



COVENANT
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Electronic Thesis & Dissertation Collection

J. Oliver Buswell Jr. Library
12330 Conway Road
Saint Louis, MO 63141

www.covenantseminary.edu/library

This document is distributed by Covenant Theological Seminary under agreement with the author, who retains the copyright. Permission to further reproduce or distribute this document is not provided, except as permitted under fair use or other statutory exception.

The views presented in this document are solely the author's.

BULTMANN'S KERYGMATIC THEOLOGY
OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT AND EXISTENTIALISM

by
Kun Sam Lee

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF COVENANT
COLLEGE AND THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF THEOLOGY

Library of
Covenant College

St. Louis, Missouri

May, 1957

Library of
Covenant College

5253

PREFACE

This thesis consists mainly of two parts : one is the analysis of Rudolf Bultmann's New Testament theology and the other a critique in the light of Reformed theology.

The first chapter is introductory showing Bultmann's importance and influence , particularly in Germany and in America. Chapters II- IV are an analysis of Bultmann's books, Theology of the New Testament (2 vols) and his article "New Testament and Mythology" in the book, Kerygma and Myth. The critique is divided into two sections, one on Bultmann's reconstruction, criticizing his form-criticism and mythological view of the New Testament. The other part is devoted to the criticism of Bultmann's existential interpretation in the light of orthodox Biblical interpretation and Reformed theology.

While writing this thesis I have realized very keenly the importance of knowing Bultmann's theology, particularly since an increasing number of articles and books on Bultmann are appearing these days, as more attention is being paid to him.

My deep appreciation is due to Dr. R.Allan Killen for his class lectures and his suggestions and corrections with regard to my thesis. It is through his kindness that

I was able to accomplish it. I would also like to express my warm appreciation to Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., Dr. R. Laird Harris, and Dr. Wilber Wallis for what I learned in their classes this semester. They have contributed many insights which I have been able to use in answering Bultmann's misinterpretation of the New Testament.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
CHAPTER I Bultmann's works and his position in Modern theology	1
1. Bultmann's life and his works	1
2. Bultmann's position in Modern theology	3
CHAPTER II Kerygma	17
3. Introduction	17
4. The message of Jesus	25
5. The Kerygma of the earliest Church	39
6. The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church	50
Chapter III Kerygma and Theology	81
7. The theology of Paul	81
8. The theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles	118
CHAPTER IV Kerygma and Myth	141
9. The necessity of Demythologization of the New Testament	143
10. Demythologization	153
Chapter V Critique	167
11. Bultmann's reconstruction	167
12. Bultmann's interpretation	185
13. Conclusion	233
BIBLIOGRAPHY	235

CHAPTER I

BULTMANN'S WORKS AND HIS POSITION

IN MODERN THEOLOGY

1..Bultmann's life and his works.

Rudolf Karl Bultmann was born on August 20th, 1884, at Wiefelstede, Oldenburg, Germany, and was a Member of a minister's family. He studied at the Universities of Tubingen, Berlin, and Marburg. After a short time of teaching at the Universities of Breslau and Giessen, he was registered as a private teacher at the University of Marburg, and he became professor of New Testament as a successor to Heitmuller in 1921 at the University of Marburg.

Rudolf Bultmann is now seventy-two years old. He was already retired from the University six years ago, in 1951, and is now professor Emeritus. He lives in a hillside villa overlooking the lazy river Lahn, napping in his book crammed study or limping through his grounds with his wife and daughter. "He does not look like," Time reports, "an intellectual tornado, but in Germany where ideas are apt to detonate like buzz bombs, sending shock waves through university faculties, students, cafes and editorial rooms, the ideas of Rudolf Bultmann have set off a major furor. In American seminaries Rudolf Bultmann, the Lutheran, is best known as one of the founders of the Form-criticism, the widely accepted method of analyzing the

Bible in terms of the forms - homilies, didactic methods, and story-telling devices - used by those who wrote down and compiled the Gospels." ¹ Back in 1941 Professor Rudolf Bultmann, then in the chair of New Testament studies at the University of Marburg, published an article, "New Testament and Mythology", in Kittle, since then that has grown into continental theology's biggest controversy and coined its most disputed word "Demythologization."

Bultmann is the author of many important works on various subjects, some of which have stimulated world-wide interest and discussion. Among them are:

Der Begriff der Offenbarung im Neuen Testament,
Tubingen, 1928.

Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition,
2te. Aufl., 1931.

Glauben und Verstehen, 1933

Jesus (Jesus and the Word), New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Das Evangelium des Johannes, 1941 (2nd ed., 1950).

Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der Antiken Religionen,
1941.

Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Stuttgart, 1947.

Theology of the New Testament, New York: Scribner's
2 Vols., 1951 & 1955.

"New Testament and Mythology" Kerygma and Myth,
ed. by H.W. Bartsch,
trans. by R.H. Fuller.
London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

Essays - philosophical and theological,

New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting,
New York: Living Age, 1956.

He is also the author of several of the most important articles in Kittle's Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Neuen

¹

Time, September 24, 1956, p. 56.

Testament. He is editor of Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testament, a distinguished series of monographs on Biblical subjects---published as separate books---and editor of the theological journal, Theologische Rundschau.

2. Bultmann's position in Modern Theology.

Bultmann taught at the University of Marburg in the field of New Testament until 1951, and has represented the free thinking tradition of the theological faculty of Marburg. It can be said that Bultmann belongs to the radical-critical wing of German Bible scholarship. But he became famous because he developed new critical perspective ways.

The history of Bible criticism in Germany has passed through different phases. It actually began about the time of the enlightenment in the eighteenth century, though it was only later that we find the existence of particular schools, under the influence of changing times, in which the principle thoughts of the enlightenment in the field of the Bible scholarship were developed and applied. There was the so-called Tübingen school, of which Bauer was the father, and which was strongly influenced by Hegelianism. Later followed the liberal schools--Holtzman, Marnack, Meitmatter, and others--which schools continued influential right down into the twentieth century.

Bultmann is a well-known pioneer of the so-called Form-Criticism born of ^{the} Tübingen school. His development of the Kerygma, the well developed form of Martin Kahler, can be described as the most recent achievement in New Testament scholarship during the period between the two great world wars. His achievement in New Testament scholarship is to reestablish the Kerygma and make it acceptable by interpretation. Bultmann accuses his fellow theologians of "Ostrich-like behaviour." In his opinion the theologians are content to repeat the Kerygma as it stands, ignoring the fact that it is embedded in the language and thought forms of first century mythology, of both Jewish apocalyptic and Hellenistic gnostic mythology. Neither of these is acceptable to man nurtured on modern scientific thinking, and therefore the Kerygma is rejected along with the myth. Bultmann would, therefore, conserve the Kerygma and he says, "If the truth of the New Testament proclamation is to be preserved, the only way is to 'Demythologize' it.... The liberal theologians of the last century were working on the wrong lines. They threw away not only the mythology but also the kerygma itself.... The last twenty years have witnessed a movement away from criticism and a return to a naive acceptance of the Kerygma,... Our task today is to use criticism to interpret it."²

²
E. W. Bartsch, Kerygma and Myth, London: S.P.C.K. 1954, p. 10, 12.

Bultmann proposes an interpretation in terms of existentialist philosophy and says, "Myth should be interpreted not cosmologically, but anthropologically, or better still, existentially.... Myth is an expression of man's conviction that the origin and purpose of the world in which he lives are to be sought not within it but beyond it...., hence the importance of the New Testament mythology lies not in its imagery but in the understanding of existence which it enshrines."³ This program has evoked a theological storm in Germany comparable to the bombshell of Karl Barth's Epistle to the Romans in 1918. No one concerned with the problem of Communication can afford to ignore Bultmann's challenge for, as Time reports,⁴ in Germany Bultmann's ideas are sending shock waves through all intelligent people.

The British theologian H. R. Mackintosh classes Bultmann as one of the Barthians and says: "Bultmann is the well-known New Testament scholar of Marburg, and was one of Barth's early allies like Thurneysen, Brunner, and Gogarton."⁵ Evidently, Karl Barth also was educated at the Universities of Berlin, Tubingen, and Marburg.

³ Ibid., p. 10,11.

⁴ Time, September 24, 1956, P. 56.

⁵ H. R. Mackintosh, Types of Modern Theology. London: Nisbet, 1954, P. 272.

Carl Henry says, "Bultmann is an early German Champion of the reactionary theology,"⁶ among the new theologians of crisis who have found their inspiration in Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855), who had reacted violently to the Hegelian atmosphere of Denmark by championing the qualitative uniqueness of God and the supra-rational and paradoxical nature of faith. One of Barth's ablest critics, the distinguished professor of Systematic Theology at the Free University of Amsterdam, Dr. G. C. Berkouwer, in his book The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth--one of the very few long and thorough going analyses of Barth's theology in English--mentions Bultmann in connection with Barth's significance today in modern theology saying: "Recently it was suggested that the influence of Barth was gradually yielding to that of the New Testament scholar, Rudolf Bultmann, whose 'Demythologization' of the New Testament has occasioned so much discussion.... It would doubtless therefore be a serious error to underestimate the response that Bultmann has found, because problems associated with the interpretation of the New Testament continue to stand in the forefront of theological interest." He continues, "but it cannot be denied that the many questions and problems posed by Barth determine the whole of the contemporary theological

⁶ Carl Henry, Fifty Years of Protestant Theology, Boston: W. A. Wilde, 1950, P. 34.

situation more decisively than Bultmann's views do. The discussion centering around the (important!) question whether Bultmann's 'demythologizing' conception still leaves room for a trustworthy kerygma is overshadowed by the comprehensive theological problems posed by Barth.⁷ Tillich, however, regards Bultmann in his systematic theology, Part III (Class syllabus-unpublished) as more important than Barth and he says, "The little article of Prof. Bultmann in Marburg, called 'The Demythologization of the New Testament'...has appeared and is the most consistent confirmation of this sentence from the side of the leading New Testament scholar in Europe. Demythologization: this means, showing what, in the New Testament, is myth and symbol, and what is problematic, probable or not probable, historical report. Now this attempt was of the greatest consequence, and the result is that today it is not Karl Barth who is the center of all discussion in Europe, but Rudolf Bultmann, whom you heard here a few months ago."⁸ Therefore, we can realize that Bultmann becomes "a storm center" of European Protestantism, particularly, in the field of New Testament theology today.

⁷ G. C. Berkouwer, The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956, p.9.

⁸ Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology, Part III, p. 99 (mimeographed.)

The importance of Bultmann's theology extends further because of the influence of existentialism upon his theological thought. Herman Ridderbos, the distinguished Dutch New Testament scholar exposes ^{this} clearly saying, "Still we must earnestly reckon with the possibility that this new view is representative of the theological development of the twentieth century just like rationalistic, romantic and idealistic theological streams were characteristic of earlier times. Existential philosophy is characteristic of the view of life held by many in our time. The fact that Bultmann attaches himself to that Philosophy and that his theology is entirely governed by the existential philosophical view of man, very largely explains the violent attacks which have fallen upon him. It is worthwhile to give attention to Bultmann even in a wider consideration than that of the circle of theologians. Bultmann's theology is typical of our time, in view of the fact that he works both in the realm of modern life and also in the territory where philosophical and theological traditions find their focus. He does this with exceptional ability and therefore we must not speak lightly of his influence. Bultmann's theology is a challenge to orthodoxy and also, in a certain sense, to the free thinkers... It is at least certain that Bultmann's appearance means a sharper presentation of the old contrast between free thinking and Bible thinking and is therefore something

that cannot be passed by lightly."⁹ The free thinkers receive in Bultmann's theology a new and greater concept of free thinking since he discards all of the older forms and presents free thinking in a radical new presentation. Bultmann very largely reproduces Heidegger's existentialist philosophy. Karl Barth recognizes this and says, "Augustine spoke in New-platonic, Thomas in Aristotelian, F. C. Bauer and Beidermann in Hegelian terminology, as Bultmann is now speaking in the language of Heidegger." And further Barth points out the danger that a philosophical system is the basis of Bultmann's theology and says, "His association with Existentialism, however, has, for Bultmann, fundamental significance."¹⁰

Heidegger is the central figure in the development of the purely philosophical side of the movement of Existentialism. He is not only profoundly influenced by Kierkegaard, and one of the main vehicles of Kierkegaard's influence upon the modern world, but Heidegger is one of the main points of contact of the New and Old Existentialism with theology proper. James Brown brings out this contrast between Barth and Bultmann as he says, "His (Heidegger's) is the influence which Karl Barth seeks to eliminate from his own theology in successive editions

⁹ Herman Ridderbos, Thinkers of our Time, part of it translated by Dr. A. Allan Hillen in his class Syllabus.

¹⁰ Berkouwer, Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Barth, p. 20.

of the Dogmatic; and his is the concealed influence which critics of Rudolf Bultmann detect behind his attempts to combine philosophical elements with a theology of the Word."¹¹ Brown continues: "The theologian who stands nearest to Heidegger and borrows most assistance in his exposition of the Christian stand-point from Heidegger is Rudolf Bultmann. Bultmann's special position is that theology differs from philosophy by occupying itself with believing human existence. He shares Heidegger's methodological presuppositions, believing that a pre-theological philosophical ontology must seek for the concepts which will express the being of human existence, as far as possible, with neutral concern for the nature of the object or thing itself."¹² John MacQuarrie writes, "The first part (of Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament) considers Heidegger's analysis of 'unauthentic existence' in relation to Bultmann's exposition of the New Testament teaching on 'man without faith'. ... The second part is concerned with Heidegger's idea of an 'authentic existence' in relation to Bultmann's exposition of the Christian life as a 'new understanding of the self'."¹³ Further he says, "Bultmann understands the term soma as roughly equivalent

¹¹ James Brown, Subject and Object in Modern Theology, New York: Macmillan, 1955, p. 86.

¹² Ibid., P. 103.

¹³ John MacQuarrie, An Existentialist Theology, New York: Macmillan, 1955, P. XI.

to Heidegger's concept "Dasein" (Being-in-the-world), and as implying the concept of existence in the sense in which Heidegger expounds it."¹⁴ Heidegger remarks that theology seeks a more original interpretation of the being of man in relation to God, drawn from the meaning of faith itself and remaining within it.

Bultmann has taken up this challenge. Before proceeding to the interpretation of what is contained in the Christian faith, he has paused to examine the presuppositions of theological thinking. And he has come to believe that these presuppositions are clarified and secured by a philosophy of the existentialist type, for "existentialism is a philosophy of being."¹⁵ Existentialism claims that it is not a speculative philosophy, but an analysis of that understanding of existence which is given with existence. The influence of existentialism upon Bultmann's theology is not an external influence like that of a Metaphysical system. It is an intrinsic influence, and it is the influence of a pre-theological or ontological inquiry into the idea of being which he assumes into his theology.

In the Epilogue to his book Theology of New Testament, when speaking about the task and problems of

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 239.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 8.

New Testament theology (the relation between theology and proclamation), Bultmann himself says: "there can be no normative Christian dogmatics, that it is not possible to accomplish the theological task once for all. Theology's continuity through the centuries consists not in holding fast to once formulated propositions but in the constant vitality with which faith, fed by its origin, understandingly masters its constantly new historical situation. It is of decisive importance that theological thoughts be conceived and explicated as thoughts of faith, that is: as thoughts in which faith's understanding of God, the world, and man is unfolding itself."¹⁶ "Theological propositions can never be the object of faith, the theological thoughts of ^{the} New Testament are the unfolding of faith itself growing out of that new understanding of God, the world, and man which is conferred in and by faith--or, as it can also be phrased: Out of one's new self-understanding. For by the believer's new 'understanding' of himself we, of course, do not mean 'understanding' as in a scientific anthropology which objectifies man into a phenomenon of the world, but we do mean an existential understanding of myself which is at one with and inseparable from my understanding of God and the world.

16

Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of N. T., Vol. 2, P.237.

For I am I, of course, not as an isolable and objectifiable world-phenomenon but I am I in my particular existence inseparably bound up with God and the world. Faith is man's response to God's word which encounters him in the proclamation of Jesus Christ. It is faith in the Kerygma, which tells of God's dealing in the man Jesus of Nazareth.¹⁷

Here we clearly see his existential thinking about faith and theology. The following sentences explain the relation between Kerygma and theology: "Kerygma is just what theology can never seize in definite form; it can always take hold of it only as something conceptually stated, and that means as something already theologically interpreted. Faith can be nothing else but the response to the kerygma, and that kerygma is nothing else than God's word addressing man as a questioning and promising word, a condemning and forgiving word..." but, "that the kerygma never appears without already having been given some theological interpretation rests upon the fact that it can never be spoken except in a human language and formed by human thought. This very fact confirms its kerygmatic character; for it makes clear that the statements of the

17

Ibid., P. 238,9.

kerygma are not universal truths but are personal address in a concrete situation. Hence they can appear only in a form molded by an individual's understanding of his own existence or by his interpretation of that understanding.¹⁸

The kerygma is understandable as kerygma only when the self-understanding awakened by it is recognized to be a possibility of human self-understanding and thereby becomes the call of decision.¹⁹ For orthodoxy, the theological statements are utterances of ^{the} Scriptures conceived as authoritative and are regarded as the object and content of faith, but Bultmann says, "orthodoxy misunderstands both kerygma and faith."²⁰ According to him the clarification of self-understanding in its reference to the kerygma is the task of the New Testament theology.

As Heidegger remarks, "Theology seeks a more original interpretation of the being of man in relation to God, drawn from the meaning of faith itself and remaining within it."²¹ Bultmann follows Heidegger at this point when he makes theology center in the question of man's existence. The basic constitution

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 240, 241.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 241.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 243.

²¹ Lacquarrie, An Existentialist Theology, p. 8.

of the being of man, according to Heidegger, is being-in-the-world. Through his existential analytic, Heidegger seeks to show the structure of the being of man, and how his being differs from the being of objects in nature, and must be differently understood and described. Bultmann approaches theology with the question of human existence in the forefront of his thought.²²

Thus, Bultmann accepts existential philosophy as the foundation of his theology and its philosophic presuppositions always take their toll.²³ But we should remember that when philosophy becomes the center of a theology, there are three perils. First, preoccupation with a secular philosophy. The employment of this in the interpretation of the Christian faith may easily lead to the distortion of Christian teaching through the overemphasis of those elements in it which happen to be specially congenial to the philosophy concerned. Second, ideas quite foreign to Christianity may slip into the theology while masquerading under the guise of traditional Christian terminology. Finally, there may be a definite accommodation of the Christian faith to

²²

Ibid., p. 14.

²³

Berkouwer, Triumph of Grace in Barth's Theology, p. 21.

the prevailing philosophical fashion of the age.

It is really important to investigate the kerygmatic theology of Bultmann today, centered as it is in existential philosophy, and challenging as it does, Orthodox Christianity, and to expose its errors.

CHAPTER II

KERYGMA

3. Introduction

What about Jesus as an historical person? What significance has Jesus for faith as an historical reality? Many conflicts have arisen concerning the biblical picture of Jesus and a good number of scholars have denied that we have any history of Christ. Criticism^{has} varied from moderate to radical points of view, but on one point the critics agree: "Namely, that the Gospels are intended, not to teach the humanity of Jesus in a faith-founding sense, but to sketch the Christ as pictured in the early Church -- a picture indicative of the arch-belief of the Christian Church but in no respect biographical."¹

In this situation a change took place in New Testament research, namely, that the Gospel witness, the witness of faith, was no longer accorded à priori disqualification. It was Martin Kähler in particular who, in the confusion of historical research, pointed the way to the Kerygma. He wrote a book called "Der Sogennante Historische Jesus und der Geschichtliche Biblische Christus" (The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historical Biblical Christ) in 1892. In this book he considered the problem of writing a biography of Christ and maintained that there was not sufficient material in the New Testament upon which to base any proper biography, because it lacked

¹ G. E. Berkouwer, The Person of Christ, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954, P. 32.

the psychological analysis that modern biography requires, as well as the slow developing of his religious genealogy, the breaking forth of his moral independency, and the rising and lighting up of his messianic consciousness. The thesis of this book is that "there is actually no proper history of Christ and that we have only the so-called historical Jesus: We do not have reliable sources on the life of Jesus. It is impossible to get behind the witness of the Gospels to the history of Christ himself. We can not go from the Biblical Christ to the historical Jesus."² What are the Gospels then? They are 'testimonies of faith' which are not intended to give us the biography of Christ and the history of Jesus, but rather to generate faith in us. They are the 'Urkunde' (document) upon which preaching is based. The Kerygma, or message, of the New Testament is the faith of the Church in Christ and is given in order to produce faith in us, and this historical faith is the only sense in which we have an historical Christ. Faith is no longer contingent upon historical research. One can simply listen to the preaching about this biblical Christ.

2

Dr. R. Allan Killen's translation from Martin Kahler

The earlier historical approach thus stands discredited by the idea of "testimony". Therefore as Dr. G. E. Berkouwer says, "without exaggeration it can be said that the basic theory of Kahler has been, and is still, very influential."³

Kähler's original theory is echoed in Brunner and Paul Tillich. Brunner is "eager to think and speak positively in line with the New Testament Kerygma."⁴ Tillich "wholeheartedly adopted the Kerygmatic view of the New Testament."⁵ Kähler's view of the Kerygma, however, was developed and made famous actually, by Rudolf Bultmann. In his book, "Theology of the New Testament", Bultmann says, "The Message of Jesus is the presupposition for the theology of the New Testament rather than a part of that theology itself."⁶

³ G. E. Berkouwer, Person of Christ, P. 54

⁴ Ibid

⁵ R. A. Killen, Ontological Theology of Paul Tillich Kampen: Kok, 1956, P.23

⁶ Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I, P. 5.

Jesus proclaimed the message as a Jewish teacher and a prophet. Jesus never had the concept of being the Messiah himself, but it was "taken up by the early Church and expressed in their proclamation of Jesus as Messiah."⁷ Jesus formerly had been the "bearer of the message",⁸ but he was drawn into the message and became its essential content.⁹ "The Proclaimer became the Proclaimed", in other words, Jesus proclaimed the message, but the Church proclaims Him".¹⁰ This is the Kerygma, proclaiming Jesus Christ -- specifically Jesus Christ the Crucified and Risen One -- to be God's eschatological act of salvation. Jesus was first so proclaimed in the Kerygma of the earliest Church, not in the message of the historical Jesus himself. Thus, Bultmann assumes the Kerygma as the presupposition of the theology of New Testament, and the New Testament begins with the Kerygma of the earliest Church. Bultmann also mentions another Kerygma, that of Hellenistic Church and says it is "the historical presupposition for Paul's theology."¹¹

⁷ Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, New York: Meridian Books 1956, P. 93.

⁸ Theology of N. T., P. 33.

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Primitive Christianity, P. 93.

¹¹ Theology of N. T., P. 63.

Christian missionary preaching in the Gentile world could not be simply the Christological Kerygma; rather, it had to begin with the Proclamation of the One God -- monotheism. Jewish and Jewish-Christian opinion held that the one true God was unknown to the Gentile world, and it was actually true that the Christian mission first reached those classes in which Polytheism was still a living force. "In this process the Old Testament - Jewish Concept of God is frequently modified or obscured by the concept of God from the Greek philosophical tradition, a concept determined by the idea of the law and order of the Cosmos."¹² As a result, Hellenistic Christianity was not a unitary phenomenon, but, taken by^{and} large, a remarkable product of syncretism.^{12a} Bultmann names the Christian Hellenistic missionary preaching, developed in this syncretism, the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church.

Bultmann's Kerygmatic theory is next related to the Pauline and Johannine Theologies.

Standing within the frame^{work} of Hellenistic Christianity Paul raised theological motifs to clarify the theological thinking of the Hellenistic Church. Thus the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church was the presupposition

¹²
Theology of N.T., P. 65.

^{12a}
Primitive Christianity, P. 177.

of Paul's Theology and Paul became the founder of a Christian theology built upon^a Hellenized Kerygma of the early Church. Because Paul's Theology originated in Hellenistic Judaism, he came into contact with Hellenistic culture and became acquainted with^{the} popular philosophy and phenomena of religious syncretism. Not having been a personal disciple of Jesus, he was won to the Christian faith by the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church.¹³ "In relation to the preaching of Jesus", Bultmann says, "the Theology of Paul is a new structure, and that indicates nothing else than that Paul has his place within Hellenistic Christianity."¹⁴

The Gospel of John with which the Epistles of John are closely connected, is separated, both from the proclamation of Jesus, and from that of the oldest Church because it is "stylistically and historically a completely different picture"¹⁵ from the Synoptics. Bultmann then makes a further distinction and says, "While in the synoptics the vicissitudes, the problems,

¹³
Ibid, P. 187.

¹⁴
Ibid, P. 187.

¹⁵
Ibid, Vol. 2, P. 4.

and the faith of the earliest Church are reflected, scarcely anything of the sort can any longer be discovered in John."¹⁶ ^{The} Only reflection from the synoptics in the Gospel of John is the conflict with Judaism, and its theme is faith in Jesus as the Son of God. Bultmann sees no relation between John and Paul, but says, "Since John is somewhat remote from the earliest Church, he is likely younger than Paul; but he does not presuppose Paul as a link between himself and the earliest Church".¹⁷ There are certain things in common in regard to the current religious atmosphere between John & Paul, but "John is not of the Pauline school and is not influenced by Paul; he is, instead, a figure with his own originality and stands in an atmosphere of theological thinking different from that of Paul."¹⁸ The thought-atmosphere out of which the Johannine Theology grew is that of Oriental Christianity.¹⁹ And its style is Semitic poetry and the motif of the self-presentation of the Revealer is introduced by the characteristic formula "I am...", "Revelation-discourse."

¹⁶

Ibid, P. 5.

¹⁷

Ibid, P. 6.

¹⁸

Ibid, P. 9.

¹⁹

Ibid, P. 10.

However, the Stylistic form of the Revelation-discourses expresses a basic dualistic view: light and darkness, truth and falsehood, above and below, freedom and bondage. Bultmann calls this Gnostic-dualism and says, "The person of Jesus, in John, is sometimes defined in terms of Jewish and Apocalyptic Categories, sometimes as the 'Lord' of the Cultus, as a mystery deity, sometimes again as the Gnostic redeemer, the Pre-existent being from the heavenly world, whose earthly body is only an outward garb."²⁰ Thus, that Primitive Christianity is the outcome of Syncretism, is his view. Further details on the message of Jesus, the Kerygma of the earliest Church and the Hellenistic Church, and the theology of Paul and Johannine will be discussed in the following chapters.

20

Primitive Christianity, P. 178.

4. The Message of Jesus

Theological thinking -- that is the New Testament thinking -- begins with the Kerygma of the earliest Church and not with the Message of Jesus. Bultmann says, "The Message of Jesus is a presupposition for the theology of the New Testament rather than a part of that theology itself."¹ But the fact that Jesus had appeared and the message he had proclaimed, were among its historical presuppositions; and for this reason Bultmann does not omit it from his theology of the New Testament, even though he believes that Christian faith did not exist until there was a Christian Kerygma. When he considers the message of Jesus, he sees the Synoptic Gospels as the source. He applies historical criticisms to the Synoptic Gospels and says, "Their use as history is governed by the so-called two source theory: i.e., Mark (which we know, however, only in a later redaction) is one source of Matthew and Luke; the other is a collection of Jesus' sayings (Q). Furthermore, throughout the synoptics three strands must be distinguished: Old tradition, ideas produced in and by the Church, and editorial work of the evangelists."² Thus Bultmann builds his theology of the New Testament on the theory^{of} form-criticism.

¹
Theology of the N.T., Vol. I, P. 3.

²
Ibid, P. 3.

a. The Eschatological Message of Jesus

The message of Jesus is controlled by an eschatological concept of the Reign of God. In this he stands in line with Jewish eschatology in general, though clearly not in its nationalistic form. Bultmann says, "No saying of Jesus mentions the Messiah-King who is to crush the enemies of the People (of Israel), nor the lordship of Israel over the earth, nor the gathering of the twelve tribes, nor the joy that will be in the bounteous peace-blessed Land. Rather Jesus' message is connected with the hope of other circles which is primarily documented by the Apocalyptic literature, a hope which awaits salvation not from a miraculous change in historical (i.e., political and social) conditions, but from a cosmic catastrophe...."³ According to Bultmann, the eschatological hope in the message of Jesus is taken from the pessimistic Jewish concept of dualism -- the Satanic corruption of the total world-complex in which the world's present course is under the sway of Satan and his demons on one hand, and of the coming of the "Son of Man" as judge and saviour, and the agent of redemption, on the other hand. But unlike, the Apocalyptic writers, Jesus does not give much detail. He is free from the fanciful speculation found in Apocalyptic writings.

³

Ibid., P. 4.

"Only a few details of the Apocalyptic picture of the future recur in his words," says Bultmann, "Everything is swallowed up in the single thought that then God will rule."⁴

If Jesus takes over the apocalyptic view of the future, he does so with considerable reductions. The unique feature in his teaching is the assurance with which he proclaims that Now the time has come. The Reign of God is breaking in; the time of the End is at hand. The signs of the times are Jesus Himself, his appearance in the stage of history, his words, and his deeds. All man can do is to be ready, to 'turn'. Now is the time of decision. Jesus' preaching is a summons to decision. (Matt. 11:6; Luke 7:23; 11:31f.; Mark 8:38). "Basically, therefore," says Bultmann, "he in his own person is the sign of the time. Yet... He does not proclaim himself as the Messiah, i.e., the king of the time of salvation, but he points ahead to the Son of Man as another who will come other than himself. He in his own person signifies the demand for decision,... as God's last word before the End, calls men to decision. Now is ... either ... or!"⁵

Now is the existential moment and the decision must be

⁴
Ibid, P. 5.

⁵
Ibid, P. 9.

drastically made, whether a man really desires God and His Reign or the world and its goods. Yet, Bultmann says, "he did not establish a religious order or a sect (still less a church). Nor did he propose that everyone should leave his home and family. But all are challenged to a decision. All must make up their minds what they really want to set their hearts on, whether it is God, or the goods of this world."⁶

On the positive side and complementary to it is the commandment of love, in which a man turns away from self and places himself at the disposal of others. In doing this, Jesus decided for God. Bultmann says, "Jesus was mistaken in thinking that the world was destined soon to come to an end. His error was similar to that of the ancient prophets..., or like Dentero-Isaiah"⁷ And Bultmann continues, "Jesus is so convinced of God's will and determination, and that it is his business to proclaim it, that he feels himself to be standing on the frontiers of time." Thus Bultmann thinks that Jesus' message is not the outcome of wishful thinking or speculation, but of his sense of the utter nothingness of man before God. Jesus had not a messianic

⁶
Primitive Christianity, P. 91.

⁷
Ibid.

concept of himself. Jesus himself is a self-transcending existential historical person. Therefore, His claims that the destiny of men is determined by their attitude to him. His words were taken up by the early Church and expressed in their proclamation of Jesus as Messiah---- particularly in their expectation that he was to come on the clouds of heaven as the "Man", bringing judgement and salvation.

b. Jesus' Interpretation of the Demand of God.

