

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

2-1-1969

The Gospel as Formulated in the Apostolic Tradition: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Corinthians 15:1-11

David Yagow

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_yagowd@csl.edu

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

Digital Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)
Commons

Network Recommended Citation

Yagow, David, "The Gospel as Formulated in the Apostolic Tradition: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Corinthians 15:1-11" (1969). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 770.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/770>

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 Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE GOSPEL
AS FORMULATED IN THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION:
AN EXEGETICAL EXAMINATION OF I CORINTHIANS 15:1-11

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by
David Charles Yagow
February 1969

A

63942

Approved by:

Walter J. Betting
Adviser

3-3-69

**CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PERICOPE.....	1
II. THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA.....	6
III. THE ORIGIN OF THE FORMULA.....	9
IV. COMMENTARY BY VERSES.....	12
V. SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	26
FOOTNOTES.....	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	45

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PERICOPE

I Corinthians 15 is Paul's most eloquent discourse on the nature, meaning, and implications of the resurrection-- both of Jesus Christ and of all believers in him. Paul endeavors not to prove the resurrection of Christ, but to show the Corinthians that the resurrection of Jesus Christ is inseparably linked with the general resurrection of the dead.¹

Most scholars who have addressed themselves to the questions of the unity and integrity of I Corinthians 15 concur that verses one through eleven are not a discontinuous pericope, but are fundamental to Paul's careful argumentation.² Bammel states that the pericope functions as a response to a two-pronged attack: first on Paul's proclaimed gospel, secondly on his official capacity as an apostle. Bammel observes that the kerygmatic formula quoted by the apostle

verschweisst Paulus auf der sachlichen wie persönlichen Ebene auf das engste mit den anderen Aposteln. Dass sie gleichzeitig die nachfolgende Passage vorbereitet, ist eine der bei Paulus so häufigen Doppelknotungen.³

Furthermore, Bammel claims that a similar Doppeltenor is traceable in Paul's use of the verbs *παράδιδωμι* and *παράλαμβάνω*.⁴ Commenting on the first verse, Bammel writes:

Die Bestimmung, die nicht ohne Absicht an die Spitze einer Reihe gesetzt ist, bringt es zur Evidenz, dass die Korinther das

παραιδεδομένον als Evangelium aufgenommen haben; wer nicht ins Blaue hinein geglaubt hat, dem erweist sich des Paulus Wort als Evangelium, wer es behalten hat, dem weist es sich aus als dasselbe Evangelium, das seine aufrichtende und rettende Macht je und je bezeugt. Und das zweite Παραλαμβάνω bindet in ähnlicher Weise dies Evangelium und seinen Verkünder an die Mitapostel. Der Doppeltenor der Perikope wird so auch hier spuerbar.⁵

In other words, Paul's opposition had undertaken to impugn his apostleship and to undermine his gospel. Who were these opponents and what convictions informed their articles of faith?

A thorough investigation of isagogical concerns would divert us from our primary task of presenting an exposition of this text. However, one can appreciate Paul's message only if he understands the essential character of Paul's opposition. Paul's rivals were most likely gnostic enthusiasts who were confident that their "resurrection" had already occurred. Because of that, they felt no need for a future resurrection.⁶

Incipient gnosticism had infected the Corinthian congregation and distorted the gospel. Schniewind's contention that the Corinthians subscribed to a popular platonic teaching about immortality has been disputed.⁷ Bartsch says that their Epicurean style of life hardly coheres with platonic idealism. The Corinthians were reveling in their new resurrection-existence, as their ecstatic tongue-speaking and baptisms for the dead indicate. They no longer took death seriously because they believed that a faith in the appearances of Christ

granted them supernatural powers as well as immortality.⁸

Likewise, because the Corinthians no longer took death itself seriously, they did not take Jesus' death seriously. Instead, they focused their attention exclusively on the appearances of Christ the risen revealer. By referring to the primitive kerygma Paul reminds them that whoever wants to believe in the risen one must see him as the crucified one.⁹ Paul argues on the basis of the whole tradition, including the death and burial, to make his point.

Nicht Erscheinungen eines Himmelswesens haben das neue Dasein gebracht, sondern die Auferstehung eines Gestorbenen und Begrabenen hat die Hoffnung auf das mit der Parusie kommende neue Dasein gegeben.¹⁰

Paul emphasizes the significance of the earthly Jesus and all that he experienced to counteract the docetic elements in Corinthian gnosticism. Paul saw that events in the life of the earthly Jesus, especially his crucifixion, were devalued or ignored in favor of his post-resurrection appearances.¹¹ Such a lopsided emphasis had led the Corinthians to misconstrue the gospel of the cross and the crucial perspective it affords for understanding new existence in the risen Christ. Bartsch says:

Nicht die Leiblichkeit der eschatologischen Hoffnung des Paulus ist der strittige Punkt, sondern der Unterschiedlichkeit der Leiber. Paulus sucht nicht etwa die Leiblichkeit der Auferstehung zu erweisen, sondern die Notwendigkeit eines Hindurchgehens durch den Tod in das neue Dasein auf Grund der Unterschiedlichkeit der Leiber.¹²

Furthermore, Paul's use of the tradition shows how he maintains the "already now-not yet" tension of the Christian's new existence.

Auf einen Beweis der Auferstehung Jesu kommt es nicht an, sondern darauf, dass die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Erscheinungen des von den Toten Erstandenen geglaubt werden, weil allein von daher dieser Glaube Grund der Hoffnung ist, nicht aber bereits der Eintritt in ein neues Dasein.¹³

If there is no resurrection, the appearances of the risen Lord are not a testimony that the crucified one has been raised. The Christian proclamation is then false and sin has not been conquered.¹⁴

Rusche has highlighted the distortion of the social dimension of the gospel at Corinth. According to Rusche, Paul is combatting people who rely on individual experiences through the Spirit but do not believe in the "'allgemeine, alle angehende Kerygma,' durch das der Einzelne sowohl an Gott als auch mit anderen Menschen verbunden ist."¹⁵

Bieder, too, has accounted for the spiritualistic, individualistic falsification of Christianity at Corinth. He suggests that the Corinthians had established their own self-oriented standards for judgment.¹⁶ They denied the resurrection and substituted their own religion of ecstasies, marvels, spiritism, and esoteric exclusivism in place of the risen one. They ignored the living reality of the glorified Lord. They had not damned the historical Jesus, as Schmithals claims, but they were preaching "another Jesus" (II Cor. 11:4), so that

Paul could hardly recognize the Jesus he had preached to them when he founded the Corinthian congregation.¹⁷

However one may structure the system of gnostic thought which had infiltrated the Corinthian congregation, it is clear that a painful hiatus existed between the original proclamation of Paul and the elaboration and explication of the message that was current at Corinth when Paul wrote this epistle. Even the rudiments of the gospel had been perverted. Thus Paul reiterated the essential gospel which he had first proclaimed at Corinth.

But this pericope is not intended merely to clarify Paul's doctrine of eschatology. It is obvious that Paul wants to straighten out some muddleheaded thinking and to enunciate anew the historic kernel of the kerygma.¹⁸ But the pericope has a double function. It serves also to validate Paul's apostolic credentials as an heir to the earliest tradition. Paul establishes his authority, authenticity, and reliability as an apostolic witness before he moves from the kerygmatic summary to unfold his elaborate argument in support of the necessity of the resurrection.

CHAPTER II

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE PRE-PAULINE FORMULA

Scholars have acknowledged universally that Paul's message from verse 3b on is a citation of some antecedent kerygmatic formulation, not a summary which Paul himself composed. This claim has been substantiated by isolating and identifying several un-Pauline elements, as follows:¹ (1) Paul uses the plural of ἁμαρτία (v. 3). Usually he employs the singular, personifying sin as a power.² (2) The phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφάς (vv. 3-4) is found nowhere else in Paul. (3) The perfect passive ἐγήγερται (v. 4) is unique, since Paul usually employs the aorist. Its use here also influences I Cor. 15:12-14, 16ff., 20, and II Tim. 2:8. (4) An ordinal numeral after a noun (v. 4 - τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ) occurs only here. (5) The verbal form ὤφθη occurs only here (vv. 5-8) and in the confessional formula of I Tim. 3:16. (6) The expression τοῖς δώδεκα (v. 5) is uncommon for Paul, who usually refers to "the apostles." (7) The presence of parallelisms suggests a carefully worded formula.³

Further evidence may be cited to establish the formula-nature of these verses: (1) Paul uses the verbs παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω, which are equivalent to the Jewish technical terms for the transmission and reception of a halachic tradition (רָצַף / לָקַח). (2) ὅτι occurs four times and is tantamount to quotation marks.⁴ (3) Paul deviates from his main

topic about the resurrection to allude to the death and burial of Christ according to the Scriptures. Therefore we realize a slight incongruity with his central argument, a tension between this section and its context.⁵ (4) The list of witnesses in this pericope had probably been ossified before Paul incorporated the formula. Bammel says, "Solche Listen hatten im spaet-juedischen Zeugenrecht ihren Ort; ihr Vorkommen in einer vor-paulinischen Tradition ist darum nicht unwahrscheinlich."⁶

The extent of this quotation cannot be indisputably determined. Some scholars say that it ends at verse 5; others say that it continues through verse 7. Jeremias argues that there is a syntactical break between verses 5 and 6; verse 6 begins with ἔπειτα, not ὅτι, and is not dependent on the first half of verse 3.⁷ Moreover, a loss of rhythm is discernible, although the parallelism at this point is not really precise.⁸ Those who argue for an extended quotation say that verse 7 parallels verse 5 and thus concludes the quoted formula. Additionally, it appears that Paul has combined two traditions of resurrection-appearances: the Petrine, ending at verse 5, and the Jacobine, ending at verse 7. Paul Winter remarks:

There appears then to be a dichotomy in the traditional statement embodied in I Cor. 15:5-7; the first two of these verses seem to comprise one distinct group of christophanies, whilst the final verse mentions apparently another group even though one of the components of both groups (οἱ ἀπόστολοι = οἱ δώδεκα) is the same.⁹

Winter's conjectural reconstruction suggests that two originally

parallel lists have been combined: Cephas/the Twelve/over 500 brethren and James/the Apostles/all the brethren. In Winter's opinion, εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάνι is a combination of two originally separate clauses-- εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις and πάνι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς .

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGIN OF THE FORMULA

This formula was developed either in a Jewish-Christian milieu or in a Hellenistic environment. Jeremias argues that the core of the kerygmatic formula is a translation of a Semitic original and emanated from Jerusalem:¹

1. Numerous Semitisms occur:²

a. Parallelismus membrorum:

ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν
κατὰ τὰς γραφάς
καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη
(καὶ) ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ
κατὰ τὰς γραφάς
καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾶ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα

b. The adversative καὶ appears at the beginning of line 3.

c. Particles except καὶ are absent.

d. The reference to Isaiah 53 is independent from the Septuagint (LXX).³

e. The ordinal number after a noun is the only possible order in Semitic languages.

f. ὤφθη is used instead of ἐφάνη because the Hebrew nir'ah and the Aramaic 'ithame have the double meaning of "he was seen" and "he appeared."

g. After a passive verb the logical subject is introduced in the dative (Κηφᾶ - the Aramaic form of Peter's name); the expected ὑπὸ with the genitive does not occur.⁴

2. The Old Testament is referred to twice.
3. There is no exact Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent to *κατὰ τὰς ἑβραϊκὰς* or the passive *ἠγέρθη*. Therefore the kerygma is not a direct translation from a Semitic original in its present wording, but it has taken shape in a Greek-speaking environment.⁵
4. Yet the formula could not have originated in a Greek environment because the kerygma of Paul is said to be identical with that of the first apostles, Cephas and the Twelve.⁶

Other scholars argue for a basis of the formula in Hellenistic Christianity:⁷

1. Even though I Cor. 15:3bff. displays no literary unity with the early speeches in Acts, there are definite similarities:⁸
 - a. an emphasis on the fulfillment of God's will;
 - b. an emphasis on the forgiveness of sins;
 - c. the prevalence of the ebed Yahweh theme;
 - d. the resurrection theme expressed as God having raised Jesus from the dead (cf. Acts 2:24; 3:26; 4:10; 10:40);
 - e. *Χριστός* as a title (Acts 3:20);
 - f. the disciples as witnesses to the resurrection (cf. Acts 1:22; 2:32; 4:33; 5:32);¹⁰
 - g. the importance of the number "twelve."
2. Though some of his traditions may have come from elsewhere, Paul attached himself to Hellenistic churches.

The formula within this pericope may have been used in a variety of ways in the early church. In 1940 Hunter suggested that it reproduced a baptismal creed of the Damascus church, perhaps taught to Paul before his baptism by Ananias.

Twenty years later Hunter changed his mind and argued along with Jeremias that the formula is from Jerusalem¹¹ and may represent a "guarded tradition," taught by catechists to converts or to missionaries when they received their commission.¹² Conzelmann says that the formula is one form of confession found in the New Testament. The New Testament has confessional statements about the person of Jesus (acclamatory or thetic) as well as confessional statements about saving events (God raised Jesus from the dead; Christ has died and is awakened, or arisen; cf. Rom. 10:9).¹³ Schoel says that this formula may well be a summary of early preaching and that it was probably used as a mnemonic device in teaching. As such it is similar to rabbinical simanim, for each element is a siman for a passage of the Gospel tradition, from which five elements have been summarized in this formula: (a) the passion narrative; (b) the burial narrative; (c) the resurrection/third day/empty tomb narrative; (d) the first revelation (to Peter) narrative; (e) the revelation to the Twelve narrative.¹⁴ Lastly, Goppelt describes the Sitz im Leben of this formula as follows:

Sie erwachst aus dem geistgewirkten Lehren, Bekennen und Anbeten der Gemeinde und wird in verschiedenem Ausmass Eigentum der Kirche. Anlass fuer die Bildung der Formeln ist der katechetische und liturgische Beduerfnis, die Abwehr haeretischer Bewegungen und das Zeugnis vor der Welt. Ihr Sinn ist es, auf Grund des Urkerygmas und der Evangelientradition verbindlich zu bezeugen und zu bekennen, was in einer bestimmten Situation das Evangelium bedeutet.¹⁵

CHAPTER IV

COMMENTARY BY VERSES

15:1a - Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί,

Paul begins this section with no clear indication of his reason for writing. Only at verse 12 do we discover that some Corinthians had denied the resurrection.¹ The word *γνωρίζω*, translated in various ways, means "cause to know," essentially, but here it derives its meaning "draw your attention to" from the context, which is "somewhat embarrassed," since Paul is reminding the Corinthians of what they ought never to have forgotten.² Baird points out the similarity of I Cor. 15:1 to Gal. 1:11 and concludes that I Corinthians stresses the form by which Paul proclaimed his gospel, while Galatians 1 refers to its essential dynamic character. Paul received the form of his proclamation from men; the essence of the gospel he received from God.³

15:1b-d - τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν,
ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐβτήκατε,

Paul proposes not to define, but to summarize the gospel in terms of the death, burial, resurrection, and resurrection-appearances of the risen Lord.⁴ For Paul the gospel is "related to human reality and proves itself to be a living power," for "it is itself salvation history. It breaks into the life of a man, refashions it and creates communities."⁵ The word

παλαμβάνω, as aforesaid, corresponds to the Hebrew technical term קַבַּל and signifies the reception of the doctrinal content of the gospel in a fixed form. Yet

the content of the *παλαμβάνειν* cannot be the legacy of the tradition of historical facts concerning Jesus.... It must be an inward and living faith which gives religious certainty to a historical narrative which is not wholly immune from questioning. For this reason *παλαμβάνειν* cannot be...the reception of purely intellectual materials. It is acceptance into the essential core of personality, which is more than the intellect alone.⁶

Lietzmann detects an ironic twist in the last phrase, when he comments,

...in Wirklichkeit laesst das 'Feststehen' der Korinther, wie der bisherige Wortlaut des Briefes selbst zeigt, recht viel zu wuenschen uebrig. Es ist die theoretische Betrachtung, 'in welchem der Grund eures Glaubens liegt.'⁷

15:2a - $\delta\iota' \text{ οὗ } \text{καὶ } \text{ἐὼςθετε}$,

Phillips translates "by which...your salvation is being worked out." According to Barrett, *ἐὼςθετε* is a futuristic present; the salvation which is still to come is assured, if men do not believe in vain. Paul wants to encourage the Corinthians.⁸

15:2b-c - $\text{τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισθᾶμεν ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε}$,

A serious textual problem afflicts this clause, since several manuscripts read *ὀφείλετε κατέχειν*. Hering proposes several possible solutions:⁹ (1) Read the phrase with *γνωρίζω* as an indirect question: "I make known to you with what words

I announced the gospel to you." But then *κατέχετε* is left without an object (cf. Barrett, p. 336). (2) Subordinate the clause to *κατέχετε*. This is awkward, since ordinarily *εἰ κατέχετε* would precede the *τίνι λόγῳ*. (Hering prefers this solution anyway.) (3) Read a full stop after *εὐζέθε* with Chrysostom and make *τίνι λόγῳ* a direct question with *τοῦτο* as the understood object of *κατέχετε*. But then there is an anacoluthon.¹⁰ (4) A haplographic omission may have altered the original *εἰ κατέχετε καθὼς ὀφείλετε κατέχειν*. This is a very hypothetical solution.

Schoel says that *λόγος* refers to a specific authoritative tradition which Paul had received.¹¹ Baird suggests that the *τίνι λόγῳ* phrase means that Paul is about to remind the Corinthians in what specific form he preached the gospel-content to them.¹²

15:2d - *ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῆ ἐπιτεύετε*.

Moule notes the obvious redundancy here, but remarks that without *εἰ μὴ*, *ἐκτὸς* would have been virtually a preposition.¹³ Barrett says that the exact meaning of *εἰκῆ* is not known. Origen defined it as those who believe for a time, but in trials turn away. Thus, Paul "is simply giving utterance to his uncertainty whether he can depend on the Corinthians or not, before coming to the substance of his Gospel."¹⁴ Hering says that Paul is here examining the foundations of the Christian conviction of the resurrection, since Christian faith is not

"baseless credulity."¹⁵ Ἐπιβτεύσατε is an ingressive aorist.

