

# What are the Gospels? Richard Burridge's Impact on Scholarly Understanding of the Genre of the Gospels

**Steve Walton**

St Mary's University, Twickenham & Tyndale House, Cambridge

## Abstract

A quiet revolution has taken place in scholarly understanding of Gospel genre since the publication of Richard Burridge's *What are the Gospels?* in 1992, reversing the earlier consensus that the canonical Gospels should not be considered to be biographies. Burridge's research has been widely accepted and has produced a new consensus, that the Gospels are a species of ancient biography ( $\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ ). This article: (i) lays out the former consensus and demonstrates its widespread acceptance; (ii) outlines the key arguments of Burridge's research and the contribution he made; (iii) provides evidence of the shift in the scholarly consensus to Burridge's view that the Gospels are ancient biographies; (iv) maps discussion of genre in recent Gospel commentaries; and (v) suggests further work that is opened up by the new consensus, notably in fine-tuning the identification of Gospel genre.

## Keywords

Gospels, genre, Richard Burridge, biography, life,  $\beta\iota\omicron\varsigma$

It was 22 May 1995, and I was sitting in a room being interviewed for the post of Tutor in New Testament at St John's College, Nottingham. Facing me was what, with hindsight, was an intimidating panel: being asked what you mean by 'hermeneutics' by John Goldingay with

Anthony Thiselton—who is ‘Mr Hermeneutics’—in the room could certainly be considered intimidating! There was a moment in the interview when I was asked which recent scholarly New Testament book I had read and appreciated, and I responded, a little hesitantly, to say that Richard Burridge’s *What are the Gospels?* (Burridge 1992; revised ed.: Burridge 2004) was the most stimulating and helpful thing I had read recently. The hesitation was because there, on the panel, was Richard Burridge himself, and he had the grace to chuckle, I recall, when I mentioned his book.

Reading that book was one of those relatively rare moments when I found my view changed, and wondered afterwards why I ever held the other view. What was it that made Burridge’s work on the four canonical Gospels (hereafter ‘the Gospels’) so remarkable? It was not that no-one had ever proposed the idea that the Gospels shared characteristics with Graeco-Roman ‘lives’. This had been the standard view in the nineteenth century and, not long before Burridge’s work, Talbert and Shuler had argued for it (Talbert 1977; Shuler 1982), although their arguments had not carried the day because of significant errors or weaknesses (Burridge 2004: 83-86; Aune 1981).

This study is significant because it is not given to many to turn round a scholarly consensus in their lifetime, and it is given to even fewer to do that with their PhD work. Yet this is what Burridge’s study of Gospel genre did: scholarship largely adopted his view that the Gospels are a form of Graeco-Roman biography. As Burridge himself is wont to remark, he has spent his scholarly career stating the ‘bleeding obvious’ (to echo the British comedians Peter Cooke and Dudley Moore): the Gospels are books about Jesus! To reflect on his contribution and impact, we shall consider the setting in scholarship into which Burridge made his contribution, the key arguments which he used to make his case, and the impact over subsequent years of his results.

## Setting the Scene in Twentieth-century Gospel Studies

The dominant view of the Gospels' genre in twentieth-century Gospel scholarship came from Germany, and it was that the Gospels were *sui generis*—they did not fit any previously-known genre of literature. This consensus grew in reaction to the nineteenth-century 'lives of Jesus', which took the Gospels as biographies and combined them to produce a 'biography' of Jesus (e.g. Renan 1863; ET: Renan 1864). Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Rudolf Bultmann represent key figures in this reaction, as BurrIDGE notes (BurrIDGE 2004:8-12; Schmidt 1923 [ET Schmidt 2002]; Bultmann 1931 [ET Bultmann 1968]). Central to their response is the distinction between *Hochliteratur* and *Kleinliteratur*—roughly, literary writing and popular or folk-writing. They identify the Gospels as folk writing because they see them as closer to stories concerning people such as Dr Faustus and St Francis, rather than Graeco-Roman biographies. In particular, they see the Gospels as oral traditions about Jesus strung together—hence their original anonymity. This shows, they claim, that the evangelists had no pretensions to write *Hochliteratur*. Bultmann regards the Gospels as stemming from worship of Jesus, and thus as being significantly different from biographies, which present an individual for admiration or imitation. Indeed, the Gospels lack the desiderata of a modern biography: the origins, childhood, education, psychological development, and personality of Jesus are notable by their absence or thin coverage (Bultmann 1968: 372). The evangelists, on this view, are not seeking to write biography, but aiming to unite the exalted Christ with stories of the earthly Jesus (Bultmann 1968: 372). Thus Gospels are 'an original creation of Christianity' (Bultmann 1968: 74), a comment Bultmann makes about Mark, but extensible to all four Gospels (Bultmann 1968: 347-48).

