Leszek Waga*

ORCID: 0000-0002-2159-5950
Opole, Poland

The Relevance of Biblical Exegesis to the Study of the Dynamics of the Educational Relationship in Contemporary Pedagogy. An Example of the Biblical Story of the Calling of Levi

Znaczenie egzegezy biblijnej dla badań nad dynamiką relacji wychowawczej we współczesnej pedagogice. Przykład biblijnego opowiadania o powołaniu Lewiego

Abstract: Pedagogues analysing the role of theology in pedagogical sciences often see theology as the basis for making moral recommendations derived primarily from the Revelation contained in the Bible. This approach minimises the relevance of biblical sciences to pedagogy while narrowing the perspective of its research areas. Biblical exegesis is now revealing a number of issues of great importance for contemporary pedagogy. One of these is the dynamics of the educational relationship, especially the mutual influence and role of the educator and the student in the educational process. The main focus of this article's analysis is the Gospel story of the calling of Levi (Matthew) and Jesus' subsequent meal with sinners and tax collectors. The interpretative possibilities of this story, or rather of the one sentence linking the calling with the description of the meal (Mark 2:15), will be presented in the light of contemporary possibilities of biblical exegesis. The results of biblical studies do not conclusively resolve the question of whether, after the calling, the disciple followed the Master

---

* Dr Leszek Waga, Institute of Pedagogical Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Opole, Poland; email: lwaga@uni.opole.pl

or the Master followed the disciple. This issue may be a symbolic exemplification of the problem of the subjectivity of the educator and the student in their educational relationship. The article deals with the meta-theoretical issue of pedagogy, demonstrating new possibilities for the use of biblical teachings in pedagogy. The aim of the study is to show close links between the dilemmas of contemporary biblical exegesis and issues of education. Sources for the analyses carried out include publications in the field of biblical exegesis as well as monographs and articles from the field of general pedagogy (concerning interdisciplinary research as well as the language of pedagogy) and Christian pedagogy.

Keywords: educational relationship; biblical exegesis; interdisciplinary research in pedagogy; meta-theory of pedagogy; language of pedagogy.

Abstrakt: Pedagodzy analizujący rolę teologii w naukach pedagogicznych postrzegają w niej niejednokrotnie podstawę do formułowania zaleceń moralnych, wywodzących się przede wszystkim z Objawienia zawartego w Biblii. Takie podejście minimalizuje znaczenie nauk biblijnych dla pedagogiki, zawężając jednocześnie perspektywę jej obszarów badawczych. Egzegeza biblijna ukazuje obecnie wiele problemów bardzo ważkich dla współczesnej pedagogiki. Jednym z nich jest dynamika relacji wychowawczej, a zwłaszcza wzajemny wpływ oraz rola wychowawcy i wychowanka w procesie wychowania. Głównym przedmiotem analiz niniejszego artykułu jest ewangeliczne opowiadanie o powołaniu Lewiego (Mateusza) i następująca po nim uczta Jezusa z grzesznikami i celnikami. Zaprezentowane zostaną możliwości interpretacyjne tego opowiadania, a właściwie jednego zdania łączącego zdarzenie powołania z opisem uczty (Mk 2,15), w świetle współczesnych możliwości egzegezy biblijnej. Wyniki badań biblijnych nie rozstrzygają jednoznacznie kwestii, czy po powołaniu uczeń poszedł za Mistrzem, czy Mistrz za uczniem. Kwestia ta może stanowić symboliczną egzemplifikację problemu podmiotowości wychowanka i wychowawcy w relacji wychowawczej. W artykule podjęto metateoretyczną problematykę pedagogiki, ukazując nowe możliwości wykorzystywania nauk biblijnych w pedagogice. Celem badań jest ukazanie bliskich związków pomiędzy dylematami współczesnej egzegezy biblijnej a zagadnieniami wychowania. Źródłami dla prowadzonych analiz są zarówno publikacje z zakresu egzegezy biblijnej, jak i monografie oraz artykuły z obszaru pedagogiki ogólnej (na temat badań interdyscyplinarnych, a także języka pedagogiki) i pedagogiki chrześcijańskiej.

Słowa kluczowe: relacja wychowawcza; egzegeza biblijna; badania interdyscyplinarne w pedagogice; metateoria pedagogiki; język pedagogiki.

1. Introduction

The relationship between pedagogy and theology has existed in principle since the beginning, when pedagogy as a scientific discipline was formed. Already Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher elaborated on major pedagogical issues in the light of theological problems, and he saw the possibility of mutual interaction between theology and pedagogy in undertaking paradigmatic analyses concerning the building of scientific theory (Nipkow, 1992, p. 225; cf. Waga, 2021, p. 326).

The complex interrelationships between the two disciplines become apparent at both the subject and meta-subject levels. This is because not only do they appear in the field of interdisciplinary research, but they also apply to the scope of the issues addressed (Benner, 2004).

Issues of education, including religious education, have always been present in theological reflection (Bagrowicz, 2000, p. 111). Similarly, in theology, the question of religious teaching and the transmission of the faith is present within catechetical activity (Kubik, 2004, pp. 112–115). On the other hand, issues of religion and related morality have been addressed since the beginning by educators (Nowak, 2001a; 2001b). For Jan Amos Comenius, religious education, implemented through religious and moral education at schools, was the culmination of the entire educational process (Komeński, 1956, pp. 39–56). The need for the formation of conscience in the context of building man's relationship with God was emphasised by Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1972, pp. 369–377).

Contemporary authors, analysing links between pedagogy and theology, note the common ground for research in these disciplines: ontological, epistemological, anthropological or axiological issues (cf. Kubik, 2004, pp. 117–120; Kunowski, 1959, pp. 240–245; Magier, 2001; Nowak, 1992, pp. 93–98).

Borderline disciplines are also an expression of interconnection between the two sciences. Referring to the Christian religion, Stefan Kunowski listed two such sciences: Christian pedagogy and the theology of education. In addition to a synthetic description of the development of a believer in God, he included – in the scope of issues from the former category – catechetical pedagogy combined with the education of religious awareness, liturgical pedagogy with the education of experiences, and pastoral pedagogy with the

education of the will and its guidance. On the other hand, in the theology of education he included catechetics, together with its related homiletics, which were supposed to be related to the problems of religious teaching, liturgy focused on issues of religious worship, and hodogetics, which analysed pastoral activities of the Church (Kunowski, 1963, pp. 161–165).

Nowadays, the role of theology of education is primarily seen in research on religious concepts of education, looking for significant elements contributing to the development of pedagogical thought (Nowak, 2000, p. 163).