Bultmann maintains that Jesus is critical of traditional Jewish piety and says, "As interpretation of the will, the demand of God, Jesus' message is a great protest against Jewish legalism."⁸ Jewish legalism is a form of piety which regards the will of God as expressed in the written Law and in the Tradition which interprets the Law, a piety which endeavors to win God's favor by the toil of minutely fulfilling the Law's stipulations. There is no differentiation between religion and morality, nor separation between the Law of religion and morality, civil, and criminal law. This state of affairs is typified by the fact that the scribes are theologians, teachers, and lawyers all at the same time. By not separating these laws, a mass of ordinances which have lost their

⁸
Theology of N.T., P. 11.

original meaning, still remain in force and are twisted by artificial interpretation into relevance for today. Therefore the cultic and ritual laws are regarded as God's demand, or as ethics demands. Bultmann reasons that the real result of this situation is that motivation to ethical conduct is corrupted -- the idea of reward and punishment becomes the motivation and the obedience man owes to God and to His demand for good, is understood as a purely formal one -- obeying a law simply because it is commanded. But Bultmann's view of obedience is --- that radical obedience which God requires --- is only possible where a man understands the demand and affirms it from within himself. Then it becomes meaningful insofar as it fulfills God's demands. But Jewish legalism developed the notion of good works that go beyond the required fulfillment of the Law, establishing literal merits. Therefore, "Jesus' Proclamation of the will of God appears as a great Protest," says Bultmann.⁹ Jesus' interpretation of God's demand is radical in opposition to obedience. So, Jesus protests the Old Testament prophets against the cultic worship of God and the official Hebrew religion.

For instance, for Bultmann, the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:21-48) sharply contrasts legalism with the will of God, : "ye have heard that it was said by them of

⁹
Ibid, P. 12

old time.... But I say unto you..." The meaning, Bultmann explains, is this, "God does not lay claim to man only so far as conduct can be determined by formulated laws (the only way open to legalism) leaving man's own will free from that point on. What God forbids is not simply the overt acts of murder, adultery, and perjury, with which law can deal, but their antecedents: anger, and name-calling, evil desire and insincerity (Matt: 5: 21f., 27f., 33-37)...; others ... are from the point of view of God's intention altogether abolished ... (Matt. 5:31f., 38-41, 43-48)." God demands complete surrender of man's will, and knows no concessions (Matt. 6:43f., and 7:16, 18, 6:22). From the standpoint of this radical attitude of Jesus toward the will of God, his position toward the Old Testament is, according to Bultmann, that Jesus makes critical distinctions among the demands of the Old Testament without contesting its authority.¹⁰ For example, Moses did permit divorce, but only "in consideration of your hard-heartedness." What God really intends is that marriage should be permanent (Mk. 10:2-9).

Therefore, Bultmann says, "The upshot is that the Old Testament, insofar as it consists of ceremonial and ritual ordinances, is abrogated. Jesus directs a

¹⁰

Ibid, P. 15.

polemic against the legalistic ritualism of the scribes, whose correct external behaviour so often went hand in hand with an impure will."¹¹ Thus Bultmann sees the attitude which critically distinguishes the important from the unimportant, the essential from the indifferent. Actually, the Old Testament legislation has been lifted off its hinges by Jesus, but Jesus' polemical contest against the authority of the Old Testament has, in turn, been taken off its hinges by the Church. Bultmann thinks that Jesus' critical attitude toward the demand of God was changed and says, "The Church formulated its standpoint -...- in the words placed on Jesus' lips about the imperishability of even the tiniest letter in the Law and expressly declaring that Jesus did not come to abolish the Law, but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17-19)-- a saying that in view of other sayings of Jesus and of his actual practice cannot possibly be genuine; rather it is a product of the Church coming out of the later period of conflict, over the Law."¹² Here we clearly can see Bultmann's Kerygmatic theory that the early Church put the words on Jesus' lips. The New Testament Gospels are only the early Christian Church's opinion for Bultmann.

¹¹
Primitive Christianity, P. 74.

¹²
Theology of N.T., Vol. I, P. 16.

What then is Jesus' positive interpretation of the demand of God? It is love. The second commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' is inseparable from the first, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength' (Mark 12:28-34). There is no formulation of the demand of love. The phrase 'as thyself' indicates both the unlimited measure and the direction of love as a principle of conduct. The commandment of love is neither a blueprint for society nor a program for Utopia. It is addressed in the first place, to the individual. It points him to his encounter with his neighbour.

Bultmann cannot think of the demand of God without mentioning the existential idea which makes the individual immediately responsible to God by transcendence, and he says, "... Jesus' eschatological message and his ethical message constitute a unity..."¹³ "Both things, the eschatological proclamation and the ethical demand, direct man to the fact that he is thereby brought before God, that God stands before him; both direct him into his NOW as the hour of decision for God."¹⁴ So, at the sight of the religion frozen into ritualism, of superficiality and love of self and the world, Jesus' message becomes "a cry of woe and repentance."¹⁵ (Matt. 23:1ff. Lk.6:24-26).

13. Ibid, P. 19

14. Ibid, P. 21

15. Ibid, P. 21

c. Jesus' Idea of God.

Bultmann asserts that Jesus' concept of God is that of the Old Testament and of Judaism. For Jesus, God is the creator who governs the world with his providential care, and feeds the birds and adorns the flowers. Bultmann says, "In the above, Jesus' idea of God does not differ from that of the Old Testament and of Judaism, though it is true that in the common piety of Judaism faith in God the Creator had weakened even while it was strictly preserved in its official theology and confession."¹⁶ For Jesus, God again became a God at hand. He is the power, here and now, who as Lord and Father enfolds every man. Bultmann extends his idea that Jesus' idea of God is that of Judaism by comparing the word "Father" in Jewish Prayer and the Lord's Prayer, and says, "The 'Prayer of Eighteen Petitions', for instance, which the devout Jew is expected to say three times daily, begins, 'Lord God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob! God Most High, Creator of heaven! Our Shield and the Shield of our fathers!' The 'Lord's Prayer' stands out above Jewish prayers not only in its simple address but in its direct simplicity throughout (Matt. 6: 9-13, or Lk. 11:2-4)".¹⁷

¹⁶

Ibid, P. 23.

¹⁷

Ibid, P. 24.

God has also come near as the "Demand-er" whose will man need not wait to find in the letter of the Law or its scribal exegesis. But the demanding God of judgment is also the merciful God of forgiveness. Unlike the prophets' preaching, his preaching is directed not primarily to the people as a whole, but to individuals who must give account of themselves before God; and it is individuals whom coming salvation will bless.

Thus, says Bultmann, "Jesus in his thought of God -- and of man in the light of this thought -- 'de-historized' God and man; ... While this was already more or less the case of Judaism..., Jesus' thought, in contrast to that of Judaism, also radically 'historized' God in a different sense of 'history'. In Judaism God is de-historized by having become a distant God enthroned in heaven; ... And man in Judaism is de-historized by being marked off from the world by ritual and finding his security within the ritually pure congregation.... For Jesus, however, man is de-secularized by God's direct pronouncement to him.... And God is 'de-secularized' by understanding His dealing eschatologically: He lifts man out of his worldly ties and places him directly before His own eyes. Hence, the 'de-historization' or 'de-secularization' both of God and man is to be understood as a paradox: precisely that God,... meets each man in his own little history, his everyday life with

its daily gift and demand, de-historized man is guided into his concrete encounter with his neighbor, in which he finds his true history."¹⁸

For Bultmann, judgement and salvation are eschatological events in the strict sense and the idea of God and man is dehistorized and desecularized, in other words, myth is described as if historical events.

d. The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus.

The common opinion about the belief of the earliest Church of the Messiah rests upon the early Church's belief in ^{the} self-consciousness of Jesus -- that Jesus himself actually did consider himself to be the Messiah, or the Son of Man. But for Bultmann this view is burdened with serious difficulties. The acknowledgement of Jesus as the one in whom God's word decisively encounters man, whatever title be given him -- Messiah, Son of Man, Lord -- is a pure act of faith independent of the historical question whether or not Jesus considered himself to be the Messiah. Bultmann reasons that the Church's belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, is not dependent upon Jesus' self-consciousness of Messiahship, but originated from the Church's belief in his resurrection. Peter's confession (Mk. 8:27-30) is an Easter story projected back into Jesus' life-time, and likewise the story of the transfiguration (Mk. 9:2-8). The account of Jesus' baptism (Mk. 1:9-11) is legend, the temptation story is

18. Ibid, P. 25, 26.

legend, the story of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem has been colored by legend, and the passion narrative is also to a considerable degree overspread with legend. These are told in the interest, not of biography, but of faith. Moreover the synoptic tradition about Jesus' life and work measured by traditional messianic ideas, was not messianic. And Paul also did not understand it as messianic. In Phil. 2:6-11 Paul indicates that Jesus is a mere man, without messianic glory -- likewise Acts. 2:36 and in Romans 1:4, Paul says that Jesus' Messiahship was dated from the resurrection.

Men may argue that Jesus was conscious of being the one destined to be the future Messiah but that his idea of ~~the~~ Messiah^{ship} was "futuristic", (Mk. 8:38, Lk. 12:8, etc.), but Bultmann argues, in reply, that Jesus speaks of the Son of Man in the third person without identifying himself with him, and says, "There is no question but that the evangelists -- and likewise the Church -- make this identification, but can that be asserted of Jesus himself?"¹⁹ Furthermore, Bultmann points out that the synoptic traditions do not mention ~~of~~ Jesus' return. There was no word $\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\delta\alpha$, which denotes the "Coming" of the Son of Man, ever understood in the earliest period of Christianity as "return", but correctly as "arrival, advent".

19. Ibid, P. 29.

The Apologete Justin in the second century was the first to speak of the "first" πρώτη and "Second Coming" δευτέρα παρουσία (Dial. 14:8, 40:4) and of the "coming back" πάλιν παρουσία (Dial. 118:2).^{19a}

Bultmann concludes his argument on this subject with "In the predictions of the passion the Jewish concept Messiah-Son-of-Man is re-interpreted - or better, singularly enriched - insofar as the idea of a suffering, dying, rising Messiah or Son of Man was unknown to Judaism. But this re-interpretation of the concept was done not by Jesus himself but by the Church *ex eventu*." ²⁰

19a

Ibid, P.29

20

Ibid, P. 31

5. The Kerygma of the Earliest Church

a. The Problem of the Relationship between the Message of the Earliest Church and the Message of Jesus.

The earliest Church reproduced the message of Jesus in such a way that while the Church passed on the message of Jesus, Jesus himself was proclaimed as Messiah. Jesus had formerly been the bearer of the message, but by the preaching of the Church, Jesus became the essential content, or as Bultmann claims, "The proclaimer became the proclaimed."¹ But in what sense? When Jesus was proclaimed as Messiah, it was as the coming Messiah, in other words as the Son of Man. According to Bultmann, neither had Jesus Messianic consciousness, nor was His past activity on earth counted Messianic by the earliest Church, but later on in the framework of Jewish eschatological expectation the proclamation made Jesus into the coming Messiah or Son of Man. If the mere man Jesus, the teacher and prophet, is made into the Messiah and exalted to be the Son of Man, then the indefinite mythical figure, Messiah, has become concrete and visible. He then says, "The myth has been transferred to a concrete historical man, and the consequence will be that trust in it will have been immeasurably strengthened."² Thus Bultmann strongly stresses on the transformation of a

1. Ibid, P. 33.

2. Ibid, P. 34.

mythical figure into a concrete historical one and claims that the primitive Christian Church was strengthened in their faith by such happening. This idea of Bultmann's becomes the basis of his theory of the "Demythologization" of the New Testament.

b. The Earliest Church as the Eschatological Congregation.

Bultmann states that the earliest Church regarded itself as the Congregation of the end days and that this is attested by Paul and the synoptic tradition. Because Jesus' significance to the earliest Church was exhausted in its expectancy that He would come as the Son of Man, and that the Church would still remain only a Jewish sect, it could not properly be called the Christian Church. The resurrection ought to mean the proof of the exaltation of the Crucified one, the Son of Man, but it was not yet understood as an event that broke the framework of Jewish eschatology.

For Bultmann the earliest Church itself was in danger of remaining a Jewish sect and Paul was against its understanding of the situation created by Jesus' coming, dying, and rising. Bultmann makes a distinction between the earliest Church and Paul's understanding of Jesus' person and fate as the eschatological occurrence.

In his study of the Kerygma, Bultmann uses the phrase, "placed upon the lips of Jesus by the Church,"³
3. Ibid, P. 37.

over and over again. He asserts, for example, the words of Matt. 16:18f. are not Jesus' but those of the Church. Jesus' band of disciples is called the "Church," which is the "little flock" to whom God will give His Reign. It is represented by the Twelve, who, when God's Reign has appeared, will sit upon twelve thrones to rule the tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28 or Lk. 22:29f.). In the Kerygma of the earliest Church the personal idea and interpretation of the disciples was an eschatological expectation that they were not only apostles, but also the eschatological regents.

This eschatological consciousness is seen in the fact, according to Bultmann, that Jesus' disciples, after the Easter experiences in Galilee, soon betook themselves to Jerusalem as the focus point for the coming Reign of God. Further evidence is furnished especially by the designations of the Church and its members. Bultmann says, "In understanding themselves as Congregation or Church, the disciples appropriate to themselves the title of the Old Testament Congregation of God, the
By designating itself ... Congregation of God, the earliest Church declared that it itself was the fulfillment of the hopes of the apocalyptists. Its members accordingly bear the eschatological titles 'the chosen' or 'the elect' and 'the saints'.⁴

4. Ibid, P. 38.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are also understood from the eschatological consciousness of the Congregation. The Missionary activity of the earliest Church was also governed by a belief in the immediately impending End. This is reflected by the charge to the Apostles, which, according to Bultmann, they placed in the mouth of Jesus. The eschatological character of the earliest Church caused the Missionary activity which called for repentance (Matt. 10: 7.9ff). Even the Q source, the collection of Jesus' saying which goes back to the earliest Church, he says, "testifies to the same belief".⁵

c. Jesus' Meaning to the Faith of the Earliest Church.

From the history-of-religious point of view, for Bultmann, the earliest Church presents itself as an eschatological sect within Judaism, which was conscious of being called and chosen ^{as the} Congregation of the end days. When the Church proclaim Jesus as Messiah-Son-of-Man, that does not mean the Old Testament tradition and Jesus' message, but that the Kerygma of Jesus as Messiah is the basic and primary thing. In other words, the earliest Church produced the Kerygma from the ancient traditions and Jesus' message, in conjunction with their view of eschatological expectation. Jesus' person and work, are formed in the light of the Easter faith in Jesus' resurrection.

5. Ibid, P. 42.

The significance of Jesus to the earliest Church lay neither in the content of what Jesus had taught nor in some modification of the Messianic idea, but in the fact that God had made the prophet and teacher Jesus of Nazareth Messiah! Jesus' coming itself was already an eschatological occurrence. According to Bultmann, there are scarcely any original words of Jesus in the collection of Jesus' sayings in the synoptic tradition, but most of the words attributed to Him are the products of the Church. Bultmann points to the "He" and "I" passages in Jesus' sayings, and identifies the "He" passages with the Church's Kerygma "as we now have it, re-interpreted by the Church and put back into his (Jesus) mouth:..."⁶

The rise of the "Easter faith" made necessary a way of understanding the cross, for the cross had to make sense in the context of the salvation-process. The scripture proves and explains Jesus' suffering and death as divinely decreed, but Bultmann takes them merely as characteristic of one stage of the earliest Church's reflection on the subject. Our Lord Himself says, "'Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?' And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning him." (Lk. 24:26f)

The acknowledgement of the Crucified as Messiah

6. Ibid., P. 44.

7. Ibid., P. 44.

implicitly contains a new understanding of Jesus as man-before-God. "Through the fact", says Bultmann, "that the Church awaits the prophet and teacher as Son of Man and in the light of Easter faith understands Jesus' earthly ministry anew, a power to determine the present is also attributed to the figure of Jesus."⁷ When Jesus' words are collected, that is done not simply because of their didactic content, but because they are the words of Jesus, the coming King. The wisdom and knowledge in Jesus' words are credited to the belief of the apocalyptic writers. For example, Bultmann says, "Perhaps the earliest Church already put this saying into the mouth of Jesus. Certainly out of the earliest Church come the words in which the risen Lord, with royal beaming, delegates to Peter the direction of the Congregation ---which he even calls 'My Congregation' (Matt. 16:17-19); likewise his promise to the twelve that they shall someday be the regents of the tribes of Israel (Matt. 19:28 or Lk. 22:28-30)."⁸

For Bultmann the titles of Jesus were borrowed from the tradition of Jewish messianic faith, and all these titles agree in being designations for the "eschatological salvation-bringer". "The predominant title in the earliest Church," says Bultmann "was 'Son of Man', which comes out of the apocalyptic hope and means a supra-

7. Ibid, P. 47.

8. Ibid, P. 48.

mundane, pre-existent being who at the end of time will come down from heaven to hold judgement and bring salvation,..."⁹ The title Son of David comes out of the national tradition and is synonymous with Messiah. The Son of God was, according to Bultmann, already interpreted messianically in Judaism as it was in the Christian Church. The messianic title, "Servant of God", which means nothing else than Messiah or Son of God, occurs in the apocalypses, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. For Bultmann, it is debatable whether the earliest Church had already given Jesus the title, "Lord", but he concludes that at least the earliest Church did not cultically worship Jesus, even if it should have called him Lord. Finally, after speaking rather indefinitely, he definitely says, "the Kyrios-cult originated on Hellenistic soil."¹⁰

Actually Bultmann denies the messianic conception of Jesus for such conceptions and titles in the New Testament are, for him, the opinion of the earliest Church borrowed from the Jewish eschatological expectation of apocalyptic writers. The prophet and teacher Jesus was exalted by the Church to Messiah.

d. Beginnings of the Development of Ecclesiastical Forms.

What consequences did the earliest Church draw from its eschatological consciousness for its practical

9. Ibid, P. 49.

10. Ibid, P. 51.

everyday attitudes, particularly its conduct toward Judaism and its institutions and adherents? How far did it see the total reality of its life in the light of eschatological occurrences?

Naturally the eschatological Congregation did not regard itself as a new religion and did not draw a boundary between itself and Judaism. It remained loyal to the temple and the temple cult. Bultmann mentions that the Congregation customarily gathered within the temple area (Acts 2:46) and it did not give up the sacrificial practice of Judaism, according to Matt. 5:23f. As the Congregation of the end days, it conceived itself as that true Israel, which is the goal of Israel's salvation-history, and for which the promises of the Old Testament were then being fulfilled. But Bultmann asks a question. How far is 'true Israel' understood as a really eschatological thing and how far as only a selection out of the historical people? The question becomes acute in regard to the validity of the Law. The Jewish-Christian sect had gradually gained ground. This was, Bultmann says, partly a reaction against the criticism of the Law and the temple-cult on the part of the Hellenistic Church. The famous saying of Jesus, "Think not that I have come to destroy the Law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle

shall in no wise pass from the law..."(Matt. 5:17, 18), was put into Jesus' mouth by them, he says.¹¹ The fulfillment of the law was also the gift of God which gave the chosen people its rank and dignity. Therefore, fulfillment was the condition for participation in salvation insofar as it was the condition for membership in the people of Israel.¹²

The development of the Church concept in the earliest Church was hindered in two ways: one, the fact that the mission to the heathen was not regarded as an obligation by the Jerusalem Church. They, therefore, placed in Jesus' mouth the saying, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans, enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. 10:5). And second, that the Jewish Congregation had not cut itself from the temple cult.

But as to the development of the Church, the direction of it was at first in the hands of "the twelve". Their practical work was evidently as proclaimers of the word both within the Congregation and outside, and on missionary journeys. The dominant authority was at first Peter. Next, eldership constituted a real office of the Congregation. Elders are named along with James.

11. Ibid, P. 54.

12. Ibid, P. 55.

Presumably James was chairman of the council of elders. These elders were instituted for the eschatological Congregation only by the proclamation of the word. This message was given forth by the twelve because they were proclaimers of the word and guardians of the tradition. This tradition is the passing on of Jesus' message, says Bultmann, but is primarily the passing on of the specifically Christian Kerygma.¹³ Tradition requires continuity and succession. The idea of apostolic succession as an institution, the custom of ordination by laying on of hands, appears for the first time in the pastoral epistles. The restriction of the concept "Apostle" to the "twelve" can scarcely have taken place in the earliest Church, says Bultmann, "however, the idea of tradition and succession finds characteristic expression in the fact that Jerusalem is regarded as the center of the whole Church..."¹⁴

Bultmann summarizes the development of ecclesiastical forms with the following words, "As time went on and membership increased, life within the Congregation naturally needed a certain regulation which could not be left to the council of elders to decide from case to case; but the sources barely permit us a glimpse of that. Matt. 16:19 and 18:18 testify that the authority 'to bind and to loose', i.e., a disciplinary power,

13. Ibid, P. 59.

14. Ibid, P. 60.

lay first in the hands of Peter, than in those of the
Congregation -- and that probably means, in the hands
of the elders; and Matt. 18:15-17 gives rules for
settling quarrels in the Congregation...."¹⁵

15. Ibid, P. 61

6. The Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church Apart from Paul.

Bultmann thinks that Pauline theology presupposes a certain development of Primitive Christianity. After the Christian message had passed over the boundary of Palestine's Judaism, the Congregations of Hellenistic Christianity arose. In this chapter, we will discuss Bultmann's view of the pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christianity which he calls the historical presupposition for Paul's theology. The significance of Hellenistic Christianity to Bultmann, is not exhausted in its being a preparatory-stage for Paul. Side by side with Paul, it developed partly along paths of its own, partly under Pauline influence.

Hellenistic Christianity is the product of reconstruction for Bultmann. Why? For the delineation of Hellenistic Christianity, before and contemporary with Paul, there is scarcely any direct witness available. The catholic epistles all come from a later time. So, Bultmann reconstructs the picture of Hellenistic Christianity from (1) a few data in Acts, (2) the Pauline letters, and (3) other sources of later date, especially sources which represent a non-Pauline type of Hellenistic Christianity, such as Hebrews, Barnabas, Clement, James, and the Kerygma Petri.¹

1. Ibid, P. 64.

a. The Preaching of God

Bultmann says, "Christian missionary preaching in the Gentile world could not be simply the christological Kerygma; rather, it had to begin with the proclamation of the one God."² ^{In Contrast} ~~to~~ Jewish and Jewish-Christian opinion the one true God was unknown to the Gentile world and their religions were polytheism and idolatry. The Jewish mission had anticipated Christianity in the preaching of monotheism. But this concept of God, which is Old Testament monotheism, was frequently modified or obscured by the concept of God from Greek philosophical tradition, a concept determined by the idea of the law and order of the Cosmos. This tendency was carried on by Christian-Hellenistic missionary preaching, though at first only in individual motifs and with characteristically Christian modifications. So, the basic characteristic of the Hellenistic-Christian missionary preaching was, "The Pagan world is held to be sunk in ignorance ἀγνοία and error πλάνη".³ For example, Paul spoke of the "heathen, who do not know God", (1 Thess. 4:5) a phrase taken from the Old Testament (Jer. 10:25, Ps. 78:6). Hence to accept Christian faith is called "to know God" or "the truth", and Bultmann says, "To know God" γινώσκειν (τὸν) θεόν is used for conversion to the Christian

2. Ibid, P. 65.

3. Ibid, P. 66.

faith by Paul (Gal. 4:9) and also, e, g., by I Clem 59:3; II Clem. 17:1 (cf. 3:1) Herm. sim. 1x18, 1f."⁴ Such monotheistic preaching is not specifically characteristic of Paul, for Bultmann, because Kerygma Patri 3, also mentions preaching "the gospel to men through the world that they should know that there is one God", and "further examples are II Clem. 1:4ff.; Tristides Apol. 15, 3 p.23, 20ff. Geffcken; ps. Clem. hom. 15, 11p. 150, 10 ff. Lagarde...."⁵ Thus, Bultmann claims the new combinations -- O. T. -- Jewish theology and the Hellenistic enlightenment theology -- of the preaching of God in the Hellenistic Church. God, the creator,^{is} also often described in expressions of the Old Testament or Judaism. But "This creation out of nothing which is in accord with Hellenistic-Jewish tradition is emphasized also in Herm. vis I 1,6; mand. I 1; II Clem. I, 8."⁶ Here, all the way through, we can see how Bultmann tries to prove the doctrine of God as taught in Old Testament-Jewish theology and the Hellenistic enlightenment theology are parallel and that this is shown by "Formula-like expressions."⁷

4. Ibid, P. 67

5. Ibid, P. 68

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

In addition to this, Bultmann says, "certain Hellenistic (Stoic) formulations serve to describe God's creatorhood and rulership of the world.... Another formulation intended to express both God's immanence and transcendence at the same time is that of Herm. mand. I, 1: '(He) contains all things, and is himself alone uncontained' or, Kerygma Petri 2: 'The... uncontained, who contains all things; this expression with variations also occurs in Hellenistic Judaism.'"⁸

Since Jewish opinion was that heathen polytheism and idolatry were in sin and vice, the missionary preaching to believe in the one true God was a call of repentance, but the call to repentance had its basis in the fact that God the Creator was also the Judge; moreover His judgement took place not in the private fate of the sinner, but would soon be held over the entire world. So, Bultmann says, "Hence, Christian preaching of the one true God is at the same time eschatological proclamation, preaching of the impending judgement of the world."⁹ This inner connection, which also is emphasized in Judaism (IV [yr. 5:56-6:6, etc.) is occasionally made explicit, as in Kerygma Petri 2: "Know therefore that there is one God who made the beginning of all things

8. Ibid, P. 70.

9. Ibid, P. 74.

and has power over the End."¹⁰ Thus, Bultmann connects the Hellenistic writings with the Scripture statements, because he sees the Hellenistic Christian Church made the Church Kerygma up out of the Hellenistic writings.

At this point Bultmann brings the christological motif into the Kerygma and says, "At God's side or in place of God, Jesus Christ appears as Judge of the world; he represents God, so to say, as His plenipotentiary."¹¹ Then Bultmann quotes Acts 17:31, "He has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained." And he gives other scriptural references to prove that, "Christ belongs in the eschatological Kerygma." Nevertheless, not only as the Judge, but also as the Saviour for those who belong to the Congregation of the faithful. The expectation of the manifestation of the Saviour Christ Jesus was, for Bultmann, so taken for granted, as an item of the Christian hope, that "Saviour" became a title for Christ used in a formula-like manner.¹² The title "the Christ" was gradually lost and became a proper name and later, in Latin-speaking Christendom, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ was no longer translated, but simply transliterated Christus. Bultmann

10. Ibid, P. 77

11. Ibid, P. 78.

12. Ibid, P. 79.

says, "As a title 'the Christ' was not understandable to the Hellenistic world,"¹³ but merely as a proper name.

However, the eschatological Judge and Saviour Jesus Christ is none other than the crucified Jesus of Nazareth whom God raised from the dead and appointed to his eschatological role, therefore, for Bultmann, "the message of the raising or the resurrection of Jesus is a basic constituent of the Hellenistic Kerygma, as the tradition of 1 Cor. 15:1ff. expressly attests, no matter whether any or all of its formulation goes back to the earliest Church or not."¹⁴ Thus that God raised him from the dead is a formula-like traditional statement, and as such, a constituent of a more or less crystallized creedal statement.

The same thing is shown by the predictions put into Jesus' mouth in Mark (and also in Matthew and Luke) which carry back the Hellenistic Kerygma into the preaching of Jesus. The focal point in the sermons of Acts, is the Kerygma of Christ's death and resurrection (and exaltation). This means to Bultmann that this pattern of the Christological Kerygma is schematized by the Church.¹⁵ As a more exact and stable formula thus grew

13. Ibid., P. 80.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., P. 83.

out of the Kerygma and gradually crystallized into creed. For Bultmann, the development of the formulation of Kerygma came to the literary form: Gospel. Its oldest exemplification is the Gospel of Mark. Bultmann gives the stages in the development of the Gospel: "1. The germ-cell is the Kerygma of the death and resurrection of Jesus, so that the Gospels have been rightly called 'passion-narratives'..... 2. The brief Kerygma of the passion and Easter required fuller visualization, as 1 Cor. 11:23-26 and 15:3-7 show,... 3. The Christian "Sacraments" had to be accounted for in the life of Jesus, the critically worshiped Lord. 4. A visualization of what Jesus had done was also indispensable, since his life considered divine, served as proof of his authority, ... 5. Probably the apophthegms (i.e, short stories whose point is a saying of Jesus and which in part also report miracles, like Mk. 3:1-6, 22-30 etc.) also stood in the service of this visualization.... 6. The reason that sayings of the Lord ... from the Christological Kerygma, came more and more to be taken up into "the Gospel" is that missionary preaching continued.... 7. Finally both the moral exhortations and the regulations of the Congregation had to be accounted for in the life and words of Jesus."¹⁶

16. Ibid, P. 86

For Bultmann, the Gospel "evangel" is synonymous with the message or "Kerygma" and in his opinion the term "evangel" is used as the technical expression for the Christian proclamation in Hellenistic Christianity.

Therefore, acceptance of the Gospel means acceptance of the message and is called ΠΙΣΤΙΣ (faith and belief) or ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ (to believing or having faith). Thus, for Bultmann, faith is the acceptance of the Kerygma and the Kerygma is the object of faith. This semantic development was prepared for by the missionary activity, because in missionary activity faith comes to be conceived of as conversion to a new religion that is being preached.

For Bultmann, there is difference or a development of the "Faith" of the Hellenistic Church from the earliest Church. The faith of the earliest Church was faith as a personal relation to God but this changed to faith as a personal relationship to the person of Christ, or faith in Christ.

b. Church Consciousness

The question of the concept of the Church is decisive. Does the salvation proclaimed by the Christian message mean only the salvation of the individual, the release of the individual soul from the contamination of sin and from suffering and death? Or does it mean salvation for the whole fellowship of God's people

into which the individual is incorporated? Bultmann says, "The fact that the earliest Church in its mission simply took the latter for granted essentially differentiate it from the propaganda of other oriental religions of redemption; and, viewed historically, therein lies a basic reason for Christianity's triumph over them," and he says further, "In Christianity, the individual believer stands within the Congregation, and the individual Congregations are joined together into one Congregation -- the Church."¹⁷

Bultmann explains the meaning of the terminology "ecclesia" so that it denotes not the individual Church at all, but the "people of God", the fellowship of the chosen at the end of days, and he says, "This was the usage not only in the earliest Church but also in Hellenistic Christianity,"¹⁸ and the individual Church before long was called "ecclesia" in the Hellenistic Church, the idea being that the individual Church was the manifestation of the one Church. Bultmann states that the reasons why a Church consciousness quickly developed in Hellenistic Christianity were: the efforts of Paul, the fact that Hellenistic Christianity in part grew out of Hellenistic synagogues, and the fact that the Old Testament had been transmitted to them as a holy book. These motives all worked together toward creating, in the

17. Ibid, P. 93.

18. Ibid,

19. Ibid, P. 97.

Christian Congregation, a consciousness of solidarity with Israel and its history. But Bultmann denies the continuity of the Old Testament history into the New Testament and says, "the relation of the Church to Israel's history is a peculiarly paradoxical one because the course of events from Jacob-Israel down to the present is not a continuous history but one broken by the eschatological occurrence in Christ", and he continues, "the eschatological Congregation is not simply the historical successor and heir of the empirical Israel of history but the heir of the ideal Israel... which, in point of fact, it never actually was."¹⁹ Bultmann rejects the realization of election in history and points to the eschatological Congregation in the future. If it came into realization, then it was only in expectation, like Abraham, in a strong faith. However, Bultmann states on the contrary that in contrast with historical Israel, this eschatological break in history, does not mean discontinuity in the history of Salvation but precisely the opposite -- continuity. This contrast is the paradoxical relation of the Christian Congregation concept of the new covenant.

Church-consciousness includes, for Bultmann, a consciousness of separateness and delimitation from the world seen in the fact, believers are called "the chosen",

19. Ibid, P. 97.

"the called", "the saints", "the sanctified" or "called saints", etc. Bultmann defines the separateness as self-exclusion from non-Christian cults of every sort, and delimitation from the world as the sphere of moral uncleanness and sin. The Congregation is the holy temple of God, it is the spiritual house of God. The eschatological Congregation really no longer belongs to this perishing world. For Bultmann, this expression is the paradox of the Christian situation. He brings the Hellenistic asceticism -- food -- asceticism and sexual asceticism, and renunciation of property -- into Paul's teachings in the New Testament. Both are identified together by Bultmann as reflections of the imminent end of this world.

