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

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (Fit - Gou)

Contents

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

Studies (mainly from 1964) in alphabetical order:

1: A - Bro
2: Buc - Day
3: De - Fee
4: Fit - Gou (Current page)
5: Gre - Klo
6: Kni - Mey
7: Mic - Pat
8: Pea - Row
9: San - Tri
10: Tuc - Z

Biblography 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. Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1970. "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke." In *Jesus and Man's Hope. Volume 1*, edited by Buttrick, D. G., 131-170. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary.
2. ———. 1985. "The Priority of Mark." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 63-75. Macon: Mercer University Press.
   Reprint of Donald G. Miller (ed.), *Jesus and Man's Hope,* Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970, Volume 1, pp. 134-147 and 164-166.
3. ———. 1985. "Luke Use of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J. Macon: Mercer University Press.
   Reprint of Donald G. Miller (ed.), *Jesus and Man's Hope,* Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970, Volume 1, pp. 147-156.
4. Fleddermann, Harry T. 1995. *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
   With an assessment by Frans Neirynck, pp. 261-307.

5. ———. 2003. "Mid-Level Techniques in Luke's Redaction of Q." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 79:53-71.

6. ———. 2005. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. Leuven: Peeters.

7. ———. 2008. "The Doublets in Luke." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 84:409-444.

8. ———. 2012. "The Plot of Q." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 88:43-69.
Abstrac t: "This essay addresses two questions: (1) Is Q a narrative?, and (2) Is Q a narrative gospel? Both questions receive an affirmative answer as Q has all the essential characteristics of a narrative, including an identifiable plot, and all the essential elements of a gospel. The author of Q develops the plot of Q in a series of dialogues and speeches. The five dialogues in Q provide a symbolic presentation of the transformation Jesus undergoes in the crucifixion and resurrection and arange of reactions to this tranformation. The speeches of Q unfold the four dimensions of the revelation contained in the transformation: (1) The disclosure of Jesus as the end-time savior and judge, (2) The revelation of a new way of living through absolute faith in God to the exclusion of any concern for the Self, (3) The revelation of a new radical ethic of love, and (4) The disclosure of a new understanding of community as a radical religious and economic democracy."

9. ———. 2016. "Matthew's Sources." In *An Early Reader of Mark and Q*, edited by Van Belle, Gilbert and Verheyden, Joseph, 1-43. Leuven: Peeters.

10. Focant, Camille. 1993. *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.

11. Foster, Lewis A. 1964. "The "Q" Myth in Synoptic Studies." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* no. 7:111-119.

12. Foster, Paul. 2003. "Is it possible to dispense with Q?" *Novum Testamentum* no. 45:313-337.

13. ———. 2011. "The M-Source. Its History and Demise in Biblical Scholarship." 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, 591-616. Leuven: Peeters.

14. ———. 2013. "Is Q a "Jewish Christian" Document?" *Biblica* no. 94:368-394.

15. ———. 2020. "The Rise and Development of the Farrer Hypothesis." In *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*, edited by Tiwald, Markus, 86-128. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
"During the period from the 1960s until the 1990s it is fair to say that the major rival alternative to the widely accepted two-source theory was the Griesbach hypothesis, or perhaps more correctly the neo-Griesbach hypothesis. In no small part, due to the indefatigable stream of publications and presentations from W.R. Farmer and his energetic band of supporters,(1) the neo-Griesbach hypothesis gained a prominence which was probably disproportionate to its numerical support. The basic tenet of this theory was that the Gospel of Mark was the last of the three synoptic gospels to be composed, and that it was the result of the conflation of the Matthean and I.ukan accounts. In the contemporary period support for this theory appears to have quite literally ‘died out’. With the deaths of the major proponents of this theory of synoptic relationships, and the failure of this hypothesis to have attracted new defenders, there appears to be few if any advocates for this solution. Moreover, no significant publications in support of the neo-Griesbach hypothesis have appeared during the last couple of decades.
This demise of the neo-Griesbach hypothesis has not, however, resulted in an upsurge of support for the two-source theory. The decrease in support for Farmer’s ideas has coincided with a notable increase in support for the Farrer hypothesis (FH), or, as some prefer, the Mark without Q theory (MwQ). The primary figure

