

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

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (Buc - Day)

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

Studies (mainly from 1964) in alphabetical order:

1: A - Bro

2: Buc - Day (Current page)

3: De - Fee

4: Fit - Gou

5: Gre - Klo

6: Kni - Mey

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. Buchanan, George Wesley. 1974. "Has the Griesbach Hypothesis Been Falsified?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 93:550-572.
 "In recent article, Professors Talbert and McKnight have attempted to falsify, or at least cast doubt upon the Griesbach hypothesis.(1) This is a legitimate and timely undertaking, because the synoptic problem is currently receiving more attention than it has commanded since Sanday's seminar at Oxford and Streeter's publication of *The Four Gospels*.(2) Like all other hypotheses, the Griesbach hypothesis should be re-analyzed periodically to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses." (p. 550)
 (...)
 "*Conclusion.* McKnight's work is certainly a contribution to the discussion which attempts to describe the literary relationships which exist between Matthew and Luke. His method of selecting parallel passages and comparing poetry with poetry or prose with poetry is one of the ways this might be done. The results of the study, however, did not falsify the Griesbach hypothesis. For the first example, there is a reasonable, alternative explanation for the literary phenomena described. Matthew and Luke appear to contain different Greek translations of the same Semitic poetry, but that does not prove that either gospel used the other or was written without access to the other during its own composition. The second example included *chreias* upon which both gospel writers had elaborated. It appears, however, that the

- absence of the phrase "scribes and Pharisees" may be explained as the sort of omission one would expect in a gospel approved by Marcion. This suggestion is at least as likely as the proposal that the addition was made by a Palestinian author. The argument is not very convincing either way, and it seems wise to acknowledge ignorance of the precise way in which these gospel writers put together these particular sources. The third example shows that in this case Luke did not use Matthew as his source but it does not show that Luke is earlier than Matthew or was the source Matthew used. It seems reasonable to suggest that Matthew and Luke are not directly related here but have instead used a common source.
- None of Talbert's and McKnight's efforts to falsify the Griesbach hypothesis turn out, upon analysis, to be conclusive. Indeed, some of the passages point the critic toward the Griesbach hypothesis rather than away from it. The purpose of this response, however, has not been to prove the validity hypothesis, but to analyze an attempt made to falsify it. A careful case against the Griesbach hypothesis suggests the verdict: "Not proved." (pp.571-572)
- (1) C. H. Talbert and E. V. McKnight, "Can the Griesbach Hypothesis JBL 91 (1972) 338-68.
- (2) B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (New York: Macmillan 1930).
2. ———. 1983. "Matthean Beatitudes and Traditional Promises." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 161-184. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- "The Old Testament and Previous Scholarship
- For many years scholars have understood that the Matthean Beatitudes were closely related to the Old Testament, especially Isaiah 57, 61, 66, and Psalms 24, 37, and 73. This Old Testament information, however, has not led scholars to realize fully the unity of the message and structure of these Beatitudes. This may be true, because New Testament scholars have not approached the Beatitudes from a midrashic point of view, realizing the influence that an Old Testament text can have upon the meaning of the midrash. They may not have understood some of the thought forms that were basic to the Old Testament texts which the author of the Beatitudes took for granted. Therefore, this essay will begin with an introduction to some of these presuppositions: first, concerning the influence of the whole text to the message of a midrash." (p. 161)
3. Bultmann, Rudolf. 1926. "The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem." *The Journal of Religion* no. 6:337-362.
- Abstract: "The two-document theory as to the relations of the Synoptic Gospels so generally held twenty years ago has proved to be insufficient to explain the facts. In this article recent developments of synoptic criticism are indicated. The method of investigation, called *Formgeschichte*, undertakes to discover the various elements in the Gospels by means of typical forms of literary style. On the basis of this study it becomes possible to discover the nature of editorial redaction in the Gospels and to distinguish those portions of the tradition which are original from the secondary elements supplied by the Gospel writers. By comparing the literary styles in the Gospels with parallel literary expressions of Hellenistic and rabbinical literature, light is thrown on the question as to whether a given utterance originated on Palestinian or on Hellenistic soil. It is the conviction of the advocates of *formgeschichtliche* investigation that this method marks a genuine advance in the task of ascertaining what the historical facts are concerning the preaching of Jesus and the rise of the early Christian community."
4. ———. 1963. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. New York: Harper & Row. Revised edition 1968.
- Translation by John Marsh of *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921 (second revised edition 1931; fourth edition 1958 with a Supplement by Gerd Theissen).
- "The following investigation therefore sets out to give an account of the history of the individual units of the tradition, and how the tradition passed from a fluid state

to the fixed form in which it meets us in the Synoptics and in some instances even outside them. I am entirely in agreement with M. Dibelius when he maintains that form-criticism is not simply an exercise in aesthetics nor yet simply a process of description and classification; that is to say, it does not consist in identifying the individual units of the tradition according to their aesthetic or other characteristics and placing them in their various categories. It is much rather 'to rediscover the origin and history of the tradition before it took literary form'. The proper understanding of form-criticism rests upon the judgement that the literature in which the life of a given community, even the primitive Christian community, has taken shape, springs out of quite definite style and quite specific form and categories. Thus every literary category has its 'life situation' (*Sitz im Leben*: Gunkel), whether it be worship in its different forms, or work, or hunting, or war. The *Sitz im Leben* is not, however, an individual historical event, but a typical situation or occupation in the life of a community. In the same way, the literary 'category', or 'form', through which a particular item is classified is a sociological concept and not an aesthetic one, however much it may be possible by its subsequent development to use such form as aesthetic media in some particular literary product. But in the literature of primitive Christianity, which is essentially 'popular' (Dibelius) in kind, this development had not yet taken place, and it is possible to understand its forms and categories in connection with their 'life situation', i.e. the influences at work in the life of the community." (p. 6, notes omitted)

