

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1967

Exegesis and History: A Comparison of the Concepts of History in Rudolf Bultmann's and Oscar Cullmann's Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19, Romans 5:12-21, And John 3:9-21

Stephen Carter

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carter, Stephen, "Exegesis and History: A Comparison of the Concepts of History in Rudolf Bultmann's and Oscar Cullmann's Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19, Romans 5:12-21, And John 3:9-21" (1967). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 320.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/320>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

EXEGESIS AND HISTORY:
A COMPARISON OF THE CONCEPTS OF HISTORY
IN RUDOLF BULTMANN'S AND OSCAR CULLMANN'S EXEGESIS
OF MATTHEW 16:17-19, ROMANS 5:12-21, AND JOHN 3:9-21

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Systematic Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by
Stephen James Carter

May 1967

49263

Approved by: Robert W. Bertram
Advisor

Edgar Wrentas
Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1967
no. 5
C.2

49263

SEMINARY TITLE

BULSWARK AND CULLMAN OF HISTORY

COPY

BOX

1967

SHORT TITLE

BULTMANN AND CULLMANN ON HISTORY

Carter

STM

1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
GREEK TRANSLITERATIONS	111
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. BULTMANN'S EXEGESIS	7
III. CULLMANN'S EXEGESIS	35
IV. HISTORICAL TREATMENT IN PERSPECTIVE	62
V. HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY OF THE BIBLICAL WRITERS	83
VI. HISTORICAL CONCEPTS OF BULTMANN AND CULLMANN	107
VII. CONCLUSION	137
BIBLIOGRAPHY	141

GREEK transliterations

α	- a
β	- b
γ	- g
δ	- d
ϵ	- e
ζ	- z
η	- ē
θ	- th
ι	- i
κ	- k
λ	- l
μ	- m
ν	- n
ξ	- x
\omicron	- o
π	- p
ρ	- r
$\sigma(s)$	- s
τ	- t
υ	- u, y
ϕ	- ph
χ	- ch
ψ	- ps
ω	- ō

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Throughout the history of the Church, New Testament exegetes have disagreed on the interpretation of individual texts. The disagreement has stemmed partly from different principles of interpretation.¹ The student of the New Testament has always had the problem of evaluating exegetes on the basis of the text itself. Since the rise of the historical-critical method of interpretation,² the problem of evaluating exegetical scholarship has become increasingly difficult. Under the label "scientific history" and the "historical-critical method," scholars produce exegetical studies with widely varying conclusions. In some cases two or more exegetes use the same philological evidence to support different points.

¹Various allegorical and literal schools of exegesis in the early Church and the history of interpretation since the Reformation are sketched in Bernard Ramm, Protestant Biblical Interpretation (Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1956).

²A survey of developments in Biblical studies since 1861 is provided by Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966). See also Werner Georg Kümmel, Das Neue Testament, Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme (Freiburg: K. Alber, 1958).

On the contemporary scene, varying interpretations of the New Testament are due in large measure to varying presuppositions. Twentieth century historiography has come to recognize the subjective element in writing history and the importance of admitting presuppositions.³ In New Testament studies the element of subjectivity is also important as a factor.⁴ The student needs to evaluate an exegete both on philological grounds and in terms of his presuppositions. If either philology or presupposition is neglected, a distorted picture of the exegete will result.

The Need

A definite need exists for case studies on the presuppositions of exegetes as they practice their craft on specific texts. One important complex of presuppositions revolves around an exegete's concepts of history. Recent British scholars have recognized a need to probe the process of thinking followed by the working historian as he practices

³The development of the subjective concern among historians is compared by Fritz Stern with the positivistic historiography of the nineteenth century. Fritz Stern, "Introduction," The Varieties of History from Voltaire to the Present, edited by Fritz Stern (Cleveland: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1956), pp. 11-32.

⁴An example of the concern for presuppositions is Rudolf Bultmann, "Is Exegesis Without Presuppositions Possible?," Existence and Faith, edited and translated by Schubert Ogden (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1960), pp. 289-296.

his craft. They define philosophy of history as an analytical investigation instead of a metaphysical quest.⁵ The tools of this new philosophy of history⁶ can be useful to the student of the New Testament in analyzing the exegete at work.

The Scope of This Investigation

This paper offers a case study of two modern exegetes who use the historical-critical method, Rudolf Bultmann and Oscar Cullmann. An introductory statement of their methodology will serve to emphasize their similarities and their differences. Bultmann writes:

- (1) The exegesis of the biblical writings, like every other interpretation of a text, must be unprejudiced.
- (2) However, the exegesis is not without presuppositions, because as historical interpretation it presupposes the method of historical-critical research.
- (3) Furthermore, there is presupposed a 'life-relation' of the exegete to the subject matter with which the Bible is concerned and, together with this relation, a preunderstanding.
- (4) This preunderstanding is not a closed one, but rather is open, so that there can be an existentiell encounter with the text and an existentiell decision.

⁵An example of this British approach is W. H. Walsh, Philosophy of History: An Introduction (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), pp. 9-28. Walsh poses the following issues for the philosophy of history to examine: the relationship between history and other forms of knowledge; the role of truth and fact in history; the question of historical objectivity; and the nature of explanation in history.

⁶The basic steps in the historical process which provide a framework for analyzing an historian's work are outlined in William Leo Lucey, History: Methods and Interpretation (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958).

(5) The understanding of the text is never a definitive one, but rather remains open because the meaning of the Scriptures discloses itself anew in every future.⁷

Cullmann explains his methodology in the preface to his

Christology of the New Testament:

Dispensing with all profound methodological observations (and thus proving myself quite 'out of date'), I emphasize here only that I know no other 'method' than the proven philological-historical one. I know of no other 'attitude' toward the text than obedient willingness to listen to it even when what I hear is sometimes completely foreign, contradictory to my own favorite ideas, whatever they may be; the willingness at least to take the trouble to understand and present it, regardless of my own philosophical and theological 'opinions'; and above all the willingness to guard against designating a biblical statement a dispensable 'form' because it is unacceptable to me on the basis of my opinions.⁸

Important comparative questions suggest themselves from these two statements of methodology: What does Bultmann mean by prejudice in individual interpretations? What does the historical-critical method imply as a presupposition? How does an existentiell preunderstanding affect interpretation? What does Cullmann mean by the philological-historical method? Does Cullmann achieve obedient willingness as he listens to the text? Are his own favorite ideas included from the text when the text is foreign to his ears?

This investigation concentrates on three passages

⁷Bultmann, p. 295.

⁸Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Revised edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. xiii-xiv.

interpreted by Bultmann and Cullmann: Matthew 16:17-19, Romans 5:12-21, and John 3:9-21. They have been selected for the following reasons:

1. Both Bultmann and Cullmann offer a detailed treatment of these three passages.
2. These three texts represent a variety of New Testament materials--Synoptic, Pauline, Johannine.
3. Three texts provide a maximum of exegetical material for a paper of this scope.

This paper will investigate the historical presuppositions of Bultmann and Cullmann on the basis of their exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19, Romans 5:12-21, and John 3:9-21. The second and third chapters will describe their exegetical interpretations of the three passages. A fourth chapter will place their historical presuppositions in proper perspective by describing (a) the type and depth of treatment given these passages in various exegetical works and (b) the polemical overtones which influence their interpretation of the three passages. A fifth chapter will concentrate on the historical methodology of the Biblical writers as understood respectively by Bultmann and Cullmann. The sixth chapter will probe relationships between their exegetical methodology and the historical concepts of Historie and Geschichte, eschatology, Heilsgeschichte, and demythologizing. It will also include a section on the question of their obedience to the text

and their need to make interpretations with or without exegetical support.

CHAPTER II

WILHELM'S EXEGETICS

Matthew 16:17-19

The German Setting

The first passage under consideration is Matthew 16:17-19, which will represent Wilhelm's treatment of scriptural material. The discussion of this passage begins with Wilhelm's interpretation of the Markan parallel (Mark 8:31-33) because he regards Matthew 16:17-19 as the original foundation to Peter's confession recorded in Mark. Wilhelm attempts to demonstrate that the setting for Peter's confession is not the life of Jesus but the Christian community. First he questions the location-Caesarea (Matt. 16:13) with Mark 8:14. Caesarea-Philippi and Bethsaida (verse 25) are geographical locations supplied by the editor to integrate

the two passages. The text reads: "Wer Christus von Sion, dem heiligen Berg Davids, sagen wird, dass er der Sohn des Menschen ist, den will ich setzen auf den rechten Thron. Und wer ihn nicht sagen wird, den will ich setzen auf den linken Thron." (Matt. 16:17-19). In this passage, Wilhelm is concerned with the question of whether the setting of the text is the life of Jesus or the Christian community. He argues that the text is not a prediction of the future but a statement of the present. He concludes that the text is a statement of the Christian community's faith in Jesus as the Son of Man.

CHAPTER II

BULTMANN'S EXEGESIS

Matthew 16:17-19

The Markan Setting

The first passage under consideration is Matthew 16:17-19, which will represent Bultmann's treatment of Synoptic material. The discussion of this passage begins with Bultmann's interpretation of the Markan parallel (Mark 8:27-33) because he regards Matthew 16:17-19 as the original conclusion to Peter's confession recorded in Mark. Bultmann attempts to demonstrate that the setting for Peter's confession is not the life of Jesus but the Christian community.¹ First he questions the location--Caesarea Philippi --in verse 27. Caesarea-Philippi and Bethsaida (verse 22a) are geographical locations supplied by the editor to integrate

¹Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Matt. 16,17-19," Theologische Blätter, XX (1941), 265-280. In this article Bultmann begins by challenging a statement of Cullmann that the genuineness of Matthew 16:17-19 is no longer disputed. He discusses especially the meaning of ekklēsia for the Urgemeinde and insists that Jesus did not proclaim an ekklēsia but only the Kingdom of God. He repeats some of his arguments from a 1919-1920 article: Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIX (1919-1920), 165-174.

the blind man apophthegm into the Markan structure. Bethsaida (and by implication Caesarea-Philippi) does not belong to the apophthegm because verse 23 takes place outside a kōmē, obviously not Bethsaida. He concludes: "So we must take Jesus' journey north as a phantasy and eliminate it from history."² The phrase en tē hodō (verse 27) provides further support for Mark's editorial activity in establishing the location. Bultmann views this phrase as "eine Regiebemerkung des Mk" by which he introduces traditional material into his design. Other illustrations of the use of this phrase include 10:17,32; 9:33-34.³

Secondly, Bultmann asserts that the question-answer form used in verses 27-29 argues against a setting in the life of Jesus. Both the fact that Jesus takes the initiative and the content of his question suggest that the narrative is secondary. With the exception of the call of the disciples, the primitive apophthegm revolves around something happening

²Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the third German edition by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 65. In this section he is discussing apophthegms where he feels precise indications of location are unsuited. While admitting that it is not always possible to distinguish the place location as editorial, he maintains that in general "we cannot avoid the question whether they are all secondary additions." (p. 64).

³Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 169. See also: Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 257. (Henceforth, HST will be its abbreviation.)

to Jesus. Normally when Jesus provides the initiative, it is a secondary formation.⁴ In the rabbinic dialogues which are widespread also in the Synoptic tradition the disciple, not the teacher, poses the question.⁵

The content of Jesus' question seems as obviously secondary as the form of the question. Bultmann challenges the statement that Jesus asks a question, fully knowing the answer, in order to elicit a confession from the disciples. While this interpretation assumes a modern psychological understanding, it is not in keeping with the understanding of antiquity. At the same time, Bultmann rejects the possibility that Jesus asks the question because he knows even less than the disciples about the evaluation of other men.⁶

Because the question does not seem to fit the life of Jesus, Bultmann proposes a context within the Christian community. The question is merely a literary device designed to stimulate an answer. The disciples represent the Church and mediate between Jesus and the people with a confession of faith in the Risen Christ. Their confession is based on

⁴Bultmann, HST, p. 66.

⁵Ibid., p. 257, n. 5. Bultmann opposes Mundle who explains Jesus' question with the parallel of Socratic pedagogical questioning. This is as foreign to the Synoptic tradition as to Jewish dialogues.

⁶Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 172.

Peter's confession of faith.⁷ According to Bultmann, the setting is not the life of Jesus but the confessing community: "This then is a legend of faith: faith in the messiahship of Jesus is traced back to a story of the first messianic confession which Peter made about Jesus."⁸

The Markan ending to Peter's confession (verses 30-33) bears the mark of editorial revision and betrays a polemic against the position of Peter in the Christian community. The original ending to this pericope seems to be missing because Jesus' response to Peter's confession is not given. The value of his confession to the Church depends upon Jesus' reaction.⁹ In place of the original conclusion Mark adds the command to secrecy (verse 30), the prediction of Jesus' passion (verse 31), and a rebuke of Peter (verses 32-33). The command to secrecy and the passion prediction are clearly Markan characteristics and therefore secondary.¹⁰

The rebuke of Peter in verses 32-33 reveals Mark's polemic against the influence of Peter in the Christian

⁷Bultmann, HST, pp. 257-258. See also: "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," pp. 172-173.

⁸Bultmann, HST, p. 258.

⁹Ibid., p. 258 and n. 1. Bultmann cites Luke 5:1-11 and John 21:15-19 as parallel situations where the community includes Jesus' attitude to a confession.

¹⁰Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 169. See also: Bultmann, HST, p. 258.

community. As a member of Hellenistic Christianity, Mark opposes the Jewish-Christian point of view represented by Peter in the Urgemeinde.¹¹ For Bultmann it is unthinkable that the original tradition of Peter's confession would have ended in Jesus' evaluation of it as a Satanic temptation.¹² Bultmann's evaluation of the Markan setting as a whole is as follows:

Jedenfalls ist ein Doppeltes festzustellen: 1. die Szene ist bei Mk verstümmelt; 2. aus dem Abschluss, den Mk der Szene gegeben hat, spricht deutlich eine Animosität gegen Petrus.¹³

The Matthean Setting

Bultmann finds the original conclusion to Peter's confession in Matthew 16:17-19, the rock saying. He first marshals evidence to prove that these verses belong to an early tradition of the Urgemeinde and are not a secondary accumulation of the post-apostolic Church. Convinced that

¹¹Bultmann, HST, p. 258. See also: Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 170. In HST, p. 258, n. 2, Bultmann defends his view of Mark's anti-Peter polemic. He answers Holl's question--Who would rebuke the celebrated Peter?--by referring to the later Hellenistic community which opposed Peter. Peter as representative of the Jewish-Christian group was opposed by Mark but still recognized as leader of that group.

¹²Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 169.

¹³Ibid., p. 170.

this saying could not have come from Jesus Himself, he establishes its place in the Urgemeinde by demonstrating (1) that many of the terms are Semitic, not Hellenistic, and (2) that only the Urgemeinde ascribes to Peter the role described by this saying.¹⁴

He lists the following examples of Semitic origins for phrases in verses 17-19: (1) Makaríos ei (verse 17) is a common Semitic expression seldom found in Greek in the second person singular. (2) The Aramaic phrase Simōn Barīōna for Peter is seldom expressed in Greek (compare John 1:42; 21:15-19). (3) Sarx kai haima is a familiar Semitic expression. (4) The word play on Peter's name in verse 18 cannot be explained in terms of the Greek language. No doubt by the time this expression was translated into Greek, Petros was well-accepted as a name for Peter. Petra was simply translated from the Aramaic with the feminine form retained. Consequently, the play on words is partly lost in the Greek. (5) The term pylai hadou can also be interpreted as a Semitism. (6) The terms dēsai and lysai in verse 19 are rabbinic terminology for forbidding and permitting. The

¹⁴Ibid. See also: Bultmann, HST, pp. 258-259, where Bultmann comments: "At the least Matthew 16:17-19 goes back to an old Aramaic tradition. The words can hardly have been formulated in any other place than in the Palestinian Church, where Peter was looked up to as the founder and leader of the Church and the blessing of Peter was put into the mouth of the risen Lord."

contrast between epi tēs gēs and en tois ouranois add the same characteristic Semitic flavor.¹⁵

The term ekklēsia demands special consideration in connection with the setting of these verses in the Urgemeinde. Bultmann maintains that ekklēsia (with roots in Semitic usage) describes the Urgemeinde as the eschatological community of the Just. Likewise Judaism frequently describes the Church as a building. It is not important which Aramaic word for community is intended in verse 18. The ekklēsia must be seen as an eschatological community, not as a synagogue attached to a religious leader.¹⁶ The Urgemeinde lives in the end days as "the vestibule, so to say, of God's Reign that is shortly to appear."¹⁷ With this understanding of ekklēsia,

¹⁵Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," pp. 170-171. For many of these expressions Bultmann adds lengthy philological source material which contrasts common Semitic usage with instances of Greek usage. Noteworthy in Bultmann, HST, p. 139, n. 2, is his elaboration on pylai hadou. Recognizing that this expression is also a Greek picture for death, he points out that it is characteristically Semitic. He opposes those exegetes who attempt to enlarge the picture of pylai hadou here to include Christ's descent into hell. Too much elaboration on this aspect, he feels, detracts from the significance of the Rock for the ekklēsia.

¹⁶Bultmann, HST, pp. 139-141. Bultmann strongly opposes the idea that Jesus used the term ekklēsia because this would reduce it to a synagogue with Him as leader and strip it of its eschatological implications.

¹⁷Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 37. The abbreviation for this work will be TNT plus volume designation.

consonant with Semitic usage, there is no need to insist on the insertion of ekklēsia as defined by the later Church.

Perhaps more important than the Semitic character of these verses is the fact that they describe the role of Peter as the Urgemeinde understands it.¹⁸

With the Urgemeinde established as the source of the rock saying, Bultmann secondly demonstrates that Peter's Easter experience forms the basis for the Church's Messianic confession. The literary question ascribed to Jesus (Mark 8:27-29; Matthew 16:13-15) sets up Peter's Messianic confession which he first makes after experiencing the resurrection of Christ (perhaps as described in John 20:22-23; John 21:15-19). Bultmann argues that the words hoti sarx kai haima ouch apekalypsen soi ktl characterize Peter's Easter experience as a unique supernatural experience. Jesus' blessing of Peter (the rock saying) constitutes the Urgemeinde's witness that their messianic faith is based on Peter's Easter experience.¹⁹ Facing the threat of unbelief in their own day,

¹⁸Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 171.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 173. In his description of Peter's Easter confession Bultmann is not suggesting that a reliable account of the growth of the Easter faith is available but merely that we have traces of its development in saying such as this. He writes in Bultmann, TNT, I, 44: "The Church had to surmount the scandal of the cross and did it in the Easter faith. How this act of decision took place in detail, how the Easter faith arose in individual disciples, has been obscured in the

these early Christians, following Peter's Easter confession, make a confession anew of Jesus as the coming Messiah. Because Peter's confession stands at the heart of the community's faith, they recognize him as the authority on the new community (verses 18-19). The words lysai and dēsai refer to authority in doctrine and discipline, first given to Peter and then later to the congregation, probably to the elders. Matthew 18:15-17 is a further application of this saying, giving rules for settling quarrels in the congregation.²⁰

In summary, Bultmann views the Markan account of Peter's confession, without the anti-Petrine editorial additions of 8:27,31-33, as the first part of the Urgemeinde's messianic confession, based on Peter's Easter experience. Matthew 16:17-19 is the conclusion of that confession which establishes Peter's authoritative role in the community.

Romans 5:12-21

The Context

The second passage under consideration is Romans 5:12-21 which will serve as a sample of Bultmann's interpretation of

tradition by legend and is not of basic importance. . . . This basic event is reflected in the narratives of Peter's confession (Mark 8:27-29), the transfiguration (Mark 16:17-19), as well as in the words about Peter, the Rock (Matt. 16:17-19). The accounts of the empty tomb, about which Paul still knows nothing, are legends."

²⁰Bultmann, HST, pp. 138-139 and notes. See also Bultmann, TNT, I, 61.

Pauline material. Important to his exegesis of verses 12-21 is his understanding of the context, chapters 1-8 in the wider sense, and chapter 5 in the narrower sense. For Bultmann the letter to the Romans provides the platform for a debate between Paul and Judaism on the subject of righteousness. Both regard righteousness as a forensic-eschatological entity. But the Jews view righteousness as a matter of hope, whereas for Paul it is also a present reality. Paul's entire argument in chapters 1-8 is devoted to establishing righteousness as both present reality and future hope. This assertion seems absurd to the Jew who asks the following questions: If righteousness is present now, where are the blessings such as life which are to accompany it? Are not death and sin present realities? Paul begins in 1:18-3:20 by showing that both Jew and Gentile stood under the wrath of God before the revealing of God's righteousness. Romans 3:21-31 proclaims that righteousness has now been established by the occurrence of salvation in Christ. Paul gives the Scripture proof of this fact in 4:1-24. Paul answers the Jewish question mentioned above in chapters 5-8. Chapter 5 asserts that eschatological life, though indeed a future hope, is already a present reality. Romans 6:1-7:6 maintains that sin has lost its dominion over the rightwised. After a digression on the role of the law in the history of salvation (7:7-25), chapter 8 concludes by reasserting that righteousness (future and

already present) brings both freedom from sin (8:1-11) and freedom from death.²¹

Chapter 5, then, is devoted to the thesis that life, a blessing of righteousness, is already present as well as future. Bultmann divides up his discussion of Romans 5 into two sections: verses 1-11 and verses 12-21.²² The first eleven verses demonstrate that life is present in hope for believers. The emphasis in these verses is on the introductory character of the present which will be actualized when the future hope is fulfilled. Present life is assured through Christ because the future hope is sure. Bultmann describes as follows this paradoxical situation of depending on a future hope and yet experiencing it in the present:

1. Der Glaubende lebt immer (nur) in der Hoffnung, d.h. nicht auf Grund dessen, was er besitzt, sondern auf Grund dessen, was er halten wird, d.h. er lebt aus

²¹Bultmann, TNT, I, 278-279.

