

Bibliographia. Annotated Bibliographies by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: rc@ontology.co

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (Kni - Mey)

Contents

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

Studies (mainly from 1964) in alphabetical order:

1: A - Bro

2: Buc - Day

3: De - Fee

4: Fit - Gou

5: Gre - Klo

6: Kni - Mey (current page)

7: Mic - Pat

8: Pea - Row

9: San - Tri

10: Tuc - Z

Bibliography of studies on Synopsis - Concordances - Harmonies of the Gospels

N.B. *Some abstracts will be added in the near future.*

Studies on the Synoptic Problem

1. Knight, Christopher. 2017. "The Synoptic Problem: Some Methodological Considerations and a New Hypothesis." *Heythrop Journal* no. 58:247-261. Abstract: "Michael Goulder's analysis of the predominant understanding of the relationship between the synoptic gospels is assessed in terms of the philosophy of science, and more nuanced criteria for assessing the rationality of synoptic study are developed, especially in relation to historical plausibility. A new hypothesis is proposed, which has claims to greater historical plausibility than the two-source hypothesis. While Luke is still seen as being based on Mark and Q, it is argued that these two documents were not a source for Matthew, but were derived from an early version of its text and used initially for didactic purposes. The advantages of this hypothesis are urged, especially in relation to Mark's 'missing ending'."
2. Knoppers, Gary N. 2009. "The Synoptic Problem? An Old Testament Perspective." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* no. 19:11-34.
3. Knox, John. 1987. "Marcion's Gospel and the Synoptic Problem." In *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church: Essays in Honor of William R Farmer*, edited by Sanders, Ed Parish, 25-31. Macon GA: Mercer University Press.

4. Knox, Wilfred L. 1953. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels: Volume One: St Mark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Posthumously edited by Henry Chadwick.
5. ———. 1953. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels: Volume Two: St Luke and St Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Posthumously edited by Henry Chadwick.
6. Koester, Helmut. 1983. "History and Development of Mark's Gospel (From Mark to Secret Mark and "Canonical" Mark)." In *Colloquy on New Testament Studies: A Time for Reappraisal and Fresh Approaches*, edited by Corley, Bruce, 35-85. Macon GA: Mercer University Press.
7. ———. 1990. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.
8. Köstenberger, Andreas J., Kellum, L. Scott, and Quarles, Charles L. 2016. *The Cradle, the Cross, and the Crown: An Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: B&H Publishing Group.
Second edition (First edition 2009).
Chapter 3: *Jesus and the relationship between the Gospels: The Transmission of Gospel Traditions*.
9. Kowalczyk, Andzej. 2013. *The Synoptic Problem*. Pelplin: Bernardinum.
10. Kudasiewicz, Józef. 1996. *The Synoptic Gospels Today*. New York: Alba House.
11. Kümmel, Werner Georg. 1975. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon.
Translated by Howard C. Kee.
Part One: The Formation of the New Testament Writings; A. The Narrative Books; I. The Synoptic Gospels and the Acts; § 5. The Synoptic Problem, pp. 38-79.
12. ———. 1985. "In Support of Markan Priority." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 53-62. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint of "Attempt at a Solution of the Synoptic Problem", *Introduction to the New Testament*, Nashville: Abingdon Press 1973, pp. 56-63.
13. ———. 1985. "In Support of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 227-243. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint of "Attempt at a Solution to the Synoptic Problem", in *Introduction to the New Testament*, Nashville: Abingdon Press 1973, pp. 63-67.
14. Labahn, Michael. 2008. "Historical Criticism (or Gospels as Sources)." In *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*, edited by Craig, Evans A., 280-296. New York: Routledge.
15. Labahn, Michael, and Schmidt, Andreas, eds. 2001. *Jesus, Mark, and Q. The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
Contents: Preface 7; Abbreviations 8; List of Contributors 12; Andreas Schmidt: Introduction 14
Part I. Mark and Q
Harry T. Fleddermann: Mark's Use of Q: The Beelzebul Controversy and the Cross Saying 17; Jens Schröter: The Son of Man as the Representative of God's Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q 34;
Part II. The Historical Jesus in New Research
Michael Labahn: Introduction 70;
A. Recent Trends in the Historical and Sociological Portrait of Jesus
David S. Du Tort: Redefining Jesus: Current Trends in Jesus Research 82; Markus Ohler: Jesus as Prophet: Remarks on Terminology 125; Tom Holmen: The Jewishness of Jesus in the Third Quest' 143; Craig E. Evans: The New Quest for

