

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

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (Tuc - Z)

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

7: Mic - Pat

8: Pea - Row

9: San - Tri

10: Tuc - Z (Current page)

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. Tuckett, Christopher M. 1979. "The Griesbach Hypothesis in the 19th Century." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 3:29-60.
Reprinted in S. E. Porter, C. A. Evans (eds.), *New Testament Interpretation and Methods: a Sheffield Reader*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, pp. 15-43.
Abstract: "Recent study of the history of the Synoptic Problem has suggested that, in the 19th century, the theory of Marcan priority was adopted, and the Griesbach hypothesis rejected, as part of an attempt to counter the historical scepticism of D.F. Strauss and others in the 'Tübingen school', and to restore the historical reliability of the gospel account.
This article examines this question, and suggests that, in fact, the Griesbach hypothesis was considered, and rejected, quite independently of any associations with the Tübingen school. A brief survey of some of the arguments which were brought against the Griesbach hypothesis suggests that what is lacking is a set of convincing reasons for Mark's having proceeded in the way which the Griesbach hypothesis alleges he did."

2. ———. 1980. "The Argument from Order and the Synoptic Problem." *Theologische Zeitschrift* no. 36:336-354.
3. ———. 1983. *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. ———. 1983. "The Beatitudes A Source-Critical Study. With a Reply by M. D. Goulder." *Novum Testamentum* no. 25:193-216.
Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 180-203.
5. ———, ed. 1984. *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
Reprint New York: Bloomsbury 2014.
Contents: C. M. Tuckett: Preface VII; P.S. Alexander: Midrash and the Gospels 1; P. S. Alexander: Rabbinic Biography and the Biography of Jesus: A Survey of the Evidence 19; F. G. Downing: Contemporary Analogies to the Gospel and Acts: 'Genres', or 'Motifs'? 51; D. L. Dungan: A Griesbachian Perspective on the Argument from Order 67; W. R. Farmer: Certain Results Reached by Sir John C. Hawkins and C.F. Burney which make more sense if Luke knew Matthew, and Mark knew Matthew and Luke 75; M. D. Goulder: Some Observations on Professor Farmer's 'Certain Results . . . ' 99; W. R. Farmer: Reply to Michael Goulder 105; M.D. Goulder: The Order of a Crank 111 157; H. B. Green: The Credibility of Luke's Transformation of Matthew 131; H. B. Green: Matthew 12.22-50 and Parallels: An Alternative to Matthean Conflation 157; G. D. Kilpatrick: Matthew on Matthew 177; A. Meredith: The Evidence of Papias for the Priority of Matthew 187; C. M. Tuckett: Arguments from Order: Definition and Evaluation 197; Index of Biblical References 221; Index of Authors Cited 228.
6. ———. 1984. "On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke." *New Testament Studies* no. 30:130-142.
7. ———. 1984. "Arguments from Order: Definition and Evaluation." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 197-219. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
Reprinted in: C. M. Tuckett, *From the Sayings to the Gospels*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014, pp. 3-22.
8. ———. 1986. *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition. Synoptic Tradition in the Nag Hammadi Library*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
9. ———. 1987. "The Two Gospel Hypothesis Under Scrutiny: A Response." *Perkins School of Theology Journal* no. 40:25-31.
10. ———. 1988. "Thomas and the Synoptics." *Novum Testamentum* no. 30:132-157.
11. ———. 1990. "Response to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis [I]." 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., 47-62. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
12. ———. 1990. "Response to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis II: The 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., 63-76. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
13. ———. 1992. "Synoptic Problem." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Vol. 6*, edited by Freedman, Martin, 263-270. New York: Doubleday.
14. ———. 1992. "Q (Gospel Source)." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Vol. 5*, edited by Freedman, David Noel, 567-572. New York: Doubleday.
15. ———. 1993. "The Minor Agreements and Textual Criticism." In *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991*, edited by Strecker, Georg, 110-142. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