Current issues of Christian pedagogy, on the other hand, are primarily approached through the prism of Christian inspiration in educational activity and pedagogy, distinguishing two positions of this inspiration: substantive and dynamic ones. Inspiration of a substantive nature manifests itself in approaching education from a theological point of view, and the pedagogical knowledge thus constructed is given the title of worldview pedagogy or normative pedagogy. Pedagogy practised from a dynamic inspiration takes into account one of the fundamental sources of pedagogy: the practice of education, and its task is to show the animating role of Christianity in human education (Nowak, 2004, pp. 38–43).

It should also be noted that various forms of collaboration between theology and pedagogy have emerged over time (cf. Magier, 2019, pp. 122–131; Nowak, 2008, pp. 97–98), which can include pedagogy of religion (Marek & Walulik, 2020, pp. 13–29), theological pedagogy, for which *paedagogia perennis* (Bagrowicz, 2014, pp. 80–86; cf. Horowski, 2007) or Catholic pedagogy (Kostkiewicz, 2013; Kunowski, 1958, pp. 285–289; Rynio, 1999b, pp. 411–415) is one of the basic categories.

The relationship between pedagogy and theology, extensively discussed in the cited publications, is only hinted at here. The main purpose of this paper is to show the relevance of not so much theology but more of the biblical sciences in pedagogy in what appears to be a new – or at least rarely present – perspective. The aim of the study will be to present close links between the dilemmas of contemporary biblical exegesis and issues of education. Sources for the analyses will include publications of biblical text and works in the field of biblical exegesis, as well as monographs and articles in the field of general pedagogy, with particular emphasis on issues such as interdisciplinary research, the language of pedagogy or Christian education.

Since the main purpose of the study is to show the relevance of biblical teachings in pedagogy, the considerations here will, therefore, be presented from the perspective of general pedagogy, whose generality will be to adopt a meta-subjective perspective. From this perspective, pedagogy itself as a science of education with its historical, methodological, and theoretical identity is made the object of research, and its fundamental issues include its structure, language, and references to wider socio-cultural contexts (Magier, 2012, p. 41; 2018, pp. 49, 52–53). A practical manifestation of the generality in such research will be an attempt to show the (at least partial) process of integrating different linguistic styles (here: theological) into the language that has so far scientifically described, explained, and interpreted educational reality (cf. Hejnicka-Bezwińska, 2008, p. 269).

Therefore, the issue proposed here will be located in the group of meta-theoretical problems which, according to Stanisław Palka, are taken up in research concerning ways of constructing theoretical knowledge, verifying theoretical constructs or analysing discourses and narratives occurring in science (2013, p. 61). The research will be carried out using the method of analysis and criticism of the source literature, enabling the search for an answer to the question of 'the developmental line of positions of different authors [here: different disciplines – author's note] on the same problem in the field of education (Goriszowski, 2006, p. 89). On the other hand, one stage of the following analyses will use exegetical methods characteristic of biblical studies, understood as one of the theological sciences.

The nature of the integration of pedagogical and theological knowledge proposed here still needs to be clarified. Applying, following Stanisław Wierzchosławski, three types of research that integrate different sciences, quasi-multidisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and interdisciplinary research, will make the present analyses interdisciplinary. This type of research involves agreeing on a common language of research for different disciplines and obtaining a homogeneous description of the reality under investigation in order to achieve such generalisations that enrich existing knowledge with new cognitive values (2009, pp. 42–44).

2. The importance of biblical issues in pedagogy

The issue of the relevance of the Bible in the field of pedagogy has been and
continues to be the subject of a great deal of analysis. Researchers emphasise
that biblical studies can inspire pedagogy in the problematic of the aims of ed-
ucation (Bagrowicz, 2007, pp. 41–43; Nowak, 2004, p. 45). Much more often,
biblical studies are combined with theological issues, revealing the biblical-
theological sources of education and the foundations of Christian pedagogy.
These analyses present theological truths about God's creation of man, the
fall of man, man's redemption by Christ or God's pedagogy as God's educa-
tion of man in the broadest sense (Bagrowicz, 2000, pp. 111–151; Horowski,
2007, pp. 16–24; Rynio, 1999a, pp. 163–166). In this way, the ontological, an-
thropological and axiological foundations of Christian education and peda-
gogy (Nowak, 2000, pp. 230–435; cf. Kunowski, 1959, pp. 240–244) are built
up, which ultimately find their practical expression in ethical assumptions
(cf. Bagrowicz, 2007, p. 60) and related ideas of Christian education that Ste-
fan Kunowski has called Christocentrism, Christian moralism, Christian
personalism and Christian humanism (Kunowski, 2000, pp. 98–104).

The above-mentioned approach of Christian educators to the signifi-
cance of the Bible in education and pedagogy means that biblical texts are
sometimes treated as one of many so-called *grand narratives*, creating and
sustaining an overall intellectual worldview that gives man a sense of his
own existence (Hejnicka-Bezwińska, 2008, p. 294). The teachings of biblical
texts are seen as unquestionable truths, operating in the world through those
who accept them (Rutkowiak, 1994, p. 93).

Meanwhile, even on the assumption accepted by Christians that biblical
texts constitute the content of Revelation (and therefore, moral teachings de-
rived from them can only be accepted unreservedly in Christian conceptions
of education), it should be pointed out that certain theological teachings, in-
cluding biblical studies as such, are unquestionably scientific (Nowak, 2008,
p. 98). Thus, linguistic research on biblical texts has the potential to provide
rather unobjectionable inspiration for pedagogy.

An interesting impulse in the non-moralistic approach to biblical texts
is Rafał Godoń's analyses of the relationship between art and human ex-
perience. This author noted that in learning about a work of art, there is
a discovery of both the meaning of the work itself and the subject identity

of the interpreter. This discovery, however, requires the emergence of some element *other* than from what has been understood so far. This reveals the nature of pursuing meanings, which is never a state located in the realm of the familiar but a process involving the subject and the artwork. Both the subject and the work itself are linked by narration. In a work of art, it is embedded in a structural-semantic set of connections, showing a vision of the world, but only through a linguistic representation of the work's meaning. Similarly, personal identity, which is the result of a rational understanding of the self, participates in a process of self-understanding that assumes a dialectical and historical approach. From this mediating view of the relationship between a work of art and subjective identity, a conception of education can emerge in which works of art have a significant place. In order for this to happen, it would be necessary to exclude from the outset the belief in the validity of moralising as an appropriate and effective way of texts influencing the reader and, on the other hand, to avoid the full subjectification of judgements on the category of good. Rather, works of art should encourage the viewer to think about his or her place in the world by means of symbolic signs, understood as a holistic representation of the art product. The symbolic analysis required here can lead the recipient from one level of meaning of the work to another, a much deeper and non-obvious one, and a determinant of the symbolicity of the work here is the problematic nature of the world indicated by the work. And it is in this interpretation of the symbol that educational action can fit (Godoń, 1999, pp. 60–64).