5. Burkett, Delbert. 2004. *Rethinking the Gospel Sources, Volume 1: From Proto-Mark to Mark*. London: T & T Clark.
 "The two-document hypothesis "affirms that Matthew and Luke drew material from both Mark and a source or sources, now lost, designated "Q" In an expanded form of the theory, Matthew also used other material designated "M" while Luke used other material designated "L"." (p. 1)
 "In this study I am concerned primarily with the material in Mark with its parallels in Matthew and/or Luke. Hence the subtitle of my study designates its limits: "from Proto-Mark to Mark." With respect to the "double tradition" found in Matthew and Luke, I do not challenge the validity of the Q hypothesis.
 My own theory includes something that could be called Q, though I will not develop this aspect of the theory in the present work. While my theory includes the hypothesis of Q, as well as M and L, it goes beyond the scope of the present study to delineate the contents of these sources or to discuss how they have been incorporated into Matthew and Luke.
 Chapters 2 through 6 present new data that leads to five major conclusions. 1) The Gospel of Mark did not serve as a source for either Matthew or Luke. 2) The Gospel of Matthew did not serve as a source for either Mark or Luke. 3) Matthew did not use Mark, nor did Mark use Matthew, but both used the same three sources. 4) Luke did not use Mark, nor did Mark use Luke, but both used the same sources. 5) Mark often conflated two or more sources that were also used by Matthew and Luke respectively. Chapter 7 uses these five major conclusions as criteria to evaluate current theories of Synoptic relations. Since no current theory meets all five criteria, I present a new multi-source theory that does. This theory proposes that a primitive gospel (Proto-Mark) underwent two revisions (Proto-Mark A and Proto-Mark B). Matthew knew Proto-Mark A, Luke knew Proto-Mark B, while Mark knew and conflated both. In addition, several smaller sources also contributed material. Chapters 8 to 11 discuss all these sources in greater detail.
 Finally, Chapter 12 gives examples of how this theory would account for the composition of Mark." (pp. 5-6)
6. ———. 2009. "The Return of Proto-Mark. A Response to David Neville." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 85:117-134.
 Abstract: "In my book *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark*, I presented evidence for a new theory of Synoptic relations, in which all three

Synoptics depended on earlier sources, including some form of a 'Proto-Mark'. My arguments for this theory have been criticized in two articles by David Neville.[*] Neville's criticisms fall into three categories: general criticisms, criticisms of my evidence against direct dependence of one Synoptic on another (Chapters 2 and 3 of my book), and criticisms of the constructive portion of my book. An examination of his critique suggests that it does not damage my case as much as Neville supposed. Ultimately, Neville's disagreements with my work are less significant than his agreements. We both recognize that theories of Markan or Matthean priority have had their day and that future progress in solving the Synoptic Problem will require a hypothesis of some form of Proto-Mark."

[*] Neville, 2006 and 2008.

7. ———. 2009. *Rethinking the Gospel Sources, Volume 2: The Unity and Plurality of Q*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

"This book constitutes the second of a series on the Synoptic Problem. The first volume, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark* (T&T Clark, 2004), offered a new theory about the sources of the material that Mark shares with Matthew and/or Luke. The present book continues the former by examining "Q," the presumed source of the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke. I address two disputed issues in the study of Q: Is it necessary to hypothesize such a source, and, if so, did the Q material come from a single source or more than one? In chapter 1, I address the first issue and conclude that some form of the Q hypothesis is necessary. In chapters 2–11, I address the second issue. I conclude that Q existed as a single written source unified by recurring features of style and theme. I then identify the reasons why Matthew and Luke often disagree in the wording of Q. Chapter 12 summarizes my conclusions. Several appendices then set out significant results of this study." (from the Preface)

8. ———. 2018. *The Case for Proto-Mark: A Study in the Synoptic Problem*.

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

"The present monograph makes a contribution to the study of the Synoptic Problem, the question of what literary sources were used by the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke). It does not consider every aspect of the Synoptic Problem but addresses a single question: If the Q hypothesis is adopted to explain the double tradition, then what theory best explains the Markan material? I examine three theories

that are compatible with the Q hypothesis: the standard theory of Markan priority, the Deutero-Mark hypothesis, and the Proto-Mark hypothesis. The first two of these are theories of Markan priority, while the Proto-Mark hypothesis is not. I conclude that the Proto-Mark hypothesis best accounts for the Markan material.

Any theory of Synoptic relations must account for two types of material: the material that Matthew and Luke share with Mark (the Markan material) and the non-Markan material common to Matthew and Luke (the double tradition). Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the most common explanation for the double tradition has been the Q hypothesis, the theory that Matthew and Luke took the double tradition from a hypothetical source, now lost, called Q. This theory has been challenged, especially by proponents of the Griesbach hypothesis and proponents of the Farrer hypothesis. However, it remains the most widely held theory to explain the double tradition. In the present study, I do not enter into the debate over the Q hypothesis but simply adopt it as a reasonable working hypothesis. The question then becomes, if we adopt the Q hypothesis to account for the double tradition, what theory best accounts for the Markan material? This question is the focus of the present study." (Introduction, p. 1)

9. ———. 2019. *An Introduction to the New Testament and the Origins of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Second revised edition (First edition 2002); Chapter 10: *The Synoptic Problem*, pp. 144-155.

"The first three gospels in the New Testament (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) share many of the same sayings and stories about Jesus. For instance, nearly every story and saying in Mark's gospel also occurs in one or both of the other gospels. In the material that they share, they also tend to say the same things about Jesus. They relate the same stories and sayings in the same order with much the same wording. Because of these similarities, scholars began to place all three texts on the same page in parallel columns in order to more easily compare them. Such a comparative view is called a synopsis, literally a "viewing together." Because these three gospels could be viewed together in this way, they acquired the designation Synoptic Gospels.

