

Chapter 1 : The Synoptic Gospels

The Synoptic Gospels A careful comparison of the four Gospels reveals that Matthew, Mark and Luke are noticeably similar, while John is quite different. The first three Gospels agree extensively in language, in the material they include, and in the order in which events and sayings from the life of Christ are recorded.

If the three Synoptic Gospels are totally independent of each other in origin and development, why do they resemble each other so closely, even to exact verbal agreement in many places? If, on the other hand, they have a literary relationship to each other, how can they be three independent witnesses to the deeds and teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ? Up until the eighteenth century the church had been mainly concerned to explain the differences between the three accounts. But now attention became directed to the agreement in the accounts. How were they to be explained? But since Matthew and Luke also have a considerable amount of material in common that is not derived from Mark, it was postulated that they both made use of another unknown early source. Streeter posited a four-source hypothesis. He limited the Q source to that material used by both Matthew and Luke but not derived from Mark. When the contents of the hypothetical Q document are culled from Matthew and Luke i. What is true with regard to the Q document also applies to the posited M document supposedly used by Matthew. When this material is isolated it is found to consist of some of the sayings of Jesus, the birth narratives unique to Matthew, and a few other narratives. Again, we must bear in mind that the existence of M is even more hypothetical than Q. All that has been said about the hypothetical Q and M documents also applies to L, the supposed source unique to Luke. It is assumed that Luke possessed yet another source containing the infancy narratives. We may summarize this portion of the present article with the words of D. The simple two-source theory had become a conglomerate of many sources before it developed into a more specific four-source theory, which in turn has never been quite convincing. Indeed, most scholars would admit that no thoroughgoing source theory has yet been produced that answers all the major problems in these Gospels p. Where there is a strongly attested tradition, it should be assumed that such tradition is probably correct, unless it can be proved wrong. When tradition gives its testimony e. Hand in hand with this, if criticism rejects a given tradition, then criticism is obligated to furnish some adequate account as to how that tradition originated, and, therefore, why it is invalid. Too often, if a tradition does not accord with modern theories about any of the Gospels, critical scholars have merely dismissed the tradition as the guesswork of an ancient writer. Such arbitrary dismissal of a disliked or inconvenient tradition without providing adequate reasons for such dismissal is inadmissible for good scholarship. It may be assumed as a starting point that most of the well-attested traditions were based, at least partially, on fact. It is generally assumed that the oral period stretched over about thirty years; i. It would seem reasonable to suppose that for a time oral teaching was the main means of communicating the gospel message and Christian teaching, but that it was supplemented by some literary productions. Here one may consider the Jewish oral tradition and its method of transmission. In his careful study, B. Gerhardsson contends that rabbinical teachers not only taught traditional material, but taught it in set forms and vocabulary that the pupils were expected to learn by heart. Since the earliest Christian preachers were Jews, Gerhardsson envisages that they would have followed the rabbinical practice. From this it follows that a basic oral tradition would be formulated that could be transmitted through catechetical instruction. Another factor that needs serious consideration is the possibility of the use of written notes as an aid to memory. Gerhardsson produces some evidence that suggests such notes were used by Jewish oral tradition and it seems quite natural to suppose that the Christian community would not have neglected to use aids of this kind. If this, indeed, is the case, the Christian tradition may have been on its way to a stage of written records long before the Gospels were produced. Such written notes and records would have proved to be invaluable when the Gospels came to be written. This brings us to the next important consideration: Were the writers of the Gospels authors in the fullest sense of the word, or were they merely editors and arrangers of a conglomerate of existing traditions, both oral and written? It is equally evident that these writings were based on reports of eyewitnesses and ministers of the word. We may assume that each Gospel writer would chose from eyewitness accounts the material that was most relevant to his own particular

