

**HE PROBLEM OF PAUL'S UNDERSTANDING OF  
THE HISTORICAL JESUS IN CRITICAL STUDY :  
A HISTORICO-CRITICAL STUDY OF THE JESUS-  
PAUL PROBLEM IN THE NINETEENTH  
CENTURY AND IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE  
TWENTIETH CENTURY**

Jong-Yun Lee

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1975

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:  
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:  
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13839>

This item is protected by original copyright

## AN ABSTRACT

The primary intention of this study is to investigate the problem of the relationship between Jesus and Paul. However, it was necessary to retrace our steps to the beginnings of the discussion and to set forth the problem in all its complexity and in all its ramification for the task of biblical study and interpretation. It is therefore hoped that this study will shed some light upon the present situation and task of biblical research.

In the discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul, two more or less independent lines of the nineteenth century historical research converged: the study of the life of Jesus and Pauline research. The lines of research initiated by Strauss and Baur were made possible by the development of methodology, and this methodology was in turn rooted in the new philosophies of history which emerged at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. The history of the problem of Jesus and Paul is closely tied to the development of methodology and philosophy of history.

The problem of Jesus and Paul is also a theological problem. Every answer to the problem of

ProQuest Number: 10166446

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166446

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

the historical relationship of Jesus and Paul has direct~~ed~~ implications for the content and nature of the Christian faith. Here basic theological issues and historical problems are inextricably intertwined. What is Christianity? Is it religion of Jesus or the gospel of Paul? What is the proper object of faith? Is it the person of the historical Jesus or the Christ of Pauline theology? These issues involve particularly the whole problem of Christology, the relationship of faith and history, of theology and historical research.

Wrede's work is here treated as the focal point of the development of the discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul. The various attempts to deal with Wrede's solution to the problem continue until World War I, after which a decreasing interest in the problem becomes apparent. More recently there has been a favorable shift from Jesus to Paul and an endorsement of Paul through contemporary mysticism and existentialism.

In the final part it is necessary to account for the dwindling interest and to discuss the present state of the problem of Jesus and Paul. A reopening of the problem might prove salutary and assist in the clarification of the problem of the relationship of revelation and history.

THE PROBLEM OF PAUL'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE  
HISTORICAL JESUS IN CRITICAL STUDY

A Historico-Critical Study of the Jesus-  
Paul Problem in the Nineteenth Century  
and First Half of Twentieth Century

---

A Dissertation  
for the Attainment of the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy at the  
University of St. Andrews

---

by  
Jong-Yun Lee, B.Th., B.D., Th.M.

March 1975



Th 8657

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by me; that the thesis is my own composition; and that it has not previously been presented for a higher degree.

The research was carried out in St. Mary's College, in the University of St. Andrews, under the direction of the Reverend Professor Ernest Best, Ph.D.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that

J O N G Y U N L E E

has spent nine terms Research work at St. Mary's College in the University of St. Andrews, that he has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinance No. 16, and that he is qualified to submit the following thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

Research Supervisor

## CURRICULUM VITAE

I matriculated in Yon Sei University, Seoul, Korea in March 1958, where I was graduated in August 1963, with the degree of Bachelor of Theology.

In September 1963, I matriculated in the Graduate School of Yon Sei University from which I was graduated with the degree of Master of Theology in September 1965.

From 1965 to 1967, I taught modern languages (English and German) at the Han Yung Senior High School, Seoul, Korea. From 1966 until August 1968, I worked as Youth minister in Choong Hyun Presbyterian Church, Seoul, Korea. At the same time, I matriculated in General Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Seoul, Korea.

I went to the United States of America in August 1968. I matriculated in the Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, U.S.A., and followed a course leading to graduation in May 1971, with the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. I spent one more academic year for my graduate work in the Westminster Theological Seminary and Temple University, Philadelphia, U.S.A.

In October 1972, I commenced research on "The Problem of Paul's Understanding of the Historical Jesus in Critical Study" which is now being submitted as a Ph.D. Thesis, in St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, Scotland, U.K.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

As I complete my formal academic studies abroad, I wish to express my deep gratitude first of all to my God whose guiding hand and sustaining mercy have enabled me to accomplish this part of my task.

Looking back over my last three years in Scotland, I have but to confess that without the untiring encouragement and support of my Christian friends my post graduate work could not have been completed. I am deeply indebted especially to Reverend E. B. Jones, Ph.D., Pastor of Holy Trinity-Bethlehem Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, U.S.A., and to Reverend Chang In Kim, Pastor of Choong Hyun Presbyterian Church, Seoul, Korea, for their spiritual and material support.

I am especially grateful to my Supervisor, Reverend Professor Ernest Best, Ph.D. (now Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism, University of Glasgow), for his stimulating guidance in my studies and for his encouragement and kind support in the undertaking of my dissertation. He has introduced me to the great breadth of scholarly activity and discussion which is presently occurring in the New

Testament field and has given me much guidance in finding my way in it. I have benefited in my study from his competent scholarship and his keen insight into the problems of the day.

My word of appreciation is also directed to Principal, Reverend Professor Matthew Black, D.Phil., D.Litt., D.D., D. Theol., F.B.A.; to Reverend Professor R. McL. Wilson, Ph.D.; to Reverend J. R. Fleming, Th.D., D.D., and to Lecturer A. J. M. Wedderburn, Ph.D., for their lectures and seminar courses at the St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews. It has been a privilege to come to know them as my professor and as a personal adviser. Their high standards of critical scholarship were always matched and more than matched by patient assistance and cheerful support.

57/ I also wish to thank Mr. D. MacArthur, F.L.A., Librarian, University of St. Andrews and all the staff of the University Library, for their kind assistance. I express my appreciation to the staffs of the libraries of the Westminster Theological Seminary and of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, U.S.A.; to the staff of the libraries of the New College, Edinburgh, and of the Tyndale House, Cambridge, and of the Tübingen University, West Germany; to the research students at St. Mary's

College, Mr. D. Lachmann and Mr. C. Wood, who have helped so willingly with proof-reading and many final details in bringing this dissertation to completed form. I also wish to thank Mrs. Marilyn Starr for her typing.

To my wife, Soon Bok, and my little children go my love and appreciation for their cooperation and patience during these more than seven years of my oversea study.

## ABBREVIATIONS

- BJRL Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester, Manchester.
- BK Bibel und Kirche, Stuttgart.
- BL Bibel und Leben, Düsseldorf.
- CJT Canadian Journal of Theology, Toronto.
- Ed Edition
- ERE Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Edinburgh, 1908.
- E.T. English Translation
- ETW Encyclopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften, Halle, 1831; 2nd ed. 1845. 3/
- EvK Evangelische Kommentare, Stuttgart.
- EvT Evangelische Theologie, München.
- ExT Expository Times, Edinburgh.
- FRLANT Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Göttingen.
- GesAuf Gesammelte Aufsätze.
- HTR Harvard Theological Review, Cambridge, Mass.
- JBL Journal of Biblical Literature, New Haven; Boston; Philadelphia.
- JDT Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, Stuttgart.
- JR The Journal of Religion, Chicago.
- Kümmel, NT Kümmel, W. G., The New Testament: The History of Investigation of Its Problems, London, 1973. E.T. by S. McLean Gilmour and H. C. Kee, from the German edition.
- LQ The Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg.

- NJDT Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, Bonn.
- NKZ Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, Erlangen.
- NovTest Novum Testamentum; An International Quarterly for New Testament and Related Studies based on International Cooperation, Leiden.
- NTSt New Testament Studies; An International Journal published Quarterly under the Auspices of Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Cambridge.
- PM Protestantische Monatshefte, Berlin; Leipzig.
- PTR Princeton Theological Review, Philadelphia; London; Princeton.
- RGG Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, Tübingen, 1930.
- RPTK Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Leipzig, 1897.
- Schweitzer, Schweitzer, A., The Mysticism of Paul the  
Mysticism Apostle, London, 1931. E.T. by W.  
Montgomery, from the German edition.
- Schweitzer, Schweitzer, A., Paul and His Interpreters,  
Paul London, 1912. E.T. by W. Montgomery,  
from the German edition.
- Schweitzer, Schweitzer, A., The Quest of the Histori-  
Quest cal Jesus, London, 1910; 7th ed. 1971.
- SHERK Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious  
Knowledge, New York.
- SJT Scottish Journal of Theology, Edinburgh.
- SNTSM Society for New Testament Society Monograph Series.
- SNT Supplements to Novum Testamentum.
- SR SR, Studies in Religion, A Canadian Journal, Toronto.

- TB Theologische Blätter, Leipzig.
- TDNT Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. by G. Kittel, Grand Rapids, 1965. E.T. by G. W. Bromiley.
- ThSt Theological Studies, New York; Woodstock.
- TJ Theologische Jahrbücher, Tübingen.
- TMR Theology: A Monthly Review, London.
- TR Theologische Rundschau, Tübingen.
- TSK Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Hamburg; Gotha.
- TTod Theology Today, Princeton.
- TUG Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature, Leipzig.
- TyB Tyndale Bulletin, Cambridge.
- TZ Theologische Zeitschrift, Basel.
- UUA Uppsala Universitets Åsskrift, Uppsala.
- WTJ Westminster Theological Journal, Philadelphia.
- ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, Giessen; Berlin.
- ZTK Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, Leipzig; Freiburg; Tübingen.
- ZWT Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, Jena; Leipzig.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                           | Page |
|---------------------------|------|
| DECLARATION . . . . .     | ii   |
| CERTIFICATE . . . . .     | iii  |
| CURRICULUM VITAE. . . . . | iv   |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENT. . . . .   | vi   |
| ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .   | ix   |
| INTRODUCTION . . . . .    | 1    |

Chapter

PART ONE: POSING THE PROBLEM

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| I. THEOLOGICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE NEW<br>EMPHASIS UPON THE LIFE OF JESUS . . . . .                 | 9   |
| A. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER (1768-1834) . . . . .   | 10  |
| B. DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS (1808-1874) . . . . .  | 32  |
| II. THE REDISCOVERY OF THE THEOLOGICAL AND<br>HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE<br>APOSTLE PAUL. . . . . | 60  |
| A. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR (1792-1860). . . . .  | 61  |
| B. CHRISTIAN ADOLPH HASERT (1794-1864) . . . . .  | 102 |

PART TWO: LEBEN-JESU-FORSCHUNG AND  
PAULINE RESEARCH IN THE  
NINETEENTH CENTURY

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| I. <u>LEBEN-JESU-FORSCHUNG</u> IN THE NINETEENTH<br>CENTURY . . . . .       | 118 |
| A. THEOLOGICAL ATTEMPTS TO <u>LEBEN-JESU-</u><br><u>FORSCHUNG</u> . . . . . | 120 |
| 1. Theological Re-Interpretation of<br>the Christological Problem. . . . .  | 122 |
| a) The Kenotic Theory. . . . .  | 124 |
| b) Speculative Christology . . . . .  | 126 |

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| c) The Christology of the<br>Mediating School . . . . .   | .129 |
| 2. The Christology of Ritschl . . . . .   | .136 |
| 3. The Modification of Ritschl's<br>Solution in the Ritschlian<br>School . . . . .                          | .150 |
| a) Wilhelm Herrmann (1846-<br>1922). . . . .  | .151 |
| b) Adolph von Harnack (1851-<br>1930). . . . .  | .155 |
| B. <u>HISTORICAL APPROACH TO THE LEBEN-<br/>JESU-FORSCHUNG</u> . . . . .                                    | .158 |
| 1. The Problem of the Conservative<br>"Lives" of Jesus: Neander . . . . .                                   | .161 |
| 2. The Markan Hypothesis. . . . .   | .168 |
| 3. The Self-Consciousness of the<br>Historical Jesus: Weizsäcker. . . . .                                   | .173 |
| 4. The Gospels as "Geschichte" . . . . .  | .182 |
| 5. <u>Leben-Jesu-Forschung</u> as a<br><u>Holzweg</u> . . . . .   | .184 |
| 6. Johannes Weiss and the Dilemma<br>of Liberal Theology. . . . .   | .192 |
| 7. Schweitzer and Wrede . . . . .   | .208 |
| II. PAULINE RESEARCH IN THE NINETEENTH<br>CENTURY . . . . .   | .215 |
| A. THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF PAULINE<br>RESEARCH IN THE LIGHT OF THE<br>PROBLEM OF JESUS AND PAUL. . . . . | .216 |
| B. BAUR'S INFLUENCE ON PAULINE<br>RESEARCH . . . . .  | .220 |

|                                       |   |      |
|---------------------------------------|---|------|
| C.                                    | PAUL'S THEOLOGY AS A SOTERIOLOGICAL SYSTEM . . . . .  | .223 |
| 1.                                    | The Shift from Justification by Faith to Soteriology: Holsten. . . . .                                    | .223 |
| 2.                                    | Soteriological Dualism in Paul: Lüdemann. . . . .   | .227 |
| 3.                                    | The Religious Character of Pauline Theology: Reuss, Sabatier, Beyschlag, Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker . . . . . | .230 |
| 4.                                    | The Separation of Religion and Theology in Paul: H. J. Holtzmann. . . . .                                 | .236 |
| D.                                    | THE INCREASING ISOLATION OF PAUL FROM THE HISTORICAL JESUS. . . . .                                       | .242 |
| 1.                                    | The Discovery of Pauline Eschatology: Gunkel, Kabisch. . . . .  | .242 |
| 2.                                    | The Breach Between the Pauline Christ and the Historical Jesus: M. Brückner . . . . .                     | .244 |
| 3.                                    | The Affirmation of the Antithesis: Jesus or Paul: W. Wrede . . . . .                                      | .249 |
| PART THREE: PROBLEM OF JESUS AND PAUL |   |      |
| I.                                    | THE DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM BEFORE WILLIAM WREDE . . . . .  | 268  |
| A.                                    | THE OPPONENTS OF PAUL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY . . . . .   | .268 |
| B.                                    | FROM PARET TO FEINE . . . . .   | .273 |
| 1.                                    | The Reaction to Baur: Paret . . . . .   | .274 |

| Chapter   | Page |
|---|------|
| 2. Paul's Dependence upon Teaching of Jesus: Roos, Nösgen, Gloatz, Jeffrey, Drummond . . .                            | 285  |
| 3. Paul Measured by Jesus: Wendt . . . . .  | 289  |
| 4. Paul's Use of the Sayings of Jesus: A. Resch. . . . .  | 292  |
| 5. Paul's Dependence upon Historical Person of Jesus: Von Soden, Drescher, Sturm, Holtzmann, Schmoller, Somerville. . | 294  |
| 6. Jesus and Paul in Terms of Historical Development: Titius. . . . .   | 303  |
| 7. The Religious Dependence of Paul upon Jesus: Feine . . . .   | 305  |
| C. THE DILEMMA OF LIBERAL THEOLOGY . .  | 313  |
| D. THE CHALLENGE OF WREDE. . . . .  | 322  |
| II. THE DISCUSSION OF WREDE'S THESIS. . . . .   | 325  |
| A. LIBERAL THEOLOGY. . . . .  | 326  |
| 1. The Religious Agreement Between Paul and Jesus. . . . .  | 327  |
| 2. The Problem of Paul's Christ-Faith and the Religion of Jesus . . . . .   | 331  |
| 3. The Problem of the Mediation of the Influence of Jesus on Paul. .  | 334  |
| 4. The Inconclusive Character of the Discussion. . . . .  | 336  |
| B. CONSERVATIVE THEOLOGY . . . . .  | 342  |
| 1. J. G. Machen's Defense of Paul . . . . .   | 343  |

| Chapter  | Page |
|--|------|
| 2. The Historical Difference<br>Between Jesus and Paul . . . . .             | 348  |
| C. <u>THE RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE</u><br><u>INTERPRETATION</u> . . . . .     | 361  |
| 1. The Question of the Origin of<br>Pauline Theology Re-Opened . .           | 361  |
| 2. Paul the Hellenist: W.<br>Bousset. . . . .                                | 367  |
| D. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL EXPLANATION:<br>A. SCHWEITZER . . . . .                | 379  |
| III. THE RECENT SITUATION OF THE<br>DISCUSSION . . . . .                     | 386  |
| A. 'THE CONTINUATION OF THE EARLIER<br>TRENDS' . . . . .                     | 387  |
| B. THE SHIFT FROM JESUS TO PAUL . . .  | 391  |
| 1. The New Approach to the<br>Bible. . . . .                                 | 391  |
| 2. Form Criticism and Historical<br>Scepticism . . . . .                     | 393  |
| C. MYSTICISM. . . . .  | 398  |
| D. EXISTENTIALISM . . . . .  | 405  |
| PART FOUR: SUMMARY AND<br>CONCLUSIONS  |      |
| I. THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PROBLEM . . . .                                  | 432  |
| II. SUGGESTIONS FOR AN APPROACH TO THE<br>PROBLEM OF JESUS AND PAUL. . . . . | 474  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .   | 489  |

## INTRODUCTION

Who was the true founder of Christianity: Jesus or Paul? Has traditional Protestantism erred in basing its faith on the gospel of Paul rather than on the religion of Jesus? Does the recovery of genuine Christianity depend upon a return from the Christ of Pauline theology to the historical Jesus? Was Paul's gospel true to the spirit and intention of Jesus, or did it represent a distortion and falsification of the religion of Jesus? In what respects was Paul an innovator and in what respects a follower of Jesus? How is the apparent continuity and divergence between Jesus and Paul to be explained? Did Paul know Jesus personally? How detailed was Paul's knowledge of the life and teachings of Jesus? Was Paul's theology influenced by the person and teaching of the historical Jesus, or was his theology determined primarily by his conversion experience or by his Jewish or Hellenistic heritage?

Such questions as these comprised the problem of Paul's understanding of the historical Jesus for the theological world at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. The teachings of Jesus and Paul, their personalities,

their religious experiences were compared and contrasted in great detail. Generally speaking, the theology of Paul had little appeal to an age which was predominantly pragmatic and positivistic in spirit. The slogan, "back from Paul to Jesus," gained considerable popular currency. The earliest attacks on Paul were motivated by an anti-church or anti-Christian spirit and undoubtedly had more influence on popular thought than on Christian scholarship. The most serious challenge was presented by W. Wrede's Paulus (1905) which gave the repudiation of Paul a scholarly basis in historical research. At this point the problem of Jesus and Paul became particularly acute for Christian scholarship. Few Christian scholars, however, were inclined to reject Paul in toto. Although liberal theology found much of Paul's theology unacceptable, it sought nevertheless to justify his place in the historical development of Christianity and to discover at least some elements of permanent value in him. Conservative theology, now compelled to deal more seriously with the historical differences between Jesus and Paul, endeavored to maintain an essential continuity between them. As a result, a discussion of the problem had a decidedly apologetic tone. A survey

of these discussions shows that the arguments were often repetitious and the treatments of the problem sometimes cursory and facile. Yet there can be no question about the seriousness with which these scholars wrestled with basic issues of the Christian faith. For the question of Jesus and Paul is ultimately the question of Christianity itself--its origin, its basis, and criteria.

The problem of Jesus and Paul is, first of all, a historical problem. What was the historical relationship between these two dominant figures in the origin of Christianity? In the discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul, two more or less independent lines of the nineteenth century historical research converged: the study of the life of Jesus and Pauline research. The discussions of the problem presuppose the whole development of these two spheres of research. Not only do the discussions summarize and condense the results of this research, but they were continually affected by the changing and shifting tides of historical study in these two spheres.

From this point of view, the history of the problem of Jesus and Paul goes back to two prominent names in nineteenth century scholarship: D. F. Strauss and F. C. Baur. Just as Strauss' Leben Jesu e/

(1835) in some sense inaugurated nineteenth century research in the life of Jesus, so also Baur's Paulus (1845) served a similar purpose for the study of Paul. The problem of Jesus and Paul was already implicit in the work of both scholars inasmuch as each in his own way challenged the traditional understanding of the historical origins of the Christian faith. Consequently, a history of the discussion of the problem of ~~the~~ Jesus and Paul requires consideration of at least the main features of the development of these two lines of research initiated by the works of Strauss and Baur.

Two factors are particularly important in this development: historical methodology and philosophy of history. The results arrived at in the discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul cannot be fully appreciated or understood apart from prior developments of methodology and philosophy of history. The lines of research initiated by Strauss and Baur were made possible by the development of methodology, and this methodology was in turn rooted in the new philosophies of history which emerged at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. The history of the problem of Jesus and Paul is closely tied to the development of

methodology and philosophy of history.

Finally, the problem of Jesus and Paul is also a theological problem. Every answer to the problem of the historical relationship of Jesus and Paul has directed implications for the content and nature of the Christian faith. Here basic theological issues and historical problems are inextricably intertwined. What is Christianity? Is it religion of Jesus or the gospel of Paul? What is the proper object of faith? Is it the person of the historical Jesus or the Christ of Pauline theology? These issues involve particularly the whole problem of Christology, the relationship of faith and history, of theology and historical research. Behind such problems lie the further questions of revelation, of the unity and authority of the Bible. The discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul are, therefore, deeply rooted in the main theological developments of the nineteenth century. It is perhaps no exaggeration to say that in no other problem are the major issues of nineteenth century theology and Biblical research so sharply focused.

The history of the problem of Jesus and Paul therefore involves the study of the somewhat complicated interaction of these three factors: historical

methodology, philosophy of history, and theology. After tracing the actual development of the discussions of the problem to its climax before World War I, the attempt will be made to show how the changing theological scene has resulted in a relative disinterest in the problem.

Discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul occupied a prominent place in Biblical scholarship around the turn of our century. It is hoped that the following study will fill, at least in ~~the~~ part, a notable lacuna in the history of Biblical scholarship. It has been the writer's purpose to trace the history of the problem from its earliest beginnings in the nineteenth century to our contemporary theological scene, and thereby to set forth the problem in all its complexity and in all its ramifications for the task of Biblical study and interpretation. It is therefore also hoped that this study will shed some light upon the present situation and task of Biblical research. It is the writer's conviction that the history of the problem of Jesus and Paul has much to teach us today.

## PART ONE

### POSING THE PROBLEM

Until the late nineteenth century the problem of Jesus and Paul did not begin to appear as a theological and historical problem. The eighteenth century rationalistic emphasis on Jesus, with its distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion which has Christ for its object, had first to be transformed in the crucible of nineteenth century theological and historical study before it could be expressed in terms of an antithesis between Jesus and Paul powerful enough to arouse a general controversy. Two separate developments in the first half of the nineteenth century contributed directly to the posing of the problem: one was the attempt to provide theological justification for the new emphasis upon the life of Jesus which issued ultimately in an unprecedented interest in the historical Jesus: the other was the "rediscovery" of the theological and historical significance of the Apostle Paul. The new interest in the historical Jesus, on the one hand, and the revival of a new theological and historical interest in the Apostle Paul, on the other,

develop independently, but eventually meet and interact to create the modern problem of Jesus and Paul.

In this part, consideration will be given to four scholars who played diverse roles in ~~setting~~ posing the problem. The first to be treated will be F. Schleiermacher who was the first to give systematic and theological expression to the centrality of the historical Jesus for faith. The second will be D. F. Strauss whose evaluation of the significance of the historical Jesus directly opposed that of Schleiermacher and led to the nineteenth century Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Third to be treated will be F. C. Baur as the man chiefly responsible for the revival of interest in the Apostle Paul. Last to be considered will be C. A. Hasert, a relatively unknown figure of the nineteenth century. Although his influence on the problem was nil, his opposing view of the Apostle Paul represents a significant contrast to Baur's and anticipates the future development of the problem.

## CHAPTER I

### THEOLOGICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE NEW EMPHASIS UPON THE LIFE OF JESUS

Prior to the nineteenth century the emphasis upon the centrality of Jesus had originated from two widely divergent sources. In neither case had it been the result of purely historical interest, but was primarily a reaction against the speculative systems of Protestant orthodoxy. On the one hand, deism<sup>1</sup> and

---

<sup>1</sup>The historical investigation of the origins of Christianity began with the English deists (John Locke 1632-1704; John Toland 1670-1722; Thomas Chubb 1679-1747), who, being philosophers and not professional historians, were able to give the first forward impulse to the historical study of Jesus and of primitive Christianity. The influence of these English deists on French writers (like Voltaire 1694-1778) of the period was pervasive. Finally the critical study of the life of Jesus in a German deist, Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768), takes its beginning. The deists' contribution to the historical study of the origins of Christianity was significant because it completely discarded every transcendental presupposition of revelation and inspiration, although all English deists did not completely deny revelation, and treated the Christian story as purely human history and the New Testament like any other historical document. See W. G. Kümmel, NT, pp. 61-51; L. Salvatorelli, "From Locke to Reitzenstein: The historical investigation of the origins of Christianity," HTR, 22 (1928), 266-268.

rationalism,<sup>2</sup> on the basis of a moralistic philosophy of religion, had isolated Jesus from the remainder of the New Testament and made his moral life and teachings exemplar~~y~~ for the Christian faith. On the other hand, pietism<sup>3</sup> with its emphasis on religious experience had combined an evangelical biblicism with a warm personal devotion to Jesus Christ as Saviour. Each in its own way, then, challenged the barren speculations of the orthodox systems and raised anew the question of the meaning of Jesus Christ for faith. Neither, however, had given systematic theological expression to their views, and it remained for theology to come to grips with the question which had been raised.

A. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER  
(1768-1834)

Schleiermacher's theological development cannot be understood apart from his life. Successive

---

<sup>2</sup>The basic approach of the rationalists is well stated by A. Schweitzer: "It is a firmly established principle that the teaching of Jesus, and religion in general, hold their place solely in virtue of their inner reasonableness, not by the support of outward evidence." Quest, p. 28; D. P. Fuller, Easter Faith and History, Grand Rapids, 1965, pp. 31-39.

<sup>3</sup>The principal pietists are J. A. Bengel, G. Menken, J. Müller, and J. Wesley.

exposures to the influences of pietism, the Enlightenment and romanticism all left their mark upon his theology. The predominant influence on his early youth was that of Moravian pietism. In 1785 he entered the Moravian theological Seminary at Barby, but a decided philosophical interest soon led to his expulsion, and he completed his theological study at Halle where the influence of the Enlightenment still prevailed. Here he took up the study of Kant as well as of Greek philosophy. Later on he became a devoted admirer of Spinoza. A six-year pastorate in Berlin between 1796-1802 proved to be a decisive period in his life. At this time Schleiermacher was strongly influenced by romanticism through his intimate acquaintance with Friedrich Schlegel and his friends. With the encouragement of Schlegel, Schleiermacher wrote and published one of his most influential works: Ueber die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern (1799).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>The first edition was published anonymously and without a preface. The book appeared in three successive editions during Schleiermacher's lifetime, the last in 1831. E. T. by John Oman, from the 3rd edition, On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers, New York, 1958.

But Schleiermacher was too profound and independent a spirit to rest content with romanticism, and eventually severed his relationship with Schlegel. In 1804 he was called to the University of Halle where he taught a wide range of subjects and also served as University preacher. When the University of Berlin was founded in 1810, he was called to the theological faculty and remained there until his death in 1834. During this time he still carried on an active preaching ministry and published his major theological work, Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhang dargestellt (1821).<sup>5</sup>

Long recognized as the greatest theological thinker of the nineteenth century, Schleiermacher to an exceptional degree combined the warmth of personal religion with the intellectual rigour of a scientific thinker. He lived at the cross roads between the reigns of metaphysical thinking and scientific methodology. Metaphysics and its claim to be able to reach God and explain Him had been

---

<sup>5</sup>E.T. by D. M. Baillie et al., The Christian Faith, edited by H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart, Edinburgh, 1928, from the 2nd revised edition (1830).

severely attacked by Kant and Hume. On the other hand, the scientific methodology which takes a clearly demonstrated object for its inquiries and proceeds to show how every statement it makes refers back to its object, was much in vogue. Schleiermacher's aim was to vindicate religion by proving it to be distinct from the rational activity of philosophical metaphysics on one hand, and from the exact sciences on the other. He tried a middle way of appealing to what we could call the experimental sciences, in the sense of experimental psychology and experimental sociology.<sup>6</sup>

In the Ueber die Religion, Schleiermacher, the apologete, set forth a new concept of religion which exercised no little influence on subsequent theology. Although colored by the influences of romanticism and the philosophy of Spinoza, this work laid the basis for Schleiermacher's later theological

---

<sup>6</sup>For Schleiermacher's life and thought, see F. Lichtenberger, History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century, E.T. by W. Hastie, Edinburgh, 1889, pp. 46-166; Hans Grass, "Schleiermacher-Literatur," TR, 38 (January, 1974), 217-223; H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology, London, 1964 (1st edition, 1937), pp. 36-101; R. R. Niebuhr, Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion, London, 1965; M. Redeker, Schleiermacher: Life and Thought, Philadelphia, 1973.

development.

In opposition to Protestant orthodoxy, as well as to the barren metaphysical and moral abstractions of the Enlightenment, Schleiermacher defined religion in terms of intuition and feeling. The essence of religion is not thinking or acting, but an intuition and feeling of the universe, i.e., the infinite.<sup>7</sup> Primary is intuition, the element of receptivity, through which we become aware, not of the nature of things, but of their operation upon us.<sup>8</sup> Religion arises from the operation of an infinitely active and creative universe upon us: to be receptive to its diverse influences, to each thing in particular as part of the whole, to everything finite as a representation (Darstellung) of the infinite--this is religion.<sup>9</sup> Every such intuition of the universe, furthermore, produces an effect which finds expression in a concrete form of feeling. Thus, intuition is necessarily accompanied by feeling, the element

---

<sup>7</sup>Bernhard Pünjer, Friedrich Schleiermacher's Reden Ueber die Religion, kritische Ausgabe, Braunschweig, 1879, p. 46. This edition contains the text of all three editions of the Reden, arranged for purposes of comparison. This and all subsequent references are based upon the original edition.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., pp. 55-57.

of activity or spontaneity, which is distinguished from morality by the fact that it has no goal outside itself.<sup>10</sup>

Therefore, intuition and feeling represent the opposition between passivity and activity, between the objective and the subjective. The essence of religion consists, precisely, in the overcoming of this opposition by binding both together in an inseparable unity.

Anschauung ohne Gefühl ist Nichts und kann weder den rechten Ursprung noch die rechte Kraft haben, Gefühl ohne Anschauung ist auch Nichts: beide sind nur dann und deswegen etwas, wenn und weil sie ursprünglich Eins und ungetrennt sind.<sup>11</sup>

Hence, religion is the necessary and indispensable "third" without which there can be no true speculation and practice, i.e., knowing and doing.<sup>12</sup>

It was this concept of religion, first expressed in the Reden, which formed the basis of Schleiermacher's great dogmatic work, Der christliche Glaube. Absent from this later work are the pantheistic overtones of the Reden, and instead we find a more specifically Christian vocabulary. The

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 69 ff.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

nature of religion is now defined as neither a knowing nor doing, but as a determination (Bestimmtheit) of feeling or of immediate self-consciousness, whose content consists in the consciousness of being absolutely dependent, or, what is the same thing, as being in relationship with God.<sup>13</sup> The concept of feeling is here so broadened as to include both those elements which Schleiermacher designated as intuition and feeling in the Reden.<sup>14</sup> Feeling, or the immediate self-consciousness, is here the primary and original element, the "mediating link" between all knowing and doing.<sup>15</sup> The elements of receptivity and activity are one in the feeling of absolute dependence. The objective element, the "whence" of our receptive and active existence is given in and with feeling and is to be designated "God."<sup>16</sup> Thus, since the feeling of absolute dependence is identical with being in relationship with God, Schleiermacher's theology is

---

<sup>13</sup>Schleiermacher, The Christian Faith, 1928, pp. 5-11.

<sup>14</sup>This feeling is not a merely subjective, psychological category. This change occurs already in the second edition of the Reden, where the two are no longer sharply distinguished and religion is defined primarily in terms of feeling.

<sup>15</sup>Schleiermacher, op. cit., § 3, pp. 7 ff.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., § 4:2-4, pp. 13-18.

a theology of feeling, or a theology of the pious self-consciousness.<sup>17</sup> Since religion is defined in terms of the immediate self-consciousness, intellectual truth becomes secondary. Christian doctrines, according to Schleiermacher, merely give intellectual expression to the various pious states of feeling (Gemüthsustände).<sup>18</sup> The inward state is original, and doctrinal propositions are secondary and derived. Schleiermacher's dogmatics consequently represents the analysis of the pious self-consciousness. And he feels no compunctions about freely reinterpreting the traditional creeds and doctrinal formulas of the church.

This new conception of religion in terms of feeling and the pious self-consciousness represents the culmination of a development begun in pietism with its emphasis on experience and furthered by romanticism with its return to feeling. His definition of religion freed theology from the admixture of metaphysics and

---

<sup>17</sup>Cf. K. Barth, Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, Zürich, 1947, pp. 405-406; E.T. by Brian Cozens and John Bowden, Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century, London, 1972, p. 457.

<sup>18</sup>Schleiermacher, op. cit., § 15, p. 76 f.

morality which had characterized the eighteenth century and won for it an independent sphere of existence.

The new understanding of religion also had important implications for New Testament theology, and consequently for the problem of Jesus and Paul. With the shift of emphasis from doctrine and morality to religious experience, new possibilities opened up for the understanding of the unity of the New Testament. Protestant orthodoxy had assumed that the unity of the New Testament consisted in the unity of a logical system of doctrine; Rationalism had radically undermined the assumption of doctrinal unity by emphasizing the difference between the moral teachings of Jesus and the theological doctrines of his followers; both had still attached absolute significance to their respective systems of intellectual truths. With Schleiermacher's new concept of religion, intellectual truth is no longer absolute and differences of doctrine and practise become secondary matters. The recovery of the unity of the New Testament now becomes possible by affirming that the diversity of ideas and principles give expression to a common religious spirit or life. The unity of the New Testament, therefore, is not to be sought in a

static system of truth or in doctrinal uniformity, but in the common religious spirit which expressed itself in individual diversity of thought and language.

In the fifth "Address" Schleiermacher deals specifically with the historical forms of religion, affirming that the nature of religion demands a multiplicity of forms for its complete manifestation. Since religion is infinite, it must have a principle of individualization.<sup>19</sup> Consequently, every individual form of religion is both complete and necessary. At this point, Schleiermacher's argument is directed specifically against the rationalistic conception of natural religion which sought to reduce all religion to a common core of principles and ideas everywhere the same. Schleiermacher, on the contrary, affirmed that every form of religion must be treated as one possessing its own individuality, and that true religion consists not in a certain abstract quantity of religious matter, but in the totality of all its individual forms. An individual form of religion exists wherever some particular intuition of

---

<sup>19</sup>Reden, pp. 241-242.

the universe is made the center and everything else related to it.<sup>20</sup> Because of natural differences in personality and character this intuition is apprehended in different ways, and religion diversifies itself endlessly in individual forms, each of which, in spite of characteristic differences, mirrors the whole.

In the light of this conception of historical individuality, Schleiermacher then discusses the nature of Christianity. The original intuition of Christianity, more glorious and more worthy than any other intuition of mature humanity, is the intuition of the universal conflict between everything finite and the unity of the whole and of the way in which the Deity achieves reconciliation. Corruption and redemption, hostility and mediation are the inseparable aspects of this intuition and determine the content and form of Christianity.<sup>21</sup> Since the hostility of the finite prevents man from entering into fellowship with the unity of the whole, the Deity raises up ever more exalted mediators in whom this hostility is overcome and in whom the Deity unites himself

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 256.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 278.

ever more closely with humanity.<sup>22</sup> One such mediator was Jesus Christ, whose divinity consisted only in the glorious clarity with which the original intuition was attained in him. His consciousness of the uniqueness of his religiosity, of the originality of his insight, and of the power to communicate and awaken religion was at the same time the consciousness of this mediatorship and divinity. Thus he became the founder of a church, of a school of followers, who derived their religion from him. Yet he made no claim to be the only mediator, and the attainment of the intuition of Christianity remains independent of him or his school.<sup>23</sup>

In the later Glaube, the broad outlines of the view of Christian religion which Schleiermacher briefly sketched in the Reden are fully developed and systematized. The ambiguities which still adhered to the conception of Christ in the Reden are removed, and the centrality of Christ for the Christian faith is now set forth more clearly and positively, and in systematic form. In the Reden the function of Christ is described in ambiguous terms. Schleiermacher had still not progressed much beyond rationalism

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 279.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 283-286.

in so far as he appeared to ascribe only an exemplary function to Christ. His real contribution to Christology is to be seen in his Glaube.

Here the fact of universal sin is reckoned with more seriously. The feeling of absolute dependence involves the fundamental contrast between God and man, and this contrast is rooted in human sin. Accordingly, Christ is above all else, for Schleiermacher, the Redeemer. Christ is seen in his supreme uniqueness, distinguished from all others as "Redeemer" alone and for all, and in no way needing redemption himself.<sup>24</sup> And Christianity is distinguished from all other religious communions by the fact that the redemptive influence of its founder is the original element and that the communion exists only on this presupposition and as a communication and propagation of that redemptive activity.<sup>25</sup>

Schleiermacher's emphasis upon the inevitability of sin and the need for redemption through personal, living fellowship with Jesus Christ as Redeemer still reflects the influence of his pietistic background and represents a marked contrast to

---

<sup>24</sup>Christian Faith, § 11, 4. p. 58.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 57 f.

the "natural religion" of the Enlightenment. At the same time, his approach to the person and work of Christ through the Christian self-consciousness resulted in a radical reinterpretation of the traditional understanding of Christ and his redemptive work.

The key to Schleiermacher's Christology is to be found in the idea of Urbild, or "archetype" which applies to Christ to describe his unique dignity and function.

If the spontaneity of the new corporate life is original in the Redeemer and proceeds from Him alone, then as an historical individual He must have been at the same time ideal (i.e. the ideal must have become completely historical in Him), and each historical moment of His experience must at the same time have borne within it the ideal.<sup>26</sup>

The Urbildlichkeit of Christ refers to the absolute perfection and potency of his God-consciousness. The possibility of transcending Christ is therefore excluded, and there is no other way of attaining to a true conception of God-consciousness than by an ever deepening understanding of Christ. Furthermore, his Urbildlichkeit was not limited to any particular moments of his life, but extended over the whole of

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., § 93, p. 377.

it. His natural human development, sinless and free from every trace of spiritual conflict, was possible by virtue of his unbroken God-consciousness. At the same time, as archetype, Christ's function is not merely exemplary, but he has the power to communicate and reproduce his God-consciousness in the corporate life of the church. Consequently, Christ as both historical and archetypal is at once the source and goal of the corporate life of the community as it advances in the power of its God-consciousness. From one point of view, the emergence of this archetype within the corporate life of sinful humanity may be regarded as a "miraculous phenomenon" or a "creative divine act," and yet must not be understood as an absolute miracle, as a breach of continuous historical development.<sup>27</sup>

Christ, then, as regards his human nature, is like all men, but distinguished from them by the constant perfection and potency of his God-consciousness which constitutes a real existence of God in him.<sup>28</sup> Schleiermacher, accordingly, insists on the essential unity of the divine and human in the person of Christ.

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., § 93:2,3,4, pp. 377-384.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., § 94, p. 385.

Any separation of the two is to be avoided; both were combined in such a way that every activity was a common activity of both. The existence of God in him is the fundamental inward power from which every activity proceeds; everything human in him forms the organism through which this power operates, so that all that is human in him originates from the divine, and no differentiation between the two is possible.<sup>29</sup>

This existence of God in him is the source from which his redemptive activity proceeds. As the Redeemer he takes up believers into the power of his God-consciousness, and this is his redemptive activity; he takes up believers into the fellowship of his unclouded blessedness, and this is his reconciling activity.<sup>30</sup> Thus, by virtue of the existence of God in him, he awakens and quickens God-consciousness in us and communicates his sinlessness and perfection to us within the community which he creates.

Thus Christ stands forth in the absolute uniqueness of his Urbildlichkeit, as the sole source of the corporate life of the church. Through vital fellowship with the redeemer we share increasingly

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., § 96,97, pp. 391-413.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., § 100,101, pp. 425, 431.

in his perfect God-consciousness and his sinless perfection.

It is now possible to evaluate the significance of Schleiermacher's Christological reconstruction in the light of previous historical development. Over against protestant orthodoxy, Schleiermacher departed from the traditional emphasis on justification by faith in favor of redemption. Instead of the traditional juridical scheme of salvation, he has the soteriological. In all this he was fully at one with pietism; he recognized the legitimate concern of pietism with a personal Saviour and sought, for the first time, to give it systematic expression.

Over against the rationalistic interpretation of Christ as teacher or example, Schleiermacher affirmed the absolute uniqueness of Christ as Redeemer. At the same time he acknowledged the validity of rationalism's interest in the life of Jesus and sought to show the relevance of the latter for the Christian faith. Thus, by means of the concept of Urbildlichkeit, Schleiermacher sought to unite what he considered to be the valid elements in both the pietistic and rationalistic emphasis upon the centrality of Jesus. The Urbildlichkeit of Jesus elevates him

above all other founders of religion as the sole source and origin of redemption. At the same time, his redemptive influence does not derive primarily from any particular events of his life, e.g., the cross and resurrection, but from his entire life which at every moment manifests his perfect God-consciousness and sinless perfection.<sup>31</sup> The entire life of Christ is redemptively significant.

Thus, the significance of Schleiermacher over against rationalism and idealism consists in the fact that he again emphasizes the redemptive significance of Christ for faith. Rationalism with all its insistence on the importance of the gospels, denied any specific redemptive work of Christ and attributed to him merely an exemplary function. Likewise with idealism, Christ is little more than a revealer, the vehicle of the "idea." Schleiermacher, on the other hand, developed a doctrine of the redemptive work of Christ. Christ is the agent of redemption in his divine-human nature. It is the divine initiative in the incarnation which explains why he is capable

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 423. Cf. Schleiermacher's view of the reports of the resurrection are not based upon "apparitions." His own opinion is what really happened was reanimation after apparent death.

of communicating his own life to believers.

On the other hand, his significance over against protestant orthodoxy is equally important. With orthodoxy the work of the risen Christ is all important, whereas with Schleiermacher it is the work of Jesus the God-man, the Jesus of the gospels. His emphasis upon the Jesus of the gospels is so strong that the state of Christ after the resurrection is only of subordinate significance for faith. The facts of the resurrection, the ascension of Christ, and the prophecy of his return to judgment are not essential to the doctrine of his person.<sup>32</sup> When God reveals himself in Christ, then this Christ cannot be directly identified with Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>33</sup> In other words, Christ is experienced as Redeemer in his human, earthly existence. Exaltation does not add anything essential to his redemptive work. Christ,

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., §. 99, pp. 417 ff.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 52. Cf. Schweitzer, who pointed out that it is not by accident that Schleiermacher regularly speaks, not of Jesus, but of Christ. Quest, p. 67.

therefore, is the agent of redemption not in his deity, but in his incarnate nature where the divine and human are inseparably united. Thus, over against orthodoxy which had overlooked the earthly life of Jesus, and over against rationalism which had denied the divinity of Christ, Schleiermacher reemphasized the union of the human and divine and showed that this was not merely speculative doctrine, but rather the basis of the redemptive work of Christ.

Thus, with his synthesis of pietistic and rationalistic elements, Schleiermacher sought to provide a theological basis for the centrality of Christ in Christian faith. What existed more or less as a practical emphasis in pietism and rationalism became in Schleiermacher a paramount theological issue. By challenging all existing conceptions of the person and work of Christ in a radical way, he compelled his age to face anew the fundamental theological question of the meaning of Christ for faith. Once this theological question had been raised in a forceful way, the problem of the interpretation of the gospels and the life of Jesus also assumed a new urgency. For in answering this question, theology eventually could not escape the necessity of coming to terms in some way with the historical

criticism of the gospels. When the answer to the Christological question was so conceived as to compel an either-or decision with respect to Jesus and Paul, then the problem of the historical relationship of Jesus and Paul was destined to become a burning issue.

However, Schleiermacher's answer to the Christological question in no way resulted in any cleavage within the New Testament itself. Far from trying to establish an abstract norm of conduct or doctrine and treating every individual deviation from it as a perversion of the original manifestation of religion in Jesus, as the rationalists had done, Schleiermacher's concept of individuality left room for the utmost diversity within the living unity of the whole. The diversity within the whole, far from indicating perversion and corruption, bore witness to the validity of the divine life mediated through Christ.

With Schleiermacher, the religion of Jesus, i.e., his God-consciousness, is communicated directly to his followers. The original impulse of the divine in Jesus is to be found with the same degree of directness in all men, but because of natural personality differences each will give expression to it

in a different way. There may be degrees of clarity with which this impulse is apprehended, but no real contradiction between them. Since the divine is manifested with equal directness in all, there is toleration and mutual supplementation between the individual types. Although the apostles were removed in time from the founder of the faith, the full divine life is found in all. It may be legitimate to differentiate historically between the founder from whom the original impulse derives and its diversifications in his followers, but this does not imply the inferiority of the latter. Thus Schleiermacher can argue that the formal division of the canon into the part which deals with the activity of Christ and the part which deals with the common activity of his disciples for the founding of Christianity implies no differentiation with respect to their canonical dignity.<sup>34</sup> Hence the New Testament is to be treated as a unified whole in which the views of the individual writers are seen as characteristic modifications of the common life and spirit which gave birth to the whole. The possibility of any antithesis

---

<sup>34</sup>Schleiermacher, Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf einleitender Vorlesungen, Zweite Auflage, 1830, p. 49.

between Jesus and Paul is hereby excluded. Thus, while recognizing the diversity within the New Testament, Schleiermacher still maintained its unity. Through Schleiermacher, the concept of individuality was now brought to bear upon New Testament theology in the nineteenth century. In his *Hermeneutics*, Schleiermacher further elaborated the implications of this view for the interpretation of the New Testament.<sup>35</sup>

B. DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS  
(1808-1874)

Strauss received his education in the conservative environment of the lower Seminary at Blaubeuren and later at the university of Tübingen which was at that time still noted for its supernaturalistic theology. Among the few teachers to whom he was attracted was F. C. Baur,<sup>36</sup> then in the early stages of his teaching career. The really formative influence on his thought, however, came

---

<sup>35</sup>Hermeneutik und Kritik mit besonderer Beziehung auf das Neue Testament, herausgegeben von Friderich Lücke, Berlin, 1838. This work was published posthumously and based on Schleiermacher's lecture notes.

<sup>36</sup>Wilhelm Lang, "Ferdinand Baur and D. F. Strauss," Preussische Jahrbücher, 160 (1915), 474-504; 161 (1915), 123-144. u/

from the more or less independent study of Schleiermacher, Schelling and particularly Hegel. After a brief interlude in the pastorate and later in a temporary teaching position at Maulbronn, Strauss visited the University of Berlin in 1831 for the express purpose of attending the lectures of Hegel, but the latter unfortunately died shortly after his arrival. He attended the lectures of Schleiermacher for a brief time, but was more repelled than attracted, preferring rather to cultivate the friendship of members of the Hegelian school to whose philosophy and speculative theology he now devoted himself completely. It was here, however, that the reading of a transcript of Schleiermacher's lectures on the life of Jesus, by arousing his opposition, became the inspiration which ultimately led him to write his own Life of Jesus. In 1832 he returned to Tübingen where until 1835 he occupied the position of a Repetent with the privilege of lecturing at the University. For a time he contemplated a teaching career in philosophy, but when that course was blocked he devoted himself wholly to theology. The manuscript of his remarkable Life of Jesus<sup>37</sup> was completed within the course of a single

---

<sup>37</sup>Das Leben Jesu, kritische bearbeitet, Tübingen,

year when he was only twenty-seven years old. Because of the drastic character of his attack upon the testimony of the gospels, the work of Strauss <sup>became</sup> when an immediate sensation, so much of a sensation, indeed, that he forthwith lost his position as Repetent at the famous Stift in Tübingen, and an end was put to an academic career that had hardly begun. His consequent bitterness and resentment was further aggravated by an ill-fated marriage and an unsuccessful venture in politics. In addition to other literary works, he also wrote a defense of his Leben Jesu and a popular Life of Jesus.<sup>38</sup> Death brought to an end his tragic career in 1874.<sup>39</sup>

Perhaps no single theological work has ever created such a furore or called forth such a storm of

---

1835/36, Zwei Bände. In the third edition Strauss made a number of concessions to his critics which were subsequently withdrawn in the fourth edition, 1840. E.T., from the 4th edition, by George Eliot, The Life of Jesus, London, 1898. Recently a new edition of Eliot's translation appeared by Peter C. Hodgson (ed.), London, 1973.

<sup>38</sup>Streitschriften zur Verteidigung meiner Schrift über das Leben Jesu und zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie, Tübingen, 1841. Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet, Leipzig, 1864.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. T. Ziegler's article on Strauss, RPTK, XIX, 76-92; A. Schweitzer, Quest, Ch. VII.

criticism as Strauss's Leben Jesu. Although he had little anticipated it, his work alienated him from practically every element of the theological world of his time--both orthodox and rationalists, the "mediating" theologians, and even the members of the Hegelian school of which Strauss wished to consider himself a part.<sup>40</sup> The negative impact of the book was of such a nature that it focused the attention of the age in an unprecedented way upon the gospels and the historical problem of the life of Jesus. If Schleiermacher had confronted theology with the question of the meaning of Christ for faith, Strauss challenged theology to reconcile its answers with the gospel records. Although not blessed with the creative mind of a Schleiermacher, Strauss compensated for his lack of originality with his clarity and critical insight and the uncompromising rigour with which he applied his critical principles.<sup>41</sup>

The question with which Strauss wrestled in his Leben Jesu was basically a methodological one: How are the gospels to be interpreted so as to meet

---

<sup>40</sup>A. Schweitzer, *ibid.*, Ch. XIX, gives a vivid account of the impact of Strauss' work on his contemporaries.

<sup>41</sup>For a detailed biography of D. F. Strauss, see Horton Harris, David Friedrich Strauss and His Theology, Cambridge, 1973.

the needs not only of faith, but also of critical scholarship? Strauss' criticism begins with an attack against all his predecessors for failing to reckon seriously with the demands of critical scholarship. This is made clear already in the preface where he distinguishes his own approach from all others. According to Strauss, the ancient exegesis of the church began from the twofold presupposition that the gospels contained history and that this history was a supernatural history. Rationalism, on the other hand, had rejected the second of these presuppositions, but clung all the more tenaciously to the first, maintaining that the history contained in the gospels was to be interpreted according to natural law. But in order to satisfy the demands of critical scholarship, Strauss insisted that the first of these presuppositions must also be rejected and the investigation be made "whether in fact, and to what extent, the ground on which we stand in the gospels is historical."<sup>42</sup>

Faith must accord to critical scholarship  
the full right to free and impartial investigation

---

<sup>42</sup>Strauss, The Life of Jesus, 1898, p. XXIX.  
(German edition, 1835/36, Erster Band, p. v.).

of the historicity of the gospels, a task for which the interpreter--and Strauss considered himself preeminently qualified in this respect--must be free from all religious and dogmatic presuppositions.<sup>43</sup> Only insofar as the gospels are subjected to the same disinterested historical criticism accorded to any historical sources can the demands of critical scholarship be met.

Since the unhistorical and uncritical procedures of supernaturalism and rationalism must be abandoned, a new viewpoint becomes necessary. And the viewpoint which in Strauss' opinion must satisfactorily meet the demands of both faith and critical scholarship is the mythological. Accordingly, in the Introduction to his work Strauss develops his mythological viewpoint in distinction from the historical viewpoint of both the supernaturalists and the rationalists. Here he traces the history of the development and application of the concept of myth to the sacred Scriptures. But whereas the concept had previously been applied only to the Old Testament and isolated portions of the New Testament, Strauss was the first to demand its consistent

---

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. XXX (German ed., p. vi.).

application to the whole of the gospel narratives.<sup>44</sup>

The superiority of the mythological over the naturalistic interpretation is brought out in Strauss' survey of the development of the mythological viewpoint. While insisting on the essential historicity of the biblical narratives, the rationalists had attempted to explain away the miraculous elements as due ultimately to natural causes. And it became necessary, therefore, to assume that the biblical writers were ignorant and naively superstitious, since they were unable to distinguish between the natural and supernatural. This procedure resulted not only in a violent and arbitrary treatment of the narratives, but also failed to do justice to the spirit and intention of the writers, to the moral and spiritual truths they wished to convey. On the other hand, by permitting the miraculous elements to remain in the narratives while leaving aside any claim to their historicity, the mythological interpretation permitted a sympathetic understanding of the intention of the writers and preserved the deeper moral truths or ideas expressed in the form of

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., § 11, pp. 63 ff (German ed., pp. 46-51).

historical narrative.<sup>45</sup>

Strauss himself made no attempt to define the concept of myth precisely;<sup>46</sup> he was more concerned with arguing for the possibility of the existence of myth in the gospels.<sup>47</sup> He argues that the oriental mentality of the early Christian community was especially disposed to express its

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 52-57. Cf. also p. 64. (German ed., pp. 32-37, p. 52).

<sup>46</sup>According to Strauss, Myth was to be found in the gospels in two forms: "Pure myths" and "historical myths." Pure myths are those having their source in the Messianic ideas and expectations existing in the Jewish mind at the time of Jesus and in the particular impression left by the personal character or actions or fate of Jesus (i.e., the story of Transfiguration and the story of the rending of the veil in the Temple). Historical myths involve some definite individual fact that was seized upon by religious enthusiasm and surrounded and embellished with conceptions culled from the idea of Christ (i.e., Fishers of men or the barren fig-tree etc). Ibid.; § 15, pp. 86-87. Strauss took over this "mythical" idea from the school of Eichhorn, Gabler, G. L. Bauer, de Wette, and Usteri. Ibid., § 11-14; Kümmel, NT, p. 121, n. 165-167; Schweitzer, Quest, p. 78; G. Müller showed that Strauss' concept of myth was essentially shaped through the thought of Schelling; K. Barth, Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century, SCM, 1972, p. 541, adds the names of Jakob Böhme and J. Kerner. But Strauss charges his predecessors with misunderstanding the idea. He regards the Old Testament as the main source of saga formation, but also contends that the messianic expectation among the Israelite people was simply transferred to Jesus.

<sup>47</sup>Strauss, Ibid., § 14, pp. 75-86.

religious ideas not in the form of abstract concepts, but in the concrete fashion of phantasy, as images and stories. Under these circumstances it was natural that a succession of sacred stories should arise which gave expression not only to the new ideas which Jesus originated, but also to older ideas which were transferred to him as individual elements of his life. The simple historical framework of the life of Jesus was gradually overlaid with a welter of religious ideas, derived for the most part from Old Testament prophecy and Jewish messianic expectations. This transformation of history into mythology, however, is not to be regarded as the deliberate and conscious action of individuals, but as the unconscious creation of the collective community as it reflected upon the life of its founder, particularly in the light of Old Testament prophecy. If such was the origin of much of the gospel narratives, it is therefore necessary to abandon the popular view that any or all of the gospels pericopae represent the accounts of eye-witnesses and to presuppose instead a period of oral tradition in which the inventive imagination of the community had free play.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., pp. 86 ff (German ed., pp. 62-74).

After having sketched his methodological viewpoint, Strauss then turned to the gospels themselves. Through more than fourteen hundred pages (in the first German edition) of the two-volume work, Strauss applied his critical knife to the details of the gospel narratives. With critical incisiveness he repeatedly exposes the difficulties and weakness of the supernaturalistic and naturalistic interpretations of the individual narratives. Each narrative is then subjected to a rigorous probing to determine whether its character is historical or mythological and legendary. The net result is that Strauss everywhere finds myth and legend, and not very much history.<sup>49</sup> Consequently, the overall impression of Strauss' critical work was predominantly

---

<sup>49</sup>Among the accounts designated mythical by Strauss were: all elements of the birth stories, the visit to the temple at age twelve, the acknowledgment of Jesus by John and the supernatural circumstances surrounding the baptism, the temptation experiences, the general chronology of the ministry, the Samaritan woman story, the miracles, the transfiguration (which story was developed to exhibit a repetition of the glorification of Moses and to bring Jesus into contact with his two forerunners), any specific prediction of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection (though he may well have had some general intimation of forthcoming death) and the predictions of a second advent, the prediction of any specific event in connection with the passion, some of the details of the passion story, the miraculous factors attending the death of Jesus, and the resurrection and ascension.

negative, both from the standpoint of History as well as of Faith. One looks in vain for any attempt to reconstruct the historical outlines of Jesus' life. The existence of the historical Jesus is never questioned, but Strauss exhibits not the slightest interest in his character or the religious import of his teachings. The impression is given that the life of Jesus has been so overlaid with myth and legend that he must remain an obscure and shadowy figure of the past, relatively inaccessible to the modern age.<sup>50</sup> Likewise, one looks in vain for any

---

<sup>50</sup>This is Strauss' own conclusion in his popular *Life of Jesus*, after having attempted to reconstruct the historical kernel of Jesus' life. We must confess "dass wir über wenige grosse Männer der Geschichte so ungenügend wie über Jesus unterrichtet sind." Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet, Dritte Auflage, Leipzig, 1874, p. 621. In this respect it is interesting to compare Strauss and Bultmann. According to Backhaus, both Strauss and Bultmann, in the last analysis, have the same view of myth, in that everything supernatural or other-worldly is regarded as unhistorical and therefore mythical. The common ground between Strauss and Bultmann is the scientific (historical critical) method. The difference is that "Strauss arbeitet anhand der Naturgesetze, Bultmann aber betreibt Literaturkritik." Gunther Backhaus, Kerygma und Mythos bei David Friedrich Strauss und Rudolf Bultmann, Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1956, p. 16. Strauss did not know kerygma behind the Gospels but only the stuff in which his criticism underlies. The result is for Strauss, the elimination of the myth and for Bultmann, interpretation of the myth. Ibid, p. 79. From these foregoing considerations, it is not hard for us to see the reason why K. Barth calls Bultmann "a new D. F. Strauss". K. Barth, Kerygma und Myth, ed. H.-W. Bartsch, E.T. by R. H. Fuller, Kerygma and Myth, II, London, 1962, 117.

positive evaluation of the religious meaning of the mythology. Narratives are simply designated as myth, and no attempt is made to recover the religious truth which they might express. Strauss wishes to deal with the gospels only with the cold objectivity of a critical historian.

If the content of the gospels is primarily myth and not history, how are they to be interpreted so as to meet the needs of faith? It is to this question that Strauss finally turns in a brief concluding chapter, and for the first time he wishes to speak as a Christian and a theologian. The task he sets for himself is to re-establish dogmatically what has been destroyed critically. Historical criticism must be followed by dogmatic criticism before faith can become intelligible.<sup>51</sup>

Strauss entitled his last chapter, "The dogmatic import of the Life of Jesus." But the positive content of this chapter is limited principally to one paragraph for he devotes most of his time to successive critiques of the Christologies of orthodoxy, rationalism, Schleiermacher, Kant, de  
e/ Wettl, and the speculative theologians of the Hegelian

---

<sup>51</sup>Strauss, Life of Jesus, § 144, p. 757 (German ed., pp. 686-688).

school.

Strauss' thought here must be understood against the background of Hegelian philosophy and speculative theology. Hegel had sought to comprehend the unity of all existence as the self-evolution of Absolute Spirit or reason to complete self-consciousness and freedom. Both philosophy and religion have the same object, i.e., the Absolute in its unity; the Absolute exists for both as Spirit, self-conscious and rational; its realization consists in becoming conscious of itself in the religious mind as well as in speculative philosophy.<sup>52</sup>

Hence, according to the speculative theology, neither God as infinite Spirit, nor man as finite spirit exist over against each other as independent entities: But God as infinite Spirit enters and creates the finite merely as a limited manifestation of himself, from which he again returns to unity with himself. From the standpoint of the divine this process is revelation, from the human point of view religion. Religion, therefore, consists in man's becoming conscious of the unity of the finite and infinite Spirit, the human and the divine. Thus

---

<sup>52</sup>J. B. Baillie's article, "Hegel," *Hastings' ERE*, 6, p. 584. Cf. K. Barth, *op. cit.*, pp. 343-378 (E.T., pp. 384-421).

the highest idea to which religion can attain is the realization that God is man and that man is of divine lineage.<sup>53</sup>

Although the content of philosophy and religion is the same, philosophy expresses this truth in logical concepts (Begriffe) whereas religion expresses it in the form of imaginative representations or symbols (Vorstellungen). With this distinction Hegel had sought to reconcile reason and religion, philosophy and faith. Begriff, however, is the highest form in which truth appears and is alone adequate to express absolute truth. Hence it is the task of speculative theology to translate the Vorstellungen of religion into the more adequate Begriffe of philosophy. Religious truth finds its final verification in philosophy.<sup>54</sup>

If, then, the divine is immediately present in the human spirit, and if this truth has its sole verification in philosophy, the question then arises as to the significance of the historical Jesus for faith. It was this question which Strauss so forcefully imposed upon the consciousness of the age.

---

<sup>53</sup> Strauss, op. cit., pp. 776 (German ed., pp. 729-730).

<sup>54</sup> Baillie, op. cit., p. 584; Cf. O. Pfleiderer, The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, 1909, pp. 73-75.

Neither Hegel nor his followers had come to grips with this question in a decisive way. The Hegelian school on the whole had assumed that the idea of the unity of the human and divine had found its concrete realization in the historical person of Jesus Christ.<sup>55</sup> But Strauss, in agreement with Hegel's concept of historical development, could argue that there were no absolute points in the historical process. For that is not the way the Idea (in the metaphysical sense in which this term was used by the Hegelians) realized itself in history.

If reality is ascribed to the idea of the unity of the divine and human natures, is this equivalent to the admission that this unity must actually have been once manifested, as it never had been, and never more will be, in one individual? This is indeed not the mode in which Idea realizes itself; it is not wont to lavish all its fulness on one exemplar, and be niggardly towards all others--to express itself perfectly in that one individual, and imperfectly in all the rest: it rather loves to distribute its riches among a multiplicity of exemplars which reciprocally complete each other--in the alternate appearance and suppression of a series of individuals.<sup>56</sup>

This was the critical point at which Strauss took issue with all those Christologies, particularly those of Schleiermacher and the Hegelians, which ascribed an absolute religious significance to the historical

---

<sup>55</sup>Strauss, op. cit., p. 778 (German ed., p. 773).

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., pp. 779-780 (German ed., p. 734).

Jesus.

For Strauss, on the contrary, it was not the historical Jesus but humanity which constituted the absolute content of Christology. The "Christ" of the church is not an individual, but an "idea," in the Hegelian sense. For the properties and functions which the church ascribes to Christ contradict themselves in an individual God-man, but harmonize in the race. It therefore becomes necessary, to use a modern expression, to "demythologize" the life of Christ, and this is the only place where Strauss deals in a positive way with the religious significance of the gospels:

Humanity is the union of the two natures-- God becomes man, the infinite manifesting itself in the finite, and the finite spirit remembering its infinitude; it is the child of the visible Mother and the invisible Father, Nature and Spirit; it is the worker of miracles, insofar as in the course of human history the spirit more and more completely subjugates nature, both within and around man, until it lies before him as the inert matter on which he exercises his active power; it is the sinless existence, for the course of its development is a blameless one, pollution cleaves to the individual only, and does not touch the race or its history. It is Humanity that dies, rises, and ascends to heaven, for from the negation of its phenomenal life there ever proceeds a higher spiritual life; from the suppression of its mortality as a personal, national, and terrestrial spirit, arises its union with the infinite spirit of the heavens. By faith in this Christ, especially in his death and resurrection, man is justified before God; that is, by the kindling within him of the idea

of Humanity, the individual man participates in the divinely human life of the species. Now the main element of that idea is, that the negation of the merely natural and sensual life, which is itself the negation of the spirit (the negation of negation, therefore), is the sole way to true spiritual life.<sup>57</sup>

If, historically speaking, this absolute content of Christology originally became attached to the person and life of the historical Jesus, this was due, first of all, to the fact that his personality and fate became the occasion for the rise of that content in the general consciousness of men, and, secondly, because the mentality of the age was such that it could only conceive of the idea of humanity in the concrete form of an individual. But it must now be recognized that the reference of the content of Christology to an individual was only a temporal and popular form of this concept of humanity; the validity of the idea is independent of its historical origin, and once it attains consciousness it no longer requires the attestation of history, but finds its sole attestation in philosophy.<sup>58</sup>

This was the result, then, of Strauss' attempt to reinterpret Christology in terms of Hegelian

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 780 (German ed., p. 735).

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., pp. 780 ff (German ed., pp. 735-737).

philosophy and speculative theology. Strauss went one step further than the Hegelian theologians: he relegated even the idea of an individual God-man to the realm of Vorstellung, i.e., "myth" for Strauss, and thereby divorced the Christ of faith from the historical Jesus. The validity of the God-man concept does not depend on its realization in an historical individual, which for Strauss was an impossibility. In direct contrast to Schleiermacher, Strauss abandoned any thought of the centrality of the historical Jesus for faith and in his place substituted the idea of a divine humanity. The shadowy figure of the Jesus of history who lies behind the gospel records ultimately has nothing to do with faith. Although it may have been his life which gave rise, historically speaking, to the idea of a divine humanity, he cannot be the proper object of faith: religious truth is not dependent upon history. Whereas for Schleiermacher, the gospels were still indispensable historical sources for the life of Jesus, for Strauss their primary significance was mythological: they merely point to eternal truths whose validity is established philosophically. This explains why Strauss, in the preface to his Leben Jesu, so confidently affirmed that the essence of the Christian

faith could never be disturbed by historical criticism.<sup>59</sup> The ideal "Christ," the absolute truth of the unity of the divine and human, once grasped by the human mind remains independent of its historical origins and can never be shaken by an historical criticism.

Strauss' attempt to divorce the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith--history and theology--met with little acceptance among his contemporaries. But his radical criticism of the gospels suddenly made the problem of the historical Jesus a burning issue for theology and historical research. In order to understand this result, it is necessary to consider more closely Strauss' methodology in contrast with that of his predecessors.

All previous attempts to write a "life of Jesus," both rationalistic and supernaturalistic, had proceeded from the dogmatic assumption that the content of the gospels was essentially historical, and that, by critical means, it would be possible to arrive at a clear picture of the historical Jesus as the given fact which corresponded to the content of faith and on which faith could find its support.

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. XXX (German ed., p. vii).

The rationalists attempted to eliminate the supernatural from the gospels by rationalizing the miracles in terms of natural law. What appeared to be of miraculous origin was the result of deception or ignorance. When such elements were eliminated, history revealed a true teacher of rational religion. As Strauss showed, the result of this dogmatic method was often a violent and arbitrary treatment of the Gospel narratives. Schleiermacher also, though making allowance for the divine in the life of Jesus, followed a dogmatic procedure. He dismissed as irrelevant those features of the evangelical tradition, e.g., the resurrection, ascension, second coming of Christ, which were unessential to his conception of the significance of Jesus. Since he refused to admit the possibility of "absolute miracle," Schleiermacher also rationalized the miracles of the gospels in such a way as to bring them into conformity with his conception of the person of Christ.<sup>60</sup> Under the guise of historical criticism such dogmatic methods arbitrarily forced the gospels into modern thought forms

---

<sup>60</sup>Cf. Strauss' criticism of Schleiermacher's lectures on the life of Jesus in Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet, 1864, § 5, pp. 18-23. Authorized translation (2 vol.), A New Life of Jesus, London, 1865, 1, § 5, pp. 19-25.

and did violence to the intention of the writers.

Over against such unhistorical treatment of the gospels, Strauss, first of all, demanded an objective criticism of the historicity of the gospels, free from all dogmatic presuppositions. The disinterested critic cannot assume the basic historicity of his sources, but must first inquire as to "whether and to what extent we stand upon historical grounds in the gospels": he cannot begin by assuming the correspondence of faith and history, but must first investigate whether or not the gospels are historically reliable. With this radical demand, Strauss called into question the work of all his predecessors. The fundamental cause of their mistakes lay in taking the historical reliability of the gospels for granted. Rather, the truly objective historian must start from the assumption that his historical sources are unreliable until proved otherwise. Thus Strauss became the first to introduce an attitude of historical scepticism into the study of the gospels.

Strauss' attitude toward the contradictions and improbabilities of the gospel records distinguished his approach from that of his predecessors. The difference is illuminated in a passage from his popular *Life of Jesus*:

The object now, therefore, must be to show that the attempt to conceal or to explain away the supernatural in the gospel details was vain, and that consequently they were not to be claimed as strictly historical. The inference rested not only on the miraculous character of the accounts, but on their contradictions and inconsistencies, as well with general history and probability as with each other, especially when it was found that in each instance of an ostensibly supernatural occurrence it was far more difficult to conceive the event so happening than certain causes which might have originated an unhistorical account of it.<sup>61</sup>

The discrepancies and inconsistencies of the gospel records play an important part in Strauss' criticism, for to him they indicate the unhistorical character of the narratives. But since the rationalists clung to the historicity of the narratives, these incompatibilities had to be explained away in some fashion so as to bring the gospels into harmony with the modern world-view. Strauss, on the other hand, sought only to explain the causes which produced them.<sup>62</sup> And his explanation is the creative mythological mentality of the primitive church. Whereas the rationalists had been compelled to disparage the qualifications of the gospel writers

---

<sup>61</sup>A New Life of Jesus, p. 34 (German ed., p. 30).