15:3a-b - Παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον,

Again Paul uses the technical terms for the transmission of oral traditions. Buechsel says that there is

no contradiction that Jesus repudiates tradition and Paul champions it. Paul's tradition agrees with Jesus' rejection, since they are both opposed to human tradition. Paul's use of παράδοσις and παραδόναι rests on the Jewish usage, and agrees with that of the Mysteries to the extent that this agrees with Jewish usage.¹⁶

Most translators agree that πρώτος shows rank, degree, or importance, not chronological time. The phrase ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον was deleted by Marcion to set aside any Pauline dependence on the Uraposteln.¹⁷ Paul does not say that he received this ἀπό - or παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, for he is re-stating an ecclesiastical tradition.¹⁸

15:3c - ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,

The anarthrous Χριστὸς is here a title with all the connotations of Old Testament Messiahship. Jeremias effectively demonstrates that the anarthrous use of π' ὠν was customary in Palestinian Judaism, particularly in rabbinical parlance.¹⁹ The fact of Christ's "piacular death" is part of the tradition which Paul received.²⁰ The word ὑπὲρ is a synonym for περὶ here, says Barrett, who translates "to deal with."²¹ At any rate, this "insight into the significance of Christ's death was not a later theological development--

it was part of the very warp and woof of the primitive proclamation."²²

Paul simply affirms the conviction that Christ's death must be in accord with the Scriptures. He cites no specific proof-texts for Messiah's death, but simply refers to the Scriptures in their entirety.²³ Yet this reference to the Scriptures is very significant. The death of any Jew would have been considered atoning in some sense, says Schweitzer; the events in and of themselves were not compelling. But when the claim is made that these events are the promised eschatological events, then their uniqueness becomes apparent.²⁴ Barrett suggests that Paul may have added "our sins" to the primitive formula. Also,

it may well be that the general allusion to the Scriptures was made before specific passages were alleged in support of it. Christian conviction saw in the death of Christ a divine act that must have been foretold because it was a manifestation of the eternal will of God; out of this conviction arose the search of the Old Testament which in due course produced an armoury of testimonies.²⁵

15:4a - καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη,

The burial of Christ was included in the kerygma because it confirmed the reality of both the death and the resurrection. "If he was buried he must have been really dead; if he was buried, the resurrection must have been the reanimation of a corpse."²⁶ Although the insistence on Christ's burial combats gnostic and docetistic ideas which contested the reality

of Christ's death, it does not imply the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell, to which Paul never refers.²⁷

15:4b - καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,

The perfect tense of ἐγείρω is important, for it connotes an enduring effect from the past into the present, although historical evidence and research can neither demonstrate nor disprove the action of God in raising Christ from the dead.²⁸ Paul does not narrate the resurrection event itself, as the later apocryphal Gospel of Peter (35-42), nor does he base his assertions on the evidence of an empty tomb. One can only deduce the conclusion that faith in the empty tomb is included by implication in the text of I Cor. 15:3-5.²⁹

However, the chief problem with this assertion is to determine what scriptural allusions Paul has in mind, if any. Metzger suggests that Paul has taken two phrases which separately qualify the verb ἐγήγερται (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ and κατὰ τὰς γραφάς) and has made them coordinate. Thus, Paul is not saying that the resurrection on the third day itself was prophesied, but only the notion of a resurrection.³⁰ Jocz says that "the third day" simply indicates an intervening day; it is a circumlocution for the Sabbath, since it was utterly impossible for the Hebrew Christian to conceive of God contradicting his own law by raising the Messiah on the Sabbath.³¹ The only possible Old Testament references are Leviticus 23:4-21 (Christ becomes the first-fruits), II Kings 20:5 (Hezekiah's

prayer), Jonah 1:17 (2:1 in Hebrew), and Hosea 6:2, which the rabbis interpreted as a reference to the resurrection.³²

Mackay concludes that the Old Testament passages, which are vague allusions at best, did not create the belief that the resurrection occurred on the third day, but the event, attested by good evidence, created the use of proof-texts. Furthermore, Mackay shows that the field of relevant scriptural passages was very wide; in fact, Mackay himself connects "the third day" with the creative activity of the third day in Genesis 1. Thus the fundamental miracle of life is emphasized, and "the third day" is the linchpin connecting the first creation and the new creation.³³

15:5 - καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη κηρᾶ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα.

The translation of ὤφθη is somewhat problematical. Does it refer to objective historical appearances or to subjective hallucinations, or visions?³⁴ Hering suggests that this verb denotes "an objective vision, that is, ...an appearance not discernible by the eyes of all."³⁵ Robertson and Plummer likewise argue for "was seen by," since "a mere vision would not make our being raised more probable."³⁶ Wenz concludes that ὤφθη must signify an event or a phenomenon in the exterior world--not a subjective vision, but an actual corporeal encounter (leibhafte Begegnung) with the risen one.³⁷ Michaelis' delineation of the meaning, however, is somewhat obscure. He says that during the appearances there is no primary emphasis

on seeing as sensual or mental perception; the emphasis is not on the resultant action of the person in the dative (his seeing or perceiving), but on the experience of the presence of the risen Lord.³⁸ Hence,

the question of the way in which He could be perceived is notably neutralised or subordinated to theological evaluation.... In all appearances the presence of the risen Lord is presence in transfigured corporeality.... This presence is non-visionary reality; no category of human seeing is wholly adequate for it.³⁹

The reference to τοῖς δώδεκα has been altered in some manuscripts.⁴⁰ This "correction" was probably made to harmonize I Cor. 15:5 with Matt. 28:16 after Judas' death.

"[The Twelve] appear to have served as witnesses who could prove the continuity between Jesus of Nazareth and the risen Lord, but not to have been significant figures in the Church...."⁴¹

15:6 - ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ, ἔξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν.

Several commentators have identified this event with the Pentecost incident.⁴² Barrett says that this is possible, though beyond proof, since the early tradition knew nothing of a corporate bestowal of the Holy Spirit distinct from the appearances of the risen Jesus. However, no neat chronological harmony can be effected,⁴³ and it seems speculative to equate this appearance with Pentecost. Hering advises that it "may refer to an appearance in Galilee where Jesus must have had many disciples."⁴⁴ Bishop interprets this event as an

appearance near Mount Tabor in Galilee and suggests that many people from Jesus' ministry would have been there, including the widow of Nain, the bridal couple from Cana "bringing their babe," and the apostles and their families!⁴⁵ Wenz cautions that Paul does not intend the appearance to the five hundred to be a guarantee of faith for the Corinthians if they will only ask those who are still living to substantiate his report. On the contrary, those who are alive are witnesses who can simply relate their experience; they cannot underwrite a guarantee or offer proof to demonstrate or corroborate their claim empirically.⁴⁶

Winter suggests that the $\epsilon\gamma\omega\upsilon$ clause is an explanatory addition to the primitive kerygma. Whether that is true or not, a question arises as to which of the two minor clauses should be accented. Bartsch suggests with cogency that the emphasis lies on the fact that some of the witnesses have indeed already died! In other words, faith in the risen one is able to grant no immunity from undergoing the experience of physical death in order to achieve the fullness of the new existence. Paul is subtly fashioning a rebuttal against those who think they are now enjoying immortality.⁴⁸ Glombitza offers a very unusual interpretation of this section. He says that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\beta\iota\upsilon$ does not refer to the living in contrast to the dead. Instead, those who remain are those who actively bear witness; those who are asleep are those who have ceased to witness, having succumbed to the world's allurements ("dass

aber etliche der Uebermacht der Welt erlegen sind"). This interpretation, Glombitza submits, coheres with the warnings to watchfulness.⁴⁹

15:7 - ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάντιν.

The canonical Gospels record no appearance of the risen Christ to James. However, James as the head of the Jerusalem church, presumably the Lord's brother, was an important figure.⁵⁰ Allen says,

The appearance to James would be of outstanding value to the Jerusalem Church and to any missionaries among Jews of the Dispersion. For James... was respected for his fidelity to the Torah. In addition, he had viewed Jesus during his lifetime with the suspicion not unnatural to a kinsman. His acceptance of the risen Lord was, therefore, against his previous inclination and not to be accounted for by any predisposition to believe. It is not surprising to find that the appearance to James figures in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with legendary accretions. Presumably, the Gentile church was less favourable to James. The appearance to him belonged to a pattern of tradition it was not disposed to preserve.⁵¹

It is not clear who are meant by ἀποστόλοις πάντιν, "though the reference to them has the effect of underlining Paul's disparaging reference to himself in the next verse."⁵² Mildemberger suggests that the phrase should be understood distributively: "Jeder, der Apostel ist, hat eine Erscheinung des Auferstandenen erlebt."⁵³ At any rate, the Greek word order stresses the noun. An apostle was "one called by Christ and sent by him to preach the Gospel."⁵⁴ Here Paul refers to a group of missionaries, "wider than the twelve, but not unlimited

in scope," which excludes himself.⁵⁵

In none of the catalogues of witnesses has Paul mentioned any specific appearance to women, as the Gospel traditions testify. Despite Bishop's imaginative reconstruction of the appearance to the five hundred, no women are cited as eyewitnesses. Manek has suggested that either Paul did not know the tradition which included female witnesses (an argument from silence) or else he chose to ignore their testimony because women were not qualified to be witnesses according to Jewish tradition.⁵⁶

15:8 - ἔβχάτων δὲ πάντων ὡπερὲι τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὥσθι καμοί.

"Ἐβχάτων is a temporal adverb here, for Paul does not mean to assert that he was the last of all the apostles. If πάντων referred to persons, the article would be present.⁵⁷

The term ἐκτρώμα is fascinating because it has been subjected to such diverse interpretations. On the surface it suggests "an unformed, undeveloped, repulsive, possibly lifeless foetus,"⁵⁸ an embryo, a miscarriage, or a birth too soon. The point of comparison, however, does not lie in the time of Paul's conversion, but in the idea of his inferiority and unworthiness to be an apostle,⁵⁹ in the suddenness and violence of the transition caused by the summons to apostleship.⁶⁰ Paul's calling could not take place in a normal, orderly, organic sequence.⁶¹

Other scholars have seen ἐκτρώμα as a derisive term which

Paul's opponents used to convey the demoniac and non-human qualities of an untimely, monstrous birth.⁶² They abused him with this Spotname for two reasons: (1) He had been a persecutor of Christians and was regarded as unfit, therefore, for the apostolic office; (2) His physical appearance was less than appealing (II Cor. 10:10).⁶³

Munck, however, disputes this "traditional" interpretation. After tracing the use of the verbal and nominal forms of *τιτρώσκω* throughout extra-biblical, biblical, and later ecclesiastical literature, Munck suggests two possible interpretations: (1) *Ἐκτρωμα* means that Paul is the most wretched of men, only to be compared to a stillborn child. If so, we have an Old Testament reminiscence here--"or rather a 'miniature quotation,' comprising in two words an Old Testament passage which in LXX appears in its clearest form in Job 3:16 and Eccles. 6:3."⁶⁴ Paul the former persecutor can be understood as ranking himself with Judas as he recalls the saying of woe to the man by whom the son of man would be betrayed (Matt. 26:24, Mark 14:21). (2) But *Ἐκτρωμα* may also signify something embryonic that must be formed. In that case it describes Paul as he was when Christ met him at Damascus, one formed under the law but an *Ἐκτρωμα* because he had not yet been formed by Christ.⁶⁵ Munck says that *Ἐκτρωμα* describes Paul's Jewish past as both a persecutor of the church and a man progressing in Judaism.

