CRUCIFIED AND RESURRECTED

Restructuring the Grammar of Christology

Ingolf U. Dalferth

Translated by Jo Bennett

Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

In keeping with biblical principles of creation stewardship, Baker Publishing Group advocates the responsible use of our natural resources. As a member of the Green Press Initiative, our company uses recycled paper when possible. The text paper of this book is composed in part of post-consumer waste.

green press INITIATIVE

To Eberhard Jüngel

Contents

Translator's Preface

"The task of translating a German theological work is never quite straightforward," wrote Sir Edwin Hoskyns in the preface to his 1933 translation of Karl Barth's *Epistle to the Romans*. Perhaps I may be allowed to echo his magnificent understatement.

Despite the complexity of the task, it has been a privilege to have been invited to translate Professor Dalferth's scholarly, carefully argued, and deeply interesting work. I have gained much personal benefit from dealing with his theological thinking on a daily basis and am convinced that this text fully merits introduction to a wider, English-reading audience. In undertaking the task, I have sought to retain a balance between conscientious translation of Dalferth's argumentation and the need for the English version to be read with fluency and enjoyment.

The issue of gender is one that may not have confronted Hoskyns but is inevitable for today's writers and translators. Wherever possible I have used "humans" or "human beings" for *der Mensch* and thus have been able to avail myself of the plural pronoun "they," resorting only where absolutely necessary to the gender-specific "he" or the slightly clumsy "he or she."

Another issue faced by German-to-English theological translators in any era is the translation of *Glaube*. In agreement with Professor Dalferth, I have used "belief" whenever the object is a doctrinal proposition or doctrine, and "faith" whenever *Glaube* expresses an attitude toward or a relationship of trust in a person.

Biblical quotations are taken chiefly from the New American Standard Bible, except where a direct English translation gives the sense of the German

ix

quotation more accurately and therefore better supports the point the author is making.

Aware that some potential readers of the English text may not have Professor Dalferth's thorough acquaintance with classical languages, I have provided, within the limits of my abilities and subject to his review, translations of the Latin and Greek terms that occur fairly frequently within the text.

My use of italics follows the original, except for a very few instances where I felt that the introduction of italics in the English translation was the best way to enhance the reader's understanding of the text.

I would like to express my gratitude both to Bishop Michael Bourke, assistant bishop in the Anglican Diocese of Hereford and former cochair of the Meissen Commission, for his reading of my draft translation and his very helpful comments and suggestions; and of course to Professor Dalferth himself, whose thorough knowledge of the English language greatly simplified our discussions of various aspects of the translation process.

Jo Bennett
January 15, 2015

Preface to the 2015 English Edition

1. Beyond *Mythos* and *Logos*

Every book has a history, and this book is no exception. Originally I did not plan to publish it separately but wrote it as the second part of a large study of the European strategy of orienting oneself in mental space by the contrast between *mythos* and *logos*, the mythical (narrative, temporal, meaning-constituting) and the rational (argumentative, atemporal, reason-giving), and the impact of this orienting strategy on Christian theology. The distinction between these different types of rationalities, experiences, and ways of thinking—variously conceived and contrasted and continuously reinterpreted since the beginnings of European philosophy, science, and theology in ancient Greece—is deeply entrenched in the history of European thought and has held a particular grip on philosophy and theology. My idea was to show that the mode and character of Christian theology can be understood neither in terms of this mental orienting strategy nor without reference to it. In antiquity Christian theology contrasted with both the *mythos* and the *logos* traditions by developing into a hybrid "third" that was different from both; in medieval Europe it tried to synthesize the mythical and the rational into a unity that transcended both, but this unity was always on the brink of breaking apart; and in modernity it redefined itself by reference to the mythical and rational strands within itself without completely identifying with either of them.