<sup>62</sup>In this sense, N. Perrin said, "So far as the rise of redaction criticism is concerned, however, the impact of Strauss' work was far from barren--even though the results were not immediate." What is Redaction Criticism?, Philadelphia, 1969, p. 5.

in order to interpret them in accordance with the rationalistic world-view, Strauss with a stronger historical sense sought at least to enter sympathetically into the minds of the writers in order to understand why they wrote as they did, without disparaging their competency. Thus, though Strauss took a more radical view of the historical reliability of the documents than his predecessors, he took a more historical view of the writers. Ultimately, Strauss is more interested in the psychological process which produced the gospels than in the events they record. He starts from the mentality of the church in which the gospels originated, and thereby tries to account for the character of the gospels as historical documents. Instead of a dogmatic approach, his is psychological. And the mythological interest predominates over the interest in historical facts.

Strauss' mythological approach, however, was rejected, and a new historical interest in the life of Jesus blossomed forth in the nineteenth century. In part, this was due to the growing influence of historical positivism on Biblical scholarship. Hegel had pointed to the absolutes in the human mind and discounted experience. Idealism in general was characterized by its belief in the absolute creativity

of human reason. But after the middle of the nineteenth century Hegelian Idealism increasingly became discredited in the theological and philosophical world, and the rise of naturalism and positivism completely reversed the situation. Speculative theology and metaphysics now fell into disfavor, and experience became absolute. Truth is to be sought by empirical means alone. The goal of historical study becomes "bare" facts, the "assured results" of the empirical historical method, as the only adequate basis for true knowledge. The objective facts of history, stripped of all subjective interpretation, are alone to be trusted. Hence the subjectivity of Strauss' psychological method is repudiated. In the spirit of the new positivism, Biblical criticism becomes a literary criticism of the documents. The new historico-critical school is not interested in the mentality of the writers, but in the documents themselves and the literary sources which lay behind them, as a means ultimately of recovering reliable sources for the reconstruction of historical fact.

Thus Strauss instituted a study of the t/  
gospels which was independent of his method. Negative  
reaction to Strauss' radical treatment of the gospels

inspired a long series of attempts to write the life of Jesus. The development of the new critical methods inspired the age with confidence in the possibility of re-discovering the true historical Jesus, by separating fact from interpretation in the gospel records.

Yet the new criticism shared Strauss' attitude in two respects. In the first place, it shared Strauss' historical radicalism in so far as it did not assume the reliability of a historical document until it could be demonstrated. It was not Strauss' demand for an objective historical treatment of the gospels, free from all dogmatic bias, that offended his contemporaries, but his indifference to the historical element in the gospels. Both Strauss and the historico-critical school demanded an impartial testing of the historicity of the documents, and both sought to distinguish between the historical and un-historical. The assumption of historical objectivity was common to both.

Secondly, this historical radicalism was coupled with a belief in the absolute value of the results of the critical method. Faith must base itself upon the "assured results" of objective critical scholarship. For Strauss, the "assured

result" was that the gospels are primarily mythological, the product of the faith of the church.<sup>63</sup> Faith, therefore, can no longer accept the presupposition of a historical God-man, but it may discover true Christianity in the mythology of the gospels. For historical positivism the "assured result" is an accurate picture of the historical Jesus, who alone is the worthy object of faith. Thus, it is the influence of positivism on Biblical scholarship which accounts in part for the prominent place which is given to the life of Jesus in the nineteenth century.

Strauss' verdict on the importance of the historical Jesus is practically reversed. Whereas Strauss had minimized the importance of the historical elements in the gospels and was interested, ultimately, in the ideal truths expressed in the form of mythology, the historico-critical school dismissed the mythology and attached an absolute value to the residue of historical fact which remained. In other words, Strauss dismissed the historical Jesus and sought to retain the ideal Christ of dogma, whereas the later nineteenth century rejected the

---

<sup>63</sup>Cf. Willi Marxsen, who affirms that the New Testament is indeed the book of the church, as long as it leads to faith in Jesus Christ. Das Neue Testament als Buch der Kirche, 1966. E.T. by J. E. Mignard, The New Testament as the Church's Book?, Philadelphia, 1972.

Christ of dogma and accepted the historical Jesus. Everything which could be attributed in some way to the faith of the primitive church, which was therefore subjective interpretation, was to be eliminated as unhistorical, and the remaining historical element was to constitute the reliable basis of the Christian faith. The historical Jesus and the Christ for faith--history and theology--tended to become separate, but the scale of values, which Strauss had used, is reversed. Thus, the old rationalistic distinction between the religion of Jesus and the religion which has Christ for its object is transposed into the more complex problem of the Jesus of history versus the Christ of faith.

It is to be noted that for Strauss as well as for Schleiermacher, the gospels are still of primary importance for the Christian faith. This predilection for the gospels was a characteristic of humanism in the nineteenth century in general. But it was inevitable that the Apostle Paul should also become a problem for New Testament scholarship. The development of Biblical criticism in the nineteenth century also resulted in a study of the Pauline epistles which for some time paralleled that of the gospels. With the growing absolutism of the critical method, it then becomes inevitable that the "historical"

Paul and the historical Jesus should conflict. Eventually the question must be raised as to how the new historical portrait of Jesus compares with what Paul had to say about Christianity. The problem of the Jesus of history versus the Christ of faith then becomes specifically the problem of the historical Jesus versus the Christ of Paul, or "Jesus versus Paul."

## CHAPTER II

### THE REDISCOVERY OF THE THEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL

The beginnings of Pauline research in the nineteenth century were of a less sensational character than in the case of the research in the life of Jesus. In fact, the early critical study of the life and theology of Paul was largely overshadowed by the furor which Strauss' Life of Jesus had created. Nevertheless, through the scholarly and meticulous labors of one man in particular, the Apostle Paul was introduced into the world of nineteenth century scholarship. Through the work of F. C. Baur, attention was increasingly drawn to the study of the Book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles. In the hands of Baur, the historical method gained a refinement and a respectability which it had not yet attained in New Testament scholarship. Beginning with Baur, Pauline research develops more or less independently alongside the study of the life of Jesus.

A. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR  
(1792-1860)

F. C. Baur received his early theological education at the University of Tübingen under the influence of the rationalistic supernaturalism of the so-called "Old Tübingen school." It was here that Ernst Bengel, grandson of the great biblical scholar J. A. Bengel, turned Baur's interest to historical studies, an interest which shaped his whole career. However, the conservative theological environment of Baur's early years left no deep impression on his independent spirit. While as professor at Blaubeuren (1817-1826) the study of Schleiermacher and Schelling directed his interests toward philosophy of religion. It was here, also, that the study of B. G. Niebuhr's Römische Geschichte, with its source analysis and Tendenz criticism, equipped him with a sound historical method which he later applied to his historical studies.<sup>1</sup> In 1826 he was called back to

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Fraedrich, Ferdinand Christian Baur, der Begründer der Tübinger Schule, als Theologe, Schriftsteller und Charakter, Gotha, 1909, pp. 19 ff. For the influence of Niebuhr on F. C. Baur, see K. Scholder, "Ferdinand Christian Baur als Historiker," EvT, 21 (1961), 436 ff. For the historical survey of 'source-criticism' and 'tendency-criticism,' see Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles (E.T., from the 14th German edition (1965), by B. Noble and G. Schinn, under the supervision of H. Anderson, and with the translation revised and brought up to date by R. McL. Wilson), Oxford, 1971, pp. 15-34.

Tübingen as a professor, where he remained for the rest of his life. In the crucial years from 1826 to 1835 Baur gradually swung from Schleiermacher to Hegel. Though he never acknowledged himself as a pupil of Hegel, there can be no doubt that he took both his concept of the nature of religion as well as his view of historical development from Hegel.<sup>2</sup>

At Tübingen, Baur gradually acquired a following of students and became the creator of a new "Tübingen school," which soon became famous for its radical historical criticism of the New Testament and the history of the early Christian church. From about 1830 on, Baur displayed an increasing preoccupation with the historical study of the New Testament, particularly the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles. A long series of preliminary studies, which began in 1831 and were published for the most part in the Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie culminated in the appearance of a monograph study of the life and theology of the Apostle Paul, Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre (1845, 2nd edition 1866-67). Although

---

<sup>2</sup>Cf. H. Schmidt's article on "Baur" in RPTK, II, 470-472.

Baur's interest in the study of Paul did not cease with the publication of his Paulus, he turned his attention to the study of the canonical gospels in 1844, nine years after the appearance of Strauss' Leben Jesu in 1835 had made the problem of the gospels an acute issue in the theological world. His major work on the gospels, Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung, appeared in 1847. The last years of Baur's life were devoted to the study of church history, a direct outgrowth of his previous study of the New Testament canon. After the publication of his Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung in 1852, Baur undertook the ambitious project of writing a history of the church from the time of Jesus up to the present. Three volumes were published between 1835 and 1860, the year of his death. The fourth and fifth volumes were prepared from his notes and published in 1862 and 1863. A work on New Testament theology was also published posthumously by his son, F. F. Baur: Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie, 1864.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 467-483. For detailed biographies, see Fraedrich, op. cit., and Ernst Wilhelm Schneider, Ferdinand Christian Baur in seiner Bedeutung für die Theologie, München, 1909. K. Barth, Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert, pp. 450 ff. E.T., pp. 499-507.

Baur's Paulus was unquestionably his Lieblingswerk. On no other individual in the history of the primitive church, including Jesus, did he lavish more time and painstaking research.<sup>4</sup> The particular stage of history which is the object of his attention in the study of Paul concerns the practical realization of the idea of Christianity first expressed in the consciousness of Jesus. This first became a problem when the idea entered the consciousness of men as a living power through the death and resurrection of Jesus and found in the limitations of national Judaism the chief obstacle to the attainment of its weltgeschichtliche reality. The study of the life of Paul deals with the question of how these limitations were broken through, how Christianity, instead of remaining a mere form of Judaism, acquired the status of an independent principle in order to break loose from Judaism and to oppose it as an essentially different form of religious consciousness and life, free from all national particularism. That Christianity in its universal historical significance first came into existence through the Apostle Paul is for Baur an undeniable

---

<sup>4</sup>Fraëdrich, op. cit., p. 171.

historical fact; the question only remains as to how this occurred---the question which Baur proposes to answer in his treatment of the life and theology of Paul.<sup>5</sup>

It was Baur's view, held in opposition to the traditional assumption of the harmonious development of the apostolic church, that the primitive church was rent by a sharp conflict between two opposing parties: The Judaizing party of Peter, and the hellenistic party of Paul. This view, worked out in its main outlines as early as 1831,<sup>6</sup> was the starting point of Baur's interpretation of the life and theology of Paul and eventually provided the objective basis for his criticism of the entire New Testament canon.

Baur's Paulus is divided into three main parts. The first part consists primarily in a thorough criticism of the Book of Acts. He regarded

---

<sup>5</sup>F. C. Baur, Paul, The Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings, Translated by E. Zeller, Williams and Norgate, 1876, I, 3-5 (German ed., Stuttgart, 1845, p. 3).

<sup>6</sup>"Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie, 1831, Viertes Heft, pp. 61-206.

Acts as a Tendenzschrift whose purpose was to provide an apology for the Apostle Paul by minimizing as much as possible the real differences between him and Peter.<sup>7</sup> For this reason Baur dated the book late in the second century, presupposing a situation in which a weakened Pauline party had been compelled to preserve its existence by making compromises with and concessions to a powerful Jewish Christian party.<sup>8</sup> The author of the book is not Luke who is represented in Col.4:14 seems to indicate but rather an unidentifiable but ecumenically minded Paulinist.<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, for Baur, the book of Acts has only secondary value as a historical source for the life of Paul.<sup>10</sup> The main content of Paul's life is to be derived from the genuine Pauline epistles. Along with the other miraculous elements in Acts, Baur also

---

<sup>7</sup>Paul, I, 5 ff (German ed., pp. 5 ff). Cf. E. Zeller, Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht, Stuttgart, 1854, pp. 316-343.

<sup>8</sup>Paul, pp. 12-13 (German ed., pp. 11-12).

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. W. W. Gasque, "The historical value of the Book of Acts. The perspective of British Scholarship," TZ, 28 (1972), 177-196.

denies the possibility of a miraculous conversion of Paul;<sup>11</sup> he insists on the complete independence of Paul over against the original apostles<sup>12</sup> and the radical cleavage between Paul and the Jewish Christians;<sup>13</sup> finally, he rejects the traditional hypothesis of a missionary journey to Spain and a second imprisonment in Rome.<sup>14</sup>

In part two Baur turns to the study of the content of the thirteen epistles traditionally assigned to Paul, and seeks to place each in the context of the historical development of the primitive church. Of the thirteen, Baur accepts only Galatians, I and II Corinthians, and Romans as genuine epistles of Paul. These four epistles represent stages in the development of the Pauline Lehrbegriff as it evolved out of his conflict with the Jewish Christians. In Galatians Paul presented the basic elements of his Christianity and freed the latter from the external legalism which demanded circumcision as a necessary condition for salvation. In the two letters to the Corinthians the stage of elementary principle passes over into the stage of practical conflict over the

---

<sup>11</sup>Paul, Ch. III.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., Ch. IV.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., Ch. V.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., Ch. IX.

authority of the Apostle, and Paul here defended his full right to apostleship along with those apostles who had been directly commissioned by Jesus. In Romans we reach the sphere of abstract dogmatic controversy in which Paul eliminates the last vestige of Jewish particularism by showing that it was only a vanishing element of the Christian universalism which embraces all nations. The elementary principles set forth in Galatians have now become a fully developed system in Romans. The remainder of the epistles usually assigned to Paul are rejected because they presuppose later stages of the Petrine-Pauline conflict and reflect later problems of the primitive church. Furthermore, according to Baur, the later epistles lack the originality and depth of the four genuine epistles, which are characterized by an organic, dialectical development of thought from one root idea.<sup>15</sup>

In the third part, Baur undertakes the presentation of Paul's distinctive Lehrbegriff. Conspicuous by its absence is any attempt to arrange the material under the traditional dogmatic loci.

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 246 ff (German ed., pp. 499-500). Baur also classified the remainder of the epistles (except four) as "antilegomena."

Instead, Baur proceeds genetically, treating the system as an organic whole developed from one central idea. The first chapter treats "the principle of the Christian consciousness" as the presupposition and basis of Paul's theology. The essence of the Christian principle, as exemplified in the Apostle's conversion, consists in its absoluteness, i.e., its liberation from all external and material limitations. But the Christian principle has its absoluteness only insofar as it is identical with the person of Christ.<sup>16</sup> In the case of Paul, the decisive transformation of his former Jewish Messianic consciousness occurred through the contemplation of the death of Christ, which led him to renounce everything national and Jewish in the Messianic idea. In the death of Christ the Apostle saw the purification of the Messianic idea from all the finite and sensual elements of Judaism, and its elevation to the truly spiritual consciousness in which Christ can be comprehended as the absolute principle of the spiritual life.<sup>17</sup> More precisely defined, the Christian consciousness consists in the awareness

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., II, 132 (German ed., p. 513).

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., II, Ch. II.

of possessing the spirit as an essentially spiritual principle which forbids the Christian from making his salvation dependent upon anything merely external, sensual, or material, but makes him conscious of his immediate communion and unity with God.<sup>18</sup> This spirit, as the principle of the Christian consciousness, is furthermore identical with the Absolute Spirit of God. When the Christian knows himself to be identical with the Spirit of God, he becomes conscious of being absolutely free from all finite limitations. "The Lord is the Spirit," (II Cor. 3:17) and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is complete freedom of the self-consciousness.<sup>19</sup>

Having thus defined Paul's conception of the Christian consciousness as essentially spiritual, whose content consists in the awareness of union with God, or of reconciliation with him, the question arises as to how this reconciliation is effected. Baur finds the answer in Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, which he regards as the chief

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

doctrine of his system.<sup>20</sup> Two entire chapters are devoted to the discussion of justification in its negative and positive aspects. Baur starts from the definition of Paul's concept of righteousness as primarily a subjective condition of man, which in its objective aspect designates that adequate relationship between man and God which is the goal of justification. Two forms of righteousness are theoretically possible: the Jewish righteousness through works of the law, and the Christian righteousness through faith.<sup>21</sup> Paul rejects the former as impossible of attainment because man is ruled by the sensuous principle of the flesh. The adequate moral relationship between man and God can only be attained through faith which has Christ, or, more precisely, the death of Christ as its object.<sup>22</sup> With respect to the interpretation of the death of Christ, Baur discovers two opposing elements in Paul's doctrine of justification. The one, a legal and juridical element, assumes that the death of Christ satisfies the justice of God, and finds expression

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., pp. 141-147 (German ed., pp. 522-523).

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., pp. 147 ff (German ed., pp. 523-525).

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 158 (German ed., p. 536).

in the ideas of expiation and substitution. The other, the moral element of grace, comprehends the death of Christ as an act of God's love. The latter predominates in Paul's thought, and must ultimately be regarded as the basis of the former. Thus, grace is the objective, and faith the subjective principle of justification.<sup>23</sup> Then follows a description of the subjective realization of justification in the believer. Through faith, as a living relationship with Christ, believers not only attain the negative righteousness which consists in freedom from the guilt of sin, but they are positively placed into an adequate relationship with God through the principle of the spirit, or "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus." When the law of sin and death is overcome through the law of the spirit, then what was at first only imputed righteousness becomes actual righteousness, and man is truly placed in a relationship to God adequate to the idea of God.<sup>24</sup>

The following chapters consist in the further elaboration and development of Pauline theology on

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 160 ff (German ed., pp. 539-544).

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 163 f (German ed., pp. 547-548).

the basis of the ideas already discussed and require no special treatment. They consist of the following: "Christ as the principle of the fellowship founded by him," "The relationship of Christianity to paganism and Judaism," "Christianity as a new principle of universal historical development," "Faith, love, and hope, the three elements of the Christian consciousness," "Special discussion of certain secondary dogmatic problems," and "Certain traits of the Apostle's Individuality."

Although not the first treatment in monograph form of the Apostle Paul, Baur's work marks the beginning of a new epoch in Biblical theology. A brief survey of previous works on Paul will emphasize the significance of Baur's study. The latter's serious and sympathetic treatment of the Apostle Paul stands in the sharpest contrast to the superficial judgments of the older rationalists. An interesting contrast is to be found in an English work on Paul by Jeremy Bentham: Not Paul, But Jesus.<sup>25</sup> Composed in the spirit of early rationalism, the book, as the title suggests, is an attack

---

<sup>25</sup>Published in London under the pseudonym of "Gamaliel Smith," 1823.

upon the Apostle Paul. Though the early rationalists were inclined to dismiss Paul without special treatment, this particular work undertakes a detailed examination of the life of Paul with special reference to the narratives in the book of Acts. The motive which prompted Bentham, however, was not primarily an interest in a rationalistic conception of religion; it represents, rather, part of an attack against the Church in England which originated out of a dispute over public education between the Church and a group of Utilitarians, of which Bentham was a member.<sup>26</sup> Without any real grasp of historical criticism, Bentham seeks to show that Paul's conversion was not genuine, that he was motivated by selfish ambitions, that his religion had nothing to do with the religion of Jesus, and finally he suggests that Paul may be regarded as the real "anti-Christ."<sup>27</sup>

Of a more positive and constructive character were the early attempts to present the Lehrbegriff

---

<sup>26</sup>E. Halévy, The growth of philosophic radicalism, E.T. by Mary Morris, London, 1928, pp. 289-291.

<sup>27</sup>J. Bentham, op. cit., pp. vii-viii. Bentham was neither a theologian nor historian, but a jurist and philosopher of the Utilitarian school.

of Paul, particularly in the work of Usteri, Neander, and Dähne. Usteri in the fourth edition of his book (1832) had freed himself to some extent from the dogmatic method which characterized the earlier editions, but his division of Paul's theology into pre-Christian and Christian periods is somewhat arbitrary. Under the influence of Schleiermacher, he interpreted Paul's theology from the standpoint of redemption rather than from justification by faith.<sup>28</sup> Neander, like Usteri, interpreted Pauline theology from the viewpoint of redemption, although he placed greater emphasis on justification by faith than Usteri and did not adopt the latter's arbitrary division of the material.<sup>29</sup> Dähne, in the spirit of the Lutheran revival, attempted to interpret Paul from the angle of justification by faith, and, to this extent, at least, directly anticipated Baur.<sup>30</sup> None of these three works, however, are completely

---

<sup>28</sup>Leonhard Usteri, Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffes in seinem Verhältnisse zur biblischen Dogmatik des Neuen Testaments. Ein exegetisch-dogmatischer Versuch, Zürich, 1832.

<sup>29</sup>J. A. W. Neander, Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel, Zweiter Band, Hamburg, 1833, pp. 503-656.

<sup>30</sup>A. F. Dähne, Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffs, Halle, 1835.

free from dogmatic interest. They all accept the genuineness of the thirteen Pauline epistles, and, although willing to see the peculiarity of Pauline theology, they presuppose the essential unity and harmony of all the doctrinal types in the New Testament.

Mention may also be made of another monograph on the life of Paul which appeared in England a few years after Baur's: The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, by W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson.<sup>31</sup> Also written from a conservative point of view, the book aims to write a life of the Apostle based on the thirteen Pauline epistles and the Acts of the Apostles. It contains extensive archaeological and geographical information for the historical background of Paul, along with translations of Paul's speeches in Acts and of his epistles. The documents are not subjected to criticism, nor is a systematic presentation of Pauline theology attempted. The approach to the life of Paul is positivistic: the facts are merely presented without attempting to evaluate the historical significance of Paul. No influence of Baur's work is

---

<sup>31</sup>London, 1850-52, two volumes.

to be detected in this study of the life of Paul.<sup>32</sup>

In contrast to the aforementioned works on Paul, Baur is the first to apply consistently the historical method and to interpret Pauline theology in terms of the historical development of the primitive church. Baur's Paulus challenged on every hand the prevailing interpretations of Paul and the history of the early church. Over against the conservative view of the essentially harmonious relationship between the early apostles, Baur emphasized the cleavage between the Petrine and Pauline elements in the church. Instead of a static existence of types which mutually supplement each other, Baur discovered stages of progressive development. His radical criticism of traditional Pauline epistles

---

<sup>32</sup>It is interesting that this work on the life of Paul appears in connection with the Evangelical movement in the church of England in the nineteenth century. See the article on "Howson" in SHERK, V, 382. Thus the revival of personal piety and the Biblical religion provide the context for a new interest in the Apostle Paul. It is the writers' hope that such a biography of Paul may "be useful in strengthening the hearts of some against the peculiar form of unbelief most current at the present day. The more faithfully we can represent to ourselves the life, outward and inward, of St. Paul, in all its fulness, the more unreasonable must appear the theory that Christianity had a mythical origin; and the stronger must be our ground for believing his testimony to the divine nature and miraculous history of our Redeemer" (p. XV). The allusion to the "mythical origin" of Christianity undoubtedly reflects repercussions in England to Strauss' Leben Jesu, 1835.

and the book of Acts challenged the traditional view of the life and theology of the Apostle. The theology of Paul now becomes a historical problem which cannot be solved apart from his life and the intimately related question of the genuineness of the epistles.

On the other hand, Baur equally challenged the rationalistic view of Paul and the history of the early church. Far from perverting the religion of Jesus, Paul stands out as the greatest of the followers of Jesus, who almost single-handedly liberated Christianity from the shackles of Judaism. After Baur, Paul may still be maligned, but he can no longer be dismissed as lightly as the older rationalists had done. Baur's Paulus constituted the strongest challenge yet to be raised against the rationalistic and humanistic emphasis upon Jesus.

This study of Paul, with its positive evaluation of his historical significance and its interpretation of his theology from justification by faith, represents a remarkable achievement in its time. Here we find the ripe fruit of the development of historical methodology and the philosophy of history. At the same time it manifests the new theological trends of the nineteenth century. The changed theological climate which made such a work

possible reflects the influence of the Lutheran revival of the early nineteenth century with its rediscovery of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith. A work like Baur's would have been inconceivable in the eighteenth century. The new theological interests inspired by the Lutheran revival is also to be seen in the fact that Baur wrote an essay on Andreas Osiander's doctrine of justification by faith in Epistola Gratulatoria ad D. Theophilum Jakobum Planck,<sup>33</sup> and also in his almost life-long interest in Reformation theology.<sup>34</sup>

Of particular importance for the later study of Paul as well as for the problem of Jesus and Paul is Baur's portrait of the Apostle. As a Hegelian, Baur's primary interest in history is ideas, and Paul accordingly stands out for Baur as the leading thinker of the primitive church. The Hegelian love for system may also, to some extent, be reflected in Baur's preference for Paul. It is characteristic that Baur finds the innate impulse toward rational,

---

<sup>33</sup>Programma: "Über die Richtfertigungslehre. Andr. Osianders, in der Epistola Gratulatoria ad. D. Theophilum Jakobum Planck, 1831.

<sup>34</sup>See the list of Baur's works in Fraedrich, op. cit., pp. 377-382.

reflective contemplation to be the great distinguishing characteristic of the Apostle. Furthermore, it is the dialectical, logical character of Paul's thought which obviously appeals to Baur, and it is this capacity of Paul which, according to Baur, was especially suited for the development of the free, universal and absolute principle of Christianity. Baur also interpreted Paul's development in terms of a completely inward spiritual and intellectual process. That Paul could have derived important elements of his theology from external sources, e.g., Judaism or Hellenism, never comes into consideration with Baur. Paul is made completely independent of early Jewish Christianity and the original disciples, and his hellenistic background remains a somewhat nebulous and undefined entity. The death and resurrection of Jesus alone is the starting point from which his speculative thought takes its course. Paul's theology, therefore, appears as the highly original and independent creation of a speculative thinker.

Thus, we find in Baur the beginning of that interpretation of Paul in terms of speculative theology so important for the later problem of Jesus and Paul. However, it is to be noted that since Baur places the main emphasis on a subjective understanding

of justification by faith, the contrast between Jesus and Paul is not yet so great as later in the nineteenth century when the emphasis in Paul is shifted to speculative Christology. Since the essence of the Christian consciousness consists, for Paul, in the awareness of immediate communion with God, Baur sees no real conflict between the religion of Jesus and that of Paul. But when Christology or soteriology is substituted for justification by faith as the center of Pauline theology, the contrast between Paul and Jesus is more sharply felt.

Furthermore, it is significant that the assertion of the originality and the uniqueness of Paul's theology--e.g., the fact that the spiritual Christ is made the object of faith--never constituted a problem for Baur. Nor could it become the basis for affirming a discontinuity in the development of the Christian religion, as was the case with the rationalists. The reason for this is to be found in Baur's Hegelian philosophy of history. Baur expressed the essence of his interpretation of history as follows:

Oder soll denn etwa darüber noch ein Zweifel sein, ob die Geschichte der christlichen Kirche die Bewegung der Idee der Kirche ist, somit auch nicht bloss aus einer Reihe von Veränderung besteht, die nur in zufälliger Folge sich an einander reihen? Spricht man mit Recht von einer Idee der Kirche, so muss auch diese Idee, wie jede andere, den lebendigen Trieb in sich

haben, aus sich herauszugeben, und in einer Reihe von Erscheinungen sich zu verwicklichen, die nur als die verschiedenen Seiten des Verhältnisses betrachtet werden können, das überhaupt zwischen der Idee und ihrer Erscheinung stattfindet.<sup>35</sup>

Accordingly Baur interprets history by means of a transcendental principle. History is the realm of necessity in which the "Idee," in the Hegelian sense, seeks to realize and objectify itself; otherwise expressed, it is the spirit seeking to attain the consciousness of its freedom. The individual becomes the instrument of the Idea, but only in such a way that the Idea becomes identical with his own self-consciousness. In this way the paradoxical relationship between freedom and necessity in history is maintained. Thus, according to Baur, the principle which lays hold of Paul is the immanent principle of his self-consciousness, and he is aware of his own independence and autonomy. The triumph of the spiritual principle over all opposition is at the same time Paul's personal sense of victory in the conflict with Judaism.<sup>36</sup> Consequently, Paul, in spite of all his individuality, does not represent an arbitrary

---

<sup>35</sup>Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschicht-  
schreibung, Tübingen, 1852, pp. 248-249.

<sup>36</sup>Paul, II, 129 f (German ed., p. 653).

deviation from the religion of Jesus, but rather a necessary stage in the development of the Idea of Christianity or the church.

Likewise, the conflict between Paul and the Jewish Christians represents a necessary stage of development. The idea which first found expression in the consciousness of Jesus seeks its practical realization through this conflict in the primitive church. The original idea differentiates itself into two opposing elements; Paul and the Jewish Christians each grasp one aspect of the original idea and enter into conflict with each other. Only through this dialectical conflict can the full implications of the original idea be apprehended. The subsequent synthesis of the opposing elements brings us to a higher stage of truth and the process begins anew.

The practical application of Baur's philosophy of history is to be seen most clearly in his reconstruction of the history of the church. In the first volume of his church history, Baur summarizes and further evaluates the results of his continuing study of the New Testament canon.<sup>37</sup> A brief

---

<sup>37</sup>F. C. Baur, Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, Tübingen, 1853. A second revised edition was published in 1860, in which Baur sought to develop further and clarify certain points of the first edition. The third edition, 1863, is identical with the second.

resumé of this work is necessary, because here for the first time Baur is compelled to define more precisely the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul. After discussing the historical presuppositions of Christianity, the most important of which Baur gives as the political universalism of the Roman Empire, the moral consciousness of Greek philosophy, and the monotheism of Judaism,<sup>38</sup> Baur then turns to the consideration of the founder of Christianity, from whose person Christianity derived its whole meaning and significance. Two aspects of Jesus' life occupy his attention, namely, Jesus' teachings and his messianic consciousness. In the Sermon on the Mount and the parables which deal with man's subjective attitude toward the Kingdom of God and with the moral conditions necessary for participation in it, Baur finds the most original and genuine elements of the teachings of Jesus.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup>Geschichte der christlichen Kirche, Erster Band, Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, Dritte Ausgabe, Tübingen, 1863. E.T., from the 3rd edition, by Allan Menzies, The Church History of the first three centuries, London, 2 vols., 1878/79, pp. 1-23.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., pp. 34-35 (German ed., p. 34).

In the Sermon on the Mount, the original principle of Christianity appears as an absolute moral demand, which is distinguished from Jewish legalism by the fact that it consists not merely in external acts, but in an inward disposition which elevates itself above the external, the contingent, and particular to the universal, the unconditioned and essential.<sup>40</sup> It is this moral disposition which gives man his highest moral value and determines his relationship to God. The righteousness by which man may bring himself into an adequate relationship to God and which is the absolute condition for entrance into the Kingdom of God, consists in attaining such an inward disposition that he completely renounces his own will and surrenders himself absolutely to the will of God. In the Kingdom of God, the will of God becomes the common task of a fellowship of individuals, in which all together are to realize more perfectly the goal ordained by the divine will.<sup>41</sup>

Having completed the survey of Jesus' teaching, Baur makes the observation that Christianity was originally a purely ethical religion rooted in the moral consciousness of man. The demand for

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 29-33 (German ed., pp. 28 ff).

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 33-35 (German ed., pp. 32 ff).

faith in the person of Jesus, which later appears as the center of the gospel, did not constitute an essential part of the original Christian teaching.<sup>42</sup> Yet Christianity, merely as an abstract doctrine of religion and morality, could not have survived without the form of a concrete structure of religious life, without the firm center from which the circle of Jesus' followers could unite into a fellowship to gain the domination of the world. It was the person of Jesus, clothed in the Jewish messianic idea, which provided this firm center. By means of the messianic idea the spiritual content of Christianity first received the concrete form in which it could enter the course of its historical development, in which the consciousness of Jesus through the mediation of the national consciousness could become the universal world-consciousness.<sup>43</sup> According to Baur, Jesus himself was conscious of his messiahship, although his own messianic idea differed from the sensual messianic concept of Jewish particularism. The decision of Jesus to go to Jerusalem was an attempt to compel the nation to decide whether it would

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 37 (German ed., p. 35).

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 37-39 (German ed., pp. 35-36).

persist in its traditional messianic belief, or whether it would accept him as the kind of Messiah he had shown himself to be.<sup>44</sup> Consequently, the death of Jesus represented a complete break between him and Judaism. Since his death contradicted all Jewish messianic expectations, it was no longer possible for a Jew, as long as he remained a Jew, to believe in Jesus as the Messiah. Jesus' death must either destroy the faith in him, or, if that faith were strong enough, it must necessarily break through the bonds of death and force its way into life. The resurrection of Jesus, though outside the sphere of historical investigation, became historical fact in the consciousness of the disciples and dispersed the doubt which threatened their faith. Yet even though the breach with Judaism had been effected, the faith in the resurrected One, who has ascended into heaven and who would return shortly in his glory as the Son of Man to accomplish what he had left undone on earth, was still too limited in its outlook. This faith was merely a new form of the old messianic expectations, distinguished only by the belief that the Messiah had already appeared, Christianity would

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., pp. 39-41 (German ed., pp. 37-39).

have remained a mere sect of Judaism had not something occurred to elevate the faith in the resurrected one to a higher significance and to liberate the Christian principle from its narrow limitations.<sup>45</sup>

It is against this background that the great historical significance of Paul appears in the fact that he was the first to grasp the full implication of the principle of Christian universalism and to assert it over against all Jewish particularism. The history of the development of Christianity which begins with the death of Jesus finds a new beginning with Paul.<sup>46</sup> At this point Baur anticipates a problem which brings him to the essence of his view of the relationship between Jesus and Paul. Since Paul assumes an attitude of freedom and independence not only over against the other apostles, but also over against the person of the historical Jesus himself, the question arises whether that which constitutes the essence of Christianity over against Judaism may really be regarded as the work of the Apostle Paul.

---

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 41-43 (German ed., pp. 39-41).

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 46-48 (German ed., pp. 44-46). Baur expressly declared that "the teaching of Jesus could not be considered as the content of the history of dogma." Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, 2nd ed., 1858, p. 6, n. 2 (quoted from Kümmler, NT, p. 429, n. 197).

The distance which separated Paul from the founder of Christianity might, at first glance, seem too great for such an achievement, particularly without the mediation of the original disciples of Jesus. In answer, Baur points back to Jesus and the two elements which were united in his person: the moral universal, the unlimited human element which gave his person its absolute significance; and the limiting and confining element of the national Jewish messianic idea as the necessary form which the former must take to become the universal consciousness of humanity. One group of his followers, then, attached themselves to the national element so as never to transcend Jewish particularism, whereas the other of the two elements received a more definite and energetic emphasis in another group. Since both parties had their natural starting point in the life and work of the founder, the question only remains as to why Paul in his epistles appears to be so indifferent to the historical facts of Jesus' life, and particularly why he so little acts like a pupil of the Master whose name he confesses, and from whom he received the teachings and principles which he advocates. Baur replies that this very fact is evidence of how great and spiritual Paul's understanding of Christianity was. Paul comprehended Christianity in the unity and

immediacy of a divine revelation. The great facts of the death and resurrection of Jesus make Christianity what it is; Paul's whole Christian consciousness depends on these facts, and in them his consciousness attains to a view of the person of Jesus that needs no historical commentary.<sup>47</sup>

Why should he go to eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of Christ's life to ask what he was according to the flesh, when he was seen himself in the spirit? Why should he ask whether what he is teaching agrees with the original teaching of Jesus, and with the discourses and sayings which have been handed down from him, when in the Christ who lives and works in him he hears the voice of the Lord himself? Why should he draw from the past what the Christ who is present in him has made to be the direct utterance of his own consciousness?<sup>48</sup>

To complete the whole picture of Baur's reconstruction of the history of the early church, it is necessary to say only that Baur traces the development of the conflict between the Petrine and Pauline parties, as he finds it reflected in the canonical books of the New Testament and in early Christian literature, far into the second century. Gradually the sharpness of the original antithesis diminished, and the two opposing tendencies began to converge

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 48-50 (German ed., pp. 46-48).

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 50 (German ed., p. 48).

in a movement toward reconciliation.<sup>49</sup> The final synthesis is attained by the end of the second century. The whole process of development reached its goal ideally in the Gospel of John, and practically in the organization of the Roman church.<sup>50</sup>

Thus it becomes clear how Baur, by means of the Hegelian philosophy of history, solves the problem of the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul. It is the idea, first expressed in Jesus, which by its inner impulse moves through a dialectical development to its practical realization in the concrete reality of the church. Therefore there can be no cleavage between the consciousness of Jesus and the consciousness of Paul, no matter how great the distance between them may seem. There is a definite continuity between them, which is not to be understood in terms of a static relationship, but in terms of necessary progressive development. Paul is aware only of his freedom and independence, yet at the same time he is the instrument of the Idea which possesses him and drives him onward to its goal. Thus there can be no question of a conflict between him and the founder of Christianity.

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 99 ff; pp. 147 ff (German ed., pp. 94 ff; pp. 141 ff).

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 130 (German ed., p. 172).

It is not to be supposed that Baur started with a particular philosophy of history and arbitrarily manipulated history to suit the philosophical scheme. As the gradual development of his picture of primitive Christianity shows, Baur was conscious only of dealing with the objective facts of history attained by means of his historical method. The Hegelian philosophy of history appeared to offer him the most satisfying interpretation of these facts.

Baur was already aware of the fact that his portrait of the Apostle Paul created certain difficulties for the interpretation of the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul when the nature of historical development was not properly comprehended, i.e., when the Hegelian interpretation was not applied. Herein appears the significance of Baur for the problem of Jesus and Paul. Many features of his historical portrait of Paul became a more or less permanent part of Pauline research in the nineteenth century, but the Hegelian interpretation of history was soon modified or rejected altogether. As a result, the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul became a problem for New Testament theology. Baur's interpretation of Paul as a

speculative theologian, his insistence upon Paul's independence over against the original disciples, and the admitted indifference of Paul toward the historical Jesus created a new problem for the historical study of the New Testament--the historical problem of the relationship between the consciousness of Jesus and the consciousness of Paul. All these features of Baur's portrait of Paul could be used as arguments against the assumption of the continuity between Paul and Jesus. Conservative theology was therefore compelled to show that Paul had been well acquainted with the life and teachings of Jesus and to demonstrate the continuity between the teachings of Jesus and the theology of Paul. Thus the nineteenth century problem of Jesus and Paul was already implicit in Baur. The nineteenth century historical Jesus is confronted by Baur's historical Paul in such a way as to challenge the assumption of their historical continuity.

Another important consequence for the problem is to be seen in the historical significance which Baur attributes to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. The latter is the chief weapon of Paul in his conflict with Judaism and his Jewish Christians, the means by which the Christian principle

is liberated from Judaism and raised to its universal significance. The implication which may be drawn is that Paul's doctrine of justification was merely a temporary expedient necessitated by the conflict with Judaism, primarily a polemic doctrine whose usefulness ended as soon as the real conflict with Judaism had begun to subside.<sup>51</sup> As a result, in later interpretation of Paul, the doctrine of justification recedes into the background as a secondary doctrine, as one of the unique aspects of Paul's speculative thought which was the product of his historical environment. The point of contact between Jesus and Paul is therefore sought in other aspects of his life and theology, and the center of his theology is sought in other doctrines.

It now becomes possible to see the significance of Baur over against rationalism, J. G. Herder,<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Baur practically suggested as much in his The Church History of the First Three Centuries, I, 113-114 (German ed., p. 108). Here Baur points out that with the decline of the conflict, works come to take a more prominent place alongside of faith. This, he says, is not to be taken as a rejection of the doctrine of justification, but a natural tempering of the one-sided way in which Paul had emphasized faith over against the works of the law.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. K. Barth, op. cit., pp. 313-340 (German ed., pp. 279-302). Kümmel, NT, pp. 79-83, 97, 151. Schweitzer, Quest, pp. 34-37. Klaus Scholder, "Herder und die Anfänge der historischen Theologie," EvT, 22 (1962), 425-440.

and the later positivism.<sup>53</sup> By the end of the eighteenth century, the development of Biblical theology, both rationalistic and conservative, had produced a new interest in the Lehrbegriffe of the New Testament. The main concern in Biblical theology was with ideas, and with the systematic presentation of the Pauline Lehrbegriffe it was now possible to compare the content of Paul's teachings with those of Jesus and the other writers of the New Testament. Baur also, as has already been indicated, was interested in ideas in history, but with an important difference. He stressed the Idea first expressed in the consciousness of Jesus, but also its practical realization in Paul and the history of the church. Over against the rationalistic concern with mere ideas, Baur was the first to relate the historical life of Paul to the development of his thought. The theology of Paul, for Baur, cannot be understood apart from his life, and his life cannot be understood apart from his theology. According to Baur, Paul was not a thinker who produced ideas for their own sake, but rather proclaimed them with a specific practical purpose,

---

<sup>53</sup>See J. Macquarrie, Twentieth-century Religious Thought, London, 1963, pp. 95-115.

namely, the conversion of men. A simple comparison of ideas alone was not sufficient, but it was also necessary to see their historical function. Ideas themselves are therefore seen by Baur in a different light. According to rationalism, the purpose of ideas was intellectual enlightenment. With Baur, on the other hand, the ideas of the New Testament, at least, had the specific historical function of converting men to Christianity and creating the church as a universal organization. In the case of rationalism we still have a certain dichotomy in which the realm of ideas is distinguished from the realm of historical events. No real relationship exists between them. The important thing is ideas, whereas events are merely contingent. Baur, on the other hand, believed that ideas are the driving force in history, and history is the product of ideas. In later positivism this order is reversed. Ideas result from material causes and are the result of historical development. Baur, in common with rationalism, insists on the superiority of the ideas over history, but in distinction from rationalism he sees a logical relationship between ideas and history: history is the self-realization of ideas. For this reason, then, the whole historical work of

Paul is essential for his theology; it is not enough to describe his theology, but also to see it in its relationship to history. Furthermore, the conflict between Peter and Paul was not purely theoretical, but is to be seen as part of a broader historical context in which we find antagonism between Jewish nationalism and hellenistic universalism. The greatness of Baur over against rationalism consists in the fact that he was the first to take seriously the historical character of Christianity and to analyze the various factors that went into the making of the Christian church.

When we turn to a comparison of Herder and Baur, we find both at one in their recognition of historical individuality.<sup>54</sup> With Herder the unifying element which underlies all diversity is a transcendental one: the divine diversifies itself into an infinite diversity of types, each of which exists in its own right. Yet Herder did not apply this in a completely consistent fashion to the history of Christianity. He rather attributed a certain superiority to Jesus over all his followers. Apparently he was aware of the danger of

---

<sup>54</sup>K. Barth, op. cit., p. 325 (German ed., p. 289).

relativizing and disintegrating religion if Jesus were placed on the same level with the apostles. Rather he found the manifestation of true humanity in Jesus, and Jesus becomes the perfect example of that humanity.<sup>55</sup> Church history is therefore related to Christ insofar as it reflects the influence of his example. But this means that only that part of the history of piety which manifests this influence is important. Thus, only a small segment of church history is directly related to the person of Christ, and the remainder is attributed to extraneous influences. Over against Herder, it was the merit of Baur that he clearly saw that the whole of church history was necessarily connected with Jesus Christ. The whole development of the Christian church from the time of Jesus to the present is the self-realization of the idea first expressed in the consciousness of Jesus.

Another weakness inherent in Herder's aesthetic view of history is that it has no explanation for the meaning of the coming of Christ. Although the true nature of mankind comes to light in Jesus, Herder has no answer to the question as to why it should have occurred in Jesus and not in

---

<sup>55</sup>A Schweitzer, Quest, p. 36.

another. While Herder tries to win a place for Jesus in history, the perfection of Jesus remains something of a historical accident. All that Herder can state is the superiority of Jesus, but not that his coming fulfilled a purpose. In this respect, Herder's aesthetic view of history is inferior to Baur's teleological view, which maintained that the coming of Jesus was the carrying out of a divine purpose. With Herder, Jesus' example of true humanity has great value, but is not absolutely necessary. As a result, Herder conceives the relationship between Jesus and the apostles in a different way from Baur. According to Herder, the subsequent attempts to imitate the example of Jesus are necessarily inferior. Strictly speaking, all that is necessary is to return to Jesus and his example, since the history of the attempts to imitate him is only of relative value. With Baur, on the other hand, all that follows Jesus is as necessary as Jesus himself. Neither the founder of Christianity nor his followers can be dispensed with. Both Jesus and the apostles are necessary for the fulfillment of the divine purpose, but Baur differentiates between their functions in the development of the church. In Jesus the idea attains to consciousness in history; in the conflicting groups within the church

it becomes historical reality. There is equal necessity but differentiation of function. This explains why there can be no real contrast, for Baur, between Jesus and Paul or the rest of Jesus' followers. That would be the case only if their functions were identical. If both Jesus and the apostles were essentially teachers of the same kind, then the master, as the rationalists affirmed, would be superior to his pupils. In the same fashion for Herder, the example is superior to its imitations. According to Baur, however, both Jesus and his followers are equally necessary. The Idea must first attain consciousness, and secondly be realized in history.

The basic distinction between Baur and later positivism or pragmatism consists in the transcendental element which Baur finds in history. Baur was not aware of interpreting history philosophically, as he was often accused of doing. He above all desired to be a Christian theologian--to a much greater extent than Hegel, who felt he had the right to reinterpret Christianity to fit his system. This can be seen both in Baur's view of Jesus and Paul. According to Baur, Jesus was not a man with religious ideas as the rationalists had maintained.

Rather in Jesus the basic Idea of human history attains consciousness. It was not Baur's view that Jesus simply concocted an idea of Christianity. But in Jesus Christ, God becomes conscious in mankind. Basic to both Baur and Hegel is the insistence upon human spontaneity, but not the spontaneity of an absolutely creative mind. The divine, rather, utilizes the human mind to attain consciousness. The mind is characterized by its spontaneity, but its content comes not from the individual, but from the divine. According to both Baur and Hegel, the significance of Jesus consists in the fact that God first became conscious in him: he is therefore the God-man. However, this does not imply an absolute distinction between Jesus and his followers. They are not dependent upon him as imitators of a perfect example, as pupils of a teacher, or as human recipients of a divine revelation. Rather, the same Spirit which attained consciousness in Jesus attains consciousness in his followers at different stages of its self-realization in history. However, with the positivistic denial of any such transcendent Spirit or principle in history, the relationship between Paul and Jesus is made to depend solely on the measure to which Paul actually reproduced the content

of Jesus' religious concepts and principles. In this fashion Jesus' teachings or his religion tends to become a static norm for true Christianity, and every departure from this fixed norm is treated as a deviation from or perversion of it. The subsequent history of Christianity has no real significance, since the possibility of a teleological development in history is denied. To recover true Christianity it is necessary only to recover the religion of the historical Jesus. This helps to explain the "back to Jesus" movement of the later nineteenth century as well as the approach of positivistic scholarship to the problem of Jesus and Paul. The diversity which exists in Paul as over against Jesus belongs to the realm of historical contingency, and is to be explained solely by psychological or environmental factors. It is assumed that Paul is understood when the source and origin of his ideas has<sup>ve/</sup> been discovered.

With Baur, however, the relationship of ideas to the historical process is differently conceived. A man who is conscious of the Idea cannot be a slave to the historical situation. Although there is much in Paul not to be found in Jesus, nevertheless Baur would insist that the Idea

of Christianity which attained consciousness in Jesus became increasingly explicit in Paul. The Idea aims at its realization in history. That which becomes explicit in Paul was already implicit in Jesus. Positivism, on the other hand, entirely overlooks this hidden teleology. According to Baur, ideas have a teleology, and it is therefore not sufficient merely to indicate their origin, but their telos must also be ascertained. The description of an idea or event in terms of cause and effect is not adequate until its inner dynamic or teleological tendency has been pointed out. In this respect Baur's grasp of history was superior to that of the later positivistic historians.

B. CHRISTIAN ADOLPH HASERT  
(1794-1864)

C. A. Hasert was a relatively unknown figure in the nineteenth century. Educated at Greifswald and Halle, Hasert was called to the chair of philosophy at Greifswald in 1836 and also served as a pastor in Greifswald from 1848 until his death. He published several volumes of sermons as well as a number of dogmatic works, none of any particular significance. As a philosopher of religion and practical theologian, he was influenced by Hegel

and Schleiermacher. The influence of the latter is apparent in his attempt to reinterpret theological dogmas in terms of religious feeling.<sup>56</sup>

The work of Hasert to be dealt with here is entitled, Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander,<sup>57</sup> and was published under the pseudonym of Philosophos Alethias.<sup>58</sup>

Although the book is a study of the gospels and their writers, it represents, above all, a polemic against the Apostle Paul and "Pauline Christianity." Apparently a first venture in the field of Biblical criticism, for which the author was obviously not well equipped, the work left no great impact on contemporary New Testament study in spite of its radical conclusions with respect to the character of the gospels and the significance of the Apostle

---

<sup>56</sup>Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, Neunter Band, Leipzig, 1879, pp. 741-742.

<sup>57</sup>Leipzig, 1845.

<sup>58</sup>Deutsches Anonymen-Lexikon, by Holtzmann und Bohatta, Band VI, Weimar, 1911, p. 172.

Paul.<sup>59</sup>

Hasert's work appeared in the same year in which Baur's first edition of his Paulus was published, and the two together present at once an interesting similarity and contrast. Both seek to explain the documents of the New Testament in the light of history, and both start from the same point, namely, the conflict between Peter and Paul in the primitive church.<sup>60</sup> In fact, the similarity is so great at this point that the conclusion seems inescapable that Hasert had borrowed Baur's idea of interpreting the books of the New Testament as the product of this conflict. However, up to this time, Baur had limited himself primarily to the

---

<sup>59</sup>Baur had read it just before publishing his Paulus and quoted Hasert's disparaging appraisal of Paul in the preface to the first edition (p. vii) to place it in contrast with his own evaluation of the Apostle, then observing: "Die Antwort auf diese neue, gegen den Apostel erhobene Anklage ist die vorliegende Schrift und es treten somit zwei sehr divergierende Ansichten über den grossen Heidenapostel zu gleicher Zeit gegen einander auf." In a later article published in the Theologische Jahrbücher, 1846, "Der Ursprung und Charakter des Lukas-Evangelium mit Rücksicht auf die neuesten Untersuchung," he made a more detailed study and refutation of Hasert's work. A brief mention of Hasert's work, rejecting his interpretation of the Gospel of Matthew, is also to be found in F. Bleek's Einleitung in das Neue Testament, 4th edition, Berlin, 1886, p. 223. K. Hase also took notice of Hasert's work in his Geschichte Jesu, Leipzig, 1876, pp. 143-145.

<sup>60</sup>Cf. Hasert, Evangelien, pp. 4-8.

study of Acts and the epistles, whereas Hasert applied the new principle of interpretation to the gospels. It must be remarked at the outset that Hasert's application of the historical method was very superficial in contrast to Baur. Absent is the thorough and meticulous source criticism so characteristic of Baur, and the often unsound and unwarranted conclusions of Hasert contrast sharply with Baur's cautious and scholarly researches. A striking feature of Hasert's book is the strange combination of a conservative attitude toward the authorship and date of the gospels with a highly sceptical view of their value as historical sources. He accepts the traditional authorship of all four gospels as well as the thirteen Pauline epistles, but impugns the reliability of the first three gospels in particular for their biased party interests. His interest appears to be primarily theological rather than historical, and in spite of a repeated "apology" for his concern for historical objectivity,<sup>61</sup> Hasert is obviously motivated by a strong theological bias.

Though Baur and Hasert start from the same point, they arrive at diametrically opposed positions

---

<sup>61</sup>See particularly the preface, pp. iii-viii, and pp. 436-438.

with respect to their estimation of the Apostle Paul. In contrast to Baur's high opinion of Paul, Hasert summarizes his conclusion as follows:

Er ist der Saulus, der den zweiten David ebenso wie der gleichnamige und aus dem gleichen Stamm entsprossene König Saul den ersten David verfolgt hat; er ist im Evangelio des Lykas der Wolf (Λύκος), der in den Stall des Herrn mit unreiner Herrschsucht und gewaltthätiger Leidenschaftlichkeit eingebrochen ist, und so manches davon aus seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt und reinen Schönheit herausgezerrt und nach seinem, nicht des Herrn, Sinne gewendet hat. Ihm, d.h. jeder Entstellung, welche durch ihn der wahren Urlehre des Herrn gegeben worden ist, gilt meine Fehde. Paulinismus ist nicht durchgängig wahres Christenthum. Mögen die, welche in seinem Christenthum das einzig wahre Heil gefunden, und daran sich festgeklammert haben, zu seinem Schutze sich erheben. Ich stehe ihnen unverzagt zur Rede. Doch nicht ich, sondern Christus selbst und seine gemisshandelten Zwölfe und die Wahrheit klagen ihn gewaltthätiger Leidenschaftlichkeit und eigenmächtiger Gestaltung des Evangelions an.<sup>62</sup>

This emphatic denunciation of the Apostle Paul is reminiscent of the older rationalism, although Hasert's theological viewpoint is not the same. It now remains to be seen how he arrived at this conclusion.

Starting from an over-simplified view of the conflict in which he identifies Peter with the Jewish doctrine of Justification by works of the law and Paul with justification by faith, Hasert attempts to

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 437.

relate everything in the gospels to this conflict. The differences between the gospels, the plan of each, as well as their individual peculiarities are all to be traced back to "party interests." In short, not one word in these Parteischriften was chosen without the most definite purpose and wholly special meaning with respect to the party conflict.<sup>63</sup>

By far the major portion of the work is devoted to the comparison of Matthew and Luke. According to Hasert, Matthew is the "Petrine" gospel in which the purely nationalistic Jewish Messiah is opposed to the Pauline Christ.<sup>64</sup> Hasert finds the clearest expression of Peter's anti-Pauline doctrine of justification by works alone in the Sermon on the Mount; in contrast, Luke's "Sermon on the Plain" is an altered version of the Sermon on the Mount, so expressed as to become a polemic against the original twelve disciples.<sup>65</sup> Luke throughout is bitterly anti-Petrine and seeks to discredit and disparage Peter as well as his fellow disciples. In opposition to Matthew, the gospel of Luke presents Paul's doctrine of salvation by grace alone, as well as his

---

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., pp. 31 ff.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., pp. 43-55.

doctrines of the divinity and the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ. In fact, Hasert finds a copious commentary on Luke in the epistles of Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians,<sup>66</sup> and prefaces the discussion of every chapter in Luke with a quotation or reference from the Pauline epistles.

Although both Matthew and Luke represent one-sided party interests, Hasert's chief censure is directed against Luke, or rather the Apostle Paul who is held directly responsible for Luke's mistreatment of the twelve. In fact, Hasert devotes considerable argument to prove that Paul not only co-operated in the composition of the Gospel of Luke, but himself actually wrote considerable portions of it.<sup>67</sup> It is not so much Paul's doctrine which is directly criticized, but the way in which he treats the original apostles and arbitrarily, one might say even dishonestly, changes the material which he found in Matthew. Luke, i.e., Paul, is most guilty of violence and passion with respect to the evangelical history. Hasert characterizes Paul's procedure as follows:

---

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., pp. 248-291.

Es sind da (in the Gospel of Luke) mit Absicht und vollem Bewusstsein Stücke aus der evangelische Geschichte der zwölf Apostel im Matthäus ausgestossen, andere dafür eigenmächtig eingeschoben, Gleichnisse und Erzählungen entweder ganz neu gebildet, oder bis zur Unkenntlichkeit umgearbeitet, persönlichen Beziehungen zulieb Zahlen, Namen und Umstände abgeändert, Zusammenstellungen gemacht oder aufgelöst--kurz mit einer grossen und nach unseren Begriffen nicht immer ganz lauterem Gewaltthätigkeit und selbst Leidenschaftlichkeit bei Abfassung der heiligen Geschichte verfahren worden;--und dies Alles, um die eigne Partei-Ansicht von der Person Jesu und von Art und Umfang der durch Jesum beabsichtigten Erlösung dadurch zu sanctioniren, den Gegnern aber die Stützen für die ihrige entziehen.<sup>68</sup> s/ e/

Hasert assigns a conciliatory role to the Gospel of Mark. In the interests of harmony between Peter and Paul, John Mark wrote a gospel in which he omitted every polemical element found in both Matthew and Luke. As Christians wearied of the intense conflict, it was realized that moderation was needed if the young church was to survive.<sup>69</sup>

When Hasert turns to the gospel of John his own theological bias becomes most apparent. The author of the fourth gospel is John the "beloved disciple," the most reliable eyewitness, and of all the disciples the one most intimately related to

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 430.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., pp. 327-329.

Jesus.<sup>70</sup> The Gospel of John represents the triumph of the Spirit over the dead "letter" of Judaism. A truly spiritual Christ takes the place of the old Jewish national Messiah. John's spiritual view of the Kingdom of God transcends the narrow, sensual conceptions of Judaism. He does not demand external obedience to the will of God, as Matthew does, for entrance into the Kingdom; nor is Paul's external faith without works, which finds salvation in the death of Christ alone, his principle of salvation and redemption. Rather, true salvation for John consists in complete self-surrender and spiritual union with God through Christ, so that in Christ man is wholly sanctified and perfected.<sup>71</sup> In John the death of Jesus is not described in the tragic overtones which characterize Matthew's account; nor is it a sacrifice to propitiate the wrath of God, as Luke describes it. But the death of Christ in John is a triumphant return to the Father, the way to glory and fellowship with God, and the highest proof of the love of Christ.<sup>72</sup> According to Hasert, in the Gospel of John all the

---

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 425.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., pp. 398-399.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., pp. 414-415.

external and carnal supports of religion are transcended, and religion becomes the true worship of God in spirit and in truth.

This conception of "spiritual" religion was characteristic of German idealism in general, and explains in part Hasert's preference for the "spiritual" Gospel. Elements of both Hegel and Schleiermacher appear in his interpretation of religion. Hasert's general construction also bears a striking resemblance to ideas of Fichte, who maintained that John alone was the true teacher of Christianity, whereas Paul and his followers, who had developed an opposing system of Christianity, had never transcended the fundamental error of Judaism and paganism.<sup>73</sup> Hasert appears to have been something of an eclectic thinker who combined a number of disparate elements in theology. This may also explain why the work had so little influence in its time.

Though we have here a rejection of Paul similar to that of rationalism, the basis is an idealistic conception of religion rather than a

---

<sup>73</sup>J. G. Fichte, Die Anweisung zum seligen Leben, Nach der ersten Aufgabe mit Nachwort neu herausgegeben von Erich Frank, Jena, 1910, pp. 96 ff. (The first edition appeared in 1806.)

rationalistic. It is not the rationalistic historical Jesus, but the "Johannine Christ" who is here opposed to Paul. Hasert's work may also be regarded as an attack on Lutheran orthodoxy. In this respect it is important to observe that whereas Baur's conception of Pauline justification was primarily subjective, Hasert's interpretation of Paul's doctrine of justification is purely forensic, in the spirit of confessional Lutheranism. Hence Paul's idea of faith is treated as the mere acceptance of doctrines about Christ, and is therefore rejected in favor of John's idea of spiritual union with Christ.

A further important distinction between Baur and Hasert lies in their respective interpretations of history. It is interesting to note that Baur's view of the relationship between the evangelists is similar to Hasert's. Baur placed the gospels in the same chronological order, and placed Matthew, Luke, and Mark in the same general relationship to the party conflict. However, he disputed their apostolic authorship and moved the dates of their composition to a much later period in the history of the early church.<sup>74</sup> A decisive difference, however, is to be seen in their interpretations of the Gospel of John.

---

<sup>74</sup>Baur, Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, Tübingen, 1847.

Here Baur found the higher synthesis of Petrine and Pauline Christianity. For Hasert, on the other hand, it is inconceivable that the Gospel of John should have resulted from a compromise between elements in Peter and Paul. The old contradiction is by-passed rather than taken up into a higher stage of unity. Thus Hasert rejected the Hegelian scheme of historical development in favor of a positivistic approach.<sup>75</sup> John does not represent the further development of the Idea, but the "beloved disciple" simply brings to light the "real" truth about Jesus, so long obscured by conflicting party interests.

The difference between Baur and Hasert is also apparent in the way in which they explain the conflict between Peter and Paul and the significance they attach to it. For Baur, the Idea is superior to and determines the empirical reality. Since each party can apprehend only one aspect of the original Idea, conflict is necessary for the Idea to realize itself fully. With Hasert, on the other hand, there is apparently no other explanation for the conflict than the natural human love of strife, selfishness, intolerance, jealousy, etc. It is human nature to

---

<sup>75</sup>Hasert, op. cit., pp. 436-437.

quarrel, grow weary of it, and then seek reconciliation. Thus, Hasert would not go beyond psychological and sociological explanations. Baur, however, would deny that the analogy of human life is sufficient to explain historical development. For him personalities and psychological differences are irrelevant, since metaphysical necessity causes the conflict. Baur was not particularly interested in Paul and Peter as personalities. Thus, for Baur, Paul represents a necessary and valid stage in the development of the Idea, whereas for Hasert he is a particularly intolerant and quarrelsome individual.

Baur's own criticism of Hasert is illuminating:

Seine ganze geschichtliche Anschauung erscheint darin höchst einseitig, dass ihm nicht die Sache über der Person, sondern die Person über die Sache steht--So richtig er erkannt hat das jedes der Evangelien seinen eigentümlichen Charakter hat, so sehr hat sich ihm diese richtige Einsicht dadurch wieder getrübt, dass er der Tendenz der Evangelien individuelle, persönliche, rein subjective Motive unterlegt. Es ist nicht die grossartige, in alle Verhältnisse der urchristlichen Zeit so tief eingreifende Gegensatz des Judismus und Paulinismus, in welchen wir hier die Evangelien, in ihrem Unterschied von einander, so hineingestellt sehen, dass sie selbst nur der lebendig, konkrete Ausdruck der allgemeinen, die Zeit ihrer Entstehung bewegenden Interessen sind, sondern es steht nur Person gegen Person, dem Petrus tritt Paulus als persönlicher Gegner gegenüber, und es giebt keine Antithese welche den Schlüssel ihres Verständnisses nicht in einer rein persönlichen Beziehung hätte.<sup>76</sup>

---

76

Baur, "Der Ursprung und Charakter des Lukas Evangeliums, etc.," TJ, 1846, p. 601.

The quotation of Baur raises the question of freedom and necessity in history and the related problem of the relationship between character and ideas. In the older rationalism truth was regarded as constant, and diversity indicated divergence from the truth. Ignorance and insufficient development of reason were seen as the primary causes of diversity. Hasert adopts a second explanation. Over against the pure intellectualism of the Enlightenment, the rise of romanticism had created a growing awareness of the role of passion and emotion in history. Thus, according to Hasert, the distorted picture which the Gospel of Luke gives resulted from the passionate conflict of personalities venting their emotions against each other. Selfish motives obscure the truth until it is brought to light by the Apostle John. Accordingly, Hasert sees only the free play of personalities ruled by human passions. Ideas are made subordinate to personalities. According to Baur, on the other hand, the Absolute is the agent of history. Individuals are instruments of the Idea seeking to objectify itself. History is therefore not primarily the history of human relationships, but rather of ideas. And the individual

is free only insofar as he is in harmony with the absolute; outside of that there is only the realm of necessity.

Thus, Baur and Hasert represent two opposing interpretations of history: the one applying the Hegelian idea of metaphysical necessity; the other rejecting metaphysical speculation and emphasizing the romantic idea of human freedom in terms of personality and self-expression. The strength and weakness of both positions also becomes clear in Baur and Hasert. Hasert's interpretation lacks the intrinsic coherence which Baur's "idea" gives to history: the continual struggle of passions is meaningless. Yet, Baur, in maintaining the subjection of the individual to the Idea fails to see, as Hasert did, that history is the work of living personalities. On the whole, the later nineteenth century was more inclined to accept the romanticist idea of freedom as against the deterministic view of Hegel. The positivistic interpretation of history also becomes an increasingly more important factor for the problem of Jesus and Paul. Hasert's work in somewhat crude fashion foreshadows future developments of the problem.

## PART TWO

### LEBEN-JESU-FORSCHUNG AND PAULINE RESEARCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

After Baur and Strauss, New Testament scholarship moved in two relatively independent lines of research--one centering in the life of Jesus, the other in the life and theology of the Apostle Paul. The former unquestionably occupied the center of attention and evoked the greatest controversy, but behind the scenes of the more dramatic developments of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung the study of the Apostle Paul was pursued with increasing intensity. Since the problem of Jesus and Paul ultimately emerged from the interaction of these two lines of research, it will be necessary to proceed with a survey of the development of the separate lines in their bearing upon the evolution of the problem of Jesus and Paul.

## CHAPTER I

### LEBEN-JESU-FORSCHUNG IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The nineteenth century Leben-Jesu-Forschung was made possible by the awakening of a new interest in the historical past and by the development of a scientific historical methodology. But the new historical interest and the growing confidence in the historical method in themselves do not account for the phenomenon of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. The first fruit of the development of historical criticism was not a Life of Jesus, but a reinterpretation of the Apostle Paul and of the history of primitive Christianity (F. C. Baur). The life of Jesus did not become a real historical problem until the new theological and Christological interests of the nineteenth century were brought into conflict with the demands of a scientific historical methodology. In the name of true historical objectivity, Strauss had worked such a radical divorcement of the Christ of faith from the Jesus of history that the question of the historical Jesus immediately became the Lebensfrage of the church. How was the historical Jesus to be related to the Christian faith? Therefore, it was basically a theological

question which motivated the Leben-Jesu-Forschung, and the continued tension between theology and the results of historical criticism provided the context in which it moved. Accordingly, the whole development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung must be considered in all its theological ramifications.

Although the problem of the Life of Jesus is at once theological and historical, it is possible to approach the problem from a viewpoint primarily theological or from a viewpoint primarily historical. Both approaches were much in evidence in the nineteenth century. The following section will be devoted first of all to the various theological attempts to come to terms with the problem raised by the results of historical research in the life of Jesus. After describing briefly the first inadequate attempts to deal with the problem, it will be necessary to consider at some length the work of Ritschl and his school. In Ritschl's systematic approach to the problem, we find the first clear point of advance beyond Schleiermacher. However, under the growing impact of historical scepticism in the study of the Gospels, some aspects of Ritschl's solution were found wanting. In Herrmann and Harnack, two of the most famous representatives of the Ritschlian

school, Ritschl's solution to the problem is modified in two distinctive directions, both of which are of decisive importance for the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung as well as of the problem of Jesus and Paul.

The second part of this section will treat the development of the historical approach to its climax in Wrede and Schweitzer. The climax consists in the positivistic repudiation of all theology, by which the stage is prepared for an understanding of the historical Jesus wholly antithetical to the Apostle Paul.

#### A. THEOLOGICAL ATTEMPTS TO LEBEN-JESU-FORSCHUNG

Rationalism had radically undermined the traditional theory of verbal inspiration and thereby called into question the authority of Scripture as well as of church dogma. But rationalism's un-historical treatment of the gospels and its philosophical concept of universal religion were not acceptable to the nineteenth century in general. As a result, the downfall of traditional authorities and the subsequent failure of rationalistic religion created a vacuum in theology which urgently needed to be

filled. Theology was compelled, as it were, to retreat from its former heights and to reorganize its ranks for a new advance. In particular it had to reformulate its understanding of the nature of the Christian faith and to re-establish it upon new grounds. The result was akin to a revolution in theology.

In this revolution the problem of Christology became a central issue. Protestant orthodoxy in its preoccupation with the doctrine of the two natures of Christ had largely neglected the gospels. Now, however, the development of historical criticism compelled theology to reckon more seriously with the gospels and the human life of Christ. In particular, historical criticism so emphasized the humanity of Christ as to raise anew the whole question of the nature of his person and its relation to faith. The incompatibility of the speculative Logos Christology and the traditional doctrine of the two natures of Christ with the newer results of historical study was increasingly assumed, and insofar as theology did not wish to reject these traditional doctrines outright, a reinterpretation seemed imperative.

1. Theological Re-Interpretation of the Christological Problem

Such theological re-interpretation was first carried out in a comprehensive and systematic fashion by Schleiermacher in his Glaubenslehre. His significance for the development of Christology consisted in a new approach to the doctrine of Christ. His starting point was neither the objectively given dogma of the two natures of Christ (Orthodoxy) nor subjective reason as such (Rationalism), but rather experience--more precisely, the Christian community's experience of the redemptive influence of Jesus. In contrast to orthodoxy, Schleiermacher did not begin with the person of Christ as an abstract theological problem, but with the work of Christ as experienced in the Christian community and thus to derive therefrom a doctrine of the person of Christ directly correlated to his work.

The resulting Christology involved considerable re-interpretation of traditional formulas. With his concept of the Urbildlichkeit of Jesus, Schleiermacher focused the center of his Christology on the historical person of Jesus in an unprecedented fashion. As ideal and archetypal man, Christ is the divine agent of redemption who mediates his perfect God-consciousness, which constitutes the real

presence of God in him, to the believer. In this fashion Schleiermacher related redemption, the divine life of the community, to its source in the whole life and person of the historical Jesus.

Whereas protestant orthodoxy had limited the redemptive significance of Christ primarily to the specific acts of his death and resurrection, Schleiermacher found it in the total impact of his person and life. What interested Schleiermacher was not any specific historical acts or achievements of Jesus, but the divine quality of his person and life which he was able to communicate to others. According to Schleiermacher, therefore, faith rests ultimately not on any redemptive acts of Christ nor on any Christological doctrine, but on the total impression of his life and personality.

