

*THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PAUL.*¹

In this study I propose to take up one side of a question which is burning to-day with more than usual fierceness. I shall not attempt to exhaust even a single side of the problem "Jesus and Paul": I only want to present a few new considerations which will serve, I hope, to supplement what has been advanced by others towards the solution of an admitted difficulty, forced to the front by the influence exerted upon the untrained reader by dilettante historians like Drews.

I start from a question of importance for the Synoptic Problem. It has been well dealt with in the brilliant volume of essays from Dr. Sanday's *Seminar*, but what I propose to discuss is independent of solutions defended there. Why does Luke so often desert his authoritative Marcan source just when he comes to the climax of his story on the eve of the Passion? Whatever other reasons may have operated, we may safely accept Professor Burkitt's claim that Luke must have had here an authority which he regarded as even higher than Mark. What can that authority have been? What but Q? says Professor Burkitt. So Q was a collection of Sayings of Jesus, plus one Deed—the Deed. Can we accept this?

I think not. There are many lines on which we may examine the question,² but I shall only pursue my own here. I am not influenced by any *a priori* conceptions as to what Q must have been. The work of evaluating Q is as fascinating a task as ever research attempted. But there is no telescope for us to turn on the place in the heavens where

¹ Expanded from a lecture given before the Cambridge University Wesley Society on May 28, 1911.

² I entirely accept Mr. Streeter's argument in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 203 and 214 f.

this new planet may have been calculated to be lurking. In no soil outside Egypt could a papyrus copy of Q have lain hid and yet safe from inevitable decay; and we have no reason to imagine that Q was read in Egypt before it received its honourable burial in our Gospels. As therefore we cannot verify our guesses by experiment, we shall do wisely to remember always that we are guessing, and be modest accordingly. But there is one difficulty which outweighs any other in my mind, when I try to believe that Q really was a Gospel, in that it had a story of the Passion. Luke regarded Q as superior even to Mark, and therefore turned away from Mark when he came to the Passion. Then why did "Matthew," who has woven Mark and Q together all through, at this point desert Q for Mark? Our problem is why Matthew left out a whole series of the Master's words, the deliberate overlooking of which is incredible. The Evangelist who takes over from Mark *one* Word from the Cross, and that the one which was always full of unfathomed mystery to Christian ears, refuses to record the kingly promise to the brigand and the dying cry that proclaims Eloi "Father" once more! How can we explain that?

No, the higher authority was not Q, or (as sometimes, I think, in the Fourth Gospel) its Aramaic original, but one weightier yet. In naming Paul I am, of course, saying nothing novel, but I want to support the guess in a new way. Dr. Souter's masterly little papers on Titus as Luke's brother (*Expository Times*, xviii. 285, 335), have confirmed us in the belief that Paul alludes to Luke's early qualifications for writing a Gospel in 2 Corinthians viii. 18. Pauline elements in Luke's Gospel are to be expected if this old identification is really correct. But I want to bring in a series of considerations from a different quarter. Few writings on Gospel problems have impressed me more in

the last year or two than Johannes Weiss's little book, *Paul and Jesus*, translated in Harper's Library (1909). Weiss has a way of capturing his readers, as we all know from his bewitching of Schweitzer: this time let us hope there will be no palinodic second editions to make too credulous followers look foolish! It is needless for me to summarise an argument which everyone ought to have read for himself, now that the German no longer blocks the path. I will only accept the results, and put the case in my own way.

Paul was in Jerusalem before the Crucifixion, studying under Gamaliel, and we find him there again not long after it. Those who insist that he never saw the face of Jesus must assume, therefore, that he went home to Tarsus when his studies were completed, and that something brought him back again very soon after the death of Jesus. It is obviously at least as simple to assume that he did not leave Jerusalem at all; and 2 Corinthians v. 16 under Weiss's convincing exposition (pp. 42 ff.) makes this alternative far more probable. He was there then when Jesus came up to the Holy City for that fateful Passover, and we may safely say that he had gathered information about Him before. What determined Paul's attitude towards Him? A stronger force than the bare fact that Jesus had denounced Pharisaic hypocrisy: mere *esprit de corps* never prompted in a spirit like Paul's such hatred of a divinely beautiful Figure, and there was nothing in his own conscience to make the accusation grip. There was in the Book of Deuteronomy (xiii. 1-5) a passage clear and imperative enough to account for all Paul's fanatical hate. There Moses foretells the coming of a tempter who would work signs that came to pass, in order to draw Israel away from their faith in the One God. The faithful people were to put him to death for his evil deed. And now the fulfilment

