

## BN399.30 Supervised Reading Course in New Testament (2002)

### Solving the Synoptic Problem For Students?

#### Introduction and Background

An English teacher, in discussing how a particular topic is made easier to understand for non-experts, observed,

There are a few geniuses, like Einstein or Teilhard, whose work is at the outer reaches of human knowledge. Their publications are so technical, so involved, so abstract that they can communicate only to a few others who, though they themselves do not do original work on that creative level, can still comprehend these new ideas and “translate them downward” to college students, government officials, readers of more academic magazines. Once again, these students “translate downward” for high school students and Sunday supplements and news magazines. In this way, the ideas gradually percolate down to the “ordinary” person in the street—in a highly diluted form, but hopefully in an honest form.<sup>1</sup>

I chose this quote from O’Malley because I saw in it a description of the very problem I was facing as I attempted to study the Synoptic Problem—the problem of a student seeking to engage in, and understand, a specialised NT topic. The key word in O’Malley’s quote is ‘hopefully.’ *Hopefully* the people who “translate downward” will become good translators. *Hopefully* the students ‘down below’ will ask difficult questions. *Hopefully* questions will be valued as much as answers have been. All students have questions, but not all students are able to recognise and articulate those questions. This essay responds to the lack of answers being provided concerning the sorts of questions a student beginning the Synoptic Problem may raise.

This essay represents an ongoing struggle to come to grips with the main arguments for and against the commonly invoked solution to the Synoptic Problem known as the Two-Source Hypothesis. I do not believe I have finished the project I have begun, but I do feel that I have gained some answers to my questions. The questions for this essay began fermenting when one of my favourite scholars proposed a theory I had never really considered—Matthew’s Gospel had been written with Mark *and* Luke as its sources, which put less emphasis on needing the Q hypothesis. I wondered, ‘Why hadn’t this been

proposed before?’ This theory sounded fantastic! But if I was going to believe in it, I needed to know more about it. Unfortunately I could not at first find anyone else who advocated it. All I encountered were statements which said that *no one argues for Matthew being the last of the synoptics to be written*. Such statements did not help me at all because I wanted to know *why* has no one had argued for it. What were the reasons? Where can I find these reasons? As I went looking I encountered even more questions. My main question throughout this time has been: ‘Are Matthew and Luke completely independently written, or not?’ Far from being an easy question to answer, it has at least been worthwhile. And this essay presents a large portion of my investigations. Due to the fact that my questions were not being answered by the kind of literature I had expected would have, I decided to present the essay in two parts. Part A is an evaluation of six Synoptic Problem presentations, from the perspective of a student (namely me). Part B investigates the question which none of the six presentations had bothered to address, namely, *the arguments for and against Matthean posteriority*.

The main point I wish to draw out from Part A is the importance of students’ own questions. Synoptic Problem presentations need to improve in being able to anticipate the kinds of questions which students are asking (or wondering). These presentations need to be able to engage the students *where they are at*.

Concerning Part B—this is only the tip of the iceberg! I believe that being forced to look for the arguments myself has given me a deeper appreciation of the problem. For example I discovered arguments *against* Matthean posteriority by attempting to arguing *for* Matthean posteriority.

I found it difficult to obtain access to some of the books and articles that would have assisted even more with my progress. But as it turned out, I still had to leave out and abbreviate several things. Just recently (but unfortunately too late for this assignment), I have been able to borrow four new books which I am looking forward to reading.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> William J. O’Malley, *Matthew, Mark, Luke & You* (Allen, Texas: Thomas More Publishing, 1996), 136-137.

<sup>2</sup> These are: David J. Neville, *Mark’s Gospel—Prior or Posterior?: A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order* (JSNTSS 222; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002). Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (The Biblical Seminar, 80; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg; PA: Trinity Press International, 2002). Christopher A. Rollston (ed.), *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response* (Harrisburg; PA: Trinity Press International, 2002). I have just finished reading

## Part A

### Evaluating Synoptic Problem Presentations

#### “And They Each Presented The Synoptic Problem As They Were Able”

The six Synoptic Problem ‘presentations’ selected here for evaluation represent a reasonable spread of different authors and years of publication (1970, 1973/75, 1987, 1992, 1999, and 2000), the oldest presentation being from Joseph A. Fitzmyer, a Roman Catholic Jesuit scholar, whose work became a reference point for future discussion. Fitzmyer’s defense of the Two-Source Hypothesis, “The Priority of Mark and The ‘Q’ Source in Luke,” was presented at the first international conference of its kind in April 1970.<sup>3</sup> Werner George Kümmel’s German introduction to the Synoptic Problem (1963-73) is likewise somewhat of a classic.<sup>4</sup> Robert Stein’s 1987 Synoptic Problem ‘Introduction’<sup>5</sup> has also proved itself, being recently revised and updated (2001).<sup>6</sup> Christopher M. Tuckett (a renowned adherent of the Two-Source Hypothesis from England and also renowned for engaging opponents of alternative source theories) wrote the ‘Synoptic Problem’ entry for the Anchor Bible Dictionary in 1992.<sup>7</sup> David L. Dungan represents the minority Griesbach Hypothesis party, with his not so minor book, published as part of the Anchor Bible Reference Library.<sup>8</sup> The sixth presentation comprises two chapters from, John S.

---

Neville’s book which is as good a book as I’ve ever read (I didn’t expect he could top his first book!), and I am part-way through both Goodacre’s books.

<sup>3</sup> It was to celebrate the 175<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, and was called, “The Pittsburgh Festival on the Gospels.” Over 200 scholars were present from around the world. Fitzmyer’s article is published in, *Jesus and Man’s Hope*, vol. 1, (Perspective 1), ed. David G. Buttrick (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), 131-170. Fitzmyer’s paper can also be found reprinted in, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 3-40, and also reprinted in, Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr. (ed.), *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 37-52, 245-257.

<sup>4</sup> Werner George Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. by Howard C. Kee, London: SCM Press, 1975), 38-80. The English edition is based on 17th edition of Feine-Behm, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1973. Kümmel’s presentation is likewise found reprinted in, Bellinzoni (ed.), *Two-Source Hypothesis*, 53-62, 227-257. Christopher M. Tuckett, “The Existence of Q,” in, *The Gospel Behind the Gospels; Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald A. Piper (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), refers readers to the above two presentations by Kümmel and Fitzmyer as “standard defenses of the Q hypothesis.”

<sup>5</sup> *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker House Books, 1987)

<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately, I have been unable to access his 2001 update so the evaluation here is of his 1987 book.

<sup>7</sup> *ABD*, VI (New York: DoubleDay, 1992), 263-270.

<sup>8</sup> David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (ABRL, New York: DoubleDay 1999).

Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* which together provide an up-to-date Synoptic Problem ‘Introduction’ from a leading ‘Q’ expert.<sup>9</sup>

It is to be expected that the four most recent presentations should prove more satisfactory than the earlier two. Especially given that the two presentations from the 1970’s were written prior to the 1984 Jerusalem ‘Symposium’ on the Gospels which was “a major watershed conference” that took five years of planning.<sup>10</sup> The conference comprised three teams in order to comprehensively explore the (then) three main source hypotheses (Two-Source Hypothesis led by Frans Neirynck; Griesbach Hypothesis led by William Farmer; and the Multi-stage Hypothesis led by Marie-Émile Boismard). The three teams had ‘Guidelines’ for their position papers dealing with four areas: *Presuppositions (external considerations)*;<sup>11</sup> *Overview of the theory (internal considerations)*;<sup>12</sup> *Role of evidence closely related to the Gospels*;<sup>13</sup> and, *Value for theology/preaching*.<sup>14</sup> Thus the four most

---

<sup>9</sup> (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 11-54; 271-328. The two chapters are, Chapter 1, “Q and the Synoptic Problem,” and, Chapter 6, “The Jesus of History and the History of Dogma: Theological Currents in the Synoptic Problem.”

<sup>10</sup> Dungan, *History*, 376.

<sup>11</sup> The presuppositions were:

- A. What text of the Gospels do you use and why?
- B. What synopsis do you use and why?
- C. Should primary importance be ascribed to Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek in the words of Jesus?
- D. Does your theory assume primarily written or oral forms of the Gospel tradition? What is the evidence for your assumption?
- E. What role(s) did individual (e.g. “Christian prophets”) or the “Christian community” play in the formulation and preservation of the Jesus tradition?
- F. How ere the Gospels composed? Identify the closest analogies (if any) in Greco-Roman or Jewish literature.
- G. What was the nature and extent of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the Gospel writers?

<sup>12</sup> The overview included:

- A. What are the facts regarding the relations among the *four* Gospels (i.e. briefly state your theory).
- B. How do you distinguish “original” from “secondary” Jesus traditions? How do you determine early or source material as compared to late or redactional material? What role do such commonly used criteria as: “semitisms,” amplitude vs. Brevity, and whole vs. Broken form play in your theory? State your view of the general tendencies of the successive Gospel redactions regarding not only the *ipsissima verba* but also the *ipsissima gesta Jesu*.
- C. How does your theory explain the phenomenon of pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels?
- D. How does your theory explain the phenomenon the order of words and phrases within pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels
- E. How does your theory deal with the following alleged problems: doublets, “Q material,” “minor agreements against Mark,” and the complex phenomena associated with the Old Testament quotations in the Gospels?
- F. Does your theory rest on any non-reversible stylistic arguments? Is there any conceivable evidence that could prove your theory false? If so, what would it look like?

<sup>13</sup> Role of Evidence:

- A. What role does evidence from Tannaitic Judaism play in your theory?

recent Synoptic Problem presentations, should possess a clear advantage concerning the type of questions which a Synoptic Problem presentation should address. This is all the more the case considering that the outcome of this conference saw an “Agenda for Future Research” proposed with two lists of items assembled, eight items concerning “areas of unanimous agreement,”<sup>15</sup> and fifteen items concerning “areas of disagreement” (desiderata for future research).<sup>16</sup>

The criteria used in Part A of this essay for evaluating the various presentations of the Synoptic Problem are not identical to the ‘Guidelines’ for presentation of papers and the

- B. What role does evidence from Hellenistic culture play in your theory?
- C. What role does evidence from the Patristic period play in your theory?
  - I. direct statements regarding the order of composition of the Gospels
  - II. quotations from the Gospels
  - III. manuscript evidence
- D. What role do the non-canonical Gospels play in your theory?

<sup>14</sup> Theology/Preaching

- A. How does your theory assist in a better understanding of the incarnation of the Word of God in its three key “moments:”
  - I. Jesus as the incarnate Word of God.
  - II. The Gospels as incarnations of the Word of God.
  - III. The situation of the theologian/preacher as incarnator of the Word of God.

The above four sections of questions are from, David L. Dungan, “Introduction: The Jerusalem Symposium 1984,” in, David L. Dungan (ed.), *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard—W. R. Farmer—F. Neirynck* (BETL, 95; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1990), xix-xxi.

- <sup>15</sup> 1. The existence of direct literary relationship involving the Synoptic Gospels.
- 2. The existence and use of earlier traditions in the Synoptic Gospels.
- 3. That a literary, historical and theological explanation of the evangelists’ compositional activity, giving a coherent and reasonable picture of the whole of each Gospel, is the most important method of argumentation in defense of a source hypothesis.
- 4. That the Gospel of John must always be included in study of the Synoptic Gospels.

Dungan, “Agenda For Future Research,” in, Dungan, *Interrelations*, 609.

- <sup>16</sup> 1. The phenomenon of order among pericopes.
- 2. The patterns of agreement in order within pericopes.
- 3. Whether one may identify redactional features in a Gospel independently of a source-hypothesis.
- 4. Whether doublets have significance in solving the Synoptic Problem.
- 5. Evaluation of the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark by means of probability analysis.
- 6. Whether the compositional activity of the evangelists was influenced by the genre(s) of the Gospels.
- 7. The Jesus tradition outside the Gospels with reference to the Synoptic Problem/all four Gospels.
- 8. Principles of synopsis construction.
- 9. Old Testament quotations or allusions in the Gospels with reference to the Synoptic Problem.
- 10. The process of handing on tradition.
- 11. Potential approaches to the Synoptic Problem in Asian and African contexts.
- 12. The socio-historical setting of each Gospel.
- 13. Theological implications of each research paradigm.
- 14. A more satisfactory way of stating the synoptic phenomenon and of posing the synoptic problem.
- 15. Computer-aided statistical analysis of the synoptic phenomena.

Dungan, “Agenda For Future Research,” in, Dungan, *Interrelations*, 609-610.

‘Agenda for Future Research.’ The criteria used here have been composed specifically from the perspective of a student, so as to be able to evaluate how successful and useful each presentation is for introducing students to various aspects of the Synoptic Problem. However, only one or two of the six presentations seem to have been written with the express purpose of being an ‘Introduction’ to the Synoptic Problem, and so it is somewhat unfair to judge them on something extraneous to their purpose. Nevertheless, there is not an abundance of specially published Synoptic Problem ‘Introductions’ available to begin with, and out of the Synoptic Problem literature available to me, these seemed suitable to evaluate. I have tried to select presentations by internationally reputable scholars and the ones selected here are ones readers are occasionally referred to in other literature on the Synoptic Problem. Thus the selected presentations hopefully encompass the sort of typical Synoptic Problem literature that students might presume to be able to turn to when looking for an Introduction to the Synoptic Problem. Indeed, besides several other sources, they were the ones to which I looked—in hope of finding some answers.

For the sake of space I have reduced the results of my six evaluations into chart form so that they may be seen at a glance (Appendix I). A few words are still necessary, however, concerning the process and results of the evaluation. The authors’ initials are used to denote the particular Synoptic Problem presentation in question, and a five-point scale (0-4) is used to give an indication of the degree to which the presentation addressed a particular aspect. Not every result will be discussed in detail, but only those which are not self-explanatory or demand further attention.

### **What is the Value and Relevancy of Studying How the Gospels Were Composed?**

Students reading Dungan’s book will most likely appreciate the enormity of the need to deal (hermeneutically) with the fact of having four different canonical Gospels. Kloppenborg and Stein, however, seem to be more aware of the importance source criticism holds for historical reconstructions concerning the traditions of the early Jesus-community/communities. But strangely, the discussion of the *value* of analyzing synoptic sources has been overlooked. The presentations generally only *presupposed* its relevancy. Not many of the presentations provided an explicit answer to the first point of concern:

*How is the Synoptic Problem relevant to students? What exactly might one's solution of the Synoptic Problem affect (historically and theologically)?* Perhaps this is because they assumed that students will already have some idea of the value of studying the Synoptic Problem or perhaps that were not writing with students in mind.<sup>17</sup> But is not the responsibility of a written presentation on the Synoptic Problem to begin with its relevancy? It should be pointed out that if the criterion here had been: 'Relevancy of the Synoptic Problem to New Testament Research,' then (besides Fitzmyer's presentation), the presentations might have fared better since they each highlighted this *in some way* by touching on issues concerning the nature of historical reconstruction.<sup>18</sup> Stein does devote several of his later chapters to issues relating to Form Criticism, Historical Jesus studies, Redaction Criticism, and the oral period of transmission. Stein's presentation seems to presuppose that there might be implications for early Christian origins at stake but he does not entertain various scenarios which might be implied by different solutions (e.g. Would a Q-document imply a Q-community? What other implications might there be for reconstructing early Christian origins and how might it effect our understanding of the death and resurrection traditions?). Similarly, Kümmel's presentation treated form criticism and alluded to the difficulty that Q (lacking a Passion Narrative) might have for early Christian origins and presupposes that the Synoptic Problem involves historical reconstruction. But as for articulating the relevant historical issues at stake which would concern students the most, Kümmel can only be said to have relayed *results* of research, without bringing students' attention to the *questions* which drove such investigations or underlay such results. Tuckett's presentation which briefly acknowledged the historical implications (and implications for individual Gospel theologies, i.e. redaction-critical

---

<sup>17</sup> Fitzmyer's presentation appears not to be written with students in mind at all

<sup>18</sup> Fitzmyer in a number of places seems to indicate that a solution concerns the dating of the Gospels. He does say "I submit, however, that 'the truth' of the matter is largely inaccessible to us, and that we are forced to live with a hypothesis or a theory" which may be construed as a lack of ability to make historical judgments about the composition of the Gospels. He disagrees with Farmer's assertion that 'son of Mary' gives reason for positing a late(r) date for Mark. Fitzmyer also acknowledges six "questions" (i.e. doubts or challenges) which he believes are raised by positing Mark as a conflation of Matthew and Luke - it is "incomprehensible to most students of the Synoptics" on compositional grounds - why would one want to reduce Matthew and Luke into Mark? Why is so much (essential details) of each omitted and "trivial and unessential details" added? How could Mark have eliminated all trace of Lucanisms? Why would Mark want to omit the common elements of the infancy narratives? Mark's ending is hardly a conflation of Matthew and Luke's endings, "What sort of early theologian does Mark turn out to be if his account is based on Matthew and Luke?"

results) of solving the Synoptic Problem,<sup>19</sup> is at least to be praised for explicitly mentioning that such issues were affected, even though he supplied no examples of what difference various solutions may entail.

### **Encountering the Text**

The second criterion concerned whether students encountered different Gospel texts, so that similarities and differences were *displayed*. To address this criterion the presentation had to do more than simply provide biblical references—it must actually provide students with biblical *text* for comparison (whether in English or both Greek and English).<sup>20</sup>

### **Drawing out Students' Pre-Conceptions and Challenging Them to Think**

The third criterion concerned engaging students current understandings (getting students to think about and *articulate* how the Gospels might have been written) which was poorly addressed by all six presentations. Reading about the Synoptic Problem requires some knowledge that the issue here concerns *how Matthew, Mark and Luke were physically written*. Are students prepared to think? What about those students who do not already approach the Gospels as historical-critical thinkers?

Stein comes closest to anticipating the need for students to think for themselves by asking them to work through several passages using a synopsis<sup>21</sup> which is supposed to confront students with the question: 'Why do they agree so closely?' After relaying the agreement of order (with Mark's order), Stein then provides examples where the Synoptics agree even in their 'parenthetical material' which suggests knowledge of *written* accounts. Stein caps off this suggestion by quoting Luke's preface which mentions written accounts already in existence. Is this is enough to allow students with fundamentalist backgrounds to begin a paradigm shift? For some students, bizarre agreements or contradictions are simply due to

---

<sup>19</sup> Tuckett, "Synoptic Problem," 270, "Older scholars perhaps thought to quickly that the isolation of the older strands of the tradition take us straight back to the historical Jesus...Nevertheless, a solution to the synoptic problem is essential if we are to reach back to earlier parts of the tradition...Any different theory of synoptic relationships [to the Two-Source Hypothesis] may well entail a drastic alteration in our assessment of the theologies of the individual evangelists." Tuckett, "Synoptic Problem," *ABD*, VI, 270.

<sup>20</sup> Understandably, Fitzmyer's and Tuckett's presentations were probably limited by too little space to address this criterion sufficiently.

<sup>21</sup> Mt 19:13-15 // Mk 10:13-16 // Lk 18:15-17; Mt 22:23-33 // Mk 12:18-27 // Lk 20:27-40; Mt 24:4-8 // Mk 13:5-8 // Lk 21:8-11

*human* questioning concerning documents influenced by the *Holy Spirit*.<sup>22</sup> I can remember a time when I assumed that Mark's Gospel would have been written down very soon after the events (not unlike a journal) and believing that it was 'dictated' from heaven. So some students have a very long way to travel in order to make any sense of Synoptic Problem presentations. Certain students may need to be able to change their idea of 'Gospel History' as something "miraculously historical" and entertain the notion that God often works through and with the very 'human' situation—speaking through simple 'human attempts' at composing a (deliberately theological) 'Biography/Story of Jesus,' based on second-hand accounts, challenging 'independent' authorship (by Holy 'dictation').