The framing of both the text of the work and the identity of the subject in terms of process, and the exclusion of moralising as the primary function of art, is in keeping with the achievements of contemporary biblical studies, especially exegesis, and thus with the demands of a contemporary pedagogy that adapts a dynamic variant of Christian inspiration (cf. Waga, 2016, p. 245).

3. Analysis of the biblical text

The inspirational role of biblical teachings for pedagogy will be demonstrated through an exegesis of a passage from the text of the Gospel according to St Mark, chapter 2:13–17, showing the calling of Levi.

3.1. Critical analysis

The first element of any analysis of a biblical text is the preparation of the text to be studied. It is obvious for biblical scholars to use the original texts in this analysis: The Gospels and the entire New Testament were edited in Greek, in the κοινή (*koine* – common, belonging to many) dialects used in literature and daily life at the time, although these writings also contain forms of classical Greek, as well as numerous Semitisms and Latinisms (Czerski, 2012, pp. 27–28). The original text of Levi's calling, together with the author's Polish translation, is as follows:

¹³Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. ¹⁴Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν Λευὶν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ.

¹⁵Καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτόν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ. ¹⁶καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει; ¹⁷καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὅτι] οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλ᾽ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες· οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλ᾽ ἁμαρτωλούς.

¹³And he went forth again by the seaside, and all the multitude came to him, and he taught them. ¹⁴And passing by, he saw Levi, the son of Alphaeus, sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, 'Follow me.' And having got up, he began to follow Him.

¹⁵And it happened that he was reclining at the table in his house, and numerous tax collectors and sinners were reclining together at the table with Jesus and His disciples, for there were many who followed Him. ¹⁶And when the scribes from among the Pharisees saw that he was eating with sinners and with collectors, they said to His disciples: Why is he eating with collectors and with sinners? ¹⁷And having heard, Jesus tells them [that] It is not the healthy who need a doctor, but the sick; I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners.

The preparation of the text for analysis takes place in several stages. To put it very simply, first a textual critique is made and then a contextual analysis (Czerski, 2012, pp. 27–63).

The need for a textual critique stems from the fact that the original writings of the New Testament have not survived to the present day. Their content is known today through many other documents, such as papyri, codices, the oldest translations into other languages of the time or quotations in the writings of the earliest Christian writers, i.e. the patristic writings and the so-called Lectionaries (Langkammer, 1991, p. 36), which were in liturgical use at the time. It is by comparing these fragments according to certain rules that the most likely text variant can be determined (Czerski, 1997, p. 53; 2012, p. 46).

The story of Levi's calling has three key places which, according to the authors of critical studies of the New Testament, raise the greatest doubts. The first is to determine the correct name of Levi in verse Mark 2:14, the second is to determine the space separating the two sentences between verses Mark 2:15/16, and the third is to choose the correct variant to end the sentence contained in verse Mark 2:16. Due to the abbreviated nature of this study, a solution to only the second doubt cited here will be presented,[1] and the basis for this analysis will be the critical editions of the New Testament (Merk, 1948; Nestle et al., 1994; Nestle et al., 2017).

The critical analysis of any text raising doubts about its authenticity consists of three elements: the presentation of variants, their analysis and comparative assessment, and conclusions (Czerski, 2012, p. 56).

The place where the verse of Mark 2:15 ends and the verse of Mark 2:16 begins has many variations. Simplifying, the four most important can be identified.

The first of these has the wording:

… ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ. ¹⁶καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες …

… they followed Him. ¹⁶And the scribes from among the Pharisees, having seen …

---

[1] An extensive critique of the text in question and comprehensive exegetical analyses of the story of Levi's calling are included in the author's previous work (cf. Waga, 2000).

This version includes, among others: *Codex Vaticanus* (B 03), *minusculus* 28, lectionary l[547] and the Syro-Palestinian translation (syr[pal]).

The second version is as follows:

… ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ. [16]καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες …

… they followed Him. [16]And the scribes and Pharisees having seen …

This version is contained in the following codices: *Alexandrinus* (A 02), *Ephraemi Syri rescriptus* (C 04), *Peresianus* (K 017), *Coridethianus* (Θ 038), *Petropolitanus* (Π 041), many *minusculi*: from family f[1], f[13], 565, 892, 1009, 1010, 1071, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148, 2174, Byzantine lectionary l[227], Old Latin codices: *Aureus* (aur 15), *Brixianus* (f 10), *Rehdigeranus* (l 11), *Monacensis* (q 13), and with some modifications *Bezae Caqntabrigensis* (d 5) and *Usserianus* (r[1] 14). This variant is also present in the *Versio Vulgata* of such Syriac translations as *Peshitta* and *Harklensis*, in the Armenian and Ethiopian translations and *Diatessaron*.

The third version reads:

… ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ [16]καὶ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων. καὶ ἰδόντες …

… followed Him [16]and the scribes from among the Pharisees. And having seen …

This version is confirmed in *Codex Sinaiticus* (א 01) and *Codex Regius* (L 019), *minusculus* 33. This version with minor modifications is also included in the Old Latin *Codex Veronensis* (b 4), *Codex Sangallensis* (Δ 037) and the Georgian translations.

The fourth version has the following form:

… ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ [16]οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι. καὶ ἰδόντες …

… followed Him [16]and the scribes and Pharisees. And having seen …

This variant occurs only in the Coptic Bohairic translation.

The presentation of the Gospel text versions made here makes it possible to systematise them according to two criteria. The first criterion for division is the position of the punctuation mark dividing the two sentences. The first and second versions place the scribes and Pharisees in a new sentence, while the third and fourth versions still place the scribes and Pharisees at the end of the sentence of Mark 2:15. In the first case, the Pharisees appear in the role of watching the feast and asking the question; in the second, they are those who, along with the disciples, the collectors and the sinners, accompany Jesus on the way.

The second criterion for dividing the variants is how the scribes are linked to the Pharisees. In the first and third versions, the Pharisees come from among the scribes, while in the second and fourth versions, they are equivalent groups, as indicated by the presence of the Greek conjunct καὶ (and) linking the coordinating elements.

