

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

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (San - Tri)

Contents

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

Studies (mainly from 1964) in alphabetical order:

- 1: A - Bro
- 2: Buc - Day
- 3: De - Fee
- 4: Fit - Gou
- 5: Gre - Klo
- 6: Kni - Mey
- 7: Mic - Pat
- 8: Pea - Row
- 9: (Current page)
- 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. Sanday, William. 1876. *The Gospels in the Second Century*. London: Macmillan.
2. ———, ed. 1911. *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Contents: Introductory VII;
I. William Sanday:
The Conditions under which the Gospels were written, in their bearing upon some difficulties of the Synoptic Problem 3;
II. John C. Hawkins:
Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel: 29
1. The Disuse of the Marcan Source in St. Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14
2. The Great Omission by St. Luke of the Matter contained in St. Mark vi. 45-viii. 16
3. St. Luke's Passion-Narrative considere with reference to the Synoptic Probiem;
III. Probabilities as to the so-called Double Tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke 95;
B. H. Streeter:
IV. On the Original Order of Q 140

- V. St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q 165
 VI. The Original Extent of Q 185
 VII. The Literary Evolution of the Gospels 209
 VIII. On the Trial of Our Lord before Herod: A Suggestion 228
 [See also Appendix, p. 425]
 W. C. Allen:
 IX. The Book of Sayings used by the Editor of the First Gospel 235
 X. The Aramaic Background of the Gospels 287
 J. Vernon Bartlet:
 XI. The Sources of Luke's Gospel 314
 W. E. Addis:
 XII. The Criticism of the Hexateuch compared with that of the Synoptic Gospels 367
 N. P. Williams:
 XIII. A Recent Theory of the Origin of St. Mark's Gospel 388
 Appendix (B. H. Streeter)
 Synoptic Criticism and the Eschatological Problem 425
 Index 437-456.
3. ———. 1911. "The Conditions under which the Gospels were Written, in Their Bearing upon Some Difficulties of the Synoptic Problem." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 3-26. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 Reprinted in: Craig A. Evans, Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *Essays in Biblical Criticism and Exegesis*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 2001, p. 40-58.
 4. Sanders, Ed Parish. 1969. *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 5. ———. 1973. "The Overlaps of Mark and Q and the Synoptic Problem." *New Testament Studies* no. 19:453-465.
 6. ———. 1985. "Suggested Exceptions to the Priority of Mark." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 199-203. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint of "Appendix II: Suggested Exceptions to the Priority of Mark", in *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1969, pp. 290-293.
 7. ———. 1985. "The Argument from Order and the Relationship Between Matthew and Luke." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 409-425. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint from *New Testament Studies*, 15, 1968-69, pp. 249-261.
 8. Sanders, Ed Parish, and Davies, Margaret. 1989. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM Press.
 9. Scherer, Hildegard. 2020. "Learning Lessons on Q: The 2DH and Q in Academic Teaching." In *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*, edited by Tiwald, Markus, 254-273. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
 10. Schmitt, John J. 1981. "In Search of the Origin of the Siglum Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 100:609-611.
 "In a recent critical note in this journal, Lou Silberman suggested that Johannes Weiss in his use of the siglum Q in NT studies was influenced by the use which Wellhausen had made of the same sign in OT study, viz., for "[der] Kern der Grundschrift." This note offers further considerations on the use of this sign in both OT and NT areas of biblical scholarship." (p. 609)
 (...)
 "Quelle was abbreviated in print by Weiss in 1890, and it stuck, no doubt, because it replaced the current Greek abbreviation Λ for λόγια(13) The young theologians at