The similarities among the Synoptic Gospels give rise to the Synoptic Problem. That is, why are these gospels so much alike? What is the relationship between them? Most scholars believe that the Synoptic Gospels have similarities because they shared some of the same written sources. The attempt to determine the sources of the gospels is called "source criticism." (p. 144)

10. Burrows, Edward B. 1976. "The Use of Textual Theories to Explain Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by Elliott, James Keith, 87-99. Leiden: Brill.
 "It is becoming increasingly popular to reject the hypothesis of Q and to accept a direct literary connection between Matthew and Luke, usually the use of Matthew by Luke. One main argument in favour of a direct connection is provided by the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in passages common to all three gospels, which, it is alleged, have not been adequately accounted for by those who believe that Matthew and Luke were written independently. Apart from the possible overlapping of Mark and Q the two explanations usually given (as for example by Streeter) are independent revision and textual corruption. To many critics of this view textual corruption looks suspiciously like an easy way out: surely we cannot alter the text of the gospels to fit in with a literary theory? Are there valid textual criteria that support the proposed revisions of the text?
 We may distinguish two main ways in which textual study has been used to explain some of the agreements." (p. 87)
11. Butler, Basil Christopher. 1951. *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 Contents: I. The Q Hypothesis Tested 1; II. II Arguments for Q 23; III. The Great Sermon 37; IV. Further Evidence 49; V. The Lachmann Fallacy 62; VI. Matthew's Great Discourses 72; VII. Streeter and Burney on Mark's Use of Q 107; VIII. Miscellaneous Passages 123; IX. Doublets in Matthew 138; X. *Inclusio*, Formulae and Aramaisms 147; XI. St Mark's Gospel 157; *Epilogue* 170; *Index of New Testament Passages* 173-178.
 "At the end of the first quarter of the present century the Two-Document hypothesis, the theory, that is to say, that our First and Third Gospels depend on the Second Gospel and on a conjectural source of which Q has become the usual designation, was regarded in many scholarly circles as no longer requiring proof, criticism or defence. It was on the way to becoming, if it had not already become, less a hypothesis than a dogma.
 But criticism does not stand still. Wellhausen's work on the editorial aspect of St Mark's Gospel was the prelude to the rise of the school of Form Criticism, which contemptuously rejected the supposition that that Gospel is virtually a mere transcript of the oral teaching of an eyewitness. On the other side of the Atlantic the eminent Professor J. H. Ropes admitted that the grounds on which Q's existence is inferred by modern scholars are 'far less secure than is commonly represented or supposed', and that the theory that St Luke's Gospel draws its Q passages from St Matthew's 'has never been shown to be impossible'.
 The investigation recorded in the following pages was not, in the main, carried out with direct reference to the Form Critics. Yet it is hoped that what it has in fact achieved is to make possible a synthesis of all that is objectively sound in the work

of that modern school with the elements of truth discovered by the documentary critics of the generations preceding them. If the outcome of the investigation may be said to contradict the conclusions of the older critics, it will I hope be agreed that this has been the result of a faithful application of their methods.

In the following pages 'Matthew', 'Mark', etc., mean respectively the several Gospels, and their authors are referred to as 'St Matthew', etc. 'Triple tradition' means those sections in which all three Synoptic Gospels are parallel, excepting only those where Mark is not the connecting-link between Matthew and Luke. 'Marcan passage' means a passage in Matthew or Luke directly (as is usually maintained) connected with a parallel passage in Mark; these passages constitute the 'Marcan tradition', a more inclusive term than * Triple tradition*. By 'Q passages' I mean such parts of Matthew and Luke as are parallel with one another but are not parts of the Marcian tradition. These terms are all used for convenience and without prejudice." (From the Preface)

12. ———. 1985. "The Synoptic Problem." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 97-118. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint of "The Synoptic Problem", *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. R.C. Fuller L. Johnson, C. Kearns, London: Nelson, 1969, pp. 815-821.
 From the Abstract: "Butler singles out for mention several solutions to the synoptic problem: (1) The Two-Document Hypothesis: original form (Weisse and Holtzmann: i.e., a first edition of Mark [or Proto-Mark] and a conjectural Discourse Source [later named Q]); (2) The Two-Document Hypothesis: modern form (McLoughlin: i.e., Mark and Q); (3) The Four Document Hypothesis (Streeter: i.e., Mark, Q, M. [the source of Matthew's peculiar material], and L [the source of Luke's peculiar material]); (4) Lagrange's Modified Two-Document Hypothesis (that is, an effort by Roman Catholic scholars to reconcile the priority of Matthew with the Two-Document Hypothesis); (5) The Priority of Matthew (Chapman); (6) Pierson Parker (Matthew and Mark depend on a common source, named by Parker K, a sort of Proto-Matthew); (7) A Post-Lagrange Hypothesis (Vaganay); (8) Mark a conflation (Farmer).
 Butler proceeds to a detailed examination of certain aspects of the Two-Document Hypothesis: (1) a seven-part critique of the so-called Q passages, and (2) a three-part critique of the priority of Mark as opposed to the priority of Matthew. He concludes that the evidence requires that Mark depends on Matthew, and that Luke depends on both Matthew (for his so-called Q material) and on Mark. If conjectural sources are not excluded from consideration, then Butler believes that it is possible that Matthew and Mark on the one hand, and Matthew and Luke on the other hand, are connected by the common use of a lost Gospel, which can best be described as a Proto-Matthew, a document of which our canonical Matthew is a fairly faithful "second edition"." (pp. 97-98)
13. ———. 1985. "The Lachmann Fallacy." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 133-142. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint from B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951, pp. 962-971.
 Abstract: "According to Butler, the priority of Mark rests, in part, on an inference that is obviously false. Lachmann himself drew a correct inference on the assumption that the Synoptic Gospels are only indirectly connected by dependence of them all on a lost document or oral tradition; namely, that the phenomena of order show that the lost document is most faithfully preserved in Mark. This conclusion was the basis of the theory of Ur-Markus as a sort of first edition of Mark and as a source for Matthew and Luke. In the course of time it was seen that Ur-Markus must have been so similar to Mark as to have been practically identical with it, and the proper step was taken of abandoning this conjectural document. But

it was not noticed that by identifying Ur-Markus with Mark the terms of Lachmann's problem were essentially altered and his inference no longer held good. In the theory of Markan priority Ur-Markus's ghost presides over his own sepulchre.

