

APPENDIX I

BRUCE M. METZGER: A PRINCETON APOSTATE

Another of the editors of the united Bible Societies' Greek New Testament is **BRUCE M. METZGER** (1914-). Metzger is George L. Collord Professor of New Testament Language and Literature, Princeton Theological Seminary, and he serves on the board of the American Bible Society. Metzger is the head of the continuing RSV translation committee of the apostate National Council of Churches in the U.S.A. The Revised Standard Version was soundly condemned of its modernism when it first appeared in 1952. Today its chief editor sometimes is invited to speak at Evangelical forums. The RSV hasn't changed, but Evangelicalism certainly has!

Metzger was the chairman for the *Reader's Digest Condensed Bible* and wrote the introductions to each book in the butchered version of the Scriptures. The Preface claims that "Dr. Metzger was actively involved at every stage of the work, from the initial studies on each of the sixty-six books through all the subsequent editorial reviews. The finished condensation has received his full approval." The *Condensed Bible* removed 40% of the Bible text, including the warning of Revelation 22:18-19! In the introductions to the books of the *Reader's Digest Bible*, Metzger question the authorship, traditional date, and supernatural inspiration of books penned by Moses, Daniel, and Peter, and in many other ways reveals his liberal, unbelieving heart. Consider some examples:

Genesis: "Nearly all modern scholars agree that, like the other books of the Pentateuch, [Genesis] is a composite of several sources, embodying traditions that go back in some cases to Moses."

Exodus: "As with Genesis, several strands of literary tradition, some very ancient, some as late as the sixth century B.C., were combined in the makeup of the books" (Introduction to Exodus).

Deuteronomy: "It's compilation is generally assigned to the seventh century B.C., though it rests upon much older tradition, some of it from Moses' time."

Daniel: "Most scholars hold that the book was compiled during the persecutions (168-165 B.C.) of the Jewish people by Antiochus Epiphanes."

John: "Whether the book was written directly by John, or indirectly (his teachings may have been edited by another), the church has accepted it as an authoritative supplement to the story of Jesus' ministry given by the other evangelists."

1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus: "Judging by differences in style and vocabulary from Paul's other letters, **many modern scholars think that the Pastorals were not written by Paul.**"

James: "Tradition ascribes the letter to James, the Lord's brother, writing about A.D. 45, but **modern opinion is uncertain**, and differs widely on both origin and date."

2 Peter: "Because the author refers to the letter of Paul as 'scripture,' a term apparently not applied to them until long after Paul's death, **most modern scholars think that this letter was drawn up in Peter's name** sometime between A.D. 100 and 150."

Metzger's modernism was also made plain in the notes to the *New Oxford Annotated Bible RSV* (1973). Metzger co-edited this volume with Herbert May. It first appeared in 1962 as the *Oxford Annotated Bible* and was the first Protestant annotated edition of the Bible to be approved by a Roman authority. It was given an imprimatur in 1966 by Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, Massachusetts. Metzger wrote many of the rationalistic notes in this volume and put his editorial stamp of approval on the rest. Consider some excerpts from the notes:

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT: "The Old Testament may be described as the literary expression of the religious life of ancient Israel. ...The Israelites were more history-conscious than any other people in the ancient world. Probably as early as the time of David and Solomon, **out of a matrix of myth, legend, and history**, there had appeared the earliest written form of the story of the saving acts of God from Creation to the conquest of the Promised Land, an account which later in modified form became a part of Scripture. But it was to be a long time before the idea of Scripture arose and the old Testament took its present form. ...The process by which the Jews became 'the people of the Book' was gradual, **and the development is shrouded in the mists of history and tradition**. ...The date of the final compilation of the Pentateuch or Law, which was the first corpus or larger body of literature that came to be regarded by the Jews as authoritative Scripture, is uncertain, although some have conservatively dated it at the time of the Exile in the sixth. ...Before the adoption of the Pentateuch as the Law of Moses, there had been compiled and edited in the spirit and diction of the Deuteronomic 'school' the group of books consisting of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, in much their present form. **...Thus the Pentateuch took shape over a long period of time.**"

NOTES ON GENESIS: "[Genesis] 2.4b-3..24 ... is a different tradition form that in 1.1-2,4a, as evidenced by the flowing style and the different order of events, e.g. man is created before vegetation, animals, and woman. ...7:16b: The Lord shut him in, a note from the early tradition, which delight in anthropomorphic touches. 7:18-20: The waters covered all the high mountains, thus threatening a confluence of the upper and lower waters (1.6). Archaeological evidence suggests that **traditions of a prehistoric flood covering the whole earth are heightened versions of local inundations**, e.g. in the Tigris-Euphrates basin."

NOTES ON JOB: "The **ancient folktale** of a patient Job (1.1-2.13; 42.7-17; Jas. 5.11) circulated orally among oriental sages in the second millennium B.C. and was probably written down in Hebrew at the time of David and Solomon or a century later (about 1000-800 B.C.)."

NOTES ON PSALM 22: "22:12-13: ...the meaning of the third line [they have pierced my hands and feet] is obscure." [Editor: No, it is not obscure; it is a prophecy of Christ's crucifixion!]

NOTES ON ISAIAH: "Only chs. 1-39 can be assigned to Isaiah's time; it is generally accepted that chs. 40-66 come from the time of Cyrus of Persia (539 B.C.) and later, as shown by the differences in historical background, literary style, and theological emphases. ...The contents of this section [chs. 56-66] (sometimes called **Third Isaiah**) suggest a date between 530 and 510 B.C., perhaps contemporary with Haggai and Zechariah (520-518); chapters 60-62 may be later."

NOTES ON JONAH: "The book is didactic narrative which has taken older material from the realm of **popular legend** and put it to a new, more consequential use."

INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT: "Jesus himself left no literary remains; information regarding his word and works comes from his immediate followers (the apostles) and their disciples. At first this information was circulated orally. As far as we know today, the first attempt to produce a written Gospel was made by John Mark, who according to tradition was a disciple of the Apostle Peter. This Gospel, along with a collection of sayings of Jesus and several other special sources, formed the basis of the Gospels attributed to Matthew and Luke." [Editor: The Gospels, like every part of the new Testament, were written by direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This nonsense of trying to find 'the original source' for the Gospels is unbelieving heresy.]

NOTES ON 2 PETER: "The tradition that this letter is the work of the apostle Peter was questioned in early times, and internal indications are almost decisive against it. ...Most scholars therefore regard the letter as the work of one who was deeply indebted to Peter and who published it under his master's name early in the second century." [Editor: Those who believe this nonsense must think the early Christians were fools and the Holy Spirit on vacation.]

NOTES FROM "HOW TO READ THE BIBLE WITH UNDERSTANDING": "The opening chapters of the Old Testament deal with human origins. They are not to be read as history...These chapters are followed by the stories of the patriarchs, which preserve ancient traditions now known to reflect the conditions of the times of which they tell, though they cannot be treated strictly as historical. ...it is not for history but for religion that they are preserved...When we come to the books

of Samuel and Kings...Not all in these books is of the same historical value, and especially in the stories of Elijah and Elisha there **are legendary elements**. ...We should always remember the variety of literary forms found in the Bible, and should read a passage in the light of its own particular literary character. **Legend should be read as legend, and poetry as poetry, and not with a dull prosaic and literalistic mind.**"

This is the same type of rationalistic wickedness that appears in Metzger's notes in the *Reader's Digest Condensed Bible*. This modernistic foolishness, of course, is a lie. The Pentateuch was written by the hand of God and Moses and completed during the 40 years of wilderness wandering hundreds of years before Samuel and the kings. The Old Testament did not arise gradually from a matrix of myth and history, but is inspired revelation delivered to holy men of old by Almighty God. The Jews were a "people of the book" from the beginning. The Jewish nation did not form the Bible; the Bible formed the Jewish nation! In Metzger's "introduction tot eh New Testament" in the *New Oxford Annotated Bible*, he completely ignores the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and claims that the Gospels are composed of material gathered from oral tradition. The Bible says nothing about this, but Jesus Christ plainly tells us that the Holy Spirit would guide the Apostles into all truth (John 16:7-15). The Gospels are the product of divine revelation, not some happenstance editing of oral tradition.

Bruce Metzger is a Liberal. He piously claims on one hand that the Bible is the inspired Word of God; but out of the other side of the mouth he claims the Bible is filled with myth and lies. He denies the Bible's history, its miracles, and its authorship, while, in true liberal style, declaring that this denial does not do injustice to the Word of God, for the Bible is not "written for history but for religion" and is not to be read "with a dull prosaic and literalistic mind"!

Metzger has been called an Evangelical by some who should know better, but upon the authority of the man's own writings, I declare that Bruce Metzger is an unbeliever. He is a false teacher. He is apostate. He is a heretic. Those are all Bible terms. Having studied many of the man's works, I am convinced those are the terms which must be applied to him. One Baptist writer partially defended Metzger to me with these words--"he did write a superb pamphlet in 1953 refuting the Jehovah's Witnesses and defending the full and absolute deity of Christ." Even the Pope of Rome defends the full and absolute deity of Christ. A man can defend the deity of Christ and still be a false teacher. A man who denies the written Word also denies the Living Word. They stand or fall together. If the Bible contains error, Christ was a liar. If Christ is perfect Truth, so is the Bible.

In *The New Testament, Its Background, Growth and Content*, which appeared in 1965, Metzger claims that "the discipline of form criticism has enlarged our understanding of the conditions which prevailed during the years when the gospel materials circulated by

word of mouth" (p. 86). Not so. Form criticism is that unbelieving disciples which claims that the Gospels were gradually formed out a matrix of tradition and myth. Form critics hold a wide variety of views (reflecting the unsettled and relativistic nature of the rationalism upon which they stand), but all of them deny that the Gospels are the perfect, verbally inspired, divinely-given, absolutely infallible Word of God. Metzger says, "What each evangelist has preserved, therefore, is not a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus, but an interpretative portrait delineated in accord with the special needs of the early church" (Ibid.) Metzger is wrong. The Gospel writers have indeed given us, by divine revelation, a photographic reproduction of the words and deeds of Jesus Christ. Praise God for it!

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 39-44

Scholars lie. They absolutely, unequivocally, unambiguously lie. So I started on a quest to find out what was going on.

I wrote a letter to Dr. Bruce Metzger, and I have here the response to my letter. Dr. Metzger is supposed to be the leading textual scholar in America. I said to him, 'Dr. Metzger, in a certain place you put a note that there was a rough breathing mark instead of a soft breathing mark on a word. Why, then, would you leave out 11 words without nay kind of footnote?' He said, 'We only put in things that would make a translational difference.' That's a real interesting statement! [As if eleven words do not make a translational difference.]

As a consequence of that, I started some research. I am one of those people who loves to count things and look at things and investigate things. I was reading again in my Greek New Testament and recognized something that was very interesting to me. I wrote again to Dr. Metzger and said, 'Dr. Metzger, I've been working on a Greek New Testament, and as I've gone through it I have found out that not one time did you ever capitalize the word of God; not one time did you ever capitalize the word for Holy Spirit; not one time, if you could get away with it, did you ever capitalize the word for Lord. Was there a reason for that?' D.r Metzger said, 'In the original manuscripts that we have there is no size difference indicating deity. To have introduced any capitalizations would have been an editorial comment.' I thought, that's interesting. I looked down the page. Here's the word for Devil; here's the word for Satan; and they are both capitalized. Interesting.

I found out that scholars lie.

