

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

Synoptic Problem: Bibliography of the main studies in English from 1964 (A - Bro)

Contents

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

Studies (mainly from 1964) in alphabetical order:

1: A - Bro (Current page)

2: Buc - Day

3: De - Fee

4: Fit - Gou

5: Gre - Klo

6: Kni - Mey

7: Mic - Pat

8: Pea - Row

9: San - Tri

10: Tuc - Z

Bibliography of studies on Synopsis - Concordances - Harmonies of the Gospels

Bibliographies on the Synoptic problem

1. Longstaff, Thomas Richmond Willis, and Thomas, Page Allison, eds. 1989. *The Synoptic Problem. A Bibliography, 1716-1988*. Macon: Mercer University Press. "This bibliography includes the major works (books and reviews; articles in journals and collected essays; dissertations; unpublished material) not only with reference to the synoptic problem, but with reference to the wider question of the sources of and interrelationships among the synoptic gospels. A number of works are included which, while not dealing with the issues directly, are relevant and have been cited in the literature. Many of the books in the bibliography themselves contain excellent bibliographies. The most important of these have the notation "Includes bibl. " This bibliography is divided into three sections: (1) Author/title index; (2) date of publication/writing index (author and entry number listed); and (3) keyword index with entry numbers." (p. XV)
2. McKnight, Scot, and Williams, Matthew C. 2000. *The Synoptic Gospels: An Annotated Bibliography*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books. *Studies on the Synoptic Gospels*, pp. 37-46. "The number of studies devoted to the Synoptic Problem is immense and no longer controllable. The following works are among the most important. For those who wish to delve further into the Synoptic Problem, the bibliography of Longstaff (see #142) is exhaustive through 1988. Besides the industry of individual scholars

poring painstakingly over the data of the texts themselves, scholars of the Synoptic Problem have frequently sponsored international conferences where heated debate and constructive progress held the day. Fortunately, many of the conferences have had their papers published. A virtual history of the debate can be traced by studying such volumes. Let it be observed that one's solution to the Synoptic Problem has a decided impact on one's perception of early Christian history and the nature of the theology of each Evangelist (see Farmer, #120)." (p. 37)

References

#142 = Longstaff, Thomas, *The Synoptic Problem. A Bibliography, 1716-1988*.

#120 = Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*.

Studies on the Synoptic Problem

1. Abakuks, Andris. 2006. "A Statistical Study of the Triple-Link Model in the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* no. 169:49-60.
Summary: "In New Testament studies, the synoptic problem is concerned with the relationships between the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke. A careful specification in probabilistic terms is set up of what is known as the triple-link model, and, as a special case, the double-link model. Counts of the numbers of verbal agreements between the gospels are examined to investigate which of the possible triple-link models appears to give the best fit to the data."
"Honoré (1968) in a pioneering paper carried out a statistical analysis of the synoptic problem, a well-known branch of New Testament studies, in which hypotheses about the relationships between the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke are investigated. A good introduction to the various theories that have been proposed for the relationships between the synoptic gospels is given by Goodacre (2001). Honoré (1968) is particularly useful in that it provides a comprehensive listing of the data that were used in the analysis and a detailed account of the mathematical and statistical reasoning. However, from the point of view of a statistician, one of the challenges of Honoré (1968) is that his terminology tends not to conform to what is accepted usage in statistical theory." (p. 49)
2. ———. 2007. "A Modification of Honoré's Triple-link Model in the Synoptic Problem." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* no. 170:841-850.
Summary: "In an earlier paper a careful specification in probabilistic terms was set up of Honoré's triple-link model. In the present paper, a modification of Honoré's model is proposed. As previously, counts of the numbers of verbal agreements between the gospels are examined to investigate which of the possible triple-link models appears to give the best fit to the data, but now using the modified version of the model and additional sets of data."
3. ———. 2012. "The Synoptic Problem: on Matthew's and Luke's Use of Mark." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* no. 175:959-975.
Summary: "Assuming Markan priority, we investigate the relationship between the words in Mark that are retained unchanged by Matthew and those that are retained unchanged by Luke. This is done by mapping the sequence of words in Mark into binary time series that represent the retention or non-retention of the individual words, and then carrying out a variety of logistic regression analyses.
4. ———. 2015. *The Synoptic Problem and Statistics*. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press.
"Outline of this book"
"In Chapter 2, we build upon the triple-link model introduced by Honoré (1968), broadly following the development in Abakuks (2006a, b, 2007), but with some changes. In Chapter 3, the bivariate binary time series obtained from the highlighted text of Mark in Farmer's *Synopticon* is introduced, and much of the rest of the book

is concerned with the analysis of such binary time series. In Chapter 3 itself, following the treatment in Abakuks (2012), under the assumption of Markan priority, i.e., that Mark was the first of the synoptic gospels to be written, the time series is analyzed using logistic regression methods in order to investigate Matthew's and Luke's use of Mark and, in particular, to test whether Matthew and Luke were statistically independent in their verbal agreements with Mark. From Chapter 4 onwards, hidden Markov models are used to analyze the series. Chapter 4 is a theoretical interlude in which the theory of hidden Markov models for binary data is presented, with some associated R code in Appendix A at the end of the book. In Chapter 5, hidden Markov models are used to investigate Matthew's and Luke's use of Mark. (24) In Chapter 6, a different bivariate binary time series, which uses Matthew as the base text instead of Mark, is analysed in order to investigate the verbal agreements of Mark and Luke with Matthew.

After the statistical analysis in earlier chapters of the binary data extracted from the gospel texts, in Chapter 7 we turn to some examples of the incomparably richer material of the texts themselves in Greek, to be able to exhibit the verbal agreements word by word, and in English translation, to make the texts accessible to a wider readership. Parallel passages from the synoptic gospels, which emerge from the results of the statistical analysis as particularly significant for the synoptic problem, are presented for detailed examination.

We focus especially on passages that, from the statistical analysis, appear likely to provide the strongest evidence that, under the assumption of Markan priority, Matthew and Luke were not independent in their use of Mark. This leads to the discussion of specific issues concerning the relationships between parallel sections of text and the responses of New Testament scholars who defend different synoptic hypotheses. Finally, in Chapter 8 we summarize the conclusions that may be drawn from our analysis and suggest directions for further research.

To put things in the broader context of New Testament studies, much of the material in this book could be regarded as falling within the scope of what is known as source criticism, which seeks to identify the sources used by the gospel authors. Some of the discussion in Chapter 7 touches on aspects of redaction criticism, which deals with the way in which the gospel authors edited and adapted their sources to fit in with their own theological standpoint.

These and other aspects of biblical criticism are surveyed in Tuckett (1987)."
(24) An introductory sketch of this approach is given in Abakuks (2015).

5. ———. 2015. "A Statistical Time Series Approach to the Use of Mark by Matthew and Luke." In *Markan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, edited by Poirier, John C. and Peterson, Jeffrey, 119-139. London: T & T Clark.

"1. Introduction

The statistical approach to the synoptic problem to be described in this study follows a tradition of statistical analysis of verbal agreements comprehensively reviewed in a recent article by John Poirier.(1) In particular, it builds on aspects of a seminal paper by A. M. Honoré.(2) Earlier analysis by the present author(3) put some of Honoré's work on the so-called triple-link model on a more rigorous mathematical footing.

Using the symbols A, B, and C to refer to any permutation of the synoptic gospels, it is supposed in the triple-link model that, (...) Gospels B and C both use Gospel A and that Gospel C also uses Gospel B as a source. To summarise very briefly the results of this earlier work, it was found that the triple-link model appeared to give a good fit to the data, with the best fit provided by the two cases of the model where Luke was the last of the gospels to be written: A = Mark, B = Matthew, C = Luke, and A = Matthew, B = Mark, C = Luke, respectively." (p. 119)

1. John C. Poirier 'Statistical Studies of the Verbal Agreements and their Impact on the Synoptic Problem', *Currents in Biblical Research* 7 (2008), pp. 68- 123.

2. A. M. Honoré, 'A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem', *NovT* 10 (1968), pp. 95- 147.

3. Andris Abakuks, 'A Statistical Study of the Triple-link Model in the Synoptic Problem', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*, 169 (2006), pp. 49- 60; idem, 'A Modification of Honoré's Triple-link Model in the Synoptic Problem', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*, 170 (2007), pp. 841- 50.
6. Abbott, Edwin. 1901. *The Corrections of Mark Adopted by Matthew and Luke* . London: Adam and Charles Black.
 Book II: *The principal corrections of Mark* , pp. 61-300; § 80. *Minor agreements of Matthew and Luke* , pp- 300-304.
 Appendix I: *A complete table of the corrections in Greek* , pp. 307-324; Appendix II: *Oral tradition* , pp. 325-330.
 "The object of this book is to demonstrate that Mark contains a tradition from which Matthew and Luke borrowed, and to discuss the corrections of Mark jointly adopted by Matthew and Luke." (Preface, VII).
 (...)
 "A comparison of the Synoptists will show that Matthew and Luke, where Mark is altogether wanting, often agree very closely indeed, as, for example, in this passage of the Sermon on the Mount: " No one (Lk. servant) can be bond-servant to two lords ; for either he will hate the one and love the other or hold fast to one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." ^ In the whole of the Triple Tradition there is perhaps no instance of such close agreement as in this and in other passages common to Matthew and Luke and wanting in Mark. But these passages are best considered by themselves.
 Almost all of them contain sayings, not doings, of Christ, and they have (many of them) peculiarities of style and subject-matter which render it desirable to consider them separately, as constituting a distinct document from the Triple Tradition. Theoretically, it may be urged that this has no more right to be treated as a distinct document than any other doubly-attested tradition, e.g. the similarities common to Mark and Matthew alone, or to Mark and Luke alone. But in practice this collection of Matthew -Luke passages is so much more important than any other " double traditions " in the Synoptists that we shall find it convenient, for brevity, to call it the Double Tradition, and to discuss it in a separate volume, without, of course, allowing this convenient title to commit us to any conclusions about the authorship of this or that passage in the collection." (p. 48)
 (1) Mt. vi. 24, Lk. xvi. 13.
7. Abogunrin, Samuel Oyinloye. 1990. "The Synoptic Gospel Debate: A Re-Examination from an African Point of View." 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., 381-407. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
8. Adamczewski, Bartosz. 2010. *Q or not Q? The So-called Triple, Double, and Single traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* . Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
 "If the 'Q source' ever existed, it must have been one of the pillars of theology of early Christianity. In such a case, why was this pillar so underdeveloped theologically, especially in comparison to the Pauline ideas? Why did 'Q' completely disappear as a literary entity soon after the composition of the gospels of Matthew and Luke? Shall we believe that Christianity is based on sand of an unknown, lost, theologically problematic document?
 It is therefore evident that the solution to the synoptic problem has fundamental importance for interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels and of the early Christian tradition as a whole. Every solution to the synoptic problem offers not only a more or less satisfactory explanation of the literary similarities and differences among the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. It either gives or presupposes also an answer to a more general question, whether the Synoptic Gospels and other New Testament writings were based on one internally coherent gospel tradition or on numerous disparate, partially overlapping traditions and literary sources.