Butler quotes Streeter, interposing his own comments: "We note, then, that in regard to (a) items of subject matter, (b) actual words used, (c) relative order of incidents, Mark is in general supported by both Matthew and Luke, and in most cases where they do not both support him they do so alternately [that is, one or the other supports him], and they practically never agree together against Mark. This is only explicable [here is the vicious inference] if they followed an authority which in content, in wording, and in arrangement was all but identical with Mark."

This mistake, although not actually made by Lachmann, was apparently fathered upon him and has been repeated in modern times by Stanton, Abbott, Wellhausen, Burkitt, Hawkins, Streeter, Rawlinson, Narborough, Redlich, and others. In fact, Butler maintains, once the theory of Ur-Markus is rejected, all that can be argued is that Mark is necessarily the connecting-link between Matthew and Luke in the Triple Tradition, but not necessarily the source of more than one of them. The data simply do not support a more precise determination of the relationship among the synoptic gospels.

Butler does concede that Mark's use of phrases likely to cause offense and his roughness of style and grammar and use of Aramaic words is an argument for Markan priority deserving serious attention."

14. Carey, Greg. 2013. "Moving Things Ahead: A Lukan Redactional Technique and Its Implications for Gospel Origins." *Biblical Interpretation* no. 21:302-319.
Abstract: "Recent and influential proposals (Richard Bauckham; James Durin) have emphasized the role of memory in the composition of the Gospels. Despite the diversity and sophistication of these proposals, they have led to a devaluation of source and redaction analysis among some interpreters. On the contrary, attention to Lukan redaction of Mark, particularly with respect to the sequence of pericopae, reveals both the value of source and redaction analysis and the limitations of memory-oriented accounts of Gospel origins. Lukan transposition manifests itself most clearly in four pericopae: Jesus in Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30), the woman who anoints Jesus (7:36-50), the question of eternal life (10:25-37), and the tradition of the fig tree (13:6-9). Looking at these pericopae one by one, many interpreters debate whether Luke relies on independent traditions; taken as a group, they reveal Luke's redactional and literary activity. In each instance (a) Luke neatly excises the pericope from its location in Mark's sequence, (b) Luke changes fundamental dynamics of the pericope, and (c) Luke's redactional activity favors widely accepted Lukan emphases. Memory-oriented interpretations will undervalue Luke's emphases in these instances."
15. Carlson, Stephen C. 2001. "Clement of Alexandria on the 'Order' of the Gospels." *New Testament Studies* no. 47:118-125.
"Proponents of the Griesbach hypothesis have often appealed to a tradition handed down by Clement of Alexandria in support of their position that Mark used Matthew and Luke. Written early in his career in the now lost *Hypotyposesis*, Clement's information has been preserved for us by Eusebius of Caesarea..." [follow the citation of Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.14.5-7] (p. 118)
(...)
"Although leading source critics have disputed the value of this information, Clement's statement, (...) is widely understood to mean that Matthew and Luke, which include genealogies, were written first, i.e. before Mark and John. Under this interpretation, Clement's statement raises perplexing questions that have not been satisfactorily resolved.
For example, Clement's order stands isolated in apparent contradiction with the chronological order Matthew–Mark–Luke–John given by virtually every other

patristic witness. In fact, Clement's order was unsupported until the ninth century." (p. 119)

(...)

"Clement's statement [*] has puzzled commentators over the years because it has been uniformly interpreted in chronological terms, but its difficulties evaporate when προγεγράφθαι is understood as a reference to the open publication of Matthew and Luke. In terms of its textual and historical contexts, therefore, the best interpretation of Clement's statement is that the gospels with the genealogies were written before the public, as gospels for all Christians. This interpretation makes better sense of the aetiology of Mark that immediately follows and explains the patristic unanimity of the chronological order for the gospels outside of Clement. For the cause of synoptic source criticism, however, Clement's testimony can no longer be relied upon as evidence for the relative order of the gospels." (p. 125, notes omitted)

[*] He said that those of the gospels comprising the genealogies [Matthew and Luke] were 'written before' (προγεγράφθαι) that Mark had this 'disposition'.

16. ———. 2015. "Problems with the Non-Aversion Principle for Reconstructing Q." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 44-61. London: T & T Clark.
 "The Critical Edition of Q was an ambitious undertaking by the *International Q Project*. As a reconstruction of Q's text, it seems reasonable that they should look for analogies by textual critics in how they reconstructed the texts of the gospels based on the manuscript evidence. Some of the techniques they adopted from the textual critics seem appropriate to their task, for example, their analysis of the text in terms of variation units. (49) In fact, some of what the IQP did can be seen as an improvement upon the praxis of textual criticism, especially the compilation and publication of a database of scholarly opinion on each variation unit. But other aspects they adopted were less successful, and the {A} grade of 'virtual certainty' is one of them. Q is a hypothetical text whose wording is contingent on other hypotheses, including the hypothesis that the textual criticism can restore a sufficiently accurate exemplar for Matthew and Luke. Because of this contingency, it is impossible to be more confident in Q's text than that of the attested gospels and *prima facie* unlikely that even Q's doubly attested text can be as confident as that of its witnesses." (p. 60, a note omitted)
 (49) Though this can be faulted since many of the variation units do not appear to be independent.
17. Carlston, Charles E., and Norlin, Dennis. 1971. "Once More -- Statistics and Q." *The Harvard Theological Review* no. 64:59-78.
 "Exegetes are probably no less prone than anybody else to long for something mathematical, something clearly right or wrong, in their discipline. It is thus hardly surprising that in recent years at least two attempts have been made to examine, on a purely objective statistical basis, the disputed question of synoptic relationships. (1) It is our intention in this paper to comment briefly on these two studies and to add new figures to the discussion." (p. 59)
 (1) Theodore R. Rosché, *The Words of Jesus and the Future of the "Q" Hypothesis*, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960), 210-20; A. M. Honoré, *A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem*, *Novum Testamentum* 10 (1968), 95-147. All pages cited below refer to these two articles.
18. ———. 1999. "Statistics and Q--Some Further Observation." *Novum Testamentum* no. 41:108-123.
 "The Problem. In an article published in the *Harvard Theological Review* in 1971(1) the authors suggested a method of word-counting ("agreements" among various parallel accounts) that might test certain literary relationships among the first three gospels. Two responses to it make further discussion necessary.(2)

