



DEPARTMENT OF LITERATURE,  
HISTORY OF IDEAS, AND RELIGION

# Griesbach Rethought: The Synoptic Problem Reviewed

The Griesbach Hypothesis (Two-Gospel Hypothesis)  
Examined in Light of Ancient Compositional Book-  
Production

by

Mattias Dufvevind

*In those days Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan.*

*And immediately coming up out of the water,*

*He saw the heavens opening, and the Spirit, like a dove, descending upon Him;*

*and a voice came from the heavens:*

*“You are My beloved Son; in You I am well pleased.”*

Mark 1:9-11, NASB 2020

*And those are the ones*

*sown with seed on the good soil;*

*and they hear the word*

*and accept it and bear fruit,*

*thirty, sixty, and a hundred times as much.*

Jesus in Mark 4:20, NASB 2020

Semester: Spring/Autumn 2021  
Course: RT2903  
Degree: Master of Arts Religious  
Studies and Theology  
Supervisor: Tobias Hågerland

## Abstract

This paper investigates the Two-Gospel hypothesis from an ancient compositional book-producing practices. Mark is seen as the middle term and most important is the theoretical framework of book production in antiquity through which we need to view the Gospels. The paper investigates common arguments in favor of the Two Document Hypothesis and finds that most arguments are reversible and can favor both Markan priority and Markan posteriority. However, to strengthen Markan posteriority, micro-conflation is required. Mark Goodacre's fatigue in the Synoptics is treated, which he claims to be the strongest argument in favor of Markan priority. However, if micro-conflation can be proven to work, the Two-Gospel hypothesis can claim that Mark conflated the accounts instead of Matthew and Luke falling back into fatigue. Mark's omission of the essential double tradition is treated and it is explained that such behavior was not improbable in light of the difficulty manoeuvring scrolls back and forth. The paper continues and discusses how Mark, if last, micro-conflated his two sources in the triple tradition. The paper aims to affirm that micro-conflation was doable due to wax tablets. The conclusion is that Mark's behavior is defensible on the Two-Gospel hypothesis since Mark omitted important material from Matthew and Luke due to the difficulty affirming the material while at the same time he expanded material in the triple tradition due to the shorter pericopes with are easier accessible than the double tradition.

Keywords: Jesus, Gospels, Two-Document hypothesis (2DH), Two-Gospel hypothesis (2GH), Griesbach, Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis (FGG), Matthew-Conflator hypothesis (MCH), Markan posteriority, Synoptics, Synoptic Problem.

## Abbreviations:

2GH	The Two Gospel hypothesis (Griesbach hypothesis)
2DH	The Two Document Hypothesis
FGGH	The Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis
JSNT	Journal for the Studies of New Testament
JSNT SS	Journal for the Study of New Testament: Supplement Series
MCH	The Matthew-Conflator hypothesis
NA <sup>28</sup>	The 28 <sup>th</sup> version of Novum Testamentum Graece of Nestle Alands eclectic Greek New Testament
NASB2020	New American Standard Bible of 2020
NTS	New Testament Studies
LXX	The Septuagint (Ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible)

## Acknowledgements

I want to give my sincerest thanks to those people who, in some way or another, have helped me complete this master thesis. First, my supervisor Tobias Hägerland has been of great support. His ingenious views have been of uttermost importance and help for me. We see the solution for the Synoptic problem from two opposite sides. Hägerland is more prone towards the Markan priority view in the form of the two-source hypothesis. At the same time, I find the Markan posteriority view to be more credible. Still, his advice has always been spot on and has helped the paper in the right direction. I greatly appreciate the help I have received with proofreading from my dear friends Johan Nilson, Daniel Grahl, and Jonatan Franson. Many errors have been corrected with the help of their sharp eyes. Needless to say, the mistakes that remain are me to blame.

# Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Mark as the middle term .....	2
1.2. Purpose and scientific questions .....	3
1.3. Method .....	3
1.4. The Synoptic Problem; Two issues .....	5
1.5. Theoretical perspectives .....	6
1.6. Primary sources and limitations .....	8
1.7. Earlier research .....	9
1.8. Disposition of the paper .....	12
<b>2. Standard arguments for Markan priority</b> .....	<b>14</b>
2.1. Mark's poorer writing style .....	14
2.1.1. <i>Colloquialisms and inferior writing style</i> .....	14
2.1.2. <i>Aramaic expressions</i> .....	18
2.1.3. <i>Redundancies in Mark</i> .....	19
2.2. Mark's harder readings .....	24
2.2.1 <i>The apparent limitations of Jesus powers</i> .....	24
2.2.2 <i>Miscellaneous Theological Issues</i> .....	26
2.3. Lack of verbal agreement in Matthew and Luke against Mark .....	27
2.4. The argument from order .....	27
2.5. Summary .....	32
<b>3. Fatigue in the Synoptics?</b> .....	<b>34</b>
3.1. The cleansing of the leper .....	34
3.2. Jesus' family outside .....	35
3.3. Parable of the sower .....	36
3.4. Healing of the paralytic .....	38
3.5. The baptism of Jesus .....	41
3.6. Summary .....	42

<b>4.</b>	<b>The Argument from Length: Ancient Compositional Book composition favors 2GH.....</b>	<b>44</b>
4.1.	The authors limitations .....	47
4.1.1.	<i>The double tradition</i> .....	48
4.1.2.	<i>Test case: The Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:1-7:29) with Luke's corresponding material</i> .....	48
4.1.3.	<i>The Reversibility of the Fatigue Argument?</i> .....	51
4.1.4.	<i>Test case: Jairus' daughter and the woman with hemorrhage: (Matt 9:18-26 // Mark 5:21-43 // Luke 8:40-56)</i> .....	52
4.1.5.	<i>Wax tablets</i> .....	56
4.1.6.	<i>Double tradition in contrast to the triple tradition</i> .....	59
4.2.	Mark-Q overlaps .....	60
4.3.	Summary .....	62
<b>5.</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>64</b>
5.1	Further investigations.....	68
<b>6.</b>	<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>71</b>
7.1.	Appendix 1: Disciples marvel when Jesus stills winds and sea ..	71
7.2.	Appendix 2: The man with the legion .....	72
7.3.	Appendix 3: Jesus heals many at the evening .....	73
7.4.	Appendix 4: Jesus did not / could not perform miracles .....	75
7.5.	Appendix 5: The cleansing of the leper .....	78
7.6.	Appendix 6: The family of Jesus outside .....	81
7.7.	Appendix 7: The Parable of the Sower .....	84
7.8.	Appendix 8: Jesus forgives sins and heals a paralytic .....	87
7.9.	Appendix 9: The baptism of Jesus .....	93
7.10.	Appendix 10: Luke's use of Double Tradition material resembling the Sermon on the Mount .....	95
7.11.	Appendix 11: Jairus' daughter: Full version .....	100
7.12.	Appendix 12: Jairus' daughter: Matthew and Luke.....	109
7.13.	Appendix 13: Jairus' daughter: Mark's use of Matthew and Luke ..	117
7.14.	Appendix 14: Mark-Q overlap: Jesus is tempted by the devil .....	126

# 1. Introduction

The Gospels in the New Testament are the foremost important source for information about Jesus of Nazareth, the central figure in Christianity, and are therefore of uttermost importance for billions of Christians. The four Gospels are different in their character, but three (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) are so similar that they can be put beside one another to be compared since they to a large extent use the same order in telling the life of Jesus, and sometimes, they even use the exact wording. Hence they are named Synoptic Gospels, from the Greek word *σύνωπις*, which means to see together. The fourth Gospel, John, is different since it commonly does not use the same stories or wording as the other three Gospels and is therefore not included among the Synoptic Gospels.

The Synoptic Problem has been a central problem in Biblical studies for several centuries and is based on the fact that the three Synoptics are so close to one another that they need to have some connection. The connection can be viewed from many different perspectives, and it is not uncommon that fundamentalist readers of the New Testament regard the likeness between the Gospels as different eye-witnesses' perspectives on the same events. Alternatively, they are sometimes regarded as inspired by God where none of the authors had any knowledge of the other Gospels. Most scholars, though, believe that the Synoptic Gospels are connected and interdependent in some way or another, either literary by someone copying someone else or orally.

When looking at the Synoptic Gospels, one soon realizes that the three Gospels share so much in common that it is very unlikely that they were eye-witnesses to the same events and independently described them. According to Porter and Dyer there are at least four different observations that make scholars believe there is an interdependence between Matthew, Mark, and Luke.<sup>1</sup> (1) The material or stories (pericopes) shared in the Gospels are the same to a considerable extent. (2) The wording within the pericopes is often similar between the three Synoptics. (3) The order of how the pericopes are placed within the Gospels is often the same. (4) The very same comments of editorial or parenthetical content are sometimes placed within the different Gospels in the very same place in the respective pericope. Those observations indicate a strong interdependence between the three Synoptic Gospels, and the question debated regards *how* the Synoptics depend on each other, not *if* they do.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stanley, E Porter and Bryan, R Dyer, "The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction to Its Key Terms, Concepts, Figures and Hypotheses" in *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, ed. Stanley, E Porter and Bryan, R Dyer (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2016), 1-26 (6).



## 1.1. Mark as the middle term

Mark Goodacre has a description of Mark as the middle term, and he advocates, like many others, a system of colors to decipher the information in the Synoptics. His system of colors is better than many others since he uses the science of colors, and he recommends the student of the Synoptics to use “one color for words found only in Matthew, one for words found only in Mark and one for words found only in Luke.”<sup>2</sup> He suggests blue for Matthew, red for Mark, yellow for Luke, purple for Matthew and Mark agreements,<sup>3</sup> green for Matthew and Luke agreements,<sup>4</sup> orange for Mark and Luke agreements,<sup>5</sup> and brown for material shared with Matthew, Mark, and Luke.<sup>6, 7</sup> Within the triple tradition, i.e., material shared in all three Gospels, the painting pattern on each pericope will contain “lots of brown, some purple, some orange but little green.”<sup>8</sup> He explains that the pattern of colors will give the following result: Matthew, Mark, and Luke share much material, and at times Mark and Matthew agree on each other against Luke; Mark and Luke sometimes agree against Matthew. Even more seldom will Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. The coloring patterns indicate that Mark in the individual pericopes stands out as the middle term;<sup>9</sup> the same pattern is also noticeable within the placement of the individual pericopes. Goodacre states that sometimes Matthew and Mark disagree against Luke in order, or Luke and Mark disagree against Matthew, but Matthew and Luke seldom agree against Mark. Therefore “Mark is also the middle term in the order of the triple tradition material.” The table visualises what he means.<sup>10</sup>

Matthew	Mark	Luke
Matthew	Mark	——
————	Mark	Luke

If, therefore, Mark is the middle term, we have in principle two basic options; the Markan priority view, i.e., Mark is the source for Matthew and Luke, or the Markan posteriority view, i.e., Mark has used Matthew and Luke as his sources. Out of those options, several branches have developed. The Two-Document hypothesis (2DH) stipulates that Mark and Q are the sources Matthew and Luke

<sup>2</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem; A Way through the Maze*. Biblical Seminary 80 (London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 34-35.

<sup>3</sup> Blue and red give purple.

<sup>4</sup> Blue and yellow give green.

<sup>5</sup> Red and yellow give orange.

<sup>6</sup> Blue, red, and yellow gives brown.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 34-35.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* The table is taken from Goodacre.

independently used; the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis (FGGH) claims that Matthew used Mark and that Luke made use of both prior accounts; the Matthew-Conflator hypothesis (MCH) states that Mark was utilized by Luke and that Matthew made use of both Mark and Luke. Those hypotheses claims Markan priority. The Griesbach hypothesis, also known as the Two-Gospel hypothesis (2GH) on the other hand maintains Markan posteriority and claims that Mark used Matthew and Luke as his sources.<sup>11</sup>

## 1.2. Purpose and scientific questions

This paper will consider the Markan posteriority hypothesis, which has been redeemed as out of date for the last decades. The purpose of this paper is to reconsider 2GH, and investigate how Mark might have used Matthew and Luke in light of a more refined understanding of antique manuscript culture. Therefore, the paper asks the following questions to investigate the problem.

1. In what way can the standard arguments in favor of Markan priority and critique against the Griesbach hypothesis be used as a defence for the Markan posteriority view?
2. How can the arguments in favor of fatigue in the Synoptics be countered in the 2GH in light of ancient compositional book production practices?
3. With the Sermon on the Mount and Luke's corresponding material as a test case, how can it be explained that Mark omitted the double tradition if he wrote last, due to the complicated procedure of writing books in antiquity?
4. In what way can a close analysis of the pericope of Jairus' daughter in (Matt 9:18-26 // Mark 5:21-43 // Luke 8:40-8:56) as a test case explain how Mark enlarged and micro-conflated pericopes if he used both Matthew's and Luke's scrolls, when ancient practices of writing are taken into consideration?

## 1.3. Method

This paper uses as the primary method source criticism, which is part of the New Testament exegetical toolbox. David Wenham describes in an exemplary manner how source criticism works and why it is essential in his 1977 article: "The Justification of source criticism." He states that source criticism is the academic method used when trying to explain what sources a specific work has used, and it is an essential method since it lay a foundation for both form criticism and redaction

---

<sup>11</sup> From now on this paper is using abbreviations for the different hypothesis. The Two-Document hypothesis, 2DH; the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis, FGGH; the Matthew-Conflator hypothesis, MCH; and the Two-Gospel hypothesis (also named Griesbach or sometimes Neo-Griesbach), 2GH.

criticism.<sup>12</sup> As stated above, the Gospels are interdependent somehow, and the proper method to investigate their relationship is source criticism. For example, Mark has 661 verses, and some 600 of those verses are found in Matthew and some 300 in Luke. Wenham states that when 2DH apply source criticism, the result is that Mark is seen as the first Gospel, and Matthew and Luke made use of Mark independently and therefore used different parts of Mark in the same pericopes. However, when the 2GH applies source criticism, the outcome is that Mark is the last Gospel, bridging together the two previous accounts.<sup>13</sup> There are some tools to use in the source criticism method when one tries to navigate through the Synoptic Problem, and Wenham points out five of them.<sup>14</sup> (1) *Wording*. Mark often stands as the middle way, either because he was first or last. (2) *Order of pericopes*. Sometimes Mark follows Matthew's order and sometimes Luke's, which has traditionally in 2DH been explained with Matthew and Luke independently having used Mark but when they felt need changed his order. (3) *Similar content*. To a large extent, the Synoptic Gospels use the same content, which indicates their relationship to one another. (4) *Style*. There are different styles in grammar and language where Mark sometimes has poorer grammar and style compared to Matthew and Luke. This have traditionally indicated that Mark is the first Gospel. (5) *Theology and ideas*. In theology, there are differences between the Gospels, where Mark sometimes have a more primitive theology. In Mark 6:5, Jesus *could* not do any great miracles, but in Matthew 13:58, which is Matthew's version of it, he *would* not do any miracles. Those five points are material for the scholar occupied with source criticism to work with, according to Wenham,<sup>15</sup> but the outcome of the arguments from those points can be strikingly different, which is apparent with the multitude of hypotheses current today trying to solve the problem.

In his important book *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, E.P Sanders emphasized that the data provided in the Synoptic Gospels are far more difficult to interpret than many want to admit.<sup>16</sup> He investigated the *length of the pericopes*, *Aramaisms*, *grammar corrections*, and *textual criticism features*, and much more. He concludes that the result of his dissertation is that far from making absolute statements of the correctness of one hypothesis, the scholar must practice more humility. There are too many ways the data could be interpreted to make a distinct hypothesis the only option

---

<sup>12</sup> David Wenham, "source criticism" in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, ed. I. Howard Marshall (Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1977, revised 1979) 139-52 (139-40).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 140.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 140-43.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>16</sup> E.P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, Monograph Series / Society for New Testament Studies, 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 272.

to explain all the data in the Synoptic Problem.<sup>17</sup> He states that some data will point towards 2DH; other data will support 2GH.<sup>18</sup> Therefore Wenham's articulation and explanation of how to use source criticism should be used with the humility Sanders announces and which Wenham is not rejecting. Even Kloppenborg urges humility using hard words that deem the Markan posteriority hypothesis as out of date or disproved since the complexity of the data is very difficult to decipher.<sup>19</sup>

#### 1.4. The Synoptic Problem; Two issues

The Synoptic problem is divided into two distinct issues that have been heavily discussed in New Testament scholarship during the last centuries; the first regards Mark's relationship with the other two Synoptics, as stated above, where Mark is the middle term.

The other part of the problem is Luke's and Matthew's similarity in the double tradition, which is material absent from Mark. This paper will consistently use the term double tradition for the material found in Matthew and Luke absent from Mark. This suggests some kind of interrelationship between Matthew and Luke. Either Luke depends upon Matthew and Mark (FGGH), or Matthew depends upon Luke and Mark (MCH), or both Matthew and Luke have gathered the double tradition from another source, Q (2DH). The double tradition material is some 220 verses long and is an essential part of every hypothesis trying to reconstruct the process of the completion of the Synoptic Gospels. Rarely a source behind Matthew's and Luke's Gospels other than Mark and the double tradition is mentioned in any hypothesis. The assumption in this paper, though, is that Matthew and Luke used a non-Markan source when they wrote. However, this paper argues out of Mark as the middle term and tries to avoid as much as possible arguments of how Matthew and Luke were written since it is not part of the purpose.

The 2GH has traditionally treated the two parts of the Synoptic Problem in two stages. It assumes in a first step a Matthean priority and states that Luke used and rewrote Matthew. It then argues that Mark utilized both Matthew and Luke as a second step. This paper aims to bring back to life the second half of 2GH by arguing that some of the arguments against the Markan posteriority view are not as strong as they seem to be. The aim is also to argue for the probability that an author that skipped the double tradition represented in Matthew and Luke while at the same time expanding many of the pericopes within the triple tradition worked under the limitations ancient writers were restricted to.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 276, 278.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> John, S Kloppenborg, "Conceptual Stakes in the Synoptic Problem," in *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-hypothesis*, ed. Heiki Omerzu and Mogens Müller. (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2018) 13-42 (42).

## 1.5. Theoretical perspectives

Though there is no developed theory of interpreting the data in the Synoptic Problem, some publications over the last two decades have investigated how the evangelists wrote, considering the physical limitations of writing books in antiquity. Derrenbacker explains well in his dissertation that desks and chairs were non existing for the writers in antiquity.<sup>20</sup> Neither were books in the sense we think of them available since ancient writers mainly used the scroll as a medium, which was more challenging to maneuver than a codex. Such perspectives adopt a viewpoint of what limits and possibilities the authors were bound to and can make more sense of the tendencies in which the data of the Synoptic Problem points. A perspective taking into consideration the limitations of book production in antiquity might be labeled a *media-theoretical perspective*.

Historically, in modern Biblical Studies, this perspective has been neglected, and scholars have often viewed the Synoptic data with the help of a synopsis, without any thought of the limitations of antique book production. However, there is a significant problem viewing the Synoptic Gospels with the aid of a synopsis since the scholar using it might not have worked through the material himself/herself. The material is already presented in columns making it easy to compare differences and correspondence between the Gospels, thus obscuring the scholar's sight from the difficulties the ancient authors faced using the scroll as a medium. Furthermore, not working through the material by oneself darkens the sight from the difficulties the first evangelists' met and might even cause anachronistic problems since the modern scholar is born after the printing press and takes our books in codex-form for granted. Most probably, the view of the modern scholar would change if he/she considered the scroll as a medium, especially when it comes to the evangelist writing last. In whatever order the evangelists wrote, one Gospel depended on at least one other. The one writing last must have used two sources which complicated his work, and how such a practice was performed is treated under the *media-theoretical perspective*. Matthew D.C Larsen explains:<sup>21</sup>

Ignoring, or at least unaware of, the disjointed discourses about gospel textuality and authorship in the first centuries of the Common Era, modern historians of first-century texts speak about the first-century gospel texts in ways unknown in the first- and second-century discourses about the gospel. At the foundation of the historical-critical questions mentioned here lies the misleading anachronism regarding books, authors, and publications.

---

<sup>20</sup> Robert A. Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (Leuven: University Press, 2005), 37-38.

<sup>21</sup> Matthew D.C Larsen, *Gospels before the book*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 2.

Even though Larsen is investigating the ways books were *published* during the first and second centuries C.E, his statement above is valid also when discussing the different techniques the authors in those centuries were bound to use. The risk of the modern Biblical Scholar is to view book production anachronistically and wonder when looking in his/her synopsis why the ancient author, if writing last, dismissed or changed a specific text or perhaps added one. It is not even sufficient to discern how the text relates to one another by comparing them; one must also consider the medium the evangelists wrote on. If the modern scholar read contemporary book production into the ancient practices, the logic is, for example, that Mark would be out of his mind leaving out the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon of the Plain from his account if writing last, as Streeter states.<sup>22</sup> On the contrary, the insights of ancient limitations on book production will help the scholar better understand how books were produced and what might have caused a Gospel author to dismiss a text or add one due to circumstances connected to writing.

Lately, such media-theoretical perspectives have been used by both Derrenbacker, Downing, and Poirier, among others, which have expanded our view on how the ancient authors were limited in their book production, and it is such a perspective that is necessary to incorporate in studies of the Synoptic Gospels if we are to move forward interpreting the data. Using the words of Derrenbacker the implication is that modern scholars have missed out on ancient book production, because "[...] while 'compositional analyses' of the Gospels seem to abound, typically these analyses make little attempt to find compositional conventions that are historically analogous to the production of the Gospels." He continues to exclaim:<sup>23</sup>

In the end, both source criticism and redactional criticism, which are often methodologically complementary, are also limited in their scope, imagination and value. Thus there is a need for these modern critical methods to be practiced with an eye on the compositional practices of the ancient world in order to compensate for some of these inadequacies.

Derrenbacker points out that the modern scholar must consider how ancient scribes worked and their limits due to ancient book production practices. Therefore, it is not helpful for a scholar of today to analyze the Gospels from a synopsis without having a media-theoretical framework as support.

One caution in introducing a media-theoretical perspective is due to the confusion between such a theoretical perspective, and the hypotheses developed interpreting the data of the Synoptic

---

<sup>22</sup> B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of The Manuscript Tradition, sources, Authorship, & Dates* (England: Macmillan and co, limited, 1924), 158.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

Problem. Many scholars have carelessly labeled their hypothesis as theory, and probably the temptation has been to view the Synoptic Problem as solved. This was especially the case for advocates of the 2DH who a few decades ago ruled New Testament studies, and most scholars viewed that hypothesis as the solution to the very problem. It is not the case anymore because of the relentless work of Mark Goodacre, who has worked hard to establish the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis and thus renamed it to the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis. Therefore, the field is much more open now than it was just a few decades ago, indicating that a hypothesis can be weakened or strengthened when new arguments are added. It is, therefore, important that we do not confuse the concept of hypothesis, which is a set of parameters to interpret the data, with the more robust concept of theory, which declares that a solution to a specific problem has been established. The aspect media-theoretical perspective in this paper will be the theoretical framework behind the hypotheses and is thus aimed to help interpret the data the different hypotheses uses. The hypotheses will probably always compete for dominance in interpreting the data of the Synoptic Problem. However, this paper sets the media-theoretical framework to appraise the limitations and possibilities the ancient authors were bound to during the first century when the Synoptic Gospels were composed.

## 1.6. Primary sources and limitations

The primary material in this paper is taken from the Nestle Aland eclectic Greek edition, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, version 28,<sup>24</sup> from now on labeled NA<sup>28</sup>. No emphasis will be made concerning textual criticism and to establish the original reading behind the displayed texts presented in NA<sup>28</sup> that this paper utilizes. The assumption is that the NA<sup>28</sup> edition has come as close to the original text of Matthew, Mark, and Luke as this paper requires to make analyses of the Gospel's relationship. A translation to the Greek text is presented in the form of the New American Standard Version 2020 (NASB2020) for the reader not acquainted with the Greek.<sup>25</sup> Sometimes the English translation is not coherent with the eclectic Greek edition presented in NA<sup>28</sup>, and the very same Greek expression in two Gospels can be translated differently. For that, I take no responsibility since the English text is not my primary concern. The appendixes at the end of the paper more thoroughly than the text within the paper display the Gospel texts and put them beside

---

<sup>24</sup> Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Aland, Nestle, Erwin, Aland, Barbara, Aland, Kurt, and Universität Münster. Institut Für Neutestamentliche Textforschung. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28. (Rev. Aufl., Herausgegeben Vom Insitut Für Neutestamentliche Textforschung. ed. 2012.)

<sup>25</sup> *New American Standard Bible: New Testament*. California: Foundation Press, Publisher for the Lockman Foundation, 2020.

one another in Greek and English. This makes it easy to compare the similarities and the differences between the different Gospels. The references of biblical passages within the paper are to the appendix verse numbers.

The paper is limited to examine why Mark, if last, skipped the Sermon on the Mount and why he expanded the deeds of Jesus presented in the individual pericopes within the triple tradition. Therefore the material is limited to (Matt 3:1-9:38) and (Luke 3:1-8:56), which roughly corresponds with (Mark 1:2-6:5). Not all the pericopes within this scope will be analyzed, but only those relevant to the argumentation dictated by Stein and Goodacre. Furthermore, no references to the patristic fathers are made in the paper because most emphasis in modern scholarship concerning the synoptic problem deals with the internal evidence presented in the three Synoptics. Therefore this paper meets the arguments of internal evidence rather than involving references to the patristic fathers.

## 1.7. Earlier research

The Synoptic Problem has been an issue in Biblical Studies from early on, and even before the dawn of the modern Biblical Studies in the 18th century, the problem was discussed by some church fathers. Augustin and Eusebius had thoughts on which synoptic Gospel was written first and their relationship. It was not, though, until the eighteenth century that the scholarly debate began in full swing. Johan Jakob Griesbach in 1776 stipulated that Matthew was the first Gospel written and that Luke utilized Matthew, while Mark used both Matthew and Luke when he wrote his Gospel.<sup>26</sup> However, Griesbach was not the first to make a synopsis of the three Synoptic Gospels, but his was the most influential.<sup>27</sup> Hence, the hypothesis that Mark used Matthew and Luke was for long called the Griesbach hypothesis. However, the scholars who have dedicated their careers investigating Griesbach's thoughts call the hypothesis the Two-Gospel hypothesis to honor all scholars who have worked with the hypothesis.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> See J.J Griesbach. Synoptic and Critical Studies 1776 - 1976 "Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaee et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur" in *Synoptic and Text Critical Studies 1776 - 1976* ed. Orchard Bernard and Longstaff R.W Thomas. (London New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 68 - 102. Griesbach wrote in latin and his work are therefore obscured for most modern readers. There is, though, a translation provided in the same work. See: J.J Griasbach. A Demonstration that Mark was Written after Matthew and Luke (trans Orchard Bernard) in *Synoptic and Text Critical Studies 1776 - 1976* ed. Orchard Bernard and Longstaff R.W Thomas. (London New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 103 - 135.

<sup>27</sup> This paper provides no reference to the work of Greisbach but he must still be presented among the earlier research because it was his work that set in motion the adherents of the 2GH.

<sup>28</sup> David B. Peabody with Lamar Cope and Allan J. McNicol (eds.), *One Gospel from two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. (Harrisburg and London and New York: Trinity International, 2002), 17-18.



Following Griesbach, the next valuable contribution to the hypotheses of the Gospel composition was put forward by Streeter, who is still seen as the principal architect behind the Four-source hypothesis.<sup>29</sup> The Four-source hypothesis is a development of the 2DH and stipulates that Mark wrote first and that Matthew and Luke, both independently, used Mark and an additional Q-source and added two additional sources, an M-source for unique Matthean material and an L-source for Luke's unique material. Since the time of Streeter, the predominant view among modern Biblical Scholars has been that Mark wrote his Gospel first.<sup>30</sup>

In 1955 Farrer contributed further to the scholarly debate when he put forward his article "On Dispensing with Q," where he argued for Luke's use of Matthew but kept Streeter's argumentation of Markan priority.<sup>31</sup> Goulder followed in the footsteps of Farrer, and developed the arguments for Luke's use of Matthew but added nothing regarding Markan priority.<sup>32</sup>

By this time, the hypothesis of Markan priority had been fixed in the scholarly debate, so most scholars adhered to the 2DH. That was temporarily changed by William R. Farmer when he wrote his influential book, *The Synoptic Problem*, where he argued for the posteriority of Mark. His book gained influence for some decades but was highly criticized.<sup>33</sup>

Finally, among others, Goodacre and Stein put an end to the Markan posteriority community by their publications. In his second chapter, "The Priority of Mark," Stein argues extensively for Markan priority in a lively debate against the Markan posteriority view.<sup>34</sup> He brings forth the strong sides of the Markan posteriority arguments, counters them, and thereby argues for Markan priority, which he sees as the better explanation to the Synoptic Problem. Interestingly, as late as 2001, the major combatant was still the 2GH, and the Farrer-Goulder (not yet Goodacre) hypothesis was redeemed as weak and even improbable.<sup>35</sup>

In his second chapter, "Setting in place the Cornerstone: The priority of Mark," Goodacre contributed to the Markan priority view.<sup>36</sup> He argued for Markan priority and against Markan

---

<sup>29</sup> Streeter.

<sup>30</sup> For the sake of simplicity and because the additional sources (M) and (L) do not influence the problem studied in this paper, this paper holds on to the 2DH.

<sup>31</sup> Allan, M Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q" in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H Lightfoot*, ed. D.E Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955) 55-88. No part of his argumentation is part of this paper, but his article must be included since he was the first in the chain of Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre argumentation.

<sup>32</sup> Michael. D Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*. (JSNT SS 20. Sheffield, 1989).

<sup>33</sup> Ruben. W Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. (New York: Macmillan (N.Y.), Collier-Macmillan, 1964).

<sup>34</sup> Robert. H Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (2ed.). (Grand Rapids, Mi: Baker Academic, 2001) 49-96.

<sup>35</sup> Stein, 145.

<sup>36</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 2001) 19-45.

posteriority so that the influence of the research team behind the 2GH lost its momentum. The publications of both Goodacre and Stein and other adherents to the Markan priority views have drained the energy out of the community proposing Markan posteriority.

As a response to the heavy critique against Farmers' arguments, the adherents of the Markan posteriority view made a new publication in the hope of regaining lost ground in the debate. The book *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* was the last public demonstration by the Markan posteriority community.<sup>37</sup> It never gained the influence they hoped for, and today the view of Mark using both Matthew and Luke is without force, and all voices for Markan posteriority have been effectively silenced.

To consolidate Markan priority, Goodacre wrote an influential article, "Fatigue in the Synoptics."<sup>38</sup> It is a piece of argumentation that takes for granted Markan priority and investigates the setting in which some particular pericopes shared by at least two Gospels where Matthew and/or Luke began of in their distinct ways but then fell back into the Markan storyline at the end.

Allan Garrow argues for Markan priority with the same clarity as Mark Goodacre, but he also argues for Matthew's use of Mark and Luke. Garrow's main contribution in this paper is what he calls the Matthew Conflator hypothesis (MCH), which is a hypothesis stipulating that Luke used Mark and Matthew used both Mark and Luke as his sources.<sup>39</sup>

Derrenbacker argues that the modern scholar must account for the writing procedures to which the ancient authors were limited. He has shown how the ancient evangelists might have worked to compile their Gospels. Derrenbacker investigates how the ancient practices of making books help our understanding of how the Gospels were written by comparing with other known authors from antiquity whose works we now can compare with the Synoptic Gospels. He concludes that the best hypothesis to explain the Gospels is the 2DH, and thereby he too contributed to the weakening of the Markan posteriority view.<sup>40</sup>

Furthermore, Downing continues to argue for how the wax tablets were used in another important work.<sup>41</sup> Downing, in his article, "A Paradigm Perplex: Luke, Matthew and Mark," criticized Goulder's view that Luke worked backward through Matthew and that Luke often omitted those things that Matthew included within pericopes in the triple tradition. Downing finds such behavior of Luke improbable and argues that the 2DH better explains the data.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Peabody (ed.).

<sup>38</sup> Mark Goodacre, "Fatigue in the Synoptics" in *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 45-58

<sup>39</sup> Alan Garrow, "Streeter's other Synoptic Solution: The Matthew Conflator Hypothesis." *NTS*, 62.

<sup>40</sup> Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*.

<sup>41</sup> Gerald F. Downing, "Waxing Careless: Poirier, Derrenbacker and Downing." *JSNT* 35, no. 4 (June 2013): 388-93.

<sup>42</sup> Gerald F. Downing, "A Paradigm Perplex: Luke, Matthew and Mark." in *NTS*, 38. (15-36).

Poirier debates against Downing's view that Goulder was wrong arguing that Luke went backward through Matthew when writing his Gospel.<sup>43</sup> Even though that argumentation is of no interest for this paper, he has valuable arguments for the Gospels authors using wax tablets, which are essential for the argumentation for Markan posteriority. Poirier responds in a critique against both Downing and Derrenbacker that Derrenbacker failed to incorporate wax tablets into his dissertation and that Downing has misinterpreted the use of the wax tablets in antiquity.

The aim in this paper is to investigate the possibility of Markan posteriority and try to explain more satisfying the Markan posteriority view in light of a more refined understanding of manuscript culture. One of the strongest arguments for Markan priority is that Mark, if last, never would have left out so much material of great importance as he did, and on the same time carefully conflating the material which Matthew and Luke share with Mark in the triple tradition.<sup>44</sup> The assumption that it was complicated to handle scrolls back and forth might explain why Mark left out the double tradition — on the other hand, considering the wax-tablets might explain why Mark has expanded the pericopes within the triple tradition. This is what the paper aims to investigate.

## 1.8. Disposition of the paper

The second chapter counters many of Stein's arguments. His contributions have helped settle the consensus that Mark was the first Gospel and is therefore in need of counter argumentation to sway the pendulum back to equal status between the Markan priority and Markan posteriority views. The arguments for Markan priority, as he present them, are double-edged, and can explain both Markan priority, but in reverse, they can also work in favor of a Markan posteriority view.

The third chapter analyses one of the most persuasive arguments for Markan priority, presented by Mark Goodacre. He argues that editorial fatigue in the Synoptics makes sense only if Mark is the first Gospel and was used by Matthew and Luke. Ian Mills contends that the strongest argument that editorial fatigue is not reversible is that conflation between sources in the micro-level was not done in antiquity due to the complicated process of handling scrolls.<sup>45</sup> However, the third chapter argues that the fatigue argument can be reversed if one take into consideration that Mark micro-conflated his sources.

