Mark's *Revised* Dateline Meter

BGT Mark 1:1 Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [10] υἱοῦ θεοῦ. 14
2 Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ· [12] 26
ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,[16] 42
ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου· ἔμπροσθέν σου. [14] 56

Notes

1. **Mark keys off Mary's endpoint in Luke's Gospel of 53-54 AD, and when Nero came to the throne: 54 + 14 = 68.** Back then, Judea was a province, so the 'kings from' convention must reference Rome. That's pregnant, as Mark's Gospel is written when Rome is investing Jerusalem, Vespasian and/or Titus. Varro's is the legal AUC everyone must use, when Mark writes; Claudius had made it a law. So this dating system uses Roman AUC, which often has a two-year variance from our BC/AD. Book of Hebrews plays off Mark's Gospel for its own outline, and is obviously datelined in 68 AD. It also matters whether the date is beginning or ending of a year, which we don't know. So allow for a two-year variance, to really mean the same date.

The 53-54 was used in Magnificat to plot when the 'payback' to reimburse the Gentiles for Abraham's too-early maturation, would complete. Mary's counting from Christ's Birth, treating His Time as a new unit. Paul does the same thing. I haven't yet worked out all their math. So we're still in the 'ballpark' of the siege, whether you call it the beginning of 68, or nearly 70 AD. Temple will go down in August of 70 AD, and the siege was very relaxed until April of that year. From Passover to 9th Av of 70 AD, there was a constant military battle to get into Jerusalem and destroy it, take prisoners, lots of house to house fighting.

Next, '14' represents shortage created by downfall of First Temple = Dan9:14. (See http://www.brainout.net/DAN9V4-19HebOnePagerPARSED.pdf for a full explanation including Bible verses Daniel references, as he speaks his prayer in meter.)

So while Mark writes, the Matthew 24 condition obtains: Jerusalem is surrounded by armies. Parallel situation to Ezekiel playing out the Temple siege to the Babylonian Jews, to Jeremiah chronicling the siege in Jeremiah 52. And of course the Temple goes down 9-10 Ab, 70AD.

So how can we justify suddenly including υἱοῦ θεοῦ , if that text is missing in about half the mss? Because Mark plays on Matthew and Luke's genealogy, to include it. Matthew 1 kept using υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. By contrast, Luke's genealogy uses the pattern Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἡλὶ, ending with τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ θεοῦ . So one or the other pattern was custom, but not both. **So the few mss which read υἱοῦ του θεοῦ,** though standard Greek, might not be used in genealogy lists, at least in Matthew and Luke's time. So one could argue Mark nattily concatenates *both genealogies* via Matthew's υἱου, to end with Luke's θεοῦ , omitting τοῦ in between. Variants of both structures are in Greek of 1 Chronicles (that Jeremiah wrote). I don't see any *combining of* υἱου του in genealogy lists, do you?

But what if Mark *did* mean υἱοῦ του θεου? Then dateline meter shifts to **28**: 15, **28**, 44, 54. So what would that mean? Mark still plays off Matthew and Luke, and the 54 still plays off Mary's endpoint. But from what beginning? Could still be *Expulsion Of The Jews*, as Luke used; but this time, Claudius' expulsion, Mark dating it to 41AD.

Problem there, as with the 19AD expulsion, is that our records of it, conflict. Bible references Claudius' expulsion in Acts 18:2. But when? We have Dio Cassius (60) saying that *the Jews had grown so numerous, Claudius decided not to expel them.* But Dio's language implies that it was a *subsequent* expulsion Claudius contemplated and finally decided against. So often the translator inserts the word 'again', in the Dio passage. Another thing: the Acts 18:2 passage doesn't say that Aquila and Prisca were actually expelled, but that the edict was the cause of their leaving. So maybe they left *later* when a *subsequent* edict was issued, but then Claudius didn't enforce it, or let it lapse. For it's obvious that Acts 18:2 is well after 40AD. Mark was not with Paul back then, but would certainly know the events; and by his time of writing, the Book of Acts had been disseminated. For if he makes Claudius' expulsion his bookending theme -- given the current *impending* expulsion, this time from Jerusalem -- he'd rely on his audience knowing, Acts 18:2. Which is all the more poignant, as he himself would have just left Italy, in the wake of Paul's execution and Timothy's release.

