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INTRODUCTION

The Problem.

Παῦλος Σοῦλος Ἰησοῦς Ἰσχου Ἰησοῦ, ¹ so the man from Tarsus was wont to identify himself. And Christian history has given him a place second only to his Master. Nearly a third of the books composing "The New Covenant Commonly Called The New Testament Of Our Lord And Saviour Jesus Christ" are from his pen. Had he not lived Christianity might not have endured a hundred years; certainly it would have followed a different course. For better or for worse his stamp is indelibly upon it.

And yet, there is no reason to suppose that he ever walked the dusty paths of Galilee or the foot-worn stones of Jerusalem with Jesus. A contemporary, yes, but a hearer, probably not, and a follower certainly not. He who labored for a generation as an ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν Θεοῦ... περὶ τοῦ νόμου ²

¹. Romans 1:1, text of Nestle, NTG, (a key to the abbreviations used will be found in the bibliography).
². Romans 1:3.
must have gleaned from others most, if not all, of his knowledge concerning the Jesus of history.

The problem, therefore, is to determine, if possible, whether or not Paul may have had some written sources regarding Jesus. It is obvious that he knew some traditions about his Master. It is equally obvious that many more traditions were in circulation, inasmuch as the Gospels came to be written. This dissertation is limited by excluding from consideration all possible sources other than written. It attempts to discover evidence of written sources and their nature and to correlate them with the documents posited as a result of Gospel-criticism.

Is there reason to believe that there were any written accounts in existence before Paul's death? As Ramsay's brilliant historical insight led him to believe,

1. Cf. 1 Cor 11:23f.
2. Craig believes that this cannot be done: "In the letters of Paul...there is evidence of a collection of the words of Jesus. Whether that was written, or as yet oral, we have no means of knowing," SNT, 27. Cf. Bundy, Art.(1942), 92.
and the ever-increasing papyri discoveries conclusively prove, it was a note-making, letter-sending age.¹

So far as antecedent probability goes, founded on the general character of preceding and contemporary Greek or Graeco-Asiatic society, the first Christian account of the circumstances connected with the death of Jesus must be presumed to have been written in the year when Jesus died.²

Certainly there is no doubt that written documents circulated between A.D. 60 and 70. Almost all modern scholars are agreed that Mark is the oldest Gospel and that it is to be dated within a decade of Paul's death.³ It is also widely accepted that at least one other written document preceded the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, "Q," which is usually put earlier than Mark.⁴ Many scholars, following the lead of Canon Streeter,⁵ believe that other written sources underlie Matthew and Luke also. With full appreciation of the "oral tradition," there is no reason to doubt that fairly extensive written documents concerning Jesus and his work were in existence

¹ Ramsay, LSCA, chapters I, II.
² Ramsay, LSCA, 5f. For the contrary view see Gregory, GT, 45f.
³ Alfaric, Art.(1927) dates it c. 100, however.
⁴ "There is pretty general agreement...that the Q material had been gathered in written form...certainly before...66," Fowler, Art.(1924), 10. Cf. Weiss, PJ, 21.
⁵ FG.
within a decade of Paul's death.

It now appears that even Mark incorporates earlier written documents. So Manson says:¹

It is probable that the author incorporates other matter along with Petrine reminiscences, and some of this matter may already have been written down (e.g. chap. 13...or 2:1-3:6).

And Craig remarks:²

Before the composition of our earliest gospel, written collections were probably in circulation...In Mark, a half-dozen sections may plausibly be referred to previous written documents.

F. C. Grant concurs:³ "There are probably sources underlying even the Gospel of Mark--some of them undoubtedly written sources." And Q is dated as early as A.D. 50 by some.⁴ All of which indicates the possibility, at least, that Paul may have known and used written documents. So Manson reconstructs the circumstances,

if we ask what literature the Church possessed at the time when Paul and Barnabas set out on the first Missionary Journey, the answer will be: the Old Testament; an outline of the Ministry of Jesus and a detailed account of the Passion, the latter in fixed form if not written down; a collection of the teachings of Jesus (Q) probably in writing; possibly other

¹. Manson, CTB, 115.
³. Grant, Art. (1945), 757.
⁴. Manson, CTB, 99.
collections...either written down or on the way to being written down."

It will be the task of this work to determine whether or not it can be demonstrated that Paul actually did use written sources for at least some of his knowledge concerning Jesus.

The Method.

We shall approach the problem from several different viewpoints. The earliest tradition of the Church must, of course, be discovered and evaluated. The insights of the greatest interpreters must be considered. The results of modern scholarship must be utilized. But the primary method will be to compare Pauline passages and Gospel passages with respect to their vocabulary, form, and content. Then the attempt will be made to determine if the Gospel passages closely paralleling Pauline passages come from any distinguishable stratum, such as Q, L, or M.

The following books will be assumed as Pauline for the purposes of this study: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, and Colossians, since there is approximate agreement

1. Manson, CTE, 99f. Cf. however, Bacon, JP, 6: "When he (Paul) and his missionary associates set out to convert the Empire none of them had so much as thought of putting their message in written form."
A Review Of The Work Of Others.

A large number of writers have dealt with the question of Paul's relationship to Jesus. Was he a faithful follower? Or was he an innovator? Are "the religion of Jesus and the faith of Paul" two different things? Is the reasoning that has "caused some to say that Paul and not Jesus is the actual founder of Christianity" sound? Our problem, it will be seen at once, is subsidiary to this main issue and has not been thoroughly probed. Paulinism, as exhibited in the New Testament, has distinctive characteristics not even alluded to in the Gospels. Those who deny any reliance of Paul on Jesus and who assert his creative originality have been impressed by these, and have read Paul with entire confidence in the literalness of his express assertion, 

1. The title of Deissmann's book, RJFP.
2. Parsons, RNT, 116.
Those who would assert the dependence of Paul on Jesus and his faithful discipleship have compared the resultant "systems" of the two as they stand in our record. Paul's vehement Galatian statement they take to be an over-exaggeration made in the heat of controversy. Of course he had learned (and by quite prosaic and mundane means) many of the facts about Jesus. "Paul, notwithstanding his violent disclaimers, must have been influenced by the ideas of those who were apostles before him." 

Bratton helps to clarify the scene with a two-column classification:

| A | Theory that Paul effected a complete break with the original Christian community, and founded a new Gentile Christianity independently on the basis of his own theology. |
| B | Theory that Paul agreed with Jesus' teachings in every department of thought and his system shows distinct dependence on the Jesus Tradition. |

---

2. As Paul could do, cf. 1 Cor 1:14-16. Enslin, ESP, 112: "It is surely unwise to see a conflict between his explicit denial of having received his gospel from men and his sympathetic appreciation of whatever friends of Jesus might have told him." Porter, MCIP, 18: "Paul knew Peter, and after spending two weeks with him early in his career as an apostle we may be entirely certain that he knew all that Peter could tell him about Jesus."
3. Ropes, AA, 142.
4. Art. (1929), 149.
5. Scott, LINT, 3, phrases it thus: The theory "that Paul knew little about the historical Jesus and cared less."
This is a little too simple, however. Modifications and syntheses have been suggested, necessitating at least three more categories.

C  Theory that Paul is often in substantial agreement with Jesus, but that no connection is to be traced between the two. Coincidences of thought and expression are to be ascribed to their common Jewish heritage.

D  Theory that Paul continues Jesus' work and gospel, being consciously dependent upon the Jesus of history.

E  Theory that Paul continues Jesus' work and gospel without any conscious dependence on the Jesus of history.

Pfleiderer may be taken as representative of column "A."

He (Paul) determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ as the crucified and risen Lord. These two facts (which in his view became one, in so far as it was precisely by his resurrection that the crucified Jesus was shown to be the Christ and the saving significance of his death on the cross was guaranteed) constituted the Alpha and Omega of his gospel, whilst nothing else—not even the life of Jesus on earth—was taken into consideration at all. For the very reason that he had become convinced of this cardinal point by an inward process, Paul could say that he had not received or learnt his gospel from men, but by revelation of Jesus Christ...If we may suppose that Paul used...(his) three years' retreat into Arabia after his conversion for the purpose of thinking over, making his own, and shaping the new conviction at which he had arrived, it follows that his gospel had already been fixed in his mind, when he sought to
make the acquaintance of the older apostles.  

Similarities between the Gospels and the Epistles he handles in this manner:

Isolated references to utterances of Jesus, it is true, occur, which presuppose a certain acquaintance with the gospel tradition. But most of them are of entirely secondary significance; the account of the institution of the Lord's supper only is of greater importance, but it is in just this case that Paul appears...not to appeal to human transmission of historical information, but to a direct revelation of Christ, a view which is in complete accord with the fact that his version of the words used by Jesus...presents a dogmatic turn which differs from the older gospel tradition, and of which he may very well have become convinced by the inward process of religious induction.

Therefore there is no evidence or reason to suppose that Paul had any oral or documentary sources concerning Jesus. Alfarc, dating "la plus archaïque des Vies de Jésus arrivées jusqu'à nous, celle qui porte le nom de Marc" c. 100 finds that it depends on Paul for its knowledge of Jesus, but that Paul had no historical knowledge of Jesus! After quoting the Galatian passages given above, he remarks "il se dit qu'eux aussi n'ont connu le Maître que par révélation." Therefore Paul's whole idea of Jesus is of an ideal rather than of an historical Messiah.

1. Pfleiderer, IAP, 49f.  
2. Pfleiderer, IAP, 51f.  
3. Alfarc, Art.(1927), 256.  
4. Alfarc, Art.(1927), 263.
Un examen rapide des passages pauliniens où l'on a cru voir des souvenirs vivants d'un Jésus historique montrera que tous se situent sur un plan idéal, complètement étranger à l'histoire, que leurs affirmations se fondent sur la seule Écriture, non sur une tradition authentique.

Such texts as Galatians 4:4 (ἐξεπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ὡδὲ αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ πνεύμatos) which seem to reflect some knowledge of a flesh-and-blood person are handled by him in this manner:

Ils peuvent fort bien avoir été ajoutés par un éditeur catholique, qui tenait à établir ainsi la réalité de la chair du Christ, à l'encontre des négations gnostiques.

And even if it should prove to be authentically Pauline, it still doesn't indicate historic knowledge. On the contrary, it demonstrates its lack.

Admettons, après tout, si l'on veut, que les mots incriminés sont authentiques. Pouvons-nous y voir une attestation historique de la naissance du Christ? Non, car leur contexte s'y oppose. Paul n'y rapporte aucun détail concret, qui donne l'impression d'une scène réelle. Il ne laisse point soupçonner davantage à quelle date arriva ce fait important entre tous. Il se contente de dire que ce fut à "l'échance" fixée par le Père, quand il arriva que fut rempli le temps... ces mots... font évidemment allusion aux anciennes prophéties qui annonçaient l'avènement d'un chef idéal préposé par Dieu

1. Alfaric, Art. (1927), 266.
à son royaume.¹

First Corinthians 7:10 (τοὺς δὲ ἐφορμηκόσιν παραγγέλλων, οὔτε ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος, γνωστα ἀπὸ ἄνδρος μὴ χωρίς. Ἐννα) is dismissed with the remark "que l'Evangile selon Marc...a été écrit assez longtemps après les Epitres de Paul."² Exactly how that invalidates Paul's testimony he does not make clear, but he is certain that Paul had no authentic tradition, oral or written, concerning Jesus.

