

SELF-CONTRADICTION IN THE IQP? A REPLY TO MICHAEL GOULDER

ROBERT A. DERRENBACKER, JR.

rderrenbacker@tyndale.to

Tyndale Seminary, 25 Ballyconnor Court, Toronto, ON M2M 4B3 Canada

JOHN S. KLOPPENBORG VERBIN

kloppen@chass.utoronto.ca

University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, ON M5S 1J4 Canada

The publication of the first volumes of the database and reconstruction of Q by the International Q Project [IQP]¹ has now elicited a thoughtful critique by Michael D. Goulder, longtime advocate of Austin Farrer's "Mark-without-Q" hypothesis.² Goulder's contention is that the IQP's criteria for the recon-

¹ The database, *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q through Two Centuries of Gospel Research*, under the general editorship of James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, will be complete in approximately thirty-one volumes. To date the following have appeared: Shawn Carruth and Albrecht Garsky, *Q 11:2b–4* (ed. Stanley D. Anderson; Leuven: Peeters, 1996); Shawn Carruth and James M. Robinson, *Q 4:1–13, 16* (ed. Christoph Heil; Leuven: Peeters, 1996); Paul Hoffmann, Josef Amon, Thomas Hieke, M. E. Boring, and Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, *Q 12:8–12* (ed. Christoph Heil; Leuven: Peeters, 1997); Albrecht Garsky, Christoph Heil, Thomas Hieke, Josef Amon, *Q 12:49–59* (ed. Shawn Carruth; Leuven: Peeters, 1997); Paul Hoffmann, Stefan H. Brandenburger, Ulrike Brauner, and Thomas Hieke, *Q 22:28–30* (ed. Christoph Heil; Leuven: Peeters, 1998). A one-volume critical edition of Q has now appeared: James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis* (Hermeneia Supplements; Leuven: Peeters; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

² Michael D. Goulder, "Self-Contradiction in the IQP," *JBL* 118 (1999): 506–17. Goulder's advocacy of Lukan dependence on Matthew has been articulated in a series of publications, the most substantial of which is *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; JSNTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989). Farrer's thesis of Luke's dependence on Matthew, coupled with Markan priority, can be found in "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (ed. Dennis E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 57–88; repr. *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal* (ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 321–56.

struction of Q are contradictory. The principal criterion adopted by the IQP for reconstructing Q, he says, “is that a word or phrase is characteristic of one of the evangelists, *and so is likely to be his redaction*.”³ But, Goulder argues, Q’s language and phraseology are in fact strongly Matthean. This makes the IQP’s procedure illogical; faced with a Matthew–Luke disagreement in the double tradition, the IQP opts for Luke’s formulation because Matthew’s formulation is Matthean.

It must be conceded at once that, on Goulder’s description of the matter, there is indeed a contradiction; but it is not a *self*-contradiction on the part of the IQP. This is because, as far as we can tell, the IQP does not share the supposition that the language of Q is overwhelmingly Matthean. On the contrary, Q’s language is sometimes reflected in Matthew’s formulations, sometimes in Luke’s. Nevertheless, if Goulder’s point about Q’s language turned out to be correct, the reconstruction of Q would have to be rethought. Should Q’s language be overwhelmingly Matthean, the IQP would be obliged to reconstruct Q following Matthew. But then Q would become virtually indistinguishable from Matthew, and there would remain no reasonable grounds for distinguishing Q from Matthew, at least on grounds of language. There might still exist other grounds for supposing that Matthew and Luke used a common source—for example, logical difficulties in deriving the sequence and arrangement of Luke’s double tradition directly from Matthew’s sequence. But in practice our view of Q would change dramatically. Recent works on Q have assumed or argued that Q is distinguishable from Matthew (and Luke) on several registers, including the significance of the death of Jesus, the understanding of the Torah, and the function of miracles.⁴ With Goulder, all this would change.

In this reply to Goulder, we would like to address four issues: first, the IQP’s general procedure in reconstructing the text of Q; second, the logic of Goulder’s argument that reduces “Q” to Matthew; third, Goulder’s argument that Q’s language and thought are predominantly Matthean; and finally, the distinctive (i.e., non-Matthean and non-Lukan) features of Q.

³ Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 506 (emphasis original). Similarly, idem, “Is Q a Juggernaut?” *JBL* 115 (1996): 671: “[T]he modern editor of Q has to balance his [*sic*] judgment which wording is the *less characteristic* of the respective evangelist and opt for that, or otherwise conjecture a third possibility. The reconstruction of Q is based on its vocabulary being *unlike* that of Matthew and Luke” (emphasis original). It would be difficult to justify the final claim with reference to any of the existing reconstructions of Q.

⁴ See, e.g., David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 22–23, 43–43, 45.

I. The IQP's Reconstruction of Q

Goulder has drawn attention to the fact that the IQP never clearly articulates its principles for reconstructing Q, even though it is possible to infer some general principles from the "Evaluation" lemma for each variation unit.⁵

For the benefit of those who have not consulted any of the *Documenta Q* volumes, it should be pointed out that *Documenta Q* attempts three things. First, the IQP determined a set of synoptic texts that have a reasonable likelihood of deriving from Q.⁶ This set comprises texts that over the course of the past 160 years have been treated repeatedly in discussions of the scope and reconstruction of Q and includes all of the double-tradition, triple-tradition texts where there is some reason to suspect the presence of Q, and a select number of *Sondergut* texts. These synoptic texts are then divided into variation units. This is done in a manner analogous to the way that text critics divide the text of the New Testament into variation units, each defining a set of variant readings. For example, the variation unit at Q 6:20b¹ has two "variant readings": μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ ἐν πνεύματι (= Matt 5:3), and μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ (= Luke 6:20b).

Second, the variation units are used as convenient points around which to construct a database. This database consists of the arguments that have been advanced by scholars in favor of one or other reconstruction of Q. As a *terminus a quo* for this history of scholarship, the IQP has chosen C. H. Weisse (1838), normally thought to be first to articulate a synoptic theory that included Markan priority and a sayings source that served as the source of Matthew and Luke.⁷ IQP variation units organize scholars' arguments in the same way that text-critical variation units are used to organize manuscripts attesting variant readings. The first and second aspects of the IQP thus lead to a more or less comprehensive database of arguments and statistical data pertinent to the

⁵ Kloppenborg has tried to articulate the general principles for the reconstruction of Q in John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 55–111.

⁶ Not every text that has been proposed for inclusion in Q is discussed. For example, in 1856 C. H. Weisse conjectured that Luke 7:11–17 came from Q, but this suggestion received very little subsequent support. Accordingly, there is no IQP database. On the other hand, a larger number of scholars have suggested that Luke 10:25–28 (Matt 22:34–40) derived from Q rather than from Mark 12:28–34, and accordingly, there is an IQP database even if in the end, it was decided that the pericope was probably not in Q.

