

Gospel according to the Neaniskos among the Synoptics and in the Postmodern European Theological Thinking

The opinion about the Markan priority divides New Testament scholars. For the last few years some argued for Matthean priority adhering to the Griesbach-hypothesis. Those who sustain the “two-document” hypothesis see in Markan priority the only acceptable explanation. Among these an important role is played by the supporters of the Farrer – Goulder hypothesis. They acknowledge Markan priority, but dispense with Q stating that Luke used Matthew in addition to Mark. Today even the “two-document” hypothesis is regarded as too old. Modern research raises an increasing number of questions. The gospels were probably formed in parallel and exercised mutual influence. The circulating earliest versions played an important role in the formation of the other ones. The paper summarizes the main arguments for Markan priority: most of Mark’s material appears in Matthew and Luke, the last two often omit Markan material but the omissions differ; Matthew and Luke follow Mark in order; Mark seems to be more precise when he presents Jesus’ humanity and the disciples’ lack of comprehension; Mark’s style seems to allude to the account of an eyewitness; Matthew and Luke differ in their genealogy but their material corresponds with each other from the point where Mark starts. Mark’s priority can be challenged by Matthew and Luke’s omission of entire paragraphs. The free borrowing was partly influenced by the congregational situation in Matthew. The paper also addresses the arguments against Matthean priority. Mark cannot be considered the abridgement of Luke and Matthew.