



Andrzej Kowalczyk

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

**THE SYNOPTIC
PROBLEM**

ks. Andrzej Kowalczyk

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

~~bernardinum~~

2013

On the cover
The miniature of the unknown author
from the cathedral in Aachen 820 year

© Copyright by ks. Andrzej Kowalczyk, 2013

NIHIL OBSTAT
ks. Stanisław Zięba
Kancelarz Kurii
Gdańsk, 13 października 2011 r.

IMPRIMATUR
† **Ryszard Kasyna**
Biskup Gdański
Gdańsk-Oliwa, 13 października 2011 r.

Published by „Bernardinum” Sp. z o.o.
ul. Biskupa Dominika 11, 83-130 Pelplin
tel. 58 536 17 57; tel./fax 58 536 17 26
bernardinum@bernardinum.com.pl
www.bernardinum.com.pl

Printed by:
Drukarnia Wydawnictwa „Bernardinum” Sp. z o.o., Pelplin

ISBN 978-83-7823-207-0

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Ant	Antonianum
ExpT	Expository Times
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
NTS	New Testament Studies
Stud. Evangel.	Studia Evangelica

PREFACE

The synoptic problem is usually presented against a background of existing theories. The present work does not follow the same pattern for two reasons: firstly, there are a lot of such theories, and my aim is to give readers as concise a study as possible, and, secondly, the most important theories together with arguments in favour and against each of them were thoroughly discussed in my previous books – “The Genesis of the Gospel of Mark”¹ and “The Genesis of the Gospel of Luke”². Therefore only a short review of the history of the synoptic problem is placed at the beginning of the present study. It does not mean, however, that the discussion with advocates of any of the afore-mentioned theories is completely skipped.

The book starts with an attempt to convince the reader that differences in the vocabulary and in sentence construction cannot be – with a few exceptions – arguments in determining the priority of the Gospels, because the evangelists used their sources with great latitude. They even deliberately introduced various changes so as to differ from the source. The inversion of words in a sentence, which was commonly used by the evangelists, goes a long way to

¹ Ks. A. Kowalczyk, *Geneza Ewangelii Marka*, Pelplin 2004.

² Ks. A. Kowalczyk, *Geneza Ewangelii Łukasza*, Pelplin 2006.

prove it. For this very reason a lot of attention is paid to the question of inversion in the present study. The next part of the book presents arguments proving that the lack of certain texts in a given Gospel in relation to a source does not testify that the evangelist was not familiar with it. The evangelists did not intend, as it is often wrongly assumed, only to extend the existing Gospel. They could add new texts or remove parts of their sources depending on their individual concept of the work about Jesus. The fact that the Gospel of Marc is the shortest does not mean that it was the first.

The aim of this study is to show that each of the synoptic Gospels belongs to another literary genre. Rating them among one literary genre – ‘the gospel’ – seems to be an unacceptable oversimplification. The proper distinction among the literary assumptions of each Gospel definitely plays a great role in solving the synoptic problem and that is why three chapters of the present book are devoted to it.

While considering the editorial assumptions of the Gospels it was regarded necessary to add answers to some objections against the priority of the Gospel of Matthew based on the differences in the content of the Gospels, for example why the Gospel of Mark does not contain the Sermon on the Mount. Such differences were thoroughly discussed in my two books mentioned above, which were devoted to the redaction of the Gospel of Mark and the Gospel of Luke. The present work deals only with objections which seem to be the most important.

1.

THE SHORT REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

The first three Gospels are very similar. They are sometimes printed in three parallel columns, so that one can see resemblances among them at one glance. Similarities and differences between the synoptic Gospels are called a synoptic fact. They are visible in the composition, the contents of pericopes, the style and the language. All three Gospels starting with the pericope of the activity of John the Baptist present the material divided in a similar manner: the baptism of Jesus, the temptation, the activity in Galilee, the journey to Jerusalem, the activity in Jerusalem, the trial, the crucifixion and the Resurrection. However, there also exist large differences referring to the selection of material, composition and vocabulary. How can resemblances and differences among the Synoptic Gospels be explained? Saint Augustine (353-430) – the greatest theologian of the ancient times – was the first to tackle the problem in question. He wrote the work “De consensu evangelistarum”, wherein he ascertains that the Gospel of Matthew was the first, then Mark shortened it, and Luke took advantage of both of the already existing ones. The opinion of the bishop of Hippo was accepted without reservations almost until the first half of the 17th century. Only Grotius in 1641 considered it necessary to differentiate between the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew used by Mark and the Gospel of Matthew in Greek. This distinction was supposed to explain the differences between the Greek texts of the Gospels of Matthew and

the Gospel of Mark. Over a hundred years later F. Büsching proposed the shift of the Gospel of Luke to the first position, while Lessing suggested the rejection of the literary dependence – according to him all the Gospels originated from one source – the Aramaic Gospel.

The first to use the word ‘synopsis’ to denote the first three Gospels was Griesbach, who was also the pioneer of scientific research on the synoptic question in modern times, as he published the first synopsis in 1774. Griesbach affirmed that Matthew wrote the first Gospel and Luke the second, both of them on the basis of the oral tradition and the Gospel of Matthew. Mark took advantage of the work of Luke and that of Matthew. According to Griesbach such an order of the Gospels is indicated, among other things, by conflations. It often occurs that Mark repeats the same phrase using other words, and Matthew has one part of this conflation in a parallel place, while Luke the other one. Here are examples of conflations:

Mt 8,16	Mk 1,32	Lk 4,40
<i>As evening drew on (opsias de genomenēs)</i>	<i>After sunset, as evening drew on (opsias de genomenēs, hote edu ho hēlios)</i>	<i>At sunset (dunantos de tou hēliou)</i>
Mt 8,3	Mk 1,42	Lk 5,13
<i>kai eutheōs ekatharisthē autou hē lepra.</i>	<i>kai euthus apēlthen ap’ autou hē lepra, kai ekatharisthē.</i>	<i>kai eutheōs hē lepra apēlthen ap’ autou.</i>

There are about 106 such conflations in Mk. Griesbach considered that Mark had known Mt and Lk and hence he was able to connect their sentences. The Griesbach’s theory is nowadays accepted by W. R. Farmer¹. However, conflations can be explained in a different way: Mark adds his own short sentence to the Matthew’s one and Luke, knowing both Gospels, deletes the Matthew’s sentence to create his own version of the text.

In 1779 Storr put forward a new proposal. According to him the oldest Gospel was that of Mark – since it is the shortest and nearly

¹ W. R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem*, New York 1964.

the whole text of it can be found in the remaining synoptic Gospels. Furthermore, the fact that the style of the Gospel of Mark is worse than that of the Gospel of Matthew also points to Mark's priority. The opinion still has many supporters, among them: J. Jeremias, A. Farmer, A. W. Argyle, M. D. Goulder and others. Its opponents the fact that not the whole material of the Gospel of Mark is found in the remaining synoptic Gospels. Out of 677 verses of this Gospel only 470 appear both in Mt and Lk, 159 solely in Mt and 20 in Lk. Twenty-eight verses from the Gospel of Mark do not appear in the two remaining Gospels. It must be pointed out that Luke skips the whole large excerpt from Mk 6,45-8,26. The simple style of Mk can be explained by the influence of St. Peter's proclamation. As for the language of this Gospel, one should emphasize that it is more 'modern' than the language of the Gospel of Matthew. Here is an example of the parallel texts from Mt 4,17 and Mk 1,14-15 (there is no parallel text in Luke).

Mt 4,17	Mk 1,14-15
<i>From that time on Jesus began proclaim this theme: "Reform your lives! The kingdom of heaven is at hand."</i>	<i>After John's arrest, Jesus appeared in Galilee proclaiming the good news of God: "This is the time of fulfillment. The reign of God is at hand! Reform your lives and believe in the gospel!"</i>

According to B. C. Butler² the term *euaggelion* in its absolute sense (Mk 1,15) came into use probably after the Ascension of Christ. The term 'Gospel of God' is undoubtedly later than the term 'Gospel of the kingdom' occurring in Mt 4,23. The former is found in 1 P 4,17 and six times in the letters of St. Paul, the Apostle. Butler also points out that the mention of 'the fulfillment of the time' in the text of Mark resembles similar mentions in Gal 4,4; Eph 1,9; Jn 7,8; Lk 21,24 and in Acts 9,23.

In the second half of the 18th century J. G. Herder formed a hypothesis which gained great popularity. He claimed that the basis for all the Synoptic Gospels was the oral tradition – *evangelium*

² B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew. A Critique of the Two-document Hypothesis*, Cambridge 1951, p. 123-124.

orale, the settled version of which developed under the influence of the proclamation of the apostles in Palestine between 35-40 AD. The Synoptic Gospels are its three variants which came into existence independently of one another in different environments and at different time. The theory was supported mainly by Catholic Biblicists at the turn of the 19th and the 20th centuries, among them: R. Cornely S.J., J. Knabenbauer S.J., Th. Soiron OFM, M.- J. Lagrange, and in the 20th century by such scholars as: J. W. Dove, P. Gaechter and J. M. Rist. Lately it has been defended by X. Léon-Dufour, who, however, introduces the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew as an intermediate stage between the oral tradition and the synoptic Gospels. Opponents of the hypothesis argue that it does not explain why Mark rejected so many speeches of Jesus and why there exist literal agreements in the Gospels. Another argument against the hypothesis is hapax legomena (the existence of the same words in the same place occurring in two or three synoptic Gospels). For example the word *afiēmi* appears in the whole New Testament only in parallel places Mt 9,16/Mk 2,5/Lk 5,20.23.

In 1817 F.D.E. Schleiermacher advanced the hypothesis that synoptic Gospels had originated from many fragments. What the apostles had said about Jesus was recorded and handed on by listeners in the form of short texts which were later joined together. Then Schleiermacher modified his hypothesis in the following way: the testimony of Papias from the 2nd century does not refer to the Gospel of Matthew, but to the collection of speeches and sayings of Jesus. The collection was worked out by unknown authors and the canonical Mt is one of such elaborations. The work of Mark, which Papias refers to, was not the canonical Gospel of Mark, but the collection of stories about the doings of Jesus as well as the collection of His sayings. It is not certain, whether Matthew and Luke made use of the Mk or its source. The hypothesis of proto-Mk and proto-Mt became a decisive moment in the research on the Synoptic Gospels. Since then the idea of two sources has often appeared in various elaborations on the synoptic problem.

One of the first to continue it was Weisse (1838). He, however, arrived at a slightly different conclusions – although he adopts the hypothesis of Storr that the oldest Gospel was that of Mk, he

believes that no earlier source except Mk should be searched for. He also accepts that the synoptic Gospels have a second source, namely the logia mentioned by Papias. Matthew and Luke used those sources independently of each other; what Matthew and Luke have in common, and what is not adopted from Mk, simply originates from the second source. The statements of Weisse became the basis for the continuously perfected theory of two sources, and so he is rightly called its father. Lachmann and Wernle contributed considerably to the popularity of this theory. The name of source Q comes from the latter. The theory of two sources is the most widely accepted one nowadays.

However, great differences between Q texts in Mt and Lk raise doubts to its truthfulness, e. g. the Sermon on the Mount in Mt is three times longer than in Lk and is composed differently. Besides, in Luke's version of the sermon there are many texts which do not appear in Matthew's version. To explain the differences in Q texts in Mt and Lk Wernle introduced the distinction between subsequent redactions of the source.

A weak point of the theory of two sources is the lack of perikopes Mk 4,26-29; 7, 32-36 and 8,22-26 both in the Gospel of Matthew and that of Luke. The fact that certain literary elements are present in Mk and Mt but not in Lk, or in Mk and Lk but not in Mt poses a great difficulty for the theory in question, as it gives rise to the suspicion that not only Mt and Lk but also Mk possess material Q. Source Q is partly identical with Mk. If, however, Mark knew source Q, then there are no objections to the assumption that Q source can be equated with the Gospel of Matthew and so one can acknowledge that Mk was dependent on Mt.

Biblicists also advance a strong argument against the thesis that Luke did not know the Gospel of Matthew. The already mentioned "conflations" indicate that Luke was familiar with the Gospel of Matthew. Ph. Rolland⁵ made up a list till 106 conflations in the Gospel of Mark. The fact that Luke always leaves Matthew's element in the Marcan conflation testifies that he knew Matthew's version of this sentence and he did not want to repeat it.

⁵ Ph. Rolland, *Les premiers évangiles. Un nouveau regard sur le problème synoptique*, (LD 116), Paris 1984, p. 110-122.

A very strong argument against the theory of two sources is a minor agreement, i.e. the agreement of small literary elements in Mt and Lk against Mk. E. A. Abbot⁴ enumerates 230 cases of minor agreements, and B. de Solage⁵ makes up a list of as many as 323 cases. Gundry⁶ points out that the Matthean texts in agreement with Lk against Mk possess features characteristic for Matthew, and sometimes they are even contradictory to features typical of Luke. According to Gundry it proves that Luke borrowed them from the Gospel of Matthew.

Here is one of the examples given by Gundry:

Mt 10	Mk 3	Lk 6
<p><i>1 Then summoned his twelve disciples and gave them authority to expel unclean spirits and to cure sickness and disease of every kind. 2 The names of twelve apostles are these: first Simon, now known as Peter, and his brother Andrew; James, Zebedee's son, and his brother John; Philip and his Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew the tax collector; James, son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus; Simon the Zealot Party member, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.</i></p>	<p><i>13 He then went up the mountain and summoned the men he himself had decided on, who came and joined him. He named twelve as his companions whom (hina hōsin met'autou) he would send to preach the good news; they were likewise to have authority to expel demons. He appointed the Twelve as follows: Simon to whom he gave the name Peter; James, son of Zebedee; and John, the brother of James (he gave these two the name Boanerges, or "sons of thunder"); Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alphaeus; Thaddaeus, Simon of the Zealot party, and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him.</i></p>	<p><i>12 Then he went out to the mountain to pray, spending the night in communion with God. At daybreak he called his disciples and select twelve of them to be his apostles: Simon, to whom he gave the name Peter, and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James son of Alphaeus called the Zealot, Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot, who turned traitor.</i></p>

⁴ E. A. Abbot, *The Correction of Mark Adopted by Matthew and Luke*, Diatessarica, II, 1901, p. 307-324.

⁵ B. de Solage, *Synopse grecque des évangiles. Méthode nouvelle pour résoudre le problème synoptique*, Leiden-Toulouse 1959.

⁶ R. H. Gundry, *Matthean foreign bodies in agreements of Luke with Matthew against Mark. Evidence that Luke used Matthew*, [in:] *The Four Gospels 1992*, Festchrift Frans Neiryck. Ed. By Van Segbroeck, Leuven 1992, p. 1464-1480.

Both Luke in 6,13 and Matthew in 10,1 do not use words *hina hōsin meta' autou* which are present in Mark 3,13-14. According to Gundry the omission of these words by Matthew is well-founded, because later on, directly after the names of the Twelve, Matthew says that Jesus sent the Twelve on a mission (10,5). Mark refers to the sending of the Twelve several chapters further, in 6,7. In the Gospel of Luke, similarly to that of Mark, Jesus sent the Twelve after they had spent a period of time together (cf. Lk 9,2). Thus Luke should have kept the above-mentioned Markan words. Why are they omitted? It can only be explained with the influence exerted on the Gospel of Luke by that of Matthew.

Luke in 6,14 agrees with Mt 10,2 as for the location of Andrew's name on the second position, Mark in 3,16-18 puts Andrew's name on the fourth position. According to Gundry, such an order of names in the Gospel of Matthew is in accordance with the description of the appointment of the first disciples in Mt 4,18-22 which is not present in Luke, but not in accordance with the list of the apostles in the Lucan Acts of the Apostles 1,13 (here the name of Andrew appears on the fourth position). Therefore Gundry comes to the conclusion that the afore-mentioned changes in the Gospel of Luke are not of the Lucan, but of the Matthean type.

Similarly to Matthew, Luke adds 'his brother' to Andrew's name, omits the surname 'Boanerges' when mentioning the names of Jacob and John and links the names of Peter, Andrew, Jacob and John with *kai*.

The thesis that Luke was familiar with the Gospel of Matthew based on minor agreements is supported by, among others: N. Turner⁷, A. W. Argyle⁸, R. T. Simpson⁹, M. D. Goulder¹⁰, and D. B. Peabody¹¹. Even some followers of the theory of two sources accept

⁷ N. Turner, „*The Minor Verbal Agreement of Mt. and Lk. Against Mark*“, [in:] Stud. Evang. I (TU, 73), Berlin 1959, p. 223-234.

⁸ A. W. Argyle, „*The Agreements between Matthew and Luke*“, ExpT 73 (1961-62), p. 19-22.

⁹ R. T. Simpson, „*The Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark*“, NTS 12 (1961-62), p. 19-22.

¹⁰ M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, Sheffield 1989.

¹¹ D. B. Peabody, *Respons to multi-stage hypothesis*; [in:] The Interrela-

such a possibility, e. g. R. Bartnicki¹², since the statement that Luke did not know the Gospel of Matthew cannot possibly be defended. However, in such a case Q serves to nothing. If Luke knew the Gospel of Matthew, then the texts not present in Mark must have been taken by him directly from Matthew. The aforementioned M. D. Goulder, in his extensive work on source Q, is positive that such a source did not exist¹³.

For many scholars, especially the French ones, the theory of two sources is too simple and does not explain the synoptic problem. According to them, it is necessary to accept that many sources constitute the basis of canonical Gospels. X. Léon-Dufour¹⁴ claims that Mark is dependent neither on the Gospel of Matthew nor on the Gospel of Luke. Otherwise it is not possible to explain so many omissions, additions and archaisms in his Gospel. Luke is also independent of Mt since his infancy accounts, genealogy etc. are completely different from that of Matthew. According to L. Devresse¹⁵, the redaction of Mk was influenced by proto-Mt which was dependent on the common source C and proto-Lk which was independent of this source. The Gospel of Matthew was dependent on proto-Mt and Q source, whereas the Gospel of Luke was dependent on C, proto-Lk and Q.

The existence of some common source C is accepted by A. Gaboury¹⁶ as well. According to him, except the aforementioned sources Mark took advantage of documents B, A1 and A2, which were also known to other evangelists, but used by them in different contexts. Moreover, Matthew and Luke took advantage of documents I and II. P. Benoit¹⁷ claims that between Mt Aramaic and synoptic

tions of the Gospels, red. D. I. Dungan, Leuven 1990, p. 220.

¹² R. Bartnicki, *Ewangelie synoptyczne*, Warszawa 2003, p. 82.

¹³ I show the problem of the source Q widely in my book "*Geneza Ewangelii Marka*", Pelplin 2004, p. 31-78.

¹⁴ X. Léon-Dufour, *Les Evangiles synoptiques*, [in:] Introduction a la Bible, t. II, Tournai 1959, p. 275 nn.

¹⁵ L. Devresse, *Les Evangiles et l'Evangile*, Paris 1963.

¹⁶ A. Gaboury, *La structure des évangiles synoptiques. La structure-type a l'origine des Synoptiques*, Leiden 1970.

¹⁷ P. Benoit, *L'Evangile selon saint Matthieu (Bible de Jérusalem)*, Paris 1972.

Gospels there existed the stage of indirect redactions (pre-Mt; pre-Mk and pre-Lk) as well as the document S which influenced Mt and Lk. According to M.-E. Boismard¹⁸, two sources – proto-Mt and proto-Mk – constitute the basis for all the Gospels. It is possible that there also existed proto-Lk and even some sources earlier than proto-Mt and proto-Mk.

Among contemporary scholars there are also a few followers of St. Augustine, among them J. Chapman¹⁹ and B. C. Butler²⁰.

¹⁸ M.-E. Boismard, *Théorie des niveaux multiples*, [in:] The Interrelations of the Gospels, red. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990, p. 231-243.

¹⁹ J. Chapman, *Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 1937.

²⁰ B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew. A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*, Cambridge 1951.

2. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

2.1. Common material in the first three Gospels

A large part of material in the first three Gospels is common for either all or two of them.

Common verses in Synoptic Gospels

Mt				Mk				Lk			
Mk		Lk		Mt		Lk		Mt		Mk	
-----				-----				-----			
			432 v.				470 v.				428 v.
-----				-----				-----			
			107 v.				159 v.				173 v.

