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THE question of the relation of Paul to Jesus has, during
certain decades in the last century and a quarter, been the
chief preoccupation of biblical criticism and systematic theology
alike. The publication in 1962 of E. Jüngel’s provocative new
book, *Paulus und Jesus*, and of W. Schmithals’s Marburg lecture,
“Paulus und der historische Jesus”, and the 1963 lecture of
W. G. Kümmel “Jesus und Paulus”¹ suggests that the topic is
still alive. But since these recent publications also make it clear
that the discussion has taken a new turn, a survey of the course of
the preceding debate may help to define the issues which most
demand the attention of critical scholarship in our own day.

The Jesus-Paul controversy in its modern form may perhaps
be dated from an article published in 1831 by the Tübingen critic,
F. C. Baur, who offered an important new hypothesis respecting
Paul’s place in the earliest church.² Baur held that Paul “had
developed his doctrine in complete opposition to that of the
primitive Christian community”,³ and that the early church was
divided into “Pauline” and “Petrine” wings. Using the
pattern of Hegelian dialectic, Baur identified the emergence of
the early catholic church as the adjustment of these two antithet­
cal streams of earliest Christianity. Along with this novel
interpretation of the character and development of earliest
Christianity went a radical sifting of the New Testament

¹ Eberhard Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der
Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie* (”Hermeneutische Untersuchungen
zur Theologie, 2” ; Tübingen : J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1962); Walter
Schmithals, “Paulus und der historische Jesus”, *Zeitschrift für die neustestament­
liche Wissenschaft*, lii (1962), 145-60. Kümmel’s lecture was subsequently
² “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde”, *Tübinger Zeitschrift
für Theologie*, 1831, pp. 4 ff.
³ Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, trans. William Montgomery
evidence. Not only were the Synoptic Gospels carefully—sometimes drastically—pruned, and thereby thrown into question as reliable historical sources, but the Pauline Corpus as well felt the sharp knife of Tübingen surgery. Only Romans, Galatians, and 1, 2 Corinthians were admitted as primary sources for Pauline thought. In 1845 Baur published the first edition of his work on Paul,1 and in 1853 the first edition of his study of the first three centuries of church history.2 In the latter he raised the question "how the apostle Paul appears in his Epistles to be so indifferent to the historical facts of the life of Jesus", and answered that Paul's "whole Christian consciousness is transformed into a view of the person of Jesus which stands in need of no history to elucidate it".3

In reaction to Baur's emphasis on Paul's religious consciousness and his spiritual view of Christ, Heinrich Paret published a lengthy article devoted exclusively to the Jesus-Paul problem.4 Paul's religious consciousness, he claimed, rested nonetheless on historical facts,5 and apart from the "Geschichte Jesu" one cannot discern the "Gesichte des Herrn".6 In the mission field Paul was in contact with persons for whom the names "Jesus" and "Christ" had no meaning, and both needed clarification and development before faith in Jesus as the Christ could be commended.7 Paret then scoured Paul's letters (he did not confine himself to the Tübingen four, but also used 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Colossians) to prove not only that the apostle knew and valued the historical facts of Jesus' life, but that he also quoted, used, and alluded to the teachings of Jesus. If materials we should expect to find there are omitted, that may be explained, Paret held, by Paul's major intention which was to emphasize the high points of dogma, while presupposing the groundwork previously laid in his missionary preaching.8

3 Ibid. p. 9.
4 "Paulus und Jesus, Einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis des Apostels Paulus und seiner Lehre zu der Person, dem Leben und der Lehre des geschichtlichen Christus", Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, iii (1858), 1-85.
5 Ibid. p. 6.
6 Ibid. p. 6.
7 Ibid. pp. 8-9.
8 Ibid. p. 11.
In later editions of his *Church History* Baur took the opportunity to respond to Paret's article, and thus the issue was joined. Said Baur,

The attempt to make out quotations is very defective and unsatisfactory, and it is impossible to help thinking that had the apostle himself felt the need of such credentials for his teaching, he would have expressed himself quite differently in his epistles.¹

Meanwhile, Baur's volumes on Paul and on church history were being translated into English (the former appeared in English in 1873-5, the latter in 1878 ff.), and shortly thereafter the Britisher, George Matheson, published a series of studies in response.² He was particularly disturbed at Tübingen's scepticism with respect to the four gospels as historical sources, and turned to Paul's letters (he was more circumspect than Paret, and used only the four letters Tübingen would acknowledge as authentic) for confirmation of the synoptic material. Passage by passage Matheson found in Paul material about the earthly Jesus: his teachings, his character, the events of his life. Matheson's purpose was not to "save" Paul but to "save Jesus" as portrayed by the four gospels, and this he was confident he had done.

In the light of St. Paul's Epistles the facts recorded in these Gospels are proved, beyond the shadow of a doubt, not only to belong to the first Christian century, but to be the product of the first Christian age, and the objects of implicit belief with the first Christian converts. The questions, therefore, of the genuineness, the authenticity, and the date of our canonical Gospels no longer stand in the foreground; the citadel can be saved apart from them.³

But one may perhaps discern Baur's influence in Karl von Weizsäcker's *The Apostolic Age*, originally published in German in 1886.⁴ Weizsäcker held that Paul's theology was guided neither by the primitive church nor by the teaching of Jesus, but by "his own thought and spiritual life...".⁵ When Weizsäcker speaks of Paul's "intuitions" as the basis for "the final and supreme principles of his theology"⁶ he seems simply to be

1. i, n. 21, pp. 50-51.
3. Ibid. ii. 369.
5. Ibid. i. 135.
6. Ibid. p. 137.
echoing Baur's earlier discussion of Paul's "Christian consciousness". Some of these ideas are further expanded in later works by Paul Wernle\(^1\) and Heinrich Weinel.\(^2\)

I

Although the first skirmishes of the Jesus-Paul controversy were prompted by the radical criticism of the Tübingen School in the years following 1831 and were in general fought on German soil,\(^3\) the article which marks the beginning of the major battles and ushers in the period of world-wide conflict was written by Hans Hinrich Wendt of Jena, and published in 1894.\(^4\) On the one hand Wendt acknowledged an essential integrity between the message of Jesus and the preaching of Paul, and ascribed this to Paul's having taken up Jesus' "religious ideal"—man's destiny as a child of a loving Father-God.\(^5\) But on the other hand Wendt asserted that in taking over this ideal Paul had re-formed it under the influence of his own Pharisaic presuppositions. Thus, the simple, popular, pictorial teaching of Jesus was cast into a theological mould by Paul "the learned Jewish theologian".\(^6\) Whereas Jesus preached a pure piety, Paul speculated about the means of salvation.\(^7\) When Wendt summarized his conclusions he acknowledged Paul's contribution in universalizing the gospel and developing Christian teaching especially in the direction of Reformation insights, and readily admitted that Paul's system


\(^3\)Notice may also be given to an article published in this period in the United States by J. H. Mcllvaine, "Christ and Paul" (Bibliotheca Sacra, xcv (1878), 425-60) which, however, seems not to have been specifically prompted by the discussion on the Continent. Mcllvaine acknowledges that Paul differed in many "particulars of form" from Jesus, explained by Paul's intention to present the "truths" taught by Jesus in "forms especially adapted to meet Jewish difficulties, and to convince the Jewish mind" (p. 431). Later, in England, J. S. Banks ("St. Paul and the Gospels", Expository Times, v (1893-4), 413-15) acknowledged these differences, but contended that the harmony between the substance of Paul's thought and the gospels is "beyond question" (p. 413).

\(^4\)"Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu", Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, iv (1894), 1-78.

\(^5\)Ibid. p. 75.

\(^6\)Ibid. p. 77.

\(^7\)Ibid. pp. 77-78.
was, "from a human point of view", more interesting than Jesus' preaching. But therein, he concluded, was Paul's greatest weakness. We know it to be certain that the teaching of Jesus, if it is only grasped and preached in its original strength and meaning, can and will exert in a yet much higher measure vital and ennobling influences upon the further development of Christendom than have proceeded so far from the teaching of Paul.1

These final words of Wendt's essay were but the opening words of a furious debate.

Adolf Hilgenfeld responded directly to Wendt.2 Whereas Wendt's final assessment of Paul had been essentially negative, Hilgenfeld stresses much more Paul's positive contributions to Christianity, and argues that Paul had simply developed what was present already in Jesus' teaching in embryonic form. The contrast between the old and new covenants is sharper in the epistles, the single point of Jesus' death is emphasized above all, and Jesus' simple, straightforward sayings about man's sinfulness are developed into an "epoch-making" ("bahnbrechende") theory about man's need for redemption,3 but of the basic integrity of Jesus' message and Paul's gospel, Hilgenfeld has no doubt. Appearing in the same year with the articles by Wendt and Hilgenfeld was one by Otto Schmoller.4 He is concerned with the more radical problem as to whether there ever was a historical person, Jesus of Nazareth. Bruno Bauer, in his Kritik der Evangelien und Geschichte ihres Ursprungs,5 after considering the Pauline as well as the synoptic evidence, had come to the explicit conclusion: "there never was any historical Jesus".6 It is to this question that Schmoller's article is addressed, for he attempts to show how a study of Paul can shed light on the historic Christ.7 After surveying the Pauline materials he concludes that they confirm the essential reliability and historicity of the portrait of Jesus.

1 "Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu", Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, iv (1894), 1-78. p. 78.
2 "Jesus und Paulus", Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, xxxvii (1894), 481-541.
3 Ibid. p. 541.
4 "Die geschichtliche Person Jesu nach den paulinischen Schriften", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, lxvii (1894), 656-705.
5 2 vols., Berlin, 1850-1.
in the gospels. Like Matheson some thirteen years earlier, Schmoller sees Paul not as contributing to our problem about the Jesus of history, but really as solving it.