- Gottingen now used with enthusiasm "Q" as a German abbreviation in NT study, after OT study in the person of Wellhausen had tried, albeit temporarily, to use it as a Latin abbreviation." (pp. 610-611, a note omitted)
11. Schnelle, Udo. 1998. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
Chapter 3. *The Synoptic Gospels*: 3.1 *The Gospel genre* 151; 3.2 *The Synoptic Problem* 161; 3.3 *The Sayings Source Q* 179-197.
 12. Schröter, Jens. 2020. "Key Issues Concerning the Q Hypothesis: Synoptic Problem, Verbal Reconstruction, and the Message of Jesus." In *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*, edited by Tiwald, Markus, 18-40. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
 13. ———. 2020. "The Synoptic Problem, the "Apocryphal Gospels", and the Quest of the Historical Jesus: Toward a Reformulation of the Synoptic Problem." In *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 135-150. New York: Bloomsbury.
"To sum up, in the late seventeenth century, the question of the foundations of Christian faith is reformulated in the context of the theology of Enlightenment. It now appears as the hermeneutical problem whether or to what extent historical testimonies from the early period of Christianity can serve as a reliable basis also for later times. In this context, the Synoptic Problem appears for the first time. As especially Lessing's thesis of an original version of the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew language shows, an important aspect of that problem was the question of the oldest sources for the activity and fate of the earthly Jesus. Griesbach's rejection of a Gospel harmony and his remark about the possible historical unreliability of all of accounts of all the Gospels points to the literary dimension of the Synoptic Problem, which eventually leads to the interpretation of the Gospels as individual writings. The Synoptic Problem is therefore discussed from the beginning in a framework determined by literary and historical dimensions. Consequently, in one respect the debate is aimed at a solution of the literary relationship between the Synoptic gospels. In this regard, the Synoptic Problem touches upon questions such as the existence of Q or Luke's use of Mark and Matthew as an alternative to the two-source hypothesis. The historical dimension of the Synoptic Problem is concerned with the oldest and most reliable sources for the activity and fate of Jesus. In this respect, it is part of the wider discussion about sources for a historical reconstruction of the activity and fate of Jesus. From a current perspective, however, the Synoptic Problem has to take into account the wider horizon of the early Jesus tradition in its literary and historical dimensions. I will return to this aspect below." (p. 141)
 14. Sewell, Peter. 2001. "The Synoptic Problem: A Stylometric Contribution Regarding Q." *Colloquium* no. 33:59-74.
 15. Shellard, Barbara. 2002. *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
Chapter 3: *Luke and Matthew: the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 59-84.
 16. Shin, Hyeon Woo. 2004. *Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem in Historical Jesus Research: The search for valid criteria*. Leuven: Peeters.
 17. Shuler, Philip L. 1980. "Griesbach Hypothesis and Gospel Genre." *Perkins School of Theology Journal* no. 33:41-49.
 18. ———. 1983. "Genre Criticism and the Synoptic Problem." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 467-480. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 19. ———. 1987. "The Genre of the Gospels and the Two Gospel Hypothesis." In *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church*, edited by Sanders, Ed Parish, 69-88. Macon

- GA: Mercer University Press.
20. ———. 1990. "The Genre(s) of the Gospels." 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., 459-463. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
 21. Sigal, Phillip. 1983. "Aspects of Mark Pointing to Matthean Priority." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 185-208. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 22. Silberman, Lou H. 1979. "Whence Siglum Q? A Conjecture." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 98:287-288.
 23. Sim, David C. 2011. "Matthew 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, 187-208. Leuven: Peeters.
 24. ———. 2011. "Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace His Primary Source?" *New Testament Studies* no. 57:176-192.
Abstract: "Most scholars acknowledge Matthew's debt to Mark in the composition of his own Gospel, and they are fully aware of his extensive redaction and expansion of this major source. Yet few scholars pose what is an obvious question that arises from these points: What was Matthew's intention for Mark once he had composed and circulated his own revised and enlarged account of Jesus' mission? Did he intend to supplement Mark, in which case he wished his readers to continue to consult Mark as well as his own narrative, or was it his intention to replace the earlier Gospel? It is argued in this study that the evidence suggests that Matthew viewed Mark as seriously flawed, and that he wrote his own Gospel to replace the inadequate Marcan account."
 25. Simpson, R. T. 1985. "The Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 381-395. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from *New Testament Studies*, 12, 1985-86, pp. 273-284.
 26. Sloan, David B. 2016. "The τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν Similitudes and the Extent of Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 38:339-355.
Abstract: "Most recent studies of Q are built on the assumption that Q is not much more extensive than the double tradition, a questionable assumption given that Mark is much more extensive than the components of Mark that are found in both Matthew and Luke and that Matthew's selective rather than consecutive approach to Q may have caused him to leave out many verses of Q. This article considers three similitudes unique to Luke that begin with the phrase τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Lk. 11.5-8; 14.28-33; 17.7-10) as well as one that is paralleled in Matthew but has been omitted from the Critical Edition (Lk. 14.5 par. Mt. 12.11-12) and argues that all four of these passages are from Q. The criteria of Vassiliadis and Kloppenborg for finding Q passages in Lukan Sondergut are used, with particular emphasis on Kloppenborg's 'stylistic coherence'."
 27. Smit, Peter-Ben A. 2014. "Synoptic, Redactional, Stylistic and Narratological Observations on the Retelling of Mark 7:30 in Matthew 15:28." *New Testament Studies* no. 70:1-6.
 28. ———. 2017. "Restoring Mark - Reducing Q? A Note on the Reconstruction of the Original Text of Mark 9:28-29." *Biblische Notizen / Biblical Notes* no. 172:53-64.
 29. Smith, Daniel A. 2009. "Matthew and Q. The Matthean Deployment of Q and Mark in the Apocalyptic Discourse." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 85:99-116.
Abstract: "In their studies of Matthew and the Sayings Gospel Q, Ulrich Luz and James M. Robinson agree in proposing that the Matthean community was, sociohistorically as well as theologically, the direct descendent of the Q community,