Luke's preface is perhaps useful for asking questions about how far away Luke stood from the eye-witness period, and the 'epilogue' or 'appendix' of John's Gospel is useful for asking questions about who the authors were. Students can begin to discuss the idea of 'whose *authority* lies behind a writing' versus more modern black and white problem of 'falsifying authorship'. The idea is to enable students to question whether it matters if Matthew was not "Apostle Matthew" (one of the twelve disciples), if Mark was not "Mark," whether previously written sources were 'borrowed.' Issues concerning modifications/alterations of previous traditions ('tampering!' 'plagiarism!') need to be sensitively addressed. Without introducing such issues some students have no hope of engaging with the Synoptic Problem, especially Matthew's *use of Mark*.

Students may never have given very much thought as to how the Gospels were composed and as Stein is aware, Luke's preface is one important starting place. Dungan does well to point out the lack of any "nimbus of glory surrounding the creation of the Gospels" in Luke's preface and even in the earliest second-century explanations of the composition of the Synoptic Gospels. The actions reported "seem surprisingly mundane."<sup>23</sup> Dungan can perhaps be excused for not dealing with students' current beliefs on Gospel composition since he spends much time on the first few centuries which allows students plenty of

---

<sup>22</sup> In other words we should not be looking for contractions or 'theories of copying' in the first place! (Augustine lives on!) I remember a friend mention how a preacher explained the different genealogies in Matthew and Luke as being due to one tracing Mary's line and the other Joseph's line (are students ready to check out/investigate things for themselves?) My wife remembers a preacher explaining how one of the Gospel authors was probably hiding behind a nearby tree watching the events of Jesus' life, taking down notes for his composition.

<sup>23</sup> Dungan, *History*, 27.

‘thinking space’ to see the variety of early Christian and non-Christian responses to the various differing Gospels. None of the other five Synoptic Problem presentations can be excused, however, for neglecting the beginning student’s situation. There is clearly a need to begin eliciting *questions* and not forcing *answers*.

### **Ancient Writing Techniques**

It is strange that all six presentations were silent on ancient writing techniques, and the likelihood of how sources were used. Was Streeter aware of the difficulty posed by positing three *documents* used by Matthew (M, Mark, Q) and Luke (L, Mark, Q) on each of their laps/desks? Is this one reason why the 4DH (Four-Document Hypothesis) instead became preferred to be called by many as the 4SH (Four-Source Hypothesis)?<sup>24</sup>

### **Definitions Say it All, But History Says it Better: The Macro Problem**

What is the Synoptic Problem? Only three of the presentations considered the ‘History of the Synoptic Problem’ directly relevant to the discussion, and only Dungan and Kloppenborg considered it important for defining the ‘problem’. The Synoptic Problem is interconnected with too many other areas to be successfully limited to a literary puzzle. But this is precisely what five of the presentations do. Dungan’s is the only one to conceive of the larger Synoptic Problem (Which Gospels to use and compare? Which critical text to use? Which theory of composition to propose? and, How to interpret them?). Dungan’s presentation has the advantage of a broad definition, but also the pitfalls—there is virtually no space dedicated to investigating the major source theories!<sup>25</sup> Dungan’s presentation is therefore particularly useful *in conjunction with other presentations*. Kloppenborg’s recognition that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries brought “a new verbally based doctrine of inspiration”<sup>26</sup> combined with Dungan’s recognition that the sudden increase in harmonies was evidence that the first phase of the modern approach to the Gospels concerned “The New Spirit of Literal Historicism in Biblical Interpretation” where “The

---

<sup>24</sup> Two of the books I have just borrowed (Neville and Rollston), each have an entire chapter concerned with ancient compositional techniques.

<sup>25</sup> Dungan, *History*, 8, acknowledges this himself, “Part Three does not attempt to discuss the current trends within each of the four components of the Third Form of the Synoptic Problem [composition theories] as completely as Parts One and Two.”

New Harmonies Reflect the Modern, Physical View of the Universe”<sup>27</sup> is helpful for defining the Synoptic Problem. Kloppenborg is helpful for indicating how this new verbal/literal doctrine of inspiration view became “an easy target” for an altogether historical suspicion of the Gospels.<sup>28</sup> Stein’s presentations also concurs in attributing special importance to Griesbach’s invention of the first “pure” synopsis,<sup>29</sup> even though he evidences little knowledge of Griesbach’s background and thought compared to the insight of Dungan (and Kloppenborg).

Defining the Synoptic Problem has a philosophical logic about it that is virtually overlooked by all six presentations. In order to define it, one must already have some idea of what ‘it’ is. Kümmel contends, “The real problem was first recognized in the second half of the eighteenth century.”<sup>30</sup> Thus there was no *modern concept* of where the synoptic Gospels ‘took material from’ until the ‘modern’ notions of Truth and History would support the idea of a synoptic ‘problem’. There is little reason to collapse the definition of the Synoptic Problem into literary data without first addressing how the problem is conceived. Even Dungan missed an opportunity to discuss how the problem *conceived and defined* is related to current Synoptic Problem research and models. The presentations all failed to acknowledge that the act of defining the problem as ‘synoptic’ actually creates its own circular problem (see further below). And although he does so uncritically, Dungan is right in not excluding John from the ‘problem.’ The problem actually concerns the *source* of material (composition) and John actually highlights the ‘synoptic’ problem. Neither did the presentations acknowledge that defining the problem also defines the solution somewhat. If the problem is defined as seeking explanation for the literary data in the synoptics, then the Synoptic Problem is really only a smaller part of the larger problem of *source criticism*. Can

---

<sup>26</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 274.

<sup>27</sup> Dungan, *History*, 303-306 (Sub-Chapter Headings). The reference is to the objective, atomistic, scientific calculation of the new era—religion was purged of emotion, and scientific ‘knowledge’ reigned. Dungan, contends that the new feature of the 16<sup>th</sup> century harmonies was the recombining of details into a ‘super-chain’ and an increasingly atomistic analysis of the Gospel narratives, where the chronology of Jesus’ life was calculated down to the hour. Osiander’s harmony published in 1537, for example, picked up on every minute difference and caused him to create an elaborate picture of Jesus’ career whereby Jesus was Tempted three times, cleansed the temple three times, healed three centurions’ sons/servants, was anointed by three different women, and was betrayed by Judas twice. This was too extreme even for Calvin. Dungan, *History*, 306.

<sup>28</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q* 275.

<sup>29</sup> Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 23.

<sup>30</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 45.

one be focused on at the expense of the other? Does the problem concern looking for sources behind the Gospels? Or is the problem only limited to explaining the relationship between the Gospels? This distinction is also not addressed by the presentations. If one is looking for *sources*, one has more room for conceiving of oral sources than if one is looking for literary relationship—this simple point deserves recognition. Defining it as the ‘Synoptic Problem’ paints the problem as a literary puzzle—e.g. Matthew *copies from* Mark or *redacts* Mark (i.e. he does *not* include the oral version he knows or prefers).

Definitions of ‘synoptic’ and ‘synoptic problem’ are importantly interconnected. Defining the word ‘synoptic’ is inconsistently done.<sup>31</sup> ‘Synoptic’ as meaning “common perspective” of the (three) narratives is one typical definition provided in Hunter’s third edition of his *New Testament Introduction* (1972), “The first three Gospels - Matthew, Mark and Luke - are commonly called ‘the Synoptic Gospels’ because they give a ‘synopsis’ or common outline, of the story of Jesus.”<sup>32</sup> This had likewise been the definition previously given in A. H. McNeile’s *Introduction to the New Testament*.<sup>33</sup> However, Kümmel’s definition of ‘synoptic’ (found in an earlier chapter) is subtly different, “*Synoptics* (from *συννοησις*, ‘to view at the same time’). The name was introduced in 1776 by J. J. Griesbach in his *Synopse*, where the parallel texts of the first three Gospels are printed beside one another for comparison.”<sup>34</sup> This definition concurs with Tuckett’s definition, “The first three gospels in the NT canon—Matthew, Mark and Luke—are known as the ‘Synoptic’ Gospels, so called because they can be viewed side by side (‘synoptically’) and compared very easily by means of a synopsis.” The difference in the latter definition is that it is *the scholars* who ‘look at them together’ *and that is why they call them ‘synoptic’* (the reverse of the former!). The difference is not contradictory but circular:

---

<sup>31</sup> The word ‘synoptic’ in everyday English refers to some kind of overview or summary (where several parts are provided together), but the six presentations did not differentiate between its everyday use and its technical use.

<sup>32</sup> A. M. Hunter, *Introducing the New Testament*, revised edition (London: SCM Press, 1972), 28.

<sup>33</sup> A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927; 1953; 1957), 59, “The first three Gospels, as has been said, are called ‘synoptic’ because they give in general the same view of our Lord’s life, and follow broadly the same narrative framework with a similarity in the selection of material and in language and vocabulary.” Note also, 59, “the problem is to determine their literary origin.” Prior to this quest for the origin of the Gospels, there was essentially no ‘problem’.

<sup>34</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, “Formation of the New Testament Writings,” 36. Fitzmyer’s, Stein’s, Dungan’s and Kloppenborg’s presentations do not define the word ‘synoptic’.

the synoptics ‘look so (inherently) similar’ that they can be ‘seen (and studied) together’.<sup>35</sup> But it is only the modern mind which says that such similarity *demand*s that the similar looking Gospels be studied alongside one another in order to be queried. In other words, scholars helped to *construct* the problem—the problem cannot exist independently of the mind which inquires of them. Thus the ‘problem’ (or ‘quest-ion’) changed when the ‘tool’ for ‘looking at them’ changed—but the tool for looking at them changed because the ‘mind’ asking the question had changed—the rational inquiring scientific *individual* mind which before could not exist *within* the Church. Dungan sees Luther as one standing on the border between tradition and innovation. Luther (who could not accept the mind of the Church/Pope/Tradition over his own mind) had also inherited the Augustinian legacy—when confronted with inconsistent chronological events Luther’s final conclusion was: “If one account in Holy Writ is at variance with another, and it is impossible to solve the difficulty, *just dismiss it from your mind.*”<sup>36</sup> But once History was granted to be *different* from the present, and seen to be *developing* over time (15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries Romanticism), the Gospels might also be seen as pointing out such *developing history*.

### **Thanks, But No Thanks John!**

What is being implied by excluding John from the ‘problem’?<sup>37</sup> Does it imply John has no relationship? Does it imply John is prior to the synoptics? Whatever is being implied is left unsaid. Perhaps formulating the Synoptic Problem has helped prejudice John’s Gospel as less historical? This issue is not raised let alone addressed by most introductions to the Synoptic Problem, including the six presentations chosen here.

### **Textual Criticism Makes the Synoptic Problem Circular: The Micro Problem**

Kümmel’s presentation unwittingly provides a better example of the circularity of textual criticism than he anticipated. In dismissing the idea of Ur-Markus, Kümmel argues that some of the Mt-Lk agreements against Mark “disappear when the text is corrected”

---

<sup>35</sup> The paradox stated is that the problem of ‘seeing them together’ is solved by ‘studying them together’!

<sup>36</sup> A sermon of Luther’s at Wittenberg cited in, Dungan, *History*, 180.

<sup>37</sup> The Synoptic Problem by definition also excludes other Gospels (e.g. Thomas and John) but if not for the non-synoptic Gospels, would the problem still be called the Synoptic Problem?

with the example, “Thus κυριε is surely to be read in Mk 1:40”<sup>38</sup> which supposedly removes the minor agreement of Mt-Lk against Mark dispensing with the need for an Urmarkus (or Mt-Lk dependence). Students may notice that textual critics do not share Kümmel’s optimistic “surely” as no recent translations (or NA/UBS text) include ‘Lord’ here at Mk 1:40. Thus Kümmel’s next sentence (“But as a consequence of the uncertainty of the wording in the Synoptics the explanation is also uncertain at times in many cases”) has more effect than he intended!

Kloppenborg’s presentation briefly acknowledged the relationship between text criticism and the Synoptic Problem noting how even older editions of Nestle-Aland can suggest that there is less verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark than occurs in NA<sup>27</sup> (Kloppenborg appropriately directs students to J. K. Elliott’s, Dungan’s, Neiryneck’s, Orchard’s and Hieke’s discussion of the issues of creating synopses). Stein’s presentation came very close to acknowledging the issue, “Bruce Manning Metzger sees the solution of the Synoptic Problem as a helpful tool for the textual criticism of those (synoptic) Gospels.”<sup>39</sup> Unfortunately Stein does not mention that the field of textual criticism has embraced Markan priority as the ‘helpful tool’, so only students who have some knowledge of textual criticism have any chance of recognising here that a different solution may bring into being a different critical NT text, which may in turn provide more support for a different source hypothesis.

### **The Problem of Using English Translations and Synopses**

None of the presentations addressed the problem of using English translations and synopses<sup>40</sup> (they would, of course, take it for granted that studies on the Synoptic Problem are done in NT Greek—but how are *students* to know this unless this is discussed?).<sup>41</sup> The point is an important one for beginning students and can be simply demonstrated by

---

<sup>38</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 62 n43.

<sup>39</sup> Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 157 n26.

<sup>40</sup> Stein, *Introduction*, 30 n1, received a ‘Barely Present’ since he merely suggests that “ideally” students should do underlining using a Greek synopsis (for those who know Greek), and Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 13, likewise received ‘Barely Present’ since he only mentions the problem of establishing which Greek text to use in order to create a synopsis (students are to *imply* that using English introduces even more problems)

<sup>41</sup> There are still some church-goers around who assume Jesus spoke in ‘King James’ English! A far cry from Jesus’ actual Aramaic.

comparing a few reasonably literal translations with each other, and an interlinear (or the Greek). For the following example, I compare the RSV, ESV and the NRSV against the Greek (NA<sup>26/27</sup>/UBS<sup>3/4</sup>) of Mt 19:13b//Mk 10:13b//Lk 18:15b (the disciples ban people from bringing children to Jesus).<sup>42</sup>

There are only two differences between the three parallels in Greek: 1) Luke’s version begins with the word “seeing”, and, 2) Luke’ uses a slightly different form of the past tense (imperfect rather than aorist):

Mt 19:13b	Mk 10:13b	Lk 18:15b
οἱ δε μαθηται ἐπετιμησαν αὐτοις.	οἱ δε μαθηται ἐπετιμησαν αὐτοις.	ἰδοντες δε οἱ μαθηται ἐπετιμων αὐτοις.
(but) the disciples rebuked them.	(but) the disciples rebuked them.	(but) on-seeing, the disciples were-rebuking them.

Students using the RSV (NT 1946) or either of its more recent revisions, NRSV (1989) or ESV (2001), will be led to believe that other differences also occur, e.g.:

### RSV

Mt 19:13b	Mk 10:13b	Lk 18:15b
The disciples rebuked the people;	and the disciples rebuked them.	and when the disciples saw it they rebuked them.

Reading the RSV:

1. Luke’s version translates ἰδοντες with “when [the disciples] saw it”.
2. Luke’s different use of the verb (imperfect past tense) “were rebuking” *is removed* by ‘conforming’ it to a simple “rebuked”.
3. Matthew’s version begins with a new sentence and so the RSV treats the δε (‘and/but/nor’) differently to the other two accounts.
4. Matthew’s version changes “to them” to “the people”.

<sup>42</sup> The Nestle-Aland text for this portion of text has remained unaffected for many editions.

5. Matthew’s version ends with a semicolon rather than finishing the sentence here like the other two.

Only the first difference is related to the actual Greek text. The remaining four differences are probably evidence that different translators have translated the different Gospels and inconsistencies have slipped through the editing process.

**ESV**

Mt 19:13b	Mk 10:13b	Lk 18:15b
The disciples rebuked the people,	and the disciples rebuked them.	And when the disciples saw it, they rebuked them.

The ESV (light revision of the RSV) merely: 1) Changes the semicolon in Matthew’s version to a comma, and, 2) Makes the “and” in Luke’s version begin a new sentence, Otherwise, the ESV is identical to the RSV, meaning that there are still the same four unqualified differences present.

**NRSV**

Mt 19:13b	Mk 10:13b	Lk 18:15b
The disciples spoke sternly to those who brought them;	and the disciples spoke sternly to them.	and when the disciples saw it, they sternly ordered them not to do it.

The NSRV maintains most of the same added differences, *plus three new differences*:

1. Luke’s version intensifies “spoke sternly” to “sternly ordered”.
2. Luke’s version adds a clarifying note “not to do it”.
3. Matthew’s version fills out ἀὐτοῖς (‘to-them’) with “to those who brought them”.

The NRSV now evidences six differences in English—only one of which is justified. This example demonstrates that students cannot expect to rely excessively on English synopses alone. The NET Bible ([www.netbible.com](http://www.netbible.com)) is perhaps the first and only English

translation possessing a specific concern for translating all synoptic parallels with this problem in mind.

### **Synoptic New-Speak: Terminology, Shorthand and Readability**

There are important terms which are simply assumed that readers will understand. For example, some scholars use the ‘First Evangelist’ to refer to Matthew, while some use the same expression to refer to Mark! And what about the supposedly simple concept of ‘priority’? Does Mark (or Matthew) actually take historical ‘priority’?<sup>43</sup> What about the dilemma of how to label ‘double-tradition,’ ‘Markan tradition,’ or ‘M’ tradition—are students clear about what constitutes each of these?<sup>44</sup> I remember encountering the word *Sondergut* on ‘Synoptic-L’ (an Internet site) and being unsure what it meant, knowing it must be a German word and eventually realising it simply meant ‘special material’ (i.e. unique to that particular Gospel).

Kloppenborg has made an effort to introduce most of his terms clearly and appending a short list of ‘Abbreviations’ and ‘Sigla’ to his book. He fails to define “pericopae” (page 13) but does explain the use of an arrow (→) meaning ‘source of’.<sup>45</sup> Dungan’s presentation uses endnotes which are linked by chapter numbers but the page headers use chapter headings which means that students have to constantly figure out which chapter number to look under to refer to the endnotes. Dungan provides no indexes for names, topics, or biblical passages and contains no bibliography.<sup>46</sup>

Stein included a ‘Glossary’ which, though not exhaustive, is nevertheless very helpful. Stein’s presentation does not distinguish clearly between oral tradition (influence) and oral tradition (source) in his attempt to invoke literary interdependence between the synoptics in

---

<sup>43</sup> Does the fact that no presentation deals with the word ‘priority’ indicate a lack of concern, or ignorance?

<sup>44</sup> Goodacre’s recent Synoptic Problem Introduction carefully introduces students to the various types of material, even attending to ‘Special Matthew in Triple Tradition contexts,’ ‘Special Lukan versions of Triple Tradition,’ ‘Not quite Triple Tradition,’ and, ‘When Mark is not the Middle Term.’ Goodacre, *Synoptic Problem*, 39-54.

<sup>45</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 15. Kloppenborg has not introduced ‘doublets’ very clearly, one moment they are “Mark’s double expressions, the next moment they are due to an overlap between Mark and Q, and then they refer to Mark’s two feeding miracles!

<sup>46</sup> This made it difficult to evaluate (how does one look up the names of modern scholars? Or topics such as Q, Urgospel, or synopsis?)

the first chapter.<sup>47</sup> Similarly Kümmel's presentation assumes that students know the concept of Mt-Lk 'independence' before it has even been explained.<sup>48</sup>

Students may wonder at the way scholars like Kloppenborg call the dominant theory the 2DH (Two-Document Hypothesis) while others like Stein call it the 2SH (Two-Source Hypothesis) without either side discussing what is going on. The 2DH and the 2SH can in fact be two different theories—one denying a written Q (arguing for fragments or various oral traditions) the other embracing a written Q. Stein notes that Q's form is not something easily or quickly resolved,<sup>49</sup> which is in contrast to Kloppenborg who has resolved that Q was a written document and assumes that the majority simply respond, "and so say all of us!"