In 1895 there were still more contributions to the Jesus-Paul debate, among them articles by Heinrici, Nösgen, and Gloatz. This last was a detailed reply to Wendt, and carried through the increasingly emphasized idea that Paul and—said Gloatz—also John had been the ones who most deeply grasped the real meaning of Jesus' message. The same point was made by two British writers in separate articles a little later. Arthur Hoyle declared that Paul was by no means the "second founder" of Christianity, and that he had simply developed Jesus' teachings; he had not departed in any crucial way from them. Alexander Mair also argued in this vein, contending that Paul had supplied the technical statement of Christianity's creed, but had in no way substantially altered it. However, Mair's case is weakened because he uses quite indiscriminately and without any real critical sense material from all four gospels and Acts.

Meanwhile, two more Germans, W. Sturm and Richard Drescher, added articles to those of Hilgenfeld, Gloatz, and others defending the essential agreement of Paul's gospel with the teaching of Jesus. Sturm made the important observation that the mere paralleling of verses from the synoptic gospels with verses from the Pauline letters is both questionable methodologically and of slight help. One must proceed, he said, by

2 It is also noteworthy that Julius Wellhausen, in the first edition of his Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte published in 1894, held that Paul "was really the man who best understood the Master and carried on His work" (quoted by Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, p. 159, n. 1).
4 Nösgen, "Die apostolische Verkündigung und die Geschichte Jesu", Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, 1895.
5 "Zur Vergleichung der Lehre des Paulus mit der Jesu", Theologische Studien and Kritiken, lxviii (1895), 777-800.
7 "The Modern Overestimate of Paul's Relationship to Christianity", The Expositor, 5th ser., vi (1897), 241-57.
taking the leading ideas, the "salvation words", from both
texts, and comparing them. Thus, for example, he compared
Mark x. 45 ("For the Son of man also came not to be served but
to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many") with Romans
v. 19 ("For as by one man's disobedience many were made
sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous");
and again Matthew xi. 29 ("Take my yoke upon you, and learn
from me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find
rest for your souls") with 2 Corinthians x. 1 ("I, Paul, myself
entreat you, by the meekness and gentleness of Christ...").
Drescher made the more general point that Paul, in the four
major letters as well as in Philippians, supports an ethic of
intention in opposition to an external legalism, and must surely
have been influenced therein by Jesus himself. The letters in
fact provide "an imposing amount of material" on Jesus' life. This
seems to have remained the dominant view, even in
Germany, for the next several years, and the names of Arthur
Titius, Adolf Harnack, Paul Feine, A. Resch, and, in the

1 "Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus", Festgruss Bernard Stade zur Feier seiner
25 jahrigen Wirksamkeit als Professor... (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuch-
handlung, 1900), pp. 99-162.

2 The articles of Sturm and Drescher were not directly available to me, and
for a knowledge of their contents I am dependent upon H. Holtzmann, "Zum
Thema Jesus und Paulus", Protestantische Monatsheften, iv (1900), 463-8, and
Albert Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, p. 159, n. 1.

3 "Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit", pt. ii of Die
neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit und ihre Bedeutung fur die Gegenwart

4 What is Christianity? trans. T. Bailey Saunders (London: Williams and
Norgate, 1901; 1st German edn., 1900). Said Harnack: "Those who blame
[Paul] for corrupting the Christian religion have never felt a single breath of his
spirit, and judge him only by mere externals, such as clothes and book-learning;
those who extol or criticise him as a founder of religion are forced to make him
bear witness against himself on the main point, and acknowledge that the con­
sciousness which bore him up and steeled him for his work was illusory and self­
deceptive. As we cannot want to be wiser than history, which knows him only
as Christ's missionary, and as his own words clearly attest what his aims were
and what he was, we regard him as Christ's disciple, as the apostle who not only
worked harder but also accomplished more than all the rest put together." In
sum, Paul "was the one who understood the Master and continued his work"
(p. 176).

5 Jesus Christus und Paulus, 1902.

6 Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu (1904). Resch found 925 allusions to
Jesus' sayings in nine Pauline letters, 133 more in Ephesians, 100 in the Pastoral
United States, R. R. Lloyd 1 may be mentioned as its exponents. Of course, exponents of what Schweitzer calls "the usual view" 2 were also to be found, the most notable being Maurice Goguel. 3 Goguel believed that there was a fundamental doctrinal difference between Jesus and Paul and that Paul's theology of redemption had gone far beyond the scope of the preaching of Jesus. 4

Goguel's position was temperate and hardly earth-shaking. But this can by no means be said of an explosive monograph which opened the debate afresh, Wilhelm Wrede's *Paulus*, published in German in 1905 and translated into English in 1907. 5 Wrede began by stressing Paul's conversion experience whereby he had been transformed from a hater of Jesus into his apostle. 6 The essence of this experience was a new conviction that Jesus was Messiah, "the germ of a dogma" from which Paul's whole theology subsequently evolved. 7 The apostle's belief in Jesus' messiahship, Wrede claimed, came not from his impression of Jesus' personality, nor was it the result of his deifying Jesus. Rather, "Paul believed in such a celestial being, in a divine

---

1 "The Historic Christ in the Letters of Paul", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, lxxxvii (1901), 270-293.
2 Paul and His Interpreters, p. 159.
3 *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ* (1904).
4 For comments on Goguel's position see Schweitzer, *Paul and His Interpreters*, pp. 159 f. In 1903 the fourth edition of Paul de Lagarde's *Deutsche Schriften über das Verhältnis des deutschen Staates zur Theologie, Kirche und Religion* had appeared (the first edition was published in 1878), contending in very radical terms that no bridge could be built backwards from Paul to Jesus. Paul Wernle (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, 1st edn., 1901, 2nd edn., 1904) was on Lagarde's side so far as positing a sharp disparity between Jesus and Paul, although at the same time he held that Paul understood Jesus better than some of his predecessors. Wernle also contended that Paul surely knew more about Jesus than his letters reveal, "but his theology intentionally ignores the biography of Jesus, as we know it from the gospels." (Cited by E. Vischer, "Jesus and Paulus", *Theologische Rundschau*, viii (1905), 177.)
6 Ibid. p. 25.
7 Ibid. p. 76.
Christ, before he believed in Jesus", and his conversion consisted in an identification of the two.¹

Wrede carries forward Wendt's insistence that Paul was essentially rabbinic in his theological background and impulses, contrasts this with Jesus' Pharisaic background, and criticizes both Wellhausen and Harnack for regarding Paul as Jesus' expounder and successor.² Wrede believes that Jesus' emphasis on the fatherly providence of God "scarcely finds an echo in Paul", and doubts "whether the Pauline picture of the future can be considered a propagation of the original thoughts of Jesus".³ Also with respect to morality and ethics Wrede finds Paul departing from Jesus' teaching.

Great as is Paul's ethical interest, there is no doubt that he subordinated the moral virtues of character to something else, and not only in polemic; to faith or belief, that is, to a conviction with a quite definite, formulable content, at bottom belief in a dogma...⁴

Wrede's conclusions were more radical than Wendt's and certainly more sharply stated. Moreover, because Wrede's book was popularly written, its effect was far greater than the scholarly article of Wendt published a decade earlier. "In comparison with Jesus", said Wrede,

Paul is essentially a new phenomenon, as new, considering the large basis of common ground, as he could possibly be. He stands much farther away from Jesus than Jesus himself stands from the noblest figures of Jewish piety.⁵

And, finally: "It follows conclusively from all this that Paul is to be regarded as the second founder of Christianity."⁶ "This second founder of Christianity has even, compared with the first, exercised beyond all doubt the stronger—not the better—influence."⁷

⁵ Ibid. p. 165. ⁶ Ibid. p. 179.
⁷ Ibid. p. 180. One may compare Nietzsche's comments that, but for the superstitious and crafty Paul, "there would be no Christianity; we should scarcely have heard of a small Jewish sect whose master died on the cross"; Paul was "the first Christian, the inventor of Christianity. Until then there were only a few Jewish sectarians" (Die Morgenröte, 1881. These quotations are from excerpts translated in _The Portable Nietzsche_, trans. and ed. Walter Kaufmann [New York: The Viking Press, 1954], pp. 76-77, 79).
An early but only partial response to Wrede’s book appeared in the same year in an article by Eberhard Vischer which summarized and commented upon the major recent contributions to the debate (viz. Wellhausen, Harnack, Lagarde, Wernle, Feine, Deissmann, Resch, and Brückner, as well as Wrede).\(^1\) Vischer insisted that Paul’s letters had been called forth by particular historical situations and that his theology was thus basically polemical. Since Paul writes to congregations where his gospel is already known, said Vischer,

one is not permitted simply to identify what stands in his letters with his missionary preaching. So it is possible, indeed probable, that Paul had imparted more about the life of Jesus and his words in the oral proclamation than one is able to infer from his letters. A passage like 1 Cor. 11, 23 presupposes that the congregations are acquainted with at least a part of the history of Jesus.\(^2\)

Martin Brückner, whose earlier work, *Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie* (1903), was a more detailed and in some ways sounder presentation of the position represented by Wrede, responded to Vischer in an article published the year after his.\(^3\) Brückner’s article focused chiefly on the question of a legitimate methodology for research into the Jesus-Paul question. He agreed with Vischer that the attempt to compare the Pauline letters with individual passages in the gospels is not very fruitful. The same point had been made by Sturm in 1900, as noted above, but Brückner’s reasons for insisting on it are his own: (1) the gospel tradition itself is uncertain; and (2) the discovery of parallels does not necessarily mean that one has proved the dependence of one source on another, as shown by history of religions’ research and the many parallels uncovered in ancient but genetically unrelated texts. Brückner holds that the controlling questions for research ought not to be “What does Paul know about Jesus? ” and “What parts of the Pauline Christ picture stem from the historical Jesus? ” but rather, “How has Paul presented the earthly life of Jesus? ” and “In what relationship to Paul’s whole viewpoint do the particular parts of his Christ

---

\(^1\) “Jesus und Paulus”, *Theologische Rundschau*, viii (1905), 129-43, 176-88.