Consequently, every solution to the synoptic problem not only explains the origin of the so-called triple, double, and single traditions in the Synoptic Gospels but also gives an explicit or implicit answer to the more fundamental literary-hermeneutic question, in what sense we may call them 'traditions' at all.

Were they channels of more or less faithful oral transmission of some preliterate material or rather ways of literary-rhetorical formulation and reformulation of some particular theological ideas? Accordingly, shall we understand the synoptic 'traditions' as having (similarly to other scriptural traditions) mainly a historical-informative or rather an intertextual-performative nature?

The quest for the correct solution to the synoptic problem is therefore by no means a purely technical issue. Every solution to the synoptic problem to a considerable degree conditions understanding not only of the history of early Christianity but also of the literary character of the New Testament writings and consequently of adequate ways of their overall interpretation." (pp. 17-18)

9. Addis, William Edward. 1911. "The Criticism of the Hexateuch compared with that of the Synoptic Gospels." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 367-386. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Syllabus: "The principles of criticism whether applied to the Old or New Testament are identical.

But the subject-matter in each case is very different.

The date of Moses most uncertain, but he must have lived at least several centuries before any record of his life, which has reached us, came into being. Contrast with this the proximity of St. Mark's Gospel and of Q to the events which they attest.

The present position of criticism of the Hexateuch. The uncritical conservatism of MoUer and Orr. New views on the early date of Monolatry. Eerdmans' rejection of critical principles accepted ever since Astruc published his book on the composition of Genesis in 1751.

Sir W. M. Ramsay's protest against the claim of Hexateuch critics to determine in the minutest details the extent of the several documents. The misleading nature of the parallel which he draws.

The minute severance of documents in the Hexateuch justified by an examination of the story of the Flood as given in Genesis.

General sketch of the documents in the Hexateuch and their characteristics.

Both Hexateuch and Gospels of composite origin. Similar composite origin can be proved in case of Chronicles, I Esdras, and may be illustrated from the Saxon Chronicle.

Doublets the best clue to diversity of documents. Doublets in Synoptic Gospels, Psalms, and Proverbs.

The compiler of the Hexateuch had no documents near to the time of Moses, and he makes his latest document the framework in which he sets and to which he adapts all his earlier material. The Synoptic Evangelists, on the contrary, base their narratives on Mark, their earliest document for the life of Christ. Matthew and Luke also build on Q, which may belong to the Apostolic age. But a peculiar difficulty arises in the Gospels from the fact that there must have been an Aramaic background."

10. Agnew, Peter W. 1983. "The "Two-Gospel" Hypothesis and a Biographical Genre for the Gospels." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by Farmer, William R., 481-499. Macon: Mercer University Press. "The gospels differ considerably from each other. The question this raises is pressing for genre criticism: what gives the gospels themselves any generic affinity with each other, let alone generic identity with Hellenistic biography? Can we really speak of the gospels as belonging to one genre? Under the *sui generis* solution this problem is nonexistent, for the gospels, being *Kleinliteratur*, are in a category by themselves, separate from any extant examples of Hellenistic *Hochliteratur*, and generically united with each other in their own genre gospel on the basis of their kerygmatic content. But if the gospels are not simply gospels alone, being instead, generically speaking, literary works, perhaps biographies, which incidentally have

gospel subject matter, then their differences do create the problem of what comprises their generic unity. Current discussion on this question must discern some factor that gives the gospels their common genre other than the gospels' subject matter, if the gospels can successfully be regarded as Hellenistic biographies.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest that such a factor is discernible, in the case of the synoptic gospels, in the historical source-copier relationship that exists among Matthew, Mark, and Luke-Acts. This proposal explores the ramifications of one of Shuler's [*] observations about genre, that it must be a dynamic concept, allowing for the influence of one work on those that follow, so that the works in question can be different because they stand in relation to one another, each author reacting to the preceding authors' work, while at the same time the works belong to a single genre. Perhaps the synoptic gospels' historical interrelationships can make intelligible the differences among these works without infringing on their generic unity, thus opening the way for a new biographical consensus view on the question of the genre of the synoptic gospels based on contemporary scholarship. We shall see how such a consensus might look after first considering in detail the historical relationships existing among Matthew, Mark, and Luke-Acts." (pp. 485-486, notes omitted)

[*] Philip L. Shuler, *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1982.

11. Allen, Willoughby C. 1911. "The Aramaic Background of the Gospels." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 287-312. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 "The first three Gospels are written in Greek.
 Was that their original language, and are they based on Greek sources? Apart from the question of the language of the first Gospel writings, did Christ speak in Aramaic or in Greek ?
 The case of St. Luke is the easiest and may be taken first. It is written in Greek, and is largely based on Greek sources. That is to say, the compiler had before him a Greek Gospel practically identical with our St. Mark.
 He has also a good many sayings which are also found in St. Matthew. Whatever St. Matthew may have done, St. Luke no doubt drew them from a Greek source or sources. The rest of the Gospel of St. Luke was probably also based on Greek sources. The first two chapters, which are strongly marked by Hebraisms (not Aramaisms), have often been thought to be translation work of a Hebrew original. But it is equally possible that they were purposely written in the style of the Greek version of the Old Testament. St. Luke's language, generally speaking, in the Gospel is tinged with Hebraisms, but these need not anywhere be signs of translation work. Conscious imitation of the Septuagint will quite adequately account for them.
 The case of the Second Gospel is rather different. This too is extant in Greek, and in the judgement of most modern writers that was the original language. The Greek of the Gospel is coloured by Aramaisms (not Hebraisms).
 So long ago as 1902 I ventured to suggest that the only adequate explanation of this foreign element is that the Gospel is a translation of an Aramaic original.(1)
 Recently this opinion has received the weighty corroboration of the judgement of Wellhausen. It is not sufficient to say that the writer may have been an Aramaic-speaking Jew who was not very adequately equipped with a knowledge of Greek, and that he was writing in Greek matter which had come to him orally in Aramaic. The evidence rather suggests, as Wellhausen points out, a translator of an Aramaic document who sometimes misinterprets by translating too literally.
 On the original language of the First Gospel much has been written, but the investigations of the last century of criticism seem to have proved beyond reasonable doubt that the Gospel was written in Greek, and is based at least in part upon Greek sources. Like St. Luke, the author had before him a Gospel practically

identical with our St. Mark. And he also has a good many sayings which in substance are also found in the Third Gospel." (pp. 292-293)

(1) *Expository Times*, xiii. 328 fl.

12. ———. 1911. "The Book of Sayings used by the Editor of the First Gospel." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 235-286. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- "The criticism of the Synoptic Gospels seems to have reached this point. It is very generally agreed that Matthew and Luke have edited and enlarged the Second Gospel. The points still debated in this connexion are details. The main fact is, as it would seem, undeniable.
- There is further a very widely held belief that Matthew and Luke had also before them a second source, consisting mainly of discourses ; and for some years attempts have been made to reconstruct this.
- It was at one time usual to call this alleged discourse source the Logia, but as that term seemed to beg disputable questions connected with a statement of Papias about the Logia written by Matthew, recent writers have preferred to adopt for it a colourless symbol Q (= Quelle).
- Harnack (2) has recently set himself to the reconstruction of Q, and as his results are likely to be widely accepted, it is the purpose of this chapter to offer some criticism of both his methods and his results by way of introducing a reconstruction of a discourse source which was used by the editor of the First Gospel." (p. 235)
- (2) *The Sayings of Jesus* (Crown Theological Library, 1908).
13. Anderson, Paul N. 2014. *From Crisis to Christ: A Contextual Introduction to the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- "Therefore, most scholars embrace a two-source or a four-source approach, and such is warranted by the evidence. A glaring weakness, though, with all approaches to the Synoptic problem is that none of them does anything with the Gospel of John. If John represents an independent Jesus tradition with different perspectives from the beginning, though theologically developed, might it require consideration alongside the other Gospels? This would call for a new theory; we might call it a Bi-Optic Hypothesis.
- A Bi-Optic Hypothesis—Bringing John into the Mix*
- The Gospel of John alone argues that the primary source for its material was an eyewitness, the beloved disciple, who leaned against the breast of Jesus at the Last Supper and whose "testimony is true" (John 21:23-24). The question is whether such is a knowing opinion or simply a rhetorical claim with no basis in knowledge—therefore a false assertion. Of course, John is so different from the Synoptics that it makes it easier for interpreters to ascribe John's story of Jesus to theological factors rather than historical ones, thereby expunging it from canons of historical memory about Jesus and his ministry. And yet, this is a simplistic and facile way out of the problem, as John's final compiler claims the opposite, and John also includes apparent historical tradition that is not in the Synoptics.
- The de-historicization of John appeals to some historical-critical scholars, as it is much easier to deal with the Synoptics' literary and historical issues without John in the mix. But is this a robust approach or a timid one? Ascribing John's origin to theology rather than history has also come to be preferred by some traditionalist scholars because if John were judged historically correct where it differed from the other Gospels, this would create new problems for interpreting the canonical Gospels. Therefore, critical and traditional scholars have settled for a more manageable compromise, differing from the early church, claiming that John is not historical but is theological only; three against one, John is the lone Gospel out. However, if Matthew and Luke built upon settled for a more manageable compromise, differing from the early church, claiming that John is not historical but is theological only; three against one, John is the lone Gospel out. However, if Matthew and Luke built upon Mark, it is not a three-to-one majority; it is a factor of John and Mark—two Gospels having individuated perspectives, perhaps from day one—deserving to be analyzed critically as the Bi-Optic Gospels." (Part I: *The*

