

What does the 'Q' mean?

The 'Q,' 'Quelle' 'Quel' means 'which' or 'what' and works like an adjective agreeing with the noun that follows; it has four forms: masculine singular (quell) and plural (quels), and feminine singular (quelle) and plural (quelles). It is an interrogative French adjective. It has been stated that the 'Q' has been used for over a century. It refers to Jesus' sayings that are found in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. However, there isn't any evidence of it being used in the gospel of Mark. There were many earlier discussions held in 1861 that there were two sources of 'Q.' These sources were the collections of sayings of Jesus and the gospel of Mark. The 'Q' hypothesis became very important in the twentieth century in the study of the gospels. The terminology of 'Q' is seen as a shortcut when referring to non-Markan ways in which the transmission of customs and beliefs that are passed on from one generation to generation that are shared by Luke and Matthew. The oral traditions Collection 'Q' may have existed in the short-written document, which became non-existent. In the early church, 'Q' as a series of events of oral customs and beliefs were moved around with an order that is fixed. 'Q' has been classified as important in the study of the gospels. It is crucial for putting together the historical Jesus, and 'Q' had direct access to Jesus' authentic teachings. Stanton stated, "that, 'Q' showed the diversity in early Christianity." There wasn't any resurrection or passion in its narratives. Luke and Matthew used 'Q' as their initial source. In English and Greek languages translations, there is a close verbal communication between Luke and Matthew.

In the verbal agreement construct, there is a close agreement in Matthew and Luke, as the verbal corresponds with the subject, singular and plural, masculine and feminine. In the phenomena of order, in a somewhat fixed order, Matthew and Luke appear to have used the cycle of oral tradition. It is very suggestive that that 'Q' was written in the phenomena of order. There are also the insertions of doublets where both Matthew and Luke used the same Markan forms of sayings, examples, "In several passages in Matthew and Luke we find that essentially the same traditions are repeated. "The one who has, to that one will be given" Mark 4:25 par, Matthew 25:29 par, Luke 19:26, "Stanton." The coherent entity shows theological, consistent, and orderly passages where they stack together. Stanton says that "the 'Q' material hangs together as an entity, "Stanton." As indicated, the nature of 'Q' was more extensive than 230 verses shared by Matthew and Luke but seemed to be larger in its final analysis. There were objections against the 'Q' hypothesis, and it became stagnant. The 'Q' Hypothesis consisted of two specific documents, which were the Markan priority and, of course, the 'Q.' These documents were accepted by scholars of that time coming from different backgrounds.

It was claimed that 'Q' could not be established as a distinct document because it was too heterogeneous. Finally, the literary of 'Q,' which is the category of composition, is determined by technique-genre of literature whose content is imaginative based on science. The first step in the interpretation of writing is an interpretation of the category of the written document. "Q" has been established as a written document and is believed to have been used in Matthew and Luke. In any serious study of the gospels, 'Q' is there as a dominant force and will continue to exist.

Mamie Paul

Reading the New Testament

September 21, 2020

Professor Glen Shellrude

The New Testament Theology

In reading the New Testament as a Theological Discourse, it is to be read as a historical document.

It is a document that can be addressed by generations to come because it is the Word of God. It is the theology of today. As we ponder the thoughts of Luke, the biblical aspect of atonement is also important. There are many questions in Wright's book regarding what approach should be taken to determine who Jesus is in the gospels. In the New Testament, Jesus is seen not as a glimpse nor a thought but as a physical person doing the will or carrying out the will of God. There are arguments about theology, biblical, or New Testament. It is stated that "The idea is that to do a theology of the New Testament will mean subscribing to the authority of these holy books and the institutions that venerate them" Wright, p. 77, 20129." The Bible is the highest authority by which we should live. The church of today and yesteryear hold the Bible in reverence because they truly believe that it is the absolute Word of God, creator of all things seen and unseen. Wright says, "We must find out what is in the New Testament and how it affects the followers of Jesus?" Isn't the New Testament about Jesus' teachings about the kingdom of God? In the practical context, the church does perceive that its task is to spread the gospel to the whole world. Isn't that what the Great Commission is about? Matthew 28:18-20 states, "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, 'All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.' Go therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world, Amen." The church is to know the truth, spread the truth to the entire world, and live the truth. The authority of Jesus is also seen in Lord's Prayer, Luke 11:1-4.