...Paul's Jewish past was also under God's election and vocation, and it is

from the standpoint of the later grace that this first stage can be described as an *ἔκτρωμα*.⁶⁶

The definite article *τῷ* may be significant if it has demonstrative force to designate Paul as the only apostle having had a special revelation.⁶⁷

15:9 - Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων,
ὅς οὐκ εἰμί κανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος,
διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Rarely does New Testament literature have a true superlative, but Paul, deeply conscious of his unworthiness to be called an apostle, employs *ἐλάχιστος* to describe his rank.⁶⁸ Paul knows that Christ's creative love and grace have commissioned him an apostle, a proclaimer of the gospel, despite his persistent persecution of the whole company of Christian believers (*ἐκκλησία*), not just the Jerusalem church.⁶⁹

15:10a-b - χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὅ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις
αὐτοῦ ἢ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη,

Paul was re-shaped and re-formed by creative grace (cf. I Cor. 3:10; Gal. 1:15).⁷⁰ He could boast that that grace had not been expended without result, profit, or effect, i.e., without reaching its goal.⁷¹ God's grace had not proved to be a "barren gift" (Phillips).

15:10c - ἀλλὰ περιβότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἔκοπιάδα,
οὐκ ἔγω δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἔμμοί.

Paul boasts that in his labors he has outdone them all (NEB).⁷² In II Cor. 11:23-27 Paul gives more details about his troubles and sufferings,

whereas here he is thinking rather of his greater achievements, probably in terms of the fact that whereas his colleagues might be content to work in churches that others had founded he made it his aim always to break new ground and to take the Gospel to those who had not heard it (Rom. 15:20, II Cor. 10:12-16).⁷³

Yet it was not really his own doing, but God's grace worked with him ("within" - Phillips) and bore the burden with him,⁷⁴

15:11 - Εἴτε οὖν ἐγὼ εἴτε ἐκεῖνοι, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν
καὶ οὕτως ἐπιτεύβατε.

Finally, Paul declares that the rehearsal of kerygmatic events that he has recited is no private creed, but the gospel of all apostles, including Peter and James.⁷⁵ Those who deny the general resurrection are not opposing merely Paul's opinion, but the preaching common to all apostles,⁷⁶ which is the foundation of the Corinthians' faith (Phillips). There is no Christianity without the announcement and affirmation, however expressed after due theological reflection, that Christ died, was buried, and was raised.⁷⁷ On that basis Paul elaborates his argument, intending to establish those who have come to faith in Jesus Christ, the risen Lord!

CHAPTER V

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has surveyed eleven verses of the New Testament--critically important verses because they enshrine one of the oldest, most primitive Christian confessions of faith. We have attempted to examine both Paul's understanding of that creed and his reasons for reiterating and applying it to vindicate his apostolic authority. Paul first met his opponents not with an arsenal of cleverly fashioned arguments, but with a testimony to the constitutive events of the Christian kerygma.

Several problems should be explored in greater detail. A closer study of the last verses (9-11) might lead us into an enriched understanding of the New Testament apostolate as Paul understood it in contrast, perhaps, to Luke-Acts. Time has limited ^{me} ~~us~~. Furthermore, a more detailed examination of the interpretations of the resurrection-event as set forth by scholars who operate with the "new hermeneutic," bridging the gap between the "then" and the "now," might enable us better to "complete" the job we have here begun--to say, finally, just what this text, particularly its creedal core, means for faith and life today. Certainly it should be obvious, as Fuchs reminds us, that the name of Jesus signifies both the place and the time of God's revelatory encounter with man.¹ God has revealed himself in our time and in our sphere of existence, that we no longer have to believe in ourselves or be doomed

to despair of our limited personal resources in meeting the challenging adventure of purposeful life.

Certainly the Easter-event, though in itself incomprehensible, is yet basic and curiously exciting. Those who have narrated the event and reported or interpreted its significance in the writings that comprise the New Testament have one common purpose in the Spirit: to stimulate and to sustain faith in the crucified and risen one. For it is through him that we come to know our God. As Fuchs says,

Jesus and faith in him do not conflict at all, but are one and the same: the event of the coming of God into a world hostile to God. One must not believe in Jesus if he wants to believe in God, but one is invited [emphasis mine] to believe in him, since God speaks with us in the person of Jesus, in that he also makes us persons and thus keeps us by his side. Then our life is not idle talk but a conversation with God.²

The resurrection is not offered as a scientific proof to unbelievers, but as a summons to faith. It is an "event of otherworldly reality, and yet an event which occurred at a definite point in the history of this world of ours...."³ And, we might add, it is an event which is proleptic of a great event yet to come at the consummation, an event in which we are privileged to participate even now because we are by grace identified by the name of him who rose.⁴

Historical-criticism cannot verify that event which is without analogy or parallel. It need not, for that event is, in Wenz's phrase, a "historisch-zeichenhaften" event that

completes the scandal of the crucifixion and the cross. Only by faith--a mysterious, nebulous, undefined, and vague concept when abstracted from the matrix of human sense and spirit--can we perceive the significance of the resurrection, that herein God has acted typically in a recklessly gracious way, and then confess τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ... ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ὅτι ὤψθη ... [καὶ ἡμῶν!].

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

¹Jerome T. Schoel, "I Corinthians 15:3b-5: Primitive Christian Proclamation," Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri, 1967, p. 38. See also pp. 36-37. Franz Mussner, "'Schichten' in der paulinischen Theologie dargetan an 1. Kor. 15," Biblische Zeitschrift, new series, 9 (1965), 60, claims that I Cor. 15 presents Paul's tractate on the resurrection. The reference to εὐαγγέλιον in verse 1 is his Ausgangspunkt for the entire chapter.

²Otto Glombitza, "Gnade--das entscheidene Wort, Erwägungen zu 1. Kor. xv.1-11, eine exegetische Studie," Novum Testamentum, 2 (1958), 281. Cf. also H.W. Boers, "Apocalyptic Eschatology in I Corinthians 15; An Essay in Contemporary Interpretation," Interpretation, 21 (1967), 59, who agrees that I Cor. 15:1-11 is the basis for a well-knit argument through v. 34. The formula of vv. 3b-5 is merely a particular expression of the broader gospel.

³Ernst Bammel, "Herkunft und Funktion der Traditionselemente in 1. Kor. 15,1-11," Theologische Zeitschrift, 11 (November 1955), 409.

⁴See the discussion below, pp. 6 and 13.

⁵Bammel, p. 411. W. Grundmann, "Ueberlieferung und Eigensaussage im eschatologischen Denken des Apostels Paulus," New Testament Studies, 8 (1961), 13, says that Paul's relationship to early apostolic tradition is dialectic; "er betont einerseits seinen Zusammenhang mit ihr [I Cor. 15:1-11], andererseits seine Unabhaengigkeit von ihr [Gal. 1:11-12]."

⁶Grundmann, pp. 14-15. See also C.F.D. Moule, "St. Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection," New Testament Studies, 12 (1966), 112, who says that Paul could not, like the gnostics, regard the resurrection as a fait accompli because he took time seriously! He indeed believed that there is a new creation in Christ, yet those who are in Christ must become what they are, ultimately exchanging the garment of this life for the garment of eternal life and thus submitting to the painful process of divestiture in death (p. 118). Cf. II Tim. 2:18 and see Hans-Werner Bartsch, "Die Argumentation des Paulus in I Cor. 15:3-11," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 55 (1964), 271, who says that Kaesemann likewise agrees that the essential Corinthian problem was their insistence that ἀνάβστασις had already

broken in. Furthermore, Bartsch, p. 266, remarks that already Chrysostom described the Corinthian problem as an insistence that the resurrection had already occurred.

⁷H. Bartsch, p. 265.

⁸Ibid., p. 273.

⁹Helga Rusche, "Die Leugner der Auferstehung von den Toten in der korinthischen Gemeinde," Muenchener Theologische Zeitschrift, 10 (1959), 149. Hans Conzelmann, "On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Cor. 15:3-5," Interpretation, 20 (1966), 24, claims that the Corinthians had no Gnostic Christology. They did not doubt that Christ had died. Conzelmann therefore prefers to call them "Spirit-enthusiasts" instead of "gnostics." Is this splitting terminological hairs?

¹⁰Bartsch, p. 271.

¹¹Bartsch, p. 271, footnote 20a, says, "Innerhalb der Gnosis hat tatsaechlich nicht nur der irdische Jesus immer mehr an Bedeutung verloren, sondern entsprechend auch der Auferstandene an Bedeutung gewonnen, wie schon die Ausweitung der Zeit seiner Erscheinungen zeigt. Im Apokryphon des Jacobus sind es 550 Tagen..., in der Pistis Sophia sind es 11 Jahre...."

¹²Bartsch, p. 269, footnote 19.

¹³Ibid., pp. 271-272.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 267.

¹⁵Rusche, p. 151.

¹⁶Werner Bieder, "Paulus und seine Gegner in Korinth," Theologische Zeitschrift (Basel), 17 (1961), 324.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 324. In addition, Bieder says, p. 325, "Die Einheit zwischen dem gekreuzigten und dem auferstandene Jesus Christus ist ihnen zerbrochen." In place of the unity of Jesus Christ as the crucified and risen one Corinthians had established a temporal succession between "dem gewesenen Jesus und den religioesen Existenzen." Furthermore, "...sie sind Sendboten der Luege [II Cor. 11:13-15], weil sie ueber den verkuendigten Jesus hinaus nur ihr eigenes pneumatisches Sein zu Darstellung bringen koennen, ohne Jesus Christus als den kommenden gnaedigen Richter und so als die unbestechliche Wahrheit anzeigen zu koennen, die Paulus in beiden Korintherbriefen als die Zukunft aller Christen der Gemeinde vor Augen stellt."