Christian theology emerged in a cultural setting in which it had no choice but to relate to the traditional orienting pattern of *mythos* and *logos* without ever fitting into it: because of its eschatological and soteriological orientation, and the christological and trinitarian ways of thinking that resulted from it, Christian theology became "the other" of both traditions by using

modes of thinking derived from both of them. Later the contrast between Christian theology, on the one hand, and the ancient *mythos* and *logos* traditions, on the other, was turned into an internal distinction within Christian theology itself, which thereby became all-encompassing but at the same time precariously unstable, always in danger of losing its balance between the mythical and the rational by overemphasizing the one at the expense of the other. Enlightenment thinkers forced theology to rethink this internalizing strategy by insisting that it had to choose between either the one or the other: Christian theology is either an outdated mythology or an unfounded theism or—and most likely—both at the same time in different respects. Many critics in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries agreed with the first or the third view, or with both, and turned their back on Christianity and Christian theology. Others opted for the second horn of the dilemma but tried to show that it was not an unfounded but rather a well-founded theism. However, neither the skeptical atheist's nor the rational theist's way out is convincing. Both wrongly accept the alternative posed by the Enlightenment against the backdrop of the medieval synthesis of the mythical and the rational. But this alternative offers a choice between the devil and the deep blue sea. Christian theology cannot identify with either the *mythos* or the *logos* strand, or simply combine them into some higher but inconsistent unity, without losing its characteristic identity as the unique thought form of the Christian faith. It is neither the mythology of a particular historical faith, nor a general philosophical theism unrelated to any particular faith, nor an inconsistent combination of both, but rather an intellectual endeavor sui generis. As Augustine made clear with reference to the Stoic pattern of theologies:[1] Christian theology is neither a form of natural theology (philosophical theism or *theologia naturalis*), nor a form of poetic or mythical theology (mythology or *theologia fabulosa*), nor a form of political theology (civil religion or *theologia civilis*), but a fundamental critique of all three. If anything, Christian theology bears a faint similarity to natural theology because it seeks knowledge and truth and is not merely a matter of human invention and social convention. But it would be best not to call it theology in any of three Stoic senses at all. It is neither a case of *mythos* nor of *logos*, nor a combination of both, but something sui generis.

It took a huge effort for Christian theology to recover this insight at the end of modernity, and it never completely achieved it in a way that left a noticeable imprint on contemporary culture. Where it succumbed to the lure of the Enlightenment alternative, it became rationalist, liberal, and modernist; and

---

1. *Civ.* VIII, 1 and 5.

where theology rejected modern rationalism, it restated the classical synthesis or became radically orthodox. However, neither is a way forward. In the light of the Enlightenment criticism, the precarious synthesis of the mythical and the rational cannot simply be continued, not even in a radically orthodox way; yet in the light of the origin of Christian faith and the beginnings of Christian theology, the Enlightenment alternative should not be accepted. Christian faith is not merely one religious belief among others (as Enlightenment rationality has it); by its own account, it is the awareness and acknowledgment that Christ's cross and resurrection mark the end of the old world and the beginning of the new. By unfolding, exploring, and thinking through this faith from its own point of view, Christian theology is neither a case of *mythos* or *logos* nor a combination of both, but something unique and sui generis.

It was only when Christian theology rediscovered its eschatological roots in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that it became aware again of the uniqueness of its intellectual project and managed to posit itself in contrast to both the *mythos* and the *logos* strands within its own tradition. It did so—without turning into something different by trying to be both or by choosing between them—by becoming theological through and through. In order to meet the challenge to be true to the eschatological reality of faith in God's creative and renewing presence in creation through Christ and the Spirit, it had to avoid three dead ends: (1) the classical *aporia* of a metaphysical "both-and," of constructing itself as an incoherent metadiscipline of the rational and the mythical; (2) the Enlightenment *aporia* of a dogmatic "either-or," of allowing itself to be forced into the Procrustean bed of choosing between rationalism and obscurantism; and (3) the self-defeating *aporia* of a "neither-nor," of cutting all constructive ties to the surrounding culture by relating in a merely negative way to it. Theology is neither a "both-and" nor an "either-or" nor a "neither-nor" of the mythical and the rational; rather, it is a sustained intellectual effort to understand everything in a new way from the point of view of the eschatological breaking in of God's creative presence in the human reality of this life and world in and through God's Word and Spirit. By orienting itself toward this life- and world-changing event, theology distances itself from both the *mythos* and the *logos* strands in European culture, freely using aspects of both without being reducible to either of them in creating and elaborating its own christological, trinitarian, and pneumatological thought forms. Only in this way can it be true to what makes it unique: the eschatological event of faith in the creative, saving, and perfecting presence of God, the poet of the possible, as it becomes disclosed in Christ when humans are changed by the Spirit from their God-ignoring

lives of nonfaith and unfaith to a life of faith, trust, hope, and love of God and God's neighbors.