-----			-----			-----		
203 v.			20 v.			20 v.		
			-----			-----		
28 v.			-----			-----		
			-----	4%				

							531 v.	
		330 v.					46%	
-----						-----		
1072 verses			677 verses			1152 verses		

The phrase ‘common verses’ does not mean that they are identical, but that they belong to pericopes with the same content. It will become evident later that common verses most often differ from each other very much with respect to vocabulary and syntax.

2.2. Resemblances and differences in the composition of the Gospels

There are striking resemblances in the composition of the first three Gospels. The order of pericopes in Mt and Mk (with one exception) is the same from the pericope “Judgment of Herod about Jesus” (Mt 14,1-12 and Mk 6,14-16) till the end of the Gospel (Mt 28, 16-20 and Mk 16,15-18). Thus 63 out of 100 Marcan pericopes are in the same order as in Mt. In the same part of the Gospel of Luke starting with the “Judgment of Herod about Jesus”

(Lk 9,7-9; Mt 14,1-12 and Mk 6, 14-16) there are only four changes in the order of pericopes.

Differences in the composition are significant, as well. Mark's Gospel, for instance, does not include the Infancy narrative and the Sermon on the Mount which appear in Mt and Lk. In the first part of the Gospel of Mark till the pericope "Judgment of Herod about Jesus" (Mt 14,1-12; Mk 6,14-16) seven pericopes are shifted into another context than in Mt. In the same part of the Gospel of Luke (from Lk 9,7-9) there appear ten similar changes.

2.3. Resemblances and differences in vocabulary and sentence construction

Some texts, particularly the logions and parables of Jesus, are given almost literally in two or three synoptic Gospels, but very often the resemblances in vocabulary and the construction of sentences are only subtle. An example of a significant similarity can be the logion "Any one among you who aspires to greatness must serve the rest":

Mt 20	Mk 10
<p>26 <i>ouch houtōs estai en humin. all' hos ean thelē en humin megas genesthai estai humon diakonos,</i> 27 <i>kai hos an thelē en humin einai prōtos estai humōn doulos.</i></p>	<p>43 <i>ouch houtōs de estin en humin. all' hos an thelē megas genesthai en humin, estai humōn diakonos,</i> 44 <i>kai hos an thelē en humin einai prōtos, estai pantōn doulos.</i></p>

Mark uses in this logion only one word, which is not present in Matthew, namely *pantōn*, but in the second line there appear differences in the sentence construction.

Let us take into consideration the logion of Jesus about fasting.

Mt 9	Mk 2	Lk 5
<p>15 Mē dunatai hoi huioi tou numfōnos penthein ef' hoson met' autōn estin</p> <p>ho numfios;</p> <p>eleusontai de hēmerai hotan aparthē ap' autōn ho numfios, kai tote nēstousousin.</p>	<p>19 Mē dunatai hoi huioi tou numfōnos en hō ho numfios met' autōn estin nēsteuein; hoson chronon echousin ton numfion met' autōn ou dunantai nēsteuein</p> <p>20 eleusontai de hēmerai hotan aparthē ap' autōn ho numfios, kai tote nēstousousin en ekeinē tē hēmera.</p>	<p>34 Mē dunasthe tous huious tou numfōnos en hō ho numfios met' autōn estin</p> <p>poiēsai nesteusai;</p> <p>35 eleusontai de hēmerai, kai hotan aparthē ap' autōn ho numfios tote nēstousousin en ekeinai tais hēmerais.</p>

Only the second part of the logion (Mk 2, 20 and parallel) is almost identical, but even here the ending in Mk and Lk differs from that in Mt.

Now let us look at the short narrative about the healing of Peter's mother-in-law.

Mt 8	Mk 1	Lk 4
<p>14 Kai elthōn ho Iēsous eis tēn oikian Petrou</p> <p>eiden tēn pentheran autou beblēmenēn kai puressousan.</p> <p>15 kai hēpsato tēs cheiros autēs,</p> <p>kai afēken autēn ho puretos. kai ēgerthē kai diēkonei autō.</p>	<p>29 Kai euthus ek tēs sunagōgēs ekxelthontes elthōn eis tēn oikian Simōnos kai Androu meta Iakōbou kai Iōannou.</p> <p>30 hē de penthera Simōnos katekeito puressousa, kai euthus legousin autō peri autēs.</p> <p>31 kai proselthōn ēgeiren autēn kratēsas tēs cheiros.</p> <p>kai afēken autēn ho puretos, kai diēkonei autois.</p>	<p>38 Anastas de apo tēs sunagōgēs eisēlthen eis tēn oikian Simōnos.</p> <p>Penthera de tou Simōnos ēn sunechomenē puretō megalō, kai ērōtēsan auton peri autēs.</p> <p>39 kai epistas epanō autēs epetimēsen tō puretō,</p> <p>kai afēken autēn. Parachrēma de anastasa diekonei autois.</p>

In these parallel texts there is only one short identical sentence, and only in two Gospels – in Mt 8,15 and in Mk 1,31: *kai afēken autēn ho puretos*. It is necessary to add, that Mk is generally closer to Mt than Lk.

2.4. Literary dependence

Taking into account large differences in the composition, vocabulary and sentence construction one could draw the conclusion that the first three evangelists took advantage exclusively or almost exclusively of the oral tradition, and that each of them was writing his Gospel individually. J. G. Herder is known to have been the author of such an opinion. However, St. Augustine, who opted for the literary dependence, seems to have been right.

Accepting the existence of an 'oral Gospel' which the evangelists only wanted to pass, it is difficult to explain the differences in the composition, unless it is assumed that each of them adapted his Gospel to his own addressees. Yet, even then there remain some problems. Let us have a look at differences in the order of certain pericopes as well as small literary formulas in Mk 1,1-3,8 and in the parallel text in Mt 3,1-9,13.

Mk	Mt	
		not found in Mk
1. 1,1-6	3,1-6	
		3,7-10
2. 1,7-13a	3,11-4,2	
		4,3-11a
3. 1,13b	4,11b	
4. 1,14a	4,12	
	4,13	
		4,14-16
5. 1,14b-20	4,17-22	
6. 1,21		
	----- 4,23	
	----- 4,24-25	
		5,1-7,28a
7. 1,22	7,28b-29	
8. 1,23-28		
	--- ----- 8,1-4	
		8,5-13
9. 1,29-34	8,14-16	
10. 1,35-38a		
11. 1,38b-39-----		
12. 1,40-45 -----		
13. 2,1-12	9,2-8	
14. 2,13-17	9,9-13	
.		
.		
20. 3,7b-8-----		

It is hard to believe that the evangelist may have included pericopes or short expressions into utterly different contexts, even quite distant, without having a written source.

3.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF DETERMINING THE PRIORITY OF THE GOSPEL ON THE BASIS OF VOCABULARY DIFFERENCES

The evangelists had their sources before their eyes, so large differences in the vocabulary and sentence construction place the direct dependence on them under a question mark. Therefore, a lot of scholars multiply the sources and accept indirect redactions of the Gospels¹. This, however, does not lead to the solution of the synoptic problem. If each indirect editor and evangelist was

¹ For example F. Kogler suggests the existence of deutero-Mark, because the Word *speirō* which is used by Matthew and Mark in the parable of Mustard Seed (Mt 13,31-32) Luke changes in the word *ballō*; see *Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und Sauerteig in seiner traditions-geschichtlichen Entwicklunk*, Würzburg 1998. M.-É. Boismard on the basis among others of large differences in the vocabulary and contents of introductions to accounts about multiplications of the loaves (Mt 14,13-14; Mk 6,30-34; Lk 9,10-11) draws the conclusion that one ought to differentiate two stages of Matthean tradition: proto-Matthew which is independent from Mk (the first part of the introduction in Mt and Lk) and the final redaction of Mt which is dependent from Mk (because Luke does not possess the logion Mt 14,14a in the second part of the introduction which is almost identical in Mt and Mk); see: M.- É. Boismard, *Introduction au premiere récit de la multiplication des pains*, [in:] *The Introductions of the Gospel*, red. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990, p. 244. However Boismard does not notice that in Mt 14,14 is found only the half of the Markan text (6,34a). If so Matthew could reject the half of the text, then Luke could reject the all text.

dependent on written sources, then the multiplication of sources explains nothing. Why was it possible for the editor of an indirect source to introduce alterations or additions, whereas the evangelist could not change or skip anything? There exist two fundamental reasons for the differences in the vocabulary and sentence construction: the correction of style and language as well as the introduction of modifications in relation to the source.

3.1. The correction of style and language

Let us take into consideration the pericope of the return of the apostles.

Mk 6	Lk 9
<p>30 The apostle returned to Jesus and reported to him all that they done and what they had taught. (<i>Kai sunagontai hoi apostoloi pros ton Iēsoun, kai apēggeilan autō panta hosa epoiēsan kai hosa edidaksan.</i>)</p> <p>31 He said to them, “Come by yourselves to <u>an out-of-the-way place</u> and rest a little.” People were coming and going in great numbers, making it impossible for them to so much as eat.</p> <p>32 So Jesus and the apostles went off in the boat by themselves to <u>a desert place</u>.</p>	<p>10 The apostles on their return related to Jesus all they had accomplished. (<i>Kai hupostrepsantes hoi apostoloi diēgēsanto autō hosa epoiēsan.</i>)</p> <p>Taking them with him, he retired to a town called Bethsaida.</p>

That pericope does not appear in Matthew. The text in Luke is not only shorter from that in Mark, but also better with regard to its style. The words: ‘separately’, and ‘the desert- place’ are repeated in the Marcan text which, additionally, does not make it clear that Jesus sailed away with the apostles. Luke supplements the Marcan text with information about the place, as well.

3.2. The principle of being different from the source

T. R. Longstaff conducts very interesting research on differences among the Synoptic Gospels. Comparing summaries about cases of healing at Peter's house in Mk 1,32-34 and parallel places he found out, that in these texts Matthew and Luke seldom follow Mark. If, for instance, Matthew borrows a word from Mark, then Luke tends not to use it, and if Matthew uses another word than Mark, then Luke often borrows the Marcan word². Longstaff shows the same alternation in the usage of sources in Mk 3,1-6 and parallel texts³, as well as in Mk 11,15-19 and parallel texts⁴. Longstaff adds, that alternations of this type have never been explained by any follower of the theory of two sources.

The fact described by Longstaff proves that there exists literary dependence among the Synoptic Gospels, and that the evangelists introduced changes in order to differ from the sources.

The above conclusion is confirmed by inversion in parallel texts. G. Howard was the first to pay attention to it in 1978⁵. He distinguished four kinds of inversion. The first is the reversal of a word order in a sentence, e. g. in Mt 9,6 and Lk 5,24 there is: *epi tēs gēs aŋienai hamartias*, whereas in Mk 2,10 there is: *aŋienai hamartias epi tēs gēs*. The second kind of inversion is the transposition of one or several words further, e. g. in Mt 26,56 there is: *pantes aŋentes auton efugon*, whereas in Mk 14,50 there is: *aŋentes auton efugon pantes*. The third type of inversion consists in the alteration of a word order and, simultaneously, the change of their context, e. g. in Mt 21,23 there is: *didasconti hoi archiereis kai hoi presbuteroi tou laou*, while in Lk 20,1 there appears: *didaskontas autou ton laon en tō hierō kai euaggelidzomenou epestēsan hoi archiereis kai hoi grammateis sun tois presbuterois*.

² T. R. W. Longstaff, *Evidence of Conflation In Mark? A Study in the Synoptic Problem*, Missoula 1977, p. 144.

³ T. R. W. Longstaff, op. cit. p. 153.

⁴ T. R. W. Longstaff, op. cit. p. 180-181.

⁵ G. Howard, *Stylistic inversion and the synoptic tradition*, Journal of Biblical Literature 97/3 (1978), p. 375-389.

The fourth kind of inversion concerns the transposition of whole pieces of text in narratives. Howard gives the following example:

Mk 11	Lk 19
<p>18 kai <u>ēkousan</u></p> <p>hoi archiereis kai hoi hoi grammateis, kai edzētoun pōs auton apolesōsin.</p> <p>ēfobounto gar auton, pas gar ho ochlos ekseplēsseto epi tē <u>didachē</u> autou.</p>	<p>47 kai <u>ēn didaskōn</u> to kath' hēmeran en tō hierō.</p> <p>hoi de archiereis kai hoi grammateis edzētoun auton apolesai kai hoi prōtoi tou laou.</p> <p>48 kai ouch heuriskon to ti poiēsōsin, ho laos gar hapas</p> <p>eksekremato autou <u>akouōn</u>.</p>

The Marcan text quoted above first refers to listening and then to teaching. In the Lucan text teaching is referred to before listening.

The research on inversion led Howard to the conclusion that the evangelists consciously modified texts which they had borrowed from the sources.

The inversion cannot be accidental. Let us take into consideration the inversion in narratives about the expulsion of the devils in Gerasa (Mk 5, 2-3 and Lk 8, 27-28).

Mk 5	Lk 8
<p>1 They came to Gerasa territory on the other side of the lake.</p> <p>2 As he got out of the boat, he was immediately met by a man from the tombs who had an unclean spirit.</p> <p>3 The man had taken refuge among the tombs; he could no longer be restrained even with a chain</p> <p>4 In fact, he had frequently been secured with handcuffs and chains, but had pullet the chains apart and smashed the fetters. No one had proved strong enough to time him.</p>	<p>26 They sailed to the country of Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee.</p> <p>27 When he came to land, he was met by a man from the town who was possessed by demons. For a long time he had not worn any clothes; he did not live in a house, by among the tombstones.</p> <p>28 <u>On seeing Jesus he began to shriek; then he fell at his feet and exclaimed at the top of his voice.</u> <u>“Jesus, Son of God Most High, why do you meddle with me? Do not torment me, I beg you.”</u></p>

<p>5 <i>Uninterruptedly night and day, amid the tombs and on the hillsides, he screamed and gashed himself with stones.</i></p> <p>6 <i><u>Catching sight of Jesus at a distance, he ran up and did him homage, shrieking in a loud voice,</u></i></p> <p>7 <i><u>“Why meddle with me, Jesus, Son of God Most High? I implore you in God’s name, do not torture me!”</u></i></p> <p>8 <i><u>(Jesus had been saying to him, “Unclean spirit, come out of the man!”)</u></i></p> <p>9 <i>“What is your name?” Jesus asked him. “Legion is my name”, he answered. “There are hundreds of us.”</i></p> <p>10 <i>He pleaded hard with Jesus not to drive them away from that neighborhood.</i></p> <p>11 <i>It happened that a large herd of swine was feeding there on the slope of the mountain.</i></p> <p>12 <i>“Send us into the swine,” they begged him. “Let us enter them.”</i></p> <p>13 <i>He gave the word, and with it the unclean spirits came out and entered the swine. The herd about two thousand went rushing down the bluff into the lake, where they began to drown.</i></p>	<p>29 <i><u>By now Jesus was ordering the unclean spirit to come out of the man.</u></i></p> <p><i>This spirit had taken hold of him many time. The man used to be tied with chains and fetters, but he would break his bonds and the demon would drive him into places of solitude.</i></p> <p>30 <i>“What is your name?” Jesus demanded. “Legion,” he answered, because the demons who had entered him were many.</i></p> <p>31 <i>They pleaded with him not to order them back to the abyss.</i></p> <p>32 <i>It happened that a large herd of swine was feeding nearby on the hillside, and the demons asked him to permit them to enter the swine. This he granted.</i></p> <p>33 <i>The demons then came out of the man and entered the swine, and the herd charged down the bluff into the lake, where they drowned.</i></p>
---	---

It can be seen that the text Mk 5,6-8 which is parallel to Lk 8,28-29 (underlined) appears in another place in the structure of the narrative; in Mk it is preceded by the mention of chains (Mk 5,3-4), whereas in Lk the mention of chains follow it (Łk 8, 29b). It is worth noticing that consecutive long parallel fragments in Mk and Lk are very similar to one another, which also proves that inversion did not result from errors in oral tradition.

The inversion in the Synoptic Gospels appears plenty of times, e. g. in the parallel texts Mt 17, 1-19, 30 and Mk 9,2-10,31 it occurs in 88, 89% of them.

The comparative analysis of quotations from the Old Testament in the Synoptic Gospels shows great latitude with which the evangelists treated their sources. As for the Gospel of Matthew 20 out of 40 distinct quotations agree neither with the Hebrew text nor with text of Septuaginta. Is it possible that differences in the quotations derive from the sources used by Matthew? The issue was examined by R. H. Gundry who discovered that quotations in all the Synoptic Gospels, and particularly in the Gospel of Matthew, show relations with Hebrew texts , targums, Septuagint, Peshitta, the translation of Teodocion (in quotations from the Book of Daniel), the rabbinic tradition and the apocryphal literature. However, in a plenty of cases the alterations are of an editorial character, because they differ from all the well-known texts of the Old Testament⁶.

Let us look at the form of the quotation from Ps 78, 2 in Mt 13, 35 and in LXX (Ps 77, 2).

Mt 13,35	Ps 77,2 (LXX)
<i>Anoiksō en parabolais to stoma mou, ereuksomai kekrummena apo katabolēs (kosmou)</i>	<i>anoiksō en parabolais to stoma mou, ftheksomai problēmata ap'archēs.</i>

Matthew completely changes the second line. It is difficult to say why he deletes *ftheggomai* (I speak) and includes *ereugomai* (I speak out, I express, I announce, I vomit). It may be connected with the attempt to improve style, but the former word appears in NT three times, in: Acts 4,18 and 2 Pt 2,26.18, whereas the latter is present only in this very place. The word *problēmata* does not appear in NT. Matthew probably used the word *kekrummena* since it appears in the logion of Jesus: *Father, Lord of heaven and earth, to you I offer praise; for what you have hidden (ekrupsas) from the learned and the clever you have revealed to the merest children* (Mt 11,25), as well as in the parable about the treasure: *The reign*

⁶ R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament In ST. Matthew's Gospel*, Leiden 1967, p. XI and 2.

of God is like a buried treasure which a man found in a field. He hid it again (Mt 13,44). Secrets hidden by God from the learned and revealed to the merest children appear in the parables. The expression *ap'archēs* (from the beginning) is replaced by Matthew with the expression *apo katabolēs* (kosmou). The former appears in Mt 19, 4.8; 24, 21, the latter in Mt 25,34. Matthew changes the text because of the new context. Ps 78 concerns the works of Exodus handed down by the ancestors, and Jesus in His parables reveals the God's plan of salvation, which was not known to them.

In the logion about the secret of the kingdom included in the triptych about the parable of the Seed (Mt 13,4-15) Mark and Luke paraphrase the quotation from Is 6, 9n which is present in Mt.