En somme, l'Apotre ne cite pas un seul mot, il ne rapporte pas un seul fait qui se rattache à la prédication de Jésus...Il eût ainsi établi sa doctrine sur des preuves bien plus directes et convaincantes que celles qu'il déduit péniblement de testes archaïques.³

Maintaining the position set forth in column "B" is John G. Machen. "What was the origin of the religion of Paul?" he asks.⁴ And the answer is straightforward, "The religion of Paul was based upon Jesus."⁵ Paul, he is confident, had "abundant sources" of knowledge about Jesus. Before his conversion he must have known the facts of Jesus' life and death. At Damascus there must have been

¹ Alfaric, Art.(1927), 267.
² Alfaric, Art.(1927), 272.
³ Alfaric, Art.(1927), 274.
⁴ Machen, OPR, 117.
⁵ Machen, OPR, 117.
those who had known the earthly Jesus. When he visited Peter and James at Jerusalem "it is quite inconceivable that the three men avoided the subject of Jesus' words and deeds." His intimate and early associations with Barnabas and Mark, both of whom were members of the primitive Jerusalem Christian community must have supplied him with Jesus-traditions. There are Gospel and Epistle parallels. The conclusion, "Paul was in possession of a fund of information about the words of Jesus."\(^1\)

Machen attempts to substantiate his view primarily be a comparison of the teachings of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels and those of Paul expressed in his letters. Thus, "Jesus and Paul present the same view of the Kingdom of God."\(^2\) "Paul is like Jesus in his doctrine of the Fatherhood of God."\(^3\) "Paul is like Jesus in presenting a doctrine of grace."\(^4\) "The ethical teaching of Paul is strikingly similar to that of Jesus,"\(^5\) and so forth.

He does not, however, touch the question of the na-

\(^1\) Machen, OPR, 147. Cf. Scott, Art. (1929), 15ff. Bartlet, Art. (1929), 387 says Paul "shows a marked insight into the character of Jesus as it is described in the Gospels."
\(^2\) Machen, OPR, 160.
\(^3\) Machen, OPR, 161.
\(^4\) Machen, OPR, 164.
\(^5\) Machen, OPR, 164. Cf. Howard, Art. (1939), 6: "The more carefully we study the letters of the Apostle the more clearly we must recognize that they are steeped in the ethic of Jesus."
ture of Paul's sources. He is content to demonstrate the
dependence of Paul on Jesus without considering whether
Paul's sources of knowledge were documentary, oral, or
both.¹

One of the most recent books in the field, The
Meaning of Christ for Paul, by Elias Andrews, deals with
the problem in a similar fashion. The "supreme" sources of
Pauline thought are "his knowledge of Jesus, and his in-
heritance from the beliefs of the early Christians."²

"That he was indifferent to, and to a great extent ignorant
of, the human life of Jesus, cannot be conceded."³ ⁴"We
find such similarity between Jesus and Paul that no other
explanation than direct knowledge by the latter is adequate."⁴
The author borders on our problem when he says, "Paul's
thought is dominated by the gospel tradition and...there
are many details in his epistles which presuppose that
tradition,"⁵ but he nowhere addresses himself to it.

Rall is of substantially the same mind.

¹. Cf. Scott, LINT, 27. "How Paul arrived at this harmony
with the mind of Christ I do not venture to guess."
Paul's "ignorance of, and indifference to, the 'Jesus
of history' is completely mistaken."
represent the source and not the result of St. Paul's
teaching."
It is wrong to conclude...that he (Paul) was either ignorant or indifferent in relation to the historic Jesus. There are scores of references to him in the epistles. He refers to Jesus as man, as Jew, born of a woman, with brothers of whom one is named, under the law, sinless, obedient, filled with the spirit of holiness, with a circle of followers, instituting the Lord's Supper, weak, suffering, betrayed, dying on the cross, buried and raised from the dead.¹

Paul's dependence on Jesus is clear, he believes, but it is not part of his purpose to demonstrate how that came about.

Enslin expresses the point of view represented by column "C." He realizes that Paul "may well have been familiar with considerable tradition about Jesus,"² but he concludes that his use of that tradition was insignificantly slight because "attempts to show verbal parallels have not been wholly convincing."³ He is inclined to believe that the similarities are to be explained as evidence of an...outlook on life essentially the same for Jesus and Paul...Jesus and Paul were both good Jews...the result was an essential harmony of thought and expression.⁴

But then, belatedly, he realizes that he has succeeded

---

1. Rall, ATP, 127.
2. Enslin, ESP, 112.
3. Enslin, ESP, 112.
4. Enslin, ESP, 114. Cf. Minear, Rev. (1949), 277: "Paul was neither an innovator nor an echo but a faithful witness to a common tradition."
only in raising the same problem from different presuppositions: "The real problem is...that Paul...so often agrees without any real literary dependence."\(^1\) He attempts no explanation of this.

Schweitzer also adheres to the position represented by the third column.

The system of the Apostle of the Gentiles stands over against the teaching of Jesus as something of an entirely different character, and does not create the impression of having arisen out of it.\(^2\)

But, particularly in his eschatological expectations, Paul is nevertheless very close to Jesus, both being products of late Jewish apocalypticism.

The fourth position (column "D") is represented by Bacon. He believes there is a fundamental harmony between Jesus and Paul.

Is it then the fact that Paul's gospel...is an innovation upon the gospel of Jesus? Certainly it was not so the the consciousness of Paul; and (what is more convincing) it does not appear to have been so to Paul's fellow disciples.\(^3\)

But it is a development, a continuation, an amplification of Jesus' message. "He continues Jesus' work; but admit-

---

3. Bacon, JP, 68.
tedly it is a transfigured gospel."¹ The reason this came about, he believes, is that in Paul's time the career of Jesus was "unrecorded save for the ordinance of the memorial Supper and the answering rite of self-dedication by baptism into his name."² Therefore it is foolish to seek evidences of literary dependence.

We find great effort expended by scholars to enlarge to the utmost the minimal traces in the Epistles of acquaintance with the teaching of Jesus, and a strong disposition to assume that it must have played a much larger part in Paul's preaching than these extremely meager references suggest.³

Resch, on the other hand, believes that not only is a fundamental harmony between Paul and Jesus discernible, but that Paul's knowledge rested on Q.⁴ His book, the most thoroughgoing yet in the field, answers "the great question: did Paul ever use Q?" affirmatively.⁵ He does it by trying to show that the connections between Paul and the Synoptics are traceable directly to Q.⁶ Paulinism is etymologically and conceptually a derivation of Q.⁷ The figures of speech

¹ Bacon, JP, 53. Cf. Grant, INTT, 311: "There is certainly a shift in emphasis as the Christian tradition passes from Jesus to Paul."
² Bacon, JP, 53.
³ Bacon, JP, 84.
⁴ Resch, PLJ, 639.
⁵ Resch, PLJ, 17.
⁶ Resch, PLJ, 18, 635.
⁷ Resch, PLJ, 515.
of Jesus slightly altered by Paul are numerous. Only eight of Jesus' parables are without some reference in Paul. Paul alludes to many historical events described in the synoptics. List upon list of parallels is given.

At least three factors have kept Resch's work from becoming definitive, however. Fundamental to his argument, they have not succeeded in gaining widespread acceptance. First, his unquestioning identification of Q with the logia of Papias; second, his confidence that Mark used Q; and third, his assumption that Q was in written form before Paul's conversion and was studied by him in Arabia. This he believes is the only possible solution to the problem of Galatians 1:17-18; and this is the place where almost all scholars part company with him.

Weiss is another who believes that Paul was dependent upon the Jesus of history. "The idea that Paul had no knowledge of the life of Jesus and also no interest in it collapses entirely." But he grounds that assertion somewhat differently than either Bacon or Resch, finding

1. Resch, PLJ, 515.
2. Resch, PLJ, 521.
3. Resch, PLJ, 528.
6. Resch, PLJ, 550, 634.
7. Resch, PLJ, 634.
the evidence for it in a knowledge of Jesus by Paul through personal contact, rather than in oral or written traditions.

Paul's vision and conversion are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus.¹

Finally, there is the fifth position, column "E."

One of the ablest presentations of it is by Ropes. He says,

now the relation between the theology of Paul and the teaching of Jesus presents a real problem... Students have been so impressed with the obvious differences...that they have denied that Paul's thought had anything to do with or was at all influenced by the thought of Jesus...(but) Paul plainly shared the deepest thought of Jesus about the nature of God...about God's attitudes of love to the world, about man's opportunity...and man's duty to observe a vigorous morality...summed up in the comprehensive principle of love. How is this to be explained?

The problem is one of the hardest in all the study of the New Testament. The secret would seem to lie in the remarkable fact that Paul did not come to his main ideas through hearing, receiving, and meditating upon the precepts and parables of the Gospels, but reached them by a different path.²

That path was Paul's own religious experience, primarily his conversion.

Out of it, and, as it were, independently of the

¹. Weiss, PJ, 31.
². Ropes, AA, 138f.
tradition of Jesus' sayings, came the harmony with Jesus' thought... In a word, Paul's theology was built on the fact of Christ's death and resurrection and on Christ's person, not on his teachings. That when it is tested by a comparison with Jesus' sayings, it proves to be an adequate interpretation of Jesus, may well illustrate the perfect correspondence of the life of Jesus with those sayings.\footnote{Ropes, AA, 140f.}

Hence, Paul's thought

is not a continuous development from the thought of Jesus, but is in a measure a new start, yet so controlled by the supreme expression of Jesus' nature, not in words but in his life and death, that it is fully dependent upon Jesus and in fundamental harmony with him.\footnote{Ropes, AA, 139.}

But the source of such accurate knowledge of Jesus' life apart from his teachings is not indicated.

Feine, one of the earliest to attempt the solution of this problem, would classify himself under column "D" rather than "E." That is, he believed that Paul was consciously dependent upon the Jesus of history.\footnote{Feine, JCP, 44, 150f.} There is a relationship between the Epistles and the Gospel source-materials, but Paul had so worked it over in his own mind and experience that it became his own.\footnote{Feine, JCP, 71f.} There are Gospel-Pauline parallels also.\footnote{Feine, JCP, 56-72.} Paul knows a number of things about the historic Jesus,\footnote{Feine, JCP, 295.} and so forth.
Feine is more truly representative of the last column ("E"), however, for several reasons. The first is that for him the "historical" life of Jesus includes both the pre-existent and resurrected Christ. For him the historical revelation of Christ can not be limited to Jesus' earthly life. The risen Christ, the "Christ of faith" who is the main theme of Paul's thinking, is a fact of human experience and hence, for Feine, is "historical." Since Paul identifies this risen Lord with a pre-existent Christ, this too is part of "history." It is evident that he uses the term "historical" in a different way than that to which we are now accustomed. Consequently, and this is a second reason, the personality and/or character of Christ is not to be understood as it would be of anyone else. He is not to be compared to historical characters because He is the Divine Son of God. His historicity consists not merely in His earthly life, but also in the experience He creates in His disciples. In the way the present writer is using the terms, therefore, Paul continued Jesus' work but without much dependence upon the human, historical Jesus of Galilee. For Feine, since we

1. Feine, JCP, 7, 44.
2. Feine, JCP, 7.
3. Feine, JCP, 7.
4. Feine, JCP, 44.
5. Feine, JCP, 11, 53.
6. Feine, JCP, 44.
cannot believe that Paul ever knew Jesus personally, 1
Paul's whole impression was that of the risen and exalted
Christ.