²²Bultmann's interpretation of Romans 5 in this section is most fully presented in an article written in 1959 against Karl Barth's exegesis of Romans 5. Instead of refuting Barth point by point, Bultmann chooses to present his own exegesis of chapter 5 before considering Barth's approach. As a result, this article serves as a unified presentation of Bultmann's interpretation of Romans 5. Rudolf Bultmann, "Adam und Christus nach Roman 5," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1959), 145-165. English translation: Rudolf Bultmann, "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5," Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation. Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper, edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 143-165. NB. The German original is quoted throughout this paper.

der Zukunft. . . . 2. Aber gerade dieses: das Gegenwärtige als das Vorläufige durchschauen, ist die Frucht des Glaubens; denn es ist die Freiheit vom Gegenwärtigen, die Unangefochtenheit von den thlipseis, die den Nichtglaubenden in Angst stürzen; also die Freiheit von der ständig das Leben bedrohenden Angst, die Offenheit für die Zukunft.²³

Bultmann suggests that Paul in verses 12-21 attempts to establish even more firmly the present character of life. Instead of emphasizing the introductory character of the present, he stresses the presentness of the future with the Adam-Christ parallel.²⁴ Bultmann also contrasts the literary form of the two sections. In 5:1-11 he finds a predominance of cultic-juridical language from the Jewish tradition. In verses 12-21 he finds the influence of Gnostic terminology. Because of these two different thought patterns, Bultmann refuses to mingle the two sections except to assert the thesis of how life is present for the believer.²⁵

²³Ibid., p. 148.

²⁴Ibid., p. 162. "Im Unterschied von vs. 1-11 ist in vs. 12-21 die Paradoxie der christlichen Situation dadurch aufgezeigt, dass der Ton nicht auf der Vorläufigkeit der Gegenwart, sondern auf der Gegenwart, sondern auf der Gegenwärtigkeit des Zukünftigen liegt." See also p. 151. "Aber ist die Gegenwart der zoe nicht nur eine relative, d.h. nur in der elpis antezipierte? Offenbar hat Paulus das Bedürfnis, die Gegenwart der zōē noch deutlicher zum Ausdruck zu bringen, und das geschieht in 5:12-21."

²⁵Ibid., pp. 151-154. Bultmann criticizes Barth for mixing these two sections together, bringing Gnostic categories into the first eleven verses and using verse 11 as the starting point for verses 12-21.

Gnostic Mythology

According to Bultmann, Paul finds Gnostic terminology useful to establish the present character of life, even though he must correct some of its implications. In this section the elements of Gnostic mythology are presented which are implicit in the text. The next section will indicate how Paul transformed the Gnostic mythology for his purpose. The first element of Gnostic mythology revolves around the primal man and the fall of creation. In primeval time, the demonic powers managed to overcome a person from the light-world and imprison him in the world. All people on earth are parts or splinters of that light-person. Together they are called primal man. The fall of that first light-person brought death and sin on mankind.²⁶ Paul identifies the Adam of Genesis 3 with this primal man.²⁷

Secondly, Gnostic mythology contains a redeemer who comes down to earth to free the light-persons from their worldly prison controlled by demonic powers. This pre-existent divine being, the Son of the Father, was sent by

²⁶Bultmann, TNT, I, 166, 174. The myth further adds that the primal man's fall was due to his inborn quality of being psychikos and choikos. This type of explanation finds expression in I Cor. 15:21, 44-49, but not in Romans 5.

²⁷Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," p. 153. See also Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting, translated from the German by R. H. Fuller (Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1956), p. 190.

the most high god. He took on the disguise of a human form to fool the demonic powers. He redeemed the other sparks of light by telling them about their heavenly home and how to get there. By returning to heavenly glory he wrests all sovereignty from the demonic powers and shows the way for the individual sparks of light. Salvation is in process of being realized after his redemption and will reach cosmic completion when all the sparks of light have returned to heaven, thus reuniting the primal man. For Gnostics, the triumph of this redeemer signals emancipation from the demonic world-rulers, present salvation, and release from death. Paul uses the Gnostic redeemer myth to characterize Christ who brought deliverance to Adamitic mankind and makes possible the origin of a resurrection life for all believers.²⁸ Paul employs the Gnostic myth in Romans 5:12-21 precisely in order to affirm the present character of life.²⁹

Transformation of the Gnostic Myth

Paul's discussion of life in Romans 5:12-21 is described by Bultmann with the Gnostic myth in the background. First, verses 12-14 are considered, followed by verses 15-19 and verses 20-21. Paul uses the Gnostic myth in the service of

²⁸Bultmann, TNT, I, 175-178, 167.

²⁹Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," p. 155.

his theme: present life in Christ. While the origin of sin is mentioned, it finds expression mostly in connection with the origin of death. The origin of death serves to contrast the all important origin of life in Christ, which is as sure as the death brought by Adam on mankind.³⁰ A second manner in which Paul tones down the Gnostic myth in these verses is by avoiding an explanation of the origin of Adam's sin from something lying behind it--the matter of which Adam consists, Satan, or the "evil tendency" of a rabbinic teaching.³¹ He simply asserts that sin came into the world through actual sins.³²

In addition to softening the Gnostic mythology, Paul corrects it in two places (verses 12b and 13-14). First, he includes the words eph hō pantes hēmarton (verse 12b). To combat the fatalism of the Gnostic fall into sin, Paul insists on the responsibility of all men. Death has passed on all men, not only because Adam sinner, but also because factually all men in their concrete situations sin against God.³³

³⁰Ibid., p. 153. See also Bultmann, TNT, I, 252.

³¹Bultmann, TNT, I, 251. I Cor. 15 does contain such an elaboration.

³²Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," p. 153.

³³Ibid., pp. 154-155. In TNT, I, 252, Bultmann observes that Paul gets into obscurity with his attempt to assert man's responsibility alongside the Gnostic myth which implies fatalism.

Secondly, Paul includes verses 13-14 as a type of parenthesis which discusses sin in the period between Adam and Moses when the law was given. Bultmann postulates that Paul includes this unintelligible section in order to counter the cosmological (natural) direction of the Gnostic myth with an heilsgeschichtlich reflection on the meaning of the law in Adamitic humanity.³⁴

In verses 15-19 Paul seeks to emphasize the overpowering gift of life through Christ which offers a new possibility of existence and overcomes the fatalism of Adam's sin presented in Gnostic terms. Instead of drawing an exact parallel with Adam immediately (verse 12a), Paul first (erst recht) demonstrates how much greater (pollō mallon) the gift of grace is than the trespass of Adam. Only then does he draw the exact parallel between Adam's trespass and Christ's act of righteousness (verses 18-19). In this section Bultmann points out that the antitheses of sin-obedience, judgment-free gift (grace), death-life are basically interchangeable and that Paul often fails to present the proper antithesis for a given term (for example, free gift-trespass in verse 15). The importance of life in the present is emphasized by

³⁴Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," pp. 154-155. In TNT, I, 252, Bultmann shows the contradictions inherent in Paul's attempted correction. If sin came into the world through Adam's sin, how can it have originated in the sin of all men? How can the sin of pre-Mosaic man have brought death if it was not "counted?"

the fact that the above combinations of opposites are interchangeable. The gift of Christ is described not as fatalism but as opening up a new possibility for life (lambanontes in verse 17 which implies a condition).³⁵ Only those men who make the decision of faith receive the gift of life, but for them it is already certain because of Christ's hypakoē.³⁶

According to Bultmann, verses 20-21 serve as a summary of what has come before with a renewed attack against Judaism on one hand and Gnosticism on the other. (1) The law is indeed not the way to life but, as verses 13-14 indicate, the way to death. The law, therefore, will increase trespasses. (2) The fact that the law exists and is now superseded by Christ indicates a connection between the two periods of history which can be called heilsgeschichtlich. This stands against the mythical understanding of Gnosticism which

³⁵In his TNT, I, 252-253, Bultmann hypothesizes that the Christ parallel with its non-fatalistic possibility of the new life might indicate Paul's intention to understand Adam's sin as bringing about the possibility of sin and death, only realized when men become guilty by their own responsible action. He adds, though, that this remains a question and that Paul clearly accepted the universal fallenness of Adamitic mankind.

³⁶Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," pp. 155-160. In this section Bultmann discusses other significant items which are not of direct importance for this investigation: pantes and hoi polloi the same through Semitic usage (pp. 156, 160); the one versus the many in verse 16 (p. 157); details on Paul's mixing of antitheses; dikaiōsynē (dikaiōma) as "das Verhältnis zu Gott," not as "die ethische Qualität" (p. 160).

shows the two periods merely following after one another. For Paul, the first period prepares for the second. The goal of zōē aiōnios (verses 1-11) is brought to fulfillment dia Jēsou Christou tou kyriou hēmōn, a heilsgeschichtlich event. The paradoxical situation is again brought to the fore. Eternal life as a goal is future, but it has already been made present by Jesus Christ.³⁷

In summary, Romans 5:12-21 fits into the context of Romans 1-8 and especially chapter 5 by proclaiming life as a present possession of the rightwised man which will be fulfilled in hope. Gnostic mythology is used by Paul to show present life as a contrast to death and sin. Paul transforms the Gnostic mythology by asserting man's responsibility and the heilsgeschichtlich emphasis of sin and grace.

John 3:9-21

The Context

The third passage under consideration is John 3:9-21 which will serve as an example of Bultmann's interpretation of Johannine material. First, in order to understand Bultmann's approach to this passage, a brief sketch is presented of John's relation to the Synoptics and to Paul. Bultmann maintains that John was familiar with the Synoptic

³⁷Ibid., pp. 160-162.

tradition as is indicated by his use of certain sayings of Jesus, certain miracle stories, and especially the account of the passion.³⁸ Nevertheless, several differences are apparent between John and the Synoptic tradition. For John, the miracles take on a symbolic meaning which provide the occasion for extended discourses on a definite theme. Instead of debate on the authority of the law and proclamation of the Reign of God, Jesus in John points only to Himself as the Revealer sent from God. John includes no parables, but instead presents lengthy symbolic discourses (Good Shepherd, chapter 10; True Vine, chapter 15). The problems of the earliest Church such as the validity of the law, the coming or delay of the Reign of God no longer concern John. He rather concentrates on the conflict between faith and unbelief. Judaism occupies the camp of unbelief and in this sense represents the world. The Jews are not divided into "pious" and "sinners," "leaders" and "the multitude," as they are in the Synoptics.³⁹

Paul and John have certain elements in common, though representing different schools of thought. Both speak from a context of Hellenism with Gnostic overtones. Therefore, both use dualistic terminology (world as bad, earthly-heavenly

³⁸Bultmann, TNT, II, 3.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 4-5.

contrast) and the Gnostic redeemer myth. In like manner, there is a common Christian terminology employed by Paul and John (life eternal; joy, peace; sending of the Spirit). However, two important features of Pauline terminology are missing in John. (1) Paul's dominant contrast between flesh and spirit is of less importance.⁴⁰ (2) Paul's terminology relating to the history of salvation is missing in John. John doesn't emphasize the law-grace antithesis, the crucifixion as salvation history, proof from prophesy, God's covenant with Israel, and the church, ekklēsia, as part of the history of salvation. In spite of their different theological approaches, Paul and John agree in basic content: that the eschatological occurrence is already taking place in the present.⁴¹

With this general comparison in mind of the relationship between John and the Synoptic tradition on the one hand and between John and Paul on the other, this section on the context of John 3:9-21 shifts to an examination of John's main source for chapter 3, namely the Offenbarungsreden (Revelation-discourses). This is the name which Bultmann gives to those sayings and discourses of Jesus in John which do not come

⁴⁰Note that John 3:6, part of the present investigation, stands as one exception to the lack of flesh-spirit terminology in John.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 6-10.

from the Synoptic tradition or from the collection of miracle-stories which he used. The Offenbarungsreden have the following characteristics: (1) The discourses in this source have a clearly Semitic character, whether originally written in Semitic and translated into Greek or whether conceived in Greek; (2) They are Gnostic, containing poetry similar to the Odes of Solomon and other Gnostic texts; (3) The structure of the discourses revolves around a self-presentation of the Revealer with the formula "I am. . . ." Included in the structure are also a call of invitation and a threat for the unbeliever, often presented in the antithetic parallelism of Semitic poetry.⁴² According to Bultmann, these Offenbarungsreden which John has reworked lie behind the structure of John 3.

John structures chapter 3 as follows. Taking his material from the Offenbarungsreden, he historicizes it with a situation in the life of Jesus, namely the visit of Nicodemus. This provides an opportunity to work his source into a Jewish dialogue between teacher and pupil. Nicodemus is important only as a representative of official Judaism.⁴³ Bultmann then divides this chapter into three parts:

⁴²Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁴³Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Zweite Abteilung, II Band in Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952), pp. 93-94.

verses 1-8--"die Begründung des Kommens des Offenbarers in der Notwendigkeit der Wiedergeburt"; verses 9-21--"das Kommen des Offenbarers als die krisis der Welt; verses 31-36--"das autoritative Zeugnis des Offenbarers."⁴⁴ The theme for the entire chapter, then, is Jesus the Revealer who confronts the world with krisis as He comes from God and returns to Him again. Bultmann feels that verses 22-30 comprise a section inserted at this point which actually belongs with the witness of the Baptist. Chapter 3:31-36 as indicated above, however, belongs with the rest of chapter 3 by virtue of both style and theme.⁴⁵

Gnostic Mythology

The specific discussion of John 3, especially verses 9-21, requires a survey of Gnostic mythology underlying the Offenbarungsreden. The first element of Gnosticism significant for John 3 is the Gnostic cosmology. The universe is divided into an earthly realm and a heavenly realm. Every person in the earthly realm has a body and a soul which are dominated by the demonic powers. At the same time, some persons on earth have also a preexistent self which comes from

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 92.

⁴⁵Ibid. Bultmann supports his case by pointing out that J. H. Bernard, F. Waburton Lewis, and J. Moffat treat 3:31-36 in a similar fashion although differing as to the exact location for these verses in 3:9-21.

the light-world (the heavenly realm). These "pneumatics" are by nature (physis) destined to be reunited with the light person because they "know" their origin and their heavenly home. By the same token, other persons are by nature destined to live in the world of darkness and to be destroyed when all of the sparks of light ("pneumatics") are reunited with the primal man. Every individual is caught up in the cosmic process of nature.⁴⁶ Evidence of these Gnostic tendencies can be detected in the following expressions: (1) Born anew or from above (gennēthē anōthen), verses 3, 4, 5; (2) Earthly things--heavenly things (epigeia--epourania), verse 11; (3) Darkness--light (skotos--phōs), verses 19-20.⁴⁷

Secondly, the Gnostic Redeemer myth is important for John as for Paul. The Offenbarungsreden describe the Heavenly Redeemer who comes from heaven as an ambassador to earth. This Redeemer declares to the "pneumatics" that they have come from the light world and will return to it if they only remember their origin and refuse to be lulled by the tactics of demonic forces. They are to know that he brings Revelation, namely that they are united with him in a cosmic unity. Since he returns to the world of light, they will return also in a cosmic redemption. John uses this myth because,

⁴⁶Bultmann, TNT, I, 164-183; II, 40-41, 66-67. See also Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp. 8-13.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 105-107.

despite many speculations, Gnostics concentrate on the bare fact of Revelation--the relation between the "pneumatics" and the cosmic process initiated by the Redeemer.⁴⁸ Basically this concept of Revelation fits John's purpose, although he is forced to change it in certain respects.

Gnostic Mythology Transformed to Present Jesus as the Revealer

John's chief purpose in chapter 3, climaxed in verses 9-21, is to proclaim Jesus as the Revealer-Revelation sent from God to judge man in his present situation. His message has no content except to point to Himself as the Word from God. His words and His actions and His person are interchangeable. What He says and does and is causes men either to accept Him or reject Him.⁴⁹ John finds it necessary to transform his source to meet this central purpose. First of all, he gives a different meaning to gennēthē anōthen (Wiedergeburt). Rejecting the Gnostic ideas of the pre-existence of souls (selves) and an earthly-heavenly Gnostic

⁴⁸Bultmann, TNT, II, 66-67. For a long discussion of his view of the Gnostic sources, see Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangelium's," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXIV (1925), 100-146.

⁴⁹Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp. 92-93. This basic thrust of John is described by Bultmann at length in the second volume of his TNT. He discusses the centrality of Jesus as the Revealer-Revelation bringing krisis to the world, especially in John 3.

cosmology, John explains them in terms of man's existence. Man has a false understanding of life which involves security without God. This earthly existence stands in direct opposition to the Word of Jesus. The heavenly life is life on God's terms, a life of faith which overcomes the offense of believing in Jesus, a man.⁵⁰ Rebirth belongs in the area of earthly things, because unless man sees it as a necessity, he can never understand that it becomes possible only through Jesus.⁵¹

Secondly, John transforms the Gnostic redeemer myth by applying Son of Man as a messianic title to the historical person--Jesus of Nazareth.⁵² He uses the language of Gnosticism to describe Him as the preexistent Son coming from the Father and returning triumphantly to the Father. Jesus is not a figure of this world but comes from elsewhere, the ambassador of the Father. He is only a visitor in this world and will return to the Father. Bultmann refers to his descending as Erniedrigung, associated with His taking on flesh and His life of obedience, and to his ascending as Erhöhung, associated with His glorious death and victorious

⁵⁰Bultmann, TNT, II, 75-76.

⁵¹Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp. 106-107. "Man könnte umschreiben: wer die Notwendigkeit der Wiedergeburt nicht einsieht, der versteht auch nicht, dass sie durch Jesus möglich geworden ist."

⁵²Ibid., p. 107.

return to the Father. The saving event which Jesus brings requires both Erniedrigung and Erhöhung as these verses indicate.⁵³ The event is referred to as the Erhöhung of the Son of Man in verse 14 (lifting up of the Son of Man).⁵⁴ On the other hand, in verses 13 and 16, His Erniedrigung is clearly presented as necessary for salvation.⁵⁵ In short, Bultmann concludes that the two belong inseparably together because His Erhöhung can only be seen in the light of His human life and death.⁵⁶

According to Bultmann, John changes the Gnostic redeemer myth even more radically than by severing it from a cosmology of preexistent souls. He also does not portray Jesus of

⁵³Ibid., pp. 109-111.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 109. In referring verse 14 to Jesus' return to the Father (hence Erhöhung) Bultmann realizes that it refers to the crucifixion but feels that John regards the death of Jesus primarily as the completion of the task begun at his incarnation and signifying a release to return to the glory of his preexistence. The crucifixion is no more important than Jesus' entire life of obedience. The Moses-serpent reference is typological, received by John from the Christian tradition.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 109-110.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 111. "Der Glaube an sie ist zugleich der Glaube an seine Erhöhung; denn in Jesus den von Vater gesandten Sohn sehen, kann ja nur der, der, den Anstosz der Niedrigkeit überwindet, in seinem Tode seine Erhöhung sieht. Und umgekehrt: der Glaube an den Erhöhten (verse 15) bejaht zugleich seine Erniedrigung (verse 16)." Bultmann in his TNT, II, 35, points out that Jesus' coming and his going, his sending and his exaltation, belong together as a unit in portraying his activity as Revealer. He cites 3:14 and 3:16 as examples.

Nazareth as a preexistent figure. Instead he concentrates on the great "offense" of the Christian faith--that God's Word addresses man through an ordinary human being whose very person speaks with authority. The preexistent Son of Man demonstrates that the Word of Jesus does not have its origin in the world of men but from outside, from God Himself. That Word, therefore, is authoritative and forces the hearer to decide for or against it.⁵⁷

The full meaning of chapter 3 comes to light when the sending of the Son is viewed as judgment (krisis) on the world which separates believers from unbelievers. Particularly verses 17-21 expound the sending of the Son as the eschatological event.⁵⁸ John discards both the Jewish-Christian view of eschatology as a future cosmic event and the Gnostic view of eschatology as a reuniting of sparks of light. In their place, he asserts a present eschatology which is krisis in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, the Revealer.⁵⁹ Men are

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 104. "Es ist klar: der ursprünglich mythologische Sinn solcher Redeweise ist preisgegeben; sie dient zu nichts anderem, als das Wesen des Offenbarungswortes zu charakterisieren als eines Wortes, das 1. von jenseits her dem Menschen begegnet, das unkontrollierbar ist und sich nicht aus der Sphäre menschlichen Beobachtens und Denkens erhebt, das 2. autoritatives, den Hörer verpflichtendes Wort ist." Bultmann makes the same point in TNT, II, 62.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 110.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 112.

judged solely on the basis of their response to the Revealer who speaks of Himself as the Revelation of God. Any inquiry into His origin or person will destroy the "offense" of His Revelation. He must simply be grasped by faith.⁶⁰

In summary, John 3:9-21 expounds the central theme of John's Gospel: namely that Jesus of Nazareth, the Revealer-Revelation of God, confronts the world with krisis demanding a present decision for or against Him. In service of this theme, John employs an Offenbarungsreden which contain the Gnostic motifs of a Gnostic cosmology and a Gnostic redeemer. John transforms these to highlight the divine origin and authority of Jesus' Revelation.

