

Snodgrass Stories with Intent
Shellrude Articles

John R. Gonzalez
ATS/NY City

Reading the New Testament
NT503
Fall 2021
Dr. Glen Shellrude
12/15/2021

Snodgrass in Stories with Intent attempts to educate the reader on the legacy, tradition, and history of understanding the parables of Jesus. In addition, the writer attempts to provide the reader with a thorough and thoughtful understanding of the origins of Jesus' parables.

The parable of "**The Lost Sheep**" in **Matthew 18:12-14 and Luke 15:4-7** is considered interrogative. An interrogative parable is regarded as a double indirect they are like similitudes. They do not have a plot development and may function the same way as an imaginative comparison. Several issues were questioned: What are the original form and context of the parable? Would a Shepherd abandon the ninety-nine other sheep? Are their theological realities?

The book of Matthew and Luke has little in common in the parable, but their accounts exhibit a unique relationship to Synoptic. Each of the writers has his wording with some significant differences. In Matthews, the parable is to the disciples and in Luke is Jesus' response to the Pharisees and scribes at a dinner table. Matthew states, "the sheep strays," and in Luke, "the sheep lost." In Matthew, it says, "if he should find" and in Luke, "the man searches until he finds." In Matthew, the conclusion stays on the inside of the parable and says that the man rejoices more over the recovery sheep than over the ninety-nine. In Luke, the decision proceeds to a theological explanation that there will be more joy over one repentant sinner than ninety-nine righteous in heaven. The author highlights the Cultural Information, Explanation of the Parable, and Decisions on Issues.

Matthew applied God's acceptance of sinners to a church context to instruct the church leaders about God's care for weak believers. Luke moves from the divine initiative of the parable to joy over to the human response of one person repenting. The parable is both theological and Christological, understanding what God is like and the nature of Jesus' ministry.

The parable of **The Mustard Seed** in the book of **Matthew 13:31-31; Mark 4:30-32; and Luke 13:18-19** is considered in Mark as a similitude referring to a recurring event, and he uses the aorist subjective twice to refer to the seed's being sown. Luke's use of aorist tense and Matthew's use of both present and aorist preceded their versions as a parable. Tense is not a guide to the contrast between similitudes and parables. The three forms of the Mustard Seed are similitudes. The forms don't develop the sequence of events: rather, each presents an analogy between the mustard seed and plant and the present and future Kingdom. The accounts of this parable give an excellent example of the Synoptic problem. The explanation is that Mark and Q, represented by Luke, maintain two different traditions of the parable. The essential aspects of the relations include **In the Placement**. Both Matthew and Mark place this parable on the collection of Kingdom and discipleship. **In the Introduction**, Matthew stands alone with his "He placed another parable before them. Mark starts with, " And he said," and has a double question. Luke, like Mark, has "he said" and a double question, but with different words. **In the Sowing of the Seed**, Matthew and Luke are identical except that Matthew has the "kingdom of Heaven." Luke has the "kingdom of God. Matthew has "sowed in his field" whereas Luke has "cast in the garden." **In the Description of the Seed**, Matthew and Mark describe the mustard seed as "the smallest of all seeds" and Mark adds "upon the earth." Luke leaves out the description. **In the Growth**, Matthew has "when it has grown, it becomes greater than all the vegetables and becomes a tree." Mark repeats "when it is sown," using a different verb for growth. Luke is simple in line with Matthew in saying "it grew and became a tree." **In the Conclusion**, Matthew and Luke are identical in the final part of the parable. The differences are only Matthew has "so that," "come," and "and" and Mark uses "so That." The important point is that the Kingdom is present in the ministry and one's stance toward the Kingdom.

The Treasure parable in **Matthew 13:44** is considered a similitude; there is no developed plot, although there is movement. Several issues were questioned: Was the finder's action unethical, and if so, is this relevant for interpretation? Do the features have symbolic significance? What does the similitude teach, the value of the kingdom, or the cost of discipleship? Does the parable have anything to do with salvation by grace?

The author depicts that neither Mark nor Luke has this parable. Matthew compares the kingdom to the treasure found and purchased. The author further illustrates some options for interpretation. Early church identified the treasure in the field as Christ either in the world, the scriptures, or the flesh. The treasure also was identified as the Bible, heaven, and wisdom. At present, the debate is whether this similitude is about the value of the kingdom or the cost of discipleship. Is it an indication or imperative? Others focus on salvation by works and acknowledge this parable on Christ's atoning work.

