

>>>>>> Lesson 06 <<<<<<<

It is difficult to come to a firm decision concerning the original text. On the one hand, it is easy to see why ὀργισθεῖς {or gis theis} ("being angry") would have prompted over-scrupulous copyists to alter it to σπλαγχνισθεῖς {splanch nis theis} ("being filled with compassion"), but not easy to account for the opposite change. On the other hand, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the following considerations. (1) The character of the external evidence in support of ὀργισθεῖς is less impressive than the diversity and character of evidence that supports σπλαγχνισθεῖς. (2) At least two other passages in Mark, which represent Jesus as angry (3:5) or indignant (10:14), have not prompted over-scrupulous copyists to make corrections. (3) It is possible that the reading ὀργισθεῖς either (a) was suggested by ἐμβριμησόμενος of ver. 43, or (b) arose from confusion between similar words in Aramaic (compare Syriac *ܗ* , "he had pity," with *ܥ* , "he was enraged").*

(from Nestle-Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, 27th Revised Edition, edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger in cooperation with the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Münster/Westphalia, © 1993 by Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. Used by permission.)

- 1) Quick review from last time to set the framework for this next passage:
 - a) Jesus is on the road, likely on His way back into Capernaum when He calls Levi (Matthew) the tax collector to follow Him.
 - b) We discussed at length (perhaps too long) the fact that this would be a shock to virtually everyone who witnessed the call.
 - c) The reason was the attitude of people and perhaps even the disciples toward tax collectors.
 - d) To make matters even worse, some of the disciples may have actually had to deal with Levi as he charged (or overcharged) them taxes.
- 1) This leads us to the next passage.
- 2) Here we find Jesus at Matthew's house (again assumed to be in Capernaum) eating a meal with him and many "other tax collectors and sinners".

Mark 2:15-17 (NASU)

- 3) It is interesting to me that even though they are eating at Matthew's house, those apparently joining the dinner were tax collectors and sinner followers of Jesus – not necessarily Matthew's friends or acquaintances.
- 4) Notice that the scribes ask Jesus' disciples – not Jesus himself the question.
- 5) I can imagine this situation;
 - a) The scribes would not have entered Matthew's house and be defiled by it.
 - b) He probably corrals some of the disciples outside and asks them the question

Gospel of Mark – NOTES

- i) "Why does he eat with tax collectors and 'sinners'?"
- 6) We can assume that the disciples were not eating at this time, so the scribe did not ask "why do you".
- 7) Obviously, they were close enough to Jesus that he heard the question.
- 8) I can also imagine that the disciple really would not have answered the question anyway – he probably turn toward Jesus as one might do as if to say, "this one's for you teacher".
- 9) One other point we might consider here is that some of the disciples might have wondered the same thing.
 - a) As we discussed, some of them were fisherman here and had likely paid much in taxes perhaps even to Levi himself.

10) Of course, Jesus gives the answer I'm sure we are all familiar with:

"It is not those who are healthy who need a physician, but those who are sick; I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners." NASU

11) There are several things to take away from this exchange:

- a) First, we can tell from the opening remarks to this incident, Jesus attracts sinners and the outcasts of society.
 - i) We can make a simple observation here that I think would be absolutely on point.
 - (1) Jesus was a great teacher and obviously a devout Jew.
 - (2) He was probably seen by those who followed him as being on the same plain intellectually as any of the Pharisees or teachers of the law.
 - (3) Despite this, he treated "sinners and tax collectors" with respect and caring – not with the holier than thou attitude that the Pharisees and teachers of the law did.
 - (4) I can also imagine that other devout Jews also treated these folks as outcasts.
- b) Along with this, we can see that Jesus did not feel it was necessary to follow the precepts of the current Jewish community with regard to who one associates with.
- c) Finally, from Jesus' own words, we get the conclusion of the teaching moment.
- d) His call was to these very people – they and anyone like them were the ones that needed his message.
- e) The problem here is that the scribes of the Pharisees were oblivious to the fact that they were in the same condition.
- f) Jesus was not saying that they were righteous and did not need him.
- g) Instead, he was saying that anyone who was sick (in a sinful condition) was in need of him (the physician).

How do we fit in this picture are we always the sinner and/or tax collector at the table with Jesus or, are we the scribe asking the question?

Gospel of Mark – NOTES

Perhaps a different way to ask the question is – are we ever oblivious to our condition?