Summary of Bultmann's Exegesis

Bultmann's interpretation of the three passages under investigation can be summarized in terms of the central concern of each pericope. In Matthew 16:17-19 the early Church debates the authority of Peter in the community. In Romans 5:12-21 Paul presents the antithesis to life in Christ with the aid of Gnostic terminology. In John 3:9-21 Jesus, pictured as the descending and ascending Son of Man, confronts the world with krisis, a present eschatological decision.

⁶⁰Bultmann, TNT, II, 69. Bultmann's chapter on faith in John (pp. 70-92) including faith as eschatological existence helps to spell out John's present eschatology in detail.

CHAPTER III

CULLMANN'S EXEGESIS

Matthew 16:17-19

The Markan Setting

Cullmann's New Testament exegesis is represented in this chapter by a summary of his interpretation of the same three passages examined in chapter II. His treatment of Synoptic material is illustrated by Matthew 16:17-19. The discussion begins with his interpretation of the Markan parallel--Mark 8:27-33--which he regards as a reliable historical account of the Caesarea-Philippi event. His purpose is to sketch the narrative framework for Matthew 16:17-19 in order to determine whether these verses fit the structure.¹ Cullmann seeks to establish the setting for Matthew 16:17-19 in the life of Jesus, not in the early Christian community.²

¹Oscar Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Second revised and expanded edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 177.

²Ibid., p. 169. "Genuineness" for Cullmann always means that a given word was spoken by Jesus; "spuriousness" that it was a later creation of the Church. As he phrases the question himself, "Can this saying have been spoken by Jesus, or was it only created by the Church after his death?"

He chooses to follow the Markan account because he feels that Mark comes closer to an historical description of the important event at Caesarea-Philippi. Matthew, except for verses 17-19, appears substantially in the same form as Mark. Cullmann lists the following reasons for preferring the Markan account: (1) Mark presents the incident more vividly and simply than either Matthew or Luke. The narrative therefore contains a certain freshness and animation lacking in the other two Synoptics.³ (2) Mark's telling of the story suggests the eyewitness account of a direct participant, Peter himself if Papias is correct.⁴ (3) The Caesarea-Philippi event in Mark has central significance. He reserves this occasion for the first confession by the disciples of Jesus' messianic role. Matthew, in contrast, lessens the importance of this occasion by introducing the disciples' confession in a chapter (Matthew 14:33) preceding chapter 16. By his editorial arrangement Mark preserves the memory of the fact that what happened at Caesarea-Philippi had not happened at any previous time.⁵

The Markan narrative demonstrates Jesus' attitude toward the title of messiah, an attitude of reserve. He neither

³Ibid., p. 177.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 180.

accepts nor rejects the title, but commands them to tell no one (verse 30). He then explains the messianic title in terms of suffering (verse 31). In other words, Jesus rejects current Jewish conceptions of the messiah as a political savior and interprets it instead in terms of suffering.⁶

Mark 8:32-33 follows very naturally from Jesus' attitude toward the title of messiah. Peter bases his confession on a mistaken conception of Jesus' messianic role. This wrong conception is shared by the other disciples. When Jesus identifies his role as one of suffering, Peter, taken aback, rebukes his Lord. Jesus, then, is forced to rebuke Peter in the strongest words possible: "Begone, Satan!" Jesus' violent reaction is stimulated not only by the disciples' misunderstanding but by His own inner struggle against the Satanic temptation to be an earthly messiah. For Cullmann, Jesus' rebuke of Peter is the real point of the entire narrative, not a mere appendix.⁷

⁶Ibid., pp. 178-179.

⁷Ibid., pp. 179-180. See also Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Revised edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 122-125. In his examination of Mark 8:27-33 in the Christology Cullmann proposes this explanation of Jesus' attitude toward the Messiah title as the real key to the Messianic secrecy motif. Contra Wrede, he therefore maintains that Jesus, not the early Church, is the source of the command not to proclaim the Messiah: "He was afraid that such a proclamation would lead him to a false conception of his task, the conception he recognized and fought as a satanic temptation. That is the reason for his restraint to the very end with regard to the title Messiah." (p. 125).

The Matthean Setting

With this understanding of the narrative framework, Cullmann proceeds to evaluate Matthew 16:17-19. In general, Matthew has a shallower understanding of the significance of the Caesarea-Philippi event than does Mark. Jesus' opening question already anticipates the answer: "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" As already mentioned, Matthew doesn't reserve this occasion for the disciples' first confession of Jesus' messiahship. Does Matthew 16:17-19 fit the narrative framework?⁸ Cullmann feels constrained to consider the possibility that Matthew inserted these verses in the Markan framework. His initial suspicion is stimulated by the more original presentation of Mark already indicated. He finds further justification in the contributions of form criticism, namely that the evangelists arrange single units of oral tradition which come to them without chronological or geographical sequence. Whereas Luke strives for chronological sequence, Matthew arranges his material primarily on the basis of content and theology.⁹ Therefore, Matthew may

⁸At this point as at several others, Cullmann hastens to add that when he questions vss. 17-19's place in this narrative framework, he is in no way questioning its genuineness as a word of Jesus. Cullmann, Peter, p. 181.

⁹Ibid. It is noteworthy that Cullmann contrasts Matthew with Luke on the question of chronology rather than with Mark, the real contrast at issue.

well have inserted verses 17-19 in the Caesarea-Philippi narrative for reasons of content rather than chronology.¹⁰

Cullmann's thesis with regard to Matthew's arrangement is as follows: (1) Matthew found in an ancient oral tradition a saying of Jesus which explained the title Cephas. (2) This saying originally was an answer to Peter's confession of Jesus as Son of God, not as the Messiah. Cullmann points to the fact that only Matthew records Peter calling Jesus the son of the living God as well as the messiah. (3) Matthew searched for a suitable location for this ancient saying in his material which is arranged according to content, not chronology. The story of the reprimand of Peter at Caesarea-Philippi seemed to provide a suitable setting.¹¹ The cornerstone of this thesis is that Jesus refused the title messiah as Peter used it and regarded it as a satanic temptation.¹² If Peter's confession was a diabolical temptation, Jesus would certainly not have called him God-inspired (verse 17). Cullmann suggests a reason for Matthew's insertion of verses 17-19 at this point in the text. Matthew may have desired to

¹⁰Ibid., p. 182.

¹¹Ibid., p. 184.

¹²Cullmann feels strongly enough about this fact that he rejects the idea of calling Peter's answer in Mark a confession. Rather he proposes the following heading: "Reprimand of Peter's Satanic Conception of the Christ." Ibid., p. 186.

correct the image of Peter as the instrument of the devil by establishing Peter as the instrument of divine revelation (verse 17).¹³

Cullmann's Reconstruction

Cullmann proposes an ingenious reconstruction of the original setting for Matthew 16:17-19.¹⁴ First, he looks for some reference to Peter's confession of Jesus as the Son of God. John 6:66-71 contains Peter's confession of Jesus as the "Holy One of God," which Cullmann asserts is the same as Son of God. It is difficult to pinpoint the original setting of Johannine material. However, since this particular confession is set in the context of the miraculous feeding, a eucharistic setting is suggested, referring to the last supper. Cullmann finds further support for this possibility in the fact that the treason of Judas is mentioned in this John 6 context.¹⁵

¹³Ibid., p. 184. For a further elaboration of Peter's confession of Jesus as the Son of God, see Cullmann, Christology, pp. 270-305, especially pp. 280-281.

¹⁴Initially Cullmann considers the popular hypothesis that the original setting for the rock-saying was a post-Resurrection appearance of Jesus to Peter, echoed in John 21:15-20. Cullmann rejects this hypothesis (1) because there is no definite proof that this appearance to the disciples and Peter is the same as his appearance to Peter alone and (2) because it seems likely that Jesus explained the title to Peter during his lifetime. Cullmann, Peter, pp. 187-188.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 188.

Turning to Synoptic material dealing with the passion story, he finds an exact parallel to thought in Matthew 16:17-19, namely Luke 22:31. Here Peter's denial is predicted in the fact of Peter's vow to accompany his Lord to prison and death. Jesus gives Peter a commission to strengthen his brethren. Although there is no direct parallel in wording, Cullmann sees the following thought parallels: (1) Peter's vow to follow his Lord to prison and death is parallel to Peter's confession of Jesus as the Son of God; (2) The prediction of Peter's denial is parallel to Jesus' reprimand of Peter for his satanic "confession" of Jesus as the Messiah; (3) Jesus' command to Peter to strengthen the brethren is parallel to Jesus' rock-saying which establishes Peter's role of authority in the apostolic Church. With these relationships established, John 21 can be viewed as a post-resurrection parallel based on Luke 22 with a direct reference to the denial.¹⁶ Cullmann, then, proposes the following reconstruction with Luke 22 as the setting:

At the Last Supper (or immediately thereafter) Peter says to Jesus: "You are the Son of God," and he promises to follow him even to death. Jesus answers that God has given Peter this revelation concerning him, and he foretells Peter's denial, but at the same time he

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 188-191. Cullmann, in this complex argumentation, presents several other connections between John 6, Luke 22, Matthew 16, and John 21 which need not be elaborated here. One notable example is the way in which he finds reference to Satan in Matthew 16, John 6, and Luke 22.

adds that Peter will have to fulfill a special task towards the company of disciples, which will fall into the same temptation he is to meet.¹⁷

Genuineness and Meaning of the Saying

In a lengthy discussion of the word ekklēsia within the context of the eschatological expectation of the messianic community, Cullmann takes issue with Bultmann and other exegetes. He does not feel that ekklēsia is incongruous with Jesus' message of the Kingdom of God. Using much the same evidence which Bultmann submits to demonstrate the Semitic characteristics of Matthew 16:17-19, Cullmann maintains the probability that such early Semitic material has its roots in the words of Jesus. He asserts that Schweitzer's emphasis on eschatology has presented a false antithesis between the already-fulfilled and the not yet-fulfilled. Strongly convinced of Jesus' messianic consciousness, Cullmann thinks it very likely that Jesus selected twelve disciples and equipped them with a messianic mission. He sees no reason why Jesus' eschatological understanding did not include both a present and a future expectation of a messianic community. When Jesus established the lord's supper as a covenant, He based

¹⁷Ibid., p. 191.

the new fellowship of God's people upon His own death.¹⁸

Cullmann then discusses the meaning of the rock saying for Peter and the Church. The rock clearly refers to the historical person of Peter and only to him in his lifetime work as apostle. The Church is the future community which continues after Peter's death. The bestowing of the keys of the kingdom of heaven applies only to Peter during his lifetime. Successors of Peter are not mentioned in this text.¹⁹ Cullmann summarizes the meaning of Matthew 16:17-19 as follows:

Jesus promises Peter that he will build upon him the earthly people of God that will lead to the Kingdom of God; he promises that in this people Peter will have the leadership, both in missionary work and in organization. His immediate thought, just as in John 21:16-18, probably deals only with the time of Peter. But even if he explicitly had in view the period following Peter's death as the time of the building of the Church, what is said of Peter as the Rock would refer only to him, the historical apostle; he represents once and for all the earthly foundation, the beginning who supports the whole structure of the ekklēsia that is to be built in the future.²⁰

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 192-207. In this discussion Cullmann dwells also on the significance of the Rock in Judaism, the metaphor of building and rebuilding the temple, and "flock" as an expression for the Christian fellowship.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 207-217. It should be noted that Cullmann considers it possible that the reference to the keys of the Kingdom and binding and loosing may well have been introduced by Matthew into this text from some other source. See pp. 209-211.

²⁰Ibid., p. 217.

In summary Cullmann regards Matthew 16:17-19 as a genuine saying of Jesus regarding the role of Peter in the apostolic Church. This saying belongs not in the Markan narrative framework but in the passion narrative as reflected by Luke 22:31.

Romans 5:12-21

The Context

Cullmann's interpretation of the Adam-Christ parallel in Romans 5:12-21 will illustrate his treatment of Pauline material. He places chapter 5 in the broad context of God's plan of salvation and man's resistance to God's revelation. Paul first presents God's revelation in creation. All men, including the Gentiles, reacted to this revelation by rejecting it and setting themselves up as gods (Romans 1:18-23). Because all men experienced the glories of creation and yet refused to believe, all are without excuse.²¹

Secondly, Paul refers to God's revelation in the law

²¹Oscar Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1965), p. 243. Cullmann refuses to call this revelation in creation a natural revelation as opposed to a Christian revelation. Rather he considers creation as part of the redemptive history brought to its fulness in Christ. Gentiles, therefore, are also linked to this redemptive line and have no excuse for their rejection of God's revelation. Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Revised edition; London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 180-184.

which was given especially to Israel, God's chosen people. In Romans 2 he demonstrates how Israel turned against God's revelation in the Law and as a result came under God's judgment. Like the Gentiles they are without excuse. Both Jews and Gentiles are guilty of unbelief, the Ursünde. Both of God's works, His revelation in creation and His revelation in the Law, could have led men to salvation if they had answered with faith.

But because they were dead in sins, God had to reveal Himself in His Son Jesus Christ who atoned for their sins (Romans 3:21-26). This revelation of Jesus Christ gives meaning to God's whole plan of salvation and will at the end bring about the liberation of all creation (Romans 8:19-25) and the salvation of all Israel (Romans 11:25).²² The Adam-Christ parallel in Romans 5 is viewed by Cullmann as part of God's total plan of salvation moving from creation to end time.

The Adam Problem in Judaism

Cullmann interprets Romans 5 against the background of an Adam problem in Judaism, which he feels Paul manages to solve. He discusses this Adam problem in his Christology under the heading, Son of Man. The Aramaic word barnasha²³--

²²Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 243-245.

²³The transliteration barnasha is used in Cullmann's Christology and will be used throughout this paper.

Son of Man--should be translated simply "man" according to philological principles.²⁴ However, in the literature of Judaism, particularly in Daniel 7:13, IV Ezra, and chapters 37-71 of the Ethiopic Enoch, the word barnasha refers to an eschatological Heavenly Man who will come to earth at the end of days as a heavenly ruler.²⁵ Cullmann feels compelled to ask why this glorious heavenly ruler should be called simply barnasha. The Jewish texts offer no explanation. He therefore looks to widespread non-Jewish speculations about an original man who was the ideal prototype of man.²⁶ He finds the idea potentially present in the Old Testament concept of man created in the image of God, but fails to find any connection between the image of God and the heavenly man in the literature of Judaism.²⁷

This brings Cullmann to a statement of the Adam problem in Judaism. The Jews were conscious of a connection between

²⁴Cullmann, Christology, p. 138.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 139-142. Cullmann finds Son of Man speculations mostly in esoteric Judaism while official Judaism espoused a political Messiah concept.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 142-143. Without attempting to detail the findings of comparative religions, Cullmann refers to traces of a divine original man in the Iranian, Chaldean, and Egyptian religions, in the cult of Attis, among the Mandaean and Manichaeans, and in Gnosticism in general. He cites the writing of W. Bousset, R. Reitzenstein, and others in the field of comparative religions.

²⁷Ibid., p. 142.

the heavenly man coming at the end of time and the original man, made in the image of God. They were unable to establish this connection because Adam, the first man, was the source of sin and could not be identified with the original man.²⁸ Both concepts--heavenly man and original man--were important to Judaism. Consequently they developed along separate lines. Daniel, IV Ezra, and the Book of Enoch develop primarily the eschatological aspect of the heavenly man. To deal with the idea of a perfect first man, made in the image of God, a special Adam literature arose in apocryphal and rabbinical-mystical writings.²⁹ The Book of Enoch treats the history of the world from creation to the establishment of the messianic kingdom, but doesn't mention a word about Adam's sin.³⁰ The Pseudo-Clementine writings of Gnostic Judaic Christianity glorify the figure of Adam and call the account of Adam's fall a lie. They are thus able to identify the original man with the heavenly man.³¹ Philo of Alexandria

²⁸Ibid., pp. 144-145. Cullmann summarizes the problem: "The Jews were faced with a dilemma: since the original speculations had done so, they felt the need to identify the heavenly man and the first man; but since according to the Old Testament Adam sinned, such an identification seemed impossible."

²⁹Ibid., p. 144.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 145-146.

³¹Ibid., pp. 146-148. These Gnostic Jewish Christians developed an elaborate account of the position of Adam. He

manages to uphold both the fall of Adam and the existence of a perfect original man. He does this by distinguishing between two Adams--one created in the image of God (Genesis 1:27) and the other made of the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:7). The first is the original man, perfect and without sin; the second is the Adam who fell into sin and the lusts of the flesh.³²

Cullmann finds all of these attempts to solve the Adam problem inadequate. The concepts of Son of Man and second Adam belong together. The fall of Adam into sin can neither be ignored (Enoch) nor denied (Gnostic Jewish Christians). The theory of an original man created before the sinful Adam (Philo) leaves no room for either an incarnation or an eschatological return because the original man is present in creation from the beginning. The common link between the original man and the heavenly man is their preexistence. Neither concept, however, suggests the possibility of an incarnation.³³

was anointed with oil from the tree of life. He is the eternal priest, reincarnate in Jesus. Obviously, there was no need for a second Adam because the first Adam was without sin.

³²Ibid., pp. 148-150. Cullmann tries to relate Philo's position indirectly to a rabbinical understanding of two original Adams which Paul might have known.

³³Ibid., pp. 150-152.

Adam and Christ in Romans 5:12-21

Paul, according to Cullmann, solves the Adam problem of Judaism by presenting Christ as the second Adam who atones for the sin of the first Adam. Paul treats the first Adam as the first man who was made in the image of God at creation but fell into sin. He rejects the interpretation of Philo who postulates two first men.³⁴ Because Adam was made in the image of God, he represents all humanity. Because he sinned, he represents all of sinful humanity. But he is in no sense the perfect prototype of all mankind according to the original man speculations of non-Jewish religions.³⁵

The second Adam is Jesus Christ, the incarnate one, who brought something new into the world.³⁶ He is the heavenly man who existed even before creation but who first came to earth in the end time. He is closely related to the first Adam but not identical with him. Their common task is the same, to exhibit the image of God. Both represent all

³⁴Paul, in Cullmann's view, directly refutes Philo in I Corinthians 15:45-47 where he places the physical first and then the spiritual. Ibid., pp. 167-169.

³⁵Ibid., p. 170.

³⁶Paul refuses to use the Jewish-Christian notion of a perfect original man which would deny the reality of sin and the need for a deliverance coming within history. He applies the Son of Man designation to a historical person--Jesus of Nazareth, not to a mythological figure coming to earth in the disguise of a man. Ibid., pp. 166-167.

humanity. But the first Adam failed in his task by sinning. The second Adam fulfilled His task and made atonement for the sins of all humanity. Romans 5:15 emphasizes the fundamental difference between Adam and Christ. Because of the power of Adam's sin, the power of Christ's atonement had to be greater. Paul uses the Son of Man concept of Judaism to describe Christ's representative work of deliverance. This concept is however inadequate to express Christ's atoning work for Adam's sin.³⁷

In order to describe Christ's atonement for sin, Paul chooses another Christological title, ebed Yahweh,³⁸ and combines it with barnasha³⁹ just as Jesus did. Because Jesus described His atoning work with the two titles, Son of Man and Suffering Servant,⁴⁰ Paul joins the same two titles to

³⁷Ibid., pp. 170-174.

³⁸Cullmann includes an entire chapter on ebed Yahweh and attaches great importance to this title because Jesus Himself used it and because it focuses on His central work, namely atonement by suffering and death. He finds it lacking only in the failure to present the entire work of Christ, including His glorious rule. Ibid., pp. 51-82.

³⁹Cullmann feels justified in considering Romans 5:12-21 a Son of Man section, even though Paul does not use the term barnasha. He bases his assertion on the fact that barnasha means man. Furthermore, Paul is capable of using anthropos to refer to the Son of Man as well as using it in its common usage. In fact he frequently uses anthropos for Son of Man. See I Cor. 15:45-50. Ibid., pp. 171-172.

⁴⁰Cullmann places great weight upon his contention that Jesus used the titles Son and Man and Suffering Servant to

show how the second Adam atoned for the sins of all mankind by His suffering and death. Romans 5:19 reflects Isaiah 53:11 in which the Servant is to make many to be accounted righteous.⁴¹

Cullmann views Paul's reference to Adam and Christ as two fragments on the time line of Heilsgeschichte. He allows for the possibility that the account of Adam's fall lies in the area of mythology, but insists that Paul has historicized it to relate it to the later coming of Christ. The account of Adam's sin should therefore not be viewed in isolation but as part of the whole history of salvation. Adam's sin is important as an event, not merely as a demonstration of the condition of sin.⁴² Cullmann recognizes that Romans 5:12-21 contains a typology involving Adam and Christ. At the same time, he maintains that the typology is based on an understanding of the whole history of salvation. Verses 13-14 and 20-21 demonstrate this heilsgeschichtliche intention of

denote (1) his work in glory at the end of time and (2) his work in the humiliation of the incarnation among sinful men. Ibid., pp. 152-164.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 171-174, 77.