To give some examples of standard New Testament and Gospels books which adopt this approach, consider these:

From C.F.D. Moule in 1962 (Moule 1962:4-05, my italics):

...two new genres of literature offered by the New Testament. First, the ‘Gospel’. Imagine (if possible) that an otherwise educated person of our own day, with absolutely no knowledge of Christianity or its literature, were suddenly presented with St Mark’s Gospel. What would he make of it? He would quickly recognize that it was quite unlike any other genre of writing known to him. It is concerned with Jesus of Nazareth, yet there is no description of his personal appearance, practically no attempt to date the action, only the barest indications of its place. It starts with no family history or background, it presents little ordered sequence of events. It springs straight into what it describes as good news, *εὐαγγέλιον*, and points to the coming of John as the fulfilment of a certain passage in the Old Testament. From this jumping-off point it goes on, through a series of brief, loosely linked paragraphs describing the activity or (more rarely) the sayings, of Jesus, to a proportionately very long account of his arrest, trial, and execution; and at the point where the tomb is found empty it seems to end abruptly—for the few verses which follow are patently from a later hand and constitute a summary of the traditions about the sequel.

*This is certainly not biography, real or fictional.* Yet neither is it an ethical or moralistic writing. It has no real parallels before it. *It is the first extant specimen of a new genre: it is what we have learnt to call ‘a Gospel’,* although the term *εὐαγγέλιον* is used by Mark himself not for his book but for its contents.

From Ralph Martin in 1975, although note his caveat (Martin 1975, 1978, 1:16, my italics):

...it is doubtful that the term “biography” really fits the case when we ask about the scope of the Christian Gospels. Certainly, *if we give a modern connotation to the term*, it becomes inappropriate for several reasons.

Martin goes on to cite the absence of Jesus' predecessors, culture, and environment, and the lack of interest in the mental and psychological development of Jesus.

From Hans Conzelmann and Andreas Lindemann, writing in 1985 in German (and translated into English in 1988) (Conzelmann and Lindemann 1988: 26-27):

There are no parallels to the NT literary type "Gospel." A comparison with certain literary types of antiquity, such as the biography and the historical monograph, demonstrates this. The substantial difference to the classical biography, such as that of Plutarch or Suetonius, is made clear especially in the Gospel of Mark: The person of the author cannot be recognized and the action of the "hero," namely of Jesus of Nazareth, is not presented biographically. Apparently the issue is not at all a continuous description of the life of Jesus or a presentation of his character; instead, the primary focal point is the work of Jesus as the revealer sent by God, as seen in his deeds, teaching, and passion. Events are of interest only from this vantage point... There is not even a trace of a development of the self-consciousness and character of Jesus.

From Graham Stanton in 1989, in a widely-used textbook (Stanton 1989:15-20):

...the more widely accepted view is that the form of the gospels is unique and that Mark had no literary models at all... It was frequently claimed that the early church was so taken up with its proclamation of the Risen Christ that it was not interested at all in the past of Jesus. On this view the gospels stemmed from the proclamation of the early church and not in any sense be seen as 'memoirs' or 'records'... The gospels must be read against the backdrop, not of modern biographical writing, but of their own times. When this is done, the gospels do not emerge as fully-fledged biographies of Jesus, but it then becomes clear that the evangelists are concerned with the *story* as well as the *significance* of Jesus... We can be almost certain that Mark did not intend

to write a biography of Jesus in the Graeco-Roman tradition...[the gospels] can only be linked with the Graeco-Roman biographical tradition only with very considerable qualifications.