Chapter four examines one of the strongest aversions against the Markan posteriority view, the argument from length. From a Markan posteriority view, the chapter explains why Mark abridged

---

<sup>43</sup> John C. Poirier, "The Roll, the Codex, the Wax Tablet and the Synoptic Problem." *JSNT* 35, no. 1 (September 2012): 3–30.

<sup>44</sup> E.P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. (London, Philadelphia; SMC Press, 1996), 117.

<sup>45</sup> "[The Synoptic Problem — Ian Mills (Duke University)]" Youtube video, 1:06:42, Posted by New Testament Review Podcast [03-02-19], <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k8z0rgxGNxM> 00:28:59 - 00:30:15.

Matthew's and Luke's total length due to the difficulty of overviewing the double tradition in scrolls. However, it also explains why Mark enlarged several pericopes in the triple tradition due to the use of wax tablets. The chapter argues that due to the ancient practices of writing books, it makes sense that Mark excluded the double tradition while at the same time extending much of the triple tradition.

## 2. Standard arguments for Markan priority

This chapter examines Stein's arguments in his second chapter, "The priority of Mark,"<sup>46</sup> The paper will consider those parts of Stein's arguments that fall within the limitations of this paper (Matt 3:1-9:38 // Mark 1:1-5:43 // Luke 3:1-8:56). His arguments provide an influential force to overthrow the 2GH, which holds on to the Markan posteriority view, and his arguments must be fought for 2GH to regain strength. This paper follows the outline of Stein's chapter and consequently holds on verbatim to his headlines.

### 2.1. Mark's poorer writing style

Mark's poorer writing style<sup>47</sup> is passages where Mark has colloquialisms and inferior writing style and where Aramaic expressions are used more than in Matthew and Luke.<sup>48</sup> The poorer writing style also considers Mark's frequent redundancies, mostly absent from both Luke and Matthew.

#### 2.1.1. Colloquialisms and inferior writing style

The first example of Colloquialisms and inferior writing style<sup>49</sup> Stein refers to comes from (Matt 9:2 // Mark 2:4 // Luke 5:18-19), where the paralytic man is lying on a *pallet* (κράβαττος), which Stein finds problematic since the LXX does not have that word. Mark has, according to Stein, used an uncommon word. In contrast, (Matt 9:2) uses a more frequent word from LXX *stretcher* (κλίνη), and (Luke 5:18) likewise uses the same word as Matthew, but in (5:19) he has another word for *stretcher* (κλινίδιον). Stein finds it problematic that Mark used an uncommon word if he wrote last, and he contends that it would be more feasible that Mark overtook the same word as Matthew and Luke used if he wrote last.<sup>50</sup> Therefore, according to Stein, it is more probable that Mark wrote first, and Matthew and Luke corrected Mark independently.

Jesus being tempted (Mark 1:12 // Matt 4:1 // Luke 4:1) is another example Stein declares as problematic. In (Mark 1:12) "the Spirit *drove* (ἐκβάλλει) Jesus into the desert," and the word *drove* (ἐκβάλλει) almost always has negative connotations in the New Testament. (Matt 4:1) has that "Jesus *was led* (ἀνήχθη) *up by the Spirit into the wilderness*," while (Luke 4:1) says that He "was led (ἤγετο) around by the Spirit in the wilderness." Therefore it is more probable, Stein argues, that Matthew and Luke used Mark as their source and changed Mark's account and thereby,

---

<sup>46</sup> Stein, 49-96.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 56-67.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 56-59.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 57.

used words with less negative connotations, rather than Mark inserting a more difficult word if he made use of Matthew and Luke.<sup>51</sup>

One more example Stein provides is from (Matt 8:27 // Mark 4:41 // Luke 8:22), where Jesus in Mark stills the sea and the storm and the disciples marvel saying “Who, then, is this, that even the wind and the sea *obey* (ὕπακούει) Him?” Here Mark uses a *singular* verb to demand *both* the wind and the sea, which is problematic. Matthew and Luke have the verb in the plural. Matt 8:27 reads “What kind of a man is this, that even the winds and the sea *obey* (ὕπακούουσιν) Him?” and (Luke 8:22) has “Who then is this, that He commands even the winds and the water, and they *obey* (ὕπακούουσιν) Him?” Again, Stein claims that it is more probable that Mark was the source behind Matthew and Luke, rather than Mark used them both, for why would he change a good sentence to a problematic one if he wrote last?<sup>52</sup>

Stein’s last example is from (Mark 5:9-10 // Luke 8:30-31), where the demon-possessed man gives Jesus an answer. The problem is, according to Stein, that (Mark 5:9-10) has problems referring to who is speaking, because after the man has answered that “*we are many*” (πολλοί ἐσμεν),” “*he begged* (παρεκάλει) him earnestly not to send *them* (αὐτὰ) out of the region,” indicating that Mark had a problem to differentiate between the singular and plural. (Luke 8:30-31), on the other hand, according to Stein, has a more consistent account, and refers to the same event with the words “And he said, ‘Legion’; because *many demons* (δαιμόνια πολλὰ) had entered him.” Luke then refers to the response of the demons “*they were begging* (παρεκάλουν) Him.” Stein, therefore, argues that it is more probable that Mark wrote last and that Luke corrected Mark rather than Mark used Luke and made him less clear.<sup>53</sup>

The above arguments are indications, according to Stein, that Mark was the first Gospel used by both Matthew and Luke, but those arguments are reversible. Farmer maintains that a less clear grammar with a Gospel writer “indicates more about his private education or that of his intended readers than it does about the date of composition of his Gospel, or its relationship to the other Gospels.”<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, Peabody argues that it is more probable that (Mark 2:4) used (Matt 9:2 and Luke 5:18) as sources and incorporated an uncommon word instead of Matthew and Luke independently using Mark and agreeing precisely on redacting *stretcher* (κλίνη), while not being entirely in agreement in the rest of the pericope.<sup>55</sup> The word *pallet* (κράβαττος) is not exclusive to

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 57-58. See appendix 14, pp. 126.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 58. See appendix 1, pp. 71.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 58-59. See appendix 2, pp. 72.

<sup>54</sup> Farmer, 122.

<sup>55</sup> Peabody, 101.

Mark. In addition to (Mark 2:4), the same word also appears in (Mark 6:55; John 5:8-11; and Acts 5:15; Acts 9:33). Particularly interesting is that Luke, when writing Acts, was not unfamiliar with the word, and if he used the word elsewhere, why would he not pick it up when he found it in Mark. Especially intriguing is it on the 2DH, therefore, that Luke changed the word in Mark in the very same way as Matthew did, and by chance. The FGGH has a more reliable model of explanation; Luke overtook the word from Matthew. Still, that hypothesis must explain why Luke did not follow Mark when he seemingly knew the word and used it himself in another context in Acts. On the other hand, since *pallet* (κράβαττος) is a Latin loanword,<sup>56</sup> it is not strange if Mark changed the word *stretcher* (κλίνη) to one he was more familiar with, because all over his Gospel, he is more acquainted and affected by the Latin language than are the other two Synoptics, Farmer declares.<sup>57</sup>

In (Matt 4:1 // Mark 1:12 // Luke 4:1), the use of *drove* (ἐκβάλλει) can in defence for 2GH against the 2DH be explained by Mark being the middle term and having to use either (Matt 4:1) *was led* (ἀνήχθη) or Luke 4:1 *was led* (ἤγετο) or insert a word of his own. If Mark were first in this account, it would be in line with the 2DH since Matthew and Luke have altered the account of Mark independently, using different words. However, the 2DH might have a problem with a Mark-Q overlap.<sup>58</sup> Following either the FGGH or the MCH, the word change makes more sense than the 2DH since it removes the problem with the Mark-Q overlap, but still, they must explain why the latest evangelist not has used the same words as any of the others. However, it is not easy to find an explanation for Mark's word of (ἐκβάλλει), no matter if he wrote first or last, because of the difficulty to know what was on the evangelists' mind when he wrote. There might, though, be a minor indication that Mark could have used the word if he wrote last. In (Matt 9:38 and Luke 10:2) where *Jesus urges his disciples to ask the Lord of the harvest to send workers into the harvest*, the word *send* is a form of ἐκβάλλω. Suppose, therefore, that Matthew and Luke used the word for sending the disciples. In that case, it is not entirely far-fetched that Mark used it when the Spirit *sent* or *drove* Jesus into the desert, even if he was the last one to write.

In the third example above, (Matt 8:27 // Mark 4:41 // Luke 5:22), the accounts of Mark, on the one hand, and Matthew and Luke, on the other, differ in how they use plural and singular. In (Mark 4:41), Jesus commands both *the wind* (ὁ ἄνεμος) and *the sea* (ἡ θάλασσα), but he has the main verb *obey* (ὕπακούει) in the singular. Matthew, on the other hand, has *winds* (οἱ ἄνεμοι) in the plural and *the sea* (ἡ θάλασσα) in the singular which clearly demands a verb in the plural, *they obey*

---

<sup>56</sup> Idid.

<sup>57</sup> Farmer, 123.

<sup>58</sup> For Mark-Q overlaps see chapter four, pp. 60.

(ὑπακούουσιν). Similarly, Luke has plural for *the winds* (τοῖς ἀνέμοις) and the singular for *the waters* (τῷ ὕδατι), and he also, as expected, has the verb in the plural (ὑπακούουσιν). We can only speculate on why Mark did not use the plural ending in the verb, but it might have been because he used both the wind and the sea in the singular. This might indicate that Matthew and Luke used Mark and corrected Mark's grammar because it is more probable that Matthew and Luke corrected Mark than Mark overtook the word in the plural and changed it to the singular.

The 2GH might explain the last example, (Mark 5:9-10 // Luke 5:9) with the ending of one sentence (Mark 5:9) where the man has *told* (λέγει) that “My name is Legion, for *we are many* (πολλοί ἐσμεν).” If the sentence ends where NA<sup>28</sup> has the punctuation, then it is not a problem that the man on behalf of the demon-forces in the following sentence *begged Him* (παρεκάλει αὐτόν) that Jesus should not drive them (αὐτὰ) out of the locality (Mark 5:10). In addition, the word for *them* (αὐτὰ) is neuter plural, which naturally takes the verb in the singular. Thus it can be both the man begging on behalf of the demons in Mark, but it can also be that the demons themselves *begged* (παρεκάλει) not to be sent away. Contrary to Stein's argument, the awkwardness does not appear in the second sentence in Mark, but in the first one, where the man gets a question and is the many demons' spokesperson. The demons in the first sentence in (Luke 5:9a) do not reply anything, but Luke explains that many demons had entered the man. Luke has, in the following sentence provided us with the verb in the plural “*they were begging* (παρεκάλουν) him” making it clear that the demons begged not to be sent away. As a result, Luke might have changed Mark's account if he had written last to avoid the ambivalence in Mark of who is speaking. However, it is equally possible that Mark overtook the pericope from Luke and wrote it either from the man's perspective, which is most plausible, or from the demon's point of view. Therefore, we cannot tell which account is most plausible.

According to Stein, there are only two reasons why Mark, if he wrote last, would have obscured the better grammar in Matthew and Luke. The second of his proposals is that Mark would have had some reason to worsen the grammar, something Stein finds improbable,<sup>59</sup> and his conclusion seems correct. His first proposal is that Mark did those changes by mistake and therefore was “incompetent,” something he also finds unconvincing.<sup>60</sup> However, Farmer objects that if Mark wrote and were affected by the Latin language, we would assume that some changes he made in the texts were due to his Latin tendencies, which could account for his use of *pallet* (κράβαττος). Farmer finds it more plausible that a text which is Latin influenced is later than a text with fewer

---

<sup>59</sup> Stein, 59.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.



Latinisms.<sup>61</sup> Even Sanders and Davies point to the fact that later New Testament Apocrypha frequently made the text worse than the text of Mark,<sup>62</sup> which makes an argument of poorer grammar as an indication for an early text less persuasive.

If we assume that Mark wrote last, he conflated the accounts in Matthew and Luke. Doing so, he probably had eyes on both texts. Since Matthew and Luke in the triple tradition are not as similar in wording as in the double tradition, Mark would have had to follow one of his records closely agreeing with one against the other,<sup>63</sup> or write with his own words. He probably used the most accustomed words following his preferred language when he wrote more freely.

### 2.1.2. Aramaic expressions

Stein highlights the Aramaic expressions<sup>64</sup> as yet another category indicating Markan priority. He has seven of those expressions in his account, but two are relevant for the scope of this paper. The first example is from (Matt 10:1-2 // Mark 3:14-17 // Luke 6:13-14), where *Jesus appointed twelve of his apostles* in all three accounts. However, Mark has an additional phrase not present in Matthew or Luke where Jesus gave John and James "the name *Boanerges*, which means, 'Sons of Thunder,'" where the word *Boanerges* is an Aramaic expression. Stein finds it more plausible that Mark wrote first and that Matthew and Luke redacted Mark and independently removed this expression than if Mark wrote last and added an Aramaic expression out of nowhere.<sup>65</sup>

The second instance is from *raising Jairus daughter* (Matt 9:25 // Mark 5:40-41 // Luke 8:54), where Jesus raised Jairus' daughter from the dead. When doing so, he used the words "'*Talitha, kum!*' (ταλιθα κουμ) which translated means, *Little girl, I say to you, get up!* (τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε)." Matthew has no corresponding words and Luke has the phrase. [He] "*spoke* (ἐφώνησεν) forcefully, saying, '*Child, arise!* (ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε)." Therefore, according to Stein, it is more probable that the Markan expression is the earliest and that Matthew took it away entirely, and Luke limited the omission to the Aramaic expression. He claims that such a procedure is more understandable than the reverse, where Mark added those Aramaic expressions. He wonders from where he got them.<sup>66</sup>

Stein alleges that it is more probable that Matthew and Luke in both instances used Mark as their source but redacted away the Aramaisms found in Mark independently. On the FGGH, Luke

---

<sup>61</sup> Farmer, 123-124.

<sup>62</sup> Sanders and Davies, 72.

<sup>63</sup> Derrenbacher, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 116.

<sup>64</sup> Stein, 59-63.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 60, 63.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 63.

overtook the text of Matthew and Mark and, in such instances like those above, chose to follow Matthew's redaction instead of Mark's original version.<sup>67</sup> The same is the case for the MCH, with the difference that Matthew followed Luke.

Farmer, argues that later New Testament Apocrypha adopted Aramaisms and those accounts are much later than Mark's Gospel. Therefore he concludes that it was a tendency in the early church to incorporate Aramaisms to make the story more in line with the language of Jesus.<sup>68</sup> Peabody adds to Farmer's discussion by asserting that Mark inserted a magic word when Jesus raised Jairus' daughter.<sup>69</sup> Therefore, we have some explanation as to why the Aramaisms might occur in Mark if he wrote last, either by referring to New Testament Apocrypha or magical formulas. The word *Boanerges* (Mark 3:17) could possibly have the explanation that James and John were known as the sons of thunder later in the early church but that this name not was as familiar to Matthew and Luke.

Both the Markan priority view(s) and the Markan posteriority view are equally valid as explanatory models to the Aramaisms in Mark since Matthew and Luke might have redacted them away, or Mark might have added them.

### 2.1.3. Redundancies in Mark

Stein continues and refers to redundancies found in Mark,<sup>70</sup> which the 2GH sees as evidence for Markan posteriority. Of particular importance are the 17 instances where Matthew has one half of the Markan expression, and Luke has the other. Stein bases much of his argumentation on Frans Nierynck's investigation, which is compressed and analyzed in Tuckett.<sup>71</sup> The result is, according to Stein, that only 17 out of the 213 redundancies are evidence pointing toward the Markan posteriority view, but that is such a small number of the total redundancies, so not much can be inferred from it.<sup>72</sup> Stein presents Tucket's compressed table<sup>73</sup> of Nierynck's investigation.<sup>74</sup>

1	Matthew has one half, Luke has the other	17 times
2	Matthew has one half, Luke has both	11 times
3	Matthew has one half, Luke has none	46 times

<sup>67</sup> For an overview of Luke's use of Matthew, see: Goodacre, *The Case against Q*, 47-48.

<sup>68</sup> Farmer, 172-174.

<sup>69</sup> Peabody, 148.

<sup>70</sup> Stein, 63-67.

<sup>71</sup> C.M Tuckett., *The Rivival of the Griesbach Hypothesis*. (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1983), 20

<sup>72</sup> Stein, 66.

<sup>73</sup> Tucket, 20.

<sup>74</sup> Stein, 66.

4	Luke has one half, Matthew has both	17 times
5	Luke has one half, Matthew has none	25 times
6	Both omit the same half	39 times
7	Both have Mark's duplicate expressions	6 times
8	Matthew has both halves, Luke has none	14 times
9	Luke has both halves, Matthew has none	1 time
10	Neither Matthew nor Luke have a parallel in Mark	37 times

Stein concludes the table with the following words:<sup>75</sup>

From the above list, it is evident that redundancy is clearly a Markan stylistic feature. However, the argument that such redundancy is a result of conflation by Mark of Matthew and Luke is difficult to accept, for only in 17 of the 213 examples could Mark be said to conflate the different expressions found in Matthew and Luke.

This paper contends that Stein's statement is challenging to accept at some points since not only the first 17 examples under point (1) indicate Mark's conflation by Matthew and Luke. Points (2) and (4) in the above table suggest that Mark could have kept the double redundancy in one account even if the other source only had one part of it, giving an additional 28 instances of redundancies he might have seized from his sources. Likewise, points (8) and (9) suggest that Mark overtook the double redundancies found in one of the Gospels even though the other Gospel did not have any redundancies present, giving an additional 15 occasions where Mark might have overtaken his material from Matthew and Luke. In points (3) and (5), Mark might well have expanded the single expression he found in one Gospel due to his tendencies of double expressions, giving an additional 71 instances of redundancies. Point (6) will give the same result as points (3) and (5) and thus adding another 39 instances where Mark might have made double statements. Point (7) explains the redundancies in Mark; he overtook them from Matthew and Luke as they were, adding six more redundancies. The stylistic feature in Mark, according to the 2GH, explains the last point (10) in the list; Mark had a habit of working with redundancies. It is as likely as Matthew and Luke's habit to remove the redundancies in the Markan priority view.

From the points above, we can see that the stylistic features in Mark can explain the redundancies. The 2GH can explain points (3), (5), and (6) by referring to Mark's regular usage of redundancies; He overtook from either Matthew or Luke a single statement and made another

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, 65-66.

statement similar to the first, thus creating a redundancy. Point (10) can also be explained by Mark's regular work with redundancies. These four points can, in the 2GH, explain the 147 instances where Mark has used redundancies as easily as any explanatory model in the Markan priority view. It is as easy to explain that Mark added redundancies due to his habit as arguing that Matthew and Luke independently removed them due to their habit of smoothening obscure texts. However, it is arguable a slight advantage for the Markan posteriority view on those points. There seem to be little reason why either Matthew or Luke would remove all of the redundancies found in several Markan expressions and not use even one half of them when they are prone to work with them in other instances. Luke, on points (3), (8), and (10), omits 97 instances of double redundancies in Mark. Out of 213 instances where redundancies occur in Mark, Luke has removed over 45 percent of them, indicating a habit to remove them. Matthew, on the other hand, in points (5), (9), and (10), omits 63 instances of redundancies, slightly more than 29 percent. Due to their lack of redundancies in those instances, is it not a slightly higher chance that Mark used Matthew and Luke and conflated them rather than Matthew and Luke used Mark and removed them, but at times added redundancies from Mark?

Points (2), (4), (7), (8), and (9) are instances where either Matthew or Luke or both has a double redundancy, and Mark has the same double redundancy, accounting for 49 instances, adding to the plausibility that Mark used Matthew and Luke rather than the opposite. Because if Matthew and Luke tend to remove the double redundancies from Mark in the Markan priority view, it seems odd that they at times (Luke 18 times, and Matthew 37 times) preserve his redundancies. The Markan posteriority view is stronger at this point since Luke and Matthew relatively few times overall work with redundancies and that Mark has twinned the two accounts together. In the light of the above statistics, Stein's articulation that only the first point indicates Mark's use of conflation is weaker than at first thought.

Further, considering the above statistics, one must conclude that the first point, where Matthew has one saying and Luke has another and Mark has a double expression, even stronger suggests that Mark used Matthew and Luke as his sources. The most substantial redundancies that are valid for the scope of this paper are:

<b><u>Matt 8:16</u></b>	<b><u>Luke 4:40</u></b>	<b><u>Mark 1:32</u></b>
Ἐσπίας δὲ γενομένης		Ἐσπίας δὲ γενομένης
	Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου	ὅτε ἔδυσ ὁ ἥλιος
_____	_____	_____
Now when evening came		Now when evening came
	after the sun had set	while the sun was setting

<b><u>Matt 4:25</u></b>	<b><u>Luke 6:17</u></b>	<b><u>Mark 3:8</u></b>
καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου		καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
	καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος	καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα
_____	_____	_____
beyond the Jordan.		beyond the Jordan
	and the coastal region of Tyre and Sidon	and the vicinity of Tyre and Sidon

<b><u>Matt 8:28</u></b>	<b><u>Luke 8:27</u></b>	<b><u>Mark 5:2-3</u></b>
ἐκ τῶν μνημείων		ἐκ τῶν μνημείων
	ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν	ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν
_____	_____	_____
they were coming out of the tombs		a man from the tombs with an unclean spirit met Him.
	among the tombs	among the tombs

<b><u>Matt 8:31</u></b>	<b><u>Luke 8:32</u></b>	<b><u>Mark 5:12</u></b>
εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων		εἰς τοὺς χοίρους
	εἰς ἐκείνους	εἰς αὐτοὺς
_____	_____	_____
into the herd of pigs		into the pigs
	enter the pigs	enter them

In nine points 2-10, the explanations can support either the Markan priority view or the Markan posteriority view, with a slight advantage for the Markan posteriority view. In contrast, the first point favors Markan posteriority. Delbert Burkett refers to some calculations of those 17 instances where Mark has overtaken one expression from Matthew and the other from Luke and concludes that the statistical chance for that to happen is 1/156. He concludes that it is not entirely improbable that Matthew and Luke made use of Mark independently, but it is unlikely.<sup>76</sup>

On the other hand, Tuckett argues from the tenth point that the redundancies are a stylistic feature in Mark and that he works with those redundancies more frequently than the other evangelists.<sup>77</sup> He states that if Mark had redundant tendencies, one must weigh those tendencies on the one hand if he wrote first against his conflation habit if he wrote last.<sup>78</sup> He also reasons that if Mark wrote last and conflated his sources where Matthew has one part, and Luke has the other, why does he not do that when he has more such possibilities in other instances following Matthew and Luke.<sup>79</sup> Tuckett finds it improbable that Mark, if last, conflated some of the redundancies and not all of them. However, Tuckett does not provide any examples in his text but only provides a footnote to Josef Schmidt's article from 1939 where Mark could have conflated and did not do it.<sup>80</sup> From his claim, he argues that it is a disadvantage for the 2GH that Mark is not coherent in his usage of double material if he conflated his sources.<sup>81</sup> If we concede to those four instances in the table above and calculate statistics, we would find that Matthew has a fifty percent chance of not picking the part of redundancies Luke picks in every case, and the same statistics are valid for Luke. In those four cases, there is, therefore, a 1/16 chance that Matthew chose one part of the redundancy in Mark and Luke the other, which is improbable and certainly not in good favor for the 2DH. Tuckett, on the other hand, as seen above, argues that since Mark have not included double material found in Matthew on the one hand and in Luke on the other, there is neither proof for the 2DH nor disproof thereof. His claim would have been stronger if he had included those passages where Mark, if last, has neglected the double material in Matthew and Luke. The FGGH must claim that when Luke came across a double redundancy in Mark, which Matthew had kept only one part of, he must have chosen that part which Matthew did not, which is highly improbable. The same reasoning would be the case if Matthew used Luke and Mark.

---

<sup>76</sup> Delbert Burkett, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources; From Proto-Mark to Mark* (New York, London, T&T Clark International, 2004), 126-127.

<sup>77</sup> Tuckett, 20-21.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 17-21.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 17, 21.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

## 2.2. Mark's harder readings

In textual criticism, a difficult reading either would create problems for the reverence of Jesus or is a complicated passage that might be harder to interpret than other textual variants. Such difficult readings occasionally occur in the Synoptics, and scholars detect them by comparing the three Synoptics with one another. According to Stein Mark has the harder readings in comparison to the other Gospels.<sup>82</sup> He writes as follows:<sup>83</sup>

In textual criticism the presence of a harder reading in a manuscript is usually seen as evidence for its being more primitive or authentic, since the scribal tendencies were to make harder readings less difficult. In a similar way, it is easier to understand why Matthew and Luke might have changed their Markan source by making the account easier for their readers than to think that Mark would have changed his source(s) and made the readings more difficult.

### 2.2.1. *The apparent limitations of Jesus' power or influence*

Stein provides three examples of the apparent limitations of Jesus power<sup>84</sup> that are useful for the scope of this paper. The first example is *Jesus heals the sick* (Matt 8:16 // Mark 1:32-34a // Luke 4:40). Here (Matt 8:16) says: "Now when evening came, they brought to Him *many* (πολλούς) who were demon-possessed; and He cast out the spirits with a word, and healed *all* (πάντας) who were ill." (Luke 4:40), on the other hand, has the following sequence: "Now while the sun was setting, *all* (ἅπαντες) those who had any who were sick with various diseases brought them to Him; and He was laying His hands on each one of them and healing *them* (αὐτούς)." (Mark 1:32-34a) has it slightly different: "Now when evening came, after the sun had set, they began bringing to Him *all* (πάντας) who were ill and those who were demon-possessed. And the *whole* (ὅλη) city had gathered at the door. And He healed *many* (πολλούς) who were ill with various diseases, and cast out *many* demons."

Here Stein argues that Mark has the harder readings since the theology makes Jesus look less powerful than Matthew and Luke describes him. In Matthew and Luke, Jesus healed everyone, and in Mark, he healed many, which might indicate that Jesus not healed *all* who were in need.<sup>85</sup>

The other example Stein provides is *Jesus heals many* (Matt 12:15 // Mark 3:9-10 // Luke 6:19). (Matt 12:15) says "But Jesus, aware of this, withdrew from there. Many followed Him, and He

---

<sup>82</sup> Stein provides several examples of Mark's harder readings on pp. 67-73.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 69.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 67-69.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 67-68. See appendix 3, pp. 73.

healed them *all* (πάντας).” (Luke 6:19) has it this way: “And all the people were trying to touch Him, because power was coming from Him and healing them *all* (πάντας).” (Mark 3:9-10), on the other hand, has the following: “And He told His disciples to see that a boat would be ready for Him because of the masses, so that they would not crowd Him; for He had healed *many* (πολλούς), with the result that all those who had diseases pushed in around Him in order to touch Him.”

Stein admits that *many* (πολλά, πολλούς) in Semitic languages might have the meaning of *all*, but he also claims that Matthew and Luke had interest in changing Mark into a more clear Greek. He finds that solution more probable than Mark using Matthew and Luke and thus making a clear Greek more obscure.

In the first example (Mark 1:32-34a), Farmer finds Mark’s language correct since the whole city was brought to him. However, not all of them were ill, so Jesus could not have healed all, even if he healed all who were ill.<sup>86</sup> In Matthew’s and Luke’s accounts, however, the sick and demon-possessed are mentioned, and of those, Jesus healed everyone, which is no inaccuracy since Matthew and Luke do not present other persons than the sick ones, contrary to Mark. In the second example, however, Semitism might explain Mark’s use of the word *many* (πολλά, πολλούς) since he, on the 2GH, overtook material from Matthew and Luke and working with both he often did not keep strictly to one or the other but in his own words told the pericopes of Jesus. Working that way, it is not difficult to understand how he might have changed to a word he was more comfortable with.

The third example is from *Jesus in his hometown* (Matt 13:58 // Mark 6:5-6), where Matthew has a more revered view of Jesus, according to Stein.<sup>87</sup> In Mark, Jesus “*could not* do any miracle there except that He laid His hands on a few sick people and healed them. And He was amazed at their unbelief.” That Jesus could not do any miracles indicates limitations in Jesus power, and Stein argues that such a view would be more expected in an account close to Jesus in a time where the theological implications on him were not yet as high as in the decades after the church more prominently had begun to declare the glory of Jesus.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, Matthew has: “And He did not do many miracles there because of their unbelief.” In Matthew’s account, Jesus could have done the miracles, but he did not by his own choice because they did not believe in him. Stein argues that Matthew has used Mark and cleared the Markan story from the negative theological implications that the limitations of Jesus would give.

---

<sup>86</sup> Farmer, 162.

<sup>87</sup> Stein, 68. See appendix 4, pp. 75.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 67.



Peabody claims that there is no dependence between Matthew and Mark in this passage because they tell the story in two different ways,<sup>89</sup> but that is not a persuasive way to defend Markan posteriority. There are some close agreements in Greek in those verses between Matthew and Mark, which makes a statement of interdependence between Matthew and Mark improbable. On the other hand, Sanders and Davies finds arguments from theological implications less persuasive because sometimes Jesus is more theological revered in one pericope within one evangelist compared to the same pericope in another evangelist. At the same time, it can be the reverse in another pericope shared by the same evangelists.<sup>90</sup> They give an example from (Mark 6:2-3) where Jesus instead is more revered than in (Matt 13:54-55), and the people in the Synagogue acknowledge Jesus and his teachings and miracle powers more. This paper finds arguments from theological implications problematic to favor any hypothesis. Since there is some rewriting occurring either of Matthew using Mark, or from Mark depending on Matthew, either one could have done the rewriting. Either Matthew did it and revered Jesus more in (v 57), but prior to this statement, he downplayed the reverence of Jesus in (Matt 13:54). The reverse is also the case if Mark used Matthew and exalted Jesus more in (v 2-3) then to give Jesus less reverence in (Mark 6:5) compared to (Matt 13:58). Therefore arguments from theological implications are difficult to give credit to any hypothesis.

### 2.2.2. *Miscellaneous theological issues*

On the miscellaneous theological issues<sup>91</sup> we must treat the pericope of *Jesus being Lord of the sabbath* (Matt 12:3-4 // Mark 2:25-26 // Luke 6:3-4). According to (Matt 12:4) and (Luke 6:4), David went in and ate the consecrated bread, which is not allowed for anyone to eat except the priests. (Mark 2:26) has the same words but adds, *in the time of Abiathar the high priest...* Stein finds it problematic that Mark has this verse, while it is perfectly understandable that Matthew and Luke took it away since it is not accurate. In the Hebrew Bible and LXX, Ahimelech was the high priest and not Abiathar, as Mark claims. Thus it makes perfect sense that Matthew and Luke would omit the wrong reference, he states.<sup>92</sup> It is nevertheless equally likely that Mark found the passages of Matthew and Luke and wanted to clarify them but got it wrong. If Matthew and Luke used Mark, it is problematic as best that both entirely omitted the reference to Abiathar and that no one changed it to Ahimelech. On this point, the 2GH has a slightly better explanation than the 2DH. However, the FGGH and MCH can state that the first one of the evangelists who used Mark omitted the

---

<sup>89</sup> Peabody, 151.

<sup>90</sup> Sanders and Davies, 98.

<sup>91</sup> Stein., 71-73.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 72-73.

reference, and the last evangelist followed, which is a more satisfactory solution, but the upper hand is not with any hypothesis in this pericope since the data can be interpreted differently.

### 2.3. Lack of verbal agreement in Matthew and Luke against Mark<sup>93</sup>

Stein finds that when the Gospels are colored, the result is, as above stated, that much will be brown or purple and some will be orange, but not much green will appear, meaning that very seldom Matthew and Luke agree with one another against Mark.<sup>94</sup> Stein argues that most probably only one Gospel was the source for the other two, which means that Mark must be that source when one considers Mark as the middle term. He comes to that conclusion because he disqualifies the options where either Matthew has used Luke, and Mark used them both, or that Luke used Matthew, and Mark had them both as his sources.<sup>95</sup> Therefore, according to Stein, Mark must be the source of Matthew and Luke. This paper, however, emanates in the position that Mark is the middle term and investigates the option that if Mark was last, he used the fully developed Gospels of Matthew and Luke as we have them today. Therefore, this paper argues that Stein's position is not persuasive since he states that only *one* Gospel can be the source to the other two.

### 2.4. The argument from order

Stein argues out of the phenomenon of order in the so-called Lachmann argument.<sup>96</sup> The observation Stein refers to is that Matthew and Luke agree closely with one another in the triple tradition; however, they do not agree on the order in the double tradition.<sup>97</sup> Moreover, he claims that if Mark had used the account of Matthew and Luke, then most probably another source than Mark is behind them, but that source must have looked so much like Mark that running such an argument would be void.<sup>98</sup> In addition, he informs that “the full Lachmann argument is still seen by many scholars as ‘an irrefutable argument for the priority of Mark.’”<sup>99</sup>

The pericopes of the three Synoptics are the same to a large extent, as we saw in the introduction. Out of Mark's 11.025 words, only 304 do *not* have any parallel in Matthew, and 1.282 do *not* have any parallel in Luke, which means that out of Mark's total length, 97,2% is found in Matthew and

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 73-74.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 73-74. Stein uses different colors than Goodacre, see p 1-2 above, but his results are the same.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 74-76.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 75-76.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 76.

88,4% of Mark is found in Luke, according to Stein.<sup>100</sup> Mark is, therefore, the middle term around which the other evangelist's circumference.

