

PAUL'S USE OF THE SYNOPTIC JESUS TRADITION

by

Heinz Arnold Hiestermann

Submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D)

in the Faculty of Theology
Department of New Testament Studies
University of Pretoria

Promoter: Prof. Gert J. Steyn

March 2016

PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

1. I understand what plagiarism entails and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.
2. I declare that this thesis is my own, original work. Where someone else's work was used (whether from a printed source, the internet or any other source) due acknowledgement was given and reference was made according to departmental requirements.
3. I did not make use of another student's previous work and submitted it as my own.
4. I did not allow and will not allow anyone to copy my work with the intention of presenting it as his or her own work.



Signature

SUMMARY

This dissertation compares the Jesus traditions in Paul's genuine letters to the synoptic Jesus tradition. The aim is to identify parallels between Jesus traditions in the Pauline letters and synoptic gospels and to determine whether the wording of the Pauline Jesus traditions is closer to any particular synoptic gospel or Q.

The first main part of the dissertation aims to establish whether Jesus traditions in Paul's letters can be presupposed, as it often has been argued that Paul did not have much knowledge about Jesus or that he was disinterested in the life and teachings of the historical Jesus. In these discussions, the biography of the apostle Paul is examined. Based on the places Paul had visited after his conversion, his encounters with people close to Jesus and his initial preaching when founding new congregations, it has to be assumed that Paul was well informed about Jesus. The explicit references to sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters (1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14; 11:23–25) confirm that Paul knew and used Jesus traditions similar to those of the synoptic gospels.

In the second main part of the dissertation possible allusions (instances in which Paul uses Jesus traditions without explicitly indicating it) to Jesus traditions in Paul's letters are investigated and compared to similar synoptic sayings of Jesus. Allusions to Jesus traditions in 1 Thessalonians and Romans are revisited. Special attention is paid to possible allusions in Galatians. Galatians 1:16 is compared to Matt 16:16–17 and Paul's rendition of the command to love the neighbour in Gal 5:14 (cf. Rom 13:8–10) is compared to the love commandment in the synoptic gospels.

The study shows that all of Paul's quotes and allusions to Jesus traditions have parallels in Matthew, although the wording of the Pauline Jesus tradition occasionally agrees more with Luke's gospel than Matthew's. Mark never shares more verbal agreement with a Pauline sayings of Jesus than Matthew and Luke.

KEY TERMS

Jesus and Paul

Synoptic Jesus tradition

Pauline Jesus tradition

Parallels

Explicit references

Love your neighbour

Divorce

Words of institution

1 Thessalonians 4:16–17

Love of the enemy

CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction	11
---------------------------	-----------

Chapter 2

Paul and the Jesus tradition. The history of the debate	23
----------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

2.1 The first stage of the Jesus–Paul debate: The continuity between Jesus and Paul is questioned	23
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.2 The second stage of the Jesus–Paul debate: The search for Jesus traditions in Pauline literature intensifies	37
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.3 The third stage: The search for parallels develops into a separate part of Pauline literature	50
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.3.1 From Victor Furnish (1968) to Dale Allison (1982)	51
---------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.3.2 From 1984: Concerns are voiced	65
--------------------------------------------	----

2.3.3 The search for parallels continues: From Wenham to Thompson	67
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.3.4 Different points of view continue to be expressed	71
---------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.3.5 Since the turn of the millennium: The latest discussions	77
----------------------------------------------------------------------	----

2.3.6 Unresolved issues from the debate’s history	88
---------------------------------------------------------	----

Chapter 3

Methods and assumptions	91
--------------------------------------	-----------

3.1 Defining the criteria for identifying parallels	91
-----------------------------------------------------------	----

3.1.1 Paul’s quoting of other sources	93
---------------------------------------------	----

3.1.2 The criteria used in the search of Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters	99
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

3.2 Methodical considerations	105
-------------------------------------	-----

3.2.1 Paul’s sources	105
----------------------------	-----

3.2.2 Verbal agreement	110
------------------------------	-----

3.2.3 The explicit references	112
-------------------------------------	-----

3.3 The assumptions	112
3.3.1 Quotes of the Jesus tradition in other early Christian writings	112
3.3.2 The genuine Pauline letters.....	114
3.4 The limitations	115

Main Part 1: Paul’s knowledge and use of traditional material

Chapter 4

Paul’s knowledge and use of Jesus traditions 117

4.1 Paul’s chronology	121
4.1.1 Before Paul’s conversion.....	121
4.1.2 Damascus and surroundings.....	122
4.1.3 Paul’s visit to Peter in Jerusalem.....	132
4.1.4 Antioch	137
4.1.5 The first missionary journey.....	145
4.1.6 The second missionary journey up to Paul’s stay in Corinth	147
4.2 Additional factors pointing to Paul’s knowledge of the Jesus tradition.....	148
4.2.1 The role of Barnabas and Paul’s other co-workers.....	148
4.3 Paul’s initial teaching	151
4.3.1 Thessalonica	153
4.3.2 Corinth.....	158
4.4 Communicational deliberations	163
4.5 Summary	165

Chapter 5

Explicit references to the Jesus tradition in Paul’s letters 168

5.1 The three explicit references in 1 Corinthians	169
5.2 “Do not separate”: 1 Cor 7:10–11 and Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6	169
5.2.1 The context of the prohibition of divorce.....	169
5.2.2 Synoptic parallels to 1 Cor 7:10.....	176

5.2.3 Synoptic parallels to 1 Cor 7:11.....	181
5.2.4 Arguments for Mark being the closest parallel.....	185
5.2.5 Arguments for Matthew being the closest parallel	187
5.2.6 Conclusion.....	190
5.3 The right to maintenance: 1 Cor 9:14 and Matt 10:10b // Luke 10:7b.....	193
5.3.1 The context of the saying about the right to maintenance	193
5.3.2 Arguments for Luke being the closest parallel	197
5.3.3 Arguments for Matthew being the closest parallel	201
5.3.4 Conclusion.....	202
5.4 The Lord's Supper: 1 Cor 11:23b–25 // Matt 26:26–28 // Mark 14:22–24 // Luke 22:19–20	205
5.4.1 The context of the words of institution	209
5.4.2 The oldest form of the words of institution: Some considerations.....	213
5.4.3 Arguments for Mark as oldest version	214
5.4.4 Arguments for Paul as oldest version	216
5.4.5 Conclusion.....	217

Main Part 2: Implicit references

Chapter 6

Synoptic parallels in Paul's letter to the Romans 221

6.1 Overcoming evil with good: Romans 12:14–21 223

6.2 Nothing is unclean: Rom 14:14 and Mark 7:15; Matt 15:11 226

Chapter 7

Synoptic parallels in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians 232

7.1 A word of the Lord in 1 Thess 4:15–17?..... 232

7.1.1 The scope of the word of the Lord..... 234

7.1.2 The origin of the word of the Lord..... 235

7.2 The thief in the night: 1 Thess 5:2 and Matt 24:43–44 // Luke 12:39–40.. 242

7.3 The traditional material in 1 Thess 5:3	246
---------------------------------------------------	-----

Chapter 8

Synoptic parallels in Paul's letter to the Galatians 249

8.1 The Gospel is not revealed by "flesh and blood": Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:16– 17	250
8.1.1 The context of the letter to the Galatians.....	250
8.1.2 The understanding of Galatians 1:11–12.....	254
8.1.3 A saying of the Lord in Galatians 1:16?.....	258
8.1.4 The Synoptic parallels of Galatians 1:16	262
8.1.5 Possible Jewish and Hellenistic parallels	263
8.1.6 Conclusion.....	264
8.2 The command to love the neighbour	264
8.2.1 The context of the command to love the neighbour in Gal 5:14	265
8.2.2 Possible Synoptic parallels to Galatians 5:14.....	268
8.2.3 The context of the love command in the Synoptic Gospels.....	270
8.2.4 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to Gal 5:14, Rom 13:8-10 and synoptic counterparts	271
8.2.5 The context of the love command in Rom 13:8–10	288
8.2.6 Possible Synoptic parallels to Rom 13:8–10	290
8.2.7 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to Rom 13:9 and its parallels	299
8.2.8 The love commandment in James 2:8; Didache 1:2; Barnabas 19:5	303
8.2.9 The command to love the enemy	307
8.2.10 Summary: The parallels between the Gal 5:14, Rom 13:8–10 and the Synoptic Gospels	310

Chapter 9

Conclusion..... 320

9.1 The authenticity of the Pauline Jesus traditions	320
------------------------------------------------------------	-----

9.2 The relationship of the Pauline Jesus tradition to its Synoptic parallels ...	322
9.3 The parallels and Q	327
9.4 Closing remarks	331
Bibliography	334

Chapter 1:

Introduction

When I took a class on the synoptic controversy–dialogues (*die synoptischen Streitgespräche*) as part of my theological studies, I noticed that the synoptic controversy–dialogues and the epistles of Paul discuss some similar topics, such as marriage and divorce, laws governing cleanliness and diet, as well as resurrection and eschatology. Subsequently, I wondered where Paul got his teachings on these issues from, and whether his statements on these topics resembled those of one of the synoptic gospels more than the others, i.e. if the Jesus tradition Paul used was closer in wording or thought to one of the synoptics or the sayings source Q. We know that Paul was familiar with at least some of the sayings of Jesus. He explicitly states on a few occasions that he quotes the Lord (cf. 1 Cor 7:10; 9:14; 11:23b–25). These sayings later became part of the synoptic Jesus tradition.

The few quotes or so-called explicit references to the Lord's words in Paul's letters do not provide enough evidence to draw any kind of certain conclusion regarding the relationship of the Jesus traditions in Paul's epistles with those in the synoptics. It is therefore necessary to look for further parallels between Paul and the synoptics in order to find out if Paul knew more than the few Jesus traditions that he actually quotes. Paul's allusions to words of the Lord – those passages in which he uses words similar to those of Jesus' statements in the synoptics without indicating it – might reveal more about the Jesus tradition used by Paul and its relationship to the synoptic Jesus tradition.

The Pauline letters are usually not consulted in the research on the development of the synoptic gospels and in the attempts to reconstruct the oldest version of a particular pericope. Discussions of the original wording of the text normally revolve around the comparison of the texts of the synoptic gospels themselves and Q. Consulting the Jesus traditions in the letters of Paul might add to our understanding of the development of these passages, as they were transcribed well before the synoptic gospels and likely before Q. Including the Pauline Jesus traditions in discussions of the development of similar synoptic texts enables one to look at the issue from a different angle.

My interest in examining whether the Pauline Jesus tradition resembles the Jesus tradition(s) of a particular synoptic gospel or of Q has been stirred further by the knowledge that some of the later New Testament letters draw on Jesus traditions, but these seem to know only the gospels of Matthew and Luke. This is particularly the case for James¹ and 1 Peter.² The authors of these letters do not quote from Mark, the oldest gospel, even when Mark provides parallels to a Matthean or Lukan passage. The same applies to the Apostolic Fathers. “Matthew quickly gained the strongest influence on the church in the second century”.³ It would be interesting to find out if the tendency to use only Jesus

¹ Cf. James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 2011), 14.

² Cf. Udo Schnelle, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 447.

³ Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM, 2000), 76.

traditions contained in Matthew and Luke (or maybe Q) could also be found in Paul's letters, and what conclusions, if any, could be drawn from this observation.

- *Problem statement*

The debate over the relationship between Jesus and Paul, and subsequently the debate over how much Paul knew about Jesus, started more than 200 years ago. In the history of the debate, consensus on the amount of Jesus tradition available to Paul could not be – and has not been – reached. Some researchers have questioned whether Paul was at all interested in acquainting himself with information about Jesus. Others presuppose that Paul knew a large part of the Jesus traditions contained in the synoptics, if not more.

Contributing to the lack of agreement on the scope of Paul's knowledge of the Jesus tradition is the fact that the question of *how* Paul got to know the sayings of Jesus has not been sufficiently cleared. As long as there is disagreement on where, when and from whom Paul learned his Jesus traditions, opinions on the amount of knowledge Paul had about Jesus will remain divided. A look at Paul's biography is necessary and can provide more insight into the matter.

Current estimations on how much Paul knew about Jesus vary so much that the researchers who have been looking for parallels between the synoptics

and the Pauline epistles are often divided into minimalists, maximalists and those with a moderate view.⁴

Minimalists claim that Paul is only quoting words of the Lord in two or three instances. Everyone seems to agree on 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14. Others add 1 Cor 11:23–25 as a third quote of the word of the Lord by Paul.⁵ Paul's other explicit references to words of the Lord (e.g. 1 Thess 4:15) are not seen as actual quotes of words of the earthly Jesus by the minimalists, because a synoptic parallel cannot be agreed upon, or the saying is not believed to be authentic.

A. Resch (1904)⁶ is normally used as the chief example of someone representing the maximalist few. Resch assumed that all the epistles attributed to Paul were, in fact, written by him and he found more than 1000 parallels between Paul's letters and the synoptics.⁷

Those with a moderate view represent the largest group in the debate over the number of parallels between Paul and the synoptics, but even within this group, there are significant differences. There is no consensus on the amount of implicit references to words of the Lord by Paul. Zimmermann adequately described the situation by observing that between the extremes of the minimal

⁴ Cf. Gerry Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul: A Historical Examination of Shared Core Commitments with a View to Determining the Extent of Paul's Dependence on Jesus* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2014), 7.

⁵ Victor P. Furnish, "The Jesus–Paul debate: From Baur to Bultmann", in *Paul and Jesus. Collected Essays*, ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 43–4.

⁶ Alfred Resch, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis untersucht* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904).

⁷ David E. Aune, "Jesus Tradition and the Pauline Letters", in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Greco–Roman Antiquity. Collected Essays II*, ed. D. E. Aune (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 316.

and maximal hypotheses, almost all possibilities are represented in regards to the amount of Jesus tradition that Paul implicitly used.⁸

When one looks at the debate over Paul's use of the Jesus tradition in general, the minimalists and the maximalists (and those with a moderate view) do not seem to enter into conversation with one another. Those who find more than just two or three allusions to words of the Lord in the Pauline letters do not seem to take the concerns of the minimalists seriously, and vice versa. This has been already recognized by Dungan, who states: "And so the debate continues, as each side periodically makes additional contributions from within its own presuppositions and, largely, for its own audiences".⁹ This problem has to be rectified if one is to come to a broader consensus about the number of allusions.

A second problem or shortcoming concerning the search for parallels between the synoptic gospels and Paul is that there is no comprehensive overview of the history of the search for parallels.¹⁰ While the listing of parallels has "become almost a special literary genre within the literature of Paul",¹¹ there is no history of this "special literary genre". Most scholars who have searched for

⁸ Mirjam Zimmermann and Ruben Zimmermann, "Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation? Die Jesuslogien in 1Kor 7,10f. und 9,14: Traditionsgeschichtliche Verankerung und paulinische Interpretation", *ZNW* 87 (1996): 84, n. 7.

⁹ David L. Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), xxv.

¹⁰ A short overview is compiled by Rainer Riesner, "Paulus und die Jesus-Überlieferung", in *Evangelium. Schriftauslegung. Kirche. Festschrift Peter Stuhlmacher*, eds., J. Ådna, P. Stuhlmacher, S. J. Hafemann and O. Hofius (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997). He himself admits: "Eine einigermaßen vollständige Darstellung der Forschungsgeschichte zu unserem Thema ist noch immer ein Desiderat" (364).

¹¹ Frans Neiryck, "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus", in *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, style et conception du ministère*, ed. A. Vanhoye, BETL 73 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 266.

parallels begin their works with an overview of the general history of the Jesus–Paul debate. No one has provided a comprehensive history focussing solely on the search for parallels between Paul and the synoptic gospels, nor of the methods used to identify such parallels. A history of the search for parallels is much needed to identify research gaps in the history of the debate and to give an overview for future scholars.

A third problem is that, while many scholars have searched for parallels between Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions, the results of the research have not been interpreted. The debate has, for the most part, revolved around the number of parallels: scholars have searched for parallels and given reasons for assuming a dependency of the similar verses. However, there has been no comprehensive attempt to use and interpret the findings to find out if the older Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters resemble those of one or more of the synoptics or Q and what conclusions could be drawn from such a comparison.

Fourthly, assuming that Mark is older (and therefore more reliable historically) than Matthew and Luke has consequences on the understanding of Paul’s explicit references to words of the Lord. Wong, for example, opines that Paul has de–radicalized Jesus’ ethical teachings. When Wong compares the teaching on divorce in 1 Cor 7:10–11 to its synoptic parallels in Mark 10 and Matt 19, he argues that while “Mark prohibits divorce and remarriage unconditionally”,¹² Paul and Matthew relax the radical prohibition of divorce by

¹² Eric K. C. Wong, “The De-radicalization of Jesus’ Ethical Sayings in 1 Corinthians”, *NTS* 46 (2002): 188.

allowing exceptions. He concludes that since Jesus strictly prohibits divorce in Mark, Paul and Matthew de-radicalized Jesus' teachings on divorce. The same can be said of Jesus' teaching on the right to maintenance (1 Cor 9:14; Matt 10:10).

However, Wong's argument only adds up if Mark indeed presents the oldest version of the text. If Paul and Matthew agree on divorce, it is at least possible that they, and not Mark, deliver the oldest version, because Paul's letters were written before the gospels. Matthew, then, could have used an older tradition, similar to the one known to Paul. It could therefore be argued that it was Mark who radicalized the teachings of Jesus – for example, on divorce – or that he knew another tradition of Jesus' sayings. Therefore, the comparison of the Jesus traditions recorded by Paul to their synoptic counterparts could have theological implications that need to be taken into consideration as well.

- *Preliminary literature review*

The debate over the number of parallels between Paul and the synoptics has largely been dealt with in essays or single chapters of books, most notably by Furnish (1968)¹³ and Allison (1982).¹⁴ Only a few monographs have been devoted to the sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters. The first Pauline letter to have been

¹³ Victor P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 4th ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978).

¹⁴ Dale C. Allison, "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels", *NTS* 28 (1982): 1-32.

thoroughly investigated for Jesus traditions is 1 Corinthians, when it was studied in the dissertations of Dungan (1971)¹⁵ and Fjärstedt (1974).¹⁶ Dungan investigated only two explicit references to words of the Lord by Paul in 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14, while Fjärstedt looked for allusions to sayings of the Lord in chapters 1–4 and 9 of the Pauline letter. Fjärstedt argued that these chapters of 1 Corinthians contain many implicit references to synoptic Jesus traditions. Thompson (1991)¹⁷ investigated extensively the synoptic traditions in Romans 12 – 15, as these chapters contain most, if not all, of the Jesus tradition in the letter. More recently, Röcker (2009) examined Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians for Jesus traditions as part of his dissertation on *Belial und Katechon*.¹⁸

- *Aims/objectives of the study*

According to Riesner, a comprehensive treatment of the question of “Paul and the Jesus tradition” remains a desideratum.¹⁹ I want to make a new contribution to the debate, based on the following objectives:

¹⁵ Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*.

¹⁶ Biörn Fjärstedt, *Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians. Themes and Clusters of Theme Words in 1 Corinthians 1–4 and 9* (Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1974).

¹⁷ Michael Thompson, *Clothed with Christ. The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.3*, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991).

¹⁸ Fritz W. Röcker, *Belial und Katechon. Eine Untersuchung zu 2Thess 2,1–12 und 1 Thess 4,13–5,11*, WUNT II/262 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

¹⁹ Rainer Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus. Studien zur Chronologie, Missionsstrategie und Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 326, n. 174.

1. To determine where the similarities between Paul and the synoptic gospels lie. Because much has been written about the Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians, Romans and 1 Thessalonians – that is, those letters normally assumed to contain most of the implicit Jesus traditions in the Pauline corpus – it should not be necessary to extensively rework all the parallels in these letters. However, the remaining undisputed letters of Paul still need to be investigated thoroughly for allusions to synoptic material.

2. To interpret the findings of parallels between Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions. Up to now, scholars have mainly been arguing over the exact number of parallels. Each scholar lists the texts he or she regards as parallels and his or her reasons for doing so. I will attempt to go a step further and use these parallels in order to find out if one or more of the gospels used the same Jesus tradition as Paul did. Additionally, if a connection between a particular synoptic gospel or Q and Pauline material can be established, the conclusions that could be drawn from such observations must be considered.

3. To investigate the problem of how or from where Paul learned his Jesus traditions. The question has not been answered satisfactorily, resulting in disagreement about the number of parallels.²⁰

²⁰ The Jesus- Paul debate is very broad. Only matters pertaining to the aims and objectives of the study will be discussed below. The search for parallels between the Jesus traditions of Paul and the Synoptics will be limited to the genuine Pauline letters (cf. Chapter 3).

- *Research methods*

In order to achieve the above-mentioned aims I will work as follows: After this introduction (*Chapter 1*), the history of the debate will be presented in *Chapter 2*. Here, it will be shown which scholars have worked on the search for parallels, what their findings were, and how the start of the search for parallels originated. Besides presenting a much-needed overview of this debate, the history of the debate should also contribute to identifying and explaining the research gap.

In *Chapter 3*, the methods and assumptions of this study are listed and discussed. Particularly important is the drawing up of a clear set of criteria for the identification of synoptic Jesus traditions in the letters of Paul. The criteria should help to establish some kind of consensus about where the synoptic authors use similar Jesus traditions to those delivered by Paul. The chapter ends with a deliberation on the limitations of this study.

Before starting the search for parallels between the synoptics and Paul himself, it is necessary to ask whether it is safe to assume that Paul came to know the words of the historical Jesus – or, for that matter, any information about Jesus – as he probably never met Jesus. Many exegetes deny that Paul had any knowledge about Jesus, or claim that we cannot establish how much Paul knew about Jesus. Other authors assume that Paul knew many stories about the life and preaching of Jesus, but they fail to satisfactorily explain why such knowledge can be presupposed. Paul's knowledge the Jesus tradition has to be made plausible or the search for parallels between Paul's letters and the synoptics would be highly speculative.

Therefore, *Chapter 4* will focus on Paul's chronology. It will be discussed where Paul was after his conversion, what he did there, and with whom he came into contact. If the Jesus tradition had already spread to the places Paul stayed and if the people he met after his conversion knew the Jesus tradition, it would be hard to deny that Paul possessed knowledge of Jesus. Many scholars have studied Paul's general chronology, but it is uncommon to use this chronology with the sole aim of determining to what extent he likely was exposed to the Jesus traditions. Without this step, we would not know if the assumption that Paul was well informed on Jesus could be made, and, consequently, if Paul could be expected to implicitly refer to the Jesus tradition in his letters.

Also discussed in this chapter is the question of what Paul taught the new converts in the congregations he founded on his missionary journeys. Questions concerning the minimum amount of knowledge necessary for new converts to become Christians, and whether this information is contained in Paul's letters, need to be answered. It can also help to determine how much knowledge of the Jesus tradition one can assume Paul to have known.

In *Chapter 5*, the focus shifts to the texts themselves. When looking to identify Jesus traditions in the Pauline literature, it is sensible to start working with the texts in which Paul himself explicitly claims to quote Jesus' words. The explicit references to Jesus' words in the Pauline literature give valuable insights into the way in which Paul used the Jesus traditions in his letters. These findings can then be used to identify implicit references to the Jesus traditions in the Pauline epistles.

After the foundation of the study has been laid by trying to establish the minimum of Jesus tradition Paul knew in chapters 4 and 5, the next step is to

move on to the implicit references, also called allusions. Parallels will be identified with the specific aim of determining in each case if the wording or meaning of the Pauline Jesus tradition is closer to any of the synoptic gospels or Q. This will be done in *Chapter 6* with Paul's letter to the Roman church, and in *Chapter 7* with his first letter to the Thessalonians.

In *Chapter 8*, I will scrutinize Paul's letter to the Galatians for implicit references to words of the Lord and for its relationship to the synoptic parallels. This letter is the only other genuine Pauline letter containing probable allusions to the sayings of Jesus.

In the final chapter, *Chapter 9*, the findings will be bundled and explained.

Chapter 2:

Paul and the Jesus tradition. The history of the debate

For the largest part of the existence of Christianity, there was no debate over the relationship or the theological and historical continuity between Jesus and Paul. “The line of continuity from Jesus to Paul was seen as straightforward and unbroken. The Christ of Paul’s theology was easily identified with the Jesus of the Gospels. But then the questions began to arise”.¹ Today, we look back over an almost 200–year history of the Jesus–Paul debate. Although much has been written on the topic in the last two centuries, the debate over the historical and theological continuity (or discontinuity) between Jesus and Paul continues to this day.

2.1 The first stage of the Jesus–Paul debate: The continuity between Jesus and Paul is questioned

It is generally assumed that the Jesus–Paul debate started seriously in the year 1831 with the Tübinger scholar F. C. Baur,² who started to challenge the assumed

¹ Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 95.

² Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 347–8, points out that before Baur, Hermann H. Cludius, *Ursichten des Christenthums. Nebst Untersuchungen über einige Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (Altona: Hammerich, 1808) found discrepancies between the Pauline epistles and the gospels. Cludius stated that Paul did not know pre–Easter teachings of Jesus, making it possible for Paul to be a representative of the new Christ religion. It was, however, only with Baur that the debate over the relationship between Paul and Jesus gained significance.

continuity between the two men.³ He published an article in which he highlighted differences in the teachings of Jesus and Paul. He also accentuated the fact that Paul seldom referred to words or sayings of Jesus in his letters. He explained Paul's infrequent references to Jesus by asserting that Paul was not dependent on Jesus for his teachings. He alleged that Paul generally was not even interested in the life of Jesus. Baur consequently argued that there was no continuity between Jesus and Paul and that Paul and the early Christian community had developed their respective doctrines in opposition to each other.⁴

In 1894, Wendt developed this viewpoint further, by writing that Paul changed the "simple, popular, pictorial teaching"⁵ of Jesus into a complex theological system, that Paul's Pharisaic beliefs had corrupted the message of Jesus, and that "whereas Jesus preached a pure piety, Paul speculated about the means of salvation".⁶ This line of thought reached its peak in 1904 with

³ The search for parallels between the Pauline epistles and the synoptic gospels has emerged from the general Jesus–Paul debate and it therefore has to be integrated into this context. Almost all of the authors who have worked on the problem of the historical and theological relationship between Jesus and Paul include a history of the larger Jesus–Paul debate in their studies (notably Furnish, "The Jesus–Paul Debate", 17-50; Bernard C. Lategan, *Die aardse Jesus in die prediking van Paulus volgens sy briewe* (Rotterdam: Bronder–Offset, 1967); Friedemann Regner, *Paulus und Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977); Detlef Häusser, *Christusbekenntnis und Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, WUNT II/210 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006). It is therefore not necessary to provide such an overview in detail here. The following analysis will focus specifically on the history of the search for parallels between the synoptic Jesus tradition and the Pauline epistles. Only those aspects of the overall Jesus–Paul debate that led to the search for parallels are incorporated into the following outline of the history of the debate.

⁴ Furnish, "The Jesus–Paul Debate", 17–8.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁶ *Ibid.* In contrast, Francis W. Beare, "Jesus and Paul", *CJT* VI/2 (1959): 79 claimed: "I would say without hesitation that the Gospels are far more difficult writings than the epistles of St. Paul; and that there is nothing in the world more difficult to fathom than the teachings of Jesus".

Wrede, who took the differences between the teachings of Paul and Jesus to an extreme. He claimed that Paul taught something completely different from Jesus.⁷ For Paul, Jesus was the Messiah and Son of God, but according to Wrede, Jesus would not have made these claims himself. Jesus did not add a soteriological meaning to his own death, but this stands at the centre of Paul's teaching.⁸ Therefore, Paul's teachings cannot stand in line with Jesus', but the apostle has to be called the "second founder of Christianity".⁹ Wrede's findings left the possibility "that one could choose between one of the two founders [...] if the differences between the two were thought to be irreconcilable"¹⁰ open. A large gulf between Jesus and Paul had been opened.

This movement highlighted the *discontinuity*, and the proponents of *continuity* between Jesus and Paul began to respond in opposition to these claims. The latter group also started to examine the Pauline letters carefully, and despite of the apparent lack of direct statements about Jesus in them, they hoped to find proof in Paul's letters that the apostle did have some kind of knowledge about the life and teachings of Jesus.

Paret started searching for Jesus' words in Paul's letters with the specific aim of proving continuity between the two men. He did this in 1858 in response

⁷ Cf. David A. Fiensy, "The synoptic Logia of Jesus in the ethical teachings of Paul", *Stone–Campbell Journal* 13 (2010): 81–2.

⁸ Cf. Rainer Riesner, "Jesus, Paulus und wir", *TBei* 14–1 (2014): 6.

⁹ Furnish, "The Jesus–Paul Debate", 24–5.

¹⁰ Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, "Introduction", in *Paul and Jesus. Collected Essays*, ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 11.

to the claims of Baur.¹¹ His work represents the first comprehensive effort to explain how Paul came to know Jesus traditions and how much information about Jesus one can presuppose Paul knew.¹² He tried to prove that Paul not only knew and valued “the historical facts of Jesus’ life, but that he also quoted, used, and alluded to the teachings of Jesus”.¹³ Paret found many similarities between the Jesus traditions in Paul and the synoptics on various topics: in their reports on the passion narrative, the Lord’s Supper, baptism, the disciples of Jesus, and Jesus’ death and resurrection.¹⁴ Paret identified general themes connecting Paul to the synoptics, but he did not compare the texts verse for verse, nor did he explain the variations in wording in the parallels. Paret assumed a connection if similar thoughts were found in both sets of writings, even if the wording did not agree.

The search for synoptic material in the Pauline letters quickly became synonymous with Resch (1904). As a proponent of continuity between Jesus and Paul, Resch found more than a thousand parallels between Paul’s letters and the synoptics in his unprecedented study (925 parallels in the nine letters he considered genuinely Pauline, 133 in Ephesians and 100 more in the Pastoral letters).¹⁵ Because of the excessive amount of parallels he found, Resch’s name

¹¹ Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia”, 83.

¹² Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 349.

¹³ Furnish, “The Jesus–Paul Debate”, 18.

¹⁴ Heinrich Paret, “Paulus und Jesus: einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis des Apostels Paulus und seiner Lehre zu der Person, dem Leben und der Lehre des geschichtlichen Jesus”, *JDT* 3 (1858): 13–21.

¹⁵ W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London: SPCK, 1955), 137.

is found in almost every book or essay on this topic. However, his results are rarely taken seriously,¹⁶ as many of the instances are regarded as “quite improbable”.¹⁷ Resch explained the similarities between the synoptics and Paul by assuming that Paul and the synoptic authors knew and used a common source that contained logia of Jesus.¹⁸ The proposed scope of Resch’s Q document is, however, much larger than what is acknowledged today.¹⁹

The next name that is often mentioned in the search for parallels is that of Holtzmann (1911).²⁰ Against the extreme views of those who see no continuity between Jesus and Paul, and those who assume total continuity, Holtzmann’s list of parallels is seen as “an example of a moderate viewpoint and a reasonable treatment of the problem”.²¹ Holtzmann’s aim in comparing the teachings of Paul to those of Jesus differed from that of Paret. The former compared the teachings of Jesus and Paul in an attempt to identify the core of Christianity and not to prove continuity between Jesus and Paul.²² Holtzmann counted twelve certain and ten

¹⁶ Häusser, *Christusbekentnis*, 9.

¹⁷ E. Earle Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, BIS 39 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 70, n. 89.

¹⁸ Resch, *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*, 635–9.

¹⁹ J. P. Brown, “Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form–History”, *NTS* 10 (1963): 28.

²⁰ Heinrich J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, Vol. 2, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911).

²¹ Neiryck, “Paul and the sayings of Jesus”, 268–9.

²² Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch*, 229.

less certain parallels between the Pauline letters and the synoptic gospels²³ (see table below).

Besides identifying parallels, Holtzmann listed the most important literature regarding the search for parallels written before him.²⁴ He started by observing that the old Tübingen School had little belief that Paul used the Jesus tradition. Tübingen scholars like Holsten (1898)²⁵ and Pfleiderer (1902)²⁶ both pointed to the lack of Jesus traditions in Paul's letters. Holsten, however, still emphasized the importance of Jesus for Paul, because without Jesus, there would not have been the change from Saul to Paul.²⁷ Pfleiderer argued that because Paul had received his gospel through a revelation (cf. Gal 1), the origin of his gospel is pneumatic, which makes it unlikely that Paul would have used words of the historical Jesus.²⁸ This argument would be raised again in future years.

In his essay, Von Soden (1892) probed the role that the Jesus traditions played in missionary preaching when new congregations were formed. To answer his question, he looked for Jesus traditions in all of the New Testament writings, including the gospels. When it comes to Paul's letters, he argued that

²³ *Ibid.*, 231–3.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 231–2, n. 3.

²⁵ Carl Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus, Paulinische Theologie. Bd. II* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898).

²⁶ Otto Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum. Seine Schriften und Lehren im geschichtlichen Zusammenhang*, 2nd rev. ed. (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1902).

²⁷ Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, 41–4.

²⁸ Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, 77.

there is sufficient evidence to indicate that Paul knew Jesus traditions similar to those of the synoptics²⁹ (his parallels are listed in the table below).

Feine (1902) also identified numerous parallels between Paul and the synoptics, especially with the Sermon on the Mount.³⁰ Because of the many similarities he found, Feine maintained that there is continuity in the teachings of Jesus and Paul.³¹ For him, Paul's gospel stands in line with the teachings of the entire early church. Consequently, he proposes that one should not speak of contradictions between Jesus and Paul, but rather of differences.³² These differences could be ascribed to Paul's individual mannerisms as well as to the fact that Paul did not simply repeat the teachings of Jesus but developed Jesus' theology further.³³

Holtzmann also pointed to the work of Wernle (1897) and Brückner (1903),³⁴ both of whom highlighted Paul's failure to cite the Our Father as reason for assuming that he was not well versed in the Jesus tradition.³⁵ A year after Brückner, Kennedy (1904) argued that Paul referred directly to Jesus' words

²⁹ Hermann von Soden, "Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte", in *Theologische Abhandlungen: Carl von Weizsäcker zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstage*, ed. A. von Harnack (Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1892), 111-169.

³⁰ Paul Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902), 245–57. Feine's list of parallels is too long to be listed here.

³¹ Similar is Hans Windisch, "Paulus und Jesus", *TSK* 106/1 (1934/5): 432.

³² Paul Feine, *Der Apostel Paulus* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1927), 398.

³³ *Ibid.*, 399.

³⁴ Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch*, 231–1, n. 3.

³⁵ Paul Wernle, *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus* (Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1897), 53; Martin Brückner, *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie* (Strassburg: Heitz, 1903), 54.

relatively often. He continued: “And these references are, no doubt, merely a sample of his practice in his oral instruction. Numerous important parallels to the sayings of Jesus may be noted in his ethical teaching”.³⁶ Kennedy also found many similarities between Jesus and Paul in their teachings on the *Parousia*, and argued that they taught a distinctly Christian eschatology that does not completely agree with Jewish eschatological teachings.

While rejecting many of the parallels he found, many scholars in later years would agree with Kennedy’s assertion that Paul echoed teachings of Jesus, primarily in ethical matters. Kennedy’s view that there is a clear Christian eschatology in Paul’s letters corresponding to the synoptic view would also be repeated, but would not be able to attract a large following.

Rüegg (1906) was convinced that Paul did not need to consult any documents on the Jesus traditions because he could have asked living persons about the life and teachings of Jesus. He argued that Paul had access to a closed cohesive body of evidence about Jesus.³⁷ Paul actually would have been able to write a gospel himself.³⁸ Rüegg cited Gal 3:1³⁹ as proof that Paul was indeed interested in the historical Jesus.⁴⁰ Rüegg mostly listed Pauline parallels to the

³⁶ Harry A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904), 96–8.

³⁷ Arnold Rüegg, *Der Apostel Paulus und sein Zeugnis von Jesus Christus* (Leipzig: Dörfpling und Franke, 1906), 61.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 64.

³⁹ Ὡ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ’ ὄφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος;

⁴⁰ Rüegg, *Der Apostel Paulus*, 70.

Sermon on the Mount in Matt 5 – 7. He indicated that there are many more parallels in Rom 14 to synoptic material. Even in those instances where no identifiable word of Jesus used by Paul can be located in the synoptics, he argued that the *Sinn and Geist* of the letters of Paul and the gospels is the same.⁴¹

For Weiß (1917), the allusions to Jesus traditions in Paul's letters are undeniable. He regarded them as proof that Paul was familiar with the Jesus tradition of the gospels.⁴² Weiß is dependent on Titius for his list of allusions. He reworked and reduced the number of echoes identified by the latter⁴³ (see table below).

In concluding the overview of the search for parallels in this, the first stage of the debate, it can be said that altogether the search for parallels still formed part of the larger Jesus–Paul debate. No literature had yet been written exclusively on the search for parallels between Paul and the synoptics. Just as Paret had devoted only a few pages of his essay on the general Jesus–Paul debate to citing parallels between Paul and the synoptics, it would become a feature of the search for parallels that it would mainly be carried out in essays and single chapters of monographs.

Furthermore, it can be noted that the listing of parallels was not done in what we would call a “scientific” manner. Most scholars have only listed the parallels they identified between the synoptics and the Pauline letters, and have not tried to prove why the texts are to be regarded as counterparts. To assume

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 74–8.

⁴² Johannes Weiß, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), 413.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 431, n. 1.

dependency between Jesus traditions in Paul's letters and the synoptics in this stage of the debate, it would suffice that the meaning of parallel passages was more or less the same.

Besides, no one listed any criteria for locating their parallels. The door had been left open for the validity of the parallels to be attacked; this subsequently happened in later years. Reasons would be sought for not regarding similar texts as parallels. This became noticeable when the teachings of Jesus were compared to contemporary Jewish texts in an attempt to establish how unique Jesus' teachings were. As Jesus used and interpreted many well-known Jewish sayings, Wilson (1984) argued that "some of the best parallels are not so much evidence for a connection between Jesus and Paul as for a connection of each of them with his Jewish environment".⁴⁴

At this stage of the debate, however, there was nothing more than sporadic listings of parallels within the Jesus–Paul debate. Then, "during this period of the early twentieth century, the debate over Paul and Jesus lay dormant".⁴⁵ It would take more than 110 years since the publication of Paret's essay in 1858 for the first dissertations on the search for parallels to be written by Dungan (1971) and Fjärstedt (1974).

In the following table, the parallels between Paul's letters and the synoptic Jesus traditions found by the various scholars in the first stage of the Jesus–Paul

⁴⁴ S. G. Wilson, "From Jesus to Paul: The Contours and Consequences of a Debate", in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*, eds., P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984), 15.

⁴⁵ Stephen J. Patterson, "Paul and the Jesus Tradition: It is Time for Another Look", *HTR* 84/1 (1991): 24.

debate are listed. Interestingly, one finds the most parallels in only three of Paul's letters: 1 Corinthians, Romans and 1 Thessalonians. 2 Corinthians and Galatians are mentioned, but very seldom. The comparison also shows how little agreement there was between these scholars regarding the parallels.⁴⁶

Table 1

Pauline Verses	Synoptic parallels						
	Paret 1858	v. Soden 1892	Titius 1900	Kennedy 1904	Rüegg 1906	Holtzmann 1911	Weiß 1917
1 Cor 2:11	Matt 11:27						
1 Cor 7:10–11		Mark 10:9, 11		Mark 10; Matt 19		Mark 10:9, 11; Matt 5:32; 19:9; Luke 16:18	
1 Cor 9:14; 10:27					Luke 10:7	Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28; Luke 10:7– 8	
1 Cor 4:12; Rom 12:14						Matt 5:44; Luke 6:28	Luke 6:27–28
1 Cor 6:2				Matt 14:28			
1 Cor 6:13	Matt 15:17						

⁴⁶ Only the parallels that scholars themselves regard as certain are included. Where scholars have expressed doubt about the validity of some of the parallels they had listed, they are not included. This applies to all other tables as well.



1 Cor 8:12	Matt 18:5						
1 Cor 9:14		Luke 10:7f					
1 Cor 9:19							Mark 10:44– 45
1 Cor 10:27	Luke 10:8						
1 Cor 13:2	Matt 17:20					Mark 11:23; Matt 17:20; 21:21	
1 Cor 15				Mark 12:18f; Luke 20:27f.			
1 Cor 15:25				Mark 12:36			
2 Cor 1:17	Matt 5:37						
2 Cor 5:10				Matt 25:31–32			
2 Cor 11:7					Matt 5:37		Matt 23:11– 12
Rom 13:8–10; Gal 5:14						Mark 12:31; Matt 7:12; 22:39–40; Luke 10:27	
Rom 13:6–7						Mark 12:17; Matt 22:21; Luke 20:25	
Rom 2:1; 14:4, 13						Matt 7:2	Matt 7:1–2
Rom 2:19	Matt 15:14					Matt 15:14; 23:16, 24	



Rom 3:31					Matt 5:17		
Rom 9:33						Matt 21:42	
Rom 12:14, 16–21	Sermon on the Mount		Luke 6:27f				
Rom 12:17, 20					Matt 5:39		
Rom 13:1–7		Mark 12:13–17					
Rom 13:9	Matt 22:40						
Rom 13:1ff				Mark 14:62			
Rom 14: 4, 2, 1	Matt 7:1ff						
Rom 14:7					Synopt ic macari sms		
Rom 14:12						Matt 12:36	
Rom 14:13, 15 (cf. 1 Cor 6:12)	Matt 17:26–27						
Rom 14:14	Matt 15:11–20						
Rom 14:17	Matt 5:3ff						
Rom 15:6					Matt 5:16		
Rom 16:19							Matt 6:25
1 Thess 3:4; 1 Cor 7:26, 28				Matt 24:19ff			



1 Thess 4:8	Luke 10:16 <i>par</i>		Luke 10:16				
1 Thess 4:15–17				Matt 24:31		Matt 24:30–31	
1 Thess 5:1	Matt 24:3 <i>par</i>						
1 Thess 5:2	Matt 24:36ff, 43		Luke 12:39; Matt 24:43	Matt 24:43		Matt 24:36, 43; Luke 12:39	
1 Thess 5:3	Matt 24:37–39						
1 Thess 5:6ff	Matt 24:42f; 25:13			Matt 24:42			
Eph 4:26					Matt 5:25		
Col 3:5					Matt 18:8		

2.2 The second stage of the Jesus–Paul debate: The search for Jesus traditions in Pauline literature intensifies

By the end of the first stage of the Jesus–Paul debate in the early 20th century, a couple of scholars had voiced their support for the continuity between Jesus and Paul with the help of parallel passages.⁴⁷ But now, with Bultmann, “the great chasm between Paul and Jesus opened up by Baur and Wrede had a theological home once again”.⁴⁸ Bultmann once more emphasized the discontinuity between Jesus and Paul. He maintained that the historical Jesus played no part in Paul’s teaching, and went so far as to say that the teachings of Jesus were essentially irrelevant to Paul.⁴⁹ Bultmann did, however, find one point in which there is agreement between Jesus and Paul: in their teachings on the law.⁵⁰

In the same year that Bultmann made these statements about the general discontinuity between Jesus and Paul, Davies (1933)⁵¹ asserted “just as confidently [as Bultmann], it was the words of Jesus himself that formed Paul’s

⁴⁷ The general Jesus–Paul debate about the historical and theological relationship between Jesus and Paul is often divided into two stages: The first one being from Baur to Wrede and the second from Bultmann onwards (cf. Wilson, “From Jesus to Paul”, 3). At the beginning of the second stage of the overall Jesus–Paul debate, the search for parallels was still firmly embedded in this debate. It would later follow its own course and detach itself from the general Jesus–Paul debate.

⁴⁸ Patterson, “Paul and the Jesus Tradition”, 25.

⁴⁹ “Jesu Verkündigung ist für ihn [Paulus] – mindestens im wesentlichen – irrelevant” (Rudolf Bultmann, “Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus (1929)”, in *Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze I*, ed. R. Bultmann (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933), 191.

⁵⁰ Lategan, *Die aardse Jesus*, 56.

⁵¹ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 136.

primary source in his work as ethical διδάσκαλος”.⁵² Davies claimed that “Paul is steeped in the mind and words of his Lord”.⁵³ Both extreme positions still existed at this stage and a consensus on the matter was still far off.

Windisch (1934/5), who also assumed some continuity between Jesus and Paul, came up with a new explanation for the differences in the two Jesus traditions. He assumed that Paul used two main sources of the Jesus tradition: one originated in Jerusalem and was passed on to Antioch, and the other had its origins in Damascus. Paul shared the gospel of Jerusalem with the other apostles and this gospel is similar to the synoptic material. The gospel of Damascus, however, contains new elements, including Paul’s calling, his relation to Hellenistic Judaism, Syncretism, and the focus on Jesus’ death and resurrection.⁵⁴ In 1 Thessalonians, probably his oldest letter, Paul predominantly uses the Jerusalem Jesus tradition and hence his statements are in line with the synoptics, so Windisch. The Damascus gospel dominates in Paul’s letter to the Galatians, resulting in discrepancies between the Jesus traditions of Galatians and the synoptics. Still, according to Windisch, the two sources of Paul’s Jesus traditions are not irreconcilable. They can be incorporated into each other.⁵⁵ This is supported by Paul’s use of the synoptic Jesus traditions in his other epistles, where he mixes his two sources. Therefore, the tensions between the Pauline

⁵² Cf. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 15.

⁵³ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 140.

⁵⁴ Windisch, “Paulus und Jesus”, 441.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 442–4.

and synoptic Jesus traditions are not caused by differences between Jesus and Paul, but by differences between the two sources Paul had used. As a result, the tension between Jesus and Paul is already present within the Pauline letters.⁵⁶ Finally, it is worth mentioning that Windisch pointed out that Paul frequently alluded to Jesus traditions in chapters 12 – 15 of his letter to the Romans.⁵⁷ This insight would be confirmed and refined in future years.

Hunter (1940) continued to advocate the continuity between Jesus and Paul by showing similarities in their respective teachings. In his search for similarities between the teachings of Jesus and Paul, Hunter distinguished between explicit references (of which he counted four) and echoes or implicit references to words of the Lord. He argued that Paul knew more of the Jesus tradition than only the sayings of the Lord contained in his explicit references.⁵⁸ He then searched for allusions to words of the Lord in the Pauline epistles.⁵⁹ He found ten such cases in Paul's letter to the Romans, all in chapters 12 and 14 (see table below) and argued that there were just too many parallels with Jesus traditions in these two chapters of Romans for it to be a coincidence. Instead, it holds true that Paul's ethical teachings in both chapters are "saturated with the ethics of his Lord".⁶⁰ Hunter then moved on to 1 Thessalonians where he

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 450–1. Windisch lists the Pauline verses in which the Jesus tradition is contained, but he omits the synoptic parallels.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 449.

⁵⁸ Archibald M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, rev. ed. (London: SCM, 1961), 11

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 47–51.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 49.

discovered another eight parallels in chapters 4 and 5. They too are found foremost in the ethical teachings of the letter.⁶¹ Therefore, one can say that Paul “had appropriated the essential principles of Christ’s ethics”.⁶² Outside of these clusters of allusions in Rom 12 and 14 and 1 Thess 4 and 5, Hunter listed Rom 16:19 and Matt 10:16; 1 Cor 13:2 and Mark 11:23 (//Matt 21:21), and finally Phil 4:6 and Matt 6:25 (//Luke 12:22) as parallels. He also suspects that Paul might have known the Lord’s Prayer.⁶³ Hunter thought that, while Paul would not have had written copies of the sayings of Jesus, he would have been able to remember the Jesus tradition after learning it. Paul was, after all, accustomed to rabbinic training.⁶⁴

Like Hunter, Davies (1955) campaigned for a degree of continuity between Jesus and Paul. He, too, claimed that Jesus had influenced Paul, particularly in his ethical teachings.⁶⁵ While regarding the Pauline epistles largely as reminiscent to the synoptic gospels, Davies acknowledged that Resch “has overstated his case”.⁶⁶ Yet, similar to Resch, Davies explained the similarities between Paul’s letters and the synoptics by assuming that they had used a common source – “the words of Jesus”.⁶⁷ Apart from six explicit references to

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*, 49–50.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 50–55.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁶⁵ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 136.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 137–8.

sayings of Jesus by Paul, he found a further eight implicit parallels in Romans, nine in 1 Thessalonians and eight in Colossians.⁶⁸ Neiryneck pointed out that Davies' list of parallels is dependent on that of Hunter.⁶⁹ The table below, which shows both authors' lists of parallels, underlines this.

Moule (1952) proposed an even greater degree of continuity between Jesus and Paul than Hunter and Davies.⁷⁰ He argued that Paul not only taught ethical teachings similar to those of Jesus, but that he also used some of the parables and other illustrative materials found in the synoptics. For example, in 1 Cor 7:35,⁷¹ Paul referred to the account of Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38–42), and in 1 Tim 6:17–19, Paul used images about wealth also found in the parable of the rich fool in Luke 12:13–21 (cf. Luke 16:14–15: Lukan *Sondergut*). Moule attempted to trace the origin of Paul's Jesus traditions, which he assumed could be found in Luke's gospel rather than Q because "St. Paul was an intimate of St. Luke".⁷²

Likewise, Stanley (1961) hoped "that some light may be shed upon Paul's use of these materials [sayings of Jesus] in his preaching and teaching as well as upon the history of Jesus' sayings before their redaction in our canonical

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 138–40.

⁶⁹ Neiryneck, "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus", 268.

⁷⁰ C. F. D. Moule, "The Use of Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in Early Christian Catechesis", *JTS* III/1 (1952): 75–9.

⁷¹ Τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν σύμφορον λέγω, οὐχ ἵνα βρόχον ὑμῖν ἐπιβάλω ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον καὶ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως.

⁷² Moule, "The Use of Parables", 79.

Gospels”.⁷³ In his review of the parallels, he found that the number of explicit or express references show that Paul “was in the habit of citing such sayings in his preaching and teaching”.⁷⁴ He further underscored that Paul used Jesus traditions in doctrinal parallels to logia of Jesus⁷⁵ and that Paul alluded to some of Jesus’ parables.⁷⁶ Stanley thus found many parallels between Paul’s writings and the teachings of Jesus. He also explained that one could not assume “*literary allusions or references*”⁷⁷ between the Jesus traditions in Paul and the synoptic gospels, as Paul wrote before the synoptic authors. Rather, Paul knew and passed on oral traditions.⁷⁸

Neither Stanley’s nor Moule’s conclusion that Paul knew the parables of Jesus has received much support since. Their suggestion is, for example, criticized by Furnish.⁷⁹

A year later, Schmithals (1962) proposed discontinuity between Jesus and Paul once more. He admitted that Paul claimed to have quoted words of the

⁷³ David M. Stanley, “Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus”, *CBQ* 23/1 (1961): 26.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁷⁵ That is, in Old Testament citations, which appear to have been influenced by Jesus’ own references to the same texts; in the Pauline doctrine of prayer and in the Christian attitude towards others (cf. *Ibid.*, 27–34).

⁷⁶ E.g. the faithful steward; the parable of the vineyard; the parable of the virgins; the owner of the vineyard; the prodigal son and the leaven.

⁷⁷ Stanley, “Pauline Allusions”, 26 (his italics).

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 39. In the same year as Stanley, Wolfgang Schrage, *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese. Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961), 243, listed what he called the most important parallels between Paul’s letters and the synoptic gospels in his monograph on New Testament ethics. He did not, however, explain why he regards the texts as parallels.

⁷⁹ Victor P. Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 40.

historical Jesus, but he doubted that Paul's explicit references to words of the Lord could be traced back to the historical Jesus.⁸⁰ In fact, Schmithals regarded even Paul's explicit citations as words of the risen Lord, which Paul received through a revelation. This includes 1 Cor 7:10 and 9:14 – which most scholars regard as words of the historical Jesus. In Schmithals's opinion, there are no allusions to words of the (historical) Lord in the Pauline letters at all.⁸¹

As can be seen from the above discussion, only a relatively small number of scholars undertook the search for parallels at this stage of the debate. Kümmel was correct when he noted that the Jesus–Paul debate had quieted down.⁸² Kümmel replied to Schmithals and attempted to counter the latter's extreme position.⁸³ He tried to explain Paul's seldom use of the Jesus tradition by assuming that, although Paul had knowledge of the actions and words of Jesus, they only played a subordinate role for him.⁸⁴ He does not provide any parallels between Jesus and Paul in an attempt to strengthen his case.

In 1963, J. P. Brown looked at possible parallels from a different angle and with another question in mind. He compared the synoptic material to all the New Testament epistles (and not only to Paul's letters) in an attempt to gain more information about the development of the Q document. He divided and compared material similar to both the synoptics and the New Testament epistles across 23

⁸⁰ Walter Schmithals, "Paulus und der historische Jesus", *ZNW* 53 (1962): 147.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 148.

⁸² Werner Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus", *NTS* 10/2 (1964): 163.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 168–71.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 175–7.

themes. Brown found many parallels between Q and the epistles, with many of the parallels being different to the ones that have been mentioned up to now. He explained the similarities between Q and the New Testament epistles in the following way: The “Epistolary parallels to Q materials must be due to *the Apostle’s having echoed Q materials*, consciously or not”.⁸⁵ He continued by saying that

the likenesses and contrasts in the theology of the Epistles and Gospels will continue to be discussed. I suggest that they possess a literary unity: each can be thought of as built around a collection of Jesus’ sayings as nucleus. Those sayings have undergone catechetical interpretation in all cases except [for ...] the Gospel of Luke. In the *Epistle*, the author turns that nucleus of sayings into exhortation throughout [...] The *Gospel* expands the nucleus of sayings with a narrative about Jesus.⁸⁶

Many scholars have responded to Brown’s position, doubting his assumption that all the writers of the New Testament epistles had access to a collection of sayings about Jesus, which Brown assumed to be the Q document. Tuckett, for example ascribed the large number of parallels found by Brown simply to Brown’s understanding of Q. He said: “Brown finds many links between Paul and Q; but he believes in a much larger ‘Q’ than is conventionally thought of: Brown’s ‘Q’ in an edited form is one of Mark’s sources too, so that ‘Q’ might contain most of the triple–tradition as well”.⁸⁷

At this stage of the Jesus–Paul debate both extreme positions – concerning how much information Paul knew and valued about Jesus – still had its proponents. Neither came closer than the other did to resolving the problem

⁸⁵ Brown, “Synoptic Parallels”, 28 (his italics).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 48.

⁸⁷ Christopher M. Tuckett, “1 Corinthians and Q”, *JBL* 102/4 (1983): 610, n. 21.

of continuity between Jesus and Paul. It still was sufficient to list some similar verses to argue for continuity between Jesus and Paul. Yet, at this stage of the debate, scholars like Moule, Stanley and Brown looked at the problem with a different question in mind: they searched not for parallels in order to prove continuity between Jesus and Paul (as was done in the initial stage of the debate). They used these parallels to look for the origin of Paul's knowledge of the Jesus tradition, setting the foundations for the development of a separate topic of New Testament literature in the third stage of the debate. As the table below shows, the number and instances of the parallels listed by the different researchers continued to vary greatly.

Table 2

	Hunter 1940	Davies 1948	Moule 1952	Schrage 1961	Stanley 1961
1 Cor 3:9b					Matt 15:13
1 Cor 3:10–11					Matt 7:24
1 Cor 3:19				Matt 11:25; Luke 10:21	
1 Cor 4:1–5					Matt 24:45–46
1 Cor 5:4–5					Matt 18:20
1 Cor 5:6b / Gal 5:9					Matt 13:33; Luke 12:1
1 Cor 8:12f				Mark 9:42; Matt 18:6f; Luke 17:1f	
1 Cor 7:10					Matt 5:32; 19:5–6; Luke 16:18; Mark 10:11–12
1 Cor 7:35			Luke 10:38–42		



1 Cor 9:7b					Matt 21:33–43 pars
1 Cor 9:14 (cf. 9:4; 2 Thess 3:9)					Matt 10:10b
1 Cor 9:19				Mark 10:44; Matt 20:27	
1 Cor 12:3					Mark 9:39b
1 Cor 13:2	Mark 11:23; Matt 21:21			Mark 11:23; Matt 17:20; 21:21	Matt 17:20
2 Cor 11:7				Matt 23:11f; Luke 14:11; 18:14	
2 Cor 11:2b					Matt 25:1–13
Rom 2:1					Matt 7:1–2
Rom 2:5–6					Matt 16:27
Rom 2:9					Matt 15:14; 23:16, 24
Rom 4:1–17					Matt 19:30– 20:16
Rom 10:4; 15:8; 3:31; 8:4					Matt 15:24; Matt 5:17
Rom 12:14	Matt 5:44; Luke 6:28	Matt 5:44		Luke 6:27f; Matt 5:44	Luke 6:27–28
Rom 12:17	Matt 5:39ff	Matt 5:39f		Luke 6:27f; Matt 5:44	
Rom 12:21	He lists no particular par, but finds similarities in Jesus’ teaching on non– resistance	He too lists no particular par, but finds similarities in Jesus’ teaching on non– resistance			



Rom 13:1ff				Mark 12:17; Matt 22:21; Luke 20:25	
Rom 13:7	Mark 12:13– 17; Matt 22:15–22; Luke 20:20– 26	Mark 12:13– 17; Matt 22:15–22; Luke 20:20– 26			Matt 22:21
Rom 13:8– 10 (Gal 5:14)	Mark 12:28– 34; Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25– 28	Mark 12:28– 34; Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25– 28		Mark 12:30f; Matt 22:37f	Matt 22:34– 40; Mark 12:28–34; Luke 10:25– 28
Rom 14:3, 4, 10, 13a	Matt 7:1; Luke 6:37				Matt 15:11, 20; cf. Mark 7:1–23
Rom 14:10		Matt 7:1f, Luke 6:37			
Rom 14:13b	Matt 18:6–9; Mark 9:42– 48; Luke 17:1–2				
Rom 14:13	Matt 18:7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:1–2	Matt 18:7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:1–2		Matt 7:1; Luke 6:37	
Rom 14:14	Mark 7:15; Matt 15:11	Mark 7:15; Matt 15:11		Mark 7:15;, Matt 15:11	
Rom 14:17	Parallels in the Beatitudes from the Sermon of the Mount (no particular par. given).				
Rom 14:20				Mark 7:15, Matt 15:11	



Rom 16:19 (cf. 1 Cor 14:20)	Matt 10:16		Matt 10:16	Matt 10:16	
1 Thess 4:8	Luke 10:16	Luke 10:16			Luke 10:16
1 Thess 4:9b	No par. Listed	No par. Listed			
1 Thess 4:15					Matt 22:32; 12:41–42
1 Thess 4:16–17	Mark 13:26 and parr.				
1 Thess 5:1					Matt 24:36
1 Thess 5:2 (–4)	Cf. Luke 12:39; 21:34	Luke 12:39ff; 21:34; Matt 24:43	Matt 24:43		Matt 24:43– 44; Luke 12:39–40
1 Thess 5:3 (Rom 8:22)					Matt 24:9
1 Thess 5:6	Matt 24:42	Matt 24:42; Mark 13:37; Luke 21:34, 36			
1 Thess 5:8	Based on an agraphon of Jesus				
1 Thess 5:13	Mark 9:50	Mark 9:50			
1 Thess 5:15	Again par. in Jesus’ teaching on non– resistance (he lists no particular par.)	Again par. in Jesus’ teaching on non– resistance (he too lists no particular par.)			
1 Thess 5:16		Luke 6:23; 10:20			
1 Thess 5:17					Luke 18:1
2 Thess 3:14–15					Matt 18:15–17
Phil 1:19					Matt 10:20



Phil 2:15b					Matt 12:39; 16:4; cf. 12:41; 17:17; Mark 8:38; Luke 17:25
Phil 4:6	Matt 6:25; Luke 12:22				
Gal 6:1				Matt 18:15	
Gal 6:2					John 13:34; 15:12, 17
Gal 6:5					Matt 16:24; 11:30
Col 2:20–21					Mark 7:1–23; Matt 15:1–20
Eph 2:1–22					Luke 15:11– 32
1 Tim 6:17– 19			Luke 16:14– 15		
2 Tim 2:26			Luke 5:10		

2.3 The third stage: The search for parallels develops into a separate part of Pauline literature

Up to this point, the search for Jesus traditions common to both Paul and the synoptics “used to be made in profusion in reaction to Baur’s standpoint that Paul did not depend on the historical facts of Jesus’ life”.⁸⁸ In other words, in the first and second stage of the debate, the aim of the research had primarily been to prove the historical and theological continuity between Jesus and Paul. In this, the third stage of the debate, the search for parallels gradually detached itself from the general Jesus–Paul debate and started to become an independent part of Pauline literature.⁸⁹

Now, essays and monographs written on the topic were no longer restricted to aiming to prove continuity between Jesus and Paul. Scholars started to argue about which texts actually constituted as parallels, the number of

⁸⁸ John W. Fraser, *Jesus & Paul. Paul as Interpreter of Jesus from Harnack to Kümmel* (Appleford: Marcham Books, 1974), 94. Maureen M. Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul. A Comparison with Special Reference to ‘Faith that can Remove Mountains’, and ‘Your Faith has Healed/Saved You’*, WUNT II/147 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 6–7, correctly observed that the “Jesus–Paul debate of this century has been conducted on two levels”. The one level is the literary one where one searches for verbal similarities in Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters and the synoptic gospels. On the second level, theological concepts are compared. Examples of scholars working on the second level are Eberhard Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie*, 5th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979); Helmut Merklein, *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus*, WUNT 43 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987); Helmut Merklein, *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus II*, WUNT 105 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); William A. Simmons, *A Theology of Inclusion in Jesus and Paul. The God of Outcasts and Sinners* (Lewiston: Mellen Biblical, 1996); Häusser, *Christusbekenntnis*, 2006, and Riesner, “Jesus, Paulus, und wir”, 2014. David Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995) is concerned with both levels. This overview focusses primarily on the first level.

⁸⁹ Cf. Neiryck, “Paul and the Sayings of Jesus”, 266.

parallels, and whose number of parallels was most likely to be correct. It was not enough to simply provide lists of parallels, as had been done in the past. Similarities in topics and thoughts were not recognized as compelling reasons for assuming that Paul and the synoptic authors had access to related collections of Jesus traditions. More concrete proof for regarding texts as parallels was now required. Over time, the arguments for and against assuming parallels became more and more specific and detailed.

2.3.1 From Victor Furnish (1968) to Dale Allison (1982)

The third stage of the debate can be said to have started in 1968 with Furnish, who managed to establish a generally accepted number of parallels between Paul and the synoptics. More than twenty years after the release of Furnish's book (1989), Wedderburn asserted that the work of Furnish "has stood the test of time".⁹⁰ Another twelve years later, Wong (2001) proclaimed that "since Victor Paul Furnish, scholars have generally accepted eight [...] parallels, in which Paul is thought to have alluded to the tradition of Jesus in the synoptic Gospels".⁹¹ With Furnish's list of eight parallels, one had a tangible result: one either could agree or disagree with it, and in comparison to it, one could define one's own position.

⁹⁰ Wedderburn, "Introduction," 11.

⁹¹ Eric K. C. Wong, "The De-radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in Romans", *NovT* XLIII (2001): 246.

Debates about the number of parallels now had a base from which arguments could be made.

