

Week 2 -Q & NT as Theology

Brooke Witterman

In reading the article entitled “Q,” written by Stanton, we begin to explore the possibility that Matthew and Luke both had another source for their writings beyond using Mark. The title “Q” comes from the word Quelle, which means “Source.” In the late 1800’s, one theologian by the name of J. Weiss abbreviated the word Quelle and referred to this document as Q and this then became widely accepted from that time on and it’s still used today.

Q is mainly explained as the use of materials found in both Matthew and Luke that do not come from materials found in Mark or what is called the Markan traditions. Scholars have debated over time if they were from a few different short documents or also if it may have been collections of oral traditions that came together to compile the Q materials. More scholars believe that this was a written document that somehow was lost after Matthew and Luke both used it in the writing of their gospels.

This theory has become important to study because they believe this helped to reiterate the early teachings of Jesus during his time in ministry. In Q we don’t find materials used by Paul or Mark on the idea of the prominence of the cross or Jesus’ resurrection, but instead, Q focuses on Jesus as a representation of God himself and the idea that Jesus is coming back for his church.

There are many arguments to support the idea of Q, and they include the similar wordings found in Matthew and Luke in passages not found in Mark. They also have found a remarkably similar order of the events in both these books as well. Another support is the use of “doublets” which are repetitions found in both. These also help supporters of Q to believe this was a written document and not oral. Supporters also believe that Q has a similar outlook. Finally, they would say that other ideas are just much harder to support. All this being said, it is still impossible to have absolute proof that Q did exist.

The article goes on to give some shortfalls of this theory. but overall many theologians have come to concur that they believe in the existence of Q and its materials being used in Mathew and Luke.

In chapter 4 of N.T. Wright and Michael F. Bird's book, *The New Testament in It's World*, they explain the theory that the New Testament is a theological document. This document, they conclude, is a document that came from God himself, who is the creator. God's primary way that he reveals himself to us is through the person of Jesus and what the disciples themselves observed about the person of Jesus and His authority. This authority gives testimony to the risen Jesus himself.

The New Testament is a story of the entire world and gives universal truth for all of us to follow. In short, they believe the New Testament is both authoritative and gives us practical actions that we as the church are to follow as we are now the hands and feet of Christ until his return. The New Testament is both a look at history as well as theology and we need to work to give sufficient justice to both themes and allow them to work together to gain the intended message.

When we think of the New Testament being a story, it is easier for us to break it down in a way to answer questions. These questions can be: Who are we? Where are we? What is the timeframe that we are in? What is wrong? What solutions can we find for the problem? What should we do about the problem?

In conclusion, I enjoyed the analogy of the merging of theology and history that is likened to a good cup of coffee. They say it "does not consist of hot water on the one hand and grounds on the other, the former to be sipped and the latter to be chewed, but a proper fusion of the two together"¹. This picture helped me to clarify the necessity of theology and history coming together as a beautiful fusion for helping us hear the message God intends us to receive.

¹ N.T. Wright and Michael F. Bird's book, *The New Testament in It's World*, 186