had come. That Jesus claimed by His title of "the Son" a unique and super-human relation to God is distinctly shown by Mark (xiii. 32, one of Schmiedel's "Pillars"!) and Q (Matt. xi. 27=Luke x. 22); nor can we psychologically account for Paul's tremendous energy of hatred without this *vera causa*. The miracles, which our sources tell us the Jewish leaders accepted as genuine but attributed to a league with the devil, become on this view a necessary element in the identification of Jesus with the predicted blasphemer; and we are thus able to recognise an argument which for an overwhelmingly sincere believer in the Law was beyond dispute, and strong enough to bear down—for a time—even the mighty impression which the Nazarene made upon the deepest forces in Paul's nature. Do those who would have us believe that Jesus never claimed to be divine really face the question whether without this claim we can explain the fanatical hatred, not of mere cynical worldlings like Caiaphas, but of profoundly religious souls like Paul?

Paul, then, was in Jerusalem during that central week of history, and it was then that he became "humanly acquainted with Christ" (*ἐγγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν*). We know him well enough to picture correctly on broad lines the behaviour of a man who never did things by halves. Even as a little later he was working for the High Priests in harrying the followers of Jesus, so he would be doing then. Among the Galilaeans who were up for the Passover we may see him busily collecting information about this Prophet of theirs, eagerly hunting for sayings and doings which might be used in building up the case. One particular charge we can be sure he would press with special ardour—one which reappeared in the trial of Stephen, and leaves its traces unmistakably on the language of the Apostle's letters years after. That Jesus of Nazareth talked of the

destruction of "this Holy Place," and dared to call it a "house made with hands," Paul could discover in his inquiries: unhappily he could not get two witnesses to agree whether He had threatened to destroy it Himself, or challenged them to do it, and let Him rear another "not made with hands." The zealous inquisitor would not be content with examining witnesses. His presence is commonly assumed in the scene where "men from Cilicia" are found disputing with Stephen (Acts vi. 9); and it is at least equally likely that he was in one or more of those deputations which came to Jesus in the Temple and tried to ensnare Him. "Pay Caesar what is Caesar's, and God what is God's" has a well recognised echo in Romans xiii. 7, and we need not assume that Paul found the original in our written sources. To this we will return. Another *κυριακὸς λόγος* which Paul seems to quote may well have been uttered at this period. The coincidence of 1 Thessalonians v. 21 with the latter part of a Logion given by Clement, beginning with *γίνεσθε δοκιμοὶ τραπεζῖται*, makes the presence of a quotation from the Lord's Sayings highly probable; and the compressed parable has decided affinities with the Parable of the Talents, which Matthew brings into Passion Week. As, however, Luke puts the similar (and more original) Parable of the Pounds into an earlier period, it will be safer to cut the short Logion loose from this connexion: the time of its utterance is, of course, indeterminate. A very notable Pauline allusion to the Words of Jesus is the use the apostle makes in 1 Corinthians vii. 10-13 of His pronouncement about marriage. Now this in its Marcan setting was expressly drawn from Jesus by Pharisees who came to "tempt" Him (Mark x. 2), when He was near the frontier of Judaea on the east of the Jordan. Professor Burkitt has illuminated this passage by showing that the "tempta-

tion" was an effort to make Him pronounce upon the sin of Herod and of Herodias, which might well end in His following the Baptist to Machaerus. It is not likely that the Pharisee deputation, after luring Jesus so easily into their trap, would keep silence about their success when they returned to Jerusalem. Paul would hear all about it then, even if he was not a member of the deputation, which is indeed likely enough. We could well conceive him present when Jesus spoke to the multitudes and the disciples about the contrast between the precepts and the example of the Scribes: Matthew xxiii. 3-28 is concentrated into a few lines in Romans ii. 21, with the phrase *ὁδηγὸς τυφλῶν* (v. 19) and *συνευδοκοῦσιν τοῖς πράσσουσιν* (i. 32, cf. Luke xi. 48) as detailed resemblances not far away. But these samples will serve my present purpose: points of contact between the teaching of Jesus and the language of Paul are much more numerous than is often supposed, and where these contacts are concerned with teaching given publicly in Jerusalem in the last week of our Lord's life, the theory we are defending gives us a very easy account of Paul's sources for them.