### **Perfect Match: Scholars and Their Source Theories**

The criterion concerning the listing of various scholars with their source theories was also poorly addressed by all six presentations. Whereabouts might students turn to find extensive lists of which hypotheses are advocated by which particular scholars? If students encounter a name such as 'McNicol',<sup>50</sup> or 'Sanders',<sup>51</sup> is it easy for students to consult a list of names in order to immediately 'place' such a scholar within a particular hypothesis? The six presentations listed names in a minimal or haphazard way with no real concern to 'group' scholars. Kümmel, for example, occasionally grouped scholars according one particular

---

<sup>47</sup> Stein, *Introduction*, 46, mentions "followers of the Q hypothesis" without any elaboration of 'Q' is or when/where it will be explained. Also, Stein several times mentions 'M' and 'L' prior to actually introducing them. Q is not introduced and defined until page 103, and 'M' and 'L' are not explained until page 142. Neither 'M' nor 'L' are in the Glossary. Also, Stein (deliberately) does not distinguish much between an Ur-gospel (primitive early Aramaic Gospel proposed by Lessing and Eichhorn) and Ur-Markus (Greek? Aramaic?)

<sup>48</sup> Mt-Lk independence is merely assumed and implied from the start. Similarly, Fitzmyer's presentation assumes some familiarity with the Synoptic Problem is assumed. Fitzmyer's reference to "a return to a form of the *Traditionshypothese*" is not explained, and the error of logic described as the 'Lachmann Fallacy' is not made explicit enough.

<sup>49</sup> Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 111.

<sup>50</sup> Dungan implies that all of the following are Griesbachians: Allan McNicol, L. Cope, W. R. Farmer, D. L. Dungan, D. B. Peabody, and, P. L. Shuler. (From 19<sup>th</sup> century: DeWette and Bleek, who according to Kümmel, *Introduction*, 48, accepted Mark's use of Matthew and Luke but denied Luke's use of Matthew.)

<sup>51</sup> E. P. Sanders and M. Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989), 117, belong with the 'Farrer-hypothesis' group by positing sayings source/s used by Matthew and Luke's use of Matthew: "We think that Matthew used Mark and undefined other sources, while creating some of the sayings material. Luke used Mark and Matthew, as well as other sources, and the author also created sayings material." "Goulder has not persuaded us that one can give up sources for the sayings material. With this rather substantial modification, however, we accept Goulder's theory: Matthew used Mark and Luke used both."

similarity (e.g. advocating Luke’s use of Matthew) without differentiating any further between them.<sup>52</sup> Likewise, Kloppenborg, is also misleading for his label “Farrer-Goulder Hypothesis” (in Figure 10)<sup>53</sup> since his diagram shows ‘Oral Sayings and Stories’ feeding into both Mark and Matthew which may be correct for Farrer but certainly misrepresentative of Goulder who opposes oral traditions influencing Matthew (arguing instead solely for Matthew’s creative expansion of Mark). Stein seemed more interested in what the *majority* of scholars actually propose than to be bothered about grouping anyone besides some proponents from the Two-Source camp. Even Dungan, who was (only barely) assessed as the highest of the six (scoring a ‘3’), hardly deserves praise on this point since he erroneously groups Austin Farrer and Michael Goulder as continuing on B. C. Butler’s solution!<sup>54</sup>

### **The “Augustinian” Hypothesis (Mt→Mk→Lk→Jn)**

The Augustinian hypothesis (i.e. that Lk used both Mt and Mk, and Jn used all three) is hardly dealt with by all six presentations. Kümmel notes that of those “few” who still defend it, Mark is now said to be dependent on an earlier form of Matthew,<sup>55</sup> and Kloppenborg also mentions it<sup>56</sup> and then argues against its proposal of Matthean priority.<sup>57</sup> Dungan argues that Augustine himself later “changed his mind” to a conflation theory

---

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Grouping those who argue that Luke took the Double Tradition from Matthew as: Rengstorf, Schlatter, Ropes, Butler, Farrer, Cassian, Turner, Farmer, Argyle, Simpson, Wilkens, Sanders. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 64 n48.

<sup>53</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 39.

<sup>54</sup> Dungan, *History*, 385. Dungan probably made this mistake in attempting to emphasise *English* scholarship and its aversion to Q, and thus confused Butler’s Augustinian theory (Luke used Matthew) with Farrer and Goulder who also argue that Luke used Matthew (and Mark).

<sup>55</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 47.

<sup>56</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 38, “John Chapman (1937) and B. C. Butler (1951b) sought to defend the ‘Augustinian’ solution, which places Mark in a medial position between Matthew, the earliest Gospel, and Luke who used both Matthew and Mark.”

<sup>57</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 39, For both the ‘Augustinian’ and the Farrer-Goulder hypotheses, a serious question is raised: why, in pericopae where both Matthew and Mark were present, did Luke always choose *Markan* order and never *Matthean* order, and why did he overwhelmingly prefer *Markan* wording even when Matthew offered something different (often in better Greek)?” 41, “For Luke to have so consistently avoided the material that Mark eliminated from Matthew (‘Augustine’) requires an idiosyncratic view of Lukan editorializing.”

resembling Griesbach's hypothesis!<sup>58</sup> Exactly how scholars who have argued for an 'Augustinian' hypothesis do so, is not described by anyone.

Of the six presentations, Kloppenborg's is the only one to correctly recognise that Augustine himself never advocated the 'Augustinian' (literary) solution. It is strange that Dungan fails to recognise this since he does acknowledge that Augustine believed that *all four Evangelists knew the real order of events* but the *Holy Spirit caused them to write things differently* for spiritual reasons and that sometimes when they wrote down events not in proper chronological order it was because they wrote them down in an order "according as they had incidence suggested to their minds by the heavenly influence."<sup>59</sup> Dungan is perhaps too eager to find support in Augustine for his own theory. Augustine himself likens Mark to playing a courtier's role in Matthew's royal portrait because he has "in concord with Matthew, he has a very large number of passages" and thus can be described as one who "follows closely and looks like his attendant and epitomizer."<sup>60</sup> There were obviously spiritual reasons affecting why some evangelists left out or included various events so Augustine is hardly concerned with who is *copying* from whom.<sup>61</sup> In Augustine's line of thinking, this is *not* to say that Matthew did *not know* what Luke *knew*. Although Augustine accepted the canonical order as relating the order of composition<sup>62</sup> he did not think in terms literary copying. To his mind, just as order of the Gospels is determined to be important for understanding their 'roles' and *theological significance*, so is the order of given episodes not without theological significance. Scholars are therefore incorrect in assuming that Augustine is thinking in terms of *copying*. Augustine's harmonizing tendency is to find the

---

<sup>58</sup> Dungan, *History*, "As he went on and learned more about the Gospels, however, he changed his mind. In Book Four, Augustine revised what he said in Book One about Mark being Matthew's summarizer", 126. Augustine's description of Mark as holding "a course in conjunction with both (Matthew and Luke)" is taken by Dungan as an "important conclusion...unknown to Gospel scholars prior to Augustine.

<sup>59</sup> Dungan, *History*, 124, also quotes from this same passage. "The Harmony of the Gospels," Book II, chapter 19.45, Philip Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. VI, 'Saint Augustin: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels' (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), 124.

<sup>60</sup> I.e. or "summarizer" as Dungan, *History*, 121, translates. The Latin is *breviator*, hence the English 'abbreviator'. (For Schaff's translation see Schaff, "Harmony," vol. 6: 78.)

<sup>61</sup> Augustine can even speak of Matthew passing over material which Luke mentions, e.g., "Matthew has simply omitted all that Luke has related respecting all that happened to the Lord in the temple..." Schaff, "Harmony," *Nicene*, vol. 6, 109.

<sup>62</sup> So correctly, Stein, *Introduction*, 130, "it would appear that his 'solution' of the Synoptic Problem is more dependent upon the present canonical order of the Gospels than upon a careful comparison of the synoptic Gospels..."

correct *chronology* of events (wherever possible) and thus he is being ‘historical’ but without allowing himself to be ‘critical’—believing rather that we humans cannot be so arrogant as to think that whatever seems contradictory gives us the right to question their perfectly divine inspired order.<sup>63</sup> Even Kloppenborg, who recognises this unwarranted historical-critical assumption by not attributing the ‘Augustinian’ theory of composition to Augustine himself<sup>64</sup> creates a slightly confused presentation of the sixteenth and seventeenth understanding of Augustine. Kloppenborg believes that it was by this time that the Augustine’s own hypothesis was thought to imply direct literary dependence (whereby Luke used Matthew, and Mark used both).<sup>65</sup> However Kloppenborg has not critically investigated the dubious assumption that literary *copying* was now in view. The result is Kloppenborg’s contradictory statement that “Reimarus [1778] accepted the ‘Augustinian’ model, which did not attempt to establish a literary and historical hierarchy among the Gospels”!<sup>66</sup> This example concerning the Augustinian hypothesis shows how scholars have difficulty engaging with non-historical-critical thinkers.<sup>67</sup>

### What’s the Synopsis?

Dungan, Stein and Kloppenborg each make some attempt to differentiate between a synopsis and a harmony. None of them, however, successfully clarify the difference between consecutive harmonies and parallel harmonies, and synopses.<sup>68</sup> There is also

---

<sup>63</sup> In chapter 13.48 of “Harmony,” Augustine speaks of the evangelists as the “historians of truth” whose sequence cannot be judged by anyone. Hence, a reader should “be content to reckon his own notion inferior to that of Mark the evangelist, who has judged it right to insert the statement just at the point it was suggested to him by divine inspiration. For the recollections of those historians have been ruled by the hand of Him who rules the waters...[therefore] it does not become any mere man, in his low estate, removed far from the vision of God, and sojourning distantly from Him, to say, ‘This ought to have been introduced here;’ for he is utterly ignorant of the reason which led God to will its being inserted in the place it occupies... Who, then, knows the mind of the Lord in the matter now under consideration?”

<sup>64</sup> Kloppenborg seems indebted to the thesis of S. McLoughlin for this insight, whom he quotes in *Excavating*, 38, “...the Platonic-minded Augustine: a second witness, who adds nothing to what the first and principal witness has already said, could well in such a mentality be described as his follower.” S. McLoughlin, “An Approach to the Synoptic Problem,” (S.T.L.thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1963), 28.

<sup>65</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, “at least from the sixteenth century it was assumed that Augustine held a conflation hypothesis.” 38 n31 (chapter 1); 274-275 (chapter 6).

<sup>66</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 275.

<sup>67</sup> Perhaps the only hope for *students* is a Synoptic Problem Introduction written in collaboration with students themselves!

<sup>68</sup> Stein provides contradictory explanations concerning what a Harmony is. In his Glossary, Stein defines a ‘Harmony’ as, “Used with regard to the Synoptic Gospels when the main concern for placing the accounts in the three Gospels together in parallel form is the attempt to place the accounts of the synoptic Gospels in

disagreement between Stein's, Dungan's and Kloppenborg's definitions of 'harmony' and 'synopsis'. Dungan does not allow anything before Griesbach (1774) to be defined as a synopsis since he proposes that the synopsis carries a different set of historical assumptions. Whereas Stein sees the work produced by Ammonius of Alexandria (c. 220 CE) as "technically...a synopsis, since its main purpose is not to arrange the accounts in historical order but to list the parallel passages in the Gospels for the sake of comparison."<sup>69</sup> Whether such "comparison" might have been for anything other than 'harmonizing' is debatable. Dungan does say Ammonius' chart resembled "a synopsis-like chart with Matthew broken up into paragraphs and the parallel texts of Mark, Luke, and John rearranged to correspond to Matthew's order" also conjecturing that Origen may have known it.<sup>70</sup> Kloppenborg seems to define a synopsis as any parallel comparison of just the synoptic Gospels.<sup>71</sup> If this is so, then Kloppenborg's definition is the least satisfactory since there are both modern synopses which include John, and ancient harmonies which exclude John. Dungan's definition is the most satisfactory, i.e. that the paradigm shift to the modern 'historical-critical' approach was evidently complete when the ancient Gospel 'harmony' (for harmonizing inconsistencies) gave way to the Gospel 'synopsis' (for highlighting inconsistencies and studying Gospel *composition*). The synopsis was willing to confront the differences in a new way.<sup>72</sup> But Dungan spends so long tracing the paradigm shift that some

---

chronological order." 274. Stein fails to clarify that he is only attempting to define here what a modern 'Gospel Harmony' is (though even some of these contain all four accounts), and his earlier comments are rendered incongruous, "Tatian's *Diatesseron* is the earliest example of what has been called a 'harmony of the Gospels.'" 16.

<sup>69</sup> Stein, *Introduction*, 17.

<sup>70</sup> Dungan, *History*, 407-408 n64. Dungan provides expert assistance in understanding the thinking behind the Gospel 'harmony', but students still have to wade through hundreds of pages to get to the discussion about the difference between a harmony and a synopsis.

<sup>71</sup> Kloppenborg *Excavating Q*, 274 n9, wishes to label Calvin's harmony as the first synopsis, "The first to compile a synopsis with the Gospels arranged in three parallel columns was Jean Calvin (1555)." Kloppenborg seems to believe this is because Calvin's harmony, unlike other harmonies, dispensed with John's Gospel "as the overall frame." However, Dungan, *History*, 181-182, shows that Calvin's *Harmony* was written in response to those with skeptical minds who keep noticing inconsistencies! Calvin argued that the Gospels were composed through "dictation of the Holy Spirit" and his 'harmony' harmonized Mark and Luke to *Matthew's order*. He insisted on the literal truth of the Gospels and so he eschewed the more 'human' explanation (of Papias) that Mark would have written down Peter's preaching and also refused that what the Gospel authors wrote about concerned anything other than plain facts. This is close to the understanding of the church-folk I grew up with, what I have called the 'miraculously historical' composition perspective or the 'historical-literal' approach.

<sup>72</sup> Dungan argues that the Gospel harmony was evidence of the second form of the Synoptic Problem associated with Augustine's method of historical harmonization which lasted for over 1000 years. The 'Third

students may miss his basic point—i.e. only when the question concerns *composition in terms of sources* is it that the harmony is left behind and the synopsis is born.<sup>73</sup> Thus Griesbach said that he confessed to the “heresy” that the chronology of the Gospels could not be harmonized.<sup>74</sup>

### **Griesbach’s Hypothesis<sup>75</sup>**

The Griesbach hypothesis is often thought to be the rival hypothesis (though still only a minority opinion) to the dominant Two-Source Hypothesis.<sup>76</sup> Fitzmyer never introduces or defines it, but simply opposes Farmer’s arguments. Kümmel’s presentation notes it once. Dungan’s presentation provides the better introduction to Griesbach and his theory.<sup>77</sup> It is not clear what differences exist between Griesbach and the Neo-Griesbachians. David Neville asserts that “Griesbach never attempted to provide a detailed analysis of Luke’s use of Matthew’s Gospel”<sup>78</sup> Does this mean Griesbach simply assumed Luke’s use of Matthew? He certainly assumed that Matthew must be first, since it was inconceivable for him that Matthew could have copied from Mark given that Mark was not an eyewitness.<sup>79</sup>

---

Form’ evidenced by Griesbach’s synopsis (published 1776). Dungan correctly acknowledges that modern Gospel ‘harmonies’ still exist down to the present day (citing as a modern example, Robert L. Thomas and Stanley N. Gundry, *The NIV Harmony of the Gospels*, 1988).

<sup>73</sup> Dungan, *History*, 368, “The genius of his [Griesbach’s] invention was that all of the minute differences among the Gospels were preserved rather than obliterated, thereby providing scholars with the concrete evidence they needed to create the intricate developmental scenarios that have become the hallmark of modern Gospel research.”

<sup>74</sup> Stein, *Introduction*, 23, provides the full quote, (as does Dungan).

<sup>75</sup> I have not addressed the fact that Henry Owen should be the official originator of the Griesbach hypothesis. Although I myself believe that the theory was ‘in the air’ at the time. Neither have I addressed the fact that the neo-Griesbachians (thanks to Farmer in about 1984) now prefer to call the Owen-Griesbach theory the Two Gospel Hypothesis (2GH).

<sup>76</sup> This is not the case in Great Britain, however, where the Farrer Hypothesis is the rival hypothesis. Goodacre, *Synoptic Problem*, 22.

<sup>77</sup> Dungan, *History*, 321, explains that Griesbach had a ‘developmental’ understanding of the history of the early Church and that he designed his synopsis in order “to facilitate the study of that *developmental history*.”

<sup>78</sup> David J. Neville, *Arguments From Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique* (New Gospel Studies 7; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1994), 36.

<sup>79</sup> “Now...it is inconceivable that Matthew, an eyewitness, choose as his guide for handing on the story of Christ a writer who had not been present at the events themselves.” *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaeei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (Jena: J. C. G. Goepferdt, 1789-1790). [A *Demonstration that the whole of the Gospel of Mark was extracted from the Commentaries and Matthew and Luke*] Translated by Bernard Orchard as “A Demonstration that Mark Was Written after Matthew and Luke,” 103-135, in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978). Cited in, Neville, *Arguments*, 19-20. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 305, asserts, “Griesbach, it will be remembered, simply assumed that Matthew was first, which meant that Mark must have been derivative.”

Although it is often asserted that Griesbach appealed to the ‘formal’ argument of order for the pattern of agreement between the order of ‘triple tradition’ to explain Mark as a conflation of Matthew and Luke, Neville has shown that Griesbach actually *argued* on ‘compositional’ grounds.<sup>80</sup>

Providing two sets of presuppositions which Griesbach held in tension,<sup>81</sup> Dungan notes that one of Griesbach’s “modern historicist” presuppositions was that the New Testament must be explained just like any other book, and one of Griesbach’s Lutheran “pietistic” presuppositions was that, “The New Testament writers were not inspired by the Holy Spirit *in the act of writing*. Rather, the Apostles received a onetime gift of the Spirit at Pentecost...Note that this left out biblical writers like Luke and Mark.”<sup>82</sup> This is why Griesbach emphasized the importance of Matthew and John since they alone were Apostles (and inspired) and they alone derived their accounts from eyewitness testimony (Mary mother of James and Mary Magdalene, respectively). Matthew and John provided “reliable testimony to the ‘historical facts’ of Jesus’ ministry.”<sup>83</sup> However, Griesbach relied on John only when he came to the Passion narrative. Thus Matthew’s testimony automatically took ‘priority.’<sup>84</sup>

An underrated argument used for positing Matthean priority, is the role of patristic traditions. Whilst Markan priorists may easily dismiss them, the traditions passed down from the early Church Fathers exert an almost invisible stronghold over the Griesbachians. Dungan hints at the important insight and knowledge that these early traditions possessed. There is not the space here to investigate the issue, but the prize for ‘who wrote the first Gospel’ always went to Matthew.<sup>85</sup> Daniel Wallace, who composed a Synoptic Problem

---

<sup>80</sup> Neville, *Arguments*, 34-37.

<sup>81</sup> It is not clear what Dungan is implying here (Griesbach stood on a dividing line? Or had a need to see Mark as a conflation?). Dungan draws out the significance of how “Griesbach himself noted that he never pleased either the liberal or the conservatives”, and draws attention to Griesbach’s “hybrid approach”.

<sup>82</sup> Dungan, *History*, 313.

<sup>83</sup> Dungan, *History*, 313.

<sup>84</sup> Griesbach, the person famed for inventing the Synopsis (for analyzing Gospel sources), was interested in being able “to perceive and judge skillfully the true nature of the events that they [Gospel authors] have recorded.” Griesbach, *A Demonstration that the whole of the Gospel of Mark was extracted from the Commentaries and Matthew and Luke* (Jena: J. C. G. Goepferdt, 1789-1790), cited in, Dungan, *History*, 318.

