

# **Mark 13:30 [This generation] is only related to the Temple – A new argument for this old hypothesis**

Omar Abur-Robb

Library: omr-mhmd.yolasite.com

omar.robb@yahoo.com

May 2023

There is a hypothesis that Mark 13:30 (*this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened*) is related to the destruction of the Temple.

This is not a new hypothesis, and there are few articles in the internet that promote it. However, this hypothesis didn't gain any momentum, and it is highly ignored by both Believers and Non-Believers. I assume that this hypothesis could indicate a partial fulfillment to the prophecy of Jesus, which most Believers couldn't accept; as Jesus' prophecies couldn't have any failures. While many Non-Believers couldn't also accept it; as Jesus' prophecies couldn't even have partial successes.

I will present here a new argument for this hypothesis, but I will start first with the general discussion:

The verses in Mark 13 from 14 to 32 have three subjects:

1# The coming war, the destruction of the temple, and the instruction to flee from Judaea when this happens (verses 14-20).

[The destruction of the temple is in a previous verse (13:2), which we can say that it is related to this subject].

2# The false Messiahs that will appear after Jesus (verses 21-23).

3# Seeing the "Son of Man" coming in clouds. This might be about the Judgement day or the Rapture day (verses 24-29).

## Then afterward, we have the "Time" verses in 30-32:

**30** Truly I tell you, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things have happened.

**31** Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away.

**32** "But about that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.

My argument here is that these three subjects were originally separates, and verses 13:30 and 13:31 were part of the "first subject" (i.e. the destruction of the Temple). However, these subjects passed from one person to the next and from one generation to next until it

reached Mark. Therefore, I am arguing here that the verses of these subjects were mixed by the force of this “anonymous oral tradition”, and as a result, verse 13:30 jumped out of the first subject, to be related to all the three subjects.

Notice verse Mark 13:14: “When you see ‘the abomination that causes desolation standing where it does not belong—let the reader understand—then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains.

I can start here by saying (as many others have said) that this prophecy has been totally fulfilled, and this could initiate the assumption that Mark 13:30 was only related to this subject (i.e. the first subject). This assumption can be supported by the account of Eusebius (260-339AD) in his book “Church History”:

The people of the Church in Jerusalem were commanded by an oracle given by revelation before the war to those in the city who were worthy of it to depart and dwell in one of the cities of Perea which they called Pella. To it those who believed on Christ traveled from Jerusalem, so that when holy men had altogether deserted the royal capital of the Jews and the whole land of Judaea..." (Ref: Wiki-Eusebius).

This revelation does fit with Mark 13:14, and the assumption here is that Jesus did warn his followers about the destruction of the Temple, and he did instruct them to leave Judea when this happens. To enforce this warning, he said the verse 13:30 {this generation will certainly not pass ...}, and it seems that his followers followed this instruction as clarified by Eusebius.

But the verses of this subject had reached Mark with a mixture (due to oral tradition) and somehow were linked with the prophecies of Daniel. Therefore, verse 13:30 appeared for both: the destruction of the Temple, and the arrival of the “Son of Man”.

I am aware that Eusebius is about 230 years from the destruction of the temple, and there are disputing opinions about his account. But there are no clear refuting evidences against this account, and it does fit with Mark 13:14, and actually I am surprised that Eusebius didn't make the link between this account and the verse in Mark.

So, although Eusebius's account is weak by itself (as it was recorded 230 years after the event), but both this account and the verse in Mark can support each other to form a good starting argument.

But there is another argument for this hypothesis: Mark 13:30 couldn't have been said by a rational person with Mark 13:32 for the same exact subject at the same exact time.

This is the main assumption here: Jesus couldn't have said Mark 13:30 and Mark 13:32 for the same exact subject. Because the expression “not the day or the hour” is almost like an idiom for saying that: the time is totally unknown.