The full significance of Schleiermacher's new approach to Christology was not immediately perceived. The subjective-speculative aspect of his Christology was soon attacked by Strauss as resulting in an unhistorical treatment of the Gospels. At the same time, Strauss raised the problem of the historical Jesus in its most acute form by his complete separation of the Christ of faith from the historical Jesus. Theology now sought the solution

of the Christological problem in new directions. A brief survey of these new attempts will be sufficient to indicate the main lines of the Christological discussions.

a) The Kenotic Theory. While the traditional theology in general repudiated the results of historical criticism and revived the theory of verbal inspiration, it could not completely escape the impact of the new interest in the historical Jesus. The problem arose as to how to reconcile the traditional orthodox Christology with the human portrait of Christ in the gospel records. In wrestling with this problem, resort was had to the theory of "kenosis" based on the texts Phil.ii.5-11. Various forms of this theory were propounded. One of them (G. Thomäsius) affirmed a partial kenosis in which the Logos, at the Incarnation,<sup>1</sup> emptied himself only of those divine properties which did not belong to the essence of God (Omnipotence, Omnipresence, and Omniscience) but were demanded by His relationship to the world. Thus the Son of God keeps his

---

<sup>1</sup>But J. Jeremias' recent article attempts to argue that the 'kenosis' refers not to the incarnation but to the crucifixion. "Zu Phil.ii.7: EAUTON EKENŌSEN," Nov. Test. 6 (1963), 182-188.

essential identity with God while assuming human attributes.<sup>2</sup> Another form of this theory appears in a still more throughgoing shape in W. F. Gess,<sup>3</sup> who extends the kenosis to immanent attributes also. He taught a full kenosis of the Logos in which he completely surrendered his divinity to become a human being. By means of a real human development he then becomes identical with the Logos.<sup>4</sup>

In this fashion it was believed possible to

---

<sup>2</sup>It was expounded by Thomasius first in his Beiträge zur kirchlichen Christologie (1845), but the fullest and most attractive statement is his Christi Person und Werk (1853-55). Thomasius' followers have included Lutherans such as Luthardt and Delitzsch, the Reformed divines Godet and Ebrard, as well as British theologians Bishop Gore, H. R. Mackintosh and D. W. Forrest.

<sup>3</sup>W. F. Gess, Die Lehre von der Person Christi entwickelt aus dem Selbstbewusstsein Christi und aus dem Zeugnisse der Apostel, Basel, Stuttgart, 1856; idem, Natur oder Gott? Christi Versöhnung der menschlichen Sünde, 1862; idem, Ueber die biblische Versöhnungslehre, 1869.

<sup>4</sup>D. M. Baillie, God was in Christ, An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement, London, 1968 (3rd ed.), pp. 94 ff. For a further understanding of the 'kenosis', see Hastings' ERE, vii (1915), 680-687 and the same author's contribution in RPTK, x (1901), 248; G. Kittel (ed.), TDNT, III, 659-60. E. Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2:5-11," ZTK, 47 (1950), 313 ff. Käsemann affirmed the anchoring of this text in the thought world of Hellenism. Most scholars today interpret the text as an early Christian hymn: L. D. Streiker, "The Christological Hymn in Philip-pians II," LQ, 16 (1964), 49-58; Jack T. Sanders,

maintain the divinity of Jesus Christ while doing justice to the full humanity of his earthly life. Neither form of the theory, however, was consonant with the traditional belief of the church in the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ, but made nonsense of the Incarnation and generally involved theology in an untenable position.

b) Speculative Christology. The Christologies associated with the Christ-Idea or Principle represented an attempt on the part of the speculative

---

The New Testament Hymns: Their historical religious background, SNTSM, 15 (1971); E. Lohmeyer, Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil.2:5-11 (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-histor. Klasse), 4 (1927-28); John Macquarrie, "Kenoticism Reconsidered," The Charles Gore Memorial Lecture, delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster, on 6 November, 1973, TMR, LXXVII, 645 (1974), 115-124; S. Faut, Die Christologie seit Schleiermacher, ihre Geschichte und ihre Begründung, Tübingen, 1907, pp. 7 ff; John G. Gibbs, Creation and Redemption. A Study in Pauline Theology, SNT, XXVI (1971), 73, n. 1; R. P. Martin, Carmen Christi: Phil.2:5-11, SNTSM, 4 (1967); C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions on Philipians 2:5-11," Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. by W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Presented to F. F. Bruce on his sixtieth birthday), Grand Rapids, 1970, pp. 264-276; P. T. Forsyth, The Person and Place of Jesus Christ, London, 1909 (1961, 9th ed.); J. M. Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," ExT, 79 (1968), 178 ff; R. Deichgräber, Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit, Göttingen, 1967; I. H. Marshall, "The Christ-Hymn in Philipians 2:5-11," TyB, 19 (1968), 104-127; T. F. Glasson, "Two Notes on the Philipians Hymn (II.6-11)," NTSt, 21 (1974), 133-139.

theology of the Hegelian school to solve the Christological problem philosophically. Hegel's philosophical idealism provided the basis. The content of the Christian religion as the highest form of religion was, according to Hegel, identical with the highest truth of philosophy, namely, the idea of the unity of God and man, whose validity as philosophical truth was finally independent of its contingent historical manifestations. s/

Speculative theology, however, was divided as to the question of the precise relationship between the Idea and the historical person of Christ. Strauss had initiated the debate by denying, on philosophical grounds, the possibility that the Idea could have been realized in a historical individual, but only in the whole of humanity. Jesus could not have been the God-man, but only gave expression to the Idea which requires the whole of human history for its realization. With this denial of the realization of the Idea in the historical person of Jesus, the relationship between the content of the Christian faith and the historical Jesus becomes merely contingent. The validity of the Idea is not affected by the results of historical criticism; the historical Jesus is not the object of faith. o/k

The various attempts of the Hegelian "right"<sup>5</sup> in some fashion to identify the Idea with the person of Jesus met with little success. The logic of the Hegelian position favored Strauss. From a somewhat mediating position, A. E. Biedermann<sup>6</sup> (1819-1885) repudiated an identification of the Christian principle with the person of Jesus, but attached a greater significance than Strauss had to the latter.<sup>7</sup> In the personality of Jesus, the Christian principle of a divine humanity entered human life as the revelation of the new religious relationship of man as divine sonship. While Biedermann attributed a positive historical significance to Jesus as the revealer of the Christian

---

<sup>5</sup>J. K. F. Rosekranz, ETW, Halle, 1831, 1845 (2nd ed.). Rosekranz (1805-1879) was a professor at Halle and then at Königsberg. He occupied himself much with the history of poetry in its relations with religious ideas; J. Schaller, Der historische Christus und die Philosophie. Kritik der Grundidee des Werkes: das Leben Jesu von Dr. Strauss, Leipz. 1838. He (1810-1868) sought to demonstrate, against Strauss, that the Idea is not real if it does not incarnate itself in an individual; K. F. Göschel, Beiträge zur speculativen Philosophie von Gott, dem Menschen u. dem Gottmenschen, 1838. He (1784-1861) sought to mix Christianity with jurisprudence, and to justify Christianity from the juridical point of view.

<sup>6</sup>Strauss und seine Bedeutung für die Theologie, 1875; Christliche Dogmatik, 1869 (2nd ed., 2 vols., 1881-1884).

<sup>7</sup>C. Welch, Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I, 1799-1870, New Haven and London, 1973, pp. 160-167, particularly see p. 163.

principle, the validity of the latter was still independent of its historical manifestation.<sup>8</sup>

c) The Christology of the Mediating School.

Because of the great diversity of the mediating school of theologians,<sup>9</sup> it is almost impossible to single out a particular Christology as characteristic of the school in general. Its theology on the whole was characterized by the attempt to achieve a mediation between the traditional theology of the church and the new philosophical and historical insights of the nineteenth century. It recognized the validity and necessity of historical criticism, while at the same time insisting on the importance of the historical person of Jesus for faith. Like Schleiermacher, it sought to reinterpret the traditional Christology of the church so as to do justice to the results of the historical criticism of the

---

<sup>8</sup>For a discussion of the speculative Christology, see E. Günther, Die Entwicklung der Lehre von der Person Christi im XIX. Jahrhundert, Tübingen, 1911, pp. 144-158; S. Faut, op. cit., pp. 10-25.

<sup>9</sup>L. F. W. Hoffmann (1806-1873), F. A. G. Tholuck (1799-1877), Rothe (1799-1867), C. Ullmann (1796-1855), J. Müller (1801-1878), and I. A. Dorner (1809-1884) are some of the most distinguished names for this school. Cf. F. Lichtenberger, History of German Theology, E. T. and edited by W. Hastie, Edinburgh, 1889, pp. 199-205, 467-541.

gospels. In this task it borrowed from philosophy such concepts as the idea of the God-man or of ideal humanity, and thus its Christology also often assumed a strong speculative character. Although characterized by a serious concern with the historical Jesus, none of these Christologies achieved the systematic power and originality of Schleiermacher or exerted any lasting influence in theology. At best they exhibit the Christological dilemma of conservative theology as it sought to come to terms with historical criticism.

The general failure of theology after Schleiermacher to provide a satisfactory answer to the Christological problem contributed in large measure to a growing distrust of philosophical speculation in theology. This attitude coincided with the increasing positivistic temper of the age after the middle of the nineteenth century. The concrete living figure of the historical Jesus was far more congenial to the spirit of the age than the speculative Christologies, both new and old. The reaction against metaphysical speculation in Christology found expression in the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. By means of scientific historical methods, the historical Jesus was to be rescued from

the shackles of dogma and metaphysics in order that faith might be given a more objective basis. In order to be truly wissenschaftlich, it was assumed that theology must seek a firm empirical basis in the historical Jesus.

This meant, first of all, that theology had to surrender the old concept of the supernatural nature of Christ and to work with the essentially human Jesus who emerged from the historical criticism of the gospels. Rationalism, of course, had already rejected the supernatural element in the gospels and had rationalized the miracles in terms of natural law.<sup>10</sup> The result was a purely human teacher and

---

<sup>10</sup>In the early period of rationalism (J. Hess of Zurich, 1741-1828, F. Reinhard, 1753-1812, J. Jakobi of Walterschausen, and J. Herder of Weimer, 1744-1803), while there was no attempt to eliminate the idea of miracles from the Gospels, there was an evident attempt to explain at least some of the miraculous incidents in the Gospels as resulting from natural causes. In the middle period (H. E. Paulus of Heidelberg, 1761-1851), there is complete rejection of the miraculous and with it an attempt to account for the miraculous in the Gospels in natural terms. In the final period (K. Hase of Jena, 1800-1890), there is somewhat of a lessening recognition in the ability of the rationalistic explanation to account for the miraculous. For further study of miracles, see H. J. Hillerbrand, "The Historicity of Miracles: The Early Eighteenth Century Debate Among Woolston, Annet Sherlock, and West," SR, 3 (2) (1973), 132-151; J. A. Hardon, "The Concept of Miracle from St. Augustine to Modern Apologetics," ThSt, 15 (1954), 229-257; C. F. D. Moule, ed., Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History, London,

example. For Strauss it was self-evident that if historical research was to be scientific, it must dispense with the possibility of the supernatural in the life of Jesus. But the content of the Christian faith could still be preserved if the supernatural element in the gospel portrait of Christ were interpreted mythologically, i.e., as a symbol pointing to the absolute truth of the unity of the divine and human.

After the debate over the question of miracle had subsided, Strauss' rejection of the supernatural gradually came to be accepted in historical research. The universal adoption of historical methods was accompanied with the rejection of miracle in the absolute sense, or at least with the recognition that historical criticism as an empirical science must exclude the supernatural as its proper object. Karl Hase's dictum, "nur ein menschliches Leben ist ein geschichtlicher Gegenstand,"<sup>11</sup> represents the

---

1965; A Schweitzer, Quest, pp. 34, 48-57; R. C. Trench, Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord, London, 1850 (3rd ed.); Ernst and Marie-Luise Keller, Miracles in Dispute, London, 1969 (translated by M. Kohl from the German, Der Streit um die Wunder, Gütersloh, 1968); R. H. Fuller, Interpreting the Miracles, London, 1963.

<sup>11</sup>K. Hase, Geschichte Jesu, Leipzig, 1876, p. 102.

attitude which had come to prevail in the Leben-Jesu research during the latter half of the nineteenth century. Theology, insofar as it wished to be wissenschaftlich, had to deal with the human Jesus recovered from the gospels by historical criticism.

Yet the alternative of the purely human Jesus of rationalism on the one hand, or the mythological, i.e., ideal Christ of Strauss on the other, was unacceptable to the liberal critics of the gospels. The Leben-Jesu scholars of the nineteenth century did not desire to exhibit a purely human Jesus, nor could they rest content with the ideal Christ of speculative theology. Rather in the pursuit of the human, historical Jesus they sought to discover those qualities which distinguished him from the rest of humanity and therefore might be called divine. If theology must dispense with miracle in an absolute sense, then the divinity of Christ was to be sought within his unique, but nevertheless human and historical life. The significance of Jesus for faith was not to be based upon an a priori dogma of the two natures of Christ, but was to be derived from an empirical knowledge of the historical Jesus as this was given by historical research: The difference with respect to the

older Christology might be expressed in this fashion: Whereas traditional Christology started from the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and therefore had to wrestle with the problem of his humanity, the new wissenschaftliche Theologie started from his humanity and therefore had to struggle with the problem of his divinity. The question as to how to reformulate the divinity of Christ in terms of his humanity was the great theological question which agitated the Leben-Jesu movement in the nineteenth century. This was the real motivation, rather than mere historical interest, which accounted for most of the new "lives" of Jesus after the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Having thus established a certain dependence upon historical research, theology was compelled to adjust itself to the results of historical criticism and ~~not~~ often found itself in conflict and tension with the same. In particular, the gradual shift of interest from the Gospel of John to the Synoptic gospels, which was brought about by historical criticism<sup>12</sup>, had profound implications for theology.<sup>12</sup> Strauss had forced the issue by

---

<sup>12</sup>M. Black describes the New Testament scholars during the past century, who made contributions to the development of Christological thought:

impugning the authenticity and historical value of the Gospel of John because of its dogmatic and apologetic character.<sup>13</sup> The initial resistance to this claim is explained by the fact that the Gospel of John was the basis of almost all contemporary Christology. Not only was the Fourth Gospel an important source for the doctrine of the two natures of Christ and the Logos Christology; but it was also the beloved "spiritual Gospel" of Schleiermacher and idealism in general. Admission of Strauss' claim would mean that all Christology based upon the Fourth Gospel was outmoded or at least unscientific. Yet Strauss' position with respect to the Gospel of John gradually came to win increasing acceptance. The ultimate exclusion of the Gospel of John as a reliable source for the Life of Jesus and the discovery of the priority of the Gospel of

---

"These scarcely enjoy a monopoly of the subject, and too often have been the disturbers of the theological peace; but as their results come from their study of the primary documents, they present the most serious challenge to traditional views." A Survey of Christological Thought 1872-1972. The Croall Centenary Lecture, Edinburgh, 1972, p. 1, n. 2.

<sup>13</sup>D. F. Strauss, The Life of Jesus, pp. 365-386; W. G. Kümmel pointed out that Strauss became the first to pose research in the traditions about Jesus with the alternative, "Synoptists or John," an alternative that New Testament research from then on could no longer evade. W. G. Kümmel, NT, p. 124.

Mark was, no doubt, a part of the reaction against orthodox and speculative theology which had leaned so heavily upon the Fourth Gospel; but it was not merely a product of this reaction; for the results remained unshaken long after the reaction ceased to be an important factor in theology. It was the discovery of the priority of Mark and the perfection of the methods employed to this end which gave theology its confidence in the possibility of recovering the historical Jesus and ultimately of solving the Christological problem.

This changed situation in theology prepared the way for the work of Albrecht Ritschl, whose Christology in many respects represented a new beginning and introduced a new era in theology. Since his work exercised no little influence on the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung, his Christology will be treated in some detail.

## 2. The Christology of Ritschl

Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889), the son of a Lutheran pastor, was born in Berlin. His later theology is to be understood in the context of his personal development. Dissatisfied with the conservative Vermittelungstheologie of his early teachers--K. E. Nitzsch, F. A. G. Tholuck, and J.

Müller--Ritschl while studying at Halle was attracted by the philosophy of Hegel. He was attracted particularly to the Hegelian theology of the Tübingen School and studied under F. C. Baur for a time. From Baur he acquired an interest in the study of the New Testament and in the history of doctrine which he never lost throughout his later career as a teacher, and which helps to explain the strong Biblical and historical interest in his systematic theology. The influence of Baur was apparent in an early historical work of Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche, Bonn (1850), but in a second edition of this book (1857) Ritschl broke sharply with Baur's Hegelian interpretation of history and pursued an independent course.<sup>14</sup> In the meantime (1846), Ritschl had begun his teaching career as a University lecturer in New Testament at Bonn; in 1848 he widened the sphere of his labors to include the history of dogma, and from 1852 onward he occupied himself chiefly with dogmatic theology. In 1864 he was called to Göttingen

---

<sup>14</sup>W. G. Kümmel, NT, p. 162 and n. 223; On this development see O. Ritschl, Albrecht Ritschl's Leben, Vol. I, 1892, pp. 112 ff., 125 ff., 151 ff., 167-168, 271 ff.

where he taught for the remainder of his life. Not a popular lecturer, Ritschl's main influence was exerted through his written works, particularly his three volume monograph: Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, which was re-published in two revised editions.<sup>15</sup> His other writings include a somewhat unsatisfactory venture in epistemology, Theologie und Metaphysik (1881) and a critique of Pietism, Geschichte des Pietismus, in three volumes (1880-1886).<sup>16</sup>

Ritschl's theological work, in general, is perhaps best understood as the revolt of an independent and controversial spirit, characterized by a strong practical and ethical interest, against all metaphysical speculation and all subjective and mystical forms of piety.<sup>17</sup> This revolt was rooted in

---

<sup>15</sup>Originally published between 1870-1874, the second edition appeared in 1882 f., and the third edition in 1888 f. The first volume has been translated by J. S. Black, A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, Edinburgh, 1872. And its third volume (English title is the same with the first volume of English translation) has appeared in English translation and edited by H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay, Edinburgh, 1900.

<sup>16</sup>See the article on "Ritschl" by Stephan in RGG, 4, 2043-2046, and by O. Ritschl, in Hauck-Herzog, RPTK, 17, 22-34. Also, H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology, London, 1964, Chapter V.

<sup>17</sup>Stephan, op. cit., p. 2043.

a positive understanding of religion as faith in supernatural powers which enable the spiritual personality to attain the consciousness of freedom and independence from the natural world.<sup>18</sup> As a consequence he continually emphasized the practical ethico-personal character of religion as opposed to speculative theology and mysticism.

On the other hand, this revolt also found expression in the importance which Ritschl attached to the historical character of Christianity. The content of his dogmatic study, Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, is filled to a great extent with the history of dogma and biblical theology. In his attempt to refine the intellectual content of Christianity from its various subjective and metaphysical distortions, Ritschl desired to return through the Reformers, particularly Luther, to its true historical and biblical basis. Thus he bridged the gap which idealism had created between history and theology and once more united the two in an intimate relationship.<sup>19</sup>

Basic to Ritschl's theology was the conviction, gained from his study of the Reformers, that

---

<sup>18</sup>Ritschl, Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, dritter Band, dritte Auflage, pp. 189 ff.

<sup>19</sup>Stephan, op. cit., p. 2044.

Christ in his person and work is the final revelation of God. Hence Ritschl could affirm: "Im Christentum ist die Offenbarung in dem Sohn Gottes der feste Punkt für alle Erkenntnis und alles religiöse Handeln."<sup>20</sup> It was chiefly on this ground that Ritschl excluded all forms of natural theology and mysticism. Theology must concern itself with the content of the revelation given in the person and work of Christ. But the knowledge of this revelation is accessible only to faith, i.e., to those who stand within the community which has experienced Christ's justification and reconciliation. Thus, for Ritschl, no mere historical study could explain the significance of Christ for the Christian faith. "Den vollen Umfang seiner geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit kann man nur aus dem Glauben der christlichen Gemeinde an ihn erreichen, und auch nur seine Absicht, dieselbe zu gründen, kann geschichtlich nicht vollständig verstanden werden, wenn man sich nicht als Glied dieser Gemeinde seiner Person unterordnet."<sup>21</sup> Since, according to Ritschl, the historical documents of the New Testament constituted the

---

<sup>20</sup>Ritschl, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 192.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

normative expression of the faith of the church, the New Testament provided the primary source material for theology. Ritschl's aim, therefore, was a theology which was above all a biblical theology.

In his Christology, therefore, Ritschl was able to avoid the pitfalls of historicism as well as the abstractions of speculative theology. The Christ of faith is the Jesus of history as he is known and experienced by faith. The starting point of Ritschl's Christology was therefore the same as that of Schleiermacher. But because Ritschl grounded his Christology more biblically and historically, he avoided the speculative aspects of Schleiermacher's reconstruction. On the basis of his positive understanding of religion Ritschl also interpreted the work of Christ in a more practical and ethical fashion, so that his Christology came to exert a greater influence on his contemporaries than Schleiermacher's had.

Ritschl's doctrine of the person and work of Christ was set forth systematically in Chapter VI, Volume III of his Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. Here he begins with the question of the divinity of Christ, treating it first as a question of religious knowledge and then as a theological problem.

Rejecting the classical formulation of the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, he proposes to solve the Christological problem by an "Analyse des Wirkens Christi zum Heile der Menschheit in Gestalt seiner Gemeinde."<sup>22</sup> This cannot be achieved by presupposing that his person was endowed with certain innate qualities, but his divinity must attest itself in the connection of his manifest activity with his religious convictions and ethical motives, for only in this way does he exert his influence upon us.<sup>23</sup> Accordingly, the divinity of Christ is not to be sought in some abstract quality of his person or in his religious consciousness as such, but in the inseparable unity of his person and work. For Ritschl, the historical work of Christ thus becomes the key to the understanding of his person.

Ritschl sought to interpret the whole life of Jesus from the viewpoint of Beruf or ethical vocation, for only by treating him as an independent personality with a personal self-end (Selbstzweck) can we comprehend his influence and intention with

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 393.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 389 ff.

respect to men.<sup>24</sup> Christ's vocation is then defined as the realization of the Kingdom of God, which for Ritschl meant the moral organization of humanity from the motive of love, or, otherwise expressed, the ethical lordship of God over the world. Every aspect of Christ's life, including his suffering and death, is to be understood as the faithful exercise of this vocation.<sup>25</sup>

In his description of the work of Christ, Ritschl utilized a modified version of the historical doctrine of the threefold office of Christ. The work of Christ as a whole is viewed as the exercise of his kingship. By this Ritschl means that Christ exhibits his independence and lordship over the world by the obedience and love with which he fulfills his vocation. Christ's work is to be understood as a unity, but may be viewed under two aspects involving a twofold relationship to God: As work directed from God to man, Christ exercises the function of a king-prophet; as a work directed from man to God, Christ acts as a king-priest.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 417 ff.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 421 ff.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 405 ff.

As king-prophet, Christ reveals the love of God through the obedience with which he fulfills his vocation. Insofar as it is his vocation to realize the kingdom of God, his own self-end is identical with the self-end of God. Because Christ in the fulfillment of his vocation acknowledged his obligation to serve men for their highest good, i.e., the Kingdom of God, in the community which he created, the essential will of God is revealed as love. Thus, Christ in the obedient exercise of his vocation is the perfect revelation of the faithfulness and love of God.<sup>27</sup>

As king-priest, Christ first of all represents himself before God, but then also the community of his followers. His obedience to his calling, as the expression of his perfect religious relationship to God, is the sole ground of the believer's justification and forgiveness. For the sake of Christ, God receives the sinner into communion with himself. Christ is therefore the representative of the community which he brings to God through the perfect fulfillment of his personal life. But this representation is not to be understood in an exclusive

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 425-528.

sense, but rather inclusive. That is to say, Christ's work does not exclude the community from doing what he has done, but rather includes it in the same relationship to God which he enjoyed. The community is led by Christ, as the revealer of God's faithfulness and love, to assume his religious attitude toward God and therefore to adopt the realization of the kingdom of God as its own self-end.<sup>28</sup>

In this fashion Ritschl sought to understand the person and work of Christ as an inseparable unity. The divinity of Christ, consequently, is not to be sought in some quality of his person which could be abstracted from his historical work, nor is it to be understood simply as the presupposition of his work. Rather, the divinity of Christ manifests itself in the way in which he fulfills his vocation and is confirmed by the success with which he produces analogous moral attributes in the community of his followers. To be brief, Christ is equal to God for us by the fact that he brings us into the same relationship with God which he himself enjoyed.<sup>29</sup>

The significance of Ritschl's reconstruction for the Christological problem is to be seen in the

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 514-516.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 437-438.

emphasis which he placed on the historical work of Christ. Prior to Ritschl, theology had never completely escaped the methodology of Protestant orthodoxy, i.e., the attempt in some fashion to derive or explain the work of Christ from his person. The approach was basically the same, regardless as to whether one started from his divinity or some aspect of his humanity. This was true also of Schleiermacher, for whom the inner life of Jesus, i.e., his perfect God-consciousness, accounted for his influence upon the life of the believer.

For the interpretation of the gospels, this meant that the person of Christ as such was always the focus of interest as it had been for Protestant orthodoxy. The stories described in the gospels were little more than illustrations or examples of the uniqueness of his person. Either his person alone became meaningful and not what he achieved as a historical individual, or his person and work were never fully integrated.

Ritschl, however, by understanding the whole life of Jesus under the concept of Beruf, gave priority to the work of Christ rather than his person as such. Thereby the gospels became meaningful, not as illustrating something about the person of

Christ, but rather as Geschichte. Something actually is accomplished in Christ's life. Consequently, the succession of events becomes important and particularly the theology lying behind it. The question of who Christ was, is not to be abstracted, according to Ritschl, from what he actually achieved as an historical individual, but can only be known by taking seriously what he accomplished in his earthly life.

In this respect, Ritschl gave an added impulse to the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. It was now possible to escape the one-sided preoccupation with the person of Jesus and to do greater justice to the gospels as Geschichte and thereby also to the original intention of the evangelists. At the same time, Ritschl's Christology could qualify as wissenschaftlich insofar as it was based upon the synoptic rather than the Johannine portrait of Christ (This is immediately apparent from the centrality of the concept of the kingdom of God in Ritschl's Christology.), and coincided with the increasing confidence in the "Markan plan," i.e., the historical framework of the Gospel of Mark. This, in part, helps to explain the wide appeal of Ritschl's solution to the Christological problem.

At the same time, Ritschl's answer to the problem of Christ's divinity was attractive, because it assured the centrality of Jesus for faith without involving it in metaphysical and philosophical difficulties. According to Ritschl, God is revealed in Christ only to the believer who has experienced the benefits of his work. In this context, Ritschl also introduced the theory of value judgments by which he sought to justify his epistemological position philosophically. In order to assure the priority of practical faith over against theoretical knowledge, Ritschl distinguished between judgments of fact, the disinterested objectivity of the empirical sciences, and judgments of value by which faith describes realities which cannot be known except in their absolute moral worth for us. Accordingly, we know the nature of God and Christ only in their value for us.<sup>30</sup>

Ritschl's theory accordingly represented still another reinterpretation of the supernatural element in the gospels which gained considerable popularity in the Ritschlian school. Whereas rationalism had rejected the supernatural element

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., pp. 193 ff.

and Strauss had sought to interpret it symbolically, Ritschl's theory offered a new solution. The statements about Christ's divinity in the gospels were not to be understood as ontological definitions, but as judgments of value. Christ has the value of God for us. Thus all ontological and metaphysical problems in which traditional Christology had become involved could be avoided. The centrality of Christ for faith could be preserved in the realm of moral values alone. Thus, Ritschl's theory, as it came to be applied by his followers, tended to increase the positivistic character of subsequent theology.

Ritschl's theology in general exerted many diverse influences upon his contemporaries. As far as historical research was concerned, Ritschl's emphasis upon the importance of the kingdom of God in the gospels and his own interpretation thereof gained wide acceptance. His solution to the Christological problem proved to be an invigorating stimulus to theology, but at the same time also left new problems in its wake. Because his Christology was grounded so firmly in a particular historical understanding of Jesus' life in terms of his vocation to establish the kingdom of God, Ritschl's Christology

proved vulnerable to the changing fortunes of historical criticism. The question of the self-consciousness of Jesus became an acute issue in the same measure that historical criticism came to challenge Ritschl's understanding of Jesus' consciousness of his vocation. Ritschl's followers, consequently, were left to wrestle increasingly with the whole problem of the relationship between faith and history, which Ritschl himself had never defined precisely.

### 3. The Modification of Ritschl's Solution in the Ritschlian School

The late nineteenth century Leben-Jesu research was characterized by a mounting scepticism as to the possibility of reconstructing the Life of Jesus. The confidence with which Ritschl had treated the historical element in the gospels was undermined by new and radical results of historical criticism. Under the impact of this scepticism, Ritschl's solution to the Christological problem seemed to require revision. In the work of Wilhelm Herrmann and Adolf von Harnack, two of the most prominent and influential Ritschlians, we find two significant modifications of Ritschl's solution. Harnack, of course, is known as one of the greatest church

historians. But it was Herrmann who, as a theologian and professor at Marburg, expended great efforts to make history more important for faith within the basic outlines of Ritschl's thought.

a) Wilhelm Herrmann (1846-1922). Herrmann's Christology as set forth in his book Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott,<sup>31</sup> Stuttgart, 1886, reflects the changed situation which had been brought about by historical criticism. The inconclusive results of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung eventually produced in the last two decades of the nineteenth century a growing scepticism as to the possibility of attaining a clear picture of the life of Jesus. The uncertainties and probabilities of historical criticism appeared to offer no firm basis for faith as far as the historical Jesus was concerned. For Herrmann, who fully shared this scepticism, historical criticism above all showed "wie wenig die neutestamentlichen Schriften für eine Geschichtschreibung hergeben, die es unternehmen wollte, das, was die Person Jesu für den Christen bedeutet, als ein Ergebnis wissenschaftlicher Beweise

---

<sup>31</sup>E.T., enlarged and altered in accordance with the fourth edition of German (Stuttgart, 1903), by J. Sandys Stanyon, The Communion of the Christian with God, London, 1895; 2nd ed. in New York, 1906.

vorzuführen."<sup>32</sup> The confidence in the historical method, which had characterized the early lives of Jesus and to some extent also the work of Ritschl, had here largely evaporated.

Herrmann defined Christianity as "ein durch Christus vermittelter Verkehr der Seele mit dem lebendigen Gott."<sup>33</sup> This communion of the believer with God is established by the revelation of God in the person of Christ, or, more precisely, in the inner life of Christ. The inner life of Christ, which for Herrmann was something of a transcendent reality, shines through the portrait of Christ which is preserved in the church, yet is not identical with any empirical knowledge of the historical Jesus. It can only be experienced by faith and can therefore never be affected by historical criticism. In this experience of the inner life of Christ we become conscious of God's communion with us, and we lay hold of Christ as the ground of our salvation.<sup>34</sup>

The portrait of Christ which can be gained from the New Testament discloses a life of perfect goodness and purity. But to see this does not mean

---

<sup>32</sup>W. Herrmann, Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott, Vierte Auflage, Stuttgart und Berlin, 1903, p. 63.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 63 ff.

that we have yet laid hold of the redemptive feature of his inner life. "Von allen Menschen, die ihm in der Hingabe an das Gute zu folgen suchen, unterscheidet sich Jesus nicht bloss als ihr unerreichtes Vorbild, sondern auch durch die Stellung, die er zu dem Ideal vollkommenen Lebens einnimmt, in dem er den Menschen ihre Seligkeit enthüllt hat."<sup>35</sup> Jesus is not only aware of conforming to the ideal for which he sacrifices himself, but is also conscious of his power to communicate this ideal to others. Once we have experienced this redemptive power in our own inner life, the fact of Jesus' personal life establishes for us the absolute certainty of the reality of God.<sup>36</sup>

It is to be observed that Herrmann was fully in accord with Ritschl's basic axiom that God is revealed to faith through the experience of Christ's redemptive work. For both, Jesus is the ground of our redemption, and therefore the revealer of God. But the redemptive work of Jesus is conceived differently by each. For Herrmann, it consists in the power of Christ's inner life to communicate the

---

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., pp. 72-73.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., pp. 73 ff; pp. 79 ff.

ideal of a perfect life through which the believer becomes conscious of his communion with God. For Ritschl, the obedience of Christ to his vocation establishes the communion of the believer with God.

Herrmann also speaks of the obedience of Christ, but it is only the revelation of man's true nature and does not accomplish anything as in Ritschl. That is to say, for Herrmann the historical work of Christ--what he actually accomplished or sought to accomplish by his obedience--is of little significance as compared with the fact of his person, the unique quality and power of his inner life. This represents a reduction from Ritschl. The representative work of Christ in its direction from man to God which was so important to Ritschl, is here eclipsed and only the revelational aspect remains with Herrmann. The historical work of Christ recedes behind his person.

This emphasis upon the inner life of Christ, which in some respects represented a return to Schleiermacher, marked the beginning of a new trend in theology as well as in the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Interest now came to be centered in the historical Jesus as a spiritual and religious personality. Even though historical criticism had failed to achieve an accurate reconstruction of the life of Jesus,

enough material appeared to remain to arrive at a clear conception of his moral character and the religious quality of his life. At least the spiritual personality of Jesus appeared to offer a firm basis to which faith could cling. The timeless quality of his personal life shone through the transient and temporal in such a way that it continued to exercise its redemptive influence upon mankind. But inasmuch as Herrmann failed to realize that the inner life of Jesus could not be dissociated so completely from the historical portrait given in the gospels, his solution remained vulnerable to the changing fortunes of historical criticism.

b) Adolph von Harnack (1851-1930). The growing historical scepticism as to the life of Jesus which had led Herrmann to modify Ritschl, expressed itself somewhat differently with Harnack. In his very influential book, Das Wesen des Christentums,<sup>37</sup> Leipzig, 1900, Harnack presented the essence of Christianity in terms of the gospel of Jesus. Although he did not wish to divorce the teaching of

---

<sup>37</sup>Originally published in 1900 as a transcript of class lectures delivered in Berlin during the winter semester of 1899-1900, the book sold over 100,000 copies by 1925 and has been translated into many languages. E.T. by T. B. Saunders, What is Christianity? New York, 1901; 1903 (3rd ed.).

Jesus from his person and life, it is clear that his interest centered in the gospel of Jesus as the source and basis of the Christian faith. In Ritschlian fashion, the concept of the kingdom of God is the starting point. Harnack acknowledges the existence of an eschatological element in Jesus' preaching of the kingdom, but rejects this as an historically conditioned element of his Jewish beliefs. The timeless truths which remain, once the husk has been removed from the kernel, consist in the understanding and experience of God as Father, of the sonship of men, of the infinite value of the human soul, and all related ethical concepts.<sup>38</sup>

Thus Harnack finds the firm basis of faith not in the inner life of Jesus as such, but in the ethical and religious teachings of Jesus whose genuineness had been assured by historical criticism. The vacillating results of historical criticism with respect to other aspects of Jesus' life would not materially affect this established core. The person of Jesus thereby ceases to have any real Christological significance. While the revelation of God through the person of Jesus is still essential

---

<sup>38</sup>What is Christianity?, 1904, pp. 53-80.

for Herrmann, with Harnack Jesus is essentially a teacher. "The Gospel, as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son."<sup>39</sup> Jesus' consciousness of being the Son of God was nothing but the consequence of his knowledge of God as Father. Convinced that he knew God as no other before him, he was conscious of the Beruf to communicate by word and deed to all others this knowledge of God, and thereby also of Gotteskindschaft.<sup>40</sup>

Thus Harnack represents a further reduction of both Ritschl and Herrmann. In Ritschl the work of Christ under the category of Beruf involved at the same time the revelation of the true nature of God as well as the establishment of the fellowship of believers. In Herrmann the work of Christ is reduced to a revelatory function, whereas in Harnack this is further reduced to the function of a teacher.

In both Herrmann and Harnack the interest in Christology reaches its lowest ebb. The positivistic spirit of liberal theology had practically driven metaphysics from the field, and the problems of traditional Christology are left behind. There are no longer traces of the traditional doctrine of the

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 147.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 130-131.

trinity. While Ritschl had strongly emphasized the work of the Father, his theology still showed traces of the trinity. But both Herrmann and Harnack tended to become unitarian in their thinking.

Herrmann and Harnack represent the two main approaches which now come to characterize liberal theology in its attempt to relate the Christian faith to its founder: the one emphasizing the inner life or religious personality of Jesus, and the other the timeless religious truths of the gospel. A further reduction also occurs when Herrmann's view of the transcendent aspect of revelation in the inner life of Jesus is replaced by the purely spiritual or ethical influence of the person of Jesus. Moral influence theories of redemption now completely dominate liberal theology.

#### B. HISTORICAL APPROACH TO THE LEBEN- JESU-FORSCHUNG

It has already been indicated that the Leben-Jesu movement issued from the tension between faith and historical research not simply as a "quest for the historical Jesus" per se, but as an apologetic endeavor to maintain a vital relationship between faith and the historical person of Jesus. It was the attempt by scientific means to give faith

a solid historical basis--and this is to be seen in the context of a growing positivistic temper reacting against speculative theology and philosophy. It now remains to trace the actual development of historical research in the life of Jesus against the background of the theological and especially the Christological problems of the nineteenth century.

However one may judge the success of the whole endeavor to reconstruct the historical Jesus, it is certain that it compelled theology to reckon with the human life of Jesus far more seriously than it ever had before. The results of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung of the nineteenth century should not be dismissed too lightly. From the viewpoint of the twentieth century it is perhaps easy to see that the nineteenth century Leben-Jesu scholars were influenced by theological and philosophical presuppositions far more than they themselves were aware of. But to discuss their results simply as the projection of nineteenth century ideals into the life of Jesus is to do injustice both to their intentions as well as their achievements, and to overlook the extent to which their results actually have contributed to the theological and Christological developments of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

No detailed treatment of the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung will be required, since the ground has been already well traversed by such scholars as Albert Schweitzer, C. C. McCown, and Weinel-Widgery. Albert Schweitzer's now famous, The Quest of the Historical Jesus,<sup>41</sup> represents a somewhat detailed survey of the historical and critical problems from a onesided interest in eschatology.<sup>42</sup> His sharp polemic against the liberal school tends to obscure its contributions and at times distorts the picture of the nineteenth century. The book, Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After,<sup>43</sup> by H. Weinel and A. G. Widgery also represents a somewhat onesided survey which is concerned chiefly with the development of the interpretation of Jesus as a religious personality. C. C. McCown's

---

<sup>41</sup>English translation by W. Montgomery, London, 1910, of the first German edition, Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung, Tübingen, 1906. Second revised edition entitled: Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung, Tübingen, 1913.

<sup>42</sup>Schweitzer's interpretation of New Testament eschatology can be seen as a reaction against nineteenth century immanentism and liberalism. See A. L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament, SNT, XIII (1966), 35-48.

<sup>43</sup>Edinburgh, 1914. A translation and revision of Weinel's Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, Tübingen und Leipzig, 1904, by Widgery.

study, The Search for the Real Jesus. A Century of Historical Research<sup>44</sup> sets the development of Leben-Jesu research within the larger context of the broad historical and philosophical currents of the nineteenth century. The viewpoint may be generally characterized as liberal. None of these works, however, represent a thorough treatment of the theological background of the development of the Leben-Jesu movement. For present purposes it will be sufficient to outline those aspects of the development which have bearing upon the problem of the relationship of Jesus and Paul.

1. The Problem of the Conservative "Lives" of Jesus: Neander

The Leben-Jesu of an early mediating theologian will serve to indicate the precise nature of the problems confronting conservative theology after Strauss. August Wilhelm Neander (1789-1850) was born of Jewish parents and originally named David Mendel. On becoming a Christian in 1806, he changed his name. He was a scholar of warm piety and faith, strongly influenced by Schleiermacher. His Leben

---

<sup>44</sup>New York, 1940. See J. H. Skilton's book review in WTJ, III (1940), 180 ff.

Jesu was originally published in 1837, two years after Strauss', and was long regarded in conservative circles as an authoritative refutation of Strauss. Its popularity is indicated by the fact that it appeared in seven editions, the last in 1872.<sup>45</sup>

Neander, in his Leben Jesu, took his stand over against the metaphysical doctrine of Christ on the one hand, and against the historical scepticism of Strauss on the other. He acknowledged the full right and validity of historical criticism for the study of the gospels, but questioned the claim that it could be free of presuppositions. We cannot free ourselves from the presuppositions inherent in our nature, "und die vermeinte Voraussetzungslosigkeit ist in der That nichts Andres, als eine Vertauschung gewisser Voraussetzungen mit andern."<sup>46</sup> It is therefore a question of starting from the right presupposition, one that springs from a higher necessity grounded in the moral order of the universe.

One must, therefore, approach the life of

---

<sup>45</sup>A. Schweitzer, Quest, pp. 100 ff.

<sup>46</sup>Neander, Das Leben Jesu-Christi in seinem geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge und seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Sechste Auflage, Gotha, 1862, p. 1 (E.T. by J. McLintock and C. E. Blumenthal, The Life of Jesus Christ, London, 1851).

Jesus, from the presupposition which is basic to the Christian consciousness and to the existence of the Christian church. It is the presupposition that "Jesus ist der Sohn Gottes in einem Sinne, in welchem dies von keinem Menschen ausgesagt werden kann, das vollkommene Abbild des Überweltlichen, persönlichen Gottes in der von ihm entfremdeten Menschheit."<sup>47</sup> In him the source of divine life appeared in humanity, and through him the idea of humanity was realized. Not only is this presupposition inseparable from the Christian consciousness, but the existence of this concept of Christ can only be explained as his self-revelation, as the reflection of his actual life in the consciousness of his first followers and then in the consciousness of the church. Accordingly, for Neander the actual life of Christ must correspond to the idea of it which exists in the Christian consciousness.

Und die unserer Auffassung des Lebens Christi zum Grunde liegende Voraussetzung muss sich durch die Darstellung selbst in ihrer Berechtigung bewähren, wenn es sich nachweisen lässt, dass ohne dieselbe das Leben Christi nicht verstanden werden kann, aber vermöge derselben Alles harmonisch zusammenstimmt.<sup>48</sup>

Thus the historical reconstruction of the

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

Life of Christ is to confirm that concept of Christ which is the presupposition of the Christian consciousness. The idea of Christ existing in the Christian consciousness is to aid us in grasping his life in its unity and wholeness, but at the same time the reconstruction of his life will also serve to correct, confirm, and enlarge the idea itself.<sup>49</sup>

It is clear from Neander's "Einleitung" that there is as yet *not* real break with the traditional usage of the gospels. Both start from an a priori understanding of the person of Christ: for Protestant orthodoxy it was the metaphysical doctrine of the two natures of Christ; for Neander the concept of the divine-human Son of God derived from the Christian consciousness. In both, the gospels are used primarily as sources to confirm and illustrate a prior conception of the person of Christ. The difference here lay in the fact that Protestant Orthodoxy merely used a proof-text method, whereas Neander sought to use historical methods. Neander's approach also appeared to resolve the tension between faith and historical study; with the presupposition

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 6-8.

that the idea of Christ in the Christian consciousness must correspond to his historical actuality, there would be little fear that historical study might contradict faith. It might help to purify the idea of Christ, but would not contradict it in its essential features. But the unhistorical character of this methodology soon became apparent and proved unacceptable to the growing historical consciousness of the age; Neander's Leben Jesu further disclosed the untenability of mediating theology.

The difficulty which the idea of a divine-human Christ created for the interpretation of the gospels is apparent in Neander's attempt to deal with certain aspects of Jesus' life. The temptation story provides a good example. Christ's victory in the temptation story represents the self-sacrifice of his creaturely will (kreatürlichen Willens) to God. Yet we dare not suppose that any real choice between good and evil was involved. "Die beharrliche Grundrichtung seines in der Gottergebenheit wurzelnden inneren Lebens enthielt die keinen Kampf zulassende Entscheidung."<sup>50</sup> The temptations were only outward and external, and never met with an

---

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

inner response--so revealing the perfect unity of the divine and human which constituted his inner life.<sup>51</sup> But with this interpretation, the temptation is not a real temptation and the real humanity of Christ is called into question.<sup>52</sup>

A similar problem arises in connection with the story of Christ's self-struggle in the Garden of Gethsemane. Christ as a man desired to escape suffering, yet he yields to the will of God. "Es unterscheidet sich das Menschliche in ihm von dem Göttlichen, damit bei dieser Unterscheidung die Einheit in der Unterordnung des Einen unter das Andere mit klarem Bewusstsein hervortreten sollte."<sup>53</sup> Here the humanity of Christ is made a kind of a subordinate appendage to the divine. When the starting point is Christ's divinity, his humanity becomes a problem for exegesis. Liberal theology sought to escape such forced interpretations of the text. By starting from the humanity of Christ, however, the divinity of Christ became a problem.

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., pp. 91-94.

<sup>52</sup>Cf. E. Best, The Temptation and the Passion, SNTSM, 2, Cambridge, 1965, 43 ff.

<sup>53</sup>Neander, op. cit., p. 554.

The above illustrations also show how Neander used the gospel material as evidence for the understanding of the person of Christ. The result is a portrait of the inner life of Christ and not a real "Geschichte." This is borne out further in the way in which he reconstructs his life of Christ from the gospels. Taking the Gospel of John as his framework, he fits various portions of the synoptic gospels into it at appropriate places without any explanation as to why he does so. The whole reconstruction then takes on the character of a mere chronicle of events, divided into two main periods: The public ministry of Jesus up to his last entry into Jerusalem; and the events which led to his death in Jerusalem together with the resurrection and ascension. Jesus is fully aware of the divine "plan" for himself from the very beginning, and never wavers in it or alters it throughout his ministry. He knows that the people will reject him, and that he will realize the purely spiritual kingdom of God through his death. His public ministry is a kind of interlude before the cross, in which he teaches the true nature of the kingdom, discloses his divine nature by the miracles, and prepares the disciples for their future work for the kingdom of God. Whatever development there is, is purely external to Jesus

and his inner nature, which as divine knows no change or development. The work of Christ, consequently, is subordinate to the interest in his person.

Neander is still caught in the difficulty of orthodox Christology, viz., that of adequately relating the person of Christ to his work.

## 2. The Markan Hypothesis

The period from the time of the controversy over Strauss to the eighteen-sixties was largely a time of transition, marked particularly by the development of what Schweitzer called the "Markan Hypothesis"<sup>54</sup> and the sharpening of critical methods which accompanied it. Neither Strauss' psychological method nor the uncritical procedures of mediating theology offered any real possibility for progress. Strauss' attitude toward the Gospel of John was unacceptable, partly because of the strong theological prejudice favoring it, partly because his repudiation of John was tied so closely with his mythological interpretation. His opinion as to the relationship between John and synoptic gospels was not sufficient to challenge the supremacy of the

---

<sup>54</sup>A. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 121-136. Cf. N. B. Stonehouse, Origins of the Synoptic Gospels, Grand Rapids, 1963, pp. 56-112.

fourth gospel until that opinion could be placed on a sounder historical basis.

However, this was forthcoming soon after Strauss' Leben Jesu made its appearance. In 1838 C. H. Weisse<sup>55</sup> and C. G. Wilke<sup>56</sup> argued independently of each other for the priority of the Gospel of Mark,<sup>57</sup> the former using a historical approach and the latter primarily a literary argument. Weisse, in particular, pointed out the direction of future developments. Over against the subjectivity of Strauss' method, he sought to discover a general continuity in the narratives of the gospels which would provide a sure historical basis for the life of Jesus and offer a sound criterion for distinguishing mythical and legendary elements. Weisse found such a continuity in the arrangement of the Gospel of Mark, and this was for him the decisive argument for its priority. In contrast to the composite

---

<sup>55</sup>Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet, Zwei Bände, Leipzig, 1838.

<sup>56</sup>Der Urevangelist, Dresden und Leipzig, 1838.

<sup>57</sup>The priority of Mark, which had had earlier champions in Koppe (Marcus non epitomator Matthæi, 1782), Storr (De Fontibus Evangeliorum Mt. et Lc., 1794), Gratz (Neuer Versuch, die Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien zu erklären, 1812), and Herder (Herder's Complete Works, ed. by Suphan, V, 35 ff.), was now maintained by Lachmann ("De ordine narrationum in evangeliiis synopticis", in TSK, 8 (1835), 570 ff), who saw in Matthew a combination of the logia-document with Mark. Cf. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 88.

character of Matthew and Luke, Mark appeared to be a unified whole wrought from a single source. However, this organization itself was due to Mark, who, guided by a living picture of Jesus' life as a whole, added the necessary details and connecting links to give his material its unity.

Gerade aber bei Marcus wird man, wenn man näher zusieht, unfehlbar gewahr werden, wie jene Zwischenbemerkungen (sie betreffen fast sämtlich die Art und Weise, wie sich der Ruf von Jesus verbreitete, wie sich das Volk um ihn zu sammeln begann, Kranke sich an ihn dragten u.s.w.), weit entfernt, die einzelnen Bestandtheile in sich abzuschliessen, vielmehr dieselben unter einander verknüpfen, in der Absicht, sie nicht als eine zufällig aneinander gereichte Anekdotengruppe, sondern wirklich als eine Gesamterzählung erscheinen zu lassen.<sup>58</sup>

Thus Mark succeeded in giving a clear conception of the effects of Jesus' work in Galilee and from Galilee to Jerusalem. This is not true of the other evangelists, particularly John who completely misrepresents the attitude of the people to Jesus.<sup>59</sup>

Not only was the primacy of the Gospel of John now more seriously challenged, but Weisse's hypothesis of the general historical reliability of the Markan outline opened entirely new possibilities

---

<sup>58</sup>Weisse, op. cit., p. 70.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., pp. 69-71. Cf. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 125 ff.

for the reconstruction of the Life of Jesus. But the success of the Markan hypothesis still awaited its more thorough demonstration. It is interesting that A. Ritschl lent his support to the Markan hypothesis and contributed to its further development.<sup>60</sup> The credit for its ultimate success belonged to H. J. Holtzmann who provided a thoroughly detailed linguistic and literary demonstration of it.<sup>61</sup> Along with the priority of the Gospel of Mark, the Markan outline was also firmly established. Holtzmann had distinguished seven stages in the Galilean ministry,<sup>62</sup> but in the later "Lives" of Jesus this was reduced to two: a period of success; and a period of "flight." The main course of Jesus' life followed these lines: During the early part of his ministry, Jesus concealed his growing consciousness of Messiahship that first came to him at the time of his baptism (Mk.1:11) until the disciples

---

<sup>60</sup>A. Ritschl, "Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der kritik der synoptischen Evangelien," TJ, 1851, pp. 480-538.

<sup>61</sup>H. J. Holtzmann, Die synoptischen Evangelien, Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter, Leipzig, 1863.

<sup>62</sup>Mark 1; 2:1-3:6; 3:7-19; 3:20-4:34; 4:35-6:6; 6:7-7:37; 8:1-9:50. See Holtzmann, *Ibid.*, pp. 479-484.

had come to a sufficiently high concept of the kingdom of God and the Messiah. When the disciples were spiritually prepared, Jesus disclosed his Messiahship at Caesarea Philippi along with the necessity of his suffering. After becoming clearer as to what this demanded of himself, Jesus revealed to his disciples his decision to present his cause in Jerusalem. His disciples followed to witness the final outcome.<sup>63</sup>

It was principally through the work of Holtzmann that the Markan outline together with the sayings' source(Q) of Matthew and Luke became the basis of many subsequent "lives" of Jesus. The development of the new critical methods inspired confidence in the possibility of recovering the historical Jesus. At the same time the primacy of the Gospel of John became untenable; insofar as Johannine material was still used, it was inserted into the Markan outline only if it did not contradict the essential Markan portrait of Jesus.

The success of the Markan Hypothesis had important consequences for the whole Leben-Jesu

---

<sup>63</sup>Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 202-204; W. G. Kümmel, NT, p. 151 ff. H. J. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 476. Then, from Chapter 10 onwards, the disciples began to realize the peculiar way in which Jesus was to be the Messiah: rather than setting up an earthly, political kingdom, he would go to Jerusalem to die.

movement. It directed the attention of theology to the material of the public ministry of Jesus as never before. This material was now used not merely as evidence for a doctrine of the person of Christ, but as the source of a real "Geschichte." It was now possible to describe his person and work in terms of historical development, and the figure of Jesus could take on life and reality in the context of history.

The fruits of the new historical approach appeared almost immediately in the "Lives" of the eighteen-sixties. However, in the development of the Leben-Jesu research two different emphasis emerge: One centering in the self-consciousness or inner life of Jesus, and the other in the external course of his life and its historical accomplishment. While both approaches deal with the same subject matter, the differences of emphasis lead to varied results as to the significance of the historical Jesus for faith.

### 3. The Self-Consciousness of the Historical Jesus: Weizsäcker

Representative of the first of the aforementioned approaches was Karl Heinrich Weizsäcker

(1822-1899), who became successor to F. C. Baur at Tübingen and was also a historian of the early church. However, Weizsäcker's affinities lay not with Hegelian theology, but rather with the mediating school. His studies in the life of Jesus were presented in a work published in 1864: Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung.<sup>64</sup> In the Foreword of his book, Weizsäcker rejoices that the dispute over the miracles has subsided and that the main question now is the "religious consciousness" of Jesus.<sup>65</sup>

He conceives his task as, "den Verlauf der Geschichte, wie er sich aus den ältesten Quellen ergibt, in seinen Hauptwendungen so zu zeichnen, dass durch denselben die Forderung eines solchen ausserordentlichen Selbstbewusstseins ~~oder~~ wenn man lieber will religiösen Bewusstseins Jesu als der Grundlage für alle Stufen und Wendungen seines Auftretens sich ergebe."<sup>66</sup> The difference over against Neander's

e.c. / Approach is immediately apparent. It is not the task

---

<sup>64</sup>Gotha, 1864 (Zweite Auflage, Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901).

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. X.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., pp. X-XI.

of historical study to prove an a priori conception of Christ's divine-human nature or divin<sup>en</sup> self-consciousness, but only to show how every stage of Jesus' life and work results from the demands of his extraordinary religious consciousness. Historical research can only inquire whether such an extraordinary person lived, whether he actually was what he claimed to be. Although Weizsäcker is convinced that the person of Jesus can only be understood with the help of the general concepts of religion and revelation, history must lead us to the point where this explanation has to begin. But a divine or transcendent consciousness does not exist for history, either in representation (Darstellung) or in reality. If dogmatics refuses to admit this, it must surrender the historical demonstration of its faith. "In der That aber scheint mir doch, dass unsere ganze Theologie, so weit sie Wissenschaft ist, vor der Erkenntnis getragen wird, dass wir die Persönlichkeit Jesu in seiner menschlichen Natur, und nicht in einer göttlichen zu suchen haben, dass die Gottheit dieser Person vielmehr in der eigenthümlichen realen Beziehung, in welcher er zu Gott stand, zu finden ist."<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. XI.

At this point the demands of faith coincide with the law of history. But faith is not endangered thereby. Even though historical criticism should eliminate all the external miracles, this would not effect the recognition of the "Geisteswunder" of his person in its real relationship to God. "Er wäre darum noch nicht vom Welterlöser zum Ideale der Menschheit, oder zu einem ihrer edleren Geister herabgerückt."<sup>68</sup> Consequently, there is for Weizsäcker no real tension between faith and historical research. The conflict which Strauss' Leben Jesu had created now appeared to be resolved. Historical research is granted its full right in the confidence that it would provide a scientific basis for theology which would not imperil the demands of faith. This was the optimistic prospect which gave the Leben-Jesu-Forschung its strong impetus in the eighteen-sixties.

The Markan hypothesis provides the basis for Weizsäcker's reconstruction, although the plan of Mark is slightly modified by the introduction of some Johannine material. The Galilean ministry is divided into the two periods according to Holtzmann's outline

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., pp. XIII, XIV.

of Mark. In the first period, Jesus appears in Galilee as a reformer of the people, proclaiming to all Israel the kingdom of God as a spiritual and ethical realm of life to be wrought by God in the near future. Although he did not yet consider himself to be the Messiah, he was conscious of a completely unique calling to prepare the coming Kingdom.<sup>69</sup> In the successful results of his work, he now realized that the Kingdom was already present instead of future and that he, in fact, was the Messiah called to stand at its head.<sup>70</sup>

Weizsäcker takes the title "Son of God" as the key for the understanding of Jesus' person. It is the expression of a personal life aware of its oneness with God, of unique "Verkehr mit Gott"; and his disciples believed in this title, because all his teaching and work corresponded to it in an absolutely unique fashion.<sup>71</sup> His Messiahship is only the application and consequence of his self-consciousness or "Sohnsgefühl," which, as the inner experience of faith, was the starting point of all his statements concerning himself, the "feste

---

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., p. 421.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 424.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., pp. 434-435.

Grundlage für die verschiedenen Stufen, in welchen Jesus das messianische Werk unter der Führung des Vaters erkennt und vollbringt."<sup>72</sup>

In the early period of his ministry, Jesus had sought only to elicit from his disciples the faith in the Kingdom of God and enlisted their aid in its further preaching. After his rejection by the people, he seeks to bring his disciples to a deeper understanding of his person. Only when he had established the faith of his followers in his inner character and his personal relation to God, could he lead this faith to an explicit knowledge of his great calling.<sup>73</sup> The disclosure follows the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. The disciples declare him to be the Messiah, because they have recognized him as the Son of God.<sup>74</sup> Jesus now, for the first time, speaks of his calling in terms of the sacrifice of his life. He had sought to save his people, but their hardness of heart made him certain that they were preparing his death. But what is striking in Jesus' attitude is not that he thinks of his death, but that he

---

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 474.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., pp. 426-427.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 472.

comprehends it as the divinely determined way to the fulfillment of his calling. This was a wholly new conception of the Messiah, and therefore shows that his conviction of his Messiahship did not rest on a human conception and external causes, but on an inner life strong enough to appropriate and assimilate the inconceivable.<sup>75</sup>

So at the close of the Galilean ministry, Jesus finally turns to Jerusalem, once more to offer the messianic salvation to the people. He dies to bring about the consummation of the Kingdom; but at the last supper he discloses to his friends that he is sacrificing his life for them, in order that they might experience his entire love as the love of God for them. "Mit dieser Erkenntniss war auch der Zweck seines Sterbens an ihnen erfüllt, und jenes Leben mit ihm bei ihnen begründet, welches nach seinem Tode beginnen sollte."<sup>76</sup>

This was the real greatness and wonder of his life. Even if one would explain such a personality from human nature, he would still remain the highest phenomenon, never to be repeated. "Seine Gemeinde hat aber mit Recht sich daran gehalten,

---

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., pp. 475-476.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 558.

dass das Leben aus Gott und mit Gott, ~~Welches~~ <sup>l.c./</sup> ihr durch ihn aufgegangen ist, in ihm selbst Wahrheit gewesen, das heisst eine göttliche Stiftung gewesen sei; dass er sich für den Sohn Gottes nicht nur hielt, sondern es auch war."<sup>77</sup>

Weizsäcker's study of the gospels shows how the Markan Hypothesis gave scholars new confidence in the possibility of understanding the life of Jesus as a connected whole. The older dogmatic theology had so concentrated upon the events of the cross and resurrection as to make his public ministry almost irrelevant except as a source of proof-texts for his divinity. But in the new "lives" of Jesus his whole life and activity becomes meaningful as the historical unfolding of a personal purpose and goal. All parts of his life now become essential to the understanding of his mission and its results.

In his attempt to understand the divinity of Christ in terms of his real relationship to God, Weizsäcker rejected the older attempt to interpret him philosophically in terms of "ideal humanity" (Herder). This appeared to make of Jesus an abstraction, and Weizsäcker insisted that Jesus

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 578.

conceived as a universal man, uniting and harmonizing all the powers of nature in himself, is really no man at all. He likewise rejected Strauss' attempt to understand Jesus in terms of the "Milde Heiterkeit seiner Weltanschauung." Rather for Weizsäcker, the basis for his life and preaching is the "vollkommene Sammlung für das Eine höchste Ziel, das Durchdringungsein von seinem Offenbarungsberuf."<sup>78</sup>

Although no natural example is adequate, he might best be compared to the type of masculine religious character, who from the truth of his faith goes into conflict with reckless energy; his whole "Geistesleben" was absorbed in his religious "Beruf."<sup>79</sup> Only on this basis is it possible to move from a mere portrait to a real "Geschichte."

In this portrayal of the life of Jesus there are lines which lead directly to Ritschl and his interpretation of Jesus' life from the standpoint of "Beruf." It is Jesus' consciousness of a divine calling which explains his actions and the course of his life. Yet Weizsäcker is interested in the life of Jesus primarily as an expression of the unique self-consciousness of his relationship to

---

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 437.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid.

God. In this respect, Weizsäcker had not completely escaped the influence of Schleiermacher and the older mediating theology. What is important for him is that the course of Jesus' life reveals the fact that he really was the Son of God he claimed to be. His work consists simply in the revelation of God's love for men, and not, as in Ritschl, the achievement of the fellowship of believers.

This line of approach with its interest in the self-consciousness of Jesus subsequently leads to Herrmann where the actual course of Jesus' life (about which historical criticism is now uncertain) is no longer of real interest, and the description of Jesus' inner life, as the proper object of faith, is the central concern.

#### 4. The Gospels as "Geschichte"

The second main emphasis in the Leben-Jesu involved the interest in the life of Jesus as history. The interest here is not so much in the self-consciousness or inner life of Jesus, but in the actions and events of his life, as these constitute a connected sequence of cause and effect. The main interest here is on the historical development of Jesus' life, particularly his public ministry. This

line of approach goes back already to the early rationalists, particularly Reimarus.<sup>80</sup> It appears again in E. Renan's La Vie de Jésus.<sup>81</sup> Apart from the fact that his book represents a highly subjective and aesthetic treatment of the life of Jesus, it is significant as a bold attempt to present the gospels as a Geschichte in which the inner connection of cause and effect is traced through the events of Jesus' life. The picture of Jesus which emerges from this treatment of the gospels is that of the tragic hero, whose death represents the miscarriage of noble ideals, and the whole story of Jesus becomes a moving historical drama.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup>A. Schweitzer states, "Before Reimarus, no one had attempted to form a historical conception of the life of Jesus." See Quest, p. 13. Between 1774 and 1778 G. E. Lessing published seven excerpts from H. S. Reimarus' fragments without revealing their author. He called them Noch ein Fragment des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten (the Anonymous Wolfenbüttel Fragments). The last and most important fragment, "Von dem Zwecke Jesu und seiner Jünger," contained what was really the first attempt in the history of thought to reconstruct the New Testament in terms of historical explanations that did not depend upon the supernatural but simply upon the normal range of human behaviour. See C. Voysey (ed.), Fragments from Reimarus, Lexington, 1962, pp. 84-119; C. H. Talbert (ed.), Reimarus: Fragments, London, 1971 (Translated by R. S. Fraser).

<sup>81</sup>Paris, 1863 (German, 1895); E.T. with an Introduction by W. G. Hutchison, The Life of Jesus, London, 1864, 1898.

<sup>82</sup>For a detailed description see A. Schweitzer, op. cit., Ch. XIII.

The significance of H. J. Holtzmann's Markan Hypothesis becomes apparent at this point as has already been indicated, by providing a scientific basis for the attempt to reconstruct the Geschichte of Jesus, and thus giving a fresh impetus to this line of approach. This same historical interest in the story of Jesus, although combined with a greater religious interest in the gospel than was the case with Reimarus and Renan, is to be found in K. Hase's Geschichte Jesu<sup>83</sup> and again in Theodor Keim's large three-volume work, Die Geschichte Jesu von Nazara in ihrer Verkettung mit dem Gesamtleben seines Volkes frei untersucht und ausführlich erzählt.<sup>84</sup> This line of approach also led to Ritschl where it found its highest theological expression.

##### 5. Leben-Jesu-Forschung as a Holzweg

During the eighteen-eighties the whole complexion of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung began to

---

<sup>83</sup>Leipzig, 1876. This work represented the culmination of an interest in the life of Jesus which had begun already with the publication of a life of Jesus in 1829.

<sup>84</sup>Zürich, 1867-1872. E.T. by E. M. Geldart and A. Ransom, The History of Jesus of Nazareth, freely investigated in its connection with the national life of Israel, and related in detail, 6 vol. (in 7), London and Edinburgh, 1876-1883.

change. The failure of historical criticism to produce assured results in the reconstruction of the story of Jesus' life, with the wide divergencies among the historical critics, coincided with a growing scepticism with respect to the reliability of the sources. Confidence in the Markan Hypothesis, particularly the Markan outline, began to be shaken. Inasmuch as the historical line of approach was so intimately connected with the question of the reliability of the sources, the effects of the new scepticism became apparent in the fact that the period of the "lives" of Jesus gradually gave place to one of "sketches," Charakterbilder, and the study of various specialized problems. The attempt of B. Weiss<sup>85</sup> and W. Beyschlag<sup>86</sup> to write "lives" of Jesus along the general lines of the older Markan Hypothesis were apologetically motivated and failed to stem the tide of growing scepticism. This line of approach finally leads, after the turn of the century, to the complete scepticism of W. Wrede on the one hand, and on the other to a return under a new guise to the

---

<sup>85</sup>B. Weiss, Das Leben Jesu, Zwei Bände, Berlin, 1882; E.T. by J. W. Hope, The Life of Jesus, Edinburgh, 1883.

<sup>86</sup>W. Beyschlag, Das Leben Jesu, Zwei Bände, Halle, 1886.

tragic-hero type of Reimarus-Renan in A. Schweitzer. The line of approach which emphasized the self-consciousness of Jesus led, under the influence of this scepticism, to Herrmann's emphasis on the inner life of Jesus and to Harnack's interest in the religious teachings of Jesus.

A further result of this scepticism was a growing discussion of the validity of the aims and results of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung as a whole. The discussion was inaugurated particularly by Martin Kähler's condemnation of the whole Leben-Jesu-Forschung as a "Holzweg" wholly unnecessary to theology.<sup>87</sup> Kähler's analysis of the gospels made him conclude that they are not reliable and sufficient as sources for a biography of Jesus written according to the standards of contemporary historical criticism.<sup>88</sup> The above is the negative aspect of his

---

<sup>87</sup>M. Kähler, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus, Leipzig, 1892, Second revised ed. 1896; E.T. by C. E. Braaten, The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ, Philadelphia, 1964, p. 46.

<sup>88</sup>Kähler adduces four literary-critical reasons for this: (1) The gospels, our only sources, exist in such isolation that apart from them we would know nothing at all about Jesus. Thus, Jesus could be taken for an imaginary picture created by the church around 100 A.D. (2) It is not at all certain that the sources can be traced back to eye-

evaluation of the gospel sources. There is a correlative positive view: The gospels are documents recording the performance of preaching which founded the Church. This incorporates the recollections of the earthly days of Jesus as they have been transformed through the experiences of the Risen Christ, and the witness to the meaning of the life, death and exaltation of Jesus Christ given by the Spirit. The Apostles had no interest of an historical nature in facts as such; rather every selection was made on the basis and for the purpose of the missionary preaching of the risen Christ who identified himself as the earthly Jesus. We receive from the Apostles not a history but a picture of Jesus Christ wherein historical and superhistorical elements have been interwoven.<sup>89</sup>

---

witnesses. The schools of bible-criticism differ as to which sections of the gospel traditions originate in the memory of the disciples. (3) The gospels deal mainly with the very brief and final period of Jesus' life. They can be called passion-stories with lengthy introductions. Moreover it is impossible to harmonize the passion narratives of the synoptic gospels, without even considering John. (4) The story of Jesus is told in two very different kinds of accounts: the Synoptics and the gospel of John. The great difference must awaken our suspicion as to the faithfulness of the recollection concerning purely factual data. Kähler, *Ibid.*, pp. 48 ff; C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ, New York, 1964, pp. 83-84.

<sup>89</sup> Kähler made a sharp distinction between the historical (historisch) Jesus and the historic (geschichtlich) Christ, See Kähler, *op. cit.* pp. 65 ff, pp. 21-22.

The life of Jesus historians were convinced that Jesus is disclosed in his true historical reality only when stripped of ecclesiastical and apostolic dogmatic vestments in which he was clothed. It became clear to Kähler that if this Jesus were the real Jesus of the New Testament, then Christianity had been committing idolatry for nineteen hundred years. It would have worshipped the creature instead of the Creator, man instead of God. Jesusology would then have to replace Christology.<sup>90</sup> Kähler points out the dominant part played by faith in the divinity of Christ among Christians. For Christians the divinity means Christ's nature according to which he becomes the object of faith without leading us to a deification of the creature.