purpose and intended audience. If two Gospel writers recorded the same incident from the same eyewitnesses a large measure of agreement would be expected, even in the verbal expressions of the narrative. Luke seems to suggest that he is writing an independent account; he claims quite specifically to have made a thorough investigation himself on the same basis of reliable sources as did his predecessors. Important Factors to Bear in Mind 1. The written Gospels were accepted at a very early period as authoritative. Furthermore, their authority was inherent and not imposed upon them. In other words, they were accepted because they were believed to have been apostolic in origin, not because the church arbitrarily bestowed its sanction upon them. Their claims to authenticity must, therefore, have been beyond dispute. But was there a period before the end of the first century when they were not regarded as authoritative? Probability is against the notion of non-authoritative initial circulation. If this had been the case, it would involve the assumption that at some stage in its primitive history each Gospel acquired an authority that it did not previously possess. It is difficult to imagine how such a process could so soon have led to unanimous acceptance of each of them. The Gospels concern a unique Person and must therefore themselves be in some measure unique. The Gospels are essentially Christo-centric and there are no parallels to this. The very uniqueness of Christ demands the possibility that the records of His life and teaching will possess unique characteristics. Too often Gospel criticism has begun from some point outside the phenomena of the Gospels themselves and the latter have been forced into a mold that they were never meant to fill. The Gospel material formed the basis of Christian preaching and teaching and was not the consequence of those Christian activities. Few scholars would deny that the early missionaries must have possessed certain Christian traditions that were agreed upon and which they were able to impart to others. It seems most natural to assume that the Christian traditions were transmitted because they were believed to be authentic and were most probably regarded as authentic in the form in which they were transmitted. Whatever part the Christian community played in the process of transmission, it is inconceivable that the community created either the sayings of Jesus or the narratives about Him. The final consideration is the impossibility of explaining the origins of the Gospels apart from the activity of the Holy Spirit. But the operation of the Holy Spirit in Gospel origins is a vital factor, indeed, the vital factor, in the historical situation. The clear promise of Jesus that the Holy Spirit would teach the disciples all things and bring to their remembrance all that He had said to them John It may first be asserted that the Holy Spirit controlled the traditions. However transmission was made during the pre-literary period, it cannot be supposed that the Holy Spirit would leave this to chance procedures. The next proposition affects the selective processes of the separate Gospel writers. If the Spirit aided memory, it is inconceivable that He did not also control the selection of the material each writer chose to use in writing his particular Gospel. The different emphases of the four Evangelists resulting in different methods of presentation may best be explained by the controlling influence of the Holy Spirit as He employed each one to suit His divine purpose. It is one of the fundamental weaknesses of all thoroughgoing source criticism that little room is left for the dynamic operation of the Spirit of God in the writing of the canonical Gospels. A Tentative Theory of Origins Stage 1: The apostolic preachers gave most prominence to the passion material, but they could not present this narrative in isolation. This may well have been the standard pattern. At the same time as the apostolic preaching, catechetical instruction was being given to the new converts. This would certainly have required some careful arrangement of the teaching material. The major content of the catechesis would most probably have been the sayings of Jesus. Such catechetical instruction may have been in oral form or written form or a mixture of both. It is possible that this early catechesis was closely connected with Matthew and that it existed in its earliest form in Aramaic. The result was a Gospel with more action narrative than teaching discourse. He studied all the written material he was able to gather and interviewed as many eyewitnesses as possible. He appears to have had a copy of Mark, although he may not have come into possession of it until after making an initial draft of his Gospel, consisting of teaching material plus much narrative material. The bulk of the teaching material Luke used was transmitted to him through catechesis, procured mainly while Luke was in Caesarea. It is probable that at first the tendency was for churches to use only one of the three Gospels as authoritative, because all three Gospels would not necessarily circulate in the same area. Why were all three Gospels preserved? Variations of emphasis and content were evidently no barrier to the eventual acceptance of

the three. Here again the governing guidance of the Holy Spirit must not be forgotten. Guided by the Spirit, the churches would recognize those literary productions that were authentically Spirit-given note 1 Corinthians Mark Bible Study Courses Section 1.

Chapter 2 : The Synoptic Gospels Commentary - A Testimony of Jesus Christ

The uncertain relationship between the synoptic gospels is known as "the synoptic problem." The synoptic problem Looking at parallel passages, it's hard to imagine that Matthew, Mark, and Luke don't share a source or sources of some kind.

