John C. Poirier – Jeffrey Peterson (eds.), *Marcan Priority without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis* (Library of New Testament Studies 455; London: Bloomsbury – New York: T&T Clark, 2015). Pp. XIV + 272. $110,00. ISBN 978-0-56715-913-7.

BARTOSZ ADAMCZEWSKI

Faculty of Theology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
address: Zamiejska 6, 03-580 Warsaw, Poland; e-mail: b.adamczewski@uksw.edu.pl

This volume can be regarded as a thematic continuation of the book *Questioning Q*, which appeared in 2004 as a collection of articles devoted to the critique of the so-called 'Two-Document hypothesis' (= 2DH). However, in difference to that book, the present volume not only criticizes the 2DH, but also contains arguments for a particular alternative hypothesis, namely the so-called 'Farrer hypothesis' (= FH), which consists in postulating the Mark-Matthew-Luke order of direct literary dependence of the Gospels, and eliminates the hypothetical 'Q source'.

In the introduction to the volume (pp. 1-15), John C. Poirier clarifies its main title. He notes that although the label 'Marcan Priority without Q' is welcomed by many supporters of the FH, it is quite ambiguous because it can also be applied to the opposite hypothesis, espoused by the present reviewer, namely that of the Mark-Luke-Matthew order of direct literary dependence, also without the hypothetical 'Q source' (the so-called 'Matthean posteriority hypothesis' = MPH). Moreover, Poirier explains the factors which nowadays encourage more numerous scholars to adopt the FH (and in fact also MPH), rather than the 2DH: (*a*) increased awareness that the evangelists were creative writers and reshapers of earlier material, rather than strict compilers; (*b*) wider acceptance of the view that Luke wrote in response to other Gospels; (*c*) increased awareness of Luke's literary ability; and (*d*) wider acceptance of a late date for Luke.

Eric Eve (pp. 16-43) analyses the Beelzebul controversy in the Gospels from the point of view of the FH. He argues that Mt 12:22-37 can be regarded as an expansion of Mk 3:20-30, and Lk 11:14-23 as a reworking of Mt 12:22-37. Accordingly, he argues that the hypothetical 'Q source' can be omitted here. However, he does not offer any detailed arguments for Luke's use of Matthew, and not vice versa. For example, the agreement in order

between Lk 11:14-28 and Mt 12:22-50 is simply taken as an argument for Luke's dependence on Matthew, without considering the reverse possibility, including the understanding of Lk 11:27-28 as Luke's original composition, and not as a reworking of Mt 12:46-50, especially in view of the fact that a similar Lucan original composition, not suggested by the text of Matthew, can also be found in Lk 23:28-29.

Stephen C. Carlson (pp. 44-61) analyses the non-aversion principle, which was used by some defenders of the 2DH to make the judgments concerning redactional traits of a given evangelist non-reversible. According to this principle, a given feature can be only identified as truly secondary if the other evangelist in a compared Gospel had no aversion to it; otherwise, the other evangelist could also have been secondary in his omission of this feature for his particular reasons. Carlson shows that the use of this apparently logical principle in Lk 20:47-21:4 par. Mk 12:40-44 in fact leads to erroneous results because Luke often changed Marcan vocabulary even if he was elsewhere not averse to it. Therefore, it can be argued that the use of this principle cannot lead to conclusive (non-reversible) results because the evangelists could freely change the wording of earlier Gospels for some barely identifiable reasons. Consequently, merely linguistic considerations cannot conclusively solve the synoptic problem, especially if they are applied to isolated fragments of the Gospels.

Heather M. Gorman (pp. 62-81) assesses the plausibility of the FH against the background of ancient rhetorical tradition, as it is witnessed in the extant *progymnasmata* and rhetorical handbooks. In her opinion, the overall order of the Lucan Gospel, which includes, as she argues, the section mainly concerning Jesus' deeds (Lk 4:14-9:50) and the section mainly concerning Jesus' teaching (Lk 9:51-19:28), suits Quintilian's advice that an encomium could include such sections. One might debate whether Quintilian's phrase *operum (id est factorum dictorumque) contextus* (*Inst.* 3.7.15 [*sic*]) in fact refers to such large sections and whether the Lucan Gospel really contains such two major parts, and consequently whether Luke's Gospel is really well arranged (cf. Lk 1:3) in terms of ancient rhetoric. Likewise, Gorman's argument that Luke considerably shortened and rearranged Matthew's Sermon on the Mount for the sake of rhetorical brevity and clarity is not very persuasive, given Luke's predilection for quite elaborate speeches elsewhere in the Gospel and Acts.

Mark Goodacre (pp. 82-100) rightly argues that the instances of very high Mt-Lk verbal agreement in their 'double tradition', reaching uninterrupted strings of 24-27 identical words in the same order in Lk 3:8-9; 7:8-9; 10:21-22; 11:32; 16:13 par., in fact disprove the 2DH, and favour the hypothesis of Mt-Lk

direct literary dependence. However, his argument that the higher Mt-Lk verbal agreement in their 'double tradition' than in the 'triple tradition' is best explained by the FH is alas unconvincing. The fact that, as Goodacre rightly notes, the highest verbal agreement can mainly be found in Mt-Lk and Mt-Mk pairs, and much more rarely in Lk-Mk pairs, in reality favours the MPH, according to which Matthew consistently rather faithfully copied from both Mk and Lk, and not the FH, according to which Luke surprisingly oscillated between a relatively free mode of literary reworking (Lk-Mk) and a relatively faithful one (Lk-Mt). Such an oscillating pattern of literary reworking of earlier texts (e.g. Paul's letters) is also absent in Acts.

