

# Biblical Theology and Hermeneutics

Anthony C. Thiselton

## Background and Origins

Biblical theology and hermeneutics achieved the status of independent subject-disciplines at roughly the same time. Biblical theology became established as a subject in its own right largely as a result of a programmatic inaugural lecture in 1787 by Johann P. Gabler (1753–1826) at Altdorf. Gabler entitled his lecture “A Discourse on the Proper Distinction between Biblical Theology and the Correct Delimitation of Dogmatic Theology.” Friedrich D. E. Schleiermacher (1768–1834) began to establish hermeneutics as a theory of interpretation and of understanding which stood fully on its own feet in his *Approaches on Hermeneutics* (1805) and more fully in his *Compendium on Hermeneutics* (1810–28).

In contrast to dogmatic theology, Gabler insisted that biblical theology constituted a *historical* discipline. Dogmatics remained concerned with the different task of exploring conceptual coherence. Within biblical theology, however, Gabler also allowed for a further subdistinction. A “true” (*wahre*) biblical theology restricted itself to the *pure description* of historical data and developments. It must not cover up the tensions and differences which different historical periods or cultures generate in material which may relate to similar themes. On the other hand, Gabler allowed, “pure” (*reine*) biblical theology entailed evaluation also. As theologians rather than only historians of religion, exponents of “biblical theology” might also attempt to sift what they judged to be of permanent value for theology and ethics from the historical variables which might be relevant only to some given culture or historical era. This supposed duality between “description” and “evaluation” persists in the twentieth century, most notably in Krister Stendahl and Heikki Räisänen.<sup>1</sup>

Schleiermacher’s fundamental work on the independent status of hermeneutics arose initially from his reflection on the inadequacies of previous work, including J. A. Ernesti’s writings (1761). Previous writers seemed to appeal to “hermeneutics” only when “difficulties” emerged. In other words, Schleiermacher rightly perceived, they presupposed that interpretation and understanding somehow took care of themselves until some supposed meaning conflicted with their own prior expectations.

But this gave the game away. They tended to invoke “hermeneutics” to legitimate some prior understanding which they had already reached. Thereby they turned hermeneutics into an instrumental service-discipline. It *served* someone’s prior theology, or someone’s assumptions about classical texts, whereas in Schleiermacher’s view the whole subject should be disengaged from what he called “regional” concerns. As an independent discipline, hermeneutics could engage fully with its proper task. Kant had formulated a transcendental philosophy which addressed not simply issues of reason, but the very basis on which reason might function, as well as its limits. Schleiermacher insisted that hermeneutics had to explore the basis on which understanding texts (or human life) became possible at all. Hence, he urged, “Hermeneutics is a part of the art of thinking, and is therefore philosophical.”<sup>2</sup> It demands both “linguistic competence” and “ability for knowing people.”<sup>3</sup> “[In interpretation it is essential that one be able to step out of one’s own frame of mind into that of the author.”<sup>4</sup>

Because this discipline now entailed philosophical issues about the nature of human understanding, linguistic questions about texts, theological enquiries about biblical texts, and social concerns about interpersonal communicative action, hermeneutics after Schleiermacher became in principle inevitably an *interdisciplinary* or *multidisciplinary* subject, as Paul Ricoeur (b. 1913) rightly confirms. Yet it also resists being absorbed into any of the disciplines on which it draws. This would equally lead to its destruction as an effective subject.

## Survey

### From 1919 to 1959

Gabler and Schleiermacher had made programmatic proposals. Nevertheless initially each discipline tended to collapse back into old paths. In biblical theology many writers accepted Gabler’s point about historical enquiry. But his “true” biblical theology tended to become subsumed under the less theological category of “the history of Israelite religion.” On the other hand a minority of more conservative writers tended still to impose prior conceptual or dogmatic categories onto biblical material. The situation was similar in hermeneutics. Perhaps only W. Dilthey (1833–1911) fully appreciated the potential of Schleiermacher’s hermeneutics, and even he stressed the social, interpersonal, or “psychological” rather than the linguistic side. From 1919 onwards Karl Barth (1886–1968) raised important hermeneutical questions, but it was only with the work of Rudolf Bultmann (1884–1976) and his former pupil Ernst Fuchs (1903–83) that hermeneutics steadily re-emerged as a subject in its own right in theology. Since 1960 it has been reborn in philosophy, in literary and critical theory, and in social studies, as well as in theology.

The turning point for biblical theology arose from an exchange of views on method which took place between Otto Eissfeldt and Walther Eichrodt.<sup>5</sup> Eissfeldt’s approach was broadly similar to that of Gabler. Eichrodt, by contrast, believed that a theology of the Old Testament could offer a significant degree of structural coherence without historical distortion. In the first volume of his monumental *Theology*

of the Old Testament he organized his theology around the central focus of "covenant." This, he believed, avoided imposing on the Bible some modern dogmatic schema. It permitted the theologian to trace a historical basis for revelation which offered more than a mere "history of Israelite religion." Eichrodt's work is generally regarded as opening the era of "biblical theology" in the twentieth century.

The publication in 1919 of Karl Barth's commentary on Romans (with a second edition in 1921) similarly moved forward both biblical theology and hermeneutics by challenging the adequacy of a purely "historical" exegesis and also of a "history-of-religions" approach. In his preface to the first edition Barth allowed that "critical historical method of biblical research has its validity," but saw it as no more than "the preparation" for understanding. Understanding, Barth insisted, entails more than scrutinizing a text as a supposedly value-neutral "object." To understand Romans we ourselves must become the object of address. The text actively engages with the reader, shedding light upon the reader's own stance.

Some dismissed Barth's approach. But in line with his own work on form criticism, Rudolf Bultmann endorsed Barth's view that the New Testament texts did not serve primarily as objects of value-neutral historical enquiry. They "speak" as *kenigma* (proclamation) to readers who are engaged with the issues posed by the text. Following Dilthey, Bultmann agrees that an interpreter "is governed always by a prior understanding of the subject."<sup>6</sup> Elsewhere he writes: "There cannot be any such thing as presuppositionless exegesis."<sup>7</sup>

Hans-Georg Gadamer (b. 1900), one of the two greatest theorists of hermeneutics in the twentieth century, observes from the standpoint of philosophy that "Barth's *Romans* is a kind of hermeneutical manifesto,"<sup>8</sup> and adds that Bultmann has contributed explicitly to the problem of hermeneutics.<sup>9</sup> He recognizes affinities between his own philosophical approach and that of Ernst Fuchs in theology. Fuchs shares Heidegger's concern to overcome "the modern entanglement in the subject-object schema."<sup>10</sup> Fuchs writes: "The texts must translate us [*uns übersetzen müssen*] before we can translate them."<sup>11</sup> "The truth has ourselves as its object" (his italics).<sup>12</sup> Fuchs published his *Hermeneutik* in 1954 (with a fourth edition in 1970).

