

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

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (Pea - Row)

Contents

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

Studies (mainly from 1964) in alphabetical order:

1: A - Bro

2: Buc - Day

3: De - Fee

4: Fit - Gou

5: Gre - Klo

6: Kni - Mey

7: Mic - Pat

8: Pea - Row (Current page)

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. Peabody, David Barrett. 1978. "A Pre-Markan Prophetic Sayings Tradition and the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 97:391-408.
2. ———. 1983. "The Late Secondary Redaction of Mark's Gospel and the Griesbach Hypothesis: a Response to Helmut Koester." In *Colloquy on New Testament Studies: A Time for Reappraisal and Fresh Approaches*, edited by Corley, Bruce, 87-132. Macon GA: Mercer University Press.
3. Peabody, David Barrett. 1983. "Augustine and the Augustinian Hypothesis: A Reexamination of Augustine's Thought in *De consensu evangelistarum*." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 37-64. Macon: Mercer University Press.
4. Peabody, David Barrett. 1987. *Mark as Composer*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
5. ———. 1987. "Chapters in the History of the Linguistic Argument for Solving the Synoptic Problem: The Nineteenth Century in Context." In *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church. Essays in Honor of William R. Farmer*, edited by Sanders, Ed Parish, 47-68. Macon GA: Mercer University Press.

6. ———. 1990. "Response to the Multi-Stage 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., 217-230. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
7. ———. 1995. "H. J. Holtzmann and his European Colleagues: Aspects of the Nineteenth-Century European Discussion of Gospel Origins." In *Biblical Studies and the Shifting of Paradigms, 1850-1914*, edited by Reventlow, Henning Graf and Farmer, William, 50-131. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
 "I first became aware that studies by members of the so-called Strasbourg school might have importance for understanding the history of a paradigm shift that took place in Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century when I read an early version of an English translation of a Dutch doctoral dissertation. The paradigm shift to which I refer was the shift from the Griesbach explanation of gospel origins to the theory of Markan Priority. The dissertation was that by Hajo Uden Meijboom entitled *History and Criticism of the Markan Hypothesis* which was defended at Groningen, in the Netherlands, on Thursday, 27 September 1866, at noon. The English translation was being prepared already in the early 1980s by John J. Kiwiet of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, It was published by Mercer University Press in 1993, after more than ten years of work.
 I have chosen to begin this paper with an overview of Meijboom's dissertation and then to move to a closer examination of one chapter within it, namely, Meijboom's analysis of the development of the Markan Hypothesis in France. The central section of my paper consists of a series of biographical sketches of Timothee Colani (1824-1888), Eduard Reuss (1804-1891), Edmond Scherer (1815-1889), Albert Reville (1826-1906) and Michel Nicolas (1810-1886), all members of the Strasbourg school." (pp. 5051, notes omitted)
8. ———. 1998. "Luke's Sequential Use of the Sayings of Jesus from Matthew's Great Discourses: A Chapter in the Source-Critical Analysis of Luke on the Two-Gospel (Neo-Griesbach) Hypothesis." In *Literary studies in Luke-Acts: essays in honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, edited by Phillips, Thomas E., 37-58. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
9. ———. 2011. "Reading Mark from the Perspectives of Different Synoptic Source Hypotheses. Historical, Redactional and Theological Implications." 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, 159-185. Leuven: Peeters.
10. ———. 2016. "The Two Gospel Hypothesis." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 67-111. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
11. ———. 2016. "Two Gospel Hypothesis Response." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 139-150. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
12. Peabody, David Barrett, Cope, Lamar, and McNicol, Allan J., eds. 2002. *One Gospel From Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
 "Also by the early 1980s, many of us had rejected the name "Griesbach" as a label for our hypothesis and had come to call our source theory "the Two Gospel hypothesis" for several reasons. First, it brought the name of our theory into an intended contrast and tension with the dominant view among experts at that time, the Two Document or Two Source hypothesis (the priority of the two documents/sources, Mark and "Q," followed by the mutual, but independent, use of these sources by Matthew and Luke)." (Preface, XII)

"In the conclusion to our volume, *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew*, we stated that we had provided a plausible account of the composition of Luke on the assumption that canonical Matthew was his main source. As far as we knew, it was an entirely new contribution to the field of Lukan Studies. Such an analysis of Luke was never attempted by Griesbach or any of his followers in the nineteenth century. In the conclusion, we stated that our next step would be to provide a pericope-by-pericope compositional analysis of the Gospel of Mark showing that a plausible account could be given of it, assuming that it was written after and on the basis of Matthew and Luke. After some forty years of painstaking research, going back beyond William R. Farmer's ground-breaking book, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, and after several preliminary attempts, we now present *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke*, the necessary complement to *Beyond the Q Impasse*, to our peers and colleagues for their consideration and critical response.

