

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Grace Theological Journal* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_grace-theological-journal.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_grace-theological-journal.php)

## THE RICH YOUNG MAN IN MATTHEW

ROBERT L. THOMAS

*An investigation of any gospel passage which is paralleled in one or more of the gospels is heavily influenced by what solution, if any, one adopts for the Synoptic Problem. If no literary dependence is assumed, one's approach is quite different from those who choose this or that solution to the Synoptic Problem. This last option results in attributing the differing emphases of the gospel writers ultimately to Jesus himself rather than to the individual writers. Matthew chose to retain several of the emphases of Jesus' encounter with the rich young man which are not retained in Mark and Luke, including the man's youthfulness, the importance of the works of love, and the future repayment for those who follow Christ. These stem from the historical occasion and are not the products of Matthew's editorial alteration of the historical incident.*

\* \* \*

**S**TUDY of the life and teaching of Christ is complex today. We have passed into an era which calls forth the deepest of analytical thought regarding the formation of the gospels. Thorough scrutiny of the avalanche of literature that has been and is appearing to treat this subject is impossible. But a student of the New Testament must maintain some familiarity with it to avoid being swept away by the tide of confusion that prevails. In the process of sifting he will hopefully gain a better perspective of how our gospels came to us and what they contain.

The basis of modern study is the findings of Source Criticism. It is a foregone conclusion to most who labor here that some type of literary interrelationship exists among the three Synoptic Gospels. Has this assumption ever been proven? Historical evidence of it is lacking. Literary proof of it depends on an adequate solution to the Synoptic Problem.

It is this problem that we must deal with first in investigating any Synoptic Gospel passage. The most widely held proposal regarding gospel relationships is currently the Two-Source Theory. Since any methodology is only as good as its presuppositions and since most

## Exhibit I

Matthew/Luke Agreements Against Mark  
Omissions

Matt 19:16-30	Mark 10:17-31	Luke 18:18-30
<p>16Και ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθῶν</p> <p>Ἰαὐτῷ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε τ, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σωζῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον; εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός τ· εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἵτηρησον τὰς ἐντολάς. 18 λέγει αὐτῷ· ποίας; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ὅτι οὐ φονεῦσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις,</p> <p>19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα τ καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν. 20 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος· ἔφυλαξα τ πάντα ταῦτα; τί ἔτι ὑστερεῷ;</p> <p>21 Ἐφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε πώλησον σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα</p>	<p>17Και ἔκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν ἔπηρώτα αὐτόν τ· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; 18 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.</p> <p>19 τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας· μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, μὴ ἀποστερήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα τ.</p> <p>20 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἔφυλαξά μιν ἐκ νεότητός μου τ. 21 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἔν τσε ὑστερεῖ· ὕπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον</p>	<p>18Και ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτόν ὀρχων λέγων· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; 19 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.</p> <p>20 τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας τ· μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα τ.</p> <p>21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ταῦτα πάντα ἔφυλαξα ἐκ νεότητος τ. 22 ἀκούσας δὲ τ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἔτι ἐν σοὶ λείπει· πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον</p>

καὶ δὸς Ὁ[τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρόν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. <sup>22</sup>ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ νεανίσκος ἔτον λόγον ἠπήλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων ἱκτῆματα πολλά.

<sup>23</sup>Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἕπιούσιος δυσκόλως εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

<sup>24</sup>πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,

Ἦ εὐκοπώτερον ἐστὶν ἱκάμηλον διὰ ἕτρυπήματος ῥαφίδος ἢ διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. <sup>25</sup>ἀκούσαντες δὲ

καὶ δὸς Ὁ<sup>1</sup>[τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρόν ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. <sup>22</sup>ὁ δὲ ἑστυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἠπήλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων ἱκτῆματα πολλά.

<sup>23</sup>Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἱλέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρεῖματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται. τ<sup>24</sup>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἑθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς ἱλέγει αὐτοῖς· ἕτέκνα, πῶς δυσκόλον ἐστὶν ἕ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τ<sup>1</sup>. <sup>25</sup>Ἦ εὐκοπώτερον ἐστὶν ἱκάμηλον διὰ Ὁ[τῆς] ἑτρυμαλιάς Ὁ[τῆς] ἱῥαφίδος ἢ διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. ἕ

καὶ ἱδιάδος ἑ πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρόν ἐν ἑ[τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. <sup>23</sup>ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα ἑ περίλυπος ἑ ἑγενήθη· ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα.

<sup>24</sup>Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἑ[περίλυπον γενόμενον] ἕ εἶπεν· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρεῖματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται.

<sup>25</sup>εὐκοπώτερον γὰρ ἐστὶν ἱκάμηλον διὰ ἑτρήματος ἱῥελόνης ἢ εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

οί μαθηταί τ' ἐξεπλήσσοντο τ' σφόδρα λέγοντες· τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι; <sup>26</sup>ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· παρά ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν, παρά δὲ θεῷ ἵπαντα δυνατά<sup>2</sup> τ' . <sup>27</sup>Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι· τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν; <sup>28</sup>ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἑαυτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι

ὕμεις οἱ ἀκολουθησαντές μοι

ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, ἵ καθήσεσθε καὶ ἱ ὑμεῖς

<sup>26</sup>οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; <sup>27</sup>ἐμβλέψας τ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει· παρά τ' ἀνθρώποις τ<sup>1</sup> ἀδύνατον<sup>1</sup>, ἀλλ' οὐ παρά τ<sup>2</sup> θεῷ· πάντα γὰρ δυνατὰ τ<sup>3</sup> παρά ὀτῷ θεῷ<sup>1</sup>. <sup>28</sup>Ἦρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήκαμέν σοι τ'. <sup>29</sup>Ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,

<sup>26</sup>εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; <sup>27</sup>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· τὰ ἀδύνατα παρά ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἐστιν<sup>1</sup>. <sup>28</sup>Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἑαφέντες τὰ ἴδια<sup>1</sup> ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι. <sup>29</sup>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ...

