

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (De - Fee)**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 (Current page)

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

- De Jonge, Henk Jan. 1992. "Augustine on the Interrelations of the Gospels." In *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Volume III*, edited by van Seegreboeck, Frans, Tuckett, Christopher M., Van Belle, Gilbert and Verheyden, Joseph, 2409-2417. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
 "In a contribution to the recent Jerusalem Symposium on *The Interrelations of the Gospels*, Frans Neirynck makes mention of the "Augustinian hypothesis" concerning the literary relationships between the Gospels. According to Neirynck, Augustine's view of these relationships was that Mark had access to Matthew, and Luke to Mark."
 (...)
 "In a paper read at the *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* of 1990, however, I have already argued that if Augustine had a "Benutzungshypothese" [usage hypothesis] at all, it can only have had the following form(3):
 Mt -> Mk -> Lk -> Jn
 The reason why Augustine should not be thought to have regarded each evangelist as dependent on all his predecessors is that he, Augustine, wrote in *De consensu*

- evangelistarum* I,ii,4: "each evangelist proves to have chosen to write not in ignorance of the other writer, his predecessor [in the singular!]"(4)" (pp. 2409-2410) (...)
- Augustine had no "Benutzungshypothese" at all. The so-called "Augustinian hypothesis" does not reflect Augustine's views on the origin and interrelations of the Gospels. It is a recent invention, possibly not older than the sixteenth Century(22)" (p. 2417).
- (3) H.J. DE JONGE, The Loss of Faith in the Historicity of the Gospels, in A. DENAUX (ed.), John and the Synoptics (BETL, 101), Leuven, University Press - Peeters, 1992, 409-421.
- (4) AUGUSTINUS, *De consensu evangelistarum*, ed F. WEIHRICH (CSEL, 43), Vienna/Leipzig, Tempsky and Freytag, 1904, p 4, I,ii,4 "non tamen unusquisque eorum velut alienus praecedentis [singular!] ignarus voluisse scribere reppentur". 22. So far as I know the first author to ascribe the "Augustinian hypothesis" concerning the relationships between the Gospels to Augustine was M. CHEMNITZ, *Harmonia evangelica*, 1593; Frankfurt-Hamburg, 1652, "Prolegomena", cap. 1, p. 3: "Et manifestius hoc inde colligitur, cum, juxta Epiphaniae et Augustini sententiam, inter evangelistas illi, qui post alios scripserunt, priorum scripta et viderint et legerint". For other sixteenth-century authors who held the so-called "Augustinian hypothesis" without ascribing it explicitly to Augustine, see H.J. DE JONGE, *The Loss of Faith* (n. 3 above), especially footnotes 23-27.
2. de Lang, Marijke H. 1993. "The Prehistory of the Griesbach Hypothesis." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* no. 69:134-139.
- "The theory that the Gospel of Mark is an abridgment of Matthew and Luke has become known mainly through the work of the eighteenth-century biblical scholar Johann Jakob Griesbach. The question we want to deal with here is whether Griesbach came to this hypothesis under the influence of the investigations of other scholars or independently." (p. 134)
- (...)
- "However, Griesbach was not the first to argue that Mark had used both Matthew and Luke. At least three authors had defended the same view before him: Henry Owen, Anton Friedrich Büsching and Friedrich Andreas Stroth. Henry Owen's Observations on the Four Gospels appeared in 1764. Owen assumed Matthew had been the first to write his Gospel, Luke being the second; and that Mark had made an epitome of both Matthew and Luke." (p. 135, note omitted)
- (...)
- "The second work in which we find the thesis brought forward that Mark is a compendium of Matthew and Luke, is the harmony of the Gospels composed by Anton Friedrich Büsching and published by him in 1766 under the title *Die vier Evangelien mit ihren eigenen Worten zusammengesetzt*. Büsching's view, however, differed from that of Owen and Griesbach on one important point: he held that Luke, not Matthew, was the earliest Gospel." (p. 136)
- (...)
- "The third scholar to defend the view that Mark is a compendium of Matthew and Luke, was the anonymous author of an article which appeared in 1781 in the periodical *Repertorium* edited by J.G. Eichhorn. The author is generally thought to be Friedrich Andreas Stroth. His essay is entitled *Von Interpolationen im Evangelium Matthäi*. In it Stroth argues that a number of passages in the Gospel of Matthew do not belong to the original text of the evangelist, but are later additions." (p. 137)
3. Deardorff, James W. 1992. *The Problems of New Testament Gospel Origins: A Glasnost Approach*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press.
4. Dearing, Vinton A. 1979. "The Synoptic Problem: Prolegomena to a New Solution." In *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, edited by O'Flaherty, Wendy Doniger, 121-137. Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union.