⁴²Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 95. Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 126-127. "Der Mythos ist sozusagen seiner Substanz als Mythos durch die Historisierung entkleidet." Cullmann strongly objects to the manner in which the Bultmann school attempts to isolate myths for an existential interpretation. He considers this to be re-mythologizing and de-historicizing instead of de-mythologizing.

Paul.⁴³ Every Christian is bound to the historical act of the second Adam as he was bound to the historical act of the first Adam.⁴⁴

In summary, Paul solves the Adam problem of Judaism in Romans 5:12-21 by presenting Jesus Christ as the second Adam who atoned for the sin of the first Adam. He combines the roles of Son of Man and Suffering Servant to link all humanity with Heilsgeschichte.

John 3:9-21

The Context

Cullmann's approach to the Johannine material is

⁴³Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, p. 111. "Hier wird ein typologischer Parallelismus zwischen Adam und Christus hergestellt. Immerhin ist auch hier die heilsgeschichtliche Schau nicht aus dem Auge gelassen, die Zwischenstufen sind nicht übersprungen: 'von Adam bis Mose. . . .' (verse 14) Die Typologie ist eingebettet in ein heilsgeschichtliches Gesamtverständnis." Cullmann defines typology as follows (p. 114): "Die Typologie stellt nur den Parallelismus zwischen zwei Gestalten oder Phänomenon fest." On p. 114 he makes this general comment about the relationship between typology and Heilsgeschichte: "Alle Typologie setzt jedenfalls einen heilsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund voraus, nämlich die heilsgeschichtlich verstandene Beziehung zwischen Altem und Neuen Testament."

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 299. "Das ist ja der Sinn von Röm. 5,12ff. So wie wir mit unserem Sündigen und seinen Folgen von der vor uns begangenen Sünde abhängen und in der Solidarität der Geschichte der sündigen Menschheit und ihrer Folge, dem Tod, stehen, so sind wir mit unserer Rechtfertigung, die uns zum Leben führt, von der Gnadentat eines anderen abhängig. Aus diesem Glauben fließt die Ueberzeugung von der Prädestination, und aus diesem Glauben fließt die Entscheidung, meine Existenz in dieses Geschehen hineinzustellen."

illustrated by his interpretation of John 3:9-21. The context is first established by some general observations on the nature of the Johannine literature. With John 20:30 as a cue, the evangelist indicates his theological principle for writing, namely "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Recognizing the evangelist's purpose, Cullmann nevertheless maintains that this theological purpose is inextricably bound up with history, the history of Jesus of Nazareth.⁴⁵ The evangelist writes his material for the Church of his day with a view to their salvation. He writes from the vantage point of his faith in the Risen Lord. As a member of the Lord's Church, he has received the gift of the Holy Spirit. Through the Spirit's power, he is able to "remember" the events of Jesus' life in the light of His death and resurrection. In other words, he understands the central importance of Jesus for his faith. For the first time, he also understands the connection in the history of salvation of the life of Jesus with the Old Testament.⁴⁶ The evangelist intermingles various events of salvation

⁴⁵Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, translated from the German and the French by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), p. 38. Cullmann points out that the statement "Jesus is the Christ" connects the theological assertion contained in the word "Christ" with the historical assertion contained in the word "Jesus."

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 48.

history with the life of Jesus in order to accomplish his central purpose. The reader, far from disregarding history in John, must be constantly alert for historical references to the life of Jesus for the history of salvation. This use of history is in fact vital to the evangelist's theological purpose.⁴⁷

Cullmann has a special theory of the background for the Johannine literature. Instead of advocating a sharp split between Judaism and Hellenism in the early Church (Tübingen school), he argues for a continuity between Judaism and Hellenism within the Christian community. He traces a relationship between non-conformist Judaism represented by the Book of Enoch, a group of Palestinian Hellenists represented by Stephen in the Book of Acts, and the Johannine group.⁴⁸

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 50. Of great importance for an understanding of Cullmann's treatment is his chapter on "Johannesevangelium und Heilsgeschichte" in his recent book, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 245-267. In reaction to Bultmann and his school, he asserts the significance of history in John. He discusses Johannine historical material under the following headings: (1) The importance of the historical life of Jesus as the center of all events. (2) The connection of the life of Jesus with the Church of the present. (3) The connection of the life of Jesus with past Heilsgeschichte, going back to creation. (4) The connection of the life of Jesus with eschatology. Cullmann is concerned to uphold (1) the presence of Heilsgeschichte in John and (2) the presence of a future eschatology in John along with the predominant emphasis on present eschatology.

⁴⁸Cullmann presents his arguments for the relationship between these three groups in an article entitled, Oscar Cullmann, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," The Expository Times, LXXI (1959-1960), 8-12, 39-43.

Cullmann concludes from this relationship that the Johannine group draws much of its material from an early Christian group in Palestine which had its origins in Jewish Gnosticism.⁴⁹ If this is correct, John deals primarily with Jewish concepts even when they have Gnostic overtones. John's use of the Son of Man concept becomes of great significance because this concept was developed in the Book of Enoch and other esoteric Jewish literature.⁵⁰ Cullmann feels that Hellenistic elements, whether stemming from Judaism or not, serve John's heilsgeschichtlich purpose. For this reason, the Gospel of John differs radically from all Gnostic gospels.⁵¹

In emphasizing John's heilsgeschichtlich purpose, Cullmann points to his frequent use of words in a two-fold sense or more.⁵² Since John is concerned to relate Old Testament history and the present life of the Church to the

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 8-10. Cullmann makes clear his purpose: "I do not say that the Gospel of John itself is as old as the Synoptics. Rather do I say: the type of Christianity represented by John's Gospel is as old as that represented by Synoptic Christianity." (p. 8)

⁵⁰Cullmann, Christology, pp. 184-185.

⁵¹Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 251-252.

⁵²Oscar Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel, IV (1948), 360-371. In this article Cullmann examines Johannine words which are to be interpreted in more than one sense. Several of the words, important to the exegesis of John 3, are cited and will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

life of Jesus, he chooses words which have more than one meaning. Some of the words which he selects are Greek words which normally have two meaning. An example would be pneuma which can mean either wind or spirit.⁵³ On other occasions, the evangelist uses words which have only a single meaning but must be understood in different connections. An example would be the use of hydōr zōn and artos tēs zōēs to refer both to water and bread respectively and to Baptism and the Eucharist.⁵⁴ Cullmann seeks to avoid the opposite pitfalls of demythologizing all symbolic language and allegorizing every expression.⁵⁵ He believes that historical expressions and symbolical expressions are false alternatives. The evangelist uses historical expressions with a theological relationship to past or future events also included.⁵⁶

The framework of John 3 provides the immediate context for the verses under examination. The conversation of Jesus

⁵³Ibid., p. 364.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 367-368.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 361. An excellent example of his refusal to interpret expressions allegorically is his treatment of Moses lifting up the serpent (3:14) as a typological expression and not basically an heilsgeschichtlich expression. Yet in the reference to Jesus feeding the people as Moses fed the Israelites manna in the wilderness, Cullmann finds an heilsgeschichtlich expression. Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, p. 263.

⁵⁶Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke," p. 361.

with Nicodemus can be divided into two parts. Verses 1-12 deal mainly with the subjective side of rebirth as it affects man. Verses 13-21 present the objective side of rebirth which lies outside of man. In both parts, rebirth means Baptism.⁵⁷ Cullmann summarizes the total thrust of John 3 with these words: "The thought is common to them all that the life of the incarnate Christ points to the Christ lifted up in death and present to the Church in the sacraments."⁵⁸

The Interpretation

In keeping with the context, Cullmann suggests the following theme for John 3:13-21: The incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus constitute the Christological foundation for the rebirth in Baptism. Three words understood in a double sense help to focus this central theme. The first word is anōthen (verses 7 and 31). In the first usage, anōthen refers to a new or second birth. In this chronological sense, Nicodemus is told that he must be born again through Holy Baptism. Nicodemus finds it impossible to contemplate a second birth in his mother's womb. But anōthen also means from above. In this local sense, the objective basis for being born anew is described, namely through the descending

⁵⁷Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, pp. 75-78.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 78.

and ascending of Jesus Christ, the Son of Man. Only after Christ has ascended to heaven will the Holy Spirit (verse 7) come to men and make rebirth possible (16:7). Anōthen, then, in its two usages establishes the link between the subjective and objective sides of rebirth.⁵⁹

The second word is hypsothēnai (verses 13-15). In its simplest sense, the word refers to Moses' lifting up the serpent in the wilderness (verse 14). In a second sense this word covers also the lifting up of Christ on the cross. Cullmann bases this interpretation on the use of the same word in John 12:32-33 with the accompanying words: "But this he said, signifying by what manner of death he should die." In a third and more customary New Testament sense (Acts 2:33; 5:3; Philippians 2:9), hypsothēnai describes the ascension of Christ into heaven (John 3:14; 12:32; and 8:28). With this three-cornered dimension of hypsothēnai, both the glorified and dying Christ are presented as the basis for the rebirth in Baptism. (Compare Romans 6).⁶⁰

The third word used in a double sense is edōken (3:16).

⁵⁹Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke," pp. 364-365. See also Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 51.

⁶⁰Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebruach doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke," pp. 365-366. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, pp. 51-52. Without the parallel of John 12:32-33, it would be allegory to refer hypsothēnai to the cross, according to Cullmann.

In the first sense, it is synonymous with apesteilen and means: God has sent His Son into the world. Because a reference to the cross has already been established (hypsōthēnai), it is proper also to interpret edōken as paredōken (compare Romans 8:32) which means: He has delivered Him up to death. This ties together the sending of the Son of Man with His mission to be delivered up into death.⁶¹

According to Cullmann, John uses two Christological titles to confirm what the three double words establish, namely the objective basis for rebirth in the death and resurrection of Christ. The first title is Son of Man (3:13-14). Because the Johannine group is related closely to the non-conformist stream of Judaism which emphasized the Son of Man instead of Messiah,⁶² the Gospel of John places special emphasis on the Son of Man title. In John 3 the evangelist clearly has in mind the preexistent divine heavenly man who comes to earth, enters fallen humanity, and ascends to heaven again in glory. Characteristically, John stresses the exaltation of the Son of Man.⁶³ John also uses the title Suffering Servant in John is found in 1:29 and 1:36 which allude to the

⁶¹Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke," p. 366. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 52.

⁶²Supra, pp. 54-55.

⁶³Cullmann, Christology, p. 185.

Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.⁶⁴ Chapter 3 provides room for a Suffering Servant concept through the use of hypsōthēnai as lifting up on the cross and the use of edōken as delivered up to death.⁶⁵ Son of Man, then, refers to the glorification of Jesus, and Servant of God to His incarnation and death.

In summary John uses words in a double sense (anōthen, hypsōthēnai, and edōken) and Christological titles (Son of Man and Suffering Servant) to establish Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen one, as the objective basis for the rebirth of Holy Baptism.

Summary of Cullmann's Exegesis

Cullmann's interpretation of the three passages under investigation can be summarized in terms of the central concern of each pericope. In Matthew 16:17-19 Jesus rebukes Peter for his confession and, in another setting, makes him the rock of the Church. In Romans 5:12-21 Christ, the second Adam, represents the world as Son of Man-Suffering Servant to atone for Adam's sin. In John 3:13-21 the incarnation,

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 71. Cullmann specifically opposes Bultmann for forcing the idea of the atonement completely into the background. He cites the work of Jeremias and C. F. Burney which gives the dual meaning--Lamb of God and Servant of God to the Aramaic phrase for annos tou theou.

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 70-73.

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL TREATMENT IN PERSPECTIVE

The first two chapters of this investigation have described the exegesis of Bultmann and Cullmann on the three passages selected. The fifth and sixth chapters will cross-section their concepts of history as revealed in their exegesis. This fourth chapter proposes to clear the way for a fair comparison of their concepts of history. An understanding of Bultmann's and Cullmann's exegetical presuppositions requires first of all an acquaintance with the type and depth of treatment given each text. A commentary, for example, is likely to contain more exegetical detail than a treatment of primitive Christianity or Christology or early Christian worship. A periodical article may reflect more of an ephemeral concern than a standard source book on form criticism. Secondly, any attempt to isolate these men's concepts of history must consider the polemical overtones of their exegesis which influence their interpretation in one direction or another. Awareness of these overtones can make possible a more balanced evaluation.

Type and Depth of Treatment

Matthew 16:17-19

Bultmann interprets this passage in the following works:

- (1) History of the Synoptic Tradition (first edition, 1921);
- (2) A periodical article of 1919-1920, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis";
- (3) A periodical article of 1941, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Matt. 16,17-19"; (4) Theology of the New Testament, Volume I (first edition, 1948-1953).

In History of the Synoptic Tradition Bultmann is pioneering in the area of form criticism along with Dibelius and K. L. Schmidt.¹ He analyzes the Synoptic tradition with the intent of sketching the origin and history of the units of tradition to determine their pre-literary form. He recognizes the fluidity of categories and the obscurity of the history of tradition.² Because Bultmann paints the

¹Martin Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919; Second edition, 1933). English translation: Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, translated from the second edition by Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935). See also Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch and Sohn, 1919).

²Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the third German edition by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 3-7. Hereafter referred to as HST). Bultmann comments that form criticism and historical study of the community belong together and operate in a circle. He adds that there is no method for regulating their interplay and no rule for where to start. (p. 5).

Synoptic tradition on a broad canvas, many of his individual exegetical conclusions are subject to reexamination.³ When references to Matthew 16 or the Markan context occur in History of the Synoptic Tradition, they are necessarily treated in connection with the Synoptic form discussed (for example, apophthegms).⁴ Similarly, individual passages cited in the Theology of the New Testament are used with Bultmann's theological concept in mind (for example, his discussion of the earliest church as the eschatological congregation).⁵

The two periodical articles present detailed interpretations of the Matthew 16 passage. The first, written in the early days of "kerygma theology,"⁶ seeks to make a clear separation between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith by challenging the messianic consciousness of Jesus.⁷

³Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 222-223.

⁴Supra, p. 8, n. 2.

⁵Supra, p. 13, n. 17.

⁶For a summary of the Kerygmatic reaction to the Quest for the Historical Jesus, see John H. Elliott, "The Historical Jesus, the Kerygmatic Christ, and the Eschatological Community," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXVII (September 1966), 477-481.

⁷Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIX (1919-1920), 165-167. The entire first section of the article lays the stage for the secondary nature of Peter's confession by denying Jesus' Messianic consciousness and basically affirming Wrede's notion of the Messiasgeheimnis.

The second, while strictly asserting the same separation, concentrates on arguments against the genuineness of Matthew 16:17-19 with an historical sketch of interpretations both for and against its genuineness.⁸ The first article provides a more complete exegetical treatment of the Markan context and Matthean setting than does the second article which concentrates on the use and meaning of ekklēsia.

Cullmann interprets the Matthew passage primarily in the following works: (1) Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr; (2) Christology of the New Testament. In the second part of Peter, Cullmann presents a comprehensive exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 which includes an extensive summary of leading interpretations of the passage from the early Church to the present.⁹ His exegesis needs to be viewed as part of his purpose for writing the book, namely to present an historical study of Peter and his role in the early Church on the basis of Biblical, liturgical, and archaeological sources.¹⁰ Cullmann's interpretation of this passage in his Christology relates to his theory of Jesus' use of the title, messiah.

⁸Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Matt. 16,17-19," Theologische Blätter, XX (1941), 265-280.

⁹Oscar Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Second revised and expanded edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 161-217.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 11-13. More of the central concerns of Cullmann in Peter will be discussed under the section on polemical overtones.

He vigorously defends Jesus' messianic consciousness as the basis for the Church's confession.¹¹

Romans 5:12-21

Bultmann interprets this passage in the following sources:

(1) A periodical article of 1959, "Adam und Christus nach Rm. 5"; (2) Theology of the New Testament, Volume I. The periodical article constitutes the primary source for this investigation. It includes a verse by verse exegesis of chapter 5. Although the article is written against Karl Barth's exegesis, Bultmann refutes Barth only after giving his own interpretation.¹² The Theology of the New Testament, besides allusions to various verses in Romans 5, presents Bultmann's description of Gnosticism, which provides the background for this text.¹³

The sources for Cullmann's exegesis of Romans 5 include the following: (1) Christology; (2) Heil als Geschichte; (3) Christ and Time. The main source is the Christology, where he presents the Adam figure as a part of the Son of Man

¹¹Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Revised edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 122-125.

¹²Rudolf Bultmann, "Adam und Christus nach Rm. 5," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1959), 145-165.

¹³Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I. Hereafter referred to as TNT. An example of his treatment of Romans 5 would be p. 252 and of his Gnostic description, pp. 166, 174.

literature and links it with the Servant of God title.¹⁴ Because Cullmann organizes his book according to the various Christological titles of the New Testament,¹⁵ a detailed exegesis of each New Testament text in the context of a whole book cannot be expected. In this respect the Christology is similar to Bultmann's Theology of the New Testament. At the same time Cullmann describes his method as an analytical one which is based solely on the philological-historical method. He asks his critics to refute him not a priori but on exegetical grounds.¹⁶ Nevertheless, his work has been criticized on the grounds that (1) it fails to interpret adequately the background of these titles in Judaism¹⁷ and (2)

¹⁴Cullmann, Christology, pp. 137-192 and 51-82. The sections cited are respectively the chapters on Jesus the Son of Man, and Jesus the Suffering Servant of God.

¹⁵He first discusses the Christological titles which refer to the earthly work of Jesus (Jesus the Prophet, Jesus the Suffering Servant of God, Jesus the High Priest). Secondly, he considers the Christological titles which refer to the future work of Jesus (Jesus the Messiah, Jesus the Son of Man). Thirdly, he reviews the Christological titles which refer to the present work of Jesus (Jesus the Lord, Jesus the Savior). Finally, he discusses the Christological titles which refer to the preexistence of Jesus (Jesus the Word, Jesus the Son of God, Jesus as "God").

¹⁶Ibid., pp. xiii-xiv, 6-10.

¹⁷For example, recent literature on the Son of Man problem reveals a varying emphasis on aspects of the Jewish background as they apply to the use of Jesus and the early community. See the following: Philipp Vielhauer, "Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesu," Festschrift für Günther Dehn, zum 75. Geburtstag am 18. April 1957, edited

that it imposes categories on the New Testament and implies a unity which does not exist in fact.¹⁸ When the Christology is used in the interpretation of Romans 5, then, the purpose and structure of the book must be considered, but Cullmann's exegetical observations must also be taken seriously.

Cullmann's references to Romans 5 in Heil als Geschichte and Christ and Time need to be considered in the light of their purpose: tracing the theme of Heilsgeschichte through the New Testament books. The former book has the advantage of treating Romans 5 in a special section on Paul and Heilsgeschichte.¹⁹

by Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Neukirchen, Kreis Moers: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1957); Eduard Schwiezer, "Der Menschensohn (zur eschatologischen Erwartung)," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1959), 185-209; Heinz Eduard Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the German by D. M. Barton (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965); Erik K. T. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955).

¹⁸Typical of critical reviews of Cullmann's book is George Johnston, Canadian Journal of Theology, VII (March 1961), 205-209. An example of a similar Christological treatise (for the Synoptic material) which applies the principles of form criticism established by Dibelius and Bultmann more rigidly and attempts fewer sweeping relationships is Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963). The companion volume for Christological titles in other New Testament materials is Werner R. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, translated from the German by Brian Hardy, Number L in Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1966).

¹⁹Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1965), pp. 225-245.

John 3:9-21

Bultmann interprets this passage in the following works:

(1) Das Evangelium des Johannes; (2) Theology of the New Testament, Volume II. The commentary provides a comprehensive exegetical treatment of John 3 in the context of the whole book.²⁰ The Theology of the New Testament, Volume II, treats certain aspects of John 3 in connection with Bultmann's understanding of Johannine theology. Helpful references to Gnostic influences on John are included.²¹

Cullmann's interpretation of John 3 can be found in the following works: (1) Early Christian Worship; (2) A periodical article of 1948, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums"; (3) Heil als Geschichte; (4) Christology of the New Testament; (5) A periodical article of 1959-1960, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel." While no individual source gives as comprehensive a treatment of John 3 as does Bultmann's Commentary on John, the first two sources contain extensive exegetical observations on this text. Early Christian

²⁰Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Zweite Abteilung, II Band in Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952).

²¹Bultmann, TNT, II, 3-92. See also Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXIV (1925), 100-146.

Worship contains a lengthy section on worship in John's Gospel. Chapter 3 receives special treatment because of the reference to Holy Baptism.²² It is important to reckon with the fact that Cullmann is treating this chapter from the slant of early Christian worship. Naturally his choice of exegetical details reveals this interest.²³ The article of 1948 demonstrates a different interest of Cullmann, John's treatment of words in a double or triple sense. Its value lies in the large number of examples taken from John 3.²⁴ Heil als Geschichte contains a special section on John and Heilsgeschichte.²⁵ In the Christology Cullmann uses John 3 passages to show the connection between Son of Man and Suffering Servant in John.²⁶ The article of 1959-1960 establishes the background in Hellenic Judaism for the Gospel

²²Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, translated from the German and the French by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), pp. 75-78.

²³Ibid., p. 57. He indicates that other studies should be made of a similar nature, for example, a study on the connection of John with the Old Testament (remembrance).

²⁴Oscar Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel, IV (1948), 360-371, especially 364-366.