Mt 13	Mk 4	Lk 8
<p>11 He answered: "To you has been given s knowledge of the mysteries of the reign of God, but it has not been given to the others.</p> <p>12 To the man who has, more will be given until he grows rich; the man who has not, will lose what little he has.</p> <p>13 "I use parables when I speak to them because they look but do not see, they listen but do not hear or understand.</p> <p>14 Isaiah's prophecy is fulfilled in them which says: 'Listen as you will, you shall not understand, Look intently as you will, you shall not see,</p>	<p>11 He told them: "To you the mystery of the reign of God has been confided. To the others outside it is all presented in parables,</p> <p>12 so that they will look intently and not see, listen carefully and not understand, lest perhaps they repent and be forgiven."</p>	<p>10 He replied, "To you the mysteries of the reign of God have been confided, but to the rest in parables that,</p> <p>'Seeing they may not perceive, and hearing they may not understand.'</p>

<p><i>15 Sluggish indeed is this people's heart, They have scarcely heard with their ears, They have firmly closed their eyes; Otherwise they might see with their eyes, And hear with their ears, And understand with their hearts, And turn back to me, And I should heal them.'</i></p> <p><i>They have scarcely heard with their ears, They have firmly closed their eyes; Otherwise they might see with their eyes, And hear with their ears, And understand with their hearts, And turn back to me, And I should heal them.'</i></p>		
--	--	--

It has already been said that resemblances in the vocabulary and the construction of sentences appeared first of all in the logions and parables of Jesus. It is worthwhile to examine introductions to these logions/parables, because due to their variety in parallel cases they point to the constant tendency of the evangelists to introduce the words of Jesus in a way different from the sources. Here is the logion of Jesus 'If a man wishes to come after me' (Mt 16, 24-25) with introductions (underlined) in three Gospels:

Mt 16	Mk 8	Lk 9
<p><u>24 Tote ho Iēsous eipen tois mathētais autou,</u></p> <p><i>ei tis thelei opisō mou elthein, aparnēsasthō heauton</i></p> <p><i>kai aratō ton stauron autou kai akoloutheitō moi.</i></p> <p><i>25 hos gar ean thelē tēn psuchēn autou sōsai apolesei autēn. Hos d’an apolesē tēn psuchēn autou heneken emou heurēsei autēn.</i></p>	<p><u>34 Kai proskalesamenos ton ochlon sun tois mathētais autou eipen autois,</u></p> <p><i>Ei tis thelei opisō mou akolouthein, aparnēsasthō heauton</i></p> <p><i>kai aratō ton stauron autou kai akoloutheitō moi.</i></p> <p><i>35 hos gar ean thelē tēn psuchēn autou sōsai apolesei autēn. Hos d’an apolesei tēn psuchēn autou heneken emou kai tou euaggeliou sōsei autēn.</i></p>	<p><u>23 Elegen de pros pantas,</u></p> <p><i>Ei tis thelei opisō mou erchesthai, arnēsasthō heauton</i></p> <p><i>kai aratō ton stauron autou kath’ hēmeran, kai akoloutheitō moi.</i></p> <p><i>24 hos gar an thelē tēn psuchēn autou sōsai, apolesei autēn. hos d’an apolesē tēn psuchēn autou heneken emou, houtos sōsei autēn.</i></p>

Here is another example – the second prophecy of the Passion with introductions:

Mt 17	Mk 9	Lk 9
<p><u>22 Sustreōfomen de autōn en tē Galilaia</u></p> <p><i>eipen autois ho Iēsous,</i></p>	<p><u>30 Kakeithen ekselthontes pareporeuonto dia tēs Galilaias, kai ouk ēthelen hina tis gnoi.</u></p> <p><u>31 edidasken gar tous mathētas autou kai elegen autois</u></p>	<p><u>43 Pantōn de thaumadzontōn epi pasin hois epoiei</u></p> <p><i>eipen pros tous mathētas autou.</i></p> <p><i>44 thesthe humeis ta ōta humōn tous logous toutous,</i></p>

<p><i>Mellei ho huios tou anthrōpou paradidosthai eis cheiras anthrōpōn, 23 kai apoktenousin auton, kai tē tritē hēmera egerthēsetai.</i></p>	<p><i>hoti ho huios tou anthrōpou paradidontai eis cheiras anthrōpōn, kai apoktenousin auton, kai apoktantheis meta treis hēmeras anastēsetai. 32 hoi de ēgnousin to hrēma, kai efobunto auton eperōtēsai.</i></p>	<p><i>ho gar huios tou anthrōpou mellei paradidosthai eis cheiras anthrōpōn. 45 hoi de ēgnouon to hrēma touto, kai ēn parakekalummenon ap' autōn hina mē aisthontai auto, kai efobounto erōtēsai auton peri tou hrēmatos toutou.</i></p>
---	--	--

In the research upon the literary dependence among the Synoptic Gospels the subject of consideration are words characteristic for a given evangelist. If such a word appears in a given text, the text is attributed to a given evangelist. If such a word is replaced by another one, there exists a tendency to attribute the text to a source. However, considering the fact that introducing alterations the evangelists not always chose their favourite words, this criterion loses its value. The occurrence of a word characteristic for a given evangelist cannot prove that he did not refer to any source. Similarly, the lack of such a word cannot testify that he was not the creator of a given text. Significant resemblances in the vocabulary and the construction of sentences can point to the literary dependence, but major differences cannot testify that the evangelist was not familiar with a given source. Therefore, seeking solutions to the synoptic problem on the basis of differences in the language most often leads to the multiplication of sources and ends in failure.

Each subsequent evangelist wanted to add, to some extent of course, features of originality to his Gospel. Among the features of originality were the new vocabulary and the new construction of sentences. Yet, the following question arises here: why the evangelists did not try to convey at least the words of Jesus in

accordance with their sources. It can be explained in the following way: the evangelists realized that the parables and logions of Jesus appearing in the source (i.e. in the preceding Gospel) were only one of the literary forms into which Jesus put His teaching. Jesus was teaching for three years and He repeated the same instructions in various places, not necessarily using the same words. Although the evangelist had known a given logion from his source, he may have considered it appropriate to use a slightly different form, because Jesus also expressed it in different ways in various situations. The evangelist (unless it was Matthew) could have known that from the preaching of the apostles. When the Synoptic Gospels were coming into being the oral tradition concerning Jesus' life was not fully settled. The oral tradition existed and was handed down by witnesses, in a way, simultaneously to the written Gospel.

4. THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

4.1. Historic data on the creation of the Gospel of Matthew

The oldest testimony about the Gospel of Matthew is the excerpt from the work of Papias entitled “The Explanation of the Speeches of Lord” going back to 90-160 A.D., mentioned by Eusebius of Cezarea (about 230-339 A.D.). Papias was the bishop of Hierapolis and a disciple of St. John the Apostle. He wrote: “Matthew had compiled logia in Hebrew and every one translated them as he was able to”. At present there are discussions whether ‘logia’ mean the whole Gospel or only the speeches of Jesus. The first writer to mention the authors of the four Gospels was Irenaeus, the bishop of Lyon (about 200 A.D.): “Matthew drew up his Gospel among the Hebrews in their language while Peter and Paul were teaching in Rome and founded the Church there. After their death Mark, the disciple and the translator of Peter, put for us in written what Peter had taught”. Then Luke, the companion of Paul, wrote down the Gospel proclaimed by him. All testimonials of the ancient Church agree that the first Gospel was the Gospel of Matthew.

Supporters of the priority of Mk can see difficulty neither in the rejection of the above tradition of the early Church nor in accepting that the community of Jerusalem did not provide a written version of Jesus’ teaching for at least twenty years. The evangelisation of

the Romans required the work about Jesus. It is difficult to accept the thesis that a similar piece of work was not necessary earlier to evangelise the Jews. The community of Jerusalem needed proofs that the prophecies had been fulfilled by Jesus, they needed elaborations of the problem of Jesus' relation to the Law and the presentation of the idea of kingdom proclaimed by Jesus as well as the explanation of the controversial truth about Jesus' death on the cross. Finally, it was necessary to interpret the doings of Jesus and His statements about His divinity in the light of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. These were the problems which, at least after a period of hot discussions, should have been worked out in written. Who could – and should – have written such a piece of work? First of all, one of the apostles whom Jesus had chosen to be His witnesses and given the secret of the kingdom (cf. Mt 13, 11). The work in question was undertaken by Matthew the Apostle and later accepted as the official document.

4.2. The literary genre and the conception of the Gospel of Matthew

What is the literary genre of Matthew's work? It is usually said to be the biography of Jesus or, simply, the Gospel, but this explanation does not account for everything. Its composition and its construction made up of short pericopes artificially connected with one another as well as the omission of chronological and often topographical data arouse reservations among some scholars regarding its historical value. What kind of biography is it, if it includes no information about the infancy of Jesus at Nazareth, about His youth or mature years before the baptism in the Jordan? There is so little about His family and education here. What kind of biography is it, if it includes only one journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem? From the Gospel of St. John we know that there were six of them. Matthew does not give the chronology of even the most important events from Jesus' life, such as the homage of three Astrologers, the baptism in the Jordan, the programmatic Sermon on the Mount or the feeding of thousands of people.

Matthew most often connects the events described by him with the word “then”. According to some scholars, e. g. the ones belonging to the Formgeschichte school, such a manner of presenting Jesus’ life gives the Gospel the character of a legend.

The best explanation of what the Gospel of Matthew is seems to be provided by its comparative analysis with the Hexateuch, i.e. with the first six books of the OT. The analysis shows that Gospel of Matthew is under a great influence of the typology of the new exit, the second Moses, the new conquest of the Promised Land and the second Joshua.

In Jesus’ day the Jews expected the coming of the second Moses and the recurrence of the exit. The expectations were connected with the prophecy of Moses in the Book of Deuteronomy 18,15: *And prophet like me will the Lord, your God, raise up for you from among your kinsmen, to him you shall listen*, and in the same book 18, 18-19: *And will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their kinsmen, and will put words into his mouth; he shall tell them all that I command him. If any man will not listen to my words which he speaks in my name, I myself will make him answer for it*. The idea of the second Moses and the new exit is also referred to by the author of the second part of the Book of Isaiah. The mysterious Servant of Yahveh, whom the speech is about, is to gather – like Moses – the generations of the God’s people and to be a mediator between God and His people. He will institute the covenant, bring Torah and face resistance.

The community of Jerusalem was convinced that the prophecy about the second Moses had been fulfilled by Jesus whose activity was the new exit and the new conquest of the Promised Land. St. Peter expresses it clearly in his second discourse: *For Moses said: «The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your kinsmen: you shall listen to him in everything he says to you. Any one who does not listen to that prophet shall be ruthlessly cut off the people.»* (Acts 3,22-23). That same prophecy is also quoted by St. Stephen in his discourse in the Sanhedrin: *This Moses is the one who said to Israelites, «God will rise up for you from among your kinsmen a prophet like me»* (Acts 7,37).

It is proper to advert thereon that in his discourse in the Sanhedrin St. Stephen (Acts 7, 1-53) strongly emphasizes, contrary to the settled tradition, the persecution of Moses by his fellow Israelites. The author of the Book of Sirach enumerates a lot of merits of Moses, yet he makes no mention of his conflicts with the Israelites (cf. Sir 44, 1-5). Stephen chooses from Moses' life only elements connecting the prophet with Jesus who was also rejected by His nation. While writing about Jesus Matthew will do the same choosing from Jesus' life elements linking Him with Moses. The presentation of certain salvation events in the history of Israel which follows the example of events of the exit and the conquest of the Promised Land is called a typology.

According to R. Bloch¹, although Jesus is not called the second Moses in the Gospels, the afore-mentioned typology is a clear evidence of the power of the ideas of the second Moses and the new exit in times of Jesus.

4.3. Material and numerical resemblances in Mt and Hexateuch

The influence the idea of the second Moses exerted on the redaction of Mt is self-evident² for many biblicists. It appears in resemblances which can be called material, i.e. in the occurrence of similar events in Mt and in Pentateuch, for instance Moses proclaims the Law – Jesus proclaims the new law, Moses fasts for 40 days – Jesus fasts for 40 days. The works on the Gospel of Matthew published before 1993 mention 19 material resemblances. Here are several of them:

¹ R. Bloch, *Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique*, [in:] *Moïse l'homme de l'Alliance*, Paris 1955.

² See: J. Danielou, *Sacramentum Futuri. Etudes sur les origines de la typologie Biblique*, Paris 1950; S. Cavaletti, *Gesù Messia e Mose*, Ant 36 (1961), p. 94-10; A. Descamps, *Moïse dans les Evangiles et dans la tradition apostolique*, [in:] *Moïse l'homme de l'Alliance*, Paris 1955; S. Grzybek, *Mojżesz na nowo odczytany*, [in:] *Scrutamini Scripturas. Księga pamiątkowa z okazji złotego jubileuszu kapłaństwa ks. Prof. Stanisława Łacha*, Kraków 1980.

- 1) Angel announces that Jesus will deliver His people from the slavery of sins (Mt 1,21). Moses receives the task of taking the people of Israel from Egyptian slavery (Gn 3,10)
- 2) Herod gives a command to kill boys under the age of two in Bethlehem. Jesus is wonderfully saved (Mt 2, 13-18). Pharaoh gives a command to kill all new-born boys in Jewish families. Moses wonderfully avoids death (Ex 1,8-2,10).
- 3) Through the angel God orders Joseph to come back from the exile (Mt 1,20-23). God orders Moses to come back from the exile (Ex 4,19). There are even similar formulas here: *“tethnēkasin gar hoi dzētountēs tēn psuchēn tou paidiou”* (Mt 2,20). *“tethnēkasin gar hoi dzētountēs sou tēn psuchēn”* (Ex 4,19).
- 4) The birth of Jesus is annunciated to Joseph in a dream (Mt 1,10-23). The birth of Moses is also, according to the midrash, annunciated in a dream; in one version – to the Pharaoh, in another – to Moses’ father.

However, there are a lot more material resemblances. On the basis of my analyses one can add thirteen⁵ examples. Here are some of them:

- 1) The Jews did not understand Jesus (Mt 13,3-15). The Jews did not understand signs and miracles of the Exodus (Dt 29, 3).
- 2) The Pharisees reject the messianic dignity of Jesus and blaspheme against the Holy Spirit (cf. Mt 12,22-32; Mk 3,22-27; Lk 11,15- 23). Korah from the tribe of Levi together with two hundred and fifty representatives of the people defied Yahweh (Nm 16,1-35).
- 3) On the mountain of Transfiguration Jesus reveals His divinity to three Apostles only (Mt 17,1-8; Mk 9,1-7; Lk 9,28-36). Having made the covenant with the Israelites God revealed Himself on Mount Sinai only to Moses and the leaders of the people (Ex 24,9-11).
- 4) High priests and the elder of the people question the activity of Jesus and His authority: *On what authority are you doing*

⁵ The detailed elaboration of typological resemblances In Gospel of Matthew one can find In my book: *The influence of typology and texts of the Old Testament on the redaction of Matthew's Gospel*, Pelplin 2004, p. 39-69.

these things? Who has given you this power? (Mt 21,23; Mk 11,28; Lk 20,2). The Jews question the activity of Moses and his authority: *Who has appointed you ruler and judge over us?* (Ex 2,14).

Except material resemblances with Moses there also exist in Mt material resemblances with Joshua and the conquest of the Promised Land, because according to the Jewish tradition adopted later by the Christians, the Messiah was also to be a new Joshua. Six resemblances of this type have been discovered, the following ones among them:

- 1) Jesus goes from Galilee to the Jordan and then across Jericho to Jerusalem (Mt 19, 1; Mk 10, 1.46; Lk 13, 22; 18, 35). Joshua leads the Israelites from the steppes of Moab behind the Jordan down to the land of Canaan passing the Jordan opposite Jericho (Jos 3, 1; 4, 19).
- 2) Jesus treats Jerusalem as a battle place: during the daytime he disputes with the scribes and Pharisees in the temple, and overnight He goes to Bethany (Mt 21, 17-18; Mk 11, 11-12). Joshua fights his battles in different parts of Canaan, but always returns to the camp in Gilgal (Jos 4, 19; 10, 15.43; 14, 6).
- 3) Jesus curses a fig tree: „Never again shall you produce fruit!” (Mt 21, 19; Mk 11, 14). Joshua curses a man who attempts to rebuild Jericho (Jos 6, 26).
- 4) Before the decisive fight for the Kingdom of Heaven, i.e. before His Passion, Jesus consumes the Passover supper with His disciples (Mt 26, 17-30; Mk 14, 12-31; Lk 22, 7-38). Before the conquest of Canaan under the command of Joshua the Israelites consume the Passover supper in the camp in Gilgal (Jos 5, 10).

The detailed comparative analysis shows also another kind of resemblances, namely, the numerical ones connected with the recurrence of certain events (episodes) in the Gospel of Matthew as many times as in Hexateuch, e.g. God feeds the people with quails twice during exit – Jesus feeds people with bread and fish twice in the desert.

The numerical resemblances are divided into two cycles: the cycle of the new exit (the second Moses) covering material from the baptism of Jesus (Mt 3, 15) to His passage from Galilee to Judea (Mt 19, 1), and the cycle of the new conquest of the Promised Land (the second Joshua) including material from the passage of Jesus from Galilee to Judea (Mt 19, 1) till His death on the cross (Mt 27, 56).

The former cycle contains numerical resemblances regarding five kinds of episodes: 1) topographical ones, 2) episodes of opposition, 3) episodes about a victory, 4) episodes with a mountain, 5) episodes about wonderful feedings of the people in the desert.

Ad 1) A topographical episode is an event from Jesus' activity occurring in a place defined by the evangelist, or an episode following the mention of the change of location in Jesus' activity. Summaries do not belong to topographical episodes. In the cycle of the new exit in Mt there are 42 topographical episodes. The same is the number of the camps of the Israelites in the table in Lb 33, 1-49.

Ad 2) In Mt from 3,13 to 19,1 there are descriptions or mentions of twelve events showing opposition against Jesus. In the story of the Exodus the Israelites also oppose to Moses twelve times.

Ad 3) In the exodus cycle Matthew makes a general remark that Jesus expelled a devil out of possessed people and then describes seven victories of Jesus over the devil. In the Exodus story there is an account of the defeat of Pharaoh in the Red Sea and six narratives (or mentions) of Moses' victories over the pagans.

Ad 4) The episodes with a mountain are the mentions of the activity or the stay of Jesus or Moses on a mountain. A repeated stay of Moses on the same mountain without changing the location of the Israelites' camp is treated as one episode. There are five episodes with a mountain in the exodus cycle in Mt and five of them in the Exodus story.

Ad 5) Matthew writes twice about the multiplication of loaves and fish by Jesus in the desert. One can also read twice about the miraculous feeding of people with quail in the story of Exodus.

In the Joshua cycle there also appear numerical similarities referring to miracles (thaumaturgical episodes) and battles.

A thaumaturgical episode is a description of a miracle or a mention of a miracle in a definite place and time. There appear

five such episodes both in Mt 19,1-27,56 and in the description of the conquest of the Promised Land.

The Joshua cycle in Mt includes the description of expelling those engaged in buying and selling from the precincts of the temple by Jesus as well as the mentions of eleven disputes with high-priests, the Pharisees and scribes. In the cycle of the conquest of the Promised Land there are mentions of eleven battles of Joshua against the pagans.

Such a great number of both material and number similarities in the Gospel of Matthew cannot be accidental. They prove that describing Jesus' activity Matthew took into consideration the episodes of the Exodus and the conquest of the Promised Land. He even took into account the number of repetitions of a given episode. Still, this is not all about the typology in Mt, because the evangelist also followed the sequence of themes in the Pentateuch and, in general, its structure.

4.4. The composition of the Gospel of Matthew

A very complicated problem of the composition of this Gospel can be solved when Matthew's work is compared to the Pentateuch. Since Bacon⁴ tackled the issue scholars agree, that five discourses in Mt are linked with the Pentateuch. We are, however, certain that also the themes of the discourses are linked with the themes of the successive Books of the Pentateuch. The comparative analysis shows that Matthew wrote his Gospel following the pattern of the Pentateuch, parallelly to the themes appearing in the latter book. Nothing is included to his work independently of the Pentateuch.

On the basis of the relations between the Gospel of Matthew and the Hexateuch one can define its structure in the following manner:

1. The Genealogy of Jesus – Mt 1,1-17 (the New Book of Genesis)
2. The birth of Jesus, the signs of God in His childhood, the inauguration of the new Exodus, the new law – Mt 1, 18 -9, 34 (New Exodus).

⁴ B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, New York 1030.