16. ———. 1993. "Mark and Q." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, edited by Focant, Camille, 149-175. Louvain: Louvain University Press.
17. ———. 1995. "The Existence of Q." In *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, edited by Piper, Ronald Allen, 19-47. Leiden: Brill.
Reprinted in : C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *From the Sayings to the Gospels*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014, pp. 3-22.
18. ———. 1996. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Peabody (MA): Hendrickson Publishers.
19. ———. 1996. "Synoptic Tradition in the Didache." In *The Didache in Modern Research*, edited by Draper, Jonathan A., 92-128. Leiden: Brill.
"This paper has analyzed some of the parallels between material in different parts of the *Didache* and material in the synoptic gospels.
The result has been that these parallels can be best explained if the *Didache* presupposes the finished gospels of Matthew and Luke.
Further, this result seems to apply to all parts of the *Didache* examined here.
Precisely how the gospels were available to the author of the *Didache* is impossible to say: they may have been available as separate texts; they may have been already combined to form a single harmonized text. However, the evidence of the *Didache* seems to show that the text is primarily a witness to the post-redactional history of the synoptic tradition. It is not a witness to any pre-redactional developments." (p. 128)
20. ———. 2011. "The Current State of 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, Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 9-50. Leuven: Peeters.
21. ———. 2014. *From the Sayings to the Gospels*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
22. ———. 2016. "Matthew's Conflation of His Sources." In *An Early Reader of Mark and Q*, edited by Verheyden, Jozef and van Belle, Gilbert, 67-107. Leuven: Peeters.
23. ———. 2020. "The Reception of Q Studies in the UK: No Room at the Inn?" In *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*, edited by Tiwald, Markus, 62-85. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
24. ———. 2020. "Theological Issues at Stake in Early-Twentieth-Century: Research on the Synoptic Problem." In *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 77-116. New York: Bloomsbury.
"As we come to the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century, the 2GH has waned somewhat in significance. Farmer and Dungan, perhaps the most vocal and energetic of the defenders of the 2GH in the recent past, have both died. Today, lip service is regularly and explicitly paid to the 2GH as a theoretical alternative to the 2DH, but I know of no great new discussions or analyses of the theory in recent years. Meanwhile, Goulder has also now died, but his mantle has been taken over by others, so that the FH has gained considerable momentum through the work of scholars such as Goodacre, Poitier, Watson, and others, and now would appear to command a significant level of support.
For some at least, it has inherited the place of the 2GH as the main alternative theory to the 2DH. In any scholarly context, the debates that take place are as often as not generated by, and reflect, the interests and positions of the participants involved. Hence today, in many contexts (colloquia, volumes of essays, etc.), space is regularly given to advocates of the FH to argue their case, and the hypothesis is also often noted and discussed in detail by advocates of the 2DH. By contrast, the 2GH today is effectively rather sidelined." (p. 4, note omitted)
(...)

"We cannot and should not expect scholars of the past to have anticipated the problems (and postulated solutions) that arose subsequently to the time they wrote, especially in relation to the Synoptic Problem where so many theoretical possibilities exist, and it is simply not possible to consider them all in detail within a finite time. In looking to the past, we have to seek to engage in "fair play" in considering how others at the time argued and debated and not impose our own agendas, and presuppositions, on them.

In considering then "theological issues at stake" in past discussions of the Synoptic Problem, I look first at the possible issues that those engaged in the discussions at the time may have thought were at stake. In a final section I offer some brief critical reflections on those issues from a contemporary standpoint from where, with hindsight, it is all too easy to be critical! However, perhaps initially one owes it to those being

considered to try to understand what they thought were the key issues concerned." (p. 6)