Jesus thanks his Father Return of the unclean spirit Discourse against the scribes and Pharisees Lament over Jerusalem Unlike triple-tradition material, double-tradition material is very differently arranged in the two gospels. This is consistent with the general pattern of Matthew collecting sayings into large blocks, while Luke does the opposite and intersperses them with narrative. These are termed the major and minor agreements the distinction is imprecise [17] [18]. One example is in the passion narrative, where Mark has simply, "Prophecy! This hypothetical document is termed Q , for the German Quelle, meaning "source". Both Special Matthew and Special Luke include distinct opening infancy narratives and distinct post-resurrection conclusions with Luke continuing the story in his second book Acts. In between, Special Matthew includes mostly parables, while Special Luke includes both parables and healings. Special Luke is notable for containing a greater concentration of Semitisms than any other gospel material. The texts of the three synoptic gospels often agree very closely in wording and order, both in quotations and in narration. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. June Learn how and when to remove this template message The synoptic problem hinges on several interrelated points of controversy: Which gospel was written first? Clearly, where one text draws from another, the source must have been composed first. Did each of the synoptic gospels draw from each of its predecessors? If not, clearly the frequent agreements between the two independent gospels against the third must originate elsewhere. Did any of the gospels draw from some earlier document that has not been preserved e. To what extent did each evangelist draw from personal knowledge, eyewitness accounts, liturgy, or other oral traditions to produce an original written account? Jesus and others quoted in the gospels spoke primarily in Aramaic , but the gospels themselves in their oldest available form are each written in Koine Greek. Who performed the translations, and at what point? How and why did those who put the gospels in their final form expand, abridge, alter, or rearrange their sources? Furthermore, some theories try to explain the relation of the synoptic gospels to John ; to non-canonical gospels such as Thomas , Peter , and Egerton ; to the Didache ; and to lost documents such as the Hebrew logia mentioned by Papias , the Jewish "Christian gospels , and the Gospel of Marcion. Instead of harmonizing them, he displayed their texts side by side, making both similarities and divergences apparent. Griesbach, noticing the special place of Mark in the synopsis, hypothesized Marcan posteriority and advanced as Henry Owen had a few years earlier [26] the two-gospel hypothesis Matthew "Luke. In the nineteenth century, researchers applied the tools of literary criticism to the synoptic problem in earnest, especially in German scholarship. Early work revolved around a hypothetical proto-gospel Ur-Gospel , possibly in Aramaic , underlying the synoptics. From this line of inquiry, however, a consensus emerged that Mark itself served as the principal source for the other two gospels " Marcan priority. In a theory first proposed by Weisse in , the double tradition was explained by Matthew and Luke independently using two sources "thus, the two-source Mark-Q theory "which supplemented Mark with another hypothetical source consisting mostly of sayings. This exemplifies the prevailing scholarship of the time, which saw the canonical gospels as late products, dating from well into the second century, composed by unsophisticated cut-and-paste redactors out of a progression of written sources, and derived in turn from oral traditions and from folklore that had evolved in various communities. Many have independently argued that Luke did make some use of Matthew after all "the Common Sayings Source. Meanwhile, the Augustinian hypothesis has also made a comeback, especially in American scholarship. The Jerusalem school hypothesis has also attracted fresh advocates, as has the Independence hypothesis , which denies documentary relationships altogether.

The "Synoptic Problem" is this: The synoptic gospels, though independently written, must have drawn much of its material from a source or sources also available to one or both of the other two. The above chart shows the literary relationship between the synoptic gospels.

Of what value are they in the account of the life of Jesus Christ? To learn how the four Gospel accounts combine to give rock-solid testimony to Jesus Christ as the Messiah, watch this short video presented by Dave Myers, Foundation Institute instructor. Students of the Bible are well aware that there are four Gospels. Interestingly, three of the accounts are similar in their presentation; and one, the Gospel of John, is quite different from the other three. After all, four men wrote about Jesus , His teachings, His actions and His life on earth. It is important to know not only if they are accurate, but if they provide any help for human beings in the 21st century. What are the synoptic Gospels? Tenney wrote the following regarding the synoptic Gospels: Each writer affords us a special look into the life and teachings of Christ in a different way. One may provide one detail, and another may provide a detail that adds to the account so that the Bible student is able to receive additional insights. These insights give a more complete picture of what Christ was teaching or give details of an event that help us have greater understanding of the heart and mind of Christ. The coincidence of material as among the Synoptics is much higher. Approximately ninety-one per cent of Mark is paralleled in one of the other two gospels or in both. It is the most special Book ever written, and it is essential that every serious Bible student believe in how the Bible was written. All apparent conflicts can be explained when one carefully considers the content and purpose of each writer. The life of Jesus Christ and the words inspired by God to Matthew, Mark and Luke provide humans in the 21st century with eternal words from the Creator and Ruler of the universe. The part that Jesus should have in the lives of all human beings cannot be overstated. The synoptic Gospels provide instruction, inspiration, encouragement and admonition regarding the most important life to ever be flesh and bloodâ€”Jesus Christ, the Son of God. The most important point about the synoptic Gospels The most important point to be made regarding the synoptic Gospels or any other book of the Bible is this: God , through His Holy Spirit, inspired the Bible to be written through human instruments. It provides us with what only God can do for us and what we have as a personal responsibility to do with His help through the Holy Spirit. It is through Him that we have access to God the Father and the path to fulfilling our purpose in life. We encourage you to read and study them carefully and regularly.

Chapter 4 : Overview - The Gospels Compared

The Synoptic Gospels commentary using A Testimony of Jesus Christ. Study the bible online using commentary on The Synoptic Gospels and more! Toggle navigation.

