

Did Paul Use the Logia?

Kirsopp Lake

The general idea of this large book [*Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenzeitigen Verk/Utnis unter-sucht*. Von Alfred Resch. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904. viii+656 pages] is to test the truth of a special theory by applying it to two cognate questions, and showing that it affords a probable solution of both. Resch's special theory is, that an original Hebrew *Logia Jesu* lies behind our gospels, and the two questions to which he applies it are the synoptic problem, and that which is generally known as *Jesus und Paulus*, i. e., the relation which the teaching of Paul bears to that of the Lord, and especially to the presentment of the latter which we find in the synoptic gospels.

The working out of the theory in relation to the synoptic problem is to be found in Resch's five volumes on the *Aussercanonische Paralleltexthe* (1893-97), in his *Die Logia Jesu*, a reconstruction of the text of the source of the gospels in Greek and Hebrew (1898), partly in his perhaps better known *Agrapha* (1889), and in the present volume.

His position may be roughly stated thus: He accepts the generally received view of the "priority of Mark," in so far as he thinks that it was known to and used by the compilers of the other gospels; but he also accepts and enlarges the view of B. Weiss, that Mark, besides his knowledge of the preaching of Peter, used the document which lies behind many of the non-Markan parts of Matthew and Luke. Weiss, who called this document the "Apostolic source," thought that it was used merely in a few places by Mark, and thus explained the so-called "secondary features in Mark;" but Resch maintains that it originally contained all that is now found in the second gospel, which is really only a selection from it, and that the other writers used it throughout as well as the Markan selection. Moreover, he thinks that it was written in Hebrew, and he incidentally offers a solution of the textual problem by treating the early variants in Codex Bezae and other authorities as independent translations of this Hebrew original, which he dates almost immediately after the ascension.

The bearing of this on Paulinism is as follows: As Resch says, the main problem of Paul's life for us is the relation between his teaching and that of Jesus. Is the one mainly dependent on the other, or is its source to be found elsewhere — in the belief, for instance, of contemporary Judaism, or in the speculations of Alexandrian thought? Again, if the former alterna-

tive be accepted, in what manner is the dependency to be explained? To these questions Resch's answer is that Paulinism is definitely derived from the teaching of Jesus, and mainly through a study of the Hebrew Logia. The attempt to establish this point is the main subject of *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*, and, whether we regard it as successful or not, we must all be grateful for the gigantic labor which has provided us with so great a mass of valuable material.

To a considerable extent Resch has arranged his work in a form which is more logical in plan and convenient for further research than at once conducive to an appreciation of his argument. In Part I (pp. 33-134) he goes through the epistles verse by verse, adding the suggested parallels from the Logia, without any attempt at classifying the probability of each suggestion. As the smallest resemblance in language or thought is sufficient reason for Resch to note a parallelism, the result is that a few really striking passages are lost in a crowd of instances which most of us will regard as valueless. For example one is inevitably prejudiced when one finds that the first three passages are the following:

1 Thess.

Logia

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| (1) 1, 2. εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ | εὐχαριστῶ σοι πάτερ (Matt. 11:25). |
| (2) — ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν ἀδιαλείπτως . . . ἐν πάντι καιρῷ δεόμενοι (Luke 21 : 36). | |
| (3) 1,4. εἰδότες . . . τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν | ὀλίγοι δὲ εκλεκτοί (Matt. 20:16). |

It is possible that, if the dependency on the Logia were firmly established, we could go back and see in such passages as the above reminiscences of a book which was known to be familiar to Paul (though, even then, I think that the first two would be with far more probability ascribed to epistolary usage), but, as at present arranged and for the present purpose, they merely tend to confuse and annoy the reader. Perhaps more than 50 per cent, of the examples given are of this nature, and should have been relegated to an appendix.