⁷ Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte: Kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838). Bibliographies, including items from a standard "Q canon" and sectional bibliographies, are supplied with each *Documenta Q* volume. A comprehensive Q bibliography by David M. Scholer will appear as one of the *Documenta Q* volumes.

reconstruction of Q, including its “original” wording, sequence, and scope. The fact that the IQP database records a particular argument in the database does *not* imply that IQP members would endorse it. Some of the arguments that have been offered in the reconstruction of Q texts are flimsy, reversible, or simply invalid. The aim of the database, rather, is to be as comprehensive and fair as possible in reporting all arguments on all sides and thus to provide a fair account of the state of question.

The final part of each lemma is a set of evaluations by IQP members, normally (a) the author(s) of the database, (b) one or (more usually) two designated respondents, and (c) one or more of the general editors of *Documenta Q*. These evaluations typically sift and evaluate the arguments that have been advanced in the last 160 years, supply fresh assessments and statistics, and propose a reconstruction based on the most compelling arguments and data. Sometimes the evaluators are mainly in agreement; sometimes there are dissents. As with the United Bible Societies’ *Greek New Testament*, the IQP grades its decisions in accordance with the degree of probability that attaches to each: {A} for “virtual certainty”; {B} for “convincing probability”; {C} for “a hesitant probability”; and {D} indicating only a general inclination. {U}, not a grade employed by the UBS, is used by the IQP when there is insufficient data for an informed decision.⁸ Lower grades reflect either the lack of convincing arguments or the lack of comparative data upon which to base a decision, or strong counterargument in favor of another reading.

Goulder suggests that the IQP’s criterion for favoring, say, Luke over Matthew is the presence of Mattheanisms in the Matthean variant and the “Jewish” character of Matthew’s language. For example, he adduces the decision between Luke’s *πάτερ* in Luke 11:2 and Matthew’s *πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* in Matt 6:9, where Luke’s reading is accepted with an {A} grade.⁹ Goulder deduces that the operative criterion is that “Q’s language and thought were different from Matthew’s.”¹⁰ Since Matthew’s phrase is “Jewish,” the IQP has reconstructed Q, a Jewish text, in such a way that it lacks this “Jewish” locution.

This statement of the IQP’s criteria is inaccurate. First, it is simply not the case that the IQP employs “Jewishness”—a remarkably vague and ambiguous term¹¹—as a criterion for reconstruction. What Goulder cited is not the IQP’s

⁸ See Carruth and Garsky, *Q 11:2b–4*, xi.

⁹ This variation is actually treated as two variants: 11:2b⁴ (Luke’s *πάτερ* or Matthew’s *πάτερ ἡμῶν*) and 11:2b⁵ (Matthew’s *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*). See Carruth and Garsky, *Q 11:2b–4*, 75–92, 93–105.

¹⁰ Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 507; similarly, idem, “Juggernaut,” 671, 672.

¹¹ The term, presumably, might refer to Semitisms (Hebraisms or Aramaisms) in Greek; Septuagintisms; idioms such as the circumlocution of the divine name by “heavens” or the use of the

evaluation but arguments of Adolf von Harnack (1907) and T. W. Manson (1937) in the database that Matthew's ἡμῶν and ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς are borrowings from Jewish liturgical usage and therefore secondary.¹² This reasoning is highly problematic. Insofar as Q, like Matthew, is (arguably) a product of the Jesus movement in Jewish Palestine or Syria, a locution representing the Hebrew בְּרֵינֵי בְּשָׁמַיִם cannot be ruled out a priori. It is logically quite unjustified to exclude ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς from Q merely on the grounds that it reflects Jewish liturgical usage, for such influence could have its effects at any of a number of stages of transmission. That Harnack's and Manson's arguments are not repeated in the "Evaluation" section indicates that the IQP regards them as invalid for deciding the wording of Q at this point.

It is not even the case that the IQP's criterion is that the presence of redactional formulations in evangelist A implies that evangelist B reproduces Q. The very construction of the database, which distinguishes, for example, arguments *against* Matt = Q from arguments *in favor of* Luke = Q, suggests that the presence of Mattheanisms in Matthew does not constitute a sufficient reason for favoring Luke. It might be that Luke is *also* secondary (leading to a {D} or {U} grade).

In the case of Q 11:2, Carruth's and Robinson's evaluations on behalf of the IQP are based on three observations. (a) First, the phrases πατήρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and ὁ πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος occurs twenty times in Matthew: it is taken from Mark once (Mark 11:25 = Matt 6:14); Matthew added it to Mark or placed it in Markan contexts three times (12:50; 15:13; 16:17); it appears in editorial contexts four times (6:1; 18:10; 18:14; 18:35); it is found in Q contexts where Luke differs nine times (5:45, 48; 6:9, 26, 32; 7:11, 21; 10:32, 33); and three times it occurs in special material (5:16; 18:19; 23:9).¹³ Although the phrase is

passive voice; formulae and idioms that are found in targumic, Mishnaic, and other rabbinic literature (not all of which is Palestinian); and spatial and other metaphors that reflect a Palestinian environment. Needless to say, Q, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John reflect various of these features and hence, "Jewishness" as such is useless as a criterion, unless it is qualified in a meaningful manner.

¹² Adolf von Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* (Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 2; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1907), 48; Eng. trans.: *The Sayings of Jesus* (New Testament Studies 2; London: Williams & Norgate; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 64: ". . . either accretions which attached themselves to the common prayer during the process of transformation into a solemn congregational prayer in the primitive Jewish Christian communities and under the dominating influence of prayers of the synagogue, or they were added by St. Matthew himself." T. W. Manson, "The Sayings of Jesus," in Henry Dewsbury Alves Major, Thomas William Manson, and Charles James Wright, *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1937); repr. *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949), 168: "Mt.'s phrase is an adaptation of the original 'Father' to conform to Jewish liturgical usage."