Some preliminary observations: For the purposes of this original article and the present response to its critics, we have assumed that the so-called "Two-Source Theory" best explains the synoptic problem.

But the Two-Source theory presumed here is not the only option.

Other perfectly competent scholars hold to a wide variety of viewpoints, which could be designated by tags such as Griesbach, proto-Mark, two editions of Matthew, Lukan priority, Luke's use of Matthew or vice versa, multiple source theories, and even a benign (resigned?) agnosticism toward the whole issue. Still, it should be noted that the Two-Source theory is far more commonly held than any other single view. Consequently, our method should not be considered a priori absurd, while those who hold different views have neither established those views nor seriously challenged the Two-Source theory by simply objecting to minor aspects of our study. The larger problem is enormously complex and not really under discussion here." (pp. 108-109)

(1) Charles E. Carlston and Dennis Norlin, "Once More-Statistics and Q," *HTR* 64 (1971) 59-78. Allusions to the "original article" in this study are intended as references to this 1971 study.

(2) John J. O'Rourke, "Some Observations on the Synoptic Problem and the Use of Statistical Procedures," *Novum Testamentum* 16 (1974) 272-277; and Sharon L. Mattila, "A Problem Still Clouded: Yet Again-Statistics and 'Q'," *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994) 314-329.

19. Carmignac, Jean. 1986. *The Birth of the Synoptics Gospels*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press.
Translation of *La naissance des Evangiles Synoptiques*, Paris: O.E.I.L. 1984.
20. Carruth, Shawn, and Garsky, Albrecht, eds. 1996. *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research. Excerpted, sorted, and evaluated: Q 11:2b-4. The Lord's Prayer*. Leuven: Peeters.
21. Carruth, Shawn, and Robinson, James M., eds. 1996. *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research. Excerpted, sorted, and evaluated: Q 4:1-13,6. The Temptations of Jesus – Nazara*. Leuven: Peeters.
22. Carson, Donald A. 1994. "Matthew 11:19b/Luke 7:35: A Test Case for the Bearing of Q Christology on the Synoptic Problem." In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, edited by Green, Joel B. and Turner, Max, 128-146. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
23. Carson, D. A., and Moo, Douglas J. 2005. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
Second edition (First edition 1992); Chapter 2: *The Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 77-133.
"Over the last two centuries, scholars have scrutinized the Synoptic Gospels from many angles and with many different results. This is inevitable, given the vital importance of these books for Christian belief and life. In these books is narrated the life of the One in whom God has chosen especially to make himself known to human beings. They depict the events on which the significance of history and the destiny of every single individual depend: the death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah. Issues pertaining to these books individually will be treated in the chapters devoted to each; here we address significant issues that embrace all three accounts. Specifically, we examine three questions: How did the Synoptic Gospels come into being? How should we understand the gospels as works of literature? And what do the gospels tell us about Jesus?" (p. 78)
24. Casey, Maurice. 2002. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"In surveying the history of previous scholarship in chapter 1, I showed that the Aramaic dimension of Q has never been properly treated, and is conventionally omitted. This is a remarkable fact. Most people have noticed that language is a

significant part of culture, but the study of Q, like the study of Jesus in general, has proceeded as if this were not the case. I also showed in chapter 1 that the whole notion that Q was a single document written in Greek has never been satisfactorily demonstrated.

The omission of the Aramaic dimension is one significant aspect of this, since it has prevented a proper critical assessment of those passages in which the material was transmitted in Aramaic, of which Matthew and Luke used or made different translations. It is not, however, the only significant defect in scholarship. The predication of a Q community, and attempts to portray Jesus as a Cynic philosopher are among other major problems. All these problems are related at a profound level. The omission of Aramaic is one aspect of a general failure to see the Q material within the culture in which it was produced. This general failure is behind most of the other serious problems. This failure is due to the presence of scholarly investigators in their own part of the modern world, and their strong tendency to repeat each other reflects the fact that a scholar's membership of our vast academic bureaucracies is in some ways as important as ideological orientation." (p. 185)

25. Catchpole, David. 1993. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Reprint New York: Bloomsbury 2015.
 "This volume incorporates a series of previously published articles, which have been extensively supplemented and in some cases very drastically revised." (p. XI)
 (...)

 "The study of Q, the hypothetical second source used by Matthew and Luke alongside Mark, has rarely flourished as exuberantly as it does now. Monographs abound, articles jostle with one another in the scholarly journals, ever more sophisticated and nuanced proposals concerning its development arise. And yet at the same time Q is experiencing a mid-life crisis, with wounding attacks being made on its identity, indeed its existence, the intention being to kill the hypothesis stone dead.
 Something therefore needs to be said in its defence." (p. 1)
 (...)