And what was Paul doing on the Friday? That he actually shared as a Sanhedrist the guilt of the Cross is perhaps excluded by the absence of reference to it, for if he recorded his participation in the murder of the followers of Jesus, he would hardly have passed by the heavier responsibility if it really belonged to him. But there is only too much probability that he was one of the fanatics who watched the scene on Calvary, stifling the horror of it by a firm conviction that they were indeed offering a service well pleasing to God (cf. John xvi. 2). If so, the poet's instinct was characteristically right when he made Paul say of the "sorrows of the Son of Man,"

Ah with what bitter triumph had I seen them,
Drops of redemption bleeding from thy brow,
Thieves, and a culprit crucified between them,
All men forsaking him—and that was thou!

It is needless to repeat after Weiss the argument which makes it so clear why on these assumptions Paul never thought of seeking the older Apostles at once, to get from them all possible light on the earthly life of Him whom he now knew as his Lord. Paul possessed enough already for his supreme purpose: a new theory, and not new facts, was what he sought first—the other new facts could be acquired later. We are indeed able to explain now with complete satisfaction why Paul limited himself so largely to the end of the Saviour's earthly life. It was what he knew for himself at first hand; and it was the completion of redeeming work. As in everything else, Paul's action was explained out of his own experience. Peter and his comrades had been won by the Master's life: His matchless words and deeds and His infinitely winning personality had made complete conquest of them from the first. His death was an agonising shock, from which His renewed presence with them recovered their spiritual energy. But for Paul the Cross blotted out every other sight: the realisation that it meant forgiveness for him, the persecutor and injurious, brought him to set it permanently in the centre of the Christian system. Critics are surely very perverse who complain that Redemption has no place in the teaching of Jesus, and was invented by Paul. Putting aside the fact that it is only when our Gospels have been critically (?) expurgated that the germ of the doctrine disappears from the words of Jesus, we cannot help asking the common-sense question how Jesus could have made His disciples understand the Cross before it came. If, as Weiss insists, Paul *recognised* in heavenly glory the Face that he had seen scarred with sorrow on Calvary, we can understand

very easily how that profound mind set everything aside till he could know *why* that wonderful visage had thus been marred. And when his revelation came he could preach it to his fellow-Christians. Their instinct found it wholly in accord with the hints that memory recalled from the days of listening to the great Teacher. They would have been quick enough to repudiate Paul's interpretation had it conflicted with their tradition of the days of the Son of man. Men may try to get away from it as they may, but to an absolutely modern mind the centrality of the Cross demonstrates itself by all experience. We need not fear being thought old-fashioned when we rest our belief on what we can see to-day in cannibal islands and in English slums. And we can assert boldly that the Providence which guided Paul's spiritual history gave us a really true interpreter of Jesus whose work is needed now more than ever to supply the one all-sufficient key to the meaning of the Lord's life and death.

So to return to the thesis of our opening. Can we trace any Pauline indications in Luke's account of Passion Week? If what I have said is true, we might expect to find some contacts between Paul's writings and the Lucan peculiarities in narratives where Paul may himself have contributed reminiscences as an eye-witness. This condition, of course, applies only to a limited part of the narrative of Passion Week: we might include Luke xix. 36-xxi. 4, xxii. 1-6, 47-xxiii. 49. This is, of course, only an outside estimate of the places where Paul *might* have been an eye-witness, and we do not contend that he actually was such throughout this section of the story. In this part of Luke's Gospel we may find a good many contacts with Paul which are absent from the parallels. Let us present in order a few that may be gathered from the "Fuller References" and the casual use of a concordance. First comes Paul's char-