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 326-327

...Scholars such as Bruce M. Metzger and Kurt Aland discredit the value of the Reformation Greek texts and subsequently the English Bibles on Textual grounds. Metzger, giving a standard reply writes,

'Partly because of this catchword [Textus Receptus] the form of the Greek text is incorporated in the editions that Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs had published succeeded in establishing itself as 'the only true text' of the New Testament, and was slavishly reprinted in hundreds of subsequent editions. It lies at the basis of the King James Version and of all the principal Protestant translations in the languages of Europe prior to 1881. so superstitious has been the reverence accorded the Textus Receptus that in some cases attempts to criticize or emend it have been regarded as akin to sacrilege' (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, Oxford University Press, 1968, p. 106).

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 351

How widely this text has prevailed in the actual use of the church, Bruce M. Metzger, himself no advocate of the TT [Traditional Text], indicates. It 'spread widely throughout Greek speaking lands.' It was the text of the first translation of the Bible into Teutonic language, by Ulfilas, 'apostle to the Goths,' in the second half of the fourth century. It was the text of the first translation of the Bible into a Slavic language, thus forming 'the basis of the New Testament...for millions of Slavic peoples.' Metzger concludes:

"As regards the history of the printed form of the Greek New Testament, the so-called Textus Receptus, which was based chiefly on manuscripts of the Antiochian recension [Metzger here repeats the Westcott-Hort myth that the Received Text was created in the fourth century], has been reprinted, with only minor modifications, in almost one thousand editions from 1514 down to the twentieth century. When one considers how many translations into the vernaculars of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America have been based on the Greek Textus Receptus of the New Testament (such as the King James version or Luther's translation), it will be appreciated how enormous has been the influence of Lucian's recension [again he refers to the Westcott-Hort myth], made in Antioch about the turn of the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era" (Bruce Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 1963, pp. 19,20).

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 377

APPENDIX II

METZGER ON DEAN JOHN WILLIAM BURGON (1813-1888)

Those students who read works such as Miller's *General Biblical Introduction* or Metzger's *The Text of the New Testament* (said by many to be "the standard in the field") or Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* or Kurt Aland's *The Text of the New Testament* are given the impression that there has been no serious scholarly rejection of the theories underlying the modern Greek text. This is plainly a deception. Metzger does mention Burgon and Salmon, but he tells us nothing of consequence of their work apart from shallow caricatures. The same can be said for Kenyon. Aland summarizes the defense of the Received Text as mere "clamorous rhetoric" (*The Text of the New Testament*, p. 19).

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 74

Bruce Metzger (1914-) also give the typically insufficient overview of Burgon's work:

"During the closing decades of the nineteenth century the traditional text found a doughty defender in the person of John W. Burgon...he has been described as 'a High-churchman of the old school' who became notorious as 'a leading champion of lost causes and impossible beliefs; but the vehemence of his advocacy somewhat impaired its effect.' His conservatism can be gauged from a sermon he preached at Oxford in 1884 in which he denounced the higher education of 'young women as young men' as 'a thing inexpedient and immodest'; the occasion was the admission of women to university examinations! ...Burgon used every rhetorical device at his disposal to attack both the English Revision and the Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort. Burgon's argument was basically theological and speculative" (Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 135).

This is an incredibly shallow survey of Burgon's opposition to the Revised Version. Metzger sets the stage for his review of Burgon by labelling him a champion of lost causes. We could put the same label on the Old Testament prophets. They championed causes which certainly appeared to have been lost in their own day. Israel did not respond to their pleas and did not return from apostasy. Most defenders of the truth throughout history, in fact, have been champions of what appear to have been lost causes. The problem here is that the end has not yet come, and there are many causes which appear to be lost but which will be victorious in the end.

And what of the supposed "impossible beliefs" of Burgon? One

of the hallmarks of his ministry was his defense of the perfect inspiration of Holy Scripture against the Modernism which was sweeping into the Church of England. Was that an impossible belief? (Of course, it is impossible to Metzger, as we saw in Chapter One.)

Metzger overlooks the great things in Burgon, does not even mention his hallmark work on Inspiration, and selects an irrelevant incident to illustrate for his readers Burgon's life and position. Burgon opposed the opening of the university of Oxford to total intermingling of men and women and to complete co-education which did not distinguish between the sexes. Metzger approvingly quotes the *Dictionary of National Biography* which refers to the title of a sermon Burgon preached on Oxford on June 8, 1884, but this *Dictionary* (and Metzger does not set the record straight) leaves out an important part of the title, which was, "To educate Young Women like Young Man AND WITH YOUNG MEN--a thing inexpedient and immodest." The omission of the words "and with Young Men" significantly changes the thrust of Burgon's position. Burgon was not opposed to women being trained institutions of higher education. He was supportive of the situation which existed prior to 1884, in which women lived in private dwelling houses while pursuing their education. "He is careful to explain that his censure does not touch the Halls already established for young Ladies in Oxford ('Lady Margaret Hall' and 'Somerville Hall')" (Edward Goulburn, *Life of Dean Burgon*, p. 235). Burgon was opposed to the close, constant, unsupervised intermingling of unmarried men and women, and he was opposed to the changes which were overtaking his times. We believe Burgon was right. There can be no doubt that the contemporary practice of coeducation has resulted in a tremendous increase in immorality in the institutions of "higher" education. Consider an excerpt from Burgon's sermon:

"You are the prime ornament of God's creation; and we men are, to speak plainly, just what you make us. ...If you set about becoming Man's rival, or rather if you try to be, what you never can become, Man's equal...you have in a manner unsexed yourselves, and must needs put up with the bitter consequence" (Goulburn, pp. 236,37).