¹⁸Ernst Fuchs, "Must One Believe in Jesus if He Wants to

Believe in God?" Journal for Theology and the Church; The Bultmann School of Interpretation: New Directions?, translated by Irving W. Batdorf (New York: Harper and Row Torchbooks, 1965), I, 154, says that "Paul has not let the revelatory event remain in the ecstatic sphere of a miraculous seeing or appearing, to which the early Christian tradition could have led him on the basis of the appearances of the Risen One.... Paul has rather transformed the ecstatic-prophetic domain into the everyday sphere of our tangible existence. As it seems to me, he has done the same thing as the historical Jesus, who... exalted everyday life as the 'stuff' of the revelatory event."

CHAPTER II

¹Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, translated by Norman Perrin (3rd revised edition; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c.1966), p. 102. See Schoel, pp. 8-9, and Robert H. Mounce, "Continuity of the Primitive Tradition. Some Pre-Pauline Elements in I Corinthians," Interpretation, 13 (1959), 417-424, especially 418.

²The six occurrences of *ἁμαρτία* in the plural or with a genitive or personal pronoun all show the influence of general early Christian linguistic usage: I Cor. 15:3,7; Gal. 1:4; Rom. 7:5; Eph. 2:1; Col. 1:14. See Jeremias, p. 102, and Eduard Schweizer, "Two New Testament Creeds Compared," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation (in honor of Otto A. Piper), edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder (New York: Harper and Row, c.1962), 291, who says that Paul's use of "sin" in the singular is theologically extremely significant and relevant. Life is one for Paul--either righteousness or sin. Life cannot be divided up into moral acts, but "is always a whole, devoted either to God or to egotism. Cf. also the usage of 'work' in the singular for the life of a Christian as contrasted to the 'works of the law.'"

³Bammel, p. 402, footnote 5, says there are un-Pauline elements in verse 6. "Statt *ἐκοιμήθησαν* braucht Paulus sonst immer das Partizip, das den hier gut passenden Nebensinn des 'Auf den Herren Harrens' hat; dieser aber ist beim Verbum selbst nicht gegeben, wie 1. Kor. 7,39; 11,30; 15,51 zeigen. *Μένειν* ohne Ergaenzungsbestimmung statt *ἕσθιν* ist auch singular. Sonst verwendet Paulus *μένειν* nicht profan, sondern im Sinne einer Beziehung zu Gott. Auch das unpaulinische *ὡφθη* haette, zumal die Konstruktion sich aendert, nicht weitergefuehrt zu werden brauchen."

⁴Archibald M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (Philadelphia:

Westminster, c.1961), p. 15.

⁵Conzelmann, p. 18. See also Schoel, p. 11.

⁶Bammel, p. 403. Cf. also Bartsch, p. 272, who says this list is probably a pre-Pauline Zeugenrechts.

⁷Jeremias, p. 101. Bartsch, p. 262, says that there is a distinct break at v. 6; there are no more οτι-clauses, "sondern Hauptsätze folgen." See also Schoel, p. 40, and Mounce, p. 419, who suggests that Paul expanded the list of appearances to establish the fact of Christ's resurrection.

⁸Schoel, pp. 40-41.

⁹Paul Winter, "I Cor. 15:3b-7," Novum Testamentum, 2 (1958), 145-146. Cf. Bartsch, p. 263; Mussner, p. 63; Schoel, p. 42; and Hunter, p. 16. For Mussner, verse 8 begins the second stratum of the tradition. Hunter says that verse 8 begins Paul's personal testimony apart from the formula. "Of whom the greater part remain, though some have fallen asleep" is considered by Hunter to be a parenthesis inserted into the formula by Paul to underline the good attestation of this appearance. William Baird, "What is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor. 15:3-8 and Gal. 1:11-17," Journal of Biblical Literature, 76 (1957), 181-191, also argues for an extended formula. Baird says, p. 186, that the formula is "almost a creed," and he gives evidence of traces of sermonic material.

CHAPTER III

¹Jeremias, pp. 102-103. See Schoel, pp. 22-26; Hunter, pp. 16-17; and Friedrich Buechsel, Παράδοξις, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1964), II, 173. (Hereafter T.D.N.T.) Cf. also Bammel, p. 418.

²Conzelmann, pp. 18-20, says that these arguments do not prove that an original Aramaic source has been translated, but merely show a Semitic way of thinking. See Bammel, p. 402, and Mussner, p. 61, who says that Paul took over an Aramaic Urevangelium, which he edited and translated into Greek.

³Jeremias, p. 103: "That the Hebrew text of Isaiah 53 is presupposed can be seen from the fact that in LXX Isaiah 52:13-53:12 ὄνειδος is not found." Cf. Fuchs, p. 167, who agrees that Isaiah 53:9 is here recalled.

⁴Robert Allan Kolb, "Pauline Paidology: The Use of the Suffering Servant of God Image of Isaiah 52/53 for Jesus Christ in the Pauline Corpus," Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri, 1968, p. 49, argues, however, that Paul typically uses Cephas instead of Peter: I Cor. 1:12; 3:22; 9:5; Gal. 1:18; 2:9,11,14. Jeremias acknowledges this, p. 103, footnote 2.

⁵Winter, p. 143, footnote 1, notes that Jeremias in his second edition of The Eucharistic Words had claimed that the kerygma was originally Aramaic.

⁶Schoel, pp. 24-26, supports the argument for a Jerusalem source. Ἐκεῖνοι in verse 11 refers to the Jerusalemites named in the immediate context. Compare also Gal. 2:7, which says that the Jerusalem apostles approved Paul's ministry. Moreover, the fact that particularly in Jerusalem the death of Christ would be emphasized as the fulfillment of the Old Testament Scriptures might best explain the double reference to the Old Testament in this formula.

⁷Schoel, pp. 27-32. Heitmueller, Dibelius, Bousset, and Bultmann adhere to this viewpoint. Cf. also Fuchs, pp. 160-167. Fuchs says that the creed was formulated in a pre-Pauline Hellenistic community and betrays distinctive apocalyptic elements: emphases on the appearances and on the third day. The list of witnesses is to be understood as an attestation of the eschatological end time. But Hunter, p. 17, says that this gospel summary probably would not have been drawn up by "Hellenists who had transmogrified Christianity into a full-blown mystery cult--a cult for which the Christ of traditional dogma became 'a generalized blend of Attis, Osiris, and Mithras, wearing as a not too-well-fitting mask the features of Jesus of Nazareth.'" Conzelmann, p. 22, says the formula was probably composed in Antioch; it excludes the idea, he says, that Jesus founded the church before his death.

⁸Leonhard Goppelt, "Tradition nach Paulus," Kerygma und Dogma, 4 (1958), 219, says that this formula is the same as that in Peter's speeches in Acts. It closely resembles early missionary preaching. The differences (e.g., that there is no reference to Jesus' earthly ministry in I Cor. or that the phrase "for us" is absent from the missionary sermons in Acts) are slight and insignificant. For a contrary viewpoint see Bammel, p. 404, who regards them as very different: In Acts the emphasis on μαρτυρες is polemical, but not in I Cor.; the Sitze im Leben are dissimilar.

⁹Grundmann considers Isaiah 53 to be the background for both I Cor. and Gal. Some scholars, however, consider the πάλις -passages of Acts to be dubious references at best to

Isaiah. Likewise, it is not certain that there are clear allusions to the ebed Yahweh passages here in I Cor. 15. See Kolb, passim, especially pp. 45-64 and 137-154. Kolb allows that I Cor. 15:3-5 could possibly be the result of Paul's meditation on Isaiah 53 (p. 154). See in addition Kasimierz Romaniuk, "De Themate Ebed Jahve in Soteriologia Sancti Pauli," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), 14-25. Romaniuk says there are some allusions to the ebed Yahweh theme in Paul, which is a consciously used concept. Cf. also footnote III,3 above.

¹⁰See footnote III,8 above.

¹¹Hunter, pp. 16 and 117. "Since the two apostles named in it, Peter and James (the chief authorities in the Mother Church), were in fact the two Paul met in Jerusalem during his fortnight's visit (Gal. 1:18), 'after three years' (i.e. about AD 35), in order 'to get information from Cephas', they may well be the source of the paradosis" (p. 118). Mounce, p. 420, says Paul probably received this formulaic summary from the Damascus church. The formula includes both the facts (events) and an interpretation of the significant meaning of those facts ("for our sins," "according to the Scriptures").

¹²Hunter, p. 22. E.L. Allen, "The Lost Kerygma," New Testament Studies, 3 (1956), 349-353, concurs. He says that the kerygma of I Cor. 15 was shaped in the missionary church, whereas the gospel stories, stressing the empty tomb as Paul had not, were shaped to defend the church against criticism (p. 351). Allen adds that gospel stories were influenced by the cult (e.g., Luke 24) and that they were shaped in the light of the church's experience (pp. 352-353). The "process of transmission was one in which fidelity did not exclude selection and interpretation, or even fresh creation" (p. 353). Mounce, p. 420, also says that the formula is a summary of the missionary proclamation, though it has some affinities with the baptismal formula underlying I Pet. 3:18-22. Winter, p. 144, remarks that in later creeds (e.g., the Roman Symbol) the list of appearances was not included because "when the Creed was formulated there was no longer any urgent need to recapitulate the evidence for the resurrection-faith, whilst this faith itself was and remained of course the mainline of Christian teaching."