<sup>85</sup> Dungan, *History*, 70, quoting Origen’s description of Gospel authorship, preserved in Eusebius, “Among the four Gospels, which are the only undisputed Gospels in the Assembly of God under Heaven, I have learned by tradition that the first was written by Matthew,...the second was (written) by Mark who composed it according

presentation for the Internet based on Stein's (1987) book, held to Matthean priority for "almost seventeen years" until "more recent years". Wallace gave up Matthean priority when he decided to place less weight on "external considerations (especially early patristic comments about Matthean priority)" and gave more weight to "internal (literary) considerations".<sup>86</sup>

In the "Agenda For Future Research," everyone attending the 1984 Jerusalem 'Symposium' agreed:

That a literary, historical and theological explanation of the evangelists' compositional activity, giving a coherent and reasonable picture of the whole of each Gospel, is the most important method of argumentation in defense of a source hypothesis.<sup>87</sup>

The world still awaits such an explanation from the advocates of the Griesbach hypothesis.<sup>88</sup> Besides exposing their semi-hidden allegiance to patristic tradition, the biggest obstacle for the Griesbachians is finding plausible reasons for Mark's omissions.<sup>89</sup>

### **Which Arguments Are You Using and Why?**

I contend that the Synoptic Problem is full of circular reasoning. Students can get quite dizzy. The nature of arguments, hypotheses and solutions are all to some extent 'self-supporting.' Therefore 'discovering' a circular argument is not necessarily anything rare—but it is certainly helpful to find it acknowledged. What *is* rare is finding scholars who willing to articulate *presuppositions* and *suppositions* so that students might clearly recognise the different types of arguments. This should be a primary concern for a Synoptic

---

to the instruction of Peter,...and the third (was written) by Luke (and is) the Gospel commended by Paul (and last of all (is) that (one) by John.

<sup>86</sup> Daniel Wallace, "The Synoptic Problem," found at:  
<http://www.bible.org/docs/soapbox/synoptic.htm>  
accessed 21.01.2002

<sup>87</sup> Dungan, "Agenda For Future Research," in, Dungan, *Interrelations*, 609.

<sup>88</sup> Farmer, "Present State," "If and when advocates of the Neo-Griesbach (Two Gospel) Hypothesis are able to provide readers with a literary, historical and theological explanation of Mark's compositional activity, giving a coherent and reasonable picture of the whole of this Gospel, the last major task in solving the Synoptic Problem will have been completed. Of course there will be the further need to provide a literary, historical and theological explanation of Matthew's compositional activity, giving a coherent and reasonable picture of the whole of this Gospel as well before the Synoptic Problem can be put to final rest. That task will help explain why Matthew was the foundational Gospel of the Church."

<sup>89</sup> Farmer, "Present State," "...the failure until now of the adherents of the Neo-Griesbach (Two Gospel) Hypothesis to explain Mark's omissions from Matthew and Luke blocks the way to a serious consideration of the merits of this theory."

Problem presentation. Kloppenborg points out the difference between complex and simple hypotheses and fails to find any usefulness with complex hypotheses since the whole point of a hypothesis should be its to simplify things and “to aid comprehension and discovery” therefore the best hypotheses are simple ones because complex solutions “lack heuristic utility as far as the final forms of the gospels are concerned.”<sup>90</sup> Complex solutions (such as Boismard, Vaganay)<sup>91</sup> locate the “moments of theologizing and innovation not with the evangelists but at rather vaguely defined and inaccessible earlier moments”<sup>92</sup> One complex solution cannot demonstrate its superiority over another complex solution since they are each just as impossible to confirm and they preclude discussion. Students interested in complex solutions will not find any treatment of them in Kümmel’s, Stein’s, or Dungan’s presentations. The argument of simple versus complex still plays an important role *within* the simple theories advocated, as will be seen later, moving into Part B.

### **Articulating Arguments for Markan Priority**

Markan Priority means different things to different people. The Griesbachians regard it as virtually un-Christian and as a product of extreme historical-criticism (see Dungan and Farmer), while the proponents of the two-source theory (and the Farrer-theory) endorse it wholeheartedly. Griesbachians have sought to discredit it by faulting the logic used by its originators/architects or by calling it ideologically charged. Markan Priorists have treasured it, forever seeking to find new reasons for its usefulness. Depending on who you ask, its a blessing or a curse!

Students may wonder why scholars are arguing past one another. Where is the common ground? Why are different scholars presuming different common ground? Fitzmyer, for example, assumes that if Mark had conflated Matthew and Luke it means that he would have had to reverse the “more developed christologies and ecclesiologies of Matthew and Luke.”<sup>93</sup> The unarticulated presupposition here is that the ‘later tendency’ was to develop the Christology and so argues against Mark ‘playing down’ the more ‘developed’

---

<sup>90</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 50-53.

<sup>91</sup> Leon Vaganay’s hypothesis (1954) is constructed upon patristic statements. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 44. M. -É. Boismard’s hypothesis (1972; 1990) seems exceedingly complex.

<sup>92</sup> Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 53.

<sup>93</sup> Fitzmyer, “Priority,” 135.

christologies and ecclesiologies implying that such a prospect is unlikely. But on this logic, Mark has already ‘played down’ the high Christology (and Ecclesiology) found in the communities and churches founded by Paul. Fitzmyer assumes that we might be able to literally ‘trace the development’ of Christology (and Ecclesiology) as it grows from something less ‘developed’ like Mark into something more like Matthew. It is perhaps this view of primitivity and development that some Markan posteriorists find problematic if their view of early Church history stresses uniformity of faith and traditions. As such, placing Matthew (or Luke) earliest prevents the semi-anti-catholic solution (where Mark as prior might provoke anti-catholic/hierarchy notions in the quest for ‘pure non-embellished history’).<sup>94</sup> Has no one wondered why Matthean priorists are not very interested in looking into *Matthew’s* sources (and *Matthew’s* redaction)?<sup>95</sup>

Fitzmyer has not admitted, that on his own theory, Matthew has played down the somewhat more Gentile sounding aspects in Mark’s Gospel, producing a more Jewish portrait *out of a less Jewish portrait*. Is this another likely ‘development’?

Another major (pre)supposition for the 2SH is that Gospel authors were more likely to ‘supplement’ rather than omit material from their sources. This point is usually only made with rhetorical questions (“Why would Mark omit...”). Why this is ‘less likely’ is never properly articulated or addressed. The problem is that no arguments are completely non-reversible.

Kümmel asserts confidently that, “C. G. Wilke and H. Weisse proved...that Mk represents the common source of narrative material for Mt and Lk.”<sup>96</sup> Fortunately, the other presentations were more cautious than this.

Markan priority at one stage was thought to rest primarily on the ‘objective observation’ of the sequential pattern of agreements between the Gospels (Streeter, 1924). Since B. C.

---

<sup>94</sup> William R. Farmer, “Introduction,” of the book by, Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis* (trans. and ed. Donald L. Niewyk; Macon GA: Mercer University Press, 1980), xviii. “It [the Marcan hypothesis] may live on in the minds of those who believe in ‘the Q community,’ and it may thrive among those who are inspired by the vision of ‘Mark’s Galilean community’ resisting the authoritarianism of the Jerusalem (read Vatican) hierarchy.”

<sup>95</sup> Is it perhaps too ‘anti-canonical’? It is interesting that when Robert Gundry set out to investigate Matthew’s use of OT sources, he did so with the belief in Matthean priority. But in the course of studying Matthew’s sources he came to believe in the Markan hypothesis. For example, Matthew’s OT quotations are extremely close to the LXX in those OT passages he shares with Mark. Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of The Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (Leiden: Brill, 1967).

<sup>96</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 48.

Butler (1951), scholars have been more careful to recognise that ‘formal’ arguments are inadequate on their own. Thus Fitzmyer’s comment, “When the argument is thus left on the theoretic level, as it often is, the priority of Mark appears to be more of an assumption than a conclusion.”<sup>97</sup> Therefore Fitzmyer argues by appealing to *plausible reasons* being found for the *transpositions* Luke made to Mark. Likewise Tuckett’s presentation notes that to argue for Markan Priority one must cease arguing “abstractly” and consider the “contents of the gospels themselves.”<sup>98</sup> Tuckett also asserts that that the order of the stories does not show anything other than that “Mark occupies a medial position in the pattern of relationships between the gospels” and the way to argue is to argue from the “texts themselves” by explaining deviations by recourse to redactional activity.<sup>99</sup> Farmer, however, wanting the real argument to remain on Streeter’s old playing grounds, believed that redaction-type arguments played no role in establishing Markan priority,

The leading proponents of *Redaktionsgeschichte*, make no such claims [that any new arguments clarify Markan priority] for their work, and indeed, acknowledge that that their confident belief in Marcan priority rests upon arguments well established in synoptic literature.<sup>100</sup>

Similarly, Dungan refers to Neville’s study which concluded that Lachmann’s approach (separating the data into pairs: Mt/Mk and Lk/Mk) began by “disallowing any literary connections between Matthew’s and Luke’s Gospels...[and] was designed to achieve a predetermined result.” Based on such biased methodologies, Dungan had hoped proponents of Markan priority “would finally admit that it is an untenable hypothesis.”<sup>101</sup> Dungan then noted how ‘formal arguments’ have gradually been abandoned and now ‘compositional arguments’ are the primary ones used by Markan priorists. Farmer would no doubt be disappointed that Markan priorists were abandoning the argument from order since he

---

<sup>97</sup> Fitzmyer, “Priority,” 134.

<sup>98</sup> Tuckett, “Synoptic Problem,” 264.

<sup>99</sup> Tuckett, “Synoptic Problem,” 264. Kümmel, *Introduction*, 59, “Lk’s alteration of the Markan sequence is readily explicable.”

<sup>100</sup> William R. Farmer, “Introduction,” xvii-xviii.

<sup>101</sup> Dungan, *History*, 388-389. Unfortunately for Dungan it “continues to be used far and wide as if nothing has happened [to discount it], resembling the headless horseman who rides across the countryside every Halloween in the light of the full moon.” A comment to the similar effect (“the observation that ‘Emperor has no clothes,’”) can be found in William R. Farmer, “The Present State of the Synoptic Problem,” published in 1999 on the internet:

<http://www.colby.edu/rel/2gh/catalog.html>

accessed 12.3.2001

himself had hijacked it from Streeter, taking Streeter's comment that whenever Matthew fails to support Mark's order, Luke supports it (and vice versa) and he turned it around, "They [Matthew and Luke] would have to conspire with one another" to achieve this effect (in other words this coincidental effect is easily explained if Mark is alternating between Matthew and Luke).<sup>102</sup> Both comments are exaggerations since *both generally support* the 'Markan' order and Matthew's deviations from Mark's order occur in the first half of Mark, while Luke's alterations mainly concern the second half of Mark. On this *observation*, not much should be concluded other than Mark is *medial*. Matthew and Luke simply do not agree together *against* Mark's order but *with* Mark's order.<sup>103 104</sup>

Farmer eventually found a new playing field—the 'pastoral' impact of one's solution to the Synoptic Problem. Farmer argued that the Two-Source Hypothesis had a more damaging effect on the living community of faith due to such implications as the absence in Mark of the Lord's Prayer and the doctrine of justification by faith.<sup>105</sup> This 'new' argument (earlier tradition is better) is perhaps not new, but simply newly articulated.<sup>106</sup> That 'justification by faith' in being absent from Mark can suggest against Mark being the earlier Gospel is certainly a new playing field!

It would appear that there are six main categories of arguments in use (no presentation, however, grouped the arguments this way): 1) formal arguments of agreement in the triple-tradition; 2) formal arguments of disagreement in the triple-tradition; 3) arguments intending to confirm a presupposition by providing explanations ('redactional,' 'compositional' or, 'explanatory' arguments); 4) arguments concerning the placement of the double-tradition 'Q' material in relation to the triple-tradition; 5) arguments concerning the

---

<sup>102</sup> Cited in, Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 27.

<sup>103</sup> Neville, *Mark's Gospel*, 76-86. Back in 1835 when positing an original-gospel (Urgospel), Karl Lachmann could argue based on this pattern of agreement that Mark's order most resembled the Urgospel's order. Using Lachmann's arguments for arguing that Mark is the source for Matthew and Luke, is described by Butler (1951) as a 'Lachmann fallacy.'

<sup>104</sup> Farmer pointed out that Lachmann's Urgospel does not really account for the fact that *both* Matthew and Luke support so often the same order as Mark. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 28 n16.

<sup>105</sup> William R. Farmer, *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knowx Press, 1994). Farmer also argued that Markan priority has its roots in German anti-Catholicism.

<sup>106</sup> In, "The Present State of the Synoptic Problem," Farmer contended, "Theology seems to have played the major role in winning support for the Marcan hypothesis."

order of the double-tradition in relation to the double-tradition (the order of 'Q'), and, 6) statistical arguments based on vocabulary.

The most numerous types of arguments used fall into the third category, 'compositional arguments' (such as Mark indicating inferior Greek or more primitive Christology which must have been touched-up or 'revised' by Matthew and Luke). Due to the circular nature of compositional arguments, students will usually find them used in conjunction with other arguments. It is disappointing that arguments (though never non-reversible) are never provided both *for and against* the same conclusion or hypothesis in an even-handed way so that students can see the various types of arguments being used and come to their own conclusions.

Stein attempts to group arguments for Markan priority into seven types, asserting, "Markan priority is not based on any one single argument but rather on the cumulative weight of all the arguments presented."<sup>107</sup> Stein's groupings (some of which overlap) are fairly representative of the kind of arguments the other presentations put forward for Markan priority (excluding Dungan's): 1) The argument from length (Mark would not have omitted so much material from Matthew and Luke only to provide more details to a fewer number of pericopes); 2) the argument from grammar (Mark's poor grammar is corrected, e.g. Mk 10:20; 16:6); 3) the argument from difficulty (Mk 1:34; 3:10; 6:5-6; and, 2:26; 3:5; 10:18 'corrected'); 4) the argument from order (triple-tradition agreements) and verbal agreement (lack of Mt-Lk agreement in wording in triple-tradition); 5) the argument from literary agreements (several of these would now be classified as 'fatigue');<sup>108</sup> 6) the argument from redaction (theological titles added to Mark by Matthew, e.g. 'Son of David'; Matthew drops many of the occurrences of Mark's εὐθὺς and γαρ); and, 7) the argument from Mark's more primitive theology (Matthew 'adds' κυριος more often to triple-tradition).

Stein presumes that Matthew altering Mark's inferior Greek is self-evident, but students deserve to be alerted to what the opposing arguments might be (or at least be referred to any scholars espousing opposing views). Concerning Aramaisms, Stein garners support from

---

<sup>107</sup> Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 87.

<sup>108</sup> The term 'fatigue' was coined by Michael Goulder, *Midrash and Lektion in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974) 35. I discuss it further as evidence for a 'secondary' source under 'Incoherence Versus Coherence'.

Cadbury's recognition that "careful writers of Greek avoided foreign words" and draws the conclusion that Matthew and Luke (being better writers of Greek) tended to omit Aramaisms from Mark. Stein argues that Mark would not have added them to his source(s).<sup>109</sup> But this also assumes either that Mark would not have added them to Mt/Lk or that pre-synoptic written sources have been successfully eliminated from the question (Stein's brief earlier attempt was rather inadequate). Griesbachians can see deliberate reasons for adding Aramaisms.<sup>110</sup> Brian Wilson (not a Griesbachian) used the presence of Aramaisms as evidence that Mk was *not* the source of Mt and Lk since *all three* manifest Aramaisms unique to each (which suggested to him a common written source for all three).<sup>111</sup> Also disappointing is that no presentation discussed priority versus posteriority in terms of coherence versus incoherence.

### Coherence Versus Incoherence

When inconsistencies are found in a single gospel, it usually indicates that the author is using sources, so when something inconsistent or inappropriate is found in Matthew then scholars may look to see if Mark's version makes more sense—this might indicate that Mark was Matthew's source. For example, the story of healing Jairus' daughter (who is "at the point of death") is more logical in Mark (Mk 5:21-43) than in Mt 9:18-26 who has the father miss his daughters funeral in order to ask Jesus to resurrect her! Also the woman who

---

<sup>109</sup> Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 58.

<sup>110</sup> E.g., Farmer, "Present State," "Furthermore, the use of the Aramaic word *Abba* for Father in addressing God, well established in churches acquainted with Paul's letters, including the Christian community in Rome, constantly reminded Mark's readers of the importance of Aramaic in the (prayer) life of Jesus and the liturgical life of the earliest Christians. This affords a simple explanation for why Mark would want to archaize the text of his Gospel by enriching it with expressions from this sacred language."

<sup>111</sup> "Synoptic Format Phenomena," a talk presented by Brian E. Wilson at the 2001 International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature at the Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome.

<http://homepage.ntlworld.com/brenda.wilson99/rome.doc>

accessed 9.7.2002

Wilson counts 35 unique Aramaisms in Matthew, 11 in Mark and 5 in Luke. Many of Wilson's examples are not derived from parallel pericopes but from vaguely similar material. Some are not very convincing e.g. *hosanna*, Mt 21:15 (c.f. Lk 19:38; but is found in Mk 11:9). Wilson's better examples from Matthew and Luke are Mt 27:6, (*korbanas*); Mt 23:7; 23:8; 26:25 (*rabbi*) (c.f. Mk 12:38; Lk 20:46); Mt 23:15 (*geenna*) (c.f. Mk 12:38-40; Lk 11:37-52; 20:45-47); and Lk 16:9, 11 (*mamomas*) (but see Mt 6:24 and Lk 16:13); Mt 5:22 (*raka*); Lk 4:24; 12:37; Lk 23:43 (*amen* [introductory])

touched Jesus' garment "came up behind him in the crowd" (in Mk 5:27) but makes less sense in Mt 9:20 ("came up behind him") because no crowd around Jesus is mentioned.<sup>112</sup>

Mt 14:15-23 is 'secondary' since it has two "evenings" in one day. Mt 8:1-4 is less coherent than Mk 1:40-45 because Matthew mentions "many crowds" following him so that it makes no sense for Jesus to say "see that you don't tell anyone" to the leper. In Mark this comment made more sense because there was no crowd.<sup>113</sup>

The story of John's beheading is a 'flashback' in Mk 6:14-29 but in Mt 14:1-13, it begins as a flashback but then simply continues as though Matthew had forgotten it was a flashback. Also Matthew's version here is less coherent since in Mt 14:5 it is Herod who wishes to kill John (unlike Mk 6:19 where it is Herodias, c.f. 6:20) but it makes no sense for Matthew to say Herod "was grieved" unless Matthew is inadvertently following Mk 6:26 as his source ("being grieved").

The argument that the less coherent account is suffering from 'editorial fatigue' (or 'docile reproduction') could also be reversed—the more coherent account may be ironing out the inconsistencies of the less coherent account! Although the less coherent account is generally the secondary account, Markan priorists do argue both ways. For example, Mk 14:55 says that "the whole council were looking for testimony against Jesus to put him to death" but later says that "Joseph of Arimathea, a respected member of the council" asked for the body of Jesus (Mk 15:43). Lk 23:50-52 straightens out the problem by inserting "Joseph *who, though a member of the council, had not agreed to their plan and action...*" and Matthew eliminates the tension by altogether omitting the reference to Joseph being a council member (Mt 27:57). Here Markan priorists argue that the less coherent account is Mark and the more coherent accounts are Matthew and Luke. Markan posteriorists would argue that the minor blunder demonstrates Mark's account to be secondary.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> But it could also be argued that the illogical command (in Mk 5:43) to keep the healing secret is absent in Matthew's account making Matthew more coherent than Mark. Most of these examples are taken from, M. E. Boring, "Matthew," *The New Interpreters Bible: A Commentary in Twelve Volumes* vol. VIII (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 236-467.

<sup>113</sup> In Mt 12:46-13:1 although Jesus is not said to be inside a house (c.f. Mk 3:20, 31) his family "stood outside" and in 13:1 Jesus "went out of the house." Mt 20:20-22 makes less sense when Jesus responds with a plural "you" since in his account it is not James and John who ask for the favour (as in Mk 10:35-38) but their "mother".

<sup>114</sup> Also after Jesus calls Levi, Mk 2:15 says, "during his reclining in his house..." and the ambiguity of whose house is removed in Lk 5:29 "Levi made him a big feast in his house." Also, Mk 11:32 ("but shall we say 'of humans' ...? They feared the crowd") is clearer in Mt 21:26 ("but if we say 'of humans' we fear the crowd").

