



UNTO THEE IN ORDER,
MOST EXCELLENT FRIEND...

THE Q SOURCE/CHRISTIANFORUMS.COM/T7421755-12

www.christianforums.com/t7421755-12

www.thechurchattroutdale.com

wm@thechurchattroutdale.com

7.2.10

spell checked 3.24.11

The 'Q Source' Forum

www.christianforums.com/t7421755-12/

(Note: Post #115 was dated 12/4/2009. The 'Q' board appears to have been idle.)

5.30.10/Post #116

wgp states, "I have found Q. "Bomber's Links" has The Gospel Of Christ according to william & The Declaration Of The Apostles according to william. The scripture of M-M-L-J that comprise the two files are linked. These files are the most important 'finding/discovery' since the writing of the new testament gospel accounts of M-M-L-J."

=====

5.31.10/Post #118

Wayseer quotes wgp, "*I have found Q.*"

Wayseer states, "You have not found Q at all. If you had a copy of Q it would be front page news."

=====

5.31.10/Post #119

ebia states, "It does seem unlikely that someone making a groundbreaking discovery of that magnitude would declare it to the world by registering as a newbie on a discussion forum and posting it at the end of a thread already past it's best-before date."

=====

5.31.10/Post #123

wgp responded, "Yes, it does seem unlikely. But I must continue to try and get the word out. My discovery has laid waste the hypothesis of higher criticism, reaffirmed the inerrancy of scripture and the historicity of the gospel. The restoration of the gospel of Christ will change everything and yet will change nothing for those who have the Spirit of Christ in their hearts. All my files are free downloads. I began this journey with the Lord some thirty years ago; and now is the appointed time to announce the restoration of the gospel of Christ."

I can email you 'Bomber's Links' which has the declaration and the restored gospel linked together. This is where you need to start if interested. So go to my website and download or email me and I will send you 'Bomber's Links'."

Grace be to all who love the Lord and wait for his return."

Wm G Pinard

=====

5.31.10/Post #124

ARBITER01 quotes wgp, "*...and now is the appointed time to announce the restoration of The Gospel Of Christ.*"

ARBITER01 responds, "...mmmmhmmmm, sure."

=====

6.4.10/Post #125

Korah quotes wgp, *"Yes it does seem unlikely. But I must continue to try and get the word out. My discovery has laid waste the hypothesis of higher criticism, reaffirmed the inerrancy of scripture and the historicity of the gospel."*

Korah states, "I went to your website, but found nothing about your "discovery" beyond what you say here. You expect me to believe that a blue-collar person with no seminary training should be taken at all seriously, particularly when claiming to overturn all sound scholarship?"

=====

6.4.10/Post #126

Korah quotes Willtor, *"Don't misunderstand: I think the evidence is strong that there is (or was, anyway) a Q document or set of documents. It's just that it's difficult to accept strong statements about its structure or content apart from what was captured in Matthew and Luke."*

Korah states, "I have read through this thread trying to find a good entry point, but this early post #47 is as good a place as any (**see also Post 156**). I disagree with Willtor about speculating on the content of Q. Here's my take on the other main source of Matthew and Luke besides Mark: (**Korah's 'solution' to the synoptic problem follows:**) The other major source of the Synoptic gospels is generally acknowledged to be Q. Q is usually assumed to be the portions of Matthew and Luke that overlap, but are not in Mark. This is only generally true. The truly Q material underlies Matthew, Luke, and also Mark as an Aramaic original that causes the word use to be different in the derivative gospels. The parables in Mark are generally not exact in word-choice with Luke, so this is a bold statement, but comparison with the (non-canonical) Gospel of Thomas shows that the Q material Thomas draws from also includes texts used in Mark. (Scholarship has had fifty years to absorb this, but still resists learning it. The Jesus Seminar is the worst example of continuing misuse of Thomas.)

Once the barrier is broken that Q material exists in Mark, the radical change is that even narrative in Mark may be from Q. The portions of Mark not already listed above could be largely from Q. The narrative material in question is called by scholars the Twelve-Source. We cannot tell whether Q and Twelve-Source are distinct.