We are convinced that Burgon's sermon, far from being obscurantist, would be very appropriate in the latter half of the twentieth century. We would like to hear it preached in pulpits across the land! Of course, Bruce Metzger, who headed up a committee which applied feministic "inclusive language" concepts to the Word of God in his New Revised Standard Version, might not appreciate Burgon's biblical view of womanhood. Metzger also fails to remind his readers that a great many of Burgon's contemporaries, probably the majority, in fact, held the same view as Burgon. What about Metzger's hero F.J.A. Hort? Since this type of thing is important, of so it would appear, why does he fail to tell his readers that *Hort* opposed women's suffrage in 1850? Or that *Hort* was a racist for writing in 1862 of the black man, "As yet everywhere (not in slavery only) they have surely shown themselves only as an immeasurably inferior race, just human and no more,

their religion frothy and sensuous, their highest virtues those of a good Newfoundland dog" (Arthur Hort, *Life and Letter of Fenton John Anthony Hort*, Vol. 1, p. 458)? Why does Metzger not label *Hort* a champion of lost causes? Why does Metzger pick out an example like this while failing to detail burgon's amazing and in some ways unexcelled credentials in textual scholarship, and while failing to cite Burgon's wonderful defense of the perfect inspiration of Scripture against the rationalism of his day? The answer lies, we believe, in the fact that Metzger himself is a Rationalist, as we have seen earlier in Chapter One.

Metzger summarizes the 1,500 or so pages of John Burgon's incredibly well researched, carefully-reasoned, biblically-based defense of the Traditional Text as "theological and speculative." This is amazing. To say that Burgon's defense of the Bible text was *speculative* is simply a lie. To use any other term would be inaccurate. But wait a minute. What in the world is wrong with a *theological* defense of the Bible! Theology is merely the teaching of the Word of God. There is no other proper way for the text of Scripture to be examined than theologically.

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 161-162

...We have already considered Bruce Metzger's unbelief in Chapter One. With his rationalistic biases, it is no surprise to me that he would quickly pass over burgon's defense of the Traditional Text. Burgon's powerful writings are devastating to Metzger's own position on biblical inspiration as well as to his position on the Bible text.

Cloud, David. For Love of the Bible. London, ON.: Bethel Baptist Church, 1995. 164

APPENDIX III

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS (1841-1913)

Biblical scholar and Presbyterian minister. A native of New York City, Briggs was educated at the University of Virginia (1857-1860), Union Theological Seminary in New York (1861-1863) and the University of Berlin (1866-1869). In 1874, after brief service as a Presbyterian pastor, he accepted a call to Union Theological Seminary in New York where, in 1876, he assumed the chair of hebrew and Cognate languages.

In 1880 Briggs became co-editor, with Archibald A. Hodge of Princeton Seminary, of the newly founded *Presbyterian Review*.

Before long the *Review* proved to be a source of profound tension as Briggs's higher-critical views conflicted sharply with the more traditional Princeton doctrine of Scripture. This, combined with differences over proposed Presbyterian confessional revision, led to the dissolution of the journal in 1889.

Throughout the 1880s Briggs published works which championed the higher-critical method and questioned the orthodoxy of Princeton Theology. Despite strong opposition to these positions in the church, it was Briggs's inaugural address, "The Authority of Holy Scripture" (1891), delivered upon his induction into the chair of biblical studies at Union, which precipitated one of the most famous heresy trials in American religious history.

In a polemical tone Briggs denied the verbal inspiration, inerrancy and authenticity of Scripture, appear to place the authority of reason and the church on a par with the Bible and defended the doctrine of progressive sanctification after death. As a result, the 1891 General Assembly vetoed Briggs's professorial appointment, the 1892 Assembly specifically endorsed the doctrine of biblical inerrancy and the 1893 Assembly suspended Briggs from the ministry. In addition the controversy occasioned the divorce of Union Seminary and the Presbyterian Church.

Briggs retained his position at Union and, in 1898, entered the priesthood of the Episcopal Church. A growing concern for church union led him to resign his chair in 1904 to teach symbolics and irenics. Briggs authored over twenty books, including *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (1899). Together with F. Brown and S. R. Driver he edited *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (1906), which is still in use today, and served as one of the original editors of the prestigious *International Critical Commentary*.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990. 188

APPENDIX IV

PHILIP SCHAFF (1819-1893)

German Reformed church historian and ecumenist. Born in Chur, Switzerland, Schaff received his education at the Universities of Tübingen (1837-1839), Halle (1839-1840) and Berlin (1840-1842), where he came under the influence of such notable scholars as Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860), Friedrich A. G. Tholuck (1799-1877) and Johann A. Neander (1789-1850). Upon completing his studies in 1842, Schaff became *privatdocent* at the University of Berlin. The next year Schaff accepted an invitation by representatives of the newly organized German Reformed Seminary at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, to become a professor there. He arrived

to take up his duties in August of 1844, and so began a career of nearly a half-century of scholarship at the forefront of the study of church history. Schaff taught at Mercersburg until 1865, lecturing occasionally at Drew and Hartford seminaries between 1868 and 1871, and in 1870 he accepted a professorship at Union Theological Seminary in New York, where he remained until his death.

In addition to his pioneering work in church history, Schaff served as secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee and was influential in the reorganization of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance in 1866, serving as its corresponding secretary until 1873, and spending hundreds of hours and traveling thousands of miles to organize the World Conference of the Alliance held in New York City, October 2-12, 1873. From 1870 to 1885, Schaff was involved with the committee for the American Revised Bible translation project and served as president to that committee (1872-1885). He founded the American Society of Church History in 1888 and served as president of that organization until his death in 1893.

In addition to these many commitments, Schaff published an astounding number of books and articles. He edited *Der Deutsch Kirchenfreund* (1884-1854), wrote regularly for the *Mercersburg Review*, serving as its co-editor (1857-1861), and founded the German periodical *Evangelische Zeugnisse aus den Deutschen Kirchen in Amerika*, which was issued from 1863 to 1865. His first major work in America was *The Principle of Protestantism* (1845), an expansion of his inaugural address at Mercersburg Seminary. This work, which brought upon Schaff charges of heresy and Romanism, traced the development of the Christian church through history and emphasized the value of the church in every age. Schaff's assertion that the Reformation was "the legitimate offspring, the greatest act of the Catholic Church" provoked strong protest among the militantly Protestant wing of the German Reformed clergy. Then next year, Schaff published *What Is Church History?*, a summary of his theology of the history of the Christian church.