In biblical theology Eichrodt owed much to the work of his teacher Otto Procksch (1874–1947), although Procksch's own Old Testament theology was not published until 1949. Procksch also influenced the work of Gerhard von Rad (discussed below). During the war years Ethelbert Stauffer published his *Theology of the New Testament*.<sup>13</sup> Stauffer rejected the kind of history-of-religions approach which drove a wedge between Jesus and Paul. Paul, in his view, was not "the originator of a turn to hellenism."<sup>14</sup> Jesus was aware of his own vocation as Son of Man "to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10: 45). He perceived himself as "sent to reveal and accomplish the *gloria dei* in a world intoxicated with its own self-glorification."<sup>15</sup>

The most influential *Theology of the New Testament* was that of Rudolf Bultmann. We include a brief discussion on his work later, together with the distinctive contribution of Oscar Cullmann. Two Roman Catholic works on New Testament theology may also be noted. In 1950 Max Meinertz argued that biblical theology should not be distorted by imposing upon it later dogmatic or structural categories. Jesus Christ constitutes a "center" seen from multiple "points of view." He is like the white light which may be split into the colours of the rainbow.<sup>16</sup> Unity and variety

must be held together. J. Bonsirven placed greater emphasis on the New Testament's continuity with the Old Testament, and with the apostolic church as an extension of the ministry of Jesus.<sup>17</sup>

Theodore C. Vriezen (b. 1899) of Utrecht published *An Outline of Old Testament Theology* in 1949 (English translation in 1958). He devotes his first hundred pages to method. He rejects equally an exclusively historical approach, which risks collapsing theology into a quasi-secular "history of Israelite religion" and an exclusively theological approach, which risks collapsing historical diversity and tension into some quasi-churchly dogmatic system. In contrast to each, Vriezen seeks to trace how "through the history of Israel God has entered history as the living Living God who seeks communion with men."<sup>18</sup> Here we may speak of a "line," but one which cannot be "copied by any man." For it does not take the form of a unidirectional line of "development" which can at all points be "observed" as such. It follows twists, turns, hidden periods, surprises, even apparent tensions. "The truth of faith can only be expressed in antinomies."<sup>19</sup> It is profoundly historical. Yet it is more than secularized history; for its mainspring and thread is that of personal interaction between God and the world which constitutes revelation in history.

A parallel in America emerged in G. Ernest Wright (1909–74), in his *God Who Acts: Biblical theology as recital* (1952). Wright stressed the unity of the Old and New Testaments, as a continuing revelation of God in history. Hence he writes: "The Church is the heir to the election of Israel . . . The events of the Exodus, wilderness wanderings and the conquest are as important for the New Testament as for the Old."<sup>20</sup> Revelation entails more than mere "statement"; "recital" is self-involving confession, praise, memory and hope. A response to its question "what precisely has God done?" can be discerned in "the Biblical confessions of faith."<sup>21</sup> These are more than value-neutral reports.

Similarities of approach in New Testament studies can be found in the English theologian Alan Richardson of Nottingham (1905–75). Like Vriezen, he rejects an exclusively historical approach as verging on secular positivism. This method "cannot tell us whether in fact God acted in history or not."<sup>22</sup> But Richardson also published work in philosophical apologetics, and examined the role of rationality and coherence in testing historical and theological reconstruction. Yet, as for Wright, faith and confession retain their role. In the earthly Jesus the power of God was "hidden but manifest to eyes of faith."<sup>23</sup> He follows Stauffer in emphasizing the role of the Son of Man for Jesus, as corporate, suffering, and awaiting vindication.<sup>24</sup> Like Bonsirven he sees the church as "apostolic" and continuing the work of Jesus.<sup>25</sup> Through baptism the verdict of the last judgment may be anticipated, so that the baptized may "be brought past . . . the final judgment . . . into the life of the Age to Come."<sup>26</sup>

With the notable exception of Bultmann's work, however, the work of virtually all of these writers came to be viewed, in spite of their intentions not to ignore historical diversity, as overemphasizing the unity of one or of both Testaments. By the close of the 1950s, biblical theology had passed its peak and it began to decline under the weight of criticisms identified below under "Debate." From 1960 onward "biblical theologies" began to take greater account of historical and theological diversity, but declined as a "movement." By contrast, hermeneutics acquired a new energy and sense of direction from Gadamer's work (1960).

## From 1960 to 1995

The story of "biblical theology" since 1960 is brief. The momentum of the 1950s became lost. Hans Conzelmann of Göttingen (1915–89) produced *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (1968; English translation, 1969), in which he made a conscious attempt to differentiate between five distinct strands of New Testament thought. He assigned different sections of his volume to the early community, to the synoptic tradition, to Paul, to post-Pauline material, and to Johannine theology. He is careful, however, not to exaggerate unduly some supposed contrast between a "simple" Jesus and a "complex" Paul.<sup>27</sup>

One year after Conzelmann, Werner G. Kümmel (b. 1905) published his *Theology of the New Testament* (1969; English translation, 1974) from Marburg. He distinguished firmly between the three "main witnesses" Jesus, Paul, and John. But he also allowed for lines of continuity. He writes: "Jesus and Paul are witnesses to the same historical truth, but Paul only points backwards and forward to the salvation brought by Jesus."<sup>28</sup> "*The experience of God's love in the encounter with Jesus*" (Kümmel's italics) can be found in the ministry of Jesus, in Paul, and in John.<sup>29</sup> Others continued the task of writing theologies of the New Testament. Joachim Jeremias (1900–79) published only the first of three projected volumes before his death, namely *The Proclamation of Jesus* (1971). G. E. Ladd produced a *New Testament Theology in America* (1974). B. S. Childs's work (1992) is discussed below. George B. Caird of Oxford, before his untimely death in 1984, was working on material which was edited and published in 1994.<sup>30</sup> Caird expounds salvation in its "three tenses" as a major theme; Jesus, as the bringer of salvation; and the need for and experience of salvation in the purposes of God.