although they differ considerably as to the compositional procedures of the author (hereafter simply "Matthew") in his use of Q (2). This paper will present brief synopses of the approaches of Luz and Robinson to Matthew's use of Q and evaluate them in light of Matthew's use of the latter parts of Q in the composition of the Apocalyptic Discourse (Matthew 24–25). The paper will also explore insights from Matthew's redeployment of Q's eschatological materials and use them, where possible, to assess the arguments of Luz and Robinson in favour of a possible sociohistorical connection between the communities behind the texts of Q and Matthew."

(2) 2. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2007, p. 49; ID., *Matthäus und Q*, in Rudolf Hoppe – Ulrich Busse (eds.), *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien. Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag*

(BZNW, 93), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1998, 201-215, translated as *Matthew and Q*, in ID., *Studies in Matthew*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2005, 39-53; James M. Robinson, *The Matthean Trajectory from Q to Mark*, in Adela Yarbro Collins (ed.), *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz* (SPHS, 22), Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1998, 122-154, reprinted in Christoph Heil – Josef Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays* (BETL, 189), Leuven, University Press – Peeters, 2005, 599-627; ID., *From Safe House to House Church: From Q to Matthew*, in Michael Becker – Wolfgang Fenske (eds.), *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils: Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Festschrift für Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (AGJU, 44), Leiden, Brill, 1999, 183-199, reprinted in Heil – Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 629-644.

30. ———. 2018. "The Sayings Gospel Q in Marcion's Edition of Luke." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 94:481-503.

Abstract: "Recent studies proposing that Marcion's Gospel represents, or provides access to, an edition of Luke earlier than its canonical form have obvious implications for Synoptic Problem scholarship. This article examines the place of the Double Tradition material (i.e., Q material) in the work of Joseph Tyson, Jason BeDuhn, and Matthias Klinghardt, with detailed analyses of the so-called Minor Agreements and the problematic attestation of Double Tradition material in Marcion's Gospel. Finally, a moderate suggestion concerning the place of Marcion's Gospel in the web of Synoptic relationships will be tentatively proposed."

Works cited

Jason David BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon*, Salem, OR, Polebridge, 2013.

Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press 2006.

Matthias Klinghardt, *The Oldest Gospel and the Formation of the Canonical Gospels: Inquiry. Reconstruction - Translation - Variants*, Leuven: Peeters 2020 (original German edition 2015).

31. ———. 2019. "Marcion's Gospel and the Synoptics: Proposals and Problems." In *Gospels and Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Experiments in Reception*, edited by Schröter, Jens, Nicklas, Tobias, Verheyden, Joseph and Simunovic, Katharina, 129-158. Berlin: de Gruyter.

"To be sure, any proposal to include Marcion's Gospel as a factor in the Synoptic Problem will be beset with problems, although this could never be an option for anyone who believes, as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and many others since then have claimed, that Marcion's Gospel (hereafter, MLk) is the direct descendent of Canonical Luke (hereafter, CLk), an abridged Luke, the product of Marcion's own editorial ("mutilating") hand.(1)"

(...)

"The essay has four parts. The first part assesses briefly the three recent reconstructions of MLk by Jason BeDuhn, Matthias Klinghardt, and Dieter Roth.(8)

The second section revisits the question whether CLk or MLk is the earlier form of Luke, with observations concerning five different arguments in favor of MLk being prior to (though not necessarily the direct source of) CLk. The third section addresses the proposal of Matthias Klinghardt and Markus Vinzent that MLk is “the oldest gospel,” the *Urquelle*, with special attention to the question of the relative priority of Mark and MLk.(9) A close reading of Mark 16:1–8 and Luke 24:1–12 will test Klinghardt’s *Arbeitshypothese* (“working hypothesis”) of Markan dependence on MLk(10). The fourth and final section deals briefly with the question of the limits of Q in a scenario in which, as BeDuhn and others propose, MLk is seen as a kind of relic of an early edition of Luke, in which Mark and Q were already combined." (p. 131)

(1) Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.27.2; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.2.4; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.9.1–2. In this essay, “MLk” is meant to refer to the recension of Luke associated with Marcion (but not to a particular contemporary reconstruction), and “CLk” either to the recension of Luke known to the heresiologists, and/or established by textual criticism today (=Nestle-Aland²⁸).

