

MARK CHAPTER 16 – WEDNESDAY 28TH JULY 2020

Hello precious friends,

Well after all these weeks we are finally coming to the end of our amazing studies on the gospel of Mark.

This week we tackle a relatively short chapter.

As you undertake your study guided by the questions which are by no means exhaustive, do keep in mind what we have learned over the course of our studies regarding interpretation:

- Understanding of the critical historical
- Asking who the writer is addressing
- Using the hermeneutical imagination (i.e. placing yourself in the situation)
- Viewing the text through the lens of our present-day culture.
- Using scripture to interpret scripture

QUESTIONS

- 1. What do we decipher from the first two versus in this chapter in relation to the scripture found in Galatians 3:28, where Paul writes, “There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”**
- 2. What do we understand as the intention of Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome in wishing to anoint Jesus?**
- 3. What does the clothing worn by the young man seen by the women in verse 5, tell us about who he was?**
- 4. Regardless of the dispute regarding the authorship of versus 9-20 what do we understand is the meaning of “in another form” found in versus 12 and 13?**
- 5. Given that there are theological scholars that dispute that versus 9-20 were authored by Mark, should we still view these versus as significant when it comes to doctrine?**

With respect to this last question please read the information below to facilitate our discussion. The information provided provides information about another hermeneutical tool that will help you in your future interpretation of scripture.

I pray this is useful to you and that you have all learned a great deal about the scriptures throughout this series.

David Miller (PhD) in his article, “Is Mark 16:9-20 Inspired?” writes:

The science of textual criticism is a field of inquiry that has been invaluable to ascertaining the original state of the New Testament text. Textual criticism involves “the ascertainment of the true form of a literary work, as originally composed and written down by its author”. The fact that the original autographs of the New Testament do not exist and that only copies of copies of the original documents have survived, has led some falsely to conclude that the original reading of the New Testament documents cannot be determined. For example, Mormons frequently attempt to establish the superiority of the *Book of Mormon* over the Bible by insisting that the Bible has been corrupted through the centuries in the process of translation (a contention shared with Islam in its attempt to explain the Bible’s frequent contradiction of the Quran). However, a venture into the fascinating world of textual criticism dispels this premature and uninformed conclusion.

Mark 16:9-20 is one textual variant that has received considerable attention from the textual critic concerning these verses of Mark. Much has been written on the subject in the last two centuries or so. Most, if not all, scholars who have examined the subject concede that the truths presented in the verses are historically authentic—even if they reject the genuineness of the verses as being originally part of Mark’s account. The verses contain no teaching of significance that is not taught elsewhere. Christ’s post-resurrection appearance to Mary is verified elsewhere (Luke 8:2; John 20:1-18), as is His appearance to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:35), and His appearance to the eleven apostles (Luke 24:36-43; John 20:19-23). The “Great Commission” is presented by two of the other three gospel writers (Matthew 28:18-20; Luke 24:46-48), and Luke verifies the ascension twice (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9). The promise of the signs that were to accompany the apostles’ activities is hinted at by Matthew (28:20), noted by the Hebrews writer (2:3-4), explained in greater detail by John (chapters 14-16; cf. 14:12). Those who reject the originality of the passage in Mark, while acknowledging the authenticity of the events reported, generally assign a very early date for the origin of the verses. For example, writing in 1844, Alford, who forthrightly rejected the genuineness of the passage, nevertheless conceded: “The inference therefore seems to me to be, that *it is an authentic fragment, placed as a completion of the Gospel in very early times*: by whom written, must of course remain wholly uncertain; but coming to us with very weighty sanction, and having strong claims on our reception and reverence”