Meanwhile, hermeneutics first became firmly established as a discipline from 1960 to the late 1970s and then exploded into a vast eruption of literature reaching huge proportions in the late 1980s and in the 1990s. Gerhard Ebeling (b. 1912) of Zurich produced a much-used survey "*Hermeneutik*" (1959) and in his inaugural lecture at Tübingen in 1947 he had argued that church history could be perceived as "the history of exposition of holy scripture." This derives part of its force from the principle that how a person or a community expounds and interprets Scripture may reveal as much about themselves as about the biblical writings. With Fuchs, he asserts: "*The text . . . becomes a hermeneutical aid in the understanding of present experience.*"<sup>31</sup> He follows Schleiermacher in insisting that hermeneutics constitutes a "theory of understanding"; it is not "a collection of rules."<sup>32</sup> It is a philosophical equivalent to a theory of knowledge.<sup>33</sup>

Gadamer and Ricoeur (discussed below) strongly influenced thought in America as well as in Europe. In America Robert W. Funk brought the approach of Ernst Fuchs to general notice in his *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God* (1966). His linking of Fuchs with related issues in narrative theory and literature also recalled claims by Heidegger and Gadamer about projected "narrative worlds." Funk dem-onstrated the value of these approaches for interpreting the parables of Jesus.

From the early 1950s to the late 1960s many French intellectuals reacted against the subjectivism of existentialist perspectives, and explored a tradition in linguistics (mainly from Saussure) and in anthropology (largely from Lévi-Strauss) that came

to be known as structuralism. Some, like F. Bovon, over-hastily saw this as an "objective" approach to meaning. Meaning appeared to be generated by forces of "difference" within a linguistic structure or anthropological system. For example, "brother" draws its meaning from its "difference" from "sister" within a kinship structure. Through the 1970s much energy was devoted by a group of biblical specialists to applying structural "grammar" (especially a grammar of narrative drawn from A. J. Greimas) to Hebrew narratives and to the parables of Jesus.<sup>34</sup>

At first in several respects these approaches were not "hermeneutics," but explanatory hypotheses about language systems (Saussure's *la langue*) rather than interpretations of language uses or choices (Saussure's *la parole*). But by the late 1960s, with the work of Roland Barthes (1915–80) and Jacques Derrida (b. 1930), structuralism had developed its own self-critique. As "poststructuralism" it showed that these "structures" transmitted social interests which made them far from "objective" or innocent. This in turn invited a new, more sophisticated hermeneutic. Some writers now described Derrida as the most important exponent of "radical hermeneutics" in the post-Gadamerian era. Barthes pointed out that such "structural systems," for example, as furniture or clothes generated coded signals about class, status, or power which invited "interpretation" at several levels.<sup>35</sup> Derrida's work entails "hermeneutics" in the sense that meaning is never "closed" but stands under "erasure" as each interpretation becomes deconstructed by fresh readings. Texts are incomplete textures which may be "undone."<sup>36</sup>

To some, biblical texts appeared also to embody structures which were far from politically neutral. Norman Gottwald explored the political and social subtexts which he claimed to detect behind what had hitherto often been viewed as merely "historical" in the reflecting ordinary processes of cause and effect.<sup>37</sup> Michel Foucault (1926–84) and Derrida underlined the part played by social power interests in literary texts. Claims to truth often represented disguised bids to legitimate power over others.<sup>38</sup> The Bible may readily be pressed into the service of such manipulative strategies. Hence behind the rise of the hermeneutics of Latin American liberation theology of the 1970s and behind the feminist hermeneutics of the 1980s lies the suspicion that power interests on behalf of a class or a gender permeate the language of texts and traditions of interpretation.

At first Latin American Liberation theologians restricted their attention to issues about "pre-understanding" (*Vorverständnis*) as these had been raised by Dilthey, Heidegger, and Bultmann. Gustavo Gutiérrez (b. 1928, Peru; *The Theology of Liberation*, 1971) and Juan Luis Segundo (b. 1928, Uruguay; *A Liberation of Theology*, 1975) stressed that no biblical interpretation is value-neutral. Only a pre-understanding already driven by a concern for justice could read liberating texts with transformative effect. Academic neutrality, they believed, is an illusion inherited from the Western Enlightenment. They found a need for a "preliminary" understanding confirmed in Freire's notion of the need for "consciousness-raising" (*concientización*).<sup>39</sup>

This set the stage for a second move. If Bultmann had argued that "myth" might obstruct the true intention of New Testament texts, might not the same be said of "ideology"? A program of "de-ideologization" was proposed, parallel to Bultmann's notion of "demythologizing." By the 1970s they could also draw on Paul Ricoeur's

notion of a "hermeneutic of suspicion." Interpretation of texts which appeared superficially "innocent" might hide the real wishes and aims of interpreters to legitimate their power over against claims of others. Leonardo and Clodovis Boff, Severino Croatto, and Hugo Assmann, among others, explore these issues further.

Initially feminist hermeneutics drew little from serious hermeneutical theory. One of the earlier works, Phyllis Trible's *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (1978), explored female imagery relating to God in biblical texts, and the gender-inclusive character of "image of God." Her later *Texts of Terror* (1984) examined narratives of exploited women, such as Hagar and Tamar.

A more explicit "hermeneutic of suspicion" and criticism of ideology may be found in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's well-known *In Memory of Her* (1983). Here she sets in contrast a willingness of the Johannine tradition to acknowledge the role of Mary Magdalene as the first witness of the resurrection, and therefore "the apostle of the apostles" and tendencies which she believes she finds in Luke and Paul to suppress the role of women in these traditions.<sup>40</sup> Feminists, she urges, must "apply content-criticism (*Sachkritik*) as well as suspicion, to rank and to select women's texts."<sup>41</sup> She endorses the theme found in many feminist writers that biblical scholarship is not, and cannot be, "value-neutral"; since both biblical author and the overwhelming majority of biblical interpreters have been men.<sup>42</sup> They produce or read texts through male eyes, but assign to the texts and readings a gender-neutral status. A flood of literature has now appeared which finds gender issues everywhere. But it should be noted that varying aims, varying hermeneutical strategies, and varying theologies may all go under the misleadingly uniform term "feminist hermeneutics," which conceals their fundamental difference.<sup>43</sup>

Hermeneutical theory and practice in the mid-1990s has become marked by a radical pluralism of goals, assumptions, and methods. The success or failure of a given attempt to meet a specific goal cannot be assessed in terms of criteria formulated in relation to some other goal. Some perceive this as a new hermeneutical freedom, others as verging on hermeneutical anarchy. Limits of space prohibit an exposition of W. Pannenberg's powerful attempt to hold together hermeneutical understanding with an emphasis on the unity of rationality and human knowledge. His work is innovative and masterly.<sup>44</sup>