This is no more than a rough sketch whose details need to be filled in before it will be convincing. But even so, it will be obvious why the test case for this view of Christian theology and its history is Christology, the distinctive form of Christian thinking about God, human existence, and the world. From the beginning, Christian theology had to face up to a threefold challenge. It had to define itself in contrast not only to the mythologies of the Greco-Roman world but also to the natural theology of Hellenistic philosophies and the prophetic theology of the Jewish tradition. It had to conceive God in personal terms, and as acting in history, without relapsing into myth; it had to conceive him as creator and ruler of the universe without reducing him to a metaphysical principle of the cosmos; and it had to conceive him as the eschatological Savior who had acted in Jesus Christ in a definite way, universally valid and relevant not only for the Jews but for everyone. None of the contemporary theological paradigms could combine all this in a convincing and consistent way. Thus Christian thinkers were forced to develop a new theological paradigm: *Christology*.[2]

The term *Christology* is understood here not in a narrow and specific sense but in a broad and foundational sense. It does not merely signify the doctrine of the person of Christ, or of the person and work of Christ, as distinct from the doctrine of the salvation achieved by Christ and appropriated through faith in Christ in the sacramental life of the church (soteriology and ecclesiology). Rather, it signifies the fundamental thought form of the Christian faith that has foundational import for all Christian theology. It informs its trinitarian thought about God as Father, Word, and Spirit; its soteriological accounts of human life in terms of sin, justification, and the church; and its eschatological views of world, life, and history as God's creation. All the characteristic teachings of Christian theology are manifestations of thinking about God, human existence, and the world in christological terms. These terms did not fit into the traditional pattern of *mythos* and *logos* in antiquity, and they do not fall prey to the criticism of both forms of rationality in modernity. It is true that the christological thought form did not develop independently of the orienting strategy of *mythos* and *logos*, and neither was it ever practiced completely unrelated to it. But it cannot be coherently stated or sufficiently understood in terms of it. It became something sui generis by using the pattern of *mythos* and *logos* to distinguish itself from both *mythos* and *logos*, thereby going beyond the whole European pattern of orientation and becoming something distinctly different and new.

2. I. U. Dalferth, *Theology and Philosophy* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002), 36–37.

2. From Confession to Grammar

The first part of the book was published in 1993 under the title *Jenseits von Mythos und Logos: Die christologische Transformation der Theologie* (Freiburg: Herder). It traced the orienting strategy of *mythos* and *logos* through the European history of thought from Greek antiquity through the beginnings of Christian theology (Logos-Christology and trinitarian thought) to the medieval synthesis and its breakdown in modernity. I then analyzed in detail three attempts to turn this strategy on itself and thereby critically reenforce or overcome it: the hermeneutics of myths, from the late eighteenth-century to the twentieth-century attempts of demythologizing Christian theology; the structuralist efforts to understand the functioning of myths and rituals in strictly rational terms of *logos*; and the philosophical and theological attempts to spell out the sui generis character of the christological form of Christian thought in terms of grammar—Newman's grammar of assent, Wittgenstein's idea of theology as grammar, Austin Farrer's reconstruction of a grammar of revelation from the "Rebirth of Images" in the biblical tradition, and Luther's insistence on a *grammatica theologica* as the proper mode of a *theologia crucis*. The study ended with an outline of Christian dogmatics as a grammar of Christian life and the practice of faith. It restated the old (but controversial) insight that theology is best understood and practiced not as a theoretical or speculative discipline that aims at knowledge of God and of everything in relation to God (*scientia speculativa*) but as a practical discipline that studies actions, acts, and activities that change human life (*scientia practica*)—not, however, merely human actions (*de rebus operabilibus ab homine*, as Aquinas rightly insisted) or primarily the religious activities of humans (as nineteenth-century neo-Protestantism maintained), but the divine activity that changes human life from sin to salvation, from disregarding God's presence to orienting itself toward God's presence, from ignoring God to loving God and one's neighbor, from death to life.