²⁵Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 245-267.

²⁶Cullmann, Christology, pp. 184-187, 70-73.

of John.²⁷

In summary, both Bultmann and Cullmann treat Matthew 16:17-19 in extensive exegetical detail, Bultmann in his History of the Synoptic Tradition and two periodical articles, Cullmann in his Peter. The Romans 5 passage is thoroughly covered by Bultmann in a periodical article but in Cullmann is interpreted mostly in special studies (for example, Christology). The John passage receives adequate treatment from both Bultmann and Cullmann, although Bultmann's exposition in his Commentary on John is more detailed.

Polemical Overtones

Matthew 16:17-19

In this section the important polemical overtones of Bultmann and Cullmann will be described as they are apparent in the exegesis of the three passages. In Bultmann's interpretation of Matthew 16:17-19, three polemical concerns seem primary. First, he strongly opposes those exegetes who attempt to uphold the genuineness of Peter's confession and the rock saying. He chides Cullmann for suggesting that critical scholarship no longer has grounds for opposing the

²⁷Oscar Cullmann, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," The Expository Times, LXXI (1959-1960), 8-12, 39-43.

genuineness.²⁸ He strikes out particularly against F. Kattenbusch who defends the genuineness of the rock saying by proposing a Son of Man concept in Judaism leading to the idea of a "people of the saints."²⁹ Similarly, he criticizes K. L. Schmidt for placing the concept of an eschatological ekklēsia in the words of Jesus.³⁰ Bultmann faults J. Jeremias for attempting to identify Kingdom of God and ekklēsia in the preaching of Jesus.³¹ The arguments of Mundle which attempt to justify Jesus' asking the question "Who do men say that I am?" are unacceptable to Bultmann.³²

Secondly, Bultmann rejects those theories which uphold Jesus' messianic consciousness. He refuses to consider any psychological theory of Jesus' consciousness such as the one

²⁸Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit." p. 265. Interestingly, Bultmann scarcely mentions Cullmann again in this article as he opposes Cullmann's statement. Instead he concentrates on Kattenbusch.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 276-277. In other sections he opposes Kattenbusch's other arguments for genuineness (for example, p. 267).

³⁰Bultmann, HST, p. 140. See also Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit," p. 267.

³¹Bultmann, HST, pp. 138-139, n. 1. Bultmann counters by pointing out the distinction between epi tes ges and en t. ouranois. In another location, Bultmann rejects Jeremias' interpretation of petra as the cosmic rock. (pp. 139-140, n. 2).

³²Ibid., pp. 257-258 and notes.

proposed by H. J. Holtzmann.³³ Schniewind's view that the messianic secret is not a theory of the evangelist but an historical fact, Bultmann finds untenable, because the literary location of all such passages is in the editorial sequences of the evangelists, not in the body of traditional units.³⁴

Finally, Bultmann polemicizes against those who deny Mark's hostility to Peter. He debates with K. Goetz who finds no polemic against Peter elsewhere in Mark and fails to see why Matthew should represent a better tradition than Mark and Luke.³⁵ Karl Holl asks the question: Who in the early Church would have presumed to rebuke the celebrated Kephas as Satan? Denying the genuineness of the saying, Bultmann answers Holl by referring to the opposition of Hellenistic Christians as a later development.³⁶

The polemical context for Cullmann's interpretation of Matthew 16:17-19 first involves the Roman Catholic Church. Traditionally the Roman Church has applied the rock saying to the institution of the papacy as the legal successor to

³³Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," pp. 165-166. Bultmann feels that Holtzmann's theory fails to come to grips with the question of "die Entstehung des Messiasglaubens nach dem Tode Jesu."

³⁴Bultmann, TNT, I, 32.

³⁵Bultmann, HST, p. 258, n. 2.

³⁶Ibid.

Peter. As Cullmann points out, recent Roman Catholic commentators presuppose the idea of succession in Matthew 16 without examining it exegetically. He cites the commentary of P. Dausch, who includes a single sentence on the question of succession:

Since, according to the second half of verse 18, the Church founded upon Peter is to be unshakable in its stability and in its duration, and since it is almost universally conceded that Peter came to Rome and died there, the primacy is already assured on this basis alone.³⁷

Cullmann's Roman critics reflect the same position although with a greater readiness to discuss the issues. Father Otto Karrer³⁸ who wrote an extensive evaluation of the first edition of Cullmann's Peter will serve as an example. While claiming that Cullmann's Biblical definition of apostolic succession actually corresponds with that of official Roman Catholic dogmatics,³⁹ Karrer at the same time places more emphasis upon the continuing apostolic function, parallel to a prophetic function, than Cullmann places upon it. He

³⁷Cullmann, Peter, p. 175.

³⁸Otto Karrer, Peter and the Church: An Examination of Cullmann's Thesis, translated from the German by Ronald Walls (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963). Karrer first commends Cullmann for an unusual understanding of the Roman Catholic mind. After reviewing his thesis in detail, he presents a critical appraisal of such questions as the position of James, the Biblical meaning of apostolic succession, and the Petrine succession.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 59-62.

refers to the need for a renewal of persons at the foundation as well as at the superstructure.⁴⁰ Karrer's divergence from Cullmann is further shown by his rejection of the apostolic Word as an adequate basis for the continuation of the apostolate without the interpretation of Church leaders.⁴¹ Finally, he asserts that the Church cannot withstand the forces of hell with only the memory of an historical Peter. A continuing structure requires living stones like Peter.⁴² The fact that Cullmann partially shapes his argumentation, especially of the second edition of Peter, in view of the polemic from Rome is attested by the final theological section of his book, numerous individual references throughout the book, and his promise in the foreword of the revised edition to produce a separate volume entitled Peter and the Pope on the subject of primacy in the narrower sense.⁴³

Secondly, Cullmann opposes the traditional Protestant interpretation of Matthew 16:17-19, which has been shaped by a strong aversion to Roman papal claims. The Reformers interpreted the rock as referring to the faith which Peter confessed for the entire Church. Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli agree on

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 73-74.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 85-91.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 91-93.

⁴³Cullmann, Peter, p. 15.

this exegesis. Behind their view that the rock is faith is their belief that Christ is the only true rock of the Church.⁴⁴ Cullmann strongly opposes this view because for theological reasons it distorts the exegetical evidence. For him, Peter is clearly the rock upon which the Church is built.⁴⁵

Finally, Cullmann polemicizes against Bultmann who opposes the genuineness of Matthew 16:17-19. Throughout Cullmann's discussion in Peter, he is concerned to demonstrate the genuineness of the Synoptic tradition. Bultmann always stands in the background. Jesus, not the disciples after the resurrection, gave Peter the title Cephas.⁴⁶ The united witness of the gospel tradition ascribes preeminence to Peter.⁴⁷ A whole chapter is included on the genuineness of Matthew 16:17-19. Repeatedly in the chapter, Cullmann reminds the reader that a misplaced saying can nonetheless be genuine.⁴⁸

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 168.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 212-213. As the Foreword to the first edition indicates, Cullmann writes his historical study of Peter with the hope of providing a third way of looking at the material, fruitful for both Roman Catholics and Protestants who have previously interpreted Peter according to their own dogma. (pp. 11-13).

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 22.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 31.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 192-217.

Romans 5:12-21

The only polemic explicit in Bultmann's exegesis of Romans 5:12-21 is a debate with Karl Barth.⁴⁹ In verses 1-11 Barth emphasizes the relationship between Christ and all believers based on His objective death and especially His resurrection. All believers are in Christ (In-Sein), the representative man.⁵⁰ While verses 1-11 speak only of Christ and those who believe in Him, verses 12-21 speak of mankind as such. The humanity of Christ is the key to the secret of mankind. Adamitic mankind stands under the Lordship of Christ. Adam is to be interpreted in terms of Christ, not Christ in terms of Adam. Because we live under Christ's Lordship already as children and heirs of Adam in weakness and sin, we know that our hope is in Him.⁵¹

Bultmann faults Barth mostly for failing to treat the question which these chapters of Romans ask: Is life a present reality? In verses 1-11 which talk in the cultic-juridical terms of the Jewish tradition, Barth mistakenly inserts the Gnostic terminology of verses 12-21, the concept

⁴⁹Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," pp. 145-165. Bultmann gives his own interpretation of Romans 5:1-11 and then refutes Barth's interpretation. Then he interprets 5:12-21 followed by a critique of Barth on those verses.

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 151-152.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 162-165.

of the Urmensch and In-Sein. The main theme of verses 1-11 is the eschatological character of present life. Barth subordinates this theme to an emphasis on the relationship of all believers to the one man Christ.⁵² Barth also misinterprets the thrust of verses 12-21. The main theme is the present character of the future. He dwells instead on mankind. Instead of contrasting the opposing periods of sin (death) and righteousness (life), Adamitic mankind and Christian mankind, Barth speaks of human nature as it is represented by the Man Jesus Christ. Bultmann ascribes Barth's interpretation to his thesis of gospel and law, instead of law and gospel. According to Bultmann, Barth misunderstands the mythological foundation of Romans 5:12-21 as a basis for Paul's argument and reduces Christ to a concept (Idee) instead of viewing Him as a concrete, historical man.⁵³

Cullmann disagrees with other scholars on two major areas connected with the interpretation of Romans 5:12-21. He feels strongly that Paul agrees precisely with Jesus in uniting the titles Son of Man and Servant of God in the person

⁵²Ibid., pp. 151-152. Bultmann also comments that Barth overemphasizes the resurrection in these verses, mentioned only in verse 10, whereas the death should be given greater weight in this section.

⁵³Ibid., pp. 162-165. Characteristic of Bultmann's reaction to Barth's interpretation of this text, even when he agrees with him theologically, is this comment: "Wie man das aus Rm 5 herauslesen kann, ist mir unverständlich." (p. 165).

of Jesus. He denounces all those, for example, W. Bousset, who claim that both Paul and the evangelists depended on the theology of the early Church for their concepts. He denies this possibility because the Synoptic writers did not base their Christology on either the Pais or the Anthropos concept.⁵⁴

Cullmann opposes the Bultmann school for attempting to separate myth from the line of Heilsgeschichte. When events of the primal history, such as the fall of Adam, are given an existential interpretation in isolation (for example signifying the condition of sin in the world), Cullmann feels they are robbed of their New Testament significance and stripped of their character as redemptive history.⁵⁵

In addition, Cullmann comments on Karl Barth's interpretation of Romans 5. He agrees with Barth's interpretation of the importance of the Christ-Adam speculation for Paul's anthropology. However, in his view Barth does not adequately consider the chronological factor in the relation between Christ and Adam.⁵⁶ He is willing to accept Barth's interpretation that what Paul says about Adam can only be understood

⁵⁴Cullmann, Christology, p. 171.

⁵⁵Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 126-127; Cullmann, Christ and Time, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Revised edition; London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 95. Supra, p. 51, n. 41.

⁵⁶Cullmann, Christology, p. 168, n. 1.

in the light of the second Adam, Christ. This is correct because man first appears in the image of God through Jesus.⁵⁷

John 3:9-21

In his commentary on John, Bultmann discusses each verse in dialogue with other exegetes, sometimes agreeing with them and sometimes questioning their interpretations.⁵⁸ The purpose of the polemical section in this paper does not require an examination of Bultmann's reactions to each exegete. Two points of Bultmann seem to receive special stress. He is convinced that the reference to Baptism in 3:5 is a redaction of the later Church and should be removed from the Johannine text along with the mention of the Eucharist in 6:51b-58 and other sacramental overtones in John.⁵⁹ He rejects Cullmann's attempt to parallel John 3:5 with Ezekiel 36:25-27 as unlikely.⁶⁰ He also maintains that John changed the Son

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 170, n. 1.

⁵⁸Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, pp. 102-115. He refers frequently to the interpretations of Odeburg, Hirsch, Spitta, Weiss, et al. An example of a minor polemic (in terms of our purpose) would be his rejection of Odeburg's "inclusive" sense of the Son of Man in John, including Jesus' relationship with all believers (incorporation), p. 107, n. 4.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 98, n. 2; also pp. 174-177.

⁶⁰Ibid., Ergänzungsheft (1952), p. 20, Zu S. 98.

of Man myth of Gnosticism involving preexistence of souls to emphasize the glorification of Jesus and His ascension to the heavenly world.⁶¹ Therefore against Hirsch he upholds verse 14 with its hypsōthēnai as an important part of the evangelist's message, not a redaction.⁶²

Cullmann polemicizes against four interpretations of John's Gospel, most of which are held by the Bultmann school. He opposes those who deny the presence of history in John.⁶³ He rejects any view which minimizes the significance of the atonement in John and cites Bultmann as an example.⁶⁴ He considers it blind exegesis to ignore the presence of future eschatology in John.⁶⁵ He believes that in John the Lord is present with the Christian community especially in the two sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. He faults Bultmann for distorting the text by concentrating too exclusively on

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 107-108 and notes.

⁶²Ibid., p. 109, n. 1.

⁶³Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 50. See also Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, pp. 245-267. Supra, p. 53, n. 46.

⁶⁴Cullmann, Christology, p. 71. Supra, p. 59, n. 63.

⁶⁵Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, pp. 53-54. In the Lazarus story, Cullmann sees a clear reference to the anticipation of the resurrection at the Last Day as well as the present resurrection. He comments (p. 54): "Faith in the future resurrection at the end of the age is clearly attested in John's Gospel (6:39, 40, 44, 54; and 5:29) and it will not do to cut out all these passages with R. Bultmann as interpolations."

revelation through the Word.⁶⁶

This brief overview of polemical overtones in the three passages yields an important consideration for the detailed comparison of Bultmann and Cullmann. Cullmann seems to consider Bultmann his major opponent and therefore frequently refers to his interpretations. Bultmann, on the other hand, directly refutes Cullmann only in the Matthew passage and even there, along with other exegetes. Comparing his exegesis with Cullmann's may require inferential evidence based on his critique of other exegetes.

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 58-59 and notes. See also Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, p. 157. He again accuses Bultmann of a misunderstanding of John's Gospel because the Sacraments are excluded. He mentions more recent commentators who, following Bultmann's lead, have this erroneous interpretation: G. Bornkamm, E. Lohse.

CHAPTER V

HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY OF THE BIBLICAL WRITERS

Matthew 16:17-19

This chapter will concentrate on the historical methodology of the Biblical writers as viewed by Bultmann and Cullmann. The next chapter will focus on the historical concepts of Bultmann and Cullmann. This first section describes the historical viewpoints of the evangelists under the categories of purpose, sources, and reconstruction, followed by an analysis of Bultmann and Cullmann's understanding of the evangelists as historians.

Purpose

The evangelists write with a purpose. Bultmann indicates this conviction by describing the purposes of both Mark and Matthew in his exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19. Mark relates the story of Peter's confession and rebuke by Jesus as a member of the Hellenistic community. His purpose is to discredit the Jewish-Christian group whose founder is Peter.¹

¹Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the third German edition by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 258. Hereafter referred to as HST. Supra, p. 11, n. 11.

Matthew's purpose, on the other hand, in Bultmann's view is to uphold the position of Peter in the Christian community.²

Cullmann likewise expresses a purpose of both Matthew and Mark. Before offering a reconstruction of the rock saying, Cullmann suggests that Matthew may have included these words in the Markan context in order to correct the image of Peter as the instrument of the devil by establishing Peter as the instrument of divine revelation (16:17).³ Mark considers the event at Caesarea-Philippi of such importance that he gives it a central position in his Gospel. His purpose is to present Jesus as the suffering messiah who views the messianic expectations of His day as a satanic temptation.⁴

The purpose of the evangelists colors their reporting of events in the life of Jesus. Both Bultmann and Cullmann share this conviction in differing degrees. Bultmann analyzes the structure of the Markan context and finds extensive

²Supra, pp. 10-11. Bultmann does not dwell on the purpose of Matthew but proceeds immediately to an analysis of the original Aramaic saying. However, the inclusion of the verses in Matthew alone suggests a pro-Peter emphasis.

³Oscar Cullmann, Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Second revised and expanded edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 184. Supra, p. 40.

⁴Supra, p. 37. Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Revised edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 5-6. He explains the central importance of this Markan passage for the Christological debate in the New Testament.

evidence of Mark's editorial activity. The location, Caesarea-Philippi, is a structural device.⁵ The question-answer form used in Mark 8:27-29 is clearly secondary.⁶ With these secondary additions described, Bultmann immediately proposes a context within the Christian community and abandons any attempt to validate the Caesarea-Philippi event in the life of Jesus.⁷

Cullmann recognizes that the evangelists do color events with their purpose in writing. However, he stops short of Bultmann's skepticism about events in the life of Jesus. He notices that in the Matthew 16 passage there is a difference in the reliability of Matthew and Mark. The Matthean account seems shallow. It lacks the vividness of Mark. As a form critic, Cullmann accepts the view that the evangelists arrange single units of oral tradition which come to them without chronological or geographical sequence. Recognizing that Matthew arranges his material primarily on the basis of content and theology, he looks for the

⁵Bultmann, HST, p. 65. Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIX (1919-1920), 169. Supra, pp. 7-8 and notes.

⁶Bultmann, HST, pp. 66, 257, n. 5. Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 172. Supra, pp. 8-9 and notes.

⁷Bultmann, HST, pp. 257-258. Supra, pp. 10-11.

presence of a theological or structural reason for inserting verses 17-19 into the Caesarea-Philippi account.⁸ By contrast, the Markan account seems to contain the freshness and immediacy of an eyewitness account, perhaps the account of Peter himself. Furthermore, Mark seems to preserve the uniqueness of the Caesarea-Philippi event by giving it central significance.⁹ Cullmann thinks it likely that Mark has substantially preserved the memory of an event in the life of Jesus which is of great importance for an understanding of Jesus' messianic consciousness.¹⁰

Sources

The evangelists make use of sources from earlier Christian communities. It is interesting to note that on this particular text Bultmann and Cullmann agree on the source--an Aramaic saying coming from the Urgemeinde.¹¹ This is

⁸Cullmann, Peter, pp. 181-182. Supra, 38-39.

⁹Cullmann, Peter, pp. 177, 180. Supra, p. 36.

¹⁰Cullmann, Christology, pp. 122-125.

¹¹Needless to say, Bultmann and Cullmann do not always agree on the nature of sources. One example of a difference comes out in Cullmann's Christology, pp. 60-79, where Cullmann finds evidence of Jesus as the ebed Yahweh in the Passion Predictions which Bultmann ascribes to late Hellenistic Christianity. Cullmann, on the other hand, feels that this thrust is characteristic of a very early form of Christianity deriving its theology from Peter.

remarkable in view of their very different conclusions on the nature and significance of the saying.¹² Bultmann goes into extensive detail on the Semitic character of Matthew 16:17-19. He treats such words as makarios ei, Simōn Bariōna, sarx kai haima, petros--petros, pylai hadou, and dēsai--lysaī.¹³ He spends considerable time demonstrating how the ekklēsia of the eschatological community differs from the organized church of later Hellenism.¹⁴ In his chapter on the genuineness and meaning of the rock saying, Cullmann also discusses the Semitic character of Matthew 16:17-19 and the use of ekklēsia in the early Church as well as in the life of Jesus.¹⁵

The earliest sources reflect the problems of the Urgemeinde. Bultmann holds this conviction more strongly than Cullmann, although the latter would probably not reject it in principle. With his reconstruction of the original saying (the Markan context minus editorial additions plus Matthew 16:17-19 as the ending), Bultmann sees an important confession of the early Church. Jesus' blessing of Peter constitutes the Urgemeinde's witness that their messianic

¹²Infra, p. 91.

¹³Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," pp. 170-171. Supra, p. 12.

¹⁴Bultmann, HST, pp. 139-141. Supra, pp. 13-14.

¹⁵Cullmann, Peter, pp. 192-217.

faith is based on Peter's Easter experience. Facing the threat of unbelief in their own day, these early Christians, following Peter's Easter confession, make a new confession of faith in Jesus as the coming messiah. They recognize Peter as the authority in the new community because of his foundational confession.¹⁶

In this text Cullmann does not discuss the problems of the Urgemeinde independently, but only in connection with the setting of Matthew 16 in the life of Jesus. However, he does on other occasions place emphasis on the problems of early Christianity.¹⁷

The earliest sources reflect words and events from the life of Jesus. While Bultmann denies any continuity between the Urgemeinde and the events of the life of Jesus for this passage, Cullmann insists upon a continuity. His main reason for tracing the origin of the rock saying to the life of Jesus is the Aramaic character of the passage which places

¹⁶Supra, p. 15.

¹⁷His book Peter has a section on the role of Peter in the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem (pp. 34-57). Similarly Cullmann recognizes in his Christology the various Christological debates taking place in the early Church. An example would be the role of the pais Christology in the early Church (pp. 69-79). See also his significant book: Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, translated from the German by J. K. S. Raid (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949). In this work, he describes the structure, setting, and content of certain early Christological creeds.

it in the Palestinian community. Since the saying reflects a favorable attitude toward Peter, Cullmann feels that it must have been transmitted at a time when Peter was still in Jerusalem before becoming active in the Jewish Christian mission.¹⁸ He then proceeds to discuss the word ekklēsia as a Jewish messianic term which includes the conception of a messianic community.¹⁹ Because Jesus had a messianic consciousness during his lifetime according to the early Church,²⁰ it is reasonable to believe that he also founded an eschatological community by choosing twelve disciples and giving them a mission. The community was mostly built up after his death on the basis of the new covenant.²¹ About the probability of the rock saying's having originated with Jesus,

¹⁸Cullmann, Peter, pp. 192-193. In an earlier chapter (pp. 34-57), Cullmann has presented the view that Peter remained as head of the Jerusalem Church for a relatively short time before becoming head of the Jewish Christian mission and relinquishing leadership of the Jerusalem Church to James.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 194-196.