5. Denaux, Adelbert. 1992. "The Q-Logion Mt 11,27/Lk 10,22 and the Gospel of John." In *John and the Synoptics*, edited by Denaux, Adelbert. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters Leuven.
6. ———. 1995. "Criteria for Identifying Q-Passages. A Critical Review of a Recent Work by T. Bergemann." *Novum Testamentum* no. 37:105-129.
Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 243-268.
"The hypothetical source Q receives much attention in N.T. research today. A quick examination of the current bibliography of D.M. Scholer clearly demonstrates this fact.(1)
The first task of Q research is to make a reliable reconstruction of Q. It is such a reconstruction, reliable done, which acts as a basis for what one can assert about other aspects of Q, such as its literary unity and macro-structure, its literary genre and theology, its (poetic) formal features, the tradition- and composition history of Q and its place in the history of Early Christianity. One cannot, of course, detach this primordial task of reconstruction from the other tasks: there is a certain reciprocity between all these aspects.
Elements of the task of reconstruction may be seen in the work of A.D. Jacobson. He distinguishes two different but complementary aspects: "Two reconstructive procedures are necessary: (a) reconstruction of the original wording of each saying or group of sayings, and (b) reconstruction of the original sequence of the material. It is not possible to do either in isolation from the other, but, as in many large tasks, some division of labor is inevitable".(2)"
(1) One can find the basic bibliography in F. Neiryck & F. Van Segbroeck, "Q Bibliography", in J. Delobel (ed.), *Logia. Les paroles de Jésus--The Sayings of Jesus* (BETL, 59), Leuven, 1982, pp. 561-586; it was continued in "Q-Bibliography: Additional List 1981-85", *ETL* 62 (1986) 157-65. From 1982 on, see the current bibliography of D.M. Scholer, "Q Bibliography: 1981-1989", *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers*, pp. 23-37; "Supplement I: 1990", *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers*, pp. 11-13; "Supplement II: 1991", *SBL 1991 Seminar Papers*, pp. 1-7; "Supplement III: 1992", *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*, pp. 1-4; "Supplement IV: 1993", *SBL 1993 Seminar Papers*, pp. 1-5.
(2) A.D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel. An Introduction to Q*, Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1992, p. 2
7. Derico, Travis Michael. 2016. *Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement: Evaluating the empirical evidence for literary dependence*. Eugene (OR): Pickwick Publications.
"This book is an attempt to address part of a difficult problem in New Testament studies that, owing to certain advances in our understanding of the relevant issues, has recently got much worse. The problem can be adequately stated in three sentences:
1. Some first-century Christians remembered and transmitted oral traditions about Jesus.
2. The Synoptic Evangelists made some use of some of these traditions in the composition of their Gospels.
3. We don't know very much about these traditions or how the Synoptic Evangelists used them.
New Testament scholars have long been aware of this problem and of the crucial importance of its solution. The Synoptic Gospels contain the earliest and most detailed accounts of the life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth now extant. To be able to accurately assess the data contained in these texts concerning Jesus, the primitive church, the Synoptic Evangelists, and the Synoptics themselves, we need to know something about the sources consulted in process of their composition. And since the Synoptic Evangelists were undoubtedly familiar with orally transmitted Jesus traditions, we need to know the extent to which their Gospels were derived from or influenced by those traditions. Unfortunately, we have very little unambiguous evidence to indicate the precise character of any part of the first-

- century oral Jesus tradition, or to illuminate the editorial policies of the Synoptic Evangelists with respect to it." (pp. 1-2)
8. Derrenbacker Jr., Robert A. 2002. "Greco-Roman Writing Practices and Luke's Gospel: Revisiting "The Order of a Crank"." In *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, edited by Rollston, Christopher A., 61-83. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
 9. ———. 2005. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
 10. ———. 2009. "The "Abridgement" of Matthew and Luke: Mark as Epitome?" In *Resourcing New Testament Studies: Literary, Historical, and Theological Essays in Honor of David L. Dungan*, edited by McNicol, Allan J., Peabody, David B. and Subramanian, J. Samuel 36-45. New York: T & T Clark.
 11. ———. 2011. "The "External and Psychological Conditions under which the Synoptic Gospels Were Written": Ancient Compositional Practices 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, 435-457. Leuven: Peeters.
 12. ———. 2013. "Texts, Tables and Tablets A Response to John C. Poirier." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 35:380-387.
 13. ———. 2016. "Ancient Literacy, Ancient Literary Dependence, Ancient Media, and the Triple Tradition." 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., 81-95. Leuven: Peeters.
 14. ———. 2017. "Matthew as Scribal Tradent: An Assessment of Alan Kirk's *Q in Matthew*." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* no. 15:213-223.
 15. Derrenbacker Jr., Robert A., and Kloppenborg, John S. 2001. "Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder." *Journal of Biblical Literature*:57-76. IQP = International Q Project.
 16. Derrett, J. Duncan M-. 1987. "Marcan Priority and Marcan Skill." *Bibbia e oriente* no. 29:135-139.
Reprinted in: John Duncan Martin Derrett, *Studies in the New Testament: Volume Five: The Sea-Change of the Old Testament in the New*, Leiden: Brill 1989, pp. 114-118.
 17. deSilva, David A. 2018. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
Second edition (First edition 2004).
Chapter 4: The Four Gospels and the On Jesus: Critical Issues in the Study of the Gospels, pp. 117-173.
 18. Dibelius, Martin. 1927. "The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels." *The Harvard Theological Review* no. 20:151-170.
 19. Dickerson, Patrick L. 1997. "The New Character Narrative in Luke-Acts and the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 116:291-312.
 20. Downing, F. Gerald. 1985. "Towards the Rehabilitation of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 269-285. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from *New Testament Studies*, 11, 1964-65, pp. 169-181.
 21. ———. 1988. "Compositional Conventions and the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 107:69-85.