Part II (pp. 155-464) deals with the subject in hand from a different point of view. The writer now takes separate passages or groups of passages from the Logia, and traces and explains their use in the Pauline epistles. Many of these notes (there are altogether 203) are extremely interesting, but hardly any are free from that peculiar form of hyper-criticism which sees allusions everywhere. It is, of course, impossible to discuss these notes at length in a review, but some idea of their character may be gathered from the fact that among the passages which Resch thinks that it is possible to trace in the Pauline epistles is the baptismal formula in Matt. 28:19. His argument is that Paul's method of thought about God is definitely trinitarian — which I suppose none would deny in a certain limited sense — and that he sometimes speaks of baptism in connection with the Spirit, sometimes in connection with

Christ. The most reasonable explanation, says Resch, is that Paul knew of the command to baptize, contained in the Logia, and so confident is he that this is so that I think he would be prepared to claim the authority of Paul as evidence for the text of Matt. 28:19, as against the so-called Eusebian reading which omits the command to baptize.

In Part III (pp. 433-630) Resch brings together the general conclusions which he derives from the previous sections, and shows their bearing on various problems connected with the epistles and gospels. The first point is, of course, the attempt to prove that Paul shows acquaintance with the Logia from the baptism of John to the ascension. He used it, Resch thinks, in the Hebrew and not in a Greek translation, the latter being excluded by a study of Pauline phraseology as compared with the corresponding words in the gospels. Turning to the latter, it is next shown that no one of them is especially Pauline, though it is startling to find that, according to Resch, there are more points of connection between Paul and Matthew than between Paul and Luke. Finally the question is reached to which the rest is preparatory: "Was the Logia the main source of Paulinism?" Resch believes that it was, and to clinch his argument considers the possibly alternative sources — the Old Testament, Jewish apocryphal literature, Philo, etc. — but dismisses them all as insufficient to account for the facts. This part of the book is, I think, much more convincingly written than any of the others; but one cannot repress the feeling that neither the scale nor the method is the same as that which has proved the use of the Logia, and one wonders whether Reschian criticism applied, for instance, to the connection between Philo and the epistles of the captivity would not produce at least as good a case for the dependence of Pauline doctrine on Philo as the present work establishes for the use of the Logia; or, on the other hand, whether the means by which Resch disposes of the use of the Jewish literature would not make quite as short work of the Logia.

The main questions, therefore, which the reader of *Paulinismus und die Logia* is bound to ask are, first, whether Resch has established a connection between the teaching of Paul and the sources of the synoptic gospels, and, secondly, supposing that this point be answered in the affirmative, whether he has shown the identity of the source used by Paul with the Logia.

I fear that the general judgment on both points will be definitely adverse, and that on the former it will be perhaps adverse to an unjustifiable extent, owing, as I have hinted, to the enormous mass of parallelisms and allusions that to most minds will seem somewhat irrelevant. This is a pity, for concealed among the mass are really striking passages. Let me give as examples two which I am sure are worthy of very serious attention — one from First Corinthians and the other from First Thessalonians.

1. Perhaps the stronger instance of the two is in First Corinthians, in connection with divorce. The parallels are I Cor. 7:10, (γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι; και ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι) and Mark 10: II, 12 (ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, μοιχᾶται ἐπ’ αὐτήν, καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς ἄλλον γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται). It is noticeable that Paul introduces these verses with the direct statement that they are the Lord's own teaching (παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος), and that they differ in this respect from what follows (cf. especially vss. 6 and 25). One explanation of this is that Paul claims a special revelation in the first case, but not in the second; yet it may be submitted that the more prosaic explanation that he was referring to a known collection of precepts of the Lord is quite as probable. That this collection of precepts is best preserved (so far as this passage is concerned) by Mark 10:11. 12 (or its source) is rendered probable by the fact that only this gospel deals with the question of divorce or desertion of a husband by a wife. It is true that many critics have regarded vs. 12 as a late addition, on the ground that it refers to a possibility which the Jews never contemplated, but Resch's views condemn this theory, and for a probably better translation of the original Hebrew he points to the variant reading of Codex Beza; — ἐὰν γυνὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται — which is certainly nearer to the Pauline γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι. One may perhaps go a little farther, for this is not the only variant which is noticeable here, as Syr. Sin. and Fam. 1 place the case of the wife before that of the husband, just as Paul does. This is important, because this otherwise unnatural order finds, if it be the true text of the gospel passage, its historical justification in its relation to the case of Herodias, which, as has been pointed out by Professor Burkitt, [Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. V, pp. 628-30; Evangelion da Mepharreshe, Vol. II, p. 250.] was probably the cause of the discourse. But why should Paul have also adopted this unnatural order? The suggestion is obvious that he did so because it was familiar to him through his source, and the only alternative which I can see is that possibly the Christian wife with a pagan husband would find more domestic difficulty than the Christian husband with the pagan wife, though I am not sure that this is correct psychology. The coincidence must, of course, not be pressed too far, but it is certainly remarkable, and it is surprising that the evidence of Syr. Sin. seems to have escaped Resch's observation.