In the following detailed compositional analysis, we do not posit the existence of lost versions of Mark (such as UrMarkus, Secret Mark or Deutero Markus), or lost recensions either of Luke (e.g., ProtoLuke) or of Matthew (Aramaic Matthew) to help make sense out of the text of Mark. The number of such hypothetical sources continues to grow in the scholarly literature on the Synoptic Problem for one fundamental reason: to defend the idea that Mark was written first. That task, however, in our view, is unnecessary. As we seek to demonstrate in this volume, Mark's secondary character *vis-à-vis* Matthew and Luke can be demonstrated at many different levels and in many different ways." (Introduction, XV)

13. Perkins, Pheme. 2007. *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids (MI) Eerdmans.
Chapter 3. The Quest for Sources. From a Synopsys: Comparing the Synoptic Gospels; From Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* to Sayings Gospels; Q: Is It a Gospel?; Strata in Q; The Community Responsible for Q.
14. Perrin, Nicholas. 2004. "Introduction: Reasons for Questioning Q." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 1-12. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
15. ———. 2004. "The Limits of a Reconstructed Q." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 71-88. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
16. ———. 2004. "Some Implications of Dispensing with Q." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 165-173. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
17. Peterson, Jeffrey. 2004. "Order in the Double Tradition and the Existence of Q." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 28-42. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
18. Petrie, C. Stewart. 1943. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis." *The Expository Times* no. 54:175-177.
19. ———. 1943. "The Proto-Luke Hypothesis: A Rejoinder." *The Expository Times* no. 54:219-222.
20. ———. 1959. "'Q' Is Only What You Make It." *Novum Testamentum* no. 3:28-33. Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 1-6.
21. Petterson, Jeffrey. 2015. "Matthew's Ending and the Genesis of Luke-Acts: The Farrer Hypothesis and the Birth of Christian History." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 140-159. London: T & T Clark.
"The present study is offered primarily to illustrate the exegetical results made available by holding to Marcan priority along with Luke's knowledge of both Mark and Matthew. I shall suggest that adopting this as one's working model for exegesis

