



BRILL

---

The Case against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem by Mark Goodacre

Review by: Christopher Tuckett

*Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 46, Fasc. 4 (Oct., 2004), pp. 401-403

Published by: [BRILL](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1561563>

Accessed: 21/02/2014 01:37

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



BRILL is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Novum Testamentum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## BOOK REVIEWS

MARK GOODACRE, *The Case against Q. Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg PA: Trinity Press International, 2002). Pp. 240 \$30 ISBN 1-56338-334-9

Mark Goodacre's earlier book, *Goulder and the Gospels* (Sheffield, 1996) provided a critical appraisal of Michael Goulder's theories about the gospels. In this latest book, Goodacre takes over more positively the mantle of Goulder and seeks to provide a spirited defence of the synoptic source theory which Goulder has defended over many years, viz. a belief in Markan priority coupled with a denial of the necessity of postulating a Q source and a claim that Luke is directly dependent on Matthew. The theory was of course not new with Goulder (it goes back to Farrer and others before him), and Goodacre does not follow Goulder slavishly: thus he refuses to adopt some of Goulder's theories about the creativity of Matthew; and he also shuns a very strict, 'hard' form of the 'non-Q' theory in that he does not claim that Luke must be secondary to Matthew at every point in the tradition: at some points Luke may have had access to independent (oral?) traditions (e.g. for the Lord's Prayer). But in general, Goodacre claims that the 'case against Q' can and should stand: there is no need to postulate a Q source, and Lukan redaction can often explain things perfectly adequately provided one is sensitive to Luke's theological and literary tendencies. Goodacre provides one chapter dealing with the issue of Markan Priority (arguing against modern Griesbachians) but the bulk of the book is devoted to developing his 'case against Q'. Here he deals with issues of order, minor and major agreements, and gives some particular case studies (e.g. the beatitudes) as key examples. Goodacre writes clearly and lucidly and with a light touch. He provides some detail at times, but the reader is never overwhelmed and the debates with others are conducted without acrimony. The case is thus made with disarming simplicity and deftness. Yet the very simplicity may hide some problems with the case being argued.

Goodacre observes (rightly) that many of the standard arguments in favour of Q are negative arguments against the alternatives (primarily Luke's dependence on Matthew). Equally, much of Goodacre's book is taken up with negative arguments against Q, showing that Q is unnecessary as a hypothesis and that Lukan dependence on Matthew can explain the evidence just as well. There is not enough space to engage with all of Goodacre's arguments here so I focus on just a few points of possible difficulty and (hopefully friendly) disagreement.

Goodacre takes up the argument of many Q defenders that Luke never shows knowledge of Matthew's additions to Mark. He claims that most such 'additions' as Q defenders have in mind (e.g. Matt 16:17-19 added to Mark 8:29) are not at all surprising as they are not very 'Luke pleasing' (p. 51). Thus on Matt 16:17-19, Luke may have disagreed with such a positive statement about Peter and hence omitted the section. However, the case for an 'anti-Peter' Luke is not easy to sustain (cf. e.g. Luke 5:1-11, the positive role played by Peter in Acts 1-12, as well as numerous smaller details giving Peter a more prominent role in Luke). And it is hard to see many of the other Matthean additions to Mark (e.g. Matt 3:14-15; 12:5-7; 27:19, 24) as clearly very 'unpleasing' for Luke. (Goodacre's 'light touch' means that he does not discuss these in detail.)

In addition Goodacre makes a further interesting point, claiming that the argument from the Q side ignores a whole host of texts where Luke does use Matthew's additions to Mark, viz. the texts usually dubbed as 'Mark-Q overlaps' on the Two Source theory (2ST). Hence Luke does not always ignore Matthew's additions to Mark: it is only the description of the data, talk of 'overlaps' already presupposing the 2ST, that hides this. A very similar point is made in his discussion of the so-called 'minor agreements' and of the claim that these agreements are all so 'minor' which makes it hard to see why Luke was influenced by Matthew in such trivial ways. Again Goodacre points out that this ignores the so-called 'overlap' passages where there are in fact major agreements between Matthew and Luke: the labelling of the passages as 'overlaps' then excludes them from consideration and skews the evidence.

The point may be valid in the abstract but again the 'light touch' approach sidelines significant difficulties which these 'overlap' texts provide for any 'case against Q'. In these passages, one can indeed refer to Luke's use of Matthew's additions to Mark, and/or to extensive non-trivial Matthew-Luke agreements. However, any non-Q theory has to explain Luke's apparently almost pathological refusal in some of these texts to use any Markan material at all (e.g. the Beelzebul controversy, or the Mustard Seed). As Gerald Downing argued many years ago, Luke's procedure on the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre model appears totally at odds with his procedure elsewhere (where, according to Goodacre and others, Luke knows Mark far better than Matthew and uses Mark in preference to Matthew). In these passages, Luke must have studiously avoided all the points where Matthew and Mark agree and reproduced only Matthew's additions to Mark. (On the 2ST, Luke generally reproduces Q, and Matthew conflates Q with Mark.) Goodacre contents himself with the general point about Luke's using Matthew's additions to Mark, and/or referring to different levels of 'agreements' against Mark here; he talks about a 'broad spectrum' and a 'sliding scale' (p. 161) or a 'continuum' (p. 163) of the level of Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark. However, he never analyses any of these 'overlap' passages in any detail. And in terms of any 'broad spectrum', the trouble is that there is not much by way of a 'continuum': there are examples at both ends of the spectrum but not much in between.