¹³ On the Matthean character of the phrase, see Hubert Frankemölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des 'Evangeliums' nach Matthäus* (NTAbh n.F. 10; Münster: Aschendorff, 1974), 161, 163; Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach*

clearly redactional only once (Matt 12:50), its appearance in editorial contexts, and the striking disproportion between occurrences in Matthew, and Mark (once)/Luke (0 + 0) suggests that the phrase is Matthean.¹⁴ (b) Second, the presence of *πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς* in Luke 10:21 and *ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* in Luke 11:13 indicates that Luke has no aversion to the phrase (Mark 11:25 has no parallel in Luke at all). Thus, had it been in Q, Luke would have had no reason to avoid it. (c) Finally, Carruth argues that *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* is more likely a Matthean expansion than a Lukan omission.¹⁵

The arguments, thus, have nothing to do with the “Jewishness” of the phrase or the avoidance of a “Jewish” locution. Robinson expressly rejects such a consideration. Both Matthew and Luke, after all, display “Jewish” features: Matthew demonstrates a preference for circumlocutions of the divine name and Luke strongly prefers Septuagintalisms. The arguments, rather, take the logical form: a phrase or word should be treated as secondary (that is, not deriving from Q), (a) when it can be shown by *reference to Matthew’s treatment of Mark* and by reference to editorial or transitional portions of Matthew that Matthew has a tendency to add the phrase or word, *and* (b) when Luke has no aversion to the phrase or word. (The same logic applies *mutatis mutandis* to Lukan phrases and words.) Carruth’s final argument is analogous to a frequently invoked criterion in text criticism, *lectio brevior potior est*, that is, it is often simpler to account for expansions than for abbreviations, especially when there is nothing controversial or problematic about the expansion. This is the case, given (a) and (b): it is reasonable to conclude that “who is in the heavens” is more likely an addition by Matthew than an omission by Luke.

These sorts of argument are not strikingly different from those employed in text criticism: when faced with two variant readings (and when equally early and good manuscripts support divergent readings), the text critic looks at the transcriptional tendencies of the manuscripts in question, and, employing criteria such as *lectio brevior potior est* and *lectio difficilior potior est*, argues that, given the nature of the manuscripts involved and the nature of the words or phrases themselves, it is more likely that $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ than that $\beta \rightarrow \alpha$.

It is of course possible that in some cases of Matthew–Luke disagreement,

Matthäus (EKKNT 1/1; Zurich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 46; Eng. trans. *Matthew 1–7* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 65; Wolfgang Schenk, *Die Sprache des Matthäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 382.

¹⁴ Luz (*Matthäus*, 341 n. 60) observes that the oldest attestations of the phrase *אֱלֹהֵינוּ שְׁמַיִם* are in *Mek. Exod.* 81a on 20:25 (Yohanen b. Zakkai, ca. 70 C.E.); *Seder Elijah R.* 28.149 (R. Zadok, after 70 C.E.); *m. Soṭah* 9.15 (Eliezer b. Hyrcanus, ca. 90 C.E.), that is, all about the time of the putative composition of Matthew, but after the putative composition of Q. Neither Carruth nor Robinson refers to this observation.

¹⁵ Carruth and Robinson in Carruth and Garsky, *Q 11:2b–4*, 104–5.

there are strong indications that a phrase or word in Matthew is a redactional preference and that Luke does not have the word at all. Or it is possible that strong indications exist that a phrase or word in Matthew is redactional, but also that Luke has an aversion to the phrase or word in Matthew. In such cases, it is more difficult to know whether the phrase was added by Matthew or deleted by Luke, and one might still prefer to reconstruct with Luke, but at a much lower degree of probability. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to Lukan phrases. This type of scenario is logically no different from cases in text criticism. For example, in Luke 22:43–44, one can cite both reasons that these verses might have been added (to \mathfrak{N}^{*2} D it Justin Irenaeus^{gr} Hippolytus), but also reasons for their omission (from \mathfrak{P}^{75} \mathfrak{N}^a A B).

Thus, whatever argumentative deficiencies might be exhibited in the IQP evaluations—and there are no doubt inconsistencies and errors—the principles in use are neither as simple nor as question begging as Goulder suggests. They are analogous to principles used in text criticism and do not invoke assumptions about the “Jewishness” or “non-Jewishness” of Q.

II. The Logic of Goulder’s Contention

The second objection that Goulder raises to the IQP has to do with the allegedly Matthean quality of Q’s vocabulary and phraseology. There are two aspects to his objection, one having to do with criteriology, and the other, with the logic of the very postulate of Q. First, he (rightly) comments that if Q’s vocabulary were dominantly Matthean, the IQP should have reconstructed Q with Matthew and against Luke. This obviously would result in a text of Q much closer to Harnack’s Q¹⁶ than that of the more recent reconstructions by Siegfried Schulz, Athanasius Polag, Wolfgang Schenk, and the IQP.¹⁷ Goulder’s second argument is more serious, for he argues that if Q’s language and thought are Matthean, if Q and Matthew lived in the same area and in the same decade,¹⁸ it would be reasonable to suppose that Matthew was the author of Q;

¹⁶ Harnack, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, 88–102. Harnack favored the Matthean order of Q (against later scholars) and shows a much stronger inclination to Matthew’s wording than other reconstructions.

¹⁷ Siegfried Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972); Athanasius Polag, *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979); idem, “The Text of Q,” in Ivan Havener, *Q: The Sayings of Jesus* (GNS 19; Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1986), 109–65; Wolfgang Schenk, *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion in deutscher Übersetzung* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1981).

¹⁸ Goulder’s suggestions (“Self-Contradiction,” 517) that Q and Matthew lived in the same area and decade are, as far as we can determine, merely asserted; he provides no argument or evidence.

but then it seems superfluous to posit Q in the first place, since Luke's double tradition must in any case be derived from Matthean wording.¹⁹

For the sake of argument, let us grant Goulder's point about the Matthean character of Q's vocabulary and ask what follows from this. Goulder believes that such a concession would lead to the abandoning of Q as superfluous. But such is not the case. Take the following example:

Suppose that author P composed an essay in two phases: she wrote a short draft (p^d) and then a final form (p^{fin}) in which she substantially rearranged the contents of p^d and added extra material. Naturally, the language of p^d will resemble that of p^{fin} , though its scope and arrangement will not. Suppose further that P's neighbor R discovered one of the two essays by P and used it as the basis for her own essay, r , supplementing it with her own material. Suppose, finally, that we discover both p^{fin} and r and compare the two. We would make several observations. First, we will observe that r contains many P-isms—supposing that R did not so thoroughly rework the essay of P that its origin is obscured. These P-isms might be sufficient to authorize the conclusion that R used the work of P. Second, we might discover that r lacks many of the elements of p^{fin} , elements that one might reasonably expect R to have used had she known them. Finally, we might discover that the material common to p^{fin} and r appears in two quite different arrangements and that is difficult to derive R's *arrangement* of that common material directly from p^{fin} , because P's arrangement of that material is literarily superior.

Faced with these three observations, we would reasonably conclude (a) that R used P's work, but (b) that R did not use p^{fin} , (i) because of R's lack of the additional material in p^{fin} and (ii) because of R's failure to adopt the superior arrangement of p^{fin} . Under these circumstances, we would be justified in suspecting that R had used some other work by P, and one that both lacked the additional material and displayed a different arrangement.