The Church-consciousness and the Consciousness of eschatological delimitation from the world are termed a dualistic view by Bultmann. This is the eschatological dualism of Jewish tradition. But still further a possibility existed that the eschatological consciousness of delimitation from the world might mingle with or even be replaced by another motif, namely, Stoic ideas--- the Stoic's battle against "desire" and his exhortation to "renounce", etc. Furthermore, Bultmann says, "the motifs of Gnostic dualism could operate on Christian thinking even in conjunction with Stoic ideas, since for both Stoicism and Gnosticism, the sphere of flesh

and sensuality is degraded, although the Spirit, which is the opposite of sensuality, is differently conceived by the two."²⁰ Thus, Hellenistic Christianity is the product of Syncreticism. He makes his great emphasis on this matter when considering the Fourth Gospel, and says, "actually the Fourth Gospel's consciousness of Church unity is influenced by Gnosticism."^{20a} Nevertheless he recognizes that Gnosticism lacks the specific characteristics of Church-consciousness.

c. The Church's Relation to Judaism and the Old Testament.

The next problem which arises is: how will the problem of the Church's relation to Judaism be solved -- a problem arising from its consciousness of being the true Israel -- and how will the authority of the Old Testament be understood?

The relation of Hellenistic Christianity to the form of Jewish Christianity represented by the earliest Church in Palestine is the relation between Torah-enthusiasts -- the so-called Judaizers -- and Torah-free Gentile Christianity as represented by Barnabas and Paul.

The Hellenistic Christian Congregation had grown out of the synagogue and a debate with Judaism itself was therefore necessary. According to Bultmann,

20. Ibid., P. 107.

20a. Ibid.

this debate develops, in purely theoretical fashion, the principle of Christian faith in antithesis to the principle of the Jewish Torah-religion. The attitude of Hellenistic Christianity, Bultmann states, was not simply a result of Paul's struggle against the Judaizers, because side by side other possibilities existed and were realized in practice. The possibilities which brought about the Torah-free attitude of Hellenistic Christianity mentioned by Bultmann are: a. Radical Gnosticism. Gnosticism had its roots in a dualistic redemption - religion which invaded Hellenism from the orient. It was a phenomenon parallel or competitive to Christian religion. Each of these movements influenced the other in many ways, and these very soon developed a Christian Gnosticism which, in its radical form, completely rejected the Old Testament. The most extreme of the possibilities is Gnosticism, and when this is adopted the Old Testament, with its law, becomes no longer valid for the Christian. b. The Epistle of Barnabas. Bultmann states that this epistle was written after 70 A.D. and before 140 — very likely after 100 A.D.. Its author does not mention the law of the Old Testament as the way of salvation. The author of Barnabas says that the Jews completely misunderstood the law. Thus, for Bultmann, the epistle of Barnabas stands in contrast to the interpretation of the earliest Church of Judaism. The Old Testament must be interpreted allegorically,

Then two things will be found in the Old Testament: ethical instruction and predictions of Christ, and Christian salvation. c. The Epistle to the Hebrews. For it the Old Testament, as a whole, is a prediction of Christ and his work. But the author's chief interest is, for Bultmann, the interpretation of the Old Testament cult, and he insists that the allegorical method is used in the interpretation of this. d. I Clement. This letter was written in 95 or 96 A.D. from the Church at Rome to the Corinthians. Its author claims that the Old Testament is a Christian book. e. Ptolemy to Flora. This is a letter written by Ptolemy (140-160 in Rome) to a lady to instruct her in the right understanding of the O.T. Law. According to it, there are three parts: the legislation of God, the legislation of Moses, and the decrees of the elders. And the law of God is divided into three: 1. the pure and perfect moral law - the decalogue; 2. the law mixed with evil which Jesus abolished; 3. the ceremonial law. Nevertheless, the god who gave this three-fold law is not the highest God, but a being standing between Him and the devil; this middle-god is not to be called "perfect", though he is to be called "righteous." f. Justin Martyr. The Apologete Justin (ca. 100-165 A.D.) deals with the problem of the O.T. in a way that later became the typical method of the Church. He divides the O.T. Law into three parts: 1. The eternal moral law.

2. The Prediction of Christ. 3. The Cultic and Ceremonial Law in its original and still valid sense.

From these possibilities, Bultmann draws the resulting picture which follows:²¹

a. The Old Testament Law is regarded as abolished so far as it contains cultic-ritual demands.

b. The Old Testament in its entire extent is generally regarded as a book of predictions, which in Christ are partly already fulfilled, and partly proceeding toward fulfillment. For Bultmann, the method of interpretation of the O.T. used is allegorical. In Bultmann's opinion these conclusions were taken over from Judaism, especially from its Hellenistic branch, which in turn had taken it over from Greek Hellenism, where, especially among the Stoics, it had been developed as a method of interpreting the old mythology and the old poets, such as Homer.

c. So far as the Old Testament contains ethical Commandments or permits such to be read out of it by the help of allegory, its authority remains uncontested and valid -- except in radical Gnosticism.

Though the forgiving grace of God, in view of Christ, is more certain than the Jewish O. T. trust, still this does not mean there was any fundamental difference from the O.T. and Judaism until the relation between God's

21. Ibid, P. 114-118

demand and the grace of God was defined anew. Bultmann concludes that the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone was that which finally/^{made}the difference between them.

d. Lord and Son of God

In the Christian worship in Hellenistic Christianity there was neither sacrifice nor priest, nor was worship bound to holy places or times in a cultic manner.

The "word", both the preached word and the word of prayer and song, was the main element in the Synagogue services. The preaching consisted in the exegesis of words of Scripture and the reading of a passage from the Old Testament. But probably, Bultmann mentions, apostolic writings and gospels along with Jewish apocalypse early everywhere, took the place of the Old Testament or supplemented it.

The act and attitude of worship in the Christian Congregation, according to Bultmann, does not first summon the deity before He is there, but rests upon God's being already present. He is present in the Spirit by which the Congregation is conscious of being sustained, and with which its speakers feel themselves filled. But He is also present in the word of Scripture when it is read.

The deity whose presence is believed and experienced in the congregational gathering is the one

true God. But Christ too has become a cultically worshiped figure, and, Bultmann says, "This is the distinctive feature of the eschatological congregation in Hellenistic Christianity, for in it for the first time Jesus Christ figures not only as the eschatological Saviour but also as the cultically worshiped 'Lord'".²² For Bultmann the titles "Son of God" and "Christ" were dying out in Hellenistic Christianity and the title "Kyrios," Lord was appearing in the congregations. This title "Kyrios", Bultmann claims, as applied to Jesus, is not derived from LXX, rather is derived from the religious terminology of Hellenism -- oriental Hellenism -- in which Kyrios was the Greek translation of typical terms which were widespread in Egypt, Asia Minor, and especially in Syria, which is the land of origin of the term "the Lord" as used absolutely.²³

In Christianity, the title "Kyrios" is used as an exorcistic formula and this was done in Hellenistic Christianity. The name "Son of God" also occurs in exorcistic formulas as a cultically worshiped figure. Bultmann means to say: "The title 'Kyrios' was first conferred upon Christ in the Hellenistic Church."²⁴

22. Ibid, P. 124

23. Ibid

24. Ibid, P. 128

And he says about the "Son of God" that it was ^{introduced} ~~spread~~ by Hellenistic-Jewish Christians through the missionary message, which originally denoted the messianic king. Now its meaning changed to the divinity of Christ, his divine nature. Even so, the meaning Bultmann gives of the divinity of Christ, "Son of God", is not that of ^{the} New Testament. He attempts through a Hellenistic way of thinking, to give several variations. One of the variation, an inheritance from Greek tradition, applied the mythological idea of being begotten by a god, to man. The Hellenistic period knows a whole series of such "divine men", who claimed to be sons of god, and some of whom were also cultically worshiped. He, the divine son, is paradoxically the divine appearing in human form, and the content of his life is marked by miracles. Another variation was the conception of divine sonship as an inheritance from old oriental mythology: the son-divines were worshiped as saviours who had suffered the human fate of death but had risen again from death. Another figure was the "Redeemer" in the Gnostic myth, a divine being who should become man and suffer a human fate.

For Bultmann, the Gentile-Christian conception of Christ as Son of God is influenced by different traditions, therefore, he applies the above variations to the New Testament usages of the title "Son of God".

The Synoptic Gospels represent the first type and they picture Jesus as the Son of God who reveals his divine power and authority through his miracles. This is the way of thinking determined by Jewish tradition. But also the mythological conception of a divine son, according to Bultmann, was taken over by Jewish Hellenism in Egypt and transferred to the devout men of the Old Testament. Therefore, naturally, early in Hellenistic Christianity the legend sprang up that Jesus was begotten by the Holy Spirit (Matt. 1:20) or by the "Power of the Most High" (Lk. 1:35) and was born of a virgin. The virgin birth was understood by the second type of thinking, namely, that Christ was the pre-existent Son of God become man. The Son of God figure of the third type, for Bultmann, was Gnostic thinking. The Son-divinity of Gnosticism was independently developed in mythologies and in religions -- philosophical speculations like those of Philo, whose cosmic Logos was the "Son" of God, and like the Hermetic writings. For Bultmann, the titles "Lord" and "Son of God" are identified with the mythological terms which were used, either in the oriental mythology or in the Gnostic mythologies and religious-philosophical speculations. In other words, Jesus became the Son of God by the syncretistic preachers of the Christian congregations and God did not become man in ^{any} supernatural way.

e. The Sacraments

In the worship of the Congregation, the Lord Jesus Christ is present. An individual gets into the Congregation through baptism and in this way he enters into relationship with the Lord. For Bultman it is self-evident that baptism is the indispensable condition for admission to the Congregation and for participation in salvation, though for the Reformed faith it is only a means of Grace.

In earliest Christianity the sacrament was a miracle working rite, but, according to Bultmann, as it became less understandable it was eliminated by the Hellenistic Church, though Gnostic sects still practiced it for a while. Its significance for him is that Paul mentions the custom without any criticism, but he interprets the mode of thought behind it as Paul's own and as earliest Christian thought in general. Bultmann mentions four interpretations of the sacrament of baptism -- purification, sealing by the Name "Lord", bestowal of the Spirit, and participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. The last interpretation originated for Bultmann, in the Hellenistic Church and should be explained as a Hellenistically understood imitation-sacrament. Such an interpretation is foreign to Old-Testament-Jewish thinking. Baptism is interpreted as mystery by Paul, and its effect is called re-birth.

For Bultmann this mystery interpretation of baptism is to be seen in the statements of Ignatius Eph. 18:2; Barn. 6:11; Justin Ap. 66:1; and in Justin Dial. 39:2.²⁵

The mystery interpretation of baptism introduces the decisive point: The Christian imitation sacrament of baptism was given a relationship to Jesus' death and resurrection - i.e., to the occurrence of salvation -- this was not original. Bultmann compares this idea with the other sources, Ignatius and Barnabas, etc., who developed the idea that "water" (baptism) and "the cross" belong together. The first interpretation, according to them, brought with it a danger of a Hellenistic, sacramental, magical interpretation. But Bultmann chooses it and understands the sacrament as an actualization, here and now, of the occurrence of salvation. He favors interpreting it existentially.

In Hellenistic Christianity the Lord's Supper, like baptism, is understood as a sacrament in the sense of the mystery religions. Bultmann thinks that the specific idea of mystery about the communion does not come from the sacramental meal, but is a wide-spread idea in primitive and classic cults. This cultic idea of communion is used by Paul. Bultmann tries to prove this from Paul's saying in 1 Cor. 10:21, "ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." He

25. Ibid, P. 142-3

interprets it "he (Paul) contrasts the cup and table of the Lord with heathen sacrificial meals: as these make the partakers partners (or communicants) with demons, the Lord's Supper brings about 'Communion' (or partnership) with the Lord...."²⁶ In this comparison, Paul accepted the idea of mystery, "Partner with demons" from the heathen cults. When the death of the Kyrios is attributed to Jesus' last supper, it is specified as the real function of the cultic meal.

Like in baptism, Bultmann introduces other interpretations in the Lord's Supper and maintains that such interpretations were adopted into the liturgy. The Lord's Supper was conceived in analogy to Hellenistic memorial-ceremonies. Another development was the divorce of the sacramental meal from an actual regular meal. According to Bultmann, the earliest witness to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is Paul, and he found it already present in Hellenistic Christianity. The Lord's Supper was not a really cultic ceremony originally, but the meal was a bond and expression of fellowship in keeping with the tradition of Judaism and of the historical Jesus himself. This meal has been transformed into a sacramental celebration in Hellenistic Christianity. Therefore, Paul is named as the earliest witness to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

26. Ibid, P. 148

f. The Spirit

According to Bultmann, Pneuma-Spirit is the miraculous divine power that stands in absolute contrast to all that is human. The manifestations of the Spirit in a man's conduct are that which is extraordinary, mysterious or terrifying, mighty, and which seems not to come from merely human capabilities and powers. The concept of Pneuma is then the miraculous -- insofar as that takes place in the sphere of human life -- either in what men do or in what is done to them. The bestowal of the spirit is an eschatological gift and its coming into effect in the Church is an eschatological event.

Over against these concepts relating to the Spirit, Bultmann thinks, Pneuma^{is} an independent agent, a personal power in animistic thinking, on one hand, an impersonal force in dynamistic thinking on the other hand. The former conception is that of the Old Testament and Judaism. The latter is apparently present in O.T., but it is characteristic of the Hellenistic world. Nevertheless, the typical "pneumatic" in Hellenism is the "divine man", who is of higher nature than ordinary mortals, filled with mysterious, divine power, which makes him capable of miraculous insights and deeds. The power in him means the pneuma which is dynamically understood in early Christianity, for Bultmann.

For Bultmann, Pneuma is understood in a double

sense: "On the one hand, it is the power conferred in baptism which makes the Christian a Christian -- a power which is already in the present takes him out of this perishing world and 'seals' him for the one to come. On the other hand, it is the power given now and again for the occasion to the Christian, enabling him to accomplish extraordinary things."²⁷ However, how will an understanding of existence, founded and upheld by the eschatological divine power of the Spirit, develop? Bultmann thus presents the problem of delimitation from the world and of eschatological dualism. He says, "If the activity of the Spirit is seen in special deeds of power which are regarded as unambiguous signs of Spirit endowment, the existence of a Christian is in danger of being conceived as that of a Hellenistic 'divine man' and the eschatological history of salvation comes to be regarded in the light of edifying legend...but which shows its full consequences in the apocryphal acts of the apostles. But if, instead, the real essence of Christian existence is held to lie in subjective emotional experiences and the activity of the Spirit accordingly to be the producing of emotional experiences, then an individualistic sort of Spirit-endowment will arise which may, of course, also express itself in deeds of power, but culminates in ecstasy. Then the Spirit will no longer be understood

27. Ibid, P. 162

as the gift conferred upon the Church rather, eschatological de-secularization will be interpreted in terms of mysticism."²⁸

g. Gnostic Motifs

Bultmann considers that in the Hellenistic world it was a historical necessity that the Gospel should be translated into the terminology with which that world was familiar, which was Gnostic terminology. He says, "there were differences and rejections, but sometimes Christianity and Gnosticism combines. "On the whole one could be tempted to term Hellenistic Christianity a syncretistic structure."²⁹ For Bultmann the only reasonable objection to the syncretistic structure of the Hellenistic Christianity is that it is not just a conglomerate of heterogeneous materials. To answer this problem Bultmann raised the following situations and the issues arising therefrom.

(1) For Christian Missions, the Gnostic movement was a competitor of the most serious and dangerous sort because of the far-reaching relatedness between them. The Essence of Gnosticism is a new understanding of man and the world; its mythology is only the expression of this understanding. In the O.T. the world had been home for man as God's creation, but the utter difference of human existence from all worldly existence was recognized for the first time in Gnosticism and Christianity.

28. Ibid, P. 163
29. Ibid, P. 164

The world is a prison to man in Gnostic thought, and this idea is expressed in Paul's and John's writings for Bultmann. To know of the heavenly origin of one's self, of one's world-foreignness, and of the way of redemption out of this world -- that is the definite "knowledge", the Gnosis, which gave the Gnostic movement its name.

Since the world structure was made by the demonic powers, it is necessary that redemption comes from the heavenly world. A light-person sent by the highest god, the son and "image" of the most high, therefore comes down from the light-world bringing Gnosis.

According to Bultmann, the Gnostic movement took a concrete form in certain baptizing sects in the region of the Jordan. The movement evidently attached itself to local cults in the near East, and in a syncretistic process melted together with them into the form of mystery-Congregation; In this manner the movement also crept into Christian Congregations. But the effect of Gnosticism extended beyond the circle of religious groups: its ideas also spread into the Hellenistic religions philosophy of neo-platonism.

(2) If Christian preaching remained true to the tradition of the O.T. and ^{the} Judaism and of the earliest Church, definite contrasts between it and Gnosticism must be straightway apparent. The Christian message did by and large hold to the idea that the world is the creation of

the one true God, and hence that the creator-God and the redeemer-God are one.

(3) Gnosticism is only dealt with so far as it is a phenomenon within Christianity. The Gnostics considered themselves Christians teaching a Christian wisdom, and that is the way they appeared to the Churches. Hellenistic Christianity was in the maelstrom of the syncretistic process. At first, Gnosticism probably penetrated into the Christian congregations mostly through the medium of a Hellenistic Judaism that was itself in the grip of syncretism. The Syncretism of Hellenistic Christianity is, in other words, Jewish Christian Gnosticism. Hence, Bultmann insists, Gnosticism could not be regarded as a heathen faith, but as a form of Christianity.

4. In what manner then did Gnostic thought, myth, and terminology influence Christian thinking and contribute to the development of Christian theological language? This question naturally arises for Bultmann since he believes Gnosticism is a form of Christianity and considers their interrelationship so intimate. Bultmann answers the above question:

(a) By further developing the concept of eschatological dualism or by further developing cosmological thinking in a more consistent way. It is Gnostic language when Satan is called "the god of this world" (II Cor. 4:4),

"the ruler of this world" (J . 12:31), "the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. 2:2). Both in name and meaning "the rulers this age", who brought "the Lord of glory to the cross (1 Cor. 2:6.8), are figures of Gnostic Mythology. Aside from the terms for mythological figures, the terminology in which dualism is expressed shows extensive Gnostic influence.

(b) Gnostic mythology lies behind the allusion to the fall of creation in Rom. 8:20ff. According to it, creation "was subjected to futility" and had fallen into bondage to decay,"³⁰ under which it groans in expectation of release. For Bultmann Rom. 5:12 ff. interprets Adam's fall quite in keeping with Gnosticism when it speaks of Adam bringing sin and death upon mankind. The contrast Psychic-pneumatic in 1 Cor. 15:21, 44-49, to designate two basically different classes of men, is an especially clear indication that Paul's anthropological concepts had already been formed under the influence of Gnosticism, because for him this contrast can be explained neither by Greek usage nor from O.T., but only from Gnostic anthropology. Thus, Bultmann says, "Gnostic mythology serves to characterize man's situation in the world as a life which by its origin is destined for destruction, a life that is prone to be ruled by demon's powers."³¹

30. Ibid, P. 174

31. Ibid.

(c) In Gnostic concepts, the Redeemer appears in the history of salvation as a cosmic figure, the pre-existent divine being, son of the Father, who came down from heaven and assumed human form, and who, after his activity on earth was exalted to heavenly glory and wrested sovereignty over the spirit-powers to himself. In other words, this Gnostic Conception of the Redeemer, for Bultmann, was adopted by Paul in Phil. 2:6-11; Eph. 4:8-10; and also is found in Hebrews.

(d) For believers the cosmic triumph of Christ means emancipation from the demonic world-rulers, sin and death. The Gnostic idea is utilized in this connection.

(e) Bultmann interprets Paul's use of the term, "body of Christ", (Rom. 12:4; 1 Cor. 12:12-27, 6:15-17) by the Gnostic term "body" in order to explain the inner unity of believers with each other and with the Redeemer, and this very materially determines the development of the Church-concept for him. According to Bultmann, the "body" concept in Colossians (1:15-20) is apparently originally of a mythological or cosmological nature. He sees the same in Hermas (II4, 1). The Gnostic motif is used when the virgins, who are building the tower of the Church are called "holy spirits" and "powers of the Son of God" (IX13,2). Also, in Ignatius, the Gnostic myth influenced the view of the Church: The Church is the body of Christ (Sm. 1:2); he is its head (Tr. 11:2).

(f) Conversion from polytheism to faith in the one true God was called, "to come to knowledge of the truth" ----which Bultmann calls emancipating knowledge -- and was common in Christianity and Gnosticism. This he says, "the" Christian preacher could say in Gnostic terminology."³² He claims that Christian and Gnostic zeal for "knowledge" united. Paul, also regards the Gnostic terminology as the appropriate form of expression for the Christian understanding of experience, and he is just as proud of his liberty and authority as the Gnostics are (1 Cor. 9:1-23).

(g) Bultmann asserts that the Gnostic myth and terminology offered the possibility of elucidating the eschatological occurrence as one inaugurated by the history of Jesus Christ, and now at work in the present and in process of consummation, and the possibility of comprehending the Church and the individual as placed in the ground context of a process of disaster and salvation.

"Gnosticism's intent is such an understanding of one's self; that is what comes to expression in the "Gnostic consciousness of 'liberty' and 'authority'".³³ But the question is whether or not the paradoxical character of "liberty" is recognized. For Bultmann, liberty is understood as liberty only if this state is kept in existence by an ever-repeated responsible decision, because of the

32. Ibid, P. 180

33. Ibid, P. 182

fact that the possibility of being sarkikos (a man determined by flesh), in accord with genuine existence in true history, continues to exist.

Failure to recognize the reality of human existence in actual history involves a non-paradoxical misunderstanding of one's possession of the Spirit and of the liberty it brings, and this misunderstanding carries with it the surrender of the idea of creation.

This Gnostic failure to recognize the human existence as fulfilling itself in one's actual history leads also to a non-historical interpretation of the "kinship" idea. It is significant that Gnosticism tends to produce an individualistic type of mysticism, in which the redemption, the ascent of the Self, is anticipated in meditation and ecstasy."³⁴

34. Primitive Christianity, P. 171

CHAPTER III

KERYGMA AND THEOLOGY

7. The Theology of Paul

A. The Historical Position of Paul

Bultmann asserts that Paul was the founder of Christian theology and says, "Standing within the frame of Hellenistic Christianity he raised the theological motifs that were in the proclamation of the Hellenistic Church to the clarity of theological thinking; he called to attention the problems latent in the Hellenistic proclamation and brought them to a decision; and, thus - became the founder of Christian theology."¹ According to Bultmann, Paul was acquainted with popular philosophy and the phenomena of religious syncretism at an early age. Thus, Paul's religion originated in Hellenistic Judaism and possibly his theology was influenced by the theological ideas of syncretism of the mystery-religions and of Gnosticism. Bultmann claims that Paul was not a personal disciple of Jesus, therefore, "he was won to the Christian faith by the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church."² When Paul met this Kerygma the question thrust upon him was whether he was willing to

¹Ibid., p. 187

²Ibid.

regard the crucified Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Kerygma asserted to have risen from the dead, as the expected Messiah. But for Paul, according to the traditions of the fathers and the Torah, it meant whether he was willing to acknowledge in the cross of Christ God's judgment upon his self-understanding up to that time - God's condemnation of Jewish striving after righteousness by fulfilling the works of the law. Paul first rejected this question and became a persecutor of the Church, but at his conversion he submitted to this judgment of God. So, Paul's conversion was not the result of an inner moral collapse. It was not a conversion of repentance; neither was it one of emancipating enlightenment; rather, it was obedient submission to the judgment of God. His conversion brought him into the Hellenistic Church and he preached in the Hellenistic territory as a missionary in company with another Hellenistic missionary, Barnabas. Paul was the advocate of Hellenistic Christianity, in opposition to the Palestinian Church, at the Apostolic council.

Bultmann thinks that after Paul was converted, he made no effort toward contact with Jesus' disciples or the church at Jerusalem for instruction concerning Jesus and His ministry, since he protests his independence of them in Gal. 1-2.³ He doubts Paul's quotations in this epistle

³Ibid., p. 188

concerning the traditions of the Jerusalem Church. Of course, there is the influence of Palestinian tradition concerning the history and preaching of Jesus, and Bultmann asserts that ^{when} Paul referred to Christ, as an example, he ~~was~~ thinking not of the historical but of the pre-existent Jesus, since he appealed to a revelation, accorded to him, by the exalted Lord. For Bultmann, Paul's real theology, with its theological, anthropological, and soteriological ideas, is neither a recapitulation of Jesus' own preaching nor a further development of it. Bultmann next points out that Paul never adduces any of the sayings of Jesus on the Torah in favor of his own teaching about the Torah, and that the concept, Reign of God, which was basic for the message of Jesus has lost its dominant position in Paul. Neither is Paul's description of the essence of salvation as the righteousness of God paralleled in Jesus' preaching. "In relation to the preaching of Jesus, the theology of Paul is a new structure, and that indicates nothing else than that Paul has his place within Hellenistic Christianity."⁴ The question, "Jesus and Paul," is the question: Jesus and Hellenistic Christianity. Paul originated in Hellenistic Judaism and has his place within Hellenistic Christianity.

³Ibid., p. 188

⁴Ibid., p. 189

Therefore, for Bultmann, there is no direct connection between Jesus and Paul in the sense that he received a calling on the Damascus road, by a special revelation, but it was merely his surrendering his previous understanding of himself - pride.

B. Man prior to the Revelation of Faith

Pauline theology is not a speculative system. It deals with God not as He is in Himself but only with God as He is significant for man - for man's responsibility and man's salvation. Correspondingly, it does not deal with the world and man as they are in themselves, but constantly sees the world and man in their relation to God. For this reason, Bultmann claims that Paul's theology is also anthropology. The Christology of Paul is likewise governed by this point of view. Paul does not speculatively discuss the metaphysical essence of Christ, or his relation to God, or his "natures", but speaks of him as the one through whom God is working for the salvation of the world and man. Therefore, Paul's christology is simultaneously soteriology.

Bultmann treats Paul's theology as the doctrine of man: first, of man prior to the revelation of faith, and second, of man under faith, for in this way the anthropological and soteriological orientation of Paul's theology are brought out.

(1) The Anthropological concepts.

"Soma" (Body). The most comprehensive term which Paul uses to characterize man's existence is soma, - body. In defining the concept soma, the place to begin is the simple popular usage in which soma means body which in a naive anthropological view can be placed in contrast with the soul or the spirit. Man, his person as a whole, can be denoted by soma. Man is called soma in respect to his being able to make himself the object of his own action or to experience himself as the subject to whom something happens. In other words, man is called soma as having a relationship to himself, or, more exactly, he is so called as that self from whom he, as subject, distinguishes himself. In the Pauline epistles man is also called soma in respect to his being able to control himself and to be the object of his own action. For Bultmann, then, the characterization of man as soma implies that man is a being who has a relationship to himself, and that this relationship can be either an appropriate or a perverted one; that he can be at one with himself or at odds; that he can be under his own control or lose his grip on himself. In other words, the concept soma is a characteristic of human existence.

But Paul does not distinguish terminologically between soma in the basic sense of that which characterizes human existence and soma as the phenomenon of the material

body. Paul connects the idea of somatic existence in the eschatological consummation with a mythological teaching concerning the resurrection (I Cor. 15).⁵ In distinction from pure mythology the real intention of Paul is to assert that specific human existence, both before and beyond death, is a somatic existence in the basic sense.

The temptation exists to let the perceived separation between himself and himself become a divorce - to misunderstand his relationship to himself as that between his self and a totally foreign being, a "Not - I".⁶ This is, for Bultmann, the understanding of the self that is found in Gnostic dualism, according to which man's self is imprisoned in the body, a prison foreign to its own nature, from which it yearns to be set free. Paul's resurrection-life - as somatic - according to Bultmann, comes close to Gnostic dualism since Paul occasionally uses soma synonymously with sarx (flesh). For example, in II Cor. 5:1 ff. Paul comes very close, not merely in form of expression, to a real Hellenistic-Gnostic dualism. In the same sense, soma is also to be understood in II Cor. 12:2-4 as the physical body, while Paul is speaking of a pneumatic

⁵Ibid., p. 198

⁶Ibid., p. 199

experience of his - doubtless an ecstasy in the sense that mysticism uses the word - in which he was influenced by the Hellenistic-dualistic depreciation of the body. This characteristic concept, first meaning the physical body, comes to serve, as we have shown, to denote man's person in the sense that having a relationship to one's self belongs essentially to being man.

Psyche, Pneuma, and Zoe. In Rom. 7:22 and II Cor. 4:16 Paul uses "the inward man" for the real self which can distinguish itself from its soma-self, and this is derived from the anthropology of Hellenistic dualism. Bultmann tries to investigate the other anthropological terms which Paul uses for that real self, namely, Psyche (soul), Pneuma (spirit), and Zoe (life). He says, "It is very peculiar that Paul is influenced in addition by Gnostic usage, with the result that he uses psyche in a depreciatory sense."⁷

Psyche is specifically the human state of a being as a striving, willing, purposing self. Yet even where psyche is depreciated in contrast to pneuma, it does not mean mere animal life but full human life, the earthly life in contrast to supernatural life. Paul uses pneuma in a sense similar to that of psyche, and makes it take the

⁷Ibid., p. 204, in addition to O.T. usage, meaning of person, self.

place of a personal pronoun. When Paul speaks of the pneuma of man he does not mean some higher principle within him or some special intellectual or spiritual faculty but simply his self. In distinction from psyche, pneuma seems also to mean the self regarded as conscious or aware of itself. In this sense, according to Bultmann, the meaning of pneuma departs from that of psyche and approaches that of nous (mind). Here pneuma means a special orientation of the will. Now, various possibilities of regarding man or the self, come to light in the use of the anthropological terms soma, psyche, and pneuma. Man is a living unity. He is a person who can become an object to himself. He is a person having a relationship to himself (soma). He is a person who lives in his intentionality, his pursuit of some purpose, his willing and knowing (psyche, pneuma).⁸ This analysis is also substantiated in the concept of the zoe (life) which is man's, in the nature of the case, when he has psyche. That man is given natural zoe by God, and that it is temporally limited and finds its end in death does not change the meaning of the formal (ontological) concept zoe. The supernatural life is also zoe and has the same formal meaning as the concept zoe when used to designate natural life. Paul understands it as the life which a man leads

⁸Ibid., p. 209

in his concrete existence, the intentionality of human existence. For Bultmann, Paul's concept of life, as lived by men, is paradoxical in that zoe means the life as the subject of its own actions, its living self though this self is not self-creative, like God. Paul sees himself confronted with the future and facing the possibilities in which he can gain his self or lose it. This finds expression in the fact that he does not simply "live", but is always "leading his life" in some particular way.

Bultmann says, "Life is lived in some sphere and that sphere gives it its direction. . . at the same time, man always lives 'for' or 'to' something,"⁹ and therefore a man's life is either for or to himself, or living for God or for the Lord who for us died and rose again. But in these statements, which describe specifically the Christian life, all that concerns us, in this context, is the bare ontological meaning this presupposes for "life" as a "form of existence".¹⁰

Mind and Conscience. The term nous most clearly expresses the being of man as a specific self that is the subject of its own willing and doing. By it is meant not

⁹Ibid., p. 210

¹⁰Ibid.

the mind or the intellect as a special faculty, but the knowing, understanding, and judging which belong to man as man except in the case that human self is replaced by the Divine Spirit in the state of ecstasy. The full meaning of nous is shown by Rom. 7:23: "But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind (nous)". Bultmann says, "the nous, therefore, is man's real self in distinction from his soma, the self which has become objectivized in relation to himself."¹¹ This self (the nous) is an understanding self, that hears God's will through the Law.