22, 28-30 (nr. 313, p. 286)

<sup>28</sup>ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔστε<sup>1</sup> οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· <sup>29</sup>καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν τ<sup>1</sup>: καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ ὀμου<sup>1</sup>: ἑ βασιλείαν, <sup>30</sup>ἵνα ἑ ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ ὀμου καὶ ἑ καθήσεσθε

ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

<sup>29</sup>καὶ πᾶς ὅστις ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα <sup>τ</sup> ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς <sup>λ</sup> ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου,

<sup>ε</sup> ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται

καὶ

ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.

<sup>30</sup>Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται <sup>ε</sup> πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι<sup>λ</sup>.

οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ <sup>ε</sup>μητέρα ἢ πατέρα <sup>τ</sup> ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ <sup>ε</sup>καὶ ὀνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, <sup>30ε</sup> ἂν μὴ <sup>ε</sup>λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα: Ὅνυν

ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς καὶ ἀδελφάς καὶ <sup>ε</sup>μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγροὺς μετὰ <sup>ε</sup>διωγμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

<sup>31</sup>πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ Ὀ[οί] ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.

(nr. 262 10,32-34 p. 224)

ἐπὶ <sup>τ</sup> θρόνων <sup>ε</sup>τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες<sup>λ</sup> τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

18,29b-30

<sup>29</sup>... οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ὀυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα <sup>τ</sup> ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, <sup>30ε</sup> ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ <sup>ε</sup>λάβῃ <sup>ε</sup>πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ

καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι

τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

(nr. 262 18,31-34 p. 224)

The text of this exhibit is reproduced from *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, ed. K. Aland, © 1976 United Bible Societies, with their kind permission. *Outline markings to indicate omissions have been added by the author.*

**Exhibit II**  
**Matthew/Luke Agreements Against Mark**  
*Inclusions*

Matt 19:16-30	Mark 10:17-31	Luke 18:18-30
<p>16Και ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθὼν</p> <p>17Καὶ εἶπεν· διδάσκαλε Τ, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;</p> <p>18ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός Τ·</p> <p>19εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἴτηρησον τὰς ἐντολάς. 18(λέγει αὐτῷ· ποίας;) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· Ὅτι οὐ φονεύσεις, ὅτι οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, ὁ οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις,</p> <p>19τίμα τὸν πατέρα Τ καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν. 20λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος·</p> <p>21πάντα ταῦτα</p> <p>22Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>23Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>24Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>25Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>26Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>27Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>28Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>29Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p> <p>30Ἐφύλαξα Τ· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;</p>	<p>17Και ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν (προσδραμῶν εἰς) καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα Ὁ αὐτόν Τ·</p> <p>18Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;</p> <p>19ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ (εἰς ὁ) θεός.</p> <p>20τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας·</p> <p>21μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, μὴ ἀποστερήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα Τ.</p> <p>22ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, (ταῦτα πάντα)</p> <p>23Ἐφύλαξα ἐκ νεότητός μου Τ. 24ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·</p> <p>25Ἐν ἴσῃ ἔτι ὑστερεῖ· ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον</p>	<p>18Και ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτὸν Ὁ ἀρχὼν λέγων· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;</p> <p>19εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.</p> <p>20τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας· Τ</p> <p>21μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης,</p> <p>22τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα Τ.</p> <p>23ὁ δὲ εἶπεν·</p> <p>24ταῦτα πάντα</p> <p>25ἀκούσας δὲ Τ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·</p> <p>26Ἐν σοὶ λείπει· πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον</p>

<p>καὶ δός Ὁ[τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν Ὑ[οὐρανοῖς], καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. <sup>22</sup>ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ νεανίσκος ἔτον λόγον ἠπήλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων ἑκτῆματα πολλά.</p>	<p>καὶ δός Ὁ<sup>1</sup> [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. <sup>22</sup>ὁ δὲ ἑστειγνύσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἠπήλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων ἑκτῆματα πολλά.</p>	<p>καὶ διάδος Ὑ πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν ἑ[τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. <sup>23</sup>ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα τὸν περιλυπὸς ἐγενήθη· ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα.</p>
<p><sup>23</sup>Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἡ πλούσιος δυσκόλως εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.</p>	<p><sup>23</sup>Καὶ περιβλεπόμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται. <sup>24</sup>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἔθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἔτεκνα, πῶς δύσκολόν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. <sup>25</sup>ὁ εὐκοπώτερον ἐστὶν ἑκάμη-</p>	<p><sup>24</sup>Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ὁ περιλυπὸς γενόμενος εἶπεν· πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται.</p>
<p><sup>24</sup>πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, τὸ εὐκοπώτερον ἐστὶν ἑκάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυφήματος ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. <sup>25</sup>ἀκούσαντες δὲ</p>	<p>λον διὰ τῆς τρυμαλιαῖας ὁ τῆς ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. <sup>25</sup>εἰσελθεῖν.</p>	<p><sup>25</sup>εὐκοπώτερον γὰρ ἐστὶν ἑκάμηλον διὰ τῆς τρυφήματος ἢ βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.</p>
		<p><sup>26</sup>εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες.</p>



<p>ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.</p> <p>29 καὶ πᾶς ὅστις ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου,</p> <p>ἐκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται</p>	<p>οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 30 ἔάν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα οὐδὲν</p>	<p>ἐπὶ τῶν θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.</p> <p>18,29b-30</p> <p>29... οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, 30 ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα</p>
<p>καὶ ζῶν ἁιώνιον κληρονομήσει.</p> <p>30 Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.</p>	<p>ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἀδελφάς καὶ μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγροὺς μετὰ διωγμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶν ἁιώνιον.</p> <p>31 πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.</p> <p>(nr. 262 10,32-34 p. 224)</p>	<p>ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶν ἁιώνιον.</p> <p>(nr. 262 18,31-34 p. 224)</p>

The text of this exhibit is reproduced from *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, ed. K. Aland, © 1976 United Bible Societies, with their kind permission. *Outline markings to indicate inclusions have been added by the author.*

methodologies depend on the validity of the Two-Source Theory, a consideration of this theory is indispensable.