(8) Jason D. BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion’s Scriptural Canon* (Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2013); Matthias Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien* (TANZ 60/1–2; Tübingen: Francke, 2015); T. Roth, “Marcion’s Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate,” *Journal of Biblical literature* 177 (2008): 513–27.

(9) See Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels* (Studia Patristica Supplements 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2014); Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (n. 8).

(10) Klinghardt, *Das älteste Evangelium* (n. 8), 1:195: “Als Arbeitshypothese ist daher davon auszugehen, dass *Mk die erste Bearbeitung dieses mutmaßlich ältesten Evangeliums* darstellt” (emphasis original).

32. ———. 2020. ““No Weapon but That of Analysis”: Issues at Stake in the Rise and Reception of the Two-Document Hypothesis.” In *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by Kloppenborg, John S. and Verheyden, Joseph, 113-135. New York: Bloomsbury.
- “The focus of this chapter, then, is the matter of stakes, theological and otherwise, in the rise and reception of the 2DH in nineteenth-century scholarship. Rather than attempting to sketch these issues out in broad outline, this chapter will focus on four figures of note, namely: Christian Hermann Weisse, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Arthur Wright, and William Sanday.(6) While the others scarcely need an introduction, Wright probably does. Admittedly, he was not a major influence in Synoptic scholarship in Britain, but his caution, moderation, and piety in proposing what is essentially an oral catechesis variant of the 2DH are worth considering. The discussion treats Wright before Sanday because a definitive statement from the latter on the Synoptic Problem was quite a long time in coming—a matter worth considering in its own right.(7)” (p. 114)
- (6) In treating the two German innovators of the 2DH with two figures from English scholarship, one from Cambridge and one from Oxford, I follow the rough schema of Farmer, who sees the history of the Synoptic Problem unfolding in two corresponding phases (Farmer, *Synoptic Problem* [n. 4], 47).
- (7) Sanday hinted in already 1872 that he “accept[ed] temporarily” the conclusions of those arguing for the 2DH, but “hope[d] to be able to approach the subject [himself] with sufficient independence”: William Sanday, *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel Considered in Reference to the Contents of the Gospel Itself: A Critical Essay* (London: Macmillan, 1872), IX.
33. Smith, David Oliver. 2011. *Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul: The Influence of the Epistles on the Synoptic Gospels*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.
34. Smith, Shawn C. 2013. “A Defense of Using Patristic Sources in Synoptic Problem Research.” *Stone-Campbell Journal* no. 16:63-83.