There is a funny and relevant story here: Bart Ehrman mentioned a story about “Edgar Whisenant” and his book: “88 Reasons Why the Rapture Will Be in 1988”. Edgar was so

convinced with his conclusion that he said: "Only if the Bible is in error am I wrong; and I say that to every preacher in town" (Ref: Wiki- Edgar).

He also said: "If there were a king in this country and I could gamble with my life, I would stake my life on Rosh Hashana 88" (Same Ref).

Bart Ehrman mentioned that Edgar was asked how could he know the time if Jesus have said: "about that day or hour no one knows", and Edgar replied: I don't know the day or the hour, I just know the week (Ref: Youtube-Bart).

Now, Edgar was so convinced by his conclusion that he couldn't allow a short verse in Mark to be an obstacle for his 88 reasons, therefore, he just minimized and marginalized this verse.

But we are not talking about Edgar here, and there are no 88 reasons in stake. What I am saying here is that the verse itself does imply that: no one knows the time, which means that no one knows the hour, the day the week the month the year the century or even the millennium.

If we accepted this assumption, then the hypothesis can now be strongly supported:

#Because verse Mark 13:30-31 was followed by Mark 13:32, and these verses cannot have been said for the same subject, therefore, there has been a process of mixing for the three subjects over the years.

#Mark 13:32 couldn't have been said for the first subject (i.e. Mark 13:14-20), therefore, we can conclude that Mark 13:30 was only related for the first subject (i.e. the destruction of the Temple).

But there is a valid question here: how could Jesus realized this prophecy?

From a scientific historical perspective (i.e. to leave all the metaphysics out), we can say that Jesus expected history to repeat itself: The Israelites were sinning, and the religious-leaders didn't care to stand firmly against this matter, and these leaders didn't listen to "Jeremiah", and then afterward, the Temple was destroyed. The same thing was happening with Jesus. So, it is possible to say that Jesus expected history to repeat itself.

Also, Daniel did have some impressive prophecies in Chapter 9, which was compiled about 64BC or even much before:

- He prophesied that the temple will be rebuilt again in a troublesome time. This prophecy was fulfilled about 20BC by Herod who was a troublesome king.
- He also prophesied the destruction of the city and the temple, which was fulfilled in 70AD.

Someone could say that Daniel was expecting history to repeat itself: The Temple was renovated at troublesome time (during the reign of Ahaz) then came (much later) the destruction of the Temple by the Babylonian.

So, if Daniel could then why not Jesus!

#####

We could assume that the first Subject (the destruction of the Temple) originated after 70AD. But there is a problem in this assumption: In order for a story to have authenticity within the community, then this story need to pass through the process of oral tradition: form one person to the next and from one generation to the next, until a good group of people truly believe in it, and then Mark would have probably written about it.

But this process takes time, therefore, if the “first subject” originated at 70AD, then Mark would have written it about 90AD, which will lead us to conclude that Matthew and Luke were written about 110AD. Which is not as the majority of Scholars think.

However, we are assuming here that Mark is a rational person who can recognize obvious false stories, but we don't actually know that for certain. Therefore, our conclusion is not certain, but it might be more probable (within the limits of our data) to conclude that Mark could recognize obvious false stories. But if we assumed that he can't, then the first subject could have been originated in 70AD, and Mark wrote about it in 71AD.

We could also assume that the “first Subject” wasn't form Jesus but from someone else before the destruction of the Temple. But in this case, the prophecy here has been fulfilled. So, if the options were either Jesus or someone else, then it might will be Jesus.

But if we accepted that Jesus did say the verses in Mark 13, then my assumption here is that the 3 subjects were separates, and Mark 13:30 was only for the “first subject”. But the force of the “oral tradition” and probably the heavy circulation of Daniel's prophecies, have mixed these 3 subjects together as seen in Mark 13.

**References:**

Wiki-Eu: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flight\\_to\\_Pella](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flight_to_Pella)

Wiki-Ed: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edgar\\_C.\\_Whisenant](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edgar_C._Whisenant)

Youtube-Bart: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q9ntDy\\_2hQc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q9ntDy_2hQc)