\(^2\) Ibid. p. 131.

\(^3\) “Zum Thema Jesus und Paulus”, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vii (1906), 112-19.
picture stand?" Do they grow out of that, or have they been imported from outside?¹

With respect to the first of these questions Brückner answers that Paul, in the main, disdains the earthly life of Jesus, considering it not a "revelation" but an abrogation of the messianic nature of Christ, an "emptying", a time of "weakness" which leads to death.² Paul's picture of Jesus thus has a half-historical, half-dogmatic character because for the apostle historical and dogmatic ideas are closely conjoined and often cannot be separated.³ Brückner concludes, thereby answering the second of his two questions, that Paul's letters themselves reveal no influence of the personality of Jesus upon the apostle's Christology. His Christology is entirely and more clearly explicable in terms of Paul's own theological perspective⁴ which, as Brückner had in his earlier work already sought to demonstrate, consisted of Paul's combining the ideas of incarnation and dying-rising with the Jewish messianic idea. Therefore, he concluded, the deep kinship between Paul and Jesus in matters of theology, eschatology, and ethics, was not just an "accident". Both shared the common ground of Judaism and the common "ideal kernel of religion"—belief in the fatherhood of God and the infinite worth of the individual.⁵

In spite of Brückner's temperate and learned support of the general position represented by Wrede, it was the latter's book which remained the centre of the controversy and to which dissenting scholars felt obliged to respond. Attacks on Wrede came, within the two years following publication of his book, from Julius Kaftan,⁶ Paul Kolbing,⁷ Arnold Meyer,⁸ and Adolf Jülicher.⁹ Kaftan sought to expose Wrede's falsely-conceived scholasticizing interpretation of Paulinism. He insisted that, although Paul's Pharisaic training led him to certain distinctive

¹ "Zum Thema Jesus und Paulus", pp. 112-13.
² Ibid. p. 114.
³ Ibid. p. 115.
⁴ Ibid. p. 117.
⁵ Jesus und Paulus (Tübingen, 1906).
⁶ Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus (Göttingen, 1906).
⁸ Paulus und Jesus, "Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher", i. 14 (Tübingen, 1907).
statements of the gospel, the apostle had much more in common with Jesus than Wrede had allowed. Jülicher was particularly concerned with Wrede's bold assertion that Paul had been Christianity's "second founder," and sought to refute that particular statement of the case.

Arnold Meyer's volume was also addressed to this specific question, as its German title indicated: "Who founded Christianity? Jesus or Paul?" But it is characteristic of Meyer's book that he does not try to minimize the differences between Jesus and Paul as many others had. In fact, he speaks of the "vastness of the gulf" separating Jesus and the "strange speculations of St. Paul." Paul's system was essentially Gnostic, Meyer argued; as opposed to the directness and simplicity of Jesus, Paul's thought was dialectic and complex, his conception of God retained "traits of Oriental despotism and caprice"; and in distinction from the pure piety of Jesus, Paul offered "a mythological drama" of redemption realized in personal experience. Echoing Wendt and also Wrede, Meyer speaks about "the warping influence [upon Paul] of the Rabbinic schools..."; he contrasts the urban Paul with the rural Jesus; he emphasizes Paul's pathological tendency to see everything in sharp contrasts; and believes that his holding aloof from those who had known the historical Jesus "was in every sort of way fatal for the Apostle." Moreover, Meyer is quite ready to acknowledge that there were certain crucial differences between Jesus and Paul respecting the law and the Gentile mission. But on the central point of Paul's gospel—the proclamation that Christ died for our sins—Meyer finds decisive agreement, although with an important qualification.

This conception can scarcely have been derived from Jesus Himself; but the disciples of Jesus could not have ascribed it to Him and could not have so interpreted His death unless Jesus had lived His own and God's forgiving love before

---

1 Since Kaftan's monograph was not directly accessible to me, I am dependent for this statement of his position upon James Moffatt, "Paul and Jesus" (Biblical World, xxxii (1908), 171).
3 Ibid. p. 24.
4 Ibid. pp. 77 ff.
5 Ibid. p. 80.
6 Ibid. p. 83.
7 Ibid. p. 87.
8 Ibid. pp. 87-88.
9 Ibid. pp. 88-89.
10 Ibid. p. 90.
their eyes. Hence it was the Spirit of Jesus that came over St. Paul, and in so far he rightly regarded Jesus as his Lord, and rightly called himself an apostle of Jesus.¹

Thus, Meyer's own answer to the question posed in the title of his book is not simply formulated. On the one hand he insisted: "Our religion in its essence is derived from Christ."² But on the other hand he could still say that "St. Paul, . . . though not the sole founder was still the principal founder of that form of Christianity which alone proved capable of subduing the wide world to Christ . . .".³ Meyer here develops what had been implicit in Wendt's presentation of the case in 1894, and which, following Meyer, became more and more the position of liberal Protestant theology: that Paul's function was necessary in its day, but that it was essentially apologetic, polemical, and organizational, and that the present-day motto of the Christian ought to be: "Back through Paul to Jesus and God!" ⁴

While each of the writers who attacked Wrede scored certain points in the debate with him (his interpretation of Paul's view of faith as belief in dogmas was particularly susceptible to attack), the force and effect of Wrede's work was by no means dissipated. Johannes Weiss correctly observed that, while some details of Wrede's thesis had been refuted, the general impression was left that his overall point remained standing.⁵ This impression Weiss now earnestly seeks to dispel. He admits one basic difference between Jesus and Paul—the latter's exaltation of Jesus to the status of God, his "religious veneration" of him⁶; and from the outset Weiss acknowledges his own preference for a "Jesus of Nazareth religion" as distinguished from the "exalted Christ religion" of Paul and the earliest church. Paul's Christology and doctrine of reconciliation could not have been simply "developments of Jesus' teaching"—thus far Weiss supports Wrede ⁷; but against Wrede, Weiss holds that Paul's doctrinal formulations were necessitated by the requirements of the age

(Meyer's point also) and were "the theological expression... of a religious attitude directly derived from the teaching of Jesus". Here is the key to Weiss's solution of the Jesus-Paul problem. Paul was influenced by Jesus' personality, by his fundamental religious consciousness and attitudes. Thus, Weiss does not concentrate on the collection of parallels between Paul's letters and the gospels, but is chiefly concerned to establish the content of Paul's conversion experience which, according to him, was "psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus". The exegesis of 2 Corinthians v. 16 ("From now on, therefore, we regard no one from a human point of view; even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard him thus no longer") is, in this connection, crucial for Weiss, and he believes the passage proves that Paul had indeed known Jesus "after the flesh", i.e. "from a human point of view".

In defining the relation of Jesus and Paul, Weiss thus differs, on the one hand, from those who had seen Paul's theological system as a simple development of Jesus' teaching and, on the other hand, from those who had viewed it as a product of Paul's rabbinic and Jewish (messianic-apocalyptic) presuppositions. Paul's Christology represented a correction of his Jewish view of the Messiah, said Weiss—a correction based on a "past experience".

Paul must have been convinced by the narratives of the first disciples or by personal impression that Jesus was entirely devoted to the task not merely of preaching the

1 Paul and Jesus, p. 14.  
2 Ibid. p. 31.  
3 Ibid. pp. 41-54. Throughout the various periods of the Jesus-Paul debate many articles dealing with the exegesis of this passage have appeared. Among them are the following: H. F. Perry, "Knowing Christ After the Flesh (2 Cor. 5:16)", Biblical World, xviii (1901), 270-86; Valentin Weber, "Wann und wie hat Paulus 'Christus nach dem Fleische gekannt' (2 Kor. 5, 16)", Biblische Zeitschrift, ii (1904), 178-87; S. T. Lowrie, "Exegetical Note on 2 Cor. v. 16", Princeton Theological Review, iv (1906), 236-41; A. D. Martin, "Knowing Christ kata sarka", Expository Times, xxiv (1912-13), 334-5; A. M. Pope, "Paul's Previous Meeting With Jesus", The Expositor, 8th ser., xxvi (1923), 38-48; Frank C. Porter, "Does Paul Claim to Have Known the Historical Jesus?", Journal of Biblical Literature, xlvii (1928), 257-75. Cf. also the remarks of A. S. Peake, "Paul the Apostle: His Personality and Achievement", Bulletin, xii (1928), 368, n. 1.
love of God, but of acting as its incarnation in His every deed and word and of preaching it so attractively that sinners were able to take courage in view of that love.\(^1\)

This "impression of the person of Jesus" Weiss identified as "the profound and decisive influence of Jesus upon Paul".\(^2\) Particularly before Paul was the "self-renouncing love" of Jesus,\(^3\) on which point "Paul 'understood' Jesus inwardly, deeply, and correctly".\(^4\) Weiss begins and concludes with the assertion that, because Paul and the early church regarded Jesus as an object of religious veneration, they represented "a new type of religion".\(^5\) But the idea that this new religious type had no "living tie with the historical figure of Jesus" Weiss firmly rejects.\(^6\)