In the search for the most likely variant of the biblical text, two issues must therefore be resolved: the place of the punctuation mark and the syntactic relationship between the words *Pharisees* and *scribes.*

Critical analysis of the biblical text follows established rules, known as external and internal criteria. The external criteria refer to the number and importance of the individual copies (the text attested by the largest number of testimonies is considered the original; however, the choice of the correct version depends more on the quality of the text and the age of its production, and the genetic and geographical origin of the copies must be taken into account). The rules for internal criteria relate directly to the text itself (the more difficult version is probably the original version; the shorter version is probably the original since it is assumed that copyists, wishing to clarify more difficult passages, may have supplemented them; the authentic version is the one that is more in harmony with the author's context, style, vocabulary, and intentions) (Czerski, 1997, pp. 59–63; 2012, pp. 51–56; Tronina, 2008, pp. 176–177).

Thus, in resolving the question of the syntactic relationship between the words *Pharisees* and *scribes*, it is assumed that the more complex term scribes *among the Pharisees* was the original version, rather than the simpler phrase scribes *and Pharisees* (i.e. the first and third versions). This is due both to the external criteria of the passages studied, as the codices containing them are considered more significant (Aland & Aland, 1982, p. 118; Romaniuk, 1975,

p. 37; Tronina, 2008, p. 160), and to the internal criteria, according to the principle that *lectio difficilior protior faciliori* (Tronina, 2008, p. 176).

In contrast, external criteria are decisive when it comes to the punctuation mark: the number of manuscripts and their earlier creation time (Waga, 2000, p. 39). The more primary version seems to be the one placing the scribes and Pharisees in the new sentence of Mark 2:16, rather than in the conclusion of Mark 2:15 verse. However, a perceptive reader of these reflections cannot overlook the fact that for some reason, still unclear now, some, especially later copyists of the Gospel text, were keen to portray the scribes and Pharisees as accompanying Jesus on the journey along with the disciples and tax collectors, rather than merely as a group asking questions. The issue is yet to be addressed.

3.2. Contextual analysis

The next stage, still preparatory to the analysis of the text proper, is contextual analysis, which aims, on the one hand, to place the passage under scrutiny in the wider context of the biblical book in question and, on the other hand, to demonstrate that the passage constitutes a closed and integrated literary unit, with its own prologue and epilogue (Czerski, 2012, pp. 58–59).

When analysing the context of the narrative of the calling of Levi, it is imperative to note that a great many biblical scholars place this passage within a wider collection, which includes the verses Mark 2:1–3:6 (Achtemeier, 1999, p. 283; Bednarz, 1996, p. 128; Czajkowski, 1997, pp. 7–8; Czerski, 1996, p. 94; Ernst, 1981, pp. 83–84; Grundmann, 1977, pp. 71–72; Michaelis, 1961, p. 43; Léon-Dufour, 1964, p. 188; Schmid, 1954, pp. 55–56; Schnackenburg, 1966, p. 11). Only M. Bednarz and X. Léon-Dufour separate the verse Mk 3:6 from this set.

This set is given various names: the *first disputes with the leaders of the people* (*Biblia Tysiąclecia*, 1980, p. 1160), *the conflict with the religious authorities* (Achtemeier, 1999, p. 283), *the five disputes and several descriptions* (Bednarz, 1996, p. 128), *the controversy with Judaism (1)* (Czerski, 1996, p. 94) or *the Galilean disputes of Jesus* (Czajkowski, 1997, p. 8).

The story of Levi's calling has a prologue that presents a new place, people and circumstances involved in the event (Gnilka, 1989, p. 103; Schmithals,

1979, p. 165). The passage also has an epilogue in the form of Jesus' final words closing the disputation (Langkammer, 2007, p. 111). The person of the tax collector – Levi – is here the element unifying the whole story.

As with the critical analysis, here, too, an interesting issue emerges, which is yet to be clarified. It may be expressed in the doubt as to why the set of Jesus' disputes with the scribes includes a description of an event: the calling of a disciple.

3.3. Linguistic, and historical-critical analyses

The analyses mentioned in the title of this section are today the primary means of studying and interpreting the biblical text. The first method is one that considers texts from a synchronic aspect, treating them as closed and coherent literary units, thus abstracting from questions about the genesis of the text itself and the process of its creation. The linguistic method consists of three stages: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic analysis. In contrast, the historical-critical analysis, which belongs to diachronic methods of textual research, takes into account the entire process of text formation. Alongside literary criticism, its procedure includes tradition critique, form critique, and editorial critique. In addition to these two methods, rhetorical analysis, narrative analysis or intertextual analysis are also mentioned in biblical studies (Czerski, 1997; 2012; Langkammer, 1994, pp. 249–252; Romaniuk, 1983; cf. Pontificia Commissione Biblica, 1993).

Given the abbreviated nature of the present study, only the most important issues concerning the exegesis of the story of Levi's calling, which have a significant bearing on the problem addressed here, will be mentioned herein.

At first, it may be surprising to see the phrase *Καὶ γίνεται…* ('And it happened…') at the beginning of the verse of Mark 2:15, since such a phrase is only appropriate for introductions to descriptions of new events. In fact, the narrative of the calling of Levi includes two separate descriptions, which originally – at least in the chronological perspective – did not occur immediately after each other. So, in fact, the description of Levi's calling is shorter and covers verses Mark 2:13–14. This description already forms the editorial background to Jesus' disputation with the scribes in verses Mark

2:16–17, and the connecting element between the two stories, apart from the theological message that Jesus' message is addressed to sinners, is the phrase Mark 2:15 (Langkammer, 2007, p. 111). And it is this sentence that will be the focus of further considerations.

The expression *καὶ γίνεται* used in this verse is a periphrastic statement in nature (Popowski, 1995, p. 109). A periphrase is a rhetorical figure, replacing the name of a phenomenon by a more elaborate description of it (Okopień-Sławińska, 1988, p. 351).