After a decade in Mercersburg, Schaff took a sabbatical leave and returned to Europe, where he presented a series of addresses about his "adopted fatherland." Published in German as *Amerika* (1854), they appeared in English the following year. There Schaff attempted to explain and defend the American system in which church and state were separated and complete religious liberty enjoyed. In 1858 Schaff published the first volume of his most ambitious work, his *History of the Christian Church*, which ultimately grew to eight volumes (the two on the Middle Ages were written by his son, David, after Schaff's death). On the centennial of the United States Constitution, he issued an interpretation of the constitutional guarantees of religious liberty entitled *Church and State in the United States*.

As an editor, he presided over the translation of Johann Peter Lange's (1802-1884) massive *Bibelwerk*, a project finally completed in 1880 when the last of twenty-five volumes was published. From

1880-1886 Schaff edited the first series of fourteen volumes of *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, co-editing with Henry Wace the first two volumes of the second series. In 1877 the first edition of Schaff's three-volume *Creeds of Christendom* appeared. The *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* was published in three volumes (1882-1884). Finally, he originated and organized the American Society of Church History's thirteen-volume American Church History Series. Inspiring all of his prodigious labors was Schaff's ultimate goal to heal the wounds caused by divisions in the church. His epitaph is apt: "He advocated the reunion of Christendom."

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
1051-1052

APPENDIX V

THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

A North American association of Biblical scholars. founded in 1880, during a period in which several other scholarly societies were being founded, in view of American interest in the Scriptures it is not surprising that the first major scholarly religious society focused on the Bible. Instrumental in the founding were Frederic Gardiner, Charles A. Briggs and Philip Schaff. There were thirty-two male charter members, mostly seminary and college professors; all were Protestants from the Northeast. By the turn of the century, Jews, Catholics and women had been inducted. The purpose of the society as it was stated in 1884 has remained essentially unchanged: "The object of the Society shall be to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on biblical topics."

Papers at the annual meetings, later published in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, focused on philology, exegesis, archaeology, text and translation, and literary criticism. Most of the articles were moderate in regard to criticism and non-polemical, with controversies over higher criticism appearing in church-related journals. Since 1910 the papers have reflected trends and positions in international critical scholarship.

The Society has expanded by establishing regional sections; publishing monographs, dissertations, texts and translation, an additional journal entitled *Semeia* and cooperating in placement and other services under the umbrella of Scholars Press. The members of the Society represent the full diversity of those teaching the Judeo-Christian Scriptures in seminaries, universities, colleges and biblical institutes, as well as those serving churches and synagogues in North America. In the last 1980s there were approximately seven thousand members, with the Society's offices

located in Decatur, Georgia.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
1108

APPENDIX VI

RUDOLF KARL BULTMANN (1884-1976)

German biblical scholar and theologian. Born in Wiefelstede, Bultmann graduated from the *Gymnasium* of Oldenburg in 1903 and did undergraduate work at the universities of Tübingen, Berlin and Marburg under the distinguished theologians and biblical scholars of his day (1903-1906). Encouraged to pursue further studies, Bultmann completed his doctoral degree at the University of Marburg (1910) and later served as an instructor at the university (1912-1916). He was then assistant professor at Breslau (1916-1920) and in 1920 became full professor at Giessen but stayed only one year. In 1921 he returned to Marburg to serve the rest of his career as professor of New Testament and early Christian history (1921-1951). After retiring he remained in Marburg until his death twenty-five years later.

Bultmann is most widely known for his program for "demythologizing" the New Testament. Defining myth as the attempt to objectify powers that cannot be objectified, as in the case of angels, demons, heaven and a heavenly redeemer, Bultmann called for a hermeneutic that would interpret the mythically conveyed truth of the New Testament into terms meaningful to modern people. In this sense he distinguished himself from nineteenth-century liberal theologians who attempted to find the historical Jesus behind what they believed were the eschatological and mythical trappings of the Gospels--a Jesus whose moral teachings could give shape and substance to liberal Christianity.

Bultmann's own investigation of the New Testament was guided by form criticism, a method he was instrumental in developing. His research into the synoptic Gospels yielded little reliable information about the historical Jesus and much that reflected the faith of the early Christians as it grew out of their subjective and visionary experiences of the resurrected Christ. Jesus, the Jewish eschatological teacher, had been transformed by the early church into the heavenly Lord, modeled after the gnostic heavenly redeemer.

But this paucity of reliable information about the historical Jesus did not trouble Bultmann. Heavily influenced by the existentialism of his Marburg colleague Martin Heidegger (1889-1976), Bultmann interpreted the Christian message in terms of the Word of God that addresses moderns in their scientific and technological quest for security. To seek a historical Jesus was

to abandon faith and engage in a quest for security and freedom apart from God. Reflective of an inauthentic existence at best, theologically speaking, it was a quest for knowledge of Christ after the flesh (2 Cor 5:16) rather than an encounter with the Word that calls men and women to meaningful existence. Thus he wedded a call to existential freedom with a modern rendition of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone.

This perspective was profoundly human-centered rather than God-centered. Bultmann was not only able to give a fresh alternative to the dilemma of the liberal quest for the historical Jesus, but also to provide a recasting of the Christian message that was attractive to many modern intellectuals who were troubled by the erosion of the foundations of their faith in the face of biblical criticism and lived in an age that raised new and troubling questions about the meaning of human existence.