It is notable that Stanton takes this view, given that in his ground-breaking doctoral thesis, published as *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, he argues carefully and cogently that the earliest Christians have an interest in the past of Jesus and sought to preserve memories of his past in the Gospels (Stanton 1974). Not only that, he argues that a comparison with the Graeco-Roman biographical tradition is helpful to illuminate the Gospels (Stanton 1974: 117-36). At this point and for some years later, however, Stanton is unwilling to take the step of placing the Gospels in the genre of ancient biography, for he writes of '[t]he wholly justifiable insistence that the gospels are not biographies' (Stanton 1974: 135). Burridge acknowledges that Stanton's work critiquing the Bultmannian consensus prepared the ground for his own argument (which persuaded Stanton to reverse his opinion on Gospel genre) (Burridge 2011: 6-9, 12-13, 16).

Finally, from Larry Hurtado, writing in the widely-used *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* in 1992, which sums up the 'state of the art' of Gospel studies at the time (it is noteworthy that Burridge himself wrote the article 'Gospel: Genre' in the 2013 second edition of this dictionary, Burridge 2013):

The Gospels are not fully explainable, however, simply in terms of the Greco-Roman literary setting or by linking them with literary genres of that era. The impetus for the Gospels derives from the religious complexion and needs of early Christianity; and their contents, presuppositions, major themes and literary texture are all heavily influenced by their immediate religious setting as well. In very general terms, the Gospels can be likened to other examples of Greco-Roman popular biography, but

they also form a distinctive group within that broad body of ancient writings.

(Hurtado 1992: 282)

The implication of this view is that the Gospels should be studied to identify the authentic sayings of Jesus, and to understand the process of transmission of the stories about Jesus, a process that was assumed to be long. The form-critical approach instantiated in this approach was followed by the development of redaction criticism, which taught scholars to reconstruct the *Sitz im Leben* of the evangelists, and ‘mirror read’ the Gospels for the situation of the church(es) to which each was addressed, the Gospel communities, as we might say. Thus both form and redaction criticism treated the Gospels as windows into the earliest churches, rather than windows on Jesus—and they considered this choice as a clear either/or. However, redaction criticism’s rediscovery of the author in the third quarter of the twentieth century began to raise questions of authorial intention (even with all its attendant difficulties), which itself led to reopening the question of Gospel genre. Following the failed attempts of Talbert and Shuler to argue for Graeco-Roman biography, Burridge entered the field.

### **Burridge’s Contribution**

Burridge came into this discussion with a training in Classics which included awareness of discussions of genre in such circles. He came to his doctoral work with the sense that the then-consensus view was correct, and expected to show that the Gospels are not Graeco-Roman ‘lives’ (Greek *βίαι*; Latin *vitae*) (Burridge 2004: 101). His doctoral work under Maurice Casey made pioneering use of (then) new computer technology to engage with the texts of Graeco-Roman ‘lives’ and the Gospels—extraordinarily, these days you could probably do it on a mobile phone!—as well as painstaking study of some of the texts by hand, including the Gospels. His work is interdisciplinary, crossing the boundaries of Classics, genre criticism, and New Testament studies, using all three disciplines to inform his approach.

Burridge identifies four significant markers of Graeco-Roman ‘lives’ which, in combination, allow him to recognise this genre with confidence (Burridge 2004: 105-23, esp. 107).

First, *opening features*: there is usually a title and an opening formula which identify the book’s focus on the subject of the biography.

Secondly, the *subject* of the biography is the subject of the lion’s share of the main verbs in the book, and is given the lion’s share of the space, placing the subject in the spotlight (cf. Plutarch, *Alex.* 1.1). This is where Burridge’s ground-breaking computer analysis fits, allowing him to get a good ‘feel’ for the focus of the verbs by considering nominative nouns and pronouns, which tend to be verb subjects. Studying verbs ‘by hand’ then allows him to fine tune his analysis by noting verbs without explicit subjects which are nevertheless performed by the book’s subject.

Thirdly, *external features* including the structure of the book, its style, etc., which enhance the focus on the subject.

Fourthly, *internal features* such as the settings, the topics and content included, the values and attitudes espoused or promoted by the work, and the author’s intention and purpose (whether stated explicitly or not).