That Q and Twelve-Source are not distinct is suggested by external criticism. Tradition says that Matthew wrote this gospel. The Higher Critics have suggested that this may have been Q, limited to sayings that occur only in Matthew and Luke. Conservatives have continued to hold that Matthew wrote the gospel with his name. I say split the difference. Acknowledge that Matthew wrote most of the Q discourses, but also allow for the Twelve-Source narrative, which would seem most likely to have come from him. His name (=Levi) occurs first at Mark 2:14, and very little occurs before that. The Q-Twelve-Source in Mark is the following: Mark 1:9-15, 1:29-2:16, 3:13-4:41, 6:2-16, 9:14-29, 9:33-37, 10:41-11:11, 1:15-19, 12:1-17, 24-34, 13:17-23, 33-37, 14:10-25, 14:43-45, 62-72, 15:29-32, 15:42-16:8."

As I stated above, the mark of this document is that it was not available in Greek at the time it was utilized to bring in to Mark and Luke. As an Aramaic text, it was not likely to survive. Conversely, the Petrine Ur-Marcus did get translated into Greek in time. Why then has it survived? Likely because it was soon merged in with the Twelve-Source to form Greek Mark.

That Q was available for Mark and yet so little was used, seems strange. We do know, of course, that we have a text, our Mark, that for the most part excludes Q. More to our common sense, another text developed that included all this Q, the Twelve-Source. The additional Q portions not in Mark are as follows in Luke: chapters 11:29-36, 11:52-12:38, 12:47-13:17, 13:23-30, 14:3-33, 15:1-16:31, 17:22-25, 19:11-27."

Korah concludes with this statement, "And here's the link to a set of my articles containing the above. In the first article, see paragraphs 7 to 9 for a general explanation of Q. The excerpt above, however, is from about page 16, the second section in my third article, Underlying Sources of the Gospels: <http://megasociety.org/noesis/181.htm#Common>

The upshot of my article is that Q was not just a sayings source, but included much of the narrative found in the Triple Tradition in Mark. It was very early and thus supports the historicity of the gospels."

=====

6.24.10/Post #129

wgp quotes Korah, *"I went to your website, but found nothing about your "discovery" beyond what you say here. You expect me to believe that a blue-collar person with no seminary training should be taken at all seriously, particularly when claiming to overturn all sound scholarship?"*

wgp responds, "Paul was a tent maker who had persecuted the church, and the followers of Christ were very fearful of him even after his conversion. And neither was Paul an eye-witness save by the revelation of the Lord that he had received while pursuing the believers.

Your comment is neither scriptural in content nor Christian in spirit.

Yes, I am a common man of no reputation. I know that. But the Lord is faithful and after all these years now is the appointed time.

What is important is the gospel of Christ. The gospel of Christ was never lost; but was very carefully 'hidden' in the four canonical gospel accounts of M-M-L-J.

So I took the four gospel accounts and laid the scriptures out in a four column harmony based on dramatic unities of action, distance, time, and location; and thereby reconstructed what I have entitled The Declaration Of The Apostles.

I used the KJV scriptures without adding any words of my own or others. There are 1682 'paragraphs' which include the first two chapters of Acts.

The inerrancy, historicity, and divine inspiration of scripture is confirmed by these two documents.

To answer the question, What is the Q source? The answer is, The four canonical gospel accounts of M-M-L-J.

Believers now have not only a perfect declaration of the four gospel accounts, but The Gospel Of Christ as well. These two documents are a gift from the first century apostolic fellowship who knew that we would need to be unified and strengthened as we entered into 'the beginning of the end' of the times of the Gentiles.

So the 'lost' gospel has been hidden in the bible all this time. True believers have always known that the four gospel accounts agreed; we could feel it in our spirit; we just didn't know how to 'rightly divide' the stumbling stones of the synoptic problem.

And with respect to Korah's statement "that a blue-collar person with no seminary training should be taken at all seriously, particularly when claiming to overturn all sound scholarship," my reply is as follows:

Yes I should be taken seriously because I do not claim as you suggest "to overturn all **sound** scholarship"; but rather the opposite: I intend to overturn all **unsound** scholarship!

My work destroys the claims of Higher Criticism and reaffirms that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

In closing, it is easy to ridicule people because they are different than you, especially on the internet. So I'm praying that you would have a change of heart and give my work your most serious consideration."

=====

6.24.10/Post #130

Hentenza states, "Most sound scholarship already reject Q."

=====

6.24.10/Post #131

Ebia quotes wgp, "Paul was a tent maker."

