The FGH received its classic expression in Michael Goulder’s Luke: A New Paradigm (2v Sheffield 1989), and was further developed in later publications by Goulder and others. FGH has its designated successor in Mark Goodacre, who is represented among the later contributions, but there is no authoritative statement of the current state of the hypothesis. The following will give a sense of later comment and opinion:

- Mark S Goodacre. Goulder and the Gospels (Sheffield 1986). This book arises from the author’s PhD thesis. The last section is devoted to the lectionary theory, undoubtedly the weakest aspect of Goulder’s model.

- Michael Goulder. Self-Contradiction in the IQP. JBL v118 #3 (1999) 506-517. Deals directly with flaws in the Q alternative theory, and attempts to show that the bidirectionality of the Mt/Lk material, on which Q relies, is a specious result of the definition of Q.


The lectionary theory is a flaw in the FGH which can be removed by simply removing it. But Goulder relies on a single Mt > Lk directionality for all the Mt/Lk common material not in Mk; it is this which is worked out in his 1989 volumes. Any significant demonstration of Lk > Mt directionality is accordingly fatal to the FGH. The place where a possible Lk > Mt directionality is most widely perceived is undoubtedly the Matthean Sermon on the Mount, in particular its most famous elements, the Beatitudes and the Lord’s Prayer.

- C M Tuckett. The Beatitudes: A Source-Critical Study. Novum Testamentum v25 #3 (1983) 193-216. Tuckett argues the case for Q (Mt and Lk independently used an earlier source), and Goulder follows with a brief defense of Mt > Lk directionality.

- Mark S Goodacre. The Case Against Q. Trinity 2002. Defends Mt > Lk directionality in both the Lord’s Prayer (64-65) and in the First Beatitude (133-151).

- Christopher Tuckett. Review of Mark Goodacre: The Case Against Q. Novum Testamentum v46 #4 (2004) 401-403. Develops the argument of order, and raises the old question (already old as stated by Streeter) of why, even if Luke’s order makes sense, he should deviate from Matthew’s order. Tuckett’s point (401) about the place of Peter in Matthew and Luke is interesting, and deserves separate discussion.

- Francis Watson. Gospel Writing (Eerdmans 2013). Chapters 3 and 4 are recommended.
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