22. ———. 1988. "Quite Like Q A Genre for 'Q': The 'Lives' of Cynic Philosophers." *Biblica* no. 69:196-225.
23. ———. 1992. "A Paradigm Perplex: Luke, Matthew and Mark." *New Testament Studies* no. 38:15-36.
24. ———. 1994. "A Genre for Q and a Socio-Cultural Context for Q: Comparing Sets of Similarities with Sets of Differences." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 55:3-26.
25. ———. 1996. "Word-Processing in the Ancient World The Social Production and Performance of Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 19:29-48.
26. ———. 2001. "Dissolving the Synoptic Problem Through Film?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 84:117-119.
27. ———. 2004. "Disagreements of Each Evangelist with the Minor Close Agreements of the Other Two." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 80:445-469.
 Abstract: "Whilst the "Q" hypothesis is largely accepted in continental European research, it continues to be disputed in English language debate. Perhaps Mk conflated Mt and Lk (Griesbach – Farmer); or Lk conflated Mk and Mt (Farrer – Goulder). Largely unattended to in these debates, however, are the very frequent though not entirely consistent refusals of the imagined third author to copy his sources when they agree verbatim or very closely, while happy to copy precisely one or the other in the same immediate context. Some sixty instances are discussed. Where other ancient authors explain their preference for agreement in their sources, these writers have to be imagined refusing just that, and going to considerable pains to avoid it. Mk and Q as the sources for Mt and Lk remains by far the more plausible hypothesis."
28. ———. 2011. "Writers' Use or Abuse of Written Sources." 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, 523-550. Leuven: Peeters.
29. ———. 2013. "Waxing Careless: Poirier, Derrenbacker and Downing." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 35:388-393.
30. ———. 2017. "Plausibility, Probability, and Synoptic Hypotheses." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 93:313-337.
 Abstract: "Scholars assert their reconstructions are possible, probable, plausible. Even Matthew and Luke quite independently agreeing against Mark in Markan contexts is agreed by sceptics to be possible, if not really plausible. Can 'possibility' or 'plausibility' be quantified? Perhaps our judgement between hypotheses is inescapably subjective. However, if some proposed reconstruction can be shown to be impossible, then any that are merely possible surely hold the field, alone or 'complausible' with others. One evangelist writing third (whether Mark, Luke, or recently, from Alan Garrow, Matthew) turns out willing to paraphrase or often copy verbatim – or all but – single matter from the other two, while assiduously avoiding forty or so extensive sequences of the verbatim agreed witness of the other two. Only the hypothesis of Matthew and Luke independently using Mark and 'Q' (2DH) avoids such an arguably impossible reconstruction."
31. Dunderberg, Ismo. 1995. "Q and the Beginning of Mark." *New Testament Studies* no. 41:501-511.
32. Dungan, David Laird. 1970. "Mark - The Abridgment of Matthew and Luke." In *Jesus and Man's Hope. Volume 1*, edited by Buttrick, D. G., 51-97. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary.
33. ———. 1974. "Reactionary Trends in the Gospel Producing Activity of the Early Church: Marcion, Tatian, Mark." In *L'Évangile selon Marc : tradition et rédaction*, edited by Sabbe, M., 179-202. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

34. ———. 1983. "The Purpose and Provenance of the Gospel of Mark according to the "Two-Gospel" (Owen-Griesbach) Hypothesis." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 411-440. Macon: Mercer University Press.
35. ———. 1984. "A Griesbachian Perspective on the Argument from Order." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 67-74. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
36. ———. 1985. "Critique of the Main Arguments for Mark's Priority as Formulated by B. H. Streeter." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 143-161. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint of "Mark - The Abridgement of Matthew and Luke", in *Jesus and the Man's Hope*, Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970, Volume 1, pp. 54-74.
37. ———. 1985. "Critique of the Q Hypothesis." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 427-433. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint of "Critique of the Q Hypothesis", from "Mark - The Abridgement of Matthew and Luke", in *Jesus and the Man's Hope*, Pittsburgh; Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970, Volume 1, pp. 74-80.
38. ———, ed. 1990. *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard, W. R. Farmer, F. Neiryck, Jerusalem 1984*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
Proceedings of the 1984 Jerusalem Symposium on the Interrelations of the Gospels, April 8-22.
Contents: F. Neiryck: Introduction: The two-source hypothesis; F. Neiryck: Matthew 4:23-5:2 and the Matthean composition of 4:23-11:1; C.M. Tuckett: Response to the two-gospel hypothesis; F. Neiryck: Response to the multiple-stage hypothesis; W.R. Farmer: The Two Gospel Hypothesis: The Statement of the Hypothesis; A.J. McNicol: The composition of the synoptic eschatological discourse; D.L. Dungan: Response to the two source hypothesis; D.B. Peabody: Response to the multi-stage hypothesis; M.E. Boismard: Théorie des niveaux multiples; B. Reicke: The history of the synoptic discussion; D.L. Dungan: Synopses of the future; J.K. Elliott: The relevance of textual criticism to the synoptic problem; S.O. Abogunrin: The synoptic gospel debate. A re-examination from an African point of view; P. Borgen: John and the Synoptics; F. Neiryck: John and the synoptics: Response to P. Borgen; P.L. Shuler: The Genre(s) of the gospel; P. Stuhlmacher: The genre(s) of the gospels: response to the P.L. Shuler; B. Gerhardsson: The gospel tradition; B.F. Meyer: Objectivity and subjectivity in historical criticism of the gospels; R.H. Fuller: Response to B.F. Meyer; H. Merkel: Die Überlieferungen der alten Kirche über das Verhältnis der Evangelien; Bernard Orchard: Response to H. Merkel.
39. ———. 1990. "Response to the Two-Source Hypothesis." In *The Interrelations of the Gospels. A Symposium led by M.-E. Boismard - W.R. Farmer - F. Neiryck, Jerusalem 1984*, edited by Dungan, David L., 201-216. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
40. ———. 1992. "Two-Gospel Hypothesis." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Vol. 6*, edited by Freedman, Martin, 671-679. New York: Doubleday.
"The Two-Gospel Hypothesis, formerly known as the Griesbach Hypothesis, proposes a comprehensive solution to the SYNOPTIC PROBLEM. It was first given this new title by Bernard Orchard (1982: vii; 1983: xii) to emphasize the central argument that the gospel of Mark was originally composed by joining together elements of the two earlier gospels, Matthew and Luke. The name is intended to distinguish this approach from the Two-Source (or Document) Hypothesis (hereafter 2SH), in that it does not postulate a hypothetical "lost document" such as "Q" plus Mark (or a second hypothetical "lost document" such as UrMark or DeuteroMark) as a source of Matthew and Luke. See TWO-SOURCE

HYPOTHESIS. The Two-Gospel Hypothesis (hereafter 2GH) contends that the gospel of Matthew was written first in the service of the Palestinian Jewish Christian proclamation of the messiahship of the recently crucified Jesus of Nazareth. It proposes that the gospel of Luke + Acts was written second for use in the Pauline mission to the gentiles, using Matthew as the main source. It proposes that the gospel of Mark was written third as a selective combination of Matthew and Luke, as an attempt to reconcile the Jewish and gentile branches in the early Church. It proposes that the gospel of John was written fourth, revealing an extensive awareness of the other Gospels but consisting mostly of a separate stream of the Jesus tradition." (p. 671)