associated with this synoptic solution, Austin Farrer, presented his major statement in defence of the basic claims of the theory prior to Farmer's work on the neo-Griesbach hypothesis.(2) Its two basic tenets are the defence of Markan priority, and in place of the Q hypothesis the claim that Luke made direct use of the Gospel of Matthew as a source for the material that is shared uniquely by Matthew and Luke (the so-called double tradition material). Farrer's work attracted some limited support in the period from the 1950s to the 1980s. However, growth in support became more widespread from the 1990s onwards, to the extent that it might now be correctly seen as the current major rival proposal to the two-source theory, which still remains the most widely accepted and preferred solution to the synoptic problem.
In this discussion, the development and emergence of the Farrer hypothesis will be traced from its antecedents to the current form of this synoptic solution theory. An attempt will also be made to account for this rise in popularity of the variant forms of this hypothesis, and an assessment will be made of its impact on synoptic gospels scholarship and possible future trajectories in the discussion surrounding the Farrer hypothesis." (pp. 86-87)
(1) Perhaps Farmer's most influential publication on the topic was Farmer, *Synoptic Problem*.
(2) See Farrer, *On Dispensing with Q*, 55-88.

16. Foster, Paul, Gregory, Andrew F., Kloppenborg, John S., and Verheyden, Joseph, eds. 2011. *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett* Leuven: Peeters.
Table of Contents: Preface VII; David R. Catchpole: Christopher M. Tuckett: An Appreciation XIII; Publications XiX; John S. Kloppenborg: Introduction 1;
PART I
Christopher M. Tuckett: The Current State of the Synoptic Problem 9; John S. Kloppenborg: Synopses and the Synoptic Problem 51; Andrew Gregory: What Is Literary Dependence? 87; Peter M. Head: Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem 115;
PART II
D.B. Peabody: Reading Mark from the Perspectives of Different Synoptic Source Hypotheses: Historical, Redactional and Theological Implications 159; D.C. Sim: Matthew and the Synoptic Problem 187; John C. Poirier: The Composition of Luke in Source-Critical Perspective 209; M. Eugene Boring: The "Minor Agreements" and Their Bearing on the Synoptic Problem 227; Robert H. Stein: Duality in Mark 253; Mark Goodacre:
The Evangelists' Use of the Old Testament and the Synoptic Problem 281; Duncan Reid: Miracle Stories and the Synoptic Problem 299; Charles W. Hedrick: The Parables and the Synoptic Problem 321; William R.G. Loader: Attitudes to Judaism and the Law and Synoptic Relations 347; William E. Arnal: The Synoptic Problem and the Historical Jesus 371;
PART III
Robert A. Derrenbacker, Jr.: The "External and Psychological Conditions under Which the Synoptic Gospels Were Written": Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem 435; Alan Kirk: Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem 459; Alex Damm: Ancient Rhetoric and the Synoptic Problem 483; Dennis R. MacDonald: The Synoptic Problem and Literary Mimesis: The Case of the Frothing Demoniac 509; F. Gerald Downing: Writers' Use or Abuse of Written Sources 523;
PART IV
Eric C.S. Eve: The Synoptic Problem without Q? 551; Ulrich Luz: Looking at Q through the Eyes of Matthew 571; Paul Foster: The M-Source: Its History and Demise in Biblical Scholarship 591; J. Verheyden: Proto-Luke, and What Can Possibly Be Made of It 617;
PART V

Richard Bauckham: The Gospel of John and the Synoptic Problem 657; Andreas Lindemann: The Apostolic Fathers and the Synoptic Problem 689; Dieter Lührmann: Übrige „apokryph gewordene“ Evangelien und das synoptische Problem 721; Judith Lieu: Marcion and the Synoptic Problem 731; Scott G. Brown: The Longer Gospel of Mark and the Synoptic Problem 753; Stephen J. Patterson: The Gospel of (Judas) Thomas and the Synoptic Problem 783; Udo Schnelle: Die synoptische Frage in der Geschichte der neueren protestantischen Theologie 809; Kathleen E. Corley: White Male Dominance of Synoptic Gospel Research and the Creative Process 831; Christopher Rowland: Another Perspective on the “Synoptic” Problem 845;
Abbreviations 857; Bibliography 859;
INDEXES
Index of Names 915; Index of Biblical References 930; Index of Other References 959.