Bultmann's influence in America spread largely through his writings, which in turn attracted students to Marburg from the U.S. Bultmann's *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921) did not appear in English translation until 1963, though its influence was felt in the scholarly world long before then. *Jesus and the Word* (1926) appeared in English in 1934 and helped introduce his method and thought to America. In 1951 he traveled to the U.S. and gave the Shaffer Lectures at Yale Divinity School and the Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University, as well as lecturing at several other leading American divinity schools. These lectures were published in the popular introduction to his thought, *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (1958). A number of other significant works eventually found their way into English, including *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (1941; ET 1971); *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols. (1948-1953; ET 1951, 1955) and the partially translated *Kerygma and Myth* (1948-1955; ET 1953-1962). In addition, some of his American students became leading New Testament scholars and further promoted his views.

Bultmann's influence among biblical scholars and theologians of the latter half of the twentieth century has been second to none. Yet his synthesis of literary-critical method, religious-historical approach and philosophical interpretation has gradually eroded. New discoveries and insights into the world of Judaism and Hellenistic religion have severely undercut Bultmann's view of the shape of Hellenistic religion and its influence on New Testament writers. By the 1980s a new generation of scholars was more optimistic about clarifying its picture of the historical Jesus against the background of a newly enhanced understanding of first-century Judaism. Moreover, Bultmann's individualistic existential interpretation of the New Testament lost much of its impact during the 1960s, when societal upheaval turned the attention of the churches to social issues and a world-formative Christianity.

Dictionary of Christianity in America - pp 200-201

Prominent twentieth-century German theologian and New Testament scholar; known primarily for his theological method of "demythologizing" the New Testament.

Bultmann was born in Wiefelstede and educated at Tübingen, Berlin, and Marburg universities. He taught at Marburg (1912-1916), Breslau (1916-1920), and Giessen (1920-1921), and then returned to Marburg (1921-1951). In 1951 he was appointed professor emeritus at Marburg and thereafter made several lecture tours to Scandinavia, Holland, and the United States. He delivered the Shaffer lectures at Yale University (1951), which became his book *Jesus Christ and Mythology* (1958). His 1955 Gifford lectures at Edinburgh University (Scotland) were published as *The Presence of Eternity* (1957).

Bultmann's theological thinking stemmed partly from his family heritage. His father, born to missionary parents in Sierra Leone (Africa), was clergyman in the Evangelical Lutheran Church; his maternal grandfather was also a minister. The political events of twentieth-century Europe also contributed to his thought. One of his brothers was killed in World War I, the other in a concentration camp in World War II. Bultmann was a supporter of the German "Confessing Church" in the 1930s and a signer of the Barmen Declaration, that movement's statement of opposition to Nazism's growing control over church affairs.

Theological debate in the universities helped to shape Bultmann's systematic thought. Various German theologians and biblical scholars (among them Hermann Gunkel, Adolf Harnack, Johannes Weiss, and Adolf Julicher) influenced the young Bultmann. He was also impressed by the teachings of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), often called the "father of liberalism." Two contemporaries, Karl Barth and Friedrich Gogarten, both shared with Bultmann an existentialist outlook on life, although Barth eventually renounced his early philosophical zeal. Especially influential was Bultmann's Marburg colleague, existentialist philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). Such influences and Bultmann's own originality created a unique modern theology of New Testament interpretation.

Bultmann's first book, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (1921), was based on an interpretative method known as "form criticism." The material of the Gospels supposedly existed first as an oral tradition in various "forms" conditioned by different circumstances. Bultmann contended that the forms of New Testament tradition were rarely intended as historical reports, but were shaped by preaching and teaching. Thus he concluded that the Gospels were not reliable sources for a history of the life of Jesus; they were theological, but not factual.

Bultmann's later thought further developed a division between theological truth and historical fact. His 1941 essay "The New Testament and Mythology" set forth his own ideas and laid the foundation for a significant symposium on biblical interpretation published in English as *Kerygma and Myth* (1953). He understood the

historical elements of the New Testament to reflect a "myth" or worldview that is unacceptable to a modern scientific outlook. Hence that old worldview must be reinterpreted (demythologized) in order for the truth contained in the Gospels to become clear to the modern mind.

Building on Heidegger's existentialism, Bultmann closely associated theological truth and present human experience. For Bultmann, the truth of the Gospels can be grasped only through an act of decision in response to the "proclaimed Word of God" (*kerygma* in Greek). Such decision is not based on reasonable historical evidence (Bultmann denied that possibility), but on an experience of Christ's eternal presence.

According to Bultmann, the New Testament authors were not trying write facts about God and the world. Rather, they were expressing in inadequate human terms their encounter with the kerygmatic Christ. God had acted and spoken in Jesus, but humans wrote the Bible as their reaction to God's Word. Bultmann rejected the Bible's three-storied universe (heaven, earth, and hell) and its view of history as spiritually controlled; he believed those concepts were derived from Jewish apocalypticism (prophetic, visionary writing) or gnostic redemption stories. He also disqualified such doctrines as the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, and the Resurrection. The modern worldview and sense of morality, said Bultmann, prohibit blind acceptance of such material as factual stories. For Bultmann, a loss of belief in Jesus' historicity is a benefit for true faith; to locate Jesus in a world of facts and "objectivity" would miss the present meaning of Christ, the object of faith.

However, the inadequacy of biblical language and doctrine does not mean that nothing significant happened in biblical history. In Jesus, God confronted the Bible's writers; today he confronts the readers of the Bible. The "myths" are not to be dismissed but interpreted, or demythologized, for clear communication of their meaning for faith. By demythologizing the New Testament, Bultmann believed he was recovering Christianity's essence and making it accessible to the modern mind.

The basic focus of interpretation for Bultmann's theology was human existence as a complex of anxieties and decisions. He saw authentic life as full of risks, offering a person no guarantees. For Bultmann, Christian faith is similar to other human choices, resting on unseen realities expressed in the story of Jesus Christ rather than on factual certainties. Theology, to Bultmann, must also lack easy guarantees and be dialectical in character. Christian theology proclaims that God has acted for people's good in Christ. Such a faith replaces anxiety and guilt with love and confidence toward God, who makes life's risks worthwhile.