 "We shall consider in a series of test cases how well the hypothesis that Luke used Matthew works, how well the theory that all the material was created by Matthew works, and how well the Q hypothesis might explain the data. The approach will be essentially a combination of the form-critical and the redaction-critical for the purpose of clarifying the source-critical situation. The suggestion will be that all traditions in the sample provide evidence that Luke gives us access to an earlier version than that in Matthew, and that in different ways they undermine the theory of Matthaean creativity.
 Some in addition provide very important evidence of the space between the theology of Q and the theology of Matthew." (p. 6)
26. Chang, Kai-Hsuan. 2019. "Questioning the Feasibility of the Major Synoptic Hypotheses: Scribal Memory as the Key to the Oral–Written Interface." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 41:407-432.
 Abstract: "Instead of blurring the oral and the literary media in antiquity (R. Bultmann and B. Gerhardsson) or dividing them with unsatisfying principles (J.D.G. Dunn), this article follows recent scholarship on orality to explore the mechanical operation of ancient scribal memory as the oral-written interface. In so doing, I argue that the agreement of order between the Synoptic Gospels is characteristic of memory-based utilizations of written texts and does not necessarily indicate the scribes' visual contact with those texts. It is, rather, the very high degree of verbal agreement that indicates Matthew's frequent visual contact with Q 10–11 and 12–13 throughout the gospel, even when following Mark's narrative sequence by memory. This approach explains the infrequent micro-conflations on the Two Document Hypothesis (2DH) with a more mechanically probable procedure, and so strengthens the argument that the 2DH is more feasible than the Two Gospel Hypothesis and the Farrer-Goulder Hypothesis."

27. Chapman, D. J. 1937. *Matthew, Mark, and Luke: A Study in the Order and Interrelation of the Synoptic Gospels*. London: Longmans, Green.
Edited by John M. T. Barton.
28. Cirafesi, Wally V. 2013. *Verbal Aspect in Synoptic Parallels: On the Method and Meaning of Divergent Tense-Form Usage in the Synoptic Passion Narratives*. Leiden: Brill.
"In this volume I argue that an approach to the Greek verbal system that is based on verbal aspect theory has more explanatory power than the traditional temporal and *Aktionsart* approaches for answering the question, why do the Synoptic Gospels at times employ different tense-forms in recounting the same narrative event? In the light of previous research, I suggest that understanding the Greek verb as operating within a systemic network of semantic relationships, from which an author/speaker can make a subjective formal choice (whether conscious nor not) that can result in a range of discourse highlighting functions, helps to explain Synoptic tense-form differences on the basis of normal Greek usage, rather than in terms of anomaly or unexplainable irregularity, and thus provides interpreters of the New Testament with a significant exegetical resource.
In view of the stated argument, I have three main goals: (1) to give insight into the individual tendencies of discourse structure within selected portions of the Synoptic Passion Narratives (PNs) via a comparison of verbal aspect choice, (2) to provide objective criteria for evaluating discourse prominence in Synoptic parallels, and (3) to demonstrate the overarching exegetical value of a rigorous understanding of the textual function of Greek verbal aspect" (p. 1)
29. Collins, Raymond F. 1983. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Chapter Two: *Historical-Critical Methodology*, pp. 115-155.
"In short, the most significant area for source analysis in the study of the Synoptic Gospels is the overarching network of issues relating to the Synoptic Problem. The associated issues with respect to a proto-Matthew, an *Urmarkus*, and a proto-Luke also require the use of the source-critical methodology.
Yet with the practical rejection of these earlier-edition theories and the popular acceptance of the Two-Source theory, source analysis of Matthew, Mark, and Luke has not been completely exhausted."
30. Collison, J. G. F. 1983. "Linguistic Usages in the Gospel of Luke." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 245-260. Macon: Mercer University Press.
"This volume has as its stated objective the furthering of redactional work on the basis of the Griesbachian hypothesis. Not only does the *Brauchbarkeit* [usefulness] argument used by the advocates of the two-document hypothesis, though not a logical argument, need to be countered, but there is also need to provide standard material which can be used by the growing company of those who operate on the basis of the Griesbach paradigm, for use in the situations in which most of them earn their daily bread, namely, teaching. This need exists particularly with regard to the Gospel of Luke.
A thorough study of the redactional theology of Luke is dependent, in part, upon one's ability to distinguish between source and redaction, particularly in those parts of his gospel which are not dependent on the Gospel of Matthew. For this, a definitive list of linguistic usages of the author of the gospel, as well as a list of linguistic usages which will help delineate whether, in addition to Matthew, Luke has used another written source or sources, is needed. While linguistic controls are not the only controls needed, the relentless pursuit of theological motifs without adequate linguistic controls can lead to subjective evaluations of the redactional theology of Luke. It also can lead to the ignoring of the influences of *Nebenquelle* [secondary sources]. By linguistic usages is meant the vocabular, grammatical, and syntactical aspects of the language of the author or of a document. For various