- affords a more plausible account of Luke's decision to compose, as a companion piece to his *protos logos* surveying Jesus' life and ministry, a *deuteros logos* covering the ministry and travels of the disciples through the succeeding generation, tracing the progress of the word of God from Jesus' first Jewish followers in Judea through Samaria to Gentile lands and peoples, toward the ends of the earth (Acts 1.1-2, 8).(3)" (p. 141)
- (3) 'Luke' is used here for the author of the third gospel and Acts, but nothing crucial to the argument depends on his traditional identification as the missionary associate of Paul, nor on a first-century date of composition for Luke or Acts.
22. Piper, Roland Allen. 1982. "Matthew 7,7-11 par. Lk 11,9-13: Evidence of Design and Argument in the Collection of Jesus' Sayings." In *Logia. Les paroles de Jésus. The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, edited by Delobel, Joël, 411-418. Leuven: Peeters.
Reprinted in: John S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*, Edited by Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1994, pp. 131-137.
23. ———, ed. 1995. *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Leiden: Brill.
Contents: Ronald A. Piper: Preface IX; Abbreviations: XI; Ronald A. Piper: In Quest of Q: The Direction of Q Studies; 1; Christopher M. Tuckett: The Existence of Q 19; Frans Neiryck: The Minor Agreements and Q 49; S.J. Jan Lambrecht: The Great Commandment Pericope and Q 73; Dieter Lührmann: Q: Sayings of Jesus or Logia? 97; C.S.J. Wendy Cotter: Prestige, Protection and Promise: A Proposal for the Apologetics of Q 117; Migaku Sato: Wisdom Statements in the Sphere of Prophecy 139; Paul Hoffmann: The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch 159; Leif E. Vaage: Q and Cynicism: On Comparison and Social Identity 199; Risto Uro: John the Baptist and the Jesus Movement: What Does Q Tell Us? 231; James M. Robinson: The Jesus of Q as Liberation Theologian 259; John S. Kloppenborg: Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q 275; Bradley H. McLean: On the Gospel of Thomas and Q 321; Luise Schottroff: Itinerant Prophetesses: A Feminist Analysis of the Sayings Source Q 347; Arland D. Jacobson: Divided Families and Christian Origins 361; Index to Modern Authors: 381; Index to Ancient Sources: Pages: 389-412.
24. Poirier, John C. 2004. "Memory, Written Sources, and the Synoptic Problem: A Response to Robert K. McIver and Marie Carroll." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 123:315-322.
25. ———. 2004. "The Q Hypothesis and the Role of Pre-Synoptic Sources in Nineteenth-Century Scholarship." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Goodacre, Mark S. and Perrin, Nicholas, 13-27. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
26. ———. 2008. "Statistical Studies of the Verbal Agreements and their Impact on the Synoptic Problem." *Currents in Biblical Research* no. 71:68-123.
27. ———. 2009. "The Synoptic Problem and the Field of New Testament Introduction." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 32:179-190.
Abstract: "The synoptic problem is an important and visible subfield within NT studies, yet, for some reason, almost every NT introduction written in the past forty or so years has passed on a defective understanding of that subfield. Two problems in particular plague these NT introductions: (1) their discussions of the synoptic problem tend to rely on a logical argument disproven almost sixty years ago, and (2) they tend to misrepresent the current state of the question by marginalizing the Farrer hypothesis, which today is the Two-Source Theory's leading competitor."
28. ———. 2011. "The Composition of Luke in Source-Critical Perspective." 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, 209-226. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
29. ———. 2012. "The Roll, the Codex, the Wax Tablet and the Synoptic Problem." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 35:3-30.
30. ———. 2015. "Delbert Burkett's Defense of Q." In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 191-225. London: T & T Clark.
 "Delbert Burkett's second volume of *Rethinking the Gospel Sources* (2009) opens with one of the most robust defenses of Q yet to address the Farrer hypothesis (= FH). Burkett understands that the existence of Q depends in some measure on the unlikelihood that Luke used Matthew. He notes that not only does the FH hold to Luke's use of Matthew, but so also do the Three-Document hypothesis (of Gundry et al.), the Augustinian hypothesis, and the Griesbach hypothesis. He seems to think that, as far as Q goes, a critique of any one of these theories might suffice, and he settles on the FH, perhaps due to its recent successes. His critique of the FH is hard-hitting on some points, and his understanding of the main source-critical issues is on all points exceptional." (p. 191)
 (...)
 "Thus the reader is made to think that, when Farrerians are said to begin from a deficit, it is as though they failed to qualify for the front row of the racing formation - that is, that they have to begin the race several rows back - while the 2DH and the 'Burkett' hypothesis somehow get to begin at the front of the pack. This in fact misrepresents the macro perspective with which one must judge the main advantages of one source theory over another. Farrerians accept the challenge of explaining how Luke worked with Matthew, because they find it easier and more believable than explaining how, on the 2DH, the minor agreements arose. Proponents of the 2DH, on the other hand, are convinced that the opposite is the case. Progress is best made, of course, by those who appreciate the straitening aspects of their own source theories as fully as they recognize them in an opposing view." (pp. 224-225)
31. ———. 2015. "Introduction: Why the Farrer Hypothesis? Why Now?" In *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 1-15. London: T & T Clark.
 "The reigning source theory in synoptic studies is the Two-Document hypothesis (= 2DH), which consists of two main tenets: (1) Matthew and Luke both used Mark as a source, and (2) they did so independently, which necessitates the postulation of an otherwise unattested source, which scholars call 'Q'. The present book features original essays written from the perspective of a competing source theory - the Farrer hypothesis (= FH) - which agrees with tenet (1) of the 2DH, but which holds, in place of (2), that Luke knew Matthew's gospel (obviating the need for Q)." (p. 1, note omitted)
 (...)
 "The PH has an easier time in 2015 than it did in (say) 1975. Why is this the case? It would be difficult to name a point at which the PH became (as it now is) the 2DH's leading challenger, and it would be even more difficult to account for all the reasons for this development.
 (...)
 There are at least four such developments: (1) increased awareness of the evangelists as writers and shapers of tradition rather than as strict (scissors-and-paste) compilers, (2) wider acceptance of the view that Luke wrote in response to other gospel writers, (3) increased awareness of Luke's literary ability, and (4) wider acceptance of a late date for Luke. These points, of course, do not tell the whole story, particularly as

