον, νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὐκ οἶομαι), the latter phrase bearing a striking similarity to the beginning of the *evocatio carmen*, “*si deus sive dea est cuius in tutela oppidum est. . .*” After the defenders had fled to the upper city, Titus invoked the memory of destroyed Carthage (J.W. 6.323) and pointed out that with the temple destroyed, the defenders were now without protection (6.348).

As is well known, Josephus tries to absolve Titus of the responsibility for the destruction of the temple, claiming that the fire that destroyed it was set by an impulsive legionary against Titus’s express intentions but evidently “moved by some supernatural impulse” (J.W. 6.241, 252). Josephus states that Titus had decided, in violation of the “laws of war” (οἱ τοῦ πολέμου νόμοι [J.W. 6.239, 346]), to preserve the temple as an “ornament to the empire” (ὥσπερ καὶ κόσμον τῆς ἡγεμονίας [6.242]) and heroically tried to extinguish the fire (6.260–66).⁷⁸ Such a claim is almost surely false, as numerous commentators agree.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Josephus, J.W. 5.412: ὥστε ἐγὼ πεφευγέναι μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων οἶμαι τὸ θεῖον, ἐστάναι δὲ παρ’ οἷς πολεμεῖτε νῦν.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 6.98: οὐκ ἂν ποτε δεῖσειεν ἄλωσιν: θεοῦ γὰρ ὑπάρχειν τὴν πόλιν. B. *Sot.* 49b preserves the aphorism that Jerusalem could not be taken while the *tamid* was being offered: “Our Rabbis taught: When the kings of the Hasmonean house fought one another, Hyrcanus was outside and Aristobulus within. Each day they used to let down denarii in a basket, and haul up for them [animals for] the continual offerings. An old man there, who was learned in Greek wisdom, spoke with them [the Romans] in Greek, saying: ‘As long as they carry on the Temple-service, they will never surrender to you.’”

⁷⁸ There are numerous expressions of this theme throughout *Jewish War* 5–6, e.g., 5.456; 6.128, 239–41: Josephus describes a debate about what to do with the temple, with some proposing that it should be destroyed under the “law of war” (τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἐδόκει χρῆσθαι τῷ τοῦ πολέμου νόμῳ), others arguing that it should be spared provided that the Jews do not keep weapons in it. Titus announced that he would not destroy the temple, but would wreak vengeance on men rather than inanimate objects, “nor under any circumstances burn down so magnificent a work,” which would be “an ornament of the empire if it stood.” Titus claims again (6.346) to have ignored “the laws of war” and instead pleaded that the rebels spare the shrines and preserve the temple.

⁷⁹ Ingomar Weiler, “Titus und die Zerstörung des Tempels von Jerusalem—Absicht oder

The destruction of the temple was deliberate and part of Roman strategy. But behind Josephus's strained apologetics and Titus's actions in ordering the destruction of the temple lies the basic belief that the separation of the conquered from their tutelary deity and the destruction of the cultic site are necessary elements of conquest. In attempting to absolve Titus of responsibility and to portray him as a man of great *pietas* (also a theme of the *evocatio* narrative of Livy), Josephus betrays knowledge of precisely what was *normal and expected* in any scenario involving war with the Romans.

As a parenthesis, it is worth pointing out that Josephus's mention of the legionaries erecting their standards in the court of the temple and their acclaiming Titus as *imperator* (ἀυτοκράτωρ [J.W. 6.316]) has a possible relevance to the question of whether Titus indeed performed an *evocatio*. Macrobius notes that only an *imperator* had the power to "evoke" the tutelary deity and to "devote" a city (*Sat.* 3.9.9), and it is noteworthy that the inscription from Isaura Vetus expressly identifies P. Servilius Vatia as *imperator*, that is, as a commander with *imperium*.

Hence, without actually describing the *evocatio* ritual, Josephus leaves sufficient hints in his account that it probably was performed. Josephus is not likely to have referred directly to the ritual, since he would scarcely wish to convey the notion that the Romans were able to provide enticements for the Jewish deity to leave the temple. According to Josephus, the deity's departure was due instead to the impious conduct of the "tyrants" who had seized control of the city and temple and who were responsible for the catastrophe of the First Revolt.