However, the search for the historical Jesus based on the critico-historical method demands, for the scientific plausibility of such a biography, the essential assumption that Jesus is a mere man--whatever superlatives the individual biographer may wish to attribute to him. If you do not assume that he is mere man, then the project of the search for the historical Jesus must be abandoned; because biographies can only be written on the principle of analogy (psychological or historical). This principle of analogy, Kähler affirms, is based

---

<sup>90</sup>Braaten and Harrisville, op. cit., p. 86.

on a similarity of the two items being compared. But in comparing Jesus with ourselves, that basic similarity is missing, if Jesus is more than a mere "Primus inter pares" among men; so the principle of analogy cannot be applied.<sup>91</sup> At this point Kähler attacks the position of the liberals as he writes, "The distinction between Jesus Christ and ourselves is not one of degree but of kind."<sup>92</sup> This being the case, Kähler illustrates the inappropriateness of psychological analysis: "The inner development of a sinless person is as inconceivable to us as life on the Sandwich Islands is to a Laplander."<sup>93</sup>

Thus, for Kähler, on purely historico-scientific grounds (i.e., source critical) a biography or psycho-analysis of Jesus is impossible. The nature of the sources, as investigated by the historico-critical method, proves that they make a biography of Christ impossible. That is a historical judgment of great value. On the other hand, faith in the divinity of Christ makes a biography in the critical historical sense not only impossible, but irrelevant. That is a dogmatic judgment. Both disciplines thus come to an agreement.<sup>94</sup> Why is a biography irrelevant?

---

<sup>91</sup>Kähler, op. cit., p. 53

<sup>92</sup>Ibid.      <sup>93</sup>Ibid.

<sup>94</sup>Braaten and Harrisville, op. cit., p. 87.

Because Christian faith is based on the experience of the Risen Christ which manifests his divinity and also his redemptive success. Christian faith has no other interest at all in any other picture of Jesus than the New Testament picture of the Christ as kerygmatically portrayed by the primitive Christian community of believers. Kähler had apologetic reasons for attacking the Life of Jesus movement: it threatened the faith of the Christian man within the church. His dogmatic concern, as described above, led him to attack the attempt to write a scientific biography of Jesus.

Kähler did not intend simply and negatively *d/* to reject the Life of Jesus movement. He had the intention of providing an alternative way of understanding faith's relation to the historic, biblical Christ, one which is both historico-scientifically more adequate and theologically more defensible. This way consists in the historian using the apostolic writings for a "history of preaching" rather than for a "life of Jesus." As a result, what is simply lacking in the tradition will not be taken as an invitation to fill in the gaps with the imagination. What Kähler prefers is a critical phenomenology of faith which analyses the New Testament as a document of faith from the

standpoint of faith. However, this leads to a circular argument: The preaching of the Biblical Christ creates faith; faith gives the assurance that this biblical Christ is essentially historic (geschichtlich).<sup>95</sup>

Kähler's position was quickly disputed, but the intimate alliance between historical research and theology, which Weizsäcker had so confidently affirmed, was increasingly called into question, and the tension between the two came to be felt more acutely.

A new factor which contributed greatly to this changing situation was the development and introduction of religionsgeschichtliche methods into the critical research of the gospels toward the end of the nineteenth century. Research in the Jewish background of the New Testament, particularly the apocalyptic literature of the intertestamental period, cast new light upon the gospels and presented new problems for the Leben-Jesu research.<sup>96</sup> There

---

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

<sup>96</sup>For the bibliographical references on inter-Testamental Jewish history and ideas, see Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, A New English Version revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar; Organizing editor, M. Black, Edinburgh, 1973, pp. 3-5.

arose a growing awareness that the thought and message of Jesus were rooted in the contemporary thought-world of his age far more deeply than the previous study of the gospels had supposed. This insight was accompanied by the realization that the subjective and psychological methods which had characterized the older "lives" of Jesus had resulted in an unhistorical modernization of Jesus. The result was a considerable reduction in emphasis on, if not outright questioning of, the historical and religious uniqueness and originality of Jesus which had been somewhat naively assumed in the earlier "lives" of Jesus. This, in particular, accounted for the new tension between theology and historical criticism. The question of how to relate faith to an historical Jesus who appeared increasingly strange and foreign to the modern world view now became particularly acute.

#### 6. Johannes Weiss and the Dilemma of Liberal Theology

The dilemma of theology and the growing tension between theology and historical research becomes very evident in the historical research of J. Weiss (1863-1914), who belonged theologically to the Ritschlian school. The first edition of his

very significant little book, Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes, Göttingen, 1892, was strictly an historical investigation of the eschatological character of Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom of God. In the second edition (1900), Weiss elaborated his argument and defined his own position more precisely in relation to his critics and the previous Leben-Jesu-Forschung. The later edition, therefore, is particularly instructive for our understanding of the dilemma which the new research had created for theology.

The direction of the religionsgeschichtliche approach becomes apparent in the first chapter where Weiss deals with the Old Testament and later Jewish concepts of the Kingdom of God. In it he seeks to show how Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God is to be explained from the Old Testament idea of the sovereignty of God as modified and supplemented in Jewish apocalyptic with the idea of a dualistic conflict between God and Satan and the concept of the two ages.<sup>97</sup>

In the older research, the Old Testament

---

<sup>97</sup>J. Weiss, Die Predigt vom Reiche Gottes, Zweite Auflage, Göttingen, 1900, pp. 1-35.

and Jewish conception of the Kingdom of God was treated largely as a historical context from which Jesus may have occasionally borrowed in order to express his higher spiritual understanding of the Kingdom. But his teachings of the Kingdom were so new and spiritual that they transcended all concepts of contemporary Jewish thinking. With the new approach Weiss completely undermined this popular assumption of the eighteen-sixties (See above p. 168). The creative power of the new religion did not lie in any theories, but in the faith with which it was able to instill them with life. Jesus' idea of the Kingdom was not new, but his proclamation of its nearness was. Jesus saw that the time was at hand when God would reveal his sovereignty and destroy all his enemies. "Jesus ist der Herold dieser neuen Zeit, sein Wort ist nicht Lehre, sondern Evangelium, sein Werk ist Kampf für Gottes Sache, sein Ausgang Bürgschaft für den Sieg Gottes. Seiner Gemeinde hat er nicht eine neue Lehre über das Reich Gottes hinterlassen, sondern die Gewissheit, dass der Satan gestürzt und die Welt in Gottes Hand ist."<sup>98</sup>

Upheld by his conviction of the nearness of

---

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

the Kingdom of God, Jesus is a heroic religious personality whose sayings often give expression to a violent, impetuous, impassioned, and therefore, onesided religious feeling.

Wie sich ein gefrorener Springquell in seiner wunderbaren regellosen kühnen Schönheit von dem Spiegel einer Eisfläche unterscheidet, so wollen diese Ergüsse einer kampf- und sturmbewegten Seele, die uns in zufälligen und unzusammenhängenden Resten erhalten sind, mit anderem Mass gemessen werden, als das harmonisch abgeklärte System eines friedlichen Ethikers.<sup>99</sup>

It is this portrait of Jesus which Weiss sets against those of his contemporaries. Instead of the "Pneumatiker," the "Seer," the "Reformer," they had portrayed a humanistic "ideal" in the spirit of the Enlightenment, but not in the spirit of true historical objectivity.<sup>100</sup> The error of the immanent ethical understanding of the Kingdom, according to Weiss, lay in the fact that scholars too often read "die synoptische Stoffe nur durch die Johanneische Brille." The Gospel of John, for Weiss, represented a transformation, prepared for already by the Apostle Paul, of the original Christian eschatology into a kind of experiential mysticism. "John's" faith was not only mere remembrance, but also at the same time anticipatory union with the

---

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., p. 53.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., pp. 53-57.

exalted Christ. Judgment and salvation are transferred from the future into the present; eternal life is no longer a hope, but a present reality through faith and fellowship with Christ. John, therefore, represents a future development of thought in which Jesus' characteristic concept of the Kingdom practically disappears. As valuable as this contribution of John may have been for the church, it must not be permitted to obscure our understanding of the peculiar synoptic thought-world.<sup>101</sup>

According to Weiss, the eschatological element in Jesus' preaching was not merely incidental, but constituted the very essence of his thought. Jesus was so unshakeably convinced of the nearness and certainty of salvation that on occasion he could speak of it proleptically as already present, but his preaching of the coming Kingdom predominates and is normative.<sup>102</sup> Weiss rejects the popular interpretation of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' thought as the highest good, as a fellowship of the righteous, and as a process of development. The Kingdom of God in Jesus' thought is a wholly transcendent; supramundane reality which man cannot

---

<sup>101</sup>Ibid., pp. 60-64.

<sup>102</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

establish, but only God can bestow.<sup>103</sup>

The joyful character of Jesus' preaching at the beginning of his ministry shows that he did not yet reckon with the possibility of his death, but still believed "an einen glänzenden Sieg der Sache Gottes." He sends out the twelve to preach the coming Kingdom to as many as possible, for the time is short. But the expected coming of the Kingdom does not materialize and cannot, because the people have not really repented. . Out of this painful and bitter experience, Jesus' attitude is gradually pervaded by a deeper pessimism.<sup>104</sup>

When the opposition of the Pharisees convinces him of the inevitability of his death, it becomes for him also a divine necessity. "Nach seiner religiösen Lebensanschauung muss auch dies dem grossen Zwecke Gottes dienen, für den er lebt. Sein Tod kann nicht ein Scheitern seines Werkes bedeuten, sondern nur ein Mittel zur Herbeiführung des Reiches Gottes."<sup>105</sup> Thus he decides to give his life for his people in the hope that they will

---

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., pp. 73-88.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid., pp. 99-102.

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 103.

repent and the coming of the Kingdom will be realized. Jesus' hope was mistaken, but "Wer etwas Sinn für das Leben hat, wird in dieser Hoffnung Jesu einen neuen Beweis finden, wie unendlich er an den Menschen gehangen hat, die ihm von seinem Vater als Gegenstand seines Wirkens zugewiesen waren."<sup>106</sup>

In his teaching, Jesus was characterized by a pessimistic doctrine of predestination which limited salvation to a small number of "elect." Yet in his practical dealings with men, he preached repentance and righteousness as though salvation depended only upon the good will of man.

Es ist ein Zeichen der Gesundheit seines Empfindens, dass jener Determinismus ihm nicht die Freudigkeit gelähmt hat, an den Menschen zu arbeiten und sie für seine sittlichen Ideale zu gewinnen. Beide Gedankenreihen, jene prädestinationische und die ethisch-imperativische, wie sehr sie sich in der Idee ausschliessen mögen--in der Seele dieses kraftvollen, thatenfrohen Mannes gehen sie neben einander her, ohne sich zu durchkreuzen und zu stören. Man darf sogar sagen, dass die Energie des sittlichen Wirkens bei ihm überwiegt--wenigstens am Anfange, ehe Enttäuschungen und Misserfolge die andere Betrachtung näher legten.<sup>107</sup>

Weiss also sees a somewhat similar double aspect in Jesus' ethical teachings, as such. In answer to the

---

<sup>106</sup>Ibid., p. 105.

<sup>107</sup>Ibid., p. 134.

objection (raised against Weiss' position in the first edition) that the eschatological interpretation of Jesus' ethics made them appear purely negative, ascetic and otherworldly, Weiss answers that this is partly true, but does not present the whole picture. At times the dark shadows of the coming judgment disappear, and the sun of the heavenly Father breaks through the clouds to speak of God's love, goodness and mercy. Jesus' innate joy in nature and men asserts itself. Then he appears in the "reinen Klarheit einer völlig harmonischen Natur, die in ihrer vollkommenen Menschlichkeit etwas Uebergeschichtliches und Ewiges hat."<sup>108</sup> But this should not be allowed to obscure the fact that many of Jesus' ethical teachings are characterized by a strong eschatological and otherworldly outlook.

The last chapter is devoted to a discussion of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, which, according to Weiss, forms a close parallel to his preaching of the Kingdom of God. We cannot speak of a "plan of Jesus," of a "Messiasentschlusses" which he deliberately set out to carry through. His

---

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., p. 136.

"Berufsbewusstsein" must be understood as a religious conviction, a kind of religious intuition of his election.

Und in dem Lichte dieser Überirdischen Erkenntnis schliessen alle Instin<sup>k</sup>te der Sehnsucht und des Eifers um Gottes Sache zusammen zu der einen gläubig-gehorsamen Gesamtempfingung, mit der er sich seinem Gott und Vater zum Dienste bereit stellt.<sup>109</sup>

And just as every faith has an element of tension and uncertainty, "So hat auch das Messiasbewusstsein Jesu, wenn man so sagen darf, zwei Seelen."<sup>110</sup> Jesus' sayings at times express a joyful and confident certainty of his calling, but also unmistakable evidence that his calling constituted a problem which only the future could solve.

Jene wunderbaren religiösen Erfahrungen, über die er sich gelegentlich ausspricht, seine Erfolge über die Dämonen und die Offenbarung vom Sturze des Satan, das dauernde Bewusstsein, dass Gott in besonderem Sinne mit ihm sei (Act. 10:38, Joh 3:2) und das unbegrenzte Zuströmen pneumatischer Kräfte--all dies musste ja die Ueberzeugung in ihm lebendig erhalten, dass er wirklich der Erwählte Gottes sei.<sup>111</sup>

As certain as he was of this, however, the question was not yet answered as to how he should attain to

---

<sup>109</sup>Ibid., p. 155.

<sup>110</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>111</sup>Ibid., p. 157.

his Messiahship in the full sense. This was a riddle whose solution at times must have appeared very difficult to him.

The fact that he chose the term "Son of Man" shows that his Messianic consciousness shared to a certain degree in the eschatological character of his preaching. Weiss rejected the older theory that this term had anything to do with his humanity as distinct from any divine qualities. It rather involves the Dánielic concept of the man who comes on the clouds of heaven.<sup>112</sup> But the prophecy of Daniel gave Jesus the solution of the problem as to how he could be the Messiah in spite of his disappointment as to the coming of the Kingdom. Jesus at first did not identify himself with the transcendent Messianic concept of the Son of Man. But the identification followed when his death became certain and expressed his hope for exaltation through death to the real glory of the Messiah.<sup>113</sup>

In conclusion, Weiss affirms that this particular religious consciousness of Jesus must now be

---

<sup>112</sup>Cf. O. Cullmann, The Christology of New Testament (E.T. by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall), Philadelphia, 1963, pp. 137-192.

<sup>113</sup>Weiss, op. cit., pp. 159-175.

recognized by every "Religionsforscher" as absolutely given, and must not be interpreted away.

Hier muss sich zeigen, ob der Theologe den geschichtlichen Sinn hat, der unter Aufopferung von modernen Stimmungen und Vorurteilen sich dem Wirklichen in seiner besondern Gestalt beugt.<sup>114</sup>

Here the claims of historical research are opposed to theology with a sharpness that is reminiscent of Strauss. This was already done by Weiss in his "Vorwort" where he acknowledged his debt to Ritschl for his understanding of the significance of the idea of the Kingdom of God as central for theology. And he further acknowledged that this central concept was best suited "unserem Geschlecht die christliche Religion nahezubringen und, recht verstanden und recht ausgemünzt, ein gesundes und kräftiges religiöses Leben zu erwecken und zu pflegen, wie wir es heute brauchen."<sup>115</sup> Yet Ritschl's concept of the Kingdom of God was not that of Jesus. Its affinities lie rather with the Enlightenment and the later re-interpretation of the church.

Indeed, the re-interpretation and transformation of Jesus' preaching had begun already with Paul.

---

<sup>114</sup>Ibid., p. 176.

<sup>115</sup>Ibid., p. v.

and the evangelists themselves, for whom the Kingdom of God was not merely future, but is already established in the church in a certain fashion by Christ. There is no objection if modern theology, following the early church, asserts that Jesus by his activity founded the Kingdom as a fellowship of men who believe in God as Father and King and live in brotherly love. But this must be understood solely as a "Werturteil," a religious evaluation, not to be read into the faith of Jesus. Modern theology, more than it wishes to admit, is influenced by the Gospel of John which sees already in the historical Jesus everything which the earliest church expected only in the Parousia. Faith is likewise justified in regarding Jesus of Nazareth as the highest and final revelation of the divine in human form. But the religious "Glaubensurteil" is not to be confused with history.

Etwas anderes ist die nachträgliche religiöse Beurteilung des Wertes einer geschichtlichen Erscheinung, etwas anderes die geschichtliche Erforschung ihrer Lebensanschauungen, ihrer Absichten, ihrer Selbstbeurteilung. Und diese geschichtliche Untersuchung lehrt, dass Jesus für seine Person ebenso wie für sein Werk die entscheidende Wendung erst von der Zukunft erhoffte.<sup>116</sup>

Thus the dilemma of liberal theology at the

---

<sup>116</sup>Ibid., p. 178.

turn of the century finds sharp expression in J. Weiss. Having embraced the historical Jesus shorn of all metaphysical and supernatural elements, liberal theology now suddenly found itself confronted with a strange historical figure who fully shared in the antiquated religious beliefs and Weltanschauung of his credulous age. The "Jesus" who had seemed so congenial to the spirit of the nineteenth century suddenly becomes a stranger, a kind of "problem-child" for theology and faith. Obviously still sympathetic toward the liberal interpretation of Jesus, Weiss keenly felt the conflict between this conception of Jesus and the new historical portrait which intellectual honesty compelled him to accept. The only alternative, as he saw it, was for theology to sever its basis in the historical Jesus and pursue its own subjective and independent course, or otherwise to try and salvage those permanent and abiding elements from the new portrait of Jesus which would still have value for faith.

As the second edition of his book shows, Weiss had already embarked on the latter course. In this he was followed by the whole liberal school. It is significant that almost at the same time as influential a scholar as Harnack asserts that the

highest task of the historian is to distinguish "the kernel from the husk"--that which is of permanent, and abiding value from that which is historically conditioned.<sup>117</sup> In this respect, the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung is somewhat ironic. Having refined the historical method to the point where it was now possible to attain a better and deeper understanding of historical phenomena, historical research of the gospels now reverted to the old unhistorical and rationalistic principle, according to which ideas alone have permanent value independently of their manifestation in contingent historical phenomena. This method of distinguishing between kernel and husk now became almost a dogmatic principle of interpretation in Biblical reserach.

Weiss' work had decisive implications for both lines of approach to the life of Jesus. Whereas, for Herrmann the inner life of Jesus remained the object of faith, for Weiss it is something of an enigma, characterized by a strange tension and conflict between passionate eschatological hopes and convictions, which at times border on abnormality,

---

<sup>117</sup> Harnack, What is Christianity? p. 12.

and a more sober joy in life. The impossibility of Herrmann's attempt to isolate the inner life of Jesus from the external course of events is here especially apparent. In any case, it cannot retain the absolute significance for faith which Herrmann had attributed to it. According to Weiss, it is necessary here also to distinguish the kernel from the husk. This line of approach is now continued on a narrower basis with a more positivistic interest in the spiritual personality of Jesus, or in his religious genius as found in Weinel-Widgery. It also led to the religiously disinterested discussion of Jesus as a psychiatric problem.<sup>118</sup>

With regard to the teachings and message of Jesus, Weiss' work struck directly at the popular Ritschlian interpretation of the Kingdom of God in terms of moral values. Jesus' understanding of the Kingdom as a transcendent, eschatological reality appeared to stand in sharp contrast to the more congenial, modern view of it. Even the ethical teachings of Jesus were influenced by his strong eschatological outlook, so that even here one had to distinguish between the transient and the

---

<sup>118</sup>Cf. A. Schweitzer, Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu, Tübingen, 1913.

permanent. Thus the whole person and life of Jesus appeared increasingly strange to the modern age. The attempt to relate faith to Jesus had now to proceed on the much narrower basis which remained after the exclusion of all historically conditioned elements, namely, Jesus' inherited eschatological concepts.

With regard to the historical approach to Jesus' life, Ritschl's understanding of Jesus' Beruf in ethical and moral terms had now to be qualified in terms of his eschatological concepts. The tragic hero-type of Reimarus-Renan makes its reappearance with Weiss, but now in eschatological form. The death of Jesus is conceived as a vain attempt to bring in the eschatological Kingdom of God, to which his strivings and hopes had been directed from the beginning of his ministry. Thus, for Weiss the external course of Jesus' life has little more significance than it did for Renan. Jesus' eschatological hopes were finally a self-deception.

In terms of the preceding Leben-Jesu-Forschung, the total impact of Weiss' work was shattering. It is not strange that liberal theology by and large continued for some time to resist Weiss' eschatological viewpoint. But the tension between

theology and historical research was greatly aggravated, and more shocks were yet to come. At the same time, the increasing reduction of the religious significance of the life and work of Jesus, could not help but intensify the awareness of the contrast between Jesus and Paul.

#### 7. Schweitzer and Wrede

The complete separation of theology and historical research was rigorously and consistently carried out in two works which appeared simultaneously the year after the publication of J. Weiss' second edition of Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes: W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien,<sup>119</sup> and A. Schweitzer, Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis.<sup>120</sup> The substance of this study by Schweitzer was later summarized and placed in the context of the whole development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung in his later book Von Reimarus zu Wrede.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup>Göttingen, 1901; E.T. by J. C. G. Greig, The Messianic Secret, Cambridge and London, 1971.

<sup>120</sup>Tübingen und Leipzig, 1901.

<sup>121</sup>Tübingen, 1906; E.T. by W. Montgomery, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, New York, 1971 (7th ed.).

The three works together constitute a dramatic climax in the development of the critical study of the gospels.

Albert Schweitzer's (1875-1965) reconstruction of the story of Jesus, in which his main interest lay, followed the general lines which Weiss had laid down for the understanding of Jesus' life from the eschatological point of view, except that now all the details were filled in. The historical line of approach to the life of Jesus, leading from Reimarus through Renan--and one may also add H. J. Holtzmann--reaches a certain climax in Schweitzer. In spite of the antipathy which Schweitzer expressed for Holtzmann's Markan Hypothesis in his Von Reimarus zu Wrede, he was nevertheless somewhat dependent upon Holtzmann, and his exegesis is at times just as psychological as the method which he so strongly criticized.

What characterized Schweitzer on the one hand was his great confidence, in a time of growing scepticism, in the synoptic gospels as historical sources for the reconstruction of the story of Jesus, and on the other his purely historical interest in the life of Jesus. In contrast to the vacillation of Weiss between the eschatological and ethical,

Schweitzer consistently interprets the entire life of Jesus from the eschatological point of view. Everything in Jesus' life is dominated by the eschatological, including his ethical teaching which as an "interim" ethic has no validity for us today. Therefore, there can be no possibility of separating the kernel from the husk, for everything appears to Schweitzer as "husk." Having discovered the "true" historical-eschatological Jesus, Schweitzer consigns him irrevocably to the past. All that lingers is his "spirit."<sup>122</sup> Here in Schweitzer is the complete separation of historical research from theology, which Weiss had suggested as one alternative to the dilemma of the Leben-Jesu research.

Whereas the historical line of approach had led in Schweitzer to konsequente Eschatologie, in Wrede (1895-1906) it led to konsequente Skepsis. Wrede's Das Messiasgeheimnis represented a more radical and thoroughgoing attack against the Markan Hypothesis and the "lives" of Jesus which had issued from it. The "plan" of Mark was not historical, but the product of a deliberate attempt to impose a dogmatic, theological idea upon history. Jesus

---

<sup>122</sup>Schweitzer, Quest., pp. 348-397 and Ch. XX (Conclusion).

actually had been no more than a teacher who never was nor claimed to be the Messiah.<sup>123</sup> Not until after his death did the early church come to believe in him as the Messiah, and in an increasing degree gradually began to introduce messianic features back into his ministry. The climax is reached in the Gospel of John where Jesus is seen not only as an earthly Messiah, but also as one who had a pre-existent divine life.

There arose a new and specifically Christian concept of messiah which cannot be sufficiently definitely distinguished from the older one. It is a concept of a very complex kind. To a great extent it came into existence as a result of the fact that a plethora of new predicates became attached to the inherited concept of the messiah, as a result of which even the old predicates took on a new look; or else it came into existence because anything essential known about the life of Jesus, or regarded as known about it, was attached to the concept of the messiah itself.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup>Wrede's understanding of Jesus was also expressed in an essay on the subject of Biblical Theology: "Jesus' whole concern was with an ethical imperative born out of the highest religious individualism." Über Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie, Göttingen, 1897, p. 67; E.T. by R. Morgan, The Nature of New Testament Theology, London, 1973, p. 108 (pp. 68-116). The same view of this is set forth somewhat more fully in his book on Paul, pp. 162 ff.

<sup>124</sup>W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, Göttingen, 1901, p. 218; quoted from J. C. G. Greig's E.T., pp. 219-220.

Of all the gospels, Mark represents the earliest stage in this process. Mark's dogmatic scheme of the Messianic secret solved the tension between the earlier belief that Jesus became Messiah at the resurrection and the growing conviction that he must have been Messiah in some sense already in his earthly life.

But the tension between the two ideas was eased when it was asserted that he really was messiah already on earth and naturally also knew this but did not as yet say so and did not yet wish to be it; and even if his activities were entirely adapted to the awakening of belief in his messiahship nevertheless he did everything he could not to betray it for only the future was to be the bringer of revelation.<sup>125</sup>

Thus, the earliest gospel, dominated by this dogmatic and theological interest, ceases to offer any real historical basis for a Life of Jesus. These dogmatic elements and not the historical ones represent

what actually motivates and determines the shape of the narrative in Mark. They give it its colouring. The interest naturally depends on them and the actual thought of the author is directed towards them. It therefore remains true to say that as a whole the Gospel no longer offers a historical view of the real life of Jesus. Only pale residues of such a view have passed over into what is a suprahistorical view for faith. In this sense the Gospel of Mark belongs to the history of dogma.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup>Ibid., p. 229 (German ed., p. 228).

<sup>126</sup>Ibid., p. 131 (German ed., p. 131).

Thus, the discovery of the eschatological elements in the gospels represented no problem for Wrede, for such elements were dismissed as foreign matter introduced into the gospels by a later generation. The Messianic consciousness of Jesus, his awareness of a Beruf, on which Schweitzer and the whole historical line of approach had laid so much emphasis, is here also categorically rejected as a later invention of the Church. Wrede was not the first to reject the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, but his significance lies in the fact that he gave this rejection a scientific basis which could not be dismissed lightly.

In Wrede not a shred of the Markan plan remained. Schweitzer's confidence in the synoptic gospels as historical sources here gives way to a complete scepticism as regards the possibility of reconstructing the story and life of Jesus. All that remains is the somewhat shadowy figure of a Jewish teacher and his simple teachings about duty to God and man. In a somewhat different manner than in Schweitzer, theology is here also driven from the field by historical research.

The reduction of the historical basis of the gospels reaches a maximum in Wrede, as it had also

in Strauss. But for Wrede there is no possibility of rescuing the Christ of faith philosophically as Strauss had at least intended to do. Neither Strauss nor Wrede could see any real connection between the Christ of faith and the Jesus of history. But for the positivism of Wrede, this meant that the Christ of faith ceased to have any validity.

At this point in the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung we reach the crucial point for the whole problem of the relationship between Jesus and Paul. If the dogmatic Christ of the Pauline epistles has no real connection with the Jesus of history, then one is compelled finally to choose between them. And if the traditional faith of the church has based itself upon the Christ of Paul, must it not really claim Paul as its true founder and not Jesus? Wrede clearly saw this implication of his study of the gospels, and it was he also who in his study of Paul, to be treated in the next chapter, raised this Lebensfrage in so forceful a manner that the very existence of the church and its faith was called into question.

## CHAPTER II

### PAULINE RESEARCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

It now becomes necessary to trace the lines of Pauline research in the nineteenth century as they led to the antithesis: Jesus or Paul. The historical development of Pauline research has been traced at some length by Albert Schweitzer and Paul Feine.<sup>1</sup> It will not be necessary here to enter into all the

---

<sup>1</sup>A Schweitzer, Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart, Tübingen, 1912; E.T. by W. Montgomery, Paul and His Interpreters, A Critical History, London, 1912. This work enjoyed none of the popularity of his Von Reimarus zu Wrede, partly because its clarity was obscured by long polemic digressions, and partly because it had little new to contribute to the contemporary study of Paul. However, it is helpful for an understanding of the main trends of critical research in the nineteenth century. A more recent work is P. Feine's, Der Apostel Paulus, Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus; Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2. Reihe, 12. Band, Gütersloh, 1927; pp. 11-206 deal with the history of the theological understanding of Paul including a historical survey of opinion on the problem of Jesus and Paul. It contains valuable descriptive materials, but suffers from a piecemeal treatment of the writers and a somewhat artificial classification of the attempts to understand the theology of Paul. A brief, but suggestive treatment is R. Bultmann's article "Zur Geschichte der Paulus-Forschung" in TR, Neue Folge, 1 (1929), 26-59.

complex problems of Pauline theology or the critical questions relating to the life of Paul; rather the purpose of this survey is to indicate the general lines of the development of the theological understanding of Paul as it affected the problem of Jesus and Paul. No attempt to reconstruct the historical development of Pauline research can ignore the question of Jesus and Paul which was involved in it, but a thorough and adequate treatment of the inter-relationship of Pauline research and the problem of Jesus and Paul does not exist. The work of Schweitzer as well as that of Feine ~~are~~ deficient in this respect. is/

A. THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF PAULINE  
RESEARCH IN THE LIGHT OF THE PROBLEM  
OF JESUS AND PAUL

The modern historical-theological study of the Apostle Paul, inaugurated by the work of F. C. Baur, started from the point of view that the theology of Paul was to be understood as the necessary unfolding of the Christian consciousness. In this respect, Baur was fully in accord with the traditional view of the direct continuity between Jesus and Paul which was also represented by conservative theologians of the nineteenth century,

although on different grounds from those of Baur.

However, as a consequence of the further development of Leben-Jesu research, there also developed an increasing awareness of the fact that certain elements in Paul appeared to be intrusions or additions to what was to be found in Jesus. Pauline research is then characterized by the effort to distinguish this element of novelty from the genuinely Christian, and to account for and explain the former by historical factors. The essential continuity between Jesus and Paul is not thereby called into question, but the extent of this continuity is gradually reduced.

A third stage in the development of Pauline research is reached with the development of religionsgeschichtliche methods toward the end of the nineteenth century. Now the new elements in Paul are no longer experienced as mere novelty, but as actually antithetical to what is found in Jesus. At this stage the continuity between Jesus and Paul becomes increasingly problematical until it is finally denied categorically in W. Wrede's treatment of the Apostle Paul.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>W. Wrede, Paulus, Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher, Halle, 1905; E.T. by E. Lummis, Paul, Boston, 1908.

In tracing this development of Pauline research to its climax in Wrede it is helpful to keep two general considerations in mind: the one pertaining to the authority of the Bible, and the other the somewhat related question of the relationship of revelation and history.

Although the traditional understanding of the authority of the Bible as based on its divine inspiration was no longer acceptable, the older liberal theology of the nineteenth century did not deny the authority of the Bible in principle. The adoption of an historical approach to the Bible seemed to imply the freedom for, as well as the necessity of eliminating unsavory or uncongenial elements from it. As a result the Bible was "reduced," but it still remained in some sense a religious authority. This implicit recognition of the religious authority of the Bible helps to explain the persistent assumption of the continuity between Jesus and Paul as well as the reluctance of liberal theology to admit an antithesis between them.

The first consistent application of the historical approach to the Bible occurs in the religionsgeschichtliche Schule where the Bible

stands in principle as a piece of historical literature differing in no respect from any other religious literature of the past.<sup>3</sup> The historical significance of the Apostle Paul as well as his great influence in the history of the church is to be given its rightful due, but it is now regarded as a mistake to attribute any religious authority to his writings as such.

The problem of relationship between Jesus and Paul becomes a purely historical question, pertaining only to the historical origins of the Christian religion.

The question of the relationship of revelation and history is crucial for the whole development of the problem of Jesus and Paul. With Baur the continuity between Jesus and Paul still depends on a concept of revelation involving a principle of transcendence. Even though Paul may have further developed or added to what was given in Jesus, this was only a necessary part of the whole revelatory process. Both are equally authoritative for the understanding of the Christian faith.

For this dynamic understanding of revelation as the unfolding of a historical process, liberal

---

<sup>3</sup>W. Wrede, Über Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie, Göttingen, 1897. E.T. appeared in R. Morgan's The Nature of New Testament Theology, London, 1973, pp. 70 ff (pp. 68-116, "The Task and Methods of New Testament Theology").

theology substituted the absolutizing of the historical Jesus or some aspect of him. Accordingly, historical differences in Paul now are treated as deviations from Jesus, and Paul's authority becomes dependent upon the measure to which he stands in agreement with Jesus. At this point the question of the origin of Paul's theology becomes particularly decisive for historical research as well as theology. The demonstration that Paul derived certain concepts from his Jewish or Hellenistic environment, as this later came to be provided by religionsgeschichtliche research, is assumed to be proof of Paul's independence of and deviation from Jesus. And if an antithesis between Jesus and Paul should thereby be established, as Wrede believed it to have been done, it would be necessary to choose between them. Herein lies the reason for the particular intensification of the problem of Jesus and Paul which occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century.

#### B. BAUR'S INFLUENCE ON PAULINE RESEARCH

The study of Paul, like that of Jesus, had its real beginning in the nineteenth century in the context of Hegelian philosophy. But whereas Strauss' influence was largely negative, Baur's was

positive. Subsequent research sought mainly to correct or modify Baur's insights at certain points. As a result, Pauline research throughout most of nineteenth century moved largely within the framework of the historical and theological problems which Baur had set for it.

The key to Baur's reinterpretation of Pauline theology was the Hegelian concept of Geist as absolute Spirit in opposition to everything relative and finite. The spirit as the Spirit of Christ is the spiritual principle of the Christian consciousness by which Christians know themselves to be identical with the Spirit of God and thereby free from the "flesh," i.e., from everything external and finite. Positively, the Christian consciousness is then the consciousness of reconciliation with God, or of sonship of God.

Inasmuch as Christ was the principle of the Christian consciousness, one might have expected Baur to take his starting point in the Christology of Paul. However, under the influence of the Lutheran revival and because Baur interpreted Paul historically from the early conflict over the Jewish law, Baur's main interest centered in the doctrine of justification by faith as expressive of the

content of the Christian consciousness. Accordingly, Baur understood justification not merely as a forensic act, but primarily as a subjective process in the consciousness of the believer.

Therefore, Paul's theology appears as the expression of his Christian consciousness, involving a logical-dialectical development of thought corresponding to the objective historical development of his life. Paul's theology accordingly appeared as the spontaneous creation of a speculative mind, independent of the historical Jesus and in antithesis to Jewish Christianity. Yet there is no discontinuity between Jesus and Paul, no matter what their actual historical relationship may have been. For the content of Paul's Christian consciousness represents the logical-dialectical unfolding of one aspect--the universal-ethical--of Jesus' consciousness. The same Geist which expressed itself in the consciousness of Jesus was the Geist which found expression in the consciousness of Paul at a different but necessary stage of its dialectical development. Thus the relationship of Paul to Jesus was conceived dialectically, but not antithetically.

By the time of Baur's death the influence

of Hegelian theology and philosophy had already begun to decline, and as a result Baur's interpretation of Paul underwent various modifications in the further development of Pauline research. However, Baur's influence on Pauline research in the nineteenth century is to be noted at two important points: his interpretation of Paul as a systematic theologian and his conception of the independence of Paul over against the historical Jesus. The latter did not go unchallenged in the nineteenth century, but it became almost an unassailable dogma for the later religionsgeschichtliche Schule.

### C. PAUL'S THEOLOGY AS A SOTERIOLOGICAL SYSTEM

#### 1. The Shift from Justification by Faith to Soteriology: Holsten

Certain modifications of Baur's interpretation of Paul appear already in Carl Holsten (1825-1897), one of Baur's foremost followers. It was Holsten's aim to show that the theological system of Paul was to be understood from the basis of his conversion experience as the product of a logical-dialectical reflection on the meaning of the cross of Christ. The basis of this approach was

worked out in an essay entitled, "Die Christusvision des Paulus und die Genesis des paulinischen Evangelium" (1861). His full presentation of Pauline theology was published posthumously as the fruit of a life-time of Pauline research.<sup>4</sup>

While Holsten otherwise sought to continue Baur's work by showing the development of Paul's thought as a total system, he felt it necessary to correct Baur at one point. In his essay on Paul's Christ-vision, Holsten took Baur to task for admitting the possibility of a transcendent element when the latter had once stated that neither dialectical nor psychological analysis could explain the inner mystery by which God revealed his Son in Paul.<sup>5</sup> Holsten then sought to analyze and explain the Christ-vision of Paul psychologically according

---

<sup>4</sup>C. Holsten, Das Evangelium des Paulus, Zweiter Teile, Berlin, 1880 and 1898. Part II, "paulinische Theologie" was prepared for publication by C. Mehlhorn, partly from students' notes.

<sup>5</sup>C. Holsten, "Die Christusvision des Paulus und die Genesis des paulinischen Evangelium" (1861), republished in a collection of Holsten's essays, Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, Rostock, 1868, pp. 65-114.

to the laws of immanent historical development. Paul's vision of the resurrected, transfigured Jesus was not merely a "Vorstellung des denkenden Bewusstseins," but a "Bild der formenden, formensschauenden Phantasie,"<sup>6</sup> which had resulted from the inner conflict of his preoccupation with the offense of the cross and the disciples' proclamation of the resurrected Jesus. Convinced by this vision that the cross really was the saving will of God, Paul's reflective spirit led him to construct on the basis of his Jewish and hellenistic categories a new theoretical-religious Weltanschauung.

Thus, according to Holsten, the genesis of Paul's speculative system was to be found in a religious experience which brought peace to his troubled conscience. Holsten's study inaugurated a long series of attempts to psychologize Paul's conversion experience and to explain his theology from it.<sup>7</sup> It is to be noted, however, that there is already in Holsten at least a weakening if not a misunderstanding of Baur. With Baur, Paul's

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Schweitzer, Paul, p. 38 f.

theology was the unfolding of the Christian consciousness itself, whereas with Holsten it now becomes a Weltanschauung giving expression to a religious experience. And the question may be raised whether the Weltanschauung adequately expresses the experience and to what extent it is an adequate Christian Weltanschauung--questions which would have seemed wholly superfluous to Baur. In fact Holsten had already raised such questions. In a study of the meaning of the word sarx, Holsten noted that because Paul's thinking was dominated by categories of transcendence, he had not grasped the content of the Christian "Lebensgefühl" in Christian thought-forms and had left a contradiction "zwischen der Gemütsempfindung des neuen religiösen Gefühls und den Gedankenformen des theologischen Bewusstseins."<sup>8</sup> With Holsten, Pauline research begins to move away from Baur's interpretation of Paul in terms of justification and treats his theology in terms of a Weltanschauung, more specifically, soteriological

---

<sup>8</sup>C. Holsten, "Die Bedeutung des Wortes σάρξ im Lehrbegriffe des Paulus" (1855), re-published in Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, p. 368 (pp. 365-447).

theory.<sup>9</sup> And the question is increasingly put as to which aspects of his soteriology are genuinely Christian, i.e., correspond to the religious viewpoints of Jesus, and which aspects represent the intrusion of new or foreign elements. Accordingly, with the weakening of Baur's concept of "revelation," the question of the measure of Paul's agreement with Jesus and the historical relationship between them assumes increasing importance in Pauline research.

2. Soteriological Dualism in Paul:  
Lüdemann

Following the lead which Holsten had given in his study of the word sarx in Paul, subsequent Pauline research occupied itself with a discussion of Pauline anthropology as the key to Paul's soteriological system of thought. In a monograph study of Pauline anthropology,<sup>10</sup> H. Lüdemann (1842-1933) distinguished in Paul two more or less mutually

---

<sup>9</sup>For the soteriological approach to Paul, see Karl Kertelge, "Der geschichtliche Jesus und das Christusbekenntnis der ersten Gemeinden," BL, 13 (1972), p. 82 f (pp. 77-88).

<sup>10</sup>Hermann Lüdemann, Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre, Kiel, 1872. For a detailed study of the historical development of this research, see Robert Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms: A study of their use in conflict settings, Leiden, 1971.

exclusive concepts of man, and therefore two differing soteriological doctrines. The one series of ideas he designated the "religiöse oder subjektiv-ideelle," and the other the "ethische oder objektiv-reale." The former was based on the Jewish concept of man, characterized by the "religiöse Gegensatz" between man and God, between sarx and pneuma. The latter was based on the hellenistic dualism of matter and spirit, which in Paul is essentially an ethical dualism. The Jewish, subjective-ideal soteriology involved the juridical ideas of redemption: abrogation of the law through the "Straftod Christi"; justification by faith with its concept of forgiveness of sins and imputation of an ideal righteousness through the death of Christ. The hellenistic, objective-real soteriology included the ethical ideas of redemption: liberation of the flesh from the power of the law by the destruction of the sarx in the "Liebestode Christi"; deliverance of the individual from the sarx through the gift of the Holy Spirit, the principle of a real righteousness which enables the individual actually to fulfill the righteousness of the law. Baptism here takes the place of faith as the mediator of redemption.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., see particularly pp. 171-172.

Although the unity of Paul's system is called into question by the co-existence of these disparate soteriologies, Lüdemann nevertheless believed that it was possible to trace the whole development of Paul's thought genetically. He sought to show how the complex of Jewish juridical ideas to be found in the Epistle to the Galatians was developed out of Paul's conflict with Judaism and Jewish Christianity. The inadequacy of these concepts ultimately led Paul to reformulate his anthropology and finally in the Epistle to the Romans to place the dualistic concept of the flesh <sup>c/</sup> in the center of his theology.

l.c./ Damit erhellt endlich auch, dass es die soteriologische Reflexion war, welche den Apostel sollicitierte, alle Momente seiner Anthropologie, wie sie zerstreut schon in seinen früheren Aeusserungen sich finden, in einen Brennpunkt zu sammeln, so seine Lehre vom Menschen zu systematischer Vollendung abzurunden, und seiner Soteriologie zur breiten, sicheren Grundlage zu geben.<sup>12</sup>

Thus the ethical system of ideas constitutes what is genuinely Pauline, his original contribution to Christian thought.

In Lüdemann it is clear how the introduction of the ethical dualism of "Geistigkeit" and

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 211.

"Sinnlichkeit" led to a modernization of Paul in terms of ethical idealism. The transcendent aspects of his theology are pushed into the background as a part of the Jewish concepts, and consequently also the doctrine of salvation bound up with them (justification by faith), which was still important for Holsten. But this doctrine of justification by faith is here disposed of as a polemical doctrine whose significance was limited solely to the time of Paul's conflict with Judaism. Paul's theology is seen as an increasingly complex thought-structure, the product of a rationalistic speculative mind wrestling with the question of salvation as an abstract theological problem.

3. The Religious Character of Pauline  
Theology: Reuss, Sabatier, Beyschlag,  
Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker

This purely intellectualistic interpretation of Paul, however, did not remain unchallenged. The significance of Paul as a systematic theologian was not questioned, but the attempt was made in various ways to show that his theology was no barren speculation but was rooted in religious feeling and experience. In the spirit of the "Vermittlungstheologie," Reuss argued that Paul's systematic theology was the necessary expression of his religious

experience and had the practical purpose of the spiritual edification of believers.<sup>13</sup> A. Sabatier took a similar position with respect to the relationship between theology and religion. But whereas Reuss conceived the unity of Paul's theology as a static unity, Sabatier interpreted it in terms of a progressive historical development, originating in the sphere of personal life (anthropology), advancing by a process of generalization to the sphere of social life and history (religious philosophy of history), and finally to the sphere of metaphysics (theology).<sup>14</sup>

Although influenced by the historical-critical school, W. Beyschlag (1823-1900), also reacted against its intellectualistic portrait of Paul.<sup>15</sup> Although agreeing that Paul's theology was

---

<sup>13</sup>E. Reuss, Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique, 3rd edition, 1864. E.T. by A. Harwood, History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, 2 vols., London, 1874. See particularly vol. I., Book III, Chs. VI, X, XI.

<sup>14</sup>A. Sabatier, L' Apôtre Paul, Strasbourg-Paris, 1870. E.T. by A. M. Hellier, London, 1891. See particularly the introduction to Book V.

<sup>15</sup>W. Beyschlag, Neutestamentliche Theologie, oder Geschichtliche Darstellung der Lehren Jesu und des Urchristentums nach den neutestamentlichen Quellen, 2 Bde, Halle, 1891/92, 2nd edition, 1896. E.T. by N. Buchanan, New Testament Theology, or historical account of the teaching of Jesus and of primitive Christianity according to the New Testament sources, 2 vol., Edinburgh, 1895, 2nd English ed., 1896.

rooted in his conversion experience, Beyschlag affirmed that his theology is much more than a "genial-subjectives Gedankengebäude," but represents "eine allgemeingültige Lösung der innersten Lebensfrage der gottsuchenden Seele."<sup>16</sup> For Paul's system was not based on his conversion experience alone. It was nourished by the historical traditions of Jesus and Old Testament and Jewish theology, but above all by the stream of the new God-begotten life through which God continued to reveal his eternal truths to Paul.<sup>17</sup> In spite of the strong theological element in Paul, his interest is primarily a practical-religious and a religio-ethical one.<sup>18</sup> Coupled with Paul's religious experience was a two-fold "Lehrtrieb": an apologetic-polemic and a speculative. In the conflict with Judaism, Paul's system appears as a predominantly anthropological system in which the complex of ideas associated with justification by faith appear in the foreground. But behind this apologetic-polemic motive there lies the speculative: "das aus rein persönlichen Anliegen entspringende

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., second German ed., p. 16.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-23.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

Ringen nach einem Gesamtverständniss der Weltgeschichte aus Gott und zu Gott."<sup>19</sup> It is the task of Biblical theology to organize both aspects of his thought into a unity. As his starting point Beyschlag takes, not the doctrine of Christ or justification, but the ethical dualism of spirit and flesh, moving to Paul's distinction between Adam and Christ in which these two "Grundmächte des Daseins" become the "Angelpunkte" of world history. The consideration of Christ leads to the doctrine of God as basic for an understanding of the historical "Stiftung, geistliche Ordnung, sittliche Bethätigung und schliesslichen Vollendung des Heils."<sup>20</sup>

Beyschlag understands Paul's concept of salvation in an ethical-subjective fashion like Lüdemann, but will not admit any real dualism in Paul's theology. Rather he conceives it as a unified scheme of salvation embracing the whole of world history.

O. Pfleiderer (1839-1908) in his earlier writings was even more dependent than Beyschlag upon the work of Holsten and Lüdemann, but he likewise

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., pp. 25-26.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

sought to emphasize the religious character of Paul's thought. Although Paul's conversion involved an intellectual, dialectical struggle of religious thought, it was more than a question of objective theory. It was the beginning of a mystical communion with the death of the crucified and with the life of the risen Christ. Paul's mysticism led to a new doctrine of the Christian pneuma and thus became the basis for the immanent ethical principle of Christianity. Although this was Paul's greatest contribution, the juridical concept was not subordinate to the ethical in Paul's thought. Both are qualified by his basic idea of the mystical communion of the believer with Christ and have their common point in the concept of reconciliation. For Pfleiderer, Paul's speculative theology is based upon his Christ-mysticism.<sup>21</sup>

This is also apparent in Karl von Weizsäcker (1822-1899) who in his sketch of Pauline theology in Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>O. Pfleiderer, Der Paulinismus. Ein Beitrag zu der Geschichte der urchristlichen Theologie, 1873. E.T. by E. Peters, Paulinism: A contribution to the history of Primitive Christian Theology, London, 2 vols. 1877. See particularly the "Einleitung."

<sup>22</sup>Freiburg, 1886. E.T. by J. Millar, The Apostolic Age, New York and London, 1894.

starts from the doctrine of Christ. Although Weizsäcker still assumes the unity of Paul's thought, there appears a declining interest in his system as such. What interests Weizsäcker particularly, however, is Paul's faith, which he takes to be the experience of the risen Christ as Son of God and Lord. The test of this experience is the reception of the Holy Spirit by which believers know themselves to be children of God. This is followed by the perfect enjoyment of present blessedness in the love of Christ and of sovereignty over the world in the love of God. And this is followed by the irresistible spiritual impulse to lead the divine life as a life in Christ, which proceeds from and is realized in believers as his body. In this respect, Paul's faith-experience of Christ does not differ essentially from what Jesus meant by the present possession of the Kingdom of God.<sup>23</sup> Paul was the creator of Christian theology, who explained the history of the world and human consciousness in all their aspects from the standpoint of the person and work of Christ. Yet he was greater than his theory. In the application

---

<sup>23</sup>Das apostolische Zeitalter, pp. 121, 126.

of his doctrine he was always free; not the scholar and thinker, but the man of faith and action.<sup>24</sup>

4. The Separation of Religion  
and Theology in Paul: H. J.  
Holtzmann

It is to be noted that throughout this whole development, the significance of Paul as a theological thinker is never questioned. The increasing awareness of the complexity of his theology did not discourage attempts to demonstrate the unity of his system. The validity of his speculative constructions is justified either by understanding them as the result of reflection on his religious experience or by distinguishing and emphasizing the religious or ethical aspects of his theology. The climax of this entire development is reached to a certain extent in H. J. Holtzmann's (1832-1910) erudite and comprehensive treatment of Pauline theology in his Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie.<sup>25</sup>

Holtzmann's analysis of Paul's theology emphasized the contradictions and antinomies in Paul's thought to the extent that it appeared almost incomprehensible. The attempt to understand Paul's letters as a unified

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., pp. 149-151.

<sup>25</sup>Zwei Bände, Freiburg und Leipzig, 1897, pp. 1-225.

system is abandoned; historical theology must remain content to trace the various strains of thought which interact and conflict with each other.<sup>26</sup>

Holtzmann's summary and evaluation of the significance of Paul's theology is particularly interesting for the problem of Jesus and Paul. Having elucidated the complicated structure of Pauline theology, Holtzmann is acutely aware of the difficulty of relating this speculative theology to the religion of Jesus.

Das Evglm Jesu von Nazaret ist im Evglm des Pls von Tarsus bereits Lehrbegriff geworden, und in dieser theoretischen doctrinären Fassung, in diesen streng systematischen Formen, welche es hier angenommen, unterscheidet es sich in sehr bestimmter Weise von der Verkündigung Jesu, um dafür schon leise an den spätere gnostische Systeme zu erinnern. Eine Vergleichung des secundären mit dem primären Religionsstifter dient immer nur dazu, den Abstand des nachschaffenden und daher überall mit dem wandelbaren Vorstellungsmaterial und Denkapparat einer bestimmten Zeit operirenden Geistes von dem, zum Unterscheid der Zeiten gleichgültiger sich verhaltenden, Kern des Christentums erkennbar werden zu lassen.<sup>27</sup>

Furthermore, Paul's entire "Lehrbegriff" as the theoretical explication of his unique conversion experience and the systematization of his "Christophanie" appears to Holtzmann as a completely

---

<sup>26</sup>For a detailed analysis see Schweitzer, Paul, Ch. I., pp. 100-116; P. Feine, op cit., pp. 48-55; Kummel, NT, pp. 191-193.

<sup>27</sup>Holtzmann, op cit., p. 203

original and isolated phenomenon in the history of the church.

Denn was dieser ganz singulär angelegtes Geist unter Einwirkungen und Umgebungen, wie sie nur einziges Mal Bestand gehabt hat, erlebt, empfunden und gedacht hat, das konnte gerade so niemals wieder ein Mensch erleben, empfinden und denken.<sup>28</sup> 9/

At this point the line of research which sought to understand Paul's theology as the speculative explication of his conversion experience reaches a certain climax. Paul, both in his speculative thought-structure as well as his religious experience appears so complex and original that the genuinely Christian element in him might well appear questionable. Paul is so new and so strange that his theology appears to bear little resemblance to the "Kern des Christentums" to be found in Jesus. He is a secondary "Religionsstifter" alongside of Jesus.

At this point one might expect the problem of Jesus and Paul to become a question of "either-or." But such is not yet the case. It is to be observed that Holtzmann does not understand the difference between Jesus and Paul in terms of antithesis, but in terms of originality. Paul is a new religious

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 205.

and historical phenomenon with respect to Jesus, but not a contradiction of him. Their relationship is not conceived antithetically, no matter how strange Paul may have appeared in comparison with Jesus.

But the question remains whether in view of Paul's originality one must not surrender any claim to his historical continuity with Jesus, thereby consigning him wholly to the past and depriving him of any authority for modern faith. On this question, however, Holtzmann exhibits--one might almost say, inconsistently--the same reluctance to abandon Paul which characterized so much of the later liberal discussion of Jesus and Paul. Holtzmann insists that it is the religious character of Paul's doctrine which constitutes his connecting link with Jesus. His doctrine is not merely "Lehrbegriff, sondern durchweg von lebendigen und furchtbaren Kräften des religiösen Gemüthes durchwaltet und wirkt daher nächst der Verkündigung Jesu verhältnissmässig am meisten wie eine Offenbarung."<sup>29</sup>

So gewiss (Paul's) Christologie eine über alle Selbstaussagen Jesu hinausliegende Schöpfung des Paulin. Geistes ist, so gewiss wirkt am letzten Ende der geschichtliche

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 215.

Christus selbst--durch diese seine Gemeinde hindurch scheidend, sichtigend, neubauend in der Gedankenwelt des Pls. nach. Dieser paulin. Lehrbegriff ist in der That ein Beweis für die übergreifende Geistesmacht Jesu selbst.<sup>30</sup>

One must however distinguish between what is transitory and permanent in Paul. The valid element in him is finally his concept of Geist as an immanent Heilsprinzip or an indwelling Lebensprinzip.

Zieht man diese belebende Seele aus dem paulin. Lehrgebäude heraus, so bleibt ein gnostisches Gedankengehäuse übrig, aus sich selbst widerstrebenden Stoffen wunderbar fein gearbeitet, aber mit lauter Faktoren eines befruchtet ist, mit der Wirklichkeit gänzlich gebrochen hat und einer endgültigen Vergangenheit angehört.<sup>31</sup>

The theological content of Paul's thought, in particular the historically conditioned Jewish and hellenistic elements, belong to the past and are the object only of "theologischwissenschaftliches" interest. The genuinely Christian element, "der Resonanz des Ewigen auf menschlichem Seelengrund," is the permanent kernel which concerns our religious-practical interest, for it belongs to the nature of our religion.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, the line of Pauline interpretation begun

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 217.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 224

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 225.

with Baur and which received a new direction with Holsten reaches a point in Holtzmann where the genuinely Christian element in Paul reaches a minimum. The speculative theology of Paul as such is historically conditioned "husk." All that remains is Paul's religious spirit which shines through his doctrine at certain points, the "Resonanz des Ewigen auf menschlichen Seelengrund."

It is to be noted here that the familiar nineteenth century distinction between Religion and Theology tends to become absolute. In Reuss, Sabatier, and Beyschlag, Paul's theology was the necessary and therefore valid expression of his religion. With Holtzmann, Paul's theology is wholly contingent and may be dispensed with as unessential to his religious feelings. By the end of the nineteenth century the positivistic spirit of liberalism had practically excluded the theoretical from faith and limited it to practical matters of ethics and feeling.

Also to be observed is the fact that the application of the older rationalistic distinction between the kernel and the husk to the theology of Paul parallels the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. In the case of both Jesus and Paul, the application of this rationalistic principle is the

consequence of the awareness of the fact that they both belonged to history far more than was formerly assumed. In both cases the application of this principle is somewhat apologetically motivated in order to assure for both Jesus and Paul their appropriate places with respect to the Christian faith. This rationalistic methodology subsequently comes to play a decisive role in the later discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul.

#### D. THE INCREASING ISOLATION OF PAUL FROM THE HISTORICAL JESUS

##### 1. The Discovery of Pauline Eschatology: Gunkel, Kabisch

The development of religionsgeschichtliche research toward the end of the nineteenth also had as decisive consequences for Pauline research as it did for the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. In 1888, H. Gunkel (1862-1932) undertook to re-examine the Pauline concept of Geist and came to the conclusion that it had nothing to do with the essentially Greek concept of Geist--spirituality as opposed to sensuality--but rather represented for Paul the invasion of an otherworldly, supernatural power into human life and history, expressing itself in somewhat

abnormal manifestations of the physical life, e.g., speaking with tongues.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, Gunkel's work exposed the modernization of the thought of Paul which had occurred since the time of Holsten under the interpretation of Paul's concept of Geist along Greek and purely ethical lines. The supernatural and transcendent element of Paul's thought would thereby appear much greater than had formerly been assumed.

In the further development of this line of approach, R. Kabisch (1868-1914) showed that both Paul's theology and his ethics were not based on a spiritual-ethical dualism, but on an eschatological outlook on life akin to that of Jewish apocalyptic.<sup>34</sup> This growing awareness of the kinship of Pauline theology with Jewish apocalyptic also left its impact upon the interpretation of Pauline

---

<sup>33</sup>H. Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus, Göttingen, 1888; Cf. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 78 ff; Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

<sup>34</sup>R. Kabisch, Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus, Göttingen, 1893; Cf. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 58 ff; Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 41-42.

theology. On the one hand, it shook the assumption that Paul was a highly independent and original thinker and seemed to indicate that his theology was dependent in many respects on contemporary Jewish apocalypticism. On the other hand, the fact that Paul appeared to be so dependent on apocalyptic "theology" also seemed to confirm the view of Baur and his successors that Paul had developed his own theology independently of Jesus. In this respect, the new discoveries tended to make the continuity between Jesus and Paul still more problematical.

2. The Breach Between the Pauline Christ and the Historical Jesus:  
M. Brückner

The impact of these new insights upon the theological understanding of Paul becomes apparent in Brückner's study of Pauline Christology.<sup>35</sup> He strongly criticizes the psychological interpretation of Pauline theology which had dominated historical theology since Holsten as not sufficiently historical. The presupposition that Paul had developed his gospel into a system by a dialectical thought-process was a consequence of the failure

---

<sup>35</sup>M. Brückner, Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie, Strassburg, 1903.

to recognize that Paul's thought-patterns were essentially Jewish rather than Greek. Paul's doctrine of salvation is not to be understood as a subjective process occurring in the inner life, but in accordance with Jewish thought it is an objective "Heilsgeschichte" based on external facts. For Paul, "Religion ist geradezu die Geschichte die sich zwischen Himmel und Erde abspielt."<sup>36</sup>

The shift in Pauline research which occurs here is that the key to Paul's soteriology is no longer found in his anthropology, as it was since Holsten, but in his Christology. But the center and starting point of Paul's "Heilsgeschichte" is not the historical Jesus, but rather his concept of the pre-existent heavenly being who would appear at the end of the times with all his holy angels to effect a cosmic salvation in which the demonic powers would be destroyed and the faithful resurrected to eternal life.<sup>37</sup> This concept of Christ and his work was not the product of a logical deduction from his conversion experience, but was derived from Jewish apocalyptic and existed in Paul's

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., Ch. 9, Cf. particularly pp. 212-213.

consciousness even before his conversion experience. The significance of the conversion consisted in the fact that Paul was led to combine two disparate concepts of Christ: the Jewish concept which he possessed before his conversion and the concept of the crucified Jesus preached by the primitive church. The two conceptions were combined by the idea of the incarnation which Paul understood as the incomprehensible "Liebestat Gottes" as well as the free act of obedience and grace on the part of the Son of God. But the Jewish concept of Christ was primary;

Das präexistente Himmelwesen erscheint als das ursprüngliche, selbstverständliche Christusbild, seine Erscheinung als der auf Erden gekommene und gekreuzigte Jesus dagegen als eine gewaltsam in dieses Bild eingefügte Episode.<sup>38</sup>

This accounts for the many unresolved contradictions in Paul's thought.

The really new element in the preaching of Paul was his conviction, derived from the conversion experience, that the death of Christ was the historical "Welterlösungstat Gottes und des himmlischen Christus."<sup>39</sup> All of Paul's teaching about the cross

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 225.

is to be understood from this point. The result was a certain transformation and enrichment of his Jewish theology.

What may we regard as new and valuable in this Christology of Paul? It is not the metaphysical Son of God and heavenly man of Jewish theology, but the personal act of his incarnation.

Indem Paulus die Menschwerdung des Christus als die Kundgebung der Vaterliebe Gottes und als die persönliche Liebes--und Gehorsamstat des Christus wertet, hat er in sein jüdisches Christusbild den Kern dessen aufgenommen, was Jesus in der Welt gebracht hat.<sup>40</sup>

For Brückner there still remains a genuine Christian element in Paul which links him with the historical Jesus.

But he goes a step beyond Holtzmann. It is impossible to speak of any historical continuity between Paul and Jesus, for Brückner excludes the possibility that Paul had ever had or desired to have any knowledge of the historical Jesus.<sup>41</sup> Since the main elements of Paul's Christology were already present in Paul's mind before his conversion, then neither the conversion experience nor the theology of Paul can be regarded in any case as due to the

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 237.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., Ch. IV is devoted to the proof of this point.

indirect influence of the person of Jesus, as even Holtzmann had still assumed.

Thus Brückner denies any historical relationship between Jesus and Paul. Paul's Christology has no causal relationship to the historical Jesus and could not have been derived from him. Yet Brückner still does not posit an antithesis between Jesus and Paul. In fact, he insists--and this apparently is purely contingent, as far as Brückner is concerned--that Paul did preserve the Kern of what Jesus brought to light. A clue as to how Brückner conceived this strange situation is given in a prefatory note to his book. He explains that it was not his original aim to prove the independence of Pauline Christology from the historical Jesus, but such a conclusion was the result to which his historical research led him. But this only proves, for Brückner, "dass die christliche Religion in ihrem Kern unabhängig von 'zufälligen Geschichtswahrheiten' ist."<sup>42</sup> Apparently in Brückner's estimation, the whole problem of the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul comes under the heading of zufälligen Geschichtswahrheiten which do not

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., in the author's introductory note immediately following the title page.

affect the essence of the Christian faith, or its gospel. Following this rationalistic-idealistic principle to its conclusion, one would also have to say that neither the historical Jesus nor the historical Paul are essential to the Christian truth. Accordingly, Brückner stands with Schweitzer in the complete separation of faith from history. While Brückner and Schweitzer in this respect stand as somewhat isolated figures at this stage of the history of the problem of Jesus and Paul, they anticipate R. Bultmann who on somewhat different grounds reaches the same position with respect to the problem of the historical relationship of Jesus and Paul.

3. The Affirmation of the Antithesis:  
Jesus or Paul: W. Wrede

The final step, in which the relationship of Jesus and Paul is construed antithetically, was taken in Wrede's Paulus appearing in the series of Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher in 1905. Wrede's interpretation of Pauline Christology and his emphasis on the centrality of Christology in Paul's theology follows the lines of Brückner rather closely. But he treats the theology of Paul in broader scope within the context of a study of the man and his historical achievements.

Semi-popular in character, Wrede's clear and simple treatment of Pauline theology stands in marked contrast to the complicated studies of the nineteenth century. But clothed in a somewhat disarming simplicity there is a critical incisiveness, a bold and uncompromising logic, and above all a keen polemic which cuts deeply into almost every contemporary interpretation of Paul. The book presented a formidable challenge to Pauline research which could not easily be ignored, and its influence both positive and negative was far-reaching in continental Europe as well as the English-speaking world.<sup>43</sup>

Wrede's Paulus represents the decisive turning-point in the entire history of the discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul. Consequently, the treatment of his work at this point in the dissertation will plunge us directly into the center of the problem before the earlier phase of the discussion

---

<sup>43</sup>An English translation appeared as early as 1908: Paul, translated by E. Lummis, London; 1908, Boston. Wrede accepted only eight letters of Paul as genuine, namely the first letter to the Thesalonians, Galatians, the two to the Corinthians, to the Romans, to the Colossians with the short note to Philemon and to the Philippians. Paul, Boston, 1908, p. xiii.

has been completed.

We shall be concerned here particularly with Wrede's presentation of Pauline theology. Wholly in accord with nineteenth century Pauline research, Wrede interpreted Paul primarily as theologian; however, not as a systematic thinker who unfolded a logical system of doctrine. Wrede finds considerable discontinuity and contradiction in Paul's thought. Nevertheless, in Paul, Christianity appears on the whole as a thought-structure. The point at which Wrede is distinguished from much of nineteenth century research is his claim that Paul's theology is inseparable from his religion.

The religion of the Apostle is theological through and through: his theology is his religion. The idea that we can find in him a cold doctrine, to be grasped by the understanding, a doctrine which soars more or less beyond the reach of mere piety, is false; and equally false is the idea that the piety of Paul can be described without mention of those thoughts in which he had apprehended Christ, his death and his resurrection.<sup>44</sup>

This is not to say, however, that Wrede in principle denied the familiar distinction between religion and theology. But he sees that in Paul, at least, doctrine and piety are so closely interwoven that a

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 76.

radical separation of the two is impossible. The radical and psychologically untenable separation of religion and theology, of feeling and thought, in Paulinism is hereby called into question with important implications for the problem of Jesus and Paul. It is therefore impossible to preserve the continuity between Jesus and Paul by isolating a residue of religion from his historically conditioned theology, as Holtzmann had done. Paul's theology and his religion stand or fall together. And Wrede, as will be seen, drew the implications with uncompromising consistency.

Wrede takes Christology as the center of Paul's theology.<sup>45</sup> Paul's conviction, which was clear through his conversion experience, that Jesus was the Christ is already the germ (keim) of a dogma, and his theology is only the "evolution of the germ."<sup>46</sup> Paul's Christ is the pre-existent divine

---

<sup>45</sup>Wrede rejects the doctrine of ~~the~~ justification by faith as central point of Pauline doctrine, because it is merely polemical doctrine of Paul, is only made intelligible by the struggle of his life, his controversy with Judaism and Jewish Christianity, and is only intended for this. Ibid., p. 123. For other scholars' views of ~~the~~ Paul's chief doctrine see E. E. Ellis, Paul and His Recent Interpreters, Grand Rapids, 1968, pp. 24-26.

<sup>46</sup>Wrede, Paul, p. 76.

being who divests himself of his divine mode of being and assumes humanity for a time, solely in order that by his death and resurrection to heavenly glory he might deliver mankind from the demonic forces and powers which enslave it. All this, according to Wrede, has nothing whatsoever to do with the human life and personality of Jesus as it is known from the gospels. The manhood of Christ is something purely formal for Paul; the concept of personality and human individuality is lacking for Paul, and therefore "the humanity of Christ remains for us an impalpable phantom."<sup>47</sup>

The soteriology which grows directly out of this Christology centers, according to Wrede, in the cross and resurrection as the triumph of Christ-- and all mankind with him--over the hostile powers which enslave the world and the entry into a new existence no longer subject to them.<sup>48</sup> Accordingly,

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 88-90.

<sup>48</sup>Wrede defines the redemption as the release from the misery of this whole present world (Gal.1:4). Every other conception of it, even release from sin, would be too narrow. Ibid., p. 92, see particularly p. 100.

all believers have already died and risen with Christ, although Paul reserves the external realization of this salvation for the imminent future end of the eschatological process inaugurated by the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>49</sup> Yet the possession of the Holy Spirit--the invasion of a supernatural power into human life, changing men and making them sons of God--is already a foretaste, a first fruit of the final eschatological age.<sup>50</sup>

In summarizing and evaluating Paul's soteriology, Wrede notes that Paul's redemption is something that takes place outside the individual, and is not for him a subjective process within man. It does not consist, as for the modern man, in subjective states of the soul--in a present bliss--

---

<sup>49</sup>The wording of Gal.2:20 is given by Wrede as evidence. Ibid., p. 104, n.3. G. Vos comments concerning this state with 2 Cor.4:16: the resurrection of the inner man is past; the resurrection of the outer man is still in the future (cf. v.14). The Pauline Eschatology, Grand Rapids, 1930, 2nd ed., 1961, pp. 203 f. In putting the matter this way, one must be careful to avoid reading into him a metaphysical or anthropological dualism. Cf. H. Ridderbos, Paulus, Kampen, J. H. Kok, 1966, p. 122, quoted from R. B. Gaffin, Jr., Resurrection and Redemption (A Study in Pauline Soteriology), Westminster Theological Seminary, Th.D. thesis (Unpublished), 1969, p. 78.

<sup>50</sup>Wrede, op. cit., pp. 107-108. Cf. Rom.--8:14, 23; I Cor.3:16; Rom. 8:9, 11.

but is essentially objective, a transformation of existence itself and the conditions of existence. Likewise, Paul's ethics are not rooted in the modern distinction between the natural and the ethical-- as so often assumed. Because he joined the flesh so inseparably with sin, redemption does not bring merely an ethical revolution, but involves a change in the nature of humanity, and the ethical change is secondary to this.<sup>51</sup> Finally, Paul's emphasis on the objectivity of redemption leads him to understand faith simply as the obedient acceptance and affirmation of the preached redemption and baptism as the means by which mystical union with Christ and the benefits of Christ's death and resurrection are automatically conferred on the believer. Thus Paul, according to Wrede, in this doctrine of redemption is not concerned with the individual or the psychological process in the individual, but rather with the race, the whole of humanity.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 132. For Wrede Paul regards Christ as the representative of the human race. Cf. For the Adam-Christ figure, see A. J. M. Wedderburn, "The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in I Corinthians," *SJT*, 24 (1971), esp. 90 ff; M. Black, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT*, 7 (1954), 170-179; E. Best, *One Body in Christ*, London, 1955, pp. 34-43.

