

Barth's critique was to register itself in the development of the Biblical Theology Movement which flourished roughly from 1945 to the mid 1960s. According to James Barr (The Semantics of Biblical Language), the Biblical Theology Movement included the following emphases:

- 1) opposition to the influence of philosophy and philosophical theology;
- 2) opposition to the systematizing tendency of dogmatic theology;
- 3) emphasis on Hebrew thought in contradistinction to Greek thought;
- 4) emphasis on the unity of the Bible; *The problem is that this by necessity makes use of systematizing*
- 5) an approach to Biblical language which concentrated on word studies-- note here especially the production of Kittel's massive Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT);
- 6) emphasis on the distinctiveness of the Bible over against its environment;
- 7) emphasis on divine revelation in history ("salvation history");
- 8) the interrelationship of Biblical study and theological concern.

For an examination of the rise and fall of this movement, see Brevard Childs, Biblical Theology in Crisis (Westminster, 1970).

4. Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976)-- probably the most influential NT scholar of the twentieth century, Bultmann was also a significant theologian and philosopher of religion. Initially he was linked with Barth and Brunner in the early movement of the Dialectical Theology, but subsequently went in quite a different direction.

Bultmann inherited several fundamental ideas from earlier writers which largely determined the shape of his system. Note three in particular:

--from Kaehler he took over the sharp distinction between *Historie* and *Geschichte*. This distinction combines in Bultmann with the development of Form Criticism to produce a general skepticism about the possibility of any knowledge about the historical Jesus.

Christ of Faith → The theological picture of Jesus in the NT was merely the theology of the primitive church, in effect devoid of historical foundation in the actual life of Jesus. Later followers of Bultmann were to draw back from his extreme skepticism. Thus, in 1953, Ernst Käsemann, one of Bultmann's former students, criticized Bultmann in a paper entitled "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." So began the New Quest for the historical Jesus.