- 1) This following passage is recorded in all three of the synoptic gospels:
 - a) Matt. 9:14–17; Luke 5:33–39
 - b) All three place it immediately after the call of Matthew.
- 2) According to MacArthur, the chronological sequence is not accidental.
 - a) Shortly before this, Jesus had stunned the crowds when He declared that He possessed the authority to forgive sins (Mark 2:10).
 - b) He then demonstrated His eagerness to extend that forgiveness to sinners by calling a tax collector to follow Him as a disciple
 - c) He even shared a meal at the tax collector’s home and with other like individuals.
 - d) Through His actions, Jesus made it crystal clear that the principle of His preaching was diametrically opposed to everything the attitude of the scribes and Pharisees represented.
 - e) They depended on self-righteous effort and legalistic works,
 - f) Jesus focused on divine grace being granted to those believing in Him, who humbly cried out for mercy and repented from sin.

Mark 2:18-22 (NASB)

- 1) The NASB which I read is somewhat confusing in this first sentence.
 - a) The NIV has the sentence ...

Some people came and asked Jesus

- b) The two words translated “they come” and “they say” would NOT be considered as not referring back to the Pharisees and John’s disciples.
 - c) They are considered indirect plurals meaning simply “some people” come and say.
- 2) Most likely the some people in this case were the Pharisees.
- 3) We have seen and will continue to see, that when the scribes and/or the Pharisees have conflict with Jesus’ actions or his teachings, they launch their protest in the form of questions.
- 4) However, getting back to the actual question asked.
- 5) In order to get a clear picture of the problem here, we need to look at the Law.
 - a) The Law demanded only one day of fasting – the Day of Atonement.
 - i) This was a day dedicated to mourning over sin in one’s life.
 - b) There were other fasts listed throughout the Old Testament, but they were voluntary.
 - i) These were used to show grief, sorrow over sin, and pursuit of communion with God

Gospel of Mark – NOTES

- c) In the first part of Isa 58, he explains that God looks on fasting as a connection to Him and His desires and requires one to commune with Him.
 - i) It requires more than just an abstinence from food.
 - ii) It requires a purposeful connection to God and being in subjection to Him – it is never about show or display
- 6) Jesus makes this clear in the sermon on the mount when he discusses prayer, fasting, and giving.
 - a) They are to be done in “secret”.
 - b) They are to honor God not put on a show for others to see.
- 7) Jesus’ answer casts a glaring light on their misunderstanding and misuse of fasting.
 - a) In the case of John’s disciples, it was perhaps an ignorance of all the facts about and a misunderstanding of the Messiah and the complete gospel.
 - b) In the case of the Pharisees, it was showing their blatant misuse of the act of fasting.
- 8) To illustrate this so clearly, Jesus refers to a wedding feast.
 - a) In Jewish tradition of that day, wedding celebrations lasted 7 days.
 - b) They started with the bridegroom’s arrival.
 - c) The attendants of the bridegroom were responsible for all the festivities – it was a time of happiness and celebration.
 - d) To fast at a wedding would have been insulting and totally inappropriate.
 - e) In fact, rabbinic rules forbade the practice.
 - f) For a member of the wedding party to mourn at such a joyous occasion would have been as ridiculous as it was rude.
 - g) Simply put, it would have been equally ludicrous to think that Jesus’ disciples ought to fast and grieve while the messiah was in their midst.
 - h) This points clearly that the Monday and Thursday (two day per week that were required by the Pharisaical Law) were not appropriate.
 - i) He then makes reference to His own crucifixion and a sudden removal of the bridegroom from the festivities and states that they (his disciples – the bridegroom’s attendants) would mourn then.
- 9) Jesus goes on to add a couple of clarifying analogies – new cloth, old garment and new wine and old wine skins.
- 10) Simply put, the point Jesus makes both of these is that the ritualistic practices of existing Judaism and the new and personal heart driven worship practices he was teaching – “the new way” are totally incompatible.
- 11) His way shows a heart transformed by love for and honoring of God.

Gospel of Mark – NOTES

- 12) Even if you do the same things – fasting, praying, giving alms, etc. – doing them from the heart is a totally different concept.
- 13) Practicing these things as a ritual to be seen and admired by men and/or as a measure of their own holiness has none of the love for or honoring of God – it is all about self.
- 14) Truly, if we are honest with ourselves, we may all fall into the “ritual” mode occasionally.
- 15) I doubt seriously that it would be because we wanted to be admired by men and/or as a measure of our own holiness.

However, if our actions become purely habitual – without much if any thought given to them would they not fall into the same category?

(discuss) How do we prevent this?