His soteriology is a salvation history. All his thoughts about salvation are thoughts about a series of events, "in which God and man take part, whose scene is on earth and also in heaven--it proceeds, properly speaking, in both places at the same time--His very piety receives its character from the salvation history; the history of salvation is the content of his faith."<sup>53</sup>

Having sketched Paul's theology, Wrede then turns to the question of its origin. He attributes the framework of Paul's theology to Jewish eschatology and notes the general extent of his Jewish heritage. However, what interests Wrede particularly is the origin of Paul's conception of Christ. He begins by rejecting the commonly accepted explanations, which sought to explain Paul's theology out of his conversion experience. Likewise he repudiates the often expressed view that Paul's concept of Christ resulted from the impression of the personality of Jesus. No matter how much knowledge of Jesus Paul may have gained from the original disciples, his Christology shows, according to Wrede, that it had no significance for him. The only historical event that concerns

---

<sup>53</sup>Wrede, op. cit., pp. 114-115.

Paul is the cross, and this not as the ethical act of a man. In fact, for Paul, it is not an historical fact, but "it transcends history; it is an occurrence in a world above that of sense."<sup>54</sup>

The further possibility that Paul's doctrine of Christ represented an idealization or apotheosis of Jesus so that the historical reality still shows through is also rejected by Wrede. The ethical predicates--obedience, love, humility--which Paul attributes to the heavenly Christ did not derive from the ethical character of Jesus, but from the apostle's own doctrine of redemption.<sup>55</sup> Neither did he deduce the pre-existence of Christ as a logical conclusion from the heavenly existence of the resurrected Christ, nor was his divine Christ the result of an impulse to enhance the dignity of Jesus as a human Messiah. All these views make the heart of Paul's doctrine of Christ a product of his spirit, a work of his phantasy. This is impossible, for "the magnificent assurance, confidence, and enthusiasm of his faith would be utterly unintelligible, if its foundation were a conception which

---

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 148.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p. 150.

he had himself excogitated."<sup>56</sup>

There remains only one explanation for Wrede: Paul already believed in such a heavenly being, a divine Christ, before he believed in Jesus. In the moment of his conversion he identified the transfigured Jesus with his own Christ and transferred to Jesus all the concepts associated with the heavenly Christ. And this was all the more easy for him because, unlike the disciples, he had never really known Jesus. Wrede thinks that Paul may have derived this concept of the heavenly Christ from Jewish apocalyptic.<sup>57</sup> If Paul was acquainted with this divine Christ before his conversion, there must have been circles in Judaism which held the same belief. But can such a belief in this field be really authenticated? Wrede's answer is positive:

Jewish apocalyptic books are really cognizant of a Messiah, who before his appearance lives in heaven, and is more exalted than the angels themselves. This is a datum of the highest importance.<sup>58</sup>

But whether every feature in the Pauline Christ can

---

<sup>56</sup>Ibid.

<sup>57</sup>Cf. O. Pfleiderer, Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, delivered in London and Oxford, 1885, The Hibbert Lectures, E.T. by J. Fredericke Smith, pp. 41-42.

<sup>58</sup>Wrede, op. cit., p. 152.

be explained by means of the extant apocalyptic accounts of Messiah is an open question.<sup>59</sup>

In the concluding chapter of the book, Wrede takes up the question of Paul's place in the historical origin of Christianity. Here the question of his relationship to Jesus immediately appears. In comparing Jesus and Paul, Wrede asserts that they belong to different strata of Judaism and move in wholly different thought-worlds--simplicity of religious ideas and their application to life in Jesus, and complexity of speculative thought in Paul. The whole religious language of Paul is on another level from the language of Jesus.<sup>60</sup> Wrede could not agree with Wellhausen's opinion, repeated by Harnack and others, that Paul was truly the man who understood the gospel of Jesus; he writes: "I rather see in it no slight historical error."<sup>61</sup>

Wrede admits that Paul and Jesus may have many things in common. This does not necessarily prove an influence of Jesus on Paul, but merely reflects the fact that they belonged to the Judaism of the same age. The conclusion at which Wrede

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 156

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 157

arrives after comparing Jesus and Paul in essential things is that the simple ethical religion of Jesus with its concern for the personality of the individual and his responsibility to God has been transformed in Paul into a religion of redemption centering in the objective events of a history of salvation. Whatever point of contact exists between Jesus and Paul, the center of Paul's gospel lies elsewhere than that of Jesus. Paul has subordinated ethical goodness of character to faith in a dogma and made everything dependent on church membership. Paul is not to be reproached for this, but it must be recognized that in spite of his own claims he was not a follower who understood Jesus and continued his work.<sup>62</sup>

Accordingly, for Wrede, Paul was an innovator, removed not only from Jesus but also from the primitive church by the fact that he was the real creator of a Christian theology in which he made certain acts of salvation--the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ--the foundation of religion. The conception of the redemption involved in all this can finally only be considered as mythological.<sup>63</sup> To be sure, Paul's historical greatness

---

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., pp. 157-163.    <sup>63</sup>Ibid., pp. 176-180.

must be recognized, for he transplanted the Christian religion to the soil of the Graeco-Roman world, gave it a new self-consciousness, and by his theology overcame the Jewish limitations of the new religion, thus rescuing it for history. But he still remains the second founder of Christianity, who transformed its character and thrust the person whom he only intended to serve wholly into the background.<sup>64</sup>

Thus for Wrede the problem of Jesus and Paul finally resolves itself into the alternative: Jesus or Paul. Traditional Christianity may want to retain with Paul the true Jesus also, but the Pauline Christ for the most part will stifle the man Jesus. On the other hand, "modern theology" does not want to relinquish Paul, particularly out of sympathy for his conflict against law. But in the real intention of Paul, all this is nothing without the kernel of his Christ-doctrine; no reverence for his personality can substitute for the surrender of this kernel. "As a whole Paul belongs absolutely to ecclesiastical orthodoxy, whether it preserves his views quite faithfully in matters of detail or not."<sup>65</sup>

Thus Pauline research reaches a certain climax

---

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., pp. 175 ff, 180-181.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 182.

in Wrede with the affirmation of an antithesis between Jesus and Paul. At the point where critical research becomes aware of past modernizations of Paul and attains a deeper historical understanding of him, there occurs a rejection of the historical Paul which parallels somewhat Schweitzer's rejection of the historical Jesus. In each case the validity of the Christian faith is radically called into question in a manner not to be ignored, and which greatly agitated the situation of New Testament research as well as theology in general.

Wrede's Paul represented a sharp challenge not only to conservative theology, but also to all shades of liberal thought. If Wrede were correct, conservative theology with its Pauline Christ had cut itself off from Jesus, from any real historical basis. On the other hand, liberal theology was sharply rebuked for its failure to do justice to Pauline thought as well as for the inconsistency of its attempt to compromise Paul with Jesus. Not only is Paul's theology foreign to Jesus and modern man, but also his religion. No real line of continuity between Jesus and Paul exists. To Wrede this is an assured result of historical research, an historical fact which can not be

controverted.

It is to be noted that in the whole development of Pauline research, Wrede still stands to a certain extent as the heir of F. C. Baur. Like Baur, Wrede still interpreted Paul exclusively as a theologian whatever the differences in their interpretation of Pauline theology. Furthermore, like Baur, Wrede sees Pauline theology, whatever its origin, as a thought-structure wrought altogether independently of the historical Jesus. A further point of similarity is to be seen in the fact that, for both, Paul's faith and his theology are essentially one: whereas with Baur, Paul's theology is the expression of his Christian consciousness; with Wrede, Paul's religion is the reflex of his theology.

Yet they arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions with respect to the relationship of Paul to Jesus. Their respective understanding of revelation and history provides a clue to the difference. With Baur, there is still something of a transcendent factor in history--absolute spirit or reason--shaping history according to the necessity of its inner dialectic. With Wrede there is also necessity in history--not in any sense

metaphysical, but the natural necessity of historical evolution proceeding by its immanent laws of cause and effect. But whereas Baur believed that diversities in historical phenomena were the necessary expression of one Spirit or Idea in the course of its dialectical development, for Wrede differences indicated conflict to be explained by differences of environment, education, etc. For Baur, the conflict of personalities and their ideas was necessary to the full realization of the truth, whereas for Wrede such conflict was the result merely of natural differences. Hence, on Wrede's presuppositions, any creative movement of the Spirit or any concept of dynamic revelation was excluded in principle. Any apparent novelty or originality within a given historical movement indicates only a discontinuity which must be explained by the intrusion of foreign factors. Hence Wrede assumes that the uniqueness of Paul's theology and religion in relation to Jesus can be explained only by the assumption that it originated from factors wholly extraneous to Jesus and the early church.

### PART THREE

#### PROBLEM OF JESUS AND PAUL

Except for brief and incomplete surveys in monographs dealing with the problem of Jesus and Paul, there exists no comprehensive treatment of the history of the discussions. Paul Feine's volume, Der Apostel Paulus. Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus, contains summaries of the more important treatments of the problem ~~for~~ H. Paret to K. Barth.<sup>1</sup> However, except ~~for~~ critical comments, Feine's treatment is largely descriptive. He makes no attempt to analyze the development of the problem in its wider theological and historical context. As a result the factors which motivated and determined the actual course of the discussions remain unexplained. The particular contribution which the present thesis seeks to make, is to show how the discussions originated and developed out of the interaction of historical research and the various

from/  
from/nt

---

<sup>1</sup>P. Feine, Der Apostel Paulus, 1927, pp. 157-206. For the history of the problem see: A. Schweitzer, Paul, 1912, 1956; R. Bultmann, "Zur Geschichte der Paulus-Forschung," TR, N.F., 1 (1929), 26-59; idem, "Neueste Paulus-Forschung," TR, N.F. (1936), pp. 1-22.

theological and philosophical interests of the age. In this fashion, it becomes possible to perceive more clearly the diverse historical and theological factors which provoked and shaped the discussions, and at the same time also to exhibit the problem in its full significance and in all its ramifications for theology and New Testament Research.

The present part attempts to trace the actual course of the discussions against the background of the development of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung and Pauline research which have been treated in the previous part. As the survey of the discussions proceeds into the twentieth century, it will also be necessary to indicate the more recent developments in New Testament research and in theology which have affected the course of the discussions.

It will be necessary, first of all, to retrace our steps to the beginnings of the discussion in the nineteenth century. Various facets of the early phase of the discussion require treatment before proceeding with the discussion after W. Wrede. Wrede's work may be compared to a lens in which the various lines of the nineteenth century discussions come to a focus, and

then are refracted and diffused along definite lines into the twentieth century.

Accordingly, Wrede's work is here treated as the focal point of the development of the discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul. After treating the early phase of the discussions before Wrede, the survey will move on to the discussions evoked by Wrede's thesis. The various attempts to deal with Wrede's solution to the problem continue until World War I, after which a decreasing interest in the problem becomes apparent.<sup>2</sup> In the final chapter of this part it will be necessary to account for the dwindling interest and to discuss the recent trends of the problem of Jesus and Paul.

---

<sup>2</sup>But the publication in 1962 of E. Jüngel's provocative new book, Paulus und Jesus, and of W. Schmithal's Marburg lecture, "Paulus und der historische Jesus," ZNW, liii (1962), 145-160, and the 1963 lecture of W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus," NTSt, X (1964), 163-181, J. Blank's Paulus und Jesus, Eine theologische Grundlegung, München, 1968, F. F. Bruce, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974 and idem, "Paul and the Historical Jesus," BJRL, 56 (1974), 317-335, suggest that the topic is still alive.

## CHAPTER I

### THE DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM BEFORE WILLIAM WREDE

#### A. THE OPPONENTS OF PAUL IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Wrede's radical repudiation of Paul in itself involved nothing new. In fact, Paul has been more or less of a controversial figure ever since he gained the stature of a leader in the primitive Christian church. But Wrede had immediate predecessors in the latter half of the nineteenth century. These include eminent names like Renan, Lagarde, and Nietzsche.

Renan gave his evaluation of Paul in the concluding chapter of his biography of the Apostle.<sup>3</sup> Renan admits, somewhat begrudgingly, that Paul succeeded in liberating Christianity from the fetters of Judaism, but he otherwise minimizes as much as possible the results of his work. Paul is inferior to the other apostles; "he had not seen Jesus, he had not heard His voice.

---

<sup>3</sup>E. Renan, Saint Paul (Paris, 1869), E.T. by W. M. T., London, 1887/89, Ch. XXII.

The divine logia, the parables, he scarcely knew. The Christ who personally revealed himself to him is his own ghost; he listens to himself, thinking that he hears Jesus."<sup>4</sup> Speaking of the contemporary situation, Renan affirms that the time of Paul's reign is drawing to a close while Jesus lives more than ever. It is no longer the Epistle to the Romans which is the resumé of Christianity, but the Sermon on the Mount. True Christianity is to be found in the gospels and not in the epistles of Apostle Paul.

The writings of Paul have been a danger and a stumbling-block, the cause of the chief faults of Christian theology. Paul is the father of the subtle Augustine, of the Thomas Aquinas, of the sombre Calvinist, of the bitter Jansenist, of the ferocious theology which condemns and predestinates to damnation. Jesus is the father of all those who seek in dreams of the ideal the repose of their souls. That which gives life to Christianity, is the little that we know of the word and of the person of Jesus. The man devoted to the ideal, the divine poet, the great artist, defies alone time and revolution. Alone he is seated at the right hand of God the Father for eternity.<sup>5</sup>

Although this attack upon Paul did not go unnoticed, Renan's study of Paul had none of the popularity of his Life of Jesus, and had no influence upon Pauline research.

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., vol. II, p. 161.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 166.

The second to vent his wrath upon the Apostle was the noted philologist and orientalist, Paul de Lagarde. In an article entitled, "Ueber das Verhältniß des deutschen Staates zu Theologie, Kirche und Religion. Ein Versuch Nicht-Theologen zu orientieren."<sup>6</sup> Lagarde polemicized against both Roman Catholic and Protestant Christianity and demanded a new and specifically national German religion. Insofar as he held Paul largely responsible for the present state of Christianity, Lagarde has only scorn for Paul. As far as Jesus and his disciples were concerned, Paul is a "völlig unberufener--der richtige Machkomme Abrahams und auch nach seinem Übertritte Pharisäer vom Scheitel bis zur Sohle." All that he had to say about Jesus and his gospel has no claim to reliability.<sup>7</sup> "Misverstand, Unverstand, ein Zwitterding aus Pharisäismus und Phantasterei" are scarcely adequate historical foundations on which to build a church. By careful criticism one can reconstruct the historical facts about Jesus from the first three gospels, but "von Paulus aus hat

---

<sup>6</sup>Göttingen, 1873, 63 pp. Bound in a volume containing articles by F. Overbeck, F. Fabri, and others.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., pp. 32-33.

keine Wissenschaft eine Brücke rückwärts zu dem hohen Meister." Paul is blamed for judaizing Christianity.<sup>8</sup> The whole "Religionsbegriff" of Christianity is false. Lagarde's separation of Jesus and Paul is also grounded in an absolute distinction between religion and dogma.

Religion is überall da, wo sie anerkanntermassen vorhanden ist, nicht Vorstellung von, nicht Gedanke über, sondern persönliche Beziehung des Frommen auf Gott, Leben mit ihm. Sie ist unbedingt Gegenwart, Hoffnung auf die Zukunft nur insoferne, als der Umgang mit dem Ewigen jedem, der ihn übt, unumstößliche Gewissheit gibt, dass er selbst auch ewig ist.<sup>9</sup>

Because Paul transformed religion into dogma, he is wholly to be repudiated.

Thus, both Renan and Lagarde in their own way perpetuate the old rationalistic distinction between the religion of Jesus and the perverted forms of his followers, although here it is specifically expressed as the antithesis between Jesus and Paul. The nineteenth century revival of interest in the theology of Paul had undoubtedly contributed to this juxtaposition of the two. It is also apparent that in their opinion the results

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 34

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

of the Leben-Jesu-Forschung provided their conclusions with scientific certainty. Such radical conclusions, however, did not otherwise characterize the Leben-Jesu-Forschung of the nineteenth century.

The last of the opponents of Paul to be considered is the philosopher F. W. Nietzsche. In his passionate polemic against contemporary Christianity, Nietzsche also attributed much of its undesirable aspects to Paul. In his critique of Christianity in The Antichrist,<sup>10</sup> Nietzsche characterized Paul as the "genius for hatred," who "nailed the Saviour to his own cross." Nothing of the life and teachings of Jesus remained after Paul had reduced it to his own uses. "Once more the priestly instinct of the Jew perpetrated the same old master crime against history--and invented his own history of Christian beginnings."<sup>11</sup> Paul had the priestly lust for power, and he used the belief in immortality, i.e., the doctrine of judgment, as a device for establishing priestly tyranny and organizing the mob.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>F. W. Nietzsche, The Antichrist, Translated with an introduction by H. L. Mencken, New York, 1920. Originally published in 1895.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 119.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 121.

None of these opinions influenced the critical research of the nineteenth century. Although often noted, they need not be taken seriously, for they obviously bore the character of emotional outbursts rather than the objective deliberations of the scientific historian. Although the historico-critical school in general would have agreed with Renan, Lagarde and Nietzsche that Paul cared little about the historical Jesus and had altered his gospel, nevertheless, the claim of an absolute breach between Jesus and Paul appeared to have no historical basis, and was not seriously reckoned with. It would appear that Renan, Lagarde and Nietzsche, although dominated by dogmatic pre-suppositions, had a clearer grasp of the implications of the position of the historico-critical school than its own scholars themselves did. In this respect, the significance of Wrede consisted in the fact that the evaluation of Paul reflected in the writings of Renan, Lagarde and Nietzsche was now given a scientific historical basis and presented as the assured result of historical criticism.

#### B. FROM PARET TO FEINE

The significance of Wrede must now be

evaluated in the light of the early discussions among Biblical scholars of the Jesus-Paul problem. A survey of the early literature of the problem confirms the view that the opinions of Renan, Lagarde and Nietzsche exercised little more than a negative influence on the discussions. The continuity between Jesus and Paul is everywhere assumed, and it is only a question in the discussions as to how this continuity was to be construed and to what extent Paul's theology agreed with the teachings of Jesus. Conservative theology could not long rest content with the isolation of Paul from Jesus effected by Baur and the historical critical school. It seemed necessary to show that Paul's dependence upon the life and teachings of Jesus was greater than the Tübingen school had maintained.

1. The Reaction to Baur<sup>13</sup>: Paret

The protest against Baur's isolation of Paul from Jesus produced the first monographic treatment

---

<sup>13</sup>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. See "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie, Viertes Heft, 1831, pp. 61-206.

of the problem of Jesus and Paul by Heinrich Paret. His article, "Paulus und Jesus,"<sup>14</sup> exercised no little influence in the later discussions of the problem and in its grasp of the problems involved surpassed many of the superficial treatments of his successors. Paret was fully aware of the difficulties which Paul's apparent indifference to the life and teachings of Jesus presented for historical theology, and he made no attempt to minimize them. The historico-critical school, following Baur, had so emphasized this fact as to create the historical "dogma" of Paul's complete theological independence of Jesus. But already during Baur's life time, Paret saw the implications of this "dogma" as clearly as Renan or Lagarde did later on. Paret pointed out that, according to the Tübingen theory,<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Subtitled "Einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältnis des Apostels Paulus und seiner Lehre zu der Person, dem Leben und der Lehre des geschichtlichen Christus," JDT, iii, Erstes Heft (1858), pp. 1-85.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. Baur raised the question "how 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." The Church History of the First Three Centuries, London, 1878, i, 49-50.

Paul's lack of knowledge about the historical Jesus enabled him to arrive at a higher concept of his person.

Der Raum, welcher bei den übrigen Aposteln durch die Anschauung wiedererzeugende Erinnerung ausgefüllt war, war bei dem Apostel Paulus leer, oder wenigstens halbleer. In diese tabula rasa konnte er seine christologischen Ideen einzeichnen; in diesem Raume konnten bei ihm, je leerer derselbe war, um so ungehinderter Theologumenen über Christus, wie das über seine Präexistenz und was damit zusammenhängt, sich ansetzen, welche, weder aus Anschauung erzeugt, noch mit ihr vermittelt, einen selbständigen Flug in die Lüfte, in's Blaue hinein nahmen.<sup>16</sup>

Accordingly, Paul appears as the first representative of that "un- and widergeschichtliche" understanding of Christianity which reached the climax of its development in the unedifying Christological and Trinitarian controversies, which in their concern over the nature of the person of Christ neglected the careful study of his human life and his earthly history.<sup>17</sup>

A protest against the one-sided interpretation of Paul as a theoretician is already apparent in Paret's remarks at this point. To interpret Paul purely as an independent, speculative thinker means, according to Paret, not only to

---

<sup>16</sup>Paret, op. cit., p. 7.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 7-8.

separate him from the historical Jesus, but also to deprive him of any real religious significance.

Over against this speculative approach to Paul's theology, Paret first of all emphasizes that Paul's theology was a "theology of facts."

Auf Thatsachen beruht sein christliches Bewusstsein; auf diese weist sein Lehren zurück; aus diesen ist es herausgewachsen. Der geschichtliche Christus, oder Jesus als der Christ, ist sein Ein und Alles.<sup>18</sup>

Paret then proceeds with a careful examination of the epistles of Paul with a view to showing that Paul actually knew more about the facts of the historical Jesus than the Tübingen school had assumed.<sup>19</sup> Paul's apparent disinterest in the historical Jesus is in part explained by the nature of the epistles in which a strong dogmatic interest dominates. Yet they presuppose a rather complete knowledge of the historical Jesus on the part of the readers. It is therefore very probable that Paul's missionary preaching contained a far greater

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>19</sup>Paret scoured Paul's letters (he did not confine himself to the Tübingen four, but also used I 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. Ibid., p. 11.

historical element than we find in the epistles, which were intended for those who had already heard and received the gospel.<sup>20</sup> The fact that Paul appeared to be indifferent to the historical Jesus is also explained by three other factors: (1) His interest in discovering Old Testament types of Christ must have drawn his attention away from the life-history of Jesus; (2) His hope in the near return of Christ; and (3) the certainty "wie lebendig er Jesum in der wirklichen Gegenwart hatte."<sup>21</sup>

He then follows with a similar examination of the epistles to show that Paul knew more about the teachings of Jesus than is generally supposed. In spite of the fact that Paul seldom appealed directly to a saying of Jesus, and then only in secondary matters, Paret points to allusions to the teaching of Jesus and many points of similarity. But Paret's judgment in this respect is generally

---

<sup>20</sup>G. Kittel also 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. "Jesus bei Paulus," TSK, 85 (1912), 394 (pp. 366-403).

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., pp. 28-30.

cautious and reserved. The fact that there is no evidence that Paul's opponents ever used a saying of Jesus against him, shows that Paul must have known not only the teachings of Jesus themselves, but also his own theology was not inconsistent with anything that Jesus had taught.<sup>22</sup>

Continuing with a discussion of the sources of this historical material, Paret rejects the theory of some orthodox theologians that such material was communicated directly by revelation of the exalted Lord. The statement of Galatians 1:11 that Paul received his gospel not by man but through revelation of Jesus, only shows that Paul's authority was under attack because his knowledge of Jesus was derived from intermediate sources and not directly, like that of the other apostles.<sup>23</sup> Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus was therefore derived by historical means, and he must have gained a considerable knowledge of Jesus during the time when he was persecuting the early Christians. Just how much knowledge he gained of Jesus before his conversion and how much after it cannot be determined.

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 60.

In any case, he did not learn his gospel or receive his apostleship from men.

Vielmehr von dem Augenblick an, wo sich ihm Jesus als Gottessohn und als der Lebendige geoffenbart hatte, war der neue Mensch und der Apostel fertig. Was von jenem Einzelstoff weiter in ihn eindrang, das gruppierte sich um seine von obenher erhaltene göttliche Gewissheit, dass Jesus Gottes Sohn, zur Versöhnung der Welt und seiner eigenen (Gal. 2:20) gestorben und nun der ewig Lebendige sei. Von weiterem Lernen kann bei Paulus von da an nur so die Rede sein, wie dieser Begriff auch auf Jesum selbst eine Anwendung gestattet.<sup>24</sup>

In the final section, Paret deals with the precise relation between Paul's higher, revealed knowledge and the knowledge derived by historical means. Paul's independence and "Geistesfreiheit" is to be understood as his dependence upon Christ and the "Christusgeist." "Die Autonomie des Apostels ist unmittelbar als Heteronomie zu bestimmen, und eine Person, Christus, unmittelbar als Princip."<sup>25</sup> Paul's relationship to Jesus was not that of a slavish scholar who sought to reproduce the teachings of Jesus in a "Lehrsystem." Nor was he a gifted pupil who sought to recreate the spirit of his teacher in himself. Paul is neither pupil and imitator of Jesus, nor a second Christ, an incarnation

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

of the "Christusgeist";

auch ist der objective Christus in seinem Bewusstsein nicht absorbiert, so dass er erst wieder als Projection daraus hervorträte, sondern er ist erstens gläubiger Verehrer, ja Anbeter Jesu (1 Kor.1:2, 11 Kor.12:8 ff.) und zweitens von ihm ebenso begeistert und ergriffen, wie die alttestamentlichen Propheten von Gott und seinem Geiste, daher er auch ebenso im Namen Christi reden kann, wie jene im Namen Gottes reden und sagen konnten, dass Gott seine eigenen Worte in ihren Mund gelegt habe.<sup>26</sup>

And this was the consequence of the Christ-revelation in the moment of his conversion.

His entire theology, then, is to be understood as the work

der frommen Reflexion des wunderbar wiedergeborenen und von Gott erleuchteten Christen und Apostels Paulus zu begreifen, als das Erzeugnis einer denkenden Durcharbeitung seines eigenen, persönlichen Lebensgangs, der Geschichte seines Volkes, der Zustände der damaligen römischen Welt, und namentlich auch, was uns hier zunächst angeht, der Geschichte und Lehre Jesu.<sup>27</sup>

His doctrine is rooted in his personal experience; his individual Christianity is universalised. All the antitheses of his theology: sin and grace, law and faith, righteousness by works and righteousness by faith, conflict and reconciliation with God, etc.--all these only express the nature of the two

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 73-74.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

periods of his life.<sup>28</sup>

His discoveries and experiences also necessitated a revision of his "Christusbegriff." Just as Jesus "ethisierte" the old Testament idea of God, i.e., purified it of everything particular and national, so Paul "ethisierte" the Jewish concept of the Messiah. Paul emphasized those elements of Jesus' life, particularly the cross, which "einerseits über alles bloss nationale hinauswiesen, ihm eine allgemeine menschliche Bedeutung verliehen, und andererseits demselben die individuellste religiöse Verwendbarkeit sicherten."<sup>29</sup> cap/

Paret's grasp of the problem was rather remarkable for his time, and his study in many respects is classic for the nineteenth century treatments of the problem of Jesus and Paul. With respect to methodology, the nineteenth century advanced little beyond Paret. There is here already the emphasis upon the historical element in Paul's theology, the attempt to show the relation between the teachings of Jesus and Paul, the application of Schleiermacher's distinction between

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 78-79.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 80-83.

religion and theology so characteristic of the nineteenth century, the interpretation of Jesus and Paul in terms of ethical idealism, and the attempt to explain Paul's theology from his conversion experience. In the later development of the problem, Paret's insights are developed and emphasized in various ways, but the development of the discussions was unfortunately not always progressive. Much of the literature was characterized by a wearisome repetition of ideas and arguments, so that it will suffice to indicate the general course of the discussions.

Paret's article apparently did not have an immediate influence upon historical theology. Baur took note of it in a footnote in the second edition of his Das Christenthum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, Tübingen, 1860, p. 48,<sup>30</sup> but dismissed it as of no particular consequence. The time was not yet ripe for a

---

<sup>30</sup>E.T. by Allan Menzies, The Church History of the First Three Centuries, i, n. 21, pp. 50-51. "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."

general discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul. Such a discussion did not ensue until the Tübingen theory of the independence of Paul had become consolidated and generally accepted by the historico-critical school. This development of Pauline research, together with the fact that men like Renan and Lagarde actually drew from it the radical conclusions which Paret had anticipated, eventually led to an increasing interest in the problem of Jesus and Paul in the last decade of the nineteenth century.

The abrupt leap in Feine's survey from Paret to Wendt (1894) leaves the mistaken impression that the problem of Jesus and Paul had been of no particular concern in the interim. However, it has already been shown in the survey of Pauline research that historical theology was not unaware of the problem which the Tübingen theory presented. And the problem inevitably asserted itself whenever the attempt was made to write a New Testament theology or a history of the primitive church. The gradual growth of monographic studies in the last decade of the nineteenth century merely represented an inevitable intensification of a problem which had long since been felt and which coincided

with new developments in theology as well as historical research.

2. Paul's Dependence upon Teaching of Jesus: Roos, Nösgen, Gloatz, Jeffrey, Drummond

Conservative theology could not remain content to be an idle spectator in the question of the relationship between Jesus and Paul. Its studies were strongly apologetic. As early as 1887, F. Roos undertook to defend the orthodox view of the organic, doctrinal unity of the New Testament over against the work of the historical-critical school as well as historical theology in general.<sup>31</sup> He criticizes Paret for not going far enough in showing whether or not there is a real factual and essential agreement between the sayings of Jesus and the Pauline gospel.<sup>32</sup> He is likewise dissatisfied with the freedom and independence which Paret attributed to Paul in the formulation of his theology and insisted that not only the conversion experience, but also the further development of Paul's theology in its literal, verbal form must be understood as the revelatory work of the Holy

---

<sup>31</sup>F. Roos, Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu. Ein Blick in den organischen Zusammenhang der neutestamentlichen Schriften, Ludwigsburg, 1887.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 32-33.

Spirit.<sup>33</sup> Roos will admit no other source for Paul's theology than the life and teachings of Jesus as presented in all four gospels, and he attempts to show that Paul's theology is "eine weitere Entwicklung, denkende Verarbeitung und Ausgestaltung, und praktische Anwendung und Individualisierung dessen, was ihm als Glaubensinhalt durch Leben und Lehre Jesu und durch die Thaten Gottes an und in der Gemeinde gegeben war." What differences do exist between the teachings of Jesus and Paul are simply the result of the different historical situations in which Paul found himself.<sup>34</sup>

Because this line of approach used the gospels uncritically and largely ignored the historical problems involved in the relation of Paul to Jesus, it exercised little influence outside the more conservative circles. Inasmuch as Roos' approach to the unity of the New Testament was primarily doctrinal he failed to do justice to the question of historical development and tended to obscure the individuality of Paul. Paul's dependence upon Jesus is seen primarily as a dependence on his teachings, and his theology is conceived as literal a/

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 235 ff.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 246-247.

extension of the teachings of Jesus. Yet Roos recognized that the question of the continuity between Jesus and Paul was not to be settled merely by pointing out that Paul had considerable knowledge of the historical Jesus or by establishing the fact that the epistles contain quotations from and allusions to the teachings of Jesus. Although he interpreted the work of the Spirit in a mechanical and literal fashion, he thereby nevertheless emphasized a factor which was all too often disregarded in the discussions of the problem.

This approach to the problem from the viewpoint of the doctrinal unity of the New Testament with its assumption of the essential agreement between the teachings of Jesus and Paul was also followed by others, including Nösgen and Gloatz.<sup>35</sup> British theology was also not unaware of the continental discussions and produced several conservative works of this type. Jeffrey, in a book-by-book treatment of several Pauline epistles and the epistles of Peter, John and Hebrews, sought to show that Paul preached the same gospel as Christ and

---

<sup>35</sup>D. Nösgen, "Die apostelische Verkündigung und die Geschichte Jesu," NJDT (1895), pp. 46-94; P. Gloatz, "Zur Vergleichung der Lehre Paulus mit der Jesu--zugleich für Bestätigung der johanneischen Darstellung durch Paulus," TSK (1895), pp. 777-800.

the other apostles had.<sup>36</sup> In a much more thorough study and with a better grasp of the problems, R. J. Drummond started from the teaching of Jesus, comparing its essential elements with the teachings of Paul and the other apostles. He finds a fundamental and widespread agreement, but with differences of terminology and emphasis, and also a certain development of the teachings of Jesus in the apostles.<sup>37</sup>

All of these writings, implicitly or explicitly, represented the reaction of conservative theology against the excessively analytical tendency of historical theology which emphasized the diversity of the New Testament at the expense of its unity. The isolation of Paul from Jesus and the resulting demand of liberal theology for a return to the religion of Jesus are treated within this larger context. Although the continuity between Jesus and Paul is understood almost exclusively in terms of doctrinal unity, this approach still reflects a serious interest in the theological significance of the New Testament.

---

<sup>36</sup>James Jeffrey, The Gospel of Paul, the Gospel of Jesus, Edinburgh and London, 1899.

<sup>37</sup>R. J. Drummond, The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ, Edinburgh, 1900.

3. Paul Measured by Jesus:  
Wendt

A somewhat different approach to the question of the unity of the New Testament was expressed in H. H. Wendt's treatment of the problem of Jesus and Paul.<sup>38</sup> Wendt, a follower of Ritschl, likewise understands the relationship between Jesus and Paul primarily in terms of doctrinal unity. But in the light of historical criticism, he cannot accept the orthodox view that the Scriptures contain a unified doctrinal norm, that what is "Pauline" is "necessarily Christian." But if Jesus in his gospel of the Kingdom and in his personal life and work is the perfect revelation of God for mankind, then his gospel must be the criterion for judging what is authentically Christian in all Christian literature, including the writings of the New Testament. The authority of Biblical doctrines and ideas for Christian doctrine will depend upon the demonstration of their inner agreement with the perfect revelation of Jesus Christ himself.<sup>39</sup> He then compares the main aspects of Jesus and Paul's teachings concerning salvation and the Messiah and

---

<sup>38</sup>H. H. Wendt, "Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu," ZTK, iv (1894), 1-78.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 1-3.

comes to the conclusion that there is a basic inner agreement between Paul and Jesus. Paul took from Jesus the religious ideal of the fatherhood of God and sonship of men, and shared his conviction that this ideal had found full realization in himself so that it could also be realized in other men.<sup>40</sup> However, although Paul preserved this religious ideal in all its power and purity, he did introduce foreign elements into his gospel from his Jewish and Pharisaic background. The unity of the religious ideal in Jesus' thought was not consistently maintained in Paul. Wendt discovers that an essentially Jewish concept of God accounts for the points in which Paul differs from Jesus. Therefore, Jesus' gospel in its simple greatness and truth, in its inner unity, remains superior to that of Paul.<sup>41</sup>

At this point there appears a definite reduction of the authority of the Apostle Paul and a limitation of the validity of his gospel. The possibility of a real historical development from Jesus to Paul is excluded, and Jesus' teaching in a static fashion becomes the criteria for

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 75 ff.

determining what is valid in the theology of Paul.<sup>42</sup> This reduction of "revelation" to Jesus and consequent absolutizing of his teachings represents a critical point in the history of the Jesus-Paul problem. Wrede is the logical outcome of this line. For as the further development of Pauline research appeared to indicate an essential discontinuity between Jesus' teachings and the theology of Paul, Wrede is perfectly consistent in demanding an "either-or" alternative for the problem of Jesus and Paul.

Wendt's treatment of the problem of Jesus and Paul, however, did not remain unchallenged either from the side of the Tübingen school or conservative theology. From the view point of the Tübingen school, A. Hilgenfeld criticized Wendt for not doing justice to the concept of historical development.<sup>43</sup> Hilgenfeld also undertakes a comparison of the teachings of Jesus and Paul, but

---

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 78 (Cf. "--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.")

<sup>43</sup>A: Hilgenfeld, "Jesus und Paulus," ZWT, N.F. 2, 37 (1894), 481-541.

discovers no weakening of Jesus' gospel in Paul, but the progressive development of a "triebhaftigen Keim" in which there is an enrichment and purification of the Messianic ideal from all Jewish-national elements.<sup>44</sup> The previously mentioned article by Gloatz was also directed against Wendt, but from a conservative viewpoint emphasized the organic unity of the New Testament in and with its individual doctrinal types.

#### 4. Paul's Use of the Sayings of Jesus: A. Resch

The growing interest in the relationship of Pauline theology to the sayings of Jesus also produced new studies, literary-historical in methodology, of Paul's use of the sayings of Jesus. Classical for this line of approach were the studies of Alfred Resch. In his essay, "Agrapha,"

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., Cf. pp. 532 ff. Of the basic integrity of Jesus' message and Paul's gospel, Hilgenfeld has no doubt. "Hilgenfeld had drawn attention for the first time (1857) to Jewish apocalyptic as an important element in the pre-history of Christianity and had pointed out that "no connection, or at least no direct connection, (exists) between Old Testament prophecy and Christianity," but that "pre-Christian Judaism itself comprised a preparation for the Christian era." In Jewish apocalyptic, Hilgenfeld saw a development toward the inner purification that prepares "for the universalism of the Christian kingdom of God." W. G. Kummel, NT, p. 206. See A. Hilgenfeld, Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christentums nebst einem Anhang über das gnostische System des Basilides, Jena, 1857, pp. 1, ix, 189.

Ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente gesammelt und untersucht,<sup>45</sup> Resch sought to show that Paul's epistles contained a whole series of sayings of Jesus from a pre-canonical gospel. In his later study, Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhaltnis untersucht,<sup>46</sup> he sought to trace and exhibit every usage of and every possible allusion to the sayings of Jesus in the Pauline epistles. Resch found 925 allusions to Jesus' sayings in nine Pauline letters, 133 more in Ephesians, 100 in the Pastoral epistles, and 64 in the Pauline speeches in Acts.

---

<sup>45</sup>TUG, 5 (1889), Part IV; George Matheson found in Paul material about the earthly Jesus; his teachings, his character, the events of his life. "The Historical Christ of St. Paul," The Expositor, 2nd Series, I (1881), 43-62, 125-138, 193-208, 264-275, 352-371, 431-443; Ibid., II (1881), 27-47, 137-154, 284-307, 357-371. For further study of parallels between Pauline exhortation and the teachings of Jesus, see W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1955, pp. 136 ff.; F. F. Bruce, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 20; idem, "Paul and the Historical Jesus," BJRL, 56 (1974), 318-319, 325 ff.

<sup>46</sup>TUG N.F., XII (1904); H. Ridderbos slightly refuted this kind of methodology. In his book, Paul and Jesus (E.T. by David H. Freeman, 1958), Ridderbos insisted: "Undoubtedly, the reproduction of Jesus' words form only a small part of the content of Paul's epistles. The central point of Paul's proclamation of Christ is formed much more by what occurred to Jesus, especially the cross and resurrection, than by that which was said and done by him." But in addition, he says that there are still a number of expressions which can be cited which do not expressly speak of a word of the Lord, but where such words clearly lay at the foundation of Paul's exhortation as, for example, in Rom.12:14; 13:9 (Cf. Gal.5:14); I Cor.13:2 p. 50 f.

5. Paul's Dependence upon Historical Person of Jesus: Von Soden, Drescher, Sturm, Holtzmann, Schmoller, Somerville

Apart from the somewhat one-sided interest in the relation of the teachings of Jesus to the theology of Paul, there were others who placed the main emphasis upon the question of Paul's knowledge of the person and life of Jesus. Although this was partly a matter of emphasis, it nevertheless reflected a different theological interest, corresponding to the growing emphasis on the person of the historical Jesus in the Leben-Jesu-Forschung and the shift of attention to Christology in Pauline research. In a certain dependence upon Schleiermacher, this line of approach attributed the existence and development of the church to the influence of the person of Jesus as such. In terms of relationship of Jesus and Paul, the main problem hinged on whether Paul's Christ-doctrine could be attributed in any manner to the influence of the historical person of Jesus.

It was the significance of Paret that he had first grasped this problem clearly. Was Paul's christology a "selbständigen Flug in die Lüfte" or was it in fact based upon a knowledge of the historical person of Jesus? How was Paul's

understanding of the risen and exalted Christ related to the historical Jesus? The perplexity of the problem was increased by the fact that most nineteenth century theologians, particularly the historico-critical school, interpreted Paul's Christology in terms of the Greek dualism of flesh and spirit. They assumed that Paul identified the risen Christ with the Spirit and earthly Jesus with the flesh, and accordingly attributed Paul's lack of interest in the latter to that distinction. Thus, Strauss' problem of the historical Jesus versus the Christ of faith assumed a new form from the side of Pauline research. Conservative theology, insofar as it was concerned primarily with the doctrinal unity of the New Testament, and Wendt and Harnack, insofar as they were concerned primarily with the teachings of Jesus, tended to neglect this problem.

One of the first monographic treatments of this aspect of the problem after Paret was H. von Soden's, "Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte."<sup>47</sup> As the title indicates, he treats the problem in a wider context

---

<sup>47</sup>Theologische Abhandlungen, gewidmet Carl von Weizsäcker, Freiburg, 1892, pp. 113-169.

than Paret, and is inclined to emphasize the apparent disinterest of the apostolic age in the historical Jesus more strongly than Paret. Von Soden attributed this indifference to two facts: First of all, the early Christians believed that they possessed the full revelation of God in the Old Testament; and secondly, their conviction of possessing the Spirit as a consequence of their fellowship with the Messiah. Whoever possessed this Spirit, which revealed the depths of God, had no need of external authorities. For such a *cap/* "selbstbewusstsein," the sayings of Jesus might have confirmatory value, but they were not the source of the knowledge of truth. Nevertheless, this conviction was an inference which rested upon the total impression of Jesus' personality, a "Schluss aus dem Geist, der sie durchwehte und sich bezeugte in allem, was er sagte, that, über sich ergehen liess, und aus dessen Wirkungskraft auf alle die, welche sich ihm hingaben."<sup>48</sup> Indeed, these influences of the Spirit were mediated by all the details of Jesus' life as they were communicated by his followers. But the details ceased to be of concern, once his followers were assured

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 167.

of possessing the Spirit.<sup>49</sup> Thus, in the fashion of Schleiermacher, von Soden would see the unity of the New Testament in a common "Geist" originating from the influence of the person of Jesus. The actual differences between the theology of the early apostles and the teachings of Jesus then become somewhat relative.

R. Drescher's book, Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus,<sup>50</sup> exhibits an interest in Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus more akin to that of Paret. But Drescher is not interested in Paul's theology as such, but only in Paul as a "classical witness to the life of Jesus." He is concerned not only with Paul's knowledge of the external events of Jesus' life, but particularly with Paul's witness to the spiritual personality of Jesus. After treating the Christology of the major Pauline epistles,<sup>51</sup> he comes to the conclusion that Paul's character portrait of Christ is essentially the same as it appears in the gospels.<sup>52</sup> In a similar

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 169.

<sup>50</sup>R. Drescher, Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus, Giessen, 1900.

<sup>51</sup>Cf. Drescher accepts five Pauline epistles as genuine; Galatians, I & II Cor., Rom., and Philip. (Ibid., p. 5).

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

fashion W. Sturm also argues that Paul had a concept of the person of Jesus, agreeing with that of the gospels, as the embodiment of absolute devotion to God and of unlimited love for man.<sup>53</sup> H. J. Holtzmann in a discussion of Drescher's and Sturm's books also agrees, but would lay more emphasis upon characteristic "Leit- und Losungsworte" in Paul which refer to the characteristics of the portraits of Jesus rather than upon the collection and comparison of passages in Paul which correspond to verses in the Synoptic gospels.<sup>54</sup> In all these attempts, the continuity between Jesus and Paul is found in the influence of the person of Jesus on Paul and not in the agreement of their

---

<sup>53</sup>W. Sturm, Der Apostel Paulus und die evangelische Ueberlieferung, Vol. I, 1897, Vol. II, 1900.

<sup>54</sup>H. J. Holtzmann, "Zum Thema, 'Jesus und Paulus'," PM (1900), pp. 463-468. He would explain Paul's conception of Christ as an objectivization and generalization of his subjective experience at Damascus. He also writes, Lehrbuch der Neutest. Theologie, II (1897), 238: "--the whole of St. Paul's doctrine (about the significance of Christ) will only be intelligible and transparent from the point of view that it is the generalization of what its author had gone through in his own person and what he, therefore, enjoins on all who follow the same path as something they should share. It simply means the explanation of the content of Paul's conversion, the systematization of the Christophany." ible/

teachings. But the actual influence of the person of Jesus on the theology of Paul is so reduced that Wrede can easily dismiss it.

Another approach, springing directly from the discussions of the problem of the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith, was to be found in O. Schmoller's article "Die geschichtliche person Jesu nach den paulinischen Schriften."<sup>55</sup> Schmoller objected to the sharp distinction between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith, which was inherent in the Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Following Martin Kähler (Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus), he affirms that the origin of the "gospel about Jesus" in distinction to the "gospel of Jesus" was a perfectly correct and necessary development, willed and ordained by God.<sup>56</sup> But we must know the "bud" from which the "fruit" has sprung, in order to be sure that the "fruit" is not a phantom instead of reality and truth.<sup>57</sup> Since the gospels are late witnesses and reflect the faith of the writers,

---

<sup>55</sup>TSK, 1894, pp. 656-705.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., pp. 656-658.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 659.

Schmoller attempts to reconstruct the external circumstances of Jesus' life, his activity, inner being and character from the epistles of Paul. In so doing he also believes to be able to confirm the historical reliability of the gospels.<sup>58</sup>

A much more adequate treatment of the problem of the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith in Paul is to be found in an English work, generally overlooked by continental theologians, by David Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, or the Doctrine of the Second Adam, Edinburgh, 1897. Over against Wendt, Somerville affirms:

The fact that the eternal significant of the life and death of Jesus for the religious life of mankind was only disclosed to those who believed in a risen and living Christ, warrants us in regarding the apostolic testimonies concerning the glory of their Lord as a continuation of the revelation made to us in Him of the will and the mind of God.<sup>59</sup>

ce/

Somerville acknowledges that Paul's conception of Christ was based upon his personal experience of the power of the risen Christ, and that the differences between this Christ of faith and the Jesus of history outwardly appear great.<sup>60</sup> However, those

---

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., Cf. p. 705.

<sup>59</sup>Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, or the Doctrine of the Second Adam, Edinburgh, 1897, pp. v-vi.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., pp. 223-224.

who regard the Christology of Paul as a corruption of the teaching of Jesus, overlook the claims which Jesus made for his own person. Out of the consciousness of being one with the truth he revealed, Jesus spoke as one who stood in a central relation to mankind so as to make men's attitude to him all-decisive for their character and destiny.<sup>61</sup> Thus when Paul attaches extraordinary importance to the person of Christ, he simply echoes Christ's estimate of himself. And even if Paul in some respects goes beyond what Christ thought of himself and includes aspects of His glory peculiar to the apostle's own experience, "The worth of these is not lessened by this circumstance, since in the estimate Christ formed of Himself, there is a judgment of His supreme place in relation to the spiritual life of mankind which warrants us in expecting statements of what He is in human experience that surpass what is said of Him as the Christ of history."<sup>62</sup> Likewise, Paul's emphasis upon the cross as the achievement of salvation "is warranted by the importance attached by Christ himself to his

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 228.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 232.

death as an integral part of his mission to save men, and as the condition of the success of his mission."<sup>63</sup>

Although Paul's portrait of the personality of the historical Christ is incomplete, there is no real contradiction between the historical Christ and the Christ of faith. Each is necessary to the understanding and appreciation of the other.

And while it is true that for us the exalted Christ can be reached only through the historical, and is a power over our lives in the measure in which our thought of Him and of His actual relations to us is enriched with the memories of His earthly life, it is equally true that the history as a whole, and his death in particular, must be conceived from the point of view of the apostle who exhibits to us the exalted Christ as the key to the understanding of the history, if our faith in Him is to be the faith of the Apostle, that is, if Christ is to be to us the power of God for our redemption from sin and death.<sup>64</sup>

Somerville obviously ignored many historical problems involved in the relationship between Jesus and Paul. What distinguishes him particularly, however, is his insight that the problem of Jesus and Paul is not merely a historical problem, but also theological; that it is a problem which cannot be solved by historical and literary means alone, but that it is also a matter of faith.

---

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 237.

Over against the strong dualism<sup>65</sup> of much continental theology, he affirms the inseparability of the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith in Paul.

6. Jesus and Paul in Terms of  
Historical Development:  
Titius

By the beginning of the twentieth century there is evidence of a deepening grasp of the nature of the problem on the part of conservative theology. A. Titius also approached the problem of Jesus and Paul from the viewpoint of the unity of the New Testament.<sup>66</sup> In contrast to the purely doctrinal approach, he attempts to understand the unity of the New Testament from the standpoint of "Seligkeit," which involves not only an objectively given salvation, "the highest good," but also its inward appropriation and enjoyment--the understanding of the life and disposition which is included in

---

<sup>65</sup>Cf. Noumenal/Phenomenal (Kant), dimension of inwardness and retrospect/dimension of external impression (Schleiermacher), value-judgment/judgment of being (Ritschl), Biblical Christ/Historical Jesus (Herrmann), geschichtlich/historisch (Kähler), individual history/world-history (Kierkegaard); Geschichte-Geschichtlichkeit/Historie-Historizität (Heidegger).

<sup>66</sup>A. Titius, Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart: Erster Theil, Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes, Freiburg I.B. und Leipzig, 1895; Zweite, Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit, Tübingen, 1900.

the idea of the highest good.<sup>67</sup>

With regard to methodology, Titius recognizes that the application of Schleiermacher's concept of religious individuality to the New Testament tends to produce a predominantly literary treatment of the materials. The result is a description of the various doctrinal types, but not an adequate historical understanding of them. The concept of religious individuality must be combined with the concept of historical development.<sup>68</sup>

Accordingly, Titius proposes to understand the doctrine of Paul as a continuation of the teaching and preaching of Jesus, conditioned by Paul's personal peculiarities and experiences and by the historical development of the church. Particularly over against von Soden, he seeks to further the work of Paret in demonstrating the Apostle's dependence upon the Gospel of Jesus. Paul let the basic ideas of Jesus--the fatherhood of God, the commandment of love, present and future salvation, the power of faith, and reconciliation--work upon himself with inner freedom and independence, so

---

<sup>67</sup>Titius, *Erster Theil*, p. 4.

<sup>68</sup>Titius, *Zweiter Abtheilung*, pp. 1-2.

that he was convinced of carrying out the intention of Jesus in his opposition to Pharisaism. And he concludes that everywhere where the original experience of Paul or the common theology of his time are not apparent, one may refer the existing agreement to dependence upon Jesus.<sup>69</sup> In this fashion, he attempts to demonstrate the essential continuity between Jesus and Paul without doing violence to the individuality of Paul's theology. Historical factors are here given greater consideration but by interpreting Paul's theology from the standpoint of "Seligkeit" Titius, like Wendt, fails to do justice to the significance of the person of Christ in Paul's thought. The dependence of Paul upon Jesus is conceived primarily as a dependence upon his teachings without doing justice to Paret's emphasis on Paul's dependence on the person of Christ.

7. The Religious Dependence of Paul upon Jesus: Feine

It was Paul Feine who fully developed this latter aspect of the relationship of Paul to Jesus. His treatment of the problem was undoubtedly the

---

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., pp. 17-18.

best and most comprehensive of all the conservative studies of the problem in the early period.<sup>70</sup> His understanding of the complexity and difficulty of the problem and his knowledge of the literature was far superior to many of the facile treatments of his predecessors. He was the first to attempt a sketch of the origin of the problem in the historical and theological developments of the nineteenth century, and he rightly understood the importance of methodology.

With regard to methodology, Feine sees the weakness of a purely literary treatment of the question of the dependence of Paul on Jesus. The supposed literary allusions often shrink, on closer examination, to common contemporary "Anschauungen und Bildungselemente." What often appears as a peculiarity of individual persons really has a broader basis. Similarity of language and concepts does not necessarily mean a real theological dependence.

Das Abhängigkeitsverhältnis ist auf Grund literarischer Beziehungen allein unter Umständen überhaupt nicht zu entscheiden und ist Paulus und Jesus betreffend hie und da geradezu auf den Kopf gestellt worden.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup>Paul Feine, Jesus Christus und Paulus, Leipzig, 1902. e/

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

Great historical personalities are rightly understood and their significance grasped only when they are evaluated in connection with the "geistigen Leben" of their time and in demarcation from it. But historical understanding also demands a "Verbindung" between the scholar and the object of his study, "eine geistige Berührung--die das Anempfinden oder wenigstens das Nachempfinden dessen ermöglicht, was in geschichtlichen Persönlichkeiten lebendig gewesen ist."<sup>72</sup> Therefore, when a theologian undertakes to describe the thought-world of men like Paul or John he must be receptive to that religious life to which they gave expression in the categories and thought-forms of their own time.<sup>73</sup> Three methodological considerations follow from this. First, all religious life is individual, and so unrepeatable. It is necessary to recognize the peculiarity of the types and representatives of Christian truth. It is not sufficient, therefore, to determine the points at which Paul agrees or disagrees with Jesus and then to assume a more or less correct understanding of the gospel of Jesus, but we also have to assess the necessary refraction

---

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 67.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

of the ideas of Jesus in the "Geist" of the Apostle. Paul would have not rightly understood the gospel of Jesus if he had merely reproduced a faithful copy of it, but only if he had formulated the content of what took historical form in the person and work of Jesus under the conditions of his own personality and education, his experience and "Berufsthätigkeit." We are reminded of Paret when Feine says:

Paulus war nicht, konnte nicht sein eine Verkörperung des Wesens Christi oder eine Kopie Christi.<sup>74</sup>

Secondly, the religious difference which separates the Apostle from his Lord is not to be ignored. The life of the disciple is kindled by that of the Master. Paul does not speak in his own authority, but bears witness that the life he lives is Christ's life in him.<sup>75</sup>

Thirdly, the historical revelation of Christ must not be limited to his earthly life, but his death and resurrection as well as his power as Lord must be reckoned to his historical "Wesen." It is not a sign of the separation of Christ of faith from the historical Jesus when the exalted

---

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid.

Christ appears in the foreground of Christian preaching or when the earthly activity of Jesus is placed under the illumination of his "Lebensausgänge" and his transference into heavenly glory and power. But just as the earthly activity of Jesus would have remained a riddle without the subsequent glorification, so the community of the disciples first experienced the full significance and "Wirkungskraft" of Christ when he disclosed himself to them as the one who had passed from death to divine life. "Die eigentlich erlösende und lebenspendende Macht sowie die gemeinschaftbildende Kraft eignet erst dem erhöhten Christus." The Christian church from the beginning confessed only him whose heavenly Lordship had been experienced as the crowning conclusion of his earthly life.

Das ist nicht eine dogmatische Betrachtung, sondern die Feststellung eines uns aus der Geschichte entgegentretenden Thatbestandes, von dessen Wahrheit, da es sich um persönliches Leben handelt, ein jeder von uns heute noch eine volle Erfahrung gewinnen kann.<sup>76</sup>

In accordance with these methodological considerations, Feine devotes the first main section of his book to the discussion of Paul's own conception of his dependence upon Jesus. It is his main

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

contention, contrary to von Soden and the historico-critical school, that the living, exalted Christ (also the pre-existent Christ) is identical in Paul's mind with the earthly Jesus, and that the decisive characteristics of the former were drawn from the earthly life and work of Jesus, inclusive of the resurrection. The whole Christ, no more nor less, is the object of faith and the bearer of salvation.<sup>77</sup>

Because of the nature of Paul's conversion experience, the risen Christ stands in the foreground of his thought. Yet the epistles show that Paul had a mastery of the evangelical traditions of the life of Jesus which he interpreted and applied freely and in an individual fashion. The decisive thing which Paul, in complete dependence upon his Lord, brought was not a sum of doctrines or traditions, "sondern es ist der Funke des Lebens, der vom Meister zum Jünger hinübergezuckt ist." The power of Paul's Christian personality took its start from the life of Jesus.

Vermöge seiner Veranlagung, aufs Grosse, Ganze zu gehen, hat Paulus, von Christus ergriffen, den Geist des Wirkens Jesu erfasst und ist bestrebt gewesen, Christi Leben in seinem Leben nachzubilden.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., see particularly pp. 44, 46.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

Having discussed Paul's understanding of his dependence on Christ, Feine then proceeds to the demonstration of this dependence in the agreement between the teachings of Jesus and Paul. After a discussion of the problem of the life of Jesus, he then moves to a comparison of their teachings. He seeks to show that Paul is dependent upon Jesus in his doctrine of God, Christology, redemption, in his ethics, attitude toward the law, understanding of baptism and Lord's supper and eschatology, only carries to a further point of development what is already present or foreshadowed in the teaching of Jesus. The differences which exist are due to individuality and education, to the peculiar conversion experience of the Apostle, the dependence of his faith on Christ, and to the historical situation changed by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ together with the gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>79</sup>

In conclusion, Feine asserts that the simple preaching and "Heilandswirken Jesu" had already assumed the form of theology in Paul--a necessary development, since that which Jesus was and did "musste zum Verständnis der Menschheit

---

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., pp. 150 ff.

gebracht werden, und jede Zeit und jedes Volk kann den Ewigkeitsgehalt dieser Person nur auf Grund des jeweiligen Vorstellungsmaterials erfassen." Paul gave expression to his thought in Jewish categories, but the Jewish element with him concerns only the form.

Durch diese und durch die auch ihn erfüllenden antike Weltanschauung hindurch leuchtet in unvergänglicher Herrlichkeit das Leben, das Christus ihm gegeben hatte-- Paulus hat das Wesen der Wirksamkeit Christi auf das Tiefste erfaßt. Aus dem Kern seiner durch Christus neugeschaffenen Persönlichkeit stellt er in innerer Freiheit und doch wieder steter Gebundenheit an Christus in individueller Weise durch sein Leben und Wirken dar, was Christus für ihn ist. Das aber ist Christi Wille an jeden Menschen.<sup>80</sup>

Feine's thorough study represents the climax of the conservative discussions in the early phase of the problem of Jesus and Paul. Here Paret's suggestive ideas bear their ripest fruit; Schleiermacher's concept of religious individuality is combined with concept of historical development in a thorough and scholarly fashion. Maurice Goguel's comprehensive study, L' Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ<sup>81</sup> takes issue with Feine at many

---

<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 298.

<sup>81</sup>Paris, 1904. For comments on Goguel's position see A. Schweitzer, Paul, pp. 159 f., and W. G. Kümmel, NT, pp. 293 ff. Goguel believed that

points and gives greater stress to the individuality of Paul's theology, but represents no essential advance over Feine's work. It is to be observed that in the whole conservative development from Paret to Feine there is a serious concern with Pauline theology as in some fashion a continuation of the teachings and work of Christ. The continuity of the Christian church and the validity of the Christian faith is seen to depend upon the historical continuity between Jesus and Paul.

#### C. THE DILEMMA OF LIBERAL THEOLOGY

In the meantime, however, the universal assumption of the continuity between Jesus and Paul was being gradually undermined by the development of "religionsgeschichtliche" research. The discovery of the eschatological-supernatural thought world of Jesus and Paul increased the sense of their estrangement from the modern world. With the

---

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. However, in spite of the considerable difference to which he draws attention, Goguel does not wish to admit that a real contrast exists between Jesus and Paul, but seeks rather to show--and at this point he clearly abandons the "strictly historical methodology" and recognizes a theological approach to the subject--that Paul carried out in the best possible way the theological task unavoidable involved in the situation at the beginning of Christianity (Kümmel, *ibid.*).

increasing disclosure of the Jewish elements in Paul the specifically Christian element in his theology began to shrink to the point where the continuity between Jesus and Paul became more problematic. This was already apparent in H. J. Holtzmann's *New Testament Theology*, but also in other works which appeared at this time.

Nevertheless, liberal theology sought to affirm an essential continuity between Jesus and Paul. So Wellhausen affirmed that Paul had introduced strong Jewish elements into the gospel, e.g., justification by faith. Yet in spite of the dross that clings to the gospel in Paul, he was the one who understood the gospel and drew its consequences.<sup>82</sup> Harnack in his Das Wesen des Christentums (1900) also expressed himself on the problem of Jesus and Paul. In spite of the fact that Harnack affirmed that not the Son, but only the Father belongs in the Gospel, he nevertheless followed Wellhausen's evaluation of Paul: "--in the opinion of the great majority of those who have studied him the true view is that he was the one who understood the master and continued his

---

<sup>82</sup>J. Wellhausen, Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte, Berlin, 1894, p. 319.

work."<sup>83</sup> It is particularly apparent in Harnack that the Ritschlian school, in contrast to the growing trend of Pauline research, laid very little emphasis upon the Christological element in Pauline theology. Like Ritschl himself, they tended to interpret Paul from the concept of the Kingdom of God. Thus Harnack affirms:

Without doing violence to the inner and essential features of the Gospel--unconditional trust in God as the Father of Jesus Christ, confidence in the Lord, forgiveness of sins, certainty of eternal life, purity and brotherly fellowship--Paul transformed it into the universal religion, and laid the ground for the great Church.<sup>84</sup>

But Paul also introduced foreign elements into the gospel which later on had harmful consequences for the history of Christianity, e.g., a theory of redemption through the work of Christ, speculative ideas about the person of Christ, retention of the Old Testament in the Christian Church.<sup>85</sup>

However, the assumption that Paul really understood the gospel of Jesus was seriously

---

<sup>83</sup>Harnack, What is Christianity? E.T. by Thomas Bailey Saunders, New York, 1904, p. 179.

<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 183.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., pp. 188-191.

threatened in the measure that it was recognized that Christology--far from being a subordinate aspect of Paul's theology--was really the key to his theology as well as his religion. The dilemma in which liberal theology increasingly found itself becomes particularly apparent in Paul Wernle's study of the history of the early church, Die Anfänge unserer Religion.<sup>86</sup> His starting point, as expressed already in the preface to the first edition, is akin to that of Wendt: "Theological ideas come under consideration only in their relation to the gospel of Jesus." He does not presume to present a comprehensive and detailed treatment of New Testament theology. "But it is well known that the Gospel does not lie everywhere on the surface, even of the New Testament, in its primitive simplicity, but has in many instances been covered up or transformed." And it is his practical goal to assist in the liberation of the gospel of Jesus from the theology which had already begun to obscure the gospel in the primitive church.<sup>87</sup> This

l.c./

---

<sup>86</sup> P. Wernle, First edition, 1901, Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, Tübingen and Leipzig, 1904 (E.T., Beginnings of Christianity by G. A. Bienemann, New York, 1903).

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., pp. IX-X.

viewpoint, which may be expressed simply as "Return to Jesus and through him to the Father God," is carried over into the second edition, where, however, it is combined more consistently with the results of "religionsgeschichtliche" research.

Through the entire chapter devoted to Paul there is a continual comparison of Jesus and Paul and evaluation of the significance of Paul as over against Jesus. The discussion of Pauline theology occupies the greater part of the chapter. Paul's theology is seen as a mixture of Jewish and Greek influences, combined in an original way and with new insights on the basis of his conversion experience and a strong apologetic interest. "St. Paul's line of thought may best be termed Christian missionary theology from an eschatological point of view," and therefore the first great system of Christian apologetics.<sup>88</sup> Wernle never ceases to emphasize the originality of Paul's theology over against the religion of Jesus, yet at the same time he still clings to the view that Paul's theology preserved valid elements of Jesus' gospel. The result is a somewhat paradoxical and contradictory picture of the relationship between Jesus and

---

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 226.

Paul, no doubt heightened by the author's pre-disposition toward contrast and paradox, but also reflecting the dilemma of historical theology.

"Paul never knew Jesus during His lifetime, and nevertheless it was he who best understood Him."<sup>89</sup> Paul was responsible for transforming the gospel of Jesus into the religion of redemption. Jesus was for him above all the redeemer, but "Paul thereby saved Christianity from the fate of stagnation as a school of ethics in the universal Greek rationalism."<sup>90</sup>

There exists a huge gap between the Christology of Paul on the one hand, and the self-testimony of Jesus and the Christ-faith of the disciples on the other. "By means of his vision St. Paul became the creator of the new christology, which drew its inspiration, not from history, but from something above it--from a mystical being, and which won over the heathen for this very reason."<sup>91</sup> Paul can never explain why we should believe in Jesus. "The cross, the resurrection, the son of God who descended from heaven--the

---

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 159.

<sup>90</sup>Ibid., p. 177.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 250.

are the three great innovations of the Pauline Christology."<sup>92</sup>

In Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, Wernle finds the closest point of contact with Jesus. "Who can fail to recognize that the entire theory of the effects of the Spirit, which, starting from miraculous forces, derives from one and the same source all knowledge, the life of prayer and moral action, is nothing but the description of the Christian ideal drawn by an enthusiastic apostle?"<sup>93</sup> Paul attributed to the Spirit that same experience of the fatherhood of God, freedom from the anxiety of sin, of the world and its cares, and of the fear of death, which the disciples had experienced in Jesus. Although Paul connected the Spirit of God with the historic Christ and with the gospel, "The Spirit is nothing but the influence of the personality of Jesus in history."<sup>94</sup>

Paul's whole theology appears to Wernle as "something entirely new and independent compared with all that has gone before. It is an original Christian creation."<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 252.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 263.

<sup>94</sup>Ibid., p. 289.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 338.

It is perfectly incredible within how short a time the Jesus of history had to undergo this radical transformation. In spite of this, however, it is just the Jesus of history that St. Paul grasped with a deep and clear insight, as the Redeemer who leads us away from the false Jewish idea to the Fatherhood of God and to the moral freedom, and who, besides setting the high ideal before us, inspires us at the same time with strength and courage for its realization. It is for this living and loving Jesus that the apostle's high Christology paves a way into the world.<sup>96</sup>

In the final section, Wernle deals with the piety of Paul and also attributes to Paul the creation of a new form of Christian piety. As opposed to the "practical piety" of Jesus, Paul's piety is characterized by mystical feeling. One important consequence of Paul's work for the history of religion consisted in the fact that he transferred real religious life into the sphere of feeling. This historical line leads from Paul to Augustine, Bernhard and Schleiermacher.<sup>97</sup> "Our task to-day is again to bring into the foreground Jesus' own personal religion, and to hold this up as a word of warning to our age."<sup>98</sup>

The historical significance of Paul consists, finally, in the fact that he introduced Christianity into world history by giving it its

---

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 339.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid., p. 355.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., p. 358.

first thought-system and a new form of piety. The whole future development of the Gospel was determined by the form he gave it. "The measure of his worth lies in the fact that he came to be the greatest minister of the gospel, and as such has often occupied its place. In more than one instance his work was of a transitory nature: but he himself, the man Paul, is one of the most inspiring and comforting characters in all history, one of those who are an unfailing source of courage and of joy to us a smaller breed of men."<sup>99</sup>

In Wernle's study of Paul the tension between the awareness of the vast difference between Jesus and Paul on the one hand, and the reluctance to admit an absolute discontinuity between them on the other hand, finds sharp expression. In view of Wernle's recognition of a vast distance between the theology of Paul and the Gospel of Jesus as well as of the great novelty of the Apostle's thought, the assertion that Paul understood Jesus best seems almost contradictory, or at least not substantiated by Wernle's treatment of Paul. The contrast is made to appear so great that Wernle's attempt to find valid Christian elements in Paul appears at

---

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., p. 359.

times forced and somewhat arbitrary, e.g., when he seeks to find a "Christian" meaning in Paul's concept of the Spirit.

#### D. THE CHALLENGE OF WREDE

Over against Wernle's vacillating and somewhat contradictory presentation of Paul, Wrede appears as wholly consistent in concluding that a choice between Jesus and Paul is necessary. Once the teaching of Jesus had become absolutized and any difference was assumed to be deviation, Wrede's evaluation of Paul was a completely logical conclusion. In this respect, Wrede represented the logical outcome of the presuppositions of liberal theology. If historical research had demonstrated, as both Wernle and Wrede apparently agreed, that Paul had transformed the ethical religion of Jesus into a religion of redemption, then Wrede's solution to the problem of Jesus and Paul was the only consistent one. In this respect Wrede's Paul was a challenge to the whole historical-critical school to face forthrightly and honestly the results of its historical research.

Wrede clearly showed that no superficial comparison of Jesus and Paul could provide an adequate solution to the problem of their relationship.

The early attempts to solve the problem merely by showing that Paul had some knowledge of the historical Jesus or by pointing to similarities between their ideas were seen to be inadequate.

Wrede pointed out that the mere fact that Paul had some knowledge of the historical Jesus was an irrelevant matter unless this knowledge could be shown to have exercised a real influence upon his thought and faith. There was no possibility of any real continuity between Paul and the historical Jesus unless the historical Jesus had played a determinative role in his theology, especially, his Christology. The effect of Wrede's work was to focus the discussions of Jesus and Paul more on basic issues than on peripheral matters. One of the more important of these issues was the relationship of Paul's Christ-faith and his Christology to the historical person of Jesus. Neither conservative nor liberal theology, at least where the person of Jesus remained important, could ignore Wrede's conclusion that Paul's Christ-faith was an element wholly foreign to Jesus.

The same critique of Wrede also applied to the teachings as well as the religion of Paul and Jesus. Any similarities between them were incidental,

unless a decisive agreement could be demonstrated in the basic issues of Paul's theology and faith. Similarities even in ethical teaching meant nothing unless there was an essential agreement in their understanding and application of ethical principle. Likewise similarity/ in religious feelings and <sup>ies/</sup> attitudes were irrelevant unless they issued from a common root and a common understanding of the relationship between God and man and the world.