17. Franklin, Eric. 1994. *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

18. Friedrichsen, Timothy A. 1989. "The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. Critical Observations on R. B. Vinson's Statistical Analysis." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 65:397-408.

19. ———. 1989. "The Matthew-Luke Agreements against Mark: A Survey of Recent Studies: 1974 - 1989." In *L'Évangile de Luc = The Gospel of Luke : Revised and enlarged edition of L'Évangile de Luc : problèmes Littéraires et théologiques*, edited by Neirynck, Frans, 335-391. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.

20. ———. 1992. "'Minor' and 'Major' Matthew-Luke Agreements Against Mk 4,30-32." In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Volume I*, edited by van Segbroeck, Frans, Tuckett, Christopher M., van Belle, Gilbert and Verheyden, Joseph, 649-676. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters Leuven.

21. ———. 1993. "Alternative Synoptic Theories on Mk 4,30-32." In *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, edited by Focant, Camille and Neirynck, Frans, 427-450. Leuven: Leuve University Press.

22. ———. 1996. "Luke 9:22: A Matthean Foreign Body?" *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 72:398-407.
Abstract: "In a lengthy article on “Matthean Foreign Bodies” (1992) Robert H. Gundry pulls together strands of the argument in his commentary on Matthew that some minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark represent subsidiary influence of Matthew on Luke's use of his primary sources, Mark and Q. F. Neirynck has already engaged in a lively exchange with Gundry concerning the minor agreements in the Great Commandment pericope (Lk 10,25-28). The purpose of this note is to respond to Gundry's continued defense of Matthean influence on Lk 9,22, with special attention to his rejoinders to the brief article on which Neirynck and I collaborated."

23. ———. 2001. "The Parable of the Mustard Seed: Mark 4,30-32 and Q 13,18-19. A Surrejoinder for Independence." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 77:297-317.

24. ———. 2003. "A Note on the Lamp Saying, Mk 4,21 and Q 11,33." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 79:423-430.
Abstract: "Mk 4,21, the saying on the lamp, has a direct Lucan parallel in Lk 8,16; a variant form appears in Lk 11,33 parallel Mt 5,15, which is considered a Q-version of the saying. Among other Mark–Q overlaps, H.T. Fleddermann proposes that here Mark uses and redacts Q for his text1. In this note, we will present Fleddermann’s argument and show why he has not demonstrated his position, concluding that it is more probable that the lamp saying in Mk 4,21 is independent from Q 11,33."

25. ———. 2004. "What Is Hidden Will Be Revealed. A Note on the Independence of Mk 4,22 and Q 12,2." *Ephemeriudes Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 80:439-444.

Abstract: "This note first provides an overview of the presentation of H.T. Fleddermann's proposal (*Mark and Q*, BETL 122, Leuven, 1995, esp. pp. 81-84) that the saying in Mk 4,22, concerning "what is hidden will be revealed", is Mark's redaction of Q 12,2. The note then critiques his methodology as insufficient for establishing Mark's dependence on Q 12,2 (this note follows the author's similar treatment of the Lamp Saying, Mk 4,21 and Q 11,33, in ETL 79 [2003] 423-430). First, Fleddermann's proposal requires that Mark take the saying of Q 12,2 out of its own logical context and attach it somewhat uncomfortably to the saying on the lamp in Mk 4,21. More specifically, the proposed Marcan redaction of Q 12,2 results in three hapax legomena in one verse, which is highly improbable. The article thus demonstrates that the independence of Mk 4,22 and Q 12,2 is a better understanding of these respective forms of the saying."

26. ———. 2005. "The Measure: Mk 4,24cd and Q 6,38c; 12,31b. A Note on Its Independence from Q." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 81:186-196.

27. ———. 2006. "“To One Who Has…": Mk 4,25 (Mt 25,29; Lk 19,26). A Note on the Independence of Mk 4,25 from Q 19,26 and on the Sayings Cluster of Mk 4,21-25." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 82:165-173.

