

Novum Testamentum

Dennis R. MACDONALD, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels*. The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord (Early Christianity and Its Literature 8). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. xv-711 p. 15 × 23. \$69.95

Whoever thought that the Synoptic problem was solved forever was wrong. The most popular solution, the *Two Source* theory, is useful heuristically, but does not resolve all problems, nor do the other proposals. The issue is multifaceted. Dennis MacDonald's *Two Shipwrecked Gospels* proposes a complex, innovative solution to the Synoptic problem; it has all the potential to guide future scholars in resolving the issue. The title of the book refers to two Gospels shipwrecked, that is, lost and survived only by some fragments in quotations of ancient authors. These lost Gospels are Papias's five-volume *Exposition of Logia about the Lord*, attested in a few citations by Eusebius, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Philip of Side, Andrew of Caesarea and John of Scythopolis; and *The Logoi of Jesus*, or the expanded Q (Q+). Q+ is identified as a work that Papias (*Hist. Eccl.* 3,39,16) wrongly assumed to be a variant translation of a Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel. If this were true, then Papias would have had two differing Greek copies of the *logia* that he mistook to be independent translations of a Semitic original. One of these was Matthew's Gospel, and the other Q+, an expanded collection of sayings and stories. According to MacDonald's hypothesis, Q+ was used by the three authors of the canonical Gospels. Papias indicated the sources known to him, and Luke and John were apparently not among them. MacDonald thinks that Luke was written in the early second century, and Luke's reference to many who wrote before him should be interpreted as his having had access not only to Mark and the "Matthean" Gospels but also to Papias' *Exposition*; Papias' influence can be witnessed in Luke 1,1-4 and Acts 1,12-26. For the rest of his Gospel, Luke used Matthew, Mark and Q. MacDonald considers the agreements of Luke and Matthew (against Papias) as an indication of Luke's knowledge of Matthew (Matt 27,3-10 || Acts 1,15-26; Luke 1,79 || Matt 4,16; Luke 22,63-64 || Matt 26,67-68). Several diagrams in the book illustrate the interconnections between the sources (xv; 67), especially the intertextual map to the Q+/Papias Hypothesis (89). This hypothesis consists in: a) Markan priority: Mark was the earliest synoptic Gospel, and served as a source to Matthew and Luke; b) the existence of a lost Gospel: Matthew redacted at least another Gospel, now lost, namely Matthew's Q; c) Mark's knowledge of the lost Gospel: the Markan evangelist knew the same document that informed Matthew; d) Papias's knowledge of Mark, Matthew and the lost Gospel

that sufficiently resembled Matthew, that he took it to be a second Greek translation of Matthew's original; e) Luke's knowledge of Papias's *Exposition* and thus also of Mark, Matthew and the lost Gospel. It would appear that Luke redacted these earlier books about Jesus sequentially, generally preferring Mark to Q, and Q to Matthew. Luke consulted Papias for his preface, Matthew for the infancy narrative, Mark for Jesus' ministry in Galilee, the lost Gospel for Jesus' teaching; further, Mark for the passion narrative, Matthew for Jesus' post-resurrection appearances, and Papias for a few episodes in the Acts of the Apostles.

The second part of the book reconstructs the *Logoi of Jesus* (Q+). Instead of beginning with the agreements between Matthew and Luke, as reconstructions of Q usually do, MacDonald compares Mark and Matthew and scrupulously avoids Luke-Acts, for both authors knew and redacted the same lost Gospel. In Part II, Chap. 4, MacDonald offers six criteria for assessing which details in which of the Gospels represent the earliest version of a tradition (96-97). With these criteria, he searches for sayings that express "inverted priority", that is, sayings that appear to be tradition-historically prior to Mark's version. In a first step, he identifies Matthew's "minimal Q", which is more primitive than the parallel version of Mark. This "minimal Q" contains Matt 5,15.18.23-24.29-30.32; 7,1-2; 10,23.26-27.32-33.34-35.38-39.40; 11,10; 12,30.32.38-39; 17,20; 18,6-7; 20,16; 21,32; 24,26.43-44; 25,29. Henceforth the author elaborates an "expanded Matthew", which does not consist of creations of the Matthew redaction but is congruent with the "minimal Q", thus incorporating the majority of Q texts, including the Markan, although Matthew preserves a more primitive tenor of the text (Matt 12,1-8.9-13; 13,3-11.13; 15,1-11).