- reasons, the phrase "literary characteristics" is an inappropriate word for these kinds of phenomena." (pp. 245-246)
31. ———. 1983. "Eschatology in the Gospel of Luke." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 363-371. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- "This is an attempt at describing some aspects of Lukan eschatology on the hypothesis that Luke* knew and used the canonical gospel of Matthew. But, it is also an attempt to delineate Lukan theology. So if the perception is right it must provide some illumination, whatever one's own hypothesis of synoptic interrelationships.(2)
1. Since Conzelmann's influential work,(3) it has become commonplace to suggest that Luke has replaced primitive Christian eschatology with salvation history and that his hortatory category is "suddenness" rather than imminence. There is in the gospel an emphasis on suddenness and unexpectedness. But this is seen clearly only in some parables and in Lk 17:20-37." (p. 363)
- * "Luke* is used to indicate the author of the Gospel, the text being indicated by the abbreviation "Lk"; and so for the Gospel of Matthew.
- (2) The reader will note in due course that there are in fact a number of instances where the perceptions of Luke derived on the basis of the Griesbach hypothesis coincide with those of the small but increasing number of scholars who do not subscribe to the Conzelmann synthesis on Luke-Acts. Among such works the writer has profited most from the following three articles: F. D. Francis, "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 37 (1969): 49-63; C. H. Talbert, "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian," in *Jesus and Man's Hope*, vol. 1 (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970) 171-222; and, R. H. Hiers, "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts", *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 145-55.
- (3) H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (London: Faber and Faber, 1960).
32. Connolly-Weinert, Frank. 1989. "Assessing Omissions as Redaction: Luke's Handling of the Charge against Jesus as Detractor of the Temple." In *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, edited by Horgan, Maurya P. and Kobelski, Paul J., 358-368. New York: Crossroad.
33. Cope, Lamar. 1973. "Matthew 12:40 and the Synoptic Source Question." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 92:115.
34. ———. 1983. "The Argument Revolves: The Pivotal Evidence for Markan Priority Is Reversing Itself." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 143-159. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- "There are two major reasons for this continued use of a hypothesis even when several of its major assertions have long since been proven faulty. The first, the subject of this essay, is the firm belief that in a number of places it can be shown that Matthew blatantly or clumsily altered Mark, either correcting or corrupting the sense of his source. Those cases present powerful, and as yet unshaken evidence that Mark is the earliest gospel. The second reason, more subtle and less often articulate, is the belief that one can make the best sense of the development of earliest Christianity and early Christian literature by use of the Mark-Q literary hypothesis.(2) Since, however, this "usefulness" argument would be blatantly circular and dogmatic if it stood alone, most critics would probably agree that the crux of current belief that Mark is the earliest gospel is the evidence that Matthew has altered Mark in several instances in unmistakable ways.
- As most readers know, the actual cases of clear Matthean alteration of Mark vary from scholar to scholar. Many of the claims rest firmly on the prior and unquestioned assumption that Mark is the earliest. In these cases the writers are unaware that the evidence is completely circular and so unconvincing. There are four passages, however, that are widely used as evidence for Matthew's transparent alteration of his Marcan source. They are: the "purpose of parables" pericope in

Mark 4 || Matthew 13, the story of "the death of John the Baptist" in Mark 6 || Matthew 14, the famous "Why do you call me good?" passage in Mark 10 || Matthew 19, and the saying on "clean-unclean" in Mark 7:15 || Matthew 15:11. The evidence from these four passages, taken together, constitutes the strongest argument available for the use of Mark by Matthew.

Thus today any challenge to the theory of Markan priority must be directed to this crucial material. In order to dispute the priority of Mark, evidence must be presented to show that Matthew did not alter Mark because of misunderstanding or for a deliberate theological motive. Moreover, one would need to show that the opposite is true, that is, that there are places where Mark can be shown to have altered Matthew (or Luke) through misunderstanding or out of deliberate theological bias. To my surprise, work with the passages usually cited in favor of Markan priority done in the process of redactional study of Matthew appears to show that the evidence in these reverses in just this way."

(2) N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 35.

35. Corley, Kathleen E. 2011. "White Male Dominance of Synoptic Gospel Research and the Creative Process " 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, 831-844. Leuven: Peeters.
36. Cotter, Wendy. 2004. "Christopher Tuckett and the Question of Q." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* no. 86:141-173.
37. Crawford, Matthew A. 2015. "Ammonius of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea and the Origins of Gospels Scholarship." *New Testament Studies* no. 61:1-29.
Abstract: "In the early third and fourth centuries respectively, Ammonius of Alexandria and Eusebius of Caesarea engaged in cutting-edge research on the relationships among the four canonical gospels. Indeed, these two figures stand at the head of the entire tradition of comparative literary analysis of the gospels. This article provides a more precise account of their contributions, as well as the relationship between the two figures. It argues that Ammonius, who was likely the teacher of Origen, composed the first gospel synopsis by placing similar passages in parallel columns. He gave this work the title Diatessaron-Gospel, referring thereby to the four columns in which his text was laid out. This pioneering piece of scholarship drew upon a long tradition of Alexandrian textual scholarship and likely served as the inspiration for Origen's more famous Hexapla. A little over a century later, Eusebius of Caesarea picked up where Ammonius left off and attempted to accomplish the same goal, albeit using a different and improved method. Using the textual parallels presented in the Diatessaron-Gospel as his 'raw data', Eusebius converted these textual units into numbers which he then collated in ten tables, or 'canons', standing at the beginning of a gospel book. The resulting cross-reference system, consisting of the Canon Tables as well as sectional enumeration throughout each gospel, allowed the user to find parallels between the gospels, but in such a way that the literary integrity of each of the four was preserved. Moreover, Eusebius also exploited the potential of his invention by including theologically suggestive cross-references, thereby subtly guiding the reader of the fourfold gospel to what might be called a canonical reading of the four."
38. Creed, John M. 1935. "'L' and the Structure of the Lucan Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis." *The Expository Times* no. 46:101-107.
39. Crook, Zeba Antonin. 2000. "The Synoptic Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: a Test-Case for the Two-Document, Two-Gospel, and Farrer-Goulder Hypotheses." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*:23-48.
Abstract: "It is not uncommon to read studies that either state explicitly or work under the assumption that the synoptic problem has been solved. Using the parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven as a test-case, it becomes clear that the problem

is far from a solution. Each of the three major source hypotheses has its strengths (and weaknesses) when it attempts to account for the data generated by these two pericopae.

Although this paper concludes that the Two-Document Hypothesis (2DH) deals with the data with the fewest problems, the strengths of the other hypotheses coupled with the weaknesses of the 2DH should help keep the 2DH honest." (...)