Another useful example is Mk 14:13 describing Jesus' instructions to two disciples for preparing the supper by going to meet a man in the city carrying a water jar. The idea of a man carrying a jar of water would have been a strange sight to behold (since women not men carried the water jars), hence that is probably how the two disciples would recognise the man in question. Matthew, however, senses the absurdity of such an idea and writes, "Go into the city to somebody and say to him..." which is quite a vague way of relaying *specific instructions!* Here we have reasons for wanting to change Mark's odd advice (though Mark could have changed Matthew's vague advice). Both cases can work both ways since all three gospels contain both coherent and incoherent accounts.<sup>115</sup> Finding something incoherent in Mark merely points to him being 'secondary' in some way to some source(s).

Secondary features in Mark can therefore be arguments *against* Markan Priority. 'Intercalation' ('Markan sandwiches') is a secondary Markan feature where one pericope/story is inserted into another (one 'sandwiched' inside another). There are about a dozen of these in Mark,<sup>116</sup> whereas Matthew only has a few of these (Luke has even less) and there is only one Markan intercalation which is shared by both Matthew and Luke (Jairus' daughter and the hemorrhaging woman). Intercalation is thus characteristically Markan. The same argument which is used for *vocabulary dependence* that generally that the Gospel with certain 'characteristic' vocabulary (e.g. Mark's εὐθυσ) is more likely to be the *source* of the Gospel which 'reproduces' a certain amount of it even though it is 'uncharacteristic' of that (secondary) Gospel (i.e. Matthew and Luke). Thus it is likely that the 'sandwich' feature was another 'Markanism' which was diminished when Matthew and Luke utilized the stories in Mark. Mark would then be 'secondary' only to his pre-synoptic sources from which he arranged the 'sandwich'. There are other features in Mark such as

---

<sup>115</sup> For Goodacre, editorial fatigue is the most persuasive argument for Markan priority, but he also appeals the notion that Matthew and Luke both display a more explicit recognition that Jerusalem and its Temple had been destroyed than Mark does (see Mt 23:27-39//Lk 13:34-35 "behold your house is forsaken"). Goodacre, *Case*, 24

<sup>116</sup> Mk 2:1-12; 3:1-6; 3:20-21; 5:21-25; 6:6b-32; 7:1-15; 9:36-10:16; 11:12-20; 13:5-22; 14:1-11; 14:53-66; 15:40-16:1

his many ‘dual expressions,’<sup>117</sup> and his several secrecy themes, which classify Mark as ‘secondary’<sup>118</sup> but which are likewise present in a diminished way in Matthew and Luke.<sup>119</sup>

Considering the fact that Mark does not seem hesitant about supplying unpleasant details,<sup>120</sup> it is interesting that when Mark describes Jesus’ execution, it is much shorter than in Matthew and Luke.<sup>121</sup> This to me indicates that Mark may be writing closer in time to Jesus’ crucifixion or closer in time to the memory or threat of crucifixion. It is not always easy, however, to be sure about what seems ‘earlier’, especially when the ‘age’ of the tradition may not match the time when it was put into writing.

### Other Hypotheses...

Obviously there will always be numerous theories neglected.<sup>122</sup> Kümmel noted the “new theories” of Lindsey (who has proposed that Luke’s Gospel is the earliest of the synoptics, which, along with the proto-Narrative and Q source was used by Mark, Matthew came last and used three sources: Mark, Proto-Narrative and Q),<sup>123</sup> and of H. P. West (Matthew’s sources were Mark and proto-Luke).<sup>124</sup> It is interesting to note that in Kloppenborg’s

---

<sup>117</sup> Frans Neiryck, *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction* (Revised Edition; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988).

<sup>118</sup> Going into and/or teaching in a house (Mk 2:1, 11, 26; 3:20; 5:19, 38; 7:17, 30; 8:3, 26; 9:28; 11:17); The enigma of parables (Mk 4:11-12); Ban of silence on demons (Mk 1:25, 34; 3:12); Keeping Jesus’ powers/identity a secret (1:43-45; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26) Messianic secret (Mk 8:30; 9:9; 10:47-48); Intention to remain incognito (Mk 7:24; 9:30-32).

<sup>119</sup> I have not discussed Mark’s dual expressions as evidence for Griesbach’s ‘conflation’ theory. Stein’s statistics (from Tuckett) show only 17 out of 213 cases where conflation could be possible. Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 61.

<sup>120</sup> That is, Mark is not ashamed of Jesus displaying human traits and characteristics by portraying Jesus as showing emotion, (e.g. getting angry at the leper or in touching people considered unclean with deep inner emotions), and saying that Jesus spits and touches the tongue of man who couldn’t speak, and in describing the details of John’s beheading (found elsewhere only in a condensed form in Matthew). Even Mark’s description of the Anguish of Jesus in Gethsemane is the longest of the Synoptics.

<sup>121</sup> On my count, the numbers of words (in Greek) are: 348 in Matthew (27:31b-54); 278 in Mark (15:20b-39); 358 in Luke (23:26-48).

<sup>122</sup> Pierson Parker argued for a common source for Matthew and Mark (proto-Matthew), and for Luke’s use of proto-Luke, Mark and proto-Matthew. Pierson Parker, *The Gospel Before Mark* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1953). Fitzmyer, “Priority,” 163 n2, lamented that he could not discuss Parker’s theory.

<sup>123</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 47 n5. Kümmel, however, fails to provide the reference. Lindsey first articulated the theory in about 1969, Robert Lisle Lindsey (Baptist House Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, n.d. [1969?]), 1-85. Lindsey’s theory “that Luke was first” is listed in Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 131, in a list of theories espousing mutual interdependence. Lindsey ‘discovered’ the theory while translating Luke into Hebrew and noticing that Luke translated into Hebrew easier than did Mark. The theory has on occasions been referred to as The Jerusalem Hypothesis.

<sup>124</sup> Again, Kümmel fails to provide the reference, which is, H. P. West, Jr, “A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew,” *NTS* 14 (1967-1968): 75-96.

treatment of Vaganay's hypothesis and the Roman Catholic hypotheses which came out between 1911-1955 (when the '2DH' was officially banned), he sees much resemblance between them and the 2DH even though they were tied to (canonical) Matthean priority.<sup>125</sup> This leads us to a discussion of another sort of 'hybrid' hypothesis—the question concerning 'Q' and the probability of complete independence between Matthew's and Luke's gospels.

### Summing Up

What can be gathered from all this? Students must obviously rely on the Synoptic Problem presentations available to anticipate their questions but unfortunately such presentations *are inadequate* for providing a solid introduction to a number of questions and issues concerning the Synoptic Problem. Will future Synoptic Problem presentations heed the call to address more of these issues? It seems that currently the only option for students is to use various presentations in conjunction with several others and to decipher the common (or not so common) playing field for themselves. The total 'scores' obtained from this evaluation of six Synoptic Problem presentations have been disappointingly low. The highest (Kloppenborg) only obtained 92/192 (47%). The lowest result of 32/192 (17%) was obtained by Fitzmyer which is not surprising given the amount of space allocated for Fitzmyer's presentation (and it being the oldest). The remaining four presentations produced results ranging between 27%-38%.

---

<sup>125</sup> E.g. in Vaganay's hypothesis, Mark's sequence more original; Matthew and Luke depend on Mark; Matthew and Luke are independent; and sources S and Sg function like Q. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 317-320, refers to the latter group of theories as the "Catholic two source hypothesis" (or "Modified two source hypothesis"), saying of Wikenhauser's theory that "'Aramaic Matthew' solved...precisely the same problem that Q solved...The differences between this 'Catholic two source hypothesis' and the simpler forms lay mostly in the name." These theories preserved "the critical insights of Holtzmann and Wernle on the priority of Mark to Matthew and Luke, and Benoit even included a source to account for the sayings now found in Luke 9:51-18:14, mostly Q sayings." Pierson Parker argued for a common source for Matthew and Mark (proto-Matthew), and for Luke's use of proto-Luke, Mark and proto-Matthew. Pierson Parker, *The Gospel Before Mark* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1953). Parker was another Roman Catholic who sought to reconcile the priority of canonical Matthew with the traditional two-source hypothesis. Fitzmyer, "Priority," 163 n2, lamented that he could not discuss Parker's theory.

## To Q Or Not To Q? That is the Question

The main reason for undertaking this project was to disentangle some of the mess surrounding Q—to find out what the arguments were *for and against* the independence of Matthew and Luke. Q is generally considered to be the logical inference from positing Matthew’s and Luke’s use (‘revisions’) of Mark. For there to be a ‘Q’, students are told, there has to be complete independence between Matthew and Luke. Because basically, Matthew and Luke share a lot of material in common which is not found in Mark (hence, ‘double-tradition’)<sup>126</sup> whereas in the portions they do share with Mark (‘triple-tradition’) they do not agree together on many of the changes each of the other has made to the (Markan) ‘triple-tradition.’ On top of this, the ‘Q-material’ is not placed in the same way into the Markan framework (Matthew weaves it into the Markan tradition whilst Luke segregates Q and Markan material into ‘blocks’).

Tuckett states the general view,

The case for the existence of Q...is in some sense a negative one, since the Q hypothesis is essentially the alternative to the possibility that Luke knew Matthew. (The theory that Matthew knew Luke is hardly ever proposed today.)<sup>127</sup>

But why is Matthew’s knowledge of Luke never proposed (today)? When *was* it proposed? By *whom* was it proposed? *How* was it proposed? Students deserve at least to be given some arguments for or against it. It seems *students* are supposed to refrain from even considering it because there are no *scholars* who do. Is this not an argument from silence? The title of this project is again rendered more intelligible—the problem with the Synoptic Problem for students is that they are prevented from asking questions or finding their own answers. It seems that whatever the majority of scholars propose and defend should suffice as (pre-digested) food for students.<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Kümmel’s, *Introduction*, 66, calls it “double traditions.”

<sup>127</sup> Tuckett, “Synoptic Problem,” 268. Likewise Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 91, asserts that Matthew’s use of Luke is “seldom argued today” referring students to Kümmel (*Introduction*, 64). But Kümmel, *Introduction*, 64, merely states, “The dependence of Mt on Lk is no longer defended today and can drop from consideration.”(!)

<sup>128</sup> Fitzmyer, “Priority,” does direct students to L. Vaganay, *Le problème synoptique: Une hypothèse de travail* (Bibliothèque de théologie, 3/1; Paris: Desclée, 1954), 294-295.

Kümmel acknowledges the notion “that Lk took his common material over directly from Mt is championed again and again.”<sup>129</sup> But Kümmel’s following remark, “This position is completely inconceivable” is odd considering the numerous people who can conceive of it (Kümmel’s list includes adherents to Farrer’s hypothesis as well as Griesbachians). The six presentations I evaluated each introduced Q as the corollary of positing Mt-Lk independence. Delimiting Q was poorly addressed (although Stein’s footnote mentioned an attempt by Petros Vassiliadis to establish some principles).<sup>130</sup>

Is Q a unified document, is it made up of ‘fragmentary’ notes, is it various oral sources, or is it a combination of the above? Did it undergo several recensions? What do the ‘overlaps’ between Mark and Q suggest? Would a unique ‘Q theology’ suggest a Q-community? It is understandable that some (Farrer, Sanders, Goodacre) think that Q is better dispensed with so as to avoid messy reconstructions. But is it *simpler* to dispense with Q or keep Q? Is simpler always better? On Goulder’s theory Matthew simply *created* the sayings—surely this *creates more problems* for Christians. For some scholars, Q is closest to the sayings of the historical Jesus and so should be either uncritically equated with Jesus or critically reconstructed.

It is generally thought that Matthew and Luke need to be independent in order to grant the existence of Q. Thus the biggest “loophole” (as Fitzmyer calls it) for the two-source theory in positing Mt-Lk independence is the minor agreements (in Markan material where Matthew and Luke are supposedly unaware of what the other is doing they sometimes agree in the changes they make to Mark). These agreements are small but pose a problem for *independent* compositions.<sup>131</sup> But do they pose a problem for Q, or simply a certain *kind* of Q? What if only Mark and one other synoptic Gospel had been preserved? If we only had Matthew and Mark, would a sayings-source have been proposed? If so, then Q does not rest solely on independence.<sup>132</sup> Matthew has *not* simply created the non-Markan sayings.<sup>133</sup> If Q

---

<sup>129</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 64.

<sup>130</sup> Stein, *Synoptic Problem*, 110 n30.

<sup>131</sup> Tuckett, “Synoptic Problem,” 267, misrepresents Goulder’s understanding of the minor agreements by asking “Why should Luke have allowed Matthew’s text to influence him in such a minor way as to create these small agreements, but rarely in any major way?” Goulder sees Luke rewriting and combining two documents (Mark and Matthew) the ‘major agreements’ are the Q/double-material!

<sup>132</sup> Does not Matthew already evidence ‘doublets’ without recourse to Luke?

<sup>133</sup> There would be no problem arguing for the ‘creation’ of some non-Markan sayings (based on the Hebrew Scriptures or the Spirit or the Risen Lord).

rests solely on Mt-Lk *independence* than why are there are a number of scholars who can conceive of Luke's use of Matthew *and* Q? Scholars such as, Holtmann, Simons, and Morgenthlaler had already proposed such a Three-Source Hypothesis,<sup>134</sup> and more recently Gundry has also argued for it.<sup>135</sup> In the 'Synoptic-L' internet discussion, Brian Wilson<sup>136</sup> likely found himself surrounded by advocates of Farrer (himself living in the UK) and so asked whether the Farrer hypothesis could logically be combined with the two-source hypothesis into a hybrid hypothesis, "how does an advocate of the 2DH know that Luke did not also copy from Matthew, and how does an advocate of the FH know that Matthew and Luke did not also interact with Q?"<sup>137</sup>

Goodacre has encountered the same question, but adamantly refuses it any credulity—if Luke knew Matthew then he cannot have known Q! Goodacre is surprised that,

Christopher Tuckett, Frans Neiryck, and Timothy Friedrichsen have claimed that even if victory in the argument over the minor agreements were to be conceded to Farrer, Goulder, and others, this would still not necessarily point to the abandonment of Q.<sup>138</sup>

Goodacre's whole 'case against Q' is at stake here since he believes that Luke's use of Matthew is what dispenses with Q. But it depends entirely on the *type of Q* one is dispensing with. Goodacre is dispensing with the *double-tradition Q* being *available to Luke in any other form than Matthew* (except an occasional oral version). Essentially Goodacre is disputing what kind of an author Luke was. But before summarizing the arguments for and against Luke's use of Matthew, it is important to fill the void in Synoptic Problem discussions—arguments for and against Matthew's use of Luke.

---

<sup>134</sup> E. Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthaëus benutzt?* (Bonn, 1980). R. Morgenthaler, *Statistische Synopse* (Zuerich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1971), 301-305.

<sup>135</sup> Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 4f.

<sup>136</sup> Wilson espouses something like an oral Urgospel translated into Greek fragments or 'notes' which form the basis of Matthew, Mark, and Luke written independently. Brian E. Wilson, "The Logia Translation Hypothesis,"

<http://www.twonh.demon.co.uk/>

accessed 15.01.2002

<sup>137</sup> Brian E. Wilson, Subject: "a hybrid hypothesis," Tue Oct 6, 1998,

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/synoptic-1/message/1056>

accessed 17.07.2002

<sup>138</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg; PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 165.

## Part B

### Investigating Matthean Posteriority

#### Arguments For Matthew's Use of Luke

The theory that Matthew used Luke's Gospel has a more respectable history than the silence of scholars might suggest. One of the earliest founders of Markan priority, Christian Gottlob Wilke, also advocated Matthew's use of Luke (supported by Bruno Bauer (1856)).<sup>139</sup> Several other scholars who have argued for Matthew's use of Luke, include, W. Lockton (1922),<sup>140</sup> Ernst von Dobschütz (1928),<sup>141</sup> Ronald V. Huggins (1992),<sup>142</sup> and Martin Hengel (2000).<sup>143</sup> I have tried to categorise the various types of arguments used for Matthew's use of Luke, adding some of my own, before providing arguments *against* Matthew's use of Luke. Most arguments concern Matthew's relative lateness.

#### A Late Date for Matthew: Matthew Resembles John's Theology

Matthew's Gospel evidences several features that suggest it was written later than Luke's Gospel. Of the synoptics, Matthew's Gospel is the closest theologically to John's Gospel (which is often dated relatively late) and in fact fits very nicely into the second century, with its catholicising theology.<sup>144</sup> 'Catholicising' refers to the umbrella type theology that incorporates tensions such as that between universalism ("all nations") and exclusivism ("only Israel"), providing a refined synthesis between the two just as we see in Matthew. It

---

<sup>139</sup> Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis* (trans. and ed. Donald L. Niewyk; Macon GA: Mercer University Press, 1980), 43. Whether Griesbach's theory (taken over by Strauss (1835-36)) had taken on too much 'myth' baggage and so Wilke's utilization hypothesis was a direct response to Strauss's 'Griesbachian-mythical' hypothesis is irrelevant here.

<sup>140</sup> W. Lockton, *CQR*, July (1922). I was unable to find this article but I did find one of his books, W. Lockton, *The Resurrection and Other Gospel Narratives, and, The Narratives of the Virgin Birth: Two Essays* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1924). Lockton's believes Luke write first, Mark used Luke and Matthew used both. His arguments in these two essays were weak.

<sup>141</sup> Ernst von Dobschütz, "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist," in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, ed. Graham Stanton (London: SPCK, 1983), 19-29. Originally published in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (ZNW)* 27 (1928) 338-48. Translated by Robert Morgan. Dobschütz also mentions H. von Soden as an advocate of Matthew's direct use of Luke.

<sup>142</sup> Ronald V. Huggins, "Matthean Posteriority: A Preliminary Proposal," *Novum Testamentum* vol. XXXIV (1992), 1-22.

<sup>143</sup> Hengel's argument is produced as part of a book, "Postscript: Reflections on the Logia Source and the Gospels of Luke and Matthew," in, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (London: SCM Press, 2000), 169-207.

is the pastor-theologian-teacher in Matthew that proved endearing to the early Church Fathers. Matthew has a high degree of ‘Father’ terminology just like we find in John’s Gospel. In Matthew, all are children before God the Father.<sup>145</sup> Matthew in fact has an emphasis on a Transcendent Healing-Wisdom theme (“come to me all who are weary-burdened”) not unlike John’s Word-become-Flesh Christology (“I am the way”). John (1:17) speaks of the Law coming through Moses and Grace and Truth coming through Jesus Messiah. Likewise Matthew (1:19) emphasises a Godly kind of righteousness that is not about cold, hard law, but about compassion and mercy.<sup>146</sup> Like John, Matthew evidences a dual theology (life—death; humility—pretense; sheep or goats; those who do righteousness—those who don’t). If John is dated late, Matthew should be. Matthew’s Trinitarian baptism formula is certainly striking.

### **Matthew Resembles Rabbinic Judaism**

Not only was Matthew theologically congenial to the second century, but Matthew is closest to formative ‘rabbinic’ Judaism (although ‘rabbinic’ is an anachronistic term and so should be thought of as ‘proto-rabbinic’). Hengel refers to a leading Talmudic expert in Germany, H.-J. Becker, who argues that at the time of Matthew’s writing there was an established and largely-accepted rabbinic self-understanding.<sup>147</sup> Matthew (unlike Mark) only uses the term “rabbi” disparagingly, indicating that “‘rabbi’ had become a fixed title of ordained scribes; thus it could no longer be used by real disciples of Jesus.”<sup>148</sup> If ‘rabbinic’ Judaism was re-forming itself after the destruction of Jerusalem, Matthew has likely been left out of the synagogue (as in John)<sup>149</sup> but still wishes to look something like its ‘parent-group’ by engaging in polemic and asserting itself.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Dobschütz, “Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist,” 28.

<sup>145</sup> Ben Witherington, III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 333-344, points out some of the similarities between Matthew’s and John’s Gospels, seeing them like ‘children of the same Mother.’