- Jesus and the New Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls 163; F. Gerlad Downing: The Jewish Cynic Jesus 184;
 B. Theological and Hermeneutical Investigations into the Proclamation of Jesus Marius Reiser: Eschatology in the Proclamation of Jesus 216; Peter Balla: What Did Jesus Think about his Approaching Death? 239; Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza: The Rhetorics and Politics of Jesus Research: A Critical Feminist Perspective 259; Index of References 283; Index of Authors 292-296.
16. Lambrecht, Jan. 1995. "The Great Commandment Pericope and Q." In *The Gospel behind the Gospels. Current Studies on Q*, edited by Piper, Roland Allen, 73-96. Leiden: Brill.
17. ———. 2003. "The Great Commandment Pericope (Mark 12,28-34 and Q 10,25-28)." In *Understanding What One Reads: New Testament Essays*, edited by Koperski, Veronica, 80-101. Leuven: Peeters.
18. Landry, David. 2015. "Reconsidering the Date of Luke in Light of the Farrer Hypothesis." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 160-190. London: T & T Clark.
- "Conclusion
 The final dating technique that is applicable to the gospel of Luke is consideration of the constellation of ideas found in the text and their consonance or dissonance with a particular historical context. Many of the scholars who argue for a late date for Luke do so on the basis of this criterion, claiming that (a) Luke's ideas clearly reflect a later stage in the development of Christianity than Mark and Matthew, and (b) that the texts whose ideas are most similar to Luke's were all written in the second century. What is more interesting is the fact that even those scholars who argue for an early date often admit that Luke's thought fits better in a second-century context than a first-century one."
 (...)
 "The fact is that the gospel of Luke (and Acts) display(s) almost unmistakable signs of having been written after 115 CE. Luke reflects know ledge of all the texts one would expect him to be familiar with if he wrote the gospel this late: Mark, Matthew, John, Josephus, and Paul. The terminus a quo for Luke cannot be earlier than about 100 CE. But no other author quotes from Luke until Marcion or Justin. Hence the *terminus ad quem* for Luke lies somewhere between 125 and 160 CE."
 (pp. 189-190)
19. Lang, Marijke Héleñe de. 2020. "The Decline of the Gospel Harmony: Loss or Gain?" In *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 19-36. New York: Bloomsbury.
- "The year 1774 is usually marked as an important year for New Testament scholarship. It was the year Johann Jakob Griesbach published his gospel synopsis, a presentation of the texts of the first three gospels in columns side by side. The work was meant as the first portion of an edition of the New Testament. The synopsis was reissued in his edition of the whole New Testament, which appeared in 1776. The importance of Griesbach's synopsis was not that it was a synopsis. In the early modern period, apart from a host of gospel harmonies, quite a number of gospel synopses had been published. Well-known examples are the synopses published by Calvin in 1555 and Jean Le Clerc in 1699. But Griesbach's publication of 1774 had one striking new feature: no attempt was made to reconstruct the life of Jesus.
 (...)
 Understandably, several experts on the history of the Synoptic Question have supposed that Griesbach's synopsis was also the point of departure from which he developed his solution of the synoptic problem, in his case the Two Gospel Hypothesis. It is true that no other synopsis before his time had ever been meant for such a purpose.
 (...)