It is not difficult to make the appropriate transferences to the situation of Matthew and Luke. The point is rather simple: Goulder's contention about the Matthean character of Q does not logically lead to the abandonment of Q, if other considerations of the scope and arrangement of Matthew and Luke lead to the deduction that Matthew existed in a prior state.

III. Mattheanisms in Q?

It is beyond the scope of this reply to Goulder to demonstrate that Luke's arrangement of the double-tradition material cannot easily be derived from

¹⁹ Goulder, "Self-Contradiction," 517.

Matthew's arrangement. But a key feature in that demonstration is the fact that after Matt 4:11, Matthew and Luke *consistently* fail to deploy their common double-tradition material (approximately 4,500 words)²⁰ in the *same* relative Markan context. Put differently, on the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis, after Matt 4:11 Luke *always* relocated the double-tradition material he found in Matthew, placing it in another location relative to Mark. It is the scope of Luke's dissection of Matthew and the ability to supply plausible explanations for that dissection that represent daunting challenges to the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis.²¹ On the Two-Document hypothesis, by contrast, the nonagreement between Matthew and Luke in the relative placement of the double tradition is precisely what is expected, since neither Matthew nor Luke could know how the other had combined Q with Mark and hence could not have been influenced by that combination.

For the purposes of this response it is sufficient to show (a) that Goulder's criteria for isolating "Matthean" vocabulary are faulty; (b) that by his own criteria there is also Lukan vocabulary in Q (or, in another form of his argument, Lukan vocabulary in Matthew); and (c) that the inferences he draws from those data are fallacious.

(a) In an effort to determine what is distinctly "Matthean" in the Q passages, Goulder limits his analysis "to phrases rather than to single words: the latter involve problems of definition as to what is to count as Matthean, whereas combinations of words often make the point without raising such

²⁰ Throughout his essay, Goulder uses the figure of 1,800 words that Matthew and Luke have in common, though he does not cite the source of this statistic. Kloppenborg's statistics suggest that Matthew and Luke agree on 2,400 words, 54.08 percent of Matthew's 4,464 Q words and 51.59 percent of Luke's 4,652 Q words. See John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes, & Concordance* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988), 209.

²¹ Goulder (*Luke: A New Paradigm*, 38–39, 40–41) attempts an answer to this problem by arguing that Luke's disagreements with Matthew's placement of the non-Markan material derives from two "policies": (a) his "block policy"—using Mark as a primary source for one or two chapters and then moving to his other source (Matthew), and (b) his "policy" never to agree "with Matthew in the context of a Q saying" (p. 39). This, however, is not an explanation; it only renames the problem. Luke's disagreement with Matthew is converted into an aesthetic preference of Luke with the help of Goulder's assumption of Luke's dependence on Matthew. Moreover, Goulder does not explain why Luke should have a "policy" of never agreeing with Matthew after Matt 4:11. Goulder posits a similar aesthetic preference in order to "explain" Luke's version of the Sermon on the Plain. He suggests that Luke did not "like" long speeches and so reduced Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (pp. 39–40, 346). But this only converts the *fact* that Luke's version is shorter than Matthew's into an aesthetic preference of Luke, with the help of Goulder's source-critical assumption. His assertion, moreover, runs afoul of the fact that Stephen's speech in Acts is fifty-two verses, and that Luke has sixty verses of continuous speech material in Luke 12:1–13:9, interrupted only by a few interjections from the crowd or the disciples. Likewise, Luke 15:1–17:10 comprises seventy-three verses of speech material, loosely connected by occasional interjections. Plainly, Luke can tolerate long speeches.

questions.”²² We agree with Goulder that an analysis of “phrases” or combinations of words is a more effective method to isolate an evangelist’s distinctive style. However, almost half of the seventeen phrases and combinations of words studied by Goulder cannot be treated as distinctly “Matthean” from a statistical point of view.²³ For example, the second phrase discussed by Goulder, γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (“brood of vipers,” 3/0/1Q-0),²⁴ occurs three times in Matthew, once in agreement with Luke (Q 3:7), once in a Q context (Matt 12:34/Luke 6:45, QD) and once in an M passage (Matt 23:33).²⁵ Only two of the instances of the phrase could be deemed “Matthean”; one is paralleled in Luke. Goulder allows his own solution to the Synoptic Problem to affect his use of statistics: QC phrases paralleled in Luke are included with those phrases unparalleled in Matthew to produce the list of “Matthean” phrases and word combinations.

Goulder also deems φύγειν ἀπό (in connection with escaping from hell) to be “Matthean.” This usage occurs twice in Matthew and once in Luke in a Q passage (i.e., 2/0/1-0).²⁶ Again, the designation of a phrase occurring only once in an “M” context as “Matthean” seems highly tendentious.

The same kind of objection can be raised with regard to other members of Goulder’s list of seventeen supposedly “Matthean” phrases and combinations of words: many occur only one to three times in unparalleled sections of Matthew:

(4) πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν κάρπον καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται (Matt 3:10/Luke 3:9Q; Matt 7:19QD, i.e., 2/0/1Q-0).

(6) συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην as opposed to the

²² Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 508.

²³ Goulder’s seventeen examples are: (1) ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (6/0/1Q-0); (2) γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (3/0/1Q-0); (3) φύγειν ἀπό (2/0/1-0); (4) πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν κάρπον καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται (2/0/1Q-0); (5) the pairs καλὸς . . . σαπρὸς (5/0/2Q-0), ἀγαθὸς . . . πονηρὸς (11/0/5Q-0), and φρόνιμος . . . μωρὸς (4/0/0-0); (6) συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην (2/0/1Q-0); (7) ὡσπερ . . . οὕτως ἔσται (4/0/2Q-0); (8) ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία (τῶν οὐρανῶν) (6/0/2Q-0); (9) converse principles of judgment (e.g., Matt 5:19; 6:14–15; 12:37; 6/1?/2Q-0); (10) ὀλιγόπιστοι (4/0/1Q-0); (11) ἄνθρωπος with a noun (6/0/1Q-0); (12) ὁ ἀδελφὸς σου/αὐτοῦ used of another human being (12/0/4Q-0); (13) ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (5/0/2Q-0); (14) εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (3/0/2Q-0); (15) cliché pairs (e.g., Law and Prophets, Tyre and Sidon); (16) pairs of animals (10/0/4Q-0); and (17) the sermon concluding phrase (5/0/1Q!-0). Goulder counts Luke 7:1 as an agreement with Matt 7:28 despite the fact that they do not share a single lexeme.

²⁴ Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 509. The system of numbering is Goulder’s (508 n. 15): n/n/nQ-n = Matthew/Mark/Luke(Q)-the rest of the NT; n/n/n+n = Matt/Mark/Luke + Acts.