The Evocatio as a Literary Topos

As the preceding survey indicates, sufficient evidence exists to warrant the supposition that the *evocatio* and, related to this, the "devoting" of enemy towns, continued to be practiced as battle rituals. Naturally, the ritual of the *evocatio* and, related to this, the inspection and interpretation of the omens by the haruspices, necessarily preceded the siege. But it goes without saying that the effectiveness of the *evocatio* and the correctness of the interpretation of sacrificial entrails could be known *and narrated* only in retrospect, after the successful completion of a siege. In this sense, then, the *evocatio* and related motifs belonged not only to the lexicon of Roman battle rituals but also to *literary and historiographic topoi* found in literary accounts of the triumph of Rome in conflict with its enemies. The evoking of enemy deities and all that

Zufall," *Klio* 50 (1968): 139–58; Gedalyahu Alon, *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 252–68; Price, *Jerusalem Under Siege*, 170–71.

went with it thus belong to the wider field of prodigies used by Roman writers in their historical accounts.⁸⁰

The motif of the desertion of the temple by the Jewish deity occurs precisely in the sections of Tacitus and Josephus that deal with prodigies. Both list the omens and prodigies that occurred prior to the destruction of the temple, which, with hindsight, should have alerted those involved to the coming desertion of the temple by the deity. Tacitus states:

There had been seen hosts joining battle in the skies, the fiery gleam of arms, the temple illuminated by a sudden radiance from the clouds. The doors of the inner shrine were suddenly thrown open, and a voice of more than mortal tone was heard to cry that “the gods were departing (*excedere deos*).” (*Hist.* 5.13)

Although these signs were sufficiently ominous to serve as dire warnings, Tacitus explains that the normal expedient—to propitiate the deity immediately—was not taken, because Jews “hated all religious rites, and did not deem it lawful to expiate by offering and sacrifice” (*Hist.* 5.13). Tacitus’s claim is absurd, but it illustrates the historiographic use to which prodigies and omens are put in later accounts of successful sieges: the losing side typically neglects, misunderstands, or fails to act on omens, just as occurred at the capture of Veii.

Josephus has an even more elaborate list of omens that he regarded as self-evident in their meaning—a sword-shaped star, a comet, and a series of omens at festivals prior to the onset of the revolt: at Passover a bright light in the temple, an unnatural birth within the temple precincts, and the opening of the eastern gate of the temple on its own. A few months later, he reports a vision of celestial armies, and at the following Shevu’ot a commotion in the temple and a voice saying, “We are departing hence” (*J.W.* 6.290–300).⁸¹ Most, Josephus

⁸⁰ At this point I am indebted to the work of Eve-Marie Becker, “Das Markus-Evangelium im Rahmen antiker Historiographie: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung von Quellen, Redaktion und Gattung des frühesten Evangeliums” (Habilitationsschrift, Universität Erlangen, 2004). On prodigies and omens, see Auguste Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l’antiquité* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1879–82), 4; Bruce MacBain, *Prodigy and Expiation: A Study in Religion and Politics in Republican Rome* (Latomus 177; Brussels: n.p., 1982).

⁸¹ The motif of the departure of God from the sanctuary or land is attested in connection with the destruction of the First Temple in Jer 12:7; Ezek 8:12; 9:9; *1 En.* 89:56: “I saw how [God] left their house and their tower and cast all of them into the hands of the lions”; *Liv. Pro.* 2.11–12: “[Jeremiah], before the capture of the Temple, seized the ark of the Law and the things in it and made them to be swallowed up in a rock. And to those standing by he said, ‘The Lord has gone away from Zion into heaven and will come again in power’”; *Pss. Sol.* 7:1–2 [a prayer]: “Do not move away from us, O God, lest those who hate us without cause should attack us. For you have rejected them, O God; do not let their feed trample your holy inheritance” [cf. 2.2, 19]; *LAB* 19:2 *et irascetur Deus in vobis, et derelinquet vos, et discedet de terra vestra*; *2 Bar.* 6:1–8:2 describes a vision in which, prior to the Babylonian destruction of the temple, an angel descended to remove the veil,

claims, were oblivious to the import of these omens or even thought them to be signs of good fortune, but a few of the scribes saw them for what they were. Jesus ben Ḥananiah's ravings that start in 62 C.E. likewise belong to Josephus's set of omens (*J.W.* 6.301–9).