Furnish allowed some continuity between Jesus and Paul by stating that “it is clear beyond question that Paul was the recipient, and in turn bearer, of Christian traditions”.⁹² Primarily, Furnish looked at the question of whether or not there is continuity between the ethical teachings of Jesus and Paul, as scholarly opinion on the matter was still divided at that time.⁹³ He then found eight convincing implicit references between the teachings of Paul and of Jesus⁹⁴ (see table below). Furnish arrived at this number by working through Davies’s list one by one. He kept only eight instances, finding that Davies’s other allusions were not convincing.⁹⁵ Interestingly, the allusions accepted by Furnish appear in clusters in Paul’s epistles: five are located in Rom 12 – 14, and the other three in 1 Thess 5. In contrast to others before him, Furnish identified no allusions to words of the Lord in Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians. This is quite remarkable, as most of the explicit references to words of the Lord are found in this letter.

When one assumes that Paul knew and used some sayings of Jesus, eight implicit references to words of the Lord seems to be a very small number. Yet Allison warns that one should not regard “only” eight parallels as meaning that

⁹² Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 51.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 51–67.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 53–4.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 56–7.

Paul did not know much of the Jesus tradition. Rather, it is the minimum of what we can be sure of.⁹⁶

2.3.1.1 *The focus on 1 Corinthians and Q*

While Furnish was convinced that there was not enough evidence for assuming any implicit references to a saying of Jesus in Paul's first letter to the Corinthian church, most of the research in the following years on Paul's use of the Jesus tradition was done on this particular letter. Robinson (1962),⁹⁷ Kuhn (1970),⁹⁸ Robinson & Koester (1971)⁹⁹ and Tuckett (1982)¹⁰⁰ all believed that 1 Corinthians showed more similarities with the synoptic gospels than any other letter of the apostle. The first two dissertations on parallels between Jesus traditions in Paul

⁹⁶ Allison, "The Pauline Epistles", 10. A similar sentiment was uttered by Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, "Paul and Jesus: The Problem of Continuity", in *Paul and Jesus. Collected essays*, ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 100, who said: "Since he [Paul] therefore seems to know at least part of that tradition it becomes more plausible that he elsewhere alludes to other sayings of Jesus contained in that tradition".

⁹⁷ James M. Robinson, "Basic Shifts in German Theology", *Int* 16/1 (1962): 76–97.

⁹⁸ Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, "Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus als traditionsgeschichtliches und theologisches Problem", *ZTK* 67 (1970): 295-320.

⁹⁹ James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1971).

¹⁰⁰ Tuckett, "1 Corinthians and Q", 607–619.

and the synoptics by Dungan (1973) and Fjärstedt (1974) investigated Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians too.¹⁰¹

Within the debate over the scope of the Jesus tradition in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, it was proposed that some kind of relationship existed between Q and the Jesus traditions known in Corinth. This was first suggested by Robinson (1962), who believed that the Jesus traditions known to the Corinthians, as well as Q, contained gnostic views. Later on, together with Koester, Robinson proposed a connection between Q and 1 Corinthians in the gnosticizing wisdom language of both writings.¹⁰²

In a similar way, Kuhn (1970) suspected that, because of Paul's frequent references to wisdom in 1 Cor 1–3, his opponents in Corinth (who tended to gnostic views) were traditioners of the literary form λόγοι σοφῶν.¹⁰³ His opponents also possibly were traditioners of the sayings of Jesus in Corinth. Paul could not use Jesus' words to argue against his opponents, because they were

¹⁰¹ Before the research focussed on the Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians, Harald Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970), 187–204, again attempted to show that Paul knew and used themes of the main parables told by Jesus, as proposed by Moule and Stanley before him. Riesenfeld reasoned that because Paul certainly knew a few traditions about Jesus, as is shown by the explicit references, he would have also known some parables, particularly those about sowing and harvesting. Riesenfeld argued that it is probable that Paul knew a written version of “parabolic themes” later taken up in the gospels, but it is impossible “to determine in which phase of its development this tradition was when Paul made use of it” (204).

¹⁰² Robinson and Koester, *Trajectories*, 40–3.

¹⁰³ Kuhn, “Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus”, 312. It is noticeable that Paul uses the words σοφία und σοφός repeatedly in 1 Cor 1–3. Of the 19 occurrences of σοφία in the genuine Pauline letters, 16 are found in these three chapters. Likewise, Paul uses σοφός 15 times in total, ten of which appear in the first three chapters of 1 Corinthians.

claiming to be in possession of the Lord's sayings.¹⁰⁴ This would explain why he did not quote Jesus traditions more often in this letter.¹⁰⁵

Apart from the two explicit quotations in 1 Corinthians (7:10; 9:14), Kuhn located a likely indirect reference to the Lord's word 1 Cor 13:2. He regarded a relationship between 1 Cor 1:21–22 and the Q logion Luke 11:29–32 to be probable, as the words σοφία, σημεῖα and κήρυγμα appear in both texts.¹⁰⁶ He also saw similarities between Luke 10:21–22 and 1 Cor 1–3.

Outside of 1 Corinthians, he found allusions to the Jesus tradition in 1 Thess 5:2; Rom 12:14; 13:9–10 and 16:9, adding that it is impossible to be completely sure that Paul is alluding to Jesus traditions in these passages.¹⁰⁷ He then highlighted that nothing in Paul's letters suggests that he knew any narrative texts like those of the gospels, not even the passion narrative, even though he was a theologian of the cross.

Tuckett (1983) and Richardson and Gooch (1984)¹⁰⁸ continued the debate over the relationship between the Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians and Q. They

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 313–8; Robinson and Koester, *Trajectories*, 40–3.

¹⁰⁵ David L. Balch, "Backgrounds of I Cor. VII: Sayings of the Lord in Q; Moses as an Ascetic 0EIOS ANHP in II Cor. III", *NTS* 18 (1972): 352–8, also inferred that the opponents of Paul in Corinth had access to sayings of Jesus. He argued that asceticism was promoted in early Christianity. This could already be seen in 1 Cor 7. Balch searched for the origin of the ascetic teaching in the congregation in Corinth. He followed Robinson in accepting that the opponents of Paul in Corinth knew a form of the Q document, in which, amongst other things, celibacy was endorsed. He believes that the ascetic views of the Corinthians agree with those of Q and Luke, but differ from Matthew.

¹⁰⁶ Kuhn, "Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus", 315.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 296.

¹⁰⁸ Peter Richardson and Peter Gooch, "Logia of Jesus in 1 Corinthians", in *Gospel Perspectives, Vol. 5, The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, ed. D. Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT, 1984), 39–62.

did not assume that the Jesus tradition was in the hands of Paul's Corinthian opponents, but investigated possible links between the text of 1 Corinthians itself and Q. Tuckett said that if it were true that Q was known in Corinth, "it would enable us to see a bit more of the way in which sayings of Jesus were collected and used in the early church; and from the point of view of the synoptic problem, it might furnish some evidence for the existence of Q independent of the synoptic tradition itself".¹⁰⁹

Tuckett worked through proposed parallel texts and concluded that 1 Corinthians does incorporate Jesus traditions similar to those of the gospels, but not those ascribed to Q.¹¹⁰ The result of his survey "is largely negative",¹¹¹ because links between 1 Corinthians and Q prove to be "very difficult to establish".¹¹² Tuckett does not deny that the Corinthians or Paul used Jesus traditions, as there is strong evidence supporting this claim. However, the Jesus traditions they used are probably from an early form of the synoptic tradition, and not from Q material.¹¹³

¹⁰⁹ Tuckett, "1 Corinthians and Q", 607. Tuckett argued that, generally speaking, numerous factors could make a relationship between the two texts likely: a) Three of the four explicit sayings of the Lord are found in 1 Corinthians, implying that Paul and the Corinthians had some knowledge of Jesus traditions; b) Both 1 Cor 1–4 and Q "have an interest in σοφία" (608); c) There are similarities in wording in 1 Corinthians and synoptic Q material, for example, the saying about "faith which can move mountains" is found in 1 Cor 13:2 and Q; and d) There are many more "less direct" pieces of evidence in which the language and thought of Paul in 1 Corinthians resembles that of Q (609–10).

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 615–6.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 619.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ *Ibid.*

Richardson & Gooch (1984) also asked which Jesus traditions Paul used in 1 Corinthians, why he used them, and whether he passed on the Jesus tradition orally to the Corinthian church. 1 Corinthians 7:10–11 and 9:14 make it clear that Paul did know Jesus traditions similar to those in the synoptics. Therefore, allusions are likely to be found. The allusions they located “centre on mission concerns”.¹¹⁴ Most of their proposed parallels are also found in Q, with a few exceptions, as some logia belong to Markan material.¹¹⁵ Richardson (1984) then explored a possible connection between the “Thunderbolt in Q” and 1 Cor 1–2 and its role in the development of the synoptic gospel tradition, which pointed him to a hypothetical Proto–Luke.¹¹⁶

The debate over the relationship between 1 Corinthians and Q has since quieted down. It has not been persuasively proven that Q (or a similar source) has been known in Corinth. It has even been doubted that Paul knew a form of Q at all.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Richardson and Gooch, “Logia of Jesus in 1 Corinthians”, 50.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 51.

¹¹⁶ Peter Richardson, “The Thunderbolt in Q and the Wise Man in Corinth”, in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*, eds., P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984), 91-112.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Neiryck, “Paul and the Sayings of Jesus”, 320.

2.3.1.2 *The first dissertations on Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians*

Dungan's study (1971) examined parallels between Paul in 1 Corinthians and the synoptics. He focused exclusively on the quotes of the words of the Lord by Paul in 1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14. With his study, arguments for or against assuming a connection between texts common to Paul and the synoptics became more detailed and more extensive.

For Dungan, the two explicit references are proof that Paul knew the words of Jesus and interpreted them in the same way as they were used in the synoptics. He argued that the Pauline texts show remarkable similarities to the parallel versions in Matthew, but are less similar to the Markan and Lukan versions. Dungan argued that, because Paul's written text is older than that of the synoptics, and Matthew's version is similar to Paul's, Matthew's material of the parallel texts is older than Mark and Luke's versions. His findings, Dungan said, support the Griesbach hypothesis, which assumes that Matthew is the oldest gospel and Mark and Luke used Matthew as a source when compiling their respective gospels.

Allison doubted Dungan's finding, as the latter's assumption represents a problem "for those unwilling to abandon the priority of Mark and Q".¹¹⁸ Allison correctly pointed out that "merely two passages" are too few "for determining how much of the Gospel tradition Paul knew or used".¹¹⁹ One cannot draw definite

¹¹⁸ Allison, "The Pauline Epistles", 4.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

conclusions from these two parallels. Moreover, Allison recognized Dungan's positive impact when he said: "Dungan has, without question, made a significant contribution. In particular, the detailed analysis of the two passages in 1 Corinthians and the use of redaction criticism on the corresponding synoptic sections reveal the methodological inadequacy of earlier work. Yet questions remain".¹²⁰

Three years later, another dissertation on Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians was published. Fjärstedt (1974) continued the more detailed investigation of synoptic Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians. Unlike Dungan, who examined the two quotes, Fjärstedt dealt with allusions to Jesus traditions in 1 Corinthians 1–4 and 9. These chapters of 1 Corinthians are assumed to contain most of the letter's allusions to Jesus traditions. Fjärstedt applied a new and different method to the search for parallels. He looked for clusters of the same words in both 1 Corinthians and synoptic passages. For example, he argued that Paul knew Luke 6:47–49, because in the Lukan verses as well as in 1 Cor 3:9–12, the three words οἰκοδομέω, τίθημι and θεμέλιος appear.¹²¹ Using this method of identifying clusters of words common to passages in both Paul and the synoptics, Fjärstedt found quite a large number of parallels.

Fjärstedt's dissertation has been much criticized, notably again by Allison. Although Allison acknowledged that Fjärstedt's study is "surely the most elaborate work" comparing "certain images or key words"¹²² in Paul and the

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ Fjärstedt, *Synoptic Traditions in 1 Corinthians*, 161.

¹²² Allison, "The Pauline Epistles", 6.

synoptics, he questioned Fjärstedt’s methodology, claiming that his “results carry one too far into the realm of uncertainty”.¹²³ As many of the agreeing words in Paul and the synoptics are “commonly paired in Greek literature”,¹²⁴ the parallels are left open to chance. It is also a problem that the allusions Fjärstedt “uncovers consist of single words, never phrases”,¹²⁵ making a dependency between the texts less likely. Allison also regrets that Fjärstedt “has failed to supply any control for his method”.¹²⁶

2.3.1.3 Moving away from 1 Corinthians

In the meantime, Schürmann (1974) listed his parallels in an effort to determine what Paul means when he uses the expression “law of Christ” in Gal 6:2.¹²⁷ His list of parallels shows that, with only a few exceptions, Paul used logia that articulate Jesus’ love command.¹²⁸ This makes it probable that “the law of Christ” means the love command.¹²⁹ Goulder (1978) attempted to find out whether Paul’s

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

¹²⁸ Heinz Schürmann, “Das Gesetz des Christus’ (Gal 6,2). Jesu Verhalten und Wort als letztgültige sittliche Norm nach Paulus”, in *Neues Testament und Kirche. Für Rudolf Schnackenburg*, ed. J. Gnllka (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 286.

¹²⁹ Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 82, thinks “that the talk of the ‘law of Christ’ refers simply to the way of life characteristic of the church of Christ”.

letters were written as a lectionary and whether Matthew orientated his five discourses according to this lectionary.¹³⁰ He compared Pauline and Matthean texts and found many “clusters of passages in Matthew which have Pauline parallels, corresponding largely with the Discourses”,¹³¹ but, as a whole, the parallels between Paul and Matthew do not support such a lectionary theory.¹³²

After Furnish’s list of eight parallels in 1968, Allison’s (1982) list of allusions became the new authoritative norm in this matter. Allison presented, in the words of Koester, “a critical and, for the time being, definitive review of the debate”¹³³ about the number of references to Jesus’ words in Paul’s letters. Scholars now dealing with the question of parallels between Paul and the synoptics could not get past dealing with the findings of both Furnish and Allison.

Furnish had argued that the synoptic Jesus traditions are found in clusters in Paul’s letters, and similarly, Allison claimed that the allusions in Paul’s letters are clustered in both the epistles and the synoptics. However, Allison differs from Furnish in exactly where these clusters are located. The former argued that Rom 12:14–21 indicates many links to Luke 6:27–38.¹³⁴ Besides Luke 6:27–38, Paul also knew collections of sayings from Mark 9:33–50 and Mark 6:6b–13 and parallels. Paul used these sayings of Jesus again in certain passages of his

¹³⁰ Michael D. Goulder, *The Evangelist’s Calendar* (London: SPCK, 1978), 227–40.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 239

¹³² *Ibid.*, 240.

¹³³ Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990), 52, n. 2.

¹³⁴ Allison, “The Pauline Epistles”, 11.

letters: “Rom. 12–14; 1 Thess. 4–5, Col. 3–4, 1 Corinthians”.¹³⁵ Apart from these clusters, Allison thinks it is likely that Paul was familiar with a passion narrative, possibly a collection of conflict stories, and some isolated logia.¹³⁶ Allison’s arguments, too, have failed to be completely convincing, as a closer look at the wording shows too many dissimilarities between the texts he listed.¹³⁷

Stuhlmacher (1983) turned his attention to the Jesus traditions in the letter to the Romans.¹³⁸ He argued that Paul’s use of the Jesus traditions in his first letters to the Corinthians and Thessalonians shows that Paul had learned Jesus traditions stemming from Jerusalem and Antioch and that Paul was a tradent and teacher of these traditions himself.¹³⁹ The same applies to the letter to the Romans. Paul’s message of justification is in line with Jesus’ teachings on the kingdom of God. The parallels between the Jesus traditions in Romans and the synoptics confirm for him that Paul knew and used the sayings of Jesus¹⁴⁰ (the parallels are listed below).

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 17.

¹³⁷ Cf. Peter Stuhlmacher, “Zum Thema: Das Evangelien und die Evangelien”, in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, WUNT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1982), and G. Francois Wessels, “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul. Revisiting Bernard C. Latagan’s Thesis”, in *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Latagan*, eds., C. Breytenbach, J. C. Thom and J. Punt (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006), 38.

¹³⁸ Peter Stuhlmacher, “Jesu-tradition im Römerbrief? Eine Skizze”, *TBei* 14 (1983): 240–250.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 242–5.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 245–50.

The following table, which lists the parallels arrived at in this stage of the debate, shows the influence of Furnish's work. This table is much shorter than the previous two.¹⁴¹ The possible number and instances of parallels were greatly reduced and greater consensus was achieved.

Table 3

	Furnish 1968	Bruce 1974	Schürmann 1974	Allison 1982
Rom 2:1; 14:4, 13, 21; 16:17			Luke 6:37 par	
Rom 12:14 (1 Cor 4:12–13)	Matt 5:44	Luke 6:28	Luke 6,27f	Luke 6:28; Matt 5:44
Rom 12:17a (1 Thess 5:15a)	Matt 5:39ff			
Rom 12:17		Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27		Luke 6:27–36; Matt 5:38–48
Rom 12:21				Luke 6:27–36; Matt 5:38–48
Rom 13:(6–)7	Matt 22:15–22	Mark 12:17	Mark 12:17	Mark 12:13–17
Rom 13:8–10; Gal 5:14		Matt 22:37–40; Mark 12:28–34	Mark 12:30f pars	
Rom 13:11–14		Luke 21:28, 36		
Rom 14:10–11				Luke 6:37; Matt 7:1–2

¹⁴¹ Michael Wolter, "Jesus bei Paulus", in *The Rise and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries of the Common Era*, eds., C. Rothschild and J. Schröter (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 206, likewise has observed that since Resch, the lists of parallels have become shorter and shorter.



Rom 14:13 (-14)	Matt 18:7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:1-2			Mark 9:42
Rom 14:14 (20)	Matt 15:11; Mark 7:15		Mark 7:15	Mark 7:15
Rom 16:19			Matt 10:16b	
1 Cor 4:12b-13			Luke 6:27f	
1 Cor 4:14				Luke 6:28; Matt 5:44
1 Cor 7:10			Mark 10:11-12	Mark 10:12
1 Cor 8:13				Mark 9:42
1 Cor 8:17f			Mark 9:42 pars	
1 Cor 9:14			Luke 10:7b; Matt 10:10b	Luke 10:27; Matt 10:10; Mark 6:8-9
1 Cor 9:19			Mark 10:44 pars	
1 Cor 10:27		Luke 10:7		
1 Cor 11:23-27				Luke 22:19- 20
1 Cor 13:2			Mark 11:23 pars	Mark 11:23
2 Cor 11:7			Luke 14:11 pars	
1 Thess 4:8				Luke 10:16
1 Thess 5:2 (4)	Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39		Luke 12:39f par	Luke 12:39- 40; Matt 24:43-44
1 Thess 5:3				
1 Thess 5:13	Mark 9:50			Mark 9:50
1 Thess 5:15	Matt 5:38-47			Luke 6:27- 36; Matt 5:38-48
Gal 6:1			Luke 17:3 par	

2.3.2 From 1984: Concerns are voiced

The search for parallels had become an independent part of Pauline literature by this stage, as entire monographs were written exclusively on the topic. Possible parallels were listed and arguments about the number of allusions were conducted. The nature of the debate shows that most of these scholars did not doubt that Paul knew and used Jesus traditions, and took it for granted. “From 1984 the tide seemed to turn: studies more sceptical about the parallels between Jesus (or the Jesus tradition) and Paul started to appear”.¹⁴² Two of these more sceptical essays were published in the 1984 *Festschrift* for Francis Beare, with the title *From Jesus to Paul*. For Wilson, Paul’s infrequent use of sayings of Jesus pointed to Paul’s difficult relationship with the Jerusalem apostles.¹⁴³ Gaston also proposed discontinuity: he compared the messages of Paul and the Jerusalem church and concluded that their theologies were very different.¹⁴⁴

Walter (1985) put forward more arguments for the minimalist position, that is, for assuming that Paul only knew and used a small amount of Jesus

¹⁴² Wessels, “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul”, 40.

¹⁴³ Wilson, “From Jesus to Paul”, 6–7.

¹⁴⁴ Lloyd Gaston, “From Jesus to Paul: The Contours and Consequences of a Debate”, in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*, eds., P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984).

tradition.¹⁴⁵ While Walter remained open to the thought that Paul might have known more words of Jesus than what is recognizable from his letters, he was not sure that this could be proven. He argued that Paul knew only the explicit references to words of the Lord and blocks of material common to Rom 12:14–21 and 1 Cor 4:11–13. These Pauline chapters connect to Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount or the Sermon on the Plain as delivered in Matthew and Luke respectively. Paul did not necessarily get to know these logia as words of the Lord. He could have learnt them as part of general Christian teachings.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, Walter repeated the observations that Paul seemingly did not know any narrative texts about Jesus,¹⁴⁷ that he did not quote words of the Lord when he expounded the central content of his gospel, and Paul only referred to sayings of Jesus in his ethical paraenesis.¹⁴⁸ Thus, Walter implied that Paul was only calling on Jesus’ authority in “peripheral matters” and not in central ones.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ Nikolaus Walter, “Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition”, *NTS* 31 (1985): 499. The other minimalists, according to Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus-Überlieferung”, 353, are Tuckett, “1 Corinthians and Q”; Jürgen Sauer, “Traditionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den synoptischen und paulinischen Aussagen über Feindesliebe und Wiedervergeltungsverzicht”, *ZNW* 76 (1985): 1-28 and Neiryck, “Paul and the Sayings of Jesus”. Christine Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?: Analogien zwischen den echten Paulusbriefen und den Synoptischen Evangelien*, BZNW 213 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 7, n. 20) adds Andreas Lindemann “Die Funktion der Herrenworte in der ethischen Argumentation des Paulus im Ersten Korintherbrief”, in *The Four Gospels. Festschrift Frans Neiryck, Vol. 1*, eds., F. van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. van Belle and J. Verheyden (Leuven: University Press; Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992), 677-88, and Jürgen Becker, *Paulus. Der Apostel der Völker* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989) to the list.

¹⁴⁶ Walter, “Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition”, 500–1.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 503.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 505.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Wessels, “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul”, 40.

Neiryck (1986) is the minimalist most often referred to in literature. In the first pages of his essay, he listed some of the parallels that scholars before him cited (270–81).¹⁵⁰ He then worked through these parallels and concluded that, except for 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14, there are no parallels between Paul and the synoptics. He rejected even the few implicit allusions recognized by Walter. Neiryck argued:

Elsewhere in the Pauline letters there is no certain trace of a conscious use of sayings of Jesus. Possible allusions to gospel sayings can be noted on the basis of similarity of form and context but a direct use of a gospel saying in the form it has been preserved in the synoptic gospels is hardly provable. Paul's knowledge of a pre-synoptic gospel, of the Q-source or pre-Q source has not yet been demonstrated.¹⁵¹

2.3.3 The search for parallels continues: From Wenham to Thompson

Despite the minimalists' objections, the search for parallels continued.¹⁵² Wenham has done extensive research on parallels between Jesus and Paul. His findings stand in sharp contrast to those of Neiryck. Wenham started this theme in 1989 with his essay *Paul's Use of the Jesus Tradition: Three Samples*.¹⁵³ In his

¹⁵⁰ Neiryck, "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus", 270–81.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 320. Aune, *Jesus Tradition and the Pauline Letters*, 317, described the work of Neiryck as follows: "In a characteristically detailed, methodologically sophisticated and incisive way, Neiryck deals almost exclusively with the secondary literature through 1984. Neiryck's procedure is to list some of the proposed allusions to the Jesus tradition [...], and to discuss the viability of each".

¹⁵² Bernard Orchard and Harold Riley, *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 118–20, for example, found many similarities in the eschatological teachings of Paul in 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Matthew. They assumed that Paul knew and used a source resembling Matthew in his eschatological teaching.

¹⁵³ David Wenham, "Paul's Use of the Jesus Tradition: Three Samples", in *Gospel Perspectives. The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, Vol. 5*, ed. D. Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 7–37.

monograph *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (1995), he compared the teachings of Jesus and Paul on various topics. From this study emerged “a massive overlap between the teaching of the two men”.¹⁵⁴ Even his monograph on the life of Paul (2002) is filled with allusions of Pauline teachings to the sayings of Jesus.¹⁵⁵ Wenham took great care to distinguish between those parallels where he thinks that it is almost certain that Paul referred to the Jesus tradition and those where he thinks that it is only a probability or possibility. He does not list his parallels in a table, but if he were to do so, his list of possible parallels would be by far the longest in this third stage of the debate. Consequently, Riesner called Wenham the most prominent representative of the maximalist position today. Riesner also regards Wenham’s work as the most comprehensive treatment of the Jesus–Paul topic since Resch.¹⁵⁶

Koester (1990) proposed adding two more references to Furnish’s eight implicit references.¹⁵⁷ To Furnish’s list, he added Rom 12:18 and its parallel in

¹⁵⁴ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 377.

¹⁵⁵ David Wenham, *Paul and Jesus. The True Story* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002).

¹⁵⁶ Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 355. In 1989, Wedderburn published a collection of essays on the topic “Paul and Jesus”. His main concern was “the continuity between the message of Jesus and that of Paul” (Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, “Paul and Jesus: The problem of continuity” in *Paul and Jesus. Collected Essays*, ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 101. He put differences between the messages of Jesus and Paul down to the “continuity and discontinuity of religious experience” (113) which was caused by the different situation of Jesus’ followers during and after his earthly ministry (114). Wedderburn sought reasons for assuming historical and theological continuity between Jesus and Paul, without necessarily using parallels. The focus, rather, is on Paul’s knowledge of the life of Jesus (and not his sayings) as proof that Paul knew something about him (cf. Christian Wolff, “Humility and Self–denial in Jesus’ Life and Message and in the Apostolic Existence of Paul”, in *Paul and Jesus. Collected Essays*, ed. A. J. M. Wedderburn (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 145–60.

¹⁵⁷ Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 53.

Mark 9:50 as well as Rom 14:10 with its parallel in Q; Luke 6:37. Koester thinks that Paul knew “units of materials” predominantly containing information about church order.¹⁵⁸ Others have argued that these texts are not words of the historical Jesus precisely because they provide community rules. Rather, they were written down some time after Jesus’ ascension, when the early church needed such rules. Therefore, Paul could not have known the sayings on church order as words of the Lord.¹⁵⁹ Bultmann has already doubted the authenticity of the logia about church order.¹⁶⁰

Patterson again followed Furnish and allowed the eight implicit references.¹⁶¹ He further identified parallels between Paul’s letters and the gospel of Thomas in order to illuminate the relationship of the Jesus tradition and Paul’s letters.¹⁶² Patterson concluded that the Christians in Corinth might have known Jesus traditions similar to the ones presented in the gospel of Thomas, as the views Paul was trying to combat in the city are similar to those of Thomas’ gospel.¹⁶³ Paul would therefore not have drawn on Jesus traditions in his letters because “in that form in which he later encountered it, he simply did not agree with the turn it had taken”.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 53–4.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Wilson, Wilson, “From Jesus to Paul”, 8.

¹⁶⁰ Bultmann, “Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus”, 190.

¹⁶¹ Patterson, “Paul and the Jesus Tradition”, 29, n. 26.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 40.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 41.

Thompson (1991) wrote the third dissertation on parallels between Paul and the synoptics. He investigated the Jesus traditions in Rom 12 – 15. With this volume, another benchmark was set in the search for parallels. This is because Thompson “has attempted a more scientific analysis, by setting out a sequence of criteria for recognizing an allusion or echo”.¹⁶⁵ The lack of criteria for finding parallels has been perplexing until Thompson. The clear criteria he set forth resulted in a greater consensus between the minimalists and maximalists.¹⁶⁶ Besides providing criteria, Thompson also wanted “to establish some realistic expectations about Paul” by looking at how the Jesus tradition was used in other New Testament books and by the Apostolic Fathers. He argued that because these latter letters do not quote the Jesus tradition frequently, one could not expect Paul to do so.¹⁶⁷

The bulk of Thompson’s book focusses on whether and how Paul used the Jesus tradition in his ethical teachings in Rom 12 – 15. He worked through many passages and found many links between Rom 12:1 – 15:3 and the synoptic gospels. He categorized his results in terms of probability, the most likely connections to synoptic material being in Rom 12:14; 13:8–10 and 14:14.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ James D. G. Dunn, “Jesus Tradition in Paul”, in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, eds., B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, NTTS 19 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 160.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 19.

¹⁶⁷ Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 356–64, lists references that support the claim that the early writings of the Apostolic Fathers do not cite the Jesus tradition frequently.

¹⁶⁸ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 237–41.

2.3.4 Different points of view continue to be expressed

Holtz (1991) also looked at the relationship between the Jesus traditions in the Pauline letters and the synoptics.¹⁶⁹ His aim was to find out in what form Paul came to know the Jesus traditions. His comparisons led him to believe that the Jesus tradition used by Paul “is generally one of an oral nature”,¹⁷⁰ rather than a written document. This is because of the differences in the various renditions of the text. He concluded:

the body of tradition of sayings of the Lord received by Paul is not basically of a different kind; rather it is essentially the same kind as that presented in the Gospels. But the early period obviously possessed the freedom to put the sayings of Jesus known to it into its own words addressed to the present time, and in this way lend the words such forceful authority.¹⁷¹

In turn, Lindemann (1992) was convinced by Neiryck’s reasoning.¹⁷² He agreed with Neiryck that, other than the two explicit references to words of the Lord in 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14, Paul did not make any further use of sayings of Jesus. According to Lindemann, it is noteworthy that in both explicit references, Paul cites a command of the Lord, but he himself failed to keep the commands. In 1 Cor 7:10, Paul allowed for divorce, something that Jesus prohibited, and in 1 Cor 9:14, he said that Jesus allowed those who proclaim the gospel to be paid, but Paul refused payment from most of his congregations.

¹⁶⁹ Traugott Holtz, “Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition”, in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, ed. H. Wansborough (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 380–94.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 382.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 393.

¹⁷² Lindemann, “Die Funktion der Herrenworte”, 677–8.

Consequently, Lindemann asked the question: What is the function of these explicit references in the Pauline letters? He concluded that in a specific situation, Paul could adapt a command of the Lord, if required. In any case, Lindemann argued, Matthew and Luke did the same when they changed a Jesus tradition they got from Mark to fit the situation they were writing in.¹⁷³

In a second essay on the Jesus and Paul theme in 2008, Lindemann pursued the question of how much Paul knew about the life and teaching of Jesus and how he came to know this information.¹⁷⁴ Lindemann worked through a number of allusions to sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters, and deduced from them that while it is possible that Paul knew some sayings of Jesus, this cannot be proven without doubt.¹⁷⁵

Furnish took on the search for parallels once more.¹⁷⁶ He searched for passages where "Paul is drawing on a traditional saying of Jesus without indicating it explicitly".¹⁷⁷ He reduced the number of parallels he had previously found. He now regarded Rom 12:14 and 14:14 as the "clearest instances" of where Paul took up sayings of the Lord.¹⁷⁸ Rom 13:7 and 1 Cor 13:2 likely also have synoptic parallels. Furnish thus omitted the parallels he had previously

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 677-8.

¹⁷⁴ Andreas Lindemann, "Paulus und die Jesustradition", in *Jesus, Paul, and Early Christianity: Studies in Honour of Henk Jan De Jonge*, eds., R. Buitenwerf, H. W. Hollander and J. Tromp (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 281–316.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 298.

¹⁷⁶ Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 40–65.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 52.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

found in 1 Thessalonians. He confirmed that Paul knew further sayings of Jesus but he remained sceptical whether Paul had intentionally alluded to the Jesus tradition more often.¹⁷⁹

Dunn (1998) looked at “the *a priori* plausibilities” as to whether Paul echoed the Jesus tradition.¹⁸⁰ Similarly to Furnish in 1989, Dunn declared that “we have reached something of an impasse in the debate as carried out in traditional terms, and little would be gained by going round the mulberry bush yet once more with a ‘fresh’ analysis of the same material”.¹⁸¹ He said that all are agreed that Paul did cite or refer to dominical traditions at least two points (1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14). He further opined: “all are agreed that there is a further group of passages in Paul which look very much as though they contain allusions to or echoes of Jesus tradition”.¹⁸² He found eight such allusions¹⁸³ and then, as others before him, looked at the Pauline texts that call on the hearers to follow the example of Jesus for further proof that Paul possessed and used knowledge of Jesus.¹⁸⁴ Dunn later expanded the number of echoes to 15 (see table below).¹⁸⁵ Dunn explained variations between the Pauline material and the synoptic Jesus tradition in the

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹⁸⁰ Dunn, “Jesus Tradition in Paul”, 155–78.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 160.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 160–1.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 161–8.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 168–73.

¹⁸⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 181–2.

fact “that the Jesus tradition was not yet set in fixed and unyielding forms. Rather it was *living* tradition, tradition which was evidently adaptable to different needs and diverse contexts. This character of the Jesus tradition was already sufficiently obvious from the variations contained *within* the Synoptic Gospels themselves”.¹⁸⁶

Riesner (1997) recorded reasons for Paul’s infrequent use of the Jesus tradition. He also listed a dozen of parallels, which he says, are generally agreed upon. He further argued that in addition to this list, in Gal 6:2 Paul presupposes Matt 11:28–30. For him, this example shows that new observations regarding parallels are still possible.¹⁸⁷ The possible parallels are not indicative of Paul’s knowledge of the Jesus tradition but rather represent the critical minimum of Jesus tradition Paul knew.¹⁸⁸ Riesner believes the parallels show that Paul’s Jesus tradition touches on all the gospel strata: Paul alludes to material from Mark and Q, as well as to Matthean and Lukan *Sondergut*.¹⁸⁹

Table 4

	Bruce 1974	Allison 1982	Walter 1985	Holtz 1991	Furnish 1993	Riesner 1997
Rom 12:14 (1 Cor 4:12– 13)	Luke 6:28	Luke 6:28; Matt 5:44	Luke 6:28a; (Matt 5:44b)	Matt 5:43– 44; Luke 6:27–28	Matt 5:44	Luke 6:28

¹⁸⁶ Dunn, “Jesus Tradition in Paul”, 174 (his italics).

¹⁸⁷ Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 362–4.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 360.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.* Riesner later argued that Paul also knew the “Ransom Logion”. Cf. Rainer Riesner, “Back to the Historical Jesus through Paul and his School (The Ransom Logion – Mark 10.25; Matthew 20.28)”, *JSHJ* 1.2 (2003): 171–199.



Rom 12:17a (1 Thess 5:15a)			Luke 6:29; Matt 5:39b–41		Matt 5:39ff	
Rom 12:17	Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27	Luke 6:27– 36; Matt 5:38–48				
Rom 12:18			Mark 9:50; Matt 5:9			
Rom 12:19– 21			Luke 6:27a, 35; Matt 5:44a			
Rom 12:21		Luke 6:27– 36; Matt 5:38–48				
Rom 13:7	Mark 12:17	Mark 12:13–17		Mark 12:17 par	Matt 22:15–22	Luke 20:22.25
Rom 13:8– 10; Gal 5:14	Matt 22:37– 40; Mark 12:28–34		Mark 12:28–34 par	Mark 12:28–34 par		Mark 12:28–34
Rom 13:11– 14	Luke 21:28. 36					
Rom 14:10– 11		Luke 6:37; Matt 7:1–2				
Rom 14:13					Matt 18:7; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:1–2	
Rom 14:13– 14		Mark 9:42				
Rom 14:14		Mark 7:15		Mark 7:15 par; Luke 11:41 par	Matt 15:11; Mark 7:15	Mark 7:15
1 Cor 4:11a			Luke 6:21a; Matt 5:6; 10:9f; 11:19			



1 Cor 4:12b–13			Luke 6:22f; Matt 5:11f; Luke 6:27f; (Matt 5:44)			
1 Cor 4:14		Luke 6:28; Matt 5:44				
1 Cor 7:10 (–12)		Mark 10:12				Mark 10:9–12
1 Cor 8:13		Mark 9:42				
1 Cor 9:14		Luke 10:7; Matt 10:10; Mark 6:8–9				Luke 10:7
1 Cor 10:27	Luke 10:7					
1 Cor 11:23–27		Luke 22:19–20				
1 Cor 13:2		Mark 11:23				Matt 17:20
1 Cor 14:37						Mark 10:43–44
1 Thess 4:8		Luke 10:16				
1 Thess 4:16–17						Matt 24:30–31
1 Thess 5:2 (4)		Luke 12:39–40; Matt 24:43–44		Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39		Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39
1 Thess 5:3				Luke 21:34–36		Luke 21:34–35
1 Thess 5:13		Mark 9:50				
1 Thess 5:15		Luke 6:27–36; Matt 5:38–48				
Gal 6:2						Matt 11:28–30

2.3.5 Since the turn of the millennium: The latest discussions

Even after many years of research and discussion on the Jesus–Paul debate, a definite answer on the relationship between Jesus and Paul has not yet been agreed upon.¹⁹⁰ Yeung (2002) remarked that “the Jesus–Paul problem is still very inconclusive”.¹⁹¹ This applies not only to the general Jesus–Paul debate, but also to the search of parallels. New insights are gained and previously unheard opinions are being expressed when Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters are compared to those in the synoptics.

Wong’s (2001; 2002) studies on the synoptic Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters led him to believe that, in both 1 Corinthians and Romans, Paul de-radicalized some of the teachings of Jesus. He opined (2001) that “Jesus’ demand for his followers is more radical than that of Paul”.¹⁹² For example, Jesus “demands that his disciples leave their families and give up their work in order to follow him (Mark 1:16–20). Paul, on the other hand, says to the Christians of his communities something entirely different regarding following Christ: everybody should stay in the position in which he/she was called (1 Cor. 7:20)”.¹⁹³ Wong also worked through the five allusions identified by Furnish in Paul’s letter to the Romans and concluded that they illustrate that Paul had de-radicalized the

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Häusser, *Christusbekennntnis*, 1.

¹⁹¹ Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul*, 10.

¹⁹² Wong, “The De-radicalization of Jesus’ Ethical Sayings in Romans”, 235.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*

teachings of Jesus in his ethical teachings as well (2002).¹⁹⁴ Wong thinks that Paul changed the Jesus traditions so that they better suited the situations he wrote to in Corinth and Rome.¹⁹⁵

Kim (2002) wrote a monograph called *Paul and the New Perspective*. In the first seven chapters, he presents his view on the new perspective on Paul, as indicated by the title of his book. He then devotes the last chapter, chapter eight, to the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters.¹⁹⁶ He located many passages similar to Paul and to the synoptics, listing around twenty–five certain or probable references¹⁹⁷ (see table below) and over that, more than forty possible echoes of words of the Lord.¹⁹⁸

In the same year as Kim, Yeung (2002) wrote a monograph on only 1 Cor 13:2. She argued convincingly that 1 Cor 13:2 has a parallel in the Q tradition (Matt 17:20; Luke 17:6) and Mark. The wording of the Matthean parallel agrees more closely with the Pauline version than Mark and Luke. Besides, there are many differences between Mark and Q, making it likely that they were originally independent sayings. Yeung is sure that Paul was influenced by the Jesus

¹⁹⁴ Wong, "The De–radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in 1 Corinthians", 188–94.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, 194.

¹⁹⁶ Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 259–92.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 260–70.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 272–3.

tradition, “although it is uncertain whether he knew Jesus’ saying in its primary or secondary form”.¹⁹⁹

Jenks (1999), in contrast, had claimed earlier that “it would seem that Paul had little access to the earliest Jesus traditions [...and] as it happens, through the critical research of generations of biblical scholars – including the Jesus Seminar, today’s Christians may actually have access to more reliable traditions about Jesus than even Paul enjoyed”.²⁰⁰ Taylor rejects this stance.²⁰¹ Taylor “assesses the material in Paul’s letters afresh, and offers an assessment of its significance for reconstructing the historical Jesus and the collection of the Gospel traditions”.²⁰² To find out what Paul knew about Jesus, Taylor first studied Paul’s statements about Jesus,²⁰³ and then moved on to the allusions of Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters. Apart from the synoptic gospels, he also included the gospel of Thomas in his comparison.²⁰⁴ He summarized his findings, which stand in opposition to those of Jenks, by stating that it is clear “that Paul was familiar with at least some traditions of Jesus’ teaching”, which “must be considered alongside

¹⁹⁹ Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul*, 33. Wolter, “Jesus bei Paulus”, 226, also assumes a connection between the Pauline text of 1 Cor 13:2 and its synoptic parallels because of the number of textual agreements.

²⁰⁰ Gregory C. Jenks, “What did Paul Know about Jesus?”.http://www.faithfutures.org/~Jesus/Jesus_Paul.pdf, 10.

²⁰¹ Nicholas H. Taylor, “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, *Neot* 37 (2003): 121.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 105.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, 108–10.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 110–8.

the *earliest strata in the Gospel traditions* in historical Jesus research”²⁰⁵ (Taylor’s parallels are listed below).

Wessels concurred with Taylor and argued that, because of the age of Paul’s letters, the echoes therein help us to find more historical information about Jesus. He concluded that “many of the echoes and allusions go either back to words of Jesus himself, or to the Jesus tradition – Jesus as he was remembered by the early Christians”. Wessels used the Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters to plead for “a material and historical continuity between Jesus and Paul”.²⁰⁶ He also demonstrated that the main stock of material common to Jesus and Paul, bar a few exceptions, is in ethical paraenesis, as had often been suggested in the past.²⁰⁷

Häusser (2006) added another element to the search for parallels – the early Christian creeds. He looked into the relevance of tradition in the historical continuity between Paul, early Christian creeds, and the Jesus tradition. His theory is that the early Christian creedal tradition and the Jesus tradition built a bridge between Jesus and Paul.²⁰⁸ Häusser found connections to synoptic material (but not necessarily to Jesus logia) in the pre–Pauline creedal traditions of 1 Cor 15:3ff; Rom 1:3–4; Phil 2:6–11 and Gal 4:4–5.²⁰⁹ He argued that the pre–

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 121 (my italics).

²⁰⁶ Wessels, “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul”, 40.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 40–1.

²⁰⁸ Häusser, *Christusbekennntnis*, 1: “Die urchristliche Bekenntnistradition und die Jesusüberlieferung haben eine Brückenfunktion zwischen Jesus und Paulus”.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

Pauline materials show that it is certain that Paul knew the ransom logia Mark 10:45 with Jesus' self-designation as son of man, accounts of the crucifixion, Jesus' burial, the empty tomb and post-Easter appearances.²¹⁰ Häusser concluded by arguing that Paul also knew many synoptic Jesus traditions dealing with Christology.²¹¹ Luke mostly delivers these traditions, and some of them are only found in the Lukan *Sondergut*.²¹² Häusser assumes that because Jesus traditions are incorporated into the early Christian creeds, the Jesus traditions contained in them is historically reliable.²¹³

While, according to Häusser, the pre-Pauline traditions reveal a connection between Paul's letters and the gospel of Luke, Röcker assumed that a connection between the Jesus traditions of Paul and the gospel of Matthew is more likely. Röcker took on the search for parallels in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians (2009). He found that the Jesus traditions Paul used when writing his first letter to the Thessalonians had close parallels in Matthew, both in the explicit reference in 1 Thess 4:16–17 as well as in the implicit references in chapter five of this letter (see chapter 7).²¹⁴

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 351.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 352.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 354.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 364.

²¹⁴ Röcker, *Belial und Katechon*. At roughly the same time, Harm W. Hollander, "The Words of Jesus: From Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q", *NovT* XLII/4 (2000): 345–9; Jens Schröter, *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament. Studien zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte und zur Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 278–80, and Wolter, "Jesus bei Paulus", listed parallels, but without discussing in great length why they regarded the texts as parallels. They are not interested in determining which synoptic parallel is closest to its Pauline counterpart.

Thompson remarked that “after a century and a half of dispute, firmly entrenched ‘minimalists’ and ‘maximalists’ continue to lob shells into the other’s camp with little apparent effect, and the battle shows no sign of abating, although some seek shelter in an agnostic ‘no–man’s land’ between the two extremes”.²¹⁵ Fiensy agreed that “the disagreement about the presence of allusions to Jesus’ logia continues”.²¹⁶ The position between the two extremes – assuming some kind of continuity between Jesus and Paul – has become the most represented today.

Fiensy searched for similarities and counted 37 parallels to synoptic material in the genuine Pauline letters and a further two in the disputed letters.²¹⁷ He divided the allusions into different themes: Twelve about love, forgiveness and non–retaliation, eight about regulations for community life, four about eschatology, four about worship, three about the law and two about humility and service. These are all themes that were important to Jesus’ ethical teachings.²¹⁸

²¹⁵ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 16.

²¹⁶ Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia”, 85.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 88–90.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 93. Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, discussed Paul’s degree of dependence on Jesus anew. In contrast to this study, he consciously did not look for parallel Jesus traditions between Paul and Jesus. His focus was on core issues which Paul and Jesus shared, what he calls a “common mindset” (14). He discussed three aspects of Jesus’ ministry: his welcome of the marginalized, his challenge to his followers that they would share his fate, and his belief that God was doing something profoundly new. Paul shares these aspects in a corresponding way: his welcome of Gentiles, his language of participation, and his belief in the present reality of new creation. Although they are expressed differently, the core issues are the same and Paul was “fundamentally shaped by perspectives of Jesus” (332). The study of Schoberg is particularly important for establishing historical and theological continuity between Jesus and Paul. He argued that Paul’s statements on these issues could be traced back to historical statements of and about Jesus, which Paul expressed in new ways (335). He argues that his “strategy of looking for Paul’s dependence on perspectives of Jesus is both complementary to and an advance upon the attempt to find verbal echoes of the life and teaching of Jesus in Paul’s letters” (336).

Jacobi (2015) conducted the latest study on parallels between the Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions. Unlike Schoberg (2014), Jacobi is sceptical of assuming that Paul had access to reliable traditions about Jesus. She discussed possible ways in which the Jesus tradition could have been transmitted before it was written down in the gospels. She summarized the transmission models of Dunn, Byrskog, Bauckham and Allison, which all assume a degree of continuity between Jesus and the gospels. They presume that the Jesus traditions were more or less stable compositions that were transmitted orally. Therefore, according to these models of transmission, the sayings of Jesus can be traced back to the historical Jesus to various extents. These models also assume that Paul and the other authors of the New Testament epistles had access to these traditions.²¹⁹ However, Jacobi doubts whether fixed traditions were available to Paul and whether the apostle could have been appealing to authentic sayings of Jesus. She opines that Pauline allusions to the Jesus tradition cannot be presupposed but have to be proven.²²⁰ At the centre of her research, she examines Pauline passages that are assumed to share a tradition history with synoptic texts in order to help us to better understand the way early Christian traditions were dealt with.²²¹ She concentrates on Rom 12:14–21 and 1 Thess 5:1–11 to examine how Paul deals with texts that are also delivered in the synoptics. The question of pre-synoptic Jesus tradition is secondary to her

²¹⁹ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 9–28.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 28–35.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 39.

research.²²² She is more concerned with the function of Paul's quotes and the role they play in the line of his argumentation.

Jacobi concluded that while it is not impossible that Paul was reciting Jesus traditions, the traditions themselves have to be differentiated from their use by Paul. The Jesus traditions used by the apostle do not necessarily derive from Jesus. The teachings of Paul and the synoptics, which they rendered as words of Jesus, could have been influenced by the circumstances of the early church.²²³ Jacobi fails, however, to explain from where Paul had received his Jesus traditions.²²⁴ She also often fails to mention the possibility that Matthew (or Luke) could in some cases preserve the oldest version of a text, and compares Paul mainly to Mark only.

The table below indicates that the scope of suggested parallels has become broader once again this millennium; this is indicated by the fact that this table is considerably longer than the previous one. Even today, a consensus on the number of parallels generally seems to be far off.

Table 5

	Kim 2000	Dunn 2003	Taylor 2003	Wessels 2006	Röcker 2009	Wolter 2013
1 Cor 2:7		Matt 13:35				

²²² *Ibid.*, 42.

²²³ *Ibid.*, 388–98.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 390.



1 Cor 4:8			Q 11:9–10 (Matt 7:7–8)			
1 Cor 4:(11–) 12–13; Rom 12:14			Q 6:27–28 (Matt 5:43– 44)	Matt 5:6, 11		
1 Cor 7:10–11	Mark 10:9– 12; Matt 19:6, 9; 5:32; Luke 16:18		Matt 5:31– 32; 19:9; Mark 10:11– 12; Luke 16:18			Mark 10:9; Matt 19:6; 5:32; Q 16:18
1 Cor 9:14	Luke 10:7; Matt 10:10		Mark 6:8–9; Q 10:4, 7, 27; (Matt 10:9–10)			Luke 10:7; Matt 10:10b
1 Cor 10:27; Rom 14:14, 20			Mark 7:14– 23			
1 Cor 11:23–25 (–27)	No parallel listed		Mark 14:22– 25; Luke 22:15–20			Mark 14:22–25 pars
1 Cor 13:2		Matt 17:20		Matt 17:20		Matt 17:20; 21:21; Luke 17:6
Rom 1:16		Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26				
Rom 2:1; 14:10		Luke 6:37; Matt 7:1– 2				
Rom 8:15			Mark 12:13– 17			
Rom 8:15– 17; Gal 4:4–6	Mark 14:32–42 pars	Abba				



Rom 12:14	Matt 5:44; Luke 6:27–28	Luke 6:27–28; Matt 5:44	Q 6:27–28 (Matt 5:43–44)	Matt 5:44		Luke 6:28; Matt 5:44b
Rom 12:17; (1 Thess 5:15)		Matt 5:39; Luke 6:29		Matt 5:38–9		
Rom 12:18 (–21)		Mark 9:50		Matt 5:44		
Rom 13:(6–) 7	Mark 12:17 pars	Mark 12:17 pars		Mark 12:17 pars		
Rom 13:8–10; Gal 5:14	Mark 12:18–34; Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28			Mark 12:31 pars		
Rom 13:9		Mark 12:31 pars				
Rom 14:13		Mark 9:42 pars				
Rom 14:14	Mark 7:15; Matt 15:11	Mark 7:15				
Rom 14:17		Kingdom of God				
Rom 14:20	Mark 7:19					
Rom 16:19				Matt 10:16		
1 Thess 2:14–15			Q 13:34–35 (Matt 24:43)			
1 Thess 4:15–17	Matt 24:30–31				Matt 24:30–31	
1 Thess 5:1					Matt 24:36 (Mark 13:32; Acts 1:7)	



1 Thess 5:2 (4, 6)	Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39	Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39		Luke 12:39–40	Matt 24:43–44; (Luke 12:39–40)	Matt 24:42–43; Luke 12:39
1 Thess 5:3	Luke 21:34–35				Luke 21:34–36	
1 Thess 5:6					Matt 24:42	
1 Thess 5:7					Matt 24:48–51	
1 Thess 5:13		Mark 9:50				
1 Thess 5:15				Matt 5:38		

Today, many monographs on the apostle Paul include discussions regarding the parallels between his letters and the synoptic gospels. Becker,²²⁵ Sanders,²²⁶ Lohse,²²⁷ Roetzel,²²⁸ Murphy–O’Connor,²²⁹ Schnelle,²³⁰ Taylor²³¹ and Schröter²³² all discuss Paul’s use of the synoptic Jesus tradition.²³³

²²⁵ Becker, *Paulus*, 119–31.

²²⁶ E. P. Sanders, *Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

²²⁷ Eduard Lohse, *Paulus. Eine Biographie* (München: Beck, 1996), 71.

²²⁸ Calvin J. Roetzel, *Paul. The Man and the Myth* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999), 96.

²²⁹ Jerome Murphy–O’Connor, *Paul. His Story* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 34.

²³⁰ Udo Schnelle, *Paulus. Leben und Denken* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 96–7.

²³¹ Walter F. Taylor Jr., *Paul: Apostle to the Nations: An Introduction* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2012).

²³² Jens Schröter, “Jesus Christus als Zentrum des Denkens”, in *Paulus Handbuch*, ed. F. W. Horn (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 283–4.

²³³ Only the scholars who provide lists of parallels are included.



Table 6

	Becker 1989	Lohse 1996	Roetzel 1999	Schnelle 2003
1 Cor 4:12			Luke 6:28	
1 Cor 7:10–11	Mark 10:2–12; Matt 5:31–32		Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18	Mark 10:9, 11
1 Cor 9:14			Luke 10:7	Luke 10:7; Matt 10:10
1 Cor 11:23– 25				
1 Cor 13:2			Matt 17:20	
Rom 12:14–21				Luke 6:27–36
Rom 12:14		Matt 5:44; Luke 6:28	Matt 7:1	
Rom 12:17 (1 Thess 5:15)		Matt 5:39; Luke 6:29f		
Rom 12:19		Matt 5:39; Luke 6:29f		
Rom 12:20				
Rom 13:7			Matt 22:15–22	
Rom 13:8–10; Gal 5:14		Matt 22:39–40 pars	Matt 22:39–40	
Rom 14:10			Matt 7:1	
Rom 14:13			Matt 7:1	
Rom 14:14			Mark 7:14, 19	Mark 7:15
1 Thess 5:2	Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39		Luke 12:39–40	
1 Thess 5:13			Mark 9:50	

2.3.6 Unresolved issues from the debate’s history

This overview shows that almost all possibilities are represented between the extremes of a maximal hypothesis – that Paul knew the entire early Christian tradition – and a minimal hypothesis – that Paul only knew the Jesus tradition he

explicitly cites in his letters.²³⁴ Although most scholars assume some kind of historical and theological continuity between Jesus and Paul, and – generally speaking – the lists of parallels have become shorter, there is still no agreement on exactly how much and where Paul refers to traditions about Jesus.

While the search for parallels began as an undertaking to provide proof of the continuity between Jesus and Paul as part of the general Jesus–Paul debate, the search for parallels became an independent part of Pauline literature. The purpose of the search for parallels has subsequently changed. Some scholars were motivated by a desire to prove that part of the Jesus tradition might have been written down before Paul wrote his letters, or at least that Paul knew and used a collection of dominical logia for his ethical teachings. Others tried to show that Paul’s opponents were the tradents of the Jesus tradition in Corinth, while still others assumed that Paul used Jesus materials similar to those of Q when writing his first letter to the Corinthians. Some scholars think that Paul’s Jesus material is closest to the Lukan material, while others think that it is closest to Matthew. Some scholars think that Paul used Jesus traditions from all gospel strata. Even the Jesus traditions in the gospel of Thomas have come into the equation. The relationship between the Jesus tradition in Paul’s letters and the synoptics has not been established in a satisfactory way. It is the aim of this study to contribute to understanding how Paul came to know the Jesus tradition and how the Jesus tradition he used is related to its synoptic parallels.

²³⁴ Cf. Zimmermann, “Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?“, 84, n. 7.

Summa: One of the reasons that the results of the various searches for parallels are not broadly accepted is that the minimalists' concerns have not been taken seriously. Another reason for a lack of consensus is the disputed question of where Paul learned his Jesus traditions. If one were to assume that he received them through a revelation, or, similarly, if one accepts that he only knew words attributed to the risen Jesus, one would come to different results in the search for parallels, as opposed to if one assumed that Paul was well versed in the early Jesus tradition. The basis from where one argues has to be established before the search for actual parallels can be made. This will be attempted in chapter 4.

This overview also highlights that, even though the search for parallels began about 150 years ago, not all aspects of the debate have been thoroughly investigated. New insights are still being gained. The bulk of the work on the search for parallels has been done in essays or in single chapters of monographs, where only a few lines have been written to either prove or disprove that Paul is citing Jesus traditions. Often, one finds lists of parallels without any explanation of why the texts should be regarded as parallels.

The history of the debate has also shown that not all of Paul's letters have been extensively investigated for Jesus traditions. And, although much research has been done on the relationship of 1 Corinthians and the synoptic Jesus traditions, a definite answer has never been reached. The debate over the number of parallels and their relationship to each other continues to this day. Lastly – and, for this study, most importantly – it remains an open question whether the Jesus tradition used by Paul is closer in wording to one or more of the synoptics or Q.

Chapter 3:

Methods and assumptions

3.1 Defining the criteria for identifying parallels

In 1 Cor 15:33, Paul uses the phrase “bad company ruins good morals” (ESV) (φθείρουσιν ἥθη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακάι). Paul was not the first person to have handed down this phrase. It was most likely put into writing for the first time in a tragedy by the ancient Greek author Euripides (480–406 BCE). Although the original manuscript containing the phrase is non-extant,¹ Socrates informs us that the saying originated from Euripides.² Meander (342/1–293/2 BCE) later repeated the phrase in the comedy *Thais*, and it was widely recited thereafter.³

Citations of non-biblical sources such as this are quite unusual in the New Testament. The only other instances of non-biblical quotes in the New Testament are found in Acts 17:28 and Tit 1:12. This makes 1 Cor 15:33 the only occurrence of Paul quoting a non-biblical source in his letters.⁴ The citation helps us to understand the way Paul incorporated material from other authors into his letters.

¹ Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 7 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), 400.

² Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 1Kor 15,1–16,24*, EKK VII/4 (Zürich: Benzinger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 247, n. 1201.

³ *Ibid.*, 247, n. 1203.

⁴ Joachim Gnllka, *Wie das Christentum entstand: 2. Paulus von Tarsus, Apostel und Zeuge* (Freiburg: Herder, 1997), 32.

The first important observation from Paul’s quoting of Euripides is that Paul gives no indication at all that he is quoting from another source.⁵ In the verses preceding the quote (v. 29–32) Paul talks about the resurrection and he “gives some specific examples of practices that would make no sense in a resurrectionless world”.⁶ Then he continues in v. 33–34a: “If the dead are not raised, ‘Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die’. Do not be deceived: ‘Bad company ruins good morals’. Wake up from your drunken stupor, as is right, and do not go on sinning” (εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν. μὴ πλανᾶσθε· φθείρουσιν ἡθὴ χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί. 34 ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε).

How, then, do we know that, in this instance, Paul has used a saying from a secondary source? How can we recognize the quote? Firstly, the principle of similarity is imperative. We know that Paul is quoting here because the words he uses are also found in Euripides’ writings. Since Euripides wrote the saying many years before the apostle did, the direction of dependence can only be from Euripides to Paul. *Therefore, the **first** tradition indicator is an agreement in wording and the **second** the presence of an older source Paul may have been quoting from. The **third** important indication that Paul is quoting here is that the quote consists of many words Paul seldom or never used otherwise.* He used φθείρω only five times in his undisputed letters (twice in 1 Cor 3:17; once each in

⁵ The words preceding the quote, μὴ πλανᾶσθε, are not necessarily a tradition indicator, as some have argued. Paul starts a sentence with the same words in Gal 6:7 as well, but in this case, no non-biblical quote follows (cf. Joachim Rohde, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, THKNT IX (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989), 265.

⁶ Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians, Interpretation. A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1997), 266.

15:33; 2 Cor 7:2; 11:3) and χρηστός just twice (15:33 and Rom 2:4). Both ἥθος, οὔς and ὁμιλία are New Testament *hapax legomena*. The wording of the phrase therefore is untypical of Paul and makes it likely that he is citing from elsewhere. A **fourth** clue that Paul is not using his own words here can also be deduced: *The quote does not connect jolt-free to the argumentation.*⁷ In other words, the logical link between v. 32 and v. 33–34 is not clear.⁸

Paul's use of Euripides' quote helps in construing the most obvious criteria for identifying whether or not Paul is quoting from another source – even when he fails to explicitly indicate that he is quoting.

3.1.1 Paul's quoting of other sources

The above-mentioned quote shows that it is possible to recognize where Paul works material from external sources into his letters. It is therefore possible to construct criteria for identifying a quote in Paul's letters, even for implicit references or allusions. This observation is confirmed by the way Paul uses other sources, especially the Jewish Scriptures. The way he quotes his other sources helps to expand the criteria for identifying parallels and also to define them more precisely.

⁷ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 773.

⁸ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 266.

3.1.1.1 Paul's quoting of the Jewish Scripture

The apostle quoted the Jewish Scriptures more frequently than other sources.⁹ When Paul was a Pharisee, before he became a Christian, he studied the Jewish Scriptures at length.¹⁰ He used this knowledge extensively when writing his letters. While Paul does not indicate that he is quoting Euripides in the above example, he uses introductory formulas most of the time when quoting from the Jewish Scriptures. Of the 89 quotes from our Old Testament in the genuine Pauline letters, 66 (about 74%) start with introductory formulas, mostly with *gegraptai* or *legei*.¹¹ This makes it much easier not only to ensure that Paul is quoting, but also to identify the source he is citing from.

The remaining 26% of the quotes from the Jewish Scriptures are implicit references. Paul quotes them without any reference that he is doing so. Still, it is possible to identify the source of these allusions as the Jewish Scriptures. Just as it was the case with the quote from Euripides, there was an older source – in this case the Jewish Scriptures – available to Paul from which he may have been quoting. At the time when Paul wrote his letters, the wording of the Jewish Scriptures was already fixed, as it “had already been laid down in Greek since

⁹ Dieter–Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 11, defines a quote in the following way: “Ein *Zitat* stellt die bewußte Übernahme einer fremden schriftlichen (seltener: mündlichen) Formulierung dar, die von einem Verfasser in seiner eigenen Schrift reproduziert wird und als solche erkennbar ist” (his italics).

¹⁰ Luke T. Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*, 3rd rev. ed. (London: SCM, 2005), 261–2.

¹¹ Koch, *Die Schrift*, 25–32; Schnelle, *Paulus*, 100–1.

the third or second century BC in the Septuagint translations”.¹² Therefore, we can compare Paul’s letters to the relevant manuscripts and find similarities, even when Paul does not indicate that he is quoting from the Jewish Scriptures.

In the search for Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters, it is important to observe how he treats the Jewish Scriptures when quoting them, because he is likely to treat his other sources in the same, or at least in a similar, way. Paul’s way of treating the Jewish Scriptures is indeed interesting. He handles the text of the Scriptures surprisingly freely, both when quoting explicitly and when quoting implicitly. He made many more alterations to the text than what was common practice in ancient Judaism.¹³ He often shortened or extended quotations, he reproduced texts from the Jewish Scriptures in his own words, and he even quoted combinations of different and seemingly unrelated passages. Furthermore, he changed the order of words and reproduced persons, genus, tempus or modus differently from its form in the Jewish Scriptures.¹⁴ It is also not always apparent why Paul quotes the Jewish Scriptures when he does.

Paul uses the quotes for different reasons: for illustration, as independent arguments, instead of his own words, for interpretation,¹⁵ and “as a support to a conclusion arrived at, sometimes to support a new train of thought”.¹⁶ Moreover, Paul quotes the Jewish Scriptures more often in his larger letters, that is, in

¹² Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 27.

¹³ Cf. Koch, *Die Schrift*, 109–8.

¹⁴ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 101–2; Koch, *Die Schrift*, 102–90.

¹⁵ Koch, *Die Schrift*, 258–73.

¹⁶ Fjärstedt, *Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians*, 53.

Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, and far less in 1 Thessalonians, Philippians and Philemon.¹⁷ It is therefore possible that Paul does not allude to Jesus traditions with the same frequency in all his letters.

Lastly, when Paul quotes from the Jewish Scriptures, the context of the quote in its original setting is important. Paul does not usually refer to only the quoted words or phrases, but also to the context in which they are embedded in the Jewish Scriptures. Wick compared the way Paul quotes from the Jewish Scriptures to links in the Internet. If one clicks on a link in the Internet, one is not redirected to only the words contained in the link, but to a particular webpage with more information on the theme contained in the link. Similarly, when Paul quotes from the Jewish Scriptures in his letters, he does not just recall the quoted words, but he thinks of the context of the quote. It is, therefore, important to take the context into consideration when Paul quotes the Jesus tradition.¹⁸ The contexts in which a Jesus tradition is used in both Paul's letters and the synoptics must be compared.¹⁹

Paul's use of the Jewish Scriptures serves as an example of how he quotes from a source known to him. These observations should be kept in mind when searching for allusions to Jesus traditions in his letters.