- the PH's newfound respect is also owed in large part to the efforts of some of its more able defenders. Nevertheless, it appears that scholarship in general has become much more accepting of the PH's major facilitating adjuncts - viz. the ideas that help it make sense within the reality of the NT world - and that this is at least partly responsible for the PH's recent fortunes." (p. 2, two notes omitted)
32. Poirier, John C., and Peterson, Jeffrey, eds. 2015. *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*. London: T & T Clark.
Contents: List of Contributors IX; Acknowledgments XI; Abbreviations XIII; Introduction: John C. Poirier: Why the Farrer Hypothesis? Why Now? 1; Chapter 1. Eric Eve: The Devil in the Detail: Exorcising Q from the Beelzebul controversy 16; Chapter 2. Stephen C. Carlson: Problems with the Non-Aversion Principle for Reconstructing Q 44; Chapter 3. Heather M. Gorman: Crank or Creative genius? How Ancient Rhetoric Makes Sense of Luke's Order 62; Chapter 4. Mark Goodacre: Too Good To Be Q: High Verbatim Agreement in the Double Tradition 82; Chapter 5. Ken Olson: Luke 11.2-4: The Lord's Prayer (Abridged Edition) 101; Chapter 6. Andris Abakuks: A Statistical Time Series Approach to the Use of Mark by Matthew and Luke 119; Chapter 7. Jeffrey Peterson: Matthew's Ending and the Genesis of Luke-Acts: The Farrer Hypotheses and the Birth of Christian History 140; Chapter 8. David Landry: Reconsidering the Date of Luke in Light of the Farrer Hypothesis 160; Chapter 9. John C. Poirier: Delbert Burkett's Defense of Q 191; Chapter 10. John S. Kloppenborg: The Farrer/Mark Without Q Hypothesis: A Response 226; Bibliography 245; Index of References 260; Index of Authors 269.
33. Porter, Stanley E. 2016. "The Synoptic Problem: The state of the question." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* no. 12:73-98.
34. ———. 2016. "The Legacy of B. F. Westcott and Oral Gospel Tradition." In *Earliest Christianity within the Boundaries of Judaism: Essays in Honor of Bruce Chilton*, edited by Avery-Peck, Alan., Evans, Craig A. and Neusner, Jacob, 326-345. Leiden: Brill.
"Brooke Foss Westcott (1825–1901), one of the so-called Cambridge triumvirate along with J.B. Lightfoot (1828–1889) and F.J.A. Hort (1828–1892), was a truly outstanding New Testament scholar of the nineteenth century, certainly in Britain." (p. 326)
(...)
"One of the least well known of Westcott's works began as an essay that he wrote when he was twenty-five years old, entitled "On the Alleged Historical Contradictions of the Gospels."(5) This prize-winning essay (one of several prizes Westcott won on the basis of his academic prowess) was expanded into his first book, *The Elements of the Gospel Harmony*,(6) and then further expanded and subsequently titled *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, which went through eight editions.(7) This is the volume with which I am concerned here. I wish to return to Westcott's theory of the origins of the Gospels, examine the response to his work in recent scholarship, and then propose some explanations for this response." (p. 327)
(5) This essay won the Norris prize for 1850 in the University of Cambridge. See C.D., "The Harmony of the Gospels," in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* 3 (1853), pp. 60–86, here 65.
(6) B.F. Westcott, *The Elements of the Gospel Harmony* (Cambridge: Macmillan, 1851).
(7) B.F. Westcott, *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1860; 8th ed., 1896).
35. Porter, Stanley E., and Dyer, Bryan R., eds. 2016. *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
Contents: Preface VII; Abbreviations IX; Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer: 1. The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction to Its Key Terms, Concepts, Figures, and Hypotheses 1; Craig A. Evans: 2. The Two Source Hypothesis 27; Mark Goodacre:

3. The Farrer Hypothesis 47; David Barrett Peabody: 4. The Two Gospel Hypothesis 67; 5. Rainer Riesner: The Orality and Memory Hypothesis 89; Craig A. Evans: 6. Two Source Hypothesis Response 113; Mark Goodacre: 7. Farrer Hypothesis Response 127; David Barrett Peabody: 8. Two Gospel Hypothesis Response 139; Rainer Riesner: 9. Orality and Memory Hypothesis Response 151; Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer: 10. What Have We Learned regarding the Synoptic Problem, and What Do We Still Need to Learn? 165; Glossary 179; List of Contributors 181; Index of Authors and Subjects 183; Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Sources 187-194.
36. ———. 2016. "The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction to Its Key Terms, Concepts, Figures, and Hypotheses." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 1-26. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
37. ———. 2016. "What Have We Learned regarding the Synoptic Problem, and What Do We Still Need to Learn?" In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 165-178. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
38. Porúbcan, Stefan. 1964. "Form Criticism and the Synoptic Problem." *Novum Testamentum* no. 7:81-118.
Reprinted in: David E. Orton (ed.), *The Synoptic Problem and Q: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, pp. 32-69.
39. Powell, Evan. 2006. *The Myth of the Lost Gospel*. La Vegas: Symposium Press.
40. Powers, B. Ward. 2010. *The Progressive Publication of Matthew: An Explanation of the Writing of the Synoptic Gospels*. Nashville: B & H Academic.
41. Price, Ron. 2001. "A Three Source Theory for the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of Biblical Studies* no. 1:1-9.
Abstract: "This paper posits that Luke used three written sources: Mark's gospel, an early sayings source and subsidiarily, Matthew's gospel. Evidence is provided for Luke's knowledge of Matthew's gospel, and for the incongruity of Q as normally delineated. Some of the pericopae usually assigned to Q are shown to have typical Matthean features and so to be unlikely to have originated in the sayings source. Instead it is suggested that Luke derived these pericopae directly from Matthew's gospel. This Three Source Theory is shown to combine the best features of the Farrer-Goulder Theory and the prevailing Two Source Theory."
42. Ra, Yoseop. 2016. *Q, the First Writing about Jesus*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.
43. Reicke, Bo. 1978. "Griesbach's Answer to the Synoptic Question." In *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies, 1776-1976*, edited by Orchard, Bernard and Longstaff, Thomas R. W., 50-67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745-1812) was active in Halle when he published his epoch-making Synopsis of 1774 which appeared separately in 1776. This instrument enabled him to apply himself to an exhaustive study of the literary relationships among the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. He later moved to Jena, and in 1783 gave scholars of Germany a hint of his Synoptic Theory.(1) In 1789-90 this was fully elaborated and published under the title of *Commentatio*(2) in 1794 the study was republished with supplements.(3) Similar theories had been put forward in Great Britain by Henry Owen in 1764 and in Germany by Anton Friedrich Büsching in 1766; but Griesbach mentioned neither of these.(4)" (p. 50)
(1) J. J. Griesbach, *Fontes unde evangelistae suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint: Paschatos solemnia...* (Jena, 1783); reprinted in J. J. Griesbach, *Opuscula academica*, ed. J. Ph. Gabler, vol. II (Jena, 1825), pp. 241-56 (quotations below are from this edition).