When Burridge studies a selection of Greek and Latin ‘lives’ and compares the four Gospels one by one with this pattern, he finds each of these features to be present in a comparable form in each Gospel. This strongly suggests that an ancient reader hearing Mark and the others read aloud (the normal means of ‘reading’ in the ancient world, e.g. Acts 8.30; see Walton 1995: 8 n. 52) would recognise them as βίαι—‘lives’—of Jesus. This does not mean that we should think of them like *modern* biographies, of course—comparing the Gospels with today’s biographies was the error which Bultmann and his generation made—but it does mean that the evangelists have chosen a vehicle which would be recognisable to a

wide readership around the Mediterranean basin. That seems intrinsically likely, for to use a literary form which was *sui generis* to communicate a new worldview, belief system and lifestyle focused on Jesus would be to place a double barrier to communication.

Burridge here identifies a key point which moves the debate forward, and which implies that *the focus of the Gospels is Jesus*, the subject of the ‘life’. This might sound blindingly obvious—and some, such as Tuckett and Petersen, regard this claim as trite or trivial (Tuckett 1993; Petersen 1994: 146)—but for much of the last hundred years the heart of Gospels scholarship has been in examining the communities supposed to be behind the Gospels, the process of transmission of individual stories, and so on, rather than their true subject, Jesus himself. Burridge followed this study up with his own attempt to read the Gospels for their Christology in his excellent, less technical *Four Gospels, One Jesus?* (Burridge 1994), a book that has been valued by generations of students.

## **The Impact of Burridge’s Work**

Burridge’s work was rapidly seen as highly significant, not to say game-changing, in understanding the genre of the Gospels, and his conclusions were widely accepted. This sea change in scholarship is Burridge’s major contribution to the scholarly world; he was not alone in contributing to this argument—Graham Stanton is another. As we noted, Stanton’s doctoral work argued that the earliest believers did regard preserving memories of Jesus and his teaching as important (Stanton 1974), and Burridge’s work built on this by offering a rigorous case that the Gospels were intended as books telling the story of Jesus, rather than being a ‘coded’ version of early church history. It is noteworthy that Stanton wrote a commendation of the first edition of Burridge’s *Four Gospels, One Jesus?*, describing it as a book which would enable ‘[n]ovices and old-hands alike [to] read the gospels with new eyes.’ Thus by 1995, only three years after the publication of Burridge’s book, Stanton wrote:

Ancient biographers often wrote with several different intentions, including apologetic and polemic. Some wrote in order to uphold (or to challenge) a system of beliefs or values personified in the subject of the biography. So too with the evangelists, whose accounts of the life and teaching of Jesus were ‘foundation documents’ for the newly emergent Christian communities.

*The Gospels, then, can be seen as a special kind or sub-set of ancient biographical writing...* They tell the story of the career of Jesus in order to persuade the reader of its significance. (Stanton 1995: 138-39, my italics)

In their discussion of genre in the New Testament, Brook Pearson and Stanley Porter state in 2002: ‘...the overwhelming trend has been towards seeing the Gospel genre as some kind of biography’ (Pearson and Porter 1997: 138). They cite Burrige as the key scholar who had moved debate in this direction (Pearson and Porter 1997: 141-42).

Bart Ehrman’s widely-used introduction to the New Testament states in 1997: ‘Scholars have come to reject the view that [the Gospels] are totally unlike anything else...some of these investigations have suggested that the Gospels are best seen as a kind of Greco-Roman (as opposed to modern) biography’ (Ehrman 1997:52). Burrige’s influence is clear, for Ehrman cites *What are the Gospels?* as ‘[a] thorough study that emphatically argues that the Gospels are best understood as a kind of ancient biography’ (Ehrman 1997:55).

It is also worth noting that some subsequent work, while not necessarily being directly dependent on Burrige’s work, was done in a context and atmosphere in the scholarly guild which was more open to such discussions. In particular, the collaboration of Richard Bauckham and others (including Burrige himself, Burrige 1997) in arguing that the Gospels were written with a wide audience in mind, rather than the narrow communities envisaged in redaction criticism (Bauckham 1997b). In the key essay in that book, Bauckham cites Burrige’s work in support of his argument: ‘...it seems very unlikely that anyone

would expect a *bios* to address the very specific circumstances of a small community of people...its relevance would be pitched in relatively broad terms for any competent reader' (Bauckham 1997a: 28).