- In this chapter, I would like to address two questions. The first is: Was the decline of the gospel harmony after the publication of Griesbach's synopsis a loss or a gain? This entails the issue of how the genre of the old-fashioned harmony related historically to the new genre of the "unharmonized" synopsis.
- My second question is: How clear-cut exactly was the "paradigm shift" in synoptic studies that was brought about by Griesbach's synopsis? Or, to rephrase this question more strongly: Can we speak at all of a turning point or paradigm shift with regard to Griesbach's synopsis?" (pp. 19-20, note omitted)
20. Lieu, Judith. 2011. "Marcion and the Synoptic Problem." In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem, Oxford Conference, April 2008. Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*, edited by Foster, Paul, Gregory, Andrew F., Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 731-751. Leuven: Peeters.
 21. Lindemann, Andreas. 2011. "The Apostolic Fathers and the Synoptic Problem." In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem, Oxford Conference, April 2008. Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*, edited by Foster, Paul, Gregory, Andrew F., Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 689-719. Leuven: Peeters.
 22. Lindsey, Robert L. 1963. "A Modified Two-Document Theory of the Synoptic Dependence and Interdependence." *Novum Testamentum* no. 6:239-263. Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 7-31.
 23. Lindsey, Robert Lisle. 1969. *A Hebrew Translation of the Gospel of Mark. Greek-Hebrew Diglot*. Jerusalem: Dugith. English introduction by R. L. Lindsey; foreword by David Flusser.
 24. ———. 1984. *A New Approach to the Synoptic Gospels*. Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers.
 25. Linnemann, Eta. 1992. *Is There a Synoptic Problem? Rethinking the Literary Dependence of the First Three Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Baker. Translated from German by R. W. Yarbrough.
 26. ———. 1996. "The Lost Gospel of Q—Fact Or Fantasy?" *Trinity Journal* no. 17:3-18.
 27. Linton, O. 1972. "The Q Problem Reconsidered." In *Studies In New Testament And Early Christian Literature: Essays In Honor Of Allen P. Wikgren*, edited by Aune, David E., 43-59. Leiden: Brill.
 28. Loader, William R. G. 2011. "Attitudes to Judaism and the Law and Synoptic Relations." In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* edited by Foster, Paul, Gregory, Andrew F., Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 347-370. Leuven: Peeters.
 29. Longstaff, Thomas R. W. 1975. "The Minor Agreements: An Examination of the Basic Argument." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* no. 37:184-192.
 30. ———. 1977. *Evidence of Conflation in Mark?: A Study in the Synoptic Problem*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
 31. ———. 1983. "Crisis and Christology: The Theology of Mark." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 373-392. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 32. Lowe, Malcolm. 1982. "The Demise of Arguments from Order for Markan Priority." *Novum Testamentum* no. 24:27-36.
 33. ———. 1982. "From the Parable of the Vineyard to a pre-synoptic source." *New Testament Studies* no. 28:257-263.
 34. Lowe, Malcolm, and Flusser, David. 1983. "Evidence Corroborating a Modified Proto-Matthean Synoptic Theory." *New Testament Studies* no. 29:25-47.