Ken Olson (pp. 101-118), similarly to Stephen C. Carlson, argues that Luke could have omitted the unparalleled Matthean expressions in the Lord's Prayer because they repeat ideas which are expressed earlier in the text, and Luke generally avoided repetitions. However, Olson fails to explain the fact that the idea of subjection to God's will was evidently important for Luke at crucial points of his narrative (Lk 22:42; Acts 21:14), so its omission in the model prayer of the disciples (Lk 11:2-4) would be really surprising.

Andris Abakuks (pp. 119-139) applies several models of statistical analysis to Matthew's and Luke's use of Mark. The simple chi-square test, time series modelling using logistic regression, as well as using hidden Markov models, commonly reveal that in the so-called 'triple tradition' both the FH and the MPH are more plausible than Matthew's and Luke's independent use of Mark, with no particular clue as to the superiority of the FH over the MPH or vice versa. The use of hidden Markov models also suggests that Matthew's or Luke's rather loose, so maybe somehow correlated reworking of Mark can most likely be found in Mk 1:40-44; 2:8-12; 3:28-33; 6:37-44; 12:36-38 parr. Abakuks's analyses would be even more persuasive if he used the NA[28] and not the NA[25] edition of the text of the Gospels.

Jeffrey Peterson (pp. 140-159) notices some important Mt-Lk thematic and linguistic agreements against Mk in the conclusions of the Gospels (and in the birth stories). He also argues that they are best explained by the FH, and not by the MPH. However, the arguments for the latter claim are rather weak. The Lucan repeated references to 'the eleven' (Lk 24:9.33; Acts 1:26; 2:14) are understandable after Judas' betrayal (Lk 22:3.47-48), but in Matthew's Gospel the phrase 'the eleven' appears only once, in a text thematically related to Luke (Mt 28:16 par. Lk 24:33.36). On the other hand, the allegedly Matthean verb *proskyneō* (Mt 28:16 par. Lk 24:52) was repeatedly used not only by Matthew, but also by Luke. The scriptural justification of the mission to 'all the nations' is hardly more explicit in Luke (Lk 24:46-47) that it is in Matthew (Mt 28:18-19; cf. Dan 7:14 LXX), and in any case such

a phenomenon cannot be taken as proving only one direction of reworking. Likewise, the Matthean idea of Jesus' spiritual presence with his disciples (Mt 28:20; cf. 18:20) can be taken as a reworking of the Lucan idea of Jesus' presence in the Spirit (Lk 24:49; Acts 1:4-5.8 etc.), and not vice versa. Notwithstanding these difficulties, Peterson's idea that the relationship between Matthew and Acts should be analysed more carefully is certainly insightful.

David Landry (pp. 160-190) argues for a late dating of Luke (*c*. AD 115-160) on the basis of Luke's use of Mark, Matthew, John, Josephus, and Paul (with the Pastoral Epistles), and on the other hand Marcion's and Justin's use of Luke. Even if the direction of the dependence between Luke and John was in fact reverse, and Luke's use of Matthew is something that Landry wants to prove, the other arguments are generally correct. On the other hand, Landry's arguments for an earlier dating of Matthew (*c*. AD 80-90), in order to prove the FH, are much weaker because they rely on the debatable dating of the letters of Ignatius of Antioch, which post-date Matthew, to *c*. AD 110.

John C. Poirier (pp. 191-225) rightly criticizes Delbert Burkett's recent support of the 2DH by pointing to his outdated understanding of the evangelists as slavish copyists and compilers of earlier sources, and not as creative authors and composers of literary works. Poirier's critique of Burkett mainly refers to the contested plausibility of various aspects of Luke's reworking of Matthew. Such issues are notoriously difficult to solve in a convincing way. For example, the FH argument concerning Luke's postulated 'editorial fatigue' in his reworking of Matthew in fact refers to the difference between Luke's greater *variatio locutionis* and Matthew's greater uniformity in style and vocabulary. Therefore, it can endlessly be debated whether it was Luke who introduced the variation into Matthew's text, or it was Matthew who uniformed the style of the Lucan material. However, the text-critical rule *lectio difficilior potior faciliori* favours Matthew's corrective uniformization of the original Lucan variation.

John S. Kloppenborg's article (pp. 226-244) is included in this volume as a response to the FH from the point of view of the 2DH. The scholar rightly argues that in some places of the Mt-Lk material (e.g. Lk 11:14-15.19-20 par.) the Lucan version seems to be more primitive than the Matthean one. On the other hand, he also concedes, alas only offering the argument from the late dating of Luke, with no discussion on the dating of Matthew, that in other sections (e.g. the resurrection narratives) Luke might have been influenced by Matthew. Consequently, Kloppenborg opts for a more complex synoptic model, including the influence of the *Gospel of Thomas*, oral traditions, multiple oral performances of texts, vagaries of human memory, etc. He also postulates analyzing ancient practices of reworking other texts

in order to give some control points for our modern assessments concerning plausibility or implausibility of various postulated synoptic transformations.

In brief, the volume is concerned with the FH as opposed to the 2DH, with no significant interaction with the 'mirror' solution, namely the MPH. Moreover, as often happens in the discussion on the synoptic problem, the three Gospels are generally only compared with one another, as though they were written in a literary vacuum. Paul's letters, classical and Hellenistic literature, etc. have not been taken into consideration as potential hypotexts for the Gospels. Therefore, although the volume presents numerous interesting observations concerning the direct literary relationship between Matthew and Luke, much work in this field has still to be done.

Recenzje