Chapter 5, "the *Logoi of Jesus* (Q+) and its Antetexts" (171-409), is the heart of the reconstruction insofar as it integrates the *logia* in Luke-Acts and attempts to reconstruct the order and even the wording of the lost Gospel. It constitutes the full reconstruction of Q+ with an original sequence for the Gospel, placing the mission instruction at the end. This chapter also highlights the intertextual relations between Q+ and several texts of the Hebrew Bible: Q+ is patterned on texts from Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel which it echoes.

The reconstruction of Q+ is much broader than the Q of the *Critical Edition* and contains much more material than other reconstructions of Q. Overall, Q+ is more like a narrative Gospel than a sayings collection. "The *Logoi of Jesus* was not a loose assortment of traditional sayings clumsily gathered into speeches: it was a strategic rewriting of Deuteronomy with a coherent and compelling structure and plot ... it is not a narrative such as one finds in the Synoptics, but it is a narrative nonetheless... The *Logoi of Jesus* was a sophisticated literary accomplishment" (512). Some of the texts included in it will surprise the reader, especially the text of the woman caught in adultery, for it is an interpolation in John's gospel,

and does not appear in the Synoptics. The proposed order for Q+ is random, then; it does not correspond to any of the Gospels.

Chapters 6–10 explore related topics such as the literary characteristics of the reconstruction (chap. 6), *Logoi* as Papias's second putative translation of Matthew (chap. 7), and the lost Gospel as a source for the Gospel of Mark (chap. 8). The book also discusses the relevance of the Q+/Papias Hypothesis to the Son of Man problem and research on the historical Jesus. With respect to the former, MacDonald argues that Jesus never referred to himself as the Son of Man. The origin of the title lies in the literary imagination of the *Logoi*'s author, who found the contrasting use of the title in Ezekiel and Daniel as inspiration for Jesus' evolution from the rejected prophet to the recipient of the Kingdom of God. With respect to the latter, the *Logoi* is our earliest witness to Jesus' teaching (before 66–70 or during the war), is composed in Greek, and the frequency of Semitic loanwords alludes to a bilingual environment; hence it is a book of the Galilean Jesus movement. The final chapter offers suggestions as to why the *Logoi of Jesus* and Papias's *Exposition* were shipwrecked. Since these texts were important (and Papias' text apparently survived for centuries), their loss cannot be considered accidental: "The problem with the lost Gospel was not that its theology was inadequate; it was that some of Jesus' predictions were flat wrong" (556). Just as the *Logoi* of Jesus may have ceased circulating because of its errant eschatology, Eusebius may have considered the *Exposition* similarly flawed. Papias' eschatology became unacceptable. It may have been the inclusion of such material in the canonical books attributed to the apostolic age that led to the loss not only of Q+ and Papias' exposition but also of Ariston's *Expositions of the Logoi of the Lord*.

This is a very inspiring book; it has handled thoroughly a lot of details on the synoptic problem, identifying the weaknesses of old paradigms and opening up new fields of discussion and research on the interrelationship among the Gospels and between other ancient documents. It is certainly an important work which challenges the spread of Q as well as the materials attributed to this lost source. However, the hypothesis also raises many questions difficult to solve: why did Mark modify so much of Q+, even to eliminate several unfulfilled predictions? Was it due to the Gentile mission? Many scholars will question the argument defending Luke's knowledge of Matthew. Also questionable is the attribution of so much Markan material to Q, for it raises issues related to Mark's compositional practice, which the hypothesis does not solve. Undoubtedly the book is a tribute to Q; it explains how Matthew and Luke can at times preserve earlier versions of their overlapping material instead of the later versions. There are some small mistakes (59: Agrippa II).