At this point, Wrede's insistence on the essential interrelatedness of Paul's religion and theology represented a powerful challenge to the attempt of liberal theology to preserve the continuity between Jesus and Paul by isolating Paul's religion from his theology. Unfortunately, liberal theology in its subsequent discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul did not come to grips decisively with Wrede's question--perhaps because Wrede himself also otherwise shared the common assumption that it was possible to have religion without theological beliefs.

In any case, the clarity with which Wrede laid bare the basic issues and the logic and force of his argument immediately stirred theology, both liberal and conservative, into an agitated and sometimes heated discussion and re-examination of the problem of Jesus and Paul.

## CHAPTER II

### THE DISCUSSION OF WREDE'S THESIS

The reaction to Wrede's thesis resulted in a profusion of literature on the Jesus-Paul problem between 1905 and 1910, and sporadic discussions appeared from time to time after that. At least within the circles of Christian scholarship, Wrede found no support in his attempt to maintain an absolute antithesis between Jesus and Paul. However, in contrast to the period before Wrede, the new phase of the problem is characterized by a greater awareness of the problematic character of the historical relationship between Paul and Jesus as well as the difficulties involved. The intensification of the problem through Wrede's work also created a more-or-less clear-cut separation of scholars into two schools of thought: those who sought to refute Wrede and maintain an essential and more or less extensive continuity between the preaching of Jesus and the Gospel of Paul; and those who with Wrede acknowledged discontinuity in various areas, but nevertheless still sought to modify Wrede's verdict on Paul by showing that at

least an element of continuity with Jesus remained. The latter approach, which characterized liberal theology as a whole, will be treated first.

#### A. LIBERAL THEOLOGY

Basic to almost all of the liberal discussions was the emphasis upon the distinction between theology and religion which had already characterized the earlier discussions of the problem<sup>1</sup> and which had not been challenged in principle by Wrede. In general, liberal theologians aligned themselves with Wrede in various degrees, but felt that Wrede had unjustly minimized the importance of the religious element in Paul. It was maintained that the religious element in Paul could be distinguished from the strictly theological, that it was more or less greater than Wrede had assumed, and finally that it was to be traced to the direct or indirect influence of the historical Jesus. Thus with respect to the general approach to the problem, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Otto Pflleiderer also discussed it in his article, Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, 1885, E.T. by J. Fredericke Smith. Cf. "Christian theology it is true, dates from Paul, but the Christian religion from Jesus, both his Lord and ours." (Pflleiderer; *Ibid.*, p. 11)

liberal discussions did not represent any essential advance over the nineteenth century. Accordingly, a detailed treatment of this discussion will be unnecessary.

### 1. The Religious Agreement Between Paul and Jesus

A common attitude toward the question of the relationship between religion and theology in Paul was expressed rather clearly by A. Jülicher,<sup>2</sup> one of the first liberals to reply to Wrede. Jülicher admits that Paul may have endangered the portrait of Christ with his theology, but he did not thereby substitute his Christ for the historical Jesus; nor did he substitute his theology for the religion of Jesus, but built his theology around it as a protective bulwark. "Paulus hat also seine Theologie nicht an die Stelle der Religion Jesu gesetzt, sondern rings um sie her. Er hat nicht zugleich die Felsblöcke auftürmen und sich im Garten still ergehen können. Aber er hat über des Tages harter Arbeit den Geschmack am Abendfrieden nicht verloren."<sup>3</sup> Thus Paul's theology,

---

<sup>2</sup>A. Jülicher, Paulus und Jesus, Religionsgeschichtlicher Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart, I. Reihe, 14 Heft, Tübingen, 1907.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

while historically conditioned, is seen to be a legitimate and necessary attempt to provide intellectual form for religious life and experience-- for without such intellectual form the religion of Jesus could not have survived nor been preserved for posterity. Whereas Wrede had interpreted Paul's religious feelings as a kind of reflex of his theological ideas, liberal theology in general insisted on the primacy of the religious spirit as the creative source and motivation for Paul's theological endeavors.

The extent of the agreement between Paul and Jesus was interpreted variously. For A. Meyer<sup>4</sup> the agreement is minimal. Like Wrede he emphasized the sharp differences between Paul and Jesus, but concludes that it was finally the power of Jesus' love, touching and transforming Paul personally, which kept Paul's religion from becoming completely different from that of Jesus. Jesus' faith in the love of God, says Meyer, and in the victory of love in the world, His faith that love is the greatest thing in

---

<sup>4</sup>A. Meyer, Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus? Tübingen, 1907, E.T. by J. R. Wilkinson, Jesus or Paul, 1909.

the universe--this it was which arrested Paul, and became for him a new revelation. It is this love which still shines through Paul's teaching and makes him essentially one with Jesus.<sup>5</sup> One might say that for Meyer it is principally the ethical motivation and energy of Paul which unites him with Jesus. W. Morgan supports Meyer's view of this problem. "Paul did not pervert Jesus' gospel, although he brought into the foreground elements that were foreign to it." But this was necessitated by apologetic considerations: "therefore the cry should be, not away from Paul back to Christ; but rather, through Paul back to Christ and to God."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 83-92, 93-104. Meyer understood that there were certain crucial differences between Jesus and Paul respecting the law and the gentile mission. Meyer argued that Paul's system was essentially Gnostic 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. But on the central point of Paul's gospel--the proclamation that Christ died for our sins--Meyer finds decisive agreement.

<sup>6</sup>W. Morgan, "The Jesus-Paul Controversy," Ext, XX (1908/09), 9-12, 55-58. Morgan concludes in his article: "Paul did not put his theology in the place of the religion of Jesus, but only as a hedge round about it," p. 58.

Kölbing<sup>7</sup> speaks to the same effect. Paul's faith is really faith in the love and grace of God that have met him in Christ's death, and we are justified in saying that it has all the religious characters of Jesus' own faith.

P. Kölbing,<sup>8</sup> K. Weidel,<sup>9</sup> and W. Bousset<sup>10</sup> all emphasize the common eschatological viewpoint of Jesus and Paul. Here they differ from Wrede in insisting that eschatological concepts determined Jesus' religion and piety. They find that the common eschatological concepts of Jesus and Paul give expression to similar religious feelings and ideas--the sense of the immediate presence of God, "Heilsgewissheit," religious inwardness, ethical consciousness and motivation, religious trust, joy and hope, etc.

J. Weiss<sup>11</sup> is inclined to emphasize essential

---

<sup>7</sup>P. Kölbing, Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus, Göttingen, 1906.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

<sup>9</sup>K. Weidel, "Jesus und Paulus," Zeitschrift für den evang. Religionsunterricht, XIX (1907/08), 73-88.

<sup>10</sup>W. Bousset, "Noch einmal Jesus und Paulus," Ibid., pp. 234-247.

<sup>11</sup>J. Weiss, Paulus und Jesus, Berlin, 1909, E.T. by H. J. Chaytor, Paul and Jesus, London, 1909.

differences between the piety of Paul and Jesus, but finds in Paul echoes of Jesus' "Gottgewissheit," faith as pure receptivity, ethical ideas.

2. The Problem of Paul's Christ-Faith and the Religion of Jesus

A crucial point in the discussions was the question of Paul's so-called Christ-faith. Does Paul's Christ-faith represent a foreign element with respect to the religion of Jesus? Here one finds a diversity of opinion. W. Bousset argues against Wrede<sup>12</sup> that Paul was not an innovator at this point, but only continued a tendency that was already to be found in the primitive church and which goes back finally to the self-consciousness of Jesus himself. Even though Paul's Christ had nothing to do directly with the historical Jesus, his Christ-faith nevertheless embodies the healthy "Kern" of the inseparability of the Christian faith from the historical Jesus.<sup>13</sup> Bousset finally sees in Jesus and Paul two different types of piety,

---

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Wrede argues that Paul's Christ had little or nothing to do with the historical Jesus and was not influenced by him.

<sup>13</sup>W. Bousset, "Noch einmal Jesus und Paulus," *op. cit.*, pp. 240-242.

not so different, however, that they constitute an either-or alternative. Paul was not the second creator of Christian piety, but his piety is r/ooted in the religious certainty of the presence of God which proceeded from Jesus and without which the reflective piety of Paul would be inconceivable.<sup>14</sup>

Along similar lines, K lbing argued that the attributing of Messiahship and Lordship to Jesus on the part of Paul and the early church was a legitimate and necessary step in view of the creative influence which the person of Jesus had and continues to have in the awakening of religious life.<sup>15</sup> However, K lbing finds an essential agreement between the Christ-faith of Paul and the religion of Jesus. K lbing will concede to Wrede that Paul's faith was connected with an " usserliche Tats chlichkeit"--the death and resurrection of Jesus--but argues that this does not change the fact that Paul's Christ-faith, like the God-faith of Jesus, was concerned with the redemptive love of God for sinners. Paul's faith as "Lebensgemeinschaft" with Christ is for

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 246-247.

<sup>15</sup>K lbing, op. cit., pp. 54-59.

him "Gemeinschaft des Glaubens und der Hoffnung mit Gott selbst."<sup>16</sup>

Weiss took a still different viewpoint. Over against those who would divorce the Pauline Christ from the historical Jesus, Weiss argued that Paul's earlier concept of the apocalyptic Messiah was basically corrected by the direct impact of the ethical personality of Jesus. Herein Weiss would see one of the deepest and most decisive influences of Jesus on Paul.<sup>17</sup> However, Weiss still finds a very essential difference between the Christ-faith of Paul and the religion of Jesus. This difference consists in the fact that for Paul, Jesus is not only a mediator, guide, and example, but also the object of religious veneration-- a difference which Weiss thinks is so great as to demand finally a choice between the religion of Jesus and the Christ-faith of Paul.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., pp. 103-104 (Cf. Gal.2:20).

<sup>17</sup>J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 113 f. (Cf. I Thess. 4:15; I Cor. 7:10, 9:14; Rom. 12:13; I Cor. 13; Col. 3).

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5, 130. The faith in Christ, for Weiss, as held by the primitive churches and by Paul was something new in comparison with the preaching of Jesus; it was a new type of religion. F. W. Beare also pointed out that this difference is expressed as a distinction between "the Gospel of Jesus," and "the Gospel about Jesus"; and it is affirmed that Paul did not preach the Gospel of Jesus, but the Gospel about Jesus. "Jesus and Paul," CJT, V (1959), 80 (pp. 79-86).

### 3. The Problem of the Mediation of the Influence of Jesus on Paul

As has already been indicated, all of the above-mentioned liberal theologians sought to trace the agreement between Jesus and Paul to an influence of the historical Jesus upon Paul. This naturally involved the more strictly historical question of how this influence was mediated. Two main viewpoints are distinguishable in the discussions. (1) K lbing and Weiss agree in attributing the agreement to the rather clear picture of the spiritual personality of Jesus which Paul acquired before his conversion experience and was determinative for it. But whereas K lbing had been content to suggest that this picture of Jesus was mediated to Paul through the preaching of the original disciples of Jesus, Weiss goes still further and argues at some length that Paul actually must have seen the historical Jesus.<sup>19</sup> He maintains that the conversion and Christ-vision of Paul would be psychologically inconceivable unless Paul had already gained a direct impression of the human personality of Jesus.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>K lbing, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

<sup>20</sup>Weiss, Paul and Jesus, pp. 17-24, 28-39.

(2) On the other hand, Meyer and Bousset, in view of their insistence of Paul's independence of the historical Jesus, find a more indirect mediation of the religious spirit of Jesus through the primitive church. This represented in some respects a new viewpoint for the liberal school in general. Wrede's isolation of Paul from the primitive church--a viewpoint which had dominated the historico-critical school since the time of F. C. Baur--was directly challenged by Jülicher. The latter argued that Paul must be understood within the context of the life of the primitive church<sup>21</sup> and as a direct development from it. Accordingly, he maintains against Wrede that Paul is not to be blamed for transforming the religion of Jesus into a religion of redemption, for this transformation had already begun at the first moment when Jesus' disciples had understood his death as a "Heil-

---

<sup>21</sup>Cf. Morgan also agrees with Jülicher, "Paul had much more in common with the primitive Christian community, and was much more indebted to it than Wrede allows." Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 55; Cf. A. Schlatter, Jesus und Paulus, Dritte Auflage, Stuttgart, 1961 (original lecture was delivered during Sommer-Semester 1906 at Tübingen), pp. 35-40.

statsache."<sup>22</sup>

Bousset, in particular, took up this suggestion of Jülicher<sup>23</sup> and further emphasized and developed it. By showing that Paul's theology as well as his piety were a direct development from tendencies already present in the primitive church, he sought to modify Wrede's exaggerated emphasis upon the novelty and originality of Pauline thought and piety. The life of the primitive church was thus the channel through which the religious spirit which emanated from the historical Jesus also touched the Apostle Paul.<sup>24</sup>

#### 4. The Inconclusive Character of the Discussion

It will be noted from the summary of the

---

<sup>22</sup>Jülicher, op. cit., pp. 68-69. Often Wrede talks as if the Apostle alone were responsible for transforming the simple religion of Jesus into a theology. Jülicher rightly points out that, before Paul's conversion, Christianity had already taken this direction, and that Peter, James, and the rest found no fault with his Christology, or with the meaning he attached to Christ's death, but only with his doctrine of the law.

<sup>23</sup>Jülicher attempts to show that the fully developed Pauline Christology was not necessarily regarded by the primitive congregation as a complete and alien innovation. Jülicher, Ibid., pp. 34 f.

<sup>24</sup>Bousset, op. cit. Cf. particularly pp. 235 f.

discussions thus far that the main direction of the arguments against Wrede lay for the most part in attempts to modify and correct Wrede at certain points in an effort to show that the measure of agreement between Jesus and Paul was greater or more essential than Wrede had assumed. It was likewise often assumed that the demonstration of a measure of agreement between the piety of Paul and Jesus was sufficient to dispose of Wrede's thesis. In this respect, the criticism of Weiss against his predecessors in the discussion merits special attention.

Weiss doubted whether the attempt merely to modify Wrede's position, no matter how pertinent it might be, could really paralyze the deep impact which Wrede's book had made on wide circles. Weiss felt that Wrede had been refuted only in various details, but that his basic position remained unshaken. The previous discussion, according to Weiss, had not taken seriously enough the basic difference between religion of Jesus and the faith of Paul. Even granting that Jesus had a form of "messianic consciousness" insofar as he not only regarded himself as called to lead men to salvation, but also considered himself a part of that

salvation--the question nevertheless remains whether the Christ-faith of Paul with its religious veneration of the person of Jesus is really a direct continuation of the "messianic consciousness" of Jesus.

Here there appears to my mind a discrepancy which no theological device can bridge. I observe in particular a change of front which implies a decisive divergence--The sacramental union with an exalted Master, the "life in Christ," are forms of a religious belief which regards Christ not as the prophetic revealer of God or the bringer of the salvation to man, but as the Godhead Himself. This view seems to me entirely novel, in comparison with the preaching and religion of Jesus Himself.<sup>25</sup>

The situation, according to Weiss, is not fundamentally changed by arguing that this transformation was not the work of Paul, but had occurred already in the primitive church. For one could say: "this new development, this fundamental change in the character of the Christian religion, had occurred before Paul's period, and that he was simply the thinker who developed the new religion with the greatest energy and clarity."<sup>26</sup> l/h

In view of this basic difference between the Christ-faith of Paul and the religion of Jesus,

---

<sup>25</sup>Weiss, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

Weiss sees in Jesus and in Paul the sources of two independent forms of religious life whose differences are so great that a choice between the two seems inevitable today. At this point Weiss stands in full agreement with Wrede, but from the viewpoint of an historian he will not admit that the antithesis between Jesus and Paul is an absolute one. Here he sides with the critics of Wrede in arguing for a historical continuity between Jesus and Paul, and even outdoes his predecessors, as has already been noted, in arguing for a direct impression of the historical Jesus upon Paul.<sup>27</sup> At the conclusion of his book he confidently proclaims that "the theory, however, that Paul's faith was not connected by any living tie with the historical figure of Jesus, and that the coincidence of the methods employed by Paul and Jesus for the solution in practice of the problem of life were merely fortuitous, is henceforward little likely to disturb theology."<sup>28</sup>

Weiss' treatment of the problem clearly

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 42-54. The exegesis of 2 Cor. 5:16 is 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."

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 131.

shows, above all, the inconclusive nature of the liberal discussions of the problem. After some years of debate, liberal theology is back practically to the point from which it started, i.e., the antithesis between Jesus and Paul. Weiss could accept many of the corrections and modifications which the critics of Wrede had suggested, but at the same time present a rather convincing case for Wrede's major thesis. He could insist upon a real influence of the historical Jesus upon Paul and a measure of agreement between them,<sup>29</sup> and yet find them so different in essentials that any possibility of a real reconciliation between the religion of Jesus and the Christ-faith of Paul was thereby excluded.

As long as the religion or the gospel of Jesus remained an absolute, the Christ-faith of Paul and the early church would appear to be an essential divergence from Jesus. Any attempt to justify the change on historical grounds would appear to be rather subjective. The argument that

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 118, 121. Cf. Weiss, Earliest Christianity, Vol. II, E.T. by F. C. Grant, 1958 (German ed., 1914), p. 455. Particularly before Paul was the "self-renouncing love" of Jesus, on which point "Paul 'understood' Jesus inwardly, deeply, and correctly."

the Christ-faith of Paul as well as of the early church was a necessary and valid conclusion from the importance of the person of Jesus for Christian piety could not be conclusive. For it could well be maintained that such an argument represented merely a value judgment reflecting a preference for that particular type of piety which made the person of Jesus central for faith rather than for the type of piety which Jesus himself represented.

Weiss' treatment of the historical relationship between Paul and Jesus was not particularly significant, and the solution which he so confidently offered was soon to be challenged in a radical fashion. Nevertheless, his contribution lay in the fact that he so clearly showed the inadequacy of any attempt merely to modify Wrede's one-sided treatment of Pauline piety without really coming to grips with essential differences between them. And Weiss likewise saw that if Wrede's basic thesis must stand, then the whole question of the historical continuity between Jesus and Paul was a matter only of relative importance--at best an interesting historical problem. If the essential difference between the religion of Jesus and the Christ-faith of Paul is to be conceived

antithetically, the question of whether the similarity between the piety of Paul and that of Jesus was to be explained by the influence of the historical Jesus or by their common Jewish heritage (Wrede) was finally somewhat irrelevant. The decision between the religion of Jesus and the Christ-faith of Paul was to be made on subjective religious grounds, and the problem of the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul could be safely left to the historians to decide.

The inconclusive results of the liberal discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul no doubt contributed to a declining interest in the problem. Inasmuch as liberal theology to a great extent shared Wrede's presuppositions, no really new or creative approach to the problem was forthcoming. After Weiss the discussion gradually tapers off to a more or less theologically disinterested treatment of historical problems.

#### B. CONSERVATIVE THEOLOGY

The influence of conservative theology on the continent was perhaps at its lowest ebb in this period and therefore did not figure prominently in the debate. Nevertheless, it reacted vigorously against Wrede. Conservative theology in both

Britain and America felt the repercussions of the debate and also contributed <sup>to</sup> the rapidly growing literature on the problem.

1. J. G. Machen's Defense of Paul

J. G. Machen<sup>30</sup> saw the importance of theological presuppositions in the whole discussion of the problem and also perceived that Wrede represented the logical outcome of the development of nineteenth century liberal theology. But for him the issue finally resolves itself into a choice between naturalism or supernaturalism.

Machen agreed with Wrede in two respects: in his interpretation of Paul primarily as a theologian, and in his acknowledgment of the inseparability of Paul's theology and religion. But over against Wrede, Machen seeks to maintain the full harmony of Paul's theology with the early church, as well as with the teachings of Jesus. Machen's view as to the agreement of Paul with

---

<sup>30</sup>J. Gresham Machen, "Jesus and Paul," Biblical and Theological Studies, by members of the faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, New York, 1912, pp. 547-578 and The Origin of Paul's Religion, Grand Rapids, photolithoprinted, 1965 (1st ed. 1925).

the early church is based not so much on a comparison of doctrines, but on the fact that there is no evidence that the original disciples of Jesus had disagreed essentially with any basic matters of Paul's theology.<sup>31</sup> But the agreement between Paul and Jesus is finally guaranteed by the supernatural character of Paul's conversion.

If Paul had detected any fundamental divergence between his own teaching and that of Jesus of Nazareth, then he could not have remained Jesus' disciple. Unless, indeed, the conversion was supernatural. But the conversion was not supernatural if it left Paul in disharmony with Jesus. For it purported to be wrought by Jesus himself. If supernatural, the conversion could not have left Paul in disharmony with the historical Jesus, because it was wrought by an appearance of Jesus; if not supernatural, it would have been insufficient to make Paul regard himself as a disciple of one with whom he did not agree.<sup>32</sup>

This assumption that Paul was a true disciple of Jesus is substantiated, according to Machen, by the picture of Jesus which the gospels present in their entirety.<sup>33</sup> At this point he

---

<sup>31</sup> Machen fully argued at length against F. C. Baur's view of this problem. The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 119-130.

<sup>32</sup> Machen, "Jesus and Paul," p. 565.

<sup>33</sup> Machen, Origin, pp. 153, 160-169. Machen holds as follows: (1) Jesus and Paul present the same view of the kingdom of God. (2) Paul is like Jesus in his doctrine of the fatherhood of God. (3) Paul is like Jesus in presenting a doctrine of grace. (4) The ethical teaching of Paul is strikingly similar to that of Jesus. Cf. F. F. Bruce, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974, pp. 56-62, 69-80.

rejects the attempt of historical criticism to recover the so-called historical Jesus and insists that the early church's (and Paul's) supernatural Christ-concept can only be accounted for by the fact that he actually was the supernatural person which the gospels present him to be.<sup>34</sup>

Accordingly, Machen maintains that the attempt to vindicate Paul as a disciple of Jesus merely by showing that he was influenced by the teaching and example of the historical Jesus is mistaken. "The centre and core of Paulinism is not imitation of the earthly Jesus, but communion with the risen Christ."<sup>35</sup> And this communion is to be understood as a personal and religious relationship established by the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>36</sup> Here Machen will admit one point at

---

<sup>34</sup>Machen, Origin, pp. 566-571, 117 ff. Machen says that Paul identified that Christ fully with the Jesus who had lived but a few years before. He emphasizes that there is in the Pauline epistles not a trace of any distinction between 'Jesus' and 'Christ,' as though the former were the name of the historic personage who lived in Galilee and the latter the name of the risen Lord. Cf. F. F. Bruce, "Paul and Historical Jesus," BJRL, 56 (1974), 317; C. Duquoc, Christologie. Essai dogmatique. II, new ed., Paris, 1974 (1st ed., 1972).

<sup>35</sup>Machen, "Jesus and Paul," p. 573; idem, Origin, p. 166.

<sup>36</sup>H. A. A. Kennedy also agrees with Machen's opinion. The Theology of the Epistles, 1919/48, pp. 99-100.

which Paul goes beyond what Jesus only intimated: namely, the fundamental Christian doctrine of the cross. But this only shows, according to Machen, that Jesus did not found Christianity by what he taught, but by what he did. "The church revered him as its founder only because his death was interpreted as an event of cosmic significance. But it had such significance only if Jesus was a divine being, come to earth for the salvation of men."<sup>37</sup> The recognition of the supernatural person of Christ is the key to the understanding of Paulinism as well as to the solution of the problem of Jesus and Paul.<sup>38</sup>

For Machen the unity of the thought of Jesus and Paul is essentially a presupposition, grounded in the recognition of the supernatural person of Christ and guaranteed by the supernatural conversion of Paul. Any possibility of real divergence of Paul from Jesus is thereby excluded. Consequently, Machen does not really come to grips with the problem of the historical differences between Paul and Jesus. In fact, for Machen the problem in the

---

<sup>37</sup>Machen, "Jesus and Paul," p. 577.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 277-278.

final analysis is theological rather than historical i.e., the problem of supernaturalism versus naturalism.<sup>39</sup>

The whole problem of the relationship of revelation and history thereby comes into the picture. Machen's one-sided emphasis upon the supernatural tends to cancel out the historical element in revelation, so that the historical problem of Jesus and Paul becomes as irrelevant as it did for Weiss. In spite of the fact that Machen insists on the historical reliability of the gospels, the earthly life of Jesus remains little more than a presupposition for faith. And here only the death of Christ is important as the ground of the Christian's communion with the risen Lord. And the question might be raised finally whether it would not be legitimate to speak of Paul as the second founder of Christianity, since it was he who first decisively developed the fundamental Christian doctrine of the cross. In any case, orthodox theology exerted little influence upon the mainstream of the discussion of the problem because of its strong apologetic character and its

---

<sup>39</sup>Machen, "History and Faith," PTR, xiii (1915), 337-351 (especially see p. 341 ff.).

sweeping rejection of historical methods.

## 2. The Historical Difference Between Jesus and Paul

On the other hand, there were elements in conservative theology which also challenged Wrede's basic thesis, yet were unwilling to take refuge in a supernaturalism. The only alternative which remained was to come to grips with the problem on historical grounds.

This group represented a minority, but constitute part of a growing protest against the interpretation of Paul primarily as a theological and speculative thinker, an approach which to a large extent had still dominated the liberal school in spite of its attempt to recover a religious element in Paul. It was at the same time a protest against the rather sharp separation of religion from theology in Paul which had characterized the liberal discussions. Paul is no longer understood primarily as a theoretician who sought to give intellectual form to his religious experience. His concern with redemption is not concern with a theory, but rather with a reality in which he lives and moves. His language is theological, but gives expression to religious realities and seeks to

convey religious truths to meet the practical needs of his readers. Paul is now understood primarily as a man of faith, as an apostle, and above all as a preacher of the gospel.

Inasmuch as this approach continued to be historical, a serious attempt was made to come to grips with the real historical differences between Jesus and Paul while at the same time endeavoring to show how Paul's gospel formed a necessary continuation and development of the proclamation of Jesus. Accordingly, this approach is a continuation of the work begun by such scholars as Paret and Feine. Feine continued to contribute to the later discussions with at least one article and in a larger context with his book on the Apostle Paul.<sup>40</sup> These works on the whole represent only an elaboration of the basic approach set forth in his original study of the problem and need not be treated here.

J. Kaftan also belongs to this group, but his treatment of the problem was devoted so much to polemic against Wrede and Bousset that its

---

<sup>40</sup>"Jesus und Paulus," NKZ, xxxvi (1925), 291-323; Der Apostel Paulus. Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus, 1927.

positive contribution was negligible.<sup>41</sup>

One of the best contributions to this line of approach was made by the Cambridge scholar, C. A. A. Scott.<sup>42</sup> Characterized by careful scholarship and an extensive knowledge of the German literature on the problem, Scott's work is exemplary for the conservative approach.

As to the question of the gospels as historical sources, Scott does not share the scepticism of much continental research, notably Wrede. He accepts Mark and Q as reliable sources for what Jesus said and did, and protests against excision from the Synoptic gospels of any material which appears to be "Pauline" as a begging of the question, based on the presumption that there could be no correspondence between the theology of Jesus and that of Paul.<sup>43</sup>

In discussing the problem of Paul's apparent indifference to the life of Jesus, Scott

---

41 J. Kaftan, Jesus und Paulus, eine freundschaftliche Streitschrift gegen die Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbücher von D. Bousset und D. Wrede, Tübingen, 1906.

42 "Jesus and Paul," in Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day, by members of the University of Cambridge, edited by H. B. Swete, London, 1909, pp. 329-377.

43 Ibid., pp. 333-334.

maintains that a "careful examination of the Epistles creates the impression that it was not knowledge that was lacking so much as interest in the subject. The reason of this is not far to seek. The details of the earthly life were for Paul transcended in importance and in luminousness by the realities and activities of the risen life of Christ."<sup>44</sup> But the references to the life of Christ found in the epistles show that the Christ Paul claims to know is the Jesus of the Gospels. Scott also concludes that Paul's knowledge of Jesus was gained not through revelation, but through oral and written records of what the Lord said and did.<sup>45</sup>

Scott readily acknowledges differences between Paul and Jesus as to the matters of the law and christology and related questions. The question

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 335.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., pp. 335-340. Scott gives the following reasons: it is the natural meaning of the Apostle's language; it was not the revelation of an unknown truth, but the bringing to Paul's knowledge of utterances of Jesus spoken on a very important occasion, and in the presence of the Apostles, several of whom were personally known to Paul. Paul might quite well have learnt it from any well instructed Christian whom he met--there is nothing in any of these passages (2 Cor.12; Gal.1:2) or their context to suggest that Paul was appealing to direct revelation. Paul received his information as to the life and teaching of Jesus by natural channels of communication.

for Scott is how these divergences are to be accounted for; "Does the divergence in all cases or in any amount to contradiction, or imply breach of continuity, or on the other hand is it capable of explanation as interpretation or development?"<sup>46</sup> With regard to the law and sin, the differences, according to Scott, are to be accounted for by differences of religious experience. Because, Paul, unlike Jesus, knew the tyranny of sin and therefore the law as burden, he had to deal with the whole series of questions which were foreign to Jesus. Yet in spite of all external differences, there is no contradiction between Jesus and Paul; they are one in their basic attitude to the power of sin and in their evaluation and criticism of the law.<sup>47</sup>

With regard to the person and work of Christ the additional features of Paul's teaching can be accounted for and justified by the facts of the death and resurrection, which in themselves demanded further explanation, and the experience of Paul along with the ancillary and confirmatory experience of the primitive community. If one takes into consideration not only Jesus' veiled assumption of the Messiahship, but also the significance which he

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 342-343.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 343-350.

attached to his presence in the world and his claim to condition men's relationship to God, Paul on the basis of his own experience as confirmed by that of the early church was justified in attributing "to Jesus an absolute significance among men and to his death a special significance in connection with sin and salvation." Paul is thereby in harmony with the total picture which the Synoptic Gospels present and not out of harmony with the mind of Jesus himself.<sup>48</sup>

Scott readily admits that Paul went much further than this in elaborating and explaining the person and work of Christ, but seeks to show that he did not thereby exceed a legitimate interpretation of the facts in the light of his own experience. Paul's thinking was conditioned by the knowledge of Jesus gained from his followers, the religious traditions of the Old Testament and later Judaism, his Rabbinic education, as well as the practical problems which arose from time to time in his churches. But primary to all this was his religious experience, originating in his conversion and centering in union with the risen and exalted Christ on the one hand, and in the saving power of vicarious

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., pp. 350-352.

suffering love on the other. It was these two foci of his religious experience which motivated and conditioned his theological thinking.<sup>49</sup>

It follows that in regard to his specific doctrines of sin, atonement and justification, his positions are not necessarily alien to the Christianity of Christ on the ground that they go beyond anything that Jesus taught. They are explanations of the twofold experience of life in Christ and life through Christ in view of the other data of his religious consciousness: their validity must be tested by examining the grounds of these data, by weighing his reasoning, and by observing their practical consequences.<sup>50</sup>

With regard to the Christ-faith of Paul, Scott again concedes a considerable expanding of Jesus' understanding of faith. This was due in part to the fact that the content of the gospel had been vastly expanded by the death and resurrection of Christ and the implications thereof. He also rejects the argument that the step by which Christ was made the object of faith has no warrant in the gospels. Even if Jesus (according to the Synoptic Gospels) did not require faith in Himself, the fact remains that he took pains to create faith, recognized it when it was present, and appeared in more than one instance to connect it with forgiveness of sins. The attitude to Jesus which the

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 352-356.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 356.

disciples recovered after the resurrection was an attitude of faith in Him. Paul fully shared this attitude, although he found new forms of expression corresponding to his deeper analysis of the facts. Over against Wrede, Scott argues furthermore that Paul's faith was not faith in a dogma and that Christ for him did not displace God as the object of faith. Rather it was through faith in Christ as a personal, religious relationship that Paul found himself exercising in the highest and fullest sense faith in God.<sup>51</sup>

In summary, Scott maintains that in all the main points at issue the differences between Paul and Jesus are quantitative rather than qualitative.

Where the thought of Paul does go beyond that of Jesus, in interpretation or in application, it has its root and ground in Him and His revelation. Where there is development there is no real contradiction, for the development is consistent with the conditions established by Jesus, and in view of the experience of Paul both legitimate and inevitable.<sup>52</sup>

This "probable result" of a consideration of the differences between Jesus and Paul finds its confirmation for Scott in a careful examination of the agreements between them. Here he is not so much

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., pp. 356-359.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 359.

concerned with verbal correspondences which in some cases might be accidental or part of a common stock of religious or ethical phraseology, but rather with the "deeper correspondences both of mental attitude and of religious conception."<sup>53</sup>

In a thorough examination of relevant materials, Scott finds that in spite of differences Jesus and Paul are one in their understanding of God as Father and in their manner of conceiving and expressing man's highest good in terms of "life." What Jesus in this respect expressed under the concept of the Kingdom of God, Paul expresses primarily with his conception of Christ, or being in Christ. Christ is Paul's synonym for the highest good, which like the Kingdom of God for Jesus, is both present possession and future hope, the free gift of God as well as the reward of obedience.<sup>54</sup> Scott finds a similar harmony between Jesus and Paul in their teachings on eschatology and in their combination of eschatology and ethics. In their whole ethical outlook both are in agreement. Inasmuch as Paul saw in the life and death of Jesus the supreme manifestation of the mighty love of

---

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., pp. 359-365.

God for sinners, and in the ideal life of a Christian the human response thereto manifested in love to God and love to men, he seized what was essential and creative in the revelation of Jesus.<sup>55</sup>

Scott concludes that a careful examination of the agreements between Jesus and Paul confirms the impression that Paul in a very remarkable way reproduces the mind of Christ. "The nearer Paul comes to the center of things, the more nearly he approximates to Jesus. And, on the other hand, the more practical he is in the application of religion to life, the more plainly does he reproduce the ideas and principles of his master."<sup>56</sup>

Scott asks, How is this to be explained in view of the fact that Paul never saw Jesus. The analysis of human experience can never fully answer this question. "We have to recognize the influence of a force from without, the work of the Divine Spirit, God active in the affairs and thoughts of man. And that after all is the indefeasible basis of religion."<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p. 371.

✓ <sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 376.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 377.

One notes that Scott's approach to the problem, in contrast to Machen, is an attempt to take seriously the real historical differences between Jesus and Paul and to account for them in terms of human individuality and historical development. On the basis of Machen's supernaturalism the historical problem is not taken seriously, and the human and historical character of God's revelation is neglected. Inasmuch as Wrede's repudiation of Paul was made on historical grounds, he can only be refuted on the same basis, i.e., by demonstrating that his interpretation of the historical data was mistaken. No mere appeal to revelation or the divine inspiration of the Bible can adequately answer Wrede without such a demonstration by historical means. In the final analysis, there is no real alternative to such a historical demonstration, but to ignore Wrede's thesis as irrelevant to the truth of the Christian gospel, which means that the latter is wholly independent of contingent historical phenomena.

On the other hand, Scott's approach represents an attempt to do justice to the character of revelation as an historical process or development. In contrast to much liberal theology, he does not

limit "revelation" in a static fashion to the religious consciousness or personality of Jesus, thus making the validity of Pauline piety depend upon the extent to which it reproduces the same, and excluding the possibility of any genuine historical development. Rather, Scott not only sees revelation in the total life and work of Jesus, but also insists that the full meaning and implication of this revelation could only come to light through the subsequent reflection and experience of the church, i.e., through the further activity of the Holy Spirit.

In line with this approach, Scott also sees that historical differences and divergences within a given historical movement do not necessarily indicate discontinuity. On the contrary, they might only point to the vitality of the movement itself. But all such differences must be carefully evaluated within the context of a living historical movement to determine whether they fall within the possibilities of development inherent in the movement or whether they actually represent contradictions. Only when the latter can be clearly shown is there justification for seeking foreign influences. This rather obvious principle

of historical research was too often neglected in the discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul. Under the influence of the religionsgeschichtliche methods, scholars too easily assumed that every divergence indicated a foreign influence, or that every resemblance between the ideas of Paul and those of contemporary religions implied a direct borrowing from the latter source. As a result the task of really coming to grips with the thought of Paul in its living context was neglected. Consequently Scott's approach, regardless of the question of the validity of his conclusions, was methodologically sounder.

However, with Scott as with Machen, the historical Jesus remains largely the presupposition or ground for communion with the risen Christ, who then becomes central. The question is thereby raised whether the place of the historical Jesus in Paul's thinking has been adequately treated, and whether full justice has been done to the historical element in Jesus' own thinking about revelation. Furthermore, if the importance of the historical character of revelation is to be admitted, the question also arises as to whether the problem of Jesus and Paul does not also need

to be treated in the wider context of the whole history of revelation.

C. THE RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE  
INTERPRETATION

After a brief lull in the discussion of the problem, the question was taken up anew under the aegis of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule. But the thesis of Wrede was no longer the primary issue. It was rather a question of certain historical problems which Wrede's study of Paul had raised. The discussion centered in the problem of the origin of Pauline theology as this pertained to the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul.

1. The Question of the Origin of Pauline Theology Re-Opened

W. Heitmüller reopened the discussion by raising the question:

Wie ist bei der Annahme der Beeinflussung Pauli durch Jesus, bei der Annahme der Zusammengehörigkeit der beiden Erscheinungen, zumal im Hinblick auf die örtliche und zeitliche Nähe, durch die sie miteinander verbunden sind, die unleugbare ausserordentlich grosse Verschiedenheit nicht bloss der Theologie, sondern an manchen Punkten auch der Frömmigkeit Jesu zu Erklären?<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup>W. Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus," ZNW (1912), p. 320 (pp.320-337)

In answer to this question, he first reaffirmed the theory of Paul's independence of the historical Jesus. Paul is a gnostic, a mystic; "seine Religiosität ist in hohem Masse eine geschichtslose--"<sup>59</sup> Heitmüller does not deny that Paul came to know something of the gospel of Jesus before his conversion or that he was influenced to some extent by the Jesus-faith of the first disciples. But he feels that Jülicher's theory of a direct line of development from the primitive church to Paul requires modification, and suggests that "Das Christentum, an das Paulus anknüpft, von dem aus er zu verstehen ist, ist nicht eigentlich das der Urgemeinde im strengen Sinn, d.h. also das Christentum der Ältesten Jesugemeinde auf judischem Boden in Jerusalem und Judäa, zu der auch die unmittelbaren Jünger und Freunde Jesu gehörten: es ist vielmehr eine bereits weiter entwickelte Form--ein hellenistisches Christentum," which had come into existence more or less independently of primitive Jewish Christianity in such gentile centers as Damascus and Antioch.<sup>60</sup> According to Heitmüller Paul's

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 324.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 326.

worship of Christ as Lord, his Christ-mysticism and sacramental ideas are to be attributed to the influence of hellenistic ideas mediated through hellenistic Christianity.<sup>61</sup>

In contrast to the earlier discussions of the problem, Heitmüller confines himself to purely historical questions. Absent is any attempt to demonstrate the agreement between Jesus and Paul or to determine what might be the genuine Christian element in Paul. An indirect influence of Jesus upon Paul is apparently assumed, but in any case not questioned. By further demonstrating the historical origins of certain Pauline ideas, Heitmüller wants to clarify the question as to the specifically unique contribution of Paul to Christianity, and he concludes that this contribution does not lie in those things which Paul shared in common with hellenistic Christianity.<sup>62</sup>

Thus, with respect to the problem of the historical relationship between Paul and Jesus, Heitmüller's contribution is essentially negative, i.e., a further reduction of the possible influence of Jesus upon Paul. Inasmuch as the main aspects

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 332 ff.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 337.

of Paul's Christ-faith are attributed to hellenistic influence, Heitmüller provides additional historical support for Weiss' view that the Christ-faith of Paul represented a foreign influence with respect to the religion of Jesus.

H. Gunkel writes in the same vein. He points out that the origin of the Pauline and Johannine Christology is not explicable simply in terms of the tremendous impression of the person of Jesus, or in terms of Paul's vision on the way to Damascus, nor in terms of the Judeo-Hellenistic doctrine of the heavenly primeval image of humanity. (himmlischen Urbild der Menschheit).<sup>63</sup>

Gunkel accepts the postulate: that this figure of Christ must have been given to him or had at least been prepared previously.<sup>64</sup> As to where this conception of Christ originated, Gunkel finds no parallel within the Old Testament or within Judaism for such great religious ideas. The disciples applied the ideals of their heart to Jesus. These strange religious motives must have penetrated into the church of Jesus directly after his death. He

---

<sup>63</sup>H. Gunkel, Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments, Göttingen, 1903, p. 89.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 90.

attempts to explain Christianity as a syncretistic religion.

Christianity is a syncretistic religion. Powerful religious motives that came from abroad were contained in it and thrived mightily, both oriental and Hellenistic. For the characteristic feature--we might say, the providential feature--of Christianity is that it experienced its classical era in the hour of world history when it stepped out of the Orient into Hellenism. Therefore it has a share in both worlds. However strong the Hellenistic element in it became, the oriental, which was characteristic of it from the beginning, never wholly disappeared. These foreign religious motives must have flooded into the church of Jesus immediately after Jesus' death.<sup>65</sup>

In Gunkel, even more strongly than in Wrede, the religionsgeschichtliche explanation of Pauline Christology appears to rest entirely upon strange motives and elements. At Gunkel's instigation at the beginning of the twentieth century, the religionsgeschichtliche school attempted to explain the origin of Paul's transcendent Christology in terms of conceptions found in specific segments of the Judaism of Paul's day.<sup>66</sup> The course quickly changed, however, and scholars began an intense study of Greek religiosity at the beginning of

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 95. It is quoted from Kümmel's NT, p. 259.

<sup>66</sup>Schweitzer, Paul, p. 189; Kümmel, NT, pp. 257-258.

the Christian era, in the manner of Heitmüller.

Another two scholars of great reputation came to the fore: Wilhelm Bousset, who sought the origin of Pauline Christology within the Hellenistic mystery cults, and Richard Reitzenstein,<sup>67</sup> who would find the real origin of the Pauline and Johannine view of Christ within the religious gnosis of the Middle East, i.e., within the Hermetic writings, and within the literary products of Mandaeism and Manicheism.<sup>68</sup> Against the background of a lively description of Hellenistic syncretism Reitzenstein portrays Paul as a Hellenistic mystic and gnostic who had read Hellenistic literature, who shares with the Hellenistic mystics the ecstatic experience of the duality of his own personality, and who demonstrates by his vocabulary

---

<sup>67</sup>L. Salvatorelli, "From Locke to Reitzenstein," HTR, XXII (1929), 352-357.

<sup>68</sup>Schweitzer, Paul, p. 188; Machen, Origin, pp. 242-244, 246, 248ff; E. Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism, London, 1973, pp. 69-72, 79-83, 135-142; E. S. Drower, The Mandaeans of Iraq and Iran, Their Cults, Customs, Magic, Legends, and Folklore, Oxford, 1937; For a criticism of Reitzenstein from the Jewish Rabbinic point of view, see W. D. Davies, Raul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948, pp. 193-200; M. Black's objection to the religionsgeschichtliche interpretation of pre-Christian Gnostic conception of a Heavenly Man is also valuable. SJT, VII (1954), 177; C. H. Dodd also devoted an entire section of his work, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (1953), to examine and refute the Mandaean parallels offered by Reitzenstein.

that the gnosis is pre-Pauline. Here, then, the process of relating Paul to pagan Hellenism, begun by Bousset, is pursued consistently, without expressly raising the question of Paul's theological peculiarity.<sup>69</sup>

## 2. Paul the Hellenist: W. Bousset

The view of the origin of Paul's Christ-faith which Heitmüller briefly sketched in his article on Jesus and Paul was decisively developed and more thoroughly grounded by religionsgeschichtliche research in W. Bousset's influential book, Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentum bis Irenaeus (1913). The problem is here placed in the broader context of the historical origin and development of Christianity in the first two centuries. Bousset challenged the commonly accepted view that the New Testament was to be understood from

cap |

---

<sup>69</sup>R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, ihre Grundgedanken und Wirkungen, Leipzig und Berlin, 1910; idem, Poimandres, 1904 (reprinted 1966). For a detailed exposition of the teachings of Poimandres, see C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, 1935 (reprinted 1954), pp. 99-209; W. Foerster, Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts, E.T. and ed. by R. McL. Wilson, Oxford, 1972, pp. 326-336. Cf. Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 268-270; Machen, op. cit., pp. 262-280.

the context of a direct line of development from the Old Testament and Judaism. Rather, it was his thesis that the decisive transformation of Christianity through hellenistic influences had begun almost immediately after the death of Jesus when the new faith was transplanted to gentile soil. In tracing this development, Bousset seeks to show the extent to which Paul belongs in the milieu of hellenistic Christianity and thus to make a contribution to the problem of Jesus and Paul.<sup>70</sup> As far as the theology of Paul is concerned, Bousset's work represents an attempt to carry out in detail the program which Heitmüller had suggested for determining the specific contribution of Paul to Christianity.

According to Bousset, Paul's Christ-faith is to be understood as a development from the Kyrios-cult of hellenistic Christianity, and determined by his own particular temperament and experience as a pneumatic and mystic. Paul's understanding of Christ and redemption result from and give expression to his cultic-mystical piety. The real agreement between Paul's proclamation of Christ and the Hellenistic piety of the

---

<sup>70</sup>Bousset, Kyrios Christos, E.T. by J. E. Steely, 1970, p. 12.

Mysteries, according to Bousset, is not found in the idea of the deity who dies and comes to life again, but in the essence of the cult itself: the mystical union with the deity. Accordingly, Paul cannot be explained on the basis of the primitive Jewish-Christian faith in the eschatological Son of Man whose return in the glory of Messiah was believed to be immanent. Rather between Paul and this early Jewish-Palestinian Christianity there lies a hellenistic form of Christianity in which, under the influence of the pagan hero-cults, the title "Lord" first came to be applied to Jesus and the latter became an object of cultic veneration. In the communal worship of the church the Kyrios is experienced and worshipped as a present reality, with whom the believer is united as in the mystery religions, by sacramental participation in his body and blood.<sup>71</sup>

Bousset's starting point for the understanding of Paul's Christ-piety is his anthropology, and his concept of the Spirit. Paul conceived the Spirit as a supernatural force foreign to and opposed to the natural self of man, the flesh.

---

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., pp. 119-152.

To be grasped by the Spirit signifies the death of the natural self and the creation of the redeemed spiritual man. This was the experience of the Apostle Paul, the experience of the ecstatic or pneumatic who under the grip of a strange power ceases to be himself.<sup>72</sup> The distinctive contribution of Paul lies in this understanding of the Spirit. Whereas, the Spirit had formerly been associated only with the abnormal phenomena of cultic worship, e.g., speaking with tongues, Paul extended his concept of the Spirit as a redemptive principle to the whole Christian life.<sup>73</sup> Hence Bousset concedes that Wrede is essentially correct in his view that it was Paul who first transformed Christianity into a religion of redemption in the supernatural sense.<sup>74</sup> However, Paul's doctrine of the Spirit is traced to the influence of a pessimistic anthropology and the dualistic-supernaturalistic concepts of redemption current in the gnostic thought-world of the time.<sup>75</sup>

Furthermore, the distinctive character of Pauline Christology derives from the fact that he

---

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 174.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 182.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 176 ff.

identified the Spirit not with the historical Jesus nor with the Christ who appeared to him at his conversion, but with the Kyrios of the hellenistic cult-piety. Just as the Spirit was for Paul the basic principle of the Christian life, so the Lord who is present in the cult becomes a redemptive power who fills the whole Christian life.<sup>76</sup> Herein lies the root of Paul's Christ-mysticism. The whole Christian life becomes a living "in Christ," a fellowship with the exalted Lord. This is Paul's distinctive contribution to Christianity--the introduction into cult-piety of the element of personal faith, which in turn becomes the basis for the development of the God-mysticism of the Johannine literature. Although the Christ-mysticism of Paul is still intertwined with the cult-piety, "Paul decrees that the Spirit belongs to the necessary stock of possessions of each Christian life (Rom.8:9). Indeed, this Spirit is given to every individual Christian at the very outset along with faith and baptism (Gal.3:2,5, 1 Cor.12:13). In the popular view the Spirit stands most of all in connection with worship and cultus; according to Paul it is the great basic

---

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

reality of the Christian life."<sup>77</sup>

Nevertheless, Paul's Christ-mysticism, like his doctrine of the Spirit, is characterized by a crude supernaturalism. The Kyrios as Spirit stands in absolute opposition to the natural man, the "second Adam" to the first, so that the coming of the second man "in the likeness of sinful flesh" is a riddle which is solved only by his death as a liberation from the natural self. Accordingly, Paul comes to understand the whole Christian life under this viewpoint as a participation through baptism in the death and resurrection of Christ signifying for the believer the death of the natural self and the entrance into the new life in Christ.<sup>78</sup> This whole complex of ideas Bousset attributes to the influence of the mystery religions, particularly the hellenistic myths of the god who suffers, dies and rises again.<sup>79</sup>

This brief survey of Bousset's treatment of the Apostle Paul indicates the new change in the interpretation of Paul which occurred in the religionsgeschichtliche Schule. The center of Paulinism is no longer justification by faith, or eschatology, but Christ-mysticism. For Bousset

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., pp. 172-181.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., pp. 181 ff.

the Jewish eschatological element in Paul is practically non-existent, or at least unrecognized. Accordingly, the new emphasis is away from the strictly theological interpretation of Paul. Paul is the pneumatic and mystic rather than the theologian, and his theological thoughts are the expression of his Christ-piety and the experience of redemption underlying it. In this respect the religionsgeschichtliche interpretation of Paul appears to coincide more nearly with the religious interpretation of Paul in conservative theology, e.g, Feine and Scott.

Nevertheless, on the question of the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul, Bousset sides fully with Wrede although the argument has a new basis. According to Bousset, the center of Paul's piety and thought, the things which constituted his unique contribution to Christianity, are derived from the milieu of hellenistic religion rather than from the Judaism in which Christianity had its origin. Accordingly, the attempt to find an agreement between Jesus and Paul in their common Jewish eschatological Weltanschauung, which had characterized much of the earlier discussions of Wrede's thesis, would appear

to Bousset not only as a fundamental misunderstanding of Paulinism, but also as a misrepresentation of the historical development of Christianity. Wrede's thesis of the historical cleavage between Jesus and Paul is here even more radically affirmed and more thoroughly grounded in historical research. There is no historical bridge between Jesus and Paul, for between them stands not only Jewish Christianity, but also an essentially new form of hellenistic Christianity.

It is true that Bousset is more inclined than Wrede to find genuine religious and ethical elements in Paul, but this does not represent a difference in principle with respect to Wrede. Behind both stands the old rationalistic understanding of religion in terms of universal moral values which finally remain independent of their manifestation in contingent historical phenomena. For Bousset, such religious values come to light in both Jesus and Paul, but without any real historical connection between them. Neither the person nor the teaching of Jesus had any direct influence upon Paul's piety. Whatever development of religion may have occurred in Paul was not the result either of transcendent or immanent necessity in

the causal process of history, but results simply from the contingent interplay of human and environmental factors.

The concept of religion as well as the understanding of history which dominated much of the nineteenth century is thereby challenged. Whereas the later nineteenth century had rejected Baur's view of history as the product of the transcendent Spirit, it nevertheless adhered to the primacy of the immanent ethical Spirit of man as the formative factor in history--in some sense as an absolute. The history of religion is seen as the product of the ethical evolution of the human spirit. Accordingly, Paul's piety is interpreted under the viewpoint of the ethical-spiritual personality growing to freedom under the impulse of the ethical Spirit which proceeded from Jesus. The Spirit therefore also remains a more or less constant factor in the process of historical development. It is not changed essentially by the addition of new factors or the accumulation of contingent elements. This explains the insistence of liberal theology on the fact that Paul and Jesus remain essentially one in their religious Spirit in spite of the fact that Paul's religion was clothed with

transitory and contingent theological concepts.

With the development of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule, this understanding of religion and history is radically changed. The fact that Paul is interpreted as a pneumatic and mystic already indicates for Bousset an essential disparity between Jesus and Paul with regard to religious experience--a difference which becomes absolute when it is shown that the piety of Paul was the product of hellenistic influences. Paul's piety is here seen not as a manifestation or expression of the ethical Spirit of man, but the result of his peculiar psychological make<sup>up</sup> as conditioned by environmental factors. That is to say, for Bousset the human spirit is not an absolute which independently reacts to or acts upon the historical process, but the spirit itself is historically conditioned and therefore a contingent historical fact. Hence Paul's piety is to be explained purely by psychological analysis and religionsgeschichtliche analogies. -/

In this fashion the idealistic monism of the nineteenth century gives way to historical pluralism. For the nineteenth century, history was still something of a unified process in which

the evolution of the spirit gives meaning to the diversity of historical phenomena. With historical pluralism, history remains the realm of independent facts in which diversity is finally meaningless. The only question which remains is whether an intrinsic similarity can be discovered in independent facts or whether they are incompatible. Bousset discovered an element of similarity between Jesus and Paul, whereas Wrede did not.

Accordingly in the religionsgeschichtliche Schule we find a completely consistent application of the scientific historical approach to the Bible. No historical absolute is recognized. The Bible as well as the Christian religion itself is no more than one aspect of the whole history of religion and can be understood only in this context. As a document of history the New Testament presents a series of independent facts that are understood in the measure that their origin in the general history of religion can be determined. Hence no unity is discoverable in the Bible beyond man's universal interest in religion. In the Bible, we have to do not with theological truths or spiritual realities, but only with religious ideas and religious experiences conditioned by history. On

this basis it is clear that the problem of Jesus and Paul ceases to have any real significance or urgency.

Bousset's conclusion on the problem of Jesus and Paul did not evoke a widespread discussion of the problem. P. Wernle undertook to defend the liberal position in a polemic against Bousset's theory of the hellenistic origin of Paul's theology and in a critique of the religionsgeschichtlich method.<sup>80</sup> W. Heitmüller in turn replied to Wernle on the same issues.<sup>81</sup> On the whole, however, the interest centers on the historical rather than theological aspects of the problem, and no new insights come to light. In some respects, the broader historical issues which Bousset's work raised overshadowed the problem of Jesus and Paul as such. Historical research became involved in a debate over the more general problem of Jewish vs. hellenistic influence in the development of the

---

<sup>80</sup>P. Wernle, "Jesus und Paulus. Antithesen zu Boussets Kyrios Christos," ZTK, XXV (1915), 1-92.

<sup>81</sup>W. Heitmüller, "Jesus und Paulus. Freundschaftliche kritische Bemerkungen zu P. Wernles Artikel 'Jesus und Paulus'," ZTK, XXV (1915), 156-179.

early church, and the religionsgeschichtliche Schule carried on a further discussion and study of the hellenistic origins of Pauline theology.

D. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL EXPLANATION:  
A. SCHWEITZER

A. Schweitzer's Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung (1912)<sup>82</sup> and Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus (1930)<sup>83</sup> mark a turning point with respect to Paul's preaching. Schweitzer approved of Wrede's criticism of the liberal conception of Jesus and Paul. Schweitzer's own view of the gospels and of Paul differs, however, from that of Wrede. Schweitzer views Paul as the direct continuer of Jesus' work, in the sense that Paul, like Jesus, was entirely dominated by the eschatological dogma of the late Jewish apocalypse.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup>E.T. by W. Montgomery, Paul and His Interpreters, London, 1912.

<sup>83</sup>E.T. by W. Montgomery, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, London, 1931.

<sup>84</sup>Schweitzer takes up the positions of W. Wrede, R. Kabisch and M. Brückner and underlines the dependence of Paul on Jewish apocalyptic and eschatology. See Mysticism, p. 193; J. C. G. Greig pointed out that "the school of A. Schweitzer, M. Werner and F. Buri has taken with utmost seriousness the possibility that Jesus had a crude apocalyptic-eschatological approach to his own mission and intentions." "The Eschatological Ministry,"

In the case of Jesus, the Eschaton (and thereby the kingdom and the Messiah), still lay in the immediate future,<sup>85</sup> whereas Paul believed the era of the kingdom had begun with Jesus' death and resurrection. While the primitive church still waited for the early coming of the Messiah, Jesus, to bring the Messianic Kingdom Paul saw a new significance in the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>86</sup> Schweitzer expresses this in two famous metaphors. The first is, "While others believed that the finger of the world clock was touching on the beginning of the coming hour and

---

in The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G. H. C. Macgregor, ed. by H. Anderson and W. Barclay, Oxford, 1965, p. 106.

<sup>85</sup>Schweitzer depicted Jesus with fiercely burning eyes, straining ahead to the speedy in-breaking of the Kingdom of God. It would come on the return of the Twelve from their mission, and Schweitzer based this on Matt.10:23. Quest, p. 357. When that expectation failed to be realized, Jesus looked for the kingdom to come with His death. He must suffer for others in order that the kingdom might come. Quest, p. 387.

<sup>86</sup>Cf. Schweitzer puts it, "Paul says so little about Jesus because, since the death and resurrection of Christ, conditions were present which were so new that they made His teaching inapplicable, and made necessary a new basis for ethics and a deeper knowledge about His death and resurrection." Paul, p. 245 f.

were waiting for the stroke which should announce this, Paul told them that it had already passed beyond the point, and that they had failed to hear the striking of the hour, which in fact struck at the resurrection of Jesus."<sup>87</sup> The second is,

"Both (Jesus and Paul) 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."<sup>88</sup>

In Paul we therefore encounter a realized eschatology.<sup>89</sup> Schweitzer assumes that Paul begins with a different eschatological scheme than Jesus (e.g., the one occurring in the apocalypse of Baruch and the Fourth Book of Ezra). For Jesus the coming of the kingdom and the Messiah coincided with the end of the world (this is the reason why Jesus considered himself only to be the Messiah

---

<sup>87</sup>Mysticism, p. 99.

<sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 113

<sup>89</sup>C. H. Dodd brought forward the conception of "realized eschatology." Dodd clearly avoids Schweitzer's view that Jesus looked for a very early conclusion to history with the coming of the kingdom, and that the early church looked for it to come with the return of Jesus, the Messiah. See The Parables of the Kingdom, 1935; idem, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development, 1936; idem, Commentary on St. Mark, 1952; R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, E. T. by F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf, Grand Rapids, 1938 ("With Schweitzer Otto maintains that the kingdom of God

designatus) whereas Paul held that the revelation of the Messianic kingdom occurred before the entrance of the end of the world.<sup>90</sup> Paul's essentially basic concept is "being-in-Christ," a mystic relation, where, although living in the natural world, believers are in the supernatural world. There is an overlapping, so to speak, of the supernatural and natural in believers, who are bound in a corporeity with Christ and one another in the church. Entry is by baptism, and in the church the power of the resurrection comes to believers, or, as Schweitzer calls them, the elect, by the Spirit. Indeed they must suffer, as suffering expresses dying with Christ;<sup>91</sup> but the Spirit is the sign of resurrection being realised in them.<sup>92</sup> The power of the Spirit proves to believers that they are already removed out of the natural state of existence into the super-

---

is an eschatological idea; but he sees, as Schweitzer did not, that the kingdom is already present and active in the ministry of Jesus." Quoted from A.M. Hunter, Interpreting the New Testament, 1951, p. 57.)

<sup>90</sup>Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 90.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 141

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

natural.<sup>93</sup>

Schweitzer was completely hostile to a Hellenistic interpretation, but was his interpretation not also religionsgeschichtlich? "Paulinism and Hellenism have in common their religious terminology, but, in respect of ideas, nothing. The Apostle did not hellenise Christianity. His conceptions are equally distinct from those of Greek philosophy and from those of the Mystery-religions."<sup>94</sup> "His mystical doctrine of union with Christ and his sacramental doctrine are entirely built out of eschatological ideas."<sup>95</sup> Paul's entire proclamation of Jesus as the Christ is in Schweitzer's opinion simply what could be expected on the basis of Paul's specified Jewish eschatological conception of the Messiah (the Son of Man). It is simply the death of Christ and the faith in his resurrection which gives an unknown twist to the eschatological drama. But even in this respect Paul could join Jesus and the early Christian community, since Jesus viewed his own death as the necessary condition for the coming

---

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 167.

<sup>94</sup>Schweitzer, Paul, p. 238

<sup>95</sup>Mysticism, p. 334.

of the kingdom.

It is striking that Schweitzer does not give a clearly defined view of Paul's Christological conceptions. The supernatural character of the person of Jesus Christ in Paul's epistles ought to be explained in terms of the late Jewish conceptions of the Son of Man, and in this connection Schweitzer speaks of the pre-existence of the Messiah (I Cor.8:6).

According to Schweitzer, Paul is not interested in whether the value of Christ and the works of the Spirit can be brought into contact with Greek conceptions. Paul was occupied only with the significance of the death and resurrection of Christ for salvation. It is noteworthy how little Schweitzer felt the problem of Pauline and Johannine Christology which Gunkel called the main problem of the New Testament.<sup>96</sup> The reason is partly that Schweitzer does not consider the epistle to the Colossians genuine, in which the cosmic and creative significance of Christ finds its most extensive expression. Yet the great significance of Schweitzer is that he has turned

---

<sup>96</sup>Gunkel, Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments, Göttingen, 1903, p. 89.

us from spiritualising and psychological approaches to face seriously the whole eschatological setting of the Gospels and the New Testament generally. He has also turned us back from Hellenism to the Messianic significance of Jesus. E. Jüngel holds fast to Schweitzer's "interpretation that eschatological motives are decisive for the relation of Jesus and Paul. He has confronted theology with the task of thinking together history and eschatology."<sup>97</sup>

Even though Schweitzer's imaginative conception of the tenor of the preaching of Jesus and Paul was not followed in various important details, nevertheless, the general tendency of his work has had a tremendous influence in modern theology. This is true also of the Christological aspect of what has been called the problem of Jesus and Paul.

---

<sup>97</sup>E. Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus, Tübingen, p. 13.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE RECENT SITUATION OF THE DISCUSSION

The recent theological scene since the first world war has been characterized by a dwindling interest in the problem of Jesus and Paul. The steady flow of literature on the problem which had shown signs of abating shortly before the war now continues to decline. While references of a general character continue to appear in theological and historical studies, monographic treatments of the problem become sporadic. The purpose of this chapter of the thesis is to describe the recent situation with respect to the problem of Jesus and Paul and to indicate the general developments in theology and Biblical research which account for the dwindling interest in the problem.

The period after the first world war was characterized by the emergence of a host of new theological and historical problems which tended to overshadow the problem of Jesus and Paul. In particular, the theological revival commonly

associated with the name of K. Barth and the consequent decline of liberal theology considerably alter the situation with respect to the problem of Jesus and Paul. The situation of the pre-war era with its preoccupation with the historical Jesus and its apologia for the Apostle Paul is almost reversed. The "back to Jesus" movement of the nineteenth century now gives way to a new interest in and a growing appreciation of the Apostle Paul as an authentic preacher of the gospel. With the ascendancy of the Pauline gospel in theology, the discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul gradually loses its urgency. However, this change does not necessarily signify a solution of the historical problem. Rather, the problem still continues to hover in the background of the general theological and historical discussions.

#### A. THE CONTINUATION OF THE EARLIER TRENDS

Before taking up the new theological developments, it will be necessary to indicate the continuation of some of the earlier trends of the discussions.

A critique of Paul of an entirely different nature is to be found in the work of the Jewish scholar, Joseph Klausner.<sup>1</sup> While there is no vindictiveness against Paul in Klausner's work, he arrives at a similar conclusion to that of Wrede: namely, that over against Jesus the prophet, Paul as theologian and organizer was the true founder of Christianity. In contrast to the religionsgeschichtliche Schule, Klausner rejected the dogma of Paul's complete independence of Jesus and sought to explain Paul's theology from hellenistic Judaism rather than from the influence of the mystery religions. Nevertheless, insofar as he attempted to account for the differences between Jesus and Paul purely on the basis of personal, psychological, and cultural factors, Klausner is representative of the positivism and historical pluralism which came to expression in Bousset.<sup>2</sup>

Among Christian scholars, a positivistic approach is represented by ~~the~~ Leroy Waterman's 9

---

<sup>1</sup>From Jesus to Paul, E.T. from the Hebrew by William F. Stinespring, Boston, 1943.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., Cf. particularly Seventh Book, Chapter XII, "Jesus and Paul," pp. 580-590.

book, The Religion of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> The work is almost anachronistic insofar as it virtually repudiates a half-century of New Testament scholarship and preaches a return to the prophetic religion of the historical Jesus wholly in the spirit of the liberal theology of the nineteenth century. Like Wrede, Waterman excludes all eschatological elements from the gospels as the later intrusion of the church and appears to hold the Apostle Paul chiefly responsible for the "theological evils" of contemporary protestantism and organized Christianity.<sup>4</sup>

From the side of conservative theology, P. Feine continued to argue for the religious dependence of Paul upon Jesus.<sup>5</sup> Over against the religionsgeschichtliche Schule, Feine argued for Paul's dependence on Jewish rather than hellenistic thought. The possibility of the influence of hellenistic categories is not rejected, but it is maintained that these affect only the form, but

---

<sup>3</sup>L. Waterman, The Religion of Jesus, Christianity's Unclaimed Heritage of Prophetic Religion, New York, 1952.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., Chapters 8 and 10.

<sup>5</sup>"Jesus und Paulus," NKZ, XXXVI (1925) 291-323; idem, Der Apostel Paulus, 1927.

not the content of Paul's religion. A somewhat similar viewpoint is represented by American F. G. Bratton.<sup>6</sup>

With the development of the theological revival in the post-war era, the religionsgeschichtliche Schule lost much of its theological identity, the name now characterizing chiefly the methodology. Some of its results with respect to the problem of the relationship of Paul and Jesus are still maintained by present-day scholarship. For example, the hellenistic roots of Pauline theology are still seen to involve his complete independence from Jesus. On the other hand, to the extent that religionsgeschichtliche research itself corrected Bousset's misunderstanding of the eschatological character of Paul's theology, an agreement between Jesus and Paul in the area of eschatology is admitted, but is not necessarily explained as due to the dependence of Paul on Jesus.

However, the decisive change in New Testament scholarship is most clearly evident in the fact that a religionsgeschichtlicher scholar like Rudolf Bultmann can unreservedly accept the complete

---

<sup>6</sup>F. G. Bratton, "Continuity and Divergence in the Jesus-Paul Problem," JBL, XLVIII (1929), 149-161.

independence of Paul from Jesus and yet at the same time endorse the Pauline gospel. The subsequent discussion of the theological development of the post-war period will also endeavor to account for this new feature in the discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul.

## B. THE SHIFT FROM JESUS TO PAUL

### 1. The New Approach to the Bible

The shift of interest from the historical Jesus to the Apostle Paul is to be explained in part from the new theological climate of the period after world war I. The experiences of the war no doubt contributed to a growing sense of disillusionment with respect to the results of liberal theology, and a sense of the inadequacy of its gospel. The result was a theological reaction of far-reaching consequences in which the theology of the Reformers and the gospel of Paul again assume a prominent place. The liberal gospel of the innate goodness of man and the inevitability of moral progress was found wanting, and the Pauline doctrines of the radical nature of sin, of eschatological redemption, and of justification

by faith now appear far more congenial than heretofore. The category of transcendence which had practically been excluded from the immanent theology of the nineteenth century now occupies an important place in theology. In particular, rediscovery of the transcendence of revelation resulted in a shift from the former preoccupation with the philosophy and history of religion to theology and biblical theology.

Accordingly, the nineteenth century approach to the Bible is revolutionized. The focus of interest in the Bible is no longer the history of religion or concept of religion, but immediate encounter with God in his self revelation. Under the influence of Kierkegaardian existentialism, faith is understood as having to do not primarily with religious ideas or historical facts, but with existential decision and obedience in the moment of encounter with divine revelation. Therefore, the Bible is understood in terms of faith-witness to such encounter. What is important is no longer the historical Jesus as he might be reconstructed by historical criticism, but the witness or kerygma in which he is proclaimed as the redeemer and revealer of God. Thus Paul as the clearest and

foremost representative of the early Christian Kerygma comes to overshadow Jesus.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. Form Criticism and Historical Scepticism

In this respect, the shift from Jesus to Paul is to be understood as a reaction against the historicism of the nineteenth century, conditioned by a growing historical scepticism with respect to Jesus. The roots lie in the failure of nineteenth century liberal theology to come to terms adequately with the problem of the historical Jesus. Having committed the solution of its theological problems so wholeheartedly to historical research, liberal theology found its "assured results" repeatedly shaken and undermined by the very instrument which appeared to promise its redemption. Under the growing discovery and awareness of the archaic thought-world of Jesus, the picture of the historical Jesus dwindles to that of a Jewish rabbi or prophet whose ethical originality also disappears

---

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Van A. Harvey, The Historian and the Believer, New York, 1966, especially Chapter I, pp. 3-37; J. M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. by J. P. Hyatt, 1965, pp. 114 ff. and Kerygma und historischer Jesus (2nd ed. 1967), pp. 87 ff; G. Ebeling, Theology and Proclamation, E.T. by John Riches, London and Philadelphia, 1966, pp. 36 ff. and 113 ff. (German ed. Tübingen, 1962).

with the further discovery of religionsgeschichtliche analogies. In the new theological climate of the post-war period, this Jesus is found wanting from a religious and theological viewpoint. The theological crisis of the post-war period is to be attributed in large measure to this conflict between theology and historical research. And the mark of the new situation is a thorough-going scepticism with regard to the whole problem of the historical Jesus.