According to Rom. 12:2, nous has as one of its functions to prove (dokimazein). Bultmann takes this word and translates it to "make a judgment" and develops it to mean "to consider worth" or "consider worthy", and then he says, "the nous is the self that makes itself the object of its own judging."¹²

The other term for "understanding" or "knowing" is conscience (syneidesis). This concept belongs to the anthropological concepts. For Bultmann this word had the meaning of knowledge shared with one's self, long before

¹¹Ibid., p. 212

¹²Ibid., p. 215

Paul's time because Hellenistic Judaism had already appropriated the word in this sense. The term also denotes a relationship of man to himself, though in a different way than soma does. While soma serves to distinguish the objectivized self from the real self and to characterize the soma-self as the object of one's own action, or that of outside powers, conscience designates a man's knowledge of his conduct as his own. Unlike nous, it is not a state of mind but one's own mind, Conscience judges. Hence, conscience is "a knowledge of good and evil and of the corresponding conduct."¹³ Insofar as the conscience's knowledge applies to that which is demanded of man, the decisive thing is that conscience knows that there is such a thing at all. "Here again we see", says Bultmann, "that Paul understands a man's self as the specific self which becomes his by his assuming responsibility, irrespective of the judgments of men, for the particular life turned over to him from outside himself."¹⁴

For Bultmann, conscience becomes the transcendent power and he says, "Precisely in 'conscience', which a man has by virtue of a power which transcends it, his self

¹³Ibid., p. 217

¹⁴Ibid., p. 219

constitutes itself as his specific self. The verdict of conscience is absolutely valid, inasmuch as in it obedience to the transcendent power takes place, hence, precisely in 'conscience' man has his 'freedom' (I Cor. 10:29)".¹⁵

Conscious for Bultmann, means the self-knowledge of self in responsibility to (the) transcendent power.

Heart. Paul uses "heart" to a large extent synonymously with nous to designate the self as a willing, planning, intending self. In II Cor. 3:14 f., "mind" and "heart" are parallel in content. Like nous, "heart" is a man's self, and, in most cases where it is used, it performs the service of a personal pronoun. The "heart" is not a higher principle in man, any more than nous, but, according to Bultmann, it is just the intending, purposing self--which decides within itself or is moved from without--which can turn to either the good or the bad. Moreover, the heart doubts as well as believes (Rom. 10:6-10). As refusal of faith is hardening of the heart (II Cor. 3:14 f.), so faith arises when God causes light to dawn in the heart (II Cor. 4:6). Everywhere "heart" stands for the self. The difference between nous (mind) and kardia (heart), however, lies

¹⁵ibid.

in the fact that an element of knowing is contained in "mind", but not in "heart". In the heart the dominant element is striving and will, and also the state of being moved by feelings. In addition to this, the term "heart" can express the idea that the self's intent and will may be a hidden thing: "heart is the interior in contrast to the exterior",¹⁶ and the real self in contrast to what a man appears to be.

The exterior and the interior can also be combined to designate the totality of man. Thus, mouth and heart stand parallel for the members of men in Rom. 10:9 f; II Cor. 6:11. So far as the "heart" is the self, which is stirred by feelings and emotions, it may express itself in rejoicing, sorrowing, or weeping.

(2) Flesh, Sin, and World.

Creation and Man. As the meaning of soma showed, man is a being who has a relationship to himself, is placed at his own disposal, and is responsible for his own existence. But this existence of man, as the terms psyche, pneuma, zoe, nous, and kardia have shown, is never found in the present, as a fulfilled reality, but always lies ahead of man. In other words, his existence is always an intention and a quest.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 227

Thus, for Bultmann, "Man has always already missed the existence that at heart he seeks, his intent is basically perverse, evil."¹⁶ What then is the meaning of evil? Paul constantly sees man as placed before God. The ontological possibility of being good or evil is simultaneously the ontological possibility of having a relationship to God. The demand for good which is made upon man is God's demand, which is a life-giving demand; and disobedience is, therefore, sin. Bultmann declares that Paul's view of God's creatorship is not a cosmological theory which professes to explain the origin of the world. Rather, it is a proposition that concerns man's existence. The earth, as God's creation, is at man's disposal for man's needs. Also knowledge of God as Creator contains primarily knowledge of man. In this sense Paul does use the familiar Stoic ideas of "natural theology" in Rom. 1:19 f., though not in order to prove the sheer existence of God and His world-dominating providence. Rather he uses them in order to only accuse, particularly to expose, the guilt of the heathen. God's being is understood aright only when it is understood as significant-for-man being. As Bultmann said before, Paul's theology proper is anthropology.¹⁷

¹⁶Ibid., p. 227

¹⁷Ibid., p. 191

Therefore when Paul says in Rom. 11:36, "for of him, and through him, and to him, are all things", Paul is using a formula of Stoic Pantheism.¹⁸

The creation has a peculiar ambiguous character: on the one hand, it is the earth placed by God at man's disposal for his use and benefit; on the other, it is the field of activity for evil, demonic powers. The Old Testament tradition and Gnostic tradition have flowed together here in Paul for Bultmann. Paul's conception of the creation, as well as of the Creator, depends upon what it means for man's existence. As God and the creation are regarded as being within the horizon of a theological view of history - in regard to their significance for man and his history - correspondingly man's being is understood in its relatedness to the Creator and the creation.

Flesh (Sarx) and Sin. Sarx means, first of all, "flesh" as man's material corporeality, but only as it is formed and animated in the human body. Like psyche and pneuma, sarx can even be used to designate the personal himself. Further examples indicate that sarx can denote also "fleshliness" meaning the nature of the earthly-human being in his weakness and transitoriness, which also

¹⁸Ibid., p. 229

means his being in opposition to God and His Spirit. Thus, for Bultmann, sarx can mean the whole sphere of that which is earthly or "natural".¹⁹ When Bultmann says "natural", it means the "outward" or the "visible" which has its nature in external "appearance" and belongs to the sphere of "flesh". In this sense, "flesh" becomes synonymous with the term "world" (Kosmos). Thus the meaning of "in the flesh" corresponds antithetically to the formula "in the Spirit", in which Spirit means the miraculous, life-giving power of God - its territory is the "hidden interior", the "unseen", the "heart".

Bultmann asserts that the "flesh" means the designation of the sphere of the humanly natural and transitory and he says, "the sinful has its origin in 'flesh' in this respect: That that conduct or attitude that directs itself according to 'flesh', taking 'flesh' for its norm, is sinful -."²⁰

The flesh and sin is a characteristic expression of the human attitude, like "to desire", "to boast", etc. Very closely related to "boasting after the flesh" is "putting one's confidence in the flesh". The hidden side of "boasting" and "putting confidence in the flesh" is fear. Thus, for Bultmann, Paul's concepts of "flesh" and "sin"

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 234

²⁰ Ibid., p. 238

can become powers to which man falls slave and against which he is powerless. The personification of these powers expresses the fact that man has lost the capacity to be the subject of his own actions. In order to prove this Bultmann uses the passages in Rom. 7:14, "I am carnal, sold under sin", and in Rom. 7:18, "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing."

Therefore not to be at one with one's self, is the essence of human existence under sin. The inner dividedness means that man himself destroys his true self.

What then is the result of this sin? By the Old Testament tradition, death is punishment for the sin a man has committed; sinners are worthy of death (Rom. 1:32). Still, for Bultmann, Paul's ideas about flesh and sin lead beyond this traditional juristic conception of death as punishment. Since sin is man's false pursuit of life after the flesh - the earthly-natural and transitory - therefore sin leads with inner necessity into death: "If you live according to the flesh you will die" (Rom. 8:13).²¹ Thus death grows organically out of fleshly life like a fruit.

²¹Ibid., p. 246

"World" (Cosmos). In Greek antiquity, the conception "universe" was expressed by the word "kosmos". It was conceived as a totality bound together rationally by the comprehensible relationships of law into a unified structure, containing heaven and earth and all living beings, and including gods and men. This conception is foreign to the Old Testament in which it is often spoken of as "heaven and earth". Paul used kosmos as "the creation", while occasionally kosmos means "world" in the restricted sense of the stage on which human life is played -- that is the "earth". However, kosmos does not always mean "earth", as the mere stage for man's life and existence, but often denotes the quintessence of the earthly conditions of life and of earthly possibilities. Thus, for Bultmann, kosmos is not a cosmological term, but an historical one, as for example in the many passages where it is used in the sense of "the world of men", "mankind", - a usage of Hellenistic Judaism. The most important thing of all, however, is the fact that the term kosmos often contains a definite theological judgment. Kosmos constitutes the implicit or explicit antithesis to the sphere of God or "the Lord", whether kosmos denotes the totality of human possibilities and conditions of life (1 Cor. 3:22, 7:31 fr.), or persons in their attitudes and judgments

(I Cor. 1:20, 27f.) or in their sinfulness and enmity toward God (Rom. 3:6, 19: 11:15; II Cor. 5:19).^{22a}

Therefore, kosmos is much more a time-concept than a space-concept; or, stated more strongly, it is an eschatological concept. It denotes the world of men and the sphere of human activity as being, on the one hand, a temporary thing hastening toward its end (I Cor. 7:31), and, on the other hand, the sphere of anti-godly powers under whose sway the individual, who is surrounded by them, has fallen. Thus, the kosmos, as the sphere of life's earthly conditions, achieves power over man whose attention is directed toward "the affairs of the world" (I Cor. 7:32-34).

For Bultmann, this eschatological-historical meaning of kosmos, and - along with it the understanding of man's situation, denotes an enslavement to powers for whose dominion man is nevertheless himself responsible. This all comes out, finally, in the interpretation of Paul's mythological statement about these powers. The kosmos, though it is God's creation, is the domain of demonic powers: the "angels", "principalities" and "powers" (Rom. 8:38; I Cor. 15:24), "the rulers of this age" (I Cor. 2:6, 8), "the elemental spirits of the 'kosmos'" (Gal. 4:3,9).

^a
22 Ibid., p. 255

Paul's naive mythology of the battle of the spirit powers against Christ means for Bultmann: The spirit powers represent the reality into which man is placed as one full of conflicts and struggle, a reality which threatens and tempts. Thus, through these mythological conceptions, the insight is expressed that man does not have his life in his own hands but he is constantly confronted with the decision of choosing his lord.

The law. Since the true will of man - the inward man - strives toward life and he has missed this life, God's demand, the law of the Old Testament, encounters man concretely in the nous, the purpose of which is no other than to lead man to life.

The Old Testament Law is conceived of in the meaning it has for the Old Testament and Judaism. It is not the rational moral law inherent in man's intellect and giving rise to discussion of such problems as education and the itemized content of "the good". Rather, the Law is the totality of the historically given legal demands, cultic and ritual as well as ethical. But Paul is thinking about the Law, in particular of the decalogue, essentially as to its ethical demands. The Law had been given by God

in order to be fulfilled. The Law however, being unable to lead to "righteousness" and leading rather only to death, is radically abolished for the man of faith. There is therefore, no true fulfillment of the Law. Man cannot achieve salvation by works of the Law, and he is not even intended to do so. The way of works of the Law and the way of grace and faith are mutually exclusive, because man's effort to achieve his salvation by keeping the Law only leads him into sin. Then what meaning does the Law still have? The Law brings to light the fact that man is sinful. Though the purpose of the Law is that of being a paidagogos to Christ, it is not conceived of in either the Greek sense or the modern sense, by Bultmann, as an educator which is to train man up to a higher level of mental life. The "educating" done by the Law leads, on the contrary, into sin. But the Law does this not by leading man into subjective despair, but by bringing him into an objective, desperate situation.^{22b} To prove this, Bultmann interprets Rom. 7:14-24 so that it is not a confession of Paul's as he describes his inner division under the Law, but the picture of the objective situation of man-under-the Law which becomes visible to him only after he has attained the viewpoint of

^{22b} Ibid., p. 266

faith. Therefore the cry, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom.7:24), is not uttered by Paul. Bultmann says, "Not that Paul utters this cry, but Paul the Christian, who puts it into the mouth of the Jew, and thereby exposes the situation of the Jew which is not visible to himself."²³ Then the ultimate purpose of the Law is, for Bultmann, to lead man to death and thereby to let God appear as God, for the Law thus gives sin its power since sin is the sting of death. And by this process the Law leads man to God as the the Creator who bestows life and from whom alone life can be given to man. It is as this God that He appears in the "grace" of the salvation-occurrence, and it is this God toward whom faith is directed.²⁴

This is for Bultmann, not a magical or mysterious transformation of man, in regard to his substance, and the basis of his nature, but his new existence standing in historical-continuity-with the old. A new understanding of one's self takes the place of the old -- it thereby becomes one's own true history -- for the transition from the old existence to the new does not take place as a

²³Ibid., p. 266

²⁴Ibid., p. 207

mental development from sin to faith; rather, faith is decision in regard to the grace which encounters a man in the proclaimed word.

The sinner is only the innerly divided and self-misunderstanding human self, and salvation is simply the realization of that destined goal of "life" and selfhood which are God's will for man, and man's own real intention, but which was perverted under sin.²⁵

C. Man Under Faith

(1) The righteousness of God.

Pre-faith man (man without faith) is man fallen under the power of death, while man under faith is man who has received life. This life is gained by righteousness or justification. For Bultmann, the salvation, the formula for life, is dependent upon and conditioned by a man's righteousness. This is the man's new grasp and comprehension of his existence before God. He says, "Strictly speaking, righteousness is the condition for receiving salvation or 'life!'"²⁶ But since this connection between righteousness and salvation is so close, righteousness itself can become the essence of salvation. When it denotes the condition for (or the essence of) salvation, dikaioyne (righteousness) is a "forensic term".²⁷ It

²⁵ Ibid., p. 269

²⁶ Ibid., p. 270

²⁷ Ibid., p. 272

does not mean the ethical quality of a person nor any quality at all, but a relationship. Then, according to Bultmann, the forensic term "righteousness" became an eschatological term since the Jewish piety came to be determined by eschatology -- God's righteous verdict over the pious expectation came from God's eschatological judgment. In this sense the formal meaning of dikaiosyne, a forensic-eschatological term is in complete agreement with that found both in the Pauline and the Jewish conception, but the difference is, first of all, that Paul asserts of this forensic-eschatological righteousness that it is already imputed to a man in the present (on the presupposition that he has "faith"). The present reality of the righteousness, however for Bultmann, does not rob it of forensic-eschatological meaning. It is paradox: God already pronounces His eschatological verdict upon the man of faith in the present; the eschatological event is already a present reality. Therefore, the righteousness which God adjudicates to the man of faith is not "sinlessness" in the sense of ethical perfection, but is "sinlessness" in the sense that God does not "count" man's sin against him.²⁵ The present reality of righteousness rests upon its having been revealed by the occurring of salvation in Christ. The forensic-eschatological sense

²⁵ Ibid., p. 276

of righteousness is also corroborated by its parallelism with the term "adoption to Sonship", which is both a legal and an eschatological term. Then the immediate contrast between the Jewish and the Pauline view is that, what for the Jews is a matter of hope, is for Paul a present reality because the eschatological life is in a certain manner already a present reality.

The contrast between the two consists not merely in the assertion of the present reality of righteousness, but also in a much more decisive thesis - the one which concerns the condition to which God's acquitting decision is tied. The Jews take it for granted that this condition is keeping the Law. In direct contrast to this view Paul's thesis runs - to consider its negative aspect first: without works of the Law. But this negative aspect of Paul's thesis does not stand alone; a positive statement takes its place: by or from faith. This antithesis of Paul's to the Jewish view signifies that "faith" is the absolute contrary of "boasting". "Boasting in the Law" is the fundamental attitude of the Jew, the essence of his sin, and the radical giving up of boasting is the attitude of faith. Righteousness, then, cannot be won by human effort, nor does any human accomplishment establish a claim to it; it is a sheer gift.²⁹

²⁹Ibid., p. 281

This may also be expressed by calling it "grace". The "Righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ" (Rom. 3:22) has an equivalent in v. 24: "Being justified freely by his grace," in which the gift-character of righteousness is emphasized. Therefore, "grace", like "faith" can be placed in direct antithesis to "works of the Law".

Righteousness, then, has its origin in God's grace - in His act of grace accomplished in Christ. "God's righteousness" means the righteousness from God which is conferred upon man as a gift by God's free grace alone.

Another term can be substituted for the term "righteousness" namely "reconciliation". The use of the term "reconciliation" makes clear that a complete reversal of the relation between God and man has taken place. But the word of "reconciliation" is not a conciliatory and reconciling word but the proclamation of an already accomplished reconciliation, and "be reconciled", is the invitation to faith.³⁰ God's "reconciliation" is His restoration of peace by no longer letting His "wrath" prevail. Bultmann considers that "forgiveness of sin" is an ambiguous term seldom used by Paul since it refers only to the release from former sins while the important thing in reconciliation is release from sinning.³¹

³⁰ Ibid., p. 287

³¹ Ibid.

(2) Grace

For Bultmann, God's "grace" is not a quality, not His timeless kindness. On the contrary, now, as then, "God's wrath" pours out "against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Rom. 1:18). "Grace" has two insights for the understanding: 1. God's grace is not His unknown or misunderstood graciousness, but it is His now occurring act of grace. 2. This act of grace does not take the place of God's previous judgment, but is His gracious dealing precisely as to the Judge. The grace of God, for Bultmann, is not a mode of dealing which God has decided henceforth to adopt, but is a single deed, God's eschatological deed which takes effect for everyone who acknowledges it in faith. Because this deed or occurrence is the decisive eschatological event in which the time of salvation, "the acceptable time" (II Cor. 6:1), has dawned, therefore grace may be spoken of as a personified power which works against the power of sin. Then the meaning of "grace" is actually identified with that of spirit.³² In the same way and with the same meaning Paul speaks of agape (love). Therefore, a consideration of his statements about agape confirms the treatment of "grace";

³²Ibid., p. 290

but Paul speaks of agape as revealed in a deed, agape at work, in action. When "the love of Christ constraineth us" (II Cor. 5:14), the love, like grace, is represented as a personified power.

The divine deed consists in the fact that God gave Christ up to die on the cross; Christ is preached as "the crucified" (I Cor. 1:23; 2:2; Gal. 3:1). Therefore, the gospel can be called the "word of the cross" (I Cor. 1:18), a "stumbling-block" (Gal. 5:11) to natural man. But the death and the resurrection of Christ are bound together in the unity of the one salvation-occurrence. The salvation-occurrence, then, includes the death and the resurrection of Jesus. That is -- Paul is interested only in the fact that Jesus became man and lived on earth. Bultmann thinks that how Jesus was born or lived interested Paul only to the extent that he knew that Jesus was a definite, concrete man, a Jew, and he says, "Beyond that, Jesus' manner of life, his ministry, his personality, his character play no role at all; neither does Jesus' message... Paul is not thinking of the historical Jesus."³³ Any evaluation of the historical person Jesus, according to Bultmann, would be a kata sarka (fleshly) view of Christ.

How then can the salvation-occurrence be recognized and experienced by man as the deed of grace? Bultmann's

³³Ibid., p. 294

answer, naturally, is that it is an event God causes to occur to the pre-existent son of God. It seems to take place in a "mythical sphere outside the realm of human experience."³⁴ The resurrection, for him, simply cannot be a visible fact in the realm of human history. The listing of the witnesses who had seen him risen in I Cor. 15:5-8 is only Paul's imagination of Gnosticizing objections to belief. Paul was only following the traditions which originated in the earliest Church and were widespread in Hellenistic Christianity and had become by that time crystallized formulations. Christ's propitiatory death and vicarious sacrifice is not merely a sacrifice which cancels the guilt of sin, but is also the means of release from the powers of this age: Law, Sin, and Death. How can Christ's death have such an effect? Bultmann's answer is: "Paul describes Christ's death in analogy with the death of a divinity of the mystery religions". And, he goes even further to classify, "Christ's death in the categories of the Gnostic myth, regarding his death as unified with his incarnation and resurrection or exaltation."³⁵ The Gnostic myth, in itself, contains only the notion of the Redeemer's coming and going, in the form of his humiliation and exaltation, and not his death. Therefore Bultmann assumes that Paul combined a mystery-conception

³⁴Ibid., p. 295

³⁵Ibid., p. 298

with the Gnostic myth. Now, for the Gnostic view, men together with the Redeemer constitute a unity: "they and he belong to one soma (body)." ³⁶ The Redeemer himself is a cosmic figure and not really an individual person, therefore his soma is a cosmic entity. For Bultmann, soma corresponds to the generic humanity assumed by Christ in Karl Barth soteriology. What happens to the Redeemer, or happened while he tarried in human form on earth, happens to his whole soma, not to him alone but to all who belong to that soma. So if he suffered death, the same is true to them. If he was raised from the dead, the same is true to them. Bultmann sees baptism and the Lord's Supper in this light. Now it is clear that for him Christ's death and resurrection are cosmic occurrence, rather than incidents that took place once upon a time in the past.

Then, why did Paul use the categories of the mysteries and the Gnostic myth? "Because through them the salvation-occurrence could be interpreted as happening actually to and for and in man." ³⁷ According to Bultmann, there are two acts of faith or belief. The first is belief: willingness to consider as true the facts reported of the pre-existent Son of God -- incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection from the dead -- and to see them as a demon-

³⁶ Ibid., p. 299

³⁷ Ibid., p. 300

stration of the grace of God. The other is a faith which is self-surrender to the grace of God and which signifies the utter reversal of a man's previous understanding of himself -- specifically, the radical surrender of his human "boasting".

The proclamation of the salvation-occurrence is the call for faith or the challenge to give up one's previous self-understanding. The salvation-occurrence is nowhere present except in the proclamation of the promised word. Thus, the salvation-occurrence is an eschatological occurrence. It does not become a fact of the past but constantly takes place anew in the present. It is present not as the after-effect of a significant fact of world-history, but in the proclamation of the word. Consequently, in the proclamation Christ himself encounters the hearer, and the "Now" in which the preached word sounds forth is the Now of the eschatological occurrence itself.³⁸ The effectiveness of the salvation-occurrence is in the word, which accosts the hearer and compels him to decide for or against it.

For Bultmann, Christ's pre-existence and incarnation are definitely of mythological nature, and not an earthly occurrence, but God was acting in them and this action of His took place "when the fulness of the time was come" (Gal. 4:4). As to the assertion that Christ's incarnation

³⁸Ibid., p. 302

is also his own deed of obedience and love, it must be admitted that the "obedience" and "love" of the pre-existent Son are not visible data. However, they are indirectly experienced in the fact that Christ is present in the ministry of the proclaimer, and if so, it has cosmic dimension and in reality, historic dimension. And this is that fact which finds "mythological expression in what is said of the pre-existence of Christ."³⁹ What the hearer affirms when he believes the pre-existence of Christ is that what has encountered him is the word of God. In the same manner, Bultmann thinks of the resurrection: Belief in the resurrection and the faith that Christ himself speaks in the proclaimed word are identical.

In the "word", the salvation-occurrence is present. Paul has historized the Jewish apocalyptic speculation of an intermediate messianic reign preceding the new aeon by conceiving the time of the Messiah's reign as the time between Christ's resurrection and parousia -- as the Now in which the proclamation is sounding forth.⁴⁰ The proclaimed word is the Kerygma of the authorized messengers, "heralds", "apostles".⁴¹ Then, the proclaimer, the apostle belongs to the eschatological occurrence.

The ecclesia is the congregation of those who are called through the preached word, therefore, its existence

³⁹Ibid., p. 305

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 307

⁴¹Ibid., p. 307

in turn is the foundation of preaching for Bultmann. The ecclesia is ambiguous: visible as a worldly fact, invisible as a thing of the world to come. But primarily the Church is meant as the "body of Christ". This metaphorical expression is also taken by Bultmann as Gnostic and he says, "Paul's Gnostic terminology serves to express the comprehensive historic complex, instituted by the salvation-occurrence, into which the individual is placed."⁴² The individual is taken into the "body of Christ" by the sacrament of baptism. "In Christ" is primarily an ecclesiastical formula. It means the state of having been introduced into the "body of Christ" by baptism. But what is the relation between incorporation into the Church by the sacrament of baptism and the dynamic process in which the salvation-occurrence continues itself through the proclaimed word? Baptism plays a subordinate role to the word. Baptism certifies participation in the salvation-occurrence, the death and resurrection of Jesus and it also brings a man under the domination of the Lord. Similarly, in Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper mystery ideas unite with his own view of the salvation-occurrence. The particular effect of this sacrament, like that of baptism, is its special application of the salvation-occurrence to those who here

⁴²Ibid., p. 307

and now are celebrating it. The additional effect, besides this, is that of instituting a fellowship among the celebrants. Then, the efficacy of the sacrament does not rest upon the elements, but rests upon the act as an act of proclamation.

(3) Faith

"Faith" is the condition for the receipt of "righteousness". Such "faith is the acceptance of the Christian message."⁴³ The structure of faith presented by Bultmann is: (a) Paul understands faith primarily as obedience. The acceptance of the message in faith takes the form of an act of obedience because the message demands of man the surrender of his previous understanding of himself. This attitude of faith is the radical opposite of the attitude of boasting. For him, faith is not an experience, not a state of the soul, rather it is the condition for receiving salvation. (b) Faith is "confession". This means to him that faith is not piety nor trust-in-God in general, but it has a "dogmatic" character: "the word of faith" or "the hearing of faith". Faith consequently contains a knowing. Thus, to say "we know" or "you know" makes an appeal to a "dogma" -- a statement in the kerygma. Ultimately "faith" and "knowledge" are identical as a new understanding of one's self.⁴⁴

⁴³Ibid., p. 314

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 318

On the other hand faith is also "undogmatic": It is no teaching about external matters. For the word is kerygma, personal address, demand, and promise; it is the very act of divine grace. Hence its acceptance -- faith -- is obedience, acknowledgment, and confession. (c) Faith is also "hope". Faith is not a self-contained condition of man's soul, but points toward the future. This "hope" is the freedom for the future and the openness toward it because the man of faith has turned over his anxiety about himself and his future in obedience to God. (d) Such "hope" has a peculiar correlative in "fear". As long as the believer lives "in the flesh", he is constantly tempted in his existence. For Bultmann, "Existence in faith, is a movement between 'no longer' and 'not yet'". 'No longer': the decision of faith has done away with the past, but as true decision, it must be made anew again and again. 'Not yet': giving up that which is part, surrendering a possession which had given a supposed security, precludes the taking a new possession in exchange for it. (e) Faith is also confidence. This is complete surrender of one's own care and strength to God.⁴⁵

Again Bultmann defines this faith as the acceptance of the kerygma as that of a genuine obedience to it, which

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 314-323

includes a new understanding of one's self.

This faith is the newly opened way of salvation. Here Bultmann considers the doctrine of predestination and election. He cannot accept these literally. If one takes them literally, a contradiction arises between God's predestination and man's freedom and there is no decision for obedience by men. For Bultmann, faith is God-given to the extent that prevenient grace first made the human decision possible, with the result that we can only understand it as God's gift. To escape from the God's election, Bultmann brings in "new creation" and says, "the existing of a Christian in the faith that operates in love is an eschatological occurrence: a being created anew."⁴⁶

(4) Freedom

"Obedience of faith" means also to be released from the power of sin and death. The new self-understanding which is bestowed with faith is that of freedom, in which the believer gains life and thereby his own self. This freedom is the gift of the spirit and it is the opposite of the flesh. The power of the Spirit gives the believer freedom, and opens up the future, or eternal life. "For freedom is nothing else than being open for the genuine future... So Spirit may be called the power of futurity."⁴⁷

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 330

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 335

Freedom is not only delivery from sin, but also release from the Law. The power of sin was the Law for the believers, but Christ is the end of the Law. Freedom from the Law, however, has a dialectic or paradoxical character: freedom from its demand and our obligation to it -- depending upon the sense in which the demand is understood. Out of Christian freedom flows "authorization", which is expressed in "All things are lawful unto me" (I Cor. 6:12 -- which could be translated: "for me all things are authorized").⁴⁸ This authorization is the Christian's independence from all worldly claims. The Christian, then, is free from all men, and yet there is a proper subjection of himself as "slave to all" and the imperative, "be servants of one another" (Gal. 5:13) still stands -- "Be servants of one another", however, stands not alone but has the characteristic modifier "through love". Freedom from the Law and sin is also freedom from death. The believer, having died with Christ, also shares in his resurrection. For Bultmann, Paul expresses this in the language of the mystery religions and Gnosticism.⁴⁹ Because by faith in the word, man lets the resurrection of Christ become the power that henceforth determines his life. As resurrection-life beyond bodily death, life is a future thing yet to come.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 342

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 345

Christ brought life for the new mankind; in him it is already present even though it will not actualize itself for the believer until the future. So, life is a present thing and the spirit is both the norm and the source and power of the Christian's new walk. The life in the spirit makes also man powerfully triumphant over suffering. Through suffering the believer experiences the "fellowship of his sufferings".⁵⁰ For Bultmann, "the fellowship of suffering" does not mean simply the historical relationship of follower and master. It means the bond with Christ which takes place in faith, conceived in the cosmological terminology of Gnosticism, but factually accomplished by the decision of faith.⁵¹ In God, freedom, righteousness, and life have their cause and the glory of God is the ultimate meaning and the ultimate goal.

8. The Theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles.

a) The historical position of John

The historical locus of the Gospel and Epistles of John must be considered in comparison with the synoptics. John, for Bultmann, is separated both from the proclamation of Jesus and from that of the earliest church. If John

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 350

⁵¹Ibid., p. 351

was acquainted with one or more of the synoptists is doubtful. The miracle stories in this Gospel indicate by their very style a more advanced stage of development than that of the synoptic tradition and their meanings are symbolic or allegorical.¹ "The result is a stylistically and historically completely different picture from that depicted by the synoptics. In the synoptics there are short dialogues between Jesus and his disciples and his opponents which are formulated as a counter-question or as figurative sayings, but in John there are extended discourses or dialogues occasioned by the miracles or by ambiguous statements or concepts like "being born again" and "living water". In John Jesus appears neither as the rabbi arguing about questions of the Law nor as the prophet proclaiming the breaking in of the Reign of God. Rather he speaks only of his own person as the Revealer whom God has sent. The authority of Jesus as the Son of God is being demonstrated. The parables, so characteristic of the synoptic Jesus, are completely lacking; in their place appear the great symbolic discourses of the good shepherd and the true vine which by symbolic figures represent Jesus as the revealer.

While in the synoptics the vicissitudes, the problems, and the faith of the earliest Church are reflected,

¹Bultmann, Theology of N.T., Vol. II, p. 3

these are hardly discovered in John -- the validity of the Law, and the coming or the delay of the Reign of God are never discussed. So far as the situation of the Church is reflected in the Gospel of John, its problem is the conflict with Judaism, and its theme is faith in Jesus as the Son of God.

The relation of John to Paul is not such that it is possible to trace a line of development from that of Paul to the early church through Paul on to John. They develop in different directions. John is remote from the earliest Church and Paulism is a different world from that of John.² It is true, however, that in regard to the current religious atmosphere Paul and John have certain things in common. Both come within the sphere of a Hellenism that is saturated with the Gnostic stream, so that a certain agreement between them in dualistic terminology is not surprising. Both use the term "world" in a dualistic depreciatory sense, and understand the "world" as basically the world of men. The antitheses typical of John -- "truth-falsehood", "light-darkness" -- occur in Paul. The antithesis "earthly-heavenly" is found in both. "Above all, in both John and Paul Christology is formed after the pattern of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth: the sending of the pre-existent Son of God in the disguise of a man."³

²Ibid., p. 6

³Ibid.