Goodacre also makes much of the argument he claims is used by Q defenders about the difficulty of conceiving Luke's rearrangement of Matthew's order. He takes up Streeter's famous (or infamous) dismissal of Luke's alleged procedure as that of a 'crank'. However, Goodacre subtly but significantly shifts the argument into a form that (as far as I am aware) no defender of Q today would espouse. He says that proponents of Q argue that Matthew's order is very appropriate, and that Luke's reordering is inconceivable, as though Luke's order in absolute terms is inferior and lacks coherence or rationale. Such an argument is of course easy to knock down and Goodacre does so to good effect. Luke's ordering can be shown to make good sense with its own coherence and reason: a fact that Goodacre shows well in relation to Luke 11:1-13 and Luke 12:13-24.

The difficulty here is that this is not quite the argument that Q defenders have used. No one has ever doubted that Luke's order may make (Lukan) sense. The argument is not that Luke's order *per se* is incoherent; it is that Luke's *changes to Matthew's order* may be difficult to conceive. Why then does Luke break up Matthew's own ordering in ways that look at times arbitrary and difficult? Goodacre has a relatively easy time showing that his chosen sections in Luke 11 and 12 make good Lukan sense with a coherent Lukan thread running through them. He might be harder pressed to explain how/why Luke relocated Matt 11:11f.; 5:18 and 5:32 in Luke 16:16-18, and how/why all these form a coherent thread within the argument of Luke 16. But no one today would deny that Luke's ordering can be seen to have some rhyme and reason to it.

There are similar difficulties with Luke's possible redaction of Matthew. Goodacre has a relatively easy time showing that in the first beatitude, Luke's interest in the poor can more than adequately explain the differences between Matthew and Luke here. It is surely rather harder to explain why Luke objected to texts like Matt 5:8 and the blessing on those who show 'mercy' (cf. Luke 10:29-36; Goodacre's appeal to Luke's interest in developing ideas of poverty and eschatological reversal in his version of the beatitudes [p. 70] might explain some relocation of the extra Matthean beatitude, but hardly its total omission). So too it is not so easy to see why Luke objected to say Matt 23:34 (Jesus himself sending envoys) and introduced the theme of persecuted Wisdom sending prophets etc in the past (Luke 11:49). Interestingly, Goodacre does not follow Goulder in claiming that Luke is secondary to Matthew at every point in the tradition: he refers to the Lord's Prayer and the accounts of the Last Supper as examples of possible liturgical influence on Luke as explaining alternative, independent versions of the same tradition. But while such an explanation of these two traditions is entirely reasonable, it is doubtful if such an explanation will work with other examples. In any case, if appeal is made too often to parallel traditions (oral or otherwise) available to Luke independently of Matthew, some form of 'Q' starts creeping in by the back door again!

Goodacre has produced a well-argued, sustained defence of a form of the 'case against Q' and all discussions of the synoptic problem (as well as of 'Q') will have to take it seriously. To register here a comment or two about the lack of detail at times in Goodacre's analysis may appear churlish; but as all who have struggled with the synoptic problem know all too well, the devil is in the detail!

CHRISTOPHER TUCKETT

MATTHIAS WALTER, *Gemeinde als Leib Christi: Untersuchungen zum Corpus Paulinum und zu den "Apostolischen Vätern"*. NTOA 49 (Freiburg, CH: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001). 346 pp. ISBN 3-7278-1257-5; 3-525-53942-8.

Die vorliegende überarbeitete Dissertation (1998 bei G. Theißen) gehört zu einer ganzen Reihe neuerer Heidelberger Studien und anderer Untersuchungen, die einzelnen neutestamentlichen metaphorischen Bildfeldern gelten: C. Hezser, *Lohnmetaphorik und Arbeitswelt in Mt 20.1-6*, NTOA 15 (Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990); P. von Gemünden, *Vegetationsmetaphorik im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*, NTOA 18 (1992); T. Roh, *Die "familia Dei" in den synoptischen Evangelien*, NTOA 37 (2001); vgl. auch I. A. H. Combes, *The Metaphor of Slavery in the Writings of the Early Church*, JSNT. SS 156 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); G. Dawes, *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Letter of Ephesians 5:21-33* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); M. J. Harris, *Slave of Christ: A New Testament Metaphor for Total Devotion to Christ*, NStBTh 8 (Downers Grove: IVP; Leicester: Apollos, 2001); R. Zimmermann, *Geschlechtermetaphorik und Gottesverhältnis*, WUNT II, 122 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

Unter den ersten Christen wurde eine Fülle von Bildern verwendet, um die neue gegenseitige christliche Gemeinschaft zu beschreiben. Die Metapher vom Leib bildete einen dieser Versuche, "das Unsagbare oder wenigstens Aspekte des Unsagbaren in Worte zu fassen" (6). Der Darstellung dieser Aspekte widmet sich Walters Studie. Nach einem gründlichen Forschungsüberblick (8-37) vom Beginn der modernen Forschung zum ekklesiologischen "Leib Christi", kommt er über die verschiedenen religionsgeschichtlichen Zugänge und Ergebnisse, die inner-