28. Frye, Roland Mushat. 1978. "The Synoptic Problems and Analogies in Other Literatures." In *The Relationships Among the Gospels. An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, edited by Walker, William O., 261-302. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.

29. Fuller, Reginald H. 1978. "Baur Versus Hilgenfeld: A Forgotten Chapter in the Debate on the Synoptic Problem." *New Testament Studies* no. 24:355-370.
"William R. Farmer's history of the debate on the Synoptic Problem contains the following footnote:
Baur answered Hilgenfeld in his *Das Markusevangelium*, Tübingen, 1851, and the two carried on the debate for years in the *Theologische Jahrbücher*. This debate is worthy of thorough analysis and evaluation.(1)
When I was invited to read a paper at this year's meeting at Tübingen with the understanding that the paper should deal if possible with some aspect of the work of the Tübingen school of the mid-nineteenth century, this seemed to be an appropriate occasion to take up Professor Farmer's challenge." (p. 355)
(...)
"What can we learn of value for the discussion of the relations between the gospels today? First, it confirms the point made by E. P. Sanders(5) that most of the arguments for the priority of one gospel over another are reversible.
To that I would add, that the direction in which you take them depends largely if not entirely on your *Blick* - the view you have already adopted on the relations between the gospels. There is however one non-reversible criterion which emerges from this debate. It appeared in Hilgenfeld's argument that the dependence of one gospel upon another is demonstrated when *Tendenz* material from the earlier gospel survives in the later. If Luke's *Tendenz* shows up in Mark and if Mark does not share that *Tendenz*, it would be a clear sign of Mark's dependence on Luke. Today we would substitute the concept of' redaction' for *Tendenz*. But even this criterion has to be applied with caution, otherwise the argument becomes circular. A gospel's redaction must be determined without recourse to a synoptic theory already presupposed.(1a) That calls into question much of the redactional study that has been done in recent years on Matthew and on Luke. It is indeed ironic that the *Tendenzkritik*, for which the Tübingen school has been so notorious, at least in the English-speaking world, should have led them to contribute a criterion of permanent value to the discussion of the relation between the gospels today." (pp. 369-370)
(1) W. R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem* (Dillsboro: WNC, ^{2}1976), p. 30, n. 50.
(5) E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTS Monograph 9; Cambridge, 1969

(1a) This is not meant to exclude a comparison of the parallels in the other gospels, a procedure necessary to expose what is unique to and characteristic of the gospel which is being studied.

30. Funk, Robert W. 1985. *New Gospel Parallels. Volume 2: John and the Other Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

31. ———. 1985. *New Gospel Parallels: Volume 1: Mark*. Sonoma: Polebridge.

32. Gamba, Giuseppe Giovanni. 1983. "A Further Reexamination of Evidence from the Early tradition." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 17-35. Macon: Mercer University Press.

33. Garrow, Alan J. P. 2004. *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. New York: T & T Clark International.

34. ———. 2016. "Streeter's 'Other' Synoptic Solution: The Matthew Conflator Hypothesis." *New Testament Studies* no. 62:207-226.

35. ———. 2016. "An Extant Instance of 'Q'." *New Testament Studies* no. 62:398-417.

36. ———. 2020. "Plausibility, Probability, and Synoptic Hypotheses: A Response to F. Gerald Downing." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 96:131-137.

37. Garsky, Albrecht, Heil, Christoph, Hieke, Thomas, and Amon, Josef E., eds. 1997. *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research. Excerpted, sorted, and evaluated: The critical edition of Q. Q 12,49-59. Children against Parents – Judging the Time – Settling out of Court*. Leuven: Peeters.

38. Gathercole, Simon. 2012. *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

39. ———. 2018. "The Alleged Anonymity of the Canonical Gospels." *The Journal of Theological Studies* no. 69:447-476.

40. Gerhardsson, Birger. 1998. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. With Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
Foreword by Jacob Neusner.

41. Goguel, Maurice. 1933. "Luke and Mark: With a Discussion of Streeter's Theory." *The Harvard Theological Review* no. 26:1-55.