Out of this, there have been two distinctly different approaches to the order of Matthew and Luke in comparison with Mark, Markan priority and Markan posteriority. Both sides have, according to Neville, respectively argued strongly that the order of Matthew and Luke is the most robust evidence for their hypotheses.<sup>101</sup>

There are two different ways to view the order of the Gospels in a synopsis. The first is the Griesbach option (2GH), and the other is the Lachmann option. Neville enlightens us that the Griesbach option is to view the three Synoptics side by side to compare all three simultaneously in parallel columns, which makes the differences and likenesses between the three Synoptics stand out.<sup>102</sup> He continues that in the Lachmann perspective, one compares Mark individually with the Gospel of Matthew and then individually with the Gospel of Luke.<sup>103</sup> In this way, the differences between Matthew and Mark stand out, and so do the differences between Mark and Luke. However, in the Lachmann's option Matthew and Luke do not have any apparent connection. Griesbach and the proponents of the 2GH, on the other hand, have historically tended to construct synopses that are divided into columns in such an order so the differences and similarities between the three Synoptics stand out as clearly as possible. The followers of Lachmann, amongst whom Tuckett belongs, have historically tended to make Synopses that tend to downplay Matthew's and Luke's differences from Mark, yielding a different kind of synopsis, Neville argues.<sup>104</sup>

The two kinds of synopses yield two different ways of placing the individual pericopes and thus gives two different results. The Griesbach synopsis views the two sides, i.e., Markan priority and Markan posteriority more neutral than the Lachmann option, according to Neville.<sup>105</sup> He shows that Lachmann's option first analyzes how Matthew and Mark are connected and shows that a Matthew knowing Mark had reasons to leave the account of Mark for some time and then after a while returning, but it can not see why Mark would leave Matthew's order then to return.<sup>106</sup> Likewise, the behavior of Luke is explainable following the reasons Lachmann proposed. Luke had good reasons

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 50-52.

<sup>101</sup> David.J Neville, *Arguments from Order in Synoptic Criticism: A History and Critique*. (Macon; Mercer University Press, 1993), 5.

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 232.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 236.

<sup>106</sup> Stein, 74.

to leave Mark at times only to return to Mark later, but Mark would not make sense doing so if he followed Luke.<sup>107</sup>

Those holding on to the Griesbach option have problems with the Lachmann's view of order of the pericopes and claim that Mark must have used Matthew and Luke. David Dungan is one of the clearest examples of the thought(s) of Markan posteriority.<sup>108</sup>

Just when Luke goes of into a special passage, there appears at Mark's side faithful Matthew, as if by magic, and just when Matthew suddenly departs on an errand of his own, in the nick of time back comes Luke as if in response to a providential bath qol. How is it possible?

There seems to be impossible in the view of the Griesbach's followers that Matthew and Luke would use Mark independently of each other because if they did, how could they do it on such a regular basis. In addition, it seems highly improbable that Matthew or Luke, on precisely the places one diverges from Mark the other shows up. The 2GH, therefore, interprets the data better than the proponents of the Markan priority views.

However, according to Neville, the critique against the 2GH has been immense, and one response that Fitzmeyer conveyed was that if Mark was last, why then did he omit *John's critique against the Pharisees and Sadducees* (Matt 3:7-10 // Luke 3:7-9) where Matthew and Luke both have the same order and the same verbatim agreements.<sup>109</sup> Those passages are one of the most extended examples of exact verbatim agreements in the Synoptics. Another pericope that Fitzmeyer offered in his critique against the 2GH is *The temptations of Jesus* (Matt 4:1-11 // Luke 4:1-13), where both Matthew and Luke present the same order except that two easily overlooked temptations have shifted place in one account in comparison with the other.<sup>110</sup> Fitzmeyer's critique is fair, for the 2GH can not offer any good reason as to why Mark would omit those passages when they both come in the same order and also share the same content, sometimes extensively verbatim.<sup>111</sup>

According to Neville, Tuckett put forward yet another critique against the 2GH, which has its foundations in statistics. Neville explains that Tucket maintains that Matthew only derived from

---

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> David Dungan, "Mark — The Abridgement of Luke" in *Jesus and Mans Hope*, vol I, ed. David G. Buttrick (Pittsburg: Pittsburg Theological Seminary, 1970), 51-97 (63).

<sup>109</sup> Neville, 180. Neville refers to Fitzmeyer, Joseph. "Mark — The Abridgement of Luke" in *Jesus and Mans Hope*, vol I, ed David G. Buttrick, 131-70. (Pittsburg: Pittsburg Theological Seminary, 1970), 136.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid. For a full overview of the temptations, see appendix 14, pp. 126.

<sup>111</sup> See the discussion on Mark-Q overlaps on pp. 60 below.

Mark's order four times, while Luke did so six times.<sup>112</sup> With such few divergences of Matthew and Luke from the order of Mark, he urged a statistical inquiry where he divided Mark into eighty pericopes, i.e., all the pericopes prior to the passion narrative, because he did not believe that Luke used Mark for the passion narrative. He argued that even Matthew's narrative did not need to include more than the pericopes prior to the passion. Thus Neville shows that Tucket reduced the possible choices of Mark for Matthew and Luke to eighty pericopes, and out of those pericopes, he calculated statistically how possible it was for Matthew and Luke to independently derive from the patterns of Mark, and he found out that the chance for this to be done was 72,6 percent.<sup>113</sup> According to Neville, Tucket claims that there is not an overwhelming support for the 2GH, and therefore supporters of 2GH can not claim that the phenomenon of order mostly favors their hypothesis. However, Neville explains that Tuckett never mentions that he used a synopsis that was to some extent biased toward the priority of Mark and thus had placed the pericopes in such a way that Mark derived as little as possible from Matthew and Luke.<sup>114</sup>

It may seem strange that the choice of a synopsis can determine the outcome of an investigation. However, the ordering of the pericopes in a synopsis can be determined in multiple ways. The synopsis that this paper uses, which was made solely for this paper, has ordered the pericopes side by side in the triple tradition. Where the three Gospels have the same pericope, they are placed beside one another in parallel columns. However, problems arise when only one or two Gospel(s) has specific contents. Should such contents be saved to the end of the synopsis as some additional material? Or should it be included within the synopsis among the other pericopes, and if so, where should it be placed? The synopsis this paper depends upon places such individual pericopes in connection with the triple tradition material, in such a way that the lead Gospel dictates the order, i.e., a passage found in one or two Gospels, not being in the lead position, is placed in connection to a pericope that all three evangelists share.

A synopsis of Matthean priority will serve as an example. Let us assume that someone produces a synopsis dictated by Matthew's order to research the probability that Luke and Mark used him as a source. Where should the healing of the demoniac in Capernaum's synagogue be placed in such a synopsis? This pericope is only represented in (Mark 1:21-28) and (Luke 4:31-37). The pericope begins with Jesus entering the synagogue in the sabbath and teaching (Mark 1:21, Luke 4:31). It has

---

<sup>112</sup> Neville, 207.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 209.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 207.

in (Mark 1:22) and (Luke 4:32) the very same words about the authority of Jesus as Matthew does in the ending of the Sermon on the Mount.

Thus we have a choice to let the pericope of the demoniac in Capernaum circumference the Sermon on the Mount since Jesus start begin his teaching in (Mark 1:21; Luke 4:31), which might be the Sermon on the Mount and ends it in both (Mark 1:22) and (Luke 4:32) with the words as Matthew does in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 7:28-29). Thus the pericopes begin with Jesus entering the synagogue and then he began his teaching and after finishing he was praised. In between, we could place the Sermon on the Mount. This means that the pericope of the healing of the demoniac in Capernaum begins before the Sermon on the Mount and ends after the same sermon is finished.

However, we could also put the very same pericope in connection to Peter's mother-in-law healed from fever, which begins at (Luke 4:38) and thus directly connects to the healing of the demoniac, which ends at (Luke 4:37). In such a case, the pericope in both Mark and Luke will be placed prior to (Matt 8:14) instead of before (Matt 5:1) and after (Matt 7:29-29). At least two different placements for this pericope make it challenging to make a synopsis. The same goes for many pericopes in the Gospels that follow the lead Gospel but not being represented in it, making it extremely difficult to make an unbiased synopsis. Therefore, the problem is solved differently depending on which synopsis is used and towards which solution it is biased. To be able to consider all different placements of pericopes is arduous work because not only must the scholar place the following Gospels in the proper order compared to the leading Gospel (and the possible positions are many), but he/she must also put all three Gospels in the leading position in different synopses and all Gospels in the second position compared to the leading one. The result is that many different synopses must be made, which tend to support either one or the other solution. It is, therefore, a cumbersome task to argue for either position using the argument from order.

The above argumentations from both sides show that arguments from order are difficult to use when it comes to establishing the order in which the Gospels were written. The subject of order is much more complicated than one might grasp at first glance, and the arguments in favor of either Markan priority or Markan posteriority are directly depending on what synopsis is used. Depending on what Gospel dictates the synopsis' order and how the following Gospels are distributed, one can get different results. William Farmer claimed that every synopsis has some bias built into it, and no

scholar can have an unbiased approach to the Synoptic Problem due to the large number of synopses he then must work through.<sup>115</sup>

Neville finds that Griesbach's synopsis is more unbiased than Tuckett's but still suffers from being un-neutral, which all synopsis does.<sup>116</sup> We, therefore, must contend that the argument from order is not as strong for any side as first claimed by virtually all proponents of either Markan priority or Markan posteriority views.

## 2.5. Summary

According to Stein, Mark's poorer writing style is the argument that Matthew and Luke, when they used Mark, made his account more smooth by either inserting or removing words and expressions in Mark that did not resemble good Greek. However, the arguments can be reversed if micro-conflation occurred and Mark used two accounts in front of him, trying to make his own story out of them. In a few instances, though, the Markan priority view(s) has the upper hand. When Mark uses the singular when the plural is required is a good example where the 2GH has some problem since it is easier to understand that Mark's wrong grammar was corrected by Matthew and Luke rather than to see how Mark made a good grammar worse.

However, the Aramaisms are more neutral because if Matthew and Luke wrote last, they might have omitted those expressions, while if Mark was last, he might have added them as healing formulas, in line with tendencies with later New Testament Apocrypha.

The redundancies are of uttermost importance for the 2GH since they strongly indicate that Mark conflated his sources. Stein, however, argues that out of the ten points Tucket provides in his table, only the first point with 17 redundant expressions in Mark can support a claim that Mark conflated Matthew and Luke. Arguably the case in favor of 2GH is stronger than Stein admits, and the last nine points have a slight advantage to support the 2GH leaving the first point with the seventeen redundant expressions in Mark as an even stronger indicator for Markan posteriority.

Mark's harder readings are examples where Mark, according to the Markan priority view(s), has readings that due to their negative character, could be misunderstood by later disciples and therefore was redacted by the later evangelists. However, in Semitic languages, the word for *many* can be interpreted as *all*, which can explain why Mark used the word if he wrote last if we assume he was affected by the Aramaic language. Furthermore, Jesus in Mark's account could not heal everyone because not all outside the house were sick, as in the case in Matthew and Luke. Even Abiathar in

---

<sup>115</sup> Farmer, 200.

<sup>116</sup> Neville, 236.

(Mark 2:26) might in the 2GH explain that Mark found two accounts without any reference to time and added one even though he was wrong with the name. The 2DH is not as strong as it wants to exclaim in this point, and the 2GH has no advantage either. The best explanations come from FGGH and MCH, claiming that the second evangelist followed the first one redacting Mark.

Mark is the middle term in the verbal agreements, and thus was the first or the last Gospel in order. However, Stein argues that only one of the Gospels could be the source to the other two and rejects that Matthew and Luke independently could have used another source than Mark in the triple tradition. However, this paper assumes another source behind Matthew and Luke and that Mark had in front of him the two fully completed scrolls of Matthew and Luke when he wrote.

The arguments from order are cut in two ways since the outcome of the arguments depends on which school of interpretation lies behind a particular hypothesis. The Markan posteriority view(s) and especially the 2DH uses an explanation model deriving from Lachmann stating that Matthew must be compared to Mark independently and likewise must Luke, yielding a different result than the Griesbach option, which is more neutral but still is somewhat bias toward the 2GH.

However, for the 2GH to use the arguments from order conflation of sources is a necessity. In most argumentations above, conflation is required for the 2GH to regain its position, either at the macro or micro level, and if micro-conflation can be accounted for the 2GH has a stronger position.



### 3. Fatigue in the Synoptics?

Editorial fatigue is the view that one evangelist wanted to remake the story found in his source(s) and began uniquely but later fell back into the formulations of the evangelist he used. Goodacre finds the argument of editorial fatigue so compelling that it proves the priority of Mark.<sup>117</sup> He explains the feature in the following way: "In telling the same story as his predecessor, a writer makes changes in the early stage which he is unable to sustain throughout. [...] they can betray an authors hand."<sup>118</sup> Thus he believes, it is one of the most important arguments for Markan priority since many other arguments are reversible.<sup>119</sup> He brings forth many examples of fatigue, but due to the limited scope of this paper, the focus will be on the pericopes that fall within the paper's limitation.

#### 3.1. The cleansing of the Leper

The first pericope Goodacre analyzes is the *Cleansing of the Leper* (Matt 8:1-4 // Mark 1:40-45, // Luke 5:12-16).<sup>120</sup> Matthew states in the pericope that large crowds followed Jesus down from the mountain where he held the great Sermon on the Mount. Coming down, a leper begged Jesus to cleanse him, and Jesus willingly did so. In (Matt 8:4), Jesus rebukes the man by saying: "*See that you tell no one; but go...*" and in (Mark 1:43) Jesus says: "*See that you say nothing to anyone;...*" Goodacre interprets the Matthean words as fatigue since Jesus commanded the man to tell no one, yet he performed the miracle in front of everyone.<sup>121</sup> He believes Matthew has unconsciously slipped with his pen and returned to the Markan story. Mark's story makes better sense due to the solitary place where the miracle occurred, and thus, Jesus' rebuke *to tell nothing to no one* is coherent, according to Goodacre.<sup>122</sup>

Goodacre's argumentation is not flawless since Jesus' rebuke makes more sense if there are people around which the man is instructed not to tell about the miracle as in Matthew, rather than in Mark, where the solitary place makes such a command less understandable. Another point that strengthens the view of Markan posteriority is the conflation of Matthew's and Luke's accounts. In (Matt 8:3), we find that *his leprosy was cleansed* (ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα), and in (Luke 5:14) *the leprosy left him* (ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ), while (Mark 1:43) conflates both expressions into one sentence: *the leprosy left him, and he was cleansed* (ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ

---

<sup>117</sup> Goodacre. 'Fatigue', 45.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 46.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 45.

<sup>120</sup> See appendix 5, pp. 78.

<sup>121</sup> Goodacre, 'Fatigue', 52.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 47-48.

λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη). Either we must assume that Matthew used Mark and left out the part which Luke already had used of the account (MCH), or that Luke used Mark and Matthew and chose to unpick Matthew's words from the Markan account (FGGH). Alternatively, we must assume that Matthew and Luke used Mark independently (2DH), and therefore, Matthew by chance made use of one half of Mark while Luke happened to utilize the other half of Mark's sentence. The most plausible explanation is therefore that Mark used Matthew and Luke and incorporated the Matthean and Lukan stories into one coherent narrative. In addition, (Mark 1:45) has much likeliness with (Luke 5:15-16), where the news about Jesus was spread farther, in Mark because the man spread the news, and in Luke, because the rumor was spread. If Mark used both Matthew and Luke, this is easily explained; he conflated the accounts. If Matthew uses Mark, we must wonder why he omitted the sentence.

### 3.2. Jesus' family outside

In the pericope about *Jesus' family standing outside calling for Jesus* (Matt 12:46-50 //Mark 3:31-35 // Luke 8:19-21),<sup>123</sup> Matthew follows Mark closely, according to Goodacre, but betrays himself while not mentioning the house where Jesus taught.<sup>124</sup> For The family of Jesus were *standing outside* (εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω) in (Matt 12:46f), and (ἔξω στήκοντες) in (Mark 3:31g) indicating outside a house. Mark has introduced the house in (3:20) *And He came home* (Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον). Therefore, it makes perfect sense in Mark that the family was outside calling Jesus to come out, according to Goodacre.<sup>125</sup> He believes Matthew missed the house and is therefore betrayed. Goodacre further claims that the account in Matthew presupposes a house since (Matt 13:1) says; "On that day Jesus had *gone out of* (ἐξελθὼν) *the house* (τῆς οἰκίας)," which indicates Matthew followed Mark but forgot to introduce the house at (12:46).

Finally, Goodacre refers to the change of scene before this pericope when Jesus enters the house in (Mark 3:20), at which place the Pharisees accuse Jesus to heal the demon-possessed by the power of Beelzebub.<sup>126</sup> It is the very same pericope as Matthew has in (12:22-45) which begins with the words: "Then a demon-possessed man who was blind and unable to speak was brought to Jesus, and He healed him so that the man who was unable to speak talked and could see." Matthew does not say where Jesus was when the man was led up to him, but it might well have been in a house. Mark, if he used Matthew, might therefore have added the house to clarify Matthew's account.

---

<sup>123</sup> See appendix 6, pp. 81.

<sup>124</sup> Goodacre, 'Fatigue', 48.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid.

We must also consider Luke when viewing this pericope from the point of Markan posteriority since there are some expressions that Mark has preserved that are only in the Lukan account and some expressions that only are represented in the Matthean account. (Matt 12:46e - 12:46h) states that Jesus family *were standing outside, seeking to speak to Him* (ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι), but they have no counterpart in Luke. However, (Mark 3:31g - 3:31j) have them represented in some different form with the words *and while standing outside they sent word to Him, calling for Him* (ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν). Directly after those words, (Mark 3:32) continues, *and a crowd was sitting around Him* (καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος), words not present in Matthew but (Luke 8:19e) have a variant of them as follows *and they were unable to get to Him because of the crowd* (καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον). Either Matthew and Luke have independently copied Mark (2DH) and just happened to include one part each, or Luke have copied Mark but unpicked some of the material in Mark (FGGH), or Matthew have copied Mark and unpicked material in Luke (MCH). Neither of these variants seems plausible, and given the setting of the pericope, it is not convincing that Matthew used Mark but happened to forget to include the house. Instead he might have skipped it due to the change of scene in (Matt 12:22). Therefore, the 2GH remains stronger, where Mark has used Matthew and Luke, conflated them, and clarified Matthew by referring to the house where they gathered.

### 3.3. Parable of the Sower

The following fatigue Goodacre argues for he finds in the *Parable of the Sower* in (Matt 13:1-23 // Mark 4:1-20 // Luke 8:4-15).<sup>127</sup> Goodacre claims that Luke has fallen into a pattern of fatigue three times in this pericope, revealing that Mark was his source.<sup>128</sup> The only way to see that this has happened, he claims, is because the parable has an explanation where Luke reveals his source.<sup>129</sup>

In the first of the examples Goodacre explains:<sup>130</sup>

Mark says that the seed that fell on rocky soil sprang up quickly because it had no depth of earth (Mark 4:5; contrast Luke 8.6). Luke omits to mention this, for whatever reason, but he has the corresponding section in the interpretation, 'those who when they hear, with joy they receive the word...' (Luke 8:13; cf. Mark 4:16).

<sup>127</sup> See appendix 7, pp. 84.

<sup>128</sup> Goodacre, 'Fatigue', 49.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 49.

Mark 4:5 has "and immediately it sprang up because it had no depth of soil (καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς·)." However, (Luke 8:6) has "because *it had no moisture* (διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα)," which Goodacre interprets as a sign of fatigue since Luke looks like Mark in the interpretation.<sup>131</sup> In the interpretation where (Mark 4:16) has "who, when they hear the word, immediately receive it with joy, (οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν)," (Luke 8:13) says "who, when they hear, receive the word with joy (οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον)." Luke thus, according to Goodacre, falls into fatigue since his explanation fell back into Mark while at the beginning he tried to make his own story.<sup>132</sup>

However, Goodacre does not enlighten his readers that (Luke 8:6) has a text where the seed *grows up* (καὶ φυεῖν), just as (Mark 4:6) does, but Mark uses a different word to express the same meaning (ἐξανέτειλεν) and Luke's account is without *immediately* (εὐθὺς). In both accounts, the seed grows up and in Mark's account *immediately*. The interpretation would be no strange for (Luke 8:13) even if he did not follow (Mark 4:6) in the parable section to state that "who, when they hear, receive the word with joy," because that is what *grow up* (φυεῖν) is implying. The argument of fatigue is therefore not weighty at this point.

The second point of fatigue Goodacre highlights is the cause for the seed to wither. In (Luke 8:6) it says "it withered away because it had no *moisture* (ἰκμάδα)," while in (Mark 4:6) "because it had no *root* (ῥίζαν), it withered away." Goodacre argues that (Luke 8:13) falls back into the Markan account when explaining the parable, for when (Mark 4:17) has, "and yet *they have no firm root* (οὐκ ἔχουσιν ῥίζαν) in themselves, but are only temporary," Luke has "and yet *these do not have a firm root* (ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν); they believe for a while." Therefore, according to Goodacre, Luke follows his path at the beginning of the parable but falls back into the Markan account when he explains it.<sup>133</sup>

It is, though, plausible that Luke wrote his account before Mark and to avoid redundancies had two different words *moisture* (ἰκμάδα) (Luke 8:6) and *firm root* (ῥίζαν) (Luke 8:13), and that Mark finding both Matthew and Luke chose to follow primarily Matthew with whom he is almost verbatim through the whole section, both parable and explanation. Since Luke's narrative has the same meaning as Matthew but is slightly less descriptive, it would make sense if Mark, following them both, leaned more on Matthew in this narrative.

Goodacre's third point has to do with the sun as a scorching agent in (Mark 4:6) "And when the sun had risen, it was scorched (καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθη)," something absent from (Luke 8:6). However, the explanation (Mark 4:17) has the words "when affliction or persecution occurs (γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ)" as a direct interpretation of, "when the sun had risen, it

---

<sup>131</sup> Ibid.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

*was scorched* (ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθη) (Mark 4:6),” which also (Luke 8:13) is leaning toward with the words *in a time of temptation* (καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ).<sup>134</sup>

However, without leaning on Mark, Luke could have made his account independently, which works perfectly fine. It might then have been the other way around that (Mark 4:6) inserted *when the sun had risen, it was scorched* in order to harmonize (Matt 13:6) and Luke’s account of the parable to match the interpretation (Luke 8:13).

Luke also shares with Mark essential elements of the parable, but Mark *adds* a few things. (1) The seed came up (quickly in Mark). (Mark 4:5) adds that *it had not much soil*. (2) They had no *firm root* (ῥίζαν) in both (Mark 4:17) and (Luke 8:13) but (Luke 8:6) refers to not having *moisture* (ἰκμάδα) in the parable. (3) (Luke 8:13) has *in a time of temptation* (καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ) as the cause for the believers falling away, and (Mark 4:17) instead has *affliction and persecution* (γενομένης θλίψεως) as the cause of their fall away which in (Mark 4:6) goes back to *the sun that scorches* (absent in Luke). We see thus that Luke has all features Mark has, and instead of claiming the fatigue argument we can claim that Mark added to Luke rather than Luke fell into the pattern of Mark.

Goodacre’s conclusion that Luke falls into fatigue is not as conclusive as he claims since Mark might have harmonized his two accounts if he wrote last. Even if we do not include Matthew into the account, it would not be improbable that Mark would have added to the account of Luke due to the habit of Mark working with redundancies and building fuller stories.

### 3.4. Healing of the Paralytic

The Healing of the Paralytic (Matt 9:1-8 // Mark 2:1-12 // Luke 5:17-26) is another example of Luke’s fatigue, according to Goodacre.<sup>135</sup> He argues that one of the main clues for fatigue is found in (Luke 5:19).<sup>136</sup>

But when they did not find any way to bring him in because of the crowd, they went up on the roof and let him down through the tiles with his stretcher, into the middle of the crowd, in front of Jesus.

Mark 2:4 have it almost the same way:

And when they were unable to get to Him because of the crowd, they removed the roof above Him; and after digging an opening, they let down the pallet on which the paralyzed man was lying.

---

<sup>134</sup> Ibid., 49.

<sup>135</sup> See appendix 8, pp. 87.

<sup>136</sup> Goodacre, ‘Fatigue’, 50.

The problem is, though, according to Goodacre, that Luke does not mention any house in the introduction to the pericope, while the Markan account has a house from the beginning.<sup>137</sup> Mark says "When Jesus came back to Capernaum a few days later, it was heard that He was at home (Mark 2:1)." Out of this, Goodacre concludes that there is an indication of Lukan fatigue.

However, the pericope begins in Luke with a scene change from the previous pericope with the words *And it happened* (Καὶ ἐγένετο),<sup>138</sup> clearly separating the pericope from the previous one. The Lukan verse in NASB2020 begins like this: *One day He was teaching*. Luke had no urgency to present the house in the opening of the pericope since he later told that four men got up on a roof. A roof per se means a house, and to avoid redundancies, Luke did not need to mention it in (5:17). That Luke did not mention any house in the introduction is no proof that Luke had in mind a setting on an open field somewhere, and then two verses later forgot that setting and introduced a house. If we read the whole pericope in Luke, we see clearly that he already had a house in mind (5:19). Mark might as well have introduced the house at the beginning of the pericope if he followed Luke due to his tendency to work with redundancies. Therefore Goodacre's conclusion is too swift.

Goodacre finds another detail within the pericope to be a sign of fatigue in (Matt 9:3 // Mark 2:6 // Luke 5:21), where the Pharisees and scribes began to grumble.<sup>139</sup> In (Luke 5:21) "The scribes and the Pharisees began *thinking of the implications* (διαλογίζεσθαι), *saying* (λέγοντες)..."<sup>140</sup> (Mark 2:6) says the following: "But some of the scribes were sitting there and *thinking* (διαλογιζόμενοι) it over *in their hearts* (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν)."<sup>141</sup> The fatigue is, however, not yet revealed but will be in the following verses (Luke 5:22), according to Goodacre:<sup>142</sup> "But Jesus, aware of their thoughts, responded and said to them, "Why are you *thinking this way in your hearts?* (τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;)" Goodacre therefore finds (Mark 2:8-9) more consistent, when Jesus says: "Why are you *thinking* (διαλογίζεσθε) about these things *in your hearts* (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν)?"

Goodacre sees here a sign of fatigue in Luke since, at first, the scribes and Pharisees discussed that only God can forgive sins (Luke 5:21), and two verses later, Jesus asks them why they think as

---

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Those words are not translated in NASB2020 but separates the pericope in a distinct way from the previous one.

<sup>139</sup> Goodacre, 'Fatigue', 50.

<sup>140</sup> A better translation might be that they began to argue or to discuss among themselves, since the word διαλογίζομαι has both the meaning of discuss, argue and think.

<sup>141</sup> Since the word διαλογίζομαι can both mean to think and to discuss the translation above is preferred because they thought in their hearts ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. It is hard to see how one discusses in the heart.

<sup>142</sup> Goodacre, 'Fatigue', 50.

they do *in their hearts*.<sup>143</sup> If they spoke out loud it was not hard for Jesus to know what they thought and a better response would have been to have addressed their speech. Probably the word should be translated to think at this very moment rather than to discuss since it is hard to discuss with someone in one's heart. However, there is a flaw in Goodacre's argument stemming from his bias position that Mark was first. He argues that Luke has fallen back into the pattern of Mark, but it could also be that Mark used Luke as a source and thereby wanted to explain Luke. If Mark wrote last, he also would have had the aid of Matthew, who in this pericope give the shortest version, but adds a fascinating view with the words "And some of the scribes *said to themselves* (εἶπαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς) (Matt 9:3)," which is as close as thinking in one's heart as possible without murmuring aloud. (Matt 9:4) says "Why are you *thinking evil* (ἐνθυμείσθε πονηρὰ) *in your hearts?* (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν);" Matthew's version is perfectly understandable. Jesus perceived their thoughts because they said among themselves, and therefore he asked them why they thought evil in their hearts.

Therefore, on the assumption that Mark wrote last and used both the accounts from Matthew and Luke and brought them together, we must assume that Luke had the information of the event from somewhere else than Mark, either by copying from Matthew or another source. If it was another source, we might assume that it contained some words quite close to Matthew's since Matthew's account gives Luke a great reason first to state that the Pharisees thought of the implications saying... (Matt 9:3 // Luke 5:21), because Luke had in mind that they murmured among themselves. Then as in Matthew, Jesus can turn to them, inquiring them why they are thinking evil in their hearts (Matt 9:4 // Luke 5:22). If Mark had both of their versions, then he might have gone with (Luke 5:22) with support of (Matt 9:4) in (Mark 2:8) and then changed his account in the earlier part of the story to "*thinking it over in their hearts* (διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν) (Mark 2:6)," because in (Matt 9:3c) *they said to themselves* and in (Luke 21a-c) *they thought it over saying*. Therefore, Mark leaning more towards Luke and using Matthew would explain the likeness of the Gospels in the pericope but would not require the argument from fatigue. Mark might have used Matthew and Luke instead of Matthew and Luke using Mark.

Stein also have a comment on this pericope under his heading literary agreements.<sup>144</sup> According to Stein, literary agreements are places where it seems like either Matthew or Luke presupposes some source that they have condensed, but it is not the same as the fatigue argument since they do not begin their pericopes in ways distinct for their editorial habits. Stein provides an example from (Matt 9:1-2 // Mark 2:1-5 // Luke 5:17-20), where Jesus sees the faith of the four men carrying the

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Stein, 76-80.

stretcher. In Mark and Luke, the faith has a visible expression in the very carrying itself and the opening of the roof. Matthew, however, does not have the scene with the four men carrying the paralyzed man and digging a hole in the roof, but reduces the following: "they brought to Him a paralyzed man lying on a stretcher," and still, Jesus observes their faith. Stein argues that Matthew, therefore, has utilized Mark as his source and compressed Mark and left out the information not entirely essential.<sup>145</sup>

Stein considers Matthew the latest evangelist since he assumes Markan priority. He claims that Matthew, out of his redactional habits, cut away less essential information in Mark.<sup>146</sup> The problem is that Stein's argument is circular since he assumes Markan priority. The very habit of Matthew proposed by Markan priority becomes the ultimate proof that Matthew has redacted Mark which proves Markan priority to be right. A better approach would be to investigate the two options (1) Matthew and Luke made use of Mark, and (2) Mark made use of Matthew and/or Luke to see what hypothesis has the best explanation for the differences within the Gospels. It could just as well have been the other way around that Matthew's record is the earliest and that Mark used Matthew and expanded him in combination with Luke's account. In the second alternative, micro-conflation must be considered an option.

### 3.5. The baptism of Jesus

Stein provides yet another example of literary agreements from (Matt 3:13-16 // Mark 1:9-10 // Luke 3:21-22a),<sup>147</sup> where *John baptizes Jesus*. (Matt 3:16) says "After He was baptized, Jesus came up *immediately* (εὐθὺς) from the water; and behold, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God." (Mark 3:21-22a) instead has this text "And *immediately* (εὐθὺς) coming up out of the water, He saw the heavens opening." Stein here argues that Matthew has an irregular placement of the word *immediately* (εὐθὺς), which indicates that Matthew redacted Mark and did not realize what effects his changes would have. Stein argues that in Mark, Jesus immediately saw the heavens open, while in Matthew, Jesus immediately went up from the water and then saw the heavens open. Stein wonders why the coming out of the water immediately would be so important in Matthew and why Matthew so carelessly changed Mark without realising the consequences.<sup>148</sup>

The problem with Stein's argumentation is again that he presupposes Markan priority when arguing, and thus Matthew has stressed the coming out of the water instead of seeing the heavens open as Mark's version seems to intend. According to Stein, Matthew has used Mark but failed to

---

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., 77, 79-80.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., 80-82. See also appendix 9, p 93.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.



realize that he stressed the wrong word, wherefore Mark is the better account here. However, if we assume Markan posteriority, Mark might have detected the ‘error’ in Matthew and changed the sentence to a more understandable one. It makes more sense that Jesus immediately saw the heavens open and that God spoke on behalf of his beloved Son than Jesus immediately came up from the water. Therefore, following Stein’s reasoning overall in his chapter and applying it to this pericope, this passage should be a sign of Markan posteriority rather than Markan priority since Matthew, in this case, has made the text more theologically obscure.<sup>149</sup>

### 3.6. Summary

The fatigue arguments that Goodacre refers to are not as strong as they initially seem to be. However, we must acknowledge that due to the limitations of this paper, we have left out the strongest arguments for fatigue in the Synoptics. Those are *the death of John the Baptist* (Matt 14:1-12 // Mark 6:14-29), and *the feeding of the five thousand* (Mark 6:30-44 // Luke 9:10-17). In the examples studied in this chapter, the fatigue is not as persuasive as Goodacre suggested if one considers micro-conflation as an option. In (Matt 8:1-4 // Mark 1:40-45 // Luke 5:12-16) the command of Jesus to the leper makes slightly better sense if Matthew wrote before Mark and not after. Furthermore, Mark has blended features that Matthew has independently from Luke and vice versa, indicating a conflation of Mark rather than Mark in some way being used by Matthew and Luke.

The arguments of Jesus’ family outside (Matt 12:46-50 // Mark 3:31-35 // Luke 8:19-21) is relatively weak because without mentioning a house it is still implied in (Matt 12:46). Building so much on one word left out is not persuasive since Mark could have clarified Matthew by inferring a house. Even in this pericope, Mark has a combination of material that Matthew and Luke have independently from one another, indicating either that Matthew and Luke made an obscure use of Mark and excluded what the other evangelist using Mark had included (FGGH and MCH), or that they by chance happened to select parts the other evangelist did not pick from Mark (2DH).

The parable of the sower might be explained by Luke using Mark, but just as well as Mark making use of Luke and trying to make the account more clear.

The last example from Goodacre is not persuasive either since it is problematic to build a case on one word (house). Furthermore, Luke’s account makes more sense in light of Matthew. If Mark made use of both Matthew and Luke and conflated them, it makes sense that the Pharisees murmured in their hearts.

---

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 80, 82.

Stein's argument on *Jesus baptism* (Matt 3:16 // Mark 1:10) is a standard 2DH argument but in reverse, because he argues that Matthew's account with the most unclear grammar is the latest one, which is opposite of how he argues in the rest of the chapter. If we follow Stein's arguments in the overall chapter, we must concede that Mark is more likely to be the latest account in this instance.

The 2GH is straightforward and claims that Mark included material from Matthew and Luke into one single account. With such a procedure, both Luke's and Matthew's unpicking are avoided, and the peculiar argument from chance the 2DH deals with is bypassed. However, for the 2GH to regain strength, it must be made clear that micro-conflations are a possibility because many of the arguments in the fatigue discussion can be explained if Mark micro-conflated Matthew and Luke.