Meanwhile, how were British and American scholars responding to the questions being debated in Germany? Wrede's book was translated into English in 1907, and the volumes by Meyer and Weiss were translated two years later. From some quarters there were anguished cries against the "anti-Paul" writers, but without a critical evaluation of the texts which had for so long been under discussion in Germany (and France).\(^7\) The earliest notable contributions in English came from James Moffatt and William Morgan in 1908. Moffatt does little more than review the work of Wrede, Kaftan, Bousset, Meyer, and Jülicher.\(^8\) With the last he agreed that Paul was not even the "second founder" of Christianity, but at the same time conceded that Paul's theological interpretation of Christ's death bears the marks of rabbinic dialectic. "But this admission", Moffatt concluded, "still leaves the core and centre of Paul's gospel to be accounted for. Jesus did not preach justification; Paul did." Moffatt "accounts for" this gospel by referring to Paul's "religious

\(^{1}\) Op. cit. p. 93.
\(^{2}\) Ibid. p. 94.
\(^{3}\) Ibid. p. 118.
\(^{4}\) Ibid. p. 121.
\(^{5}\) Ibid. p. 130.
\(^{6}\) Ibid. p. 131.
\(^{7}\) Cf. William H. Johnson, "Was Paul the Founder of Christianity?" *Princeton Theological Review*, v (1907), 398-422; and W. Sanday in *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, ed. James Hastings, vol. ii (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908), p. 888: "That there is a real connexion, and a close connexion between the ideal laid down by Christ and that inculcated by St. Paul cannot be denied; it is really one and the same."
\(^{8}\) "Paul and Jesus", *Biblical World*, xxxii (1908), 168-73.
experience” which was “the direct outcome of the impression made by Jesus Christ upon him”.1 Thus far Moffatt’s emphasis on Paul’s religious experience and the “impression” Jesus made on him recalls Weiss’s book (to which Moffatt does not refer); but in another respect Moffatt goes beyond Weiss when he suggests that Pauline thought was, in fact, “a genetic development of [Jesus’] original gospel”.2

Morgan’s article also is mainly a review of the German discussion, and considers primarily Wrede, Kaftan, Jülicher, and Meyer.3 Morgan’s own conclusion is essentially that of Meyer. “Paul did not pervert Jesus’ gospel, although he brought into the foreground elements that were foreign to it.”4 But this was necessitated by apologetic considerations: “The gospel had to be presented in the thought-forms of the time”,5 says Morgan, and then concludes as Meyer had concluded: “Therefore the cry should be, not away from Paul back to Christ; but rather, through Paul back to Christ and to God.”6

More original than the articles of Moffatt and Morgan is the essay on “Jesus and Paul” by C. A. A. Scott.7 Scott challenges Wrede, as many of his German critics had, on his view of Paul’s doctrine of faith,8 and contends against him (and with Wellhausen, Harnack, etc.) that Paul’s thought represents a development of Jesus’ teachings but no contradiction of them.9 There is indeed, he insists, substantial agreement between the two on such key issues as the Fatherhood of God and ethics.10 Scott acknowledges that Paul shows little interest in Jesus’ earthly career,11 but ascribes this to the apostle’s anticipation of Jesus’ parousia, “an expectation which would tend at least to suspend interest in the record of Jesus of Nazareth”.12 In so far as Paul’s thought did differ from Jesus’ teaching (Scott has reference to the two points of distinction discussed by F. C. Baur: nomology and

1 “Paul and Jesus”, p. 173.  
2 Ibid.  
3 “The Jesus-Paul Controversy”, Expository Times, xx (1908), 9-12, 55-58.  
4 Ibid. p. 58.  
5 Ibid.  
6 Ibid.  
8 Ibid. p. 358.  
9 Ibid. p. 359.  
10 Ibid. pp. 360 ff.  
11 Ibid. p. 335.  
Christology), these differences are to be explained by "three distinctions of experience"\(^1\): (1) Jesus never knew the sense of dependence on the authority of another, whereas Paul lived as one "under authority"; (2) Jesus never knew a sense of guilt such as was crucial in Paul's experience; (3) Jesus, unlike Paul, never sensed the law as an intolerable tyranny.\(^2\) Nevertheless, concludes Scott, "Paul shews just that harmony with Jesus, with His aim and method, which in another we should put down to intimacy".\(^3\) "The thought of Jesus reaches us through Paul as well as in the records of the Gospels..."

One other article in English deserves notice here. In 1909 Arthur Cushman McGiffert summed up the discussion for American readers, and then presented his own point of view.\(^5\) To Christianity, McGiffert concluded, Jesus contributed a deep, religious piety, a "vivid realization of God as his father and the father of his brethren, and [an] attitude of perfect trust and joyful devotion...".\(^6\) In these respects Paul was profoundly influenced by Jesus. But, as far as the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, its ideas of redemption, salvation, atonement, the church, and the sacraments, McGiffert concluded: "All of these had their origin ultimately in the experience of Paul and not in the teaching of Jesus."\(^7\)

Of three major articles published in the year 1912,\(^8\) the most original and important was by Wilhelm Heitmuller.\(^9\) Heitmuller proposes two points for discussion. First, he wishes to emphasize Paul's conscious and deliberate self-reliance and independence in

---

2. Ibid. pp. 343-4.
3. Ibid. p. 375.
4. Ibid. p. 377.
5. "Was Jesus or Paul the Founder of Christianity?" American Journal of Theology, xiii (1909), 1-20.
6. Ibid. p. 18.
7. Ibid.
his religious life and theology. He takes account of the arguments of those who insist that Paul, due to his contacts with the twelve disciples, must have known more about Jesus than his letters reveal, but insists that there is nothing in his letters which leads us necessarily to postulate that possibility.\(^1\) The frequent assertion that Paul’s missionary preaching contained more about Jesus’ life and personality than we find in his letters Heitmüller regards as a conjecture which the sources really do not permit,\(^2\) and concludes that, on the basis of our sources, we must only suppose Paul’s missionary preaching to have centred on Jesus’ incarnation, obedience, crucifixion, and resurrection.\(^3\) Paul’s theology, according to his own testimony, came not from a revelation in the historical Jesus but through the living, exalted Lord.\(^4\)

Heitmüller’s second point was, in 1912, even more original. A second factor in Paul’s departure from the historical Jesus is the apostle’s dependence not upon Christianity in its Palestinian-Jewish form, but in its Hellenistic form.\(^5\) "Paul is separated from Jesus not only by the primitive community, but also by a second factor. The line of development reads: Jesus—the primitive community—Hellenistic Christianity—Paul."\(^6\) In proposing Hellenistic Christianity as the background and chief factor in the formulation of Paul’s thought, Heitmüller is not only criticizing those who had dealt with the Jesus-Paul problem as if there were no third term to consider, but he is also criticizing those who, like Wendt, Brückner, Wrede, and many others, had described the major influence on Paul’s theology as Jewish-rabbinic-apocalyptic. Heitmüller now insists that Paul was dependent on a form of Christianity which was already far from Jesus and that Paul’s theology had not been an innovation, but could be explained in terms of historical origins.

The other two articles published in 1912, one by a German, one by an American, attack Wrede on the basis of conservative presuppositions and theological interests and do not significantly

---

\(^1\) "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus", p. 322.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Ibid. p. 324.
\(^4\) Ibid.
\(^5\) Ibid. pp. 325-6.
\(^6\) Ibid. p. 330.
advance the discussion. Gerhard Kittel disputes Wrede's ascription to Paul of a doctrine of Christ's pre-existence and a magical view of the sacraments. Like others before him Kittel remarks that Paul's letters are somewhat silent about the historical Jesus because the first readers were already acquainted with the facts of his life and teaching. Yet Kittel finds many Pauline passages which seem to him to give much more of a picture of Jesus' character, individuality, and "moral personality" than Wrede had acknowledged. Even Paul's use of κύριος and ἐν χριστῷ are often, if not always, in contexts where the historical Jesus is in mind (e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 27). Thus, concludes Kittel, the historical Jesus stands more in the foreground of Paul's thought than is often supposed.

In America, J. Gresham Machen led the conservative attack against Wrede. For him the "value" of Wrede's book was the demonstration that "Paul was no disciple of the liberal Jesus", for modern liberalism had "produced a Jesus who [has] really but little in common with Paul". The liberals, then, had created their own problem by liberalizing Jesus, and given their presuppositions, there was indeed a Jesus-Paul problem. But this liberal picture of Jesus Machen sharply attacks: "As a teacher, . . . Jesus was not the founder of Christianity. He was the founder of Christianity not because of what he said, but because of what he did." "Paul was a disciple of Jesus, if Jesus was a supernatural person; he was not a disciple of Jesus, if Jesus was a mere man." Machen also criticized the liberals' habit of making a distinction between Paul's practical religion (or "religious attitudes") and his doctrinal formulations. It is impossible, said Machen, "to separate Pauline piety and Pauline theology . . ." He also insisted that the very sparsity of information about Jesus in Paul's letters, and the casual way he

1 "Jesus bei Paulus", Theologische Studien und Kritiken, lxxv (1912), 366-402.  
3 Ibid. p. 394.  
4 Ibid. p. 397.  
5 Ibid. p. 399.  
6 Ibid. p. 400.  
7 "Jesus and Paul", Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), pp. 547-78.  
8 Ibid. p. 549.  
9 Ibid. p. 577.  
10 Ibid. p. 550.
includes what information they do contain, supports the view "that for him such factual knowledge was a matter of course".1 "A missionary preaching", Machen said, "that included no concrete account of the life of Jesus would have been preposterous. The claim that a crucified Jew was to be obeyed as Lord and trusted as Saviour must surely have provoked the question as to what manner of man this was." 2