35. Soards, Marion L. 1987. *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
Reprint: New York: Bloomsbury 2015.
36. Stanton, Graham N. 1985. "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Teil II: Principat. Band 36: Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik. 5. Teilband: Philosophie (Einzelne Autoren, Doxographica)*, edited by Haase, Wolfgang, 1889-1951. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
"Q was assumed without discussion. In 1951 B. C. BUTLER launched the first modern full-scale attack on Marcan priority, but his attempt to revive Augustine's solution of the synoptic problem did not attract many followers and it was not influential on Matthean scholarship. In 1964 W. R. FARMER revived the GRIESBACH hypothesis and he has continued to champion it vigorously. On this view, Matthew's gospel was the first to be written, Luke used Matthew, and Mark used both Matthew and Luke. If the GRIESBACH hypothesis (or a modern modification of it) were to be accepted, many of the conclusions accepted by most Matthean specialists would be falsified, for they rest on the presupposition that Matthew used two sources, Mark and Q, as well as oral tradition not found elsewhere in the gospels. Hence it is not surprising to find that the origin and relationship of the three synoptic gospels has been debated fiercely in recent years." (p. 1899)
(...)
"Three British scholars, A. M. FARRER (1954), H. B. GREEN (1975) and M. D. GOULDER (1974) have acknowledged that there are sound reasons for concluding that Matthew's main source is Mark, but have challenged the existence of Q. FARRER argued that the Q hypothesis wholly depends on the incredibility of Luke's having read Matthew's book. "It needs no refutation except the demonstration that its alternative is possible." (p. 62) Once rid of Q, FARRER believed, we are rid of a progeny of nameless chimaeras, and free to let St. Matthew write as he is moved. Most scholars have conceded that while FARRER'S account of Luke's use and redaction of Matthew is ingenious, it is implausible."
(,,,
"GOULDER has taken up and adapted FARRER'S emphasis on Matthew's creative freedom. He claims that Matthew has expanded Mark (his only source, apart from a small handful of oral traditions) by means of midrash. Matthew's gospel is, quite simply, a very free midrashic exposition and expansion of Mark. Why did Matthew want to write in this way? GOULDER' s answer is novel, to say the least: Matthew's gospel was developed liturgically and was intended to be used liturgically; its order is liturgically significant, for the author has taken the Jewish Festal Year and its pattern of lections as his base. With a wave of the lectionary wand, Q is consigned to oblivion." (pp. 1901-1902)
37. Stanton, Graham N., and Perrin, Nicholas. 2013. "Q." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. Second edition*, edited by Green, Joel B., Brown, Jeannine K. and Perrin, Nicholas, 711-718. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
38. Stegner, William Richard. 1982. "The Priority of Luke: An Exposition of Robert Lindsey's Solution to the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research* no. 27:26-38.
39. Stein, Robert H. 1971. "The Proper Methodology for Ascertaining a Marcan Redaction History." *Novum Testamentum* no. 13:181-198.
40. ———. 1983. "Luke 1:1-4 and *Traditiongeschichte*." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* no. 26:421-430.
41. ———. 1983. "The "Redaktionsgeschichtlich" Investigation of a Marcan Seam (Mc 1 21f.)." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Kunde der Älteren Kirche* no. 26:421-430.

42. ———. 1987. *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
43. ———. 1992. "The Matthew–Luke Agreements Against Mark: Insight from John." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* no. 54:482-502.
44. ———. 2001. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic.
Second revised edition of *The Synoptic Problem* (1987).
45. ———. 2011. "Duality in Mark." 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, 253-280. Leuven: Peeters.
46. Stephenson, T. 1918. "The Classification of Doublets in the Synoptic Gospels." *The Journal of Theological Studies* no. 20:1-8.
47. ———. 1918. "The Overlapping of Sources in Matthew and Luke." *The Journal of Theological Studies* no. 21:127-145.
48. Stoldt, Hans-Herbert. 1980. *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis*. Macon (GA): Mercer University Press.
Translated from the German *Geschichte und Kritik der Markus-hypothese*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, and edited by Donald L. Niewyk; introduction by William R. Farmer.
"The present work does not approach a critical analysis of the whole problem of the Gospels, but for the time being examines only its most highly controversial and therefore most essential feature, the synoptic problem." (p. 2)
(...)
"Until now it has been generally accepted that there were, in all, six different possibilities of utilization, calculated according to the law of permutation theory. But that hardly exhausts all of the potential combinations of the three Gospels: of these, there are not six, but over thirty (see below, p.44ff). It can be said that almost all of the theoretical relationships have been represented experimentally, or have at least put in an appearance, during the course of research. However, only two of them have received the concentrated attention of scholarly discussion, and thus taken on true historical importance; the Griesbach hypothesis, and the Marcan hypothesis.
Both of these theories proceed from the assumption that the key to the solution of the synoptic problem must lie in the Gospel of Mark. Without a doubt, the Gospel of Mark occupies a central position, and its relationship to the first and third Gospels is different from the relationship between those two. One may also reverse the situation and say: each of these two Gospels has for its very own a special relationship to Mark which cannot be compared with the one that relates it to the other. Both hypotheses, therefore, start from the same alternative: Either Matthew and Luke are dependent on Mark, or Mark is dependent on them. In a chronological sense this would mean that the Gospel of Mark is either the first or the last of the synoptic Gospels. Griesbach's hypothesis asserts the latter, and the Marcan hypothesis the former." (pp. 4-5)
(...)
"One looks in vain among the founders of the Marcan hypothesis for such a preparatory balancing of the pros and cons of their theory of sources. Rather, one has the impression that they rush too quickly into the thick of the fray, and that their gaze is overwhelmingly turned toward questions of detail in the synoptic gospels in order to consider these questions from the perspective of the Marcan hypothesis and to bring them into harmony with it whenever necessary. But only if these parts were fitted together to form an unbroken chain of evidence without excluding any unsolved questions could it be said that the Marcan hypothesis had been proved, at all events from this point of view.
Therefore, in the following chapters we shall submit this source-theory to a severe ordeal by fire. In doing so it is of decisive importance to examine this fundamental

question from its very beginning, that \s,from the laying of its foundation by its originators. But for what reason? Is it not possible to object and say that all of this is "old hat"—old research results that have gathered dust for more than a hundred years? Have not these results again and again been scrutinized and confirmed by competent researchers? It does not seem to be necessary to repeat the whole process; for some time these conclusions have belonged to the "assured results of scholarship," and they have stood forth like a rock of Gibraltar.