It is worth mentioning here that such periphrastic marking of the subsequent phase of a narrative in the so-called synoptic Gospels (according to St. Mark, St. Matthew and St. Luke), occurs relatively frequently – 44 times, but the rarest, even exceptional occurrence may be found in the Gospel according to St. Mark: only 3 times; in the version of St. Matthew – 6 times, and in the version of St. Luke – 35 times (Waga, 2000, p. 62). Generally, in the Gospels, such an expression is followed by a conjunction ὅτι ('that') or ὡς ('as'), or by a *Genetivus absolutus*, or finally by another verbless sentence. In the Mark 2:15 verse, however, this expression is uniquely combined with the *Accusativus cum infinitivo* construction (Popowski, 1995, p. 109; Blass & Debrunner, 1979, §§ 393, 408), which has a decisive impact on the subsequent construction of the verse, making the sentence of Mark 2:15b syntactically co-ordinated with the sentence of Mark 2:15a (Theobald, 1978, p. 173). For it should be noted here that the verse Mark 2:15 consists of four single sentences.

Mark 2:15a:

Καὶ γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτόν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ,

And it happened that he was reclining at the table in his house,

Mark 2:15b:

καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·

and numerous tax-collectors and sinners were reclining together at the table with Jesus and His disciples,

Mark 2:15c:

ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ

for there were many

Mark 2:15d:

καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ.

who followed Him.

Of particular importance in synchronic analysis is the characterisation of syntax, especially the way sentences are combined. The first two parts of the verse of Mark 2:15ab are linked paratactically (coordinated combining of several sentences into one), by means of a conjunction *καὶ* ('and'). The next two parts of Mark 2:15cd are a complement to Mark 2:15ab and are linked to them by a conjunction *γὰρ* ('for'). This conjunction – included in the group of coordinating causative conjunctions – generally occurs in Greek sentences in the second place, indicating a cause, conclusion, extension of thought or explanation (Popowski, 1995, p. 103; Czerski, 1997, p. 129; Egger, 1989, p. 80; Blass & Debrunner, 1979, § 442). It evidently breaks the parataxis that has prevailed so far, which is noteworthy also because the consecutive *καὶ* ('and') between Mark 2:15c and Mark 2:15d no longer acts as a conjunction linking coordinating elements, but is a relative particle. This particle introduces a new sentence (relative phrase) following on the model of a Hebrew conjunction אֲשֶׁר – called *nota relationis*, and which usually replaces all forms of the relative pronoun (Feyerabend, 1961, p. 16; Nowicki, 1967, p. 126; Szir & Szir, 1958, p. 44).

Before drawing conclusions from the above analysis, attention should still be drawn to the occurrence of as many as four pronouns (personal and possessive) throughout the verse: *αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ* (respectively: 'he,' 'his,' 'his,' 'him'). There are particular doubts about the first two pronouns: personal and possessive. These, for many exegetes, have given rise to penetrating inquiries. For, depending on whom the personal pronoun 'he' points to, different places of action can be established concerning 'his house:' whether it is the house of Jesus or that of the called collector. Eliza-

beth S. Malbon concluded that from the point of view of narrative logic rather than historical probability, the supper was held in the house of Jesus (1985, p. 283). A similar position has been taken by M. Theobald, who believes that the unity of all the sentences in verse Mark 2:15 is expressed in their common reference to the person of Jesus, which is supposedly expressed in the four pronouns pointing to Him (Theobald, 1978, p. 173).

The fact is, however, that from the point of view of synchronic analysis, the sentence Mark 2:15 raises a number of serious doubts due to *the roughness* of style. For, in summing up and drawing conclusions from the above analyses, it must be said that: firstly, the introduction of the phrase ('and it happened …') into this verse, as mentioned earlier, is unusual. The Evangelist Mark was the most frequent among the Evangelists to use the conjunction καὶ ('and') at the beginning of successive parts of the text (pericopes) (as many as 80 times out of 88 pericopes), but not καὶ γίνεται ('and it happened …') (cf. Waga, 2000, p. 69). Secondly, he interrupted the characteristic parataxis by introducing the conjunctions γὰρ ('for') and καὶ ('and') as a relative particle. Thirdly, it is not clear who the subject is in the sentence Mark 2:15a, and consequently – who owns the house. And fourthly, it is not clear for what purpose the sentences of Mark 2:15cd were introduced, further interrupting the parataxis, when they actually repeat the information communicated earlier (Czajkowski, 1997, pp. 53–59).

A decidedly different view of the verse in question can be taken from the perspective of diachronic analyses. They indicate that the calling of Levi and the feast with sinners did not take place immediately after each other. Some believe that, from the level of *Formgeschichte*, the calling of Levi in the collection of Jesus' polemics is an addition (Czajkowski, 1997, p. 54), although there are also differing opinions on the matter (cf. Ernst, 1981, pp. 93–94).

This is why the aforementioned *roughness of style* would indicate a connection between the two events at the editorial stage of the text, and the motive for their connection would be the presence of the collectors during the meal (Pesch, 1968, pp. 43–45; 1976, p. 104; cf. Wojciechowski, 1991, pp. 51–52). Some biblical scholars put forward the even more far-reaching conclusion that the very verse about the calling of Levi (Mark 2:14) was not Mark's work, but only the verse of Mark 2:13, since the presence of the name 'Levi, son of Alphaeus' was not necessary at all: during the meal he plays a passive role (Czajkowski, 1997, p. 55; Gnilka, 1989, pp. 104, 110; Zimmermann, 1978,

p. 183), not to mention the fact that in the Gospel according to Matthew he is called Matthew (cf. Kiley, 1984, pp. 347–351; Pesch, 1968, pp. 40–56).

Therefore, it seems – on the basis of diachronic research – that R. Pesch might be right, in claiming that the pronoun αὐτοῦ ('him') in verse Mark 2:15a was put there at the redaction stage by the Evangelist, who introduced it there in place of the expression 'Levi, son of Alphaeus,' which had been transferred to verse Mark 2:14. This would mean that it was in fact the collector who held a feast for his former comrades in state, for Jesus and His disciples, as advocated by many ancient and modern exegetes (Schmid, 1954, p. 64; Czajkowski, 1997, p. 56; Romaniuk, Jankowski & Stachowiak, 1999, p. 178).

It is much easier to resolve the interpretative difficulties of Mark 2:15a verse on the plane of synchronic research. Since the verb calling Levi to accompany Jesus ἀκολούθει μοι ('follow me!') semantically requires following the caller – as is evident from the semantic analysis of the word, omitted here (cf. Waga, 2000, pp. 86–95) – it therefore seems more likely that it was Levi who followed Jesus to His house. Moreover, the disputation with the scribes would have taken on more acuity if Jesus had brought sinners into his house than if he had merely accepted an invitation from the collector. Finally, the very presence of scribes seems more likely in Jesus' house than in that of a tax collector (Malbon, 1985, pp. 282–283).