THE TWO-SOURCE THEORY  
AND MATTHEW/LUKE AGREEMENTS AGAINST MARK

The Two-Source Theory proposes that Matthew derived his account of the Rich Young Man from Mark's Gospel, and that Luke did likewise. It also presupposes besides this that there was no literary collaboration between Matthew and Luke in areas where they were thus dependent on Mark. While various modifications have been and are being offered, this continues to be the basic posture of the typical Two-Source proponent. The addition of sources M and L by some does not alter this characteristic of the view.

A question that has never been answered with any degree of success by those who advocate this approach is: how can one by following this scheme account for agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark? If each used Mark alone as his source in certain places, how do the two manage to write identical accounts in so many places where Mark has something different? The story of the Rich Young Man furnishes a good sampling of the widespread agreements between Matthew and Luke in cases where the two differ from Mark. The agreements are of two kinds: agreements of omission and agreements of inclusion. The agreements of omission are ten in number (see Exhibit I, pp. 236-39). It is noted that the majority of alleged omissions are substantial. While a rationale might be proposed to explain why Matthew and Luke could have coincidentally decided to omit each portion, the probability of such a happening in such a prolonged series is not great.

The agreements of inclusion number eighteen items<sup>1</sup> (see Exhibit II, pp. 240-43).

These alleged insertions by Matthew and Luke fall into three categories: those cases where the two have substituted a different word for the one Mark uses (6 instances of this), those cases where the two have chosen a different form of the same word (6 instances of this), and those cases where the two use the same word when Mark has nothing (6 instances of this):

<sup>1</sup>This list may be reduced if the  $\epsilon\tau\iota$  parallel is considered invalid (Matt 19:20/Luke 18:22) and if two variant readings are altered as they were in United Bible Society's 3rd edition and the Nestle-Aland 26th edition (Matt 19:24, 29).

**Exhibit III****Matthew/Luke Agreements Against Mark**  
*Kinds of Agreements*

## Different choice of vocabulary:

- ἀκούσας instead of στυγνάσας (Matt 19:20/Luke 18:21)
- δέ instead of καί (Matt 19:23/Luke 18:24)
- τρήματος instead of τρυμαλιᾶς (?) (Matt 19:24/Luke 18:25)
- εἰσελθεῖν instead of διελθεῖν (Matt 19:24/Luke 18:25)
- εἶπεν instead of ἔφη (Matt 19:28/Luke 18:29)
- πολλαπλασίονα instead of ἑκατονταπλασίονα (?) (Matt 19:29/Luke 18:29)

## Different form of the same word:

- ἐφύλαξα instead of ἐφυλαξάμην (Matt 19:20/Luke 18:21)
- οὐρανοῖς instead of οὐρανῶ (Matt 19:21/Luke 18:22)
- εἶπεν instead of λέγει (Matt 19:23/Luke 18:24)
- εἶπεν instead of λέγει (Matt 19:26/Luke 18:27)
- εἶπεν instead of ἤρξατο λέγειν (Matt 19:27/Luke 18:28)
- ἠκολουθήσαμεν instead of ἠκολουθήκαμεν (Matt 19:27/Luke 18:28)

## Common word where Mark is blank:

- ἐτι (?) (Matt 19:20/Luke 18:22)
- ἀκούσαντες (Matt 19:25/Luke 18:26)
- δέ (Matt 19:26/Luke 18:27)
- δέ (Matt 19:28/Luke 18:29)
- αὐτοῖς (Matt 19:28/Luke 18:29)
- ὅτι (Matt 19:28/Luke 18:29)

It also is significant that the coverage of the 15 or so verses is evenly spread from beginning to end of the whole section. It is hardly probable that the two happened to refer to an additional source besides Mark 26 or 28 times in 15 verses. If they did, they must have been dependent on the other source rather than Mark.

After reviewing the impressive variety and quantity of the Matthean-Lucan agreements, one wonders how some can write them off so glibly. Marshall, for example, after commenting on one of the omissions in Luke 18:18, writes, "Similar omissions by Matthew are probably coincidental, since there is no other evidence of significant agreement between Lk. and Mt. here."<sup>2</sup> But the passage is full of such, and the statistical probability of such a long series being coincidences is infinitesimally small.

Attempts to reduce the length of such a list have included the presumption that Matthew and Luke frequently change Mark's *καί* to *δέ*. This has little impact on the present series of agreements, however, since it accounts for only one of the agreements. It also is less than persuasive that even this one should be deleted, because in at least two instances elsewhere in triple tradition portions Matthew and Luke agree in their use of *καί* where Mark has *δέ* (Mark 2:6 and par.; 14:47 and par.).

Another such attempt to limit the number of significant agreements has cited Matthew's and Luke's aversion to Mark's historical present, particularly in their frequent substitution of *εἶπεν* for *λέγει*. Yet if this be valid, and strong doubt exists that it is since Matthew himself uses the historical present *λέγει* in 19:18 and 20, the list is reduced by only two agreements.

#### PRESENT TRENDS AMONG NEW TESTAMENT SCHOLARS

With the Two-Source Theory resting upon such shaky foundations as these, it is no wonder that a growing number of scholars are forsaking it in quest of one that is more intellectually satisfactory. Walker notes, "In recent years . . . the so-called 'Two-Document' or 'Two-Source Hypothesis' . . . has been seriously challenged from various quarters, and an increasing number of scholars is now arguing both for the elimination of the 'Q' theory and for the priority of Matthew or perhaps even Luke."<sup>3</sup> He adds, "In short, the critical

<sup>2</sup>J. Howard Marshall, *Commentary on Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 684; see also Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), 211.