Then ebia comments, "Yes, but he was also well educated by the rabbinical schools - it was perfectly usual for educated rabbis to have a manual trade to make ends meet - it doesn't mean that they weren't among the best educated scholars of their world."

=====

6.24.10/Post #132

Willtor quotes Hentzena, *“Most sound scholarship already reject Q.”*

Willtor responds, *“I'm surprised to hear this. Do you have sources?”*

=====

6.24.10/Post #133

wgp quotes Hentzena, *“Most sound scholarship already reject Q.”*

then wgp responds, *“Orthodox scholars reject Q because they cannot find Q, leaving them a synoptic problem with no solution. In effect their 'sound' scholarship is 'no' scholarship. They watch in silence having failed.*

The proponents of Higher Criticism joyfully continue in their search for the lost gospel while publishing their 'hypotheses' and banking their royalty checks.

The reason why the 'no' scholarship of the proponents of Higher Criticism has failed in its efforts to find Q and thereby solve the synoptic problem is because the scholars did not look to scripture for the solution to the synoptic problem; but went outside the canon of scripture looking for some lost manuscript or 'lost gospel' that would 'solve' the synoptic problem for them.

They're both imaginative and lazy, ever hypothesizing, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

The 'sound scholarship' that you refer to has never been sound; but rather testifies to the failed attempts to solve the synoptic problem; which has made a way for the scholastic aberrations advanced by the proponents of Higher Criticism.

I have solved the synoptic problem and reaffirmed the doctrine of the infallibility of holy scripture.

Luke 1:1 introduces The Declaration Of The Apostles according to william: *“Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth a declaration of those things...*

Acts 1:1 introduces The Gospel Of Christ according to william: *“The former treatise have I made...”* knowing that centuries later The Declaration Of The Apostles would be reconstructed and The Gospel Of Christ would be restored by someone who could not be an eyewitness.”

=====

6.24.10/Post #134

Hentzena quotes wgp's #133, *“Orthodox scholars reject Q because...post and then states, “There is no synoptic problem. Never has been.”*

=====

6.24.10/Post #135

Kiwimac quotes Hentzena, *"There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."*

Kiwimac then states, "Indeed there is Hentzena and well you know it. Mere rejection of "Q" does not a solution make. There is a similarity of content, word choices and events in Matthew, Mark and Luke which necessarily indicates some kind of literary interrelationship. The synoptic problem then relates to how this interrelation came to be and the nature of that interrelationship itself."

=====

6.24.10/Post #136

Korah quotes Hentzena, *"There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."*

Korah then states, "And there's no "wgp problem"? Verges on blasphemy, I'd say.

Korah continues, "Ironically, the very Luke 1:1 he quotes proves that there are other sources such as Q (or "S" or "Logia" or "Oracles" or whatever you want to call it). Eusebius said that Papias said, "Matthew recorded the oracles in the Hebrew tongue, and each interpreted them to the best of his ability." (Bettenson, 2nd Ed., p. 27, also footnoting that "oracles" may be Q.) Our Matthew is not in Hebrew, so apparently it as well as Luke (and probably Mark) are said to have used Q as a source. Incidentally, I get no royalty checks. My research uncovering Q has only cost me money. I do it for the love of the Lord."

=====

6.24.10/Post #138

wgp quotes Korah, *"And there's no "wgp problem"? Verges on blasphemy, I'd say. Incidentally, I get no royalty checks. My research uncovering Q has only cost me money. I do it for the love of the Lord."*

wgp responds, "I have no idea what you are trying to communicate? I do not understand your statement about blasphemy? As I stated in an earlier post, the four gospel accounts of Matthew-Mark-Luke-John is Q."

=====

6.24.10/Post #139

Wayseer quotes wgp, *"Orthodox scholars reject Q because they cannot find Q."*

Wayseer states, "That is not why Q is being questioned."

Wayseer again quotes wgp, *"The reason why the 'no scholarship' of the proponents of Higher Criticism has failed in its efforts to find Q and thereby solve the synoptic problem is because the scholars did not look to scripture for the solution to the synoptic problem; but went outside the canon of scripture looking for some lost manuscript or 'lost gospel' that would 'solve' the synoptic problem for them."*

Wayseer continues, "Scholars are not really interesting in 'finding' a document called Q. Also, the canon was not finalized until rather recently."