35. Ludlum, John H. 1958. "New Light on the Synoptic Problem (Part I)." *Christianity Today* no. 3:6-9.
 "What is called the "modern" and the "critical" study of the gospels began in earnest about 170 years ago. Through a series of fortunate circumstances the writer has sometimes been led—sometimes impelled—to examine in detail for himself nearly the entire course of development of "critical" or "scientific" gospel study. A thirteen years' investigation of this little known field yields a very different impression of it than the books and the popularizers give us. Real acquaintance with such work leads also to a markedly different evaluation of it than the current one. The results of such study would normally find embodiment in monographs, and be put on a library shelf to collect dust. But in the present case the results have an unusual practical value for the Church and for its ministers. We will say no more of this, but will allow the reader to judge of this matter for himself."
36. ———. 1958. "New Light on the Synoptic Problem (Part II)." *Christianity Today* no. 3:10-14.
37. ———. 1959. "Are We Sure of Mark's Priority? (Part I)." *Christianity Today* no. 3:11-14.
 Abstract: "Is Matthew, our first canonical Gospel, a genuine and authentic production of an apostle? The answer to this question is at stake in the debate on the validity of the Mark-hypothesis. The question of Matthew's authenticity is tied to the question whether it was known and used by Mark, or Mark was used by its writer. It is therefore of importance to decide whether Mark came first, as the Mark-hypothesis holds, or whether Matthew was written first.
 The writer of "More Light on the Synoptics" (*Christianity Today*, March 2 issue) tries to prove the Mark-hypothesis. He claims that Mark was written first and was used and adapted by the writer of our Matthew. His attempted proof of the priority of Mark is the most important part of his article. Therefore we will consider it first. We meet here a kind of argument often given for the Mark-theory. We are firmly convinced that it is not, and indeed in the nature of the case can never become, a valid proof. After pulling the attempted proof to the ground four distinct times by four separate handles, we will explain why, in our opinion, no one should accept the same article's special pleading for Matthew's genuineness and authenticity. And lastly, we have a point to clarify. Some readers of *CHRISTIANITY TODAY* concluded that the present writer argued ("New Light on the Synoptic Gospels") for totally independent origination of our first three Gospels. But this was not so."
38. ———. 1959. "Are We Sure of Mark's Priority? (Part II)." *Christianity Today* no. 3:9-10.
39. Lührmann, Dieter. 1989. "The Gospel of Mark and the Sayings Collection Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 108:51-71.
40. Luomanen, Petri. 2013. "From Mark and Q to Matthew. An Experiment in Evolutionary Analysis." In *Mark and Matthew II. Comparative Readings: Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*, edited by Becker, Eve-Marie and Runesson, Anders, 37-73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
41. Luz, Ulrich. 2011. "Looking at Q through the Eyes of Matthew." In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* edited by Foster, P., Gregory, A., Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 571-589. Leuven: Peeters.
42. MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. 2011. "The Synoptic Problem and Literary Mimesis: The Case of the Frothing Demoniac." In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* edited by Foster, Paul, Gregory, Andrew F., Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 509-522. Leuven: Peeters.
43. ———. 2012. *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logos of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

44. MacDonald, Dennis Ronald, and Van Dore, James R. . 2019. *From the Earliest Gospel (Q+) to the Gospel of Mark: Solving the Synoptic Problem with Mimesis Criticism*. Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic.
45. MacEwen, Robert K. 2015. *Matthean Posteriority: An Exploration of Matthew's Use of Mark and Luke As a Solution to the Synoptic Problem*. London: T & T Clark.
46. Mack, Burton L. 1992. "Q and the Gospel of Mark: Revising Christian Origins." *Semeia* no. 55:15-39.
Abstract: "The importance of Q for reimagining Christian origins can hardly be overstated. Recent studies in Q have identified layers of literary tradition from which stages of the social history of its tradents can be reconstructed. The movement that comes into view is markedly different from the kerygmatic congregation that scholars have customarily imagined as the first social formation of Christianity. Since the traditional picture of "the earliest Christian community" is largely dependent upon a conflation of Pauline texts and the Gospel of Mark, scholars are now forced to consider the relation of Q to Mark and Paul. This essay takes up one of these challenges by focusing upon the relation of Q to Mark. It argues for the priority of Jesus movements like that reflected in Q and explains the Markan divergences from Q in terms of Mark's own plan for his gospel. Finally, the implications for a reconstruction of Christian origins are sketched and some consequences for New Testament studies in general are drawn."
47. ———. 1993. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco.
48. MacLean, Gilmour. 1948. "A Critical Re-Examination of Proto-Luke." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 67:143-152.
49. Maio, Eugene. 1959. "The Synoptic Problem and the Vaganay Hypothesis." *Irish Theological Quarterly* no. 26:167-181.
50. Malan, Gert J. 2014. "Is rewritten Bible/Scripture the solution to the Synoptic Problem?" *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* no. 70:1-10.
51. Manson, Thomas Walter. 1949. *The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM Press.
52. Marshall, Ian Howard. 1984. "How to solve the Synoptic Problem: Luke 11:43 and Parallels." In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke. Vol. 1*, edited by Weinrich, William C, 313-325. Macon: Mercer University Press.
53. Martin, R. A. 1987. *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
54. Matson, Mark A. 2004. "Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 43-70. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
55. Mattila, Sharon Lea. 1994. "A Problem Still Clouded: Yet Again -- Statistics and "Q"." *Novum Testamentum* no. 36:313-329.
Reprinted in: David E. Orton. (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 226-242.
56. ———. 1995. "A Question Too Often Neglected." *New Testament Studies* no. 41:199-217.
57. ———. 2004. "Negotiating the Clouds Around Statistics and "Q": A Rejoinder and Independent Analysis." *Novum Testamentum* no. 46:105-131.
58. McCool, Francis J. 1956. "Revival of Synoptic Source-Criticism." *Theological Studies* no. 17:459-493.
59. McIver, Robert. 1997. "Implications of New Data Pertaining to the Problem of Synoptic Relationships." *Australian Biblical Review* no. 45:20-39.