<sup>3</sup>William O. Walker, Jr., "Introduction: The Colloquy on the Relationships Among the Gospels," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, William O. Walker, Jr., ed. (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1978), 2.

consensus regarding gospel relationships now appears to have been shaken, if not shattered."<sup>4</sup> Outler joins in this appraisal: "A century-old consensus in the liberal Protestant tradition of gospel studies (with respect to dating, provenance, literary interdependence, etc.) has somehow, almost unexpectedly, become problematic all over again. . . . The tide of dissent from the academic conventions in which most of us were indoctrinated has now reached a level where it has to be taken seriously."<sup>5</sup> Lord agrees with the others: "In short, I find the Two-Source Theory inadequate to explain the relationship among the gospels in this significant complex of passages."<sup>6</sup> Reginald Fuller sums it up thus: "We are entering into a period of great 'fluidity' so far as acceptable views regarding the relationships among the gospels and other introductory matters are concerned."<sup>7</sup>

A recently published article by Boismard entitled "The Two Source Theory at an Impasse" expresses the dilemma through an examination of Mark 6:31-34 and parallels:<sup>8</sup>

Twenty years ago we could assume that the Two-Source theory, as the decisive solution to the synoptic problem had won the day. An unassailable dogma in Germany, on the front lines in Louvain, well positioned in England and the United States, it had little fear from the last spasms of its opponents, and could view them as the final stand of the rearguard. But times have changed. Aged Griesbach turns in his grave, refusing to stay defeated. After two centuries he has returned to the field in the persons of Dom Butler of England and, especially, W. R. Farmer of the United States. . . . Even in Germany the enemy has gained a foothold. Already in 1971 A. Fuchs saw that a large number of the Matthew/Luke agreements against Mark could not be explained in terms of the Two-Source theory.<sup>9</sup>

Attempts to explain away these agreements Boismard labels as "not very serious scholarship" and "a model of slapdash workmanship."<sup>10</sup> After careful examination of the omissions in his passage where Matthew/Luke agree against Mark, he notes, "It is true that Matthew

<sup>4</sup>Walker, "Introduction," 3.

<sup>5</sup>Albert C. Outler, "'Gospel Studies' in Transition," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 18.

<sup>6</sup>Albert B. Lord, "The Gospels as Oral Tradition Literature," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 82.

<sup>7</sup>Reginald H. Fuller, "Classics and the Gospels: the Seminar," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 192.

<sup>8</sup>M.-E. Boismard, "The Two-Source Theory at an Impasse," *New Testament Studies*, Lorraine Coza, Robert Beck, and Francis Martin, trans., vol. 26, 1-17.

<sup>9</sup>Boismard, "Two-Source Theory," 1.

<sup>10</sup>Boismard, "Two-Source Theory," 4.

and Luke *could have* independently eliminated from Mark's text all the phrases which are found only in Mark. However, this possibility can be given but a relatively small coefficient of probability."<sup>11</sup>

#### ALTERNATIVES TO THE TWO-SOURCE THEORY

What course is there to follow then? In the face of an imminent collapse of the Two-Source theory, what is this "growing number of students of the Bible, both Old Testament and New, who are scrutinizing not only the results of source criticism but also its assumptions and methods"<sup>12</sup> doing about it? They are taking different courses.

(1) A good number are turning back to Griesbach. It is generally agreed that "the Griesbach theory has now achieved a position of respectability, that it is at least a possible solution."<sup>13</sup>

(2) Others are writing off all the currently proposed solutions as being too simplistic. There has been widespread endorsement of E. P. Sanders' statements about this: "I rather suspect that when and if a new view of the Synoptic problem becomes accepted, it will be more flexible and complicated than the tidy two-document hypothesis. With all due respect for scientific preference for the simpler view, the evidence seems to require a more complicated one."<sup>14</sup> As Classical scholar George Kennedy adds, "The inability of New Testament scholars over a period of two hundred years to agree on the composition of the gospels, despite a general agreement that there are signs of a literary relationship, suggests that the true relationship may be very complex."<sup>15</sup> Walker's evaluation is relevant: "Many believe that an impasse has now been reached, with confidence in the Two-Source Hypothesis weakened but no other hypothesis successful in replacing it."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Boismard, "Two-Source Theory," 11.

<sup>12</sup>James A. Sanders, "The Gospels and the Canonical Process; a Response to Lou H. Silberman," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 219.

<sup>13</sup>Joseph B. Tyson, "Literary Criticism and the Gospels, the Seminar," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 340-41.

<sup>14</sup>E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969), 279.

<sup>15</sup>George Kennedy, "Classical and Christian Source Criticism," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 153.

<sup>16</sup>Walker, "Introduction," 3. A comparison of Warfield's remark in 1929 with a similar statement by Tyson in 1978 is interesting. Warfield writes, "And in general, *no form of criticism is more uncertain* [italics added] than that, now so diligently prosecuted, which seeks to explain the several forms of narratives in the Synoptics as modifications one of another" (Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *Christology and Criticism* [New York: Oxford, 1929], 115n.). Tyson writes, "The situation now appears to be one in which there are *no certainties* [italics added] and few probabilities regarding relationships among the gospels" (Tyson, "Literary Criticism," 341). Outler

(3) Yet another way that has been suggested is to study the gospels "holistically."<sup>17</sup> This concept maintains that "disintegrating approaches by New Testament critics bypass the first essential step in historical scholarship, namely, the understanding of the religious documents in their integrity."<sup>18</sup> It maintains "that a greater degree of trust in the accuracy of the primary sources and of the external evidence is justified."<sup>19</sup>

This third approach has been restated in different ways. Lord and Rist have suggested that the problem of relationships among the gospels is not a literary problem at all, but rather an oral tradition problem, thus making the Synoptic Gospels represent three independent versions of "oral tradition literature."<sup>20</sup> Lord cites evidence that points "to the independence of each gospel rather than to the primacy of any one."<sup>21</sup> Meeks observes that the earliest church fathers were disinterested in the Synoptic Problem because they viewed the gospels as independent works. He says, "Both Papias and Clement write as if there were *no literary connection* between any of the gospels. . . . Clement and Origen . . . mention the gospels in the orders, respectively, Matthew, Luke, Mark, John and Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, but neither has a word to say about dependence."<sup>22</sup> Keck notes that "if Lord is correct, then the history of the debate over the Synoptic Problem becomes intelligible; this debate has not succeeded in solving the problem because it has pursued the wrong question for two hundred years; in other words, a great deal of gospel study has been a goose chase."<sup>23</sup>

The approach which considers the Synoptic Gospels to be independent of one another has been chosen as a basis for the methodology to be applied to the story of the Rich Young Man. Reasons for the choice differ somewhat from those of some others who choose to view the gospels thus, except in one respect: that is the inadequacy of any of the other approaches to explain the nature of an alleged literary relationship among the Synoptic Gospels. Outler expresses

---

says bluntly, "I regard this problem as formally insoluble" (Outler, cited by Walker, "Introduction," 12). Reginald Fuller views it as an impossibility at the present juncture to solve the Synoptic Problem (Fuller, "Classics," 176).