The second part was meant to ground this conception of theology as a grammar of the life of faith in a detailed reconstruction of the beginnings of the christological thought form of Christian theology. Combining analytic and hermeneutical approaches and paying close attention to exegetical and historical findings, I explored and discussed the issues of incarnation, cross, and resurrection; the basic doctrinal problems of classical Christology and trinitarian thought; and the soteriological issue of understanding the salvific significance of the death of Jesus in terms of sacrifice and atonement. In the end the book was published independently and with a different publisher under the title *Der auferweckte Gekreuzigte: Zur Grammatik der Christologie*

(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994). But the overall argument stayed untouched. I attempted to substantiate in *Crucified and Resurrected* what I had outlined in *Jenseits von Mythos und Logos*. And I did so by tracing the genesis of the fundamental pattern of christological thought from (1) the resurrection confessions through (2) the gospel account of the cross and the life and message of Jesus to (3) his understanding of God that (4) reworked, intensified, and sharpened the heritage of Israel in which Jesus grew up and (5) grounded the resurrection experience of his Jewish followers who became the first Christians. The rationale of this account is twofold: If, as I argue, the confession that Jesus has been raised by God is the starting point of christological reflection in the New Testament, then Christian theology stands or falls with the clear and careful conceptual exposition of this confession. Second, the method I use to do this is the hermeneutical strategy of asking for the question or questions to which a given text, idea, or view seeks to provide an answer; of exploring to whom this answer may be, has been, or may have been given; and of identifying the question or questions that either were raised or may and perhaps should have been raised, by the answers given: What is the problem posed by the resurrection confession of the first Christians that is answered by reference to the cross? What is the problem posed by the Gospel account of the cross that is answered by the New Testament narratives of the life and message of Jesus? What is the problem to which Jesus's proclamation of the coming of God's kingdom seeks to give an answer? What is the problem posed by understanding the references to God in the Gospel accounts of the cross in terms of Jesus's message of God's coming? What is the problem posed by Jesus's death on the cross that is answered by the resurrection confession of (some of) his followers? What is the problem posed by the Christian accounts of Jesus's death and resurrection for those who did not or do not see Jesus's life and death in this way? And what is the problem posed for Christians by the fact that most don't see or understand it in this way? In short, if we try to understand the emergence of the christological thought form, we have to interpret the resurrection confessions with respect to the cross; the cross with respect to the life and message of Jesus; the life and message of Jesus with respect to God; Jesus's message of God with respect to the cross, the life of those who confess God to have raised Jesus from death, the world that they confess to be God's creation, and the life of those who live in God's creation but ignore or deny all this. The result of this dynamic interpretative process is the emergence of a christological thought form about God, human life, and the world that is never finished but permanently in the making, driven forward by the life and practice of faith and the inquiring intellect that seeks to understand the life and practice of faith in the light of the self-presenting

and self-communicating activity of God. Because of its christological thought form, Christian theology is essentially about the creative activity of God in creation and new creation, and about the creative passivity of human life as the locus where God's prior activity in creation becomes manifest in a way that transforms human life from a life of ignoring or denying God's presence to a life of faith in the love of God and all others as God's neighbors.