¹⁷ Koch, *Die Schrift*, 88.

¹⁸ Peter Wick, *Paulus*, UTB Basics (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 49.

¹⁹ Cf. E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), 11.

3.1.1.2 Paul's quoting of pre-Pauline Christian material

Apart from a Greek author and the Jewish Scriptures, Paul frequently quotes a variety of older traditions, including baptismal formulas, Christological hymns, creeds, kerygmatic statements and liturgical formulas.²⁰ While we can identify Euripides' quote and most quotes from the Jewish Scriptures because the sources Paul quotes from are available to us, no written copies of these older traditions are preserved outside of Paul's letters. The material is no longer accessible to us.

This makes the way Paul incorporates these pre-Pauline traditional materials into his letters especially important in pinpointing guidelines for the search for Jesus traditions. Just as we do not have written copies of the pre-Pauline material Paul used, neither do we have written copies of the Jesus traditions Paul might have known. The synoptic gospels with their information about Jesus were completed only after Paul had written his letters.

Paul's use of traditional (pre-Pauline) material is assumed to not be very different from the way he quotes the Jewish Scriptures. When he recites older material, he also would not have always quoted verbatim. Likewise, he may have

²⁰ Cf. Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament*, 271.

only used certain elements of the traditional formulas, or he may have formulated the material new.²¹

Interestingly, New Testament scholars are more or less in accord with each other about where Paul quotes the older pre–Pauline material, even if we do not have access to the original documents anymore. Yet, when it comes to the Jesus tradition, there is far more disagreement about where and how Paul quotes sayings of Jesus. In order to find a broader consensus on the texts in which Paul cites the Jesus tradition, it is necessary to incorporate the criteria for identifying pre–Pauline material in Paul’s letters into the search for Jesus traditions.

²¹ Cf. Anton Dauer, *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in Antiochia. Kritische Bestandaufnahme der modernen Forschung mit einigen weiterführenden Überlegungen* BBB 106 (Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1996), 77–8. Scholars have identified criteria for identifying pre–formed traditions in the Pauline letters. The most important ones are: 1. The identification of a citation– or introductory formula (e.g. 1 Cor 11:23a; 15:1–3a; Rom 10:9a), 2. Stereotyped or poetic stylistic elements (e.g. Rom 4:25; Phil 2:5–11), 3. Terminology that is unusual for the writer, 4. Theological or Christological motives which are alien to the author, 5. The same or a similar motive used by different NT writers, 6. Thoughts that go beyond the obvious connection and are closed, 7. Grammatical flaws and unfitting stylistic features, 8. The more the above criteria that apply to a certain text, the more likely it is that tradition is being used (Ludger Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde. Geschichtliche und theologische Entwicklung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990), 327; cf. Philipp Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter*, 2nd rev. ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978), 12; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1997), 489–90. Not all the criteria need to be fulfilled to assume that Paul is quoting traditional material (*Traditionsgut*). For Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 12, it suffices when two or more of the criteria apply. Koch, *Die Schrift*, 13–7, lists criteria for identifying allusions from Jewish Scriptures.

3.1.2 The criteria used in the search of Jesus traditions in Paul's letters

In the history of the search for parallels between Paul's letters and the synoptic gospels, only a surprisingly small number of scholars have outlined the criteria they used for identifying such parallels. The lack of clear criteria and the consequent failure to set a standard for identifying parallels has been the most important factor in preventing greater unity among scholars regarding the scope of the Jesus traditions used by Paul. Allison pointed out that "there is apparently no criterion by which one might determine what is or is not a substantial parallel".²² This was true at the time he conducted his study. While little progress was made towards establishing a broader consensus on the number of parallels, the need for identifying criteria became more and more evident. Thompson reiterated Allison's call for a clear set of criteria and a sound exegetical method when he stated:

Too often writers in the past have been content simply to cite parallels as though a surface similarity in vocabulary or thought was enough to warrant confidence in a genetic relationship. What evidence there is has not usually been scrutinized with the kind of rigour necessary to convince more sceptical scholars who rightly raise questions of objectivity and method.²³

²² Allison, "The Pauline Epistles", 5.

²³ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 18.

3.1.2.1 Michael Thompson 1991

Thompson then went on to identify an extensive set of criteria for identifying and evaluating possible parallels.²⁴ He listed eleven criteria for a proposed allusion or echo, and he explained and justified the criteria in great detail. In formulating these criteria, Thompson acknowledged that he was

dependent not only on comments by students of the Jesus–Paul issue, but also on studies of the use of the OT in the NT, an essay on criteria for hymns and homologies, discussions of criteria for determining authenticity of dominical logia and general essays more concerned with the parallels between Christianity and Judaism.²⁵

With these comprehensive criteria, Thompson managed to challenge the pessimism concerning the possibility of detecting Jesus traditions in Paul's letters.²⁶

Thompson regards an explicit introductory formula as “the clearest sign of a possible allusion”.²⁷ He also stated that although not all criteria are equally important (verbal, conceptual and formal agreement are more important than most), “we cannot assign numerical relative values to the criteria and add them

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 30–6.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 30. The eleven criteria given by Thompson are, in short: a. Verbal agreement; b. Conceptual agreement; c. Formal agreement; d. Place of the Gospel saying in the tradition; e. Common motivation, rationale; f. Dissimilarity to Graeco–Roman and Jewish traditions; g. Presence of dominical indicators; h. Presence of tradition indicators; i. Presence of other dominical echoes or word/concept clusters in the immediate context; j. Likelihood the author knew the saying; k. Exegetical value.

²⁶ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 18–9. Thompson has applied these criteria in the search for Jesus traditions in Rom 12-15. Interestingly, the criteria have not been used to substantiate possible parallels between Paul's other letters and the synoptic gospels.

²⁷ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 31.

up to determine mechanically whether or not a genuine allusion or echo exists. Their value lies in assisting the judgment of relative probability”.²⁸ Thompson’s criteria remain the most complete, and they are indispensable to the identification of parallel Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters and the synoptic gospels.

3.1.2.2 David Wenham 1995 and David Fiensy 2010

Both Wenham and Fiensy are indebted to Thompson for the formulation of their own criteria. Both have reduced the number of Thompson’s criteria, because these are at times difficult to implement due to their large scope. Wenham focused on three of the criteria: 1. Tradition indicators, 2. Verbal and formal similarity, and 3. Similarity of thought.²⁹ Fiensy reduced and adapted Thompson’s eleven criteria to four:

The criteria are: 1. There are at least two identical Greek words in both the Pauline text and one or more Synoptic texts; 2. There is one identical Aramaic word used in the same unique way or the word is an unusual or rare word; 3. There is a sequence of similar ideas (but not necessarily identical Greek words) in the Pauline text and in words attributed to Jesus; 4. There is the same unique concept in both the Pauline statement and a saying of Jesus in the Synoptics.³⁰

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

²⁹ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 25–8.

³⁰ Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia of Jesus”, 88, n. 29.

3.1.2.3 Victor Furnish 1993

Furnish, who is more critical than Wenham and Fiensy when it comes to locating parallels, made it clear that “it is not enough to find places where Paul’s ideas agree with sayings attributed to Jesus in the synoptic gospels. Agreement in ideas must be matched with at least some measure of agreement in wording”.³¹ Apart from the necessity of matching words, he emphasized the need for the following criteria:

First, some of the sayings in the Jesus tradition are similar in both form and content to teachings that had widespread currency in the first century, especially within the Jewish community. In such cases we cannot be sure whether Paul is echoing the Jesus tradition specifically, or some other. Second, the apostle may sometimes be echoing the teaching of Jesus without even realizing it himself. It is altogether possible that he knew some of Jesus’ sayings not as *his* teaching, specifically, but simply as the teaching of the church.³²

Furnish thus pointed out that we cannot always be sure that the sayings in the Jesus tradition can be traced back to Jesus, because, on occasions, the teachings attributed to Jesus are similar to widespread sayings within the first century Jewish community. Bultmann had already argued that in those places where Paul alluded to teachings of Jesus, it is possible that both Jesus and Paul draw from Jewish literature.³³ Similarly, Wilson argued: “Some of the best parallels are not so much evidence for a connection between Jesus and Paul as for a connection of each of them with his Jewish environment”.³⁴ In fact, the objection that we cannot always be sure that a particular saying can be traced

³¹ Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 51.

³² *Ibid.* (his italics).

³³ Bultmann, “Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus”, 191.

³⁴ Wilson, “From Jesus to Paul”, 15.

back to Jesus, especially when similar Jewish or Greek sayings exist, is the single most important objection against regarding similar Pauline and synoptic texts as parallels. Therefore, when one searches for agreements between Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions, “the warning that many of the parallels [...] are to be accounted for as common Jewish tradition must still be rigorously heeded”.³⁵ Kim called this “the principle of dissimilarity (i.e., a Pauline statement that is similar to a saying of Jesus could have come only from the latter, since the latter is unique, being dissimilar to Old Testament–Judaism and Hellenism)”.³⁶ Jacobi also emphasized that the Jesus tradition common to Paul and the synoptics must go back to a mutual tradition history and be distinguishable from common teachings of the time.³⁷ One must be able to classify the texts as specific Christian teachings, if one is to assume a dependency between similar Pauline and synoptic texts.³⁸

3.1.2.4 Maureen Yeung 2002

Yeung’s criteria show a willingness to take the above-mentioned concerns of the more sceptical scholars seriously. According to Yeung,

³⁵ Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 150.

³⁶ Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 275.

³⁷ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 42.

³⁸ Furnish’s other argument – that Paul might simply be quoting a teaching developed in the early church, which was not necessarily a saying of Jesus – needs to be taken seriously as well.

[T]he first control is the *elimination of false parallels*. Real parallels need to match both in form and in content. The second control is to make sure we are comparing Jesus and Paul, and not the Gospels and Paul. [...] we need to establish *the authenticity of the Jesus' sayings* involved [...] The third control is to find out how much of the similarity [...] is due to the fact that they shared the same cultural and religious traditions. [...] The fourth control is to find out how much of the similarity is due to Paul's use of *early Christian tradition* (or vice versa). [...]. The fifth control is to see if there is anything *distinctive in Jesus' teaching* that is found also in Paul. [...] we will see if what is *distinctive or central in Paul's teaching* is found in its seminal form in Jesus.³⁹

The principle of dissimilarity was challenged by some scholars who expressed their concerns about using it as a criterion for identifying Jesus traditions in Paul's letters. Schoberg, for example, wrote: "While it may be true that a piece of tradition that stands in tension with the early church is more likely to be authentic than not, the converse does not necessarily follow: it does not follow that a tradition that is not in tension with the early church is not likely to be authentic".⁴⁰ Dunn, likewise, thinks the belief that Jesus could only have said what others did not say seems rather odd and questionable, as Jesus was a Jew, who interpreted the Jewish faith. Dunn argued that one should not look for the "*distinctive Jesus*", but for the "*characteristic Jesus*".⁴¹ This way, we can "reflect the original impact made by Jesus' teaching and actions on several at least of his first disciples", including Paul.⁴²

Thompson agreed that "recent Gospel scholarship has increasingly recognized that Jesus was much more a man of his culture than earlier writers thought", but he rightly points out that the less exceptional Jesus' teachings

³⁹ Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul*, 13–4 (her italics).

⁴⁰ Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 20.

⁴¹ Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 4–7.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 11 (his italics).

become, “the more difficult it is to demonstrate that Paul or any other early Christian adopted a given ethical position *because it was the way of Jesus*”.⁴³ Although the objections raised by Dunn and Schoberg are valid, it is nearly impossible to prove that Jesus’ statements can be traced back to early traditions about Jesus (and were not influenced by Jewish or Hellenistic sayings), if Jesus has used similar teachings to well-known sayings of his time. The principle of dissimilarity remains necessary if one wants to convince a broad number of scholars of the presence of a parallel.

3.2 Methodical considerations

3.2.1 Paul’s sources

Whether Paul quotes the Old Testament or the Greek author Euripides, he is quoting from sources that were written down before he wrote his letters. The direction of dependence is clear – it is from the older material to Paul. This also applies to the pre-Pauline material, even though we are not always sure if it was delivered to Paul in oral or written form.

However, when comparing the Jesus tradition in Paul’s letters to the parallels in the synoptic gospels, the relationship between these two sets of writings is far more difficult to define. The difficulty in establishing the direction of

⁴³ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 25–6 (his italics).

dependence is due to the dating of these two sets of writings. The Pauline epistles were written between 50 and 61 CE⁴⁴ and are older than the synoptic gospels, which were completed approximately 70–90 CE,⁴⁵ in their final canonical form. Paul, therefore, could not have known our synoptic gospels. Still, since Jesus was a contemporary of Paul, the (oral) sayings of Jesus are older than the apostle's letters.

This observation brings the Q document and its dating into play. Q is a collection of sayings of Jesus, but without the passion and Easter narratives.⁴⁶ It was developed with a concrete intention and “with an identifiable order and arrangement”,⁴⁷ yet it was not intended to be a complete account of the ministry of Jesus. It was written for a specific group of people.⁴⁸ It was available to and used by both Matthew and Luke when they wrote their gospels. Due to Matthew's and Luke's dependence on Q (the order of Luke's gospel best reflects the one of Q),⁴⁹ it had to be compiled before these two canonical gospels. Yet, the dating of Q varies substantially: all possibilities, from an early dating in the 40's to a late dating in the 70's, are endorsed.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 62, 146.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 243, 286.

⁴⁶ Michael Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender. Die Logienquelle as erzählte Geschichte*, ABG 32 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2010), 13.

⁴⁷ John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1987), 41–3.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 130.

⁴⁹ Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 81.

⁵⁰ Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender*, 101.

To complicate matters when dating Q further, one has to take into account the fact that Q may have undergone several redactions. If one takes redactional activity into consideration, the writing of the document itself would have started earlier, but would have been completed later.⁵¹ Kloppenborg suggested three redactional stages of Q.⁵² It started with the sapiential sayings (Q¹), then later prophetic/judgment and apocalyptic passages were added (Q²), and, in the final revision, it was supplemented with narrative passages (Q³). Others refer to Q¹ and Q² only, assuming Q¹ to be an earlier redaction and Q² a secondary redaction with Deuteronomistic theology.⁵³ Still others differentiate between Q^{Matt} and Q^{Luke} to explain the differences in wording between Matthew and Luke when the gospel authors render the same account.⁵⁴ Even if one assumes a relatively early date for the beginning of the textualization of the sayings source, more or less the same time that Paul wrote his letters,⁵⁵ Paul would not have known the document we regard as Q. To assume that Q was written before 50 CE takes us too far into the realm of uncertainty. A final form of Q is thought to have been completed before or close to 70 CE.⁵⁶

⁵¹ On the problems of dating Q see Sarah E. Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism in the Jesus Movement: The Ideological Project in the Sayings Gospel Q*, WUNT II/374 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 94–100.

⁵² Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 96–9.

⁵³ Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 189.

⁵⁴ John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000), 104–11.

⁵⁵ Assumed by Holtz, “Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition”, 381; Brown, *An Introduction*, 428; Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 225, and Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender*, 103.

⁵⁶ Cf. Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 99; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 77–8, and Paul Hoffmann and Christoph Heil, eds., *Die Spruchquelle Q. Studienausgabe Griechisch und Deutsch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002), 21–3.

From the above, it can be deduced that Q had to have been a written document. It would have looked somewhat like the Critical Edition of Q (CEQ). It would likely have been written in Greek, because it does not give the impression that it has been translated and it reflects sophisticated Greek. The wording of Matthew and Luke would also have not been so similar if Q were not Greek.⁵⁷ The evidence for assuming the earliest form of Q's being written in Aramaic and then being translated is scant.⁵⁸ According to Rollens, the general area of Lower Galilee is the most likely place of origin of Q.⁵⁹

To add to the confusion of a possible relationship between the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters and Q, it must be remembered that Q's being written down did not cause oral traditions to die out.⁶⁰ While Matthew and Luke agree closely in most of their Q material, in some pericopies there is little agreement in wording. This can be explained by assuming that they may have used another source instead of Q in these pericopies, or that they just "vary the wording of their

⁵⁷ Cf. Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 99; Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender*, 83 and James M. Robinson, John S. Kloppenborg and Paul Hoffmann, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), xxxii–xxxiii.

⁵⁸ Cf. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 73, 77–8. Guido Baltes, *Hebräisches Evangelium und synoptische Überlieferung. Untersuchungen zum hebräischen Hintergrund der Evangelien* WUNT II/312 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), argues in his dissertation that Jesus had taught the main points of his preaching to the disciples so that they could remember it. In other words, the synoptic tradition goes back to an original Hebrew form and has an early origin. The transmission of words of Jesus started before Easter already (cf. Riesner, "Jesus, Paulus, und wir", 7).

⁵⁹ Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 102–4; cf. Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender*, 97, and Hoffmann and Heil, *Die Spruchquelle Q*, 21–3.

⁶⁰ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 59–60.

sources”.⁶¹ Apart from Q, therefore, other documents or traditions, either written or oral, which Paul could have come to know, could have existed. This has to be taken into consideration.⁶²

In other words, even though the Pauline corpus is the oldest set of written documents in the New Testament and the synoptic gospels date later, the synoptics contain some of the oldest Jesus–logia, as reflected in the Q–source. Some sayings from the Q–source may be of a similar age to the Pauline Jesus traditions. It is therefore possible that Paul knew Jesus traditions that were later taken up in the Q document or the synoptic gospels.

Yet, it is not always easy to know if a saying of Jesus in the Pauline epistles is dependent on traditions used later by the synoptic authors or Q, or if, conversely, the evangelists were influenced by Paul.⁶³ Great care must be taken

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 64

⁶² David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1993), 4–5, observes that, just as we cannot argue that Q did not exist simply because the document remains lost, we cannot simply assume that Paul did not quote pre–Pauline traditions because “those traditions have never been found existing separately”.

⁶³ Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 129–46, and Eric K. C. Wong, *Evangelien im Dialog mit Paulus: Eine intertextuelle Studie zu den Synoptikern*, NTOA 89 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), for example, assume that the evangelists were influenced by Pauline traditions. This position has, however, not received much support, as most scholars believe that it cannot be proven that the synoptic authors used Pauline material.

to identify the possible oldest version of a parallel text, so that the direction of dependence is clear.⁶⁴

3.2.2 Verbal agreement

A second methodological problem is this: The fact that similar words need to appear in both Paul's letters and the synoptic gospels has been listed as one of the most obvious criteria for identifying a parallel. Others argue that it is possible to identify a parallel even when the wording does not agree completely. Examples of this are Paul's explicit references to words of the Lord in 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14, where there is little verbal similarity between Paul's words and their synoptic counterparts. However, it is not seriously doubted whether Paul is citing sayings of Jesus in these instances. As a result, Kim argues: "verbal parallelism cannot be made the sole criterion for judging whether a Pauline statement reflects a dominical saying or not. The presence of a parallel content or meaning must also be considered".⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Looking at the complexity of the development of Q, it is understandable that in his authoritative study about parallels between the synoptic gospels and Rom 12–15, Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 21, stated: "There will be enough hypotheses employed here without building on a further unknown, that is, the existence of 'Q'". Like most other scholars searching for parallels, Thompson was concerned primarily with the identification and location of parallels, and not with interpreting these results. His concern was neither to find the oldest version of a text, nor to find out if the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters is closer in wording to any one of the synoptic gospels. When comparing the Jesus traditions of Paul and the synoptics, one has to consider Q, as it was a source for both Matthew and Luke. Q might often contain the oldest version of a parallel.

⁶⁵ Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 275.

The prerequisite that parallels need to be similar in wording is challenged in particular by Dunn.⁶⁶ Dunn first compared passages from within the synoptic gospels with one another and illustrated that in a number of cases there is “hardly any verbal agreement [between the synoptic material] although the subject matter is evidently the same”.⁶⁷ Moreover, he said, according to the two–source hypothesis, these passages are literary dependant on one another. Dunn then raised the question why the same criteria do not apply when comparing passages between Paul and the synoptics. The lack of verbal agreement is no reason to deny literary dependence when comparing synoptic passages, but when synoptic material is compared to Pauline texts, literary dependence is demanded. Each case requires seemingly different standards.

Even though the issue raised by Dunn is apparent, the lack of agreement in wording between Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions makes a dependency of the parallels extremely difficult to prove. Therefore, only passages with similar wording will be considered as possible parallels. Since the search for parallels undoubtedly “involves a fair degree of subjectivity”,⁶⁸ clear criteria are needed to gain a degree of objectivity.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 29–35.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁶⁸ Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 275.

3.2.3 The explicit references

Lastly, Paul's explicit references to Jesus traditions can help us understand the way he incorporated sayings of Jesus into his letters. Consequentially, when searching for parallels, it is sensible to start with the explicit references and then to move on to the implicit references, that is, to move from the certain to the less certain material. This will help to formulate clearer guidelines about the way Paul used the Jesus traditions available to him.

3.3 The assumptions

3.3.1 Quotes of the Jesus tradition in other early Christian writings

Paul is not alone in his failure to quote Jesus traditions frequently. Early Christian literature quoted the gospels as seldom as Paul did, although their authors knew the gospels. Irenaeus, Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna are examples of people who undoubtedly knew the gospels, but did not

⁶⁹ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 6: "Some scholars see allusions everywhere and others fail to recognize them anywhere". Ernest van Eck, "Memory and Historical Jesus Studies: *Formgeschichte* in a New Dress?", *HTS* 71/1 (2015): 1-11, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i1.2837>, has compared the approach of memory studies to the methodology of the criteria approach in their value for validating "the historicity of the Gospel traditions". He underlines the necessity of the criteria approach when it comes to finding authentic Jesus traditions. Similarly, criteria are indispensable for the identification and verification of parallels between Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions. A clear set of criteria also helps to avoid parallelomania (cf. Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania", *JBL* 81.1 (1962): 1-13.

quote them often in their writings.⁷⁰ In 1 Clement, the gospels are quoted for the first time outside of New Testament scripture; however, the quotes are not verbatim.⁷¹ The first real quotation of gospel material in early Christian literature is found in Barn 4:14: “Many are called, but few are chosen”. It is quoted from the gospel of Matthew.⁷²

More surprising than the Apostolic Fathers’ failure to quote Jesus traditions is the virtual absence of such traditions in the other New Testament scriptures. Not even the books of the New Testament that were written after the gospels make much use of them.⁷³ Paul is, therefore, not alone in failing to regularly quote Jesus tradition.

McKnight points out:

The more common form of connection between most early Christian texts and their predecessors, and this has been frequently observed for the early church up to the middle or late second century, is one of allusion (or even ‘emulation’) rather than explicit citations. One of the notable features of the earliest Christians was not only their use of traditions before them but even more was that the mode of use was to recapture, allude to, and carry on what had been said before. This mode chafes against the all-too-common drive by contemporary historians and tradition critics to search exclusively for explicit quotations as a sign of dependence.⁷⁴

If one follows the above argument, one cannot assume that Paul’s failure to explicitly quote the Jesus tradition often implies that he was not really interested in Jesus, or was poorly informed on his ministry, as has often been argued in the Jesus–Paul debate. We also cannot really expect Paul to quote the Jesus

⁷⁰ Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 356.

⁷¹ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 131-2.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 132.

⁷³ Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus–Überlieferung”, 358.

⁷⁴ Scot McKnight, *The Letter of James*, NICNT 14 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 27.

tradition word for word, as this was not common in the time he lived in. It is also unlikely that his letters would have been flooded with Jesus traditions. It is, however, realistic to find some implicit references to other sources in his letters, including the Jesus tradition.

3.3.2 The genuine Pauline letters

As I will attempt to find similarities primarily between the Jesus tradition in the synoptic gospels and the genuine letters of Paul, it is important to establish which letters were indeed written by Paul. In different phases of the Jesus–Paul debate, the number of letters regarded as genuinely Pauline has varied. Colossians and 2 Thessalonians are often viewed as genuinely Pauline.⁷⁵ As scholars have assumed a different number of epistles to be written by Paul, it is difficult to compare the number of parallels identified by the various scholars. The more epistles one considers as being genuinely Pauline, the more parallels one can find.

At the start of the Jesus–Paul debate, the Tübingen School of the 19th century regarded only four of Paul’s letters to be authentic: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians.⁷⁶ In mainstream New Testament literature three additional New Testament letters attributed to Paul are regarded as genuinely

⁷⁵ Allison, “The Pauline Epistles”, 27, n. 29.

⁷⁶ Fraser, *Jesus & Paul*, 11; cf. Häusser, *Christusbekennntnis*, 2.

Pauline: 1 Thessalonians, Philippians and Philemon. Colossians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians and the Pastoral letters are regarded as secondary.⁷⁷ I follow this classification.

3.4 The limitations

It is my aim to establish where Paul implicitly uses the Jesus tradition in his letters, and to use these results to find out if the Jesus tradition Paul uses is closer in wording to any particular synoptic gospel or Q, and what conclusions can be drawn from such a comparison. Within the undisputed Pauline letters, “the three most important letters of Paul for our study are Romans, 1 Corinthians, and 1 Thessalonians”.⁷⁸ Paul’s only explicit references to words of the Lord are located in 1 Corinthians (7:10–11; 9:14; 11:23–25; 14:37) and 1 Thessalonians (4:15–17). There are no explicit references in Paul’s letters to the church in Rome.⁷⁹

As the Jesus traditions in these three letters have been investigated, not every possible parallel can be revisited in detail. If a parallel is widely assumed, agrees in wording and has no clear Jewish or Hellenistic parallels, it will be considered. Thereafter a detailed word analysis will be used in an attempt to link parallels and to determine the relationship between the texts. An emphasis on

⁷⁷ Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 7–12; Brown, *An Introduction*, 407; Taylor, *Paul: Apostle to the Nations*, 22–3.

⁷⁸ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 24.

⁷⁹ This could be because Paul did not found the congregation in Rome himself.

such a word analysis and its use to determine if a Pauline Jesus tradition is closer to a particular synoptic Jesus tradition is lacking in research.

In the criteria for identifying parallels set out above, it has been noted that the respective contexts of the Pauline and synoptic texts have to be comparable. Jacobi has compared the contexts of some Jesus traditions in the Pauline and synoptic texts in great detail.⁸⁰ Therefore, I will discuss the contexts only broadly insofar as it is necessary for establishing a connection between texts.

Lastly, the history of the debate shows that parallels have occasionally been found in Paul's letter to the Galatians as well. This letter has not been extensively searched for parallels and it will form a large part of this examination. 2 Corinthians also occasionally shows up resemblances with synoptic material, but only in issues also discussed in the explicit references of 1 Corinthians. As a result, the relevant passages of Paul's second letter to the Corinthians will be incorporated into the discussions about synoptic parallels to 1 Corinthians.

In the remaining genuine Pauline letters, it is difficult to attest to any clear parallels with the synoptic Jesus traditions. These letters will not be consulted individually.

⁸⁰ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, discusses the contexts of the explicit references as well as synoptic parallels to 1 Thess 5:1-11 and Rom 12:14-21; 14:14.

Main Part 1: Paul's knowledge and use of traditional material

Chapter 4:

Paul's knowledge and use of Jesus traditions

“Although the relationship between Jesus and Paul is a theological problem, it must first be solved as a historical problem within the context of the primitive Christian movement”.¹ In other words: There is no use in searching for Jesus traditions in Paul's letters when it cannot be historically confirmed that Paul did indeed have such information about Jesus.² If Paul did allude to traditions about Jesus in his letters, he must have received at least some information about the life, work and teachings of Jesus from someone at some point in his life. Consequently, this chapter will consider how, where and from whom Paul potentially could have obtained his knowledge about Jesus by looking at the apostle's biography. If the people Paul encountered on his various journeys knew the Jesus traditions of the early church, and if traditions about Jesus had reached the places Paul had visited, the impression that Paul did not know much of the Jesus tradition would have to be seriously doubted.

The history of the debate shows that many scholars have denied that Paul had much information about Jesus, while others argued that Paul simply was not interested in the life and teachings of Jesus. Recently, Schoberg attempted to

¹ Patterson, “Paul and the Jesus Tradition”, 40.

² Cf. Stefan Alkier, *Neues Testament*, UTB Basics (Tübingen; Basel: Francke, 2010), 262.

explain the small number of clear references to sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters by stating that "it is possible that Paul's knowledge of the Jesus tradition – at least knowledge specific enough to enable him to cite Jesus – was limited".³ Jacobi shares similar sentiments, and concluded that Jesus was not relevant for Paul, neither as author of tradition nor as teacher.⁴ While a look at Paul's chronology could help to decide how many Jesus traditions Paul could have known, this matter has, seemingly, not been investigated in any detail. This is rather surprising considering the lengthy duration of the Jesus–Paul debate. Some scholars have looked briefly at particular aspects of the apostle's chronology when determining whether he was informed about Jesus, like his stay in Antioch, his visit to Peter in Jerusalem or his call to follow the example of Jesus.⁵ A more complete look at his biography has not been used to shed light on the matter. If Paul's chronology makes it plausible to assume that Paul was exposed to traditions about Jesus, it would be probable that he alluded to these traditions, as he would have known them.⁶ This step will remove one of the obstacles to

³ Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 337–8.

⁴ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 392. Hollander, "The Words of Jesus", 345, again reasoned: "Whether the apostle knew more about the historical Jesus [than indicated by the explicit references], is – as said before – and open question". The aim of this chapter is to show that answers that a more definite can be given on the matter.

⁵ Cf. Thomas Schmeller, "Kollege Paulus. Die Jesusüberlieferung und das Selbstverständnis des Völkerapostels", *ZNW* 88 (1997): 265–8.

⁶ A tradition in this sense is "more than a prior idea or story floating in the memory of the Apostle, of his co-traditioners or of the amanuenses and co-senders of the letters. It is, more concretely, a specific item in a traditioning process that was formed and in oral or written usage before Paul incorporated it into his letter" (E. Earle Ellis, "Traditions in 1 Corinthians", *NTS* 20 (1986): 481).

accepting that Paul had knowledge about Jesus even when he seldom cited information about Jesus in his writings.

Reconstructions of Paul's general chronology can be found in almost all monographs on the apostle. As I will only be looking at those aspects of his chronology that can help to find out where, when and from whom Paul could have received traditions about Jesus, I will not be able to go into every detail of Paul's life. While the dating of the important events in Paul's life differs slightly from scholar to scholar, the exact dating of these events is not important for the purpose of this study.⁷ It is only important that the main events that happened from Paul's conversion up to the year 50 CE are included, as this is when Paul wrote his first letter to the Thessalonians, which probably is his first retained letter. The first letter to the congregation in Thessalonica probably contains echoes to the Jesus tradition. Therefore, if Paul knew some Jesus traditions, he would have had to have received them by then.⁸

The most important sources for the relevant chronology of Paul's life are, firstly, Gal 1:11 – 2:14, where Paul himself describes the important events of his life, and, secondly, the outline of Paul's biography in Acts 7 – 18. Both texts depict Paul's life from about the time of his conversion up to the apostle's death.⁹ In New Testament literature, Paul's own version in Galatians is regarded as the primary source and Luke's narrative as a secondary source when reconstructing

⁷ Cf. Gnilka, *Wie das Christentum entstand*, 95.

⁸ Unless indicated otherwise, I follow the dating of Schnelle, *Paulus*, 40. Greater deviations from Schnelle's dating will be noted if important.

⁹ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 33.

the Pauline chronology.¹⁰ Even though the historicity of some of the events in Acts is doubted, these reports cannot be omitted and need to be used when reconstructing Paul's chronology, albeit only as secondary sources. The reason for this is that, without the information supplied by Luke in Acts, our knowledge of Paul's biography would be very patchy,¹¹ as Paul leaves several inexplicable gaps when retelling the story of his own life.¹² If we want a more complete picture of the happenings of early Christianity, we need to incorporate the information provided by Acts, as this informs us about the time in which the gospel expanded from the unbelieving Israel to all nations, including the work done in this regard by the apostle Paul.¹³

¹⁰ Cf. Hermann von Lips, *Timotheus und Titus. Unterwegs für Paulus*, Biblische Gestalten 19 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2010), 17–8; Wick, *Paulus*, 184, and Taylor, *Paul: Apostle to the Nations*, 31. Taylor has neatly arranged both the differences and the similarities in Paul's biography between the accounts in his undisputed letters and Acts (32–3).

¹¹ Cf. Eva Ebel, "Das Leben des Paulus", in *Paulus. Leben – Umwelt – Werk – Briefe*, UTB 2767, ed. O. Wischmeyer (Tübingen: Francke, 2006), 83.

¹² Fraser, "Jesus & Paul", 36. Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 25, proposed that the information on Paul in Acts "needs to be assessed on a case by case basis, giving Luke the benefit of the doubt unless there is reason to question his portrayal".

¹³ Martin Hengel, "Zwischen Jesus und Paulus. Die 'Hellenisten', die 'Sieben' und Stephanus (Apg 6, 1–15; 7,54–8,3)", *ZTK* 72 (1975): 154, suggested that the book of Acts should rather have been called *From Jesus to Paul*, with the subtitle *From Jerusalem to Rome*. Similarly, Von Lips, *Timotheus und Titus*, 16, pointed out that more than half of the book Acts (chapters 13–28) describes the way the gospel spread from Jerusalem to Rome.

4.1 Paul's chronology

4.1.1 Before Paul's conversion

At the start of this section, it is important to remember that Paul probably never met Jesus,¹⁴ although they must have been in Jerusalem at the same time for at least a while. Paul, who was born in Tarsus, came to Jerusalem because of his studies (cf. Acts 22:3). Even if it is impossible to tell exactly when and for how long Paul was in Jerusalem, he would have been in the city during Jesus' public ministry.¹⁵ Yet, because of the size of the city and the large number of people living there, it is plausible that Jesus and Paul would not have met.¹⁶

Because of his stay in Jerusalem, Paul would have heard something about Jesus, even before the latter's crucifixion.¹⁷ As Paul travelled to Damascus, he certainly would have known the basic teachings or principles of the group of people he intended to persecute there.¹⁸ In the words of Schoberg:

¹⁴ Schröter, "Jesus Christus als Zentrum", 279.

¹⁵ Lohse, *Paulus*, 20.

¹⁶ Cf. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 15; John W. Fraser, "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians V. 16 once more", *NTS* 17 (1971): 295. 2 Corinthians 5:16 has often been used to support the notion that Paul did not know much about Jesus. This view has been widely rejected (cf. Herman Ridderbos, *Paulus en Jezus* (Kampen: Kok, 1952), 44-6; Fraser, "Jesus & Paul", 46-7; Paul-Gerhard Müller, *Der Traditionsprozess im Neuen Testament. Kommunikationsanalytische Studien zur Versprachlichung des Jesusphänomens* (Freiburg: Herder, 1982), 208-9).

¹⁷ Cf. Müller, *Der Traditionsprozess*, 209.

¹⁸ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 95; Lindemann, "Paulus und die Jesustradition", 287; Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien: die unbekanntesten Jahre des Apostels*, WUNT 108 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 73.

[H]e must have had a significant amount of information about them [Christians]; and since early Christians remembered and interpreted the deeds and sayings of Jesus, and made various claims about him – about who he was, about the significance of his death, and that he had been raised from the dead – Paul must have had a significant amount of knowledge about Jesus, otherwise he could not have held his ground in an argument [with Christians].¹⁹

It is, however impossible, to tell exactly what Paul might have known about Jesus at this stage of his life. The next phases provide a clearer picture.

4.1.2 Damascus and surroundings

4.1.2.1 Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus

Paul is mentioned for the first time in the book of Acts in chapter 7 in connection with the stoning of Stephen. He would have come into direct contact with the Christian movement at this event.²⁰ Acts 8:1–3 then briefly mentions that Paul persecuted the church in Jerusalem.²¹ While only short notes on Paul are given in Acts 7 and 8, a longer piece of biographical information is portrayed in chapter 9. In this chapter, Paul's encounter with the risen Christ on the way to Damascus around 33 CE,²² which marked a radical turn in his life, is depicted. While on his

¹⁹ Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 7, n. 78.

²⁰ Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 6.

²¹ F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), 193.

²² Schnelle, *Paulus*, 34. Rainer Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus: Studien zur Chronologie, Missionsstrategie und Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 286, supposes an earlier date of his conversion: 31/32 CE and Klaus Berger, *Paulus*, 2nd ed. (München: Beck, 2005), 14, a later date between 34 and 36 CE.

way to Damascus, Paul was surprised by a light from heaven that shone around him. He heard a voice, which said to him: “Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?” (v. 4: Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις;). After his encounter with the risen Lord, Paul was blinded for three days (v. 8–9). His companions led him to Damascus, where he met a disciple of the Lord, called Ananias. Ananias was sent by God to lay his hands on Paul so that he could see again. At the same, Paul was filled with the Holy Spirit (v. 17).

This event is important because it informs us that Paul was baptized in Damascus after his vocation (v. 18–19). Some scholars consider it unlikely that Paul would have been baptized before being introduced to the basic teachings of Christianity, meaning that he would have learned Jesus traditions immediately after his conversion.²³ In contrast, Pesch,²⁴ who suspects that Ananias himself baptized Paul, sees the baptism as a seal of Paul’s sudden conversion rather than as an indication that Paul received teaching before being baptized. Yet, regardless of whether Paul was baptized before or after he had been catechized, it is likely that he was “received into the Christian church in the same way as any other convert”, that is, by filling up his knowledge of Christianity.²⁵

Besides possible catechetical instruction, Paul may also have learned the Jesus tradition from other Christians in Damascus. After his baptism, “Saul spent

²³ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 73–4; Schnelle, *Paulus*, 95.

²⁴ Rudolf Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 1–12)*, EKK VI/1 (Zürich: Benzinger Verlag; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), 307.

²⁵ Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, 12.

several days (ἡμέρας τινάς) with the disciples in Damascus” (Acts 9:19).²⁶ He would have had ample time to deepen his knowledge of Jesus in the time he spent with other Christians.²⁷ It is, after all, only natural that the Christians in Damascus were interested in the life and teachings of Jesus. They would have passed on what they had learned and so the new convert Paul would have been instructed about Jesus.²⁸ This is vividly described by Thompson: “There is no reason to doubt that sharing his own story with fellow Christians in Damascus he listened to theirs as well, joining in their worship, and soaking up traditions conveyed through exhortation and eucharist”.²⁹ After all, “Paul did not live in a vacuum. He lived in the primitive Christian society in which all that was known of Jesus was current”.³⁰

Further happenings make it likely that Paul had already been exposed to the Jesus tradition in Damascus. Firstly, Paul may have learned something about Jesus from Ananias. While Ananias is not explicitly portrayed as a transmitter of tradition – neither by Paul in Gal 1 nor by Luke in Acts ³¹ – it is hard to imagine that he and Paul did not converse about Jesus. This is because Ananias is called

²⁶ P⁴⁵ attests that Paul spent not only several days with the disciples, but many days (cf. Bruce, *Commentary on the Book of Acts*, 201, n. 37).

²⁷ Cf. Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 (Tübingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 52; Ernst Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, KEK 3, 6th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 278.

²⁸ Cf. Dunn, “Jesus Tradition in Paul”, 157.

²⁹ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 65.

³⁰ Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*, 12.

³¹ In Acts, Ananias only carries out the Lord’s command, which is to lay his hands on Paul and to free him from his blindness. Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 75.

a disciple (μαθητής) in Acts 9:10 and he was the first Christian who may have taught Paul about Jesus.³² Paul, without doubt, would have wanted to learn as much as possible about Jesus of Nazareth, whom he had just met, and Ananias would have been the ideal person to talk to. Ananias was of Jewish decent and probably one of the leaders of the young congregation in Damascus.³³ Therefore, he had to be well informed about Jesus, whose death did not lie more than three years back. Ananias' seemingly close ties to the Christian mother congregation in Jerusalem back up this assertion. According to Acts 9:13, Ananias knew “how much evil Paul has done to the saints in Jerusalem” (ἤκουσα ἀπὸ πολλῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου ὅσα κακὰ τοῖς ἀγίοις σου ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ). If he was informed about Paul's persecutions in Jerusalem, he probably will have known facts about Jesus from Jerusalem too, where, shortly after Jesus' death, there still would have been many eyewitnesses of the Lord. These eyewitnesses and “the disciples of Jesus no doubt spoke about what they had seen Jesus do, and about his teaching”.³⁴ Ananias would also have needed to introduce Paul to the people of Damascus; otherwise, Paul would not have been received into the church well because of his past.³⁵

³² Cf. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 299.

³³ Cf. *Ibid.*, 150; Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, KEK 3, 17th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 281–2.

³⁴ Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 23.

³⁵ Cf. Nicholas H. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity*, JSNTSup 66 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 66.

Additionally, the little information available to us about the beginnings of the congregation in Damascus further makes it plausible that Paul was informed about the Jesus tradition while still in Damascus.³⁶ That Hellenists, who – because of Paul’s persecution – fled from Jerusalem, had founded the congregation³⁷ is the only generally accepted assumption about the beginnings of the congregation.³⁸ The Hellenists are often associated with Stephen and the group of seven in Acts 6.³⁹ While the disciples of Jesus, who knew the Lord personally and ensured that the traditions about Jesus were looked after, formed the leadership circle of the church in Jerusalem,⁴⁰ the Hellenists, too, were firmly anchored in the early church, the *Urgemeinde*.⁴¹ They had their own group of seven leaders (Acts 6).⁴² The Hellenists were Jews whose mother tongue was Greek,⁴³ indicating that they were raised in the Diaspora. As Jews, they would

³⁶ Walter Schmithals, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, ZBK 3,2 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1982), 88, explains that we know so little about the beginnings of this congregation that even the information that Paul’s conversion happened on his way to Damascus comes as a surprise, as Luke had not yet said anything about the expansion of Christianity outside of Palestine. Yet, because “Damascus was a major city en route to Antioch” (Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 113), it is not unlikely that a congregation quickly formed in the city. Many of the Jews who lived in the large Syrian trade city would have formed part of the congregation (cf. Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 147).

³⁷ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 2003.

³⁸ Cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 66. Häusser, *Christusbekenntnis*, 357, thinks that the congregation was founded not by Hellenists but by relatives of Jesus, but they too would have had information about Jesus.

³⁹ Edwin Larsson, “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”, *NTS* 33 (1997): 212.

⁴⁰ Stuhlmacher, “Zum Thema”, 7.

⁴¹ Larsson, “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”, 214.

⁴² Cf. Eckhard Rau, *Von Jesus zu Paulus. Entwicklung und Rezeption der antiochenischen Theologie im Urchristentum* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994), 15.

⁴³ Cf. Larsson, “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”, 207–9; Simmons, *A Theology of Inclusion*, 94–5.

have frequently visited Jerusalem.⁴⁴ They probably “were the very ones who had taken the first step of overcoming the Jewish particularism and started preaching to non–Jews”.⁴⁵ Even if it cannot be proven that they were eyewitnesses of Jesus themselves, the Hellenists would have still had contact with Jesus’ disciples and would have been informed about Jesus from eyewitnesses. For this reason, the first Jesus traditions Paul learned while he was staying in Damascus would have stemmed from the early church, going back to the disciples in Jerusalem. They would have been historically reliable, as only a short period had passed since Jesus’ ascension.

The information given in Acts 9:1–2 is also important: “Meanwhile Saul, still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord went to the high priest and asked him for letters to the synagogues at Damascus, so that if he found any who belonged to the Way, men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem”.⁴⁶ Although it is unclear how much of the information of Paul’s conversion as told in Acts 9 is historical, v. 1b–2 are normally regarded as pre–Lukan tradition.⁴⁷ From these verses it is clear that there were disciples of

⁴⁴ Larsson, “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”, 222.

⁴⁵ Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*, WUNT II/4 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981), 62; cf. Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 118–36. Simmons, *A Theology of Inclusion*, 88–91, rejects the often-supposed assumption that Paul persecuted the Hellenists because they were critical of the law and the temple. The association of the Hellenists with sinners and outcasts, which failed to distinguish between Jews and Gentiles, would rather have been the reason for the persecutions.

⁴⁶ Ὁ δὲ Σαῦλος ἔτι ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου, προσελθὼν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ἠτήσατο παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγὰς, ὅπως ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἀνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

⁴⁷ Cf. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 302.

the Lord in Damascus in, at the latest, in the year in which Paul was on his way to persecute them (33 CE).⁴⁸ Luke calls these Christians in Damascus by different names. He calls them “disciples of the Lord” (τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου) in v. 1, those who belong to the way (τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας) in v. 2, your saints (τοῖς ἁγίοις σου) in v. 13, and disciples (μαθηταῖς) in v. 19. Particularly noteworthy is Luke’s use of the phrase “τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ κυρίου”. This is because Luke uses the noun “μαθητής” 65 times (28 times in Acts), but only speaks of disciples *of the Lord* this one time. While Luke uses the word “disciples” to refer to Christians in general in Acts,⁴⁹ the description of these particular disciples as disciples *of the Lord*, whom Paul persecuted, surely means that they had a closer relationship to Jesus than Christians did in general. The fact that Luke uses the phrase μαθητής τοῦ κυρίου only in Acts 9:1 seems to have been overlooked by scholars. I do agree with Jervell that the disciples of the Lord mentioned in Acts 9 probably were not part of the twelve apostles, as Paul vehemently denies meeting the apostles directly after his conversion (Gal 1:16–17).⁵⁰ Yet, they would have known reliable traditions about Jesus, which they then may have passed on to Paul during his stay in Damascus.

Finally, according to Acts 9:20, Paul immediately (εὐθέως) began to evangelize in Damascus. He preached in the city’s synagogues. Some see this as an indication that Paul preached only to the Jews at the beginning of his

⁴⁸ Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde*, 188–9.

⁴⁹ Cf. Karl–Heinz Rengstorf, “mathētēs”, *THWNT* 4:444–5, 462–3; Poul Nepper–Christensen, “mathētēs”, *EWNT* 2:921.

⁵⁰ Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 285.

missionary activity.⁵¹ Acts 9:15, however, says that Paul was chosen to bring the name of Jesus to Gentiles as well as to the people of Israel. Ollrog points out that, according to Paul's own report in Galatians, he was commissioned already at his vocation to evangelize the Gentiles (cf. Gal 1:16), which he probably did straight away in Damascus.⁵² These passages, as well as Paul's association with the Hellenists, that is, with the group of people who included sinners and outsiders in their midst without expecting them to first becoming Jews,⁵³ suggest it is likely that Paul's proclamation to the Gentiles started in Damascus.⁵⁴ Ultimately, who Paul preached to in Damascus and whether or not he preached in the synagogues only is less important to the question of his knowledge of the Jesus tradition than the fact that he had already preached in Damascus, because, for Paul to be able to preach, he must have possessed enough knowledge about Jesus to be able to pass it on. He needed to have had more than just basic knowledge about his Lord to be able to convince others of his newfound faith. These observations are confirmed by Paul's activities after he left Damascus.

⁵¹ Cf. Klaus Berger, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, 2nd ed. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2012), 445.

⁵² Wolf-Henning Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter. Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission*, WMANT 50 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979), 9.

⁵³ Detailed argument by Simmons, *A Theology of Inclusion*, 1996.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 114. Simmons thinks that the Hellenists had already begun to actively evangelize the Gentiles when they were scattered from Jerusalem because of persecution.

4.1.2.2 Arabia

From Damascus, Paul went to Arabia around 34 CE.⁵⁵ When locating Arabia, the majority of commentators assume that by Arabia, Paul means the Nabatean kingdom with its capital Petra,⁵⁶ although the description “is somewhat vague”.⁵⁷ If Paul indeed went to the Nabatean kingdom, he did not go far from Damascus.⁵⁸ It is uncertain how long Paul stayed in Arabia.⁵⁹

Paul possibly worked as a missionary and proclaimed his new message in Arabia,⁶⁰ because of his report in 2 Cor 11:32–33. In these verses, Paul recalls the incident in which the ethnarch of King Aretas wanted to arrest him because “he [Paul] had evidently done something to attract the hostile attention of the

⁵⁵ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 33–5. Paul’s journey to Arabia is only delivered in Gal 1:17 and not in Acts. Acts 9:26 reports that Paul went to Jerusalem after leaving Damascus. By his own admission, though (Gal 1:18), Paul travelled to Jerusalem again only three years after his conversion (cf. *Ibid.*, 40, 106). Because Luke emphasizes that Paul was called as missionary to all nations, it is rather surprising that he left out Paul’s journey to Arabia and allowed Paul that much time before he preached “expressis verbis” before the Gentiles, which happened only after Paul’s visit to Peter in Jerusalem (cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 237–8). Schnelle, *Paulus*, 33–5, suspects that Luke probably left out the visit to Arabia because of ecclesiological reasons: to emphasize the unity of the early church and to show that Paul was in constant contact with the church in Jerusalem.

⁵⁶ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 179–84; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Dallas: Word, 1990), 23; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 95–6; Gnllka, *Wie das Christentum entstand*, 49.

⁵⁷ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 34

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* Cf. Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Paul the Missionary. Realities, Strategies and Methods* (Westmont, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 63.

⁵⁹ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 174–8.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, 209; Becker, *Paulus*, 18; Peter Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinischen Evangelium. I. Vorgeschichte*, FRLANT 95 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 84; Schnabel, *Paul the Missionary*, 47

Nabatean authorities”,⁶¹ who must have “regarded Paul’s activities as a threat for their community”.⁶² If Paul were missionary active there, it would have invoked anger from the Nabatean king.⁶³ These events could, in fact, indicate that Paul not only preached there, but also that his preaching was successful and that some people came to faith in Jesus Christ. It is difficult to explain the hostile attitude towards Paul any other way.⁶⁴ If Paul did proclaim the gospel in Arabia, it would strengthen the case that he had received his commission to preach to the Gentiles at his conversion.⁶⁵

An additional reason could make Paul’s mission in Arabia more likely: Lindemann perceives Paul’s decision to not go to Jerusalem immediately after his conversion (Gal 1:17) as indicative that Paul saw no necessity to learn the

⁶¹ Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 95.

⁶² Schnabel, *Paul the Missionary*, 59. Again, there is disparity in the reports of Paul and Acts regarding this event, as Paul wrote in his report in 2 Corinthians that the ethnarch of King Aretas wanted to arrest him, but Acts 9:23–24 reports that it were the Jews who wanted to murder Paul (cf. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 311; Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 25). Galatians and Acts further disagree on when this happened. Galatians 1:17 tells us that Paul went from Damascus to Arabia, before returning to Damascus. The attempt to kidnap Paul and his escape took place when he visited Damascus the second time (cf. Schnabel, *Paul the Missionary*, 59). According to Luke, though, who does not know of Paul’s visit to Arabia, Paul’s escape from Damascus happened during his first stay in the city (Acts 9:23–25).

⁶³ Cf. Lindemann, *Paulus und die Jesustradition*, 300; Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*, 63.

⁶⁴ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 209, argue that it is furthermore possible that Paul founded congregations in Arabia, as he worked nowhere without success.

⁶⁵ Cf. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem*, 68–9. Not everyone accepts that Paul was missionary active in Arabia, despite the above events. For example, Longenecker, *Galatians*, 34, argues that although many assume a “missionary outreach”, we cannot “tell from Paul’s brief statement why he went to Arabia” (cf. Lindemann, “Paulus und die Jesustradition”, 300). Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem*, 70, assumes “a period of withdrawal from society for the purpose of contemplation of his recent conversion experience and reordering his mind to his new convictions”.

Jesus tradition from the apostles themselves.⁶⁶ It can, however, be argued that Paul did not *need* to go to Jerusalem *to learn* the Jesus tradition, because he had already learned some reliable traditions about Jesus in Damascus. There must have been another reason for him to not go to Jerusalem immediately, probably because he wanted to start his missionary work under the Gentiles as soon as possible. In any case, as he previously had persecuted the Christians in Jerusalem, it would not have been advisable to go there. It is not necessary to imply independency from Jerusalem and its Jesus traditions at this stage.

Although it is possible that Paul spread the gospel in Arabia, doubt remains.⁶⁷ From Arabia, Paul returned to Damascus (Gal 1:17).⁶⁸ From Damascus, Paul journeyed to Jerusalem.⁶⁹ That was two to three years after his conversion.

4.1.3 Paul's visit to Peter in Jerusalem

In Jerusalem, Paul visited Peter for fifteen days (Gal 1:18) around 35 CE. Most scholars take it for granted that Paul informed himself of the message and work

⁶⁶ Lindemann, "Paulus und die Jesustradition", 299.

⁶⁷ Many individual pieces of circumstantial evidence point to Paul's preaching in Arabia, but it is not explicitly mentioned by Paul or Luke.

⁶⁸ Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 289, thinks that, with Paul's second visit to the city, he would have again been missionary active there.

⁶⁹ In Gal 1:18 Paul emphasized that he went to Jerusalem on his own accord, but according to Acts 9:27 Paul's later co-worker Barnabas took him to the apostles (cf. Brown, *An Introduction*, 430, n. 15).

of Jesus from Peter.⁷⁰ For Bruce it “should go without saying” that Peter gave Paul “first-hand information about Jesus’ life and teaching”.⁷¹ He certainly had enough time to do so as “two weeks of conversation with Peter [...] is a lot of conversation”.⁷² While it seems obvious that Paul did indeed receive information about Jesus from Peter, not all scholars share this view. The discussion over whether or not Peter informed Paul about Jesus revolves mainly around the exact meaning of the verb ἰστορέω, which is a New Testament *hapax legomen*. Numerous essays have been written about the meaning of this word. Dunn pleaded that the word ἰστορέω has the aspect of Paul getting information about Jesus from Peter attached to it,⁷³ but, according to Hofius, it cannot be deduced from this word that Peter informed Paul about Jesus. Linguistically, it can only mean that Paul was “getting to know Peter personally”.⁷⁴ Lindemann defended Hofius’ point of view, and he asserted that the sole purpose of Paul’s visit to Jerusalem was to get to know Peter personally. This is because, in his opinion, the word ἰστορέω can only have this meaning.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ Cf. Peter Stuhlmacher, “Das paulinische Evangelium”, in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, WUNT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1982), 164; Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem*, 78.

⁷¹ Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 98.

⁷² Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses. The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 266.

⁷³ James D. G. Dunn, “Once More – Gal 1.18: ἰστορήσαι Κηφᾶν. In reply to Otfried Hofius”, *ZNW* 76:1/2 (1985): 138–9.

⁷⁴ Otfried Hofius, “Gal 1.18: ἰστορήσαι Κηφᾶν”, *ZNW* 75:1/2 (1984): 73–85.

⁷⁵ Lindemann, “Paulus und die Jesustradition”, 301.

It is extremely unlikely, however, that Paul and Peter would have not conversed about Jesus in the two weeks they spent together. One has to consider more than simply the meaning of ἱστορέω to know what Peter and Paul talked about. A look at the context is vital. This shows that Paul already got to know a chunk of the Jesus tradition in Damascus and that he had been preaching there, and possibly in Arabia as well. Therefore, I agree with Hengel's statement in regards to the meeting of Paul and Peter: "At their memorable fourteen-day meeting in Jerusalem [...] they will certainly have exchanged views on the 'Gospel' that they preached".⁷⁶ If Paul visited Peter out of courtesy to get to know him, a visit of half a day would have been sufficient".⁷⁷ It is likely that Paul was interested in Peter's theological thinking and, more precisely, in his view on Christology and soteriology, which certainly also included stories about the words and deeds of Jesus.⁷⁸ Paul would have used the time with Peter to find out more about Jesus, or as Murphy-O'Connor states: "Only one basic question burned Paul's mind: what was Jesus really like? [...] Peter could answer any question about Jesus that Paul wanted to ask".⁷⁹ Peter was a witness of the pre-Easter events, of which he could have informed Paul.⁸⁰

In either case, even if Paul went to Jerusalem only to get to know Peter, this would not imply that he was uninterested in learning more about Jesus. It

⁷⁶ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 157.

⁷⁷ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 232.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 229–36.

⁷⁹ Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 32–3.

⁸⁰ Cf. Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem*, 80.

would mean that he went to Jerusalem with the self–conception of being an equal partner to the Jerusalem apostles, who knew and interpreted the intentions of the earthly Jesus as well as the others.⁸¹ In other words, if Peter did not inform Paul about Jesus, this would confirm that Paul had already learned the Jesus tradition in Damascus and did not need any more information. The discussion around the exact meaning of ἱστορέω is, therefore, in my opinion unproductive if one wishes to deduce whether or not Paul had learned some form of Jesus tradition from Peter. The broader context makes it highly plausible that Paul indeed conversed with Peter about Jesus. Not only because the newly converted Paul would have seized the opportunity to learn about Jesus – whom Paul himself now proclaimed as Son of God – with both hands, but also because of numerous other reasons that will be discussed below.⁸²

4.1.3.1 Syria and Cilicia

After his visit to Jerusalem, the city that quickly became the acknowledged centre of the new messianic congregation,⁸³ Paul evangelized (εὐαγγελίζεται) in Syria and Cilicia (Gal 1:23).⁸⁴ While not all scholars agree that Paul was missionary

⁸¹ Cf. Müller, *Der Traditionsprozeß*, 236.

⁸² During his stay in Jerusalem, Paul met another eyewitness of Jesus: the Lord's brother James (Gal 1:19). How much time Paul spent with James is not delivered; therefore, we cannot know if Paul learned something about Jesus from him.

⁸³ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 156.

⁸⁴ Cf. Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, 164.

active in Arabia, he began his missionary work at this time at the latest, spreading the message of Jesus, which he learned in Damascus and in Jerusalem. This was about six years after Jesus' death, when many eyewitnesses of Jesus, who could have supported Paul's teachings, were still alive. Syria and Cilicia is "a relatively small geographical area", which makes it highly unlikely that Paul would not have "encountered at some point the Jesus movement with its rich heritage of sayings".⁸⁵ If there were significant differences in his teachings compared to the Jerusalem apostles', it probably would have caused conflict at this time already.

While in Syria and Cilicia, Paul stayed, amongst other places, in his hometown Tarsus (Acts 9:30). This was a meaningful city at the time, with not only a strong Jewish community,⁸⁶ but also a metropolis of the Hellenistic culture.⁸⁷ According to Riesner, Paul stayed in the vicinity of Tarsus between three and ten years. This is ample time for Paul to have founded congregations here.⁸⁸ Acts 15 supports this observation.⁸⁹ In Acts 15:36, Paul said to Barnabas: "Let us return and visit the brothers in every city where we proclaimed the word of the Lord, and see how they are" (ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς κατὰ πόλιν πᾶσαν ἐν αἷς κατηγγείλαμεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου πῶς ἔχουσιν), while v. 41 informs us that they carried out their intention to visit the

⁸⁵ Patterson, "Paul and the Jesus Tradition", 30.

⁸⁶ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 270.

⁸⁷ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 43.

⁸⁸ Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, 239.

⁸⁹ Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 26.

congregations. As Paul returned to the cities in Syria and Cilicia according to the Acts report, he must have established churches during his first visit there. These congregations would have consisted of both Gentiles and Jews. In order for Paul to establish Christian congregations, he needed to tell them about Christ. For his missionary activity to be successful, he needed to have had an extensive knowledge of Jesus traditions, at the latest by his time in Syria and Cilicia.

4.1.4 Antioch

After leaving Tarsus around 42 CE, Paul went to Antioch in Syria, where he stayed until about 44 CE. He would later return to the city. In total, Paul spent eight to nine years in Syria and surroundings, with Antioch as his centre, until the Antiochian conflict.⁹⁰ Antioch is situated about 300 miles from Jerusalem⁹¹ and was the third biggest city of the empire; in the time of the reign of Caesar August, only Alexandria had more residents. For the first time, the messianic movement had taken foot in a large city.⁹² Antioch was a multicultural and multireligious city. About ten percent of the city's population were Jews, who had synagogues there.⁹³ In this city, boundaries were transcended: an independent Christian congregation was founded apart from the synagogue, circumcision and ritual law

⁹⁰ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 567.

⁹¹ Cf. Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 27.

⁹² Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 287.

⁹³ Dauer, *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in syrischen Antiochia*, 12.

played no role, and the Christian Jews and Christian Gentiles celebrated Eucharistic table fellowship together without any problems.⁹⁴

Hellenists who were forced to leave Jerusalem in connection with the persecution of Stephen (Acts 11:19–20)⁹⁵ founded the congregation in Antioch. Although this information is only delivered in Acts, Taylor is certain that “there are no good reasons to doubt the essence of the Acts account of the foundation of the church”.⁹⁶ While the exact year of the start of the congregation is unknown, the persecution of Stephen, which happened shortly before Paul’s conversion and is dated between 32 and 34 CE,⁹⁷ gives an indication of when the congregation was founded. It must have been shortly after Stephen’s death. After the Hellenists had left Jerusalem, members of the group found their way to Antioch. There they established a vibrant relationship with the Jerusalem church.⁹⁸ Because of Paul’s long stay in Antioch, it is impossible that he had no knowledge of the Jesus tradition stemming from Jerusalem. The opposite is far more likely.⁹⁹

At the beginning of their mission in Antioch, the Hellenists probably turned to their fellow Jews when spreading the gospel,¹⁰⁰ but they were ultimately

⁹⁴ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 331.

⁹⁵ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 108.

⁹⁶ Taylor, “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, 120.

⁹⁷ Hengel, “Zwischen Jesus und Paulus”, 172.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 175.

⁹⁹ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 108.

¹⁰⁰ Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, 97–8.

responsible for ensuring that the message of Jesus could have had its worldwide effect.¹⁰¹ They were decisive in changing the reserved attitude towards mission in the early Jerusalem church.¹⁰² Even though Paul was not part of the Antiochian congregation from its beginning,¹⁰³ as he only went there about ten years after its conception, Antioch became “the base for Paul’s outgoing missionary activity”.¹⁰⁴ At first, Paul was a co-worker of the Antiochian mission¹⁰⁵ and was sent out by the congregation to do his missionary work (Acts 13:3). Only after his fight with Peter in the Antiochian conflict (Gal 2:11–12), did Paul start his independent mission work.¹⁰⁶

Apart from being involved in their missionary activity, Paul’s role as a teacher in Antioch is an additional indication of the apostles’ knowledge of the Jesus tradition.¹⁰⁷ That Paul taught in Antioch is portrayed in at least two instances in Acts. Firstly, in Acts 13:1, it is said that in the church at Antioch there were prophets and teachers: “Barnabas, Simeon who was called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen a lifelong friend of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul”.¹⁰⁸ This list of

¹⁰¹ Larsson, “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”, 207–8, 214–5.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 213.

¹⁰³ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 108.

¹⁰⁴ Brown, *An Introduction*, 430.

¹⁰⁵ Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*, 10.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁰⁷ Geréb Zsolt, “Auf der Spur der Jesusworte im Ersten Thessalonicherbrief”, in *Spannweite. Theologische Forschung und Kirchliches Wirken. Festgabe für Hans Klein*, ed. C. Klein (Bucharest: Blueprint International, 2005), 104.

¹⁰⁸ Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι ὃ τε Βαρναβᾶς καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ καὶ Λουκίος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μαναὴν τε Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετραάρχου σύντροφος καὶ Σαῦλος.

names is probably pre-Lukan.¹⁰⁹ All five names listed in this verse are connected to the congregation in Jerusalem,¹¹⁰ but no one was part of the group of seven.¹¹¹ The Christians in Antioch were thus informed about the events in Jerusalem that took place before and after the death of Jesus by this group of prophets and teachers who had information about Jesus from Jerusalem. This leaves little room for doubt that the Antiochian congregation was well informed of Jesus. In this list of five people, Barnabas is named first. He, therefore, would have been the most important of these men (the role of Barnabas is discussed below). That the five men were teachers signifies that they were responsible for the care and interpretation of tradition.¹¹² In Antioch, Paul would have been able to learn the Jesus tradition from other teachers and prophets, as well as to pass the tradition on himself.¹¹³

Secondly, in Acts 11:26, it is reported that Paul and Barnabas taught in Antioch: “So for a whole year Barnabas and Saul met with the church *and taught* (διδάξαι) *great numbers of people*”. The place of their teaching would likely have

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Dauer, *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in syrischen Antiochia*, 20–1.