However, the Johannine terminology of the Redeemer's "coming" and "going" and "being exalted" are lacking in Paul. Paul's characteristic anthropological terminology derived from the Old Testament is not found in John: soma and psyche in the Pauline sense do not occur in John. Still more important is the fact that Paul's terminology relating specifically to the history of salvation is not encountered in John. Also the Hellenistic ecclesiological terminology is lacking and so is any reference to the Myrious - cult and sacraments. "Clearly, then", Bultmann says, "John is not of the Pauline school and is not influenced by Paul; he is, instead, a figure with his own originality and stands in an atmosphere of theological thinking different from that of Paul . . . and this independence of John emerges all the more clearly as one perceives the deep relatedness in substance that exists between John and Paul in spite of all their differences in mode of thought and terminology."⁴ The similarity in both of them, is that the eschatological occurrence is already taking place in the present. For Bultmann, in both writers the idea of Jesus' "glory" is made an historical occurrence and he says, "Both John and Paul de-mythologize Gnostic cosmological dualism in the fact that by both the world continues to be understood as

⁴Ibid., p. 9

God's creation and in the fact that the God-concept of both contains the paradoxical union of the judgment and grace."⁵

For him the author of the Johannine writings is unknown and also the place, but they were written in the first century after the first literary fixation of the synoptic tradition. But the Gospel and the epistles grew out of the thought-atmosphere of oriental Christianity. The Gospel was not originally written in a Semitic language (Aramaic or Syriac), but was written in Greek. Its Greek is similar in form and different from the Greek of the synoptics both in grammar and style.

The stylistic form of the Revelation-discourses⁶ (the source of Jesus' sayings and discourses) expresses the basic dualistic view in antithetical terms: light and darkness, truth and falsehood, above and below, freedom and bondage.

Terminologically, this complex of views is also expressed by the fact that Jesus as the Revealer is called he whom the Father "sent" or "commissioned". This mode of expression also took on a special meaning in Gnosticism. While for Paul the earthly Jesus, as the pre-existent one appearing in the form of a servant, is empty of any divine

⁵Ibid., p. 10

⁶Ibid., p. 10, 11

glory (Phil. 2:6 ff.), in John the incarnate Logos, reveals his "glory" in his work on earth -- though admittedly in a paradoxical fashion visible only to the eyes of the believing (John 1:14; 2:11). In short, then, the figure of Jesus in John is, for Bultmann, portrayed in the forms offered by the Gnostic Redeemer-myth.⁷ John, he concludes, lived within the sphere of Gnostic-dualistic thinking because the literary devices which he uses are ambiguous concepts and statements which elicit misunderstandings. They are the expression of his underlying dualistic view: the Revealer and the "world" cannot understand each other; they do not speak the same language, "Why do ye not understand my speech?" (John 8:43).

b) Johannine Dualism

World and Man. John's proclamation consists of the message that God so loved the world that He sent His "only-begotten" Son -- not to judge it, but to save it (3:16; I John 4:9,14). Judgment would be what it deserves, for "the whole world lieth in wickedness" (I John 5:19); it stands in need of being saved. For John, as for Paul, the kosmos means primarily the world of men. In its radical opposition to God it is characterized, as in Paul, by the term "this world" which comes from Apocalyptic eschatology. In this term, the

⁷Ibid., p. 12

point is the contrast between the nature of the world and of God. What is then the essence of the kosmos? The essence of the kosmos is darkness, for: "the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light" (John 3:19). This means that men are blind, blind without knowing it. Also this means that the world's nature is designated as falsehood because through Jesus came grace and truth (1:17), Jesus himself is truth (14:6), but the world refused him. The characteristic of the world, therefore, is the compound of freedom and falsehood and it is a power to which the world has fallen into bondage. Kosmos, then, is in essence existence in bondage, which is of sin and death.

For Bultmann, John's concept of light, as in religious language, has the meaning that light is understanding in its original sense: "The daylight in which man is able not only to orient himself as to objects but also to understand himself in his world and find his way in it. But the "true light" is the state of having one's existence illumined, an illumination in and by which a man understands himself, achieves a self-understanding which opens up his way to him, guides all his conduct, and gives him clarity and assurance.⁸ Darkness, then, means that a man does not

⁸Ibid., p. 7, 8.

125
seize the possibility of a genuine self-understanding. It means that instead of understanding himself as a creature he arrogates to himself a self-sovereignty that belongs to the Creator alone. To the question whence darkness comes, Bultmann answers, "Only because there is revelation of God, is there enmity toward God. Only because there is light, is there darkness. Darkness is nothing other than shutting one's self up against the light. It is the turning away from the origin of one's existence, away from that which alone offers the possibility of illumining one's existence."⁹ So, being in darkness, the world is simultaneously in falsehood. For it is an illusion, not some immoral conduct, but the illusion of a false self-understanding which is revolt against God, against the "truth". The basic meaning of "truth" in John is God's reality, since God is the Creator, it is the only true reality. For Bultmann, truth is not the teaching about God transmitted by Jesus, but God's very reality revealing itself -- which is occurring in Jesus. So, "to be of the truth" is synonymous with "to be of God" and "to be the world" is "to be of the devil."¹⁰ This means to him that a man is determined by his origin and in each present moment does not have himself in hand;

⁹Ibid., p. 18

¹⁰Ibid., p. 19

he has only one alternative: to exist either from God or from the world. For him God is reality and ^{the} world is unreality, and he says, "The cosmological dualism of Gnosticism has become in John a dualism of decision."¹¹

Johannine Determinism. In particular the division of mankind into two groups -- those who are "of God" or "of the devil", "of the truth" or "of the world", "from above" or "from below" -- is the language of Gnostic dualism, and these two classes are from the outset determined as to their essence and their fate by their specific nature. As in Paul, John's predestinatory formulations mean that the decision of faith is not a choice between possibilities within this world. He never has his security in himself, but always in God alone. The conduct of every man, therefore, corresponds to his origin, to what he is, his essence. Sin is not an occasional evil occurrence; rather in sin it comes to light that man in his essence is a sinner, that he is determined by unreality, Nothing.¹²

The Universality of sin, the determination of man by unreality, for Bultmann, by John, is not attributed to a mythical cause but simply shows itself to be a fact -- a fact by virtue of the light's coming (John 1:5, 10).

The perversion of the creation into "the world".
Human existence knows of its dependence upon that from which

¹¹ Ibid., p. 21

¹² Ibid., p. 25

it can live. It hungers and thirsts, for it has a will to live. And this will is directly concerned with mere food and drink, the imaginative mythical notions of miraculous food (6:31) and life-giving water (4:15) indicate in themselves that this longing is ultimately for life itself. When Jesus calls himself the bread and the water of life, he assumes for Bultmann, such a preliminary understanding as is expressed in mythology. Jesus is the fabled tree of life told about in myth. The "I - am" passages are the answer to this quest for life. The "I" in them is a predicate nominative, not the subject: the "true bread from heaven" (6:32) is he; the "true vine" (15:1) is he. This is, for Bultmann, a delusion that arises from the will to exist which by itself perverts truth into a lie, perverts the creation into the world.¹³ For instance, what the Jews call mystery is no genuine mystery at all; for they make the other-worldly -- Jesus' mysterious origin in God -- into a this-worldly thing that is subject to their approval or disapproval. This is "their mythologizing theology".¹⁴ Therefore, the Jews are in error not because they are misinformed about Jesus' origin but because they apply the wrong standard to him.

The world speaks of sin, righteousness, and judgment, but understands these terms in its own sense.

¹³Ibid., p. 27

¹⁴Ibid., p. 30

What is sin? It is the unbelief in which the world anchors itself to itself. What is righteousness? To the world it means to turn out to be in the right, to be crowned with visible success. What is judgment? In the world's opinion, it takes place in that which is visible, either as a cosmic catastrophe or in catastrophes within world history. Thus the world, for Bultmann, creates for itself a security of its own and operates within it as that which is familiar and to be taken for granted.

C. The "Krisis" of the World.

The sending of the Son. Within this world of death life appeared (I John 1:2); into the world of darkness came the light (1:5; 3:19) -- by the coming of the Son of God into the world. Jesus is He. He was prior to John the Baptist; he was before Abraham; he was before the foundation of the world and was from the beginning. In him the "word" which was with God became flesh and came into his own property -- into the world.

To what extent are such statements, which speak of Jesus in mythological form as the pre-existent Son of God who became man, to be understood in the actual mythological sense? That can only be answered by detailed interpretation: "Jesus is not to be understood as a figure of this world, but his appearing in the world is to be conceived as an embassy from without, an arrival from elsewhere."¹⁵

¹⁵Ibid., p. 33

In mythological formulation, Jesus came down from heaven. His coming is the Revelation of the divine reality in the world. His coming is not a phenomenon of the world, a figure within world-history. Just as He came down from heaven, He will ascend once more -- mythological language again. His coming and His going belong together as a unit, the unity of His activity as Revealer.

The sending of the Son is the deed of God's love: that it is God's love manifested in the sending, is expressed both by the content of the sentence and by its formulation (3:16). The fact that the love of God is the basis for the sending of the Son is expressed by the way the purpose of his sending or coming is given.

Jesus, accordingly can be called "the Saviour of the world" (4:42, I John 4:14). For Bultmann this term is accorded the Hellenistic title of the salvation-bringer, but the meaning of his sending is more fully expressed by Jewish and earliest Christian tradition: Messiah; whereas the Kyrios-title is completely missing.¹⁶ Other titles of Jesus in John -- Messiah, Christ, king of Israel, Son of God, and Son of Man -- express that Jesus is the eschatological salvation-bringer, that His coming is the eschatological event. The historizing of eschatology is radically carried through by John in his understanding of Krisis,

¹⁶Ibid., p. 36

"judgment". The judgment takes place in the response of men to the word of Jesus - "The theme of whole sections (of John) is that Jesus' coming-and-going is the 'judgment' of the world (3:1-21; 31-36; 4:43-46; 7:15-24; 8:13-20)".¹⁷ For Bultmann, John applies a historizing of eschatology by de-mythologizing eschatology in his interpretation of mythical figures such as, for example, the Antichrist in I John 2:18; 4:3, where the appearing of false teachers is interpreted as the coming of the Antichrist.

The Offense of the Incarnation of the Word.

How does God's Son come into the world? John says, "The word became flesh" (1:14) as a human being. This is the theme of the whole Gospel of John. For Bultmann, John knows neither the legend of the Virgin Birth nor that of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem, the revealer appears not simply as a bearer of human nature, but as a definite being in history: Jesus of Nazareth. His humanity is genuine humanity: "the word became flesh". The divinity of Jesus in John is completely lacking in visibility, while the disciples' relation to him -- as "friends" (15:14) -- is conceived of simply as a personal relationship of human friendship. He was not in the full sense the revealer until he had been lifted up and glorified. The divine-man Jesus in John is represented in the Hellenistic sense -- a man who has miraculous knowledge at his command and does miracles. In

¹⁷Ibid., p. 39

In John Jesus is taken from tradition like a divine man and a symbolic picture. The "omniscience" of Jesus is therefore not understood to be his super-human ability, but his knowledge which is transmitted to the believer. Again, Jesus performs miracles, but as "signs" the miracles of Jesus are ambiguous. They point to the fact that the Revelation is no worldly occurrence, but an other-worldly one. They are pictures and symbols. The faith of the many, which rests upon the miracles, is no trustworthy faith. John's whole presentation shows that if the miracles are not understood as signs, they are an offense!¹⁸ The offense of the assertion, "the word became flesh", comes most clearly to light in the direct contradiction of Jesus' claim. For Bultmann, then, "Faith in Jesus, is faith in the exalted Jesus, but not as if he were a heavenly being who had stripped off the garment of earthly-human existence as the Gnostic Redeemer was conceived to do. Rather, the exalted Jesus is at the same time the earthly man Jesus; the "glorified one" is still always he who "became flesh". In other words, Jesus' life on earth does not become an item of the historical past, but constantly remains present reality. The historical figure of Jesus, i.e. his human history, retains its significance of being the revelation of his 'glory' and thereby of God's. It is the eschatological occurrence."¹⁹

¹⁸Ibid., p. 45

¹⁹Ibid., p. 49

The Revelation of the Glory.

The unity of Jesus the Son with God the Father is insisted upon: "I and the Father are one" (10:30). God Himself encounters men in Jesus who is a man in whom there is nothing unusual except his bold assertion that in him God encounters men. In that fact lies the paradoxical nature of the concept of Revelation, a paradox which, for Bultmann, John was the first to see with any distinctness. John emphatically expresses this paradox: in one direction Jesus has equal dignity and rights with God; in the other direction, Jesus speaks and acts only in obedience to the will of the Father and does nothing on his own authority.²⁰

Jesus' death and resurrection, according to Bultmann, are the facts of salvation in the Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church. In John, the death is subordinated to the incarnation and the incarnation is the decisive salvation event, although it is a part of the total salvation-occurrence for Paul. But the incarnation and death constitute a unity in John, as the coming (incarnation) and the going (death) of the Son of God. In John, Jesus' death has no pre-eminent importance for salvation, but is the accomplishment of the work which began with the incarnation and the last demonstration of the obedience. His death is

²⁰Ibid., p. 50

his exaltation and there is no atonement for sins in John's view of Christ's death,²¹ but forgiveness of sin, release from sin is promised through Jesus' word, or through the "truth" mediated by his word. Therefore, for Bultmann, Christ's death is not a sacrificial atonement for sin.

If Jesus' death on the cross is already his exaltation and glorification, his resurrection cannot be an event of special significance. No resurrection is needed to destroy the triumph of death. For the cross itself is already triumph over the world and its ruler. Bultmann says, "There is not a word in John of the idea that not until the resurrection and exaltation after his death Jesus was made lord of all cosmic and demonic powers."²² Jesus is the resurrection and the life, or the way, the truth, and the life that encounters men and calls the believer into life now.

The Revelation as the Word.

The works of Jesus are his words. The true works of Jesus are: "judging" and "making alive". How are these works accomplished? By Jesus' word. What then of the content of Jesus' word? What Jesus saw or heard with the Father he speaks. But Jesus' words never convey anything specific or concrete that he has seen with the Father. Never is the heavenly world the theme of his words. His theme is always

²¹ Ibid., p. 53, 54, 55.

²² Ibid., p. 56

just one thing: that the Father sent him, that he came as the light, the bread of life, the witness for the truth; that he will go again, and that one must believe in him. So, Bultmann says, "It is clear that the mythological statements have lost their mythological meaning. Jesus is not presented in literal seriousness as a pre-existent divine being who came in human form to earth to reveal unprecedented secrets. Rather, the mythological terminology is intended to express the absolute and decisive significance of his word -- the mythological notion of pre-existence is made to serve the idea of the Revelation."²³ Therefore, the evangelist conferred upon Jesus for his pre-existent period the mythological title: Word - Logos.

The title "Logos", for Bultmann, is not derived from the Old Testament, for in it "the word of God" is found, but we never find the unmodified expression, "the Word". Nor is it derived from Greek philosophical tradition in general or from Stoicism in particular and transmitted to the evangelist by Philo of Alexandria, for the philosophical idea of logos as the rational orderliness of the divine cosmos is quite foreign to John. Rather, the figure of the "Logos" is derived from the same tradition of cosmological mythology which also exercised an influence upon Judaism, especially upon Philo. In the Old Testament and

²³Ibid., p. 62

Judaistic literature there is a figure "Wisdom", which is a parallel to John's "Word". In Gnosticism, which also influenced Philo, the figure "Logos" has not only cosmological but also soteriological functions. Therefore, it is within this sphere that the origin of the Johannine Logos lies.²⁴ In Gnostic myth, -- which language John uses -- the Revelation consists of nothing more than the bare fact of it. For even though Gnosticism speaks at length in cosmogenic and soteriological speculations about the content of the Revelation, the decisive thing for it is the bare fact of Revelation. Thus in John also, "Jesus as the Revealer of God reveals nothing but that he is the Revealer."²⁵ Revelation that Jesus brings is the "I - am", "It is I" statements. For Bultmann, "I" in these "I" statements is predicate nominative and not the subject. He does not give content to the Revelation -- it is mystic. But John wishes to understand this in the sense of his Revelation-idea.²⁷ God bears this revelation through Jesus' own works. But these works are identical with his word. The testimony, therefore, is identical with that which is to be substantiated. Hence, contradictory statements can stand in the Gospel: that Jesus does not bear witness to himself (5:31) and that he does (8:14, 18). He bears witness to himself with his "It is I". But only by faith is this testimony understood as

²⁴Ibid., p. 64

²⁵Ibid., p. 66

²⁶Ibid., p. 65

²⁷Ibid., p. 67

testimony (3:33).

Now then, the Revealer is nothing but a definite historical man, for Bultmann, Jesus of Nazareth. This Jesus had to meet men in a definite form. The Church's task of proclamation was not the transmitting of the historical tradition about Jesus. But to make the traditional picture of Jesus and his proclamation understood, John wanted it in the light of his Revelation-idea. Faith alone can make itself available as Revelation.

d. Faith

Faith as the hearing of the Word.

In his terminology John takes the general Christian usage as his starting-point. In it "to believe" means the acceptance of the Christian message. Since Jesus and his word are identical, his words can also be named as the object of faith. Just as he himself is said to be "received" or "accepted", so are his "words" or his "testimony". A counterpart to the identity of Jesus' word and his person is the fact that faith proceeds from hearing or faith is hearing: a hearkening and learning, or a hearing and keeping. This is faith perception: faith recognizes in the historical Jesus the "truth" and the "life". What does Bultmann mean by faith in the historical Jesus? "It was not just once upon a time that the revealer was incarnate -- he remains

so forever", therefore, "the role of the believing contemporaries of Jesus is not that they give a certifying guarantee to the faith of following generations by their eye-witness testimony, but that they pass on to them the 'offense' of 'the Word become flesh'."²⁸

Faith is genuine only insofar as it is a knowing faith. This is expressed by Jesus' promise of knowledge of the truth to believers if they loyally "abide" in his word (8:31). That Jesus is the Christ, is believed (11:27; 20:31) but also known (6:69). Faith and knowledge cannot be distinguished as two stages. Knowledge cannot cut loose from faith; faith also contains knowledge -- faith itself knows. Knowing is a structural aspect of believing.

Faith as Eschatological Existence.

The demand for faith is the demand that the world surrender the understanding it has had of itself. Faith is, like Paul's concept, turning away from the world, the act of desecularization, the surrender of all seeming security and every pretense, the willingness to live by the strength of the invisible and uncontrollable. It means accepting completely different standards. Faith then, is the overcoming of the "offense" -- the offense that life meets man only in the word addressed to him by a mere man, Jesus of

²⁸ Ibid., p. 73

Nazareth. The natural man without faith is offended by the incarnation of a mere man, Jesus of Nazareth, according to Bultmann, but a man of faith overcomes this offense, therefore, faith is victory over the world. In overcoming the offense, faith is the decision against the world for God. Thus, Bultmann reaches in faith to desecularization which is "transition into eschatological existence".²⁹ In the midst of the world the believer is lifted out of secular existence -- though he is still "in the world", he is no longer "of the world".

The characteristics of the eschatological existence are "peace" and "joy". "Peace" given by faith in Christ is not as the world gives. It is not something that can be realized in the external conditions of life or some state of mind. On the contrary, since it can be seized as a reality by faith alone, it can no more become a state or condition than "freedom". It is eschatological. The same is true of "joy", it is not a realized state, but always lies ahead of the believer as something to be realized. Another way to describe eschatological existence is that the believers are in the Revealer or he in them in such a way they are bound together into a unity.

All these sayings describe the believer's eschatological existence withdrawn from the world. But only in faith is this existence a reality -- "not in any direct

²⁹ Ibid., p. 78

relationship to Jesus or to God."³⁰ God is never available except when man overcomes that offense.

Inasmuch as a relationship to God is mediated to the believer by the Revealer, the relationship is that of prayer. Prayer shows that the believer is still "in the world", but it is an expression of his eschatological existence which is no more "of the world". Because prayer flows out of his eschatological existence, the believer can be sure that it will be heard by asking God "in Jesus' name" to make it a reality. This attitude in prayer is called "confidence".³¹

The final criterion of eschatological existence is the possession of the Spirit. This spirit, for Bultmann, is the eschatological gift, but is neither the power that causes miracles, nor the power and norm of Christian conduct. It is power within ^{the} Church which brings forth knowledge and the proclamation of the Word.³² The designation "Spirit of Truth" has the meaning that the Spirit's activity consists in "teaching all things", and "guiding into all the truth". However, the knowledge bestowed by the spirit is not a quantum of information or doctrine supplemental to what Jesus said or surpassing it, but whatever Jesus taught or did will appear in new light under the Spirit's teaching. The Spirit's testimony, which calls to mind Jesus' words, consists in the

³⁰ Ibid., p.85

³¹ Ibid., p.87

³² Ibid., p.88

fact that Jesus' word is constantly being understood anew in an ever repeated Now. This is the way in which the Spirit "glorifies" Jesus. The knowledge bestowed by the Spirit has to witness in the proclamation and in preaching (15:26). This is the activity of the Spirit and it continues the eschatological occurrence which took place in Jesus' coming and going. Therefore it becomes Church's task and the Church's word must sound forth ever the same yet in ever new form. The Word is its commission to the world.

CHAPTER IV

KERYGMA AND MYTH

Bultmann published an article in 1941 called "New Testament and Mythology", while in the chair of New Testament studies at the University of Marburg. Since its first appearance, this has evoked a storm of indignant repudiation. He described the New Testament universe as being like a snug house with hell in the cellar and heaven upstairs. This, Bultmann says, is the language of mythology, meaningful in New Testament times but derived mainly from Greek Gnosticism and Jewish Apocalypticism. But modern men cannot accept it as true. What the New Testament really presents is the saving act of God given in the form of the Kerygma. In order that modern men may accept the New Testament, Bultmann says, we must free the Kerygma from its encrustation of myth. "Bultmann has clearly and explicitly repudiated any intention of dissolving the Kerygma".¹ At first look, demythologisation seems to be nothing but a continuation of "liberal" Christianity's old effort to reduce the Gospel to a palatable compound of clean living and the golden rule, minus the miraculous and the theological. But Bultmann expressly dissociates himself from the liberalism of

¹ Julius Schniewind, "A reply to Bultmann -- Theses on the emancipation of the Kerygma from Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, ed. H. W. Bartsch, trans. R. H. Fuller, London: S.P.C.K., 1954, p. 45.

the old school such as Harnack's 'God and the Soul' as well as from the mystical approach of Troeltsch and the History of Religions school. Unlike the liberals, Bultmann is not interested in the evolution of religion."² But Bultmann's thinking goes far deeper than this. Instead of eliminating mythology entirely, Bultmann would have man re-experience it in terms of his own religious life, because he relies on the existential element in Christianity, which makes personal experience the measure of a man's religion.

The objections against Bultmann's demythologization are obvious. The recent article "Christianity and Myth" in Time magazine presents various opponents saying: "Bultmann's opposition hits him literally right and left. The leading councils of German protestantism ... have generally rejected his approach. Priests are horrified. 'The Bible is at stake' cried one pamphlet, which branded Bultmann an out-and-out heretic. ... Karl Barth ... maintains that Bultmann backtracks completely from the Christ-centered theology of the Reformation — reducing Christ to a mere element in man's search for salvation, rather than the focus and object of the Christian's whole humble attention. ... While the conservatives attack Bultmann for going too far, the existentialist philosophers, e.g., Switzerland's Fritz Buri, attack him for not going far enough. The Kerygma — God's revelation in Christ — is a myth, too, says Buri; Bultmann should recognize the whole New Testament as nothing but a

symbolic way of expressing the existential experience. Philosopher, Karl Jaspers criticizes Bultmann's emphasis on modern man's scientific viewpoint. People in New Testament times, he says, were not much different from people today or any other time — prone to gross materialism on the one hand, and willingness to believe the absurd on the other."³

In this chapter we shall consider Bultmann's article "New Testament and Mythology"⁴

9. The Necessity of the Demythologization of the New Testament.

For Bultmann, in his New Testament studies, there are two great problems. The one is the mythological element in the message of the New Testament: the mythical view of the world and the mythical event of Redemption; the other is that modern man cannot accept this mythical view as true.

Bultmann claims that the cosmology of the New Testament is essentially mythical in character. He says "Gnostic mythology lies behind the allusion to the fall of Creation."⁵ The world is a three-storied structure the earth in the center, the heaven above, and the underworld or hell, beneath.⁶

But even the earth is more than the scene of the natural. It is the scene of the supernatural activity of

³ "Christianity and Myth", Time, Sep. 24, 1956, pp 55, 57.

⁴ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, pp. 1-44.

⁵ Theology of N.T., Vol. I, p. 174.

⁶ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, 1954, p. 1.

God and his angels on the one hand, and of Satan and his demons on the other. Man is not in control of his own life: Evil spirits may take possession of him; alternatively Satan may inspire him with evil thoughts; or God may inspire him with good thoughts and guide his purposes. He may give him the supernatural power of His Spirit. "Thus, Gnostic mythology serves to characterize man's situation in the world"⁷ Within this cosmology, the event of redemption becomes the subject of New Testament preaching. It proclaims, in the language of mythology, that the last time has now come. "In the fulness of time" God sent forth his Son, a pre-existent divine Being, who appears as a man. He died the death of a sinner on the cross and made atonement for the sins of men. His resurrection marks the beginning of the cosmic catastrophe, etc.⁸ These are "the categories of the Gnostic myth"⁹ and of a "mythical nature"^{9a} All this is the language of mythology and the origin of the various themes can be easily traced in the contemporary mythology of Jewish Apocalyptic and in the redemption myths of Gnosticism. Therefore, he says, "To this extent the Kerygma is incredible to the modern man, for he is convinced that the mythical view of the world is obsolete."¹⁰

⁷ Theology of N. T., Vol. I, p. 174.

⁸ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p. 2.

⁹ Theology of N. T. Vol I, p. 298.

^{9a} Ibid., p. 304.

¹⁰ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p. 3.

"Can Christian preaching expect modern man to accept the mythical view of the world as true?"¹¹, He asks. Of course not — because he sees such a mythological view of the world is simply the cosmology of a pre-scientific age. A blind acceptance of the New Testament mythology would be irrational, and to press for its acceptance as an article of faith would be to reduce Christian faith to the level of a human achievement and would result in "a curious form of schizophrenia and insincerity"¹² for the intellect.

Bultmann emphasizes that the scientific knowledge of modern man makes it impossible for him to seriously hold the New Testament view of the world, and he says, "We no longer believe in the three-storied universe which the creeds^{#12a} take for granted. The only honest way of reciting the creeds is to strip the mythological framework from the truth they enshrine—."¹³

No longer can any heaven or hell be understood in the traditional sense of the word, nor the return of the Son of Man on the clouds. The forces and laws of nature have been discovered, so that no longer can one believe in

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid., p. 4.

^{12a} See Theology of N.T., Vol. I, p. 85. -- Out of the germ-cell, the Kerygma, more exact and stable formulas grew and gradually crystallized into creeds, before the literary form: Gospel.

¹³ Ibid., p. 5.

spirits, whether good or evil. The miracles of the New Testament have ceased to be miraculous for Bultmann, "It is impossible to use electric light and the wireless and to avail ourselves of modern medical and surgical discoveries, and at the same time to believe in the New Testament world of demons and spirits."¹⁴ This dilemma is particularly serious when you expect others to do so, because it makes the Christian faith unintelligible and unacceptable to the modern world.

The mythical eschatology is unbelievable because the parousia of Christ never took place as the New Testament foretold. History did not come to an end and even if it comes to the end it will not be a mythical event such as the New Testament expects, but a natural catastrophe.¹⁵

The dilemma is not only challenged by natural science, but also by modern man's understanding of himself. He bears the sole responsibility for his own feeling, thinking, and willing. "He is not as the New Testament regards him, the victim of a strange dichotomy which exposes him to the interference of powers outside himself."¹⁶

A modern man can hardly understand what the New Testament has to say about the "Spirit" and the sacraments. Biological man cannot comprehend how a supernatural entity like the Pneuma can penetrate within the close texture of

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 6.

his natural powers and set to work within him.

Also the modern world view (Weltanschauung) is very important, whether it be idealism or naturalism. Because the only criticism of the New Testament which is theologically relevant, for Bultmann, arises necessarily out of the situation of modern man. The only relevant question for the theologian is the basic assumption on which the adoption of a particular science, as of every other world view rests, while that assumption is the view of the world which has been moulded by modern science and the modern conception of human nature as a self-subsistent unity immune from the interference of supernatural powers.

Again the Biblical doctrine that death is the punishment of sin is ridiculous to both naturalism and idealism; for to the naturalist death is no problem at all, but for the idealist it is a problem. The idealist is faced with a paradox: on the one hand man is a spiritual being, different from plants and animals, and on the other hand he is the prisoner of nature. Death may present him with a problem, but he cannot see how it can be a punishment for sin. For both of them death is simply a necessary process of nature.

Human beings are subject to death even before they have committed any sin. And to attribute human mortality to the fall of Adam is sheer nonsense, for guilt implies

personal responsibility, and the idea of original sin as an inherited infection is sub-ethical, irrational, and absurd.¹⁷

The same objections apply to the doctrine of the atonement. The resurrection of Jesus is also difficult. To the biologist such language is meaningless, for he does not regard death as a problem at all.

A God-man idea is due to Gnostic influence and Christ's death and resurrection were not isolated facts which concerned him alone, but a cosmic event in which all men are involved. In the sense of modern science, the descriptions in the New Testament of the pre-existence of Christ with its corollary of man's translation into a celestial realm of light —and the clothing of the human personality in heavenly robes and a spiritual body are all not only irrational but utterly meaningless.

To solve this dilemma — mythological elements in the New Testament and the scientific attitude of modern man toward the mythical element in the New Testament — by reinterpreting the mythology in the New Testament, is for Bultmann the task of New Testament theology.

a. Not Selection or Subtraction.

This drastic criticism of the New Testament mythology does not mean the complete elimination of the Kerygma.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

Bultmann's idea of this criticism is to save the Kerygma, therefore he cannot reduce the amount of mythology in it. For him, it is impossible to dismiss St. Paul's teaching about the Holy Communion or baptism. He says, "If we accept one idea, we must accept everything which the New Testament has to say about baptism and Holy Communion. ..."
And he continues, "If we once start subtracting from the Kerygma, where are we to draw the line? The mythical view of the world must be accepted or rejected in its entirety."¹⁸

Bultmann claims that if the truth of the New Testament proclamation is to be preserved, the only way is to demythologize it. In so doing, the question is whether the New Testament message consists exclusively of mythology, and whether it actually demands the elimination of myth if it is to be understood as it is meant to be. For him, this question must be answered in two parts: the nature of myth in general and the New Testament itself.

b. The Nature of Myth, according to Bultmann, 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."¹⁹ Myth is what man speaks of the other world

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 9.
¹⁹ Ibid., p. 9.

in terms of this world, and of the gods in terms derived from human life. Therefore, myth is, we might say, an expression of man's conviction that the origin and purpose of the world in which we live are sought not within it but beyond it. Myth is also an expression of man's awareness that he is not lord of his own being. It expresses his sense of dependence, while within the visible world, on the forces of the unknown. Finally, myth expresses man's belief that in this state of dependence he can be delivered from the forces within the visible world. The real purpose of myth, then, is to speak of a transcendent power which controls the world and man. Thus myth with its imagery claims to have an objective validity. But the New Testament mythology is not mere imagery, but the understanding of existence which it enshrines. Faith, for Bultmann, claims that this is true.

c. He says, "The New Testament itself invites this kind of criticism,"²⁰ because there are myths in it and because some of its features are contradictory. For example, the death of Christ is sometimes a sacrifice and sometimes a cosmic event, his person is sometimes interpreted as the Messiah and sometimes as the Second Adam. The kenosis of the pre-existent Son (Phil. 2:6ff.), and ^{the} Virgin Birth are

²⁰ Ibid., p. 11.

inconsistent. The doctrine of the Creation is incompatible with the conception of the "rulers of this world", the "god of this world", and the "elements of this world".