Bultmann's views provoked a debate that has not ended. Some critics have objects to his selective use of an existentialist philosophy in his theological work; theologians and philosophers alike suspect that he inadequately united the two disciplines. His

views of history have also been challenged as a threat to faith rather than a help. Demythologizing could logically lead to belief that Jesus never lived and that factual history has no bearing at all on the content of faith. Bultmann's use of the term *myth* has also been criticized; all kinds of symbolic or analogical language might be included in his definition, leaving no possibility for any way to speak about God. His theology thus could lead to a godless worldview, or at least one in which nothing about God could be known.

In addition to works already mentioned, Bultmann's important writings include *Jesus and the Word* (1926), *The Gospel of John* (1941), *Essays, Philosophical and Theological* (1954), and a three-volume *Theology of the New Testament* (1948, 1951, 1953).

Douglas, J.D., Ed., et. al. Who's Who In Christian History.
Wheaton, IL.: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1992. 116-117

APPENDIX VII

DEMYTHOLOGIZATION

Rudolf Bultmann's 1941 essay, "New Testament and Mythology," spoke of demythologization (German, *Entmythologisierung*) as a method of interpreting the New Testament. His concern was to communicate the gospel of Jesus Christ to modern men and women who no longer believe in literal phenomena such as angels, demons and a heavenly redeemer, but regard them as mythical images from a pre-scientific world view. Bultmann argued that biblical myths are not to be ignored, as was done by many nineteenth-century liberals, but interpreted as portrayals of a self-understanding. biblical interpreters must ask what this mythology points toward, what it says about God, the world and human existence. To explain the message of the Christian myth, Bultmann drew upon existential philosophy, especially that of his colleague Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). Bultmann maintained that only when texts are demythologized can one come to a faith decision and commitment to Christ who redeems individuals from self-centeredness and calls them to authentic existence in reliance on God's grace.

Reid, Daniel G., Ed., et. al. Dictionary of Christianity in America. Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
349-350

APPENDIX VIII

A REAPPRAISAL OF RUDOLF BULTMANN IN THE LIGHT OF FORM CRITICISM

The second half of the twenty-first century has seen a revival of "form criticism." This method of criticism was widely used by New Testament scholars in the twentieth century. They would take a story or saying in the gospels, analyze the "form" in which it was written, and deduce from that analysis how and why the story or saying was passed on and modified in the early church.

By the end of the twentieth century, form criticism of the gospels was no longer practiced. Scholars had come to realize how little was known about the period with which gospel form criticism was concerned--the years between the resurrection of Jesus and the writing of the gospels. The form critics were seen to have worked largely by guesswork. Form criticism became discredited as a scholarly technique.

In recent years, however, form criticism has been revived in a different area. It is now used as a tool for analyzing, not the New Testament itself, but the writings of twentieth-century New Testament scholars. This is a more fruitful use of the tool because we know a great deal about the "life situation" (*Sitz im Leben*) of twentieth-century scholars. We have, for example, the recent study by Professor Dee in which he analyzes that most characteristic of twentieth-century scholarly art forms, the doctoral dissertation. In this article I wish to contribute to this developing area of research by means of a form-critical analysis of a passage from *The Gospel of John* by Rudolf Bultmann.

The subject matter of this passage is the miracle of changing water into wine as recorded in John 2:1-11. Bultmann believed the gospel writer took this story from a previous source:

The *source* [*Quelle*] counted this as the first miracle. It is easy to see why it put it at the beginning of its collection; for it is an epiphany miracle. There are no analogies with it in the old tradition of Jesus-stories, and in comparison with them it appears strange and alien to us. There can be no doubt that the story has been taken over from heathen legend and ascribed to Jesus. In fact the motif of the story, the changing of the water into wine, is a typical motif of the Dionysus legend. In the legend this miracle is the miracle of the epiphany of the god, and was therefore dated on the day of the Dionysus Feast, that is on the night of the 5th to 6th of January. This relationship was still understood in the Early Church, which saw the Feast of Christ's Baptism as his epiphany and celebrated it on the 6th of January. Equally it held that the 6th of January was the date of the marriage at Cana.

The key sentence in this passage is, "There can be no doubt that the story has been taken over from heathen legend and ascribed to Jesus." Professor Crochop has classified this sentence as a DS

(Dogmatic Statement). Crochipp lists three categories of the DS: the DS^p, Dogmatic Statement Based on Presupposition; the DS^g, Dogmatic Statement Based on Guesswork; and the DS^{ie}, Dogmatic Statement Based on Insufficient Evidence. Common to all three categories are two characteristics of the DS, namely,

- a. an introductory formula stating there can be no other interpretation, and
- b. failure to mention the other interpretations that were available.

These two characteristics are clearly present in the key sentence:

- a. the introductory formula--"there can be no doubt that..."
- b. failure to mention the other interpretations which could be found in commentaries on the same story in contemporary authors.

Scholars disagree as to which category of DS this Key sentence represents. Some classify it as a DS^p. They point out that Bultmann's rejection of one possible explanation of the story (namely, that the miracle actually happened) was a result of his presupposition about miracles. As is well known, Bultmann was under the influence of the twentieth-century "modern man" mythology. He therefore rejected the possibility of any miracle that could not be explained by the limited scientific knowledge of his day.

Others classify the sentence as a DS^{ie}. They claim that Bultmann did bring forward evidence, though not sufficient to prove his point. This evidence was fourfold: (a) the miracle story differed from the miracle stories in the Synoptic Gospels; (2) the story appeared strange and alien to twentieth-century Europeans; (3) the motif of the story appeared also in legends about the Greek god Dionysus; and (4) the early church observed the night of the feast of Dionysus as the Feast of the Epiphany and as the date of the marriage at Cana.