But let us assume that this "assured result of scholarship" was false. Then it must have been, or at least could have been, false from the very beginning. Then it would be of decisive importance to examine it as it comes to birth and to discover its *peccatum originale*. This is what we shall undertake in the following chapters." (pp. 22-23)

49. Stonehouse, Ned B. 1964. *Origins of the Synoptic Gospels: Some basic questions*. Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans.
50. Strecker, Georg, ed. 1993. *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Inhalt: Georg Strecker: Vorwort/Foreword 7; Georg Strecker: Begrüßung/Words of Welcome 17; Frans Neiryck: The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory 25; Albert Fuchs: Die "Seesturmperikope" Mk 4,35-41 parr im Wandel der urkirchlichen Verkündigung 65; Wolfgang Schenk: Zur Frage einer vierten Version der Seesturm-Erzählung in einer Mt/Lk-Agreement-Redaktions-Schicht ("Dt-Mk") 93; Christopher M. Tuckett: The Minor Agreements and Textual Criticism 119; Michael D. Goulder: Luke's Knowledge of Matthew 143; William R. Farmer: The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark and the Two Gospel Hypothesis 163; Ulrich Luz: Korreferat zu W.R. Farmer, The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark and the Two-Gospel Hypothesis 209; The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis (F. Neiryck): Appendices I, II, III 221; Literatur 231; Abkürzungen 241; Register 243; Teilnehmerliste 245.
51. Streeter, Burnett Hillman. 1911. "On the Trial of Our Lord before Herod: A Suggestion." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 228-231. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
52. ———. 1911. "The Literary Evolution of the Gospels." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 209-227. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
53. ———. 1911. "On the Original Order of Q." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 140-164. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
54. ———. 1911. "Synoptic Criticism and the Eschatological Problem." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 425-436. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
55. ———. 1911. "The Original Extent of Q." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 185-208. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
56. ———. 1911. "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 165-184. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
57. ———. 1921. "Fresh Light on the Synoptic Problem." *The Hibbert Journal* no. 20:103-112.
58. ———. 1924. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. London: Macmillan.
Selections (pp. 157-169 and 195-197) reprinted with the title *The Priority of Mark* in: Arthur J. Belinzoni, Jr. (ed.), *The Two-Source Hypothesis A Critical Appraisal*,

- Macon: Mercer University Press 1985, pp. 23-36.
59. ———. 1985. "The Priority of Mark." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 23-36. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint of B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels; A Study of Origins*, London: Macmillan 1924, pp. 157-169 and 195-197.
60. ———. 1985. "The Document Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 221-225. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, London: Macmillan 1924, pp. 182-186.
61. Strickland, Michael. 2014. *The Evangelicals and the Synoptic Problem*. Bern: Peter Lang.
"The purpose of this work is to discover how, throughout their history, evangelical Christians have approached the Synoptic Problem (SP)-the classic puzzle in NT criticism-and engage with recent scholarly discussion among evangelicals about solutions to the SP. This study addresses five crucial questions. First, for how long have those with evangelical convictions sought to explain the similarities and differences between the synoptic gospels by appealing to the evangelists' sources? Second, as they considered these sources and the evangelists' use of them, how were views of inspiration held by those evangelicals affected and explained? Third, how have evangelical solutions to the SP evolved as biblical criticism has developed over the centuries? Fourth, how have evangelicals advocated their preferred solutions to the SP and characterized those solutions different from their own? Fifth, how has ecclesiology factored into evangelical discussions of the SP?" (p. XII)
62. ———. 2016. "The Synoptic Problem in Sixteenth-Century Protestantism." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* no. 67:82-93.
Abstract: "This article examines early Protestant discussion of the historic puzzle in New Testament study known as the Synoptic Problem, which deals with the potential literary relationship between the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. The subject was addressed by John Calvin, pioneer Reformer, and by the early Lutheran Martin Chemnitz. Calvin made a puissant contribution by constructing the first three-column Gospel harmony. Chemnitz contributed nascent redaction-critical assessments of Matthew's use of Mark. Thus, far from simply being a concern to post-Enlightenment critics (as is often assumed), interest in the Gospel sources was present from the earliest days of the Reformation."
63. Stuhlmacher, Peter. 1990. "The Genre(s) of the Gospels. Response to P. L. Shuler." In *The Interrelations of the Gospels. A Symposium led by M.-E. Boismard - W.R. Farmer - F. Neiryneck, Jerusalem 1984*, edited by Dungan, David L., 464-494. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
64. Styler, G. M. 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 from C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, New York: Harper & Row 1962, pp. 223-232.
"The priority of Mk and the hypothesis of Q have been widely accepted in the present century, and are conveniently denoted by the name 'The Two-document Hypothesis', although it should be noted that the documents may well have been many more than two.
The classical statement and defence was made by B. H. Streeter,(1) who attempted to reconstruct Q as a unitary document, but restricted it more narrowly than previous scholars. He gave the labels 'M' and