It is in this context that Tacitus's and Josephus's accounts of the departure of the deity should be seen: as one of the omens that (supposedly) occurred prior to the capture of the city and the temple, which should have been (but was not) understood at the time, and whose interpretation became clear only *following* the siege. Eva-Marie Becker concludes:

Die im engeren Sinne historiographische Literatur *historisiert* die Prodigien, d.h. sie bringt sie in Verbindung mit geschichtlichen Ereignissen und deutet sie nachträglich explizit von diesen her. Gerade in der *Synthese* historischer Darstellung mit den Mitteln einer an sich esoterischen literarischen Konvention liegt das innovative Potential historiographischer Literatur im Umgang mit Prodigien.⁸²

This raises a crucial distinction between omens and rituals that (allegedly) occurred before the events, and their literary and historiographic use in narrative. Gustafsson, who defends the existence of the *evocatio* as a battle ritual, also points to its literary use in what she terms the “mythical historiography” of Livy. In historiographic narrative the ritual became part of a systematic theology of history that placed Rome at the center of the world, to which foreign gods were moved to find their “natural” home. It is not irrelevant that Livy's depiction of Camillus emphasizes certain of Augustus's characteristics, with the result that the expansion of Roman power in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. are connected to the much earlier solidification of the power of the state within Italy. Gustafsson concludes:

The historiographical, ideological, theological and mythical aspects of *evocatio*, in Livy's narrative, are concentrated on certain particularly important

the ark, and its cover, the two tablets of the Law, the priestly vestments, the altar, precious stones, and vessels. Then a voice was heard saying, “Enter you enemies of Jerusalem, and let her adversaries come in: for he who kept the house has abandoned it” (8:2); *2 Bar.* 64:6 [of the time of Manasseh]: “And the impiety of Manasseh increased to such a degree that the glory of the Most High removed itself from the sanctuary.” See further Otto Michel and Otto Bauernfeind, *De bello judaico: Der jüdische Krieg* (Munich: Kösel, 1962–69), 2:185; Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2:60–61.

It is a standard trope of rabbinic literature that the Shekinah went into exile with Israel during the Babylonian captivity (*Lam. Rab.* 1.19–20 §54) and that Jeremiah saw the temple destroyed and the Shekinah depart: *Lam. Rab.* Proem 23; *Qoh. Rab.* 12.7 §1: “When Jeremiah saw Jerusalem destroyed, the Temple burnt, Israel sent into exile, and the Holy Spirit departed, he began to say over them, *Vanity of vanities.*”

⁸² Becker, “Markus-Evangelium im Rahmen antiker Historiographie,” 180 (emphasis original).

themes. Together, they present a mythical spatial tension, the effect of which is an emphasis on importation, on the mutual interests of the Roman state and the gods of the enemies, and on destruction and deprivation as intimately related to the positive aspects of Roman expansion. Furthermore, in all of this, piety is connected with power and divine favour and support even for the expansion and, what is more, even from the foreign gods. Finally, the symbolic and mythical functions of places are strongly emphasized, as well as the relation of these functions to power. . . . The expansion of early Rome is given religious legitimacy through the emphasis on what Livy may have regarded as ritual “correctness,” intimately connected with the concept of piety. At the same time, the decisive even in Roman history of the conquest of Veii is associated with mythical themes and given a theological explanation, and the temple of Juno Regina is given an etiology that fits well into a coherent, historico-theological scheme.⁸³

Mark 13:2bc as an Allusion to the Evocatio

Is the substance of Mark 13:1–2 imaginable as a saying that circulated prior to August 70 C.E.? Given knowledge of the Roman ritual of *evocatio* and given conditions in which conflict with Rome seemed likely or inevitable, it is indeed conceivable that someone could conclude that the deity would depart and the utter demolition of the temple would result. Whether Mark 13:1–2 in its details represents that saying is another matter. It is widely conceded that the framework of 13:1–2ab is due to Markan redaction,⁸⁴ and that the saying itself, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ᾧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃ οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ, could not have been transmitted apart from a concrete indication of its context. Thus, Rudolf Bultmann treated Mark 13:2c as a Markan construction, created from a traditional saying (such as Mark 14:58) and formulated in a manner consistent with the

⁸³ Gustafsson, *Evocatio Deorum*, 124–28, here 128.