## 4. The Argument from Length: Ancient Compositional Book composition favors 2GH

Stein's main argument in favor for the Markan priority view comes from the omissions Mark must have done from Matthew and Luke if he wrote last. He wonders why any person would remove so much of important material. He writes:<sup>150</sup>

Why would Mark omit so much material from his Gospel? Why would he omit everything concerning Jesus' birth, the birth of John the Baptist, the Sermon on the Mount, so much teaching material, the Lord's Prayer, all the resurrection narratives (if Mark originally ended at 16:8), and so on? It is hard to conceive of any reason why Mark would want to omit so much material from his Gospel, if it all lay before him as he copied Matthew and/or Luke.<sup>151</sup>

Stein finds some additional weighty reasons why Mark must be the first Gospel and not the last. The first set of evidence he views is from within the pericopes themselves, where the observation is that Mark often has the most extended version. Below is a list from Stein included, but it is abbreviated to fit the limitations of this paper.<sup>152</sup> The numbers within the parenthesis are the number of words within each pericope, and the numbers in bold type display which Gospel has the longest account.

Name of pericope	MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
<b>1. Simon's mother-in-law</b>	8:14-15 (30)	<b>1:29-31 (44)</b>	4:38-39 (38)
<b>2. Sick healed in evening</b>	8:16-17 (36)	1:32-34 (46)	<b>4:40-41 (52)</b>
<b>3. Cleansing of leper</b>	8:1-4 (62)	1:40-45 (98)	5:12-16 (98)
<b>4. Healing of paralytic</b>	9:1-8 (126)	2:1-12 (196)	<b>5:17-26 (213)</b>
<b>5. Calling of Levi</b>	9:9-13 (71)	<b>2:13-17 (109)</b>	5:27-32 (94)
<b>6. Question about fasting</b>	9:14-17 (104)	2:18-22 (129)	<b>5:33-39 (142)</b>
<b>7. Picking grain on Sabbath</b>	<b>12:1-8 (136)</b>	2:32-28 (108)	6:1-5 (92)
<b>8. Man with withered hand</b>	12:9-14 (90)	3:1-6 (94)	<b>6:6-11 (115)</b>
<b>9. Chosing of the twelve</b>	10:1-4 (74)	<b>3:13-19 (90)</b>	6:12-16 (76)
<b>10. Parable of sower</b>	13:1-9 (131)	<b>4:1-9 (151)</b>	8:4-8 (90)

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 51-52.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 53-55.

Name of pericope	MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
<b>11. Why Jesus used parables</b>	<b>13:10-17 (154)</b>	4:10-12 (52)	8:9-10 (36)
<b>12. Interpretation of Sower</b>	13:18-23 (128)	<b>4:13-20 (146)</b>	8:11-15 (109)
<b>13. Parable of mustard seed</b>	13:31-32 (50)	<b>4:30-32 (57)</b>	13:18-19 (40)
<b>14. Stilling the storm</b>	8:23-27 (73)	<b>4:35-41 (120)</b>	8:22-25 (94)
<b>15. Gerasene demoniac</b>	8:28-34 (135)	<b>5:1-20 (325)</b>	8:26-39 (293)
<b>16. Jairus's daughter and woman with hemorrhage</b>	9:18-26 (138)	<b>5:21-43 (374)</b>	8:40-56 (280)

Matthew has the longest pericopes two times, Luke four times, and Mark nine times in the above list. When one considers Stein's complete list of fifty-one pericopes, Mark has the most extended pericopes twenty-one times, Matthew has the longest pericopes ten times, and Luke eleven times.<sup>153</sup> That Mark is the most extended version most of the time contradicts that he excluded the important teaching material found in Matthew and Luke because if he was consequent throughout his account, he should have expanded *all* material.

Stein continues his reasoning by referring to the teaching sayings in Mark, where Jesus many times is said to be a great teacher. He writes:<sup>154</sup>

We see this emphasis in the introductory *seams* by which he joins his pericopes—1:21-22 (the noun or verb for "teach" is found three times); 2:13; 4:1-2 (the noun or verb for "teach" is again found three times); [...]. It is clear from the above that Mark is seeking to emphasize Jesus' role as a teacher. Yet, the majority of the material that Matthew and Luke have in common and that Mark has omitted consists of teaching material, such as Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (5:1-7:29) or Luke 6:20-8:3 and 9:51-18:14. It is difficult to understand why, if Mark used Matthew and/or Luke, he would emphasize Jesus' teaching ministry and yet at the same time eliminate the majority of the teachings of Jesus found in his source(s). *Furthermore, if one would argue that he did so because he sought to compose an abbreviated or abridged version of Matthew and/or Luke, then the fact that he lengthened the material he did use becomes even less understandable. An abridged work becomes shorter by both eliminating various materials and abbreviating the accounts retained.*

On the 2GH, Mark's references to Jesus' teachings are seen as summaries of the very preachings performed in Matt and Luke. However, due to the difficulty of overviewing the double tradition,

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., 53.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 55 (emphasis added).

which mainly consists of the teachings of Jesus, Mark summarized them by inferring that Jesus taught or was a teacher or rabbi. For instance, (Mark 1:21) tells us that Jesus taught the people in the synagogue of Capernaum and (Mark 1:22) says that his teaching was authoritative. In Luke's version, the preaching in Capernaum ends in the same way as the Sermon on the Mount does. If, therefore, Mark had access to both Matthew and Luke, he could assume that Jesus held the Sermon on the Mount in the Capernaum's synagogue. It is, therefore, according to the 2GH, possible to insert the Sermon on the Mount between the two verses in (Mark 1:21-22), and thus it is understandable why Mark referred to Jesus as a teacher, without quoting any of his teachings. On the other hand, we could assume that Matthew and Luke used Mark and inserted teachings where Mark only told his readers that Jesus was a great teacher. But it is not as likely, especially not if they did so independently.

Goodacre likewise has problems with the Markan posteriority view since he cannot see why Mark would have omitted so much of essential theology if he knew Matthew and Luke.<sup>155</sup> Goodacre finds no valid reason why Mark would dismiss the Lord's prayer since he in his Gospel share the same theology.<sup>156</sup> By referring to William Farmer, where Farmer states that Mark made a new account bringing together the diverged accounts of Matthew and Luke, Goodacre questions what in those Gospels were in opposition to Mark's theology.<sup>157</sup> Goodacre, furthermore, shows in a convincing way that Mark shares much of the theology of Matthew and Luke. He does so by comparing the phrases in the Lord's prayer in Matthew and Luke with corresponding features in Mark.<sup>158</sup> He finds in (Mark 11:24) that Jesus is encouraging his disciples to pray with the words "*therefore, I say to you, all things for which you pray and ask,*" presupposing that Jesus in Mark taught his disciples to pray. Those words corresponds well with the words in (Matt 6:9): "*Pray, then, in this way,*" or with the words of (Luke 11:2): "*When you pray, say.*" Jesus additionally calls God Father in (Mark 14:36), as in (Matt 6:9). Likewise is the coming of the kingdom of heaven (Matt 6:10) not a troublesome expression in Mark since, already in the beginning Jesus proclaims that "*the kingdom of God is at hand*" (Mark 1:15). Finally, Goodacre explains that God's will be done in (Mark 3:35), where Jesus says "*For whoever does the will of God, this is My brother, and sister, and mother.*" Therefore, doing God's will in (Mark 3:35) is as essential as in (Matt 6:10) which states that "*Your will be done, On earth as it is in heaven.*" Finding no disturbances in Mark's

---

<sup>155</sup> Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 29-31.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., 29. Goodacre refers to Farmer, *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 24.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 29-31.

view of either Matthew's or Luke's theology, Goodacre claims that it is not reasonable that Mark would have used Matthew's and Luke's accounts and omitted the double tradition.<sup>159</sup>

The assumption then is with both Stein and Goodacre that Mark, according to the 2GH, left out material that he found problematic for his theology or that was ill-representations of the life of Jesus. On the other hand, Stein correctly observes that Mark also expanded much of the material in Matthew and Luke in the triple tradition and thereby did not have problems with those accounts. The problem is that the questions of both Goodacre and Stein are wrongly asked since Mark's omission of the double tradition probably had nothing to do with him disliking the accounts of Matthew and Luke for whatever reason.

#### 4.1. The authors limitations

Derrenbacher claims that most scholars performing works on the Synoptic Problem fail to consider the ancient compositional practices that the Gospel writers were subject to.<sup>160</sup> The authors of antiquity did not have the opportunities modern writers have today when they wrote their works. First, the scroll was the primary media used in antiquity, and even if the early church fairly quickly began using the codex, the Gospels were probably written on scrolls.<sup>161</sup> Furthermore, the first proof of writing desks are from the fifth century; thus, the ancient scribe wrote the scroll having it on his lap. Such a procedure was according to Derrenbacher "indubitably a difficult task and, [...] must have placed serious limitations on what could be achievable."<sup>162</sup> In this, Derrenbacher strongly criticizes Stein for not considering why Mark would have omitted the material he did if he wrote last.<sup>163</sup>

Derrenbacher bases a relatively large part of his book on Gerald Downing's work, who in two articles investigated how Josephus worked with his sources when compiling his books which depended on "the Deuteronomistic history and its parallels in 1 and 2 Chronicles, as well as his use of the letter of Aristeas in Jewish Antiquities."<sup>164</sup> According to Derrenbacher, Downing argued that Josephus never conflated two sources, and he always followed exclusively one of them at every given time, freely reciting or copying.<sup>165</sup> He also shows referring to Downings work that Josephus did not retract material from his sources, but he tended to include rather than subtract. The source

---

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., 31.

<sup>160</sup> Derrenbacher, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 5.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid., 32-3.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid., 68, see his footnote 42.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., 96, 113.

Josephus followed at any given time was also the source to which he was closest in wordings.<sup>166</sup> The procedure of antique authors seems to have been the same as Josephus' procedures due to the difficulty of handling scrolls.<sup>167</sup>

#### 4.1.1. *The double tradition*

Matthew has five large speeches, *The Sermon on the Mount* (5:1-7:29); *The Mission of the Twelve* (10:1-10:42); *The Parables* (Matt 13:1-52); *The Ecclesiastical Speech* (18:1-35); and *The Eschatological Speech* (Matt 24:1-25:46). The double tradition is all the material Matthew and Luke share, not present in Mark, and much of the material within those speeches are not present in Mark, but Luke has preserved much of them in different locations in his Gospel, and they are therefore referred to as the double tradition. The Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:1 -7:29) with compatible material in Luke is the double tradition material this paper aims to investigate in the light of ancient compositional practices. Here we must conclude that Matthew's characteristic is to bring the material together while Luke has shed it over multiple passages in his Gospel. The tendencies of the Sermon on the Mount is, therefore, a valid test case to see how Mark might have treated the complete double tradition material if he wrote last.<sup>168</sup>

#### 4.1.2. *Test Case: The Sermon on the Mount: Matt 5:1-7:29 with Luke's corresponding material*

Matthew opens the Sermon on the Mount with an introductory statement where *Jesus went up on the mountain accompanied by his disciples* and sat down (5:1-2), and Luke has a corresponding opening, but in (Luke 6:17a), *Jesus stands on a plain*. Luke then continues the introduction further and tells that *large crowds came to Jesus to be healed* (Luke 6:17b-6:19), material absent from Matthew. Matthew then advances with the *eight Beatitudes* (Matt 5:3-5:12), but Luke only provides *four of them* (Luke 6:20-23), sometimes in reverse in comparison to Matthew. Luke then adds *the woes* (Luke 6:24-26), which Matthew does not include. In (Matt 5:12), Jesus speaks of the *disciples as the salt of the earth*, which Luke provides in (14:35). Matthew then adds the saying of Jesus about the *disciples as the light of the world* (Matt 5:14-16), which Luke preserves for us at (8:16) in an abridged version. Matthew proceeds that *Jesus has not come to abolish the Law or the prophets* (Matt 6:17), something Jesus also says in (Luke 16:17). Matthew then enlarges the saying with the words that *heaven and earth shall perish but not an iota of the Law will fall idle* (5:18-20), but Luke does not have that part. Continuously (Matt 5:21-24) adds the *anti-murder saying* of Jesus, absent

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., 116-17.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

<sup>168</sup> For a fuller overview of the Sermon on the Mountain, see appendix 10, pp. 95.

from Luke; however, the saying in Matthew ends with the passage of *coming in terms with your accuser* which Luke suddenly adds at (12:58-59) where the first part of (Luke 12:58) is very different from Matthew's, while the rest of the saying in this passage in Luke resembles well the corresponding account in Matthew. Matthew moves on with the words of Jesus *against adultery* (5:27-30), which Luke does not match, after which Matthew continues with the *words of divorce* (5:31-32), where Luke only has an abridged version (16:18). (Matt 5:33-37) includes *woes and oaths*, absent from Luke, continued by the saying of *not resisting evil* (Matt 5:38-42), where Luke only preserves a part of the material (Luke 6:29-30). Matthew continues with the *love for the enemies* (Matt 5:43-45), which Luke has in reverse compared to his previous material (Luke 6:27-28). Matthew continues with *the exhortation to love exceedingly more than the heathens do* (Matt 5:46-5:48), which Luke also has in (6:32-36) but not in the exact wording as Matthew. (Matt 5:48) continues with the exhortation to *be perfect as the Father in heaven*, and (Luke 6:37) change it to *be merciful as the Father in heaven*. *Do not give in sight of men* (Matt 6:1-4) is absent from Luke, likewise Luke do not have (Matt 6:5-8) *teachings of prayer*, but in (Luke 11:1), *the disciples ask Jesus about prayer*. *The Lord's prayer* follows, which is somewhat different in Matthew (Matt 6:9-13) in comparison to (Luke 11:2-4). Matthew ends the prayer with an *exhortation of forgiveness* (6:14), which Luke adds at (6:37), and (Matt 6:15) adds the *negative consequence of not forgiving*, something Luke does not have. Matthew continues with the *teaching about fasting* (Matt 6:15-18), absent in Luke, and then Matthew continues with the *treasures in heaven* (Matt 6:19-21), something Luke presents at (12:33-34). *The eye as the body's lamp* is represented in Matthew (6:22-23), and Luke has that saying in (11:34). (Matt 6:24) begins the saying of *God and Mammon*, and Luke has that saying at (16:13), and the continuation of the saying follows smoothly in Matthew (6:25-34), while Luke has placed that saying entirely different in comparison to his beginning of the saying (Luke 12:22-32). The saying of *not judging* comes next in (Matt 7:1), and Luke has that at (6:37), and in Luke it follows with *the giving of the good measure* (6:38a), which is absent from Matthew, but Matthew continues in (7:2) with the corresponding words of (Luke 6:38b) that *by your measure, it will be measured to you*. In (Matt 7:3-5) Jesus speaks of *the log and the speck in the eye*, which Luke has in (6:41-42), and (Matt 7:6) has *the holy gifts to the pigs*, which Luke does not include. In (Matt 7:7-8) Jesus teaches about *asking, praying, and knocking*, which Luke has in (11:9-10), but in Luke, that saying is preceded by *the friend asking for bread in the night* (Luke 11:5-8). Jesus teaches in (Matt 7:9-11) that *God will give better gifts than earthly fathers do*, which Luke has in the same order at (11:11-13). (Matt 7:12) and (Luke 6:31) represent *the Golden Rule*, and (Matt 7:13) has Jesus teaching about *entering the narrow gate*, which in Luke comes at (13:24). The



information of the narrowness of the gate is information that only (Matt 7:14) provides. (Matt 7:15-20) has the saying of *the tree and its fruit*, but (Luke 6:44) has only a tiny part of it which corresponds to (Matt 7:16). (Matt 7:21) and (Luke 6:46) have the passage of *not everyone saying Lord, Lord will enter the kingdom, but only those who perform the will of God*. (Matt 7:22) continues with the saying that *though people have done deeds in the name of the Lord, still, they are cast out*, information Luke has in a somewhat different form in (13:25-26). (Matt 7:24-27) has the saying of the *two house builders*, which Luke also has in (6:47-49). The Sermon on the Mount ends with the words that *Jesus spoke with authority* (Matt 7:28-29), which Luke has from the preaching within Capernaum's synagogue (Luke 4:32).

The above record shows the characteristic of the double tradition material; it does not follow the same order as does the triple tradition. It is not well contained within a limited space, and it does not follow the same order or structure as the triple material, as Stein has shown.<sup>169</sup> If we now assume Markan posteriority and that Mark worked with two scrolls, Matthew's and Luke's, one soon realizes the very complex procedure following Luke in the Matthean account. Mark must for over-viewing the double tradition and attesting its trustworthiness from two accounts go back and forth in Luke multiple times, sometimes even backward in comparison to the material in Matthew. From such a complex procedure, it is incredibly troublesome imagining Mark if he wrote last to have moved forward and backward through Luke's scroll. Doing so one time would have been arduous enough, but continuing to do so at least twenty-seven times to reassemble the words in the Sermon on the Mount from Luke's account is inconceivable. Derrenbacher quotes what L. Avrin writes on the difficulty of handling scrolls:<sup>170</sup>

The ancient reader of Greek [scrolls] was inconvenienced in several ways. Holding the scroll open as one read and simultaneously rerolling the scroll in one's left ha[n]d, required exceptional coordination. Looking up an exact quotation in a different scroll was totally discouraging. If the scroll fell on the floor, retrieving it was a nuisance, much worse if it ripped. Unless the reader was familiar with the text, the absence of word spacing and punctuation slowed comprehension. When the reader found the scroll with the end of the story first, he or she had to reroll it before having the pleasure of reading the book. No wonder that when readers finished the scroll, they [typically] did not rewind it for the next person!

---

<sup>169</sup> Stein, 74.

<sup>170</sup> Derrenbacher *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 31-32, taken from footnote 57. Derrenbacher quotes L. Avrin, *Scribes, Script and Books: The Book Arts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, (Chicago, IL — London, American Library Association, 1991, p 153).

It would be even more demanding if he tried to monitor all of the double tradition. Therefore if Mark wrote last, he was not the lunatic as Streeter thought he was to have excluded the double tradition material.<sup>171</sup> Mark, therefore, excluded the material because the complexity of handling scrolls forced him, not because he was crazy or disliked the theology of Matthew and Luke.

If Mark used Matthew and Luke and "unified [...] the [...] diverse and sometimes diverging accounts of Matthew and Luke," as Farmer claims,<sup>172</sup> then we should expect that he wanted to affirm the trustworthiness of Jesus' sayings in Matthew and Luke. Doing so, he had two accounts of sayings spread out far in Luke and gathered in Matthew, but due to the difficulty of overviewing the material in Luke, he could not affirm the material of sayings and therefore omitted the double tradition.

However, the omission of material is only half of the problem for the 2GH since, as Stein asserted, multiple times within several pericopes, Mark expanded the material he found in Matthew and Luke.

#### *4.1.3. The Reversibility of the Fatigue Argument?*

Goodacre contends that the argument of fatigue is not reversible because in no pericope in the Gospels has he found that Mark behaves in a way toward Matthew and Luke that would indicate fatigue, i.e., that Mark begins a pericope differently from Matthew or Luke, in a unique Markan style, and then falls back into their accounts."<sup>173</sup> He also writes: "In five out of six cases, therefore, Matthew and Luke appear to be making characteristic changes at the beginning of a pericope only to involve themselves in problems later on as fatigue sets in. There is nothing in Mark like this."<sup>174</sup>

Even if there is no tendency the other way around, as Goodacre argues, it does not mean that fatigue is a strong argument for Markan priority. Without falling into fatigue Mark had the opportunity to bring together two accounts to make a fuller story and at points make clarifications to both Matthew and Luke if he wrote last, resulting at times in some obscure Greek, at times including redundancies, thus expanding Matthew's and Luke's neater accounts.

In the accounts labeled as fatigued by Goodacre, Mark has unique parts from Matthew included in his account and also special Lukan features, which strongly indicate that he wrote last. If Mark wrote first, we must have a good explanation for why Matthew and Luke at specific points included

---

<sup>171</sup> Streeter, 158.

<sup>172</sup> Goodacre, *The Case against Q*, 29. Taken as a quote from William R. Farmer, *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem*. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 24.

<sup>173</sup> Goodacre, 'Fatigue,' 52.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

parts and why they missed out on the part the other included. On the 2DH, either Matthew or Luke independently used Mark and by chance left out what the other included. There seem to be too many of those instances to attribute to coincidence. Following FGGH, we must assume that Luke dismissed parts that Matthew included from Mark on those occasions, and such an unpicking seems improbable. The same seems to be the case for MCH. Markan Posteriority, therefore, seems like a more probable solution than has traditionally been assumed.

However, it is not an unproblematic claim that Markan Posteriority is more probable than the other hypotheses since any argumentation claiming Markan posteriority must involve micro-conflation. A procedure in antiquity where an author micro-conflated two sources are scarcely heard of and only occurs with some tiny poems, but never with masses of texts like the Gospels.<sup>175</sup> If the claim that micro-conflation was not probable or even deemed impossible during antiquity due to the difficulties producing books, we must conclude that Mark was indeed the first Gospel, at least when considering the pericopes where micro-conflation is concerned.

We are now to view the pericope of Jairus' daughter and the woman with hemorrhage (Matt 9:18-26 // Mark 5:21-43 // Luke 8:40-56) where Mark is the middle term and has an expanded version compared to Matthew and Luke. This pericope is treated in detail in both Greek and English in appendix 11-13.<sup>176</sup>

#### 4.1.4. Test case: *Jairus' daughter and the woman with hemorrhage: Matt 9:18-26 // Mark 5:21-43 // Luke 8:40-56*

The pericope begins with an opening scene where Jesus gets from the other side of the lake, where he recently healed the demoniac man. In (Mark 5:21) *a large crowd gathered around Him; and He stayed by the seashore*, and in (Luke 8:40), *the people welcomed Him, for they had all been waiting for Him*. This scene is missing in Matthew, where Jesus instead is talking of *new wine and new wineskins* (Matt 9:17) when he gets interrupted by a ruler whose name we do not get to know (Matt 9:18). However, in (Mark 5:22) his name is Jairus, and he is a ruler of the synagogue (ἀρχισυναγωγῶν, ὀνόματι Ἰαῖρος), and (Luke 8:41) says: *Jairus came, and he was an official of the synagogue* (ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰαῖρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν). This far, Mark and Luke have agreed on the plot, but not verbatim. Next, all three agree that the man fell down in front of Jesus (Matt 9:18 // Mark 5:22 // Luke 8:41), however not verbatim. Then in (Mark 5:23a), Jairus *pleaded with Him earnestly*, something absent from Matthew and Luke, followed by an interesting connection between Matthew and Mark. (Matt 9:18g-h) says: *My daughter has just died;*

<sup>175</sup> Poirier, 'The Roll,' 8. Poirier refers to Downing, 1988 and 1992 for his claim.

<sup>176</sup> For a full version of the synopsis of this passage, see appendix 11, pp. 100.

*but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will become alive again.* (Mark 5:23c-d) agree in the plot with (Matt 9:18g-h) but not in exact wording by saying: *My little daughter is at the point of death; please come and lay Your hands on her, so that she will get well and live.* That part of the pericope is missing in Luke, but he instead has this saying: *and [he] began urging Him to come to his house; for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, and she was dying* (Luke 8:41f-42a). In Matt 9:19a, Jesus follows Jairus, as in Mark 5:24a, whereas Luke does not provide such information. In (Mark 5:24a) and (Luke 8:42a), the crowds press against Jesus, which is absent from Matthew. (Mark 5:25b) agree with (Luke 8:43b) verbatim where it says *A woman who had had a hemorrhage* (γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος),<sup>177</sup> but (Mark 5:25c) *for twelve years* (δώδεκα ἔτη) agree with (Matt 9:20d) and not with Luke. In the next section of the verse, (Luke 8:43d) is of unsure legitimacy,<sup>178</sup> but if we ought to include it, it resembles (Mark 5:26), which declares that she had suffered for a long time. Matthew does not have that information. (Mark 5:27a-d) has the same content as both (Matt 9:20e-h) and (Luke 8:44a-d), and says that she *came up behind Him and touched the fringe of His cloak.* However, (Mark 5:28a-d) has no correspondence with Luke but are very close to (Matt 9:21a-d) *for she was saying to herself, 'If I only touch His cloak, I will get well....'* (Luke 8:44e-8:47e) has a correspondence in (Mark 5:29a-5:33e), even though Mark has a longer telling than Luke does. On the same verse Matthew does not share any of the content. Then follow a passage (Matt 9:22 // Luke 8:48 // Mark 5:34), where all three agree in the general plot but not in exact wording. Furthermore, in the next section, only (Mark 5:35-37) and (Luke 8:49-51) are close to one another without any resemblance in Matthew. However, (Mark 5:38a-g) has much in common with (Matt 9:23a-h) where Jesus entered Jairus' house, something Luke does not tell. However, all three accounts agree that it was much crying for the dead girl (Matt 9:23i // Luke 8:52a // Mark 5:38h). The following sequence of the story is also shared between all three accounts when Jesus wonders why they are weeping, but they laughed at him (Matt 9:24 // Luke 8:52b-8:53b // Mark 5:39a-40a). Only in (Matt 9:25a) and (Mark 5:40b) are the people cast out from the house, and in the following sequence, all three accounts share much of the same information, but only Mark and Luke agree that Jesus spoke to the girl (Matt 9:25b-e // Mark 5:41a-42a // Luke 8:55b). At the ending of the pericope (Mark 5:42b-43) share much of the content with (Luke 8:55c-56), where Jesus forbids the parents to spread the news, information absent from Matthew. However, in (Matt 9:26) are we provided with the information that the news spread all over the land.

---

<sup>177</sup> the translation is unfortunately different between the two accounts in NASB 2020, even if the Greek is the same in both accounts.

<sup>178</sup> The NA<sup>28</sup> put the phrase [ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον] within brackets but still presents it in the text. The NASB2020 has not included this part of the verse.

From the above analysis of the pericope, we see that Mark is the middle term and that either Matthew or Luke have used Mark as their source, or that Mark used Matthew and/or Luke. In the 2DH, both Matthew and Luke must have made the changes of Mark independently, both the positive ones where they add things to Mark, which is more abundant in Luke than Matthew, in this pericope, due to the shortness of Matthew's account; but also in the negative agreements where they omit the same things. At some points, they will agree on omitting the same material, which causes negative minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. These are from the Markan account (5:26-27a, 5:29b, 5:30a, 5:34, 5:41d), and 5:42b.<sup>179</sup> Stein admits that those omissions against Mark seem to be impressive at first glance, but then he argues from length that Matthew and Luke must omit the same things due to their relative shortness to Mark.<sup>180</sup> Mark has only 138 words and Luke 280 compared to Mark's 374. However, Stein presupposes Markan priority when he argues from length and explains why it is not a problem that Matthew and Luke omitted so much from Luke. He claims that "It would for all practical purposes be impossible for Matthew and Luke not to agree at times in their omissions against Mark."<sup>181</sup> Stein argues as if Matthew and Luke were allocated a certain amount of words before writing, and thus, as a natural law, must have omitted the same things at times. There is, however, nothing that says that Matthew had to be so much shorter than Mark and that Luke would miss out 96 words. Therefore, if they both used Mark as a source, we must wonder why they omitted so much material as they did. According to Sanders and Davies, it is impossible to derive all the agreements against Mark to chance since there are over one thousand of them if both the negative and the positive ones are considered.<sup>182</sup> The risk of circular arguments is evident if one presupposes a specific hypothesis and claims redactional traits of each author that the hypothesis demands before analyzing the problem. For Matthew, such a trait would be the shortness of his accounts due to his uninterest in retelling long stories, and therefore, he has shortened his source(s). However, assuming a Markan priority position and then to argue, as Stein does, that it is necessary that Matthew and Luke must omit the same things at times leads to a circular argument where the assumption which is the foundation of the argument at the same time is the very proof of the very same argument.

In the above pericope, not only the argument of Matthew's and Luke's omissions against Mark are indications of Mark's use of both the accounts. An even stronger argument lurks in the texts where Mark at times only agrees with Matthew. Those instances are: Mark 5:23d / Matt 9:18h;

---

<sup>179</sup> Stein, 128.

<sup>180</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>182</sup> Sanders and Davies, 73.

Mark 5:24a // Matt 9:19a-b; Mark 5:28a-d // Matt 9:21a-d; Mark 5:38a-g // Matt 9:23a-h.<sup>183</sup> But then he suddenly only agrees with Luke for some length. The Mark and Luke agreements are the following: Mark 5:21 // Luke 8:40; Mark 5:24b // Luke 8:42b; Mark 5:26 // [Luke 8:43d]; Mark 5:29a // Luke 8:44e; Mark 5:33b-e // Luke 8:47a-e; Mark 5:35a-37c // Luke 8:49a-51d; Mark 8:42c-43 // Luke 8:55c-56.<sup>184</sup> On the 2DH, it is hard to see how a combination of Matthew's and Luke's common omission against Mark in combination with the agreements of Mark and Matthew against Luke and the agreements of Mark and Luke against Matthew does not pose a great problem in this pericope. For how can it be that where Matthew suddenly begins to follow Mark, Luke stops, and when Matthew ends following Mark, Luke begins, except in the case where Matthew and Luke agree on one another, either in omissions against Mark or in following Mark. However, most of the pericope consists of parts where either Luke or Matthew follow Mark, and the other do not.

For the FGGH or the MCH, the problem is at parts the same as for the 2DH, but still, some difference exists. On both hypotheses the first of the Gospels that used Mark, either Matthew in the FGGH or Luke in the MCH, omitted certain parts of the Markan pericope. Then in the second step of the composition of the Synoptics, the last evangelist, either Luke or Matthew, omitted parts from Mark, which either Matthew or Luke at first had included. On the FGGH, Matthew used Mark and omitted some 142 words from his account. When Luke used Mark and Matthew, he retold much of the pericope that Matthew *did not* include but excluded many parts Matthew included. In MCH, Matthew used Mark and Luke and included much of the pericope that Luke *did not* include from Mark, while he excluded parts Luke overtook. Such behavior seems strange because why would any Gospel writer want to omit those parts within the very pericopes that are attested and easily accessed in two of the accounts he used? Such an unpicking seems very strange for both the FGGH and the MCH.

The 2GH on the other hand, explains those features with the conflation practices of Mark. Having two of the accounts in front of him, he conflated the sources into one account, including both material from Matthew and Luke, and no complicated practices of excluding particular Gospel material must be accounted for. On the other hand, Mark must have *included* extra material where the Markan priority view(s) claim Matthew and Luke made omission. This can be explained by creative habits where he included parts to fill in some gaps, which made his account more lively.

However, there is a wearisome problem obscuring the view of Markan posteriority; we have no proof of any writer in antiquity conflating two sources in the micro-level, and such a practice was

---

<sup>183</sup> See appendix 12, pp. 109, and appendix 13, pp. 117.

<sup>184</sup> See appendix 12, and 13.

practically impossible using the scroll as the primary medium. Derrenbacher criticizes the micro-conflation practices the 2GH implores. He claims that it is even hard enough to work as Josephus did, shifting from one block in one source to a block in another source when using scrolls, but it is absolutely out of the question that micro-conflation could be done since the thought would easily be lost handling two scrolls. It is according to Derrenbacher virtually impossible to handle scrolls in such a way.<sup>185</sup>

#### 4.1.5. Wax tablets

The zig-zagging back and forth within each pericope Mark copied if he was the last one to write is very difficult to explain. Because even handling one scroll was challenging, and two were even trickier, as Derrenbacher explains.<sup>186</sup> The difficulty handling the scrolls then made it unthinkable that Mark would have used two scrolls simultaneously as he wrote a new scroll on his knee, but can he have achieved it without making use of the scroll? Is it possible that he used another technique than copying directly from a scroll, like using a notebook or a wax tablet? This we will now investigate.

Downing explains that the amount of text in one column in a scroll usually never exceeds five hundred characters,<sup>187</sup> which means that an average pericope in Matthew or Luke in the triple tradition can be placed within one to three columns.<sup>188</sup> The limitation of the triple tradition in length in comparison to the double tradition material, which at times build up to nineteen columns (Matthew's Sermon on the Mount), makes it much easier to overview.<sup>189</sup> Moreover, the shorter length of the triple tradition pericopes had the advantage of being transferred to one (or several) wax tablet(s) with more ease than the double tradition could.

Goulder suggested that Luke used Matthew and Mark in the forms of scrolls, and worked backwards through Matthew,<sup>190</sup> and Downing criticized that it would have been much too challenging to maneuver.<sup>191</sup> However, Poirier criticizes Downing and adds to Goulder's hypothesis that Luke first transcribed the scrolls into wax tablets that he rearranged into the order he wished. He maintains that this procedure was also valid for the other evangelists'.<sup>192</sup> He finds that the

---

<sup>185</sup> Derrenbacher, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 161-162.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>187</sup> Gerald F. Downing, 'A Paradigm Perplex' 20.

<sup>188</sup> See p 56 below.

<sup>189</sup> Downing, 'A Paradigm Perplex,' 20.

<sup>190</sup> Goulder, 571-664.

<sup>191</sup> Downing, 'A Paradigm Perplex,' 35.

<sup>192</sup> Poirier, 'The Roll,' 21.

arguments until now of the procedures of antique book production "have turned too often on a set of unrealistic and factually groundless claims,"<sup>193</sup> and thus criticizes Downing and Derrenbacker since they have not investigated the possibility that the Gospel writers used wax tablets. In Poirier's view, the wax tablets were an essential intermediate step for the authors of the Gospels since the tablets allowed them to write with the possibility to erase if needed. Furthermore, in his view, they had control over the writing process and could be very flexible.<sup>194</sup> In Poirier's view,<sup>195</sup>

[t]his would have allowed them to refine their structure, phrasing and word choice with nearly as much ease as writers in the twenty-first century enjoy. Only after a complete set of tables had been filled up would the new Gospel be 'published' by being transferred onto a roll or codex

Poirier explores several extra-Biblical ancient authors who frequently used wax tablets to improve their writings. He states that Pliny the Younger wrote that his uncle<sup>196</sup>

Horace wrote that if one frequently inverted the stylus (viz. used it as an eraser), then one's writing would be more worthwhile to read (*Sat.* 1.10.72-73). As Gamble (1995: 268, 69 n 36) observes, such a statement can really only refer to the writing of literary drafts.