Jesus' purpose was to save the world and fulfill the law by His work on the Cross, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, whereby His Spirit will resurrect us believers. This is an ongoing Perfect Plan of God. In Wright's book, we see different approaches; one is the Robust Approach. In this approach, the New Testament study, history and theology must come together.

They must be mixed together.

Indeed, the teaching of the kingdom, Jesus' followers had faith in their teacher/Lord. Jesus brought earth and heaven together by His coming. These truths are timeless because God is timeless.

Studying the New Testament is to do justice to both theology and history. Wright states that "the New Testament was written for us but not to us, Wright, p. 79, 2019." See Paul's narrative to the Galatians Chapter 2 verses 11-14. "But when Peter was come to Antioch I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, if thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do in Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" This shows the hypocrisy in the text. Rudolf Bulkmann attempted to bring history and religion to find the meaning for human existence. It is

this writer's understanding that God created humans for Himself and gave them dominion over creation! For the early Christians, it was one theology, one Holy scripture, and one Holy Bible. Finally, God wants us to live by His Commandments. That is to love the Lord thy God with all our heart, mind, soul and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself.

The Priority of Mark

The Study of the Synoptic Gospels

Studying the three Synoptic gospels, there is a literary relationship between them which means that is the question as to the sources used when they were written. The gospels tend to agree close or closely in order and words. It is seen in narratives and quotations. Stein also discussed the fragmentary hypothesis, whereby they vary in length but not a continued document. This approach is accounted for the Torah's diversity, but it is not able to account for the consistency of its structure, especially its arrangement of its dates and the order of these events. There were theories upon theories, arguments upon arguments, problems upon problems, and comparisons. Matthew and Luke's gospels were addressing their Greek-speaking audience. In the discussion of length between Matthew and Luke, it was seen that Mark was an abridgement of Matthew and Luke. It showed that Mark omitted a large portion of scripture out of the text. The calculations of percentages of wordings and comparisons were not concluded as to the purpose or reason Mark eliminated so much text. In Table 4, when the gospels were paralleled, Mark was the longest of the three accounts. Therefore, it appears that Mark is not an abridged work. The argument regarding grammar and style was an observation that was indicated as inferior compared to Matthew and Luke. It was shown that Matthew and Luke's grammar was of better quality. The argument of difficulty showed that Mark was the most difficult of the three gospels regarding understanding. The argument about the verbal agreement in its writing, in Table 2.1, showed some singular verb followed by a compound subject. Here, the verb should have been plural. This was about the style or manner in which the wording was presented. For example,

"These two arguments are similar in that they both argue that within the triple tradition the Matthew-Mark agreements against Luke, the Mark-Luke agreements against Matthew, and the paucity of Matthew-Luke arguments against Mark both in wording and in order are best explained on the basis of a Markan priority, Stein, p.53" In comparison, Mark is seen as more primitive of the gospels. The argument of literary agreement, this argument was a comparison of Matthew and Mark. In Table 2.23, such an agreement does exist in the Synoptic Gospels, and the explanation is that there is a bias of the Markan priority. Another is the argument from redaction, which is "the process of editing text for publication, what is left after redaction would be virtually useless, Webster Dictionary." It is the heaviest argument in favor of Markan priority when comparing the Synoptic Gospels. In the Matthean use of Mark, it is seen that redactional consistency that is emphasized in Matthew. The redaction criticism is viewed in Markan use of Matthew. In comparing the Matthean redactional in Markan and Luke, the theological most used title for Jesus is the "Son of God" in all three Synoptic Gospels. It is clear that there is a strong usage of the title for Jesus is the "Son of God." There were different emphasis in comparison with phrases, for example, "to fulfill" and "this was to fulfill." In the discussion on style, in the Gospel of Mark, there is repeated use of "immediately." It is acknowledged that Mark tends to add "immediately" to his text, whether written or oral. In the final argument, regarding Mark's writing as being primitive. In the church usage, the title for Jesus is Lord in traditional gospel responses. Therefore, Mark is more primitive than Matthew.