<sup>17</sup>Tyson, "Literary Criticism," 335.

<sup>18</sup>Roland Mushat Frye, cited by Tyson, "Literary Criticism," 335.

<sup>19</sup>Charles Thomas Davis, cited by Fuller, "Literary Criticism," 334-35.

<sup>20</sup>Albert B. Lord and J. M. Rist, cited by Walker, "Introduction," 10.

<sup>21</sup>Albert B. Lord, "The Gospels," 58.

<sup>22</sup>Wayne A. Meeks, "Hypomnēmata from an Untamed Skeptic: A Response to George Kennedy," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 171.

<sup>23</sup>Leander E. Keck, "Oral Tradition Literature and the Gospels," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 116.

current dissatisfaction this way: "The ratio of conjecture to hard data in the historical-literary study of the gospels is higher than most critical historians would find acceptable."<sup>24</sup> Frye says it in these words: "Few if any of the leading literary historians in secular fields would be comfortable with the widespread assumption among New Testament critics that it is possible to move backwards in time from passages in the extant gospel texts in such a way as to identify previous stages or forms through which the tradition has supposedly developed and, ultimately, to arrive at or near the original life and teachings of Jesus; or that it is possible, through a similar procedure, to explain the synoptic redactions as we now have them."<sup>25</sup> Farmer agrees "that the conclusions provided by popular methodologies now being employed do little to carry us beyond subjective satisfaction."<sup>26</sup>

Aside from any solution to the Synoptic Problem, we will look at Matthew's account of the Rich Young Man with the presupposition of its integrity and worthiness of examination in its own right.<sup>27</sup> What can be learned from what he chose to retain, but Mark and Luke

<sup>24</sup>Outler, "Transition," 22.

<sup>25</sup>Roland Mushat Frye, "The Synoptic Problems and Analogies in Other Literatures," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 287. Frye notes how literary critics of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries went through many of the same phases as NT critics are going through in relation to Source, Form, and Redaction Criticism. They applied certain criteria to Shakespearean texts and determined that some portions were not attributable to Shakespeare himself, but were explainable in light of an earlier play taken over by Shakespeare or in light of a later editor who revised this text or that. Without being guilty of frivolity or wilful chicanery they made what is now recognized to be equivocal use of evidence to arrive at subjective conclusions. Through an elaborate scissors-and-paste process, one scholar was able to create from *Hamlet* an *Ur-Hamlet* so as to remove some of the problems and mysteries of *Hamlet* from the Shakespearean canon. Among literary critics this methodology has now been thoroughly discredited, even though it "was presented with elaborate learning, with extensive critical apparatus and sophisticated arguments, often with statistical tables and charts, and with repeated appeals to 'science'" (Frye, "Analogies," 288-89). The methodology of this disintegrating approach is strikingly similar to much that goes on in NT analysis (pp. 289-90). One wonders when such an "awakening" will occur among NT critics and they will realize the futility of the methodology which has such a stranglehold on the thinking of so many.

<sup>26</sup>William R. Farmer, "Basic Affirmation with Some Demurrals: a Response to Roland Mushat Frye," *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 313.

<sup>27</sup>If the question be raised as to how one can account for the widespread agreements among the Synoptic Gospels apart from any theory of literary dependence, the option should be retained that the agreements may be accounted for by the fact that it happened that way in the historical setting of Jesus' life and by postulating some agreements in editorializing among the thousands of sources that must have been available to the writers. The accurate recording of the happening is more than adequately explained on the basis of memory, a large assortment of written descriptions, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

chose not to retain, should be a key to what emphases from Christ's life and teaching are his main interests.

#### MATTHEW'S SPECIAL EMPHASES

The following shows a number of the areas that are peculiar to Matthew and are therefore worthy of discussion (see Exhibit IV, pp. 252-55).

To begin with the more obvious, the rich young man in Matthew (19:20, 22) is the rich man in Mark (10:22) and the rich ruler in Luke (18:18, 23). Matthew is alone in referring to his age. Νεανίσκος is indefinite as to how young the young man was, but it may include up to 50 years of age.<sup>28</sup> One was "young" or νεώτερος until he became an elder or πρεσβύτερος (cf. 1 Pet 5:5). With this age-range possibility there is nothing inconsistent in the man's claim about his conduct "from his youth" as recorded by Mark (10:20) and Luke (18:21).

#### *Works of Love*

Matthew's special interest in the performance of good works comes to light in several features. He has chosen to retain the young man's question about the "good thing (or deed)" necessary to acquire eternal life (Matt 19:16), while Mark and Luke have not. To suppose that this feature is original with Matthew or that he has imported it from some other setting is completely unnecessary. He had no reason to do so, though some have accused him of this.<sup>29</sup> This accusation rests on the assumption that Matthew depended on Mark as his source, an assumption that is fraught with pitfalls. Long ago Warfield noted three hinges on which such a presupposition rests:

- (1) that in Mark's account Jesus is repelling the ascription of goodness, and therefore, of deity.
- (2) that Matthew, offended by the vocative "Good Teacher" in a way that Mark and Luke were not, has deliberately removed the "good" from the young man's address.
- (3) that Matthew in the process bungled the change by attributing to Jesus a masculine pronoun and adjective rather than a neuter.<sup>30</sup>

Add to these three the hinge that Matthew used Mark as a source, and there are four shaky presuppositions on which to base Matthew's

<sup>28</sup>L. Coenen, "Bishop, Presbyter, Elder," *NIDNTT*, Colin Brown, ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), I, 192.

<sup>29</sup>Allen, *Matthew*, 208.

<sup>30</sup>Warfield, *Christology and Criticism*, 113-14.