One way to check these alternative dateline meters (14 versus 28), is to run the x7 test, to see what other past events Mark might tie, to provide us with his theme. Dateline meters are always thematic. So what back-dates, obtain? Assuming that Mark is playing on the Magnificat date matrix, we have:

Mark's *Revised* Dateline Meter

* **14 x 7** = 98 - 68 (pretend) = 30, year Christ Died. Peter's dateline meter uses 66 to mean our 68, so we'd 'translate' the 30 into 32. Peter's meter theme datelines back to when Herod started to rebuild the 2nd Temple, because a) it's about to go down, Paul having just died and Peter getting the heads-up from God that he will, too; and b) for his letter is about the Temple of Believers, an update on Paul's prophetic Eph1:3-14 timeline re future history of Church. James based his meter on the Herods as well (both first and last), prior to Peter. James' meter is simultaneously based on when Christ died. So this **14x7** is a handy way for Mark to concatenate his meter to reference both of theirs. Coupled with the standard years-from-king usage -- 14 years after Claudius died or Nero became Emperor, take your pick -- Mark's meter is rather deft.

Year 98 of Christ's age, the Millennium was supposed to begin, 4200 years after Adam's fall in Genesis 3:22.

* **28 x 7** = 196 - 68 = 128 BC, defeat of Antiochus VII, ties to Mary's Magnificat dateline **35** meter. Mary was tracking Daniel 11 when she crafted her meter. Daniel 11 explains how Daniel 9:27, gets done. So now Rome plays prequel, her armies surround Jerusalem; *so will the Rapture happen now?* That's what everyone wondered, since 40 years' warning on the Temple -- to 'reimburse' it for the 40-year delay Entering the Land -- will soon end. Paul's Eph1:4 mapped a potential Rapture date that year as a possible benchmark: again, using 66, as 'our' BC/AD is about two years forward of the Roman AUC. (See page 8 of http://www.brainout.net/Eph1DecreeSyllablesREPARSED.pdf .) That's why Book of Hebrews came out. Did Mark write that book, too? Can't tell, for sure. Obviously the author is not Paul, but someone who had been under him.

So which of these two meter themes, is more apt? The first is full-circle, idea of CHRIST DIES, THEN ISRAEL DOES TOO, just as Daniel 9:26-27 had explained. The second is also full-circle in a different way, parallelling the current fight with the current King of the North, with that one in the past. Only in that past, Israel won; *because Rome got involved.* Just as Daniel had foretold. So the 'new' King of the North, invests Jerusalem yet again; this time, freedom will be lost.

Another test: '**is this text repeated** elsewhere in the letter'? Both constructions, with and without the article, are used: see Mark 3:11 and 15:39.

Finally, there's a **syntax test**, and the 28, flunks it: for if the dateline meter changes to 28, *it's changing in the wrong place.* Syntactically, the sevening must occur either in the first clause, or in the last one. A quotation is a single unit. So, that argues for **14**.

2. **Greyed-out 'variant' text** ἔμπροσθέν σου, **is not counted.** It only appears in the later manuscripts, and is missing even in half of them, going by the Bibleworks 9 collection. Thematically, it makes sense to omit the phrase: for what's on the road before Mark's readers, is TEMPLE DESTRUCTION. The herald and King have *already left* the Building, and instead Matthew 24 is laid before them; just as formerly (heh) foretold. *Machaira* rejected, *romphaia* now leads. For Mark quotes Matthew, in Mark 1:2. Matthew 11:10, Christ *interpretatively* quotes an amalgam of Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3. Exact same quote is in Luke 7:26-27. Since the Isaiah quote comes next in Mark's text (verse 3), and since he obviously quotes Matthew 11:10 as Luke does -- he's counting on readers to know the quote -- Mark says 'Isaiah'. It's not an error, but an economy of speech, to set up Mark 1:3. And ἔμπροσθέν σου 's omission, will alert them as an update, stressing the siege.

If we include the phrase as valid, then Mark's ending meter becomes 57 or 58; that still ties to Daniel 9, for his verses 11-12 link that number to Manasseh, as the cause for Temple Downfall. In the Mosaic Law, 57 is the sum of Passover Week and Pentecost; doubled, it's the number of days between first day of Passover and 9th Av; 58, signifies 'missed'. The 'seven' format of this, is 56, very prominent in OT meters from Psalm 90 forward. Still, 57-58 are not datelines (not divisible by either 7 or 3), so you decide whether to include the extra words. They are meant, but whether *Mark actually wrote them*, is debatable. I vote *No, he didn't.*

3. The red underlined letters are elisions or krasis. So if υἱοῦ του θεου, then you'd have to increase or remove, elisions. I don't see anywhere elision can be *additionally* assumed. Removal, would add 3 syllables at most.

First clause syllable count range: 10 (two elisions but no extra text), 11 (one elision), 12 (no elisions), 14 (two elisions but includes υἱοῦ θεοῦ), 15 (plus του), 16 (minus one elision), 17 (minus both elisions). Only 14 is divisible by 7.