25. Turner, Nigel. 1959. "The Minor Verbal Agreements of Mt. and Lk. against Mk." In *Studia Evangelica. Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957, held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957"*, edited by Aland, Kurt et al., 223-234. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
26. Tyson, Joseph B. 1976. "Sequential Parallelism in the synoptic Gospels." *New Testament Studies* no. 22:276-308.
27. ———. 1983. "Conflict as a Literary Theme in the Gospel of Luke." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 303-327. Macon: Mercer University Press.
28. ———. 1985. "The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 437-452. Macon: Mercer University Press.
29. Uchido, Kazuhiko. 1981. *The Study of the Synoptic Problem in the Twentieth Century: a Critical Assessment*, Aberdeen University. Unpublished dissertation, Aberdeen University, accessible from EThOS e-theses online service.
30. Vaage, Leif E. 2016. "How I Stopped being a Q-Scholar." In *Scribal Practices and Social Structures among Jesus Adherents: Essays in Honour of John S. Kloppenborg*, edited by Arnal, William E., Ascough, Richard S., Derrenbacker, Jr., Robert A. and Harland, Philip A., 213-231. Leuven: Peeters.
31. Vaganay, Léon. 1954. *Le problème synoptique : un hypothèse de travail*. Tournai: Desclée.
32. Valantsis, Richard. 2005. *The New Q: A Translation with Commentary*. New York: T & T Clark.
33. Van Dore, James R. 2019. "Evidence for a Relationship Between Mark and Q." In *Greco-Roman and Jewish Tributaries to the New Testament: Festschrift in Honor of Gregory J. Riley*, edited by Crawford, Chritpher S., 45-68. Claremont, CA: Claremont Press.
34. Van Oyen, Geert. 1997. "The Doublets in 19th-Century Gospel Studies." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 73:277-306.
 "In contemporary gospel study, the word 'doublet' is used for doubly attested sayings or narratives in one and the same gospel. Its use was originally limited to saying doublets (*logia*), especially in Mt and Lk. The great number of doublets in these gospels became a classic argument for the two-source hypothesis⁶: besides their knowledge and use of Mk, Matthew and Luke used a second common source (a sayings collection, *Logienquelle*, which was later called Q). At the times this explanation of the doublets was something new in the study of the synoptic gospels.

- Before the rise of historical criticism it had been common to say that the evangelist, who wrote twice the same saying of Jesus, was convinced that Jesus had spoken these words on two different occasions." (p. 278, notes omitted)
(...)
"At the end of the 19th century, with the priority of Mark established, the search for Mark's literary sources will be elaborated in the many theories of a primitive Markan gospel and of a double miracle cycle. It will create a debate in Markan exegesis of the twentieth century." (p. 306)
35. van Zyl, H. C. 1997. "Objective Display or Textual Engineering? Hermeneutical aspects in Making and Using a Synopsis of the Synoptic Gospels." *Neotestamentica* no. 31:361-368.
 36. Vassiliadis, Petros. 1973. "Behind Mark: Towards a Written Source." *New Testament Studies* no. 20:155-160.
 37. ———. 1978. "The Nature and Extent of the Q-Document." *Novum Testamentum* no. 20:49-73.
Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 138-162.
 38. ———. 1982. "The Original Order of Q: Some Residual Cases." In *Logia. Les paroles de Jesus = The Sayings of Jesus: Memorial Joseph Coppens*, edited by Delobel, Joël, 379-387. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
 39. ———. 1999. *LOGOI IĀSOU. Studies in Q*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
Reconstruction of Q: *The Q Text*, pp. 85-116.
 40. ———. 1999. "Prolegomena to a Discussion on the Relationship Between Mark and the Q Document." In *LOGOI IĀSOU: Studies in Q*, 71-84. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
 41. Verheyden, Joseph. 1996. "Mark and Q." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 72:408-417.
 42. ———. 2011. "Proto-Luke, and What Can Possibly Be Made of It." 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, 617-654. Leuven: Peeters.
 43. ———. 2020. "Introducing "Q" in French Catholic Scholarship at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Century: Alfred Loisy's Évangiles synoptiques." In *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*, edited by Tiwald, Markus, 146-174. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
 44. Vinson, Richard. 2004. "How Minor? Assessing the Significance of the Minor Agreements as an Argument against the Two-Source Hypothesis." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 151-164. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
 45. Vinzent, Markus. 2014. *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*. Leuven: Peeters.
 46. Viviano, Benedict Thomas. 2013. "Who Wrote Q? The Sayings Document (Q) as the Apostle Matthew's Private Notebook as a Bilingual Village Scribe (Mark 2:13-17; Matt 9:9-13)." In *Mark and Matthew II. Comparative Readings: Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*, edited by Becker, Eve-Marie and Runesson, Anders, 75-91. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 47. ———. 2013. *What Are They Saying About Q?* New York: Paulist Press.
 48. ———. 2020. "French Catholic Scholarship on the Synoptic Problem in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries." In *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 151-164. New York: Bloomsbury.