42. Goodacre, Mark S. 1996. *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
An Examination of a New Paradigm.

43. ———. 1998. "Fatigue in the Synoptics." *New Testament Studies* no. 44:45-48.
Abstract: "Matthew and Luke sometimes write versions of Marcan pericopae in which they make initial changes, only to lapse into the thought or wording of the original. Clear examples are Matt 14.1-12 II Mark 6.14-29 (Death of John); Matt 8.1-411 Mark 1.40-5 (Leper); Matt 12.46-5011 Mark 3.31-5 (Mother and Brothers); Luke 8.4-1511 Mark 4.1-20 (Sower); Luke 5.17-2611 Mark 2.1-12 (Paralytic) and Luke 9.10-1711 Mark 6.30-44 (Five Thousand), all of which make good sense on the theory of Marcan Priority. 'Fatigue' may also suggest a solution to the problem of double tradition material: Luke 9.1-6 (cf. Matt 10.5-15, Mission Charge) and Luke 19.11-2711 Matt 25.14-30 (Talents) both make good sense on the theory of Luke's use of Matthew."

44. ———. 1999. "*Beyond the Q Impasse* or Down a Blind Alley?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 76:33-52.

45. ———. 2000. "The Synoptic Jesus and the Celluloid Christ: Solving the Synoptic Problem though Film." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 80:31-43.

46. ———. 2000. "A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000*:583-622.

47. ———. 2001. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze*. London: T & T Clark.

48. ———. 2002. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

49. ———. 2003. "On Choosing and Using Appropriate Analogies: A Response to F. Gerald Downing." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 26:237-240.

50. ———. 2004. "A World without Q." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 174-179. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

51. ———. 2004. "When Is a Text Not a Text? The Quasi Text-Critical Approach of the International Q Project." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 115-126. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

52. ———. 2011. "The Synoptic Problem: John the Baptist and Jesus." In *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*, edited by McGowan, Andrew B. and Richards, Kent Harold, 177-192. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

53. ———. 2011. "The Evangelists' Use of the Old Testament 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, 281-298. Leuven: Peeters.

54. ———. 2012. *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids (MI): Eerdmans.

55. ———. 2012. "Criticizing the Criterion of Multiple Attestation: The Historical Jesus and the Question of Sources." In *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, edited by Keith, Chris and Le Donne, Anthony, 152-169. London: T & T Clark.

56. ———. 2014. "A Flaw in McIver and Carroll's Experimentsto Determine Written Sources in the Gospels." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 133:793-800.

57. ———. 2014. "Did Thomas Know the Synoptic Gospels? A Response to Denzey Lewis, Kloppenborg and Patterson." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 36:282-293.

58. ———. 2015. "Too Good to Be Q: High Verbatim Agreement in the Double Tradition." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 82-100. London: T & T Clark.
"It is a fact seldom acknowledged that the double tradition material in Matthew and Luke shows a remarkably high degree of verbatim agreement.
It is a fact still more rarely acknowledged that the high verbatim agreement makes best sense if Luke is copying from Matthew. The issue is surprisingly straightforward, and yet it is almost always missed in
discussions of the Synoptic Problem. Where two documents show very close agreement in wording in parallel passages, the best explanation is that one is copying directly from the other, not that both are copying
from a hypothetical third document. Where two documents are copying from a third, we should not expect to see the kind of high verbatim agreement that we often see in the double tradition. The evidence
suggests that Luke had direct contact with Matthew, and this entails dispensing with Q." (p. 82)

59. ———. 2016. "Re-Walking the "Way of the Lord": Luke's Use of Mark and His Reaction to Matthew." In *Luke's Literary Creativity*, edited by Nielsen, Jesper Tang and Müller, Mogens, 26-43. New York: Bloomsbury.

60. ———. 2016. "Farrer Hypothesis Response." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 127-138. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

61. ———. 2016. "The Farrer Hypothesis." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 47-66. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

62. ———. 2017. "Q, Memory and Matthew: A Response to Alan Kirk." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* no. 15:224-233.

63. ———. 2018. "Taking Our Leave of Mark-Q Overlaps: Major Agreemnts and the Farrer Theory." In *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis*, edited by Müller, Mogens and Omerzu, Keike, 201-222. New York: Bloomsbury.