II

After World War I the Jesus-Paul debate was not resumed with anything like its prior intensity. It is significant that, in the period between 1920 and 1945, the articles and books bearing on the topic are primarily in English, not in German3 —indicating perhaps, that only now was biblical scholarship in Britain and America taking full account of the debate which had been raging on the Continent. However, with only a few exceptions the articles and books produced have little original to contribute. For example, the article by Fred G. Bratton, "Continuity and Divergence in the Jesus-Paul Problem", is virtually the only contribution to this debate appearing in the pages of the American

1 "Jesus and Paul", p. 563.  
2 Ibid. p. 562.  
3 An "Appendix" in Emil Brunner's, The Mediator (trans. Olive Wyon, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1947 [first published in German in 1927], pp. 536-46) denies the alleged contradiction between Paulinism and the message of Jesus. Although Brunner believes that "the uniting factor between the witness of the Apostle Paul and the Message of Jesus Himself can, in the nature of the case, only be like a very slight thread, a minute point" (p. 545), it is nonetheless real, and to be found in Jesus' eucharistic words which Paul claims to have "received" from the master himself (pp. 543-5). German publications on this topic in the decade prior to World War II should be read in the light of the popular appeal of Alfred Rosenberg's, Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit (München: Hoheneichen-Verlag, 1930). Rosenberg claimed that Paul was the sole creator of the gospel of faith and grace, so much so "that the churches are not Christian but Pauline..." (p. 235), and that Paul the Pharisee had falsified (i.e. Judaized!) the gospel by identifying Jesus as the Jewish Messiah (p. 605). Rosenberg's position (influenced by Paul de Lagarde and H. S. Chamberlain) is of course properly discussed in relation to the rise of Naziism, and does not deserve serious consideration in a discussion of the Jesus-Paul debate per se. See Albert R. Chandler, Rosenberg's Nazi Myth (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1945), esp. pp. 42-48.
He begins by noting that since such diametrically opposite solutions have been proposed to the problem, one must conclude that a synthetic answer is the valid one. Yet Bratton’s conclusion simply follows in the line of those who separate Paul’s “theology” from his “religion”.

Paul’s spiritual *elan vital* was identical with that of Jesus—the creative power which is derived from personal fellowship with the divine. Paul’s continuity with Jesus is seen in the realm of spiritual values. . . . ²

In 1923 Adolf Deissmann had published some English lectures under the title, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*,³ in which he reaffirmed the position he had already taken in his earlier volume on Paul.⁴ In that work, completely revised and published in a second German edition in 1925, Deissmann had concluded:

The Christ-centered Christianity of Paul is . . . neither a breach with the Gospel of Jesus nor a distortion of the Gospel of Jesus. It secures for many the evangelical experience of God which had been the possession of the One, and it does so by anchoring these many souls in the soul of the One.⁶

This view also characterizes the 1923 volume:

To Paul Christ is not a person of the past, with whom he can have intercourse only by meditating on his words as they have been handed down. To Paul Christ is not a great “historic” figure, but a reality and power of the present, an “energy” whose life-giving power is daily made perfect in him.⁶

In England ⁷ J. Ernest Rattenbury also emphasized Paul’s Christ-faith, the “Jesus of personal experience”, in a special section on this topic in his book, *The Testament of Paul: Studies in Doctrines Born of Evangelical Experience*.⁸ “Paul’s letters”, he said, “portray the Christ whom he experienced “,” and this

---

¹ Journal of Biblical Literature.² Ibid. p. 159.
³ Trans. William E. Wilson (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923; the volume had not previously been published in German).
⁵ Ibid. p. 258. In this citation I have slightly altered Wilson’s translation where this alteration seemed to me necessary.
⁷ In *History and the Gospel* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1938) C. H. Dodd does not deal with the Jesus-Paul problem, but he does use the Pauline letters as a source for the life and teaching of the historical Jesus, and even believes that “Paul has a definite conception of the character of Jesus” (p. 65).
⁹ Ibid. p. 61.
"not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."  

However, Rattenbury cautions, Paul plainly identified this Christ of faith with Jesus of Nazareth:

The vagueness of mysticism is avoided by Paul's identification of the Christ of his experience with the Jesus of history, and all attempts to break down such an identification endanger Christianity.  

Therefore, the antithesis "Jesus or Paul?" misses the point, for it fails to see beneath Paul's doctrines to his experience.

Meanwhile, the "Chicago School" of social-historical research was dominating American biblical studies, and its chief spokesman, Shirley Jackson Case, had brief but significant comments on Paul's view of the historical Jesus. Paul "could have written a gospel that would have been quite as accurate and extensive as the Gospel of Luke", he opined, but he unfortunately "had no interest in such an enterprise". Case mentions several factors which resulted in Paul's indifference to the matter: his supreme concern for "the heavenly Christ"; his eschatological expectation; and his need, in the face of attacks upon his apostleship, to minimize the significance of historical contact with Jesus. One who, like Paul, claims to possess the mind of Christ, need have no concern for seeking out "traditional information about the life and teaching of the earthly Jesus."  

Brief notice may also be given here to an arresting article in which Hans Windisch insists that the apparent paradox of continuity and divergence between Jesus and Paul is due to a mixing, in Paul's letters, of a "Jerusalem Gospel" and a "Damascus Gospel". Windisch maintains that the alternative, "historical Jesus/preached Christ", is false.

In the Synoptic Gospels we have a Christ other than the one met in Paul. It is Christ Jesus, the one met by the earliest disciples, the authentic disciples, in Galilee and Jerusalem, and who were there forced to a decision in a completely different manner than Paul had been forced to a decision. It is the Christ who was living before there was an apostolic kerygma concerning him, before Paul, before the gospel which originated in Damascus.
Windisch’s attempt to forge a link between Jesus and Paul by saying that the two were the same “religious type” (Windisch compared the apostolic and messianic offices) was later regarded by W. G. Kümmel as so far-fetched as to warrant no response. Kümmel himself strives to take account of both the similarities and differences in Jesus’ preaching and Paul’s gospel, but like Windisch is critical of the way in which Rudolf Bultmann had been stressing the historical discontinuity between Jesus and Paul.

It was, indeed, during this period between the Wars that Bultmann’s initial contributions to the Jesus-Paul debate were published. In the first of two important articles Bultmann poses three questions: (1) Is Paul’s thought-structure influenced by the historical (historische) Jesus, and is that influence direct or mediated through the primitive community? (2) What is the material relation of Paul’s theology to Jesus’ preaching? (3) What significance for Pauline theology has the fact of the historical (geschichtliche) Jesus? In responding to the first question

1 “Jesus und Paulus”, Theologische Blätter, xix (1940), col. 211. Ernesto Buonaiuti’s attempt to define the relationship of Jesus and Paul deserves notice here (“Christus und Paulus”, Eranos Jahrbuch, 1940/41 [Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1942], pp. 257-94). Like Windisch he seeks to identify Jesus and Paul as belonging to the same religious type, although this is defined in a different way. “The agreement of attitude between Christ and Paul presupposed by the orthodox tradition does not exist, but just as little does the unbridgeable, impenetrable distinction assumed by liberal criticism prevail. Christ and Paul are inseparably connected in the same programme: to make out of religion an enduring dynamism of ‘conversions’ and ‘rebirths’ which occur from moment to moment and which permit escape from the enclosing wall of tangible values into the sphere of spiritual values” (p. 283).

2 “Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus”, Theologische Blätter, viii (1929), 137-51, later reprinted in Glauben und Verstehen, i (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1933), pp. 188-213. Page references herein are to the latter. Kümmel, in his most recent discussion of Jesus and Paul (see above, n. 1), criticizes this threefold division of the problem as methodologically untenable “because the questions of the influence of the person and teaching of Jesus on Paul and of the meaning of the person of Jesus for Paul are in reality only different aspects of the one problem of the continuity between Jesus and Paul” (p. 171). Kümmel’s reformulation of the problem has two foci: “(1) The historical connection between Jesus and Paul (i.e. the problem of continuity), (2) the material correspondence or difference between Jesus and Paul (i.e. the problem of identity)” (ibid.).
Bultmann contends that Paul first met Christianity in its Hellenistic form (the influence of Heitmüller, to whose Marburg chair Bultmann succeeded in 1921, is apparent here) and concludes: 

"When one focuses on the essential Pauline ideas, it is clear that in them Paul is not dependent upon Jesus. Jesus' preaching is for him—at least in essentials—irrelevant."  

With respect to the second matter, he affirms a far-reaching material similarity between Paul's theology and Jesus' preaching about the law (for both the love-commandment is basic). Yet the two are significantly different in that the decisive event for which Jesus waited is proclaimed by Paul as having already occurred. Bultmann criticizes Wrede and Jülicher for having, each in his own way, interpreted Paul's theology as a theological development of Jesus' message.

The significance of Pauline theology is not that in it views of Jesus are further developed, but rather that in it the fact of Jesus' 'having-been-there' [Dagewesen-seins] is understood in a specific manner.

For Paul, "the situation of the world is fundamentally another, new, since Jesus was there". These observations lead on to Bultmann's major concern in the article, to discover the meaning of the historical (geschichtliche) person of Jesus for Paul's theology. This can be answered, he says, in a single sentence:

... the historical [geschichtliche] person of Jesus makes Paul's preaching a gospel. For Paul proclaims neither a new God-idea nor a new messianic concept, but rather an act of God in history [Geschichte], the coming of the Messiah, who is identical with the person of Jesus.