⁸⁴ Mark 13:1 belongs to Mark’s overall framework of Jesus’ movement in and out of Jerusalem: 11:11: ὄψιας ἤδη οὕσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν . . . 15 καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν . . . 19 καὶ ὅταν ὄψῃ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως . . . 27 καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι . . . 13:1 καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ . . . 13:3 καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν . . . 14:26 καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. Specific details are also Markan: (a) the opening genitive absolute (καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ) duplicates a Markan introduction in 10:17; (b) dialogues formed by introducing the interlocutor’s question or comment with the historic present λέγει, followed by Jesus’ reply with εἶπεν αὐτῷ occur also in 2:18–19; 4:38, 40; 7:5–6 (with ἐπερωτῶσιν . . . εἶπεν), and 7:28–29; (c) the vocative διδάσκαλε appears frequently in Mark. See Lambrecht, *Markus-Apokalypse*, 68–72; Pesch, *Naherwartung*, 84–85; Dupont, “Pierre sur pierre,” 304–6; Neirynck, “Marc 13,” 397–99.

On 13:2ab, Pesch observes that Mark frequently anticipates the content of sayings of Jesus in the introduction: 7:18–19; 8:11–12; 10:17–18; 12:14–15 (*Naherwartung*, 86–87).

framework in 13:1–2a.⁸⁵ Others have suggested a version of the saying found in Luke 19:43–44a as the source of Mark 13:2b.⁸⁶ The latter suggestion is predicated on the supposition that Luke 19:43–44a is pre-Lukan rather than a Lukan construction based on Mark 13:2 and his redaction of Mark 13:14–20, as seems more probable. A third possibility, mooted by Jan Lambrecht and John R. Donahue, is that Mark 13:2c is derived from Q 13:35a, ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν.⁸⁷ This latter suggestion has in its favor not merely the verbal coincidence of the use of ἀφίεσθαι in two sayings that pronounce doom on the temple—which had initially drawn Lambrecht’s and Donahue’s attention—but a more substantive convergence: Mark 13:2 presupposes what Q 13:35a states expressly, that the deity has abandoned the “house” (= temple).⁸⁸

Although it is still conceivable that οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ, ultimately adapted from Q 13:35a and furnished with a suitable introduction, might have circulated prior to the war, it seems to me more likely that it was Mark who recast a saying such as Q 13:35a, knowing of the Roman practice of *evocatio* and drawing out what it implied concretely regarding the fate of the temple. Still, a pre-Markan and pre-70 version of Mark 13:1–2 can hardly be dismissed out of hand. As an element in Mark’s historical narrative,

⁸⁵ Rudolf K. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (rev. ed.; trans. John Marsh; Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 36: “Vv. 1, 2a may well be a scene constructed for a prophecy handed down in the Church, as it manifestly was in a variety of forms. . . . If this be the case the form (v. 2b) would be determined by its context. . . . There is little here to encourage us to think that this is the oldest form of the prophecy handed on to us complete with this setting; the address in v. 1 sounds far too much as if made for the specific purpose of evoking the prophecy.” Similarly, Willi Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums* (FRLANT 67; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956; 2nd ed., 1959), 113–15; Pesch, *Naherwartung*, 83–96. Pesch reversed his view in his commentary (*Markusevangelium*, 2:269): “Da Jesu Weisung (V 2c) nicht als von 14,58 abgeleitete red. Bildung erklärt werden kann . . . , ist auch der Rahmen des Wortes nicht als mk. Bildung vorzustellen.”

⁸⁶ Johannes Bihler, *Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte* (Münchener Theologische Studien, 1, Historische Abteilung 16; Munich: Huebner, 1963), 13–16; Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 220; Dupont, “Pierre sur pierre”; Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 66. K. Paesler argues that 13:2c reflects an authentic saying of Jesus, formulated in Aramaic and transmitted as an unfulfilled prophecy until Mark used it (*Das Tempelwort Jesu: Die Traditionen von Tempelzerstörung und Tempelerneuerung im Neuen Testament* (FRLANT 184; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999)).

⁸⁷ Lambrecht, *Markus-Apokalypse*, 77–78; Donahue, *Are You the Christ?* 108.