41. ———. 1995. "'Eppur si muove': Circumnavigating the Mythical Recensions of Q." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* no. 78:541-570.
42. ———. 1999. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. New York: Doubleday.
- "Why Another History of the Synoptic Problem?
Given the hundreds of handbooks introducing the New Testament and Bible study guides being used around the world, as well as the scores of commentaries on the Gospels and the dozen or so histories of New Testament scholarship, why should I feel impelled to add another lengthy study of this subject, especially since there is such unanimity regarding the solution to the Synoptic Problem, namely, the almost universal acceptance of the Two Source Hypothesis? What more could be said that hasn't been already, more than once? My account will differ from all others in four important ways:
- Most accounts do not tell the whole story; they begin around 1800 instead of at the beginning. As a result, they privilege the most recent form of the Synoptic Problem, treating it as if it were somehow self-evident. Thus, they do not notice that there are earlier forms of the Synoptic Problem, and, by comparison with them, they do not notice how destructive to traditional Christianity the modern form is. This skewed situation is instead regarded as morally and politically neutral and objective, when precisely the opposite is the case.
 - No history of source criticism correlates the four basic components of the full Synoptic Problem to each other or explains their intrinsic interrelationships. This history will show how the Synoptic Problem has always involved much more than just the question of how the Gospels were composed and what sources were used. The complete Synoptic Problem has always also involved the question of which Gospels to consider (the question of canon), which text of the normative Gospels to use (text criticism), and how to interpret the Bible as a whole and the Gospels in particular (hermeneutics). The full Synoptic Problem, strictly speaking, always includes these four components.
 - This history is unique in that it discusses the history of each of these four components as they arise within each of the major Forms of the Synoptic Problem.
 - No history of the Synoptic Problem has tried to indicate the cultural, political, economic, and technological presuppositions undergirding and shaping the debate in every historical period. Instead, most biblical scholars naively believe that their discipline is free of such mundane concerns, as if their biblical research had no economic agenda and did not serve fundamental political objectives. It will be the task of this history to make these political and economic aspects clear for each of the major Forms of the Synoptic Problem." (pp. 2-3)
43. ———. 2011. "Dispensing with the Priority of Mark." In *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus. Vol. 2. The Study of Jesus*, edited by Holmén, Tom and Porter, Stanley E., 1313-1342. Leiden: Brill.
44. Dunn, James D. G. 1992. "Matthew's Awareness of Markan Redaction." In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Volume II*, edited by van Segbroeck, Frans, Tuckett, Christopher M., van Belle, Gilbert and Verheyden, Joseph, 1349-1359. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.

- Reprinted in James D. G. Dunn, *The Oral Gospel Tradition*, Grand rapids, MI: Eerdmans, pp. 109-119.
45. ———. 2003. "Altering the Default Setting: Re-envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition." *New Testament Studies* no. 49:139-175.
Abstract: "The literary mindset ('default setting') of modern Western culture prevents those trained in that culture from recognizing that oral cultures operate differently. The classic solution to the Synoptic problem, and the chief alternatives, have envisaged the relationships between the Gospel traditions in almost exclusively literary terms. But the earliest phase of transmission of the Jesus tradition was without doubt predominantly by word of mouth. And recent studies of oral cultures provide several characteristic features of oral tradition. Much of the Synoptic tradition, even in its present form, reflects in particular the combination of stability and flexibility so characteristic of the performances of oral tradition. Re-envisaging the early transmission of the Jesus tradition therefore requires us to recognize that the literary paradigm (including a clearly delineated Q document) is too restrictive in the range of possible explanations it offers for the diverse/divergent character of Synoptic parallels. Variation in detail may simply attest the character of oral performance rather than constituting evidence of literary redaction."
46. ———. 2005. "Q¹ as Oral Tradition." In *The Written Gospel*, edited by Bockmuehl, Markus and Hagner, Donald A., 45-69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reprinted in James D. G. Dunn, *The Oral Gospel Tradition*, Grand rapids, MI: Eerdmans, pp. 80-108.
47. Dyer, Charles H. 1981. "Do the Synoptics Depend on Each Other?" *Bibliotheca sacra* no. 138:230-245.
"What is the literary relationship between the Synoptic Gospels? How does one explain the many similarities of content and wording within the Gospel accounts while at the same time accounting for the numerous differences between the individual records? This article examines the theories which have been proposed in an attempt to arrive at an acceptable solution to the question of literary dependence in the Synoptic Gospels." (p. 230)
48. Edwards, James R. 2009. *The Hebrew Gospel and the Development of the Synoptic Tradition*. Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans.
49. Edwards, Richard Alan. 1975. *A Concordance to Q*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
50. ———. 1976. *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
51. ———. 1982. "Matthew's use of Q in Chapter 11." In *Logia : les paroles de Jésus. mémorial Joseph Coppens*, edited by Delobel, Joël, 257-275. Leuven: Peeters.
52. Elliott, James Keith. 1971. "The Synoptic Problem and the Laws of Tradition: A Cautionary Note." *The Expository Times* no. 82:148-152.
"It is a commonplace of Form-critical studies that as the Gospel tradition developed, proper names were added to the material. The 'proofs' for this usually include such examples as the identification of the high priest's servant as Malchus only in the developed tradition of the Fourth Gospel. The criterion that the earliest tradition was largely without names is usually used by writers on the synoptic problem often to support Markan priority, it being stressed that Matthew makes many aspects of Mark's material more precise and detailed.(1)" (p. 148)
(...)
"In this paper I have dealt only with the appearance or absence of proper names. In assessing the order of the gospels one needs obviously to consider many other features, for example, Hawkins' conclusions about language(2) must be tested against Butler's(3) and both tested against the developments in Koine on the one