Only now can the efforts of the copyists of the biblical texts, who in later variants necessarily emphasised the numerous and continuous presence of the scribes with Jesus, as indicated by the critical analysis above, seem understandable.

It should also be added that *the roughness* of style of the verse Mark 2:15, which has already been mentioned several times, was to some extent removed in subsequent redactions of the biblical text from the other synoptics: Matthew and Luke.

Matthew 9:10:

Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐλθόντες συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

And it happened, while He was reclining at the table in the house, that a multitude of collectors and sinners having come, were reclining at the table with Jesus and His disciples.

Luke 5:29:

Καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην Λευὶς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων οἳ ἦσαν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι.

And Levi held a great banquet to Him in his house. And there was a large crowd of tax collectors and others who were with them, lying around the table.

An analysis of the parallel sites in the Synoptic Gospels allows us to conclude that, while in Mark's version there are a number of uncertainties due to stylistic difficulties and the method of textual analysis adopted, in Matthew's version the feast is more likely to be held in the house of Jesus, attended by tax collectors and sinners, while in Luke's version the host of the feast appears to be Levi.

All the issues described above in relation to the analysis of Mark 2:15 verse indicate the difficulties and uncertainties in interpreting the biblical text. Such a situation can provide interesting inspiration for reflections in the field of pedagogy.

4. The dynamics of the educational relationship

The phrase 'the dynamics of the educational relationship' is understood here specifically as the activity manifested by specific actors in the educational relationship. Simplifying, it is possible to point to two main and traditionally considered types of this activity and, at the same time, two main models of the educational relationship: single-subject and two-subject ones (Jeziorański, 2022a, pp. 126–127; cf. 2022b, pp. 17–18).

The adoption of a particular model in a way influences the understanding of education itself. In the single-subject model, the main activity is taken up by the educator grooming the pupil. This state of affairs is illustrated by the so-called praxeological definitions of education. In the two-subject model, the educator and the educated individual interact with each other. An extreme case of increasing the role of the pupil even further can be a situation in which education becomes a task and a challenge for the pupil, and the role of the educator is minimised as much as possible. This model is illustrated by

evolutionary definitions of education (Kunowski, 2000, pp. 167–169; Nowak, 2000, pp. 236–239).

One can attempt to link both the definition types to different types of pedagogical reflection practice. This has long been pointed out by Kazimierz Sośnicki, who indicated two ways of understanding education: the first is education conceived as an activity and its product, the second: as a process and development. The first identifies education with pupil grooming. It is described by so-called traditionalist and conservative (normative) pedagogy. The second way of understanding education, on the other hand, makes the process dependent on the inner predispositions of the pupil; education is conceived in a liberal and naturalistic way, and pedagogy shaped on such assumptions can be referred to as dynamic and progressive pedagogy, or empirical and experimental pedagogy (Sośnicki, 1949, pp. 6–8, 115–117).

The discussion between these two polar opposite positions finds its exemplification in questions about the size of the space of freedom given to the pupil, about the role of contemporary educators, about the scale of educational assistance, and about leaving the pupil on his/her own (cf. Nowak, 2000, p. 183).

Arguably, it is easy to see that a symbol of the above dilemmas of pedagogy could be the doubts and difficulties in interpreting the Bible: whether the Master follows the disciple to his home, or rather the disciple follows the Master. The differences between the conclusions arising from the synchronic and diachronic analysis of the narrative of the calling of Levi, not to mention the general differences arising from the comparative analyses of the Synoptic Gospels, can show educators, as well as teachers, some horizons of uncertainty and under-determination of biblical texts (too often considered as *grand narratives*). And, after all, experiences of various types of uncertainty and incompleteness of knowledge are present in everyday scientific and educational practice (cf. Kwiatkowska, 2008, pp. 11–12).

5. Conclusions

The Bible in pedagogy – as mentioned – is often treated as a source of theological, ontological, anthropological, axiological or moral claims. Too little attention is paid to the genesis and history of the texts themselves, treating

them as closed literary units in accordance with the assumptions of synchronic methods. Exploring the process of biblical texts creates the hope of activating the process of discovering one's individual identity by exploring as yet unknown interpretations of a usually literally known text. Through these two processes, the discovery of deeper meanings of the literary text of the Bible – as postulated by R. Godoń – has the potential to set in motion a process of education, in a perspective far from attributing merely moralising functions to the Bible.

The story of Levi's calling, which raises many interpretive questions, can not only inspire educators to reflect on the uncertainty and indeterminacy of knowledge about education. This is because, both at the level of the object-analysed (semantically) text and at the level of the research procedure, the story is an opportunity for further in-depth reflections.

At the level of content, it is possible to reflect on the importance of getting to know the pupil's environment and entering the world of their experiences (like Jesus entering the customs chamber of Levi), on the acceptance of the weaknesses of pupils (like the tax collectors and sinners who were welcomed and invited to accompany Jesus), on the need to think critically about the processes taking place in the modern world (like the disputes conducted by Jesus with the scribes), on the processes of dynamic change taking place in the pupil (like the immediate, although perhaps pre-supposed, decision taken by Levi in connection with the new calling – we can refer here to the processes of change taking place in the pupil, according to the three-subject model of the educational relationship – cf. Jeziorański, 2022b), on the uniqueness of educational situations, and on the dynamically changing destiny of the human being (just as Levi's calling took place in motion, somehow as Jesus walked along the lake).

Similarly, the very plane of the research procedure can have an educative effect. An example of this would be gaining awareness of the internal criteria for critiquing a text. The criterion expressed in the phrase that *lectio difficilior protior faciliori*, indicating the importance of difficulties in arriving at the truth, may prompt reflection on the difficulties in human life and the developmental potential inherent in the moments of crisis experienced.

The discovery of new meanings contained in biblical texts by learning (through diachronic and synchronic analyses) about the process of forma-

tion of these texts can show new perspectives of the influence of biblical sciences on the construction of pedagogical knowledge.