Gospels and Jesus; Excursus I: A Bi-Optic Hypothesis - A Theory of Gospel Relations , pp. 102-126)

14. Andrejevs, Olegs. 2019. *Apocalypticism in the Synoptic Sayings Source: A Reassessment of Q's Stratigraphy* . Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 "While we presuppose the validity of the 2DH and Q's written character, in what follows we shall engage the feasibility of Q's reconstruction and the attainability of the document's wording. The former has recently been dismissed by a number of scholars who have pointed out the inferiority of the reconstructed Mark(4) to the canonical version of the gospel, while Q's wording has come under renewed scrutiny. This will be followed by arguments in support of the autonomy of *Didaché* 1:3b–2:1 and portions of the *Gospel of Thomas* , both contested subjects in recent academic discussion. Some of the observations included in the treatment of these matters will cover familiar terrain. However, their configuration is designed to highlight the problematic nature of a number of current claims and to lay the methodological foundation for the present investigation as well as for a fresh treatment of the Sayings Source and related documents." (p. 2, note 5 omitted)
 (4) Viz., Mark's gospel as reconstructed from its reception by Matthew and Luke.
15. ———. 2020. "The "Reconstructed Mark" and the Reconstruction of Q: A Valid Analogy?" *Biblical Theology Bulletin: Journal of Bible and Culture* no. 50:83-91.
 Abstract: "Described as a "thought experiment" by a number of scholars, Mark's Gospel as reconstructed exclusively from its reception by Matthew and Luke has been repeatedly advanced as a challenge to the reconstruction of Q in recent decades. This essay analyzes the "Reconstructed Mark" argument, finding it to form a poorly calibrated analogy for the Q document. It will be shown that Matthew and Luke treat Q, which is a sayings collection, differently from the sayings of Jesus in Mark's Gospel, which are already valued by them more highly than Mark's narrative. Further arguments in support of the feasibility of Q's reconstruction and the attainability of its text will also be provided."
16. ———. 2020. "A Source-critical Analysis of the Lord's Prayer: Multiple Autonomous Recensions or Q?" *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* no. 96:661-679.
 Abstract: "Although in the New Testament the Lord's Prayer is extant only in Matthew and Luke, scholars who work with the Two-Document hypothesis frequently maintain the Prayer's proliferation apart from the Q source, in a liturgical tradition potentially also responsible for the *Didache* 's recension and for the Prayer's echoes in Mark's gospel. This essay analyzes the data supporting the above hypothesis, reopening the question of the Prayer's exclusive transmission through Q. Some observations are included concerning the alternative solution offered by the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis."
17. ———. 2021. "The Double Tradition in Luke (Q) 3–7 as a Macro-Chiasm and its Significance for the Synoptic Problem." *New Testament Studies* :388-406.
 Abstract: "The level of scepticism met by the concept of macro-chiasm in ancient literature is noticeably lower today than two decades ago, with sizable agreement coalescing around certain examples. One such example is found in the synoptic double-tradition material as it is preserved in Luke's Gospel, which provides the methodological foundation for the reconstruction of the hypothetical synoptic source document Q. This article explores the study of the macro-chiasm identified in Luke (Q) 3.7–7.35 and its implications for the synoptic problem. It also addresses the methodological considerations advanced by S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed in their NTS article two decades ago, meeting a certain stipulation placed by them upon subsequent scholarship."
18. Argyle, Aubrey William. 1985. "Evidence for the View that St. Luke Used St. Matthew's Gospel." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* , edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 371-379. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint from *Journal of Biblical Literature* , 83, 1964, pp. 390-396.

Abstract: "Argyle notes that there are a number of editorial agreements between Matthew and Luke that are best explained not by their use of a common source (Mark), but by the fact that one of them was acquainted with the work of the other. The evidence at the beginning of Matthew 5 suggests unmistakably that Luke followed Matthew.

Argyle examines a number of passages to show how Luke has dealt with material from Matthew and argues that the differences between Matthew and Luke are no obstacle to the belief that Luke uses Matthew's gospel, a belief for which the very many agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark afford sufficient warrant. After examining in detail several passages in the Triple Tradition, Argyle concludes on the basis of the evidence that the view that Luke knew and used Matthew's gospel is not only a possible one, but is very probable."

19. Arnal, William E. 2007. "The Q Document." In *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered, Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, edited by Jackson-McCabe, Matt, 119-154. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
20. ———. 2011. "The Synoptic Problem and the Historical Jesus." 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, 371-432. Leuven: Peeters.
 "Arguably, the synoptic problem has been intimately related to the quest for the historical Jesus from its inception. The recognition that the gospels are not perfect renditions of "what actually happened" is what raises the question of their sources of information and the reasons for their agreements or disagreements; and at the same time, what makes pressing the issue of how much of what they relate is reliable" (p. 371)
 (...)
 "To conclude inconclusively, then, one's solution to the synoptic problem does have important consequences for how one approaches individual texts, and even for what one may reasonably infer about the overall development of the traditions about Jesus – consequences that are not always admitted by advocates of that solution. There may also be affinities between one's solution and one's reconstruction of the historical Jesus, something we see when a 2DH advocate produces a Q-like Jesus, or a FH advocates produces a Mark-like Jesus, or a 2GH advocate produces a Matthew-like Jesus. At the same time, however, both in theory and in practice, no necessary relationship emerges between one's synoptic source theory and one's portrait of Jesus: similar portraits of Jesus are held by adherents of different synoptic source theories, while very different reconstructions of Jesus may be offered by adherents of the same solutions to the synoptic problem. The critical questions that must be answered before one can address the vexed matter of the historical Jesus are less those of the literary relationship among the extant gospels than historical questions about the nature and transmission of the tradition." (pp. 429-430)
21. ———. 2013. "The Trouble with Q." *Forum. Foundations and Facts* no. 2:7-76.
 "The bulk of this article, therefore, is devoted to attempting a rather less idealized characterization of Q's literary development and social history than has been customary. It is not of especially great concern to me that the people responsible for Q be identified specifically and precisely with the exact office of village scribe (κομογραμματεὺς, sometimes translated as "village clerk"), or whether they "should perhaps be estimated a few notches higher."(30) Caviling about just how high or low on the spectrum of literate administrators these people should be does not much affect the basic reading of Q's rhetoric or situation (though it might have some impact on the details), and in any case misses the point, which is to situate Q and its literary development in a genuinely historical context, that is, one that is specific, concrete, material, and also has the potential to be truly explanatory.(31) So long as Q and its traditions are recognized as the literary product of a bureaucratic-scribal milieu rather than an incidentally transcribed

- residue of indigenizing village prophets or the self-promotion of destitute peasant itinerants, this will suffice." (pp. 15-16, some notes omitted)
- (30) So Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, 399.
- (31) In what follows I am taking it for granted that Q is the product of a Galilean environment and that it dates to before the war of 66–70 CE.
22. Asgeirsson, Jon Ma, De Troyer, Kristin, and Meyer, Marvin W., eds. 2000. *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
 Contents: Preface VII;
 H. Koester: An Intellectual Biography of James M. Robinson XIII;
 James M. Robinson: Curriculum Vitae XXIII; James M. Robinson: Bibliography XXV;
 Founder and Fashion
 M. Frenschkowski: Welche biographischen Kenntnisse von Jesus setzt die Logienguelle voraus? Beobachtungen zur Gattung von Q im Kontext antiker Spruchsammlungen 3; Th. Hieke: Schriftgelehrsamkeit in der Logienguelle: Die alttestamentlichen Zitate in der Versuchungsgeschichte Q 4,1-3 43; J.S. Kloppenborg Verbin: A Dog among the Pigeons: The "Cynic Hypothesis" as a Theological Problem 73; M. Ebner: Feindesliebe - ein Ratschlag zum Überlegungen? Sozial- und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mt 5,38-47/Lk 6,27-35 119; M.W. Meyer: Did Jesus Drink from a Cup? The Equipment of Jesus and His Followers in Q and al-Ghazzali 143;
 Topos and Topics
 F. Neiryck: *NAZAPA* in Q: Pro and Con 159; C.M. Tuckett: Q 12,8: Once again "Son of Man" or "I"? 171; A.O. Jacobson: Jesus against the Family: The Dissolution of Family Ties in the Gospel Tradition 189; R.A. Piper: Wealth, Poverty and Subsistence in Q 219; P.J. Hartin: The Woes against the Pharisees (Matthew 23,1-39): The Reception and Development of Q 11,39-52 within the Matthean Community 265; F. Bovon: Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30 Back to Q: A Study in Lukan Redaction 285; H.W. Attridge: "Seeking" and "Asking" in Q. Thomas, and John 295; R. Uro: Washing the Outside of the Cup: *Gos. Thom.* 89 and the Synoptic Parallels 303;
 Indexes; Abbreviations 325; Index of Biblical References 329; Index of Other Ancient Writings 341.
23. Barker, James W. 2016. "Ancient Compositional Practices and the Gospels: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 135:109-121.
 Abstract: "Recent studies of ancient compositional practices and the Synoptic Problem have validated the Two-Source hypothesis and challenged the "Augustinian," Farrer–Goulder, and Griesbach hypotheses. These studies conclude that, according to the Two-Source hypothesis, subsequent evangelists would have adhered to the Greco-Roman conventions of working with one source at a time and not working backward through a text. The present essay adduces counterexamples such as the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever, which predates the Gospels, and Tatian's Diatessaron, which postdates the Gospels. Upon further examination, simultaneously accessing multiple sources and reordering those sources were established compositional practices in the first century. Moreover, every solution to the Synoptic Problem necessitates such scribal conventions. Therefore, the lesser extent of these ancient compositional practices does not privilege the Two-Source hypothesis over its rivals."
24. Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1985. "Q: A Reexamination." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 259-268. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Reprint from *The Expository Times*, 54, 1942-43, pp. 320-323.
 Abstract: "Barrett questions the theory that the material we have called Q was all derived from one written document; rather it was derived from a number of non-

Markan sources that were used by Matthew and Luke. Barrett's investigation is directed toward two issues.

