

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

PAUL, Q, AND THE JERUSALEM CHURCH

HENRY THATCHER FOWLER

BROWN UNIVERSITY

PERHAPS I should have called my subject "Q as a Principal Source for our Knowledge of the Jerusalem Church," since my main purpose is to raise the question whether the time has not come when we may use the Q material as a major source for our knowledge of the life and thought of that Church in the sixth and seventh decades. The hasty comparison that I can make between the Pauline and Q material is little more than a suggestion of such possible use.

In his *History of the Apostolic Age*, Weizsäcker, speaking of the Evangelic tradition preserved by the primitive Jewish Church and embodied in the Synoptic Gospels, wrote: "This is the finest memorial erected by the primitive Church in its own honor"; and again, "The memorial which the primitive Church thus left of itself may be still employed to furnish an insight into its own life" (Eng. Trans. pp. 34, 35). In the thirty-seven years that have passed since Weizsäcker wrote, our knowledge of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels has advanced materially. So far as I am familiar with the literature, however, there has been no comparable advance in the line that Weizsäcker suggests—the employment of the finest memorial of the primitive Church to furnish an insight into its own life. Most Synoptic study has been directed to the analysis and attempted reconstruction of the sources; if use has been made of the results, it has been largely with reference to the recovery of the teaching of Jesus.

The analysis is by no means completed, we may hope. Professor Cadbury surveyed for us, in the January, 1923,

number of *Harvard Theological Review*, some recent efforts to get back to the sources of the sources. He summed up: "Synoptic study has been excavating the upper strata; we need now to dig down into the older archaeological layers underneath." While in hearty accord with that conclusion, I am led to ask whether we need to wait for the excavation of the lower levels before making more use than has yet been done of our knowledge of the upper stratum.

There is pretty general agreement (justified agreement, is it not?) that the Q material had been gathered in written form before the death of James, and certainly before the outbreak of the war in 66. If so, my query is: May we not use our knowledge of this material with a good deal of assurance in our effort to understand the spirit of the Jerusalem Church, let us say at the time of Paul's last visit; in our consideration of the relation of Peter to the thought and spirit of that Church during the latter years of his life; perhaps even in a reconsideration of the question whether the Epistle of James may possibly have emanated from the Jerusalem environment before the year 66? In a word, may not a survey of the material which we can confidently assign to Q throw light upon many puzzling questions which we might answer if we only had more knowledge of the inner life of the last ten or fifteen years of the Church in Jerusalem?

In order to make such use of this material it does not seem to me absolutely necessary to determine whether Q represents one document or more than one; but I think it is necessary to limit ourselves pretty rigidly to the minimum Q, or Q proper, if we are to get results upon which we can agree. By this I mean, of course, the common matter of Matthew and Luke not found in Mark, with little if anything added. I recognize the probability that the Second or Jerusalem Source included considerably more than this. For myself I specifically include some Marcan logia, having been very slowly convinced. On the other hand it does not seem to me safe definitely to include, as Castor does, certain Lucan material not found in Matthew. I have not been able to follow Burton and his school in believing that most of Luke's

long Perea section once constituted a document used by the author of Matthew. But it does not seem to me necessary to decide all these points before making progress along the line which I have in mind. Whether the material common to Matthew and Luke and not found in Mark once existed in Burton's Galilean and Perea documents or in one writing, if this material was collected and formulated in the Jerusalem Church before 62 or even before 66, it seems to me the most adequate source we have for a knowledge of the inner life of that Church during the ten or fifteen years before the outbreak of the Jewish war.

Passing from these considerations to an illustration drawn from a general comparison of the Pauline and Q material, I may remark that every time I go through the life and letters of Paul, I regret once and again that the Apostle had no book of the life or teachings of Jesus to leave with his newly founded churches. Especially in connection with I Thessalonians do I feel this lack. If only Paul could have referred the Macedonian Christians to such a record for their guidance, as well as to his own holy and unblamable life among them! I always remind my undergraduate students that Paul had no copy of the Gospel to leave with the Thessalonians, lest with the uncompromising judgments of youth they form an unfair and unfavorable impression of the Apostle's personality. Woe betide the college teacher who lets his students think that he regards himself as an example! And woe betide the reputation, with them, even of an apostle who does so, except in case of dire necessity.

I do not know how great use Paul would have made of a book of Jesus' deeds or words had he had one — how far he would have carried his determination to know Christ no more after the flesh. The theologians who have built on Paul have commonly seemed much more interested in dogmas about Jesus than in the deeds and words that reveal the person. But I do feel quite sure we should find more references to the facts of the life or the specific teachings, if Paul had had either an *Ur-Marcus* or a Q. If he could, for example, have quoted the saying about the law and the prophets being until

John, it might have been very useful in maintaining his contention for the temporary character of the law. On the other hand the saying that one horn of a letter of the law should not fall, might have given him pause. Surely he would have made larger use of the ethical teachings of the Q material if he had had them. His conceptions harmonize closely with their exalted requirements of absolute devotion to Christ transcending all other obligations, and his scale of values accords well with their placing of justice and mercy above the laws of tithing.