Here, then, we have a possible, perhaps even probable, allusion to some document containing the teaching of the Lord, which was used by Paul and by the editor of the second gospel.

2. In I Thess. 4:15 f. Paul introduces a short statement 3 as to the parousia by saying that he gives it ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, and concludes in vs. 18 by telling the Thessalonians to comfort one another with τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις. It is possible that he merely means in the for-

mer verse to claim some special solemnity, or perhaps inspiration, for what follows, and that in the latter "these words" merely means the preceding passage. But it is, I think, slightly more probable that he is referring to a collection of *logoi* of the Lord. Resch finds the parallel to this passage in the gospels in Mark 13:26, 27,4 and the criticism which one naturally makes is that, in spite of a certain degree of verbal similarity, the characteristic features of both are different. The gospel is concerned with the question of the parousia in itself. The resurrection of the dead is, perhaps, implied, but it is not a main feature, and I do not think that the taking up of the faithful into the air is even implied. In fact, the whole question as to the possibly different treatment of those who were alive and those who were dead at the time of the parousia is not before the writer's mind. On the other hand, it is just these points which are characteristic of the epistle, and, therefore, at first sight one is inclined to reject Resch's view that Paul is dependent on the source of Mark for his teaching. But perhaps this is too hasty. Paul was not quoting; he was explaining; and the difference of statement and emphasis is due to the difference in the point of view. I can easily imagine that the Thessalonians had heard teaching from Paul based on a collection of *logoi*, and that this belonged to the same stage of development as the discourse in Mark: the speaker and his listeners were concerned in establishing the certainty of the parousia — the main problem for the earliest disciples. But as soon as the first generation began to die out, the question at once arose as to the possibility that the dead would not share in all the benefits which the living would enjoy at the parousia. The *logoi* were ambiguous on this point, and the necessity of an exegesis naturally arose. The question is legitimate whether 1 Thess. 4:15 ff. is not an example of this exegesis, the taking up of the saints into the air being deduced from a comparison of the gathering together of the elect, and the coming of the Lord in the clouds. This seems not untenable; personally, however, I think it more likely that Mark 14: 26 ff. is in itself an early attempt to expound some genuine saying, perhaps the same as that implied in 1 Thess. 4:15, by an exegesis, inspired by Jewish apocalyptic literature, parts of which are imbedded in the present text. I am more inclined to take this view, partly because in 2 Thess. 2:2 we have, probably, traces of other mistaken attempts at exegesis which were current (in which *διὰ λόγου* may mean "Logos of the Lord"), but chiefly because it seems to be almost certain that by the time he wrote Second Corinthians Paul had abandoned the eschatological teaching given in First Thessalonians. This is intelligible if he had in the meantime given up the use of Jewish apocalyptic literature as a means of arriving at the exegesis of the *logoi* of the Lord.