(1) The degree of agreement not only in words but also in traditional background (*Sitz im Leben*) between Matthew and Luke when they are reporting sayings of the same purport. Barrett finds, in this regard, that in some of the Q passages the agreement is so close that there is no reason to doubt they were drawn from a common source or sources, but in other passages the agreement is much less close. He concludes that the part of the material where agreement is closest may be satisfactorily explained as derived from a single common Greek source, but that the remainder cannot be explained without recourse to some parallel version. Barrett maintains that it is simpler to suppose that Matthew and Luke in collecting their material used traditions that were similar but not identical than that they each had identical copies of one source, which in the case of one of them was contaminated with a parallel version.

(2) If Matthew and Luke are both using the same continuous source, we should expect them to show in their use of it the same agreements in order that, in general, they show when both are following Mark. Barrett finds, in this regard, that the argument that the order of the Q sections in Matthew and Luke indicates that they were drawn from a common document, breaks down. The common order of much of the Q material in Matthew and Luke is afforded rather by the outline of Mark. In conclusion, Barrett argues that behind Q we should probably see a wider editorial research and a greater number of sources than have commonly been allowed for."

25. Bartlet, J. Vernon. 1911. "The Sources of Luke's Gospel." In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem By Members of The University of Oxford* edited by Sanday, William, 314-363. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syllabus: "The current Two-Document theory is open to question. The differences in the Logian element of Matthew and Luke demand fuller scope for the Oral factor. I. Yet Luke used a second written source besides Mark, and our problem is to define its character.

(i) The test of style points to the Jewish-Christian or Hellenistic nature of Luke's special source (S).

(ii) Characteristic ideas confirm this, e.g. the notion of 'fulfilment', Messiah, etc. Analysis of certain sections in this light:—The Epileptic Boy (ix. 37-43*); Peter's Confession; the non-use of Mk vi. 45-viii. 26; the Feeding of the 5,000 (ix. 10b-17); and especially the Mission of the Twelve.

Hence the basal Apostolic tradition (Q), implied even by Mark, was used by Luke in an independent form (QL) already embedded in his 'special source' (S); while Q itself included the 'Logia'. This seen in the Great Sermon, the Message of the Baptist and Jesus' response, and the Parable of the Sower.

The question whether one 'special source' will explain all Luke's non-Markan matter, to be answered in the affirmative: e.g. for the Sermon at Nazareth, the incident at Nain, etc.

These results apply also to the Passion story, on the view that this also stood in Q as far back as we can trace it: detailed proof. Further, it is there even clearer than elsewhere that the continuous twofold special material in Luke (S + QL), apart from Mark, lay before the Evangelist already unified in an order fixed by the witness of a single authoritative informant.

Traces of independent historical witness peculiar to Luke's narrative, both before the Passion (xviii. 15-xxi. 38) and after (ch. xxiv).

Luke's 'Great Insertion' (ix. 51-xviii. 14) best explained on the above theory: The 'Peraean' Ministry; the Mission of the Seventy (special relation of Luke's informant to their circle); the Lucan Parables, their setting and special features.

Exact form of Luke's special source: its probable place of origin among Palestinian Hellenists; its Johannine elements; Luke's editorial handling of it.

II. Objections met.

Professor Stanton's kindred view.

Merits of the theory. Diagram.

26. Batovici, Dan. 2009. "The Oxford Conference on the Synoptic Problem." *Currents in Biblical Research* no. 7:245-271.
Abstract: "The past two centuries have witnessed a wide spectrum of solutions for the Synoptic Problem. Even though quite far from a consensus, the problem tends to incorporate new domains from ongoing connected research: the relevance of the Gospel of Thomas, the Synoptic authors' use of the Old Testament or recent studies on communication media in antiquity. This article surveys a number of issues presented in the papers of the Oxford Conference on the Synoptic Problem, held in May 2008, ranging from challenging past and present solutions of the Synoptic Problem from different perspectives to new directions of research on this topic."
27. Bauckham, Richard. 2011. "The Gospel of John 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, 657-688. Leuven: Peeters.
28. ———. 2014. "Gospels before Normativization: A Critique of Francis Watson's *Gospel Writing* ." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 37:185-200.
Abstract: "This extended review of Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing* , engages critically with some of the major arguments of the book, including Watson's case against Q and for Luke's use of Matthew, his claim that the *Gospel of Thomas* preserves a very early genre of gospel writing, his argument that the Gospel of John is dependent on the Egerton Gospel, and his account of the process ('normativization') that produced the canon of the four gospels. His work is criticized generally for neglecting the wider literary context of the gospels in ancient Jewish and Graeco-Roman literature."
29. Bauer, David R. 2019. "Streeter Versus Farmer: The Present State of the Synoptic Problem as Argument for a Synchronic Emphasis in Gospel Interpretation." *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Studies* no. 6:7-28.
Abstract: "The dominant method for Gospel interpretation over the past several decades has been redaction criticism, which depends upon the adoption of a certain understanding of synoptic relationships in order to identify sources that lie behind our Gospels. Yet an examination of the major proposals regarding the Synoptic problem reveals that none of these offers the level of reliability necessary for the reconstruction of sources that is the presupposition for redaction criticism. This consideration leads to the conclusion that approaches to Gospel interpretation that require no reliance upon specific source theories are called for."
30. Baum, Armin D. 2008. "Matthew's Sources - Written or Oral? A Rabbinic Analogy and Empirical Insights." In *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* , edited by Gurtner, Daniel M. and Nolland, John, 1-23. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
"How did the textual similarities and differences between Matthew and Mark and Matthew and Luke develop? The answer to this question has to be well founded. A mere description of the New Testament evidence is not enough. The synoptic data raise a number of preliminary questions, but in themselves they do not provide a reliable answer. In order to solve the Synoptic Problem on the basis of a broader foundation it is necessary to compare the New Testament synoptic data (part 1) to the relationship that exists between other parallel texts from antiquity, especially from rabbinic tradition (part II), and to relevant results from experimental psychology and oral poetry research (part III).
Most Gospels scholars have not paid much attention to these analogies to the Synoptic Problem. But of those scholars who took these analogies into account only a minority argued for a simple literary dependence between the New Testament Gospels. Most of them integrated, to varying degrees, an oral factor into their solution to the Synoptic Problem. I would like to develop their approach a step further.
One of my results is that neither the selection of material nor its order is adequate criterion for distinguishing between literary and orally related parallel texts. The

verbal agreements and disagreements are much more relevant.

But it has turned out to be essential to look not only at the number of verbal agreements (1) but also at their dispersion (2), and at the higher figures in the poetic sections (3), in the words of Jesus (4) and in the Old Testament quotations (5) as well as at the Minor Agreements (6)." (pp. 1-2)

31. ———. 2013. "Synoptic Problem." In *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. Second edition*, edited by Green, Joel B., Brown, Jeannine K. and Perrin, Nicholas, 911-919. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
 "The Synoptic Problem deals with the interrelationship of the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke) and addresses a foundational question: What is the best explanation for the textual similarities and differences between Matthew, Mark, and Luke? Based on the Synoptic evidence, this question can be split into a number of subquestions, which can be formulated on the basis of the most commonly accepted solution, the two-source hypothesis (...).
 1. The Synoptic Evidence
 2. The Proposed Explanations
 3. Insights from Cognitive Psychology
 4. Conclusion" (p. 911)
 (...)
 "2.8. Conclusion. Irrespective of the many different opinions about chronological order and the mutual relationships among the Synoptic Gospels, there exists a broad variety of views about the relative amount of literary dependence and oral tradition involved in the composition of the Gospels. The explanation of the Synoptic evidence in terms of a more or less exclusively literary dependence is widespread (cf. Wilke; Farmer; Goulder; Burkett) but contested. A second approach combines literary dependence with the influence of oral tradition and/or human memory and appears in two variants. Some parts of the Synoptic parallels are explained by literary dependence, while other parallel sections are explained as the result of oral tradition (Dunn; Mournet). Alternatively, one ascribes the Synoptic parallels to a concurrence of literary dependence and human memory activity (Goodacre). Third, a clear alternative to the theory of literary dependence is the oral-tradition hypothesis originally put forward by Westcott (Reicke; Baum)." (p. 918)
32. Beare, Francis W. 1964. *The Earliest Records of Jesus: A Companion to the Synopsis of the First Three Gospels by Albert Huck*. Oxford: Blackwell.
 "This book is intended in the first instance for the use of students in theological colleges and kindred institutions who have in their hands the well-known edition of the Synoptic Gospels arranged in parallel columns, first prepared by Albert Huck. This *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* is now available in an English edition prepared by Professor F. L. Cross, which is based upon the ninth German edition of Huck, revised by Hans Lietzmann, with the same Greek text, but with prolegomena, section-headings and sub-titles given in English.
 Students also have at their disposal the same text in the English of the American Revised Standard Version, edited by Burton H. Throckmorton, Jr. (and edition, 1957).
 (...)
 These notes are intended to serve as a companion to the Huck *Synopsis*. They are not meant to offer anything like a commentary on the first three Gospels. Their purpose is rather to lead the student into an understanding of the nature of the materials with which he has to deal, and of the motives and methods of the Evangelists. Exegesis and exposition are therefore subordinated to the discussion of the problems raised by criticism." (from the Foreword)
33. Becker, Eve-Marie. 2013. "Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature." In *Mark and Matthew I. Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings*, edited by Becker, Eve-Marie and Runesson, Anders, 123-143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

" *Conclusion* s. Even if it seems to be the case that, in terms of a relative chronology, Matthew follows Mark rather than vice versa, in terms of an absolute dating, Matthew provides no unique or even more precise indications for a *terminus post quem* in comparison to Mark. This observation can be interpreted twofold: First, in regard to the *post quem* -dating, Mark and Matthew need to be treated equally.