Bauckham draws a further implication from the written nature of the Gospels, which is that it seems strange for a member of a community (an evangelist) to *write down* a 'coded' message for his own community's situation, rather than address the situation orally. Indeed, by contrast with a letter, which would probably stop circulating with its first, named recipients, a 'life' would be highly likely to circulate *and be intended to circulate* more widely (Bauckham 1997a: 29).

## **Whence Scholarship?**

Let us turn to consider one area where Burrige's work might be expected to make an impact, commentaries on the Gospels, and one area where there is unexploited capital to be gained.

### *Gospel Commentaries since What are the Gospels?*

Given the wide acceptance of Burrige's conclusions, it is worth considering commentaries on the Gospels since 1999, on the basis that a seven-year interval should give sufficient time for Burrige's conclusions to permeate scholarship sufficiently to affect the commentaries—for good quality commentaries generally take a long time in the making.

There is some discussion of Gospel genre in the introductions to some (but not all) commentaries, and this shows that the issue is now on the agenda of Gospel commentators. Examples, among about twenty samples considered, are the work of Craig Keener on Matthew and John (Keener 1999: 16-24; 2003: 1.3-34), the work of Andrew Lincoln on John (Lincoln 2005: 14-17), and the work of both R.T. France and Robert Stein on Mark (France 2002: 4-11; Stein 2008: 19-21). All four scholars substantially accept Burrige's case.

In his Matthew commentary, Keener summarises and accepts Burridge's conclusion that the Gospels are 'lives', and spends the largest part of his introduction to the Matthew's themes on Christology (Keener 1999: 53-68).

On John, Lincoln sketches the range of the genre βίος, from ancient history writing to encomium, and draws important implications from the differences between this genre and ancient historiography, notably that a βίος would be likely to build on core events 'with substantial correspondence to what happened in the past' by adding 'varying amounts of embellishment' to present the story (Lincoln 2005: 17). Lincoln's fine commentary carries through Burridge's hermeneutical programme, of focusing attention on the portrait of Jesus in John, well.

Keener, in his John commentary, discusses Gospel genre and strongly sides with Burridge's view (Keener 2003: 1.11-12). In a careful discussion of Graeco-Roman biography and history, Keener rejects the false dichotomy of historical or theological and argues rather that John should be seen as 'both historical *and* literary/theological', while recognising that John is the most literary/theological of the four Gospels (Keener 2003: 17, his italics). Keener's two-volume study of John holds its focus commendably on Jesus.

France on Mark also accepts Burridge's case, and notes how it turned around the consensus of a previous generation (France 2002: 4-6). Stein, similarly, states that Mark is a form of Graeco-Roman biography, citing Burridge in support (Stein 2008: 19-21). France goes on to recognise that Mark writes to tell the story of Jesus in order to summon people to follow him as disciples, and identifies three distinctives in Mark's 'life of Jesus' compared to other Graeco-Roman 'lives': first, the subject matter of Mark is one who was more than a great man, but one who is even now alive and worthy of worship, although rejected and humiliated while on earth; secondly, the material of Mark bears the signs of being used in Christian proclamation; and thirdly, it is written not for private use, but for reading in

communities which were not composed only of the highly educated. France's commentary is a fine example of reading Mark christologically.

We should also note that James Edwards' valuable narrative-critical commentary on Mark focuses attention strongly on Jesus throughout, and his introduction strongly highlights the portrait of Jesus in Mark (Edwards 2001: 12-15), although he does not engage explicitly with questions of genre (and, surprisingly, Burridge does not appear in his index).

That is not to say that Burridge's work has entirely carried the day among the commentators. Joel Marcus offers an interesting half-way house position, in placing Mark within 'the Markan community', whose composition he appears to know rather well (Marcus 1999, 2009: 1.25-39), and yet in accepting, too, that it shares many features of hellenistic biography (Marcus 1999, 2009: 1.64-69). Marcus places himself clearly in the camp influenced by Schmidt and Bultmann, however, for he regards the continuing presence of Jesus in the church as marking the Second Gospel as an incomplete βίος.