Aside from the fact that he nowhere attempts to anal-
lyze the sources of Paul's knowledge, 2 but is content to
demonstrate the dependence of Paul on Jesus in a number of
areas, 3 there are at least two factors making revision and
extension of his work desirable. First of all, he relies
on the historicity of the Gospel According To John and be-
lieves that its picture of Jesus is identical with that of
the Synoptics and that of Paul. 4 Secondly, he uses all of
the epistles traditionally ascribed to Paul, including the
Pastorals. 5

A number of scholars do not discuss this issue.
Among them are Hatch and van Manen, 6 Findlay, 7 Menzies and
Edie, 8 and Deissmann. 9

Indirectly, some attention has been given to the
problem in periodical articles. Among these articles none

1. Feine, JCP, 93.
2. Beyond ascribing his mysterious depth of understanding
to "Christ mysticism," p. 7.
3. Fatherhood of God, grace, eschatological salvation, Last
Supper, etc. pp. 155-295.
4. Feine, JCP, 15.
5. Feine, JCP, 17.
6. Art. (1914).
7. Art. (1900).
9. RJFP.
are of more than casual interest in our present investigation. One of these is a vigorous refutation of Weiss' claim that the words of 2 Corinthians 5:16 "admit no other interpretation than...that Paul had seen and known Jesus in person."1 Its author concludes that Paul "makes no claim, here or elsewhere, to have seen the earthly Jesus."2 But this in no way affects our inquiry. Another answers the question of its title, "Did Mark Know Q?"3 with an emphatic "No." Incidental to that task it insists that Q is to be defined as a written document rather than an oral tradition or a combination of the two, which supports the possibility of Paul's having had access to written documents. A third article asserts that "between the ethics of St. Paul and the moral teaching of Jesus there is an intimate parallelism,"4 but does little to support that assertion.

Only one article speaks directly on the issue that concerns us, but the author presents no thorough investigation in support of his contention.

I do not know how great use Paul would have made of a book of Jesus' deeds or words had he had one...But I do feel quite sure we should find more references to the facts of the life or the

specific teachings, if Paul had had either an Ur-Marcus or a Q.¹

Perhaps the approach most nearly like that of this works is suggested by Sanday. Paul, he believes, cannot have had access to our present Gospels; but is it not possible that he may have had in his hands one or other of the documents out of which our present Gospels are composed?...there is nothing, so far as we can see, in this document (Q) to make it impossible for St. Paul to have had the opportunity of consulting it...We may well believe that this was really the object with which it was composed—that it was a manual for Christian missionaries.²

However, he makes no investigation into the question of whether or not his conjecture can be demonstrated. To the problem of whether or not it can be clearly shown that Paul actually used written sources for his knowledge of the life and teachings of Jesus this study is addressed.

1. Fowler, Art. (1924), 11f.
I. TRADITION AND INTERPRETATION IN THE CHURCH

Before Nicea.

Exceeded in importance only by the testimony of the New Testament itself in such a study as ours is the tradition of the Church. Late traditions, which are usually little more than the figments of overly active pious (and often superstitious) imaginations, are worthy of little consideration, to be sure. But everything having documentary sources as early as that convenient dividing line, A.D. 325 must be carefully sought out and considered.

In our particular area little is to be found. What there is, however, is unanimous. Wherever the specific subject arises the Fathers are one in agreeing that Paul had accurate, probably written sources about Jesus. And always the reliability of Paul as an interpreter of the Gospel and the validity of his Apostleship is sustained. So Clement of Rome asserts the authority of the Apostles in these words: "Ὅι ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν εὐβηγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγενεμφηθή,"¹ and a little later refers to "Paul the Apostle" and appeals to his authority.

Ἀναλαβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.²

---

¹. XLII 1f. (All quotations from the Apostolic Fathers are from the text of Lake, AF.)
². XLVII 1.
Ignatius equates Paul's apostolic authority with that of the eyewitness Peter, Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διακοσμοῦσιν ὑμῖν, ἐγὼν ἀπόστολος. Paul's precision is affirmed by Polycarp, 

ἐν ὑμῖν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν τότε ἐν Ὀρθώπων ἐξέδωκεν ἀκριβῶς καὶ βασιλεῖς τῶν περὶ ἀληθείας λόγον.

Nowhere is there any suggestion that Paul was ignorant of or indifferent to Jesus; rather, he is taken to be the true expositor of the living gospel.

It is not until we reach the time of Irenaeus that any specific statement relative to our problem is to be found. In Against Heresies he says directly that Luke recorded the Gospel preached by Paul: "Luke...the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him." And in another passage it is strongly argued that what Luke knew he learned from Paul. These references sound, however, as though Luke were writing down, perhaps after Paul's death, what had been the substance of Paul's preaching (as Papias says Mark did of Peter's). At any rate, they are concerned with establishing the

---

1. Romans IV, 3.
2. Philippians III, 2.
3. III, 1.1. (Quotations and references in the Church Fathers are from Roberts, ANF).
authority of Luke's Gospel and not the relationship of Paul to Jesus. If accurate, in the light of modern documentary theories it would indicate, however, that Paul had some written documents. Luke's Gospel is also connected with Paul by others. The Muratorian Fragment speaks of Luke's connection with Paul.\(^1\) Tertullian\(^2\) informs us that Luke's version of the Gospel is customarily ascribed to Paul. Origen, as quoted by Eusebius,\(^3\) refers to the third gospel as "by Luke, the Gospel commended by Paul, and composed for Gentile converts."\(^4\) Eusebius himself implies that such was the common understanding in his day, "and they say that Paul meant to refer to Luke's Gospel wherever, as if speaking of some Gospel of his own, he used the words, 'according to my gospel.'"\(^5\) And again he remarks that Luke was aided in his work "by his intimacy and his stay with Paul."\(^6\)

---

1. Ayer, SECH, 118.
3. Ch. Hist. VI 24.6. (Quotations from Eusebius are from Schaff, NPNF).
4. This may be the passage that Schaff (History of the Christian Church, N.Y.: Scribner's, 1882 vol. I p. 649) has in mind when he says that Origen interpreted the words "according to my gospel" in Rom 2:16; 16:25; and 2 Tim. 2:8 as a Pauline reference to Luke's Gospel causing McGiffert (in Schaff, NPNF, I, 137) to comment, "I have not been able to find in Origen's works anything to confirm the statement."
The few allusions in the Christian apocryphal literature represent Paul as being an authoritative interpreter of Jesus. One of the Coptic Passion narratives implies that Paul was the head of those Jews to whom Jesus was betrayed by Judas. One of the Syriac narratives of the Assumption of the Virgin depicts Paul as criticizing Peter, John, and Andrew so severely as to make them angry. While they are disputing in front of Mary's tomb, Jesus appears and justifies Paul as against the others. In The Acts of Paul, which is dated c. 160, Paul is described as explaining to Demas and Hermogenes "all the oracles of the Lord, and of the teaching and interpretation (of the Gospel)... and (he) related unto them word by word all the great works of Christ." And in another instance it records Paul as uttering a series of beatitudes, including "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," and "blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy." In the "correspondence" of Paul with Corinth we read, "For I delivered unto you in the beginning the things which I received of the Holy Apostles which were before me, who were at all times with Jesus Christ."

1. James, ANT, 150.
2. James, ANT, 224.
3. James, ANT, 272.
4. James, ANT, 273.
5. James, ANT, 289.
What importance can we attach to these testimonies from the early literature of the Church? Certainly not very much to the apocryphal materials. They are so clearly legendary and/or polemical, even contradicting Paul's own Epistles, as to cause us to disregard them altogether. The Apostolic Fathers make no direct contribution to our study. The Church Fathers do provide valuable statements worthy of careful consideration. When that is given, however, it seems likely that their close association of Paul with Luke's Gospel comes from a combination of three factors, 1) an elaboration of New Testament references to the companionship of Luke and Paul, 2) faulty exegesis of the words "according to my gospel," and 3) the struggle to establish an authoritative canon during the last part of the second century, rather than that they are faithful witnesses to an earlier and presumably valid tradition. We must not attach more than a very modest value to them.

After Nicea.

We pass now from tradition to interpretation in the Church. What have the creative and moulding minds of Christendom to say concerning our problem? The question is a difficult one because it is hard to ask them a question they never asked themselves. They labored under a view of
the uniformity and unity of Scripture\(^1\) which, while perhaps "the best that even transcendent spiritual genius could at that time achieve,"\(^2\) no longer commends itself to spiritually inquiring minds. The problem of this dissertation would have been summarily dismissed by John Calvin with the words, "impious curiosity"!

Only by indirection, then, can we look for the insights of Jerome, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, and Calvin in this matter. As with the tradition of the early Church there is not a great mass of material, but what there is is unanimous.

Jerome regards Paul as a loyal follower and faithful interpreter of Jesus. Letter XXII\(^3\) is devoted to holding up Paul as a true interpreter of the Master. Speaking of Paul's admission in 1 Cor 7:25 that "I have no command of the Lord," he ingeniously shows how even this is a faithful following of Jesus. Jesus, says Jerome, never gave a command on this matter because "what is freely

---

1. "It seems to me that most disastrous consequences must follow upon our believing that anything false is found in the Sacred books." Augustine, NPNF vol. I, 251. Cf. Aquinas, ST, 1087: "In the canonical scripture we must not hold anything to be false."
3. All quotations from Jerome are from Schaff, NPNF.
offered is worth more than what is extorted by force."¹

Several times he collates Pauline and Gospel teachings.

He mentions "a thing which the Lord...has forbidden in the gospel. Hence also, the apostle says: 'It is good for a man not to touch' a wife..."² Galatians 5:17 he takes to be the exposition of Matthew 6:24,³ and Ephesians 5:18 is equated with Luke 21:34.⁴ Speaking of Paul's injunction in 1 Corinthians 7:39 he remarks: "The Apostle does not pro-
mulgate this decree on his own authority but on that of Christ who speaks in him. For he has followed the words of Christ in the gospel."⁵ And "Against Jovianus" he de-
clares of Paul, "what he decreed we may regard as the law of Christ speaking in him."⁶ That "the Apostle Paul, the chosen vessel, the doctor of the Gentiles, who could boldly say: 'Do ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me?' knowing that he really had within him that greatest of guests,"⁷ had a sure knowledge of Christ Jerome never doubted.

In addition to more general references (Paul a chan-

2. Vol. VI, 68.
nel of the Holy Spirit,¹ and "Behold God hath taught you, he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord."²) to the authority of Paul, Augustine also views Paul as an authoritative spokesman for Jesus, with earthly sources of knowledge about him and his teachings. In commenting on Romans 8:26 he says: "It is wholly incredible that either he (Paul) or those to whom he wrote were ignorant of the Lord's Prayer."³ He refers to 1 Timothy 6:16 as "the word of the apostle, yea, rather, of Christ by his apostle."⁴ And again, "we ought to obey with docility the great precept of the One Master... when he says to us by His apostle: 'Owe no man anything, but to love one another.'"⁵ "Our Lord says... 'love your enemies, do good to them that hate you.' And so also the Apostle Paul teaches when he says...(Romans 13:9, 10)."⁶ In The City of God he refers to Paul as "that noble and mighty hero... the teacher (doctor) of the nations in faith and truth... that hero I say, and athlete of Christ, instructed by Him, anointed of His spirit, crucified with Him, glorious in Him..."⁷ He regards 1 Corinthians 6:7 as a parallel to Matthew 5:50 and Luke 6:30.⁸ Pressed to explain how it

---

1. All quotations from Augustine are from Schaff, NPNF. This particular one, Vol. I, 276.
is that Paul uses oaths (Romans 12:1, Galatians 1:20, etc.), he can only say, "to pronounce Paul guilty of violating the commandment...were an impiety."¹ And discussing "the work of monks" he asks, "How...could the Apostle think contrary to the Lord...?"²

Let these persons, who from perverse understanding of the gospel labor to pervert apostolical precepts, either take not thought for the morrow, even as the birds of the air; or let them obey the Apostle, as dear children: yea, rather, let them do both, because both accord. For things contrary to his Lord, Paul the servant of Jesus Christ would never advise.³

Augustine equates the teachings of John 8:36 and Galatians 5:13,⁴ Titus 1:15 and Matthew 16:11,⁵ Ephesians 5:25 and Matthew 19:3,⁶ John 15:13 and Romans 13:8-10,⁷ and throughout his exposition of "Our Lord's Sermon On The Mount" he continually uses Pauline materials in illustration and exposition.⁸

Thomas Aquinas, "the Angelic Doctor," everywhere quotes Scripture as a bulwark of truth, or defends and interprets it as having absolute authority. Naturally he displays no consciousness of any divergence between Jesus and Paul. It is interesting to note that he apparently accords

---

8. Vol. VI.
the same high authority to Aristotle and to the Church Fathers. His usual introduction for a Pauline phrase is, "The Apostle says..." Similarly we frequently find, "Augustine says..." and "the Philosopher says..." "Christ," he declares, "bestowed on the apostles the fulness of the Holy Spirit." He assumes the authority of Scripture.