And because we could not find a further(112) or later date than 70 C. E. in the history of the first century C. E. that could function as a *terminus post quem* for dating Mark and Matthew, we need to conclude that both Gospels were written either before or after 70 C. E. Secondly, what can be said for the literary intention of the Markan Gospel is also relevant for Matthew: Both Gospels obviously refuse a precise dating. This does not mean, however, that we are discharged from dating Mark and Matthew. To the contrary, a precise dating of Mark and Matthew could shed light on central issues of Markan and Matthean exegesis: for instance, we could precisely formulate the extent of the authors' agreement in creating the 'level of narration,' how much they reveal of the 'level of reference,' and the extent to which each narrator affects the Gospel narrative and makes himself visible. In terms of a relative chronology, Matthew might be the later Gospel. The manner in which Matthew succeeds Mark also indicates how

Matthew values his writing in relation to the Markan 'Vorlage,' namely, as a competitive completion of Mark rather than as a totally new-conceptualization." (p. 143, a note omitted)

(112) The only exception might be 44 C. E. (cf. Mark 10:35 ff.par. Matt 20:20 ff.).

34. Becker, Eve-Marie, and Runesson, Anders, eds. 2011. *Mark and Matthew I. Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First-Century Settings*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 Table of Contents: Preface V; Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson: Introduction: Studying Mark and Matthew in Comparative Perspective 1;
 1. History of Research
 Cilliers Breytenbach: Current Research on the Gospel according to Mark: A Report on Monographs Published from 2000–2009 13; David C. Sim: Matthew: The Current State of Research 33;
 2. Reconstructing the Artifacts: Text-Critical and Linguistic Aspects of the Study of Mark and Matthew;
 Barbara Aland: Was heißt Abschreiben? Neue Entwicklungen in der Textkritik und ihre Konsequenzen für die Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühesten christlichen Verkündigung 55; Tommy Wasserman: The Implications of Textual Criticism for Understanding the 'Original Text' 77; Stanley E. Porter: Matthew and Mark: The Contribution of Recent Linguistic Thought 97;
 3. Date and Genre
 Eve-Marie Becker: Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature 123; David E. Aune: Genre Theory and the Genre-Function of Mark and Matthew 145;
 4. Socio-Religious Location
 Sean Freyne: Matthew and Mark: The Jewish Contexts 145; Morten Hørning Jensen: Conflicting Calls? Family and Discipleship in Mark & Matthew in the Light of First-Century Galilean Village Life 205; Linden Youngquist: Matthew, Mark and Q 233; Wayne Baxter: Matthew, Mark, and the Shepherd Metaphor: Similarities, Differences, and Implication 263s;
 5. Conflict and Violence
 Warren Carter: Matthew: Empire, Synagogues, and Horizontal Violence 285; Lorenzo Scornaienchi: The Controversy Dialogues and the Polemic in Mark and Matthew 309; John S. Kloppenborg: The Representation of Violence in Synoptic Parables 323;
 6. Building Community Using Text
 Oda Wischmeyer: Forming Identity Through Literature: The Impact of Mark for the Building of Christ-Believing Communities in the Second Half of the First Century

C. E. 355; Anders Runesson: Building Matthean Communities: The Politics of Textualization 379;

7. Notes from the Conference: Further Discussion

Adela Yarbro Collins: Reflections on the Conference at the University of Aarhus, July 25–27, 2008 411;

Bibliography 415; List of Contributors 457; Index of References 459; Index of Subjects 483-491.

35. ———. 2013. "Introduction: Studying Mark and Matthew in Comparative Perspective." In *Mark and Matthew I. Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings*, edited by Becker, Eve-Marie and Runesson, Anders, 1-10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- "The study of Mark and Matthew in comparative perspective has a long history, but mainly insofar as we attempt to solve the Synoptic Problem, and, to a certain degree, to untangle the relationship of these Gospels through redaction-historical analyses. However, ever since the theory of Markan priority became firmly established in the first half of the 19th century, such redaction-historical work has focused on understanding Matthew rather than Mark when they are compared. To be sure, many studies, especially commentaries of either Mark or Matthew, make observations related to the other Gospel as they interpret specific passages or reconstruct certain events; nevertheless, most often the result of studying Mark and Matthew is that one Gospel stands in the shadow of the other." (p. 1)
- (...)
- "In this volume, the purpose of comparing Mark and Matthew is to shed light on the earliest history of gospel literature, i. e., the earliest history of Jesus-traditions that were transformed into a more or less coherent Jesus-story that was not only repeated and imitated, but also modified and redefined. Within this comparative approach, the most challenging and deceptively simple question arises: What is it that makes Mark's Gospel a *Markan* Gospel, and Matthew's Gospel a *Matthean* Gospel?
- For the Aarhus conference, and thus for this volume, we decided to focus on investigating the first Gospels in their first-century C. E. settings." (pp. 2-3)
36. Becker, Eve-Marie, and Vinzent, Markus. 2018. "Marcion and the Dating of Mark and the Synoptic Gospels." In *Studia Patristica. Vol. XCIX: Marcion of Sinope as Religious Entrepreneur*, edited by Vinzent, Markus. Leuven: Peeters.
- In conversation with Markus Vinzent.
- "In this contribution, however, I [E.-M- Becker] have to limit my thoughts about the Marcionite Gospel, and I will restrict myself to examining some of the critical reflections and ideas concerning Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels raised in your 2014 monograph.[*] The following remarks should therefore be seen as critical responses to the discourse opened up – or, better, renewed – by you and your suggestion that we view Marcion as the creator of ‘the new literary genre of the “Gospel”’. (26) As indicated already, my remarks are motivated by – what I would call – a New Testament scholar's view on Marcion's general place in 2nd century CE Christianity and – more particularly – Marcion's interaction with the gospel traditions and writings.
- Firstly, I will outline my general approach to Marcion and 2nd century literary history – an approach derived from my perspective on New Testament exegesis and its specific interest in literature that succeeds – what might best be called – the ‘New Testament’ period of formative literature. This will help to illuminate more in detail my disciplinary perspective and heuristic presuppositions when investigating and interpreting who Marcion was and which role he really played in Christian literary history in the 2nd century CE.
- Secondly, I will comment on some of your arguments that present Marcion as the founder of the gospel genre. Finally, I will suggest how to approach the question of dating the Synoptic Gospels, and, more specifically, the Markan Gospel, which I consider to be the earliest gospel narrative with a prototype like status in the history of early Christian literature." (pp. 12-13)

- [*] Markus Vinzent, *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*, Studia Patristica Supplement 2 (Leuven, 2014).
- (26) M. Vinzent, *Marcion* (2014), 277. As Dieter Roth claims, this discourse can only be renewed to the extent that it was initiated by scholars such as Baur and Ritschl in the 1840s and 1850s. See D.T. Roth, 'Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008), 513-27.
37. Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., ed. 1985. *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 Edited with an Introduction by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr. with the assistance of Joseph B. Tyson and William O. Waker, Jr.
 Contents: Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr.: Preface IX; Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr.: Introduction 1;
 THE CASE FOR THE PRIORITY OF MARK 21
 B. H. Streeter: The Priority of Mark 23; J. A. Fitzmyer: The Priority of Mark 37; W. G. Kümmel: In Support of Markan Priority 53; G. M. Styler: The Priority of Mark 63; H. G. Wood: The Priority of Mark 77; F. Neirynck: The Synoptic Problem 85;
 THE CASE AGAINST THE PRIORITY OF MARK 95
 B. C. Butler: The Synoptic Problem 97; N. H. Palmer: Lachmann's Argument 119;
 B. C. Butler: The Lachmann Fallacy 133; D. L. Dungan: Critique of the Main Arguments for Mark's Priority as Formulated by B. H. Streeter 143; W. R. Farmer: A New Introduction to the Problem 163; E. P. Sanders: Suggested Exceptions to the Priority of Mark 199; P. Parker: The Second Gospel Is Secondary 205;
 THE CASE FOR THE Q HYPOTHESIS 219
 B. H. Streeter: The Document Q 221; W. G. Kümmel: In Support of Q 227; J. A. Fitzmyer: Luke's Use of Q 245; C. K. Barrett: Q: A Reexamination 259; F. G. Downing: Towards the Rehabilitation of Q 269; E. L. Bradby: In Defense of Q 287; V. Taylor: The Original Order of Q 295;
 THE CASE AGAINST THE Q HYPOTHESIS 319
 A. M. Farrer: On Dispensing with Q 321; R. Rosche: The Words of Jesus and the Future of the "Q" Hypothesis 357; A. W. Argyle: Evidence for the View that St. Luke Used St. Matthew's Gospel 371; R. T. Simpson: The Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark 381; A. M. Farmer: A Fresh Approach to Q 397; E. P. Sanders: The Argument from Order and the Relationship Between Matthew and Luke 409; D. L. Dungan: Critique of the Q Hypothesis 427;
 CONCLUSION 435
 Joseph B. Tyson: The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal 437; Bibliography 453; Indexes: Biblical Citations 471; Names 483-486.
38. ———. 1985. "Introduction." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 1-19. Macon: Mercer University Press.
 "Basically, the purpose of this collection of essays is to afford to the reader easy access to the literature that is most critical to an understanding of the question of synoptic relationship, or more particularly to an understanding of the two-source hypothesis. Specifically, the volume is divided into two main sections: the first dealing with the question of the priority of the Gospel of Mark, and the second dealing with the question of the hypothetical source "Q." In each principal section we have tried to assemble those essays which argue most strongly, most forcefully, most convincingly the case for and the case against Markan Priority and Q. Some of the arguments are repeated in more than one essay, but each essay makes a special contribution to the question of synoptic relationships.
 Effectively, the volume should be read as a whole, although it may serve some readers simply as a convenient source for the individual essays being consulted. Each main section is viewed as a unit; together the several essays within the section argue the case for or the case against Markan priority or the use of Q. The effect of the case made by each section must weighed as the reader tries to judge whether the two-source hypothesis deserves to continue to serve as the basic model for contemporary gospel research." (pp. 12-13)