- a. The fulfillment of prophecies in the childhood of Jesus Mt 1, 18-2, 23.
 - b. The pronouncement of John the Baptist – Mt 3, 1-12.
 - c. The baptism and the temptation of Jesus – Mt 3, 13-4, 11.
 - d. Jesus appears to the people as the Messiah – Mt 4, 12-25.
 - e. The Sermon on the Mount (the New Book of the Covenant) – Mt 5-7.
 - f. Jesus confirms His dignity of the Son of God with signs (Signs of the presence of God amidst the people) – Mt 8, 1-9, 34.
3. Jesus chooses the Apostles, defines their mission and gives them special gifts (organizes the new people) – Mt 9, 35-10, 42 (New Leviticus).
 - a. Summary. The logion about sheep without a shepherd – Mt 9, 35-38.
 - b. The appointment of the Apostles – Mt 9, 38-10, 4.
 - c. The missionary discourse – Mt 10, 5-42.
 4. Israel rejects the mission of Jesus. The description of the New Promised Land – Mt 11, 1- 13, 53 (the New Book of Numbers).
 - a. The mission of John the Baptist and Jesus' testimony of John – Mt 11, 1-15.
 - b. The reproach to those who reject the proclamation of Jesus – Mt 11, 16-24.
 - c. The call to accept the teaching of Jesus – Mt 11, 25-30.
 - d. The question of Sabbath. The reservations of the Pharisees and scribes – Mt 12, 1-50.
 - e. The discourse in parables about the reign of God (The New Promised Land) – Mt 13, 1-53.
 5. Further controversies, signs and instructions – Mt 13, 54-18, 35 (New Deuteronomy).
 - a. The disregard of Jesus as a prophet and the beheading of His predecessor – Mt 13, 53-14, 12.
 - b. New manna. The miracles of the New Exodus. The contention about the tradition – Mt 14, 13-15, 39.
 - c. The issue of signs of the New Exodus – Mt 16, 1-12.
 - d. Jesus as the Messiah, the suffering Servant of Jahveh and the Son of God – Mt 16, 13-27.
 - e. The ecclesiological discourse – Mt 18, 1-35.

6. New ethical prescriptions, polemics with enemies, admonitions and prophecies, the story of Passion and the death of Jesus – Mt 19, 1-27, 66 (the New Book of Joshua).
 - a. Instructions on new justice – Mt 19, 1-20, 34.
 - b. Polemics of Jesus in Jerusalem (Battles for the New Promised Land) – Mt 21, 1-23, 39.
 - c. The eschatological discourse (admonitions and prophecies) – Mt 24, 1-25, 46.
 - d. The story of Jesus' passion and death – Mt 26, 1-27, 56 and (not related to the Book of Joshua), the burial of Jesus – 27, 57-66.
7. The Resurrection of Jesus and the commissioning of the Apostles (the victory of the Messiah and the Son of God) – Mt 28, 1-28, 20.

So what kind of work is the Gospel of Matthew? Scholars are divided in their opinions. According to some of them, e.g. C. W. Votaw⁵, C. Talbert⁶, P. L. Shuler⁷ and R. A. Burridge⁸ it is a biography written in the ancient style, whereas others believe that it cannot be considered a biography, because it demonstrates no interest in chronology and, moreover, it is characterized by great fragmentariness. In the Gospel of Matthew as well as in the remaining Gospels there is very little or even nothing about Jesus' family, His childhood, youth and appearance etc. Therefore, such scholars as K. L. Schmidt⁹, R. Bultmann¹⁰, D. O. Via¹¹, R. H. Gundry¹² rate the

⁵ C. W. Votaw, *The Gospel and contemporary Biographies in the Graeco-Roman World*, Philadelphia 1982.

⁶ C. Talbert, *What is a Gospel?*, Philadelphia 1977.

⁷ P. L. Shuler, *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew*, Philadelphia 1982.

⁸ R. A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels. A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTS MS, 70), Cambridge, 1992, p. 12-17.

⁹ K. L. Schmidt, *Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte*, [in:] H. Schmidt, *Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*; H. Gunkel zum 60 Geburtstag, Göttingen 1923.

¹⁰ R. Bultman, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, Oxford 1972, p. 371-373.

¹¹ D. O. Via, *Kerygma and investigation in the New Testament: A structuralist Approach to Hermeneutic*, Philadelphia 1975.

¹² R. H. Gundry, *Recent investigation into the Literary Genre Gospel*, [in:] R. N. Longenecker and M. V. C.

Gospels to the “Kleinliteratur”, i.e. folk literature having very little or no historical value. Other scholars, among them G. N. Stanton¹³, D. E. Aune¹⁴ and J. Kudasiewicz¹⁵, also claim that the Gospels are not biographies, but they do not negate their historical value. L. Cerfaux¹⁶ calls the Gospels solemn proclamations of salvation, C. F. D. Moule¹⁷ rates them to apologues, while K. Stendhal¹⁸ considers the Gospel of Matthew to be a manual for missionaries, catechists and pastors of the early Church. Our comparative analysis of this Gospel with Hexateuch shows that it is a New Torah and, more precisely, a New Hexateuch – a Book the key to which is the typology of the Exodus and the Conquest of the Promised Land. It is a narrative about the stories of the second Moses and the second Joshua, and, finally, it is a collection of new Law. The Jerusalem community realized they were the people of the New Alliance, and as such they needed a New Torah. In the redaction of his work Matthew not only takes into consideration material and numerical resemblances, but also – to some degree – follows the compositions of the Pentateuch interlacing collections of rules (sermons) with narrative fragments. Matthew imitated the pattern of themes from the Pentateuch, which explains why his Gospel consists of short, loosely linked pericopes.

What conclusions can be drawn from the above analysis regarding the synoptic problem? The first conclusion is that Gospel of Matthew had to come into being early, because the Jerusalem community needed a work of this type (a new Torah) from the very beginning of its existence. The second conclusion is that the Gospel

¹³ G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, Cambridge 1974.

¹⁴ D. E. Aune, *The Problem of the Genre of the Gospel: A Critique of the C. H. Talbert's What is a Gospel*, [in:] R. T. France and D. Wenham, *Gospel Perspectives: Study of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, t. II, Sheffield 1980, p. 45.

¹⁵ J. Kudasiewicz, *Ewangelie synoptyczne dzisiaj*, Warszawa 1986, p. 75.

¹⁶ L. Cerfaux, *Evangelie selon saint Luc*, [in:] DBS V, Paris 1957.

¹⁷ C. F. D. Moule, *Le origini del Nuovo Testamento*, Brescia 1971, p. 111.

¹⁸ K. Stendhal, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*, Philadelphia 1968, p. 21-22, 24-27.

of Matthew must have been created independently of the Gospel of Mark, since it was too closely connected with the Hexateuch.

4.5. The Problem of the doublets in the Gospel of Matthew

In the Gospels of Matthew and Luke the same text appears twice, while in Gospel of Mark only once. In the Gospels in which the same text is repeated, it occurs once in a non-Markan once in a Markan context, for example:

Mk	Mt	Lk
4,25 <i>To those who have, more will be given; from those who have not, what little they have will be taken away.</i> (The parable of the measure. The context of the sermon in parables).	13,12 <i>To the man who has, more will be given until he grows rich; the man who has not, will lose what little he has.</i> (The purpose of the parables. The context of the sermon in parables).	8,18 <i>Take heed, therefore, how you hear: to the man who has, more will be given; and he who has not, will lose even the little he thinks he has.</i> (Parable of the lamp. The context of the sermon in parables).
	25,29 <i>Those who have, will get more until they grow rich, while those who have not, will lose even the little they have.</i> (The parable of the silver pieces).	19,26 <i>The moral is: whoever has will be given more, but the one who has not will lose the little he has.</i> (The parable of the silver pieces).

According to the supporters of the two-source theory the doublets mentioned above prove that Matthew and Luke took advantage both of the Gospel of Mark and of another source. When the same text appeared in another source in a new context, it was rewritten too. Such a thesis, however, is not convincing at all. J. C. Hawkins¹⁹ points to twenty-two doublets in the Gospel of Matthew, but he believes that only half of them derive from two sources. It should be added that there exist doublets appearing only in the Gospel of

¹⁹ J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, Oxford 1909, p. 80-107.

Matthew or only in the Gospel of Luke. According to G. D. Kilpatrick²⁰ and D. L. Dungan²¹ the doublets in the Gospel of Matthew do not prove the existence of two sources, as they were included by the evangelists in order to disseminate a definite theological idea. Even the advocate of two sources C. M. Tuckett²² claims that doublets can be explained without referring to Q.

F. C. Grant²³ argues that doublets in Mt and Lk point to the presence of Q in the Gospel of Mark, therefore they are evidence against the theory of two sources. According to C. Butler²⁴ they undermine the priority of the Gospel of Mark.

We are positive that there are only five true doublets in the Gospel of Matthew and all of them are connected with the doublets of themes in the Pentateuch.

- a) Both in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5, 29-30) and in the ecclesiological sermon (Mt 18, 8-9) there appears the same logion about removing the cause of a sin. Matthew includes the logion for the second time, because it suits the warning against idolatry in Dt 13, 2-9. The eschatological sermon is redacted by Matthew in relation to the themes from the Book of Deuteronomy. In both cases the reference is made to being high-principled while avoiding a scandal.
- b) Matthew addressees the issue of prohibition on divorce in the Sermon on the Mount (5, 32) and in Mt 19, 1-9. The repetition is connected with the rule on divorce in Dt 24, 1-4.
- c) Matthew includes the theme of prayer in the Sermon on the Mount twice (Mt 6, 5-15 and 7, 7-11) because there are two collections of prescriptions about a cult in Ex 20, 22-26 and 23, 14-19.

²⁰ G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to Matthew*, 1946, p. 92.

²¹ D. L. Dungan, *Response to Two-Source Hypothesis*, [in:] *The Interrelations of the Gospel*, ed. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990, p. 203-204.

²² C. M. Tuckett, *The Existence of Q*, [in:] *The Gospel behind the Gospel*, *Current Studies on Q*, ed. R. A. Piper, Leiden – New York – Köln 1995, p. 27.

²³ F. C. Grant, *The Growth of the Gospel*, New York 1933, p. 129-130.

²⁴ C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew. A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*, Cambridge 1951, p. 138-146.

- d) Matthew places two texts about persecution: in the missionary sermon (Mt 10, 17-22) and in the eschatological sermon (Mt 24, 9-13). The inclusion of the text about persecution into the eschatological sermon is connected with the mention of the persecution of the 'saint of the alliance' in Dn 11, 28-30. The prophecy about 'the end of the age' in Dn 11, 14-35 is taken into consideration by Matthew while redacting the eschatological sermon.
- e) The opponents of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew demand a sign from Him twice, and Jesus answers twice that no other sign is to be given to them but that of Jonah, the prophet (Mt 12, 38-42 and 16, 1-4). The texts are related to the two mentions of the rebellion of Korah: in Nm 16 and Dt 11, 6.

It is significant that the text repeated in Mt does not anticipate the text repeated in the Pentateuch. Let us see the tabel below:

Mt	Pentateuch
a) 5,29	
b) 5,32	
c) 6,5-15	c) Ex 20,22-26
cc) 7,7-11	cc) Ex 23,14-19
d) 10,17-22	
e) 12,38-42	e) Dn 16
ee) 16,1-4	ee) Dt 11,6
aa) 18,8-9	a) Dt 13,2-19
bb) 19,1-9	b) Dt 24,1-4 bb) Dt 24,1-14
dd) 24,9-13	d) Dn 11,28-30

The order of the doublets demonstrates that Matthew included in his Gospel the same text for the second time only when in the Pentateuch a similar theme was repeated again.

5.
THE GOSPEL OF MARK
– ITS COMING INTO BEING
(THE CREATION OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK)

5.1. Tradition of the Ancient Church

Bishop Papias mentioned earlier commented not only on the Gospel of Matthew, but also on the creation of the Gospel of Mark. Here are his words: 'And the elder said this also: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately all that he remembered of the things said and done by the Lord, but not however in order. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him, but afterwards, as said, Peter, who adapted his teaching to the needs (of the hearers), but not as though he were drawing up a connected account of the Lord's oracles. So then Mark made no mistake in thus recording some things just as he remembered them, for he made it his one care to omit nothing that he had heard and make no false statement therein' (HE 3,19,15). In the work of Eusebius the testimony about the Gospel of Mark precedes the testimony about the Gospel of Matthew, but it is not possible to deduce from that which Gospel was regarded to be the first by Papias or Eusebius. St. Irenaeus, the bishop of Lyon, who – as we know – was the first to mention all the four Gospels, considers the Gospel of Matthew to be the earliest. He says: 'Matthew drew up his Gospel among Hebrews in their language, when Peter and Paul taught in Rome and founded there the Church. After the death of

these Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also transmitted to us in writing the things preached by Peter. Then Luke, the follower of Paul, wrote down in the book Gospel proclaimed by him' (HE 5,8.24.). However, Eusebius gives also a slightly different testimony, namely that of Clement of Alexandria (150-215 A.D.), according to whom the first Gospels were those including the genealogy of Jesus, i.e. Mt and Lk. At this point it is worth adding that the successor of Clement of Alexandria at the Christian school in Alexandria – Origen (185-253 A.D.) – was of the opinion that the first was Mt, then Mk and finally Lk. St. Jerome (342-420 A.D.) and St. Augustine agree with Origen, whereas St. Augustine refers to the literary dependence of the evangelists: Mark shortened the Gospel of Matthew and Luke took advantage of both of his predecessors.

5.2. Why Mark wrote the Gospel

We agree with St. Augustine as long as his thesis is slightly modified: Mark not only shortened the work of Matthew, but also changed it in accordance with his original idea.

To answer the question why Matthew drew up the second Gospel the supporters of the priority of Mark's Gospel say that the former was too short (it lacked information on the childhood of Jesus as well as the Sermon on the Mount, i.e. ethics) and poorly developed from the theological point of view (lacking in many parables). According to them it was absolutely impossible for Mark to dare to delete 533 out of 1072 verses from the Gospel of Matthew.

The followers of the priority of Matthew explain the problem pointing out that Mark wanted to give the catechumens in Rome a shortened version of the Gospel and so he deleted elements too closely connected with the Jewish environment. Indeed, the Sermon on the Mount, for example, is largely connected with the topic of 'The Old Law and the New'; see the antithesis: *You have heard the commandment imposed on your forefathers... What I say to you is* (Mt 5, 21-22) and the next ones. The detailed comparative analysis of Mt and Mk shows that for the sake of his addressees Mark also

deletes texts which could insult pagans, were of the anti-Jewish character or could be unacceptable for the Romans due to the praise of poverty, patience and humility.

The fact that texts on certain topics found in Mt are not present in Mk, whereas Matthew's texts on other themes almost always appear in Mk, proves that Mark deliberately eliminated certain topics while keeping others. The lack of a given text in Mk does not testify that Mark did not know it, but that it did not suit his conception of work about Jesus. Mark had his individual idea of such a work, which was different from Matthew's.

Mark did not only want to delete certain texts – his aim was to meet the expectations of pagans. The work of Matthew was to answer the expectations of the Messiah, of the God's kingdom and of the new Exodus present among the Jews. 'The good news' in the work of Matthew is the news about the kingdom. In the summary following the calling of the first disciples Matthew writes: *Jesus toured all of Galilee. He taught in their synagogues, proclaimed the good news of the kingdom (euaggelion tēs basileias), and cured the people of every disease and illness* (Mt 4, 23). The term 'the gospel' with the phrase 'of the kingdom' is used by Matthew in two other texts: in 9,35 and 24,14. Only in one case – in 26,13 – the phrase in question is not used. Mark, on the other hand, never uses the term *euaggelion tēs basileias*. In texts parallel to Mt, Mark deletes 'of the kingdom'; cf. Mt 4,23 and Mk 1,39; Mt 9,35 and Mk 6,6. In the excerpt following 13,9 the whole Matthew's verse 24,14 including this term is deleted.

According to Matthew the theme of Jesus' teaching in Galilee was calling on to conversion and the closeness of the kingdom: *Reform your lives! The kingdom of heaven is at hand* (Mt 4, 17). Mark broadens the information with the call for believing in the Gospel: *This is the time of fulfillment. The reign of God is at hand! Reform your lives and believe in the gospel!* (Mk 1, 14-15). In this verse parallel to Mt 4, 17 Mark uses the term 'gospel' twice, while in Mt it does not appear at all. It is worthwhile adding that Mark takes advantage of the term *euaggelion* eight times, while Matthew only four times.

It can be seen that Mark shifts the emphasis from the proclamation of the kingdom to the proclamation of the Gospel, since in his opinion the pagans in Rome should be approached with 'the Good news', and this is exactly how he calls his work: *Here begins the gospel of Jesus Christ* (1, 1). According to Mark, however, the 'Kingdom of Heaven' is not the most important part of the Good News as it is in Mt.

The departure from the theme of the kingdom can already be noticed in the preaching of the early Church directed to the Jews in the diaspora. St. Paul in his speech in the synagouge at Pisidian Antioch makes no mention of the Kingdom of Heaven at all (cf. Acts 13, 16-41). The topic of his preaching is salvation (*it was to us that this message of salvation was sent forth* – Acts 13, 26) as well as the fulfillment of the promise of God in Jesus (*We ourselves announce to you the good news that what God promised our fathers he has fulfilled for us, their children, in raising up Jesus...* – Acts 13, 32- 33). When Paul rejected by the Jews at Pisidian Antioch addresses the pagans, he focuses only on the proclamation of salvation (*The word of God has to be declared to you first of all; but since you reject it and thus convict yourselves as unworthy of everlasting life, we now turn to the Gentiles. For thus were we instructed by the Lord: "I have made you a light to the nations, a means of salvation to the ends of the earth"* – Acts 13, 46-47) The term 'salvation' (sōteria) occurs in the Epistles more often than the term 'kingdom.' The latter appears 19 times, whereas the former as many as 32 times. In the Letters of St Peter 'salvation' appears six times more than the 'kingdom.'

Mark was aware that the Church first of all proclaimed salvation and thus it was supposed to be the fundamental subject of the Good News, especially to the pagans.

5.3. The influence of prophecies about Gospels on the idea of the Good News in the Epistles of St Peter and St Paul

Let us have a look at the beginning of the First Epistle of St Peter: *5 Praised be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, he who in his great mercy gave us new birth; a birth unto hope which draws its life from the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead... 5 who are guarded with God's power through faith; a birth to a salvation which stands ready to be revealed in the last day... 8 Although you have never seen him, you love him, and without seeing you now believe in him, and rejoice with inexpressible joy touched with glory 9 because you are achieving faith's goal, your salvation 10 This is the salvation which the prophets carefully searched out and examined. They prophesied the divine favor that was destined to be yours. They investigated the times and the circumstances which the Spirit of Christ within them was pointing to... 12 They knew by revelation that they has now been proclaimed to you by those who preach the gospel to you...* (1 Pt 1, 3-12).

In the short passage quoted above the term 'salvation' is used as many as three times. St Peter refers to the revelation of matters which are the subject of the Gospel (the verse 12) to the prophets. There also appears the term 'gospel' in it .

The same three elements: salvation, the announcement of prophets and the gospel are mentioned in the first sixteen verses in the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans: *Greetings from Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle and set apart to proclaim the gospel of God which he promised long ago through his prophets, as the holy Scriptures record – the gospel concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to flesh but was made Son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness, by his resurrection from the dead: Jesus Christ our Lord.* (Rom 1,1-4).

I am not ashamed of the gospel. It is the power of God leading everyone who believes in it to salvation, the Jew first, then the Greek (Rom 1,16).

St Peter and, even more clearly St Paul, say that the Gospel was announced by the prophets. Such prophecies occur in Is 40, 1-11; Is 52, 7-12 and Is 61,1-3. According to the Gospel of Luke the fragment of the last prophecy was referred by Jesus to himself in the synagogue in Nazareth:

The spirit of the Lord is upon me;

Therefore he has anointed me.

He has sent me to bring glad tidings (euaggelisasthai)

to the poor...

(Lk 4,18).

The content of the Good News in them includes: (1) the arrival of God with power; cf. Is 40, 10: *Here comes with power the Lord God...* ; (2) the inauguration of the reign of God; cf. Is 52, 7a: *How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who brings glad tidings...* (3) the gift of peace, happiness and salvation; cf. Is 52, 7b *announcing peace, bearing good news, announcing salvation...* Let us advert that the salvation in these texts refers to the lives on earth, is given together with an inauguration of the kingdom.

The predication of the Good News is mentioned in Ps 96(97) as well:

Ps 96, 2 Sing to the Lord a new song;

sing to the Lord, all you lands.

Sing to the Lord; bless his name;

announce his salvation (euaggelizesthe), day after day.

96,3 Tell his glory among the nations;

among all peoples, his wondrous deeds.

Here salvation is also associated with earthly life, where the miracles of God are visible.

In the fragment of the Epistle St Paul to the Romans quoted above there are more elements common with the prophecies about the Gospel than in the quoted excerpt from the first Epistle of St Peter. In the Epistle to the Romans there also appears the mention of the 'Son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness' (the fourth verse.)