---

1 "Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus", Theologische Blätter, p. 191.  
2 Ibid. pp. 191-5.  
3 Ibid. pp. 200-1.  
5 Ibid. Here Bultmann is in some accord with Albert Schweitzer whose book, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, while begun in 1906, was published in the same year as Bultmann's article. Says Schweitzer: "... Paul shares with Jesus the eschatological world-view and the eschatological expectation, with all that these imply. The only difference is the hour in the world-clock in the two cases. To use another figure, both are looking towards the same mountain range, but whereas Jesus sees it as lying before Him, Paul already stands upon it and its first slopes are already behind him" (trans. William Montgomery [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1931], p. 113).  
Bultmann does not intend to posit a complete disjunction between Paul and Jesus even at this point, for he acknowledges that already in Jesus' preaching there is an implied Christology which is then formulated in the earliest church's preaching of Jesus as God's decisive word spoken, his decisive action. But the church's preaching—and Paul's—was centred not on the "what" of Jesus' life (his character, ministry, teaching) but on its "thatness" [Dass], the fact of it. This means that for Paul Jesus was a teacher only in so far as he was first of all Kyrios; that he was an example only in so far as he was first of all acknowledged as the pre-existent Christ. And certainly Paul did not preach Christ as a "hero", for he declared that the cross of Christ is a devastating judgment against all human achieving in work and wisdom, against all kavxao&bat, all heroism, and that precisely therein lies the liberating act of God.

Bultmann's solution of the Jesus-Paul problem represents a sharp break with many of the most frequently recurring ideas in the previous literature on the subject. For one thing he stresses the importance of acknowledging a third factor—the primitive community—as Paul's immediate background, and like Heitmüller he suggests that Paul's inheritance was from the Hellenistic, not the Jewish side (against Wendt, Schweitzer, and many others). For another thing he refuses to separate Paul's theology from his religious experience, to interpret his theology as a dogmatic, mechanical salvation-theory, or to define Paul's relationship to Jesus in terms of a common idea of God or ethical ideal. Basic to Bultmann's viewpoint is his emphasis on the kerygma by which Paul had been converted and of which he had become a preacher. Bultmann's remarks on this are important enough to be quoted in full.

The kerygma does not proclaim general truth, a timeless idea, be it a God-or a Redeemer-idea, but rather a historical [geschichtliche] fact. But it does that not in such a manner as to make itself superfluous when it has mediated the knowledge of this fact to the hearer (in that case it would have only the role of a mediator); but rather, the kerygma itself belongs to the fact.

Therefore, one must not attempt to go behind the kerygma, using it as a "source", in order to reconstruct a "historical [historische] Jesus" with a

"messianic selfconsciousness," his "inwardness," or his "heroism." That would be precisely the χριστός κατὰ σάρκα which is gone. Not the historical [historische] Jesus, but Jesus Christ, the proclaimed, is Lord.¹

In the mid thirties Bultmann published a second article ² in which the central question is not whether Paul's theology was dependent upon Jesus' message (he regards a negative answer to this as "a sure result of research"),³ but whether and in what way "the actual subject matter of Paul's theology is related to Jesus' proclamation...".⁴ Bultmann argues that with respect to the law, man's sinfulness, the transcendence of God, and even the Reign of God, Paul and Jesus were in essential, if not verbal accord. "Thus," says Bultmann, "whoever finds Paul offensive and uncanny must find Jesus equally so."⁵ Finally, then, one cannot flee from Paul and return to Jesus. For what one encounters in Jesus is the same God who is encountered in Paul.... All that one can do is to go to Jesus through Paul; i.e., one is asked by Paul whether he is willing to understand God's act in Christ as the event that has decided and now decides with respect both to the world and to us.⁶

Schniewind's 1937 Herford lecture, which took particular note of Bultmann's essays, sought from the standpoint of a more conservative handling of the sources to show that much of what is called "Pauline theology" is "nothing other than the collected preaching of the first community", and that Paul himself had emphasized the unity of the church's tradition from Jesus on down. Schniewind seeks to maintain the probability that Paul's missionary preaching had contained more about the earthly Jesus than did his subsequent letters, by comparing the differences in content between the First Epistle and Gospel of John, and Acts and Luke.⁷ But the character of and relationships between these writings are not sufficiently analogous to the character of and relationships between Paul's letters and preaching to lend much credibility to Schniewind's argument.

The years since the close of World War II yield a few scattered articles on the Jesus-Paul question, but until recently most of these have been simply restatements of positions articulated, attacked, and defended many years before. At one extreme is an ultra-liberal tirade against historic Christianity which holds that the gospels were second century, mythological, literalizing corruptions of the profounder mystery ("trance-experience") proclaimed non-literally by Paul to and for educated men.¹ "Paul knew nothing of good tidings newly preached in Galilee", says this writer; "he spoke of Hidden Wisdom and a revelation vouchsafed to Moses long centuries before".² At the other extreme are the Roman Catholics, Lattey and Stanley, who are still at work cataloguing Paul's quotations of and allusions to Jesus' sayings,³ and the conservative Protestant, H. E. Turlington, who maintains that Paul accurately describes Jesus' moral character, reflects his ethical teachings, and records numerous details of his earthly career.⁴ Turlington believes he can find evidence that Paul's missionary preaching had dealt fully with the historical Jesus, and that it was Paul's preaching especially which influenced and made possible the writing of the canonical gospels!⁵

Anton Fridrichsen takes a position highly reminiscent of that assumed by Machen. Fridrichsen criticizes those who describe Paul as having no or little knowledge of and interest in the historical Jesus. They are guilty, he says, of overlooking and denying the messianic features in the person and work of Jesus, and of seeking "to put together on the same level Jesus the

¹ Ray Knight, "Gospels and Epistles", Hibbert Journal, xlv (1947), 304-8; "Jesus or Paul? In Continuation of Gospels and Epistles", Hibbert Journal, xlvii (1948), 41-49.
² "Jesus or Paul?", p. 47.
⁵ Ibid. pp. 58-64.
Messiah in his historical situation and the apostle in his ".1 Fridrichsen evidently seeks thus to emphasize what Machen had called the "supernatural Jesus". Paul was not a disciple in the sense that he sought to transmit and interpret Jesus' teachings; indeed, Jesus had no "disciples" in that sense.2 Rather, Paul, like the gospel writers, sought "to fulfil the intention of Jesus";3 and this was accomplished by preaching his death and resurrection.

Whoever heeds the watchword: Back to Jesus! [Fridrichsen means: in the "liberal" sense] will find himself further back than he foresaw. He will have to go back beyond Jesus to the synagogue. He stops at the Sermon on the Mount and the parables and thinks he is then in the company of Jesus. But even in the Sermon on the Mount and the parables Jesus is on the way to Calvary and the glory of the Father.4

Paul's gospel, then, was "immediately derived" from the preaching of Jesus, and "the origin of the Easter faith and of the Pentecost experience lay in the person and deeds of Jesus".5 Essentially in accord with Fridrichsen's conclusions, but with varying emphases and critical methodologies, are Duncan, Ridderbos and Beare.6

The most significant current contributions to the Jesus-Paul debate are related to the recently re-opened and redefined "quest of the historical Jesus", and the attendant discussion of hermeneutics and historical research.7 This converging of the Jesus-Paul problem and the "new quest" has resulted in a new formulation of the old question. Now it is not so much the question of the relationship of Jesus and Paul as it is the more inclusive question of the relation of Jesus and the kerygma.

1 "Jesus, John, Paul", The Lutheran Quarterly, iii (1951), 243-4.
2 Ibid. p. 245.
3 Ibid. pp. 244-6.
4 Ibid. p. 246.
5 Ibid. p. 253.
7 See, e.g., H. Braun, "Der Sinn der neutestamentlichen Christologie", Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, liv (1957), esp. pp. 342-7, 364-8. Braun believes there is a factual, but not a historical connection between Paul and Jesus, and that this is in the area of anthropology, not Christology.
Bultmann's work has directly influenced this reformulation of the question, and it is to this issue that Bultmann's Heidelberg lecture, "Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus", is directed. There Bultmann re-emphasizes, in fact sharpens, a distinction he had made previously between two questions—on the one hand, the question of the historical continuity between Jesus and the kerygma, and on the other, the question of the material, or substantial relationship between them.

With respect to the first of these questions Bultmann is prepared to acknowledge a historical continuity between Jesus and the kerygma only in so far as one may say it is the historical Jesus who was preached as the Christ. But there are two important qualifications on which Bultmann insists. First, this historical continuity is not between the Jesus of history and the Christ of the kerygma, but between the Jesus of history and the primitive Christian proclamation of the kerygma. Second, this proclamation of the Christ of faith need not go beyond the "that" of Jesus' historicity; Bultmann does not acknowledge any historical continuity between the kerygma and the "what" and "how" of the historical Jesus.

In discussing the second question Bultmann distinguishes two types of approach which have been followed in an effort to establish a material correspondence between Jesus' teaching and the Christian gospel. One focuses on the kerygma and attempts to prove by historical-critical analysis that it presupposes the objective historicity of Jesus' person and ministry. Bultmann is critical of this attempt not only because he believes it impossible to separate scientifically "faith" and "fact" in the kerygma (e.g. in the gospels), but also because he fears that its practitioners (e.g.