- (...)
 "This volume does not represent a single point of view. It has no particular model that it seeks to promote. It has no axe to grind other than to offer the strongest arguments possible on both sides of the issues, to give a hearing to alternative solutions to the synoptic problem, and to encourage further research in the area. This volume has no pretense of being exhaustive, but these essays and their bibliographical references are important resources for any scholar interested in synoptic studies." (p. 14)
39. Betz, Hans-Dieter. 1992. "The Sermon on the Mount and Q. Some Aspects of the Problem." In *Synoptische Studien. Gesammelte Aufsätze II*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck).
 "The relationship between the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5: 3-7: 27 (henceforth abbreviated: SM), and Q is far more intricate than a superficial view of a synopsis of the New Testament gospels would suggest.
 James Robinson pointed to the problem years ago in a footnote, when he said: •The cohesion of the collection suggests that the Sermon on the Mount (or Plain) is derived from an oral or written collection of its own, and did not first come into being in the context of Q ... The end seems to be the conclusion of a collection, and this is not simply because of the occurrence there of the term *logoi*. (1) This way of stating the matter, however, leaves room for several options. Since two texts are involved, the SM and the Sermon on the Plain, Luke 6: 20b-49 (henceforth: SP), the question is whether we are dealing with one sermon or two. Which of them is derived from a previous collection? Since that previous collection is said to be oral and thus different from the written Q, how many collections are we to assume? What relationship exists between the presumed oral source and the written Q?" (p. 249)
 (1) James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 94 n. 4 7.
40. Bird, Michael F. 2014. *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
 Chapter 4: *The Literary Genetics of the Gospels: The Synoptic Problem and Johannine Question 221*; Excursus: Patristic Quotations on the Order of the Gospels 281-298.
 "Conclusion: In sum, I believe in a literary relationship between the Gospels, because oral tradition does not account for the strong verbal and structural correspondences that we find in the Gospels and because proto-Gospel theories are speculative and lack solid evidence. I believe in Marcan priority, because it explains why Mark is the middle term between Luke and Matthew and why Mark's roughness in language is smoothed over by the other two Evangelists. I believe in Q because, despite its potential misgivings, it allows us to hold together a literary connection between Matthew and Luke that is indirect enough to explain their varied order and divergent utilization of the double tradition. I believe that Luke used Matthew because it accounts for the minor agreements and erases the anomaly of the so-called Q-Mark overlaps." (p. 187)
41. Black, David Alan. 1988. "Some Dissenting Notes on R. Stein's The Synoptic Problem and Markan "Errors"." *Filologia neotestamentaria* no. 1:95-101.
42. Black, David Alan, and Beck, David R., eds. 2001. *Rethinking the Synoptic Problem*. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic.
 Contents: Abbreviations; David Alan Black and David R. Beck: Introduction; 1. Craig L. Blomberg: The Synoptic Problem: Where We Stand at the Start of a New Century; 2. Darrell L. Bock: Questions about Q; 3. Scot McKnight: A Generation Who Knew Not Streeter: The Case for Marcan Priority; 4. William Farmer: The Case for the Two-Gospel Hypothesis; 5. Grant R. Osborne: Response; Notes; Subject Index; Scripture Index.

43. Black, Steve D. 2010. "One Really Striking Minor Agreement: ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ in Matthew 26:68 and Luke 22:64." *Novum Testamentum* no. 52:313-333.
Abstract: "It is asserted that Matt 26:68|Luke 22:64(|Mark 14:65) is the most difficult of the minor agreements. Some advocates of the two-source theory have addressed this minor agreement by trying to make sense of the narrative as we have it, and others by making sense of the text as we have it (arguing for textual corruption or lost recensions). While some of these arguments are reasonable, in the final analysis they are not satisfying. Although we might remain persuaded that the two-source theory best integrates the data relating to the synoptic problem, this minor agreement reminds us that the synoptic problem is still a problem."
44. Blair, Geroge Alfred. 2003. *The Synoptic Gospels Compared* . Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.
45. Bloomberg, Craig. 2001. "The Synoptic Problem: Where We Stand at the Beginning of a New Century." In *Rethinking the Synoptic Problem* , edited by Black, David Alan and Beck, David R., 17-40. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
"... I limit this survey to what has traditionally come under the rubric of the "Synoptic problem"—the question of the written sources of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the literary interrelationship of these three Gospels. The most recent history of the Synoptic problem, by David Dungan, casts its net far more widely, covering issues of textual criticism, canonization, and hermeneutics as well, demonstrating the interrelatedness of each of these three issues with source-critical questions.(5) It is a fascinating study that I highly commend, but I cannot hope in this short time to do anything as wide-ranging.
With this introduction, let us turn to the major solutions to the Synoptic problem. I discuss them in what I perceive to be a decreasing order of probability, which also roughly corresponds to a decreasing order of how commonly each is held. Obviously, not all of us agree that these two sequences match each other. Also I focus on the most recent and important work in each area, because the literature is voluminous and others have well documented earlier developments.(6)" (p. 18)
(5) David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition and the Interpretation of the Gospels* , ABRL (New York and London: Doubleday, 1999).
(6) In addition to Dungan, *History* , and the previous historical surveys cited therein, see esp. the thorough bibliography by T. R. W. Longstaff and P. A. Thomas, *The Synoptic Problem: A Bibliography, 1716–1988* , NGS 4 (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1988).
46. Bock, Darrell L. 2001. "Questions about Q." In *Rethinking the Synoptic Problem* , edited by Black, David Alan and Beck, David R., 41-64. Grand Rapids (MI): Baker Academic.
"In this opening section I treat how arguments against Q are made by those who do not believe the source ever existed as well as explain the rationale for arguing for the source's existence. In sum, those who hold to Matthean priority reject Q's existence largely on the basis of the external evidence of church tradition, which argued that Matthew was the first Gospel composed. In their view, there is no need to posit the existence of this hypothetical source. It is necessary to evaluate this church tradition surrounding Matthew's origin. Only then does it become clear that one should also consider issues tied to internal evidence, such as the order of units and their wording, as well as evidence for or against Luke's use of Matthew.(1) If Matthew is not the first Gospel written or there is evidence that Luke did not use Matthew, then the rationale for the existence of a source like Q becomes plausible." (p. 41)
(1) For reasons of space, I cannot go over the full debate that argues internally for Matthean priority, including the important argument made from agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark. I will only try to make the positive case for the possibility of Q. A complete treatment would require that one deal with this

- argument in some detail. In fact, this essay in general focuses only on “macro” arguments of larger structures between the Gospels. The issues raised by “micro” arguments of details within are also important, but are so varied as to be difficult to pursue in a summarizing essay. For a full argument to be present, however, both macro and micro arguments need consideration.
47. Boismard, Marie-Émile. 1979. "The Two-Source Theory at an Impasse." *New Testament Studies* no. 26:1-17.
 "To summarize the conclusions resulting from the analyses in this article:
 1. Mark blends two parallel accounts, taken from two distinct sources, which we could call Document A and Document B.
 2. One must distinguish between two successive states of Matthew; we call them Matt. I and Matt. II. Matt. I does not depend on Mark, but on one of Mark's sources, Document A. Matt. II complements the Matt. I account by copying *ad litteram* a section from Mark.(32)
 3. Luke, here, depends fundamentally on Matt. I and not on Mark. He complements the former by using Mark: this shows up most if one thinks of the account which immediately precedes the pericope we have analysed.
 4. In this article we have not studied John's text. It would be possible to show that John 6. 1-2 depends either on Matt. I or, more probably, on Matt. I's source, Document A, as we have acknowledged in our Commentary on John's Gospel.(33)
 A synoptic theory that wishes to account for all the literary facts contained in the Gospels should include, at the minimum, the synoptic relations which we have just mentioned. The Two-Source theory is much too simple to answer such a requirement; the same can be said about Griesbach's theory, though it has the advantage of recognizing an influence of Matthew on Luke.
 The reader might refer to the rather complex synoptic theory we presented, which takes into account the literary facts analysed here.(34"
 (32) All the conclusions in this second paragraph can be found in Michel Hubaut's study, *La Parabole des vigneronniers homicides* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 16; Paris, 1976); see the outline on page 128.
 33) M.-E. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean* (Synopse des quatre évangiles en français, tome III; Paris, 1977), 179.
 (34 P. Benoit and M.-E. Boismard, *Synopse des quatre évangiles en français*, tome II, Commentaire, par M.-E. Boismard avec la collaboration de A. Lamouille et P. Sandevor (Paris, 1972).
48. ———. 1992. "Two-Source Hypothesis." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary: Vol. 6*, edited by Freedman, Martin, 679-682. New York: Doubleday.
 Translated from French by Terrence Prendergast.
 "To account for the complexity of the Synoptic Problem, the Two-Source Hypothesis in its purest form can best be summarized in the following three propositions: (a) in the sections common to the three Synoptics (the Triple Tradition), Matthew and Luke depend on Mark; (b) in the sections common only to Matthew and Luke (the Double Tradition), these two gospels depend on a second source, designated by the letter "Q" (for the German *Quelle* = "source", which was made up almost exclusively of *logia* ("sayings")); c) Matthew and Luke are independent of one another. Scholars also concur that Matthew and Luke had available to them their own particular sources for those sections which are unique to themselves. This hypothesis—widely held today, though with important qualifications—was only worked out in successive stages." (p. 679)
49. Borgen, Peder. 1990. "John and the Synoptics." 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., 406-437. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
50. Boring, M. Eugene. 1992. "The Synoptic Problem, "Minor" Agreements, and the Beelzebul Pericope." In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neiryneck. Volume I*, edited by van Segbroeck, Frans, Tuckett, Christopher M., van Belle, Gilbert and Verheyden, Joseph, 587-619. Leuven: Peeters.