For Poirier, the evidence is that *all* authors of essential works during antiquity used the wax tablets prior to the final composition of their works.<sup>197</sup> Poirier reasons that an entire Gospel might have been too long to write on wax tablets since it would require almost 180 of them, so Luke might have been forced to write in portions of one third, á 60 tablets each time, and then transferred it to his scroll before erasing the tablets and restart the process with the second and third part.<sup>198</sup>

Both Downing and Derrenbacker responded to Poirier's critique and argued that Poirier's argumentation of wax tablets is too imaginative. However, Derrenbacker finds Poirier's discussion helpful and commends him to have spotlighted an ancient practice in order to give a more realistic account of ancient book production many times forgotten in modern scholarship.<sup>199</sup> He also reminds Poirier that Derrenbacker did not forget to consider the wax tablet in his disputation because he had a lengthy discussion where he pointed out Sato's discussion about Q in booklets which much

---

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>199</sup> Robert A. Derrenbacker "Texts, Tables and Tablets: A Responce to John C. Poirier." in *JSNT* 35 (2013) 380-387, (385).



resembles the use of the wax tablets.<sup>200</sup> When inferring the use of the wax tablets, Derrenbacker does not insinuate that wax tablets could not be used to conflate sources, but he claims that Poirier should slightly rework his thesis.<sup>201</sup> He does not find that *all* ancient authors worked with wax tablets as a medium but assert that they used another medium for notes.<sup>202</sup> In the big picture, therefore, Poirier and Derrenbacker agree.

Downing assumes that a wax tablet had approximately the same space for characters like a column in an ordinary scroll, approximately five hundred characters.<sup>203</sup> Thus Luke would require many wax tablets, and Downing wonders what proof Poirier has for other ancient writers to have conflated two sources in such a way.<sup>204</sup> However, Downing does not criticize the very use of wax tablets nor the support for micro-conflation or disproof thereof that Poirier provides. What he does criticize is the very practice of "Luke [who] *is* on the lookout for verbatim agreements in his sources — albeit, to omit."<sup>205</sup>

Inferring the use of the wax tablets to the triple tradition within the 2GH is therefore not as far-fetched as one may think. The tablet size of approximately five hundred characters (if Downing assumes the size correctly) would require three wax tablets each for the largest pericopes in Matthew and Luke. Matthew's longest pericope is 1.435 characters long (Matt 15:1-20) *Teachings on defilement*; Lukes most extended version is *the healing of Jairus' daughter and the woman with hemorrhage* (Luke 8:40-56) with 1.404 characters. Conflating the two sources into one single account to see where they agree or disagree would conceivably require one or two more wax tablets for each Gospel to account for the space between sentences. For Mark, the finished length of his longest pericope would be four wax tablets since the longest of his accounts in the triple tradition is 1.845 characters long (Mark 5:21-43) *The healing of Jairus daughter and the woman with hemorrhage*. In total, Mark would need twelve wax tablets which are not implausible because Derrenbacker quotes Millard who states that "Plato's secretary — Philip of Opus — copied the entirety of Plato's work *The Laws* from wax tablets onto papyrus, a work that contained some 400 pages in a modern published edition."<sup>206</sup> Therefore, the procedure would arguably be to write the account of Matthew on wax tablets and put it on one side and to write the account of Luke on wax tablets and put them on the other side. In doing so, a comparison between the two accounts could be

---

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., 384.

<sup>201</sup> Ibid.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 385.

<sup>203</sup> Downing, 'A Paradigm Perplex,' 20.

<sup>204</sup> Downing, 'Waxing Careless,' 391.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., 392.

<sup>206</sup> Derrenbacker, 'Texts,' 384. Derrenbacker quotes Millard 2000: 28.

made, and in the next step, he would synchronize the two accounts adding spaces in Matthew's account where Luke has material absent from Matthew, and adding spaces in Luke's accounts where Matthew has material absent from Luke. Doing this, the result would be a synopsis of two Gospels that Mark could expand by adding clarifying particles or sentences.<sup>207</sup> Mark could, from the accounts of Matthew and Luke, have made the most of his pericope by combining his two sources. He only added a few sentences to clarify that the woman was in the midst of the crowd pressing on towards Jesus and a few other things. Such a procedure is far more likely than Matthew and Luke using Mark and by chance omitting what the other included or unpicking what the other had chosen to include from Mark's account.

#### 4.1.6. *The double tradition in contrast to the triple tradition*

If Mark used wax tablets in the triple tradition pericopes, why did he not do the same with the double tradition material? We can only answer the question by looking at the two distinct traditions. The double tradition is lengthy, some 220 verses of which Matthew has mainly collected the material in his five speeches while Luke has spread it out over large parts of his Gospel. If, therefore, Mark would reproduce the double tradition, he had not too many difficulties finding the material in Matthew, but it would have been much more troubling finding them in Luke. First, it is the length of the double tradition that is problematic. The Sermon on the Mount is some 9000 characters long, and with five hundred characters in each column, eighteen columns are required for the Sermon to fit. Since the wax tablet probably had the same size as a standard column, eighteen wax tablets would also have been required to write it all down.<sup>208</sup> Then comes the problem of finding the corresponding material in Luke, which is hard enough with a printed Bible in book format and with the aid of a good Bible program on the computer. The task is not as simple as looking up the Sermon on the Mount in a synopsis and seeing the material fixed already. Unfortunately, we tend to read the Gospels anachronistically and put modern possibilities on writing in the hands of the ancient authors.<sup>209</sup> The problem with the lengthy discourses in the double tradition is that it is so difficult to track in Luke if Matthew is the lead Gospel, and the opposite is also the case. Therefore, it would be easier for Mark to dismiss the double tradition if he wrote last. The longest pericope in both Matthew and Luke, as stated above, can fit in three columns, and all the words of the pericope are contained within a limited space, making it relatively easy for Mark to

---

<sup>207</sup> See appendix 12, pp. 109, and 13, pp. 117.

<sup>208</sup> See pp. 58 above.

<sup>209</sup> Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 19.

overview the words of a single pericope. It is made even easier since the order of events in almost every pericope within the triple tradition is similar between Matthew and Luke, even if one of them omitted what the other included. Therefore the single pericopes of Matthew and Luke are relatively easy to overview and remake into a fuller account. The double tradition is not short, nor are the words well contained in Luke's account, making an overview of the double tradition tremendously problematic for Mark if he wrote last. In addition, Luke's account of the double tradition flips back and forth in comparison to Matthew, making it a very cumbersome task to overview. Therefore the praxis of relatively short pericopes in the triple tradition transferred onto wax tablets is not the same as the praxis of capturing the entire double tradition on tablets. We, therefore, can assume that the difficulties capturing the double tradition were so demanding that Mark skipped it out altogether, and if we assume that he wanted to incorporate into his Gospel what he could attest from two of his sources such a procedure is logical.

The problem for the 2GH is that the pericopes that Mark shares with only one of the other evangelists obscure the argument that Mark only wanted to refer to material attested in both of his sources. There are some pericopes that Matthew and Mark share that Luke does not have, and Luke and Mark share some pericopes that Matthew does not have in his Gospel. Therefore the 2GH must assume that Mark could incorporate material that was not double attested in his sources. However, the same kind of problems will occur on whatever hypothesis. On the 2DH, the problem is that Luke did not incorporate the material Matthew and Mark shared and arguably because of theological reasons. However, it is hard to say anything of the theological motives that drove Luke to dismiss the pericopes Matthew incorporated from Mark. The same kind of problem will also arise with the FGGH and MCH because if either Matthew or Luke had both Mark and the other evangelist in front of them, why would they dismiss certain pericopes that were double attested. So in every hypothesis, those pericopes that Mark only shares with one of the other Synoptics is problematic.

## 4.2. Mark-Q overlaps

Some pericopes suffer in the 2DH from coherence in agreement in Matthew and Luke against Mark in a major way. Such agreements are referred to as a Mark-Q overlap where Mark and Q tell the same part of a story, but Q has an extended version.<sup>210</sup> According to Goodacre, those passages are triple tradition material where Mark is not the middle term because Matthew and Luke agree

---

<sup>210</sup> Burkett, 7.

substantially against Mark. He explains that those passages are not many because most of the triple tradition material has Mark as the middle term.<sup>211</sup> Sanders and Davies reason that there seems to be relatively many instances where Mark overlaps with Q. They also display that Matthew and Luke must have followed the Q-source in the Mark-Q overlap passages rather than Mark.<sup>212</sup> Furthermore, they invoke four additional passages other than Streeter's five<sup>213</sup> where Mark and Q seem to have overlapped: "(Mark 4:21-25 (5 sayings); Mark 9:42-50 (sayings collection); Mark 12:28-34 (The Great Commandment); Mark 12:38-40 (Denunciation of the Pharisees))."<sup>214</sup> If therefore, the Mark-Q overlaps expand into further pericopes where the minor agreements are severe, the Q-source will more and more resemble the Gospel of Matthew according to Sanders and Davies,<sup>215</sup> indicating that the Matthew priority hypotheses are valid explanations to the Synoptic problem.<sup>216</sup> Therefore the Mark-Q overlaps are significant obstacles to the 2DH. In extension, the Mark-Q overlaps keep growing, according to Sanders and Davies, since much of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark are referred to as those overlaps, both major and minor.<sup>217</sup> They conclude that there are some verbatim agreements between the Q-source and Mark in the temptations of Jesus (Matt 4:1-13 // Mark 1:12-13 // Luke 4:1-11).<sup>218</sup> They discern this because they do not deem it likely that Matthew and Luke used Mark as their source for the first two verses and then shifted to Q. Instead, they believe that they used Q all the time, wherefore Mark and Q have a verbatim overlap.<sup>219</sup>

Goodacre finds a more probable solution to the problem, which excludes the Q-source; Matthew overtook the text from Mark and extended it while Luke liked Matthew's telling better and kept it, thus creating an agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. Therefore, he has a more reasonable explanation than the 2DH does in the Mark-Q overlap pericopes.

Peabody representing the 2GH finds another solution; Mark used Matthew and Luke and disliked the "irreconcilable difference in the order of temptations."<sup>220</sup> In addition, according to Peabody, Mark disliked the discourse of Jesus and Satan, which was yet another reason for Mark to omit the

---

<sup>211</sup> Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem*, 52.

<sup>212</sup> Sanders and Davies, 79.

<sup>213</sup> Streeter, 186. Streeters five examples of Mark Q overlaps are: "*John the Baptist's Preaching* (Matt 3:1-12 // Mark 1:1-8 // Luke 3:1-18), *the Baptism and Temptation* (Matt 3:13-4:11 // Mark 1:9-13 // Luke 3:21-4:13), *the Beelzebub Controversy*, (Matt 12:25-32 // Mark 3:23-30 // Luke 11:17-23, 12:10) *the parables of the Mustard Seed and the leaven* (Matt 13:31-35 // Mark 4:30-32 // Luke 13:19-21), and the *Mission Charge* (Matt 10:5-15 // Mark 6:6b-13 // Luke 10:1-12)."

<sup>214</sup> Sanders and Davies, 79.

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, 80

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*, 80.

<sup>218</sup> See appendix 14, pp. 126.

<sup>219</sup> Sanders and Davies, 80.

<sup>220</sup> Peabody, 78.

lengthy parts of the pericope in his Gospel. There is, however, a problem with Peabody's reasoning in that the temptations are not that different; Luke has only shifted place on the last two temptations compared to Matthew. Another reason Peabody's reasoning is not adequate is because we can not know what Mark thought about the discourses in the temptation and why he omitted them if he wrote last.

This paper argues that Mark had both the account of Matthew and Luke before him and kept the two first verses and omitted the rest, for whatever reason. However, as Fitzmeyer claimed,<sup>221</sup> the 2GH has problems explaining why Mark did not include the temptations when they many times are verbatim and also have the same order. Therefore Goodacre, in this case, seems to have the best and most consequent explanation for the relationship between the Synoptics.

### 4.3. Summary

Stein's principal objection to the Markan posteriority view is due to the omissions in Mark of essential parts of Matthew and Luke. Why would any author omit the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, the birth of Jesus and John the Baptist, and the resurrection material if he had the accounts in front of him, he wonders. In addition, the behavior of Mark, if last is peculiar at best, he states, because Mark would never omit extensive and essential material in his sources while at the same time attentively blending the stories about Jesus from two Gospels, making them longer.

The 2GH response in light of ancient compositional practices is that this behavior of Mark is due to two different kinds of materials. The double tradition is lengthy and hard to find in Luke's account, and manoeuvring scrolls back and forth were cumbersome, and therefore Mark had hard times affirming the double tradition material and bypassed it. On the other hand, Mark could easily overview the pericopes within the triple tradition, since both in Matthew and Luke every such pericope is contained within three columns of a standard scroll or less. At the same time they follow the same order within the pericopes, which is not the case with the material in the double tradition. Therefore, it is plausible that Mark omitted the double tradition while he at the same time expanded the triple tradition. The 2DH has in the triple tradition problems with Matthew and Luke omitting by chance what the other evangelist saved from Mark, and the FGGH and MCH suffer from the implausibility that Mark or Luke searched for double attested material in their sources only to exclude the parts of Mark that the other evangelist used. Therefore Mark's use of Matthew and Luke in the 2GH does not seem to be all too unimaginable in light of ancient compositional

---

<sup>221</sup> See pp. 28 above.

practices. The obstacle for 2GH is the material Mark only shares with either Matthew or Luke. However the other hypotheses suffers from the same problem.

## 5. Conclusion

The second chapter covered many of Stein's arguments in favor of Markan priority and against Markan posteriority. However, we saw that most of the arguments were reversible and that the Markan posteriority view could not be ruled out. The obstacle, though, for Markan posteriority is that micro-conflation, as required in most arguments, has not been redeemed as possible, and therefore the best explanation for Mark as the middle term is the Markan priority view according to Sanders and Davies.<sup>222</sup> Furthermore, Stein argued that it is exceedingly difficult to understand why Mark in many of the pericopes carefully integrated two accounts into a new one, when he simultaneously omitted so much of important content, such as the Sermon on the Mount and other double tradition material.<sup>223</sup>

In the third chapter, we investigated Mark Goodacre's perhaps strongest arguments for Markan priority, the editorial fatigue of Matthew and Luke when using Mark. However, his arguments seem only to work if Markan priority is assumed because if Mark used both Matthew and Luke, many of his arguments do not apply since Mark then could have conflated two accounts, as we saw proof of. Nevertheless, as for chapter three, the main obstacle for Mark having used Matthew and Luke is the micro-conflation, which is never attested in any ancient author of the similar size as the Gospels. Therefore, according to Ian Mills, editorial fatigue is the most substantial proof for Markan priority.<sup>224</sup>

In the fourth chapter, we investigated how Mark might have conflated Matthew and Luke into a new account, and with the Sermon on the Mount as a test case, we saw that there were reasons for Mark not to include the double tradition into his Gospel if he wrote last. The reason is that it is all too challenging to maneuver the double tradition material in Luke's account and to compare it with Matthew's. This is due to the lengthy non contained material in Luke, which, is smeared out over many chapters, making it extremely difficult to overview. Sometimes he has the same information as Matthew, but in a different location, sometimes he goes backward compared to Matthew, and sometimes he combines things from two of Matthew's speeches into a single entity. The material is hard enough to maneuver with the help of printed Bibles and a good Bible program on the computer. It would be almost unattainable to maneuver and find the double tradition material in two scrolls without verse numbers, punctuation, or spaces between words, as Derrenbacker shows.<sup>225</sup>

---

<sup>222</sup> Sanders and Davies, 117.

<sup>223</sup> Stein, 62.

<sup>224</sup> See footnote 45 on pp. 12.

<sup>225</sup> Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 161-62.

As for the individual pericopes in Matthew and Luke, we found that the largest ones are at a maximum three columns long, and all the words are contained within this space in both Matthew and Luke, making it fairly easy to overview and utilize. The utilization of the individual pericopes would be even more uncomplicated since the wording within pericopes of both Matthew and Luke in the triple tradition mainly follow the same order. Mark, if last, could follow the single line contained in both Matthew and Luke within each pericope and then add the special Matthean and Lukan expressions, thus making a new fresh, and extending pericope. At times, he could also insert some clarifications needed so the two accounts could be conflated effectively and understandably.

Therefore the 2GH is more understandable than if Mark would have avoided the double tradition material due to theological inconsistencies. It is, therefore, a feasible hypothesis, and E.P Sanders and Margeret Davies might here find the answer they are looking for when they write:

The Griesbach hypothesis [...] is technically possible. It suffers from the inability to explain Mark. It may be that here we face only a failure of imagination: why would anyone carefully conflate parts of Matthew and Luke, while omitting so much from both? Nevertheless, scholarship cannot accept a theory of literary relationship which it cannot comprehend. Moreover, what is known of ancient authors who conflated indicates that they did so by incorporating their sources in blocks, rather than by switching back and fourth phrase to phrase.<sup>226</sup>

The conflation explanation above ought to satisfy Sanders and Davies' failing imagination. This explanation is twofold and includes first Mark's treatment of the pericopes of the triple tradition where Mark's behavior, if last, not only is explainable but even defensible if we include the use of micro-conflation. Even if no other ancient author made such micro-conflations on such large entities of texts prior to the Synoptics, we must conclude that there is some micro-conflation on whatever hypothesis we chose to investigate. On the 2DH, we find the micro-conflation in the Mark-Q overlaps, which are frequently referred to by the proponents of that hypothesis, to explain specific material. If FGGH or MCH is correct, there is no Q, or at least Q is not that large as the 2DH proposes, and Matthew and Luke have, in such cases, made use of both Mark and the other source and conflated them, but many times in reverse, by omitting what the other included from Mark's account, something that seems peculiar. Therefore, on each hypothesis proclaiming Markan priority, we must assume some kind of micro-conflation even if it is contained to smaller entities of text than is required for the Markan posteriority view to function. If we then assume that Mark used

---

<sup>226</sup> Sanders and Davies, 117.



wax tablets for each of the pericopes Matthew and Luke share, there are some very contained material in each pericope accessible to overview, and therefore, it is feasible to micro-conflate two sources in the pericopes.

However, the problem for the 2GH is the material that Mark shares only with one of the other Synoptics because that implies that he very well could incorporate material that was not double attested in his sources. Nevertheless, all the hypotheses suffer from this weakness. It is hard for the 2DH to explain why Luke did not incorporate the material Matthew overtook from Mark and why Matthew dismissed what Luke incorporated. Perhaps the behavior of Matthew and Luke in those instances could be inferred by chance. On the FGGH, the question must be answered why Matthew did not incorporate those pericopes that Luke did, and on the MCH, we must know why Matthew omitted this double attested material. Therefore the 2GH is as strong as the other hypotheses in this argument.

The questions asked in the beginning of this paper are therefore answered.

1. In what way can the standard arguments in favor of Markan priority and critique against the Griesbach hypothesis be used as a defence for the Markan posteriority view?

Most of the pericopes Stein provides as a critique against the Markan posteriority view are reversible, and are only indications of how interpreting the data and not proof for the 2DH. The perhaps weightiest argument favoring the 2GH is the micro-conflation indicated under the heading of redundancies, where Mark has material found in both Matthew and Luke, one-half each. It is more probable that Mark overtook them from Matthew and Luke than Matthew and Luke, by chance or by deliberate unpicking chose one half each.

2. How can the arguments in favor of fatigue in the Synoptics be countered in the 2GH in light of ancient compositional book production practices?

The fatigue in the Synoptics is substantial evidence, according to Goodacre, for the priority of Mark, but many of his arguments are weak, only building on a single word omitted in one source compared to Mark. Such words not in Matthew or Luke might as well be explained by Mark adding instead of Matthew and/or Luke omitting or slipping back into the Markan storyline. A fundamental problem for the FGGH and MCH in the pericopes provided by Goodacre is the blending in Mark of

material from both Matthew and Luke. Therefore Luke or Matthew on those hypotheses must not have included what the other had already overtaken from Mark, thus creating a new account different from both Mark and Matthew/Luke. It is, therefore, easier to see why Mark would have conflated Matthew and Luke into one single account than to see why Luke or Matthew behaved so obscure. The 2DH suffers from a similar problem, but it is induced by chance where either Matthew or Luke omitted what Mark included.

3. With the Sermon on the Mount and Luke's corresponding material as a test case, how can it be explained that Mark omitted the double tradition if he wrote last, due to the complicated procedure of writing books in antiquity?

A fundamental critique of both Stein and Goodacre against the 2GH is the very peculiar behavior that Mark omitted so much of essential material from both Matthew and Luke if he wrote last. Goodacre believes Mark on the 2GH had problems with the theology of Matthew and Luke and therefore omitted the material, but he finds that improbable. On the other hand, Stein cannot see why Mark would omit 220 verses of double tradition material while at the same time expanding the material from Matthew and Luke within the triple tradition.

However, it had probably nothing to do with either theology or a peculiar behavior in Mark that he, if last, omitted the double tradition. Due to the difficulty of overview the double tradition in Luke compared to Matthew, Mark had troubles attesting the material and therefore omitted it. To affirm the material found in Matthew and Luke, he would have been forced to scroll through Luke back and forth at least 27 times to collect the Sermon on the Mount, which is far more cumbersome than comparing the Gospels in a Synopsis. Therefore, due to the complicated process of overviewing the material in Matthew and Luke, he omitted the double tradition.

4. In what way can a close analysis of the pericope of Jairus' daughter in (Matt 9:18-26 // Mark 5:21-43 // Luke 8:40-8:56) as a test case explain how Mark enlarged and micro-conflated pericopes if he used both Matthew's and Luke's scrolls, when ancient practices of writing are taken into consideration?

Using the pericope of Jairus' daughter as a test case, we saw that Matthew and Luke on the 2DH, by chance, omitted much of the material the other included from Mark. Their behavior was intended on the FGGH and MCH, which makes those hypotheses peculiar. Mark's version of the pericope has so

much of uniquely Matthean and Lukan material included that it is hard to see how either chance or intended reasons can explain the differences in the three Synoptics. The 2GH, on the other hand, can explain those features by Mark's micro-conflation of his sources. This would be doable because he could use the wax tablets to rewrite his sources into a new account, which arguably was possible due to the limited length of the pericopes and Matthew's and Luke's agreement of order within those pericopes.

## 5.1. Further Investigations

This paper suffers from only arguing from one half of the Synoptic problem, Mark as the middle term. If Matthew and Luke did not depend on Mark, we must explain how Matthew and Luke are similar and yet different. I do not believe that Matthew and Luke depend on one another but rather that they depend on other sources than Mark and Q. Conceivably, a source worked through by the followers of Jesus in Jerusalem (Acts 6:4). That source would probably have shared the core of the material in Matthew and Luke and thereby also Mark. I believe the oral traditions behind the Gospels that Gerhardsson, Byrskog, Dunn, and Reisner have investigated profoundly impacted the Gospel tradition. The works of David Flüsser and the Jerusalem school are also of great interest in exploring how Matthew and Luke came into being. I hope to investigate the source(s) behind Matthew and Luke in a future inquiry.

# Bibliography

- Burkett, Delbert., *Rethinking the Gospel Sources; From Proto-Mark to Mark*. New York, London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Derrenbacker, R.A., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*, Leuven: University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Texts, Tables and Tablets: A Responce to John C. Poirier*, in *JSNT* 35, vol 4 (2013) 380-87.
- Downing, Gerald F., *A Paradigm Perplex: Luke, Matthew, and Mark*, in *NTS* 38, (1992) 15-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Waxing Careless: Poirier, Derrenbacker and Downing*. in *JSNT* 35, vol 4 (2013) 388–93.
- Dungan, D.L., *Mark — The Abridgement of Matthew and Luke*, in D.G. Buttrick (ed.), *Jesus and Man's Hope*, vol I , Pittsburg PA, Pittsburg Theological Seminary, 1970, pp. 51-97.
- Farmer, W Reuben., *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Farrer A.M., *On Dispensing with Q*, in D.E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H Lightfoot*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955, pp. 55-88.
- Garrow, Alan., *Streeter's other Synoptic Solution: The Matthew Conflator Hypothesis*, in *NTS* 62, (2016) 207-226.
- Griesbach, J.J., *Synoptic and Critical Studies 1776 - 1976: Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* in *Synoptic and Text Critical Studies 1776 - 1976* (ed.), Orchard Bernard and Longstaff R.W Thomas, London, and New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Goodacre, Mark., *Fatigue in the Synoptics*, in *NTS* 44 (1998) 45-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Synoptic Problem; A Way through the Maze*, London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Goulder Michael D., *Luke a New Paradigm*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Kloppenborg, John S., *Conceptual Stakes in the Synoptic Problem*, in Heiki Omerzu and Mogens Müller (ed.), *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-hypothesis*, London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2018, pp. 13-42.
- Larsen, Matthew D.C., *Gospels before the book*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Mills, Ian. "[The Synoptic Problem — Ian Mills (Duke University)]" Youtube video, 1:06:42, Posted by New Testament Review Podcast [03-02-19], <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k8z0rgxGNxM>.

- Nestle, Eberhard, Erwin Aland, Nestle, Erwin, Aland, Barbara, Aland, Kurt, and Universität Münster. Institut Für Neutestamentliche Textforschung. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28. Rev. Aufl., Herausgegeben Vom Insitut Für Neutestamentliche Textforschung. ed. 2012.
- Neville, J David. *Arguments from Order in Synoptic Criticism: A History and Critique*, Macon; Mercer University Press, 1993.
- New American Standard Bible: New Testament*. California: Foundation Press, Publisher for the Lockman Foundation, 2020.
- Peabody, D.B. (ed.), *One Gospel from two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*, Harrisburg: Trinity International, 2002.
- Poirier, John C., *The Roll, the Codex, the Wax Tablet and the Synoptic Problem*, in *JSNT* 35 no. 1 (September 2012) 3–30.
- Porter, E. Stanley and Dyar, R. Bryan., *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction to its Key Terms, Concepts, Figures and Hypotheses, in the Synoptic Problem*, in Porter, E. Stanley and Dyar, R. Brian (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016, pp. 1-26.
- Sanders, E.P and Davies, Margaret., *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, London and Philadelphia: SMC Press, 1996.
- Sanders, E.P. *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Stein, H Robert. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (2ed), Grand Rapids, Mi: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, The Manuscript Tradition, sources, Authorship, & Dates*, England: Macmillan and co., limited, 1924.
- C.M Tuckett. *The Rivival of the Griesbach Hypothesis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Wenham, David. *source criticism* in (ed.), I. Howard Marshall, *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (ed.), Carlisle: The Paternoster Press, 1979, pp. 139 - 52.

## 7. Appendix

### 7.1. Appendix 1: Disciples marvel when Jesus stills winds and sea

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
8:26a	<sup>26</sup> καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς·	4:40a <sup>40</sup> καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·	8:25a <sup>25</sup> εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς·
8:26b	τί δειλοί ἐστε,	4:40b τί δειλοί ἐστε;	
8:26c	ὀλιγόπιστοι;	4:40c οὐπὼ ἔχετε πίστιν;	8:25b ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;
8:27a	<sup>27</sup> οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι		
		4:41a <sup>41</sup> καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν	8:25c φοβηθέντες
8:27b	ἐθαύμασαν		8:25d δὲ ἐθαύμασαν
8:27c	λέγοντες·	4:41b καὶ ἔλεγον	8:25e λέγοντες
		4:41c πρὸς ἀλλήλους·	8:25f πρὸς ἀλλήλους·
8:27d	ποταπός	4:41d τίς ἄρα	8:25g τίς ἄρα
8:27e	ἐστιν οὗτος	4:41e οὗτός ἐστιν	8:25h οὗτός ἐστιν
		4:41f ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα	8:25i ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι,
8:27f	ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν;	4:41g ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;	8:25j καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;

---

	<u>MATTHEW'S GOSPEL</u>	<u>MARK'S GOSPEL</u>	<u>LUKE'S GOSPEL</u>
8:26a	<sup>26</sup> He said to them,	4:40a <sup>40</sup> And He said to them,	8:25a <sup>25</sup> And He said to them,
8:26b	“Why are you afraid,	4:40b “Why are you afraid?	
8:26c	you men of little faith?”	4:40c Do you still have no faith?”	8:25b “Where is your faith?”
8:27a	<sup>27</sup> The men	4:41a <sup>41</sup> They	8:25c But they
		4:41b became very much afraid	8:25d were fearful
8:27b	were amazed,		8:25e and amazed,
8:27c	and said,	4:41c and said	8:25f saying
		4:41d to one another,	8:25g to one another,
8:27d	“What kind of a man is this,	4:41e “Who, then, is this,	8:25h “Who then is this,
8:27e	that even the winds and the sea	4:41f that even the wind and the sea	8:25i that He commands even the winds and the water,
			8:25j and they
8:27f	obey Him?”	4:41g obey Him?”	8:25k obey Him?”

## 7.2. Appendix 2: The man with the legion

### ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ

### ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

5:9a	ἔκαι ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν·	8:30a	<sup>30</sup> ἐπηρώτησεν δὲ αὐτόν
		8:30b	ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
5:9b	τί ὄνομά σοι;	8:30c	τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν;
5:9c	καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·	8:30d	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν·
5:9d	λεγιῶν	8:30e	λεγιῶν,
5:9e	ὄνομά μοι,		
5:9f	ὅτι πολλοὶ ἐσμεν.	8:30f	ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν.
5:10a	<sup>10</sup> καὶ	8:31a	<sup>31</sup> καὶ
5:10b	παρεκάλει	8:31b	παρεκάλουν
5:10c	αὐτόν	8:31c	αὐτόν
5:10d	πολλὰ		
5:10e	ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας.	8:31d	ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν.

### MARK'S GOSPEL

### LUKE'S GOSPEL

5:9a	<sup>9</sup> And He was asking him,	8:30a	<sup>30</sup> And Jesus asked him,
5:9b	“What is your name?”	8:30b	“What is your name?”
5:9c	And he said	8:30c	And he said,
5:9d	to Him,		
5:9e	“My name is		
5:9f	Legion,	8:30d	“Legion”;
5:9g	for we are many.”	8:30e	because many demons had entered him.
5:10a	<sup>10</sup> And	8:31a	<sup>31</sup> And
5:10b	he	8:31b	they
5:10c	begged Him	8:31c	were begging Him
5:10d	earnestly		
5:10e	not to send them out of the region.	8:31d	not to command them to go away into the abyss.

### 7.3. Appendix 3: Jesus heals many at the evening

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
8:16a	<sup>16</sup> Οψίας δὲ γενομένης	1:32a <sup>32</sup> Οψίας δὲ γενομένης,	4:40a <sup>40</sup> Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου
		1:32b ὅτε ἔδυν ὁ ἥλιος,	4:40b ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθεν- οῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν·
		1:32c ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας	
8:16b	προσῆνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονι- ζομένους πολλούς·	1:32d καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους·	
		1:33 <sup>33</sup> καὶ ἦν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπι- συναγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν.	
		1:34a <sup>34</sup> καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις	4:40c ὁ δὲ ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.
8:16c	καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα	1:34b καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν	4:41a <sup>41</sup> ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κρ[αυγ]άζοντα
8:16d	λόγῳ		4:41b καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
		1:34c καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια,	4:41c καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν,
		1:34d ὅτι ᾔδεισαν	4:41d ὅτι ᾔδεισαν
		1:34e αὐτόν.	4:41e τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.
8:16e	καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν,		



MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

8:16a	<sup>16</sup> Now when evening came,	1:32a	<sup>32</sup> Now when evening came,		
		1:32b	after the sun had set,	4:40a	<sup>40</sup> Now while the sun was setting,
		1:32c	they began bringing to Him all who were ill	4:40b	all those who had <i>any who were</i> sick with various diseases brought them to Him;
8:16b	they brought to Him many who were demon-possessed;	1:32d	and those who were demon-possessed.		
		1:33	<sup>33</sup> And the whole city had gathered at the door.		
		1:34a	<sup>34</sup> And He healed <i>many</i> who were ill with various diseases,	4:40c	and He was laying His hands on <i>each one</i> of them and healing them.
8:16c	and He cast out the spirits	1:34b	and cast out many demons;	4:41a	<sup>41</sup> Demons also were coming out of many,
8:16d	with a word,			4:41b	shouting, "You are the Son of God!"
				4:41c	And <i>yet</i> He was rebuking them
		1:34c	and He would not permit the demons to speak,	4:41d	and would not allow them to speak,
		1:34d	because they knew	4:41e	because they knew
		1:34e	who He was.	4:41f	that He was the Christ.
8:16e	and healed <i>all</i> who were ill.				

## 7.4. Appendix 4: Jesus did not / could not perform miracles

<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>		<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	
13:54a	<sup>54</sup> καὶ	6:1d	καὶ
13:54b	ἐλθῶν	6:1e	ἔρχεται
13:54c	εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ	6:1f	εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ,
		6:1g	καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.
		6:2a	<sup>2</sup> καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου
13:54d	ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν,	6:2b	ἤρξατο διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ,
13:54e	ὥστε	6:2c	καὶ πολλοὶ ἀκούοντες
13:54f	ἐκπλήσσεσθαι	6:2d	ἐξεπλήσσοντο
13:54g	αὐτοὺς		
13:54h	καὶ λέγειν·	6:2e	λέγοντες·
13:54i	πόθεν τούτῳ	6:2f	πόθεν τούτῳ
		6:2g	ταῦτα,
		6:2h	καὶ
		6:2i	τίς
13:54j	ἡ σοφία	6:2j	ἡ σοφία
13:54k	αὕτη	6:2k	ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ,
13:54l	καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις;	6:2l	καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις
		6:3a	τοιαῦτα διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γινόμεναι;
13:55a	<sup>55</sup> οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός;	6:3b	<sup>3</sup> οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων,
13:55b	οὐχ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαριάμ	6:3c	ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας
13:55c	καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ	6:3d	καὶ ἀδελφός
13:55d	Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας;	6:3e	Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήτου καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος;
13:56a	<sup>56</sup> καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσιν;		καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς;
13:56b	πόθεν οὖν τούτῳ ταῦτα πάντα;	6:3f	
13:57a	<sup>57</sup> καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ.	6:4a	καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ.
13:57b	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·	6:4b	<sup>4</sup> καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
		6:4c	ὅτι
13:57c	οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι		οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ**

		6:4d	αὐτοῦ
		6:4e	καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ
13:57d	καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	6:4f	καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
13:58a	<sup>58</sup> καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ	6:5a	<sup>5</sup> καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι
13:58b	δυνάμεις πολλὰς	6:5b	οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν,
		6:5c	εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεῖς τὰς χεῖρας ἐθεράπευσεν.
13:58c	διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.	6:6a	<sup>6</sup> καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.
		6:6b	Καὶ περιῆγεν τὰς κόμας κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL****MARK'S GOSPEL**

13:54a	<sup>54</sup> And He came to	6:1d	and came into
13:54b	His hometown	6:1e	His hometown;
		6:1f	and His disciples followed Him.
		6:2a	<sup>2</sup> And when the Sabbath came,
13:54c	and <i>began</i> teaching them in their synagogue,	6:2b	He began to teach in the synagogue;
13:54d	with the result that they were astonished,	6:2c	and the many listeners were astonished,
13:54e	and said,	6:2d	saying,
13:54f	“Where <i>did</i> this man	6:2e	“Where did this man
13:54g	<i>acquire</i>	6:2f	learn these things,
		6:2g	and what is
13:54h	this wisdom	6:2h	this wisdom
		6:2i	that has been given to Him,
13:54i	and <i>these</i> miraculous powers?	6:2j	and such miracles
		6:2k	as these performed by His hands?
13:55a	<sup>55</sup> Is this not the carpenter’s son?	6:3a	<sup>3</sup> Is this not the carpenter,
13:55b	Is His mother not called Mary,	6:3b	the son of Mary
13:55c	and His brothers, James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas?	6:3c	and brother of James, Joses, Judas, and Simon?
13:56a	<sup>56</sup> And His sisters, are they not all with us?	6:3d	And are His sisters not here with us?”