¹¹⁰ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 334–5.

¹¹¹ Cf. Dauer, *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in syrischen Antiochia*, 21.

¹¹² Schnelle, *Paulus*, 109–10.

¹¹³ Paul speaks of his teaching activity at least twice. In 1 Cor 4:17 he says: “That is why I sent you Timothy, my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, to remind you of my ways in Christ, as I teach (διδάσκω) them everywhere in every church”, and in 1 Cor 14:6: “Now, brothers, if I come to you speaking in tongues, how will I benefit you unless I bring you some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching?” Additionally, Luke calls Paul a teacher often (Acts 11:26; 13:12; 15:35; 17:19; 18:11; 20:20; 21:21, 28; 28:31; Klaus Scholtissek, “Paulus als Lehrer, Eine Skizze zu den Anfängen der Paulus-Schule”, in *Christologie in der Paulus-Schule, Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des paulinischen Evangeliums*, ed. K. Scholtissek (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999), 26.

been the congregational meetings in one or more house churches, as these were probably the places of the early Christian mission.¹¹⁴ As a teacher, Paul was commissioned to pass on the Jesus tradition in the different congregations.¹¹⁵

Additionally, Antioch is the place where the followers of Jesus were called “Christians” (Χριστιανοί) for the first time (Acts 11:26). In Antioch, the Christian congregation was perceived as a group separate from Jews and Gentiles with a discernible theological profile and their own teachings. Secondly, it shows that the missionary activity in Antioch had been successful, as there had been a larger group of Christians.¹¹⁶

A similar development had happened in Palestine. From 41–43/44 CE, Agrippa I reigned over the empire of Herod. During this time, the Zebedee James was killed and Peter was thrown into prison.¹¹⁷ This could only have happened if the Christians and their teachings were discernible from the Jews and their teachings. The Christians were so convinced of the truth of Jesus’ teaching that they were willing to be persecuted, even to give their lives. From around 40 CE, therefore, one can speak of Christianity as being an independent and distinguishable movement.¹¹⁸ In order to distinguish themselves from other

¹¹⁴ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 336–7.

¹¹⁵ Zsolt, “Auf der Spur der Jesusworte”, 104. Charles H. Dodd, “The ‘primitive catechism’ and the sayings of Jesus”, in *More New Testament studies*, ed. C. H. Dodd (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968), 16, believes that because of the mission to the Gentiles, there would have been a “need for a standardized *catechesis*” (his italics), which could have been used in Antioch. He considers it likely that the synoptic authors drew upon material from the catechesis, which served “as a vehicle for transmitting the teaching of Jesus” (20).

¹¹⁶ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 108.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 168.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 172; cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 91.

groups, the early Christians would have required “a foundation story”, especially because Jesus “was the source of salvation [...] The early Christian movement was interested in the genuinely past history of Jesus because they regarded it as *religiously relevant*”.¹¹⁹ Now, when even outsiders could differentiate Christians from Jews and Gentiles, how much more should the Christians themselves have been familiar with the person they were named after – Jesus Christ? Paul himself was responsible for the expansion of Christianity with his preaching. He could not have done this if he did not know anything about the life and work of his Lord Jesus Christ.

The important status of Antioch in early Christian theology gave rise to wide-ranging historical and theological consequences.¹²⁰ Many exegetes claim that Paul was heavily influenced by the Antiochian theology. This theory presupposes that Antioch had its own theology with a distinguishable profile even before Paul came to the city. One of the distinguishing features of the Antiochian theology would have been the mission to the Gentiles, as the city is seen as the birthplace of the Gentile mission.¹²¹ This view is primarily given by the testimony in Acts, as Dauer points out.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 277 (his italics).

¹²⁰ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 110.

¹²¹ Cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 87–104, 107–19; Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 136; Michael Zugmann, *Missionspredigt in nuce. Studien zu 1Thess 1,9b–10* (Linz: Wagner, 2012), 38–42.

¹²² Dauer, *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in syrischen Antiochia*, 9.

This view has been challenged in recent times. It is likely that Paul had started to develop his theology *before* his stay in Antioch. Paul would not only have been influenced by the Antiochian theology, but he would have played a role in its formation. As indicated above, Paul probably came to know Jesus traditions before he went to Antioch for the first time. This does not exclude him from learning more about Jesus in Antioch, as there were traditions from the early church in Jerusalem available in the city.¹²³ It is only unlikely that the proclamation of the gospel to the Greeks, that is, to Greek speaking non-Jews or Gentiles, started in Antioch, as is often assumed. After all, Paul had already preached in Syria and Cilicia before his stay in Antioch. It is more likely that the preaching to the Gentiles had already started when the Hellenists left Palestine, for example, Philip's leaving for Samaria and Caesarea, and Paul's preaching in Damascus, Arabia and Tarsus.¹²⁴

The same applies to Paul's teaching of justification without adherence to the law. It is highly disputed in New Testament literature whether Paul had already developed this teaching when he wrote his letter to the Thessalonians, as Paul does not touch upon this theme in 1 Thessalonians. Those scholars who assume that Paul already developed this view early in his life often point out that, before Paul, Stephen had already criticized the Temple and ritual laws.¹²⁵ Other scholars, however, doubt that Stephen criticized the Torah.¹²⁶ Schnelle holds it as

¹²³ Zugmann, *Missionspredigt in nuce*, 38–42.

¹²⁴ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 300.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 164–7.

¹²⁶ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 84–7; Rau, *Von Jesus zu Paulus*, 79.

Lukan redaction that Paul received his Torah critical gospel from the Stephen group. Similarly, Becker opined that there is no reason to believe that Paul prosecuted the Hellenists because of their law free gospel, as Stephen himself criticized the Jews for not adhering to the law (Acts 7:53).¹²⁷ This position assumes that Paul developed this teaching later in his life in confrontation with the Jews. It is often associated with the conflict in Galatia.¹²⁸

In his book on Paul, Berger writes *Theologie ist Biographie*.¹²⁹ This is particularly true for the life of Paul. In my opinion, the look at Paul's biography presented above indicates that it is more likely that Paul developed his law free gospel before the conflict in Galatia around 55 CE. It is rather impossible to think that – because of Paul's contact with Gentile Christians much earlier in his life – the law free gospel only became a theme that late in Paul's life. I therefore agree with Riesner¹³⁰ that Paul only refined his teaching of justification without adherence to the law in his letter to the Galatians. The beginning of the teaching, though, is to be found in Paul's meeting with Jesus on the Damascus road (and the events before Paul's travels to Antioch).¹³¹ One should therefore not have a one-sided view on Paul's early period focussed exclusively on Antioch. Even if Antioch played an important role in this theological development, it is only one of

¹²⁷ Becker, *Paulus*, 13–4; cf. Larsson, “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”, 216–20.

¹²⁸ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 28–30.

¹²⁹ Berger, *Paulus*, 8.

¹³⁰ Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, 349–53.

¹³¹ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 161–2.

many places from where Paul could have come to know the Jesus tradition and that influenced his thinking.¹³²

4.1.5 The first missionary journey

Barnabas and Paul were sent out by the congregation in Antioch to preach the gospel to the Gentiles around 45–47 CE (Acts 13:3).¹³³ On this, their first missionary journey, they visited Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe. Paul's ministry to these places is described as fruitful, as a large number of disciples were won.¹³⁴ The first missionary journey lasted two to three years. If one looks at the amount of churches Paul and Barnabas founded in this time, the return is astonishing.¹³⁵

4.1.5.1 The apostolic council in Jerusalem and the Antiochian incident

After his first missionary journey and before he wrote his letters, Paul met more of Jesus' disciples. Together with Barnabas and Titus, Paul went to the apostolic council in Jerusalem 48 CE.¹³⁶ There, Paul met Peter and James for a second

¹³² Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 112–3.

¹³³ Paul himself does not report of this journey, it is only delivered in Acts (cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 91–2).

¹³⁴ Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 40–1.

¹³⁵ Cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 132.

¹³⁶ Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 36.

time; he also got to know John personally. Schnelle highlights that the apostle's contact with the Jerusalem church was vital for Paul's chronology as he met Jesus' disciples there and could have learned Jesus tradition for them in the time before he wrote his first letter.¹³⁷

At the apostolic council, it was decided that Peter was responsible for the gospel to the circumcised and Paul for the gospel to the uncircumcised. That Paul had been willing to travel to Jerusalem for the meeting "with Peter and James (Gal. 2.2) reveals that he had no desire to break away and establish separate 'Pauline' churches, but rather was concerned to preserve the unity (and thus the central tradition) of the body of Christ".¹³⁸ Again, Paul would not have been able to debate with members of the twelve if he did not know the Jesus tradition. The Jerusalem apostles would also not have allowed Paul to become the apostle to the Gentiles if they were not convinced that he was proclaiming the same traditions about Jesus as they were. At the council, they would have talked about their different interpretations of Jesus' sayings, but this does not imply divisive theological differences between Paul and the Jerusalem church at the time.¹³⁹

From Jerusalem, Paul and Barnabas went to Antioch once more, where they met Peter yet again in connection with the Antiochian conflict.¹⁴⁰ After the conflict between Peter and Paul, Paul and Barnabas went their separate ways and the conflict resulted in Paul's final disentanglement from the Antiochian

¹³⁷ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 122–6.

¹³⁸ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 67.

¹³⁹ Lategan, *Die aardse Jesus*, 163–4.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 32–3.

mission. The apostle's independent missionary work began,¹⁴¹ which once more indicates that Paul had enough knowledge of Jesus to do so. Paul had more than enough opportunities to gain information about Jesus' life and teaching, even from the Lord's disciples themselves.¹⁴²

4.1.6 The second missionary journey up to Paul's stay in Corinth

Two more years passed until Paul wrote his first letter. After the apostolic council, Timothy joined Paul and Silas, and together they went to numerous Greek cities: Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens and Corinth (Acts 15:36 – 18:22).¹⁴³ Paul spent 18 months in Corinth around 50/51 CE (Acts 18:2).¹⁴⁴ From there, he wrote his first letter to the Thessalonians, which contains allusions to words and traditions of Jesus. It is therefore not necessary to explore the chronology of Paul further, as he would have known the bulk of his Jesus tradition by the time he started writing his letters. This was already 17 to 18 years after his conversion around 33 CE.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 137.

¹⁴² Cf. Fiensy, "The Synoptic Logia of Jesus", 86.

¹⁴³ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 32.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 31.

¹⁴⁵ The meaning of Gal 1:11–12 is often discussed in debates over Paul's knowledge of the Jesus tradition. This matter will be dealt with in chapter 8.1.

4.2 Additional factors pointing to Paul's knowledge of the Jesus tradition

4.2.1 The role of Barnabas and Paul's other co-workers

The meeting of Barnabas and Paul cannot be underestimated in terms of Paul's knowledge of the Jesus tradition. Barnabas was a Levite from Cyprus¹⁴⁶ who joined the Jerusalem congregation early¹⁴⁷ and became a prominent member of the congregation.¹⁴⁸ Although he had a prominent role in the early church, Barnabas would not have been regarded as an apostle.¹⁴⁹ He lived in Jerusalem around 40 CE, that is, about ten years after Jesus' death, when there were still many Jews in Jerusalem who either knew Jesus personally or were familiar with him.¹⁵⁰ While Ollrog thinks Barnabas might have been close to the Stephen group,¹⁵¹ Hengel and Schwemer doubt this.¹⁵² They opine, rather, that he was an Aramaic speaking Jew who also knew Greek, called a *Graekopalästiner*. If he were a Hellenist, he would likely have had a Greek name like the seven Greek

¹⁴⁶ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 223.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Stuhlmacher, "Jesu-tradition im Römerbrief?", 241.

¹⁴⁸ Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde*, 79. Dauer, *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in syrischen Antiochia*, 16–22, notes that it has been previously denied that Barnabas was a member of the early church in Jerusalem. However, he showed that the information given by Acts in this regard is historically trustworthy, as Paul's own statements in Gal 1–2 support it.

¹⁴⁹ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 320–1.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 333.

¹⁵¹ Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*, 14.

¹⁵² Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 326–31.

leaders in Jerusalem. Whether he had ties to the Hellenists in Jerusalem or not, his stay in the city and his role in the congregation leave little room for doubt that Barnabas had comprehensive knowledge about Jesus, which he received from the first Christians in Jerusalem, that is, from eyewitnesses and/or the disciples of Jesus themselves.¹⁵³

In Acts 11:24, Barnabas is called “a good man, full of the Holy Spirit and faith” (... ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως). Thereafter (v. 26–27) we are informed that Barnabas brought Paul to the disciples of Jesus during Paul’s first visit to Jerusalem, because the disciples were afraid of Paul and did not believe that he was converted. This would have then been the occasion that Paul and Barnabas met.¹⁵⁴ They met again later, when Barnabas came to Paul in Tarsus in order to take him to Antioch. The two men worked together for an entire year at Antioch (Acts 11:25–26), meaning that Paul probably learned more from Barnabas about Jesus during that year in Antioch than from anyone else.

Apart from the year in Antioch, Barnabas and Paul were partners in mission in Syria and Cilicia, Cyprus, Pamphylia, Pisidia and Lycaonia. In total, if we follow the events in Acts 13 and 14, they worked together for eight to nine years (39/40–48/49 CE). In Gal 1:21, Paul wrote only of his missionary activity in Syria and Cilicia, leaving out the other cities as places of mission before the apostle

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 336–9.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Gnllka, *Wie das Christentum entstand*, 54.

convent.¹⁵⁵ In any case, Paul would have had more than enough opportunity to learn from Barnabas. If anyone, it was Barnabas who would have influenced Paul's theological thinking.¹⁵⁶ Paul's interaction with Barnabas leaves little room for doubt that Paul was reliably informed of the Jerusalem Jesus tradition.

Paul's later co-worker in Macedonia and Achaea – Silas, or Silvanus – also came from Jerusalem. Acts 15:22 depicts Silas as one of the leaders of the church in Jerusalem who was sent to Antioch. Ollrog doubts if the report in Acts is correct, and instead regards it as a Lukan construction.¹⁵⁷ However, even if Silas was not one of the leaders of the early church, his Jerusalem origins make it at least possible that he would have learned the Jesus tradition there.

Paul would not have learned any Jesus traditions from his other co-workers before 50 CE. Titus, who probably stems from Antioch, was one of the first people to be converted in Europe.¹⁵⁸ Mark, yet another co-worker of Paul, also met Paul in Antioch.¹⁵⁹ He would have learned the Jesus tradition in Antioch, too, and it is more likely that he learned about Jesus from Paul than the other way round. Timothy comes from the city of Lystra in Asia Minor and was converted by Paul.¹⁶⁰ As a result, Paul would not have learned any Jesus tradition from him.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 35. Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, 242–8, explored the different places Paul – together with Barnabas – may have visited.

¹⁵⁶ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 313–4.

¹⁵⁷ Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter*, 18–9.

¹⁵⁸ Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, 239.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. E. Earle Ellis, "Paul and his co-workers", *NTS* 17 (1970/71): 438–9.

¹⁶⁰ Von Lips, *Timotheus und Titus*, 87.

4.3 Paul's initial teaching

The places Paul, Barnabas and the other co-workers visited on the missionary journeys were new to them. No one had preached the gospel there before.¹⁶¹ In order to convert the people they encountered, Paul and his colleagues had to have told them about Jesus.¹⁶² To be able to do this, they must have had knowledge about Jesus, indicating once again that Paul had to have been informed on the teachings of his Lord. Furthermore, as the gospel about Jesus “is a quite incredible and revolutionary message, without analogy in the ancient world”, Paul “must have told of this man Jesus when founding communities, not least because he would have been constantly asked about this crucified Messiah Jesus in Judaea, who could not have been preached without a vivid and concrete account, simply because his hearers would have had a healthy curiosity”.¹⁶³ This makes for a compelling case that Paul taught his listeners about the life and work of the earthly Jesus.

According to Hengel and Schwemer, Paul also informed the new congregations about the beginnings of the church in Jerusalem and its representatives.¹⁶⁴ For example, Paul mentions Kephas, the twelve, James, and others in his letters without telling his readers who these persons were. The same

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 10–11.

¹⁶² Taylor, “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, 106–7.

¹⁶³ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 151.

¹⁶⁴ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 31–3.

applies to what Paul was writing about his own past. He must have told the Galatians about his past as student of the Torah and persecutor of the Christians for them to be able to understand Galatians 1. If his own life and the information about Jerusalem and its representatives interested his listeners, they would have been much more interested in hearing about Jesus. Jesus, his work, his death and his resurrection, and not the person of Paul, was the reason for their salvation.

All this makes it virtually impossible that Paul did not have substantial knowledge of Jesus and that he was not interested in facts about the life and teachings of the Lord. A closer look at the beginnings of the congregations Paul founded and his initial preaching in new places he visited supports the thesis that he informed these new congregations of Jesus. This will now be discussed using Paul's first letters to the Thessalonians and Corinthians as examples. These letters provide a general overview of Paul's preaching during his first visits to new cities, as the circumstances of the congregations differed.¹⁶⁵

Although these letters give some insights into the message Paul proclaimed in the new congregations he formed, they do not contain much of the initial preaching itself. In his letters, Paul is more concerned with answering questions concerning his preaching. The search for the content of Paul's first preaching to the congregations in Thessalonica and Corinth therefore resembles the search for Jesus traditions in his letters. Just as we do not have access to the

¹⁶⁵ Benjamin A. Edsall, *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, WUNT II/365 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 30.

apostle's oral preaching anymore, and this must be deduced from his letters, we do not have access to the Jesus traditions used by Paul.

Besides making it plausible that Paul informed the congregations about Jesus, this step further illuminates the problems one faces when searching for Jesus traditions in Paul's letters.

4.3.1 Thessalonica

Acts 17:1–15 reports the beginnings of the congregation in Thessalonica. On his second missionary journey, Paul went from Philippi to Thessalonica, the capital of the Roman province Macedonia,¹⁶⁶ accompanied by Silvanus and Timothy, both of whom he mentions as co–authors of his first letter to the Thessalonian church (1 Thess 1:1).¹⁶⁷ Thessalonica was a strongly Greek city, and the congregation consisted mainly of Gentiles.¹⁶⁸ Paul himself had found the church,¹⁶⁹ around 49 CE, only a few months before he wrote his first letter to the congregation, 50 CE.¹⁷⁰ Paul did not stay in Thessalonica for very long. According to the report in Acts 17:2, Paul's visit to the city lasted only three Sabbaths.

¹⁶⁶ Zugmann, *Missionspredigt in nuce*, 1.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Riesner, *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, 301–5.

¹⁶⁸ Edsall, *Paul's Witness*, 51.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Brown, *An Introduction*, 433.

¹⁷⁰ Dieter Lührmann, "The Beginnings of the Church at Thessalonica", in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Essays in honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, eds., D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson and W. A. Meeks (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990), 248.

Lührmann¹⁷¹ and Schnelle¹⁷², however, suspect that Paul actually worked in Thessalonica for about three months, because Paul himself reports in Phil 4:15–16 that the congregation in Philippi supported him twice during his time in Thessalonica. This would have been unlikely if he had stayed in Thessalonica for only about three weeks, because Philippi was about 150 km away from Thessalonica. This distance would have been too far to travel twice in three weeks.¹⁷³ Still, even if Paul’s stay in the city lasted only three Sabbaths, he would have had ample time to inform the Thessalonians about the life of Jesus. Over three months, he would have had even more opportunity to teach the new converts about their saviour.

Paul taught in the synagogues of the city (Acts 17:2), where he recorded large missionary success.¹⁷⁴ Paul himself gives a summary of his “initial preaching in Thessalonica” in 1 Thess 1:9b–10.¹⁷⁵ He proclaims: “you turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come”.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, in their conversion experience, the Thessalonians had to

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 238.

¹⁷² Schnelle, *Paulus*, 145.

¹⁷³ Cf. Von Lips, *Timotheus und Titus*, 49.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 166.

¹⁷⁵ Lührmann, “The Beginnings of the Church at Thessalonica”, 239.

¹⁷⁶ Ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ καὶ ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ [τῶν] νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης.

have known the bit of information given about Jesus in these verses at least.¹⁷⁷ This report is substantiated by the similar Acts account, according to which Paul was “explaining and proving that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, and saying, ‘This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ’” (Acts 17:3).¹⁷⁸ Here, already, Paul’s emphasis on Jesus’ death and resurrection becomes visible.

The information proclaimed by Paul in 1 Thess 1:9b–10 is thought to go back to the proclamation of the early church in Jerusalem.¹⁷⁹ This is because these verses most likely represent older traditional material, which Paul either reflects or quotes.¹⁸⁰ In his analysis of 1 Thess 1:9–10, Schnelle likewise concludes that the many *hapaxes* in the text point to the traditional character of the verses.¹⁸¹ This is important, because it reveals to us that Paul knew pieces of material about Jesus, which probably originated in the early church in Jerusalem. It supports the idea that Paul’s learning of Jesus traditions stemmed from Jerusalem, as his biography indicated.

Paul’s use of traditional formulas in his letters, which helps him to explain the Christian message, also indicates that he had to have had informed the congregations about the Jesus tradition. If he had not told the congregations

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Dodd, “The ‘Primitive Catechism’”, 12.

¹⁷⁸ ... διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος ὅτι τὸν χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 457.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Zugmann, *Missionspredigt in nuce*, 13–4. Stuhlmacher, “Zum Thema”, 259, n. 2, lists fellow scholars who subscribe to this view.

¹⁸¹ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 180–1.

about Jesus, his use of the expounding traditional material cannot be explained. The new converts would not have been able to understand the traditional kerygmatic formulas. If Paul quoted fixed formulas in his letters, there likely would have been fixed Jesus traditions available to him as well. It is unthinkable that the Jesus traditions would not have been handed down, while explanatory material was already in the process of being fixed. Furthermore, as some traditional formulas reflect a great deal of reflection (like Phil 2), it is likely that traditions about the life and work of Jesus were also transmitted, as these traditions only had to be recalled, and not reflected.

Another reason for assuming that Paul had to have informed the Thessalonians about Jesus is the suffering they endured (cf. 1 Thess 2:13–16). “In light of the persecution of the Thessalonian believers, Paul reminds them of his previous teaching about suffering, his instructions regarding love for fellow believers, the quiet life and his example of working diligently in the face of persecution”.¹⁸² It is unlikely that the Thessalonians would have chosen to suffer persecution for being Christians if they had not known anything about the ministry and life of Christianity’s founder.

The first letter to the Thessalonians provides further evidence that Paul informed the congregation of sayings of Jesus. When he wrote about the *Parousia* in 4:13 – 5:11, he answered questions posed to him by the Thessalonians on the topic. This shows that the members of the Thessalonian congregation possessed some information on this question, but not all the

¹⁸² Edsall, *Paul's Witness*, 73.

information they needed. They asked Paul for more detail, particularly concerning their loved ones who had died before Jesus' second coming. They could only have learned about the Lord's future coming from Paul himself on his first visit to the city.¹⁸³ In 1 Thess 4:15–17, Paul appeals to a word of the Lord directly. These verses indicate that Paul gave the Thessalonians information about teachings attributed to Jesus, even if scholars do not agree that these verses have parallels in the synoptics (See also Chapter 7). In 1 Thess 5:2, Paul writes that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night (ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται). "Paul's metaphor about the day of the Lord as thief is unique to early Christianity and likely comes from an early Jesus tradition".¹⁸⁴ This is more evidence that Paul repeated some of the sayings of Jesus in his initial preaching.

Additionally, Paul writes in 1 Thess 4:9: "Concerning brotherly love, you have no need that I write to you, since you yourselves are divinely instructed about loving one another" (Περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς θεοδίδακτοὶ ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους). The congregation, therefore, had already been informed of the love commandment, a central teaching of Jesus.¹⁸⁵ Finally, the *Hoheitstitel* or "the fact that Paul used the name 'Jesus' without an explanatory title such as 'Christ' or 'Lord' indicates that when he preached to new audiences, he recounted the life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth before explaining the significance of his death and resurrection as central

¹⁸³ Cf. Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 96–7.

¹⁸⁴ Edsall, *Paul's Witness*, 96.

¹⁸⁵ Stanley, "Pauline Allusions", 28.

events that render his message ‘good news’¹⁸⁶. Paret had already argued that when Paul was on his missionary journeys, he came into areas where no one knew the name Jesus or the title Christ.¹⁸⁷ If he used these titles, the people would not have been able to understand him. He would have had to explain what he meant. This leaves little room for doubt that Paul informed the congregation about Jesus, even if only a small portion of his initial preaching can be reconstructed. Without the information about Jesus, he would not have been able to successfully do his mission work.

4.3.2 Corinth

After Paul left Thessalonica, he travelled to Corinth. This city had a strong Roman influence.¹⁸⁸ The apostle’s first letter to the Corinthians was written four to five years after 1 Thessalonians and provides more and different perceptions of Paul’s initial preaching in a congregation.¹⁸⁹ Paul worked in Corinth for about 18 months during his first visit there.¹⁹⁰ He preached about Christ, as the first internal reference to Paul’s teaching in the congregation shows: “For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified” (1 Cor 2:2: Οὐ γὰρ

¹⁸⁶ Schnabel, *Paul the Missionary*, 128.

¹⁸⁷ Paret, “Paulus und Jesus”, 9–10.

¹⁸⁸ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 201.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 204.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Edsall, *Paul’s Witness*, 55.

ἔκρινά τι εἶδέναι ἐν ὑμῖν εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἑσταυρωμένον).¹⁹¹ Just as in his first letter to the Thessalonians, there is an immediate focus on the crucifixion when Paul starts writing about Jesus. He would certainly have taught more about Jesus, including other aspects of his life and teaching, to the Corinthians.¹⁹²

1 Corinthians 11:2; 23–25 and 15:1–5 are often mentioned as instances of Paul’s initial preaching in Corinth because of the tradition indicators he uses at the start of these verses. In 1 Cor 11:2, Paul writes: “Now I commend you because you remember me in everything *and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you*” (Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου μέμνησθε καί, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε).¹⁹³ Here, Paul reminds the Corinthians of traditions he had personally given to them, but it is difficult to determine the content of these traditions.¹⁹⁴ 1 Corinthians 11:23–25 and 15:1–8 are different from the passage mentioned first, because here Paul repeats what he had taught the congregation.¹⁹⁵ In 1 Cor 11:23–25 he reproduces the so-called “words of institution” of the Lord’s Supper. In 1 Cor 15:1–8 Paul reminds the congregation of Christ’s death and resurrection (v. 1–4; which he does indirectly in 11:23), before he speaks about Jesus’ appearance before Cephas, the twelve and five

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 75.

¹⁹³ Cf. Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia of Jesus”, 85.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Edsall, *Paul’s Witness*, 84.

¹⁹⁵ Leander E. Keck, “Jesus’ in Romans”, *JBL* 108/3 (1989): 445.

hundred brothers (v. 5–8). All three instances indicate that Paul had taught the congregation about Jesus, using material he had received and passed on.

Other observations in this letter lead us to believe that Paul informed the congregation about Jesus. Without explaining what it entails, the apostle talks about baptism in 1 Cor 1:14–17. He reminds the Corinthians that they were not baptised in the name of Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, but in the name of Christ. The Corinthians must have known what baptism was and why they needed to be baptised. “If Paul and company had not required and taught about baptism as an entry ritual, there would have been no reason for the Corinthians to adopt this one–time ritual immersion on their own”.¹⁹⁶

Furthermore, Paul calls on his readers to be “in Christ” (ἐν Χριστῷ), that is, to follow the example of the earthly Jesus,¹⁹⁷ which they could only have done if they had known the ethics taught by Jesus.¹⁹⁸ Again, when Paul writes in 1 Cor 8:6 that there only is “one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist” (... ἀλλ’ ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ), the meaning of this verse would have been difficult for Gentiles to understand. The Jewish

¹⁹⁶ Edsall, *Paul's Witness*, 79.

¹⁹⁷ Klaus Scholtissek, “Geboren aus einer Frau, geboren unter das Gesetz (Gal 4,4). Die christologisch–soteriologische Bedeutung des irdischen Jesus bei Paulus”, in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*, eds., U. Schnelle and T. Söding (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 214–6.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Knut Backhaus, “Evangelium als Lebensraum. Christologie und Ethik bei Paulus”, in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*, eds., U. Schnelle and T. Söding (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 21.

monotheistic creed is unfolded in a binatarian way and, because the creed is very dense and Paul does not explain it in his letter, he would have needed to further explicate the relationship of God, the Father, and the Lord, Jesus Christ, in his initial preaching in the city.¹⁹⁹ Moreover, the Corinthians would have needed to understand the role of the Mosaic Law in their lives, that is, if and how it saved them, and what Christ had to do with it. Otherwise, they would not have been able to understand Paul's letter to them.²⁰⁰ Lastly, the Corinthian Christians would not have understood the *Hoheitstitel* Paul frequently uses in this and all of his letters, for example, Christ (Χριστός) and Lord (κύριος). The Gentile religions knew many Lords and it would have been essential to explain to them that there was only one Lord, Jesus Christ. Paul had to make sure that Jesus was not seen as one of many deities.²⁰¹

If one compares the probable initial teaching to the Thessalonian and Corinthian congregations, it follows that both were taught about the one God,

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Otfried Hofius, "Christus als Schöpfungsmittler und Erlösungsmittler. Das Bekenntnis 1Kor 8,6 im Kontext der paulinischen Theologie", in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*, eds., U. Schnelle and T. Söding (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 48–57.

²⁰⁰ John Riches, "Gerechtigkeit – Gesetz – Christus", in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*, eds., U. Schnelle and T. Söding (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 140–58.

²⁰¹ Cf. Cf. Udo Schnelle, "Heilsgegenwart. Christologische Hoheitstitel bei Paulus", in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*, eds., U. Schnelle and T. Söding (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 178–86. Similar argumentation is used when it comes to the Q document. If one is to understand all the information of Q, the text's internal information does not suffice. The readers would have needed a basic knowledge about Jesus; else they could not understand the meaning of the document. They also needed to be familiar with the Jewish Scriptures in order to understand Jesus' use of it (cf. Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender*, 567). In other words, without more information about Jesus, the recipients of Paul's letters would not have understood the correspondence of the apostle.

about Jesus Christ, the Lord, who died for us and was resurrected and who will come again, about the Holy Spirit, about ethical topics, and about eschatology. Thus, there is a considerable overlap in the themes of Paul's initial preaching to the congregations, even if the precise wording cannot be recovered.

Paul's other letters, in short, also provide numerous examples of where Paul reminds his congregations of something he had taught them while he was at the congregation. Paul points his readers to traditions about Jesus in Phil 4:9 when he "encourages his churches to do what they have learned and received and heard".²⁰² In Rom 6:17 and 16:17, Paul reminds the congregation about traditions they already had received.²⁰³ Finally, Paul's letter to the Galatians serves as another important example of Paul's teaching activity in the congregations he had founded, as Paul – confronting his opponents – reminds the congregation that there is only one gospel: "the gospel of Christ" (Gal 1:7: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Paul proclaimed the same gospel to the various congregations – no one has ever accused him of changing the content of his gospel.²⁰⁴ The number of places in which Paul refers to something he had taught his congregations and the few references to his initial teaching confirm that he had taught his listeners about Jesus.

²⁰² Cf. Allison, "The Pauline Epistles", 21.

²⁰³ Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 54–5.

²⁰⁴ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 453–4.

4.4 Communicational deliberations

In the view of the minimalists, Paul did not know more about Jesus than what can be explicitly deduced from his letters. However, his biography, along with considerations of his initial teaching, show that he had to have been well informed on Jesus. Furthermore, the minimalists assume that Paul only spoke about Jesus' death and resurrection and about ethical matters. While it is true that this is Paul's emphasis, this bit of information would not have been sufficient for Gentiles to believe. They would have needed additional information on Jesus' life and ministry if they were to believe in Jesus Christ, whom Paul proclaimed as Son of God. There is a minimum amount of knowledge about Jesus one needs to possess in order to understand what the new Jesus movement was all about.

If Paul did inform his listeners of the most important aspects of their new faith, it is a problem for Walter that Paul does not refer to words of Jesus in his letters in those places where he outlines the key content of his gospel, that is, where he makes important Christological or soteriological statements.²⁰⁵ When Walter makes this statement, he does not take communicational factors into consideration. Edsall points out: "Successful communication, at its most basic, must proceed from what the recipient already knows".²⁰⁶ In other words, in order to understand his letters, the readers had to have had some background information about what Paul was writing, as well as about the Christological and

²⁰⁵ Walter, "Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition", 498–9.

²⁰⁶ Edsall, *Paul's Witness*, 20.

soteriological statements. This background knowledge could only have been imparted to Paul's recipients with his initial preaching.²⁰⁷

Paul's letters were written after he had visited the congregations. It is one of the characteristics of the Pauline mission that he did not plant new congregations, which he then regarded as "finished". Rather, he had been the "father" of those congregations and he remained responsible for them.²⁰⁸ Most of the letters contain answers to questions posed by the congregations about Paul's teaching during his first visits. Without the information given to them when he founded the congregations, they would not have been able to understand his letters, nor would they have been in a position to pose questions.

One can, therefore, speak of two stages of the Pauline mission. While he preached the gospel in the first stage when he formed the congregations, he aided the new congregations in the second stage. This partly explains the lack of clear references to the sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters, as all the letters belong to the second stage, and therefore they "do not offer direct access to Paul's preaching of the gospel".²⁰⁹ Rather, they are "occasional letters to meet the practical needs of Christian communities to whom the fundamentals of the

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 29. Edsall speaks of "three types of appeal to presumed knowledge [...]. The first comprises of (1) *explicit reminders* about Paul's teaching seen in places such as 1 Thess 4:1; Gal 5:21; or 1 Cor 2:1–4. The second type of appeal comprises of (2) *direct appeals to knowledge* (you know, do you not know? etc.). [...] The third type is an (3) *implicit appeal to knowledge*, found in concepts and statements that are fundamental to Paul's argument but not explicated in the letter. [...] While explicit reminders unambiguously make claims about Paul's previous teaching, the direct and implicit appeals require careful analysis in order to assess the relationship to it" (his italics).

²⁰⁸ Von Lips, *Timotheus und Titus*, 11.

²⁰⁹ L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, *Paul the Missionary*, CBET 34 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 205.

kerygma had been already proclaimed”.²¹⁰ That Paul was addressing specific problems in the congregations he was writing to, is for Hengel the first and foremost reason why Paul rarely “makes direct quotations [of sayings of Jesus] in his letters”.²¹¹

It is likely that, when missioning to the Gentiles, proclamation and teaching, and preaching and catechesis, were closely combined. As a result, Paul did not need to reproduce traditions about Jesus in his letters, but could focus on the salvific meaning of the death and resurrection of Christ as it was delivered to him by tradition.²¹²

4.5 Summary

From the above discussion it follows that Paul had to have taught the new converts in Thessalonica and Corinth about Jesus when he founded the congregations. It is, however, impossible in many instances to tell exactly *what* Paul proclaimed. Paul simply does not inform us in any detail of his initial teaching in the new congregations he founded.

²¹⁰ Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, 12; cf. Allison, “The Pauline Epistles”, 22. David P. Scaer, *Discourses in Matthew. Jesus Teaches the Church* (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2004), 12, describes the epistles “as advanced theological treatises or catechesis to those who already are versed in the fundamentals of the faith from either oral tradition or from written Gospels”. The congregations to whom Paul wrote would not have been able to understand his letters without knowledge of the Jesus tradition (38).

²¹¹ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 149.

²¹² Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 97-9.

The look at Paul's biography shows that a statement such as "Paul's access to the Jesus traditions may have been limited by, among other things, his strained relationship with the Jerusalem church"²¹³ is questionable, as he learned most of his Jesus traditions before that time. The same applies to Bultmann's statement: "After his conversion [...] Paul made no effort toward contact with Jesus' disciples or the Jerusalem Church for instruction concerning Jesus and his ministry".²¹⁴ The evidence presented through Paul's biography suggests the contrary.

On the same basis, it has to be denied that Paul was not interested in Jesus' life. His biography confirms his interest in Jesus. Moreover, one has to ask why he would have written all his letters, or even more importantly, why he would have gone on missionary journeys and suffered so much persecution for the sake of Christ, if he had not been interested in him. Paul's biography makes it more likely that Paul possessed a detailed knowledge of the Jesus tradition and supports the statement that the Jesus tradition "can be presupposed"²¹⁵ in Paul's letters.

The references to words of the Lord in Paul's letters can, therefore, be compared to the iceberg model. We know that only ten percent of an iceberg's total mass is above the water, while 90 percent of it is underwater. We can only see a small part of the iceberg, even though it is much larger. When we apply this

²¹³ Wilson, "From Jesus to Paul", 9.

²¹⁴ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 88.

²¹⁵ Ellis, "Traditions in 1 Corinthians", 486.

to the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters, it means that we only have access to a small portion of the Jesus traditions he used. He had only written down a few of the Jesus traditions in his letters. Yet, we can deduce from his biography and initial teaching that he knew and used many more Jesus traditions than those he mentions in his letters.

Consequently, the search for parallels in the Jesus tradition in Paul and the synoptics is valid, even where Paul does not refer to such traditions directly, as his knowledge of the Jesus tradition would always have been in the back of his mind when he was writing his letters.

Chapter 5:

Explicit references to the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters

The look at the explicit references to Jesus tradition in Paul's letters has a dual function. Firstly, Paul's explicit references to sayings of Jesus can confirm his knowledge of Jesus traditions, which – in light of the evidence provided by his biography and his initial teaching – could be presupposed. Secondly, the explicit references provide further insights into the way Paul treated traditions handed down to him. Dealing with the explicit references will show whether Paul's treatment of Jesus traditions is in line with his quoting of Euripides, and his use of the Jewish Scriptures and pre-Pauline material. They will provide further guidelines for identifying implicit references or allusions. If the way Paul incorporates the explicit references into his letters is similar to his use of the Jewish Scriptures and pre-Pauline material, and his knowledge of Jesus traditions is confirmed, the search for implicit references will have a solid base.¹

¹ Just as there is little agreement regarding the number of implicit references to sayings of Jesus by Paul, a similar situation exists in regard to the actual quotes. The history of the debate has shown that many scholars only allow 1 Cor 7:10 and 9:14 as genuine quotes. One is not sure that in the other instances, the Pauline references have a substantial parallel in the synoptics. Only Pauline passages with possible synoptic counterparts will be considered in this study: 1 Thess 4:15–17; 1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14; 11:23–25. 1 Thessalonians 4:15–17 will be discussed in chapter 7, because of its similarities to Jewish apocalyptic literature, and the resulting doubt if it should be regarded as a parallel to Jesus' statements in the synoptics. Acts 20:35; 1 Thess 4:2; 1 Cor 7:25; 14:37; 2 Cor 12:9 and Phlm 8 have also been mentioned as instances in which Paul explicitly refers to a saying of Jesus, but these verses have no clear synoptic parallels.

5.1 The three explicit references in 1 Corinthians

1 Corinthians was written in Ephesus in the spring of 55 CE.² Paul reverts to older and well-known material often in this letter. He recites words of the Lord explicitly in 1 Cor 7:10–11, 9:14 and 11:23–25, as well as several baptismal traditions and confessional formulas.³

In the following section, the context of the respective sayings of the Lord in their settings will be examined shortly. Then the possible parallels will be compared to one another, after which the discussion will revolve around the question if the rendition of a saying of Jesus by Paul is closer to that of one or more of the synoptic gospels or Q.

5.2 “Do not separate”: 1 Cor 7:10–11 and Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6

5.2.1 The context of the prohibition of divorce

1 Corinthians 7:10–11 belongs to the paraenetical part of Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians, which comprises of chapters 5–7. In this passage, Paul answers questions posed to him by the Corinthian church,⁴ primarily regarding matters of

² Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 74.

³ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁴ Cf. Brown, *An Introduction*, 512; Dieter Zeller, “Der Vorrang der Ehelosigkeit in Kor 7”, *ZNW* 98 (2005): 62–3.

marriage and celibacy.⁵ The questions raised by the Corinthians imply that they were instructed on these matters, but they still had questions that needed to be cleared.⁶ This is also the case for chapter 7, in which the first explicit reference in the letter is located.

Paul begins to deal with marital matters in 5:1–13, where a case of sexual immorality is discussed. He takes up the topic again in 6:12. The matter is continued in chapter 7 under a different aspect.⁷ The chapter begins with the introduction: “Now concerning the matters about which you wrote” (1 Cor 7:1: Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε). It should not come as a surprise that the Corinthians had questions on the matter of marriage and divorce, as Jesus’ statements on the matter were untypical for the time in which he lived, and the meaning of the statements as delivered in the synoptics is not always easy to understand.⁸

In the first seven verses of chapter 7, Paul reacts to the Corinthian thesis that it is not good to touch a woman. Here, he makes general statements about the relationship between men and women. From v. 8, Paul addresses the unmarried and the widows. He tells them that it is good for them not to marry (v.

⁵ Cf. Andreas Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, HNT 9/1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 120; Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 41.

⁶ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 205–6, points out that Paul’s arguments in this chapter are shorter than usual. The apostle does not explain or discuss his views in detail. This, too, indicates that the basis for the argumentation possibly had been set when Paul visited the congregation.

⁷ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 199.

⁸ Cf. Ernest van Eck, “Die huwelik in die eerste-eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (III): Jesus en die huwelik”, *HTS* 63/2 (2007): 481–513. Paul’s statements on the matter are not straightforward either; cf. William Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 220: “Paul’s response to sexual desire and sexual intercourse is not simple”.

8), “but if they cannot exercise self–control, they should marry” (v. 9: εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται, γαμησάτωσαν). It is important to note that Paul expresses his own opinion on matters of marriage in the first nine verses of 1 Cor 7,⁹ but quotes from v. 10. With the quote, he makes it clear “that it is not he but the Lord who is ‘giving instruction’ in this matter”.¹⁰

In the quote in 1 Cor 7:10–11, Paul treats a specific question about the divorce of married couples in the case where both partners are Christians.¹¹ Paul commands (παραγγέλλω) the wife in v. 10 not to separate from her husband, explicitly referring to a saying of Jesus. With this introduction, the saying is authorized; in 1 Cor 7 παραγγέλλω is reserved for the commands of the Lord.¹² In v. 11, Paul seemingly continues the Lord’s saying when he commands already divorced people to remain unmarried or to reconcile themselves with their spouses. He then continues his teachings on relationships in the rest of the chapter.¹³

⁹ Cf. Lindemann, “Die Funktion der Herrenworte”, 678–9.

¹⁰ Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 42.

¹¹ Dieter Zeller, *Der erste Brief and die Korinther*, KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 234; cf. Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 200.

¹² Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 219.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 199.

Interestingly, the quote does not form the centre of Paul's teaching on marriage and divorce.¹⁴ It is used in a first line of argument that claims that marriage is preferable to a sexually immoral life.¹⁵ Paul tries to convince the Corinthians that his proposed way of handling marriage and sexuality is beneficial to them.¹⁶ In chapter 8 a new theme starts: food offered to idols.

5.2.1.1 Possible synoptic parallels

There are not many passages in the New Testament that deal with divorce, so the number of possible synoptic parallels to the prohibition of divorce rendered by Paul is limited. The word of the Lord to which Paul refers to in 1 Cor 7:10–11 is usually believed to be in Luke 16:18 // Matt 5:32 and Matt 19:6 // Mark 10:9.¹⁷ Apart from these New Testament texts, the only other passage that deals with the issue of divorce in the New Testament is the short notice in Matt 1:19, where

¹⁴ This is particularly shown by Jacobi (*Ibid.*) in her proposed structure for 1 Cor 7:
 (1b) propositio
 (2–7) **A** I. Sexualität in der Ehe
 (8f.) **B** Jungfrauen und Witwen
 (10–16) **A** II. Trennung
 (17–24) > Zentrum: Bleiben im Stand der κλησις
 (25) **B** I. Jungfrauen
 (26–38) **A** Nachteile des Verheiratetseins gegenüber dem Ledigbleiben
 (39f.) **B** II. Witwen

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 201–2.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 205–6.

¹⁷ Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 244; Kuhn, "Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus", 313; Taylor, "Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest", 114; Riesner, "Paulus und die Jesus-Überlieferung", 359; Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 163–4; Allison, "The Pauline Epistles", 2; Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 140; Tuckett, "1 Corinthians and Q", 609; Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 52; Schröter, "Jesus Christus als Zentrum des Denkens", 281, and many others.

Joseph wanted to divorce (ἀπολῦσαι) Mary when he found out that she was pregnant in order not to shame her. This notice is part of the narrative in Matthew's gospel and does not come into consideration as a parallel to the prohibition of divorce. Only the first four mentioned instances could possibly be equivalents.

5.2.1.2 *The context of Matt 5:32 // Luke 16:18*

The first of the two parallel passages that come into question as parallels to the Pauline prohibition of divorce are Matt 5:32 // Luke 16:18.¹⁸ These verses are located in different contexts in the respective gospels. In Matthew, Jesus' statements regarding marriage are delivered at the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus talked about adultery in Matt 5:27–30, and about divorce in 5:31–32. These statements come after some about murder, and a saying about oaths follows them. The part about marriage and divorce can, therefore, easily be demarcated.¹⁹

The Lukan parallel (Luke 16:18) is not found in the counterpart Sermon on the Plain. It is part of Jesus' speech to the Pharisees about money and

¹⁸ The synoptic texts on marriage and divorce have been broadly analysed and discussed in their immediate context by Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 109-151, 240-292. Their context cannot be extensively repeated here.

¹⁹ Jesus' brief statements about adultery and divorce are characteristic in this part of the Sermon on the Mount, where he expounds "the true meaning of the Torah, in contrast to current rabbinic interpretations of the Torah". Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Matthew*, ConcC (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2006), 292.

possessions in Luke 16:14–31. In v. 14–17, Jesus talks about the validity of the Torah and from v. 19 the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is told. At first, it is unclear why Luke brings this instruction on divorce in this context. Consequently, it has often been considered unlikely that v. 18 was connected to v. 17 in Q.²⁰ Loader, however, proposes that if greed it the reason for divorce (“divorcing one’s wife in order to marry one who would bring a more substantial dowry”), the saying fits into its context about money and wealth.²¹

The content of the Matthean and Lukan verses is very similar apart from the exception clause (παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας), which Luke omitted in his version.²²

5.2.1.3 Mark 10:1–12 // Matt 19:1–12

The second of the pair of parallel synoptic passages on divorce is found in Mark 10:1–12 // Matt 19:1–12. In both instances, a debate between Jesus and the Pharisees is portrayed. It is one of the synoptic controversy–dialogues.²³ The

²⁰ John Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, WBC 35b (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1993), 814.

²¹ Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 258.

²² The clause is only delivered by Matthew and can best be explained as a Matthean addition. *Ibid.*, 816; cf. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, WBC 33a (Dallas, TX: Word, 1993), 124. Against this view it has been argued by Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 109–15, that the πορνεία–clause is a necessary part of the text. He says: “Jesus is portrayed as holding the same general position (taking 19.3–12 as a whole) that celibacy is a gift for some (‘not all can receive it’), while for everyone else, marriage must be once–for–all. It is a position corresponding precisely with Paul’s” (125–6). Another possibility to consider is that Matthew had found the clause in his source; cf. Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 261.

²³ Joachim Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Markus 1,1–8,26*, EKK II/1, Studienausgabe (Mannheim: Patmos; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 70.

pericope can stand by itself and the following passage is independent of it.²⁴ In this controversy–dialogue, Pharisees came to Jesus and asked him whether it was “lawful for a man to divorce his wife” (Mark 10:2: εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι). After referring to a concession made by Moses in regard to divorce in v. 3–4, Jesus gave his view on divorce in Mark 10:5–9. He first referred to God’s will for marriage since creation (v. 6–8) and explained that it was the Creator’s will that what “God has joined together, let not man separate” (v. 9: ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω). The parallel pericope in Matt 19 is similarly structured to the Markan version, but significant smaller differences exist.²⁵

Both the Markan and Matthean passages consist of two parts: a “public dialogue” of Jesus with the Pharisees (Mark 10:2–9 // Matt 19:3–9) and a “private instruction” with the disciples (Mark 10:10–12 // Matt 19:10–12.²⁶ In the first part, Jesus focusses on the essence of marriage; in the second part, which is similar to Q 16:18, the focus is on adultery and remarriage.²⁷ The two units have to be treated separately,²⁸ as Matt 10:10–12 contains some Matthean Sondergut.²⁹

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 69.

²⁵ These will only be discussed if they are important for this study.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, David R. Catchpole, “The Synoptic Divorce Material as a Traditio–Historical Problem”, *BJRL* 57 (1974/75): 96.

²⁷ Cf. Van Eck, “Die huwelik in die eerste–eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (III)”, 485.

²⁸ Catchpole, “The Synoptic Divorce Material”, 96–8.

²⁹ Cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 546.

5.2.2 Synoptic parallels to 1 Cor 7:10

As stated above, 1 Cor 7:10–11 is usually believed to be connected to Luke 16:18 // Matt 5:32 and Matt 19:6 // Mark 10:9 because all of these texts deal with the issue of divorce. This assumption, however, fails to distinguish that the word of the Lord itself in 1 Cor 7:10–11 consists of two aspects, which are related, but should be differentiated. In v. 10, Paul repeats the command not to get divorced. In v. 11, he gives guidelines that must be followed in the case that it does come to divorce.³⁰ It is therefore sensible to treat the verses separately when comparing the two Pauline verses to synoptic material.

The first part of Paul’s quote, the explicit prohibition of divorce in 1 Cor 7:10, only has possible parallels in Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6. Matthew 5:32 // Luke 16:18 do not directly prohibit divorce and therefore do not come into question as parallels.

1 Cor 7:10	Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6
Τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος, γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι	ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

On a first glance at the comparison above, these verses actually have little in common. Paul does not quote the saying of Jesus – which is identical in Mark and Matthew – verbatim.³¹ Paul uses the same verb expressing the prohibition of

³⁰ Zimmermann, “Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?“, 94–6.

³¹ Cf. Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 1 Kor 6,12–11,16*, EKK VII/2 (Mannheim: Patmos; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995), 92.

divorce, but he formulates it in a different tense than the synoptic authors. However, a closer look at the verb χωρίζω suggests that the appearance of the verb in these parallels is not insignificant, as this word is used distinctly seldom in the New Testament. In the synoptic gospels, χωρίζω appears only in these two instances – Mark 10:9 and Matt 19:6. If Paul does indeed take up a word of the Lord in 1 Cor 7:10, and we know this saying through the gospels, these synoptic verses are the only two that come into consideration as parallel verses.

Paul's use of the verb χωρίζω is striking as well. It indicates that he had the same prohibition of divorce as the one contained in Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6 in mind. Paul uses the verb seven times in his letters. Four of these instances are found in Paul's handling of the question of divorce in 1 Cor 7:10–15. He further uses the verb in Rom 8:35, 39 and Phlm 15. It is, however, only in 1 Cor 7 that χωρίζω has the meaning "to divorce" in Paul's letters. In Rom 8:35, 39 and Phlm 15, χωρίζω has the meaning "to separate", which does not involve a married couple being separated by divorce. Paul refers to the impossibility of the separation between the love of Christ and us (Rom 8:35: τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ;), to the fact that nothing can separate us "from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom 8:39: δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν), and to the separation between master Philemon and slave Onesimus in Phlm 15 (Τάχα γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὥραν, ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχης). Only in the context of the saying of the Lord in 1 Cor 7 does the verb have the meaning of divorce in Pauline literature.

Furthermore, Paul does not always use the verb χωρίζω when talking about divorce. When Paul elaborates on his own thoughts on divorce (1 Cor 7:12,

13) in the verses that follow immediately after the word of the Lord in v. 10–11, he prefers the verb ἀφίημι. The synoptic gospels, in turn, mostly use ἀπολύω when they write about divorce, for example, in both Mark 10 and Matt 19, ἀπολύω is used four times in Jesus' statements on marriage and divorce. Paul prefers using ἀφίημι when he elaborates on his own thoughts on divorce, Mark and Matthew favour ἀπολύω. This makes their use of χωρίζω conspicuous.

If we now look at the way χωρίζω is used in other New Testament passages, the presumption that it is unusual for this verb to have the meaning “to divorce” is strengthened. This makes a connection between the instances in which χωρίζω does have the meaning of “to divorce” more likely. Apart from the above-mentioned passages, χωρίζω is used three times in Acts and once in the so-called letter to the Hebrews. In Acts 1:4, it is said that Jesus had ordered his disciples not to depart (μὴ χωρίζεσθαι) from Jerusalem. In Acts 18:1–2, we read: “After this Paul left (χωρισθείς) Athens and went to Corinth. And he found a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, recently come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave (χωρίζεσθαι) Rome”. The final time χωρίζω is used in the New Testament, it does not mean “divorce” either. In Heb 7:26, we read: “For it was indeed fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, innocent, unstained, separated (κεχωρισμένος) from sinners, and exalted above the heavens”. The use of χωρίζω shows that it is unusual for

the verb to have the meaning “divorce” in the New Testament. Again, this implies a dependency in the cases in which it is used this way.³²

The fact that χωρίζω only has the meaning “to divorce” in 1 Cor 7:10–15 and Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6 allows one to assume that Paul, Mark and Matthew shared a common tradition when they used χωρίζω. This is supported by the observation that the verb has another meaning when Paul renders it elsewhere. Mark and Matthew only use the verb once.

5.2.2.1 *The origin of the word of the Lord*

The prohibition of divorce, which Paul reproduced in 1 Cor 7:10–11 is generally understood as an authentic saying of Jesus.³³ According to Mark and Matthew, Jesus spoke these words during a fierce dispute with the Pharisees. Voices that are more critical argue that the prohibition of divorce originated in the Jewish–Hellenistic congregation (*Gemeindebildung*). They believe that the synoptic

³² It is rarely doubted that Mark 10:9 and Matt 19:6 are parallels of 1 Cor 7:10, despite the small amount of verbal agreement. Zimmermann, “Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?”, 93, 97–8) has tried to explain the lack of verbal agreement between the synoptic gospels and 1 Cor 7:10 by arguing that Paul had formulated these verses himself and that he is not literary dependent on the synoptics. He concluded that Paul was not only a recipient, but solely because of age of his letters, an independent traditor of sayings of Jesus who is to be treated equally to the evangelists (93). Zimmermann thereby points out that it is problematic to make verbal similarity a criterion for judging the validity of parallels because of the small amount of agreement in wording in this particular case. Against the view of Zimmermann, it can be argued that although the verbal agreement is small, it is still significant. Therefore, a degree of verbal agreement must remain as criteria.

³³ Cf. Taylor, “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, 114; Catchpole, “The Synoptic Divorce Material”, 112–3. Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul*, 276, gives reasons for believing that “arguments against the authenticity of Jesus’ saying here presented by the Jesus Seminar are not sound”.

controversy–dialogues do not reflect historical events, but were formed because of the tension between the early Christian church and the pharisaic Rabbis after the fall of Jerusalem 70 CE.³⁴ As a result, it is reasoned that the sayings of Jesus in these disputes cannot be traced back to the earthly Jesus.³⁵

There is a strong case, however, for linking Paul's prohibition of divorce to that of the synoptic authors (and back to Jesus). As argued above, the terminology used by Paul and the synoptic authors makes a connection between the verses plausible. Moreover, while other synoptic controversy–dialogues might be *Gemeindebildung* with no direct link to the earthly Jesus, this is likely not the case for Mark 10:2–9 // Matt 19:3–9 for the following reasons: According to Deut 24:1–4, Moses allowed divorce. Jesus' hearers would have taken it for granted that divorce was possible.³⁶ The Greek–Roman law of the time also permitted divorce. As a result, it has to be asked why the Jewish–Hellenistic community would have created such a word of Jesus prohibiting divorce, which stands in opposition to the Greek–Roman law as well as their own Mosaic law, where divorce was allowed. Why would the early congregation have changed the Old Testament concession to divorce given by Moses?

Such a change would stand in opposition to the sayings of Jesus in the other synoptic controversy–dialogues. In the controversy–dialogues, it is common that the Jewish–Hellenistic law is adapted to conform to the Greek–

³⁴ Cf. Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde*, 162, 170.

³⁵ Cf. Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 244.

³⁶ Catchpole, "The Synoptic Divorce Material", 93.

Roman practice: The commandments for the Sabbath are relaxed (for example, Mark 3:1–6, where Jesus heals on a Sabbath, which, according to the Pharisees, was not allowed), as are the laws about food and ritual purity (for example, Mark 7:1–23), and fasting (for example, Matt 9:14–17). It is unlikely that the early Christians would differentiate their teachings from Greek–Roman law only in the handling of divorce while aligning itself to the Greek–Roman law in other cases, especially because Moses made provision for divorce. It is more likely to assume that the prohibition of divorce can be traced back to Jesus.³⁷

5.2.3 Synoptic parallels to 1 Cor 7:11

In the second of the two Pauline verses containing the citation of the word of the Lord (v. 11), divorce is not explicitly prohibited.³⁸ Here Paul's main subject is remarriage and adultery, as it is the case in Luke 16:18 // Matt 5:32. The two synoptic texts are usually traced back to Q.³⁹ 1 Corinthians 7:11 furthermore could have possible parallels in Matt 19:9 // Mark 10:11, where the same topic is

³⁷ This does not exclude the sayings from being handed down as isolated logia which were then later incorporated into a controversy–dialogue on an issue important to the early church (cf. Helmut Koester, “Formgeschichte/Formenkritik II”, *TRE* 11:291). It just means that the logia themselves probably have formed part of the early Jesus tradition (cf. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 268), which Paul came to know.

³⁸ Cf. Zimmermann, “Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?”, 94.

³⁹ Luke is assumed to have the more original form of Q 16:18, because it is better suited to its Jewish environment; cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 236–40.

deliberated. Matthew 19:9 is assumed to be dependent on its parallel Mark 10:11 and the Markan version is regarded as the oldest.⁴⁰

1 Cor 7:11	– ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῆι, μενέτω ἄγαμος ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγῆτω,– καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι.
Mark 10:11–12	11καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ’ αὐτήν· 12 καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται .
Matt 19:9	λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ <u>πορνείᾳ</u> καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται .
Luke 16:18	Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει , καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει .
Matt 5:32	ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου <u>πορνείας</u> ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι , καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται .

The comparison of these verses shows that the four synoptic parallels are very similar. All four passages deal with divorce and remarriage, using the same keywords ἀπολύω and μοιχᾶω. In 1 Cor 7:11, Paul too expresses his doubts about remarriage. This is interesting, because the allowance of divorce in Deut 24, by the giving of the certificate of divorce, implies the right to remarry.⁴¹ In this sense, a factual agreement exists between the verses, but because Paul uses

⁴⁰ Cf. Zimmermann, “Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?”, 94; Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 43.

⁴¹ Ernest van Eck, “Die huwelik in die eerste–eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (II): Huwelik, egbreuk, egskeiding en hertrou”, *HTS* 63/1 (2007): 121.

neither of the synoptic keywords μοιχάω nor ἀπολύω, one still has to ask if these verses really do constitute as parallels to the Pauline saying of Jesus.

If one looks at Paul's use of ἀπολύω and μοιχάω, serious doubts arise whether Paul in 1 Cor 7:11 does quote a word of the Lord similar to one in the proposed synoptic parallels. Paul uses the first of the two verbs, μοιχάω, only in Rom 2:22; 13:9, but these have little connection to the above-mentioned synoptic parallels. In the synoptics, apart from the four above-mentioned parallels, μοιχάω is used a further four times (Matt 5:27, 28; Mark 10:19 and Luke 18:10). Again, these verses show no similarities with 1 Cor 7:11. Paul could not have quoted these verses on the issues of divorce and remarriage from synoptic traditions.

The occurrences of ἀπολύω make it even less likely that Paul quotes a synoptic saying of Jesus in v. 11. The verb ἀπολύω is used 67 times in the New Testament; 46 of those occurrences are found in the synoptic gospels (20 in Matthew, 12 in Mark and 14 in Luke). However, Paul never uses the verb ἀπολύω. He has not copied it from any other source.

Furthermore, the command to remain unmarried (ἄγαμος) or to be reconciled (καταλλάσσω) is found only in Paul's letters. In the New Testament, ἄγαμος and καταλλάσσω are both used exclusively by Paul. There is no significant linguistic connection between 1 Cor 7:11 and the proposed synoptic parallels. It is rather surprising that Luke 16:18, Matt 5:32; 19:9 and Mark 10:11 are naturally regarded as parallels to 1 Cor 7:11 by most scholars. The linguistic peculiarities cast doubt over the assumption that Paul was quoting a synoptic Jesus tradition in v. 11.

Since little verbal agreement exists between 1 Cor 7:11 and the corresponding verses from the synoptics, it is necessary to ask how to deal with

v. 11. After Paul had introduced the word of the Lord in v.10a (οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος), he limits the scope of the saying to the end of v. 11. In v. 12a, Paul unambiguously indicates that he has stopped using a word of the Lord and is now formulating his own opinion again (λέγω ἐγὼ οὐχ ὁ κύριος). It is therefore normally assumed that v. 11 is part of the word of the Lord because Paul does not indicate before the start of v. 12 that he stops quoting a Jesus tradition. Yet, because of the lack of agreement in wording, it is possible that the interposed thought in v. 11a is from Paul himself and not an actual quote of a saying of Jesus. V. 11b (“the husband should not divorce his wife”; καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι) would then be a continuation of v. 10. While v. 10 forbids the wife to divorce, v. 11b forbids the same for the husband.⁴² Therefore, what Paul says in v. 11a has no clear parallel in the synoptic gospels, and this is important to this study.

Ellis points to a further connection between Paul’s statements in 1 Corinthians and the synoptic controversy-dialogue in Mark 10:2–9 // Matt 19:3–9. Mark 10:8 and Matt 19:5 give a similar warning against fornication as Paul does in 1 Cor 6:16–20.⁴³ Paul’s warning to not unite with a prostitute in v. 16 is introduced by οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι, a phrase that Paul uses frequently in 1 Corinthians when referring to a doctrine that he, or one of his co-workers, had previously given to the Corinthians. Within this exhortation, the same Old Testament verse as in Mark 10:8 // Matt 19:5 is quoted, namely: Gen 2:24 from the Septuagint.

⁴² Lindemann, “Die Funktion der Herrenworte”, 681–4. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 255, attempts to prove that v. 11a stands in the same tradition as the synoptic teachings and Paul did not act on his own authority when formulating this sentence. She fails to explain the lack of agreement in wording.

⁴³ Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 73–4.

These texts are again identical in Mark and Matthew and cannot be used to argue for a closer relationship of one of the two gospels to Pauline material. The quote strengthens the possibility that Paul, Mark and Matthew were drawing from a common tradition when they deliberate on issues of marriage and divorce, as they reproduce the same quote in a similar context, and do not make use of the quote elsewhere.

