THE MESSAGE OF JESUS AND THE PROBLEM OF MYTHOLOGY

Rudolf Bultmann

How can the writings of the New Testament, composed back in the first century of our era, still communicate with men who live in the very different thought-world of today? The New Testament writers conceived their world mythically, whereas we have all been influenced by the scientific view of the world. Rudolf Bultmann has seen in existentialism a possibility of reinterpreting the New Testament teaching in a manner that can once again show its relevance for life. The process of “de-mythologizing” involves the translation of the New Testament message out of the language of myth into the language of human existence. Bultmann's method of interpretation is one of the major events in religious hermeneutics in a long time, and some of the basic principles are expounded by him in the following excerpt.

The heart of the preaching of Jesus Christ is the Kingdom of God. During the nineteenth century exegesis and theology understood the Kingdom of God as a spiritual community consisting of men joined together by obedience to the will of God which ruled in their wills. By such obedience they sought to enlarge the sphere of His rule in the world. They were building, it was said, the Kingdom of God as a realm which is spiritual but within the world.

Hallowed be thy name,
Thy Kingdom come,
Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

Jesus expected that this would take place soon, in the immediate future, and he said that the dawning of that age could already be perceived in the signs and wonders which he performed, especially in his casting out of demons. Jesus envisaged the inauguration of the Kingdom of God as a tremendous cosmic drama. The Son of Man will come with the clouds of heaven, the dead will be raised and the day of judgment will arrive; for the righteous the time of
bliss will begin, whereas the damned will be delivered to the torments of hell.

When I began to study theology, theologians as well as laymen were excited and frightened by the theories of Johannes Weiss. I remember that Julius Kaftan, my teacher in dogmatics in Berlin, said: "If Johannes Weiss is right and the conception of the Kingdom of God is an eschatological one, then it is impossible to make use of this conception in dogmatics." But in the following years the theologians, J. Kaftan among them, became convinced that Weiss was correct. Perhaps I may here refer to Albert Schweitzer who carried the theory of Weiss to extremes. He maintains that not only the preaching and the self-consciousness of Jesus but also his day-to-day conduct of life were dominated by an eschatological expectation which amounted to an all-pervading eschatological dogma.

Today nobody doubts that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God is an eschatological one—at least in European theology and, as far as I can see, also among American New Testament scholars. Indeed, it has become more and more clear that the eschatological expectation and hope is the core of the New Testament preaching throughout.

The earliest Christian community understood the Kingdom of God in the same sense as Jesus. It, too, expected the Kingdom of God to come in the immediate future. So Paul, too, thought that he would still be alive when the end of this world was to come and the dead were to be raised. This general conviction is confirmed by the voices of impatience, of anxiety and of doubt which are already audible in the synoptic gospels and which echo a little later and louder, for example, in the Second Epistle of Peter. Christianity has always retained the hope that the Kingdom of God will come in the immediate future, although it has waited in vain. We may cite Mark 9:1, which is not a genuine saying of Jesus but was ascribed to him by the earliest community: "Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power." Is not the meaning of this verse clear? Though many of the contemporaries of
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Jesus are already dead, the hope must nevertheless be retained that the Kingdom of God will still come in this generation.

This hope of Jesus and of the early Christian community was not fulfilled. The same world still exists and history continues. The course of history has refuted mythology. For the conception "Kingdom of God" is mythological, as is the conception of the eschatological drama. Just as mythological are the presuppositions of the expectation of the Kingdom of God, namely, the theory that the world, although created by God, is ruled by the devil, Satan, and that his army, the demons, is the cause of all evil, sin and disease. The whole conception of the world which is presupposed in the preaching of Jesus as in the New Testament generally is mythological; i.e., the conception of the world as being structured in three stories, heaven, earth and hell; the conception of the intervention of supernatural powers in the course of events; and the conception of miracles, especially the conception of the intervention of supernatural powers in the inner life of the soul, the conception that men can be tempted and corrupted by the devil and possessed by evil spirits. This conception of the world we call mythological because it is different from the conception of the world which has been formed and developed by science since its inception in ancient Greece and which has been accepted by all modern men. In this modern conception of the world the cause-and-effect nexus is fundamental. Although modern physical theories take account of chance in the chain of cause and effect in subatomic phenomena, our daily living, purposes and actions are not affected. In any case, modern science does not believe that the course of nature can be interrupted or, so to speak, perforated, by supernatural powers.

The same is true of the modern study of history, which does not take into account any intervention of God or of the devil or of demons in the course of history. Instead, the course of history is considered to be an unbroken whole, complete in itself, though differing from the course of nature because there are in history spiritual powers which influence the will of persons. Granted that
not all historical events are determined by physical necessity and
that persons are responsible for their actions, nevertheless nothing
happens without rational motivation. Otherwise, responsibility
would be dissolved. Of course, there are still many superstitions
among modern men, but they are exceptions or even anomalies.
Modern men take it for granted that the course of nature and of
history, like their own inner life and their practical life, is nowhere
interrupted by the intervention of supernatural powers.

