

known among Two Source Theorists as the L material, Goulder comes down hard on the conclusion that this is mainly Lukan composition. Here, Goodacre deftly notes that Goulder not only spends a lot of time refuting the notion of hypothetical written sources but also remains tone deaf to the possibility of oral tradition.⁴ Finally, in Part 3, Goodacre assesses Goulder's use of the Lectionary Thesis.

Procedure

In a brief response it will be necessary for us to address Goodacre's contribution selectively. Consequently, we will not enter into a dialogue with him with respect to his analysis

Second, we wish to decide whether we can agree that Goulder has truly undermined the case for Q.

In this context, the Minor Agreements are brought on stage. Basically, we are on Goulder's side with respect to the Minor Agreements. But because of his acceptance of Markan priority, we believe that he has unnecessarily complicated the issue. On a neo-Griesbachian hypothesis the Minor Agreements are a non issue. Luke utilized Matthew as a major source; and

generally goes along with Goulder's usages. For Goodacre, the QD passages can be somewhat

author (Matthew or Luke) has the less characteristic word or phrase; and go with that as the reconstructed text.¹⁶ Such a procedure is patently unpersuasive. Goulder sees this clearly and goes on the attack. The *Tendenz*

Before evaluating Goodacre's conclusions a crucial issue must be raised as to what determines Goulder's criteria for the acceptance of a linguistic characteristic of Matthew. In respect to this issue we will make two points and then briefly comment on Goulder's results.

First, there is the question as to whether Goulder has distorted his formulation and listing of the Matthean linguistic characteristics by his acceptance of Markan priority. Has Goulder engaged in a fair construal of the linguistic data? According to Goodacre, in *Midrash and Lektion in Matthew*

items which occur more often in Matthew than in Luke: and (2) those words and phrases which are inserted redactionally by Matthew into an agreed Markan context or an O.T. citation.²⁷

In response, we have already raised questions about the appropriateness of his formulation

So there we have it. According to Goodacre, Goulder has not made his case that the essence of bedrock Q (QC) is the text of Matthew. This is not a negative argument for Q. But it does not undermine Q either. Goulder has made a stout-hearted effort. But the case against Q must be placed on more objective grounds.

In our judgment, Goodacre has already directed us toward the answer: the need to compile an objective list of the characteristic linguistic words and phrases of each synoptic writer not presuming any source hypothesis.³⁰ Then, we could take the bedrock Q (QC) words, check to see the number of Matthean linguistics characteristics vis-a-vis those of Luke. Finally, as a way of determining the direction of literary dependency, we would only accept as impregnable evidence

evidence--not all of it. Nevertheless, the test may have usefulness as a point of comparison with Goodacre's results.

A Selective Test

Analysis of Linguistic Characteristics of Mt 3:1-12//Lk 3:1-9; 15-17

Goodacre notes that Hawkins has one vocabulary item that is characteristic of the QC words in Mt 3:1-12. It is *sunagw*. Tevis has determined that the collocation of

On the other hand, the collocation of $u^{\text{p}} \text{odeiknumi}$ with tij and u^{h} i

Second, the use of *ἐξήκουσεν* in Lk 9:35 and 20:14, without a parallel in Matthew, means that this phraseology cannot be used as strong evidence of literary dependence of Luke on

It is evident in this instance the balance (6 to 4) is mildly in favor of Luke's dependence upon Matthew. Goodacre is proven to be correct in his assessment that this passage is "problematic for Goulder's thesis."⁴⁴ But, on the other hand, in our judgment, no firm conclusion

by Goulder's thesis; and the evidence deduced from a study of the Minor Agreements, although leaning in Goulder's direction, is not absolutely decisive.

In our judgment Goodacre has made a thorough and fair analysis of Goulder's work. However, there are two areas in which the analysis may have been improved. The first is in the