Sometimes human life is determined by cosmic forces and sometimes it is challenged to decision. Man is sometimes regarded as a cosmic being, and at other times as an independent "I" who makes his own decision.

d. How then is the mythology of the New Testament to be reinterpreted? This is not the first attempt to do so! The Liberal theologians in the nineteenth century were working on this task, but along the wrong line, because "they threw away not only the mythology but also the Kerygma itself."²¹

In the last twenty years a movement away from criticism has been attempted in order to bring back a naive acceptance of the Kerygma. What does this mean for Bultmann? Bultmann cannot give up this critical labour. He takes them up and tries to put them into constructive use to interpret it. Therefore, "the criterion adopted must be taken not from modern thought, but from the understanding of human existence...."²²

According to Bultmann, Harnack reduced the Kerygma to a few basic principles of religion and ethics, and of

²¹ Ibid., p. 12.

²² Ibid.

this he says, "Unfortunately this means that the Kerygma has ceased to be the Kerygma: it is no longer the proclamation of the decisive act of God in Christ."²³ For Bultmann, even the person of Christ is written in mythological terms, but still the Kerygma should not be rejected altogether.

In the next place, the History of Religions school says that the New Testament is permeated by mythology, and therefore the importance of the New Testament is not to be found in the teaching about religion and ethics, but in its actual religion and piety; Not in dogmatic objectivity based upon mythical imagery, but in the religious life — the experience of mystical union with Christ, in whom God took symbolic form.

The critics of the History of Religions school, however, fail, according to Bultmann, to see that detachment from this world is essentially eschatological and not mystical. "If the History of Religions school is right," says Bultmann, "the Kerygma has once more ceased to be Kerygma. Like the liberals, they are silent about a decisive act of God in Christ proclaimed as the event of redemption."²⁴ For what is described in mythological terms is nothing more than mythology. The truth of Kerygma can not be interpreted apart from mythology.

²³ Ibid., P. 13.

²⁴ Ibid., P.15.

e. An Existentialist interpretation is the only solution. The meaning of the mythology of the New Testament which is in essence that of the Jewish Apocalyptic and Gnostic redemption myths, lies not in their imagery, with its apparent objectivity, but in the understanding of human existence. It needs to be interpreted existentially. It is clear, then, that Bultmann's task is to produce an existentialist interpretation of the dualistic mythology of the New Testament. This approach is not proved by logic or by an appeal to factual evidence, but an existential self-understanding.

10. Demythologization (The reinterpretation of Mythology)

a. The Interpretation of Being.

As we have seen already in the previous chapter, in his interpretation of Pauline theology and Johannine theology, Bultmann analyzed the human being as "man prior to the Revelation of Faith", and "man under Faith", which corresponds to Johannine dualism. Thus, he considers the human being, first as a life "apart from Faith" and as "the life under Faith."

The former is the man as the slave of the world and of its powers, of the prince, or god of this world. This human being is imprisoned in a material body in which he has

lost his authentic self, the soul of man. This world is the world of corruption and death. Therefore, when Paul says "flesh", it means not the bodily or physical side of human nature, but the sphere of visible, concrete, tangible, and measurable reality, which, as such, is also the sphere of corruption and death.

When a man chooses to live entirely in and for this sphere, or when he "lives after the flesh", that means that he places his confidence in the flesh (Phil. 3:3f), and the consciousness of security finds its expression in glorying, that way of life which is based on the pride of achievement. Thus man's life is weighed down by anxiety and he becomes the slave of anxiety. This is called in other words, "self-glorying" and "self-assertion". But this is the way in which he loses his true life and becomes the slave of that very sphere which he had hoped to master, and which he hoped would give him security.

The authentic life, on the other hand, would be a life based on unseen, intangible realities. This is identical, for Bultmann, with "life after the Spirit" or what the New Testament means by "life in faith". This life can be gotten only by faith in the grace of God. The grace of God means the forgiveness of sin, and brings deliverance from the bondage of the past. But at the same time faith means, for Bultmann, "turning our backs on self

and abandoning all security",²⁵ which is surrendering all our self-confidence, and resolving to trust in God alone — radical self-commitment to God. Such a life is the deliverance from all worldly, tangible objects, and leads to complete detachment from the world and thus to freedom. This detachment from the world, however, is something different from asceticism.

This is eschatological existence — being a "new creature". What then does he mean by the "new creature"? Bultmann answers, "the new life in faith is not an assured possession or endowment, which could lead only to libertinism ... life in faith is not a possession at all ... the decision of faith is never final; it needs constant renewal in every fresh situation. ... It means always to be traveling along the road between the "already" and the "not yet", always to be pursuing a goal."²⁶

The new life has a possibility by spirit in faith. "Being led by the Spirit" (Romans 8:14) is not an automatic process of nature, but the fulfilment of an imperative: "live after the Spirit, not after the flesh". Imperative and indicative are inseparable.

Bultmann's structure of Being has been borrowed largely from Heidegger's existential Being. He says,

²⁵ Ibid., p. 19.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 21.

"Karl Jaspers has found no difficulty in transposing Kierkegaard's interpretation of Christian Being into the sphere of philosophy. Above all, Heidegger's existentialist analysis of the ontological structure of being would seem to be no more than a secularized, philosophical version of the New Testament view of human life. For him, the chief characteristic of man's being in history is anxiety. Man exists in a permanent tension between the past and the future..., and thus alone achieves his authentic Being. Is not that exactly the New Testament understanding of human life?"²⁷

According to Bultmann, the concept of Soma stands for a way of being and has three fundamental propositions:²⁸ (a) Man's existence is always somatic, (b) Man in his being has a relation to himself, and (c) Man has two fundamental possibilities — he can be at one with himself or he can be estranged from himself. This interpretation, which Bultmann puts forward immediately, invites comparison with Heidegger's teaching that man is always "Being-in-the-world," that he exists in the sense of being related to himself, and that his existence can be authentic or unauthentic.²⁹ This same idea extends into the interpretation of Johannine theology as Johannine dualism — light and darkness, truth

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 24, 25.

²⁸ Theology of N. T., Vol I, pp. 192 - 202.

²⁹ John Macquarrie, An Existentialist Theology, p. 43.

and falsehood, life and death, freedom and enslavement. This concept also expresses, for Bultmann, the double possibility in man's existence.³⁰ That double possibility is to live from God, or to live from human resources — for man to be himself as the child of God, or to lose himself in the world.

b. The Event of Redemption.

(1) Christianity without Christ?

In the New Testament, faith is always faith in Christ. It claims that faith only becomes possible at a definite point in history in consequence of an event — the event of Christ. Faith in the sense of obedient self-commitment and inward detachment from the world is only possible when it is faith in Jesus Christ.

Now the problem is: Can we have a Christian understanding of Being without Christ? Because the event of Christ might be a relic of mythology, according to Bultmann, it might be possible to have a Christian understanding of Being without Christ. From a consideration of the recent developments in philosophy, it might be concluded that the New Testament lays bare what the existentialist call "the historicity of Being".³¹

³⁰ Op. cit., Vol. II. pp. 21-26.

³¹ Kerygma and Myth, p. 23.

Yorck and Dilthey reject dogmatics and treat them as an attempt to formulate an ontology of the higher historic life. Christian dogmatics is the antithesis of intellectualism. Dilthey says, "Hence the principal Christian dogmas which include such symbols as 'Son of God', 'Sanctification', 'Sacrifice', and the like, are, in so far as they are limited to the fact of Christian story, untenable. But once they are re-interpreted as statements of universal validity, they express the highest living form of all history."³²

Karl Jaspers, Kierkegaard, and Heidegger have the same Christian interpretation of Being in the sphere of philosophy. Bultmann says, "Heidegger's existentialist analysis of the ontological structure of being would seem to be no more than a secularized, philosophical version of the New Testament view of human life".³³

Thus Bultmann favors Heidegger and he applies his philosophical interpretation of Being to the New Testament Christian concept of Being.

According to this existentialist interpretation, Christian faith would seem to be identical with natural self-commitment. Since it offers the true understanding of Being, philosophy emancipates natural self-commitment and enables it to become what it was meant to be. Thus

³² Ibid., p. 24.
³³ Ibid.

it has no need of any revelation.

Christian love is open to a similar interpretation. "It is equivalent to committing ourselves to our familiar surroundings." Following Kamlah — Wilhelm Kamlah who attacks the eschatological character of the Christian understanding of Being and develops it Philosophically, while secularizing things in Christianity — Bultmann thinks that the Christian conception of love interrupts the smooth flow of history.

Faith is not a mysterious supernatural quality, but the disposition of genuine humanity. Similarly, love is not the effect of mysterious supernatural power, but the natural disposition of man. Faith does not require revelation, but philosophical reflection. How then, can man achieve his authentic being by a mere act of reflection?

For Heidegger, man has lost his individuality, and therefore he invites him to recover his true selfhood. This point agrees with the New Testament. Philosophy seeks to liberate the naturalness of man. But the New Testament affirms the total incapacity of man to release himself from his fallen state. Only by an act of God can man be delivered.

For Bultmann, the New Testament and Heidegger agree that authentic life is possible only because, in some sense, it is already a present possession. But there is one diff-

erence namely, that the New Testament speaks thus only to Christian believers — only to those who have opened their hearts to the redemptive action of God.³⁴ Man is a fallen being and he knows he is not what he really ought to be or what he would like to be, though he can be aware of his plight. The awareness of his authentic nature is essential to human life, and without it man would not be man. But his authentic nature is not an endowment of creation or a possession of man at his own disposal. The philosophers, according to Bultmann, would agree to this point, for they also know that man's authentic nature has to be apprehended by a deliberate decision.

"The New Testament addresses man as one who is through and through a self-assertive rebel who knows from bitter experience that the life he actually lives is not his authentic life, and that he is totally incapable of achieving that life by his own efforts. He is totally fallen man ... sinner. The self-assertion of which we have spoken is identical with sin..."³⁵ It is then clear that self-assertion is guilt only if it can be understood as ingratitude. Self-assertion deludes man into thinking that his existence is *a*prize within his own grasp. Man's

³⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 30.

radical self-assertion then blinds him to the fact of sin, and this is the clearest proof that he is a fallen being. Hence it is no good telling man that he is a sinner. He will only dismiss it as mythology. But sin is not merely mythology when the love of God meets man as a power which embraces and sustains him even in his fallen, self-assertive state. At the very point where man can do nothing, God steps in and acts on man's behalf.

Now, then, forgiveness of sins, is neither a juridical concept nor the remission of punishment. Rather, forgiveness conveys freedom from sin, while man himself has been made new.

The event of Jesus Christ is the revelation of the love of God. It makes a man free from himself and free to be himself, free to live a life of self-commitment in faith and love. Thus, we understand unauthentic man (self-assertion) and authentic man (self-commitment in faith and love). In such^a way, Bultmann restates in non-mythological terms the New Testament teaching on human existence both apart from faith and in faith.

(2) The Event of Jesus Christ.

Bultmann has tried to demythologize, thus far, the Christian understanding of Being in faith and love. He also classes the idea of an act of God in Christ as myth.

He says, "... the event of Christ is of a wholly different order from/the cult-myths of Greek or Hellenistic religion. Jesus Christ is certainly presented as the Son of God, a pre-existent divine Being, and therefore to that extent a mythical figure. But he is also a concrete figure of history — Jesus of Nazareth. His life is more than a mythical event.... We have here a unique combination of history and myth. ..."³⁶

Does this mythological language then amount to an attempt to express the meaning of the historical figure of Jesus and the events of his life? The answer, for Bultmann, is yes, in the sense that the objective form is permissible. The doctrine of Christ's pre-existence and the legend of the Virgin Birth can be accepted in this way because they attempt to explain/the meaning of the person of Jesus for faith. This must also be existential because he says, "Our interest in the events of his life, and above all in the cross, is more than an academic concern with the history of the past. We can see meaning in them only when we ask what God is trying to say to each of us through them. Again, the figure of Jesus cannot be understood simply from his context in human evolution or history. In

³⁶ Ibid., p. 34.

mythological language, his origin transcends both history and nature."³⁷

Mythological language was absolutely necessary for the explanation and the understanding of the historical Jesus. Apart from it, we lose the significance of Jesus' historical figure and of the events of his life as figures of the event of salvation.

Next we may consider the demythologization of the cross and the resurrection in particular as the event of Christ. "Is the cross, understood as the event of redemption, exclusively mythical in character or can it retain its value for salvation without forfeiting its character as history?" Bultman says, "It certainly has a mythical character as far as its objective setting is concerned. ... This mythological interpretation is a hotch-potch of sacrificial and judicial analogies, which have ceased to be tenable for us today."³⁸ But we understand it existentially — The cross releases men not only from the guilt of sin, but also from its power; The historical event of the cross acquires cosmic dimensions and so its full significance is brought into sharper relief; the cross becomes the judgment of ourselves as fallen creatures

³⁷ Ibid., p. 35.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 35.

enslaved to the powers of the world, in other words, the Cross is not just an event of the past, but the eschatological event in and beyond time, for so far as its meaning for faith is concerned, it is an ever-present reality — then, the cross can no longer be mythical but the Cross and passion are ever-present realities, and its redemptive aspect, the Cross of Christ, is a permanent historical fact.³⁹

This interpretation of the cross as a permanent fact rather than a mythological event, does far more justice according to Bultmann, to the redemptive significance of the event of the past than any of the traditional interpretations. Bultmann does not give up mythology but he says, "in the last resort mythological language is only a medium for conveying the meaning of the past event."⁴⁰

By the existentialistic interpretation, the Cross had the significance of being discerned in the actual event of past history by ^{the} first preachers of the Gospel. But for modern men, the Cross cannot disclose its own meaning — not as the figure of history but only as a spiritual meaning.

What of the resurrection? For Bultmann, obviously

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 36, 37.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 37.

it is not an event of past history with a self-evident meaning. The resurrection is an article of faith because it is far more than the resurrection of a corpse — it is the eschatological event. And so it cannot be a miraculous proof. As an article of faith the redemptive efficacy of the Cross cannot be proved by invoking the resurrection. For Bultmann, faith, as for Kierkegaard, must be based on something that cannot be proven or it would not be true faith!^{40a} However, the more important thing, for Bultmann, is that the resurrection of Christ is the eschatological event, because Paul says not only "In Christ shall all be made alive" — in future tense, but he also speaks of rising again with Christ in the present tense. Through the sacrament of baptism, Christians participate not only in the death of Christ but also in his resurrection. And again, in everyday life the Christian participates not only in the death of Christ but also in his resurrection. Thus, for Bultmann, resurrection, like the Cross, becomes of spiritual significance rather than historical. In this way, Bultmann would take the resurrection as non-mythological and he says, "In this way the resurrection is not a mythological event adduced in order

40a

Ibid., p. 42.

to prove the saving efficacy of the Cross, but an article of faith. ... Indeed, faith in the resurrection is really the same thing as faith in the saving efficacy of the Cross."⁴¹

This is the way in which the Cross is proclaimed. It was always proclaimed together with ^bte resurrection. Christ meets us in the preaching as one crucified and risen. He meets us in the word of preaching and nowhere else. Therefore, the faith of Easter is faith in the word of preaching. The resurrection itself is not an event of past history. For him, the historical problem is not relevant to Christian belief in the resurrection, ^{stis} simply meant for the first disciples.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 41.

CHAPTER V.

CRITIQUE

11. Bultmann's Reconstruction.

A. Form-criticism.

The framework of Rudolf Bultmann's theology of the New Testament is "Demythologization", namely the recognition of the elements of mythology in the New Testament and the interpretation of the mythology by the existential method which he adopts from Heidegger's existentialistic philosophy.

His extensive Demythologization has to go back to the liberal concept of Jesus and the Gospels. If he even admitted the fundamental concept of Jesus he would not demythologize the New Testament, but his approach is that of Kerygmatic theology based upon, first of all, Wrede and Wellhausen's criticism - Form-criticism.

William Wrede (1907) and Julius Wellhausen (1918) are the forerunners of the present Formgeschichte. Wrede was one of the first to undermine the historical dependability of the gospels including even Mark's gospel. Wellhausen added to this idea that Mark's gospel is largely made up of little narratives or sections, which had, at first, a separate existence;

these were revised to the present form. The contents of Mark and the other gospels represent not only the life of Jesus Christ, but, to some extent, also the beliefs of the early Church at the time when they were written. The chief exponents of this view today are Dibelius of Heidelberg, Rudolf Bultmann of Marburg, C. H. Dodd of Mansfield College, Oxford, R. H. Lightfoot of New College, Oxford, B. S. Easton of the General Theological Seminary, New York City, and D. W. Riddle of Chicago University.¹

Wrede attempted to attack the Liberal view of Christ in his book entitled, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, which Bultmann has called "the most important work in the field of gospel research in the generation now past."² According to Professor Stonehouse, the approach of Wrede, -- who attacked the Liberal view that Mark is essentially a theological construction rather than history, and is only relatively superior even to John -- received strong confirmation from Wellhausen and Bultmann. Bultmann also credits Wellhausen with the establishment of the principle that "a literary work or a fragment of tradition is a primary source for the historical situation out of which it arose, and is

² N. B. Stonehouse, "Rudolf Bultmann's Jesus," Paul Before the Areopagus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957, p. 117.

¹ H. G. Thiessen. Introduction to the N. T., pp. 119f.

only a secondary source from the historical details concerning which it gives information."³

This new approach of Wrede and Wellhausen attempted to reject, first of all, Baur and Strauss' criticism against the miraculous elements in the gospels and their theory based upon the naturalism of Hegelian philosophy; next to reject Weisse, the forerunner of the approach to the study of the life of Jesus, both by his non-eschatological interpretation of the Messianic consciousness and by his argument for the priority of Mark; and next to reject the Marcan Hypothesis which was developed especially by Holtzmann as the two-documentary theory of synoptic criticism - Mark and Q; and to reject the Ritschlian school, which is Neo-Kantianism -- ruling out metaphysics and mysticism from religion and developing a religious evaluation of a purely natural phenomena of history or historicism. In this fashion the history of religious personalities and heroes of faith came to be given the value of revelation. In general, theocentric Christianity was naturalized and made into a religion of human experience.

The next outstanding liberal figure, Harnack, while affirming the historicity of the Messianic consciousness, relegated it to the periphery of Jesus'

³Ibid., p. 118

estimate of Himself. Harnack made a distinction between the Easter message and the Easter faith. The Easter message, the message of the empty tomb and of the bodily resurrection is untrustworthy, but its rejection needs not destroy the Easter faith, the faith that Jesus lives and that there is eternal life.

Wrede and Wellhausen tried to attack all of these criticisms, but this Form-criticism, according to Martin Dibelius, is "the literary criticism of the forms in which ideas, thoughts, reports, descriptions, etc., are passed on orally or in writing."⁴ They make the Synoptic writers collectors and editors, and they still remain in the liberal circle of criticism. Bultmann, following after them, admits that the gospels are not to be taken seriously as historical records of the life of Christ and, for him, there is no source of the biography of Jesus at all in the gospels, but primarily the sources for our knowledge of early Church history. The Kerygma, therefore, becomes the most important part of his theology of the New Testament.

Bultmann insists upon both a reconstruction and an interpretation of the New Testament and says, "Since the New Testament is a document of history, specifically

⁴Thiessen, Intro. to the N.T., p. xix.

of the history of religion, the interpretation of it requires the labor of historical investigation.... Now such labor may be guided by either one of two interests, that of reconstruction or that of interpretation, that is, reconstruction of past history or interpretation of the New Testament writings. Neither exists, of course, without the other, and they stand constantly in a reciprocal relation to each other."⁵ But his purpose in reconstruction is to use it for the interpretation of the New Testament writings under the presupposition that they have something to say to the present. The reconstruction of the Kerygma, for him, becomes the most important basis upon which to interpret the New Testament writings. The Gospels are far removed from the historical Jesus and they are the theology of the Hellenistic communities. In other words, the gospels were expansions of the Hellenistic preaching of Christ, which was the earliest preaching that set forth Christ as a cult-deity whose death and resurrection are the basis of salvation. For Bultmann the gospels are expanded legends and their message that of the Christ-myth. There is no witness in the gospels to the history of Christ. The gospels are the creative activity of the early Church. This is

⁵Bultmann, Theology of N.T., Vol. 2, p. 251.

not the historical Reformed view, but is "historical skepticism,"⁶ Dr. Stonehouse declares.

Modern criticism generally uses the term "historical Jesus" synonymously with a merely human Jesus. While the new view, according to it, presents Jesus as one who cannot be explained in terms of human categories. For Bultmann, all of the material in the gospels, that reflects their distinctive view of Jesus, and that may be explained as having originated to meet the needs of the early Church, is to be explained as the product of the community. This process presupposes his negative judgment on the Messianic consciousness of Christ. Jesus did not plan for the establishment of the Church. According to Bultmann, Jesus did "not proclaim himself as Messiah,"⁷ but Jesus "was proclaimed as Messiah,"⁸ The prophet and teacher was made Messiah; "the indefinite, mythical figure,"⁹ thus, becomes concrete. Peter's confession of Jesus as Messiah, according to Bultmann, depends upon a subjective experience of Peter in Galilee, but since it is without evidence, Bultmann concludes it is a legend.¹⁰

This criticism, accordingly, does not allow at all for a continuity running from the Old Testament to the

⁶Stonehouse, Paul before Areopagus, pp. 111, 124, 137
140, 144

⁷Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, p. 90

⁸

⁹*ibid.* n. 34

historical Christ and attested by the eyewitnesses^{es} of Jesus' life. The historical record may have been strongly influenced by its kerygmatic purpose, but the final purpose of the gospel nonetheless is to demonstrate the trustfulness of what has been said of Christ. Of course, the gospels were written out of faith and this faith is the conviction that the historical Christ is the Son of God, that Jesus is a supernatural person; a heavenly Redeemer came to earth for the salvation of men. The gospels present a supernatural Jesus. "It admits of no doubt, and it is not doubted, that supernaturalistic Christianity is the only historical Christianity," says Warfield, "The naturalistic reconstructors, on the other hand, engage themselves in an effort to substitute for the Jesus of the transmission another Jesus of their own, a Jesus who will seem 'natural' to them, and will work in 'naturally' with their naturalistic world-view."¹² Dr. Machen also declared ^{there were} supernatural elements in the gospels and says, "critical process is very difficult. It is certainly no easy matter to separate natural and supernatural in the gospel picture of Jesus for the two are inextricably intertwined."¹³

¹¹B.B. Warfield, Christology and Criticism, New York: Oxford, 1929, p. 165.

¹²Ibid., p. 166

¹³J. Gresham Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 155.

Bultmann, like Wrede, denies the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. However, the Messianic element in the consciousness of Jesus is rooted too deep in the sources ever to be removed by any critical process. If Jesus never thought Himself to be the Messiah and never presented Himself as such during his life, how did His disciples come to regard Him as the Messiah after His death? The element of Messianic consciousness is the basis upon which Jesus taught His disciples. Bultmann makes a distinction between Jewish Christianity and Hellenistic Christianity and Paul was the founder of a new religion of syncretism.¹⁴ But there is no reason to introduce this discontinuity into Christianity. Paul was not a new founder of another religion, but he was a follower of Jesus Christ.¹⁵ Although Paul has no occasion to enter into the details of Christ's earthly life, Paul had known the Christian movement, Warfield says, from its beginning; "first from the outside, as one of the chief agents in its persecution, and then from the inside, as the most active leader of its propaganda."¹⁶ After his conversion he was familiarly acquainted with the Apostles and other immediate

¹⁴Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, p. 177

¹⁵See Macken, The Origin of Paul's Religion, "Paul and Jesus", pp. 117-139.

¹⁶Warfield, Christology and Criticism, p. 150

followers of Jesus. He did not mention the narratives of Jesus in his epistles but they are alluded to as matters of common knowledge, and with the plainest intimation of the unquestioned recognition of them by all, and Paul's knowledge about Jesus' life can be seen scattered throughout his epistles.

Warfield declares "Paul's testimony alone provides thus an exceptionally good basis for the historical verity of Jesus' personality and career. But Paul's testimony is far from standing alone. It is fully supported by the testimony of a series of other writings . . . most of them from actual companions of our Lord and eye-witnesses of His majesty, and handed down to us with credible evidence of their authenticity."¹⁷ This statement clearly represents what the Scriptures say in I Cor. 15:3, "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures," and 11:23, "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread:" These verses support the fact that Paul's testimony to Christ was neither from his own subjective imagination nor from pagan mythology,

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 152

but from the eye-witnesses of the actual companions of our Lord.

Bultmann, then, like the older liberals, knows Jesus humanistically (kata sarka).¹⁸ He does not and cannot believe the supernatural and absolutely ignores the supernatural mystery of the two natures of Jesus Christ -- the perfect human nature and the perfect divine nature in one person.

B. Mythology.

Bultmann's New Testament theology is based upon the decisive influence of modern scientific thought, and he views the world view of the New Testament as "simply the cosmology of a pre-scientific age",¹⁹ and says that therefore no man who is scientifically minded can adopt the world view of the New Testament with its mythological terminology. In Bultmann we encounter precisely the same arguments as used by the rationalistic modernist theologians in the 19th century against the possibility of the Incarnation and the Resurrection. "It is on the basis of this philosophical point of view -- (Rationalism), that Bultmann came to the necessity of myth-debunking."²⁰

¹⁸"kata sarka" (after flesh). Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr. translates it "humanistically".

¹⁹Kerygma and Myth, p. 3

²⁰Berkouwer, The Person of Christ, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954, p. 41.

Bultmann makes a sharp distinction between the Palestinian world and the Greek world, and between Palestinian Christianity and Hellenistic Christianity, the basis for the rejection of the authority of a great part of the material of the Gospel tradition.

(1) Jewish Apocalyptic Mythology.

Bultmann says, "Jesus' message is connected with the hope of other circles which is primarily documented by the apocalyptic literature, a hope which awaits salvation not from a miraculous change in historical conditions, but from a cosmic catastrophe which will do away with all conditions of the present world as it is."^{21a} Not only Jesus' message itself, but the kerygma of the earliest church also had the concept of Messiah, or Son of Man -- an indefinite mythical figure based upon Jewish Apocalyptic eschatological expectation. But "the Apocalyptic Messiah was not an object of worship nor a living person to be loved."^{21b}

According to R. H. Charles,²² the book of Enoch, one of the Jewish Apocalypses, has had more influence on the New Testament than has any other apocryphal or pseud-epigraphic work. How much then has the New Testament been

^{21a} Bultmann, Theology of N.T., Vol. 1, p. 4.

^{21b} Hachen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 317

²² The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T., Oxford, 1913, Vol. II, (Apocalypses pp. 163-624).

influenced? It is significant to examine it at this point, and it will be an answer to Bultmann's idea that Jewish apocalyptic mythology has influenced the New Testament.

First Enoch 108:8 says, "love . . . nor any of the good things which are in the world," and Charles identifies it with I John 2:15, "Love not the world nor the things that are in the world." But it cannot be so because Enoch continues to say, "but gave over their bodies to torture." It seems to be asceticism. It is not the same as the New Testament. Merely similar verbiage is used. I Enoch 62:5 ff. indicate the picture of the "Son of Man" and according to Charles, its influence is seen in Matt. 19:28. Enoch's account came from the Book of Daniel and Isaiah. The Apocalypse, it is sure, was influenced from the Old Testament but it is questionable if the New Testament was influenced from Apocalypses. Of course there are many similarities between the two and the original writings of the Apocalypses were written before Christ, but the translation may be from the 4th century A.D. or the 16th century A.D., and the translators have slipped the New Testament passages into the Apocalypses. As the result the Apocalypses merely sound Christian.²³

²³cf. R. Laird Harris, Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957, p. 183.

Quite clearly Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal books including Apocalypses are legendary, but they are not Scripture. Dr. R. Laird Harris, in his book, Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible, denies their canonicity for two reasons, namely, "the one historical and the other an appeal to authority."²⁴ Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha both alike were all composed after the period when prophecy was recognized to have departed from Israel. In the two Books of the Maccabees the entire historical situation is avowedly that of the second century B.C. and quite different from that of any canonical book.²⁵

These books make no claim to prophetic authorship nor can they be defended as such, as Dr. Harris says, "The description 'false prophets' would better characterize their authors."²⁶ They were not received as prophetic and inspired; in the pre-Christian era these writings were known, but were not among those accepted as authoritative in Palestine, nor were they accepted by Christ and His apostles. There are about 600 quotations from the Old Testament in the New,²⁷ and these show clearly that the Old Testament books were esteemed divine and regarded as absolute truth and they were quoted with such authoritative phrases as "it is written", "God said," "through

²⁴Ibid., p. 180 . ²⁵Ibid., p.181 ²⁶Ibid., p. 182
²⁷Ibid., p. 183 ²⁸Ibid.

the prophet," "Scripture saith," etc. On the contrary the Apocryphal books were never quoted in anyway, nor did the early church receive them.

These writings are evidently legendary and entirely uninspired in nature, and on the basis of the historical evidence, the Apocryphal books should be rejected. They claim no divine inspiration and were never received either by their contemporaries or their immediate successors.

The New Testament is constituted of quotations taken directly from the Old Testament and an historical revelation of the person, life and teachings of Jesus Christ. It shows that the continuity from the Old Testament to the New is both historical and still supernatural. On the basis of what has been said, we can therefore rule out Bultmann's concept of the Jewish Apocalyptic mythology in the New Testament; there is no room for it.

(2) Gnostic Mythology.

According to Bultmann, Gnostic influence has a large part in the New Testament. Gnostic thought, myth, and terminology influenced Christian thinking and contributed to the development of Christian theological language, first of all, by further developing the concept of eschatological dualism or cosmological thinking in a more consistent manner.²⁹

²⁹ Bultmann, Theology of N.T., Vol. 1, p. 172.

Christ's death unified with his resurrection and exaltation is a Gnostic mythical category, also Satan as expressed in the terms, "the god of this world," "the prince of the power of the air," or "the ruler of this age" is a Gnostic mythological figure. Thus, Bultmann calls Biblical Christian doctrine "Gnostic myth" again and again.

At this point it is necessary to consider, in regard to Gnosticism, whether, as Bultmann says, it has so much influence in the New Testament that it must be demythologized.

First of all, Gnosticism was not sufficiently developed to be so influential that the New Testament, particularly Paul and his writings, were influenced much. According to Reinhold Seeberg, Gnosticism arose in Apostolic age, particularly in Asia Minor and Antioch, and by the end of the Apostolic period, about the close of the first century, it had taken a more fixed form, then from the early part of the second century, it openly proclaimed and widely circulated.³⁰ "If this view of the case be correct," says Dr. Machen, "it is at least significant that pagan teachers of the second century (the Gnostics) should have been so ready to adopt Christian elements and so anxious to give their systems a Christian appearance."³¹ From these statements we can conclude that

³⁰ Reinhold Seeberg, Textbook of the History of Doctrines, Grand Rapids: Baker, Vol. 1, p. 93.

³¹ Machen. The Origin of Paul's Religion. no. 227.228.

it was not the New Testament, which was written in the first century, that was influenced by Gnosticism, but rather Gnosticism which developed its spiritual atmosphere from Christianity. Gnosticism was too late a development to have been the source for Bultmann's theory of Gnostic myths in the New Testament.

Secondly, Christ's death, resurrection, and redemption were not originally produced by the pagan myth. Bultmann says, Paul's interpretation of Christ's death and resurrection is Gnostic and the Redeemer is not the historical Jesus.