²⁵ QC = words common to Matthew and Luke or, in the IQP’s vocabulary, “minimal Q.” QD = Q words where Matthew and Luke differ.

²⁶ Matt 3:7/Luke 3:7 (QC); Matt 23:33 (M).

chaff, which is burned (κατακαύσει) (Matt 3:12/Luke 3:17Q; Matt 13:30M, i.e., 2/0/1Q-0).

(7) ὅσπερ . . . οὕτως ἔσται (4/0/2Q-0).²⁷

(10) ὀλιγόπιστοι (4/0/1Q-0).

(13) ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (5/0/2Q-0).

(14) εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (3/0/2Q-0).

Goulder's definition of words characteristic of an evangelist derives from J. C. Hawkins's criterion. Hawkins defined as words and phrases characteristic of (e.g.) Matthew, words and phrases that occur at least four times in Matthew and either (a) not in Luke at all, or (b) twice as often as in Luke and Mark combined.²⁸ Only three of the phrases and combinations of words listed above fulfill Hawkins's criteria (nos. 7, 10, 13); the others should be excluded. But Hawkins's definition of "characteristic" sets the threshold unreasonably low: four occurrences of a word in one Gospel versus two in another hardly make it "characteristic" of the first.²⁹ Moreover, Goulder uses Hawkins's criterion in a way that the latter would never have countenanced. Hawkins only observed that each of the evangelists introduced favorite vocabulary into source material. He did not use such observations as evidence of the direction of literary dependence. At best, statistics such as 4/0/2Q-0 or 5/0/2Q-0 indicate that the phrase in question is more common in Matthew than it is in Luke. It should be underscored, however, that the far more obvious Mattheanisms such as ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (32/0/0 + 0) or γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταὶ (6/0/0 + 0), both of which occur in Q contexts in Luke, are wholly lacking in minimal Q or Luke. In other words, the "Mattheanisms" that Goulder finds in Q are not obviously Matthean, and the more obvious Mattheanisms are completely lacking in Q.

(b) If for the sake of argument we accept Goulder's use of Hawkins, the criterion produces statistics that are in fact unfavorable to Goulder's own case. For the IQP's text of Q also exhibits vocabulary and phrases *characteristic of Luke*. Goulder himself acknowledges this phenomenon, offering some clarifi-

²⁷ Matt 12:40 (QD); Matt 13:40 (M); Matt 24:37/Luke 17:26 (QC); Matt 24:37/Luke 17:26 (QC); Goulder, "Self-Contradiction," 510.

²⁸ See J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1909), 3, 15. See Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 79–86, 800–809. Obviously, the first possibility (a) is of no use to Goulder, since he is looking for words that occur at least once in Q (and therefore in Luke).

²⁹ Robert Morgenthaler sets the threshold at ten occurrences but makes no stipulations concerning the relative number of occurrences in other Gospels (*Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* [3. Aufl.; Zurich: Gotthelf, 1982], 49–52, 181–82).

cation: “Naturally there are typically Lukan phrases in Q, as there are Lukan words, but they are brief and colorless compared with the Matthean phrases.”³⁰ Also worth noting are Goulder’s comments on the difficulty of identifying vocabulary characteristic of Luke:

Matthew has a somewhat stereotyped style: he uses formulas, and is fairly regular in his vocabulary, as he is also in his doctrinal tendencies. Luke, however, has a rich vocabulary, and a dismaying habit of varying his synonyms. It is therefore much easier to pick out the characteristically Matthean than the characteristically Lukan expression.³¹

Goulder notes the “brilliant counter-test” made by Mark Goodacre to Goulder’s claim “that Matthean wording occurs frequently in Q.”³² Goodacre, who is sympathetic to Goulder’s solution, examined fifty-five pericopae in Q and found a number of words and phrases that are either Lukan or “semi-Lukan.”³³ His study, moreover, “has shown that there is a large number of Lukan words and phrases in Q, frequently in individual pericopae as much characteristic of Luke as there is characteristic of Matthew.”³⁴ Thus, Goodacre concludes that what Goulder calls “the Matthean vocabulary fallacy” allegedly committed by Q theorists “does not stand up to scrutiny.”³⁵

Goodacre recently revisited his argument on the “Synoptic-L” Internet discussion list. In his response to Goulder’s “Self-Contradiction” article, Goodacre states:

In the current article [“Self-Contradiction in the IQP”], Goulder effectively admits the point [concerning Lukanisms in Q] but then attempts to limit its force. He says that “Luke has merely taken on a limited number of brief and unremarkable phrases, which he found congenial” (p. 517). My point was—and still is—that we are not talking about “a limited number” but about a large number, as many striking Lukanisms as there are striking Matthean-

³⁰ Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 516.

³¹ Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 17.

³² Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 516. See Mark Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), esp. 42–88, “QC Words and Characteristic Vocabulary.”

³³ Goulder adds to Hawkins’s list of ninety-seven “Matthean” words (supplemented by thirty-eight additional phrases) a larger number (two hundred) of “semi-Matthean” words and phrases which “either . . . occur twice as often in Matthew as in Mark *and* more often than in Luke; or they are inserted redactionally by Matthew into an agreed Marcan context or OT citation” (*Midrash and Lection in Matthew* [London: SPCK, 1974], 476–85). Goulder notes that some words occur only three times in Matthew, but some of these meet both of the criteria. Goulder uses the term “semi-Lukan” analogously in *Midrash and Lection* (e.g., pp. 283, 304, 305, etc.), but not in *Luke: A New Paradigm*.

³⁴ Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*, 84.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 85.

isms. The fact that the Lukanisms tend to be “brief and unremarkable” is precisely my point: that it is less easy to spot Lukanisms in general because they are (relatively) “brief and unremarkable.”³⁶

Goulder takes issue with Goodacre’s claim that “Luke has a richer, more varied vocabulary, in which ‘characteristic’ groups of words are less frequent and less striking.”³⁷ Against this Goulder asserts that a number of Lukan characteristics can be identified. For example, Luke is fond of “anarthrous fours”;³⁸ he is prone “to have proportions of ten to one”;³⁹ and Luke “may artistically repeat his message in *oratio recta* in a parable.”⁴⁰

Goodacre retorts that “the difficulty of this analysis is that two of the three Lukan locutions isolated by Goulder do occur in Q”—that is, “the proportion ten to one occurs in the Q parable of the Talents/Pounds” (IQP: Q 19:12–13, 15–24, 26, [[27]]), and “*oratio recta* repetitions” are found in Q 6:41–42.⁴¹ As a result, Goodacre can conclude:

I do not think that it would be at all difficult to continue to find examples of the same kind: indeed many more are turned up in Part Two of *Goulder and the Gospels* [pp. 132–291] in which I go through each of Goulder’s special Lukan features, looking each time for examples of the feature in question through all strands of synoptic material, Mk, M, Q, L and R (redactional additions to Mark). Soliloquy in parable material, for example, is common in Luke, but also occurs in Matthew in parallel with Luke (Matt. 24.48/Luke 11.24 [i.e., Q 11:24], see *Goulder and the Gospels*, pp. 169–71).⁴²

We agree with Goodacre that there remain characteristically Lukan words and phrases that appear in Q that are anything but “colorless.” One that comes to mind is the expression ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ: this phrase occurs five times in Matthew, fourteen times in Mark, thirty-two times in Luke, and six times in Acts. The phrase occurs at least nine times in the IQP’s text of Q, with only one

³⁶ Mark S. Goodacre, “‘Self-Contradiction in the IQP’: A Response,” *Synoptic-L* (September 17, 1999). Cited Mar. 2, 2000. Online: <http://www.egroups.com/group/synoptic-l/3102.html?>. Cited by permission of the author.