Wayseer again quotes wgp, *"I have solved the synoptic problem and reaffirmed the doctrine of the infallibility of holy scripture."*

Wayseer concludes, "Good for you. We eagerly look forward to your dissertation."

=====

6.24.10/Post #140

Wayseer quotes Hentzena, *"There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."*

Wayseer then states, *"Denial is one form of deflecting the issue."*

=====

6.25.10/Post #141

wgp quotes Hentzena, *"There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."*

wgp responds, *"The synoptic problem is an illusion caused by the parabolic design of the scripture of the four canonical gospel accounts. The synoptic problem was intentionally crafted by the apostolic writers when they set forth in order the words of each gospel account. The synoptic problem is an illusion intentionally crafted by the apostolic writers. Q is all scripture of the four canonical gospel accounts of M-M-L-J.*

One need only use the scripture of Q (meaning the four gospel accounts of M-M-L-J) to first reconstruct the declaration mentioned in Luke 1:1; and then conflate the four-columns of text in The Declaration Of The Apostles into one column of text; and thereby restore The Gospel Of Christ, being the 'former treatise' mentioned in Acts 1:1.

It isn't easy. A real 'hands on' job. But I'm certain you could do it. If "a blue-collar person with no seminary training" could do it, certainly you could. It took me seven years. And then seven more after that to triple check the job. Then I called it good and moved on to new challenges with my Lord Jesus."

=====

6.25.10/Post #142

Wayseer states, *"Please tell me your are joking."*

=====

6.25.10/Post #143

Willtor quotes wgp, *"The synoptic problem is an illusion caused by the parabolic design of the scripture of the four canonical gospel accounts.*

The synoptic problem was intentionally crafted by the apostolic writers when they set forth in order the words of each gospel account.

The synoptic problem is an illusion intentionally crafted by the apostolic writers.

Q is all scripture of the four canonical gospel accounts of M-M-L-J.

One need only use the scripture of Q (meaning the four gospel accounts of M-M-L-J) to first reconstruct the declaration mentioned in Luke 1:1; and then conflate the four-columns of text in The Declaration Of The Apostles into one column of text; and thereby restore The Gospel Of Christ, being the 'former treatise' mentioned in Acts 1:1.

It wasn't easy. A real 'hands on' job. But I'm certain you could do it. If "a blue-collar person with no seminary training" could do it, certainly you could. It took me seven years. And then seven more after that to triple check the job. Then I called it good and moved on to new challenges with my Lord Jesus."

Then Willtor comments, "I think the evangelists had far plainer intentions than you think they did."

=====

6.25.10/Post #144

wgp quotes Willtor, *"I think the evangelists had far plainer intentions than you think they did."*

wgp responds, "Maybe you could provide a far more plainer explanation of the evangelists' intentions. And then you could give a far more plainer explanation of what the evangelists did with Q after they were done explaining it."

=====

6.25.10/Post #145

Hentenza quotes wayseer, *"Denial is one form of deflecting the issue."*

Hentenza then responds, "Making it up is one form of making it an issue."

=====

6.25.10/Post #146

wgp quotes wayseer, *"Please tell me your are joking."*

wgp responds to wayseer, "In light of the reconstruction of The Declaration Of The Apostles according to william and the restoration of The Gospel Of Christ according to william...this is very very serious business."

=====

6.25.10/Post #147

wgp quotes Hentenza, *"There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."*

wgp responds to Hentenza, "Matthew-Mark-Luke-John record that there was much 'green grass' at the feeding of the five thousand.

Then later on Matthew and Mark record the feeding of the four thousand with Jesus then going to Jerusalem where he is crucified; however, Luke's gospel account has his 'travelogue' which would have taken at least four to six months to complete, and therefore an additional year can be added to the Lord's ministry.

So M-M-L have Jesus being baptized and then going to Jerusalem in six months (or maybe a year and a half if you want to add another year because of the 'green grass' at the feeding of the 5000 and Luke's travelogue).

In any event, M-M-L have Jesus being baptized in the fall and entering Jerusalem a year and a half later when he is crucified. This calculation gives Jesus two passover celebrations after he is baptized by John.

The gospel of John has four passovers spanning a three and one-half year public ministry.

So there is a synoptic problem. M-M-L have a year and six months while John has three years and six months.

The synoptic problem is a problem of dramatic unities of time-distance-movement.