acteristic *μὴ γένοιτο*, for which the New Testament gives us no parallel beyond Luke's vivid addition (xx. 16) to the Parable of the Husbandmen: the eye-witness here seems obvious. In xx. 20 the combination *τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ* is Pauline; and *ἀρχή* in the sense of *rule* occurs in Luke and Paul alone. That Paul recalls the idea of the Christ as *Heir*, and that of the "Stone of Offence," is a coincidence of another kind, for the former occurs in Mark and the latter in Q (unless, indeed Matt. xxi. 44 is spurious and the saying purely Lucan, which is decidedly more probable). Luke's mention of *φόρος* (against the Marcan *κῆνσος*) in xx. 22 we have already compared with Paul's allusion to this saying. In the next verse comes *πανουργία*, a word which (with *πανούργος*) is elsewhere only Pauline. That the future apostle was present when Jesus confuted the Sadducees seems highly probable: the failure of even this triumph to move him shows how determinedly he was shutting his eyes to everything outside the one decisive consideration. Luke's additions to Mark's report of the Lord's words in this episode are peculiarly striking, and they find unmistakable echoes in Paul. "The sons of this world" (cf. Luke xvi. 8) is not actually repeated outside this Gospel, but it lies very near to Pauline language. The impressive opening of v. 35 has a verb (*καταξιοθέντες*) which Luke uses again (Acts v. 41), but shares exclusively with Paul: 2 Thessalonians i. 5 is a parallel of thought as well as word. We remember also how Paul repeats the same idea negatively in Acts xiii. 46. In v. 36 the declaration that "they cannot die any more" reminds us of 1 Corinthians xv. 54 f.; and "they are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" provides the basis of Romans viii. 19 and 23. In v. 38 we have the impressive addition "for all live unto him"—a thought which we meet time after time in Paul. That Paul remained to hear the answer as to the Great

Commandment might be inferred from his use of it in Romans xiii. 10 : while his use of Psalm cx. 1 (1 Cor. xv. 25) comes naturally out of the Lord's application of it to effect the final rout of His opponents. But these of course are not Lucan peculiarities. On the denunciation that follows I have commented already. Note how the remarkable Lucan addition (xi. 52) about "taking away the key of insight (*γνῶσις*)" brings in a word found everywhere in Paul and hardly outside his writings. I place it here because its nearest parallel belongs according to Matthew to a great discourse of this period : but we cannot guarantee the chronology of a saying that depends on Q or a source of the same kind. Our last sign of Paul's presence before the events of the last night will be in the story of the poor widow (xxi. 1-4 and Mark xii. 41-44). The allusion to this in 2 Corinthians viii. 2 is made the more probable by the pointed antithesis of *περισσεύειν* and *πτωχεία* : we may also note in Luke the use of *ὑστέρημα*, which elsewhere is peculiar to Paul (8 times).

As we might expect, our indications begin again with the Arrest : Paul was not likely to miss the opportunity of action which silenced the revolt within. His disciple alone records the tremendous words (xxii. 53) with which the Lord falls back into silence more awe-inspiring still. We gather from Mark that the disciples fled when He said, "But let the scriptures be fulfilled."¹ One who remained was to give thanks long years after (Col. i. 13) that God had delivered him "from the power of the darkness" with which he had co-operated on that night of Satan's "hour." Luke xxii. 66 has the word *πρεσβυτέριον*, which outside Luke is used only by the Paul of the Pastorals. In xxiii. 11 we meet with *ἐξουθενήσας* : the verb occurs in xviii. 9 and Acts iv. 11, and eight times in Paul. (Mark ix. 12 has

¹ So I translate : cf. my *Prolegomena*, p. 179.

ἐξουθενωθῆ NAC or ἐξουδενηθῆ BD.) Later in the same episode comes (τι) ἄξιον θανάτου, which recurs thrice in Acts: Paul once has ἄξιοι θανάτου. The last three verbal parallels do not, of course, take us far, nor indeed are the remainder very strong. The Lucan compound verb ἐκμυκτηρίζω is twice used (xvi. 14, xxiii. 35) of bitter mockery directed against Jesus; while Paul once uses the simplex (Gal. vi. 7) of man's futile bravado in action that tries to mock God. The vernacular word ἄτοπος¹ is found once in Paul, and in Luke xxiii. 41, Acts xxv. 5, xxviii. 6. More noteworthy is ὁ παράδεισος (absol.) in xxiii. 43, which in the New Testament is only paralleled in 2 Corinthians xii. 4.