**Exhibit IV**  
Several Matthean Distinctives

**Matt 19:16-30**

16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθῶν  
 16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς προσελθῶν  
 διδάσκαλε τ, αὐτῷ εἶπεν· τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον; 17 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός· ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ἀγαθός· εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἀποστρέψου ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἰσχυρίων σου καὶ ἕρπεσον ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἕρπεσον τὰς ἐπιτολάς, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ὅτι οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, 19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν. 20 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος· ἔφυλαξα πάντα ταῦτα, τί ἔτι ὑστερεῖ; 21 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε πώλησον σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα

**Mark 10:17-31**

17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν (προσδραμών εἰς) καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; 18 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός. 19 τὰς ἐπιτολάς οἶδας· (μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης), μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, μὴ ἀποστερήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. 20 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, (ταῦτα πάντα) ἔφυλαξά μιν ἐκ νεότητός μου. 21 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἕν ἔστι ὑστερεῖ· ὕπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον

**Luke 18:18-30**

18 Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέν τις αὐτόν ὄρχων λέγων· διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; 19 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός. 20 τὰς ἐπιτολάς οἶδας· (μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης), τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. 21 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ἔφυλαξα ἐκ νεότητος. 22 ἀκούσας δὲ τὸ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἔτι ἔν σοι λείπει· πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον

καὶ δὸς Ὁ[τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυ-  
ρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ  
μοι. <sup>22</sup>ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ νεανίσκος ἴτον λόγον ἵ  
ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων  
κτήματα πολλά.

<sup>23</sup>Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς  
εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἀμὴν  
λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἵπλούσιος δυσκόλως ἵ  
εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρα-  
νῶν.

<sup>24</sup>πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,

ἵεὺκοπώτερον ἔστιν ἵκάμη-  
λον διὰ ἵτρυπήματος ἵραφίδος  
ἵδιελθεῖν ἵπλούσιον ὀεισελθεῖν εἰς τὴν  
βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. <sup>25</sup>ἀκούσαντες δὲ

καὶ δὸς Ὁ<sup>1</sup> [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυ-  
ρὸν ἐν οὐρανῶ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ  
μοι ἵ. <sup>22</sup>ὁ δὲ ἵστυγνάσας ἐπὶ ἵ τῷ λόγῳ  
ἵ ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων  
κτήματα πολλά ἵ.

<sup>23</sup>Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ ἵησοῦς  
ἵλέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·  
πῶς δυσκόλως ὀί τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες  
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται.  
ἵ<sup>24</sup>οἱ δὲ μαθηταῖ ἵ ἔθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς  
λόγοις αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἵησοῦς πάλιν ἀπο-  
κριθεῖς ἵλέγει αὐτοῖς· ἵτέκνα, πῶς δύσ-  
κόλον ἔστιν ἵ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ  
εἰσελθεῖν ἵ<sup>1</sup>·<sup>25</sup> ὀεὺκοπώτερον ἔστιν ἵκάμη-  
λον διὰ ὀ[τῆς] ἵτρυμαλιᾶς ὀ[τῆς] ἵ<sup>1</sup>ραφίδος  
ἵ<sup>2</sup>διελθεῖν ἵ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν  
τοῦ θεοῦ ὀ<sup>1</sup> εἰσελθεῖν. ἵ

καὶ ἵδιάδος ἵ πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν  
ἐν ἵ[τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς ἵ, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ  
μοι. <sup>23</sup>ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα ἵ  
περίλυπος ἵ ἔγενῆθη· ἦν γὰρ  
πλούσιος σφόδρα.

<sup>24</sup>ἵδῶν δὲ αὐτὸν ὀδ ἵησοῦς ὀ[περίλυπον  
γενόμενον] ἵ εἶπεν·  
πῶς δυσκόλως ὀί τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες  
εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται·

<sup>25</sup>εὺκοπώτερον γὰρ ἔστιν ἵκάμη-  
λον διὰ ἵτρήματος ἵ<sup>1</sup>βελόνης  
ἵ<sup>2</sup>εἰσελθεῖν ἵ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν  
τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

οὐ μαθηταὶ τ' ἐξεπλήσσαντο τ' σφοδρὰ λέγοντες· τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι; <sup>26</sup>ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· παρά ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν, παρά δὲ θεῶν πάντα δυνατά.<sup>27</sup> Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι· τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν;<sup>28</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι

ὕμεις οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι

ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, ἢ καθήσεσθε καὶ ἡμεῖς

<sup>26</sup>οὐ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσαντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; <sup>27</sup>ἐμβλέψας τ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει· παρά τ' ἀνθρώποις τ' ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρά τ' θεῶν· πάντα γὰρ δυνατά τ' παρά τῷ θεῷ.<sup>28</sup> Ἦρξατο λέγειν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήκαμεν σοι τ'.

<sup>29</sup>Ἐφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,

<sup>26</sup>εἶπαν δὲ οἱ ἄκούσαντες· καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; <sup>27</sup>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· τὰ ἀδύνατα παρά ἀνθρώποις δυνατά (παρά τῷ θεῷ ἐστιν).

<sup>28</sup>Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι. <sup>29</sup>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ...

22, 28-30 (nr. 313, p. 286)

<sup>28</sup>ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔστε ἡμεῖς οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· <sup>29</sup>καὶ ἐγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν, ὡς καὶ πατήρ μου ἡ βασιλείαν, ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου καὶ καθήσεσθε

ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

<sup>29</sup>καὶ πᾶς ὅστις ἀφῆκεν οἰκίας  
ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ πατέρα  
ἢ μητέρα <sup>τ</sup> ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγρούς<sup>2</sup> ἕνεκεν τοῦ  
(ὀνόματός μου),  
ἐκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται

καὶ  
ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.  
<sup>30</sup>Πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται <sup>ε</sup>πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ  
ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι<sup>2</sup>.

οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν  
ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ <sup>ε</sup>μητέρα  
ἢ πατέρα<sup>1</sup> <sup>τ</sup> ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγρούς ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ  
καὶ ὅνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, <sup>30</sup>εἰ ἂν  
μὴ <sup>ε</sup>λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα: Ὅνδ  
ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς  
καὶ ἀδελφάς καὶ <sup>ε</sup>μητέρας καὶ τέκνα καὶ  
ἀγρούς μετὰ <sup>ε</sup>διωγῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι  
τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον<sup>1</sup>.  
<sup>31</sup>πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ  
Ὅ[οἱ] ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.  
(nr. 262 10,32-34 p. 224)

ἐπὶ <sup>τ</sup> θρόνων <sup>ε</sup>τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς  
κρίνοντες<sup>2</sup> τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

18,29b-30

<sup>29</sup>... οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ  
(γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ γονεῖς)  
ἢ τέκνα <sup>τ</sup> ἕνεκεν  
τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, <sup>30</sup>ὃς  
οὐχὶ μὴ <sup>ε</sup>[ἀπο]λάβῃ <sup>ε</sup>πολλαπλασίονα  
ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ

καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι  
τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.  
(nr. 262 18,31-34 p. 224)

The text of this exhibit is reproduced from *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*, ed. K. Aland, © 1976 United Bible Societies, with their kind permission. *Outline markings to indicate Matthean distinctives have been added by the author.*

alleged addition of "good" to the young man's question about acquiring eternal life.<sup>31</sup>

The subordinate enclitic  $\mu\epsilon$  and the emphatic  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\nu$  in Jesus' answer to the young man (Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19) show the nature of that answer. He called attention to the young man's light use of "good," not to His own relation to God.<sup>32</sup> Matthew knew this just as well as Mark and Luke and was not trying to provide a corrective or a differing meaning to the same question. Rather he was describing another question that was asked on the same occasion. That the young man fired a series of questions at Jesus is suggested by Mark's imperfect  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha$  (Mark 10:17).<sup>33</sup> Matthew records one question and its answer while Mark and Luke record another. If it be objected that this explanation is artificial, there is precedent for one's repeating himself in different words on the same occasion precisely in this pericope. In Mark 10:24 Jesus is quoted as saying, "Children, how hard it is to enter the kingdom of God!" just after he has been quoted in Mark 10:23 similarly: "How hard it will be for those who have riches to enter the kingdom of God!" Those who so narrowly restrict conversations and discourses to only what is recorded in the gospels apparently have a distorted concept of what communication was like in these early times.

The young man asked it and Matthew recorded the young man's question in accordance with his desire to emphasize the importance of good works. This same desire appears in Jesus' words  $\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\iota \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  which Matthew alone retains (19:17). The others record, "You know the commandments" (Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20). Endorsement of the Mosaic law is a strong aspect of the first gospel throughout (5:17-20; 18:16; 23:23).<sup>34</sup> But this endorsement carries with it an emphasis upon obedience to that law, and Matthew chose this as one of his gospel's emphases. This accounts for the frequent denunciation of Jesus' opponents who burdened men with commandments which they themselves were unwilling to keep (23:4; cf. 11:28-30).<sup>35</sup> This issue is at the heart of the anti-Pharisaic attitude so clearly displayed in Matthew (e.g. 3:9; 5:20; 6:2, 5, 16; 23:1-36). These leaders stood for a superficial type of adherence to the Mosaic law

<sup>31</sup>Stonehouse proposes that Matthew was only trying to be more succinct in omitting the "good" from "Good Teacher," but this is hardly likely since Matthew is actually more wordy than Mark at this point. See Ned B. Stonehouse, *Origins of the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 107-8.

<sup>32</sup>Warfield, *Christology and Criticism*, 104-7; Henry Barclay Swete, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956 [reprint]), 223.

<sup>33</sup>Warfield, *Christology and Criticism*, 109.

<sup>34</sup>Allen, *Matthew*, lxxvii.

<sup>35</sup>H. H. Esser, "Command, Order," *NIDNTT*, 1. 335.

which did not reflect itself in the good deeds that the law required. So it is quite fitting in the framework of the first gospel that we read Jesus' response to the young man: "Keep the commandments."

The commandment in Matthew which is not found in the others is "you shall love your neighbor as yourself" (19:19), a summary of the second table of the law (cf. Rom 13:9). This feature displays another emphasis in Matthew. The commandment from Lev 19:18 is in Mark and Luke only once, in the discussion about the greatest commandment (Mark 12:31; Luke 10:27), but Matthew uses it three times (5:43; here; 22:39). It cannot be doubted that Jesus himself placed great emphasis on this commandment. His half-brother James reflects the need to comply with it in his epistle (James 2:8), as does Paul in his two epistles about the righteousness of God (Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14).

It is, therefore, no surprise to find another of the Twelve, John, dwelling upon this commandment also. "The new ἐντολή of Jesus to his disciples is to love. It is given its deepest basis in Jn. 13:34. . . . They are to love one another as those who are loved by Jesus," writes Schrenk.<sup>36</sup> The foundation in John is Christological. This differs from Matthew who cites the occasions when Christ adhered strictly to Lev 19:18. John, in view of the Gentile background of his Christian readers in Asia Minor, had more reason to give as the measure of one's love Christ's love for believers. Matthew's predominantly Jewish readers were more accustomed to the precise terminology of the Mosaic law.

Another Matthean distinctive in his account of the rich young man reinforces Matthew's special attention to love for one's neighbor. It is his εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι (19:21). Perfection or completeness in keeping the commandments, Jesus tells the young man, is contingent upon his selling his possessions and giving the proceeds to the poor. On another occasion Jesus commanded completeness (τέλειος) such as is the characteristic of the Father (5:48). He was discussing love for one's neighbor on this other occasion also. Apparently, performance of this obligation represented the capstone of obedience in Matthew's eyes.

There is a sequel to Jesus' directive that the rich young man keep the *Mosaic* commandments. After one became Jesus' follower, Jesus directed that he keep *his* commandments: "teach them to keep all things that I have commanded you" (Matt 28:20).<sup>37</sup> The "all things" that Jesus commanded doubtless featured this same commandment to love others. John the son of Zebedee, another apostolic witness,

<sup>36</sup>G. Schrenk, *TDNT*, 2. 553-54.