"The order of the sections is not meant to presuppose a favored hypothesis. The 2DH is presented first because for better or worse it is the most widely accepted hypothesis. Though the Griesbach hypothesis was popular before the 2DH, in its modern manifestation (2GH) it is a reaction against the 2DH, and hence follows. The Farrer-Goulder hypothesis can also be said to be a reaction against the 2DH (and possibly the 2GH as well), and so it is third." (p. 24 note 3)

40. Damm, Alex. 2003. "Ornatus: An Application of Rhetoric to the Synoptic Problem." *Novum Testamentum* no. 45:338-364.
Abstract: "In this essay I shall consider ancient rhetoric as a means to suggest synoptic relationships. Focusing on the stylistic virtue of *ornatus* ("adornment"), I shall examine three triple tradition sentences in which the gospel of Mark employs a word used nowhere by the gospels of Luke or Matthew. Focusing on the relationship between Mark and the other gospels, I shall ask whether it is more likely that Mark adds the word to Matthew and/or Luke on the Two-Gospel Hypothesis, or whether Matthew and/or Luke delete it from Mark on the Two-Document Hypothesis. My study leads me to two conclusions. On grounds of *ornatus*, editing on either source hypothesis is plausible. But such editing on the Two-Document Hypothesis is more plausible, since Mark's addition of each word would entail the unlikely discovery of near-perfect or coincidentally co-ordinated literary patterns in Matthew and/or Luke."
41. ———. 2011. "Ancient Rhetoric 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, 483-508. Leuven: Peeters.
42. ———. 2013. *Ancient Rhetoric and the Synoptic Problem: Clarifying Markan Priority*. Leuven: Peeters.
43. Davis III, Charles T. 1983. "Mark: The Petrine Gospel." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 441-466. Macon: Mercer University Press.
"Thomas Longstaff argues persuasively, drawing on studies assuming both the Griesbach and the Two Source Hypotheses, that Mark should be understood as a spokesman for orthodoxy, the author of a Gospel written primarily to present to the reader the correct understanding of Jesus' messiahship and the correct understanding of what following him entails.(1)
The present study seeks to advance this argument by defining more precisely the Markan understanding of messiahship on the grounds of an intrinsic literary analysis of the gospel as a whole.(2) It will be suggested that Mark's understanding of messiahship is compatible with a Roman provenance in that it advances the claims of Peter to be the fountainhead of the true "secret" gospel. By implication the gospel challenges the Gnostic claim of a "secret" tradition deriving from Thomas or others. Finally it will be argued that this literary understanding of Mark gives one a basis for explaining adequately why Mark could have abbreviated the available tradition that we see reflected in Matthew and Luke by omitting birth narratives, genealogy, Sermon on the Mount/Plain traditions, postresurrection appearances and much teaching material." (pp. 441-442, two notes omitted)
(1) "Crisis and Christology: The Theology of the Gospel of Mark," *Perkins Journal* 33:4 (Summer 1980):28. (See p. 392, above).
(2) For a complete exposition of method see Charles Thomas Davis III, *Speaking of Jesus* (Lakemont GA: CSA Press, 1978) 61-81; or, by the same author, "A

- Multidimensional Criticism of the Gospels," *Orientation By Disorientation: Studies in Literary Criticism and Biblical Literary Criticism* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1980) 87-98.
44. Day, Matthew. 2005. "Reading the Fossils of Faith: Thomas Henry Huxley and the Evolutionary Subtext of the Synoptic Problem." *Church History* no. 74:534-556. "In what follows, I want to examine a thicket of historical relationships and issues that the warfare model has obscured from view by unraveling the connection between evolutionary thought and biblical criticism in the nineteenth century. Specifically, my aim is to unearth the link that unites the Synoptic Problem, the workhorse of modern New Testament studies, and Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-95)?a man who is often viewed as the paradigmatic scientific warrior against religion." (p. 536)
 (...) "As I see it, the pressing historical question is not "Why did Huxley write about the Synoptic Problem?" but is instead "Why did Huxley believe all three Synoptic Gospels were dependent upon a single *Ur-Marcus*?"
 I will argue that Huxley arrived at this conclusion by viewing biblical criticism as one plank within a larger campaign for cultural and social reform - a campaign that, among other things, would make science the conceptual foundation for humanistic studies. More precisely, by extending the discourse of natural history to address religion, Huxley could regard "scientific" biblical criticism and the anthropology of religion as forms of biological inquiry. Thus, both the form and content of the *Ur-Marcus* solution to the Synoptic Problem became an opportunity for Huxley to demonstrate the methodological superiority of scientific thought and the explanatory breadth of the Darwinian hypothesis."
45. Dayton, Wilber T. 1963. "A New Look at the Marcan Hypothesis and Gospel Research." *The Asbury Seminarian* no. 17:53-64. "For more than half a century there had been a "consensus" among the scholars not only as to the nature of the Synoptic Problem but as to its solution. As early as the nineties, students at Cambridge had been told that there was no longer a synoptic problem to solve.(1)" (p. 53)
 (...) But in 1961 William R. Farmer, of Perkins School of Theology, said, "During the past ten years the situation has changed. "(8)
 He cites the work of Butler in England (1951), Parker in America (1953), Vaganay in France (1954), and Ludlum in America (1958), all of whom opposed the view that our Mark could have been used as a source by our Matthew. Upon investigation. Farmer rejects the hypothesis that these writers were but serving some ecclesiastical or traditional cause. And the major thrust of his paper is to present the question whether, in the light of serious research, the priority of Mark can still be assumed as an assured result of nineteenth century criticism. Since this question haunts every serious student of the Gospels, he has entitled his treatise, "A 'Skeleton in the Closet' of Gospel Research. " (pp. 54-55)
 (1) Foakes Jackson, *Constructive Quarterly* (June 1920), p. 326.
 (8) William R. Farmer, "A 'Skeleton in the Closet' of Gospel Research," *Biblical Research*, VI, (Papers of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, published at 800 West Beldon, Chicago 14, Illinois), pp. 18-42..