51. ———. 2011. "The "Minor Agreements" and Their Bearing 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, 227-251. Leuven: Peeters.
52. Bradby, E. L. 1985. "In Defense of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Bellinzoni Jr., Arthur J., 287-293. Macon: Mercer University Press.
Reprint from *The Expository Times*, 68, 1956-57, pp. 315-318.
Abstract: "Bradby's purpose is to suggest a rough-and-ready method of judging Austin Farrer's hypothesis in "On Dispensing with Q" that Luke had available and used as the basis of his gospel both Mark and Matthew. Bradby maintains that Farrer's thesis can fairly be judged by reference to a small number of key-passages from the Triple Tradition in which Matthew's text is *fuller* than Mark's. In these instances, if Farrer is right, we should surely find some instances in which Luke has reproduced material from Matthew which neither Matthew nor Luke could have gotten from Mark, because it is not paralleled in Mark. Bradby considers four sets of passages from the Triple Tradition:
1. the walk through the cornfields and its sequel
2. the parable of the sower
3. the charge to the apostles
4. Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi.
Bradby concludes that Farrer's thesis cannot be "proved" or "disproved." But in the four instances examined, if Farrer's thesis is correct, then Luke has consistently spurned the latter and fuller version in Matthew in favor of the earlier and shorter version in Mark. Bradby prefers to fall back on the theory of the priority of Mark and the use of Mark and Q by both Matthew and Luke."
53. Breckenridge, James. 1983. "Evangelical Implications of Matthean Priority." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* no. 26:117-121.
"The fact is that no evangelical solution to the synoptic problem is going to be found through Marcan priority. Scholars like Farmer and Griesbach have presented the elements of an answer. It is up to modern evangelicals to take that answer-Matthean priority-and adapt it to a conservative view of Scripture. Such an option requires three things: (1) a clear theological commitment to inerrancy, (2) an elevation of patristic tradition and resources, and (3) a reasonable and constructive use of form criticism. Relative to the latter, we seem to have two choices: either opt for Matthean priority and a reasonable exercise of form criticism, or accept Marcan priority and suffer the consequences of a more severe redaction criticism." (p. 121)
54. Breytenbach, Cilliers. 2013. "Current Research on the Gospel according to Mark. A Report on Monographs Published from 2000–2009." In *Mark and Matthew I. Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings*, edited by Becker, Eve-Marie and Runesson, Anders, 13-32. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
"Six years ago, in 2004, Andreas Lindemann published his report on Marcan research from 1992 till 2000.(1) His essay is valuable for many reasons, not least because it helps us to follow certain tendencies in Marcan research² Rather than structuring the current report according to categories such as volumes of essays, monographs, specific topics, expositions of particular passages, and commentaries, as Lindemann did, I shall focus this review on the literature that has been published in monograph form since 2000. When necessary, the preceding discussion will be briefly summarized. Sometimes the question is not only what was published, but rather what questions have not been addressed. It is not possible to give due credit to new commentaries, nor is it commendable to pay attention to the volumes of collected essays on Mark or monographs confined to specific episodes or single passages of the Gospel." (p. 13, some notes omitted)

- (1) A. Lindemann, "Literatur zu den Synoptischen Evangelien 1992–2000 (III): Das Markusevangelium," *Theologische Rundschau* 69 (2004): 369–423.
55. Broadhead, Edwin K. 1997. "On the (Mis)definition of Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* no. 68:3-12.
Abstract: "Important developments in the study of the Sayings Tradition (Q) and growing awareness of this issue beyond critical circles demand renewed attention to how the Sayings Tradition is defined and to the terminology by which it is described. Definitions based upon where this tradition is found or how it was used are no longer adequate. Future descriptions must be based upon the fundamental identity of this tradition and upon its role in the development of early Christianity. Furthermore, it is time to rethink the terminology by which we refer to the collection of Jesus' sayings. The relevance of the designation 'Q' is questionable, and the propriety of speaking of a Sayings Gospel is debatable. In light of these problems, new terminology is proposed, and a more descriptive definition of the Sayings Tradition is offered."
56. Brodie, Thomas L. . 1995. "Re-Opening the Quest for Proto-Luke: The Systematic Use of Judges 6-12 in Luke 16:1-18:8." *The Journal of Higher Criticism* no. 2:68-101.
57. Brodie, Thomas L. 1999. "The Unity of Proto-Luke." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts* , edited by Verheyden, Jozef, 627-638. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
"The theory of Proto-Luke is an hypothesis that Luke-Acts first existed in a shorter edition, independently of Mark(1). As proposed here - in a way which differs from the proposal of M.-E. Boismard(2) - there are essentially three arguments for Proto-Luke:
(1) Distinctive dependence on the LXX. Within Luke-Acts is a stream of texts which has a distinctive dependence on the LXX. This does not prove former separateness, merely distinctiveness. The texts: Lk 1,1-4,22a(3) (except 3,7-9; 4,1-13); 7,1-8,3; 9,51- 10,20; 16,1-9.19-31; 17,11-18,8; 19,1-10; chaps. 22-24 (except 22,31-65): Acts 1.1-15,35.
(2) Distinctive unity, especially unity of structure (eight diptychs).
The above texts have a unique unity: unity of content and, above all, of structure - a precise structure of eight diptychs. Such unity argues not only for distinctiveness but also for former separateness. (Separateness need not mean two authors. Both editions probably come from one person - Luke the evangelist).
(3) Subsequent verification: the hypothesis solves problems. Once Proto-Luke is so identified (as in the above texts), problems about gospel origins and relationships, including aspects of Mark and Q. come closer to resolution." (p. 627)
(1) On the history or Proto-Lukan research. see esp. J.M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative. The Markan Material in Luke 22.1, S4-23, 2S*. Diss. Leuven. 1998, pp. 4-557, esp. 4-45, 98-200, 412-468.
(2) See esp. *En quête du Proto-Luc* (ÉB, 37). Paris, Gabalda, 1997.
(3) Not 4,30 or 427 as indicated in some of the present authors earlier publications.
58. ———. 2001. "An Alternative Q/Logia Hypothesis: Deuteronomy-Based, Qumranlike, Verifiable." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* , edited by Lindemann, Andreas, 729-743. Leuven: Peeters.
"Within Matthew 5 and 11,25-30 lies a group of sayings that constitutes a distinct synthesis of Deuteronomy, and, to a lesser degree, of Sirach.
The sayings are three-part: Five Beatitudes (Matt 5,5-9); Five Antitheses (plus prologue and sequel) (partly scattered, within Matt 5,17-48); A Wisdom Cry/Song/Hymn (Matt 11 ,25-30). The relationship of these Matthean sayings to the OT is complex, but it is precise and verifiable.
The purpose of this paper is to indicate that this short arrangement of sayings constituted the original logia which underlie many NT writings.
This hypothesis. when combined with a specific form of the theory of Proto-Luke(1) makes the prevailing notion of Q unnecessary." (p. 729)

- (1) On the general history of Proto-Luke research, see J.M. Harrington, *The Lukan Passion Narrative. The Markan Material in Luke 22,54-3,25. A Historical Survey 1891-1991* (NTTS. 30) Leiden, Brill, 2000, esp. 4-45, 98-200, 412-468 (diss. Leuven, 1998; dir. F. Neiryneck). For the specific theory of Proto-Luke presupposed here there are three basic arguments: (A) *Distinctive dependence on the LXX*. Within Luke-Acts is a stream of texts which as a distinctive dependence on the LXX. This does not prove former separateness, merely distinctiveness. The texts: Lk 1,1-4.22a (excerpt 3,7-9; 4,1-13); 7,1-8,3; 9,51-10,20; 16,1-9.19.31; 17,11-18,8; 19,1-10: chaps. 22-24 (except 22,31-65); Acts 1,1-15,35. (B). *Distinctive unity, especially unity of structure (eight diptychs)*. The above texts have a unique unity: unity of content and, above all, of structure - a precise structure of eight diptychs. Such eight-fold unity argues not only for distinctiveness but also for former separateness. (Separateness need not mean two authors. Both editions probably come from one person - Luke the Evangelist), On a literary precedent of this eight-fold structure in the Elijah-Elisha narrative, see T.L. Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge. The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels*. Collegeville. MN, Liturgical Press, 2000, pp. 6-27, 85. (C). *Subsequent verification: the hypothesis solves problem*. Once Proto-Luke is so identified (as in the above texts), problems about gospel origins and relationships, including aspects of Mark and Q, come close to resolution. For further details, see T. L. Brodie, *The Unity of Proto-Luke*, in J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL, 142), Leuven, University Press - Peeters, 1999, pp. 627-638, esp. 627; Id. *Intertextuality and Its Use in Tracing Q and Proto-Luke*, in C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Scripture in the Gospels*, (BETL, 131), Leuven, University Press - Peeters, 1997, pp. 469-477.
59. ———. 2004. *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
 "The purpose of this work is to outline the literary development of several of the New Testament writings and, while doing so, to unravel the Synoptic Problem—the well known puzzle about the relationship between the first three gospels ('the Synoptics').
 'Outline' is the key word. The New Testament is like a vast complex tapestry, and one volume cannot try to unravel all the levels of textual weaving. This work does indeed look closely at some levels of some texts, but the volume has already become bulky, and for several reasons it is appropriate, necessary even, to keep a focus on leading threads and to provide just an outline. This then is the goal: an outline that hopefully can be tested and developed by others.
 The work has four parts:
 I. General Introduction: Ancient Writing and its Context (Chapters 1-9)
 II. The Overall Picture: Initial Evidence (Chapters 10--26)
 III. Proto-Luke as Septuagint-Based (Argument 1): Supporting Evidence (Chapters 27-54)
 IV. Appendices: Further, Exploratory Aspects of New Testament Intertextuality (Appendices I-8)" (Preface, p. XX)
60. ———. 2006. *Proto-Luke: The Oldest Gospel Account: A Christ-Centered Synthesis of Old Testament History, Modelled Especially on the Elijah-Elisha Narrative. Introduction, Text, and Old Testament Model*. Sheffield: Phoenix.
61. Brooks, Stephenson. 1987. *Matthew's Community: The Evidence of His Special Sayings Material*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
 Reprint New York: Bloomsbury 2015.
 [Matthew 23,1-3 and 16-22]
 Verses 1-3 and 16–22 contain statements that imply various and even contrary relationships to Jewish authorities sanctioned by reference to sayings of Jesus. What relationship did Matthew advocate for his readers? Not only are Matt 23.1-3, 16-22 unique in the Synoptics specifically and in the NT generally, but a large portion of Matt 23 is unparalleled in the Synoptics. Sayings similar to those found in Matt 23