---


2 Ibid. pp. 15-16.

3 Ibid. p. 18.

4 Ibid. p. 20.

Althaus) think thereby somehow to "legitimize" the kerygma. But the kerygma itself, Bultmann contends, offers no such objective (historical) legitimation of the faith it proclaims.¹

The second approach focuses on Jesus' preaching and ministry and attempts to find there the kerygma in nuce.² That Jesus' message had a certain "kerygmatic character" Bultmann does not deny, nor even that one may find there an implied Christology. "How far does all this take us?" he asks. "The argument that the kerygma goes back to the claim of Jesus contained in his activity does not yet demonstrate the material unity between the activity and preaching of Jesus and the kerygma."³ In the kerygma, he says, not the historical but the exalted Jesus speaks.

The Christ of the kerygma has, as it were, displaced the historical Jesus and authoritatively addresses the hearer—every hearer. So how can we speak of an identity of Jesus' activity with the kerygma in the sense that in Jesus' deed and word the kerygma is already contained in nuce?⁴

That Bultmann's questions and answers have been influential in setting the stage for the most recent discussion is demonstrated in Jiüngel's monograph where he summarizes at the outset the questions most important to discuss⁵:

1. To what extent does the historical ["historische"] Jesus belong to the theology of the New Testament?
2. To what extent had Paul to be a theologian in his preaching of the historical ["historischen"] Jesus as the crucified and risen Lord?
3. What does that mean for the relationship of the Pauline teaching about righteousness to the preaching of Jesus?
4. How far are eschatological themes determinative for this relationship?
5. To what extent and is the historical ["historische"] Jesus himself an eschatological theme?
6. In what eschatological mode is the historical ["historische"] Jesus expressed ["zur Sprache kommt"] in Paul's teaching about righteousness?
7. What relationship between the preaching of Jesus and faith in Jesus Christ follows from this?

³ Ibid. p. 30.
⁴ Ibid. p. 30.
Jacques Barzun has keenly distinguished "intellect" on the one hand, and "intelligence" on the other.\(^1\) While intelligence is "an individual and private possession" which "dies with the owner unless he embodies it in more or less lasting form";\(^2\) intellect, he says,
is the capitalized and communal form of live intelligence; it is intelligence stored up and made into habits of discipline, signs and symbols of meaning, chains of reasoning. . . . Intellect is at once a body of common knowledge and the channels through which the right particle of it can be brought to bear quickly, without the effort of redemonstration, on the matter in hand.\(^3\)

And so it is appropriate and necessary that we ask with respect to the continuing debate which has been the subject of this survey: What has it taught us? To what relatively firm conclusions has it come? To what extent has it directed us to meaningful questions? At what points has it served to caution us against travelling "dead end" streets? Or, to put the matter into a single question, and in terms of intellectual history: What is the residue of "live intelligence" which remains as "community property", which has been built into our "House of Intellect" as a result of the Jesus-Paul debate? And what does all this portend for the future?

Let us begin by observing three relatively firm conclusions at which the debate may be said to have arrived. First, one must acknowledge that the Pauline letters (whether we accept Tübingen's four, Bultmann's seven, or even all thirteen) contain only fragmentary materials about the life and teaching of Jesus. This fact is most dramatically apparent when one asks what, for example, would be known about Jesus' life if, of the New Testament materials, only Paul's letters had survived. One would know that Jesus had been born under the law as a Jew (Gal. iv. 4), of the line of David (Rom. i. 3); that he had a brother, James (Gal. i. 19), and twelve disciples (1 Cor. xv. 5), of whom he mentions by name James (1 Cor. xv. 7), Peter, and John (Gal. ii. 9); that he ate a last meal with them, and on that same night was betrayed (1 Cor. xi. 23 ff.); that he was put to death on a cross

\(^2\) Ibid. p. 5.
\(^3\) Ibid. p. 4.
Gal. iii. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 2, et passim), was buried (1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4), and was (on the third day) raised from the dead (1 Cor. xv. 4, et passim), after which he appeared to his followers (1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.). This is virtually a complete catalogue of the "hard facts" of Jesus' life and ministry one is able to glean ("glean" is precisely the word for it, for they are not readily apparent) from Paul's letters. We find there no details about Jesus' birth, no stories of baptism and temptation, no calling of the disciples, no direct mention of Jesus' teaching or healing ministry, no confession at Caesarea Philippi, no transfiguration, no cleansing of the temple, no conflict with the authorities, no Gethsemane scene, no trial, no thieves crucified with Jesus, no last words from the cross, no soldiers, no weeping women, no word about the place or time of the crucifixion, no mention of Joseph or Mary, or of John the Baptist, or of Judas, or of Pilate.

The situation is not very different when we inquire into the matter of the teachings of Jesus reported in Paul's letters. Of course it is true that the phrase "teachings of Jesus" is not to be found in them at all. Paul refers, rather, to "the word" or "charge" of the "Lord", and this is of the greatest significance. Moreover, one can find, at the most, only four instances in the Pauline homologoumena where Paul cites the "words of the Lord". Three of them are in 1 Corinthians, and each of these is in a context where Paul is dealing with problems of church order and discipline: vii. 10 ("To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband..."), ix. 14 ("...the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel"); and xi. 23 ff. (the words of institution). A fourth possible instance is in 1 Thessalonians iv. 14-15 where Paul is discussing the problem created by the delay in the Lord's return, and what will happen to those Christians who have already died ("For this we declare to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive, who are left until the coming of the Lord, shall not precede those who have fallen asleep").

The sparsity of biographical material and direct reference to Jesus' words has prompted interpreters from the earliest (Paret) to the most recent (Lattey, Stanley) years of the debate to search
out *allusions* to Jesus' personality, ministry, and words. The search for allusions to Jesus' personal moral character and to his career has never been very successful, in spite of repeated references to such passages as 2 Corinthians x. 1 ("the meekness and gentleness of Christ"), Philippians ii. 1-11 (Christ's humility and obedience), and 2 Corinthians xii. 12 (where Paul's statement that "the signs of a true apostle were performed among you in all patience, with signs and wonders and mighty works") is supposed to prove that Paul attached significance to Jesus' miracles).

A somewhat better case can be made for Pauline allusions to Jesus' teaching (e.g. Rom. xii. 14; xiii. 9; xiv. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 2, which are certainly the clearest ones), although this quest may be said to have reached the point of no return in the *tour de force* of Resch in 1904,¹ and it is remarkable that this search still has its practitioners. Thus, one may readily identify as a second relatively firm conclusion, that the Jesus-Paul debate has not ever been significantly advanced, nor will a solution to the Jesus-Paul problem ever be finally achieved, by locating parallel passages in Paul and the gospels. This was seen already by F. C. Baur and repeatedly emphasized in the thick of the debate by Sturm, Vischer, and Brückner. This is so, as Brückner observed, partly because of the difficulties necessarily involved in recovering the "*ipsissima verba Jesu*", and partly because such parallels, even where they are established, do not necessarily prove genetic dependence.²

But there is yet another flaw in this hunt for parallels, indicated by a third relatively firm conclusion one may draw from the history of the Jesus-Paul debate: the issue cannot be fruitfully discussed so long as a narrowly bifocal concern is retained. The most significant contributions to the discussion have been those which have seen that the problem is far broader than the relation of the individual, Jesus of Nazareth, to the individual, Paul of Tarsus. Schweitzer saw this clearly and thus criticized Maurice Goguel for posing the issue in an unreal form: "The statement of the problem which is here presupposed leaves out the

¹ See above, p. 348 and n. 6.
middle term, primitive Christianity." Heitmüller, making a similar point, had, however, inserted an additional factor: Hellenistic Christianity. That this insight has been appropriated by the most recent discussants is shown by the way in which the problem is now more broadly defined in terms of Jesus and the earliest kerygma (Bultmann, et al.). Thus, Schmithals is perfectly correct when he describes the problem as having to do essentially with the origins of Christianity.

But new results always raise new issues, and that is certainly the case with each of the three points just recorded. First, granting the sparsity of biographical and teaching material relating to Jesus found in Paul, what accounts for this? The radical answer that Paul had no such historical information because there was none to be had, although it has a recent exponent, does not deserve serious consideration. Chapters 7 and 11 of 1 Corinthians supply firm evidence that, at the very least, Paul was acquainted with Jesus' words as mediated in the catechetical and liturgical traditions; and Galatians (i. 18 et passim) requires us to acknowledge that, in his contacts with Jesus' disciples, Paul at least had the opportunity for learning about the historical Jesus. The custom of conservative interpreters (e.g. Paret, Vischer, Kittel, Machen, Turlington, but also Kümmel) has been to hold that Paul is so silent about the historical Jesus because he can presuppose his readers' knowledge of Jesus' life and teaching. This knowledge, it is asserted, had been relayed to them in the apostle's missionary preaching. But Heitmüller was correct in criticizing such a point as pure conjecture, and beyond this one must ask whether it is not true that, even though the letters in general presuppose the apostle's missionary preaching, they nonetheless provide some clues as to

1 Paul and His Interpreters, p. 160.  
3 Ray Knight, op. cit. above, p. 368.  
4 G. D. Kilpatrick's attempt to show that Gal. i. 18 refers specifically to the dissemination of information about the historical Jesus is hardly successful ("Galatians i : 18 ἵστορησαν Κηφᾶν", New Testament Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893-1958, ed. A. J. B. Higgins [Manchester : Manchester Univ. Press, 1959], pp. 144-9), and Heitmüller's point that contact with Jesus' disciples does not necessarily prove Paul's knowledge of his career and character is still valid.  
5 Above, pp. 358-59.
its probable content. One thinks immediately of 1 Corinthians ii. 1-2 ("When I came to you, brethren, I did not come proclaiming to you the mystery of God in lofty words or wisdom. For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified") and 1 Thessalonians i. 9-10 (where Paul refers to his initial visit and "how [the Thessalonians] turned to God from idols, to serve a 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"). There is nothing in these summaries of his missionary preaching in Corinth and Thessalonica to support the conjecture that the narration of Jesus' earthly life or instruction into his sayings was the central, or even an essential part of it. Moreover, in Romans Paul cannot presuppose a knowledge of his own previous message, and, although he strives to summarize its essential points, he says no more there (if as much) about the earthly Jesus than he does in the letters written to congregations of his own founding. Scott's suggestion that Paul's anticipation of the parousia precluded any substantial interest in Jesus' career, and Case's additional one that Paul had to minimize his historical contacts with Jesus for polemical reasons, are at least worthy for discussion.