²⁰Cullmann, Christology, p. 8. Cullmann here as in other places faults Bultmann for rejecting Jesus' Messianic consciousness a priori. Recognizing Jesus as the Son of Man-Suffering Servant of God, Cullmann feels compelled to accept the Messianic consciousness of Jesus because the early Church believed that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah.

²¹Cullmann, Peter, pp. 196-207. Supra, pp. 42-43. Contra Schweitzer, Cullmann finds an already--not yet tension in Jesus' life which allowed for founding a Messianic community. He discusses a number of terms related to ekklēsia (for example, rock, flock) to bolster his point.

Cullmann makes this significant comment:

The very early character of the tradition, which is vouched for by the Palestinian character of the verses, naturally does not prove beyond question that the utterance must come from Jesus, but it nevertheless is an important presupposition for that conclusion.²²

Bultmann denies Jesus' messianic consciousness and the idea that Jesus founded an ekklēsia during his lifetime, just as vigorously as Cullmann defends it. Mainly Bultmann objects to the idea that Jesus was merely the leader of a synagogue instead of the proclaimer of an eschatological Kingdom of God coming in the future.²³ Jesus was a prophet and not a king who looked for the coming of a Son of Man in the future. He could not have regarded Himself as the messiah.²⁴

Reconstruction

The Synoptic material permits a reconstruction of the sources. Both Bultmann and Cullmann share this conviction simply because they practice form criticism which seeks the

²²Cullmann, Peter, p. 193.

²³Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt. 16, 17-19," Theologische Blätter, XX (1941), 265-280. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 4-11. Hereafter referred to as TNT. Supra, p. 13.

²⁴For an enunciation of Bultmann's view on Jesus' Messianic consciousness, see Bultmann, TNT, I, 26-32.

setting for the sources lying behind the Synoptic tradition.²⁵ Bultmann employs the technique of reconstruction to determine the setting in the early Christian community. In this text he describes the problems of the Urgemeinde.²⁶ Cullmann on the other hand tries to reconstruct the original setting in the life of Jesus. In this text he demonstrates his confidence that the original setting can be determined by piecing together clues in the Synoptic tradition and John. He establishes the original setting in the passion story and links together the last supper, a confession of Jesus as the Son of God, a rebuke of Peter, and his commissioning. He arrives at this reconstruction by using Matthew 16:17-19, John 6:66-69, Luke 22:31, and John 21.²⁷

Analysis

The purpose of this section is not to provide an alternative interpretation of Matthew 16:17-19. Instead questions are asked regarding Cullmann's and Bultmann's methodology.

First, their convictions about purpose are examined, the fact that the evangelists had a purpose and that their purpose colored the reporting of events in the life of Jesus.

²⁵Bultmann, HST, pp. 107. Cullmann, Peter, p. 176.

²⁶Supra, pp. 14-15, 87-88.

²⁷Supra, pp. 40-41.

Of Bultmann the following questions should be asked. Bultmann rejects the possibility of a connection in the life of Jesus on the basis of Mark's editorial activity. From his commentary on the text there is no indication that these questions are considered. Could the Caesarea-Philippi event have happened but in a different setting than the one described by Mark? Some prior questions need to be asked about Mark's editorial activity. On what basis is Jesus' rebuke of Peter in Mark considered editorial activity? Even if the recurring verses about the passion prediction are editorial, does it follow that the rebuke verse, which occurs only at this point in Mark, is editorial? Does the question-answer form used in Mark automatically indicate a secondary addition? Bultmann opposes the rabbinic dialogue form to Socratic and/or modern psychological questioning. Are there other alternatives? Is Jesus bound to a rabbinic form of questioning? Perhaps the central question about the editorial work is this: Could Mark's editorial work be based on eyewitness or other reliable knowledge of events in the life of Jesus? If Matthew reflects a pro-Peter purpose, why does he also include Jesus' passion prediction and rebuke of Peter?

Certain questions must also be asked of Cullmann: On what basis is Mark a more reliable witness of Peter's confession than Matthew is? Does not Mark also apply theological concerns to his structuring of the material? What besides

the Papias tradition about Mark's interpreting Peter provides a reason for suspecting an eyewitness account of the Caesarea-Philippi event? Vividness and freshness are elusive qualities in a writer's style. Mark makes the Caesarea-Philippi incident central to his account. What if the Caesarea-Philippi event was not central to Jesus' life but more accurately described in Matthew or not accurately described by any of the evangelists? Is Jesus' reserve toward the Messiah title a Markan characteristic primarily or a reaction of Jesus? Where does the seemingly editorial quality of the passion predictions and command to secrecy fit into this picture?

Secondly, Bultmann's and Cullmann's convictions about sources are reviewed. Bultmann considers Matthew 16:17-19 the original ending to the story of Peter's confession in the Urgemeinde. If this is the case, can Aramaic expressions be found in the first part of the story to correspond with the many Aramaic expressions in Matthew 16:17-19? By the same token, can Cullmann find Aramaic characteristics in Luke 22:31 or in any of the correlate passages which help to establish the original setting for Peter's confession and blessing in the life of Jesus? Is there any reason why Jesus could not have rebuked Peter for a wrong understanding of His mission (even without considering the question of Jesus' messianic consciousness)? Bultmann makes the statement that only the Urgemeinde held the view of Peter described

in Matthew 16:17-19. Could not this view fit also the later Church at least in part? If it fits only the Urgemeinde, why does Matthew use it? Does Cullmann consider the problems of the Urgemeinde in this text? Does the evidence support either Bultmann's or Cullmann's contradictory views about the ekklēsia and the messianic consciousness of Jesus? Can the same evidence be used with equal validity for both? Is Cullmann's reconstruction of the original setting for the rock saying correct? Are all of the necessary historical clues available in the Synoptic materials?

Romans 5:12-21

Purpose

This second section describes Bultmann's and Cullmann's understanding of Paul's purpose for writing Romans 5 and his use of sources. For Bultmann Paul writes this chapter to demonstrate that life is not only a future hope but actually a present reality in Christ. He argues against the Jewish position that life will only come in the future. Romans 5:12-21 particularly stresses that the future hope is already being realized in the present.²⁸ In God's Son this life is present. His obedience has overcome disobedience; God's free gift in Him has overcome God's judgment against sin.

²⁸Supra, pp. 15-18.

In other words, new life which can overcome death is possible in Christ.²⁹

For Cullmann Paul's purpose in Romans 5:12-21 is to present Christ's atoning sacrifice as the only payment for Adam's sin. Paul is concerned to relate Christ's saving activity to God's total revelation which includes creation and the giving of the law in the face of man's continued disobedience. Paul seeks to solve the Adam problem of Judaism and reject all erroneous notions of a perfect first man who remained unblemished.³⁰

Sources

For Bultmann Paul employs the terminology of Gnostic mythology in order to emphasize his theme of the present character of life. Basically the Gnostic mythology which he uses stems from the thought world of Hellenism. Paul calls Gnostic terminology into his service in order to speak convincingly to Hellenistic ears. Within the context of the Kyrios-cult, Christianity and Gnosticism combined to express the doctrine of redemption.³¹ While Gnostic motifs are

²⁹Bultmann, "Adam und Christus nach Rm. 5," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1959), 155-160.

³⁰Supra, pp. 44-45, 49-52.

³¹Bultmann, TNT, I, 164. Paul contrasts the Gnostic terminology of Romans 5:12-21 with the cultic-juridical

helpful to Paul to express his eschatological message, he also finds it necessary to correct them in a number of instances.³²

While Paul corrects this Gnostic myth in various ways,³³ he still describes Christ as a preexistent being, the Son of the Father, who by his cosmic redemption makes it possible for all believers to return to a celestial realm of light.³⁴ Paul combines this non-historical myth of preexistence with a conviction that God worked through a concrete figure of history, Jesus of Nazareth.³⁵ Most important for the interpretation of Romans 5:12-21 is the fact that Paul uses this combination of myth and history in the service of his purpose: to demonstrate that life is a present reality for all believers.³⁶

terminology of 5:1-11 and refuses to mix the two actions except to present the common theme of life in the present. Supra, p. 18.

³²Supra, pp. 20-24.

³³He transforms the Gnostic mythology by asserting man's responsibility and by an heilsgeschichtlich emphasis on the relationship between the era of sin and the era of grace. Supra, p. 24.

³⁴Rudolf Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth, edited by Hans Werner Bartsch, revised translation by Reginald H. Fuller (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 8.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 34-35. He implies that Paul's demythologizing of the Gnostic myth needs to be further demythologized to arrive at the significance of the event.

³⁶Supra, p. 24.

Cullmann maintains that Paul uses concepts taken from the thought world of esoteric Judaism in his exposition of the Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5:12-21. These Jewish speculations attempt to identify the Son of Man with Adam, an impossible task. In the background of the Romans passage stand the various attempts to solve the Adam problem in Judaism.³⁷ The Book of Enoch which treats of the Son of Man doesn't mention Adam's sin, even though describing the history of the world from creation to the establishment of the messianic kingdom. The Pseudo-Clementine writings of Gnostic Jewish Christians glorify the figure of Adam and call the account of Adam's fall a lie. Philo of Alexandria tries to solve the problem by postulating two Adams, one created in the image of God and the other made of the dust of the ground.³⁸

According to Cullmann, then, a combination of sources form the background for his interpretation of the Adam-Christ parallel: (1) Specifically Jewish thought about an eschatological heavenly man who will appear only at the end of time;³⁹ (2) Jewish Christian Gnostic thought which traces the original true prophet through a series of incarnations

³⁷Cullmann, Christology, pp. 166-167.

³⁸Supra, pp. 47-48.

³⁹Cullmann, Christology, pp. 139-142.

(Adam, Abraham, Moses, Jesus);⁴⁰ (3) Philonic thought of a basically Greek character which postulates a heavenly man from the beginning, leaving no room for historical development;⁴¹ (4) Extra-Jewish Gnosticism with its preexistent redeemer coming to earth and returning to heaven.⁴²

Paul rejects all of the above speculations even though he uses the terminology of Judaism. He stresses the incarnation of the Son of Man, Jesus Christ. No Jewish or extra-Jewish speculation included the concept of an incarnation. Basing his Christology on the messianic consciousness of Jesus, Paul combines the titles Son of Man and Suffering Servant to present the theme of representative redemption by suffering. The second Adam by His atonement overpowered the sin of the first Adam and exhibited the image of God.⁴³ In other words, Paul changes his sources with a new concept of redemption by atonement. The myth of Adam's fall is important as an event connected to Paul's time line of salvation which centers in the historical event of Jesus Christ, the second Adam.⁴⁴

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 147-148; 38-42.

⁴¹Ibid., pp. 148-150.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 151-152; 172-173.

⁴³Supra, pp. 51-52.

⁴⁴Supra, pp. 51-52 and notes 41-42.

Analysis

A direct comparison of Bultmann and Cullmann on Romans 5:12-21 is difficult because their individual interpretations do not take the same tack and because Bultmann's polemic is specifically directed against Barth.⁴⁵ The following differences can be sketched nevertheless; First, Bultmann maintains that Paul relies on a Gnostic redeemer myth. Cullmann maintains that Paul uses the speculations of esoteric Judaism, combining both Jewish (eschatological Son of Man) and Gnostic (original man) speculation. Cullmann further adds as a source the specific teaching of Jesus about Himself as Son of Man and Suffering Servant of God. Perhaps Cullmann stresses the Jewish origin of Paul's source so that he can demonstrate a continuity between the thought of Jesus and the thought of Paul, based on the Christological problems of Judaism.⁴⁶ Furthermore, Cullmann feels that the Gnostic myth

⁴⁵Supra, pp. 77-79.

⁴⁶In laying the groundwork for his discussion on Christological titles, Cullmann explains that early Christians had at their disposal various Christological titles from Judaism. Their early reflections on Jesus were based on questions such as these: "To what extent did Jesus fulfil what these concepts implied? At what point does his work stand in contradiction to analogous concepts and views which may have been attached to the same expression in Judaism?" Cullmann, Christology, pp. 4-5. In his chapter on Jesus the Son of Man, Cullmann discusses all non-Jewish speculations under Judaism because he claims that neither Jesus nor the early Church were influenced directly by these concepts, but only through Judaism. Ibid., p. 138. The continuity between Jesus and

contains no notion of a redemption from sin.⁴⁷ Bultmann in his interpretation of this passage does not consider the possibility of a Jewish background for these verses.⁴⁸

Secondly, Bultmann maintains that Paul subsumes everything under his existential purpose of demonstrating the present character of life. Cullmann, by contrast, stresses Christ's atonement as the new happening in the time line of God's plan leading from Adam to Christ. For Bultmann the mythical language of Gnosticism is important only to emphasize this existential purpose.⁴⁹ For Cullmann the mythical language of Adam's fall is important to the time line, and the mythical language about the second Adam is changed by Paul to stress the incarnation and historical atonement of

Paul according to Cullmann consists of their similar answer to the Christological problems of Judaism. Ibid., p. 171.

⁴⁷Cullmann maintains that the descending-ascending Heavenly Man of Gnostic Hellenism is not enough for Jewish and Christian theology which needs an atonement for sin. Ibid., pp. 172-173. In another section, he asserts that the Heavenly Man of extra-Jewish Gnosticism knows even less of a genuine incarnation than does esoteric Judaism because the redeemer never enters history but is only disguised as a man. Ibid., pp. 151-152.

⁴⁸While Bultmann does not comment on esoteric Jewish speculations, he does attack Barth for mixing cultic-juridical Jewish terminology of Romans 5:1-11 with the Gnostic terminology of verses 12-21. Bultmann, "Adam und Christus," pp. 151-152.

⁴⁹Supra, p. 20. Bultmann's mention of Heilsgeschichte in Romans 5 will be discussed in Chapter VI of this paper.

the Son of Man-Suffering Servant.⁵⁰

The following questions should be asked of Bultmann and Cullmann: Does Cullmann clearly distinguish between the various strands of Judaism? For example, he uses Philo as a background source for Paul, suggesting without presenting evidence, that Philo may have taken his theory from the Jewish rabbis.⁵¹ Can Bultmann apply the Gnostic redeemer myth to Romans 5:12-21 as the main source of Paul or is the picture more complex? Does Cullmann sufficiently emphasize Paul's anthropological theme of life present in Christ? Does Bultmann adequately treat the Christological role of Jesus in Romans 5?

John 3:9-21

Purpose

Both Bultmann and Cullmann would basically agree that the theme of John is faith in Christ. Bultmann emphasizes primarily faith in Christ while Bultmann usually describes faith in Christ as the eschatological occurrence which demands faith now.⁵² Cullmann uses the words of John 30:31 to express his conception of John's purpose: "That ye might believe that

⁵⁰Supra, pp. 49-52.

⁵¹Cullmann, Christology, p. 150.

⁵²Supra, pp. 30-31.

Jesus is the Christ."⁵³

For Bultmann John presents Jesus as the krisis which demands faith or unbelief. He both proclaims the Word of God and represents in His own person the Word of God. Bultmann calls Him both the Revealer and the Revelation. John has no interest in the historical facts of Jesus' life except the fact that He was obedient to the Father all during his life and that He was glorified in His death.⁵⁴

Cullmann considers the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus to be of great importance to John as he explains their significance in the whole history of salvation.⁵⁵

John uses both history and symbol as he writes. The symbolic portions serve to relate Jesus' historical life to previous and subsequent events in the history of salvation.⁵⁶ Whereas Bultmann stresses Jesus as the Word, Cullmann finds an important emphasis on the sacraments as well, especially Baptism in John 3. These sacraments make Christ present for all believers.⁵⁷

⁵³Supra, p. 53.

⁵⁴Supra, pp. 30-34.

⁵⁵Supra, p. 53.

⁵⁶Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, translated from the German and the French by A. Steward Todd and James B. Torrance (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), p. 56.

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 58-59.

Sources

In Bultmann's view John lives and writes in the thought-world of Gnosticism.⁵⁸ He uses a special source called the Offenbarungsreden along with Synoptic material and a source containing miracle stories.⁵⁹ This source is used extensively in John 3. The Offenbarungsreden, reflected in such words as gennēthē anōthen, epigeia-epourania, and skotos-phōs, contain a Gnostic cosmology of preexistent souls and a Gnostic redeemer sent on a mission to earth as Revealer of God.⁶⁰ John eliminates the Gnostic cosmology and centers attention on the man Jesus who brings the Word of God to men in His own person, calling for a decision of faith.⁶¹ The reference to Baptism in 3:5 is considered a later redaction, foreign to John's present eschatology.⁶²

Cullmann's use of sources in the John 3 passage does not seem to differ too radically from Bultmann's. Cullmann postulates a special connection between John and esoteric

⁵⁸Bultmann, TNT, II, 10-14. Bultmann is ready to admit, in light of recent discoveries, that the Gnostic influence to which John was exposed might have come from a pre-Christian gnosticizing Judaism (p. 13, note).

⁵⁹Supra, pp. 26-27.

⁶⁰Supra, pp. 27-28.

⁶¹Supra, pp. 30-34.

⁶²Supra, p. 80.

Judaism through a community of Palestinian Hellenists akin to Stephen in the Book of Acts.⁶³ This connection exposes John to the same sort of Jewish speculations about the Son of Man described in the Romans 5 passage.⁶⁴ Cullmann recognizes the presence of a myth about a preexistent Son of Man who comes to earth and returns to the heavenly realm after gloriously completing his mission.⁶⁵ While Bultmann might stress different details (for example, cosmology involving preexistence of souls), he generally paints the same picture regarding the Son of Man in John 3. Cullmann maintains that John uses this mythological Son of Man language to proclaim the glorification of the resurrected and ascended Christ⁶⁶ and that he joins with the Son of Man concept the concept of a Suffering Servant of God to proclaim the atoning death of Jesus.⁶⁷ As evidence he points to John's double use of the words hypsōthēnai and edōken.⁶⁸ Although Bultmann

⁶³Supra, pp. 54-55.

⁶⁴Supra, pp. 45-48, 97-98.

⁶⁵Cullmann, Christology, p. 185.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 70.

⁶⁸Oscar Cullmann, "Der johanneische Gebrauch Doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel, IV (1948), 365-366.

does not entirely exclude a reference to the cross in these two words,⁶⁹ he finds little emphasis in John on a juridical atonement.⁷⁰

Analysis

Bultmann and Cullmann's differences in their interpretation of John 3:9-21 seem to originate from their different conceptions of the purpose of John. They have slightly different concepts of the sources used by John, but these differences do not account for their divergent interpretations. The following questions should be posed: Is there tangible evidence for the presence of a Suffering Servant title in John 3 as Cullmann suggests? Does John's present eschatology override his historical and Christological concerns as Bultmann suggests? What is the role of Baptism in John 3? Should it be the main orientation for the entire chapter (Cullmann) or should it be completely eliminated (Bultmann)?

Reflections on the Biblical Writers as Historians

Our examination of Bultmann and Cullmann's interpretation

⁶⁹Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Zweite Abteilung, II Band in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, edited by Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952), p. 110, notes 2 and 5.

⁷⁰Bultmann, TNT, II, 53-55.

of Matthew 16:17-19, Romans 5:12-21, and John 3:9-21 leads to the following reflections. In the Matthew 16 passage the question of sources seems most important. A different selection and structuring of sources within the community lead Bultmann and Cullmann to widely differing conclusions. The source question also involves certain assumptions about the life of Jesus and the transmission of reliable historical materials. The decision as to the purpose of Matthew, Mark, the Urgemeinde, and Jesus depends to a great extent on the decision about the nature of the sources. In the Romans 5 passage, both purpose and sources are important. Is Paul answering the Jewish question about the presence or futurity of the gift of life? Or is he writing to solve the Adam problem of Judaism? The answer to that question depends partly on the whole structure of Romans and partly on the sources-- Jewish, Hellenistic, or some combination--which lie in the background. In the John 3 passage, the purpose of the evangelist is of greatest importance. The different emphasis by Bultmann and Cullmann respectively on faith and Christ depends more upon John's purpose in writing than upon his use of sources. On none of the three passages are Bultmann and Cullmann in complete disagreement. The Matthew passage brings out the most direct conflict. In the other two passages, their differences are less pronounced.

CHAPTER VI

HISTORICAL CONCEPTS OF BULTMANN AND CULLMANN

This chapter will explore the familiar historical concepts of Bultmann and Cullmann as they appear in the three passages under investigation. While Chapter V concentrated on the methodology of the Biblical writers according to Bultmann and Cullmann, this chapter will probe relationships between their specific exegetical methodology and the larger concepts of Historie and Geschichte, eschatology, Heilsgeschichte, and demythologizing. The final two portions of this chapter examine (1) instances of obedience to the Biblical text despite disagreement with their concepts of history and (2) "necessary" interpretations of a non-exegetical nature.