In the Bible where a variety of earlier sources have been quoted, the historian seeks to identify and date those sources used by biblical writers as the first step in evaluating their historical reliability. In other cases, Bible scholars use the way a text is written changes in style, vocabulary, repetitions, and the like to determine what sources may have been used by a biblical author. With some reasonable guesswork it is possible to deduce sources not identified as such e. Some inter-biblical sources can be determined by virtue of the fact that the source is still extant, for example, where the Books of Chronicles quotes or retells the accounts of the books of Samuel and Kings. Documentary hypothesis The documentary hypothesis considers the sources for the Pentateuch the first five books of the Bible , claiming that it derives from four separate sources: It is thought to have been written c. The Elohist E source is characterized with God being called Elohim, and deals more with the kingdom of Israel. The Deuteronomistic D source is characterized by a sermon like style mostly concerned with law. The Priestly P is characterized by a formal style that is mostly concerned with priestly matters. For example, of the two creation stories at the start of Genesis, the first is ascribed to P, while the second the creation of Adam and Eve in chapter 2 is ascribed to J. While the documentary hypothesis has widespread support among biblical scholars, other hypotheses such as the "fragmentary" and "supplementary" have also been proposed[citation needed]. Other cases[edit] The writers of the Tanakh sometimes mention sources they use. These include Acts of Solomon 1 Kings A more complicated and speculative form of source criticism results from critical evaluation of style, vocabulary, reduplication, and discrepancies. An example of this kind of source criticism is found in the book of Ezra-Nehemiah typically treated by biblical scholars as one book where scholars identify four types of source material: It is thus deduced that the writer of Ezra-Nehemiah had access to these four kinds of source material in putting together his book. Source criticism also leads many scholars towards redaction of the book of Isaiah from original multiple authorship. Biblical criticism Source criticism is the search for the original sources which lie behind a given biblical text. Critics noticed that the three Synoptic Gospels, Matthew , Mark and Luke , were very similar, indeed, at times identical. The dominant theory to account for the duplication is called the two-source hypothesis. This suggests that Mark was the first gospel to be written, and that it was probably based on a combination of early oral and written material. Matthew and Luke were written at a later time, and relied primarily on two different sources: This latter document has now been lost, but at least some of its material can be deduced indirectly, namely through the material that is common in Matthew and Luke but absent in Mark. In addition to Mark and Q, the writers of Matthew and Luke made some use of additional sources, which would account for the material that is unique to each of them. There is general consensus among New Testament scholars that the Mark used a variety of sources, most of them written, and that the authors of Matthew and Luke were dependent on some version of Mark plus a lost collection of "sayings" called the Q Document. There is less of a consensus that the writers of the Gospel of John may have used a hypothetical Signs Gospel.

Chapter 5 : Synoptic Gospels Summary - calendrierdelascience.com

The first three gospels - Matthew, Mark and Luke - are known as the synoptic gospels, and they share a number of similarities. However, the three also differ in major ways from John's gospel. Indeed, much of what is found in the fourth gospel is not found in the synoptics. Consider some of the.

Matthew, Mark and Luke. In our present study we will be focusing on the Gospel of Mark, with references to the parallel passages found in Matthew and Luke as well as John. However, in this introductory article we will provide a brief overview of each of the three Synoptic Gospels. The Gospel According to Matthew Authorship The first Gospel is traditionally ascribed to Matthew, a publican or, tax collector whom Jesus called to be one of His twelve disciples. Nowhere in the first Gospel is Matthew explicitly identified as the author, but the early church fathers attributed this Gospel to Matthew the apostle. Furthermore, the language of the Gospel as it has come down to us bears no marks of being a Greek translation of an Aramaic original. It is possible that Matthew also composed a Greek edition for the Gentile converts, perhaps for those living in Antioch in particular. Since the Greek-speaking Gentile converts and churches quickly outstripped the Aramaic-speaking congregations in number both in the region around Palestine and throughout the Roman Empire, the Aramaic original may have perished at an early date. The general agreement among the early church fathers in accepting this Gospel as having been written by Matthew accords well with what we know about the apostle. As a publican he must have been literate and accustomed to taking notes as part of his business activity. This may indicate that the feast was held in the home of the writer of the first Gospel, which would tend to confirm that he is none other than Matthew the apostle and former publican. Date and Place of Composition M. It should be noted, however, that some scholars such as E. The actual place of origination for this Gospel cannot be positively determined, although modern study has tended to view the city of Antioch as the place of composition. Favorable to Antioch is the fact that the church father Ignatius of Antioch, writing early in the second century, shows knowledge of this Gospel. Also, a large Jewish population existed in Antioch dating back to early Hellenistic times. Matthew purposes to show that the major events in the life of Jesus took place in fulfillment of prophecy. The theme of this Gospel is announced by its opening statement: Each Old Testament occurrence of this phrase marks a stage in the development of the Messianic promise. Matthew picks up the genealogy at that point and declares its fulfillment in the person of Jesus M. In all probability there was an apologetic purpose in writing this Gospel. The infancy story, for instance, would answer any charge of illegitimacy against Jesus. The descent into Egypt and the subsequent return to Nazareth would account for the residence of Jesus in Nazareth rather than Bethlehem. We can also detect the apologetic character of some of the details in the resurrection narrative that is unique to Matthew e. Then comes another narrative section, consisting mainly of a number of miracles, followed by the second discourse section, this one dealing with the mission of the Twelve. The next descriptive section deals with the incidents that illustrate the growing opposition to Jesus, this is followed by the third teaching section, the group of parables about the kingdom of God. These events lead into the final section of discourses, featuring the woes pronounced upon the scribes and Pharisees and the eschatological discourse. The Gospel then concludes with the passion and the resurrection narratives. The earliest witnesses to the Gospel of Mark generally connect it with the preaching of Peter in Rome some time between A. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis c. The degree of parallelism may be seen by consulting the following table provided by Wm. Lane in his commentary, pp. Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God 1: And when he came up out of the water, immediately he saw the heavens opened and the Spirit descending upon him like a dove 1: Mark now focuses on the passion and crucifixion of Jesus. This is the word he [God] sent unto the children of Israel, preaching the gospel of peace by Jesus Christ he is Lord of all. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and power. He [Jesus] went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all he did in Jerusalem. God raised him up on the third day and caused him to be seen. Swift points out p. Mark may have intended for his Gospel to be an encouragement and challenge to the Roman Christians who about this time were experiencing the effects of persecution at the hand of the