The book concentrates on reconstructing the grammar of this christological thought form, not on applying it to the complex and wide-ranging issues of Christian life and practice in a globalizing world. All this is no doubt important, but unless we are clear about the christological grammar enacted in Christian life, we cannot ensure that what we claim to be Christian is in fact so. The problems of our world are not solved in or by theology, but Christian theology aims at helping Christians to engage in identifying and solving the problems of our time by providing guidelines and signposts for orientation. A grammar book is not to be confused with a discourse or a practice that enacts that grammar, and while Christian theology seeks to outline the grammar of a Christian life of faith, it is in the actual practice of this faith in the manifold areas of human life in our contemporary world that this grammar is enacted. We must not expect theology to do what can only be done in the life and practice of faith. Theologies come and go, and no theological view ought to be confused with the eschatological reality that it seeks to unfold. In theology, there is always room for improvement and deeper insight, and there is always a chance of being wrong whereas others may be right. What is decisive about human life from a Christian point of view is not what we think and do but that this life is the locus of God's creative and transforming presence, whether we believe it or not. Accordingly, the crucial question is not about our theologies but rather the question of whether our life is actually transformed from a life of unfaith and self-love to a life of faith and the love of God and neighbor. If we are justified, then we are justified by faith and not by how we experience or think about faith or practice it. Faith is not something we can achieve by what we do or think ourselves, but a gift for which we may pray and give thanks but which we cannot give to ourselves or to anybody else. The christological thought form is the thought form of this gift, and Christian theology is unique and sui generis precisely by being christological through and through.

3. Further Reflections

The book left its mark on debates in Germany, Great Britain, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, but it was not the last thing I wrote on Christology. In

the following years I deepened, defended, and elaborated what I had written in a number of areas, concentrating in particular on the following: the significance of the life and person of Jesus for the Christian faith ("Jesus Christus—Zeichen für Gottes Zuwendung: Die Bedeutung der Person Jesu für den christlichen Glauben," in *Theologie zwischen Pragmatismus und Existenzdenken: Festschrift für Hermann Deuser zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. G. Linde, R. Purkarthofer, H. Schulze, and P. Steinacker [Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 2006], 231–44), the debate about Jesus's death and the empty grave ("Volles Grab, leerer Glaube? Zum Streit um die Auferweckung des Gekreuzigten," *ZThK* 95 [1998]: 379–402), the hermeneutics of the resurrection ("The Resurrection: The Grammar of 'Raised,'" in *Biblical Concepts and Our World*, ed. D. Z. Phillips and M. van der Ruhr [New York: Palgrave, 2004], 190–208), the importance of the christological dogma for Christian theology ("Gott für uns: Die Bedeutung des christologischen Dogmas für die christliche Theologie," in *Denkwürdiges Geheimnis: Beiträge zur Gotteslehre; Festschrift für Eberhard Jüngel zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. I. U. Dalferth, J. Fischer, and H. P. Großhans [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 51–75), and the outline of a critical Christology ("Weder Mythos noch Metaphysik: Grundlinien einer kritischen Christologie," in *En in een Heer Jezus Christus: Het Dogma van Chalcedon als Leesregel en Spreekregel*, ed. H. Rikhof [Utrecht: Najaarsconferentie Samenwerkingsverband voor theologisch onderzoek, 2002], 14–30). These writings should be taken into account when discussing the issues of this book. They are further stepping-stones toward a Christian theology that takes the christological thought form seriously and does not shy away from emphasizing that Christian theology, as deeply contextual and context dependent as it always is, has its beauty and significance precisely in being unique and sui generis: it explores something new that cannot sufficiently be understood in terms of something familiar, and although we have to make use of our available cognitive, emotive, and conceptual resources to understand it at all, we are well advised to use the christological thought form in theology in the way outlined: not as a definitive doctrinal statement of a truth that we cannot understand but only accept or reject, but as a hermeneutical guideline that inducts us into a process of reorienting our life toward the creative presence of God and helps us to move through the questions and answers posed and provoked by the gift structure of Christian faith again and again in our own way and at our particular place in history. It is not theory but practice that counts, and the practice of faith is not an economic exchange of goods in a relationship of mutual rights and duties but a free gift that exceeds anything we can receive and that creates its own recipients by making more of them than they could ever become by themselves.

Acknowledgments

Grateful thanks are due to the original publisher, Mohr Siebeck (Tübingen), for permission to translate this book.