'L' to the material peculiar to Matt. and Lk., or (to be more precise) to the sources from which he took most of their peculiar material to be derived. Here again it may be noted that some scholars have been cautious in accepting the unity of the M or L material, and that since this material appears in only one gospel any reconstruction of its alleged source is even more speculative than the reconstruction of a Q.

It was not necessary to maintain that Mk's version must at every point be older than Matt.'s parallel version, since it was possible to say that anything in Matt. which in fact seemed more original than Mk could have been derived from Q. Further, there had been lingering doubts about the existence of Q. But it came as a shock when in 1951 Dom B. C. Butler published his book *The Originality of St Matthew*, attacking the Q-hypothesis and the priority of Mk at the same time. In a minutely detailed study he subjected both hypotheses to a severe criticism, and argued strongly for the priority of Matt.

Mk, he argued, was dependent on Matt.; Lk. was dependent on Mk for the material which the two had in common, and on Matt. for the Q-material. Once the Q-hypothesis is abandoned, the priority of Matt., he claimed, quickly follows from the existence of those passages in which Matt.'s text seems clearly more original than Mk's, or in some other way superior to it.

In spite of much close and careful reasoning, and the existence of at any rate some passages which tell in favour of Butler's conclusion, scholars have not abandoned the usual belief in the priority of Mk.

In this Excursus it will not be possible to examine all Butler's arguments and instances one by one.(2) But an attempt will be made to show that the belief in the priority of Mk is in fact securely grounded, and to make clear the principal arguments on either side, on which the decision must turn." (pp. 223-224)

(1) *The Four Gospels* (1924.).

(2) Nor to consider the various articles that have appeared subsequently.

65. Talbert, Charles H. 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.
66. ———. 1978. "Oral and Independent or Literary and Interdependent?: A Response to Albert B. Lord." In *The Relationships Among the Gospels. An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, edited by Walker, William O., 92-102. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.
67. Talbert, Charles H., and McKnight, Edgar V. 1972. "Can the Griesbach Hypothesis Be Falsified?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 91:336-368.
68. Taylor, Vincent. 1926. *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
69. ———. 1927. "Is the Proto-Luke Hypothesis Sound." *The Journal of Theological Studies*:147-155.
70. ———. 1933. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures*. London: Macmillan.
71. ———. 1985. "The Original Order of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 295-317. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essay: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, 1893-1958*, Manchester: Manchester University Press 1959, pp. 246 ff.; reprinted in V. Taylor, *New Testament Essays*, London: Epworth Press 1970, pp. 95-118.
72. Thomas, Robert L. 1976. "An Investigation of the Agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* no. 19:103-112.