<sup>146</sup> “I desire mercy and not sacrifice” is quoted twice (9:13; 12:7). The true covenant concerns true righteousness, true righteousness concerns true mercy.

<sup>147</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 197, 73, Matthew “presupposes the powerful consolidation of Judaism in Jewish Palestine after the catastrophe of AD 70.”

<sup>148</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 198.

<sup>149</sup> The destruction of Jerusalem as ‘judgment’ (Mt 21:41) could be in view here in Matthew’s mind. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 316 n753. Also Matthew may believe that the Jews who were killed in the destruction of Jerusalem brought about their own judgment with the saying in Mt 27:25. Perhaps this saying serves a dual

It is ‘rabbinic’ to refer to “Jerusalem” (Lk 4:9) as “the holy city” (Mt 4:5; 27:53), and to replace “Father” with “Our Father the one in the heavens,” (Mt 6:9). Mt 5:18-19 is specific teaching which would concern the Jewish lawyer/rabbi.<sup>151</sup> Also, Matthew does not seem to prefer using the Greek Bible when quoting Scripture (unless copying it from Mark). Half of the time he uses translations which we call ‘mixed’ (they are either from Targums or from the Hebrew or a common folk translation or memory). Dobschütz, says, “only a pupil of the rabbis would think of getting a literal fulfilment of Zech. 9:9 at Matt. 21:5f by introducing two animals.” The Talmudic literature is compiled after the second century but does seem to resonate most with this later style.

### **Matthew Resembles the Catechism of the *Didache***

Matthew is written as a Church Manual. The *Didache* (c.104-150) offers a good parallel. Like Matthew’s (original) Gospel, the author of the *Didache* provides community traditions and is a Community Rule or Discipline. Like Matthew it is a compilation of very early traditions and has an emphasis on Christian baptism, teaching and training. Like Matthew it is from a time of settling and consolidation and it is becoming wary of itinerant preachers (wandering prophets) and so it provides teaching on how the settled community should respond to them. While the *Didache* is more specific in how to treat such itinerant “teachers,” “prophets,” and “apostles,” and cautions against being enticed by parasitic itinerants and favouring them over the resident leaders,<sup>152</sup> Matthew evidences a similar concern—of the synoptics Matthew alone has the saying, “Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep’s clothing...you will know them by their fruits” (Mt 7:15-16) i.e. they are dangerous to the flock. Matthew alone says not to be overly impressed by the prophet

---

purpose—not only responsibility as *blame*, but responsibility in *owning* Jesus since Jesus was really *their* true Saviour and *their* true Identity which is also rightfully theirs, not unlike the dual idea of stumbling-stone/ corner-stone challenge. If so, then Matthew’s focus is not so much on the past or even on history generally but more so on the *present* and *continuing* life of the Church with the abiding voice of God with them.

<sup>150</sup> Matthew resembles the type of intra-Jewish debate that presupposes ongoing Jewish practice and the fight over who are the true leadership of the Jewish people and displays comparatively little concern for explaining or detailing the Jewish war. This is true also of John’s Gospel, who evidences some of the similar controversy with the synagogue, though John does mention the destruction of Jerusalem explicitly in Jn 11:48 (and with subtle irony in 19:15; and generally in 4:21). Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 316.

<sup>151</sup> Dobschütz, “Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist,” 25.

<sup>152</sup> Itinerants are dangerous because they could take over the community and lead people astray—if they ask for money they must be false prophets!

but to welcome the child (Mt 10:41).<sup>153</sup> Like the *Didache*'s community, Matthew's community has been 'burnt' and is still learning and recovering. Matthew might just as well be called 'The Teaching (of the Lord) for the Community'.<sup>154</sup> Like Matthew the *Didache* gives the community prayers and speaks of fasting and says *they* do it that way, but *we* do it this way. *Our prayers are different, are fasts are different. Their leaders are mere actors, ours are true.* Fasting is not to be done on the same days as the "wayward" or the "hypocrites" (ὕποκριται superficial-actor leaders), This is not surprising for a document which begins with the classic 'Two Ways' theme. The call is to seek and follow *the way of God*, the humble way of true righteousness. This is the same frame of argument which Matthew uses (Mt 23:7-8). Their leaders are called 'rabbi' (seek a 'great' name for themselves) but your leaders will be different—your leaders will seek true greatness and true righteousness.<sup>155</sup> Christians are to gain their own 'family' identity from Jesus (you are all ἀδελφοί 'brothers' with one supreme 'teacher'). Matthew was written to be easily remembered and recited, as a Church manual. Mt 6:5-15 has several 'catch-word' phrases on praying, Mt 6:19-34 on 'cares', Mt 7:1-5 on 'judging'—these are a compilation demonstrating the deployment of catechetical skills of repetition. Matthew is written to provide his community with "a kind of church order and catechism of Christian behaviour".<sup>156</sup> Thus Matthew has an eye for traditional expressions and uses them to his advantage. Consider one characteristic formula of Matthew's "in order that it may be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet." This may stem from Mk 14:49 ("but so that the scriptures may be fulfilled").<sup>157</sup> Likewise, Matthew easily made use of the stereotyped formulas: "will be held liable," (5:22) "whoever says," "throw it away, it is better that," (5:29ff.) "neither by...because," (5:34ff.) "you have heard...but I say" (5:21-5:44). It seems that Matthew has patterned these formula on something, and even if he did not 'create' them he certainly preferred them for some reason. They do not occur at all in Luke. Why does Matthew's Jesus speak like a scribe (scholarly religious teacher)? Matthew

---

<sup>153</sup> Note that in Luke "prophet" is always positive.

<sup>154</sup> The *Didache* has come down to us with two other names: "The Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations," and, "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles."

<sup>155</sup> When Mt 23:7-8 says not to be called 'rabbi' it is clearly over and against the practice of those "who have the best seats in the synagogues".

<sup>156</sup> Dobschütz, "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist," 24-26.

<sup>157</sup> Dobschütz, "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist," 22.

had a church that needing looking after, a flock that needing feeding.<sup>158</sup> Matthew's is the only Gospel to use "church" (and on the lips of Jesus! Mt 16:18; 18:17). Judging by the date of the *Didache* Matthew should be dated just before it, around 95-105 CE.

### **Matthew Resembles the Later Discourse Gospels**

Discourse Gospels allow an interesting comparison. They provide a narration of a post-resurrection dialogue between Jesus and the disciples. For example, in the *Apocryphon of James* (c. 90-110 CE), Jesus visits the disciples after his resurrection and Jesus speaks to them, they answer, he speaks, etc. Likewise in *The Sophia of Jesus Christ* (c. 70-100 CE), "the Saviour" appears to his twelve disciples, and he speaks, and they marvel and fear, he laughs, speaks, Philip answers, "the Saviour" speaks...etc. Again in *Epistula Apostolorum* (c. 150-190 CE) after beginning with a biographical account of miracles, it changes into a post-resurrectional dialogue between (Jesus) "he said..." and (apostles) "we answered..."<sup>159</sup> The point is that the narrator chooses to present the risen (eternal) Jesus speaking to the amorphous group of disciples through an other-worldly means of simple narration. John's Gospel at times resembles a dialogue between Jesus and the disciples, or Jesus and opponents, and the dialogue continues after the resurrection (albeit with less extreme 'glory' than a discourse Gospel):

Just after daybreak, Jesus stood on the beach; but the disciples did not know that it was Jesus. Jesus said to them, "Children, you have no fish, have you?" They answered him, "No." He said to them...  
(Jn 21:4-6)

In Matthew there is no dialoguing after the resurrection, only Jesus speaking. But consider the following,

Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a net that was thrown into the sea and caught fish of every kind; when it was full, they drew it ashore, sat down, and put the good into baskets but threw out the bad. So it will be at the end of the age. The angels will come out and separate the evil from the righteous and throw them into the furnace of fire, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. "Have you understood all this?" They answered, "Yes." And he said to them, "Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old." (Mt 13:47-51)

---

<sup>158</sup> The 'shepherd' and 'flock' theme is another theme shared with John.

<sup>159</sup> John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1998), 32-34.

At the finish of Jesus' set of parables the narration is somewhat like a dialogue or discourse gospel. It is not surprising that this entire block is Matthean *Sondergut*, and that Matthean language abounds (“kingdom of heaven,” “righteousness,” “treasure,” “weeping and gnashing of teeth,”) given the semi-discourse format of narration. Thus Matthew evidences its lateness and we hear *Matthew the narrator* relaying a piece of Matthean teaching to his church and their would-be leaders.<sup>160</sup>

### **Matthew Has Many Legendary Characteristics**

Astrologers interpret a new star and Jesus' family retreats into Egypt at the prospect of another massacre of babies by King 'Pharaoh' Herod—both have a more legendary character than Luke's version of a journey to Bethlehem and the family celebrations of Elizabeth and Mary. The death of Judas (26:25, 50; 27:3-8) also has a legendary ring to it. The coin in the fish's mouth (18:15-20) and the bodies of dead people coming out of their tombs (27:51-53) both sound very legendary. The story of the guards who were bribed which “is still told among the Jews until this day” (28:15) is another indication of Matthew's lateness.<sup>161</sup>

### **Other Clues to Matthew's Lateness**

Arguing for Matthew being later than Luke can also be assisted by arguing for Luke being relatively early. Luke's “behold your house is abandoned” shows that the Temple's destruction lay in the recent past whereas Matthew adds ἐρημος “desolate” describing the continuing desolate ruins of the Temple which have been around for some time.<sup>162</sup> Luke still retains a vivid picture of the destruction of Jerusalem whereas for Matthew it lies further back in the past. The trauma is still noticeable in Lk 21:24 where the Gentiles are said to trample Jerusalem underfoot and people fall by the edge of the sword and are taken

---

<sup>160</sup> Matthew's *Sondergut* reaches back prior to this from 13:24-13:46 (There are weeds among us! What should we do!...Nothing—all will be sorted out at the end of the age. The kingdom of heaven is worth everything.) Matthew displays his interest in the End of the Age when the righteous and the unrighteous will be sorted out (judged).

<sup>161</sup> Matthew deals explicitly with other rumors that were beginning to spread. The rumor that Jesus was a deceiver who led the people astray (Mt 27:63) resembles the accusation against Jesus in bSanh 43a: Jesus is executed “because he did magic, led people astray (*whysyt*) and invited Israel to apostasy.” Cited in Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 321-322 n788.

<sup>162</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 190.

away as prisoners which is a vivid description of what actually occurred (note also the specific description in 21:21). Lk 23:37-31 displays sympathetic concern for the Jerusalemites (the days are coming when you mothers will say ‘how fortunate are those who have no children to mourn over,’—put us out of our misery!) and the traumatic events could not be downplayed by someone who had lived during the period.<sup>163</sup> Luke manifests more shock and mourning than any of the other Gospels—it has hardly been a decade since the actual events.<sup>164</sup>

Even though Matthew does not share Luke’s same degree of interest in the destruction of Jerusalem, Matthew does display a slight agreement *with Luke against Mark* by evidencing two Lukan stylistic changes which Luke made to Mark’s apocalyptic farewell speech. Mk 13:19 had “for [there] will be [in] those days [a] tribulation” which in Lk becomes: “for *then* [there] will be [a] *mega* trouble” (...and Jerusalem pillaged, etc) these two changes are found in Mt 24:21, “for [it] will be *then* a *mega* tribulation”.

Matthew’s anachronistic use of the word “church” has already been mentioned. Another clue is comparing the two groups sent out in Lk 11:49//Mt 23:34. Luke’s “prophets and apostles” have become highly trained by Matthew’s day (“prophets, sages and scribes”). Here is evidence that in Matthew’s time Christian “scribes” / “scholars” are being trained for the kingdom (cf. 13:52).<sup>165</sup> By John’s time the distinction between the term “scribes” (associated with the Jerusalem Temple) and Pharisees (lay leadership found mainly outside Jerusalem) disappears as descriptions of place or function (since what difference do terms make when the Temple is long gone?) so that John even says that *Pharisees* oppose Jesus

---

<sup>163</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 191.

<sup>164</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 314 n734, notes that “the last *Iudaea capta* coins were minted under Titus in 79-81.” These coins displayed “the lamenting Jewish woman under a palm tree or a Roman trophy”. Hengel believes that Josephus’ *Jewish War* must have been written about the same time as Luke: “The Aramaic version [of *Jewish War*] was written around AD 75; the Greek was completed around AD 79/81.” “It is remarkable that Luke, the non-Palestinian Greek, makes the most impressive reference among all the New Testament authors to the conquest of Jerusalem and its cruel consequences, whereas the Jewish Christian and former scribe who composed the First Gospel and was close to Palestine, makes only peripheral mention of this fearful event which deeply shook not only Judaism but the whole of the eastern Roman empire — as a judgment.” 193.

<sup>165</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 195. Matthew seems to have no problem with the role of scribes/scholars per se (there are Christian ones!)—only the type which are *Pharisees*. The expression “scribes and Pharisees” means “scribes who are Pharisees!”.

while in Jerusalem (11:47, 57; 18:3). Similarly Mt 21:45 and 27:62 have *Pharisees* gather before Pilate.<sup>166</sup>

The author of Mark's Gospel was not asserted to be an apostle, this is evidence that the name 'Mark' was an early attempt/designation. Hengel argues that Matthew would not have required an apostolic name if it had been written earlier in the century (like Mark)—it was only later generations who required an apostolic name for the Gospel (especially in the second century). Therefore Matthew was (pseudepigraphically) written so as to deliberately guarantee its establishment. But whose authority to give it? He could not use Peter because Mark had already done that to some extent. Why not remain anonymous, it was of course general apostolic teaching...however, it was still necessary to limit it down to one apostle's name. Therefore in Mt 9:9 and 10:3, the Evangelist uses his sources carefully to explicitly change Levi into an apostle by changing him into Matthew.<sup>167</sup> This was the generation *after* Luke's where Gospels now *had to have* Apostolic names. There was felt no need to write the authors name at the top since it was already done in the story itself.

### **Matthew's Methodology: Omission of Lukan *Sondergut***

It is one thing to argue that Matthew is later than Luke, but does this necessarily imply he actually used Luke? If Matthew post-dates Luke, judging by the speed which news and people travel, there is a high chance Matthew would have encountered it within a couple of years.<sup>168</sup> But then it needs to be addressed why Matthew seems to favour Mark's Gospel, and why he omitted so many traditions of Luke (unlike his acceptance of most of Mark).

---

<sup>166</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 196 points out that Luke is more accurate. Luke has the Pharisees make their final appearance in Lk 19:39 as Jesus enters Jerusalem and from here on it is the scribes and chief priests who are Jesus' opponents.

<sup>167</sup> As Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 177, puts it: "That the author of the First Gospel had some interest in this apostle is shown by the renaming of the tax-farmer Levi, son of Alphaeus, as Matthew, and the addition ὁ τελωνης, 'the tax-farmer', in the catalogue of disciples in Matt. 10.3. It is surely striking that this disciple of Jesus, who elsewhere in the New Testament is utterly unimportant, becomes the 'apostolic author' of a Gospel. [Otherwise] Why should the author of the First Gospel have emphasized this particular peripheral figure so discreetly?" "Such corrections of names can also be found, for example, in the rabbinic haggada and with tradents of the halakah." 309 n688. Matthew in other words says: 'Actually, the person Jesus called wasn't Levi the son of Alpheus it was somebody called Matthew the tax collector.' Readers then connect this Matthew to one of the twelve since it is pointed out again in the list of disciples, "and Matthew the tax-collector!" Mt 10:3.

<sup>168</sup> Considering the amount of journeying Paul could manage to do in a missionary tour (still managing to stay for a decent period at each place) it is likely that a Gospel text could travel abroad quite easily by the end of 1

But this is such an unexpected thing once it is recognised that Luke had also been selective in only including about half of Mark's Gospel. Thus for example (among many other pericopes) Luke omitted the story of John's beheading (too crude for most excellent Theophilus?); Mk 9:53-48 ("if your right hand causes you to sin cut it off"); 9:35-42 (James and John asking for prime positions); and Mk 14:34, 37 (the disciples inability to obey Jesus' command to stay awake several times—instead they fall asleep once "because of grief" Lk 22:45). If Matthew did find something about Luke's gospel aversive, then his omissions will be all the more explicable.

It is important first of all to provide arguments for Matthew's omission of Luke's special material. For example why did he drop out John's ethical teaching? By Matthew's time it was no longer acceptable for Christians to have the professions of soldier or a tax-collector. In Mt 9:9 the tax-collector Matthew *leaves* his profession.<sup>169</sup> Thus we can see why Matthew had to omit Lk 3:12-14.<sup>170</sup> Matthew presupposes that tax collectors and prostitutes *gave up their previous occupations* as fruits of repentance. This meant that Matthew also needed to reject texts like Luke 18:10-14 and 19:1-9.<sup>171</sup> Luke's stories about tax-collectors were not unambiguous—they might be misappropriated by implying a condoning of tax-collecting. Likewise Lk 14:7-11 (Jesus dines with a Pharisee and teaches about becoming least to become exalted) has the same moral paralleled in Mt 18:4 and 23:12.

Matthew was cautious of the theologically dubious or ethically ambiguous status of the parable of the unjust steward (Lk 16:1-8), the obstinate widow (Lk 17:1-8) and the midnight request (Lk 11:5-8). The stories may not have been thought appropriate for his church since they praise a bizarre daringness, outgoingness and disrespectfulness unfit for Matthew's mind and purposes. It is not hard to see the build up of mistrust of Luke's blunt stories flaunting religious sensibilities—who does the unjust steward represent? How can he be *rewarded*? Are people being warned about ending up lonely in heaven if they have neglected utilizing worldly goods to enrich earthly friendships? The mammon-God contrast

---

or 2 years. Thus it would be strange to follow Vincent Taylor's estimation in dating Luke between 80-85 CE and dating Matthew between 85-90 but still argue that Matthew did not know Luke.

<sup>169</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 182. Mt 5:46 regards tax collectors disparagingly—the worst thing one can be in Matthew is a tax-collector! (See also Mt 18:17)

<sup>170</sup> Matthew also reserves the ethical teaching for Jesus leaving John's teaching *anticipating* Jesus the Coming One.

<sup>171</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 311 n704.

is ambiguously placed in Luke: people can only serve God or mammon, but Luke's context suggests *using* mammon. Matthew does, however, find an appropriate setting for the mammon-God saying (in Mt 6:24) which in fact replaces the need to use the entire "rich fool" parable from Lk 12:13-21 which in Luke had introduced the saying about not worrying about clothes and wealth, and likewise 'mammon-wealth' does so in Matthew.

The friend at midnight endorses insolence and disregard of etiquette. The parable of the obstinate widow, however, is less aversive and its omission is more difficult to explain.

Matthew has no use for a parable of the lost coin (Lk 15:8-10) since he already had a parable about finding hidden treasure (13:44) and finding a pearl of immense value (13:45-46). There is no need to liken the kingdom to finding a coin which would seem comparatively less to celebrate over—the kingdom in Matthew's mind should be represented by a *big* find not a *small* find!

The mission-minded Matthew would read Lk 16:19-31 (if they have not listened to Moses and the Prophets...) as indicating there is no hope for evangelising Jews and that even the Scriptures have failed to elicit faith. (On the other hand, Luke may be later than Matthew if Luke sees no hope for evangelising Jews.) Matthew shies away from this parable since it also suggests that resurrection is unimportant for faith. Scriptures and resurrection are both very important to Matthew. Luke's challenge is too 'open' for Matthew who responds with the principle 'If in doubt, leave it out.' Matthew does not incorporate sayings and parables willy-nilly just in order to fill up space. Matthew is providing a Community-Canon Book for God's Universal People based on his Jewish-Christian heritage and the Spirit's help.

Only one of Luke's 'lost' parables is used by Matthew (the parable of the lost sheep). Matthew likes the sheep-shepherd theme but Matthew's version (18:12) misunderstands the more original version whereby Jesus had spoken of a shepherd who risked ninety-sheep to go looking for one lost one! The lost sheep being riskingly and graciously/ lavishly restored to the flock (and to Jesus) were the *tax-collectors and sinners*. Matthew transforms the saying into a parable about restoring a wandering *Christian* to the flock (i.e. the Church) by risking the 99 just like a shepherd would naturally do! Was the (usual) Lukan outlandish point missed on Matthew? Did Matthew really think shepherds do that naturally?