Historie and Geschichte

Bultmann

The specific issue is the sharp differentiation between Historie and Geschichte enunciated in the nineteenth century by Martin Kähler.¹ For the purposes of this study, Historie

¹Martin Kähler, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1894), edited by E. Wolf (Third edition; München: C. Kaiser,

refers to the role of fact in history and Geschichte to the role of meaning or significance.² Without attempting to give

1961). English translation: Martin Kähler, The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ, translated and edited by Carl E. Braaten (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1964). Kähler makes a distinction between the historische Jesus of the nineteenth century liberal historians and the geschichtliche Christ of the Biblical writers. He does not by this distinction sever fact from meaning but rather rejects a faith based on the historical attempts of biographers. Believing that the New Testament documents are intended for preaching, he nevertheless feels that an historical picture of Jesus does penetrate the kerygma even though not of a biographical character. For discussions of Kähler's distinctions between Historie and Geschichte see Paul Althaus, Fact and Faith in the Kerygma of Today, translated from the German by David Cairns (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), pp. 19-37; Carl E. Braaten, "Martin Kähler on the Historic Biblical Christ," The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ, edited by Carl E. Braaten and Roy Harrisville (New York: Abingdon Press, 1964), pp. 79-105.

²The terms Historie and Geschichte are used differently by different theologians, making a uniform definition difficult. One definition would establish Historie as mere fact without future significance and Geschichte as an event of the past with great significance for the future. See John H. Elliott, "The Historical Jesus, the Kerygmatic Christ, and the Eschatological Community," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXVII (September 1966), 479. However, the central issue in current systematic debate seems to revolve around a split between fact and meaning. See Hermann Diem, Dogmatics, translated from the German by Harold Knight (Edinburgh and London: Oliver Boyd, 1959), pp. 63-81; Carl E. Braaten, History and Hermeneutics, volume II in New Directions in Theology Today, edited by William Hordern (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 33-52. In a section on existentialist historiography Braaten comments: "The existentialist concept of history, classically represented in the theology of Rudolf Bultmann, provides us with a convenient bifocal view of historical reality that places historical facts and existential faith out of reach from each other. There can be no conflict between the findings of the historical scientist, however negative, and the concerns of faith." (p. 37).

Bultmann's or Cullmann's definitions of these two terms on the basis of their complete writings, we search for clues to their understanding of these concepts in their exegesis.

First, Bultmann seems to acknowledge a clear-cut distinction between Historie and Geschichte so that a given event might be Geschichte without being Historie.³ This emphasis is particularly evident in his treatment of Peter's confession in Matthew 16:17-19. He establishes with extensive argumentation that the saying is not genuine but combines a confession of the Urgemeinde with the editorial work of the evangelist.⁴ Convinced that the proper setting for the saying is the Urgemeinde, Bultmann concludes that the basis for the faith of the early Church is Peter's Easter experience. On the strength of his confession alone the eschatological community makes the same confession of faith in Jesus' messiahship.⁵ By saying that the messianic consciousness of Jesus cannot be established in the Synoptic tradition, Bultmann in effect lays aside the historical basis for Peter's confession. By emphasizing the Urgemeinde's need to decide anew for the messiah, he infers that their confession

³Bultmann does not specifically talk of this distinction in any of the three texts.

⁴Supra, pp. 7-15.

⁵Rudolf Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIX (1919-1920), 173.

was based solely on Peter's Easter experience which perhaps had no basis in fact. Whether Peter's confession is based on fact (Historie) is unimportant.⁶ What is important is that his confession was of great significance (Geschichte) for the Urgemeinde because they gained a new self-understanding by facing the same decision of faith.⁷

Secondly, Bultmann seems to insist on a separation between Historie and Geschichte in order to preserve the existential character of faith. He is concerned above all, for example, to describe the Urgemeinde as an eschatological congregation. Any attempt to explain their origin in the life of Jesus causes him to react with alarm. If Jesus founded the community, they are merely a synagogue following a religious leader instead of as eschatological community open to the future.⁸ Bultmann explains the necessary reaction of the believer to the question of Jesus' messianic consciousness as follows:

⁶Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 26. Hereafter referred to as TNT.

⁷Supra, pp. 15-16.

⁸Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the third German edition by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 140-141. Hereafter referred to as HST.

In discussing this question it is important to bear in mind that if the fact should be established that Jesus was conscious of being the Messiah, or the Son of Man, that would only establish a historical fact, not prove an article of faith.⁹

In other words, Historie and Geschichte must be separated both for historical reasons and for reasons of faith. However, in both the Romans text and the John text, Bultmann does assert one historical fact: Jesus' life and death.¹⁰ In Romans 5 Jesus' death is the source of present life.¹¹ In John 5 Jesus is the bearer of God's Revelation.¹²

Cullmann

Cullmann also seems to draw a distinction between Historie and Geschichte so that a given event might be Geschichte without being Historie. For example, in the Romans 5 passage Cullmann stands ready to consider the account of Adam's fall a myth because it comes from the period of primal history.¹³

⁹Bultmann, TNT, I, 26.

¹⁰Because Bultmann maintains this one "brutum factum," Schubert Ogden and Fritz Buri accuse him of being inconsistent and making faith dependent on history after all. See Schubert M. Ogden, Christ Without Myth (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961); John Macquarrie, The Scope of Demythologizing (London: SCM Press, 1960), pp. 129-153. In this chapter Macquarrie discusses Buri's criticism of Bultmann.

¹¹Supra, pp. 15-24.

¹²Supra, pp. 30-34.

¹³Oscar Cullmann, Christ and Time, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Revised edition; London: SCM Press, 1962), p. 95.

One difference between Bultmann and Cullmann is that the latter has a broader conception of Geschichte than does Bultmann. While for Bultmann Geschichte involves those events significant for gaining an existential self-understanding,¹⁴ Geschichte for Cullmann includes all those events significant to the Biblical writers on the time-line of salvation history.¹⁵ Thus the myth of Adam's fall is Geschichte because it records an event which happened before the coming of Jesus Christ. It is not intended to describe the condition of sin but rather sin as an event which requires a later salvation event.¹⁶

Along with his wider understanding of Geschichte, Cullmann also attempts to demonstrate that in many cases Geschichte is clearly based on Historie. A good example of this attempt is his treatment of Matthew 16:17-19. The Caesarea-Philippi narrative in Mark seems to bear traces of

¹⁴For an example of Bultmann's linking existential self-understanding with the significance of events (although he doesn't specifically discuss it in the Historie-Geschichte terminology) see Rudolf Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth, edited by Hans Werner Bartsch, revised translation by Reginald H. Fuller (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), pp. 1-44, especially 17-44.

¹⁵For an example of Cullmann's approach to Geschichte in a wider sense, see Oscar Cullmann, "Rudolf Bultmann's Concept of Myth and the New Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVII (January 1956), 13-24.

¹⁶Supra, pp. 50-52.

an eyewitness account (Peter?).¹⁷ The Semitic character of Matthew 16:17-19¹⁸ suggests his messianic consciousness.¹⁹ It is likely that He founded a messianic ekklēsia with His disciples as the nucleus.²⁰ A similar attempt is made in Cullmann's interpretation of John as a book which relates historical events in the life of Jesus to events in the history of salvation.²¹ The use of hypsōthēnai and edōken connects Jesus' incarnation, atoning death, and ascension into heaven.²² In short, Cullmann separates Historie and Geschichte but maintains the significance of a wide number of New Testament events and attempts to ground as many of the events as possible in Historie.

¹⁷Supra, pp. 35-36.

¹⁸Supra, p. 42.

¹⁹Oscar Cullmann, Peter: Disciples, Apostle, Martyr, translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson (Second revised and expanded edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), p. 196. See also Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (Revised edition; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), pp. 152-164.

²⁰Supra, p. 42.

²¹Supra, pp. 52-54.

²²Supra, pp. 58-59.

Eschatology

Bultmann

The second historical concept is eschatology.²³ Traditionally placed as the last chapter in dogmatics, it received emphasis at the beginning of this century through the writing of Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer. Central among the concerns in current eschatological discussion are the following questions. How did eschatological thinking develop in the New Testament? How is eschatology meaningful to the modern mind?²⁴ Two approaches to the problem of eschatology are represented respectively by Bultmann (existentialist eschatology) and Cullmann (heilsgeschichtlich eschatology).²⁵ This section attempts to construct their views of eschatology on the basis of their exegesis of Matthew 16, Romans 5, and John 3.

Bultmann gives evidence of his concept of eschatology in all three passages. In Matthew 16:17-19 he insists on

²³A very helpful summary of the current discussions on eschatology is provided in chapter 7 of Braaten, History and Hermeneutics, pp. 160-179.

²⁴Ibid., p. 161.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 166-172; 165-166. Braaten further enumerates the following categories: Consistent eschatology (Schweitzer, Martin Werner, and Fritz Buri); Realized eschatology (C. H. Dodd); Dialectical eschatology (Paul Althaus, Karl Barth, and Emil Brunner).

the eschatological character of the Urgemeinde. They are to make the decision of faith in the presence of unbelief. Their example is Peter who made the same leap of faith in his Easter confession.²⁶ In Romans 5 Bultmann sees Paul entertaining a paradoxical eschatology with a tension between the future hope and the present possession of faith. He reacts to the problem of the delayed parousia by telling the Jews that life is also a present reality. He still points, however, to the future realization of life.²⁷ In John 3 eschatology exclusively is present. Especially verses 17-19 declare the sending of the Son as the eschatological event which confronts every man with judgment, demanding a decision of belief or unbelief. Bultmann comments that both the Jewish-Christian view of eschatology as a future cosmic event and the Gnostic view of eschatology as a reuniting of sparks of light are clearly discarded by John in these verses.²⁸ As far as their central thrust is concerned, both Paul and John agree that the eschatological occurrence is already taking

²⁶ Supra, p. 14.

²⁷ Rudolf Bultmann, History and Eschatology (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), pp. 40-47. Supra, pp. 15-24.

²⁸ Bultmann, History and Eschatology, pp. 47-49. Supra, p. 33. Cullmann accuses Bultmann of ignoring references to a future eschatology in John just because it fits his own scheme. Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, translated from the German and French by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953), pp. 53-54.

place in the present.²⁹

Apparently the problem of the parousia lies behind Bultmann's comments on eschatology in these three passages.³⁰ Jesus' expectation of an imminent end of the world was disappointed in His death. The Urgemeinde maintained that same future outlook. Thus it was eschatological and not dependent on a religious leader (Jesus). Paul began to solve the problem by interpreting the future language of a coming judgment in terms of present decision. John completed the task by restricting eschatology to the present. Later the church as reflected in Acts contemplated its continued existence as part of the sweep of salvation history.³¹ This scheme generally describes Bultmann's references to eschatology in Matthew 16, Romans 5, and John 3.

Cullmann

Cullmann, by contrast, maintains in these three passages that the tension between already present and not yet fulfilled was a problem for Jesus and the early Church as well as for Paul and John. In Matthew 16:17-19 Cullmann finds a reference to Jesus' messianic consciousness. Jesus anticipates

²⁹Supra, p. 26.

³⁰Bultmann, History and Eschatology, pp. 23-55.

³¹Ibid., pp. 38-55.

the coming Kingdom of God but also recognizes that it is present in His person.³² Because Cullmann accepts Matthew 16 as a genuine saying of Jesus, he believes that Jesus foresaw a period of the Church after His death before the end.³³ He doesn't think that Jesus expected a lengthy period of time after His death before the end, but He does anticipate a brief period.³⁴

Cullmann also discusses eschatology in his treatment of the Christological title, Son of Man, related to both the Romans 5 and the John 3 passages. The Son of Man concept which Jesus used contains the notion of the coming Judge who will gather all nations to the throne for judgment. Cullmann maintains that Jesus applied this eschatological title to Himself.³⁵ Because Jesus was convinced that the Kingdom of God was already coming in His person, he was also able to apply the title Son of Man to His earthly work.³⁶ To account fully for His earthly work, Jesus combined the Son of Man title with the Servant of God title. Paul's usage of

³²Cullmann, Peter, pp. 199-201.

³³Ibid., p. 204.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 206-207. See also Oscar Cullmann, "Das wahre, durch das Ausbleiben der Parusie gestellte Problem," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel, III (1947), 177-179.

³⁵Cullmann, Christology, pp. 152-164.

³⁶Ibid., p. 159.

the Son of Man title agrees precisely with Jesus' usage.³⁷ While John emphasizes present eschatology, he stresses Jesus as the Judge and gives an overtone of future eschatology to his concern for the present.³⁸ Since Jesus' usage of the Son of Man concept carries a built-in tension between future and present eschatology, the parousia problem does not separate Jesus from the Church.³⁹ Their eschatologies are in basic agreement.⁴⁰

Heilsgeschichte

Cullmann

The term Heilsgeschichte as used today in New Testament studies is often associated with Oscar Cullmann and particularly with his book Christ and Time.⁴¹ Central to Cullmann's

³⁷Ibid., p. 171.

³⁸Ibid., p. 158.

³⁹Cullmann, Peter, p. 201.

⁴⁰In his review of Cullmann's Christ and Time, Bultmann strongly condemns him for ignoring the problem of the parousia. Rudolf Bultmann, "History of Salvation and History," Existence and Faith, edited and translated by Schubert M. Ogden (Cleveland: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1960), pp. 237-239.

⁴¹The term was prominent in the theology of the Erlangen School of the nineteenth century represented by J. C. K. von Hofmann. Hofmann wrote primarily in connection with the Old Testament. Braaten, History and Hermeneutics, pp. 19, 189-190.

concerns is the already-not yet tension⁴² in the framework of a New Testament time-line with Christ as its center. He desires to establish what is central in the Christian proclamation--namely redemptive history.⁴³ Without elaborating on his theory,⁴⁴ this section will seek references to Heilsgeschichte in Cullmann's and Bultmann's exegesis of the three passages.

The three passages indicate for Cullmann that Heilsgeschichte is a major thrust of the New Testament writers. In Matthew 16:17-19 Cullmann sees the future of the Church based on the eph hapax event of Peter's commission from the Lord.⁴⁵ In rejecting the Roman Catholic position on successors to Peter, Cullmann places Peter's confession in a perspective of Heilsgeschichte:

In opposition to Hellenism, it is characteristic of the thinking of Jesus as of all Biblical thinking that what continues has its roots in the once-for-all unique event. A historically unique event is the redemptive event; that is, it definitely cannot be

⁴²Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. xxv.

⁴³Ibid., pp. xv-xvi.

⁴⁴For a good summary of Christ and Time see Bultmann, "History of Salvation and History," pp. 226-231. For a good summary of Cullmann's theology of Heilsgeschichte see S. C. Guthrie, Jr., "Oscar Cullmann," A Handbook of Christian Theologians, edited by Dean G. Peerman and Martin E. Marty (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 338-354.

⁴⁵Supra, p. 43.

repeated but is the foundation of a continuing situation whose ongoing life derives from this never-to-be repeated event.⁴⁶

In Romans 5:12-21 Paul brings also the primal history about the fall of Adam into the history of salvation by establishing a time sequence between Christ, Moses, and Adam. Recognizing the Adam-Christ relationship as a typological one, he finds justification in calling it also heilsgeschichtlich because of the reference to the time span between Adam and Moses. In this instance the line of salvation history includes an event which is in the realm of myth. The importance of Adam's fall is attested by its incorporation into the time-line.⁴⁷

According to Cullmann's comments on the style of John, Heilsgeschichte plans an important role. John with his new understanding of the importance of Jesus Christ relates events in the life of Christ to events in the history of salvation.⁴⁸ In his specific exegesis of John 3:12-21 Cullmann alludes to salvation history only through Jesus' use of double words and through the typological reference to Moses' lifting up the serpent in the wilderness, not a direct heilsgeschichtlich reference.⁴⁹ While Cullmann's scheme of

⁴⁶Cullmann, Peter, p. 217.

⁴⁷Supra, pp. 50-52.

⁴⁸Supra, pp. 54-55.

⁴⁹Supra, pp. 57-60.

Heilsgeschichte lies in the background of the three texts, it does not seem to be central. The related subject of Christology receives more emphasis.

Bultmann

Bultmann's comments on Heilsgeschichte in the three passages come primarily in a negative form. His emphasis on the eschatological character of the early Church, which was only later forced to make provisions for the ongoing life of the Church, keeps him from espousing an heilsgeschichtlich connection between Jesus and the Church.⁵⁰ He finds no place at all for a salvation history approach in John.⁵¹ In the Romans passage, he discusses Paul's deliberate use of imagery from Heilsgeschichte. Paul uses this imagery to correct the cosmology of Gnosticism in the Adam myth.⁵² However, Bultmann does not use Heilsgeschichte in the same sense that Cullmann does. It can be considered Heilsgeschichte because a relationship is established between the two eras, the Adamitic period of sin and the Christian period of grace. The second period marks the end of history, not its continuation.⁵³

⁵⁰Supra, pp. 13-14.

⁵¹Bultmann, TNT, II, 8-9.

⁵²Supra, pp. 19, 22.

⁵³Bultmann, History and Eschatology, pp. 40-47.

Demythologizing

Bultmann

Demythologizing is usually associated with Rudolf Bultmann just as Heilsgeschichte suggests Oscar Cullmann. Although Bultmann worked with the concept almost from the beginning of his career,⁵⁴ the word rose to prominence as a result of his programmatic essay of 1941--"New Testament and Mythology."⁵⁵ Because the New Testament message is couched in the terms of a mythological cosmology (primarily Jewish apocalyptic and Gnostic redemption myths), the kerygma needs to be interpreted as an understanding of human existence.⁵⁶ This section explores traces of demythologizing in Bultmann's exegesis of the three passages and Cullmann's approach to the same material.

In Romans 5 Bultmann finds Paul engaged in the process

⁵⁴Schubert Ogden, "Introduction," Existence and Faith, edited by Schubert Ogden (Cleveland: Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, 1960), p. 11.

⁵⁵An example of the debate centering around this essay is the volume: Hans Werner Bartsch, editor, Kerygma and Myth, revised translation by Reginald H. Fuller (New York: Harper and Row, 1961). This book contains Bultmann's essay and the comments of five critics. Another recent volume bringing Bultmann's idea of the kerygma into focus is Carl E. Braaten and Roy A. Harrisville, editors, Kerygma and History (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962).

⁵⁶Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," pp. 1-6.

of demythologizing. Paul uses a Gnostic myth to emphasize the present character of life. He corrects (demythologizes?) the myth by asserting man's responsibility and his relationship to the two aeons of salvation history.⁵⁷ Bultmann, however, finds it necessary to demythologize Paul's exegesis further by untangling the confusion between Gnostic terminology and the terminology of salvation history in order to proclaim Paul's central message of life as a paradoxical present-future possession.⁵⁸

Bultmann likewise observes the process of demythologizing in John 3. John uses a Gnostic myth but rejects its cosmology regarding the preexistence of souls. John (or Bultmann) further demythologizes by removing the figure of a pre-existent Son of Man. The message is simply that the Word of God addresses men in a human being, Jesus, who speaks with authority.⁵⁹

It would seem fair to conclude that Bultmann considers demythologizing necessary for a modern understanding of the New Testament. The interpretation of Paul and John offer precedent for this practice. Bultmann's discussion of the Matthean text makes use of terms such as legend.⁶⁰ However,

⁵⁷Supra, pp. 20-24.

⁵⁸Bultmann, "New Testament and Mythology," pp. 34-35.

⁵⁹Supra, pp. 32-34.

⁶⁰Bultmann, HST, p. 30.

this seems to call for source criticism to determine the original context in the Urgemeinde rather than demythologizing to arrive at an existential meaning.

Cullmann

Cullmann opposes the process of demythologizing because he feels that it strips essential elements away from the New Testament message. His strongest objection to Bultmann's demythologizing comes in Romans 5 where he believes that the Adam event is part of Heilsgeschichte. When exegetes try to isolate myths from the scheme of Heilsgeschichte in order to give an existential interpretation, they are re-mythologizing and de-historicizing instead of de-mythologizing.⁶¹ Cullmann insists upon the historical character of John. Since for him John's symbolic discourse is intended to relate Jesus' life to Heilsgeschichte,⁶² demythologizing has no place.

Obedience to the Text

Bultmann

This section records instances in the interpretation of the three passages where Bultmann and Cullmann seem to set

⁶¹Oscar Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1965), pp. 126-127.

⁶²Supra, pp. 54-55.

aside historical concepts because they are listening faithfully to the text. This does not suggest that in all other instances they are not faithful to the text. Examples such as the following demonstrate unusual obedience to the text.