5.4. The influence of prophecies about the Gospel on the composition of the Gospel of Mark

Peter and Paul undoubtedly knew the prophecies about the Gospel and the same can be said about Mark. Both the prophecies and the afore-mentioned Epistles of St Peter and St Paul must have influenced the idea of the work of Mark.

For this very reason Mark focuses on the image of Jesus as the Son of God in power who is already saving people from the spiritual and physical evil. The word 'power' appears in Mk ten times, while in Mt only four.

Due to the idea of the work about Jesus as the Good News about the Son of God and about salvation (also in its earthly sense as the deliverance from the spiritual and physical evil) Mark deletes from Mt mainly the parables about the kingdom and ethical instructions. Out of 64 pericopes deleted by Mark from Mt only four regard the miracles of Jesus, whereat he includes three stories of his own: the cure of the demoniac in Capernaum (Mk 1, 23-28), the cure of a deaf-mute (Mk 7, 31-37), and the cure of a blind man (Mk 8, 22-26). Mark does not delete any text of Matthew, whose main subject is the divinity of Jesus. God comes in Jesus to bring – in accordance with the prophecies about the Gospel – peace, happiness and salvation to His people. Jesus bestows peace, happiness and salvation on people delivering them from sins and disease. Mark finishes his Gospel with the instruction of Jesus which is not present in Matthew: The man who believes in it and accepts baptism will be saved; the man who refuses to believe in it will be condemned (Mk 16, 16.)

Both Matthew and Mark begin the tale of Jesus' public activity with the calling of the first disciples over Galilean lake, but the very next pericope is different in each Gospel: Matthew places here the summary of Jesus' teaching and healing in Galilee, whereas Mark includes the testimony about casting out a demon in the synagogue in Capernaum as well as the healing of Peter's mother-in-law and numerous cases of healing and expelling demons outside Peter' house. The testimony, wherein the place of a miracle

is defined in detail and witnesses are mentioned is much more convincing, one could say more powerful, than a general summary. Mark begins with 'a heavy blow': we saw Jesus cast out demons and heal people.

After the afore-mentioned summary Matthew includes the Sermon on the Mount, while Mark still develops the theme of the deliverance from evil; cf. 1, 39: *He went into their synagogues preaching the good news and expelling demons throughout the whole of Galilee*, and continues with the story about the healing of a leper (1, 40-45) and a paralytic (2, 1-12).

In the missionary sermon Matthew includes the order of Jesus to heal and cast out demons (Mt 10, 8) which is not present in Mark. Instead, Mark mentions that Jesus gave the apostles the power over evil spirits and that the apostles preached the need of repentance, expelled demons and healed (Mk 6, 12-13). To sum up, in Mk instead of Jesus' order there is a testimony: the power of Jesus worked (and still works) in the apostles. The deliverance from evil – according to Mark – will accompany the preaching of the Gospel and the power of Jesus will reveal also in his disciples, because He said: *Signs like these will accompany those who have professed their faith: they will use my name to expel demons, they will speak entirely new language... and the sick upon whom they lay their hands will recover* (Mk 16, 17-18).

Putting emphasis on miracles and exorcisms by Mark does not point to the 'folk character' and 'the poor theology' of his work, since it results from the new concept of it. Mark wants to give his addressees 'the Good News' about salvation by God who came to the world in Jesus. In this way Mark meets the needs of the pagan world and adapts his Gospel to the manner of evangelization conducted by the early Church, particularly by St Peter and St Paul. Matthew did not call his work 'a gospel', because his aim was to write a new Torah (new Hexateuch). Mark, in contrast, works out a new idea of the work about Jesus – 'Gospel' – and so he gives this very name to his work .

Since the times of Bishop Papias the Church has accepted that Mark was a secretary of Peter who taught in Rome and that Mark wrote his Gospel under Peter's influence. The influence is generally

visible in a simple language and in narrative texts which are more developed than in Mt. Papias recognized the influence in question in a different order of pericopes than in Mt, but it is undoubtedly expressed also in the idea of the Gospel as the proclamation of salvation.

5.5. The influence of St Paul's teaching about the secret of wisdom on the redaction of the Markan sermon in parables (Mk 4, 1-34)

The comparative analysis of Mark's sermon in the parables (Mk 1-34) and the sermon in the parables about the Kingdom of God in Mt 13, 1-52 clearly shows that Mark had his own theological conception and for this very reason his Gospel differs from that of Matthew. In accordance with his editorial assumptions Mark shortens the sermon – he deletes nearly half of all Matthew's verses (25 out of 52). However, his aim is not just to shorten the other work, because Mark includes into the sermon the pericope 'The seed grows of itself' (Mk 4, 26-29), the parable of the lamp from The Sermon on the Mount (Mk 4, 21-23; cf. Mt 5, 15), the logion '*Things are hidden only to be revealed at a later time*' from the Matthean missionary sermon (Mk 4, 22; cf. Mt 10, 26), and the parable of the measure from the Sermon on the Mount (Mk 4, 24; cf. Mt 7, 2.) The logion „*To those who have*” (Mk 4, 25), on the other hand, is transferred to another context within the framework of the same sermon (cf. Mt 13, 12). Only two parables here are preceded with introductions stating that they refer to the kingdom, while in Mt there are six such parables. What is the purpose of the above alterations?

Mark wants to emphasize that the kingdom is a secret. Matthew addresses the topic of the secret only in the triptych of the sower, while Mark refers to it also in all three parables added by him. In Mt the apostles arrive at understanding the secret in the antepaschal period; cf. the words of Jesus: *But blest are your eyes because they see and blest are your ears because they hear* (Mt 13, 16). This logion does not appear in Mk., who also deletes the

passage from the end of the sermon in parables in Mt: *Have you understood all this? "Yes," they answered* (Mt 13, 51). Moreover, Mark wants to stress that the secret given to the group of the apostles and witnesses of Jesus' life, passion and resurrection is to be revealed to the whole world. It is the central theme of the parable of the lamp. Transferring the parable to a new context Mark gives it a new interpretation. In the Sermon on the Mount every disciple of Jesus has to be such a lamp. The parable starts with the following words: *You are the light of the world* (Mt 5, 14) and it ends like this: *your light must shine before men so that they may see goodness in your acts...* (Mt 5, 16). In the Markan context the lamp is Jesus Christ who brings salvation. This is what results from the next logion in the Markan sermon: „*Things are hidden only to be revealed at a later time*” (Mk 4, 22). In Matthew's context the same logion goes as follows: *Nothing is concealed that will not be revealed, and nothing hidden that will not become known* (Mt 10, 26). The logion is followed by these words: *What I tell you in darkness, speak in the light. What you hear in private, proclaim from the house-tops* (Mt 10, 27). In the above-mentioned logions in Mt the secret in question refers to the dignity of Jesus – the God's Son, the Messiah and the Savior who is rejected by the Pharisees and scribes calling Him Beelzebub (cf. Mt 10, 25). This secret can also be God's plan of salvation.

The emphasis put by Mark on the revelation of the secret to the whole world is probably connected with the prophecies about the Gospel. One of them goes as follows: *All the ends of the earth will behold the salvation of our God* (Is 52, 10).

The parable of the measure and the logion '*To those who have*' warn the readers not to disregard the word (of God) proclaimed to them (reference to the parable of the sower) and to be aware that this word contains a secret which is difficult to grasp. The parable of the measure is taken out by Mark from the context of ethics (Mt 7, 1: *If you want to avoid judgment, stop passing judgment*), and the logion '*The man who has*' is taken out from the triptych of the seed (Mt 13, 12), where it referred to the secret of the kingdom.

Mark puts emphasis on the secret in the context of preaching the word of God (Mk 4, 14: *What the sower is sowing is the word*)

probably under the influence of St Paul's statement about preaching the Gospel (cf. 1 Cor 1, 17- 2, 16). In 1 Cor 1, 17 St. Paul writes: *For Christ did not send me baptize, but to preach the gospel...* In 2, 7 he says: *No, what we utter is God's wisdom: a mysterious, a hidden wisdom.* Thus the apostle identifies the Gospel with 'the secret of God's wisdom' and the 'hidden wisdom.' And now let us examine the context in order to discover what the secret is. The content of the notion is very rich. 1,18 suggests that it is the teaching about the cross, 1,30 shows that it is Christ crucified, and from 2, 9 one can deduce that it is eternal salvation:

Of this wisdom it is written:

*"Eye has not seen, ear has not heard,
nor has it so much as dawned on man
what God has prepared for those who love him."*

Mark, similarly to Paul the Apostle, realizes how difficult it is to preach the Gospel 'to wise man', 'to scribes', 'to masters of worldly argument' (cf. 1Cor 1, 20) and 'to the rulers of this age' (cf. 1 Cor 2, 8). Therefore, he warns listeners that hidden wisdom is meant here so they should be very attentive. Mark ends the parable of the lamp with the logion: *Let him who has ears to hear me, hear!* (Mk 4, 23), and begins the parable of the measure with the following words: *Listen carefully to what you hear* (Mk 4, 24).

One of the objections against the priority of the Gospel of Matthew is the fact, that the sermon in parables in the Gospel of Mark is shorter and seemingly poor from the point of view of its composition. The analysis of the Markan sermon on the background of the first Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians testifies that Mark did not ruin Matthew's sermon, but, under the influence of this Epistle, rephrased it in accordance with his idea of the work about Jesus.

5.6. Why the narratives about the infancy of Jesus, the temptation and the Sermon on the Mount are not present in the Gospel of Mark

All the three texts mentioned above did not suit the conception of the Markan work about Jesus which was to contain the Good News about salvation. In the narrative of Jesus infancy Matthew wants to show that the Scripture was fulfilled in Jesus. In the genealogy Matthew points out that Jesus descends from the tribe of David, from which Messiah was to descend. In the pericope about Jesus' birth Matthew stresses that, in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah 7, 14, Jesus was born from the virgin and He will be '*God with us*'. In the story about the homage of Astrologers Matthew quotes the text of Prophet Micah 5, 2 about the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem. The text of Hosea about the call '*of the God's Son*' from Egypt (11, 1) refers to the flight of the Holy Family to Egypt and the text of Jeremiah about crying Rachel, the mother of Israel, refers to the massacre of the innocents in Bethlehem. Finally, the return to Nazareth is linked with '*the word of the Prophets*': – '*He shall be called a Nazorean*'. It is known that the verification of the messianic dignity of Jesus on the basis of the prophecies was not the fundamental purpose of Mark. In the Matthean narrative the Holy Family is forced to flee to Egypt, which did not harmonize with the image of the powerful Son of God. The influence of the preaching of Saint Peter who neither in his sermons (in the Acts) nor in his Epistles referred to the signs in the infancy of Jesus, but emphasized the fact that he had witnessed the events described by him could also play a certain role here. One ought to remember that Mark had no intention of writing the biography of Jesus. His aim was to pass on the Good News in the form in which it was presented by the witness of Jesus' doings.

In the description of the three temptations Jesus is carried with the power of the demon, which probably did not correspond to the image of the God's Son in power. Let us advert that Mark does not mention consecutive temptations, but rewrites only Matthew's mention that Jesus was served by angels on the desert (cf. Mt 4, 11 and Mk 1, 13).

The Sermon on the Mount is a very important part of the Gospel of Matthew (chapters 5-7), since it is a collection of the new Law proclaimed by Jesus and it is parallel to the first collection of the Law in the Book of Exodus (chapters 19-23), the so-called 'Sinaiticus Code'. Verses Mt 5, 17-20 include Jesus' general comments on His relation to the Mosaic Law. In chapter 5, 21-48 Matthew not only presents Jesus' teaching, but also shows the difference between it and the the rules of Torah. The formula „*You have heard the commandment imposed on your forefathers... What I say to you is* (Mt 5, 21-22), or a similar one appear six times in this passage. It goes a long way to prove that the above texts are closely linked with the Jewish environment.

It may seem that Mark should not have deleted the Eight Beatitudes or the New Law of Love, or so important a rule as that about the annulment of divorce. However, the New Law of Love and the rule about divorce appear in other contexts: see Mk 12, 28-34 and Mk 10, 1-11. As for the Eight Beatitudes, it is proper to mention that Luke included only four of them into his Gospel. Mark eliminated them totally, as they did not correspond to his Gospel because of the praise of poverty, humility and resignation in the face of persecution, which the Romans found offensive. It should be emphasized that the Sermon on the Mount deleted by Mark includes the following pericopes: 'Heavenly Treasures' (Mt 6, 19-24)' and '*Do not worry about your livelihood*' (Mt 6, 25-34), in which Jesus proclaims indifference to earthly riches. There are also other texts not present in the Gospel of Mark such as: the pericope about abnegation concerning poverty (Mt 8, 18-22), the logion about the need of being '*gentle and humble of heart*' (Mt 11, 29), the quotation from Is 42, 1-4 about the humble Servant of Lord (Mt 12, 15-20) and the final passage from the pericope about avoiding the scandal, wherein Jesus stands up for the ordinary (Mt 18, 6-11).

Why does Mark delete the logions about the mission of the twelve disciples (Mt 5, 13-16)(the text parallel to Ex 19, 5-6)? It is because the logion about light is shifted by Mark to the sermon in parables and in this new context it refers not to the disciples, but to Christ; see Mk 4, 21-23.

Is it possible that Mark did not know the Sermon on the Mount? Undoubtedly, he must have known it, which is proved by at least two facts. Firstly, as it has already been said, the logion about light from the Sermon on the Mount appears in another context in his Gospel and, secondly, Mark adds the final passage of the Sermon on the Mount to the pericope about Jesus' teaching in Capernaum:

Mt 7	Mk 1
<p>28 <i>Jesus finished this discourse and left the crowds spellbound at his teaching.</i></p> <p>29 <i>The reason was that he taught with authority and not like their scribes.</i></p>	<p>22 <i>The people were spellbound by his teaching because he taught with authority, and not like the scribes.</i></p>

Mark rejects the Sermon on the Mount, because it does not meet the editorial requirements of his Gospel. Moral instructions cannot be called the Good News, all the more that in the prophecies about the Gospel there was nothing on the Law.

5.7. The lack of the title 'the Son of living God' in Mk 8, 29

The lack of the title '*the Son of living God*' in Mk 8, 29 is for the advocates of the priority of the Gospel of Mark a clear argument confirming their opinion. According to them, Matthew added a qualifying phrase '*the Son of living God*' (16, 16) to a short formula found in Mk *You are the Messiah!* (8, 29) . They claim that it was improbable for Mark to shorten the Matthew's formula. However, I reckon that, firstly, the phrase '*the Son of living God*' is not an editorial addition of Matthew, and, secondly, that Mark deleted it.

The afore-mentioned words must be authentic words of Matthew, because in His reply to Peter Jesus puts a great emphasis on the fact that the confession of Peter stems from the God's revelation. According to Jesus Father, who is in heaven, revealed to Peter the

true dignity of Jesus as the Messiah and the God's Son. If it were only the issue of the dignity of the Messiah, the emphasis would not be necessary, because, as the apostles themselves confirmed, a lot of people not being Jesus' disciples considered Him to be 'one of the prophets'. The Messiah is, obviously, more than a prophet, but in this case 'the prophet' can also mean the Messiah, since the Israelites at that time waited, under the influence of the teaching of St John the Baptist, for the Messiah. Matthew does not use the title of the prophet in the apostles' reply so as not to repeat it again in Peter's reply. The feature which the Jews did not attribute to Jesus was His divinity. Only the extraordinary revelation of God could point to it.

The question arises here why Mark deleted the words mentioned above. The reason for that is the so called 'Messianic secret', which concerns mainly the dignity of Jesus as the Son of God. 'The secret' appears also in the Gospel of Matthew, but the emphasis put on it is not as strong as in the Gospel of Mark. Let us compare the logion about the secret in the two Gospels:

Mt 13	Mk 4
<p><i>10 When the disciples got near him, they asked him, "Why do you speak to them in parables?"</i></p> <p><i>11 He answered: "To you has been given a knowledge of the mysteries of the reign of God, but it has not been given to the others. To the man who has, more will be given until he grows rich; the man who has not, will lose what little he has.</i></p> <p><i>13 "I use parables when I speak to them because they look but do not see, they listen but do not hear or understand.</i></p> <p><i>14 Isaiah's prophecy is fulfilled in them which says:</i></p> <p><i>'Listen as you will, you shall not understand,</i></p> <p><i>look intently as you will see.</i></p>	<p><i>10 Now when he was away from the crowd, those present with the Twelve questioned him about the parables.</i></p> <p><i>11 He told them: To you the mystery of the reign of God has been confided. To the others outside it is all presented in parables,</i></p> <p><i>12 so that they will look intently and not see, listen carefully and not understand, lest perhaps they repent and be forgiven."</i></p>

15 Sluggish indeed is this people's heart.

*They have scarcely heard with their ears,
they have firmly closed their eyes;
otherwise they might see with their eyes,
and hear with their ears,
and understand with their hearts,
and turn back to me,
and I should heal them.'*

*16 "But blest are your eyes they see
and blest are your ears because they hear.*

13 He said to them: "You do not understand this parable? How then are you going to understand other figures like it?"

Both texts address the topic of the privilege of the disciples, but there are certain differences: Matthew writes about 'the knowledge of the mysteries of the reign of God (Mt 13, 11)', while Mark refers to 'the confidence of the mystery of the reign of God' (Mk 4, 11). In Matthew's text the concealment of the mystery by Jesus stems from the fact, that 'sluggish is the people's heart' and 'they have closed their eyes', whereas in Mark's text it is planned by Jesus. Matthew finishes the discourse in parables about the Kingdom of Heaven with Jesus' question: '*Have you understand all this?*' to which the listeners answer Yes (Mt 13, 51). Mark, on the other hand, concludes the discourse with the mention of the difficulty listeners have in understanding Jesus and with a remark, that Jesus explained the parables only to His disciples: *By means of many such parables he taught them the message in a way they could understand. To them he spoke only by way of parable, while he kept explaining things privately to his disciples* (Mk 4, 33-34).

Although Jesus explains His teaching to the disciples, in Mk they seem to be as confused as others. At the end of the logion about the mystery in Mt Jesus praises His disciples for their ability to see (Mt 13, 16), whereas in Mk Jesus rebukes them for their dullness (Mk 4, 13). Let us see how Jesus interprets the incomprehension of His words about yeast by the Pharisees and the Sadducees in the dialogue on the boat in both Gospels:

Mt 16	Mk 8
<p>8 <i>Why do you suppose it is because you have no bread? How weak your faith is!</i></p> <p>9 <i>Do you still not understand? Do you not remember</i></p> <p><i>the five loaves among five thousand and how many baskets-full you picked up?</i></p> <p>10 <i>Or the seven loaves among four thousand and how many hampers-full you retrieved?</i></p> <p>11 <i>Why is it you do not see that I was not speaking about bread at all but warning you against the yeast of the Pharisees?</i></p>	<p>17 <i>Aware of this he said to them, "Why do you suppose that it is because you have no bread? Do you still not see or comprehend? Are your minds completely blinded?"</i></p> <p>18 <i>Have you eyes but no sight? Ears but no hearing?</i></p> <p>19 <i>Do you remember when I broke the five loaves for the thousand, how many baskets of fragments you gathered up? They answered, "Twelve."</i></p> <p>20 <i>When I broke the seven loaves for the four thousand, how many full hampers of fragments did you collect?" They answered, "Seven."</i></p> <p>21 <i>He said to them again, "Do you still not understand?"</i></p>

The fact that Jesus had not been recognized by the witnesses of His miracles was probably to be an argument in the discussion with the Romans, the addressees of the Gospel, about the reason why Jesus had been rejected in His motherland. The same might have been the purpose of emphasis put by Mark on the fact that Jesus was not understood by His disciples. According to Mark, Peter's confession of Jesus' divinity on the way to Caesarea of Philippi did not mean that the apostles understood the dignity of Jesus. They will comprehend who Jesus really is only when seeing Him after the resurrection. Matthew omits the Christophanies in Jerusalem after the resurrection, while Mark says that Jesus appeared to the apostles in Jerusalem and reprimanded them for their lack of faith: *Finally, as they were at table, Jesus was revealed to the Eleven. He took them to task for their disbelief and their stubbornness, since they had not had faith in those who had seen him after he had been raised* (Mk16, 14).