None of these statements, however, can properly be called evidence for the origin of the story. Certainly there is a parallel between the gospel story and the Dionysus legend; but a parallel proves nothing about origins. Bultmann's DS was, it would seem, a guess. Of the many possible ways of explaining the origin of the story, this was the one that appealed to him. We should therefore classify it as a DS^g.

In the course of the twenty-first century there has been much discussion of the Bultmannian DS as a literary form. Scholars have understood the significance of the form in three ways.

1. *The literal interpretation.* According to the literal interpretation all Bultmann's statements were intended as statements of fact. When he wrote "there can be no doubt" he literally meant *there can be no doubt*. The problem with this interpretation is that in Bultmann's day there both could be and

was doubt.

Consider, for example, the commentary of C. K. Barrett. Barrett, like Bultmann, referred to the legendary power of Dionysus to change water into wine, but he also pointed out that the Jewish writer Philo referred to the Logos as the winegiver. In Barrett's opinion, John might have followed the Jewish precedent of Philo; or "it is even conceivable that the miracle story had a non-Christian origin" (157); or again, the story could be related to the synoptic tradition, with its references to wine and wedding feasts. "The Johannine narrative may have simply been made up out of these elements, or John may have taken an already existing story and...used it to bring out these points" (157-58).

Barrett's comments exemplify the normal "form" of a twentieth-century scholarly commentary. The characteristics of this form were (a) and examination of various possible interpretations and (b) a refusal to dogmatize where the evidence was inconclusive. By contrast, Bultmann's commentary contains only a Dogmatic Statement of one possible hypothesis. It seems incredible that a scientific twentieth-century scholar should have intended literally a statement of this kind.

2. *The existential interpretation.* The existential interpretation is based on the distinction that Bultmann drew elsewhere between "Historie" (the bare facts of history) and "Geschichte" (*meaningful* history). According to this interpretation, Bultmann's Dogmatic Statement was "Geschichte" and could be paraphrased as follows.

The assumption that this story has been taken over from heathen legend gives us today a basis for existential decision making about which we can have no doubt.

Professor Ampelophilos has suggested that the decision making Bultmann had in mind concerned the wine industry, so vital to the economy of Germany in the twentieth century. Ampelophilos thinks the wine industry may have been under threat at that period, because of social problems connected with alcoholism. If the church of Bultmann's day were to recognize that the gospel story was dependent on a pagan wine festival, it could then make an existential decision to support more actively the traditional wine festivals of Germany, many of which had similar pagan origins.

However true this may be, most scholars regard the views of Professor Ampelophilos as eccentric. but it is not easy to think of any other existential decision that could have been in Bultmann's mind when he made his Dogmatic Statement.

3. *The criminological interpretation.* Advocates of the criminological interpretation point out the many similarities between twentieth-century New Testament scholars and the heroes of the detective stories so popular at that period. Like the fictional detectives, the scholars spoke with great authority. They were able to show up other investigators for the fools they

were. They alone could discern, amid the mass of evidence, those clues that were significant. They had disciples who wrote theses under their direction, just as detectives had disciples (often called "Watsons") who admired and reported their methods of detection. Many critics therefore regard the work of Bultmann as belonging to the *Gattung* of the detective fiction.

We should not underestimate the psychological importance of the detective story for Christians in the twentieth century. At a time when the traditional sources of infallibility, the church and the Bible, were under increasing attack, the illusion of infallibility created by the great fictional detectives was very comforting. It is significant that many detective stories were written by leading religious authors, such as G. K. Chesterton and Dorothy Sayers. For Christians in need of reassurance, the Bultmannian Dogmatic Statement may well have performed a psychological function similar to that of the detective story.

Nevertheless, there was one decisive difference between Bultmann and the detectives. The best detectives always based their conclusions upon sound evidence. If they did resort to guesswork, their guesses were not made public until they had been objectively confirmed. Their pronouncements were thus quite unlike the DS which, in its characteristic Bultmannian form, was based either on insufficient evidence or on none at all.

4. *The gelotological interpretation.* Previous attempts to analyze the form of the Bultmannian Dogmatic Statement have proved unconvincing, I wish to adduce a twentieth-century parallel that, I believe, can throw new light on this problem. It forms part of an essay by a latter contemporary of Bultmann, Frank Muir.

In my opinion the decline of the British nation as a great power is directly connected with the decline in our consumption of boiled pudding.

It is an undeniable fact that our nation began to lose its preeminence at the same time as the good, old-fashioned steamed suet pudding fell into desuetude.

Professor Ernest Chuckle, Professor of Risible Science at Aberdeen University, in his study of humorous writing in the twentieth century, puts Frank Muir in the category of "sit-down comics." These were comedians who appeared on television and took part in intellectual games. One of the requirements of a sit-down comic was to keep what was known as a "straight face"--to make statements purporting to be statements of fact without betraying their falsity by facial expression. This style of speaking and writing, which belonged originally to the playing of intellectual games, was then extended to other fields.

The twentieth century is often called "the age of sport." sport was the major preoccupation of many people in that century. More pages in newspapers were devoted to sport than to any other subject. It would therefore be natural for an academic writer of

that period, who wished to present his material in a form the general public would understand, to employ the "sporting" style of sit-down comedy. The problem for us in the twenty-first century is that we do not instinctively appreciate this style of writing. Only when the literary form of a twentieth-century work has been determined can the modern reader discern whether its statements are intended literally or humorously.

In my opinion, the parallel between the method of argument of Bultmann and that of Muir is so close that we must regard their writings as belonging to the same literary genre. I hope that, when this is recognized, the works of Bultmann, which are now little read except by researchers in twentieth-century studies, will be appreciated for what they are--masterpieces of twentieth-century comedy.

Hall, David R. The Seven Pillories of Wisdom. Macon, GA.: Mercer University Press, 1990. 121-126