It seems quite surprising that St. Thomas did not professedly and explicitly treat of the existence of inspiration. In the Summa of Theology the word 'inspiration' as such does not occur.

The Angelic Doctor rightly says that the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture is a doctrine of faith, for it is heretical to say that any error exists in...any of the canonical Scriptures (In Joan. XIII, I, I).

He equates the teaching of Jesus and Paul a few times, as when he says:

Just as it is lawful to strike a person...for the purpose of correction, so too, for the purpose of correction, may one say a mocking word to a person...It is thus that Our Lord called the disciples foolish (Lk 24:25), and the Apostle called the Galatians senseless (Gal 3:1).

1. ST, 12, 525, 1007, etc.
2. ST, 27, 509, 1001, etc.
3. ST, 515, 541, etc.
4. ST, 2425.
5. Cf. footnote 1, p. 29 above.
8. BT, 1501.
And he quotes Lk 18:1, "we ought always to pray" as a parallel to 1 Thess 5:17, "pray without ceasing." In discussing the Lord's Prayer he states:

Sin...directly excludes a man from the kingdom, according to 1 Cor 6:9, 10, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, etc., shall possess the kingdom of God, and to this refer the words, Forgive us our trespasses.

Paul's unquestionable authority he specifically notes. "It is unlawful to disregard the command of the Apostle in whom Christ spoke." The Reformers.

Luther, in discussing Paul's "let no man judge you in meat or drink...or of a new moon or Sabbath day," holds: "So saith our Saviour Christ: 'the kingdom of God cometh not with observation of the law' Luke 17:20." And Christ's support in Matthew 22:39 of Galatians 5:14 is preaced with the remark, "the same thing Christ also witnesseth." Again, "Paul teacheth the very same thing which Christ taught...that works and fruits do sufficiently testify whether the trees be good or evil." And commenting on Galatians 5:16 he observes, "our saviour Christ teacheth the same thing in

1. ST, 1548.
2. ST, 1544.
3. ST, 1510.
4. Luther, EG, 476. Luther misquotes and misinterprets the passage.
5. Luther, EG, 562.
6. Luther, EG, 581.
the tenth of Luke."¹

Perhaps the most rigorous logician of them all, Calvin also finds Paul and Jesus in accord. In arguing for the existence of the soul he cites Christ's teaching in Luke 10:22 and then says, "Paul confirms the same point"—referring to 2 Corinthians 5:6,8.² Again, he finds Paul to be making a specific application of one of Jesus' teachings when he says that 1 Corinthians 7:7 is a more explicit putting of Matthew 19:12.³ Galatians 5:14 he regards as a parallel to Matthew 7:12.⁴ "For as Paul declares that 'whom he predestined them he also called,' so Christ informs us that 'many are called, but few chosen.'"⁵ And in discussing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper he points out,

Christ does not address the bread, to command it to become his body; but enjoins his disciples to eat, and promises them the communication of his body and blood. Nor does Paul teach any other order than that the promises should be offered to believers, together with the bread and the cup.⁶

This survey of the tradition and interpretation of the Church regarding the relationship of Paul to Jesus reveals that the Church has done little more than assume Paul

¹. Luther, EG, 607.
². Calvin, ICR, I, 173.
³. Calvin, ICR, I, 365.
⁴. Calvin, ICR, I, 375.
⁵. Calvin, ICR, II, 185.
⁶. Calvin, ICR, II, 573.
to have been a faithful follower and interpreter of Jesus. It has unquestioningly accepted the dictum of Luther, "who-so reads Paul may, with a safe conscience, build upon his words."¹ It has seldom if ever before modern times been sensitive to their differences (such as Paul's almost complete lack of references to the "Son of Man" which occurs so frequently in the Synoptics). Whether or not that assumption needs to be modified is the task to which we now address our inquiry.

¹. Luther, TT, 10.
II SOURCES PAUL MIGHT HAVE HAD

That Paul was in possession of a certain minimum fund of knowledge about Jesus is revealed by his letters. He refers to Jesus as humanly born (Gal 4:4), descended from David (Rom 1:3), one of several brothers one of whom he (Paul) knew personally (Gal 1:19), as "not pleasing himself" and "a servant to the circumcized" (Rom 15:3,8), as one who could be imitated (1 Cor 11:1), instituting a memorial meal (1 Cor 11:23), and put to death by crucifixion (Rom 4:25, 1 Cor 1:23). There is no adequate reason to suppose that he learned these facts in any other way than would normally be expected—from others.1 There is every reason to believe that they were the core of the "tradition" he was conscious of handing on even as it had been handed to him. To the Corinthians he says, "for I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received" (1 Cor 15:3), and again, "I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you" (1 Cor 11:2); he writes similarly to the Philippians

1. Even as conservative a scholar as Machen does not rely on any supernatural theory of revelation, OPR, 117ff. (above pp. 11). Knox says, "We cannot deny some previous knowledge of Christ on his (Paul's) part. Paul regarded himself as a witness of the Resurrection. The one who appeared to him was recognized to be the one who had lived and taught in Galilee and had been put to death in Jerusalem. That Paul had already a definite impression of this one is clearly indicated." CLP, 124.
(4:9). To the Thessalonians he commands "you know what instructions we gave you through the Lord Jesus" (4:2) and he affirms that his eschatology is accurate "for this we declare to you by the word of the Lord" (4:15). And in 2 Thess he urges, "so then, brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us" (2:15) and warns, "keep away from any brother who is living...not in accord with the tradition that you received from us" (3:6). ¹

Furthermore,

by this tradition he felt bound; remarriage after divorce is a matter he cannot discuss, for on this the Lord has given his ruling and the question is closed (1 Cor 7:10). On other marriage questions Paul may state his own opinion, but even though he is persuaded that he 'also has the Spirit of God' and that he has 'obtained mercy or the Lord to be trustworthy,' his opinion must be very carefully distinguished from the Lord's 'commandments.' (1 Cor 7:40, 25, 12).²

To these facts concerning the external life of Jesus of Nazareth we have to add the much more important knowledge which Paul shows as to the demeanor and character of Jesus. He refers to his grace (χάρις)...He tells us of his 'obedience,' of his 'endurance' (υπομονή)...of his 'purity' and his 'disinterestedness...(πραπτής)...He records his prudence, absence of self-assertion...and his εὐγένεια...'magnanimity.' Finally, Paul, who does not exaggerate but rather minimizes, sums up the inward character of Jesus by ascribing to him a 'spirit of holiness,' and his

1. To be sure, this "tradition" may not always have direct reference to Jesus, but it must always have been presumed to be in harmony with the teachings of Jesus.
2. Easton, GBG, 120.
outward life by telling us that 'he pleased not himself.'

Inasmuch as the canonical gospels were not written until after his death it is certain that they were not the sources of Paul's knowledge. In this chapter it will be our task to penetrate, if possible, "the hinterland of the decades from 30 to 50 A.D." and discover what sources might have been available to him.

A tool of primary importance for this task is "form-criticism." This line of study has been hotly pursued now since the First World War and has made certain definite contributions to New Testament research. It attempts the study of the tradition in its earliest phase, before it was written down, endeavoring to cast light on its transmission from the death of Jesus until it began to assume documentary form. Perry has succinctly described its assumptions:

The study rests upon three basic principles: (1) that the substance of our gospel narratives was transmitted for a time orally, in the form of disconnected anecdotes and sayings; (2) that in this process those anecdotes were selected which served the needs of the church; (3) that this use in the churches resulted, with frequent repetition, in giving to each anecdote a fixed form, the most concise and effective possible, which from then on could hardly be varied in the further retelling. To these principles the form critics add a fourth, the most distinctive and most debatable of all:

1. Scott, LINT, 18f.
(4) that the history and origin of the anecdote can be discovered from its form.

Adopting the terminology of Taylor,² which on the whole seems more lucid than that of Dibelius³ or Bultmann,⁴ we should expect traditions about Jesus to be circulating in Paul's time in the following "forms." First, passion narratives. Virtually all⁵ critics are agreed that a connected story of the last events of Jesus' life and his appearances following the resurrection assumed a fixed form almost immediately.

We must assume that Paul himself had learned a formula in which, amongst others, the following words were to be found:—

'He died for our sins according to the Scriptures.
'He was buried.
'He rose on the third day according to the Scriptures.
'He appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve.'⁶

Paul's description of the institution of the Lord's Supper is also looked on as being part of a passion narrative.

Secondly, pronouncement stories. These are defined as short narratives that "culminate in a saying of Jesus which expresses some ethical or religious precept."⁷

1. Perry, Art. (1949), 2. Cf. Taylor, FGT, 10. Another good introduction to form criticism is that by Cadbury, Art. (1923).
2. FGT.
5. Taylor, FGT, 13 cites Schmidt, Dibelius, Bultmann.
6. Dibelius, TTG, 18f.
7. Taylor, FGT, 53.
question about tribute money in Mark 12:13ff. enshrining the words, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's" is the classic example of this form.

Thirdly, sayings and parables. These are isolated bits of teaching which became detached from the time and place and circumstance which brought them forth. Some of them are poetic in structure,¹

He makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, And sends rain on the just and on the unjust. (Mt 5:45)

They are frequently found grouped together, because of a similarity in subject, such as "light," or "the Pharisees," or "John the Baptist."²

Fourthly, miracle stories. These are popular narratives in which the miracle itself is the main point of interest. They are to be found in all the strata of the tradition (earliest as well as latest)³ and should not be too rigidly classified formally.

Finally, we find a grouping which, for lack of a bet-

---

1. Taylor, FGT, 89; cf. Manson, Art. (1938), 322 f; Bultmann analyzes the sayings with particular care.
2. Craig, BC, 62.
3. Taylor, FGT, 125.
ter term, we may describe as the narrative tradition. These are stories which "cannot be further classified into sharply defined forms." But they are usually self-contained units intimately connected with the concerns of the primitive Church. "We have to take each story by itself, or examine them in groups which are not always mutually exclusive." Some of them are of literary origin and some "are too detailed to be treated as stories told and re-told by a series of nameless narrators." They effectively demonstrate, we may add, the limitations of form-criticism itself.

For our study, the contribution of form-criticism seems to be this: that we can assume fairly confidently that the tradition was circulating during Paul's time in, at least, the foregoing "forms." We would apriori expect any evidence his letters betray of a knowledge of Jesus to show signs of such "forms." What would have been the forms most popular in Paul's time is not definitely stated. The Passion Narrative must be included, to be sure. Taylor does hazard the generalization that

1. As Taylor, FGT, 142 points out, to call them "Legends" prejudges their historical value in the common usage of that word. The term he prefers is "stories about Jesus," but one of his examples is Mk 1:5-8 which relates chiefly to John. He also speaks, however, of this form as "the narrative tradition."
2. Taylor, FGT, 146.
3. Taylor, FGT, 142.
4. Taylor, FGT, 150.
the first period (30-50 A.D.) is one in which the self-contained story, the sayings-group, and the single saying represent the normal types of tradition and the prevailing range of interest.¹

Thus we would not expect any reflection in Paul of the gathering of large blocks of material.