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

13:56b	Where then <i>did</i> this man <i>acquire</i> all these things?"		
13:57a	<sup>57</sup> And they took offense at Him.	6:3e	And they took offense at Him.
13:57b	But		
13:57c	Jesus	6:4a	<sup>4</sup> Jesus
13:57d	said to them,	6:4b	said to them,
13:57e	"A prophet is not dishonored except	6:4c	"A prophet is not dishonored except
13:57f	in his hometown	6:4d	in his hometown
		6:4e	and among his own relatives,
13:57g	and in his <i>own</i> household."	6:4f	and in his own household."
13:58a	<sup>58</sup> And He	6:5a	<sup>5</sup> And He
13:58b	<i>did</i>	6:5b	<i>could</i>
13:58c	not do	6:5c	not do
13:48d	many miracles there	6:5d	any miracle there except that He laid His hands on a few sick people and healed them.
13:58e	because of their unbelief.	6:6a	<sup>6</sup> And He was amazed at their unbelief.
		6:6b	And He was going around the villages, teaching.

## 7.5. Appendix 5: Cleansing of the Leper

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
8:1	<sup>1</sup> Καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρουσ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί.		5:12a <sup>12</sup> Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων
8:2a	<sup>2</sup> καὶ	1:40a <sup>40</sup> Καὶ	5:12b καὶ
8:2b	ἰδοῦ		5:12c ἰδοῦ
8:2c	λεπρὸς προσελθὼν	1:40b ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς	5:12d ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας· ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν,
8:2d	προσεκύνει αὐτῷ	1:40c παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ γονυπετῶν]	5:12e πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ
		1:40d καὶ	
8:2e	λέγων·	1:40e λέγων	5:12f λέγων·
		1:40f αὐτῷ ὅτι	
8:2f	κύριε,		5:12g κύριε,
8:2g	ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.	1:40g ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.	5:13h ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.
8:3a	<sup>3</sup> καὶ	1:41a <sup>41</sup> καὶ	5:13a <sup>13</sup> καὶ
		1:41b σπλαγχνισθεὶς	
8:3b	ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα	1:41c ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα	5:13b ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα
8:3c	ἤψατο αὐτοῦ	1:41d αὐτοῦ ἤψατο	5:13c ἤψατο αὐτοῦ
		1:41e καὶ	
8:3d	λέγων·	1:41f λέγει	5:13d λέγων·
		1:41g αὐτῷ·	
8:3e	θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·	1:41h θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·	5:13e θέλω, καθαρίσθητι·
8:3f	καὶ εὐθέως	1:42a <sup>42</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς	5:13f καὶ εὐθέως
8:3g	ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.	1:42b ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα,	5:13g ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.
		1:42c καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.	
		1:43 <sup>43</sup> καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτὸν	5:14a <sup>14</sup> καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ
8:4a	<sup>4</sup> καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·	1:44a <sup>44</sup> καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·	
		1:44b ὄρα	
8:4c	μηδενὶ	1:44c μηδενὶ	5:14b μηδενὶ

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ**

		1:44d	μηδέν		
8:4d	εἶπης,	1:44e	εἶπης,	5:14c	εἰπεῖν,
8:4e	ἀλλ’	1:44f	ἀλλ’	5:14d	ἀλλ’
8:4f	ὑπαγε	1:44g	ὑπαγε	5:14e	ἀπελθὼν
8:4g	σεαυτὸν δεῖξον	1:44h	σεαυτὸν δεῖξον	5:14f	δείξον σεαυτὸν
8:4h	τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκον	1:44i	τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε	5:14g	τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε
8:4i	τὸ δῶρον	1:44j	περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου	5:14h	περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου
8:4j	ὁ	1:44k	ἃ	5:14i	καθὼς
8:4k	προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.	1:44l	προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.	5:14j	προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.
		1:45	<sup>45</sup> Ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἔξω ἐπ’ ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν· καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντοθεν.	5:15 - 5:16	<sup>15</sup> διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν· <sup>16</sup> αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος.

**MATTHEW’S GOSPEL****MARK’S GOSPEL****LUKE’S GOSPEL**

8:1	<sup>1</sup> When Jesus came down from the mountain, large crowds followed Him.			5:12a	<sup>12</sup> While He was in one of the cities,
				5:12b	behold,
8:2a	<sup>2</sup> And a man with leprosy came to Him	1:40a	<sup>40</sup> And a man with leprosy came to Jesus,	5:12c	<i>there was</i> a man covered with leprosy; and when he saw Jesus,
8:2b	and bowed down before Him,	1:40b	imploring Him and kneeling down,	5:12d	he fell on his face and begged Him,
8:2c	and	1:40c	and		
8:2d	said,	1:40d	saying	5:12e	saying,
		1:40e	to Him,		
8:2e	“Lord,			5:12f	“Lord,
8:2f	if You are willing, You can make me clean.”	1:40f	“If You are willing, You can make me clean.”	5:12g	if You are willing, You can make me clean.”
		1:41a	<sup>41</sup> Moved with compassion,		
8:3a	<sup>3</sup> Jesus reached out with His hand and touched him,	1:41b	Jesus reached out with His hand and touched him,	5:13a	<sup>13</sup> And He reached out with His hand and touched him,
		1:41c	and		

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

8:3b	saying,	1:41d	said	5:13b	saying,
		1:41e	to him,		
8:3c	"I am willing; be cleansed."	1:41f	"I am willing; be cleansed."	5:13c	"I am willing; be cleansed."
		1:41c	and		
8:3b	saying,	1:41d	said	5:13b	saying,
		1:41e	to him,		
8:3c	"I am willing; be cleansed."	1:41f	"I am willing; be cleansed."	5:13c	"I am willing; be cleansed."
8:3d	And immediately	1:42a	<sup>42</sup> And immediately	5:13d	And immediately
8:3e	his leprosy was cleansed.	1:42b	the leprosy left him,	5:13d	the leprosy left him.
		1:42c	and he was cleansed.		
		1:43	<sup>43</sup> And He sternly warned him and immediately sent him away,	5:14a	<sup>14</sup> And He ordered him to
8:4a	<sup>4</sup> And Jesus said to him,	1:44a	<sup>44</sup> and He said to him,		
8:4b	"See that you	1:44b	"See that you		
8:4c	tell	1:44c	say	5:14b	tell
		1:44d	nothing		
8:4d	no one;	1:44e	to anyone;	5:14c	no one,
				5:14d	<i>saying,</i>
8:4e	but	1:44f	but	5:14e	"But
8:4f	go,	1:44g	go,	5:14f	go
				5:14g	and
8:4g	show yourself to the priest	1:44h	show yourself to the priest	5:14h	show yourself to the priest,
8:4h	and present	1:44i	and offer	5:14i	and make
8:4i	the offering	1:44j	for your cleansing	5:14j	an offering for your cleansing,
8:4j	that	1:44k	what	5:14k	just as
8:4k	Moses commanded,	1:44l	Moses commanded,	5:14l	Moses commanded,
8:4l	as a testimony to them."	1:44m	as a testimony to them."	5:14m	as a testimony to them."
		1:45	<sup>45</sup> But he went out and began to proclaim it freely and to spread the news around, to such an extent that Jesus could no longer publicly enter a city, but stayed out in unpopulated areas; and they were coming to Him from everywhere.	5:15 - 5:16	<sup>15</sup> But the news about Him was spreading <i>even</i> farther, and large crowds were gathering to hear <i>Him</i> and to be healed of their sicknesses. <sup>16</sup> But <i>Jesus</i> Himself would <i>often</i> slip away to the wilderness and pray.

## 7.6. Appendix 6: The family of Jesus outside

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
12:46a	<sup>46</sup> Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις		
12:46b	ἰδοῦ	3:31a <sup>31</sup> Καὶ	
		3:31b ἔρχεται	8:19a <sup>19</sup> Παρεγένετο
			8:19b δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν
12:46c	ἡ μήτηρ	3:31c ἡ μήτηρ	8:19c ἡ μήτηρ
		3:31d αὐτοῦ	
12:46d	καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ	3:31e καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ	8:19d καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ
		3:31f καὶ	
12:46e	εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω	3:31g ἔξω στήκοντες	
12:46f	ζητοῦντες	3:31h ἀπέστειλαν	
12:46g	αὐτῷ	3:31i πρὸς αὐτὸν	
12:46h	λαλῆσαι.	3:31j καλοῦντες αὐτόν.	
		3:32a <sup>32</sup> καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος,	8:19e καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.
[12:47a	[ <sup>47</sup> εἶπεν δὲ τις	3:32b καὶ λέγουσιν	8:20a <sup>20</sup> ἀπηγγέλη δὲ
b	αὐτῷ·	3:32c αὐτῷ·	8:20b αὐτῷ·
c	ἰδοῦ	3:32d ἰδοῦ	
d	ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου	3:32e ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου	8:20c ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου
		3:32f [καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου]	
e	ἔξω ἐστήκασιν	3:32g ἔξω	8:20d ἐστήκασιν ἔξω
f]	ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι.]	3:32h ζητοῦσίν σε.	8:20d ἰδεῖν θέλοντές σε.
12:48a	<sup>48</sup> ὁ δὲ	3:33a <sup>33</sup> καὶ	8:21a <sup>21</sup> ὁ δὲ
12:48b	ἀποκριθεὶς	3:33b ἀποκριθεὶς	8:21b ἀποκριθεὶς
12:48c	εἶπεν τῷ λέγοντι αὐτῷ·	3:33c αὐτοῖς λέγει·	8:21c εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
12:48e	τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ	3:33d τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ	
12:48f	τίνες εἰσὶν		
12:48g	οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;	3:33d οἱ ἀδελφοί [μου];	
12:49a	<sup>49</sup> καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ	3:34a <sup>34</sup> καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους	



**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ**

12:49b	εἶπεν·	3:34b	λέγει·		
12:49c	ἰδοὺ	3:34c	ἴδε		
12:49d	ἡ	3:34d	ἡ		
12:49e	μήτηρ μου καὶ	3:34e	μήτηρ μου καὶ	8:21e	μήτηρ μου καὶ
12:49f	οἱ	3:34f	οἱ		
12:49g	ἀδελφοί μου.	3:34g	ἀδελφοί μου.	8:21f	ἀδελφοί μου
12:50a	<sup>50</sup> ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς	3:35a	<sup>35</sup> ὅς [γὰρ] ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ,	8:21g	οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιῶντες.
12:50b	αὐτός	3:35b	οὗτος		
12:50c	μου ἀδελφός καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.	3:35c	ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν.		

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL****MARK'S GOSPEL****LUKE'S GOSPEL**

12:46a	<sup>46</sup> While He was still speaking to the crowds,				
12:46b	behold,				
		3:31a	<sup>31</sup> Then	8:19a	<sup>19</sup> Now
12:46c	His mother and	3:31b	His mother and	8:19b	His mother and
		3:31c	His		
12:46d	brothers	3:31d	brothers	8:19c	brothers
		3:31e	came,	8:19d	came
				8:19e	to Him,
12:46e	were	3:31f	and while		
12:46f	standing outside,	3:31g	standing outside		
12:46g	seeking	3:31h	they sent word to Him,		
12:46h	to speak to Him.	3:31i	calling for Him.		
		3:32a	<sup>32</sup> And a crowd was sitting around Him,	8:19f	and they were unable to get to Him because of the crowd.
[12:47a	<sup>47</sup> [Someone said to Him,	3:32b	and they said to Him,	8:20a	<sup>20</sup> And it was reported to Him,
b	“Look,	3:32c	“Behold,		
c	Your mother and Your brothers	3:32d	Your mother and Your brothers	8:20b	“Your mother and Your brothers
d	are standing outside,	3:32e	are outside	8:20c	are standing outside,
e]	seeking to speak to You.”]	3:32f	looking for You.”	8:20d	wishing to see You.”
12:48a	<sup>48</sup> But			8:21a	<sup>21</sup> But

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

12:48b	Jesus replied	3:33a	<sup>33</sup> Answering	8:21b	He answered
12:48c	to the one who was telling Him and said,	3:33b	them, He said,	8:21c	and said to them,
12:48d	“Who	3:33c	“Who		
12:48e	is	3:33d	are		
12:48f	My mother, and	3:33e	My mother and		
12:48g	who are				
12:48h	My brothers?”	3:33f	My brothers?”		
12:49a	<sup>49</sup> And extending His hand toward His disciples,	3:34a	<sup>34</sup> And looking around at those who were sitting Him,		
12:49b	He said,	3:34b	He said,		
12:49c	“Behold:	3:34c	“Here are		
12:50d	My mother and My brothers!	3:34d	My mother and My brothers!	8:21e	“My mother and My brothers
				8:21f	are
12:50a	<sup>50</sup> For whoever does the will of My Father who is in heaven,	3:35a	<sup>35</sup> For whoever does the will of God,	8:21g	these who hear the word of God and do <i>it</i> .”
12:50b	he	3:35b	this		
12:50c	is	3:35c	is		
12:50d	My brother, and sister, and mother.”	3:35d	My brother, and sister, and mother.		

## 7.7. Appendix 7: The Parable of the Sower

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
13:5a	ἄλλα δὲ	4:5a ἔκαι ἄλλο	8:6a ἔκαι ἕτερον
13:5b	ἔπεσεν	4:5b ἔπεσεν	8:6b κατέπεσεν
13:5c	ἐπὶ	4:5c ἐπὶ	8:6c ἐπὶ
13:5d	τὰ πετρώδη	4:5d τὸ πετρῶδες	8:6d τὴν πέτραν,
13:5e	ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν,	4:5e ὅπου οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν,	
13:5f	καὶ εὐθέως	4:5f καὶ εὐθὺς	
13:5g	ἐξανέτειλεν	4:5g ἐξανέτειλεν	8:6e καὶ φυνὲν
			8:6f ἐξηράνθη
13:5h	διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν	4:5h διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν	8:6g διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν
13:5i	βάθος γῆς·	4:5i βάθος γῆς·	8:6h ἰκμάδα.
		4:6a ἔκαι ὅτε	
13:6a	ἥλιου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος	4:6b ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος	
13:6b	ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν ἐξηράνθη.	4:6c ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ρίζαν ἐξηράνθη.	
		4:16a ἔκαι οὗτοί εἰσιν	
13:20a	ἰδοὺ	4:16b οἱ	8:13a ἰδοὺ
13:20b	δὲ		8:13b δὲ
13:20c	ἐπὶ	4:16c ἐπὶ	8:13c ἐπὶ
13:20d	τὰ πετρώδη	4:16d τὰ πετρώδη	8:13d τῆς πέτρας
13:20e	σπαρεῖς,	4:16e σπειρόμενοι,	
13:20f	οὕτως	4:16f οὕτως	8:13e οὕτως
13:20g	ἔστιν		
		4:16g ὅταν	8:13f ὅταν
13:20h	ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων	4:16h ἀκούσωσιν τὸν λόγον	8:13g ἀκούσωσιν
13:20i	καὶ		
13:20j	εὐθὺς	4:16i εὐθὺς	
13:20k	μετὰ χαρᾶς	4:16j μετὰ χαρᾶς	8:13h μετὰ χαρᾶς
13:20l	λαμβάνων	4:16k λαμβάνουσιν	8:13i δέχονται
13:20m	αὐτόν,	4:16l αὐτόν,	8:13j τὸν λόγον,
		4:17a ἔκαι	8:13k καὶ
13:21a	ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ρίζαν	4:17b οὐκ ἔχουσιν ρίζαν	8:13l οὗτοι ρίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ**

13:21b	έν	4:17c	έν	
13:21c	έαυτῶ	4:17d	έαυτοῖς	
13:21d	ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιρός ἐστίν,	4:17e	ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν,	8:13m οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν
		4:17f	εἶτα	
13:21e	γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ	4:17g	γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ	8:13n καὶ ἐν καιρῶ πειρασμοῦ
13:21f	διὰ τὸν λόγον	4:17h	διὰ τὸν λόγον	
13:21g	εὐθὺς	4:17i	εὐθὺς	
13:21h	σκανδαλίζεται.	4:17j	σκανδαλίζονται.	8:13m ἀφίστανται.

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL****MARK'S GOSPEL****LUKE'S GOSPEL**

13:5a	<sup>5</sup> Others	4:5a	<sup>5</sup> Other	8:6a	<sup>6</sup> Other
		4:5b	seed	8:6b	<i>seed</i>
13:5b	fell	4:5c	fell	8:6c	fell
13:5c	on	4:5d	on	8:6d	on
13:5d	the rocky	4:5e	the rocky	8:6e	rocky
13:5e	places,	4:5f	ground	8:6f	<i>soil</i> ,
13:5f	where	4:5g	where		
13:5g	they	4:5h	it		
13:5h	did not have much soil;	4:5i	did not have much soil;		
13:5i	and they sprang up immediately,	4:5j	and immediately it sprang up	8:6g	and when it came up,
				8:6h	it withered away
13:5j	because	4:5k	because	8:6i	because
13:5k	they	4:5l	it	8:6j	it
13:5l	had no	4:5m	had no	8:6k	had no
13:5m	depth of soil.	4:5n	depth of soil.	8:6l	moisture.
13:6a	<sup>6</sup> But after	4:6a	<sup>6</sup> And when		
13:6b	the sun	4:6b	the sun		
13:6c	rose,	4:6c	had risen,		
13:6c	they were	4:6d	it was		
13:6d	scorched;	4:6e	scorched;		
13:6e	and because	4:6f	and because		
13:6f	they	4:6g	it		

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

13:6g	had no root,	4:6h	had no root,		
13:6h	they withered away.	4:6i	it withered away.		
<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>	
13:20a	<sup>20</sup> The one	4:16a	<sup>16</sup> And in a similar way	8:13a	<sup>13</sup> Those
		4:16b	these		
		4:16c	are the ones		
13:20b	sown <i>with seed</i>	4:16d	sown with seed		
13:20c	on the rocky places,	4:16e	on the rocky places,	8:13b	on the rocky <i>soil</i>
13:20d	this				
13:20e	is			8:13c	are
13:20f	the			8:13d	the
13:20h	one			8:13e	ones
13:20i	who	4:16f	who,	8:13f	who,
13:20j	hears	4:16g	when they hear	8:13g	when they hear,
13:20k	the word	4:16h	the word,		
13:20l	and				
13:20m	immediately	4:16i	immediately		
13:20n	receives	4:16j	receive	8:13h	receive
13:20o	it	4:16k	it	8:13i	the word
13:20p	with joy;	4:16l	with joy;	8:13j	with joy;
		4:17a	<sup>17</sup> and	8:13c	and
13:21a	<sup>21</sup> yet	4:17b	yet	8:13d	<i>yet</i>
13:21b	he	4:17c	they	8:13e	these
13:21c	has no <i>firm</i> root	4:17d	have no firm root	8:13f	do not have a <i>firm</i> root;
13:21d	in	4:17e	in		
13:21e	himself,	4:17f	themselves,		
13:21f	but is <i>only</i> temporary,	4:17g	but are only temporary;	8:13g	they believe for a while,
13:21g	and	4:17h	then,	8:13h	and
13:21h	when affliction or persecution occurs	4:17i	when affliction or persecution occurs	8:13i	in a time of temptation
13:22i	because of the word,	4:17j	because of the word,		
13:21j	immediately	4:17k	immediately		
13:21k	he	4:17l	they	8:13j	they
13:21l	falls away.	4:17m	fall away.	8:13k	fall away.

## 7.8. Appendix 8: Jesus forgives sins and heals a paralytic

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
9:1	<sup>1</sup> Καὶ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν.	2:1a <sup>1</sup> Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ δι' ἡμερῶν	
		2:1b ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν.	
		2:2 <sup>2</sup> καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ ὥστε μηκέτι χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν, καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον.	5:17 <sup>17</sup> Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων, καὶ ἦσαν καθημενοὶ Φαρισαῖ-οὶ καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι οἳ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν.
9:2a	<sup>2</sup> καὶ	2:3a <sup>3</sup> Καὶ	5:18a <sup>18</sup> καὶ
9:2b	ἰδοὺ		5:18b ἰδοὺ
			5:18c ἄνδρες
		2:3b ἔρχονται	
9:2c	προσέφερον	2:3c φέροντες	5:18d φέροντες
9:2d	αὐτῷ	2:3d πρὸς αὐτόν	
9:2e	παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον.	2:3e παραλυτικὸν	5:18e ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος
		2:3f αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.	
			5:18f καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ θεῖναι [αὐτόν] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.
		2:4a <sup>4</sup> καὶ μὴ	5:19a <sup>19</sup> καὶ μὴ
		2:4b δυνάμενοι προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ	5:19b εὐρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν
		2:4c διὰ τὸν ὄχλον	5:19c διὰ τὸν ὄχλον,
		2:4d ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσιν τὸν κράβαττον ὅπου ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.	5:19d ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθῆκαν αὐτόν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
9:2f	καὶ ἰδὼν	2:5a <sup>5</sup> καὶ ἰδὼν	5:20a <sup>20</sup> καὶ ἰδὼν
9:2g	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	2:5b ὁ Ἰησοῦς	
9:2h	τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν	2:5c τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν	5:20b τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν
9:2i	εἶπεν	2:5d λέγει	5:20c εἶπεν·
9:2k	τῷ παραλυτικῷ·	2:5e τῷ παραλυτικῷ·	
9:2l	θάρσει,		

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ**

9:2m	τέκνον,	2:5f	τέκνον,	5:20d	ἄνθρωπε,
9:2n	ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.	2:5g	ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.	5:20e	ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
				5:20f	σου.
9:3a	<sup>3</sup> Καὶ ἰδοὺ	2:6a	<sup>6</sup> Ἦσαν δέ	5:21a	<sup>21</sup> καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι
9:3b	τινες τῶν γραμματέων	2:6b	τινες τῶν γραμματέων	5:21b	οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
		2:6c	ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι		
9:3c	εἶπαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς·	2:6d	καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν·	5:21c	λέγοντες·
		2:7a	<sup>7</sup> τί οὗτος	5:21d	τίς ἐστιν
9:3d	οὗτος	2:7b	οὗτος	5:21e	οὗτος
		2:7c	λαλεῖ;	5:21f	ὅς λαλεῖ
9:3e	βλασφημεῖ.	2:7d	βλασφημεῖ·	5:21g	βλασφημίας;
		2:7e	τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός;	5:21h	τίς δύναται ἁμαρτίας ἀφεῖναι εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ θεός;
		2:8a	<sup>8</sup> καὶ εὐθύς	5:22a	
9:4a	<sup>4</sup> καὶ ἰδὼν	2:8b	ἐπιγνοὺς	5:22b	<sup>22</sup> ἐπιγνοὺς δέ
9:4b	ὁ Ἰησοῦς	2:8c	ὁ Ἰησοῦς		ὁ Ἰησοῦς
		2:8d	τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ	5:22c	
9:4c	τάς ἐνθυμήσεις	2:8e	ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς		τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς
				5:22d	
9:4d	αὐτῶν			5:22e	αὐτῶν
				5:22f	ἀποκριθεὶς
9:4e	εἶπεν·	2:8f	λέγει	5:22g	εἶπεν
		2:8g	αὐτοῖς·	5:22h	πρὸς αὐτούς·
9:4f	ἵνα τί ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρὰ	2:8h	τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε	5:22i	τί διαλογίζεσθε
9:4g	ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;	2:8i	ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;	5:23a	ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;
9:5a	<sup>5</sup> τί	2:9a	<sup>9</sup> τί		<sup>23</sup> τί
9:5b	γάρ			5:23b	
9:5c	ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν·	2:9b	ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν		ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν·
		2:9c	τῷ παραλυτικῷ·	5:23c	
9:5d	ἀφίενταί	2:9d	ἀφίενταί	5:23d	ἀφέωνταί
				5:23e	σοι
9:5e	σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,	2:9e	σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,		αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου,

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

9:5f	ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ	2:9f	ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ	5:23f	ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ
		2:9h	ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου		
		2:9i	καὶ		
9:5g - 9:6a	περιπάτει; <sup>6</sup> ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι	2:9j - 2:10a	περιπάτει; <sup>10</sup> ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι	5:23g- 5:24a	περιπάτει; <sup>24</sup> ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι
9:6b	ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας-	2:10b	ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς-	5:24b	ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας-
9:6c	τότε				
9:6d	λέγει	2:10c	λέγει	5:24c	εἶπεν
9:6e	τῷ παραλυτικῷ·	2:10d	τῷ παραλυτικῷ·	5:24d	τῷ παραλελυμένῳ·
		2:11a	<sup>11</sup> σοὶ λέγω,	5:24e	σοὶ λέγω,
9:6f	ἐγερθεῖς	2:11b	ἔγειρε	5:24f	ἔγειρε
				5:24g	καὶ
9:6g	ἄρόν σου τὴν κλίνην	2:11c	ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου	5:24h	ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιόν σου
9:6h	καὶ ὑπαγε	2:11d	καὶ ὑπαγε	5:24i	πορεύου
9:6i	εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.	2:11e	εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.	5:24j	εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.
9:7a	<sup>7</sup> καὶ ἐγερθεῖς	2:12a	<sup>12</sup> καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ εὐθύς	5:25a	<sup>25</sup> καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς
		2:12b	ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον	5:25b	ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο,
9:7b	ἀπῆλθεν	2:12c	ἐξῆλθεν	5:25c	ἀπῆλθεν
		2:12d	ἔμπροσθεν πάντων,		
9:7c	εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.			5:25d	εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ
				5:25e	δοξάζων τὸν θεόν.
9:8a	<sup>8</sup> ιδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι	2:12c	ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας	5:26a	<sup>26</sup> καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαν- τας
9:8b	ἐφοβήθησαν	2:12d	καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν	5:26b	καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν
9:9c	καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεόν			5:26c	καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου
9:9d	τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.	2:12e	λέγοντας ὅτι οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν.	5:26d	λέγοντες ὅτι εἶδομεν παρά- δοξα σήμερον.



MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

9:1	<sup>1</sup> Getting into a boat, <i>Jesus</i> crossed over <i>the Sea of Galilee</i> and came to His own city.	2:1a	<sup>1</sup> When Jesus came back to Capernaum a few days later,		
		2:1b	it was heard that He was at home.		
		2:2	<sup>2</sup> And many were gathered together, so that there was no longer space, not even near the door; and He was speaking the word to them.	5:17	<sup>17</sup> One day He was teaching, and there were <i>some</i> Pharisees and teachers of the Law sitting <i>there</i> who had come from every village of Galilee and Judea, and <i>from</i> Jerusalem; and the power of the Lord was <i>present</i> for Him to perform healing.
9:2a	<sup>2</sup> And	2:3a	<sup>3</sup> And	5:18a	<sup>18</sup> And
9:2b	they	2:3b	some people	5:18b	<i>some</i> men
		2:3c	came,		
9:2c	brought	2:3d	bringing	5:18c	<i>were</i> carrying
9:2d	to Him	2:3e	to Him		
9:2e	a paralyzed man lying on a stretcher.	2:3f	a man who was paralyzed,	5:18d	a man on a stretcher who was paralyzed;
		2:3g	carried by four men.		
				5:18e	and they were trying to bring him in and to set him down in front of Him.
		2:4a	<sup>4</sup> And	5:19a	<sup>19</sup> But
		2:4b	when	5:19b	when
		2:4c	they were unable to get to Him	5:19c	they did not find any <i>way</i> to bring him in
		2:4d	because of the crowd,	5:19d	because of the crowd,
		2:4e	they removed the roof above Him; and after digging an opening, they let down the pallet on which the paralyzed man was lying.	5:19e	they went up on the roof and let him down through the tiles with his stretcher, into the middle <i>of the crowd</i> , in front of Jesus.
9:2e	And	2:5a	<sup>5</sup> And	5:20a	<sup>20</sup> And
		2:5b	Jesus,		
9:2f	seeing	2:5c	seeing	5:20b	seeing
9:2g	their faith,	2:5d	their faith,	5:20c	their faith,
9:2h	Jesus			5:20d	He
9:2i	said	2:5e	said	5:20e	said,

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

9:2j	to the man who was paralyzed,	2:5f	to the paralyzed man,		
9:2k	“Take courage,				
9:2l	son;	2:5g	“Son,	5:20f	“Friend,
9:2m	your sins are forgiven.”	2:5h	your sins are forgiven.”	5:20g	your sins are forgiven
				5:20h	you.”
9:3a	<sup>3</sup> And some of the scribes	2:6a	<sup>6</sup> But some of the scribes	5:21a	<sup>21</sup> The scribes
				5:21b	and the Pharisees
		2:6b	were sitting there		
		2:6c	and thinking it over in their hearts,	5:21c	began thinking of the implications,
9:3b	said			5:21d	saying,
9:3c	to themselves,				
		2:7a	<sup>7</sup> “Why	5:21e	“Who is
		2:7b	does		
9:3d	“This man	2:7c	this man	5:21f	this <i>man</i>
		2:7d	speak	5:21g	who speaks
		2:7e	that way?		
9:3e	is blaspheming!”	2:7f	He is blaspheming!	5:21h	blasphemies?
		2:7g	Who can forgive sins, except God alone?”	5:21i	Who can forgive sins, except God alone?”
9:4a	<sup>4</sup> And	2:8a	<sup>8</sup> Immediately	5:22a	<sup>22</sup> But
9:4b	Jesus,	2:8b	Jesus,	5:22b	Jesus,
9:4c	perceiving	2:8c	aware	5:22c	aware of
		2:8d	in His spirit		
9:4d	their thoughts,	2:8e	that they were thinking that way within themselves,	5:22d	their thoughts,
				5:22e	responded
9:4e	said	2:8f	said	5:22f	and said
		2:8g	to them,	5:22g	to them,
9:4f	“Why are you thinking evil	2:8h	“Why are you thinking about these things	5:22h	“Why are you thinking this way
9:5g	in your hearts?	2:8i	in your hearts?	5:22i	in your hearts?
9:5a	<sup>5</sup> For				
9:5b	which is easier, to say,	2:9a	<sup>9</sup> Which is easier, to say	5:23a	<sup>23</sup> Which is easier, to say:

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

		2:9b	to the paralyzed man,		
9:5c	'Your sins are forgiven,'	2:9c	Your sins are forgiven';	5:23b	'Your sins are forgiven
				5:23c	you,'
9:5d	or to say, 'Get up	2:9d	or to say, 'Get up,	5:23d	or to say, 'Get up
		2:9e	and pick up your pallet		
9:5e - 9:6a	and walk'? <sup>6</sup> But so that you may know	2:9f - 2:10a	and walk'? <sup>10</sup> But so that you may know	5:23e - 5:24a	and walk'? <sup>24</sup> But so that you may know
9:6b	that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins"—	2:10b	that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins”	5:24b	that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins.”
9:6c	then				
9:6d	He said	2:10c	—He said	5:24c	He said
9:6e	to the paralyzed man,	2:10d	to the paralyzed man,	5:24d	to the man who was paral- yzed,
		2:11a	<sup>11</sup> “I say to you,	5:24e	“I say to you,
9:6f	“Get up,	2:11b	get up,	5:24f	get up,
				5:24g	and
9:6g	pick up your	2:11c	pick up your	5:24h	pick up your
9:6h	stretcher	2:11d	pallet,	5:24i	stretcher,
9:6i	and go home.”	2:11d	and go home.”	5:24j	and go home.”
9:7a	<sup>7</sup> And he got up	2:12a	<sup>12</sup> And he got up and immedi- ately	5:25a	<sup>25</sup> And immediately he got up
				5:25b	before them,
		2:12b	picked up the pallet	5:25c	and picked up what he had been lying on,
9:7b	and went home.	2:12c	and went out in the sight of everyone,	5:25d	and went home
				5:25e	glorifying God.
9:8a	<sup>8</sup> But when the crowds saw <i>this</i> ,				
9:8b	they were awestruck,	2:12c	so that they were all amazed	5:26a	<sup>26</sup> And they were all struck with astonishment
9:9c	and they glorified God,	2:12d	and were glorifying God,	5:26b	and <i>began</i> glorifying God.
9:9d	who had given such authority to men.			5:26c	They were also filled with fear,
		2:12e	saying, “We have never seen anything like this!”	5:26d	saying, “We have seen re- markable things today!”