Mark deletes the confession of Jesus' divinity by Peter to avoid implying that the apostles believed that Jesus was the Son of God equal to Father in the period before the paschal event.

It is worthwhile examining the difference between the two Gospels concerning the revelation of Jesus' divinity by Father after the baptism in the Jordan:

Mt 3	Mk 1
17 <i>With that, a voice from the heavens said, "This is my beloved Son. My favor rests on him."</i>	11 <i>Then a voice came from the heavens: "You are my beloved Son. On you my favor rests."</i>

According to the text in Mt Father revealed the dignity of Jesus to the witnesses of the baptism, at least to John the Baptist. The same, however, cannot be deduced from the Markan text implying that the revelation of Jesus' divinity in the pre-Paschal period was not a part of God's plan. The narrative about Jesus' transfiguration (cf. Mt 17, 1-13 and parallel) confirms that He concealed His dignity from the Jews.

As the dignity of Jesus was not recognized by the witnesses of His life, Mark avoids calling Jesus 'the Lord' both by the disciples as well as other people. Let us see how many times Matthew and Mark use this very title of Jesus in the parallel texts.

Mt	Mk
8,2 <i>Suddenly a leper came forward and did homage, saying to him, "Sir, if You will to do so, you can cure me".</i>	1,40 –
8,25 <i>so they made their way toward him and woke him: "Lord, save us! We are lost!"</i>	4,38 – ("Teacher, does it not matter to you that we are going to drown?").
15,22 <i>I happened that a Canaanite woman living in that locality presented herself, crying out to him,</i>	7,25 –
<i>"Lord, Son of David, have pity on my!"</i>	7,26 –

15,25 She came forward then and did him homage with the plea,
“Help me, Lord!”

15,27 **“Please, Lord,” she insisted, “even the dogs eat the leavings...”**

16,22 At this, Peter took him aside and began to remonstrate with him.
“May you be spared, Master!

17,4 Then Peter said to Jesus, “Lord how good that we are here!

17,15 “Lord,” he said, “take pity on my son...”

20,30 who heard that Jesus was passing by, began to shout, “Lord, Son of David, have pity on us!”

20,31 but they only shouted the louder; “Lord, Son of David, have pity on us!”

20,33 “Lord”, they told him, “open our eyes!”

21,3 **If anyone says a word to you, say, “The Master (ho kurios) needs them.”**

26,22 Distressed at this, they began to say to him one after another; “Surely it is not I, Lord?”

7,28 **“Please, Lord,” she replied, “even the dogs under the table eat the family’s leavings.”**

8,32 –

9,5 – (Then Peter spoke to Jesus: ‘Rabbi, how good it is for us to be here...’)

9,17 – (“Teacher”, a man in the crowd replied, I have brought my son to You...)

10,47 – (On hearing that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to call out, “Jesus, Son of David, have pity on me!”)

10,48 – (but he shouted all the louder; “Son of David, have pity on me!”)

10,51 – “Rabboni, “ the blind man said, “I want to see.”)

11,3 **If anyone says to you, “Why are you doing that?” say, “The Master (ho kurios) needs it but he will send it back here at once.”**

14,19 – (They began to say to him sorrowfully, one by one, “surely not I!”)

As can be seen above only in two cases out of thirteen there exists compliance in the use of the title ‘Lord’ referring to Jesus between the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. In the first case Jesus is called ‘Lord’ by a Canaanite woman, and in the second Jesus use the same word to refer to himself. The Canaanite woman certainly uses the term ‘Lord’ not as the title of God, but as the title showing respect, i.e. in the same meaning in which high-priests used it with regard to Pilate (cf. Mt 27, 63). In Mt the term ‘Lord’ most often appears in this very sense, but Mark – if he were the second – replaces it with ‘the Teacher’ (Rabbi), so that readers, who already associate ‘Kurios’ with the divine dignity of Jesus, do

not assume that Jesus was considered to be the Son of God as early as in the period before the paschal event.

5.8. The logic of the composition of Mark's Gospel

The composition of Mark's Gospel poses, similarly to the Gospel of Matthew, a great problem to Biblicists. To define its composition some scholars take into consideration topographical data, others the subject matter of each pericope or both topographical data and the themes of pericopes. In our opinion the composition of Mark's Gospel is determined by the themes of pericopes, and a detailed division should not be sought for. It is easy to notice that in the first part of the Gospel, i.e. before the pericope about Peter's confession (Mk 8, 27-30), the theme repeated most often is the dignity of Jesus as the Son of God which manifests itself in the acts of healing and in having power over nature and the world of spirits. There are as many as eleven texts clearly regarding the dignity of Jesus here and the recapitulation of this part is Jesus' question: Who do people say that I am? They replied, "Some. John the Baptizer, others, Elijah, still others, one of the prophets." "And you," he went on to ask, "who do you say that I am?" (Mk 8, 27-29). Then Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah. However, the actual ending of this part is the pericope about the transfiguration of Jesus on the mount, where heavenly Father reveals: '*This is my Son, my beloved, Listen to him.*' (Mk 9, 7). The aim of the first part as a whole is to lead to the belief in Jesus as the Son of God. After the confession of faith by Peter and the confirmation of Jesus' divinity by Father, Mark goes on to present Jesus' comments on the necessity of suffering and on the conditions of entering the Kingdom of God. Actually, Jesus addresses the issue of suffering earlier, after Peter's confession and before the transfiguration. The two parts defined by us overlap with each other in this short passage Mk 8, 31-9. The reason for it is probably the fact, that Mark wants to connect, in compliance with chronology, the first announcement of the Passion with Peter's confession. Therefore, the whole Gospel of Mark can be divided only in two parts: 1) Jesus

as the powerful Son of God, who comes to save the men. Along with Jesus there comes closer the reign of God (1, 1-9, 8). 2) The salvation character of the Passion and death of Jesus. Jesus is the suffering Messiah. The conditions of entering the kingdom (9, 9-16, 20).

The above bipartition is also confirmed by inclusions. At the beginning of the first part, namely in the description of the baptism, there is a speech about theophany in which heavenly Father reveals the dignity of Jesus: *'You are my beloved Son, On your my favor rests.'* (Mk 1, 11). At the end of this part Mark includes the pericope about theophany (the transfiguration of Jesus) and similar words of heavenly Father: *'This is my Son, my beloved. Listen to him'* (Mk 9, 7). The second part opens with the first announcement of the Passion (Mk 8, 31) and finishes with the description of the Passion and Resurrection.

Markan material in the Gospel of Matthew

Mk	Mt	Mt
<i>The first part of the Gospel</i>		
John the Baptizer (1,1-8)	3,1-12	
The baptism of Jesus (1,9-11)	3,13-17	
The temptation (1,12-13)	4,1-11	
Summary (1,14-15)	4,12-17	
Call of the first disciples (1,16-20)	4,18-20	
Teaching in Capernaum (1,21-22)	–	
Cure of a demoniac (1,23-28)	–	
Peter's mother-in-law (1,29-31)	8,14-15	
Other miracles (1,32-34)	8,16-17	
Teaching in Galilee (1,35-39)	–	
A leper (1,40-45)		8,1-4
A paralytic at Capernaum (2,1-12)	9,1-8	
The call of Levi (2,13-17)	9,9-13	
The question of fasting (2,18-22)	9,14-17	
The disciples and the Sabbath (2,23-28)		12,1-8
A man with a withered hand (3,1-6)		12,9-14
The mercy of Jesus (3,7-12)	–	
Choice of the Twelve (3,13-19)		10,1-4
Blasphemy of the Scribes (3,20-30)		12,22-30

Jesus and His family (3,31-35)		12,46-50
Parable of the seed (4,1-20)		13,1-20
The logion of the lamp (4,21)		5,14-15
“Things are hidden” (4,22-23)		10,26
The logion about the measure (4,24)		7,2
”To those who have” (4,25)		13,2
Seed grows of itself (4,26-29)	–	
The mustard seed (4,30-32)		13,31
The end of the teach. in parabl.(4,33-34)	–	
The storm on the sea (4,35-41)		8,23-27
Expulsion of the devils in Gerasa (5,1-20)		8,28-34
The woman with a hemorrhage (5,21-34)	9,18-22	
The daughter of Jairus (5,35-43)	9,23-26	
Jesus at Nazareth (6,1-6)		13,53-58
Mission of Twelve (6,7-13)	10,5-16	
Death of the Baptizer (6,14-29)	14,1-12	
Returns of the disciples (6,30-33)	–	
Jesus feeds five thousands (6,34-44)	14,13-21	
Jesus walks on the water (6,45-52)	14,22-33	
Other miracles (6,53-56)	14,34-36	
Jesus and the Pharisees (7,1-23)	15,1-20	
A Canaanite women (7,24-30)	15,21-28	
Healing of a deaf-mute (7,31-37)	–	
Jesus feeds four thousands (8,1-9)	15,32-39	
The Pharisees ask a sign (8,10-13)	16,1-4	
The leaven of the Pharisees (8,14-21)	16,5-12	
A blind man at Bethsaida (8,22-26)	–	
The Messiah (8,27-30)	16,13-20	
First teach. of the Pasch. Event (8,31-33)	16,21-23	
The doctrine of the cross (8,34-9,1)	16,24-28	
Jesus Transfigured (9,2-8)	17,1-8	
<i>The second part of the Gospel</i>		
On the coming of Elijah (9,9-13)	17,9-13	
A possessed boy (9,14-29)	17,14-21	
Sec. teach.of the Pasch.Event (9,30-32)	17,22-23	
Against ambition and envy (9,33-37)	18,1-5	
In the name of Jesus (9,38-41)	–	
The scandal (9,42-50)	18,6-18	
The question of divorce (10,1-12)	19,1-12	
Jesus blesses the children (10,13-16)	19,13-15	
The danger of riches (10,17-31)	19,16-30	

Third teach.of the Pasch.Event (10,32-34)	20,17-19	
Ambitions of James and John (10,35-45)	20,20-28	
The blind Bartimeus (10,46-52)	20,29-34	
Triumphal entry into Jerusalem (11,1-11)	21,1-11	21,18-19
Jesus curses a fig tree (11,12-14)		
Cleansing of the temple (11,15-19)	21,12-17	
The fig tree withered (11,20-25)		21,20-22
The authority of Jesus (11,27-33)	21,23-27	
Parable of the tenants (12,1-12)	21,33-46	
Tribute to the emperor (12,13-17)	22,15-22	
The Sadduc. and the Resur. (12,18-27)	22,23-33	
The great commandment (12,28-34)	22,34-40	
The Son of David (12,35-37)	22,41-46	
Hypocr. of the oppon. of Jesus (12,38-40)	23,1-38	
The widow's mite (12,41-44)	–	
Questions about the temple (13,1-4)	24,1-3	
Beginning of calamities (13,5-13)	24,4-14	
The supreme tribulation (13,14-23)	24,15-22	
Last act of the drama (13,24-31)	24,23-31	
Need for watchfulness (24,32-37)	24,32-44	
The official decision (14,1-2)	26,3-5	
The anointing at Bethany (14,3-9)	26,6-13	
The betrayal (14,10-11)	26,14-16	
Passover preparation (14,12-16)	26,17-19	
The betrayer (14,17-21)	26,20-25	
The holy Eucharist (14,22-26)	26,26-30	
Peter's denial foretold (14,27-31)	26,31-35	
The agony in the garden (14,32-42)	26,36-46	
Jesus arrested (14,43-52)	26,47-56	
Jesus before the Sanhedrin (14,53-65)	26,57-68	
Peter's denial (14,66-72)	26,69-75	
Jesus before Pilate (15,1-15)	27,1-2.11-26	
The crowning with thorns (15,16-20)	27,27-31	
The way of the cross:the cruc. (15,20-32)	27,32-44	
Death of Jesus (15,33-41)	27,45-56	
The burial (15,42-47)	27,57-61	
The women at the tomb (16,1-8)	28,1-8	
Christophanies (16,9-14)	28,9-10	
Last order (16,15-18)	28,16-20	
Jesus was taken up into heav. (16,19-20)	–	

It can be seen that changes in the pericope order made by Mark in relation to the Gospel of Matthew appear almost exclusively in the first part of his Gospel preceding the pericope of 'The Mission of the Twelve' (Mk 6, 7-13). In the remaining part of the Gospel there is only one alteration of the same type. The frequency of editorial changes in the Gospel of Mark in relation to the Gospel of Matthew corresponds to the occurrence of the theme about the secret of Jesus. The conclusion one can draw from it is that Mark changes the order of pericopes to emphasize the theme of Jesus' dignity (who Jesus is.) According to Mark, the first part of the Gospel was to show who Jesus was. The differences in the composition of Mt and Mk in this part may equally well prove that Matthew 'improved' Mark or that Mark adapted material from Matthew to his conception of the Gospel.

5.9. The argument for the priority of Mt resulting from the composition of Mk

In the Gospel of Mark there are seven passages containing the same pericopes as the Gospel of Matthew and, additionally, in the same order. Besides, four pericopes in Mk are in accordance with the order of themes in Mt and, simultaneously, in the Hexateuch.

The fragment Mk 2, 1-22 containing three pericopes: 'A paralytic at Capernaum', 'The calling of Levi' and 'The question of fasting' is parallel to the fragment Mt 9, 1-17 including the same three pericopes in the identical order. The excerpt in question belongs to the first part of the Gospel of Mark whose subject matter is, as we already know, the dignity of Jesus – and, indeed, all of them refer to this dignity: in the first pericope Jesus forgives sins, in the second one He says that he has come to call sinners (so He forgives their sins), and in the third one He presents himself as 'the groom', i.e. the joy of the people. It is, however, worth emphasizing that the pericopes also correspond to the Matthean composition of the Gospel drawn up parallelly to the themes of the Pentateuch. All the three pericopes are in relation to the verse Ex 34, 9, wherein Moses asks God for three things: *If I find favor with You, O Lord,*

do come along in our company. This is indeed a stiff-necked people; yet pardon our wickedness and sins, and receive us as your own. In this excerpt Matthew demonstrates that the prayers of Moses were fully answered during the new exit. Forgiving the paralytic's sins and his healing are the signs that God came along in His people's company. The calling of Levi, a tax collector and a sinner (to pardon their sins), are the signs of the fulfillment of the second request. Lastly, the fact that Jesus calls himself 'the groom' of the people is the sign acknowledging the relationship of God with his people. The order of the three pericopes perfectly corresponds to the order of Moses' requests. Is it probable, then, that Mk was the source for Matthew? If the Gospel of Mark had been the first, Matthew would have found in Mk a ready-made, three-part fragment parallel to Ex 34, 9. It seems, however, a lot more probable that it was Mark who adopted the fragment from the Gospel of Matthew, because they both addressed the dignity of Jesus in some way.

There are striking resemblances in the order of pericopes in the second part of Mk. and in Mt.

Parallel pericopes in Mk – Mt – Hexateuch

Mk	Mt	Hexateuch
A paralytic at Capernaum (2,1-12)	9,1-8	Ex 34,9
The call of Levi (2,13-17)	9,9-13	Ex 34,9
The question of fasting (2,18-22)	9,14-17	Ex 34,9
The disciples and the Sabbath (2,23-28)	12,1-8	Nm 16,17
A man with a withered hand (3,1-6)	12,9-14	Nm 16,17
[Jesus at Nazareth (6,1-6)]	13,53-58	Dt 1,26-46
Death of the Baptizer (6,14-29)	14,1-12	Dt 1,37
Jesus feeds five thous.lake,mirac. (6,34-56)	14,13-36	Dt 4,34
(Jesus and Pharisees (7,1-23))	15,1,20	
A Caanite women (7,24-30)	15,21-28	

[Jesus feeds four thous. sign, leav. (8,1-21)]	15,32-16,12	Dt 4,34; 10,19
First teach. of the Pasch. Event. (8,31-33)	16,21-23	Dt 4,34
The doctrine of the cross (8,34-9,1)	16,24-28	
Jesus Transfigured. Elijah, a posses. (9,2-29)	17,1-21	Dt 4,34
Second teach. of the Pasch. Event (9,30-32)	17,22-23	Dt 4,34
Against ambition and envy (9,33-37)	18,1-5	Dt 1,9-18
{In the name of Jesus (9,38-41)}		
The scandal (9,42-50)	18,6-11	Dt 1,9-18
The question of divorce (10,1-12)	19,1-12	Dt 24,1-4
The danger of riches (10,17-31)	19,16-30	Dt 30,15-20
Ambitions of James and John (10,35-45)	20,20-28	Jos 3,1-6
The blind Bartimeus (10,46-52)	20,29-34	Jos 3,1-6
Jesus curses a fig tree (11,12-14)	21,18-19	Jos 6,26
Cleansing of the temple (11,15-19)	21,12-17	Jos 5,15

As it can be seen 20 passages in the Gospel of Mark (i.e. 152 verses – one-fourth of the whole Gospel of Mark) appear in the same context as parallel fragments in the Gospel of Matthew whose place in the structure of the Gospel is connected (with two exceptions) with the consecutive themes in the structure of Hexateuch. It is worthwhile adding that in Mt the order of the above pericopes is well-founded due to their relations with the Hexateuch, while in Mk it is not, especially in case of some details. Therefore, it seems a lot more probable that Mark adopted the order of pericopes from the Gospel of Matthew than that its similarity to the order of themes in Hexateuch in so many cases is completely accidental.

It is proper to add that the priority of Mt is further confirmed by changes in the eschatological sermon. The prophesy about the destruction of Jerusalem is linked in the Gospel of Matthew with great calamities, which are 'soon' to be followed by the coming Jesus to the Last Judgement (cf. Mt 24, 29). In the Gospel of Mark

the word 'soon' is replaced with the phrase 'During that period' (cf. Mk 13, 24). In the Gospel of Luke the announcements of the destruction of Jerusalem are not connected with the second coming of Jesus at all (cf. Lk 21, 25-27). The differences in question point to the gradual departure of the early Church from associating the second coming of Jesus with the destruction of Jerusalem. All this goes a long way to prove that the Gospel of Matthew must have been the first one and the Gospel of Luke – the last.

6. THE REDACTION OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Let us repeat that according to the ancient tradition of the Church regarding chronology, the Gospel of Matthew was always considered to be the first. As for the Gospels of Mk and Lk there existed certain divergence. St. Irenaeus, the bishop of Lyon, who was the first to mention the four Gospels and their authors, placed the Gospel of Mark on the second place and the Gospel of Luke on the third. Clement of Alexandria, living at the turn of the 3rd century, affirmed that the first Gospels must have been the ones including the genealogies of Jesus, namely Mt and Lk. As we already know, Origenes, the successor of Clement at the Christian school in Alexandria did not share his predecessor's opinion claiming that the Gospels came into being in the following sequence: Mt-Mk-Lk. This very order was also approved by St. Jerome and St. Augustine. Moreover, St. Augustine believed that Mark shortened the Gospel of Matthew and Luke took advantage of both of the preceding Gospels.

In our opinion St. Augustine was right. The similarities between the Gospel of Luke and the remaining synoptic Gospels provide evidence for its literary dependence on the two preceding ones. To explain the resemblances it is necessary to refer neither to any source Q which is unknown in history, nor to indirect redactions.

The question arises here why Luke wrote his work called the Gospel, although he knew the two preceding ones. The answer is

exactly the same as in case of the Gospel of Mark, namely Luke had a new conception of the work about Jesus. Neither the Gospels of Matthew nor that of Mark corresponded to his idea because the previous was too strongly connected with the Jewish background, while the latter was too short. According to Luke, the two existing Gospels needed to be supplemented with new important themes. Furthermore, he had another image of Jesus which he intended to show – the universal and full of charity Saviour. Such an image of Jesus seems to have met the demands of the pagan world in the best way.

6.1. Three stages in building the structure of the Gospel of Luke

The Material from the Gospels of Matthew and Mark in the Gospel of Luke

Bold type means the shift in the order of pericopes in relation to the structure of Mt.

Sign @ means that Luke departs from the order common for Mt and Mk.

The shift of the address means that a given text is a part of the preceding pericope.