The synoptic problem is not a problem of thematic unities.

John Chapter 17 is a thematic unity. The sermon on the mount and the sermon on the plain are thematic unities. The gospel message receives no consideration whatsoever with respect to reconciling the dramatic unities of the four gospel accounts.

So don't worry, Hentzena. *"The Synoptic Problem"* will be there for those individuals who will always want it to be there.

As for me, I have *"The Synoptic Agreement"* that will be always there, whether I want it to be there or not. As Jesus said, '...the scripture cannot be broken.'

Hentzena, you need to download The Declaration Of The Apostles according to William. There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."

=====

6.25.10/Post #148

Willtor quotes wgp, *"Maybe you could provide a far more plainer explanation of the evangelists' intentions. And then you could give a far more plainer explanation of what the evangelists did with Q after they were done explaining it."*

Willtor responds to wgp, "A far plainer explanation of the evangelists' intentions: The evangelists wanted to pass along their knowledge of the revelation of God in Christ: his teachings, his life, death, and resurrection. Specifically, they wanted to ensure the faith of the apostolic age was passed to the next generation. The early Church's culture is characterized as one of exuberant disclosure. It was not a mystery cult.

I want, explicitly, to contrast this with the idea that they created a puzzle for Christians to piece together, millennia later.

A far plainer explanation of what they did with Q: They did nothing special with Q. I think Q is multiple sources (from Luke's description of what he had done), and I think they simply died out as individual entities after Matthew and Luke used them because the knowledge contained now existed in a broader context in those two gospels.

Again, I want to contrast this with the idea that the evangelists colluded to break up a single gospel into multiple accounts, hiding the whole from their contemporaries, and releasing the parts, staggered over many years.”

=====

6.25.10/Post #150

Wayseer quotes Hentzena, *“Making it up is one form of making it an issue.”*

Wayseer responds to Hentzena, *“If 'making it up' is done methodically from a theologically supportable base leads to a better understanding of how the Gospels were constructed then perhaps such is better than pretending otherwise.”*

=====

6.25.10/Post #151

wgp is quoted, *“The synoptic problem is an illusion caused by the parabolic design of the scripture of the four canonical gospel accounts.”*

Wayseer then asks, *“Could you explain?”*

wgp is quoted, *“The synoptic problem was intentionally crafted by the apostolic writers when they set forth in order the words of each gospel account.”*

Wayseer then asks, *“And your reference is...?”*

wgp is quoted, *“The synoptic problem is an illusion intentionally crafted by the apostolic writers.”*

Wayseer then asks, *“Are you suggesting that the authors deliberately set out to create an illusion?”*

wgp is quoted, *“Q is all scripture of the four canonical gospel accounts of M-M-L-J.”*

Wayseer then asks, *“Where does John fit into what is generally termed the 'synoptic problem'?”*

wgp is quoted, *“One need only use the scripture of Q (meaning the four gospel accounts of M-M-L-J) to first reconstruct the ‘declaration’ mentioned in Luke 1:1; and then conflate the four-columns of text in The Declaration Of The Apostles into one column of text; and thereby restore The Gospel Of Christ, being the ‘former treatise’ mentioned in Acts 1:1.”*

Wayseer asks, *“Really - what is the purpose of this exercise?”*

wgp is quoted, *“It wasn't easy. A real 'hands on' job. But I'm certain you could do it. If "a blue-collar person with no seminary training" could do it, certainly you could.*

It took me seven years. And then seven more after that to triple check the job.

Then I called it good and moved on to new challenges with my Lord Jesus.”

Wayseer then asks, *“Do what exactly?”*

=====

6.25.10/Post #152

Ebia quotes Hentenza, *"Making it up is one form of making it an issue."*

Ebia responds to Hentenza, "Making what up, exactly?"

*There is a lot of overlap between Matthew and Luke.

* Some of that overlap is explained satisfactorily by them both using Mark as a source.

* Some of that overlap is not explained by that and is crying out for explanation.

Which bit of that is made up?"

=====

6.25.10/Post #153

wgp quotes Wayseer who quotes Hentenza, *"There is no synoptic problem. Never has been."*
and then asks wgp, "Could you explain?"

wgp explains, "Matthew-Mark-Luke-John record that there was much 'green grass' at the feeding of the five thousand. Then later on, Matthew and Mark record the feeding of the four thousand with Jesus then going to Jerusalem where he is crucified; however, Luke's gospel account has his 'travelogue' which would have taken at least four to six months to complete, and therefore an additional year can be added to the Lord's ministry.