The author depicts that when a parable starts with "The kingdom is like..." the analogy is not only between the kingdom and the treasure. The analogy is with the whole process described in the similitude. The kingdom is like the man who finds a treasure, covers it, and sells all, and purchase the land because of the joy. The kingdom encompasses all these aspects. The parable has no specific indication of the audience, and there is nothing in the parable that makes it suitable only for disciples.

The value of the parable is in the word "treasure" and the man's action. The intention of the similitude is in the man's behavior; he found something hidden worth all he had in his possession and took all necessary action to purchase the land. The hidden kingdom is just like that, beyond compare or worth. Whatever is needed to participate in the kingdom of heaven.

The parable of **The Two Sons** in **Matthew 21:28-32** is considered a juridical parable. As a subset of a double indirect narrative parable, known as the most forceful parable. It is similar to Isaiah 5 and other Old Testament texts. Several issues were questioned: **Is this parable Christological? Is this parable anti-Semitic? What is the meaning of the parable?** Nothing in the parable suggests a Christological reference. The word "son" is not used, and no mention is made to Jesus in any way. The parable is not anti-Semitic and does not have the Jews as an ethnic group. The parable is directed and opposed to the high priests and the elders. The parable breaks the deadlock over authority by enticing the Jewish leaders to judge themselves. They are accused of not participating in God's work with John the Baptist.

Except for John 11:56, this parable begins with a question "What do you think?" The question in this exact form occurs only in Matthew. The second question in v.31 allures the hearers to a self-condemning decision. The author explains the parable by quoting B. Scott, who argues that both sons shamed and honored their father by refusing and then going. The other by appearing to be a good son but doing nothing. He interprets the parable as a parable of the kingdom, like a family, an imperfect family. The author highlights Decisions and Issues with three forms of the story.

The goal of the text is clear. God expects productive and obedient living from his people. An assertion and concern for appearance are not enough. In the church today, there is a separation between believing and doing. This parable fights for the integrity of life before God. Talk is cheap, and appearance is more inferior: what counts is doing the will of God from the heart. The separation of believing and doing is a straining of the gospel message and is directly faced by this parable. You cannot think apart from obedience.

The Workers in The Vineyard in the book of **Matthew 20:1-16** is considered as a double indirect narrative parable with an introduction announcing the kingdom. Matthew saw this parable as dealing with discipleship. Many see this parable about the grace of God. The majority of interpreters would want more theology than what it has. There are two easy problems with the parable: the identity of the audience and the meaning of the parable.

The author depicts some issues requiring attention: Are all the workers accepted as faithful people of God, or are some rejected? What did Jesus mean with the parable, and what did Matthew mean? Is the parable “allegorical” with some or all of the elements in the story corresponding to theological realities?

The author further depicts cultural information regarding the parable. The life of a day worker in ancient times was difficult. Unemployment was an ongoing problem, and it was easier to hire workers for a short period. A denarius was considered the average daily wage for a day of work. In reading the parable, there were seven options of explanation of the parable. Six of the options had little to commend them for serious consideration, with one favorable. Some readers would consider the parable directed against envy, greed, boasting, or any kind of reckoning among Jesus’ disciples.

The concentration of the parable is with the issues of envy, justice, and goodness done to others, not with the laboring of the vineyard. Why is it so difficult for people to rejoice over the good that people are blessed in their lives, and why do people spend their time calculating how much they have been cheated? Life in the kingdom of God with its focus on communal love cannot be experienced if we continue to compare ourselves with others. The relevancy of the parable is speaking of rewarding. People are always thinking they deserve more.

Luke 16:1-13 in The Unjust Steward is considered a single indirect narrative parable.

Luke's travel audience alternates between disciples, crowds, and opponents, usually the Pharisees.

Most of Luke 6 is arranged and concerns money, one of Luke's most substantial interests in his Gospel and Acts. The amount of the debts is large, one hundred baths of oil would be equivalent to about 800 or 900 gallons, and 150 olives trees is the equivalent to the wages of about three years for an average worker.

The author depicts some issues requiring attention: Who focuses on the parable, the steward, or the master? Is the description of the master as rich intended to portray him negatively? To whom the parable addressed the disciples, as Luke indicates, Israel generally, or the Jewish leaders, particularly the Pharisees? How does the parable function, and what is its intent?

Some would see the master as the focus viewing him as the master as the focus because he is gracious and kind; other readers would see the master as unfavorable. Nothing in the parable suggests that the rich master should be viewed negatively or that he is concerned with regaining honor. The story's focus must be seen in the steward and his actions and the master's response to those actions. To whom the parable is addressed depends on the decision made to the parable's extent. Luke's designation of the disciples as the addresses could result from his reaction. The rest of the Gospel tradition demonstrates how important teaching about possessions was for Jesus, so it would be disbelieving that he did teach the group of disciples on this topic. This is an analogy, not an allegory; one arena's decisions and actions are analogous to those in another arena. The parable sends the urgency that was present in Jesus' ministry. The urgency was different in the early church. The sense of urgency accompanies life and discipleship, which is still valid. The parable gives no answers about what to do with the money.