- hand and against the evangelists' own style and idiosyncrasies of grammar on the other. Similarly, the author's own theological position will need to be tested against the developments of theological thought elsewhere in the New Testament. Stringent use of a redaction-critical approach to the gospels not only enables the reader to assess the relative priority of the synoptic gospels as complete units, but can also be harnessed to test the relative antiquity of individual pericopes in the gospels; but the main contribution it can make to New Testament studies is less in assessing antiquity of tradition than explaining the theological position of the Gospel writers. And it is this which seems the more worthwhile pursuit." (p. 152)
- (1) e.g., *The Gospel According to St Matthew* by W. C. Allen (I.C.C.) (1907), xxiv f.
 (2) J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed. (1909).
 (3) B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St Matthew* (1951).
53. ———. 2015. "The Relevance of Textual Criticism to the Synoptic Problem." In *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism*, edited by Elliott, J. K., 147-158. New York: Bloomsbury.
54. Engelbrecht, John. 1996. "Challenging the Two-Source Hypothesis: How Successful are the Commentaries?" *Neotestamentica* no. 30:89-101.
55. Enslin, Morton S. 1985. "Luke and Matthew: Compilers or Authors?" In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Principat 25.3. Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu; Neues Testament [Kanonische Schriften und Apokryphen], Forts.*), edited by Temporini, Hildegard and Haase, Wolfgang, 2357-2388. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
56. Evans, Craig A. 2004. "Sorting out the Synoptic Problem: Why an Old Approach Is Still Best." In *Reading the Gospels Today*, 1-26. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
57. ———. 2016. "The Two-Source Hypothesis." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 27-46. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
58. ———. 2016. "Two-Source Hypothesis Response." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 113-126. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
59. Evans, Owen E. 1961. "Synoptic Criticism since Streeter." *The Expository Times* no. 72:295-299.
60. Eve, Eric. 2004. "Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 89-114. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
61. ———. 2011. "The Synoptic Problem without Q?" 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, 551-570. Leuven: Peeters.
62. ———. 2015. "Memory, Orality and the Synoptic Problem." *Early Christianity* no. 6:311-333.
63. ———. 2015. "The Devil in the Detail: Exorcising Q from the Beelzebul Controversy." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 16-43. London: T & T Clark.
- "In all three synoptic gospels, the Beelzebul Controversy (Mt. 12.22-37 // Mk 3.20-30 // Lk. 11.14-23) takes the form of a sorcery accusation. It also provides a textbook example of where, exceptionally, it is Matthew rather than Mark that constitutes the 'middle term' among the three synoptics. On the Two-Document hypothesis (henceforth 2DH) this is explained as a Mark-Q overlap, meaning that versions of this pericope

appeared in both Mark and Q, and that Matthew combined the two (while Luke, in this case, broadly followed Q alone). On the Griesbach hypothesis (henceforth GH) the data are explained on the basis that Luke and Mark each adapted Matthew (there would be little need to argue for Mark's conflation of Matthew and Luke in this case). Supporters of the Farrer hypothesis (henceforth FH) would instead argue that here Matthew adapted Mark and Luke adapted Matthew." (p. 16, notes omitted)

(...)

"The present essay has had the following limited aim: to determine whether the Synoptic parallel Mt. 12.22-37 // Mk 3.20-30 // Lk. 11.14-23 is more plausibly explained on the Two-Document hypothesis (2DH) or on the Farrer Hypothesis (FH) - that is, whether, assuming Marcan priority, the major agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in the Beelzebul Controversy are more plausibly explained as a Mark-Q overlap or an instance where Matthew has reworked Mark and Luke has reworked Matthew. To achieve this, the Matthaean and Lucan versions of the Beelzebul Controversy have been examined in some detail." (p.42)

64. ———. 2016. *Writing the Gospels: Composition and Memory*. London: SPCK.
65. ———. 2021. *Relating the Gospels: Memory, Imitation and the Farrer Hypothesis*. New York: Bloomsbury.
66. Farkasfalvy, Denis. 1992. "The Presbyters' Witness on the Order of the Gospels as Reported by Clement of Alexandria." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* no. 54:260-270.
 "In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius reports that Clement of Alexandria in his work *Hypotyposes* had transmitted a tradition preserved by "the ancient presbyters" about the order of the Gospels.[*]
 (...)
 Current scholarship routinely uses this text for claiming that Clement of Alexandria not only accepted the fourfold Gospel canon but also held that Matthew and Luke were composed before Mark and John. The purpose of this article is to propose a new interpretation of this text by carefully distinguishing among the three levels on which this passage must be analyzed: the understanding of Eusebius, that of Clement, and that of the "ancient presbyters."
 While the actual order of the composition of the four Gospels is undoubtedly an important issue, here I do not want to enter into that question as such, nor do I think that this article should be considered as support for any of the theories espoused in the current debate. In fact, I attempt to show that the presbyters quoted by Clement of Alexandria did not provide information about the chronological order of the four canonical Gospels and thus the passage neither favors nor contradicts any of the modern theories concerning that question." (pp. 261-262, note omitted)
 [*] Book 6.14.5
67. ———. 1998. "The Papias Fragments on Mark and Matthew and Their Relationship to Luke's Prologue: An Essay on the Pre-History of the Synoptic Problem." In *The Early Church in its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*, edited by Malherbe, Abraham J., Norris, Frederick W. and Thompson, James W., 92-106. Leiden: Brill.
 "Papias is our earliest known author who tells us explicitly of two gospels coexisting in the Church, Matthew and Mark. The fragments of Papias which have survived do not speak of the parallel or combined use of these two gospels but reveal the problem caused by the plurality of the gospels as it was perceived at the beginning of the second century. The thesis of this article is threefold. First, it intends to show that Papias transmits information coming from a significantJy earlier source.
 Second, it demonstrates that this source, when speaking of Mark, is reflecting views closely similar to those contained in the prologue of Luke. Third, it demonstrates that, in the fragments of Papias, Mark is judged by the same criteria which Luke