It is a pleasure to thank Jo Bennett, who has done an excellent job of translating the book into English. Without her the book would not have appeared in English at all.

I also thank David Chao, who put me in contact with Baker Academic, and Dave Nelson for his painstaking help in editing the manuscript and seeing it through to press. Without them the book would not have been published now.

The index was prepared by Sean Callaghan, and my research assistant Marlene Block has been of invaluable help in getting everything ready for print. Without them I would still be reading the proofs.

The book was originally dedicated to Eberhard Jüngel on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. Twenty years later the English translation is now being published shortly after his eightieth birthday. If there is one thing I do not want to change in this book, then it is this dedication: *Ad multos annos*!

<div align="right">Ingolf U. Dalferth</div>

Preface to the 1993 German Edition

Christian theology finds its proper thought form in dogmatics. Beyond the boundaries of religious myth and philosophical logos, but in constant reference to faith imageries, life experiences, and the conceptualizing efforts of the thought process, dogmatics describes the inner rationality of the Christian way of life in the form of a christological grammar of the Christian life of faith. It re-creates the structures of faith imageries by undertaking a critical examination of the identity of faith in the multiplicity of its articulations. It clarifies the conditions of the identity of faith and the rationality of the Christian life of faith by establishing rules to govern its practice and the focus of its content. It unfolds this focus systematically by using argumentative discourse to analyze the Christian eschatological understanding of reality and by presenting its main features coherently. And it examines the reliability of this understanding of reality by shedding light on its grounds for validity in comparison with other concepts of reality and life orientations, and by testing whether its claims to truth and validity are justified in the light of those grounds. Dogmatic thought thus makes plain what it means to have reasons for advocating the Christian faith, by illuminating the ground of faith as the rationality of the life of faith and the validity of the confession of faith. In itself it is neither the ground nor the foundation for faith; instead, it shows that a reasoned faith is not impossible, because faith in Jesus Christ has a unique ground, so that the Christian life of faith, too, has its own rationality.

As the grammar of the Christian life of faith, dogmatics seeks to illuminate this rationality in a systematic way by reference to the ground of faith, the triune God. So it unfolds the specificity of the content of faith in christological terms by affirming God's saving activity in Jesus Christ as the basis of faith

and as the foundation and criterion for true knowledge of God; it apprehends the existence and practice of the Christian life of faith pneumatologically, by tracing it back to God himself, who has revealed himself and allowed himself to be known in Jesus Christ as all-transforming, creative love; and it conceives of the ground of faith in trinitarian terms, since it is only on this basis that the rationality of the Christian life of faith can be disclosed and illuminated theologically in its christological specificity and its pneumatological basis.

This trinitarian approach means that the thought form of dogmatics is far from being an irrelevant, abstract theory. As a christological grammar, it is not just externally related to practical experience but is in fact practical in itself. It is not simply the theory of a specific religious practice in Schleiermacher's sense; it aims to be practical in the soteriological sense emphasized by Luther: that its theme is the presence of God in Jesus Christ, whose death is appropriated by faith.[1] Dogmatic theology itself can never be or accomplish this appropriation of faith; it is thus no substitute for faith. But it can lead to the appropriation of faith by using its tools of argumentation to guide thought and life onto the foundation to which faith, and everything else along with it, owes its existence. Hence, dogmatic theology is not only unequivocally distinct from faith but also intrinsically related to it, in that it distinguishes the ground of faith from faith itself and affirms this ground as the point of reference for the life of faith and for all else. It cannot formulate this ground apart from faith, but the dogmatic formulation of this ground of faith is no more the ground of faith itself than theology is a substitute for faith. Hence, theology must apply to itself the differentiation that it claims theologically for faith; this has always been the case, and is so now more than ever. This preserves it from the danger of a fundamentalism that takes itself too seriously, but at the same time underlines the realism with which it counts on the effective presence of God. By systematically differentiating faith from the ground of faith, and itself from both, it resists the temptation to make its fallible theological insights into a yardstick for the Christian life of faith; it is able, instead, as a christological grammar of the Christian life of faith, to guide this lifetime and again to orient itself anew toward what constitutes it: God's saving activity in Jesus Christ.