The Rich Man and Lazarus are considered a single indirect, two-stage narrative parable that serves as a warning. This parable is self-evident, here the characters have names, and only here a parable from Jesus on everyday reality to focus on the afterlife.

The author depicts some issues requiring attention: What is the primary focus? What significance does Lazarus have? What is the basis for the judgment that sends the rich man to Hades and Lazarus to Abraham's bosom? Finally, what is the parable's teaching about attitudes and actions concerning wealth and poverty?

The focus question appears different when you isolate either the rich man or Lazarus as the main character. The story is told from the rich man's view because he is mentioned first with a significant speaking role. Lazarus doesn't act or speak; other than the desire to eat with a passive character. More attention is given to him and his death than to the rich man and his death. Lazarus is a shortened version of 'Eli ezer or 'El azar, both of which mean "God helps." Presuming that the hearers of the parable understood this meaning, it signifies God's identification with the poor. It does not permit the hearer to think Lazarus is cursed because of his condition. He is poor and miserable, but God is still at his side.

The basis for judgment of the two men is not made explicit the parable presupposes that Lazarus has faith. No reason is given for Lazarus's favorable fate. Then, the parable must be understood as expressing God's identification with the poor. Parables like this insist that Christians must not be like the rich man who cares only for his kind and cannot see the poor until too late. Gospel that is not good news to the poor is not the gospel of Jesus (Luke 4:18-22). God forbid that we do not see, not care, and not act to ease the plight of the poor.

The Friend at Midnight is considered an interrogative parable. Even though these parables are like similitudes, they do not have plot development and may logically function the same way, their form is different.

The author depicts some issues requiring attention: In verse eight, how should the four occurrences of the third person masculine pronoun "him/his" (autou) be understood? Does anaideia have any connotation of persistence? What does this text about God and Prayer? This parable is usually interpreted as encouraging persistence in prayer. Luke's interest is to promote faithfulness in prayer. The translation of anaideia is "persistence" in five of the seven translations mentioned. Commentaries continue to acknowledge that anaideia means persistence, with little or no evidence existing.

The parable has problems because interpreters want a more direct application to prayer than what the parable offers. Suggesting that it should be a comparison dealing with worship, but many parables are not comparable. The primary concern appears to be in the request for bread in the Lord's Prayer. If a human responds to a rude friend's request for bread, how much more will God provide in response to the request of his people? Indirectly, the parable does encourage boldness in praying.

The focus of the parable must not be changed to speak of persistence. The parable does not show any continual asking or knocking and no initial refusal. If a matter of concern continues, we should continue praying, but a conversation of persistence usually carries the implications; if we speak enough, God will change his mind. The parable affirms the importance of prayer and is an invitation to pray. A person of faith should pray faithfully as part of their walk with God. Indeed, if you ask for and expect help from a neighbor, how much more should you seek and expect the help of God.

Luke 18:1-8 The Unjust Judge the parable is about two specific people in a particular locale, something not true with similitudes. This is a double indirect narrative parable functioning as a contrast.

The author depicts some issues requiring attention: Does *en tachei* in verse 8a mean "quick/soon" or "suddenly," as several argue? What is the meaning of the parable?

The overwhelming intent with this expression is that something will happen quickly or soon, even if how soon may not be clear. The emphasis on both length of time and quick vindication seems odd. We should not conclude that God tests the elect by not answering immediately. Delay and fleeting vindication frequently stand as parallel biblical and Jewish eschatology themes. Widows were numerous but not necessarily old because they married in their teens. Widows were often left without means of support. If her husband left an estate, she did not inherit it; provision for her upkeep would be made. Widows were so victimized that they were often sold as slaves for debt. The parable's focus may be seen as the necessity of prayer, the certainty of God's hearing prayer, or both.

The parable is not about persistence in praying to God until we get our desires. Communicating the parable should concentrate on two primary areas—the character of God, who is not like the uncaring, unrighteous judge. But God is merciful, patient, and eager to assist his people and the necessity of staying alert and ready for God's vindication and judgment. Vindication is begun in the kingdom and the resurrection of Jesus, but it awaits God's future eschatological action. The evidence of faithfulness and a primary path to alertness and fatefulness prayer, constant involvement with God as we interpret and deal with the world, we live in.