The second conclusion, that the collection of parallel passages is not ultimately very helpful, leads us only to the new question, whether and how more substantial material correspondences may be detected between Jesus and Paul. That there are material correspondences almost every participant in the debate has been willing to agree. But there has been large disagreement as to how these are to be defined and detected. Some speak in terms of common "religious ideals" (the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, etc.) or "spiritual values". One may list here the names especially of Wendt, Brückner, Sanday, Scott, McGiffert, and Bratton. Since Bultmann, however, this particular way of defining the correspondence has been increasingly attacked. Bultmann himself defines the essential correspondence between Jesus' preaching and Paul's gospel in terms of the kerygma, the coming and present-ness of God's Word addressing man and calling him to decision. And now in Jüngel's vocabulary the concept of speech-event ("Sprachereignis") seems to
be the key for establishing a material correspondence between the two.

Our third point was that the debate needs to be broadened so as to include more than Jesus and Paul as isolated figures. Here again new questions arise, and indeed were already being raised in the first decade of our century. They concern the religiocultural milieu not only of Jesus and Paul, but of earliest Christianity as a whole. Is Jesus to be viewed as a unique phenomenon in world history, or against his background in Judaism? If the latter, what kind of Judaism? Is Paul to be viewed against a rabbinic-Jewish-apocalyptic background (Wendt, Wrede, Brückner, Schweitzer, etc.) or in terms of a Hellenistic one (Bousset, Heitmüller, Morgan, Bultmann, etc.)? How important a role did Oriental and Gnostic tendencies play within the earliest church? To what extent did they figure—either positively by the contribution of new categories and concepts, or negatively as the objects of the church's polemic—in the formation of early Christian doctrine?

In stating these "new" questions we must not lose sight of a very fundamental issue which has been a central matter for discussion at least since Wendt's article in 1894: what accounts for the distinctive features of Paul's gospel? What is the origin of the differences between Jesus and Paul? This, of course, thrusts us back upon the prior question which asks about the kind and extent of the differences between the two. Most of the scholars here surveyed would agree that there are formal differences, at least, between Jesus' preaching and Paul's gospel relating to vocabulary, style, etc. But there is widespread disagreement as to whether these are "only" formal differences, and as to the extent of them. Six distinguishable positions may be listed.

1. First, the view that Paul simply provided the "technical" statement of Jesus' religion (Mair, Hoyle), and that there is therefore a virtual identity between the preaching of Jesus and Paul. This is certainly also the basic position of Matheson, Schmoller, and Turlington, each of whom regards the Pauline letters as actually confirming the preaching of Jesus as it is present in the gospel tradition.
2. Only a short step removed from this view is the one shared by Gloatz, Wellhausen, Harnack, and Deissmann, that Paul was the interpreter of Jesus, perhaps even—as some of these men held—the one who best understood Jesus. Although Jüngel represents a perspective in some ways very different from that of these earlier men, his final assessment of Paul's relationship to Jesus is not dissimilar to theirs. For he too insists that Paul's doctrine of righteousness is but the interpretation—indeed the necessary interpretation—of Jesus' preaching about the Kingdom of God.

3. Diametrically opposed to the notion that Paul simply continues, or at most interprets, the message of Jesus, is the radical assertion that Paul was essentially an innovator. This concept is present in its most unrefined and unacceptable form in Nietzsche (who called the apostle "crafty" and "superstitious") and Knight (who called him "profound"), but it also appears in F. C. Baur, Weinel, and Wernle.

A term which constantly recurs in the Jesus-Paul discussion as a description of Paul's theology in relation to Jesus is: "development." Paul, it has been said very often, was the "developer" of Jesus' message. Here, however, one must be careful to distinguish between two very different views of this development.

4. On the one hand, Wendt, Wrede, and Goguel regarded Paul's theology as an essentially illegitimate development of Jesus' message; thus the "Back to Jesus" slogan.

5. But, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld, Kaftan, Meyer, Weiss, Moffatt, Morgan, Scott, Fridrichsen, Duncan, and Beare all regard Paul's doctrinal teaching as a legitimate extension and development of Jesus' message.

6. Finally, Bultmann may be listed as the most prominent present exponent of the view that Paul's theology is not identical with Jesus' message, nor explicitly an interpretation of it, nor historically a development from it, either in the positive or negative sense. Rather, for Bultmann, Paul's theology is an explication of the kerygma of the Hellenistic church, and its subject-matter is neither the message nor the deeds of Jesus, but the present-ness of God's address to men in the Risen Lord.
But now we must return to the question of how one is to account for the distinctively Pauline traits. What factors determined the form and content of Paul’s theology? This is a question whether one regards it as a continuation of Jesus’ message, an interpretation of it, a development from it, or a unique innovation. Our literature provides instances of three possible answers, no two of which need necessarily be regarded as mutually exclusive. Each of these answers usually involves its exponent in some particular view of Paul’s place and function within the developing Christian church, and one may perhaps venture to speak of them as stressing, respectively, the historical, psychological, and theological origin of Paul’s gospel.

First is the view that Paul’s contribution to the church was in universalizing the gospel and that his theological statement of it was called forth by the apologetic and polemical needs of his day. Here one meets a historical explanation for Paul’s theology, and it is the position taken, for example, by McIlvaine, Wernle, Vischer, Meyer, and Morgan.

This perspective on Paul is not absent from Wrede’s interpretation, but neither is it determinative for him. Wrede refers Paul’s theology basically to his own unique piety, and particularly to the transforming event of his conversion, the essence of which was the conviction, “Jesus is Messiah”. This was the “germ” from which his theology supposedly evolved. Wrede, however, did not develop this “theology of experience” motif as much as some others. Weizsäcker, for example, spoke of Paul’s “intuitions” in a way reminiscent of F. C. Baur’s “principle of Christian consciousness”, and similar passages can be found in the books of Wernle and Weinel.

The emphasis on the psychological origins of Paul’s theology is most apparent, however, in the works of Weiss and Deissmann, both of whom take Paul’s conversion experience as the key to the structure and scope of his gospel. One also encounters British and American exponents of this view, notably Moffatt, Scott, McGiffert, and Rattenbury. Along with this stress on the

---

1 See also S. MacLean Gilmour, “Paul and the Primitive Church”, Journal of Religion, xxv (1945), 119-28, who maintains that “it is difficult to over-emphasize the importance of Paul’s conversion experience for his life and thought
psychological importance of Paul's conversion often goes the insistence that Paul's doctrine is not only separable, but necessarily to be separated from his personal piety, that his theology is distinct from his religion (so, for example, Hilgenfeld, Mair, Meyer, McGiffert, and Bratton). This arbitrary separation of the two was rooted in nineteenth-century presuppositions and was characteristically used as a way of relating the "religious ideals" of Jesus and Paul. Machen and Bultmann, although of course with very different results, have rightly sought to maintain the integrity of these two.

Finally, there is the attempt to explain the origin of the distinctively Pauline gospel in a *theological* way. This is perhaps the appropriate term for describing Bultmann's position as he sets it forth in his *Theology of the New Testament*.

Standing within the frame of Hellenistic Christianity [Paul] raised the theological motifs that were at work in the proclamation of the Hellenistic church to the clarity of theological thinking; he called to attention the problems latent in the Hellenistic proclamation and brought them to a decision; and thus—so far as our sources permit an opinion on the matter—became the founder of Christian theology.\(^1\)

Here also one may refer to Jüngel's recent book, although between the positions represented by Bultmann and Jüngel there is an important difference: Bultmann describes Paul as a theologian of the Hellenistic church, that is, one who develops theologically the faith of the post-Easter community, while Jüngel describes Paul as a theologian of the preaching of Jesus, one who develops theologically the motifs already present in his teaching about God's Reign.\(^2\)

This brings us to a final issue, and the one which seems to be at the centre of the Jesus-Paul question as it is now being reformulated: To what extent are the questions of historical continuity and material correspondence in theology distinct? Or, to put it as a Christian " (p. 122). "Paul's gospel was determined by his conversion experience, and there was little place in it for a heroic Christ, a didactic religion, or a nonmystical faith " (p. 125). Gilmour also lists Paul's Hellenistic environment and upbringing and his "own genius" as having significantly influenced his theology.

---

another way, How important is the historical element in the church’s kerygma? Bultmann urges a clear distinction between history and kerygma, and wants to keep the questions of historical continuity and material correspondence strictly separate. With this Jüngel disagrees,¹ and holds that the very essence of the kerygma is its identification of the eschaton and history (“Geschichte”).²

It is not easy to consolidate all these issues of the past and present into any single project for the future. Further research will necessarily and properly be carried on at many points simultaneously. But it is at least clear from this survey and analysis of the discussion so far, that in the future scholars must concentrate not on what or how much Paul knew about the historical Jesus, but rather on the way he employed and applied the knowledge he did have, and what place the Jesus of history had in relation to the heart and centre of his preaching.