64. Goodacre, Mark S., and Perrin, Nicholas, eds. 2004. *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
Contents: List of tables VIII; N. T. Wright: Foreword IX; Abbreviations XIII; Nicholas Perrin: Introduction: Reasons for Questioning Q 1; John C. Poirier: The Q Hypothesis and the Role of Pre-Synoptic Sources in Nineteenth-Century Scholarship 13; Jeffrey Peterson: Order in the Double Tradition and the Existence of Q 28; Mark A. Matson: Luke s Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount 43; Nicholas Perrin: The Limits of a Reconstructed Q 71; Eric Eve: Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment 89; Mark Goodacre: When Is a Text Not a Text? The Quasi Text-Critical Approach of the International Q Project 115; Ken Olson: Unpicking on the Farrer Theory 127; Richard Vinson: How Minor? Assessing the Significance of the Minor Agreements as an Argument against the Two-Source Hypothesis 151; Nicholas Perrin: Some Implications of Dispensing with Q 165; Mark Goodacre: A World without Q 174; Bibliography 181; Index of Ancient and Biblical Texts 191; Index of Modern Authors 198-201.

65. Gorman, Heather M. 2015. "Crank or Creative Genius? How Ancient Rhetoric Makes Sense of Luke's Order." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 62-81. London: T & T Clark.
"Conclusion
In sum, with the help of the ancient rhetorical tradition, I have demonstrated that Luke's narrative is indeed orderly, just as he claims. This proves true on a macro scale insomuch as Luke arranges his material sequentially according to the topics listed in the *progymnasmata*. On a micro scale, I have also shown that if Luke did indeed use Matthew as a source for his SOP [Sermon of the Plain], such redaction would have made sense on ancient rhetorical grounds. His rearrangements and omissions of Matthaean material would be justified in light of his larger concerns for clarity, brevity, and plausibility.
What implications does this study have for source criticism of the gospels? Perhaps one of the strongest criticisms launched against the FH has been aimed at Luke's order.
(...)
"The above clarification of the rhetorical principles on which Luke ordered his narrative suggests that there is less need to invoke Q to account for Luke's sequence. This study, of course, does not prove that Luke used Matthew, but it does make the FH that much more probable. While there are still problems to be solved regarding the sources of the Synoptics and their relationship to one another, this study has done at least two things: (1) it has removed a significant obstacle for proponents of the FH by showing Luke's order is justifiable on rhetorical grounds, and (2) it suggests that rhetorical analysis may be a profitable way forward in source-critical studies of the gospels." (pp. 80-81, a note omitted)

66. Goulder, Michael D. 1974. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: London. The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies 1969-71.
Reprint: Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

67. ———. 1978. "On putting Q to the Test." *New Testament Studies* no. 24:218-234.

68. ———. 1978. *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK.

69. ———. 1980. "Farrer on Q." *Theology* no. 83:190-195.

70. ———. 1984. "Some observations on Professor Farmer's 'Certain Results...'." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 99-104. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

71. ———. 1984. "The Order of a Crank." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by Tuckett, Christopher M., 111-130. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

72. ———. 1985. "A House Built on Sand." In *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study*, edited by Harvey, Anthony Ernest, 1-24. London: SPCK.

73. ———. 1989. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

74. ———. 1993. "Luke's Knowledge of Matthew." In *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991*, edited by Strecker, Georg, 143-162. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

75. ———. 1993. "Luke's Compositional Options." *New Testament Studies* no. 29:150-152.

76. ———. 1994. "The Pre-Marcan Gospel." *Scottish Journal of Theology* no. 47:453-472.

77. ———. 1996. "Is Q a Juggernaut?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 115:667-681.

78. ———. 1999. "Self-Contradiction in the IQP." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 118:506-517.

79. ———. 2002. "The Derrenbacker-Kloppenborg Defense." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 121:331-336.

80. ———. 2003. "Two Significant Minor Agreements (Mat. 4:13 Par.; Mat. 26:67-68 Par.)." *Novum Testamentum* no. 45:365-373.

81. ———. 2009. *Five Stones and a Sling: Memoirs of a Biblical Scholar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
Chapter 13: *The Synoptic Problem*, pp. 69-76.