The Pharisee and The Tax Collector is considered a single indirect narrative parable. However, in reality, it is a "synthesis," a comparison of opposites by juxtaposition. "Synthesis" is an ancient rhetorical method. He was comparing the presentation of a character with another to compare them. "Juxtaposition" is two things placed together, giving a contrasting effect.

The author depicts some issues requiring attention: Was the parable initially addressed to the disciples, the Pharisees, or a larger general audience? Why is acquittal assigned to the tax collector and not the Pharisee? What is the Pharisee's error? What is the teaching of the parable?

Luke wrote this parable in his travel narratives with few geographical indicators or journey notes. Throughout Jesus' travel, he was teaching and addressed differently to his disciples, to the crowds, or the Pharisees. In Luke, the Pharisees seem to hear even when teachings were to the disciples.

The fault of the Pharisee is that he thinks he can be obedient to God and still have antipathy for people like the tax collector. He believes he can fulfill what the Torah demands with no attention to the love command. The acquittal of the tax collector's sense of his need, he's throwing himself on the mercy of God and the compassion of God forgiving sinners.

Righteous acts having no compassion and love are not considered righteous by God. God is not a God impressed with self-righteous acts and feelings of superiority. Instead, God is a God of mercy who responds to his people's needs and honest prayers.

The parable is usually interpreted as a contrast between self-righteousness and spiritual poverty or humility. At times the self-righteousness is framed as Jewish legalism. Christians are as quickly guilty of self-satisfaction as the Pharisees. The parable raises the question of how our assessment of people agrees with God's assessment.

Shellrude in Imputation in Pauline Theology attempts to educate the reader on the legacy, tradition, and history of Christ's justification. In addition, the writer attempts to provide the reader with a thorough and thoughtful understanding of the Imputation in Pauline theology.

The Greek word "dikaiosune" means "righteousness," "justice," and "equality." When Jesus was baptized, he full filled all righteousness. The word "soteriological" comes from two Greek words. The term is used for the salvation of individuals and sometimes of a group. It means "salvation" or the "way to salvation.'

The theme in reading the article is the concept of imputed righteousness, the foundation for justification. The Reform Church has accepted that the imputation of Christ's righteousness as the basis for justification. In explaining Paul's theology of justification, Pauline scholars don't apply the imputation of Christ's righteousness in their arguments or interpretations. The author depicts that the term "dikaiosune" used in New Testament text describes a gift given to or received by the person who has faith in Jesus. Paul uses the word in two different ways: in moral righteousness and soteriological status. The author depicts that contextual evidence powerfully demonstrates that the meaning of a justified or acquitted status central meaning of the word dikaiosune when used in a soteriological sense.

The writer highlights several Pauline tests to support Paul's theology. They conclude that the texts reviewed demonstrate that the noun dikaiosum systematically refers to the gift of soteriology and contextually is evidence that this status is justified or acquitted. The gift of Christ's moral righteousness is significant in the process of justification and consistent in how Paul applies dikaiosune.

Shellrude in The Structure of Revelation 6-19 attempts to guide the reader on the structure of how to read the text providing the reader with a thorough and thoughtful understanding of reading Revelation. There are many issues in reading Revelation. It's full of symbolic language, literary genre, framework, and structured text. The focal point of the reading is on the structure of chapters 6-19 regarding the kaleidoscope of images used by John, illustrating "what must soon take place"(1.1). A kaleidoscope is a tube that mirrors loose pieces of colored glasses that you will see current patterns as you turn the tube. The bible may be the same in that a reader can form many different messages and manipulate words. The writer gives six conclusions before he explains the structure of specific sections. He highlighted first; that these chapters are divided into five sections with aspects of eschatological tribulations with three areas structured around a series of seven. He is describing the anti-Christ persecuting Christ people. Explaining there is no connection between sections and structure. Second, He explains that John continues the same grounds using different symbols. The arrangement of the images serves another function in each context. He explains you must recognize the parallel material and respect the unique literary context. Third, each of the five sections ends with an eschaton image (an image of the world is coming to an end). Fourth is a symbol of climatic, penultimate judgment close to the eschaton. A destructive war is in the sixth trumpet, and six bowls are portrayed. The sixth seal may be the same war or broader range of judgments. The fifth is images of eschatological tribulation concentrating on the realities of the period as a whole. Both sections focus is on the anti-Christ and order of destruction. The sixth is the recapitulation in understanding the structure of Revelation. Each unit has a unique form and combination of images. To be seen by a summary comparison of the content of the seal, trumpet, and bowl sections.