60. ———. 2011. *Memory, Jesus, and the Synoptic Gospels*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
61. McIver, Robert, and Carroll, Marie. 2002. "Experiments to Develop Criteria for Determining the Existence of Written Sources, and Their Potential Implications for the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 121:667-687.
62. McKnight, Scot. 1988. *Interpreting the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
63. ———. 2001. "A Generation who Knew not Streeter: the Case for Markan Priority." In *Rethinking the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Black, David Alan and Beck, David R., 65-95. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic.
64. McLoughlin, Michael. 2009. "Synoptic Pericope Order." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 85:71-97.
65. ———. 2011. "Listing the Minor Agreements." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 87:201-228.
66. ———. 2018. "Using the Minor Agreements." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* no. 84:93-114.
 Abstract: "According to the Two Source theory (2ST) Matthew and Luke derived their triple tradition material by copying Mark. But occasionally the others agree against Mark. These agreements are slight, but they could suggest that Mark was not the only source. Authors who contest the 2ST frequently cite these minor agreements as evidence against that theory. An attempt is made here to identify the most weighty cases. Forty were found. These are explained as independent reactions by Matthew and Luke to the Markan text, so that the 2ST is safe from objection. In addition, rival source theories are positively discouraged."
67. McNicol, Allan J. 1987. "The Two Gospel Hypothesis Under Scrutiny: A Response to C. M. Tuckett's. Analysis of Recent Neo-Griesbachian Gospel Criticism." *Perkins School of Theology Journal* no. 40:5-13.
68. McNicol, Allan James. 1990. "The Composition of the Synoptic Eschatological Discourse." In *The Interrelations of the Gospels. A Symposium led by M.-E. Boismard - W.R. Farmer - F. Neirynck, Jerusalem 1984*, edited by Dungan, David L., 157-200. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
69. ———. 2009. "Has Goulder Sunk Q?: On Linguistic Characteristics and the Synoptic Problem." In *Resourcing New Testament Studies: Literary, Historical, and Theological Essays in Honor of David L. Dungan*, edited by McNicol, Allan J., Peabody, David B. and Subramanian, J. Samuel 46-65. New York: T & T Clark.
70. McNicol, Allan James, Dungan, David L., and Peabody, David Barrett. 1996. *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press.
71. Mealand, David L. 2011. "Is There Stylometric Evidence for Q?" *New Testament Studies* no. 57:483-507.
72. ———. 2017. "The Synoptic Problem and Statistics: A Review." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 40:236-241.
73. Meijboom, Hajo Uden. 1993. *A History and Critique of the Origin of the Marcan Hypothesis, 1835-1866. A Contemporary Report Rediscovered*. Louvain: Peeters. A translation with introduction and notes of *Geschiednis en critiek der Marcushypothese (History and Critique of the Marcan Hypothesis)*, translated and edited by John J. Kiwiet.
 "The synoptic problem has vehemently disturbed the minds of biblical scholars ever since the controversial publication of *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet* by David Friedrich Strauss in 1835-1836 (ET *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 1846). The author compared the reaction to his book to "a wailing of terrified women after

hearing the sound of a gunshot in their vicinity.” Even deep into the American frontier, revival preachers for more than a century afterward would blast the supposed demonic attack of higher criticism. Strauss not only questioned the historical data of the New Testament, but its theological content as well. The Gospel, he contended, did not give the message of Jesus in the first place, but rather the historical interpretations of the authors.