At the end, respective sums would be 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, **56**, 57 -- meaning no elision but yes include υἱοῦ του θεου ; else 57 with the three elisions debited, plus ἔμπροσθέν σου. Three more, sum no higher than 60; which is divisible by 3, but not 7. You could argue the base as *years since Judea a province* -- John uses that convention for his dateline in Rev 1:1-3 -- and still equate to our 68 AD. Jude uses Trinity meter for a dateline, also '60', seems to use the same convention.

Mark's *Revised* Dateline Meter

So now the x3 test (Trinity meter): 180 years prior, 112-114 BC range; I see nothing significant re the Gospel. If we instead say x7, then 420 years prior, circa 352 BC. As explained here (http://books.google.com/books?id=bgFPIeE727wC&lpg=PA99&ots=CS4b7NfskA&dq=352%20BC&pg=PA99#v=onepage&q=352%20BC&f=false), Philip of Macedon claims Thermopylae *in order to rescue the Delphic Temple.* Was that event so well known, it should be tagged by Mark in parallelism?

Our last dateline meter candidate would be **56;** it removes both υἱοῦ του θεου and ἔμπροσθέν σου with no elisions, either. That would be a cute parallel to Paul's use of 56, yet a hard argument to make. What happened in 10-12 AD to justify the tie? Or, Christ age 10-12? Surely the leaving-behind at the Temple, wouldn't be the analogy here? Closest relevant thing I could find, is that Quirinius' political appointment over Judea province, then ended. So again Mark tags Luke at the opposite end, since back in 4/2 BC, Quirinius was in Syrian garrison mentoring young Gaius, handily available to collect the first tax the Romans and not the Herods, would have to administer.

392 years prior, would be kinda pregnant, and Paul even played on it, 322-324 BC, Alexander's death, the impetus and *raison d'etre,* for Daniel 7-11. Paul's **56** benchmark was 336 BC, year Alexander's father died; so that year, the son whose succession had been in doubt, suddenly became king. Every Greek reading Ephesians, would smile at that meter, which of course Daniel and even Maccabees, were dedicated to explaining. If we say **56** here for Mark, then he benchmarks the end of Alexander, idea that *all the history God foretold, is coming to pass for both goyim and Jew.*

All that being said, the meter offering the most full-circle wit, convergence and relevance, is still the **14**. That's the most pregnant Time meter in the Bible, and we all know that history converges on Christ. Witness:

- By Mary's '54' endpoint and **Mark's ending clause**, Church not Israel, has the Time Baton. So Mark's **first clause**, 14x7 years from His Birth, Time Which Was Scheduled to End with His 2nd Coming, is now on hold.
- That 14 remains pending, since God in Daniel 9:26, had to allot 7 of it within His Lifetime -- which didn't get spent, since He died early -- and the other 7, also remains reserved for the Tribulation.
- **Second clause**: 14 years after Mary's endpoint when Mark writes, Jerusalem is under siege *22-23 years early*, rather than closer to Messiah's 2nd Coming aka the Millennium (under the Daniel schedule, Temple should have stayed up until 94 AD, mid-Trib). And now, instead of being 23 years after He died when Paul wrote, it's 33 years. So Paul had meter-marked 66, an equidistance 'reimbursement' to the world, which has now had as much time *after* He lived, as when He lived, Psalm 90:15 answered.
- So Israel's at the same place in history as under Nebuchadnezzar, facing expulsion yet again; this time, from a 'king of the north' who's been in office for.. 14 years. Time from initial deportation to Temple Destruction under Nebuchy baby was 21 years. If the seven-year takedown of the Temple begins on time per the 40-year schedule, it will end when the current 'king of the north' will *also* have been in office.. 21 years.
- **Third clause**: Then again, when the 40 years is up, if the Trib begins then as everyone expected, the Temple would remain.. until the 43rd year. *Who knew how long the siege would actually last, if a pact will be made as Daniel 9:27 said would happen, mid-week?* For the Lord warned everyone to GET OUT as soon as they see Jerusalem surrounded by armies. Mark of course is out, having been with Paul, who'd just been executed. So like Peter now dead, and Jude maybe-dead, Mark's now playing Ezekiel to those in Diaspora. Where the others, would soon ideally join them.
- **Fourth clause**: just as Mary calculated, Abraham's too-early-maturation credit of 53.5 years now finally reimbursed, the last 3.5 years aka the 'time of Jacob's trouble', can finally play. But are left in ellipsis, since now Church must mature for the last seven years, to even begin. In which case, maybe only the first seven of the 14, will play. *Beginning at, 54+14 or so...*