However, for Paul, it was an account of something that had happened. The death and resurrection of Jesus, upon which Paul's gospel was based, had happened only a few years before, and Paul appeals to the eyewitnesses in detail. Dr. Machen writes, "The single passage, I Cor. 15:1-8, is sufficient to place a stupendous gulf between the Pauline Christ and the pagan saviour-gods. But the character of Paulinism does not depend upon one passage. Everywhere in the Epistles Paul stakes all his life upon the truth of what he says about the death and resurrection of Jesus. The religion of Paul was not founded upon a complex of ideas derived from Judaism or from paganism (Gnosticism). It was founded upon the

historical Jesus who died and rose again from the dead."³²
But it does not rest upon the so-called historical Jesus
whom the critics reconstructed.

Why then, is the New Testament, for Bultmann,
mythological? Simply because he does not and cannot believe
in the Supernatural: the existence of a personal God,
verbal inspiration, miracles, and the deity of Christ, let
alone His pre-existence, incarnation, consciousness of
Messiahship, resurrection, and second coming.

His reconstruction of the gospels as mythology is
intended, according to him, to remove the mythical elements
in the New Testament, but this removal of myth does not
necessarily destroy the witness itself, rather, the his-
torical event, cast in a mythological mold, enables us to
discover the meaning of the cross in which God comes to
this world in the fullness of grace. In this way, for him,
the Cross is not a mythical, but becomes a truly meaningful
historical event. This approach, however, seems to be the
result of his being ashamed of the Gospel before science.
He proceeds, he claims from a pastoral and missionary
motive -- namely, in order to preserve modern man from
rejecting the New Testament because of its mythical structure
-- to reinterpret the mythical.

³² Ibid., p. 317

While Bultmann, on the one hand, devaluates the doctrine of the two natures of Christ by putting Christ's essence as myth, on the other hand, he despises the sacrificial and redemptive work of Christ by applying his mythical concept of redemption.

Because of these things, Bultmann's theology of the New Testament can rightly be called a "New Outbreak of Liberalism"³³ by Karl Barth, although Bultmann is usually listed as belonging to the post-Barthian movement. Yet, Barth himself is one of the Kerygmatic theologians and to this extent a liberal (Neo-Modernist³⁴). But Barth is not such a radical reconstructionist as Bultmann. Bultmann is certainly the most representative of the form-critics.³⁵

³³John Baillie, "The Changing Theological Scene," The Presbyterian Outlook, March 11, 1957, p. 6.

³⁴Cornelius Van Til names Barthians "Neo-Modernists", in his book, Neo-Modernism.

³⁵see Prof. Stonehouse's article, "The Pathos of Religious Liberalism", in Christianity Today, Vol. 1, 15, March 22, 1957

12. Bultmann's Interpretation

A. The Principle of Interpretation

Interpretation is an important part of Bultmann's New Testament theology of "Demythologization." The problem of the interpretation of the so-called mythological elements in the New Testament is not in itself a new one. The older Liberal theologians tried to answer it by the elimination of all mythology from the New Testament, but this proved impossible, and the problem presented itself anew among later critics in a far more inexorable form than before. And now the critics have adopted a new approach claiming that what is needed is not elimination, but interpretation. Bultmann makes interpretation the task of the New Testament theology and writes, "The liberal theologians of the last century were working on the wrong lines. They threw away not only the mythology, but also the kerygma itself . . . the last twenty years have witnessed a movement away from criticism and a return to a naive acceptance of the kerygma . . . whereas the older liberals used criticism to eliminate the mythology of the New Testament, our task today is to use criticism to interpret it."¹

Interpretation has been constantly attempted ever since Martin Kähler's novel *Landreiso*² appeared, and it,

¹Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p. 12.

²Martin Kähler, Das sogenannte historische Jesus

actually, can be traced back as far as William Wrede in the identical form in which Bultmann has presented it. In our time we meet it when we compare Bultmann's own commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the Meyer series (1941) with Ernst Pery's examination of the sources of the Johannine theology (Lund, 1939). We see it again in many of the recent commentaries on the synoptic Gospels, and also in Martin Dibelius's Jesus (1939).

Bultmann thinks this interpretation of mythology can even reconcile the conflict seen in the old battles between orthodoxy and liberalism and says, "Failure to do so . . . will have to be fought out all over again."³ What is, then, the key to interpretation in Bultmann's theology of the New Testament? He says, ". . . the understanding of the text is attainable only in systematic interpretation . . ., this means subordinating the work of exegesis to that of the philosopher."⁴ He adopts Heidegger's philosophy, and for him, there is no reason why he should not admit "right" philosophy.⁵ This is the existentialistic philosophy of Heidegger.

Existentialism

Bultmann himself is an existentialist and his theology of the New Testament is fully based upon the

³Kerygma and Myth, p. 12

⁴Ibid., p. 192 f.

⁵Ibid., p. 193.

contemporary philosophy or existentialism. He says, "Existentialist analysis can only make clear to me that each concrete instance of love can only be understood existentially, and that no man can be deprived of his understanding of his own particular love by any existentialist analysis."⁶ Can we, then, adopt Bultmann's interpretation of the New Testament? No! The existential interpretation of the New Testament is utterly different from the Bible's interpretation of itself. What then are the main characteristics of the existential interpretation?

First of all, existential interpretation is irrational in nature. Bultmann says, "Interpretation lacks understanding if it investigates the text in accordance with dogmatic propositions considered as the result of scientific research, and if in consequence it takes the text in question as the 'source' of a particular stage in the history of philosophy, and thus sees this history as an event which lies in the past, instead of revitalizing it for the present."⁷ He is actually skeptical about historical facts as data of knowledge. Scientific research can not understand the true meaning of the text, but only the historical subject can understand it. This becomes more clear when we read, "If the concept of objective knowledge is taken from natural science, . . . then it is not valid for the comprehension of historical phenomena; for these are of a different kind

⁶ Ibid., p. 195.

⁷ Bultmann, Essays, p. 246

from those of nature. They do not exist as historical phenomena at all, without the historical subject which comprises them. For the facts of the past only become historical phenomena when they become significant for a subject which itself stands in history and is involved in it; only when they have something to say; and that they only do for the subject which comprehends them."⁸ This irrational view of the relation between history and natural science is a reaction against the rationalism which played a great role in early humanist philosophy. Thus Bultmann makes a distinction between facts of science as truth and facts or data of history. Facts of science exist apart from man but facts of history only exist, Bultmann maintains, existentially, that is in relation to men. There are scientific facts apart from man but historical facts only insofar as they exist existentially for man!

Humanistic philosophy, founded upon the basic religious motives of nature and freedom, displays a polar tension between what we may call the ideal of science and the idea of personality. If a person absolutizes one of the natural aspects of the cosmos, in order to seek the total meaning of reality in this absolutized aspect, then a philosophy develops under the primacy of that ideal/or science. The method of natural science was extended in

⁸ Ibid., p. 254.

the nineteenth century, because of man's desire to dominate the entire cosmos, by means of the power of his scientific knowledge. Rationalism holds reason to be the law-giver of cosmic reality. Theoretical thought is deified when all of reality can be explained rationally and can be intellectually comprehended. When philosophy is exercised under the primacy of the ideal of science, rationalism appears in the form of absolutized special scientific thought, namely, mathematical, mechanical, biological, or psychological thought. But existential philosophy is a reaction against rationalism in all its forms.

In contrast to rationalism, existential philosophy is irrational and "based upon a faith in the autonomous sovereign person of man; it no longer deifies cosmic law, but deifies a subject instead."⁹ Thus, existentialism is a deification of the subjective human existence as an historical stream of experience. It denies objective reality, and historical facts as well as the doctrines based upon the historical facts.

From the Reformed view of Biblical interpretation, irrational, subjective, existential thinking cannot be accepted because the Bible should be interpreted Grammatically and Historically rather than subjectively or existentially.¹⁰ Christianity is based upon the solid

⁹J.M.Spier, Christianity and Existentialism, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1953, p.103.

¹⁰cf. Louis Berkhof, Principles of Biblical Interpretation, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952.

ground, that the historical facts in the Scriptures are God's revelation. By fact is meant either some objective discovery (such as an archeological find), or some event (such as an historical battle), or some phenomenon which may be personal (such as in the case of Paul's conversion), or social (such as the spread of the Christian Church). These facts may be classified, according to Bernard Ramm, three ways, "First, there is material fact . . . anything of a very concrete, specific nature, e.g., things, historical events, meteorological phenomena, documents, or monuments. Secondly, there is supernatural fact, which involves events or phenomena which can be satisfactorily accounted for by invoking the category of the supernatural. Thirdly, there is experiential fact which refers to the experience of people, and social phenomena which are traceable back to the impact of the Christian religion."¹¹ Philosophically, existentialism is idealistic in that objective reality is made to depend entirely upon subjective mind, but this is incorrect because the universe is made up of both mind and matter and dependent upon the creation of God. Objective reality is a substantive entity, existing in itself whether it is known or not. To be is not the same as to be known -- it is independent of one's opinions and desires metaphysically. There is a great difference between those who maintain and those who deny that facts are essential to Christianity.

¹¹Bernard Ramm, Protestant Christian Evidences, Chicago: Moody Press, 1954, p. 17.

Samuel Craig points out the importance of the historical facts and says, "Here revelation is on principle inseparable from a background of historical facts with which to bring man's life into vital contact, is indeed the main reason for its existence."^{12a} Special revelation itself gives us history, the kernel and the true content of all history. Herman Bavinck says, "Christianity is itself history; it makes history, and is one of the principal factors of history. . ."^{12b} He continues, saying, ". . . think Christ away for a moment, with all he has spoken and done and wrought. Immediately history falls to pieces. . . It becomes a chaos, without a centre. . . but revelation teaches that God is the Lord of the ages and that Christ is the turning point of these ages. And thus it brings into history unity and plan, progress and aim."^{12c}

As a result of his view of historical facts, Bultmann also denies the Biblical doctrines. For him they are built upon myths. This greatly endangers our Christian faith. Biblical interpretation is not only Grammatical-historical, but also theological.¹³ James Orr writes, "The gospel is no mere proclamation of 'eternal truth', but the discovery of a saving purpose of God for mankind, executed in time. But the doctrines are the interpretation of the facts. . . When John declares that

^{12a} Samuel Craig, Christianity rightly so called, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1953, p. 117.

^{12b} Herman Bavinck, The Philosophy of Revelation, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953, p. 140.

^{12c} Ibid., p. 141

Jesus Christ is come in flesh, and is the Son of God, he is stating a fact, but he is none-the-less enunciating a doctrine. When Paul affirms, 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures', he is proclaiming a fact, but he is, at the same time, giving an interpretation of it."¹⁴ The historical facts and doctrines are inseparable. Dr. Machen most clearly indicates in his book, "Christianity and Liberalism", that the facts and the doctrines are always combined in the Christian messages. He says, "'Christ died'-- that is history; 'Christ died for our sins'--that is doctrine. Without these two elements, joined in an absolutely indissoluble union, there is no Christianity."¹⁵ He continues, "The narration of the fact is history; the narration of the facts with the meaning of the facts is doctrine. 'Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried'-- that is history. 'He loved me and gave Himself for me'-- that is doctrine."¹⁶

Secondly, Existential interpretation is radical, subjective, and individual.

Irrational philosophy naturally introduces Subjectivity. Søren Kierkegaard's key phrase was, "Subjectivity is truth." This idea has prevailed in all the contemporary philosophy and theology of existentialism. Søren Kierkegaard (1813-55) is rightly called the father of existentialism.

¹⁴James Orr, The Christian View of the God and the World, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954, pp. 22f.

¹⁵J. Gresham Machen, Christianity and Liberalism, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956, p. 27.

¹⁶ibid. p. 22.

One of the Barthian theologians, Cochrane says, "Kierkegaard's works were published in Denmark. . . in the middle of the nineteenth century. . . translated into German during the 1920's. . . Their influence upon Barth, Brunner, Gogarten, and Bultmann was prodigious. . . Consequently, Barth could write in the preface to the second German edition of his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (1921) that 'if I have a system, it is limited to a recognition of what Kierkegaard called the infinite qualitative distinction' between time and eternity, and to my regarding this as possessing negative as well as positive significance: . . ." ¹⁷ This influential man, Kierkegaard inherited from his father a melancholy disposition, a rich fantasy, and a tendency to engage in continual introspection. He was an introvert, and broke his engagement as he did not consider himself worthy. When the last years of his life were plagued by the persecutions of a local newspaper, he was deeply offended by the fact that the church did not rise to his defense. All of these circumstances, and his personal struggles, made him irrational, individual and subjective. His whole attitude and convictions were anti-social. Individual subjectivity alone, for him was truth. Man flees from his own existence, he reasoned, as soon as he subjects himself to laws and seeks certainty in universal rules. Kierkegaard's idea that real

17

Arthur C. Cochrane, The Existentialists and God, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1950, p. 31.

existence is the individual subjectivity of the free man has had a tremendous influence in all later Existentialism.¹⁸

Martin Heidegger, has directly influenced Bultmann, and shares with him the effect of the phenomenology of Husserl. Heidegger aimed at a phenomenological analysis of human existence in respect to its temporal and historical character. At the same time, under Kierkegaard's influence, he pursued an "existential" analysis of human existence in order to discuss the original philosophical question of being in a new way.¹⁹ According to Spier, Heidegger intended to develop a general ontology, but he has not yet done so. Rather he has attained to merely limited being in Dasein (human being there). The Dasein is characterized by Existence. To exist is to exceed oneself; it is to stand outside of oneself and to transcend oneself. It is self-transcendence. Since this philosophy of existence analyzes the understanding of existence--a human existence, it follows that this philosophy does not directly give an account of the being of God. Further, Heidegger makes an important distinction between authentic and unauthentic Dasein. Authentic existence is real existence in which man really finds himself, and unauthentic existence is the fallen existence in which the self is lost. Unauthentic existence is the life of the large masses of people in and with the world.^{19a}

¹⁸ cf. Spier, Existentialism and Christianity, pp. 71.

¹⁹ cf. D.D. James, The Dictionary of Philosophy, New York: Philosophical Library, p. 124.

^{19a} cf. J. M. Spier, Christianity and Existentialism, pp. 29-37.

Adopting this philosophy to his theological interpretation of the Kerygma, Bultmann says that Jesus taught that the worst that can happen to a man is to lose himself because a man is only saved when he comes to himself. Man is therefore pressed to a radical decision. The whole eschatological teaching of Jesus stresses the urgent need for decision which, for Bultmann, is existential self-determination, self-projection, or self-transcendence. Bultmann's analysis of Being: "Man prior to the Revelation of faith" and "Man under faith" in the theology of Paul,²⁰ and "Johannine dualism" in the theology of the Gospel of John, and the Johannine Epistles,²¹ presents exactly the same concept of existence, as Heidegger's. Thus, the philosophy and theology of existentialism are concerned with the serious concrete problems of human existence.

While the earlier rationalistic philosophy, whether under the primacy of the ideal of science or of personality, was optimistic in nature, irrationalistic, subjective philosophy, in contrast, was soon to show a pessimistic trait. The Existentialist thinks that human life is not motivated by rational factors, but by irrational tendencies which have a religious root; the impotence of man in the face of the great problems of life, anxiety, suffering, death, and destruction. Man has not only lost his certainty in God and His word, but he has also lost his faith in any

²⁰Theology of N.T., Vol. I, pp. 190-352.

²¹Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 15-32.

fixed order in life. Consequently, he has the experience that he is completely thrown upon his own resources and must seek final certainty in his own experience. Man becomes, however, conscious of his impotence and finitude but cannot embrace the being which surrounds him. Spier quotes from Zuidema and says, "This philosophy cannot be exclusively explained as an internal theoretical development within an autonomous sphere of philosophy. It would be wrong to think of it as being free from outside influences... Existentialist philosophy gives philosophical form to modern man's defeatism, pessimism, despair, negativity and feeling of the meaningless and absurdity."²²

Thus, Angst and Sorge become the motivation of the existential thinking of Heidegger. He has been trying to find the ideal of personality, and the peace and freedom of man, but cannot, because for him existence is itself existence for the end--it is a life leading to death. For him there is no room for things after death. In other words, he has no problem of immortality and eternal life. Existentialism interprets man's consciousness of the crisis and his lack of certainty. It does not offer him any safety and cannot protect him against the fate of his freedom or the contingency of his existence. Thus, it only leads to complete, perishable, and meaningless nothingness.

Therefore, it is not correct to say, as existentialists do, "truth is subjectivity" or the truth comes into

being only by being made the object of our knowledge through self-understanding. Bavinck says again, "For this purpose God has deposited the truth in nature and Scripture, that we might have it, and by knowing it might rule through it. . .; reality is an instrument to enable us to find the truth; reality is intended to become truth in our consciousness and in our experience."²³ God has not left himself without witness, but speaks through all nature. The objective reality; the forms of being, the laws of thought, and the forms of conduct, have their common source in the divine wisdom. The three departments of philosophy,- physics, logic and ethics, form a harmonious whole. The criteria of truth does not lie in its human, subjective usefulness to life.

The Scriptures tell us of the total inability of man, but also of the promise of God--the Covenant of Grace-- so that we can be saved. This promise is revealed through the Old Testament in historical events and God's commandments and prophecies, as well as through the New Testament by the incarnation, the death, and the resurrection of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, in history, as facts supported by clear evidences. Christianity presents propositional truths as the norms and for authority.

Thirdly, existential interpretation is reductive.

²³ Bavinck, The Philosophy of Revelation, p. 62.

As over against the immanentistic and mystical theology of Schleiermacher and the modern school, Barthian theology wants to be a theology of revelation and is often spoken of as the theology of the Word. Bultmann is also often called a reformed theologian in the sense that he is a reaction against modern liberal theology.

He asserts that the interpretation of the Scripture is a matter of understanding, and he says, "The exegete is to 'interpret' Scripture, after he has responsibly 'heard' what Scripture has to say! And how is he to 'hear' without understanding? The problem of interpretation is precisely that of understanding!"²⁴ In other words, it is to be an existential analysis of human existence or an existential understanding of the self. This prior understanding of the subject is to be the criterion of the understanding of the New Testament. According to Bultmann, "It is a mistake to think we can understand a word of the New Testament without such a prior understanding and the concepts which emanate from it, if it is to be understood as the Word of God."²⁵ He argues against Karl Barth's view of interpretation and says, "Karl Barth rejects the view that a theological proposition can only be valid when it can show itself to be a genuine component part of the Christian understanding of human existence."²⁶ While Karl Barth recognizes God's revelation is not historical he seeks for a direct revelation from God in

²⁴Bultmann, Essays, p. 261.

²⁵Ibid., p. 258.

²⁶Ibid. n. 259.

history or experience. The text of the Bible is a witness to revelation, it is an "echo" of the voice of God. According to Dr. Van Til, Barth is still subjective and he says, "In the Work under consideration Barth is still struggling with historical relativism and religious individualism. The world of surface phenomena is a world that is taken as much as given by the mind of man."²⁷

All the Barthians, including Bultmann, are largely determined by the influence of Kierkegaard and Heidegger and seek to cure historical relativism and psychological individualism by instilling into the convulsive patient, modern man, a large dose of irrationalism. They desire earnestly to rid themselves of the last remnants of "speculation" and "metaphysics". Although Barth calls himself "the theologian of the Word of God", for him the Word of God is completely hidden in the Bible. In this manner, even Barth reduces the Word of God, while Bultmann oversimplifies by overlooking and denying a part of the richness which God has placed in created reality. God has created all the objective materials and God has revealed himself in history. All the historical events are part of God's revelation and since the creation this is progressing and it will continue to progress evermore. Also God's revelation actually came into history while God is at the same time taking up history into his revelation.

²⁷C. Van Til, The New Modernism, p. 143.

Every philosophical system which does not take the Word of God into account to the fullest degree, must, to some extent, be guilty of a reductionism. The reason for this is that the general revelation of God in His creation cannot be properly understood apart from the light of special divine revelation. Existentialism has withdrawn itself from the Word of God as it rejects the revelation of God in the Holy Bible, therefore, reductionism cannot be avoided by it. As a result the existentialist does not hear the divine law. The subjective self is authorized and becomes the norm instead of the divine law. In this form of reduction there is no room for any norms or ordinances which would dominate or rule human existence and society. Man possesses absolute freedom and autonomy. This philosophy lives upon anthropology, or as Bultmann says, the Bible "... constantly sees the world and man in their relation to God. Every assertion about God is simultaneously an assertion about man and vice versa. For this reason and in this sense Paul's theology is, at the same time, anthropology."²⁸ Furthermore, while he asserts that the supernatural and miraculous facts are myths, he meets the problem by interpretation and says, "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,

²⁸Bultmann, Theology of N.T., Vol.I, p. 191

or better still, existentially."²⁹

Yet, Bultmann rejects the idea that the revelation of God in the Bible in mythology is a production of the human imagination. If the diversity of things and relationships are not seen in the place in which the Creator has placed them in the totality of His cosmos, then the richness of the creation can no longer be approached. The only path that is open is that which leads to a disastrous reductionism and oversimplification.

The Reformed view of Biblical interpretation is entirely different from that of Bultmann and the other existentialists. Hermeneutica Sacra has a very special character because it deals with the Bible as the "inspired word of God". It is only when we recognize the principle of the divine inspiration of the Bible that we can maintain the theological character of the Hermeneutica Sacra. The matter of understanding the Bible does not depend upon a subjective understanding, but upon the inner witness of the Holy Spirit or the illumination of the Spirit, because the Holy Bible is written by inspired men of God through verbal inspiration.³⁰

The natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned.³¹ The two fundamental principles,

²⁹ Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p. 10

³⁰ II Tim. 3:16

or the essential character of the exegesis of the reformers, are therefore reasonable and acceptable: Namely, (1) Scripture is the interpreter of Scripture, and (2) let all understanding and exposition of Scripture be in conformity with the analogy of faith.³²

According to Bavinck, Scripture is not a human, incidental, arbitrary, and defective supplement to revelation, but is itself a component part of revelation. In fact, Scripture is the rounding out and the fulfillment, the cornerstone and the capstone of revelation.³³ Finally, the most frequently quoted statement of the doctrine of the Scripture is to be found in the larger catechism of the Westminster Confession of Faith, where question 3 asks, "What is the word of God?" and answers, "The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience."

This reformed view of the Scriptures, expressing their authority and the doctrine of inspiration, alone makes for correct Biblical interpretation and can alone solve the problems of God, the world, and man.

B. Being

(1) Soma.

According to Bultmann, Soma is the most comprehensive

³² L. Berkhof, Principles of Biblical Interpretation, p. 26

³³ Bavinck, Our Reasonable Faith, Erdmans, 1956, p. 96.

term to characterize man's existence and also the most complicated and difficult to understand.³⁴ Bultmann defines the concept of Soma in three propositions: first of all, Man's existence is always somatic. He says, "man, his person as a whole, can be denoted by Soma... Man is called soma in respect to his being able to make himself the object of his own action or to experience himself as the subject to whom something happens."³⁵ Even in the life to come, man will still be a body--not of flesh and blood, but nevertheless of some kind. The body is his characteristic way of being. Secondly, man in his being has a relationship to himself, he says, "man is called soma in respect to his being able to control himself and be the object of his own action."³⁶ That relationship can be either an appropriate or a perverted one, and he can be under his own control or lose his grip on himself. Thirdly, man has therefore two fundamental possibilities: he can be at one with himself or he can be estranged from himself.

This interpretation of the concept of Soma clearly constitutes an existential interpretation and Bultmann connects it immediately with Heidegger's teaching of Dasein. Heidegger's theory of Dasein in "Sein and Zeit".³⁷ is summarized: (a) man has a relation to himself in a way that is peculiar to him, an existing. He is at once subject and

³⁴Theology of N.T., Vol. I, p. 192

³⁵Ibid., p. 195

³⁶Ibid., p. 196

³⁷...

object to himself or as is said, he transcends the subject-object relationship. (b) Man is possibility. He is always more than he is, his being is never complete at any given moment. He therefore has no essence as an object has. But man is possibility of decision. (c) Man is individual--existence is always mine.

This concept of existence carries with it two implications: that man is in a world and that existence can be either authentic or inauthentic. Man as Dasein can lose himself to the being that meets him in the world, and be taken over by it. Because he has a relation to himself, man can become an object to himself, and can understand himself merely as one object among the other objects in his world. This is what is meant by an inauthentic existence. He exists authentically, ^{only} when, instead of being enslaved to the world, he is free for his world.³⁶

Thus, Bultmann's exposition of Soma comes exactly from Heidegger's Dasein theory. If it is valid, then it is a confirmation that there is a kinship between existentialism and New Testament thought. This interpretation of the concept of soma clearly shows the existential influence found in Bultmann's thinking. It is neither a scriptural nor a Christian view.

Firstly, Bultmann's concept of Soma rests upon incorrect exegesis. Bultmann argues that the ~~use~~ of soma

36

John Macquarrie, An Existentialist Theology, pp. 32 ff.

as "form", "shape" is un-Pauline, and is based upon the resurrection-body which is not a physical body or one of dust, but a "spiritual body", a "body of glory". In contrast, in I Cor. 15:35-49, Paul uses well-known facts of nature to show the reasonableness of a belief in a higher form of life in the resurrection state. Paul is reasoning by analogy and shows that the identity or matter is preserved in a variety of forms. Corn is still corn whether it be seed or plant; flesh is still flesh whether it be human or belonging to some kind of animal; matter is still matter whether it exists in the earth or in the sun, moon or stars. Of course there is a difference and change between the physical body and the resurrected body. How is the material change even within life to be solved? A body which is just born and a body of an old man are different,--the latter is changed chemically from the former;-- there is no material identity, but still numerical identity in the same person. By analogy some of resurrection body means numerical identity but different matter and form, though still matter (res extensa) and form (having space). For example, Jesus' resurrection body had space in this world with his disciples and his resurrection body was visible and tangible. (Jn.20:27) this answers Bultmann's denial of form and shape of body in the resurrection (I Cor. 15:50). "Flesh and blood", in this verse, cannot receive the kingdom of God because they are

corrupted by sin, yet the resurrection body which is still matter and form in glory shall be incorruptible.

Further, Bultmann denies the "form of soma" or just "body" in reference to Rom. 6:12 and 12:1, and he says that the soma, in these verses, means the whole person. However, these verses do not deny the physical body because the nature of man consists of soul and body and the Scriptures use either soul or body either interchangeably, or together, as representative of the person.

Bultmann says, "it is clear that soma is not a something that outwardly clings to a man's real self, but belongs to its very essence, so that we can say man does not have a soma; he is soma...soma can be translated simply "I"...³⁹ and he gives references; 1 Cor. 13:3; 9:27; 7:4, or Phil.1:20; Rom. 12:1; 6:12. This is a misinterpretation as seen for example, in 1 Cor. 13:3, "I give my body to be burned", whereby "body" is meant physical body objectively to the subjective soul. In other passages, 1 Cor. 9:27, 7:4, "body" means "self" but it does not exclude physical body, but rather designates the whole/^{person}including the body. Phil. 1:20 shows more clearly that by "body" is meant the person, but his personality in honoring Christ must be manifested through a physical body because a person cannot exist without a body. All of these passages mean by "body" the "living body".

³⁹Theology of N.T., Vol. I, p. 194.

Furthermore, even in the Pauline epistles, as well as in gospels, Paul uses soma as physical body,⁴⁰ and says, "the body is one and hath many members and all the members of that one body, being many are one body."⁴¹ Bultmann's interpretation of the concept of soma can then not be accepted, first of all, exegetically. He simply puts Heidegger's concept of Dasein into the New Testament and uses the N.T. Soma for the ideal of the personality.

Secondly, Bultmann's concept of Soma denies the Biblical doctrine of the constitution of human nature. He denies the presence of two components in the human being as he interprets Soma as a formless body.

Man is made up of a human body (physical form) and a living soul.⁴² Man is not merely mind or soul--that would be pure idealism, nor merely body--that would be pure materialism. Man is made up of body and soul. He is formed of a union of body and soul. Psycho-somatic problems of mental and physical health have their origin in this relation.

Hodge makes a distinction, sharply, between matter and mind as he says, "the phenomena or properties of matter are essentially different from those of mind, we are forced to conclude that matter and mind are two distinct substances;

⁴⁰I Cor. 6:13; Heb. 13:3; I Cor. 11:27

⁴¹I Cor. 12:12

⁴²Gen.2:7; Eccl. 12:7.

that the soul is not material nor the body spiritual."⁴³

This view of the nature of man, which is presented in the original account of his creation, is sustained by the constant representation of the Bible.⁴⁴

"Man, then," Hodge says, "according to the Scriptures, is a created spirit in vital union with a material organized body. The relation of these two constituents of our nature is admitted to be mysterious. That is, it is incomprehensible,"⁴⁵ and yet it can be explained: (1) that the relation between the two is a vital union, in such a sense as that the soul is the source of life to the body. (2) It is a fact of consciousness that certain states of the body produce certain corresponding states of the mind. (3) It is also a fact of consciousness that while certain operations of the body are independent of the conscious voluntary action of the mind, as the processes of respiration, digestion, secretion, assimilation, etc., there are certain actions dependent on the will.

The doctrine above stated, as the doctrine of the Scriptures and the Church, is properly designated as realistic dualism, Hodge says.⁴⁶ It asserts the existence of two distinct substantive entities; the one extended, tangible, and divisible, the object of the senses; the other unextended and indivisible, the thinking, feeling, and willing subject

⁴³ Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. II, pp.42,43.

⁴⁴ Gen. 2:7; 3:19; Eccl. 12:7; Is. 10:18; Dan. 7:15; Matt. 6:25; 10:28; II Cor. 5:1; Phil. 1:23, 24.

⁴⁵ Hodge. *op cit.* p. 44

in man. This doctrine stands opposed to materialism and idealism. The importance of this doctrine of human nature is connected with other important doctrines of the Bible; with the constitution of the person of Christ, and consequently with the nature of his redeeming work and of his relation to the children of man; with the doctrine of the fall, original sin, and of regeneration; and with the doctrine of a future state and of the resurrection.

(2) Man prior to Faith (Unauthentic existence).

According to Heidegger, unauthentic and authentic being are different forms of Dasein. Unauthentic existence is man fallen away from true existence, in which the self is lost. It is the life of the masses in and with the world. Human existence has two possibilities--authentic or unauthentic--and they are conditioned by the reality of the world. Man flees from the disclosure to himself in the anxiety of his "being-there". On the one hand he identifies himself with the world and becomes absorbed in worldly concerns, and on the other hand he sheds his responsibility by joining the depersonalized collective way of being which is called the public. These two reactions are brought together in the concept of fallenness, or unauthentic existence.

This existential interpretation of Being has affected Bultmann and therefore he asserts that man without faith is the slave of the World, and of its power, and of the prince

of this world. He has lost his authentic life because "This world' is the world of corruption and death."⁴⁷ Bultmann, nevertheless, still mentions that corruption and death are the consequence of the fall of Adam and that sin is the cause of corruption and death. Does he, then, by the fall of Adam mean the same as the Scripture means by original sin? No! Because he assumes that sin and death are derived from the flesh (sarx) while by flesh he means the sphere of visible, concrete, tangible, and measureable reality.⁴⁸ In other words, visible reality is the cause of sin and death!

Here again Bultmann has an entirely different concept of flesh (sarx) from the scriptures and his exegesis is contrary to the Biblical meaning. The term "Flesh" has been used in the New Testament sometimes to designate the physical body (soma),⁴⁹ and sometimes in an ethical sense, man's sinful nature.⁵⁰ These two usages have different meanings. When it is used as designating

⁴⁷ Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p. 17

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 18

⁴⁹ Flesh, according to Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of N.T.:

- 1) The soft substance of living body, I Cor. 15:50, etc.
- 2) Body-material organic body, Acts 2:26, II Cor. 12:7.
- 3) A living creature, I Pet. 1:24, John 1:14.