"In the end," however, "the study of forms brings us only to the threshold of the historical problem."² "Form criticism may prepare the way for historical criticism, but form-criticism is not historical criticism."³ The classification of materials which form-criticism has contributed is widely accepted as one of the tools of criticism, but there are other tools also which must be utilized.

Literary criticism has its contribution to make in suggesting what sources Paul might have had. There is virtual unanimity that one or more written documents underlie our canonical Gospels, including Mark. "It is not assumed that...(written) sources of Mark can be reconstructed; but nevertheless it is claimed that evidence of their existence is clear."⁴ What kind of material can we reasonably believe was written down prior to Mark and hence during Paul's lifetime?

1. Taylor, FGT, 175.
2. Taylor, FGT, 134.
3. Easton, GBG, 81.
The first item to claim our attention is "an enigmatic word of Papias."¹ Eusebius preserves in his Church History,² this quotation from the Bishop of Hierapolis, "Matthew collected the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted (or translated) them as he was able."

"Conservative writers...have frequently maintained that the writing here referred to was virtually the Hebrew original of our Greek Gospel."³ But the overwhelming majority are agreed that the canonical Gospel According to Matthew is "a Greek document making use of Greek sources."⁴ Some scholars would dismiss the passage altogether, "as to Papias' implication that Matthew actually wrote in Aramaic the Sayings of the Lord, its worth is doubtful."⁵ On the other hand, as radical a critic as Schmiedel believed that the logia of Papias referred to "a source used in common by Matthew and Luke but different from Mark"--the hypothetical document posited by the two-source theory of Synoptic criticism now usually called "Q."⁶ No early end to disagreement seems likely. Two of the ablest and most recent students of the issue, Enslin and Manson, champion dia-

1. Enslin, Art.(1945), 449.
2. III, 39, 16.
3. Stanton, V.H. Art.(1911)¹.
6. Art.(1899), 1853.
metrically opposed positions.

Sober exegesis of Papias' word would indicate that he is referring to our gospel of Matthew and not one of its sources...To continue to use logia as the equivalent of Q is misleading and deplorable.¹

The question whether the statement of Papias preserved by Eusebius...refers to Q is still in debate. In my opinion the question ought to be answered in the affirmative.²

The statement of Papias which cannot be made to fit the Gospel of Matthew except by a forced and unnatural interpretation, does, when taken in its simple and natural meaning, fit a document such as Q like a glove.³

For our purposes at least, the issue of the controversy is not decisive. If the statement is a reference to Q, then it indicates a source we already know about. If it refers to the canonical Gospel, Paul could not have known it. If it refers to neither, then it is a lost document and cannot contribute to this study.⁴

Canon Streeter forcefully argued that the authors of canonical Matthew and Luke each had access (in addition to Mark and Q) to a written tradition unknown to the other.⁵

To account for the material peculiar to Luke he posits

---

1. Enålin, Art. (1945), 449.
2. Manson, CTB, 99.
4. To the present writer it seems that the view logia=Q has most to commend it.
5. FG.
"L." To account for the material peculiar to Matthew he posits "M." And then, to account for Luke's method of using Mark, he suggests that Q plus L was the "first edition" (so to speak) of Luke's work, later "revised and enlarged" by the addition of Markan material by the author. This first edition he calls "Proto-Luke." His theory is neglected by none; most accept it in whole or in part, with or without their own modifications.

Taylor, for example, adds an appendix to his book¹ defending Proto-Luke. Manson² accepts M, L and Proto-Luke. Knox affirms that in addition to Q and Mark "Luke also had his own otherwise unknown sources: for example a document (documents?) rich in parables, now found chiefly in 9:51-18:14,"³ and at least recognizes the possibility of a Proto-Luke.⁴ Grant says,

I am strongly convinced of the fundamental correctness of Streeter's hypothesis of the development of the Gospel of Luke: viz. the combination of Q and L to form 'Proto-Luke'...I am equally unpersuaded of the existence of a document which Streeter labels 'M.'⁵

¹. FGT; BTG is an earlier work devoted to the subject.
². CTB, 115f.
³. CLP, 22.
⁴. CLP, 24.
⁵. GG, 9.
At least the certainty of the existence of a definite, homogeneous, written source (L)—whatever its exact limits—is now...practically established.¹

Craig, however, while admitting that "before the composition of our earliest gospel, written collections were probably in circulation," (among them Q) is doubtful about M and feels that there is virtually no proof that L wasn't just a "common body of tradition."²

Even if we assume the existence of M, L, and Proto-Luke, however, we must be cautious about believing that they could have contributed to Paul's knowledge. Streeter himself dates Proto-Luke at approximately the same time as Mark.³ Taylor puts it between 60 and 65.⁴ Manson puts L and Proto-Luke c. 60,⁵ but M between 50 and 60.⁶ For the most part we must doubt a priori that Paul could have gained much knowledge from the hypothetical document Proto-Luke, and it is virtually certain that (because of the lateness of its composition) it would not be reflected in the unquestioned letters.⁷ M and L remain as possibilities.

There is widespread agreement that a few passages were

---

¹ GG, 159.
² BC, 62.
³ FG, 200.
⁴ FGT, 192.
⁵ Art. (1938), 320.
⁶ Art. (1938), 317.
⁷ See above p. 5.
circulating in written form more or less independently.

It is possible that other collections (than Q) of material concerning the Ministry were put together at an early date. There is, for example, the so-called 'Little Apocalypse' embedded in Mark 13; there is the collection of conflict-stories (Mark 2:1-3:6; 11:27-12:34); there is the mass of teaching peculiar to Matthew...and more besides.¹

Scott, seeking for an explanation of John's apparently deliberate correction of the Synoptists, remarks that on the passion he may have "had before him a brief early document of great value."² Such possibilities will have to be borne in mind as our study proceeds, but the likelihood is that any discoveries we make will as well fit one theory as another—if we find that Paul repeats something in one of these units it could either mean he was drawing from a documentary source, or that the oral tradition had reached that fixed form in which it eventually came to be written. There may not be enough evidence to make a decision.

The universally accepted product of literary criticism, Q, remains as a written source which Paul might have had.

In such attempts (to restore Q) as have been made in recent years there is a large measure of agreement, though no two restorations correspond exactly. At the same time, the differences between scholars are

¹. Manson, CTB, 99.
². Art.(1945). For others who agree that written units circulated early see above, pp. 4, 43.
on the fringes. If we take what are perhaps the three most important of modern restorations, those of Harnack, Streeter, and Bussmann, we find a large measure of agreement...The matter common to all three restorations...represents the minimum to be assigned to Q.¹

These passages are


Without abandoning our cautious attitude, we may with some confidence assume that these passages were in written form before Paul's death.

The date and provenance of Q cannot be established with certainty. There are those who answer the question, did Mark know Q? with an unequivocal, No.³ This of course does not necessarily mean that it was not in circulation in non-Markan circles. Others, however, believe that Mark knew Q.⁴ This would necessitate an earlier date. And irrespective of Mark's knowledge, Streeter's hypothesis requires an earlier date for Q. "Most probably Q is an Antiochene translation of a document originally composed in Aramaic."⁵

---

1. Manson, Art. (1938), 307f.
2. Manson, Art. (1938), 308. He himself adds several more passages; Grant also reconstructs Q, GG, 74.
One would normally expect the lapse of a few years between the first publication of the document and its gaining acceptance sufficient to justify its translation—and Proto-Luke is usually dated (as we have seen) 60-65. Bultmann also sees an Aramaic background:

It is...probable that the collection of sayings was originally made in Aramaic and then translated into Greek...and so reached...Matthew and Luke.¹

Manson is most specific of all concerning the date and provenance of Q. "It...was written down in Aramaic and...translated into Greek, probably before the middle of the First Century at Antioch."²

Knox has shown how carefully we must sift the Book of Acts in respect to Paul's travels, chronology, etc.³ We dare not glibly assume that Antioch was his "home base" and jump to unwarranted conclusions. At the same time, however, hints contained in the Apostle himself suggest (an) origin of the tradition. The traditions which he adduces in 1 Cor 11 and 15 he confesses to have received. According to the evidence of Galatians, Jerusalem, which Paul only rarely and briefly visited as a Christian, may be left out of account as the place where he received this tradition. Hence we have only to do with...Damascus and Syrian Antioch.⁴

¹. Art. (1930), 15.
². CTB, 99.
³. CLF.
The nature of the document itself suggests the probability that Paul would have been acquainted with it. Q "was a guide to catechists, a manual for the newly converted...a handbook of 'the Way.'"\(^1\)

The conclusion of literary criticism for us is that if Paul had any written documents known or surmised by us they were in all probability Greek\(^2\) editions of M and/or L and/or Q.\(^3\)

---

1. Grant, GG, 81.
2. Paul worked in Greek; cf. Rall, ATP, 20. In a personal note H.J. Cadbury states, "There is every reason to suppose the Apostle wrote and even thought in Greek...the Semitic coloring seems to me negligible."
III THE COMPARISON OF SIMILAR PASSAGES

"Attempts to show verbal parallels between his (Paul's) writings and the traditional sayings of Jesus recorded in our gospels have not been wholly convincing," says Enslin.¹ He, no doubt, has in mind particularly the work of Resch and that of Feine recapitulated on an earlier page of this study. It is equally true that the theory which would deny to Paul any interest in or knowledge of the life or teachings of the Jesus of history has also failed to command itself. If the matter can be settled at all, it is on the basis of similarities of thought, of phrase, and of figure found in Paul's letters in comparison with the Synoptic Gospels.

The most striking point of similarity between the two is in the description of the Last Supper (1 Cor 11:23-25; Mk 14:22-25; Mt 26:27-29; Lk 22:19-20). The agreement is closest between Paul and Luke. Virtually all commentators are forced by this reference to agree that this tradition reached a fixed and probably written form early. Paul's own statement is that he received it "from"² the Lord,

¹. ESP, 113f.
². Greek: ἀπὸ... often means "by authority of," Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, Gal 1:3. Cf. Thayer, GEL, 59a. D manuscript reads παρὰ which with the genitive is used "to denote that a thing proceeds from...one's sphere of power," Thayer, GEL, 476b. That this information came "from" the Lord may therefore simply mean "from the Christian community."
meaning probably that it came to him from unimpeachable sources (as with other traditions he perpetuated as "commands" of the Lord). Since this passage is firmly imbedded in the "triple tradition" there is now no certain way of knowing whether Q or M or L might have contained it, or if it was circulating independently. Its similarity to Lk suggests the possibility of L's influence. It is not unlikely that it was in written form.

A similarly striking correspondence is found in the outline of the Passion Story Paul gives in 1 Cor 15:3-7, which he "also received." The account is brief, to be sure, and omits the Gethsemane story, Peter's dereliction (were these unrecorded until a "young man" told them in his Gospel?) and the trial. It is again impossible to discern whether Q, M, or L had any such references. An interesting and perhaps significant observation is made by Bussmann, however. He argues that the phrase καὶ τὸς Ἰησοῦς Παύλος Paul uses in verses 3 and 4 implies the existence of a written Passion and Resurrection source. He points out that none of the O.T. passages which have been cited can have been meant by Paul and that nowhere else does Paul quote the O.T. when speaking of Christ's death as "for us." Furthermore, Paul's usual formula is καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς or an equivalent.

1. The Passion Story and some Appearance stories. In Paul, however, it sounds like a single unit.
phrase, and he habitually uses the singular "γραφή" when he refers to the O.T. "Accordingly, he concludes that Paul is appealing, not to the O.T., but to accounts of the Passion Story existing in the community, perhaps even to one or some of the attempts at Gospel-writings mentioned by Luke." And Taylor goes on to remark,

when there are good grounds for thinking that a continuous tradition existed at a very early date, Bussmann's interpretation becomes very persuasive. 