Mt	Mk	Lk
3,1-3.5-6.11 John, the Baptist	1,2a,3-5.7-8	3,2-4.16
3,13.16-17 The baptism of Jesus	1,9-11	3,21-22
4,1-11 The temptation	1,12-13a	4,1-12
4,17 “Reform your lives!”	1,14b-15	
4,18-22 The calling of the first disciples	1,16-20	
8,1-4 The healing of a demoniac	1,40-45	5,12-16
8,14-15 Peter’s mother-in-law	1,29-31	4,38-39
8,16-17 Other miracles	1,32-34a	4,40-41a
8,18-22 Conditions for following Jesus		9,57-62
8,23-27 Calming of the storm	4,35-41	8,22-25
8,28-34 The expulsion of the demons in Gad.	5,1-20	8,26-39

9,1-8 A paralytic in Capernaum	2,1-12	5,17-26
9,9-13 The calling of Levi	2,13-17	5,27-32
9,14-17 The question of fasting	2,18-22	5,33-39
9,18-26 The woman with the hemorrhage and the daughter of Jairus	5,21-43	8,40-56
10,1a.2-4 The appointment of the Twelve	3,13-14.16-19	6,12-16
10,7-16 The mission of the Twelve	6,7-13	9,1-6; 10,3-12
12,1-4.8 The disciples and the Sabbath	2,23-28	6,1-5
12,9-10.12b-14 A man with a withered hand	3,1-6	6,6-11
12,15-16;cf.4,24.25. The mercy of Jesus	3,7-8.10-12	6,17-19
12,24-26.29.31-32 Blasphemy	3,20-30	11,15-18. 21-22; 12,10
12,46-50 Jesus and His Family	3,31-35	8,19-21
13,1-9 The Parable of the seed	4,1-9	8,4-8
13,10-11.13 The purpose of parables	4,10-12	8,9-10
13,18-23 The explanation of the parable	4,13-20	8,11-15
13,31-32 The mustard seed	4,30-32	13,18-19 @
13,34-35 Why in parables	4,33-34	
13,53-58 Jesus at Nazareth	6,1-6a	4,16-30 @
14,1-2 Herod about Jesus	6,14-16	9,7-9
14,3-12 The death of the Baptist	6,17-29	
14,13-21 Jesus feeds the five thousand	6,32-44	9,10b-17
14,22-27.32-33 Jesus walks on the water	6,45-52	
14,34-36 Other miracles	6,53-56	
15,1-11.15-20 Jesus and the Pharisees	7,1-23	
15,21-28 The faith of the Canaanite woman	7,24-30	
15,29-31 Jesus heals the suffering	7,31-37	
15,32-39 Jesus feeds the four thousand	8,1-10	
16,1-2a.4; por.12,38-40 The sign	8,10-13	11,16.29-30 @
16,13-20 The Messiah	8,27-30	9,18-21
16,21-23 The first teaching on the passion	8,31-33	9,22
16,24-28 The doctrine of the cross	8,34-9,1	9,23-27
17,1-8 Jesus Transfigured	9,2-8	9,28-36

17,9-13 On the coming of Elijah	9,9-13	
17,14-21 A possessed boy	9,14-29	9,37-43a
17,22-23 The second teaching on the passion	9,30-32	9,43b-45
18,1-5 Against ambition	9,33-37	9,46-48
18,6-7 The scandal	9,42	17,1-2 @
19,3-12; p. 5,32 Divorce	10,2-12	
19,13-15 Jesus blesses the children	10,13-16	18,15-17
19,16-26 The danger of earthly riches	10,17-27	18,18-27
19,27-30 The reward	10,28-31	18,28-30
20,17-19 The third teaching on the passion	10,32-34	18,31-34
20,20-23 Ambition of James and John	10,35-40	
20,24-28 You must serve	10,41-45	22,24-27 @
20,29-34 The blind Bartimeus	10,46-52	18,35-43
21,1-3.6-11a The triumphant entry	11,1-11	19,28-38
21,12-17 The cleansing of the temple	11,15-19	19,45-48
21,18-22 The fig tree	11,12-14.20-25	
21,23-27 The authority of Jesus	11,27-33	20,1-8
21,33-46 The parable of the tenants	12,1-12	20,9-19
22,15-22 The tribute to the emperor	12,13-17	20,20-26
22,23-33 The question of resurrection	12,18-27	20,27-40
22,34-40 The great commandment	12,28-34	
22,41-46 The Son of David	12,35-37a	20,41-44
23,1-39 Condemnation of hypocrisy of the opponents	12,37b-40	20,45-47
24,1-25 The question about the temple	13,1-23	21,5-24
24,29-31 The signs	13,24-27	21,25-28
24,32-35 The time of coming	13,28-31	21,29-33
24,42-47 A good servant	13,33-37	12,35-40
26,3-5 The plot	14,1-2	
26,6-13 The anointing at Bethany	14,3-9	
26,14-16 The betrayal	14,10-11	22,3-6
26,17-20 The passover preparation	14,12-17	22,7-14
26,21-24 The betrayer	14,18-21	22,21-23 @

26,26-29 The Holy Eucharist	14,22-25	22,19-20.18
26,31-35 Peter's denial foretold	14,27-31	22,31-34
26,36-41 The agony in the garden	14,32-38	22,40-42.45-46
26,42-46 The second and the third prayer	14,39-42	
26,47-52.55-56 Jesus arrested	14,43-50	22,47-50.52-53
26,57-68 Jesus before the Sanhedrin	14,53-63	22,54.55.63-71
26,60-63a False witnesses	14,56-61a	
26,69-75 Peter's denial	14,66-72	22,56-62
27,11-26 Jesus before Pilate	15,2-15	23,2-25
27,15-23 Barabbas	15,6-14	23,17-23
27,27-32 The crown of thorns. The way of the cross	15,15b-21	23,26-32
27,33-38 The crucifixion	15,22-28	23,33-35a.38
27,39-40 Insulting by people	15,29-30	
27,41-44 Insulting by chief priests	15,31-32	23,35b.39
27,45-51.54-56 The death of Jesus	15,33-41	23,44-49; por. 36.37
27,57-61 The burial	15,42-47	23,50-56
28,1-10 The women at the tomb	16,1-8	24,1-11

The conclusion resulting from the above table is that: 1) Luke deletes some texts common for Mt -Mk; 2) In cases where the order of pericopes in Mk and Mt is different, Luke always follows Mark; 3) Luke sometimes departs from the order common for Mt and Mk.

The fact that Luke always follows the Markan order of pericopes, if it differs from the Matthean one, testifies that Luke treated the Gospel of Mark as the basis for the structure of his work. The reason behind it is probably the fact that the texts connected with the Jewish environment which seemed unnecessary in the evangelization of pagans had already been deleted by Mark from his Gospel.

The first stage in the composition of Luke's Gospel was the adoption of certain texts from Mark which are common with Mt (the threefold tradition Mt-Mk-Lk) and those which are not present in Mt (the double tradition Mk-Lk) followed by changing the order

of some of them. At this stage Luke deletes from the Gospel of Mark 21 pericopes which are either too closely connected with the Jewish background or repeated.

The change of order of some Markan pericopes is connected with the new conception of the Gospel structure. The analysis of the whole Gospel shows that Luke, after the story about Jesus' infancy, arranges pericopes in four blocks, the last two of which are almost identical with Mk. The theme of the first block (up to Peter's confession – Lk 9, 18-21) is the secret of Jesus, i.e. – who Jesus is. The second block (up to the third announcement of Passion – Lk 18, 31-34) is marked by the fight of the Pharisees and scribes against Jesus. Jesus announces His Passion and, simultaneously, warns His opponents about the threat of punishment. In the third block (up to the pericope about the time of Jesus' coming – Lk 21, 29-33), on the background of the developing conflict Luke once again touches the theme of Jesus' dignity and the teaching about salvation. The fourth block is the story about the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus.

The second stage of building the Gospel structure is connected with the addition of some texts from Mt which do not appear in Mk. These texts are generally included by Luke as whole blocks. It is noteworthy that Luke changes the order of pericopes in the blocks borrowed from Mt (there are six of them) apart from the ending of the first block (Lk 7, 18-35). The alterations suggest that Luke' intention is simply to differ from the structure of Mt. As for the deleted texts it is as easy to explain and justify their omission as in case of the deletion of Markan texts.

The third stage is the inclusion of Luke's own texts into the already existing structure in compliance with the planned out subject matter of each part of the Gospel.

6.2. Why Luke's narrative about the infancy of Jesus differs from that in the Gospel of Matthew

The lack of Matthew's narrative about the infancy of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke is for some opponents of St. Augustine's theory an argument confirming that Luke did not know the Gospel of Matthew. However, it is not difficult to explain the phenomenon.

There seem to be two reasons – negative and affirmative – accounting for the rejection of the above-mentioned narrative by Luke. The negative cause is his intention to eliminate from the Gospel events which in the opinion of the pagans might not correspond to the image of Jesus – the God's Son and Savior as well as the image of Mary. Here are such events – the doubts of St. Joseph regarding the innocence of Mary, the flight into Egypt, the death of innocents in Bethlehem and Joseph's fear of Archelaus. It is also worthwhile mentioning that the three Astrologers came from the east, i.e. from Parthia, the eternal enemy of the Romans. Matthew mentions the events, because they demonstrate the fulfillment of the Scriptures already in Jesus' infancy – each of five pericopes in Matthew's narrative is connected with a certain prophecy. Luke, contrary to Matthew, was not interested in showing the fulfillment of prophecies. As regards the affirmative reason, it is, undoubtedly, the desire to emphasize the role of Mary in the history of salvation. Luke seems to be a historian to a greater degree than Matthew or Mark. According to him, the Messianic times begin not in Nazareth, but in the temple of Jerusalem with the vision of Zachariah. In order to mention the visit of Mary to Elisabeth, the words of Elisabeth inspired by the Holy Spirit and the splendid Mary's hymn, Luke had to present events connected with the birth of John, the Baptist. As a matter of fact, John the Baptist portrayed Jesus as the Messiah. Therefore, it was well-founded to show the unusual events connected with his birth. Finally, it is necessary to add the Lucan narrative, unlike that of Matthew, is full of joy. Generally, joy seems to be a characteristic feature of his Gospel: Angel Gabriel addresses Mary, Elisabeth rejoices in the arrival of Mary, angels proclaim the peace to people,

Simeon and Anna bear witness to Jesus as the Messiah. Parallel to the narrative about the infancy of Jesus, Luke presents the birth of John the Baptist as a joyful event, too. In the Lucan diptych there was no place for Matthew's texts.

6.3. Why the genealogy in the Gospel of Luke is different from that in the Gospel of Matthew

Luke not only places the genealogy of Jesus in another place, namely after the narrative about the baptism, but also changes it completely. Matthew begins the genealogy with Abraham, whereas Luke starts with Jesus and goes back to Adam, the first man. In this way Luke places Jesus in the genealogy of the whole humankind, which is quite intelligible in the Gospel intended for the pagans. Yet, the differences in names and in the number of generations from David to Jesus seem to be less clear. There exist two possible explanations of this problem: 1) due to the law of the levirate Jesus could have two genealogies – natural and legal; 2) as Jesus had no human father, Luke was able to include the genealogy of Mary, alternatively Joseph got included into the genealogy of Mary.

However, one can raise a question why Luke did not rewrite the genealogy from the Gospel of Matthew or simply extended it to Adam. It seems that Luke had good reasons to introduce the change in question.

In the Gospel of Matthew the genealogy of Jesus implies certain theological messages, among other things the suggestion that Jesus is the Messiah. The divine dignity of Jesus is demonstrated by the fulfillment of the definite number of generations: three times fourteen (cf. Mt 1, 17). Number 14 is the sum of three numbers: $4+6+4$. When these numbers are presented in the Hebrew alphabet, as it used to be done in Matthew's day, we receive dalet+haww +dalet, i.e. the name of David. Thus, in the genealogy of Jesus the name David appears three times, which was significant and important for Matthew. Luke also saw an important message in the genealogy included into his Gospel. There are 76 generations from Jesus to Adam and number 76 is the sum of two numbers:

61 and 15. Number 61, in turn, is the sum of four numbers (1 – the aleph, 4 – dalet, 6 – waw, 50 – nun), which together create the word „ADWN”, i.e. ‘Adon’ – ‘Lord’. Number 15 is the sum of letters 10 – iod and 5 – he. These two letters mean IH, i.e. the abbreviation of the name of God ‘Jah’. To sum up then, the number of generations in the Lucan genealogy gives ‘Adon Jah’, i.e. ‘Jahveh Lord’.

One could ask how Luke knew that number 76 had to be divided into 61 and 15. It should be assumed that it was not Luke who discovered the meaning of the above numbers, but the community of Jerusalem whose members undoubtedly knew the genealogy of Jesus back to Adam. The theological message of this genealogy was discovered by the community of Jerusalem in the same way as the numerical message of Jesus’ genealogy in the Gospel of Matthew.

6.4. Why the Sermon on the Mount in Mt and the sermon in Lk parallel to it are different from each other

There exist several opinions with regard to the resemblances and differences between the above-mentioned sermons. G. Strecker¹ believes in the existence of a common source of both sermons. According to him the Lucan sermon is closer to the original version than the Matthean one. L. Sabourin² is of a similar opinion. Dupont³ and B. de Solage⁴, on the other hand, accept the original version in the Q source as the basis for both the Lucan and Matthean sermons, but they tend to believe that the Sermon on the Mount is closer to the original.

¹ G. Strecker, *Les macarismes du discours sur la montagne*, [in:] L’Evangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie, red. M. Didier, Gembloux 1972, p. 185-208.

² L. Sabourin, *Il Vangelo di Matteo. Teologia e esegesi*, vol. I, Marino 1975, p. 350.

³ J. Dupont, *Le Beatitudini*, Roma 1972, p. 163.

⁴ B. de Solage, *La composition des Evangiles de Luc et de Matthieu et leurs sources*, Leiden 1973, p. 163.

E. Peterson⁵ claims that there was no pre-evangelical Sermon on the Mount. According to him the source of both sermons were either separate maxims or there might have been two different sermons – in the Q source and in another one called M which was not known to Luke. According to A. M. Perry,⁶ Matthew borrowed a larger part of material from his unique source M and the remaining part from Q as well as other sources. T.W. Manson⁷ and A. M. Hunter⁸ are in favour of the multiplicity of documents as the basis for two sermons, whereas according to Butler,⁹ Luke simply rephrased the sermon of Matthew. And we tend to agree with his point of view. Butler claims that the sermon on the plain in Lk derives directly from the Sermon on the Mount, which is proved by the vocabulary of the former which is evidently influenced by the latter. For example, the word ‘reward’=misthos occurring in the phrase *‘for your reward shall be great in heaven’* in Lk 6, 23b is typical of Matthew. In his Gospel it appears 10 times, while in the Gospels of Mark and of John as well as the in Acts of the Apostles it occurs only once. Except the above-mentioned phrase the word ‘reward’ appears in the Gospel of Luke only in 6, 35, where its presence can also be explained with the influence of Mt (5, 46) and in 10, 7. Therefore, as Butler claims, misthos in Lk 6, 23b must have been borrowed from the parallel text in Mt 5, 12.

The detailed analysis of the five chapters of the Book of Exodus 19-23 which include the description of forming the Covenant as well as the first collection of Law in the Pentateuch, the so-called ‘Sinaitic Codex’, points to the existence of plenty of themes common with the Sermon on the Mount and appearing in the same order,

⁵ E. Peterson, *Bergpredigt, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, t. 1, Tübingen 1972, p. 907-910.

⁶ M. Perry, *The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount*, JBL 54, 1935, p. 103-115.

⁷ T. W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah. The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ, with Special Reference to Form Criticism*, London 1943, p. 22, 43, 150.

⁸ A. M. Hunter, *Design of Life. An Exposition of the Sermon on Mount, its Making, its Exegesis and its Meaning*, London 1953, p. 13.

⁹ B. C. Butler, *The Originality of Matthew. A Critic of Two-Document Hypothesis*, Cambridge 1951, p. 37.

e.g.: the announcement of the Ten Commandments on Horeb is preceded with 'a promise with a condition' (*Therefore, if You hearken to me voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my special possession, dearer to me than all other people, though all the earth is mine. You shall be to me a kingdom of priests, a holy nation. That is what you must tell the Israelites.*- Ex 19, 5-6). At the end of the Book of the Covenant there appear new promises, the object of which is mainly the help of God in the conquest of Canaan (cf. Ex 23, 22-31). Matthew also begins and finishes the sermon with promises – at the beginning they appear in the Beatitudes and at the end in the parable of a man who built his house on the rock (7, 24-27). The promise preceding the Ten Commandments contains not only privileges, but also the tasks of the chosen people of the Old Testament – Israel will be a kingdom of priests. The Beatitudes in the Gospel of Matthew are followed by the pericope about the tasks of the new chosen people – they are to be the salt of the earth, the light of the world and a city set on a hill (cf. 5, 13-16). Thematic resemblances of the sermon with Ex 19-23 demonstrate that Matthew wrote it in relation to the afore-mentioned text from the Book of Exodus and that he meant the sermon to be a collection of the New Law parallel to the Decalogue as well as the Book of the Covenant¹⁰. It is beyond question that the Sermon on the Mount is the collection of Christ's instructions preached in various circumstances independently of one another. Luke is aware of that and does not feel obliged to quote them precisely. His conception of the sermon is independent of the structure of the Sinaitic Codex.

Let us see what Luke deletes from Matthew's sermon and what is shifted to another context:

	The sermon in Mt	The sermon in Lk	Lk (other context)
Introduction	5,1-2	6,20a	
The Beatitudes	5,3-12	6,20b-23	

¹⁰ A. Kowalczyk, *The influence of typology and the texts of the Old Testament on the redaction of Matthew's Gospel*, Pelplin 2008, p. 201.

Logion of the salt	5,13		14,34-35
Logion of the light	5,14-16		8,16 11,33
The Law and the Prophets	5,17-18		16,16-17
	5,19-20	–	–
Do not kill	5,21-24	–	–
Be reconciled	5,25-26		12,57-59
Do not commit adultery	5,27-30	–	–
Divorce	5,31-32		16,18
Do not swear	5,33-37	–	–
The New Law of retaliation	5,38-42		6,29-30
Love of enemies	5,43-45	6,27-28	
	5,46-48	–	–
Alms	6,1-4	–	–
Prayer	6,5-6	–	–
Lord's Prayer	6,7-15	11,1-4	
Fasting	6,16-18	–	–
Heavenly treasures	6,19-21		12,33-34
'The eye is the body lamp'	6,22-23		11,34-36
God or money	6,24		16,13
'Do not worry'	6,25-34		12,22-32
'Stop passing judgment'	7,1-5	6,37-42	
Pearls and swines	7,6	–	–
The power of prayer	7,7-11		11,9-13
The golden rule	7,12	6,31	
Two ways	7,13-14		13,23-34
Good fruit	7,15-20	6,43-45	
Do the will of God	7,21-23	6,46	13,25-27
A house on the rock	7,24-27		6,47-49

The sequence of the common material in both sermons is the following:

The Beatitudes	6,20a-23	5,3-12
Love of enemies	6,27-28	5,43-45
New Law of retaliation	6,29-30	5,38-42
The golden rule	<u>6,31</u>	7,12
Love of enemies	<u>6,32-36</u>	5,46-48
'Stop passing judgment'	6,37-38	7,1-2
Hypocrisy	6,41-42	7,3-5
Good fruit	6,43-45	7,16-20

Do the will of God	6,46	7,21-23
A house on the rock	6,47-49	7,24-27

As can be seen above the pericopes about ‘the love of enemies’ and about ‘the golden rule’ appear in different places in the Lucan and Matthean sermons. In Mt ‘the love of enemies’ follows the pericope about ‘the new law of retaliation’, whereas ‘the golden rule’ appears after the pericopes about ‘the love of the enemies’, ‘do not judge’ and ‘hypocrisy’.

The changes in the order of the pericopes mentioned above seem to be deliberate.