This present work sets out to do what I outlined last year in *Jenseits von Mythos und Logos*[2] as the task of Christian dogmatics. Guided by the question of the proper argumentational structure for dogmatic thought, it seeks to

---

1. *WATR* 1, no. 153.
2. I. U. Dalferth, *Jenseits von Mythos und Logos: Die christologische Transformation der Theologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 6.

unfold the main features of a grammar of Christology so as to state, clearly and systematically, the consequences of the christological transformation of theology. It does not claim to offer the only possible representation of even the main features of such a grammar. But it does seek to show that a dogmatic unfolding of the Christian faith has to follow a path of thought that leads from the resurrection to the cross, from the cross to the life of Jesus, and from there to the understanding of God, which, when given a new and remodeled form, leads to the understanding of salvation. Every attempt to curtail or avoid this christological line of argument leads down a side alley and, in neglecting the understanding of God, bypasses the Christian understanding of salvation and of reality as well.

Once again I would like to thank my friends and colleagues for a great deal of help of various kinds. Just before the start of the examination period, Philipp Stoellger, with some assistance from Franziska Mihram, undertook the time-consuming task of creating the index. He had already provided critical comments on the manuscript at many points, prompting me time and again to reconsider the positions I had adopted. I am inclined to doubt that I have convinced him. But I hope that I may be successful where other readers are concerned, at any rate.

This book is dedicated to Eberhard Jüngel on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. As he once said, he was never in favor of theology based on the "rotary-fan principle," in which "everything is thrown into the air and given a vigorous whirl, producing the impression of a theological departure for new shores, although in the end it is impossible to identify any genuine advancement of knowledge." As a theological teacher, he always insisted that theology should never be negligently allowed to fall short of its proper intellectual level, and that the mere grouping together of fashionable buzzwords should be kept for formulating theological brainteasers. As its fruits attest, theology accomplishes its real task when, with eyes and ears open to the concerns of its age, it follows its course unwaveringly and is practiced in accordance with its true purpose: to be an introduction to the "logic of the gospel."

Frankfurt, November 1993
Ingolf U. Dalferth

Abbreviations

Apostolic Fathers

2 Clem.	*2 Clement*
Did.	*Didache*

Ignatius

Eph.	*To the Ephesians*
Magn.	*To the Magnesians*

Ancient Sources

Augustine

Civ.	*De civitate Dei* (*The City of God*)
Trin.	*De Trinitate* (*The Trinity*)

Epictetus

Diatr.	*Diatribai (Dissertationes)*

Irenaeus

Haer.	*Adversus haereses* (*Against Heresies*)

Josephus

Ant.	*Jewish Antiquities*

Origen

Cels.	*Contra Celsum* (*Against Celsus*)

Plato

Tim.	*Timaeus*

Tertullian

Prax.	*Adversus Praxean* (*Against Praxeas*)

Modern Sources

AA	Immanuel Kant, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Ausgabe der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review*
BK	*Bibel und Kirche*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BSLK	*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 11th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
DS	*Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, ed. Heinrich Denziger and Adolf Schönmetzer. Freiburg: Herder, 1997.
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EKL	*Evangelisches Kirchenlexicon*. Edited by Erwin Fahlbusch et al. 4 vols. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985–96.
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie*

GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte
IKaZ	*Internationale katholische Zeitschrift*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
KD	*Kerygma und Dogma*
MT	Masoretic Text
NIDNTT	*The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology.* Edited by Colin Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–78.
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
RGG³	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* Edited by Kurt Galling. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957–65.
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
Theol	*Theology: A Journal of Historic Christianity*
ThLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
ThPh	*Theologie und Philosophie*
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
ThR	*Theologische Rundschau*
TWNT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1932–79.
WA	*D. Martin Luthers Werke.* Weimarer kritische Ausgabe. 120 vols. 1883–2009.
WATR	*D. Martin Luthers Tischreden.* 6 vols.
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZKhT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZThK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*