Crucial to this confrontation was the “two-document hypothesis,” also called the “Marcan hypothesis.” The opponents of the Tübingen School, which followed Strauss, saw in this hypothesis a valid argument for the historicity of the data presented by the synoptic gospels. They interpreted a statement by Papias(2) as a reference to two historic documents, namely an earlier form of Mark and a Logia (“Sayings”) document, with which the later hypothetical Quelle (“Source”) or Q-document is sometimes identified. Thus the Marcian hypothesis claimed to defend the historical reliability of the New Testament. This interpretation of history clashed with that of the Tübingen school, whose adherents attempted to discover the historical tendencies of the gospel writers, a view later described as “Tendency Criticism”.

Over against a documentary history came a doctrinal history, which reflected the situation during the decades following the cross and the resurrection. The Hegelian dialectic provided a convenient pattern for this history, as Professor Bo Reicke has described? The Jewish original Gospel of Matthew was counteracted by the Hellenistic Gospel of Luke, which Mark—as the new catholic gospel—then synthesized.

Conservative scholars welcomed Marcian priority, while liberal theologians, valuing the ethical norms of the Sermon on the Mount, claimed traditional Matthean priority. The debate was fanned by the sociopolitical tensions of early mid-nineteenth-century Germany. Conservative forces wanted to maintain and extend the Prussian establishment, while liberal forces hoped to achieve a more democratic pattern of government and society. Originally the center of the debate was the newly established University of Berlin, founded by the Prussian King Friedrich Wilhelm III in order to revamp the German spirit by establishing a bulwark against the rising revolutionary tide of the French Revolution. Two of the leading protagonists were Georg F. W. Hegel and Friedrich E. D. Schleiermacher." (pp. XIII-XIV)

(1) See below, Hajo U. Meijboom, "History and Critique of the Marcian Hypothesis," 11.

(2) See below, Meijboom, "History and Critique," 17, cf. 67ff.

74. Meredith, Anthony. 1984. "The Evidence of Papias for the Priority of Matthew." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 187-196. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

"The central purpose of this essay is to examine the external evidence for the priority of Matthew; and as the main evidence of this type is arguably, though not I suspect demonstrably, to be found in the fragments of Papias largely preserved in Eusebius, something must be said about the reliability as distinct from the exact import of the evidence he provides. It has become the fashion to decry Papias himself and consequently the evidence which comes from him by means of an argument that can be reduced to syllogistic form somewhat as follows.

(i) All the available external evidence for the independence and priority of Matthew is derived from Papias.

(ii) But Papias was a 'pinhead, as well as a 'bottle neck'. (For this minor Eusebius's words at *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.39.13 are taken as conclusive evidence.)

(iii) Therefore we can afford to disregard all the external evidence in favour of Matthean priority." (p. 187)

(...)

"I have implied or more than implied in the above argument that not all that Eusebius has to say on the subject of Papias need be taken at its face value.

Valuable though he is as an historian, he is also a propagandist. In his efforts to

portray the empire as God's work on earth and as reaching its culmination he could not afford to treat favourably those writers or writings which told a different story. Hence the silence on the Montanist writings of Tertullian and the apocalyptic strain in Hippolytus. Hence the fondness for the spiritualizing versions of the gospel to be had in Origen and Dionysius. Hence too the hostility to Papias. My conclusion is that to accept the superior dismissal by Eusebius of Papias as *σφόδρα μικρός ὢν τοῦ νοῦν* is to adopt a less than serious attitude to the historiographical problems that H.E. 3.39.12-17 raise." (p. 195)

75. Metzger, Bruce M. 1950. "Tatian's Diatessaron and a Persian Harmony of the Gospels." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 69:261-250.
76. Meynell, Hugo. 1967. "The Synoptic Problem: Some Unorthodox Solutions." *Theology* no. 70:386-397.