- (2) Idem, *Commentatio qua Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (Jena, 1789-90).
- (3) Idem, *Commentatio* (n. 2) . . . *locupletata*: J. C. Velthusen et al (eds.), *Commentationes Theologicae*, vol. I (Leipzig, 1794), pp. 360-434; reprinted in Griesbach, *Opuscula* (n. 1), pp. 358-425 (quotations below are from this edition).
- (4) H. Owen, *Observations on the Four Gospels* (London, 1764), p. 32: Matthew-Luke-Mark; A. F. Büsching, *Die vier Evangelisten mit ihren eigenen Worten zusammengesetzt und mit Erklärungen versehen* (Hamburg, 1766), pp. 99,108,118ff.: Luke-Matthew-Mark.
44. ———. 1983. "A Test of Synoptic Relationships: Matthew 10:17-23 and 24:9-14 with Parallels." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 209-229. Macon: Mercer University Press.
45. ———. 1986. *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
46. ———. 1987. "From Strauss to Holtzmann and Meijboom: Synoptic Theories Advanced during the Consolidation of Germany, 1830-70." *Novum Testamentum* no. 29:1-21.
Abstract: "The discussion of the synoptic problem, which had been promoted by Griesbach's publication of a Greek synopsis in A.D. 1774, was largely intensified among German Protestants during the years 1830-70. It was a period of academic liberalism, historical positivism, national enthusiasm, and political consolidation. During these years German theologians produced critical and challenging studies of the synoptic question with an enormous assiduity. Their contributions gained wide importance for later generations occupied with the synoptic Gospels, and the circumstances under which the German discussion took place is therefore of interest."
47. ———. 1990. "The History of the Synoptic Discussion." 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., 291-316. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
48. Reicke, Bo, and Peabody, David B. . 1999. "Synoptic Problem." In *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation: Volume 2*, edited by Hayes, John H., 517-524. Nashville: Abingdon.
49. Reid, Duncan Graham. 2011. "Miracle Stories 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, 299-319. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
50. ———. 2016. *Miracle Tradition, Rhetoric, and the Synoptic Problem*. Leuven: Peeters.
51. ———. 2016. "Gospel Openings and the Synoptic Problem." In *Scribal Practices and Social Structures among Jesus Adherents: Essays in Honour of John S. Kloppenborg*, edited by Arnal, William E., Ascough, Richard S., Derrenbacher, Jr., Robert A. and Harland, Philip A., 281-307. Leuven: Peeters.
52. Riesner, Rainer. 2012. "Martin Hengel's Quest for Jesus and the Synoptic Question." In *Earliest Christian History, History, Literature, and Theology. Essays from the Tyndale Fellowship in Honor of Martin Hengel*, edited by Bird, Michael F. and Maston, Jason, 171-190. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
53. ———. 2016. "The Orality and Memory Hypothesis." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 89-112. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
54. ———. 2016. "Orality and Memory Hypothesis Response." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Porter, Stanley E. and Dyer, Bryan R., 151-164.

- Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
55. Riley, Harold. 1989. *The Making of Mark: An Exploration*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
 56. ———. 1992. *The First Gospel*. Macon GA: Merce University Press.
 57. Rist, John M. 1978. *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 58. Robbins, C. Michael. 2007. *The Testing of Jesus in Q*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
 59. Robinson, John Arthur Thomas. 1975. "The Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen: A Test of Synoptic Relationships." *New Testament Studies* no. 21:443-461.
 60. Robinson, James M. 1971. "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q." In *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, edited by Robinson, James M. and Koester, Helmut, 71-113. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
 61. ———. 1999. "A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige." *The Harvard Theological Review* no. 92:61-77.
 "By way of conclusion, let me draw two inferences from this little study that point the way for biblical scholarship of the next century: First, the flood of new source material from early Christianity that has emerged over the last half century not only provides its own new information about early Christianity, but also provides material for understanding better the traditional source material, the New Testament itself. A scribal error in Matthew and Luke, because it was already in Q, has corrupted the text of one of the oldest small sayings collections in the New Testament, containing material that has usually rightly been ascribed to Jesus himself. Now a noncanonical gospel fragment of the early third century and an erased text of Matt 6:28 from the fourth century produce the text as it was prior to the scribal error, and containing other traits of primitiveness. The canon has always been seen as the official norm for the noncanonical material, but in this case it is the noncanonical material that corrects the very wording of the canon itself and may well be nearer to what Jesus actually said.
 Second, already as early as Q, a spiritualizing trend away from the basic necessities of life was creeping into the Jesus tradition in such a way that food and clothing were held to be less important to God than the soul and body they nourish. What Jesus himself had probably wanted to say was to trust God precisely for the physical necessities of life, such as food and clothing. That may not have sounded religious enough for the early church or for much spirituality even today. Yet since God acts through people, what Jesus would seem to have said amounts in our time to a call for social responsibility that, though uncomfortable for much of the established church, may point the direction for the survival of a relevant Christianity in the century to come." (p. 74)
 62. ———. 2005. *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
 Edited by Christoph Heil and Joseph Verheyden.
 63. ———. 2016. "The Matthean Trajectory from Q to Mark." In *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz*, edited by Collins, Adela Yarbro, 122-154. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
 64. Robinson, James M., Hoffman, Paul, and Kloppenborg, John S. 2002. *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English: with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 65. Robinson, James M., Hoffmann, Paul, and Kloppenborg, John S., eds. 2000. *The Critical Edition of Q*. Leuven: Peeters.
 Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas.