emperor Nero. But the situation was radically altered by the disastrous fire that swept Rome in the summer of A. After the initial shock, popular resentment was fanned by the widespread rumors that the fire had been officially ordered by the emperor. Blame for the fire was placed upon the Christians. Such behavior by the imperial government meant that life became precarious for Christians living in Rome and throughout Italy. The cross and resurrection were the central features of the Christian gospel. There is no prologue, except for the title; Mark gets right to the significant events in the life and ministry of Jesus. For its size, Mark gives more space to the miracles of Jesus than does any other Gospel. Mark is also a Gospel of personal reactions. Harrison points out p. In keeping with his action orientation, Mark has selected and arranged his material in such a way as to present the Lord Jesus as One who continues to speak and act meaningfully in the context of crisis, in particular, the crisis the church in Rome was then facing. His language and style is less elaborate than Matthew or Luke. Mark is especially fond of using the present tense to relay past happenings. When Mark does not himself speak directly to his readers cf. The account of the stilling of the storm 4: Throughout this Gospel Jesus continues to manifest His presence and His authority. Finally, we must say a word about the high Christology of this Gospel. Christ possesses power over all types of illnesses and casts out evil spirits with irresistible authority 1: He stills storms with a mere word and thus demonstrates His authority over nature 4: It begins with the assertion that He is the Son of God 1: That final testimony is confirmed by the resurrection that follows the passion This is borne out by the following considerations: Because of the intimate relationship between Luke and Acts, any data derived from Acts bearing on authorship should be applied to the Gospel as well. Of those who were present with Paul in Rome, the most likely candidate for authorship of Acts and of the third Gospel is Luke. For a more detailed discussion of this topic, see M. The concluding verses of Acts also seem to describe a time when the Roman authorities were still lenient toward Christianity. This would indicate a time of composition prior to the latter years of the seventh decade, at which time the church began to be persecuted by the Roman government. During this period, up until the time of their departure for Rome, Luke would have had ample time to interview eyewitnesses in Jerusalem, Judea, and Caesarea. He could have spent much time with the original apostles and examined whatever early written accounts of the life and teaching of Jesus were at his disposal Lk. Luke may have undertaken the actual composition of his Gospel while present with Paul in Rome. In this connection the words of Paul to Timothy 2 Tim. Take Mark and bring him with you, for he is useful to me. Therefore, Luke now undertakes to write in an accurate and systematic manner an orderly account concerning Christ from all the data at his disposal. Thus, Luke may be said to be the first Christian historian. The educated Greek sought for the ideal, the perfect individual. In the person of Jesus, Luke found the fulfillment of that ideal. Now in his Gospel he shares with all the Gentile world this man who fulfills to the highest and most absolute extent the ideal of perfectionâ€”in love and severity, in tenderness and might, in humility and fearlessness, in wisdom and in all other virtues of character N. But in presenting this perfect man Luke makes clear that He is none other than the Son of God. Jesus is completely humanâ€”born of a woman 2: Luke makes clear that Christ did not merely come to be the ideal man who is to be imitated 6: Luke presents Jesus as the universal Savior, the Savior of men from all classes of society. Admission to the Kingdom is open to Samaritans Unique to this Gospel is the emphasis placed on prayer. Luke records nine prayers of Jesus, these prayers are associated with important events in His life and ministry. Two parables only recorded in Luke deal with prayer. Another feature unique to the Gospel of Luke is its emphasis on the ministry of the Holy Spirit. All of the chief actors in the Gospel, John the Baptist 1: Jesus was conceived by the Spirit 1: Many of the parables unique to Luke relate to money matters; note, especially, the rich fool In the Sermon on the Plain the first woe is pronounced against the rich 6: Bibliography Atkinson, Basil F. Mark Bible Study Courses Section 1.