As has been pointed out, the very resistance of the Passion Narrative to form-critical analysis is *prima facie* evidence of its existence in written form at such an early date.

To this must be added the fact that the letters reveal several other similarities. These can be demonstrated most clearly, perhaps, by a synoptic presentation. The salutation in many of them (Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, Phil 1:2, Col 1:2, 1 Thess 1:1, 2 Thess, 1:2, Philemon 1:3) follows Jesus' injunction in Lk 10:5(Q).

---

**PAUL**

Grace to you and peace... Whatever house you enter, first say, "Peace be to this house!"

**JESUS**

---

1. As set forth by Taylor, FGT, 49.
2. FGT, 49. Perhaps the enigma of the untraced quotation in 1 Cor 2:9 is to be solved in a similar manner.
3. Cf. p. 3 above.
4. As a general rule Lk will be cited for Q, Mt for M, and Mk for triple-tradition material.
Rom 2:13 recalls Mt 23:3(M) and Lk 6:46(Q),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous before God, but the doers of the law who will be justified.</td>
<td>So practice and observe whatever they (the scribes and Pharisees) tell you, but do not what they do; for they preach, but do not practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you call me Lord and not do what I tell you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only the spirit, but almost the very letter of the Gospels is reproduced in Rom 12:14. Compare it with Lk 6:28(Q).

| Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them. | Bless those who curse you, pray for those who abuse you. |

Rom 11:16 and Mt 7:17(Q) can stand side by side also,

| If the root is holy, so are the branches. | Every sound tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears evil fruit. |

Rom 12:17 and 1 Thess 5:15 compare favorably with Mt 5:39 (M).

| Repay no one evil for evil. | Do not resist one who is evil. |

See that none of you repays evil for evil, but always seek to do good to one another and to all.

Rom 13:9 sums up the Law in the same commandment that Jesus did in Mk 12:31:

The commandments, 'You shall not commit adultery, You shall not kill, You shall not steal, You shall not covet,' and any other... The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these.
commandment, are summed up in this sentence, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.'

Rom 14:14 and Mk 7:15 sound strangely alike:

I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself.

There is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him.

Rom 16:19 parallels Mt 10:16(M):

I would have you wise as to what is good and guileless as to what is evil.

So be wise as serpents and innocent as doves.

1 Cor shows conscious dependence of Paul on Jesus in such a passage as 7:10, "To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord," and the teaching which follows in 7:11 replicates the teaching of Lk 16:18(Q):

The wife should not separate from her husband...and that the husband should not divorce his wife.

Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery.

Again, 1 Cor 9:14 and Lk 10:7(Q), speaking on the same subject, the livelihood of those who preach the gospel, concur.

The Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel.

The laborer deserves his wages.

1. Easton, GBE, 106f calls Rom 14:14 a quotation of Mk 7:15.
2. It is not impossible to translate this, "I am persuaded by the Lord Jesus," the dative of person with év as described by Thayer, CEL, 210.
And in 1 Cor 14:37 Paul asserts, "what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord."

1 Cor also displays verbal similarities, as in 4:12, 13 and Lk 6:28(Q):

**PAUL**
When reviled we bless; when persecuted, we endure.

**JESUS**
Bless those who curse you.

The idea of Mt 11:25(Q) is strikingly paralleled in 1 Cor 3:19:

For the wisdom of this world is folly with God. Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes.

In 1 Cor 13:2 a simple, yet illuminating, phrase occurs:

If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains...

Where we may justly inquire, did Paul get the idea that faith could move mountains? It is not an Old Testament figure of speech; was it a current proverb? If so, commentators have failed to cite parallels. It does occur twice in the synoptic accounts as one of the figures Jesus used:

If you have faith and never doubt, you will not only do what has been done to the fig tree, but even if you say to this mountain, 'Be taken up and cast into the sea,' it will be done. (Mt 21:21, but Marcan material)

I say to you, if you have
It looks like a clear reflection of one of Jesus' hyperboles by Paul.

2 Cor 5:10 summarizes well the famous judgment scene of Mt 25:31ff(M):

For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil according to what he has done in the body. Then he (the Son of man) will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them one from another...and they will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.

2 Cor 11:17 again shows that Paul believed that he had the Lord's authority for the essentials of his teaching, "what I am saying I say not with the Lord's authority but as a fool."

Gal 2:20 reveals a similar turn of thought to Lk 9:23 and 14:27(Q):

I am crucified with Christ. And he said to all, 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me.'

Whoever does not bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple.
Gal 5:14 again echoes Mt 22:39:
For the whole law is fulfilled in one word, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.'

And a second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

It is not so much the quotation of the words, which are not original with Jesus, as it is the repeated and lofty eminence given to them by Paul as the summation of the Law which echoes his Master's estimate. The meaning of Jesus is again caught in Gal 6:2 and could have been suggested by Jesus' scathing scorn recorded in Lk 11:46(Q):

Bear one another's burdens. Woe to you lawyers also! for you load men with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not touch the burdens with one of your fingers.

Philippians 4:3 may be reminiscent of Lk 10:20(L):
Whose names are in the book of life. Your names are written in heaven.

Phil 3:7 shows that Paul personally practiced the injunction of Lk 14:33(L):

Whatever gain I had I counted as loss. Whoever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple.

Col 4:1 is strikingly similar to Mt 23:10(M):
You have a Master in heaven. You have one master, the Christ.

The similarity is heightened by the fact that the same virtue--brotherliness--is enjoined by both by reason of
the observation. In Col 4:6 Paul uses the same simile that appears in Mk 9:50:

**PAUL**

Let your speech always be gracious, seasoned with salt.

**JESUS**

Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace with one another.

Scott compares Col 3:5 with Mk 9:47 saying, "Paul...reproduces in a striking way both the teaching of Jesus...and the curious form in which he puts it."\(^1\)

Put to death, therefore, what is earthly in you.

If your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out.

It may well be that 1 Thess 4:2 records another self-admission of dependence on Jesus by Paul. Thayer\(^2\) suggests that it should be translated, "for you know what instructions we gave you by reminding you of the Lord Jesus." At any rate, in 4:15 Paul specifically ascribes his doctrine of the second coming to Jesus, "for this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep." And in 5:2 there is another of those illuminating flashes where Paul uses one of Jesus' own metaphors; compare Lk 12:39f(Q):

For you yourselves know well that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night.

But know this, that if the householder had known at what hour the thief was coming, he would have been awake.

\(^1\) LINT, 191.

\(^2\) GEL, 134.
and would not have left his house to be broken into. You also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect. (Mk has a similar saying in 13:35).

1 Thess 5:17 harmonizes with Lk 18:1(L) which, though an editorial comment, catches the meaning of the parable which follows.

Pray constantly. They ought always to pray.

What shall we say as to the probable source of the knowledge of Jesus’ teaching implied by these passages in the letters? They are not simply to be brushed aside.\(^1\) Paul’s own vehement claim not to have received his gospel from men (Gal 1:11, 12) can be understood in this fashion: “Paul distinguished between the facts of the Christian religion (cf. 1 Cor 15:3-11) and his gospel, ...

1. Particularly when so careful a student of the subject as Enslin compares 1 Cor 7:32-35 and Lk 10:40-42(L) in this fashion: “In both passages the advantage lay in freedom from all 'cares' that would 'distract' the attention from the Lord. The same word μηδέμια is used in both passages, while the adverb ἄπειρος ἐκτὸς (1 Cor 7:35) is from the same root as πεπληρωμένος (Lk 10:40) each occurring in these passages alone in the N.T....It cannot be denied that knowledge on the part of Paul of a logion like this about Martha might have influenced this turn of expression. It is one of the cases insufficient in themselves to afford proof, but raising an unanswered question in the student’s mind.” ESP, 116, footnote. His parallelism is certainly less obvious and more labored than those we have cited.
the interpretation which his illumined heart has given him.”¹

The passages cited above fall into three major groupings with reference to their sources: M, Q, and Mk. There are five (maybe six) similarities to M; twelve (maybe eleven) to Q; five to Mk. Only three are from L. These groupings are interesting and significant, but, admittedly, by themselves are insufficient to establish the possibility of Paul’s having used written sources. In any event,

evidence of dependence is not found by amassing proof texts, but on the basis of unity of purpose and the use of phrase and expression so strikingly unusual as to be explicable on no other basis.²

Therefore we have the task, not only of distinguishing “what are quotations, express or implicit, of language used

---

¹ Howard, Art. (1929), 1186b.
² Enslin, ESP, 38. Porter, MCIP, 20, sees such unity of purpose and use of phrase in “one word, 'Abba,'” the word in his native Aramaic with which Jesus addressed God, Paul quotes twice... (Gal 4:1-7; Rom 8:14-17). This one word, 'Abba,' is convincing proof...that the religion of Jesus was the religion of Paul.” This observation gains weight if Manson, TJ, 101 is correct in saying that Jesus used the word "Father" with "extraordinary reserve." If, as Manson suggests, the frequent use of the word in the earlier part of Mt is due to insertion by the gospeler under the influence of his M source, then the likelihood of Paul’s familiarity with M is increased also. At any rate, faith moving mountains, and the Day coming as a thief in the night ought to be "strikingly unusual" enough, and I do not believe that the thinnest wedge can be driven between Paul’s and Jesus’ purposes.
by the Lord,"¹ which we have attempted in this chapter, but
also of taking into consideration "the much more numerous
reproductions of his thought in the language of Paul him-
self."² We now turn to that task by comparing the ethical
teachings of Paul and Jesus.

¹ Scott, LINT, 20.
² Scott, LINT, 21.
When the question of the source of Paul's ethical incentive has been raised in the past, one answer has invariably come to the fore:... Paul's early training in the Jewish religion. Even the recent work of Professor Enslin... arrives at this conclusion... It seems to the present writer that the stock answer that Paul was what he was in ethical outlook only because he was a Jew needs revision.¹

So one modern scholar sums up the province of this chapter.

A careful and patient perusal of the letters reveals a number of ethical teachings which may be classified broadly as follows: Conditions of Entrance into the Kingdom, the Judgment, the Nature of the Ethical Life, Methodology, Daily Relationships with one's Fellows, Civil Obedience, Self-Discipline, Marriage and Divorce, Repentance, Stewardship, and Attitude toward Slavery. An equally careful reading of the Synoptics with these categories in mind ought to reveal any similarity between Jesus and Paul which may exist in the realm of ethics. Here are the results of such a study.

1. Conditions of Entrance into the Kingdom. For Paul, the conditions are ethical. So also for Jesus. Compare 1 Cor 6:9f with Mt 13:49(M) and Mt 7:21(Q):

¹ Andrews, ETP, 5.
Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God.

For neither Paul nor Jesus does this fact obscure the grace of God nor his power of choice in the matter, Rom 9:16 and Mt 18:23-35(M); 20:1-16(M):

The angels will...separate the evil from the righteous.

Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven.

For the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant (18:27, "out of pity for him the lord of that servant released him and forgave him the debt.")

For the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who went out early in the morning to hire laborers for his vineyard...

Nor does this ethical demand imply for either that because a man has once been a sinner that he is forever excluded—only that such must change his ways and become ethical; 1 Cor 6:11, Mk 1:15 and 2:17:

And such were some of you. But you were washed, you were consecrated, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.

The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel.

Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; I came not to
2. The Judgment. For Paul accountability is the cornerstone of the ethical life. So also is it with Jesus. Compare Rom 14:10b, 12; 2 Cor 5:10; Rom 2:5,6 with Mt 12:36(M), and the famous judgment scene of Mt 25:31-46(M).