also occur in Matt 5.17–6.18 and Matt 10. These sayings, like those in Matt 23, are also unparalleled and suggest the possibility of various relationships between Matthew's community and Judaism. Unparalleled sayings are also found in Matt 5.5, 7–10, 14–16; 7.6, 15 16a, 11.28-30; 12.34–37; 16.17–19, 18.16–19; 19.10-12." (pp. 11-12)

(...)

"Chapters 2, 3, and 4 will isolate the M sayings in Matt 5.17–6.18; 10, 23, respectively. Each chapter will be organized according to thought units made apparent by literary shifts in the text. Within each section of the text, first a translation will be given, followed by an identification of four types of material, always in the same order: (a) verses with parallels in Mark; (b) verses with parallels in Luke; (c) verses likely to come from Matthew; (d) verses with a strong possibility of containing an M saying. Chapter 5 will accumulate the results from these chapters, describe the material, and establish probable life settings for the sayings or groups of sayings. Use of the preliminary results from Chapter 5 will be an aid in Chapter 6 in recovering other M sayings that may occur throughout the Gospel." Whereas the unparalleled material in Matt 5.17–6.18; 10; 23 occurs in contexts where the use of parallels, style, vocabulary, and content can be employed with relative ease, there are other unparalleled sayings in Matthew in contexts where those criteria are more difficult to utilize. These additional M sayings will also be described and assigned life settings. Chapter 7 will relate the results of the analysis to a hypothesis that suggests a reconstruction of the history of the community and accounts for the tradition(s) recovered." (p. 22)

62. Brown, John Pairman. 1959. "An Early Revision of the Gospel of Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 78:215-227.

"fundamental datum of the Synoptic problem is that Luke in its "Markan materials" (primarily Luke 4 31-44, 5 12-6 19, 8 4-9 50, 18 15-43, 19 28-22 23, 22 31-24 11) has only minor agreements with Matthew against Mark, either in matter or order.' Mark then must be some kind of connecting link between Matthew and Luke; the usual solution, which I take to be correct, is that both Matthew and Luke knew some form of Mark. What form of Mark they knew I hope here to define more precisely." (p. 215)

(...)

"We are thus led to the proposal that there existed in the first century a revised version or versions of Mark, which accounts for many textual variants in our MSS of Mark, for many divergences from Mark in Matthew and Luke, and particularly for the bulk of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark; and that to this recension the best witness is the "Caesarean."

We have already considered the importance of this suggestion for the Synoptic problem; I add just a word about what it would mean for textual history, and then leave it to the mercy of more competent hands.

If the suggestion is right, Mark's Greek was very rough, scribes corrected it very early, and already in the first century we could talk about a "vulgate text" of Greek Mark. Only Alexandria, most particularly in codex B, preserved with any consistency the forms of the original; although indeed a series of Aramaisms, in Mark as elsewhere, have been preserved only in D.(30). Both the Old Syriac will then come from good local texts with a moderate contamination of "vulgate" readings; the Byzantine text will represent a different contamination of vulgate readings into a local text, which, further revised, happened to win the day.

The "Caesarean" witnesses, which it is becoming harder and harder to localize geographically, will then simply be direct descendants of the "first century vulgate" which to varying degrees have escaped assimilation to the Byzantine text."

(1) I.e., Luke (unlike Matt) after 4 16 does not give "Q-materials" in the context of their Markan parallels. The only exception is Luke 9 3-5, where the agreements with Matt 10 7-14 against Mark 6 6-11 are echoes or transfers from the (Q) mission-discourse Luke 10 1-12.

- (30) Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1954).
63. ———. 1959. "Mark as Witness to an Edited Form of Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* no. 80:29-44.
 "It is doubted, even by believers in the existence of the Q document, that Mark can have known it. Streeter's earlier view(1) was that "Mark wrote to supplement Q," which explained why Mark, "while apparently familiar with Q ... uses it so little and usually with abbreviation." Afterwards Streeter(2) rejected this view, and his second thoughts have usually been taken as decisive; e. g., by Taylor, on the grounds that "the existence of parallel versions of sayings in the great Churches of primitive Christianity is highly probable."(3) That is, the question, "Did Mark know Q?"(4) tends to be answered a priori, on the basis of our general opinion how the sayings of Jesus circulated. I here suggest, on the contrary, that the relations between Mark and Q are concrete evidence how those sayings circulated." (p. 29)
 (1) W. Sanday (ed.), *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* , p. 219; cf. pp. 166-83.
 (2) B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, rev. ed., pp. 186-91.
 (3) V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* , p. 87.
 (4) Cf. T. E. F. Honey, "Did Mark Use Q?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* , 62 (1943), pp. 319-31; B. H. Throckmorton, Jr., "Did Mark Know Q?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* , 67 (1948), pp. 319-29.
64. ———. 1961. "The Form of 'Q' known to Matthew." *New Testament Studies* no. 8:27-42.
 "It is usually assumed that Matthew did not know Luke, nor Luke Matthew.(1) The non-Markan ('Q,-) materials common to Matthew and Luke, then, ultimately go back to a common source or sources, oral or written, much of which anyway had reached a fixed Greek form. Attempts have been made to split up the source of the Q-materials into two documents,(2) into one-sheet 'tracts',(3) and into individual floating sayings.(4) I here assume that the great bulk of the Q-materials have as their ultimate common source a single Greek document 'Q,' (while holding open the possibility that behind Matthew—but probably not Luke—there lies also independent knowledge of Aramaic originals for some sayings). The basic evidence is the considerable series of Q-materials given in the same order by Matthew and Luke." (p. 27)
 (1) I have made a textual suggestion ('An Early Revision of the Gospel of Mark', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 215-27) which would eliminate most of the 'minor agreements' between Matthew and Luke. Mgr de Solages, *A Greek Synopsis of the Gospels* (Leiden, 1959), pp. 1055-65, now gives the fullest list of such agreements. For the text of Mark known to Matthew and Luke, cf. A. F. J. Klijn, 'A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts', 11, *Novum Testamentum* , III (1959). 162 note 2.
 (2) Wilhelm Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien : II, Zur Redenquelle* (Halle, 1929), pp. 137-49.
 (3) Wilfred L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels: II, St Luke and St Matthew* (Cambridge, 1957), ed. H. Chadwick.
 (4) Joachim Jeremias, ' Zur Hypothese einer schriftlichen Logienquelle Q,' *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* xxix (1930), 147-9.
65. Brown, Raymond E. 1997. *An Introduction to the New Testament* . New Haven: Yale University Press.
 Chapter 6: Gospels in General; Synoptic Gospels in Particular, pp.118-139.
 The Synoptic Problem p. 127; The Existence of Q, p. 130-136.
 "A further stage in Gospel development is required to explain the interrelationship of the first three Gospels, called "Synoptic" because they can be reviewed side by side (syn-optically). These Gospels have so much in common that in the third stage described above there must have been some dependence of one or two on the other or on a common written source. Although much scholarly attention and even

passion has been devoted to this problem, most readers of the NT find the issue complex, irrelevant to their interests, and boring—a fact that causes me to be succinct in my treatment. Ample bibliography will be given; but beginners are warned that the subject tends to generate complexity, and they may want to settle for the most common conclusions that I have italicized below (pp. 114, 115, 122). Statistics and terminology: Mark has 661 verses (vv.); Matt has 1,068, and Luke has 1,149. Eighty percent of Mark's vv. are reproduced in Matt and 65 percent in Luke. (18) The Marcan material found in both the other two is called the "Triple Tradition." The approximate 220–235 vv. (in whole or in part) of nonMarcan material that Matt and Luke have in common is called the "Double Tradition." In both instances so much of the order in which that common material is presented, and so much of the wording in which it is phrased are the same that dependence at the written rather than simply at the oral level has to be posited. Let me simply list some proposals offered to explain these statistics, including for each the main argument(s) pro and con. Finally I shall draw out corollaries from the most commonly accepted solution." (p. 127, a note omitted)

(18) 18Numbers drawn from Neiryneck, *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 40:5. Very few Marcan pericopes have no parallel in either Matt or Luke.

66. Brown, Scott G. 2011. "The Longer Gospel of Mark 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, 753-782. Leuven: Peeters.

External links

Stephen C. Carlson, [Synoptic Problem Website](#)

Alan Bill, [Gospel Origins](#)