³⁷ Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 517. See Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels*, 84–85.

³⁸ E.g., ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου (Luke 12:19), or πτωχοῦς, ἀναπεύρους, χωλοῦς, τυφλοῦς (Luke 14:13, 21) (“Self-Contradiction,” 517).

³⁹ E.g., “ten lepers with one grateful [Luke 17:11–19], ten drachmas with one lost [Luke 15:8–10], ten servants with a mina apiece [Luke 19:11–27], fifty dinars and five hundred [Luke 7:40–43],” (“Self-Contradiction,” 517).

⁴⁰ Goulder, “Self-Contradiction,” 517. E.g., “he came seeking fruit on it and found none . . . I have been coming seeking fruit on this fig tree and found none” (Luke 13:6–7); “Which of you wanting to build a tower . . . and not being able to complete it . . . This man began to build and could not complete” (Luke 14:28–29).

⁴¹ Goodacre, “Self-Contradiction in the IQP: A Response.”

⁴² *Ibid.*

of those occurrences classified as QC (Q 11:20/Matt 12:28). Moreover, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ occurs in at least two *Sondergut* texts that are possible candidates for inclusion in Q (Q 9:60b–62; 17:20–21 [3x]).

Goulder's purported discovery of Mattheanisms in Q (or Luke) is, hence, troubled by both statistical and logical problems: two to five occurrences of a phrase in Matthew are hardly sufficient to make it Matthean, especially when there are Lukan occurrences of the same phrase; and, as we have pointed out, Goulder's designation of phrases as Matthean presupposes his assumption of Luke's use of Matthew. His argument is thus circular. Moreover, the presence of alleged Mattheanisms in Q (or Luke) is scarcely an indication that Q is Matthean, or that Luke used Matthew, since Goodacre's finding of Lukanisms in Matthew (and hence in Q) would "prove" precisely the contrary: that Q is Lukan and that Matthew used Luke!

(c) Goulder's argument concerning Mattheanisms appears in a different form in earlier articles, where he suggests that the presence of Mattheanisms in Luke and the Matthean character of the minor agreements indicate that Luke copied Matthew and so inadvertently took over these Mattheanisms.⁴³ This argument is an updated version of one first made by Eduard Zeller, a defender of the Griesbach hypothesis.⁴⁴ Zeller argued that in cases where Gospel A uses a word several times and Gospel B uses the word only once or twice and *only in contexts parallel to those of Gospel A*, one can conclude that B used A. Zeller's results were mixed, with seventy-eight words and phrases allegedly supporting Matthean priority and thirty-one supporting Markan priority. Despite the seemingly inconclusive nature of his statistics, Zeller declared that there was an "overburdening proportion" (p. 532) favoring Matthew.⁴⁵

There are several problems with Zeller's list: C. M. Tuckett noted that the list included many instances where a word that occurs once in Mark and twice in Matthew or twice in Mark and three times in Matthew is declared to be "characteristically Matthean"⁴⁶—the same difficulty that we have noted apropos of Goulder's list. The more serious problem is with the logic of Zeller's inference. Zeller seemed to take the matter to be one of democracy, the Matthean vocabulary winning in a vote against the Markan. This is hardly a

⁴³ Michael D. Goulder, "On Putting Q to the Test," *NTS* 24 (1978): 218–34; idem, "Juggernaut?"; idem, "Luke's Knowledge of Matthew," in *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991* (ed. Georg Strecker; GTA 50; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 143–60.

⁴⁴ Eduard Zeller, "Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie 4: Vergleichende Uebersicht über den Wörtervorrath der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller," *Theologische Jahrbücher* (Tübingen) 2 (1843): 443–543, esp. 527–31. (We are indebted to David Peabody for sending us a copy of this article.)

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 532.

⁴⁶ C. M. Tuckett, "The Griesbach Hypothesis in the 19th Century," *JSNT* 3 (1979): 29–60, 69 n. 57.

secure basis for a conclusion of Matthean priority. The only secure basis for a directional inference is when it can be determined that a phrase in Gospel A is the editorial work of its author and when the phrase is found in a parallel position in Gospel B. But this is not what Zeller's (or Goulder's) vocabulary demonstrates. On the contrary, Zeller and Goulder have only shown that particular lexemes and phrases are more common in Gospel A than in Gospel B. If the vocabulary that Zeller had isolated was indeed unassailably redactional, then its presence in parallel Markan passages would indicate Mark's dependence on Matthew. And the Markan vocabulary that appeared in Matthew would indicate the contrary, thus leaving us with a logical contradiction.

What Zeller did not consider was the possibility that vocabulary appearing a few times in one Gospel would be taken over and expanded in its successor Gospel. These are precisely the points that Goulder made against William Farmer's reiteration of Zeller's argument in 1984:

But [Farmer's argument] is a fallacy. A's favorite expressions may not have appealed to B; indeed they may be classified as favorite *because* they did not appeal to B. Sometimes later B may copy in expressions of earlier A inadvertently; and sometimes a casual expression of earlier A may appeal strongly to B so that he uses it often.⁴⁷

To illustrate the final point, Goulder noted that he had taken over some of Austin Farrer's favorite phrases, some inadvertently, others used more often. He continues:

I do not wish to seem hard on Farmer, as I made virtually the same error of method myself in a paper to the SNTS seminar in 1981, where Farmer was present. Three of my instances of "inadvertent" carrying over of a characteristic Matthean phrase by Luke were on Hawkins' list [*Horae Synopticae*, 170–71]: "you generation of vipers!," "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," "and it came to pass when Jesus finished these sayings." They might just be Q phrases that Matthew liked very much; though there are other reasons in fact for preferring the inadvertence explanation, which I offered.⁴⁸

It is logically possible that the Matthean phrases collected by Goulder are Luke's borrowings from Matthew; but it is equally possible that they are Q phrases taken over by Matthew and expanded, and taken over by Luke without significant elaboration. This type of explanation is precisely what the Two Doc-

⁴⁷ William R. Farmer, "Certain Results Reached by Sir John C. Hawkins and C.F. Burney which Make More Sense if Luke Knew Matthew . . .," in *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; JSNTSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 75–98; and Goulder's reply: "Some observations on Professor Farmer's 'Certain Results . . .,'" *ibid.*, 105–9, here 100.