References

- Achtemeier, P. J. (1999). Ewangelia według św. Marka, transl. T. Mieszkowski. In P. J. Achtemeier (Ed.), *Encyklopedia biblijna* (pp. 280–284). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Vocatio" – Oficyna Wydawniczo-Poligraficzna „Adam."
- Aland, K. & Aland, B. (1982). *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Bagrowicz, J. (2000). *Edukacja religijna współczesnej młodzieży. Źródła i cele*. Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Bagrowicz, J. (2007). Wychowanie w świetle Biblii. In A. Rynio (Ed.), *Wychowanie chrześcijańskie między tradycją a współczesnością* (pp. 39–60). Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Bagrowicz, J. (2014). Paedagogia perennis w strukturze nauk pedagogicznych. *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Pedagogika*, *30*(422), 79–98. https://doi.org/10.12775/AUNC_PED.2014.004.
- Bednarz, M. (1996). *Ewangelie synoptyczne*. Tarnów: Wydawnictwo BIBLOS.
- Benner, D. (2004). Erziehung – Religion, Pädagogik – Theologie, Erziehungswissenschaft – Religionswissenschaft. Systematische Analysen zu pädagogischen, theologischen und religionspädagogischen Reflexionsformen und Forschungsdesiderata. In E. Groß (Ed.), *Erziehungswissenschaft, Religion und Religionspädagogik* (pp. 9–50). Münster: Lit Verlag.
- *Biblia Tysiąclecia. Pismo święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych*. (1980). Poznań–Warszawa: Pallottinum.
- Blass, F. & Debrunner, A. (1979). *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Czajkowski, M. (1997). *Galilejskie spory Jezusa. Struktura kerygmatyczna Mk 2,1–3,6*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Teologii Katolickiej.
- Czerski, J. (1996). *Ewangelie synoptyczne w aspekcie literackim, historycznym i teologicznym*. Opole: Wydział Teologiczny Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Czerski, J. (1997). *Metody interpretacji Nowego Testamentu*. Opole: Wydział Teologiczny Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

- Czerski, J. (2012). *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

- Egger, W. (1989). *Methodenlehre zum Neuen Testament. Einführung in linguistische und historisch-kritische Methoden*. Freiburg: Verlag Herder.

- Ernst, J. (1981). *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.

- Feyerabend, K. (1961). *Słownik hebrajsko-polski*, transl. P. Leks. Kraków: Zakład Produkcji Skryptów K.Z.P.P.T. w Krakowie.

- Gnilka, J. (1989). *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Neukirchen – Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

- Godoń, R. (1999). Mimesis – Praxis – Wychowanie. *Kwartalnik Pedagogiczny*, *44*(2), 51–67.

- Goriszowski, W. (2006). *Podstawy metodologiczne badań pedagogicznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej TWP.

- Grundmann, W. (1977). *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

- Hejnicka-Bezwińska, T. (2008). *Pedagogika ogólna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

- Horowski, J. (2007). „*Paedagogia perennis*" *w dobie postmodernizmu. Wychowawcze koncepcje o. Jacka Woronieckiego a kultura przełomu XX i XXI wieku*. Toruń: Europejskie Centrum Edukacyjne.

- Jeziorański, M. (2022a). *Relacja wychowawcza. Rozumienie, modele, propozycja*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

- Jeziorański, M. (2022b). Three-subject Model of the Educational Relationship. *Paedagogia Christiana*, *50*(2), 11–35. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/PCh.2022.013

- Kiley, M. (1984). Why "Matthew" in Matt 9,9–13?. *Biblica*, *65*, 347–351.

- Komeński, J. A. (1956). *Wielka dydaktyka*, transl. K. Remerowa. Wrocław: Zakład imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

- Kostkiewicz, J. (2013). *Kierunki i koncepcje pedagogiki katolickiej w Polsce 1918–1939*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls."

- Kubik, W. (2004). Dialog pomiędzy pedagogiką i teologią. In S. Palka (Ed.), *Pogranicza pedagogiki i nauk pomocniczych* (pp. 111–120). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Kunowski, S. (1958). O potrzebie naukowego wyodrębnienia współczesnej pedagogiki katolickiej. *Katecheta*, *4*, 258–296.
- Kunowski, S. (1959). Teologia a potrzeby pedagogiki katolickiej. *Ateneum Kapłańskie*, *51*(1–3), 233–245.
- Kunowski, S. (1963). Katechetyka a pedagogika katolicka. *Katecheta*, *7*(4), 157–167.
- Kunowski, S. (2000). *Podstawy współczesnej pedagogiki*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Salezjańskie.
- Kwiatkowska, H. (2008). *Pedeutologia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Langkammer, H. (1991). *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Św. Krzyża.
- Langkammer, H. (1994). Metody lingwistyczne. In J. Flis, H. Langkammer, J. Szlaga & A. Tronina, *Metodologia Nowego Testamentu* (pp. 233–270). Pelplin: Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne.
- Langkammer, H. (2007). *Ewangelia według św. Marka. Wstęp – Przekład z oryginału – Komentarz*. Poznań: Pallottinum.
- Léon-Dufour, X. (1964). Die synoptischen Evangelien. In A. Robert & A. Feuillet (Eds.), *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift. Band 2. Neues Testament* (pp. 123–305). Wien–Freiburg–Basel: Herder Verlag.
- Magier, P. (2001). Współczesna myśl pedagogiczna wobec „pytania ostatecznego." In A. Rynio (Ed.), *Wychowanie człowieka otwartego. Rola „Zmysłu religijnego" Luigi Giussaniego w kształtowaniu osoby* (pp. 234–239). Kielce: Wydawnictwo Jedność.
- Magier, P. (2012). Pedagogika ogólna w strukturze nauk pedagogicznych. In R. Skrzyniarz, E. Smołka & S. Konefał (Eds.), *U podstaw tożsamości pedagogiki. Wielowymiarowość – biografistyka – historia* (pp. 31–49). Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Magier, P. (2018). Kategoria ogólności w pedagogice. Uwagi metodologiczne. *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Pedagogika*, *36*(446), 41–58. https://doi.org/10.12775/AUNC_PED.2018.013.
- Magier, P. (2019). *Metateoria pedagogiki chrześcijańskiej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II.
- Malbon, E. S. (1985). TH OIKIA AUTOU: Marc 2,15 in Context. *New Testament Studies*, *31*, 282–292.

- Marek, Z. & Walulik, A. (2020). Geneza pedagogiki religii. In Z. Marek & A. Walulik (Eds.), *Słowniki Społeczne. Pedagogika religii* (pp. 11–31). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Ignatianum w Krakowie.

- Merk, A. (1948). *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

- Michaelis, W. (1961). *Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Die Entstehung, Sammlung und Überlieferung der Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Bern: Berchthold Haller.

- Nestle, E., Nestle, E., Kurt, B., Kurt, A., Karavidopoulos, J., Martini, C. M. & Metzger, B. M. (1994). *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

- Nestle, E., Nestle, E., Kurt, B., Kurt, A., Karavidopoulos, J., Martini, C. M., Metzger, B. M., Bogacz, R. & Mazur, R. (2017). *Novum Testamentum Graece et Polonice / Nowy Testament Grecki i Polski*. Poznań: Pallottinum.