It is difficult to believe that there was any such body of written teaching when Paul spent his fifteen days with Peter or even when he went up to lay before them who were of repute the gospel which he preached, when those who were of repute imparted nothing to him. Perhaps this material may have assumed written form before Paul paid his last visit to Jerusalem, although we find no indication in the imprisonment epistles that he had received a copy of it during his very brief intercourse with the Church before his arrest. We can scarcely doubt, however, that this body of teaching was taking final form in the Judean Church during the period of Gentile missions.

In making a general comparison of Q with Paul's writings, one is struck by the absence of any such conception as that of salvation by faith or of dying with Christ and of being raised with him to a new life. Indeed the death of Jesus with any atoning significance seems to be foreign to the Q material. Despite its condemnation of the Pharisees and the assurance that many will come from distant regions to share the fellowship of the Patriarchs, Q offers no suggestion of any antinomy between Christianity and rigid Judaism.

Viewing the document as indicative of the ideas that were emphasized in preaching and in the instruction of converts at Jerusalem, it appears that, to a considerable extent, Paul and the Jerusalem teachers were theologically moving in different rather than hostile universes of discourse. Each body of writings by itself opens up such a noble vista of lofty ideals, formulated, cherished, and taught, that our regret deepens

because a mutual understanding could not be reached between Paul and Jerusalem, since each had so much of inestimable value for the other. I think that this regret is increased rather than lessened by the important coincidences between Paul and Q which Professor Bacon pointed out in his Oxford lectures—Jesus' relation to the Baptist, the place of faith, and the idea of the Servant in the conception of Sonship.

A comparison of the literary style of Paul and Q is hardly less significant than the content in indicating the separation of the Apostle and the Jerusalem Church. Though the rushing stream of Paul's thought sometimes overflowed its banks and cut for itself a new channel quite other than that in which it had started, and, at other times, the implications of an idea so stirred his emotional nature that he left his argument for rhapsodic flights of poetic apostrophe, still Paul was fundamentally a reasoner. He loved to unfold the implications of his basic conceptions to their issue in a satisfying theory of life or history. In the Q material, the form is usually as different as one can well imagine. The style is that so often noted as characteristic of the Synoptic discourse, but the separation of Q from the rest gives us the familiar characteristics in purest essence. Truths are here set forth as axiomatic or as immediate deductions from common human experience. Even a barren summary of the contents of the writing would indicate its picturesque, concrete methods of inculcating moral and spiritual truths, and its wealth of illustration from homely experience and from nature—giving the cloke to the one who takes the coat, turning the other cheek, the blind guiding the blind, the twig in the brother's eye, grapes from brier bushes, the contrary children who will play neither party nor funeral. Occasionally the concrete pictures are expanded into parables, but those which we can certainly assign to this document are very brief and concise, suggestive rather than elaborated. Truths which seem quite contrary to experience and common belief are stated in the simplest way as self evident facts—Blessed are the hungry, the mourners. Socrates, as reported by Xenophon and Plato, is prosy indeed in comparison, and even Paul with all his fire appears labored when put beside these brief

utterances that, with a single winged word, challenge the deepest searchings of the heart and the highest aspirations of the soul.

In noting these characteristics of thought and expression, we are forced to the conviction that we are not dealing with the literary style of the Apostle Matthew, or whoever the penman may have been. We are back in the inner circle of Jesus' personal followers, where one has recalled this barbed saying, another that, and thus out of the common memory the whole has gradually been built up. This is true, I think, even if the final hand discernible in the composition of the Second Source be that of one who shows some individuality of authorship and literary ability. Peter, James the brother of John, and John himself doubtless had their part in the earlier days of gathering this garnered treasure of memories, though it was left to other hands to give it final shape in the Q document or documents.

In the community where this living tradition of the Supreme Teacher was preserved and finally crystallized in written form, Paul's conception and presentation of the Christian life and fellowship must have seemed something foreign and dangerous in its elaboration. The surprising thing is that the recognised head of the Church which has left this memorial of itself could be persuaded at all that Paul had been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision.

Whether such inferences concerning Paul and the Jerusalem Church are correct or not, am I right in my feeling that larger use should be made of the separated Q material as a major source for our knowledge of the Jerusalem Church and consequently for a better understanding of such questions as the relations between Paul and Jerusalem—an understanding which may now be based upon written testimony from both sides?