⁵⁰ Opposite to Pneuma (spirit)--earthly, human nature of man apart from divine influence and opposed to God, II Cor. 7:5; Rom. 8:3,6; Gal. 5:13, 16, 19, etc.

outward body, it never includes the sinful nature of man, but just the fleshly part of the material substance of the human body (I Cor. 15:39) or a material organic body (Acts 2:26), or a living being as Jesus Christ was at his incarnation (John 1:14), though Jesus knew no sin (II Cor. 5:21).

Bultmann, however, puts these two different meanings together and assumes that all that is "outward" and "visible", all that has its nature in external "appearance," belongs to the sphere of "flesh" and therefore, "flesh" becomes synonymous with the term "world" (kosmos), and "flesh" is sinful, and consequently, external things and the world are all evil and sin.

Next, the anxiety (angst) and care (sorge) for the things in the world are identified by Bultmann with the scriptural phrase "according to the flesh" (kata sarka), and man becomes the prisoner of the body and the slave of the world. This is the man apart from faith, as Bultmann calls him. However, Bultmann's concept of unauthentic existence is not that of Biblical "sinful-man" who has imputed to him Adam's original sin and himself sins personally, but unauthentic man is the man who is swallowed up by the visible, measurable, objective world, which is the cause of sin and death. Bultmann's sin concept turns the Biblical doctrine of sin upside down. Scripture never teaches the sinfulness of nature, but the sinfulness of man. This view is similar to the Roman Catholic view that "we are born in

sin' that we are oppressed with corruption of nature....,"⁵¹
meaning we are oppressed by the corruption of our physical
bodies. In the Reformed view, however, according to the
short catechism, sin is any want of conformity unto or trans-
gression of the divine law. Hodge defines sin more clearly,
(1) As specific evil, differing from all other form of evil.
(2) Standing in relation to law: the two are correlative, so
that where there is no law, there can be no sin. (3) The
law to which sin is related, is not merely the law of reason,
or of conscience, or of expediency, but the law of God.
(4) Sin consists essentially in the want of conformity on the
part of a rational creature, to the nature or law of God.
(5) It includes guilt and moral pollution.⁵²

Thus, sin is the relation or attitude of man to God--
which is the rebellion against God and disobedience to the
law of God. Because of human sin, nature was cursed,⁵³ but
nature itself is not evil. When God created the world, it
was good and it was really according to God's pleasure.
Since man's fall, on the contrary, nature is cursed. This
does not mean that outward, tangible matter and the world
are evil and sin, as Bultmann thinks. Since Adam's sin against
God's law, as the federal head and representative of all
mankind, man has had a sinful nature, though he is not sinful
by nature. At the same time we read in the Scriptures that

⁵¹Quotation from the Roman Catechism in Hodge's
Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 179.

⁵²Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, Merdman's, 1952,
Vol. II, pp. 180 f.

nature was cursed and is now waiting for the deliverance from the bondage of corruption unto the glorious liberty of the sons of God (Rom. 8:18-21).

(3) Man under faith (Authentic Existence).

The authentic life is a life based on unseen, intangible realities, in contrast to unauthentic life. This is what the New Testament means by "life after the spirit" or "life in faith" according to Bultmann. He writes, "For this life we must have faith in the grace of God."⁵⁴ The grace of God means the forgiveness of sin and brings deliverance from the bondage of the past. By "faith" is meant to open ^{our-}selves freely to the future and turn back to self.

What is grace for Bultmann? Grace is not a mode of dealing decided upon by God, but God's eschatological deed and it takes effect for one who acknowledges it in faith. In other words, grace is a subjective acknowledgment. His concept of grace is skeptical and contentless in contrast to that of the Bible which teaches clearly that God eternally decreed the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace for the salvation of the fallen men. The grace offered through the death of Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of God's decree. It does not depend upon a subjective human acknowledgment, but upon God's mercy for these fallen men

⁵⁴ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p. 19.

whom He has himself elected to save from their sins. This grace is manifested through the channels of grace--the means of grace for the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit upon the souls of men.

The Reformed faith accepts three means of grace--the word, the sacraments, and prayer. The word of God, the Bible--the Old and New Testaments, is an indispensable means of salvation. Bultmann cannot believe that the Bible, as a whole, is the inspired word of God. He construes the gospels and other writings of the New Testament as mythological. Denying the Bible as the word of God, Bultmann says, "for the proclaimed word is neither an enlightening *Weltanschauung* (World View) flowing out in general truths, nor a merely historical account which, like a reporter's story, reminds a public of important but by-gone facts; rather, it is Kerygma--herald's service--in the literal sense--authorized, plenipotent proclamation, edict from a sovereign."⁵⁵ Reformed theologians, however, believe the Bible as written in the original manuscripts is the infallible word of God.

Bavinck speaks of a clear self-attestation by God of the Scripture: "First God frequently charges His prophets not merely to proclaim the revelation by word of mouth, but to set it down in writing also"^{56a} (Ex. 17:14; 24:3, 47; etc.). Secondly, "Moses and the prophets are themselves perfectly

⁵⁵ Theology of N.T., Vol. I, p. 307.

^{56a} Bavinck, Our Reasonable Faith, p. 96

aware of the fact that they are to proclaim the word not only orally but in writing also"^{56b} (Lk. 3, 6). Thirdly, "there is the witness of the New Testament. It is true that Jesus and the apostles repeatedly quote speeches from the Old Testament (Matt. 8:4; 15:7; 22:43; 24:15;"^{56c} with such introductory phrases as "It is written" (Matt. 4:4), or "the Scripture hath said" (John 7:38), or "the Holy Ghost saith" (Heb. 3:7), and the like. Fourthly, "as for the scriptures of the New Testament itself, it can be said that, although Jesus Himself did not leave any written documents behind Him, He chose, called, and qualified His apostles to go into the midst of the world, particularly after His departure, and to be His witnesses."⁵⁷ He equipped them for this task by giving them special graces and powers,⁵⁸ and more specifically He endowed them with the Holy Spirit who was to bring, all things, which Jesus had told them, to their remembrance (John 14:26), guiding them into all truth, including the truth about things to come (John 16:13). Really, therefore, it is not the apostles themselves who give a witness about Jesus but it is the Holy Spirit who testifies in them and through them about Jesus (John 15:26-27)... The apostles were not only to bring their witness of Christ to their contemporaries and fellow-countrymen..., but to all creatures and to the ends of the earth."⁵⁹ In this mandate to go out to

^{56b} Ibid., p. 97

^{56c} Ibid., pp. 97f.

⁵⁷ Matt. 10:1; Lk. 3:13; Lk. 6:13, 9:1; Jn. 6:70

⁵⁸ Matt. 10:1-9; Lk. 10:1-11; Matt. 2:43; Rom. 15:19; Heb. 2:1

the whole world is also contained the command to testify of Jesus scripturally, although the apostles are not told to do so directly... Accordingly, the apostles were so guided in their mission-work by the Holy Spirit that they quite naturally reached for the pen, and by the means of epistles and letters witnessed to the fullness of grace and truth which had appeared in Christ Jesus. Not only in their oral preaching, but also in their writings, it was their clearly perceived purpose to unfold the truth which God had revealed in Christ and had made known by the Holy Spirit to them."^{59a}

It is the united testimony of Scripture and of history that the Bible, the Word of God, is the greatest means for promoting the sanctification and salvation of man, and of securing their temporal and eternal well being. The minds of men, however, since the fall, are not in a condition to receive the transforming and saving power of the truths of the Bible, and therefore it is necessary that it should be attended by the supernatural power of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁰

What, then, is meant by "faith" when Bultmann speaks of, "life in faith" as the authentic man? He says, Faith is the acceptance of the Kerygma by a genuine obedience to it including a new understanding of one's self. "Although essentially transcendent, faith must be reduced to an immanent possession. Its outward signs are freedom, power, pneumatic phenomena, and above all, ecstasy."⁶¹ Bultmann,

^{59a} op.cit., pp.93f.

⁶⁰ I Cor. 2:14; John 8:43, 47.

⁶¹ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth,

therefore, like Tillich, admits that it is a faith which has no special content. For faith is the acceptance of the Kerygma and the Kerygma is the recorded message of the writers' own faith in Christ, and not what they were guided by God through the Spirit to write. Inspiration has been moved from the objective aspect of revelation to the subjective correlate and become a part of the existential experience known by Bultmann as ecstasy and, therefore, even faith in the Kerygma, is itself also ecstasy

The Reformed view of faith, however, is absolutely different from this. In the strict and special sense of the Word faith means belief in things not seen, on the ground of testimony and authority. When, therefore, it is said that faith is founded on testimony, it is meant that it is not founded on sense, reason, or feeling, but on the authority of Him by whom it is authenticated.

Hodge proves that this is the foundation and the distinctive characteristic of faith: "1. From the general use of the word. We are said to know what we see or can prove; and to believe what we regard as true on the authority of others. This is admitted to be true of what is called historical faith. This includes...almost all the contents of the Bible... The Scriptures are a record of the history of the creation, of the fall, and of redemption... Whoever

believes this record has set to his seal that God is true, and is a child of God. 2...Consciousness teaches us that such is the nature of faith not only when historical facts are its objects, but when propositions are the things believed. The two indeed are inseparable. That God is the creator of the world, is both a fact and a doctrine... 3. It is the uniform teaching of the Bible that faith is founded on the testimony or authority of God... The Scriptures come to us under the form of a revelation of things we could not otherwise know,....the Scriptures teach that faith is the reception of truth on the ground of testimony or on the authority of God... This is faith: receiving as truth what God has testified, and because He has testified it... 'And this is the testimony, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son' (I John 5:10,11)...

If faith...rests on philosophical grounds, then the door is opened for rationalism; if it rests on feeling, then it is open to mysticism. The only sure, and the only satisfying foundation is the testimony of God, who cannot err, and will not deceive.

Faith may, therefore, be defined to be the persuasion of the truth founded on testimony. The faith of the Christian is the persuasion of the truth of the facts and doctrines recorded in the scriptures on the testimony of God."⁶²

⁶²Hodge, Systematic Theology, Vol. II, p. 63-67.

Thus, Bultmann's "man under faith", as authentic existence, is not the saved man of the Bible, but is autonomous man who can transcend himself by his own subjective self-understanding, or man in the existential moment of ecstasy which Bultmann equates with salvation. This is no faith bond upon reasonable evidences, for Bultmann, but autonomous man transcending himself in ecstasy. The Bible teaches our faith in Christ rests upon reasonable evidence even though regeneration occurs by the enabling of the Holy Spirit.

C. Jesus Christ

(1) Person of Christ

For Bultmann, Jesus was a teacher and prophet⁶³ but he had no concept himself of Messiah-ship⁶⁴ because Phil. 2:6-11 indicates that Jesus was without Messianic glory. His Messiahship was dated from the resurrection. Jesus speaks of the Son of Man in the third person without identifying himself with him.⁶⁵ However, the Jewish concept Messiah-Son-of-Man is reinterpreted with the idea of a suffering, dying, rising Messiah or Son of Man. This re-interpretation of the concept was done, not by Jesus himself, but by the church and placed in his mouth by the gospel writers. Then Jesus, who formerly had been the bearer of

⁶³Theology of N.T., Vol. I, p. 33

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 9

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 29

the message, became its essential content as the Coming Messiah.⁶⁶

It is myth, for Bultmann, that God had raised from the dead, Jesus of Nazareth, the teacher and prophet crucified by the Romans, made him Messiah, and exalted him to be the Son of Man who is to come on the clouds of heaven to hold judgment and to bring in the salvation of God's Reign. This mythical figure, the Messiah, has become concrete and visible. The myth has been transferred to a concrete historical man! This was the only way they understood Jesus.

The fact that this Messiah, Jesus, became an object of worship in the cult of the Hellenistic Christian Church is the distinctive feature of the eschatological congregation in Hellenistic Christianity, because in it, for the first time, Jesus Christ appears not only as the eschatological saviour but also as the cultical "Lord" (Kyrios), and "Son of God"--meaning the divinity of Christ, his divine nature. However, this concept of Christ--a divine figure--originated from Gnostic myth, according to Bultmann.⁶⁷

What, then, shall we do? Shall we destroy and eliminate the New Testament because of mythology, or shall we re-interpret it and save the Kerygma? This is the crucial point for Bultmann. He says, "Neither exists, of course,

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 33.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 130.

without the other, and they stand constantly in a reciprocal relation to each other... But... it was so urgent to interpret the theological thoughts of the New Testament in their connection with the "act of living"--i.e. as explication of believing self-understanding...such self-understanding is the reply to the kerygma as the word of God addressing him,..."⁶⁸ Now, for Bultmann, the mythological expressions in the New Testament are the more or less clear expression of an understanding of Being, "as it has been given clear expression in modern existentialist philosophy."⁶⁹ Further, "The Christ who is worshipped in the cultus as the present Kyrios is truly thought of as Lord of the present only when the present is understood as made absolutely new by him--i.e. when Christ's appearing is understood in Paul's sense (Gal. 4:4, etc.) and John's (Jn. 5:25, etc.) as the eschatological event which terminated the old world and when, correspondingly, Christian existence is understood as divorced-from-the-world, eschatological existence."⁷⁰ Thus, Bultmann's christology is, thoroughly, anti-Biblical, being based upon a reconstruction of the Christ of history, even though he does not eliminate the kerygma, and presents Christ as a product of subjective-understanding by his interpretation based upon the philosophy of existentialism.

⁶⁸ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 251

⁶⁹ "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, p.23

⁷⁰ op cit., p.201.

Our argument against Bultmann's Christology should begin with the problem of Jesus' concept of his Messiahship. Bultmann denies supernaturalism, and he regards Jesus simply as a religious teacher and therefore has no religious contact with Him at all. Because of this, he cannot follow Jesus' self-consciousness of his Messiahship. The Messiahship of Christ is the incarnate representation of that divine authoritativeness which is so characteristic of Biblical religion. It is not a later misdirected development. G. Vos gives a careful analysis that proves Jesus' Messiahship: "1. The idea of intensification of divine authority is present in the oldest messianic prophecies. The 'Shilo' of Gen. 49:10 is the one to whom the obedience of the peoples shall be given in a unique degree. And the solemn manner in which Jesus puts his 'I say unto you' by the side of the commandment of God, goes far beyond the highest that is conceivable in the line of prophetic authority (Matt. 5:20-43). The verses 17-20 in the same chapter are in perfect consonance with the Messianic attitude of the speaker. 2. The Messianic is at bottom a species of the eschatological. Paul precisely and emphatically affirms the eternity-value and eternity-function of Christ through all the coming aeons: Rom. 5:17; 8:29, 38, 39; I Cor. 15:49; Col. 1:13-16; 3:4. Jesus being con-

sciously the Messiah, his whole manner of thinking and feeling could not be otherwise than steeped in this atmosphere. 3. The conception of the messiahship is the most supernaturalistic conception in the whole range of Biblical religion. The miracles of the Gospels are the appropriate supernatural concomitants of the supernatural Christ. To Paul Jesus was the One from heaven, the Second Adam, the prototype of the heavenly image. 4. The next element of the Messiahship is the "soteric" element. The Messiah stands for salvation; indeed, "Saviour" is the most popular name by which the Christ has come to be known among His followers. This saving aspect of the Messiah's work is inseparable from His vocation. The exorcism of demons and the healing miracles are liberating acts, and as such they form a part of the general Messianic deliverance. Jesus placed upon the Messianic consciousness, a solid soteric interpretation of the most realistic kind. Jesus was the Saviour and into this flowed all the powers of His Messianic life. 5. The Messianic consciousness is most intimately interwoven with . . . His right to receive worship and His identification with God. Jesus set his name with God and he claimed the oneness with God.⁷¹ From this view of the Messiahship of Jesus, the Jewish apocalyptic view-- by which, Holtmann thinks that the concept of Messiahship

⁷¹Geerhardus Vos, The Self-disclosure of Jesus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, New ed. 1954, pp. 18-29.

of the gospels is influenced--is very different. The Apocalyptic Messiah has no deity and is the hidden one. Therefore, as Schürer observed: "Nothing of a specifically Christian character is to be met with in this section."⁷² Bultmann builds up a mistaken reconstruction, by the way in which he has to interpret this and destroys the Biblical picture of Jesus Christ in the process.

Next, his view of "Lord" should be examined in the light of the Scriptural context since Bultmann argues that the "Lord" is the object of worship in Gnostic myths, and not the original title of Christ in earliest Christianity. As we investigateⁱⁿ the Scriptures, however, and the synoptic gospels in particular, the terms "Son of God" and "Lord" we find^{they} are^{used} as designations of our Lord Jesus Christ already in his life time. The term "Lord" was indeed already used in the instruction given by Christ to His disciples, telling them to bring Him the ass's colt on which He might make his entry into Jerusalem. He could not have instructed them to say, "The Lord hath need of him" (Mk. 11:3; Mt. 21:3; Lk. 19:31), unless He had been accustomed to be spoken of as "the Lord". That He was accustomed to thinking of himself as their "Lord" follows also from such a passage as Mt. 24:42 (cf. Mk. 13:35): "Watch, therefore, for ye know not on what day your Lord

⁷² quotation in Vos, ibid., p. 47.

cometh"; and indeed from the didactic use of the term by Himself in encouraging or warning His followers (Mt. 10:24), and by its free employment in parabolic pictures, where He represents Himself as the "Lord" over against His servants (Lk. 12:36, 43). In Lk. 1:43, Elisabeth, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, expresses her wondering joy that "the mother of her Lord" should come to her. In passages like Lk. 5:8, there seems to be an ascription to Jesus of a majesty which is distinctly recognized as supernatural: "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man" (v.8) is the natural utterance of that sense of unworthiness which is signalized in Scripture as the mark of the recognition of the divine presence. Another remarkable passage is the angelic annunciation to the shepherds of the birth, in the city of David, of that "Saviour" who is "Christ the Lord" (Lk. 2:11). Here is already expressed the height of sovereignty and authority he possesses as the delegate of Jehovah.⁷³

This proves that the designation of Christ as "Lord" is not to be found only in the later cultic worship, but in the angelic annunciation, Jesus' own consciousness of His Lordship and His followers' recognition of Him. Both tradition and Scripture prove that this Christian concept of Jesus is not a later development. Jesus does not become

⁷³ B. B. Warfield, The Lord of Glory, pp. 140-145.

"Lord" by His resurrection, but only comes to His rights as "Lord", by and through His resurrection and ascension, which are the culminating and completing acts of His saving work.⁷⁴

Can the "Lord" (Kyrios) become the "Lord" only as He is called "Lord" by men? Bultmann's existential interpretation is unjustified according to our earlier criticism. Christ as the Lord, for Bultmann, is the same as Jesus becoming "the Christ" in Paul Tillich.^{75a} For Tillich, Christ is a man in unity with the Logos and it is "the presence of God in him which makes him the Christ."^{75b} Unity with God is the New Being. This theory of "the New Being in Jesus as Christ" means that "he becomes divine and the transmitter of the New Being to man."^{75c} In other words, it is not that God became a man but a man, Jesus, became God. These men know Jesus, thus, only humanistically, but not spiritually, and though they speak of an existential understanding, still their themes remain within humanity itself in that they see a man becoming God rather than God becoming man. Reformed theology, however, believes the second person of the trinity, God the Son, has come down from heaven and taken upon Himself a full human nature, and become flesh and a man--the doctrine of the two natures in the person of Christ, or the Incarnation. This doctrine

⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 231 f.

^{75a} cf. Paul Tillich, Systematic Theology, Vol. III, Chicago University, 1957.

^{75b} _____

of the Incarnation is the hinge on which the Christian system hangs. If there are not two natures there is no Incarnation; if no Incarnation, no Christianity in any distinctive sense.

The two natures of Christ are united in one person and He is a divine person. The personality of Christ is found in the divine nature. He existed as a divine person from eternity past. This Calvin designates as the ineffable mystery of the act of God in the Incarnation of the Word.⁷⁷

(2) Death of Christ

Bultmann's view of the Cross starts with an insistence on the mythical character of the New Testament because the Jesus who was crucified is represented as the pre-existent, incarnate Son of God, and as without sin, yet the cross is represented as releasing men not only from the guilt, but also from the power of sin. But Bultmann thinks the cross is an eschatological event in and beyond time, and thus, that the cross and passion are ever-present realities. In its redemptive aspect the Cross of Christ is, for Bultmann, no mere mythical event, but a permanent existential fact originating in the past historical event which is the crucifixion of Jesus. The significance of the cross is that it is the judgment of the world, and the

⁷⁷ or. John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Sermons, 1953. Vol. I, p. 415.

judgment and the deliverance of man. In this sense Christ is crucified "for us", but this phrase "for us" does not necessarily imply any theory of sacrifice or satisfaction. This interpretation of the cross as a permanent fact rather than as just a mythical event does do some justice to the redemptional interpretation. Then, mythological language is only a medium for conveying the meaning of the past event. The real meaning of the cross is that it has created a new and permanent situation in history.⁷⁸

However, the existential interpretation of the cross does not imply sacrifice or satisfaction. The cross of Christ was a simple crucifixion of a hero. The unauthentic man, sinful man, can save himself by the ecstatic experience of the meaning of the cross--which amounts to a self-understanding of himself by subjective speculation.

For Bultmann, there is therefore, no need of either sacrifice or satisfaction for redemption. This is not the Biblical interpretation, either exegetically or theologically.

While God did not have to save sinful man yet if he would save anyone, it was necessary to secure this salvation through such a satisfaction as could only be rendered through a substitutionary sacrifice and a blood-bought redemption (Heb. 2:10; John 3:14-16; Heb. 9:23, 14, 22, 26). The cross of Christ is the supreme demonstration of the love

⁷⁸"New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, pp. 35-8.

of God (Rom. 5:2; 1 John 4:10) and the supreme character of the demonstration resides in the extreme costliness of the sacrifice rendered. It assures us of the greatness of the love and guarantees the bestowal of all other free gifts. Sin, which is rebellion against God and disobedience to the Law of God, must meet with divine judgment. It is inconceivable that there be salvation from sin without expiation and propitiation. John Murray says, "the death upon the cross, as the climactic requirement of the price of redemption, was discharged as the supreme act of obedience; it was not death resistlessly inflicted but death upon the cross willingly and obediently wrought."⁷⁹ The nature of the atonement the Scriptures set forth is considered in two aspects: sacrifice (propitiation) and ransom (expiation).

According to Warfield, the New Testament, as a whole, represents Christ as a sacrifice and as a substitutionary expiation.⁸⁰ Christ, in the synoptic gospels in Mt. 20:28; and Mk. 10:45, uses sacrificial language and distinctly the language of substitution, e.g. "in the place of many"; that of Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20 is equally sacrificial and expiatory language--"blood shed for many," "for the remission of sins." The reference to the "blood" of Jesus ascribes a sacrificial character and effect to His death. The Apostles also speak of Christ's work as sacri-

⁷⁹John Murray, Redemption-Accomplished and Applied, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955, p. 30.

⁸⁰D. B. Warfield, The Person and Work of Christ p. 121

ficial (Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:7 and Rev.), and it is clear that this is no figure of speech or mere illustration. It is quite plain that His work was conceived of by them to be of precisely that nature which a sacrifice was understood by them to be.⁸¹ This work of Christ, rendered to Justice, satisfied the demands of the law of God.

Next, Bultmann speaks of the significance of the cross--as the judgment and deliverance of man from the world. This, however, is not the redemption spoken of in the Scriptures. Bultmann's redemption is a subjective speculation of the self and a return to Dasein (Soma) or to the Being-itself of Paul Tillich. It is autonomous man not depending upon this expiatory ransom price paid by Jesus Christ. The Ransom price must be by ^{none} other than the Son of God, who died for the sins of men in history. In the New Testament, the Lord Himself declared, "For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mt. 20:28; Mk.10:45). Jesus says, "ransom" (lutron) with "anti". Here He speaks of giving His life as a ransom "for", or rather "in the place of," "instead of", many. The preposition "anti" emphasizes the idea of substitution.

The Apostle's concept of redemption is based upon such declarations of the Lord as I Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14;

⁸¹Ibid., p. 393.

Gal. 1:4; Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14, etc. The great passage in which the nature of our ransom is unfolded for us, however, is Rom. 3:24. There, all the scattered intimations of its essential nature, found here and there in other passages, are gathered together in one comprehensive statement that justification by God's grace is possible only because the ransom was paid by Jesus Christ as an expiatory sacrifice, enabling God righteously to forgive sins. In Rom. 3:24, Warfield says, the fundamental idea, underlying the representation of salvation as a ransom, is its costliness, and in all the passages in which Christ is said to have given Himself, or His blood, as a ransom for His people.⁸²

The death of Christ is not an eschatological event or existentialism, but it is a part of God's continuous revelation in history. It was decreed in the covenant of redemption, and carried on through creation, the fall of Adam, the covenant of grace, and the incarnation, and Christ's death on the cross. There is no room at all for Bultmann's existential event of the cross, as separated from a substitutionary sacrifice.

(3) The Resurrection of Christ.

The resurrection of Jesus is often used in the New Testament as a miraculous proof of Christ, yet the empty

⁸²cf. Warfield "Redemption", Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ed. by James Hastings, New York: Scribners', 1922, pp. 302-309.

tomb and the appearances are only legends for Bultmann. When Paul mentions, in I Cor. 15:3-8, the risen Lord, the list of eye-witnesses was, according to him, not to prove the fact of the resurrection, but to guarantee St. Paul's preaching. For Bultmann, the resurrection is only an article of faith. Without the resurrection, the redemptive efficacy of the cross cannot be proved because the resurrection is the mythological proof of the eschatological event of the cross. In this sense, the resurrection can be accepted as a mythological event, but interpreted as a proof of the event of the cross. (If such an ambiguous contradicting view makes sense). This is the way in which the cross is proclaimed.⁸³

In Bultmann's view, there is no solid foundation for faith at all, rather it fully depends upon a subjective understanding or experience. Therefore, though using the same terminology, it has completely different sense from that of the Bible. This is not the Scriptural teaching of the resurrection of Christ, the revelation in history and ^{the} eternal truth that Christ has conquered death.

Christ's resurrection was not only spiritual but also physical. A spiritual resurrection would not be enough, and would be only a half victory--that would be no victory at all, but a defect! Savanck writes, "By His physical resurrection it was first proved that he, by his obedience even unto the cross and the grave, had perfectly conquered

⁸³cf. "New Testament and Mythology", Kerygma and Myth, pp. 38-43.

sin and all its consequences, including death..."⁸⁴ The fact that, according to the teaching of Paul as well as the conclusions of reason, flesh and blood--a corruptible body--can have no place in the kingdom of God, or in the eternal world does not deny Christ's resurrection. The physical resurrection remains, though it is a great mystery. A. B. Bruce writes, "In the resurrection of Jesus, two processes seem to have been combined into one: the revivification of the crucified body, and its transformation into a spiritual body endowed with an eternal form of existence..."⁸⁵

Thus, Christ is the first fruit of resurrection of the Christians, and in Christ alone we have the eternal hope of life forever more. Bultmann never answers the crucial problem of man, immortality.

13. Conclusion.

Bultmann's theology is based upon the liberal conception of the historical Jesus and the gospels (reconstructionism). He finds mythology in the New Testament and therefore proposes demythologization. He does not eliminate myth from the New Testament, but he uses the concept of existentialism for its interpretation. He maintains that mythological language is the form of expression used by the first believers, and proceeds to interpret all

⁸⁴ Bavinck, Our Reasonable Faith, p. 368.

⁸⁵ A. B. Bruce, Apologetics, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 3rd ed. 1905, p. 398.

the facts and doctrines in the New Testament by the concepts of existential philosophy.

The writer's conclusion is that we must reject in toto Bultmann's theory of the demythologization of the New Testament. The reasons why we reject it are: 1. His concept of Existence leads to the deification of autonomous human nature. 2. Bultmann does not believe in supernatural facts. Everything must be subjectively understood before it becomes truth for him. In this Bultmann and the other existentialists limit their epistemology to certain limited subjective knowledge. The Christian view of the world and man transcends such limitation, since it is based upon a revelation of God given in the Scriptures. Existentialism lacks both a full and a unified vision of the entire created reality. 3. Bultmann does speak of God, but it is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is a philosophical God. This God is created on the pattern of human existence, and is a hidden God, who has not given us any real true propositional revelation of Himself. He is not personal nor can he perform miracles. Human existence can be summed up as autonomous man.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Bartsch, H. W., Kerygma and Myth, trans. by R. H. Fuller, London: S. P. C. K., 1954, 228 pp.
- Bavinck, H., Our Reasonable Faith, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956, 568 pp.
- _____ The Philosophy of Revelation, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953, 349 pp.
- Berkhof, L., Principles of Biblical Interpretation, 2nd ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1952, 169 pp.
- Berkouwer, G. C., The Person of Christ, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954, 368 pp.
- _____ The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956, 414 pp.
- Brown, J., Subject and Object in Modern Theology, New York: MacMillan, 1953, 214 pp.
- Bruce, A.B., Apologetics or Christianity Defensively Stated, 3rd ed., Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 522 pp.
- Bultmann, R. K., Essays - Philosophical and Theological, New York: MacMillan, 1955, 337 pp.
- _____ Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, New York: Meridian Books, 1956, 240 pp.
- _____ Theology of the New Testament, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, Vol. I, (1951), 366 pp.; Vol. II, (1955), 278 pp.
- _____ "New Testament and Mythology" in Kerygma and Myth, ed. by Bartsch, London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Calvin, J., Institutes of the Christian Religion, Vol. I, new trans. by H. Beveridge, Eerdmans, 1953.
- Charles, The Apocalypses and Pseudopigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. II. (Apocalypses) Oxford, 1913.
- Cochrane, A. C., The Existentialists and God, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956, 174 pp.
- Craig, S., Christianity Rightly So Called, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed pub., 1953, 275 pp.
- Hastings, J., Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, New York: Scribners, Vol. II, 1922.

- Harris, R. L., Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957, 304 pp.
- Henry, C.F.H., Fifty Years of Protestant Theology, Boston: Wilde Co., 1950, 113 pp.
- Hodge, C., Systematic Theology, Vols. II & III, Eerdmans, 1952. reprinted.
- Killen, R. A., The Ontological Theology of Paul Tillich, Kampen: Kok, 1950, 284 pp.
- Machen, J.G., Christianity and Liberalism, Eerdmans, reprinted, 1950, 189 pp.
- _____, The Origin of Paul's Religion, Eerdmans, reprinted 1947, 329 pp.
- Mackintosh, H.R., Types of Modern Theology, London: Miscet, reprinted 1954, 333 pp.
- MacQuarrie, J., An Existentialist Theology, New York: Macmillan, 1955, 252 pp.
- Murray, J., Redemption - Accomplished and Applied, Eerdmans, 1955, 236 pp.
- Orr, J., The Christian View of God and the World, Eerdmans, Reprinted 1954, 480 pp.
- Ramm, B., Protestant Christian Evidences, Chicago: Moody Press, 1954, 252 pp.
- Runes, D. D., The Dictionary of Philosophy, New York: Philosophical Library, 343 pp.
- Seeberg, R., Textbook of the History of Doctrines, trans. by C. E. Hay, Baker Book House, 1954.
- Spier, J. M., Christianity and Existentialism, trans. by D. H. Freeman, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed., 1953, 140 pp.
- Stonehouse, N.B., Paul Before the Areopagus, Eerdmans, 1957, pp. 109-150.
- Thiessen, H.C., Introduction to the New Testament, Eerdmans, 1952, 347 pp.

Tillich, Paul, Systematic Theology, Chicago: University Press, Vol. II, 1957, 187 pp.

Van Til, C., The New Modernism, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1947, 392 pp.

Vos G., The Self-Disclosure of Jesus, Eerdmans, new ed., 1954, 311 pp.

Warfield, B.B., Christology and Criticism, New York: Oxford, 1929

_____, The Person and Work of Christ, Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1950, 575 pp.