- held and that these reflect a gospel model developed in the early church under the influence of Matthew's gospel. The importance of this investigation consists in unveiling the thought pattern which brought together the Synoptic Gospels into one single gospel canon." (p. 92)
68. Farmer, William R. 1962. "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke." *New Testament Studies* no. 8:301-316. Extract: "We may begin our analysis of the synoptic tradition peculiar to Luke with a study of one of its most important component parts, namely that preserved in the fifteenth chapter. The whole of this chapter constitutes a single literary unit, whose beginning and end are well defined and whose internal structure, while not uniform, is perfectly self-consistent. The introduction to this literary unit points to the 'grumbling' of the Pharisees and Scribes in response to Jesus' behaviour of receiving and eating with those tax collectors and sinners who had come to hear him. This response of the Pharisees and Scribes occasions a threefold response from Jesus, namely a threefold insistence upon the single point that it is right to accept the repentance of sinners and to rejoice with them, since their repentance is accepted by God who himself in heaven rejoices over their return."
69. ———. 1964. *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Macmillan. A critical review of the literary relationship between Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Contents: I. The Essential Developments in the Pre-Holtzmann Period 1; II. The Holtzmannian Synthesis 36; III. The English Endorsement and Modification of the Two-Document Hypothesis 48; IV. An Analysis of Streeter's Contribution to the Two-Document Hypothesis 118; V. Other Factor Contributing to the Twentieth-Century Consensus 178; VI. A New Introduction to the Problem 199; VII. Notes for a History of the Redaction of Synoptic Tradition in Mark 233; Appendix A 284; Appendix B 287; Index 294-308.
- "A history of the Synoptic Problem is a history of the basic ideas which have influenced men's thinking about this problem. These ideas are limited in number and can be presented in such a way as to provide the reader with a firm grasp of the essentials of the problem and its history. He who would attempt to go beyond this, and attempt to review all the work that has ever been done on this problem, faces an almost limitless task." (p. 3)
- (...)
- "Prior to the publication of Lessing' views in 1784 [*], other developments had taken place, the importance of which it is essential to grasp. We have already mentioned the emergence of a new type of Gospel harmony, specifically the famous "Synopsis" of Griesbach. While Griesbach printed some passages of John, he included the entire texts of only Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Therefore, these three Gospels, which were featured in his "Synopsis," came to be known as the "Synoptic" Gospels.
- In the beginning of this work, which in its successive editions was to become a handbook for subsequent scientific investigators, Griesbach confessed to "the heresy" of doubting the possibility of harmonizing even the closely related but conflicting chronologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. In other words, Griesbach's harmony, if a harmony at all, was a harmony to end harmonization. Henceforth, those who followed in his footsteps would no longer seek to reconcile the conflicting chronologies of the Gospels, but rather would seek to understand the relationships between the Gospels in terms of their direct literary dependence, or in terms of their indirect literary dependence through the mutual use of earlier hypothetical sources.
- It is important to recognize the fact that all previous authors of Gospel harmonies had been wrestling with the problem created by chronological differences between Gospels believed to have been written by authoritative witnesses who would not deliberately have differed from one another without good cause. The frank and shocking admission of Griesbach that he confessed to the "heresy" of doubting that this problem could be solved paved the way for widespread theological interest in Lessing's solution. For with Lessing's hypothesis, scholars were provided with an

- explanation of the reasons why the canonical Evangelists, who frequently agreed verbatim, sometimes differed from one another. Because on this hypothesis each Evangelist could be thought of as following faithfully an apostolic model preserved in the particular modified form of the original Nazarene Gospel available to him." (pp. 5-6)
- [*] Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, "Neue Hypothese über die Evangelisten als bloss menschliche Geschichtschreiber betrachtet," *Theologischer Nachlass*, Berlin, 1784, pp. 45-72. English translation: "New hypothesis on the evangelists as merely human historians", in H. B. Nisbett (ed.), *Lessing. Philosophical and Theological Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005, pp. 148-171.
70. ———. 1968. "The Lachmann Fallacy'." *New Testament Studies* no. 14:441-443.
71. ———. 1973. "A Response to Robert Morgenthaler's "Statistische Synopse"." *Biblica* no. 54:417-433.
72. ———. 1977. "Modern Developments of Griesbach's Hypothesis." *New Testament Studies* no. 23:275-295.
73. ———. 1980. "A Note on the Ideological Background of the Marcan Hypothesis." In *Occasional Notes on Some Points of Interest in New Testament Studies*, edited by Farmer, William R., 1-6. Dallas: Southern Methodist University.
 "In his recent book on the synoptic problem, after having presented the results of his extensive and detailed philological analysis of the seven most important arguments that have been used to support Marcan priority. Hans-Herbert Stoldt turned to the larger and very speculative historical and sociological question of the ideological background of the Marcan hypothesis.¹ Because of the importance of the issues involved, and because of their complexity, it is necessary to clarify the larger significance of Stoldt's over-all argument, and explore the perimeters within which Stoldt's original contribution to our understanding of the ideological background of the Marcan hypothesis can best be evaluated The purpose of this note is not to settle any of the issues involved, but rather to orient readers to the current discussion of Stoldt's book in such a way that his discoveries about the importance of the reaction to David Friedrich Strauss' *Leben Jesu* for understanding the history of the synoptic problem are neither over-emphasized nor unfairly discounted." (p. 1)
74. ———. 1980. "Notes For a Compositional Analysis on the Griesbach Hypothesis of the Empty Tomb Stories in the Synoptic Gospels." In *Occasional Notes on Some Points of Interest in New Testament Studies*, edited by Farmer, William R., 7-14. Dallas: Southern Methodist University.
 "A hypothesis that works may not be true. But any hypothesis that merits widespread consideration ought to work. How well the Griesbach hypothesis does or does not work may be seen from a compositional analysis of the empty tomb narratives in the Synoptic Gospels. On the Marcan hypothesis one begins an analysis of this tradition by considering the text preserved in Mark 16:1-8. But on the Griesbach hypothesis the Gospels were written in the order of Matthew, Luke and Mark. On this hypothesis, therefore, the synoptic texts can best be understood when considered in that order.
 The strict parallel in Matthew to Mark 16:1 -8 is Matthew 28:1 -10. It is especially important to study Matthew 28:1 -10 within the context of the continuous narrative of which it is a part. The thread of this narrative can be conveniently picked up at 27:50 where "Jesus ... gave up his spirit." For with these words the account of the events leading up to the death of Jesus are brought to an end, and what follows narrates the events that occurred after Jesus' death." (p. 7)
75. ———, ed. 1983. *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Table of Contents:
 Introduction
 William R. Farmer: Introductio 1;