Adela Yarboro Collins, in her commentary on Mark, appears to give with one hand and then take back with the other, when she concedes that Burridge makes a good case for the likeness of Mark to Graeco-Roman βίοι, but argues that Burridge should have considered other models, especially in the Old Testament (Collins 2007: 27-29). Collins herself prefers to think of Mark as a new genre, eschatological historical monograph. Burridge has to a degree responded to this criticism in his essay 'Gospel Genre, Christological Controversy and the Absence of Rabbinic Biography: Some Implications of the Biographical Hypothesis', appended to the second edition of *What are the Gospels?* (Burridge 2004: 322-40).

Ulrich Luz, in his commentary on Matthew, considers that treating Matthew as a Graeco-Roman 'life' would be foreign to what he takes to be a predominantly Jewish audience. He considers that Matthew modelled his work on Mark, and wrote it as a 'foundation story', much like some Old Testament books (e.g. Chronicles) (Luz 2007: 13-15, esp. 15).

The debate is clearly far from over. Indeed, some commentary writing appears to go on just as before, with little recognition that genre must affect exegesis. It may be that such commentators have read Burridge and rejected his view, but if so they show sign of engaging with his work. This appears to be the case with François Bovon's commentary on Luke (Bovon 2002-12: 1.5-6). Disappointingly, although David Turner mentions genre (including citing Burridge) in his commentary on Matthew, he focuses mainly on the historical value of Matthew in his discussion of genre, suggesting that he sees the generic question as not greatly relevant to the interpretation of Matthew (Turner 2008: 5-6). There is still room for good commentating (perhaps particularly on Luke) which takes the biographical nature of the Gospels seriously, and which works out the agenda set by Burridge's research at every level of the exegesis of the text.

### *Unexploited Capital: Fine-tuning the Genre Description*

Burridge himself recognises that the Graeco-Roman βίος is a broad genre, ranging over books which are rather different in style and contents, and others repeat this point (e.g. Alexander 1994: 75-76). So a key question is whether we can get a more fine-grained description of the genre of the Gospels, perhaps by more detailed comparison with specific types of βίος.

Burridge hints at this in writing

since many βίοι were used by philosophical groups or schools for teaching about their beliefs and founder, as well as for attack and defence in debate with other groups, and some of their generic features are also found in the gospels, we can begin interpreting them with the expectation that we will find didactic, apologetic and polemical purposes and material here also. (Burridge 2004: 248)

One valuable suggestion comes from Scot McKnight, who accepts Burridge's 'now established conclusions' concerning Gospel genre (McKnight 2011: 61), and seeks to fine-tune them by comparing Matthew with the content of Paul's gospel message. McKnight

sketches four key claims based on studying both the key Pauline texts (notably 1 Cor. 15) and other ‘gospel’ passages (especially in Acts) (McKnight 2011: 61-67): (i) the gospel narrates and declares the whole life of Jesus, from incarnation through exaltation and onto consummation; (ii) the gospel treats the Jesus story as fulfilling Israel’s story—it necessarily involves a hermeneutic of Israel’s story; (iii) a key feature of the Christian gospel’s instantiation of Israel’s story is that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah of Israel; (iv) the gospel story saves, frees and gives victory to those who receive it. Thus, turning to Matthew, McKnight argues that as a βίος, Matthew is ‘a *gospelling βίος about Jesus, who is Messiah and Lord and Saviour*’ (McKnight 2011: 67, his italics), and he goes on to argue that Matthew fulfils each of the four distinctives of ‘gospel’ (McKnight 2011: 69-74). This is helpful and suggestive, and may open doors into further work—many will hear resonances with some of N.T. Wright’s work on the Gospels (notably Wright 2012—he mentions McKnight’s work, but not this essay).

Building on McKnight’s work, there is an as-yet-unfulfilled agenda for potential PhD students to pursue. Can we develop a more fine-grained description of the Gospels in dialogue with a range of ancient βίοι and thus deepen our understanding of the Gospels’ testimony to Jesus yet further? It is considerable tribute to Richard Burridge’s work that we are now ready and able to engage with such a question.

## References

- Alexander, L.  
1994            Review of R.A. Burridge 1992 *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), *EvQ* 66: 73-76.
- Aune, D.E.  
1981            ‘The Problem of the Genre of the Gospels: A Critique of Charles H. Talbert’s *What is a Gospel?*’, in R. T. France and D. Wenham (eds), *Gospel Perspectives, vol. II* (Sheffield: JSOT): 9-60.