In Matthew’s sermon the pericope about ‘the New Law of retaliation’ follows the Old Testament rule *‘An eye for an eye and tooth for tooth’* (Mt 5, 38), so it occurs in a proper place. The pericope about ‘the love of enemies’ is also appropriate for Matthew’s context, because it follows verse 43 regarding the love of neighbour and the hate of enemies. In his sermon Luke quotes neither the Old Testament law of retaliation nor the commandment of the love of neighbour. Hence, it is logical that first in his sermon there appears a general speech about the love of enemies and then a detailed example showing how to behave when one gets struck on a cheek.

‘The golden rule’ – *Treat others the way you would have them treat you* – precedes in the Lucan sermon the pericope about doing good to everybody, and so it appears in a proper place. Although the golden rule might be a good conclusion to the pericope, Luke places it at the beginning in order to summarize with the call: *Be compassionate, as your Father is compassionate* (6, 36).

Although the pericope ‘do not judge’ (6, 37-38) can be, in a way, associated with the theme of love of the neighbour and mercy, the following ones – starting from ‘The two blind’ – cannot.

The further part of the sermon from Lk 6, 39 is not as logically composed as the preceding one. Nevertheless, it is joined by the common subject matter, namely ‘false piety’. It is noteworthy that the teaching about the love of the neighbour (5, 43-48) in the Sermon on the Mount is followed by the collection of pericopes in which Jesus warns against false piety (cf. Mt 6, 1-18). Most of

these pericopes are deleted by Luke from his Gospel, but the topic itself seems important to him and so it is taken up. False piety is recognized by Luke in the activity of 'blind' guides and undereducated teachers, who the parables in 6, 39-40 refer to.

The admonition against false teachers (Lk 6, 39-40) is not present in the Gospel of Matthew, yet there appears there a warning against false prophets (7, 15-16a). In the Sermon on the Mount it directly precedes the fragment about the tree and fruit (7, 16b-20). The admonition against false teachers in the Gospel of Luke also precedes – but not directly – the fragment about the tree and fruit (Lk 6, 43-45). Luke probably thought that the theme of false prophets – intelligible in the Jewish environment – would not be equally clear to the Greek, who should have been warned against false teachers promoting false piety. False piety, according to Luke, manifested itself in hypocrisy (6, 41-42), bearing bad fruit (6, 43-45) and words not put into action (6, 46-49). Who are the false teachers in question? Luke calls them 'the blind' and 'students' who cannot be considered masters. In chapter 23 of the Gospel of Matthew Jesus addresses the Pharisees and scribes using the word 'blind' e. g.: *It is an evil day for you, blind guides!* (23, 16). He calls them frauds, too e. g.: *Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, you frauds!* (23, 13). To conclude, Luke must have known the speech of Jesus against the scribes and Pharisees beyond any doubt, although he did not include it in his Gospel. False teachers are, according to him, the judaizing Christians of the Jewish origin who introduce confusion in the communities established by St Paul (cf. 2 Cor 11, 4).

On the other hand, 'the students' who want to be 'above their teacher' are probably the Christians from Greek communities rejecting the authority of Paul the Apostle and following the teaching of the judaizing ones (cf. Gal 3, 1-5).

In the light of the above interpretation of the parable about the blind and about the student the second part of the sermon (following four 'Woe's') becomes quite coherent – first it refers to the true Christian piety, i.e. love, and then it contains the admonition against false piety. The pericopes from Matthew's sermon, namely the ones about salt (5, 13), light (5, 14-16), the law and prophets (5, 17-18), reconciliation (5, 25-26), divorce (5, 31-32), the Lord's

Prayer (6, 7-15), as well as the one about heavenly treasures (6, 19-21) and others did not correspond to Luke's concept of a Gospel, and so they were shifted into another context.

A characteristic feature of Luke's sermon on a level place is a repeated dimerous schema – four blessings directed to the disciples and four 'Woe's' to opponents; the teaching on the law of love directed to the disciples (6, 27-36) and admonitions to opponents (6, 37-45). The opinion that Luke could not have known the Sermon on the Mount, because if he had, he would not have risked damaging its perfect composition, is ungrounded. The composition of his sermon is not 'worse' by any means, but based on different editorial assumptions.

7. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF DETERMINING THE PRIORITY OF THE GOSPELS ON THE BASIS OF DIFFERENCES IN THE SELECTION OF MATERIAL AND COMPOSITION

7.1. Differences in the selection of material

As regards the material of the Gospels, the evangelists seem to have chosen it in accordance with their individual editorial assumptions. The analysis of the synoptic Gospels conducted in the present paper proves that each evangelist had his individual conception of the work about Jesus and, as a result, the gospels differ with respect to their literary genre. Although all the three works are called Gospels, it should be remembered that only Mark used this very word to refer to his one. Each subsequent 'Gospel' came into being, because the preceding one did not meet the requirements of evangelization in a new environment. In order to avoid the presence of certain texts the evangelists decided to write a new work. Reasons for the omission of some texts from the Gospel of Matthew are quite obvious in case of Mark: writing for the Romans he deletes texts too closely connected with the Jewish environment, e.g. Jesus' to the Law and the fulfillment of the prophecies in Him. Similarly, it is not difficulty to understand why Luke eliminates some texts from the Gospel of Matthew writing for the pagans,

7.2. Reasons behind the differences in the composition of the Gospels

The changes in the composition of the synoptic Gospels seem to be motivated by reasons similar to those behind the differences in their material. The evangelists moved certain pericopes borrowed from the sources into different contexts due to their individual editorial assumptions. The detailed analysis of deletions and shifts of pericopes in the synoptic Gospels is presented in my previous books on the genesis of the Gospel of Mark and the genesis of Gospel of Luke mentioned in the introduction. Another reason for changes in the composition of the Gospels, especially in the selection of material, is the difference in theological interests of the evangelists. Each of them has his individual image of Jesus. Obviously, they all show Jesus as the Son of God and the Messiah, but emphasize various aspects of Jesus' image. The Gospel of Matthew stresses the image of Jesus – the Legislator, the Gospel of Mark puts emphasis on the image of the powerful Son of God delivering people from spiritual and physical evil, whereas the Gospel of Luke highlights the image of Jesus the universal and merciful Savior. To create the images in question it was necessary not only to add certain texts, but also to skip others.

The claims of the 'Formgeschichte' school that the Gospels are collections of loosely and accidentally linked pericopes did a lot of harm to the research of the synoptic problem, because the thesis which plays an important role in solving it says that the Gospels were redacted according to certain assumptions which the evangelists strictly followed while choosing material. Thorough research of the Gospel editorial assumptions is necessary to solve the synoptic problem.

To conclude, the lack of certain texts or the alterations in their position do not point to their literary independence from the source containing such texts. However, it seems impossible to determine the order of the Gospels on the ground of the presented differences. Each Gospel is a well-thought-out work, even the Gospel of Mark. Therefore, additions to a given Gospel and alterations in the order

of pericopes do not mean that its author improved anything and, hence, should be regarded as the second. Similarly, the lack of certain pericopes does not mean that a given evangelist damaged anything in the composition (which he should not have done), and therefore he must have been the first. The fact that a given Gospel is shorter or longer cannot prove its priority, either. The same can be said about an allegedly better composition.

It is noteworthy that the synoptic Gospels are very similar to one another, although they are based on different literary assumptions and different conceptions. The explanation for that phenomenon is that the evangelists, following the first of them, had no courage to delete too much from the Gospel which had already been accepted by the Church as the official written testimony regarding Jesus. The second and the third evangelists had no intention of writing a completely new work. Their goal was only to adapt the first Gospel to the needs of evangelization in their environment.

CONCLUSION

The literary analysis proves that resemblances between the synoptic Gospels result from their literary dependence. We fully agree with St. Augustine who claimed, following the tradition of the early Church, that the oldest was the Gospel of St. Matthew, which was then rephrased by Mark. Luke took advantage of both of the preceding works. Neither additional sources nor indirect redactions are necessary to explain differences among the Gospel. The evangelists treated the texts of their predecessors with great latitude, which is testified by the quotations from the Old Testament in the Gospels. They tried to introduce alterations to the texts borrowed from their sources so as to differ from them. It is demonstrated by the inversion of words in sentences and the inversion of passages in pericopes as well as great differences of vocabulary in parallel texts. The lack of certain texts present in a given source does not mean that the Evangelist was not familiar with them, and, consequently, that he did know the source at all. The evangelists deliberately skipped texts which seemed unacceptable or uninteresting for the addressees of a given Gospel. Mark deleted a lot of Matthew's texts, because they were closely connected with the Jewish environment, and so did Luke. Differences in the selection of material and in the composition of the Gospels also point to the fact that each evangelist was interested in certain

themes and that he wanted to give the reader his individual image of Jesus.

Each synoptic evangelist had his own idea of the work about Jesus. Matthew wanted to give the early Church a new Torah, whereas Mark wrote the Good News influenced by the prophecies about the Gospel as well as by the preaching of Peter the Apostle and Paul the Apostle. Luke, on the other hand, intended to write the history of Messianic events. For him the Gospel of Matthew was too closely associated with the Jewish background, while the Gospel of Mark was simply too short. The attempt to determine the order of the synoptic Gospels on the ground of their allegedly better theology or composition is a misunderstanding.

To sum up, the resemblances visible in the first three Gospels result from the literary dependence, whereas differences – from different redaction assumptions and deliberate changes in the composition of the Gospel as well as alterations to the vocabulary and syntax of sentences in the adopted texts. The Gospel of Matthew – in accordance with the witnesses of history – is chronologically the first. It must have had special authority, because it exerted a great influence on the style and composition the next two works. The Gospel of Mark was an attempt to adapt the first Gospel to the needs of evangelization in the Roman environment, and Luke adapted the Gospel of Mark, taking advantage also of the Gospel of Matthew, to the requirements of the evangelization of the pagans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot E. A., *The Correction of Mark Adopted by Matthew and Luke, Diatessarica*, II, 1901.

Argyle A. W., "The Agreements between Matthew and Luke", ExpT 73 (1961-62).

Aune D. E., *The Problem of the Genre of the Gospel: A Critique of the C. H. Talbet's What is a Gospel*, [in:] R. T. France i D. Wenham, *Gospel Perspectives: Study of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, t. II, Sheffield 1980.

Bacon B. W., *Studies in Matthew*, New York 1930.

Bartnicki R., *Ewangelie synoptyczne*, Warszawa 2003.

Benoit P., *L'Evagile selon Saint Matthieu* (Bible de Jérusalem), Paris 1972.

Bloch R., *Quelques aspects de la figure de Moïse dans la tradition rabbinique*, [in:] Moïse l'homme de l'Alliance, Paris 1955.

Boismard M.-É., *Introduction au premiere récit de la multiplication des pains*, [in:] *The Introductions of the Gospel*, red. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990.

Boismard M.-E., *Théorie des niveaux multiples*, [in:] *The interrelations of the Gospels*, red. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990.

Bultmann R., *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, Oxford 1972.

Burridge R. A., *What are the Gospels. A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTS MS, 70), Cambridge 1992.

Butler B. C., *The Originality of St. Matthew. A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*, Cambridge 1951.

Cavaletti S., *Gesù Messia e Mose*, Ant 36 (1961).

Cerfaux L., *Evangile selon saint Luc*, [in:] DBS V, Paris 1957.

Chapman J., *Matthew, Mark and Luke*, 1937.

Danielou J., *Sacramentum Futuri. Etudes sur les origines de la typologie Biblique*, Paris 1950.

de Solage B., *La composition des Evangiles de Luc et de Matthieu et leurs sources*, Leiden 1973.

de Solage B., *Synopse grecque des évangiles. Méthode nouvelle pour résoudre le problème synoptique*, Leiden-Toulouse 1959.

Descamps A., *Moïse dans les Evangiles et dans la tradition apostolique*, [in:] Moïse l'homme de l'Alliance, Paris 1955.

Devresse L., *Les Evagiles et l'Evagile*, Paris 1963.

Dungan D. L., *Respons to Two-Source Hypothesis*, [in:] The Interrelations of the Gospel, ed. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990.

Dupont J., *Le Beatitudini*, Roma 1972.

Farmer W. R., *The Synoptic Problem*, New York 1964.

Gaboury A., *La structure des évangiles synoptiques. La structure-type a l'origine des Synoptiques*, Leiden 1970.

Goulder M. D., *Luke: A New Paradigm*, Sheffield 1989.

Grant, F. C. *The Growth of the Gospel*, New York 1933.

Grzybek S., *Mojżesz na nowo odczytany*, [in:] Scrutamini Scripturas. Księga pamiątkowa z okazji złotego jubileuszu kapłaństwa ks. prof. Stanisława Łacha, Kraków 1980.

Gundry R. H., *Mathean foreign bodies in agreements of Luke with Matthew against Mark. Evidence that Luke used Matthew*, [in:] The Four Gospels 1992, Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Ed. by F. Van Segbroeck, Leuven 1992.

Gundry R. H., *Recent investigation into Literary Genre Gospel*, [in:] R. N. Longenecker i M. C. Tanney, New Dimensions in the New Testament Study, Grand Rapids 1974.

Gundry R. H., *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, Leiden 1967.

Hawkins J. C., *Horae Synopticae*, Oxford 1909.

Howard G., *Stylistic inversion and the synoptic tradition*, JBL 97/3 (1978).

Hunter A. M., *Designe of Life. An Exposition of the Sermon of the Mount, its Making, its Exegesis and its Meaning*, London 1953.

Kilpatrick G. D., *The Origins of the Gospel according to Matthew*, 1946.

Kogler F., *Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und Sauerteig in seiner traditions-geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Würzburg 1998.

Kowalczyk Ks. A., *Geneza Ewangelii Łukasza*, Pelplin 2006.

Kowalczyk Ks. A., *Geneza Ewangelii Marka*, Pelplin 2004.

Kudasiewicz J., *Ewangelie synoptyczne dzisiaj*, Warszawa 1986.

Léon-Dufour X., *Les Evangiles synoptiques*, [in:] Introduction a la Bible, t. II, Tournai 1959.

Longstaff T. R. W., *Evidence of Conflation In Mark? A Study in the Synoptic Problem*, Missoula 1977.

Manson T. W., *Jesus the Messiah. The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ, with Special Reference to Form Criticism*, London 1943.

Moule C. F. D., *Le origini del Nuovo Testamento*, Brescia 1971.

Peabody D. B., *Respons to multi-stage hypothesis*, [in:] The Interrelations of the Gospels, red. D. L. Dungan, Leuven 1990.

Perry M., *The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount*, JBL 54, 1935.

Petersen E., *Bergpredikt, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, t. 1 Tubingen 1972.

Rolland Ph., *Les premiers évangiles. Un nouveau regard sur le probleme synoptique*, (LD 116), Paris 1984.

Sabourin L., *Il Vangelo di Mateo. Teologia e esegesi*, vol. I, Marino 1975.

Schmidt K. L., *Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Litergeschichte*, [in:] H. Schmidt, Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments; H. Gunkel zum 60 Geburtstag, Göttingen 1923.

Shuler P. L., *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew*, Philadelphia 1982.

Simpson R. T., "The Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark", NTS 12 (1965-66), s. 273-284.

Stanton G. N., *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, Cambridge 1974.

Stendahl K., *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*, Philadelphia 1968.

Strecker G., *Les macarismes du discours sur la montagne*, [in:] L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie, red. M. Didier, Gembloux 1972.

Talbert C., *What is a Gospel?*, Philadelphia 1977.

Tuckett C. M., *The Existence of Q*, [in:] The Gospel behind the Gospel. Current Studies on Q, ed. R. A. Piper, Leiden – New York – Köln 1995.

Turner N., “*The Minor Verbal Agreements of Mt. and Lk. Against Mark*”, [in:] Stud. Evangel. I (TU, 73), Berlin 1959.

Via O. D., *Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament: A structuralist Approach to Hermeneutic*, Philadelphia 1975.

Votaw C. W., *The Gospels and contemporary Biographies in the Graeco-Roman World*, Philadelphia 1982.

CONTENT

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	5
PREFACE	7
1. THE SHORT REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM	9
2. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES	18
2.1. Common material in the first three Gospels	18
2.2. Resemblances and differences in the composition of the Gospels	19
2.3. Resemblances and differences in vocabulary and sentence construction	20
2.4. Literary dependence.....	22
3. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF DETERMINING THE PRIORITY OF THE GOSPEL ON THE BASIS OF VOCABULARY DIFFERENCES	24
3.1. The correction of style and language	25
3.2. The principle of being different from the source	26

4. THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW	35
4.1. Historic data on the creation of the Gospel of Matthew	35
4.2. The literary genre and the conception of the Gospel of Matthew	36
4.3. Material and numerical resemblances in Mt and Hexateuch.....	38
4.4. The composition of the Gospel of Matthew	42
4.5. The Problem of the doublets in the Gospel of Matthew	46
5. THE GOSPEL OF MARK – ITS COMING INTO BEING	49
5.1. Tradition of the Ancient Church	49
5.2. Why Mark wrote the Gospel	50
5.3. The influence of prophecies about Gospels on the idea of the Good News in the Epistles of St Peter and St Paul	53
5.4. The influence of prophecies about the Gospel on the composition of the Gospel of Mark.....	55
5.5. The influence of St Paul’s teaching about the secret of wisdom on the redaction of the Markan sermon in parables (Mk 4, 1-34)	57
5.6. Why the narratives about the infancy of Jesus, the temptation and the Sermon on the Mount are not present in the Gospel of Mark	60
5.7. The lack of the title ‘the Son of living God’ in Mk 8, 29	62
5.8. The logic of the composition of Mark’s Gospel.....	68
5.9. The argument for the priority of Mt resulting from the composition of Mk	72
6. THE REDACTION OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.....	76
6.1. Three stages in building the structure of the Gospel of Luke	77
6.2. Why Luke’s narrative about the infancy of Jesus differs from that in the Gospel of Matthew.....	82

6.3. Why the genealogy in the Gospel of Luke is different from that in the Gospel of Matthew	83
6.4. Why the Sermon on the Mount in Mt and the sermon in Lk parallel to it are different from each other	84
7. THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF DETERMINING THE PRIORITY OF THE GOSPELS ON THE BASIS OF DIFFERENCES IN THE SELECTION OF MATERIAL AND COMPOSITION.....	91
7.1. Differences in the selection of material.....	91
7.2. Reasons behind the differences in the composition of the Gospels	92
CONCLUSION.....	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96



Rev. Andrzej Kowalczyk

(born on 20.02.1940) graduated from Pontificio Instituto Biblico and the University of St. Thomas in Rome. He is a Doctor of Philosophy with a post-doctoral degree in biblical theology and the lecturer of biblical theology at the Theological Seminary in Gdansk. He wrote the following books on the Synoptic Gospels: 'The influence of typology and texts of the Old Testament on the redaction of Matthew's Gospel', Pelplin 2008; 'Geneza Ewangelii Marka', Pelplin 2004; 'Geneza Ewangelii Łukasza', Pel-

plin 2006; as well as numerous articles. In the first of these books he presents the theory that the Gospel of Matthew came into being in close relation to the Hexateuch. The research on the literary genre of the Synoptic Gospels leads him to the conclusion that the only reason behind the differences among the Gospels is the redactional activity of their authors. In his book Andrzej Kowalczyk is in favour of the priority of the Gospel of Matthew and agrees with St. Augustine according to whom the Gospel of Matthew was the first one and the other two were literary dependent on it.

Biblicists usually try to solve the synoptic problem on the basis of two rules: the first claiming that each next Gospel should be longer than its source, which means that the evangelists could only add not delete anything from the previous text; and the second according to which compositional and vocabulary differences as well as the lack of some words or expressions indicate the lack of literary dependence. Both rules are false. Although nobody negates the redactional work of the evangelists, i.e. introducing certain alterations in relation to their sources, yet such a possibility is rarely taken into account. It should be strongly emphasized that none of the synoptic theories can explain all the differences among the Gospels disregarding the redactional activity of the evangelists, and this activity should not be limited only to adding new texts or changing the form of the already existing ones. As for the material of the Gospels, the evangelists selected it in accordance with their individual redactional assumptions. The analysis of the Synoptic Gospels leads to the conclusion that each of the evangelists had his own concept of the work (about Jesus). The Gospels belong to different literary genres, which definitely influenced their composition.

Wydawnictwo

bernardinum

ISBN 978-83-7823-207-0



9 788378 232070