We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God... each of us shall give account of himself to God.

For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body.

By your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed. For he will render to every man according to his works.

3. The Nature of the Ethical Life. For Paul the ethical life is inward and spiritual, as it is with Jesus. Col 2:16, 20f; Rom 2:28f; 1 Cor 4:5 may be put alongside Mt 5:8(M), 5:21(M), 6:17(M), 9:31(M), and Mk 7:15.

Therefore let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or a new moon or a sabbath. Why do you submit to regulations, 'Do not handle,
PAUL

Do not taste, Do not touch' (referring to things which all perish as they are used) according to human precepts and doctrines?

For he is not a real Jew who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external and physical. He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal.

Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of men's hearts.

4. Methodology. For Paul the law of love is supreme. So also is it with Jesus. The extremely close correspondence in this central idea is evidenced by Rom 13:8; 1 Cor 16:14, 1 Thess 4:9; 1 Cor 13; Rom 12:12, 20, 21; Rom 12:14, as compared with Mk 12:31, Mt 5:39f(Q), and Mt 5:44(Q).

He who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law.

Let all that you do be done in love.

Concerning love of the brethren you have no need to have anyone write to you, for you yourselves have been taught by God to love one another.

JESUS

is angry...

When you fast, anoint your head and wash your face, that your fasting may not be seen by men but by your Father who is in secret.

Go and learn what this means, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice.'

There is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him.

'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these.
PAUL

If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love...

Repay no one evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all... 'if your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him drink... Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them.

JESUS

But I say to you, Do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any one would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well.

Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you.

5. Daily Relationships With One's Fellows. Humility and mercy are for Paul the fundamental lubricants in social relationships. So also are they for Jesus. Rom 14:10, 12:16 (mg); Phil 2:3; Col 3:12 are set beside Mt 5:5(M), 6:7(M), 7:1(Q); Mk 10:43; Lk 10:36(L), 14:10f(L) below.

Why do you pass judgment on your brother?

Do not be haughty, but give yourselves to humble tasks.

In humility count others better than yourselves.

Put on then... compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, and patience.

Judge not, that you be not judged.

Blessed are the meek.

Whoever would be great among you must be your servant.

When you are invited, go and sit in the lowest place... For everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted.

Which of these three, do you think, proved neighbor to the man who fell among the robbers? He said, 'The one who showed mercy on him.' And Jesus said to him, 'Go
Forgiveness is also enjoined by both Paul and Jesus, as such passages as Col 3:13, Mt 6:12(Q), Mt 18:32, 33, 35(M), and Lk 17:3f(Q) bear witness.

Forbearing one another and, if one has a complaint against another, forgiving each other; as the Lord has forgiven you, so you must also forgive.

And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.

'You wicked servant! I forgave you all that debt because you besought me; and should not you have had mercy on your fellow servant, as I had mercy on you?'...So also my heavenly Father will do to everyone of you, if you do not forgive your brother from your heart.

If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him.

Scott points out the similarity of Philemon 15 and Mt 18:15 (Q): "The same object, to gain a brother, is assumed in both cases to be a worthy ambition, and in both cases the method suggested is to forgive him."¹

Perhaps this is why he was parted from you for a while, that you might have him back between you and him alone. If forever, no longer as a slave but more than a slave, as a beloved brother.

Governing one's self as to be no hindrance to one's

¹. Scott, LINT, 191.
fellows is another insight they share. Rom 14:20f, Phil 2:4, and Mt 18:6mg(Q) follow.

**PAUL**

It is wrong for any one to make others fall by what he eats; it is right not to eat meat or drink wine or do anything that makes your brother stumble.

Let each of you look not only to his own interest, but also to the interests of others.

A considerable correspondence is to be found in the listing of vices by the two, also. In describing the sins of the Gentiles and also what he fears the Corinthians have relapsed into Paul uses words which echo Jesus' estimate of the things that defile a man. Rom 1:29-31, 2 Cor 12:21, and Mk 7:21,22.

They were filled with all manner of wickedness, evil, covetousness, malice. Full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity, they are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless.

Impurity, immorality, and licentiousness.

6. **Civil Obedience.** Paul's famous judgment in this regard comes from Rom 13:1f. The least that can be said is
that the Gospel records indicate that Jesus took a similar attitude toward "the powers that be." Mt 17:24-27(M) describes him as paying the temple-tax and Mk 12:17 is well known.

PAUL

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities...pay all of them their dues, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.

JESUS

When they came to Capernaum, the collectors of the half-shekel tax went up to Peter and said, 'Does not your teacher pay the tax?' He said, 'Yes.' Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's.

Paul's dictum seems to be in conformity with Jesus' attitude and practice so far as we have any record.

7. Self-Discipline. Paul's concepts of faith and grace never vitiated his insistence on self-discipline, as Rom 6:12, 13; Gal 5:23, 1 Thess 4:3 make clear. Turning to the Gospels we find a similar note in Mt 7:13, 14(M) and Mk 9:43-47.

Enter by the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the way is easy, that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few.

And if your hand causes you to sin, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life maimed than with two hands...
that you abstain from immorality.

That you abstain from immorality.

8. **Marriage and Divorce.** Problems at Corinth brought forth a lengthy statement from Paul in 1 Cor 7 to which 1 Thess 4:4 may be added. The essence of his position compares with Jesus' briefer words, found in Mk 10:11, 12 (the Mt and Lk parallels, however, are credited to Q), and Mt 19:12 (M).

It is well for a man not to touch a woman.

It is well...to remain single.

To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband ...and that the husband should not divorce his wife.

This is the will of God... that each one of you know how to take a wife for himself in consecration and honor. (note how this passage is apparently meant by Paul as one of "the in-

**PAUL**

**JESUS**

to go to hell... And if your foot causes you to sin, cut it off; it is better for you to enter life lame than with two feet to be thrown into hell. And if your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out; it is better for you to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye than with two eyes to be thrown into hell.

Whoever divorces his wife and marries another, commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.

There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.
Paul does not question the rightness of marriage (which Jesus specifically upholds, Mk 10:6f) but only its wisdom in view of "the impending distress." Not a hairbreadth's variation between Paul and Jesus is to be detected. This stern stand against divorce "is very un-Jewish advice" as the Jews, except for the school of Shammai, favored rather easy divorce."

9. Repentance. Surprisingly little is to be found in either the letters or the gospels on this subject, which is often taken as one of the central themes of Jesus' preaching. Mk 1:15 and Rom 2:4b follow.

Do you not know that God's kindness is meant to lead you to repentance? The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel.

10. Stewardship. Paul does not say much on this subject (perhaps because few practical difficulties arose in this area among the "not many" who "were wise according to worldly standards" or "powerful" or of "noble birth").

---

1. As Jesus admits, Mk 10:5.
2. Andrews, ETP, 82.
3. Knox notes the paucity of direct statement also and believes that Paul implies the idea with his familiar terms, "justification," and "reconciliation." CLP, 142ff.
One passage does imply that virtue was attached to giving away all one had (1 Cor 13:3). The "great collection" was rooted in humanitarian considerations (Gal 2:10). Jesus' advice to "sell your possessions, and give alms," (Lk 12:33(Q)), and parable of the rich fool (Lk 12:13-21(L)), conversation with the rich young man (Mk 10:17-31), woe on the rich (Lk 6:24-26 (Q or L)), and statement about serving two masters (Lk 16:13(Q)), are neither parallelled nor contradicted.

11. **Attitude Toward Slavery.** What little evidence there is suggests that both Paul and Jesus accepted slavery as a social institution of their time. The letter to Philemon is all the evidence we need about Paul; about all that we can say is that Jesus never challenged slavery and thought highly of a centurion who kept slaves (Lk 7:1-10(Q)).

What shall we say as to the origin of this remarkable similarity in ethical teaching and outlook? Fifteen of the Synoptic quotations cited in this chapter come from M. Thirteen (perhaps fourteen, one is debatable between Q and L) come from Q. Nine from Mark and three (or possibly four) from L. Taken in conjunction with the tabulation made in the previous chapter, this seems to indicate fairly certainly that the basic sources of Paul's knowledge of Jesus are the
same materials as are found in M and Q.

The contribution of Judaism to both Paul and Jesus is not to be overlooked, to be sure. "Ethics is the soul of Jewish religion," and that ethics should be basic to both Jesus and Paul is therefore to be expected. That both should condemn "fornication, theft, murder, adultery, coveting, wickedness, deceit, licentiousness...slander, pride, foolishness," (Mk 7:21f; cf Rom 1:29; 2:21,22; 2 Cor 12:21) was no doubt dictated by their Jewish training. So also is the nearly identical instruction given in Mt 18:16(M) and 2 Cor 13:1, "any charge must be sustained by the evidence of two or three witnesses." But to explain the fact that Paul's ethics should so closely approximate those of Jesus as this chapter has demonstrated they do by ascribing them to a common source is to overlook a salient fact: how similar Paul and Jesus are in what they do not say.

They are similar in what they do not say despite the opposition of their countrymen. Many parallels for words of Jesus may have been found in rabbinical sources. But so much more, alas, is also found there. That oppressive excess of triviality and formalism places an impassable gulf between Jesus and the Jewish teachers. But Paul belongs with Jesus, on the same side of the gulf. In his ethic there is no formalism, no triviality, no casuistry--there is nought but "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control." What has become

1. Quoted in Enslin, ESP, 1.
of all the rest? Was it removed by the genius of Paul? It is strange that two such men of genius should have arisen independently and at the same time. Or was the terrible plus of Pharisaic formalism and triviality burned away from Paul when he fell at the feet of the great Teacher?

There are, we must admit, differences between Jesus and Paul. Paul plainly states that his ethical outlook is dominated by the expected end of the world. (1 Cor 7:29.) Nowhere do the gospels even intimate that Jesus was preaching such an "interim ethic." (We may infer it, but it is only an inference.) Jesus seems to have practiced a somewhat higher attitude toward women than Paul allows (1 Cor 14:34f). Paul enunciates a "domestic code" (Col 3:18f).

1. Machen, OPR, 164. While we are thinking about things Paul did not say, we may well wonder about such passages as that of Lk 7:1-10(Q) involving the centurion's slave in which Jesus marvels at the faith of a non-Israelite; Paul certainly could have used it to advantage in his running fight with the "Judaizers." Mt 15:20b, "to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man" would also have come in handy (it may be from M or an editor's comment). Mt 21:43(M) "therefore I tell you, the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it" would neatly help the argument of Romans. And the parable of the great banquet in Lk 14:15f (Q according to Manson, but perhaps Mt 22:1-10 is not a true parallel and is from M) would also have been useful when he "turned to the Gentiles." Three comments are in order: 1) the argument from silence is always precarious, 2) Paul certainly caught the spirit of these passages even if he doesn't quote them, and 3) it is not beyond the realm of possibility that they reflect Paul's work justified by the gentile Church by being put into the mouth of Jesus. On the creativity of selectivity see Fosdick, GUB, 41.
that is without a parallel in Jesus' recorded words. And so on. But it is the conviction of this writer that it is easier to explain their differences while accepting Paul's conscious dependence on Jesus than it is to explain the similarities in the absence of such dependence. The differences are to be ascribed to the environments they moved in and the situations they confronted.

Paul's outlook was urban, cosmopolitan, not rural. He could never have endured a quiet life in the hills of Galilee...It is no wonder that Paul's ethics have a different orientation than those of Jesus.