"This is not a mysterious issue. The main figures are Loisy, Lagrange, their reception of Harnack, the Biblical Commission Decree of June 26, 1912, Leon Vaganay (1882-1969), and the happy ending in the heroic figure of Bruno de Solages, whose story should be better known." (p. 151)

(...)

"This report on French Catholic scholarship on the Synoptic Problem in the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries does not come to a happy ending. From 1911 to 1956, French Catholic scholars who expected an *imprimatur* for their studies of the gospels felt that they were obliged to accept the decrees of the Biblical Commission on this matter. The Commission gave a particular reading of the words of Papias, as

preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39. Papias briefly mentions that Matthew wrote the oracles in the Hebrew language. The Commission took this to mean the whole gospel of canonical Matthew, but in Hebrew or Aramaic. This brief notice in Papias/Eusebius was continuously repeated by those ancient authors who discussed gospel origins, and they added the chronological nuance that Matthew wrote before Mark, although Papias does not say this. This ghost of an Aramaic Matthew nearly identical with our canonical Greek Matthew dominates Vaganay and still hovers over Boismard's intermediate Matthew.

Boismard's three-volume work remains the most important work in our purview. It culminates in a rich and remarkable commentary on all of John, and in a valuable monograph on Johannine Christology.

Recent commentaries on Mark by Simone Legasse(26) and Camille Focant breathe a fresh spirit. Because of the war and press of other business, de Solages never wrote a full commentary on a Synoptic gospel.

The two-source hypothesis still has many enemies in France. The battle is not over." (p. 164)

(26) Simon Legasse, *L'Evangile de Marc* (2 vols.; *Lectio divina. Commentaires 5*; Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1997); Camille Focant, *L'Evangile selon Marc* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2004), E.T. *The Gospel According to Mark: A Commentary* (trans. L. R. Keylock; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2012).

49. Walker, Norman. 1966. "Patristic Evidence and the Priority of Matthew." In *Studia Patristica. Vol. VII*, 571-575. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
50. Walker, William O. Jr. 1977. "A Method for Identifying Redactional Passages in Matthew on Functional and Linguistic Grounds." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* no. 39:76-93.
51. ———. 1983. "The Son of Man Question and the Synoptic Problem." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 261-301. Macon: Mercer University Press.
52. ———. 1987. "The State of the Synoptic Question: Some Reflections on the Work of Tuckett and McNicol." *Perkins School of Theology Journal* no. 40:14-21.
53. Walters, Patricia. 2010. "The Synoptic Problem." In *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*, edited by Aune, David E., 236-253.
54. Wansbrough, Henry, ed. 1991. *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
Contents: Henry Wansborough: Introduction 9; Ørvind Andersen: Oral Tradition 17; David E. Aune: Prolegomena to the Study of Oral Tradition in the Hellenistic World 59; Hans Peter Rieger: Oral Tradition in the Old Testament 107; Shemaryahu Talmon: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission, or the Heard and the Seen Word in Judaism of the Second Temple Period 121; Philip S. Alexander: Orality in Pharisaic-rabbinic Judaism at the Turn of the Eras 159; Rainer Riesner: Jesus as Preacher and Teacher 185; David E. Aune: Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus 211; Birger Gerhardsson: Illuminating the Kingdom: Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels 266; E. Earle Ellis: The Making of Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels 310; Marion L. Soards: Oral Tradition Before, In, and Outside the