Chapter 6 : Bible Study on the Synoptic Gospels

The Gospels (literally, good news) of Matthew, Mark, and Luke have been called Synoptic (seen together) Gospels since the end of the eighteenth century because they contain similar details in the.

Scripture Verses 2 Timothy 3: The Gospel parallels provided here also include the Gospel of John for comparison. These first three books have been called the synoptic Gospels since the 18th century and are so called because they give similar accounts of the ministry of Jesus. The term is also applied to apocryphal works of the 2nd century e. The Gospel according to John has a number of points of contact with the three synoptic Gospels but differs considerably from them in content and therefore not all Gospel synopses display the book of John. The fourth canonical gospel of John differs significantly from the synoptics in terms of Christology, which is the field of study within Christian theology which is concerned with the nature of Jesus the Christ, in particular, how the divine and human are related in his person. The synoptic gospels often recount the same stories about Jesus, though sometimes with different and more or less detail, but mostly following the same sequence and to a large extent using the same words. The question of the relationship between the three is called the synoptic problem. This problem concerns the literary relationships between and among the first three canonical gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke collectively known as the synoptic Gospels. Similarity in word choices and event placement shows an interrelationship. The synoptic problem concerns how this interrelation came to pass and what the nature of this interrelationship is. Any solution must account for the similarities and differences in content, order, and wording. Possible answers speculate either a direct relationship one Evangelist possessed one of the gospels or indirect two Evangelists having access to a shared source. Most Protestant and some Roman Catholic scholars agree that Matthew and Luke were written later than Mark, which they followed closely. Matthew then divided Mark into five portions and used them in order, separating them by other material. Luke divided the book only in two, nine chapters being inserted between. Mark however, only accounts for half of the other two Gospels. Matthew and Luke each have about verses in common, most of them sayings like the Beatitudes. Views about the dating of all four Gospels vary greatly from about 60â€”70 AD until the end of the first century where it is believed the Gospel of John was last written. The tables of Gospel parallels here are where necessary repeated to give a continuous series of references in canonical order for each of the four gospels. The bold type in the tables indicates the verses in order for each gospel. For example, pericopes that are identical except for the difference in bold type shows that the pericope in bold comes before the other reference for the other gospel not in bold face.

Chapter 7 : Synoptic Gospels - Wikipedia

The first three Gospels are called "synoptic" because they "see together with a common view" (the word synoptic literally means "together sight"). Matthew, Mark, and Luke cover many of the same events in Jesus' life—most of them from Jesus' ministry in Galilee—in much the same order.