Strict Pharisaic upbringing, the competition and stimulation of Stoic philosophy and the Mystery religions, the need to adjust the Messianic idea to the historical fact of crucifixion--these are the main factors which have colored Paul's vocabulary and arguments. Then again, Paul is primarily a reasoner whereas Jesus was an illustrator; Paul inclined to be speculative, Jesus to be poetic. But the fact remains, as this chapter has shown, that,

when we examine Paul's own teachings we see that he himself has so remembered the words of the Lord, Jesus as to assimilate their very gist and marrow.

1. Grant, INTT, 312.
2. Griffith, PLC, 112. Cf. Holl, "If we lay the teaching of Paul as a whole alongside the preaching of Jesus, we cannot but marvel at the firmness with which Paul has grasped what was distinctive in his gospel." Quoted by Scott, LINT, 32.
CONCLUSION

This study substantiates the position of those who believe that Paul continued Jesus' work and gospel, being consciously dependent on the Jesus of history.\(^1\) Paul's explicit statements revealing that to have been his own self-consciousness are confirmed by the similarities in thought and phrase which have been presented in detail in Chapters III and IV. That he deliberately attempted to perpetuate a tradition about Jesus, and to a large degree succeeded in his attempt, cannot be denied.

Secondly, parallels are too few to establish beyond question any literary dependence.\(^2\) However, they are of sufficient number and quality to lend additional weight to certain other hypotheses of criticism, namely: 1) The suggestion of form-criticism that scattered sayings for the most part were the content of the very primitive oral tradition is supported by the nature of the references found in the letters. Aside from the Passion Narrative, there are no extended references; no quotations of illustrative parables, no miracle stories, no groupings of sayings topically. 2) The case for the written existence of M is

1. p. 8 above.
2. "When Paul... says... 'I have no directions from the Lord,' we do not know whether... he speaks of a tradition... handed down by his memory, or of words of Jesus which he possessed upon sheets of papyrus." Dibelius, TTG, 39.
greatly strengthened by the fact that so much of the material found to be similar belongs to this stratum, an amount approximately equal to that from Q.

Thirdly, Paul's ethics are virtually identical with those of Jesus. He certainly was no innovator in this regard but is the most faithful of disciples. "It is perhaps only when we are challenged as to the relation between Paul and his Master that we recognize how faithfully he reproduces what is essential in our Lord's teaching."¹

Finally, when coupled with conclusions drawn by other studies, this study makes the most reasonable and tenable solution of the problem of the sources of Paul's knowledge of Jesus this: Paul had and used some written sources. When the conclusions of Bussmann concerning the "writings" referred to in 1 Cor 15:3,4² are added to the admitted impossibility of form-critically analyzing the Passion Narrative, and the conclusions of Streeter and Manson as to the provenance of Q and M--Antioch in Syria--and Manson's allowance of both Q and M being in written form as early as A.D. 50--when these are added to the discovery of this study that Paul was familiar with many of the same traditions as are to be found not only in Q but also in M, then

¹ Scott, LINT, 21.
² Above, p. 53.
the most coherent interpretation is that the Apostle had and used some written sources. The burden of proof is now upon those who would deny any such dependence.
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ABSTRACT

The problem is to determine whether or not Paul may have had some written sources regarding Jesus. This dissertation is limited by excluding from consideration all possible sources other than written. It attempts to discover evidence of written sources and their nature and to correlate them with the documents posited as a result of Gospel-criticism. The tradition in the Church and the insights of the greatest interpreters must be used, but the primary method used in this study is to compare Pauline and Gospel passages with respect to their vocabulary, form, and content. These books are assumed as Pauline: Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon. Previous workers in the area of Paul's relation to Jesus fall into five groups: 1) those who believe that Paul founded a new Gentile Christianity independently on the basis of his own theology; 2) those who believe that Paul is dependent upon and agrees with Jesus in every way; 3) those who believe that Paul is often in substantial agreement with Jesus but that no connection is to be traced between the two; 4) those who believe that Paul continues Jesus' work and gospel being consciously dependent upon the Jesus of history; and 5) those who believe that Paul continues Jesus'
work without conscious dependence upon the Jesus of history.

I TRADITION AND INTERPRETATION IN THE CHURCH

Wherever the specific subject arises the Apostolic and Ante-Nicene Fathers are one in agreeing that Paul had accurate, probably written, sources about Jesus. He is frequently associated with the Gospel According to Luke. The Apocryphal materials exalt Paul's authority. But not more than a very modest value can be attached to any of the evidence because it rests partly on faulty exegesis and may have been influenced by the struggle to establish an authoritative canon.

After Nicea such men as Jerome, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, and Calvin are unanimous in their confidence in Paul as a faithful follower and interpreter of Jesus. The Church has unquestioningly accepted the dictum of Luther, "whoso reads Paul may, with a safe conscience, build upon his words." It has seldom if ever before modern times been sensitive to the differences between Paul and Jesus, largely due, no doubt, to the ideas concerning the inspiration and unity of Scripture which have been held.

II SOURCES PAUL MIGHT HAVE HAD

That Paul was in possession of a certain minimum fund of knowledge about Jesus is revealed by his letters. He was conscious of handing on a tradition by which he felt
bound. Whence could his knowledge have come?

"Form-criticism" is a tool of importance at this point. It classifies the materials into 1) passion narratives, 2) pronouncement stories, 3) sayings and parables, 4) miracle stories, 5) narrative traditions. We can assume fairly confidently that the tradition was circulating orally in at least the foregoing "forms."

Another tool that must be used is literary criticism. There is virtual unanimity that one or more written documents underlie the canonical Gospels. The logia mentioned by Papias, Canon Streeter's L, M, and Proto-Luke, perhaps some sections of Mark, and Q are identifiable literary strata which might have been available to Paul. If, however, Paul had any written documents known or surmised by us they were probably Greek editions of M and/or L and/or Q.

III THE COMPARISON OF SIMILAR PASSAGES

If parallels between Paul and Jesus exist at all, they will be found by comparing Paul's letters with the Synoptic Gospels.

The most striking similarity is the description of the Last Supper; another is the Passion Story. All are agreed that these reached fixed form very early. Bussmann argues that Paul's phrase in 1 Cor 15:3,4 refers to Christian documents telling the Passion Story. Other
similarities between the Letters and the Gospels seem to be in such passages as are presented in parallel columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Phil 1:2; Col 1:2; 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:2; Philemon 1:3</td>
<td>Lk 10:5(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 2:13</td>
<td>Mt 23:3(M); Lk 6:46(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 12:14</td>
<td>Lk 6:28(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 11:16</td>
<td>Mt 7:17(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 12:17; 1 Thess 5:15</td>
<td>Mt 5:39(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 13:9</td>
<td>Mk 12:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 14:14</td>
<td>Mk 7:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:19</td>
<td>Mt 10:16(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 7:11</td>
<td>Lk 16:18(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 9:14</td>
<td>Lk 10:7(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 4:12,13</td>
<td>Lk 6:28(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 3:19</td>
<td>Mt 11:25(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 13:2</td>
<td>Mt 21:21(Marcan); Mt 17:20(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor 5:10</td>
<td>Mt 25:31ff(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 2:20</td>
<td>Lk 9:23(Marcan); Lk 14:27(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 5:14</td>
<td>Mt 22:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal 6:2</td>
<td>Lk 11:46(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil 4:3</td>
<td>Lk 10:20(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil 3:7</td>
<td>Lk 14:33(L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col 4:1</td>
<td>Mt 23:10(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col 4:6</td>
<td>Mk 9:50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul several times shows that he is consciously depending upon Jesus (1 Cor 7:10, 2 Cor 11:17), and perhaps 1 Thess 4:2 is best translated, "for you know what instructions we gave you by reminding you of the Lord Jesus." Certainly 1 Thess 4:15 shows dependence.

What shall we say as to the probably source of this knowledge of Jesus' teaching? Paul's vehement claim in Gal 1:11,12 not to have received his gospel from men means that he distinguished between the facts of the Christian religion and the interpretation his illumined heart had given him, the latter constituting his "gospel." Tabulating the above we note 5 (perhaps 6) similarities to \( M \), 12 (perhaps 11) to \( Q \), 6 to \( Mk \) and only 3 to \( L \).

IV A COMPARISON OF PAULINE AND GOSPEL PASSAGES FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ETHICAL CONTENT

The ethical teachings of Paul's letters may be classified and the parallels presented in parallel columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col 3:5</td>
<td>Mk 9:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess 5:2</td>
<td>Lk 12:39f(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess 5:17</td>
<td>Lk 18:1(L)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Conditions of Entrance Into The Kingdom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAUL</th>
<th>JESUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 6:9f</td>
<td>Mt 13:49(M); Mt 7:21(Q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 9:16</td>
<td>Mt 18:23-35(M); 21:1-16(M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 6:11</td>
<td>Mk 1:15; 2:17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAUL

2) The Judgment.
Rom 14:10b,12; 2 Cor 5:10; Rom 2:5,6

3) The Nature of the Ethical Life.
Col 2:16,20f; Rom 2:28f; Mt 5:8(M), 5:21(M), 6:17(M), 9:31(M); Mk 7:15
1 Cor 4:5

4) Methodology
Rom 13:8; 1 Cor 16:14; Mk 12:31, Mt 5:39f(Q); Mt 5:44(Q)
1 Thess 4:9; 1 Cor 13; Rom 12:12,20,21; Rom 12:14

5) Daily Relationships With One's Fellows.
Rom 14:10; 12:16(mg); Phil 2:3; Col 3:12
Col 3:13

Philemon 15

Rom 14:20f; Phil 2:4
Rom 1:29-31; 2 Cor 12:21

6) Civil Obedience.
Rom 13:1f

7) Self-Discipline.
Rom 6:12,13; Gal 5:23; Mt 17:24-27(M); Mk 12:17
1 Thess 4:3

8) Marriage and Divorce.
1 Cor 7; 1 Thess 4:4
Mk 10:11,12(Q); Mt 19:12(M)

9) Repentance.
Rom 2:4b

10) Stewardship.
11) Attitude Toward Slavery.

Tabulating the above we find 15 of the Synoptic quotations are from M, 13 (or 14) from Q, 9 from Mk and 3 (or 4) from L. Taken in conjunction with the earlier tabulation this seems to indicate fairly certainly that the basic sources of Paul's knowledge of Jesus are the same materials as are found in Q and M.

Paul and Jesus both were steeped in Jewish ethics, to be sure. But how did each happen to emphasize the same things? There are differences between Paul and Jesus, but they may be ascribed to personal temperament, the environments they moved in, and the situations they confronted.

"When we examine Paul's own teachings we see that he himself has so remembered the words of the Lord Jesus as to assimilate their very gist and marrow."

CONCLUSION

This study substantiates the position of those who believe that Paul continued Jesus' work and gospel, being consciously dependent on the Jesus of history. Paul's explicit statements revealing that to have been his own self-consciousness are confirmed by the similarities in
thought and phrase which have been presented in detail. That he deliberately attempted to perpetuate a tradition about Jesus, and to a large degree succeeded in his attempt, cannot be denied.

Secondly, parallels are too few to establish beyond question any literary dependence. However, they are of sufficient number and quality to lend additional weight to certain other hypotheses of criticism, namely: 1) The suggestion of form-criticism that scattered sayings for the most part were the content of the very primitive oral tradition is supported by the nature of the references in the letters. Aside from the Passion Narrative, there are no extended references; no quotation of illustrative parables, no miracle stories, no groupings of sayings topically. 2) The case for the written existence of M is greatly strengthened by the fact that so much of the material found to be similar belongs to this stratum, an amount approximately equal to that from Q.

Thirdly, Paul's ethics are virtually identical with those of Jesus. He certainly was no innovator in this regard but is the most faithful of disciples.

Finally, when coupled with conclusions drawn by other studies, this study makes the most reasonable and tenable solution of the problem of the sources of Paul's knowledge of Jesus this: Paul had and used some written sources.
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