Genesis 2:24 (LXX) = Mark 10:8 par	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.
1 Cor 6:16	ἔσονται γάρ, φησὶν, οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

5.2.4 Arguments for Mark being the closest parallel

As the prohibition of divorce is identical in Mark 19:6 // Matt 19:9, these two texts cannot be used on their own to determine whether the Markan or Matthean version is closer to the Pauline text of 1 Cor 7:10. The same applies to the quote of Gen 2:24. The contexts also have to be considered, as does the relationship of v. 11 to the synoptics. Texts that are similar in thought (but not in wording) to 1 Cor 7:11 are found, as mentioned above, in Mark 10:11–12 and Matt 19:9. At the end of this discussion, it will have to be decided if there is enough evidence to assume that Paul's version of the prohibition of divorce can be linked more closely to Mark or to Matthew.

A closeness of 1 Cor 7:10–11 to Mark 10:11–12 is sometimes assumed because it differs from its parallel in Matt 19:9 in one particular aspect: the request for divorce is allowed for both men and women in Mark, but Matthew only talks

about a man divorcing his wife. Here, Mark 10:11–12 agrees with 1 Cor 7:10, 11b.⁴⁴

Addressing both men and women on the issue of divorce, as Mark and Paul do, corresponds to the Hellenistic and Roman practice of the time. In contrast, the Matthean and Lukan versions seem to follow the Palestine custom that only a man could initiate divorce. Matthew and Luke do not mention women when writing about divorce.⁴⁵ It has been argued above that the synoptic controversy-dialogues commonly conform the Jewish law to Greek–Roman practice, except for the issue of divorce. This makes it difficult to explain the closeness between the Markan and Pauline versions to the Greek–Roman custom of addressing both men and woman, because, on the issue of prohibiting divorce, the Jesus tradition itself differentiates from Greek–Roman law.

Gnilka suspects that the equal treatment of women in Mark 10:12 is a secondary tradition because it results in some remarkable variants of the text.⁴⁶ In addition, because Deut 24 allows only a man to initiate divorce, and Mark 10:3–4 refers to this passage, one could expect Jesus to focus on men only, as is the

⁴⁴ In the other two possible parallel passages on divorce in Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18, it is likewise the husband who is held responsible in matters of divorce. The Lukan material again differentiates itself from both Matthew and Mark insofar as it does not forbid divorce. Luke 16:18 rather assumes that divorce is possible.

⁴⁵ Cf. Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 244; Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 163–4; Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 140–1.

⁴⁶ Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Teilband 2: Markus 8,27–16:20*, EKK Studienausgabe (Mannheim: Patmos Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 75.

case in Matthew.⁴⁷ Jesus was explaining a passage that focussed on the rights of the husband only.⁴⁸ Consequently, the link between the Pauline and Markan texts is not particularly strong.⁴⁹

5.2.5 Arguments for Matthew being the closest parallel

Mark 10:6 // Matt 19:9, as well Mark 10:8 // Matt 19:5, are identical. These Markan and Matthean verses cannot be used to decide if one of the synoptic texts is closer to the Pauline version than the other. Looking at the surrounding verses though, the keyword πορνεία (1 Cor 6:18; 7:2) establishes a connection between Paul's statements and Matthew's gospel (19:9) only.⁵⁰ In Matt 19:9, Jesus says: "Whoever divorces his wife, *except for sexual immorality*, and marries another, commits adultery" (λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται). Paul wrote in 1 Cor 7:2 that "*because of the temptation to sexual immorality*, each man should have his own wife and each

⁴⁷ Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 164 and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "The Divorced Woman in 1 Cor 7:10–11", *JBL* 100/4 (1981): 600, point out that Mark addresses the man first and then the woman; Paul does it the other way round.

⁴⁸ Francis W. Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew. A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981), 389. Van Eck, "Die huwelik in die eerste-eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (II)", points out that from around 70 CE, a woman could request to divorce her husband. She would have needed to prove to a rabbinic court that her request was reasonable. This practice, however, likely started too late to have influenced our passages. Cf. Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 56-7.

⁴⁹ Below, the relationship between Paul and Matthew's teachings on marriage and divorce will be discussed, after which it will be decided whether a closer relationship with Paul's teachings to either Mark or Matthew can be established.

⁵⁰ Πορνεία stands in Matt 5:32; 15:19; 19:9 and Mark 7:21. Only in Matt 5:32 and 19:9 is it used in connection to the relationship between men and woman.

woman her own husband” (διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω). Both passages discuss the issue of sexual immorality in the context of discussions about marriage.⁵¹ This is the case in these two New Testament passages only.⁵²

Another reason for assuming closeness between the texts of Matthew and 1 Corinthians is that only Paul and Matthew know an exception to the prohibition of divorce. Matthew acknowledges adultery as a valid reason for divorce, and Paul allows divorce when it is requested by the non-Christian spouse (1 Cor 7:15). Mark on the other hand, “prohibits divorce and remarriage unconditionally”.⁵³ The synoptic controversy-dialogue on marriage and divorce indicates that it was God’s will since creation that people should not get divorced. Mark focusses on bringing the intended prohibition of divorce to the fore.

Mark and Matthew also inform us that since Moses, divorce was allowed because of the “hardness of heart” (Matt 19:8: πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν). In other words, even if God did not intend divorce since creation, exceptions were allowed since the time of Moses. Matthew and Paul seem to follow this line of thought. They acknowledge the general prohibition of divorce, but they allow for divorce in certain cases.

⁵¹ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 209.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 258. Jacobi argues that Paul combines the LXX quote Genesis 2:24 with πορνεία in a strange way. The synoptics, in contrast, use the Old Testament quote in connection to matters of divorce and marriage. Jacobi fails to notice that Matthew combines πορνεία and Genesis 2:24 in a similar context as Paul. The difference she highlights exists between Mark and Paul only.

⁵³ Wong, “The De-radicalization of Jesus’ Ethical Teachings in 1 Corinthians”, 188; cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 27.

It is unlikely that Paul would have allowed for divorce if he knew only the strict prohibition as delivered by Mark. It is more plausible to assume that he knew an exception allowing for divorce similar to Matt 19:9. Paul was addressing a different situation and would have adapted the reason for allowing divorce to fit the context he was writing in.⁵⁴ Yet, because the exceptions Paul and Matthew allow differ from one another,⁵⁵ and there is no verbal agreement between 1 Cor 7:11 and Matt 19:9, a dependency between the verses is hard to prove.

Paul and Matthew also list instances in which it is better for people not to get married. The eunuch sayings in Matt 19:11–12 resemble Paul’s teaching about celibacy in 1 Cor 7:6–7. In Matt 19:11–12, Jesus implies, according to Wenham, “that celibacy is a worthy calling in the cause of the kingdom of God, but that not everyone is able to go that path, only those so gifted by God”. Similarly, Paul “accepts that celibacy is a good vocation for a Christian”.⁵⁶ Beare thinks that Paul’s statements are “in the spirit of the saying of Jesus”.⁵⁷ Loader also mentions that χωρέω and οἷς δέδοταις (Matt 19:9) are not typical words used

⁵⁴ Cf. Gibbs, *Matthew*, 296. Consequently, one can only regard Paul’s allowance for divorce as a contradiction of the saying of the Lord (cf. Lindemann, “Die Funktion der Herrenworte”, 678), if one assumes that Paul knew the Markan version. If Paul knew an exception for the prohibition of divorce, one cannot argue that Paul could change the rulings on divorce, because of his encounter with Jesus, as Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 228, does.

⁵⁵ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 283.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 245.

⁵⁷ Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 391. Cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 262: “Mt 19,10–12 schließt zudem an das Streitgespräch über Dtn 24,1, das Matthäus aus Mark 10 übernimmt, ein Jesuswort über Eunuchen an, in welchem der matthäische Jesus (ganz im Einklang mit Paulus) von den verschiedenen Voraussetzungen des Menschen spricht, ein Leben in Askese zu führen, und dabei den freiwilligen Verzicht auf die Ehe [...] kennt”. Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 494, speaks of “a striking parallel” between the Pauline and Matthean sayings.

by Matthew, pointing to pre-Matthean tradition.⁵⁸ It is possible that Paul and Matthew knew a similar teaching of Jesus on the matter, because both assume that some people were not created to get married. Paul and Matthew agree in thought, but the wording of the passages is again too different to imply a compulsory dependence between the two authors.

5.2.6 Conclusion

Van Eck points out that not even the most recent scholars who have worked on the topic of marriage and divorce agree with one another on which words of Jesus about marriage are authentic, on the oldest version of Jesus' statements, or on their meaning.⁵⁹ This discussion does not solve all the unanswered questions on the topic, but it sheds new light on the problem of the relationship between the different passages on divorce by looking at them from a different angle.

The discussion has shown that the following agreements exist between the Pauline teachings on marriage and divorce and its synoptic parallels:

Pauline passage	Markan parallel	Matthean parallel	Similar Topic
1 Cor 7:10	Mark 10:9	Matt 19:6	Prohibition of divorce

⁵⁸ Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, 440.

⁵⁹ Van Eck, "Die huwelik in die eerste-eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (III)", 496–8.

1 Cor 7:11a		Matt 19:9	Possibility of divorce (cf. Matt 5:32; Luke 16:18)
1 Cor 7:10, 11b	Mark 10:11–12		Men and women are addressed
1 Cor 6:18; 7:2		Matt 19:9	Marriage and πορνεία
1 Cor 7:6–7		Matt 19:10–12	Marriage is not for everyone
1 Cor 6:16	Mark 10:8	Matt 19:6	Gen 2:24 Quote

The explicit reference to a saying of Jesus in 1 Cor 7:10 has a parallel in Mark 10:9 and Matt 19:6, confirmed by the unusual use of χωρίζω. The synoptic versions are identical and therefore equally close to Paul's prohibition of divorce. This also applies for the quote of Gen 2:24. The only other verbal agreement is in the use of πορνεία by Paul and Matthew, but in this instance it is not clear whether this is a later Matthean addition.

When one looks at non-verbal agreements or matching thoughts or ideas, the table above shows that Mark agrees with Paul in one aspect – the addressing of both men and women on issues of divorce. Matthew agrees with Paul on two other issues: both entertain the possibility of divorce, and both state that it is better for some people not to get married and rather to remain single.⁶⁰ Therefore, more similarities between Paul and Matthew's teachings, both in wording and in ideas, can be shown. Mark agrees with Paul on some aspects, but not on as many as Matthew.

If we take the structure of the synoptic parallels into account, it can be seen that there are Pauline similarities to both Jesus' debate with the Pharisees about divorce (Mark 10:2–9; Matt 19:3–9), and with the following (separate) discussion

⁶⁰ Cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 233, 241.

between Jesus and his disciples about the understanding of Jesus' teaching (Mark 10:10–12; Matt 19:10–12). The majority of the agreements with Paul's teachings are located in Matthew's version of Jesus' controversy with the Pharisees (Matt 19:3–9). This includes verbal and factual agreements. Mark's version does not contain all the sayings of Jesus Paul would have needed to arrive at his conclusions. Consequently, it is more likely that Matthew, and not Mark, knew a tradition similar to the one used earlier by Paul.

Although no assertion can be made about the pericopies as a whole in their canonical form (Mark 10:2–12; Matt 19:3–12), based on the arguments presented here, it can be agreed that Matthew's version probably contains elements that are "more original than Mark's",⁶¹ because similar traditions were already known and used by Paul long before the synoptic gospels were written down. Mark may still have written the completed passages as a whole first, including Jesus' attached discussion with the disciples.

While it is normally taken for granted that 1 Cor 7:10–11 has parallels in Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6 and Luke (Q) 16:18 // Matt 5:32, this comparison shows that the prohibition of divorce in 1 Cor 7:10 has verbal parallels in Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6 only. There are no meaningful verbal agreements between 1 Cor 7:11 and synoptic material. Rather, v. 11 represents a logical continuation and application of the word of the Lord contained in v. 10.⁶²

⁶¹ Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 102.

⁶² Cf. Schröter, *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament*, 84.

Lastly, it is interesting to note that Paul's teachings on divorce show little resemblance to Q. The only possible connection to Q is between 1 Cor 7:11a and Q 16:18, where the possibility of divorce is presupposed. The Matthean version of the Q tradition is, however, closer to Paul than the Lukan version is, because only Matt 5:32 contains the *πορνεία* clause, which verbally links Paul and Matthew. There are no verbal agreements between 1 Cor 7:11 and Luke 16:18. As a whole, Matthew's version shares more agreements with the Pauline one, when compared to Mark, Luke and Q.

5.3 The right to maintenance: 1 Cor 9:14 and Matt 10:10b // Luke 10:7b

5.3.1 The context of the saying about the right to maintenance

This reference to a saying of Jesus by Paul too "is very widely recognized by scholars".⁶³ The tradition indicator at the beginning of 1 Cor 9:14 (οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν) gives a clear indication that Paul is quoting a saying of Jesus. After the introduction to the verse, Paul says "those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel" (τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν). This Pauline verse stands in the third main part of 1 Corinthians, which includes the chapters 8:1 – 11:1. In chapter 8, Paul discussed what Christians are allowed to eat. This theme needed to be discussed because the

⁶³ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 192.

Corinthian Christians were not sure if they were allowed to eat meat sacrificed to idols.

In chapter 9, then, Paul defends his apostolate.⁶⁴ He financed his means of subsistence as far as he could with his own labour (cf. Acts 18:3)⁶⁵ and now he has to explain to the Corinthians why he has the right to be called an apostle, even if he does not use the right of an apostle to be subsidised.⁶⁶ Paul defends his practice in 1 Cor 9:1–13 by directing 16 questions to the congregation.⁶⁷ V. 14 closes off the line of argument with a word of the Lord⁶⁸ that Paul, again, does not quote verbatim, but only references.⁶⁹

Similar texts to 1 Cor 9:14 are found in the synoptic gospels as part of their respective missionary discourses, that is, in speeches of Jesus to the disciples before he sent them out to proclaim his message⁷⁰ (Matt 9:36–10:15; Mark 6:7–13; Luke 9:1–6; 10:1–12).⁷¹ The disciples are ordered not to take anything

⁶⁴ Cf. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. Vol. 2, 279, 283.

⁶⁵ Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7, 16th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (1986), 338.

⁶⁶ Cf. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. Vol. 2, 286, 295.

⁶⁷ Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus*, 187.

⁶⁸ Cf. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Vol. 2, 286.

⁶⁹ Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus*, 195. That Paul did not quote the words of Jesus verbatim is to be expected. To quote sayings of Jesus with “a relative freedom in wording” was common until “the first half of the second century, before Justin”. Furthermore, “as a rule the first Christians often quoted from memory” (Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 27).

⁷⁰ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 284–5, highlights that with the sending out “Jesus expected his disciples to transmit his teaching to others”. He regards this as the beginning of the formal transmission of the teachings of Jesus. The transmission of the sayings of Jesus therefore may already have started during Jesus’ earthly ministry.

⁷¹ Luke informs us of two different occasions apostles were sent out. In Luke 9, Jesus sends out the twelve, and in Luke 10, 72 others were sent out. Matthew and Mark only report on the sending out of the twelve.

valuable with them when they go on their journeys. According to Matt 10:10 and Luke 10:7, they should eat and drink what is provided to them by the people willing to host them while they are on their travels. Consequently, they are allowed to be maintained by the people they are proclaiming the gospel to. Mark does not mention this allowance, but Paul in 1 Cor 9:14 refers to it.⁷² When one looks in the synoptics for a comparable text to 1 Cor 9:14, Luke 10:7b // Matt 10:10b are the only alternatives that come into consideration.⁷³

1 Cor 9:14	Matt 10:10b	Luke 10:7b
οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν.	ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ	ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ

Again, like it was the case with 1 Cor 7:10–11 and parallels, the above table shows that the synoptic texts are very similar, but that the verbal agreement between the synoptic verses and Paul is low. Luke’s “wages” (μισθός), Matthew’s

⁷² David Horrell, “‘The Lord Commanded... but I have not Used...’ Exegetical and Hermeneutical Reflections on 1 Cor 9.14–15”, *NTS* 43 (1997): 597, explains that “Paul’s practice was closer to Jewish custom, in which warnings are given against teaching Torah for personal gain”.

⁷³ Allison, “The Pauline Epistles”, 12, argued that “[L]ittle effort need to be expended to prove that Paul knew some version of the missionary discourse”. In contrast, Wolter, “Jesus bei Paulus”, 218–9, said: “Hätte Paulus sich für seine Feststellung nicht ausdrücklich auf Jesus berufen, wäre niemand auf die Idee gekommen, hier eine Aufnahme des in Lk 10,7 par. Matt 10,10b überlieferten Logions zu vermuten”.

“food” (τροφή),⁷⁴ or the “worker” referred to by both, are not found in 1 Cor 9:14.⁷⁵ One might substitute the synoptic “worker” with the Pauline phrase “those who proclaim the gospel” (τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν), having the same meaning. It has been argued that Paul would have been wary of using the term “worker” because he used it elsewhere in a negative sense: he otherwise refers to “evil” (Phil 3:2) and “deceitful” (2 Cor 11:13) workers.⁷⁶ Likewise, it could be argued that one could replace “their living” used by Paul with “wage” or “food”. In this sense, the meaning of the passages is the same, but the wording is different.⁷⁷ Again, the lack of verbal agreement makes it hard to assume a closer relationship between these passages, although the similarity in meaning is striking.

The saying of Jesus that a worker is due his worth has been transmitted in later texts as well. The Matthean version is repeated in Did 13:2, where – like in Matt 10:7b – τροφή is preferred to μισθός. Luke’s “the labourer deserves his wages” (ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ), in turn, is found in 1 Tim 5:18 as

⁷⁴ Scaer, *Discourses in Matthew*, 279: “Matthew’s use of the word *food* instead of *wage* corresponds with the admonition in the Sermon on the Mount that Jesus’ disciples are not to be concerned about food (6:25)” (his italics).

⁷⁵ Zimmermann, *Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?*, 96.

⁷⁶ While Paul used ἐργάτης only in 2 Cor 11:13 and Phil 3:2, it is used more often by Matthew (9:37, 38; 10:10; 20:1, 2, 8) and Luke (10:2 (2x); 10:10; Acts 19:25); cf. Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 49.

⁷⁷ Lindemann, *Die Funktion der Herrenworte*, 687, argued that when Paul cites the words of the Lord in his first letter to the Corinthians, he does something similar to Matthew and Luke when they change the wording of their source, Mark. Like Matthew and Luke, Paul adapted logia to suit his circumstances.

well.⁷⁸ Both use the word μισθός. This shows us that we are dealing with a well-known Christian saying.

5.3.2 Arguments for Luke being the closest parallel

The first explicit reference in 1 Cor 7:10 in itself does not provide enough evidence to link the Pauline verse to a particular gospel, and the same applies to 1 Cor 9:14. Even though 1 Cor 9:14 and its synoptic parallels contain similar thoughts, little agreement in wording is present. A look at the context is necessary once more. Yet again, other Pauline verses show agreements with the synoptic missionary discourses. One such verse is 1 Cor 9:4, which is similar to Luke 10:7a. Both verses talk about eating and drinking.⁷⁹

1 Cor 9:4	Luke 10:7a
μη οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν;	ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν.

In Luke 10:7a, the disciples are given the right to “eat and drink” what their hosts provide while they proclaim the gospel on their missionary journeys. Similarly, in 1 Cor 9:4, Paul refers to his right to “eat and drink”.⁸⁰ He continues his argument

⁷⁸ Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 195, n. 181.

⁷⁹ Zimmermann, “Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?“, 96.

⁸⁰ The combination of the words “eat” and “drink” is found in 32 verses in the New Testament. It is used most often by Luke (in 14 verses (12 in the gospel, 2 in Acts), then by Paul, who used it in 11 verses. Otherwise, it is found six times in Matthew’s gospel and once in John’s.

in v. 5–6, where he compares his rights as an apostle to that of the twelve. Paul claims that he and Barnabas have the same privilege of refraining from working for a living as the disciples. They were sent out with the same authority as the twelve. According to the synoptics, Jesus had sent out his disciples with “authority” (Matt 10:1 // Mark 6:7 // Luke 9:1). Paul takes up the “question of authority” in v. 4, 5, 6, 12, 18,⁸¹ claiming that he and Barnabas also have the authority of the Lord, including the right to be nourished by their proclamation of the gospel. Wenham, therefore, draws the conclusion that “the conjunction of ideas in the two contexts can hardly be coincidental”.⁸²

Furthermore, the word “work” stands in Luke 10:7 (ἐργάτης) and 1 Cor 9:6 (ἐργάζομαι), connecting the verses. Here, Paul makes it clear through a rhetorical question that he and Barnabas had the right “to refrain from working for a living” (ἢ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρναβᾶς οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι;). Paul repeats his right to be sustained by his preaching of the gospel in 1 Cor 9:18, using the same verb (μισθός) as Luke in 10:7. Paul thus agrees that he is allowed to receive wages for his work as preacher, although he does not make full use of it. Both the main words of Luke 10:7b (μισθός and ἐργάτης) are used by Paul in 1 Cor 9, connecting the passages.

There are even more connections between the missionary discourse in Luke 10 and 1 Corinthians when one moves on to chapter 10 of Paul’s epistle. In 1 Cor 10:23–33, the subject is “meat sacrificed to idols”.⁸³ In v. 27 Paul writes: “If

⁸¹ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 195.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 193.

⁸³ Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia of Jesus”, 89.

some unbeliever invites you to a meal and you want to go, *eat whatever is put before you*” (see table below). According to Luke, Jesus used similar words when he sent out the 72 (70) disciples. Luke 10:8 reports: “When you enter a town and are welcomed, *eat what is set before you*” (see table below). This is “almost a verbatim parallel”.⁸⁴ This piece of information is missing in the missionary speeches of Matt 10 and Mark 6.

1 Cor 10:27	Luke 10:8
εἴ τις καλεῖ ὑμᾶς τῶν ἀπίστων καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι, πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἔσθίετε μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.	καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἔσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν

The verb παρατίθημι occurs 19 times in the New Testament and is used by Paul here only (Luke uses it 5 times, Mark 4 times, and Matthew twice). Furthermore, in the New Testament, the verb is used in conjunction with “eating” (ἔσθίω) only in 1 Cor 10:27 and Luke 10:8. The linguistic affinity between the two verses to each other is obvious.⁸⁵

Wenham shows a further parallel between a Pauline letter and Luke’s missionary discourse.⁸⁶ In 1 Thess 4:8, “Paul speaks of the authority of his teaching in a way that is verbally and grammatically quite similar to the conclusion

⁸⁴ Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 46–7.

⁸⁵ Cf. Tuckett, “1 Corinthians and Q”, 612; Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 380.

⁸⁶ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 196.

of the mission discourse in Luke 10:16. Both verses use the formulation ὁ ἀθετῶν ... ἀθετεῖ, which in the New Testament is used on only these two occasions.⁸⁷

The likeness of the formulation is noteworthy. However, it does not help to support a connection between 1 Cor 9 and Luke 10.⁸⁸

Luke 10:16	1 Thess 4:8
ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ	ὁ ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ

There is much evidence for assuming that Paul knew a version of the missionary discourse similar to the one later written down by Luke. In the whole argument of 1 Cor 9:1–14, elements of Luke’s missionary discourse are reflected. There are numerous verbal agreements and many of the agreeing words are used seldomly by Paul, indicating that he was incorporating traditional material. Paul’s argument in this chapter would not be understandable to the Corinthians if they did not know a form of the missionary discourse, including the right of an apostle to live by the proclamation of the gospel.

To conclude: In the first verses of 1 Cor 9 Paul defends his apostleship, claiming that he, too, is an apostle of Jesus. He has the same rights as Peter and the other apostles, including the right to refrain from working for a living. Paul did not always make use of this privilege. He had to explain to the Corinthians why he really was an apostle like the others, authorized by the Lord to proclaim the gospel, if he did not make use of his right to be maintained by the congregation.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, n. 80.

⁸⁸ Fjärstedt, *Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians*, 74, found many more clusters of similar words in 1 Cor 9 and Luke 10, but there is nothing extraordinary or unusual about the way the respective authors use these words.

Therefore, one has to assume that the Corinthians knew the saying of Jesus on this matter. If they did not know of this right, Paul would not have needed to defend his non-adherence to the allowance of Jesus.

Paul uses more elements found in the missionary discourse of Luke, as illustrated above. Although the explicit reference in 1 Cor 9:14 does not share substantial verbal agreements with the synoptics in itself, the validity of the parallel is affirmed by the other meaningful words and phrases shared by Paul and Luke in the same context.

5.3.3 Arguments for Matthew being the closest parallel

Matthew's version of the missionary discourse shows fewer verbal agreements with Paul's assertions on the matter than Luke's. While Paul and Luke share words and phrases in the same context in various verses, only one more possible connection can be established between Matthew's missionary discourse and similar statements made by Paul. Matthew 10:8 matches 2 Cor 11:7b. Here, Paul writes that he is "preaching (εὐαγγελίζειν) the gospel of God to you free of charge (δωρεάν)". Matthew 10:8 contains a similar thought: "Freely you have received, freely give" (δωρεάν ἐλάβετε, δωρεάν δότε).⁸⁹ Both verses are reminiscent of 1 Cor 9:14.⁹⁰ The adverb δωρεάν is seldom used in the New Testament. In the

⁸⁹ Cf. Christian Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 8 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1987), 219–20.

⁹⁰ Cf. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 338.

synoptics, it is only used by Matthew and only in this verse, where it occurs twice. Paul uses it in Rom 3:24; 2 Cor 11:7; Gal 2:21 and 2 Thess 3:8. In this case, it is difficult to draw a direct line between Matthew's and Paul's use of δωρεάν. Paul used the word more often than Matthew, making it unlikely that Paul was influenced by traditional material. Both passages use δωρεάν in the context of the proclamation of the gospel, but the agreement in wording is small.

As a whole, the evidence is overwhelming for a connection between Paul and Luke's missionary discourse, and not Matthew's. Matthew omits the points of similarity between Paul and Luke.

5.3.4 Conclusion

In 1 Cor 9:14, Paul uses a word of the Lord to explain why he should be regarded as an apostle, even if he did not fully comply with the instruction of the Lord to live from proclaiming the gospel. He defends his way of dealing with the Lord's command in this chapter. This implies that the Corinthians were familiar with the word of the Lord, as they challenged Paul's interpretation thereof.⁹¹ They might have known of other apostles who did adhere to the Lord's instruction.⁹² If there were not traditions about this issue available to the Corinthian congregation, Paul would not have needed to justify his non-adherence. This observation

⁹¹ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 200.

⁹² Horrell, "The Lord Commanded", 596.

strengthens the case for assuming that words of Jesus were transmitted to new congregations.

Paul acknowledged the validity of the Lord's saying, but justified his position.⁹³ He did not want to hinder the proclamation of the gospel, as he writes in 1 Cor 9:12.⁹⁴ The word of the Lord is, according to the apostle, a privilege and not a command. Paul could have chosen to make use of the privilege, but he chose not to, for the sake of the gospel.⁹⁵ 2 Corinthians 11:8–9 and Phil 4:15 show that Paul principally had no difficulties in being nourished from his proclamation of the gospel. In certain circumstances, however, he argued it was better not to make use of this right (cf. 1 Cor 9:12).

This train of thought is underlined by the context of 1 Cor 9:14. In the surrounding debate about food offered to idols in chapters 8 and 10, Paul uses himself as an example of someone who relinquishes his right to eat such meat out of consideration of those who are weak in faith. "He is an example of someone who has restricted his own freedom and rights for the sake of the gospel".⁹⁶ In the same way, Paul gave up his right to be supported by the congregation, because it was to their benefit. In any case, Paul would not have wanted to represent an example of someone who did not comply with the word of the Lord. He tried to

⁹³ Cf. Taylor, "Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest", 115; Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 191.

⁹⁴ Gerhard Dautzenberg, "Der Verzicht auf das apostolische Unterhaltsrecht. Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu 1 Kor 9", *Bib* 50 (1969): 219.

⁹⁵ Cf. Wolfgang Harnisch, "Der paulinische Lohn (1 Kor 9,1–23)", *ZTK* 104 (2007): 35–7.

⁹⁶ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 191; cf. Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 47; Horrell, "The Lord Commanded", 591–2.

show that he interpreted the word of the Lord in the same way as it was delivered to the Corinthians.

Considering all this, the Lukan missionary discourse probably contains elements that are older than those of Mark and Matthew because of its closeness to Pauline material. It would, therefore, be incorrect to assume that the missionary discourses were written later to polemize against missionaries like Paul and Barnabas, who contributed to their own subsistence.⁹⁷ Much rather, the context indicates that the Corinthians already knew parts of a missionary discourse, and that is why Paul had to explain why he did not make use of his right to be maintained. This agrees with Wenham's conclusion: "Whatever the precise relationships of the different texts, the probability is that in the mission discourse we have a tradition that goes back very early".⁹⁸ It is possible that Paul and Luke came to know similar versions of the tradition, because of the age thereof.

The above discussion shows that Paul and Luke share the most agreements in thought and in wording when it comes to the word of the Lord on the right to maintenance in 1 Cor 9:14. This is interesting because Paul's prohibition of divorce in 1 Cor 7:10 is closer to Matthew's and is not even delivered by Luke. Mark, in turn, omits the saying about the labourer deserving his wages in his missionary discourse. In the first explicit reference, (1 Cor 7:10-11) Paul's statements are closer to Matthew, and to Luke in the second one (1 Cor 9:14). In both cases, however, the relevant verses are delivered by either Matthew or Luke

⁹⁷ Wong, *Evangelien im Dialog mit Paulus*, 173.

⁹⁸ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 166; cf. Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde*, 27.

and omitted by the other, so that the synoptic verses agreeing with Paul cannot be traced back to Q.

5.4 The Lord's Supper: 1 Cor 11:23b–25 // Matt 26:26–28 // Mark 14:22–24 // Luke 22:19–20

It has to be remembered that many scholars regard 1 Cor 7:10–11 and 9:14 as the only explicit references.⁹⁹ These two passages are seen as the *Minimum des Gesicherten* of the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters.¹⁰⁰ It has often been questioned whether Jesus spoke the words of 1 Cor 11:23b–25 at all, and whether Paul took over these verses from the actual Jesus tradition.¹⁰¹ This is mainly because Paul delivers these verses in isolation, and further elements of the passion tradition are lacking in 1 Corinthians.¹⁰² References to the passion are missing in Q as well, with the consequence being that these words are omitted in one of the oldest sources of sayings of Jesus.

1 Corinthians 11:23b–25 is, rather, believed to be a *Kultätologie*¹⁰³ that cannot be traced back to the earthly Jesus. Schmithals calls these verses

⁹⁹ Neiryneck, "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus", 277.

¹⁰⁰ Zimmermann, "Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation?", 85.

¹⁰¹ Kuhn, "Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus", 296.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 308–9.

¹⁰³ Otfried Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1 Kor 11:23b–25", *ZTK* 85 (1988): 371, defines a *Kultätologie* as a text that constituted and standardized a liturgical custom of the first congregations (cf. Jens Schröter, *Das Abendmahl: Frühchristliche Deutungen und Impulse für die Gegenwart*, SBS 210 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2006), 123.

*hellenistische Bildung*¹⁰⁴ and Maccoby even alleges that Paul derived the Eucharist from Hellenistic religion and that he himself was the originator of the Eucharist words.¹⁰⁵ According to these arguments, Paul cannot be repeating a saying of Jesus in these verses, as the latter did not utter them. Instead, the words arose from the liturgical worship of the early church.¹⁰⁶

Others point out that 1 Cor 11:23a starts with an introductory formula, containing the words παραλαμβάνω and παραδίδωμι. It is common in Jewish and Hellenistic language to use these verbs to indicate that a traditional piece is handed down.¹⁰⁷ Hofius points to similarities with 1 Cor 15:3, where the same two verbs are used (cf. 1 Cor 11:2).¹⁰⁸ The Gentile readers of Paul's letters would have been familiar with these tradition indicators because they were frequently used "in the Hellenistic schools".¹⁰⁹ In addition to the tradition indicators in the introduction, the linguistic peculiarities of v. 23b–25 support the observation that Paul reproduced these verses verbatim. Hofius stated with conviction that it has not been proven that Paul changed the wording of the text.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ Schmithals, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, 147.

¹⁰⁵ Hyam Maccoby, *Paul and Hellenism* (London: SCM; Philadelphia, PA: Trinity, 1991), 126–7.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 364, n. 75.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 253.

¹⁰⁸ Hofius, "Herrenmahl", 371; cf. Ellis, "Traditions in 1 Corinthians", 481.

¹⁰⁹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 264.

¹¹⁰ Hofius, "Herrenmahl", 372.

Dunn argues in a similar line, saying that “the tradition of the institution of the Lord’s Supper is already part of the passion”.¹¹¹ Therefore, it could have been repeated without the passion narrative itself, as the Corinthians already knew the passion narrative. This observation is supported by 1 Cor 15:3, which shows that Paul had knowledge of the burial of Jesus, that is, of another part of the passion narrative.¹¹² Allison adds that the “ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο clearly reveals an awareness of the circumstances surrounding the Last Supper”.¹¹³ The fact that Paul delivers the words of Jesus isolated from the passion narrative is therefore no reason to assume a later origin of these words. The main events of the passion narrative are assumed to be known,¹¹⁴ otherwise, the words of Jesus quoted by Paul would be without context and could not be understood.¹¹⁵

Bauckham challenged the notion that 1 Cor 11:23b–25 is a liturgical text recited at the Eucharist, or *Kultätologie*. In his opinion, “Paul cites the Jesus tradition, not a liturgical text, and so he provides perhaps our earliest evidence of narratives about Jesus transmitted in a way that involved, while not wholly verbatim reproduction, certainly a considerable degree of precise memorization”.¹¹⁶ Wessels argued similarly: “Even if Paul knew what happened

¹¹¹ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 183.

¹¹² Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 365.

¹¹³ Allison, “The Pauline Epistles”, 16.

¹¹⁴ Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 264–5.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 254.

¹¹⁶ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 267-8.

at the last supper from liturgical tradition, it means he knew basically what happened”.¹¹⁷ Hengel furthermore pointed out that “the four Gospels were primarily written for liturgical reading and not so much for private interests or for the theological reading of individual prominent theological teachers”.¹¹⁸ The gospels, therefore, are liturgical texts. Even if the words of institution are liturgical, this does not automatically disqualify them from being historical.¹¹⁹ Likewise, Wolff argued that the tradition of celebrating the Lord’s supper by the early Christian congregations can best be explained as reception and continuation of Jesus’ last supper with his disciples.¹²⁰ Additionally, Hengel and Schwemer think that because the accounts of Mark 14:22–25 and 1 Cor 11:23–26 agree in the crucial points, they presuppose the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in the first congregation.¹²¹ Bauckham goes as far as to state that the tradition of the words of institution is the safest reference to Jesus tradition by Paul.¹²² As a result, “[T]here is no reason to doubt that theologically and cultically significant words and acts of the historical Jesus lie behind the texts”.¹²³

¹¹⁷ Wessels, “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul”, 33.

¹¹⁸ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 116.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Wessels, “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul”, 33.

¹²⁰ Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 270; cf. Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, WBC 34b (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 389.

¹²¹ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 437.

¹²² Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 265.

¹²³ Taylor, “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, 109. It is, therefore, an exaggeration when Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 266, n. 3, alleges: “Dass es sich bei den zitierten Einsetzungsworten nicht um authentische Jesustradition handelt, darüber besteht in der Forschung ein weitreichender Konsens”.

Even if it were not the case that 1 Cor 11:23b–25 could be traced back to the earthly Jesus, this passage is still helpful in determining the relationship between Jesus traditions in Paul’s letters and the synoptics. These verses have clear parallels in the synoptics and, because the tradition of these verses is older than both the Pauline and synoptic texts, Paul and the synoptic authors could have used the same or a similar tradition.

5.4.1 The context of the words of institution

The words instituting the Lord’s Supper are found four times in the New Testament.¹²⁴ In the synoptics, they are handed down in the context of Jesus’ last supper with his disciples as part of the passion narrative. In 1 Corinthians they form part of Paul’s criticism against the way the Corinthians met for table fellowship (1 Cor 11:17–34).¹²⁵ Divisions within the congregation, caused by social differences, characterized the worship service in the Corinthian congregation. The rich people in the congregation would eat their meal before the poor were able to be present. By the time the poor had finished working and were able to attend, only remnants of the meal were left over for them. Paul admonished the Corinthians because they made a real celebration of the Lord’s

¹²⁴ The so-called words of institution of the Lord’s Supper have been investigated thoroughly on numerous occasions. Therefore, only those aspects that will help determine the relationship between the Pauline and synoptic texts will be reproduced here.

¹²⁵ Cf. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 248–9.

Supper impossible by their behaviour.¹²⁶ By recalling the words of institution, he explained why such a practice was wrong.¹²⁷

As with the other texts, a comparison of Paul's version with the synoptic parallels gives valuable insight into the understanding of the text. In Luke, the longer version is assumed original.¹²⁸ All texts have in common that they want to be understood as Jesus' words that were been spoken at a meal.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Cf. Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 365; Hofius, "Herrenmahl", 374; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Vol. 3*, 23–7; Peter Lampe, "Das korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistisch-römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11, 17–34)", *ZNW* 82 (1991): 183–213. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, offers a different interpretation. He does not think that the Corinthians took along their own food and ate it at the meetings for worship. This cannot be deduced from the wording of the text, in his opinion. The problem that caused the division in the congregation was, rather, that the Corinthians ate at home and the meal was not taken in the community. The rich did not share with the poor at all, and so real fellowship was not possible.

¹²⁷ Cf. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 257–8, 262.

¹²⁸ Gerd Theißen and Annette Merz, *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 368, n. 9. John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, WBC 35c (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1993), 1041, thinks that v. 21–23 comes from a tradition Luke shared with John. He also states that it is broadly accepted that Luke 22:19b–20 is "an authentic part of the Lukan text". I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 800, lists the reasons for favouring the longer text as the more original one.

¹²⁹ Cf. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 256.



1 Cor 11:23b–25	Luke 22:19–20	Mark 14:22–24	Matt 26:26–28
<p>ὁ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἧ παρεδίδοτο <u>ἔλαβεν ἄρτον</u> 24 καὶ εὐχαριστήσας <u>ἔκλασεν</u> καὶ εἶπεν·</p> <p><u>τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν·</u></p> <p><i>τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.</i></p> <p>25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ <u>ποτήριον</u> μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι <u>λέγων·</u></p> <p><u>τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι·</u></p> <p><i>τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσαύτως ἐὰν πίνετε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.</i></p>	<p>19 καὶ <u>λαβὼν ἄρτον</u> εὐχαριστήσας <u>ἔκλασεν</u> καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων·</p> <p><u>τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</u> διδόμενον·</p> <p><i>τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.</i></p> <p>20 καὶ τὸ <u>ποτήριον</u> ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, <u>λέγων·</u></p> <p><u>τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</u> ἐκχυννόμενον·</p>	<p>22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν <u>λαβὼν ἄρτον</u> εὐλογήσας <u>ἔκλασεν</u> καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν·</p> <p><i>λάβετε,</i></p> <p><u>τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου·</u></p> <p>23 καὶ λαβὼν <u>ποτήριον</u> εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.</p> <p>24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·</p> <p><u>τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν·</u></p>	<p>26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν <u>λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον</u> καὶ εὐλογήσας <u>ἔκλασεν</u> καὶ δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν·</p> <p><i>λάβετε φάγετε,</i></p> <p><u>τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου·</u></p> <p>27 καὶ λαβὼν <u>ποτήριον</u> καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς <u>λέγων·</u></p> <p>πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,</p> <p>28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν <u>ἐκχυννόμενον</u> εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.</p>

Based on this comparison, the following can be stated:

On the one hand, it is obvious that the Lord's words in Matthew and Mark are very similar, and on the other hand, that Luke and Paul have much in common. The following observations support this statement:

- At the thanksgiving of Jesus, while breaking the bread, Matthew and Mark write εὐλογέω, but Paul and Luke use εὐχαριστέω. At the thanksgiving in connection with the cup after the supper, Matthew and Mark have εὐχαριστέω; Paul and Luke in turn use ὡσαύτως.
- Only in Paul and Luke do we find the prompt: “Do this in remembrance of me” (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). By repeating this command, both texts have a liturgical function.¹³⁰
- In Paul and Luke the cup (ποτήριον) is mentioned twice, but only once in Matthew and Mark.
- Furthermore, only Paul and Luke report that the Lord said that his body is given *for you* (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). In Matthew and Mark, the blood of Jesus is shed “for many”, echoing Isa 53:11–12.¹³¹
- According to Paul and Luke, Jesus talked about a new covenant (καινὴ διαθήκη). The adjective “new” is missing in Matthew and Mark. Luke and Paul allude to Jer 31:31–34, which also reports of a *new* covenant. The Mark and Matthew texts remind of the blood of the covenant of Ex 24:8.¹³²

¹³⁰ Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 257. This does not imply that the command is necessarily secondary. Mark could have omitted it (cf. Evans, *Mark*, 390; different Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 804).

¹³¹ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 146.

¹³² Scaer, *Discourses in Matthew*, 198–9.

– All three synoptic texts have one thing in common against Paul: they all mention that the blood was shed (ἐκχύνω). This additional piece of information is missing in Paul’s version.

5.4.2 The oldest form of the words of institution: Some considerations

In the first two explicit references of 1 Cor (7:10–11; 9:14) there is little agreement in wording with the synoptic parallels. Consequently, reasons had to be listed to assume that Paul was indeed citing a word of the Lord in these passages, even when explicitly indicating that he was doing so. In the quote of a saying of Jesus in 1 Cor 11:23b–25, Paul again starts with an introductory formula: “For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you” (Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν). In the quote itself that follows thereafter, many verbal agreements exist with the synoptic parallels. It is therefore rarely doubted that Paul is quoting in this instance and it does not need to be proven. It still must be asked, however, whether Paul is quoting older material or if he was the first person to have written down the words instituting the Lord’s Supper. Only when this question is answered, can statements about the direction of dependency of the texts be made.

The question of which of the four New Testament versions of the *verba testamenti* is the oldest, as well as the relationship between the Pauline version and the synoptic texts, is fiercely debated. In the comparison of the four parallel texts, consensus seems to be found only in the fact that the different versions of the words of institution have a common origin. It is regarded as highly unlikely

that the different versions originated from isolated sources because they are so close.¹³³ This does not mean, however, that the wording had been fixed.¹³⁴

When looking at the different texts as a whole, it is believed that Matthew has taken over the Markan text, as he usually does. When it comes to the Pauline/Lukan version, the Pauline one was written down earlier. According to this line of argument, either Mark or Paul could represent the oldest version of the text.¹³⁵

5.4.3 Arguments for Mark as oldest version

The debate over the primary version of the words of institution has largely revolved around the question of whether or not a Hebrew or Aramaic *Urform* existed.¹³⁶ In this debate, it has been argued that a *Urform* of Mark's, and not Paul's, text existed, as Paul's version – especially the bread word τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν – cannot be translated back into Hebrew or Aramaic, and must therefore have been formulated in a Greek-speaking community. The possessive pronoun of the bread word has been adapted to conform to the Greek

¹³³ Cf. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 258.

¹³⁴ Schröter, *Das Abendmahl*, 125.

¹³⁵ Every single element of the words instituting the Lord's Supper has been compared to its parallels in an attempt to find out which aspects are more original in the respective renditions (cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 1041–9). Little will be gained by analysing the material anew.

¹³⁶ Rudolf Pesch, "Das Evangelium in Jerusalem. Mk 14,12–26 als ältestes Überlieferungsgut der Urgemeinde", in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*, ed. P. Stuhmacher, WUNT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 113-155.

language.¹³⁷ The version in Mark is considered generally more Semitic and therefore older.¹³⁸ Some scholars have used the Semitisms of Mark and the apparent Greek features of the Pauline and Lukan versions to argue that the origin of the latter tradition is found in the Hellenistic congregation of Antioch.¹³⁹ The version delivered in 1 Corinthians, therefore, could be seen as a Hellenized version of the *verba testamenti*¹⁴⁰ and the version in Mark 14 as the “Jewish–Christian” version of the words of institution.¹⁴¹ Similarly, Hengel and Schwemer argue that the Markan version goes back to the Petrine tradition, the Lukan version to the Pauline tradition.¹⁴²

Another reason why Mark could offer the oldest version of the words instituting the Lord’s Supper is that he presented the words in a narrative text as part of the passion story. The aetiology for ritual in 1 Cor 11:23–25 would have been derived from the Markan text, because it can be used autonomously or separately from the situation of Jesus’ Passover meal. The Pauline text could be rendered without context, because the context, as delivered by Mark, is presumed to be known.¹⁴³ Furthermore, a formation of Mark or Matthew from Paul

¹³⁷ Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 266.

¹³⁸ Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 800.

¹³⁹ Cf. Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 369; Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 257, and Otfried, Hofius, “τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 1Kor 11,24”, *ZNW* 80 (1989): 87.

¹⁴⁰ Hofius, “τὸ σῶμα”, 80.

¹⁴¹ Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde*, 108–9.

¹⁴² Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 436, n. 1788.

¹⁴³ Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium. II. Teil. Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20*, HTKNT II/2 (Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 369–76.

is hard to imagine, because the deletion of some parts cannot be explained, e.g. the omission of the word “new” and the repetition command.¹⁴⁴

5.4.4 Arguments for Paul as oldest version

Others assume that Paul’s version is older. Lührmann thinks that the *Sitz im Leben* of the text is located outside of the passion narrative – in the early worship services – before the passion narrative was written down.¹⁴⁵ This would mean that the Pauline text is older and not dependent on the passion narrative. In his essay *τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 1 Cor 11:24*, Hofius argued convincingly against the opinion of Pesch and others that the Pauline/Lukan “bread word” can be translated back into Hebrew as well as into Aramaic.¹⁴⁶ This argument cannot be used as evidence of the older age Mark’s version. For the older age of Paul or Luke, Hofius argued that the cup word and the bread word are not formulated parallel in these versions, as they are in Mark and Matthew. The parallel structure in Mark and Matthew is likely to be younger.¹⁴⁷ Furthermore, the command to drink the cup that symbolizes the blood of Jesus would be difficult to reconcile

¹⁴⁴ Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 268–9.

¹⁴⁵ Dieter Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, HNT 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 235.

¹⁴⁶ Hofius, “τὸ σῶμα”, 80–8.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 68; Lampe, “Das korinthische Herrenmahl”, 207.

with the Jewish prohibition of drinking blood and could be used as argument for the priority of Paul and Luke.¹⁴⁸

5.4.5 Conclusion

The relationship between the words of institution in 1 Corinthians and those in the synoptics is important for this study. The comparison of the texts has shown that Paul and Luke are very similar. Matthew and Mark, on the other hand, share striking similarities. Yet, the four conveyed versions of the words instituting the Lord's Supper are not identical. Their relationship to one another remains difficult to explain, as is whether Mark or Paul holds the oldest version. The problem has not been solved in a satisfactory manner. It is sometimes proposed that Luke knew both the version of Mark and the one testified by Paul, and that he combined the two.¹⁴⁹ Against this assumption, it has been argued that Luke did not adopt Paul's redactional changes, making a direct dependency unlikely.¹⁵⁰ Bauckham concludes that "only strict memorized oral tradition (memorized in Greek) can explain the high degree of verbal resemblance".¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸ Schröter, *Das Abendmahl*, 128.

¹⁴⁹ Theißen and Merz, *Der historische Jesus*, 367.

¹⁵⁰ This proposal cannot explain, either, the minor agreements between Matthew and Luke. Consequently, it has been considered whether Luke could be a combination of the versions of Paul and Matthew. This solution bridges the problem of the minor agreements (cf. Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 702), but since Matthew is dependent on Mark according to the two-source hypothesis, this solution does not satisfy, either.

¹⁵¹ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 281–2.

Schröter argues that various versions of the words of institution existed from the beginning. The different versions are conditioned by their respective contexts.¹⁵² Paul probably knew different interpretations of the early Christian meal and used them in his argumentation.¹⁵³ Ultimately, one can only assume that both in Mark or Matthew and in Paul or Luke, respectively older and younger elements of the words of institution can be found,¹⁵⁴ and that it is not possible to reproduce the original version of the text.¹⁵⁵ For the purpose of this study, the observation that Paul and Luke had access to a similar tradition is the crucial point.

When we compare this third quote of Paul to his other two explicit quotations of words of the Lord, it shows that 1 Cor 7:10 is similar to texts from Matthew and Mark, and that 1 Cor 9:14 corresponds to verses from Luke and Matthew. Luke does not deliver the prohibition of divorce, while Mark does not address the right to maintenance in his missionary discourse. All three synoptic gospels contain the words of institution. While 1 Cor 7:10–11 agrees more with the Matthean version, 1 Cor 9:14 is closer to the Lukan version. When compared to 1 Cor 11:23b–25, Luke is, again, the synoptic author that reproduces the most similar tradition to the one delivered by Paul.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² Schröter, *Das Abendmahl*, 125–7.

¹⁵³ Jens Schröter, “Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferung im 1. Korintherbrief. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der ‘Einsetzungsworte’ in frühchristlichen Mahltexten”, *ZNW* 100 (2009): 86.

¹⁵⁴ Gnilka, *Wie das Christentum entstand*, 241.

¹⁵⁵ Hans Conzelmann, “Current Problems in Pauline Research”, in *New Testament Issues*, ed. R. Batey (London: SCM, 1981), 245; Hofius, “Das Herrenmahl”, 372.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 258.

Paul's use of the sayings of Jesus in the three explicit references do not allow one to define a clear relationship between Paul and a particular synoptic gospel or Q. Twice, the Lukan text is closer to the Pauline version, once Matthew's is. In none of the cases is Paul's tradition closest to Mark. In the next step, it will be considered whether the implicit references show a similar tendency.

Finally, Paul's three explicit references tell us why he quoted words of the Lord. On each occasion, he took it for granted that the Corinthians knew the respective sayings of Jesus, but it was unclear how they were to be interpreted by the Corinthians in their specific circumstances.¹⁵⁷ In 1 Cor 7:10–11, Paul needed to interpret the prohibition of divorce. A specific case of divorce in the congregation arose and Paul needed to apply the word of the Lord to that situation.¹⁵⁸ In 1 Cor 9:14, Paul took up a word of the Lord from a missionary discourse. He had to justify his conduct because he was accused of not following the command of the Lord. The Corinthians knew about the right to maintenance and challenged the way Paul dealt with it. The words of 1 Cor 11:23b–25 are also used within a hortatory section. The Corinthians again knew the words of institution and Paul had to remind them of the correct interpretation thereof and its practical consequences. Paul thus quoted words of the Lord when the Corinthians were either unsure of their correct understanding of them or when

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Wong, "The De-radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in 1 Corinthians", 187: "So this Jesustradition was not detailed or specific enough to solve all the problems the Corinthians Christians faced".

¹⁵⁸ Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Vol. 2*, 92.

they had interpreted them differently. Whether this also applies to the implicit references will have to be seen.

Paul's explicit quotes of sayings of Jesus supports the assumption that he knew Jesus traditions and handed them on during his initial preaching when he founded new congregations. One can therefore safely assume that Paul knew more words of the Lord. Therefore, the search for allusions in his letters is legitimate.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Riesner, "Jesus, Paulus, und wir", 8.

Main Part 2: Implicit references

Chapter 6:

Synoptic parallels in Paul's letter to the Romans

Together with the explicit references in 1 Corinthians, the implicit references to sayings of Jesus in Rom 12:14–21 and 14:14 are often used to argue for Paul's knowledge of a large part of the Jesus tradition.¹ In Rom 12:14–21, Paul writes about loving the enemy and about non-retaliation. These instructions are regarded core parts of Jesus' earthly teaching and the Pauline verses share similarities with Jesus' statements in the Sermon on the Mount or Plain. Since Paul renders the oldest written version of these words and they are found in the synoptics, they are often attributed to the historical Jesus.² The same applies to Rom 14:14, where Paul argues that noting is unclean. Similar sentiments, which are attributed to Jesus as well, are delivered in Mark 7:15 and Matt 15:11.

All these possible echoes in Romans are located within chapters 12:1 – 15:13, the last major part of the corpus of the letter.³ This part of Romans is a paraclesis,⁴ in which Paul describes the influence of the message of the gospel

¹ Paul does not explicitly quote any sayings of Jesus in his letter to the Romans.

² Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 48.

³ Klaus Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, THKNT 6, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006), 282.

⁴ Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, EKK VI, Studienausgabe (Mannheim: Patmos; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 1.

on the lives of believers.⁵ That Paul includes the Lord's words in this section of Romans – without explicitly labelling them as such – is so obvious for Lohse that he emphasizes it in the introduction to these chapters in his commentary on Romans.⁶

The letter to the Romans is different from Paul's other letters insofar as Paul was writing to a congregation he did not found. He did not teach the members of the Roman congregation himself, and he was not a tradent of the Jesus tradition there.⁷ Paul, however, wrote to this congregation with the certainty that its members were familiar with the Christian doctrine.⁸ Again, as there was a Christian congregation in Rome, the people needed to have some kind of knowledge about Jesus in order for them to have joined the new congregation.⁹ It remains impossible, however, to be certain which Jesus traditions were known to the congregation.

⁵ Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 332.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 344. According to Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 250, as well, these chapters "are particularly important [...] for the question of Jesus and Paul", because of Paul's frequent references to sayings of Jesus.

⁷ Romans was likely written in Corinth in the spring of 56 CE (Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 129).

⁸ Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 59.

⁹ Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer. Teilband 1: Röm 1-8*, EKK VI/1 (Mannheim: Patmos; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2014), 39, points out that during the reign of Nero (54-68), the Christians would have been perceived as a group separate from the Jews in Rome, as Nero only persecuted the Christians. The Jesus tradition must have been delivered to Rome before then. As in other cities, the message about Jesus would have been told in the synagogues, and would have been received first by the God-fearing Gentiles. Stuhlmacher, "Jesu-tradition im Römerbrief?", 246, accepts a foundation of the church in Rome by Antiochian messengers and therefore anticipates that the Christians in Rome were familiar with the Antiochian tradition and faith of Jesus, which Paul also knew from his stay in Antioch. In the same line Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 128, argues: "Probably the Roman community also had a collection (or several collections) of sayings of the Lord with a catechetical orientation in its book cupboard".

6.1 Overcoming evil with good: Romans 12:14–21

It is often assumed that a collection of sayings of Jesus lies behind Romans 12:14–21 because the themes discussed in this Pauline passage are similar to those in the synoptics. Rom 12:14–21; Matt 5:38–48; 7:1–2 and Luke 6:27–38 all contain a command of non-retaliation, an instruction to leave the judging to God, as well as a demand for good conduct towards the enemy. The combination of these themes and the similar structure of the three passages is often used to presuppose a pre-synoptic, early Christian collection of sayings, which can be traced back to Jesus.¹⁰

Jacobi has challenged the view that a collection of sayings of Jesus lies behind Rom 12:14–21. She has shown that the material in these Pauline verses is conventional and known in extra-Christian literature. This applies to Paul's commands in Rom 12:17: "Repay no one evil for evil" (μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες) and the similar statement in v. 21: "Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good" (μη νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν).¹¹ The same relates to Rom 12:19, where it is commanded to leave judging to God (cf. Matt 7:1–2). The criterion of dissimilarity excludes these verses as possible parallels to synoptic sayings of Jesus because the combination of

¹⁰ Cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 40–58.

¹¹ Cf. Kent L. Yinger, "Romans 12:14–21 and Nonretaliation in Second Temple Judaism: Addressing Persecution within the Community", *CBQ* 60/1 (1998): 74–96.

motives in Rom 12:14–21 is not an early Christian innovation, but known from New Testament surroundings.¹²

Moreover, the paraenetic material of Rom 12:17 is found in 1 Peter 3:9 and 1 Thess 5:15. The material in the epistles is the same, and shows more similarities within the epistles than with the synoptic parallels. The high degree of agreement in wording between Rom 12:17 and 1 Pet 3:19 (cf. 1 Thess 5:15) makes a common preliterate tradition of the texts of the epistles likely,¹³ and has to be differentiated from the tradition of the synoptics.¹⁴ Paul would have known a different line of tradition to that of the synoptics and, because of the difference in wording, it is unlikely that the tradition he cites is the same as that of the synoptics on these matters.¹⁵

Another of Jacobi's arguments against assuming that Paul knew and recited a collection of sayings of Jesus in Rom 12 is that Paul's instructions derive their authority not from sayings of Jesus, but from scripture.¹⁶ For example, whereas the word of the Lord in 1 Cor 9:14 is located at the end of the argument

¹² Gordon M. Zerbe, *Non-Retaliatio in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts. Ethical Themes in Social Contexts*, JSPSS 13 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993) has shown that the idea of non-retaliation was expressed in various ways in Jewish literature. John Piper, 'Love Your Enemies'. *Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis* (Cambridge: University Press, 1979), 64, adds that the command to not return evil with evil "occurs repeatedly in Joseph and Asenath [...] and was a common possession of Palestinian and Hellenistic paraenesis". Romans 12:21 resembles Test. Benj. 4:3 and can too be disregarded as a parallel (cf. Wolter, "Jesus bei Paulus", 222–3).

¹³ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 113, 115.

¹⁴ C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans, Vol. 2*, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1998), 645, assumes that the agreement in wording between the three epistle texts is due to "the fixed formulation of the catechetical tradition".

¹⁵ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 51–2.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 53.

as support and confirmation of the thesis that an apostle has the right to be maintained because of his work, Rom 12:14–21 ends with quotations from scripture (Deut 32:35; Prov 25:21–22) as support for the argument.¹⁷ The scriptures, and not the possible sayings of Jesus, substantiate his argument. Jacobi argues, therefore, that if Paul had known a saying of Jesus on these matters, he would have used it, and not the scripture, to motivate his claims.¹⁸ Combined with the fact that the apostle is not indicating that he is referring to words of the Lord, a powerful argument is set up against assuming parallels to synoptic texts in Rom 12:17, 21.

A look at the wording of the possible Pauline and synoptic parallels also excludes these verses from being genuine parallels. Although Rom 12:17, 21 as well as Matt 5:39 and the similar Luke 6:35 all mention repaying evil with good, there is no striking verbal agreement between these verses. Paul uses the adjective *κακός* twice in both verse 17 and 21; Matthew and Luke do not use it in their respective Sermons on the Mount or Plain. Likewise, Paul's use of *νικάω* in Rom 12:21 has no parallels in the Sermons on the Mount or Plain.

The only verse where the above-mentioned objections against assuming parallels does not apply, is the command to love the enemy in Rom 12:14, which has no extra-Christian parallels.¹⁹ The motive of blessing or praying for the

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 99.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 102–3.

¹⁹ Cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 96; Zerbe, *Non-Retaliatio*, 267. Wolter, “Jesus bei Paulus”, 222, came to the same conclusion: “Abgesehen von Vers 14 gibt es in dem zitierten Abschnitt des Römerbriefs [Rm 12:14–21] freilich keine erkennbare überlieferungsgeschichtliche Berührung mit synoptischen Jesuslogien”.

enemy is contested nowhere in the surroundings of the New Testament.²⁰ Jewish wisdom literature can mention love for the enemy and non-retaliation as a criterion for a functioning relationship with God, but the New Testament understands these commands as a result of an already intact relationship with God.²¹

As a consequence of the lack of verbal agreement and Jacobi's arguments, especially the fact that it cannot be proven that the teachings in Rom 12:14–21 – except for Rom 12:14 – are unique, the principle of dissimilarity excludes these verses as possible parallels. It is only the exceptional attitude towards the enemy in Rom 12:14 that is made a marker of the Christian identity.²²

6.2 *Nothing is unclean: Rom 14:14 and Mark 7:15; Matt 15:11*

Staying with the paraenetical part of Rom 12 – 15, Rom 14:1 – 15:7 forms a subsection in which Paul commands mutual acceptance amongst congregation members: The strong and weak are ordered to respect one another. The passage in Rom 14:14–20 is concerned with requirements regarding purity.²³ Paul claims that dietary purity has no salvific relevance, but the strong in faith should not

²⁰ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 52. Cf. *Ibid.* 85: “Die Forderung, den religiös, politisch oder sozial motivierten Feind im umfassenden Sinn zu *lieben*, lässt sich in der Umwelt des Neuen Testaments daher (bisher) nicht nachweisen” (her italics).

²¹ As I will deal with the love command in the context of Gal 5:14 in chapter 8, Paul's statement in Rom 12:14 will be incorporated into that discussion.

²² Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 90–1.

²³ *Ibid.*, 305.

misuse their freedom of regarding all food as clean to cause temptation for the weak.²⁴ While in Rom 12:14–21 a cluster of motives comparable to those in the synoptics are found, this is not the case for Rom 14:14. Here, only one similar issue to synoptic material is discussed.

Paul writes in Rom 14:14: “I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself, but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean” (οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι’ ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν). This verse, with its introductory formula οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, is said to hold an in-between position between the explicit and implicit references,²⁵ because Paul derives his authority on the matter from the Lord without explicitly quoting a saying of Jesus. Alternatively, it is seen as an echo of a saying of the Lord,²⁶ or it is argued that the introduction to the verse indicates not the source, but the truth of the following words.²⁷ Still other times, it is regarded as uncertain whether Paul quotes a saying of the Lord, even if the historical Jesus had probably represented the same conviction, as this is a specific Christian maxim.²⁸

Jacobi again raises doubts over the validity of this proposed parallel. She maintains that the ἐν-κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ formulation in the introduction of the verse

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 311.

²⁵ Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus and die Römer*, 320.

²⁶ Cf. Allison, “The Pauline Epistles”, 20; Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia”, 89. According to Dunn, “Jesus Tradition in Paul”, 162, Rom 14:14 is “a widely accepted example” of an implicit reference.

²⁷ Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 56.

²⁸ Cf. Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 377; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Vol. 3, 91.

does not imply that Paul is referring to a saying of Jesus. Paul uses ἐν–κυρίῳ or ἐν–Χριστῷ formulations 98 times in his letters,²⁹ but in none of the other occasions does it refer to Jesus as the source of a saying.³⁰ Romans 14:14 would, therefore, be the only instance where ἐν–κυρίῳ is used as a tradition indicator. The use of the formulation by Paul is too wide to presuppose that Paul is claiming to be quoting words of Jesus.³¹ Jacobi concludes that Paul uses the authority of Jesus to justify his thesis that all things are clean, but nothing is said about the origin of the statement.³²

Jacobi points out that in Acts 10:1 – 11:18 the discussion about clean and unclean food is delivered in a post–Easter setting with the vision of Peter. It is regarded as a central principle of the teaching tradition of the Hellenistic church.³³ Jacobi accepts that the open attitude of Jesus to table fellowship with unclean persons and his rejection of pharisaic purity regulations were common knowledge, but she is not sure that Paul knew Jesus' sayings on the matter.³⁴ Paul could have been confronted with this matter in Antioch. These circumstances cast doubt over a direct line of tradition from Jesus to Paul on the matter of clean and unclean food.³⁵

²⁹ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 328.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 333.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 330–2.

³² *Ibid.*, 343.

³³ Cf. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 91.

³⁴ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 380.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 366.

A similar ruling to the one by Paul about clean and unclean food is handed down in Mark 7:15 // Matt 15:11.³⁶

Rom 14:14	Mark 7:15	Matt 15:11
οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκεῖνῳ κοινόν.	οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἕξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά ἐστὶν τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον.	οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον.

The three verses above are connected by the keyword “unclean”. Paul only uses the adjective κοινός in this verse. In the synoptics, it is used only in Mark 7:2, 5. Paul does not once deliver the verb κοινῶ. The verb is found in Mark 7, as well as in Matt 15.³⁷ The analysis of the wording does not help in determining a relationship between the verses.