The Shellrude in All Are Elect, Few Are Elect: Understanding New Testament

Election Language attempts to guide the reader on how to read the text, providing a thorough and thoughtful understanding of reading the election language in the New Testament. The author depicts the traditional approaches to election language understandings, focusing on “selection.” Traditional Arminian-Wesleyan describes God’s selection of individuals for salvation based on a foreknowledge of who will believe to a modern view to understand election in corporate terms. The writer highlights these approaches have significant problems. To interpret election based on a foreknowledge of who believe you must understand foreknowledge in Romans 8:28 and 1 Peter 1:1. In addition, understanding of election eviscerates the grace component of an election, reducing it to God’s ratification of human decisions, which he foresees. Finally, the corporate structure lacks exegetical support. In New Testament, we as believers receive adoption, justification, sanctification, redemption, reconciliation, glorification, and election from God. The Calvinist traditional interpretation of the election language is described as the unconditional selection of a subset of humanity for salvation. The author further depicts that this approach is unlikely to happen because of two attested theological affirmations in the New Testament. One God desires the salvation of the whole of humanity, and two apostasies are a real possibility. Finally, the writer depicts election as a gracious initiative and the debates in the New Testament regarding the concept of selection but rather on the idea of generous initiative as the basis for one’s status as a believer. He highlights four supporting arguments—first, the use of election language by Jesus and the early church. The second election vocabulary is to speak Jesus’s love for his people. The third is the language part of soteriological terms. Four consider metaphorical and analogical language. Fifth, the word “elect” is designated to those who belong to God without the ‘mechanics.’

Shellrude in The Freedom of God in Mercy and Judgement: A Liberation reading of Romans 9:6-29 attempts to guide the reader on how to read the text, providing a thorough and thoughtful understanding of the article. The author depicts that the argument is usually interpreted in deterministic and predestination terms. The argument is about Israel's unbelief of God's failure because it had been his intention from the beginning to harden Israel as a whole. The analysis in this reading is what is the reason for Jewish unbelief. The writer highlights Roman 9:30-10:4 contributing Jewish unbelief due to their commitment to Mosaic Law, which is the basis for salvation, and wrongly estimating the place of works ensuring personal salvation, and due to these commitments, they stumble over the stone. They refused to recognize what God had done in Jesus the Messiah in so many words. The Calvinists would intercept this as God is holding out his hands to Israel, at the same time holding back the grace that would enable them to respond. In addition to Israel's handling of their commitment to the Mosaic Law and their continuous disobedience to God. The writer explains how Paul researches Jewish unbelief in a matter that doesn't agree with a deterministic and predestinarian theology. The author highlights significant points that Paul establishes from scripture and responds to the claim God fail Israel. First, God is free and in no obligation to determine who his people are, and God is not obligated to all Abraham's descendants. Second, God is free to judge by hardening. He is free to respond to Israel's unbelief. Third, God is free and has will use those harden to further his purpose. Fourth, God is free to demonstrate his mercy to whom he wants. To the Gentiles and those who are the primary recipients of God's covenant promises. The writer explained that God's word has not failed; the challenge to the traditional Calvinist reading of the text, an alternative which is not exegetical and supported by a reconstruction of Paul's issue.

Shellrude in Calvinism and Problematic Readings of New Testament Texts or, Why I Am Not a Calvinist attempts to guide the reader on how to read the text, providing a thorough and thoughtful understanding of the Calvinist view of New Testament readings. The author educates the reader that theological determinism is affirming that everything happens because God ordained it to happen. A view associated with John Calvin and Reformed Theology. Calvinists are connected with the doctrines of election and perseverance. They understand election as God's selection of a subset of humanity for salvation and only those elected can respond to the gospel. The ones selected for salvation will necessarily persevere in the faith and cannot commit apostasy. The author informs the reader that both Calvinist and New Testament scholars will develop their theology relating to text which speaks of issues of salvation and perseverance. The writer explains in detail to the reader some of the implications in reading many texts in the theoretical account of theological determinism. He highlights Moral Exhortation in the New Testament, God's purpose in the believer, God's daily work in the life of the believer, Critiques of the sins of believers, Warning to believers, Well-intentional differences among Christians, God's universal salvific will, Warning against apostasy and the Seven concluding observation.

- Lack of historical and contextual evidence that validates interpreting the New Testament.
- Theological determinism conflicts in reading many Scriptural texts.
- Calvinist reading of scriptures and the motivational effectiveness.
- The accounts of the chasm between God says about moral will for humanity.
- Calvinist usage of language and concepts unparalleled in human experience.
- Calvinist view of God is contradicted by God's self-revelation in scripture.