### Specific Writers on Biblical Theology

#### *Walther Eichrodt and Gerhard von Rad*

Walther Eichrodt (1890–1978) became a professor at Basel in 1933, and followed the first volume of his *Theology of the Old Testament* with a fifth revised edition in 1957, and a second volume in 1964 (English translations 1961 and 1967). Covenant, he argued, provides the theological basis for a defined relationship between God and his people. He writes: "The fear that constantly haunts the pagan world, the fear of arbitrariness . . . in the Godhead, is excluded. With this God, men know

exactly where they stand; an atmosphere of trust and security is created."<sup>45</sup> This offers a line of continuity with the New Testament. Jesus trusts God as "Abba" and Paul speaks of a defined relationship of "adoption" (Mark 14: 36; Romans 8: 16, 17). In Eichrodt's view, this is different from any "naturalistic" relationship which depends on divine immanence. It expresses "personal communion between God and man"<sup>46</sup> and has "a moral basis."<sup>47</sup>

This covenantal structure makes possible "sacral communion."<sup>48</sup> In this relationship "gift" sacrifices become significant but "atonement or expiation" also has a place<sup>49</sup> since God is both "the creative power of love" and yet also "the wholly other."<sup>50</sup> God promises an "ultimate goal of history . . . the messianic consummation."<sup>51</sup> He gives his Spirit "to actualize the will of God in all forms of human existence."<sup>52</sup> His purpose thus extends beyond Israel to all creation. Family, friendship, peace, and prosperity indirectly witness to God as the giver of all that is good.

Gerhard von Rad (1901–71) published the two volumes of his influential *Old Testament Theology* in 1957 and 1960 (English translations, 1962 and 1965). He taught at Jena, Göttingen, and Heidelberg. Like Eichrodt, he saw Israel's faith as based on historical events, interpreted as acts of God. Old Testament theology springs from successive reinterpretations of past history in the light of new events in a dialectic of continuity and novelty.

Gunkel's form criticism (especially on the Psalms) influenced Gerhard von Rad. Changes in a psalm's setting (its *Sitz im Leben*) suggested reinterpretations of its earlier meaning and function. The Deuteronomist, similarly, "retells" the narrative of Moses from the vantage point of the Deuteronomist's own setting in history. Deuteronomy and Chronicles offer examples of "the most varied forms of the presentation of God's history with Israel in its different strata."<sup>53</sup> Yet this diversity of "re-interpretation" does not eclipse a thematic unity. Thus in the Hexateuch "God's promise of the land" remains a recurrent theme at all levels. On the other hand, "Israel reflected on this saving act in very diverse ways."<sup>54</sup>

To reinterpret an already interpreted history from various vantage points brings us close to the concept known as "effective history" (*Wirkungsgeschichte*). This assumes importance in the hermeneutics of Gadamer and Wolfhart Pannenberg (b. 1928). One example comes from Israel "historicizing" agrarian festivals. Gerhard von Rad insists that this reflects "a unique understanding of the world . . . Israel's belief that she was not bound primarily to the periodic cycle of nature but the definite historical events . . . [constituted] entering into the saving event itself."<sup>55</sup> This understanding of history as "linear," or as moving toward an end, became for Pannenberg an essential condition for interpreting the meaning of the present within history. Only in the light of the end does the present have meaning. "The eschatological events . . . bind history into a whole."<sup>56</sup> This "linear" view of history gives rise to "expectation" and in Pannenberg's theology this offers an essential clue for christology. "Jesus stood in a tradition that expected the coming of this God." Yet, in a changed setting this also invites reinterpretation. Israel's tradition also became "transformed from within by the appearance of Jesus."<sup>57</sup> This view affirms "an intertwining . . . of words and of events," a "unity of facts and their meaning."<sup>58</sup> The influence of the biblical theology of Gerhard von Rad can scarcely be exaggerated.

### Is Brevard Childs an exponent of "biblical theology"?

Brevard S. Childs (b. 1923) of Yale is associated in his earlier work with a critique of "biblical theology" rather than with an exposition of it, in his *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (1970). Yet he has recently published a volume under the title *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (1992). The key to Childs's work lies in his approaching the theology of the Bible as a content disclosed by the canonical text of the Bible as the sacred Scripture of the Christian Church, rather than as the end-product of a more primary history which lies behind it. The "context" for interpretation is the role of a chapter or book within the larger canonical text, not the process of retracing history back to some "earliest source." This shift of focus from processes behind the text to *the text itself* marks off what many call "canon criticism" in contrast to "biblical theology." Childs's proximity to the Yale school of literary theory with its earlier emphasis on the text alone may be thought to play a part.

In his *Biblical Theology in Crisis* Childs accused the biblical theology school of a compromise with the older liberal "history-of-religions" school, in spite of their claims on behalf of "theology." Nevertheless Childs shares with Wright the notion of biblical theology as self-involving confession. Henning Graf Reventlow places him among those biblical theologians for whom theology is "related to faith" and "the descriptive task was included in the theological task."<sup>59</sup> As against Stendahl and Räsänen, Childs approaches the biblical text "from within a community of faith, rather than from a neutral phenomenological reconstruction."<sup>60</sup> Thus his commentary on Exodus (1974) includes some account of the "reception" of interpretations among communities of readers.

### Rudolf Bultmann and Oscar Cullmann

Bultmann (1884–76) receives attention in a separate chapter. Hence we offer only a brief account of his *Theology of the New Testament* (1948–53; English translations 1952 and 1955) and some notes on his hermeneutics. The message of Jesus is in Bultmann's view not a part of New Testament theology. It is only "a presupposition for the theology of the New Testament."<sup>61</sup> Jesus did proclaim the reign of God and call people to decision.<sup>62</sup> But only retrospectively after the rise of the Easter faith was the "proclaimer" then "proclaimed."<sup>63</sup> Only retrospectively can it be said that Jesus' call to decision implies a christology.<sup>64</sup>

Only in the pre-Pauline hellenistic church did the confession of Jesus as "Lord" and "Son of God" emerge.<sup>65</sup> With the theology of Paul, an appreciation of the message of the cross as pure grace emerged explicitly and the cross perceived as "the judgment of God . . . upon all human accomplishment and boasting."<sup>66</sup> A radical contrast emerges between humankind prior to faith and humankind under faith. "Flesh" (*sarx*) in its most explicitly theological usage denotes "trust in oneself as being able to procure life . . . in one's own strength."<sup>67</sup> Under faith, however, God may pronounce a verdict in advance of the judgment as "rightwised."<sup>68</sup> "The decision of faith has done away with the past," although it must be daily renewed.<sup>69</sup> Humankind may become liberated from bondage to the cause-effect chain of past

decisions (law, sin, and death) to experience the freedom of the Holy Spirit as "the power of futurity."<sup>70</sup>

How much of this language, however, can be interpreted as describing states of affairs? Bultmann's proposals about "demythologizing" put forward in other writings make this problematic. Especially in Paul and in John, any quasi-historical language needs to be interpreted as existential language which addresses the hearer or reader in terms of his or her own present. Language which might appear to describe future judgment, for example, may be interpreted without remainder as a summons to responsibility in the present. Supposedly "objective" language in Paul about atonement or resurrection is a "primitive mythology" designed to call the self to self-renunciation and obedience. These issues are discussed fully elsewhere.<sup>71</sup>

Oscar Cullmann (b. 1902) taught at Strasbourg, Basel, and Paris. In his foreword to *Christ and Time* (1945) he asks: "In what does the *specifically Christian element* of New Testament revelation consist?"<sup>72</sup> He rejects the answers of Barth, Bultmann, and Martin Werner. Werner had argued that virtually the whole of New Testament and early Christian theology depended on a conscious reorientation away from eschatology when an expectation of an imminent end did not materialize.