More agreement in wording between the Pauline and Markan passages is found in Rom 14:20 and Mark 7:19.³⁸ Paul says: “Everything is indeed clean” and Mark proclaims: “Thus [Jesus] he declared all food clean”.

Rom 14:20	Mark 7:19
μη̄ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ. πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ	καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα

³⁶ Cf. Walter, “Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition”, 502.

³⁷ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 364–5.

³⁸ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 93.

Paul uses the adjective καθαρός to declare all food clean, Mark the verb καθαρίζω. Interestingly, Paul uses the adjective only once – Mark never uses it. When it comes to the verb, Paul also uses it only once: in 2 Cor 7:1. Mark uses it four times (Mark 1:40, 41, 42; 7:19). In Acts 10:15 and 11:9, the verb is used again when declaring food clean.

The noun βρῶμα, connecting Rom 14:20 and Mark 7:19, is used only once by Mark, while Paul uses it 9 times. In 1 Cor 8 and 10, Paul uses βρῶμα in his discussion about meat sacrificed to idols. In these chapters, Paul uses the word in his own deliberations about clean and unclean food. He would not necessarily have copied it from an older source. This casts doubt over the validity of the parallel.

Jacobi raises another objection against regarding Mark 7:19 and Rom 14:20 as parallels, because the Markan verse is mostly understood as redactional commentary.³⁹ Matthew omitted Mark 7:19 in his account, meaning that Mark might have added “interpretative additions”⁴⁰ to Jesus’ sayings on clean and unclean food. All these factors speak against regarding the Pauline and synoptic verses of Rom 14:14 and 20 as undisputed parallels, even though the subject matter agrees.⁴¹

When one looks at the meaning and implication of the passages on clean and unclean food, Dunn argues that Paul and Matthew are closer than Paul and

³⁹ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 363.

⁴⁰ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 93.

⁴¹ Cf. Wolter, “Jesus bei Paulus”, 225.

Mark, because the saying of Jesus is unambiguous in Mark. According to Mark 7:20, Jesus declared all food clean.⁴² In Matthew and Paul, however, the saying is less radical.⁴³ Paul says in Rom 14:14 “that nothing is unclean in itself, *but* it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean” (ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι’ ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν). Matthew does not explicitly state that all foods are clean. Furnish adds that when one argues that the Romans had known the unambiguous Markan version, there would not have been disputes on this matter.⁴⁴ It would not have been necessary for Paul to state that all foods are clean.⁴⁵ Taking all these factors into consideration, Rom 14:14 and Mark 7:15, 19 (and Matt 15:11) cannot be regarded as substantial parallels. It cannot be proven without doubt that a common Jesus tradition lies behind the verses.

⁴² James D. G. Dunn, “Paul’s Knowledge of the Jesus Tradition: The Evidence in Romans”, in *Christus bezeugen: Festschrift für Wolfgang Trilling*, eds., K. Kertelege, T. Holtz and C.–P. März (Freiburg: St. Benno, 1990), 203.

⁴³ Dunn, “Paul’s Knowledge”, 203: “It is best resolved by assuming [...] that Jesus’ original words had been more ambiguous than Mark represents (closer to Matthew’s version)”. If Mark’s version were more unambiguous than Matthew and Paul’s, this would be similar to the prohibition of divorce. Mark prohibits divorce unconditionally, while both Matthew and Paul allow exceptions, weakening the command.

⁴⁴ Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 57–8.

⁴⁵ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 93–4. Within the paraenetic section of Rom 12–15, Rom 13:7 and 14:13 too have been mentioned as possible allusions to the Jesus tradition. In Rom 13:7, Paul orders his readers to pay “taxes to whom taxes are owed”, reminding of Jesus’ command to “render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s” (Matt 22:21; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25). Paul prohibits judging (κρίνω) in Rom 14:13, as he does in 2:1. It strongly resembles Matt 7:1 // Luke 6:37 in which judging is forbidden as well (cf. *Ibid.*, 253). In both cases, however, it is difficult to prove that one or the other has influenced the wording used by Paul and the synoptic authors. Therefore, arguments for a direct dependency of the verses or a common tradition behind the similar texts are not compelling, even though similar thoughts are expressed in these instances.

Chapter 7:

Synoptic parallels in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians

Similar to Rom 12:12–21, 1 Thess 4:13 – 5:11 represents another Pauline passage that shows up several similarities to synoptic material. Here – in contrast to the Roman passage – Paul is writing to a congregation that he had founded and taught himself. The recipients should have been able to recognize allusions to the words of Jesus as instructed to them by Paul.

7.1 A word of the Lord in 1 Thess 4:15–17?

The *Parousia* is a major theme throughout this letter and Paul seems to accept that the *Parousia* would still arrive in his lifetime.¹ In 1 Thess 4:13 – 5:11, Paul responds to verbal or written questions from the congregation in Thessalonica about the end times. In each instance, Paul's answer to a question from the Thessalonians start with περί (1 Thess 4:9, 13; 5:1).² In answering two of their questions (4:9–12; 5:1–11), Paul underlines that the Thessalonians do not need any more information on the matters they are enquiring about. He says, for example, in 1 Thess 4:9: "Now concerning brotherly love you have no need for

¹ Cf. Nils Hyldahl, "Auferstehung Christi – Auferstehung der Toten (1 Thess. 4, 13–18)", in *Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie*, ed. S. Pedersen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 122.

² Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 63.

anyone to write to you” (Περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν; cf. 5:1). In 1 Thess 4:13–18, however, Paul gives the congregation information they do not have yet. He starts v. 13 by stating: “But we do not want you to be uninformed, brothers, about those who are asleep” (Οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων).

The church in Thessalonica had been hit by unexpected deaths after Paul had departed from the congregation. The deaths caused uncertainties because the Thessalonians were not sure what would happen to those members who had died before the *Parousia*.³ They wanted to know from Paul if the deceased would also participate “in the glory of Christ’s return”.⁴ Paul fills the gaps in 4:13–18 and gives the congregation the information they were lacking.

After the introduction in v. 13, Paul quotes a formula of faith about the death and resurrection of Jesus in v. 14.⁵ In v. 15a, Paul claims to be passing on knowledge in the form of a word of Jesus, using a tradition indicator.⁶ He says: “For this we declare to you by a word of the Lord” (Τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν ἐν

³ Cf. Traugott Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, EKK XIII (Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), 187.

⁴ M. Eugene Boring, *An Introduction to the New Testament: History, Literature, Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 215.

⁵ According to Gerd Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel, Bd. 1, Studien zur Chronologie*, FRLANT 123 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 235, the formula of faith was composed by Paul himself because of its odd formulation. Ulrich Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*, BEvT 49 (Munich: Kaiser, 1968), 325, and Günter Haufe, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Thessalonicher*, THKNT 12/I (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999), 78, also assume a Pauline authorship. V. 14 does not take up any typical synoptic material.

⁶ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 305.

λόγω κυρίου). The citation goes up to v. 17,⁷ and in v. 18 Paul closes the section with a summary paraenesis, using his own words again.⁸

7.1.1 The scope of the word of the Lord

Again, Paul does not quote the word of the Lord verbatim. This has led to a dispute about exactly where the Lord's saying begins and ends. Most scholars see v. 15b as a summary of the instruction, and v. 16–17 as the actual word of the Lord.⁹ The reasons for locating the word of the Lord in v. 16–17 are the following: The whole of v. 15 is written in the first Person plural like the rest of the letter, but v. 16–17 are written in the third Person and describe the events of the end of time in a general way. Additionally, Lüdemann, using a detailed word analysis, shows that v. 16–17 contain mainly non–Pauline phrases, meaning that Paul takes up traditional material in these verses. Verse 15b, however, contains typical Pauline vocabulary and can be understood as the application of the word of the Lord, contained in v. 16–17, to the situation in Thessalonica.¹⁰

⁷ Verse 17b with its Pauline formulation (“And so we will be with the Lord forever”) does probably not belong to the Lord's saying (Peter Siber, *Mit Christus leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung*, ATANT 61 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971), 38).

⁸ Cf. Jörg Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik. Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen*, WMANT 44 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1975), 92.

⁹ Cf. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 232; Hyldahl, “Auferstehung Christi”, 21; Haufe, *Der erste Brief des Paulus and die Thessalonicher*, 79, n. 78; Zsolt, “Auf der Spur der Jesusworte”, 108; Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990) 171. It is not unusual that the summary is given before the actual quote. Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 247, refers to Rom 10:14 and 1 Cor 15:51 as examples.

¹⁰ Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 242–7.

Holtz, in contrast, claims that the word of the Lord stands in v. 15b because v. 16–17 has a parallel in 1 Cor 15:51, and there Paul does not claim to cite a saying of the Lord.¹¹ 1 Thess 4:15b has no parallels in the New Testament. Therefore, following Holtz’s argument, v. 15b has to contain the word of the Lord. He regards v. 16–17 as an affirmation of the Lord’s word by an apocalyptic tradition.¹² It can be argued against Holtz that the first epistle to the Corinthians was written after the letter to the Thessalonians. To make sure that the same questions did not arise in Corinth as in Thessalonica, Paul would have given the Corinthians the information the Thessalonians had inquired about. After all, he stayed in Corinth for 18 months and wrote 1 Thessalonians from the city.¹³ This way, Paul may have already given the Corinthians all the necessary information on the *Parousia*. It was not necessary for him to call on a word of the Lord in 1 Corinthians 15, because the Corinthians were already informed on the matter.

7.1.2 The origin of the word of the Lord

Most commentators are convinced that the word of the Lord that Paul uses in 1 Thess 4:16–17 is not a word of the earthly Jesus, because one is not sure which

¹¹ Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 185–6.

¹² Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 63, mentions that the attempts to locate the word of the Lord in v. 15b are not very persuasive.

¹³ Cf. Boring, *An Introduction*, 209.

of Jesus' words Paul is referring to.¹⁴ 1 Thess 4:16–17 is considered an “agraphon”¹⁵ or a prophetic word spoken in the name of the exalted kyrios.¹⁶ Others claim that the word originates from a Jewish apocalypse,¹⁷ from references to prophetic words of the Lord in the Old Testament¹⁸ or “that these verses are a midrash founded on the apocalyptic teaching of Jesus”.¹⁹

Holtz differentiates between the “true source” of the word of the Lord and the source supposed by Paul. In his opinion, it can almost certainly be ruled out that Paul refers to a saying of the Lord that he did not believe to be a word of the earthly Jesus. The possibility that the early Christian tradition has construed such a word and passed it on as a word of the Lord that Paul then got to know must be considered.²⁰ Ellis, in turn, argues: “While the ‘word of the Lord’ (4. 15) seems to refer to a revelation (perhaps including a vision) from the exalted Jesus, the

¹⁴ Cf. Luz, *Geschichtsverständnis*, 327. Put forward as possibilities are, amongst others, Matt 10:39, 16:25, 16:28, 20:1ff, 24:30–31, 24:34, 25:6, 26:64, Luke 13:30, John 5:25, 6:39f, 11:25–26.

¹⁵ Joachim Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte*, 4th ed. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1965), 79.

¹⁶ Siber, *Mit Christus Leben*, 38; Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik*, 94.

¹⁷ Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 254.

¹⁸ Neiryneck, “Paul and the Sayings of Jesus”, 311. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 305, n. 25, argues that “the OT usage is far from conclusive”.

¹⁹ Taylor, “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, 111.

²⁰ Holtz, *Der erste Brief and die Thessalonicher*, 183. Wanamaker, *The Epistle to the Thessalonians*, 171, likewise, argues that because of the similarities between this Pauline passage and Matt 24:29–31; 40f, Paul would have believed that the passage he quoted stemmed from the Lord.

passage also includes fairly clear allusions to sayings in the Synoptic apocalypse (Matthew 24. 1–36 parr)”.²¹

Numerous possibilities have been mentioned regarding the origin of 1 Thess 4:16–17. The verses often have been disregarded as a parallel to the synoptic apocalypses, because of its closeness to Jewish apocalyptic material.²² It is assumed that the sayings in these verses have been taken from Jewish apocalyptic literature, and have not been used by Jesus. As a result, Lüdemann refers to 1 Thess 4:15–17 as a miniature apocalypse (*Miniaturapokalypse*).²³ The listing of the signs of the end times, such as the voice of the archangel, the trumpet, the resurrection of the dead and the “cloud motive”, are common to eschatological visions. Καταβαίνω also is a word that is generally found in the context of the coming of eschatological events. Since these elements are all found in 1 Thess 4:16–17, Lüdemann assumes a uniform apocalypse and searches for similar passages in the surroundings of the New Testament. The first parallel to 1 Thess 4:16–17 he finds is in 4 Ezra 13.²⁴

²¹ Ellis, “Traditions in 1 Corinthians”, 498, n. 47. Taylor’s sentiment (“Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”, 112) is similar: “It is inherently unlikely that such a saying could have been created by tradition, given its falsifiability within a very brief period after the historical ministry of Jesus”.

²² Cf. Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 63: “But one of the difficulties is that the end–time imagery which is common to Paul and the Synoptics is found in many Jewish sources as well. It need not derive specifically from the Jesus tradition”.

²³ Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 247.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 250. 4 Ezra is a Jewish apocalypse written around 100 CE, probably in reaction to the destruction of the temple in 70 CE (Josef Schreiner, *Das 4. Buch Esra, Apokalypsen*, JSHRZ V (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1976), 292–306.

Lüdemann points out that, in comparison to 1 Thess 4:16–17, a reference to the resurrection of the dead at the *Parousia* is missing in 4 Ezra. He finds a text that reflects this relationship in 2 Bar. 29-30. According to the latter text, the dead will rise after the arrival of the Messiah.²⁵ The Thessalonians were unsure what would happen to those who have died before the *Parousia*. They asked Paul for an answer. Paul informs them about the resurrection at the *Parousia*, using images from the Jewish apocalyptic literature, according to Lüdemann. Lüdemann argues that the basic structure of 1 Thess 4:16–17 has an analogy in the Jewish apocalyptic tradition.²⁶

Lüdemann assumes that Paul’s answer to the Thessalonians concerning the deceased believers in 1 Thess 4:16-17 is taken from Jewish apocalyptic literature. I consider these assumptions, which are accepted by many researchers,²⁷ as problematic due to the following comparison.²⁸

1 Thess 4:15–17	Jewish parallels	Matt 24:30–31
For this we declare to you by a word from the Lord, [...] until the coming of the	4 Ezra 13:3: And I looked, and behold, this wind made something like the <u>figure of a man come</u> up out of the heart of the	[...] they will see the <u>Son of Man coming</u> (<i>παρουσία</i>) on the

²⁵ Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 252.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 252–5. Lüdemann however does not see a parallel to 1 Thess 4:16–17 in the synoptic gospels.

²⁷ Cf. Furnish, *Jesus According to Paul*, 63: “But one of the difficulties is that the end–time imagery which is common to Paul and the Synoptics is found in many Jewish sources as well. It need not derive specifically from the Jesus tradition”.

²⁸ Lüdemann compares the Pauline text to its Jewish parallels only. I have added the similar Matt 24:30–31. With the italics, Lüdemann highlights the striking points of contact between 1 Thess 4:16–17 and Jewish parallels.



<p>Lord (<u>παρουσία</u>) [...] For the Lord himself will <u>descend</u> from <u>heaven</u> with a cry of command, with the <u>voice</u> of an archangel (<u>ἀρχάγγελος</u>), and with the sound of the <u>trumpet</u> (<u>σάλπιγξ</u>) of God. <u>And the dead in Christ will rise first.</u> Then <i>we who are alive</i>, who are left, will be caught up together with them in the clouds (<u>νεφέλη</u>) to meet the Lord in the air [...]</p>	<p>sea. And I looked, and behold, that man flew with the clouds of <i>heaven</i> [...] 4: and whenever his <u>voice</u> issued from his mouth, all who heard his voice melted as wax melts when it feels the fire. 12: After this I saw <u>the same man come down</u> from the mountain and call to him another multitude which was peaceable. 48: But <i>those who are left</i> of your people, who are found within my holy borders, shall be saved. 2 Bar 30:1 And it will happen after these things when the time of the appearance of <u>the Anointed One</u> has been fulfilled and he returns with <u>glory</u>, that then <u>all who sleep in hope of him will rise</u>.²⁹</p>	<p>clouds (<u>νεφέλη</u>) of <u>heaven</u> with power and great <u>glory</u>. And he will send out his <u>angels</u> (<u>ἄγγελοι</u>) with a loud <u>trumpet</u> (<u>σάλπιγξ</u>) call, and they will gather his <i>elect</i> from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

There are various elements connecting the three texts, as indicated above. The main points in Paul's statements on the end times in 1 Thess 4:16–17 are found in Jewish apocalyptic writings. Lüdemann consequently assumes that Paul got to know his information on the end times from there. He fails, however, to take Matt 24:30–31 into consideration. While Lüdemann himself lists angels and trumpets

²⁹ The Jewish parallels are quoted from James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983).

as signs of the end times,³⁰ neither of these elements are found in the passages from 2 Bar. or 4 Ezra. The trumpet (σάλπιγξ)³¹ and the angels (ἄγγελοι or ἀρχάγγελος) on the other hand, connect 1 Thess 4 and Matt 24 to each other.³² Paul and Matthew are also connected through the keyword παρουσία (Matt 24:3, 27, 37, 39), which – of the synoptic authors – only Matthew uses.

If Paul now got the information he reproduces in 1 Thess 4:16–17 from Jewish apocalypses, this does not explain the agreements between Paul and Matthew. It would either mean that Matthew has copied from Paul (which is unlikely, because Matthew does not quote Paul’s text verbatim), or that Paul and Matthew have, independently of each other, combined material from different Jewish apocalypses and the Old Testament, and have arrived at a similar text. This is again implausible. The only conceivable explanation for the similarities (and differences) of Paul and Matthew to the Jewish apocalyptic texts is, that Paul and Matthew had access to a common source, in which the Jewish apocalyptic literature was already interpreted in a Christian way.

There are, furthermore, statements in Jewish apocalyptic literature contrasting those in 1 Thess 4:16–17. 4 Ezra 13:24 (“Know that those who remain

³⁰ Lüdemann, *Paulus*, 234.

³¹ Cf. Röcker, *Belial und Katechon*, 280–1. In the Old Testament, the trumpet is mentioned for example in Joel 2:1, Zeph 1:16, Isa 27:13. Of the eleven occurrences of the word in the New Testament, the majority are in Revelations (1:10; 4:1; 8:2, 6, 13; 9:14). Paul could have known these eschatological elements from his rabbinic training.

³² Paul uses σάλπιγξ again in 1 Cor 14:8 and 15:52 (2x), the latter also an apocalyptic text, while it is used only this one time in the synoptics. Stuhlmacher, “Jesustradition im Römerbrief?”, 243, does not doubt that Paul knew the infrequently used keywords παρουσία and σάλπιγξ from Matt 24.

are far more blessed than the dead”),³³ for example, contradicts 1 Thess 4:16 where Paul claims that those who will be alive at the Lord’s return have no advantage over the departed.³⁴ This supports the observation that Paul did not quote directly from Jewish apocalyptic sources.

A look at Paul’s audience is important as well. Paul founded the congregation in Thessalonica. Many of the members were formerly pagans³⁵ who would not have known the Old Testament or Jewish writings. Paul’s letter, in fact, assumes the predominance of Gentile Christians.³⁶ They would not have been able to understand the eschatological teachings if Paul had not explained them. They would not have understood the eschatology on the backdrop of Jewish teachings, but only would have known what Paul had taught them about the return of Jesus. What they had learned must have looked somewhat like the synoptic eschatological discourses.³⁷

As already stated, the Thessalonians were not sure what would happen to those who had died before the arrival of the *Parousia*. No information is found on this topic in the apocalypse of Matt 24 (as well as in Mark and Luke). If Paul’s instructions were reminiscent of the synoptic eschatological discourses, it would

³³ Cf. Schreiner, *Das 4. Buch Esra*, 396.

³⁴ Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 98.

³⁵ F. F. Bruce, *1&2 Thessalonians*, WBC 45 (Waco, TX: Word 1982), xxii–xxiii.

³⁶ Becker, *Paulus*, 137.

³⁷ F. F. Bruce, *Paul & Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1974), 32. Cf. Walter, “Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition”, 507–8: “In 1 Thess 4. 15 ff. handelt es sich nicht um ein in prophetischer Vollmacht neu kreierte Jesuslogion, sondern um die prophetische Aktualisierung vorgegebenen Jesusgutes durch Paulus”. Walter does not, however, think that Paul was aware that he was actualizing a word of the Lord.

explain why this piece of information was lacking. Since the Thessalonians did not have information on the future resurrection of the dead, Paul had to provide the missing information in his letter.³⁸

Many similarities between 1 Thess 4:15–17, Matt 24 and Jewish- and Old Testament apocalyptic texts do exist.³⁹ The differences between the texts should, however, also be taken into consideration. Paul and Matthew share similarities, which they have not simply taken over from Jewish apocalyptic texts, as, indicated above. The origin of the word of the Lord used by Paul cannot be located exclusively in Jewish apocalyptic literature. The use of a common source by Paul and Matthew is more likely.

7.2 The thief in the night: 1 Thess 5:2 and Matt 24:43–44 // Luke 12:39–40

In 1 Thess 5:1–11, the eschatological teaching that started in 4:13–18 is continued,⁴⁰ albeit under a different aspect, which is introduced with περί again in 5:1. The point in time of the future coming of the Lord is now the subject. 1 Thess 5:2 states that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night. The image of

³⁸ Hyldahl, “Auferstehung Christ”, 130: “Was dort [in Matthäus 24] fehlt, hat Paulus selbst ergänzt”. Hyldahl argues that because Paul expected the *Parousia* to come immediately, he did not find it necessary to tell the Thessalonians about the resurrection of the believers. Cf. Josef Plevnik, “The Taking up of the Faithful and the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18”, *CBQ* 46 (1984): 276.

³⁹ Cf. Peter Fiedler, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, TKNT 1 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), 360.

⁴⁰ 1 Thess 5:11 is parallel to 4:18 and it closes the whole of 4:13–5:11 (cf. Joseph Plevnik, “1 Thess 5,1–11: Its Authenticity, Intention, and Message”, *Bib* 60 (1979): 77.

the thief used by Paul in v. 2 is broadly attested in the New Testament. It has parallels in Luke 12:39–40; Matt 24:44; 2 Pet 3:10; Rev 3:3; 16:15 and the Gospel of Thomas 21:5–7. The consistency of the use of the image makes the dependence on an authoritative source likely.⁴¹ Paul does not say here, as in 1 Thess 4:15, that he recites a word of the Lord, and therefore this is a possible allusion to a saying of Jesus by Paul.

At the beginning of 1 Thess 5:2, Paul repeats something he had already informed the Thessalonians of.⁴² He says: “For you yourselves are fully aware that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night” (αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς οἶδατε ὅτι ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται). Paul does not unfold the “thief–image”, supporting the observation that the Thessalonians knew what Paul was writing about. Paul presumes that the image is known and understood.

1 Thess 5:2	Matt 24:42–43	Luke 12:39
αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκριβῶς οἶδατε ὅτι ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται.	Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδατε ποῖα ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται. 43 Ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα φυλακῆ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγγηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν	τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, οὐκ ἂν ἀφήκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

⁴¹ Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 213.

⁴² The same is true for 5:1, where Paul is speaking of “the times and the seasons”. Paul reminds the Thessalonians of what he had taught them before about the coming of the Lord. Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 306.

	εἶασεν διορυχθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ.	
--	-----------------------------------------	--

From the comparison between the three texts, it is clear that Paul is linguistically closer to Matthew than to Luke. Only in Matthew and Paul, it is specifically stated that the thief will come in the night (Paul uses νύξ, Matthew φυλακή). There is no real parallel in Mark, as he never uses the word κλέπτης.⁴³ Paul and Matthew also are connected through their references to the ἡμέρα κυρίου, which is a translation of יְהוָה יוֹם. In Jewish literature, the “Day of the Lord” is, however, never linked to the image of the thief,⁴⁴ further strengthening the relationship between the Pauline and Matthean texts.

Apart from sharing some lexeme when they call for vigilance in connection with the end times, the Pauline and synoptic passages are also structured in the same way, indicating a relationship between the passages.⁴⁵ Jacobi has compared the image of the thief to similar texts of its surroundings and she found that even though certain structural characteristics of the synoptic eschatological

⁴³ This is seemingly not noted by Wolter, “Jesus bei Paulus”, 227, who writes: “Gemeinsam ist allen Texten die Rede von einem *Dieb*, von dem man nie weiß, wann er *kommen* wird, so dass man immer *wachsam* sein muss” (his italics).

⁴⁴ Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 212–3, argues that it is unlikely that the image of the thief can be traced past Jesus to Jewish apocalyptic literature. In contrast, Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 55, says 1 Thess 5:2 “appears in a traditional Jewish form” and Paul did not know “this tradition as a saying of Jesus”.

⁴⁵ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 159–64. Cf. *Ibid.*, 160–1: “Sie [die Makrostruktur der Texte] besteht (1) aus einer Beschreibung des *Kommens des Menschensohns* bzw. der *Parusie* Christi, (2) der Problematik des *Zeitpunkts* der Endereignisse, (3) daraus folgenden *Ermahnungen* und (4) zumindest für Matthäus, Lukas und – in charakteristischer Abwandlung – im 1. Thessalonicherbrief im Ausblick auf die Scheidung im *Gericht*” (her italics).

discourses are comparable to those of early Jewish apocalypses, there is no call for watchfulness (*Wacksamkeitsappell*) in the paraenetic parts of the latter texts. The call to be ready for the sudden coming of the Lord is singular and strongly links the Pauline and synoptic verses.⁴⁶ Jacobi assumes a larger, possibly orally passed-down complex about the end times. Her assumption is built less on lexical and syntactical similarities than on a parallel structure of the texts and the similar order of events depicted.

The image of the thief has often been linked to the earthly Jesus, because “it is unlikely that the followers of Jesus would have invented such an unfavourable comparison for the one from whom they expected salvation”.⁴⁷ They would not have called their master a thief.

Paul renders the oldest written version of the text. Yet the Q version is mostly regarded as the oldest version of the motive.⁴⁸ Despite the closeness between the Pauline and Matthean versions, Jacobi does not think that Matthew offers the original Q text. Rather, she assumes that Luke (Q) 12:36–38 has reworked the related text of Mark 13:22–35. Luke has, as a whole, possibly preserved the Q template.⁴⁹ Furthermore, she continues, Matthew and Luke have reworked, edited and expanded through their *Sondergut* the texts of Mark 13:33–

⁴⁶ Cf. *Ibid.*, 172: “Es fällt insgesamt auf, dass gerade der synoptische Gebrauch von ‘Wachen’ im Sinne eines besonders qualifizierten *Wartens* und sich Vorbereitens auf ein bestimmtes Ereignis keine Entsprechung im alttestamentlichen und frühjüdischen Schriften findet” (her italics).

⁴⁷ Scaer, *Discourses in Matthew*, 143.

⁴⁸ Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 125.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 179–80.

37 and Q 12,39f.42–46 (17,26f.31.34f).⁵⁰ She believes that Paul knew an early form of the image of the thief, which is independent of the synoptics.⁵¹ Jacobi fails however to explain the similarities between the Pauline and Matthean texts.

The closeness of 1 Thess 4:16–17; 5:2 to passages from Matthew, both in chapter 24, strengthens the case for assuming a common tradition behind the apocalyptic texts of Paul and Matthew. In New Testament literature, it is generally assumed that Mark 13 is older and that Mark had a fixed written copy of the tradition, which he again reworked redactionally.⁵² It is also supposed that Matthew and Luke used Mark 13 in their apocalyptic passages. Mark does not deliver the material common to Paul and Matthew. When Matthew composed his apocalyptic speech, he would, therefore, likely have used Mark 13 as well as a source close to Paul's eschatological teachings.

7.3 The traditional material in 1 Thess 5:3

1 Thessalonians 5:3 might be taken from the Jesus tradition (Matt 24:37–39 // Luke 17:26–30) too,⁵³ because the motive of false security is found in all three

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 152, n. 100.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 184.

⁵² Schenke, *Die Urgemeinde*, 265–67. Schenke does not hold Mark 13 as originally Jewish, but as a Christian tradition, which originated in Judea or Jerusalem at the beginning of the Jewish war 66 CE.

⁵³ Cf. Plevnik, "1Thes 5:1–11", 83–4. Tuckett, "1 Corinthians and Q", 173–8, however, argues that Luke was influenced by Paul and not vice versa. In light of the other connections between 1 Thess 4 and 5 and the synoptic eschatological discourses this seems unlikely. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 335, finds Tuckett's logic "unpersuasive".

texts.⁵⁴ Moreover, the formulation ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις combines the parallel synoptic eschatological discourses in Matt 24:19; Mark 13:17 and Luke 21:23 with 1 Thess 5:3.⁵⁵

Paul uses five *hapax legomena* in 1 Thess 5:3, indicating his dependence on traditional material in this verse. The adjective αἰφνίδιος is used in the New Testament only in v. 3 and in Luke 21:34. Additionally, the verb ἐφίστημι, which is common in Luke and Acts, is found only here in the genuine Pauline epistles. The noun ἀσφάλεια is, apart from the Pauline verse, only used by Luke, who uses it in Luke 1:4 and Acts 5:23. Luke does not use the word in an apocalyptic passage. The noun ὠδίν, ἴνος is found in the New Testament in 1 Thess 5:3, the apocalyptic material Mark 13:8 and Matt 24:8, as well as Acts 2:24. Luke never uses it. The last of the five Pauline *hapaxes* in 1 Thess 5:3 is γαστήρ, τρός, which is used in the apocalypses of all three synoptic gospels (Mark 13:17; Matt 24:19; Luke 21:23). It is used outside of this context in Matt 1:18, 23 and Luke 1:31 in the synoptics.

Although 1 Thess 5:3 has parallels in the synoptic apocalypses, the references are scattered. Of the five Pauline *hapaxes*, one occurs in Mark 13:8,

⁵⁴ Cf. Holtz, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 215.

⁵⁵ The contractions of a pregnant woman are also typical of Jewish apocalyptic literature (cf. Zsolt, "Auf der Spur der Jesusworte", 111; Bruce, *1 Thessalonians*, 110).

two occur in Matt 24 (v. 8, 19)⁵⁶ and three occur in the Lukan apocalypse (Luke 21:23; 34 (2)). The wording, therefore, is closest to the Lukan version.⁵⁷ The Pauline *hapaxes* leave no doubt that Paul uses traditional material in this verse; still, a common tradition between the Pauline material and any particular gospel cannot be proven without doubt because the Pauline *hapaxes* are spread in the synoptics. Even in Luke, the matching words are not found in the same or consecutive verses.

1 Thessalonians 4:16–17; 5:2 are the passages in Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians in which he most likely is repeating Jesus traditions. Both passages can be linked to verses from Matthew 24. The Pauline and Matthean texts are not identical, but they share elements that are not found in Jewish apocalyptic texts, indicating the use of a common source by the two authors.

⁵⁶ Röcker, *Belial und Katechon*, 322, concludes that 1 Thess 4:13–5:11 as a whole is shaped by the same tradition as Matt 24. He finds further evidence that the author of 2 Thess knew and extensively used a similar tradition or source to the one used by Matthew in chapter 24. He also argues that further implicit references to words of the Lord can be found in 1 Thess 5 and that all of them have parallels in Matt 24. 1 Thess 5:1 is similar to Matt 24:36 (*par* Mark 13:32). 1 Thess 5:6 could be considered to be parallel to Matt 24:42 and 1 Thess 5:7 to Matt 24:48–51 (*Ibid.*, 514–23), but there is not enough agreement in wording to be sure that the verses have a common tradition. These verses can only support the observation that similarities between the Pauline and Matthean apocalyptic material do exist.

⁵⁷ Lars Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 192, finds the similarities between 1 Thess and Luke 21 at this point so great that they had to use the same tradition.

Chapter 8:

Synoptic parallels in Paul's letter to the Galatians

Paul made use of traditional material in the letter to the Galatian churches in the pre-Pauline baptismal formula in Gal 3:26–28 and the virtue–and–vice catalogue in Gal 5:19–23.¹ Only scattered references to Jesus traditions are found in the epistle to the Galatians. Mentionable are the image of the leaven which has a verbatim parallel in 1 Cor 5:6, the commandment to love the neighbour taken up in Gal 5:14, and a further possible allusion in Gal 1:16, where Paul uses the term “flesh and blood”, in a similar way in which Jesus did according to Matt 16:16.²

¹ According to Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1979), 26: “Galatians is made up of a variety of traditions and doctrinal presuppositions [...]. The letter serves as a ‘reminder’ of these presuppositions, which Paul then uses to build his ‘argument’”. Paul’s letter to the Galatians is mostly assumed to have been written after his letter to the Romans because he uses similar themes and ideas in the two letters. I follow this dating. Others date Galatians much earlier, to around 48 CE, making it Paul’s oldest letter (cf. Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 48; Bruce, *Jesus & Paul*, 27).

² The proposed parallels between Gal 6:1 and Luke 17:3 (Schürmann, “Das Gesetz des Christus”, 286), and Gal 6:2 and Matt 11:28–30 (Riesner, “Paulus und die Jesus-Überlieferung”, 362–4), do not show up significant verbal agreements and therefore cannot be traced back to a similar tradition.

8.1 The Gospel is not revealed by “flesh and blood”: Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:16–17

8.1.1 The context of the letter to the Galatians

Paul’s letter to the Galatians was written in a time of deep crisis between the Galatian congregations and Paul. Competing missionaries, who had visited the congregations after Paul had been there, caused the conflict. The whole letter is influenced by the conflict between Paul and his opponents,³ to such an extent that “Paul’s letter to the Galatians is one of the fiercest and most polemical writings in the Bible”.⁴ There is no thanksgiving in the introduction of the letter, as is usually the case in the apostle’s writings. Paul immediately proceeds to the problem at hand, signalling the urgency of the situation.⁵

Paul needed to write the letter to the Galatians because his authority had come under attack in the congregations. His opponents were asserting that they, and not Paul, were the real apostles.⁶ Paul had to defend his apostolate, which he already does in the first verse of the letter where he makes it clear that he too is an apostle of the Lord (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι’

³ Dieter Sänger, “Galaterbrief”, in *Paulus Handbuch*, ed. F. W. Horn (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 195.

⁴ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul’s Letter*, 1.

⁵ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 13.

⁶ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul’s Letter*, 22.

ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν).⁷

While Paul's message was approved at the apostle convent in Jerusalem, where it had been decided that there was "no material difference" between the message to Jews and Gentiles because "both are the work of God",⁸ Paul's authority had been in dispute since his relationship with the Jerusalem apostles had been strained by the conflict in Antioch.⁹ In Antioch, Peter ate with Gentiles, as Paul did. God taught Peter that he was allowed to eat with Gentiles according to the Cornelius episode in Acts 10.¹⁰ However, after members of the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:12: "certain men from James") came to Antioch, Peter stopped his table fellowship with the Gentiles and again observed the strict Jewish rituals.¹¹ Peter would have kept the same strict rituals when eating with fellow Christian Jews in Jerusalem.¹² His handling of table fellowship now became a problem in Antioch, where there were both Jewish and Gentile Christians.

The question of whether Gentile converts to Christianity had to adhere to Jewish customs apparently had not been cleared at the time. Different points of

⁷ Paul does not refer to himself as an apostle in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, presumably because his apostleship had not been questioned at that stage. He does introduce himself as an apostle in the letters after 1 Thessalonians, but only in Galatians does he take great care to emphasize why he is an apostle (cf. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 4).

⁸ Betz, *Galatians*, 49.

⁹ Cf. James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, BNCT (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 13.

¹⁰ Cf. Franz Mußner, *Der Galaterbrief*, HThKNT 9 (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 138–9.

¹¹ Cf. Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1953), 96.

¹² Cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 39.

view existed. There were Christian Jews who still lived as Jews, following the Jewish rituals, but they did not expect the Gentile Christians to do the same. They accepted the law-free gospel to the Gentiles, without adhering to it themselves. Other Jewish Christians required that Gentiles take on a Jewish lifestyle when converting to Christianity. They were “stressing the need for Gentiles to be circumcised and to keep the rudiments of the cultic calendar, both for full acceptance by God and as a proper Christian lifestyle”.¹³ This was the point of view of Paul’s opponents in Galatia, who are usually referred to as Judaizers. These Christian–Jewish missionaries required of Gentile Christians to live under the Jewish law and as a result, the salvific meaning of Christ’s death, which was so important to Paul, was “no longer recognized in its all-sufficiency”.¹⁴ Their teachings caused conflict between them and Paul.

More conflict between Paul and his opponents in Galatia, who “feature in every chapter of the letter”,¹⁵ was caused by the attack on the apostolate of Paul. The authority of the Jerusalem apostles, with whom the Judaizers presumably were in contact, was unquestioned, because they had been the disciples of Jesus. They personally knew and followed the Lord. Paul, however, did not have “personal contact with the historical Jesus”.¹⁶ He had to explain where he got his message from, and why his gospel was authoritative, “with his opponents

¹³ Longenecker, *Galatians*, xcv; cf. Betz, *Galatians*, 31.

¹⁴ Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul*, 49.

¹⁵ Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 3.

¹⁶ Betz, *Galatians*, 39.

claiming that he [Paul] was dependent on and subordinate to the apostles at Jerusalem”.¹⁷

Apart from the fact that Paul did not have contact with the earthly Jesus, he was also a missionary of the Antiochian church for some time (cf. Acts 13:1–3). The congregation in Antioch sent him out, and this could have caused his opponents to claim that his apostleship was authorized by and through men. They could have argued that Paul was sent out to preach the gospel by other humans, while the Lord himself sent out the Jerusalem apostles. Consequently, it was necessary for Paul to explain and defend his apostolate. He needed to put his apostolate on the same level as that of the Jerusalem apostles, in order to legitimize his apostolate and message.¹⁸

The message of the Judaizers was effective and many Galatians started to live a Jewish lifestyle, abandoning the law-free gospel introduced to them by Paul. They consequently shifted “their allegiance away from Paul, their founder, and away from the Pauline form of the gospel to his Jewish-Christian competitors and enemies”.¹⁹ Paul saw the truth of his gospel threatened as a result of the activities of his opponents and accused them in Gal 1:6–9 of preaching “another gospel” (ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον). According to Paul, this “other gospel” is in reality no gospel, as there only is one gospel: the same gospel he had received from the Lord. Paul claims that every other form of the gospel is contrary to the one gospel

¹⁷ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 33.

¹⁸ Cf. Ridderbos, *The Epistle of Paul*, 65.

¹⁹ Betz, *Galatians*, 46.

of Christ, even if it is preached by “an angel from heaven” (Gal 1:8). A stronger claim for the authority of his gospel is not possible.

8.1.2 The understanding of Galatians 1:11–12

After claiming to be an apostle of the Lord in Gal 1:1, Paul continues to defend his authority in v. 11–16 of the same chapter²⁰ as part of his autobiography (1:11 – 2:21).²¹ In Gal 1:11–12, he asserts “that the gospel that was preached by me is not man’s gospel. For I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it, but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ” (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Paul here argues that because of the Damascus experience, his gospel and his apostolate “required neither the confirmation nor the interpretation of any human authority”.²² God sent him out with the same authority as the Jerusalem apostles and his gospel does not need to be approbated by them.

Galatians 1:11–12 has often been consulted as a passage that could provide more information on the amount of knowledge Paul had about Jesus. Like Gal 1:18, v. 11–12 are usually referred to by the “minimalists” to strengthen

²⁰ Betz, *Galatians*, 38–9.

²¹ Charles H. Cosgrove, *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and Theology of Galatians* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 31.

²² Taylor, *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem*, 65.

their case that Paul had no or limited knowledge of the Jesus tradition.²³ They opine that these verses make it improbable that Paul got familiar with the Jesus tradition through fellow Christians, as – by his own admission – he received his gospel in a revelation.

The majority of scholars do not agree with this interpretation, because Galatians 1–2 is a polemical text. It does not claim to depict a neutral or temporal sequence of Paul’s life, but rather an argument that Paul intended to win.²⁴ Paul wanted to underline his independence from the Jerusalem apostles and prove that his gospel had been authorized by Christ alone.²⁵ His aim was to defend his gospel against the claim that it is of a secondary nature, because he did not belong to the twelve, and to justify his apostolate.²⁶

After the Antiochian conflict, Paul broke with Antioch and, consequently, he “lost his apostolic accreditation and his legitimizing base”.²⁷ His only option in response to his opponents in Galatia was to claim his authority directly from Christ.²⁸ Paul uses the revelation to place his calling on the same level as the appointment of the original Jerusalem apostles.²⁹

²³ Cf. Lindemann, “Paulus und die Jesustradition”, 298.

²⁴ Becker, *Paulus*, 17.

²⁵ Hengel and Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 72–3.

²⁶ Cf. Ridderbos, *Paulus en Jezus*, 51.

²⁷ Murphy–O’Connor, *Paul*, 113.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 112–3.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 106; Cf. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 137–8. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 83, highlights that Paul never voluntarily mentions the revelation on his way to Damascus. He refers to it only in conflict with his opponents when his authority came under attack.

Perhaps the most important aspect in Gal 1:11–12 is the meaning of the word “gospel”. When Paul states that he did not receive his gospel from humans, the “minimalists” understand “gospel” as meaning “information about Jesus”. Yet, if Paul wanted to stress in Gal 1:11–12 that he did not receive *the wording* of his gospel from humans, but through a revelation in Jesus Christ, this would be contrary to his emphasis in 1 Cor 15:1–7; 11:2; 11:23–25, where he unambiguously states that he reproduces material which he had received from other humans.³⁰ Galatians 1:8–9 further indicates that the gospel Paul preached can very well be regarded as “tradition”. Paul also incorporates many pre-Pauline traditions into his letters, so that it cannot be denied that he did learn something about Jesus from others.

Paul’s declaration that he did not receive the gospel he preached from humans, but through the revelation of Jesus Christ at the time of his call to be an apostle, does not exclude him from learning the Jesus tradition from fellow Christians. As his chronology showed, Paul started learning the Jesus tradition in Damascus and preached the gospel he received in the revelation even *before* meeting Peter and James in Jerusalem.³¹

In a similar way, Paul claimed to have been *called by God* to proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles (cf. Gal 1:15–16). At the same time, he was *sent by the*

³⁰ Schnelle, *Paulus*, 95. Schoberg, *Perspectives of Jesus*, 123: “Turning to the issue of Paul’s dependence on tradition, scholars generally agree that in a number of places Paul reflects sayings or beliefs that he has inherited from Christians before him”.

³¹ Cf. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 266–7.

church in Antioch to proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 13:1–3). These aspects do not exclude, but complement, each other.³²

In other words, in Gal 1:11–12 Paul is concerned about *the truth of the contents* of the gospel and not about *the specific wording* of the gospel.³³ As there can be only one gospel of the one God, who has revealed himself through Jesus Christ, the purpose of the revelation is to validate its content. This Paul explains in the preceding verses 6–10.³⁴ Galatians 1:11–12 cannot be used as proof that Paul was not well informed about the Jesus tradition.³⁵

In summary, it can be argued that “he [Paul] was not trying to stand aloof from Jerusalem in respect of everything to do with the new movement. What he wanted to safeguard was quite simply the claim that his basic understanding of his apostleship to the Gentiles came direct from God”.³⁶ Thus, the revelation cannot be used as an argument against the knowledge of the Lord’s words by Paul.³⁷ Combined with the observation that Paul probably had learned something

³² Cf. Becker, *Paulus*, 84.

³³ Cf. Lietaert Peerbolte, *Paul the Missionary*, 171 (my italics).

³⁴ Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, 168.

³⁵ Cf. Lindemann, “Paulus und die Jesustradition”, 298. With “gospel” Paul can however also refer to the law-free gospel – to his commission to proclaim Christ among the Gentiles – in contrast to the understanding of the gospel of Paul’s opponents, who demand strict adherence to the Torah, even from Gentiles (cf. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 88; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 23; Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 396). If it is assumed that Paul had received his commission to proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles in the revelation on his way to Damascus, he is only denying in Gal 1:11–12 that his “law-free gospel came to him by means of any human instruction” (Longenecker *Galatians*, 23–5; Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 93; Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 20).

³⁶ James. D. G. Dunn, “The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2”, *NTS* 28 (1982): 465.

³⁷ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 266.

about Jesus even before his conversion, it cannot be denied that Paul received at least some parts of his gospel from others. The revelation of Christ on the road to Damascus, rather, showed him that the gospel of the congregation that he prosecuted was true.³⁸ It is, therefore, part of Paul's self-understanding that the gospel is transmitted both as revelation and through men.³⁹

8.1.3 A saying of the Lord in Galatians 1:16?

Paul continues to defend the truth of his gospel as well as the authority of his apostleship when he describes his own call and ministry in Gal 1:15–17. Paul's description of his calling in these verses shows allusions to Isa 49 and Jer 1.⁴⁰ Paul describes his calling in a similar way to that of the Old Testament prophets. He thereby underlines his own authority as someone who was called by God.

Paul also defends his independence in Gal 1:15–17,⁴¹ by denying that he consulted the Jerusalem apostles before he started to proclaim the gospel.⁴² He claims that he saw the Jerusalem apostles only three years after his conversion, when he finally did go to Jerusalem (v. 18). In other words, Paul again

³⁸ Wick, *Paulus*, 60–2; cf. Schmithals, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, 91.

³⁹ Cf. Schnelle, *Paulus*, 95.

⁴⁰ Roy E. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2*, WUNT II/102 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 111.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 73.

⁴² Cf. Betz, *Galatians*, 72.

demonstrates that he was not commissioned by the Jerusalem apostles to preach the gospel to the Gentiles,⁴³ nor did he receive his gospel from the Jerusalem pillars.⁴⁴ God commissioned him with the same authority as the Jerusalem apostles.

Galatians 1:16 contains a possible allusion to a synoptic Jesus tradition. When Paul explains that God had called him through grace and that he did not confer with “flesh and blood” (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα) before proclaiming the gospel to the Gentiles, the formulation “flesh and blood” comes as a surprise. It is unusual to refer to other humans this way. The formulation “flesh and blood” is used in Matt 16:13–20 in the confession of Peter – a passage that describes from where Peter had received his authority.⁴⁵

Gal 1:16	Matt 16:16–17
<p>ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως <u>οὐ</u> προσανεθέμην <u>σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι</u></p>	<p>ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. 17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι <u>σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν</u> σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.</p>

⁴³ Cosgrove, *The Cross and the Spirit*, 127.

⁴⁴ Cf. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 68; Francois Vouga, *An die Galater*, HNT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 33.

⁴⁵ Interestingly, this possible parallel has attracted little attention in essays and monographs written on parallels between Paul's letters and the synoptic gospels. The possible link between these verses has been the subject of investigation in some commentaries, especially by W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Vol II*, ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1991).

The following linguistic peculiarities link Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:16–17:

- The key words σὰρξ and αἷμα are both used often on their own in the New Testament: σὰρξ 147 times and αἷμα 97 times. The formulation “flesh and blood” (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα) is, however, found only five times in the New Testament: In the synoptics only in Matt 16:17 and in the (genuine) Pauline letters only in Gal 1:16 and 1 Cor 15:50 (cf. Eph 6:12; Heb 2:14).⁴⁶
- The verb ἀποκαλύπτω occurs 26 times in the New Testament;⁴⁷ Matthew uses it four times and Luke five times, while Mark never uses this verb. Paul uses it most often (ten times). What is significant about the use of ἀποκαλύπτω, is that Matt 16:17 and Gal 1:16 are the only instances in the New Testament where God is the one who reveals, that is, the subject of the verb.
- Jesus is called the Son (υἱός) of God in both passages. It is unusual for Paul to refer to Jesus as the “Son”. He only calls Jesus the “Son” when quoting pre-Pauline material or the scriptures (cf. Rom 8:3; Gal 4:4, 30).

Apart from the verbal agreements, the role of the apostles comes under scrutiny. Paul certainly knew that Peter had a special position among the twelve. Galatians 2:17–18 and 1 Cor 15:5 show that Paul was familiar with Peter’s prominent role in early Christianity (as is illustrated in Matthew 16:17), because Peter is depicted as leader of the apostles in both instances.⁴⁸ In the synoptics, “the passage about

⁴⁶ Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, WBC 33b (Dallas, TX: Word, 1995), 610.

⁴⁷ Traugott Holtz, “ἀποκαλύπτω”, *EWNT* 3:313.

⁴⁸ Cf. Donald Senior, *Matthew*, ANTC 1 (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998), 194; Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, 41.

Peter the rock, is easily the most explicit narrative elevating Peter to a position of leadership”.⁴⁹ And because Paul’s letter to the Galatians was written shortly after the Antioch conflict (Gal 2:11–14), “the question of Paul’s apostleship vis-à-vis that of Peter will have been uppermost in Paul’s mind”.⁵⁰ The only way Paul could validate his apostolate and the truth of his gospel was by placing himself on the same level as Peter, who had been commissioned by Jesus himself. Therefore, when Paul claimed to have been called to be an apostle in the same way as Peter – not by “flesh and blood” but by God himself – this was the ultimate argument that Paul could have used to validate his apostolate as well as his gospel. The work of his opponents had necessitated him to such a drastic step.

The phraseology between Gal 1:13–17 and Matt 16:16–20 shows that “it is at least possible that Paul is telling the story of his conversion in a way that brings out the parallel between himself and Peter; certainly he compares himself to Peter in what follows”.⁵¹ The situation in Galatia and the attack on his apostolate and gospel had forced Paul into comparing himself with Peter.

⁴⁹ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 200–1. The pericope “forms the central turning point in Matthew’s narrative, as it is in Mark’s” (R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 612). Peter acts as spokesperson for the group (*Ibid.*, 617).

⁵⁰ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 202 n. 95.

⁵¹ Wenham, *Paul and Jesus*, 69. Wenham thinks that Paul “may be an early witness to Matthew’s account” (69-70).

8.1.4 The Synoptic parallels of Galatians 1:16

In Mark 8:27–30 and its parallels Matt 16:13–20 and Luke 9:18–20, Peter confesses Jesus to be the Christ. The scene starts with Jesus and his disciples going to the villages of Caesarea Philippi. On their way there, (according to Mark 8:27), Jesus asked the disciples: “Who do people say that I am?” And they told him, “John the Baptist; and others say, Elijah; and others, one of the prophets.” And he asked them, “But who do you say that I am?” Peter answered him, “You are the Christ”.⁵² The Lukan version is similar to its counterpart in Mark, but Matthew adds a saying of Jesus specifically addressed to Peter. Matt 16:17–19 is Matthean *Sondergut*.⁵³ Jesus says to Peter: “Blessed are you, Simon Bar-

⁵² Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλιππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες [ὅτι] Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστὴν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἥλιαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτοῦς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.

⁵³ For differences between the Markan and Matthean parallels, cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 464. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 605–15, argue that their findings point to the originality of the Matthean version by cautiously formulating: “Matthew 16.17–19 may preserve the original conclusion to the incident at Caesarea Philippi, and the text may give us an important glimpse into the life of Jesus”. They give numerous reasons for their assumption: These verses contain “several words and expressions Matthew does not use elsewhere: Βαριωνᾶ, σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, πύλαι ἄδου, καπισχύω, κλείς. There is also a high number of Semitisms – a higher percentage than is normal for redactional material”. Cf. Bernard P. Robinson, “Peter and His Successors: Tradition and Redaction in Matthew 16.17–19”, *JSNT* 21 (1984): 86. Mark could have omitted these verses because they can be misunderstood as meaning that Peter is the foundation of the church, as opposed to Jesus. That John also leaves out the corresponding verses similarly to Mark, does not support Mark’s priority. John consistently mutes the prominence of Peter. In contrast, A. Vögtle, “Zur Herkunft von Matt 16,17–19”, in *Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Für Josef Schmid*, eds., P. Hoffman, N. Brox and W. Pesch (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), 390–1, thinks that Matt 16:17 was formed by Matthew and therefore is neither a logion nor traditional material.

Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven”.

8.1.5 Possible Jewish and Hellenistic parallels

The formulation “flesh and blood” (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα) used by Jesus in Matt 16:17 proves to be rare. While all seem to agree that “flesh and blood” refers to humanity in contrast to being from a higher order like God, there are very few parallels to the phrase “flesh and blood”, as used by Paul and Matthew. The proposed parallels in Sirach 14:18: “Like abundant leaves on a spreading tree that sheds some and puts forth others, so are the generations of flesh and blood (σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος): one dies and another is born” (NRSV) and Sirach 17:31: “What is brighter than the sun? Yet it can be eclipsed. So flesh and blood (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα) devise evil”, show little resemblance with the Pauline and Matthean verse would not have served as template for these texts.

In addition, Evans lists Ignatius, Phil. 7:2 as a possible parallel to Matt 16:17. In this verse, Ignatius denies learning “from flesh *of man*” similar to Paul who denied learning his gospel from humans. However, Ignatius does not use the phrase “flesh and *blood*”. The use of the formulation by Paul and Matthew is unique.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ The only possible parallels to the use of “flesh and blood” in Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:17 are found in the New Testament verses 1 Cor 15:50; Eph 6:12 and Heb 2:14. Paul and Matthew have no possible *Vorlage* for their use of the formulation.

8.1.6 Conclusion

The verbal agreements between Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:16–17 about “flesh and blood”, combined with the lack of clear Jewish or Hellenistic parallels, make it at least possible that Paul knew about the commissioning of Peter as described in Matt 16:16–17. A connection between the verses is strengthened by the fact that it is unusual for God to be the subject of the verb ἀποκαλύπτω as well as Paul’s infrequent references to Jesus as the “Son”.

The context of the agreeing words again plays an important role. In Matthew, the saying of Jesus gives Peter a special authority. Moreover, since Paul’s authority had been questioned due to the Antiochian conflict, and by his opponents in Galatia, he needed to defend his apostolate. Paul justified his apostolate and message by referring to his experience on the road to Damascus, where the Lord called him, similar to the other apostles. He then gave the strongest possible defence of his apostolate and message, comparing his calling to that of Peter.

In summary, it can be said that because Paul was informed about the special authority of Peter, and because of the linguistic agreements between Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:16–17, Paul probably knew a text similar to the one later used by Matthew. Again, Matthew’s version is the only synoptic passage that comes into consideration as parallel to the Pauline verse, as it is Matthean *Sondergut*.

8.2 *The command to love the neighbour*

In the history of the search for parallels, Gal 5:14 is the most frequently mentioned Galatian passage.⁵⁵ It is commonly mentioned in the same context as Rom 13:8–10, as the command to love the neighbour is present in both of these Pauline texts. Synoptic counterparts containing the command to love the neighbour are found in the great commandment in Mark 12:28–34 and its parallels in Matt 22:34–40 and Luke 10:25–28, as well as in the narrative of the rich young man in Matt 19:16–22.⁵⁶ Due to the dating of Paul's letters prior to the synoptics, Paul's rendition of the love command is the first written contribution about loving the neighbour in the emerging Christendom.⁵⁷

8.2.1 The context of the command to love the neighbour in Gal 5:14

After Paul had defended his apostolate in Gal 1 and 2, freedom from the law became one of the letter's main topics. It was necessary for Paul to deal with this matter, again because of the Jewish–Christian missionaries. After Paul had left the Galatian congregations, his opponents went there, demanding of the Galatians that they live under the Mosaic Law and be circumcised.⁵⁸ As previously mentioned, Paul saw a real danger that the gospel would be compromised in the

⁵⁵ Cf. Chapter 2 (Tables 1–6).

⁵⁶ The command to love the neighbour is not repeated in the narrative of the rich young man in the versions of Mark 10:17–22 and Luke 18:18–25.

⁵⁷ Cf. Oda Wischmeyer, "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe bei Paulus", *BZ* 30 (1986): 161.

⁵⁸ Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 9–11.

measures of the Jewish–Christian missionaries.⁵⁹ He needed to take a stance against the missionaries; otherwise, his law–free gospel would have been undermined.

Another threat to the law–free gospel was that the Galatians had misunderstood it. Evidently, the misunderstanding of the concept of Christian freedom caused the lovelessness that was present in the churches of Galatia. Paul corrected the view of the Galatians by proclaiming that Christian freedom does not allow for neglecting to love the neighbour, but is much more “expressed in loving service to others”.⁶⁰ Paul unfolds the correct understanding of the freedom from the law in Gal 5:1 – 6:10. Galatians 5:14 forms part of this larger passage.

The issue of circumcision dominates Gal 5:1–12, and in v. 13, Paul reminds the Galatians that they were indeed called to freedom.⁶¹ Paul makes it clear that the Galatians should not misuse their freedom, but keep on serving one another in love. Understood in the right way, this call to freedom is “a call not merely *from* the older enslavement, but also a call *to* a new responsibility”.⁶²

⁵⁹ Victor P. Furnish, *The Love Command in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1973), 96.

⁶⁰ Longenecker, *Galatians*, 238. Paul argues that the Christians should keep the love commandment not because it stands in the Torah (because they would then need to keep all the other commands as well and be circumcised), but because it is an essential determination of the children of God, who do not live for themselves, but for the one who died for them (Gal 2:20). This becomes visible in the service to others (cf. Jürgen Becker, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 18th ed., NTD 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 86.

⁶¹ Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 12th ed., KEK 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 241.

⁶² Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 287 (his italics).

In Gal 5:14, Paul continues his argument, when he writes: “For the whole law is fulfilled in one word: ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself’” (ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν).⁶³ The apostle quotes Lev 19:18b as the one word in which the law is fulfilled: ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.⁶⁴ This is an exact quote of the LXX version.⁶⁵

The command to love the neighbour from Lev 19:18b could be listed alongside Paul’s other Old Testament citations. Yet, because Jesus quoted the same commandment according to the synoptics, Paul’s understanding of the Old Testament commandment could have been influenced by the way it was used by the synoptic Jesus, making it at least possible that Paul was thinking of a saying of Jesus when he was quoting this commandment. The probability that Paul was influenced by Jesus’ words about loving the neighbour will be discussed next.

⁶³ “The conjunction γάρ (‘for’) connects in an explanatory fashion v 14 to the final statement of v 13, thereby giving a reason why Christians are to serve others through love, for such loving service results in all that the law pointed toward in its commandments” (Longenecker, *Galatians*, 243).

⁶⁴ The statement requiring love towards the neighbour comes “somewhat surprisingly” in this context. Paul, who has “so definitely denounced legalism (cf. esp. 3:6–14) and set aside the law as a pedagogue in the Christian life (cf. 3:23–4:7)”, is now paradoxically requiring the holding of the same law (Longenecker, *Galatians*, 241). Similarly, Becker, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 86, agrees that v. 14 is irritating at first, because Paul has just emphatically stated that the law is not a binding Christian norm (5:1–12), and now, in v. 14, commands to love the neighbour, quoting the same law.

⁶⁵ Becker, *Der Brief an die Galater*, 86.

8.2.2 Possible Synoptic parallels to Galatians 5:14

If one looks at the tables presented in the history of the search for parallels in chapter 2, it is noticeable that all the scholars who assume a connection between Jesus and Paul's renditions of the commandment to love the neighbour list Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28) as synoptic counterparts of both Rom 13:8–10 and Gal 5:14.⁶⁶

Some unsubstantiated assumptions have been made in the search for possible synoptic parallels of Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10. Firstly, in the comparison of Rom 13:8–10 and Gal 5:14 to their synoptic parallels, the two Pauline passages have been treated as similar texts. Although both Pauline texts contain the command to love the neighbour as the self, there are significant differences between the two texts. The significance of these differences has not been satisfactorily recognized, as will be shown. Secondly, in searching for synoptic parallels, not all the possibilities have been considered. It has, for example, been overlooked that the command to love the neighbour is found not only in the great commandment of Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28), but in other synoptic texts as well. While Mark and Luke only report on one episode in which the command is used, Matthew renders the command to love the neighbour three times, each time in a different setting (Matt 5:43; 19:19;

⁶⁶ Cf. Tables 1–6 (chapter 2) demonstrate that roughly half of the listed scholars think that the two Pauline passages do indeed have parallels in Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28). For the others, significant reasons exist for assuming that Paul was not necessarily influenced by Jesus' interpretation of the love command. These objections will be dealt with throughout the following analysis.

22:39). The first two Matthean verses have not been sufficiently considered as possible parallels to Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10. In the table below, the usually proposed parallels are listed. They all contain the command to love the neighbour.

Rom 13:8–10	Gal 5:14	Mark 12:28–34	Matt 22:36–40	Luke 10:25–28
<p>Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, ἐν τῷ·</p> <p><u>Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</u> 10 ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.</p>	<p>ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ·</p> <p><u>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</u></p>	<p>ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολή πρώτη πάντων; [...] <i>καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου</i> [...] δευτέρα αὕτη·</p> <p><u>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</u> μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολή οὐκ ἔστιν.</p>	<p>ποία ἐντολή μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; [...] <i>ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου</i> [...] δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ·</p> <p><u>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</u> ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος κρέμαται καὶ οἱ προφῆται.</p>	<p>[...] Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν·</p> <p><u>Ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου</u> [...] <u>καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</u></p>

8.2.3 The context of the love command in the Synoptic Gospels

Mark 12:28–34 and its parallel Matt 22:36–40 portray a discussion between Jesus and a counterpart (in Mark a scribe; in Matthew a lawyer). In their sequence, the Markan and Matthean accounts are similar: After a discourse between Jesus and the Sadducees about the resurrection, Jesus is approached with a question about the most important commandment. Jesus' answer contains the great commandment – to love God and to love the neighbour.⁶⁷ The great commandment is often believed to have been used by Jesus.⁶⁸

The setting in which the commandment to love the neighbour is portrayed in the third synoptic gospel is quite different. In Luke, the question asked by Jesus' counterpart is not specifically about the most important commandment, as it is in Mark and Matthew. According to Luke 10:25, a lawyer asks Jesus: “Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” (διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζῶν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;). There are more striking differences between Mark and Matthew on the one hand, and Luke on the other. In Mark and Matthew, Jesus

⁶⁷ Although the sequence of the accounts is similar, there are many differences in the wording between Mark and Matthew. Matthew, who is assumed to be dependent on Mark, “makes several substantial omissions, the longest of these being the omission of the entirety of Mark 12:32–34” (Hagner, *Matthew*, 644–5). Moreover, while all three synoptic gospels follow the LXX when quoting Lev 19:18, their versions of Deut 6:4–5 vary greatly (cf. Arland J. Hultgren, “The Double Commandment of Love in Mt 22:34–40: Its Sources and Compositions”, *CBQ* 36 (1974): 374. Matthew, for example, omits “the opening words of the Shema in v 37” and the phrase “and with the whole of your strength” (Mark 12:30). Further differences will only be noted if they are important to the study.

⁶⁸ Evans, *Mark*, 261, argues that it is unlikely that “Jesus' affirmation of the Shema, which is neither remarkable nor specifically Christian, would have been created by an early Christian prophet or tradent. Exalting the Jewish Law is hardly what one would expect an early Christian to do (especially if Jesus had not)”. Cf. Sherman E. Johnson, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, 2nd ed., BNTC (London: Black, 1972), 202.

himself uttered the great commandment, and in Luke's gospel, the double commandment of love is put into the mouth of the lawyer. In addition, in Matthew and Mark, Jesus' discussion with the lawyer or scribe happened in Jerusalem; in Luke, Jesus is still on his way to the city.⁶⁹ Another obvious deviation from Mark and Matthew in Luke is that, in the third gospel, the command to love the neighbour forms part of the introduction to the parable of the Good Samaritan, which is Lukan *Sondergut*. In Mark and Matthew, the account containing the great commandment forms its own passage, without the parable. Luke's version is sometimes not regarded as a real parallel because of these differences, but is thought of as a different event.⁷⁰ Still, because the Lukan passage contains the command to love the neighbour as oneself, it is the only Lukan text that comes into consideration as parallel to the Pauline verses.