These two passages, and some others of but little less weight, seem to present a fair case for the theory that Paul was acquainted with a collection of *logoi* which in some points resembled our second gospel, but I fail to see that they sufficiently support the Reschian view

of the existence of a primitive document of enormous size. To make this good, Resch must produce some stronger evidence, and I do not think that such exists. If I am right, then it is inevitable that Resch's theory that *die Logia Jesu* are the main source of the gospels, and were known to Paul, will be condemned. For unless the evidence in support be really strong, there is a presumption against any theory which builds up a lost source by putting together documents which are supposed to have been derived from it — a presumption which it is wrong to neglect, because it is based, not on any *a priori* reasoning, but on our knowledge of the methods of antiquity. Nothing is more certain than that, as a rule, the ancients compiled their writings by a process of conflation. Our first gospel represents the conflation of Mark with another document — even Resch admits this to be undeniable and Tatian carried the process still farther in producing the Diatessaron. If we wish to reconstruct the original, it would, therefore, seem to be unwise to continue the conflation. This, however, is just what Resch has done, for in trying to reconstruct the sources used by the early church in manufacturing the gospels, he has copied instead of reversing the process which that church employed.

In conclusion, it may not be amiss to ask whether, supposing that, after all, Resch is right, and that the Logia really did exist, and that Paul used them, or even merely supposing that Paul knew some smaller collection of *logoi*, is it probable that they were the main source of Paulinism? Resch's suggestion is that, immediately after the conversion of the apostle, he went away to the deserts of Arabia and studied the Logia for three years, thinking out his doctrines on this basis, and learning to see the true meaning of Christianity in relation to Jew and gentile. I cannot think that this is probable, although the view that the visit to Arabia was one of meditation has the support of Bishop Lightfoot's authority. What is the natural meaning of Gal. 1:17? Surely it is that the apostle's first act was to preach the gospel to the Arabians. His argument, if I follow it correctly, is that the accusation that he is in any way dependent on the apostles of Jerusalem is shown by history to be untrue: "When it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the gentiles, immediately I went into Arabia . . . afterwards, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to speak with Peter." That is to say, as soon as he received the call to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, he obeyed and immediately did his work, without consulting the other apostles. The whole point of the passage is to show that his work as an evangelist and apostle was independent of flesh and blood, and of the other apostles. The suggestion that there was a period of three years' inactivity in Arabia, followed by an interview with Peter, however brief it may have been, before he began his preaching, immeasurably weakens the force of the argument. Probably it would never have been made, had it not been for the feeling which Resch shares, that Paul would not have been in a position to begin work at once but would have required time to

grasp what the teaching of Christ really meant. Such a view implies that Paul had been persecuting the Christians without understanding their doctrines, and I would submit that it is far more probable that he really understood them quite as well as the Christians did themselves, and in some ways far better. He had persecuted them vigorously, as we can see from Acts 6:11 ff., because he regarded their teaching as subversive of Judaism — as, indeed, it was. The apostles at Jerusalem did not understand that this must be the logical conclusion of their arguments, but Saul of Tarsus did, and the more closely he followed them, the more clearly he saw that it was so, and the more firmly he persecuted, because he believed that they erred in their fundamental argument or rather presupposition, that Jesus was Christ. The only change, therefore, made in his position by his conversion was that he was convinced that this fundamental presupposition was correct. All his own arguments as to the logical result of the Christian position remained; he altered none of them; he preached them now as facts which had to be faced in consequence of the revelation which had been made to him, instead of holding them up as terrible examples of the false doctrine of the Nazarenes. There is always a danger of underestimating the importance of Paul's knowledge of Christianity, derived from keen hostile attention to the preaching of the disciples in Jerusalem, and I think this is far more likely to have been the *Hauptquelle des Paulinismus* than the Logia.

I am really sorry to find so little in this book with which to agree, for Reich's works have always been a source of great instruction and stimulation to my own studies; and in spite of my failure to be convinced by his arguments, I am sincerely grateful to the writer for this as for his earlier books.