¹³Conzelmann, p. 17. See Schoel's criticism of Neufeld's claim that this kerygmatic formula is an expansion of the primitive confession "Jesus is Lord" (p. 15). Yet Schweizer, p. 292, has astutely pointed out that the second coming of Christ is missing in New Testament creeds. For the Jewish-Christian church the last judgment was probably "a matter of

course. The really new and surprising facts which distinguished her from Judaism lay not there but in the events of incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Christ."

¹⁴Schoel, p. 17.

¹⁵Goppelt, p. 225.

CHAPTER IV

¹C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Harper and Row, c.1968), p. 335. Hans Lietzmann, An die Korinther I,II, in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: Verlag J.C.B. Mohr), p. 76, adds that Paul here deals with a new theme without any external or internal connection with the preceding. He is probably responding to the letter presumed to be written by the Corinthians, but now lost.

²Barrett, p. 335. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on First Corinthians, in the International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914), p. 331, suggest also that there is a gentle reproach in the word γνωρίζω. However, they translate "make known," not "call to attention." F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1890), II, 326, says that γνωρίζω, "I declare," is a word chosen with the intention of humiliating the readers. Moreover, "there is between the verb γνωρίζειν ...and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ...this difference: that the second indicates the simple statement of the historical fact, and the first embraces the explanation of its full meaning and its relation to salvation as a whole" (p. 327).
Translations: KJV - declare; RSV, NEB - remind.

³Baird, pp. 186 and 190. I Cor. 15:1 - γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισθήκεν ὑμῖν.
Gal. 1:11 - γνωρίζω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ.

⁴Gerhard Friedrich, εὐαγγελίζομαι, in T.D.N.T., II, 730.

⁵Ibid., p. 731. Cf. Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.), p. 18, footnote: "Behind the word 'gospel' in St. Paul we cannot assume a formula, but only the very preaching of salvation."

⁶Gerhard Delling, παραλαμβάνω, in T.D.N.T., IV, 14. Delling also notes that Plato defines the relation of a pupil

to his teacher as that of *παράδοσις* to *παραδίδους*. Pedagogy was based on oral transmission of traditions. Not merely historical knowledge, but a legacy of thought was mediated to raise a strongly authoritarian claim anchored primarily in the personality of the teacher (p. 11). Paul does not use this word in connection with *μυστήριον*, lest his message be confused with that of the Hellenistic Mysteries (p. 12).

⁷Lietzmann, p. 76.

⁸Barrett, p. 336. Cf. Robertson and Plummer, p. 331.

⁹Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London: Epworth Press, c.1962), p. 157. See also F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and edited by R.W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c.1961), paragraph 478. (Hereafter BDF.)

¹⁰Lietzmann, p. 76, prefers this solution.

¹¹Schoel, p. 13.

¹²Baird, p. 191.

¹³C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1959), p. 83. See BDF, paragraph 376.

¹⁴Barrett, p. 337. Robertson and Plummer, p. 332, suggest that there are two possible defects: (1) They may not be holding fast to what Paul taught; (2) They may have received it so hastily that they do not comprehend it. Thus, their belief is not very sure. *εἰκῆ* means "heedlessly, rashly, without consideration." Godet, p. 328, says there are two meanings for *εἰκῆ* which come together: (1) without foundation, without sufficient reason; (2) without result or effect. Thus faith remains without effect because its object is nothing real.

Other translations:

Phillips - unless, of course, your faith had no meaning behind it at all.

NEB - if not, your conversion was in vain. Or, for I assume you did not accept it thoughtlessly.

Moffatt - unless indeed your faith was all haphazard.

¹⁵Hering, p. 158.

¹⁶Buechsel, *παραδοσις*, in T.D.N.T., II, 172. Cf. Barrett, p. 337: Paul was a "Christian rabbi, handing on a body of established truth within the circle of his pupils, but at the same time he was an evangelistic preacher; he preached what

he taught, and he taught what he preached." Cf. also Hans Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," New Testament Studies, 12 (April 1966), 231-244, who argues that Paul had probably organized a school in Ephesus, where he instructed students in "wisdom" and practiced the diatribe method of argumentation.

¹⁷Lietzmann, p. 77.

¹⁸Hering, p. 158. 15:3-4 is gospel, comparable to Mishnah; 15:5-8 is the Pauline logos, comparable to the Gemara.

¹⁹Joachim Jeremias, "Artikkelloses Χριστός. Zur Ursprache von I Cor. 15:3b-5," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 57 (1966), 212.

²⁰Hunter, p. 18. Glombitza, p. 283, says the term "Christ" emphasizes Jesus' priestly function; Messiah is shown not to be a lawgiver or a bringer of this-worldly salvation, a nationalistic ruler.

²¹Barrett, p. 338. Cf. Gal. 4:1, Rom. 8:3; ὑπέρ may convey a double meaning here.

²²Mounce, p. 423.

²³Hering, p. 159. In a footnote (#8, p. 159) Hering says, "The difficulty of finding scriptural proof of the passion and resurrection of the Messiah is one of the strongest arguments in favour of the historicity of these great facts which are at the basis of Christianity." Cf. Isaiah 53:8,12 (LXX), and Fritz Rienecker, Sprachlicher Schluessel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament (Giessen-Basel: Brunnen-Verlag, c.1960), p. 338.

²⁴Schweizer, p. 168.

²⁵Barrett, p. 339. Ps. 118:22 and Deut. 21:22 do not seem like probable allusions to Barrett.

²⁶Barrett, p. 339. So Schoel, p. 62. Conzelmann, "On the Analysis," p. 21, sees the ἐτάφη as an allusion to the death, not the empty tomb.

²⁷Hering, p. 160. Glombitza, p. 283, says that the fact that Paul has to stress Jesus' burial shows that he is removed from the Jewish province and is engaged in dialogue with the Hellenistic world, which was concerned about a θεός ἀνὴρ. It should be noted that this is the only occurrence of the verb θάπτω in the Pauline corpus.

²⁸Barrett, pp. 340-341. Cf. the discussion in William Baird, The Corinthian Church--A Biblical Approach to Urban

Culture (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, c.1964), pp. 167-174. Jindrich Manek, "The Apostle Paul and the Empty Tomb," *Novum Testamentum*, 2 (1958), 277, claims that the verb ἐγείρειν has the same meaning as ἀνίστημι; both imply movement of the body. Ἐγείρειν is often used to denote the movement of a body when rising from sleep (Matt. 2:13; 8:26). Friedrich Mildener, "Auferstanden am dritten Tage nach den Schriften," *Evangelische Theologie*, 23 (1963), 272-273, quibbles with Pannenberg's call for an historical investigation of the resurrection on the basis that one cannot verify the resurrection's facticity by means of historical criticism because it is an event without analogy or parallel. Boers, p. 60, says that Paul apparently presented the resurrection of Christ as an objective historical fact. Yet Boers sees faith as a response to the proclamation of the resurrection of Christ (p. 61). He concurs with Bultmann's efforts to demythologize mythically conceived events of resurrection and hope in a personal resurrection. Faith must be rooted in the event of the cross as the event of salvation. Jesus was raised in the kerygma (the kerygma itself being an eschatological event; Jesus himself being present with his word), so that our hope is to be identified and described as openness to the future. Paul's understanding of the resurrection of Christ as a historical event which initiated a cosmic redemption cannot stand up today under historical criticism (p. 63). Man never gets a foothold for faith in the objective world (p. 65).

While it is true that faith has no empirical premise, can one go this far in distinguishing between Historie and Geschichte? Does only the latter (interpreted events) have existential relevance? L. Goppelt, p. 218, rejects the fine distinction between tradition as a proclamation existentially addressing mankind and tradition as pure historicity. Is not existentially significant Geschichte necessarily rooted in Historie?

²⁹Manek, p. 278. Barrett also notes that the story of the empty tomb is a late construction, albeit based on the conviction of Jesus' being alive again and hence a valid inference (pp. 339-340). Helmut Wenz, "Fatale Argumentation des Paulus?" *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 15 (1961), passim, reacts to Bultmann's dismissal of I Cor. 15:3-8 as kerygma. According to Wenz, Bultmann argues that the resurrection cannot be a historic event if it has anything to do with faith, for faith is concerned only with the invisible, the non-demonstrable. Thus Bultmann claims that Paul's argument is fatal because he tries to establish the resurrection as a historic event by references to eyewitnesses; he is trying to prove the credibility of the kerygma (p. 304). Wenz, on the other hand, says that God's action in the resurrection belongs to the realm of Historie, not Geschichte. Contrary to Barth, Wenz understands Paul to be summoning witnesses for the resurrection itself, not just for his gospel in general (so the chronological order of

the text; see below). Paul does not mention the empty tomb, but surely he must have known it, for he would not have said that this Jesus appeared to the disciples after the third day if he were still lying dead at the time (p. 305). In conclusion, Wenz calls the resurrection a historico-symbolical (historisch-zeichenhaften) event; those who do not believe in the resurrection of the dead will not understand the significance of Christ's resurrection. "Das Aergernis besteht ferner darin, dass die Auferstehung in der Verborgenheit und in aller Bezweifelbarkeit der Heilsbedeutung der Historie geschah. Nur der Glaube erkennt die wirkliche Bedeutung dieses Geschehen" (p. 306). Furthermore, with regard to the empty tomb, S. MacL. Gilmour, "The Evidence for Easter," Andover Newton Quarterly, 5 (1965), 7-23, argues that the earliest believers were persuaded of the resurrection not by the negative evidence of the empty tomb, but by the positive evidence of visions, which were interpreted in the light of the inherited belief in the ultimate resurrection at the end of the age. Those who experienced visions would conclude that the tomb was empty; hence the doctrine of the empty tomb gradually emerged. (Volume 5 of this periodical was not available to me in the Concordia Seminary library. I have relied on the condensation by J.J. Collins which appeared in New Testament Abstracts, 9 (1965), pp. 365-366, paragraph 1008.)