Then the question inevitably arises: is it possible that Jesus’
preaching of the Kingdom of God still has any importance for
modern men and the preaching of the New Testament as a whole
is still important for modern men? The preaching of the New
Testament proclaims Jesus Christ, not only his preaching of the
Kingdom of God but first of all his person, which was mytholog-
ized from the very beginnings of earliest Christianity. New Testa-
ment scholars are at variance as to whether Jesus himself claimed
to be the Messiah, the King of the time of blessedness, whether
he believed himself to be the Son of Man who would come on the
clouds of heaven. If so, Jesus understood himself in the light of
mythology. We need not, at this point, decide one way or the
other. At any rate, the early Christian community thus regarded
him as a mythological figure. It expected him to return as the Son
of Man on the clouds of heaven to bring salvation and damnation
as judge of the world. His person is viewed in the light of mythol-
ogy when he is said to have been begotten of the Holy Spirit and
born of a virgin, and this becomes clearer still in Hellenistic Chris-
tian communities where he is understood to be the Son of God in
a metaphysical sense, a great, pre-existent heavenly being who be-
came man for the sake of our redemption and took on himself
suffering, even the suffering of the cross. It is evident that such
conceptions are mythological, for they were widespread in the mythol-
ogies of Jews and Gentiles and then were transferred to the historical
person of Jesus. Particularly the conception of the pre-existent
Son of God who descended in human guise into the world to re-
dem mankind is part of the Gnostic doctrine of redemption, and
nobody hesitates to call this doctrine mythological. This raises in an

acute form the question: what is the importance of the preaching
of Jesus and of the preaching of the New Testament as a whole for
modern man?

For modern man the mythological conception of the world, the
conceptions of eschatology, of redeemer and of redemption, are
over and does with. Is it possible to expect that we shall make a
sacrifice of understanding, sacrificium intellectus, in order to ac-
cept what we cannot sincerely consider true—merely because such
conceptions are suggested by the Bible? Or ought we to pass over
those sayings of the New Testament which contain such mytho-
logical conceptions and to select other sayings which are not such
stumbling-blocks to modern man? In fact, the preaching of Jesus
is not confined to eschatological sayings. He proclaimed also the
will of God, which is God’s demand, the demand for the good.
Jesus demands truthfulness and purity, readiness to sacrifice and
to love. He demands that the whole man be obedient to God, and
he protests against the delusion that one’s duty to God can be ful-
filled by obeying certain external commandments. If the ethical
demands of Jesus are stumbling-blocks to modern man, then it is
to his selfish will, not to his understanding, that they are stumbling-
blocks.

What follows from all this? Shall we retain the ethical preaching
of Jesus and abandon his eschatological preaching? Shall we reduce
his preaching of the Kingdom of God to the so-called social gospel?
Or is there a third possibility? We must ask whether the eschato-
logical preaching and the mythological sayings as a whole contain
a still deeper meaning which is concealed under the cover of my-
thology. If that is so, let us abandon the mythological conceptions
precisely because we want to retain their deeper meaning. This
method of interpretation of the New Testament which tries to re-
cover the deeper meaning behind the mythological conceptions I
call de-mythologizing—an unsatisfactory word, to be sure. Its aim
is not to eliminate the mythological statements but to interpret
them. It is a method of hermeneutics. The meaning of this method
will be best understood when we make clear the meaning of my-
thology in general.
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It is often said that mythology is a primitive science, the intention of which is to explain phenomena and incidents which are strange, curious, surprising, or frightening, by attributing them to supernatural causes, to gods or to demons. So it is in part, for example, when it attributes phenomena like eclipses of the sun or of the moon to such causes; but there is more than this in mythology. Myths speak about gods and demons as powers on which man knows himself to be dependent, powers whose favor he needs, powers whose wrath he fears. Myths express the knowledge that man is not master of the world and of his life, that the world within which he lives is full of riddles and mysteries and that human life also is full of riddles and mysteries.

Mythology expresses a certain understanding of human existence. It believes that the world and human life have their ground and their limits in a power which is beyond all that we can calculate or control. Mythology speaks about this power inadequately and insufficiently because it speaks about it as if it were a worldly power. It speaks of gods who represent the power beyond the visible, comprehensible world. It speaks of gods as if they were men and of their actions as human actions, although it conceives of the gods as endowed with superhuman power and of their actions as incalculable, as capable of breaking the normal, ordinary order of events. It may be said that myths give to the transcendent reality an immanent, this-worldly objectivity. Myths give worldly objectivity to that which is unworldly. (In German one would say, "Der Mythos objektivierte das Jenseitige zum Diesseitigen").

All this holds true also of the mythological conceptions found in the Bible. According to mythological thinking, God has his domicile in heaven. What is the meaning of this statement? The meaning is quite clear. In a crude manner it expresses the idea that God is beyond the world, that He is transcendent. The thinking which is not yet capable of forming the abstract idea of transcendence expresses its intention in the category of space; the transcendent God is imagined as being at an immense spatial distance, far above the world: for above this world is the world of the stars, of the light which enlightens and makes glad the life of men.
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When mythological thinking forms the conception of hell, it expresses the idea of the transcendence of evil as the tremendous power which again and again afflicts mankind. The location of hell and of men whom hell has seized is below the earth in darkness, because darkness is tremendous and terrible to men.

These mythological conceptions of heaven and hell are no longer acceptable for modern men since for scientific thinking to speak of "above" and "below" in the universe has lost all meaning, but the idea of the transcendence of God and of evil is still significant.

Another example is the conception of Satan and the evil spirits into whose power men are delivered. This conception rests upon the experience, quite apart from the inexplicable evils arising outside ourselves to which we are exposed, that our own actions are often so puzzling; men are often carried away by their passions and are no longer master of themselves, with the result that inconceivable wickedness breaks forth from them. Again, the conception of Satan as ruler over the world expresses a deep insight, namely, the insight that evil is not only to be found here and there in the world, but that all particular evils make up one single power which in the last analysis grows from the very actions of men, which form an atmosphere, a spiritual tradition, which overwhelms every man. The consequences and effects of our sins become a power dominating us, and we cannot free ourselves from them. Particularly in our day and generation, although we no longer think mythologically, we often speak of demonic powers which rule history, corrupting political and social life. Such language is metaphorical, a figure of speech, but in it is expressed the knowledge, the insight, that the evil for which every man is responsible individually has nevertheless become a power which mysteriously enslaves every member of the human race.