⁴⁸ Goulder, "Some observations," 100.

ument hypothesis invokes to account for such phenomena on Goulder's list as (1) ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (6/0/1Q-0); (2) γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (3/0/1Q-0); (3) φύγειν ἀπὸ (2/0/1-0); (4) πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν κάρπον καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται (2/0/1Q-0); (6) συναΐζει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην (2/0/1Q-0); (10) ὀλιγόπιστοι (4/0/1Q-0); and (14) εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (3/0/2Q-0). Matthew saw the potential of certain phrases that he found in Q and expanded their usage.

The same explanation must be given by both the Two Document hypothesis and the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis for Matthew's expansion of Mark: Matthew used Markan phrases such as υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, enhancing its use in 13:37, 41; 16:13, 28; 26:2, and Mark's υἱὸς Δαβὶδ (10:47–48 = Matt 20:30–31; Mark 12:35–37 = Matt 22:41–45), adding it in 1:20; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 21:9 [cf. Mark 11:10]; 21:15. On the logic of Zeller's argument, however, Mark should be dependent on Matthew. Goulder, of course, does not countenance such an argument when it comes to the relation of Matthew to Mark; he is satisfied to hold that Matthew has developed Markan usages. Thus it seems logically inconsistent when he claims that the same argument maintains its force when it comes to the relationship of Matthew to Luke.⁴⁹ The same logic applies to Lukan expressions. It is well known that Luke employs gender-paired couplets: Simeon and Anna (2:25–38); Elijah and the widow, Elisha and Naaman (4:25–27); the centurion's slave and the widow's son (7:1–17); the queen of the south and the men of Nineveh (11:31–32); ravens who sow and lilies who spin (12:24, 27); the bent woman and the dropsical man (13:10–17; 14:1–6); the man who sowed mustard and the woman who hid yeast (13:18–21); the man who lost a sheep and the woman who lost a drachma (15:4–10); men on a couch and women at the grindstone (17:34–35); and the persistent woman and the toll collector (18:2–14). On the Two Document hypothesis, Luke saw gender pairing in Q (11:31–32; 12:24, 27; 13:18–21; 15:4–10;⁵⁰ 17:34–35)⁵¹ and developed this. Matthew, by contrast, did nothing to enhance gender pairing and in fact omitted the parable of the drachma. On the logic of Zeller's argument, Matthew betrays knowledge of Lukan gender pairing and must therefore be dependent on Luke. Again, Goulder cannot countenance Zeller's argument in this application.

⁴⁹ C. M. Tuckett made a similar point in "The Existence of Q," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (ed. R. A. Piper; NovTSup 75; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 19–47, esp. 35–36.

⁵⁰ The IQP has included Luke 15:8–10 in Q {C} on the basis of a database by John S. Kloppenborg and evaluations by Kloppenborg, Ronald A. Piper, and James M. Robinson.

⁵¹ On gender pairing in Q, see William E. Arnal, "Gendered Couplets in Q and Legal Formulations: From Rhetoric to Social History," *JBL* 116 (1997): 75–94; Alicia Batten, "More Queries for Q: Women and Christian Origins," *BTB* 24 (1994): 44–51.

Zeller's principle is reversible and could be used to subvert Goulder's assumptions of Markan priority and of Luke's dependence on Matthew. Since the principle produces logically contradictory conclusions, it is invalid for determining the direction of dependence.

IV. Distinctive Features of Q

It is obvious that any document that is reconstructed from two successor documents will display some of the features of one or both successors. Hence, it is quite wrong to state, as Goulder does, that "[t]he reconstruction of Q is based on its vocabulary being *unlike* that of Matthew and Luke."⁵²

On the other hand, it is perfectly conceivable that, although a source document is fully embedded in later documents, as Q is embedded in Matthew and Luke, certain features might stand out in the source that are not so obvious in the successor documents. This is indeed the case with Q. Although Q contains sayings, *chreiai*, and stories of varied character and rhetorical form, it is unified by at least three overarching themes, none of which is particularly Matthean (or Lukan).

1. First, as Arland Jacobson has shown, the Deuteronomistic interpretation of the history of Israel and its characterization of prophets as repentance preachers dominate Q's structure.⁵³ Deuteronomistic motifs can be found at strategic points throughout Q: Q 6:23c, 11:47–51, and 13:34–35 recall the persistent rejection, persecution, and even murder of the prophets sent by God. Q aligns Jesus' followers with those prophets and their fate (6:22–23) and interprets the role of the Baptist primarily as that of a repentance preacher (Q 3:7–9). He along with Jesus is rejected by "this generation" (7:31–35). Jesus himself is cast in the role of a repentance preacher in 10:13–15 and 11:29–32, where Jonah's role in the repentance of Nineveh is recalled.

What is significant about these Q texts is not only their distribution but their specific locations in Q—at its beginning (3:7–9) and in pericopae that have on other grounds often been identified as redactional. To defend this contention fully would exceed the bounds of this reply to Goulder; suffice it to say that Q

⁵² Goulder, "Juggernaut," 671 (emphasis original).

⁵³ Arland D. Jacobson, "The Literary Unity of Q," *JBL* 101 (1982): 365–89 = "The Literary Unity of Q," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. John S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 98–115. The basic work on Deuteronomistic theology in early Christian literature is Odil H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967).

6:23c, 11:49–51, 13:35b have been frequently and widely considered redactional by a number of scholars of Q.⁵⁴ Equally important for our purposes is the fact that Deuteronomistic theology is hardly present in Mark, reflected perhaps only in Mark 12:1–12. Nor is it developed significantly by Matthew, who takes over Q's references but embeds them in a narrative framework more controlled by messianic, Mosaic, and Davidic motifs and by prophecy-fulfillment patterns. Luke's treatment of Q elaborates somewhat more on the Deuteronomistic themes of repentance and the persecution and death of prophets,⁵⁵ but it is fair to say that such motifs are submerged and recast in a much more complex narrative of a miracle-working benefactor who bests opponents with his fair and direct speech. Deuteronomistic motifs appear in structurally determinative ways in Q's theological contours, but do not in Q's two successor documents; and they are largely absent from Mark.