## 7.9. Appendix 9: The baptism of Jesus

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
3:13a	<sup>13</sup> Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς	1:9a <sup>9</sup> Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς	
3:13b	ἀπὸ	1:9b ἀπὸ	
		1:9c Ναζαρέτ	
3:13c	τῆς Γαλιλαίας	1:9d τῆς Γαλιλαίας	
3:13d	ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην		
			3:21a <sup>21</sup> Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν
3:13e	πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.	1:9e καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου.	3:21b καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος
3:14 - 3:15	<sup>14</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης διεκώλυεν αὐτὸν λέγων· ἐγὼ χρεῖαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με· <sup>15</sup> ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπειν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν.		
3:16a	<sup>16</sup> βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς		
		1:10a <sup>10</sup> καὶ	3:21c καὶ
3:16b	εὐθὺς	1:10b εὐθὺς	
			3:21d προσευχομένου
3:16c	ἀνέβη	1:10c ἀναβαίνων	
3:16d	ἀπὸ	1:10d ἐκ	
3:16e	τοῦ ὕδατος·	1:10e τοῦ ὕδατος	
3:16f	καὶ ἰδοὺ		
		1:10f εἶδεν	
3:16g	ἠνεώχθησαν [αὐτῷ]	1:10g σχιζομένου	3:21e ἀνεωχθῆναι
3:16h	οἱ οὐρανοί,	1:10h τοὺς οὐρανοὺς	3:21f τὸν οὐρανὸν
3:16i	καὶ	1:10i καὶ	3:22a <sup>22</sup> καὶ
3:16j	εἶδεν		
3:16k	[τὸ] πνεῦμα [τοῦ] θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν [καὶ] ἐρχόμενον	1:10j τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν·	3:22b καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν
3:16l	ἐπ' αὐτόν·		3:22c ἐπ' αὐτόν,

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

3:13a	<sup>13</sup> Then Jesus arrived	1:9a	<sup>9</sup> In those days Jesus came	
3:13b	from	1:9b	from	
		1:9c	Nazareth	
3:13c	Galilee	1:9d	in Galilee	
3:13d	at the Jordan,			3:21a <sup>21</sup> Now when all the people were baptized,
3:13e	<i>coming</i> to John to be baptized by him.	1:9e	and was baptized by John in the Jordan.	3:21b Jesus also was baptized,
3:14 - 3:15	<sup>14</sup> But John tried to prevent Him, saying, "I have <i>the</i> need to be baptized by You, and <i>yet</i> You are coming to me?" <sup>15</sup> But Jesus, answering, said to him, "Allow <i>it</i> at this time; for in this way it is fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness." Then he allowed Him.			
3:16a	<sup>16</sup> After He was baptized,			
3:16b	Jesus came up immediately from the water;	1:10a	<sup>10</sup> And immediately coming up out of the water,	
3:16c	and behold,			3:21c and while He was praying,
		1:10b	He saw	
3:16d	the heavens	1:10c	the heavens	3:21d heaven
3:16e	were opened,	1:10d	opening,	3:21e was opened,
3:16f	and	1:10e	and	3:22a <sup>22</sup> and
3:16g	he saw			
3:16h	the	1:10f	the	3:22b the
				3:22c Holy
3:16i	Spirit	1:10g	Spirit,	3:22d Spirit
3:16j	of God			
3:16k	descending as a dove <i>and</i> settling on Him,	1:10h	like a dove, descending upon Him;	3:22e descended upon Him in bodily form like a dove,

## 7.10. Appendix 10: Luke's use of Double Tradition material resembling the Sermon on the Mount

Matthew	Content	Luke	Content
5:1	Jesus saw the crowds, went up on the mountain, sat down and began to teach.	6:17a	Jesus came down and stood on a plain.
_____	_____	6:17b -19	A large crowd from Judea, Jerusalem Tyre and Sidon. He healed everyone so they pressed against him.
_____	_____		
_____	_____		
_____	_____		
5:2	He began to teach them	6:20a	He began to teach them
5:3	Blessed are the poor, theirs is the kingdom of God.	6:20b	Blessed are you who are poor, yours is the kingdom of God.
5:4	Blessed are those who mourn, they shall be comforted.	6:21b	Blessed are you who weep, you will laugh.
5:5	Blessed are the gentle...	_____	_____
		—	—
5:6	Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, they will be satisfied.	6:21a	Blessed are you who are hungry now, for you will be satisfied.
5:7	Blessed are the Merciful...	_____	_____
		—	—
5:8	Blessed are the pure in heart...	_____	_____
		—	—
5:9	Blessed are the peacemakers...	_____	_____
		—	—
5:10	Blessed are those who have been persecuted ...	_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
5:11	Blessed are you when people insult or persecute you...	6:22	Blessed are you when people hate you, and insult you...
5:12	Rejoice... your reward is great, the prophets before you were persecuted.	6:23	Rejoice, jump for joy, your reward is great. Their fathers treated the prophets in the same way.
_____	_____	6:24-26	Woes...
—	—		
5:13a	You are the salt of the earth	14:34a	Salt is good
5:13b	If the salt have become tasteless how can it be made salty again? It is useless.	14:45b	If the salt has become tasteless with what will it be seasoned? It is useless.
_____	_____	14:35c	The one who has ears let him hear.
—	—		
5:14	You are the light of the world...	_____	_____
		—	—
5:15	No lamp under the basket or bed, but on lamp stand for all to see.	8:16	No lamp under the basket or bed, but on lamp stand for all to see.

<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>Content</b>
5:16	Your light must shine before people...	_____	_____
5:17	I have not come to abolish the Law, but to fulfil it.	_____	_____
5:18	Heaven and earth will pass away before the Law does.	16:17	Heaven and earth will pass away before the Law does.
5:19-20	The one who nullifies the Law is the least in the kingdom of God...	_____	_____
5:21-24	You shall not murder...	_____	_____
5:25a	Come to good terms with your accuser	12:58a	Make an effort to settle with your accuser
5:25b	so he will not hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the officer and the officer to prison.	12:58b	so he will not hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the officer and the officer to prison.
5:25c	You will not get out until you have paid the last quadrans.	12:59	You will not get out until you have paid the last lepton.
5:27-30	You shall not commit adultery...	_____	_____
5:31a	It is said		
5:31b	whoever	16:18a	Everyone
5:31c	sends his wife away	16:18b	who divorces his wife
5:31d	is to give her a certificate of divorce.	_____	_____
_____	_____	16:18c	and marries another commits adultery
5:32a	But I say to you that everyone who divorces his wife, except for the reason of sexual immorality, makes her commit adultery;	_____	_____
5:32b	whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.	16:18d	and he who marries one who is divorced from a husband commits adultery.
5:33-37	About vows...	_____	_____
5:38	Eye for an eye, tooth for tooth	_____	_____
5:39a	Do not stand against the one who is evil	_____	_____
5:39b	Whoever alaps you...turn the other cheek also	6:29a	Whoever hits you...turn the other cheek also

<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>Content</b>
5:40	If anyone takes your cloak...	6:29b	If anyone takes your cloak...
5:41	Whoever forces you to go one mile, go two.	_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
5:42	Give to him who asks of you, do not turn away from him who wants to borrow	6:30	Give to everyone who asks you, and whoever takes away what is yours, do not demand it back
5:43	You have heard: Love your neighbour, hate your enemy	_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
5:44a	Love your enemies	6:27	Love your enemies
_____	_____	6:28a	Do good to them who hates you
_____	_____		
5:44b	Pray for those who persecute you...	6:28b	Pray for those who are abusive to you.
5:45	Then you are sons of your Father in heaven...	_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
5:46a	No reward only loving those who love you...	6:23a	No reward only loving those who love you...
5:46a	Even tax collectors do so...	6:23b	Even sinners do so...
_____	_____	6:33-34	If you do good to those who love you... If you lend to those who give back...
_____	_____		
_____	_____	6:35	Love your enemies, do good, lend and except nothing in return...
_____	_____		
5:48	Be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect	6:36	Be merciful just as your Father is merciful.
6:1-4	Do not practice righteousness in front of people...	_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
6:5-8	Do not pray for people to see...	_____	_____
		_____	_____
		_____	_____
_____	_____	11:1	The disciples asked Jesus to teach them to pray...
_____	_____		
_____	_____		
6:9-13	The Lords prayer.	11:2-4	Luke's shorter version of the Lord's prayer.
6:14a	If you forgives	6:37b	pardon
6:14b	your heavenly Father will forgive you.	6:37c	and you will be pardoned.
6:15	If you do not forgive...	_____	_____
		_____	_____
6:16-18	About fasting...	_____	_____
		_____	_____



<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>Content</b>
6:19	Do not gather treasures on earth...	12:33a	Sell your possessions and give to charity
6:20	Store up treasures in heaven...	12:33b	Make yourselves money belts that do not wear out ... in heaven.
6:21	Where your treasure is your heart will be.	12:34	Where your treasure is your heart will be.
6:22	The eye is the body's lamp...	11:34a	The eye is the body's lamp...
6:23	If your eye is bad...	11:34b-35	If your eye is bad...
6:24	No one can serve two masters...	16:13	No one can serve two masters...
6:25-33	Do not worry about your life, neither food nor drink or clothing...	12:22-31	Do not worry about your life, neither food nor drink or clothing...
6:34	Do not worry for tomorrow...	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	12:32	Do not be afraid... your Father has chosen to give you the kingdom.
7:1	Do not judge...	6:37a	Do not judge...
_____	_____	6:37b	Do not condemn...
7:2a	With the judgement you judge you will be judged.	_____	_____
_____	_____	6:38a	Give and it will be given to you...
7:2b	By your measure it will be measured to you.	6:38b	By your measure it will be measured to you.
7:3-5	The speck and the log.	6:41-42	The speck and the log.
7:6	Do not give the holy to dogs and pearls to pigs...	_____	_____
_____	_____	11:5-8	The friend in the night.
7:7-8	Ask, pray, knock...	11:9-10	Ask, pray, knock...
7:9	Who among you gives a stone to his son when he asks for bread...	_____	_____
7:10	Who among you gives a snake to his son when he asks for fish...	11:11	Who among you gives a snake to his son when he asks for fish...
_____	_____	11:12	or an scorpion if he asks for an egg...
7:11a	If you despite being evil understands how to give good gifts, how much more will your Father give...	11:13a	If you despite being evil understands how to give good gifts, how much more will your Father give...
7:11b	what is good to those who ask him	11:13b	the Holy Spirit to those who ask him.

<b>Matthew</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>Content</b>
7:12	Treat people as you want to be treated...	6:31	Treat people as you want to be treated...
7:13	Enter the narrow gate...	13:24	Enter the narrow gate...
7:14	The gate is narrow that leads to life	_____	_____
7:15	Beware of the false prophets in wolf's clothing...	_____	_____
7:16a	You will know them by their fruits	_____	_____
7:16b	Grapes are not gathered from thorn bushes, nor figs from thistles...	6:44b	For people do not gather figs from thorns, nor do they pick grapes from a briar bush.
7:17-18	Every good tree bears good fruit and a bad tree bad fruit...	_____	_____
7:19-20	Every tree not bearing good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. You will know them by their fruit.	_____	_____
7:21	Not every one calling me 'Lord,' 'Lord', will enter the kingdom of heaven, but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven will enter.	6:46	Why do you call me 'Lord,' 'Lord,' and do not do what I say?
_____	_____	13:25-26	Once the head of the house gets up and shuts the door... He will answer you, 'I do not know where you are from'...
7:22	Many will say to me on that day 'Lord,' 'Lord,'...	_____	_____
7:23	Then I will declare to them 'I never knew you; Leave Me, you who practice Lawlessness.'	13:27	And yet he will say, 'I do not know where you are from; Leave Me, all you evildoers.'
7:24-27	Building house on the rock or on the sand.	6:47-49	Building house on the rock or on the sand.
7:28-29	The crowds were amazed at his teaching; For He was teaching with authority...	4:32	and they were amazed at His teaching, because His message was delivered with authority.

## 7.11. Appendix 11: Jairus' daughter: Full version

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
		5:21 <sup>21</sup> Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.	8:40 <sup>40</sup> Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.
9:18a	<sup>18</sup> Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς,		
		5:22a <sup>22</sup> Καὶ	8:41a <sup>41</sup> καὶ
9:18b	ἰδοὺ		8:41b ἰδοὺ
9:18c	ἄρχων εἷς ἐλθὼν	5:22b ἔρχεται εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν, ὀνόματι Ἰάϊρος,	8:41c ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάϊρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν,
		5:22c καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν	
9:18d	προσεκύνει	5:22d πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας	8:41d καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας
9:18e	αὐτῷ	5:22e αὐτοῦ	8:41e [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ
		5:23a <sup>23</sup> καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτόν πολλὰ	
9:18f	λέγων	5:23b λέγων	
9:18g	ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν·	5:23c ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει,	
9:18h	ἀλλ' ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χειρὰ σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.	5:23d ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆ ἵνα σωθῆ καὶ ζήσῃ.	8:41f παρεκάλει αὐτόν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,  8:42a <sup>42</sup> ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν.
9:19a	<sup>19</sup> καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς	5:24a <sup>24</sup> καὶ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ.	
9:19b	ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.		
		5:24b καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν.	8:42b Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτόν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν.
9:20a	<sup>20</sup> Καὶ	5:25a <sup>25</sup> Καὶ	8:43a <sup>43</sup> Καὶ
9:20b	ἰδοὺ		
9:20c	γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα	5:25b γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος	8:43b γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος
9:20d	δώδεκα ἔτη	5:25c δώδεκα ἔτη	8:43c ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα,
		5:26 <sup>26</sup> καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χειρόν ἐλθοῦσα,	8:43d ἦτις [ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον]

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

			8:43e οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι,
	5:27a <sup>27</sup> ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,		
9:20e προσελθοῦσα	5:27b ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ	8:44a <sup>44</sup> προσελθοῦσα	
9:20f ὄπισθεν ἤψατο	5:27c ὄπισθεν ἤψατο	8:44b ὄπισθεν ἤψατο	
9:20g τοῦ κρασπέδου		8:44c τοῦ κρασπέδου	
9:20h τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·	5:27d τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·	8:44d τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ	
9:21a <sup>21</sup> ἔλεγεν γάρ	5:28a <sup>28</sup> ἔλεγεν γάρ		
9:21b ἐν ἑαυτῇ·			
9:21c ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι	5:28b ὅτι ἐὰν ἄψωμαι κἂν		
9:21d τοῦ ἱματίου	5:28c τῶν ἱματίων		
9:21e αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.	5:28d αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.		
	5:29a <sup>29</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς	8:44e καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ρύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.	
	5:29b καὶ ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἴαται - ἀπὸ τῆς μαστίγος. <sup>30</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς		
	5:30a ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξεληθοῦσαν ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ		
	5:30b ἔλεγεν·	8:45a <sup>45</sup> καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·	
	5:30c τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων;	8:45b τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου;	
		8:45c ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων	
	5:31a <sup>31</sup> καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·	8:45d εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος·	
	5:31b βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἤψατο;	8:45e ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.	
	5:32 <sup>32</sup> καὶ περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν.	8:46 <sup>46</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἤψατό μου τις, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνω δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.	
	5:33a <sup>33</sup> ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῇ,	8:47a <sup>47</sup> ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν, τρέμουσα	
	5:33b ἦλθεν καὶ	8:47b ἦλθεν καὶ	
	5:33c προσέπεσεν	8:47c προσπεσοῦσα	
	5:33d αὐτῷ	8:47d αὐτῷ	
	5:33e καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.	8:47e δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα.	

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

9:22a	22ὁ δὲ	5:34a	34ὁ δὲ	8:48a	48ὁ δὲ
9:22b	Ἰησοῦς στραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν				
9:22c	εἶπεν·	5:34b	εἶπεν	8:48b	εἶπεν
		5:34c	αὐτῇ·	8:48c	αὐτῇ·
9:22d	θάρσει,				
9:22e	θύγατερ·	5:34d	θυγάτηρ,	8:48d	θυγάτηρ,
9:22f	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.	5:34e	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε·	8:48e	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε·
		5:34f	ὑπάγε	8:48f	πορεύου
		5:34g	εἰς εἰρήνην	8:48g	εἰς εἰρήνην.
9:22g	καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὄρας ἐκείνης.	5:34h	καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιὲς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου.		
		5:35a	35Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος	8:49a	49Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
		5:35b	ἔρχονται ἀπὸ	8:49b	ἔρχεται τις παρὰ
		5:35c	τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου	8:49c	τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου
		5:35d	λέγοντες	8:49d	λέγων
		5:35e	ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν·	8:49e	ὅτι τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου·
		5:35f	τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον;	8:49f	μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον.
		5:36a	36ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς	8:50a	50ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
		5:36b	παρακούσας	8:50b	ἀκούσας
		5:36c	τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον		
		5:36d	λέγει	8:50c	ἀπεκρίθη
		5:36e	τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ·	8:50d	αὐτῷ·
		5:36f	μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.	8:50e	μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευσον,
				8:50f	καὶ σωθήσεται.
				8:51a	51ἔλθων δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
		5:37a	37καὶ οὐκ ἀφήκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι	8:51b	οὐκ ἀφήκεν εἰσελθεῖν τινα σὺν αὐτῷ
		5:37b	εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην	8:51c	εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον
		5:37c	τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.		
				8:51d	καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα.
9:23a	23Καὶ	5:38a	38καὶ		

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

9:23b	ἐλθῶν	5:38b	ἔρχονται	
9:23c	ὁ Ἰησοῦς			
9:23d	εἰς	5:38c	εἰς	
9:23e	τὴν οἰκίαν	5:38d	τὸν οἶκον	
9:23f	τοῦ	5:38e	τοῦ	
9:23g	ἄρχοντας	5:38f	ἀρχισυναγώγου,	
9:23h	καὶ ἰδῶν	5:38g	καὶ θεωρεῖ	
9:23i	τοὺς ἀσλητάς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβοῦμενον	5:38h	θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά,	
		5:39a	<sup>39</sup> καὶ εἰσελθῶν	8:52a <sup>52</sup> ἐκκλαίον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν.
9:24a	<sup>24</sup> ἔλεγεν·	5:39b	λέγει	8:52b ὁ δὲ
		5:39c	αὐτοῖς·	8:52c εἶπεν·
9:24b	ἀναχωρεῖτε,	5:39d	τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε;	
9:24c	οὐ γὰρ			8:52d μὴ κλαίετε,
9:24d	ἀπέθανεν τὸ κοράσιον	5:39e	τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν	8:52e οὐ γὰρ
9:24e	ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.	5:39f	ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.	8:52f ἀπέθανεν
9:24f	καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.	5:40a	<sup>40</sup> καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.	8:52g ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.
				8:53a <sup>53</sup> καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ
9:25a	<sup>25</sup> ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος εἰσελθῶν	5:40b	αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας	8:53b εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν.
		5:40c	παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.	
9:25b	ἐκράτησεν			8:54a <sup>54</sup> αὐτὸς δὲ
9:25c	τῆς χειρὸς	5:41a	<sup>41</sup> καὶ κρατήσας	8:54b κρατήσας
9:25d	αὐτῆς,	5:41b	τῆς χειρὸς	8:54c τῆς χειρὸς
		5:41c	τοῦ παιδίου	8:54d αὐτῆς
		5:41d	λέγει αὐτῇ· ταλιθα κουμ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον· τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.	8:54e ἐφώνησεν λέγων· ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε.
				8:55a <sup>55</sup> καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς
9:25e	καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον.	5:42	<sup>42</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον	8:55b καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ**

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ**

**ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ**

5:42b και περιεπάτει· ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα.

5:42c -

5:43 και ἐξέστησαν [εὐθύς] ἐκστάσει μεγάλης. <sup>43</sup>και διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο, και εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.

8:55c - και διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. <sup>56</sup>και ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

9:26 <sup>26</sup>και ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL**

**MARK'S GOSPEL**

**LUKE'S GOSPEL**

5:21 <sup>21</sup>When Jesus had crossed over again in the boat to the other side, a large crowd gathered around Him; and He stayed by the seashore.

8:40 <sup>40</sup>And as Jesus was returning, the people welcomed Him, for they had all been waiting for Him.

9:18a <sup>18</sup>While He was saying these things to them,

9:18b behold,

9:18c a synagogue official came

5:22a <sup>22</sup>And

5:22b one of the synagogue officials, named Jairus, came,

5:22c and upon seeing Him,

9:18d and bowed down before

5:22d fell at

8:41c and he fell at

9:18e Him,

5:22e His feet

8:41d Jesus' feet,

5:23a <sup>23</sup>and pleaded with Him earnestly,

9:18f and said,

5:23b saying,

9:18g "My daughter has just died;

5:23c "My little daughter is at the point of death;

9:18h but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will become alive again."

5:23d please come and lay Your hands on her, so that she will get well and live."

8:41e and *began* urging Him to come to his house;

8:42a <sup>42</sup>for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, and she was dying.

9:19a <sup>19</sup>Jesus got up *from the table*

9:19b and *began to* accompany him,

5:24 <sup>24</sup>And He went off with him;

9:19c along with His disciples.

5:24b and a large crowd was following Him and pressing in on Him.

8:42b But as He went, the crowds were pressing against Him.

9:20a <sup>20</sup>And

8:43a <sup>43</sup>And

MATTHEW'S GOSPELMARK'S GOSPELLUKE'S GOSPEL

9:20b	behold,			
9:20c	a woman who had been suffering from a hemorrhage	5:25a	<sup>25</sup> A woman who had had a hemorrhage	8:43b a woman who had suffered a <i>chronic</i> flow of blood
9:20d	for twelve years	5:25c	for twelve years,	8:43c for twelve years,
		5:26	<sup>26</sup> and had endured much at the hands of many physicians, and had spent all that she had and was not helped at all, but instead had become worse—	8:43d and could not be healed by anyone,
				[8:43e] [NASB omits this part]
		5:27a	<sup>27</sup> after hearing about Jesus,	
9:20e	came up	5:27b	she came up	8:44a <sup>44</sup> came up
		5:27c	in the crowd	
9:20f	behind Him, and touched	5:27d	behind Him and touched	8:44b behind Him and touched
9:20g	the border			8:44c the fringe
9:20h	of His cloak;	5:27e	His cloak.	8:44d of His cloak,
9:21a	<sup>21</sup> for she	5:28a	<sup>28</sup> For she	
9:21b	was saying to herself,	5:28b	had been saying to herself,	
9:21c	“If I only touch	5:28c	“If I just touch	
9:21d	His cloak,	5:28d	His garments,	
9:21e	I will get well.”	5:28e	I will get well.”	
		5:29a	<sup>29</sup> And immediately the flow of her blood was dried up;	8:44e and immediately her bleeding stopped.
		5:29b	and she felt in her body that she was healed of her disease.	
		5:30a	<sup>30</sup> And immediately Jesus, perceiving in Himself that power from Him had gone out, turned around in the crowd	
		5:30b	and said,	8:45a <sup>45</sup> And Jesus said,
		5:30c	“Who touched My garments?”	8:45b “Who is the one who touched Me?”
				8:45c And while they were all denying it,
		5:31a	<sup>31</sup> And His disciples said to Him,	8:45d Peter said,
		5:31b	“You see the crowd pressing in on You, and You say, ‘Who touched Me?’ ”	8:45e “Master, the people are crowding and pressing in on You.”



MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

5:32	<sup>32</sup> And He looked around to see the woman who had done this.	8:46	<sup>46</sup> But Jesus said, "Someone did touch Me, for I was aware that power had left Me."
5:33a	<sup>33</sup> But the woman, fearing and trembling, aware of what had happened to her,	8:47a	<sup>47</sup> Now when the woman saw that she had not escaped notice,
5:33b	came and fell down before Him	8:47b	she came trembling and fell down before Him,
5:33c	and told Him the whole truth.	8:47c	and admitted in the presence of all the people the reason why she had touched Him, and how she had been immediately healed.
9:22a	<sup>22</sup> But Jesus,	8:48a	<sup>48</sup> And He
9:22b	turning and seeing her,		
9:22c	said,	8:48b	said
		8:48c	to her,
9:22d	"Daughter,	8:48d	"Daughter,
9:22e	take courage;		
9:22f	your faith has made you well."	8:48e	your faith has made you well;
		8:48f	go in peace."
9:22g	And at once the woman was made well.		
5:34a	<sup>34</sup> And He		
5:34b	said		
5:34c	to her,		
5:34d	"Daughter,		
5:34e	your faith has made you well;		
5:34f	go in peace		
5:34g	and be cured of your disease."		
5:35a	<sup>35</sup> While He was still speaking,	8:49a	<sup>49</sup> While He was still speaking,
5:35b	people	8:49b	someone
5:35c	came from the house of the synagogue official, saying,	8:49c	came from <i>the house of</i> the synagogue official, saying,
5:35d	"Your daughter has died;	8:49d	"Your daughter has died;
5:35e	why bother the Teacher further?"	8:49e	do not trouble the Teacher anymore."
5:36a	<sup>36</sup> But Jesus,	8:50a	<sup>50</sup> But when Jesus
5:36b	overhearing what was being spoken,	8:50b	heard <i>this</i> ,
5:36c	said to the synagogue official,	8:50c	He responded to him
5:36d	"Do not be afraid,	8:50d	"Do not be afraid

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

			8:50e <i>any longer;</i>
	5:36e	only believe.”	8:50f only believe,
			8:50g and she will be made well.”
			8:51a <sup>51</sup> When He came to the house,
	5:37a	<sup>37</sup> And He allowed no one to accompany Him	8:51b He did not allow anyone to enter with Him
	5:37b	except Peter, James, and John the brother of James.	8:51c except Peter, John, and James,
			8:51d and the girl’s father and mother.
9:23a	<sup>23</sup> When Jesus	5:38a <sup>38</sup> They	
9:23b	came	5:38b came	
9:23c	into	5:38c to	
9:23d	the official’s house	5:38d the house of the synagogue official,	
9:23e	and saw the flute players and the crowd in noisy disorder,	5:38e and He saw a commotion, and people loudly weeping and wailing.	8:52a <sup>52</sup> Now they were all weeping and mourning for her;
		5:39a <sup>39</sup> And	8:52b but
		5:39b after entering,	
9:24a	<sup>24</sup> He said,	5:39c He said	8:52c He said,
		5:39d to them,	
9:24b	“Leave;	“Why are you making a commotion and weeping?	8:52d “Stop weeping,
9:24c	for		8:52e for
9:24d	the girl	5:39e The child	8:52f she
9:24e	has not died,	5:39f has not died,	8:52g has not died,
9:24f	but is asleep.”	5:39g but is asleep.”	8:52h but is asleep.”
9:24g	And they <i>began</i> laughing at Him.	5:40a <sup>40</sup> And they began laughing at Him.	8:53a <sup>53</sup> And they <i>began</i> laughing at Him,
			8:53b knowing that she had died.
9:25a	<sup>25</sup> But when the crowd had been sent out, He entered	5:40b But putting them all outside,	
		5:40c He took along the child’s father and mother and His own companions, and entered the room where the child was in bed.	

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

				8:54a	<sup>54</sup> He, however,
9:25b	and took her by the hand,	5:41a	<sup>41</sup> And taking the child by the hand,	8:54b	took her by the hand and
		5:41b	He said to her, "Talitha, kum!" (which translated means,	8:54c	spoke forcefully, saying,
		8:42c	"Little girl, I say to you, get up!").	8:54d	"Child, arise!"
9:25c	and the girl got up.			8:55a	<sup>55</sup> And her spirit returned,
				8:55b	and she got up immediately;
		5:42a	<sup>42</sup> And immediately the girl got up		
		5:42b	and began to walk, for she was twelve years old.		
		5:42c - 5:43	And immediately they were completely astonished. <sup>43</sup> And He gave them strict orders that no one was to know about this, and He told them to have something given her to eat.	8:55b	and He ordered that <i>some-thing</i> be given her to eat.
				8:56	<sup>56</sup> Her parents were amazed; but He instructed them to tell no one what had happened.
9:26	<sup>26</sup> And this news spread throughout that land.				

## 7.12. Appendix 12: Jairus' daughter: Matthew and Luke

<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>		<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>	
9:18a	<sup>18</sup> Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς,	8:40	<sup>40</sup> Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.
		8:41a	<sup>41</sup> καὶ
9:18b	ἰδοὺ	8:41b	ἰδοὺ
9:18c	ἄρχων εἷς ἐλθὼν	8:41c	ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ὃ ὄνομα Ἰαῖρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν,
9:18d	προσεκύνει	8:41d	καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας
9:18e	αὐτῷ	8:41e	[τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ
9:18f	λέγων		
9:18g	ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν·		
9:18h	ἀλλ' ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χειρὰ σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.	8:41f	παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,
		8:42a	<sup>42</sup> ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν.
9:19a	<sup>19</sup> καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς		
9:19b	ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.		
		8:42b	Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν.
9:20a	<sup>20</sup> Καὶ	8:43a	<sup>43</sup> Καὶ
9:20b	ἰδοὺ		
9:20c	γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα	8:43b	γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος
9:20d	δώδεκα ἔτη	8:43c	ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα,
		8:43d	ἣτις [ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον]
		8:43e	οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι,
9:20e	προσελθοῦσα	8:44a	<sup>44</sup> προσελθοῦσα
9:20f	ὀπισθεν ἤψατο	8:44b	ὀπισθεν ἤψατο
9:20g	τοῦ κρασπέδου	8:44c	τοῦ κρασπέδου
9:20h	τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·	8:44d	τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ
9:21a	<sup>21</sup> ἔλεγεν γὰρ		
9:21b	ἐν ἑαυτῇ· ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι		
9:21c	τοῦ ἱματίου		

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

9:21d	αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.		
		8:44e	καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ρύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.
		8:45a	<sup>45</sup> καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
		8:45b	τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου;
		8:45c	ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων
		8:45d	εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος·
		8:45e	ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.
		8:46	<sup>46</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἤψατό μου τις, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνω δύναμιν ἐξεληλυ-θυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.
		8:47a	<sup>47</sup> ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν, τρέμουσα
		8:47b	ἦλθεν καὶ
		8:47c	προσπεσοῦσα
		8:47d	αὐτῷ
		8:47e	δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἴαθη παραχρῆμα.
9:22a	<sup>22</sup> ὁ δὲ	8:48a	<sup>48</sup> ὁ δὲ
9:22b	Ἰησοῦς στραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτήν		
9:22c	εἶπεν·	8:48b	εἶπεν
9:22d	θάρσει,	8:48c	αὐτῆ·
9:22e	θυγάτερ·	8:48d	θυγάτηρ,
9:22f	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.	8:48e	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε·
		8:48f	πορεύου
		8:48g	εἰς εἰρήνην.
9:22g	καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.	8:49a	<sup>49</sup> Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
		5:49b	ἔρχεται τις παρὰ
		5:49c	τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου
		5:49d	λέγων
		5:49e	ὅτι τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου·
		5:49f	μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον.

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

		8:50a	<sup>50</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
		8:50b	ἀκούσας
		8:50c	ἀπεκρίθη
		8:50d	αὐτῷ·
		8:50e	μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευσον,
		8:50f	καὶ σωθήσεται.
		8:51a	<sup>51</sup> ἔλθων δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
		8:51b	οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν τινα σὺν αὐτῷ
		8:51c	εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον
		8:51d	καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα.
9:23a	<sup>23</sup> Καὶ		
9:23b	ἔλθων		
9:23c	ὁ Ἰησοῦς		
9:23d	εἰς		
9:23e	τὴν οἰκίαν		
9:23f	τοῦ		
9:23g	ἄρχοντος		
9:23h	καὶ ἰδῶν		
9:23i	τοὺς ἀύλητάς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον	8:52a	<sup>52</sup> ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν.
		8:52b	ὁ δὲ
9:24a	<sup>24</sup> ἔλεγεν·	8:52c	εἶπεν·
9:24b	ἀναχωρεῖτε,	8:52d	μὴ κλαίετε,
9:24c	οὐ γὰρ	8:52d	οὐ γὰρ
9:24d	ἀπέθανεν τὸ κοράσιον	8:52e	ἀπέθανεν
9:24e	ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.	8:52f	ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.
9:24f	καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.	8:53a	<sup>53</sup> καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ
		8:53b	εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν.
9:25a	<sup>25</sup> ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος εἰσελθὼν		
		8:54a	<sup>54</sup> αὐτὸς δὲ
9:25b	ἐκράτησεν	8:54b	κρατήσας
9:25c	τῆς χειρὸς	8:54c	τῆς χειρὸς
9:25d	αὐτῆς,	8:54d	αὐτῆς

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ**

**ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ**

		8:54e	ἐφώνησεν λέγων· ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε.
		8:55a	<sup>55</sup> καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς
9:25e	καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον.	8:55b	καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα
		8:55c - 8:56	καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. <sup>56</sup> καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρ- ἠγγείλεν αὐτοῖς μηδεὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.
9:26	<sup>26</sup> καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκεῖνην.		

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL**

**LUKE'S GOSPEL**

		8:40	<sup>40</sup> And as Jesus was returning, the people welcomed Him, for they had all been waiting for Him.
9:18a	<sup>18</sup> While He was saying these things to them,		
9:18b	behold,	8:41a	<sup>41</sup> And
9:18c	a synagogue official came	8:41b	a man named Jairus came, and he was an official of the synagogue;
9:18d	and bowed down before	8:41c	and he fell at
9:18e	Him,	8:41d	Jesus' feet,
9:18f	and said,		
9:18g	"My daughter has just died;		
9:18h	but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will become alive again."	8:41e	and <i>began</i> urging Him to come to his house;
		8:42a	<sup>42</sup> for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, and she was dying.
9:19a	<sup>19</sup> Jesus got up <i>from the table</i>		
9:19b	and <i>began to</i> accompany him, along with His disciples.		
		8:42b	But as He went, the crowds were pressing against Him.
9:20a	<sup>20</sup> And	8:43a	<sup>43</sup> And
9:20b	behold,		
9:20c	a woman who had been suffering from a hemorrhage	8:43b	a woman who had suffered a <i>chronic</i> flow of blood
9:20d	for twelve years	9:43c	for twelve years,
		8:43d	and could not be healed by anyone,
		[8:43e]	[NASB omits this part]
9:20e	came up	8:44a	<sup>44</sup> came up
9:20f	behind Him, and touched	8:44b	behind Him and touched
9:20g	the border	8:44c	the fringe
9:20h	of His cloak;	8:44d	of His cloak,



**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL**

**LUKE'S GOSPEL**

9:21a       <sup>21</sup>for she  
9:21b       was saying to herself,  
9:21c       “If I only touch  
9:21d       His cloak,  
9:21e       I will get well.”