<sup>37</sup>Schrenk, *TDNT*, 2. 545.

assures us of this. Frequently he reminds his readers of their obligation by using the τηρεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς combination (John 14:15, 21; 15:10; 1 John 2:3, 4; 3:22, 24; 5:3; Rev 12:17; 14:12) as well as the closely related τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον (John 14:23, 24; 15:20; 1 John 2:5; Rev 3:8, 10; 22:7, 9). The substance of Jesus' commandment or word to be obeyed was love for one another (John 13:34; 15:12; 1 John 2:3, 4, 7, 10; 3:11, 14, 18, 23; 4:7, 11, 12, 20, 21; 2 John 5). As verified by two firsthand reports, Jesus repeatedly told his own followers to keep his commandment of love for one another as he instructed non-followers to keep Moses' commandment of love for one's neighbor. This was one of those occasions when he did the latter, as verified by Matthew.<sup>38</sup>

### *Future Repayment for Following Christ*

The application drawn from this incident by Jesus is somewhat surprising. We might have expected something about the young man's loss of treasure in heaven because of his refusal to give to the poor (cf. Matt 19:21 and par.). Instead, however, Jesus focuses upon the hindrance of wealth in one's quest for salvation. Entering the kingdom, being saved, and receiving eternal life have equivalent meanings in this discussion.

Matthew's emphasis reflects the Jewish background of the constituency for which he wrote. This is seen by his choice of retaining "kingdom of heaven" (Matt 19:23) rather than "kingdom of God" (Mark 10:23; Luke 18:24) and his retention of the words about the Son of Man's throne and rule over the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt 19:28).

"The kingdom of heaven" is a designation that can be traced through Jewish apocalyptic literature back to Dan 2:44; 7:13, 14.<sup>39</sup> This kingdom on earth will have its origin in heaven. The God of heaven will set it up, doing so through one like a son of man who comes with clouds of heaven. This Son of Man will have a universal dominion. Such was the hope extended by the OT to those Jewish people to whom the Messiah ministered. It would be a kingdom in which Israel enjoys primacy, but would extend throughout the world and include Gentiles as well.<sup>40</sup>

Matthew's orientation toward this future reign of Messiah is reflected also in Jesus' words about τῆ παλιγγενεσίᾳ (19:28). Just as he does in the Olivet Discourse (25:31), he tells of the Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. Here only in Matthew, however,

<sup>38</sup>Cf. Riesenfeld, *TDNT*, 8. 144-46.

<sup>39</sup>Allen, *Matthew*, lxix.

<sup>40</sup>Alva J. McClain, *The Greatness of the Kingdom* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959) 279-80.

does Jesus reveal specifically that the Twelve will be repaid for their self-sacrifice by being placed on thrones with authority to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. To Matthew relevant rewards for leaving all to follow Jesus are entirely future. Such a role in the future Messianic age will be a repayment abundantly beyond whatever sacrifice has been made and will include eternal life as an inheritance (19:29). It is significant that Matthew chooses not to mention repayment in the present time such as is found in Mark (10:30) and Luke (18:30). The future of Israel was a dominant feature for him in light of the interests of his audience.

The legitimacy of this motivation is not to be questioned. In other words, Peter is not to be disparaged because of his question, "What then will we have?" (Matt 19:27). This does not reflect Peter's self-centeredness as M'Neile proposes.<sup>41</sup> It simply was a request for reassurance in light of what Jesus had just said about the impossibility of man's attaining his own salvation.<sup>42</sup>

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have looked first at a proposed solution to the Synoptic Problem since this issue is foundational in any study of the Synoptic Gospels. That proposed solution, the Two-Source Theory, proved inadequate to answer one well established characteristic of the Rich Young Ruler passage, the phenomenon of the many agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark.

We then noticed a pronounced trend away from preference for the Two-Source Theory among today's scholars. This trend is in part attributable to the Matthew/Luke agreements. In place of the once almost universal adherence to the Two-Source Theory, some are turning back to Griesbach, others are proposing more complex systems of dependence in place of the currently espoused simplistic solutions, and still others are recommending the study of the gospels as independent literary productions. It was this last approach that was selected for the present study.

In implementing this approach, we found that two major emphases retained by Matthew from the life of Christ emerge. One was his insistence on works of love. This emphasis was reflected in a number of ways: the question about good works, the instruction to keep the commandments, the use of Lev 19:18, and the suggestion as to how the young man could attain the perfection or completeness of love.

<sup>41</sup>Alan Hugh M'Neile, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (London: Macmillan, 1961), 281.

<sup>42</sup>William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973), 729; John A. Broadus, *An American Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, (Philadelphia: American Baptist, 1886) 409.

The other emphasis was upon the future repayment to the Jewish follower of Christ. The Jewish background of Matthew's readers is reflected in his reference to the kingdom of heaven, the regeneration, and the twelve tribes of Israel. His preoccupation with future rewards in the Messianic Age is seen in his omission of any reference to rewards in the present age.

By way of conclusions regarding the procedure followed in this study, three observations are in order.

(1) It needs to be kept in mind that this type of study does not yield the total meaning of Matthew's account, only the special features that he alone has retained. He has much more material that is common to him, Mark, and Luke, such as the all-important injunction to keep on following Jesus. A danger in this type of approach could be to miss some primary emphases while straining to find what one writer emphasizes exclusively.

(2) This approach avoids erroneous conclusions such as might be drawn if it is assumed that one writer used another as his source. An obvious example from the present passage would be the possibility of inferring that Matthew had some special interest in maintaining the deity of Jesus because of an alleged alteration of the young man's statement and Jesus' answer. To be sure, Matthew *was* careful to teach the deity of Jesus, though not in this passage,<sup>43</sup> but so were Mark and Luke. Realization that Matthew did not use Mark as a source eliminates the misconception that this was Matthew's intention.

(3) There is not the least bit of implausibility in attributing the emphases of Matthew to Jesus himself. They fit precisely into the pattern of what we know about Jesus from other scriptural sources. To imply that Matthew invented them or imported them from another setting is pure conjecture and therefore has a very low coefficient of probability in a historical-literary study of the gospels.

One cannot help marveling at the vast amount of work yet to be done in bringing out the full contribution of each gospel to our knowledge of the life of Christ. Hopefully this small sample will stimulate an interest in pursuing that goal in the face of multiplying theories of skepticism. Only by accepting the gospels at face value can we hope to grow in our quest to know the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.

<sup>43</sup>Warfield, *Christology and Criticism*, 107.