First of all, Bultmann wrestles with the question of fatalism and human responsibility in Romans 5. According to his existential presuppositions, every man is responsible to God in every moment of his existence. Recognizing that Paul presents Christ as the one who opens up the possibility of life (verse 17--"those who receive") instead of inevitably saving all men, Bultmann is tempted to assume by analogy that through Adam only the possibility of sin and death was opened up. He knows that the Gnostic myth which Paul uses is fatalistic. He wants to know whether Paul intended to change this fatalism of sin. The answer he gives indicates his obedience to the text:

Whether that may be regarded as Paul's real thought must, to be sure, remain a question; at any rate the universal fallenness of Adamitic mankind to sin and death is beyond all question to Paul.⁶³

Secondly, Bultmann shows obedience to the text in his exegesis of John 3. He treats the word hypsōthēnai which Cullmann understands in the three senses of serpent in the wilderness, Christ on the cross, and Christ ascending in glory. Bultmann's theology of John makes the atonement only

⁶³Bultmann, TNT, I, 252-253.

a minor emphasis. While John does mention the cross, the main focus is on the total life of obedience of Christ (His Erniedrigung). The whole process of his coming from the Father and going to the Father is emphasized rather than any particular event. Jesus' sacrifice comes in His total ministry, not just in His death.⁶⁴ On the basis of this understanding, one would expect Bultmann to minimize references to the cross. Cullmann who is prone to find the cross in John's Gospel to emphasize the atonement writes that except for the Passion reference in John 12:32-35 the allusion to the cross in John 3:14 could be dismissed as allegory.⁶⁵ Yet Bultmann is willing to find a reference to the cross in this passage, citing John 8:28 as a parallel. Even the fact that he applies the cross to Jesus' glorification does not detract from his obedience to the text. He writes:

Das hypsōthēnai bedeutet zunächst nichts anderes als die Rückkehr des Offenbarers aus der Welt in die himmlische Heimat. . . . Das hypsōthēnai ist zugleich das doxasthēnai . . . aber wie dieses zweideutig ist, sofern Jesu Verherrlichung durch das Kreuz erfolgt, so auch das hypsōthēnai, das zugleich die Erhöhung aus Kreuz bedeutet (8:28). Für die Evglisten ist dieser zweite Sinn auch 3:14 mitzuhören, wie v. 16 zutage kommt.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Bultmann, TNT, II, 33-69.

⁶⁵Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 51.

⁶⁶Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Zweite Abteilung, II Band in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, edited by Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952), p. 110, n. 2.

Two other examples of obedience to the text are not quite as clear-cut as the first two but nevertheless represent a faithful reading. Bultmann stresses the theme of Heilsgeschichte in Romans 5 as Paul's way of correcting the Gnostic myth.⁶⁷ He does not treat it in the same way as Cullmann.⁶⁸ He also stresses Paul's appeal to human responsibility.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the very fact that he admits the presence of salvation history in the text and explains Paul's conscious purpose for using it indicates a willingness to listen. Finally, Bultmann recognizes the Semitic character of Matthew 16:17-19. Other exegetes who protest the genuineness of Matthew 16 argue for a later origin of the saying.⁷⁰ Bultmann, on the other hand, argues for its earlier origin on the basis of Semitisms.⁷¹ While it is true that he proceeds to deny its genuineness and to discuss the saying in the context of the Urgemeinde, he records the evidence of the text against possible opposition to his view of eschatology.

⁶⁷Supra, pp. 19, 22.

⁶⁸Bultmann, History and Eschatology, pp. 40-47.

⁶⁹Supra, p. 19.

⁷⁰Cullmann, Peter, pp. 169-171. He mentions for example H. J. Holtzmann.

⁷¹Supra, pp. 12-13.

Cullmann

The most striking example of Cullmann's obedience to the text comes in his interpretation of John 3:14. With his concern for Heilsgeschichte and his heilsgeschichtlich interpretation of John's Gospel,⁷² it is remarkable that he does not use Moses' lifting up the serpent in the wilderness as a heilsgeschichtlich reference. He rather considers it to be a typological reference.⁷³ Typological examples for Cullmann parallel only two forms. They do have Heilsgeschichte lying behind them because usually the unity of the two Testaments is involved.⁷⁴ Yet Cullmann wants to avoid the possibility of an allegorical interpretation in John. He gives many examples of Moses' heilsgeschichtlich role in John but then makes the following comment about John 3:14:

Nur an wenigen Stellen wie John 3,14 ist die Verwendung das Alten Testaments eher typologisch als spezifisch heilsgeschichtlich. Dabei erinnern wir uns, dasz auch die Typologie heilsgeschichtlich fundiert ist und dasz die Grenzen fließend sind. Jedenfalls haben wir es nicht mit allegorisierender Wegdeutung des geschichtlichen Elements zu tun, und die Benützung des Alten Testaments beruht auch nicht auf einer nur mechanischen Anwendung des Schriftprinzips.⁷⁵

Cullmann finds a similar Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5

⁷²Supra, pp. 54-55.

⁷³Supra, pp. 57-60.

⁷⁴Cullmann, Heil als Geschichte, p. 111.

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 263.

but feels an heilsgeschichtlich interpretation justified because of the further reference to Moses.⁷⁶

Necessary Interpretations

Bultmann

This section considers instances where the total theological approach of Bultmann and Cullmann makes it necessary for them to interpret one of the three texts in a certain way. To need a given interpretation means more than to find it helpful to complete a concept. Need involves basic theological convictions.

First, Bultmann needs to understand the Urgemeinde as an eschatological community. Bultmann writes in his History of the Synoptic Tradition:

On the other hand I freely admit that it seems to me quite impossible to take Matthew 16:18-19 as a genuine saying of Jesus, as K. L. Schmidt wishes to do, finding in this saying the foundation of a special community. The price that has to be paid for this information is that the ekklēsia is deprived of its radically eschatological character.⁷⁷

In the footnotes he presents evidence for his conviction but also admits that a special community could regard itself as a people waiting for the appearance of the eschatological

⁷⁶Supra, pp. 50-52.

⁷⁷Bultmann, HST, p. 140.

gahal.⁷⁸ Whether his exegetical evidence (usage of gahal, intent of oikodomēsō) supports his point here is not of significance for our discussion. More important, Bultmann infers that the saying cannot be genuine, because radical eschatology is essential to the New Testament message. One is tempted to observe that his interpretation of this passage is governed more by his need for a particular view of eschatology⁷⁹ than by the exegetical evidence.

Secondly, Bultmann's view about Jesus' Messianic consciousness seems to indicate a need to separate faith from this question. On one hand it could be argued that Bultmann is relatively free of a need to establish Jesus' Messianic consciousness since his faith does not require it.⁸⁰ In

⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 140-141 and notes. Bultmann argues for a separation between the idea of a gahal and a synagōgē, the former eschatological and the second dependent on a religious leader. He admits the possibility that the two could be combined as in fact they are in the parallelism of the Psalm of Solomon (for example, 10;7). He then bases his argumentation on the future of promise--oikodomēsō. Then in a rather unclear discussion he questions the possibility that the early Church could have been a synagogue by pointing out (1) the early Church was later forced to become a synagogue but (2) the tradition shows Jesus participating in the worship of any local synagogue. Could not the primitive church look upon Jesus as their founder even though he did not organize a traditional synagogue in his own lifetime?

⁷⁹Supra, pp. 114-116. See also Bultmann, History and Eschatology.

⁸⁰For example, Ogden says of him: "However exaggerated may be the familiar claim that he is a 'radical sceptic' in basic matters of historical judgment, it can hardly be doubted

another sense, though, Bultmann perhaps needs the separation of faith from the labors of the historian, because he lacks confidence in the historical basis for the kerygma.⁸¹ He wants to make it clear that the question of Jesus' Messianic consciousness is not a vital question for faith:

The acknowledgment of Jesus as the one in whom God's Word decisively encounters man, whatever title be given him--"Messiah (Christ)," "Son of Man," "Lord"--is a pure act of faith independent of the answer to the historical question whether or not Jesus considered himself the Messiah. Only the historian can answer this question--as far as it can be answered at all--and faith, being personal decision, cannot be dependent upon a historian's labor.⁸²

These two major examples will serve to elucidate Bultmann's dependence upon certain theological convictions as he approaches the text. A third example would be his comment that Matthew 16:17-19 comes from the Urgemeinde above all because this is precisely the picture of Peter which Bultmann would construct for the Urgemeinde: "Ich meine: hier haben wir was wir suchen; Mt. 16:17-19 stammt aus der Urgemeinde und spiegelt die Bedeutung des Petrus für die Urgemeinde wieder."⁸³

that he is indeed singularly free of the defensiveness and special pleading that so frequently blight the historical work of other theologians." Ogden, "Introduction," p. 19.

⁸¹For an example of this particular criticism, see Althaus, Fact and Faith in the Kerygma of Today.

⁸²Bultmann, TNT, I, 26.

⁸³Bultmann, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein," p. 171. The argument also rests on exegetical evidence but he refers to the above reason as "vor allem aber."

Cullmann

Cullmann demonstrates certain necessary interpretations connected with his exegesis. The first would be his insistence that Jesus had a messianic consciousness upon which the Christologies of the New Testament are based. He writes in the introduction to his Christology:

But is it not illusion to think that we can have the same faith as the early Church if we accept its Christological views, but still assert that Jesus himself had no "self-consciousness" of being what we confess him to be? In reality an essential characteristic of the early Church's faith in Christ was its conviction that Jesus believed himself to be the divine Son of Man, the Servant of God, and conferred on himself this or that title of which we shall have to speak. The early Church believed in Christ's messiahship only because it believed that Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah.⁸⁴

With this basic conviction, it is understandable that the genuineness of Matthew 16:17-19 is of more than academic concern to Cullmann. The Markan narrative and the rock saying in its original setting constitute primary witnesses to Jesus' messianic consciousness as Suffering Servant and Son of God.⁸⁵ Consequently, Cullmann frequently advises his readers in defense of the genuineness of the rock saying to

⁸⁴Cullmann, Christology, p. 8.

⁸⁵The Markan narrative shows Jesus' rejection of an earthly Messiah title in favor of a suffering role. Cullmann, Peter, pp. 178-180. The rock saying indicates Jesus' acceptance of the Son of God title in the Passion Setting which causes Him to commission Peter. Ibid., p. 191.

remember that a misplaced unit of tradition may still be genuine.⁸⁶ He gives all available evidence also for the authenticity of the Markan account.⁸⁷

Secondly, Cullmann needs to establish that Jesus founded a church. No doubt this need is based on his understanding of Heilsgeschichte as the heart of the New Testament message with Jesus Christ the central figure in history to which the Church looks back for her authority.⁸⁸ Cullmann writes in connection with his discussion of the genuineness of the Matthew 16 passage:

In so far as we, in agreement with the entire gospel tradition, ascribe to Jesus the Messianic consciousness in any form whatsoever, we should have to assume, even if we had no text on the subject, that his thinking included the idea of the eschatological people of God that belonged to him.⁸⁹

While Cullmann gives some evidence about the concept of a Messianic community in Daniel connected with the Son of Man, the above statement seems to represent a stronger conviction than the exegetical evidence alone will bear. A few pages

⁸⁶Examples of this reminder of genuineness as a possibility include Ibid., pp. 176, 181, 186, 191.

⁸⁷Ibid., pp. 176-180, 185-186.

⁸⁸Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. xi-xxxi.

⁸⁹Cullmann, Peter, p. 196.

later Cullmann is refuting Schweitzer's over-simplified presentation of the sharp division in eschatology between Jesus and the Church. He makes the following comment:

But there is no conflict here at all. Rather, the fulfilment in the Church, and the fulfilment in the Church points back in turn to the fulfilment in the person of Jesus. Therefore it is not merely possible that Jesus also sees the people of God already beginning to be constituted in his day; we would almost have to postulate this even if we had no clear texts to prove it.⁹⁰

It is not easy to pinpoint Cullmann's specific theological need. His need to establish Jesus' messianic consciousness and his need to base the Church on the commission of Jesus seem interrelated in the same way that his view of Christology and his view of Heilsgeschichte are interdependent.⁹¹

Summary

All of the historical concepts discussed are closely related. Both Bultmann and Cullmann operate with a distinction between Historie and Geschichte although Cullmann tries to bridge the gap by grounding events in the life of Jesus. Bultmann's conviction of the separation between Historie and

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 201.

⁹¹Cullmann, Christology, p. 9. "There can be no Heilsgeschichte without Christology; no Christology without a Heilsgeschichte which unfolds in time." Other needs of Cullmann (for example, Heilsgeschichte in John; Suffering Servant-Son of Man combination in Romans and John) are related to these two major needs.

Geschichte finds expression in concepts of eschatology and demythologizing. Cullmann's desire to preserve the core of the Biblical message in its historical form leads to his concept of Heilsgeschichte.

Examples of obedience to the text with both exegetes demonstrate the fact that critics must deal with their exegesis, not only with their presuppositions. Examples of necessary interpretations guard against a purely exegetical evaluation of their work. Perhaps they disagree most sharply on the interpretation of Matthew 16:17-19 because this passage focuses on the area of their major theological needs. Bultmann refuses to make faith dependent on Jesus' messianic consciousness. Cullmann considers it necessary to faith. Bultmann insists on the radical eschatological nature of the Urgemeinde. Cullmann insists on a continuity between the Church and the words of Jesus to Peter.

This investigation has not attempted to criticize the historical concepts of Bultmann and Cullmann per se,⁹² but

⁹²The following categories of critical works provide a framework for a criticism of Bultmann and Cullmann's concepts of history: (1) Criticisms of their views of history in general--Althaus, Fact and Faith in the Kerygma of Today; Braaten, History and Hermeneutics; Braaten and Harrisville, The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ; Diem, Dogmatics; Arnaldo Momigliano, "Time in Ancient Historiography," History and the Concept of Time, Beiheft VI of History and Theory (1966), 1-23; Alan Richardson, History Sacred and Profane (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), especially chapters 4-8. (2) Criticism of Bultmann's theology--Braaten

instead has chosen to describe their use of these concepts in Matthew 16:17-19, Romans 5:12-21, and John 3:9-21.

and Harrisville, Kerygma and History; Ian Henderson, Rudolf Bultmann (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1966); Charles W. Kegley, editor, The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann (New York: Harper and Row, 1966); Macquarrie, The Scope of Demythologizing; L. Malevez, The Christian Message and Myth, translated from the French by Olive Wyon (London: SCM Press, 1958); Giovanni Miegge, Gospel and Myth in the Thought of Rudolf Bultmann, translated from the Italian by Stephen Neill (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1960); Ogden, Christ Without Myth. (3) Criticism of Cullmann's Theology--Erick Dinkler, "Earliest Christianity," The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), pp. 171-214; Guthrie, "Oscar Cullmann," A Handbook of Christian Theologians, pp. 338-354; John Marsh, The Fulness of Time (London: Nisbet and Co., 1952), especially the appendix: "Professor Cullmann's Christ and Time," pp. 174-181; James Barr, Biblical Words for Time, Number XXXIII in Studies in Biblical Theology (London: SCM Press, 1962); James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Exegesis

Bultmann and Cullmann differ on their interpretation of each of the three passages. In Matthew 16:17-19 Bultmann sees a debate on the authority of Peter in the Urgemeinde. Cullmann holds the view that Jesus commissions Peter as the rock of the Church.

In Romans 5:12-21 Bultmann highlights Paul's use of Gnostic terminology to establish the already present (not only future) character of life. Cullmann concentrates on Jesus' Christological roles as Son of Man-Suffering Servant to atone for Adam's sin.

In John 3:9-21 Bultmann stresses the present eschatological krisis addressed to men by the divine Word on the lips of the human Word, Jesus of Nazareth. Cullmann upholds the incarnation, atoning death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as the Christological foundation for the rebirth in Baptism.

Historical Treatment in Perspective

Part of the difference in their exegetical interpretation is explained by differing types of exegetical literature.

For example, Cullmann's theological treatment in his Christology naturally pursues a different purpose in analyzing Johannine material from the purpose of Bultmann in his commentary on John.

The presence of a polemic against various exegetical and theological positions further complicates the exegetical comparison between Bultmann and Cullmann. Bultmann's interpretation of Romans 5, for example, cannot be contrasted with Cullmann's exegesis of the passage without considering Bultmann's polemic against Barth.

Historical Methodology of the Biblical Writers

Bultmann and Cullmann's exegesis of the three passages must be viewed in the light of their understanding of the historical methodology of the Biblical writers, particularly their historical purpose and their use of sources. The question of sources is especially acute in the Matthew 16 text where a reconstruction of sources within the early Christian communities is determinative for their exegesis. The Romans 5 passage highlights both the purpose of Paul in the context of Romans and the question of extra-Biblical sources in Judaism or Hellenism. The John 3 passage centers on the purpose of the evangelist as either faith oriented or Christology oriented.

Historical Concepts of Bultmann and Cullmann

Bultmann's conviction of the separation between Historie and Geschichte and his related concepts of eschatology and demythologizing find clear expression in his exegesis of the three passages. While he needs to remain skeptical on the question of Jesus' messianic consciousness and insists on the radical eschatology of the Urgemeinde, he is willing in some instances to recognize interpretations foreign to his historical concepts.

Cullmann's desire to bridge the gap between Historie and Geschichte and his related concern for Heilsgeschichte express themselves in his exegesis of the three passages. Although willing to forego an heilsgeschichtlich interpretation of a major passage (John 3:14), he needs to uphold Jesus' messianic consciousness and the foundation of the Church on Jesus' words.

Implications for Future Studies

This investigation has established a relationship between the historical presuppositions of Bultmann and Cullmann and their exegetical interpretations of three passages from Synoptic, Pauline, and Johannine material. Further investigation of these two exegetes on a wider range of passages would help to confirm or disprove the conclusions of this paper. The standard of comparison will

undoubtedly differ with each passage considered because of type of treatment and theological issues at stake.

Similar studies might well be undertaken which compare different exegetes or a larger number of exegetes to test a wider range of historical assumptions. For example, it might be profitable to include with Bultmann and Cullmann a representative exegete from the Reformation era, the period of nineteenth century liberalism, and the current scene with its New Quest for the Historical Jesus.

Finally, it might be profitable to prepare case studies which examine a different range of presuppositions. For example, the exegesis of two or more exegetes could be compared on the basis of their presuppositions in the area of philosophy, systematic theology, or homiletical theology.

This investigation has confined itself to an examination of the historical concepts of Bultmann and Cullmann present in their exegesis of three passages. Before any wider systematic conclusions are justified, more groundwork needs to be laid by additional studies of this nature. Perhaps the critical evaluation of the exegete-at-work should be a major function of systematic theology in this twentieth century "Age of Analysis."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Adam und Christus nach Rm 5," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. L (1959), 145-165.
- : Das Evangelium des Johannes. Zweite Abteilung, II Band in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Edited by Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952.
- : "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. XIX (1919-1920), 165-174.
- : "Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt 16, 17-19," Theologische Blätter. XX (1941), 265-280.
- : Glauben und Verstehen, gesammelte Aufsätze. 3 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1961-.
- : History and Eschatology. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- : "History of Salvation and History," Existence and Faith. Edited and translated from the German by Schubert M. Ogden. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1960. Pp. 226-240.
- : The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated from the third German edition by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- : "Is Exegesis Without Presuppositions Possible?," Existence and Faith. Edited and translated from the German by Schubert M. Ogden. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1960, pp. 289-296.
- : "New Testament and Mythology," Kerygma and Myth. Edited by Hans Werner Bartsch. Revised translation by Reginald H. Fuller. New York: Harper and Row, 1961, pp. 1-44.

- . Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting. Translated from the German by Reginald H. Fuller. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1956.
- . Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated from the German by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Christ and Time. Translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson. Revised edition. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- . The Christology of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Revised edition. Philadelphia; The Westminster Press, 1963.
- . The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated from the German by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- . Early Christian Worship. Translated from the German and the French by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.
- . The Early Church, Studies in Early Christian History and Theology. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Abridged edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.
- . Heil als Geschichte. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1965.
- . "Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel. IV (1948), 360-371.
- . "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," The Expository Times. LXXI (1959-1960), 8-12, 39-43.
- . Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. Translated from the German by Floyd V. Filson. Second revised and expanded edition. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.
- . "Rudolf Bultmann's Concept of Myth and the New Testament," Concordia Theological Monthly. XXVII (January 1956), 13-24.

- . "Das wahre, durch das Ausbleiben der Parusie gestellte Problem," Theologische Zeitschrift Basel. III (1947), 177-179.

B. Secondary Sources

- Althaus, Paul. Fact and Faith in the Kerygma of Today. Translated from the German by David Cairns. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Braaten, Carl E. History and Hermeneutics. Volume II in New Directions in Theology Today. Edited by William Hordern. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.
- . "Martin Kähler on the Historic Biblical Christ," The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ. Edited by Carl E. Braaten and Roy Harrisville. New York: Abingdon Press, 1964.
- Diem, Hermann. Dogmatics. Translated from the German by Harold Knight. Edinburgh and London: Oliver Boyd, 1959.
- Elliott, John H. "The Historical Jesus, the Kerygmatic Christ, and the Eschatological Community," Concordia Theological Monthly. XXXVII (September 1966), 470-491.
- Guthrie, S. C., Jr. "Oscar Cullmann," A Handbook of Christian Theologians. Edited by Dean G. Peerman and Martin E. Marty. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1965. Pp. 338-354.
- Karrer, Otto. Peter and the Church: An Examination of Cullmann's Thesis. Translated from the German by Ronald Walls. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Lucey, William Leo. History: Methods and Interpretation. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958.
- Neill, Stephen. The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu Seinem 60. Geburtstag Ueberreicht. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962. An important bibliography of Cullmann's works is contained in this volume, pp. ix-xix.

Ogden, Schubert M. Christ Without Myth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

-----, "Introduction," Existence and Faith. Edited by Schubert M. Ogden. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1960. Pp. 9-21.

Ramm, Bernard. Protestant Biblical Interpretation. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1956.

Stern, Fritz. "Introduction," The Varieties of History from Voltaire to the Present. Edited by Fritz Stern. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1960. Pp. 11-32.

Walsh, W. H. Philosophy of History: An Introduction. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.