Shortly after the war, the historical study of the gospels was reactivated by the development and application of formgeschichtliche methods to the gospels. With the discovery that the gospels present Gemeindeüberlieferung, the gospels are no longer treated as more or less independent literary creation<sup>8</sup>, but as sociological phenomena which reject the life and faith of the church in a missionary situation. The Markan outline again comes under attack now as the work of a redactor fashioning a framework for independent units of the tradition.<sup>8</sup> Hence the gospels are inadequate as historical sources for the reconstruction of

---

<sup>8</sup>K. L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, Berlin, 1919.

a life of Jesus. Under the leadership of such form critics as Martin Dibelius,<sup>9</sup> Rudolf Bultmann,<sup>10</sup> and K. L. Schmidt,<sup>11</sup> the task of form critical study of the gospels is conceived not as that of reconstructing the life of the historical Jesus, but through form-analysis of the Gemeindeüberlieferung and the study of its Sitz im Leben to trace the historical process by which the tradition took shape out of the practical religious needs and problems of the church.

Both Dibelius and Bultmann are agreed that the decisive impulse to the development of the tradition did not come from the historical Jesus himself--from an interest in his person or piety as such--but from the Kerygma and the Christ-faith of the church. According to Dibelius the earliest stage of the process is one in which the teachings and simple narratives of Jesus are used to elucidate

---

<sup>9</sup>M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen, 1919, Zweite Auflage, 1933; E.T. from the second edition by B. L. Woolf, From Tradition to Gospel, London, 1934.

<sup>10</sup>R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition, Göttingen, 1921; Zweite Auflage, 1931, E.T. by John Marsh, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, 1963.

<sup>11</sup>K. L. Schmidt, op. cit.

and explain the Kerygma for the practical needs of the church. Later on, under the secularization of the church through hellenistic influences, particularly the cult-piety and the gnostic Christ-myth, a host of mythical and legendary elements are introduced into the tradition. But the important thing for Dibelius in the understanding of the gospels is the kerygma.

The first understanding afforded by the standpoint of Form-geschichte is that there never was a "purely" historical witness to Jesus. Whatever was told of Jesus' words and deeds was always a testimony of faith as formulated for preaching and exhortation in order to convert unbelievers and confirm the faithful. What founded Christianity was not knowledge about a historical process, but the confidence that the content of the story was salvation: the decisive beginning of the End.<sup>12</sup>

What is now decisive for Dibelius is not the historical Jesus as such, but the kerygma in which this Jesus is preached as the eschatological redeemer. Thus the whole attitude toward the gospels is changed. The questions which once agitated theology and historical research--e.g., the religion of Jesus, his spiritual personality, his self-consciousness, his religionsgeschichtliche originality, etc.--cease to be important except as

---

<sup>12</sup>Dibelius, op. cit., 1934, p. 295.

purely historical problems, as also the problem of the historical relationship of Paul to Jesus. What really becomes important now is the right understanding of the gospel.<sup>13</sup>

Bultmann, in greater dependence upon Bousset, conceives the tradition-process in a more radical fashion. The primitive Palestinian-Jewish tradition was concerned only with the teachings of Jesus, whereas the kerygma first originated in the milieu of hellenistic cult-piety and Christ-faith. Accordingly, the gospels are understood as the product of hellenistic Christianity after it had appropriated the Palestinian tradition.

The Christ who is preached is not the historic Jesus, but the Christ of the faith and the cult. Hence in the foreground of the preaching of Christ stands the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as the saving acts which are known by faith and become effective for the believer in Baptism and Lord's Supper. Thus the kerygma of Christ is cultic legend and Gospels are explained cult legends.<sup>14</sup>

Under Bultmann's radical scepticism, the gospel is seen as the projection of the Christ-faith and

---

<sup>13</sup>For the critical view of Dibelius, see N. B. Stonehouse's article, "M. Dibelius and the Relation of History and Faith," WTJ, II (1940), 105-139.

<sup>14</sup>Bultmann, op. cit., 1963, pp. 370-371.

Christ-piety of the church. It has no connection with the historical Jesus, except that it presupposes his historical factuality. Nevertheless, Dibelius and Bultmann both agree on the presupposition that the Jesus who stands behind the gospel and the tradition is the Jewish teacher or prophet, of whom we can know relatively little apart from his teaching. What distinguishes them from liberal theology is the belief that this historical Jesus is not constitutive for the Christian faith.

Accordingly, the shift of interest from the historical Jesus to Paul is directly related to this historical scepticism. The question which remains, however, is how in view of the development of Pauline research it is now possible to endorse the gospel of Paul. Two approaches are discernable: the one interpreting Paul in terms of mysticism and the other in terms of existentialism.

### C. MYSTICISM

The Mysticism was a development from within the religionsgeschichtliche Schule itself and is associated particularly with the work of Adolph

Deissmann.<sup>15</sup> Like Bousset, Deissmann finds the center of Paulinism in cult-piety and Christ-mysticism. But whereas Bousset found this to be merely a historically conditioned form of religion, for Deissmann it represents the true essence of religion. In the tradition of romanticism and of Schleiermacher, the true nature of religion is found in the experience of the soul, of the immediate contact with the divine not dependent upon the mediation of history or of ideas. The mysticism of the cult transforms what we call history into present fact. It preserves the traditions of its own beginnings in the form of a Mythos or a Heilsgeschichte and pushes them back into the realm of the "Metahistorische," i.e., it makes them eternally present. Hence as Christ-cult, Christianity is not dependent upon historical facts and requires no historical justification. It has its basis in the revelation of the ever-present God through the ever-present Saviour.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>A. Deissmann, Paulus, eine kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze, Tübingen, 1911, Zweite Auflage, 1925, E.T. by L. R. M. Strachan, St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History, London, 1912.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 173; Cf. F. J. Schlerse, "Jesus und Paulus: Hat Paulus Jesus zum Kultgott gemacht?", BK, 26 (1971), 9-11.

According to Deissmann, all of Paul's theological ideas as well as his ethics are to be understood as expressions of the one fundamental experience of being "in Christ," which had its hidden origin in his conversion experience.<sup>17</sup> All his statements about Christ and his varied metaphors for describing salvation are intended to describe what Paul experienced as communion with God through mystical-spiritual union with the risen Christ. But at the center of Paul's thinking about Christ stand the inseparable facts of his cross and resurrection. But in accordance with the law of mysticism and cult-religion, Paul thinks of these not as historical facts, but as a present reality or process of salvation in which the believer shares ethically and mystically not only through baptism, but in continued fellowship with the risen Christ.<sup>18</sup>

In conclusion, Deissmann affirms that by thus linking faith with Christ, Paul did not

---

<sup>17</sup>E. Best's full discussion of the formula, 'in Christ'. One Body in Christ, London, 1955. See, in particular for Deissmann's view of it, pp. 8 ff.; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, New York, 1950, pp. 141-159.

<sup>18</sup>Deissmann, op. cit., pp. 203 ff.

transform the gospel of Jesus concerning God and the nearness of his kingdom. The form which Paul gave Christianity was necessary for the preservation and the appropriation by mankind of the revelation given in Jesus. According to Paul, the experience of God which was unique to Jesus alone is now accessible to all men.

St. Paul's Christianity founded on Christ is therefore neither a breach with the Gospel of Jesus nor a sophistication of the Gospel of Jesus. It secures for the souls of the many the Gospel experience of God which had been the possession of One, and it does so by anchoring these many souls in the Soul of the One.<sup>19</sup>

Accordingly, Deissmann's historical scepticism leads him to emphasize the inner experience of the divine as the essence of religion and hence independent of historical fact and the results of historical research. On this basis he can also affirm the religious similarity between Paul and Jesus without concerning himself particularly with the problem of their historical relationship, Paul's relationship to Jesus is primarily one of spiritual dependence expressed in terms of Christmysticism. Hence all historical differences between Jesus and Paul cease to be of serious

---

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 232.

concern.

The new element that appears in Deissmann is the concept of myth as applied to Pauline theology. Since the time of Wrede it had become customary in the religionsgeschichtliche Schule to designate Paul's soteriology as "myth," i.e., a characteristic of primitive religion in which redemption was conceived as an external process or transaction between heaven and earth.

That mythological elements were in the Bible had already been detected in the late eighteenth century and was the subject of considerable discussion in the first part of the nineteenth. After the first world war, the subject of myth again becomes important in theology. Religionsgeschichtliche research had characterized Pauline soteriology as mythological and thereby stamped it as an element of primitive religion uncongenial to the modern world-view. But the views of Deissmann show how the recovery of a concept of myth akin to that of Romanticism offered new possibilities for the interpretation of Paul. For Deissmann myth is seen as a valid and necessary means of expressing religious reality, a basic law of mysticism and cultic religion. Accordingly, Paul's redeemer-myth,

while it appears to describe the transaction of a supernatural being in the historical past, really gives expression to his experience of the present reality of redemption in Christ. Paul is not interested in the cross and resurrection primarily as past historical events, but as religious realities which are immediately present to the believer. This does not mean for Deissmann that the historical Jesus thereby becomes superfluous. Rather it is the concrete figure of the historical Jesus which prevents Paul's mythology and his mysticism from dissolving into subjective phantasy. At least the outlines of Jesus' life are presupposed, but what is important is that these historical facts are seen and proclaimed as supra-historical events which mediate mystical communion with God. Hence Paul can be endorsed, not in spite of his mythology, but precisely because of it.

#### D. EXISTENTIALISM

A somewhat similar endorsement of Paul was also obtained by way of an existential reinterpretation of Paul's gospel. Karl Barth's exposition of the epistle to the Romans first disclosed the

possibilities of this approach.<sup>20</sup> On the basis of a neo-Kantian epistemology, Barth conceives God as the unknowable, the wholly-other, who cannot be grasped in human concepts, but confronts man in the gospel as the negation of history and human existence. Faith, accordingly, has nothing to do with concepts of God, with a Christian Weltanschauung, or with pious states of the soul; it involves the obedient acceptance of the word of the cross as the Krisis of one's own existence in which one stands at once under the judgment and the grace of God.

While Barth in his later writings modified his existentialist interpretation, it was R. Bultmann who developed this approach to Paul as well as the New Testament as a whole in a consistent and systematic fashion. His now famous article: "Neues Testament und Mythologie," summarizes in a consistent way the results of his earlier research with respect to the existential understanding of the gospel.<sup>21</sup> Here Bultmann is concerned specifically with the problem which historical research had

---

<sup>20</sup>K. Barth, Der Römerbrief, Bern, 1919; E.T. from the sixth edition (1929) by E. C. Hoskyns, The Epistle to the Romans, London, 1933.

<sup>21</sup>Republished in Kerygma und Mythos, Ein theologisches Gespräch, ed. by H. W. Bartsch, Hamburg, 1948, pp. 15-53. This volume contains a selection

raised for theology by showing that the New Testament kerygma was expressed in the historically conditioned mythology of Jewish apocalyptic and the gnostic redeemer-myth. He criticizes the more recent uncritical acceptance of this mythology as a representation of myth which makes the kerygma unintelligible to the modern man. At the same time he also rejects the attempt of the older liberal theology to eliminate this mythology by a separation of the kernel from the husk. "It will be noticed how Harnack reduces the kerygma to a few basic principles of religion and ethics. Unfortunately this means that the kerygma has ceased to be kerygma: it is no longer the proclamation of the decisive act of God in Christ."<sup>22</sup> The religionsgeschichtliche Schule, on the other hand, rightly saw that the Christian faith was no religious idealism and that the Christian life did not consist in the formation of the personality or any kind of worldly structure, but in a turning away from the world, in "Entweltlichung." But because it failed to see the eschatological character of this "Entweltlichung" in the New Testament,

---

s/ of essays<sup>f</sup> which discuss the problem which Bultmann's article had raised for theology and biblical research. E.T. by R. H. Fuller, Kerygma and Myth, A Theological Debate, London, 1953, pp. 1-44.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

and understood it instead in terms of a mystical concept of religion, the religionsgeschichtliche Schule also deprived the New Testament proclamation of its kerygmatic character. The question which here also arises is whether the event of salvation which the New Testament presents as a mythological event and the person of Jesus which is understood as a mythological person in the New Testament are nothing but mythology.<sup>23</sup>

According to Bultmann, the solution to the problem lies in a proper understanding of the nature of myth as a religious concept.

The real purpose of myth is not to present an objective picture of the world as it is, but to express man's understanding of himself in the world in which he lives. Myth should be interpreted not cosmologically, but anthropologically, or better still, existentially.<sup>24</sup>

Hence the solution lies not in the elimination of the New Testament mythology or by distinguishing valid from invalid myth, but in a critical reinterpretation of mythology. Myth is only the objectification of the human mind in which a definite self-understanding or understanding of

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 14-15.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 10..

existence comes to expression. Hence the New Testament kerygma must be subjected to a demythologizing which will disclose the understanding of existence which underlies the kerygma, thus enabling the interpreter to comprehend it existentially as a possibility of his own existence.

However, according to Bultmann, the kerygma is not pure myth, history and myth are here intertwined. The historical figure of Jesus and the event of his life is described in mythological language in order to express its meaning as a figure and event of salvation.<sup>25</sup> That is to say, the historical Jesus and historical fact of the cross have no significance as such. Rather the cross is proclaimed as the event of salvation, as such its significance is not 'historische', but 'geschichtliche', i.e., a present event in the life of believers. And this is the meaning of faith in the resurrection, which is not belief in an historical event, but faith in the cross as the event of salvation. Hence, according to Bultmann, it is mistaken to inquire as to the historical origin of the proclamation, as though faith in the word of God could be established by historical

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 35.

research. The word of the proclamation confronts us as the word of God which does not ask to be legitimized, but only asks us whether or not we will believe it. "But in answering this question, in accepting the word of preaching as the word of God and the death and resurrection of Christ as the eschatological event, we are given an opportunity of understanding ourselves."<sup>26</sup> Hence to believe in the cross and resurrection as an eschatological event is to know oneself crucified and risen with Christ, or--expressed unmythologically--to know oneself freed by an act of God from one's old existence under bondage to the world for a new existence of obedience in faith and in love.<sup>27</sup>

Hence both mysticism and existentialism lead to an endorsement of Paul in such a way that the whole problem of the historical Jesus assumes a secondary importance at the most. For both Deissmann and Bultmann redemption is not an objective action of God in an historical event or process, but occurs essentially within man. For Deissmann,

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 41. Cf. W. Pannenberg accuses Bultmann of substituting his own idea of the 'eschatological' for the 'suprahistorical' in an even more ruthless antithesis to historical reality. W. Pannenberg, Revelation as History, London, 1968, Ch. IV.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 32 ff.

it is mystical communion of the soul with God, whereas for Bultmann it is recognition in faith of the possibilities of a new existence. In neither case does the historical Jesus form the starting point or the object of faith. Faith has to do with a transcendent God whom history as such cannot reveal. Although Deissmann and Bultmann treat the mythological element in Paul in a somewhat different manner, they attach greater importance to the mythology than to its historical basis. With Deissmann at least the redeemer mythology is accepted somewhat literally so that the Christ tends to become a cult-symbol expressing mystical communion with God. With Bultmann the mythology is to be reinterpreted in terms of human self-understanding.

In all this it is to be observed that the Christology and the Christ-faith of Paul which had presented such a problem for the liberal discussions of the problem of Jesus and Paul no longer appears to present a serious difficulty. Deissmann's solution does not represent anything new in this respect, except that faith in the risen Christ rather than the historical person of Jesus is regarded as the necessary form which the Christian faith had to assume. However, the origin

of this Christ-faith is not seen as a conclusion from the importance which the person of the historical Jesus had for faith, nor was it derived primarily from the unique self-consciousness of Jesus. The origin of Paul's Christ-faith lay in the mystery of his conversion experience, which in turn had its antecedents in the Jesus-cult of the first Apostles as a result of the mystery of their Easter experiences.<sup>28</sup>

Bultmann also addressed himself to this problem in an article on the Christology of the New Testament.<sup>29</sup> Bultmann understands the Christology of the New Testament as first of all proclamation-statements, and then also as the explication of the believer's understanding of the new being. Accordingly, from the viewpoint of faith the origin of this Christology is irrelevant, but as a historian Bultmann recognizes the problem raised by historical research. He fully accepts the results of Wrede's and Bousset's reconstruction of the Christological development of the early

---

<sup>28</sup>Deissmann, op. cit., pp. 175 f.

<sup>29</sup>Bultmann, "Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments," Glauben und Verstehen, Tübingen, 1933, pp. 245-267, E.T. by L. P. Smith, Faith and Understanding, London, 1966, pp. 262-285.

church in which the purely human Jesus is gradually transformed and elevated until in the Gospel of John he becomes the eternal Son of God.

Bultmann thinks that this development had its basis in the proclamation of Jesus, but not in the content of his proclamation, which differed not in the least from pure Judaism or pure prophetism. The basis lies rather in Jesus' recognition that the fact of his activity was decisive for men. "What is decisive is not what he proclaims but that he is proclaiming it."<sup>30</sup> Now is the time of decision. But this call to decision implies a Christology which is proclamation, statements. The fact that the primitive church called him the Messiah would indicate that in their own way they rightly understood him.

The great enigma of New Testament theology, how the proclaimer became the proclaimed, why the community proclaimed not only the content of his preaching, but also and primarily Christ himself, why Paul and John almost wholly ignore the content of his preaching-- that enigma is solved by the realization that it is the fact, 'that he proclaimed', which is decisive. There appeared to be an 'enigma' only because attention was focused on 'religio-ethical' concepts and on the worldview instead of on the event itself. Then the existence of a double gospel was claimed, two proclamations with different ideas were alleged, and a development which

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 283.

was determined by the history of ideas or by other external causal relations, was postulated. This concept of development was correct insofar as it was applied to the forms of presentation. But the really essential and decisive element was ignored.<sup>31</sup>

Because the primitive church called him the Messiah, it understood him as the decisive event, as the act of God which brings about the new world. What is important with regard to the Messiah-concept is not the kind of nature which may be ascribed to him. But the Messiah is the one who in the last hour brings God's salvation, the eschatological salvation which marks the end of all human virtue and desire and is salvation only for the obedient. The only task which remained was further to explain this situation, and above all to show how the decision with respect to the person of Jesus gained its particular character through his death on the cross, and so to include the cross in the proclamation. If the concept of the Messiah was later replaced by the mythological notions and cultic concepts of hellenistic syncretism, they only become the means by which the meaning of the person of Jesus as the decisive eschatological saving act of God comes to expression. The unity of

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 283-284.

the palestinian and hellenistic Christologies is to be noted in the fact that the titles of Jesus in their real sense are confessional. Yet it is the right and duty of historical criticism to show the differences of the world view connected with these titles and to show at the same time that every time and culture must say the decisive thing in terms of its own concepts.<sup>32</sup>

Accordingly, the whole question of whether Paul (or the primitive church) transformed the gospel proclaimed by Jesus into a new gospel about Christ here loses its force. Bultmann will readily admit that this was the case if one thinks in terms of the history of ideas. If the gospel were only a matter of ethical or religious ideas, Wrede's thesis would be correct. Yet for Bultmann the idea of geschichtliche differences between Jesus and Paul are only incidental, and do not touch the essence of the gospel.<sup>33</sup> To emphasize them in such a way as to see a distortion of the gospel in Paul would be for Bultmann a radical misunderstanding of the Christian gospel as event of

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 284.

<sup>33</sup>E. Jünger agrees with Bultmann's view in his Paulus und Jesus, Tübingen, 1964, p. 272.

salvation. At the same time Bultmann wants to show that a proper understanding of the historical situation indicates that the development of the gospel of Christ was already implicit in the proclamation of Jesus--however, not in such a way that the kerygma is understood as a direct development of the teaching or self-consciousness of Jesus. The message of the historical Jesus is only the presupposition for the kerygma which first came into existence when the historical Jesus was proclaimed as the event of salvation. l.c./

This passage also clearly indicates the real intention of Bultmann's labors. On the one hand, he wishes to further the historical research of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule and at the same time to understand the New Testament theologically as in some sense communicating the word of God. His intention is to maintain the alliance between theology and historical research which had been threatened by the development of liberal theology. He desires to be at once a scientific historian as well as a theologian, and by means of historical research to deepen the understanding of the gospel. This helps to explain this particular interest in the problem of Jesus and Paul, which was not

otherwise a special characteristic of existential theology.

Bultmann's first article on the Jesus-Paul problem was entitled "Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus,"<sup>34</sup> and was devoted primarily to the historical problem of the relationship of Paul's gospel to the preaching of Jesus. The results of this study were summarized in the article on the Christology of the New Testament and have already been treated above. A second article entitled "Jesus und Paulus"<sup>35</sup> is of particular interest because it treats the problem in the context of the liberal discussions of the problem and deals to a greater extent with a theological comparison of the message of Jesus and the gospel of Paul.

---

<sup>34</sup>Bultmann, "The Significance of the Historical Jesus for the Theology of Paul" (German ed., 1929), E.T. in Faith and Understanding, 1966, pp. 220-246. Bultmann asked the problem of 'Jesus and Paul' in three ways: "(1) Is the development of Paul's thought determined by the historical Jesus; either directly, or indirectly through the medium of the primitive community? If so, how far did this influence extend? (2) How is the theology of Paul related in its content to Jesus' proclamation, quite apart from whatever causal significance Jesus' proclamation had for Paul? (3) What significance has the fact of the historical Jesus for the theology of Paul? (Ibid., p. 220).

<sup>35</sup>Published in Jesus Christus im Zeugnis der Heiligen Schrift und der Kirche, Beiheft 2 zur Evangelische Theologie, München, 1936, pp. 68-90, E.T. by S. M. Ogden, Existence and Faith, London, 1961, pp. 217-239.

Bultmann acknowledges that liberal theology in its discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul was concerned with the always relevant question as to the essence of Christianity. The discovery of the mythological character of Pauline theology and its origin in the contemporary Jewish and hellenistic thought-world appeared, on the one hand, to signify the destruction of the traditional Christian doctrine of ~~sal~~vation. But on the other hand, it also appeared to clear the way for a return to the simple gospel of Jesus. Consequently, in the demand for the surrender of Christianity and a return to the historical Jesus the question of the real nature of the Christian faith comes to its sharpest expression. The meaning of what Christianity is must become clear in the reflection on the relationship of Paul to Jesus.<sup>36</sup>

Over against liberal theology, Bultmann contends first of all that religionsgeschichtliche research has shown that the attempt to discover an unmythological Christianity by a return to the historical Jesus does not succeed, for it fails to do justice to the eschatological message which

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., pp. 218-220.

Jesus shared in common with Paul: namely, the message that the old aeon has reached its end; the last hour is at hand, and the reign of God is already breaking in; the Son of man will come for judgment and salvation. While this message is obviously expressed in mythological language, the question of its possible validity will depend on ascertaining the theological presuppositions underlying it.<sup>37</sup>

After a comparison of the views of man and God and history implied in Jesus' message of the Kingdom with those of Paul, Bultmann concludes:

Jesus also shares Paul's expectation of an act of God that will bring the present corrupt course of the world to an end and redeem the pious from it. Blessed are all who look for the Reign of God that is to come, for it is theirs. Thus whoever finds Paul offensive and uncanny must find Jesus equally so. For what Paul expressly says, namely, that the gospel is a scandal, is exactly what is shown by Jesus' proclamation, ministry, and destiny.<sup>38</sup>

Likewise Bultmann finds no real difference between Jesus and Paul in their understanding of the grace of God. The fact that Paul links the grace of God to the person of Jesus is no limitation. Jesus, of course, did not demand faith in his person, but

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., pp. 220-221.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 229-230.

in his word. He came in the consciousness that God had sent him in the last hour of the world to call men to repentance and decision in view of his work. When Paul, like the primitive church, came to regard Jesus as the Messiah, he did nothing else but affirm the claim of Jesus that the destiny of men is decided by him. But this means for Paul that God had made an end to the old aeon in the sending of Jesus. The long awaited liberation and redemption from the evil age had become reality in Christ.<sup>39</sup>

Herein lies the real difference between Jesus and Paul: namely, that Jesus awaited the reign of God as an immanent event, whereas Paul looks back to what has already happened: The turn of the age has already taken place; the day of salvation is already present. Although Paul still awaits the day of consummation, the decisive thing has already happened, so that believers now have the possibility of belonging to the new world.<sup>40</sup>

In answer to the question as to whether the mythological language which Paul uses to describe the cross and resurrection as a saving fact does

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., pp. 231-233.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 233. Cf. E. Jüngel, op. cit., p. 273.

not make it unacceptable to the modern man, Bultmann replies that one must seek the fundamental idea which lies behind every mythological expression; "it alone signifies a genuine question of decision for us that we cannot avoid."<sup>41</sup> Paul's basic idea is that in the cross of Christ, God had spoken his judgment over the world and thereby opened for it the way to salvation. The proclamation of the crucified Christ as Lord is the demand that man subject himself to the judgment of God, i.e., that all human willing and striving, and all human criteria of values are nothing before God and are condemned by the cross.<sup>42</sup>

But the resurrection is not to be separated from the cross. Whoever accepts the judgment spoken in the cross, whoever lets himself be crucified with Christ experiences the cross as liberation and redemption and so is able to believe that God by surrendering Jesus to the cross led him into a life which he shares with all who let themselves be crucified with him. So Paul in surrendering himself to death, in dying to his own strength and boasting, experiences true life in himself.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid., pp. 234-235.

This is the real meaning of Paul's doctrine of the death and resurrection of Christ. All theological-mythological discussions therefore can be left aside, once this meaning is comprehended. Faith in the cross and resurrection is, therefore, not the acceptance of irrational-mythological doctrines, "but rather is primarily submission to the judgment of God, the renunciation of all boasting. Thus Paul defines faith as 'obedience', i.e., as precisely the acknowledgment of the way of the cross as the way of the life. As such obedience, it is also trust in God's power as Creator to give life to the dead."<sup>44</sup> Such faith does not result in withdrawal from the world, but is the source of ethical action. Since the liberating love of God is opened to the believer in the cross, the love of Christ drives him to the service of others and his faith becomes effectual in love.<sup>45</sup>

Although the sacraments of baptism and Lord's supper are related to the practices of the mystery religions they are only a special means of re-presenting the salvation-occurrence, which in general is re-presented in the word of preaching.

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 236.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 237.

Preaching itself belongs to the salvation-occurrence, and as such it is neither a narrative of a past event, nor instruction about questions of world view, but in it God addresses man. Therefore Christian doctrine is not a religious world view that can be discussed and that can develop and change; it is the one, unchanging Word of proclamation which proclaims the cross as God's act of judgment and liberation, and asks everyone whether he will submit to the cross and understand his life from it.<sup>46</sup>

Bultmann finally concludes:

One cannot flee from Paul and return to Jesus. For what one encounters in Jesus is the same God who is encountered in Paul--the God who is Creator and judge, who claims man completely for himself, and who freely gives his grace to him who becomes nothing before him. 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. Paul was aware that the preaching of the cross is a scandal and a folly. The question that it puts to us is whether we are ready to become aware of our nothingness before God and to receive life in the midst of our death. It asks us whether we are prepared to understand the meaning and goal of our life not in terms of our own worldviews and plans, but on the basis of the Christian proclamation that encounters us as the word of God.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 238.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 238-239.

One notes in Bultmann's solution to the problem of Jesus and Paul several important developments in historical research. By no means the least of these is the recognition that the teachings of Jesus involve much more than moral precepts or a simple ethical religion. Rather it is now seen that his teachings have a theological character and presuppose a definite theological understanding of history and of man and his relationship to God. This deepened understanding of the theological character of Jesus' teaching casts a new light on the relationship between the teachings of Jesus and the theology of Paul. Wrede's theory of an absolute difference between the two is now seen to be inadequate and superficial. Bultmann recognizes, for example, that the theological ideas implicit in Jesus' parable of the Pharisee and the publican and that of the Prodigal Son are essentially the same as those which are explicit in the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith.<sup>48</sup> Hence the differences between the theology of Paul and the message of Jesus are no longer as sharply felt, and can easily be attributed to differences of

---

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., pp. 225.

temperament and historical situation.

With respect to Pauline research one also notes a deepened understanding of Pauline theology, particularly a rediscovery of the importance of the doctrine of justification by faith, which had long been dismissed as a purely polemical doctrine. At the same time, however, the unity of Pauline theology is also recognized. Paul's theology is not composed of various disparate elements of Jewish or hellenistic origin, nor is it to be understood simply from a single viewpoint, e.g., justification by faith, or eschatology, or the so-called Christ-mysticism. All these elements are interrelated and combined in a certain organic unity. Hence, for Bultmann the endorsement of Paul and the solution to the problem of Jesus and Paul becomes possible when it is recognized that the Jewish and hellenistic mythology of Paul give expression to an understanding of existence which represents a real possibility of our own existence. Accordingly, the problem of Jesus and Paul resolves itself in a decision. It is not, however, a decision between 'Christianity' and the religion of Jesus or between two types of religious piety, but the decision as to whether or not one will accept Jesus as the event of salvation, i.e., whether or not one will accept

the understanding of existence embodied in the Pauline kerygma as a genuine possibility for our own existence.

That is to say, finally, that the historical Jesus is in no way constitutive for the Christian faith. Faith in Jesus as the event of salvation is not dependent on what the historical Jesus actually was or what he did and said. That he was no more than a human prophet or teacher is obvious to Bultmann. Faith in him is the "Easter-faith," i.e., a trans-subjective event which signifies a new understanding of my own existence in terms of the symbolism of the cross and resurrection.

Accordingly, Bultmann sees no essential connection between the kerygma of Paul and the historical Jesus. He accepts the hypothesis of the independence of Paul from Jesus as an assured result of historical research. Paul was no disciple of Jesus, either directly or through the mediation of the first disciples. Naturally, he knew the kerygma of the cross or he would not have persecuted the church. But he was as good as untouched by the proclamation of Jesus; it was

essentially irrelevant for him.<sup>49</sup>

At this point the theological implications of the historical relationship between Paul and Jesus become apparent. In fact, his theological presuppositions would preclude any other solution, even though his demonstration of the rather wide agreement between Jesus and Paul naturally suggests a relationship of dependence, but otherwise remains a strange and unexplained historical enigma. However, to accept the natural historical explanation would involve a contradiction of his theological understanding of the kerygma. While Bultmann is anxious to keep the kerygma independent of historical research, it is clear that his understanding of the kerygma is nevertheless dependent upon what he considers to be the assured results of historical research. His theological understanding of the kerygma is intimately related to his historical scepticism.

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., pp. 219-220. Bultmann argues that it was Hellenistic not Palestinian Christianity to which Paul was first introduced, and "after his conversion--Paul made no effort toward contact with Jesus' disciples or the Jerusalem church for instruction concerning Jesus and his ministry. On the contrary, he vehemently protests his independence from them in Gal.1-2." Thus, according to Bultmann, on Paul's own testimony, he is not only ignorant of, he is also indifferent to the teachings of Jesus. Bultmann, Theology of New Testament, I (E.T. by K. Grobel, New York, 1951), pp. 188 ff.

His theological presuppositions also contradict his historical research in another respect. One notes a strange vacillation in his attitude toward the historical origin of Paul's theology. Bultmann follows the religionsgeschichtliche Schule quite closely in affirming that the decisive influence upon Paul comes from hellenistic Christianity rather than from the Jewish-Palestinian. In fact, the kerygma as cult-legend really originated first on hellénistic soil. Yet in treating the problem of Jesus and Paul, the Jewish heritage of Paul assumes an importance which overshadows the hellenistic. In Bultmann's view, Paul and Jesus are wholly one in their eschatological understanding of salvation, except for the fact that Paul regards it as already present. Moreover, Bultmann finds that the real center of the kerygma comes to expression most clearly in the doctrine of justification by faith, which was expressed essentially in Jewish categories. It would seem that for Bultmann the only decisive thing which distinguishes Pauline Christianity from Judaism (Jesus for Bultmann being a pure representative of Jewish prophetism) was the faith that the Messiah had already come. Granting the influence of hellenistic Christianity

upon Paul, the fact that Paul the hellenist nevertheless agreed in so many respects with Jesus would make it even more probable historically that he was in some manner directly or indirectly dependent upon Jesus. In any case, Bultmann's theological presuppositions lead him to results which are not wholly consonant with the results of his historical research. It would appear that Bultmann's attempt to maintain a strictly scientific historical approach to the Bible alongside a theological one is not too satisfactory either from a theological or a historical viewpoint.

The basic issue is the question of the relationship of history and revelation. The viewpoint of the scientific historian, which Bultmann wishes to maintain, excludes the possibility of any divine intervention in the historical process. Hence, history cannot reveal God or exhibit the effects of his activity, for it always presents itself to us as a closed continuum of cause and effect. Revelation can only be understood dialectically as occurring in an existential encounter which is at once the negation of history and of all human thoughts and feelings about God.

Hence revelation cannot be expressed in

concepts or ideas. Theology is only human language about God which finally is only the expression of human self-understanding. For one cannot speak about God without speaking of one's own existence. In dealing with the Bible, it is the task of the historian to discover the concept of human existence which underlies its historically conditioned language about God. Therefore, there is also a certain monism in Bultmann's understanding of history. However, it is not the monism which is determined by the idealistic development of the human spirit or of a revelatory process in history. It rather lies in the recognition that human existence is always and everywhere the same. For Bultmann, it is the understanding of existence which can be understood and expressed philosophically in the categories of existentialism.<sup>50</sup> On the basis of this anthropological monism Bultmann can maintain a certain unity of the New Testament. The kerygma is a unity in spite of the diversity of mythological language in which it is expressed, for underlying the language is a common understanding of existence. Thus Bultmann can see an essential

---

<sup>50</sup>See Bultmann's article "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth, pp. 23 ff.

agreement between Jesus and Paul, for each in his own way gives expression to the same self-understanding. The historian is supposed to be able to ascertain this self-understanding in the same manner in which he would treat any historical document. The only question which remains is whether he will accept the self-understanding expressed in the kerygma as a real possibility for his own existence. But with this monism, God seems to be little more than a question-mark over human existence. In theology man can only indulge in a monologue with himself. One is left wondering whether revelation has any objective reality; for Bultmann, God is little more than a symbol for something which lies wholly beyond history and human perception. One can only accept the kerygma as a challenge to understand one's existence as the possibility of a new life of freedom from bondage to the world.

Thus Bultmann's solution to the problem of Jesus and Paul--one cannot get behind Paul to Jesus; one can only decide when confronted with the kerygma whether or not one will accept Jesus as the event of salvation for one's own existence--stands in opposition both to the old liberal solution "Back to Jesus" as well as any attempt to retain Paul on the basis of his historical or

religious continuity with Jesus. It may well be said that the discovery of the kerygmatic character of the New Testament witness has led to a deepened understanding of its nature and purpose. And it is no doubt right and salutary that the present preoccupation with the meaning and interpretation of the kerygma should overshadow the discussion of the historical problem of Jesus and Paul. Yet Bultmann's study shows rather clearly that the problem of Jesus and Paul is crucial for our understanding of the kerygma. How is the historical Jesus related to the kerygma? Does the historical Jesus belong in any essential way to the kerygma? For Bultmann, Paul's indifference to and independence of Jesus means ultimately that the historical Jesus is no more than a presupposition for the kerygma and does not belong to its content.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, if we still insist that the historical Jesus

---

<sup>51</sup>cf. To insure faith's independence of historical research, the cost of the premium is the dismissal of all historical elements in the kerygma. Bultmann, however, makes a single exception: the bare fact of Jesus' historicity and his death on the cross. C. E. Braaten's understanding of it is as follows: "--having singled out the historicity of Jesus and his cross as essential to the kerygma, Bultmann has already compromised his rule. Here lurks the glaring inconsistency in Bultmann's theology." C. E. Braaten, History and Hermeneutics, Philadelphia, 1966, p. 65.

belongs essentially to the kerygma, it becomes imperative to demonstrate that the historical relationship of Paul to Jesus was different from the way in which Bultmann conceives it. Otherwise there is no alternative but to admit that Paul's kerygma and thereby all his theology and faith were deficient with respect to the place and importance of the historical Jesus. In this respect, Bultmann's study presents a real challenge to contemporary theology to reckon seriously with the problem of Jesus and Paul.

PART FOUR  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER I

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PROBLEM

Perhaps the most decisive change as over against earlier discussions of the problem is the widespread agreement as to a similarity between Jesus and Paul, wholly apart from the question of their historical relationship.<sup>1</sup> One of the most common arguments, among the scholars of the 'New Quest of the historical Jesus,' concerning the nature of the continuity of Jesus and Paul is based upon the phenomenon of Jesus' authority. It is this sovereignty and authority of Jesus which the kerygma brings to expression and which,

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. R. Bultmann claims an uncompromising distinction between historical continuity (historischen Kontinuität) and the relationship in terms of content (sachlichen Verhältnis) between Jesus and his message on the one hand and the primitive Christian kerygma on the other. Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus, Heidelberg, 1960, p. 6. (This article is translated into English by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, in The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ, New York, 1964, pp. 15-42.)

therefore, constitutes the continuity between Jesus and the church's proclamation.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, J. M. Robinson rests his own case on establishing a continuity of intention between the teaching of Jesus and the kerygma, a continuity between the understanding of human existence embodied in the conduct and message of Jesus and that of the kerygma.<sup>3</sup> After a very detailed analysis of the Christological terminology of Paul, the Synoptics, and the Johannine literature, H. Braun also concludes that despite the wide discrepancy in the terminology, which is always a function of the cultural environment, there is a fundamental

---

<sup>2</sup>A number of Bultmann's most influential students--E. Käsemann, G. Bornkamm, H. Conzelmann, and E. Fuchs etc.--have sought to establish this continuity more firmly. They argue that the kerygma not only presupposes that there was a man named Jesus but that the what and how of his life are the object of Christian proclamation. The gospel of Jesus Christ as the risen Lord has an essential continuity with Jesus' own life and message. See E. Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes (Studies in Biblical Theology, 41), E.T. by W. Montague, London, 1964, pp. 15-47; G. Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, E.T. by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with J. M. Robinson, London, 1960, p. 58; H. Conzelmann, "The Method of the Life of Jesus Research," in The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ, ed. by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, pp. 63 ff.; E. Fuchs, Studies of the Historical Jesus, E.T. by A. Scobie, London, 1964, pp. 12-31.

<sup>3</sup>J. M. Robinson, A New Quest of the Historical Jesus, London, 1971 (7th ed.), pp. 119-125.

similarity in the basic conception of human existence before God.<sup>4</sup>

F. Gogarten claims that while Paul "has not the slightest biographical interest in Jesus, yet the humanity of the historical Jesus, and therefore Jesus himself, was of crucial significance for the theology of Paul."<sup>5</sup> E. Fuchs maintains that the letters of Paul are the 'source' bearing witness to the 'fact' of the historical Jesus. There is a continuity of the Pauline kerygma with the historical Jesus insofar as "the historical Jesus is the substance of the kerygma." Thus, in opposition to Bultmann and in real agreement with Gogarten, Fuchs says: "--the so-called Christ of faith is in fact none other than the historical Jesus." Because God himself wishes to be encountered in the historical Jesus, in the preaching of faith, also, faith remains bound to the historical Jesus. In His appeal (Frage) to us God approaches us through the preaching about Jesus in the same way

---

<sup>4</sup>H. Braun, "Der Sinn der neutestamentlichen Christologie," Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, Tübingen, 1962, pp. 243-282.

<sup>5</sup>F. Gogarten, Die Verkündigung Jesu Christi, Heidelberg, 1948, p. 178 (quoted from E. Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus, pp. 14-16); Cf. G. Kittel, "Jesus bei Paulus," TSK, 85 (1912), 400 f.

as in Jesus, because in the preaching of the resurrection the historical Jesus himself has approached us.<sup>6</sup> This is 'Sprachereignis', speech-event.<sup>7</sup> With the concept of 'Sprachereignis', Fuchs proceeds to show that the result of both Jesus' proclamation and Paul's kerygma was the transformation of the law. The 'Sprachereignis' of Jesus' proclamation reveals that even with the law the way is opened up in which God comes to us and in which we move towards God. "Jesus erlaubt uns, Gottes Weg zu betreten, Gottes Willen zu erfüllen."<sup>8</sup> When we come to Paul, it seems at first as if his handling of the law were fundamentally different from Jesus' use of it. It is the gospel of faith which his proclamation serves (Rom.1:14-17). Paul's treatment of the law is different insofar as he says that the law reveals the wrath of God (Rom.4:15). But he has the cross of Christ before his eyes. It is only at the end of

---

<sup>6</sup>E. Fuchs, op. cit. (quoted from E. Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus, pp. 14-16).

<sup>7</sup>See H. Anderson, Jesus and Christian Origins, A commentary on modern viewpoints, New York, 1964, p. 10.

<sup>8</sup>E. Fuchs, Zum hermeneutischen Problem in der Theologie, Ges Auf I, Tübingen, 1959, p. 291.

Romans in chapters 12-14 that Paul treats the law as the "hilfreiche Regel Jesu" (Gal.6:2).<sup>9</sup> The difference between Jesus' and Paul's treatment of the law is most easily explained by the analogy which Paul makes between the law and conscience (Rom.2:12-15).

Gott sagt dem Menschen in Christus nichts anderes, als was ihm sein eigenes Gewissen auch sagt, sobald man dieses Was, den Inhalt, nur recht menschlich betrachtet. Die Botschaft sagt: Du sollst deinen Gott an mir haben! Und was sagt das Gewissen? Das Gewissen sagt: an mir habe ich nichts! Paulus variiert diesen Gedanken oft, so z.B. in 2Kor.5:10 f.: wer den Herrn fürchtet, der weiß daß er mit allem, was er hat, dem Gericht unterworfen ist, weil er nichts hat, was er diesem Gericht entziehen und für sich vorbehalten könnte.<sup>10</sup>

This insight is strange and difficult for the natural man to accept. One normally expects that one has at least one's faith to show before God, but one must come to the point of acknowledging that one has nothing. This is the purpose of the analogy between the law and conscience in Paul. In the light of the knowledge of God, man learns to know himself as the one who wishes to assert himself, indeed must assert himself apart from God. But in the word of God comes his election to live to God. God's election comes to us in nothing

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 294.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., pp. 294-295.

other than the word which is spoken to us in his name. For those who have become the ones elected by God, the law is now transformed into that rule for both Jews and Gentiles, which was already the rule of Jesus--the "law of Christ" of Galatians 6:2. Therefore, Fuchs also sees a continuity between Jesus and Paul in terms of 'Sprachereignis' of the law.<sup>11</sup>

E. Jüngel, a pupil of E. Fuchs, sets the speech-event of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, central to Paul's theology, over against the speech-event of the preaching of Jesus. Jesus' teaching is limited to the teaching in the parables of the Kingdom of God that speak of God's 'time to come'. The parables of Jesus are half figure and half event. "They help us to understand the imminent coming of God's Kingdom, not as something that is yet to come, but as a power breaking in in the present, and they also help us to respond to it." Imminent expectancy (Naherwartung) is not descriptive of Jesus' teaching. Jesus' call was not a call for repentance but a summons to the community of the living love of God's

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., pp. 283-295

'yes'. Paul looks back to the eschaton; the eschaton became an event in history, and the so-called imminent expectancy is a secondary eschatological phenomenon in Paul's thought. He looks back to the eschaton and speaks of it as the revelation of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ in the death and resurrection of Jesus, whereas Jesus looked to the future, when he spoke of the eschaton as the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.<sup>12</sup> This distinction, for Jüngel, is only a linguistic difference, within history, since behind both "speech-events" stands the "eschatological 'yes' of God to men (Gottes eschatologisches Ja dem Menschen) as the extra nos of the speech of God making both speech events possible."<sup>13</sup>

Apart from the theological issues involved,

---

<sup>12</sup>Cf. E. Käsemann's revision (with the exegesis of Matt. 11:12 ff.; Jesus looks back to John as marking the end of the old Aeon and the beginning of the new) of the eschatological timetable (from Bultmann's view; what for Jesus is future, is for Paul present) also brings the thought of Jesus and Paul closer together. Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

<sup>13</sup>E. Jüngel, op. cit., p. 266, pp. 282 f.; W. Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus," NTSt, 10 (1964), 171; Cf. "Speech-event" is similar to the use of kerygma by Bultmann as a way in which God encounters man existentially now. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I (E.T.), p. 302.

there is a general willingness to recognize that Jesus and Paul share a not insignificant eschatological element in their teaching, and that this eschatological element presupposes a common understanding of God and men and of their relationship to each other.<sup>14</sup> The old liberal view that Jesus and Paul held different concepts of God, or that Paul's pessimistic understanding of man is to be contrasted with Jesus' optimistic view has not been sustained by historical research. Hence, the attempt to oppose Paul the theologian to Jesus the ethical teacher is seen to be inadequate and in need of revision. While it is recognized that Paul does use abstract theological concepts to a much greater extent than Jesus, it is also perceived that Jesus' teachings presuppose theological ideas not unlike those of Paul. Whatever explanation may be given to account for this agreement, the fact remains that it is widely acknowledged.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>A. Schlatter, Jesus und Paulus, Stuttgart, 1961 (3rd ed.), pp. 64 ff.; W. Kümmel, op. cit., p. 180; idem, Promise and Fulfillment, London, 1957, pp. 141-155; idem, The Theology of the New Testament, London, 1972, p. 248; C. H. Dodd, New Testament Studies, Manchester University Press, 1953, pp. 53-56; E. E. Ellis, Paul and His Recent Interpreters, Grand Rapids, 1968 (3rd ed.), p. 33.

<sup>15</sup>A. Fridrichsen, The Root of the Vine, Essays in Biblical theology by members of Uppsala

In connection with the discovery of the eschatological character of Jesus' teaching, Jesus' mission is now seen from the viewpoint of response to the eschatological work of God. He is now interpreted not primarily as an ethical teacher or religious genius, but as the herald of eschatological salvation.<sup>16</sup> On the other hand, Paul is now also interpreted from the viewpoint of his apostolic mission to proclaim the kerygma.<sup>17</sup> Accordingly, Jesus and Paul are no longer regarded as representatives of two wholly disparate religious types, one preoccupied with religion and the other with ~~the~~ theology. In spite of differences of

---

University, Edinburgh, 1953, p. 48; H. Conzelmann, "Das Urchristentum," Reformatio, VI, Zürich, 1957, p. 571; E. Jüngel sees Paul as a theologian of the preaching of Jesus, one who develops theologically the motifs already present in his teaching about God's Reign, op. cit., pp. 281-283.

<sup>16</sup>Cf. J. C. G. Greig, "The Eschatological Ministry," in The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G. H. C. Macgregor, ed. by H. Anderson and W. Barclay, Oxford, 1965, p. 106 f.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. W. N. Pittenger summarized and agreed with C. H. Dodd's view of Paul's preaching (which Dodd called in his book, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, London, 1936, pp. 3-73, "the apostolic preaching or kerygma, the Greek word for proclamation"). The Life of St. Paul, London, 1968, p. 120.

religious experience, they are nevertheless one in the consciousness of a divine calling to proclaim the message of salvation.<sup>18</sup>

General agreement on another crucial point is also to be noted: namely, the question of Paul's Christ-faith in relation to faith in God. This was the point which proved to be such a problem and a stumbling block to Wrede, Weiss and others. It is acknowledged that Paul's Christ-faith, whether or not it was anticipated to a certain extent by Jesus, represented a fully valid and justifiable development. Accordingly, the old attempt to set the religion of Jesus over against the religion which has Christ as its object is repudiated. There never was a Christian gospel or faith which did not

---

<sup>18</sup>G. Bornkamm demonstrates that Paul proclaims, in his kerygma, the message of God's act of salvation in Jesus Christ in a way parallel to Jesus' own proclamation of the Kingdom of God. "Glaube und Vernunft bei Paulus," *Ges. Auf.*, II pp. 119-137. (This essay has appeared in condensed form and without notes in *NTS*, 4 (1957/58), 93-100.); W. G. Kümmel also gives us decisive insights: Jesus preached a proximate coming of the final eschatological salvation as well as a partial fulfillment in Himself, and thus His preaching is the basis of early Christian (including Pauline) theology. In addition, Jesus did apply to Himself one of the terms of Jewish salvation--expectations, "Son of Man," or "richtiger 'Mensch'." Kümmel, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-180.

center in some fashion in Jesus Christ. In this respect, the older conservative viewpoint has been sustained. A contributing factor to the present situation was the discovery of the kerygmatic nature of the gospels and the Gemeindeüberlieferung which they present.

One might be tempted, in view of the general agreement as to the similarity between Jesus and Paul and as to the validity of Paul's Christ-faith, to conclude that the problem of Jesus and Paul was solved for all practical purposes, and that the question of their relationship could safely be set aside. However, as soon as one raises the question of the nature of Paul's Christ-faith or of his kerygma, the question of the historical relationship of Paul to Jesus cannot finally be ignored, and at this point there are still widespread differences of opinion. Theological and historical problems become strangely intertwined.

V. P. Furnish's summary of this question is a valuable contribution. According to Furnish's classification,<sup>19</sup> some hold that there is a vital identity between the preaching of Jesus and Paul

---

<sup>19</sup>V. P. Furnish, "The Jesus-Paul Debate," BJRL, 47 (1964/65), 377 f.

(e.g., Paret, Feine, Resch, Titius, Matheson, Schmoller, etc.). Others hold that Paul was the interpreter of Jesus, perhaps even--as some scholars held--the one who best understood Jesus (e.g., Wellhausen, Harnack, Gloatz, Deissmann, etc.). Others hold that Paul was essentially an innovator (e.g., Baur, Weinel, Wernle, Nietzsche, etc.). Paul, it has been often said, was the "developer" of Jesus' message. However, here one must be careful to distinguish between two very different views of this development: (a) Paul's theology as an essentially illegitimate development of Jesus' message; thus the "Back to Jesus" slogan (e.g., Wendt, Wrede, etc.). (b) Paul's doctrinal teaching as a legitimate extension and development of Jesus' message (e.g., Hilgenfeld, Kaftan, Meyer, Moffatt, Morgan, Weiss, Scott, Fridrichsen, Duncan, Beare, etc.). Finally, Bultmann holds that Paul's theology is not identical with Jesus' message, nor explicitly an interpretation of it, nor historically a development from it, either in a positive or negative sense. 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.

W. G. Kümmel, successor of Bultmann at Marburg, understands the problem as the question of identity, i.e., the essential agreement or difference between Jesus and Paul. But the main problem, for Kümmel, is also the question of continuity, the historical connection between Jesus and Paul. The distinction is not clear, and Kümmel does admit that the two questions cannot be completely separated.<sup>20</sup>

The question of continuity is raised in a most simple form in the ambiguous knowledge of Jesus "κατὰ σάρκα" (II Cor. 5:16).<sup>21</sup> "κατὰ σάρκα"

---

<sup>20</sup>W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus," *NTSt*, 10 (1964), 171 ff.

<sup>21</sup>This interpretation is twofold: Some scholars (e.g., J. Weiss, W. Bousset, H. Lietzmann, C. A. A. Scott, J. Klausner, J. H. Moulton, van Unnik, A. M. Hunter, W. D. Davies, etc.) have held that Saul saw Jesus before His passion, when Jesus was teaching in Jerusalem. But others (e.g., R. Bultmann, E. B. Allo, M. Dibelius, Kümmel, Schoeps, J. Knox, etc.) claim that Paul did not see or know the historical Jesus. See E. Güttgemanns, *Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr*, Göttingen, 1966, pp. 282-312; J. Blank, *Paulus und Jesus*, München, 1968, pp. 304-326; C. F. D. Moule, "Jesus in New Testament Kerygma," *Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag*, Herausgegeben von Otto Böcher und Klaus Haacker, Wuppertal, 1970, pp. 17 ff.; J. W. Fraser "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Cor. 5:16 Once More," *NTSt*, 17 (1971), 293-313; J. L. Martyn, "Epistemology at the Turn of the Ages: 2 Corinthians 5:16," *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to John Knox*, ed. by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr, Cambridge, 1967, pp. 269-287.

in II Corinthians 5:16 does not refer adjectivally to  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ , but adverbially to the verbs of knowing.<sup>22</sup> Two verbs to know are used: in v.16a  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ , in v.16b  $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  (1)  $\omicron\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  (v.16a) and (2)  $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  (v.16b) refer to the present knowledge of (1) others, and (2) Christ, while  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  (v.16b) covers previous knowledge of Christ.<sup>23</sup> Paul's former knowledge of Christ ' $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$ ' refers to his political messianic idea<sup>24</sup> and "his former hostility to Jesus and His followers, which has now been replaced by apostolic devotion to Jesus and brotherly

---

<sup>22</sup>It is true that Paul elsewhere uses the phrase ' $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$   $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$ ' sometimes adjectivally, sometimes adverbially. See J. L. Martyn, *Ibid.*, p. 270.

<sup>23</sup>See F. C. Baur, Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie, Leipzig, 1864, p. 131; J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 43; F. C. Porter, "Does Paul Claim to Have Known the Historical Jesus? A study of 2 Corinthians 5:16" JBL, 47 (1928), 257 ff., 267.

<sup>24</sup>A. Plummer, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, I.C.C., 1915, p. 177. F. F. Bruce, "Paul and the Historical Jesus," BJRL, 56 (1974), 322; idem, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 25. Bruce says that Paul's former conception of the Messiah was "worldly" and wrong. This is exactly opposite to the view of W. Wrede, according to whom Paul had an antecedent idea of the Messiah as a "supramundane, divine being," which he retained after his conversion.

love to His followers. It is the person, not the office, that Paul has in mind.<sup>25</sup> To know other men, and also Christ, 'κατὰ σάρκα' is, in this verse, a knowing which ceases when one becomes Christian. Personal acquaintance of 'others' is not what is meant here in 16a, or 16b; and it is not personal acquaintance with Christ now, or Jesus 'then', in the past, e.g., before or during the passion. Paul had a way of looking at, regarding, understanding Christ. Some hold that it refers to Paul's post-conversion knowledge of Christ.<sup>26</sup> However, it cannot be a knowing of the historical Jesus. The verse has no bearing on the question whether Paul had seen the earthly Jesus.<sup>27</sup> Yet

---

<sup>25</sup>Plummer claims that Paul knew Jesus as a heretical, turbulent teacher, justly condemned by the Sanhedrin and crucified by the Romans. *Ibid.*; J. Weiss interpreted it, in terms of knowing Jesus in his human, earthly nature, *op. cit.*, pp. 137 f., 347 f.. But Porter rejected Weiss' opinion and suggests that 'κατὰ σάρκα' here means selfishly, not outwardly, *op. cit.*, p. 268; F. F. Bruce, "Jesus and Paul," *TSF Bulletin*, 46 (1966), 22.

<sup>26</sup>For the full discussion of this view, see Fraser, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-307.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. F. C. Baur, *op. cit.*; C. F. D. Moule, "Jesus in New Testament Kerygma," *Verborum Veritas*, pp. 17 f.; Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 260; F. F. Bruce, *Paul and Jesus*, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 23; R. Bultmann's own interpretation of the text is as follows: ". . . that he even saw Jesus and was impressed by him . . . is to be read out of 2 Cor. v.16 only by fantasy." Paul, E.T. in *Existence and Faith*, London, 1964, p. 133.

the possibility that he had cannot be excluded.

The point at issue, however, is no longer primarily the basic similarity between Jesus and Paul, nor even Paul's knowledge of the facts of Jesus' life. Rather the question is whether the historical Jesus was really constitutive for Paul's kerygma, and therefore for his theology and Christ-faith. But it is a question here, as Bultmann rightly maintains, of the very essence of the Christian faith. Our survey of the whole history of the problem of Jesus and Paul seems to warrant the conclusion that, as far as the New Testament is concerned, the problem of the Christian faith is neither the problem of Jesus nor the problem of Paul as such, but the problem of Jesus and Paul. The history of the problem of Jesus and Paul clearly shows that the problem of Jesus and the problem of Paul are ultimately inseparable and that the problem of their togetherness involves the problem of the nature of the Christian faith itself. To what extent is the Christian faith rooted in history? How are we as Christians related to the Jesus of history? But this is simply to generalize the question of Paul's relationship to Jesus. The whole question of the relationship of faith and history comes to a sharp focus in the historical

problem of Jesus and Paul.

The problem which the gospels still present for the clarification of the relationship of Jesus and Paul is the problem of ascertaining a solid historical basis for a comparison of Jesus with Paul.<sup>28</sup> A growing interest in the problem of the life of Jesus seems to suggest that there is today a dissatisfaction with the radical scepticism which characterized the form-critical school. But the problem still remains as to what extent the traditions of the life and teachings of Jesus were shaped by the faith and the kerygma of the early church. Here there is still a wide diversity of opinion. Many scholars argue that Paul was so far removed from the Jerusalem church that he was unable to receive the primitive Palestine tradition about Jesus. Bultmann discounts the claims of Acts 22:3 that the Apostle studied at the feet of Gamaliel and Acts 8:3 that he persecuted the church in Jerusalem. This is because of Paul's own assertion in Galatians 1:22 that long after his conversion he was "still not known by sight to the

---

<sup>28</sup>Cf. B. Gärtner, "The Person of Jesus and the Kingdom of God," *T. Tod.*, 27 (1970), 32-43; G. S. Duncan, "From Paul to Jesus," *SJT*, 2 (1949), 5.

churches of Christ in Judea."<sup>29</sup> But van Unnik answers Bultmann, "An objection . . . to Paul's training in Jerusalem, on the ground that this would conflict with Galatians 1:22, is hardly tenable, for Paul speaks there about a later time, and it can hardly be assumed that in a city like Jerusalem everyone would know definitely all the pupils of the rabbis."<sup>30</sup> To make Galatians 1:22 exclude the Apostle from any previous relation to Jerusalem is to give it more weight than it can bear. This would mean that Paul's pre-Christian persecution of the church went on in the Diaspora, being based on the minimal knowledge that Christians awaited the recently crucified Jesus as the Messiah.<sup>31</sup> Thus, it was through the Hellenistic church that Paul was converted, and this community served as an effective buffer against the Palestinian tradition about Jesus. There is evidence apart

---

<sup>29</sup>R. Bultmann, Faith and Understanding, I, p. 220; Cf. W. Wrede, Paul, p. 4; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, p. 35.

<sup>30</sup>W. C. van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem, E.T. by G. Ogg, London, 1962, p. 52; Cf. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, Göttingen, 1962, p. 63.

<sup>31</sup>R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 221.

from Acts, however, that Paul persecuted Christians in Jerusalem. In Galatians 1:13 the Apostle recalls, "I persecuted the church of God . . . ;" and when the churches of Judea hear of his conversion they are made to assert in Galatians 1:23, "He who once persecuted us /now preaching the faith. . . ." <sup>32</sup> It must be questioned also whether the Hellenistic church of Bultmann's reconstruction is a reality. <sup>33</sup> Weiss notes that we lack any direct sources for its history. <sup>34</sup> This leads Schoeps to scepticism about the existence of such a church, "It is quite unknown and therefore indefinable. I would rather be inclined to credit Paul as a Hellenistic Diaspora Jew with independent reinterpretations of a teaching and practice which was already in existence in the non-Hellenistic Palestinian tradition." <sup>35</sup> We should also remember

---

<sup>32</sup>J. Weiss, Earliest Christianity, New York, 1959, Vol. I, p. 189, n. 9.

<sup>33</sup>R. Bultmann, Theology of New Testament, I, pp. 63-183. Cf. W. Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus," ZNW, 13 (1912), 320-337.

<sup>34</sup>J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 178.

<sup>35</sup>H. J. Schoeps, Paul, p. 61; Cf. F. Hahn and R. H. Fuller operate with a threefold division in the early pre-Pauline church: the Palestinian Jewish (Aramaic speaking) Church, the Hellenistic Jewish Church and the Hellenistic Gentile Church. F. Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel, Ihre

that it was the "Hellenistic church" which preserved the tradition about Jesus contained in the Gospels. At least the tradition was circulating in that church. Bultmann would agree, but would evaluate the gospel tradition with great scepticism.<sup>36</sup>

While the questions of Paul's pre-Christian relationship to Jerusalem and the existence of a Hellenistic church are still open to debate, the intercourse between Jerusalem and the churches in the Diaspora is not. Paul states in Galatians 1:18 that he went to Jerusalem three years after his conversion to visit Cephas.<sup>37</sup> There he also saw James, the Lord's

---

Geschichte im frühen Christentum, FRLANT 83, Göttingen, 1963, p. 11 (E.T. by H. Knight and G. Ogg, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, London, 1969, pp. 12f.); R. H. Fuller, Foundations of New Testament Christology, London and Glasgow, 1965, pp. 164-167; See I. H. Marshall's critique of Hahn and Fuller, The Development of Christology in the Early Church, TyB, 18 (1967), London, 7 ff.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Oxford, 1963; In contrast compare M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, London, 1934; V. Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London, 1960 (2nd ed.); B. Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, Uppsala, 1961, Part II (pp. 193-335); H. Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginning, London, 1957.

<sup>37</sup>Whether ἰστορησαὶ Κηφᾶν means merely "to visit" or "to consult" is still open to question. See G. D. Kilpatrick, "ἸΣΤΟΡΗΣΑΙ ΚΗΦΑΝ," A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, Manchester, 1959, pp. 144-149; W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge, 1964, p. 453 f.

brother (Galatians 1:19). Weiss writes that the time (of Paul's stay in Jerusalem) was long enough for coming to an agreement over many matters, long enough for learning a number of details about the sayings and the life of Jesus. To suppose that Paul at this time scrupulously avoided all information about the life of Jesus is to take a view of the situation which is singularly remote from the facts.<sup>38</sup> A. M. Hunter<sup>39</sup> recalls C. H. Dodd's famous dictum, "Paul did not spend all the time (with Peter) talking about the weather."<sup>40</sup> J. Munck also attempts to remove any gulf between Paul and certain Judaistic elements in the Urgemeinde.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, Barnabas (Acts 11:22, 13:1; Galatians 2:1, 13; 1 Corinthians 9:6), and Silas,<sup>42</sup> Paul's

---

<sup>38</sup>J. Weiss, Earliest Christianity, I, p. 201.

<sup>39</sup>A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, Hastie Lectures for 1939; London, 1940. New revised edition, with appendix, London, 1961, p. 12.

<sup>40</sup>C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, London, 1936, p. 26.

<sup>41</sup>J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, Richmond, 1959.

<sup>42</sup>If we can trust Acts 15:22 and if Silas is identical with Silvanus in I and II Thess. 1:1; II Cor. 1:19. See Weiss, op. cit., p. 277 f.

companions, are represented by Acts as having come from the Jerusalem church. Then Cephas himself visited Antioch followed by "certain men from James" (Galatians 2:11-12), and saw Paul there.

If, as Bultmann asserts, the Apostle valued a saying of the Lord for matters of church discipline, he had many opportunities to receive such sayings. Thus, Paul had sufficient opportunity to acquaint himself with some of the tradition about Jesus from the Jerusalem church, and no adequate grounds can be given a priori to expect him to reject such tradition for theological reasons. Bultmann himself has admitted that Paul was interested in a saying of the Lord when he could find one for matters of church discipline.<sup>43</sup> This is ground enough to reopen the question of tradition in Paul's letters and the subsequent question of the historical Jesus and Paul.

A methodological principle which has

---

<sup>43</sup>cf. D. L. Dungan also follows Bultmann's view: Paul used two sayings of Jesus (I Cor. 7:10 and I Cor. 9:14) to regulate the life of early congregations. The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul, The use of the Synoptic Tradition in the regulation of early church life, Oxford, 1971; F. F. Bruce, "Paul and the Historical Jesus," BJRL, 56 (1974), 326 ff.

dominated much contemporary scholarship<sup>44</sup> is to exclude as unhistorical whatever in the gospels appears to echo the kerygma. Consequently, such scholarship tends to prove what was already taken up by the adoption of the methodological principle: namely, that there was no essential link between the historical Jesus and the kerygma. The result is to leave a rather wide gap between Jesus and the kerygma, and accordingly also between Jesus and Paul. It is assumed on the one hand that the life and teachings of Jesus could not have decisively anticipated the kerygma, and on the other that the

---

<sup>44</sup>N. Perrin, Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus, 1967, pp. 39-43; R. H. Fuller, The Foundation of New Testament Christology, 1965, pp. 18, 116; M. D. Hooker, "Christology and Methodology," NTSt, 17 (1970/71), pp. 480-487; D. G. A. Calvert, "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic words of Jesus," NTSt, 18 (1971/72), 209 ff.; J. Jeremias, The Prayers of Jesus, Naperville, 1967, pp. 108-115; H. K. McArthur, "Basic Issues: A Survey of Recent Gospel Research," in Interpretation, 18 (1964), 39-55, Reprinted in New Theology, No. 2, ed. by M. E. Marty and D. G. Peerman, New York, 1965 and in In Search of the Historical Jesus, ed. by H. K. McArthur, pp. 139-144; F. G. Downing, The Church and Jesus, Naperville, 1968, p. 113; N. A. Dahl, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," in Kerygma and History, E.T. and ed. by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville, New York, 1962, pp. 138-171, Reprinted in In Search of the Historical Jesus, ed. by H. K. McArthur, New York, 1969, pp. 131-138; R. S. Barbour, Tradition-Historical Criticism of the Gospels; Some comments on current methods, London, 1972 (Studies in creative criticism, 4, Part I); C. H. Dodd, History and the Gospel, London, 1938.

early church's preoccupation with the kerygma precluded any real interest in the historical Jesus. Since historical scholarship must reckon seriously with the possibility that the kerygma of Jesus was influenced by the tradition of Jesus, the attempt to exclude on principle every kerygmatic idea or allusion is a begging of the question. In this respect the question of methodology in the study of the gospels stands in need of reconsideration.

With respect to Pauline research, one of the major problems pertaining to the relation of Paul and Jesus involves the question of the origin of his theology, i.e., the extent to which his thinking was influenced by hellenistic ideas. There are probably few scholars who would deny such influences on Paul,<sup>45</sup> but scholars are rather sharply divided

---

<sup>45</sup>A. Schweitzer, Paul, pp. 73, 179-236; idem, Mysticism, pp. 52 ff.; H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, London, 1913; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, Grand Rapids, 1965 (1st ed., 1921), pp. 255-290; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1955 (1st ed., 1948), p. 89 f.; idem, "Paul and Judaism," in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. by J. P. Hyatt, New York, 1965, pp. 178-182; M. Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," Israel, ed. by M. Davis, New York, 1956, pp. 79-80; W. G. Kümmel, "Jesus und Paulus," NTSt, 10 (1964), 173-175; Kümmel says: Paul depends upon both apocalyptic and rabbinic Judaism (but not Hellenistic) and departs from them as his dependence on the Christian kerygma requires. D. E.

as to the extent of these influences. On the one hand, there are those who maintain that hellenistic influences affected only the form of Paul's preaching and teaching, but not its essential content which remained dependent finally upon that which he had received from the Jewish-Palestinian church which had stood nearest to the historical Jesus.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, others argue that the decisive influence upon Paul was exercised by Hellenistic Christianity. Paul remained essentially untouched by Jewish-Palestinian Christianity. Hence he remained wholly independent of the historical Jesus in the development of his kerygma. And the influences of the hellenistic cult-piety and cult-mysticism on his faith explain his apparent disinterest in the historical Jesus, including Jesus'

---

H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, Philadelphia, 1964; H. J. Schoeps, Paul, London, 1961; F. C. Grant, Roman Hellenism and the New Testament, Edinburgh and London, 1962; van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem? London, 1962; G. Bornkamm, Paul, E.T. by D. M. G. Stalker, New York, 1971; J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, London, 1959.

<sup>46</sup>A study in which this viewpoint is given through treatment is Johannes Leipoldt's Jesus und Paulus--Jesus oder Paulus, Leipzig, 1936. Leipoldt makes extensive concessions to the theory of hellenistic influences, and argues that the needs of Paul's Gentile mission required the accommodation of his message to his hearers, but that employing hellenistic ideas and categories he nevertheless remained a faithful disciple and interpreter of Jesus.

teachings. Except for the cross, Paul has no interest in the life of Jesus and is not determined in his theology by it. Bultmann, in contrast to some of the earlier representatives of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule, sees that Paul radicalized to some extent the hellenistic ideas. Nevertheless, Bultmann pointed to the affinity of Paul's literary style with the Stoic diatribe.<sup>47</sup> Some maintained Paul's doctrine of the 'corporate body,'<sup>48</sup> and others held that Paul's natural theology and his concept of conscience was rooted in Stoicism.<sup>49</sup> But the inadequacy of these arguments was urged, respectively, by E. Best,<sup>50</sup> B. Gärtner<sup>51</sup> and C. A. Pierce.<sup>52</sup>

However, the more modern view is that

---

<sup>47</sup>R. Bultmann, Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe, Göttingen, 1910.

<sup>48</sup>Cf. W. L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge, 1939, p. 161.

<sup>49</sup>E. Norden, Agnostos Theos, Leipzig, 1913.

<sup>50</sup>E. Best, One Body in Christ, London, 1955, pp. 83 ff.

<sup>51</sup>B. Gärtner, The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation, Uppsala, 1955, pp. 133-169.