- Bauckham, R.  
1997a 'For Whom Were the Gospels Written?', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 9-48.
- Bauckham, R. (ed.)  
1997b *The Gospels for All Christians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Bovon, F.  
2002-12 *Luke* (3 vols; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
- Bultmann, R.  
1931 *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).  
1968 *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Blackwell).
- Burridge, R.A.  
1992 *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Græco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).  
1994 *Four Gospels, One Jesus: A Symbolic Reading* (London: SPCK).  
1997 'About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 113-45.  
2004 *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Græco-Roman Biography* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).  
2011 'The Gospel of Jesus: Graham Stanton, Biography and the Genre of Matthew', in D. M. Gurtner, J. Willitts and R.A. Burridge (eds), *Jesus, Matthew's Gospel and Early Christianity: Studies in Memory of Graham N. Stanton* (LNTS 435; London: T. & T. Clark): 5-22.  
2013 'Gospel: Genre', in J. B. Green, J.K. Brown and N. Perrin (eds), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (2nd ed.; Downers Grove: IVP): 335-42.
- Collins, A.Y.  
2007 *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
- Conzelmann, H. and A. Lindemann  
1988 *Interpreting the New Testament: An Introduction to the Principles and Methods of NT Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).
- Edwards, J.R.  
2001 *The Gospel according to Mark* (Pillar NT Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Ehrman, B.  
1997 *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- France, R.T.  
2002 *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Carlisle: Paternoster).
- Hurtado, L.W.  
1992 'Gospel (genre)', in J. B. Green, S. McKnight and I.H. Marshall (eds), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Leicester/Downers Grove: IVP): 276-82.
- Keener, C.S.  
1999 *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans).  
2003 *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson).

- Lincoln, A.T.  
2005 *The Gospel according to Saint John* (BNTC 4; London: Continuum).
- Luz, U.  
2007 *Matthew 1–7: A Commentary* (revised ed.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
- Marcus, J.  
1999, 2009 *Mark* (2 vols; AB 27, 27A; New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Martin, R.P.  
1975, 1978 *New Testament Foundations* (2 vols; Exeter: Paternoster).
- McKnight, S.  
2011 'Matthew as 'Gospel'', in D. M. Gurtner, J. Willitts and R.A. Burridge (eds), *Jesus, Matthew's Gospel and Early Christianity: Studies in Memory of Graham N. Stanton* (LNTS 435; London: T. & T. Clark): 59-75.
- Moule, C.F.D.  
1962 *The Birth of the New Testament* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black).
- Pearson, B.W.R. and S.E. Porter  
1997 'The Genres of the New Testament', in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (NTTS 25; Leiden: Brill): 131-65.
- Petersen, N.  
1994 'Can One Speak of a Gospel Genre?', *Neot* 28: 137-58.
- Renan, E.  
1863 *Vie de Jésus* (Histoire des origines du christianisme 1; Paris: Michel Lévy).  
1864 *The Life of Jesus* (London: Trübner).
- Schmidt, K.L.  
1923 'Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte', in H. Schmidt (ed.), *EYXAPIΣΤHPION: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. 2. Teil: Zur Religion und Literature des Neuen Testaments* (FS H. Gunkel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): 50-134.  
2002 *The Place of the Gospels in the General History of Literature* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press).
- Shuler, P.L.  
1982 *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress).
- Stanton, G.N.  
1974 *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 27; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).  
1989 *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford Bible Series; Oxford: Oxford University Press).  
1995 *Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels* (London: HarperCollins).
- Stein, R.H.  
2008 *Mark* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic).
- Talbert, C.H.  
1977 *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels* (London: SPCK).
- Tuckett, C.M.  
1993 Review of R.A. Burridge 1992 *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), *Theology* 96: 74-75.

- Turner, D.L.  
2008 *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic).
- Walton, S.  
1995 'Rhetorical Criticism: An Introduction', *Them* 21: 4-9.
- Wright, N.T.  
2012 *How God Became King: Getting to the Heart of the Gospels* (London: SPCK).