So M-M-L have Jesus being baptized and then going to Jerusalem in six months; (or maybe a year and a half if you want to add another year because of the 'green grass' at the feeding of the 5000 and Luke's travelogue).

In any event, M-M-L have Jesus being baptized in the fall and entering Jerusalem a year and a half later when he is crucified. This calculation gives Jesus two passover celebrations after he is baptized by John.

The gospel of John has four passovers spanning a three and one-half year public ministry.

So there is a synoptic problem. M-M-L have a year and six months while John has three years and six months.

The synoptic problem is a problem of dramatic unities of time-distance-movement.

The synoptic problem is not a problem of thematic unities.

John Chapter 17 is a thematic unity. The sermon on the mount and the sermon on the plain are thematic unities. The gospel message receives no consideration whatsoever with respect to reconciling the dramatic unities of the four gospel accounts."

wgp quotes Wayseer, *"And you reference is ...?"*

wgp answers Wayseer, "The four canonical gospel accounts of M-M-L-J".

wgp quotes Wayseer, *“Are you suggesting that the authors deliberately set out to create an illusion?”*

wgp explains, *“Not an illusion. A parable to be rightly discerned.”*

wgp quotes Wayseer, *“Where does John fit into what is generally termed the 'synoptic problem?’”*

wgp explains, *“John is included. The scripture cannot be broken.”*

wgp quotes Wayseer, *“Really? What is the purpose of this exercise?”*

wgp explains, *“So believers who wanted to walk in the vanity of their own thoughts could do so. What says the scripture, ‘Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools.’ Rom 1:22*

wgp quotes Wayseer, *“Do what exactly?”*

=====

6.25.10/Post #154

Ebia posts #153 in its entirety, then states, *“The arrogance implicit in the above is simply breath-taking.”*

=====

6.26.10/Post #155

Wayseer quotes wgp, *“Matthew-Mark-Luke-John record that there was much 'green grass' at the feeding of the five thousand.”*

Wayseer answers, *“The amount of green grass or otherwise has nothing to do with the synoptic problem.”*

Wayseer quotes wgp, *“Then later on, Matthew and Mark record the feeding of the four thousand with Jesus then going to Jerusalem where he is crucified; however, Luke's gospel account has his 'travelogue' which would have taken at least four to six months to complete, and therefore an additional year can be added to the Lord's ministry.*

So M-M-L have Jesus being baptized and then going to Jerusalem in six months (or maybe a year and a half if you want to add another year because of the 'green grass' at the feeding of the 5000 and Luke's travelogue).

In any event, M-M-L have Jesus being baptized in the fall and entering Jerusalem a year and a half later when he is crucified. This calculation gives Jesus two passover celebrations after he is baptized by John.

The gospel of John has four passovers spanning a three and one-half year public ministry. So there is a synoptic problem. M-M-L have a year and six months while John has three years and six months.

The synoptic problem is a problem of dramatic unities of time-distance-movement.”

Wayseer offers his advice, "May I suggest you make yourself conversant with what is known as the 'synoptic problem'. At the moment you have no idea. The 'problem' has little or nothing to do with inconsistencies or contradictions."

Wayseer quotes wgp, "Not an illusion. A parable to be rightly discerned."

Wayseer refutes wgp's statement, "The Gospels are not parables - they are narratives."

Wayseer quotes wgp, "John is included. The scripture cannot be broken."

Wayseer concludes, "You probably don't realize you are demonstrating an incredible lack of knowledge. If you are going to make sweeping statement at least do some research. It not so much that you apparently have little idea of what you are talking about but the arrogance that you actually think you are something worthwhile to contribute."

=====

6.26.10/Post #156

Korah quotes kiwimac, "I am shaking the dust off my feet in regards to this discussion. I have rarely seen such large quantities of willful delusion."

Korah responds, "Right on!" I was thinking. Then it occurred to me that he might be including me among the deluded. Although I accept there is a Synoptic Problem and that Q is a studied consensus solution, maybe he thinks that I go too far to the opposite extreme in delineating a specific underlying document. Kiwimac, are you still there? Anyone else care to comment on my proposed solution in my Post #126?