<sup>52</sup>C. A. Pierce, Conscience in the New Testament, London, 1955, pp. 16 ff.

everything, or almost everything, in early Christianity can be explained as being derived either from the kind of Jewish apocalypticism represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls or from the kind of Gnostic thought reflected in the writings criticized by the early church Fathers or found at Nag-Hammadi in Egypt. Here we deal with W. Schmithals who took a fresh look at the problem of Jesus and Paul from the perspective of his recent research into early Christian Gnosticism.<sup>53</sup>

Schmithals claims that the Apostle tells us nothing about Jesus' life or teaching and quotes no saying that can with certainty be considered characteristic.<sup>54</sup> Schmithals has made several

---

<sup>53</sup>Schmithals describes gnostic view of the historical Jesus: "Die gnostische Tradition verwirft den historischen Jesus, weil sie den Menschen Jesus überhaupt zugunsten des Pneuma-Christus verwirft. Sie bestreitet die Identität von Jesus und Christus. Paulus aber bekennt gerade die Menschheit, die Fleischlichkeit, das 'Daß' der Historizität Jesu, also die Identität von Jesus und Christus, und ignoriert lediglich den historischen Jesus, und auch diesen ja nicht grundsätzlich. Diese gleichsam gespaltene Einstellung zu der Menschlichkeit und Historizität Jesu, lässt sich aus gnostischen Traditionen nicht erklären." "Paulus und der historische Jesus," ZNW, 53 (1962), p. 152.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 146; H.-W. Kuhn also sustained Schmithals' approach in his recent article, "Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus als traditions-geschichtliches und theologisches Problem," ZTK, 67 (1970), 295-320.

attempts to solve the problem: (1) that Paul did not wish to know the historical Jesus. Schmithals maintains that II Cor. 5:16 which is the most important passage for the problem, is a gloss inserted later. In fact, says Schmithals, it expresses the Gnostic heresy that Paul is attacking in the letter. Probably one of Paul's Gnostic opponents at Corinth wrote the words in the margin and they were later copied into the letter.

Schmithals argues that v.17 follows on well after v.15 and (taking Bultmann's interpretation of Paul's meaning here) that v.16 does not fit into the argument. He also regards II Cor. 3:17 and 18b as Gnostic glosses;<sup>55</sup> (2) that Paul knew nothing or practically nothing about Him; that Paul's attitude was not unique in early Christianity.

Schmithals finds that Christian literature until Justin, and much of the writing between the time of Justin and Irenaeus, manifests a position similar to Paul's with regard to the Jesus of

---

<sup>55</sup>W. Schmithals, "Zwei gnostische Glossen im Zweiten Korintherbrief," Die Gnosis in Korinth, 1965, pp. 286 ff.

history.<sup>56</sup> For that reason the problem is not uniquely Pauline, nor can a solution be found solely in his theology. Therefore, Schmithals claims a new approach to the problem: "Statt 'Paulus und der historische Jesus' heisse sie dann: 'Die Urchristenheit und der historische Jesus', und das Problem wäre geblieben."<sup>57</sup>

According to Schmithals, our Gospels and earlier tradition concerning the historical Jesus have the character of a definitely apocryphal literature.<sup>58</sup> It was hidden, not in the sense that the Church wished to keep it secret, but it was not proclaimed as was the message of the cross and resurrection. As the matter now stands, therefore, one cannot affirm that the Pauline kerygma is legitimate because the historical continuity between the Jesus of history and the post-Easter community has been proved. On the other hand, if Paul's

---

<sup>56</sup>Schmithals also finds that not only does Paul ignore the tradition about the historical Jesus, but also the rest of the New Testament writings (apart from the Synoptics) show the same lack of interest. "Kein Streit um des Kaisers Bart. Zur Diskussion über das Bekenntnis zu Jesus Christus," EVK, 2 (1970), 76-82.

<sup>57</sup>Schmithals, "Paulus und der historische Jesus," ZNW, 53 (1962), 153-157; H.-W. Kuhn, op. cit., pp. 297-298.

<sup>58</sup>Schmithals, *Ibid.*, p. 157.

preaching of Jesus was and is valid and produced faith, the foundation was not the proof that the historical Jesus and risen Lord are identical. Instead, the event (das *Dag*) and not the content (das *Was*) of the historical existence of the risen and glorified Christ formed the foundation of Christian preaching.<sup>59</sup> Thus, Schmithals, following Bultmann, asserts that Paul knew only the fact of Jesus and His crucifixion as the basis of his kerygma.

However, H.-W. Kuhn's conclusion is slightly different from that of Schmithals. Q, for Kuhn, represents a Christology which emphasized Jesus' announcement of the coming judgment. The positive attitude toward the Gentile mission and the "Son" Christology expressed in Lk. 10:22 and Mt. 11:27 prove that the redaction of this source was completed in the Greek speaking Hellenistic Church. Here Kuhn holds that we have a Christology (like the Theios Anēr Christology)<sup>60</sup> which is not

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 159.

<sup>60</sup>Kuhn holds that the disciples and Apostle saw Jesus as a hellenistic 'Θεῖος ἄνθρωπος' who triumphs as a martyr. He attempts to prove it with the miracle stories of MK. 4-6 and the 'Signs-sources' of John. Kuhn, op. cit., p. 305.

concerned with the passion but rather with the continuity between the earthly Jesus as preacher of wisdom and the present-day community.<sup>61</sup> When Paul combats the 'wisdom' of his adversaries in I. Cor. 1-3, he is not opposing the words of the earthly Jesus but only those representatives of this Christology who seem to be moving in the direction of Gnosticism.<sup>62</sup>

But Kummel criticizes these views. "It is very questionable whether we can, starting from the presupposition that Paul was inadequately instructed concerning the views of the Gnostics, establish also a genuine gnostic Christology on the part of the opponents in Corinth."<sup>63</sup> He also

---

<sup>61</sup>Kuhn, *Ibid.*, pp. 309-310; H. Windisch, in his book Paulus und Christus, 1934, "stellt Paulus und Jesus in unmittelbarer Analogie nebeneinander, weil beide zum religionsgeschichtlichen Typus des θεῖος ἀνὴρ gehören." Windisch understands both Jesus and Paul in terms of passion. E. Güttgemanns, Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr, Göttingen, 1966, pp. 13-14.

<sup>62</sup>Kuhn, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

<sup>63</sup>Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament (E.T. by A. J. Mattill), 1965, p. 202; For the opponents in Corinth, see C. K. Barrett, "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians," NTSt, 17 (1971), 233-254, Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism, 1973, pp. 41-42, R. McL. Wilson, "How Gnostic Were the Corinthians?" NTSt, 19 (1972), 65-74; *Idem*, Gnosis and the New Testament, 1968, p. 54

holds that it is extremely unlikely that the glosses (II Cor. 5:16, 3:17, 18b) of Paul's opponents could have crept into the letters unnoticed.<sup>64</sup>

Further we do not need to assume that it is a gnostic interpretation. There seems to be no manuscript evidence for it being a gloss and it can be understood as fully Pauline. Munck's criticism of Schmithals' methods is more scornful: "The author of this book lacks historical training-- Schmithals' book is a striking proof of the decline of exegetic research since the 1930's."<sup>65</sup> R.

McL. Wilson says that Paul adopts a Hellenistic cosmogony and terminology only to oppose Gnosticism and to interpret Jesus' authority over the Gnostic 'powers'; the Apostle rejects the gnosticizing interpretation.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup>Kümmel, op. cit., p. 211; For further full discussion of Schmithals' methods, see E. Yamauchi, op. cit., p. 41 f.

<sup>65</sup>J. Munck, "The New Testament and Gnosticism," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, ed. by W. Klassen and G. Snyder, 1962, p. 152.

<sup>66</sup>R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, London, 1958, pp. 75-80, 108; Idem, Gnosis and the New Testament, Oxford, 1968, p. 144; Cf. F. G. Bratton, "Continuity and Divergence in the Jesus-Paul Problem," JBL, 47/48 (1929), 158.

It becomes clear that the two more or less mutually exclusive views of the origin of Paul's theology and the problem of the historical relationship between Jesus and Paul have an important bearing upon the problem of the place of the historical Jesus in the kerygma. In this respect, however, all this is somewhat hypothetical unless it can actually be demonstrated from the epistles that the historical Jesus, so far as he can be known from the gospels, actually did or did not play a constitutive role in Paul's theology. A mere collection of biographical facts about Jesus from the Pauline epistles as such is inconclusive for this purpose. The mere fact that Paul knew something about Jesus does not prove that he took him seriously in his theological endeavor. It must actually be shown in the whole context of Paul's theology that Jesus played a determinative part.

The burden of proof would appear to lie upon those who maintain the hypothesis of the dependence of Paul upon Jesus. For Paul can assert that he is not an apostle through men, and that he did not receive his gospel through the mediation of men, but through the revelation of

Jesus Christ (Gal. 1:1, 11 f.).<sup>67</sup> In the same context he also insists on his apostolic independence of the original disciples of Jesus. While it should be recognized that such isolated statements in a particular historical context are not in themselves a conclusive argument for the independence of Paul from Jesus, a thoroughgoing demonstration of the contrary is demanded.<sup>68</sup>

Furthermore, one must honestly face the fact that Paul so seldom appeals to a saying of Jesus in any of his theological arguments, and when he does it is never in theologically decisive matters, e.g., on the question of the law.<sup>69</sup> The fact that Paul's ethical admonitions sometimes echo those of Jesus is also in itself inconclusive.<sup>70</sup> Even when agreements between the teachings

---

<sup>67</sup>See F. F. Bruce, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1974, pp. 27-39; H. N. Ridderbos, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1958, pp. 43-46.

<sup>68</sup>For further discussion of this statement, see H. N. Ridderbos, Paul and Jesus, Grand Rapids, 1958, pp. 43-46; J. Y. Lee, The Problem of the Historical Jesus in Paul (Unpublished Thesis for Th. M. degree, the Graduate School of Yon Sei University) Seoul, 1965, pp. 67-83.

<sup>69</sup>D. L. Dungan, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul, Oxford, 1971, pp. 140-142, particularly p. 150, n. 2.

<sup>70</sup>Schoeps, Paul, p. 56; K. Tominomori, "Historical Jesus in Paul's Epistles," Christian Studies, Doshisho University, Kyoto, 15 (1938), 1-20.

of Paul and Jesus are admitted,<sup>71</sup> the decisive issue is still the relationship of Paul's Christ-faith to the historical Jesus, the place of the latter in the kerygma.

On the other hand, conservative theology since the days of Paret has indeed also been aware of the problem of Paul's apparent indifference to the historical Jesus. However, the question remains whether it has adequately demonstrated its contention of the inseparability of Paul's Christ-faith from the historical Jesus. The usual argument of conservative theology has been that Paul's lack of interest in the historical Jesus, is to be explained from the great importance which Paul has attributed to the risen Christ as the result of his conversion experience. One thinks of Machen's statement that the center of Paulinism is not imitation of the earthly Jesus, but communion with the risen Christ. C. A. A. Scott insisted that Paul's indifference to Jesus was not the result of a lack of knowledge so much as

---

<sup>71</sup>cf. Bultmann even acknowledges that Paul is one with Jesus in emphasizing the demand of love as the fulfillment of the law and the essence of Christian life. Faith and Understanding, pp. 223.

a lack of interest in the subject, although he still maintains that the Christ whom Paul claims to know is the Jesus of the Gospels.<sup>72</sup> Yet this is essentially what Bultmann also contends, and he finds therein substantiation for his view that the historical Jesus was little more than a pre-supposition for the kerygma. Inasmuch as the problem of Jesus and Paul is as much historical as it is theological, the issue becomes particularly acute therein.

In the conservative solutions to the problem of Jesus and Paul, the revelation in Jesus Christ has historical objectivity. The life of the historical Jesus, both his teaching as well as his activity, are a revelation of God. But this revelation is not understood primarily in terms of ideas about God or as a concept of religion, but

---

<sup>72</sup>cf. The view of some of the conservative interpreters (e.g., Paret, Machen, Kittel, 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. 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 its probable content. Heitmüller, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus," ZNW, XIII (1912), 322.

as the revelation of God himself in history. But because this revelation has become objective in an historical event, it is the object of human understanding and can be expressed in rational concepts. There is thereby also the possibility of a legitimate development and growth in the comprehension of the meaning and significance of the event of revelation.

Hence, in terms of the problem of Jesus and Paul, the differences between Jesus and Paul can be understood in terms of such a historic progression in understanding of the significance of the event of revelation.<sup>73</sup> That is to say, also, that the revelatory significance of Jesus transcends what he may have expressed in his own self-consciousness. This is particularly true of the cross and resurrection, about which Jesus himself only gave a few intimations.<sup>74</sup> The full

---

<sup>73</sup>Cf. G. Vos, Biblical Theology, Grand Rapids, 1948, p. 15 f.

<sup>74</sup>J. Blank saw Jesus' resurrection as a center of revelational event. He deals with the kerygma of I Cor. 15:1-11 and the theological problem of the Jesus' resurrection and he examines Paul's calling as the revelational basis of his relation to Christ, of his apostolate and his theology (I Cor. 15:8-10, 9:1-3; Gal. 1:11-16; Phil. 3:6-11). Paulus und Jesus, Eine theologische Grundlegung, München, 1968, p. 327.

significance of what Jesus said and did does not come to light until after his death and resurrection when the church began to reflect on these things in the light of its individual and collective experience of the redemptive reality of God.<sup>75</sup>

Accordingly, Scott, for example, understands Paul's thought as an unfolding of the meaning of Jesus Christ for faith, conditioned by the historical conditions under which Paul lived and his own unique experience of the revelation of God in Christ. The validity of Paul's gospel is therefore dependent not on the extent to which he exactly reproduces the message or the religion of Jesus, but on the extent to which he rightly unfolds the total meaning of the event of revelation. The "rightness" of his interpretation finds its confirmation for Scott in a twofold way: in the measure in which Paul accords with the mind of Christ in which the meaning of revelation is already anticipated; and in the measure in which his interpretation is confirmed by the collective experience of the church. The fact that Paul so faithfully

---

<sup>75</sup>A. Fridrichsen pointed out that the apparent discrepancy depends on the difference of the situations before and after Easter and Pentecost, The Root of the Vine, 1953, p. 47.

reproduces the essential mind of Christ in spite of differences of time and situation is for Scott the evidence of the working of the Holy Spirit.

However, this solution to the problem of history and revelation is unacceptable both to the mystical as well as the existential interpretations of the Christian faith. For by thus objectifying revelation in history, the Christian faith again appears to be made dependent upon the results of historical research. If God is indeed transcendent he cannot be reduced to the historically "given," to one historical fact among others. History is only the realm of the contingent and the transitory. God cannot be known through historical facts as such. Revelation can only take place in direct encounter with God in which historical existence is negated and transcended, and the recipient of revelation is freed from history. There is no revelation which occurs objectively as such, but only that which occurs subjectively for me. Hence, Paul's faith is not dependent upon his knowledge of Jesus as an historical event of the past. Paul's theology is not the result of reflection upon an objective event of revelation in the light of certain religious experiences. His theology is rather

the attempt to express what he has experienced subjectively as revelation. Thus for D~~ie~~ssmann Paul's theology is the reflex of his experience of being "in Christ"; for Bultmann it is the explication of faith's self-understanding.<sup>76</sup> What is important to faith, therefore, is not the historical Jesus, but the experience of Christ as a contemporaneous event of salvation. Both Bultmann and D~~ie~~ssmann presuppose the historical factuality of Jesus, but the historical Jesus himself is not determinative for faith. Accordingly, the validity of Paul's gospel is not dependent strictly speaking on his relationship to the historical Jesus or on the extent to which he reproduces his mind.

It is clear from the above discussion that the theological problem of the relationship of history and revelation is crucial for the problem of Jesus and Paul. How does God reveal himself in History?<sup>77</sup> What is the connection between the historical Jesus and our understanding and

---

<sup>76</sup>See Bultmann's essay on the nature and task of the New Testament Theology, in Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II, E.T. by K. Grobel, New York, 1955, pp. 237-251.

<sup>77</sup>Cf. J. Baillie, The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought, London, 1956; W. Pannenberg, Revelation as History, E.T. by D. Granskou and E. Quinn, London, 1969.

apprehension of revelation? Bultmann's complete exclusion of the objective aspect of revelation appears to be ontologically unacceptable, for it absolutizes the ontology of the natural sciences and threatens to dissolve the Christian faith into existential philosophy. On the other hand, conservative theology needs to come to grips more decisively with the relationship of the subjective and objective in revelation.

However, theological considerations should not be permitted to dictate the answers to the historical problem of Jesus and Paul. Since the theological is inextricably involved with the historical, neither can be neglected. It is to Bultmann's credit that he has so forcefully raised again the problem of history and revelation. However, the impulse has come primarily from his demands for a de-mythologization of the kerygma rather than from his treatment of the problem of Jesus and Paul. The latter has been strangely neglected in contemporary discussions of the problem of revelation and history. The discussions have been carried on primarily from theological and philosophical perspectives. Hence a re-opening of the problem of Jesus and Paul might

prove salutary and assist in the clarification of the problem of the relationship of revelation and history.

## CHAPTER II

### SUGGESTIONS FOR AN APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF JESUS AND PAUL

A study of the problem of Jesus and Paul ought to begin with a careful consideration of Paul's own understanding of his relationship to Jesus. This involves the theological problem of the place of the historical Jesus in the Pauline kerygma. Expressed in its broadest form, it is the question of how Paul related himself in his total existence as a Christian and an Apostle to the Jesus of history. This is the theological problem of Jesus and Paul as distinguished from the historical. The latter involves the actual historical relationship of Paul to Jesus, i.e., the extent of his actual dependence upon the teaching of Jesus and the facts of his life, the source or sources from which he derived his knowledge of Jesus, and the extent to which he actually reproduces or agrees with the teachings of Jesus.

Our survey of the history of the problem shows that the theological and historical aspects

are closely interrelated, yet it is important from the viewpoint of methodology to distinguish between them. Considerable confusion in the discussion of Jesus and Paul has resulted from the failure to distinguish clearly between theological and historical problems. On the one hand, scholars have been tempted to answer the theological problem primarily on the basis of Paul's historical relationship to Jesus without really coming to grips with Paul's own understanding of his relationship to Jesus. As a result, Paul's claim to be a follower of Jesus has been affirmed or disputed simply upon the basis of his knowledge, or lack of knowledge of the historical Jesus and the extent to which his teachings actually agree with those of Jesus. On the other hand--and this is true particularly of conservative theology--scholars have been tempted to answer the historical problem primarily on the basis of Paul's understanding of his relationship to Jesus, without really coming to grips with the historical problems involved in Paul's claim to be a follower of Jesus.

Purely from the standpoint of scientific scholarship, it seems desirable to begin with a thorough consideration of Paul's understanding of

his relationship to Jesus. Paul ought to be given a fair hearing before he is judged by subjective standards of what constitutes an adequate relationship to Jesus. Only by a thorough consideration of Paul's understanding of his relationship to Jesus will it be possible to account for his seeming indifference to the teachings of Jesus and the apparent freedom with which he develops his theological ideas. While such a study will not solve the historical problems connected with Paul's relationship to Jesus, it may serve to cast them in a quite different light from that in which they have often been viewed.

In view of what has already been said about the importance of the problem of history and revelation for the problem of Jesus and Paul, it seems desirable also to consider Paul's understanding of his relationship to Jesus in the wider context of his views on revelation. The significance of the phrase to Paul's understanding of his own relationship to Christ as well as that of all believers is expressed in his oft repeated formula "in Christ." For Paul the whole Christian life may be summarized as a life in Christ. Everything that the believer has and is, he has and is in Christ.

In Christ believers are sons of God (Gal. 3:26), new creatures (II Cor. 5:17); in him they have eternal life (Rom. 6:23), redemption and forgiveness (Col. 1:14; Eph. 1:7), sanctification (I Cor. 1:2); in him they are justified (Gal. 2:17), partakers of the promise (Eph. 3:6), recipients of grace (Eph. 1:6).<sup>1</sup> To be in Christ, therefore, is to be a part of the hidden purpose of God for the redemption of the world, revealed in the sending of his Son into the world and now proclaimed in the gospel of the crucified and risen Jesus; it is to participate in the new age, the new reality which had entered history in Christ and which is now overcoming the powers of sin and death and making all things new; it is to belong to the new people of God who by the gift of the Holy Spirit share in the invisible life of the crucified and risen Christ. .

Thus the present life of the believer in Christ, his fellowship with the risen Christ,

---

<sup>1</sup>We have accepted the usual Epistles of Paul as genuine, although the debate still continues concerning the authenticity of the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians. Cf. E. Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbrief, Lund, 1946; C. L. Mitton, The Epistle to the Ephesians; its authorship, origin, and purpose, Oxford, 1951.

involves the subjective realization of that which was revealed and accomplished in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. On the one hand, the believer has died and been raised with Christ, dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus (Rom. 6:5-11; Cf. Col. 3:1 ff.). Paul can say, "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me" (Gal. 2:20). We have died with Christ to share his risen life. On the other hand, this involves the necessity of a continual subjective realization of the death and resurrection of Christ in the believer in a putting to death of the deeds of the body (Rom. 8:13), a crucifixion of the flesh with its passions and desires (Gal. 5:24), a putting-off of the old man and a putting-on of the new (Eph. 4:22, 24), a walking by the Spirit so that the fruits of the Spirit may be manifest in us (Gal. 5:16-25). The old self must die in order that the life of Christ may be formed in us (Cf. Gal. 4:19).

This subjective realization of what was accomplished in Christ is also expressed by Paul in other ways. The true destiny of man was revealed and accomplished in the life of the man Jesus. Through the obedience of the one man, Jesus

Christ, the realm of sin and death inaugurated by the first man, Adam, is broken, so that Christ becomes the head of a new humanity in which the creation-purpose of God for man is fulfilled (Rom. 5:12 ff.). But this true manhood revealed and wrought in Christ is to find its realization in the body of Christ, the church. Through the various gifts and ministries of the Holy Spirit, the body grows and upbuilds itself in love until we attain to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ (Eph. 4:1 ff.).

This entire process has an eschatological character. The complete realization and fulfillment of what was revealed and wrought in Christ awaits the consummation and end of history in his return in glory. We are redeemed and justified in Christ, but the full realization and manifestation of what this means for us is yet to come (Cf. Rom. 8:23; Gal. 5:5). We have been raised with Christ, yet our present life is hid with Christ in God until we shall appear with him in glory (Col. 3:1-4). Then shall we know fully, even as we are already known (I Cor. 13:12). The gift of the Holy Spirit is the earnest--the foretaste and guarantee--of the salvation prepared for us (II Cor. 5:5; Eph. 1:13-14).

Accordingly, Paul understands revelation as a historical process in which the redemptive purpose of God objectively disclosed in Christ is being subjectively realized and unfolded in the life of the believer as well as in the whole of history through the church as the body of Christ (Eph. 3:1-13). The historical process for Paul has a teleological oneness in God's purpose in Christ to redeem the world. But this purpose remains hidden even as it is revealed, until the full meaning of the historical process is disclosed in the consummation and attainment of its goal. Then the sons of God will be set free from ~~its~~ <sup>their/</sup> bondage to decay and will obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. 8:18-25). The revelation of the presence of God in the historical manifestation of Christ moves toward its realization and fulfillment in the transformation and renewal of the old creation until the full reality of God is manifested in the redemption of the world. Thus the believer awaits the full disclosure and attainment of his life in Christ in the future. Yet this hope is grounded in the faith that the reality of God, the new creation, has entered history in Christ, so that it is now possible through the Holy Spirit to participate in the living reality

of the risen Christ as an earnest of the salvation to be revealed.

Thus it becomes clear that Paul's faith as well as his kerygma is inextricably rooted in the historical revelation of Christ (Gal. 1:12). The life of the believer as a life in Christ is grounded in the total manifestation of Christ, both as the man Jesus and as the glorified and risen One. While the life in Christ involves fellowship with God in the risen Christ, this fellowship and participation in the redemptive purpose of God receives its concrete content from the life of the man Jesus. In fact, one may say that fellowship with the risen Christ is also a fellowship with the true man Jesus, whose life, death, and resurrection is continually being reproduced by the Holy Spirit in the members of his body, the church, of which he is the head.

The manner in which Paul relates the content of the new life in Christ to the life of Jesus is expressed in a variety of ways in addition to those already indicated. The sonship which we have in Christ Jesus is realized in us by the Holy Spirit when we cry "Abba Father" (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6). The realization of this sonship implies

the perfect obedience and submission of the Son to the Father, exemplified by his prayer in the garden of Gethsemane: "Abba, Father . . . not what I will, but what thou wilt" (Mk. 14:36). To walk by the Spirit means to bear the fruits of the Spirit. Concretely, in the life of the church, this means the bearing of one another's burdens in order to fulfill the law of Christ, the law of love, which was supremely realized and fulfilled in the life and death of Jesus (Gal. 6:2). The Christians in Philippi are exhorted by Paul to live lives of selfless and humble service and so have among themselves the mind which they have in Christ Jesus, the mind expressed in the life of the humble servant who became obedient unto death and was therefore exalted by God (Phil. 2:1-11).

Furthermore, Paul understands the suffering and persecution resulting from the exercise of his ministry in the world as a participation in the suffering of Christ (II Cor. 1:5), as a carrying in his body the death of Jesus so that the life of Jesus might be manifested in his body (II Cor. 4:10), as a sharing of Christ's ministry of suffering on behalf of his body, the church (Col. 1:24). By no means least of all, Paul also shares Christ's

ministry of reconciliation (II Cor. 5:18 ff.).

The mission of the body of Christ in the world is a participation in and continuation of the mission of the early Christ. th/

With regard to the ethical dying and rising of the believer, it is scarcely the case that Paul arbitrarily ethicized the historical cross and resurrection of Christ, or that he arbitrarily used them as symbols for what took place ethically in the new life of the believer. Rather, for Paul, the dying to sin and living to God, to which the Christian is to be conformed, is the reproduction of what took place in the entire life of the man Jesus. The cross and resurrection of Jesus are the actual result and climax of a life which was perfectly a dying to sin and a living to God, a perfect putting to death of the self through obedience to the will of God and of service to others. This is to suggest that in Paul's mind the death and resurrection of Jesus were never isolated from his entire earthly life, and that without a knowledge of that life the full significance of the cross and resurrection could not be apprehended.

If this view of Paul's understanding of his relationship to Jesus is correct, many of the

problems relating to Paul's historical relationship to Jesus are clarified. First of all, Paul's seeming indifference to the historical Jesus needs to be qualified. Obviously Paul's primary interest in Jesus is not to be understood in terms of an interest in a body of teaching or in a religious ideal. Conservative scholars like Paret and Feine rightly observed that Paul's dependence upon Jesus was not primarily that of a pupil upon a teacher, but rather that of the redeemed upon the Redeemer, who was the source and goal of his life. Paul as a Christian is wholly dependent upon the total manifestation of Christ, whose life is being continually re-formed not only in Paul, but in the church as his body.

Secondly, it indicates the untenability of the dogma of Paul's independence of the historical Jesus, as if the former's interest in the kerygma or his preoccupation with the risen Christ precluded any interest in the historical Jesus. Paul's faith is rooted in history and in the historical manifestation of Christ. Any sharp differentiation between the risen Christ and the earthly Jesus would have been inconceivable to Paul. As the risen and exalted Christ, he entered a new phase

of his redemptive activity. But the risen Christ was the earthly Jesus, and the work of the Risen One is always interpreted in terms of his historical life and work.

In his epistles Paul was obviously not concerned to establish the historical basis of faith in any detail. He was writing to Christians whose faith had already been established by the facts of Jesus' life and teaching. He was rather concerned about the life and the problems of the church, and so to expound and explain the implications of the continued presence of God in the church. In order to do this he refers constantly to the archetypal presence of God in the historical manifestation of Christ. But he refers mainly to the cross as the point in which the perfect obedience of the true man was most clearly exhibited and consummated.

Furthermore, it must also be maintained that the assumption of conservative theology that Paul's preoccupation with the risen Christ overshadowed his interest in the historical Jesus fails to do justice to the fact that Paul's experience of being in Christ is inseparably related to the life of the man Jesus. But it is not here

merely a question of the origin of salvation, but the life-story of the man Jesus is continually reproduced in the life of the believer as well as in the life of the church as the body of Christ. In effect, the life-story of the true man Jesus, without ceasing to be historical, becomes contemporaneous through the work of the Holy Spirit for every believer as the story of his own life.

As to the question of hellenistic influence upon Paul, any decision as to the extent of that influence must be left to detailed historical research. However, there would appear to be implications for this problem in the view of revelation and history here set forth in connection with the study of Paul. It may be said that Jesus and Paul belong together in spite of rather obvious differences of environment, education, experience, and personality--not because they share a common cultural heritage or a common understanding of human existence, but rather by virtue of the common goal which they serve in the realization of God's purpose in history. The historical differences between Jesus and Paul do not mean their incompatibility. In some respects, Jesus and Paul

lived in two different worlds; yet they are held together by their common participation in the one purpose of God for the redemption of the world.

Yet it may legitimately be asked whether Paul was faithful to the intention of Jesus, whether he faithfully reproduced the mind of Christ. A certain basic agreement between the teachings of Jesus and Paul can be ascertained, as the work of even a radical critic such as Bultmann shows. However, the fact that this need not involve an identity of ideas becomes apparent when we place the problem in a somewhat wider context. For Paul, the mind of Christ is not simply expressed in the teachings of Jesus or in his message, but is exhibited in his whole life-story. Therefore, the test as to whether any man is faithful to the mind of Christ is not, first of all, the extent to which he can recite his teachings, but whether in the daily relationships of life the mind of Christ is reproduced in the believer in the form of self-sacrificing service and love. It may be said that a true test of the worth of any theology is whether it leads to the upbuilding of the body of Christ in love, whether it is edification to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the

fullness of Christ. In this respect Paul's whole life, as far as it can be known to us, seems to bear witness to his conformity to the mind of Christ, a conformity which bears witness to the reality of God's presence in history.

The problem of Jesus and Paul does not admit to any once and for all solution any more than the question of what Christianity in its essence really is. The latter question is one which every age must take up anew and come to grips with in terms of its own time and situation. The latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sought to do this particularly in its discussion of the problem of Jesus and Paul. One can be grateful for this discussion and humbly be instructed by it, recognizing the provisional character of our own solutions. Contemporary discussions of the nature of the Christian faith have moved in different directions and involve new questions and problems of which the older generations were unaware. Yet it may be suggested that a reconsideration of the problem of Jesus and Paul might contribute to a clarification of the issues.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allo, E. B. Saint Paul Seconde Epître aux Corinthiens. Paris: 1937.
- Anderson, C. C. Critical Quests of Jesus. Grand Rapids: 1969.
- Anderson, H. Jesus and Christian Origins, A Commentary on Modern Viewpoints. New York: 1964.
- Andrews, E. The Meaning of Christ for Paul. New York: 1959.
- Backhaus, G. Kerygma und Mythos bei David Friedrich Strauss und Rudolf Bultmann. Hamburg-Bergstedt: 1956.
- Bacon, B. W. Jesus and Paul. London and New York: 1921.
- Baillie, D. M. God was in Christ, An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. London: 1956 (3rd ed., 1968).
- Baillie, J. The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought. London: 1956.
- Baillie, J. B. "Hegel," ERE, 6, 568-587.
- Barbour, R. S. Traditio-Historical Criticism of the Gospels, Some Comments on Current Methods. London: 1972.
- Barrett, C. K. "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians;" NTSt, 17 (1971).
- Barth, K. Der Römerbrief. Berlin: 1919. E.T. from the 6th ed., 1929, by E. C. Hoskyns. The Epistle to the Romans. London: 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kerygma und Myth, ed. H.-W. Bartsch. E.T. by R. H. Fuller. Kerygma and Myth. Vol. II. London: 1962.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert. Zürich, 1947. E.T. by B. Cozens and J. Bowden, Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century. London: 1972.
- Bauer, W. Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im Ältesten Christentum. Tübingen, 1934. E.T. and ed. by R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel, from the 2nd German ed. (1964), Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. Philadelphia and London: 1971.
- Baur, F. C. "Die Christus-Partei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der Ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom.," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie, 4 (Tübingen, 1831), 61-206. c/l.c./
- \_\_\_\_\_. Programma: Ueber die Rechtfertigungslehre Andr. Osianders, in der Epistola Gratulatoria ad D. Theophilum Jakobum Planck. Tübingen: 1831.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Stuttgart: 1845. 2nd ed. Ed. E. Zeller. 2 Vols. Leipzig, 1866-67, and revised by A. Menzies. Paul, The Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings. London and Edinburgh: 1873 (1st ed.), 1876 (2nd ed.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältnis zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung. Tübingen: 1847.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung. Tübingen: 1852.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Ursprung und Charakter des Lukas Evangeliums, etc.," TJ (1846).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte. Tübingen: 1853. 2nd rev. ed., 1860, and 3rd ed., 1863.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte. 1st ed., Stuttgart: 1847. 2nd ed., Tübingen: 1858.

\_\_\_\_\_. Geschichte der christlichen Kirche. Erster Band. Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, Dritte Ausgabe, Tübingen: 1863. E.T. from the 3rd ed., by Allan Menzies, The Church History of the First Three Centuries. 2 Vols. London: 1878/79.

\_\_\_\_\_. Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie, published posthumously by F. C. Baur's son, F. F. Baur. Leipzig: 1864.

Beare, F. W. "Jesus and Paul," CJT, V (1959).

Beasley-Murray, G. R. "A Century of Eschatological Discussion," ExT, LXIV (1953).

\_\_\_\_\_. Jesus and the Future. London: 1954.

Bentham, J. Not Paul, But Jesus, published in London under the pseudonym of "Gamaliel Smith," 1823.

Best, E. One Body in Christ. London: 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology. SNTSM, 2, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. London: 1972.

Beyschlag, W. Das Leben Jesu. Zwei Bände. Halle: 1886.

\_\_\_\_\_. Neutestamentliche Theologie, oder Geschichtliche Darstellung der Lehren Jesu und des Urchristentums nach den neutestamentlichen Quellen. 2 Bde. Halle: 1891/92. 2nd ed., 1896. E.T. by N. Buchanan, New Testament Theology, or historical account of the teaching of Jesus and of primitive Christianity according to the New Testament sources. 2 Vols. Edinburgh: 1895. 2nd English ed., 1896.

Biedermann, A. E. "Strauss und seine Bedeutung für die Theologie," Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze. Berlin: 1885.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Christliche Dogmatik. 1869. 2nd ed.,  
Zürich: 1881/84 (2 Vols.).
- Black, M. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second  
Adam," SJT, 7 (1954).
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. New  
York: 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Survey of Christological Thought 1872-  
1972: The Croall Centenary Lecture.  
Edinburgh: 1972.
- Blank, J. Paulus und Jesus, Eine theologische  
Grundlegung, Studien zum Alten und Neuen  
Testament 18. München: 1968.
- Bleek, F. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 4th ed.  
Berlin: 1886.
- Bornkamm, G. "Glaube und Vernunft bei Paulus,"  
GesAuf, II.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus von Nazareth. Stuttgart: 1960. E.T.  
by Irene and Fraser McLuskey with J. M.  
Robinson, Jesus of Nazareth. London: 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paul. E.T. by D. M. G. Stalker. New York:  
1971.
- Bousset, W. "Noch einmal Jesus und Paulus,"  
Zeitschrift für den evang. Religionsunterricht,  
XIX (1907/08).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des  
Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des  
Christentum bis Irenaeus. 1913. E.T. by cah/  
J. E. Steely, 1970.
- Bowman, J. W. "From Schweitzer to Bultmann,"  
TTod, XI (1954).
- Braaten, C. E. History and Hermeneutics. Phila-  
delphia: 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Harrisville, R. A. The Historical  
Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ. New York:  
1964.

- Bratton, F. G. "Continuity and Divergence in the Jesus-Paul Problem," JBL, XLVIII (1929).
- Braun, H. "Der Sinn der neutestamentlichen Christologie," Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Tübingen: 1962.
- Bruce, F. F. Paul and Jesus. Grand Rapids: 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul and the Historical Jesus," BJRL, 56 (1974).
- Brückner, M. Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie. Strassburg: 1903.
- Bultmann, R. Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe. Göttingen: 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition. Göttingen, 1921. Zweite Auflage, 1931. E.T. by J. Marsh, The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford: 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus," Glauben und Verstehen, pp. 188-213. Originally published in Theologische Blätter, VIII (1929). E.T. by L. P. Smith, "The Significance of the Historical Jesus for the Theology of Paul," in Faith and Understanding. London: 1966, pp. 220-246.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Geschichte der Paulus-Forschung," TR, Neue Folge, 1 (1929), 26-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments," Glauben und Verstehen. Tübingen: 1933, pp. 245-267. E.T., "The Christology of the New Testament," Faith and Understanding. London: 1966, pp. 262-285.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und Paulus," published in Jesus Christus im Zeugnis der Heiligen Schrift und der Kirche. München, 1936, pp. 68-90. E.T. by S. M. Ogden, Existence and Faith. London: 1961, pp. 217-239.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Neueste Paulus - Forschung," TR, N.F. 1936, pp. 1-22.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Neues Testament und Mythologie," in Kerygma und Mythos, Ein theologisches Gespräch, ed. H.-W. Bartsch. Hamburg: 1948, pp. 15-53. E.T. by R. H. Fuller, Kerygma and Myth, A theological debate. London: 1953, pp. 1-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Theology of New Testament, I, II. E.T. by K. Grobel. New York: 1951, 1955 for Vol. II.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus. Heidelberg: 1960. E.T. by C. E. Braaten, and R. A. Harrisville, in The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ. New York: 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford, 1963.
- Calvert, D. G. A. "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus," NTSt, 18 (1971/72).
- Chadwick, H. (ed.). Lessing's Theological Writings. London: 1956.
- Conybeare, W. J., and J. S. Howson. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. 2 Vols. London: 1850/52.
- Conzelmann, H. "Das Urchristentum," Reformatio, VI (Zürich, 1957), 564-573.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Method of the Life of Jesus Research," in The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ, ed. C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville. New York: 1964.
- Cullmann, O. The Christology of the New Testament. E.T. by S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: 1963.
- Dähne, A. F. Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffs. Halle: 1835.
- Dahl, N. A. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," in Kerygma and History. E.T. and ed. by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville. New York: 1962; reprinted in In Search of the Historical Jesus, ed. H. K. McArthur. New York: 1969.

- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul and Judaism," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. P. Hyatt. New York: 1965.
- Deichgräber, R. Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit. Göttingen: 1967
- Deissmann, A. Paulus, eine kultur-und religions-geschichtliche Skizze, Tübingen: 1911. Zweite Auflage, 1925. E.T. by L. R. M. Strachan, St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History. London: 1912
- Dibelius, M. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. Tübingen: 1919. Zweite Auflage, 1933. E. T. From the 2nd ed. by B. L. Woolf, From Tradition to Gospel. London: 1934
- Dodd, C. H. The Meaning of Paul for Today. London and Glasgow: 1968 (6th edition) 1st ed., 1920
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Parables of the Kingdom. London and Glasgow: 1971 (7th ed.) 1st ed., 1935
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Bible and the Greeks. London: 1935 (reprinted 1954).
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development. London: 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. History and the Gospel. London: 1938
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Testament Studies. Manchester: 1953
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: 1953.
- Downing, F. G. The Church and Jesus. Naperville: 1968.
- Drescher, R. Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus. Giessen: 1900.

- Drower, E. S. The Mandaean of Iraq and Iran, Their Cults, Customs, Magic, Legends, and Folklore. Oxford: 1937.
- Drummond, R. J. The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ. Edinburgh: 1900.
- Duncan, G. S. "From Paul to Jesus," SJT, 2 (1949), 1-12.
- Dungan, D. L. The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. Oxford: 1971.
- Duquoc, C. Christologie. Essai dogmatique. II: Le Messie, Cogitatio Fidei 67; new ed. Paris: 1974; 1st ed., 1972.
- Ebeling, G. Theologie und Verkündigung--Ein Gespräch mit Rudolf Bultmann. Tübingen: 1962. E.T. by J. Riches, Theology and Proclamation. London and Philadelphia: 1966.
- Ellis, E. E. Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids: 1968; 1st ed., 1961.
- Faut, S. Die Christologie seit Schleiermacher, ihre Geschichte und ihre Begründung. Tübingen: 1907.
- Feine, P. Jesus Christus und Paulus. Leipzig: 1902.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Apostel Paulus, Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus: Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2. Reihe, 12. Band. Gütersloh: 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und Paulus," NKZ, XXXVI (1925), 291-323.
- Fichte, J. G. Die Anweisung zum seligen Leben. Jena: 1910; 1st ed., 1806.
- Foerster, W. Gnosis. A Selection of Gnostic Texts. E.T. and ed. by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: 1972.

- Forsyth, P. T. The Person and Place of Jesus Christ. London: 1909; 1961 (9th ed.).
- Fraedrich, G. Ferdinand Christian Baur, der Begründer der Tübinger Schule, als Theologe, Schriftsteller und Charakter. Gotha: 1909.
- Fraser, J. W. "Paul's Knowledge of Jesus: II Cor. 5:16 Once More," NTSt, 17 (1971), 293-313.
- Fridrichsen, A. "The Apostle and His Message," Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus, St. John and St. Paul," The Root of the Vine, The Essays in Biblical Theology by members of Uppsala University. Edinburgh: 1953.
- Fuchs, E. Zum hermeneutischen Problem in der Theologie. GesAuf. I. Tübingen: 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus. Tübingen: 1960. E.T. by A. Scobie, Studies of the Historical Jesus, Studies in Biblical Theology, 42. London: 1964.
- Fuller, D. P. Easter Faith and History. Grand Rapids: 1965.
- Fuller, R. H. Interpreting the Miracles. London: 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London and Glasgow: 1965.
- Furness, J. M. "Behind the Philippian Hymn," ExT, 79 (1968).
- Furnish, V. P. "The Jesus-Paul Debate," BJRL, 47 (1964/65).
- Gärtner, B. The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation. Uppsala: 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas. E.T. by E. J. Sharpe. London: 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Person of Jesus and the Kingdom of God," TTod, 27 (1970).

- Gaffin, R. B., Jr. "Resurrection and Redemption, A Study in Pauline Soteriology." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, 1969.
- Gasque, W. W. "The Historical Value of the Book of Acts. The Perspective of British Scholarship," ThZ, 28 (1972), 177-196.
- Gerhardsson, B. Memory and Manuscript. Uppsala: 1961.
- Gess, W. F. Die Lehre von der Person Christi entwickelt aus dem Selbstbewusstsein Christi und aus dem Zeugnisse der Apostel. Basel und Stuttgart: 1856.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Natur oder Gott ? Christi Versöhnung der menschlichen Sünde, 1862. (In Foundations, The, of our faith. London, 1867.)
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ueber die biblische Versöhnungslehre, 1869.
- Gibbs, J. G. Creation and Redemption, A Study in Pauline Theology, SNT, XXVI, 1971.
- Glasson, T. F. "Two Notes on the Philippians Hymn (II. 6-11)," NTSt, 21 (1974).
- Gloatz, P. "Zur Vergleichung der Lehre Paulus mit der Jesu--zugleich für Bestätigung der johanneischen Darstellung durch Paulus," TSK (1895), 777-800.
- Göschel, K. F. Beiträge zur speculativen Philosophie von Gott, dem Menschen u. dem Gottmenschen, 1838.
- Gogarten, F. Die Verkündigung Jesu Christi. Heidelberg: 1948.
- Goguel, M. L' Apôtre Paul et Jesus-Christ. Paris: 1904.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Life of Jesus. New York: 1933. E.T. by O. Wyon; the other ed. by J. Sibree.
- Grant, F. C. Roman Hellenism and the New Testament. Edinburgh and London: 1962.

- Graß, H. "Schleiermacher-Literatur," TR, 38  
Jahrgang, Heft 3 (1974).
- Gratz, P. A. Neuer Versuch, die Entstehung der drei  
ersten Evangelien zu erklären. Tübingen:  
1812.
- Greig, J. C. G. "The Eschatological Ministry," in  
The New Testament in Historical and Con-  
temporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of  
Macgregor, G. H. C., ed. H. Anderson and W.  
Barclay. Oxford, 1965.
- Günther, E. Die Entwicklung der Lehre von der  
Person Christi im XIX. Jahrhundert.  
Tübingen: 1911.
- Güttgemanns, E. Der leidende Apostel und sein Herr.  
Göttingen: 1966.
- Gunkel, H. Die wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes nach  
der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit  
und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus.  
Göttingen: 1888.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis  
des Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: 1903.
- Haenchen, E. The Acts of the Apostles. E.T. from  
the 14th German ed. (1965), Die Apostelge-  
schichte. Göttingen, by B. Noble and G.  
Shinn, under the supervision of H. Anderson,  
and with the translation revised and brought  
up to date by R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: 1971.
- Hahn, F. Christologische Höheitstitel, Ihre  
Geschichte im frühen Christentum, FRLANT,  
83. Göttingen: 1963. E.T. by H. Knight  
and G. Ogg. The Titles of Jesus in Christology.  
London: 1969.
- Halévy, E. The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism.  
E.T. by M. Morris. London: 1928.
- Hardon, J. A. "The Concept of Miracle from St.  
Augustine to Modern Apologetics," ThSt, 15  
(1954), 229-257.

- Harnack, A. von. Das Wesen des Christentums. Leipzig: 1900. E.T. by T. B. Saunders, What is Christianity? New York: 1901; 1904 (3rd ed.).
- Harris, H. David Friedrich Strauss and His Theology. Cambridge: 1973.
- Harvey, Van A. The Historian and the Believer. New York: 1966; (paperback ed. 1969).
- Hase, K. Geschichte Jesu. Leipzig: 1876.
- Hasert, C. A. Die Evangelien, ihr Geist, ihre Verfasser, und ihr Verhältniss zu einander. Leipzig: 1845. (Published under the pseudonym of Philosophos Alethias.)
- Hegel, G. The Philosophy of History, E.T. by J. Sibree: (Great Books of the Western World, 54.)
- Heitmüller, W. "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus," ZNW, Dreizehnter Jahrgang, 1912, pp. 320-337.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und Paulus. Freundschaftliche kritische Bemerkungen zu P. Wernles Artikel 'Jesus und Paulus'," ZTK, XXV (1915), 156-179.
- Herrmann, W. Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott. Stuttgart: 1886. E.T. and altered in accordance with the 4th ed. of German (1903), by J. S. Stanyon, The Communion of the Christian with God. London: 1895; 2nd ed. New York, 1906.
- Hilgenfeld, A. Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Christentums nebst einem Anhang über das gnostische System des Basilides. Jena: 1857.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und Paulus," ZWT, N.F. 2, 37 (1894), 481-541.
- Hillerbrand, H. J. "The Historicity of Miracles: The Early Eighteenth-Century Debate Among Woolston, Annet Sherlock and West," SR, 3 (1973), 132-151

Holsten, C. Das Evangelium des Paulus. Zweiter Teil. Berlin: 1880 and 1898.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Die christusvision des Paulus und die genesis des paulinischen evangelium," 1861; republished in a collection of Holsten's essays, Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus. Rostock: 1868, pp. 65-114.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Die Bedeutung des Wortes Sarx in Lehrbegriffe des Paulus," 1855; republished in Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus. Rostock: 1868.

Holtzmann, H. J. Die synoptischen Evangelien, Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter. Leipzig: 1863.

\_\_\_\_\_. Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie. 2 Vols. Freiburg und Leipzig: 1897.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Zum Thema, 'Jesus und Paulus'," PM (1900), pp. 463-468.

Hooker, M. D. "Christology and Methodology," NTSt, 17 (1970/71).

Hunter, A. M. Paul and His Predecessors, Hastie Lectures for 1939. London: 1940; new revised ed. with appendix. London: 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Interpreting the New Testament. Philadelphia: 1951.

Jeffrey, J. The Gospel of Paul, the Gospel of Jesus. Edinburgh and London: 1899.

Jeremias, J. "Zu Phil. ii.7: EAUTON EKENOSEN," Nov Test., 6 (1963), 182-188.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Prayers of Jesus. Naperville: 1967.

Jewett, R. Paul's Anthropological Terms--A study of their use in conflict settings. Leiden: 1971.

Jülicher, A. Paulus und Jesus, Religionsgeschichtlicher Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart. I. Reihe, 14 Heft. Tübingen: 1907.

- Jüngel, E. Paulus und Jesus. Tübingen: 1962.
- Kabisch, R. Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus. Göttingen: 1893.
- Kähler, M. Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus. Leipzig: 1892; 2nd revised ed., 1896. E.T. by C. E. Braaten, The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historical Biblical Christ. Philadelphia: 1964.
- Käsemann, E. "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2:5-11," ZTK, 47 (1950), 313 ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen. Bd. I. Göttingen: 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Essays on New Testament Themes, Studies in Biblical Theology 41. E.T. by W. Montague. London: 1964.
- Kaftan, J. Jesus und Paulus, eine freundschaftliche Streitschrift gegen die Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbücher von D. Bousset und D. Wrede. Tübingen: 1906.
- Kant, I. Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone. E.T. and ed. by T. M. Creeve and H. Hudson. Chicago: 1934; original ed., 1793.
- Keim, T. Die Geschichte Jesu von Nazara in ihrer Verkettung mit dem Gesamtleben seines Volkes frei untersucht und ausführlich erzählt. Zürich: 1867/72. E.T. by E. M. Geldart and A. Ransom, The History of Jesus of Nazareth. London and Edinburgh: 1876/83.
- Keller, E., and M.-L. Miracles in Dispute: A Continuing Debate. London: 1969. E.T. by M. Kohl, from the German, Der Streit um die Wunder. Gütersloh: 1968. (Chapter 5 was written especially for the English edition.)
- Kennedy, H. A. A. St. Paul and Mystery Religions. London: 1913.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Theology of the Epistles. London: 1919 [reprinted in 1923, 1928, 1934 and 1948].

Kertelge, K. "Der geschichtliche Jesus und das Christusbekenntnis der ersten Gemeinden," BL, 13 (1972), 77-88.

Kilpatrick, G. D. "ΙΣΤΟΡΗΘΑΙ ΚΗΦΑΝ," in New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson. Manchester: 1959; ed. A. G. B. Higgins, pp. 144-149. Σ/

Kittel, G. "Jesus bei Paulus," TSK, LXXXV (1912), 366-403.

Klausner, J. From Jesus to Paul. E.T. by W. F. Stinespring, from the Hebrew. Boston: 1943.

Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul. New York: 1950.

Knox, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: 1939.

Kölbing, P. Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu auf Paulus. Göttingen: 1906.

Koester, H. H. "Paul and Hellenism," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, pp. 187-195.

Koppe, J. B. Marcus non epitomator Matthæi. Sylloge Commentationum theologicarum, 1782, ed. Pott and Ruperti, Helmstadii.

Kuhn, H.-W. "Der irdische Jesus bei Paulus als traditionsgeschichtliches und theologisches Problem," ZTK, 67 (1970), 295-320.

Kümmel, W. G. "Jesus und Paulus," TB, 19 (1940); reprinted in Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. Marburg: 1965, pp. 81-106.

\_\_\_\_\_. Promise and Fulfillment, The Eschatological Message of Jesus. London: 1957. E.T. by D. M. Barton.

\_\_\_\_\_. The New Testament: The History of Investigation of its Problems. London: 1973. E.T. by S. M. Gilmour and H. C. Kee, from the German ed., 1958.

- \_\_\_\_\_, P. Feine, and J. Behm. Introduction to the New Testament. E.T. by A. J. Mattill, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und Paulus," NTSt, X (1964); reprinted in Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte. Marburg: 1965, pp. 439-456.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments nach seinen Hauptzeugen Jesus. Paulus. Johannes. Göttingen, Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage, 1972. E.T. by J. E. Steely, The Theology of the New Testament. London: 1972.
- Lachmann, C. "De ordine narrationum in evangeliiis synopticis," TSK, 8 (1835).
- Lagarde, Paul de. Ueber das Verhältnis des deutschen Staates zu Theologie, Kirche und Religion. Ein Versuch Nicht-Theologen zu orientieren. Göttingen: 1873.
- Lang, W. "Ferdinand Baur und D. F. Strauss," Preussische Jahrbücher, 160 (1915).
- Lee, J. Y. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus in Paul." Unpublished Th.M. thesis, The Graduate School of Yon Sei University, Seoul, 1965.
- Leipoldt, J. Jesus und Paulus--Jesus oder Paulus. Leipzig: 1936.
- Lessing, G. E. Fragmente des Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenannten. Berlin: 1788.
- Lichtenberger, F. History of German Theology. E.T. and ed. by W. Hastie. Edinburgh: 1889.
- Lietzmann, H., and W. G. Kümmel. An die Korinther I. II, 1949.
- Lohmeyer, E. Kyrios Jesus. Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2:5-11, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. Histor. Klasse, 4. Heidelberg: 1927/28.
- Lüdemann, H. Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre. Kiel: 1872.

- Machen, J. G. "Jesus and Paul," Biblical and Theological Studies, by members of the faculty of Princeton Seminary. New York: 1912, pp. 547-578.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "History and Faith," PTR, XIII (1915), 337-351.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Origin of Paul's Religion. Grand Rapids: 1965; 1st ed., 1925.
- Mackintosh, H. R. Types of Modern Theology. London: 1964.
- Macquarrie, J. Twentieth-century Religious Thought. London: 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Kenoticism Reconsidered," The Charles Gore Memorial Lecture, delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster, on 6 November 1973, TMR, LXXVII (1974), 115-124.
- Marshall, I. H. The Development of Christology in the Early Church. London: 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Christ-Hymn in Philippians 2:5-11," TyB, 19 (1968).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity: Some Critical Comments," NTSt, 19 (1973), 271-287.
- Martin, R. P. Carmen Christi: Phil. 2:5-11, SNTSM, 4, 1967.
- Martyn, J. L. "Epistemology at the turn of the Ages: 2 Corinthians 5:16," Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to J. Knox, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: 1967.
- Marxsen, W. Das Neue Testament als Buch der Kirche, 1966. E.T. by J. E. Mignard, The New Testament as the Church's Book?! Philadelphia: 1972.
- Matheson, G. "The Historical Christ of St. Paul," The Expositor, 2nd Seri. i (1881); ii (1881).

- Meyer, A. Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus? Tübingen: 1907. E.T. by J. R. Wilkinson, Jesus or Paulus, 1909.
- Meyer, G. W. Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffs, 1801.
- Mitton, C. L. The Epistle to the Ephesians; its authorship, origin, and purpose. Oxford: 1951.
- Moore, A. L. The Parousia in the New Testament, SNT, XIII (1966).
- Morgan, W. "The Jesus-Paul Controversy," ExT, XX (1908/09), 9-12, 55-58.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11," Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W. W. Gasque, and R. P. Martin (Presented to F.F. Bruce on his sixtieth birthday). Grand Rapids: 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus in New Testament Kerygma," Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Otto Böcher. Wuppertal: 1970, pp. 15-26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History. London: 1965.
- Munck, J. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. E.T. by F. Clarke. Richmond: 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Testament and Gnosticism," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, ed. W. Klassen, and G. Synder. New York: 1962, pp. 224-238.
- Murphy-O'Connor, O. P., (ed.). Paul and Qumran. London: 1968. J. /
- McArthur, H. K. "Basic Issues: A Survey of Recent Gospel Research," in Interpretation 18 (1964); reprinted in New Theology, No. 2, ed., M. E. Marty, and D. G. Peerman. New York: 1965, and in In Search of the Historical Jesus, ed. H. K. McArthur.
- McCown; C. C. The Search for the Real Jesus. A Century of Historical Research. New York: 1940.

Neander, J. A. W. Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der Christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel, Zweiter Band. Hamburg: 1833.

\_\_\_\_\_. Das Leben Jesu-Christi in seinem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange und seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Sechste Auflage. Gotha: 1862. E.T. by J. McClintock, and C. E. Blumenthal, The Life of Jesus Christ. London: 1851.

Niebuhr, R. R. Schleiermacher on Christ and Religion. London: 1965.

Nietzsche, F. W. The Antichrist. E.T. with an Introduction by H. L. Mencken. New York: 1920. (Originally published in 1895.)

Nösgen, D. "Die apostelische Verkündigung und die Geschichte Jesu," NJDT, 1895, pp. 46-94.

Norburn, C. G. "Kant's Philosophy of Religion: A Preface to Christology," SJT, 26 (1973), 431-448.

Norden, E. Agnostos Theos. Leipzig: 1913.

Otto, R. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. E.T. by F. V. Filson, and B. L. Woolf. Grand Rapids: 1938.

Pannenberg, W. Revelation as History. E. T. by D. Granskou and E. Quinn. London: 1969.

Paret, H. "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," JDT, III, Erstes Heft (1858), 1-85.

Percy, E. Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbrief. Lund: 1946.

Perrin, N. Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus. New York: 1967.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, ihre Grundgedanken und Wirkungen. Leipzig und Berlin: 1910.
- Renan, E. La Vie de Jésus. Paris: 1863; German ed., 1896. E.T. with an Introduction by W. G. Hutchison, The Life of Jesus. London: 1864; 1898.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Saint Paul. Paris: 1869. E.T. by W. M. T. London: 1887/89.
- Resch, A. "Agrapha. Ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente gesammelt und untersucht," TUG, 5, part iv (1889).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis untersucht," TUG, N.F. xii (1904).
- Reuss, E. Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique, 3rd ed., 1864. E.T. by A. Harwood, History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age. 2 vols. London: 1874.
- Ridderbos, H. Paul and Jesus. E.T. by D. H. Freeman. Grand Rapids: 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Paulus. Kampen: 1966.
- Riesenfeld, H. The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginning. London: 1957.
- Ritschl, A. "Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der Kritik der synoptischen Evangelien," TJ (1851), pp. 480-538.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. Bonn: 1850; 2nd ed., 1857.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 3 vols. 1870-74; 1882; 1888. First volume trans. by J. S. Black, A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation. Edinburgh: 1872. Third volume trans. and ed. by H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay. Edinburgh: 1900.

- Ritschl, A. Theologie und Metaphysik. Bonn: 1881.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Geschichte des Pietismus. Bonn: 1880/86.
- Ritschl, O. A. Ritschls Leben. Vol. I. Freiburg: 1892.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ritschl," in RPTK, 17, 22-34.
- Robinson, J. M. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. P. Hyatt. New York: 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kerygma und historischer Jesus. Zürich/Stuttgart: 1967 (2nd ed.).
- \_\_\_\_\_. A New Quest of the Historical Jesus. London: 1971 (7th ed.).
- Roos, F. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu. Ein Blick in den organischen Zusammenhang der neutestamentlichen Schriften. Ludwigsburg: 1887.
- Sabatier, A. L' Apôtre Paul. Strasbourg-Paris: 1870. E.T. by A. M. Hellier. London: 1891.
- Salvatorelli, L. "From Locke to Reitzenstein: The Historical Investigation of the Origins of Christianity," HTR, 22 (1929), 263-369.
- Sanders, J. T. The New Testament Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background, SNTSM, 15 (1971).
- Schaller, J. S. Der historische Christus und die Philosophie. Kritik der Grundidee des Werkes: das Leben Jesu von Dr. Strauss. Leipzig: 1838.
- Schlatter, A. Jesus und Paulus. Stuttgart, Dritte Auflage, 1961.
- Schleiermacher, F. Ueber die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern, 1799. E.T. by J. Oman, from the 3rd ed., On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers. London: 1893; New York: 1958.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhang dargestellt. Halle: 1821. E.T. by D. M. Baillie, et al., and ed. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart, The Christian Faith (trans. from the 2nd ed., 1830). Edinburgh: 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf einleitender Vorlesungen, Zweite Auflage. Berlin: 1830.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hermeneutic und Kritik mit besonderer Beziehung auf das Neue Testament, herausgegeben von Friderich Lücke. Berlin: 1838.
- Schlerse, F. J. "Jesus und Paulus: Hat Paulus Jesus zum Kultgott gemacht?," BK, 26 (1971).
- Schlier, H. Der Brief an die Galater. Göttingen: 1962.
- Schmidt, H. "Baur," in RPTK, Vol. II (1897), 470-472.
- Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Berlin: 1919.
- Schmithals, W. "Paulus und der historische Jesus," ZNW, 53 (1962), 145-160.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zwei gnostische Glossen im Zweiten Korintherbrief," Die Gnosis in Korinth. Göttingen: 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und die Weltlichkeit des Reiches Gottes," EvK, I (1968), 313-320.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Kein Streit um des Kaisers Bart. Zur Diskussion über das Bekenntnis zu Jesus Christus," EvK, 3 (1970), 76-82. n/
- Schmoller, O. "Die geschichtliche Person Jesu nach den paulinischen Schriften," TSK, 1894, pp. 656-705.
- Schneider, E. W. F. C. Baur in seiner Bedeutung für die Theologie. München: 1909.

- Schoeps, H. J. Paul, The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. E.T. by H. Knight. London: 1961. (German ed., 1959.)
- Scholder, K. "F. C. Baur als Historiker," EvT, 21 (1961), 436 ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Herder und die Anfänge der historischen Theologie," EvT, 22 (1962), 425-440.
- Schrader, K. Der Apostel Paulus, in 3 Vols., 1830/33, Vols. 4 and 5 appeared 1935/36.
- Schürer, E. The History of Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, ed. M. Black. Edinburgh: 1973.
- Schweitzer, A. Das Messianitäts--und Leidensgeheimnis. Tübingen und Leipzig: 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung. Tübingen: 1906. c4/  
The Quest of the Historical Jesus, trans. W. Montgomery. London: 1910.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart. Tübingen: 1912. E.T. by W. Montgomery, Paul and His Interpreters, A Critical History. London: 1912.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu. Tübingen: 1913.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus, 1930. E.T. by W. Montgomery, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. London: 1931.
- Scott, C. A. A. "Jesus and Paul," Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day, by members of the University of Cambridge, ed. H. B. Swete. London: 1909, pp. 329-377.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christianity According to St. Paul. Cambridge: 1927.
- Selby, D. J. "Changing Ideas in New Testament Eschatology," HTR, L (1957), 21 ff.

- Skilton, J. H. Book Review of C. C. McCown's The Search for the Real Jesus. A Century of Historical Research, WTJ, III (1940), 180 ff.
- Smith, M. "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," Israel, ed. M. Davis. New York: 1956.
- Soden, H. Von. "Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte," Theologische Abhandlungen, gewidmet Carl von Weizsäcker. Freiburg: 1892, pp. 113-169.
- Somerville, D. St. Paul's Conception of Christ or the Doctrine of the Second Adam. Edinburgh: 1897.
- Stendahl, K. The School of St. Matthew. Philadelphia: 1954; 1968 (2nd ed.).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.). The Scrolls and the New Testament. New York: 1957; London: 1958.
- Stephan, H. "Ritschl," in RGG, IV, 2043-2046.
- Stonehouse, N. B. Origins of the Synoptic Gospels. Grand Rapids: 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "M. Dibelius and the Relation of History and Faith," WTJ, II (1940), 105-139.
- Storr, G. C. De fonte evangeliorum Mt. et Lc., Commentationes Theologicae, ed. J. C. Velthusen. Lipsiae: 1794.
- Strauss, D. F. Streitschriften zur Verteidigung meiner Schrift über das Leben Jesu und zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie. Tübingen: 1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet. Tübingen: 1835/36 (Zwei Bände). E.T. from the 4th ed. by G. Eliot, The Life of Jesus. London: 1898. New edition of Eliot's translation appeared by P. C. Hodgson. London: 1973.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Leben Jesu, für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet, Dritte Auflage. Leipzig: 1874 (1st ed., 1864). E.T. (Authorized translation) 2 vols. A New Life of Jesus. London: 1865.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hermann S. Reimarus und seine Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes. Leipzig: 1862.
- Streiker, L. D. "The Christological Hymn in Philippians II," LQ, 16 (1964) 47-58
- Sturm, W. Der Apostel Paulus und die evangelische Ueberlieferung, Vol. I (1897), Vol. II (1900).
- Suphan, L. B. (ed.). Herder's sämtliche Werke. Herausgegeben von B. S., 1877.
- Talbert, C. H. (ed.). Reimarus: Fragments. London: 1971. E.T. by R. S. Fraser, Lives of Jesus Series, L. E. Keck, General Editor.
- Taylor, V. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London: 1960 (2nd ed.).
- Thomasius, G. Beiträge zur kirchlichen Christologie. Erlangen: 1845.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christi Person und Werk. Darstellung der evangelisch-lutherischen Dogmatik vom Mittelpunkte der Christologie aus, 2 vols. Erlangen: 1853/55, 1887 (3rd ed.).
- Tillich, P. Perspectives on 19th and 20th Century Protestant Theology, Ed. and Intro. C. E. Braaten. London: 1967.
- Titius, A. Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart: Erster Theil, Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes, Freiburg und Leipzig, 1895; Zweite, Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit. Tübingen: 1900.
- Tominomori, K. "Historical Jesus in Paul's Epistles," Christian Studies (Journal of the Society of Christian Studies, Doshisho University, Kyoto, Japan), 15 (1938), 1-20 (\*written in Japanese).

- Trench, R. C. Notes on the Miracles of Our Lord. London: 1850 (3rd ed.).
- Usteri, L. Entwicklung des paulinischen Lehrbegriffes in seinem Verhältnisse zur biblischen Dogmatik des Neuen Testaments. Ein exegetisch-dogmatischer Versuch. Zürich: 1832.
- Van Unnik, W. C. Tarsus or Jerusalem. E.T. by G. Ogg. London: 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_, G. Quispel, and H. C. Puech. The Jung Codex, A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus. Trans. and ed. F. L. Cross. London: 1955.
- Vos, G. The Pauline Eschatology. Grand Rapids: 1930; 1961 (2nd ed.).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Biblical Theology. Grand Rapids: 1948.
- Voysey, C. (ed.). Fragments from Reimarus. Lexington: 1962 (A reprint of the 1879 ed., E.T. anonymously).
- Waterman, L. The Religion of Jesus, Christianity's Unclaimed Heritage of Prophetic Religion. New York: 1952.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. "The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in I Corinthians," SJT, 24 (1971).
- Weidel, K. "Jesus und Paulus," Zeitschrift für den evang. Religionsunterricht, XIX (1907/08), 73-88.
- Weinel, H., and A. G. Widgery. Jesus in the Nineteenth Century and After. Edinburgh: 1914. A translation and revision of Weinel's Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert, by A. G. Widgery. Tübingen and Leipzig: 1904.
- Weiss, B. Das Leben Jesu, Zwei Bände. Berlin: 1882. E.T. by J. W. Hope, The Life of Jesus. Edinburgh: 1883.
- Weiss, J. Die Predigt vom Reiche Gottes, Zweite Auflage. Göttingen: 1900; 1892 (1st ed.).

- \_\_\_\_\_. Paulus und Jesus. Berlin: 1909. E.T. by H. J. Chaytor, Paul and Jesus. London: 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Earliest Christianity, 2 vols. E.T. and edited with a new introduction and bibliography by F. C. Grant. New York: 1959; German ed. Das Urchristentum, 1914.
- Weisse, C. H. Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet, Zwei Bände. Leipzig: 1838.
- Weizsäcker, K. von. Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung. Gotha: 1864; Zweite Auflage. Tübingen und Leipzig: 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche. Freiburg: 1886. E.T. by J. Millar, The Apostolic Age. New York and London: 1894.
- Welch, C. Protestant Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. I, 1799-1870. New Haven and London: 1972.
- Wellhausen, J. Israelitische und Judische Geschichte. Berlin: 1894.
- Wendt, H. H. "Die Lehre des Paulus verglichen mit der Lehre Jesu," ZTK, IV (1894), 1-78.
- Wernle, P. Die Anfänge unserer Religion, 1901; Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Tübingen und Leipzig: 1904. E.T. by G. A. Bienemann, Beginnings of Christianity. New York: 1903.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus und Paulus. Antithesen zu Boussets Kyrios Christos," ZTK, XXV (1915), 1-92.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Philadelphia: 1964.
- Wilke, C. G. Der Urevangelist. Dresden und Leipzig: 1838.

Wilson, R. McL. "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?,"  
NTSt, 19 (1972), 65-74.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Gnostic Problem. London: 1958.

\_\_\_\_\_. Gnosis and the New Testament. Oxford:  
 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Gospel of Thomas. London:  
 1960.

Windisch, H. Paulus und Christus. Ein biblisch-  
 religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich. Unters.  
 zum Neuen Testament 24. Leipzig: 1934.

Wrede, W. The Messianic Secret. Cambridge and London  
 1971. Translated and with an Introduction by  
 J. C. G. Greig, from the German ed., Das  
Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien.  
 Göttingen: 1901.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Task and Methods of 'New Testament  
 Theology', in The Nature of New Testament  
Theology. London: 1973. Edited, translated  
 and with an Introduction by R. Morgan, from  
 the German, Über Aufgabe und Methode der  
sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie.  
 Göttingen: 1897.

\_\_\_\_\_. Paul. Boston: 1908. E.T. by E. Lummis,  
 from the German ed., Paulus, Religions-  
 geschichtliche Volksbücher. Halle: 1905.

Yamauchi, E. Pre-Christian Gnosticism. London:  
 1973.

Zeller, E. Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt  
und Ursprung kritisch untersucht. Stuttgart:  
 1854.

Ziegler, T. "Strauss," in RPTK, XIX, 76-92.