Luke's third parable about something 'lost' being 'found' is the parable of the Lost Son (or: The Two Sons).<sup>172</sup> But was there only *one* lost son? If the elder son was never 'lost' then who might he represent? Church members who haven't strayed? The Jewish people? Matthew had used the 'lost-found' motif already for Church members who had strayed, and the ambiguity as to the state of the elder son put Matthew off altogether. Matthew liked *clear* contrasts (two paths, two kingdoms; rash brutal King Herod versus calm gentle Jesus; hypocrisy versus discipleship) *all* Jewish authorities are thus portrayed as in opposition to Jesus in Matthew. In the parable of the Father and the Two Sons, the elder son is told to relax because everything in the kingdom belongs to you him too. But did he really belong to the kingdom? Was the elder son right to be upset over such lax boundaries and gross forgiveness? Matthew believes God's way of mercy is both old and new but Luke's unconditional Mercy to non-distinct characters is too open-ended—where is the conclusion? Matthew does, however, see the potential in beginning a parable with “A man had two sons...” thus Matthew later gives a very short parable of two sons in Mt 21:28-31 (“A man had two sons/heirs/children...”). Matthew's parable provides straightforward teaching with a clear contrast (between the tax collectors and prostitutes who repented and the temple priests/elders of the people who still only 'talk the talk').<sup>173</sup>

Matthew has no reason to use Lk 13:6-9 (parable of a barren fig tree which gets three years to prove itself until being cut down) because he prefers Mark's version of the acted out 'parable' of the fig tree (Mk 11:11-14). Luke's parable is rather plain (resembling Isaiah 5:1-7).

Lk 14:28-33 (On counting the cost) is omitted but he had used both verses 26-27 concerning 'for the cause' and 'the cost of bearing one's cross' and the remainder was inappropriate for the tone of Matthew's mission chapter. Matthew could have made use of these sayings in his chapter 13. If one cannot give one's all don't bother—this clashes with Matthew who wants to point out the hidden *reward* of the kingdom (which *induces* giving one's all and inspires the quest).

Matthew takes his cue from Lk 12:35a (“Be dressed for action and have your lamps lit”) and turns it into a parable about ten bridesmaids (Mt 25:1-13).

---

<sup>172</sup> More commonly: The Prodigal Son. It should be properly seen as 'The Father and His Two Sons.'

Likewise Matthew picks up Lk 17:3-5 (“If another disciple sins...and if there is repentance, you must forgive...seven times a day...Increase our faith!) and turns it into a dialogue/teaching session with Peter just after the teaching concerning the restoration of church members and that which is obtained by the kingdom on earth will carry over to the heavenly kingdom (Mt 18:21-22).

What about everyone’s favourite parable from Luke? The Good Samaritan. Although Matthew knows that in the Jewish mind ‘Gentile’ is a derogatory title and Gentiles are unworthy of emulation since it is Jews who should provide the example (Mt 5:47; 6:7, 32; 10:18), and Matthew is concerned in defining who *now* belongs to the new inclusive Israel *because of Jesus’ mission*, Matthew *can* use gentiles as examples for faith. But Matthew chooses such examples precisely because they demonstrate *faith in Jesus* (Mt 8:5-13 and Mt 15:21-28). Matthew’s examples concern extremely Gentile characters: a Roman centurion (the new enemy of Israel who were to destroy the ‘Holy City’), and a woman who was a “Canaanite” (Israel’s ancient enemy who were not supposed to even be allowed to exist!)<sup>174</sup> Luke’s Samaritan does not evidence *faith in Jesus* (unlike Matthew’s examples). It is noteworthy that in both of Matthew’s Gentile faith examples, the healings were done *from afar*—Jesus did not go into a Gentile house! The centurion’s ‘faith example’ is the longest healing story in Matthew (with woes, blessings and all!), with an obviously important eschatological design anticipating the Gentile mission. Matthew has his Jewish-Gentile theme all worked out and has no need of a simple “good” Samaritan.

Matthew has no need of Lk 10:1f. because he is content with Mk 6:7-13. In Matthew’s version the disciples are portrayed as not going anywhere and the section turns out to be a discourse concerning *instructions for mission* rather than an actual mission. “[T]he seventy-two Gentile nations, which are indirectly indicated by the seventy-two messengers in Luke 10.1, do not fit into his Christological scheme.”<sup>175</sup> Against Luke, Matthew asserts

---

<sup>173</sup> This parable is not traditional, it is a Matthean narration—notice the semi-discourse/dialogue style.

<sup>174</sup> Krister Stendahl, “Personal Reflections on the Goulder Symposium: An Afterword,” 131-136, in, *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, ed. Christopher A. Rollston (Harrisburg; PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 133-134, points out, “By the way, there were no Canaanites around in Jesus’ time. Matthew uses the word as a code word for ‘utterly Gentile’ so that we understand that it is a story to make a point. Rabbis taught by telling such stories about their masters.” Sounds like an ancient ‘what-would-Jesus-do’ teaching device!

<sup>175</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 184.

that the disciples were instructed not to go among the Gentiles “nor to go into a Samaritan city” (10:5).

Hence, most of Matthew’s omissions are not difficult to explain. One of the hardest omissions to explain is Lk 13:10-17 since all its elements are conducive to Matthew. Perhaps three stories of Sabbath healings (Mt 12) would be too much? Matthew had already used Lk 13:34 so had no need of 19:42-44. Lk 17:7-10 is not used by Matthew (servants do not deserve praise, i.e. a person never reverses the servant role with God so that he/she might ‘owe’ him/her some praise). One cannot earn oneself some ‘credit’ by doing deeds—it is hard to see why Matthew omitted it.

The penitent thief (Lk 23:39-43) is considered too ambiguous. Matthew prefers clear-cut two ways/ two types. Matthew omits the road to Emmaus story—but what would be the point in having two people wandering around Emmaus (close to Jerusalem) when the plan is to go straight to Galilee. Likewise Luke’s Ascension flows from Luke’s theology not Matthew’s. Matthew’s Jesus is said to be *with* the disciples *always* (1:23; 28:20) Jesus words are left resounding in the air—Jesus is still present even upon finishing the Gospel. Matthew would not want to portray Jesus leaving them as in Luke.

### **Matthew’s Genealogy, Birth Narrative, Baptism and Temptation**

Matthew is considered to be critical of Luke’s attempt to produce a genealogy and sets about producing one (or inserting one he knows from elsewhere) to replace it—one with a clear theological story-line, following the Messianic promise from two points: Abraham (Father of the Israelite nation) and David (Israel’s favourite king) tracing a smooth outline through to the Babylonian exile and out again leading to Jesus but deliberately along the way exposing several ‘glitches’ where the marriage unions might make the offspring suspect but nevertheless resuming again (also providing us with a clue that Jesus likewise does not really belong to David’s line except by ‘adoption’!) Why did Luke’s family sagas not appeal? Perhaps they had not enough theological import and Matthew could not see the point in providing a birth narrative for John the Baptist.

Huggins has noted twelve agreements with Luke’s birth narrative 1) the names of both parents 2) Joseph’s Davidic descent, 3) the virginal conception, 4) the pregnancy occurring

during Mary's betrothal, 5) an angel announcing Jesus' coming birth, 6) Mary's pregnancy said to be due to the Holy Spirit, 7) the angel's command on giving the name Jesus, 8) the angel predicts Jesus' role as Saviour, 9) the birth takes place after the parents come to live together, 10) the birth occurs at Bethlehem, 11) during the reign of Herod, and, 12) Jesus is reared in Nazareth.<sup>176</sup>

This is an impressive number for supposedly independently derived accounts. But there are still more agreements. Matthew and Luke have *witnesses seek* the baby Jesus.<sup>177</sup> Instead of lowly shepherd Matthew has astrologers come over from the east *seeking* the new king. This idea of seeking is intensified in Matthew's Gospel where King Herod is unnerved at the news of a different king and also 'seeks' the child for sinister purposes (Mt 2:8). There is also some kind of sign in both. For Matthew it is not a baby in feeding trough but a sign in the sky (it was common to interpret the signs in the sky as relating to the rise of kings). The Gentiles are seen to be ready to accept a Jewish king—but in this story it will not be King Herod!

The Temptation in Luke is less rational than Matthew. Luke says the devil led him (Jesus) up and showed him as though it meant "took him up into the air". Matthew has "led him up into a very high mountain" has Luke forgotten to mention the mountain? Perhaps not because Luke next has the devil lead him into Jerusalem which is just as irrational. In fact neither of the accounts is very logical but it makes sense that Matthew has clarified "took him up" by adding "to a very high mountain," although this has still not alleviated the Q hypothesis. Matthew has made the account neater and placed the temptation to fall miraculously from the Temple in the centre of the story.<sup>178</sup>

Considering that Matthew was critical of Luke's Gospel it makes sense that only some of Luke's additions to Mark will show up in Matthew. Matthew shows knowledge of Luke's

---

<sup>176</sup> Huggins also finds some agreements between Luke and Matthew's resurrection accounts. He sees that Matthew's comment "but some doubted" (were of two minds) (Mt 28:17) makes more sense if one presupposes some *knowledge of Luke's account* since in Luke: 1) the disciples would *not believe* the women's testimony, 2) the two disciples on the road to Emmaus are rebuked for being foolish and *slow to believe*, 3) the disciples in the house think they are *seeing a ghost* and 4) when they checked his flesh and saw him eat they were "*disbelieving and still marveling.*"

<sup>177</sup> Lk 1:14 had said of John's birth that "many will rejoice at his *genesis*," the same word is used in Lk 1:35 when the angel said to Mary "the [child] being- *genesis-ed* (begotten/produced) in you is holy and will be called Son of God." Likewise in Matthew we have the same word "the [child] having-been-*genesis-ed* (begotten/produced) in her is from the holy spirit.

<sup>178</sup> Hengel, *Four Gospels* 182.

account of the Baptism since he agrees in changing Mark's "being split" to "opened up" and Mark's "(in)to him" to "upon him". Also Mt 17:2 reproduces Luke's description of Jesus' face changing appearance (Lk 9:29, cf. Mk 9:3). Mt 26:75 reproduces Luke's addition of "bitterly" (Lk 22:62, cf. Mk 14:72). These are of course very minor agreements. Goulder's and Goodacre's famous example is "who is the [one] having smote you" (Lk 22:64 found also in Mt 26:75). Hengel appeals to Lk 10:25 ("a lawyer") and Mt 22:35 ("and one of them, a lawyer") against Mk 12:28 ("one of the scribes"). But the UBS<sup>4</sup> rates "a lawyer" as merely a {C} here suggesting textual corruption which prevents making too much of it. However, if textual criticism is based on the two-source hypothesis then this would downplay evidence that Matthew might have actually included it.

### **Matthew Critical of Luke**

Assuming that there were various sources (oral and written) around in the first century, would an Evangelist approach all sources on a neutral basis? No. The source of every tradition was not uncritically accepted—the source was important. On this supposition, Luke's source was more suspect than Mark's. Perhaps because it was more recently published by someone unknown to "Matthew". If Matthew knew Luke's Gospel the omissions Matthew made while composing his Church-Gospel demonstrated Matthew's critical stance of Luke's Gospel or perhaps simply a greater confidence in the tradition he himself had to offer. The reverse is true for those who argue for Luke's use of Matthew—it implies Luke was critical of Matthew's Gospel! The idea that anyone could be unhappy with Matthew's Gospel seems unthinkable for many people. But it is easier to see why Matthew could be critical of Luke's Gospel. Luke was too Gentile. Luke was too daring. Luke was too ambiguous. Luke does not evidence the same Jewish-Christian concern for teaching the catholic Church. Luke is too Pauline. On the other hand, Matthew evidences a great deal of loyalty to Mark's Gospel. Why did he endorse Mark so much? Perhaps his community had known and used it for some time? Perhaps he preferred the Galilean Gospel

of Mark over the Jerusalem Gospel of Luke.<sup>179</sup> Finally, John's Gospel displays a similarly critical stance of the synoptic who have downplayed or neglected the importance of John.<sup>180</sup>

### **Luke's Gospel Spurred the Production of Matthew**

If Matthew's church had known Mark's Gospel for several years and were already modifying it slightly (orally) to fit the extra sayings they knew (to include the Lords prayer, etc.), then the discovery of Luke's Gospel may have spurred on the production of Matthew.<sup>181</sup> Matthew was given the incentive to write an expanded Gospel of Mark with birth narratives and resurrection appearances and extending teaching sections. In Luke's Gospel Matthew found some of the same traditions already transcribed for him. Some traditions he copied closely, such as Jesus' Temptation, and John's preaching, but other passages he was not so concerned to keep to Luke's version. As Matthew watched his community become more Gentile (and now Gentile Gospels were beginning to show up!) Matthew was concerned to teach Gentiles about the danger of becoming uprooted from Judaism. Matthew did not want the salvation message to be dislocated from its Jewish roots. The salvation message begins with the Hebrew Bible and Gentiles must not become detached or arrogant. Like the *Didache*, Matthew is concerned with instructing Gentile converts into God's household.

### **Some Specifics**

The so-called Q-material which is found in Matthew and Luke is added to Mark in different ways. Matthew's approach is to weave it into his Markan source, whereas Luke's is to use block's of 'Q' and blocks of Mark.<sup>182</sup> This makes it easier to argue for Matthew obtaining the Q-material material from Luke since it would be relatively easy to find. Arguing for Luke obtaining it from Matthew demands more work on the part of Luke.

---

<sup>179</sup> C. G. Wilke, the first proponent of Matthean posteriority saw that, "The order was in the possession of the Gospel of Mark before he had news of Luke's writing, or he knew it as the older work and was aware that Luke had simply made additions to this work. Therefore he inserted what he had to insert into his original document and began from there to supplement the discourses of Jesus which appear in it with similar discourses." W. Schmithals, *Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien* (Berlin and New York, 1985), 166-173.

<sup>180</sup> See Appendix II.

<sup>181</sup> Dobschütz, "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist," 28, imagines that Matthew has read Luke, "made a few notes in the margin of his copy of Mark and then used them in his own writing of the material."

<sup>182</sup> Matthew makes fifteen insertions of Q-material while Luke makes only five.

The form of Q-material in Luke is not so ‘redacted’ as in Matthew. For example Matthew has a larger set of beatitudes. It is easier to argue that he enlarged the set than that Luke diminished them.

One of Matthew’s formulas is “and when it happened that Jesus finished these words...” (Mt 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1) and the only occurrence of it in Luke is Lk 7:1. Based on the more general argument that dependence is usually on the Gospel with the characteristic vocabulary/phrase, then Matthew cannot be dependent on Luke since the opposite case could be true—Luke shows residue of Matthew’s formula. However, given Matthew’s love of formulas, and fondness for correspondence of all sorts, such as doubling pericopes (Mt 9:27-31=20:29-34 taken from Mk 10:46-52 and Mt 9:32-34=12:22f taken from Q/Lk 11:14)<sup>183</sup> it seems more likely that these five occurrences are again Matthew’s handiwork. Thus Lk 7:1 may be Matthew’s source here. What would be the purpose of this saying in Q unless it already belonged to the narrative of the healing of the Centurion’s son/servant in Capernaum? Q would thus be more than just sayings.

Another favourite Matthean expression is “weeping and gnashing of teeth” (8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30) again the saying is paralleled in Luke only once (Lk 13:28) and again it might be argued for Luke as the source or vice versa or to trace it to Q. Passages in Matthew with matching wording are evidently Matthean redaction, for example: John the Baptist preaches the same message as Jesus (possibly assisted by the verb “to evangelize” in Lk 3:18),<sup>184</sup> but does this help sway us toward Luke as the source and not Q?

Jesus in Mk 6:8 commands them to take no “copper in your belts”, in Lk 9:3 it is “no silver”, and in Mt it is “no gold, or silver or copper” which appears to be a conflation of both Mark and Luke plus an insertion of gold. Considering that Luke is comfortable with cities (and that he upgrades the wealth/ standing of the women following Jesus in Mark by inserting Joanna) and that the preface is addressed to Theophilus (“your Excellency”) indicating that Luke is writing to a distinguished member of (Roman) society, it is not surprising that Luke links the Gospels events into Roman history (Jesus’ birth is linked with the decree of the Roman “Emperor Augustus” to have “all the world” “registered”) and tries to demonstrate to the Romans that they have nothing to fear of Christianity. But why

---

<sup>183</sup> For other Matthean duos cf. Mt 4:18, 21; 8:28; 9:27; 18:15-16, 19-20; 20:21, 24, 30; 21:2, 7.

Matthew is the one with conflation (and inflation) and not Luke is striking (suggesting Matthew postdates Luke).

Matthew takes a cue from Lk 12:35a (“Be dressed for action and have your lamps lit”) and turns it into a parable about ten bridesmaids (Mt 25:1-13).

Likewise Matthew picks up Lk 17:3-5 (“17:3 Be on your guard! If another disciple sins, you must rebuke the offender, and if there is repentance, you must forgive. And if the same person sins against you seven times a day, and turns back to you seven times and says, 'I repent,' you must forgive.” The apostles said to the Lord, "Increase our faith!") and turns it into a dialogue/teaching session with Peter just after the teaching concerning the restoration of church members and that which is obtained by the kingdom on earth will carry over to the heavenly kingdom (Mt 18:21-22).

### **Luke’s Use of Matthew?**

Samuel Sandmel says “The Gospel of Luke comes from the Greek dispersion at some time between 100 and 140....I would date it nearer 150 than 100.”<sup>185</sup> Here we have the complete reversal of Matthean posteriority—Lukan posteriority. Since Luke omits all the material from Mk 6:44 to Mk 8:27, arguments for Luke’s use of Matthew point out that Luke is certainly able to leave out material from his sources. The main argument confronting the hypothesis that Luke may have used Matthew is that Luke would not have broken up Matthew’s beautifully crafted Sermon on the Mount had he seen it. Thus for people like Mark Goodacre, they feel the need to justify why Luke may have done so. Sandmel sees that “Luke consciously and deliberately excised the Matthean legalism. Luke retains the Beatitudes, but not as a prescribed code; he holds on to what Matthew tells us Jesus taught, but never in the form of a commandment from Jesus.”<sup>186</sup> Thus arguments for the use of Matthew by Luke and vice versa assume the possibility of dependence and attempt to argue *from an evangelist’s own emphasis* as to *why they each changed the other*. However, what is to convince us that the other’s source is (canonical) Luke or (canonical) Matthew? What is to convince us that both simply share a common source?

---

<sup>184</sup> Dobschütz, “Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist,” 22.

<sup>185</sup> Sandmel, *Jewish Understanding*, 190-191.

Both Matthean and Lukan posteriority hypotheses involve the later author being ultra-critical in each of their approaches to the other's Gospel, and thus only manifest minor agreements against Mark (i.e. similar additions and omissions made to Mark).

### **Arguments Against Matthew's Use of Luke**

Arguments against Matthew's use of Luke (assuming Markan priority) concern doubting the assertion that Matthew could know so much of Luke's *Sondergut* yet still reject it. Also, most of Luke's alterations to Mark do not seem to affect the way Matthew alters Mark (except on a larger scale of adding birth narratives, genealogy and resurrection appearances). Luke's form of Q material is occasionally considered to be more redacted than Matthew. But such examples are more difficult to find. I believe that arguments for Matthew's use of Luke often proceed from the assumption that there is something inherently wrong with positing a non-canonical Q document (or unified source) but such assumptions need to be brought out into the open.

The biggest problem with Matthew's use of Luke is that it forces the solution away from oral influence and sees all Q material as being 'cut and pasted' from Luke. This is also the same problem with Luke's use of Matthew.

That Luke's Temptation narrative is slightly less cohesive than Matthew's may suggest that Luke's is the secondary account.