(In any case, I'm not so deluded that anyone chose to point out how wrong I am or in what way. Wayseer and ebia have both disagreed with me in the past, so I expected some discussion from them. And Polycarp1 has proposed in the past a solution different from what I presented here, but which I declined to refute because it seemed acceptable to many serious thinkers here. Maybe I'm receiving the same non-interference from them because I am at least presenting intelligent thought.)"

=====

6.27.10/Post #157

wgp quotes ebia, "The arrogance implicit in the above is simply breathtaking."

wgp responds, "Am I arrogant because I also know the earth is round? Back in the old days, Galileo watched a thirty-three year old monk, who had taught the other monks that the earth was round, burned at the stake; with Galileo himself placed in house arrest for the remainder of his life.

Ebia, would you have me burned at the stake for teaching the solution to the synoptic problem if you were so empowered as the pope?"

=====

6.27.10/Post #158

ebia quotes ebia, *"The arrogance implicit in the above is simply breathtaking."*

ebia quotes wgp, *"Am I arrogant because I also know the earth is round? Back in the old days, Galileo watched a thirty-three year old monk, who had taught the other monks that the earth was round, burned at the stake; with Galileo himself placed in house arrest for the remainder of his life."*

ebia responds, *"You don't seem to know your history and science very well."*

ebia quotes wgp, *"Ebia, would you have me burned at the stake for teaching the solution to the synoptic problem if you were so empowered as the pope?"*

ebia 'in live time' concludes with this statement, *"No, I would simply laugh."*

=====

6.27.10/Post #160

wgp quotes wgp, *"Am I arrogant because I also know the earth is round? Back in the old days, Galileo watched a thirty-three year old monk, who had taught the other monks that the earth was round, burned at the stake; with Galileo himself placed in house arrest for the remainder of his life."*

wgp quotes ebia's response, *"You don't seem to know your history and science very well. No, I would simply laugh."*

wgp 'in live time' asks ebia, *"Is that what the pope did?"*

=====

6.27.10/Post #161

Willtor quotes wgp and edia, *"Am I arrogant because I also know the earth is round? Back in the old days, Galileo watched a thirty-three year old monk, who had taught the other monks that the earth was round, burned at the stake; with Galileo himself placed in house arrest for the remainder of his life."* **wgp**

"You don't seem to know your history and science very well. No, I would simply laugh." **Edia**

"Is that what the pope did?" **wgp**

Willtor concludes, *"Galileo promoted a Copernican view of the solar system (with the Sun at the center, rather than the Earth). Everybody already knew that the Earth was round. Nobody got burned at the stake for it."*

=====

6.27.10/#162

Willtor writes an addendum to post #161: "I don't know if comparing yourself to Galileo shows a lot of humility. Maybe let other people do that."

=====

6.27.10/Post #163

wgp states, "The culture of Higher Criticism is condescending, prideful, and meanspirited; and frustrated by their failure to have found a Q document or to have manufactured a facsimile of Q; a real document comprised of real words that all could read.

But they never have. So they do second best. They publish many books that advance the theories of Q without ever producing a document that is Q.

Do you guys know what a shell game is?

The proponents of Higher Criticism have deluded themselves while promoting the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on the body of Christ.

In light of the reconstruction of "The Declaration Of The Apostles" and the restoration of "The Gospel of Christ," the proponents of Higher Criticism must now produce Q or turn their time and energies to "The Restoration Of The Gospel Of Christ".

=====

6.27.10/#164

wgp states, "Higher Criticism is a corroding sickness, a cancer that is slowly eating away at the very foundation of western civilization. The foundation of western civilization being Old Testament law and New Testament grace."

=====

6.27.10/#165

ebia responded to post #164, "Yup, anti-intellectual rant will quickly persuade the scholarly community to take you seriously."

=====

6.27.10 5:13 pm/#166

wgp quotes ebia, "*Yup, anti-intellectual rant will quickly persuade the scholarly community to take you seriously.*"

wgp responds, "In light of the reconstruction of the declaration referenced in Luke 1:1, "*Forasmuch many have set forth in order a declaration of those things*" which is entitled "The Declaration Of The Apostles according to william"; and...

In light of the restoration of the gospel of Christ referenced to in Acts 1:1, "*The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus...*" which is entitled "The Gospel Of Christ according to william"...no one will take the pseudo scholarship of Higher Criticism seriously.