- Canonical Passion Narratives 334; James D. G. Dunn: John and the Oral Gospel Tradition 351; Traugott Holtz: Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition 380; Willy Rordorf: Does the Didache Contain Jesus Tradition Independently of the Synoptic Gospels? 394; Ben F. Meyer: Some Consequences of Birger Gerhardsson's Account of the Origins of the Gospel Tradition 424; Index of Biblical and other References 441; Index of Authors 463.
55. Watson, Francis. 2009. "Q as Hypothesis: A Study in Methodology." *New Testament Studies* no. 55:397-415.
 56. ———. 2013. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
 57. ———. 2014. "A Response to Richard Bauckham and Heike Omerzu." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 37:210-218.
Response to Bauckham (2014) and Omerzu (2014).
 58. ———. 2016. "Luke Rewriting and Rewritten." In *Luke's Literary Creativity*, edited by Nielsen, Jesper Tang and Müller, Mogens, 79-95. New York: Bloomsbury.
 59. ———. 2020. "The Archaeology of the Q Hypothesis: The Case of H. J. Holtzmann." In *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 37-52. New York: Bloomsbury.
"The question this raises is whether the Q consensus that established itself in the later nineteenth century was the all-but-inevitable conclusion of a century of intensive synoptic research, or the product of contingencies-decisions that might have gone the other way given a different set of scholarly priorities. In addressing this question, the case of H.J. Holtzmann (1832-1910) will prove to be exemplary. Spanning the last four decades of the nineteenth century, the period of transition between the diversity of early synoptic research and the triumph of the two-source hypothesis, Holtzmann's work both contributes to that triumph and discloses the uncertainties on which it is founded." (p. 39)
 60. Wenham, John William. 1972. "The Synoptic Problem Revisited: Some New Suggestions about the Composition of Mark 4:1-34." *Tyndale Bulletin* no. 23:3-38.
 61. ———. 1981. "Synoptic Independence and the Origin of Luke's Travel Narrative." *New Testament Studies* no. 27:507-515.
 62. ———. 1992. *Redating Matthew, Mark & Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem*. Downers Grove (IL): InterVarsity Press.
 63. West Jr., Philip H. 1967. "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew." *New Testament Studies* no. 14:75-95.
 64. Westcott, Brooke Foss. 1902. *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels with Historical and Explanatory Notes*. New York: Macmillan.
 65. Williams, C.S.. 1945. "Did Matthew and Luke see a 'Western' Text of Mark." *The Expository Times*:41-45.
 66. Williams, Matthew C. 2000. "The Owen Hypothesis: an Essay Showing that it Was Henry Owen Who First Formulated the So-Called "Griesbach Hypothesis"." *The Journal of Higher Criticism*:109-125.
 67. ———. 2006. *Two Gospels from One: A Comprehensive Text-critical Analysis of the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids (MI): Kregel.
 68. Williams, N. P. 1911. "A Recent Theory of the Origin of St. Mark's Gospel." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 388-421. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 69. Wilson, B. E. 1997. "The Two Notebook Hypothesis: An Explanation of Seven Synoptic Patterns." *The Expository Times* no. 108:265-268.
 70. Wilson, Robert McL. 1959. "Farrer and Streeter on the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark." In *Studia Evangelica. Papers presented to the*