³⁰ Bruce Metzger, "A Suggestion Concerning the Meaning of I Cor. 15:4b," Journal of Theological Studies, new series, 8 (1957), 120-121. However, the emphasis on the third day underscores the fact that Jesus was just a visitor in the house of the dead, not a permanent resident therein. Cf. I Macc. 7:16. Cf. Barrett, p. 340, who is troubled by trying to find an explicit forecast in the Old Testament. He suggests that "the resurrection experience and faith came first; then the conviction that the resurrection must have been foretold; then the documentation." Cf. footnote IV,23 above.

³¹ J. Jocz, "Tertia Die, Secundum Scripturas," Canadian Journal of Theology, 9 (1963), 179 and 181.

³² Schoel, p. 56. Gustav Staehlin, "On the Third Day," translated by Wayne P. Todd, Interpretation, 10 (1956), 293, footnote 6, remarks that "all the 'history of religion' examples, in which the 'third day' occurs in a similar way, have significance merely as essentially irrelevant parallels. Likewise, all of the attempts to find the origin of the 'third day' in the Old Testament prophecies...stand on a weak foundation."

³³ Cameron Mackay, "The Third Day," Church Quarterly Review, CLXIV (1963), 290, 292, 294-297. See also Conzelmann, "On the Analysis," p. 21, footnote, for other explanations of "the third day" and Schoel, pp. 59-60.

³⁴ See Schoel's discussion pp. 63-65. Schoel opts for "he was seen." Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted by W.F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 581-582, (hereafter BAG) is not very helpful when he says that $\omega\phi\theta\eta$ is used of beings that make their appearance in a "supernatural manner." What does that mean? Mildenerger, pp. 268-269, says that $\omega\phi\theta\eta$ is used of subjective visionary experiences, though we cannot determine precisely what Paul meant by it. At any rate, they contributed to the apostles' conviction that Jesus was still alive (p. 271).

³⁵ Hering, p. 161.

³⁶ Robertson and Plummer, p. 336.

³⁷ Wenz, p. 305.

³⁸ Wilhelm Michaelis, $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, in T.D.N.T., V, 356-358.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 359.

⁴⁰ The first hand of D (Claromontanus), G (Boernerianus), lat (the Vulgate and some of the Old Latin manuscripts), and sy^{hm}g (the important marginal readings from the Revision of the Peshitto by Bishop Thomas of Charkel, or Heraclea, in 616 A.D.) have the reading $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$, a "correction" of the text to accord with the known data of history.

⁴¹ Barrett, p. 342. The use of "the Twelve" with reference to a group of special disciples shows that Paul is quoting a formula here (p. 341). Cf. Schoel, p. 67, and Winter, p. 144, who understands "the Twelve" not as an indication of the numbers, but as a collective designation of the official body regardless of how many members at that time. Bammel, p. 405, footnote 20, agrees that $\sigma\upsilon\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ is a "Bezeichnung eines amtlichen Kollegiums, dessen eigentliche Zahl oft nicht voll war." He says that the appearance to the Twelve signifies no specific event, but is merely a designation for a "Gruppenerscheinung" in contrast to an "Einzelerscheinung" or a "Gemeindeerscheinung" (pp. 404-405). Staehlin, p. 294, footnote 9, also assumes that the priority of an appearance to an individual over a group corresponds to the priority of a commission to an individual over the commission to a group.

⁴² So von Dobschuetz, C.H. Weisse, Holl, Barrett in his commentary on the Gospel according to Saint John (p. 475), John Knox, and S. MacLean Gilmour, "The Christophany to More Than 500 Brethren," Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 248-252. C.F. Sleeper, "Pentecost and Resurrection," Journal

of Biblical Literature, 84 (1965), 389-399, refutes this identification, since the resurrection appearances are never associated with glossalalia, are restricted to the first generation of apostles, and are distinguished from later visions in the church by both Luke and Paul.

⁴³Barrett, p. 342.

⁴⁴Hering, p. 161.

⁴⁵Eric F.F. Bishop, "The Risen Christ and the Five Hundred Brethren," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 18 (October 1956), 342. This article is an example of exegesis executed more on the basis of fancy than examination of the data!

⁴⁶Wenz, p. 305.

⁴⁷Winter, p. 146. See footnote II,9 above and Hunter, p. 16, and compare also Bammel, footnote II,3 above, who claims there are non-Pauline elements in this clause, too.

⁴⁸Bartsch, p. 273.

⁴⁹Glombitza, p. 286.

⁵⁰See Winter, pp. 147-150, and chapter II, p. 7, above.

⁵¹Allen, p. 353.

⁵²Barrett, p. 343.

⁵³Mildenberger, p. 267.

⁵⁴Barrett, p. 293. See BDF, paragraph 275(5).

⁵⁵Barrett, p. 343. So Hering, p. 162, and Lietzmann, p. 178 - "ein ueber die Zwoelf irgendwie hinausgehender, aber eng begrenzter Kreis persoenlicher Juenger Jesu...." Glombitza, p. 286, says that Paul's definition of apostleship was much broader than a college of Twelve plus one. See Rom. 16:7, where he presumably refers to two co-workers as "apostles."

⁵⁶Manek, p. 277. Cf. also Bammel, p. 403. Staehlin, p. 295, says that they are included in the term "brethren," but he, too, believes that Paul does not mention them because of the Jewish-Christian tradition which would not accept women as witnesses.

⁵⁷Glombitza, p. 286.

⁵⁸Barrett, p. 344. Other translations:

Phillips - one born abnormally late
 NEB - though this birth of mine was monstrous
 TEV - even though I am like one who was born in a most unusual way
 Barrett - one hurried into the world before his time

⁵⁹Hering, p. 52. See also Thorleif Boman, "Paulus abortivus," Studia Theologica, 18 (1964), 46-50, and Bammel, p. 410, footnote 40, who agrees that *ἐκτρώμα* does not refer to the pre-Christian time of the apostle, but is used metaphorically to refer to his unworthiness to be an apostle; "v. 8 drueckt das Erstaunliche des Vorgangs, v. 9 das besonders Unzureichende des Objectes aus." Johannes Munck, "Paulus Tanquam Abortivus," in New Testament Essays (in memory of T.W. Manson), edited by A.J.B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, c.1959), 189-190, says that Eph. 3:8 and I Tim. 1:15 may also indicate that only the contrast between imperfection and mercy is being emphasized. For patristic exegesis *ἐκτρώμα* was considered a humble self-designation which merely indicated that Paul became an apostle later. For the fathers the time element was important.

⁶⁰Robertson and Plummer, p. 339. Cf. Godet, pp. 338-339, and Munck, p. 180, who admits this interpretation has found favor, though he rejects it.

⁶¹Johannes Schneider, *ἐκτρώμα*, in T.D.N.T., II, 465-467.

⁶²Munck, p. 180, cites the studies of Anton Fridrichsen and Gudmund Bjoerck in this regard. Munck, p. 183, argues, however, that *ἐκτρώμα* did not signify a "monster" in Paul's day; only in later usage did it acquire that connotation.

⁶³Boman, p. 50, says that "mit ὡςπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι bezeichnet sich Paulus teils als ein bei seiner Berufung zum Apostel vorzeitig geborenes Kind Gottes, teils als einen koerperlich kleinen, gebrechlichen Mann. Um anzudeuten, dass er mit der Bedeutung spielt, setzt er ὡςπερὶ hinzu." Cf. Munck, p. 180; ὡςπερὶ shows that Paul used the term metaphorically.

⁶⁴Munck, p. 190. On p. 183 he says that in the LXX *ἐκτρώμα* (=prematurely born dead foetus) is used as an image of deepest human wretchedness.

⁶⁵Munck, pp. 190-191. This interpretation was first elaborated by Severian of Gabala. Its merit lies in the fact that it carries out the metaphor completely. However, it is strange that Paul would make no overt mention of the law in this context if this is what he intended to imply.

⁶⁶Munck, p. 191.

⁶⁷ So Schneider, p. 467. Munck, p. 181, says the article has no demonstrative force. Hering, p. 162, suggests that the article may simply be the result of a Semitism, since Hebrew likes to use articles in comparisons ('to roll up the heavens like the book,' Is. 34:4, Massoretic Text).

⁶⁸ BAG, p. 248. Cf. Eph. 3:8 - ἑλακιστότερος. Morris Ashcraft, "Paul's Understanding of Apostleship," Review and Expositor, 55 (1958), 400-412, shows how the theory that the apostolate is based on the Jewish institution of the sheluchim (official messengers who traveled throughout the Dispersion) needs to be re-evaluated. There is no evidence that Jesus or his disciples knew of such an institution. Paul uses the word "apostle" 25 times--9 times with reference to himself, 13 times with reference to an undefined group of which he was a member, 3 times with reference to a group in which he was not included (I Cor. 15:7; Gal. 1:17,19) (p. 404). Wilhelm Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, originally edited by Edgar Hennecke and translated by R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c.1965), II, 28, says that the apostolate is of late origin. He says the Twelve were an institution closely related to the church's apocalyptic world of ideas, but no longer a functioning institution in Paul's time, since he did not consult with them when he went up to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18). Ἀπόστολος is a term used to define a missionary, he suggests (p. 29).

⁶⁹ Barrett, p. 345. Cf. Acts 8:1,3; 9:1,2; 22:4,5; 26:9ff.; Gal. 1:13 for Paul's activities as a persecutor.

⁷⁰ Glombitza, pp. 289-290, suggests that II Cor. 12:7 is instructive for Paul's view of the importance and relevancy of grace. His thorn in the flesh is understood as his former existence as a persecutor of the church, not some physical malady. Whenever he was assailed by guilt, only the saving message of grace could restore him. This may be true enough, we would reply, but hasn't this interpretation been influenced too much by contemporary psychology?

⁷¹ BAG, p. 429; Robertson and Plummer, p. 341.

⁷² Bammel, p. 410, footnote 41, reads v. 10b with 9c and says that Paul emphasizes his hard work to point out how he has been making up for the obstruction of the course of the gospel which he had caused. Godet, p. 341, suggests that Paul is saying he has outdone all of them together rather than any one of them in particular.