Cullmann recovers the principle that "Primitive Christian faith and thinking do not start from the spatial contrast between the Here and the Beyond, but from the time distinction between Formerly and Now and Then . . . Thus the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in his famous definition of faith (11: 1) names first of all the 'assurance of things hoped for,' that is, things which are future."<sup>73</sup> Cullmann does not deny that a contrast between "above" and "below" exists within the New Testament. But it is not "the essential thing." Even the reference here to faith in "things not seen" refers primarily to what is not yet seen because it has *not yet visibly occurred*. Noah, Abraham, and the people of faith act in the present *on the basis of promise concerning the future* which is yet to become visible, because it is yet to occur.

Purposive time embodies moments of opportunity.<sup>74</sup> Linear time demands the concepts of a "beginning" and an "end."<sup>75</sup> Cyclical notions of time by contrast remain foreign to distinctively biblical perspectives. In contrast to gnosticism and docetism, "primitive Christianity knows nothing of timelessness."<sup>76</sup> The experience of the Holy Spirit does not remove the believer from time. "The Holy Spirit is nothing else than the anticipation of the end in the present."<sup>77</sup> "Man is that which he *will become* only in the future."<sup>78</sup> Yet Christians still sin and still die. "The time tension is manifested in the Church through the continuance of sin, which nevertheless has already been defeated by the Spirit."<sup>79</sup> "The decisive battle in a war may already have occurred . . . and yet the war still continues."<sup>80</sup> Thus time may be perceived as a "history of salvation" or "salvation-history" (*Heilsgeschichte*). Within this process Christ represents "the central point." "For the believing Christian the *mid-point, since Easter, no longer lies in the future*."<sup>81</sup> Judaism and Christianity do not tell different histories, but they differ decisively "in the *division of time*."<sup>82</sup> Yet expectation of a decisive end still remains in the New Testament. Here Cullmann convincingly attacks the views of Schweitzer and Werner.

The groundwork laid out in *Christ and Time* informs Cullmann's later work *The Christology of the New Testament* (1957; English translations, 1959 and 1963) and *Salvation in History* (1965; English translation, 1967). In his *Christology* Cullmann

refuses to underestimate the continuity between the Old and New Testament. As against Bultmann's view that the confession of Christ as "Lord" (*kyrios*) arose first in hellenism, Cullmann refers to the unavoidable "memory" that "*Adonai* was certainly the characteristic Jewish designation for God."<sup>83</sup>

In *Salvation in History* Cullmann argues that Christian apostles, like the Jewish prophets before them, witness to and interpret God's saving activity in history. Like Gerhard von Rad, Cullmann sees each new interpretation as a reinterpretation (often in the light of new events) of already interpreted events. Nevertheless salvation-history remains a single history, of which Christ's coming in redemptive work constitutes the "mid-point." Christian existence draws its distinctive character from its part in the tension between "already fulfilled" and "not yet completed."

Cullmann includes a brief section on hermeneutics. He comments: "It is surely correct that an exegesis without presuppositions is an illusion."<sup>84</sup> His view is not to be equated with Stendahl's. But he warns his readers not to abuse this principle. He stresses the need for "*special effort*" to become aware of our own prejudices, and to engage in "*a simple listening*."<sup>85</sup> More seriously still, he warns against Bultmann's proposals to reduce meanings of texts to the level of the existential present. This would destroy salvation *as history*. Faith, in Paul, means "believing that someone else has already accomplished the saving work *for me*, precisely because it has been done completely *independently of me and my believing*."<sup>86</sup>

### Specific Exponents of Hermeneutical Theory

#### Hans-Georg Gadamer

Hans-Georg Gadamer (b. 1900) studied under Heidegger and published work on Plato in the 1930s. After difficult war years he became Rector of Leipzig University, and then professor at Frankfurt and Heidelberg. His monumental *Truth and Method* (1960; fourth edition, 1975; English translation from fifth edition, 1989) has entirely reshaped twentieth-century hermeneutics. It led to reappraisals of reason in philosophy, of texts in theology and literary theory, and of understanding in social sciences. His *Collected Works* amount to ten volumes in German.

Gadamer sees "method" as a hindrance to truth. Following too closely the generalizing techniques of science, "method" tends to determine *in advance* the terms on which truth should be understood. Deceived by method in science, an interpreter tries to "master" texts, life, or art, rather than letting them confront him or her on their own terms. Except for his correct exemption of morality, Descartes in effect promoted "the total reconstruction of all truths by reason."<sup>87</sup> But this Enlightenment "method" is misconceived. We must return with Vico to "old truths . . . to the *sensus communis* . . . to elements present in the classical concept of wisdom."<sup>88</sup> Wisdom goes deeper than knowledge and draws on tradition for transmitting reinterpretations and actualizations of truth in events. It does not merely "subsume the individual under a universal category."<sup>89</sup>

Like a game, or like a work of art, truth becomes disclosed in a variety of eventual "performances," none of which is identical in every way with another, or it would

not be a game. Art is never "exhausted" by cashing it out as a series of "aesthetic concepts." In play, the game projects a "world" which enfolds the player in its own network of objectives and criteria of success. It provides the horizons within which players think and act. Here we see "the primacy of play over the consciousness of the player."<sup>90</sup> Against the false trail initiated by Enlightenment rationalism, Gadamer traces the hermeneutical tradition from Schleiermacher through Dilthey, Husserl, and Yorck to Heidegger. In Heidegger, the horizon of a pre-given "world" provides the starting point for understanding. But Gadamer has a more positive view of tradition and its "history of effects" (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) than Heidegger. A tradition which, along with its prejudices, also transmits wisdom allows for a "formation" (*Bildung*) which "builds." In particular, this process is achieved through a mutual respect between those who stand within different horizons, through a genuine "listening," each to the other, in dialogue. If neither tries simply to impose assertions onto the other, "something new" may "emerge," in which truth becomes "actualized" in an event of meeting. The key is not "asserting one's view," but "being transformed . . . We do not remain what we were."<sup>91</sup>

In theology this invites a renewed understanding of what it is to listen to the text and to listen to others (or to God) without imposing our own terms as the "grid" or "method" which we ourselves choose to use. This has profound consequences for reappraisals of reason. Reason alone is not enough; but credulity alone would not be "wisdom." Like Hegel and Wittgenstein, Gadamer's creative genius treads a razor edge from which it can fall into either of two opposite difficulties. Some see Gadamer as upholding tradition; others see him as legitimizing a move toward contextual relativism and postmodernism. Both responses are partly true and partly false, and demand that we read Gadamer with care.