- International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957, held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957"*, edited by Aland, Kurt et al., 254-257. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
71. Winter, Paul. 1956. "The Proto-Source of Luke I." *Novum Testamentum* no. 1:184-199.
72. ———. 1970. "The Proto-Source of Luke I. Addenda." *Novum Testamentum* no. 12:349.
73. Wittkowsky, Vadim. 2016. "Luke Uses/Rewrites Matthew: A Survey of the 19th Century Research." In *Luke's Literary Creativity*, edited by Nielsen, Jesper Tang and Müller, Mogens, 3-25. New York: Bloomsbury.
 "For more than one hundred years, research on the Synoptic Problem has tended to deny any direct interdependence between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. There are several well-known (but partly fallacious) arguments against the assumption that one author used the text of the other, but as a rule, dismissal of the dependence idea no longer seem to require explanation." (p. 3)
 "The present study deals with that period in New Testament studies when it was considered quite natural that Luke should have been a sort of critic and one who deconstructed the Gospel of Matthew. This starting point even dominated scholarship in the nineteenth century. The contemporary authors of the time, mostly German, would have been surprised to hear that precisely the "scattering" should be seen as a huge problem with regard to Luke's dependence on Matthew. These scholars, who have been unmeritedly forgotten, can in part be considered as the predecessors of Austin Farrer, Michael Goulder, Mark Goodacre and especially - as we will see below - Eric Franklin, and their works therefore need to be reexamined and integrated into the ongoing discussion." (p. 4)
74. Wood, Herbert G. 1985. "The Priority of Mark." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 77-84. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint of "The Priority of Mark", *The Expository Times*, 65 (1953-19654), pp-17-19.
75. Woods, F. H. 1890. "The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels." In *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica: Essays Chiefly in Biblical and Patristical Criticism. Volume 2*, edited by Driver, S. R., Cheyne, T. K. and Sanday, William, 59-104. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 Reprint: Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2006.
 "It will be seen that the essential feature in the line of argument adopted is the importance attached to parallelism of sequence between the three Synoptics, as distinguished from mere resemblance in subject-matter and even language." (p. 1)
 (...)
 "I will now give the reasons which seem to me to prove conclusively that the original basis of the Synoptical Gospels coincided in its *range* and order with our St. Mark(A).
 (1) The earliest and the latest parallels in all three Gospels coincide with the beginning and end of St. Mark. The first is the ministry of St. John the Baptist, the last the visit of the women to our Saviour's tomb,
 (2) With but few exceptions we find parallels to the whole of St. Mark in either St. Matthew or St. Luke, and to by far the larger part in both.
 (3) The order of the whole of St. Mark, excepting of course what is peculiar to that Gospel, is confirmed either by St. Matthew or St. Luke, and the greater part of it by both.
 (4) A passage parallel in all three Synoptists is never immediately followed in both St. Matthew and St. Luke by a separate incident or discourse common to these two evangelists alone.
 (5) Similarly in the parts common to St. Matthew and St. Luke alone, no considerable fragments, with some doubtful exceptions(B), occur in the same relative order, so that it is unlikely that they formed part of the original source.

(6) To this we may add the fact that in the same parts the differences between St. Matthew and St. Luke are generally greater than in those which are common to all three.

Not one of these arguments is of itself necessary to prove our point. That the Synoptists should have preserved so much of the original source and of its order, is for the Gospel student a happy accident which enables him to determine its limits with a certain degree of exactness. It may be added that arguments of a like kind could not be adduced to prove the priority of a Gospel resembling St. Matthew or St. Luke." (pp. 61-62)

(A) By our St. Mark here and throughout is meant our present Gospel according to the best critical texts, and excluding therefore xvi. 9-20, against the genuineness of which this inquiry alone will be found to add strong evidence.

No Marcan section of anything like the same importance is absent from St. Matthew and St. Luke.

(B) 1 Cf. Matt. xii. 22-30 with Luke xi. 14-23 ; xii. 38-42 with xi. 29-32 ; xii.43-45 with xi. 24-26. See pp. 77, 78. Perhaps we should add Matt xii.33-35 compared with Luke vi. 43-45.

76. Worden, Ronald D. 1975. "Redaction Criticism of Q: A Survey." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 94:532-546.
77. Wright, Arthur. 1890. *The Composition of the Four Gospels: A critical inquiry*. London: Macmillan and Co.
78. Youngquist, Linden. 2013. "Matthew, Mark and Q. A Literary Exploration." In *Mark and Matthew I. Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings*, edited by Becker, Eve-Marie and Runesson, Anders, 233-261. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
79. Youngquist, Linden E., Klampfl, Thomas, Carruth, Shawn, and Reed, Jonathan L., eds. 2011. *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research. Excerpted, sorted, and evaluated: Q 6:37-42. Not Judging – The Blind Leading the Blind – The Disciple and the Teacher – The Speck and the Beam*. Leuven: Peeters.