⁷³ Barrett, p. 345.

⁷⁴ Rienecker, p. 389. Σύν is not an expression of synergism, but it belongs with the verb: "Die Gnade trug die Last mit ihm."

⁷⁵Hunter, p. 15.

⁷⁶Schoel, p. 10.

⁷⁷Barrett, p. 346. See also Fuchs, p. 161: "It is therefore false to equate the form with the content of proclamation. Precisely the fact that this content was expressed not in a single formula but in a variety of ways and with the help of very diverse ideas, for example, very different titles of honor for Christ, in always new approaches, demonstrates that the content of faith as the content of proclamation was basically subject to theological reflection; such theological reflection is to be understood as an act of freedom and not as an act of compulsion.... Faith was directed to the event that was here proclaimed, and to nothing else." Fuchs' essay deserves careful study, for he stresses the need to maintain the "perpetual event character of the proclamation of the freedom of the children of God." This is the heart of the gospel as it addresses us existentially. Eduard Schweizer's brilliant essay, "Two New Testament Creeds Compared," articulates with comparable eloquence and greater lucidity the same concern.

CHAPTER V

¹Fuchs, p. 156.

²Ibid., p. 168.

³Staehlin, p. 299.

⁴It seems to me that any talk about new self-understanding or authentic existence must take shape in the light of these concerns about faith, the cross, the resurrection-kerygma.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ✓ Allen, E.L. "The Lost Kerygma," New Testament Studies, 3 (1956), 349-353. ✓
- Ashcraft, Morris. "Paul's Understanding of Apostleship," Review and Expositor, 55 (1958), 400-412. ✓
- ✓ Baird, William. The Corinthian Church--A Biblical Approach to Urban Culture. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, c.1964. ✓
- ✓ ----- "What is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor. 15:3-8 and Gal. 1:11-17," Journal of Biblical Literature, 76 (1957), 181-191. ✓
- Bammel, Ernst. "Herkunft und Funktion der Traditionselemente in 1. Kor. 15,1-11," Theologische Zeitschrift, 11 (November 1955), 401-419.
- ✓ Barrett, C[harles] K. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Harper and Row, c.1968. ✓
- ✓ Bartsch, Hans-Werner. "Die Argumentation des Paulus in I Kor. 15:3-11," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 55 (1964), 261-274.
- ✓ Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 4th edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Bible, Holy. Authorized, Revised Standard, New English Bible, Today's English, and Phillips versions.
- ✓ Bieder, Werner. "Paulus und seine Gegner in Korinth," Theologische Zeitschrift (Basel), 17 (1961), 319-333.
- ✓ Bishop, Eric F.F. "The Risen Christ and the Five Hundred Brethren," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 18 (October 1956), 341-344. ✓
- ✓ Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. 9th-10th German edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c.1961.
- ✓ Boers, H.W. "Apocalyptic Eschatology in I Cor. 15; an Essay in Contemporary Interpretation," Interpretation, 21 ✓

(1967), 50-65.

✓ Boman, Thorleif. "Paulus abortivus," Studia Theologica, 18 (1964), 46-50.

Buechsel, Friedrich. δίδωμι, παραδίδωμι, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1964. Pp. 166-173.

Bultmann, Rudolf. γνωρίζω, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. I. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1964. P. 718.

✓ Conzelmann, Hans. "On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Cor. 15:3-5," Interpretation, 20 (1966), 15-25. ✓

✓ ----- "Paulus und die Weisheit," New Testament Studies, 12 (April 1966), 231-244.

✓ Delling, Gerhard. λαμβάνω, παραλαμβάνω, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. IV. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1967. Pp. 5-7, 11-14.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated from the revised 2nd German edition by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Dodd, C.H. According to the Scriptures. Digswell Place: James Nisbet and Company, 1952. ✓

----- "The Appearances of the Risen Christ," in Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 9-25.

✓ Fannon, P. "Paul and Tradition in the Primitive Church," Scripture, 16 (1964), 47-56. ✓

Friedrich, Gerhard. εὐαγγελίζομαι, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1964. Pp. 707-737, especially 729-734.

Fuchs, Ernst. "Must One Believe in Jesus if He Wants to Believe in God?" Journal for Theology and the Church: The Bultmann School of Biblical Interpretation: New Directions? Vol. I. Edited by Robert W. Funk. New York:

Harper Torchbooks, 1965.

- Gilmour, S. MacLean. "The Christophany to More than 500 Brethren," Journal of Biblical Literature, 80 (1961), 248-252.
- "The Evidence for Easter," Andover Newton Quarterly, 5 (1965), 7-23.
- Glombitza, Otto. "Gnade--das entscheidende Wort, Erwagungen zu 1. Kor. xv.1-11, eine exegetische Studie," Novum Testamentum, 2 (1958), 281-290.
- Godet, F. Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1890.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. "Tradition nach Paulus," Kerygma und Dogma, 4 (1958), 213-233.
- Grundmann, W. "Ueberlieferung und Eigenaussage im eschatologischen Denken des Apostels Paulus," New Testament Studies, 8 (1961), 12-26.
- Hennecke, Edgar. New Testament Apocrypha. Vol. II. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c.1965.
- Hering, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Translated from the 2nd French edition by A.W. Heathcote and P.J. Allcock. London: Epworth Press, c.1962.
- Holtz, T. "Zum Selbstverstaendnis des Apostels Paulus," Theologische Literaturzeitung, 91 (1966), 321-330.
- Hunter, Archibald M. Paul and His Predecessors. New edition. Philadelphia: Westminster, c.1961.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Artikelloses Χριστός: Zur Ursprache von I Cor. 15:3b-5," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 57 (1966), 211-215.
- The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated from the 3rd German edition by Norman Perrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1966.
- Jocz, J. "Tertia Die, Secundum Scripturas," Canadian Journal of Theology, 9 (1963), 174-184.
- Kaesemann, Ernst. "Konsequent Traditionsgeschichte?" Zeitschrift

fuer Theologie und Kirche, 62/2 (1965), 137-152.
(No. 2 is missing from Vol. 62 in the Concordia Seminary library; only nos. 1 and 4 are available.)

- Kolb, Robert Allan. "Pauline Paidology: The Use of the Suffering Servant of God Image of Isaiah 52/53 for Jesus Christ in the Pauline Corpus," Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, 1968.
- Lichtenstein, Ernst. "Die aelteste christliche Traditionsformel," Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte, IV/I/LXIII/1 (1950), 1-74.
- Lietzmann, Hans. An die Korinther I.II. In Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. 4th edition. Tuebingen: Verlag J.C.B. Mohr, n.d.
- Mackay, Cameron. "The Third Day," Church Quarterly Review, CLXIV (1963), 289-299.
- Manek, Jindrich. "The Apostle Paul and the Empty Tomb," Novum Testamentum, 2 (1958), 276-280.
- Martin, Ralph P. Worship in the Early Church. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, c.1964.
- Metzger, Bruce. "A Suggestion Concerning the Meaning of I Cor. 15:4b," Journal of Theological Studies, new series, 8 (1957), 118-123.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. ὁρίω, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. V. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1967. Pp. 347-361.
- Mildenberger, Friedrich. "Auferstanden am dritten Tage nach den Schriften," Evangelische Theologie, 23 (1963), 265-280.
- Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. New York: Harper, 1938.
- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- "St. Paul and Dualism: The Pauline Conception of Resurrection," New Testament Studies, 12 (1966), 106-123.
- Moulton, W.F. and A.S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th revised edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963.

- Mounce, Robert H. "Continuity of the Primitive Tradition; Some Pre-Pauline Elements in I Cor.," Interpretation, 13 (1959), 417-424.
- Munck, Johannes. "Paulus Tanquam Abortivus (I Cor. 15:8)," in New Testament Essays (in memory of T.W. Manson). Edited by A.J.B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, c.1959. Pp. 180-193.
- Mussner, Franz, "'Schichten' in der paulinischen Theologie dargetan an 1. Kor. 15," Biblische Zeitschrift, new series, 9 (1965), 59-70.
- Neill, Stephen. The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1961. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. 25th edition. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Rienecker, Fritz. Sprachlicher Schluessel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. 10th edition. Giessen-Basel: Brunnen-Verlag, c.1960.
- Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on First Corinthians. In International Critical Commentary. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914.
- Romaniuk, Kasimierz. "De Themate Ebed Jahve in Soteriologica Sancti Pauli," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), 14-25.
- Rusche, Helga. "Die Leugner der Auferstehung von den Toten in der Korinthischen Gemeinde," Muenchener Theologische Zeitschrift, 10 (1959), 149-151.
- Schmithals, Walter. "Paulus und der historische Jesus," Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 53 (1962), 145-160.
- Schneider, Johannes. Ἐκτρομα, in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. II. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, c.1964. Pp. 465-467.
- Schoel, Jerome T. "I Corinthians 15:3b-5: Primitive Christian Proclamation." Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, 1967.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Die 'Mystik' des Sterbens und Auferstehens

mit Christus bei Paulus," Evangelische Theologie, 26 (1966), 239-257.

- . "Two New Testament Creeds Compared," in Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation (in honor of Otto A. Piper). Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. New York: Harper and Row, c.1962. Pp. 166-177, 291-293.
- Sleeper, C.F. "Pentecost and Resurrection," Journal of Biblical Literature, 84 (1965), 389-399.
- Staehlin, Gustav. "On the Third Day," translated by Wayne P. Todd, Interpretation, 10 (1956), 282-299.
- Tenney, M.C. "The Essence of the Gospel," Christianity Today, 3 (no. 12, 1959), 9-12.
- Wenz, Helmut. "Fatale Argumentation des Paulus?" Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung, 15 (1961), 304-306.
- Winter, Paul. "I Cor. 15:3b-7," Novum Testamentum, 2 (1958), 142-150.