When I lecture on the synoptic gospels synoptic means "seeing together" in my Who Wrote the Bible? Why did the earliest canonical written gospel not appear until the late 60s CE? Which gospel was written first and why? Did Matthew, John Mark, and Dr. Luke write the synoptic gospels or are they pseudopigraphal? Many of them were executed for it, even though they probably did not do it and everybody knew it. In the winter of 64 CE a similar thing happened in Rome. It was shortly after this that a papyrus roll bearing the title: This is the book we know as the earliest written Gospel Why was a gospel not written until 66 CE? In graduate school my New Testament literature professor, Dr. In my class I show students the following chart of the first century CE to demonstrate this principle. The first thirty years I call the period of Inception. This is the time of the "historical Jesus", his life, death, and resurrection CE. The period of Expansion CE sees the Jesus movement grow from a small sect of Judaism in Jerusalem to a growing international religion spread throughout the Mediterranean region and increasingly centered in the imperial capital of Rome. The method of gospel transmission is oral. Scholars call this "living story of Jesus" as the Kerygma from the Greek verb kerusso, meaning to proclaim in the manner of a herald. The term Kerygma means the consequence or outflow of what is preached It is during the period of Consolidation CE that most of the books of the New Testament, including the synoptic gospels, are written. Why was a gospel not written sooner? I suggest five reasons: What is the "Synoptic Problem"? Look carefully at the parallel passages from Matthew and Luke. Identical wording is rendered in red. This illustrates the critical problem of the remarkable literary parallelism between the synoptic gospels. The synoptic gospels, though independently written, must have drawn much of its material from a source or sources also available to one or both of the other two. The above chart shows the literary relationship between the synoptic gospels. Of the 55 verses of Mark which Matthew does not reproduce, Luke reproduces 31; therefore there are only 24 verses in all of Mark not reproduced somewhere in Matthew or Luke. This suggests another literary source in independent of Mark used by Matthew and Luke in the evolution of the synoptic gospels tradition. Scholars have made various attempts to solve the synoptic problem Oral tradition theory According to this theory, behind the synoptic gospels lies a common oral story of Jesus, which all three evangelists knew. This solution does not explain the minute resemblances in wording among the synoptic gospels. A Study of Origins London: Today the 2SH commands the support of most biblical scholars from all denominations. The first principle of the 2SH is the priority of Mark. Luke and Matthew use Mark as one of their main sources. Scholars offer three proofs: The cumulative force of these facts compels us to conclude that the earliest written Gospel is Mark. The second principle of 2SH is that Matthew and Luke both used a second written source. This explains the words and verses in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark. Mark was a source for Matthew and Luke, both of whom also independently used a now lost source called Q. Click here to learn more about the lost source Q. The 4SH proposes at least four principle literary sources behind the synoptic gospels: Mark, Q, M, and L. Who wrote the synoptic gospels? None of the synoptic gospels name their author or authors. In each case authorial attribution dates from the second century CE. The Gospel According to St. So then Mark made no mistake in thus recording some things just as he remembered them, for he made it his one care to omit nothing that he had heard and to make no false statement therein. From 1 Peter 5: This agrees with the later Papias tradition, which is supported by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius that associates Mark with Rome. Peter to his friend John Mark. Document describing the conflicts between Jesus and Jewish religious leaders; collection of parables; Chapter 13 originally may have been an independent document dated after 70 CE ; the Passion story; the names of the Twelve; a account of the Work of John the Baptist. Icon of Saint Matthew, c. Second, it proves that the Church is the consummation and continuation of the saving purposes of God begun with Abraham in the Old Testament. Papias attributes this gospel to Matthew c. Most critics date the composition of the gospel around

85 CE. The Sources of Matthew: It departs from other materials in the account in its interpretation of the difference between the Jewish and Christian attitudes towards the Law. It Shows a distinctive attitude toward the Church. Luke and Acts Right: Luke by Andrea Mantegna, c. In addition to contributing to the synoptic gospels, traditionally Luke is believed to be the author of Acts. Internal evidences pointing to common authorship of Luke and Acts include: About words in Luke-Acts are used nowhere else in the New Testament. External evidence relating to the authorship of Luke and Acts include the Anti-Marcionite Prologue c. At the age of eighty-four he died in Boeotia, full of the Holy Spirit. Although gospels already existedâ€”the one according to Matthew written in Judea, the one according to Mark in Italyâ€”he was impelled by the Holy Spirit to write this whole gospel among those dwelling about Achaea, making clear in his preface the fact that other gospels were written before his, and that it was necessary to set forth the accurate narrative of the Dispensation to gentile believers, so that they should not be distracted by Jewish fables nor, deceived by heretical and empty fancies, miss the mark of the truth And afterward the same Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles; later John, the apostle, one of the Twelve, wrote the Apocalypse on the Island of Patmos, and after that the gospel. When was Luke written? Some scholars suggest a possible Proto-Luke as early as CE. Most agree that the final version is dated CE. Luke 21 indicates that the fall of Jerusalem 70 CE had already happened and that the persecution of Christians by Domitian CE was underway. Sources used by Luke: Comments Have your say about what you just read! Leave me a comment in the box below. Contributions are deductible under section I write informative and inspirational Bible study material exclusively for subscribers to to my monthly newsletter, eBibleTeacher. It also tells you each month about the new information that I have added to free-online-bible-study. So please subscribe today! I promise to use it only to send you eBibleTeacher. Check out the sections of the store listing resources related to this and other articles under the store category Who Wrote the Bible? The books and resources listed do not represent the views of Free-Online-Bible-Study. Org or Teach the Nations, Inc. Top picks from our aStore Take advantage of the many great resources to enrich your personal and group Bible study. Check out opportunities to further your education in religious studies, philosophy, history and practical ministry. Here are my recommended books and resources that will enhance study and understanding of the Synoptic Gospels. Review these other study materials and resources Would you like to host a Who Wrote the Bible? The Who Wrote the Old Testament? This is ideal for a weekend seminar. I am able to conduct a Who Wrote the Bible? I am also available to facilitate seminars in other countries on a more limited basis.

Chapter 8 : Bible Study Courses » The Synoptic «Problem»

John's Gospel omits a large amount of material found in the synoptic Gospels, including some surprisingly important episodes: the temptation of Jesus, Jesus' transfiguration, and the institution of the Lord's supper are not mentioned by John.