#### Paul Ricoeur

Paul Ricoeur (b. 1913) studied at the Sorbonne with Marcel, and has been a professor at Strasbourg, Paris, and Chicago. Behind his earlier works on the human will (1950) and human fallibility (1960) lay Marcel's interest in human personhood. But during the years of war, in which he both won the Croix de Guerre and was a prisoner in Germany, Ricoeur used the opportunity to undertake a close study of Jaspers, Husserl, and Heidegger. Jaspers's dual interest in philosophy and psychiatry informed Ricoeur's work *The Symbolism of Evil* (1960; English translation, 1969). Sharing Jaspers's positive view of symbols, Ricoeur argued that symbols operate with power not least because they embrace two levels of meaning. Guilt, for example, draws on the "double meaning" of burden, bondage, and stain. Far from being inferior versions of conceptual thought, "the symbol gives rise to thought."<sup>92</sup>

We noted above why French intellectual life turned first to structuralism and then to its own self-critique in poststructuralism. Ricoeur cautiously utilized aspects of these approaches for "explanation" or "critique," as a check against uncritical "understanding." His first genuinely "double" hermeneutic, of critical "suspicion" and post-critical "retrieval," comes in his masterly volume *Freud and Philosophy* (1965; English translation, 1970). The argument turns on "relations between desire and language."<sup>93</sup> Freud had shown that dreams could be expressions of hidden desire, but were



“disguised . . . expressions.”<sup>94</sup> Deception and disguise operate at several levels, so that even the self is deceived about its true wishes. People “tell” dreams (the “dream-text”) which differ from the dream-content (“dream-thoughts”). Hence the interpreter needs “a hermeneutic of suspicion” to try to understand them. In a key comment Ricoeur asserts: “Hermeneutics seem to me to be animated by this double motivation: willingness to suspect, willingness to listen; vow of rigor, vow of obedience.”<sup>95</sup> Ricoeur concludes: “*The idols must die – so that symbols may live.*”<sup>96</sup>

Ricoeur pays particular attention to metaphor, where he draws on the interactive theory of Max Black. As tensive “double-meaning” expressions which entail “split reference” they operate with creative force. However, the climax of Ricoeur’s work, after a series of other volumes, appears first in his three-volume *Time and Narrative* (1983–5; English translation, 1984–8) and then in his *Oneself as Another* (1990; English translation, 1992). He begins *Time and Narrative* by discussing Augustine’s reflections on time. The human experience of time makes possible an experience which becomes differentiated into expectation (future), attention (present), and memory (past). Hence, “through the experience of human time (memory, attention, hope) I come to understand the world, its objects, and my own present.”<sup>97</sup> But Augustine considers human time both as a series of moments and as a whole, as a part of creation. “It is true of the whole history of mankind.”<sup>98</sup> “Temporality” (in Heidegger’s sense of the “possibility” of “human” time) constitutes the necessary condition for narrative and for the intelligibility of texts, life, and action. This is complemented by Aristotle’s theory of “plot” (*mythos*). “Plot” organizes narrative events into a *coherent whole*, through “*poiesis*” or “making” (*faire*). “To make up a plot is . . . to make the intelligible spring from the accidental, the universal from the singular.”<sup>99</sup> In temporal terms it projects “a world that the reader appropriates.”<sup>100</sup> This readily applies to biblical texts. Some argue, for example, that the Gospel of Mark uses changes in the speed of “human time” to depict a hastening toward a goal which turns out to be the Passion portrayed as if in slow motion. Thus “plot” “organizes” the action by *poiesis*.

Ricoeur’s complex volume *Oneself as Another* exceeds even *Time and Narrative* in depth and power. He draws on earlier themes to vindicate a concept of personhood as identity-within-temporal-change that does much to restore human selfhood against the skepticism not only of Hume and positivism but more especially of the shifting quicksands of postmodernity.

## Debate, Achievement, and Agenda

### *The “biblical theology” movement*

The central item of controversy surrounding the classical exponents of biblical theology in the 1950s concerned their emphasis on the unity of the Old or New Testament, and often also the unity between them. Did this serve negatively to flatten the rich diversity of distinct theological and historical traditions? Or did it reflect positively the coherent outworking of divine purposes which lead toward a promised goal? Such unity need not be “timeless” nor uniformly “linear.” As Vriezen

argued, it may allow for twists and turns, for relative discontinuities, tensions and surprises. On the other hand, a new emphasis on theological diversity arose from redaction criticism in the late 1950s and this weakened the hold of “biblical theology.”

A more difficult clash of method arises from a recurring debate about the possibility of a purely descriptive approach to historical phenomena (Stendahl, Räisänen) and those who believe that this standpoint proves to be inadequate for theology or impossible for hermeneutics (Bultmann, Wright, Childs, Gadamer). Childs sees no way of accommodating the contrast between a liberal or secular “history-of-religions” approach and the role of the biblical writings as texts for Christian theology. Reventlow traces how this *impasse* emerges again and again in the history of the subject. Nowadays it has come to be perceived as an explicit issue within hermeneutics,<sup>101</sup> where it becomes transposed into issues about the difference between report and descriptive propositions and the logic of self-involvement or of speech-acts. Stendahl and Räisänen fail to address these issues adequately, but on the other side we must note Pannenberg’s comments (below).

In his rightly influential work *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (1962), James Barr attacks tendencies among exponents of biblical theology from the 1930s to the 1960s to exaggerate the supposed distinctiveness of “Hebraic thought-forms” on the basis of accidents of grammar and lexicography. This tendency is present in the first four volumes edited by Gerhard Kittel of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (in German, 1933–42), even if it is less pronounced in later volumes edited by G. Friedrich (in English, 10 volumes, 1964–76). Such arguments often rested on dubious evidence. They also exaggerated differences from the modern world. However, these generalizing claims should not be countered merely by equally sweeping claims in the opposite direction. A “linear” rather than cyclical view of time and history, for example, does indeed characterize Hebrew-Christian traditions. Barr perceived that part of the problem arose from overestimating the importance of histories of words. He observes: “the etymology of a word is not a statement about its meaning but about its history.”<sup>102</sup>

The specific approach to history worked out by Gerhard von Rad maintains a strong influence on contemporary systematic theology. This plays a major part in Pannenberg and in Moltmann, and has affinities with Gadamer’s hermeneutics. Gullmann’s recovery of the importance of the temporal dimension for understanding salvation and God’s acts also has far-reaching effects. It avoids dualist distortions of biblical Christianity. Nevertheless Pannenberg resists the notion of what he perceives as “a ghetto of redemptive history” which is found too readily in “biblical theology.”<sup>103</sup> If God is one, history is one, and knowledge is one. Creation and eschatology point to this.