73. ———, ed. 2002. *Three Views on the Origins of the Synoptic Gospels*. Grand Rapids (MI): Kregel
 Contents: Contributors 7; Robert L. Thomas: Introduction 8;
 Chapter 1: Grant R. Osborne and Matthew C. Williams: The Case for the Markan Priority View of Gospel Origins: The Two-/Four-Source View 19; John H. Niemeld: Two-Gospel Response 97; F. David Farnell: Independence Response 111;
 Chapter 2: John H. Niemeld: The Case for the Two-Gospel View of Gospel Origins 126; Grant R. Osborne and Matthew C. Williams: Markan Priority Response 198; F. David Farnell: Independence Response 210;
 Chapter 3: F. David Farnell: The Case for the Independence View of Gospel Origins 226; Grant R. Osborne and Matthew C. Williams: Markan Priority Response 310; John H. Niemeld: Two-Gospel Response 323;
 Robert L. Thomas: Conclusion: The Evidence Summarized 337;
 Author Index 389; Scripture Index 393; Subject Index 398-406.
74. ———. 2002. "Two-Gospel Response." In *Conclusion: The Evidence Summarized*, edited by Thomas, Robert L., 327-387. Grand Rapids (MI): Kregel
75. Throckmorton Jr., Burton H. 1948. "Did Mark Know Q?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 67:319-329.
76. Tischendorf, Costantin. 1867. *Origins of the Four Gospels*. Boston: America Tract Society.
77. Tiwald, Markus. 2015. *Q in Context I: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in Early Judaism and in the Sayings Source*. Göttingen: V & R unipress.
78. ———. 2015. *Q in Context II: Q in Context II: Social Setting and Archaeological Background of the Sayings Source*. Göttingen: V & R unipress.
79. ———, ed. 2020. *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
 Contents: Markus Tiwald: Looking behind the Curtain: An Introduction to the Volume 9; Jens Schröter: Key Issues Concerning the Q Hypothesis: Synoptic Problem, Verbal Reconstruction and the Message of Jesus 18; Lukas Bormann: Das Interesse an Markuspriorität, Logienquelle und Zweiquellentheorie im deutschen Protestantismus des 19. Jahrhunderts 41; Christopher Tuckett: The Reception of Q Studies in the UK: No room at the inn? 62; Paul Foster: The Rise and Development of the Farrer Hypothesis 86; Markus Tiwald: The Investment of Roman Catholics in the 2DH and Q 129; Joseph Verheyden: Introducing "Q" in French Catholic Scholarship at the Turn of the 19th and 20th Century: Alfred Loisy's *Évangiles synoptiques* 146; Gerd Theissen: Itinerant Radicalism: The Origin of an Exegetical Theory 175; Marco Frenschkowski: Itinerant Charismatics and Travelling Artisans - Was Jesus Travelling Lifestyle Induced by His Artisan Background? 191; Sarah E. Rollens: Where Are All the Women in Q Studies?: Gender Demographics and the Study of Q 223; Hildegard Scherer: Learning Lessons on Q: The 2DH and Q in Academic Teaching 254; Ralf Miggelbrink: The Quest for the Historical Jesus and Q in the View of Systematic Theology 274; Contributors 283.
80. ———. 2020. *The Sayings Source: A Commentary on Q*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
81. ———. 2020. "The Investment of Roman Catholics in the 2DH and Q." In *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled: Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues Behind the Sayings Source*, edited by Tiwald, Markus, 129-145. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
82. Toda, Satoshi. 2012. "The reasons why the synoptic problem should be reconsidered once again." *Hitotsubashi Journal of Arts and Sciences* no. 53:47-78.
83. Trevett, Christine. 1984. "Approaching Matthew from the Second Century: the Under-Used Ignatian Correspondence." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 20:59-67.
 "We are often told that in writing the seven letters of the so-called *Middle Recension* Ignatius of Antioch, bishop and martyr, showed knowledge of Matthew's

Gospel.(1) His epistles, it has been claimed, provide therefore a *terminus ante quem* for that Gospel's creation and/or supportive evidence in favour of its Syrian provenance.(2)

Although such statements are made, the question of literary relationship has been relatively little studied, and this paper will draw attention to the findings of a small number of scholars which has considered seriously Ignatius's alleged dependence on Matthew's Gospel. To facilitate comparison for readers, it will include a table of the parallels between the Gospel and the letters most frequently adduced as well as comments concerning some of those factors which render the approach to a Gospel from the second century difficult and worth undertaking. For although no consensus of scholarly opinion has emerged regarding Ignatius's usage, the few studies cited in this paper provide tempting glimpses of insights yet to be gained.

They suggest that our knowledge of the Synoptic Problem, of the form, date and provenance of individual Synoptic sources and of the use of Gospel traditions in Christian communities may be furthered by means of an approach to the Gospels from the second century." (p. 59)

(1) Written to Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia, Smyrna and to Polycarp.

(2) E.g. B.H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London, 1929), p. 281; G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Oxford, 1946), p. 6; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Gottingen, 1962), pp. 35f.; J.C. Fenton, *The Gospel of St. Matthew* (Harmondsworth, 1963), p. 11; D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London, 1972), pp. 48f., 51.

84. Tripp, Jeffrey M. 2013. "Measuring Arguments from Order for Q: Regression Analysis and a New Metric for Assessing Dependence." *Neotestamentica* no. 47:123-148.