8.2.4 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to Gal 5:14, Rom 13:8–10 and synoptic counterparts

The existence of similar Jewish or Hellenistic texts is frequently put forward as a reason for not regarding comparable texts in Paul and the synoptics as parallels. Therefore, great care must be taken to establish whether Paul or the authors of the synoptics could be dependent on writings known in the surroundings of the New Testament when they render the commandment to love the neighbour.

⁶⁹ Cf. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 25.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 34. Hagner, *Matthew*, 644, calls the Lukan account a “secondary parallel”.

Commentaries and other secondary literature to Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28) list numerous ancient parallels to various aspects of Jesus' discussion with his counterparts about the most important commandment.

All these aspects need to be taken into consideration in order to establish whether Paul and Jesus' rendition of the love commandment is unique and can be discerned from similar ancient texts. If the Pauline passages and Jesus' teaching (as portrayed in the synoptics) include the same distinguishable features, there could be reason to assume that Paul and the synoptic authors had access to similar versions of the words of Jesus. In the following section, possible Jewish and Hellenistic parallels will be compared to Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8–10 and Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28) in order to determine whether the Pauline and synoptic verses could be dependent on ancient parallels or not.

8.2.4.1 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to the great commandment

In Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28), the command to love God (Deut 6:5) and the command to love the neighbour as the self (Lev 19:18b) are combined. Paul would have known both Old Testament texts because of his Pharisaic background. However, as these commands are found in different Old Testament books, one has to ask when these commandments were connected for the first time, and if they were already combined in writing before Paul.

The following texts could all be regarded as parallels to the great commandment, because each one includes both the command to love God and

the command to love the neighbour.⁷¹ Most of the resembling texts are found in the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs.⁷²

- T. Dan 5:1–3: Observe the Lord’s commandments, then, my children, and keep his Law. [...] Avoid wrath, and hate lying, in order that the Lord may dwell among you, and Beliar may flee from you. 2 Each of you speak truth clearly to his neighbor, and do not fall into pleasure and troublemaking, but be at peace, holding to the God of peace. Thus no conflict will overwhelm you. 3 Throughout all your life love the Lord, and one another with a true heart.
- T. Iss. 5:1–2: Keep the Law of God, my children; achieve integrity; live without malice, not tinkering with God’s commands or your neighbor’s affairs. 2 Love the Lord and your neighbor; be compassionate toward poverty and sickness.
- T. Iss. 7:6: I acted in piety and truth all my days. The Lord I loved with all my strength; likewise, I loved every human being as I love my children.
- T. Benj. 10:2–3: Do the truth, each of you to his neighbor; 3 keep the Law of the Lord and his commandments.
- T. Zeb. 5:1: Now, my children, I tell you to keep the Lord’s commands; show mercy to your neighbor, have compassion on all, not only human beings but to dumb animals.
- T. Jos. 11:1: You, therefore, my children, in every act keep the fear of God before your eyes and honor your brothers.
- T. Sim. 5:2: And now my children, “Make your hearts virtuous in the Lord’s sight, make your paths straight before men, and you shall continually find grace with the Lord and with men”.
- Jub. 36:7–8 And now I will make you swear by the great oath [...] that you will fear him and worship him. 8 And (that) each one will love his brother with compassion and righteousness and no one will desire evil for his brother from now and forever all the days of your lives so that you will prosper in all your deeds and not be destroyed.
- Philo, *Spec. Laws* 2:63: And there are, as we may say, two most especially important heads of all the innumerable particular lessons and doctrines; the regulating of one’s conduct towards God by the rules of piety and holiness, and of one’s conduct towards men by the rules of humanity and justice; each of which is subdivided into a great number of subordinate ideas, all praiseworthy.⁷³

⁷¹ Cf. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 133–4; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 477, n. 63; Evans, *Ancient Texts*, 357, 364; Evans, *Mark*, 264–5; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1998), 64–6; Andreas Nissen, *Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1974), 230–1.

⁷² Unless otherwise indicated, quotes are from James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vols. 1 and 2* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).

⁷³ Philo is quoted according to *The Works of Philo, Complete and Unabridged*, trans. C. D. Yonge (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993).

- Philo, *Decalogue* 109–110: But they who have thought that beyond their duties to their fellow men there was no such thing as goodness, have clung solely to their fellowship with and to the society of men, and, being wholly occupied by a love of the society of men, have invited all men to an equal participation in all their good things, labouring at the same time to the best of their power to alleviate all their disasters. 110 Now, one may properly call both these latter, these philanthropic men, and also the former class, the lovers of God, but half perfect in virtue; for those only are perfect who have a good reputation in both points.⁷⁴

Clearly, there are quite a few instances in which the commands to love God as well as the neighbour were combined in ancient literature. What is striking, though, is that in none of these citations are the two love commands connected “by means of actual OT quotations”.⁷⁵ There is not a single explicit reference to either Deut 6:5 or Lev 19:18. It is neither commanded to “love the Lord *your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might*” (Deut 6:5) nor to “love your neighbour *as yourself*” (Lev 19:18b). In fact, Deut 6:4–5 is not cited verbatim in any late Jewish texts.⁷⁶ Furthermore, in the vast majority of the instances in which *πλησίον* is used in ancient literature, it is found in the LXX and in the New Testament; it is found far less often in non-biblical literature.⁷⁷ Marshall adds that because of their age, it is “impossible to be certain that the

⁷⁴ Udo Schnelle, ed., *Neuer Wettstein. Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechenland und Hellenismus, Bd. I/1. 1, Texte Markusevangelium* (Belin: de Gruyter, 2008), 577–82, lists nine possible Greek and Hellenistic parallels to Mark 12:28–34: Pseudo-Phocylides. Sent. 8; Philo, Spec. 2:63; Dio Chrysostom Or. 10:22; 31:7; 74:5; Epictetus Diatr. II 14:10–13; IV 7:20; Seneca Ep. 90:3; 95:50–51 (cf. Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, 142–68). All of the texts mention God and other humans, but they do not quote Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18.

⁷⁵ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 477–8; cf. Wischmeyer, “Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe”, 174; Furnish, *The Love Command*, 62.

⁷⁶ Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu*, 72, 80.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 101.

Jewish parallels have not been subjected to Christian influence”,⁷⁸ rather than the other way round.

When it is also taken into consideration that the Old Testament itself gives no indication that the commands to love God and the neighbour are the most important commandments (it does not link the two commandments in any way), we have to assume that the double commandment *with its explicit Old Testament quotes* was first formulated *in writing* in the synoptics (Paul does not combine the two commandments in the same context).⁷⁹

It can, however, not be excluded without doubt that the Jewish texts served as templates for the formulation of the great commandment, as the commandments to love God and the neighbour were frequently combined. The idea of love towards God and the neighbour is clearly expressed outside of the New Testament (as shown in the examples above), even though the extra-biblical writings do not quote Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18. Because of the closeness of ideas, the basis for the combination of the two love commandments into the great commandment of the New Testament could have been laid in Jewish literature.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 444.

⁷⁹ Cf. J. B. Stern, “Jesus’ Citation of Dt 6,5 and Lv 19,18 in the Light of Jewish Tradition”, *CBQ* 28 (1966): 312 (my italics).

⁸⁰ Nolland, *Matthew*, 581, likewise, assumes that Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18b could be sources for these ancient texts, even though the wording does not agree.

8.2.4.2 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to the command to love the neighbour

A similar situation as with the great commandment seems to apply regarding the quote of the command to love the neighbour. This command also was not expressed by an actual citation from the Old Testament. Before Paul, Lev 19:18 is not even found as an explicit quote in Jewish literature.⁸¹

The following texts can be considered as parallels to the command to love the neighbour:⁸²

- T. Reub. 6:9: I call to witness the God of heaven that you do the truth, each to his neighbor, and that you show love, each to his brother.
- T. Zeb. 5:3: Have mercy in your inner being, my children, because whatever anyone does to his neighbor, the Lord will do to him.
- T. Zeb. 6:6: Therefore the Lord made my catch to be an abundance of fish; for whoever shares with his neighbor receives multifold from the Lord.
- T. Zeb. 7:2: You, therefore, my children, on the basis of God's caring for you, without discrimination be compassionate and merciful to all. Provide for every person with a kind heart.
- T. Zeb. 8:3: To the extent that a man has compassion on his neighbor, to that extent the Lord has mercy on him.
- T. Gad. 4:1–2: Beware, my children, of those who hate, because it leads to lawlessness against the Lord himself. Hatred does not want to hear repeated his commands concerning love of neighbor, and thus it sins against God.
- Jub. 20:2: And he [Abraham] commanded them that they should guard the way of the LORD so that they might do righteousness and each one might love his neighbour.
- Jub. 36:4: And among yourselves, my sons, be loving of your brothers as a man loves himself, with each man seeking for his brother what is good for him, and acting together on the earth, and loving each other as themselves.
- Let. Aris. 168: Our Law forbids harming anyone in thought or in deed. [...] to the intent that through the whole of our lives we may also practice justice to all mankind in our acts, remembering the all-sovereign God.

⁸¹ Wischmeyer, "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe", 163–4.

⁸² Unless otherwise indicated, quotes are from James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vols. 1 and 2.

- Sir 10:6: Do not get angry with your neighbor for every injury, and do not resort to acts of insolence (NRSV).
- m. 'Abot 1:2 by R. Simon the Just: "By three things is the world sustained: by the Torah, by the temple worship, and by deeds of love".⁸³
- In Aboth of R. Nathan is written: "It happened that R. Johanan ben Zakkai went out from Jerusalem, and R. Joshua followed him, and he saw the burnt ruins of the Temple, and he said, 'Woe is it that the place, where the sins of Israel find atonement, is laid waste'. Then said R. Johanan, 'Grieve not, we have an atonement equal to the Temple, the doing of loving deeds', as it is said, 'I desire love, and not sacrifice'".⁸⁴
- Sipra Lev. 200: Rabbi Aqiba: "'but you shall love the neighbour as yourself.' Rabbi Aqiba says, 'This is the encompassing principle of the Law'".⁸⁵

The golden rule – which is also an indirect command to love the neighbour – can be added to these commands to love the neighbour.

- Syr. Men. 250–251: Everything that is hateful to you, you should not wish to do that to your neighbor.
- Let. Aris. 207: "What does wisdom teach?" This next guest replied, "Insofar as you do not wish evils to come upon you, but to partake of every blessing, (it would be wisdom) if you put this into practice with your subjects, including the wrongdoers, and if you admonished the good and upright also mercifully. For God guides all men in mercy."
- Tob. 4:15: "And what you hate, do not do to anyone" (NRSV).

A sizable number of texts refer to loving the neighbour. However, again: "Explicit references to Lev. xix.18 LXX are lacking in Jewish literature *before Paul*, and

⁸³ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 481, n. 74.

⁸⁴ Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament*, 203.

⁸⁵ This is the only comparable text that explicitly quotes Lev 19:18b (Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament*, 202; cf. France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 477). R. Aquiba's text was written later, though, and Paul would not have known it (Wischmeyer, "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe", 164). Nissen, *Gott und der Nächste*, 399–401, does not believe that the saying of the Rabbi is a parallel to Mark 12:28–34, as the intention of the question and the function of the answer in which the command to love the neighbour is given is completely different in both sets of writings. Rabbi Aquiba speaks about the highest principle and not about a command, as the synoptic gospels do.

allusions to it are given no particular prominence. [...] In contrast, Lev. xix.18 is the Pentateuchal passage most often cited in the NT”.⁸⁶ The absence of direct references to Lev 19:18b is highlighted by the fact that Jewish–Hellenistic parallels before Paul usually do not command to love the neighbour as *the self* (ὡς σεαυτόν). Dunn, therefore, argues: “The stimulus to focus thus on Lev. xix.18 must therefore be peculiarly Christian and is best explained as deriving from Jesus himself, as the Synoptic traditions indicate”.⁸⁷

Furthermore, Furnish underlines a difference between the Pauline and synoptic meaning of the command to love the neighbour in contrast to Hellenistic teachings. He remarks that “to be bound in Christ means to be bound to one another in a love that cares and that serves. The Hellenistic popular philosophers of Paul’s day would have found it hard to agree that freedom consists in servant concern for others”.⁸⁸

Similarly to the great commandment, the command to love the neighbour – when analysed on its own – does have templates in Jewish and Hellenistic writings, but is not quoted from the Old Testament itself. The use of the command to love the neighbour in Jewish and Hellenistic writings again causes doubt as to

⁸⁶ Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 29 (my italics). It is quoted in Mark 12:31 *pars*; 12:33; Matt 5:43; 19:19; Rom 13:9; Jas 2:8.

⁸⁷ Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 291. Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Talmud und Midrash*, 4th ed. (München: Beck’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), 353-368, differentiate the Christian command to love the neighbour from its Jewish parallels. When Paul and the synoptic gospels command love for the neighbour, all people are included. In contrast, the Jewish literature only commands love to the fellow Jew, or in some cases, the proselyte, when they command to love the neighbour (cf. chapter 8.2.9 below).

⁸⁸ Furnish, *The Love Command*, 97–8.

whether the extra-biblical writings served as templates for the New Testament use of the command to love the neighbour. A dependency on Jewish and Hellenistic writings is again a possibility.

8.2.4.3 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to the summarization of the Law

Another link between Gal 5:14 (Rom 13:8–10) and Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28) is found in the attempt to summarize the law into a single commandment, and to identify the most important commandment. All three synoptic gospels give the great commandment as the answer to the highest commandment in the Torah. The attempt to identify the most important commandment in the Torah was not uncommon at the time, as many rabbinic discussions revolved around this question.⁸⁹ The fact that the law is summed up in Paul as well as in the synoptics is not unique in itself.⁹⁰ Yet, the answer given by Paul and Jesus about the most important commandment differs from that of comparable Jewish texts,⁹¹ as the following references indicate:

- b. Sabb. 31a: “Once a heathen came to Shammai and said to him, ‘I’ll become a convert if you can teach me the whole Torah while I stand on one foot.’ Shammai became angry and drove him off with a tool he had in his hand. He came to Hillel with the same proposition. Hillel said to him, ‘What you dislike, do not do to others. That is the whole Torah. The rest is commentary. Go and learn the commentary!’”.
- t. Pe’ah 4:19: “Charity and deeds of loving–kindness outweigh all other commandments of the Torah” (France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 477, n. 61).

⁸⁹ Cf. Gert J. Steyn, “Pretexts of the Second Table of the Decalogue and Early Christian Intertexts”, *Neot* 30/2 (1996): 454.

⁹⁰ Cf. Floyd V. Filson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 2nd ed. (London: Black, 1971), 237; Hagner, *Matthew*, 646.

⁹¹ Cf. Nissen, *Gott und der Nächste*, 389–415.

- b. Mak. 23b–24a: R. Simlai said: “Six hundred and thirteen commandments were given to Moses, 365 negative commandments, answering the number of the days of the year, and 248 positive commandments, answering to the number of a man’s members. Then David came and reduced them to eleven [Ps. xv]. Then came Isaiah, and reduced them to six [Isa. xxxiii. 15]. Then came Micah, and reduced them to three [Mic. vi. 8]. Then Isaiah came again, and reduced them to two, as it is said: ‘Keep ye judgement and do righteousness’. Then came Amos, and reduced them to one, as it is said, ‘Seek ye me and live’. Or one may then say, then came Habakkuk [ii. 4], and reduced them to one, as it is said, ‘The righteous shall live by his faith” (Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament*, 202).
- Midr. Tanh. B on Judg §10 (16b) similarly refers to the reduction of the 613 commandments of Moses to 11 by David (Ps 15).
- Mek. Ex 15:26: “Obey: this is the main rule, containing the whole Torah”.
- b. Ber. 63a: Bar. Kappara said: “Upon what short text do all the essential principles of the Torah depend? ‘In all your ways acknowledge Him and He will direct your paths”.

In these quotes, various answers are given regarding the most important commandment, or the command by which the whole Torah can be summarized. None of the commandments could have served as a template for the Pauline and synoptic passages, because neither the great commandment nor the command to love the neighbour is present in any one of them. In b. Sabb. 31a, Rabbi Hillel summarizes the Torah with the golden rule, which does, of course, have parallels in Matt 7:12 and Luke 6:31,⁹² but not in Mark 12:28–34 and its parallels.⁹³ Furthermore, Hillel’s golden rule cannot be regarded as a summary, guiding principle or yardstick of the Torah, because the Gentile who asked the question still had to learn its commentary. In other words, it does not suffice to know the

⁹² France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 478.

⁹³ Cf. Peter Dschulnigg, *Das Markusevangelium*, TKNT (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007), 323, n. 119.

most important commandment according to this passage. Hillel's golden rule does not relativize or reform the Torah, nor does it make it redundant.⁹⁴

More reasons exist for doubting that the summarization of the law in the New Testament in Gal 5:14 (Rom 13:8–10) and Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28) has templates in Jewish or Hellenistic literature. In only one of these ancient passages summarizing the law, as listed above, is the neighbour (πλησίον) mentioned. This is in Ps 15:3 (Ps 14:3 LXX), where the neighbour is mentioned in one of the eleven commandments of the Psalm. More importantly, love is mentioned nowhere when the Torah is summarized in contemporary literature of the New Testament. Consequently, these passages do not provide suitable parallels in regards to the summarization of the law, neither to Mark 12:28–34 and its parallels, nor to Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10.

8.2.4.4 Possible parallels to the fulfilling of the Law

The final aspect that combines the Pauline and synoptic passages is the idea of fulfilling the law. The search for possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels in which the concept of fulfilling the law is present proves to be difficult. Schnelle and Strecker list no parallels to the fulfilling of the law, neither to Rom 13:8–10 nor to Gal 5:14.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Nissen, *Gott und der Nächste*, 396–7. In the New Testament, only the Matthean version of the golden rule has a summarizing character: “So whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also to them, *for this is the Law and the Prophets*”. In Luke, the italic words are missing.

⁹⁵ Udo Schnelle and Georg Strecker, eds., *Neuer Wettstein. Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechenland und Hellenismus, Bd. II/2, Texte zur Briefliteratur und zur Johannesapokalypse* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996).

Evans lists Wis 6:18 as parallel to Rom 13:10, but the aspect of fulfilling the law is not present in this verse.⁹⁶ That the concept of fulfilling the law has no parallels in Jewish literature is to be expected, because the possibility of fulfilling the Torah through a single commandment would not have been thought to be possible in Hellenistic Judaism. Philo, for example, retains the Torah with all its requirements.⁹⁷ According to Räisänen: “Any Jew would have agreed with the statement that a perfect obedience to the law is impossible”.⁹⁸ It is, therefore, not attested in Jewish or Hellenistic texts that the whole law depends on the great commandment or the single command to love the neighbour, as Paul and the synoptic authors had argued.

The concept of fulfilling the law is unique, but the relationship between the New Testament passages expressing the idea of fulfilling the law is difficult to establish. Galatians 5:14 and all three verses of Rom 13:8–10 mention the fulfilling of the law, but the concept is more scarcely attested to in the synoptics, as the following table shows:

Gal 5:14	Rom 13:8	Rom 13:9	Rom 13:10	Matt 22:39–40	Mark 12:30–31
For <i>the whole law</i> is fulfilled (πεπλήρωτα)	<u>The one who loves another</u> has fulfilled	[...] and any other commandment, are summed up	<u>Love</u> is the fulfilling (πλήρωμα) of the <i>law</i>	[...] <u>You shall love your neighbor as yourself.</u> On	[...] ‘ <u>You shall love your neighbor as</u>

⁹⁶ Evans, *Ancient Texts*, 383. Wis 6:18: “Love of her is the keeping of her laws, and giving heed to her laws is assurance of immortality” (NRSV).

⁹⁷ Wischmeyer, “Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe”, 183.

⁹⁸ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 120.

i) in one word: <u>“You shall love your neighbor as yourself”</u> .	(πεπλήρωκεν) <i>the law</i>	(ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται) in <i>this word</i> : <u>“You shall love your neighbor as yourself.”</u>		these two commandments depend (κρέματα) <i>all the Law</i> and the Prophets.	<u>yourself.</u> There is no other commandment greater than these.
---------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Three of the four Pauline verses claim that the law is fulfilled in the command to love the neighbour (Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8, 10); the other speaks of summing up the law in the command to love the neighbour (Rom 13:9). The only synoptic version that somewhat resembles the Pauline concept of fulfilling the law is that of Matthew. When it comes to Mark and Luke, neither comes into the equation when considering parallels to the fulfilling of the law. Mark 12:30 does not speak of fulfilling the law, and Luke has no parallel to the above-mentioned Markan and Matthean verses. Paul and Matthew are connected through the word “law” (νόμος), a word that stands 194 times in the New Testament, yet is not used once by Mark.⁹⁹

At first, it is not clear whether Matthew and Paul can be considered as parallels at all, as the possible parallels have little verbal agreement apart from the quote of Lev 19:18 and their use of νόμος. Matthew uses the verb κρέματα when highlighting the importance of the great commandment. When Paul mentions the fulfilling of the law, he uses the verb πληρώω in Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8, while using the noun πλήρωμα in Rom 13:10. In Rom 13:9, he says that the

⁹⁹ Matthew uses νόμος in 5:17, 18; 7:12; 11:13; 12:5; 22:36, 40; 23:23 and Luke in 2:22, 23, 24, 27, 39; 10:26; 16:16, 17 and 24:44. Paul uses the word often, especially in Romans and Galatians.

law can be summed up (ἀνακεφαλαιῶ) by the love command.¹⁰⁰ There is nothing unusual about Paul’s use of these words for fulfilling or summing up the law: They are words that he also uses elsewhere, and that are typical for him.¹⁰¹ Yet, despite of his choice of words, “Paul’s language has significance because there are few references in Jewish literature to ‘fulfilling’ the law”.¹⁰²

As mentioned above, there are not many verbal agreements between Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8-10 and Matt 22:34–40 (// Mark 12:28–34; Luke 10:25–28) when it comes to statements regarding the fulfilling of the law. One has, therefore, often searched for other synoptic verses in which the same concept of Paul’s understanding of fulfilling the law is present. Matthew 5:17, then, is often considered as a parallel to both Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10. Kim, for example, states: “The expression ‘fulfilling [πληρῶ] the Law’ in Rom 13:8b and in Gal 5:14 (especially with its eschatological nuance), while rare in Jewish literature, is paralleled by Matt 5:17”.¹⁰³ In Matt 5:17, Jesus says: “Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to

¹⁰⁰ According to Georg Bertram, “κρέμαμα”, *TDNT* 3:920–1, “κρέμαται, ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται and πεπλήρωται are exact material parallels which have the same fact in view. The believer is not bound in his conduct by a multiplicity of demands. He acts in the power of love”.

¹⁰¹ The verb πληρῶ is used 86 times in the New Testament, 13 times by Paul. Of the 17 instances the noun πλήρωμα is used in the New Testament, six are found in Paul’s letters. The verb ἀνακεφαλαιῶ is used only twice in the New Testament (Rom 13:9; Eph 1:10).

¹⁰² Cf. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 128. Cf. *Ibid.*, 139: “Paul’s paraenesis here is not simply lifted from Jewish tradition”.

¹⁰³ Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 267. Cf. Fiensy, “The Synoptic Logia”, 89.

fulfill them” (Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι).¹⁰⁴

Another verse could be added here. When one searches for New Testament verses containing both πληρῶω/πλήρωμα and νόμος, apart from Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8, 10 (cf. Rom 8:4) and Matt 5:17, one finds that Luke 24:44 is the only other verse that meets the criteria. In Luke 24:44, Jesus says: “These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled” (οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὧν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ).

Although Paul, Matthew and Luke express the concept of fulfilling the law in various ways, the relationship between the verses is not clear. Therefore, one has attempted to establish a relationship between the various texts by discussing the meaning of the passages. Discussions about what precisely is meant by the ‘fulfilling the law’ are normally carried out in deliberations over the meaning or the role of the law in the New Testament.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Similar to νόμος, πληρῶω is used seldom by Mark (twice), while Matthew (16x), Luke (9x) and Paul (18x) use it often.

¹⁰⁵ The debate over the understanding of the law in the various New Testament writings is complex and cannot be repeated here in detail.

Many researchers seem to agree that Paul and Matthew had the same concept in mind concerning the fulfilling of the law.¹⁰⁶ Matthew is the only synoptic author who, comparable to Paul, speaks of the fulfilment of the law. He does this in 5:17, where he uses the same verb (πληρώω) as Paul does in Rom 13:8 and Gal 5:14. Furthermore, Matthew's statement in Matt 22:40 that "the Law and the Prophets" depend (κρέμνται) on the great commandment is similar to the Pauline concept of fulfilling the law.¹⁰⁷ What differentiates Paul and Matthew's respective deliberations on the law is the different situations they were writing in.¹⁰⁸

However, despite these similarities, a dependence between the Matthean and Pauline texts cannot be presupposed. The Pauline statements on the fulfilling of the Law are found in the same verse (Gal 5:14) or in consecutive verses (Rom 13:8–10). In Matthew, one would have to combine two verses from different chapters to get the same idea across.

¹⁰⁶ According to Hagner, *Matthew*, 105, "the precise meaning of πληρώσαι, 'to fulfill,' is a difficult question that has produced much debate". The word "is never used by Matthew to describe obedience to the law". "It is best to understand πληρώσαι here as 'fulfill' in the sense of 'bring to its intended meaning' – that is, to present a definite interpretation of the law, something now possible because of the presence of the Messiah and his kingdom" (*Ibid.*, 106). Longenecker, *Galatians*, 243, assumes a similar meaning: "So with respect to Paul's statement here, 'Galatians 5:14 is not itself a command to fulfill the law but a statement that, when one loves one's neighbour, the whole law is fully satisfied in the process'". Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Matt 1–7*, EKK I/1 (Zürich: Benzinger Verlag; Neukirchener-Verlag; Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 231, notes that the Matthean idea that Jesus came to fulfil the law is formulated so broadly that it is not permissible to exclude specific interpretations (cf. *Ibid.*, 235).

¹⁰⁷ When Matthew states that "on these commandments depend all the Law and the Prophets", the Law and Prophets are not understood as two separate sets of scripture, but as denoting the totality of the will of God (cf. Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 224). The whole law is not reduced in the love commandment, but is concentrated in it (cf. Backhaus, "Evangelium als Lebensraum", 18–9).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Ulrich Luz, "Die Erfüllung des Gesetzes bei Matthäus (Matt 5, 17–20): Eduard Schweizer zum 65. Geburtstag", *ZTK* 75/4 (1978): 431–5.

In other words, despite the distinctive topic of the fulfilling of the law in the love commandment by Paul and Matthew, which differentiates it from Jewish and Hellenistic texts, the Pauline texts summarizing the law (Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8–10) have no substantial parallels in the synoptics. There is not enough agreement between Paul and Matthew to assume a connection between the verses.

8.2.4.5 Summary

Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10 are frequently compared to possible synoptic parallels in Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28).¹⁰⁹ As illustrated above, these texts share many similarities, but not all of the features are unique. The only distinguishable concept combining the Pauline and synoptic texts is the idea of fulfilling the law, but the Pauline and synoptic texts are too different to assume a connection between the verses.

Based on the comparisons above and the relationship to Jewish and Hellenistic literature, one has to ask whether Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10 are substantial parallels to Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28), especially because Paul never uses the great commandment. The single commandment to love the neighbour is contained in all the texts, but the surrounding verses show no similarities in wording or thought. It does not suffice to assume that Paul knew the great commandment, but simply did not quote the

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Walter Diezinger, “Zum Liebesgebot Mark xii 28–34 und Parr.,” *NovT* 20/2 (1978): 81.

combination of the commands to love God and the neighbour.¹¹⁰ One cannot downplay the significance that the command to love God is lacking in Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10, when comparing these verses to Mark 12:28–34 and its parallels, as Bertram, for example, does.¹¹¹

Since little verbal agreement exists between Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8–10 and Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28), one has to search for further parallels. Similarly to Paul's single command to loving the neighbour, Matthew quotes the command to love the neighbour (without the command to love God) in Matt 5:43; 19:19. Matthew 19:19 reminds of Rom 13:8–10, and a closer at these passages will now be taken.¹¹²

8.2.5 The context of the love command in Rom 13:8–10

Romans 13:8–10 is part of the greater passage Rom 12:1 – 15:13. In these chapters of Romans, Paul discusses many themes resembling teachings from his other letters, including the fulfilment of the law in Rom 13:8–10, which resembles Gal 5:14.¹¹³ In the exhortations of Romans 12 – 15, Paul takes up

¹¹⁰ Paul uses Deut 6:4 in 1 Cor 8:4b.

¹¹¹ Bertram, *TDNT* 3:920.

¹¹² Matthew 5:43, in its context of the Sermon on the Mount, has no clear Pauline parallel.

¹¹³ Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, TICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 745.

various traditional materials,¹¹⁴ including a number of sayings similar to those attributed to Jesus in the synoptics,¹¹⁵ as was shown in chapter 6.

In Romans 13, Paul starts by discussing obedience to the state in v. 1–7, then returns to the topic of love in Rom 13:8–10,¹¹⁶ a theme he had already addressed in chapter 12.¹¹⁷ Addressing Christians divided by scruples, he insists that “love for one another is the only debt that should remain” (Rom 13:8).¹¹⁸

Paul repeats the command to love the neighbour in each of the three verses of Rom 13:8–10. In v. 8, he states that “the one who loves another has fulfilled the law”, in v. 9, he quotes the love commandment as part of a collection of commandments, and in v. 10, he makes more comments on the commandment to love the neighbour.¹¹⁹

In v. 9, Paul lists some of the commandments from the second table of the Decalogue in addition to the command to love the neighbour. The authors of the synoptic gospels repeat similar lists of Decalogue commandments: All three synoptics integrate some commandments from the second Decalogue table into

¹¹⁴ Cf. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 594; Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 81; Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 332.

¹¹⁵ James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, WBC 38b (Dallas, TX: Word, 1988), 706.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1993), 677.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, 303.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 121.

¹¹⁹ Paul’s use of πλησίον is noteworthy. He only uses it in Rom 13:8–9; 15:2 and Gal 5:14. In Rom 13:8–9, as well as in Gal 5:14, he quotes the command to love the neighbour from Lev 19:18. Therefore, he only uses πλησίον once when not quoting from another source (cf. Dunn, “Jesus Tradition in Paul”, 170). When Paul talks about the neighbour without quoting, he prefers to use ὁ ἕτερος (cf. Rom 2:1, 21; 1 Cor 4:6; 6:1; 10:24, 29; 14:17; Phil 2:4), as he also does in Rom 13:10 (cf. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Vol. 3, 68).

the narrative of the rich young man in Mark 10:17–31 and its parallels in Matt 19:16–30 and Luke 18:18–30.

8.2.6 Possible Synoptic parallels to Rom 13:8–10

The account of the rich young man is portrayed in all three synoptic gospels. The narrative tells “the story of a young man whose great riches kept him from the full and unreserved commitment required of one who would become a disciple”.¹²⁰ The man in question came to Jesus and asked (Mark 10:17): “Good Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” (διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;). In his response, Jesus asked the young man why he called him good (v. 18), because only one is good (τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός).¹²¹ Thereafter, Jesus told the man to keep the commandments. While doing so, Jesus listed some of the Decalogue commandments (v. 19), resembling Rom 13:9. In all three synoptic gospels, the narrative of the rich young man is followed by a dialogue on the question whether the rich could enter the kingdom of God.

When one compares the three synoptic versions of this narrative, there are many divergences in the different passages. The differences between Mark (who is assumed to be the source of Matthew and Luke’s versions)¹²² and Matthew, for

¹²⁰ Hagner, *Matthew*, 555.

¹²¹ The statement “there is only one who is good” might allude to Deut 6:4 (cf. *Ibid.*, 557).

¹²² Cf. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20*. Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1989), 510.

example, are so vast, that one has to assume that the Markan passage was “extensively reworked” by Matthew, even “more so than is usually the case and with a number of special interests in mind”.¹²³ The unusually high number of minor agreements between Matthew and Luke also causes confusion when the texts are compared. Most of the minor agreements can be attributed to the “independent Matthean and Lukan redaction, although it is difficult to explain their great number”.¹²⁴ Klijn thinks that there were two different versions of the tradition about the rich young man, because Matthew differs so much from Mark and Luke.¹²⁵

The synoptic account of the rich young man is closely related to the synoptic rendition of the great commandment. This is exemplified by Luke’s gospel in particular. In Luke’s introduction into the account of the great commandment, a lawyer asks Jesus (Luke 10:25): “Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” (διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;). This is almost the exact question asked by the ruler in Luke 18:18: “Good Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” (διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;). In the second instance, Jesus is called a “good” teacher; otherwise, the question introducing the passages is the same. Luke thus delivers two different accounts starting with the same introductory question. This is the same question as the one asked in Mark in the narrative of the rich young man

¹²³ Hagner, *Matthew*, 555–6; cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 510, n. 9.

¹²⁴ Luz, *Matthew*, 510.

¹²⁵ Albertus F. J. Klijn, “The Question of the Rich Young Man in a Jewish–Christian Gospel”, *NovT* 8 (1966): 149–55.

(Mark 10:17 = Luke 18:18). Matthew 19:16 is slightly different, because the rich man asks: “Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life?” (διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;).

In Mark and Matthew’s account of the great commandment, Jesus’ counterpart did not ask what he should do to enter eternal life, as in Luke’s gospel. According to Mark 12:28, he asked for the most important commandment of all (ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων;), and, following Matt 22:36, the lawyer wanted to know: “Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?” (διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ;). In both narratives, Jesus was asked to somehow summarize what is important, making the two accounts of the greatest commandment and the rich young man comparable.¹²⁶ The agreements between the two synoptic accounts could explain why Rom 13:8–10 shows similarities to both synoptic passages.

When the synoptic texts are then compared to the Pauline letters, it can be noted that Paul does not repeat narrative elements of Jesus’ conversation with the rich young man. The verbal agreements between Paul and the synoptics are

¹²⁶ Cf. Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 396.

found in the rendering of the Decalogue commandments only. This is illustrated in the table below.¹²⁷

¹²⁷ In order to make the comparison of the various texts easier, I have changed the order of the commandments in the synoptic texts, as well as those of the Exodus text, so that their respective sequences match the one of Rom 13:9. The order of the commandments in their original setting is given in brackets. Exodus 20:13–16 is quoted from the LXX. The commandments of Deut 5:17–20 are identical to those of Ex 20:13–16 in the BHS and are not included separately (Cf. Ulrich Schmid, “Old Testament and New Testament Versions of the Mosaic Law: The Intersection of Oral and Written Tradition”, in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010*, ed. M. K. Peters. (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 589). For the textual criticism of the different New Testament versions of the Decalogue commandments, see Steyn, “Pretexts”, 453-9.



Rom 13:8–10	Mark 10:19	Matt 19:18–19	Luke 18:20	Ex 20:13–16 LXX
<p>⁸ Μηδενί μηδέν ὀφείλετε, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. ⁹ τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, (1) <i>οὐ φονεύσεις,</i> (2) <u>οὐ κλέψεις,</u> (3) οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, (4) (καὶ εἴ τις ἐτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται) [ἐν τῷ]. <i>ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.</i> ¹⁰ ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.</p>	<p>μὴ μοιχεύσης, (2) <i>μὴ φονεύσης,</i> (1) <u>μὴ κλέψης,</u> (3) <u>μὴ ψευδο– μαρτυρήσης,</u> (4) μὴ ἀποστερήσης, (6) <u>τίμα τὸν πατέρα</u> <u>σου καὶ τὴν</u> <u>μητέρα.</u> (5)</p>	<p>τὸ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, (2) <i>οὐ φονεύσεις,</i> (1) <u>οὐ κλέψεις,</u> (3) <u>οὐ ψευδο– μαρτυρήσεις,</u> (4) ¹⁹ <u>τίμα τὸν</u> <u>πατέρα καὶ τὴν</u> <u>μητέρα,</u> (5) <i>καὶ ἀγαπήσεις</i> <i>τὸν πλησίον σου</i> <i>ὡς σεαυτόν.</i></p>	<p>τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας· μὴ μοιχεύσης, (1) <i>μὴ φονεύσης,</i> (2) <u>μὴ κλέψης,</u> (3) <u>μὴ ψευδο– μαρτυρήσης,</u> (4) <u>τίμα τὸν πατέρα</u> <u>σου καὶ τὴν</u> <u>μητέρα.</u> (5)</p>	<p>¹³ οὐ μοιχεύσεις. (2) ¹⁵ <i>οὐ φονεύσεις.</i> (4) ¹⁴ <u>οὐ κλέψεις.</u> (3) ¹⁷ οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (6). ¹⁶ <u>οὐ ψευδο– μαρτυρήσεις</u> (5) ¹² <u>τίμα τὸν πατέρα</u> <u>σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα,</u> (1) [...]</p>

Based on this comparison the following can be stated:

- The Decalogue is quoted incompletely in Matthew, Mark, Luke and Paul, that is, in all four of these New Testament renditions.¹²⁸ Although the Decalogue “formed the heartbeat of the Jewish religion”,¹²⁹ this should not come as a surprise, since in early Christianity the Decalogue was quoted nowhere as a whole. It was much rather common that only a few commandments from the second table were listed together in early Christianity. One should therefore not expect Paul to have rendered the whole Decalogue.¹³⁰
- None of the four New Testament versions is identical to any other version. The order cited by Paul is encountered in the B text of LXX Deut 5:17–19 (Codex Vaticanus). Luke and James follow this order too, as do Philo¹³¹ and Papyrus Nash. It was the most frequently cited order at the time.¹³² The sequence of the Greek Deuteronomy tradition differs from the

¹²⁸ Cf. Udo Schnelle, “Das Liebesgebot im Neuen Testament: Jesus, Paulus und Johannes”, in *‘Liebe’ im Wandel der Zeiten. Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven*, ed. K. Tanner (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005), 30.

¹²⁹ Steyn, “Pretexts”, 453.

¹³⁰ Wilckens, *Der Brief and die Römer, Vol. 3*, 69–70.

¹³¹ Gert J. Steyn, “A Comparison of the Septuagint Textual Form in the Torah Quotations Common to Philo of Alexandria and the Gospels of Mark and Matthew”, in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010*, ed. M. K. Peters (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 605-624, has compared the Decalogue commandments of Mark and Matthew to those of Philo.

¹³² Schmid, “The Old Testament”, 590.

Masoretic text.¹³³ Matthew and Mark follow the order of the Masoretic text, but in the LXX translation.¹³⁴

– The first three commandments in Luke and Paul follow the same order, but the former lists five commandments and Paul four. Furthermore, Matthew and Luke contain the same commandments (five in total), although in a slightly different sequence. Luke inverts the first two commandments in comparison to Matthew.¹³⁵

– Mark adds a sixth commandment, which only he delivers (μὴ ἀποστερήσης). The commandment “Do not defraud” in Mark is unique. It is not found in any other Decalogue version, neither inside nor outside of the New Testament. It might be a substitute for the tenth commandment,¹³⁶ but its appearance is hard to explain.¹³⁷

– Another striking feature in the comparison is that Mark and Luke on the one hand, and Paul and Matthew on the other formulate their commandments differently.

Paul/Matthew οὐ + 2nd person singular, *future indicative active*

Mark/Luke μὴ + 2nd person singular, *aurist conjunctive active*

¹³³ Cf. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 677, n. 2.

¹³⁴ Cf. Wolfgang Wiefel, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, HKNT (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998), 338; William F. Albright, Christopher S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, AB 26 (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1971), 232.

¹³⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X–XXIV), Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28a (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1986), 1199.

¹³⁶ Cf. Evans, *Mark*, 96; Hagner, *Matthew*, 555.

¹³⁷ Cf. K. J. Thomas, “Torah Citations in the Synoptics”, *NTS* 24 (1977): 89.

To use the future tense in the place of the imperative is not uncommon for the language of the law (*Gesetzessprache*) of the Old Testament (cf. Lev 19:18b LXX where ἀγαπήσεις is used in the command to love the brother).¹³⁸ It is also known in classical Greek.¹³⁹ The linguistic differences between the different renditions are significant, because, apart from Mark and Luke, in no other Decalogue version outside of the New Testament are individual commandments formulated with μή and in the conjunctive.¹⁴⁰ Inside the New Testament, Jas 2:11 is a comparable text. It follows Mark and Luke, but quotes only two Decalogue commandments: μή μοιχεύσης and μή φονεύσης.¹⁴¹

– Despite the linguistic and stylistic similarities between the Pauline and Matthean versions, there are some notable differences between the two passages. The prohibition of desire (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) is delivered only by Paul in Romans, and the Pauline passage lacks the commandments “Honour your father and mother” (τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα) and

¹³⁸ Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner and Friedrich Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 17th ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), §362.

¹³⁹ Steyn, “Comparison”, 621.

¹⁴⁰ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 419. Steyn, “Pretexts”, 456, also notes that Mark’s choice of words is unusual, as he “is usually in close adherence to the LXX when using formal quotations from his Jewish scrolls”.

¹⁴¹ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 419–20.

“You shall not bear false witness” (οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις) in comparison to Matthew, Mark and Luke.¹⁴²

– Interestingly, the command to honour the parents is displaced and moved and mentioned last in Matthew, Mark and Luke in comparison to Deut 5. That this particular commandment is listed only after the social Decalogue commandments is hardly known in Judaism.¹⁴³

– All three synoptic gospels deliver the Decalogue commandments in the narrative of the rich young man (Mark 10:17–31 // Matt 19:16–30; Luke 18:18–30). When compared to Rom 13:8–10, the synoptic texts only have parallels to Rom 13:9. Similarities to Rom 13:8, 10 are not found in these synoptic passages.

– Only Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:19 contain the command to love your neighbour as yourself together with the selection of Decalogue commandments. In their renditions of this passage, Mark and Luke omit the command to love the neighbour.

¹⁴² Hagner, *Matthew*, 557. It is hard to explain why Paul, Mark, Matthew and Luke have chosen to list these particular selections of commandments. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Vol. 3, 69–70, thinks that Paul lists only those commandments that protected from attacks on the lives of others, i.e. those whose scope is the love commandment. This, however, does not explain the omission of the commandment “Do not bear false witness”.

¹⁴³ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 420.

8.2.7 Possible Jewish–Hellenistic parallels to Rom 13:9 and its parallels

Apart from the above-mentioned texts containing a selection of Decalogue commandments, Decalogue commandments are quoted in other extra-biblical sources, too. Evans lists 4 Macc 2:6 and T. Zeb. 3:7 as parallels to Rom 13:9,¹⁴⁴ and Sir 4:1, m. Mak. 1:3 and m. Tamid 5:1 as possible ancient parallels to Mark 10:19. To the other synoptic verses (Matt 19:18–19; Luke 18:20), Evans lists no ancient parallels.¹⁴⁵ All of the examples listed by Evans contain only one Decalogue commandment. There is no comparable list of four to six social Decalogue commandments as in Rom 13:9 and the similar synoptic passages. The same applies when searching for Greek parallels. Schnelle lists eleven Greek–Hellenistic parallels to Mark 10:19, and, as is the case in the examples listed above by Evans, these parallels also mention only one or two Decalogue commandments.¹⁴⁶ The Greek-Hellenistic texts also do not come into consideration as parallels to the more extensive lists of commandments of the second table of the Decalogue, as delivered by Paul and the synoptic authors.

The order of the Decalogue commandments in the New Testament has, as mentioned above, been compared to the sequence of the Decalogue commandments in Jewish writings. Papyrus Nash and Josephus, *Ant.* 3, 91–92, contain all Ten Commandments. Philo renders a list of Decalogue

¹⁴⁴ Evans, *Ancient Texts*, 383.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 350, 367.

¹⁴⁶ Schnelle, *Neuer Wettstein*, 506–11.

commandments comparable to the Pauline and synoptic texts. He writes in Philo, *Decalogue*, 36: You shall not commit adultery (οὐ μοιχεύσεις), You shall not murder (οὐ φονεύσεις), and You shall not steal, (οὐ κλέψεις).¹⁴⁷ The occurrence of other lists of Decalogue commandments means that the Pauline and synoptic lists of commandments are not necessarily dependent on one another. The relationship between the different renditions of the Decalogue commandments is complex (Matthew, for example, shows up similarities with Philo when quoting the commandments),¹⁴⁸ and has been discussed elsewhere.¹⁴⁹

The combination of Decalogue commandments with the command to love the neighbour is, however, unique. This combination of commandments is found only in Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19.

There are no extra-biblical examples of the command to love the neighbour as the self's being joined to other Decalogue commandments. It did occur that the Decalogue was connected to the golden rule, or the Shema Yisrael,¹⁵⁰ but the combination of Decalogue commandments with the command

¹⁴⁷ Philo, *Decalogue*, 51, also contains some of the commandments. Cf. Schmid, "The Old Testament", 590.

¹⁴⁸ Steyn, "Pretexts", 616-22.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Schmid, "The Old Testament", 587-604; Steyn, "Pretexts", 451-62; Steyn, "Comparison", 616-22.

¹⁵⁰ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 265–7. Examples of combining the golden rule with Decalogue commandments are found in Pseudo-Philo (Lib. Ant.) where the fifth to the tenth commandments are interpreted according to the golden rule. In the Syriac Didascalia, two Decalogue commandments ("Thou shalt not desire" and "Thou shalt not commit adultery") are used in the same context as the golden rule ("what thou hatest that it should be done to thee by another, thou do not to another") as well (*Ibid.*, 265).

to love the neighbour is otherwise unknown.¹⁵¹ Paul was the first person to connect the Decalogue with Lev 19:18 in writing.¹⁵²

Berger lists Jub. 7:20 as an example of Decalogue commandments combined with the command to love the neighbour.¹⁵³ In Jub. 7:20 it is said:

And in the twenty-eighth jubilee Noah began to command his grandsons with ordinances and commandments and all of the judgments which he knew. And he bore witness to his sons so that they might do justice and cover the shame of their flesh and bless the one who created them and honor father and mother, and each one love his neighbor and preserve themselves from fornication and pollution and from all injustice.¹⁵⁴

This verse from the Book of Jubilees cannot, however, be regarded as a real parallel to Rom 13:9. In Jub. 7:20, only one Decalogue commandment (“honour father and mother”) is listed together with other commands (which do not stem from the Decalogue), as well as with the command to love the neighbour. It can also be added that, in the verse from the Book of Jubilees, it is not commanded to love the neighbour *as the self*. Leviticus 19:18 is not quoted verbatim. For these reasons, it is not likely that there is any connection between Rom 13:9 and Jub. 7:20. Romans 13:9, with its parallels, is not only lacking in Jewish parallels, but also in Greek or Latin parallel texts linking Decalogue commandments to the command to love the neighbour, as a look at the *New Wettstein* suggests.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ Wischmeyer, “Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe”, 168, adds that this combination is not to be expected: “Eine *Zusammenfassung der Tora* gerade in Dekalog und Nächstenliebe schließlich liegt außerhalb des Gesichtskreises der verschiedenen Spielarten jüdischer Theologie vorpaulinischer Zeit” (his italics).

¹⁵² Cf. Thomas Söding, *Das Liebesgebot bei Paulus*, NTA 26 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 257, n. 139.

¹⁵³ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 390.

¹⁵⁴ James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. With Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books, Vol. 2.*

¹⁵⁵ Schnelle, *Neuer Wettstein*, 506–11.

In other words, there are no Jewish or Hellenistic texts explicitly combining Decalogue commandments with the command to love the neighbour. The unique combination of these commands and its difference from the Jewish theology of its time indicates a dependency of the renditions of Paul and Matthew. Only Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19 combine Decalogue commandments with Lev 19:18. The command to love the neighbour is omitted in the Markan and Lukan parallels. The differences between the Pauline and Matthean accounts make it difficult to establish a more precise relationship between the texts.¹⁵⁶ It can be assumed, however, that a common tradition is likely, because these two text deliver Decalogue commandments together with Lev 19:18, and there are no comparable extra-biblical texts.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Paul quotes four Decalogue commandments and Matthew quotes five. Three of them are the same.

¹⁵⁷ The uniqueness of the combination of Decalogue commandments with the command to love the neighbour in Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19 has not received a great deal of attention in New Testament commentaries up to now. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer, Vol. 3*, 69, for example, makes some remarks about the sequence of the commandments, without noting anything about the relationship of the commandments to one another. Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Matt 18–25*, EKK I/3 (Zürich: Benzinger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 122, assumes that Matthew added the command to love the neighbour to the Decalogue, but he does not mention the parallel in Rom 13. Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 598–9, highlights the high number of minor agreements between Matthew and Luke. Yet, neither he, nor Dieter Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, HNT 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 175, nor Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium. II. Teil. Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20*, HTKNT II (Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 139, mention Rom 13 in their discussions of the synoptic renditions of the Decalogue commandments. Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 86, lists Rom 13:9 because commandments from the second Decalogue table are mentioned there, but he does not comment on the relationship between the passages. Interestingly, the minimalist Walter, “Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition”, 502, assumes a connection in the traditions of Rom 13:9 and its synoptic parallels.

8.2.8 The love commandment in James 2:8; Didache 1:2; Barnabas 19:5

The command to love the neighbour is also quoted in the letter of James, and outside of the New Testament, in the Didache and Barnabas. The frequent quotation of Lev 19:18b shows its importance for the early church.¹⁵⁸ The large number of quotes of the love command, together with its high significance when quoted, is often used to argue that Jesus used these words.¹⁵⁹

Rom 13:9	Matt 19:18-19	Matt 5:21, 27	Jas 2:8, 11	Did. 1:2; 2:2-7	Barn 19: 2, 4
τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται [ἐν τῷ].	τὸ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις* 19 τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον	21: οὐ φονεύσεις; 27: οὐ μοιχεύσεις	8 Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφήν· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε· [..] 11 ὁ γὰρ εἰπών·	1:2 πρῶτον ἀγαπήσεις τὸν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε, δεῦτερον τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν· [..] 2:2: οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις+, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ μαγεύσεις, οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, οὐ	2 ἀγαπήσεις τὸν ποιήσαντά σε, [..] 4 οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις+.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Filson, *A Commentary*, 238.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 647.



<u>ἀγαπήσεις</u>	<u>σου</u> <u>ὡς</u>		<u>μὴ</u>	<u>φονεύσεις</u> [...],
<u>τὸν</u>	<u>σεαυτὸν</u> .		<u>μοιχεύσης,</u>	<u>οὐκ</u> <u>ἐπιθυμήσεις</u>
<u>πλησίον</u>			εἶπεν καί·	τὰ τοῦ πλησίον. 3.
<u>σου</u> <u>ὡς</u>			<u>μὴ</u>	οὐκ ἐπιιορκήσεις,
<u>σεαυτὸν</u> .			<u>φονεύσης·</u>	οὐ
				ψευδομαρτυρήσει
				ς*, οὐ
				κακολογήσεις, οὐ
				μνησικακήσεις. 4.
				οὐκ ἔση διγνώμων
				οὐδὲ δίγλωσσος
				2:7: οὐ μισήσεις

James’s letter was presumably written at the end of the first century CE. In this letter, many similarities to the Jesus tradition of the synoptics,¹⁶⁰ especially to Matthew, exist.¹⁶¹ The Jesus tradition in James “is especially connected to the Sermon on the Mount, Q (material found in Matthew and Luke but not in Mark), and Matthew apart from Luke, even where our present Matthew’s version is not identical to what we see in James”.¹⁶²

James 2:1–13 is “a warning against a disparaging of the poor and a preference for the rich in the community”.¹⁶³ In Jas 2:8, Lev 19:18b is quoted: “If

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 426, 430–1.

¹⁶¹ Ralph Martin, *James*, WBC 48 (Waco, TX: Word, 1988), lxxv–lxxvi, lists 18 similar verses in James and Matthew. He does not include James 2:8, 11. McKnight, *The Letter of James*, 25–6, lists 14 similar verses between James and Matthew.

¹⁶² McKnight, *The Letter of James*, 26.

¹⁶³ Martin, *James*, 57.

you really fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself,’ you are doing well” (Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε). Similar to Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19, James quotes the command to love the neighbour and some Decalogue commandments. As already mentioned, they are formulated with μή and in the aorist conjunctive by James, resembling the formulation of Mark 10:19 and Luke 18:20. The two commandments follow the order of Rom 13:9 and Luke 18:20, in contrast to the Markan and Matthean verses.¹⁶⁴

Another contrast between James and its possible parallels is visible. In James, the commandments follow a few verses after the command to love the neighbour; in Paul and Matthew, the Decalogue commandments are listed first, and are immediately followed by the quote from Lev 19:18b. Furthermore, “[t]he commandment of love is not considered in our passage [Jas 2:8] to be the chief command, in the sense of the famous saying of Jesus (Mark 12:31 and parallels); instead, it is one commandment alongside others, for otherwise the argument in vv 10f would make no sense”.¹⁶⁵ It is listed first in a series of commandments in Jas 2:8–13. This, too, differentiates it from its possible parallels.

In other words, it can be said that even if Jas 2:8–11 does resemble synoptic passages – in particular Rom 13:8–10 and Matt 19:18–19 (in all three

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Charles Freeman Sleeper, *James*, ANTC (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998), 75–6.

¹⁶⁵ Martin Dibelius and Heinrich Greeven, *James*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1976), 142.

passages the command to love the neighbour is combined with some Decalogue commandments) – the differences between the versions are too large to assume a dependency between James and Paul / Matthew.

The love command is also employed in the Didache (1:2; 2:2–7) and in Barnabas 19:5.¹⁶⁶ Didache 1:1–2 states: “So the way of life is this: first, love God who made you; second, your neighbor as yourself. And whatever you might not want to happen to you, similarly do not do to another”.¹⁶⁷ In these verses, the great commandment and the golden rule are combined. However, Deut 6:4–5 and Lev 19:18b are not quoted verbatim,¹⁶⁸ and, in contrast to the synoptic versions of the golden rule in Matt 7:12 and Luke 6:31, where the rule is formulated positively, it is given in a negative form in the Didache.¹⁶⁹

Barnabas 19:2, 4 combines the command to love God with Decalogue and other commandments, differentiating it from Rom 13:9; Matt 19:18–19 and James 2:8–11, where Decalogue commandments are combined with the command to love the neighbour.

In closing, it can be said that Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19 show up unique characteristics when the Decalogue commandments are combined with the command to love the neighbour. Similar texts are found in James, the Didache and Barnabas, but they differ from the Pauline and Matthean versions in

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 16–7.

¹⁶⁷ Clayton N. Jefford, *Didache. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Early Christian Apocrypha, Vol. 5 (Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2013), 19–20.

¹⁶⁸ Berger, *Gesetzesauslegung*, 172.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 66.

important aspects. The connection between Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19 is highlighted thereby, and the case for a common tradition behind the texts is strengthened.

8.2.9 The command to love the enemy

Many exegetes consider a parallel between the commands to love the enemy in Rom 12:14 and the Jesus tradition of the synoptic gospels likely. Neiryneck, for example, states that “there seems to be unanimity among recent commentators” that Rom 12:14 is related to Matt 5:44 and Luke 6:27–28.¹⁷⁰ The commandment to love enemies is generally attributed to Jesus, as it is otherwise inconceivable that someone would have expected love for the enemy.¹⁷¹ The command is revolutionary and has “no exact parallel in the Jewish tradition”,¹⁷² or, in the words of Reiser: “Be a friend to your friend and hate your enemy, but in moderation: this

¹⁷⁰ Neiryneck, “Paul and the Sayings of Jesus”, 516. Cf. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 96, who affirms that, apart from the explicit references, this is “by far the most commonly cited ‘allusion’ to dominical teaching [...]; one can even speak of ‘unanimity’ among the commentators”.

¹⁷¹ Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 347.

¹⁷² Hagner, *Matthew*, 134. Cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*, 94–5: “In der Neuinterpretation des Vergeltungsverzichts und der ‘Feindesliebe’ in Röm 12,14 und in seinen synoptischen Parallelen stößt man folglich auf eine originelle, *in der Umwelt sonst nirgends belegte Überlieferung*, die uneingeschränkt und ohne unmittelbare Lohnverheißung des Segnens eines mächtigen Feindes verlangt. Allerdings entspricht weder Matthäus noch Lukas vollständig der paulinischen Variante, und auch der synoptische Wortlaut ist je flexibel. Während Mt 5,44c ebenso wie Röm 12,14 die *διώκοντες* als Objekt des Kontrasthandelns in den Blick nimmt, bei Matthäus aber der Segensimperativ fehlt, sollen nach Lukas die *καταρώμενοι* gesegnet werden” (my italics). Nolland, *Luke*, 294, thinks that the command to love the enemy is not “uniquely Christian”. The texts he lists as proof for his statement require kindness to the adversary, but nowhere is it commanded to love the enemy.

is what Jews and Greeks say. Love your enemy, says Jesus”.¹⁷³ With his command to love the enemy, Jesus radicalized the Old Testament command to love the neighbour.¹⁷⁴

Rom 12:14	Matt 5:44	Luke 6:27–28
<p>εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας [ὑμᾶς], εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταράσθε.</p>	<p>ἀναπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς,</p>	<p>ἀναπάτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, [...] 28 εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεάζοντων ὑμᾶς.</p>

The relatively seldom use of the verbs εὐλογέω and καταράομαι indicates that Paul is repeating pre–Pauline material in Rom 12:14.¹⁷⁵ He is again rendering a command of Jesus in his own words, as he did in the quotes of 1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14.¹⁷⁶

The comparison of the three texts commanding love to the enemy shows that Matthew and Luke are more similar to each other than to Paul, as they have

¹⁷³ Marius Reiser, “Love of Enemies in the Context of Antiquity”, *NTS* 47 (2001): 423. Alan Kirk, “‘Love Your Enemies’, the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27–35)”, *JBL* 122/4 (2003): 668, also points out that the command to love the enemy can be sharply discerned from the Golden Rule. The latter rests on the principle of reciprocity, the former expects to give without return.

¹⁷⁴ Dieter Lührmann, “Liebet eure Feinde (Lk 6,27–35/Mt 5, 39–48)”, *ZTK* 69/4 (1972): 437.

¹⁷⁵ Sauer, “Traditionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen”, 19. Paul uses εὐλογέω in Rom 12:14; 1 Cor 4:12; 10:16. In all three instances, he does so when reciting traditional material. In the rest of the New Testament, the verb is found a further 36 times. Paul uses καταράομαι only here. It is also used in Luke 6:28 and the unrelated Matt 25:41; Mark 11:21 and James 3:9 (cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 95).

¹⁷⁶ Cf. John Piper, *‘Love Your Enemies’: Jesus’ Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and the Early Christian Paraenesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 57.

more agreement in wording, especially in the command to love the enemy. On the other hand, the texts of Romans and Luke share more verbal agreement than Romans and Matthew. Combining Paul and Luke are the verbs εὐλογέω and καταράομαι, which Matthew does not have. Against Luke, Romans and Matthew share the verb διώκω. In their turn, Matthew and Luke share the commandment to love the enemy as well as the verb προσεύχεσθε, which Paul does not explicitly use. It is assumed that Matthew and Luke made use of a common source, namely Q.¹⁷⁷

The first verb connecting Rom 12:14 to Luke 6:27–28 is εὐλογέω. It is found 41 times in the New Testament and frequently used by all three synoptic authors. The general occurrence of the word does not help to establish a relationship between the verses. What is unique about the use of εὐλογέω, though, is that only in Rom 12:14 and its parallel Luke 6:28 do we have the imperative to bless the enemy, making its use distinctive.¹⁷⁸ The verb διώκω, connecting Rom 12:14 to Matt 5:44, is found 45 times in the New Testament. It is frequently used by Paul, Matthew and Luke (Mark never uses it). No strong verbal link can be established between the Pauline and Matthean wording.

While Rom 12:14 has more verbal agreements with Luke 6:27–28 than with Matt 5:44, it can be argued that the broader context of Matthew's command to love the enemy has more similarities with the Pauline text than the Lukan. This is because Paul again cites the love command in Rom 12:10. Here, he does not

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Zerbe, *Non-Retaliatio*, 208.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Jacobi, *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?*, 87. Cf. *Ibid.*, 93: "Ein Imperativ von εὐλογεῖν ist neben Röm 12,14 im Neuen Testament sonst nur noch in Lk 6,28a [...] belegt".

quote Lev 19:18b, but renders it in his own words: “Love one another with brotherly affection” (τῆ φιλᾰδελφίᾰ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι). In other words, Paul uses the command to love the neighbour (v. 10) in close proximity to the command to love the enemy (v. 14). These two commandments are connected in Matt 5:43–44 as well.¹⁷⁹ In Matt 5:43, Lev 19:18b is partly quoted (ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου) and in v. 44, Matthew commands love towards the enemy. The combination of the two commandments is not found in Luke, as Luke does not mention the neighbour in Luke 6:27–39. There is, however, little agreement in wording between Paul and Matthew when they combine the commands to love the neighbour and the enemy, although the idea expressed is very similar.

The closest and most certain parallel between Paul and the synoptics in respect of loving the enemy therefore remains between Rom 12:14 and Luke 6:27–28.

8.2.10 Summary: The parallels between the Gal 5:14, Rom 13:8–10 and the Synoptic Gospels

The command to love the neighbour from Lev 19:18b is often cited in the New Testament and in Christian writings thereafter. It has a high prominence in the gospels, Paul’s letters, Johannine literature, and James, and it is present in the

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Olav Hanssen, “Zum Verständnis der Bergpredigt: Eine missionstheologische Studie zu Mt 5,17–48”, in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 100.

later Didache and epistle of Barnabas. The love commandment is used and expounded in five different ways in the New Testament:

1. The law is summarized by the command to love the neighbour;
2. The love commandment is connected to the fulfilling of the law;
3. The love commandment is expressed in a list of four or five Decalogue commandments from the second table;
4. Decalogue commandments are combined with the command to love the neighbour; and
5. It is commanded to love the enemy.

1. The Law is summarized into the command to love the neighbour

The law is summarized in Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8, 9, 10 and in the great commandment in Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28). Although the attempt to summarize the Torah into one commandment is not distinctive in itself, the summarization of the law using the love command is. This combines the Pauline and synoptic passages. It must be noted, however, that while the synoptic gospels use both the command to love God and the command to love the neighbour to summarize the law, Paul sums up the law in the command to love the neighbour only. The Pauline and synoptic passages summarizing the law can be regarded as parallels because of their uniqueness in quoting Lev 19:18b to summarize the law, but the texts are not dependent on one another, as

Paul never renders the great commandment. It does not suffice to argue that Paul would have known and presupposed the command to love God. There is no verbal agreement between the relevant Pauline and synoptic passages to indicate that Paul was thinking of the love of God as well when he wrote down Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10.