PART ONE

The Patristic Evidence

1. William R. Farmer: *The Patristic Evidence Reexamined: A Response to George Kennedy* 3; 2. Giuseppe Giov. Gamba: *A Further Reexamination of Evidence from the Early Tradition* 17; 3. David Peabody: *Augustine and the Augustinian Hypothesis: A Reexamination of Augustine's Thought in De consensu evangelistarum* 37;

PART TWO

Further evidence for the Posteriority of Mark and for the Early Character of Matthean Tradition in Relation to Luke and Mark

1. Pierson Parker: *The Posteriority of Mark* 67; 2. Lamar Cope: *The Argument Revolves: The Pivotal Evidence for Markan Priority Is Reversing Itself* 143; 3. George Wesley Buchanan: *Matthean Beatitudes and Traditional Promises* 161; 4. Phillip Sigal: *Aspects of Mark Pointing to Matthean Priority* 185; 5. Bo Reicke: *A Test of Synoptic Relationships: Matthew 10:17-23 and 24:9-14 with Parallels* 209;

PART THREE

New Methodological Approaches

1. Albert C. Outler: *Canon Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* 233; 2. J. G. F. Collison: *Linguistic Usages in the Gospel of Luke* 245; 3. William O. Walker, Jr.: *The Son of Man Question and the Synoptic Problem* 261; 4. Joseph B. Tyson: *Conflict as a Literary Theme in the Gospel of Luke* 303;

PART FOUR

Papers Assuming the "Two-Gospel" (Owen-Griesbach) Hypothesis

1. Jack Dean Kingsbury: *The Theology of St. Matthew's Gospel according to the Griesbach Hypothesis* 331; 2. J. G. F. Collison: *Eschatology in the Gospel of Luke* 363; 3. Thomas R. W. Longstaff: *Crisis and Christology: The Theology of Mark* 373; 4. J. B. Orchard: *The "Common Step" Phenomenon in the Synoptic Pericopes* 393;

PART FIVE

Papers Exploring a Paradigm Shift in Gospel Studies

1. David L. Dungan: *The Purpose and Provenance of the Gospel of Mark according to the "Two-Gospel" (Owen-Griesbach) Hypothesis* 411; 2. Charles T. Davis III: *Mark: The Petrine Gospel* 441; 3. Philip Shuler: *Genre Criticism and the Synoptic Problem* 467; 4. Peter W. Agnew: *The "Two-Gospel" Hypothesis and a Biographical Genre for the Gospels* 481;

Appendix

William R. Farmer: *A Response to Joseph Fitzmyer's Defense of the "Two-Document" Hypothesis* 501-523.

Index: Modern autors: 525; "Fathers" of the Church 532-533.

76. ———. 1983. "The Patristic Evidence Reexamined: A Response to George Kennedy." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 3-15. Macon: Mercer University Press.
77. ———. 1983. "Appendix: A Response to Joseph Fitzmyer's Defense of the "Two-Document" Hypothesis." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 501-523. Macon: Mercer University Press.
78. ———. 1984. "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." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 75-94. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
79. ———. 1984. "Reply to Michael Goulder." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 105-110. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
80. ———. 1984. "Is Streeter's Fundamental Solution to the Synoptic Problem Still Valid?" In *The New Testament Age, Volume 1: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*, edited

- by Weinrich, William C., 147-164. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
81. ———. 1984. "The Import of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* no. 48:55-59.
82. ———. 1985. "A New Introduction to the Problem." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 163-197. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Appraisal*, second edition, Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press 1976, pp. 199-232.
83. ———. 1985. "A Fresh Approach to Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 397-408. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Part One: New Testament, Leiden: Brill, 1975, pp. 39-50.
84. ———. 1990. "The Passion Prediction Passages and the Synoptic Problem: a Test Case." *New Testament Studies* no. 36:558-570.
85. ———. 1990. "The Two Gospel Hypothesis: The Statement of the Hypothesis." 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., 125-156. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
86. ———. 1993. "The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark and the Two Gospel Hypothesis. A Study of These Agreements in Their Compositional Contexts." In *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991*, edited by Strecker, Georg, 773-815. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
87. ———. 1994. *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
88. ———. 1995. "State *Interesse* and Markan Primacy: 1870-1914." In *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850-1914*, edited by Reventlow, Henning Graf and Farmer, William, 15-49. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
"In 1987 the late Professor Bo Reicke of Basel University published his study of 'Synoptic Theories Advanced during the Consolidation of Germany, 1830-1870', in which he traced the history of the idea of Markan primacy from Strauss to Holtzmann. In passing, Reicke noted that the appointment in 1874 of Holtzmann to the prestigious chair of New Testament at the reconstituted University of Strasbourg gave this young scholar's career (and thus the Markan Hypothesis) an important boost.(2) Stoldt had analyzed Holtzmann's influential work published in 1863 in his 1977 work, and had demonstrated its critical untenability. This had been done independently as early as 1866 by Hajo Meijboom, eight full years before Holtzmann's appointment to the chair at Strasbourg.(3) Thus it is an unsolved question in the social history of biblical studies how and why this important appointment was made.(4) This leads me to focus on the decade in which this happened—1870-1880, the era of the *Kulturkampf*—in order to see whether it is possible to discover how and why what was still only a very popular 'scientific' hypothesis in 1870 was eventually transformed into what Bo Reicke designates as a *theologumenon*. It should be said in advance that this bit of social history cannot settle the vexing question of whether Mark was or was not the earliest Gospel. That question can only be settled on the basis of historical and literary evidence. This bit of social history can, however, help explain what might be called the sociology of Markan primacy. (pp. 16-17)
(2) 'From Strauss to Holtzmann and Meijboom: Synoptic Theories Advanced during the Consolidation of Germany, 1830-1870', *Novum Testamentum* 19.1 (1987), pp. 1-