- Contents: Q Texts in Matthean Order IX; Frank Moore Cross and Helmut Koester: Foreword XIII; James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg : Preface XV; Acknowledgements XVII; James M. Robinson: History of Q Research XIX; James M. Robinson: Technical Data LXXII--CVII; The Critical Text of Q 2-561; John Kloppenborg: Concordance of Q 563-581.
66. ———, eds. 2001. *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas* Leuven: Peeters.
Contents: Preface: 3; Acknowledgements: 4; Q Texts in Matthean Order 5; Divergences for the Lukan Sequence 9; James M. Robinson: Introduction 11; Sigla 73; The text of Q in Greek and English 75; John S. Kloppenborg: Concordance: Introduction 153; Concordance 156; Recommended Reading 175.
67. Rodriguez, Rafael. 2017. "Matthew as Performer, Tradent, Scribe: A Review of Alan Kirk's *Q in Matthew*." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* no. 15:192-212.
68. Rollens, Sarah E. 2010. ""Why Do You Not Judge for Yourselves What is Right?": A Consideration of the Synoptic Relationship between Mt 5,25-26 and Lk 12,57-59." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*:449-469.
69. ———. 2011. "Does "Q" Have Any Representative Potential?" *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* no. 23:64-78.
Abstract: "This article examines mutually exclusive reconstructions of the community "behind" Q. It argues this state of affairs is a product of the implicit assumptions about religion that each reconstruction takes for granted. Rather than dismissing theoretical reflection on the category of religion as irrelevant for their work, it is time for Q scholars to recognize that presuppositions about "religion" fundamentally shapes their understanding of the text's representative potential."
70. ———. 2017. "Q in Matthew: A Review Essay." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* no. 15:169-191.
"In Q in Matthew: Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmissions of the Jesus Tradition, Alan Kirk presents the culmination of a long-held interest in the Synoptic Problem with a nearly as long-held interest in the role of memory in the transmission of the Jesus tradition and the production of the earliest texts. This book is a welcome intervention into synoptic studies, for it brings fresh attention to ancient media practices, the production and conditions of writing, and the influence of memory. Understanding ancient media practices (and the mountain of scholarship that informs the topic) is no easy task, and to be honest, biblical scholars have been known to ignore methodologies other than philology and history. Therefore, the careful attention to these neglected topics in Q in Matthew is an invaluable contribution to the field." (p. 169)
71. Rollston, Christopher A., ed. 2002. *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
Contents: Preface VII; Contributors IX; Abbreviations X; 1. Michael D. Goulder Matthew's Gospel Round the Year 1; 2. Bruce Chilton: Festivals and Lectionaries: Correspondence and Distinctions 12; 3. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin: Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem 29; 4. Robert A. Derrenbacher Jr.: Greco-Roman Writing Practices and Luke's Gospel: Revisiting "The Order of a Crank" 61; 5. Gary Gilbert: From Eschatology to Imperialism: Mapping the Territory of Acts 2 84; 6. Alan F. Segal: Transformation and Afterlife 111; 7. Krister Stendahl: Personal Reflections on the Goulder Symposium: An Afterword 131; Appendix: Michael Goulder Responds 137; Index of Ancient Texts 153; Index of Authors and Subjects 162-165.
72. Ropes, James Hardy. 1934. *The Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
73. Rosché, Theodore R. 1985. "The Words of Jesus and the Future of the "Q" Hypothesis." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by

- Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 357-369. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 79, 1960, pp. 210-220.
74. Rowland, Christopher. 2011. "Another Perspective on 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, 845-853. Leuven: Peeters.