Allison has also identified the problem that the command to love God is absent in possible Pauline parallels to the great commandment.¹⁸⁰ Walter even argues that Paul is consciously contradicting the Jesus tradition since he omits the command to love God.¹⁸¹ What he overlooks is that both Paul and Matthew deliver the commandment to love the neighbour more than once (Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14; Matt 19:19, 22:39; cf. 5:43). In only one of Matthew's quotes of Lev 19:18b is the commandment to love the neighbour connected to the commandment to love God (Matt 22:39). When comparing Rom 13:9 to its parallel Matt 19:19, though, it is notable that the commandment to love God is found in neither of the texts. Therefore, the command to love God cannot be missing. That the single command to love the neighbour is found in these verses only is precisely what makes the proximity of these verses to each other so unmistakably clear. While the presence of the command to love God in Mark 12:28–34 and its parallels

¹⁸⁰ Allison, "Pauline Allusions", 5; cf. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, 57: "The double commandment [...] is reduced in Romans 13 (cf. Gal. 5:14) to the single command to love the neighbor". The Johannine references to the 'new commandment' also include only the second part of the great commandment (John 13:34; 15:12; 1 John 2:7; 3:11); cf. Freeman Sleeper, *James*, 74.

¹⁸¹ Walter, "Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition", 512–3.

disqualifies it from being a substantial parallel to Rom 13:8–10, it does not disprove a connection between Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19.

Neiryck's comment: "The 'word' quoted in Rom 13,9 and Gal 5,14 is the single command to love one's neighbor (Lev 19,18), not the so-called double command of the Synoptics (Mark 12,28–34; par. Matthew 22,34–40; Luke 10,25–28), and this presents 'a grave difficulty to those, who [...] wish to see Paul reverently dependent upon Jesus's words'", in fact, does not provide any difficulties.¹⁸² Neiryck is correct in stating that Paul does not quote the double command of love, but he fails to recognize that what he calls "the single command to love one's neighbor (Lev 19,18)" is present more than once in Matthew's gospel and that Matt 19:18–19 is close to Rom 13:9. He also treats Rom 13:9 and Gal 5:14 as identical texts, without noting the differences between the Pauline texts.

2. The love commandment is connected to the fulfilling of the Law

Again, the idea of fulfilling the law is present in Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8–10; Matt 5:17; 22:40 and Luke 24:44. Matthew 22:40 is the only synoptic verse mentioning the summarisation and the fulfilment of the law, both of which are issues contained in Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:8–10. Yet, there is not sufficient verbal agreement between Matt 22:40 and the Pauline passages to assume a relationship between

¹⁸² Neiryck, "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus", 293. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 246, makes a similar statement: "The issue [of whether Paul is quoting Jesus tradition] is complicated through the fact that the authenticity of the dual commandment of love (Paul, however, omits the love of God!) as part of Jesus' teaching is debated; we cannot be sure that it was actually contained in any tradition of Jesus' sayings at the time Paul was writing".

the verses. Greater agreement in wording to the Pauline verses is found in Matt 5:17, where Matthew speaks of the fulfilling of the law using the verb πληρώω. Paul uses the same verb in Rom 13:8 and Gal 5:14 (cf. Luke 24:44). These texts are used, however, in different contexts. As a result, it is hard to imagine an affiliation of these verses.

3. The love commandment is expressed in a list of four or five Decalogue commandments from the second table and 4. Decalogue commandments are combined with the command to love the neighbour.

The most likely parallel between Paul and the synoptics concerning the love command is in Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19. Both instances include a list of Decalogue commandments combined with the command to love the neighbour. Gal 5:14 includes the command to love the neighbour as oneself, but it does not join Lev 19:18 with other Decalogue commandments. Galatians 5:14 does not know the great commandment either. Therefore, neither the account of someone asking Jesus about the most important command in Mark 12:28–34 (// Matt 22:34–40; Luke 10:25–28), nor the narrative of the rich young man are real parallels of Gal 5:14.

When it comes to the listing of four to six Decalogue commandments together with Lev 19:18b, the combination is unique and implies a relationship

between the Pauline and Matthean texts.¹⁸³ This is because the command to love the neighbour is combined with a list of Decalogue commandments only in Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19, and there are no similar texts that could have served as templates for Paul and Matthew.¹⁸⁴

Neiryck is, however, sceptical of treating these texts as parallels, as Paul summarizes the Decalogue with the command to love the neighbour in Rom 13:9, while Matthew does not indicate that he is summarizing the commandments when he reproduces Lev 19:18b in Matt 19:18–19.¹⁸⁵ One can ask whether Matthew is not also summarizing, if one looks at the introduction to the narrative of the rich young man in Matthew. After the man asks Jesus in v. 16: “Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life?” (διδάσκαλε, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον;), Jesus says to him in v. 17: “If you would enter life, keep the commandments” (εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς). The man, longing for a summary of what he is to do, then asks: “Which ones?” (ποίας; v. 18). That Matthew does not explicitly say that he is summarizing the law is no reason for not assuming a connection between Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:18–19. Rather, the uniqueness of their respective combinations of Decalogue

¹⁸³ Cf. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 139: “The fact that Paul chooses to ground his call to love in the OT without appealing to Jesus, and the general absence of dominical indicators in 13.8–10 render a dominical allusion here at best only a possibility”. That might be true for v. 8 and 10, but certainly not for v. 9, if one recognizes the uniqueness of the connection.

¹⁸⁴ Tradition—historically, Matt 19:19 is secondary to Rom 13:9 (cf. Wischmeyer, “Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe”, 180).

¹⁸⁵ Neiryck, “Paul and the Sayings of Jesus”, 292.

commandments with Lev 19:18b leads one to assume a common tradition.¹⁸⁶

“The connection between the commandments in the second table of the Decalogue and Lev 19:18 must have taken place during the early beginnings of Christianity in order to combine the commandments of the Decalogue with the interpretation of the Jesus tradition”.¹⁸⁷

5. It is commanded to love the enemy

The command to love the enemy is cited in Rom 12:14; Matt 5:44 and Luke 6:27–28. It has no clear extra-biblical parallels. The Lukan parallel is the closest to the Pauline version. The other expressions of the love command all suggest a relationship between the Pauline and Matthean texts.

Although most of the connections between Paul and the synoptics on the command to love the neighbour are found in Matthew’s gospel, it does not help us to establish which synoptic framework containing the love commandment is the oldest. This is mainly due to the fact that Paul only quotes words of Jesus, and not the narrative elements in which these words are portrayed in the synoptics. Even though the Markan version of the great command is, for example, the most extensive and, even though he has additional material in the narrative of the rich young man (for example, only Mark tells us that Jesus loved the

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Holtz, “Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition”, 390–1: “The audacious summing up of the whole law in the command of love [...] can scarcely be understood except against the background of the Jesus tradition. The lack of the first part of Jesus’ double commandment can hardly count against this”.

¹⁸⁷ Steyn, “Pretexts”, 455.

man),¹⁸⁸ this does not mean that the Markan version is less original. In fact, “Mark’s account [on the great commandment] appears to be more original insofar as Luke and Matthew turn it into a controversy dialogue by deleting the questioner’s positive response and imputing to him the motive of ‘tempting’ Jesus”.¹⁸⁹ Evans explains the differences in the synoptic accounts by assuming that “several forms of the double commandment pronouncement, or dialogue, were in circulation in the oral dominical tradition”.¹⁹⁰ Burchard adds that the relationship between the three texts has puzzled researchers for many years.¹⁹¹

The comparison of the synoptic words of Jesus in these passages with the Pauline Jesus tradition do not help to determine the age and order of the narrative frameworks the sayings are delivered in. They only show that Paul and Matthew used a similar tradition of the words of the Lord when they combined Decalogue commandments with the command to love the neighbour.

Further observations have been used in an attempt to strengthen the connection between Rom 13:8–10 and the synoptic gospels. In the verses preceding Rom 13:8–10, Paul deliberates on submission to authorities (13:1–7) which reminds of Jesus’ statements in Mark 12:13–17; Matt 22:15–22 and Luke 20:19–26. In Mark and Matthew, the passages in which Jesus talks about paying taxes to Caesar are delivered only a few verses before he talks about the great

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Furnish, *The Love Command*, 71.

¹⁸⁹ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 133.

¹⁹⁰ Evans, *Mark*, 262.

¹⁹¹ Burchard, “Das doppelte Liebesgebot”, 40–6.

commandment. Luke follows another sequence with the passage about paying taxes to Caesar. If there were an echo of Jesus' saying in Mark 12:17 and its parallel in Rom 13:7, this would increase the likeliness of Paul's citing Jesus traditions in Rom 13:8–10 as well,¹⁹² as Paul would have known more than one passage similar to Mark 12 or Matt 22. However, differences between the Pauline and synoptic texts about taxes and a lack of verbal agreement make it difficult to assume a direct relationship between these verses. Thompson calls the evidence that Rom 13:7 contains a tradition of Jesus "indecisive".¹⁹³

Finally, it has also been observed that two Pauline passages (the quote in 1 Cor 7:10–11 and the allusion to words of Jesus in Rom 13:9), have parallels in Matt 19. That Paul shares similarity with two passages from Matt 19 cannot prove that Paul knew more parts of Matt 19. This observation has only probative value, making it more likely that the words of Jesus quoted or alluded to by Paul are connected to the synoptic Jesus tradition.

6. Conclusion

While Matthew shows up similarities to Paul in four of the five above-mentioned points, only in one of those (4) is it likely that Paul and Matthew knew and used a similar tradition. Their combination of Lev 19:18b and a selection of Decalogue commandments is distinctive. Luke is closely related to Paul in point five – the

¹⁹² Cf. Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 269.

¹⁹³ Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 119.

command to love the enemy. The Markan text is never closer to Paul than Matthew or Luke. Mark only connects with Paul in point one. In fact, many of these aspects are omitted in Mark's gospel: He does not speak of fulfilling the law (2), he does not combine Lev 19:18b with Decalogue commandments (4) and he does not deliver the command to love the enemy (5).

What is furthermore interesting is that Paul takes up numerous themes also found in Matt 5. Although not all the mentioned parallels can be proven without doubt because the wording differs, it is noteworthy that Paul shares many similar topics with the first chapter of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount.

Paul	Matt	Topic
Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8, 9, 10	5:17	Fulfilling the Law
1 Cor 7:10–11	5:30–32	Divorce
Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8–10	5:43	Love the neighbour
Rom 12:14	5:44	Love the enemy

Finally, it can be said that the love commandment, which was an important part of Jesus' ethics, was delivered in various ways and with different emphases in mind. There had probably been many forms of the love commandment in circulation, presumably in the oral tradition. Paul came to know and then reproduced different variations thereof. When it comes to loving the neighbour, Paul's statements agree mostly with Matthew's, while his rendition of the command to love the enemy resembles Luke's version more closely.

Chapter 9:

Conclusion

9.1 The authenticity of the Pauline Jesus traditions

The biography of Paul discussed at the start of this study has confirmed that Paul would have possessed a substantial amount of knowledge about Jesus. After the death and resurrection of Jesus, sayings of the Lord spread from Jerusalem into Gentile territory, firstly through the Hellenists. Information about Jesus reached Damascus and Antioch before Paul visited these cities. He met many people who were well informed about Jesus. In other words, the life of Paul, the places he visited, and the people he met all indicate that he had to have known a substantial part of the Jesus tradition, probably stemming from Jerusalem.

The comparison of synoptic traditions about Jesus to sayings used by Paul in his letters, shows that the apostle did occasionally use sayings attributed to Jesus. These Jesus traditions often have no Jewish or Hellenistic parallels, making it probable that Paul and the synoptic authors were dependent on a similar tradition when they rendered the parallels. The fact that in the parallel passages Paul frequently uses words he otherwise seldom uses indicates that he is quoting, even in those instances where he fails to indicate that is repeating traditional material.

It remains a problem that despite of his apparent knowledge of many more Jesus traditions, Paul only explicitly and implicitly quotes or alludes to a few of the sayings in his letters. The most plausible reason for the lack of Paul's use of

sayings of Jesus remains the fact that the letters of the apostle represent a second stage of communication between Paul and the congregations (with the exception of Romans). The aim of the letters was not to inform the recipients about Jesus, but to answer questions received from the congregations, to further explain the sayings of Jesus, or to give advice on issues the congregations were facing.

The second important reason for Paul's infrequent use of the Jesus tradition in his letters deduced from this study has to do with the defence of his apostolate and message when it came under threat. Since the Antiochian conflict, Paul constantly had to defend himself against accusations that he did not have the same standing as the Jerusalem apostles. In his autobiography in Gal 1 and 2, he goes to great lengths to explain why his authorization as apostle is not different to that of Peter, the spokesperson of the twelve, even though he never met Jesus personally. Paul underlined his independence from the Jerusalem apostles by allowing three years to pass from his Damascus experience to his first visit with Peter in Jerusalem (Gal 1:18). Should Paul have reproduced more sayings of Jesus in his letters, he could have been accused of repeating what he had learned from other apostles, casting more doubt on his claim to be an apostle. Rather, the letters demonstrate the apostle's authority, independence and self-awareness. The lack of sayings of Jesus does not indicate that Paul was

not interested in the life of Jesus, or that he was not familiar with words of the Lord.¹

9.2 The relationship of the Pauline Jesus tradition to its Synoptic parallels

Another aim of this study was to find out if the Jesus traditions used by Paul was closer in wording to any particular of the synoptic gospels or Q, and if any conclusions could be drawn from the parallel texts in regards to the development of the synoptics. The following table listing those places where Paul explicitly and implicitly quotes or refers to a Jesus tradition found in the synoptics gives an overview of the matter.²

¹ Cf. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 115: “Paul, who may never have heard or seen Jesus for himself, nevertheless can be characterised as one of the truest disciples of Jesus – not simply of the exalted Lord Jesus Christ, but also of Jesus of Nazareth”.

² Although many more possible parallels were discussed, only those instances where verbal agreement between the passages exists and independence from Jewish or Hellenistic texts can be assumed are included here. The synoptic texts in bold are those closest to the Pauline passage.

Paul	Mark	Matthew	Luke	Q
1 Cor 7:10	10:9	19:6		
1 Cor 9:14		10:10b	10:7b	10:7b
1 Cor 11:23b–25	14:22–24	26:26–28	22:19–20	
1 Cor 13:2	11:23	17:20	17:6	17:6
1 Thess 4:16–17		24:30–31		
1 Thess 5:2		24:43–44	12:39–40	12:39–40
Rom 12:14		5:44	6:27–28	6:27–28
Rom 13:9	10:19	19:18–19	18:20	
Gal 1:16		16:17		

The table shows that all the above listed verses from the genuine Pauline literature have parallels in Matthew. Most of them have parallels in Luke too, while the least agreement is found in Mark. The Markan text in its context is never closer to Paul than its Matthean or Lukan counterparts. While most of the synoptic parallels to Pauline literature are found in Matthew and / or Luke (Q) only, others are located in all three synoptics. Only the prohibition of divorce is found only in Mark and Matthew. When Paul cites sayings resembling those of Q material, the wording is sometimes closer to Matthew, and on other occasions, there is more verbal agreement with Luke.³

³ The table also shows that, if you put Mark and Q together (the two oldest trajectories), it covers all the texts in Matthew, except for 1 Thess 4:16-17 / Matt 24:30-31 and Gal 1:16 / Matt 16:17, which contain Matthean *Sondergut*. Mark and Luke do have parallels to the apocalyptic discourse in Matt 24 and the confession of Peter in Matt 16, but they omit the information linking Paul and Matthew. This observation supports the view that Matthew has used different sources when compiling his gospel, namely Mark and Q, as well his *Sondergut*. He does, however, not always follow the wording of Mark and Q.

The closeness in wording between the sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters and Matthew's gospel is surprising because "Matthew is usually thought to represent that Jewish Christian strand of Christianity from which Paul differed most sharply",⁴ despite the fact that both men have a Jewish background.⁵ Paul proclaimed a law-free gospel, while for Matthew, the law is binding.⁶ Wong agrees that Paul and Matthew's gospel do not have much in common, because their respective understandings of the law differ too much.⁷ He suggests, however, that Matthew is not anti-Pauline but rather un-Pauline.⁸ Räisänen, in turn, asserts that both Paul and Matthew are unclear in their statements on the law.⁹

While the statements on the law seem to differentiate Paul and Matthew, the origin of Matthew's gospel could connect the two writings. If the gospel of Matthew had been written in Antioch of Syria,¹⁰ the connection between the Pauline and Matthean Jesus traditions could be explained, as Paul was very

⁴ Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 391.

⁵ Cf. Roger Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*, SNTSMS 48 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 7.

⁶ Cf. *Ibid.*, 42–3: "Matthew, whose writing reflects the perspective of a church predominantly Jewish in background and outlook, views the Christian community as still under the jurisdiction of the Mosaic law (albeit as now interpreted by Jesus); while Paul, whose mission is directed outward to the non-Jewish world, sees the life of the Christian community as no longer fundamentally ordered by the law at all".

⁷ Wong, *Evangelien im Dialog mit Paulus*, 27.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁹ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 82–90. According to Wong, *Evangelien im Dialog mit Paulus*, 27–8, a persuasive picture of the relationship between Paul and Matthew has not been constructed, even after hundred years of scientific exegesis of the New Testament.

¹⁰ Cf. Hagner, *The New Testament*, 194.

familiar to the city and had learned a large part of his Jesus traditions there.¹¹ Paul and Matthew could have known similar traditions about Jesus, which Matthew then later worked into his gospel. One also has to take into account that Paul had learned his sayings of Jesus in Antioch and Damascus before the Antiochian conflict and the apostolic council in Jerusalem. Only thereafter Paul became an independent missionary and developed his concise and polemical teachings.¹² Paul thus likely had learned the sayings of Jesus in the same or a nearby area to where the gospel of Matthew was written. Similar traditions about Jesus would still have been in circulation.¹³ When it is added that the similarities between Paul and Matthew exist in sayings of Jesus only and not in the narrative framework of the gospel (where differences to Pauline thought can be noted), the similar versions of the sayings of Jesus should not come as a surprise. The sayings of Jesus had been worked into the gospels about 20–30 years after Paul had written his letters.

¹¹ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 97, mentions Palestine as another possible place of origin of Matthew's gospel. As the Jesus tradition spread from Jerusalem to Damascus and Antioch, similarities to the Pauline Jesus tradition would still be possible if Matthew was written in Palestine.

¹² Cf. Wong, *Evangelien im Dialog mit Paulus*, 49.

¹³ Cf. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 42: "One of the major failings of the attempts to resolve the Synoptic Problem in exclusively literary terms was the inference (not usually consciously formulated) that when Matthew or Luke received his copy of Mark's Gospel, that was the first time each had encountered the stories and teachings contained in Mark. But such a scenario is hardly credible. Much or most of the Jesus traditions inscribed by Mark must have been widely circulating and well known in the Christian communities in Syria and beyond. In many cases where Matthew and Mark diverge on the same oral tradition, the most obvious explanation is that Matthew knew an (oral) version of that tradition different from the Markan version, and that Matthew preferred in these cases to transcribe the other version, which perhaps he knew better. In other words, we probably see in such data evidence of Jesus tradition both oral and written circulating at the same time and among the same churches".

More noteworthy than the similarities in Pauline and Matthean Jesus traditions is the lack of agreement between Pauline and Markan sayings of Jesus, because Mark's gospel is usually assumed the oldest gospel.¹⁴ It was likely written around 69–70 CE, probably in Rome.¹⁵ Intrinsically linked with regarding the gospel of Mark as the earliest gospel is the two-source hypothesis that assumes that Matthew and Luke used Mark and Q independently as their sources. The two-source hypotheses allows synoptic passages to be compared to one another to determine which synoptic parallels was written first.¹⁶ It therefore comes as a surprise that, as shown above, Paul and Mark seldom share words of the Lord. Most of the probable parallels between Paul and Matthew or Luke have no Markan counterparts.¹⁷

¹⁴ Cf. Brown, *An Introduction*, 115: "The basic argument for Marcan priority is that it solves more problems than any other theory". Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, 1, claims: "The priority of Mark is a conviction shared by advocates and opponents of Q". Arguments for Mark's priority are listed by Ehrman, *The New Testament*, 77–9.

¹⁵ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 39–40, 208.

¹⁶ A number of scholars working on parallels between the Pauline and synoptic Jesus traditions have expressed doubt over the validity of the two-source hypothesis because Mark's gospels shares less verbal similarities with the Jesus tradition in Paul's letters; cf. Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 185; Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 18; Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 110, n. 1. According to James D. G. Dunn, *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2005), 37–46, there is too much emphasis on written documents and that the role of the oral tradition is underestimated. The first documents about Jesus were written about 20 years after Jesus' ascension and in this time information about Jesus was passed on orally. David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition and the Interpretation of the Gospels*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 365–91, lists various criticisms towards the two-source theory.

¹⁷ This applies to the right to maintenance in 1 Cor 9:14, the saying about the thief in the night in 1 Thess 5:2, the failure to combine Decalogue commandments with the command to love the neighbour (similar to Luke), and Mark's failure to mention the law, which plays an important role in Paul's literature, and Mark's omission of the command to love the enemy.

One also has to remember that although Paul cites Jesus traditions similar to those in Matthew on various occasions, the agreement in wording consists of only two or three words in each case. The matching words in Paul and Matthew are used very infrequently – if at all – by Paul outside of the parallel verses. This is again to be expected, as allusions rather than explicit quotations were the normal mode of transmission. Paul’s use of the Jewish Scriptures also shows that one should not expect him to be quoting, but to render sayings or traditions in his own words. The only exception is, of course, 1 Cor 11:23b–25, where it is assumed that Paul quoted a verbally fixed tradition.¹⁸ In other words, even if the verbal agreement between the parallels exists in a few words only, it indicates the use of a common tradition.

Generally speaking, the failure of Paul to reproduce Markan sayings of Jesus is in line with the use of the gospel of Mark in the early church: “[T]hroughout the whole of the early church there is never a real commentary on Mark”.¹⁹

9.3 The parallels and Q

If one follows Kloppenborg’s suggestion of three redactional stages of Q: the sapiential sayings (Q¹), prophetic/judgment and apocalyptic passages (Q²),

¹⁸ Cf. Holtz, “Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition”, 383.

¹⁹ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 39.

supplemented with narrative passages (Q³),²⁰ one cannot allocate the sayings of Jesus known by Paul to only one of these redactional stages. Most of Paul's citations are in ethical matters: The prohibition of divorce (1 Cor 7:10), the command to love the enemy (Rom 12:14), the keeping of commandments from the second Decalogue table (Rom 13:9), and the admonition on the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:23b–25). 1 Thessalonians 5:2 could be counted to the apocalyptic passages of Q². Bultmann calls Luke 10:7b, the parallel to 1 Cor 9:14, a wisdom saying. It then would belong to Q¹. Gal 1:16 is more difficult to categorize.²¹

The Jesus tradition in Paul's letters supports the existence of a source such as Q, as Paul often cites material found in Matthew and Luke but not in Mark.²² More importantly, the sayings of the Lord used by Paul support the concept that Q was a sayings source.²³ Paul quotes words of the Lord without their narrative settings, even though the parallel sayings in the synoptic gospels

²⁰ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 96–9.

²¹ Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. J. Marsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), 74. Bultmann argues that Matt 16:17–19 goes back “to an old Aramaic tradition”, because of the importance of Peter in the Palestinian church (*Ibid.*, 258–9).

²² It is, however, difficult to explain why the wording of Paul's sayings of Jesus is closer to Matthew on some occasions and to Luke on other occasions. Brown, *An Introduction*, 117, suspects that because of the differences in wording between Matthew and Luke, there existed more than one copy of Q “to which Matthew and Luke had independent access”. James M. Robinson, “Early Collections of Jesus' Sayings”, in *Logia: Les paroles de Jesus – The Sayings of Jesus*, ed. J. Delobel, BETL 59 (Leuven: Uitgewerij Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982), 391, also assumes that Q is “a secondary collection of originally smaller collections” and Brown, *Synoptic Parallels*, 28, that “the Q tradition underwent development of some sort”. The Griesbach hypothesis does not need a Q document (Dungan, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 131, n. 1), but this fails to explain where Paul got his Jesus traditions from, as the sayings of Jesus cited by the apostle cannot be limited to one gospel or a possible pre-form thereof.

²³ Paul, however, quotes the *verba testamenti* in 1 Cor 11:23b–25, which are not delivered in Q.

are delivered within a narrative framework.²⁴ The sayings of Jesus in Paul's letters furthermore support the thesis that Matthew made use of Mark and other sources when compiling his gospel. In the eschatological discourse in Matt 24, for example, Matthew makes use of Markan material as well as additional sayings of Jesus, which are delivered not by Mark, but resemble statements made by Paul on the *Parousia*. Similarly, in the narrative of the rich young man, the Matthean version contains elements from Mark, but Matthew also includes the combination of Decalogue commandments with the command to love the neighbour, resembling the Pauline text of Rom 13:9.

The fact that Paul used words he otherwise does not when he recited sayings similar to the synoptic Jesus tradition makes it plausible to assume some kind of a written document containing logia of Jesus. If Paul only had access to oral traditions, it probably would not have influenced his choice of words in the manner it does. The agreement in wording points to a Greek source, as Q was.²⁵ When the results of memory studies have been applied to the "issue of whether Q was written or not, the high verbatim agreement between Matthew and Luke in a large number of pericopae virtually necessitates that they had recourse to a

²⁴ According to Jens Schröter, "Nicht nur eine Erinnerung, sondern eine narrative Vergegenwärtigung: Erwägungen zur Hermeneutik der Evangelien-schreibung", *ZTK* 108 (2011): 131–2, the Jesus tradition was delivered in small blocks and was incorporated into narrative texts when written down. This does not mean that the narrative texts are of lesser value: the narrative texts are indispensable for the preservation of the life of Jesus as a substantiated happening.

²⁵ Cf. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*, 61.

document, not oral memories”.²⁶ Varieties in traditions are to be expected and are not proof of historical invalidity.

In her study on Q, Rollens assumes some “Mark–Q” overlaps, that is, “places where both Mark and Q appear to have independent versions of a similar account”.²⁷ The parallels between the Jesus traditions in Paul and the synoptics support such an observation. 1 Corinthians 13:2; 1 Thess 5:2 and Rom 13:9 all have parallels in the three synoptics, but significant differences exist between the Q und Markan versions.

Simmons in turn argues that the Hellenists, by whom Paul was heavily influenced, were responsible for the “openness to outsiders” or a “theology of inclusion”,²⁸ following the example of Jesus. This, he assumes is a characteristic feature of Q. The many examples to love the neighbour and the enemy, in Paul’s letters as well as in Matthew and Luke, support this observation. These are early traditions, which Paul had already known and incorporated into his letters.

²⁶ John S. Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance and the Sayings of Jesus”, *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 106.

²⁷ Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 85.

²⁸ Simmons, *A Theology of Inclusion*, 150–1.

9.4 Closing remarks

This study has shown that when Pauline texts and possible synoptic parallels are compared, not all possibilities have been explored. The failure to recognize that, in the search for parallels, the command to love the neighbour is delivered more than once by Matthew means that agreement between Rom 13:9 and Matt 19:19 has often been overlooked. Romans 13:9 has mostly been compared to the synoptic rendition of the great commandment, while more similarities exist with the synoptic narrative of the rich young man. The verbal and contextual agreements between Gal 1:16 and Matt 16:16–17 have also not been sufficiently recognized.

Where parallels are assumed, not enough notice has been taken of the differences between the respective synoptic versions. The prohibition of divorce in 1 Cor 7:10, for example, is generally assumed to have parallels in Mark 10:9 // Matt 19:6 and Matt 5:32 // Luke 16:18, although there is no verbal agreement between the Pauline verse and Matt 5:32 // Luke 16:18.

In conclusion, it can be said that while Mark's gospel is often regarded as historically more reliable than that of Matthew or Luke because of its age,²⁹ the comparison of sayings of Jesus delivered by both Paul and the synoptic authors

²⁹ Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul*, 2, for example, stated: "Concerning Matthew's written source, Mark is regarded as the only infallible source upon which we may safely rely". Schröter, *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament*, 111–29, has listed criticism from various scholars for doubting the historical worth of the gospels. The Pauline Jesus tradition, and especially the way the tradition was transmitted to Paul, is not included in his discussion.

shows that some sayings found in Luke and Matthew also go back early.³⁰ Matthew and Luke render sayings that are already contained in the older Pauline material. Mark also used various collections, single narratives and rows of sayings when compiling his gospel.³¹ He and the other evangelists have adapted traditional material for it to fit in the context of their gospels.³² One portrayal of a certain event in a specific gospel, therefore, is not by default historically more trustworthy than the others.³³

The comparison of the Pauline Jesus traditions to the synoptic parallels shows that the letters of Paul contain information about Jesus similar to that of the synoptics on various occasions. Matthew shares more Jesus traditions with Paul than Luke, and both contain older material than Mark, in the texts they share with Paul.³⁴ In other words, when synoptic texts are compared in an effort to reconstruct the most original version of the text, a look at the older Pauline

³⁰ Armin D. Baum, "Der semitische Sprachhintergrund der Evangelien und die Urevangeliumshypothese. Überlegungen im Anschluss an Guido Baltes", *TBei* 44 (2013): 315–6, thinks that because sometimes Mark, sometimes Matthew and sometimes Luke has the most detailed version of a pericope, the synoptic gospels are literarily independent from one another. He draws on the study of Baltes (*Hebräisches Evangelium*), who searched for the Hebrew traditions behind the synoptics. Baltes's research led him to believe that Matthew and Luke are mostly closer to the Jewish and Hebraic pattern of thought and speech than Mark. In other words, when the three synoptics are compared, Matthew and Luke often reproduce a more original form of tradition than Mark, because they are closer to the Jewish background and Hebrew language. In other cases, Mark seems to deliver the oldest version of the text. He proposes a *Vorlagen* hypothesis (590–2).

³¹ Cilliers Breytenbach, "Das Problem des Übergangs von mündlicher zu schriftlicher Tradition", *Neot* 20 (1986): 56.

³² *Ibid.*, 49–50; cf. Hollander, *The Words of Jesus*, 343.

³³ Cf. Chris Keith, "Memory and Authenticity: Jesus Tradition and What Really Happened", *ZNW* 102 (2011): 155–77.

³⁴ Cf. Wenham, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*, 11. Yet, because of the differences between the Pauline and synoptic texts, one has to assume the use of a common tradition between Paul and Matthew or Luke. The Pauline and synoptic texts are not directly dependent on one other.

parallels (if present) is necessary, because it contributes to our understanding of the development of the synoptic texts.

Bibliography

Aland, Kurt, ed., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. 8th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1973.

Albright, William F. and Christopher S. Mann. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. AB 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971.

Alkier, Stefan. *Neues Testament*. UTB Basics. Tübingen; Basel: Francke, 2010.

Allison, Dale C. "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels". *NTS* 28 (1982): 1–32.

———. "Paul and the Missionary Discourse". *ETL* 61/4 (1985): 369–375.

Aune. David E. "Jesus Tradition and the Pauline Letters". Pages 303-327 in *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Greco-Roman Antiquity. Collected Essays II*. Edited by D. E. Aune. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Backhaus, Knut. "Evangelium als Lebensraum. Christologie und Ethik bei Paulus". Pages 9–31 in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*. Edited by U. Schnelle and T. Söding. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Balch, David L. "Backgrounds of I Cor. VII: Sayings of the Lord in Q; Moses as an Ascetic ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ in II Cor. III". *NTS* 18 (1972): 351–364.

Baltes, Guido. *Hebräisches Evangelium und synoptische Überlieferung. Untersuchungen zum hebräischen Hintergrund der Evangelien*. WUNT II/312. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds., *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. 3 vols. 3rd rev. ed., Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses. The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.

Beare, Francis W. "Jesus and Paul". *CJT* V/2 (1959): 79–86.

———. *The Gospel According to Matthew. A Commentary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

Bauer, Walter. *Griechisch–deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Edited by K. Aland and B. Aland. 6th ed. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 1988.

Baum, Armin D. “Der semitische Sprachhintergrund der Evangelien und die Urevangeliumshypothese. Überlegungen im Anschluss an Guido Baltes”. *TBei* 44, 13–6 (2013): 306–323.

Baumgarten, Jörg, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik. Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen*. WMANT 44. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.

Becker, Jürgen. *Paulus. Der Apostel der Völker*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

Becker, Jürgen. *Der Brief an die Galater*. NTD 8. 18th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

Berger, Klaus. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu. Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament. Teil I: Markus und Parallelen*. WMUNT 40. Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

———. *Paulus*. 2nd ed. München: C. H. Beck, 2005.

———. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. 2nd ed. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2012.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 17th ed. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.

Boring, M. Eugene. *An Introduction to the New Testament: History, Literature, Theology*. Louisville; Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2012.

Bornkamm, Günther. *Paul*. Translated by D. Stalker. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1975.

Bovon, Francois. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. EKK. 4 vols. Düsseldorf; Mannheim: Patmos; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989-2009.

Breytenbach, Cilliers. “Das Problem des Übergangs von mündlicher zu schriftlicher Überlieferung”. *Neot* 20 (1986): 47–58.

Brown, J. P. “Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form–History”. *NTS* 10 (1963): 27–48.

Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1997.

Brückner, Martin. *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie*. Strassburg: Heitz, 1903.

Bruce, F. F. *Paul & Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1974.

———. *Commentary on the Book of Acts*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981.

———. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.

———. *1&2 Thessalonians*, Word Biblical Commentary 45. Dallas, TX.: Word, 1982.

Bultmann, Rudolf. “Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus (1929)”. Pages 188–213 in *Glauben und Verstehen, Gesammelte Aufsätze I*. Edited by R. Bultmann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1933.

———. *The history of the synoptic tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.

———. “Jesus and Paul [1936]”. Pages 217–239 in *Existence and Faith. Shorter writings of Rudolf Bultmann*. Translated by S. M. Ogden. London: Meridian Books, 1964.

———. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by K. Grobel. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Burchard, Christoph. "Das doppelte Liebesgebot in der frühen christlichen Überlieferung". Page 39–62 in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by E. Lohse. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Catchpole, David R. "The Synoptic Divorce Material as a Traditio–Historical Problem". *BJRL* 57 (1974/75): 92–127.

———. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.

Ciampa, Roy E. *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2*. WUNT II/102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Charles, R. H., ed., *The apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with instructions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Charlesworth, James H., ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd; Oxford: Clarendon, 1983-1985.

Cludius, Hermann H. *Uransichten des Christenthums. Nebst Untersuchungen über einige Bücher des Neuen Testaments*. Altona: Hammerich, 1808.

Hans Conzelmann. "Current Problems in Pauline Research". Pages 130–147 in
New Testament Issues. Edited by R. Batey. London: SCM Press, 1981.

———. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK 5. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck
& Ruprecht, 1981.

Cosgrove, Charles H. *The Cross and the Spirit: A Study in the Argument and
Theology of Galatians*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Epistle to the Romans, Vol. 2*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T
Clark, 1998.

Dauer, Anton. *Paulus und die christliche Gemeinde in Antiochia. Kritische
Bestandaufnahme der modernen Forschung mit einigen weiterführenden
Überlegungen*. BBB 106. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1996.

Dautzenberg, Gerhard. "Der Verzicht auf das apostolische Unterhaltsrecht. Eine
exegetische Untersuchung zu 1 Kor 9". *Bib* 50 (1969): 212–232.

Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline
Theology*. London: SPCK, 1955.

Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Vol
II*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

Dibelius, Martin and Heinrich Greeven. *James*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Diezinger, Walter. "Zum Liebesgebot Mark xii 28–34 und Parr." *NovT* 20/ 2 (1978): 81–83.

Dodd, Charles H. "Matthew and Paul". Pages 53–66 in *New Testament Studies*. 2nd ed. Edited by C. H. Dodd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1954.

———. "The 'Primitive Catechism' and the Sayings of Jesus". Pages 11-29 in *More New Testament studies*. Edited by C. H. Dodd. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.

Dschulnigg, Peter. *Das Markusevangelium*. TKNT. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007.

Dungan, David L. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

———. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

Dunn James D. G. "The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2". *NTS* 28 (1982): 461–478.

———. "Once More – Gal 1.18: ιστορησαι Κηφᾶν. In reply to Otfried Hofius". *ZNW* 76:1/2 (1985): 138–39.

———. *Romans 9–16*. WBC 38b. Dallas: Word, 1988.

———. "Paul's Knowledge of the Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of Romans". Page 193–207 in *Christus Bezeugen, Festschrift Wolfgang Trilling*. Edited by K. Kertelege, T. Holtz and C. –P. März. Freiburg: St. Benno-Verlag, 1990.

———. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. BNTC. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.

———. *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. "Jesus Tradition in Paul". Page 155-178 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. NTTS 19. Edited by B. Chilton and C. A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. *Jesus Remembered. Christianity in the Making, Vol. 1*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

———. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

———. *New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.

———. *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

Ebel, Eva. "Das Leben des Paulus". Page 83-96 in *Paulus. Leben – Umwelt – Werk – Briefe*. UTB 2767. Edited by O. Wischmeyer. Tübingen: Francke, 2006.

Edsall, Benjamin A. *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*. WUNT II/365. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 2nd ed. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Ellis, E. Earle. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

———. "Paul and his Co-workers". *NTS* 17 (1970/71): 437–452.

- . “Traditions in 1 Corinthians”. *New Testament Studies* 20 (1986): 481–502.
- . *The Making of the New Testament Documents*. BibInt 39, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
- Evans, Craig A. *Mark 8:27–16:20*. WBC 34b. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- . *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Feine, Paul. *Jesus Christus und Paulus*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1902.
- . *Der Apostel Paulus*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1927.
- Fiedler, Peter. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. TKNT 1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006.
- Fiensy, David A. “The synoptic Logia of Jesus in the ethical teachings of Paul”. *Stone–Campbell Journal* 13 (2010): 81–98.

Filson, Floyd V. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 2nd ed.

London: Black, 1971.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke (X–XXIV). Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB 28a. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1986.

———. *Romans. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1993.

Fjärstedt Biörn. *Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians. Themes and Clusters of Theme Words in 1 Corinthians 1–4 and 9*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1974.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.

Fraser, John W. “Paul’s Knowledge of Jesus: II Corinthians V. 16 once more”. *NTS* 17 (1971): 293–313.

———. *Jesus & Paul. Paul as Interpreter of Jesus from Harnack to Kümmel*. Appleford: Marcham, 1974.

Freeman Sleeper, Charles. *James*. ANTC. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998.

Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.

Furnish, Victor. P. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1973.

———. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. 4th ed. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1978.

———. “The Jesus–Paul debate: From Baur to Bultmann”. Pages 17–50 in *Paul and Jesus. Collected essays*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

———. *Jesus According to Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Gaston, Lloyd. “Paul and Jerusalem”. Pages 61–72 in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.

Gerhardsson, Birger. “Der Weg der Evangelientradition”. Pages 79–102 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. WUNT 28. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Gibbs, Jeffrey A. *Matthew 1:1–11:1*. ConcC. Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2006.

———. *Matthew 11:2–20:34*, ConcC. Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2010.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Wie das Christentum entstand: 2. Paulus von Tarsus, Apostel und Zeuge*. Freiburg: Herder, 1997.

———. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. EKK II. Studienausgabe. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag; Mannheim: Patmos Verlag, 2010.

Goulder, Michael D. *The Evangelist's Calendar*. London: SPCK, 1978.

———. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

Haacker, Klaus. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. THKT 6. 3rd ed. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006.

Haenchen, Ernst. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK 3. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. WBC 33. 2 vols. Dallas, TX: Word, 1993-1995.

———. *The New Testament. A Historical and Theological Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2012.

Hanssen, Olav. "Zum Verständnis der Bergpredigt: Eine missionstheologische Studie zu Mt 5,17–48". Pages 94–111 in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern*. Edited by E. Lohse. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Harnisch, Wolfgang. "Der paulinische Lohn (1 Kor 9,1–23)". *ZTK* 104 (2007): 25–43.

Hartman, Lars. *Prophecy Interpreted. The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13 par.* Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.

Haufe, Günter. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Thessalonicher*. THKNT 12/1. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999.

Häusser, Detlef. *Christusbekenntnis und Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*. WUNT II/210. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1989.

———. *First Corinthians, Interpretation. A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.

Hengel, Martin. "Zwischen Jesus und Paulus. Die 'Hellenisten', die 'Sieben' und Stephanus (Apg 6, 1–15; 7, 54 – 8, 3)". *ZTK* 72 (1975): 151–206.

———. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. London: SCM, 2000.

Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer. *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien. Die unbekanntten Jahre des Apostels*. WUNT 108. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Hoffmann, Paul and Christoph Heil, eds., *Die Spruchquelle Q. Studienausgabe Griechisch und Deutsch*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002.

Hofius, Otfried. "Unbekannte Jesusworte". Pages 355–408 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

———. "Gal 1.18: ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν". *ZNW* 75 (1984): 73–85.

———. "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis. Erwägungen zu 1Kor 11,23b–25". *ZTK* 85 (1988): 371–408.

———. "τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 1Kor 11,24". *ZNW* 80 (1989): 80–88.

———. “Christus als Schöpfungsmittler und Erlösungsmittler. Das Bekenntnis 1Kor 8,6 im Kontext der paulinischen Theologie”. Pages 47–58 in *Paulinische Christologie. Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by U. Schnelle and T. Söding. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Hollander, Harm W. “The Words of Jesus: From Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q”. *NovT* XLII/4 (2000): 340–357.

Holsten, Carl. *Das Evangelium des Paulus. Paulinische Theologie. Bd. II*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1898.

Holtz Traugott. *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*. EKK XIII. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986.

———. “Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition”. Pages 380-394 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by H. Wansborough. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

Holtzmann, Heinrich J. *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie. Vol. 2*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911.

Horrell, David. “‘The Lord Commanded... but I have not Used...’ Exegetical and Hermeneutical Reflections on 1 Cor 9.14–15”. *NTS* 43 (1997): 587–603.

Hultgren, Arland J. "The Double Commandment of Love in Mt 22:34–40: Its Sources and Compositions". *CBQ* 36 (1974): 373–378.

Hunter, Archibald M. *Paul and His Predecessors*. Rev. ed. London: SCM, 1961.

Hyldahl, Nils. "Auferstehung Christi – Auferstehung der Toten (1 Thess. 4, 13–18)". Pages 119-135 in *Die paulinische Literatur und Theologie*. Edited by S. Pedersen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Jacobi, Christine. *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus?: Analogien zwischen den echten Paulusbriefen und den Synoptischen Evangelien*. BZNW 213. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

Jefford, Clayton N. *Didache. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Early Christian Apocrypha. Vol. 5*. Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013.

Jenks, Gregory. C. *What did Paul know about Jesus?*. http://www.faithfutures.org/Jesus/Jesus_Paul.pdf, 1999.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Unbekannte Jesusworte*. 4th ed. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1965.

———. *Die Abendmahls Worte Jesu*. 4th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Jervell, Jacob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK 3. 17th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

Johnson, Luke T. *The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation*. 3rd rev. ed. London: SCM, 2005.

Johnson, Sherman E. *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. BNTC. 2nd ed. London: Black, 1972.

Jüngel, Eberhard. *Paulus und Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie*. 5th ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.

Keck, Leander E. “Jesus’ in Romans”. *JBL* 108/3 (1989): 443–460.

Keith, Chris. “Memory and Authenticity: Jesus Tradition and What Really Happened”. *ZNW* 102 (2011): 155–177.

Kennedy, Harry A. A. *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.

Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. WUNT II/4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981.

———. *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Klijn, Albertus F. J. "The Question of the Rich Young Man in a Jewish–Christian Gospel". *NovT* 8 (1966): 149–155.

Kirk, Alan. "'Love your enemies', the Golden Rule, and Ancient Reciprocity (Luke 6:27–35)". *JBL* 122/4 (2003): 667–686.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. 11 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-1979.

Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1987.

———. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000.

———. "Memory, Performance and the Sayings of Jesus". *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 97–132.

Koch, Dieter–Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.

Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development*. London: SCM, 1990.

Kuhn, Heinz–Wolfgang. “Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus als traditionsgeschichtliches und theologisches Problem”. *ZTK* 67 (1970): 295–320.

Kümmel, Werner. “Jesus und Paulus”. *NTS* 10/2 (1964): 163–181.

Labahn, Michael. *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender. Die Logienquelle als erzählte Geschichte*. ABG 32. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2010.

Lampe, Peter. “Das korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistisch–römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11, 17–34)”. *ZNW* 82 (1991): 183–213.

Lang, Friedrich. *Die Briefe an die Korinther*. NTD 7. 16th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Larsson, Edwin. “Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde”. *NTS* 33 (1997): 205–225.

Lategan, Bernard C. *Die aardse Jesus in die prediking van Paulus volgens sy briewe*. Rotterdam: Bronder–Offset, 1967.

Lichtenberger, Hermann, ed., *Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*. 5 vols. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1973-1998.

Lietaert Peerbolte, L. J. *Paul the Missionary*. CBET 34. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Lindemann, Andreas. “Die Funktion der Herrenworte in der ethischen Argumentation des Paulus im Ersten Korintherbrief”. Pages 677-688 in *The Four Gospels. Festschrift Frans Neiryck. Vol. 1*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. van Belle and J. Verheyden. Leuven: University Press and Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.

———. *Der erste Korintherbrief*, HNT 9/I. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

———. “Paulus und die Jesustradition”. Pages 281–316 in *Jesus, Paul, and Early Christianity: Studies in Honour of Henk Jan De Jonge*. Edited by R. Buitenwerf, H. W. Hollander and J. Tromp. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.

Loader, William. *The New Testament on Sexuality*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.

Lohse, Eduard. *Paulus. Eine Biographie*. München: Beck, 1996.

———. *Der Brief an die Römer*. KEK 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas, TX: Word, 1990.

Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paulus, der Heidenapostel, Bd. 1. Studien zur Chronologie*. FRLANT 123. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Lührmann, Dieter. "Liebet eure Feinde (Lk 6,27–35/Mt 5, 39–48)". *ZTK* 69/4 (1972): 412–438.

———. *Das Markusevangelium*. HNT 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

———. "The Beginnings of the Church at Thessalonica". Pages 237–249 in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Essays in honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson and W. A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Luz, Ulrich. *Das Geschichtsverständnis von Paulus*. BEvT 49. München: Kaiser, 1968.

———. "Die Erfüllung des Gesetzes bei Matthäus (Matt 5, 17–20): Eduard Schweizer zum 65. Geburtstag". *75/4* (1978): 398–435.

———. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. EKK I. 4 vols. Zürich: Benzinger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985-2002.

———. *Matthew*. Hermeneia. 3 vols. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress. 1989-2005.

Maccoby, Hyam. *Paul and Hellenism*. London: SCM, 1991.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

Martin, Ralph. *James*. WBC 48. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.

McKnight, Scot. *The Letter of James*. NICNT 14. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

Merklein, Helmut. *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus*. WUNT 43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

———. *Studien zu Jesus und Paulus II*. WUNT 105. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

Mohrlang, Roger. *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*. SNTSMS 48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Montefiore, Hugh. "Thou Shalt Love the Neighbour as Thyself". *NovT* 5 (1962): 157–170.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Use of Parables and Sayings as Illustrative Material in Early Christian Catechesis". *JTS* III/1 (1952): 75–79.

Müller, Gerhard et al., ed., *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*. 36 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977-2004.

Müller, Paul–Gerhard. *Der Traditionsprozess im Neuen Testament. Kommunikationsanalytische Studien zur Versprachlichung des Jesusphänomens*. Freiburg: Herder, 1982.

Murphy–O'Connor, Jerome. "The Divorced Woman in 1 Cor 7:10–11". *JBL* 100/4 (1981): 601–606.

———. *Paul. His Story*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Mußner, Franz. *Der Galaterbrief*. HTKNT 9. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.

Neiryndck, Frans. "Paul and the Sayings of Jesus". Pages 265–321 in *L'Apôtre Paul: Personalité, style et conception du ministere*. Edited by A. Vanhoye. BETL 73. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.

Niederwinnner, Kurt. *The Didache: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998.

Nissen, Andreas. *Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum*. WUNT 15. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1974.

Nolland, John. *Luke 9:21–18:34*, WBC 35b. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1993.

———. *Luke 18:35–24:53*, WBC 35c. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1993.

Ollrog, Wolf–Henning Ollrog. *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter. Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission*. WMANT 50. Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979.

Orchard, Bernard and Harold Riley. *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987.

Paret, Heinrich. "Paulus und Jesus: einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis des Apostels Paulus und seiner Lehre zu der Person, dem Leben und der Lehre des geschichtlichen Jesus". *JDT* 3 (1858): 1–85.

Patterson, Stephen J. "Paul and the Jesus Tradition: It is Time for Another Look".

HTR 84/1 (1991): 23–41.

Pesch, Rudolf. "Das Evangelium in Jerusalem. Mark 14,12–26 als ältestes Überlieferungsgut der Urgemeinde". Pages 113-155 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

———. *Das Markusevangelium. II. Teil. Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20*. HTKNT II/2. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

———. *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 1–12)*. EKK VII; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986.

Pfleiderer, Otto. *Das Urchristentum. Seine Schriften und Lehren im geschichtlichen Zusammenhang*. 2nd rev. ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1902.

Piper, John. "‘Love Your Enemies’: Jesus’ Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and the Early Christian Paraenesis". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Plevnik, Joseph. "1 Thess 5,1–11: Its Authenticity, Intention, and Message". *Bib* 60 (1979): 71–90.

Plevnik, Joseph. "The Taking up of the Faithful and the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18". *CBQ* 46 (1984): 274–283.

Rahlfs, Alfred., ed., *Septuaginta*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Räsänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Rau, Eckhard. *Von Jesus zu Paulus. Entwicklung und Rezeption der antiochenischen Theologie im Urchristentum*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994.

Regner, Friedemann. *Paulus und Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Reiser, Marius. "Love of Enemies in the Context of Antiquity". *NTS* 47/4 (2001): 411–427.

Resch, Alfred. *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis untersucht*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1904.

Richardson, Peter. "The Thunderbolt in Q and the Wise Man in Corinth". Pages 91-112 in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.

Richardson, Peter and Peter Gooch. "Logia of Jesus in 1 Corinthians". Pages 39-62 in *Gospel Perspectives, Vol. 5. The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. Edited by D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984.

Riches, John. "Gerechtigkeit – Gesetz – Christus". Pages 140-58 in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*. Edited by U. Schnelle and T. Söding. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Ridderbos, Herman. *Paulus en Jezus. Oorsprong en Algemeen Karakter van Paulus' Christus-Prediking*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1952.

———. *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1953.

Riesenfeld, Harald. *The Gospel Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1970.

Riesner, Rainer. *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus. Studien zur Chronologie, Missionsstrategie und Theologie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.

———. "Paulus und die Jesus-Überlieferung". Pages 347-365 in *Evangelium. Schriftauslegung. Kirche, Festschrift Peter Stuhlmacher*. Edited by J. Ådna, P. Stuhlmacher, S. J. Hafemann and O. Hofius. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.

———. “Back to the Historical Jesus through Paul and his School (The Ransom Logion – Mark 10.25; Matthew 20.28)”. *JDHJ* 1.2 (2003): 171–199.

———. “Jesus, Paulus und wir”. *TBei* 14–1 (2014): 6–15.

Robinson, Bernard P. “Peter and His Successors: Tradition and Redaction in Matthew 16.17–19”. *JSNT* 21 (1984): 85–104.

Robinson, James M. “Basic Shifts in German Theology”. *Int* 16/1 (1962): 76–97.

———. “Early Collections of Jesus’ Sayings”. Pages 389-394 in *Logia: Les paroles de Jesus – The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by J. Delobel. BETL 59. Leuven: Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982.

Robinson, James M. and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Robinson, James M., John S. Kloppenborg and Paul Hoffmann. eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress; Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Röcker, Fritz W. *Belial und Katechon. Eine Untersuchung zu 2Thess 2,1–12 und 1 Thess 4,13–5,11*. WUNT II/262. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Roetzel, Calvin J. *Paul. The Man and the Myth*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999.

Rohde, Joachim. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. THKNT IX. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989

Rollens, Sarah E. *Framing Social Criticism in the Jesus Movement: The Ideological Project in the Sayings Gospel Q*. WUNT II/374. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Roloff, Jürgen. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. NTD 5. Tübingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.

Rüegg, Arnold. *Der Apostel Paulus und sein Zeugnis von Jesus Christus*. Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1906.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania". *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13.

Sänger, Dieter. "Galaterbrief". Pages 194–203 in *Paulus Handbuch*. Edited by F. W. Horn. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Sauer, Jürgen. "Traditionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den synoptischen und paulinischen Aussagen über Feindesliebe und Wiedervergeltungsverzicht". *ZNW* 76 (1985): 1–28.

Scaer, David P. *Discourses in Matthew. Jesus Teaches the Church*. Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 2004.

Schenke, Ludger. *Die Urgemeinde. Geschichtliche und theologische Entwicklung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1990.

Schmeller, Thomas. "Kollege Paulus. Die Jesusüberlieferung und das Selbstverständnis des Völkerapostels". *ZNW* 88 (1997): 260–283.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. KEK 7. 12th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Schmid, Ulrich. "Old Testament and New Testament Versions of the Mosaic Law: The Intersection of Oral and Written Tradition". Pages 587-604 in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010*. Edited by. M. K. Peters. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Schmithals, Walter. "Paulus und der historische Jesus". *ZNW* 53 (1962): 145–160.

———. *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*. ZBK 3,2. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1982.

Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Paul the Missionary. Realities, Strategies and Methods.*

Westmont, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha.* 2 vols. Rev. ed.

Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Louisville; London: John Knox, 2003.

Schnelle, Udo and Georg Strecker., eds., *Neuer Wettstein. Texte zum Neuen*

Testament aus Griechentum und Hellenismus. 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter,

1996.

Schnelle, Udo., ed., *Neuer Wettstein. Texte zum Neuen Testament aus*

Griechentum und Hellenismus. 2 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008-2013.

———. “Heilsgegenwart. Christologische Hoheitstitel bei Paulus”. Pages 178–

193 in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum*

70 Geburtstag. Edited by U. Schnelle and T. Söding. Göttingen:

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

———. *Paulus. Leben und Denken.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

———. “Das Liebesgebot im Neuen Testament: Jesus, Paulus und Johannes”.

Pages 21–34 in *‘Liebe’ im Wandel der Zeiten. Kulturwissenschaftliche*

Perspektiven. Edited by K. Tanner. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt,

2005.

———. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 6th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

Schoberg, Gerry. *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul: A Historical Examination of Shared Core Commitments with a View to Determining the Extent of Paul's Dependence on Jesus*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2014.

Scholtissek, Klaus. "Paulus als Lehrer. Eine Skizze zu den Anfängen der Paulus-Schule". Pages 11–35 in *Christologie in der Paulus-Schule. Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte des paulinischen Evangeliums*. Edited by K. Scholtissek. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1999.

———. "Geboren aus einer Frau, geboren unter das Gesetz (Gal 4,4). Die christologisch-soteriologische Bedeutung des irdischen Jesus bei Paulus". Pages 194–219 in *Paulinische Christologie: Exegetische Beiträge. Hans Hübner zum 70 Geburtstag*. Edited by U. Schnelle and T. Söding. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Schrage, Wolfgang. *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese. Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961.

Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. EKK VII. 4 vols. Zürich: Benziger Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991-2001.

Schröter, Jens. *Das Abendmahl. Frühchristliche Deutungen und Impulse für die Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2006.

———. *Von Jesus zum Neuen Testament. Studien zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte und zur Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

———. “Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferung im 1. Korintherbrief. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der ‘Einsetzungsworte’ in frühchristlichen Mahltexten”. *ZNW* 100 (2009): 78–100.

———. “Nicht nur eine Erinnerung, sondern eine narrative Vergegenwärtigung: Erwägungen zur Hermeneutik der Evangelien-schreibung”. *ZTK* 108 (2011): 119–137.

———. “Jesus Christus als Zentrum des Denkens”. Pages 279–285 in *Paulus Handbuch*. Edited by F. W. Horn. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Schürmann, Heinz. “‘Das Gesetz des Christus’ (Gal 6,2). Jesu Verhalten und Wort als letztgültige sittliche Norm nach Paulus”. Pages 282–300 in *Neues Testament und Kirche. Für Rudolf Schnackenburg*. Edited by J. Gnllka. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.

Senior, Donald. *Matthew*. ANTC 1. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Siber, Peter. *Mit Christus leben. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Auferstehungshoffnung*. ATANT 61. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971.

Simmons, William A. *A Theology of Inclusion in Jesus and Paul. The God of Outcasts and Sinners*. Lewiston: Mellen Biblical, 1996.

Söding, Thomas. "Der Erste Thessalonicherbrief und die frühe paulinische Evangeliumsverkündigung. Zur Frage einer Entwicklung der paulinischen Theologie". *BZ* 35 (1991): 180–203.

———. *Das Liebesgebot bei Paulus*. NTA 26. Münster: Aschendorff, 1995.

Stanley, Christopher D. "Who's Afraid of a Thief in the Night?" *NTS* 48/4 (2002): 468–486.

Stanley, David M. "Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus". *CBQ* 23/1 (1961): 26–39.

Stern, J. B. "Jesus' Citation of Dt 6,5 and Lv 19,18 in the Light of Jewish Tradition". *CBQ* 28 (1966): 312–316.

Steyn, Gert J. "Pretexts of the Second Table of the Decalogue and Early Christian Intertexts". *Neot* 30/2 (1996): 451-464.

———. “A Comparison of the Septuagint Textual Form in the Torah Quotations Common to Philo of Alexandria and the Gospels of Mark and Matthew”. Pages 605-624 in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki 2010*. Edited by. M. K. Peters. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. München: Beck, 1922–1961.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Das paulinische Evangelium. I. Vorgeschichte*. FRLANT 95. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

———. “Zum Thema: Das Evangelien und die Evangelien”. Pages 1–26 *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

———. “Das paulinische Evangelium”. Pages 156-182 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

———. “Jesu-tradition im Römerbrief? Eine Skizze”. *TBei* 14 (1983): 240–250.

Taylor, Nicholas H. *Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem: A Study in Relationships and Authority in Earliest Christianity*. JSNTSup 66. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.

———. “Paul and the Historical Jesus Quest”. *Neot* 37 (2003): 105–126.

Taylor Jr., Walter F. *Paul: Apostle to the Nations. An Introduction*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2012.

The Works of Philo. Complete and Unabridged. Translated by C. D. Yonge. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.

Theißen, Gerd and Annette Merz. *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Thomas, K. J. “Torah Citations in the Synoptics”. *NTS* 24/1 (1977): 85–96.

Thompson, Michael. *Clothed with Christ. The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.3*. JSNTSup 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Titius, Arthur. *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900.

Tuckett, Christopher M. “1 Corinthians and Q”. *JBL* 102/4 (1983): 607–619.

Van Eck, Ernest. “Die huwelik in die eerste-eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (II): Huwelik, egbreuk, egskedding en hertrou”. *HTS* 63/1 (2007): 103–128.

———. “Die huwelik in die eerste-eeuse Mediterreense wêreld (III): Jesus en die huwelik”. *HTS* 63/2 (2007): 481–513.

———. 2015. “Memory and Historical Jesus Studies: Formgeschichte in a New Dress?”, *HTS* 71/1, 1-11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i1.2837>.

Vielhauer, Philipp. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter*. 2nd rev. ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1978.

Vögtle, A. “Zur Herkunft von Matt 16,17–19”. Pages 372–393 in *Orientierung an Jesus. Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Für Josef Schmid*. Edited by P. Hoffman, N. Brox and W. Pesch. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.

Von Lips, Hermann. *Timotheus und Titus. Unterwegs für Paulus*. Biblische Gestalten 19. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2010.

Von Soden, Hermann. “Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte”. Pages 111-169 in *Theologische Abhandlungen: Carl von Weizsäcker zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstage*. Edited by A. von Harnack. Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1892.

Vouga, François. *An die Galater*. HNT 10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Walter, Nikolaus. "Paulus und die urchristliche Jesustradition". *NTS* 31 (1985): 498–522.

Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.

Wedderburn, Alexander J. M. "Paul and Jesus: Similarity and continuity". *NTS* 34 (1988): 161–182.

———. "Introduction". Pages 11-15 in *Paul and Jesus. Collected essays*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

———. "Paul and Jesus: The Problem of Continuity". Pages 99-115 in *Paul and Jesus. Collected essays*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

———. "Paul and the story of Jesus". Pages 161–189 in *Paul and Jesus. Collected essays*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

Weiß, Johannes. *Das Urchristentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.

Wenham, David. "Paul's Use of the Jesus Tradition: Three Samples". Pages 7–37 in *Gospel Perspectives. The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, Vol. 5*. Edited by D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.

———. *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. *Paul and Jesus. The True Story*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Wernle, Paul. *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus*. Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1897.

Wessels, G. Francois “The Historical Jesus and the Letters of Paul. Revisiting Bernard C. Lategan’s Thesis”. Pages 27-51 in *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*. Edited by C. Breytenbach, J. C. Thom and J. Punt. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006.

Wick, Peter. *Paulus*. UTB Basics. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Wiefel, Wolfgang. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. THKNT 1. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer*. EKK VI. Studienausgabe. Mannheim: Patmos; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010.

Wilson, S. G. “From Jesus to Paul: The Contours and Consequences of a Debate”. Pages 1-21 in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984.

Windisch, Hans. "Paulus und Jesus". *TSK* 106/1 (1934/35): 432–468.

Wischmeyer, Oda. "Das Gebot der Nächstenliebe bei Paulus". *BZ* 30 (1986):
161–187.

Christian Wolff. *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. THKNT 8. Leipzig:
Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1987.

———. "Humility and Self-denial in Jesus' Life and Message and in the Apostolic
Existence of Paul". Pages 145–160 in *Paul and Jesus. Collected Essays*.
Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

———. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. THKNT 7. Leipzig:
Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996.

Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

———. "Jesus bei Paulus". Pages 205–232 in *The Rise and Expansion of
Christianity in the First Three Centuries of the Common Era*. Edited by C.
Rothschild and J. Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

———. *Der Brief an die Römer (Teilband 1: Röm 1-8)*. EKK VI/1. Neukirchen-
Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2014.

Wong, Eric K. C. "The De-radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in Romans".
NovT XLIII (2001): 245–263.

———. "The De-radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in 1 Corinthians". *NTS*
48 (2002): 181–194.

———. *Evangelien im Dialog mit Paulus: Eine intertextuelle Studie zu den Synoptikern*. NTOA 89. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Yeung, Maureen M. *Faith in Jesus and Paul. A Comparison with Special Reference to 'Faith that can Remove Mountains', and 'Your Faith has Healed/Saved You'*. WUNT II/147. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Yinger, Kent L. "Romans 12:14–21 and Nonretaliation in Second Temple Judaism: Addressing Persecution within the Community". *CBQ* 60/1 (1998): 74–96.

Zeller, Dieter. "Der Vorrang der Ehelosigkeit in 1Kor 7". *ZNW* 96 (2005): 61–77.

———. *Der erste Brief and die Korinther*. KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Zerbe, Gordon M. *Non-Retaliation in Early Jewish and New Testament Texts. Ethical Themes in Social Contexts*. JSPSup 13. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Zimmermann, Mirjam and Ruben Zimmermann. "Zitation, Kontradiktion oder Applikation? Die Jesuslogien in 1Kor 7,10f. und 9,14: Traditionsgeschichtliche Verankerung und paulinische Interpretation". *ZNW* 87 (1996): 83–100.

Zsolt, Geréb. "Auf der Spur der Jesusworte im Ersten Thessalonicherbrief". Pages 103–117 in *Spannweite. Theologische Forschung und Kirchliches Wirken. Festgabe für Hans Klein*. Edited by C. Klein. Bukarest: Blueprint Internațional, 2005.

Zugmann, Michael. *Missionspredigt in nuce. Studien zu 1Thess 1,9b–10*. Linz: Wagner, 2012.