- 21, p. 18.
- (3) Hajo Uden Meijboom, *Geschiedenis en critiek der Marcushypothese* (Amsterdam: Gebroeders Kragg, 1866). [English translation: *A History and Critique of the Origin of the Marcan Hypothesis, 1835-1866. A Contemporary Report Rediscovered*, 1993]
- (4) The correspondence between Bismarck and Ledderhose, who represented the University in the appointment process, focuses on Holtzmann's church politics.
89. ———. 1998. "The Present State of the Synoptic Problem." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, edited by Thompson, Richard P. and Phillips, Thomas E., 11-36. Macon (GA): Mercer University Press.
90. ———. 2001. "The Case for the Two-Gospel Hypothesis." In *Rethinking the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Black, David Alan and Beck, David R., 97-135. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic.
- .
91. Farnell, F. David. 2002. "Independence Response." In *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels*, edited by Thomas, Robert L., 111-125. Grand Rapids (MI): Kregel
92. Farnell, P. David. 1999. "The Synoptic Gospels in the Ancient Church: the Testimony to the Priority of Matthew's Gospel." *The Master's Seminary Journal* no. 10:53-86.
 Abstract: "Modern historical criticism has systematically ignored the writings of the early church fathers regarding their viewpoints on the Gospels. This article examines pertinent writings of several significant early fathers (Papias, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Augustine) regarding any information that they can impart regarding the chronological order of the Gospels. Their writings reveal that the unanimous and unquestioned consensus of the early church was that Matthew was the first gospel written. They also reveal that, while they considered John as written last, Luke was predominately considered second and Mark third (although admittedly Mark, at times, appears in second place). Since the church fathers lived much closer to the time of the composition of the gospels and were scholars in their own right, their testimony must be given serious consideration in any hypothesis regarding chronological order. Such early testimony stands in direct contradiction to the predominant contention of source criticism that concludes for the Two- or Four-Document Hypothesis (i.e. priority of Mark and Q), especially since the latter is not a product of objective historical analysis but a late-blooming conjecture spawned by Enlightenment ideologies."
93. ———. 2002. "How Views of Inspiration Have Impacted Synoptic Problem Discussions." *The Master's Seminary Journal* no. 13:33-64.
 Abstract: "Second Corinthians 10:5 and Colossians 2:8 warn believers to examine their thought life carefully to guard against being taken prisoner by philosophical presuppositions that are hostile to the Bible. One can either take thoughts captive or have their thought life taken captive to the detriment of their spiritual lives. One place in particular where conservative evangelicals have been taken captive is in the historical-critical discipline of source criticism. The predominant view of the early church was that the Gospels were four independent witnesses to the life of Christ. Starting around the A. D. 1600-1700s, there occurred a philosophical and ideological shift in thinking about the origin of the Gospels, particularly in relationship to Synoptic Gospels. Due to the rise of Rationalism, Deism, Skepticism, the Enlightenment, and Romanticism (to name a few), the Independence approach was rejected and two qualitatively different approaches in explaining the Gospels resulted: the Two-Gospel hypothesis and Two-Source hypothesis. A careful investigation reveals that both approaches stemmed from the same errancy roots as modern unorthodox views of inspiration. Because of the history and philosophy behind source criticism, when evangelicals adopt either

- approach in their interpretation of the Gospels, they automatically tap into these errancy roots that inevitably lead to deprecating the historicity of the Gospels."
94. Farrer, Austin M. 1954. *Saint Matthew and Saint Mark*. Westminster: Dacre Press.
95. ———. 1985. "On Dispensing with Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 321-356. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, Oxford: Blackwell 1955, pp. 55-88.
96. Fee, Gordon D. 1978. "Modern Text Criticism and the Synoptic Problem." In *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies, 1776-1976*, edited by Orchard, Bernard and Longstaff, Thomas R. W., 154-169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"That there is an interrelationship between textual criticism and the Synoptic Problem is the presupposition of most Synoptic studies. Nonetheless the specific nature of that relationship, especially as it affects the finding of solutions, is seldom spelled out, and, it would seem, is frequently neglected. This present paper is an attempt, partially at least, to fill up that lacuna. As far as I know, the last comprehensive study which took both disciplines (textual and Synoptic criticism) seriously as being interrelated in arriving at solutions was B. H. Streeter's monumental *The Four Gospels* (1924). The first two large sections of his book were entitled 'The Manuscript Tradition' and 'The Synoptic Problem'. I may be pardoned for borrowing this *Gattung* for my paper. In part I, some suggestions are offered as to what 'modern textual criticism' means, by overviewing some recent work on method. Since I am part of the debate in this area, I can scarcely be expected to achieve objectivity! But I do hope I have been fair to all, and have touched on the essential issues. In part II, I offer some general observations on the chief area of interrelationship, the problem of harmonization/dis-harmonization. The illustrations in this section are basically concerned with the resolution of textual questions." (p. 154)
97. ———. 1980. "A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem." *Novum Testamentum* no. 22:12-28.
Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 163-179.
98. ———. 1993. "Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels." In *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, edited by Epp, Eldon Jay and Fee, Gordon D., 174-182. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.