### *Hermeneutics*

Gadamer’s epoch-making work has placed a permanent question mark against the privilege accorded by Enlightenment rationalism to the centrality of the individual self and to the “method” of reason alone. All human life, including action, art, and texts, invites understanding on its own terms, not in terms of some prior method predetermined in advance of engaging with the material. Nothing is value-neutral

in the sense of failing to reflect some prior horizon of understanding. From within that horizon, an advance can be made only by respecting fully the otherness of other horizons, and undergoing an open process of listening which may result in the transformation of the self and its prior horizons. Horizons may then move and become enlarged.

The strengths of Gadamer's work for biblical studies include a recognition on grounds other than theology of "the primacy of the text," and for pastoral theology they encourage respect for the other and "listening." Wisdom is rightly perceived to transcend mere knowledge. This is especially relevant to our age of information technology. Nevertheless Gadamer's work may also lead in a less constructive direction. It may also encourage a contextual pragmatism which offers no criteria to determine what would count as a "valid," "appropriate," or even "edifying" (cf. *Bildung*) performance of a text or work of art outside its own context. Hence his work may be interpreted either in a more conservative direction (with G. Warnke) or in a postmodernist direction (with R. Rorty).

A fine balance is achieved by Ricoeur between the need for a hermeneutic of suspicion which "destroys idols," and a hermeneutic of retrieval which seeks to recover the creative power of symbol, metaphor, and narrative. He recognizes and counters the attack of postmodernism on the human self as a responsible agent; but with equal balance rejects Enlightenment rationalism which places the self at the center. Rightly, he draws on the interdisciplinary resources of philosophy, semiotics, literary theory, social studies, and at times theology to offer a constructive way forward. Perhaps only his account of the relation of certain texts to history and his over-ready acceptance of notions of "the death of the author" call for serious hesitation.

Hermeneutics has now given birth to a wide plurality of goals, methods, criteria, and approaches. Even supposedly single named movements (e.g., feminist hermeneutics) cover a multitude of approaches, some incompatible with others. Some view this as positive liberation, others as negative anarchy. The latter see this trend as reducing biblical and Christian claims to truth to the status of textual forces, or worse, to bids for power by sub-traditions or guilds. A massive agenda has been set for theology which raises profound issues of language, meaning, truth, manipulation, domination, and self-deception.

## Notes

- 8 Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd English edn (London, 1989), p. 509.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 521.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 527.
- 11 Ernst Fuchs, "The hermeneutical problem," in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Future of Our Religious Past* (London, 1971), p. 277; published in German in E. Dinkler (ed.), *Zeit und Geschichte* (1964), p. 365.
- 12 E. Fuchs, "The New Testament and the hermeneutical problem," in J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, Jr., *New Frontiers in Theology II: The New Hermeneutic* (New York, 1964), p. 143.
- 13 Ehelbert Stauffer, *Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1955). First published in German in 1941, with a revised edition in 1948.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 75.
- 15 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- 16 M. Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2 vols (Bonn, 1950), vol. 1, p. 3.
- 17 J. Bonsirven, *Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1963).
- 18 Theodore C. Vriegen, *Outline of Old Testament Theology* (Oxford, 1958), p. 17.
- 19 *Ibid.*, pp. 125, 76.
- 20 G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as recital* (London, 1952), pp. 62-3.
- 21 *Ibid.*, p. 66.
- 22 Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1958), p. 11.
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 63.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- 25 *Ibid.*, p. 291.
- 26 *Ibid.*, p. 341.
- 27 H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1969), pp. 157-70.
- 28 W. G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1974), p. 254; cf. pp. 249-54.
- 29 *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- 30 G. B. Caird, *New Testament Theology*, ed. L. D. Hurst (Oxford, 1994).
- 31 Gerhard Ebeling, *Word and Faith* (London, 1963), p. 33; Ebeling's italics.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 313.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 317.
- 34 A typical exponent is D. Patte, *What is Structural Exegesis?* (Philadelphia, 1976)
- and *The Religious Dimensions of Biblical Texts* (Atlanta, GA, 1990).
- 35 R. Barthes, *Elements of Semiology* (London, 1967) and *Mythologies* (London, 1972).
- 36 J. Derrida, *Speech and Phenomena, and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs* (Evanston, IL, 1973) and *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore, MD, 1975); cf. Hugh J. Silverman, *Textualities: Between hermeneutics and deconstruction* (New York and London, 1994).
- 37 N. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh* (New York, 1979).
- 38 M. Foucault, *The Order of Things* (London, 1970) and many other works.
- 39 Gustavo Gutiérrez, *A Theology of Liberation* (New York, 1973, and London, 1974), p. 156; cf. pp. 6, 11, 216-25.
- 40 Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her* (New York and London, 1983), pp. 315-34; cf. p. 52.
- 41 Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "The will to choose or to reject," in Letty M. Russell (ed.), *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 125-46.
- 42 *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- 43 Anthony C. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The theory and practice of transforming biblical reading* (London and Grand Rapids, MI, 1992), pp. 430-70; cf. 379-409.
- 44 Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Basic Questions in Theology*, 3 vols (London, 1970-3), vol. 1, pp. 96-210; cf. Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, pp. 331-8.
- 45 Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols (London, 1961-7), vol. 1, p. 38; Eichrodt's italics.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 43; Eichrodt's italics.
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- 48 *Ibid.*, p. 154; Eichrodt's italics.
- 49 *Ibid.*, p. 138.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 281.
- 51 *Ibid.*, pp. 478-9.
- 52 *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 63.
- 53 Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1962-5), vol. 1, p. v.
- 54 *Ibid.*, pp. 296-7.
- 55 *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 104.
- 56 Wolfhart Pannenberg, "The revelation of God in Jesus of Nazareth," in J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, Jr. (eds), *New Frontiers*

- 3 Krister Stendahl, "Biblical theology, contemporary," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville, TN, 1962), vol. 1, pp. 418-31, and "Method in the study of biblical theology," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (Nashville, TN, 1965), pp. 196-209; Heikki Räisänen, *Beyond New Testament Theology* (London, 1990).
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 101.
- 5 Eissfeldt and Eichrodt published their essays respectively in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 44 (1926), pp. 1-12, and 47 (1929), pp. 83-91.
- 6 Rudolf Bultmann, "The problem of hermeneutics," in *Essays Philosophical and Theological* (London, 1955), p. 239; Bultmann's italics.
- 7 Rudolf Bultmann, *Existence and Faith* (London, 1961), p. 344.