If John knew of the synoptics, then he wrote to supplement them. Omission by John of material found in the synoptics. John mentions no examples of Jesus casting out demons. Inclusion by John of material not found in the synoptics. John also includes a considerable amount of material not found in the synoptics. Prior visits of Jesus to Jerusalem before the passion week are mentioned in John but not found in the synoptics. The seventh sign-miracle, the resurrection of Lazarus John 11 is not mentioned in the synoptics. The extended Farewell Discourse John 13-17 is not found in the synoptic Gospels. Literary Point of View: John versus the synoptics. The synoptics are written from a third person point of view, describing the events as if the authors had personally observed all of them and were reporting what they saw at the time. Thus they are basically descriptive in their approach. The author of the Fourth Gospel very carefully separates himself from the events he describes cf. However clear it is that he was an eyewitness of the life of Jesus, it is no less clear that he looks back upon it from a temporal distance. We understand more of the significance of the events described from the position the writer now holds than an eyewitness could have understood at the time the events took place. Four will serve as examples: He looks back on the events and emphasizes the inability of the apostles to understand the things that were happening in their true perspective at the time they occurred. Extended dialogues or discourses rather than proverbial sayings. The Gospel of John passed on the words of Jesus predominantly in another genre than the synoptics; it did not do so in sayings, parables, and controversy dialogues, but in connected or dialogical discourses. Use of symbolism and double meaning. John makes more frequent use of these literary techniques than the synoptics. Much of this symbolism takes the form of dualistic antitheses: Much of this antithetical dualism is also found in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls texts. Jesus says something to someone which is misunderstood, thus giving Jesus a further opportunity to clarify what he really meant. *Ipsissima verba versus ipsissima vox.* Realized eschatology in the Gospel of John. Dodd can be seen in microcosm in John 5: On the one hand there are statements that speak of the parousia second advent as a future event in the traditional sense: Alongside these on the other hand are statements that seem to speak of the full realization for believers of salvation in the present 5: There is an obvious tension between these statements that must be reconciled; judgment cannot be both present and future at the same time. Differences in grammatical style from the synoptic gospels. The Gospel of John is written in a style of Greek quite different from the synoptics. The range of vocabulary is smaller. There is frequent parataxis use of coordinate clauses rather than subordinate clauses. Related to paragraph 7 above, there is little difference between the words that are ascribed to Jesus and the words of the Evangelist. Eerdmans, , 2:

Chapter 9 : The Synoptic Gospels and Acts

The "synoptic problem" is the question of the specific literary relationship among the three synoptic gospels—that is, the question as to the source or sources upon which each synoptic gospel depended when it was written.

Those who were close to him could pass to others what they remembered about him. Those who looked upon him as the Messiah believed that he would soon inaugurate a new kingdom; all that was necessary to know about him could be remembered until that time. They were, of course, sorely disappointed when he was put to death on the cross, for it seemed as though his cause was lost. Afterward, they were convinced that despite his death, he really was the Messiah. With this recognition on their part, there was now a new reason for remembering the events of his earthly life. What he had done before his death took on a new meaning in relationship to what happened since that time. Evidence was needed that would convince unbelievers that Jesus was the Messiah, and the faith of those who already believed in him needed to be confirmed and strengthened. The early Christians believed that Jesus would soon return to earth and complete the work of preparing for the coming kingdom. An authentic record of his life on earth would be a great help to those who were expecting his return, and with the passing of the years, the need for such a record was greatly increased. The situation is complicated also by the fact that the Gospels are not all alike, nor is it possible to harmonize completely all of the materials contained in them. They agree on many points but disagree on others. What has been called the "synoptic problem" concerns finding some hypothesis that addresses the origin of the Gospels and that accounts both for their agreements and for their differences. Many different solutions have been proposed, but no one of them is fully accepted by all New Testament scholars. The most widely held view maintains that the Gospels, in their present form, are based very largely on older source materials in existence at a time not far removed from the events that they record. If the authors of the Gospels used the same sources, the similarities between the Gospels would be explained; likewise, that other sources were used by only one of the authors would explain the differences that we find when comparing the different accounts. That the earliest source materials were written by people who were contemporaries of Jesus and his disciples adds considerable weight to their historical reliability. The Gospel of Mark is generally agreed to be the oldest of the three Synoptic Gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke—and was used as one of the sources for each of the other two. The outline of events as they occur in Mark is followed by each of the other biographers, and about two thirds of the material found in Mark is also present in both Matthew and Luke. This similarity suggests very strongly, although it does not prove, that the authors of Matthew and Luke took their materials from Mark. There is also reason to believe that both Matthew and Luke had another source in common. Scholars refer to this other source with the letter Q, the first letter of the German word *Quelle*, which in English means source. Because there is some unique material in Matthew, possibly its author used still another source M, which was not used in any of the other Gospels. The same holds true for the Gospel of Luke, and scholars use the letter L to refer to his special source.