Our evidence, then, of Paul's actual presence at the scenes following the Arrest amounts to very little, if we are to depend on words and phrases. We might regard 1 Timothy i. 13 as an echo of the first Word from the Cross; but when higher criticism refuses the one passage to Paul, and lower criticism removes the latter from Luke,² we cannot argue strongly from the parallel. The man who forced himself to see the end of Stephen had the same motive for being present at Calvary. It was a θεωρία of horror enough (Luke xxiii. 48), but the sight that sickened a man of highly strung nerves and tenderest humanity became by its very horror an enhancement of the λατρεία that Paul was rendering to the One God in witnessing the doom of the Blasphemer. The sight thus burnt into his brain was to be the means afterwards of the vivid "portrayal" of which he wrote to the Galatians (iii. 1). And as Professor Anderson Scott has well remarked,³ Paul's striking reticence

¹ See Professor Milligan on *Thessalonians*, p. 110.

² It is, I think, a later addition to the narrative, repeated in some local church by the centurion or one of his men, who alone would hear it. The textual facts seem to presume its origin in a limited local attestation.

³ In his observations at the close of the lecture of which this paper is an expansion. I am greatly encouraged by having the general approval

on the sufferings of Jesus—a reticence best realised by contrast with the morbid insistence of later ages—is motivated with complete psychological truth by the assumption that he was there. How impossible was it for Paul to dwell on agonies that, as far as will went, he had himself inflicted and fiercely gloried in! He found his comfort in proclaiming everywhere the unutterable love that had forgiven him, and in welcoming pain and peril incurred for His dear sake, which enabled him to “know the fellowship of His sufferings.” The stones of the fickle Galatians at Lystra had branded on his brow what he cherished as *στίγματα Ἰησοῦ*.¹ They were marks won in the ordinary course of warfare for Christ’s cause, and as such a healthier sign of *κοινωνία* than those for which Francis prayed.

I have intentionally refrained from repeating much that others have urged in explanation of the limited range of Paul’s portraiture of the Saviour’s earthly life. These notes are meant to be added, if accounted worthy, to the reasons that have been already given for Paul’s apparent indifference to the Teaching Ministry of Jesus. Personally, I believe that if we had the knowledge that first-century Christians enjoyed we should recognise a large number of unsuspected Agrapha in the Epistles of Paul. But this by the way. I venture to think that Johannes Weiss has enabled us to understand better why the last week of the life of Jesus so completely overshadows the earlier story for Paul. Probably other disciples similarly preferred to select for use

of one of the best of all the writers on the subject “Jesus and Paul” (*Cambridge Biblical Essays*, xi.).

¹ In *Expository Times*, xxi. 283 f., I assumed a resemblance of this scar to that by which the *sicarius* of Acts xxi. 38 was identified in his official description (*εἰκὼν*): the man was badly “wanted,” and such an item as *οὐδὲ μετώπῳ*—which we can assign to the warrior safely enough—would be an essential element in the description sent to every likely Roman garrison. Some such assumption is imperative to account for the chiliarch’s mistaking Paul for this brigand leader.

in Christian instruction what they had themselves seen and heard : this motive may account for omissions otherwise perplexing in our extant fragments of the Gospel history. But beyond all this there is the overwhelming impulse from Paul's own experience which forces this many-sided genius to narrow himself to one message in his passionate striving for the souls of men. He who knew so many things will know nothing (1 Cor. ii. 2) but Jesus the Christ, and Him not firstly as the matchless Teacher, the pitying Healer, the flawless Example, but as Redeemer from sin. First things must stand first. Paul the Hebrew, the Greek, the Roman, gathered into his one person all the great forces of his age to accomplish his life-work of turning men's eyes to the Cross, over which were written in letters of Hebrew, Greek and Latin the words: THIS IS THE KING.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ODE OF SOLOMON.

IN bringing out the second edition of the text of the Odes of Solomon, and in reviewing the various hypotheses which have been current with regard to this perplexing book (and I do not ever remember a problem in criticism more obscure or more difficult to resolve), I have tried to indicate directions in which it was likely that further light would before long appear. It is only by the careful testing of these various hypotheses and by a renewed and microscopic study of the text that we can hope to resolve this hitherto recalcitrant problem or series of problems. It was not possible, of course, to stay the stream of articles and studies which were appearing all over Europe and America which already constitute a small literature : even while the second edition was passing through the press, the kaleidoscope of criticism was shifting into new combinations of form