9:22a       Jesus,  
9:22b       turning and seeing her,  
9:22c       said,  
9:22d       “Daughter,  
9:22e       take courage;  
9:22f       your faith has made you well.”  
9:22g       And at once the woman was made well.

8:44e       and immediately her bleeding stopped.  
8:45a       <sup>45</sup>And Jesus said,  
8:45b       “Who is the one who touched Me?”  
8:45c       And while they were all denying it,  
8:45d       Peter said,  
8:45e       “Master, the people are crowding and  
              pressing in on You.”  
8:46       <sup>46</sup>But Jesus said, “Someone did touch Me,  
              for I was aware that power had left Me.”  
8:47a       <sup>47</sup>Now when the woman saw that she had  
              not escaped notice,  
8:47b       she came trembling and fell down before  
              Him,  
8:47c       and admitted in the presence of all the  
              people the reason why she had touched  
              Him, and how she had been immediately  
              healed.  
8:48a       <sup>48</sup>And He  
8:48b       said  
8:48c       to her,  
8:48d       “Daughter,  
8:48e       your faith has made you well;  
8:48f       go in peace.”

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

		8:49a	<sup>49</sup> While He was still speaking,
		8:49b	someone
		8:49c	came from <i>the house of</i> the synagogue official, saying,
		8:49d	“Your daughter has died;
		8:49e	do not trouble the Teacher anymore.”
		8:50a	<sup>50</sup> But when Jesus
		8:50b	heard <i>this</i> ,
		8:50c	He responded to him,
		8:50d	“Do not be afraid
		8:50e	<i>any longer</i> ;
		8:50f	only believe, and she will be made well.”
		8:51a	<sup>51</sup> When He came to the house,
		8:51b	He did not allow anyone to enter with Him
		8:51c	except Peter, John, and James,
		8:51d	and the girl’s father and mother.
9:23a	<sup>23</sup> When Jesus		
9:23b	came		
9:23c	into		
9:23d	the official’s house		
9:23e	and saw the flute players and the crowd in noisy disorder,	8:52a	<sup>52</sup> Now they were all weeping and mourning for her;
		8:52b	but
9:24a	<sup>24</sup> He said,	8:52c	He said,
9:24b	“Leave;	8:52d	“Stop weeping,
9:24c	for	8:52e	for
9:24d	the girl	8:52f	she
9:24e	has not died,	8:52g	has not died,
9:24f	but is asleep.”	8:52h	but is asleep.”
9:24g	And they <i>began</i> laughing at Him.	8:53a	<sup>53</sup> And they <i>began</i> laughing at Him,

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL**

**LUKE'S GOSPEL**

		8:53b	knowing that she had died.
9:25a	<sup>5</sup> But when the crowd had been sent out, He entered		
		8:54a	<sup>54</sup> He, however,
9:25b	and took her by the hand,	8:54b	took her by the hand and
		8:54c	spoke forcefully, saying, "Child, arise!"
		8:55a	<sup>55</sup> And her spirit returned,
		8:55b	and she got up immediately;
9:25c	and the girl got up.		
		8:55b - 8:56	and He ordered that <i>something</i> be given her to eat. <sup>56</sup> Her parents were amazed; but He instructed them to tell no one what had happened.
9:26	<sup>26</sup> And this news spread throughout that land.		

## 7.13. Appendix 13: Jairus' daughter: Marks use of Matthew and Luke

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ / ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>		<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>
<u>L8:40</u>	<u>40</u> Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.	5:21	<sup>21</sup> Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.
M9:18a	<sup>18</sup> Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς,		
<u>L8:41a</u>	<sup>41</sup> καὶ	5:22a	<sup>22</sup> Καὶ
M9:18b	ἰδοῦ / ἰδοῦ		
M9:18c / <u>L8:41c</u>	<u>ἄρχων εἷς ἐλθὼν / ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάϊρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν.</u>	5:22b	ἔρχεται εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων, ὀνόματι Ἰάϊρος,
		5:22c	καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν
M9:18d / <u>L8:41d</u>	<u>προσεκύνει / καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας</u>	5:22d	πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας
M9:18e / <u>L8:41e</u>	<u>αὐτῷ / [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ</u>	5:22e	αὐτοῦ
		5:23a	<sup>23</sup> καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτόν πολλὰ
M9:18f	λέγων	5:23b	λέγων
M9:18g	ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν·	5:23c	ὅτι τὸ θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει,
M9:18h / <u>L8:41f</u>	<u>ἀλλ' ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χειρὰ σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται. παρεκάλει αὐτόν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.</u>	5:23d	ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ.
<u>L8:42a</u>	<u>42</u> ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθνησκεν.		
M9:19a	<sup>19</sup> καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς		
M9:19b	ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ	5:24a	<sup>24</sup> καὶ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ.
<u>M9:19c</u>	καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.		
<u>L8:42b</u>	<u>Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτόν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν.</u>	5:24b	καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν.
M9:20a / <u>L8:43a</u>	<sup>20</sup> Καὶ / <sup>43</sup> Καὶ	5:25a	<sup>25</sup> Καὶ
M9:20b	ἰδοῦ		
M9:20c / <u>L8:43b</u>	<u>γυνὴ αἱμορροοῦσα / γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος</u>	5:25b	γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος
M9:20d	δώδεκα ἔτη / <u>ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα.</u>	5:25c	δώδεκα ἔτη
<u>L8:43d - L8:43e</u>	<u>ἥτις [ιατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὄλον τὸν βίον] οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι,</u>	5:26	<sup>26</sup> καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χειρὸν ἐλθοῦσα,
		5:27a	<sup>27</sup> ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ / ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ**

M9:20e / L8:44a	προσελθοῦσα / <u>44προσελθοῦσα</u>	5:27b	ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ
M9:20f / L8:44b	ὄπισθεν ἤψατο / <u>ὄπισθεν ἤψατο</u>	5:27c	ὄπισθεν ἤψατο
M9:20g / L8:44c	τοῦ κρασπέδου / <u>τοῦ κρασπέδου</u>	5:27d	τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·
M9:20h / L8:44d	τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· / <u>τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ</u>		
M9:21a	<sup>21</sup> ἔλεγεν γάρ	5:28a	<sup>28</sup> ἔλεγεν γάρ
M9:21b	ἐν ἑαυτῇ· ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι	5:28b	ὅτι ἐὰν ἄψωμαι κἀν
M9:21c	τοῦ ἱματίου	5:28c	τῶν ἱματίων
M9:21d	αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.	5:28d	αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.
L8:44e	<u>καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστι ἡ ρύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.</u>	5:29a	<sup>29</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς
		5:29b - 5:30a	καὶ ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἴαται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος. <sup>30</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξεληθοῦσαν ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ
L8:45a	<u>45καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·</u>	5:30b	ἔλεγεν·
L8:45b	<u>τίς ὁ ἀνάμενός μου;</u>	5:30c	τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων;
L8:45c	<u>ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων</u>		
L8:45d	<u>εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος·</u>	5:31a	<sup>31</sup> καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·
L8:45e	<u>ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.</u>	5:31b	βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἤψατο;
L8:46	<u>46ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἤψατό μου τις, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνω δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.</u>	5:32	<sup>32</sup> καὶ περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσαν.
L8:47a	<u>47ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθεν, τρέμουσα</u>	5:33a	<sup>33</sup> ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδυῖα ὁ γέγονεν αὐτῇ,
L8:47b	<u>ἦλθεν καὶ</u>	5:33b	ἦλθεν καὶ
L8:47c	<u>προσπεσοῦσα</u>	5:33c	προσέπεσεν
L8:47d	<u>αὐτῷ</u>	5:33d	αὐτῷ
L8:47e	<u>δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἤψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἴαθη παραχρῆμα.</u>	5:33e	καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.
M9:22a / L8:48a	<sup>22</sup> ὁ δὲ / <u>48ὁ δὲ</u>	5:34a	<sup>34</sup> ὁ δὲ
M9:22b	Ἰησοῦς στραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτήν		
M9:22c / L8:48b	εἶπεν· / <u>εἶπεν</u>	5:34b	εἶπεν
L8:48c	<u>αὐτῇ·</u>	5:34c	αὐτῇ·

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ / ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ**

M9:22d	θάρσει,		
M9:22e / L8:48d	θύγατερ· / θυγάτηρ,	5:34d	θυγάτηρ,
M9:22f / L8:48e	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. / <u>ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε·</u>	5:34e	ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε·
L8:48f	<u>πορεύου</u>	5:34f	ὑπαγε
L8:48g	<u>εἰς εἰρήνην.</u>	5:34g	εἰς εἰρήνην
M9:22g	καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.	5:34h	καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιῆς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου.
L8:49a	<u><sup>49</sup>Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος</u>	5:35a	<sup>35</sup> Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος
L8:49b	<u>ἔρχεται τις παρὰ</u>	5:35b	ἔρχονται ἀπὸ
L8:49c	<u>τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου</u>	5:35c	τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου
L8:49d	<u>λέγων</u>	5:35d	λέγοντες
L8:49e	<u>ὅτι τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου·</u>	5:35e	ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανεν·
L8:49f	<u>μηκέτι σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον.</u>	5:35f	τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον;
L8:50a	<u><sup>50</sup>ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς</u>	5:36a	<sup>36</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς
L8:50b	<u>ἀκούσας</u>	5:36b	παρακούσας
		5:36c	τὸν λόγον λαλοῦμενον
L8:50c	<u>ἀπεκρίθη</u>	5:36d	λέγει
L8:50d	<u>αὐτῷ·</u>	5:36e	τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ·
L8:50e	<u>μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πιστευσον,</u>	5:36f	μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνονπίστευε.
L8:50f	<u>καὶ σωθήσεται.</u>		
L8:51a	<u><sup>51</sup>ἔλθων δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν</u>		
L8:51b	<u>οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν τινα σὺν αὐτῷ</u>	5:37a	<sup>37</sup> καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι
L8:51c	<u>εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον</u>	5:37b	εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην
		5:37c	τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.
L8:51d	<u>καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα.</u>		
M9:23a	<sup>23</sup> καὶ	5:38a	<sup>38</sup> καὶ
M9:23b	ἐλθὼν	5:38b	ἔρχονται
M9:23c	ὁ Ἰησοῦς		
M9:23d	εἰς	5:38c	εἰς
M9:23e	τὴν οἰκίαν	5:38d	τὸν οἶκον
M9:23f	τοῦ	5:38e	τοῦ
M9:23g	ἄρχοντος	5:38f	ἀρχισυναγώγου,

**ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ / ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ****ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ**

M9:23h	καὶ ἰδῶν	5:38g	καὶ θεωρεῖ
M9:23i / L8:52a	τοὺς ἀύλητάς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον/ <u>52</u> ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν.	5:38h	θόρυβον καὶ κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά,
L8:52b	ὁ δὲ	5:39a	<sup>39</sup> καὶ εἰσελθῶν
M9:24a / L8:52c	<sup>24</sup> ἔλεγεν· / <u>εἶπεν</u> ·	5:39b	λέγει
M9:24b / L8:52d	ἀναχωρεῖτε, / <u>μὴ κλαίετε</u> .	5:39c	αὐτοῖς·
M9:24c / L8:52e	οὐ γὰρ / <u>οὐ γὰρ</u>	5:39d	τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε;
M9:24d / L8:52f	ἀπέθανεν τὸ κοράσιον / <u>ἀπέθανεν</u>	5:39e	τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν
M9:24e / L8:52g	ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. / <u>ἀλλὰ καθεύδει</u> .	5:39f	ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.
M9:24f / L8:53a	καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. / <u>53</u> καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ	5:40a	<sup>40</sup> καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.
L8:53b	<u>εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν</u> .		
M9:25a	<sup>25</sup> ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος εἰσελθῶν	5:40b	αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας
L8:54a	<sup>54</sup> αὐτὸς δὲ	5:40c	παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.
M9:25b / L8:54b	ἐκράτησεν / <u>κρατήσας</u>	5:41a	<sup>41</sup> καὶ κρατήσας
M9:25c / L8:54c	τῆς χειρὸς / <u>τῆς χειρὸς</u>	5:41b	τῆς χειρὸς
M9:25d / L8:54d	αὐτῆς, / <u>αὐτῆς</u>	5:41c	τοῦ παιδίου
L8:54e	<u>ἐφώνησεν λέγων· ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε</u> .	5:41d	λέγει αὐτῇ· ταλιθα κουμ, ὃ ἐστὶν μεθερμηνευόμενον· τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρε.
L8:55a	<u>55</u> καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς		
M9:25e / L8:55b	καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον. / <u>καὶ ἀνέστη</u> <u>παραχρῆμα</u>	5:42a	<sup>42</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον
L8:55c - L8:56	καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. <sup>56</sup> καὶ <u>ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρ-</u> <u>ἠγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.</u>	5:42b	καὶ περιεπάτει· ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα.
M9:26	<sup>26</sup> καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.	5:42c - 5:43	καὶ ἐξέστησαν [εὐθὺς] ἐκστάσει μεγάλη. <sup>43</sup> καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδεὶς γνοῖ τοῦτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL / LUKE'S GOSPEL**

**MARK'S GOSPEL**

L8:40	<u>40And as Jesus was returning, the people welcomed Him, for they had all been waiting for Him.</u>	5:21	21When Jesus had crossed over again in the boat to the other side, a large crowd gathered around Him; and He stayed by the seashore.
M9:18a	18While He was saying these things to them,		
M9:18b / L8:41a	behold, / <u>41And</u>	5:22a	22And
M9:18c / L8:41b	a synagogue official came / <u>a man named Jairus came, and he was an official of the synagogue;</u>	5:22b	one of the synagogue officials, named Jairus, came,
		5:22c	and upon seeing Him,
M9:18d / L8:41c	and bowed down before / <u>and he fell at</u>	5:22d	fell at
M9:18e / L8:41d	Him, / Jesus' feet,	5:22e	His feet
		5:23a	23and pleaded with Him earnestly,
M9:18f	and said,	5:23b	saying,
M9:18g	“My daughter has just died;	5:23c	“My little daughter is at the point of death;
M9:18h / L8:41e	but come and lay Your hand on her, and she will become alive again.” / <u>and began urging Him to come to his house;</u>	5:23d	please come and lay Your hands on her, so that she will get well and live.”
L8:42a	42for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, and she was dying.		
M9:19a	19Jesus got up <i>from the table</i>		
M9:19b	and <i>began to</i> accompany him,	5:24a	24And He went off with him;
	along with His disciples.		
L8:42b	<u>But as He went, the crowds were pressing against Him.</u>	5:24b	and a large crowd was following Him and pressing in on Him.
M9:20a / L8:43a	20And / <u>43And</u>		
M9:20b	behold,		
M9:20c / L8:43b	a woman who had been suffering from a hemorrhage / <u>a woman who had suffered a chronic flow of blood</u>	5:25a	25A woman who had had a hemorrhage
M9:20d / L8:43c	for twelve years / <u>for twelve years,</u>	5:25c	for twelve years,
L8:43d	<u>and could not be healed by anyone,</u>	5:26	26and had endured much at the hands of many physicians, and had spent all that she had and was not helped at all, but instead had become worse—
[L8:43e]	[NASB2020 omits this part]		
		5:27a	27after hearing about Jesus,
M9:20e / L8:44a	came up / <u>44came up</u>	5:27b	she came up



**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL / LUKE'S GOSPEL**

**MARK'S GOSPEL**

		5:27c	in the crowd
M9:20f / L8:44b	behind Him, and touched / <u>behind Him and touched</u>	5:27d	behind Him and touched
M9:20g	the border		
M9:20h	of His cloak;	5:27e	His cloak.
M9:21a	<sup>21</sup> for she	5:28a	<sup>28</sup> For she
M9:21b	was saying to herself,	5:28b	had been saying to herself,
M9:21c	“If I only touch	5:28c	“If I just touch
M9:21d	His cloak,	5:28d	His garments,
M9:21e	I will get well.”	5:28e	I will get well.”
L8:44e	<u>and immediately her bleeding stopped.</u>	5:29a	<sup>29</sup> And immediately the flow of her blood was dried up;
		5:29b	and she felt in her body that she was healed of her disease.
		5:30a	<sup>30</sup> And immediately Jesus, perceiving in Himself that power from Him had gone out, turned around in the crowd
L8:45a	<u><sup>45</sup>And Jesus said,</u>	5:30b	and said,
L8:45b	<u>“Who is the one who touched Me?”</u>	5:30c	“Who touched My garments?”
L8:45c	<u>And while they were all denying it,</u>		
L8:45d	<u>Peter said,</u>	5:31a	<sup>31</sup> And His disciples said to Him,
L8:45e	<u>“Master, the people are crowding and pressing in on You.”</u>	5:31b	“You see the crowd pressing in on You, and You say, ‘Who touched Me?’ ”
L8:46	<u><sup>46</sup>But Jesus said, “Someone did touch Me, for I was aware that power had left Me.”</u>	5:32	<sup>32</sup> And He looked around to see the woman who had done this.
L8:47a	<u><sup>47</sup>Now when the woman saw that she had not escaped notice,</u>	5:33a	<sup>33</sup> But the woman, fearing and trembling, aware of what had happened to her,
L8:47b	<u>she came trembling and fell down before Him,</u>	5:33b	came and fell down before Him
L8:47c	<u>and admitted in the presence of all the people the reason why she had touched Him, and how she had been immediately healed.</u>	5:33c	and told Him the whole truth.
M9:22a / L8:48a	Jesus, <u><sup>48</sup>And He</u>	5:34a	<sup>34</sup> And He
M9:22b	turning and seeing her,	5:34b	said
M9:22c / L8:48b	said, / <u>said</u>		

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL / LUKE'S GOSPEL**

**MARK'S GOSPEL**

<u>L8:48c</u>	to her,	5:34c	to her,
M9:22d / <u>L8:48d</u>	“Daughter, / <u>“Daughter,</u>	5:34d	“Daughter,
M9:22e	take courage;		
M9:22f / <u>L8:48e</u>	your faith has made you well.” / <u>your faith</u> <u>has made you well;</u>	5:34e	your faith has made you well;
<u>L8:48f</u>	go in peace.”	5:34f	go in peace
M9:22g	And at once the woman was made well.	5:34g	and be cured of your disease.”
<u>L8:49a</u>	<sup>49</sup> While He was still speaking,	5:35a	<sup>35</sup> While He was still speaking,
<u>L8:49b</u>	someone	5:35b	people
<u>L8:49c</u>	came from <u>the house of the synagogue</u> <u>official, saying,</u>	5:35c	came from the house of the synagogue official, saying,
<u>L8:49d</u>	<u>“Your daughter has died;</u>	5:35d	“Your daughter has died;
<u>L8:49e</u>	<u>do not trouble the Teacher anymore.”</u>	5:35e	why bother the Teacher further?”
<u>L8:50a</u>	<sup>50</sup> But when Jesus	5:36a	<sup>36</sup> But Jesus,
<u>L8:50b</u>	<u>heard this,</u>	5:36b	overhearing what was being spoken,
<u>L8:50c</u>	<u>He responded to him,</u>	5:36c	said to the synagogue official,
<u>L8:50d</u>	<u>“Do not be afraid</u>	5:36d	“Do not be afraid,
<u>L8:50e</u>	<u>any longer;</u>		
<u>L8:50f</u>	only believe,	5:36e	only believe.”
<u>L8:50g</u>	<u>and she will be made well.”</u>		
<u>L8:51a</u>	<sup>51</sup> When He came to the house,		
<u>L8:51b</u>	<u>He did not allow anyone to enter with Him</u>	5:37a	<sup>37</sup> And He allowed no one to accompany Him
<u>L8:51c</u>	<u>except Peter, John, and James,</u>	5:37b	except Peter, James, and John the brother of James.
<u>L8:51d</u>	<u>and the girl's father and mother.</u>		
M9:23a	<sup>23</sup> When Jesus	5:38a	<sup>38</sup> They
M9:23b	came	5:38b	came
M9:23c	into	5:38c	to
M9:23d	the official's house	5:38d	the house of the synagogue official,

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL / LUKE'S  
GOSPEL**

**MARK'S GOSPEL**

M9:23e / <u>L8:52a</u>	and saw the flute players and the crowd in noisy disorder, / <u><sup>52</sup>Now they were all weeping and mourning for her;</u>	5:38e	and He saw a commotion, and people loudly weeping and wailing.
<u>L8:52b</u>	but	5:39a	<sup>39</sup> And
		5:39b	after entering,
M9:24a / <u>L8:52c</u>	<sup>24</sup> He said, / <u>He said,</u>	5:39c	He said
		5:39d	to them,
M9:24b / <u>L8:52d</u>	“Leave; / <u>“Stop weeping,</u>	5:39e	“Why are you making a commotion and weeping?”
M9:24c / <u>L8:52e</u>	for / <u>for</u>		
M9:24d / <u>L8:52f</u>	the girl / <u>she</u>	5:39f	The child
M9:24e / <u>L8:52g</u>	has not died, / <u>has not died</u>	5:39g	has not died,
M9:24f / <u>L8:52h</u>	but is asleep.” / <u>but is asleep”</u>	5:39h	but is asleep.”
M9:24g / <u>L8:53a</u>	And they <i>began</i> laughing at Him. / <u><sup>53</sup>And they <i>began</i> laughing at Him,</u>	5:40a	<sup>40</sup> And they began laughing at Him.
<u>L8:53b</u>	knowing that she had died.		
M9:25a	<sup>5</sup> But when the crowd had been sent out, He entered	5:40b	But putting them all outside,
		5:40c	He took along the child’s father and mother and His own companions, and entered the room where the child was in bed.
<u>L8:54a</u>	<u><sup>54</sup>He, however,</u>		
M9:25b / <u>L8:54b</u>	and took her by the hand, / <u>took her by the hand and</u>	5:41a	<sup>41</sup> And taking the child by the hand,
<u>L8:54c</u>	spoke forcefully, saying,	5:41b	He said to her, “Talitha, kum!” (which translated means,
<u>L8:54d</u>	“Child, arise!”	5:41c	“Little girl, I say to you, get up!”).
<u>L8:55a</u>	<sup>55</sup> And her spirit returned,		
M9:25c / <u>L8:55b</u>	and the girl got up. / <u>and she got up immediately;</u>	5:42a	<sup>42</sup> And immediately the girl got up
		5:42b	and began to walk, for she was twelve years old.

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL / LUKE'S  
GOSPEL**

**MARK'S GOSPEL**

L8:55b - and He ordered that *something* be given her  
L8:56 to eat. <sup>56</sup>Her parents were amazed; but He  
instructed them to tell no one what had  
happened.

M9:26 <sup>26</sup>And this news spread throughout that  
land.

5:42c -  
5:43

And immediately they were completely  
astonished. <sup>43</sup>And He gave them strict  
orders that no one was to know about this,  
and He told them to have something given  
her to eat.

## 7.14. Appendix 14: Mark-Q overlap: Jesus is tempted by the devil

	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ</u>	<u>ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ</u>
4:1a	<sup>1</sup> Τότε	1:12a <sup>12</sup> Καὶ εὐθὺς	
4:1b	ὁ Ἰησοῦς		4:1a <sup>1</sup> Ἰησοῦς δὲ
			4:1b πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
			4:1c καὶ
4:1c	ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος	1:12b τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.	4:1d ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
		1:13a <sup>13</sup> καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ	
		1:13b τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας	4:2a <sup>2</sup> ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα
4:1d	πειρασθῆναι	1:13c πειραζόμενος	4:2b πειραζόμενος
4:1e	ὑπὸ τοῦ	1:13d ὑπὸ τοῦ	4:2c ὑπὸ τοῦ
4:1f	διαβόλου.	1:13e σατανᾶ,	4:2d διαβόλου.
		1:13f καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων,	
4:2a	<sup>2</sup> καὶ νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα,		4:2e Καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
			4:2f καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν
4:2b	ὑστερον ἐπείνασεν.		4:2g αὐτῶν ἐπείνασεν.
4:3a	<sup>3</sup> καὶ προσελθὼν		
4:3b	ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν αὐτῷ·		4:3a <sup>3</sup> εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος·
4:3c	εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπέ		4:3b εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰπέ
4:3d	ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι		4:3c τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ ἵνα
4:3e	ἄρτοι γένωνται.		4:3d γένηται ἄρτος.
4:4a	<sup>4</sup> ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν·		4:4a <sup>4</sup> καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
4:4b	γέγραπται·		4:4b γέγραπται
			4:4c ὅτι
4:4c	<i>οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος,</i>		4:4d <i>οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.</i>
4:4d	<i>ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ.</i>		
4:5a	<sup>5</sup> Τότε		
4:5b	παραλαμβάνει		4:9a <sup>9</sup> ἤγαγεν

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

4:5c αὐτὸν  
 4:5d ὁ διάβολος  
 4:5e εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν  
 4:5f καὶ ἔστησεν  
 4:5g αὐτὸν  
 4:5h-  
 4:6a ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ  
 ἕκαὶ  
 4:6b λέγει  
 4:6c αὐτῷ·  
 4:6d εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, βάλε  
 σεαυτὸν  
 4:6e κάτω· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι  
 4:6f *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ  
 ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ*  
 4:6g καὶ  
 4:6h *ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσίν σε,  
 μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς  
 λίθον τὸν πόδα σου.*  
 4:7a ἕξῃ  
 4:7b αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·  
 4:7c πάλιν γέγραπται·  
 4:7d *οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον  
 τὸν θεόν σου.*  
 4:8a ἕΠάλιν  
 4:8b παραλαμβάνει  
 4:8c αὐτὸν  
 4:8d ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν  
 λίαν  
 4:8e καὶ  
 4:8f δείκνυσιν

4:9b δὲ  
 4:9c αὐτὸν  
 4:9d εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ  
 4:9e καὶ ἔστησεν  
 4:9f ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ  
 καὶ  
 4:9g εἶπεν  
 4:9h αὐτῷ·  
 4:9i εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, βάλε  
 σεαυτὸν  
 4:9j ἐντεῦθεν  
 4:9k-  
 4:10a κάτω· <sup>10</sup>γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι  
 4:10b *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ  
 ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ*  
 4:10c *τοῦ διαφυλάττει σε*  
 4:11a <sup>11</sup>καὶ  
 4:11b ὅτι  
 4:11c *ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσίν σε,  
 μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς  
 λίθον τὸν πόδα σου.*  
 4:12a <sup>12</sup>καὶ  
 4:12b ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν  
 4:12c αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς  
 4:12d ὅτι εἴρηται·  
 4:12e *οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον  
 τὸν θεόν σου.*  
 4:5a ἕΚαὶ  
 4:5b ἀναγαγὼν  
 4:5c αὐτὸν  
 4:5d ἔδειξεν

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

4:8g αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας

4:8h τοῦ κόσμου

4:8i καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν

4:9a Ἡ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

4:9b ταῦτά σοι πάντα δώσω,

4:9c ἐὰν πεσῶν προσκυνήσης μοι.

4:10a <sup>10</sup>τότε

4:10b λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·

4:10c ὕπαγε, σατανᾶ·

4:10d γέγραπται

4:10e γάρ·

4:10f *κύριον τὸν θεόν σου  
προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ  
μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.*4:11a <sup>11</sup>Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ  
διάβολος,

4:11b καὶ

4:11c ἰδοὺ

4:11d ἄγγελοι

4:11e προσῆλθον

4:11f καὶ

4:11g διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

4:5e αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας

4:5f τῆς οἰκουμένης

4:5g ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου

4:6a Ἡ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ

4:6b ὁ διάβολος·

4:6c σοὶ δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν  
ταύτην ἅπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν  
αὐτῶν,4:6d ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ὃ  
ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν·4:7 Ἡ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσης  
ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, ἔσται σοῦ  
πᾶσα.

4:8a Ἡ καὶ

4:8b ἀποκριθεὶς

4:8c ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

4:8d γέγραπται·

4:8e *κύριον τὸν θεόν σου  
προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ  
μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.*4:13a <sup>13</sup>Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα  
πειρασμὸν

4:13b ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ

4:13c ἄχρι καιροῦ.

1:13e καὶ

1:13f οἱ

1:13g ἄγγελοι

1:13h διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

**MATTHEW'S GOSPEL****MARK'S GOSPEL****LUKE'S GOSPEL**

4:1a	<sup>1</sup> Then	1:12a	<sup>12</sup> And immediately	4:1a	<sup>1</sup> Now
4:1b	Jesus			4:1b	Jesus,
				4:1c	full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan
				4:1d	and
4:1c	was led up by the Spirit	1:12b	the Spirit brought Him out	4:1e	was led around by the Spirit
4:1d	into	1:12c	into	4:1f	in
4:1e	the wilderness	1:12d	the wilderness.	4:1g	the wilderness
		1:13a	<sup>13</sup> And He was in the wilderness		
		1:13b	for forty days,	4:2a	<sup>2</sup> for forty days,
4:1f	to be	1:13c	being	4:2b	being
4:1g	tempted by	1:13d	tempted by	4:2c	tempted by
4:1h	the devil	1:13e	Satan;	4:2d	the devil.
		1:13f	and He was with the wild animals,		
4:2a	<sup>2</sup> And after He had fasted for forty days and forty nights,			4:2e	And He ate nothing during those days,
				4:2f	and when they had ended,
4:2b	He			4:2g	He
4:3a	then became			4:2h	was
4:3b	hungry.			4:2i	hungry.
4:3c	<sup>3</sup> And			4:3a	<sup>3</sup> And
4:3d	the tempter			4:3b	the devil
4:3e	came and				
4:3f	said to Him,			4:3c	said to Him,
4:3g	“If You are the Son of God,			4:3d	“If You are the Son of God,
4:3h	command			4:3e	tell
4:3i	that				
4:3j	these stones			4:3f	this stone
4:3k	become bread.”			4:3g	to become bread.”
4:4a	<sup>4</sup> But			4:4a	<sup>4</sup> And
4:4b	He			4:4b	Jesus
4:4c	answered			4:4c	answered



MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

4:4d and said,  
4:4e “It is written:  
4:4f ‘*Man shall not live on bread alone,*  
4:5a <sup>5</sup>Then  
4:5b the devil  
4:5c took  
4:5d Him  
4:5e along  
4:5f into  
4:5g the holy city  
4:5h- and had Him stand on the  
4:6a pinnacle of the temple, <sup>6</sup>and  
4:6b he said to Him,  
4:6a “If You are the Son of God,  
4:6b throw Yourself down;  
4:6c for it is written:  
4:6d ‘*He will give His angels orders concerning You*’;  
4:6e and  
4:6f ‘*On their hands they will lift You up, So that You do not strike Your foot against a stone.*’ ”  
4:7a <sup>7</sup>Jesus  
4:7b said to him,  
4:7c “On the other hand,  
4:7d it is written:  
4:7e ‘*You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.*’ ”  
4:8a <sup>8</sup>Again,

4:4d him,  
4:4e “It is written:  
4:4f ‘*Man shall not live on bread alone.*’ ”  
4:9a <sup>9</sup>And  
4:9b he  
4:9c brought  
4:9d Him  
4:9e into  
4:9f Jerusalem  
4:9g and had Him stand on the pinnacle of the temple, and said to Him,  
4:9h “If You are the Son of God,  
4:9i throw Yourself down  
4:9j from here;  
4:10a <sup>10</sup>for it is written:  
4:9b ‘*He will give His angels orders concerning You, to protect You,*  
4:10c *to protect You,*’  
4:11a <sup>11</sup>and,  
4:11b ‘*On their hands they will lift You up, So that You do not strike Your foot against a stone.*’ ”  
4:12a <sup>12</sup>And  
4:12b Jesus  
4:12c answered and  
4:12d said to him,  
4:12e “It has been stated,  
4:12f ‘*You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.*’ ”  
4:5a <sup>5</sup>And

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

LUKE'S GOSPEL

4:8b the devil  
4:8c took  
4:8d Him  
4:8e along  
4:8f to a very high mountain  
4:8g and showed  
4:8h Him all the kingdoms  
4:8i of the world  
4:8j and their glory;  
  
4:9a <sup>9</sup>and  
4:9b he  
4:9c said to Him,  
4:9d “All these things I will give  
You,  
  
4:9e if You fall down and worship  
me.”  
  
4:10a <sup>10</sup>Then  
4:10b Jesus  
4:10c said  
4:10d to him,  
4:10e “Go away, Satan!  
4:10f For it is written:  
4:10g *‘You shall worship the Lord  
your God, and serve Him  
only.’*”  
  
4:11a <sup>11</sup>Then  
4:11b the devil  
4:11c left Him;

4:5b he  
4:5c led  
4:5d Him  
4:5e up  
  
4:5f and showed  
4:5g Him all the kingdoms  
4:5h of the world  
  
4:5i in a moment of time.  
4:6a <sup>6</sup>And  
4:6b the devil  
4:6c said to Him,  
4:6d “I will give You all this  
domain and its glory,  
  
4:6e for it has been handed over to  
me, and I give it to whom-  
ever I want.  
  
4:7 <sup>7</sup>Therefore if You worship  
before me, it shall all be  
Yours.”  
  
4:8a <sup>8</sup>Jesus  
4:8b replied  
4:8c to him,  
  
4:8d “It is written:  
4:9e *‘You shall worship the Lord  
your God and serve Him  
only.’*”  
  
4:13a <sup>13</sup>And so when the devil had  
finished every temptation,  
  
4:13b he  
4:13c left Him  
4:13d until an opportune time.

MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

MARK'S GOSPEL

4:11e and  
4:11f behold,

4:11g angels

4:11h came

4:11i and *began to*

4:11j serve

4:11k Him.

1:13f the

1:13g angels

1:13h were

1:13i serving

1:13j Him.