Arguments can be raised against Matthew's use of Luke by pointing out that dating NT documents is an exercise which is extremely conjectural and very difficult to sustain. That many of Matthew's traditions may 'sound' later than Luke might be merely Matthew's way of passing on his traditions as opposed to Luke's own way of writing a Jesus-narrative.

Finally, Luke seems to be more of a historian than Matthew. Luke seems to be more concerned to portray events in the time of Jesus as different to the events of the Church. Luke can better do this since he reserves a second volume dealing with Church issues. Luke's higher degree of flexibility with Greek combined with his historian's eye, come together to provide reason to believe that *if Matthew or Luke were not independent*, Luke would be in a better position to use Matthew as one of his "many" sources since he is more

---

<sup>186</sup> Samuel Sandmel, *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament* (Augmented Edition, London: SPCK,

able than Matthew to write a primitive-sounding Gospel. In which case it is of no worth focusing on arguments which point out Matthew's lateness since Luke could have given us the *impression* of writing earlier. Arguments appealing to the dating of Matthew and Luke are not very conclusive. Matthew and Luke are generally dated according to their lack of knowledge of each other! Here we are stuck in another vicious circle. While it does not seem highly probable that the two Gospels Matthew and Luke were composed in the very same year, it is also difficult to demonstrate that Luke had direct knowledge of Matthew or Matthew had direct knowledge of Luke. If Matthew did have knowledge of Luke (or vice versa) he did not consider it worth copying in the same way as Mark, and unless this is highly probably (that he had a lower view of Luke than Mark), then it might be suggested instead that he did not hold any suspicion of it but decided not to use its particular versions of non-Markan material simply because he knew different versions of this material. But this simply pushes us back to where we started—with a Q source rather than a (second) Gospel source.

### **And So Q Remains...**

Theodore R. Rosché conducted some statistical analysis on how closely Matthew and Luke parallel the words of Jesus in their Markan in comparison with narrative material and in comparison with Q material in order to clarify the nature of Q. He found that Matthew and Luke more faithfully reproduce Mark's sayings of Jesus than they reproduce Mark's narrative sections. A range of between 25%-45% of Mark's words were taken over faithfully by Luke in narrative material and this rose to 78% paralleling Markan sayings. Similarly Matthew's reproduction of Mark's words in narrative sections ranged from 36%-52%, while the correspondence rose to an average of 79% for words of Jesus. When Q is tested, the results are strangely different. Assuming that both Matthew and Luke treated their Q source in the same way (as they treated Mark) the degree of correspondence in wording and order was not high enough overall to validate the assumption that both Matthew and Luke treated the Q source in the same way! Only about 1/3 of Q corresponded enough with itself in wording to test properly, and of these 78 verses there was no common order and about 1/3 of these evidence influence from a different version of the same saying

---

1974), 191.

now found in Mark (Mark-Q overlap). The only way of maintaining a Q document on Rosché's analysis is to assume that Matthew and Mark did not treat the sayings source in the same way in which they treated Mark. Otherwise a Q document must be rejected because "Matthew and Luke would have treated these common sayings to some extent as they treated sayings taken from their common source."<sup>187</sup> The question is: Why would Matthew and Luke treat Q sayings different than Markan sayings? The only way to maintain a Q document is to grant that Matthew and Luke both deployed a different standard of evaluating and reproducing sayings in their Markan source than they did with their Q source.

But is that not exactly what Farrer, Goulder, Huggins, Hengel and Goodacre imply with their source theories? They argue that one particular author is favouring one source over another. Thus there are those who see the sources Mark and Q as equally exerting influence upon Matthew and Luke, while others see the authors Matthew or Luke as using the other in a biased or ultra-critical way, and then there are others who see that oral traditions did not die when the first Gospel was composed, and so oral traditions still continued when Matthew was being written and when Luke was being written. I am currently leaning toward an oral Q hypothesis—one that is not overly simple and easy to explain on paper, but one, nevertheless, that I hope will explain not only the similarities between the synoptic Gospels but the many unique differences.<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> Theodore R. Rosché, "The Words of Jesus and the Future of the 'Q' Hypothesis," *JBL* 79 (1960): 210-220. These results are far different from Kloppenborg's. Kloppenborg believes that at least 50% of the words of Q material are in agreement, which he thinks is too high to put down to oral tradition. What would be helpful is if the percentages of *significance* were also provided, that is, what is considered significant and on whose analysis?

<sup>188</sup> This may explain the *uneven* amount of verbal correspondence between Lk's Q-material and Mt's.

## APPENDIX I

### Survey of Evaluation

**0** = Not Acknowledged / Not Addressed / Not Present  
**1** = Barely Acknowledged / Briefly Noted / Barely Present  
**2** = Weakly Described, Addressed or Demonstrated / Present  
**3** = Explained / Addressed (but lacking critical exploration of various alternatives)  
**4** = Critically Explored, Detailed, Examined / Various Alternatives Engaged

**JF** = Joseph A. Fitzmyer  
**WK** = Werner Kümmel  
**RS** = Robert h. Stein  
**CT** = Christopher M. Tuckett  
**DD** = David L. Dungan  
**JK** = John S. Kloppenborg Verbin

J F	W K	R S	C T	D D	J K	Evaluation Criteria
0	2	2	1	0	2	(1) RELEVANCY FOR STUDENTS STUDYING THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM
0	0	4	1	2	1	(2) EXAMPLES OF DIFFERENCES WITHIN THE GOSPELS DISPLAYED
0	0	3	0	1	0	(3) STUDENTS CHALLENGED TO THINK ABOUT HOW THE GOSPELS WERE COMPOSED
0	2	3	2	1	3	(4) STUDENT FRIENDLY (E.G. INDEXES, GLOSSARY, READABILITY)
0	1	2	1	4	3	(5) DEFINING THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM
0	0	0	0	2	0	(6) IS JOHN BANNED FROM THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM?
0	0	1	0	4	1	(7) DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN A 'HARMONY' AND A 'SYNOPSIS'
0	0	1	0	4	1	(8) (CIRCULAR) LINK WITH TEXTUAL CRITICISM
0	0	0	0	0	1	(9) PROBLEMS WITH USING ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS AND SYNOPSES
0	0	0	0	4	0	(10) SYNOPSES WHICH PRESUPPOSE MARKAN PRIORITY
0	0	0	0	3	3	(11) PROBLEMS OF 'SYNOPSIS MAKING' (E.G. DELIMITATION OF PERICOPES; WHAT CONSTITUTES A PARALLEL?; ARRANGING OF SYNOPTIC PARALLELS)
0	0	0	0	0	0	(12) STUDENT PARTICIPATION ENCOURAGED THROUGH THE MAKING OF A SHORT SYNOPSIS
0	0	2	0	0	0	(13) TECHNIQUE OF SYNOPSIS UNDERLINING
1	2	1	2	3	2	(14) ADVOCATES OF MAIN THEORIES LISTED OR GROUPED
2	3	3	3	1	3	(15) REFERS STUDENTS WHERE NECESSARY TO OTHER WORKS
0	1	3	0	0	4	(16) CHARTS, FIGURES AND DIAGRAMS UTILIZED
0	1	3	1	2	3	(17) ABBREVIATIONS, KEY TERMS AND SHORTHAND INTRODUCED
2	2	3	1	0	1	(18) RELEVANCY OF (PRE-SYNOPTIC & CONTINUING) ORAL SOURCES
0	3	1	0	4	4	(19) HISTORY OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM
0	1	1	1	2	3	(20) 'AUGUSTINIAN' HYPOTHESIS
0	1	3	2	4	2	(21) GRIESBACH HYPOTHESIS
1	3	2	0	1	4	(22) ARAMAIC URGOSPEL
0	3	1	2	3	1	(23) PATRISTIC COMMENTS
2	2	3	3	1	3	(24) MINOR AGREEMENTS
1	1	1	3	0	2	(25) PROTO-LUKE
3	3	3	3	2	3	(26) TWO-SOURCE HYPOTHESIS
1	0	2	2	0	1	(27) FOUR-SOURCE HYPOTHESIS
0	1	1	0	0	1	(28) LUKAN PRIORITY HYPOTHESES
1	1	1	2	1	3	(29) FARRER HYPOTHESIS (LUKAN POSTERIORITY HYPOTHESIS WITHOUT Q)
0	0	0	0	0	0	(30) GOULDER HYPOTHESIS (LUKAN POSTERIORITY HYPOTHESIS WITHOUT ANY ORAL INFLUENCE ON MATTHEW OR LUKE)
0	0	0	0	0	0	(31) LUKAN POSTERIORITY HYPOTHESIS WITH Q (GUNDRY)
0	1	1	1	0	0	(32) MATTHEAN POSTERIORITY WITHOUT Q (WILKE; HUGGINS)
0	0	0	0	0	0	(33) MATTHEAN POSTERIORITY WITH Q / ORAL SOURCES (HENGEL)
2	1	0	0	1	4	(34) MULTIPLE STAGE HYPOTHESES
2	3	4	3	0	3	(35) VARIOUS TYPES OF ARGUMENTS CLASSIFIED OR DESCRIBED
2	3	3	3	2	4	(36) FORMAL ARGUMENTS: AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT IN ORDER
2	2	2	2	1	4	(37) OMISSION VERSUS SUPPLEMENTATION
2	1	1	3	0	3	(38) COMPOSITIONAL ARGUMENTS CIRCULAR BUT NECESSARY
0	1	3	1	0	1	(39) ARGUMENTS CONCERNING COHESION AND FATIGUE
1	1	0	0	0	4	(40) SIMPLE THEORIES VERSUS COMPLEX THEORIES

0	0	0	0	1	1	(41) ANCIENT WRITING TECHNIQUES
2	0	2	1	1	1	(42) 'DEVELOPMENT' AND TRADITION TENDENCIES
1	2	3	2	1	1	(43) STYLE AND GRAMMAR
1	2	1	1	3	2	(44) PATRISTIC ACCOUNTS
0	1	1	2	0	1	(45) ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST VARIOUS KINDS OF Q: DEFINING AND DELIMITING Q
0	1	1	2	0	4	(46) THEOLOGICAL OR HISTORICAL ISSUES WHICH Q RAISES
2	0	1	0	0	0	(47) AUTHOR OPEN ABOUT PERSONAL REASONS FOR CONVICTIONS
1	0	0	1	0	2	(48) PORTRAITS/SKETCHES PROVIDED OF SYNOPTIC EVANGELISTS AND THEIR COMPOSITIONAL PROCEDURES IMPLIED BY THE THREE MAJOR SOURCE HYPOTHESES (TWO-SOURCE, GRIESBACH & FARRER)

**JF WK RS CT DD JK**

**TOTALS** (out of a possible 192)

32 52 73 52 59 90

## APPENDIX II

### The Gospel of John: Independent of and Therefore Critical of Synoptics

John's Gospel challenges the significant position which the Synoptics had given the figure of Peter, evidencing a rival perspective. At certain points this perspective rises to a level of competition. The first two males to visit the empty tomb in John's Gospel are involved in a race to see who will get there first! It is the disciple whom Jesus loved who outruns Peter and so arrives first and manages to have a quick peep inside *without going in* so that although Peter is second to arrive and see inside the empty tomb, he is still the one who goes in. Peter is still being acknowledged as the leader of the group but subtly rivalled/undermined/replaced by the alternative traditions concerning "the disciple whom Jesus loved". In Mark we read how all the disciples fled immediately at Jesus' arrest except for Peter who followed at a distance into the courtyard of the high priest. In John once again the narrator manages to still have Peter there (since some of these tradition could not be easily written out) but again gives privilege to the "other disciple".

#### Mark 14:53-54

They took Jesus to the high priest; and all the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes were assembled.

Peter had followed him at a distance, right into the courtyard of the high priest; and he was sitting with the guards, warming himself at the fire.

#### Luke 22:54-55

Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest's house.

But Peter was following at a distance. When they had kindled a fire in the middle of the courtyard and sat down together, Peter sat among them. (Luke 22:55)

#### Matthew 26:57-58

Those who had arrested Jesus took him to Caiaphas the high priest, in whose house the scribes and the elders had gathered.

But Peter was following him at a distance, as far as the courtyard of the high priest; and going inside, he sat with the guards in order to see how this would end.

#### John 18:15-16

Simon Peter and another disciple followed Jesus. Since **that disciple was known to the high priest**, he went with Jesus into the courtyard of the high priest, but Peter was standing outside at the gate. So the other disciple, who was known to the high priest, went out, spoke to the woman who guarded the gate, and brought Peter in.

John's Gospel gives the 'other disciple' a distinctive position. It knows the story as the Synoptic Gospels present it and wishes to promote a different perspective which promotes this "other disciple". The sponsor/s of John's Gospel display their allegiance to their leader whose importance they felt had been somewhat neglected in the Synoptic tradition (and the importance of Peter overplayed). One way this is done is to neglect the type of narratives that the Synoptics provided by ignoring the parables and the healing stories they relay.

Again, the Synoptics specify that no male disciples were present at the crucifixion because they had all fled, but John's Gospel states that there was one male disciple who remained to witness the crucifixion (Jn 19:35).

### APPENDIX III “You Will Name Him”

καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ  
καὶ τέξῃ υἰὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.  
And behold you will conceive in womb  
and will bear a son and you will call his name  
Jesus. (Lk 1:31)

Is easily transferred to a third person reference by Matthew who has corrected the angel’s visitation more suitably to Joseph (by means of a dream):

τέξεται δὲ υἰὸν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν  
and she will bear a son and you will call his name Jesus. (Mt 1:21)

Matthew is either: 1) taking pains to stress that Joseph will be the one to name the child, or, 2) he exhibits some fatigue in copying Luke’s account which contains second person references throughout.

Perhaps there are strong reasons for the former argument, that Matthew is suggesting that *Joseph* be the one to name Jesus. After all, it was John’s *father* in Luke who had named John (Lk 1:62-63).

On my count, 16 out of the 36 child naming instances in the Hebrew Bible are done by the mother. This is not strong evidence for a father naming majority considering that Esau was named by his *parents* (Gen 25:25) and it is the *women* from the neighborhood who name Obed (the grandfather of David) in Ruth 4:17. Thus there is an even count on both male and female sides. However, it seems that most of the child naming in Genesis that is done by women, is especially being narrated this way when the focus is already on the women as when Jacob’s wives (Leah and Rachel) name their sons because this is part of the competition being expressed in the narrative between the two women (29:32-35:18).

To tip the scales in favour of Matthew’s deliberate change to having Joseph name the child, one needs to look closer to home—Matthew’s own setting. In Matthew’s narrative, only Joseph is active while Mary is completely passive. Thus it is very likely that it is Matthew’s own emphasis being given in Mt 1:21. Translators are therefore correct in translating the third person singular aorist verb in Mt 1:25 “*he* called his name Jesus”.

The verbal similarity between Mt 1:21 and Lk 1:31 is still striking which is why Goodacre takes it as evidence that Luke has read Matthew!

## Bibliography

- Augustine. "The Harmony of the Gospels." Book II, Chapter 19.45. Ed. Philip Schaff. *Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol. VI, Saint Augustin: Sermon on the Mount, Harmony of the Gospels, Homilies on the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956.
- Bellinzoni, Jr. Arthur J. (Ed.), *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Boring, M. E. "Matthew." *The New Interpreters Bible: A Commentary in Twelve Volumes* vol. VIII (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993).
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1998.
- Didache*. Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist." Trans. Robert Morgan. In, *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Ed. Graham Stanton. London: SPCK, 1983.
- Dungan, David Laird. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. ABRL, New York: DoubleDay 1999.
- Dungan, David L. (Ed.) *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard—W. R. Farmer—F. Neiryneck*. BETL, 95; Leuven: Leuven University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1990.
- Farmer, William R. "The Present State of the Synoptic Problem." At, <http://www.colby.edu/rel/2gh/catalog.html> accessed 12.3.2001
- Farmer, William R. *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knowx Press, 1994.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Priority of Mark and The 'Q' Source in Luke." In, *Jesus and Man's Hope*. Vol. 1. Ed. David G. Buttrick. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970. 1:131-170.
- Goodacre, Mark *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

- Goodacre, Mark. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. The Biblical Seminar, 80; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Goulder, Michael. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Griesbach, J. J. *A Demonstration that the whole of the Gospel of Mark was extracted from the Commentaries and Matthew and Luke*. Translated as, "A Demonstration that Mark Was Written after Matthew and Luke." Trans. Bernard Orchard. In *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*. Ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. 103-135.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Gundry, Robert Horton. *The Use of The Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. London: SCM Press, 2000.
- Huggins, Ronald V. "Matthean Posteriority: A Preliminary Proposal," *Novum Testamentum* vol. XXXIV (1992), 1-22.
- Hunter, A. M. *Introducing the New Testament*. Revised Edition. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- Kümmel, Werner George. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. Howard C. Kee, London: SCM Press, 1975.
- Lockton, W. *The Resurrection and Other Gospel Narratives, and, The Narratives of the Virgin Birth: Two Essays*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1924.
- McLoughlin, S. "An Approach to the Synoptic Problem." S.T.L.thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1963.
- McNeile, A. H. *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927; 1953; 1957.
- Morgenthaler, R. *Statistische Synopse*. Zuerich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1971.
- Neiryneck, Frans. *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction*. Revised Edition; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988.

- Neville, David J. *Arguments From Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique*. New Gospel Studies 7; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1994.
- Neville, David J. *Mark's Gospel—Prior or Posterior?: A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order*. JSNTSS 222; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- O'Malley, William J. *Matthew, Mark, Luke & You*. Allen, Texas: Thomas More Publishing, 1996.
- Parker, Pierson. *The Gospel Before Mark* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1953).
- Lindsey, Robert Lisle. *A Hebrew Transaltion of the Gospel of Mark: Greek-Hebrew Diglot with English Introduction*. Baptist House Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, n.d. 1969]
- Rollston, Christopher A.(Ed.). *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*. Harrisburg; PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Rosché, Theodore R. "The Words of Jesus and the Future of the 'Q' Hypothesis." *JBL* 79 (1960): 210-220.
- Sanders E. P. and M. Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM, 1989.
- Sandmel, Samuel A *Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*. Augmented Edition. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Schmithals, W. *Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien*. Berlin and New York, 1985.
- Simons, E. *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthaëus benutzt?* Bonn, 1980.
- Stein, Robert H. *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker House Books, 1987.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Personal Reflections on the Goulder Symposium: An Afterword." In, *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*. Ed. Christopher A. Rollston. Harrisburg; PA: Trinity Press International, 2002. 131-136.
- Stoldt, Hans-Herbert. *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis*. Trans. Ed. Donald L. Niewyk; Macon GA: Mercer University Press, 1980.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "The Existence of Q." in, *The Gospel Behind the Gospels; Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald A. Piper. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "Synoptic Problem." *ABD*, VI (New York: DoubleDay, 1992), 263-270.

- Wallace, Daniel. "The Synoptic Problem." At,  
<http://www.bible.org/docs/soapbox/synoptic.htm>  
accessed 21.01.2002
- West, Jr, H. P. "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew." *NTS* 14  
(1967-1968): 75-96.
- Wilson, Brian E. "Synoptic Format Phenomena." A talk presented by at the 2001  
International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature at the Pontifical  
Gregorian University, Rome. At,  
<http://homepage.ntlworld.com/brenda.wilson99/rome.doc>  
accessed 9.7.2002
- Vaganay, L. *Le problème synoptique: Une hypothèse de travail* (Bibliothèque de  
théologie, 3/1; Paris: Desclée, 1954), 294-295.
- Wilson, Brian E. "The Logia Translation Hypothesis." At,  
<http://www.twonh.demon.co.uk/>  
accessed 15.01.2002
- Wilson, Brian E. Subject: a hybrid hypothesis. Tue Oct 6, 1998. At,  
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/synoptic-1/message/1056>  
accessed 17.07.2002
- Witherington, III, Ben *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Edinburgh: T & T  
Clark, 1994.