Both of the above mentioned documents are in pdf format and available at no charge. You should make no further comments until you have examined these documents."

=====

6.27.10/#167

ebia states, "I had a look and saw nothing that would cause me to take them seriously."
 =====

6.27.10/#168

wgp quotes ebia's comment, "*I had a look and saw nothing that would cause me to take them seriously.*"

wgp responds, "What you sow you reap. I've had a look at you and have seen nothing that would cause me to take you seriously. I will no longer respond to your posts."
 =====

6.27.10/#169

Willtor quotes wgp, "*The culture of Higher Criticism is condescending, prideful, and meanspirited; frustrated by their failure to have found a Q document or to have manufactured a facsimile of Q; a real document comprised of real words that all could read. But they never have. So they do second best. They publish many books that advance the theories of Q without ever producing a document that is Q.*"

Willtor responds, "I don't know that there is a "culture of Higher Criticism" but there is scholarship. And, given that Luke indicates that he has used other sources, it suggests that there are or were other sources. That said, the number of first and second century manuscripts and fragments is very small – for anything. If something stopped being copied after the first century, it is likely we would never find it. That doesn't mean there is no evidence of its existence."

Willtor again quotes wgp, "*Do you guys know what a shell game is? The proponents of Higher Criticism have deluded themselves while promoting the greatest fraud ever perpetrated on the body of Christ. In light of the reconstruction of The Declaration Of The Apostles and the restoration of The Gospel of Christ, the proponents of Higher Criticism must now produce Q or turn their time and energies to "The Restoration Of The Gospel Of Christ."*

Willtor concludes, "I don't think they're going to do so. This new idea involves a lot of speculation with little explanatory power."
 =====

6.27.10/#170

wayseer quotes wgp, "*What you sow you reap. I've had a look at you and have seen nothing that would cause me to take you seriously. I will no longer respond to your posts.*"

wayseer responds, "...and that is where your arrogance is fully displayed - you fail to see what is 'serious'. You have made unsubstantiated claims about the the Synoptic Problem and expect everyone to agree with you. Rather than addressing the 'serious' nature of the questions directed at you, you elect to rant and rail against everyone and everything. If you have something worthwhile to say we are all listening. Simple providing links is not sufficient - anyone can google and we can all read. What you have to demonstrate is how your opinion is supported by those references and you need to argue your case rather than avoiding the issues."
 =====

6.27.10/#171

wgp quotes wayseer, "...and that is where your arrogance is fully displayed - you fail to see what is 'serious. You have made **unsubstantiated claims** about the the Synoptic Problem and expect everyone to agree with you. Rather than addressing the 'serious' nature of the questions directed at you, you elect to rant and rail against everyone and everything. If you have something worthwhile to say we are all listening. Simply providing links is not sufficient - anyone can google and we can all read. What you have to demonstrate is how your opinion is supported by those references and you need to argue your case rather than avoiding the issues."

wgp responds, "I have two "substantiated" claims. The first is a printed physical book entitled "The Declaration Of The Apostles according to william" which is the "declaration of those things" which Luke makes reference to in Luke 1:1-4. The second is a printed physical book entitled "The Gospel Of Christ according to william" which is "The former treatise have I made..." referenced to in Acts 1:1."

I would prefer that you download *Bomber's Links* to start. *Bomber's Links* has the Dec and the Gospel merged and linked in a pdf; so you can go toggle between the Dec and The Gospel Of Christ. I don't have a theory or a hypothesis to explain. I have two hard documents to be examined and reviewed. The work speaks for itself. Grace be with you."

The Church At Troutdale
www.thechurchattroutdale.com
wm@thechurchattroutdale.com

=====

6.28.10/#172

ebia quotes wgp, "The work speaks for itself."

ebia states, "I think we can all agree on that!"

=====

6.28.10/#173

wayseer quotes wgp, "I don't have a theory or a hypothesis to explain. I have two hard documents to be examined and reviewed."

wayseer responds, "If you place you faith is such stuff then you don't need me - you need help".

=====

6.28.10/#174

Korah quotes wayseer, "If you place you faith is such stuff then you don't need me - you need help."

Korah responds, "I was careful to avoid saying that (deleted before posting), but yes, I agree."

=====