⁸⁸ Lambrecht suggests that “die ursprüngliche Bedeutung von οἶκος ist höchstwahrscheinlich ‘die Stadt’” (*Markus-Apokalypse*, 76). Gaston draws the same conclusion (*No Stone on Another*, 244), on the supposition that Luke 19:44 (which concerns Jerusalem rather than the temple specifically). Beasley-Murray, however, comments: “it may be doubted that Mark 13:2 related originally to the ruin of the city rather than the temple, and that such importance attaches to the issue as Gaston has implied, since neither city nor temple could be destroyed without the other” (*Jesus and the Last Days*, 286).

however, Mark 13:1–2 is better seen as a retrospective comment on that destruction, just as the uses of omens, portents, and reports of the desertion of towns by their tutelary deities serve as topoi of Roman historiography. Of course Mark does not express Rome’s ideology of empire—that foreign deities are either transported to Rome, where they find their “proper” home, or honored in Roman temples built for them in territory that has now become a Roman possession.⁸⁹ Instead, Mark 13:2 reflects the distinctive perspective of Mark, who created a “dual narrative” that related the fate of Jesus at the hands of his priestly opponents and Pilate’s soldiers, and the fate of the temple and its city, destroyed, as Mark 11:15–19 and 12:1–12 suggest, because of the actions of the priests, who would not recognize John or Jesus and who had turned the temple into a den of bandits.

Thus the prediction of the destruction of the temple in 13:1–2, when combined with 11:12–21, 27–34; 12:1–12; 13:5–37; and 15:33, 37–39, becomes part of a historiographic narrative with a dual focus: the fate of Jesus and the fate of the temple, in which Jesus’ death, at the instigation of the officials of the temple (12:1–12), is directly connected to the eventual destruction of the temple. The death scene contains two prodigies of the coming destruction of the temple—the darkening of the sky and the tearing of the temple’s veil (15:33, 38). Mark bracketing the story of Jesus’ disruption of the temple (11:15–19) with the evidently symbolic story of the cursing and destruction of a barren fig tree (11:12–14, 21) turns the unit into another omen of coming destruction. His introduction of a pre-Markan apocalyptic discourse which featured, among other things, a prediction of the desecration of the temple, by a chria that shifts the focus to the destruction of the temple also underscores Mark’s interest in the destruction of the temple. In this way Mark creates a narrative in which the fate of Jesus is correlated with the destruction of the temple. If there was a pre-Markan tradition of Jesus’ oracle against the temple, alluding to the Roman ritual of *evocatio*, Mark has historicized and narrativized this oracle, using it retrospectively in his account of the dual fates of Jesus and the temple.

⁸⁹ Mark 13:2, if understood as implying a statement about the departure of the deity, does not imply the new location of the deity. From the Roman standpoint, as Gustafsson has shown (above pp. 440–41), the *evocatio* did not necessarily imply transport to Rome (though Josephus reports that some of the temple furnishings were taken to Rome and placed in the newly refurbished temple of Pax [Εἰρήνη; *J.W.* 7.158]). Rabbinic tradition takes for granted that while the divine presence abandoned the temple, it remained nearby. R. Isaac b. Samuel says in the name of Rab: “The night has three watches, and at each watch the Holy One, blessed be He, sits and roars like a lion and says: ‘Woe to the children, on account of whose sins I destroyed My house and burnt My temple and exiled them among the nations of the world!’” (*b. Ber.* 3a) and quotes R. Yosé (first century C.E.) as entering one of the ruins in Jerusalem and reporting: “I heard a *bath qol*, cooing like a dove, and saying: ‘Woe to the children, on account of whose sins I destroyed My house and burnt My temple and exiled them among the nations of the world!’” (*b. Ber.* 3a).

V. Conclusion

The extraordinary prediction made in Mark 13:2—the complete and final demolition of the temple—should be regarded not as a fortunate guess about the accidents of war. It presupposes awareness of Roman siege tactics and, in particular, the ritual of *evocatio* and the separation of an enemy from its protective deity preliminary to the razing of a town and its temples. Mark's forecast of the destruction of the temple is thus not merely a statement about real estate but entails a claim that the divine presence is no longer there; accordingly Mark 13:2 should be read in concert with Q 13:35a and the oracle of Jesus ben Ḥananiah, both uttered before the revolt. But as an element in Mark's narrative, Mark 13:1–2 is best seen as a historiographic effort to provide a retrospective account of the dual fates of Jesus and the temple where his allusion to the Roman ritual of *evocatio* is treated as another of the prodigies (along with darkness at midday and the tearing of the temple veil), analogous to those catalogued by Tacitus and Josephus, of the temple's destruction by Titus.