- Nipkow, K. E. (1992). Religion in der Pädagogik? *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, *38*(2), 215–234.

- Nowak, M. (1992). Pedagogika a teologia wychowania w dialogu interdyscyplinarnym. In A. Tchorzewski (Ed.), *Z problematyki metodologicznej teorii wychowania* (pp. 93–99). Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Uczelniane WSP w Bydgoszczy.

- Nowak, M. (2000). *Podstawy pedagogiki otwartej. Ujęcie dynamiczne w inspiracji chrześcijańskiej*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

- Nowak, M. (2001a). Treści religijne w teorii pedagogicznej. In A. Rynio (Ed.), *Wychowanie człowieka otwartego. Rola „Zmysłu religijnego" Luigi Giussaniego w kształtowaniu osoby* (pp. 230–233). Kielce: Wydawnictwo Jedność.

- Nowak, M. (2001b). Wychowanie religijne w pedagogice katolickiej XX wieku. *Paedagogia Christiana*, *7*(1), 43–69.

- Nowak, M. (2004). Pedagogika chrześcijańska: jej podstawy, rozwój i aktualny stan. *Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, *27*, 37–58.

- Nowak, M. (2008). *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

- Nowicki, P. (1967). *Greczyzna biblijna. Wprowadzenie*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.

- Okopień-Sławińska, A. (1988). Peryfraza. In J. Sławiński (Ed.), *Słownik termi-nów literackich* (pp. 351–352). Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo.

- Palka, S. (2013). *Problemy badawcze w pedagogice a praktyka badawcza peda-gogów*. In T. Bauman (Ed.), *Praktyka badań pedagogicznych* (pp. 61–68). Kra-ków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls."

- Pesch, R. (1968). Levi–Matthäus (Mc 2,14 / Mt 9,9; 10,3). Ein Beitrag zur Lö-sung eines alten Problems. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, *59*, 40–56.

- Pesch, R. (1976). *Das Markusevangelium*. Freiburg–Basel–Wien: Verlag Herder.

- Pestalozzi, J. H. (1972). *Jak Gertruda uczy swoje dzieci. Próba podania matkom wskazówek w formie listów, jak mają uczyć swoje dzieci*, transl. W. Szewczuk. In J. H. Pestalozzi, *Pisma pedagogiczne* (pp. 209–386). Wrocław–Warszawa–Kra-ków–Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich – Wydawnictwo.

- Pontificia Commissione Biblica. (1993). *L'interprétation de la Bible dans l'Eglise*. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

- Popowski, R. (1995). *Wielki słownik grecko-polski Nowego Testamentu. Wyda-nie z pełną lokalizacją greckich haseł, kluczem polsko-greckim oraz indeksem form czasownikowych*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Vocatio."

- Romaniuk, K. (1975). *Wprowadzenie do krytyki tekstu Starego i Nowego Testa-mentu*. Poznań–Warszawa–Lublin: Księgarnia św. Wojciecha.

- Romaniuk, K. (1983). *Morfokrytyka i historia redakcji czyli Form- i Redaktions-geschichte*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.

- Romaniuk, K., Jankowski, A. & Stachowiak, L. (1999). *Komentarz praktyczny do Nowego Testamentu*, vol. 1. Poznań–Kraków: Wydawnictwo Pallottinum – Tyniec Wydawnictwo Benedyktynów.

- Rutkowiak, J. (1994). Wielość języków pedagogiki a problem jej tożsamości. In H. Kwiatkowska (Ed.), *Ewolucja tożsamości pedagogiki* (pp. 85–99). Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Pedagogiczne, Instytut Historii Nauki, Oświaty i Techniki.

- Rynio, A. (1999a). Biblijne podstawy wychowania. In A. Rynio (Ed.), *Peda-gogika katolicka. Zagadnienia wybrane* (pp. 163–166). Stalowa Wola: Oficyna Wydawnicza Fundacji Uniwersyteckiej w Stalowej Woli.

- Rynio, A. (1999b). Katolicka myśl pedagogiczna. Próba syntezy. In A. Rynio (Ed.), *Pedagogika katolicka. Zagadnienia wybrane* (pp. 411–417). Stalowa Wola: Oficyna Wydawnicza Fundacji Uniwersyteckiej w Stalowej Woli.

- Schmid, J. (1954). *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.

- Schmithals, W. (1979). *Das Evangelium nach Markus. Band 2/1*. Gütersloh–Würzburg: Siebenstern.

- Schnackenburg, R. (1966). *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Düsseldorf: Patmos–Verlag.

- Sośnicki, K. (1949). *Pedagogika ogólna*. Toruń: Księgarnia Naukowa T. Szczęsny.

- Szir (Wolman-Sieraczkowa), M. & Szir, D. (1958). *Słownik hebrajsko-polski. Cz. 1*. Tel-Aviv: DVIR.

- Theobald, M. (1978). Der Primat der Synchronie vor der Diachronie als Grundaxiom der Literarkritik Methodische Erwägungen an Hand von Mk 2, 13–17 / Mt 9, 9–13. *Biblische Zeitschrift*, *22*, 161–186.

- Tronina, A. (2008). Tekst Pisma świętego. In J. Szlaga (Ed.), *Wstęp ogólny do Pisma świętego* (pp. 150–183). Poznań: Pallottinum.

- Waga, L. (2000). *Analiza lingwistyczna opowiadania o powołaniu Lewiego (Mk 2, 13–17)*. Opole: manuscript WT UO.

- Waga, L. (2016). Obecność teoretycznych i metateoretycznych założeń współczesnej pedagogiki chrześcijańskiej w „De catechizandis rudibus" św. Augustyna. *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego*, *36*(1), 227–249.

- Waga, L. (2021). Theological Aspects of Educational Postulates of Ludwika Jeleńska (1885–1961) in the Light of Contemporary Interdisciplinary Discourses of Theology with Education Sciences. *Studia Oecumenica*, *21*, 325–340. https://doi.org/10.25167/so.2870.

- Wierzchosławski, S. (2009). Wielodyscyplinarność i interdyscyplinarność statystycznych badań zjawisk społecznych. *Studia Demograficzne*, *1*, 30–47.

- Wojciechowski, M. (1991). *Czynności symboliczne Jezusa*. In J. Łach (Ed.), *Studia z biblistyki* (pp. 7–253). Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.

- Zimmermann, H. (1978). *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre. Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.