- 8 F. D. E. Schleiermacher, *Hermeneutics: The handwritten manuscripts* (Missoula, MN, 1977), p. 97 (manuscript from 1819).



- in *Theology III: Theology as history* (New York, 1967), p. 122; cf. 101–33.
- 57 *Ibid.*, pp. 102, 108.
- 58 *Ibid.*, pp. 120, 127.
- 59 Henning Graf Reventlow, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century* (London, 1986), p. 8.
- 60 Breward S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (London, 1992), p. 100.
- 61 Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols (London, 1952–5), vol. 1, p. 3.
- 62 *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- 63 *Ibid.*, pp. 48–9.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- 65 *Ibid.*, pp. 121–33.
- 66 *Ibid.*, p. 188.
- 67 *Ibid.*, p. 239.
- 68 *Ibid.*, pp. 270–9.
- 69 *Ibid.*, p. 322.
- 70 *Ibid.*, p. 335.
- 71 Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament hermeneutics and philosophical description* (Carlisle and Grand Rapids, MI, 1980 and 1993), pp. 205–92.
- 72 Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (London, 1951), p. 12.
- 73 *Ibid.*, p. 37.
- 74 Greek *kairos*, *ibid.*, pp. 39–44.
- 75 *Arche* and *telos*, *ibid.*, pp. 51–60.
- 76 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
- 77 *Ibid.*, p. 72.
- 78 *Ibid.*, p. 75.
- 79 *Ibid.*, p. 155.
- 80 *Ibid.*, p. 84.
- 81 *Ibid.*, p. 81; Cullmann's italics.
- 82 *Ibid.*, p. 82; Cullmann's italics.
- 83 Oscar Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament* (London, 1959), p. 200.
- 84 Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History* (London, 1967), p. 66.
- 85 *Ibid.*, p. 67; Cullmann's italics.
- 86 *Ibid.*, p. 69; Cullmann's italics.
- 87 Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd English edn (London, 1989), p. 279.
- 88 *Ibid.*, p. 19.
- 89 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- 90 *Ibid.*, p. 102.
- 91 *Ibid.*, p. 379.
- 92 Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil* (1969).
- 93 Paul Ricoeur, *Freud and Philosophy: An essay on interpretation* (New Haven, 1970), p. 5.
- 94 *Ibid.*
- 95 *Ibid.*, p. 27.
- 96 *Ibid.*, p. 531; Ricoeur's italics.
- 97 Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols (Chicago and London, 1984–8), vol. 1, p. 16.
- 98 *Ibid.*, p. 22.
- 99 *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- 100 *Ibid.*, p. 50.
- 101 Francis Watson, *Text, Church and World: Biblical interpretation in theological perspective* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp. 1–77; Thiselton, *The Two Horizons*, pp. 53–114, 314–26, and *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, pp. 272–313, 558–619.
- 102 James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford, 1961), p. 109.
- 103 Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Basic Questions in Theology*, vol. 1, p. 41.

## Bibliography

- Primary: biblical theology*
- Bultmann, Rudolf, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols (London, 1952–5).
- Childs, Breward S., *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (London, 1992).
- Cullmann, Oscar, *Christ and Time* (London, 1951).
- *Salvation in History* (London, 1967).
- Eichrodt, Walther, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols (London, 1961–7).
- Rad, Gerhard von, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1962–5).
- Richardson, Alan, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1958).
- Vriezen, Theodore C., *Outline of Old Testament Theology* (Oxford, 1958).
- Wright, G. Ernest, *God Who Acts: Biblical theology as recital* (London, 1952).
- Primary: hermeneutics*
- Bultmann, Rudolf, "The Problem of Hermeneutics," in *Essays Philosophical and Theological* (London, 1955), pp. 234–61.

- Ebeling, Gerhard, *Word and Faith* (London, 1963).
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 2nd Eng. edn (London, 1989).
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart, *Basic Questions in Theology*, 3 vols (London, 1970–3), vol. 1, pp. 96–181 and vol. 3, pp. 192–210.
- Ricoeur, Paul, *Freud and Philosophy: An essay on interpretation* (New Haven, 1970).
- *Essays on Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia, 1980).
- *Time and Narrative*, 3 vols (Chicago and London, 1984–8).
- *Oneself as Another* (Chicago and London, 1992).
- *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, narrative and imagination* (Minneapolis, 1995).
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich D. E., *Hermeneutics: The handwritten manuscripts* (Missoula, MN, 1977).
- Secondary or critical*
- Barr, James, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford, 1961).
- Childs, Breward S., *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia, 1970).
- Fodor, James, *Christian Hermeneutics: Paul Ricoeur and the refiguring of theology* (Oxford, 1995).
- Grondin, Jean, *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics* (New Haven and London, 1994).
- Harrington, Wilfrid, *The Path of Biblical Theology* (Dublin, 1973).
- Hayes, John H. and Prussner, F. C., *Old Testament Theology: Its history and development* (London and Atlanta, GA, 1985).
- Jeanronod, Werner G., *Theological Hermeneutics* (London, 1991).
- Morgan, Robert, with Barton, John, *Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford, 1988).
- Mueller-Volmer, Kurt (ed.), *The Hermeneutics Reader* (Oxford, 1986).
- Räsänen, Heikki, *Beyond New Testament Theology* (London, 1990).
- Reventlow, Henning Graf, *Problems of Biblical Theology in the Twentieth Century* (London, 1986).
- Schneiders, Sandra M., *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as sacred Scripture* (San Francisco, 1991).
- Smart, James D., *The Past, Present and Future of Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia, 1979).
- Stendahl, Krister, "Biblical theology, contemporary," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville, TN, 1962), vol. 1, pp. 418–31.
- "Method in the study of biblical theology," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (Nashville, TN, 1965), pp. 196–209.
- Thiselton, Anthony C., *The Two Horizons: New Testament hermeneutics and philosophical description* (Carlisle and Grand Rapids, MI, 1980 and 1993).
- *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The theory and practice of transforming biblical reading* (London and Grand Rapids, MI, 1992).
- Warnke, Georgia, *Gadamer: Hermeneutics, tradition and reason* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Watson, Francis, *Text, Church and World: Biblical interpretation in theological perspective* (Edinburgh, 1994).