2. Second, Q displays a striking set of allusions to the Lot cycle.⁵⁶ Q opens with a reference to the *περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, a phrase that in the Tanak occurs principally in connection with the story of Lot (Gen 13:10–12; 19:17, 25, 28). This might be taken as insignificant were it not for the fact that the oracle of John that follows speaks of “fleeing” the coming wrath, warns against reliance on kinship to Abraham, threatens a fiery destruction, and inverts the story of Lot's wife by declaring God's ability to fashion people out of stones or pillars. Further allusions to the Lot cycle occur in Q's threat against inhospitable towns: “I tell you, it will go easier for Sodom on that day than for such a town” (Q 10:12). The Lot story is invoked a final time near the end of Q, explicitly in 17:28–30⁵⁷ and implicitly in 17:34–35. In Q 17:28–30 the destruction of Sodom in the midst of everyday activities is used as a figure of the unanticipated character of the “day of the Son of Man”; in 17:34–35 Q continues this motif by raising the specter of kin or co-workers torn apart, one being “swept away” (*παραλαμβάνεται*) and the other “spared” (*ἀφίεται*), the same pair of verbs appears in Gen 18:26 and 19:17 to describe the destruction of the wicked and the sparing of Lot's family.

Again it is important to note *where* these allusions to the Lot cycle appear:

⁵⁴ For a survey, see John S. Kloppenborg, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” in *Symbols and Strata: Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. Risto Uro; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 65; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 1–66.

⁵⁵ See Robert J. Miller, “Prophecy and Persecution in Luke-Acts” (Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1986).

⁵⁶ Kloppenborg first argued this view in “City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q),” *Semeia* 52 (1990): 145–60, and developed it further in *Excavating Q*, 118–24.

⁵⁷ This saying, which stands in parallel with Q 17:26–27, is attested only in Luke. For a summary of arguments for its inclusion in Q, see Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 194.

in the framework of Q—at the beginning and at the end—and, significantly, in Q 10:12 which is almost certainly the creation of the redactor who joined Q 10:2–12, 16 with 10:13–15).⁵⁸ This implies that the allusions to the Lot cycle are not simply an accident of the heterogeneous traditions absorbed in the collection but derive from purposeful editing at a stage near the main redaction of Q.

While Lot is a key figure for Q, the Lot story does not figure importantly in the architecture of Matthew: Matthew omitted Q 17:28–29 and, as Kloppenborg has suggested elsewhere, seems to misunderstand the allusion to the circuit (כְּסָב) of the Jordan. Matthew associates John's activities with the wilderness of Judah (Matt 3:1), which technically did not include the Jordan Valley (Judg 1:16 LXX B; Ps 63:1). Moreover, he conflated *περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου* with two phrases taken from Mark (*πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία* and *Ἱεροσόλυμα*), which describe the places from which John's audiences come rather than the site of his activities. Hence, the connection with the Lot/Sodom story fades.⁵⁹

Luke is keener to develop allusions to the Lot story, adding the warning in 17:32 to Q's scenario of the coming Son of Man. But Luke's interests focus more on deriving a parenetic message regarding attachment to possessions (17:31–33) than Q's starker warnings about the utter unpredictability and completeness of the coming wrath.

Our point is that, while both Matthew and Luke preserve Q's allusions to Lot and Sodom, neither Matthew nor Luke has preserved the structural significance that the story of Gen 19 has in the architecture of Q. Matthew and Luke have other literary and theological interests that served to submerge Q's interests.

3. Finally, Q invokes the figure of Sophia at several points, explicitly in 7:35, where John and Jesus are depicted as τέκνα Σοφίας, and in 11:49, where Jesus quotes an oracle of Sophia, and implicitly in 10:21–22, where Sophia's attributes of intimacy with God are transferred to Jesus,⁶⁰ and in 13:34–35, widely regarded as an oracle of Sophia. Matthew has obscured some of these features by converting Q's *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς* (7:35) into *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς* (11:19), thus shifting the focus from a characterization of John and Jesus to a characterization of Jesus' works (cf. 11:2: *Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμοτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*).⁶¹ Matthew further masks allusions to Sophia by converting the Sophia oracle in Q 11:49 (*διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν· ἀποστελῶ*

⁵⁸ See Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems," 18–19; David R. Catchpole, "The Mission Charge in Q," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 162.

⁵⁹ Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," 150.

⁶⁰ See John S. Kloppenborg, "Wisdom Christology in Q," *LTP* 34 (1978): 129–47.

⁶¹ Goulder (*Luke: A New Paradigm*, 60–61), contrariwise, argues that Luke, who added 7:29–30 (*Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν*), converted Matthew's *ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς* to *ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς* since he understood Wisdom to mean God (as in

. . .) into Jesus' speech (διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀπόσπελλω . . . , 23:34) and by attaching Q 13:34–35 directly to this oracle as its continuation (Matt 23:37–39). Luke preserves these elements in Q but in a context where the Spirit, not Sophia, is the dominant transcendental agent.

Our point in each of these instances is simple. Q is reconstructed from Matthew and Luke and therefore is contained in Matthew and Luke. Yet when viewed on its own, it exhibits architectural features and theological emphases that are not at all prominent in the two successor documents. Or, to put it differently, Q displays a theological and structural integrity quite apart from the structuring devices of Matthew or Luke. This finding is all the more important because these structuring features *have nothing to do with the basic criteria for the isolation of Q from Matthew and Luke*; there is nothing circular about the discovery of the importance of Deuteronomistic theology, allusions to the Lot cycle, and the role played by Sophia in Q since these features have never been used in order to reconstruct Q. They are not criteria but results. Indeed, we should expect that if Q was in fact a document, composed for particular purposes, it should display its own structuring features.

V. Conclusion

In this reply to Goulder, we have shown, first, that there are inaccuracies with Goulder's description of the IQP's criteria for reconstructing Q and logical problems with his own thesis. The IQP's criteria are not as question begging as Goulder thinks, and his own attempts to isolate "Matthean" style and thought in Q (i.e., Luke) fail on both statistical and logical grounds. Finally, far from collapsing into Matthew from either a stylistic or theological point of view, Q shows itself to be *non-Matthean* in important respects and organized along lines that are not developed (or perhaps even grasped) by Matthew or Luke. This situation is no different from that of Mark: although Matthew and Luke used Mark (taking over some Markanisms), their respective recastings of Mark (the addition of infancy accounts, speech material, appearance stories) altered and obscured some of the basic dynamics of their source. Q and Mark each have their own stylistic and theological integrity. This is precisely what we ought to expect of two *documents* that existed prior to their incorporation by Matthew and Luke.

7:29) and God's works to be his children (as in 7:29). But in that case, Luke also passed over the apologetic notion of the "works of Christ," which was highly congenial to Luke (cf. Acts 10:38: Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διήλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ) in favor of a far more obscure locution.